

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Dated.....20.11.52

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

3759

3760

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 14th July, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past
Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform Members that in pursuance of sub-rule (1) of Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I nominate the following to be the members of the Business Advisory Committee:

- (1) Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.
- (2) Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
- (3) Shri Harekrushna Mahtab.
- (4) Shri Narahar Vishnu Gadgil.
- (5) Shri Dev Kanta Borooah.
- (6) Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.
- (7) Shri P. T. Chacko.
- (8) Col. B. H. Zaidi.
- (9) Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan.
- (10) Shri P. T. Punnoose.
- (11) Shri Sarangadhar Das.
- (12) Shri Hukam Singh.
- (13) Shri Chandikeshwar Sharan Singh Ju Deo.
- (14) Dr. Lanka Sundaram.

Under the Rules, I will be the Chairman of the Committee.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS OF RAILWAYS IN INDIA FOR 1949-50—PART I—REVIEW AND PART II—DETAILED APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS FOR 1949-50.
110 PSD.

PROPRIATION ACCOUNTS; CAPITAL STATEMENTS, BALANCE SHEETS ETC. OF INDIAN GOVT. RAILWAYS, 1949-50; BALANCE SHEETS OF RAILWAY COLLIERIES AND STATEMENTS OF ALL-IN-COST OF COAL, ETC. FOR 1949-50; AND RAILWAY AUDIT REPORT, 1951.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to lay on the Table a signed copy of each of the following documents under article 151 of the Constitution:

- (1) Appropriation Accounts of Railways in India for 1949-50. Part I—Review. [Placed in Library. See No. IV. U. (a) (75).]
- (2) Appropriation Accounts of Railways in India for 1949-50. Part II—Detailed Appropriation Accounts. [Placed in Library. See No. IV. U. (a) (75).]
- (3) Capital Statements, Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts of Indian Government Railways, 1949-50. [Placed in Library. See No. IV. U. (a) (74).]
- (4) Balance Sheets of Railway Collieries and Statements of all-in-cost of coal, etc. for 1949-50. [Placed in Library. See No. IV. A. (a) (71).]
- (5) Railway Audit Report 1951—Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Railways in India, including the Appropriation Accounts for 1949-50. [Placed in Library. See No. IV. U. (a) (76).]

INDIAN TARIFF (THIRD AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934."

The motion was adopted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I introduce* the Bill.

**STATE ARMED POLICE FORCES
(EXTENSION OF LAWS) BILL.**

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of disciplinary laws in force in any State relating to the armed police force of that State to members of the said force when serving outside that State, be taken into consideration."

Very few words are necessary in respect of this motion. The House is aware that in several States both in Part A and Part B, armed constabularies exist, and for their maintenance, discipline and various other matters there are statutes in existence. Recently when one State sent for the assistance of the armed constabulary in the neighbouring district (belonging to another State) the question has arisen as to how this loan of constabulary is to be governed, and this Bill provides that when any members of any armed constabulary force go elsewhere they would continue to be governed in relation to matters of discipline and other liabilities by their own laws. That is the object of this Bill. There is nothing else.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of disciplinary laws in force in any State relating to the armed police force of that State to members of the said force when serving outside that State, be taken into consideration."

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): May I just ask one or two questions—I do not want to make any long speech.

What exactly was the provision of section 3 which is sought to be amended now? Secondly how will co-ordination be obtained if some portion of the police force working in a particular province is under the disciplinary jurisdiction of another authority? Does not the hon. Minister feel that it may lead to practical complications? Uptil now the practice has been that if any police force from one State is

sent to another State, then all the police forces in the latter State work under one disciplinary jurisdiction. How exactly will those details be worked out? Were there any practical difficulties in giving effect to the provisions of the law which have been in existence for the last sixty years, or is it that this demand has just been made on account of the old Indian States coming into the Indian Union? The hon. Minister may explain how this co-ordination will be obtained under the proposed amendment.

Dr. Katju: There would be no difficulty. The question arose in this way. The police forces were governed by their own laws. When they were lent, and they went outside, you had to amend the statutes in this way that either you provide that they would for as many days as they remained outside their own States be governed by some other laws, or you provide that they would be governed by their own laws. I am speaking, not with exact knowledge, but I imagine it is true that when Armed Forces go outside and go for assistance to other countries they continue to be governed by their own laws. That is my impression. But so far as this is concerned I do not think there will be any difficulty whatsoever because we have considered the matter and we thought that when these armed constables go elsewhere they should continue to be under their own officers—they are for purposes of service, subject to the direction of the other Inspector-General—but so far as the internal management is concerned, the observance of discipline and other things, they continue to be subject to their own officers. And there should be no difficulty in the working of this.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): I wish to make a few observations on this matter. The object of the Bill as stated by the hon. the Home Minister is that with regard to the armed police forces that are moved out from one province to another the laws of discipline of the particular force will govern them and not the laws of discipline of the State to which they go. That is what I understand.

In the first place there is no indication as to why this new extension has been sought for. What exactly has been the difficulty felt in the past and what have been the conditions that persuaded the Government to bring in this extension, have not been explained.

I would also request this House to take into consideration the whole mental attitude of our people with regard to these things. The forces

*Introduced with the previous recommendation of the President.