

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Date: 25.11.2014

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

525

526

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 19th February, 1953.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY
GRANTS FOR 1952-53

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have received notices of a number of cut motions. I will bring once again to the notice of hon. Members that these cut motions will be allowed so far as Supplementary Demands are concerned. Cut motions for Supplementary Demands must be restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which Supplementary Grants are sought and to application of the items which compose those Grants and that a question of policy cannot be raised on Demands for Supplementary Grants in so far as such Demands refer to schemes which have already been sanctioned by the House.

The following cut motions are out of order being beyond the scope of Supplemental Demands: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21 and 22.

Sarimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): The whole lot?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If you make the mistake, what can I do? Those in order are: 2, 3, 13, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24 and 25.

483 PSD.

DEMAND NO. 1—MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,92,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry'."

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): The cut motion on this Demand you have ruled out of order. But you have held No. 23 in order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will see: "To discuss about trade policy and continuation of the present system of control and management."

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The first part about trade policy is out of order but continuation of the present system of control and management is in order. Just as in No. 25, surely continuation of the present system of control and management is also in order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will reconsider No. 23 also.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will allow any amount of proper discussion on this matter. To discuss about trade policy is not in order. About the continuation of the present system of control and management, the hon. Member will kindly see that at the time the Budget was passed, the system of control and management was there. Normally they are allowed, if a policy is accepted for a year. If, from time to time, Supplementary Demands are brought, you cannot go on saying, "Sir, last month it was all right, hereafter useless.....". The hon. Member will kindly consider this. He was in charge of this Department. Therefore, there must be some time allowed for the Government to come to a conclusion as to what the effect of

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

that policy is. That is reasonably a year. That is why at the end of the year once again it will come for discussion. The whole policy will be reviewed in between. We cannot go on reviewing from time to time.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I was in charge of that Department. I feel that the question of continuance of control is a matter which cannot be decided by Government for one year at a time without any intention of changing it during the year. Government itself has changed that policy now. When you are having a Supplementary Grant, the question of desirability of continuing control in the present shape is certainly a matter in issue. If the present policy is modified to a certain extent, we can save some expenditure. Trade policy you can exclude but continuation of the present policy is a matter which becomes relevant. It is for you, Sir, to decide.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: My point is we have had two Supplementary Grants, the total of which comes to about one-sixth of the original Budget and you are pushing them without allowing discussions on the subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Instead of allowing Mr. Basu to table a cut motion, the hon. Member herself could have come forward with this motion. Before I put the motion to the vote I will allow her to make any representation. She can even now.....

Shri Damodara Menon rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me dispose of this matter. With all respect, I feel that whereas, in certain circumstances, the Government might feel that a particular policy which was started may not be desirable to continue, it is Government that brings out a policy before the House. It is for the Government to watch from time to time. The majority is bound to see that a particular policy is pursued. That is different from the Opposition or any Member asking the Government to have a particular policy before Government comes to any conclusion. It will be endless. Therefore, with all respect to what the hon. Member has said, I am unable to agree with him. I still urge that this is a matter of policy both in the first half as well as in the second half. I feel that there is no reason to change my opinion regarding this. It is out of order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Almost all the cut motions have been ruled out of order. When they are coming up with Supplementary Grants totalling huge amounts, I think we should be allowed to discuss them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as cut motions are concerned, if they are not properly worded, what can I do? If the hon. Member wants to draw attention to any particular portion, she might have given notice of a cut motion. Otherwise, if she wants to raise a debate on a particular Demand, certainly I will give an opportunity not only to her but to others also.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Now we are asked to grant Rs. 46 crores. Previously we were asked to grant Rs. 26 crores. All of a sudden, within 24 hours' notice, we are asked to grant Rs. 46 crores. The time for discussion is very little. Therefore, proper time must be given for discussing these.

Shri Damodara Menon: One or two clarifications. I find in the footnote on this motion.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will see which cut motions are in order and which not in order and then put the Demands. I do not want to throttle discussion but if hon. Members look into the footnote and then have something to say how long am I to wait?

Shri Damodara Menon: From the very beginning I said this. In the footnote I find—item No. (vii) Publication of Weekly Bulletin of Import and Export Trade from Headquarters and Port Offices—an amount of Rs. 78,000 is allotted for that.

I want to know when this publication began. If the publication actually began some months ago, it should have been possible for the hon. Minister to include it either in the Budget or in the Supplementary Demands that came up for consideration. Was this publication started very recently after the last demands were passed? Otherwise, where is the justification for including this expenditure now?

There is another item, more expenditure on liveries, Rs. 10,000. I want to know why this huge expenditure on liveries has become necessary now.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Unfortunately, my cut motion has been ruled out for a technical error, or

whatever it may be. My submission is this. In these Grants we find three specific heads, the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, the Industrial Development and Regulation Act, and Cottage Industries work, and Supplementary Demands are made. These things were not there when the original Grant was made. Especially, the Cottage Industries work was taken up and the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act was passed only in the last session. That is why I thought we could bring in the policy and then discuss it in detail. However, I would like to know the details. In view of the fact that such a heavy expenditure is being proposed, without a clear explanatory note, we do not really understand what the specific details of the expenditure are. It is no use only giving the heads of expenditure and then asking us to give our verdict on that. I expect the hon. Minister to explain to us in detail the specific reasons why a Deputy Secretary and so many Under Secretaries have had to be appointed and why the expenditure has over-shot the expenditure granted by the original Budget.

As my learned friend pointed out about publications, under the head Foreign trade control, we have not been supplied with a full explanation as to the situation which has developed since the passing of the Budget last year, which warrants this expenditure. Unless these things are explained to us, it is very difficult for us to understand and read into the minds of the hon. Minister, so that we could give our considered opinion on each subject.

Under E, Leave and Deputation Salaries, Rs. 25,000 has been demanded. We do not know why all of a sudden this extra amount of Rs. 25,000 is required. Whether the rates have had to be increased or more officers were sent on leave, what are the specific reasons? Unless these facts are given to us, it is very difficult to consider in detail and give our verdict. Therefore, I expect, when Supplementary Demands are brought forward, at least some explanatory note will be furnished. Otherwise, it is very difficult in one day's time to consider the position. That is why I wanted to consider the question in a comprehensive way.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): On a point of order, Sir. Are we dealing with Demand No. 1 only or Demands Nos. 1 and 4?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Demand No. 1.

The Minister of Revenue and Expenditure (Shri Tyagi): On a point of order, Sir. As it is a measure pertaining to money, will you not be pleased to fix a time for guillotine, by which time these discussions should come to a close? In the past, the convention has been that in such cases a last minute was fixed when the discussions should come to a close. I would like you to give your ruling on this matter and fix a time-limit.

Shri K. K. Basu: On a point of submission, Sir. We find the hon. Minister of Revenue and Expenditure most zealous about the financial part. That is why I want the main points to be considered immediately before considering this question.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: True. I must have fixed a time. Having regard to the fact that only four or five cut motions are outstanding, I would like to finish this by 5-30 P.M.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: There are so many Demands and each Demand will have to be considered even if there is no cut motion. You should consider the total number of Demands and not the cut motions which you have ruled out on technical grounds.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What does the hon. Member want?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Each Demand must be considered.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me hear the hon. Dr. Mookerjee.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Some reasonable time must be allowed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We may have that. Can we go on for ten days?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There must be some limit.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Not beyond today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will fix six o'clock.

Hon. Members: Seven o'clock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes. The guillotine will be applied at seven o'clock.

Shri Tyagi: If not finished earlier.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): In regard to the question raised by the hon. Member from Malabar, the printing of the Weekly Bulletin was undertaken on 5th July 1952, after the Budget proposals for the year were framed. I do not think it is quite right for him to say that merely because Demands for Supplementary Grants were made some time ago, this should have been included there. The question of inclusion must be left to the Finance Ministry. It is a fact that the decision was taken on the 5th July 1952 and we have been issuing the Weekly Bulletin in a printed form.

Hon. Members: We are not able to hear.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member asked me in regard to the printing of the weekly Bulletin, when it was started. I said it was started on 5th July 1952, and that was after the annual Budget proposals were framed.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): When was it decided to start?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Whatever may be the date when we mentally decided to start, it was actually started on the 5th July 1952.

Shri S. S. More: When was the decision to start taken? It is not a question of your mental state. When was the particular decision taken?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to say when the decision was actually taken. I can only give the date when it was actually started, and when the expenditure commenced. Therefore, it could not be included in the previous Budget proposals.

In regard to the liveries, class IV servants were given only half scale liveries until March, 1952. It was decided to give them full scale liveries...

Shri S. S. More: Will you explain what is meant by half scale and full scale liveries? We cannot understand that.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Only a half of the dress allowance was given.

It does not mean that they were given half the clothing.

Shri S. S. More: We did not mean that.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Vertically or horizontally?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is as the hon. Member thinks. Because, it is only a matter of intellectual exercise and the hon. Member can say whether it is vertical or horizontal, which portion of a man's anatomy he would like to expose.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: One part of the hon. Minister's anatomy, the head, has been too much exposed.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The Ministers want the entire anatomy of the person to be covered. It is left to the hon. Member to decide which he would like to expose if only half clothing is given.

The decision could not be incorporated in the last Budget.

As regards the other point raised by Mr. Basu, I can only very numbly submit that he is straining at a gnat.

Shri S. S. More: At you.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am quite prepared to receive all the remarks that my hon. friends opposite are willing to fling at my head. Only let them be a little louder so that I can hear them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No matter; that does not form part of the Demand.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It happens even that is a demand these days. The only thing that we would like to demand is that the criticism had better be intelligible, if not intelligent.

Let me proceed to business. In regard to item A. I. Pay of Officers, a sum of Rs. 30,000 is being required by my Ministry Rs. 15,000 is spent on an Officer on Special Duty in connection with cottage industries. The officer served in my Ministry until February. The decision to appoint him was taken long after the last Budget proposals. He was a retired Director of Industries. We found him useful for the purpose we had on hand. An extra Deputy Secretary was sanctioned merely because of the extension of the cottage industries activities, and similarly, two Under Secretaries. The other expenditure is incurred consequent on this House having passed the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act.

The other item A-3 concerns the Commodity Controls Committee and the State Trading Committee. I had given an assurance to the House that we would streamline the commodities control. So a Committee was appointed for that purpose. An hon. Member of the other House agreed to be the Chairman. The other Members of that Committee were departmental officers.

State trading is a thing which this House has been very keen on. We found that it was necessary to bring the report up to date. A Committee was appointed for that purpose. And the hon. Members will know that recently a Committee has been appointed for enquiring into the pharmaceutical industry. Expenditure has not yet been incurred. It is likely to be incurred within this financial year.

In regard to Foreign trade control, we had to appoint an Officer on Special Duty for the purpose of bringing the nomenclature used in import trade control schedules more or less in conformity with the nomenclature used in tariff schedules, because we found a lot of difficulty—at any rate, the public found a lot of difficulty—in clearing goods which have been imported under licence given by the import licence authorities because of difficulties with customs. That officer has completed his work.

A new import and export control office was started in Cochin recently—on 15th January. We had to make provision for that which we could not anticipate in the last Budget estimate.

In regard to Rs. 25,000, it is a matter of adjustment. It is not one that has occurred this year, but when an officer of the Bengal cadre who was in the Commerce Ministry in the past took his leave which we were entitled to give him, we had to make adjustments in that regard. His leave allowance had to be paid, and this Ministry had to pay also the leave allowance of another officer of our Ministry. That is why this amount has to be brought in here.

That represents the total amount of demands that we have made.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,92,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Ministry of Commerce and industry.’”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 4—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

“That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 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, 1953, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.’”

Economy

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

“That the demand for a Supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

I have moved this cut motion with a view to raise a very significant and far-reaching issue. It is a political issue. It is an issue which will concern all of us, which will concern our relations with other countries and also it is an issue which will certainly affect the personal pride of the hon. Minister who has come forward with this Demand. I naturally refer to our participation in the London Exhibition at the time of the Coronation.

The Coronation which is to come in the month of May or June is a political matter. It concerns closely with the historical tradition of England. It is completely a national event of England. When I say it is political, when everybody agrees with me that it is a political ceremony, then it is but logical to ask the hon. Minister whether it is advisable to participate in any manner in that function. Of course, as invitees we may go, but in any other capacity, is it advisable at all to participate in that political celebration? Here I find that the Government of India is committed to a proposal to open an exhibition stall in London at the time of the Coronation. That means that we want to participate in the political festival. That means India should feel herself a partner in that celebration. That means also we should add our bit to the colour, splendour and glory of the festival. So, I feel it is rather unbecoming of us, not befitting to our national honour and dignity to participate in any manner actively in that function. If the desire of the Govern-

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

ment is to sell, exhibit and advertise our goods, then there are other occasions for doing so. This is not the occasion we should take advantage of for exhibiting and advertising and selling of our goods. So far as the international trade exhibition at Toronto is concerned, I have no objection. It is purely a non-political matter. Only with regard to this I say—I feel and many Members, I think, feel—that it is an inglorious act, an act of indignity that we should participate in this celebration in any manner. So this Demand is not at all a good and reasonable Demand. We cannot morally or on any ground support this Demand. I want the hon. Minister to reconsider the whole matter and withdraw this Demand.

Moreover, I find the amount that has been mentioned here for this purpose is Rs. 1,11,000/-. That will not cover the entire expenditure. It is only to cover expenditure up to March end. We have to incur a further sum after this Budget year. So, we do not know how much amount will have to be invested on this exhibition. Is it at all beneficial, and is it at all good to our country to spend lakhs of rupees on exhibiting our things and getting shame in return? And have the Government calculated any benefits in terms of money? The statement of the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry is very vague. And moreover, as I said, it is an act of indignity that we should participate in this celebration in any manner, and that we should have any stall in the exhibition. If we do so, the prospective enemies of India may misconstrue us, may call us—'though we do not really deserve it the stooge of Eng'and, may call us the satellite of the British Crown. So, we should not give any scope for misconstruction or misunderstanding by other countries. Though the exhibition is non-political in its nature, it is held however under a political auspices. It will be held during an important political occasion. That is why I do not want my country to participate in the exhibition. Moreover, I want to ask the hon. Minister whether there is any tradition or precedent of our country having participated on such occasions before. I do not remember whether there is any. There were many Coronations in other countries, as for instance, in Belgium. Have we participated in those Coronations? I do not think we have. If so, why participate now? I would also like to know from the hon. Minister whether we participated in the exhibition at the time of the Coronation of the previous British King. I feel that the whole matter

must be reconsidered. The hon. Minister has been rather hasty in this matter, and he must withdraw this hasty step.

There is another minor issue to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister. Some amount is proposed to be spent on an automobile expert for the purpose of guiding the Tariff Commission in their inquiry with regard to the protection to be given to the automobile industry. I would like to know whether there is any precedent of such an expert having been appointed earlier in connection with inquiries for protection to any industry. For instance, there was an inquiry on silk industry. I do not think there was any expert appointed for that purpose. There have been so many other inquiries also conducted by the previous Tariff Board, where experts had not been appointed. Such expert advice as was required on these occasions, was usually given by the Departments concerned, and also by the various associations and trade interests concerned. So, where is the necessity of appointing an expert now and spending on him to the tune of Rs. 24,000? We do not know on what terms the expert has been engaged, whether he is a permanent employee, whether he is for a temporary period, if so for how long, what is his pay and allowance etc. We are not clear about such matters, and the whole thing is left in a nebulous state. Under these circumstances, we cannot grant this Demand, and I beg of the hon. Minister to reconsider the whole issue, and not to force us to vote for this Demand now.

