

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

- (d) a separate Ministry on the same lines as that of Rehabilitation Ministry should be formed with a view to safeguarding the interests of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and to bring them to the level of other advanced classes in India in economic, educational and social matters; and
- (e) immediate steps should be taken to provide Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes with compulsory primary education all over India."

The Noes have it.

An Hon. Member: The Ayes have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find only 35 for, and a very large number against. The amendment is lost.

*The motion was negatived.*

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Sir, many are in the lobbies.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any hon. Member or the whip of a party must keep his Members ready here.

Shri Nambiar: The bell may be rung. What is the use of the bell, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not going to ring the bell. It is not for bringing in lazy Members. The hon. Members have come here leaving their homes. What are they here for? What is the attraction in the lobby? They not only do not discharge their duties but impose additional responsibility upon the Chair.

The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the cultivable waste lands in the country and the waste lands reclaimed by the

Government organisations both of the States and of the Centre, should be distributed to persons belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes without any delay."

*The motion was negatived.*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end, namely:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that—

- (a) members of the Scheduled Tribes, who have been adversely affected by the prohibition of *jhuming* or shifting cultivation should be rehabilitated;
- (b) the Scheduled Tribes of Tripura should not be ousted from the land belonging to them due to the requisitioning of such land by the Government for settling others there;
- (c) free land, implements and seeds should be given to landless persons belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Tribes."

*The motion was negatived.*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the other amendments are lost.

There is no more to be done regarding this motion. It has already been taken into consideration.

#### DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1953-54

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will now proceed to the consideration of the supplementary demands for 1953-54.

If any of the hon. Members who have given notice of cut motions want any of the motions to be moved, they may stand in their places.

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri M. C. Shah):** Many of them are out of order, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** So far as the cut motions on Demand No. 1 are concerned, I find only No. 1 to be in order. I will hear other hon. Members if they want to press their motions.

Mr. Gurupadaswamy has given notice of a cut motion for economy in various items of expenditure for which the supplementary demands for grants are requested. Hon. Members might know—how often I have to repeat it—that there are three kinds of cut motions. One is for the refusal of supplies. That relates to policy. The total demand might be reduced to one rupee. The other kind is for individual grievances,—that the demand may be reduced by Rs. 100. That will be a token cut for drawing the attention of Government regarding that particular matter. The third kind is economy cut. Wherever there is an economy cut, the hon. Member must show the particular items in which economy can be effected, say an item of Rs. 15973, and they must suggest the solution. There cannot be a general cut motion that the demand be cut by Rs. 100/- in these economy cuts. Anyhow, I am allowing this. All the same, I am willing to admit 'Economy', so that in future they may follow it. Regarding the others, I wish to say this. These are Supplementary Demands and on the Supplementary Demands, for a new service or for a service which was not thought of and for which no provision was made in the original budget, for such a thing that is coming up for discussion for the first time, hon. Members can go into it wholly, into the policy etc., and throw it out if they like, but if the matter has already been raised in the budget discussion or a provision was already made in the budget, on a matter of policy no discussion can now take place. On that ground I am unable to accept 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of these Cut Motions.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara):** 2 is reasonable, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** "Government's indifference to the crisis in the cashew nut industry" was discussed already. I think there was also a Bill regarding cashewnut industry.

**Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil):** No, Sir. I only pointed out certain specific cases.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** One other thing. Do any of the items in the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,27,000 relate to expenditure on cashewnut industry?

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** That is included here. An officer for enquiring into the cashewnut industry has been sent to the Travancore State. This is a new question and it was not provided in the budget already.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** In view of the representations made to the Commerce Minister that the position in respect of the cashewnut industry is very grave and that the Government of India must take immediate steps in the matter, the Government seems to have sent this officer.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let us hear the hon. Minister.

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karnarkar):** I might say that the officers for whom provision has been asked for now are these—Officer on Special Duty for Cottage Industries; Officer on Special Duty for Automobile Industry; one Deputy Secretary to deal with exports; one Deputy Director, Exhibitions; one other officer for the Industry Journal. We have not asked for any amount for the cashewnut industry.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Therefore, that does not arise.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** The other item is travelling allowances.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That also does not relate to the cashewnut industry. The hon. Member does not know the position and he cannot assume. Whatever has been specifically stated is stated.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** There is a specific provision for 'Other Miscellaneous Items'. We should be very clear on this. They cannot send the officer and find money from sources which are not voted. This is a new matter which came up before the Government only last month. How are they meeting the funds for this purpose?

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Please see page 3 of the Supplementary Demands for Grants, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does 'other miscellaneous items' include cashew-nut industry? The hon. Minister will look into the matter. But hon. Members might know that with respect to the Budget Demands, from one major demand, no transfer can be made to another major demand, and from a minor head in the same sub-head transfers can be made, and whenever there is provision, they do so. It is only when they do not have sufficient money, they come to the House. Under those circumstances, I am sorry this matter cannot be raised.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** That is not the point we have sought to raise, Sir. There is an omnibus entry 'other miscellaneous items'. We want to know precisely what it is.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They may ask for information about such items by means of questions, but now I do not allow Cut Motions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** What is the increase in travelling allowances?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You will have a chance and you can ask then.

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** Regarding 7, actually the Minister said last time that there was going to be a conference to review the working of the GATT. Here there is only the Demand, but as yet we do not know what has been the experience of the Government with regard to the working of the GATT, whether they are going to review it or whether the position has changed.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** My only point is this. There are various procedures which hon. Members are fully aware of. Whenever they want to raise a debate, they get it as they got one day for External Affairs. If they wanted to be particular about knowing the position relating to this conference and get assurances from Government, a day for debate would have been allotted. This cannot be raised in a Motion like this. I am sorry I cannot allow it under this head. Now, Shri Gurupadaswamy may speak on No. 1, but let him be brief.

**Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram):** Let us have a day in the next Session for discussing the GATT.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member might write to the Leader of the House about it. I am not in a position to deal with it now.

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

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,27,000 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 Commerce and Industry'."

#### *Economy in various items of expenditure*

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore):** I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,27,000 in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir, I find various items of expenditure given under Demand No. 1. I wish to get a few clarifications from the hon. Minister regarding certain matters that arise. The expenditure incurred on the publication of the Journal, *Industry and Trade* is extravagant and wasteful, because the amount that is being spent on the purchase of paper that is required

for the Journal is not purchased in the open market and the paper is not purchased at prevailing market rates. The quotations called for by the Ministry are excessive and the firms that have been supplying are quoting exorbitant rates. So, there is a clear case of a large expenditure on the purchase of paper for this journal. We do not know how much is being spent on the printing of this journal. I do not say that we do not want the journal or we should stop the printing of the journal. We want the journal but I suggest that steps be taken to improve the standard of the journal, the quality of the journal and steps also be taken to issue a more comprehensive journal covering all items. I find that there is some improvement in this regard, but it is not sufficient. If adequate steps are taken and if a serious attempt is made, the journal may be made more comprehensive and more informative. Further as I said before, steps should be taken to cut down the expenditure as there seems to be a lot of waste in this item. Then, Sir, regarding the exhibitions and the duties of officers who are asked to look after these exhibitions, I want to say a few words. The tendency of the Government seems to be to open exhibitions mostly in the western countries—Europe, Canada and such other countries, and not to open exhibitions in South-East Asia or the Middle East. So, I want a positive assurance from the Minister that hereafter he will not only concentrate upon exhibitions being opened only in Western Europe, England or Canada or America, but also in the East. It is necessary that we should capture the neighbouring markets—the markets in the Middle East and South-East Asia. So far, no serious attempt has been made to popularize our industries and our industrial products in those parts. Also, no attempt has been made to popularize our goods in East Africa and North Africa. So, it is very necessary that steps are taken in this regard.

Then, Sir, regarding expenditure on the exhibitions, I feel the expenditure can be considerably reduced. We

have got so many trading agencies of our own or consulates in various countries. No attempt has been made, or, if attempt has been made, no serious attempt had been made and no adequate steps have been taken to ask our consulates to take up the entire responsibilities or organizing the exhibitions in those countries. If such steps had been taken, I feel that extra expenditure for the extra staff could have been avoided. The Ministry seems to be very fond of spending more and more money on these exhibitions. Hereafter, it should put a check on this item of expenditure as far as possible, or, we should decrease the expenditure under this head.

Next, Sir, I want to refer to administrative expenditure. Sir, here I want to make some things very clear. Expenditure in this department is mounting up and no fruitful result has been noticeable as a result of this expenditure. There is expenditure on travelling allowance, expenditure on appointments of new categories of staff, expenditure on trade delegations, etc. But there is no proper result which is ordinarily expected out of this expenditure. If we look at the export side of our trade, there also there is a sort of recession or a sort of fall—in the export to various foreign countries, of the West. We have not been able to popularize our goods in our neighbouring countries. But all the same the expenditure is on the increase.

Now, Sir, I come to the last item—“other miscellaneous items.” We do not know what miscellaneous items are included in this. Because it is a huge amount, I want a little explanation or clarification by the hon. Minister as to what various items are included in this heading. It is very necessary that as far as possible more clear explanation should be given or annexed to the demands.

Lastly, there is “deputation of officers to the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade conference and the International Cotton Advisory Committee at Washington and Rome.” We have spent Rs. 47,000. It requires

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

careful scrutiny, because I learnt recently that some superfluous officers were sent on delegation to attend these two conferences, and I want the hon. Minister to take the House into confidence and say whether the appointment of these people in these delegations was made purely out of patronage just to favour one or two people or not. Not that I complain about this but I want such things should not be repeated hereafter.

