

This statement is also not justified. The reduction in excise duty has been much more pronounced so far as coarse and medium cloth is concerned

than in the case of fine and superfine cloth as will be seen from the following figures:—

Category of cloth	Previous rate of duty per sq. yd.	Add. excise duty per sq. yd.	Present rate of duty per sq. yd.	Add. excise duty per sq. yd.
Coarse (dhoties & sarces)	6 ps.	3 np.	3 np	3 np.
Coarse (other varieties)	1 anna 6 ps.	3 np	6 np	3np
Medium (dhoties & sarces)	1 anna 6 ps.	4 np	7 np	4 np
Medium (other varieties)	1 anna	4 np	9 np	4 np
Fine	3 annas	6 np	17 np	8 np
Superfine	4 annas	13 np	22 np	13np

The statement attached giving the spot prices of Kalyan cotton from 1956 upto 14.4.1958 also indicates that the prices are not low at all. They are more than Rs. 200/- per candy above the floor price. This will also suggest that there is sufficient demand for this cotton as otherwise the prices will not rule high.

The above facts would clearly indicate that exports of cotton have been allowed consistent with our internal requirements, and deteriorated varieties of Kalyan cotton can as well qualify for export. The supply position of cotton is not such as to place the cotton grower of Kalyan cotton in any nervous position as has been brought out in the notice. Further the reduction in excise duty has been more pronounced so far as coarse and medium categories of cloth is concerned than fine and superfine.

Prices of Kalyan Cotton

Floor Price: 510.	} (per candy of 784 lbs.)	
Ceiling: 570.		
1956		
Sept.		850/870N
Oct.		750/800
Nov.		750/770
Dec.		730/750N

1957

Jan.		720/73-N
Feb.		725/750N
Mar.		870
Apr.		870
May.		860/870
June		840/870

July	845/870
Aug.	790/825
Sept.	750/800
Oct.	775/805
Nov.	730/760
Dec.	700/720

1958

January		
4-1-58		700/720
11-1-58		685/730
18-1-58		695/730
25-1-58		695/730
31-1-58		695/730
February		
4-2-58		695/730
11-2-58		725/740
18-2-58		730/770
25-2-58		715/755
28-2-58		715/755
March		
4-3-58		715/755
11-3-58		710/760
18-3-58		710/760
25-3-58		710/760
31-3-58		710/760

April

1-4-58	710/760
14-4-58	700/755
14-4-58	700/755

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House in their Seventh Report have recommended that leave of

[Mr. Speaker]

absence may be granted to the following Members for the periods indicated in the Report:—

1. Shri V. Eacharan.
2. Shri Balasaheb Sajunke.
3. Shri U. Muthuramalinga Thevar.
4. Shri Chandikeshwar Sharan Singh Ju Deo.
5. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.
6. Shri P. C. Bose.
7. Shri Rajaram Balkrishna Raut.
8. Chowdhry Brahm Perakash.
9. Shri Pendakanti Venkatasubbaiah.
10. Shri R. Kanakasabai.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): With regard to one hon Member, Shri Thevar, he is under preventive detention for a long time in connection with certain riots that took place in the Ramanathapuram where hundreds of houses were burnt down and thousands of Scheduled Caste people were uprooted from their places. This is the third time that the hon Member has come up again asking for leave of absence from the sittings of the House. I request you to consider the whole question in this light.

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member raises this point now. It is not as if the hon. Member concerned got into custody by himself. If he is under preventive detention, how far leave should be refused? He may be under preventive detention for a thing for which he is not responsible. He may be responsible in a way that he is accused of or is responsible for acts which ultimately ended in preventive detention. That is a matter for the courts to decide.

So far as we are concerned, it does not appear to be proper that when a person is taken under custody and kept there, we should impose another punishment, irrespective of the question whether a punishment is imposed by the Court or not. So far as all

hon. Members are concerned, we will proceed under the impression that all is well, and try to accommodate them, and not put an additional burden upon the constituency to return another Member. I hope and trust that the House will accept the recommendations of the Committee.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): If he is released from detention he is prepared to attend the House. Each time he has been hoping that he would be released from detention but he has been kept there still.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any necessity for argument?

