

[Shri M. C. Shah]

in the note attached to the Explanatory Memorandum presented to Parliament in May 1952. The difference of Rs. 13 crores was one such change and the reason for it was that a part of the loan wheat expected in 1951-52 actually was received in the year 1952-53.

3. The second difference noticed by him was in the figure under industrial Development for the Budget 1952-53 as shown in the two Explanatory Memoranda mentioned earlier. Here, too the difference was due to the inclusion of a provision of Rs. 25 lakhs for investment in shares of the Machinery Manufacturing Corporation in the final budget for 1952-53, which again was, explained in the note attached to the Explanatory Memorandum presented in May 1952.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Sir, may I ask whether copies will be made available to Members of this House?

Mr. Speaker: If any hon. Member requires a copy, it can be made available, but it is not generally to be given.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: My point was that on a point of order, the Deputy-Speaker ruled that copies of such papers will be sent to particular Members or such members who wanted it.

Mr. Speaker: There is hardly any point of order.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): Sir, on the 10th March, 1954, in one of the supplementaries to Starred Question No. 867, Shri Krishnacharya Joshi desired to have information regarding the total amount of Hali Sicca currency then in circulation in Hyderabad State. In reply, due to some misunderstanding the figures given were for the currency withdrawn and not in circulation. The

actual amounts in circulation on this date are as under:—

Currency Notes (including one rupee notes)	Rs. 12 79 crores.
Coins (including one rupee coins)	Rs. 4 55 crores.
Total Rs. 17 34 crores.	

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PRESS REPORTS ABOUT THE VIEWS OF PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA REGARDING MOROCCO, TUNISIA, PALESTINE AND ISRAEL AT THE ASIAN PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE AT COLOMBO.

Mr. Speaker: Sardar A. S. Saigal to call the attention of the Prime Minister.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Sir, under Rule 215, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

(1) A report published by the *Dawn* of Karachi and broadcast by Pakistan Radio that proposals about Morocco, Tunisia and Palestine were accepted by the Prime Ministers at Colombo at Pakistan's initiative despite opposition from the hon. Prime Minister of India.

(2) American news agency report which alleged that the Prime Minister of India had threatened to tear the Pakistan Prime Minister to pieces at the conference when he raised the Kashmir issue.

(3) The report also says that the Prime Minister of India defended Israel's aggression which has also been circulated in certain countries in the Middle East.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The Press reports

referred to are entirely without foundation. It is a matter of deep regret to me that such extraordinary reports should be given currency. It becomes very difficult to catch up the lies once they have had such a big start. The proceedings of the Conference were, as is well known, confidential and they are not supposed to be broadcast. Occasionally, apparently, some newspapers guess what happened or get some bit of information and build a story upon it. Anyhow, it would be improper for me here or anywhere else in public to discuss the actual proceedings of the Conference, what somebody said and what somebody did not say. Naturally, they were frank and every subject was discussed from many aspects. But, the point is that ultimately agreements were arrived at and a statement embodying the unanimous opinion of the five Prime Ministers present there was issued and the House must have seen that statement. That is the important thing: not the discussions that went before. It is not for me to say or to discuss as to what part India took or whose was the greater initiative. I would say, all the countries took full part in these discussions and all the countries took the initiative at the right times. There is no question of rivalry about these matters in a Conference of this kind, or any attempt by one country to score off another. I would commend to this House and to the country not the unauthorised Press reports, but the statement issued by the Conference itself at the end.

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
(AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the motion for referring the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill to a Joint Committee along with the motion in the name of Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, and the various amendments.

Before we resume the discussion, I should like to invite the attention of the House once again to the important aspect of trying to satisfy the urge

of a large number of Members to speak on such an important Bill. I have been receiving chits and requests. But, it is impossible for me to accommodate all unless those who get up to speak realise that others also should get an opportunity, and not repeat things, but just mention the points of importance without going into the details. One is not very willing to impose any time limit when a legislation is under discussion. But, I think, looking to the desire of a large number of Members to speak and the time at our disposal,—which, by the way, has been extended and as the House knows, we have now 7 hours at our disposal, including the time for the reply of the hon. Home Minister—some restriction may be necessary. I hope the hon. Home Minister will not take much time now. I would request the hon. Members to be short in their speeches and confine themselves to, say, 15 minutes and at the most not exceeding 20 minutes if it be the opinion that they have really to make out good points.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): May I submit, Sir, that the rule that you have laid down now that an hon. Member should restrict his speech to 15 minutes and at the most 20 minutes should apply whenever we discuss any Bill. I think this may be treated as a general rule of discussion.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: The rule will depend upon the exigencies of the situation each time. There cannot be a general rule in matters of this type. Now, Shri N. S. Jain.

Shri N. S. Jain (Bijnor Distt.—South): I am quite alive to the remarks of the Chair. But, I regret to say that if you impose a time-limit of 20 minutes for a Bill covering 600 clauses, I think it would not be possible to an ordinary speaker who is not well-versed in condensing his remarks and his ideas to a shorter time. So, I may be excused if I transcend a little the time-limit that you have suggested.