

fore the House and I think the House will accept it.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Marking of Heavy Packages Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### Clause 2

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.  
Clause 1 —(Short title)

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** I beg to move:

Page 1, line 4,—

for "1960" substitute "1961". (2).

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

Page 1, line 4,—

for "1960" substitute "1961". (2).

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

#### Enacting Formula

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** I beg to move:

Page 1, line 1,—

for "Eleventh Year" substitute "Twelfth Year". (1).

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

Page 1, line 1,—

for "Eleventh Year" substitute "Twelfth Year". (1).

*The motion was adopted.*

*The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

*The Title was added to the Bill.*

**Shri Raj Bahadur:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

13.12 hrs.

#### DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (GENERAL)\*, 1958-59

**Mr. Chairman:** The House will now proceed to the discussion and voting on the Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1958-59.

#### DEMAND NO. 1—MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 2,23,716, be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Ministry of Commerce and Industry for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

#### DEMAND NO. 31—OPIUM

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 1,98,432, be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Opium for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

#### DEMAND NO. 37—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 3,34,105 be granted to the President to make good in excess of the grant in respect of 'Superannuation Allow-

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Mr. Chairman.]

ances and Pension for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 48—MEDICAL SERVICES**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 79,170, be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Medical Services for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 51—MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 2,66,056 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Ministry of Home Affairs for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 52—CABINET**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 39,193, be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Cabinet for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 60—HIMACHAL PRADESH**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 14,70,042 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Himachal Pradesh for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 69—MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 69,073 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Ministry of Irrigation and Power' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 99—DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 16,413 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Department of Atomic Energy' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 121—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 7,82,071 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Health' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**DEMAND No. 132—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CIVIL AVIATION**

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 7,52,019 be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959'."

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to make a few observations on the demands for excess grants. Firstly, I would like to have an explanation from the hon. Minister. Certain items by way of excess grants are being brought forward through the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee made in their 32nd report. The report was presented to this House in December, 1960. What are the reasons for the delay of four months in presenting these demands for excess grants? I am afraid the Finance Ministry is not working vigorously. The Ministry seems to work in a leisurely way. For instance, the other day, when there was a notification made sometime in February last was being laid on the Table of the House,—it was being

laid on the Table of the House sometime in April—I brought that aspect to the notice of the Speaker and asked as to how it was that there had been a delay of two months in laying the copy of the notification on the Table of the House. The Speaker was pleased to say that the Finance Minister should make a statement about the delay in laying it on the Table of the House. On several occasions, he had ruled that as soon as a notification was issued, a copy of it should be laid on the Table of the House. In spite of the Speaker's directions or instructions, the Finance Minister has not so far come out with a statement, explaining the reasons for the delay.

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat):** It has been sent to the Secretariat. I think it will come to the hon. Member also.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I would like to have a categorical assurance to the effect that these things will not be repeated. The Public Accounts Committee made a report which was presented to the House in December 1960. The hon. Minister should have come forward with the demands in February itself.

Then, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one aspect in regard to civil aviation. I am very glad that the Deputy Minister concerned is in the House so that he may help the Deputy Minister of Finance in giving an answer. The Public Accounts Committee, in their 32nd report which was presented to the House in December last, have questioned about certain expenditure connected with the Civil Aviation Department—Demand No. 132. The Committee asked as to why there was an expenditure to the tune of Rs. 7 lakhs and over as excess grant. The reason that was given by the Minister in charge of Civil Aviation was that certain works undertaken by the CPWD were accelerated. Were they not aware that the expenditure had to be incurred

because the work had to be accelerated? They could have easily come to the House and asked for a supplementary grant. Here is a sum of Rs. 7 lakhs odd which was spent in excess of what had been granted originally. What have they got to say for this? What the Public Accounts Committee had to say is very relevant in this connection. I hope that the Finance Ministry and the Minister of Transport and Communications will draw a lesson out of the observations made by the Public Accounts Committee. Let me quote from page 9 of their report where they say as follows:—

“The Committee are not convinced by this explanation. When the progress of the work has accelerated to achieve the target set out, the Ministry should have kept a closer watch over the payment for the works and provided for reasonable funds to avoid excesses. This is again a case of defective control over expenditure.”

Although there is a statutory provision in the Constitution, namely, article 115, under which excess demands for grants can be passed, these are meant only for very, very emergent cases and in very rare cases. But from year to year this has become the practice in this House to see the Ministries coming forward with excess grants and making demands for these excess grants. The present item relates to the grant of Rs. 7 lakhs. How can I grant this sum of Rs. 7 lakhs? There is nothing given in the note: what are the works, where are the works, to which works these sums appertain, etc. All these details are not given. Simply Rs. 7 lakhs is mentioned. Is this the fashion in which this House is to be asked to vote for a sum of Rs. 7 lakhs? I think the House deserves a better treatment from the Treasury Benches than what they are doing now.

Secondly, I come to the item regarding pensions and superannuations—

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

Demand No. 37. There, it is stated that the settlement of pension cases has been expedited. I am glad that they have expedited the payment of pensions. But still there are several cases pending with the Ministry for a settlement. I know some cases have been pending for more than a year. But what I would like to submit is that the forms that have to be filled and submitted by the dependents who are entitled for family pension and gratuity are very cumbersome. When a widow, for instance, has to apply for these benefits, she finds it very difficult to fill in the various forms. Some simple forms may be devised, and some method may be evolved so that these forms could be simplified.

Then I find a very interesting thing in these forms, in one of the footnotes. It is said that finger-prints have to be given in those forms. In the case of non-Indian who have been employed in India and when they go back, when they get a pension or the widows get pension, there is no question of finger-prints for them. I do not know why such an exemption should be made. Anyway, this is a discrimination. But I would like to know why these finger-prints are necessary at all. I am not a lawyer or an advocate. But I think that the calling for finger-prints on the forms is a little out-of-date. The need for finger-prints in these forms is a little out-of-date in my opinion. I do not know, but I would only request the hon. Minister to examine the suggestion of mine; if it is possible, I would like them to do away with the finger-prints in the application for pension or gratuity.

