

Particulars of Investments	Amount	Ratio of old ng
B. Co-operative Sector—	(Rs. lakhs)	(%)
1. Debentures of Co-operative Land Mortgage Banks	15,08.56	
2. Debentures of Co-operative Housing Corporation	10.00	
3. Debentures of Co-operative Bank	23.49	
4. Loans to Co-operative Housing Finance Societies and Sugar Factories	13,56.68	
5. Deposits with Co-operative Banks	1,00.00	
6. Loans to Co-operative Industrial Estates	6.14	
TOTAL	30,04.87	4.3
C. Joint Sector—		
1. Debentures of Oil India Ltd. (in which Government holds 50 % of the Share Capital)	7,13.20	1.0
D. Private Sector—		
1. Debentures, Preference and Ordinary Shares	135,92.39	19.2
GRAND TOTAL	707,59.64	100.00

FALL IN THE BUSINESS OF LIC

559. SHRI RAM SINGH: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the business transacted by the Life Insurance Corporation of India during the recent past has recorded a fall of nearly Rs. 5 crores;

(b) if so, whether the causes for this fall in business have been analysed; and

(c) what steps Government propose to take to step up the business of the Life Insurance Corporation of India?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): (a) Yes, Sir. The business during the year 1963-64 was lower by nearly Rs. 5 crores than the business during the

corresponding period 1st April 1962 to 31st March 1963.

(b) and (c) The Corporation has analysed the causes and is taking steps to achieve a satisfactory increase in business. Government are also in touch with the Corporation and are studying the situation carefully.

12 NOON

CALLING ATTENTION TO A
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE

SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE PROPOSAL
OF THE GOVERNMENT TO SET UP A
LEPROSARIUM AT AGRA

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARAN-JPYE
(Nominated): Sir, I beg to call the attention of
the Minister of Health

to the situation arising out of the proposal of the Government to set up a Leprosarium at Agra.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a long statement. Does the House want the whole Statement to be read?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : A gist may be given. What about the controversy that was going on regarding this Leprosarium?

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH (DR. SUSHILA NAYAR) : Sir, with your permission I will give a summary but lay the Statement on the Table of the House.

The proposal was initiated in 1961 when Dr. Mivazaki, a Japanese Doctor, came as a WHO. Consultant to India. In Japan the Christian Missionaries have done a lot of work to help the fight against leprosy and the Japanese have set up a Buddhist Mission called JALMA, Japanese Mission for Leprosy in Asia and their hope is that they will help fight leprosy out of Asia. We received this information from the Prime Minister's Office, External Affairs Ministry, in 1962 that the Japanese Mission would like to set up an institution in India and that the External Affairs Ministry wanted to know the reaction of the Health Ministry and the U.P. Government because the institution was to be set up in U.P. We felt at that time that Dehra Dun would be a better place. They had originally thought of Dehra Dun. It could cater for Tehri Garhwal as well as for Hardwar where a lot of leprosy patients go in search of either alms or in the hope that the Ganges might cure them. The U.P. Government suggested two or three sites in Bijnor, Saharanpur and Hardwar districts. Ultimately when an agreement went to them, they said they would like to have the institution at Agra and there was an existing Leprosy Institution there run by the

Agra Corporation very close to the Taj and they said they would hand over this Institution to the JALMA that the Corporation had agreed to do that and the Japanese could develop their institutions there. At that time I stated on that proposal:

I am not sure that the Agra District is the best for this purpose both from the point of view of climate and incidence of leprosy. The original proposal for Dehra Dun was better as they could have catered for patients from hill areas as well as from Hardwar. However, if U.P. and JALMA like Agra, it is O. K. with us."

After that we received a letter through the External Affairs Ministry from our Ambassador in Japan who drew the attention of the Government to the fact that the proposed site for this institution is close to the Taj Mahal and whether the Government have considered the likely effect upon the tourists, etc. We forwarded that letter to the U.P. Government and the reply of the U.P. Government was:

"The matter has been reviewed in the light of the fears expressed in the letter of the Indian Ambassador in Japan. It has transpired that a small leprosy Home is already working at the site selected for the establishment of the proposed leprosy Centre. The road to the Leprosy Home does not pass through the Taj premises and there is complete separation and the site cannot be called adjacent or appurtenant to the Taj. As a matter of fact, the proposed site is an open place about four furlongs from the Taj"

Actually it is 2 kilometers, it is more than four furlongs—

"... and its surrounding areas and no tourist ever comes beyond the Taj. There is thus no chance of any danger to the tourists from the occupants of the Leprosy Home or the Leprosy Centre. Besides, the

entrance to and exit from the Taj are not on the side on which the Leprosy Home is located or the Leprosy Centre is proposed to be located. In these circumstances no change in the proposed location seems to be called for."