I feel very sorry that not much economy has been exercised by this Ministry. It seems to be fond of too much of extravagance, pomp and such of the things. It is very necessary that it should make a very drastic cut in this expenditure, and so it is not proper for this House to grant unconditionally all these demands that have been placed before the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,27,000 in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I think the hon. Minister has not treated the House properly because from a glance at the details he has given we find that the excess amounts are classified into (i) to (ix) and the details are categorized as (a) to (h). How these are interlocked, how these are correlated, is something which is not explained, and we are asked to give money for 'other miscellaneous items' which runs to the tune of Rs. 1,02,000, an increase of Rs. 37,000. I do not know why additional travelling allowance has been necessary. We do not know what these miscellaneous items are. When a specific question has been asked on the best authority and *bona fides* of two Members of this House as to whether promises have been given to Travancore-Cochin, the Minister wriggled out of the question entirely, without saying yes or no.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members will kindly go through the rules regarding the budget—when an amount has been voted for a particular item, the Ministry can easily find money from one minor head to the other. It is only when the items are exhausted, that the Government comes to the House for supplementary demands. Even if an officer is sent, say, for cashew-nuts, the very purpose or policy regarding cashew-nuts does not come before the House. Hon. Members know all this. If there is any explanation needed for any particular item of detail, and if there is not enough explanation on that matter, information can be asked and I shall ask the hon. Minister to give it.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** There is an explanation (e) at page 4, where it is stated that posts of certain Assistant Controllers will be created and that an Assistant Controller will be upgraded to be a Deputy Controller of Imports and Exports in connection with the opening of a new office at Cochin. I want to know, Sir, the purpose why a Deputy Controller of Imports and Exports is to be appointed in Cochin from now on. In this connection, I would submit that there is a very important matter which the Commerce Ministry should take into consideration: and that is the import of African nuts into India.

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

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** It is a new office which is functioning there.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is with regard to the general import. Not about cashew-nuts.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I am putting it as a general proposition.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is this an office which was not contemplated during the budget time?

**Shri Karmarkar:** It is a new office.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Sir, what is this office to do? I am making the suggestion that in the matter of cashew-nut which is imported from foreign

countries such as East Africa, there should be some more concrete proposals, and the Cochin Office which is to function under this supplementary grant must be given certain powers. Why I say so is because the whole of the imported cashew-nut is consumed in Travancore-Cochin and the surrounding places, while the monopolists who offer them for sale there import it from Bombay. The result is that the factory people have to pay the freight on the cashew-nuts which are imported, from Bombay to Travancore-Cochin sometimes by train, sometimes by sea. It also makes the cost of raw cashew-nuts go up, and on which alone the cashew-nut industry of Travancore-Cochin can carry on for some time, because we have found that the hon. Minister has answered that over 50 per cent. of the cashew-nut has to come from Africa. Our domestic production is very inadequate for our requirements. Under such circumstances, it is absolutely necessary that the new office which is to function at Cochin should have a control over the import of cashew-nuts and the Commerce and Industry Ministry should direct that henceforth if Bombay capitalists should not monopolise import of raw nuts from Africa, and as these nuts are to be consumed in and near about Cochin, they must be imported only through Cochin.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is a matter of policy. The hon. Member when he starts, starts off, and I am not in a position to prevent him.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** I had tabled a cut motion which you, Sir, had disallowed. The hon. Minister gave us an assurance some time back that after participation at last year's Conference, Government would reconsider *de novo* our continuance in the GATT. I hope the hon. Minister will now be in a position to throw some light on it.

**Shri B. K. Das (Contai):** Sir, I would like to have some enlightenment in connection with the additional grant that has been asked for exhibitions.

The other day in reply to a question the hon. Minister said that exhibitions have been held in a dozen or so countries abroad and mostly cottage industry goods have been exhibited. I want to know the criterion for our participation in these exhibitions—whether the exhibitions are held in countries outside India, or inside our country, where these cottage industry goods are exhibited. I would also wish to know whether this post has been created for any particular purpose of giving publicity to our cottage industry goods.

**Shri Karmarkar:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am happy that these points have been raised, not because there is substance in the arguments advanced or criticisms made, but because it gives us an additional opportunity for explaining some of the important activities of the Commerce and Industry Ministry.

Sir, I shall deal firstly with the point made by my hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy. I am very unhappy to say that he tried to sustain the points he raised with rather a lot of lack of information. Firstly, let me deal with the bulletins. I am prepared to make a present of a sample copy of these to him. He can for himself see the materials that are being published in them and I am quite sure in fairness to the Ministry he will agree that much useful work is being done by it. In fact, I won't be surprised if he said that he has not even seen a copy of these weekly bulletins. It gives an idea of import and export licences issued to each individual for amounts ranging from Rs. 500 to Rs. 5 lakhs. This we do in order to give the public an idea of the working of the Import and Export Control section. In so far as we are liberalising the field of exports and imports, naturally the bulk cost of the bulletin increases. He may be surprised to learn that every week we bring out about 250 to 300 pages of matter. If he were to look into one of them his comment will be that this is unnecessary. That is one of the reasons why our expenditure on the bulletin is increasing.

[Shri Karmarkar]

Mr. Gurupadaswamy has, however, grudgingly conceded that our monthly Journal on Industry and Trade has recently shown improvements. I am very happy to learn this from him, for even these small compliments mean a lot for us. He is rather conservative in appreciation. In spite of that, the usefulness of the monthly journal is being highly appreciated by the public. It is not meant for propaganda. We place all the available material before the public. We have made it a point to supply copies of the Bulletin to every Member of Parliament. We have done that advisedly, because we want the matter to reach all hon. Members of Parliament. Sometimes, of course, hon. Members of Parliament make very good use of it in attacking us. We do not believe in withholding any matter which may work against us. We want all the vigilance to be exercised by hon. Members of Parliament. The work in connection with the Bulletin is increasing. I am very happy to say that during the course of the year, as an experimental measure, we have been able to bring out a Hindi version of the Bulletin. This means increased expenditure, because we have to employ Hindi-knowing staff. It may also lead us into a little inconvenience. Though Hindi is one of the recognised official languages...

**Shri Velayudhan** (Quilon cum Malvelikkara—Reserved—Schr. Castes): Have we got enough subscribers for all this? Is it profitable?

**Shri Karmarkar**: I want hon. Members to help us in that matter. Though it is not so at present, we shall be able to make it self-sufficient.

For the free copy he gets, we shall be grateful if the hon. Member secures us a couple of subscribers. In fact he has made a useful point. He has all along been a good friend of this side.

**Shri Velayudhan**: I know the publicity side of it very well—better than the hon. Minister himself.

**Shri Karmarkar**: It is very refreshing to find the hon. Member rising and supporting Government in a matter like this. This will have a very good effect upon the public at large, if properly reported.

I was on the subject of Hindi version of our journal. We are hoping this will serve a very useful purpose among the public who would like to be acquainted with the activities of the Ministry in the matter of trade and industry.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of exhibitions. The House has shown keen interest in our participation in exhibitions. I am very happy to say that our exhibits have aroused the curiosity of visitors. I recently had the privilege of visiting one such exhibition myself in Berlin. Ours was a small stall. The German Government very much appreciated the fact that we were able to participate. They made all arrangements for us. Though it involved some expenditure, the return was more than commensurate. In terms of the persons who visited the exhibition. The minimum number who attended the exhibition was 30,000 and the maximum reached 80,000 odd. The exhibition went on for ten days. Though it was at first a matter of curiosity, a number of business-like enquiries followed.

But, Sir, I am very unhappy to say that we are not able to do as much as possible, because it is difficult for us from this distance to send as many exhibits as might be necessary to reap the full advantage of such vast exhibitions. For instance our participation in an exhibition in Canada is likely to result in a business tie-up. This is one of the best means of popularising our products. I am also very happy to know that during the last two years there has been a demand from foreign markets for the cottage industry products of U. P., some parts of Rajasthan and Mysore, e.g., items like printed articles, ivory work and Banarás brocades. Now,

Sir, these exhibitions are the only medium through which we have been able to achieve this much of popularity for our products. I wish we had more finance. In this matter my hon. colleague who is dealing with this subject can come to our rescue, because any grant spent on exhibitions, in our opinion, if properly spent, is bound to make a good return by way of inviting greater exports from this country.

Then my hon. friend Mr. Das raised a point as to why we are not concentrating our efforts in Asia. We are trying to do that. As my hon. friend knows we have many more of these exhibitions in the West than in the East. It takes more money to run an exhibition ourselves, than to participate in one which is organised by others. For instance, next year in Lausanne in Switzerland they are going to have the usual annual fair. We are the only foreign country which is going to participate. Every year they invite a guest country and this year the invitation has been extended to us. We have budgeted some amount. We have naturally had to spend more than what we would have spent normally, on these exhibitions. Now, because it comes in September we may take advantage of it as India, apart from Switzerland, will be the only country making its appearance as a guest country. All suggestions for expansion are welcome to us. We are naturally anxious to expand our activity in this direction but subject to limitations which necessarily are imposed by the finances available.

Then about Consulates I am happy in one way and unhappy in the other, happy because it affords an opportunity to me to explain the matter and unhappy because my hon. friend Shri Gurupadaswamy does not realise the consequence of his suggestion. Consulates and Embassies are there for specific purposes, one of them being to advance our trade interests in

foreign countries. But we cannot saddle our representatives abroad with a larger burden than they can possibly cope with. We are not able to send many officers. To the extent we draw assistance from our Consulates and Embassies, not all of which are very adequately staffed, the work of the Embassy itself suffers. For instance, at Berlin it was our diplomatic representative who took part in this and the Bonn Embassy gave all the assistance. We cannot rest content asking them to look after it. Adequate results cannot come out of such an arrangement. I would like encouragement from this House that we should be able to depute more and more officers, though it means more expenditure. The purpose served is so important and every country attaches so much importance to this matter that we are rather feeling that we are lacking that amount of resources which we need if we were to make these exhibitions fully fruitful.

