

APPROPRIATION (NO. 3) BILL

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

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54, be taken into consideration."

I have received notice of a number of points from the leaders of various groups. Hon. Members are aware that the scope of discussion on the Appropriation Bill was elaborately discussed on the floor of the House last year and it was held that it was intended to give an opportunity to groups to place before the House certain very important points and elicit any remarks or explanations from the Government. These should be points which have not been touched upon during the Budget debates, but which are of very great importance, to which the pointed attention of Government ought to be drawn. With this end in view, I suggested to leaders of various groups to send me such points, so that I may communicate them to the Ministers concerned, and they may be able to explain the position. When I made that suggestion, I naturally expected only particular subjects to be given on behalf of particular groups. I now find that individual Members also have sent in points, and apart from the points which I received yesterday and which have been circulated to hon. Members, there is a very large number of other points here. I consider that the points which I got before sufficiently of importance and notice of them has also been given to the Ministers concerned. They will suffice, I think. The others I have subsequently received are legion and run into two pages. When I made my suggestion, it was not the intention that so many points may be brought up.

I would also point out that this is the second reading and then there will be the third reading. These points may be stressed in the third reading stage. I would like to know how many Ministers would be participating and

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

how many minutes each would like to take, taking only the points that were circulated yesterday to be the subject matter of discussion. The other points need not be taken up, because we have not got much time. Half an hour before seven o'clock I will apply closure to the discussion.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): May I point out that the understanding yesterday was that points may be submitted to you up to 11.30 this morning?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: True. I thought that unattached Members would send in one or two subjects and the groups may confine themselves to particular points. I suggest that the National Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the Praja Socialist Party and Independents may have one subject each and the Unattached Members may have one subject, thus making up a total of five subjects for discussion. Let us therefore settle the subjects. The Acting Leader of the Communist Party has given notice of the following point:

"Provision in the Budget for payment of Rs. 10,20,000 to the U.K. Government towards expenses of the Commonwealth Relations Office, and the absence of any arrangement for associating the House with the conduct of our relations with the Commonwealth."

That is one subject. Now, let me enquire from the Praja Socialist Party what is the particular point that they want to discuss.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): Under the Ministry of Production, we would like to discuss the working of the machine tool factory and also, the working of the organizations under the Ministry of Production.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is too vague. There are various organisations under the Ministry of Production.

Shri Damodara Menon: I have given the name separately also. The intention is to discuss Demand No. 83 relating to the Coal Commissioner's organisation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That settles it. The following will be the subject that will stand to the credit of the Praja Socialist Party:

"Discussion of the Coal Commissioner's organisation."

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Now, is there any spokesman for the National Democratic Party? What is the subject that they will confine themselves to?

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): We have given a list. Under the Production Ministry, we would like to discuss the iron and steel factory, and the machinery for....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only one subject.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: But we have mentioned in the notice about our desire to discuss the machinery for management of State industrial concerns.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The proposed iron and steel factory will be the subject of the National Democratic Party, but there is a small doubt relating to it. If cut motions had been already tabled on this very subject and negatived, it cannot form the subject matter of discussion again during the Appropriation Bill.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: But the Ministry of Production was not discussed and the cut motion was moved on a wrong Demand. This is the correct Ministry under which it should be taken up, and that Ministry was not discussed at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But I find from the proceedings that a cut motion was moved that the demand under the head Capital Outlay—Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Demand No. 110) be reduced by Rs. 100 (to discuss the vacillating policy regarding the setting up of the iron and steel factory.) That cut motion was negatived. Whether it relates to one Ministry or another, we cannot reopen a matter here which has been previously closed.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: This was not discussed. We had given notice of a cut motion about the provision of Rs. ten lakhs made in Demand No. 133 for the setting up of the iron and steel factory, and that has not been discussed at all.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): The cut motion under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry may have had reference to private enterprise also being allowed to start iron and steel factories.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The difficulty arises out of this, namely, there are

certain cut motions which hon. Members wanted to be put to the vote of the House and they have been negatived. That emphasises all the more the need for great circumspection in the matter of choosing cut motions. Hon. Members wanted to have the chance of moving a number of cut motions and this is the result. Therefore, it is not possible to reopen that matter again.

I think what they actually want to discuss today is the agency for production, meaning evidently whether it should be a corporation, committee, company or some other agency?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: You may say 'management'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very well. 'Management of various factories, under the Production Ministry' will be the subject of the National Democratic Party. What about unattached Members?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I would like to discuss the management of the Machine-tool factory at Ambarnath, notice of which I gave this morning.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): I have a subject for discussion, namely, the urgent necessity of introducing compulsory, free, elementary education throughout India. It has not been properly dealt with under any of the cut motions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid it is too wide a subject to be discussed under the Appropriation Bill.

Shri Pocker Saheb: But it is an important subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Simply because they are unattached, hon. Members cannot bring forward as many subjects as there are unattached Members. I have already spent over ten minutes on this. Except the four subjects which I have read out, I am not going to allow any other subject.

Shri Pocker Saheb: Is the point I mentioned, one of the four subjects?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is beyond the four subjects.

Shri Pocker Saheb: But why is it excluded, I would like to know?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Because under the Appropriation Bill only specific subjects of general importance, which are given by groups or individuals, will be taken up for consideration, having regard to the time at the disposal of the House

Shri Pocker Saheb: But is it not an important matter—I would like to know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are many things of importance. Then there is the question of time to be considered. These are the only four subjects which with some advantage can be discussed now.

Shri Pocker Saheb rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not going to allow any further discussion. I will allow only four subjects, which I have read out. If any hon. Member has any subject for discussion he can bring it during the Finance Bill. We cannot have all the subjects. It may be important, but there is no time for it.

Shri P. T. Chacko (Meenachil): What about notices given by some of the Congress Members, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the Appropriation Bill is concerned, this is an opportunity for the Opposition. The Congress Members are represented by the hon. the Finance Minister.

Shri P. T. Chacko: We have also a right to represent certain things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They have a right to rule this country. Prof. Hiren Mukerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I propose, in pursuance of your ruling, Sir....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Having regard to the fact that we have taken fifteen minutes already, we will close this at a quarter past seven.

Shri R. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Distt): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to the point of order. Is the point of order to my standing?

When will the hon. Minister like to reply? Four subjects have been brought forward for discussion. Each hon. Member will have fifteen minutes. Will the hon. Finance Minister himself reply, or does any other Minister want to intervene?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It would do if you give half an hour to all of us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then we may be able to close at seven.

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री (जिला आज़म-गढ़-पूर्व व जिला बलिया—पश्चिम) :हर

सब्जेक्ट पर अपोजीशन के लोगों को ही बोलने का अख्यार है या हम लोगों को भी है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, नहीं, सब लोगों को अख्यार है ।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मेरा प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर यह है कि जितने ह्म मैजारिटी पार्टी के लोग बैठे हुए हैं उन को बोलने का, अपने श्रीवान्सेज को बताने का अपनी कांस्टिटुएन्सी को रिप्रेजेंट करने का क्या कोई अख्यार नहीं है, जब कि अपोजीशन के मेम्बरो को पूरा अख्यार दिया जाता है कि वह जितना प्रोपोजेन्डा चाहें करें और जितना देश का सत्यानाश करना चाहें करें ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not going merely to call these four gentlemen. Others also will have a right to reply. As a matter of fact they have to justify what has been done.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं तो अपने राइट के मुतालिक बोल रहा हूँ ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These are the only four subjects which will be discussed now.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): I would like to change our subject to election laws.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the Government been apprised of it?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We have given notice of it in time.

✓ **Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central):** It is such a popular subject that the Minister does not want any notice.

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I got notice of it at half past three: but I do not mind.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In place of agency for management of various industries, 'Election Laws' will be the subject.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, in pursuance of your ruling, I confine myself to the question of the provision in the Budget for the payment of Rs. 20,20,000 to the Government of the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

United Kingdom towards expenses of an organisation called the "Commonwealth Relations Office" and also to the absence of any provision for securing some sort of real association of this House with at least the general conduct of our relations with the Commonwealth. I find that there is already a provision in our Budget for Rs. 52·08 lakhs are expenditure on the Office of the High Commissioner in London. This additional sum of over Rs. ten lakhs is being expended and is being handed over, as far as I can make out to the United Kingdom towards expenses of the Commonwealth Relations Office. We would like very much to know what exactly is done and why this sum is given over to the British Government for expenses in connection with that office.

This naturally brings us back to the question of our relation with the Commonwealth. This is a hardly 'monthly'—I should say, from the way it comes up over and over again in this House. But the trouble is we have to bring up this point because it is a continuing sore in our body politic. I do not wish to tire the House with quotations from speeches made by the Prime Minister or things which he wrote some time ago. He might say—I am sorry he is not here—that consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds. He has every right to change his views. He may at one time have said all kinds of nasty things about the Commonwealth, but he has a right to change his views in regard to that. I quite concede that might be his position.

