9553 Written Answers CHAITRA 13, 1881 (SAKA) Notices under 9554 Bulz 377

Export of Onions

2795. Shri Jadhav: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) to what countries onions were exported during the year 1958-59;

(b) what was the amount of foreign exchange earned therefrom;

(c) what was the production of the onions in the year 1958-59 in the various States and Union Territories (State-wise); and

(d) through what agencies were the onions exported with the quantity exported by each agency?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): (a) Ceylon, Malaya, Singapore, U.K., Aden, Bàherin Islands, Kuwait, Trucial Oman, Pakistan, Hongkong, Muscat, Saudi Arabia, Rhodesia, Zanzıbar, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Mauritus, Seychelles, Belgian Congo and Mozambique.

(b) Rs. 133 lakhs during April. December, 1958 (Figures beyond December are not yet available).

(c)	Andhra Pradesh		•	165000 tons
	Bihar .	•		Not available.
	Bombay	•	•	385000 .ons
	Madrus .	•	•	152000 ,,
	Mysore .			105500 "
	Pondicherry	•	Les	is than 500 ,,

(d) Agency-wise figures of exports are not available.

Bharat Sevak Samaj in Rajasthan

2766. Shri Karni Singhji: Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of financial aid, if any, given to Bharat Sevak Samaj in Rajasthan State by the Government of India, Division-wise, from 1954-55 to 1956-57; and (b) the schemes for which aid has been given?

The Deputy Minister of Planning: (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) The Planning Commission did not give any direct financial aid to the Bharat Sevak Samaj in Rajasthan State from 1954-55 to 1956-57.

(b) Does not arise

Tea Trade

2707. Shri P. C. Borosah: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state the amount spent on propaganda and promotion of export of tea in U.K., U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. during 1956, 1957 and 19587

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri): The following amounts have been spent in the U.K., U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. during the financial years 1956-57 to 1958-59 on propaganda and promotion of tea exports:

	(In rupces)					
	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59			
U.K	5,717	3,913				
U.S.A. U.S.S.R.	29,22,43 0 513	32,20,053 5,740	24,09,443*			

•An instalment of contribution to the U.S. Tea Council due on 31st January, 1959 is not included as the remittance is now being made.

12.03 hrs.

NOTICES UNDER RULE 377

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have received two notices under rule 377 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business----one from Shri Braj Raj Singh and the other from Shri Khadilkar. Both are identical. I will look into them and if I give my consent I shall then fix a date and time when this matter can be brought up.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad) rose---

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is for me to fix a date and time. It is not an 9555

adjournment so that it must be discussed straightaway. Therefore, I am informing the hon. Member that if I give my consent, then I will decide about the date and the time. Then the hon. Members would be informed and they will have the opportunity which they want just now.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Let the House know the contents.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House would know if he shows a little amount of patience.

12.04 hrs.

NOTICE UNDER RULE 222

' Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Nath Pai has sent me a notice under rule No. 222 of the Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure, giving notice of his intention to raise a motion of privilege. He says:

"The matter arises out of a PTI report of the proceedings of the House of the 1st of April, 1959 published in the Times of India of 2nd of April, 1959. The relevant document is being attached herewith. As is evident from the reported remark of the hon. Member Prof. Hiren Mukerjee to the effect that, "You are American Agents (turning to the Praja Socialist benches)."

It is prima facie a slander against the PSP Members of Parliament and constitutes a very serious breach of privilege².

So far as this is concerned, this was brought to my notice, and I looked into the file. Our records do not show that such an observation was made or such remarks were uttered. Now, the only course left for me is to find out from the hon. Member whether he uttered those words. If he were present I would have asked him just now, but as he is not present, I will hold it over. When he is present, I shall ask him what the position was and tell me.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to say only one thing. My party normally would not have condescended even to repudiate a charge which is palpably silly and patently wrong. Nonetheless, since it is alleged as having been uttered by a senior Member of the House we are interested in seeing that such an impression does not go round the country. I should like to say one thing more. There would not be two opinions in this country so far as the loyalty of my party is concerned. Throughout, the record of my party is glorious a fine record of the most chapter in the freedom strugle of the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What does he want to say? He might come to that straight.

Shri Nath Psi: I am coming to it. I want to bring to your notice this thing. It is true---that it is not perhaps on the record---and I am not interested in condemning Shri H. N Mukerjee who unfortunately is not here, nor am I interested in arranging the press agency. But you must guide us before I formally raise it, as to what is the protection given to a party which on the face of it, seems to be maligned like this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think there is any necessity for discussing it just now, because we have to ascertain the facts. I am holding it over so that the hon Member against whom this charge is made might also be present and so that we may make enquiries as to what position he takes. Unless he is present and we know the facts, how can we go further? That is what I am doing. I am not disposing of it. I do not think there is any discussion necessary.

Shri T. B. Vitial Rao (Khammam): Shri H. N. Mukerjee's absence was referred to now. My friend Shri Nath Pai said that he was going to give a notice of a privilege motion. He informed me yesterday. I consulted Shri H. N. Mukerjee. As he had to