Mr. friend had a word to say about superfluous officers, and one of the two superfluous officers who went, according to him, was myself! It was in connection with the GATT that I went and it served, if I may say so with modesty, quite a useful purpose. Because Ministers from other countries came and we had a good exchange of views. And, by and large, if I am not egotistic, it was wise that one of the Ministers went—(An hon. Member: Hear, hear). Thank you very much—because it makes a small difference. And my friend knows us quite well. There is a small detail which I might as well give to indicate how much we care for economy. If I had wished for my own convenience I could have requested the Finance Ministry to send my Private Secretary with me. But I said: I won't take my Private Secretary, we could do with a little inconvenience, but give me an officer from my Ministry who has been dealing with the subject for the last seven years. And I took an Under Secretary whose presence was extremely useful.



[Shri Karmarkar]

Then regarding Cochin I thought we would get a bouquet for getting a Deputy Chief Controller in Cochin.

**Shri Velayudhan:** We are grateful.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The suggestion. I think, was now that the Deputy Chief Controller's office has been opened there. Licences for import of cashew-nuts may be given only to that port and not to Bombay.

**Shri Karmarkar:** I cannot avoid that point at all, Sir.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Unfortunately, Sir, you have also misunderstood me.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I believe the Estimates Committee had also made a recommendation.

**Shri Karmarkar:** You are perfectly right, Sir, and if you remember what you said ten seconds back now that we have a responsible officer there it is all to the good. He has naturally pointed out that. We are also happy about that, because it is a port we wanted for a long time to develop. We want also the export and import trade to develop. As I said some time back, Travancore-Cochin, is a place about which we have to take great care. If this results in a little more employment there, we would be happy. But the point is rather difficult in execution. Because we have followed a particular pattern in respect of export and import licences. There is not much difficulty about export licences because generally there is a large amount of free licences. But in regard to import we stick largely to the idea of restricting our import licences, in so far as it is necessary, to what we know as established importers. We tried an experiment about two years back, but to our dismay we found that something like 1,50,000 applications or thereabout came—I am speaking from memory—and that resulted in a certain amount of chaos. Because anybody who could

afford Rs. 25 or Rs. 10 which was the fee prescribed, sent an application, like backing a race-horse.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The other suggestion was that the very established importer may import through Cochin harbour.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Sir, he has admitted in answer to certain questions that now the import of cashew-nut is the monopoly of three or four people who operate from Bombay. They were in Africa fifty or 100 years back and they control the supplies from Africa, with the result that factory owners, however rich they are, cannot compete in getting raw nuts from Africa, a position primarily responsible for the crisis in the cashew industry, though we are said to have allowed a free chance to all importers.

**Shri Karmarkar:** Sir, I am very happy and I need not labour the point because my friend appears to agree with me in substance. If the importers are very limited and if the manufacturers are to get licences what will be the difficulty in taking away the privilege, you may call it, or the facility given to established importers?—that is another question. And I can assure him that we shall examine it on its merits, though I may say that I am not very sanguine about that.

Then Mr. Basu wanted to draw me in about GATT. As I have said on the floor of the House that is a matter over which we spent a lot of time; in 1947 we had a conference lasting about ten months in all. We thought then and we think now that our participation in the GATT has been rather useful.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He wants to know whether a day will be allotted for that.

**Shri Karmarkar:** Since we attach importance to the question and since the next session is coming I shall be happy to have the views of the House.

Maybe the budget session may be a convenient time. I am not sure, I cannot make a commitment now. But it may be possible to place the question before the House in the budget session. We would be happy to have the views of the House on our participation in the GATT. I cannot say more on that. These are the points that have been raised.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Explanation about the expenditure?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He says it will come up in the budget session.

**Shri Karmarkar:** Sir, it is in the Members' hands in any case. I am sure my friend can raise it at the time of the budget.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I hope you don't mean what you say!

**Shri Karmarkar:** We on this side of the House would be happy to have the express views of this House before we go to the next session of the conference to review the GATT. We do not want to avoid a discussion; we welcome it. But, naturally, with regard to fixture my friend will appreciate that I am not in a position to make an off-hand statement like the one he might perhaps tempt me in. That is all I have to say.

Something was said about economy. I have mentioned about officers. With regard to officers, except for one we have been able to meet the expenditure under other heads. We are not anxious to add on to the expenditure. Sir, that is all that I wish to content myself with on the present occasion.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** I want to know.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has said enough. Every hon. Member knows English. He put a question and wanted an explanation. The Minister has given it to the best of his ability.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** He has not touched that point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If he has not touched it, he does not know.

I shall now put Shri Gurupada-swamy's cut motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,27,000 in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry' be reduced by Rs. 100"

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will now place the demand before the House.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,27,000 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 Commerce and Industry'."

*The motion was adopted.*

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

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,15,000 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'."

Cut motion No. 8 is out of order.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat):** Why is it ruled out, Sir? We never know what is ruled out and what is admitted.

**Shri Velayudhan:** That is the only cut under that item.

5 P.M.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** How does this arise? This relates to Reduction in

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

India's contribution to the International Civil Aviation Organisation. This is a matter of policy. Let me ascertain from the hon. Minister as to when this contribution to the ICAO was arrived at. Was it the subject matter of a previous Budget?

**The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram):** Yes, Sir. It has continued for so many years. There is nothing new about it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Therefore the amount is already settled. This is not the first time that it is coming. Therefore it has to be ruled out.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We want a reduction of this amount.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** How can there be a reduction?

**Some Hon. Members:** Why not?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Any amount voted in the Budget cannot be reduced in a supplementary demand. The amount has been spent on various other items. Now, he comes with a demand under this head. He does not want anything more.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** This amount was not put in the Budget. He said that it was drawn on the 31st March 1953 and now it has to be included in order to adjust the amounts. It was not there in the Budget.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** The amount has been paid.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** You can pay; but we can ask you.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let me see. The scope is limited. It is a matter of adjustment. It was there in the previous Budget and in the present Budget.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** No.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The payment was not actually debited on account of some difficulty in the Reserve Bank. This is a matter of accounting.

Instead of in 1952-53, it comes in 1953-54.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Why?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. The hon. Member can ask why. We cannot go into the question of International Civil Aviation Organisation and reduce the contribution.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Please listen to what I say, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no. The hon. Member must weigh the words when saying anything against the Chair. Read the language here. Reduction in India's contribution to the International Civil Aviation Organisation. I would straightaway rule it out of order. There is no question of reduction. No amount voted in the previous Budget or the present Budget could be reduced. It is a question of accounting. Why it was not brought in the last year, you can ask. Barring that, the cut motion is out of order.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Before you rule it out, I would like to know why there has been this delay in paying. What is it due to?

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Another point, Sir. Out of this amount, Rs. 4,72,000 represents the amount which has to be paid for 1951-52, carried forward due to certain difficulties. A sum of Rs. 43,000 is an additional sum that is asked for. Why?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is another question.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We have been paying this amount for two years. Anyway, why is it that it was paid on the 31st of March 1953, and therefore could not be adjusted? That is one point. The other point is this. We have been increasing our contribution also. We are almost paying on a par with many big countries which have very big interests.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has there been an increase after the last Budget?

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Yes; formerly it was 20; now it is 30.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am asking about Civil Aviation. There is another item, an additional amount of Rs. 82,000 required for payment of enhanced contribution to the Telecommunication Union. That is another matter. That is not what is referred to here. We are concerned here with the International Civil Aviation Organisation. That is quite another matter.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Was that in the last Budget for 1953-54? It was not there.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Was it in the Budget for 1952-53?

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** About this Civil Aviation matter, this demand was granted by supplementary grant in Parliament. The information about approval was received in the Ministry of Communications in the second week of March 1953. Necessary sanction for the payment of contribution was issued to the A.G., C.R. on the 25th March 1953. The payment was made by the Reserve Bank of India on the 31st March, 1953. Unfortunately, the debit for the expenditure was not raised and adjusted in the accounts for 1952-53, by the Bank. Hence, this expenditure has to be adjusted in the accounts for 1953-54. That is the position regarding the contribution.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** That is not the position. He has read out what is stated here. We can read it out. My point is this. Was this in the Budget presented to us and adopted this year? (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Hon. Members must know that the House is not a place where they go on talking as in the lobby. They are so absorbed in their talk that they do not even hear what I say. What am I  
639 P.S.D.

to do? We must get on with the work. Both on the right and the left, there is talking.

The point is this. The hon. Member evidently thinks that because I read the Budget, any point could be raised. When once a matter comes up in the Budget or the supplementary demand, by way of a token cut or otherwise, and it is disposed of and the amount passed, any item relating to matters of policy cannot be referred to later. This is merely a matter of accounting. The hon. Member thought differently.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** May I seek a clarification? If the amount had not been voted, if the whole item had not been put down in the Budget can we not raise the point at all?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It can be raised. If there had been a supplementary demand which was voted, it is only now a matter of accounting. We will assume that the matter comes up for the first time before the House and the question is one of clerical mistake regarding adjustment of accounts. Once again the question of policy cannot be reopened. I am only trying to state what I understood the hon. Minister to say. Is this the first time that this matter of contribution to the International Civil Aviation Organisation has come up?