Then it is stated that certain demands are due to the fact that the railway freights have come into the picture. When the demands for excess grants for the railways come in, I would speak on it a little more exhaustively, and I do not want to say anything on that now.

Then, in Demand No. 32, I find that one Minister has drawn his salary for

the month of March in the same month. (*Interruptions*). I am sorry; it is demand No. 52. I am really confused when a responsible Minister draws his salary for the month of March in March itself. This is not done anywhere. I do not know why the Minister had gone out of pocket by Rs. 1,750. This is not permitted by the rules for gazetted or non-gazetted officers. They are not allowed to draw the salary for a month in that month itself. If at all, they are paid advance of salary which will be recovered in instalments. This is very strange that a Minister seems to violate the rules. I do not know what is provided for under the rules for salaries for Ministers and whether there is a rule for drawing pay for a month in that month itself. This is rather curious.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** Do you want that he should be dismissed?

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** It is said here "this amount could not be included through oversight". Is this the way in which accounts are maintained? Is this the way in which audit exercises its check? This does not do any credit to the functioning of the Finance Ministry.

Then, there is an item "tour expenses Rs. 29,214." This is also due to debit raised by railways. I would deal with this also when railway demands are taken up.

One more important item is about demand No. 60—Himachal Pradesh. Here is an excess grant of Rs. 14,70,000 asked for. A sum of Rs. 14.28 lakhs has been asked for payment of freight and hire charges to private transport owners. In Himachal Pradesh, as far as I know, both passenger and freight—the whole transport system—is nationalised. How is it that private transport authorities have been allowed to ply their services in that par-

ticular place, because the whole thing is nationalised? There seems to be something wrong with the working of the transport department in Himachal Pradesh. It is a funny department where a technical man is not the head of the transport department; there is a non-technical man who is the head. When an amount of Rs. 14.28 lakhs has been asked for, I should have liked a little more explanation. That is why I asked the Minister whether he was going to make a statement while moving this demand for the acceptance of the House, because from this note, we are not able to make out anything and we have to go through all the PAC reports in this short period. I would like to have an explanation regarding this.

These are the few observations I have to make on these demands for excess grants.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** Sir, I think most of the observations made by the hon. Member over there are out of all proportion to the excess demands for grants which have been put forward by the Finance Ministry. In most cases, the excess is only to extent of 1 per cent. and in a few cases it is to the extent of 2 per cent. I think in a budgeting of this kind, such small excesses should not be made a subject of such eloquent observations as the hon. Member has made.

But there is one thing. After going through this book, I have come to one conclusion that no adequate justification has been given for putting forward these demands. For instance, here is demand No. 132. It is said here that:

"The expenditure during the last few months of the year, however, exceeded anticipation mainly on account of (a) accelerated progress of works, (b) execution of emergent works, (c) increase in the scope of projects and (d) unanticipated adjustment of the cost of materials."

You will agree with me that these generalisations can apply to any Ministry in the Government of India. The hon. Finance Minister should have told us for instance, what is the accelerated progress of works which he is referring to. Something concrete and specific should have been stated, but that has not been done. Then "execution of emergent works" What are those emergent works? How are we to know what they are? Then, "increase in the scope of projects". What are those projects? We are being asked to vote for this excess grant to the tune of Rs. 7 lakhs without being told what we are doing. This is like asking us to vote for these demands in a manner which I can describe as "blindly". I think more details should have been given than what have been provided by the Ministry.

I come to demand No. 60. Himachal Pradesh is one of the Union territories. Our Ministry of Finance is responsible for whatever is happening there. We foot the bill there and we have to finance the execution of the projects there. But I cannot understand what kind of budgeting it is that the actual expenditure is only about Rs. 4 crores and the excess is about Rs. 14 lakhs. Rs. 14 lakhs in terms of the financing of the Government of India is nothing; it is true because the Government of India deals with crores. But the tax-payer has to think in terms of every naya paisa every rupee, hundreds of rupees and thousands of rupees. Here he has been asked to vote for an excess grant of Rs. 14,70,042.

**An Hon. Member:** No naya paisa?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** What is that grant meant for? It says:

"Payment at the close of the year for the cost of fodder and concentrates required for animals in the first two months of the following year."

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

We are asked to dole out this money of Rs. 14 lakhs for fodder and concentrates required for animals and adjustment of unanticipated debits relating to the cost of sheep-shearing machines. I do not know what kind of machines they are which require so much money. Then, we are told that this money will be required, among other things, for purchase of bulls. What kind of bulls are they? Then, it is said here:

"Construction of Sheep Breeding Farm at Chamba".

All these things are there. I think they are very desirable things, and they should be provided for. But I do not understand why so much money should be asked for. It is said here:

"The receipts realised on account of hired private vehicles are credited to the receipt head and payments made to the owners of the vehicles on account of hire charges are treated as working expenses."

Here is the transport business, and in that transport business also we are being asked to shell out such a large sum of money. What I say is, in a Grant of this kind we should be given more details, and it should be justified why Rs. 14 lakhs are required by way of Excess Grants.

Then I come to Demand No. 58. This is very important. The excess was due to adjustment of arrear debits towards the close of the year and restoration in the later part of the year of a portion of the privy purse of a Ruler which was withheld temporarily in the earlier part of the year. Mr. Chairman, we would have been very much interested in knowing who this great Ruler was whose privy purse was withheld temporarily.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak):** And why it was withheld.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** In the first place, we should have been told why it was withheld and, in the second place, we should have been told why

it has been restored. This is something abnormal, and we should have been given all reasons for that. That has not been done. We are only told about some mythical prince....

**Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir):** We do not know whether he is alive or not.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** We are only told about a mythical privy purse. We are only told about the actual grant of the privy purse after six months. Why it has been done, we do not know. I agree with Shri Vittal Rao in one thing. He was talking about the pensions. I am sorry the Home Minister is not here.

