

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

already over; of the Second three years will be completed by the end of this month—Government have been following a consistent policy so far as land reforms are concerned, so far as the interests of the poor cultivators are concerned. Therefore, Sir, it is not necessary for me to go further into that matter. My hon. friend has again dwelt upon the considerations which apply so far as urban areas are concerned, and here in this case we have to deal with rural areas, and I would not like to repeat them.

Then the next question is regarding what a standard acre is. Now, so far as a standard acre is concerned, may I invite my hon. friend's attention to the rules that the Government have made in this respect. They have been published in the Gazette of India on January 20, 1955, and there we get the definition, that a standard acre shall be the equivalent of one ordinary acre of any class of land in any assessment circle as determined by dividing by sixteen the valuation shown in the following Table—the Table is given there—for such class of land in the same assessment circle. Then, Sir, they have followed a certain principle, and this question of standardisation of an acre has been considered by a number of committees and by the Planning Commission, and then the matter was put in this way, and I have pointed out, Sir, that there were different kinds of tenure and different types or qualities of land, and therefore Government took into account, in fixing a standard acre for a particular area, all these considerations and, as I have stated, ordinarily eight acres of land would constitute an economic holding, and I have pointed out also, Sir, the income that an agricultural cultivator would have—not any rent—so far as this particular property is concerned. This is the reason why eight standard acres for the Delhi area are considered as an economic holding; below eight, if we go, it would be uneconomic, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

## THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

THE MINISTER OF REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (DR. B. GOPALA REDDI): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1958-59, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Bill arises out of the Supplementary Demands of Rs. 131·09 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on the 23rd February last, and the expenditure of Rs. 30·55 crores "charged" on the Consolidated Fund of India as detailed in the Supplementary Demands Statements presented to the House on the 17th February, 1959.

The total additional requirements are estimated at Rs. 161·64 crores. Of these, Rs. 16·79 crores relate to Revenue, Rs. 74·85 crores to Capital and the balance of Rs. 70 crores to Loans and Advances. Detailed explanations have, as usual, been given in the footnotes below the Supplementary Demands Statements, and I do not wish to repeat them here except to make a brief reference to the main items. Of the increases under Revenue, Rs. 4·02 crores are for payment to States of their share of Union excise duties. As the hon. Members are aware, 25 per cent. of the net proceeds of Union Excise Duties on matches, tobacco, sugar, vegetable products, coffee, tea, paper and vegetable non-essential oils is payable to the States. The Budget assumed a payment of Rs. 29·5 crores on this

account. On account of improvement in the actual collections of excise duty on sugar, matches, tea and paper, it is now estimated that the States' share for the current year would be Rs. 33.49 crores necessitating a Supplementary Appropriation of Rs. 3.99 crores. A further sum of Rs. 2.97 lakhs is required for payment of the States' share of additional duties of excise on sugar, tobacco and textiles, which were levied in replacement of States' Sales Tax.

Of the other important increases under Revenue Expenditure, Rs. 4.27 crores are for expenditure on displaced persons and minorities. But this reflects merely a transfer of sale proceeds, etc. of evacuee property for credit to the Capital account from which payments of compensation are made. Rs. 2.9 crores are required for the purchase of building material and stores for works executed by the Central Public Works Department and Rs. 1.5 crores for payment of interest on debt due mainly to increase in the actual market loan floatations during the year.

The increase of Rs. 74.85 crores under Capital is distributed over six Demands of which Rs. 67.59 crores are accounted for by the purchase of foodgrains following larger imports from abroad. Rs. 1.63 crores are required for payment to the Mysore Government for the purchase of gold produced in their mines and Rs. 4.14 crores for investment in commercial concerns. Of the latter, Rs. 2.5 crores are for the Nepa Newsprint and Paper Mills, in which majority interest has now been acquired by the Government of India, Rs. 68.97 lakhs to meet the additional needs of the Nangal Fertilisers and Chemicals (Private) Limited, Rs. 85 lakhs for conversion of outstanding loans into additional equity capital of Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Limited and Rs. 10 lakhs for the new Foundry project of this Company.

The additional provision of Rs. 70 crores under Loans includes Rs. 25 crores for loans to States for Irriga-

tion and Miscellaneous Development purposes, Rs. 34.02 crores for loans to the Hindustan Steel (Private) Limited and Rs. 10.98 crores for loans to the Railway Development Fund.

As has been mentioned in the Introductory Remarks to the Supplementary Demands, of the additional amounts asked for, Rs. 77.26 crores will be covered by recoveries, receipts, surrenders, etc., under other heads or grants. The net additional outgo from the Consolidated Fund of India would, therefore, be of the order of Rs. 84.38 crores only.

Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1958-59, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak on Vote No. 72—Rs. 2,00,000 are sought to be provided for for the Wage Committee which has been appointed under the Working Journalists (Fixation of Rates of Wages) Act passed by this Parliament. Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the manner in which this particular Committee has been functioning and the problems this Committee and the working journalists in the country are facing in this matter.

The decision of the Wage Board was set aside by the Supreme Court, as you know, Sir, in March, 1958, on the mere ground that there was nothing on record to show that the Board had taken into account the capacity of the papers to pay. The Government of India then issued an Ordinance on June 14, 1958, called the Working Journalists (Fixation of Rates of Wages) Ordinance, which was later passed as an Act in this House. The Committee was later appointed under this particular Act, for which provi-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

sion is sought to be made in this Supplementary Demands for Grants Bill.

Now, Sir, I would like to make certain observations about this Committee. The Committee appointed authorised officers to go into the accounts of the cross-sections of the industry. Later the Committee called the publishers and the Indian Federation of Working Journalists to tender oral evidence. After collecting all the relevant data the Committee, though not directed by the Act to do so, published their tentative proposals, which were published, of course, in all newspapers on December 29, 1958. Then, Sir, written representations were asked for, the last date being February 2, 1959. Now, Sir, the Committee has not so far finalised their proposals or recommendations to the Government. This is the position. It appears to me that the Committee is functioning in this matter in a rather slow way, and it also appears on all accounts that it has been subjected to all manner of pressure on the part of newspaper-owners. Immediately after the proposal was published, the management of the Amrit Bazar Patrika Limited closed down their newspaper at Allahabad. Hon. Members know that in order to circumvent the wage fixation and to bring pressure upon the particular Committee, the management transferred their business to a new company which, according to me, is a *benami* company. This is a fact. The capital of the new company—please note it—is fixed at Rs. 5,000 as against the liability in respect of retrenchment compensation to its employees of Rs. 5 lakhs. Then a strike was launched by the employees and the management suspended publication of the newspaper. These are well-known facts to the country. Sir, this is a very serious matter, *viz.*, that one of the leading newspaper establishments in the country, immediately after the proposals of the Wage Committee were published, chose to take recourse to such a measure, as the closure of the particular paper.

Sir, as soon as the new company took over, overnight the title of the newspaper, many hon. Members will have noted, was changed to The Northern India Amrit Bazar Patrika without registration under the Press and Registration of Books Act. I would like to know from the hon. Minister opposite as to what happened that the paper suddenly changed its name and brought out, technically speaking, a new paper which was not registered. This is a serious offence under the existing law. This newspaper was published for a week. It is surprising that the Government did not take any action and did not prosecute the particular paper. It was known that this was a kind of thing which was illegal in law, apart from other considerations.

Sir, the Amrit Bazar Patrika group is a very well-known newspaper group in the country. In Allahabad they have got two papers. In Bengal they have got Jugantar and Amrit Bazar Patrika. Now, Sir, I do not know how the Wage Board feel about it, but I would like the Wage Board, for which we are sanctioning the money, to kindly take note of it. Shri Tushar Kanti Ghosh, Editor of the Amrit Bazar Patrika, published a statement, a full-page statement, barring a little advertisement, giving the reasons for closure of the paper. It was published on 31st January, 1959 in his paper and other papers also, I believe. Surprisingly enough, on the 2nd February, the P.T.I.—I have got a copy of the report from the teleprinter itself—carried a long summary of this particular statement in 1500 words or so. Sir, this statement was rebutted by a statement by Mr. R. K. Sharma, Vice-President of the U.P. Journalists' Union, answering many of the points. I do not know what happened. Am I to understand that the P.T.I. placed its services at the disposal of this particular employer just because Mr. Tushar Kanti Ghosh happens to be one of the members of the Board of Directors of the P.T.I.? Somebody has to answer me on the Government side. Sir, such a monopoly organisa-

tion is placed at the disposal of an employer in an industrial dispute, an employer who had closed down his establishment, threatened workers with retrenchment, is interested in pressurising the Wage Committee to bring down the scales of pay and functioned in a manner which would suit his interests. Who is to answer in the country? There must be somebody to answer that. I would like the Labour Minister or the Information Minister or other Ministers to answer. I would also seek an explanation as to why Mr. Sharma's statement, in all fairness, was not given the same space by the P.T.I. as was given to the statement of Mr. Tushar Kanti Ghosh. Sir, there is a conspiracy from the P.T.I. in conjunction with the big owners of the newspaper to frustrate the work of the Wage Board and Wage Committee to deny a fair deal to the working journalists in the country. This is a very serious matter.

