

Shri K. K. Basu: We are not objecting to the leave, but we should know what the Bill contains. He may have deducted Rs. 11,25,000. But let him state the position now.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The entire Bill, as it stands, should be placed before the House. The hon. Minister should have made a statement after moving for consideration.

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): He has not made any speech.

Mr. Chairman: I have not put the motion to vote.

Shri M. C. Shah: I have already moved the Bill for consideration. This Bill consists of all the items that have been voted by the House. It has been already improved upon, because Rs. 11,25,000 have been deducted from the Bill. So this Bill consists of just those items that have been passed minus Rs. 11,25,000. I do not know what other matters the hon. Member from Calcutta wants me to give him. I think he knows the practice and procedure. He is here for the last three and a half years and he knows the procedure. He is an eminent solicitor of the Calcutta High Court and he ought to know the procedure also.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): May I submit that contingent notice of the Appropriation Bill was one of the items on the agenda. The Bill contains in the main all the items voted in the House and these Bills are not distributed to the hon. Members, as a matter of practice, earlier. It cannot contain more than what has actually been voted by the House. That is the practice.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has just tried to help the hon. Minister out.

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 1955-56, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

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

Shri M. C. Shah: I beg to move: "That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Chairman: The question is: "That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS

Mr. Chairman: Now, the discussion on Excess Demands will take place.

DEMAND No. 28-A—MINISTRY WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 1,097 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Ministry without Portfolio' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 40—BOTANICAL SURVEY

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 6,384 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Botanical Survey' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 51—AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 28,30,744 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Agriculture' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 54—SALT

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 28,88,199 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Salt' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 64—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 23,52,190 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 74—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 6,25,810 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 80—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE UNION AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 47,864 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Union and State Governments' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 82—CIVIL DEFENCE

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 8,287 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Civil Defence' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 83—PREPARATION PAYMENTS

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 58,62,358 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Pre-partition Payments' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 89A—VINDHYA PRADESH

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 2,83,049 be granted to the President to make

good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Vindhya Pradesh' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 96—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS (NOT MET FROM REVENUE)

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 30,79,935 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Indian Posts and Telegraphs (Not met from Revenue)' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 97—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—STORES SUSPENSE (NOT MET FROM REVENUE)

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 1,13,72,975 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Stores Suspense (Not met from Revenue)' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

Indent for Scientific Instruments

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I beg to move:

"That the Demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Delay in receipt of equipment

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Retention of an officer beyond normal date of retirement.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Gorakhpur Dist.—North): I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Non-settlement of bonus to sugarcane growers

Shri S. L. Saksena: I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 28,30,744 in respect of 'Agriculture' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): With your permission, may I submit that cut motion No. 4 by Shri S. L. Saksena is out of order because the excess expenditure relates to the year 1950-51 and this cut motion deals with the payment of bonus to the sugarcane growers. This scheme came into operation only in 1953-54 and did not exist at the time when the excess expenditure was made. Apart from that, the excess expenditure has nothing to do with the sugarcane bonus. In fact, the sugarcane bonus did not exist at that time and therefore this cut motion is completely and totally out of order.

Mr. Chairman: What has the hon. Member to say? The fact stated by the hon. Minister is that this bonus to sugarcane growers did not exist at that time, in the financial year for which this excess grant is being demanded. If that is a fact, this cut motion cannot be allowed to be moved.

Shri S. L. Saksena: The Fund was for the benefit of the sugarcane growers.

Shri A. P. Jain: But bonus did not exist at that time.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Probably the hon. Member wants to argue why did you not give bonus then?

Mr. Chairman: *Prima facie* it looks as if the scheme for bonus did not exist at that time and so such a cut motion cannot be moved. Is it the contention of the hon. Member that it existed at that time?

Shri S. L. Saksena: It might not have existed; it ought to have.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid that the rules of this House do not allow hypothetical questions to be discussed. Therefore, cut motion No. 4 is out of order and cannot be allowed.

Cut motions moved:

(1) "That the Demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 5,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(2) "That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(3) "That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Shri Kamath: I shall be very brief indeed. This excess demand with reference to the Botanical survey is composed of two items. One is unanticipated and the second is unexpected—unanticipated payment, and unexpected retention of an officer. It is payment for scientific instruments indented for in 1948-49 and received in 1950-51. That means to say that they were received in 1950-51.

