

16-32½

केसेज मेरे देखने में आये जिनमें किसानों ने अनियमित टैक्सेशन के खिलाफ टैक्स कलेक्टर के यहां अपील की तो फैसला हुआ कि सरकार सारी तम्बाकू को वापस ले ले। साल भर से फैसला हुआ पड़ा है लेकिन वह लोग वापस नहीं लेते हैं इसलिये कि तम्बाकू की पैदावार की मिकदार कम है लेकिन टैक्स वापसी का रुपया ज्यादा है। इस तरह के मैं पचासों केसेज बतला सकता हूं। वहां पर कि गरीबों पर एक्साइज इयूटी के नाम पर गलत तरीके से टैक्सेशन हो रहा है और इसका असर गरीब जनता पर गलत तरीके से पड़ रहा है। मैं चाहता हूं कि सरकार इस और ध्यान दे। अगर आप मांगेंगे तो मैं सौ पचास केसेज आप को दे सकता हूं।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : मांगने की क्या जरूरत है, अगर आप को कुछ करवाना है तो देना चाहिये।

श्री गणपति राम : जी हां, मैं दूंगा आप को।

16.32 hrs.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

**Mr. Speaker:** Before I call upon the Finance Minister, may I make an announcement to the House?

I have received the following message dated the 21st March, 1962, from the President:—

"I have received with great satisfaction the expression of thanks by the Members of the Lok Sabha for the Address I delivered to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 12th March, 1962."

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL  
DISCUSSION—contd.

**The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai):** Generally, in the general debate on the Budget, every subject is relevant. The presentation of this Budget has only a limited purpose, because the regular Budget will be presented before the new Parliament next month, and therefore, we have seen that the debate has also taken a limited shape.

But, as we have come out just from the elections, elections also have occupied a large part of the time during this debate as also in the debate on the President's Address. I do not want to take the time of the House in referring to the elections or to the various criticisms made as regards elections because the Prime Minister has dealt with this subject fully in the course of his reply to the debate on the President's Address, and I do not think that anything new has been said or requires to be said in that connection.

But I might mention one thing as regards the criticism that the functioning of Government has not been very satisfactory and that there is great discontent among the people all around. The elections have shown that in spite of a concerted effort to run down the Government in every place, in all sorts of ways, not depending upon facts but depending more on fables and caricatures and all that, the party which runs this Government has got a majority, and, therefore, the people have on the whole accepted that the criticism is not correct substantially. I cannot say that the criticism is not correct at all or that there is no truth in it, but on the whole that criticism has not been accepted by the people.

It is not possible for me at this stage to speak anything about the

## Discussion

method of taxation, whether indirect or direct, because there are no taxation proposals involved in the Budget which I have presented to the House; and if I try to say anything on it, it is possible that something may be concluded from whatever I say and all sorts of inferences may be drawn which may be highly dangerous. It is, therefore, that I would prefer not to refer to this particular criticism about direct and indirect taxation, or whether we are overtaxed or whether we are undertaxed or whether the taxation is proper or not proper in certain items. I think that that is a subject which can be dealt with more appropriately when the regular Budget is presented to the new Parliament next month.

In this connection, I would, however, like to clarify one matter which was pointed out by a few hon. Members. They repeated the charge of under-estimation of revenue and over-estimation of expenditure as a deliberate attempt on the part of the Finance Minister to justify his taxation measures.

I have said in the previous years also in this connection, that we are trying to take as much care as is possible to make correct estimates, both about revenue and about expenditure. But the subject is such that a very precise estimate either of revenue or of expenditure is not really possible, and yet we try to improve upon it from year to year.

Revenue depends upon several factors, as I said before, and it will continue to depend on several factors. Moreover, when new taxation is levied, it is not possible to collect all the facts which will give a precise estimate of the new measures of taxation when they are brought into force, because if any attempt is made to collect all facts before levying new taxation, everybody will know or will be able to surmise what new taxation is going to come in and that would be disastrous for the Finance Minister to do.

Therefore, generally, one has to depend on facts which are immediately available in these matters, in the new items of taxation, and it so happens that the estimates do not prove completely accurate. But I hope that it will be granted that it is not expected that the Finance Minister should over-estimate the revenue and under-estimate the expenditure. If at all, it is necessary for him to see that he is conservative in these estimates, so that the finances of the State do not come to any mishap, and that is the policy followed by this Government from year to year, and it will continue to be followed, I hope, in future years too. I do not think that it is necessary for me to speak at any length on this subject, because this is an item which is annually debated, and the same reasons are given on both sides every year.