But what I do not understand is: did we curse the British Empire with bell, book and candle for purely sentimental reasons or were there very much more behind our attack on the British Commonwealth. While a foolish consistency might be the characteristic of very little minds, actually we have to find out whether consistency in this regard is in conformity with the patriotic interests of our country or not. There I say that our Government has begun to weave a very tangled web because it has already practised some sort of deceit—I should say—upon the patriotic instincts of our people. Let us assume for a moment that we are in the Commonwealth because as a business proposition, as a practical proposition we have found that it is right for us, that it is proper for us and that it is consistent with our self-respect for us to be in the Commonwealth. But what exactly do we get out of it? We surely are not

in the Commonwealth, we are not spending so much money for our High Commissioner's Office as well as for the Commonwealth Relations Office, we are not there for the good of our souls; we are getting something in return for it. And what exactly is that?

As far as I could find out—apart from what everybody knows, namely the reality of our economic affiliation with the Commonwealth—occasionally Commonwealth Conferences are held. There was a conference last November where the hon. the Finance Minister went. Now, I remember very well how, when the Prime Minister made a statement regarding the visit of the Finance Minister to the Commonwealth Conference, on that occasion—it was on the 19th of November, 1952—the first man to jump up in this House was the Father of the House, Mr. B. Das. It was not one of ourselves. But Mr. B. Das got up to say that we should have a discussion as to whether we should at all participate in the Commonwealth Conference or not. That was the kind of reaction which he had: why should we go to this sort of Commonwealth Conference? And then again, all sorts of very vague, generalised statements were made to us regarding the virtues of this Commonwealth Conference and after the return of the Finance Minister a communiqué was issued. Now, as far as this communiqué is concerned we can hardly make head or tail out of it. Actually, knowing the Finance Minister as we all do, I was reminded of a person, whose name comes to my mind very much when I come to this House, Lewis Carroll, and of his poems "Through the Looking Glass," and I thought this was perhaps the kind of thing happening in the Commonwealth Conference:

"The Time has come", the Walrus said,

"To talk of many things:

Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—

Of cabbages—and Kings—

And why the sea is boiling hot—

And whether pigs have wings'."

Possibly this is the kind of discussion which the Finance Minister on behalf of the Prime Minister had at the Commonwealth Conference. We could not make head or tail out of it. And I tried to sort of educate myself in regard to these very technical matters and I looked up some profes-

sional, technical, economic journals where also we find that they came to the conclusion that in the Commonwealth communiqué issued by the Finance Minister that were platitudes like "the aim of concerting measures for increasing the economic strength of the Commonwealth or the promotion of the expansion of world production and trade". This is the kind of very vague and generalised formulation given to us.

But actually what do we know? We know some very definite, concrete, objective facts regarding the results of our association with the Commonwealth, regarding the implications which impinge on our life from day to day of our being in the Commonwealth. That is the domination of British imperialism over our economy which has expressed itself in so many various ways. We know that British capital directly controls some of our major industries. It makes enormous profits and exports them out of the country. These, together with the profits which are earned by British banks, insurance companies and shipping companies enable Britain to exercise over our economy a sort of dominating influence. Britain has a sort of lien over our foreign trade. Britain has deciding voice: with whom and how much we shall trade. There are powerful foreign exchange banks, for example, who rule the roost, who make us depend upon not only the British Commonwealth but the United States of America for the disposal of our produce. And we are forcibly linked with the crisis-ridden war economies of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. We are compelled to seek the narrowing markets within the confines of the Commonwealth and dollar areas, and we are prevented from seeking profitable trade and exchange with countries like People's China. I say, in spite of the accusation that we repeat the same things, that we are really deeply interested in expanding our trade with all countries—Britain and the United States of America included. But what we object to is that practically we are confined to obey the behests of Great Britain. We are not allowed to carry on trade with countries with whom we have had intimate commercial trade relations in the past and with whom we can trade with national honour.

I say this with very great confidence, particularly because we find

what happens on account of the overweening influence of the British Commonwealth upon those who are associated with it. I find that *Reuter* reported from London on the 23rd March that Britain was consulting—it was routine consultation according to the Under Secretary for Commonwealth Relations in the Government of Great Britain—that Britain was consulting India, Pakistan, Ceylon and other Governments about her recent decision to tighten restrictions on British shipping which had trading with Chinese ports. Along with this there was another note in the same day's papers that Ceylon, under pressure from the Commonwealth, had to ban transshipment of rubber and other strategic materials through Colombo to China. We all know that Ceylon and China have entered into a mutually advantageous commercial deal for the exchange of rice for rubber. Possibly here is an attempt to sabotage that deal by means of this thin end of the wedge—which is not very thin at all—and this decision is imposed on Ceylon when Ceylon had to ban transshipment of rubber and other strategic material through Colombo to China. In regard to this the External Affairs Secretary of the Ceylon Government, Sir Kaithiah Vaithianathan, who had led the Ceylon delegation to China for the trade deal, said this was international thuggery over the free movement of international trade. This kind of thing happens. This is one of the examples of how Commonwealth relations have led us to a kind of a bog.

Why are we in the Commonwealth? What are the advantages we are getting? I shall not go into the whole pattern of our trade because there will be no time for it.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

I wish we do get some opportunity for it so that we may go into the details of it. Because it is more or less clear, for whoever really cares to see, what the position is like. There are certain very basic and inescapable facts. There are under-developed areas, and we include ourselves among them, where there is appalling poverty. Even the ex-Minister of Health of Great Britain, Mr. Aneurin Bevan who came here and was feted like a lord and who tried to go into the countryside was appalled by the poverty he saw, contrasted with the decorated splendour of New Delhi (in spite of its being a desert), and the countryside around it. So under-developed areas are in this condition of absolute and almost hopeless penury.

{Shri H. N. Mukerjee}

We see also that we do not get a kind of advantage out of this Commonwealth connection, which we have a right to expect. Calumny is being perpetrated in Kenya. We cannot do anything about it, it seems. We have not been able to raise our voice. I do not know whether we raised our voice at all in the Commonwealth counsels. We cannot do it. There is at present in Delhi, I expect, a representative of the Kenya Freedom Movement who, I am sure, is trying to do what he can to secure assistance from our own proud national movement. But so far as our own association with the Commonwealth is concerned, we cannot get a thing. In regard to South Africa we have not been able to do very much at all. In regard to Ceylon we are in trouble. Pakistan is a Member of the Commonwealth. We are a Member of the Commonwealth. In regard to Pakistan we do not get any assistance from the Commonwealth for a solution of all our mutual troubles. On the contrary we find that the U.K. and the U.S.A. are exploiting the Kashmir issue in order to drive a wedge between our countries. They are trying to lure Pakistan into their M.E.D.O. We cannot do very much about it. There is N.A.T.O., there is M.E.D.O., there is A.N.Z.U.S. which are being pushed and boosted in the Commonwealth but we cannot do anything about it. We are roped in. All sorts of undesirable people come into this country and God knows with what commissions—and they do so with impunity because they can exercise whatever influence they have in order to rope us into their own racket. That is exactly what is happening.

This brings me to the last point which I gave notice of, the absence of any kind of effective association of the House with the conduct of Commonwealth relations. Maybe we do not know much about what is going on behind the scenes. I do not have any illusions of what is being done for the good of the country and for the self-respect of our country. I have no illusions about it. But we ought to know generally how the Commonwealth relations are being conducted. In regard to this, last year this question came up over the issue of the abolition of the Standing Committees of the House and on that occasion, the Prime Minister made a speech in which he said that he was very willing to have suggestions from non-Members in the Opposition as well as hon. Members in the Government party. He was very willing to secure

more co-operation in the working of Government. He said, of course, that he was not in favour of the idea of reviving the old system of Standing Committees. He said again that the Standing Committees, in any case, had no access to secret information. Really, there was no harm done if Members of the House do get an opportunity of how certain aspects of administration are conducted. Last time he opposed the idea of the revival of the Standing Committees but he said that he was prepared to consider any proposal which would bring about a closer association of the House with the actual conduct of the administration. At least the generality of the Members of the House could be taken into confidence in that regard as far as that goes. We know that even in regard to foreign policy, we had only met once in the last twelve months, but we are going to meet the Prime Minister again. I do not know what is exactly in the mind of the Government. At least, in so far as Commonwealth relations are concerned, I am sure the whole House feels very deeply—the Members of the Government party may not say so, the party whip may prevent them. We ought to be able to present to the country an understandable justification of our being in the Commonwealth. As far as we are concerned, we do not see any justification at all. We can say that this Commonwealth is a racket, and for us to be roped into this racket should not be perpetuated. At least we should not be a party to continue as a member of this racket and that is why we say, as far as our relations with the Commonwealth are concerned, surely let us carry on our relations in as friendly a way as possible. I do not object to our spending as much money as is necessary for the High Commissioner's Office but I do not for the life of me understand why we should keep up another organisation. We should resist the maintenance of a Commonwealth Relations Office. Why should we pay as much as Rs. 10,20,000? It is not a matter merely in regard to the expenditure involved. Also some very deep and basic matters of principle are concerned. That is why I brought it up in connection with the discussion of the Appropriation Bill.