**An Hon. Member:** The Deputy Minister is here.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Only the Deputy Minister in charge of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is here.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):** There are many Tribals in Himachal Pradesh.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am sorry the hon. Home Minister is not here. Even the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs is not here. Why I want them to be here is this. I have been putting so many questions, all of us have been putting so many questions about pensions. Have the pensions been finalised? No. I think so many years have passed and some of these pensioners are being given only *ex gratia* payments or *ad hoc* payments.

**Shri Warrior:** Provisional payments.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Their pensions have not been finalised. What is the jungle of rules about which so much time is being taken to be cleared? I cannot understand. About 14 years have passed and still we have not been able to finalise the rules for these pensions. We have not been given any justifiable reasons for this also. I may tell you, Sir, that now they have formed themselves into an association.

**Ch. Ranbir Singh:** Who has formed?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** People form associations. For instance, there may be an association of cattle breeders of which the hon. Member may be...

**An Hon. Member:** Cattle lifters.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am talking about the association of pensioners. Why have they formed themselves into an association? It is because they are not paid their pensions. It is up to the Home Ministry to tell us why they are delaying the finalisation of these rules, and why they are not coming forward to make the payment of pensions which are due to these people.

I hope, Sir, that in future it would be seen that whenever such Demands for Excess Grants are brought before the House we are told something specific about all these things. Unless that is done, I think these Grants do not acquire any kind of reality. That is why I request the hon. Minister to do it.

**Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Puri):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I only want to refer to Demand No. 58 relating to privy purse and allowances to Indian rulers. Though it is a charged item and we are not going to vote on it, I think we can discuss it in this House. It has been stated that an appropriation of more than Rs. 5,42,18,000 was first made and then the actual expenditure went up to Rs. 5,43,48,778. The hon. Member, Shri Sharma has also referred to this matter. Recently, Sir, one of the hon. Members belonging to Ganatantra Parishad—a prominent Member—Shri Mahanty who has now left Ganatantra Parishad, met the Prime Minister and it appeared in the newspapers that the Prime Minister is reported to have told him that the Government has really become too much generous to these ex-rulers so far as payment of privy and allowances to the ex-rulers and their relations is concerned.

Sir, I would like to know what is the actual position. We find that the Government sometimes take a decision to withhold the payment of privy purse to a particular ruler because the Government is not satisfied with the behaviour of that ruler. Recently there was a case. So far as Bastar is concerned, the Maharaja of Bastar always used to support the Madhya Pradesh Government. So long as he was supporting the Congress Government there, there was no remark against him and he was a good boy. But the moment he went against the Government, particularly the Madhya Pradesh Government, there were charges of all kinds against him. It was said that he was a maniac and it was good that he was deposed. There the ruler was deposed and immediately after another man, his own younger brother, was made the Maharaja. Was it very necessary can't the government do without Maharaja? Sir, either the Government is not very much serious on this matter, or it thinks that whenever it suits the convenience of the Government it can utilise this provision and depose a ruler when it so likes and install another ruler if it so likes. Therefore, at least the House must know—because the Government has been given this latitude—whether the Prime Minister or the Government of this country is going to utilise this latitude to the advantage of the ruling party of this country.

Sir, the people of India are paying more than Rs. 6 crores every year on this account. I am told that this is a charged item under the Constitution. But the people of Orissa are also paying towards this privy purse, and it is not being paid directly by the Government of India. The State Governments are paying because the Government of India stands guarantee under the Constitution for the payment of privy purses. The State Governments are actually paying these amounts to the rulers. Therefore for all times to come the principle must be finally settled, if the government

[Shri Chintamoni Panigrahi]

are really serious about the conduct of ex-rulers in this country, then, at least stop it.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Sir, can this be raised on Excess Grants?

**Shri Chintamoni Panigrahi:** Why not? I told in the beginning that we were not going to vote on it. But we can discuss it.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** The House has granted that amount. The appropriation was accepted by the House. Only because of some un-anticipated adjustments if there is some excess, I do not think it is proper to discuss it.

**Shri Warrior:** There is something said about withholding and again restoring it.

**Shri Chintamoni Panigrahi:** You withheld it from a ruler. What for? Did you tell the House about it? We do not know why you withheld it. Now you are coming with your Demand for Excess Grant. What for? Is it because it suited your whim that you withheld it then and now you are restoring it because it suits you again? Therefore, we are perfectly right in questioning you. I hope the hon. Deputy Minister will give us a satisfactory answer.

The Prime Minister feels concerned about this matter. It was reported in the papers, as I said, that the Prime Minister is very serious about this and he is thinking whether some steps should be taken for having taxes on the privy purses and allowances of the rulers. We do not know whether he is going to take some drastic measures against the conduct of ex-rulers in this country. If the Government is really serious, then we must at least know what it is up to and how it is going to act. If not, we will have to come to the conclusion that Government has two voices and two different standards, so far as the rulers are concerned. It has got its own favourite rulers on whom it bestows all the privileges. But if

the rulers go against the Government. It deposes them and takes action against them. I say this is wrong in principle. It must be finally settled for all times to come here and now. The people of India are not going to pay indefinitely these privy purses to the ex-rulers who are not behaving in a way which is really appropriate and befitting them, so far as the changing conditions in India at the present time are concerned.