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** No.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** This is the first time. It was not there in the Supplementary demand.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** For what amount?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It has never come up.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** Rs. 4,72,324 or something like that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The same amount: payment for this contribution.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** This was the amount voted by this House.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** When?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has read it out.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** I gave the date. The Supplementary demand was moved in Parliament and approved.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Date? This year or last year?

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** This is a voted amount. That is what I say.

**Some Hon. Members:** When?

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** February 1953; in the last financial year.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** It has not come in this year's Budget.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** It is not necessary.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** It is coming in the Supplementary demand for the first time.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** It was passed in the Supplementary Demands in February, 1953.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The only point is this. This is a matter in which the House has gone into the question of policy. So far as.....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** There was no Supplementary Grant in February 1953.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member cannot go on like this.

I am stating what ultimately ought to be the ruling so far as this matter is concerned. The House had an opportunity and discussed this matter and it was voted as early as February, 1953.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** No Sir, not supplementary grants.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is what he has said. Let it not be in this budget. The budget was passed in March, 1953. Now that matter is voted. The only question is that what was voted last year was not paid or adjustable during the year. That is

sought to be adjusted now. Therefore, so far as the Cut Motion is concerned that it ought to be reduced, merely because it was not paid in time last year it ought not to be reduced. It is a matter of policy. Hon. Members have not tabled any Cut Motion saying this kind of adjustment must not be made, that it must be made there and then, it causes inconvenience so far as accounting is concerned etc. If they had done so, I would have allowed them to speak, but that is not the subject matter of the cut motion.

**Shri Velayudhan:** Why then was it brought as a supplementary demand?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It was not paid then; therefore, it has been brought now.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** We do not accept that.

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

**Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack):** May I just say a few words?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has missed the bus. I will grant him an opportunity on another occasion.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,15,000 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.*

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** With your permission, Sir, I will submit that the hon. Minister cannot say that during last February he came to the House with a Supplementary Grant. That was the time when we had the Budget presented. Does he mean to say there was a Supplementary Grant in it?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Supplementary Demands for the previous year 1952-53 must be moved before the budget for 1953-54 is moved. The Budget is presented on the 28th—if it is a leap year on the 29th—of February.

There are other Demands on which hon. Members can equally well speak.

#### DEMAND NO. 27—CUSTOMS

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

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 25,00,000 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 ‘Customs.’”

Cut Motion No. 9 regarding amount of drawbacks and the manner of their utilisation is out of order.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi** (Bombay City—North): May I have a few minutes on this Demand?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Very well.

**Shri Velayudhan:** There is no Cut Motion moved, Sir.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya** (Muzaffarpur Central): It is not necessary.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Apart from that, he can ask for information. Anybody can oppose a Demand and throw it out, but not on general policy. I have supplied copies of all the Rules and decisions to every hon. Member. They may kindly read them again and again and come back to the House.

**An Hon. Member:** We have learnt it by heart now.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** This Demand for Rs. 25 lakhs is the direct consequence of the Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill which this House passed only a few weeks ago. This amount is going to be utilised for the payment of the drawbacks on imported materials used in the manufacture of goods which are exported. Obviously, therefore, this amount will be utilised through the agency of Customs administration at the ports. And the measure of its success will depend, therefore, on the man-

ner in which the Customs authorities utilise this amount and also on the manner in which they will use the powers that they have newly acquired in this matter.

Now, Sir, the House will recollect that the Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill was originally to come before this House last session, but due to pressure of other legislative business, it could not be brought before this House. In the intervening period between the last session and this session, an Ordinance was promulgated, Ordinance No. 3.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the meaning of discussing once again the whole thing?

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** No, Sir. I am coming directly to the point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why should he say that he is coming directly. Let him come directly.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** I will try to come to the point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the point first?

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** The point is that this Customs administration should be made to understand how this House expects them to utilise the powers or operate under the powers that are given under this new Act.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. Hon. the Minister.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** I have nothing to say, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has no right to go once again into the policy, administration etc. This is merely a consequence of the Act that has been passed. When once the Act is passed...

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** Sir, may I say a word?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have allowed him to say so far. The hon. Member will sit down when I get up. I have allowed the hon. Member so far with a view to know exactly and to decide

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

whether what he says is relevant for this issue or not. I have come to the conclusion that it ought not to be allowed. The matter is out of order. The matter has been disposed of. It is only recently we had occasion to discuss. That means the policy, the method of administration, the rules and regulations, conduct of all those persons who give drawback, all these were discussed, and whether discussed or not, this is not now the forum.

Now, the question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 25,00,000 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 'Customs'."

*The motion was adopted.*

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

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,00,000 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 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance'."

- (i) *Setting up of a village centre at the International Exhibition on Low Cost Housing.*
- (ii) *Additional expenditure on postage, telegrams etc. for the Community Projects Administration.*
- (iii) *Opening of Centres of training for social education.*

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I beg to move:

(1) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,00,000, in respect of

'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(2) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,00,000, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(3) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,00,000, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

I will only speak on Cut Motion No. (3)—to shorten the time. This money is to go to centres of training for social education. Recently we have been asking many questions on this point. And even recently, just a few days ago, the hon. Education Minister told us that they had not decided what they were going to do, and yet now I find there is quite a big amount which is going to be voted. Already for 1953-54, a sum of Rs. 198 lakhs has been provided. There are already many educational centres which are working. Why do we want this extra amount of money for a short course of scientifically conducted programme for social education organizers. Already there are quite a number of organizations working for adult education etc. We ourselves are not clear what social education is. Our Minister is unable to tell us what it is, and now we find this extra amount of money is going to be given, and we are also given this amount of comfort by saying that the Ford Foundation and the Technical Co-operation Administration are giving us some money. I want to know why it is those who are working are not to be helped. In Bengal, for instance, they have an adult education centre, and they have other centres also. I find also that Mr. Amarnath Jha is opening a centre. I want to know whether this is covered by that. Why is it we are having to pay this extra

amount. We do not know what it is all about.

**Shri Velayudhan:** Can I speak? I have also a Cut Motion.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Please read.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Not necessary. The hon. Member need not take the cue from another hon. Member.

**Shri Velayudhan:** I want to speak only about social education centres. In the Supplementary Demands for Grants, it is stated that five centres of training have been opened at Nilokheri, Hyderabad, Gandhigram, Santiniketan and Allahabad, where social education schemes are being introduced, and it is said they are now training Social Education Organisers. I would like to know how many organisers were trained and whether they are now employed in any schemes or in any centres, because I was told that many of these people who were trained in these centres have gone out and are not having any work at all. At Gandhigram I know personally that a lot of persons are being trained, but they are not being employed in any place. I would like to know about the state of affairs from the hon. Minister.

**Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East):** I want one information about the accounting system as disclosed by the footnotes. I find that the amounts under the Technical Co-operation Administration and the Ford Foundation will now be deposited under some fund and expenditure against that will be shown under this head. I want to know whether there is any special accounting of all these funds under separate heads, or whether all of them go together into a consolidated fund, like the Consolidated Fund of India. If they go in a bulk to a consolidated fund, how are they separated out for inspection purposes?

**Shri B. K. Das:** I want to know the break-up of the expenditure for these five social education centres separately. I would also like to know how many persons are being trained there.

How many have already been trained, and how many are under training now?

**Shri M. C. Shah:** As for the funds, I would like to inform my hon. friend that there is a Special Development Fund into which whatever we get from the Wheat Loan, the Colombo Plan and the TCA is credited. All the expenditure contemplated will come under that fund. From the Colombo Plan we expect about Rs. 28 crores this year. All this will go into the Special Development Fund.

**The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi):** A question was asked about the number of trainees, that have been trained so far, and the number that are being trained every year. We require about 1800 persons to be trained during the Plan period. There is not sufficient accommodation at present in the five centres that are being run. Up to now, we have trained 159 persons, and 157 are being trained. With the present accommodation, we find that only 40 can be trained in each of these centres at present, at a time. Hence, we want further accommodation.

**The break-up of these expenses is as follows.** The sum of Rs. 2 lakhs and odd asked for will be spent at the rate of about Rs. 50,000 per each centre, for extra accommodation for the trainees. Since we are short of accommodation, it is not possible to cope up with the demand and have the required number of organisers that we want during the Plan period. Naturally therefore, we require further accommodation. The break-up of the expenditure will be as follows:

Furniture and other things. Rs. 40,000

Books, and other things. Rs. 1 lakh  
and odd.

Other charges on other projects.....  
Rs. 1,12,000

Incidental expenditure.....Rs. 75,000

As to the question where these five centres are located at present, I might inform hon. Members that they are at



[Shri Hathi]

Gandhigram, Hyderabad, Santiniketan, Nilokheri, and Allahabad.

A question was asked as to what these organisers would do after they are trained. They are sent to several community project centres. In fact they have all been absorbed. I do not know if any of them who are trained already are not employed. If there is any instance of a trained organiser who has not been absorbed, the hon. Member may bring it to our notice, and he will be absorbed.