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): The Ministry of Production deserves some mention. It is a Ministry which is now nine months old after the re-organisation of certain adjustments. Whether it has got a right to continue

or whether it is necessary or whether the Supply Ministry, this Ministry and some other Departments have to be pooled again, we need not go into all this now; but so far as our present purpose is concerned, this Ministry is sought to be expanded and stabilised for the purpose of expediting the industrialisation of this country. It is of vital importance now. Six items are given for this Ministry, the most important of which is coal. Of course, I do not touch upon the Sindri Factory. It has come into existence, and it has shown some output, and criticism in favour or against is not necessary now.

So far as the coal industry is concerned, it is a very old industry. It is managed and owned by foreign interests and it is high time that it should be nationalised. It seems the opinion of the Government is that getting some strategic positions to control will be sufficient to have an effective utilisation of this industry; but they have not got the mind to state what the strategic control is. Unless that control is stated, we are not in a position to judge whether the ownership and management in the hands of the foreigners will be justifiable. The Government's declaration that their policy in regard to Industries is to have a control over strategic points is an eyewash. This is a basic industry. We are having large quantities of coal in our country, but without our own management and our own control over it. It is a deplorable aspect of our attempt to industrialise this country totally. Already opinions are divided in respect of the private sector and the public sector. Great importance is given to the private sector now, because in the trend of the proceedings of so many Chambers of Commerce meetings and also conferences in which our Government officers and Ministers have participated, the thing is made clear. Eight months before, one industrial magnate demanded in plain words that the Government must frankly come out and state what their intention was in respect of the private enterprise. Though the private enterprise was willing to co-operate with the Government in working out the Plan, unless this understanding was specifically stated, they were not prepared to co-operate. Recently when a Chamber of Commerce had celebrated one of its annual functions the assurance was candidly given that nationalisation—(It was only intended for the platform and election purposes)—will not be implemented. The private sector is thus

made a permanent feature of this economy. The public sector is doing all that is possible to help the private sector. So far as I am able to see, investment of several crores of rupees on one or two items in a public sector does not mean that we are nationalising almost all the basic industries. Now there is no scope for the appearance of socialism, at least in the form. There is no use of talking socialism now. All things are done with a view to bring socialism under the control of this dominant capitalistic system of maintaining private enterprise. It is a deplorable feature in this country that in spite of so much of literature that is existing on behalf of socialism created by the Congress party itself, that socialism is not now so tasteful. There is not going to be nationalisation of many a basic industry in this country, and as a matter of fact it is said that private capital must be allowed to flow into the private sector and thus the country's Five Year Plan must be worked out. You may take into your fold all the capitalists; you may try to canvass all the opposition parties to work with the Congress Party. But, it has entirely lost the confidence of the people without whose co-operation the plan cannot be worked out. Now we are not here to see that the Plan must fall. We want the country to prosper. In all sincerity we say the Plan must come forward but the difficulty is this. In the administration there are people who do not believe in khadi, there are people who do not believe in Gandhism, there are people who do not believe in rural reconstruction, there are people who do not believe in cottage industries, there are the people who talk so much and never think of the poor men dying in miserable conditions throughout the country. When I see all these, the external appearance is polished and seems substantial. But internally, every thing is insincere and deceptive. In this baneful atmosphere, we the representatives of the people are expected to pave the way for a national Welfare State. I think we are defective. This is my conception. I want them to appreciate whether there is any sense in what I say. This seems to be the attitude today. We say we have no money. There is no right earnestness nor sincerity in this utterance. We all worked under Gandhiji. If really you repose confidence in the people and appear to be so, you will simply announce that we want about Rs. 500 crores within two months, you will get it from each poor man. Instead of the token five rupees note which is sent to the Finance Minister

[Shri Vallatharas]

this year to be shown to the Parliament, you will receive hundreds of hundred rupee notes from all quarters which will make up the necessary capital for working the Plan. But as a matter of fact, there is no sincerity behind all these efforts.

In Bangalore, in the Mysore State you have got an industry, i.e. the machine tool industry. What is the progress made? There are, I understand, so many foreign people who are employed in that industry. They have come from distant countries; they are receiving fat salaries; there is no work for them as no work is started. Who is to account for the waste? In Hirakud Dam, sometime before, (we have got on record) that for work to be started in the year 1950 the Government got in advance stocks of all things in 1948 itself costing several crores of rupees which were left in the open without even a clerk to make a list of them. There was no proper record to show receipts or distribution of the stock. There was terrible waste and loss. But, at this late stage, after four years, we have to break our heads as to who should be held responsible for all these things. There are several other matters. As a member of the Public Accounts Committee, I know in how many instances stores worth several lakhs and crores have been wasted and lost without any hope of recovery. Now, in Mysore we have invited so many foreign experts and employed them. Certainly Government should have seen beforehand that as soon as these people arrived, they were put to work. They are sitting idle. What are we going to do with them?

Take the Telephone and Cable factory. Stores are arriving. The plant and machinery that had been ordered are being received. A field office of the factory has been opened at Chittaranjan, at a distance of five miles from the factory site. I have no criticism on this factory except that I only want to tell the Government that the stores which have been received should not be allowed to be stolen away or wasted, and after two or three years, it should not be subjected to any criticism by the Public Accounts Committee, when we will have to ruminate over these things.

As a matter of fact, this Ministry has not got full work. I do not mean

any personal reflection. There are nine items. These could as well have been tackled by the Supply Ministry. It seems there is also a Deputy Minister. Of course, I do not know what both the Minister and the Deputy Minister are doing. As regards the activities of this Ministry also, we have got nine paras in the publication 'Activities of the Ministry', appearing as essays of Hazlitt. Each contains some materials, the omissions being more noticeable there. It says, there are two industries for pig iron. Where they are situated, we are not told. In that way, the information supplied by the Government in regard to various new undertakings and projects had been incomplete and sometimes erroneous.

There is another important matter. The last three years have been years of anxiety, wild and ferocious criticism and misgivings. Now you justify your existence behind the Plan. Either you rise with the Plan or fall with the Plan. We also want to co-operate with the implementation of the Plan whatever might be our differences about so many other things. So far as the Plan is concerned, you say you will do better. We are also hoping that we could do very much. After 25 years, history may record something about our activities. Today, let us have some mutual understanding at least so that good will may prevail. Or else, we will have to roam about in the darkness all over the country.

As conditions exist today, unemployment is the chief problem. To solve unemployment there is no consistent, intelligent policy pursued by the Government during the last three years. One says, handloom industry; another says we have forgotten khadi, or that it has become an antiquated thing; One says, have this industry in Calcutta; another says, have this industry in Madras. What are all these? It is just like diluting asafotida in the Indian ocean. With a population of 35 crores, how are you going to solve this unemployment? In all sincerity, I offer a challenge. You cannot remove unemployment, unless nature is sympathetic to us and pours rain upon the entire South, and West and also upon our own heads so that the heated brains may cool and we may work for the country's happiness.

An Hon. Member: Also on the other side.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): They need floods.

Shri Vallatharas: We Members of Parliament are treated with scant courtesy by the Government. We all come here. I do not know Calcutta; I do not know Chittaranjan; I do not know Hirakud; I do not know Damodar. The Public Accounts Committee sat over the Hirakud Dam project in all earnestness at 45 meetings and produced a report. All do see report. But one day before the presentation of the report, the hon. Minister praised Hirakud to the skies! What is the meaning? I want to ask. We want to see personally every big national industry, either agricultural or regular industries throughout the country. Government must help us with the necessary railway concessions and also some allowance. In Australia, in England, in Japan all the Members are given facilities to travel throughout the country and see how things work. We also must go and see for ourselves. We cannot hear stories from the Ministers and get convinced that what they say is correct or conducive to national safety. Our co-operation with them lies in this fact that we must get certain opportunities to travel throughout the country and see personally at least the most important of these projects. This is the opinion of the majority of the Members of the House. I have heard it from so many Members and I am expressing it.

One thing more, Sir. Mere utterances of high minded sentiments without any effort being made for their application in practice will not enhance the credit of those indulging in it: nor will it, when they happen to run the Government, invest it with stability, dependability and robust worthiness. Timidity is written in the face of each one of the present Government's industrial enterprises.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I would like briefly to draw the attention of this House to the management of the Machine Tool Factory at Ambarnath, near Bombay. It was only on the 13th of January this year, that the Prime Minister formally inaugurated this factory which, the country is told, and we are told, is how coming into production. I want to give one assurance that I am not giving usually to running down institutions. I have before me a certain type of information which I feel the House is entitled to know because I am most anxious that if this information is wrong, it must be set right forthwith. I am glad that my hon. friend Mr.

Tyagi, who had earned the reputation of being a go-getter when he was in the Finance Ministry till recently, would look into this question very early and set matters right, if the information which I place before the House, in all good faith, is proved to be correct.

