LOK SABHA DEBATES

Detect 09./2.20/4

(Part II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1667

T668

LOK SABHA

Friday, 11th March, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
(See Part I)

12 Noon.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): With your permission, Sir, I wish to make a correction to the reply that I gave to one of the supplementary questions arising out of starred question No. 1290 asked by Shri Morarka on the 16th December. 1954.

To his question whether Government had considered it desirable to make use of the Research Programme Committee of the Planning Commission for the purpose of guiding the National Sample Survey, I replied in the affirmative.

The correct position, however, is that the National Sample Survey is a governmental activity with which the Research Programme Committee of the Planning Commission has no connection. My reply to the question would therefore be in the negative.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE ANDHRA BUDGET

Mr. Speaker: We have now to take the Supplementary Demands for Grants, Andhra State and the Appropriation Bill—that would follow—and also the Vote on Account of the 705 LSD Andhra Budget. No time seems to have been allotted for this.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Not so far.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know what time will be required by hon. Members. I believe that there will not be much scope now for further discussion in view of the elections in Andhra.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I make a submission? The Supplementary Demands seem to be rather important for our purpose today, because the Vote on Account is only a nominal business, which will be taken over by the Andhra Legislature in the next few days. These Supplementary Demands are in respect of the regime of the Governor under the Presidential Order. I think you may give some time to hon. Members to express their views on them.

Mr. Speaker: How much? Half an hour?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I think two hours should be given.

Shri Raghavachari: (Penukonda): My hon. friend pressed only the Supplementary Demands. My submission is that even in respect of the General Budget that is now placed before this House, much of the purpose is taken away because a responsible Government will come into existence there in Andhra very soon. Nevertheless, as the whole Budget is placed before the House—it ought to be placed before the House—it would be proper if we are given at least two hours for discussion.

Even the incoming Government might welcome a discussion here as to

how their Budget and their administration is regarded by other sections of the country. Therefore it would be helpful if you could allot two hours for the General Budget.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): There are several subjects which are concerned with the Central Government as well as the Andhra Government. We should very much like to represent the Andhra view point before the Central Government and we should have a chance.

Mr. Speaker: That would be on a different occasion: not in respect of the Budget for the Andhra State. I appreciate the point about the Supplementary Demands and I think these may be discussed. So far as Vote on Account is concerned, it need not take a long time. After all, we are following a sort of a convention that Vote on Account is just a device for the purpose of giving more time for discussing the Budget.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I make a further submission? If it is at all possible from the procedural point of view, both the Supplementary Demands and the General Budget could be discussed together. That would be very helpful because, this Parliament, which has held the baby, so to speak, for four months may, in passing it on to the Andhra Legislature, still give some directives.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think there could be any objection to that. Then, it will be two hours for both.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri. B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Can it not be increased by half an hour?

Mr. Speaker: I should have thought that the Supplementary Demands did not require more than at the most one hour. The other thing was merely a formal business. I have extended the time by 100 per cent.

Shri Raghavachari: As regards the other observation that you were pleased to make that the Vote on Account is simply a device for giving more time for discussion of the General Budget, I think you will appreciate

that this House is not going to discuss it at all. Time is the essence of the matter. The general discussion will be in the Assembly there. Therefore, I think two hours may be allotted for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker: It is true some discussion has to take place, or Members may like to have it discussed. The chief point is that the Budget for the coming year being pricipally a matter for the Andhra State, any discussion here will practically be of no use. That is what I feel. It is for the Andhra Legislature to discuss it fully. They are going to do it.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I think a general discussion on both subjects will serve the purpose.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I said. That would be immediately helpful. Looking to the time at our disposal and the pressure of business, I think all legitimate demands will be met by allotting two hours for the discussion of both. The question will be, if the Supplementary Demands are discussed for a long time, the general discussion will be curtailed to that exertent.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There is no compartmentalism like that: both will be discussed together.

Mr. Speaker: That is right.

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): After the discussion is over, both the Appropriation Bills and Vote on Account will be taken up at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. There are also Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of Railways. For that also no time has been fixed. Will half an hour do?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The next half hour.

Mr. Speaker: Whether we take it in the next half an hour or thereafter, is not very material. Only half an hour is to be allotted for that.