

**\*DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1953-54**

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall now proceed with the Demands for Supplementary Grants 1953-54. There are also the P.E.P.S.U. Demands. The time allotted is from 3 P.M. to 5 P.M., that is two hours, for all of them.

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

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall call Demand after Demand. First I shall call Demand No. 10.

**DEMAND NO. 10.—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Communications'."

There is a cut motion. Since this is not a new service, that cut motion is out of order.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** But before Demand No. 10, there is Demand No. 6.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members are aware that there are votable items and non-votable items. The Demands are placed on the Order Paper with regard to votable items. Non-votable items are no doubt also placed here for information. They may ask any information they want relating to these Demands, but they are not going to be put to the vote of the House.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat):** This is the second or the third time that Supplementary Demands are being presented, and it is for a very big sum. We would like to know exactly why it is necessary to come again and again before this House for these Supplementary Grants.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is no new suggestion that has been made. I have asked the Government and the Government have also given sufficient details at the bottom of the page relating to Demand No. 6. If hon. Members want any more information, it is open to them to ask. It is not as if no explanatory note has been attached. There is the explanatory note for all these items here under each Demand.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** The point is this. We are now on the eve of the General Budget. On the face of it it looks irresponsible for the Government to come before the House again and again asking us to discuss and pass Supplementary Grants for big amounts. It is not any particular item we refer to. We will come to these items as we go from Ministry to Ministry.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not able to understand the objection. So far as these items are concerned, the hon. Member will kindly see.....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We are not going into the details.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then, what is the objection? I am not able to understand. There is no meaning in merely saying that the Government is irresponsible in just placing these Demands before the House. These are the items. This is the explanation the Government has given after repeated suggestions. If the hon. Member wants any further elucidation, it is open to her to put a question and elicit an answer.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Is that all we can do? Can't we ask why it is.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am asking the hon. Member to ask that question.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I am asking this question for the third time.

---

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then the hon. Member may resume her seat. Does any other hon. Member want to put a question? That question will be noted, and once for all the hon. Minister will answer.

**The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh):** I think it is a very short point, and it might be convenient if I gave the reply now. My reply is very simple.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shall I ask the hon. Minister to reply, and then call another hon. Member and then is the Minister again to reply with respect to the same Demand?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** This is the principle and practice in regard to Supplementary Demands.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why should not the hon. Minister wait till all the points raised on this Demand No. 6 are exhausted?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** It is not actually specifically related to Demand No. 6. The hon. Member has taken the very broad point that the Government ought not to come before the Legislature so many times in connection with Supplementary Demands, and that is the point to which.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister may answer on Demand No. 6 that point also. I am not able to understand how many Supplementary Demands can be brought according to the hon. Member. What is the number of Supplementary Grants that can be brought? There is absolutely no limit. The hon. Minister is not going to give an assurance of that kind. He will bring them whenever there is necessity.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** May I seek some clarification? According to the principles of budgeting, the Government is supposed to make provision for all the requirements throughout the year in the original Budget.

If they bring before the House Supplementary Demands, are we not entitled to some explanation, apart from the different items, from Government side, as to why these particular items were not anticipated by Government and not provided for in the original Budget itself? If Government develop the habit of bringing forward Supplementary Demands for Grants in this manner very frequently, there is no propriety in passing the General Budget.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The point is this. So far as Supplementary Demands are concerned, they may arise in one of two ways. They may relate, firstly to services which are new and which have been thought of only after the Budget Estimates were originally presented. With respect of them, matters of policy can be raised in the House. Secondly, they may relate to excess in respect of particular items, that might have arisen for various reasons. Therefore, there cannot be a general principle with regard to all Supplementary Demands. In respect of one particular Demand, the excess might have been anticipated, while in respect of another, it might not have been possible to anticipate it. Therefore, I would suggest that with respect to each Supplementary Demand, hon. Members may ask why it has arisen. If they are not satisfied with the explanation given in the book circulated, they may put questions, and I would ask the hon. Minister to answer, with respect to each Demand. I am not going to ask Government to answer the general question as to why they have come again a third time to the House with Supplementary Demands. It may be that a new service might have come into existence, in which Government are bound to come before the House with a Supplementary Demand relating to that new service.

**Shri S. S. More:** Let Government say so.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is all right. But there cannot be a general

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker.]

question, with respect to all these. One of them may relate to a new service, while another one may be due to other reasons. The answers to the one will be different from the answer to the other. This will involve two different answers, first with respect to all Demands in general, and secondly with respect to one Demand in particular. I want to save the time of the House, so that as much opportunity can be given to hon. Members on both sides of the House, as possible, to put questions and to get answers.

First of all, if any hon. Member has got any question to put with respect to Demand No. 6, he may do so. Then, I shall call upon the other hon. Members, and so on.

**Shri S. S. More:** From the face of the hon. Finance Minister, it appears he seems eager to offer a preliminary explanation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I know. He may be eager to do so, but I am equally eager to avoid repetition of the same thing on particular matters.

Now I shall call upon hon. Members to put questions with respect to Demand No. 6, if they have any.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The footnote under Demand No. 6 is very beautifully vague. Under item (iii) in the footnote, it is stated:

"Increase in interest largely due to the enhancement of the rate of interest".

What does it mean?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If originally the interest was 4 per cent., now it has been increased to 4½ per cent. That is the meaning.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** That should be the explanatory note. As it is, what does the expression in item (iii) mean?

Moreover, we will oppose this increase, because already we are paying a certain amount to the general revenues, on the capital invested on the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department. After paying interest, if any surplus is left, 50 per cent. of the surplus is also given to the general revenues. When we are embarking on a huge development work, if we go on paying interest at an enhanced rate, there will not be any money left for development work in the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

Further, the present condition of the Indian post offices is so very bad, that the office buildings are congested, and no quarters have been provided for the postal employees.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** General discussion of this kind is absolutely irrelevant. The only point is why there was an increase in the rate of interest. General questions such as houses having not been built, and so on, are not relevant now.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I am saying about the developmental aspect. If we go on paying at an enhanced rate, where is the money left for development?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Development policy ought not to be discussed on this matter. The only point that can be gone into is why there is a necessity to pay a larger interest than before.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Another point I would like to refer to is this. Interest is also being paid on the value of Stores Balance. How does this arise? How can we pay interest on Stores Balance? Already, it is charged to the capital. Again, there seems to be some anomaly in paying interest on this. For instance, in the Railways, we do not pay any such interest. I would like to have some clarification on this point.

**Shri O. D. Deshmukh:** I was going to answer the general point, which

you indicated I should answer. I have got very little to say in view of what you have said, and I am no longer eager to answer it. The plain fact is that these Supplementary Demands come individually before the House and are approved by the House, and that procedure was followed necessarily on the last two occasions on which we brought Supplementary Demands before the House. Now if, there was any objection to be taken in regard to any individual Demand, that was the time to take it. I am not now recalling where it was taken and where it was not taken; the House approved of those previous two sets of Supplementary Grants. In regard to the third, they ought to wait till all these Demands are over. By that time, again by the same process.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it now the third set?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** Yes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The other side is anxious to know why there should be a first list, and then a second list and then a third set of Demands, and why not all this be anticipated. They think that a piecemeal Grant is rather inconvenient. But then the hon. Member forget what exactly has been given and under what circumstances. That is the point.

**Shri S. S. More:** May I make supplementary remark on this Supplementary Grant?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I already gave him an opportunity.

**Shri S. S. More:** I would like to invite your attention to one of the rules of procedure. I would invite your attention to rule 230 at page 57 of the latest edition of the Rules of Procedure. It says:

"Supplementary, additional, excess and exceptional grants and votes of credit shall be regulated by the same procedure as is applicable in the case of demands for grants subject to such adaptations, whether by way of modification, addition or omission as the

Speaker may deem to be necessary or expedient."

Now, you were pleased to say in your considered ruling that when a Supplementary Demand is placed before the House, a Member shall not be competent to raise certain issues which he could conveniently and competently raise when the original Budget is being discussed. So, this is a restriction on our power of discussion to save the Government, which is not prepared to face the opposition criticism, they may place the original Budget in a truncated form and may try to enter even the Treasury by the back-door by putting in some supplementary budgets which would restrict our power of discussion. We shall be then in a disadvantageous position in safeguarding the interests of the body or party of which we are supposed to be the true representatives. This is a question of fundamental importance. We have to be vigilant and watchful over the Treasury Benches when they are spending money. So, with these restrictions regarding power of discussion, it is highly necessary that the hon. Speaker—the Chair—must stand by the House in interpreting that a supplementary budget should not be a matter of ordinary routine business. I would rather make an appeal to you that Government should be called upon seriously to explain why this third set of Supplementary Demands is being placed before the House, which restricts our power of attacking the Government or finding out their defects by virtue of the rules of procedure.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Merely because the hon. Finance Minister may choose to place before the House a list of Supplementary demands, it does not mean that the House should accept it. He has to satisfy the House. The hon. Member is aware that even at the Budget session—it may be a token grant, say, a thousand rupees—a grant may be brought up only for the purpose of inviting the decision of the House on a matter of policy.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

It may not be possible for the Government to anticipate what exactly the amount will be that will be involved. Of course, the amount involved in a particular matter may be one of the main considerations to vote for or not. Independently also, the decision of the House may be invited.