Finally, I would also like to make a submission that these Supplementary Demands for Grant have become an annual feature; they are coming every now and then. Only the Budget should be an annual feature. It is not at all a correct budgetary policy, if the Supplementary Demands for Grants come often in the year. Normally there should be only one Budget presented in a year, and if there is any extraordinary circumstance which necessitates Supplementary Demands for Grants, then only the Ministry should come forward with those Demands, and not otherwise. But nowadays we are seeing so many Supplementary Budgets coming up before us. This is not at all becoming of a good budgetary policy. So, the Government should have more vision, fore-thought and planning in budgetary matters.

I want the hon. Minister to consider these things coolly, and reasonably, and take correct steps.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 in respect of Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry be reduced by Rs. 100."

There is a cut motion to discuss about tariff rates, specially the protection to automobiles. The general tariff rates cannot be discussed here. The scope of the cut motion can only be this. An automobile expert was appointed to advise the Tariff Commission to arrive at some conclusions regarding the tariff rates. It does not appear that the tariff rates have yet been recommended by the Commission. Apart from that, this matter was referred to them earlier. My object in having allowed this cut motion is that if the hon. Member in whose name this cut motion stands wants to say, as the other hon. Member has said that no expert ought to be appointed at all, that the officers' advice would be enough, no other person need be appointed on whom Rs. 24,000 is to be spent etc., then he is entitled to say all this, but he cannot go into the rates as such.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I bring within the scope of this cut motion, the appointment of the automobile engineers, and the necessity for the protection to be given to this particular industry?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As to whether protection ought to be given is a matter of policy. It has already been given, I think. A Committee was appointed for the purpose, and the matter was referred to the Tariff Commission to consider under what circumstances, the protection should be continued, or something like that. I think the matter has already been referred to the Commission before the Budget Session. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the reference to the Tariff Commission was made before the Budget or after the Budget.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Actually the decision was taken by Government early in 1952. We have had a further reference after the Budget. The original reference was before the Budget. I do not understand what my hon. friend has in his mind. Is it a question of his disputing the right or the propriety of Government giving protection to this industry? In that case, when the Commission submits its report, and when Government take

action on the same, naturally, the House will have a say in the matter to discuss whether it is right to give protection or not. At the moment, what the House is seized of is the point that was raised by the hon. Member from Mysore, namely whether it is right to appoint a special adviser to aid the Tariff Commission or not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is a simple point.

Shri S. S. More: May I make a few observations?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: First, let Mr. K. K. Basu make his remarks.

Shri K. K. Basu: Sir, I want to speak on both the cut motions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: With the restriction that I have mentioned regarding the cut motion standing in his name.

Protection to automobiles

Shri K. K. Basu: I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 in respect of Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, be reduced by Rs. 100."

Before I come to my own cut motion, I would like to state that I fully support the standpoint of my hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy, as to the feasibility of opening an exhibition at London on the occasion of the Coronation. A sum of Rs. 1,11,000 has been lumped together for two purposes, firstly for participation in the Canadian International Trade Fair at Toronto, and secondly for participation in the wholly Indian exhibition to be held at London. We do not know what is the actual proportion of amount that has to be spent on the latter. In view of the fact that the party in power today finds it its duty to attend the Coronation, and express their support to the British Government, I surmise that a large proportion of this money will be spent on the exhibition to be held at London. This exhibition cannot be considered from the standpoint of a trade fair wherein Indian products are sent out for advertisement with a view to exploring international markets for our products. It is well-known to all of us that the main purpose of this is not to consider the possibility of opening out a market by the show of the products in exhibition, but to support or

[Shri K. K. Basu]

express the support of the participating countries, to the British Throne. We feel that the time has come, when, if the freedom which the party in power so loudly broadcasts has any tangible meaning, we should consider the question in terms of our economic independence. It is too well known that our economy even today is tied up with the economy that was prevalent till 1947. We feel therefore that participation in this exhibition during the Coronation would not result in any added advantage of opening out a market for our products. Here it is only a question of an exhibition being organised in the course of a big fair or a big festival, not for the trade value of it, but to show our respect and support to the British Queen. Therefore, we feel that this is a matter which this Parliament today cannot possibly sanction without a voice of protest from those who do not see eye to eye with the party in power. We feel that this sum should not be granted. The time has come for us to break away from the British Commonwealth, though day in and day out the Members of the Treasury Benches have tried to propound their case that by remaining in the Commonwealth India is benefited. We do not know, apart from the continuation of the old ties, political and economic, what special benefit this country of ours is actually deriving today.

Therefore, I personally feel that that portion of the amount which will be spent for the International Trade Fair at Canada may be spent if the hon. Minister would justify in detail the actual scope of it, but so far as the money earmarked for organising the exhibition at London on the occasion of the Coronation is concerned, it cannot be sanctioned by this Parliament. We must decide here and now whether we should have any truck with the British Crown and all the economic ties and the economic dependence that we had to the British business interests. In India, the time has come for us to put a stop to it. Still we find, if we go through the length and breadth of the country, the attitude of the British business houses has not changed.

The other day, as Members of the Treasury Benches themselves know, they wanted to get certain information about the appointment of Indian personnel in the British business houses in Calcutta, and what reply they have got to their questionnaire. As a result of that, I understand they are possibly bringing forward a Bill

which gives them the right to demand statistics in regard to this matter. We know very well that even today in many ways and on many pretexts these business houses give a raw deal to our nationals. We have known, specially in our part of the country, that a large number of Indian personnel that was appointed during the last war in positions of responsibility has now been degraded or forced to accept jobs with lower pay or forced to resign. In their place Europeans with very little experience are brought in with much higher pay and emoluments. We also know how these big British business houses in India try to cheat our national exchequer in many forms of tax evasion and in many other ways by giving concessions to their British employees whereas the Indian employees with much better qualifications and experience do not get the same facilities. Therefore, we strongly feel the time has come for us to sever all our connections with them and also give a notice to them that they should leave our country immediately or as soon as they can possibly arrange shipping facilities.

Therefore, we strongly oppose the spending of any sum of money on the occasion of the Coronation. We do not know whether any member of the Government would be there to represent our people. If that matter is brought before us, we shall try and express our opinion, but so far as this item of expenditure is concerned, we strongly oppose spending of any sum of money.

I now come to my cut motion on the question of granting protection to the automobile industry. We did not know—the hon. Minister said the matter was referred to the Tariff Commission previously—whether this automobile industry was going to be protected for which the Tariff Commission needed the help...

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: May I say that there is no question of any further protection to the automobile industry until we get the report of the Commission? When the report is received we will place it before the House.

Shri K. K. Basu: At the moment there is no protection?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: At the moment whatever protection there is, exists with the approval of the House. Any further protection will depend on the recommendation to be made by the Tariff Commission. The decision will have to be taken by the Government and ratified by the House.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I know, when the original protection was granted, whether the help of an expert was called for?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The original protection was of a different category and that was granted in 1950. And that was a decision of Government. No enquiry was made by any body—the Tariff Commission or any other body.

Shri K. K. Basu: So glad for the information given. About the granting of protection to the automobile industry, we have something to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Unfortunately, you cannot say that.

Shri K. K. Basu: Not in detail.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No details. We are not on the question of protection for the automobile industry at all today. As a matter of fact, protection was already granted. Under the Act that was passed on the recommendation of the Fiscal Commission, protection can be given to industries which are in contemplation—big and heavy industries—to enable them to come into existence. Then advance protection was given and to consider whether protection was excessive or inadequate it was referred to the Tariff Commission and the Tariff Commission in such matters naturally requires the assistance of an expert.

Shri S. S. More: Why naturally?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There may be a difference of opinion regarding the need for an expert. Hon. Members can discuss that matter, but not the question of reference to the Tariff Commission, the policy of protection and so on. It does not arise here. They will have to wait until the Tariff Commission's report is received.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I make a submission? The hon. Minister himself has suggested that they intend to give a different kind of protection. That means...

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No, Sir. We do not intend to do anything of that sort until the Commission reports.

Shri K. K. Basu: As I understand...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whatever the hon. Member may say, it is wrong to misunderstand what the hon. Minister said, and say all that can be done. We are not going into the policy of protection regarding the automobile industry. The policy exists already. No decision has been taken. This expenditure has been incurred by virtue of a

decision that was taken after the previous Budget. But there can be a difference of opinion as to whether an expert was necessary or not. It is a very limited matter.

Shri K. K. Basu: In view of your ruling, Sir, I would like to support only that part of the contention whether there is necessity for appointing an automobile expert. I will not go into the details of the automobile industry in our country. We know very well that most of it is nothing but an assembling plant. We all wish that our country should have good automobiles manufactured but under the present set-up of our industry when there is so much dearth of the basic and key industries and an iron and steel plant, the question is whether it will be economically possible in the near future to manufacture automobiles at a price...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that is not relevant. I have said that once or twice.

Shri K. K. Basu: In view of that, Sir, we consider there is no necessity of appointing an expert to go into the details and continuing this protection that has been given. We feel that if the Tariff Commission, as it is constituted, had called for the facts that were absolutely necessary on the basis of which protection could be given and continued to be given, they would have been in a position on their own to give a clear verdict and advise the Government whether protection was necessary. Also, I do not know whether the expert is an Indian or an Englishman.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): A German from West Germany! Is he not?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Neither the one nor the other.

Shri K. K. Basu: He is not Indian anyway. We do not know of what special benefit the advice of the foreign expert will be in the present state of things, for the continuation of this policy of protection. Therefore, we feel that the Tariff Commission themselves were competent enough to give judgment on the points that have been placed before them by the Government of the day. Therefore, we oppose the grant of this Rs. 24,000 on account of the employment of an automobile expert to the Tariff Commission.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 in respect of

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

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

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): May I have one clarification from the hon. Minister? I do not want to make any speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will have his turn even for clarification. I would like to make a suggestion to hon. Members. Now that the time has been fixed up to seven o'clock, I would like that one Demand is taken and all hon. Members can participate, and then allow all the other items to be put to the guillotine. I am only saying that while one hon. Member is speaking the leaders of the Opposition Groups may sit together and then say, 'on this particular Demand we will spend so much time'; I will try to utilise it. Otherwise, if four or five hon. Members take a lot of time and not allow even one particular Demand to come up, other hon. Members who are interested may not have their say on that matter. Therefore, I leave it to them. I shall go on with the debate until seven o'clock when the guillotine will be applied. I leave it to the leaders of the Groups.

Shri S. S. More: I seriously object to the grant of this Rs. 24,000 for the purpose of an automobile expert. Sir, you must be remembering that we had some discussion when the hon. Minister in charge of this Demand had moved a Bill for amending the Tariff Commission Act and then he was very profuse in pouring encomiums on the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. According to section 4 of the Tariff Commission Act, the persons who compose this Tariff Commission are either experts with long experience in administration or in industry and commerce. If they are experts who are supposed to know the intricacies of commerce and industry, I see no reason why there should be any expert to give any advice. Shri Gurupadaswamy particularly asked whether there was any precedent. Possibly, there may not be any precedent in the past but this present appointment is likely to be the first precedent for future action.

Then there is no material supplied as to for what period this expert will be there. We do not know what are his qualifications for this particular post. According to our own notion an automobile expert is a man who knows the mechanism of the motor, a man who knows the anatomy of the motor. What is this motor expert? How is he going to render any advice.

He is supposed to be a German. Of course, the hon. Minister in his usual way said that he is neither Indian nor an Englishman. He has not come out specifically to what particular nationality this particular expert belongs. Unemployment in this country is going up. But we are very particular to relieve unemployment among the experts of foreign countries. This is one of the reasons why we are rising in the estimation of foreigners. My submission is that if we lay this foundation for the precedent of granting this particular demand of the Tariff Commission that they can have foreign experts for different items of industries, I do not know where we shall stand.

Then this expert may not have the attitude of independence towards the automobile industry which is to be given protection. I do not venture to make a suggestion but it is quite possible that these so-called experts are always associated with the industry. Only by associating with the industry they get their expert knowledge. Possibly this expert knowledge placed at the disposal of the Commission may be indirectly to the advantage of the industry itself. What will happen? When the industry chooses to make a case for getting protection or some other advantage, it will be in a position to influence the Commission itself in its favour. That should not happen, that is my submission.

Regarding the exhibition, I do not want to give it a political colouring. But what are we? We are essentially producers of raw material. Are we going to send our raw material to England or Canada for exhibition? Somebody was saying in the Lobbies that some of the hon. Ministers are going there. I do not know whether for the purpose of exhibition or for other purposes.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: They are raw material.

Shri S. S. More: Of course, they may go there as specimens of the Treasury Benches. I do not know whether they form part of the raw material at our disposal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it contended that other hon. Members of the Opposition should be sent?

Shri S. S. More: I support it, Sir, if I get a trip.

My submission is that we are producers of raw materials; we do not produce any finished product, any manufactured products worth the name which we can send to the International

Exhibition and find some market for that sort of article. My submission is that when the country is faced with famine, when we are wanting money for minor irrigation and other useful purposes, we can avoid going to the exhibition and usefully spend this amount for giving the much-needed relief to the country's people. This is the only thing that I want to submit and I believe that the hon. Minister in charge will give very serious, not humorous, consideration to this matter.

Shri A. C. Guha: Can I put one question to the hon. Minister?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Every other hon. Member is also putting a question.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: (Calcutta North-East): I had no intention to participate in this debate but I do so because I am rather intrigued by the formulation made in foot-note (c) to Demand No. 4. I can quite understand our Ministry of Commerce and Industry to be interested in the Canadian International Trade Fair, Toronto. Of course, we should like to know very much more about it before we are going to pass this Demand. In item (2) under (c), he refers to a 'wholly Indian Exhibition at London on the occasion of the Coronation'. I do not quite understand the significance of the expression 'wholly'. As far as I can see, there might be one of two things. Possibly there is going to be a sort of exhibition of the British Empire countries; the menagerie is to be there and we are going to be a part of the menagerie to be shown to whoever comes from whichever country to attend the Coronation. Or, possibly there might be a 'wholly Indian Exhibition' organised on the occasion of the Coronation. Possibly, we are more royalist than the King and therefore we want to set up a 'wholly Indian Exhibition'. In either case it is a disgusting exhibition which, I am sure, we ought to keep away from. I need not add to the arguments which have already been made by my hon. friends who have spoken earlier. I would say that if now we are going to have a 'wholly Indian' exhibition either as part of an Empire menagerie or a uniquely Indian exhibition, through which it exhibits independent of others, in any case, politically speaking, it is a disgusting business and we ought to keep our hands off...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, please. So far as this matter is concerned, hon. Members ought to constantly bear in mind that we are an international platform here. Each country is enti-

tled to celebrate the accession to the throne wherever there is a monarchy. What is the good of calling an international exhibition disgusting? Hon. Members can certainly say, 'We shall not participate for various political or other reasons'. But it is wrong to say that it is disgusting.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I did not say that the Empire exhibition itself is a disgusting matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On the occasion of the celebration of the Coronation, each set of people are entitled to celebrate it in their own way. We are not here to criticise their action because they are entitled to have exhibitions or anything. Let there be anything, but so far as we are concerned, we may not participate, but we need not say all that. Let there be no misunderstanding of that.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I thought that the hon. Minister would at least answer this question whether it is a general exhibition that is going to be held in London in connection with the Coronation and India will participate there, or it is an exhibition which is going to be held by India exclusively, and no other country is going to hold an exhibition: because if it is the latter, that India alone is holding an exhibition on that occasion, then it certainly becomes a somewhat extraordinary course.