I had referred to the question of stabilisation of prices, while I presented the budget estimates this year, and I had referred to the fact that there has been some stability in prices in the last part of 1961. When I said this, I did not mean to suggest that we have now arrived at a stage where there will be complete stability all the while in the future and that there is no need for looking after the stability of prices every month or every year or from year to year. As a matter of fact, while we are developing, it is very necessary to see that we continuously keep a watch on prices every month and from year to year, to see that there is, on the whole, a reasonable stability of prices.

When I referred to this phenomenon which took place during the last few months, I referred to it only to show that whereas in the Second Plan, there was a continuous rise,—and hon. Members and Government were feeling anxious about that trend all the while, as they should be—we have now some hope of seeing that there would be a stability of prices in the future years, if we are sufficiently careful. All this happened because we took certain measures in regard to

[Shri Morarji Desai]

production and also in mopping up some resources which we should have done. This is a process which has to be continued all the time, and I hope there will be full help from the hon. House to Government in this particular matter. But when on one side it is said that prices are high and on the other I find in questions and answers sometimes a suggestion that the minimum price fixed for wheat, is low, what is to be expected if we are going to bring down the prices? Are we going to keep them stable? Is it suggested that we should go on increasing prices of food materials and then keep the stability of prices all around? How is that going to be possible? Therefore, we should have a sense of proportion in this matter and not indulge in contradictions.

My hon. friend, Shri Bal Raj Madhok, has said, that there is any amount of food and cloth in the country and what is required is more purchasing power for the people, that is, there is less purchasing power and there is more food and more cloth. This is a complete contradiction. If there is more food and more cloth in the country and there is less purchasing power, prices ought to come down. Any man of commonsense can see that.

**The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna):** But he belongs to the Jana Sangh.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Therefore, the criticism requires a greater sense of reality. That is all that I want to say.

Whereas wholesale prices showed a slight decline over the past year, the all-India consumer price index continued to increase till August 1961. But this happens because the whole prices have not an immediate effect on consumer prices. Even now, the consumer prices have not gone down, though the wholesale prices went down during the last six months a little. And in January, the wholesale prices increased by a point, and

yet the consumer prices have remained the same. Therefore, this cost of variation between the wholesale prices and consumer prices remains because the reaction does not take place immediately either on the plus side or on the minus side. But on the whole, we have got to see that there is a relative stability of prices maintained if we are to carry on our development in a proper, calculated manner and with effect. That is what we are seeking to do in all the steps that we are taking.

It has also been suggested that when we referred to exports in the estimates that were presented, the export outlook is not very rosy or that it will not be wise to expect to fulfil the export target which is fixed in the Third Five Year Plan. I know that the task is difficult, and yet we have got to perform that task successfully. I hope we are doing so. There has been an increase in the exports this year and the steps we are taking from time to time will, I hope, enable us to fulfil the target for export in the future years also, in the remaining period of the Third Five Year Plan.

In this connection, we have got to see that we produce more, that we keep our prices also at a competitive level and keep our consumption low so that all the production is not utilised in the country itself; we have to see that we have proper savings also so that our plans go ahead. All these things are necessary if we are to push our exports forward and realise full satisfaction from our export drive. That also requires co-operation from all sections. I am sure that that co-operation will be forthcoming.

There was again the general criticism, which is there every time in regard to the budget, about lack of economy in expenditure. One hon. Member, I believe the hon. Member, Shri Braj Raj Singh, suggested that if we effected economies in our expenditure, we would be able to economise

## Discussion

to such an extent that more than Rs. 63 crores would be saved and there would be no necessity for having any new taxation. I do not see how he has come to that conclusion. If what he has said is true, then it will only mean that we are absolutely blind to the question of proper utilisation of our resources, that we are extravagant in our expenditures and also in our estimates and that we waste money. It has been said that there is a lot of wastage. One hon. Member, while referring to corruption, went so far as to say that there is corruptions not only at the lower level but also in ministerial ranks, barring a few honourable exceptions. Every hon. Member in this House has full liberty to say what he likes. But I do not think it would be proper for anybody to make such an extravagant and violent allegation in such a sweeping manner. I have no doubt in my mind that this allegation is completely false. In the higher ranks of the services there never was the integrity which is found today in this country at any time before. They have got a greater sense of responsibility and a greater sense of integrity than is found anywhere else. And yet if people make such sweeping accusations, it will be difficult to bring in morality in this country.