Under the circumstances the matter of policy has already been accepted so far as these demands are concerned. But it is certainly open to the hon. Members now to ask: "If we had known that so much of money would have been spent, whereas in the original demand, at the Budget Session, a small amount has been shown,—if this much amount is involved in this demand—we would not have accepted it at all." It is open to them to say it now. But it is equally obligatory on the part of the Government to satisfy the House as to why a small amount has been shown there, why such a large additional expenditure is involved, etc., and in which case they must justify as to whether they got a vote of the House on a prior occasion. I am placing these views before the House only because I am anxious to see that the House must be given an opportunity to discuss this matter, and also to enable the House to see that every pie that is voted for, is voted with the full knowledge that it is necessary in the interests of proper administration. Elucidating the point, it was observed on a prior occasion:

"Supplementary demands may relate to excess grants. If during the budget session a particular item was discussed, the policy accepted by the House and some amount voted, if some extra amount is wanted now, no matter of policy can be discussed on that matter because the policy was already decided for the whole year during the budget session."

It is true if a small amount is voted there, hon. Members can easily say that if such a large amount out of all proportion to the original amount is

asked for—say, a lakh of rupees is increased to ten crores of rupees—certainly they would not have accepted the policy for the year at all. Therefore, it is obligatory on the Government to satisfy the House why such a small amount was placed before the House.

"If during the course of the year, some item or some service which was not contemplated and not included in the budget this year comes up, and if for that some money is sought to be spent, that is a matter of policy and it can be discussed."

that is, something which has arisen now and the matter of policy had not been discussed. As regards the original sum, it has already been discussed and voted upon. Therefore, I will allow latitude to the extent of the excess amount alone, if the amount that is wanted by way of supplementary grant is out of all proportion to the amount that was originally voted upon at the time of the budget. Now, the hon. Minister should not merely stand on a formality and say that this policy has been decided upon, but satisfy the House that even if this amount which is now asked for, which is a large amount, had been put in the original Demand, the House would have equally accepted that policy. I expect some such satisfaction to be given to the House.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpore *cum* Purnea): May I suggest that the objection of the Opposition is this, that it is bad budgeting which stands in need of frequent supplementary budgets?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree, but Government can easily explain why it has arisen.

Acharya Kripalani: Explain away!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not explain away.

Shri S. S. More: He has nothing else to say.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** No, I did not say that I have nothing to say in regard to the point raised by the hon. Member. I said that in regard to the point raised by the previous speaker.

Now, Sir, you have already referred to your ruling that the debate should be restricted to the particulars contained in the Estimates on which Supplementary Grants are sought and to application of the items which composed those Grants. Now, you have also ruled that questions of policy cannot be raised; they can be raised in respect of a new service. That we accept, except that where a question of policy is to be raised it must now be confined to the items on which the vote of the House is sought. Now, that includes the extension of the principle which you have just enunciated, namely, if by the order of the figures themselves it becomes a question of policy as to whether this additional demand should be granted, that is to say, in view of the large total now, if it had been brought forward before the House, whether the House would have accepted it or not. I should say that an argument like that would be perfectly relevant and we shall try and meet it if in respect of any particular demand it is raised. The only other point I would make is that in regard to these supplementary grants, it is not always possible to anticipate. There are always limitations on the human power of anticipation. In case there is an excess, then we have to come to the House to cover that excess. In certain cases advances are possible from the Contingency Fund but the order of figures involved may be so large that there again we have to come before the House. Although this is the third set of supplementary demands, I should like to remind the House that during the August-September Session, we took a gross grant, that is to say, for a gross expenditure of Rs. 1,036 lakhs, but the recoveries and receipts amounted to Rs. 8 crores; and, therefore, the net additional expenditure

which we asked the House to vote was Rs. 236 lakhs. Similarly, in the November-December Session, Supplementary Grants for a gross expenditure of Rs. 1,466 lakhs were taken against which recoveries amounting to Rs. 1,385 lakhs were to be adjusted in reduction of expenditure. Therefore, that left a net additional expenditure of Rs. 81 lakhs only. Therefore, all that we have obtained from the House in the past is Rs. 2·36 crores in August-September and Rs. 81 lakhs in November-December.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** May I ask whether these recoveries were known at the time of the Budget or were they wind-falls?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** These are recoveries associated with the expenditure.

**An Hon. Member:** Purchase and sale of sugar?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** They are the reverse and obverse of the same transactions.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If they are not windfalls but part of the same transaction, they cannot be taken advantage of.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** These are connected transactions. So, that is the situation. For all practical purposes, we might say that we are dealing with the main budget of supplementary demands here and now.

**Shri S. S. More:** May I ask what is the total amount sought by way of the three Supplementary Demands together? What is the total amount including this Supplementary Demand?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** If the hon. Member will be good enough to add Rs. 236 lakhs and Rs. 81 lakhs—the present Demands are for Rs. 83·89 crores and the recoveries are Rs. 6·54 crores and he has got to take the difference between the two, Rs. 77·35 crores and add it to these figures.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It comes to about Rs. 80 crores; what is the original Budget demand?

573

**Shri S. S. More:** Rs. 400 crores.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** It is much more than that.

I say that while we should do this exercise in arithmetic, we should defer drawing conclusions from these till we have dealt with all these Supplementary Demands.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Therefore the hon. Finance Minister has come to the same conclusion that there cannot be a general answer to all these supplementary demands.

Now, does any other hon. Minister want to say anything about the Posts and Telegraphs?

**The Deputy Minister of Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur):** So far as this particular Demand is concerned, I may submit that Sir, it is accepted policy that the Posts and Telegraphs Department which is being run as a commercial department must pay interest to the general revenues on the capital invested. This particular figure of Rs. 526,000 which has been added to the value of the stores has resulted from increased rates. Secondly, there was a physical verification, following independence the partition of the stores in hand. The value of the stores could not be calculated at that time and, consequently, the interest also could not be calculated. Now, after the verification, all these calculations have been made and this has resulted in this increase in the amount of interest. It is going to the general revenues from the Posts and Telegraphs; so, there should be no objection to it. It is just as a matter of course that we have come up for the sanction of this particular demand.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Sir, it is stated that the increase in interest is largely due to the enhancement of the rate of interest.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It has to be paid.

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** This interest is being paid to the general revenues

from the Posts and Telegraphs; this has been going on.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Sir, 50 per cent. of the surplus left over after paying interest is given to the general revenues or allocated to the general revenues. But, here it is seen that the rate of interest has been enhanced. When was it increased? That is the point.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** It is not an arithmetical calculation.

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** Sir, it is not a question of addition to the general revenues. The general revenues are supposed to have subscribed to the capital invested in the Posts and Telegraphs and on that capital we have to pay interest. In the rate of interest on that capital, there has been some periodic fluctuations. On account of that, this small amount of Rs. 73,000 is going to the general revenues.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Normally, it must have been anticipated that the interest has to be paid and some rate of interest should have been provided for in the Budget as being payable to the general revenues from which the loan is advanced. The Central Government borrows from the market. It may be that, from time to time, there might have been an increase in the rate of interest, which might not have been contemplated in the original Budget. The hon. Member wants to know whether there was not a uniform rate of interest for the whole year which was provided in the Budget, and how this fluctuation arose during the course of the year. It is stated against item (iii) that the increase in interest largely due to the enhancement of the rate of interest is Rs. 73,000. When once the rate of interest has been fixed for a particular year—that is the assumption—what is the meaning of enhancement during the course of the year, for which a supplementary demand is necessary?

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** There is a slight adjustment in the rate of interest, but as the cut motion has not

been tabled on that particular point, I cannot bank upon my memory and give specifically the increase in the rate. I think it has been increased from 3½ per cent. to 3¾ per cent. subject to correction.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There cannot be a cut motion with reference to a non-votable item.

