

AMENDMENT TO CENTRAL EXCISE RULES

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I beg to lay on the Table, under Section 38 of the Central Excise and Salt Act, 1944, a copy of the Notification No SRO 2108 dated the 29th June 1957, making certain further amendments to the Central Excise Rules, 1944 [Placed in Library See No S-132/57]

NAVY BILL—contd

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the motion moved by the Minister of Defence on the 22nd July 1957, for referring the Navy Bill to a Joint Committee

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon) Mr Speaker, Sir, in moving that the Navy Bill be referred to Joint Committee on behalf of Government, I sought to observe here the general rule that we were to deal with the main and salient principles of the proposed legislation. Owing to the considerable interest evinced in the Indian Navy and the attention that various Members had given to the study of this Bill clause by clause, the debate went much further afield and not only covered matters that are not strictly relevant to the Bill at all, but went into the consideration of the various clauses of the Bill in a very detailed manner.

With great respect, if I were to pursue this procedure, I am afraid I shall tire the patience of the House. There will be opportunity for the Joint Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause and, therefore, in replying to the debate, I propose to deal with the main set of observations that were made during the debate.

Government is happy to feel that the Bill has received general welcome in the House. The utmost criticism of it has been that there are some

drawbacks in it. I hope the time will never come when a spokesman of the Government will ever be able to present to this Parliament a Bill which is free from drawbacks, because then the whole purpose of debate and our procedures would stand nullified.

But I am not, as the Minister responsible, prepared to say that the Bill suffers from very serious drawbacks and while I am grateful for the observations made, I am rather sorry to say that criticism of only parts of a section without reference to the other parts has led to a great deal of confusion.

Now, the first general onslaught on this Bill from one or two quarters has been that this too closely follows the British Act and that it is dominated by fear complex. First of all, may I say that there is no Navy Act in Britain as yet? They will have one. Probably it is being debated now in Parliament. Ours is ahead of their prior effort. If it is contended that we should not borrow the experience of other nations in our legislation particularly the experience of British legislation, then perhaps we would immediately have to consider the scrapping of the Government of India Act, and the rules which you, Mr Speaker, follow in this House—I think, they closely follow the rules of the British Parliament.

We have had to take the experience of other peoples and adapt them to our own purposes, not forgetting the social purposes of our community and not forgetting also that this is a law governing the Navy. It is not a law regulating the Hindu Joint Family? Therefore, its purpose is to maintain an efficient Navy under modern conditions, and such penal provisions as may appear in it also reflect the modern trend of opinion.

Not only have we not borrowed any Act, but we have made considerable adaptations to suit our conditions and there is no reason to think that the British or any other Parliament may not benefit by our experience.

As I said yesterday, four or five thousand years of navigation by man has seen the emergence of common question. That is still a prominent feature of all naval law. In clause 84 and 85 of this Bill itself, there is reference to this custom. No Act of Parliament regarding the administration of justice, meting out punishment, maintenance of discipline etc., can be read outside the context of circumstances and history outside the relationship that exists between those on whom these laws make their impact and those who have to administer them. Therefore, to read these clauses outside the context of the history of the Indian Navy would be not to understand the reality of the situation.

I do not know why this particular legislation should be regarded as reflecting a fear complex. All law is based upon sanction, namely, the ultimate power to exercise force and the fear of punishment. That is the basis of modern law. It may be that with the advance of time we may move to other methods of evaluation, of social processes, but at present, this Bill shares the characteristic of all naval laws namely, that if certain regulations are broken, if there is conduct prejudicial to the service of the Navy, then certain penalties are prescribed with necessary safeguards.

If it is said that there is provision against mutiny in the Navy and that arises from a fear complex, all I would say is this, it is not the fear of mutiny but prudent caution against the contingency of a mutiny which would endanger the safety of this country and the position of the armed forces.

The distinguished lady Member from West Bengal referred to the status of women. May I say in this connection that I welcome the statements from that side of the House in general support of the Bill? One cannot but expect that women Members of this House would have something to say about the status of women under my Bill, if they do not, I suppose they would suffer criticism elsewhere. But

the clause that is relevant is clause 10(3). This is a clause which is essential for purposes of this Bill. We have not come to that stage in this country where women should carry lethal weapons in the armed forces. Whether it is the Army, the Navy or the Air Force or the National Cadet Corps, there are certain differences between men and women in respect of joining these services as against other services.