4 P.M.

I would not have liked the question of the Coronation to have come in the way in which it has come. Many of us do hold the view that in view of what has happened during the last few years, India should come out of the Commonwealth. But that is not the matter at issue here at this stage. The Coronation, of course, will be there, and it is an occasion which will call to England not only people belonging to Commonwealth countries but representatives from different parts of the world, and if on that occasion an exhibition is held there, I do not think it is either disgusting or anything abnormal. If India participates in that exhibition, it does not express any opinion on any political issues, because the exhibition is quite apart from participation in the Coronation itself. It has been announced in the papers that the Prime Minister is going to represent India at the Coronation. He has accepted the invitation. So long as India continues to remain in the Commonwealth, I suppose even courtesy would require that if an invitation comes the principal citizen of India should go there as its representative. We may hold different views and say that India should not

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

at all remain in the Commonwealth. But one question should be answered by the hon. Minister, whether it is a special exhibition which we are organising to express our particular affection, or whether we are merely participating in an exhibition which is being organised on that occasion along with other countries. It may be that some countries other than Commonwealth countries may also come there. I personally welcome India participating in a properly constituted International Exhibition, because it is in our self-interest. It is not in the interest of the country where the exhibition may be held. It gives us a welcome opportunity to take our goods and the things that we would like to be exhibited there on international plane, so that in the international market we can take full advantage out of it. Of course, there are certain possible limits within which we must confine ourselves.

As regards this automobile industry, some apprehension has been expressed regarding the desirability of having an expert. I had a lot to do with regard to the question of giving certain special facilities and privileges to the automobile industry about two and a half years ago, and it is quite pleasant to find that the hon. Member who, in those days, was very vehemently opposed to the Government policy is himself now occupying the chair of the Minister of Commerce and Industry. This is not quite an easy matter. I know that sometimes we have to be very careful about the experts we choose, because sometimes experts come and make a mess of things. But I believe that the gentleman who has been selected is free from any possible political or other bias or pressure, and that he has been specially instructed to deal with certain peculiar problems which face this industry in India today. One of our chief difficulties obviously will be that we cannot produce cars at an economic price unless we can produce them in sufficiently large numbers, and if we produce them in sufficiently large numbers there are no buyers in India, and unless and until they reach a certain standard they cannot be sold to countries outside India. Other countries like Australia and Canada had to pass through very difficult times before they could complete their plan for making their country more or less self-sufficient in the matter of automobiles. We have yet to pass through that stage, and during this interim period naturally the brunt of the suffering falls on the consumers. Prices go up. Certain restrictions are imposed prohibiting im-

ports of cars during the interim period. Naturally, the attack comes on the consumers themselves. One of my hon. friends said that the factories which we have in India today are all merely assembling factories. That is not so. We have factories today which are attempting to manufacture a large number of parts which are required for building an automobile. Of course, a lot more has to be done before we can consider the position to have reached a satisfactory stage. Therefore, I am not opposed to the appointment of an expert as such, but we have to take certain positive precautions, so that we can really take advantage of the advice of such an expert. It will be good if the hon. Minister while giving his reply assures the House that all such steps have been taken. The gentleman concerned is a German. I do not know which area of Germany he comes from. I suppose the hon. Minister has satisfied himself as to the proper area. In any case, is he satisfied that this gentleman is specially qualified to deal with the peculiar difficulties with which our industry is confronted?

Lastly, I was interested to find that the Government had announced its policy with regard to the import of automobiles from foreign countries during this transitional period. I suppose the decision was that pending a report by the Tariff Commission, this policy would continue. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is the intention of Government to change that policy in any large measure, because if that policy is changed in a large measure then it will create fresh difficulties for the industry and even though the expert may come and the Tariff Commission may make its report and we may all be anxious to do something for the purpose of helping this industry, the change in policy will create difficulties for the industry itself. I suppose the Minister is fully aware of the difficulties of the industry and will be able to give an answer which will be satisfactory to all sections of the House.

Shri A. C. Guha: I merely want to know whether it is an International Exhibition open to all other countries including non-Commonwealth countries or whether it is an exhibition simply for the Commonwealth countries or whether it is simply organised by the Indian Government. If this point had been clarified, much of this discussion would have been avoided.

Shri Bansal: I rise to speak a few words on this question of the automobile expert. I know that this expert

is from Germany. I would say straight-way that there is a precedent for the appointment of experts in the Tariff Commission. I have great suspicion about these foreign experts.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): You brought a British expert then.

Shri Bansal: For determining the retention price of steel, an American expert was appointed. That answers Mr. More's point. But with regard to this automobile industry we have in this country certain foreign vested interests which have been threatening before the Tariff Commission—their threat is directed against both the industry and Government—that if any measure of protection is given to the indigenous industry they will close down and go out of the country. While giving evidence before a recent session of the Tariff Commission, the representatives of the General Motors and Ford Companies, according to a Press report, sounded a note of caution about the manufacturing of cars in this country. They stressed the need for collection of accurate statistics regarding the future volume of production and the cost of production and suggested that limited manufacture in India may not prove economical. After about ten days of this, the representatives of General Motors made an announcement saying that they had decided to close down their assembly plant in Bombay as they had not received a licence for the import of component parts. Whether it was on account of the non-receipt of a licence for the import of these component parts or on account of this enquiry that is going on before the Tariff Commission, it is not for me to say. But an impression is gaining ground in this country that these foreign vested interests do not want the Indian automobile industry to take a firm root in this country. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry to take the House into confidence and tell us as to whether the foreign expert who is there is only to advise the Tariff Commission on technical questions relating to the automobile industry or whether he is to advise also on long-term policy questions. My humble submission is that when we invite experts from abroad, they must be given definite instructions only to guide and advise the Commission on technical matters and keep themselves aloof from general policy matters.

Another point was raised about our participation in the Coronation and the exhibition. I was surprised at the

way in which this question has been treated by the Members of the Opposition. Whenever there is an occasion for a large number of people to assemble at a place, it is very common for businessmen to collect there and exhibit their products. This happens everywhere. In fact it will be a very **good business proposition for any business** concern to start an exhibition in a place where a large number of people are likely to gather. At the Coronation which is taking place after quite a number of years, representatives from various countries—not only from Empire countries but from other countries as well—will gather in London and that will provide a fine opportunity for our goods to be exhibited.

My hon. friend Mr. More suggested that we produce only raw materials. I think his knowledge of our economic history is twenty years behind. If he turns to facts and figures of our external trade, of our sea-borne trade, he will find that India is very rapidly emerging as an exporting country of manufactured goods—manufactured goods not merely of the ordinary kind, but of a highly technical kind, of sewing machines, of fans, of a number of electrical goods. (*Interruption*). I refuse to yield to these interruptions.

Shri S. S. More May I ask one question of the hon. Member? He is maintaining that we are exporting manufactured articles to some of the foreign countries. May I know whether we are exporting them to backward countries or to advanced countries like England or America?

Shri Bansal: We are exporting to both. We are exporting our piece-goods to America as well as to United Kingdom. We are exporting a number of other manufactured goods to these countries. If the hon. Member is really interested, I am prepared to give him facts and figures. I shall place in his hands a whole list of manufactured articles that we are exporting. We are exporting sewing machines, we are exporting power looms. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is no use quarrelling with an hon. Member who knows something. Hon. Members may look into details of exports and imports. These are figures that are readily available. The hon. Member is not appearing for the I.A.S. examination.

Shri Bansal: All this I was saying just to show that participation in an exhibition, whether it is held here or in any other country, is an ordinary business proposition into which all

[Shri Bansal]

these political considerations, like the playing of the gramophone record need not come in. If there is anything else which is at the back of their minds, this is not the occasion to ventilate them.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I was about to say that I was disgusted with these disgusting Demands for these disgusting Grants for disgusting affairs. But having heard what you said, I think I shall not use the disgust or disgusting words. But, I hope, that notwithstanding the austerity of the Chair, your good nature will incline you to some degree of indulgence when such apt words are used.

Generally speaking, I am against these so-called experts, and particularly so, in this case, because the hon. Minister has already said several times that the Tariff Commission consists of experts. We know that the hon. Minister himself would say that he is an expert on all matters under the sun, although his illustrious predecessor would not accept the position! We know that whatever the hon. Minister might say, he is capable of doing more of these things. We are not given any opportunity to know the precise nature of advice which will be sought, from this so-called automobile expert.

The defect in the working of the automobile industry is to be sought elsewhere. It is not merely in the running as it is—but it is there from the original financing. You will find that the Indian automobile industry is not actually, or strictly speaking, Indian. International combines and international monopolists have a pincer hold over it. There is the combination of Indo-United States capitalists and Indo-British capitalists in this industry. You do not find a single automobile industry which is completely Indian owned. There is the Birla-Studebaker combine. There is the Nuffield-Birla combine. There is the Ashok-Austin combine. There is the Walchand-Chrysler combine. Thus you will see that in the Indian automobile industry there is a large share of foreign capital. You will have to seek the defect of the industry there, in the actual undertakings.

I will read out some portions about certain manipulations in the automobile industry which has led to this crisis.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not on this occasion going into the history of the automobile industry.

Shri V. P. Nayar: This is just a small quotation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May be small, may be big; unfortunately, it is too big for this particular Demand. We are not going into a discussion of the automobile industry. The matter has been referred to the Tariff Commission. Under the Act the Commission can co-opt experts, or advisers or assessors to assist it in its investigations. A German expert was therefore appointed. It is for the House to say that the appointment was unnecessary. Let us not go into the wide question of whether the industry is working properly or not. An occasion for such a discussion may arise when the question for protection to the industry comes before the House. It would then be open to the hon. Member to say that it is not really an Indian industry, but a foreign industry, therefore, protection should not be granted. Such observations are relevant at that stage, not now.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What we are considering is whether this particular German expert is necessary or not. My contention is that this is not the type of expert who is required. We have to look for the defects of the industry elsewhere.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even if it were so, the matter has been referred to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Board feels that it wants an expert to assist it in its investigations. The hon. Member said the hon. Minister himself knows everything. But the Minister perhaps does not feel that he knows everything in the world and so wants an expert to advise the Tariff Commission.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I consider that this Rs. 24,000 which has been provided for this expert would be a waste, because the defect of the industry, as I said, lies elsewhere.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member forgets the link. The matter has been referred to the Tariff Commission and it is the Commission that wants the assistance of the expert.

Shri V. P. Nayar: My point is that the German automobile expert who has been appointed, and for whom a grant is sought, is not the particular expert whom we want, but that we want an expert to guide the industry. I shall close with a few words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But I shall not allow him to read even for one second what is not relevant.

Shri V. P. Nayar: In view of what you say, I shall close with this observation that the House must reject this sort of approach for Supplementary Grants.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am indeed very grateful to my hon. friend my illustrious predecessor in this office, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee for having placed the issue in its right perspective. I shall deal firstly with this Grant for payment to an automobile expert. In fact, the amount that is needed for this purpose is Rs. 40,000. We have been able to adjust from the existing money allotted for the Tariff Commission a sum of Rs. 16,000 and now want only Rs. 24,000.

I think Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee had indicated very clearly that this expert is for a specific purpose, because the Tariff Commission has been asked to go into this question of affording protection or not to the automobile industry, and if so what is the nature of that protection to be. It happens that all the experts that are available are attached to one or other of the units now engaged either in the manufacture or in the assembling or in marketing of automobiles or trucks in this country. Therefore, we cannot afford to have the views of any one of them to assist the Tariff Commission. We thought of getting an expert from outside. We could have got an American. He would be wedded to one or other manufacturing unit who has some interests in this country. We could have brought out an Englishman. The same position would have obtained in that case as well. Therefore we took some time. And it was really with some difficulty that we were able to get this German engineer who has no interest in any automobile plant which exports to India. And competent people assured us that he was in a position to give all the assistance that is necessary to the Tariff Commission.

But that was not all. He was not the only expert on whom the Tariff Commission had to depend in this matter. We have attached to the Commission an officer of the Defence Ministry who deals with this particular problem, who is a competent engineer and who could take an unbiased view of the situation. These are the two experts that are placed at the disposal of the Tariff Commission.

Whether it is right or proper for us to get an expert from Germany is a question which, I very humbly submit, has to be left to Government. We felt that an expert is necessary. We took all the precautions in this regard to see that the expert did not have any interests in the ultimate opinion or opinions

that the Tariff Commission might submit in this regard. And having taken all those safeguards the Government feel that this is a justifiable expenditure. It is an expenditure part of which has been met by readjustment. The expert will go very soon. The Tariff Commission's enquiry is likely to end by the end of March. He probably would have gone I think, but for the fact that he is ill and could not give them the necessary assistance. He may perhaps stay for a few more weeks. That is the position with regard to the expert.

Of course, if the Opposition feel that it was wrong to give any protection to the automobile industry, they are at perfect liberty to raise the question when the action of the Government on the decision of the Tariff Commission comes before this House.

Some other question was raised by my hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee in regard to the quantum of protection that has now been given. The quantum of protection that has now been given is not one of *per se* protection. It is largely a matter governed by our foreign exchange position. Naturally, in deciding the question of imports of automobiles or trucks in relation to our foreign exchange position, we had in mind the possibilities of manufacturing or assembling in this country, and Government exercised their right only in regard to re-validation of licences that were given. We had, in view of the slump in the market, to bring down the quantum of licences given during the last half year. So any decision that Government have taken, or will take in the future until such time as we think we are in a position to judge the question on the basis of the report of the Tariff Commission, would be entirely governed either by the foreign exchange position or the needs of the country. That assurance I can give to the hon. Member. It is not a question of *per se* protection. The question of protection will have to be decided only after the Tariff Commission reports.

In regard to the question of exhibition, again, I must express my gratitude to Dr. Mookerjee for having put the position very clearly. The very words which in the eye of the acting Leader of the Communist Party are wrong, are the words which, I claim, cover the position so far as the Government of India is concerned. Coronation in England of the British Queen is an occasion which draws thousands of people from all over the world. And I say it is my right, without in any way sacrificing my political integrity or my principles, as a person who wants to

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

further the interests of the commerce and industry of this country, to use every opportunity for furthering those interests. Hon. Members in this House apparently have no experience of the world outside this House. If they had gone to a festival, a Hindu festival, they would find a Salvation Army man preaching that the way of salvation lies in putting one's trust in the Nazarene—I suppose, the question of prestige or of surrendering to Hindu religious principles never occur to him—he thinks it a good opportunity to gather a flock of those people to believe in the Nazarene. Similarly, I think it is my right and privilege to go to whatever part of the world where an opportunity offers itself when I can further the trade and commerce of this country.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayawada): That is how you shut out so many countries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do not, in the way the Hon. Member shuts out many things from his mind. That is exactly the position. As a Minister in charge of Commerce and Industry I have nothing to do with politics. And if by my action I shall be doing something which is—to use the word which was contributed by the acting Leader of the Communist Party to this discussion—'disgusting' to the prestige of this country, if I should do anything 'disgusting', I should be aware of it, and I shall not do it. But I do not think we do it. If a sweet smelling flower smells foul to my friend on the other side I cannot help it. It is his nose that is wrong. If I think it is something which is perfectly proper and correct for me to do in the interests of the country, which looks to him disgusting, his attitude of mind is wrong. It is not so in my view; it might be so in his view. But it is more or less a subjective view. He thinks he is objective, but I say he is subjective. We must leave it at that and cannot argue it further.