Before I proceed, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Minister concerned—neither the then Minister nor the present Minister—is present here at this time.

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): The Finance Minister who embraces everybody is here.

Shri Kamath: This demand is—I take the papers at their face value—for the year 1950-51. I wonder why Government has come forward in 1955-56 for the sanction of this amount. I see it is not a very big amount, but it is a question of principle involved. It takes so long for the Audit to find out this excess payment.

Why was it not brought before the House earlier? The indent was placed in 1948-49 and the instruments were received in 1950-51. Which was

[Shri Kamath]

the company with whom the indent was placed? When the indent was placed, did not Government have any idea as to what the instruments would cost? At least its approximate cost could have been shown in the budget at that time. As soon as it was spent, why did not Government come forward with a supplementary demand before the House?

The second part of it is the unexpected retention of an officer beyond his normal date of retirement. This, of course, is becoming common nowadays and it has become a habit with Government now. There is no point in criticising the Government. The Government has become thick-skinned and absolutely inured to criticism. Retirement of an officer beyond the normal date of his retirement is a normal thing nowadays with the Government. I do not want to say much except to reiterate the criticisms against the Government that has been directed from these benches time and again on this score. Unfortunately due to the vast majority—I would not use the words “brute majority”—of the Government, these criticisms have no effect. I would like to know who the officer concerned was that was retained and why he was retained. I would like the hon. Minister, Shri Shah, if he can throw light on this. I wonder whether he can, but I hope he will.

Shri S. L. Saksena: I have only to say this. Although I can admit that the payment for the instruments may have been unanticipated, I cannot understand how the Government can justify the retention of the officer beyond the normal date of retirement. To say “unexpected” has no meaning. His date of retirement should have been known first. Still he had been retained for a period beyond that date. It cannot be unexpected and that is something which the hon. Minister has to explain. This thing happened in 1950-51 but the Government did not come up before the House till today, which is surprising.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: My point is about the delay in the receipt of the scientific equipment. In the Third Progress Report of the Five Year Plan, in the relevant chapter on scientific development of natural resources, it was stated that the work of the development of natural resources was held up for some time due to the non-receipt of equipment in time. We find that the Government has entered into a number of agreements with other countries even during this period. There is the Colombo Plan, there is the T.C.A. and there is the T.C.M., but in spite of all these, our work is being held up due to non-receipt of the equipment in time. Here, the indent was placed in 1948-49 but it was only after three years that the equipment was made available to this country. This only means that our reliance on the countries where we placed these orders was responsible to some extent for this delay. This is an equipment relating to botanical survey, as has been stated in the Demand. I want to know something about the type of the scientific equipment for which order was placed and with which country the order was placed, and what is the reason for delay in the receipt of the equipment.

श्री बिभूति मिश्र (सारन व चम्पारन) :
यह जो डिमान्ड नं (मांग संख्या) ५१ है
उस में लिखा हुआ है :

“for the benefit of the sugar-cane growers and improvement of the sugar industry.”

इस में ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपया १,६८,६४,७४४ दिया गया है। इस में एक्सेस (अधिक) दिया जा रहा है २८,३०,७४४ रु०। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय चीनी का दाम गिर गया था तो सरकार ने टैक्स (कर) लगा कर और ले कर चीनी के खरीद के दाम को पूरा किया। फिर भागे चल कर चीनी का दाम बढ़ गया। तो दाम बढ़ने से प्रोफ़िट (उत्पादकों) को मदद कैसे मिली ?

दूसरी बात यह है कि इस में लिखा है कि शुगरकेन प्रोग्रस को फायदा पहुंचाने के लिये दिया गया। यह तो मैं मान सकता हूं कि मिलमालिकों के फायदे के लिये कानून बना कि पैसा लिया जाय। लेकिन हम लोग जो गरीब किसान हैं, गन्ने की खेती करते हैं, उन को क्या फायदा हुआ जोकि उन का नाम इस में लिख दिया गया? अगर हम लोगों का कुछ फायदा नहीं होता है और प्रोग्रस (उत्पादकों) का लाभ नहीं होता है तो मैं समझता हूं कि मिनस्टर साहब को और सरकार को इस में से शुगरकेन प्रोग्रस (गन्ना उत्पादकों) का नाम हटा देना चाहिये। मूठ मूठ उन का नाम लिखने से क्या फायदा है। और अगर फायदा है तो सरकार बतलावे कि गन्ने की खेती करने वालों का क्या फायदा हुआ है क्योंकि चीनी का दाम गिर गया तो जो चीनी के मालिक हैं उन के नुकसान को पूरा करने के लिये सरकार ने पैसे ले कर मिल मालिकों को दिया न कि प्रोग्रस के फायदे के लिये।

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : फैंक्ट्री (कारखाना) के फार्म का तो फायदा हुआ ?