If you read the clause, what it really seeks to state are the exceptions which are brought to the forefront.

"No woman shall be eligible for appointment or enrolment in the Indian Navy or the Indian Naval Reserve Force except in such department branch or other body forming part thereof or attached thereto."

Therefore, the positive part of it is that women can still join certain departments, certain branches or other body forming part of the Navy or attached thereto. These are subject to the conditions laid down by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Bihar): My point was this that you just put positively by notification that women can join such and such services. That is all.

Shri Krishna Menon: It is only natural that each person should have a different way of putting things. But we are more concerned with the substance. It is put the other way here.

So that this is really a positive provision for the inclusion of women in the services, and it is necessary from a legal point of view to make the reservation from the general provision that men and women are equal under our fundamental rights.

So in drafting this Bill, one has to think—particularly after the last ten years' experience—of how it would fare before the Supreme Court or any other court in the land. Unless such an express reservation was made

[Shri Krishna Menon]

having regard to the general provisions of our Constitution, and at the same time, to meet the other valid objection namely exclusion of women, a specific mention is made by the incorporation of the service to women the purpose that all of us have in mind would not be served.

I hope with this assurance the objection would be far less pointed than it was. Government do not have any objection against the modification or formulation of these clauses if there are better draftsmen on the Joint Committee. I think that is the purpose of the Joint Committee.

Then, we have had a large number of observations on which I am bound to comment because the reports of proceedings in this House are read outside and are also read by the members of the Services. May I say with respect that it is regrettable that suggestions should be made that in legislation put forward by this Government, particularly in regard to the Armed Services, there is an attitude to create a caste of officers. There are officers in every country in the world, irrespective of the nature or economy of their society, in some cases more than in others. But, the suggestion made is that the other ranks of the Navy are treated as an inferior class, socially, biologically or otherwise and that they suffer under greater disabilities.

I do not propose to read the relevant clauses. But, if the relevant clauses relating to these, clauses 53, 54, and 55 were read, it will be found that the officer is placed under more onerous conditions under this Bill than the ratings. That is the position.

I was asked yesterday, why it is an offence for a rating to strike an officer that he would be court-martialled and why is it not an offence for an officer to strike a rating? The answer is, the question is not contemplated as arising because an officer striking a rating is

an officer behaving in a way not consistent with the dignity and duties of the officer and thus is provided for in the Bill. He would be acting in an undignified way and thereby subjecting himself to disciplinary action immediately. But, in the other case, it is an unusual occurrence in the normal state of our relationship and, therefore, specific provision has to be made. I want to assure the House that any penalty that will be visited on officers for this lack of good behaviour towards other ranks of the Navy is indeed incorporated in this Bill. There are greater responsibilities resting on those wearing the uniform of officers of Armed Services and the clauses are, therefore, not intended to countenance conduct unbecoming the character of an officer.

I think, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, in dealing with the question of dismissal with disgrace, seems to have proceeded from the belief that this Bill provides for two kinds of treatment in respect of officers and ratings. The rating, it was alleged, may be dismissed with disgrace and the officer may not. That is not the position at all. If you read clause 55, further on, it says—

“Provided that in the case of officers, unless the sentence of dismissal with disgrace is also awarded—

The clause refers to dismissals with disgrace. Later on, it says that if the officer is dismissed with disgrace, he must resign his commission. In every case where sentences are pronounced on officers, they have to resign their commissions. In the case of the ratings, it does not always mean termination of services. Therefore, if anything it is the other way about and naturally so because the officer has the advantage of greater education and has had the opportunities of exercising responsibility and, therefore, it is expected that he must shoulder this responsibility and behave in that way. Therefore, instead of these provisions being weighted

as against the other ranks of the Navy, the Indian Navy Bill has taken very good care to see that there shall be onerous burdens placed upon the officers of the Indian Navy, to behave in a way consistent with our civilisation, with the background of our country with modern trends of relationships between the officers and men