With regard to the objection raised by the Mover of this cut motion, Shri Gurupadaswamy, let me assure him that this has nothing to do with our being members of the Commonwealth. This has nothing to do with it by way of participating in some exhibition that has been started as a Commonwealth exhibition, nor with the British Trade Fair or the Engineering Fair held every year which might be a big thing this year. We want to use the occasion for a display of Indian goods which will attract business to us. We shall be wholly independent of any other

scheme organised either by Commonwealth countries or by the British industries groups. That is why we very advisedly put the word—which seems to offend some—the word "wholly". Because, it shall not be in collaboration or participation with any other country. But it shall be a completely unilateral affair, where Indian goods will be shown. And not purely for the British people, but for all. Americans will come. I hope some will come from the Iron Curtain countries also

Shri Nambiar: Let us know the countries by name

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member knows too well

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: To go back to Mr. Gurupadaswamy, I think his objection is to the Government participating in an exhibition conducted on their own, taking advantage of a time when in London there will be large groups from all over the world. There is nothing political about it. I do not think it is derogatory to the dignity of this country and Government had all these points under consideration and it is only then that they decided that there has to be an exhibition, which must be wholly an Indian exhibition, and it should not be part of any other exhibition. This, I think more or less completely answers the question raised.

The other question was that these Supplementary Grants should not come and there should be only one Budget. That means the Government must not do anything beyond what they considered to be right at the time of framing the Budget. Subsequently important things come up and they have to carry on the policy of this House and their own policies and expenditure has to be incurred. When we framed the Constitution, we did provide for Supplementary Grants because we felt that as time went on, many things will be necessary, Government will have to spend money and come to the House off and on.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I do not know if it will make further discussion of the Grants easier if I remove some misconceptions about the Supplementary Grants. In the first place, when we have passed Supplementary Grants which were placed before the House last time, it is hardly necessary to include them in the charge sheet again, because the House had considered them and passed.

*Expunged by order of the Chair.

Actually the largest amount was about Rs. six crores, consisting of compensation in respect of sugar, that was about Rs. 4½ crores, and Rs. 1½ crore was on Rehabilitation. These were the two big items.

So far as this list is concerned, the important items are these. Food subsidies Rs. 6.11 crores. This was as a result of a post-Budget decision.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Which Demand?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Demand No. 49. Hon. Members will find it easier to refer to the first list here and they can spot out the amount. It is in the middle of the page.

This was as a result of a post-Budget decision. That is to say, we took note of the discussion that took place on the subject of subsidy. Then, Grants-in-aid to States under articles 273 and 275 of the Constitution, Rs. 5,85,00,000. That follows the Finance Commission's award. Surely, no hon. Member would object to our implementing the award of the Finance Commission, appointed in accordance with the Constitution.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Except that you are doing that without giving us an opportunity to discuss the Report.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is another matter. So far as this House is concerned,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This Demand is concerned, he means.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh:..... Expenditure on Displaced persons, mainly from East Pakistan, Rs. one crore and seven lakhs. The only other two large sums are in the capital portion. One is the transfer of the net sale proceeds of the American loan wheat to a special development fund. That is purely an accounting adjustment. We receive credit in one place as sale proceeds and then we transfer that to a special development fund so that the plus and minus are exactly equal. Then, the last big amount is additional loans to States: Rs. 13,28,00,000. That is due to famine relief, ways and means and other capital expenditure. Sometimes, in the course of the year, the ways and means resources of the States are diminished as a result of unforeseen circumstances and in order that they may be enabled to proceed with important projects, sometimes we have to increase the loans to them. That adds up to the bulk of this additional demand.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What about Demand No. 96?

483 PSD.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Sixty nine lakhs; that does not require any explanation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I shall put the Demand and the cut motions to the House. In this connection, I would like to say to hon. Members that whenever economy is sought to be discussed, it is not by a cut of Rs. 100. What exactly would the hon. Member like to effect by way of economy out of this Rs. 1,46,000? He can say that Rs. 1,20,000 is not necessary or Rs. 46,000 is not necessary. That would clinch the issue and enable the Government to focus attention on that particular point. Hon. Members also can come prepared with respect to that particular matter. Anyhow, this is a new thing and therefore I have allowed it.

The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then No. 31 has not been allowed; so also No. 49.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Are you talking of the Demands, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to that. After Demand No. 4, I have disallowed all the cut motions up to Demand No. 53. If any hon. Member wants to me to put any Demand separately, so that he can speak on that, I shall do so. Otherwise, I shall put all these Demands together. I am only

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

suggesting for the convenience of hon. Members. They may say that a particular Demand may be put separately. I shall allow discussion on that Demand and I shall put to the House the rest of the Demands up to that.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We are keeping these Demands and we would like to discuss them. They are Demands Nos. 36, 38, 49, 57, 60, 69, 79 and 96. The rest you can put to the House.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): I would request you to keep Demand No. 87 also.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): And 88 also.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The rest, you can put to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think I need not worry about these cut motions.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: They would be covered by these Demands which you have allowed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no Demand No. 38.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: There is Demand No. 38: Grants to States. We can discuss that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as Demand No. 38 is concerned, hon. Members are aware that whenever an expenditure is charged on the Consolidated Fund, it will not be placed before the House for voting. No doubt, they can speak on it. If their desire is to make observations regarding that Demand, I have no objection to allow that. It is for the purpose of enabling the Government to know the views of hon. Members.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I request the Minister of Finance to fix a date so that we can discuss the Finance Commission's Report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will come to it later on. Till seven o'clock whatever time is taken is taken away.

Shri A. C. Guha: If a particular date is given for the Report, then, I do not think that Demand No. 38 needs to be discussed here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Demands where particular items are charged on the Consolidated Fund of India cannot be put to the vote of the House. They can, all the same, be discussed in the House if the hon. Members want to know if special time is going to be devoted.....

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is not the intention, but we expect that as part of the general discussion on the Budget, reference will be made to the subject. Several days have been allotted to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It will not be necessary.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: We do not consider it necessary. Otherwise, it is really inviting criticism from almost every State where it may not be intended.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: If I may make an appeal to the Finance Minister, it is for the first time the Finance Commission's Report is out under the Constitution, and it will be desirable if we get a chance to discuss the recommendations one day. Then the discussion will be relevant. Otherwise, if they come along with all sorts of other criticisms in the general discussion of the Budget, it will not be desirable.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why not on the motions to be made by the Finance Ministry?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Or, they can suggest to the Leader of the House discussion of a resolution if they want. I do not know. I am not in a position to say so. So far as my own opinion is concerned here, I should have thought that all the requirements of the situation would be met by the opportunities for discussion that will be provided.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is not so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is my feeling. So far as this is concerned, my feeling is that we have spent so many days—four days—on the discussion of the President's Address. Practically it is a Budget speech. Then, we have got some days for general discussion of the Budget; another set of days for general discussion of the Finance Bill. Thus, we are saying the same thing over and over again. But, if by agreement, all the Members on this side want a day, they can discuss only this matter during a particular day. Let it be part of the Budget discussion technically, but independently let the time be devoted to this matter. There is no harm in doing so.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I suppose it is your intention some day in the near future to sit with the representatives of the Opposition and decide the programme for the coming weeks. You can take up this matter also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I intend doing so on Saturday, so that we will know the work for the next week. Unless there is a scheme, the House may be spending away all the time we have on one small matter ignoring various other matters. That way, I would like to focus attention on particular matters and.....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I suggest that you may convene a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee for this purpose?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is what I intend to do.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: There is also the possibility of legislation in regard to the implementation of the Finance Commission's Report. Maybe on that legislation, this discussion might be fixed.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That will be for the distribution of the excise duties. It is only a specific subject, but not general income-tax and so on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There will not be special legislation for that. It is also provided in the Constitution. We can say that on a particular day, discussion on this matter will take place. The appointed day may be devoted to the discussion of this matter. We will sit together and try to make the proceedings as effective as possible, and at the same time not take away unnecessarily the time of the House.

The following Demands will be discussed now. Let there be no misunderstanding. There are, in this list that has been given by Dr. Mookerjee, some of those items which I allowed by way of cut motions to particular Demands—say for example, Demand No. 53. I said that was in order. Demand No. 69 is given here. Demand No. 70 I allowed. But, let it not be said that those cut motions should be moved and debated.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): These may be treated as withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They must be treated to have been withdrawn.

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, 1953,

in respect of the following Demands entered in the second column thereof:

Demands Nos. 10, 31, 39, 53, 70, 91, 97, 103-A, 105, 112, 114, 123, 124 and 126."

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. 10—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

"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, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Communications'."

DEMAND No. 31—PAYMENTS TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS, DEPARTMENTS, ETC., ON ACCOUNT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS AND MANAGEMENT OF TREASURIES

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 51,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Payments to other Governments, Departments etc. on account of the Administration of Agency Subjects and Management of Treasuries'."

DEMAND No. 39—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE UNION AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 37,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Union and State Governments'."

DEMAND No. 53—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,84,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Health'."

DEMAND No. 70—MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 35,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research'."

DEMAND No. 91—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,99,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

DEMAND No. 97—SALT

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,00,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Salt'."

DEMAND No. 103-A—SECRETARIAT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 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, 1953, in respect of 'Secretariat of the Vice-President'."

DEMAND No. 105—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS (NOT MET FROM REVENUE)

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,00,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Indian Posts and Telegraphs (not met from Revenue)'."

DEMAND No. 112—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 10,77,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Commutated Value of Pensions'."

DEMAND No. 114—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 16,57,36,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Finance'."

DEMAND No. 123—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON MULTIPURPOSE RIVER SCHEMES

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,30,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Multipurpose River Schemes'."

DEMAND No. 124—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 82,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research'."

DEMAND No. 126—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STATES

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,17,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of States'."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The rest of the Demands other than Nos. 1 and 4 which have already been adopted are reserved for further discussion.

DEMAND No. 36—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 14,00,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

Shri Nambiar: I have only to make a submission here.

The point is ...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he speaking on Demand No. 36?

Shri Nambiar: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very well.

Shri Nambiar: I have to submit that it is stated:

"If an officer dies while in service after completing 5 years' qualifying service, he is eligible to a minimum gratuity of 12 times his monthly emoluments at the time of his death."

Suppose an officer dies after five years of qualifying service, he gets a gratuity of 12 times his monthly emoluments. This is not extended to the other staff under the Government. Supposing he is not an officer, he does not get it. This is a particular benefit shown only to the officers. By giving special consideration to the officer category and not extending it to the other sections of the staff, it creates a bad impression among the other sections. It creates discontent, and it is pure and simple discrimination. I therefore object to this sort of thing, unless Government is prepared to extend it to other sections, Class II, III and IV staff and treat them on an equal par. This is the point which I wanted to mention.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I think the word "officer" has been used in a very general sense. There is a reference here:

"An officer who retires only in the manner indicated in sub-paragraph 2 may be granted a retiring pension, not exceeding 38 months of the average emoluments. Average pay in the case of an officer belonging to the Central service Class II....."

So, it really means—Class IV is not what we call gazetted officers or Class I or Class II—that it is admissible to everybody, every employee—both officers and staff. I am sorry the word "officer" has been used in that misleading sense.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): Will an officer who has served for six years get this benefit?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is the conclusion that the hon. Member can draw from here. It is stated "after completing five years"; for six years certainly.

Shri Nambiar: On page 8, it is stated:

"Larger payments than originally anticipated on account of death-cum-retirement gratuity paid under the liberalised pension rules introduced from the 17th April, 1950."

5 P.M.

Under these rules, an officer who retires on completion of five years' service will be entitled to certain benefits. I would like to know whether that benefit would be extended to Class II, Class III and Class IV staff.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is precisely what I said. The word 'officer' here means every Government servant in pensionable service.

Shri Nambiar: In pensionable service?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: That is to say it means every employee to whom these rules apply, and to whom pensions are payable. It means both officers and staff. The word 'officer' has been misused.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 14,00,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 38—GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES

Mr. Chairman: May I take it that this Demand is not going to be discussed in view of what has just fallen from the Deputy-Speaker?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It is charged expenditure?

Mr. Chairman: I take it that it is not going to be discussed. I shall now pass on to the next Demand.

DEMAND NO. 49—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,11,00,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Here, the question which is to be asked is as regards the circumstances under which there was a change of the Government policy, requiring this additional expenditure. During the last Budget debate, the hon. Finance Minister justified the reduction in the subsidy. But now subsidy had to be increased with regard to certain States, especially with regard to foreign wheat. We would like to have some more information as regards the circumstances under which this decision was taken and what the ultimate effect of this has been on the prices of foodgrains in the country.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Originally it was Rs. 20-8-0 per maund. And that was reduced to Rs. 18-6-0. We found that open market prices were falling just at about the time this decision was taken. On the other hand food ships were bringing wheat here, and there were some difficulties experienced in the storage of the grain. So, really the considerations which influenced us in taking this decision were straight considerations. On the one hand, our stocks were increasing. On the other hand, temporarily there was difficulty in disposing of them or alternatively storing them, and I thought it was better that we should let the community have the wheat at a cheaper rate, than that the Government should run the risk of grain, for which they have paid out of borrowed funds, being spoiled.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Those stocks have been disposed of now?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Yes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I make a few observations, Sir? Now in the ration shops and the fair price shops in many parts of the country, the price of wheat and other grains has gone up, as for instance, recently in Hyderabad and Mysore, where the prices have gone up. Does that mean that the wheat that is being now issued from the shops is no longer from the quantity that came from

abroad at the time this was subsidised, or is it that the price of wheat itself has gone up and we are not subsidizing it any further?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): Regarding Mysore and Hyderabad, they were able to sell the wheat at a rate cheaper than the economic cost, at Rs. 18-6-0 per maund. And they used to meet the loss on account of this from out of the profits they used to earn out of the locally procured grains. When this profit was wiped off, they had to revert back to the old economic price. That is all that has happened. Even the existing rate is the economic rate at which we supplied to them. In no case are they allowed to sell wheat at a price higher than the economic cost at which we supplied to them.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is it not a fact that the prices have gone up in Mysore?

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: They have not gone up. They were not able to subsidise it. That was all the problem. In Hyderabad they were able to subsidise it and sell it at cheaper rates. But now that the profit earned out of the locally procured grain is wiped off, they have to revert to the old rates. That is all.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: In view of the fact that the hon. Finance Minister has said that it was subsidised at Rs. two per maund, I would like to know whether it is being continued?