It was nearly three years ago that the Government of India entered into a contract with a Swiss firm called the Oerlikon Machine Tool Works Limited, Zurich, involving an expenditure of about 22 million Swiss francs, about three crores of rupees. I suppose; I am not sure about the exchange rate at the moment. Under the terms of the contract, this company has to supply 30 Swiss technicians and 500 machines which should be installed in this country in order to manufacture machine tools. I have here particulars of the various types of officers who have been imported into this country by the Swiss firm under the Agreement I have referred to, and I gather that very soon their tenure of office will be renewed and that the contract is being renewed. The reason why I am making reference to these officers of the Swiss company is to ensure that, if they are not properly qualified, if their experience is not sufficient for running this particular factory on efficient lines, they may be sent back and replaced, if necessary, within the terms of the contract, by better people. Here is the record of the Chief Engineer who claims that he has graduated from the GRAZ Technical Institute in Austria and has eight years experience of the type of work, of which, he says, three years as the owner of a Design office. Here are the particulars relating to the Standards Officer. He calls himself a degree holder of the Polytechnic at Vienna and claims to have five or six years' Drafting experience.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): What is the name of the Officer?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: You know the names.

Shri Tyagi: Who is this Officer?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I said, Standards Officer. I am not trying to give the names because it is not my intention at all.

I am asking my hon. friend the Minister to look into these qualifications. Here are three categories of staff employed in the Designs office, in the Workshop, in the Artisan school, etc. I have not particulars here to

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

show that most of these 30 Swiss technicians are hardly 25 years of age: it is something which strikes me as extraordinary, and they have been dumped into this country as experts. I may again give this assurance that I am not making any political speech, or any tendentious speech. I am anxious that this particular Machine Tool Factory, which to my mind is one of the most important of our Precision Instruments factories, which is of vital importance to the Defence Services, should not be managed in this particular manner. I would not weary the House with the terms and conditions of service of these people, but I find their salaries range from Rs. 1,200 to Rs. 2,500, and most of their basic pay is paid in Swiss Francs so that the money goes to Switzerland, and most of these gentlemen are living in India on the allowances given to them which, I gather, works out to Rs. 500 in Indian currency. In contrast to this, there are, I gather, 16 Indian officers, quite a number of them properly trained and equipped, most of them educated abroad, who are made to work under these Swiss technicians on salaries which will put every one of us here in this House to shame by comparison.

With your permission, Sir, I would now like to review as briefly as I can the record of achievement of this particular factory. As I have said, nearly three years are lapsing. Actually, the contract is to be renewed. I gather that after more than two years of labouring, these particular technicians were able to manufacture a 14x20 inches tool grinder which is not a design of their own, which should have been the case under their contract, but copy of a design of another company called the Magerle Tool Grinder. They have made drawings—mark my words,—and only drawings, of a polishing machine.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Polishing machine?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Yes, it is a very technical term....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I know polishing machines.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: ...and a single purpose lathe, etc.

This is their record of achievement—of manufacturing one particular machine tool, and finishing the drawings of three types of machines. In

addition, I am given to understand that this particular band of Swiss technicians were able to copy the prototype of a machine gun with some difficulty. I would like to know from my hon. friend the Defence Minister whether the Defence Ministry has been satisfied with this particular copy of a prototype machine gun, and whether it is of the desired quality and utility.

Having said this, I would like to put a couple of questions to my hon. friend Mr. Tyagi. Will he take this House into confidence and tell us without betraying any secrets of strategic or vital importance, what exactly is the production programme of this company? What do they propose to do? Copy the drawings, copy the machine tools or something else? What will be the output? How many machine tools and prototypes and implements of war, if I may use the word, are going to be manufactured in the factory? What will be the capital cost involved in this transaction? I feel on a Bill like the Appropriation Bill, this House is entitled to information of this character. I may assure him I am not asking for secret information. I am asking for information of a structural type to which this House is entitled.

The second question I would like to raise is this. Has the Defence Minister examined the record of achievement of certain Indian companies like the Investa Machine Tool factory which has been in operation for the past several years, and also Kerloskars, and a number of other companies in India which are manufacturing precision machine tools which make this country proud of their achievement. Instead of getting this white elephant put across here in terms of the amounts of money I have detailed, cannot there be some sort of integration in order to give an opportunity to Indian technicians to take their fulsome part in this particular matter?

One final word and I will sit down, because I find a number of hon. Members are anxious to speak. Who is in charge of this particular Machine Tool Factory at Ambarnath? My information is that the officer directly concerned has the reputation or the experience of having been a teacher of radio engineering at an institute in Bangalore. I want my hon. friend to correct me if I am wrong.

Shri Tyagi: I am sorry I could not hear.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Who are the people who are controlling, in the name of the Defence Ministry, this particular factory at Ambarnath? My information is this, that the officer directly in charge there locally is one who had the experience of having been a teacher of radio engineering at an institute in Bangalore. And he is the man in direct charge of the management of this factory at Ambarnath.

In addition to this, I would like to post another question. I gather that this institution, in terms of management, as far as the Defence Ministry goes, is under the Director-General of Ordnance Factories. He is an I.S.E. officer, but I am given to understand that he is not experienced in this line of producing machine tools or even producing or manufacturing machine guns and implements of war of this character.

I would like to repeat my assurance that I am not raising these issues in order to embarrass the Defence Minister, because I consider that anything dealing with the Defence Ministry is of vital importance to us because of security reasons, but I feel this importation of foreign experts has been going on to such an extent, and we have to renew the terms of contract for three years, perhaps for these people. Please examine their qualifications, their record of achievement and put matters right, and I will be satisfied.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I should like briefly to refer to certain aspects of the laws relating to our elections and certain other matters connected therewith.

A Bill has been introduced before the House, as hon. Members are aware—the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill of 1953—and that Bill deals with a number of points which have been formulated in the light of experience, as has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, gained by the Election Commission as well as by Government during and after the last general elections. But there are a few important omissions, and I would like to know from Government how they propose to deal with those matters.

As you are aware, Sir, when the Bill will come up before the House for consideration, it is not open for us to suggest amendments which are outside the scope of the particular Sections which are sought to be amended. Technical objections can legitimately be taken at that stage. On the other hand, if Government consider

the points which I am going to raise before the Bill is taken up, it is quite likely that these matters, by agreement, can be considered and decided by the House in whatever manner the House should decide to dispose of them.

These matters were referred to by me in the course of the debate on the President's Address in the first meeting of Parliament after the general elections, and the Prime Minister, while replying to the debate, was good enough to declare that Government would, in due course, consider those suggestions. Unfortunately, I have not been able to bring with me a copy of those proceedings, and although I have asked for it from the Library, they have not arrived.

One point which arose was with regard to the counting of votes. As you are aware, Sir, lots of complaints were made and suggestions were made regarding irregularities and malpractices due to the delay in the counting of the votes. Of course, it became inevitable since the constituencies were large and the number of polling centres also was large. The suggestion which we had made was that the counting should take place as soon as the election is completed on that very day. Certain difficulties were pointed out by the Election Commissioner as also by spokesman of the Government, that properly qualified persons to supervise counting may not be available then and there. I recognize the force of that argument, but still I do not consider that to be completely insuperable. That is one point which I would like Government to consider which has not been covered by the amending Bill. This is the practice which obtains in the U.K. and also in other countries where Parliamentary elections take place. What some of us had suggested was that the counting should take place in each polling centre and then, after the counting had taken place,—it may take three, four or five hours—the officer presiding over each polling centre will give a declaration which may be countersigned by the representatives of the candidates concerned. If that is done simultaneously at all the polling centres, then, later on, after three or four or five days or even a week, the results may be added up and announced in due course. That is one point.

The second suggestion was with regard to the labelling of the symbols. Now, there, the Prime Minister himself agreed on the last occasion that very serious allegations had been

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

made with regard to the possibility of changing labels from one box to another. The labels should be painted and not pasted on boxes where usually they do not stick and various malpractices have been alleged to have occurred. These were two specific suggestions which were made by various persons not belonging to the Opposition, but even belonging to the Congress party, and I would like these suggestions to be considered by Government.

6 P.M.

The next point was with regard to the facilities which should be made available to Ministers, and others who are in the Government at the time of the elections. We had a discussion on that point also. Certain replies were given on behalf of the Government, and I had occasion to refer to the practice which obtains in the U.K., with regard to the facilities which are made available to Ministers and others who may be candidates at the general elections. I do not wish to go into those details, but those are very salutary provisions, and there is no reason why similar conventions or rules should not be made applicable to our country. In fact during the last general elections in the U.K., as was reported in the papers, Mr. Attlee who was then the Prime Minister of England toured the whole of the U.K. in his own motor-car, and he could not even afford to keep a chauffeur; his wife was driving the car on most of the occasions, and he never utilised any car or any other vehicle from Government. Also, there were certain definite rules which had to be followed when Ministers and others visited particular centres for election propaganda. Local officers also had definite instructions as to how they should behave on those occasions. These are conveniences which we would like to see established in our country also. When we had a discussion on this point last time, the hon. Prime Minister very kindly agreed that quite apart from any personalities, these matters should be discussed dispassionately, at the time when rules will have to be modified for purposes of holding the next general elections. But I am sorry to find that none of these matters finds a place in the amending Bill which is now before the House.