**श्री ह० प्र० सिंह (गाजीपुर) :** सभापति जी, मैं बिनाइ संख्या ३१ के बारे में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्रोपियम के सम्बन्ध में काफी खर्च बढ़ा है, जिसका कारण यह है कि रेलवे यातायात में बहुत ज्यादा खर्च होता है। गाजीपुर में प्रोपियम का सबसे बड़ा कारखाना है। देश के अन्य भागों से लगभग तीन, चार करोड़ रुपये का माल गाजीपुर आता जाता है और करीब-करीब चार, छः करोड़ का माल गाजीपुर से विदेशों में जाता है। आज स्थिति यह है कि गाजीपुर से बनारस मीटरगेज रेलवे लाइन ४६ मील है और बनारस से आगे ब्रिडगेज रेलवे लाइन है। वहाँ स्टेशन पर बारह महीने गाड़ रखना पड़ता है और माल को डिब्बों में इधर उधर उलट-पुलट करने में बहुत नुकसान हो जाता है जिसकी काफी सुरक्षा करनी पड़ती है। इस प्रकार बाहर के देशों और हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे भागों में जो अफोम भेजी जाती है, उसका खर्च बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ जाता है। इसलिये मैं इस सम्बन्ध में सब से अच्छा तरीका आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। गाजीपुर में गंगा नदी के एक किनारे पर अफोम की फैक्ट्री है और दूसरे किनारे पर ब्रिडगेज रेलवे स्टेशन टारीघाट है। अगर गंगा पर ब्रिज बना कर टारीघाट को अफोम की फैक्ट्री से कनेक्ट कर दिया जाये, तो बड़ी आसानी से और बिना किसी परेशानी के यह समस्या हल हो सकती है और खर्च में बहुत कमी हो सकती है। यह ठीक है कि एक दूसरा ठो खर्च ज्यादा



करना पड़ेगा, लेकिन प्रोन दि होल यह खर्च बहुत कम हो जायगा ।

सरकार अफ्रीम की खेती को उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ा रही है, लेकिन गाजीपुर या उसके करीब के जिलों में किसानों को इस के लाइसेंस काफ़ी मात्रा में नहीं दिये गये हैं । पहले तो वे दिये ही नहीं जाते थे । इस साल उनको देना शुरू किया गया है, लेकिन वे भी गाजीपुर के चन्द हिस्सों में दिये गये हैं । दूसरे करीब के जिलों में लाइसेंस बिल्कुल नहीं दिये गये हैं मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जंगल पर इतना बड़ा कारखाना काम कर रहा हो जहाँ से चार छः करोड़ का माल बाहर भेजा जाता है और राजस्थान, मध्य प्रदेश आदि से अफ्रीम मंगा कर बाहर भेजा जाता हो जबकि उन इलाके में ही किसान अतीम अधिक से अधिक पैदा कर सकते हैं, तो वहाँ के किसानों को ही लाइसेंस बढ़ाने चाहिए जिसमें अफ्रीम का उत्पादन भी काफ़ी मात्रा में बढ़ा जा सके । इसके अतिरिक्त किसानों को अफ्रीम के दाम कम मिलते हैं, जबकि सरकार बाहर उसका काफ़ी पैसा वसूल करती है । इस तरफ भी ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है ।

गाजीपुर में जो प्रोपियम फँट्टे है, वहाँ माल का काफ़ी नुकसान होता है और चोरी भी होती है । उस तरफ सरकार का ध्यान बिल्कुल नहीं गया है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रोपियम बहुत महंगा सौदा है, इसलिए इस तरफ भी थोड़ा ध्यान देना चाहिए, ताकि जो नुकसान हो रहा है, उसको बचाया जा सके ताकि सरकार को आमदनी बढ़े ।

मैंने जो सुझाव दिये हैं कि प्रोपियम पर निगरानी बहुत अच्छी तरह होनी चाहिए और बिज बना कर रेल के खर्च हो कम किया जाना चाहिए, आशा है कि सरकार उन पर विचार करेगी ।

**Shri Warior:** I want to make some observations on Demand No. 58. The

hon. Deputy Minister was fighting shy and pointed out that this is a charged item. We know that under article 113 of the Constitution there cannot be any voting on this item as it is a charged one. But he should not fight shy of facing this issue. I know this is a very ticklish and sensitive point.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The ruling party is very touchy about it.

**Shri Warior:** There have been some developments recently which we want to bring to the notice of the House. Political parties are wooing the ex-rulers and now some of the ex-rulers are ready to shed their privileges. But, even then, certain quarters are not willing to take it that way. We do not know how or why, but there is open wooing of these princes to come into the political field.

Why was privy purse given to these rulers? There was a principle underlying that. The rulers were keeping aloof from the ordinary people, the common masses. They were considered as privileged people belonging to the aristocracy, unapproachable by others. They were in the upper strata of society, as distinct from the lower strata of the common people, unapproachable by the common masses. So, they had to maintain some dignity, some status and some paraphernalia, which will cost them some money. The privy purse was given to them to meet that expenditure. As they are not ordinary people, the rights which are enjoyed by the common people should not be extended to them. If they want the privy purses, they must keep themselves aloof. They cannot, on one side, ask for the continuance of the privy purse and, on the other, ask for the rights and facilities which are enjoyed by the common people, as the two cannot be reconciled. Either they must become ordinary common citizens of this country, leaving all the privileges, and fight the battles

[Shri Warrior]

of life in political, social and economic fields or they must remain where they are, satisfied with what they are getting as privy purses. In that case, we will not have any trouble from them.

The question of Bastar was raised. There are people in certain quarters in our political life who are wooing the princes and the princelings to come into their fold.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Swatantra party.

**Shri Warrior:** Yes. Swatantra party I did not mention Congress, because they are also a privileged party now. So, naturally, privileged party can approach privileged people. But now even new parties are approaching these privileged people. Then, what will be the position? The result will be that the free vote of the ordinary citizen will be jeopardised and will be in peril. If the privileged people are going to become unprivileged people and some princelings become privileged by means of privy purse or some other means, our democracy will be in jeopardy, the rights and interests of the ordinary common people will be harmed and, in course of time, there will be plutocracy and not democracy. Hence, this is a fit occasion when such demands must be discussed to make the party in power adopt a firm policy by taking certain steps. Of course, we cannot vote this down; we can only appeal to their good sense, their democratic sense in the name of our constituencies and in the name of the future of our country. We can only appeal to them that since we had so many experiences, bitter experiences, with these princes and princelings, it is time we thought, or applied our mind to the question, whether the privy purses should be continued and they should be kept aloof from the common people or their privy purses should be discontinued and the ex-rulers should become

people fighting the battles of life just like any other citizen of this land.