This is in short the reply to all the questions that have been asked.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I have also a cut motion relating to drafting of permanent officers in Commission of Enquiry, cut motion No. 12 under Demand No. 38.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it not a matter of policy? I have not allowed it.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** If it is a matter of policy, they would not have come out with a fresh demand for Rs. 83,000. It is only an additional expenditure. The Taxation Enquiry Commission is a new Commission, and this demand is in respect of pay of officers.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** We had made a provision of Rs. 5 lakhs in the budget, but from actuals we find that the expenditure will be much more, and they have asked for this expenditure. We are reappropriating, and only for the balance we are asking for a supplementary sum.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** That is exactly the reason why I want to say something about it. You are sending to the Commission some officers, for whom this money is required. I would not have sent in this cut motion, had it not been for the fact....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member wants to say that the existing officers may be utilised, instead of drafting new persons.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** As a matter of fact, the position is that wherever we re-

trench, we take all those people into these fields. In the Taxation Enquiry Commission also, we have taken some from our own staff.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let the hon. Member say what he wants.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I do not want to discuss the merits. I shall explain why I was forced to send in this cut motion. Yesterday I tried to get some information through the Research Officer of Parliament Secretariat, about certain officers functioning in certain Commissions, including the Taxation Enquiry Commission. Here is the letter from the Research Officer. When I asked for certain details as to the number of Commissions and Committees of Government of India, on which the present Finance Secretary is serving, it was stated that the Finance Ministry was contacted on the phone, but the information was not available, and that if the Member so desired, the information might be collected after officially writing to the Ministry concerned, which will take some time. This is a very bad practice. It is after that that I sent in this cut motion. The present Finance Secretary, is functioning in several Committees, God knows how many, he was there in the Lady Hardinge Committee, in this committee, that committee, a third committee, and so on. I wanted to know in how many committees he is serving, and why it was necessary for Government to send only one or two officers on whom alone they seem to have confidence, and who seem to be having a monopoly of all wisdom in all matters, including those of taxation, for all these commissions and committees. When I could not get the information from the Finance Ministry, there was no other way open before me except to send in a cut motion. If the hon. Minister would tell me in what all committees, the present Finance Secretary and the Secretary for Economic Affairs in the Finance Ministry, function, I think I can withdraw this cut motion.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** I can get that information for my hon. friend. It is

not secret, and in fact it cannot be kept secret. As a matter of fact, not only the Secretary, but even the Joint Secretaries of the Finance Ministry serve on several committees. Wherever there is any financial implication, we have to send some representative of the Finance Ministry. Whatever information, my hon. friend wants, I am prepared to give. There is nothing to be kept secret.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister may pass on that information to the hon. Member.

Now, is it necessary to put all these cut motions to the vote of the House? I find hon. Members are not pressing them.

I shall put the demand to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,00,000 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 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I find that the voices of 'Ayes' are feebler than those of the 'Noes'. The whips must be here to assist the Minister. They ought not to be away from the House, or at least other hon. Members may be instructed to assist the Minister. I have to judge by voices. If I hear only one voice for 'Ayes', and two voices for the 'Noes', hon. Members ought not to look to the Chair, they will only see that the two will prevail over the one.

**The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Kidwai):** Let us hope not.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall take up the next demand.

#### DEMAND NO. 45—AGRICULTURE

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 32,22,000 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'."

I find there is a cut motion in the name of Shri Kelappan, for emphasizing the need to encourage cultivation of long staple cotton. That is not a matter of policy, so it is not in order.

**Shri Kelappan (Ponnani):** I want to have one information from the hon. Minister. In the note appended to the Demand, it is said that "during 1950, the plan for increasing cotton production in the country, with a view to achieving self-sufficiency in the requirements of cotton for the textile industry was put into operation."

Now, if the object is self-sufficiency, it is very necessary that the cultivation of long-staple cotton has to be encouraged. Out of 40 lakh bales that we consume in the country, 10 lakh bales are imported cotton, i.e. we are importing about 25 per cent. of our requirements. This is all long-staple cotton. There is a small surplus in our production which we are exporting, that is, about 2 lakh bales. So this must evidently be short staple cotton. We are only deficient, therefore, in long staple cotton. Every encouragement has to be given to the production of long staple cotton. Sir, the cotton experts of the Government of India say that there is a special island variety of long staple cotton which is better than even Egyptian cotton which will thrive in the west coast where there is a high rainfall. In the opinion of those experts, it is possible to meet all our demand for long staple cotton by encouraging the cultivation of that particular variety. I do not know if anything is being done to encourage cultivation of that variety.

[Shri Kelappan]

There is one other thing also that I wanted to know from the Minister. If this remission is to benefit the actual cultivators, then the cultivators must be the owners of the land also. In our parts it is the landlord who pays the land tax and who is benefited by a remission of land tax and not the cultivator, unless the owner of the land also happens to be the cultivator. I do not know how it is in the States which claim this compensation. If the rent to the extent of the remission of tax is also not reduced, the remission of tax will not result in increased production, as it will be no incentive to the actual producer. Therefore, I wish to be enlightened on that point. My request to the Minister is to see to it that the actual cultivator is benefited by the reduction of tax. He will also see that the production of long staple cotton alone is encouraged.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I wanted information on this point. This claim has been made or is being settled, in any case, after three years. After all, this amount was actually paid in the current year when the cotton growers brought additional land under cultivation. The Accountant General must have seen the accounts long before. Was there any dispute about this that it took such a long time? If it was a dispute, I would like to know what was the nature of that dispute. Were the accounts of the Bombay and Saurashtra Governments questioned? Was the actual additional payment made by these Governments checked by our people here—how this was being accepted? I only wanted information on this point.

**Shri B. K. Das:** It is stated here that the Bombay and Saurashtra States have put in claims. I want to know whether there are other States also who have put in claims and whether their claims are to be settled, and what would be the total amount involved in payment of these claims of all States.

**Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk):** In this connection, Sir, we are paying Rs. 32 odd lakhs to Bombay and Saurashtra

for expenditure in regard to additional production of long staple cotton which was incurred in 1950-51. We are glad to sanction it, but at the same time, we would urge the hon. Minister to inform us what additional quantity of cotton was produced, of what varieties, and whether we have to try this grow-more-cotton campaign in future also.

**The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa):** Sir, every effort was made to scrutinise the accounts. It was because of that scrutiny—strict scrutiny—that three years' time was taken. Bombay and Saurashtra had submitted accounts and under this scrutiny we had to tally them with the revenue records of those States, because this remission was meant for the additional acreage that was brought under cultivation in 1950. So whether it was additional acreage or the usual acreage—all these things required scrutiny. So the revenue records of those States had to be examined and the examination was done and it was certified by the Auditor-General and then alone the amount was being paid.

Regarding other States, similar claims are before the Government from Hyderabad, Madras, PEPSU, and Uttar Pradesh and they are being scrutinised. Regarding total production, Mr. Kelappan wanted to know what steps we have taken to encourage cultivation of long staple cotton. I may bring to the notice of the hon. Member that in 1947-48 the total production was 3.18 lakh bales of long staple cotton. In 1948-49 it was only 3.10. In 1949-50 it increased to 4.92 lakh bales and in 1951-52 it has increased to nearly 10 lakh bales. So all the efforts that we have taken to increase the production of long staple cotton have resulted in increasing the long staple cotton production by about 5 lakh bales in the country within the course of two or three years.

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 32,22,000 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:** Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 15,00,000 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 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Sir, my cut motion is No. 17. I only want to know why it is that originally the amount was Rs. 16.77 crores and now on the basis of the final accounts, it is said that it is Rs. 16.99 crores. It looks very innocuous, but already such a huge amount has been lost. What is the new factor that has entered into the accounts that again requires us to give an amount additional to what has already been placed before this House.

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** In fact, there is a reduction of more than Rs. 2 crores. The actual 'capital' loss worked out in the beginning was estimated at about Rs. 19 crores, whereas the actual figures have now come down to Rs. 16.99 crores.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It is written here that the 'capital' loss was originally estimated at Rs. 16.77 crores.

**Shri M. C. Shah:** The cost of the wheat was Rs. 90 crores and we originally estimated to get Rs. 71 crores when we sold that wheat. So there was a 'capital' loss of about Rs. 19 crores. We have kept that in suspense account and every year we make a contribution to make good that loss. That is the position.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Why have you put it?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Why is this Rs. 16.77 crores then mentioned here? Here it is stated: The 'capital' loss was originally estimated at Rs. 16.77 crores and a provision of so much was made in the budget for the current year. Now, we want to know why on the basis of the final accounts, it is put at Rs. 16.99 lakhs, involving one extra lakh of rupees or so. How has it come about?

**Shri M. C. Shah:** According to the original estimate of accounts it came to about Rs. 19 crores; it was kept in the suspense account.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I want one information, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why not clear up this present information?

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I think it has been cleared, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I don't think; they have still some doubts.

**Shri Kidwai:** I am not able to quite appreciate the point raised by the other side.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** In the footnote it is said,

"The 'Capital' loss was originally estimated at Rs. 16.77 crores and a provision of Rs. 48.40 lakhs was made in the budget for the current year to cover the instalment due to be met from 'Revenue' during the current year. On the basis of the final accounts, however, the total 'Capital' loss on American Loan Wheat has now been worked out at Rs. 16.99 crores and the amount of the instalment....."

Therefore another one lakh or so is necessary. But, the Deputy Minister of Finance says that it was 19 crores. We cannot just make out that.

**Shri Kidwai:** Last year or the year before, in reply to a question it was

[Shri Kidwai]

stated as to how much of subsidy was paid in 1951-52. There 19 crores was shown, for reducing the price of the Loan Wheat. After calculation, we find that the sum actually does not come to that extent. It comes to about 16.99 crores. Wheat was being sold from year to year and the final loss has come to the figure just mentioned.

**Shrimati Benu Chakravarty:** Then are we to take it that this is on account of deterioration or any other cause?

**Shri Kidwai:** We were getting wheat from three sources. One was by barter from Argentina. Then we got by barter from Russia. Then we purchased in the international market and also in the open market at the open market prices. The barter with Argentina was almost on the international market rate; so also with Russia. In the first barter we paid a little more. But, in order to bring down the open market prices to the level of our food prices from other sources we had to bear a loss. This subsidy has to be paid. The price of the wheat has to be paid in 35 instalments and so this subsidy has been taken over 35 instalments.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** This particular loan of the wheat is being accounted for separately and the losses are being sought to be recovered in the course of 15 years. Similarly, in the case of subsidy the Government have also lost other monies. As you said just now, the Government has been giving a subsidy for bringing down the prices of wheat from year to year. That means losses have been incurred on the sale of wheat also in the past. In other years we used to charge it direct to expenditure itself and there the matter ended. But, in this case we are having a sort of annual recovery in the course of 15 years. I would like to know why this particular procedure has been adopted in this regard.