Another point raised was with regard to the use of the All India Radio and the broadcasting machinery etc. As it is known, these facilities are not

available to candidates belonging to Opposition parties. In the United Kingdom, in accordance with a timetable, each party is allowed to use the radio and broadcast machinery, for the purpose of appealing to the electorates. There is no reason why in our country also, a similar provision should not be applied.

The other question which is related to this is with regard to giving the rights of franchise to those who have come from Pakistan. As you know, under our Constitution, people who came to India after, I believe, 24th July, 1949, are not entitled to become Indian citizens, unless Parliament passes a law that gives them the rights of citizenship. Unfortunately this matter was not disposed of before the last elections took place. The House may remember, that in the last Parliament, about one hundred Members belonging to all groups signed a representation addressed to the Prime Minister, requesting him to take steps for introducing a special legislation and give the rights of franchise to lakhs of people who have come away from Pakistan to India, after 24th July, 1949, and who definitely have no intention of going back to Pakistan. But unfortunately that could not be done, as the Prime Minister said, due to want of time. Even now, we hear from the papers that a Bill is now under preparation. Already steps are being taken for modifying the electoral rules. I do not know what the intention of the Government is, when the Bill will be ready, when it will be placed before the House, and when we will have an opportunity of discussing it. Now, there is a certain urgency about this matter, involving the rights of citizenship of millions of people who have come from both eastern and western Pakistan, but more from eastern Pakistan, because they came in larger numbers from there, after that date, namely the 24th July, 1949. On that point also, I would like to know what the position now is.

Lastly I come to the question of the future of the Part C States. That question also was raised as to whether they should remain as separate units, or before the general elections, Government would revise their policy with regard to the future existence of some of the Part C States at least. For instance Ajmer is supposed to be a Part C State with only seven and a half lakhs of people, and a contribution from the Centre to the tune of more than a crore of rupees per year, and with all the paraphernalia, a

Chief Minister, a Minister, a Chief Commissioner, a Deputy Chief Commissioner, an Assistant Chief Commissioner, a Deputy Commissioner, an Assistant Deputy Commissioner, and so many other types of officers whom it is so difficult to justify in a small State like this. These are matters which obviously have to be gone into. They are questions of policy, not that they fall within the portfolio of the hon. Minister of Law. But still unless a policy decision is taken with regard to the future of these territories, we will be caught by time, and it will not be possible for us to give effect to the changes. We want to economise expenditure, and there is much scope for economising expenditure in these particular areas. Undoubtedly we also feel that there should be more decentralisation, but that decentralisation does not mean that we will have States, Ministries, Governments and Legislatures, in small areas in different parts of India, whatever historically might have been the reasons for keeping Bhopal, or Ajmer or Coorg or some other parts of eastern India as separate units. During the last two or three years, such a historical necessity has disappeared, and the Government now should be able to make up their minds, and merge these areas with other adjoining territories or make suitable readjustments.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: What about Delhi?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I have not referred to Delhi, because I thought my hon. friend Pandit Algu Rai Shastri will deal with Delhi, and take it to U.P. U.P. is a very small province, and it can form part of U.P.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Why not make him Rajpramukh of Delhi?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: But if the Government want to reconsider the position of Delhi, I do not wish to oppose it, but I have not applied my mind with regard to Delhi. That may be considered on special merits.

With regard to these matters, we would like to have some policy decision taken as early as possible. These are the few matters which I wanted to raise in connection with the electoral rules.

55 PSD

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : चैयरमैन साहब, आज इस एप्रोप्रियेशन बिल पर जो आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया उसके लिये मैं पहले आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ।

इस हाउस में मैंने यह देखा कि जिस तरीके पर प्रजातंत्र का नाजायज फायदा उठाया जा रहा है वह शायद ही और कहीं उठाया जाता होगा। सबसे बड़ी रियायत इस देश में अपोजीशन वालों को दी जा रही है सब जानते हैं कि यहां कांग्रेस की गवर्नमेंट है इसलिये हमारा यह फर्ज है कि हम कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्तों के मुताबिक अपने देश की सरकार को चलावें और अपने देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था को बनावें। लेकिन हम जो कांग्रेस वाले हैं जिनकी बड़ी भारी कसरत राय है उनको ज्यादा मौका नहीं मिलता। बल्कि रूल्स और कायदे और कानून के मुताबिक अपोजीशन पार्टी के मेम्बरान को ज्यादा मौका मिलता है, हर बिल पर मिलता है, हर कट पर मिलता है और बजट के हर ग्रैंट पर मिलता है, लेकिन हम लोगों के लिये कोई मौका नहीं मिलता है जैसे कि जिस कांस्टीट्यूएँसी से हम आये हैं उसमें हम लोगों की कोई शिकायत ही नहीं है या हम उसे दूर कराना नहीं चाहते हैं। आज अगर कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट है तो वह कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट कांग्रेस की मंजारिटी की वजह से है।

An Hon. Member: How it is relevant, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: Now it was decided by the hon. Deputy-Speaker that only four subjects were there for consideration, and that the discussion should centre round them only. But now the hon. Member seems to take another line. Whatever he says may be right or may be wrong, but I would request him to discuss only these four subjects.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: He is coming to it.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं उसी विषय पर बोल रहा हूँ। अभी मेरे मित्र श्री श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी ने इलेक्शन के मुताल्लिक बात कही और उसी के सिलसिले में मैं यह जवाब देना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी साहब ने इस देश के इलेक्शन के कानून के अन्दर कुछ खराबियाँ बताईं कि जिन की वजह से उनको मुश्किलता पेश आई, वहाँ इलेक्शन होने के बाद जो मुश्किलता हमारे सामने पेश आ रही हैं वह भी तो हम आप के सामने लावें।

Mr. Chairman: Unfortunately, this does not relate to the election law. I will request the hon. Member to speak on the relevant matters.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं श्रीमान् की रुलिंग के मुताबिक आपने सबजेक्ट को बदलता हूँ, क्योंकि आप की राय में इस से उस का सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : मुश्किल तो बताइये।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि मैं अब आप को अपनी मुश्किल बता नहीं सकता हूँ। हमारे फाईनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब संस्कृत में इंटरस्टेड हैं। इसलिये मैं संस्कृत का एक वैदिक मन्त्र बताता हूँ जिसके अनुसार यह बजट बनाया जाना चाहिये। मन्त्र साधारण है जिस को हम रोज़भर संध्याओं में कहा करते हैं। लेकिन जो मन्त्र है वह जहाँ ईश्वर से सम्बन्ध रखता है, वहाँ आर्थिक भाषलात से भी वह सम्बन्ध रखता है। वेद मन्त्रों का आध्यात्मिक और भौतिक दोनों से अर्थ होता है। मैं उस मन्त्र को आप को बताता हूँ।

“अन्नेय नय सुपथा राये अस्मान् विश्वानि

देव वयुनानि विद्वान् ।
य्योध्यऽस्मज्जुहुराणमेनो भूयिष्ठां ते
नमउक्तिं विधेम ॥”

इसका अर्थ भी मैं बतला देता हूँ। अर्थ है :

Oh, leader, with due respects and humble submission I pray to you to guide us on good economic plan. An economic plan means budget. Oh, leader, with due respects and humble submission, I pray to you to guide us on a good budget, because you know all our views—of all the Members who belong to the Government party. You are a Congressman and you know the views of Congressmen. So you must prepare a budget in the spirit in which the Congress people want.

“य्योध्यऽस्मज्जुहुराणमेनो”
It means: to enable us to fight with all these forces which are bent upon obstructing our path.

इस लिये मैं आप से अपील करता था कि बजट एक ऐसी चीज है कि बजट बनाने से देश उन्नतिशाली हो सकता है और बजट से ही देश नीचे को जा सकता है। आप को रुपया चाहिये। रुपये की जहाँ तक बात है, आप बहुत होशियार हैं, आप की काबलियत में कोई शक नहीं है। आप ने और देश के नेताओं ने मिल कर जो कानून बनाया, अपने देश के लिये जो विधान बनाया, वह बहुत बढ़िया है। जो आप ने प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट दी और जो रिपोर्ट फाइव ईयर प्लान की बनी है वह बहुत बढ़िया है। और भी जितनी बातें हो सकती हैं वे बढ़िया हैं, लेकिन कसर क्या है। कसर यह है कि हमारी कैबिनेट एक कोने में जा पड़ी। इधर अपोजीशन में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के मंत्री हैं। वे गवर्नमेंट को क्रिटिसाइज करते हैं। प्रजा सोशियलिस्ट पार्टी आप को क्रिटिसाइज करती है।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Whatever the hon. Member is saying is very interesting, but I am very sorry he is not relevant. I will request him to come to the four points.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि बजट के सम्बन्ध में हमारे फायनेंस मिनिस्टर को तमाम पाटियाँ क्रिटिसाइज करती हैं और इधर जो हम चुपचाप बैठे हैं हम भी यह देखते हैं कि बजट में हमें भी कुछ बातें कहनी चाहिये। तो मैं अपील करता हूँ कि जहाँ रुपये के लिये आप यह तमाम बजट बनाते हैं और विरोधी लोग उसको क्रिटिसाइज करके देश में असंतोष फैलाते हैं तो वहाँ हमको भी देश के सामने ऐसी बातें कहने का मौका मिलना चाहिए जिस से असंतोष दूर हो और गवर्नमेंट कामयाब हो। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस में कोई ज्यादा पैसे की बात नहीं है। आप चारों तरफ से घिरे हुए हैं इस बजट के सिलसिले में ही सब प्रकार की बातें कही गईं और हम चुप सुनते चले आ रहे हैं। मैं कह रहा था कि एक ओर जुमला विरोधी पाटियाँ मिल कर आप को घेरें हुए हैं। इधर हम देखते हैं कि कहा जाता है कि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट है। जरूर कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट है इस माने में कि हम जितने कांग्रेस वाले हैं वह अक्सरियत राय में इलेक्ट हो कर आए हैं और हम में से ही मिनिस्टर बने हैं। लेकिन.....