**Shri O. D. Deshmukh:** When we framed the Budget, we take the average rate of interest on Government's borrowing for the year. We can only take it for the Budget year based on the data in our possession at the time that the Budget is framed. After that, a certain portion of that year has to elapse before the Budget year begins. Now, as this is a commercial department, we have to make an adjustment in view of the developments that have taken place in that interval, and it often happens that although we have taken 3·20 as the average rate of borrowing for a particular year, on taking account finally, it turns out that it is 3·30, and this difference really represents the recalculation made on account of a small increase.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We may now proceed to Demand No. 10.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department is governed by a fixed rate of interest.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is assuming it.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The Finance Minister said the other day at the time of the Budget that whatever is charged or payable in the market for raising loans is payable by the particular departments to which the loans are transferred. The average is thought of originally and subsequently we find that the average is increased during the course of the year. I want to know whether there is no fixed formula.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes, there is no fixed formula. I gave first of all opportunity for enquiries to be answered by the Minister. If after the Minister has answered it, hon. Members from this side or that get up, when can the Minister end his reply? Merely because I am looking this side, I am not ignoring the other side.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal):**  
With regard to Demand No. 10,....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member's cut motion is out of order.

**Shri N. B. Chaudhury:** My point is that this was not provided for in the original Budget. The explanation furnished is that no provision for this expenditure was made in the Budget of the current year as the extent of the expenditure was not known.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is this a new service?

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** No, it is not a new thing, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member said that this is a thing which did not find a place in the original Demand, which means that the House was not given an opportunity of a discussion relating to the policy. I am asking the hon. Minister this question, and if I have any doubt, I will ask for the papers to be produced.

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** It was under Demand No. 10-A, 'Contributions to the International Tele-Communications Union, Geneva' and the International Radio Consultative Committee is an organ of the parent body, namely, the International Tele-Communications Union. We have been paying contributions to the international body. So, it was provided for in the last Budget year, but as these particular bills did not come then—they came to us only in February—we have to pay them; otherwise, we will have to pay additional interest on the amount of the bills.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is a matter of a policy which has already been accepted by the House. Therefore, this cut motion is out of order.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** But if you read the explanation you will find that no provision was made for it in the current year.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not understand the significance of the name of the organisation. Is it the same organisation of which we are members and for which contributions are made from time to time, or from year to year, or a branch of it?

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** I would again refer the hon. Member to the original Budget grant of 1953-54. This was Rs. 2,40,000.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the organisation called?

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** International Tele-communications Union. Radio also plays an important part in tele-communications and as such the Radio Consultative Committee is an organ under that International body. For the Seventh Plenary Session to be held in 1953 we had provided for Rs. 53,500 in the original Budget demand. This was utilised to meet some other expenditure. The bills of the plenary Session were received as late as February. Hence this Demand has to be made.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Let us apply ourselves to larger amounts. The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Communications'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 14—DEFENCE SERVICES,  
EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,87,66,000 be granted to the President to defray the

charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force.'"

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** The item for the aircraft was provided for last year. They say that full provision for it was not made, because it was expected that the money could be spread over a little longer period. I would now like to know the reason for this demand of Rs. 3 crores now. What is the emergency or particular situation in which we are asked to grant this additional amount, because it could not be spread over a longer period. Is it because we had to pay cash down immediately, or were there certain transactions and agreements which did not go through according to stipulations?

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore):** Sir, I want to say that in the General Budget nearly 47 per cent. of the revenue is allotted for Defence that is nearly Rs. 197 crores are spent on Defence Organisation for various purposes. Now we have been asked to vote another Rs. 3 crores. It makes nearly Rs. 200 crores. Nearly 50 per cent. of our Budget will be diverted for purposes of Defence Organisation. At the time of the Budget last year we were given to understand that so far as military expenditure is concerned, there will be no supplementary demands made during the year. Now the Minister has come forward with a new Demand for nearly Rs. 3 crores. I would like to know what is the emergency, or the extraordinary situation that has arisen as my hon. friend the previous speaker put it; which demanded so much money now. We are almost on the eve of another Budget and we have been asked to vote another Rs. 3 crores. I want to know from the hon. Minister why this item could not be kept for the next year; why there was such a hurry and haste.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** I want to know the basic policy of our Government in regard to this item.

As you know, I made three attempts in the course of the last session to know, in regard to this question—about the purchase of French Ouragons. I wanted to know from the Prime Minister as to why we were buying this aircraft at all. I can understand expediency. This item concerns over 50 French aircrafts, not exceeding 100 I believe. This subject raised a talk around the world, in New York specially where they said that we had paid very much higher price than what the Americans would have been prepared to sell us. We cannot buy from nations who have their 'pockets' in our land, be they of France or Portugal. When the fight and conflict in regard to these pockets is sharpening—the conflict is really sharpening on the borders of Goa and it must also sharpen on our side against France, though our Prime Minister has been magnanimous to appeal for a cease fire in Indo-China which has been well received by circles in the French National Assembly—and when the N.A.T.O. is going to lend vast amounts of aircraft.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is going.....

**Shri Joachim Alva:** It is a very important matter.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am only sorry for the hon. Member; if he had no opportunity to speak on the Budget, he cannot speak now.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** I am asking for information, Sir. I just wanted to know the decision. I sent a short notice question on this very subject to the hon. Prime Minister and that question was not even placed before the House. I raised the matter: how did you happen to place an order when the basic policy has not been settled?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sorry, in spite of all my sympathies for the hon. Member, I cannot allow this. It is a misfortune that many speeches are undelivered; during the course of the Budget debate, all the 500 Members, cannot take part. Therefore, you must only wait for another budget.

So far as this is concerned, the only point raised by Shrimati Renu Chakravartty is appropriate to the matter. Why should not this be put off? Both the hon. Members on this side spoke: they could have originally anticipated this matter so that the expenditure would be spread over some years and therefore, immediate payments during this year may not be called for. What has happened now and why should this be called for? The other point is a point of policy and may be taken up next year.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** May I ask at least one question? Are we going...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not a question of bargain. If it is a question of policy, even half a question I will not allow.

**The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra):** It was decided to purchase these aircrafts early this year. The negotiations were conducted and the contract was entered into after the current year's budget had been framed.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He may speak more distinctly and more slowly.

**Shri Satish Chandra:** The contract for the purchase of new Ouragon aircraft—which the hon. Member knows we have purchased this year—was finalised on 25th June 1953. Before that date the exact price and the delivery dates were not known. It was thought that these aircrafts will be available to us during a period of next two or three years and the payment will also be spread over the next two or three years. We will now be able to get all of them during this year. Half of them or more have already arrived and the rest are arriving next month. The entire payment has to be made during the current financial year. That is why we have come with this Demand for the supplementary grant to meet extra expenditure under this Head. That, I think, clarifies the position regarding the point raised by Mrs. Chakravartty.

[Shri Satish Chandra.]

As regards the point raised by Mr. Gurupadaswamy, I think the Finance Minister will bear me out when I say that we have not exceeded the ceiling fixed for the Defence budget. There will be some savings under certain other heads and the overall defence ceiling is not likely to be exceeded on account of the purchase of this particular equipment. Though under this particular head we are spending more than what was budgeted for, it does not necessarily follow that the percentage of the Defence expenditure to the entire Government of India expenditure will be increased. We remain, as far as I think, within the ceiling i.e., within the amount sanctioned for Defence Services. Under this particular head, we are of course spending more.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** It is true that the finalisation of this agreement was made in 1953. But surely on the basis of what the hon. Minister said, that they were expecting to pay it in various instalments, there were certain negotiations and a certain understanding, on the basis of which the Finance Minister drew up the budget in respect of that Ministry. I want to know whether those negotiations fell through, or is it that we had to contract for certain other aircraft which were not originally intended? Otherwise, why has it exceeded?

**Shri Satish Chandra:** Apparently I have not been able to explain the position clearly. As a matter of fact, the supply of the aircrafts has been expedited at our own request. The delivery of all the aircrafts is being completed within this financial year, instead of being spread over two years.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** So it actually means that we are buying more aircraft than we had originally intended.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Orders have been placed. But, for the current year the expenditure was not anticipated to be the total amount of the

whole order. The execution of the order may be spread over two or three years, because the supplying country may take its own time. If against a hundred aircraft they agree to send thirty this year, the budget provision is made for that number. There might be an emergency when all these may be called for, and if thirty or forty more come during this year itself I do not think we should pursue the question of emergency at this stage.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I want to ask the Finance Minister whether the budget ceiling is actually exceeded or not. The Deputy Defence Minister was saying that the ceiling originally fixed is not exceeded. I want to know from the Finance Minister whether it is exceeded or not.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If it is exceeded, some article is purchased.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** The information can only be given as at this stage. But in a few days' time the House will know whether the Defence budget is exceeded or not.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Anyhow, we have got some aircraft in return for that money.