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: Yes.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I may mention that there are several elements in this cost. We supplied the wheat to all the States last year at Rs. 18-6-0. On that, the State Governments add only their handling charges. Their economic cost would therefore be, say, Rs. 20-4-0, and of course it varies in different States according to the charges incurred. If any particular State wishes to issue that wheat at a rate cheaper than their book-cost, then it is for them to find the amount of subsidy. Either to find out of their revenues, or out of their profits on some previous trade transactions. Apparently in Mysore, they had a certain credit on which they could operate, and so they were enabled to reduce the price to a figure which was lower than their book-cost, but when that credit was

exhausted, then they had to raise the prices, but not above the level which I have referred to, as the economic or book-cost.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I would like to ask another question. This applies, according to the Finance Minister, to the stock of imported wheat which was then at our disposal. But if the price level which has now been accepted, due to the grant of this subsidy, is to be continued, will that mean more expenses, in the future, in relation to the present price of imported wheat?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Most of that wheat has been sold now. About 300,000 tons are left. On that we will calculate the price on the basis of what it cost us, so to speak; then the new wheat will be added to it. Fortunately the freight rates on the new wheat have fallen very considerably, and freight rates play a very important part, being about 25 to 30 per cent. on the cost of the wheat. Therefore, we expect that the cost of the wheat landed to us will be much less than what it has been in the last few years. We shall have to pool all these prices together, and then evolve our economic cost, so to speak, and in the light of that, and in view of any past losses that may have occurred, and in view of maintaining a stable price, we may have to redetermine the issue price of our wheat for the current year.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,11,06,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 57—POLICE

Mr. Chairman: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,94,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Police'."

Shri A. C. Guha: This Demand refers to the passport and visa system. Recently there has been some discussion in the course of the question-hour in this House, about the irregularities

and difficulties that are being felt by quite a large number of persons, and it was also suggested that the visa system might be abolished and only the passport system maintained. I do not know whether the Government have come to any decision on this question. A question was also asked in this House as to the number of persons who had received passports from India, but who had not been able to receive visas from the Pakistan Government. It was also pointed out that visas for Pakistan involved quite a good amount of difficulty, more formalities, more expenses and much more time than visas for any other country. I think the Government could clarify these points and say whether that state of affairs is to continue, or whether they are going to devise some means whereby the intending travellers can get a visa in the ordinary course of things.

Another point I would like to mention is this. I think there have been several categories of visas and a particular category was reserved for the people residing within ten miles of the border of both the territories. So far as East and West Bengal are concerned, the difficulty is that the partition has been effected in such a way that one person living on this side may have his property on the other side. His agricultural land, his business centres, all these things, are on the other side. So before the introduction of the passport system, there was a regular traffic going on from this side to that side and people of both sides were mutually exchanging goods and selling their articles. Perishable edible things also were daily taken over from this side to that side or from that side to this side. All these things have now been stopped.

More particularly, I want to draw the attention of the Government to the lot of the people living within the five or ten mile-strip border of this side. Are they getting the same facilities as those on the other side are getting—to go to Pakistan and harvest and dispose of their crop? I think the hon. the Home Minister is aware that there is a system known as *Jiratia Praja*. My report is that the *Jiratia Praja* residing in East Bengal are getting all the facilities to go over to Tripura, harvest their crop and then dispose of it or take it away, whereas the *Jiratia Praja* residing in Tripura are not getting the same facilities to go over to Pakistan, harvest their crop and dispose of it. The same is the case across the border—in West Dinajpur, Malda and other partitioned districts. Govern-

[Shri A. C. Guha]

ment should clarify how they are going to remove this difficulty.

With regard to passports and visas, the Pakistan Government are making political use. The Government of India might have issued a passport for a certain person, but Pakistan is not issuing the visa. I have known of several cases—individuals known to me—who have got passport from this side but on political grounds have not been able to obtain visa from the other side. Is this state of things to continue or have Government any scheme to give relief to intending travellers? I beg of this House to remember that East Bengal and West Bengal, even now after five years of partition, are not economically completely separated. Even now the two Bengals have much in common in trade and commerce, and so this passport and visa system has put the common man to a lot of difficulties. I would like the hon. the Home Minister to clarify how these difficulties are going to be solved or whether they are going to continue for ever.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I would like to say just a few words. Naturally we cannot discuss the question of policy now. Some of the difficulties have been pointed out by my hon. friends just now. I will not repeat them. But two questions I would like to put to the House and also to the hon. the Home Minister.

One relates to the need for opening a large number of our own visa offices in East Bengal. We saw in the papers sometime ago that as a result of the last Indo-Pakistan conference held in Delhi, it was agreed that the Pakistan Government would not object to our opening a larger number of offices in select centres in East Bengal so as to facilitate the grant of visas to those citizens of East Bengal who desired to come over to West Bengal or Assam. You will remember, Sir, that in connection with the last debate Mr. Biswas pointed out that although there was no objection on the part of the Government of India to open such offices, the Pakistan Government did not agree to it. I would like to know exactly at what stage the position now stands, because if that facility is given, it will remove a lot of practical difficulties which are now being experienced especially by poorer, illiterate people living in different parts of East Bengal.

The second relates to the Indian enclaves within Pakistan territory. There are a good number of such villages. The total area will be about 20,000

acres of land, and so far as the Pakistan enclaves within India are concerned, their area will be about 12,000 acres of land.

An Hon. Member: Square miles.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It must be acres of land.

So far as Indian citizens living in Indian enclaves within Pakistan are concerned, their condition is now most deplorable. They have to pass through Pakistan territory before they can come to India and they are not allowed to do so. They have been advised that they would have to get the necessary passport and visa. But there is no office situated in those enclaves and it is impossible for them to cross the border and then come to the Indian border. You will be surprised to know, Sir, that in these areas there is no police of the Government of India or of the Government of West Bengal functioning, there is no *chowkidar*, there is no post office and they are completely left to their fate. I had an opportunity of meeting some of their representatives who came to Calcutta a few weeks ago. I know the future of these enclaves is receiving the attention of the Government of India, because the Prime Minister had declared some time ago that he had suggested some sort of exchange of population and property in respect of these areas. Now, is it proposed to open at least some centres in the Indian enclaves there so as to facilitate the moving out of these people? They cannot get into those areas, nor can they get out of those areas. And in some of these enclaves the Hindus living there have been pushed out. It was reported only two days ago in the newspapers that Ansars and other people were entering into those areas which are our territory and creating all sorts of difficulties for these unfortunate people. Now, what arrangements do the Government propose to make for facilitating the safe passage of our own citizens living in Indian enclaves within Pakistan?

These are the two specific matters which I wanted the Home Minister to deal with.

Shri Damodara Menon: I want to say a few words with regard to the second item relating to the grant we are making for the armed police force—Rajasthan Armed Constabulary. We are, as a result of an agreement, to give a subvention to the Rajasthan Government for maintaining a police force to guard the Indo-Pakistan border extending

over 730 miles. According to the agreement, we are to make good half the expenditure of the Rajasthan Government for the maintenance of this armed force. The Rajasthan Government has submitted a bill for 17½ lakhs of rupees according to the footnote supplied here. I want to know whether we are having any sort of control regarding this expenditure by the Rajasthan Government. Have we any voice in determining the number of the forces maintained and also the places where they are to be maintained and the expenditure the Rajasthan Government should incur on this account? Or, are we simply to foot the bill that they give us? Now, here we are giving on account 7½ lakhs of rupees. I hope the Home Minister will clarify this point.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: We are told that in addition to the 28 existing posts, 31 further passport checking posts are going to be constructed and for that an additional expenditure is being provided for. The point that we would like to know is whether these passport checking posts are largely in the rural areas because great difficulties are experienced by those who are living in these villages which are far away from the towns or the small district centres, where these checking posts generally are. In an area where there is about 500 or 600 miles length of border, it is essential that we should have the largest number of checking posts so that people can get to them as easily as possible. We have all heard that this passport system has brought about a great amount of difficulty and suffering and expenditure for the ordinary people and we must be quite sure that we are able to give them the easiest and the cheapest method whereby they can get these passports and other travel facilities. Therefore, we should like to be assured that the Government is not only asking for these 31 posts but are making further provisions so that there will be a larger number of these centres and secondly, we should like to know whether Government is considering the lowering of the costs of these visas and passports. This is one of the greatest difficulties for the poor people who daily need to go across and come back. That is the second point which I would like the hon. Minister to clarify.

डा. रामनारायण सिंह (हजारीबाग पश्चिम): मैं एक बात जो कि राजस्थान और पाकिस्तान के बीच की सीमा के बारे

में है जानना चाहता हूँ। यह सीमा करीब चार सौ मील पड़ती है। यह बात भी ठीक है कि वहाँ पर न सब जगह पुलिस ही है और न पलटन ही है। साथ ही रोज़ रीपोर्ट आ रही है कि पाकिस्तान के हमले हो रहे हैं। मैं गृह मंत्रों से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ के लोगों की रक्षा के लिये क्या प्रबन्ध किया जा रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इतनी लम्बी सीमा पर काफी पुलिस या काफी पलटन का रखना भी मुश्किल है। तो क्या वहाँ के लोगों को हथियार रखने का अधिकार दिया गया है? मैं इस बारे में गृह मंत्री का ध्यान विशेष रूप से दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): As my hon. friend just now remarked, we are not discussing policies. The occasion will be very near—I imagine within a month—when there will be ample opportunity to discuss this whole difficult question of passport and visas and also the other question relating to Rajasthan. The House knows that recently there has been an Indo-Pakistan Conference and so far as the participants of this Conference are concerned, they have arrived at certain conclusions, the object being to simplify the procedure and to afford the largest measure of facilities. Now, so far as I know, the agreement has not yet been formally ratified by Government and I imagine that by the time we take up the Budget discussion within a month or less than a month that ratification will be available. So far as the Supplementary Demand is concerned, that really relates to expenditure which has been substantially incurred; and all the points that have been raised, I am myself familiar with. I can only give this undertaking that I shall consider them all properly and make proper enquiries from the State Governments and when the Budget Demands come for consideration, if there is any point remaining for clarification then I shall do the best I can to satisfy the hon. Members. There is no difficulty about that.

All of us are agreed that the maximum facilities should be given. So far as I am concerned, I am free to say that I should like to have the passport system removed altogether and I imagine that there is a large volume

[Dr Katju]

of opinion in East Bengal too, to that effect, because the economy of the two Bengals is so inter-mixed particularly in the agricultural areas. You have the trade in oranges, you have the trade in agricultural produce. People who are living five miles this side or five miles that side are constantly coming and going and when the system was being examined, there were different groups, 1, 2 and 3. Care was taken that the people living in the border areas should be given ample facilities.

Shri A. C. Guha: The question is whether those facilities are given to people who are living on this side also or whether the people on that side alone are getting these facilities from India.

Dr. Katju: I can only say that this is not going to be a one-way traffic, namely all facilities to be given to people on that side only. All people who want to come over to this side, whether they be Hindus or Musalmans—to me it does not matter—should not be put to difficulties. I imagine this is one of the very problems that were considered in the Indo-Pakistan Conference. They deliberated, they met and discussed in an atmosphere of great cordiality and they discussed for three or four days. In the agreement, I imagine that most of the points that have been raised would have been met.

My hon. friend, the lady Member, referred to the agricultural classes in the rural areas and Dr. Mookerjee mentioned the enclaves. Well, that has to be looked into. I hope I shall be able to give satisfactory information if not full information within three or four weeks when we discuss the subject later.

So far as Rajasthan is concerned, the small point raised in the Supplementary Demand is the payment of the subvention which has been agreed upon, under certain circumstances, namely, that if the State Government was facing a deficit then the Central Government would come to its aid and give 50 per cent. Now that has got to be honoured. The wider question as to whether care is being taken on the border or not, that is the responsibility of the State but in a larger measure it is the responsibility of the Central Government. I can only assure the House that so far as we are concerned, we are perfectly alive to the responsibilities and we are seeing almost every day that the border

remains secure and safe. It is not only a question of providing Armed Constabulary there but also, if necessary, there must be some other arrangement made. So the House need be under no apprehension on that score.

Another point was raised whether the Central Government have any hand in the location of troops. Now, primarily it is the responsibility of the State but in this matter relating to the security and safety, the Central Government and the State Government work in the utmost concert. Consultations are going on and while it may not be possible for me to say as to what exactly the formal decision is, the House may remain satisfied that every care is taken that the border is properly guarded.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,94,000 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, 1953, in respect of ‘Police’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 60.—ANDAMAN AND
NICOBAR ISLANDS

Mr. Chairman: Motion is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,40,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Andaman and Nicobar Islands’.”

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): I wholeheartedly support the additional Demand of Rs. 2,40,000 for additional expenses incurred for the charter extension of *S. S. Bharatkhand*. The communication from the mainland of India to the islands of Andaman and Nicobar is very difficult. We happen to have its experience recently. In this connection, I should request the Government to do their best to improve the communication facilities which can only be made available by chartering ships such as *Bharatkhand* and others. There were only two ships plying from the mainland of India to Andaman. Even Government work suffers so much that it cannot be described. It takes a letter fifteen days to come from Port Blair to Delhi, and it takes another fifteen days for a letter to go back from Delhi to Port Blair, and the position therefore is that even for

going through Government files it takes at least a month. Administrative work at Port Blair is so difficult that we have to give large powers to the Commissioner there, and he feels himself in a very awkward position to carry on the administration. Therefore, while sanctioning this sum, I would urge upon the Government to look to the communications that will be required because of the fact that we are going to exploit the Andaman forests and the exploited forests are going to be used for the rehabilitation of displaced persons from India. The Government of India are also inviting persons from other parts of India where the population is very dense. So, while exploiting these forests for finding land for rehabilitation of people, we must look to the communication difficulties that confront us at present. You will be astonished to hear one particular incident. An officer at Port Blair was put to great difficulty. The steamer *S S Maharaja* sailed one day and that same morning he received a telegram saying that his father had died in the mainland. He had to wait for fifteen days. You can imagine the position. So even the officers who live there are put to so much difficulty, what to talk of others. The other avenues of communication also should be explored. Air communication may be established. This morning I heard that some sea planes would be bought by our Government. Government should see to it that for emergency cases one of the sea planes may be used for landing in Port Blair.

The internal communication there is also very difficult. There are some small launches. When these small launches travel from one part to another in the open sea, it is very dangerous. So, the number of ships like *S S Bharatkhand* and *S S Maharaja* should be increased, and for internal communication also there should be one such big ship available. I hear that these two big ships are chartered ones. I am sure this House will not grudge it if the Government comes forward to buy or build one or two such big ships for the communication facilities in these islands.

With these few words, I wholeheartedly support the Demand. I do hope that Government will come forward with a bigger amount for these islands. After all, the people who live there are blood of our blood, they are flesh of our flesh, but they are not able to have any contact with us, although they desire so much to do so.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The difficulty about communication has been empha-

sised by the hon. Member who just spoke. It is a very important point, because now that the island is developing and is also being used for the purpose of rehabilitation of refugees from East Bengal...