We all talk of morality and insist on raising morality in this country. But we cannot bring in morality and a moral tone if we continuously condemn ourselves and condemn others whom we should not condemn. I can understand a person condemning himself. I can understand myself condemning myself; that is a good way of being moral. But to condemn others, to say that one is better than the others is, I think, just the contrary path, contrary to bringing in morality in the country. Therefore, I plead with my hon. friends who said this that they ought to have more consideration in this matter if they care for the moral uplift of our people.

When it is said that there is greater corruption in this country today, it is

forgotten that this is a result of what happened during the last war. During the last war, the then Government was very nervous on account of the Quit-India Movement and was afraid that the services might give up their jobs and might join the nationalist ranks. Therefore, they wanted that the services should remain satisfied, and gave them full scope, full latitude. And there was competition between the services and the businessmen to reap as much benefit as possible from the huge war effort which was going on at that time. As Congressmen were behind bars at the time they were not there at all, to do anything to start this corrupting process. There was complete freedom for corruption in those days. There was temptation also which was terrific.

I can just give an instance of how it happened in one particular case where a friend of mine was concerned.

A friend of mine knew one of the officers who was giving contracts for pegs for tents. And, as he happened to be a friend, he asked him, 'Why don't you put in a tender?' He said, 'I am prepared to put in a tender'; and he put in a tender for pegs—about 2 million pegs for tents. He had put down the tender at 4 annas a peg. But the officer told him, 'You put in Re. 1/4 a peg'. My friend had a greater sense of conscience and he refused to do so. Another man put in the tender, and you know what must have happened. This is what happened in those days. Bridges were built where there were no bridges; then, they were demolished; and money was spent on both sides. Many things happened during the war as is inevitable in war time, and especially in a country like this where there was a foreign power ruling the country. Those things are pursuing us today. As a matter of fact, we are getting out of it faster than people imagine. I think if we have a proper sense of proportion, and if we pool our efforts together instead of making allegations against all and sundry, I have no doubt that we will be able to

[Shri Morarji Desai]

root out corruption to the extent possible in society. But, for that it is necessary that we should have a proper sense of proportion. We should point out instances and not make wild allegations and make generalisation from knowing one instance here or there.

I do not say, therefore, that there is no corruption. There is corruption; but it is not in the higher ranks; it is in the lower ranks where the temptation become very great and some people want to encourage it for their own purposes. This can be removed if there is a concerted attempt on the part of both Government and of those who serve the people and also the people themselves. Government has been trying to find out cases and to punish them; and these cases of punishment are published in newspapers from time to time as will be seen by all hon. Members. It cannot, therefore, be said that Government is not at all particular about this matter. As a matter of fact, Government is very keen to see that there is complete integrity established at all levels of Government; and will welcome all help from all sections of the people and from all hon. Members to root out corruption from administration and from society.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali):** What do the reports of the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee bring out? These are reports of Parliamentary committees and they are submitted here and they bring out the very bad cases.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** What about the Audit Reports?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** It would not be proper for me to speak of them on this occasion. If there is any particular report then I can speak about it. But there are also explanations given about many of these things. The explanations are never attended to; and it is only the first criticism

which is just mentioned. That also happened in other cases. I do not say, therefore, that there would not be any case where moneys may not have been mis-spent. There would be cases like that; but out of a total expenditure of how much, how much is found out: that is what ought to be seen. If we say that there will be no case of misuse of money at any time in Government, I think, that day is not going to be seen at any time in the world. But we can only minimise it; and that is what we are trying to do. And that is where all help is asked for.

If we look into cases with a microscope then, certainly, anything will look very big. But, if we look with the ordinary eyes, then, we will be able to apply proper ordinary remedies which are available to human society. That is what all the time I am trying to say. I do not want to say that there has been no misuse at all. I certainly say that there has been misuse. But people have been punished also. Because, in some cases people have retired and something is found out afterwards nothing can be done. Therefore, there are certain instances where there are no remedies.