**श्री चौ० रणबीर सिंह :** सभापति महोदय, हमारे बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ा चढ़ा कर बातें कही हैं और बहुत बढ़ा चढ़ा कर टीका-टिप्पणी की है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि १४१ ग्रांट्स हैं और उन १४१ ग्रांट्स में से सिर्फ १५ ग्रांट्स में ही मंजूर शुदा रकम से कुछ फालतू रुपया खर्च हुआ और वह भी शायद ५० लाख से नीचे चि है, ४४.१२ है। आमतौर पर आप जानते हैं कि हमारे यहां जो खाता रखा जाता है, उसमें कौड़ से कम की गिनती कम ही होती है और इसका कारण यह है कि हजारों कौड़ रुपया साल में खर्च करने की यह सदन मंजूरी देता है और एडमिनिरट्रेशन अपने काम को चलाने के लिए खर्च करता है और हजारों करोड़ पये में एक आध करोड़ की गिनती नहीं ले सकती है। बड़ी-बड़ी और नई-नई योजना चालू करने के लिए या जो पहले से चली आ रही हैं, उनको पूरा करने के लिए इस रुपे का स्तेमाल होता है।

मेरे माननीय दोस्तों ने गिला बिया है कि ये प्रिवी पर्स क्यों दिये गये हैं या यह रकम पहले क्यों दी गयी थी। अगर उन्होंने यह बताया होता कि यह जो पया रोका गया है, यह किसी सियासी कुत्तेनिगाह से रोका गया है और इसी वजह से पेमेंट में देरी की गई है या कांग्रेस पार्टी ने एडमिनिरट्रेशन के जरिरे इसको रुकवाया और राजा महाराजाओं को कांग्रेस पार्टी में शामिल करने के लिये ऐसा किया गया है, तो उनकी बात और उनकी टीका-टिप्पणी समझ में आ सकती थी। लेकिन उनको पना नहीं है कि किसी राजा का जो प्रिवी पर्स रोका गया था, वह क्यों रोका गया था। मैं मानता हूँ कि इसके अन्दर कुछ हद तक जिम्मेदारी मंत्रालय की भी है। अगर मंत्रालय पूरी तरह से इस के कारण बिस्तार से लि देता और इस तरफ ध्यान देता तो शायद जो टीका-टिप्पणी

हुई है और बेवक्त हुई है, वह बेवक्त की टीका-टिप्पणी न हुई होती। लेकिन जहां तक प्रिवी पर्स का ताल्लुक है और राजाओं को उनके दिये जाने का ताल्लुक है, मेरे भाई भल जाते हैं कि क्या वजह थी कि उनको प्रिवी पर्स दिये गये थे। इस बिना पर नहीं दिये गये थे कि वे इलैकशन में हिस्सा न लें। वे इलैकशन में हिस्सा ले सकते हैं। इस प्रश्न पर जब विधान बन रहा था विचार हुआ था कि इलैकशन में वे हिस्सा लें या न लें, इसकी उनको इजाजत हो या न हो। उस वक्त हमने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का जो विधान है, या जो उनका तरीका है, उसको कबूल नहीं किया। यह कम्युनिस्ट देशों का तरीका है कि लाखों की तादाद में जिन भाइयों को वे वैंस्टड इंटिरेस्ट का नुमाइंदा मानते हैं, राय देने से वंचित कर देते हैं। इस देश में हमने इस तरीके को कबूल नहीं किया और महात्मा गांधी जी के बताये हुए तरीके को कबूल किया। उनका कहना था कि बुराई से हमें बँर है, इंसान से बँर नहीं है।

आप जानते हैं कि चीन में तीस साल तक गृहयुद्ध चलता रहा है। वे किसी विदेशी राज से नहीं लड़े बल्कि आपस में ही लड़े हैं और इसमें देश की तबाही हुई है, बरबादी हुई है। तीस साल के बाद कुछ थोड़ा बहुत फँसला हुआ है और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वालों के हाथ में शासन की बागडोर आई है। करोड़ों रुपया उस देश का इस गृहयुद्ध में खर्च हुआ होगा। आज भी आप देखें तो पता चलेगा कि कांगो के अन्दर लड़ाई और भेदभाव चल रहा है। जिन लोगों को प्रिवी पर्स देना विधान में मंजूर किया गया है उनके पास अपनी फौजें थीं, हथियार थे और वे इस देश में खानाजंगी करा सकते थे। उनके साथ सरकार ने वायदा किया था प्रिवी पर्स देने का और यह शरीफ आदमी का काम नहीं है कि वायदा करके उससे वह मुकर जाये। शरीफ आदमी का काम होता है कि वक्त गुजर जाने

के बाद भी जो वायदा दिया गया है, उसको निभाये और अगर कोई बुरा वक्त भी आ जाता है तो उसमें भी अपने वायदे को न भूल जाये और अपने वायदे को निभाने की कोशिश करे। उन लोगों ने शान्ति से, अमन से अपने राज को इस देश के नुमाइंदों के हाथ में दे दिया और इस देश का एक नया नक्शा बनाने में हम लोगों की मदद की। उनके इस काम के लिए इनाम के तौर पर या मुआवजे के तौर पर ये प्रिवी पर्स दिये गये हैं। अगर कोई भाई समझते हैं कि ये इसलिए दिये गये हैं कि वे इलैकशन में न खड़े हों तो वे गलतफहमी में हैं। अगर यह बताने की और इसको साबित करने की कोशिश की जाती कि जो रुपया किसी प्रिस का रोका गया था वह इसलिये रोका गया था कि उसके अन्दर कोई सियासत छिपी हुई थी या किसी प्रिस को किसी पार्टी के साथ लगाना या उसके खिलाफ करना था तो टीका-टिप्पणी को मैं समझ सकता था और वह टीका-टिप्पणी वक्त के मुताबिक होती। लेकिन ऐसा कोई सबूत नहीं दिया गया है। इस वास्ते यह टीका-टिप्पणी मेरी समझ में नहीं आई है।