Shri A. C. Guha: Question.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Why should you question it? I have heard it from some of the persons who have been there. Although there is much room for improvement, they feel that if that place is properly developed, it can be used as a place where Bengali refugees can be rehabilitated. So, why should you question it? If there is some defect there, undoubtedly let us remove it, but the possibility of developing that island economically for rehabilitation purposes should not be ignored.

Without going into the question of policy, may I make one suggestion to Government? This name "Andaman Islands" naturally raises past memories which are not of a very pleasant type. It is time that the name is changed. I would suggest to Government that this island should be named after Netaji Subhash Bose, because that was the place where he actually landed, and if we can say truly and faithfully that an independent Government in India was established in any spot, wrenched out of British hands, that was in the Andaman Islands. There is still a memorial which he had himself opened, marking the day of his arrival there and the time when the flag of Free India, as he wished to see Free India to be, was flown under his command. If we name it "Subhashdweep", I think it will be quite appropriate. Not that any memorial is needed for Netaji Subhash Bose, but for our own purposes and for creating a new psychological atmosphere it will be appropriate so that people may be attracted there and may not be discouraged by old memories. It will be a desirable change. In fact, I may draw the attention of the Home Minister to the fact that some time ago this matter was discussed, and a decision to that effect was almost taken when I was in the Government. But, for some reasons that decision was postponed. So, I think the matter may be taken up now and a decision may be announced as soon as possible.

Shri A. C. Guha: In this connection I would like to know one or two points from the hon. Minister. We have some information that the entire Andaman waters have been mortgaged to some particular shipping company. To use

[Shri A. C. Guha]

the word "mortgaged" may not be quite appropriate, but the fact is that other shipping companies cannot go there. If Government want to develop these islands, then traffic should be free and no shipping company should be given any monopoly right for traffic there. I have an apprehension that this shipping company is not an Indian one and it is a foreign one. Therefore, I would like some clarification from the Government on this point. It may be a legacy from the past Government, but let the hon. Minister examine the position and see whether there is any contract, and if there is one, whether Government cannot terminate it as soon as possible.

As regards the development of the island, we are vitally interested in its development, because East Bengal refugees can be accommodated there in large numbers. Somehow or other, it has not been possible to arrange for their rehabilitation in other States outside West Bengal, and Andamans has proved to be somewhat successful.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Question again,

Shri A. C. Guha: But the question now is whether Government is really serious about sending East Bengal refugees to this island.

Mr. Chairman: This point is not relevant. The Demand relates to clearing up of arrear bills.

Shri A. C. Guha: But there is a scheme for the development of the island.

Shri S. S. More: He is speaking about development in arrears.

Shri A. C. Guha: There is widespread apprehension in Bengal that the Central Government is not really serious about sending East Bengal refugees there. I do not know if the Government has any apprehension about Bengalis being settled in that island. I hope they will take immediate steps for sending more refugees.

As regards the clearing of the forests, so long the method adopted was recruiting some sort of indentured labour through a Catholic Missionary Society. This should also be put an end to. The labour should be recruited as far as possible not through any Christian Missionary or any other Missionary Society. You may persuade the East Bengal refugees to do this work, and they may be given the assurance that they would be given the right to settle on those lands which

they clear; that will also save some money. The indentured labour go there for only two or three years and then they come back. So the question of transport expenses will be eliminated if some real colonists can be sent there for clearing the forests and then to be rehabilitated there. I think the East Bengal refugees can be persuaded to go there in large numbers even for clearing the forests.

Shri K. K. Basu: I take it that this extra grant is asked for, for developing transport facilities to the island. I do not want to go into details of this subject. But we must go into the basic need and the basic requirements for which the island is to be developed. I shall not deal in detail with the conditions that obtain there, because that will not be within the purview of the discussion. I only want to say this that as has been expressed by some of the speakers from my part of the country there is some real apprehension that these islands are being utilised for the development of forests leased out to individuals and people are taken there to work as hired labour. I hope the Government will consider these grievances and allegations made, and as my hon. friend Mr. Guha has said if the people who are taken there to clear the jungles are allowed to settle down on land and become its future owners, there will be a real incentive on their part. I am sure Government will take this factor into consideration.

Dr. Katju: I am very heartened by the general demand for improvement in transport facilities to the Andaman islands. Some Members of this House and of the other House recently went on a tour of investigation to these islands and have brought very heartening views. Nobody denies that these islands can be developed; but the misfortune today is that the population there is very scanty. In the Andaman islands it is only 30,000; in Nicobar it is perhaps 10,000 or even less. The difficulty is that there is very little traffic even for these two steamers which the Government of India are running. I have been very anxious that we might be able to induce one of the air companies to touch these islands once or twice in the month. If that were a manageable proposition. I think it would be a great advantage.

So far as this question of emigrants is concerned, though it does not arise on this Demand, I shall deal with it as it has been mentioned. I am personally most anxious that refugees from East Bengal should go there in

large numbers, and if I may indulge in a personal reminiscence, I think I went twice on the jetty to see them off. My hon. friends should encourage their brothers and sisters to go and stay there, and if they are able to persuade them to become permanent colonists, permanent residents, they would be welcomed with open arms. It is not a question of hired labour. I think when they went there, each of them got ten acres and there was a money grant to enable them to buy a pair of bullocks and implements. The attraction of home is sometimes irresistible and I am not surprised that some of them want to go back.

Shri A. C. Guha: Only very few.

Dr. Katju: As compared with Bihar and Orissa they are more agreeable to live in Andamans. I do not know what happens in Bihar and Orissa for them to be more agreeable to live in Andamans. Government has taken in hand a very large scheme, I think at a cost of one or two crores of rupees—you may be familiar with it—for the development of these islands, the cutting down of timber, the deforestation and clearing of jungles and getting rid of malaria and all that and we want our people to go there and live there. The idea is that within four or five years there should be a colony of twenty thousand people—and if you can give us 20,000 people, well and good, we shall be most happy. The Chief Commissioner there and everybody will be most happy. There is no reluctance on their part. I do not want any impression to spread in the country that there is the least desire or disinclination on the part of the Government of India or anybody to keep out the refugees of East Bengal from the islands. I know that the East Bengal people are very good cultivators. If they can only go and stay there nobody will be more happy than myself.

Shri A. C. Guha: About the Andaman waters, is it true that some monopoly right has been given to some shipping company?

Dr. Katju: Do not believe all that.

My hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee mentioned something about the name of the islands. I was in the I.N.A. trials and we had a good deal of discussion about what actually happened. The veneration for the great Subhas Babu is well known. So this question will be examined. But I must say one thing. If you go to the

countryside in India—I do not know about Bengal—the name of Andamans is not known. What is known as 'Kalapani'—people used to be sent to 'Kalapani'. As far as Andamans is concerned, the anglicised people will know it. So, the name does not carry any particular idea. If you can change 'Kalapani' into 'Gorapani' so much the better. That name can be changed by making it more populous and more flourishing by a large number of Indians going and settling down there and making it their home.

My hon. friend Mr. Guha referred to some monopoly. Please remember that these islands are of very great strategic importance. We do not allow foreigners to go there at all. So there is no question of anybody giving a licence or monopoly to any foreign company.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,40,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Andaman and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO.—69.—ADMINISTRATION OF
JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 57,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

Shri K. K. Basu: I do not propose to take a long time because the sum might be necessary, but I would like to impress upon the hon. Minister that the people have a feeling that the special tribunals are taking a much longer time. The result is that important persons who are involved in these trials are not properly brought to book under the law. I would urge upon the hon. Minister to see that these trials are finished quickly. A feeling is gaining ground that when ordinary persons are involved for misappropriations, they are meted a harsher treatment. When big people are involved they take advantage of this long process of judicial trial and somehow or other try to soften the hearts of the prosecution and manage to get away

[Shri K. K. Basu]

without experiencing the rigours of the law. Therefore, I would urge that the Government should take interest and see that these trials are completed soon.

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I can speak only about the present trial for which this extra demand is made. The delay is not due to anything for which you can hold the tribunal responsible. The tribunal finished the trial. But then there was an appeal to the High Court. The High Court directed that a certain number of additional witnesses, both for prosecution and for defence, should be examined. They were residing in England and in Burma. Commissions had and will have to be issued for their examination. One Commission has completed the examination in England. Another has to be appointed and executed still in Burma. It is for this purpose that extra expenditure had and will have to be incurred. This was not anticipated because the High Court order had not been made at the time when the Budget proposals were made.

Shri K. K. Basu: The whole trial will be gone through again *de novo*?

Shri Biswas: No. The High Court has sent back the case to the tribunal to consider the case on certain points in the light of the additional evidence which would be forthcoming.

And then there is another point. In some of these cases the trial has been finished. I shall give one instance. One case has been compounded. Rs. 15,000 has been settled as the amount to be paid by the accused. It is only when the payment is made that the final order disposing of the case will be passed by the tribunal. Now, Rs. 15,000 is there. But the accused was a Muslim. The money is in the Lahore treasury. We have been writing and writing to Pakistan to release that money. That has not been done. It is said that the general question ought to be settled, there ought to be some agreement between the two Governments—all sorts of excuses are being put forward, and we cannot get the money. That is one reason.

In another case certain accused persons are in Pakistan.

Shri A. C. Guha: How are you going to solve that?

Shri Biswas: They say: "There are certain proceedings against them in Pakistan. We have agreed to send them back, but unless those cases are disposed of what are we to do". And they say "There must be an agreement for exchange of undertrial prisoners". All these questions have been raised. That accounts for the delay. The delay is not of our seeking.

Shri A. C. Guha: Is there any chance of getting those accused persons from Pakistan in the near future, or will the tribunal go on for ever?

Shri Biswas: We are extending for the present the life of the tribunal to some date, I believe, in June, by which time we expect the execution of the Commission in Burma will be completed. That is the time we are taking. If we are to ask for time till those other uncertainties are solved. We may have to wait till Doomsday.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 57,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 79.—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. Chairman: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,06,57,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This is the third time in the course of the year when we are discussing rehabilitation matters. Just about a month and a half ago we voted for a like sum for this same Ministry. This particular grant refers to a further amount being given to the East Bengal refugees who came in 1952. In spite of the fact that sums have been allocated for the rehabilitation of these displaced persons, the phenomenon we see is that larger and larger numbers

of people are accumulating on the platforms of Sealdah and Howrah. We find that the rehabilitation schemes, on which this money has been poured and is being poured, still remain as worthless as they were before.

I will only speak of those schemes for which this money is allocated or is being spent, or allied schemes. There were schemes for the agriculturists, there were schemes for the businessmen—schemes that had failed. I will just give you one example. Five hundred agriculturist families were sent to the Rabnagar area in Orissa. They were given land which was five miles away from their rehabilitation centre. They had to wade across a river, and when they got there they found that it was a jungle land. Not only that. There was very little cultivable land which could be used. But to that very area, after the influx of 1952, on the 25th of October a fresh number were going to be sent—in spite of the fact that from that very area hundreds had come back. Instead of finding out what had happened in those Orissa rehabilitation centres, they were again being sent there.

As a matter of fact, it was a disgraceful case. They were told that they would go to Burdwan. But when they were in Sealdah they got to know that they were going to be taken to Orissa. And the train was stopped, and in the end Government was forced to stop that exodus and they were taken back to the transit camps.

This is one example of how money is being poured down schemes which are not rehabilitating the refugees at all.

Secondly, I would also like to point out that this amount of money is going to be spent, or has been spent, on clothing, feeding, on medical charges and on accommodation of these additional displaced persons from East Pakistan. I went to various points right at the border. At the border stations we saw the terrible suffering of these people. I have seen and I think many other Members have seen, at the border stations of Itindaghat and Bongaon for days on end how the people did not have food. In those days there was heavy rain but there was no shelter. All that happened. Yet it is said the money is supposed to have been spent on those people.

On the question of medical charges I know in Babughat camp, there were women and children kept together without even being segregated while

there were chicken-pox and other infectious diseases prevalent. As for as clothing goes at that time the weather was very cold, and hardly any blankets had been given to those women and children. All this money is being spent and we are told that they are given clothing and medical facilities. But what is it that we see? How is it that these things do not reach those persons for whom they are intended?

Then again I will take the case of Ramchandrapur which has become notorious, I may say. My hon. friend is smiling, but as soon as he hears further he will go into flames. The Ramchandrapur people have been branded as people who are very obstinate, very lazy, and who refuse to work. These Ramchandrapur colonists came back to Sealdah or Howrah stations. They were told by Government in a very firm manner, "Unless you go back you will get no relief". These colonists, 85 families, on the 31st of October, taking the word of the Minister, went back. What is happening? They have got Rs. ten for going back. They have been given eight *bighas* of land for tilling, and they were given jobs for building roads in November and part of December. After that they were given nothing more. Nor did they get anything for house-building except Rs. ten as wages nor anything in the form of tin or other building material. For the last five weeks they have had no work at all. They were giving two *bighas* of land, no other agricultural loan. They have been writing to the Government, to the Minister of Rehabilitation on 13th of January and on the 4th of February, saying that "We came here at your assurance, you told us you would help us when we go back. Now the same story is being repeated." These are the points which make us very apprehensive—the way in which this rehabilitation is going on.

6 P.M.

I will not touch upon the transit camps. Of course almost all of them are uninhabitable and those camps have become notorious places.

I would now say one or two words about the large number of people who have come over from the Hajang tribal areas of Mymensing district and have taken refuge in the area of the Garo Hills. There are about 15,000 to 20,000 East Bengal tribal refugees in the villages of Bagmara, Shivbari, and

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Daldan in Assam and I have already approached the Minister on this point. I have told him that during the last five years, including this influx of 1952, out of these 20,000 people rupees have been received as help by 12 families. He has written to me saying, "You have referred to the migration from East Bengal. I am not unaware of their problem. The tribal matters require special attention and I am writing to the Assam Government to look more closely into their needs". Nothing has been done. Only two days before I left, I again received representation from them. Due to all this we feel very apprehensive. It is not a question of opposition to sanctioning money. We must be very sure that this money is really going to rehabilitate those people for whom it is intended and also that it is not going to be wasted as it has been all along.

I will come to the last point. I feel that these grants are dealt with in an unplanned way. My friend, Mr. Guha also referred to this matter the other day. I do not think at that time the Minister was here, only the Deputy Minister was here, but we feel there are obviously arrears of payment to the State Government. In the explanatory notes, it is said arrears from 1948-49, 1950-51 and so on are being paid now. I know that money from the Centre has been given to my province but it has been given in a most unplanned manner. Some times a big amount comes and then the West Bengal Government—which is not the most efficient Government in regard to all these things—do not know what to do and they go about rushing as to how they can spend it. I also know that all these grants have been passed by the Central Government but the executive authority is the West Bengal Government. The co-ordination between the West Bengal Government and the Centre is so loose, is so unsatisfactory that the sanctions they have received are in danger of lapsing. Therefore, I feel that we want to be assured how exactly this additional grant, this big amount of money totalling to almost Rs. 13 crores, will be allocated. We want to be assured by the Minister how far it is being effectively spent. He has told us that he does not think other political parties need come into this, there will be more troubles, they will only utilise these sources of trouble for their own political ends. We should like to know exactly how he is using this money for the welfare of the refugees and must be sure that this money is

really going to be used towards their improvement.