It was also said that if there is more economy in the administrative expenditure we would have very large savings. We are trying to save as much as we can in all the expenditure that is incurred by Government. We have also examined the estimates of buildings and of the various other projects and especially the building part. There was a committee for this purpose and it is constantly working at it. They have suggested various improvements in estimates and in the use of materials. We have saved lakhs and lakhs by applying those suggestions. We are not, therefore, sitting silent over it nor are we taking up this matter lightly. We are constantly examining this and trying to save as much as we can do. As I said last year, we have put an embargo on re-

## Discussion

cruitment of new personnel and no extra hand can be engaged outside the Plan by any Ministry without taking the approval of the Finance Minister and the Home Minister. Both of them are supposed to go personally into each proposal and I may assure the hon. Members that both of us go into it very carefully and do not allow any new hand to be taken unless it is absolutely necessary.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** Both of you are gentlemanly.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Not only that. In case our gentlemanliness makes us soft, we are also trying to utilise the Special Reorganisation Unit to go into the items themselves and to tell us whether this is justified or not.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** We have far greater confidence in you than in that organisation.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** We stop people from recruiting the staff and we have saved a few lakhs every year in this way. That unit is also going from Ministry to Ministry, from office to office re-organising everything and trying to limit personnel that way. But I hope that it will be accepted that it is not the function of Government to economise by any means; we have got to make economy and safeguard efficiency. Both the things have got to be done. It is true that the larger the staff, the less the efficiency; there should not be larger staff than necessary. But the converse cannot be true. It is not as if the lesser the staff, the greater the efficiency. It depends upon the work that is done. We are also changing the methods of work so that less staff is required; that requires proper examination. It is with that purpose in view that we have set up the special reorganisation unit which is training officers in the various Ministries and we will go on constantly looking into these problems and applying these methods from time to time. We are attacking the problem from two sides: we try to see that unnecessary work is removed and that

the personnel that is employed had proper work to do so that there is no extra staff employed. We are vigilant on both these fronts.

17 hrs.

My hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is not here just now and he will not be here in the next Parliament. He mentioned here for the last time several points which he had mentioned before also and wanted me to look at them. I had told him about the Joint Hindu family about which he has made his point. I had written to him a letter explaining to him what I think about it and why I think there is no injustice in the matter to which he referred. I do not think that there is any injustice in this matter. As a matter of fact, this particular thing was looked into earlier also by the Taxation Enquiry Commission and by some other bodies also, and they also came to the conclusion that there is no injustice to the Hindu undivided family. As a matter of fact, the Hindu undivided family now is only in sentiment; in actual practice, most of them are divided but take full advantage of the Hindu undivided family laws. That also is true. If at all any exemption is required, in my view, the exemption is required in the other direction and not in the direction in which my hon. friend is always pointing out, while mentioning the difficulties which he is experiencing.

He also referred to the question of prohibition. That also is there with Government, and Government is trying to make it more and more effective and also to persuade the various State Governments which are concerned with it, to see that they prosecute this policy with greater energy. But ultimately it is for the State Governments to tackle these problems and for the Central Government to help them to the best of its capacity, and that is what we are trying to do.

The hon. Member also referred to the question of cattle breeding and increasing the milk production in the

[Shri Morarji Desai]

country. It is a curious thing that we have the largest cattle population in this country—one-fifth of the total population in the world—and yet, we have the smallest milk production, probably, compared to the cattle wealth. We are therefore paying more and more attention to this problem of breeding better cattle and especially cows. Against an expenditure of Rs. 16 crores in the first Plan, and Rs. 33 crores in the second Plan, we have provided Rs. 91 crores for animal husbandry and dairy products in the third Plan. This will show that Government is quite conscious of the necessity of making larger and larger efforts in this direction not only for the sake of milk but also for the sake of better agriculture in this country.

Then, I would only refer to the question of the third Finance Commission's recommendations which were taken up by my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. He was critical of the decision taken by the Government to reject the majority recommendation of the Commission for including 75 per cent of the revenue component of the States' plans in its scheme of devolution. In his view, the reasons explained by the Finance Commission for its proposal were sound and the States did not get proper consideration at the stage of their annual discussions of their plans with the Planning Commission. The reasons which have not made it possible for the Government to accept this part of the recommendations of the Finance Commission have been set out in detail in the Explanatory Memorandum circulated with the report. These reasons have also been communicated to the State Governments. For the benefit of Shri Harish Chandra Mathur and also for other Members, who may be sharing his views, I would briefly reiterate them.