**Shri G. S. Singh (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur):** May I ask a question?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will allow the hon. Member to put a question. But let not hon. Members think of questions after the hon. Minister has answered; let them think of the questions in advance.

**Shri G. S. Singh:** Does this Supplementary Demand relate only to Ouragons or to other aircraft which have been purchased by the Defence Ministry?

**Shri Satish Chandra:** What other aircraft the hon. Member has in mind?

**Shri G. S. Singh:** Firefly, for instance.

**Shri Satish Chandra:** Firefly aircraft does not belong to the Air Force at all. This Demand for expenditure relates only to the Air Force items and not to the Navy.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Sir, is it proper on our part to purchase these aircraft from the French Government in view of what the French are doing to our people in Pondicherry?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question need not be answered. I have already said that that is a matter of policy.

The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,87,66,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 31.—STAMPS**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,30,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Stamps'."

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Now, this is a good example to show what my first point was. That the expenses had not been anticipated even on the basis of things that were actually needed to be executed even before the Budget was framed. For instance, it may be possible to accept that there was an increase in the consumption of paper for things like post-cards, banderols and inland letter cards. That is quite reasonable. But, then it says about certain new jobs like the printing of U.P. Zamindari Abolition Compensation Bonds and Rehabilitation Grant Bonds. Obviously these are things that the Government knew before and things for which they would have budgeted for. I do not

understand why at this late stage, suddenly, we are asked to wake up and say that this is something that was unforeseen, some new job for which we had suddenly to cater for and therefore we ask for a new additional supplementary grant? That was the question which I wanted to put.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** Sir, I have also one cut motion. In view of the fact that the U.P. Zamindari Abolition Act was passed some time back—two years back—why is it that the U.P. Government makes delay in submitting orders for the necessary Bonds? Only the other day we heard from the hon. Finance Minister that with regard to certain matters, some other State also approached the Central Government rather late. That was a grievance on the part of the Government of India. So, why is it, when the Government of India will have to make extra provision, the State Governments could not submit their requirements for such extra work?

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** May I know, Sir, if there has been any increase in the sale of post-cards and inland letter during the year 1953-54 as against 1952-53?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Each Ministry gives an Administrative Report. Before the Ministry is taken up for discussion, I am sure these figures will be given. If the hon. Minister has got the figures, he may give them immediately.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** We have not got it.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** They say the Demand is for printing, post-cards and inland letters.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member wants a comparative statement of the demand of 1953-54 and that of 1952-53, but the extra demand relates not to 1952-53 but to 1953-54.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Whether in this year—1953-54—there has been an increase in printing of post-cards and inland letters, and if so, am I to

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

understand from this that there has been an increase in the sale of post-cards and inland letters as compared to 1952-53?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is a different thing. There are two things—provision made in the Budget and excess in the Budget. Each one is separate from the other. So far as this question is concerned, it will be answered at the time of the Budget. So far as the Supplementary Demands given by the Minister are concerned, these are excess over the anticipated expenditure.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** We were asked why we could not make the provision in respect of the U.P. Bonds. So far as the press is concerned, it is a commercial undertaking and it can take on a new job only when it is required to do. This is not a point which I can answer on behalf of the press. It is a very complicated transaction. The total sum involved is about Rs. 130 crores. and that by itself, even if we had known it, does not give a clue to the number of Bonds required. That depends upon the number of intermediaries to whom these Bonds are to be distributed.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There may be others also.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** That is another matter. That is the financial part of it. But, we understand that there are about 20 lakhs of intermediaries. We have no information in our possession which would have enabled us to make a forecast even if we could have anticipated the assignment of this new job to us.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

“That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,30,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954. in respect of ‘Stamps’.”

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND No. 34.—(CURRENCY)**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

“That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 12,06,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of ‘Currency’.”

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND No. 38.—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The motion is:

“That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,80,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance’.”

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Here we are budgeting for a new Research Programmes Committee, which, it is said, has to arrange for suitable schemes of research and investigation into social, economic and administrative problems relating to national development. It goes on to say that it will organise, in co-operation with Universities and other institutions, a programme of co-ordinated research in agricultural economics, problems relating to employment, economic and social aspects of river valley projects, etc. My question is this. We have already a large number of committees. For instance, we have under the Education Ministry such technical committees which are going into various aspects of industrial research. There are certain other Committees and statistical institutions which are doing some other types of work. By putting up a new Research Programmes Committee with such a wide scope

of activity, will it have any effect? The amount of work which it is supposed to do is fantastic, from river valley projects to relationship between investment and output, and co-ordinated research in agricultural economics. We have also the Agricultural Councils and Research Institutions. On top of that we are now budgeting for a Research Programmes Committee. I am afraid we do not see the exact nature in which this is going to be effective and how it will really carry on its work. This is a completely new thing. Although it is stated that this has been budgeted in the Five-Year Plan, it is not the Research Programmes Committee that was budgeted in the Five Year Plan, a provision of Rs. 50 lakhs has been made for general objectives. How this particular Research Programmes Committee is to function and how it will be effective, all that is not stated. It is impossible for us to judge whether it is something that we should pass or not.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** My cut motion refers to this. I would like to know the exact nature of the programmes. It is stated that Universities and certain persons who may be connected with the Universities, or University professors will carry on research work. Will they carry on research in regard to the conditions of agricultural workers or others who are working at present in connection with the river valley projects? Will they also study the conditions of peasants who would be asked to pay a particular rate of betterment levy and other water rates etc.? The problem involves the betterment rates and other charges of various kinds which may be realised later on. Will they also study how these things will affect the people? The work covers a very wide field, social and economic consequences, etc. There are cottage industries; there is town planning. I would like to know whether the question of how particular classes of the community will be affected will also be included.

4 P.M.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I find that much of the money required

under this Demand is meant for expenditure incurred on the Research Programmes Committee. Where is the necessity for such a committee? The Planning Commission is already there. It is a permanent body sitting throughout the year. It is meant only for plan-making and making researches. I do not understand why Government have a mania for such committees.

Then, I do not know whether this committee will be useful at all. By experience, we know the fate of these committees. They send up their reports, which are not properly examined and Government normally sleep over them. I may mention the Damodar Valley Corporation Enquiry Committee. It sent its report long ago, but till today Government have not examined it and no action has been taken. If that is the attitude of Government, what is the necessity for having such committees? It is sheer waste of time, energy and public money.

In this particular case, there is absolutely no case for having such a committee. The Planning Commission is enough. It has so many experts. I do not see why it needs the guidance and assistance of other committees. If it does require such guidance and assistance, there are other agencies available. The Universities are there. They are sending their reports. There are professors and leaders of public opinion, who have been expressing their views. If those people are consulted, that would be enough. The expenditure on such committees is totally unnecessary and uncalled for. I feel that this Demand should not be granted.

**The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda):** In the first instance, I would like to submit that this is no time for me to answer the criticism about the report on the D.V.C. At an appropriate occasion later, I shall do so. At present, I would only say that the criticism is unjustified.

Regarding this particular committee, I believe there is a misapprehension. Hon. Members seem to think

[Shri Nanda]

that all this money is going to be spent on the committee. There is a provision of Rs. 50 lakhs in the Plan for research of the type indicated here, namely, research on social, economic and administrative problems. The money is to be spent on that research. The committee is not going to claim much of that money.

I thought that hon. Members would welcome the progress of research of this nature. Somebody asked whether we are going to look into the problems of the peasants, the question of a betterment levy, etc. I have here a list of the schemes of research which have been already sanctioned. Once you concede the need for research—and it has been conceded and is part of the Plan—then effective arrangements have to be made for conducting that research. The Planning Commission has its various organs for co-ordinating and looking after various schemes. Research is a specialised matter. Therefore, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, along with some eminent economists and others has constituted a small committee for the purposes of direction, co-ordination, laying down of principles, giving of grants and the looking after of the proper execution of the work.

It had not been possible at an earlier stage to anticipate the precise nature of the work or the amount of expenditure. It was done only towards the latter part of the year. A portion of the expenditure of Rs. 12 lakhs in connection with schemes already sanctioned had to be paid during the year. I may give the House some of the schemes:

Survey of unemployment in Travancore-Cochin.

Social and economic effects of tenancy reforms in Bombay.

Enquiry into low income farmers in Kodinar.

Investment and employment aspect of Bhakra-Nangal.

Investigations re: small-scale industries in Delhi State.

Tenancy reforms in Bombay.

Changing patterns of employment and earnings in Poona City.

Cultivators' holdings—analysis of data of Agricultural Labour Enquiry.

Regional development of Aligarh City.

Socio-economic survey of Allahabad City.

Urbanisation of Vishakapatnam Harbour.