There are several provisions in the Bill, which when the Joint Committee examines then will come to light and which definitely make provision in regard to the conduct of officers. It is the duty of the officers to cultivate good relationship. But, even if these provisions were not there, I would say that reference is made in clauses 84 and 85 to the custom of the Navy and the relationship that exists is adequate guarantee. And, I would submit that it is a poor tribute to our men, whether they be officers or ratings, to think that the Navy as it exists at present, or the trends of its development or the tendencies which exist, are reflections of an authoritarian attitude towards life and I am happy to say, as Minister of Defence, with the limited experience I have of our Armed Forces, that the relations between our officers and men are sound and healthy

There have been a number of observations with regard to appeals. It was mentioned that Government was careful to mention that there would be no appeals from court-martial and, at the same time, it was pointed out that the procedure of court-martial had been varied to bring it in conformity with modern standards, that the Indian Law of Evidence where applicable to court-martial, that defence by outside advocates or by other persons duly qualified whom the accused wanted to appear before trials, all these things are now incorporated in the Navy Bill. But, appeal in the sense of appeal to the courts or a new trial is not allowed for a very very good reason and I hope the Joint Committee will take this into account. By necessity, all punishments in the Armed Forces must be of a character

that is comparatively safe. Otherwise, you cannot maintain discipline in the Armed Forces

Secondly, we could not have procedures which would entail long absence of personnel concerned from their services along with a number of officers if evidence is required and so on and so forth. I would like those who have this apprehension—I do not say this criticism—to bear in mind that, certainly, so far as the Navy is concerned, it is for the greater part of the time afloat. Is the appeal to wait till the ships come back? Circumstances may have changed, probably, evidence might be capable of being produced. What we have avoided in this retrial, going through the witnesses and the whole procedure as in a court of appeal. But review is provided. The review is by the Judge Advocate General whose qualifications are prescribed in the Bill. It is for the Chief of the Naval Staff to deal with the punishments already awarded. What is more, there is a provision in clause 167 which goes much further than any assurance or insurance we give to our civilians in regard to treatment of convicted persons. There may be many persons who think that, perhaps, all of these ought to be introduced into our civil law. That is not for me to say.

Mr Speaker, clause 167 (b) says

“the case may at any time, and shall at intervals of not more than three months, be reconsidered by the Central Government or committing authority or a prescribed officer, and if on any such reconsideration it appears to the Central Government or committing authority or such prescribed officer that the conduct of the offender since his conviction has been such as to justify a remission of the sentence the Central Government or committing authority or such prescribed officer shall remit the whole or any part of it.”

There is a provision by which the case comes under review automatically. There is nothing so elaborate

[Shri Krishna Menon]

rate as this in any other law. There is an obligation on the Commanding Officer or the Central Government to review the sentences every three months.

It was argued against the Bill that in this review that is undertaken by the Judge Advocate, General or by the Central Government, or indeed, by the Chief of the Naval Staff, the accused or his representatives cannot appear. The Bill does not provide against their appearance. The Bill simply says that it is not obligatory that they should do so. They need not. It is entirely open to the Judge Advocate General to ask for the accused's presence or to call in anybody he considers necessary in the exercise of his judicial mind and discretion in order to assist him in his review. The whole of this procedure is based upon the conception that the Judge Advocate General is not only a being qualified but an independent officer acting with a judicial approach. The clause with reference to this matter is not as rigid as suggested. It simply says, there is no obligation that the accused should be present. Because, if there was an obligation on the accused to be present and if a ship is thousands of miles away with many days of travelling, then the course of justice may be delayed.

There was some criticism about the vagueness and absence of definitions. As I said it is partly due to the tradition of the armed forces, more particularly the Navy where justice has been rough but ready. It is not possible to define some things. Things happen there fairly quickly. By the time some preliminaries are carried out as under the Civil Codes, we may very well have passed the course of events. It has been said that there is no definition of cruelty. It is not capable of being defined in terms that the critics would like. There is no definition of drunkenness, somebody has said. Mr. Speaker, there is no definition of drunkenness anywhere in the world. I believe there was once a

definition given by someone who thought he was a humorist who said that a man is drunk when he does not know whether he holds the ground or the ground is holding him! Surely, we cannot write that sort of thing in the Bill. The definition or rather the decision on whether a man is drunk or not is this: A man is drunk when he is not sober, when he has no control over himself and there are physical evidences of the consumption of alcohol or other material and so on. If this is not adequate, the Joint Committee would presumably go into it. So far as the Government is concerned, if definitions are practical and in line with the Criminal Procedure Code and our law and modern conceptions then they would be worthy of consideration.