As the hon. Members are aware, the Finance Commission is appointed under

Article 280 of the Constitution for recommending the distribution between the Union and the States of the net proceeds of taxes and duties which are to be, or may be, divided between them and the allocation between the States of the respective shares and the principles which should govern the grants-in-aid of the revenues of the States. The Finance Commission is thus concerned only with the assessment of the revenue gaps of the State Governments and for suggesting the assistance to be provided by the Centre for filling that gap. On the other hand, the Central assistance towards the State plans is made available to them both on revenue as well as on capital account. In its terms of reference, the Commission was required to make its recommendations for the payment of grants-in-aid having regard, among other considerations, to the requirements of the third Five Year Plan and the efforts to be made by the States to raise the additional revenues from sources available to them. These terms were exactly similar to those of the second Commission and were merely intended to emphasise that the Finance Commission in assessing the revenue gaps of the States should also take into account the revenue grants which the Plan assumes the States would receive from the Centre for financing the Plan and the additional taxation which the States were expected to raise as part of the resources for the Plan. It was never intended that the Commission should review and cover in its recommendations any part of the Plan assistance which the Centre had agreed to provide to the States. The Plan assistance, both on revenue and capital account, has necessarily to be treated as an integrated scheme and there was no point in covering a part of the Plan assistance on revenue account as a statutory grant to the States under the Finance Commission's award, leaving the rest of the assistance to be made available through the processes of annual reviews by the Planning Commission. There was no real

advantage to the States in this dual process.

The Plan, which this House has already approved, contains sufficient assurance to the States that given the necessary effort on their part to mobilise the resources expected of them and subject to an assessment of the overall financial and economic situation, the central assistance to the extent agreed will be made available to the States through annual plans. Non-acceptance of the Finance Commission's recommendations, therefore, does not affect in any way the totality of the central assistance to the States for the Plan. On the other hand, there are considerable advantages in continuing the work on the basis of annual plans and yearly review of the financial resources of the Centre and the States. This procedure also enables the observance of proper priorities from the overall national point of view.

I may add that the Commission itself in para. 72 of its report has stated that the Plan grants recommended by it may have to be reviewed from year to year by Parliament or by the President under article 275 of the Constitution. As such, there is hardly any merit in the Commission's proposal and the Government should consider that the position should appropriately be left to be governed under the more flexible arrangement of annual review by the Planning Commission in consultation with the State Governments, as at present. Government, however, are in full sympathy with the view that the States should have the maximum possible freedom within the framework of their annual plans for making suitable adjustments in the utilisation of the assistance made available to them. During the last few years, a great deal has already been done to introduce flexibility in the administration of Plan assistance. It is also proposed to review these arrangements further and where possible make them more flexible.

#### Discussion

While on this subject, I may also refer to the suggestion made for the restoration of the shortfall in the central assistance to Jammu and Kashmir State under the recommendations of the third Finance Commission. It is, however, necessary to remember that the task of determining what would be the fair share for each State is precisely what we entrust to an independent high-powered body like the Finance Commission and it has been the practice—a healthy practice—to accept the Commission's recommendations on this point. The Central Government does not and should not as a rule make any changes in the shares of individual States. The Commission's recommendations are made after a very careful assessment of the resources of each State and its needs.

The Commission does not give any detailed reasons for its recommendations nor are we expected to go behind them. Any attempt on our part to modify the individual shares would mean a reopening of the entire scheme of devolution and in fact defeat the very object of setting up an independent Commission. But I might add also that we have always been careful to see that all the States, as also the Jammu and Kashmir State, are helped to the maximum of our capacity and consistently with the efforts that they make for the development of the States. That is what we are trying to do, we will continue to do that, and that is what I have also assured the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir State.