**Shri Kidwai:** I said 35 years and I do not know where my friend got

the figure 15 years. I said because the price of this wheat has to be paid in 35 yearly instalments, with each instalment we pay the loss.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The loss is not now incurred; it is being paid in 35 instalments.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** Does it include interest charges also?

**Shri Kidwai:** This was the money required to bring down the prices of home wheat to the pool prices.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang):** The other day during question hour when it was asked why it was that wheat sold to Assam was not sold at the pool prices, the hon. Minister said that it was because there was no arrangement for milling wheat there. So far as my information goes, there is arrangement for milling wheat into *atta* but there is no arrangement for milling it into flour. The flour requirements of Assam are only 20 per cent. of the whole. Therefore if the hon. Minister gives the wheat for purposes of milling into *atta* and retains the wheat for purposes of flour then the saving in Assam would be Rs. 10 per maund.

**Shri Kidwai:** Very good.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi:** It would be a tremendous saving.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is suggesting measures for savings in the various departments of the Government of India.

**Shri Kidwai:** No, Sir; he is suggesting in Assam. I think this question has nothing to do with this.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are other demands. Let me devote this time to other demands. There are many things which can be raised generally but not on this matter.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 15,00,000 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 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

*The motion was adopted.*

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

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 26,000 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'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 84—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF PRODUCTION.**

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 31,60,000 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 Production'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. 86—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS**

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 50,28,000 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 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

Are there any cut motions?

**Excessive expenditure on Faridabad township**

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,28,000, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will call hon. Members one after another. Let them speak on all these matters if they like.

- (i) *Expenditure on relief to East Pakistan Displaced Persons.*
- (ii) *Expenditure on Displaced Persons in Faridabad Township.*
- (iii) *Construction of mudhuts for indigent Displaced Persons.*
- (iv) *Reimbursements to States on remission for housing loans.*

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I have my cut motions Nos. 20, 21, 22 and 23. I beg to move:

(1) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,28,000, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(2) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,28,000, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(3) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,28,000, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(4) "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,28,000, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain):** Money had already been provided for all these items, Sir. This is only excess expenditure.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, whatever might be the wording of this cut

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

motion, I would ask the hon. Member to bear this in mind. They can only discuss it. These cut motions Nos. 20 to 23 relate to Demands which have already been voted. If they are not satisfied that additional expenditure is not necessary, they can speak without going into the policy. Having accepted the policy, they cannot say anything against that. They can only say that this could have been avoided by prudent management. That is all.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I am not against the principle at all. But I do want to say this. May I say this about the expenditure on East Pakistan displaced persons? Here it says that:

"The original Budget Estimates were based on the expectation that the average number of East Pakistan Displaced Persons in camps in West Bengal would be 20,000. But the actual camp population in that State on 1.4.53 was 73,557 and on 8.10.53 it was 65,000."

I just want to point out to the House, how the hon. Minister could think that we would have only 20,000 persons in that camp on the basis of their own reports, which astonishes me. In the statement from the West Bengal Rehabilitation Committee it is shown that all the refugees were moved into the camps by October 1952, which was the last date on which the last big influx came, and the number dispersed according to them came to 1,20,486. After giving the figures of the various camps to which they have been redistributed—which comes to 1,07,710—the figure is 62,776. I cannot understand how we could have budgeted only for 20,000 people. It is fantastic. We have been saying all the time that the calculations of the Government are wrong, the expectations of the Government are wrong because they start from wrong premises. From 20,000 we are finding that the figure has now come to 65,000. We want 50 lakhs of rupees. That is one point on which I want classification. (*Interruption by*

*Shri Kidwai*). How can it be now so much when at that time according to their own data the figures were quite different? I think the hon. Minister of Food does not know much about this, Sir.

The other point which I want to make is this. Since the Budget, there has been a fact-finding Committee and certain new proposals have been made by them. There again, we find one significant point. After the fact-finding Committee has come into existence, there is supposed to be a certain re-organisation both in the administration as well as in the problems of the destitutes in the camps. But actually, is it on that basis that we shall be giving this money? It is not on that basis, but on the new basis that we are giving this money and I hope it will be spent properly. Here again I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that actually we have been getting very alarming news that even after the Fact Finding Committee's report has been available, the various categories of refugees, who were actually put in the category of being destitutes who had come away from camps, have been sent back in two lots—one to the town building site and the other to the Ramchandpur Colony. In the township scheme, we find that in the Zaffarpur Colony, they are getting Rs. 675 per home, and at the same we find in another area, village area, but which is now near a municipality, they are getting Rs. 2,250. These are all points which we want clarified. There must be one system of payment for township planning. About agriculturists, in the case of Ramchandpur colony, who went back to the agricultural scheme, they have been given land not in one instalment. Again another two big has are promised. One season has come and gone and another season is about to come and go. It is not sufficient for them to buy bullocks, ploughs etc. I believe the expenditure on camps may also be at work-site camps. The new policy is not to keep them far too long in camps, but

to put them in work-site camps. We want to be sure that this money which is being given to agriculturists as additional expenditure would be used in the best manner possible. A number of people come out as destitutes from this particular camp.

Next, about mud-huts. Actually there is one peculiar position in the construction of mud-huts. Actually in 1952-53, a provision of Rs. 43 lakhs was made, and out of this only Rs. 7 lakhs was spent in 1952-53. That is a very big difference. In that very year in Girgaum—the hon. Minister knows as I represented the matter to him—there were 2,500 mud-huts and within one rainy season about 1,500 of them were spoiled and yet we find that this amount of money has not been used. In this year, we find that actually there has been a provision of Rs. 15 lakhs and now the hon. Minister wants another Rs. 5 lakhs. We must be sure that these mud-huts, which are constructed in a haphazard fashion, with very small floor space, etc., will be able to stand the rigours of the weather. The demand of the refugees is "Give us more well-constructed houses". When you have already made a provision for Rs. 43 lakhs in 1952-53, that means you can spend that money. Why not spend it in a better way than having these tiny huts without latrines and built in a *kutch* manner.

About Faridabad, my friend Mr. Nayar will say something and so I do not wish to take the time of the House on it.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** There is a demand for a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs for relief works for providing gainful employment to the residents of Faridabad. This is a matter in which the House should know certain facts as to why this money has become necessary. You will remember that in this Session, several questions on Faridabad Technical Institute and other institutes were answered by the hon. Minister and to our utter dismay, the hon. Minister revealed that instead of rehabilitating the unfortunate refugees who have been sent there, Government, by all

its programmes and policies of rehabilitation, has rehabilitated certain retired officers. I have been to Faridabad and in one of my visits, the Contractor there told me personally that he was in the forests for 10 years, doing penance, to find out the inner secrets of man. This Contractor has been able to get 33 1/3 per cent. of the net profits—the total investment in Faridabad is about 3.25 crores of rupees till now. This Contractor tells me that he has been visiting 1,000 factories in Europe during the course of one year. This contractor has been responsible for certain factories closing down in Delhi and does claim to be a communist when he sees a communist or to be a socialist when he sees a socialist Sir, when I visited the Institute he wrote a slip and passed it to me. The red ink script read that "a Sikh is a good communist who hates none and loves all." He said "I am a friend of the communists."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has at last found a friend.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I generally disown such friends. When the Government of India send certain people to study the working of certain factories, the most technically qualified people, with many degrees to their credit take one or two years to do the job, but this gentleman says he has seen a thousand factories in Western Germany, after the War, and he also says "I was doing penance for 10 years just to find out my inner secrets." This is the man whom Government thinks to be the fittest person to be appointed as a contractor. He is paid a fantastic salary of Re. 1 per month, just to bring him within the ambit of the rules, just to bring to him powers of authority to boss over all the workers, just to make it possible for him to curb the workers' movement. Under his "wonderful" management...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Are we discussing the entire policy now?

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I am only referring to what is gainful employment.



**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What does this item relate to? We are not generally going into the method of employment.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** There are certain refugees there who are employed on earth-digging and other light works. They cannot put in the full amount of work and we have to subsidise them. This sum of Rs. 3 lakhs is for giving subsidy for that earth-work and similar kind of work.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** The necessity for providing such employment would not have arisen had it not been for the fact that the Faridabad administration is under the control of somebody who does not know anything about refugee rehabilitation, anything about the working of a factory, or anything about a technical institute. After the present Administrator was appointed, about 12 or 13 technically qualified officers, doctors and engineers, were forced to suffer as he was creating hell for them. That is the position.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We are not going into the entire administration of Faridabad. There are various occupations and employment that have been provided and one of them is digging trenches or rather doing some such earthwork. Some of the people are not able to do work which will entitle them to earn a full wage on which they can sustain themselves and so the balance is to be subsidised by Government, because they are all refugees. Are we to go now into general observations like "if you had some other work or if you had some other factory or if it had been managed properly and so on"?

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Because the administration must be taken as a whole, for example...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No question of example. The hon. Member will confine himself to the mud business.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I don't want to throw mud at other people for nothing.