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): He is not speaking on the Bill, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry to interrupt the hon. Member again. He is not speaking on any of these points. The hon. Member should realise that this is not the time for making prayers or giving advice etc. or discussing the procedure of the House. If he wants to speak on any of these matters which are being discussed before the House, he can go on. Otherwise, I will ask him to resume his seat.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): May I submit, Sir, that prayers in the House are not ruled out by the Constitution?

Shri R. D. Misra rose—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should resume his seat. He is not

speaking on any of the matters before the House.

Shri Tyagi: I am glad my friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, gave me an occasion to talk about one of our best factories we have only recently established in India. My friend who is sitting in front of him has also got a lot of knowledge about this factory. About this factory, I have nothing to put before the House—about what it has been able to produce—except the factory itself. It is only three years that we started putting up this factory. Perhaps the House knows that this factory ranks among the very few not only in Asia but in the whole world. This is one of the first class factories.....

An Hon. Member: So what?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let there be no laughter. This is a very serious matter.

Shri Tyagi: Anything which is constructive my friends on the opposite do not take it seriously.

In the past whenever there was any emergency like war, India had to depend on foreign supplies both for weapons, armament and other requirements—both raw materials and machines. By now we have already during the last war and after put up factories and at present we have about 20 Ordnance Factories which are busy producing whatever armaments we could, and whatever other requirements of Defence Forces; they are being produced locally. In the past, so long as the British were here, we were always dependent for every little thing on them. They supplied them; they brought them here because they thought that it was their duty to protect India and they were doing it very well—for their own benefit. But now since they have left, we have again to depend either on the British or others for all types of weapons. Then if there is a war, or if conditions are not so easy as to import from outside, we shall only have a blockade of our supplies. Therefore, those who have put up these factories deserve our thanks and congratulations. About these ordnance factories I had explained last time in the budget debate as to how much they were producing. But all that production would cease immediately for want of machines which on account of use go out of order. They would have to be renewed. For that purpose, it is not enough that you have ordnance factories producing goods and producing armaments. You have also to have ma-

[Shri Tyagi]

chines which will help to run those factories. Otherwise, those factories will have to close down. This is a factory which will give us prototypes, drawings, specifications and all other things pertaining to ordnance stores, our armament requirements and our ammunition. Dr. Lanka Sundaram was really anxious—and rightly too; he wanted a list of things for which this factory has been put up. Well, they are material of armament use. From his attitude, as the House will acknowledge, he does not want to go beyond a limit and I would therefore, excuse myself in the hope that he will agree it is not possible for me to put forward the whole list of what this factory can produce. This factory, I must make it clear, although known mostly, as a tools factory, does not produce tools alone. It is primarily meant for armament purposes. For that purpose, prototypes, specifications, drawings and other things are to be had. It will, in fact, produce machines which will be used in Ordnance Factories. But, we cannot use the whole factory for armament purposes all the time. So long as there is peace, we shall not need a perennial production of Ordnance stores. Whenever our armament needs are fulfilled, this factory will be switched on to the production of machine tools which are the essential requirements not only of Ordnance Factories but also of civil factories. Everywhere, in the public sector these machines are in need and the House will agree that in this matter of machines it is always better to be self-sufficient. It is for that purpose this factory is intended.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: What about the age?

Shri Tyagi: This factory is not leased out to any party; it is a pure and simple Ordnance Factory like the other 20 Ordnance Factories. This is the central nucleus; really speaking it is the king-pin in the whole set up of Defence production. For that purpose the experts have been used. As my friend said, this Swiss firm is known to be the best expert in the whole world and therefore we selected it to help us. The whole factory has been put up and completed within three years. This in itself is an achievement.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: We congratulate you for this.

Shri Tyagi: This factory has actually been built by our Chief Engineer

and the staff of the Southern Command and, of course, with the co-operation of this big expert firm. It is not as if this firm is to be always in charge of the control and working of this factory. Like other factories it will be under the direct control of the Government. These experts are here for the purpose of prototypes and other things of which we have no knowledge. We have to have experts and I am not ashamed of having experts from one nation or the other. I must confess that wherever knowledge is available, we shall have it. If my friends take a pledge that their children will never have any knowledge or any invention which has been made by the British or the U.S.A. and that their children will not look at it, I am sure their children will not get wise. For knowledge there is no colour bar, red or white. Knowledge is knowledge. It must be had from wherever it can be had. In the present case it is only expert knowledge which has been had from the country which is renowned for its neutrality. Then again this firm does not belong either to this bloc or that bloc of which my hon. friends always take notice. At present there are 29 or 30 foreign experts engaged. We have not depended solely upon the experts working in the factory. We have started a school in which about 100 technicians are taught. It is attached to the factory and in this way, in three years 300 experts will be given training.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Apprentices and not experts.

Shri Tyagi: If my friend wants the actual word, they are technicians. Not only that, quite a number of engineers have been sent to get their training in Switzerland with this very firm. So a good number of engineers have gone and they are now coming back. We are very soon going to have our own men working in the factory.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Are you going to renew the contract for three more years for this work?

Shri Tyagi: This firm was not on contract. It is just an arrangement that the firm was to help and co-operate with us in putting up this factory on a commission basis. We had to purchase some machines for this factory; we had arranged with them that they were to procure these for us—they were our procuring agents—and for that procurement of tools through their help and advice, we have given them some commission.

For this purpose the contract was only for three years and it is not the intention to renew it, because there is nothing to build now. The only question is that there are certain of their experts whom we just now have engaged and who are working in the factory. I may assure my friends that I will take pretty good care not to renew their contracts unless they are needed. As and when I can put **my own boys into the factory, they** will be released and none of them will be asked to stay here for a day more than is necessary.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: How many kinds of machine tools are produced: can you give the numbers?

Shri Tyagi: It is only two months since the factory has started smoking. Even a child takes quite a few months to be born.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: At what age does the child start smoking?

Shri Tyagi: I think my hon. friend is not so ignorant about this.

I may just inform him at present the programme is to produce the following machine tools. I will just read them.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: We are satisfied; he need not read.

Shri Tyagi: These are: Tool grinders. Double handed grinders. Polishing machines. Monodrives. Head turning and Mouth reaming machines.

I think that will be quite interesting for my friends.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It has already turned the head of my hon. friend.

Shri Tyagi: I hope it was all in good humour. I am grateful that my hon. friend has not criticised the factory. He only wanted me to acquaint him with the tools. I may give this assurance to the House that whenever any further details are needed I shall always be very happy to give the details to the House and nothing will be kept back from the House. I share the sentiments which my hon. friend has expressed, and I can assure him that the factory will be kept under the direct control of the Government.

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): Owing to the limitation of time, I regret that this House had no opportunity to raise a debate on the Demands falling under my Ministry during the stage of the voting of the Demands. I hope, however, that there will be a suitable occasion during the budget discussion next year, at any rate, when this House

may have an opportunity to discuss the various important aspects of the working of my Ministry. During the discussion of this Appropriation Bill, a passing reference has been made to a few matters coming within the purview of my Ministry by only one hon. Member, my hon. friend Mr. Vallatharas. I would like to dispose of one or two small points which he referred to, before I take up the major aspect on which he concentrated his attention. He referred to the Machine Tool Factory which is being established at Bangalore and asked, 'What have the experts who have come there from Switzerland been doing?' He also carries an impression in his mind that they are wasting their time. I would like to inform the hon. Member that these few foreign experts who have come recently—only during the last few weeks—are, according to my information, having their hands full and no valuable time is being wasted by them. It would be well for the hon. Member to realise that this factory is just coming up. These experts—a few of them—have come only recently and it would be unfortunate and unjust to make any sweeping criticism or remarks regarding the work of these experts at the present stage.