I was also told that the word 'lawful' did not appear before 'command' everywhere. It is very inappropriate in the law relating to the Navy to insert the word 'a lawful' before the word 'command'. Because, all commands are lawful, otherwise, they are not commands. The Navy has great objection—I am not saying that it could over-rule Parliament but it is my duty to put the view of the Government in its naval arm and the Ministry of Defence—to the suggestion that commands that are issued by an officer would be unlawful commands, if they are otherwise they are not commands. There is reference to 'lawful' in some places but it is not repeated everywhere. Naturally, if a person disobeys the command on the ground that it is unlawful, he does take a certain amount of risk, but that is a risk which every individual in a civilised society carries with him.

There was much concern that the Navy had made no provision that the ratings or other ranks are not enjoined to provide for their family members other than wife and children. I submitted in the beginning that this was an Act for the Indian Navy—not something to regulate the joint family.

Why should there be any greater responsibility placed upon a rating than upon any other individual in this respect. There is no legal obligation except in our private law to provide for the maintenance of others. There are moral obligations; but in view of that you cannot attach a Naval man's salary because you have also to see that the Navy works. The man should be capable of maintaining himself and performing his duties. There are however certain limitations placed upon him even then. He must maintain his wife and children, legitimate or otherwise. But, if the officer or other ranks are to maintain all their relations, close and distant, I am afraid you are asking the Navy to take a responsibility, I may say with great respect, which is not placed upon the Members of Parliament who also receive a salary. But, if there is any other obligation under the civil law or under the Hindu Law or any other law to maintain relatives, that is not abrogated by this provision. We are here dealing with the self earned property of an individual and there is nothing in our law which places a statutory responsibility upon any permanent servant that he is bound to spend his salary in this particular way. The obligation of maintenance of families rests on our private law or by a provision. In this Bill we have made provision that a sailor shall provide for the maintenance of his wife and offspring. If you proceed further and place upon our armed personnel such another obligation and if it has to be obliged it will really mean placing on the community a greater burden. You cannot expect the discharge of such a responsibility unless you provide the resources. If each sailor would then probably have to maintain not only himself and his limited family but the whole of his joint family, this maintenance provision in the Bill if I may say with respect is entitled to an unqualified welcome in this House. I want to report that it does not take away any responsibility that the ordinary law of the land places

upon the citizen. It only protects the navy man's salary and his clothing and equipment; it is necessary for naval purposes.

Fahdit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hisar): If according to the Hindu law, a person who gets a salary is bound to maintain his parents, should he not do so?

Mr. Speaker: He does not say so. We have passed legislation recently making it obligatory for the son and the daughter to maintain the parents. The hon. Minister does not say that this law is intended to abrogate the ordinary law of the land.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): The point is about a particular word. 'Pay' is limited. There is no obligation as far as I can make out from that clause for the maintenance of the father and mother which we have put in the ordinary law.....
(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: If otherwise he is obliged, he is obliged.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Then, why have this particular clause put in?

Shri Krishna Menon: I have stated the Government's point of view and it can certainly be considered in the Joint Committee. But, it would be quite impossible in any provision that Parliament makes for the armed forces to maintain and to discharge a greater social responsibility than the officers or ratings could carry at present. I believe this clause does provide for normal families, it certainly cannot provide for abnormal cases. In this connection, I may say that there are various other institutions connected with the armed forces which deal with some of these special cases of hardship. Where some relative is a destitute because provision has not been made for him or her or those who have been provided are not sharing benefits with others, such cases are considered on compassionate grounds. It is not possible to make legal provision for the maintenance of all members of the family.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Article 24 was criticised and some observations were made with regard to those who had patriotically served the country. There is nothing in this article which precludes these people. If it is the desire of Parliament that a particular group of people, either because they come from a particular part of the country or because they have done something or not done something, should have benefits, it should pass separate legislation for that special purpose. It is not possible to include in the Navy Act a provision of that kind. It can only prescribe qualifications for service. If a candidate passes the necessary tests and has the qualifications, then his enrolment follows if there is room for him in the service concerned.

To read clause 24 as though this provision excludes by a legal provision this particular class of persons from certain things is, I think, a wrong reading. [.]