6 P.M.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** On a point of information, Sir. There is what is colloquially called "the mitti uravo" scheme. For building of the roads, workers are taken to Kalkaji, for instance. We are having this to give them proper employment. What I want to know is, while giving this Rs. 48,000, whether the Government have, at the same time, got proposals to continue this scheme or whether they are finding out new methods, because some of the schemes are technical. For instance, in Faridabad, sock-making is contemplated. But actually it could not go on there, because Government could not give money. Out of the two and a half lakhs to Faridabad industries, actually one and a half lakhs of stocks were there, but they could not be sold in time, because the accounting had not been gone through by the Union Secretariat.

There are other matters also which I could illustrate, but I am sure the Speaker will cut off my speech and therefore I am not giving them. But the point is this: This scheme which the hon. Minister has put through almost at the last point of despair,—whether they are going to continue it or, whether they are going to reconsider the scheme after making it a proper industrial establishment, eliminating all the defects and flaws that were in the administration itself such as the integration between the Ministry of Rehabilitation and Faridabad.

**Shri Velayudhan:** Can I elicit one information?

**Shri B. K. Das** rose—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will ask Mr. Das to speak.

**Shri B. K. Das:** As regards item No. (c) (i) at page 19, the figure, as on 8th October, 1953, was 65,000. I infer, and, of course, the hon. Minister will correct me when I say that when it was stated by the Government that it was 1,20,486 in October, 1952—this figure included the number in the permanent liability camps and the women's re-

habilitation camps also. If we deduct this 25,000 or so and the number in some other centres, we get again the same figure. The hon. Minister will please throw light on this.

Secondly, in these camps, as on 1st September, 1953, there were 68,444 persons, and here, under the note of the Bengal Government, it is said that it has been difficult to rehabilitate those persons who are there for more than a year. They say that the main reason is paucity of land. The Minister of Rehabilitation of West Bengal said in a statement that there are agriculturist families numbering about 9,768. There are also other *Barujibi* families—fishermen—and those belonging to other occupations who number about 5,587. I want to know if it is difficult to procure land why it has not been possible to send these people—fishermen and other families belonging to other occupations—to work for one year or more in the rehabilitation camps.

Another point is, as regards (d),—that Hyderabad State people are being helped. I want to know whether these people were displaced as back as 1948, and what was the condition so long, and what help was rendered to them. Rs. 5 lakhs have been asked for their help now. I want to know whether during these four or five years, any help was given to them.

**Shri Velayudhan:** May I know, Sir, whether after the appointment of a new Faridabad Administrative Officer, there were a large number of strikes and other difficulties in the Faridabad township, and whether this officer was practically, and in fact, an anti-refugee from the very beginning, while he was working as Deputy Commissioner? Is it to suppress the refugees that he was sent there. I have got a letter with me...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** How does it arise on this supplementary demand?

**Shri Velayudhan:** Mr. Nayar had...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Mr. Nayar need not be followed.

**Shri Velayudhan:** I want to submit only one thing. I have got a letter in which it is said: It is understood that this Administrative Officer engaged certain goondas against the refugees....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Whatever might be the relevancy of this elsewhere, it is not relevant here. Already there appears to be trouble there; such remarks would only aggravate them.

**Sardar Hukam Singh** (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): In page 18 under sub-head (a) the explanation given is as follows:

"At the time of framing the budget estimates for 1953-54, it was expected that the Property Organisations at Lahore and Karachi would be closed from 1.4.53. Later on, it was decided to allow these organisations to continue as negotiations were continuing with the Government of Pakistan in connection with movable property."

Rs. 65,000 is asked for for these organisations. I want to know what were the reasons which led to the conclusion that they might be closed by 1st April, 1953, what are the additional reasons which now impel Government in continuing them, whether these organisations had any part to play during these negotiations, whether the officers who go from here cannot perform those functions, and the exact functions that have so far been performed by these organisations or are still to be performed if the negotiations continue.

Only two days back it was pointed out that eleven letters have been sent to Pakistan, not one of which has been replied to by them. Is it considered advisable even now to wait for these negotiations, and whether for that purpose these organisations are necessary?

**Pandit Thakar Das Bhargava** (Gurgaon): Sir, we find in this de-

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

mand under (g) the following explanation is given:

"The additional funds are required for a larger number of cheap tenements in Delhi than originally estimated for squatters at the rate of Rs. 500 per family."

I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the accommodation that would be provided for a family in these Rs. 500 tenements and how many persons could live in them. We know, Sir, that the mud-huts that were built for a family were very small ones and it was very difficult for a family to sleep, in the accommodation provided even if the members tried to squeeze themselves. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that it is not fair to provide this type of accommodation. These mud-huts are not fit for a family of five to live in.

Secondly, I find that three lakhs of rupees are being given by way of subsidy for unemployment relief in Faridabad. Lately there has been a suggestion that some lands are to be given to these people. In regard to Faridabad we have been insisting that some means should be found whereby unemployment in that township could be relieved. Unemployed from there come here, and stage hunger strikes. The unemployment problem is not going to be solved through subsidies even if you spend crores. In Nilokheri we have spent as much as Rs. 3,500 per family as against this Rs. 500 tenements to poor families in Delhi. This is discriminatory so far housing is concerned. There is unemployment in Faridabad, Palwal and other places. I would request the hon. Minister to find other means than subsidy of solving this problem once for all.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in fact quite large and important issues have been raised, and in order to do full justice to the Government point of view I would ordinarily require considerable time. Nonetheless I would try to compress things in as short a time as possible.

First, as regards figures of West Bengal, according to the estimate at the time when the budget was being framed there were about 1,22,000 people in camp. Out of these, 40,000 were permanent liabilities and there was no question of reduction of their number. The balance of 83,000 persons were living in relief camps and were expected to be rehabilitated. At that time we were expecting that we would be able to find lands and settle these camp families on land and in different occupations so that the average population of the camps during the year 1953-54 would be considerably reduced. On account of litigation by which certain provisions of the Land Planning Act have been nullified, our expectations with regard to the acquisition of land could not be fulfilled. Moreover there is a paucity of land in West Bengal and the refugees there generally do not want to go out of West Bengal. The difficulties of acquiring land by themselves are considerable. Those expectations would not be fulfilled and therefore we have come forward for a supplementary grant.

The present camp population other than permanent liabilities would be about 60,000. That is we have been able to reduce it by about 23,000. But if the present difficulties subsist I am afraid rehabilitation will have to be delayed, because unless we get lands it is not possible to settle people. That is the reason why our original calculations could not be fulfilled.

Although several things which have been said about Ramchandrapura are not relevant to the discussion under these supplementary grants, yet I would like to clarify some of the points raised by my friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty. She asked: how is it that some persons are being given Rs. 2,250 as house building loan while others are being given Rs. 500 as house building loan? House building loans are granted under various schemes and in various places. In the rural colonies house loans at the rate of Rs. 500 are granted, whereas in the urban colonies house loans are

granted on a higher scale, Rs. 1,250 being the minimum, and persons who are prepared to contribute the balance of the expenditure on housing get 75 per cent. of the loan, from us. These persons are being settled in urban areas and therefore they are entitled to loan at a higher rate.

Quite a number of things have been said with regard to Faridabad. The money which we want relates to certain subsidies that are being given to people who are being provided with temporary work. In Faridabad the employment problem is rather acute. There are about 6,000 persons out of which only 2,500 persons have permanent employment. I quite appreciate that subsidy is not a good form of assistance, but in the transitory period we have to give it.

We have been trying to solve the problem of Faridabad in various ways. There are about 1,200 persons who have claims for land. I offered to these persons land in Bikaner, some of the best lands in the Indian Union. They are all irrigated lands. The minimum area which I offered to them, to each family, was 8 acres, irrespective of whatever the verified claim may have been. The maximum was an area of about 40 acres. Besides this, we offered them a loan of Rs. 800 to each one of the families. Not one family moved. I also made an offer to some of these families that they could come to Delhi and settle here because there was larger scope for settlement here. I said that we will give you Rs. 500 as a subsidy for house construction or we will give you built houses. Not one family has moved. The situation in Faridabad is that these people are not co-operating...

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Why?

**Shri A. P. Jain:**...and difficulties are multiplying. I have, of course, a way. I may deprive all these persons of further employment in Faridabad so that either starvation may drive them out or I may remove them from Faridabad forcibly. I do not want to take those steps unless forced and we are paying a subsidy. We shall have  
639 P.S.D.

to stop it. We are taking some steps to bring some industries there. We are negotiating with the Wearwell Cycle Co., and also with the Hindustan Electricals for the starting of an industry for the manufacture of cables and electrical appliances, etc. We are also negotiating with Spun Pipe India Ltd., for the manufacture of hume pipes. We are also negotiating with Tatas, etc., for the manufacture of diesel engines here. Hon. Members know that setting up a big industry is by no means an easy job, particularly in these difficult times when the economic situation is none too good and unemployment is increasing. In order to reduce unemployment in Faridabad, either the co-operation of the people in Faridabad or the use of force may become necessary. We have tried to avoid force and we shall try to avoid it as much as possible. Ultimately if the situation is not properly controlled, we shall have to do something.

I am sorry that some very unwarranted remarks have been made about the person who is in charge of the technical institute. An impression has been created as if we have sent him to Europe. He may have been to Europe at his expense but we have not sent him to Europe. The terms under which he has agreed to undertake the work, are rather onerous for him. He gets a nominal salary of one rupee per month because we wanted to give him the status of a Government servant. Besides he is entitled to thirty three and one-third per cent. of the net profits. They are nil. In fact, we are running the Technical Institute at a heavy loss. During the last 8 months, ever since this gentleman has been working, he has not received a single pie. I have been thinking whether it is not too hard upon him, that he should spend the whole day and not get a single pie. I am inclined to think that...

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I did not want to interrupt. But, I want to say...