Survey of small-scale industries in Salem.

A preliminary survey of Kakrapar Project.

Economic Survey of Bombay.

Economic Survey of Greater Delhi.

Regional development of Bhopal.

Research project on small-scale and cottage industries and handicrafts in Nasik.

I would not like to take up the time of the House by reading all of them. Most of these schemes have a bearing on rural development, the condition of the peasants, the problem of unemployment and the development of small-scale industries.

So far as the nature of the work is concerned, nobody can take exception to the character of the research. The need for it is obvious. When we are spending nearly Rs. 2,000 crores on programmes of development, we want to bring to bear on them all the benefits of research, so that we can utilise that money effectively. There are, in the Plan, a number of recommendations regarding improvement of administration, creation of better foundations for development in future, etc. and for these purposes we need better knowledge than we have.

In the First Five Year Plan itself, it has been stated: "a word may be added about the provision of Rs. 50 lakhs in the Plan for research and investigation into social, economic and administrative problems relating to national development". It points out that "in many fields, sufficient data are wanting to enable schemes to be formulated". It adds, "It is therefore proposed to organise in co-operation with the Universities and other institutions special investigations into selected problems of development". You will thus see that the idea is to bring in the Universities and the University professors who are already working in this field and give them the facilities which they lack, and thus mobilise their energy and get more work done than would otherwise be the case. It is not really a case of a new big committee being created.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** We are in the third year of the Plan, and I would like to know why only towards the close of the third year this committee has been set up. It ought to have been set up at the beginning of the Plan itself.

**Shri Nanda:** It is a legitimate point.

**Shrimati Reau Chakravartty:** I would like to seek a clarification, so that the hon. Minister may reply to both points. I feel it is better late than never. I have no quarrel on that point. But may I know what this committee is meant for? Is it only going to co-ordinate the activities of existing organisations, governmental or otherwise? Are only the policies and requirements of the Planning Commission going to be discussed? Is that the idea behind this committee? Are we right in understanding it that way?

**Shri Nanda:** The Planning Commission has laid down certain directions for research in consonance with the demands of the Plan. The schemes are invited from college, Universities, individual economists and institutions that are in the field. These schemes are then examined and any guidance that is required as also the money is

given. The hon. Member is right. It is the existing institutions that will conduct the research, and if there is no provision for research on any particular item, the Planning Commission, through this Committee, is certainly free to make provision for that also.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** May we have this assurance that after setting up this Committee the Government would not try to levy an irrigation rate or any other levy as was done in the case of West Bengal with regard to the Mayurakshi project where a rate has been levied?

**Shri Nanda:** These are administrative problems.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** How does it arise out of this?

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** Then what is the utility of the research? He says this amount will be spent in research on the condition of the people and the socio-economic consequences. Unless we know the present position of the peasants or other people concerned, how can we decide on the future effects?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They will study the present. They will indicate the future.

Has the hon. Minister anything more to say?

**Shri Nanda:** I do not think anything more is called for.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He need not stop on my account.

Of course, Rs. 50 lakhs has been provided for in the Five Year Plan as the hon. Minister has said. The provision by way of Supplementary Demand is Rs. 2 lakhs for this year. The hon. Finance Minister will bear with me. Prior to the last budget the practice has been that when a new service is contemplated—as it is definitely stated here—the Standing Finance Committee used to meet. Now, the Standing Finance Committee is no longer there. The whole Parliament is going into the matter. I would

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

urge for future guidance that with respect to new services, greater details must be given along with a memorandum on the lines that used to be submitted to the Standing Finance Committee with respect to new services.

It is said the Committee has already come into existence. When was it brought into existence? How is the research going to be made? There are river valley projects, there are universities, economic students and professors. Are those professors going to give us advice regarding river valley projects? How many committees are there? What is the amount that is going to be expended? When once Parliament comes to a conclusion regarding a new service, the next year the policy cannot be gone into. Only the amount that is to be spent can be discussed, because the service has already been started and the principle has been accepted. Therefore, so far as new sub-heads are concerned, I would like greater details to be given to the House so as to make it possible for the House to consider the *pros* and *cons* of the entire amount required not only for this year but for future years.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** That proceeds on the assumption that we came to the conclusion that it was a new service.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** New sub-head. Hon. Minister might look into page 8. It is not my interpretation.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** New sub-head, not new service. The word "new service" has a special significance—some departure in policy. I am only telling you, Sir, what view we took. It is not my purpose to challenge the opinion or the views that you have expressed, and this is only in self-defence. We took the view that this was not a new service because research in social, economic and administrative problems is part of the ordinary duties of the Government and a normal feature of Government's activities. We have now—and the hon.

Member referred to them—various statistical committees; we have the National Income Unit, we have the National Sample Surveys and we have various other odd research problems we undertake. Therefore, we thought that this was only a kind of streamlining of our research activity. Instead of taking up research on an *ad hoc* basis, we thought it would be better if we set up a committee for co-ordinating and guiding the activities in this direction.

The novel feature, if I may say so, of this—which we thought still did not make it a new service—was that the Universities and other similar bodies were to be associated with the research. In the past it was always the tendency for Government to set up an organisation of its own to conduct research, and we felt that the Universities and Economic Departments were more or less left out of the current of research work which was of such great importance in the economic development of the country, and this Research Programme Committee has been formulated to give effect to that particular idea, i.e., to invite the co-operation of the various Universities.

If I might add to the statement made by my hon. colleague, it includes nearly all the prominent economists and the statisticians in the country, and they have been in touch with the Universities. They invited the research schemes on subjects which they indicated, the priority of which was decided by them. And these schemes have been scrutinised. Each scheme perhaps involved an expenditure of Rs. 18,000, Rs. 20,000, Rs. 25,000 and so on. So, this research now is very broad-based all over the country and is largely being carried out through the Universities.

We have, I might add, issued two Press *communiqués*, one in August, 1953, and one in December, 1953, just after each of the two meetings which have already been held by the Research Committee. But if your ruling

now is that this is a new service, we can only bear it in mind. We cannot undo the harm that has already been done by our coming to the conclusion that it was not a new service.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** May I make a submission? While I understand the position taken by the Finance Minister, I do want your ruling on this point that we should not interpret very widely such things as research. For instance, industrialisation is something that every Government supports, and therefore, any new item can be introduced as we stand for industrialisation. Definitely we stand for research, but how to carry it out? That is a matter that we do not accept as coming under policy. We should not put such a wide interpretation. I do appeal to you that we should have more information.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Nobody denies the necessity for research, nor did I intend by what I said before that I wanted to take a decision on what the Government has already done. Rs. 50 lakhs has been provided for in the Plan. But every time Government asks Parliament to sanction a particular sum, it is open to any Member of Parliament to say that the money ought not to be spent in that manner, but in some other manner. So, this is the opportunity when Rs. 2 lakhs are asked for, for hon. Members to say that this is not right method of research. Hon. Members are entitled to indicate the best and the most efficient method of spending the money for the purpose for which it is contemplated. Therefore, I thought this was an opportunity for the House to come to a conclusion and then make constructive suggestions to the Ministry and to the Government as to how the maximum benefit may be attained by the amount that is spent. In the circumstances, wherever there may be a reasonable doubt, a decision may be taken in favour of Parliament's control over it. It is not as if I am now willing to decide whether it is a new service or a new sub-head. It might not be a new service or a new

sub-head, it might already be there, but if the Parliament wants to raise any question, the only occasion for them to do so is when the money is voted for that particular purpose. So, they must have some more material than what they have got.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I do not demur to any observations made by the hon. Members, but I am trying to say that we have indicated on page 8 in the note, that the main purpose of the Committee will be to organise, in co-operation with Universities and other institutions, a programme of co-ordinated research on selected problems in agricultural economics, problems relating to employment, economic and social aspects of river valley projects, relationship between investment and output in different lines and other allied subjects of interest to the Planning Commission. All this sum is made up of small grants of Rs. 15,000 or Rs. 20,000—as I said earlier,—such as individually we would have made even in the past. If we had made a grant to some school or University, it could not have been called a new service, because it is usual for us to give a grant for economic research. Now what differentiates this from those isolated grants is this comprehensive effort made to promote economic research in a broadbased way, but the total is made up of the small items of Rs. 15,000, Rs. 20,000 and so on. The only additional information which we could have supplied to hon. Members would have been a list of the Universities which have sent up these various schemes. But I do not know whether that would have been necessary because this sum of Rs. 12 lakhs includes grants given to quite a large number of Universities. Each scheme is scrutinised very carefully by this Committee, before they recommend the allotment of funds to the Universities. The only detail which we have not given is the list of the Universities which have sent up schemes, and which, after scrutiny will be called upon to undertake the research work.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,80,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Demand No. 39 is not to be voted.