There has been some criticism also of the position of officers and men of the Navy in relation to civilians in regard to offences and crimes and, if I may say so, it is a very just apprehension. There is, however, no reason for the kind of thought that was expressed, that the men in our Armed Services are likely to run riot and be a danger to civilian population. The function of the Armed Forces is to protect the community both from external difficulties and internal troubles, and to go to the aid of civil authorities when any such troubles arise whether naturally or otherwise.

Now, with regard to civilians, first of all it is possible to ask the Commanding Officer to enable a civil trial to take place. Nothing in this law prevents a civilian who suffers an injury from going to the courts as against a person in the Navy. But, if at the time the alleged offender is already under trial by court-martial then, in my humble submission, no doubt, the courts of this land would

take into question the doctrine of double jeopardy, whether it is right to try a man twice over. This is an ordinary basic principle of civilised jurisprudence. It is however the intention of the Government, when rules are issued under this Bill, to bring this position in regard to civilians in conformity with Section 549 of the Criminal Procedure Code. That should satisfy any feeling that we are creating a class of people who can with immunity commit violence or place other people in danger. There has not been a consideration at all of exempting any officer who is responsible for offences against civilians. In fact, the provision of the law is that it should be immediately brought under Naval law, because the offender may not be here and he would be brought to trial in the manner prescribed and punished if found guilty.

If there are any civilian claims, claims of property or damages, nothing in this Bill exempts those who are responsible. As a matter of fact, that is the law of the land. It is also possible for any civilian concerned to make his reference through the usual channels and in any legitimate way through the Officer Commanding or to the Government itself. If a civilian should so suffer, no doubt he would have recourse to the support of the Members of Parliament, Officers of the Government and Ministers who must all be presumed to be approachable. In this way the attention of the naval authorities could be drawn to any case? But provision has to be made against a member of the Armed Forces being tried for the same offence twice. And, what is more, against the possibility that the material that might have come out in the first trial will be used against him in the second trial, as it would be.

It was also said that there is no provision for withdrawing minors from the Navy. First of all, there is a period of three months during which

the candidate or the appointee can come away. That should be enough time for him to make up his mind. Here again, I say, these provisions should be read in the context of the facts as they are. How does a young man get into the Navy? He goes to a training school, college or military establishments for training. In any case he has three months further time to make up his mind. Then he is part of the Armed Forces bound by the law of the Armed Forces. We cannot have a law for the Army or Navy under which a person just gives a week's notice and goes away.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Not even minors?

Shri Krishna Menon: There are not so very much and in big sense minors. If they are good enough to risk their lives for the country, they are good enough to choose for themselves and to abide choice.

Shri Warrior (Trichur): Before appointment of minors, will the Government take the responsibility of ascertaining whether the parents agree or not, because the minors cannot themselves decide on such matters?

Shri Krishna Menon: Parents are consulted. During the period of three months the minor can withdraw himself or the parents can get the minor withdrawn. What was asked for was not that. It was said that during the whole period of minority of the rating or officer as the case may be, there should be an authority vesting in the parent to withdraw him. Then the question really becomes who is really the Commanding Officer of the Navy, the parent or the officer?

Reference was also made to the relationship that should exist between officers and other ranks. We fully concede, not only concede, we think, more in the positive sense, that these relations should be based upon self-respect, upon allegiance to the com-

mon law of the Navy as a whole and a common purpose, namely, defence of the country, traditions of the Navy and maintenance of good discipline. But, over and above that, the relations that actually exist in the Indian Navy are of a character where there is no reason to think that the rights or the self-respect of other ranks would be disregarded. I am not able to subscribe, Mr Speaker, to the view that our legislation should be such that when the Navy turns out on parade the other ranks would give orders to officers and the officers would obey. We cannot reverse positions in that way and maintain armed forces. But, there is nothing in this provision of the Bills or the practice that obtain that need cause any apprehension.

There were some misgivings in regard to death sentences. It is not customary for a Minister to express his personal opinion in the House except perhaps in matters of conscience. If it was the law of the country that death sentences should be abolished, I as a person would be extremely happy at that consummation. But, so long as this country permits capital punishment, it is necessary that in this law the capital sentence should be prescribed for all those offences which would merit capital sentence under the civil law, and also for such matters which concern the discipline of the Navy, in regard to treason, mutiny or such other matters. It does not mean that the sentence as prescribed, which is the maximum, is always the sentence that is imposed. Secondly, death sentence is subject to confirmation by Government, it cannot be carried out without that.