Shri A. C. Guha: My first point is I should like to know whether this House has got any authority over the expenditure of the sum that we shall pass today. On several occasions the Minister in Charge has taken a very legalistic attitude and has said that he cannot give any information because all these are under the control and management of the State Governments. And recently even a question has been disallowed by the Parliament Secretariat on the ground that a particular camp is not under the control and management of the Central Government; so no question can be allowed about that camp. So, if it is the privilege of this House only to pass this amount and then it has no authority to scrutinise this expenditure through whatever machinery, it is a very sorry condition; and I hope this House will realise that it is not a very honourable position for the Members of this House. I demand that this House which passes all the Demands has every right to scrutinise the expenditure through whatever machinery that might be effected.

Now we have got the figure of the new exodus just on the eve of the introduction of the passport system—3,38,000—and the sum now asked is particularly for meeting the necessities of these new-comers. My predecessor, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty has referred to the transit camps. I would like to refer to the conditions that prevail in some temporary camps. Those are not even transit camps. One day, on my way to my constituency, I found some tents put up in an open field. I stopped my car and enquired. I found about 200 refugees had been put there without any water, without any medical arrangements without any supply of food; and without other preliminary necessities; the Government had to take about 15 to 20 days to make arrangements for these most essential necessities for the human lives. There were several camps like this and I know there were quite a number of deaths, particularly among the children.

Reference has also been made to Ramchandrapur colony. In reply to a question of mine, the hon. Minister stated that that colony had failed and he would institute an enquiry into the affairs of that colony. I do not know whether he has made an enquiry.

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): Which colony?

Shri A. C. Guha: Ramchandrapur colony.

Shri A. P. Jain: I have made.

Shri A. C. Guha: Who was responsible for this failure? I would like to take a few minutes of the House to give a narration about this colony. One Rai Saheb procured 1,200 bighas of land at Rs. 1,200/- *salami* and Rs. 1200/- as annual rent. He then gave the plot to a land mortgage company or started a land mortgage company with that plot of land. After some time, that company went into liquidation. Then he gave it to some bank and the bank went into liquidation. Then he sold that land to the Government. Of course the Government can say that technically it is not a sale but it is really a sale to the Government. It is a type of colony which they call as variant type of colonies. The Government arranged the sale through that Rai-Saheb and I think that Rai Saheb got Rs. 2,21,000/- or something like that for that Rs. 1200/- which he paid as *salami* for that land and that was supposed to be an urban colony. 1150 families were simply enticed there through some agents/procurers working somewhat in a name like which were operating there for indentured labour.

They enticed these people, told some alluring stories to the refugees in camp; and these people were lured to a desolate place which the Government intended to develop into a variant type of urban colony. That colony has failed totally. Out of 1100 families, about 100 families were in Sealdah when the hon. Minister came to West Bengal. After his departure, I saw a Press note that nothing would be done to them till they returned to their original place. I contacted the Minister in charge in West Bengal, Mrs. Ray, and she gave me some assurances. On my assurance the refugees agreed and I wrote to the Minister in charge in West Bengal that they have agreed to go, provided she made certain arrangements. I must say, that she made good arrangements in the beginning. But, recently, there have been some troubles. Only today I have got a big communication from them. I have read only the first line, with the opening words, "We have come here depending on your word." Subsequent things I have not read. I know some of their difficulties. Government have

incurred some loss on account of that colony. They made certain grants to the refugees. Now, they want that the amounts which were given to them should be deducted from the total amount that they are entitled to have.

The position is this. That colony has failed due not to any lapse on the part of the refugees but to some mis-handling on the part of the officials of the Rehabilitation Department for which those officials and if possible that Rai Saheb ought to have been penalised. Now, the Government want to penalise these refugees for the failure of the Government. They say that out of Rs. 1250, their house-building loan, the amount that was originally given would be deducted and they will get only Rs. 300 or 400 or something like that and they have to fend for themselves with that small amount. I lay before the Minister this case. These refugees should not be penalised for the mistakes, or I should say, dishonesty which was done by his officials in collusion with that Rai Saheb, and certain officials of the Rehabilitation Department. They should be given full facilities, and should be taken as new refugees to be settled in that area, not as deserters, because desertion was not due to any fault of theirs but to some initial mistake in the Government scheme.

Before I conclude I would like to be enlightened on this question. I find the Finance Minister is not here, but his two assistants are here. I would like to have the ears of Mr. Tyagi. I would like to be informed by the Finance Minister whether, if any sum is passed by this House, this House has no authority subsequently to scrutinise the expenditure of that money through whichever machinery they may choose to spend that money. The Minister in charge of rehabilitation has taken the stand that he is not responsible to give any information about the rehabilitation expenditure which is being carried on by the West Bengal Government or some other provisional Government. Recently a question has also been disallowed on the ground that that particular camp was not under the control of the Central Government. It is the position of this House that we simply pass the money and we have no authority to scrutinise the expenditure of that money subsequently through whatever machinery you may choose to spend that amount? That point should be clarified.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I do not wish to discuss any question of policy regarding rehabilitation. We will have

[Shri A. C. Guha]

an opportunity to do that during the Budget discussions. There are just two points to which I would like to refer arising out of this Demand. One has been referred to by the previous speakers. That is about the position of the refugees who are sent to States outside West Bengal. Speaking for myself, I have supported the decision of the Government to send out refugees to States outside Bengal, subject to certain conditions being fulfilled, namely, that they should be States near about West Bengal and they should be sent there in sufficiently large numbers so that they can develop a community life. In fact, both these conditions were accepted by the Prime Minister himself and he made an announcement to that effect recently.

Now a difficulty has arisen. Quite a good number of these unfortunate people are coming back to West Bengal and Government has taken up the attitude that unless they go back to those States, they will be treated as deserters and will be deprived of any assistance whatever. Here, I have previously drawn the attention of the hon. Minister to the need for having some sort of enquiry made as to why these persons are coming away from the States to which they were sent for rehabilitation. I believe the hon. Minister has himself seen in what conditions they are living in Calcutta. Only a few days ago, when I was coming here, at the Howrah station, I saw some of them. No human being can willingly submit to such conditions. There, the children were hovering round dustbins trying to get something out of the contents there or what drops out of the dustbins. No one would like to be placed in that condition. That is obvious. Why are they coming out? We have talked to them individually. They have their own story to tell. I am even prepared to concede that there may be some persons who are undesirables, who may be creating difficulties. I am prepared to concede that 100 per cent. may not be good. The bulk of them have grievances which have got to be looked into. The main reason is that in the places where they are sent, the conditions are sometimes such that they cannot be properly rehabilitated. Only a few weeks ago I had been to Orissa. I saw some parts of Bihar also. I am not blaming anybody. There is a general atmosphere of sympathy from many of these provincial Governments. I talked with the Chief Minister of

Orissa. He personally expressed his great anxiety to do everything that was possible. I am giving this only just by way of example so that the hon. Minister may understand as to how matters really stand.

Take the town of Cuttack itself, where some of these refugees have been sent. In one place they have been given quarters. They have been given shops. A structure has been put up, which, I was told by the officers of the Government of Orissa, had cost the Government more than a lakh of rupees; a beautiful looking bazaar they have made with a court-yard at the centre. I went there accompanied by the Government officers. That was arranged for by the Chief Minister of Orissa himself. When I went there, I found that barring three, all the others, if you look at their faces, were just in starving conditions. We were simply shocked at their condition. They said they had no buyers. Why are there no buyers? The market has been located in such a place that there cannot be any buyers. There is a big market which is a little away from that place and all the customers are attracted to that place. There are other places in or near the town where the market could have been located. I do not know whose fault it was. They selected a wrong place and spent 1½ lakhs of rupees. The men there find day in and day out, week in and week out that cannot do any business at all. Well, naturally, some of them have to sell whatever they have got and run away to West Bengal. This is not an isolated instance. I went to another place. There also I found that the surrounding conditions were such that rehabilitation was not possible. Next day, I went to a place nearly 15 miles away from the town of Cuttack. I found there 4000 people, people who were removed from the city of Calcutta just when Pandit Nehru visited Calcutta last time. There was such an accumulation of these distressed people in Calcutta that somehow they had to be sent away and they were packed off. They were packed off to this particular place in Orissa and elsewhere also. There, the Chief Minister of Orissa himself told me that they had not made up their minds to rehabilitate them. The men, women and children fell before my car. The officers were there with me. I tried to plead with them that they should remain there. They said: "We came like beggars from East Bengal. From the border station, we were sent

to one camp. From there we were sent to a second camp, and from there to Orissá. Two months have passed, and we have not yet been told whether we will be rehabilitated at all or not". Do you know that 90 per cent. of them are agriculturists, and they said they did not want to be beggars? They do not want anything from anybody. Only they want some land which is capable of being cultivated, and they will immediately settle on land there. Now, what a big wastage of this human material which can be utilized for the good of the country.

Now, these people are coming back. I would appeal to the Minister not to treat them as deserters, not to treat them as mischievous persons, but find out some machinery so that each individual case may be examined. I can assure him on behalf of myself, and on behalf of others also who may not see eye to eye with Government with regard to the rehabilitation policy, that we will do everything that is possible to get these people agree to go back to the places provided we are satisfied that they will be really rehabilitated.

Mr. Guha just now gave an example where he himself persuaded these people to go to a certain place, and now they have been sending frantic letters to him.

This is assuming very serious proportions. There are more than 2,500 people in Sealdah station today, and the bulk of them are unfortunate persons who have been forced to come away from outside States and they are there as helpless persons on Sealdah platforms. Some of them have died recently, and if you look at the way in which they are moving about, begging here and begging there, it is a most distressing sight. And Government is spending money. We are sanctioning a crore of rupees today, and much of it will be spent outside West Bengal, and still rehabilitation is not being carried on. It is not a question of party politics. It is not a question of finding fault with the machinery or the administration of Government. We sanction this money and are anxious that this money should be utilised in a proper way.

I am referring only to one aspect. There are other aspects of rehabilitation which I am not touching.

The last point is with regard to persons who have come away from Indian enclaves in Pakistan. I had occasion to refer to it in connection with another demand a few hours ago. Now, a few hundred of such unfortunate people have been forced out of the Indian territory on account of the activities of Ansars and other people connected with Pakistan. They have been forced to run away. We have not been able to protect them. Our police is not there. We have not been able to help them in any way, and they are today distressed people in West Bengal. I had a talk with Dr. B. C. Roy, a few weeks ago, and he agreed with me that these people should be treated as refugees, because for no fault of their own, they have now become a burden on the Government of West Bengal. He said that the Government of India would not agree. I do not know whether the policy has been changed. I wish to draw the attention of the Centre to the cases of these few hundred families, *bona fide* people who have been forced to come away from Indian enclaves within Pakistan because of our inability to protect them. It should be left to the West Bengal Government to decide in appropriate cases what facilities should be given to them according to the principles which have been laid down by the Central Government.

I do not wish to go to other aspects of rehabilitation policy. We will have an opportunity of doing so when the Budget discussion takes place.

Shri A. P. Jain: Quite a number of points have been raised, and one among them is a constitutional point, viz whether this House should deal with the details of the schemes which are being implemented by the West Bengal Government. Some of the questions tabled by Mr. Guha and, may be by some other Members of the House, have been disallowed by the Parliament Secretariat. We are working under a federal constitution and the powers of the Central Government and of the State Governments have been defined by the Constitution. We have to abide by the Constitution. Article 162 deals with cases which fall either in the State List or in the Concurrent List. Rehabilitation is one of these subjects which falls in the concurrent list, and the provision in regard to the subjects falling in the Concurrent list: that the executive powers shall be exercised by the State provided:

[Shri A. P. Jain]

"...that in any matter with respect to which the Legislature of a State and Parliament have power to make laws, the executive power of the State shall be subject to, and limited by, the executive power expressly conferred by this Constitution or by any law made by Parliament upon the Union or authorities thereof."

Unless we make a law to the effect that the executive powers will be exercised by the Central Government in respect of a subject in the Concurrent List, those powers will be exercised by the State Government. That is the legal aspect of it.

But I am not taking shelter under the purely legal interpretation. The points which have been raised by my friend Mr. Guha illustrate the difficulties which confront a Minister in answering the detailed matters which are raised in this House. Mr. Guha, during the course of his speech, referred to certain conversations which he had with the Rehabilitation Minister of West Bengal, certain things which he did on the assurance given by the Minister of West Bengal, and naturally, I am not in a position either to affirm or deny them. The Centre sanctions money for schemes. It lays down the policy. The schemes are, in a broad way, scrutinised by either the Secretariat here or by the Branch Secretariat in Calcutta, and the accounts are audited; but the implementation is done by the State. These are the only powers which we are exercising in regard to schemes of rehabilitation. If any questions have been disallowed by the Parliament Secretariat on the basis of the constitutional provisions under which we are working, that is no fault of mine, but I do say that the practice is in conformity with the constitutional position. So many points have been raised by Mr. Guha, by Mrs. Renu Chakravartty and by Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee about details of certain things happening in a number of colonies. I confess that I do not carry full answer in my head, and am unable to answer those questions unless they are specifically raised, and I am given time to make enquiries from the West Bengal Government beforehand.

Mrs. Renu Chakravartty has referred to certain cases of rehabilitation. There will be time enough, during the course of the general budget discus-

sion, when we can deal with those questions, but today, the matter before us is one of limited nature. The monies which I have sought are meant to be spent on the camps and work centres which have been set up on account of the new influx. They do not refer to rehabilitation. I know that in certain cases rehabilitation schemes have not come up to our expectations, in particular with regard to the Ramchandra-nagar colony, about which my friend Mr. Guha complained. He wrote to me. I got enquiries instituted. Naturally, the enquiries had to be conducted by the West Bengal Government, and we are looking into the case. There has been a certain amount of failure there. I am not happy about it, but in rehabilitation a certain amount of failure is bound to occur.

I do not propose to deal with the questions about rehabilitation which have been raised by Mrs. Renu Chakravartty. She has said something about the relief aspect of it. Well, those are relevant matters, and I can assure the House that I have been taking every care. I have visited the border stations. I have also gone to the camps and I have been trying my best to improve the conditions of these camps and I dare say that a good deal of improvement has taken place. I cannot say that everything is O.K., because when there is such a great onrush, it is not always possible to make all the arrangements that are desired.

Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has raised a question which I believe, I must answer. He has raised the question of persons who leave a camp or a rehabilitation centre and come and sit either on the Howrah station or on the Sealdah station. That is a matter which has been engaging attention both of the Centre and of the West Bengal Government. The policy which we have decided upon is this. Where a person leaves the rehabilitation centre or camp, but returns to it again, we shall look into the case, and examine to what extent the failure is due to our working, and to what extent is due to his working, and then make up the deficiencies. But once we accept that anybody who has been given rehabilitation benefit or is living in a camp has a right to go and squat on the railway station, then the work will become absolutely impossible. That is the policy on which the Rehabilitation Minister of West Bengal has been working, and I take full responsibility

for that policy, because it has been enunciated and is being worked with my full concurrence.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee has also referred to the cases of certain persons who are now squatting on the railway stations of Howrah and Sealdah. I am very unhappy about them. They are living in a miserable condition, but let us examine their cases. I held a Conference of the Members of this House, representing the various parties, and I found that the general consensus of opinion was that—one or two parties differed; I think the Communist party did not see eye to eye—we should make efforts to settle as many persons outside West Bengal as we possibly could. In pursuance of that decision, I requested the Prime Minister to issue a rather pressing telegram to Bihar and Orissa to accept 15,000 newly arrived displaced persons. They agreed to that.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: They did not. The Orissa Chief Minister told me that he did not.