**DEMAND NO. 40.—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE UNION AND STATE GOVERNMENTS.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,92,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Union'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 45.—AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 47.—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,97,65,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year

ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 48.—MINISTRY OF HEALTH**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 21,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Health'."

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I would like to know the necessity for the appointment of a Deputy Secretary and an Under Secretary.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Are these new appointments or only old appointments to which new persons have been appointed?

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** They are new appointments altogether. If they were old appointments, they would not have come forward with this Supplementary Demand. I would like to know from the hon. Minister the necessity for these appointments.

We have been over-burdened with top-heavy expenditure on administration, and there have been lots of recruitments to various administrative departments recently and there has been too much of adding up of hands and legs, and not adding up of hearts. This has made the administration a vertiable jungle. I want to impress on this House the necessity for economy on administration.

After making this general observation, I want to ask why the Ministry is in need of one Deputy Secretary and one Under Secretary. Till now, I think, they have been carrying on the work, from the point of view of administration, satisfactorily, and therefore this demand for extra staff is not necessary. Further, I do not

know whether the work of this Ministry has increased really in these days. If the work has really increased, we would not grudge this extra expenditure. I know the hon. Minister will say that the work is progressively increasing, but we have not seen any progress in the work, and the Health Ministry has cut a very sorry spectacle in the eyes of the public for not having done satisfactory work in improving the health of the country. It has not delivered its goods. That is my charge. Therefore, it has no case to come before the House with a supplementary demand. Hence, I feel that this supplementary demand is not justified, and we should not vote for more staff than is necessary.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** The amount asked for is only Rs. 21,000, and as such it is not a very big amount. But considering the fact that the Ministry of Health is one of the Ministries to which the least amount of money has been allotted from the General Budget, and therefore we would like all the expenditure that is possible to be incurred on manning the hospitals, giving more nurses, doctors etc. for the public and also more medicines, we would wish that the minimum expenditure should be made on Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries. When there are various categories of class III and IV servants fighting in order to get even their minimum wages, we are seeing here that the salaries of officers are being increased. When we are appealing to the class III and IV servants to have a sense of love for the country and a spirit of sacrifice, I think we should ask the officers also to do the same especially when this is being done after the Budget has been passed.

Lastly, I would like to know one other point. A sum of Rs. 6,000 has been asked for under the head 'Allowances, honoraria etc'. What is this remuneration meant for? On what basis will this remuneration be given? I do not quite understand these points.

A sum of Rs. 6,000 has been asked for to provide for the leave salary of

an officer. Who is this officer, and why is it necessary to have this officer, after the Budget has been passed, and to provide for his salary in a supplementary demand in a Ministry which has the least amount of money allotted to it?

These are the reasons why we are objecting to this grant, not because we do not want to give more money to the Health Ministry—in fact, we would like to give more to it—but we want to be sure that every pie is spent well, and for the people.

**The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur):** As has been said, the amount asked for is very small. I take it therefore that it is on a matter of principle that hon. Members opposite have objected to it. I would like hon. Members to know that up to the end of August 1949, there were two posts of Deputy Secretary in my Ministry. But as a measure of economy—at that time, we were appealed to for economy particularly—one post was not renewed. But I found that it was very difficult for me to carry on with just one Secretary and one Deputy Secretary. Time and again, when the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary was on leave, I had only person in my Ministry to work for me. On more than one occasion, when one of these officers was ill and absent, I had nobody at all to help me. I made it clear to the Ministry of Finance at that time that should circumstances make it necessary to revive the second post of Deputy Secretary, the absence of a specific provision should not be a bar to the recreation of this post. I must also say that the work of the Ministry has increased to such an extent that I find it absolutely impossible to carry on now. I would have withheld asking for this appointment until the end of this financial year, but my one and only Deputy Secretary had to proceed on deputation to the U.S.A. in the beginning of November. I discussed everything with the Finance Ministry and the Staff Enquiry Committee,—a special one which was appointed,—and having looked into the tremendous increase of work in

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

my Ministry, this appointment was agreed to.

Moreover, as far as one more Under Secretary is concerned, I can only ask the Members to believe me when I say that my officers are working up to half past seven every day, on all Saturdays and even on Sundays. We have got special schemes now: the training of health workers, the Community Projects, the Ford Foundation Centres, the All-India Council of Health which has been appointed recently, and the establishment of the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences; there is the contributory health service scheme which is going to give tremendous relief especially for those who never had it before. There is the question of the Central Health Cadre; the national filaria control scheme; the scheme for family planning, etc. There is, thus, so much increase of work in my Ministry, and I do want hon. Members to believe me when I say that I would be the last person in the world to ask for any further appointments unless they were absolutely necessary.

One hon. Member asked me as to why one officer had to go on leave for six months. Actually, there was a Joint Secretary in my Ministry, and I expected him back after three months, but he did not come back to the Ministry, because, under the new rules framed, anybody who had been in a Ministry for five years has to be transferred and so he had to take extra leave. It was an unforeseen thing to which I could not possibly have reckoned on. The other items are small: Rs. 1,000 for payment of dearness allowances, and so on, none of which could be foreseen. I beg to submit that the sum demanded is an absolute necessity.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 21,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year

ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Health'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 22,50,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Police'."

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** The explanatory note given under this Demand is not sufficiently clear. We want to know—this House is entitled to know—why it was thought necessary to spend more money on police. I learn that the northern borders of India are not so secure nowadays, and I also learn that there has been continuous and progressive infiltration of foreigners in these areas. I assume that extra expenditure on this score was necessitated due to that reason. Or, if that is not correct, I want to know from the Minister why there was necessity for this increased expenditure.

In this connection, I want to impress upon the House that our northern borders are exposed to new danger. In Kalimpong and other places, there has been too much of activity of foreign nationals. There has been systematic infiltration into various ranks by foreigners and I have come to know also that there has been a lot of subtle propaganda carried on in these areas against India. If that is so, then, it is necessary that Government should take proper precautions and all necessary measures to protect the northern borders. The security of India is most essential for us. By safeguarding our external security, we would be safeguarding our freedom. But I want to know from the hon. Minister whether this expenditure on police is meant to protect our borders against these infiltrations, or, whether it is meant for other purposes. The explanatory

note is not very clear. If the expenditure is meant only to safeguard our territorial security, I feel that we can vote for the Demand.

In this connection, I may submit, that the Government is not acting effectively in respect of national security. There has been too much of slackness on the part of the Government in taking proper measures to counteract this foreign menace in our borders. In this matter, it is better we co-operate by holding consultations with our border States like Nepal, Bhutan, etc. So far, there is no co-ordination of activities between these States with regard to the protection of our borders. It is very necessary that we should follow a systematic policy of consultation with our neighbouring States in the north, so that our defence and their defence are properly secured. It is very necessary that we should take more measure in this regard and I expect that the Ministry will come forward with an assurance that everything will be done to protect the security in the north.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We have got the panicky report from the previous speaker, but I would like the hon. Minister to tell us why it has been necessary to have almost one-third of the original Estimate again brought forward under this police grant.

**Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati):** Ask yourself.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** About Rs. 22,50,000 has been asked for. "This is required to meet the expenditure incurred by the Governments of Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh on border police". What has happened between May, 1953 and now—up to the present moment that we have suddenly required this huge amount of money which could not be foreseen then? That is the question that I would like to put, for an answer, because police is an item on which we spend quite a lot of money, both at the Centre and in the States. So, I would like to know why it is that this amount has suddenly been brought

forward and why it was not foreseen during the last budget.

श्री भक्त दर्शन (जिला गढ़वाल पूर्व व जिला मुरादाबाद उत्तर पूर्व) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में दो एक वाक्य कहने हैं। अभी श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने यह शंका प्रकट की कि यह जो पुलिस रखी जा रही है वह अनावश्यक है। मैं सीमावर्ती प्रदेश का रहने वाला होने के नाते जानता हूँ कि इस पुलिस के न होने से वहाँ कितना आतंक था। जब से पुलिस वहाँ नियुक्त की गई है तब से वहाँ की जनता में संतोष और धैर्य पैदा हो गया है। मैं एक ही उदाहरण आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि इस साल टेहरी-गढ़वाल की नीलंग घाटी के व्यापारी इस भय से पश्चिमी तिब्बत को नहीं गये कि वहाँ वे लूट लिये जायेंगे। इस तरह की घटनायें वहाँ आये दिन हुआ करती हैं। और मैं इस सदन को विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि इस पुलिस की वजह से सीमावर्ती प्रदेश की स्थिति में बहुत सुधार हुआ है। मैं तो आगे बढ़ कर अपने मंत्री महोदय से यह अनुरोध करना चाहूँगा कि वे इस के लिये अगले वर्ष और भी अधिक रुपया रखने की कृपा करें और यह प्रबन्ध कुछ वर्षों के लिये वहाँ पर स्थायी हो जाना चाहिये। इस में लिखा है कि उत्तर प्रदेश, पंजाब और हिमाचल प्रदेश, इन तीन प्रान्तों के लिये २२,५०,००० रुपया स्वीकृत किया जाय। क्या माननीय मंत्री महोदय यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस में से प्रत्येक प्रान्त का कितना हिस्सा है और वह किन किन मदों में खर्च किया जा रहा है ?