He referred also to the Telephone Cable Factory which is being put up at Rupnarainpur. What all he said was that stores are arriving and that one has to take good care that these stores are not stolen or misused. He was referring, obviously, to a thing which might happen in future. He had nothing else to say. So I do not take that point of his speech as a matter of criticism but only as a sort of a friendly warning to see that such things do not happen in future. He also seemed to have a doubt in his mind as to whether there is any necessity for this Ministry at all, and whether there is any work for this Ministry. He asked as to where is the necessity for a Minister for this Production Ministry and a Deputy Minister. If he had taken some trouble to find out the real truth of the matter, he would have known, for instance, that there is no Deputy Minister for the Production Ministry at all. So far as the necessity for this Ministry is concerned, I wish he had read the introduction to the Report for 1952-53, which has been already circulated to Members. With your permission, I would read it:

"The reconstitution and regrouping of some of the Ministries of the Government of India in May, 1952 was, more or less, a necessary prelude to the fulfil-

[Shri K. C. Reddy]

ment of the National Five Year Plan. The Plan has, amongst other things, given shape and form to the objectives of the Industrial Policy Resolution of April, 1948.....”

I hope he has taken the trouble to read the Industrial Policy Resolution—

“.....to secure the rapid industrialisation of the country by careful planning and by the active and progressive participation of the State in the creation of new industrial undertakings in certain basic industries of national importance. It remained to reorganise the machinery of Government to translate the Plan into reality. While in the initial stages, when the Plan was in the making, it was convenient and feasible to leave responsibility with the new defunct Ministry of Industry and Supply, it became evident that if there was to be a balanced and complementary development in the public and private sectors of the Industry, a special organisation had to be established for this purpose. The Production Ministry thus came into being to plan and co-ordinate policy, control and manage industries in the public sector. It was also felt that the time had come when the entire energy and resources of a full-ferred to Delhi, because I thought myself for the creation of new productive-units, for the speedy implementation of those under execution, and for the more efficient management of those which are already in production”

I am sorry that I have not got sufficient time at the present moment to elaborate as to what the Ministry has been doing in respect of the various points that have been highlighted in this introduction.

I may mention for the information of the hon. Member and also this House that the present subjects falling under this Ministry are:

Coal;

Sindri Fertilizer Factory ;

Telephone Cable Factory ;

Machine Tool Factory at Jalahalli;

Penicillin Factory, Pimpri, near Poona ;

D.D.T. Factory being put up at Delhi ;

Shipbuilding Yard at Visakhapatnam ;

Nahan Foundry in Himachal Pradesh;

Iron and steel project now in hand;

Heavy electrical power plant, also in hand;

National Instruments Factory, Calcutta;

Government Housing Factory, Delhi;

Salt ;

Establishment of oil refineries in India.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): No poultry farm?

Shri K. C. Reddy: I submit that as all these need constant attention, require a lot of processing and various steps to be taken in order to bring into existence most of the industries which have been taken in hand, the Production Ministry has sufficient work and no valuable time is being wasted by anyone in this Ministry, leave alone the poor Minister.

The hon. Member referred to nationalisation of coal in particular and to the policy of nationalisation in general. So far as the nationalisation of coal is concerned, I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Member to the Industrial Policy Resolution announced in April, 1948 by the Government of India. Under that resolution, coal was one of the six industries in which the State—which in this context included Central, Provincial and State Governments and other public authorities like municipal corporations—would be exclusively responsible for the establishment of new undertakings except where in the national interest the State itself found it necessary to secure the cooperation of private enterprise, subject to such control and regulation as the Central Government may prescribe. This resolution was reconsidered in May, 1949 and Government came to certain tentative conclusions in regard to this matter of nationalisation of coal. I would like to make one point on this subject very clear. In the course of my replies to questions tabled in this House I gave the information that foreign and other private capital invested in the coal industry was of the order of Rs. 25 crores, and the proportion of foreign capital was not very much. I gave figures with regard to that aspect also. Now, if we

want to nationalise the coal industry, we have to proceed according to the principles we are following now and which we have to follow in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, namely, we have to compensate properly, and the compensation according to a rough estimate will be anywhere in the region of Rs. 75 crores in order to nationalise the coal industry. The question I would like to pose is this: Shall we try to find out resources to the extent of Rs. 75 crores or so for the nationalisation of this coal industry, or, if we have that sum of money available to us, shall we utilise it for building up some other basic industries like, for example, a new iron and steel project, or a heavy electrical machinery project or a heavy machinery project and certain other basic industries of that kind for which there is a crying need in this country at the present moment.

With regard to nationalisation, one basic factor we have to keep in mind is that our objective is to increase production. We have to have more and more production of basic materials which are necessary for the industrialisation of the country and also for consumption. Taking coal for example, if we nationalise it and spend Rs. 75 crores on it, would we be securing the objective of increased production? I submit not. So, as realists we have to keep in mind the limitations under which we are working, namely, what is the manpower that we have got with the required training for nationalising these industries; what is the money resource that we have got; and so on. We have to keep all these things in mind before we can come to any decision with regard to these important aspects. All these aspects, I submit, have been canvassed at great length in the Five Year Plan Report which I suppose the hon. Member who referred to this aspect has studied. If he had studied it...

Shri Vallatharas: I have perfectly studied it. I have also fully studied the directive principles which clearly say that all these things must be nationalised. If the Government is not in a position to nationalise, it is not my fault and it is no use for the Minister saying that perhaps I have not studied it. Leave the Government with me for one year: I will nationalise everything. I challenge.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I am sorry that I cannot oblige the hon. Member by giving him the Government for one year.

Shri Vallatharas: If you are not capable of translating into action the directive principles, you must admit

it. There is no use saying that I have not studied the Plan.

Mr. Chairman: He should not interrupt like this any further.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: May I point out that the hon. Minister should not say, "I do not know whether he has studied it or not"? How does he know whether the hon. Member has studied it or not?

Mr. Chairman: To that the hon. Member has already retorted that he wants to take charge of the whole Government for one year. It is not fair to the hon. Minister to interrupt him at every step. Let him proceed. Let there be some patience and forbearance in hearing the replies to criticism made by Members on this side.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I was about to conclude. I was only telling the hon. Member that had he read the Five Year Plan aright, he would have understood the reasons, the rationale, of the policy which we are pursuing at the present moment. He said that he had studied the Plan and that it advocated nationalisation. Yes, it is partly true, but at what pace; under what circumstances;—all these things also he should have borne in mind. If he had done so, he would not have offered the criticism that he has done.

In conclusion, I would say that the Production Ministry which has been specially brought into existence in order to build up the industrialisation of the country in the public sector is doing its best in order not only to build up the industries that have been already taken in hand, but is also conscious of the new industries that are very urgently necessary for the country, and the Ministry is doing its best in order to build up these new industries also.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): On a point of order. This House has not yet voted supplies to the Government, because the Finance Bill has not yet been passed. Sanctioning of supplies is not supplying funds. Therefore, the consideration of the Appropriation Bill is premature before the Finance Bill is passed. (Shri K. K. Basu: It is misappropriation.) I do not know what the practice is in other countries. My hon. friend the Law Minister will acquaint us with that position. My submission is that the consideration of the Appropriation Bill at this stage is unconstitutional. I will await your kind ruling on this point.

Mr. Chairman: I think this is not a point of order at all. All these years

[Mr. Chairman]

the Appropriation Bill] has been passed first and finally the Finance Bill comes. All the grants have been considered by this House and passed. Now the Appropriation Bill is there for authorising payment and appropriation from and out of the Consolidated Fund. I do not see what point of order there is.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: My submission is that passing of the Appropriation Bill at this stage will affect the rights and privileges of this House which is the guardian of public funds.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I should like to say a few words about the subject which has been put in by the hon. Member Prof. Mukerjee in regard to a provision in the Budget for the payment of Rs. 10,20,000 to the United Kingdom Government towards the expenses of the Commonwealth Relations Office. I confess I was surprised to see this question crop up in this way. Prof. Mukerjee possibly thinks that this is somehow connected with our being in the Commonwealth. It has nothing to do with our being in the Commonwealth or not.

This item relates chiefly to certain pensions and other things which we have been trying to wind up. In the old days, of course, a vast number of activities were undertaken by the old India Office. Now all those activities, or nearly all of them, have been either ended or taken over by the India House, that is by our High Commission in London. Some minor activities do remain there, chiefly payment of pensions, and they perform a kind of agency function on our behalf to pay these things. We are, in fact, trying to wind up these things in two ways: one is by taking them over and the other is by coming to an arrangement with the United Kingdom Government so that they may deal with the matter and we have no contact with them on that subject. I cannot say how long these calculations may take. But this will be ended. Anyhow, this has nothing to do with our being in the Commonwealth or not being in the Commonwealth. It is only a question of certain liabilities in regard to pensions, etc., that we have, a large part of which we are discharging directly and some through them. Probably these agency functions they are doing on our behalf will end fairly soon, at any rate at not too long a time.