अभी मेरे मानयोग साथी श्री दी० चं० शर्मा जी ने जो अब चले गये हैं पैशनर्ज की हमदर्दी में एक बात कही। वह इस बात को भूल गये कि हमदर्दी करते करते कहीं उनके खिलाफ तो वह नहीं बोल रहे हैं। पैशन का जो रुपया ज्यादा दिया गया है, उसके अन्दर यह लिखा है कि यह सरकार के खयाल के मुताबिक एंटीसिपेटिड नहीं था, उसके अंदाज में यह नहीं था और उसको नहीं पता था कि यह देना पड़ेगा। पैशनर्ज के साथ हमदर्दी के बाबजूद सरकार को इस बात का पता नहीं था, हिसाब-किताब के मुताबिक इसका अंदाजा नहीं था कि उन लोगों को उसे इतना रुपया पैशन के तौर पर और देना पड़ेगा। उनके साथ हमदर्दी के तौर पर यह सब कुछ किया गया है। हमारे भाई इस बात को नहीं समझते हैं कि सरकार ने उनकी तक़ीफ को समझा है और

[श्री० रणवीर सिंह]

उसको समझ करके जितना रुपया ज्यादा देना पड़ा है, देने की कोशिश की है . . .

श्री त० ब० विट्टल राव : क्या इसके लिए सप्लीमेंटरी डिमांड नहीं लाई जा सकती थी ?

श्री० रणवीर सिंह : वह भी लाई जा सकती थी। लेकिन अगर मेरे लायक दोस्त का यह मुद्दा दू कि किसी के साथ ज्यादाती की गई है या किसी के साथ कोई रियायत की गई है, तो मैं उनकी बात को समझ सकता था। वरना सप्लीमेंटरी डिमांड के तौर पर या बजट के अन्दर या फिर ए सेस ग्रांट के तौर पर इसको कर दिया गया है, तो इसमें एतराज की कौन सी बात है। यह तो एक तरीका है हिसाब किताब रखने का। हम लोग इतने ज्यादा पेंचों के अन्दर फंस जायें कि एक हजार करोड़ रुपया जो हम खर्च करते हैं, उसकी तरफ तो ध्यान न दें और इस ४४ लाख रुपये की जो एक्सेस ग्रांट्स हैं, उनके बारे में टीका टिप्पणी करते जायें या उसके बारे में अपनी बुद्धिमत्ता दिखाते जायें, तो यह कोई ज्यादा समझ की बात नहीं हो सकती है। मैं तो यह चाहता हूँ कि एक भी पैसा मंजूरशुदा पैसे से ज्यादा खर्च न किया जाये। अगर ऐसा हो सके तो यह स्वागत योग्य बात होगी। लेकिन देश बन रहा है, तरक्की कर रहा है और आप जानते हैं कि इस सदन ने मंजूर किया है भाखड़ा नंगल के मामले में, कि सरकार १४० करोड़ के बजाय १७० करोड़ रुपया खर्च कर सकता है और यह एक अच्छी बात है। जितने भी ये छोटे बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, इनके मुतालिक कौन कह सकता है कि जो भंडाबा है उससे ज्यादा खर्च नहीं होगा या कौन नाप तौल से पैसा खर्च कर सकता है। हमारी एक कमेटी ने सिफारिश भी की है कि जहां तक डिबेलपमेंट प्रोजेक्ट्स के बजट्स का ताल्लुक है, वह एक कंट्रोल प्रस होना चाहिये, उसके अन्दर यह पाबन्दो नहीं होनी चाहिये कि ३१ मार्च तक इतना ही रुपया खर्च हो। जहां पर आतानी से और

ठीक तरीके से रुपया खर्च हो सकता है, ज्यादा रुपया खर्च हो सकता है, और वह किया जाता है वह बड़ी खुशी की बात है। अगर डिबेलपमेंट के कामों पर रुपया ज्यादा खर्च होता है या जल्दी खर्च होता है, तो हमें अफसोस नहीं होना चाहिये क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि जितनी जल्दी कोई प्रोजेक्ट पूरा होगा, उतनी जल्दी ही देश को फायदा पहुंचना शुरू हो जायेगा और इसके लिए हमें अफसोस नहीं करना चाहिये।

The Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation (Shri Mohiuddin): Sir, Shri Vittal Rao and Shri Sharma have criticised the excess grant worth about Rs. 7,52,00,000. I may just say a few words about this criticism.

A Minister sometimes or usually salls, according to the old saying, between Scylla and Charybdis. I think he is usefully criticised for delays in the construction of different aerodromes or projects. There are a number of questions in this House and in the other House as to why there is such a delay in the construction of such-and-such aerodromes or such-and-such place. When the Ministry accelerates the construction and unfortunately it happens that the amount that has to be paid at the end of the year is in excess of the voted grant, there is criticism that the Minister is not watchful and that he does not see as to how much expenditure is incurred from day to day so that it does not exceed at the end of March the amount that was voted for that particular item.

The provision made during 1958-59 for construction works in connection with aviation was Rs. 3,23,67,000. This was the voted grant. The expenditure incurred, as we found out later on, was Rs. 3,31,19,019 which shows an excess of Rs 7,52,000 and odd. Shri Sharma criticised us by saying that the notes for the excess grant do not show as to what the facts were.

Usually, these notes that are circulated to hon. Members are not burdened with details. That is why, I suppose, all these details were omitted from the notes that were circulated to hon. Members.

14 hrs.