श्री विभूति मिश्र : तो यह लिख दें कि फैंक्ट्री (कारखाना) के फार्म को दिया गया। केन प्रोग्रस (गन्ना उत्पादक) का नाम वहां से हटा दें।

श्री सुनसुनचाला (भागलपुर मध्य) : वह भी तो केन प्रोग्रस (गन्ना उत्पादक) है।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : दूसरी तरफ लिख दिया गया कि केन प्रोग्रस को फायदा हुआ। मैं समझता हूं कि यह गलत है। जो गरीब आदमी छोटी मोटी खेती करते हैं उन को कहा जाता है कि फायदा हुआ जबकि बड़े बड़े फैंक्ट्रीज के फार्म को ही फायदा हो सकता है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि शुगर केन प्रोग्रस का नाम क्यों रक्खा गया।

मैं चाहता हूं कि हमारे मंत्री जी इस बात को समझावें कि उन का क्या फायदा हुआ है और कैसे हुआ है। साथ ही यह भी बतलावें कि भिन्न भिन्न स्टेटों में कितना रुपया केन प्रोग्रस को दिया गया है।

श्री कामत : कृषि मंत्री तो हाजिर नहीं हैं।

Mr. Chairman: I would like to say that when particular Demands of the Ministries are there, instead of leaving the entire thing to the hon. Finance Minister, it would be better if the particular Minister in charge was able to be present as that would make things easier and give more satisfaction to the Members who want some information. For the time being, the hon. Finance Minister can reply.

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): I think there has been some misunderstanding on the part of Shri Kamath, Shri Saksena and the last speaker. These are the Demands for the excess payments made in the year 1950-51. Because of our present system of financial control the payments are made. When there are unexpected expenditure to be incurred, and then when it is discovered that there was no provision in the budget for such payments, the excess is brought to notice at the stage of preparation of the appropriation accounts. The appropriation accounts are prepared by the Comptroller and Auditor-General and examined by the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee recommends the regularisation of these items. In the first instance, the indent was placed in 1948-49. It was not anticipated that those instruments would be delivered in 1950-51 and that payment would have to be made in 1950-51. The instruments were delivered in 1950-51, and because we had not got the separation of accounts and audit, the excess could not be detected. When the goods were received and the value

[Shri M. C. Shah]

was to be paid, there was no provision for the amount in the grants voted by the House then. Therefore, when the Appropriation Accounts were prepared, it was found out that this was an excess of the demand and therefore that has to be regularised according to the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. All these items shown here and now before the House were items which were not provided for but because of the present system of financing and because of keeping audit and accounts together, these excess payments could not be detected during the year. According to our Constitution, article 115, these items are to be regularised and passed by this House. Therefore, these have been brought forward.

My friend just mentioned about the cane growers. These payments ought to have been made earlier in 1947 but they had to be made later. Sugar control was lifted and certain differential prices were to be paid. Something like Rs. 46 lakhs were to be paid but only Rs. 12 lakhs were paid in that year and Rs. 34 lakhs had to be paid in the year 1950-51. There was no budget provision then. This obligation had to be honoured and so payment was made. As I said when the Appropriation Accounts were made, this was found to be an excess payment. The P.A.C. have gone into all these items and they have recommended that under article 115 of the Constitution these must be regularised. Therefore, there is nothing extraordinary.

It has been said that there has been delay. As long as the present system continues and there is no separation of accounts and audit, such things may happen. This is the first batch for 1950-51. We may have to come for regularisation of the excess relating to 1951-52, 1952-53, 1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56.

An Hon. Member: For excess payments?