Then again, a very impassioned plea was made to me about looking after Jammu and Kashmir State far more liberally than what is being done today. I hope it is not argued that we are not dealing with the Jammu and Kashmir State as liberally as we should do. Doing anything more liberally to that State would be doing injustice to the other States. After all, we have got to be careful in all these matters and hon. Members of Parliament have got an



[Shri Morarji Desai]

equal duty to all States, and not only to one State. If we do not bear that in mind, we might get into difficulties and my task will become much more difficult. Therefore, I will plead that in this matter it must be borne in mind that what the States have got to do must be done by them.

**Shri Tyagi:** What is the hitch in the mind of the Government in bringing Jammu and Kashmir State on par constitutionally with the other States after the integration is over?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** It is still in the United Nations.

**Shri Tyagi:** After integration, what is the difficulty?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** It is pending in the United Nations. Therefore, we do not want to take any hasty steps. Then, what my hon. friend wants is already there for all practical purposes. Then, we have to give full respect to the United Nations and its functioning. We have got to have patience in this matter and we should not do anything which would go counter to that. That is one thing which makes it difficult to take a quick decision. But I am quite sure that it will take place in course of time.

Then, some questions were raised about several States, roads and things like that. These are not matters....

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** I have made a reference to the election manifesto of the Congress Party about the construction of roads in the villages. He may at least correct that statement.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I have only contradicted it by saying that it is not possible.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** He said that it is not in the election manifesto.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I did not say that it is not there.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** It is in the record.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Please show me if it is there. I am dealing with what is provided in the Plan, and what is said there shows the hope that it should not be so at the end of the Third Plan, it does not mean that it will be done in the Third Plan, if I have to explain it like that. They are all hopes and they are all goals. That does not mean that money will be provided in the Congress manifesto for doing all these things. How can that be done? That can be done only after careful assessment of all the resources, and that is what the Planning Commission does. The Planning Commission cannot do everything that every election manifesto says. Ultimately, that is the direction in which we go, that is the goal we want to reach as quickly as possible; that is the meaning of it. If my hon. friend is going to interpret thus every word that is said in the election manifesto, I think he will give a bitter weapon in the hands of the opposition. I hope that is not his intention and I think he will be wise enough not to refer to these matters. That is all I can plead with him. We are not very wise ourselves; that I know. Therefore, I cannot tell him that he should be wiser. I should be wiser; that is what I can say.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvella):** We have no illusions about your manifesto.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I know we have no illusions about them. That is also equally true. At any rate, they have no illusions about their election propaganda; that we know. Therefore, we have no illusions about each other. That is a very good thing which will lead to healthy and sound understanding. Whatever it may be, it is a good thing ultimately. Therefore, they should thank us that we leave no illusions to them about this.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there not many instances where they have supported the Congress manifesto?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Yes, where that suits them. They are not restricted by any consideration whereas we are restricted by the principles in which we believe. They believe that everything that serves their purpose is good. Therefore, they can utilise every person, they can utilise every company, we cannot utilise every company. That is our difficulty, and that is the difference between us. But that difference gives us strength and gives them weakness. That is all what I have got to say. I will certainly maintain my methods; let them maintain their methods and, I have no doubt, they will not prosper. I have no doubt on that score.

I do not think it is necessary for me to take any more time of this House in this matter. After all, it has a limited purpose of taking a vote on account for three months.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** May I know whether any decision has been taken on the question of the payment of dearness allowance which he has promised?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** The Government will not get out of their promises whatever promises the Government have made. Therefore, the Government have got carefully to consider all these matters. I cannot declare offhand on the floor of the House anything unless a decision is taken.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I did not want him to declare. I only wanted him to say that the figures quoted by him and by us justify at least a reconsideration of the dearness allowance.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** The hon. Member need not be very anxious to make his propaganda in this matter.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** No propaganda. All propaganda I have done.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Hon. Members have only the right to express their views and leave it to the Government.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** No propaganda after election . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Why did he rise again and again? He is transgressing the rules of debate in this House. The last word is the hon. Minister's. Afterwards, why should he get up? He did not get up and ask me. I did not permit him to put the question. He shot up the question and he got an answer. He must be satisfied with that.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I said . . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** How can I prevent him when he goes on speaking?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I always obey you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hereafter, let him do so.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I have been doing so.

17-16 hrs.

#### DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT, 1962-63

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall now take up the Demands for Grants On Account.

#### DEMAND NO. 1—MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,60,000 be granted to the President, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1963, in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry'."