Shri A. P. Jain: They have agreed to that, and we have sent persons on the basis of that agreement.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: They did not do so when you sent the persons there.

Shri A. P. Jain: You accept it from me. I will show you the papers to show that he has agreed.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Very well let us see.

Shri A. P. Jain: In pursuance of that agreement, we sent about 3500 persons to Orissa, and about 300 persons to Bihar. There was a train carrying about 1500 persons, which was moving for Bihar, but certain persons created all kinds of troubles, and took the other people down from the train. Now, each one of these persons who were being sent to Bihar had given in writing that they wanted to go to Bihar to settle there. While so many things are being said...

Shri G. P. Sinha (Palamau *cum* Hazaribagh *cum* Ranchi): On a point of information, Sir. May I know whether a section of people in Bengal instigated these refugees to leave camps of Bihar, to come and settle only in Singhbhum and Manbhum districts, so that in future it will be relatively easier for them to get them amalgamated to Bengal?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: A very desirable intention.

Shri A. P. Jain: All sorts of questions are being asked, but I will continue with what I was saying. A very difficult position is being created. First we are asked to take people out of Bengal, and when that is being done, the refugees are persuaded to get down from the trains. So far as the new refugees who have been sent to Bihar or to Orissa are concerned, not one of them has been sent to the rehabilitation centre. They are living in the camps. The recent policy which we have adopted with more or less the concurrence of the different groups and the different parties in Parliament and outside is that we do not want that people should live on doles. We want them to work. Out of these 3500 persons who were sent to the Charbatia camp in Orissa, grown-up and adult men were offered work. They are mostly agricultural workers who have been used to working with their own hands. They refused to work.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: They did not refuse. I was there myself. I can say they did not refuse to work. Many of them worked, but when they were asked to break stones which was not physically possible, they said they could not do it. The Minister should visit that centre and then make this statement.

Shri A. P. Jain: They were put on road making and they refused to work. They came and sat down at Howrah station. Now that creates a very difficult position. I again reiterate that when a person who is given work refuses to work and goes and sits in Sealdah station, I will not give him assistance unless he goes back to the camp where he came from. (*Interruption*) I can not giving way.

Shrimati. Renu Chakravarty: That is the position.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Give them work which they can physically do. Give them land to cultivate.

Shri A. P. Jain: Here is an agriculturist who all his life has been working on land doing ploughing and using shovel. If he cannot do work on road making, what other types of work can we give him? Can we put him in office?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Give them work on land. Give them land.

Shri A. P. Jain: It is not possible to give land to everybody immediately. When it comes to the question of rehabilitation, we will certainly give land, but in the transit camp he has to be put on either road-making or canal-digging or such other work.

[Shri A. P. Jain]

Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has raised another question—about the persons displaced from enclaves. I appreciate the difficulties of these persons.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I may assure the House that in deserving cases I will give authority to the West Bengal Government to render them relief.

Before I close I want to utter one word of request. Rehabilitation is a difficult thing. It requires the effort of all of us. It is said by those sitting opposite that they do not want to make it a party question. Yet I regret to say that at least some parties are making it a party question more for the sake of propaganda. (Interruptions). Well, you have only to see how many persons have been rehabilitated. Of course, according to you nobody has been rehabilitated and nobody can be rehabilitated!

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: How do you know that?

Shri A. P. Jain: That is all I can say. There have been difficulties, but we are trying to improve conditions.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: May I ask one question of the Minister? He said at the beginning of his speech that the latest decision had been that if these people came away from other States to West Bengal, they would be first asked to go back to their previous places and Government would then inquire into their grievances. What procedure has been laid down for that so that we can take the responsibility for advising them to go back? Who holds the inquiry? How is it done? How long it takes to make a decision?

Shri A. P. Jain: The State Government responsible for the camp or the rehabilitation centre will make the inquiry.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: If the charge is that something has gone wrong at the local spot, you will ask the very gentlemen who have been responsible for mismanagement to hold the inquiry and decide.

Shri A. P. Jain: When did I say that? I said 'the State Government' which does not mean the same officer who is responsible for the fault.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I asked a question about those who had come from Hajang areas in Mymensing and are now in the Garo Hills of Assam. I would like to know how they have been "totally rehabilitated" according

to the answer which the hon. Minister gave.

Shri K. K. Basu: That is a party question!

Shri A. P. Jain: So far as the Hajang people are concerned, they are tribals. In the tribal area there is hardly any money economy and therefore you cannot settle these persons in terms of money. The hon. lady Member wrote to me and I made enquiries when I was there in Assam a few months ago. I personally enquired from the Rehabilitation Minister. I have again written to the Governor of Assam who is responsible for these tribal areas to look into their case. He is a person who is very deeply interested in the displaced persons and who is trying to render them as much help as possible.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know whether this money which is.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order: order. When I am standing, hon. Members must sit down. I believe the hon. Member had an opportunity to speak and she spoke and there was a reply. When is the end for all this? Now, any hon. Member can put questions when he has an opportunity to speak and can say all relevant matters. They may be met or they may not be met. It is now my duty to place before the House the Demand.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I want, Sir.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall I sit down and allow all these questions? Is this a double speech or a treble speech?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This is not a double speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members are entitled to say all that they want to say when they get an opportunity. How long is this to go on? If he does not answer it, he does not answer it. What can be done in this matter?

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,06,57,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 87—RELATIONS WITH STATES**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,34,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Relations with States'."

DEMAND No. 88.—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF STATES**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,30,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States'."

Shri U. M. Trivedi: About this Demand No. 87 I will only put a few questions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both Demands Nos. 87 and 88 are before the House

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am speaking on 87 alone, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both relate to the Ministry of States.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not know much about the other item, Sir.

Just look at the footnote. We do not know what this particular Demand is. I do not know, what is happening in the Government of India with this Demand. On page 989 of the original Demands, it is with reference to Central Armed Police. Then from the Central Armed Police, in the Supplementary Demands passed last time, page 37, it becomes Central Reserved Police. Now, when the Demand is made it becomes District Executive Force. We lose sight of what all this is. I want to suggest only this. There is something wrong somewhere in the system of accounting of this Force. There is some ignorance somewhere or some officer is trying to play hide and seek. The debits that have to be made for this are not disclosed to us in the year 1951-52 or in 1952-53. Now, at the tag-end it is found out that a big debit of Rs. 2,50,700 is to be paid. Why did such big sums escape notice? Let the Minister not take it amiss. I will point out that all this expenditure that is shown for this Central Reserve Police is not a genuine expenditure. The Ajmer Police which controls the Central Reserve Police is known for its corruption and nepotism. Let us know

how this expenditure has been incurred. Let every item be scrutinised and the fact ascertained whether it is for moving a particular battalion or platoon, or whether the movement relates only to a few trucks which were used by certain officers for supplying them with fuel and quarry stones for building their houses. My own feeling is that this expenditure was incurred either on such movements, or on movements which were not necessary. Supposing this movement was in connection with sending some companies to Kashmir, are we entitled legally to do so? Can we send the Reserve Police to Kashmir? The Kashmir Government has entered into an agreement with us. Our Constitution provides that the President can only interfere in the internal security of a State under given conditions. But in regard to Kashmir, can he interfere in its internal security unless and until the Maharaja—the old Maharaja is gone and there is a new one now—and his Government declare a state of emergency and ask the President for his interference? Has the Maharaja or his Government requested our Government to send the Central Police Force? I am afraid this expenditure has been incurred only for sending platoons to shoot our own people. If that is so, let the hon. Minister think twice before demanding this money. Unless he explains the position, we would have to say no. Therefore, I put a poser to him to look into this expenditure very carefully and settle this affair. Let him find out on which Force exactly this expenditure has been incurred. Let us not appear like children, to whom a clerk in an office can say something and we accept it as true.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: May I just ask one question from the Finance Minister? Under Demand No. 88, Aid to Kashmir there is a footnote which says:

"The additional provision now proposed is necessary on account of Central assistance in respect of community projects, etc."

I do not know what this "etc." means. Is it something miscellaneous? This "etc." is a queer thing in a note dealing with financial estimates. The Finance Minister may explain that. But my main point is: have the Government of India come to an agreement with the Jammu and Kashmir Government regarding control over these community projects just as they have control in the rest of India? So far as my own views are concerned, since I want

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

that that State should completely integrate with India. I shall be most happy if anything can be done for the development of this area. But so far as the pending constitutional issues are concerned—and, as you know, they are of a fairly serious character—does this mean that it is an unconditional grant made to the Jammu and Kashmir Government, or has that Government agreed to be subject to such restrictions as other States have agreed to with regard to the working of the community projects? And what is this "etc." about?

Shri Tyagi: These grants were made to the Jammu and Kashmir Government off and on.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Not off and on, but for community projects.

Shri Tyagi: ...on conditions similar to those applied to other States. The Deputy Prime Minister came to negotiate with me.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We know only one Deputy Prime Minister and that was Sardar Patel.

Shri Tyagi: I mean the Deputy Chief Minister. Anyway, I hope you would understand who he is. Bakshi Sahib came to discuss with me when these grants were made and it was agreed that in all matters, not only in regard to community projects but in regard to other projects as well, they will submit their projects for examination, technical as well as other examinations, of the Central Government and advances will be made to them after their audited accounts are submitted to the Central Government as is done in the case of the other States. So I do not think there is any special difference, distinction or discrimination made between grants made to Jammu and Kashmir and the grants made to other States, as regards these projects.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The hon. Member referred to sanction of the projects before work starts. My question was simple: will the working of the community projects in Jammu and Kashmir be subject to same supervision, same direction, etc. as is done with regard to other States.

Shri Tyagi: Quite, just the same. There has been no distinction so far and if my hon. friend has any information, I will be obliged if he passes it on to me.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The source of my information is the hon. Minister himself.

Shri Tyagi: Then you can rely on my words.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I rise to oppose Demand No. 88 which has puzzled my senior hon. colleague and leader, Dr. Mookerjee. One foot-note under this Demand contradicts the other. The note at the end of this Demand is that the entire amount is recoverable from the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and is to be treated as a loan and will be transferred to the loan head "Loans and Advances under Demand No. 115." But the last sentence of the other foot-note says: "The additional provision now proposed is necessary on account of central assistance in respect of community projects, etc."

We are called upon to vote a Demand—I do not know what this "etc." is. The House, I think, should be treated with greater respect, while calling upon it to vote for a Demand which is include in "etc.". Community projects we can understand. About the first Supplementary Demand also they have said that it was granted for rehabilitation of displaced persons of the Yol Camp, care of unattached women and children, etc. The first demand was "etc." and the Supplementary Demand also is "etc.". Therefore, it is very difficult for the House to vote this sum. This is not a very big sum. At the way in which we are wasting public finance, rupees three lakhs is not a very big sum. But as my leader has rightly pointed out a question of principle is involved in spending any money on Jammu and Kashmir. As has been rightly said, the financial integration is such a complicated issue that even if it is settled, it may take at least one year to complete all the details. We do not know what control we will have over Kashmir. They say Kashmir is one with India and as has been pointed out we expend lakhs of rupees on Kashmir without any control. Our Deputy Minister of Finance has very generously pointed out that so far as the community projects.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: He is Minister of State.

Shri Tyagi: You will have to again change my title: I am Minister of Revenue and Expenditure.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: He has been very generous in making expenditure where we have no control. We know

that Jammu and Kashmir is a State which was integrated with India only in three subjects. And now under this head of "Aid to Kashmir" we are called upon to spend money to the extent of Rs. 76 lakhs. We opposed this Demand not because we are against any development in Jammu and Kashmir. As we have assured this House we are prepared even to forego the loss of one crore of rupees as customs revenue if there is complete integration of Jammu and Kashmir with India. But, as the fate of Jammu and Kashmir is not only in suspense and we are afraid that the terms which this House has passed in July have not been implemented by the Jammu and Kashmir Government, but Sheikh Abdullah is insisting, not for greater provincial autonomy, but, as one of the propaganda pamphlets says, that Jammu and Kashmir insists on residuary sovereignty. I do not know what this residual or residuary sovereignty is. As Lord Reading had once pointed out to His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad, paramountcy will be paramountcy...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member is taking advantage of the fact that Jammu and Kashmir appears here. The Supplementary Demand is for "etc.". It will be explained

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I am very sorry. I want to make a very brief observation that this House is not prepared to pass any Demand in which we will have to spend money over which we have no control. Therefore, as we are opposed to this residuary sovereignty and as we believe in the sovereignty of this House, we oppose this Demand as Jammu and Kashmir is not prepared to be completely integrated with India.

Dr. Katju: I should first like to say a few words about Demand No. 87.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Only 3½ minutes left. Guillotine on the Home Minister!

Dr. Katju: I am very grateful to my friends for having taken all the time. In fact if they had taken these minutes also I would have been happy, because I am not in love with my own voice. I have been hearing it for forty years!

The hon. Member who spoke evidently has not much affection for the Central Police Reserve at Neemuch. He and I do not share the same opinion though we come very nearly from the same place. He lives there; it is my constituency. He has been elected from elsewhere. The Central Reserve Police

is doing very distinguished service in different parts of the State assisted by the Rajasthan Government. If you go and ask them they will say that it has played a great part in restoring law and order. And if I may say so with respect, it is not fair for anyone to attack the officers and men here on very serious charges when they are not here to answer them. You do not give me any assistance, details, concrete and specific instances which I can enquire into. The only thing I can say is that there is the Accountant General, there is the Finance Department. And before a Supplementary Demand is submitted to this House it is checked. I do not know how serious an examination it is. Then it is passed. So far as this question of Jammu and Kashmir business is concerned.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Etcetera?

Dr. Katju: Etcetera is etcetera. It does not require much explanation. It is an account for the entire thing. It may be two annas here or there. It only means you have got the general heads like rehabilitation and so on. You go to Nagrota camp. Just now my friends were very eloquent about the conditions and the miseries of the refugees. They might as well have gone to Nagrota and Yol camps. Who is to come to their assistance? Fifteen hundred families: Were we to think in terms of rupees, annas and pies? All the constitutional issues are raised here. I sometimes find it difficult, because they are sitting on two stools. In the first place they say no money should be given to them. In the second place, they say they are part of India. The thing is very clear. Crores and crores of rupees have been spent during the last five years on Kashmir.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Is there anything other than community project, etc.?

Dr. Katju: You are not doing justice to yourself. It is for various purposes, the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons in the Nagrota camp, rehabilitation of displaced persons in the Yol camp, caring of unattached women and children, etc. That does not mean medical help.....

7 P.M.

Dr. Ianka Sundaram: There is only one Demand left out—No. 96.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,34,000 be granted to the President to defray the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Relations with States'.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,30,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953 in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 96—SUPPLIES

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 69,86,000 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, 1953, in respect of 'Supplies'."

The motion was adopted.

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"The 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 1952-53."

The motion was adopted.

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

I also 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 1952-53, 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 1952-53, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

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

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

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Friday the 20th February, 1953.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.