

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: What were the considerations for giving this advice for the release of the property from the Court of Wards? Was this a political decision or a decision on merits?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: It cannot be a political decision. When he was a minor, the property was taken over by the Court of Wards. When he was deposed, the Court of Wards continued to be in charge of the property. He was, for some time in detention, etc. When he was released, he said that this was his private property and "the control over it by the Court of Wards should be withdrawn. Naturally, the Madhya Pradesh Government gave thought to it because they were directly concerned with it and the Madhya Pradesh Government suggested to us their taking this step and we agreed with that decision.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: Is it a fact that the position of the ruling party in Madhya Pradesh is not very sound and, therefore, the Maharaja has advised Members belonging to his party to join the ruling party? Is it because of this that the property has been released?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: These suggestions are absurd

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It seems that in Bastar the Government of India have made a new departure by recognising one person as the Ruler of the pality and, therefore, entitled to the privy purse and recognising another man as the owner and holder of the private estate. So far, the Ruler of the principality was the owner of the private estate also. In this case, why have two men been recognised, one as the Ruler of the principality being entitled to the privy purse and another entitled to the private estate? If the principality belongs to one man, the private estate which is an appendage of the principality should have have been passed on to him.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: The very expression "private property" means that it is not an appendage of the Ruler's property. It is something entirely different and is governed by the personal law and falls within the personal rights. It is merely the Ruler's right to be so recognised and to administer the property of the Ruler.

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालालजी औरड़िया :  
क्या माननीय मंत्री महोदय यह बतायेंगे कि  
जैसा श्री भीमान ने बताया कि वह माइनर थे  
इस लिये उनकी सारी सम्पत्ति कोर्ट आफ वार्ड्स  
में चली गई, लेकिन उनको मेजर हुये काफी  
वर्ष हो गये और मेजर होने के पश्चात् उन्होंने  
काफी वर्षों तक इस बात का प्रयत्न किया कि  
उनकी प्रापर्टी वापस दी जाय और उसके पीछे  
उनको डिटेंशन में जाना पड़ा और सब कुछ हुआ  
और फिर जब डी० पी० मिश्र साहब का चुनाव  
था उसी समय जो यह निर्णय लिया गया कि  
उनकी जायदाद उनको लौटा दी जाय, उसका  
कोई खास कारण है क्या ?

श्री आर० एस० हजरतबीस : चुनाव से  
इसका कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है ।

#### INDIA OFFICE LIBRAE r

\*12. SHRI J. S. PILLAI: Will the Minister of SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan have made a joint demand to the U.K. Government for the transfer of the India Office Library-

(b) if so, when the demand was made, and what is the result thereof; and

(c) how many books and material (apart from the books) are there in the Library?

THE MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR): (a) Yes, SIT

(b) September, 1959. The matter is still under discussion by the three Governments concerned.

(c) 2,20,615 books, 837 volumes plus 20,400 manuscripts, approximately 8,000 drawings and pictures, approximately 34,000 photographs and prints, 27 sets of epigraphic inscriptions, 22 volumes of textile samples, and a large number of coins.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: In answer to part (b) of the question, the Minister has said that the demand was made in 1959. Before that, how many times did our Government make requests to the United Kingdom Government to return the books?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: The matter has been under dispute ever since 1947 but between 1947 and 1959 there was practically a stalemate.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know whether any reply has been received from the United Kingdom Government to the joint communication sent by India and Pakistan and, if so, what are the reasons given in that for not returning the books to India and Pakistan?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: The answer to the first part of the question is "Yes" and as far as the second part is concerned, the reasons cannot be divulged because of the agreement between the Prime Minister, the President of Pakistan and the British Government.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: May I know whether any agreement has been arrived at between the Government of India and Pakistan about the distribution of the books that would be received?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: At present, India and Pakistan have made a joint demand for the return of the library to undivided India.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: May I know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that when he was himself in the

U.K. he had some discussions with the authorities of the U.K. Government and I think he also met Lord Home in this connection. May I know the result of those discussions with the U.K. Government and what is their attitude about this?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: The attitude is very clear. There has been a number of discussions. Whenever I have passed through London I have taken the opportunity of discussing this question. The U.K. Government took a legal position which India and Pakistan have categorically rejected. That matter is under discussion as to how to settle the dispute.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: He has not replied to my question. What was the nature of the discussions and what was the attitude of the British Government? He held discussions there and he . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he has replied.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: Is it a fact that after the return of the Minister from the United Kingdom after this discussion the Commonwealth Minister, Mr. Duncan Sandys, made a categorical statement that the United Kingdom Government was not going to part with this library?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: That question cannot arise since the matter is under discussion. Some joint documents were sent on the 15th of March, this year by India and Pakistan and the British Government also have sent a reply. So that question obviously cannot arise.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: The hon. Minister made a statement that there was a stalemate from 1947 to 1959. It implies that this stalemate has been broken afterwards. In what sense has it been broken? Has the United Kingdom Government recognised the position that it does not belong exclusively to the U.K.? Has it reconsidered its position? Has the U.K. Government

come to the position that it would return the India Office Library to us? In what sense has it been broken? The position should be fully stated here.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Without divulging any of the things which are in secret discussions, two facts are clear. Between 1947 and 1959 no joint demand on behalf of India and Pakistan was made. Since then two joint documents have been submitted by the two Governments. This itself is an indication that the stalemate has been broken. Up to 1959 the British Government were not prepared to discuss this at all. Since 1959 discussions have started and are continuing.

#### **DAMAGE TO THE BUILDINGS OF THE HEAVY ENGINEERING CORPORATION**

\*13. SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the Minister of STEEL AND HEAVY INDUSTRIES be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been any damage to the buildings of the Heavy Engineering Corporation at Ranchi, on account of the recent storms; and

(b) what is the nature of the damage?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY INDUSTRIES (SHRTP. C. SETHI): (a) Yes, Sir;

(b) The temporary storage shed near Hatia Railway Station collapsed and A. C. Sheets of a few of the temporary quarters were blown away. There has been no damage to any of the permanent buildings.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Is it a fact that the damage that has occurred is estimated at several lakhs of rupees and that the shed in question to which a reference was made by the Minister was constructed to withstand a wind

velocity of 85 miles per hour but it collapsed when the storm blew over Ranchi with a velocity of 60 miles per hour?

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: An enquiry has been instituted and the Committee is to submit the Report to the Government. The Government would be receiving the Report very soon and after that I would be able to give more details about this.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I should like to know whether the design of this was drawn by the Central Design and Drawing Office of the Heavy Engineering Corporation and this is a very bad advertisement for the Heavy Engineering Corporation that a small shed designed by it collapses to a wind velocity of 60 miles per hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has expressed an opinion. You will give the details when you have the Report.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I know who constructed this shed? Was it constructed by the machinery of Government or was it constructed by some contractor?

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I do not have the details as to whether a contractor built it but it was designed by the Heavy Engineering Corporation.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: May I know if there was a fire in the same collapsed shed a few weeks later that consumed all the stores lying there under the debris?

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Yes when the Committee was investigating into the cause of the collapse a metal had to be cut and while cutting that a spark fell below and caused a fire. But it is not true that the whole machinery was damaged. There was damage to the machinery to a certain extent. That is also under investigation now.