

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

the blame on them, but they should have taken the courage to operate the service. That is my personal opinion.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In view of the inconvenience caused to more than a hundred thousand persons, if the Minister could give us an assurance that the service will start operating immediately after the monsoon, we are satisfied.

**Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri:** Certainly, it will be opened after the monsoon.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO  
 UNSTARRED QUESTION

**The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Mojithia):** In reply to unstarred question No. 1422, asked by Shri Bhakt Darshan on the 7th September, 1956, regarding Garwali soldiers, I stated that the audited entitlement of the Garwali soldiers was Rs. 10751-1-0, and indicated that the element on account of pay included in this amount was Rs. 2000-10-0.

In the statement laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in reply to parts (c), (d) and (e) of the question, the total amounts to be paid to Hav. Chandar Singh Bhandari and Hav. Narain Singh Gussain (Serial Nos. 1 and 2 of the statement) were shown as Rs. 295-8-0, and Rs. 303-14-0 respectively.

I wish to inform this House that the audit authorities have since intimated some corrections to these figures; according to the latest figures furnished by the audit authorities, the total entitlement of the Garwali soldiers is Rs. 10,735-6-0 and the element on account of pay is Rs. 1,984-15-0. The total amounts to be paid to the two individuals named earlier are Rs. 282-15-0 and Rs. 300-12-0 respectively.

I wish to add that out of the 62 personnel involved, 57 were dismissed, and the rest discharged from service.

The statement laid on the Table of the House contains the names of 57 persons dismissed and two persons who were discharged, as all these persons forfeited their pay and allowances at the time of their dismissal discharge from service.

APPROPRIATION NO. 3 BILL

**The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** I beg to move\*:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amount spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1954, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, be taken into consideration."

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

**Shri Bharucha (East Khandesh):** I want to speak on the Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** The scope is limited.

**Shri Bharucha:** Still, one can speak on it.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The motion is not yet placed before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March 1954, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, be taken into consideration"

**Shri Bharucha:** The point that I desire to make is this. This Bill incorporates the excess expenditure incurred by Government in the year 1953-54. Only the other day we passed the Excess Demands, and this is being incorporated into an Act as required

under the Constitution. The point that arises is this: if the expenditure was incurred in excess in the year 1953-54, why is it that the Government sat tight over it for 38 months before coming to the House? The point that I desire to enquire is...

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The excess Demands were discussed and I had made the position clear, and even indicated why it was made. The hon. Member apparently was not here at that time.

**Shri Bharucha:** The hon. Minister was, totally inaudible—he usually is. I do not know whether it is due to a defect in the working of the sound system or...

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** He is so gentle.

**Shri Bharucha:** May be, but he will have to make himself heard.

**Mr. Speaker:** This point was raised when the Excess Demands were before the House and it was answered. The hon. Member was not present in the House at that time. Therefore, should this matter be once again discussed in the House? The point as to why there was delay was made and has been answered.

**Shri Bharucha:** I quite agree. My explanation is that at that time there was a conference which the Prime Minister had called regarding Goa and I was inevitably absent.

**Mr. Speaker:** He may look into the proceedings and find out the details.

**Shri Bharucha:** I accept that.

The second point I desire to make is this. There is an item of Rs. 1,30,850 against item No. Vote No. 53—Cabinet. I think the major portion of this is excess expenditure incurred by Ministers on their tours. Could we get the major break-ups of this item?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The Demand has been approved by the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us not go beyond the scope of it. The Demand has been approved by the House in this session itself and on that approval, the Appropriation Bill gets almost automatic acceptance.

**Shri Bharucha:** I cannot move an amendment to this Bill, but I can certainly ask for explanation. Article 115 of the Constitution prevents me from moving an amendment, but I can certainly ask for explanation. Suppose when the Excess Demands were voted, there was an amendment and a change took place. Then at what stage can a Member ask for explanation? At this stage only.

**Mr. Speaker:** The relevant rule, rule 218(4) of our Rules of Procedure, says:

"The debate on an Appropriation Bill shall be restricted to matters of public importance or administrative policy implied in the grants covered by the Bill which have not already been raised while the relevant demands for grants were under consideration".

So far as Ministers' tours are concerned, it is a matter of detail. He might have gone; he might not have gone; what exactly is the need for going so much? This is not a matter of policy; it is not a matter of public importance or administrative policy which should have been raised here. This is an ordinary matter of detail. Nobody denies that the Ministers can go on tour; the only question is whether in a particular case he has gone a little too often.

**Shri Bharucha:** Unless I have the major break-ups of the amount of Rs. 1,30,850, how can I say whether a question of policy is involved or not? For instance, it may be that only one Minister has gone on tour in excess. Then the question may arise: why he has gone so much whereas other Ministers have not?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not for me to say; it is a question of policy. Sub-rule (5) states as follows: "The

[Shri Bharucha]

Speaker may, in order to avoid repetition of debate require members desiring to take part in discussion on an Appropriation Bill to give advance intimation of the specific points they intend to raise, and he may withhold permission for raising such of the points as in his opinion appear to be repetitions of the matters discussed on a demand for grant or as may not be of sufficient public importance."

The hon. Member is new and I did not insist upon this rule. Anyhow, it is not a matter of such administrative policy or public importance which should be raised. It is a matter of detail.

Shri Barucha: I shall not press.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1954, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.*

*The Schedule, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.*

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

## GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the general discussion of the General Budget. Shri Banerjea will continue his speech.

Shri S. K. Banerjea (Cooch Behar): While I mentioned yesterday about the problem of common tea of North East India and this is due to the fact that our cost of production of tea is greater than the common tea of East African territories and further they have no export duty. The only door open to North Indian producers of tea is to increase the consumption in India and we believe that this consumption can be easily increased by over 100 million lbs. within the Second Five-Year Plan. The present consumption of tea in India is about 200 million lbs. If we fail to increase our internal consumption, the producers will have inevitably to curtail the production. The reduction of production of tea is contrary to the accepted principle of the Government of India. If the curtailment of production is heavier than it was last year, I am afraid some of the small tea estates would have to close down and this would result in heavy unemployment.

So, I request the Finance Minister to examine the problems before he comes to a decision finally of imposing this Excise tax.

In my constituency there is a great problem of rehabilitation of refugees. It is not only the problem of my constituency alone, but it is a problem of the country as a whole. These refugees have no income, but they shall have to bear the brunt of the Excise tax. This is an additional burden on them. I know both the Central and State Governments are quite alive of the situation and are doing their best to rehabilitate them. I must mention here about the abnormal