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I am not giving way.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** On a point of personal explanation, Sir,...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. In giving personal explanations, the hon. Member ought not to be impatient. He must wait. After the hon. Minister finishes, he can get up and say with the permission of the Chair what he wants to say by way of personal explanation.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Yes, Sir.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I am in fact thinking whether I should not start giving this gentleman a small salary and revise the terms of employment.

Certain very unfortunate remarks have been made about the Administrator about whom I can say that he is an official having ample experience, who has, during the time—of about one year—that he has been there, rendered very valuable service as Administrator and looked after the displaced persons with all the sympathy that was possible.

Some questions have been asked about the Hyderabad displaced persons. These persons are Muslims, mostly those who had been displaced on account of the Police Action from their usual place of residence. Originally, they were being looked after by the Hyderabad Government. They rendered assistance under the various items under which we proposed to give them assistance. Last year, we decided to give assistance to these persons. I visited the place and examined the whole problem. Now the Government of India have undertaken the responsibility of giving assistance to these persons and provision has been made for that.

Sardar Hukam Singh has raised the question of the property organisation, as to why we were thinking that we would be able to close the property organisation in Lahore and Karachi, and what functions it performs. The functions of this organisation are: to assist in the

repatriation of the movable property, to gather and supply information to the correspondents and to deal with the Pakistan authorities. At one time practically all the negotiations on the evacuee property between ourselves and Pakistan had come to a standstill and we were feeling that any continuance of this organisation was not called for. We thought that we would be able to close this organisation with effect from 1st April 1953. However, at that stage certain statements were made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan which raised some hopes and we thought that if these negotiations with regard to the movable property came to a successful conclusion we shall need this organisation and it would have been unwise for us to have discontinued it, and therefore we have asked for a supplementary grant.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Now, may I...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Now about cheap tenements. Pandit Thakurdas Bhargava and other hon. Members have made some observations with regard to the cheap tenements. What we do under the cheap tenements scheme is this: We give 100 sq. yards of developed land. Of course, the development is not of the same standard as in our regular colonies. Then, we give an outright grant of Rs. 500. They need not confine the construction to Rs. 500. This is a free grant for which they need not pay any interest or rent. Ordinarily, this scheme has been found to be very popular and displaced persons have preferred to avail of this grant of Rs. 500 even in preference to some of the tenements which we have built costing Rs. 2,000, Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 4,000. They put in some money themselves and it is for them to construct. This is an optional grant. Here we give you a piece of land, a plot, and here we give you money. It is up to you

to do the construction. If they do not want it, we do not force it upon them. This scheme, as I said, has found great favour with the displaced persons. It is deserving more of praise than of condemnation.

These were some of the points which were raised, and if they put any questions, I shall certainly answer them.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Did the hon. Minister answer the question about the mud-huts scheme just now? I did not follow.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** These are cheap tenements.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** There is one grant which deals with mud-huts. There I had raised the question why, it was popular in the first year that only Rs. 7 lakhs out of Rs. 48 lakhs or so was used.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** This is about cheap tenements which I have explained.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** This is a different scheme it appears.

**Sardar Hukam Singh:** May I know if they have been able to repatriate any property since 1st April, 1953?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** No. The Movable Property Agreement has been ratified by Pakistan, and it will come into effect from 1st January, 1954.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Sir, the hon. Minister when replying to me stated that it was unfortunate that I cast some aspersion on certain officers who were very efficient. I want to inform the House and the hon. Minister through you that not only did Mr. Madusudhan Singh tell me all that I said before, but he also said that both Mr. A. P. Jain and Mr. Mehr Chand Khanna wanted him to be there. I did not believe it then, but now because Mr. Jain says so, that he is to be paid a salary, I believe it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is no personal explanation.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Yes, Sir. I want him to be there.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will put it to the vote of the House, now that two hours exactly are over. Hon. the Home Minister finished at 4-25, and two hours from then is 6-25. I will put all the other Demands.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I want your ruling and guidance on one point before you guillotine the other cut motions and demands for the vote of the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I know that.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** How do you know that? I have not stated nor begun to say what ruling I wanted.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I have already looked into that.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Not about this. You were just informing the House that all the other demands will be put to the vote of the House. Before that, in respect of one demand, I wanted to raise a point, and to have your ruling on it. Am I wrong in doing that?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Nothing can be done hereafter.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I am not going into the merits. On a question of general principle or policy, I want your ruling.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Before you guillotine, I would like to know one thing in regard to the import of sugar. Previously, it was decided to import 2 lakhs of tons of sugar. Now the quantity has been increased by about 50,000 tons.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** For the general information of hon. Members I might say, that at the time of guillotine, if anything is left over, on which hon. Members want some information, they may write to the hon. Minister, and the hon. Minister will give a note, if it is a matter of general public importance, and not a matter of detail.

**Shri Kidwai:** If I am given the questions, I shall answer them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members may give these questions directly to the hon. Minister, or to the office, in

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

which case, we shall pass them on. So memoranda will be given, regarding the other matters.

**Sri V. P. Nayar:** What I wanted to know was something different.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is not unfortunately the time I can hear the hon. Member. I am sorry. This is not the time.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I wish to raise a point of order, because it is such an important matter. I want to have your guidance and ruling, before you apply gullotine.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** At the gullotine time, no point of order will apply.

**Sri V. P. Nayar:** That is very strange.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** You must allow us to raise a point of order.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Guillotine is to be applied only at 6-27 P.M.? Can you not give me just half a minute so as to enable me to raise the point on which I want your ruling and guidance?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall finish this first, and then hear the point of order. There is no harm in that.

The question is:

"That the separate supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper 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 the following Demands entered in the second column thereof:

Demands Nos. 86, 95, 125 and 138."

*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. 86—EXPENDITURE ON  
DISPLACED PERSONS**

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 50,28,000 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 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

**DEMAND No. 95—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF STATES**

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 95,23,000 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 States'."

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,72,00,000 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 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

**DEMAND No. 138—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT**

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 18,50,000 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 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport'."

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** The point of order which I wanted to raise was this. Along with my other cut motions, I had given some cut motions in respect of Demand No. 107 also. I

know that on charged amounts, cut motions cannot be carried. But here is a provision in the Constitution, which says:

"So much of the estimates as relates to expenditure charged upon the Consolidated Fund of India shall not be submitted to the vote of Parliament, but nothing in this clause shall be construed as preventing the discussion in either House of Parliament of any of those estimates."

Although I knew that these cut motions cannot be accepted, still I wanted to raise a discussion on this Demand relating to the Speaker's salary. It was a very important matter on which I wanted to focus the attention of this House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have heard the hon. Member sufficiently. If hon. Members want to raise any discussion on any Demand relating to a charged item, certainly the House is entitled to discuss that matter. No doubt, those cut motions shall not be put to the vote of the House. But now, we had to apply the guillotine, and so I could not allow any opportunity for the hon. Member to raise the matter referred to in his cut motion. If they had come in the usual course, possibly I would have considered the question of giving an opportunity to the hon. Member to speak.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I submit in the matter of questions, when questions are not admitted we are informed officially by letters. And in this case I wanted to submit this for your ruling, because I contacted the office and the office informed me that in the year 1929...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am aware of the convention ....

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Will you please hear me?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would like to say this for the consideration of the House and the hon. Member that normally, whenever any demand re-

lates to Parliament, the procedure is not to ask questions on the floor of the House.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** That is different.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Because it will be thrusting the Speaker into the hands of the Government and making them justify his existence or the existence of the office. Therefore, ordinarily the procedure is that the Member should go to the Speaker and ask him about information and try to get satisfaction about that matter. That is the convention. It is not as if we cannot raise any matter here. Parliament is supreme. Parliament can certainly raise any matter relating to this matter, and if there is anything particularly either against the Deputy-Speaker or the Speaker...

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** That is not the point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** .... there is another provision.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** That we know.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now with respect to the office and other things, information ordinarily can be had of the Speaker. He will just...

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** My difficulty was this. When I asked the office, the office told me that there was a convention, that there was a precedent. The precedent which was shown to me was a precedent in which the then President of the House had given a ruling in answer to a question from Mr. Mohammed Rafi. That was in the year 1929. We will discuss that matter...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no. Order, order. There is a limit to this kind of digression. The hon. Member raised a particular point as to whether a demand here which is charged can be discussed in the House. I agree it can be discussed. But we have applied the guillotine now. That was accepted. But if anything more arises on any particular matter, we will discuss. Only with regard to matters relating to the Parliament Secretariat or the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, in the first instance, as far as possible,



[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

they will have to make an approach to the hon. the Speaker. That is the convention. If in spite of it...

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Can I take it that your ruling is that we can discuss a matter relating to the Secretariat and the Speaker and Deputy-Speaker on the floor of the House or that we should go to the Chamber....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no. Order, order. There is an Act of Parliament. There is no question of discussing about the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker or the Secretariat.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Not in ...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. I am not prepared to answer the hon. Member. It is not cross-examination of any particular person. I have already said that so far as that matter was concerned, if there had been no guillotine, I would have considered it as to whether it ought to be allowed or not. That is the only thing that arises. I am not here to answer hypothetical questions.

**Shri V. P. Nayar rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member introduces all sorts of irrelevant matters, notwithstanding the fact that I have told him very often....

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** There is a difference in understanding.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now take up the Appropriation Bill.

#### APPROPRIATION (No. 5) BILL

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri M. C. Shah):** 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 M. C. Shah:** I \*introduce the Bill and 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 M. C. Shah:** 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:** Now, are there any cut motions regarding PEPSU?

**Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada):** Sir, I have a cut motion.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is general policy; it is not allowed.

\*Introduced and moved with the recommendation of the President.