Shri M. C. Shah: Yes, It is because of this. We are trying to separate the

audit and accounts. Then it can be seen that the demand is not exceeded. These things happen because they are not separated. We have already started separating audit from accounts in the Ministry of Food, in Supply Department, in the Ministry of Rehabilitation. Recently we have also applied that policy so far as the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha Secretariats are concerned. As long as the financial control system is as it is today, the accounts and audit departments remaining together, these excesses will be coming. These extra payments will be scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee and after the recommendation of that Committee they will have to come before this House for regularisation. That is the long and short explanation of the whole thing.

श्री बिभति मिश्र : मैं मंत्री जी से एक सवाल का जवाब चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने सब बातें बतलाई कि इस तरह हुआ और उस तरह हुआ। पार्लियामेंट एक सोवरेन बाडी है और उनको चाहिए था कि वह एक केस बनाते और हमें बताते कि कौन प्रोजेक्ट को इससे क्या फायदा हुआ है। इस बात का जवाब उन्होंने नहीं दिया है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब वह इस का जवाब दे।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has replied to the question why excess demands have been made; he said that it was due to certain ways of accounting. The hon. Member wants to know and get a specific answer as to item 51 under which the cane growers are stated to have benefited by a certain deal. He wants the hon. Minister to substantiate the position and show how the cane growers had actually been benefited. Otherwise, he wants that to be taken away if this was not allotted to the benefit of the cane growers.

Shri M. C. Shah: From the differential prices that we paid and which they collected on the stocks frozen in

the mills, certain amount was realised and that sum was sent to the welfare fund of the cane growers. From that welfare fund whatever was to be spent for the welfare of the cane growers was spent.

Shri S. L. Saksena: He had not answered about the retention of an officer beyond his term.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member wants to know why a particular officer was retained beyond his term.

Shri M. C. Shah: There was no question of retaining an officer. The officer was not responsible. In 1948-49 an indent was placed and it was not expected that those goods would arrive in 1950-51. Those goods arrived in 1950-51.

Mr. Chairman: That is not the point. The small point is this. What is the relation between the retention of the officer beyond the normal date of retirement with the late arrival of scientific instruments? That is the small point.

Shri M. C. Shah: I am sorry, I thought that Shri Kamath raised this.

Shri Kamath: You have confused it.

Shri M. C. Shah: It must have been found necessary by the administrative Ministry to retain him for a certain period and therefore, he has to be paid. I have got the explanation also. There was some delay in the U.P.S.C. and before the recommendation came from the U.P.S.C. the period had expired and therefore as long as the recommendation did come from the U.P.S.C. we had to extend the period. We had to pay because we had kept him.

Mr. Chairman: I shall put the cut motions, Nos. 1, 2 and 3 to vote.

The question is:

"That the Demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 6,384 in respect of 'Botanical Survey' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: I think I can put all these Demands together.

The question is:

"That the respective Excess sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to make good the amounts spent during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951, in respect of corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Excess Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below:—Ed.]

DEMAND NO. 28-A—MINISTRY WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

"That a sum of Rs. 1,097 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Ministry without Portfolio' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND NO. 40—BOTANICAL SURVEY

"That a sum of Rs. 6,384 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Botanical Survey' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND NO. 51—AGRICULTURE

"That a sum of Rs. 28,30,744 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in

[Mr. Chairman]

respect of 'Agriculture' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 54—SALT

"That a sum of Rs. 28,88,199 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Salt' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 64—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS

"That a sum of Rs. 23,52,190 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 74—EXPENDITURE ON DIS-PLACED PERSONS

"That a sum of Rs. 6,25,810 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 80—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE UNION AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

"That a sum of Rs. 47,864 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Union and State Governments' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 82—CIVIL DEFENCE

"That a sum of Rs. 8,287 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Civil Defence' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 83—PREPARATION PAYMENTS

"That a sum of Rs. 58,62,358 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Pre-partition Payments' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 89A.—VINDHYA PRADESH

"That a sum of Rs. 2,83,049 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Vindhya Pradesh' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 96—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS (NOT MET FROM REVENUE)

"That a sum of Rs. 30,79,935 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Indian Posts and Telegraphs (Not met from Revenue)' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

DEMAND No. 97—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—STORES SUSPENSE (NOT MET FROM REVENUE)

"That a sum of Rs. 1,13,72,975 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Stores Suspense (Not met from Revenue)' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1951."

APPROPRIATION (NO. 5) BILL

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1951, in excess of the amounts authorised or granted for the said services.