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** My task has been very much lightened by the speeches—at least two of them—which we have just heard. The hon. Member who spoke first correctly assessed the demands of the situation. This is not

[Dr. Katju]

a topic into which I can go into at any great length, nor would the House expect me to do so. We are very much alive to the security of India, to the protection of the integrity of India, on all sides and in all directions, north, west, south and east—everywhere.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** You contradict the Prime Minister.

**Dr. Katju:** Do I?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Yes.

**Dr. Katju:** But you must have misunderstood him.

**An Hon. Member:** Always.

**Dr. Katju:** The borders now extend, as one hon. Member said, right from the borders of Pakistan on this side, namely, Western Pakistan, to Eastern Pakistan, and great care has to be taken. We have got our military forces, into which I need not go. Then there is the armed police which is, in the first instance, maintained by the State Governments. The State Governments naturally said that, technically, border defence might be within their sphere of liability, but it is only fair that they should be relieved of this extra burden,—establishment of check-posts, protection of Indian nationals, and so on and so forth. Therefore, these matters we have gone into in a great detail with the three States of Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Himachal Pradesh and arrived at these figures. I can only say this much, that if in the next year we find that this amount is inadequate, that larger funds are required, then Parliament will be asked to sanction that, because this is really not a party matter at all. All of us are agreed that every possible care should be taken for protection. I can understand the anxiety of my hon. friend who spoke second in the debate for an inquiry as to why this huge sum—it is not a huge sum at all—should be spent.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** One-third.

**Dr. Katju:** That is right. My hon. friend who spoke first was most anxious that it should be enlarged. It appeared to him to be too small. (*Interruption*). I suggest that as a *via media* the House should be prepared to grant it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Vote for half of this? I did not understand the hon. Minister. As a *via media*—one Member wants more and the other Member wants less—have 50 per cent.?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Could we just have the break-up of the figures between Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh, if the hon. Minister has it?

**Dr. Katju:** They are really not of much interest to you, but I will give you.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister will address the Chair.

**Dr. Katju:** Sir, I always—somehow or other—invite that observation from you. That is my mistake. I am attracted to that side always. The break-up is: over Rs. 18 lakhs in Uttar Pradesh, over Rs. 4 lakhs in the Punjab and nearly Rs. 2 lakhs in Himachal Pradesh. I am giving round figures.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 22,50,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Police'."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### DEMAND NO. 61.—MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,75,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Irrigation and Power'."

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** With regard to this particular Demand, first of all, I would like to ask one question, whether the Government of India requested the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development that the meetings which they are required to hold in this connection should better be held either in Pakistan or in India? Here you see that as much as Rs. 3,18,600 is going to be spent in connection with this matter and expenditure is to be incurred both in India and in Washington. The expenditure is very large. You see that the posts of Special Commissioner, *ex-officio* Special Secretary and other officials on high salaries have been sanctioned for this purpose. Now, when the matter was taken up at the instance of the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, I want to ask whether India could not have asked the President to make a provision that such meetings should be held in India or in Pakistan. That is one point. Another thing is this. We now read in the papers that the Government of Pakistan is going to evolve some plan for utilising the Indus water in connection with some other plan. It so appears, and for that also the Government of the U.S.A. is perhaps going to help them. Recently it has appeared in the Press. I want to ask whether that plan will not in any way affect the plan which is referred to here. These two things must be clarified. Why should this huge expenditure be incurred in this connection not particularly to evolve any plan for the maximum utilisation of water in the two independent States, but simply for negotiating the matter in a distant place—as far as in Washington?

**Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack):** With regard to this item of expenditure on the canal water dispute, we do not have particulars of the officers who have gone there. But I do not see the necessity or expenditure on air passages, travelling and other allowances etc. in the U.S.A., including the cost of two stenographers

rendering secretarial assistance to it in Washington up to the end of February 1954, which is estimated at Rs. 2,67,500. I know very well that in the United States in the present age every other man and woman know shorthand and typewriting. There are plenty of stenographers available in the United States and I do not see the necessity of spending money, taking our stenographers from here by air and giving them special allowances and incurring special expenses. That is why I want to know why it becomes necessary, inasmuch as on previous occasions the House had heard from the Prime Minister—when there were complaints that the Embassies and the Legations in foreign countries are not manned entirely by Indians—that certain staff members are available in those countries from local people and at cheaper cost than taking them over from here. This does not also say when they went there, because it only says continued “up to the end of February”. How long have they been there? That also, I would like to know.

Then with regard to the expenditure on the appointment of these two Committees—the Damodar Valley Committee and the Mahanadi Rail cum Road Bridge Committee. I see the Damodar Valley Committee was appointed in October, 1952. No doubt, its term has been extended from time to time, but it should have come in the Budget for 1953-54. That has not come but it is coming now. Then the Mahanadi Rail-Road Bridge Committee; it too should have come in the Budget of 1953-54. Moreover, the Committees have reported long ago. The Damodar Valley Committee reported in June, 1953 and the Mahanadi Committee in October, 1953. I should like to know why these reports have not been laid on the Table of the House up to now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would like myself to know this. There is one post of Special Commissioner, Rs. 15,000, and one post of *Ex-officio* Special Secretary, Rs. 22,600. What

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker:]

are the functions of these two gentlemen? There is also one post of Executive Engineer and one post of Private Secretary to the Special Secretary.

**Shri Nanda:** In the first place, may I know whether I would be in order in taking up the question of these Committees' reports, and extending their time-limits, because that is not within the wording of this cut motion? It refers only to canal water dispute.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Other hon. Members who have not tabled cut motions would like to raise various matters. In voting for the Demand they would like to be appraised of the whole situation; otherwise, they might vote against.

**Shri Nanda:** I would like to clear up some factual doubts. Regarding the stenographers, no stenographers were sent by air. Stenographers go with the working party, specially for the reason that the work of this party is of a highly confidential nature. It was, therefore, necessary that for at least a large part of that work we should have people in whom we could repose confidence. I am not quite sure that even otherwise it would be very much cheaper to have the stenographers there rather than take them from here, considering the costs there. But, I do not want to labour that point. My chief point is that considering the nature of the work, it is necessary that we should have our own stenographers there.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad):** Why not utilise the services of the stenographers in our Missions there?

**Shri Nanda:** They must be having their own responsibilities. I am sure that would have been explored also.

Now, Sir, regarding the question why we did not ask for the venue of the Conference to be not Washington but some place in India, that is a very relevant point. My answer is, we did try. We tried very hard to see if we could secure

the consent of the other parties concerned to having this Conference held in some place in India. This was not acceded to. And, considering the vital issues involved and the great stake of the country, we could not have just stood out on that point and wrecked the whole arrangement.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** May I know one thing? Who did not agree to this arrangement—the Pakistan Government or the President of the Bank?

**Shri Nanda:** It was the Bank, more or less, to whom it was convenient to have the conference there. Having ascertained their attitude in the matter and their inclination, we had to agree to that. That is one part of it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Did they make any local inspection here?

**Shri Nanda:** Previous to this Conference, there were several investigations, joint visits and enquiries and inspections and much work had preceded that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** By the Bank?

**Shri Nanda:** Mutually, by the two parties; of course, the Bank was associated at several stages. That Conference had to be there. It was prolonged, we thought that it might end in about two months; but, we are not our own masters and there is the other party. We had gone there to get a settlement, if possible, and not to come away without a settlement. The circumstances and the exigencies of the situation called for a prolongation and we had to submit. Therefore, our representatives have to stay there longer than we had anticipated. That accounts for the increased expenditure.

Questions have been raised here regarding certain posts. There is the Special Commissioner. We have certain arrangements and understandings with Pakistan regarding the utilisation of the water resources common to both countries. You will recall, Sir, that certain disputes arose

and at least in the Press there were several times reports appearing, which created doubts in the minds of several people as to whether these arrangements were being adhered to. Both the Governments thought that there should be officers who would collaborate in watching the implementation of those understandings, so that we might avoid any disputes over minor matters. The Special Commissioner was the result of that. He is there and he consults his 'opposite number' regarding small matters that might arise from time to time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is he an engineer?