Soon after that, objections were raised from our Department of Tourism and the matter was referred to the late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He suggested a visit to the site. When I visited the site, a Deputy Minister of U.P., the Mayor of Agra, some Members of Parliament and others some ML.As. of U.P. and officers of the State Government, local as well as from Lucknow, were all present. We went into a thorough discussion of the matter. The alternative was a site on the Mathura Road side as one enters Agra while the proposed site is beyond the Taj. The U.P. leaders as well as the officers were very clear that it was undesirable to put the institution on the Mathura Road side and the site already selected was much better than any other site and they decided that the proposed institution should stay at the site they had already selected. It was in view of this that the late Prime Minister agreed to lay the foundation stone and he laid the foundation stone on 15th December 1962. He made certain suggestions about access to the Taj from the leprosy centre being made still more difficult, etc. but he laid the foundation stone. At the foundation stone laying ceremony he stated:

"One question I might mention about the location of this mission here. As I speak to you, in front of me I can see the Taj Mahal and some people raised the objection that it is too near the Taj Mahal. We went into that and decided in favour of keeping this location because it is not very near, it is some distance away and access to it from the Taj Mahal is not particularly easy."

1096 RS—4.

After that, in July 1964 this year, some more objections were raised. The Education Minister had a meeting with myself, the Chief Minister of U.P. and the Transport Minister along with the officers. A lot of discussion took place and I think the Education Minister also contacted the Japanese—JALMA—people and at the end of it, the Education Minister agreed that we should have only indoor patients and research activities in this Institute and that we should let the project remain as it is. He said he had talked to the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and he had also agreed to it provided that if at a later date it was found that there was any adverse effect on tourists or any adverse world opinion, we retain the right to change the location. We passed on this letter to the Japanese. They accepted these conditions. After that they were allowed to deposit the money and the work was entrusted to the U.P. P.W.D., and the construction started. The work is in progress, I understand the residential quarters are four to five feet above the foundation and the Research Institute has also come above the ground level. Recently some more objections have been raised and all these facts as before the Cabinet and the matter is under the consideration of the Cabinet.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: I would like to know how many patients were being treated in the original Leper Home and how many patients are supposed to be treated after this new Leper Home if and when comes into existence?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: The existing one is for 60 patients. From time to time there are more than that number—80 or more. The proposed indoor capacity at present is meant for 100.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): May I know whether the Japanese in charge of the Leprosy Centre had expressed preference for a site different from the one as published in the "Indian Express"? •

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: No, Sir, they have located this site and they are very keen that this site should be retained.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: May I ask one other question? When there were about sixty inmates already there, did it ever effect the tourist traffic to the 'Taj' nearby in the same locality?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Sir, it is very difficult for me to say anything about it. Their have been some beggars near the 'Taj' from time to time, which was not desirable but, obviously, no objection has been voiced in public.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, after listening to the long statement by the hon. Minister may I know whether she realises that the tourists who come to visit the 'Taj' from all over the world will naturally feel about this leprosy home being near that beautiful place and it may have «an effect an our tourist trade?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Well, Sir, the tourists that come are not quite so subject to irrational fear as some of us seem to be. In fact, Sir, about half a dozen of them were at one time questioned by some workers when they were at the 'Taj'. They were asked that if there wa:, that leprosy institution there they would have any objection. They said: "What objection can we have to your institutions? **Hcfcv** are we concerned as to what institutions you like to keep here?"