I am mentioning a few items in which there was an excess over the budgeted amount as these details have not been given. For example, for the runway at Dum Dum only a sum of Rs. 15,000 had been provided, but the actual expenditure that was incurred there was Rs. 4,11,380. This expenditure had to be incurred because we had to accelerate construction of the runway on account of the coming Boeing services. Similarly, there was an excess with regard to the Lucknow runway; a second runway had to be constructed there. The other items relate to Kumbigram, Agartala, Ahmedabad, and the glider dome at Poona. All these were items which were undertaken and which had to be completed and which had to be accelerated for one reason or the other. The ultimate effect of it was that there was an excess expenditure over the voted amount of Rs. 7,52,000. I hope these explanations are satisfactory and that the grants will be voted.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Will they satisfy the public?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** The hon. Member who initiated the debate took a misconceived view of the functioning of the Finance Ministry on one or two very minor items and came to the conclusion that the Ministry is not functioning properly. I think as a very serious student of public affairs that he is, he himself would see the fallacy of his logic and the fact that the general conclusion that he has drawn is not substantiated by any facts, leave aside one or two minor facts.

He referred to one earlier item unconnected with this, namely about the 479(Ai) LS—6.

notification in regard to the Industrial Finance Corporation. I had promised to the House to get the facts and lay the same on the Table of the House. I have collected the facts and sent a statement to the Lok Sabha Secretariat for being laid on the Table of the House, as also a copy to be sent to the hon. Member.

So far as the question of delay in this case is concerned, the hon. Member said that the Public Accounts Committee considered this matter in its Thirty-second report and submitted its recommendation in December 1960 and asked why it is that the Finance Ministry is coming after so many months before the House. He did so without knowing the facts and knowing what are the procedures in this which the Finance Ministry has to go through.

I have made enquiries in this respect. The position is that in the very first week of January we wrote to the Department of Parliamentary Affairs, which is in charge of conducting the consultation with the Business Advisory Committee, that this matter should be taken up in the next session of Parliament for regularisation. In preparing this we have to prepare the notes, foot-notes and all these things, and we are trying to make it increasingly fuller and fuller; we have to send them to various Ministries for comments and factual verification. With these things we try to come to the House as early as possible. The Department of Parliamentary Affairs, and certainly it must be with the knowledge of the Business Advisory Committee, had fixed that it should be taken up at the end of the session. It was fixed for the 25th April. But because the House was occupied with so many things, it could not be taken up on the 25th April, and it has been taken up now. So it is a matter of arrangement of the business of the House and there is no question of any lapse on the part of the Finance Ministry. It could as well have been taken up earlier if the House had had time or

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

if the Business Advisory Committee had so decided. To say on the basis of facts which are absolutely wrong that the Finance Ministry unnecessarily caused delay and is not functioning properly, is not correct. The facts being what they are, I think the hon. Member will grant that his conclusions are not correct.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** This issue was never brought before the Business Advisory Committee at any time.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I do not know. But it is a question of the procedure concerning Parliament. We were ready and we notified. It is not as if we were not ready and that we wanted to delay it. Because, once the matter goes to the Public Accounts Committee, it scrutinises it. The hon. Member said that it reprimanded or passed strictures with respect to certain things. I shall explain that matter presently. The matter was examined by the Public Accounts Committee. So the Finance Ministry or any other Ministry has no purpose in keeping it out from the House. It was only mere regularisation of the procedure that had to be done. And it can be done only according to the time or the convenience of the House as fixed by the Business Advisory Committee. My only point is that there is no motive or effort on the part of the Finance Ministry to delay it. In the circumstances it is uncharitable to charge the Ministry that it is inefficient, incompetent, etc. because of this delay. As a matter of fact, it has no purpose or motive in delaying it. That is my point.

The hon. Member said that these excesses occurred and it shows a very sad state of affairs. If I may, again, inform the hon. Member of the facts—he explained them, but I would like to explain them further—out of a total number of 141 grants and appropriations pertaining to 1958-59, excesses occurred in 15 cases only,

the total amount of excess being Rs. 44.12 lakhs only as against the final grants and appropriations amounting to Rs. 7286 crores for that year. What is the percentage? The percentage is infinitesimally low: it is 0.006 per cent only. If you see the corresponding percentage in 1957-58, that is one year earlier, that was also low. But the 1958-59 figure is several times lower. While the 1957-58 percentage was 0.07 per cent, the 1958-59 figure was 0.006 per cent, that is, at least one-tenth lower. Because of the fact that some excesses, very minor ones, were infinitesimally low in certain aspects, to say that it represents a very sad state of affairs is not correct. I do not see how that conclusion can be drawn.

But I would say that excesses occurred. That is the point. And it has been said again and again that in the present system of our exchequer control, where there is no complete separation of audit and accounts, where the indenting and supplying authorities are different, payments are being made; all payments are not made by cheque in which case when the total ceiling is reached automatically the payment could be stopped. There is still prevalence of inter-departmental adjustments after the year is over. So long as this system prevails and unless we are able to completely separate audit and accounts, unless we eliminate all inter-departmental adjustments and took adjustments later and all payments are made by cheque and the indenting and supply authority are not different we cannot prevent excesses. Then alone we can say there will be no excesses. And excess occurs because the paying authority does not know at a particular time that it has made excess payment—because everybody is terribly afraid and nobody wants to make excess payments—but they do not know it, and these things are revealed only afterwards. As I said, it is inherent in the system. Although we are trying to streamline it, all of

us. that is the Comptroller and Auditor-General, the Finance Ministry and all other Ministries and Departments concerned, are trying to eliminate these things, we have been able to eliminate them to the extent of making the excess so low, namely 0.006 per cent. The point is how low it can be. But, it cannot be totally eliminated. That is what I would appeal to the House to understand; in the system itself, it cannot be totally eliminated, because if you make the payment and the other person controls the purse, then you can make excess payment, because the other man will not know that he is making more payment than what he is allowed to do. This is what is called inter-departmental adjustment or book adjustment. Unless there is complete separation of audit from accounts, it is not possible to eliminate it. This separation was tried in certain departments, but somehow or the other, the Comptroller and Auditor-General and others are of the view that in the present stage, it cannot be done completely. So, with the system that prevails, we, on our part, are trying to eliminate it or minimise it or limit it to the lowest possible percentage and we have done it. Instead of credit being given to the Finance Ministry, the charge is being laid at our doors that we are inefficient, incompetent and so on. I think this charge cannot be laid at our doors.