**Shri Nanda:** Yes, Sir, he is a high-grade engineer.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Rs. 15,000— for what period?

**Shri Nanda:** It should be for the period of the budget year.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it per month?

**Shri Nanda:** He is drawing his usual pay; he was an officer working with us; he has been sent to work there.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why is it put here, if he has not been specially appointed?

**Shri Nanda:** Probably, he is re-employed; I am not sure.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has he been re-employed for this purpose?

**Shri Nanda:** He had been working with us when he was sent there.

5 P.M.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is his monthly salary?

**Shri Nanda:** I am not quite sure of his monthly salary, but I will let the House know in a short time.

You ask about the Special Secretary. He is the leader of the delegation and a status has been assigned to him and so it is not a new post in that sense.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is he already a Secretary here?

**Shri Nanda:** He has been specially appointed for the purpose.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the Special Commissioner for?

**Shri Nanda:** The Special Commissioner is to function here in India. This is entirely a different proposition; the Special Secretary's work is in connection with the conference, and his function is to conduct and lead the delegation, but the Special Commissioner does not go there; his salary is Rs. 2,000 less pension. The Special Commissioner, who is here functioning in relation to the implementation of the understandings between the two countries.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Special Secretary is also paid on a monthly basis?

**Shri Nanda:** He has been given some special terms and I will find out his salary in a very short time. He is also an engineer—he is Mr. Khosla, who has retired.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** Does he get his pension also?

**Shri Nanda:** The hon. Member is asking me about the Rs. 2,000 which I quoted, but that salary was in relation to the Special Commissioner, which is Rs. 2,000 less pension. The pay of the Special Secretary, Mr. Khosla, is Rs. 3,750/-, which he was drawing before, and I presume it is also less pension.

Now, I have in mind the questions of the hon. Member.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Speaker said that the Supplementary Demands should finally be put to vote at five o'clock. There are a number of other cut motions also here. As soon as this is finished, I shall allow the hon. Member to speak on any one of the cut motions. I will apply the guillotine at 5-15 P.M.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** May I put my question? If there is no settlement yet between the two countries

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

In Washington, I should like to know what the Special Commissioner is doing here for implementing the agreement.

**Shri Nanda:** I should like to clarify the position. The work of that commission or working party is in connection with an overall settlement of the entire question of the utilisation of the water resources common between the two countries. That is a very large question, and when a settlement comes, it will really be a very good thing for all of us. But this is regarding the distribution of the waters subject to existing understandings. Whatever the existing arrangements are, disputes arise as to whether any party has done something which might disturb those arrangements and might work to the disadvantage of any party, and such matters are within the purview of the Special Commissioner.

I thought the other question about the committees has been very amply dealt with in the notes here. An important matter for investigation was entrusted to the committee and it finds that it cannot discharge its terms of reference adequately within a particular period. It asks for extension and then we have to give, within reasonable limits, such an extension. The Damodar Valley Committee is concerned with very important issues and it took more time. There was a question of scrutiny of data, going into matters of detail, engineering aspects, etc., and so the time could not be anticipated and it had to be extended by various stages and steps and it had to be provided for later on.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** What about the Press reports of a separate plan of Pakistan to utilise the Indus water?

**Shri Nanda:** I wish the hon. Member does not place so much trust on the Press report. Of course, reports appear in the Press from time to time, but the reports regarding another settlement and another plan have not been seen by me—I have not heard of them. It is enough if they have one plan. They are also among the mem-

bers of same conference and have joined in those deliberations and negotiations, and so they cannot have a separate plan with somebody else. After all, the plan is between India and Pakistan and the good offices of the Bank are available to both. We do not know of any other effort and I think we should discount anything that might have appeared in papers about this plan.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** What about those two reports?

**Shri Nanda:** I have already given the answer to that question. The reports will be laid on the Table of the House. If it arises out of this cut motion, let me state the position in that respect. It may take some time to state the entire position, but I believe in the course of replying to certain questions, the answer was given as to what the position in respect of these reports is. Some action is being taken and it is not that we are sleeping over the reports. We are having very active deliberation and we have been pursuing various matters arising out of the reports.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Will the Parliament have the benefit of these reports?

**Shri Nanda:** Yes, Sir, very soon, and the Parliament will find that whatever delay has occurred has been justified.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,75,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Irrigation and Power'."

*The motion was adopted.*

DEMAND NO. 96—MINISTRY OF  
TRANSPORT

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The motion is:

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,000 be granted to the President to defray the

charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Transport'."

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I wish to raise a point regarding the running expenses of staff cars. The pooling of cars was done with a view to effecting economy and it was recognised that the running expenses per car would be Rs. 1,800—that was the figure that we had been given. We find that instead of there being some saving, at one point there is a saving and at another point the number of cars has increased and so the running expenses are likely to amount to Rs. 3,700 per car. A policy was made out for effecting savings, and instead of each car having running expenses of Rs. 1,800, the figure has come to Rs. 3,700, which is more than double the original figure.

The next point is that in sub-clause (ii), it is stated that originally it was budgeted for 60 cars, including four new cars. Now, they have 69 cars, and it is stated that they have purchased 8 new cars and one second-hand car for the different Ministries as against four provided for in the Budget. On this basis, we find 8 new cars and one second-hand car minus the four provided for, that is, five cars, and these five cars cost Rs. 96,000. Does it mean that each car is costing about Rs. 19,000. From the explanation here it seems to me that there is something very wrong about the whole thing and I would request the hon. Minister to clearly state what the position is and why it is that instead of there being any saving the whole thing has gone up by leaps and bounds.

**The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan):** Sir, while the running expense was expected to be only Rs. 1,800 it has risen to Rs. 3,700 per car. I do not know what confusion has arisen in the mind of the hon. Member with regard to that. If the hon. Member is particular I shall give the prices of the cars purchased.

Four new cars purchased for the External Affairs Ministry and one old

car replaced comes to Rs. 76,000; a second-hand car for the Ministry of Irrigation and Power, Rs. 3,000; one new car for the I.A.S. Training School to replace the old car Rs. 9,000; one new car for the Ministry of Commerce and Industry to replace the old car, Rs. 20,000; one new car for the Ministry of External Affairs and Ministry of Health to replace the old car (new car yet to be purchased), Rs. 27,500.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is there any uniformity of standard in the matter of purchase of cars, or they can order *de luxe* cars?

**Shri Alagesan:** Though all the cars are supposed to be under a pool and under the Ministry of Transport, the purchase of these cars is decided by individual Ministries and there is not much of a pool left. I may inform the House, except control by way of log book, or other minor things. They themselves get sanction for these purchases.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is the increase in running charges due to increases work?

**Shri Alagesan:** Many of the cars are old cars and they have to be serviced.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South):** What are the makes of these cars?

**Shri Alagesan:** If the House is anxious I can provide that information.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** And also, regarding the need for all these cars, their bigness, their size, etc.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor):** Are the old cars fetching any value?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is now a quarter past five and I have to apply the "guillotine".

The question is:

"That the respective Supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 71, 89, 96, 105, 113, 125, 128, 129 and 132 be granted to the President to

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker:]

defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

*The motion was adopted.*

[The motions for Demands for Supplementary Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]

**DEMAND No. 71—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

**DEMAND No. 89—PRIVY PURSES AND ALLOWANCES OF INDIAN RULERS.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Privy purses and allowances of Indian Rulers'."

**DEMAND No. 96—MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,06,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Transport'."

**DEMAND No. 105.—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 65,57,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

**DEMAND No. 113—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,84,90,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Communications'."

**DEMAND No. 125—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,91,73,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

**DEMAND No. 128—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON BROADCASTING**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Broadcasting'."

**DEMAND No. 129—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON MULTIPURPOSE RIVER SCHEMES**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 58,09,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Multipurpose River Schemes'."

**DEMAND No. 132—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.**

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954,

in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research'."

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

**The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** I \*introduce the Bill.

I beg to †move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further 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:** The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further 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.*

*Clauses 1 to 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. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### †DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS IN RESPECT OF P.E.P.S.U. FOR 1953-54.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the respective Supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 2, 3, 8, 13, 14, 15, 21, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 46 and 48 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

*The motion was adopted.*

*[The motions for Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of P.E.P.S.U. which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]*

#### DEMAND NO. 2—STATE EXCISE DUTIES.

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,47,900 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of PEPSU to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'State Excise Duties'."

#### DEMAND NO. 3—STAMPS.

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 10,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of PEPSU to defray the charges which will come in course of

\*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

†Moved with the recommendation of the President.