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): From the statement made by the Health Minister I gather that there was a leprosy home there treating sixty to eighty patients. Now we are having a centre there which will be treating about a hundred patients. So there is much ado about nothing, I should say. We are already having a home treating 60 to 80 persons. **Now**

we will be having a centre to treat about a hundred persons. I do not think that that way the problem will be solved. Will the Minister not consider the need of retaining this home as it is and opening a centre at some other place accommodating about a hundred patients so that near about two hundred patients may be treated?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Well, Sir, it is not for the Minister to take any decision in this matter. The U.P. Government was the active partner in this project, because the Japanese will run it for five years and after that it will have to be taken over by the U.P. Government. The U.P. Government found that the present home is very ugly, ill-equipped and too close to the "Taj", and they wanted to shift it a little further away and make it into a better institution.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARAN-JPYE: Sir, I want to know—a part of my question has been covered by Prof. Lal—another thing; I would like to know how much money will it involve and if the Japanese Mission is going to foot the entire bill, or is the Government also contributing towards it?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Sir, I could not give the exact amount that it will cost. They have deposited initially five lakhs of rupees. They are going to foot the entire cost of construction and the running expenses for the first five years. They are bringing a good deal of very elaborate and costly equipment also.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): The hon. Minister ^aid that the fears were not well founded, were not very rational. I think we are not proceeding on the basis whether the idea of locating the leprosy home is rational or irrational. I do not think the tourists of the world proceed on the basis of the rationality of a thing. I do not know why it does not strike them that the very idea of locating the leprosy home near the 'Taj' itself

is ugly. Therefore may I know whether even now—it is not late—the Minister will see to it that this leprosy home is removed from that place in Agra and may I also know whether no other place anywhere in U.P. is available to shift this leprosy home there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: She said that the matter is before the Cabinet but-----

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: How can I answer the question? The institution is there. Who located it? Why they located it? I am not able to answer.

PROF. M. B. LAL: Of course, the matter is before the Cabinet but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now Dr. Sapru's turn.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Am I right in assuming that according to the latest medical theories leprosy is not half as contagious as tuberculosis, that there are forms of leprosy which are not contagious at all, and if that is so, where is the objection to this leprosy home which is half a mile away from the "Taj"?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Well, Sir, it is true that leprosy is far less infectious than T.B. and it requires long years of intimate contact for the infection to be conveyed. But, Sir, it is not as the hon. Member said, the scientific facts but it is the emotional and psychological reactions which are causing the problem.

PROF. M. B. LAL: Sir, I wish to say this. As the matter is before the Cabinet, may I suggest to the Minister that while that home, which already exists there, may be kept in a better form than it is kept today, there is need for an extra leprosy centre somewhere near Dehra Dun, or a place like that? When I say so I am conscious that while it is the responsibility of the U.P. Government to look after the problem the Centre also has certain responsibilities with regard to those that suffer from leprosy.

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Well, Sir, so far as the requirements of treatment of leprosy in this country are concerned, naturally it is the responsibility of the Indian Government. Questions whether it is primarily the responsibility of the State, to what extent the Centre helps the State, such questions are immaterial since it is a national problem, and, Sir, to that extent, wherever the institutions may be necessary, they will be coming up. The present question is only with regard to this particular institution to be put up by the Japanese.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): May I suggest that in the interests of the tourist trade, the less advertisement this leprosarium gets, the better. And I am afraid it has already had too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take the hint and I would stop further discussion.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask for a clarification. There is some misstatement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the other people have put the questions.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I want a clarification about the facts supplied. May I know from the hon. Minister whether the foundation stone was laid on the 15th December, 1963, and not on the 15th December, 1962, as was stated by her, and whether it is a fact that since the foundation stone was laid there have been numerous complaints about the tourist traffic and that necessitated a rethinking on this question?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Well, Sir, I had said that the foundation stone was laid on the 15th December, 1963. I do not think I said '1962', and if I had said '1962' it was a slip of the tongue. It is 1963, Sir. And may I say, Sir, that there have been no complaints from the tourists at all to the best of my knowledge?