Then, my hon. friend referred to the cases of pension. It is true that all pension cases are human cases, and hard cases. I myself have come across certain cases in which the pensions could not be paid for several years. Whatever may be the reasons for that, the human aspect is so important that whatever difficulties are there have to be eliminated, because it is very hard that a person who has put in thirty years of service or more should be in the wilderness and he should not get his pension for several years. So, we went into the question and we had long consulta-

tions with the Comptroller and Auditor-General, and we have tried to streamline the rules. We want to streamline them further; we have expedited it and we are trying to do as much as possible. Actually, the position is much better now, not that there is no cases at all. Whatever it may be, we are trying to expedite it. But there are certain difficulties, because there is the question of identification, the question of the claims to be made by the pensioners, and their settlement and so on; all these questions require reference to back records, and, therefore, it takes some time.

The hon. Member said that there should be no finger-prints taken. We are not very keen on that, namely that the finger-print should be there, but there must be some identification, and the finger-print being the only source, we have it; if some other way could be found out for complete identification, we could have it, but the point is that correct identification should be there. We have the finger-prints only because they constitute an easy method of having some identification.

Then, my hon. friend referred to certain comments of the Public Accounts Committee. We have given due respect and consideration to the recommendations of the august bodies like the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee.

Particularly, we considered very carefully the charge of loose budgeting that the committee had referred to in respect of certain items. Under the existing procedure, the expenditure is not incurred directly by the identifying department concerned but is initially incurred by the supplying ministry and reimbursements are made either by the former to the latter in cash or by book adjustments. And in this system, sometimes, there is an excess. Similarly, in para 6 of their report, the committee mentioned about

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

the excesses due to loose budgeting and non-preparation of revised estimates on firm data. To secure effective control over expenditure and better standard of budgeting, the committee has stressed the need for regular monthly review of expenditure, timely reconciliation of the departmental expenditure figures with the accounts figures and up-to-date maintenance of liability registers and other ancillary records. Necessary instructions in this regard have been issued to the Ministries, and I hope that the matters will be set right in future.

Then, the committee has also said something about the question of budgeting and financial control. This was thoroughly examined in connection with the proposals made by the Comptroller and Auditor-General, in the Appendix to the Civil Audit Report, 1955. The Department of Expenditure have issued instructions in regard to the revised arrangement for budgeting. It is hoped that the position would show a further improvement in future. The impact of these instructions can only be known in the accounts of the years subsequent to the period referred to in the report. So, every effort is being made to ensure that such excesses are reduced to the minimum. It may at the same time be mentioned that so long as a complete system of exchequer control is not introduced, and a ban is not imposed on book adjustments in respect of inter-departmental transfers etc. after the close of the year, excesses over the grants approved by Parliament cannot altogether be avoided. I want to draw the pointed attention of the hon. Member to this. In the case of Departments where separation of audit and accounting functions has been brought about, such excesses would not occur, as the Pay and Accounts Officers are not authorised to make payments unless these are covered by budget provisions or advances from the Contingency Fund.

In para 2 of the report, the Public Accounts Committee have once again deprecated the tendency of delay on the part of the Ministries in the submission of their notes on excesses to them. In order that the report on the examination of excesses may be submitted to Parliament at the earliest, the Committee have desired that the notes should be sent to them within the prescribed time-limit. Instructions have been issued to all Ministries to keep a careful watch on the progress of action taken for the preparation of the notes to be submitted to the Public Accounts Committee and to ensure that explanations are submitted within the prescribe period of eight weeks. These instructions are again being brought to the notice of the Ministries for compliance. In future, I have no doubt that it would be strictly followed.

With these words, I would commend these Demands for the acceptance of the House.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** May I just ask for one clarification? In regard to the finger-print, the hon. Minister said

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** There is one more point that I have to deal with.

About the Ruler,—although I still feel that the question of privy purses and the political aspects of it need not be raised on this occasion, because the House had other occasions to discuss them—I would like to mention that Shri Chintamani Panigrahi raised the question whether Government had any right, or whether it was on the whims of Government, to withhold payments to the Ruler first and later on give them to him. And he asked 'What is this? This indicates that there is some sort of whimsical action on the part of Government.'. The fact is that this relates to a minor Ruler in Manipur for which territory an Administrator was appointed by Government. I think the privy purse allowed to the Ruler was about



Rs. 2:54 lakhs or something like that. Having an estimate of the expenditure of the Ruler, the Administrator drew at first only Rs. 1.80 lakhs or thereabouts. So, it is not as if the amount was withheld in the sense that the amount was not allowed to the Ruler. The Administrator thought that this was the expenditure, but, later on, he found that some more money was needed for the Ruler. So, he drew more. But, by that time, there was no provision in the Budget, nor could supplementary grants be taken, because it was quite late. So, excess expenditure was incurred. So, it was not because of any whims, but because the Administrator drew a lower amount having regard to the estimate, that this discrepancy occurred.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** May I just ask for one clarification? When a widow of an employee claims pension, she has to put the finger-prints of all her five fingers. Instead of asking for finger-prints, why can the photo not be asked for? The photo of the claimant can be asked for as an enclosure. That would provide a proper identification.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** That suggestion will be considered. We shall see how far it is practicable and all that.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the respective excess sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to make good the amounts spent during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of the following Demands entered in the second column thereof, namely Demands Nos. 1, 31, 37, 48, 51, 52, 60, 69, 99, 121 and 132."

*The motion was adopted.*

14:20 hrs.

APPROPRIATION (No. 3) BILL\*

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat):** On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg to move for leave to introduce a 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 1959, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a 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 1959, in excess of the amount granted for those services and for that year."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I introduce† the Bill.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, 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 1959, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, be taken into consideration".

**Mr. Chairman:** 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

\*Published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary Pt. II, Section 2, dated 2nd May, 1961.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.