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): The hon. Member Shri Kasliwal made a statement about the Ramanathapuram riots and also about the connection of this particular Member of the House with those things. Once a sessions case is pending, in which there are allegations, is it proper for the hon. Member to say that he is involved and all that and thus fix up the liability, before this House, when the hon. Member is not here?

Mr. Speaker: All that he mentioned was this. He has not come to any conclusion. In case there is a case against him, he says there ought to be no leave granted. Well, there are 500 hon Members, and how can I prevent any hon. Member from saying what he wished to say? But of course the hon Member ought not say anything which might prejudice any particular case in a court. All hon Members will kindly bear that in mind, whoever may be the hon. Member against whom a case is pending, nothing shall be said on the floor of the House which might prejudice the proper conduct of the case. I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I want to raise a pertinent question. Cannot some arrangement be made by which the hon. Member may be

brought here to Delhi and kept under preventive detention here and he may be allowed to take part in the proceedings of the House?

Mr. Speaker: We are on the question of leave of absence from the sittings of the House. Some hon. Members may say that no leave ought to be granted. This hon. Member swings the pendulum the other side and asks whether the hon. Member may not be allowed to attend. Let us be satisfied with what is before us. I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly

CORRECTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION NO. 1738

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): I beg to make a statement correcting the reply given on the 18th April, 1958, to the supplementaries by Shri Bhakt Darshan, Shri Hem Barua and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty on Starred Question No. 1738 regarding Himalayan Expedition

In the supplementary questions, arising from the answer given to Starred Question No. 1738 in the Lok Sabha on the 18th April, 1958, Shri Bhakt Darshan and Shri Hem Barua wished to know whether such parties as the Cho Oyu expedition would be sent up every year, and also whether members of the team had undergone any training in any international mountaineering club. Further, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty asked whether Geological Department, specialists in Botany, etc., were associated with the expedition.

The answers given in reply to these questions are likely to give an impression that the Cho Oyu expedition was sponsored by, or was being

conducted under, the auspices of the Himalayan Mountaineering Institute, Darjeeling. As already indicated by me in answer to part (a) of the main question, the Cho Oyu expedition is purely an unofficial expedition. The expedition was actually sponsored by a Committee not connected with the Himalayan Mountaineering Institute. As regards training in mountaineering, of the three Service Officers who are members of the expedition, one was the ex-Principal of the Himalayan Mountaineering Institute, and the other two Service Officers had undergone the basic course at that Institute. I have no information about the training undergone by the other members of the expedition.

In regard to the query raised by Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, as already indicated by me in answer to part (c) of the main question, there are two scientists attached to the expedition—one from the Botanical Survey of India and the other from the Zoological Survey of India.

श्री बकल दर्शन (गढ़वाल) : श्रीमान्, म एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ। यह जो कवचशन किया गया है, उसमें बतलाया गया है कि हिमालयन माउन्टेनीयरिंग इन्स्टीट्यूट के एक एक्म-प्रिन्सिपल इस एक्सपेडिशन के एक सदस्य थे। अभी समाचारपत्रों में उनके अचानक देहान्त होने का समाचार आया है। वह हमारी फौज के एक बड़ अफसर थे और हम दिशा में एक विशेषज्ञ बने गए थे। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या गवर्नमेंट ने इस बात की पूरी छान-बीन कर ली है कि उनको पूरी डाक्टरों महायत्ना दी गई थी या नहीं? मैं इसलिए यह प्रश्न पूछ रहा हूँ कि श्री नेर्नामह नीकों ने

Mr. Speaker: How does it arise out of this question? It is only a simple correction of a statement that has been made. Unless that correction relates to somebody dying on the way, there is no meaning in asking a