AN. HON. MEMBER: They will now start coming in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you something very important to say?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): With your permission, Sir, I just wanted to tell the Minister that she has conceded that it is a contagious and infectious disease and so, from the point of view of the patients themselves, is it not better to have it in an open space and in a better place?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: Sir, the place that is proposed is open and very good, and I have already submitted that the fear of contagion is irrational, not based on scientific facts, that it is far less contagious than the T.B. patients who are in our midst. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, I will carry on the discussion as long as the Members like and let me see for how long this goes on. Yes, Mr. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): In view of the fact that the utility of the proposed leprosarium has been limited because of human psychology or the objection of the Education Minister and inasmuch as this leprosarium shall serve only in-door patients and its services shall not be available to out-door patients, may I know, would it not be proper to shift it to some other place and make it available both to in-door patients and Out-door patients?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not give any reply because it seems to me from your reply that the matter is under the consideration of the Cabinet, and the considerations that are being pointed out, you might inform the Cabinet of.

(Interruptions)

Yes, I will allow you to speak; I will allow everybody to speak. Yes, Mr. Sinha.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): The hon. Minister might have given us a summary of the note

which she is laying on the Table. Now, in the early portion of her statement she had quoted her own notings on the file when she had objected to the location of this institute at Agra.

She had suggested Dehra Dun or, some other place. I find that she has changed her mind probably, or her viewpoint, after pressure was brought upon her from the U.P. Government. I am not sure whether she is speaking out today when defending the position, her conscience or whether she is only doing her duty as a Minister. I would like to know from her whether she still holds that what she wrote at the first time on the file was a correct statement of her, and if so, why she does not, when there is such great agitation and pressure, as is evident from the House also now, persuade the Uttar Pradesh Government—let them have some small institution there because the foundation-stone had been laid—to shift the location of this institution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A small institution as attraction to the tourists?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: May I say, Sir, that the hon. Member has distorted my statements. Sir, Dehra Dun was not suggested by me and Agra was not suggested by me. The suggestion came from the U.P. Government and the JALMA people together, after their inspection I preferred Dehra Dun in the first instance; but afterwards, Sir, when all the developments had taken place, I did think that it would be a good idea to build the place where the late Prime Minister had laid the foundation-stone, particularly, Sir, when I received a letter from the Japanese after the objections were voiced in the newspapers. They wrote a very strong letter in which they said, "We the Japanese people have great love and faith in the people of India, but if there is any attempt to change this site, where the foundation stone was laid by Pandit Nehru, it will have a disastrous effect upon the entire goodwill of the Japanese People

p

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Kureel.

شہری بیمار لال کوریل سے مطالبہ ہے
 (اُن پر دیکھیں): جناب والا - عام نظریہ
 یہ ہے کہ لہپورسے پیشکش کو
 سمجھ کر ہیٹھ ایڈیاز میں رکھنا چاہئے
 ان کی کالونی یا ان کا ہسپتال آبادی
 کے قریب نہیں رکھنا چاہئے۔ یہ
 ایکسپریمنٹ ویو ہے - یہ عام نظریہ ہے -
 تو کیا وجہ ہے کہ جب جنتا کی
 اتنی سخت مانگ ہے کہ اس ہسپتال
 کو کسی اور دوسری جگہ لے جایا
 جائے تو سرکار اس مانگ پر دھیان
 دینے کے لئے کیوں نہیں تیار ہے ؟

towards the people of India." And they also stated—and I remember the words because they were rather urj-usual—that it will be a firing shock to the JALMA, its purpose and its people and so on. Sir, if I had gone to work in some other country and after I had done so much work there I was asked to shift, I would have felt very bad. Therefore, I felt for the Japanese people. For the rest, I have no interest as to where this institute is located.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pra. desh): I want to put one question, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can put more.

SHRI SYED AHMAD: I am afraid you will not allow it. You will not allow me more than one question.

PROF. M. B. LAL: He has allowed you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, go ahead.

SHRI SYED AHMED: Since this leprosarium is close to The Taj and since this apprehension has been expressed in some correspondence that the hon. Minister read out, will the hon. Minister take care, supposing that ultimately it comes to be built there, that the lepers do not escape from the leprosarium and

AN HON. MEMBER: And go to The Taj?

SHRI SYED AHMAD:.... as often happens in other leprosariums, and pester the tourists"

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: May I say that indoor patients are not allowed to wander out without the permission of the authorities of the institute? The Japanese people have given us that assurance that they will take every precaution to see that the patients do not go outside their compound.