Then, the last of the observations which I would like to deal with and which, if I may say so, reflects a very legitimate apprehension, is the fear that delegated legislation may make great inroads into the liberty of the citizen and of the use of the rule making power really destroy the very purpose of law itself, and also

[Shri Krishna Menon]

make a very big dent in our constitutional safeguards. Perhaps I did not make it clear in my opening statement but it is in the Bill. If you look at clause 188, it is expressly provided that all regulations that are made under this Act shall be submitted to Parliament. If Parliament is not an adequate repository of the capacity to protect and safeguard the rights of the citizens, in our system we can indeed look no further. These regulations are made in the same way as Presidential Orders, till now they were Presidential Orders and now these rule making powers are sought to be vested with the Executive by this Bill. Regulations have to be submitted to Parliament in the normal way. Clause 188(3) says

"All regulations made under this Act shall, as soon as may be after they are made, be laid for not less than thirty days before each House of Parliament and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make during the session in which they are so laid or the session immediately following."

This is a very long way from the time when the Captain of a ship made a law which enabled him to tie the offender to the corpse and push him into the sea. He cannot take the law any further than Parliament directly or indirectly, but effectively permits. I do not see any other way of dealing with the administration of law in modern society. Regulations have to be made because contingencies do arise and several new questions may have to be dealt with. It is not possible or wise to come to Parliament and introduce Bills on such individual cases or consequential matters. In all modern systems of administration a considerable field of delegated legislation has become necessary on account of the pressure on parliamentary time, and also the rate of activity, intensity and complexity of modern life. But the constitutional

safeguard that these regulations shall be placed before Parliament, where they are subject to modifications or amendments, is, I submit, a good and complete protection in regard to the misuse of the frame to make regulations.

Sir, I hope I have dealt with the main provisions of the Bill, and with the main question raised and, if I may so hope, also some of the misconceptions which seem to have crept in some of the speeches made.

I am grateful to those who have spoken on this Bill and for the general welcome that it has received from all sides of this House. I feel sure that this Bill will emerge from the Joint Committee where it will receive full consideration and improvements as the collective wisdom of the Members of both the Houses of Parliament will bring to bear upon it. In this belief I commend the motion before House for its acceptance.

Mr Speaker I shall put the motion to the House.

The question is

'That the Navy Bill 1957 be referred to a Joint Committee consisting of 39 members 26 from this House, namely Shri S V Ramaswamy, Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah, Lt Col H H Maharaja Manabendra Shah of Tehri Garhwal, Shri Raghunath Singh, Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh, Shri Arun Chandra Guha, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri Bhawanji A Khimji, Shri K P Kuttikrishnan Nair, Shri Joachim Alva, Shri B S Murthy, Shri Dwarka Nath Tewary, Shri P Thanulmgom Nadar, Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, Shri T Sanganna, Shri Mool Chand Jain, Shrimati Maimoona Sultan, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri K K Warrier, Shri T C N Menon, Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray, Shri Aurobindo Ghosal, Shri Shradhakar Supakar, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri C R Basappa, Shri V K Krishna Menon.

and 13 members from Rajya Sabha;
 "that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next Session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make, and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee"

The motion was adopted

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos 23, 24, 25, 26 and 108 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. As the House is aware 4 hours have been allotted for the Demands of this Ministry.

Regarding the time limit for speeches, the usual practice has been to fix a time-limit of 15 minutes for all Members including Movers of cut motions and 20 minutes, if necessary or 30 minutes for Leaders of Groups.

There are a number of cut motions to these Demands. Hon. Members may hand over at the Table within 15 minutes the numbers of the selected cut motions which they propose to

move. I shall treat them as moved, if the Members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

DEMAND No 23—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 3,39,51,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1958, in respect of "Tribal Areas"

DEMAND No 24—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 4,84,44,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1958, in respect of 'External Affairs'"

DEMAND No 25—STATE OF PONDICHERRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 1,92,69,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1958, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'"

DEMAND No 26—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 2,11,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum

*Moved with the recommendation of the President