Now, over the larger question of our Commonwealth relationship; I spoke the other day in this House and I do not know if it is necessary or worthwhile for me to take the time of the House again on that subject, because it is a little difficult by any arguments that I might advance to do away with some kind of lurking suspicion that some hon. Members opposite might have in their minds. But I should like to beg of them to think of it from a different point of view. That is to say first of all, the Commonwealth relationship has nothing to do with any economic activities of ours in relation to the Commonwealth. The two are entirely separate. They are many countries in Europe and elsewhere, for instance, which are in the sterling bloc, but which are not in the Commonwealth. Now it is up to us to determine whether we should remain in the sterling bloc or not. We have naturally to think of that matter in terms of our national advantage. We can come to any decision any day that we should no longer be in the sterling bloc. There the matter ends. We can come to that decision. It has nothing to do with our being in the Commonwealth or not. It is quite apart from that. There are countries with economic relationship with England but not in the Commonwealth and there are countries in the Commonwealth, but not in the sterling bloc and having some other relationships. The two are entirely apart and both should be judged apart from each other, naturally and entirely from the point of view of our national advantage in the matter. This relates to a certain payment of pensions, etc., a hangover from the old days. We had to pay them, unless we repudiate them which we have no intention of doing. We can pay of course directly. And we do pay directly most of our pensions. But there are certain minor items where it will be a greater burden and we pay for the agency functions which are gradually fading out.

Having put aside the question of any economic contact we may have with the United Kingdom or with the Commonwealth, and chiefly with the United Kingdom and not with the rest of the Commonwealth, which has to be judged again on the merits, so far as the political matter is concerned, I discussed it on the last occasion. I should like the House to remember that this, if I may repeat, our being in the Commonwealth puts no kind of strain upon us; no limitation upon us. It is not binding us, in the slightest,

politically or economically. I should like hon. Members to object to any particular policy or any action or step we might take because of that. We can consider that, whether it is a right step or not. But merely to imagine that our being there leads to something, I do not think, is justified. I think that our being in the Commonwealth—it is an odd thing to say, but I say after fully thinking—in a sense gives us a larger freedom in international activity than otherwise, to a certain extent. And we have utilised that freedom and we propose to utilise it. The hon. Member might think that by being in the Commonwealth or because of other pressures and the rest, we are afraid of dealing with this country or that. Well, we are not. We decide about our trade policy entirely on the merits, and not because of what other countries think or of what other countries may have decided—whether it is some countries deciding about blockade of China or preventing China from getting this or that, or any other country. We are not bound by anything they do. We decide the matter entirely from the point of view of our own relations with other countries and of our own national advantage.

At this hour I do not wish to repeat what I said previously on that day. But I would say this that in the balance—if you leave out one factor, some hon. Members may feel sentimentally attracted towards something or may have some suspicion lurking about something else, it is difficult to deal with that kind of thing—looking at the question practically, this our being in the Commonwealth after we became a Republic was, I submit, not only good in itself but a good example to others of the type of relationship that should subsist between nations without binding each other down at all in the slightest. It is not a question of the Commonwealth only. I am prepared to have that type of relationship with other countries. I am prepared to join other groups on that basis, friendly groups. It does not prevent me from doing that. As I pointed out, with some countries our relations are closer than with the Commonwealth—with some countries outside, lately. Take Burma, our neighbour country. That is not in the Commonwealth. But our relations with Burma in many ways are far closer than with any Commonwealth country. So it does not come in that way. I think there are no precedents for this kind of thing. For this kind of being associated not constitutionally, not legally, but in a vague kind of way

55 P.S.D.

of understanding, there is no precedent. You cannot judge and all your experience in international law cannot help you. It is only a friendly understanding when we want to continue it. I think that it has been to our advantage. It does us good both in the international sphere and in regard to certain other matters of development activities, supplies, training, etc. which we get more easily in that way, but that does not limit us from going to other countries.

Then again remember another factor which must be borne in mind, and that is a large number of Indians overseas. It helps us to deal with them. I am not talking about Indians in South Africa, Indians in Ceylon, because Ceylon and South Africa are presumed to be independent countries. They are different but there are a large number of Indians in all kinds of places, Mauritius, Fiji and East Africa, here and there spread out. Now it is very helpful for us to deal with their questions. Otherwise, a very difficult problem would arise for them. They have to choose what to do; whether to have any connection with Indian nationality or to break away and become nationals in Mauritius and Fiji, etc. So taking all these factors into consideration, we came some years ago to this decision, but in the main I think it has been to our advantage and it has not led to our doing anything which we objected to. It has not led to any pressure being exercised on us in the slightest. If we have decided something it may be right or wrong but it is not due to our being in the Commonwealth. You can discuss the matter independently but it certainly does not flow from our being in the Commonwealth. I would put it to the House that it is a little difficult to carry this argument further but this type of association itself is a good type of association with any country. Any alliance that we may have, any treaty that we may have always binds you down to a certain extent. It is a give and take affair. It may be a treaty, may be an alliance but inevitably it is a give and take affair. If it is a military alliance you are very much tied down, otherwise you are tied down to a certain extent. Even take the Charter of the United Nations. We have accepted that. By accepting that we do make some commitments, we accept certain responsibilities and obligations. We gladly do so. Here we are accepting being in the Commonwealth and that not even legally or constitutionally but by friendly arrangement without the slightest binding factor which any treaty or any alliance might do. I do

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

submit—if I may use that word—it is a very good arrangement for us and for other countries. I am not taking of the Commonwealth Ministers who may come together in that way. In any event, the larger question does not arise here in Mr. Mukerjee's subject, other than just a kind of hangover of payments for certain agency functions and pensions.

Shri Biswas: I do not think I need take more than a few minutes. The hon. Dr. S. P. Mookerjee has called attention to certain matters relating to elections and pointed out that nothing is to be found in the proposed Bill which is going to be placed before the House very shortly dealing with these matters. Well, I may tell the House that that Bill does not purport to be a comprehensive amending Bill. As I pointed out I believe on a previous occasion, there are many other matters for which we shall have to provide. We are awaiting the results of the election petitions which are now being tried by Election Tribunals all over the country. So this is not a comprehensive measure. Another measure will be introduced in the House and the matters to which my hon. friend has referred will all be incorporated therein after they have been considered. Take this question of counting of votes, for instance. The suggestion that he has made is that the counting must be made at the polling station immediately after the conclusion of the polling. That is, no doubt, theoretically a very sound proposition. But, it is a practical question. We have got to consult the States how far it will be possible for the States to provide adequate staff for the purpose. Polling goes on throughout the whole day. Counting sometimes takes hours and hours. We have to see whether it will be practical or not, and whether the staff and resources will be available for that purpose. This requires reference to the different States. We have introduced in this Bill only such amendments as appear to be of a non-controversial nature, which would not necessitate a reference to the different States. That is all. On this question of counting, we have made one amendment. Under the law as it stands, it is only the Returning Officer who can take part in it; in the Bill we have introduced an amendment giving the power to Assistant Returning Officers also to take part in the counting. That will expedite matters to a certain extent. But, I am quite free to admit that there are other matters also to be considered.

Then, about fixing the labels, that is no doubt a very important matter. We are also awaiting the results of the election petitions. We want to find out in how many cases such things have occurred. That was the subject matter of complaint in many of these elections. That is a matter which will be taken up after getting the results of the election petitions. Adequate steps will be taken to ensure that these labels are not torn off or removed or are not liable to be removed. The suggestion that has been made that the symbols should be painted both inside and outside, seems to be on the face of it quite reasonable. All that will be considered.

As regards the question of facilities to Ministers and other Government officers who may be candidates, whether they could use the facilities which they enjoy by virtue of their office as Government servants, that cannot be provided in the Act. That is a matter in which, as Dr. Mookerjee himself said, conventions must grow. Nobody suggests that the Ministers should enjoy any exceptional advantage from the mere fact that they are Ministers. So far as elections are concerned, certainly, they should act as any other ordinary citizen who offers himself as a candidate at the election.

The other question whether the All India Radio should be allowed to be used by all parties on a footing of parity, so to say, is a question which can be taken up. It is not a question for amendment of the law. Lastly, on the question of granting franchise to migrants from Pakistan, there is already provision in the Constitution, transitional provision, no doubt. Those who have migrated up to July, 1948, are citizens of India. Those who migrated between 18th July, 1948 and some date in 1949, are also entitled to be citizens on application, if they apply and get themselves registered. The matter stands there.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: They have no franchise.

Shri Biswas: Unless the Constitution is amended, you cannot enroll those persons who do not come within these categories and you cannot give them rights of franchise.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: By having an Act of Parliament.

Shri Biswas: That Act will come. We cannot take it up piecemeal. When the Citizenship Bill is there provision

will be made for migrants from Pakistan. So far as the Representation of the People Act is concerned, it deals merely with the preparation of electoral rolls. We must await the passing of the Citizenship Bill before we can introduce the necessary amendments in the electoral roll rules. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

7 P.M.

Mr. Chairman: Now, the House will proceed to clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, the Schedule, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Now, I have to make an announcement that the list which has already been circulated to the Members for April 8, 9, 14 and 15 stands. Now, the business of 8th is over, and from tomorrow the business of the House will be taken up according to this list.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That means the Handloom Bill will be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman: That is so. The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Thursday, the 9th April, 1953.