[श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील "तालिब"]

(उत्तर प्रदेश) : जनाबवाला, ग्राम नजरिया यह है कि लेपेरोसी पेशेंट्स को सैगरिगेटेड एरिया में रखना चाहिये। इनकी कालोनी या इनका हस्पताल आवादी के करीब नहीं रखना चाहिये। यह एक्सेप्टेड थ्यू है, यह ग्राम नजरिया है तो क्या वजह है कि जब जनता की इतनी सख्त मांग है कि इस हस्पताल को किसी और दूसरी जगह ले जाया जाये तो सरकार इस मांग पर ध्यान देने के लिये क्यों नहीं तैयार है ?]

श्री सभापति : इसका जवाब तो वे बराबर दे रही हैं।

डा० सुशीला नायर : श्रीमन्, मैंने निवेदन किया है पूरी तरह से। मैं यह भी कह दूँ कि आज तो हम लेपेरोसी पेशेंट्स को न शहर से निकाल रहे हैं और न घर से निकाल रहे हैं। उनको घर बैठे बैठे ही हम दवायें दे रहे हैं। 25 लाख लेपेरोसी पेशेंट्स हैं इस मुल्क में,

[] Hindi transliteration.

उन सब को कहां ले जाया जाय। किस के पास इतना पैसा है कि उन सब के लिये अस्पताल खोले जायें और वहां उनको रखा जाय।

SHRI SYED AHMED: Send them to Taj Mahal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything further?

شری پیارے لال کوریل مدظلہ العالی :

اتر پردیش میں جب دوسری جگہوں میں اور وہ تو ایک ہسپتال ہے باقاعدہ ایک کالونی کے روپ میں ہے تو کیا وجہ ہے کہ یہ دوسری جگہ نہیں بنا سکتا ہے۔ وہاں پر جو لیپروسی پیشکش میں وہ ایک جگہ کے نہیں ہیں بلکہ مختلف جگہوں کے ہیں۔ لیکن یہ ہسپتال اب بھی وہیں پر ہے۔ تو کیا وجہ ہے کہ اس لیپروسی سینٹر کو کسی اور دوسری جگہ نہیں کھولا جا سکتا؟

श्री प्यार लाल कुरील "तालिब" :
उत्तर प्रदेश में जब दूसरी जगहें हैं और वह तो एक हस्पताल है बाकायदा एक कालोनी के रूप में है तो क्या वजह है कि यह दूसरी जगह नहीं जा सकता है। वहां पर जो लेपरोसी सेंटर है वे एक जगह के नहीं हैं बल्कि मख्तलीफ जगहों के हैं। लेकिन यह हस्पताल अब भी वहीं पर है तो क्या वजह है कि इस लेपरोसी सेंटर को किसी और दूसरी जगह नहीं खोला जा सकता।]

SHM SYED AHMAD: Why not shift the lunatic asylum of Agra also to the vicinity of The Taj?

[] Hindi transliteration.

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: May I finally submit in all humility that when there is a hospital it is much safer for the population than when there is no hospital? When there is no hospital, any patient may be going about anywhere and nobody even knows about it. But when there is a hospital, the patients are under protection and all precautions are taken that a patient is not a danger. Sir, as I said earlier, these are scientific facts, but here it is not a matter of scientific facts but of something else and as I have already submitted, it is for the Cabinet to decide and whatever the Cabinet decides, naturally will be carried out.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Will she convey to the Cabinet the views of this House?

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: The Cabinet will know about it.

MH. CHAIRMAN: It is a great disappointment to me that there is no more curiosity.

*

REFERENCE TO CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE RE SATYAGRAHA BY REPUBLICAN PARTY

شری پیارے لال کوریل مدظلہ العالی :

(اتر پردیش) : میں نے ایک کانگ्रेस انٹیشن نوٹس ریپبلکن پارٹی نے جو ستمبر گزرا کر رکھا ہے اس نے سلسلہ میں دیا تھا۔ آج کئی دن ہو گئے ہیں لیکن مجھے یہ پتہ نہیں چل سکا کہ اس کا کیا ہوا۔ کیا وہ اسلئے رجسٹر کیا گیا ہے کہ اس کی انلی امپورٹنس نہیں ہے کہ وہ یہاں قسقس کیا جا سکے۔ ہزاروں آدمی