Similarly, you will see that the management of the Bombay Chronicle and Bombay Sentinel have also served notice of closure on their employees. The notice dated the 24th January, 1959 is signed by Mr. M. N. Cama, the Managing Director. It reads:—

“Dear Sir,

We have after very careful consideration and with considerable regret decided to discontinue the publication of the Bombay Chronicle and therefore to terminate the services of all the Working Journalists and such of the workmen including clerks of the Company whose services will now no longer be required.

This is therefore to give you notice that in view of the discontinuance of the publication of the Bombay Chronicle, your services will stand terminated on the expiry of three months from the receipt of this notice by you.

Yours faithfully,

The Bombay Chronicle Co. (P.) Ltd.”

Sir, not only this group but the Express Newspaper group is going to serve a notice on its employees. This notice was taken to a member of the Wage Committee and was shown to me even before it has been served. The notice dated the 25th February, 1959 says:

“The Management has, therefore, decided to close their undertakings in Madras, Bombay, New Delhi and Madurai as from 1st June 1959. Due to this decision you are hereby informed that your services will stand terminated as from 1st June 1959 and this notice will serve as a notice within the meaning of Section 25 (FFF) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as amended by Act 18 of 1957 and Section 3 of the Working Journalists (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955.

Yours faithfully,

For Express Newspapers (P.) Ltd.,  
Manager”.

Sir, I have the information that the Managing Director of the Express Newspapers, Mr. Ramnath Goenka, met a member of the Wage Committee and showed him a copy of the notice of closure he had prepared, to be served on the working journalists. This is how things are going on.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Will the hon. Member kindly name the member he met?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Notice has not been served as far as I know. The hon. Minister has to give a reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants the name of the member to whom Mr. Goenka showed this notice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister has his Intelligence Department. If it is not able to find out, I will help him. I am asking the hon. Minister to note it. At the back of the employees this manipulation goes on—pressure, intimidation, coercion in order to see that the Wage Commit-

tee accepts the proposals that would be suitable to the employer. In what world are we living today? You see so many big groups joining against the employees. Am I to understand that these newspapers, in the expectation of some increase, suddenly decided to close down? It is a clear conspiracy, manoeuvre, to pressurise the Wage Committee to accept the position these groups would like to be accepted to the detriment of the working journalists and in defiance of the spirit and will of the Parliament in this pattern.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, my hon. friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta just now said that it was a strange thing. I go a step further and say that it is not only strange, it is a very serious thing and it deserves serious consideration of the Government, because the fate of thousands and thousands of journalists is involved in this affair of accidental and sudden closure of a chain of newspapers—the Express group of papers, Amrit Bazar Patrika and Bombay Chronicles. I say this is a sort of conspiracy . . .

*(Interruptions.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order; such speeches are not allowed as interruptions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am grateful to the hon. Member who has expressed the right sentiment. We passed this measure regarding the working journalists in all good faith, with great expectations and hope. Are we to be onlookers and are we to stand on the side-lines when we see a monopoly of newspaper owners coming out with this kind of pressure tactics with a view to frustrating the whole scheme of things that Parliament has devised? Are we to be mere onlookers of such things? That is the question. It is a challenge not merely to the working journalists or to a Member of this House, it is a challenge, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to the decisions of Parliament, because it is through the back-door and by unsavoury and foul methods that at-

tempts are being made by people who have got the power of money to frustrate one of the clear decisions of Parliament. That is something which the hon. Members on all sides should take serious note of.

Sir, now this is quite clear that they want to pressurize, they want to compel the Wage Committee to climb down further and accept whatever they have to say, because they want to confront the Wage Committee with the proposition that until and unless their demands were accepted, until and unless the gentlemen were placated, the country would be faced with the closure of a large number of newspapers and the readers will be put to great hardship. This is their line of action. *(Time bell rings)*. Please do not ring the bell. I know my time is limited.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have two minutes to finish your speech. There are other speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me finish it. I have got one or two points to make. It becomes difficult, Mr. Deputy Chairman, when one develops arguments. Generally, I think in Parliament when the leading Members of Parliament develop an important point it is not usually the practice to ring the bell and disturb the speaker.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe your party knows that the time-limit for speeches is there and you must co-operate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall fully co-operate with you, but I would not like to be disturbed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you exceed the time-limit, I shall have to call you to order. This is my unpleasant duty.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is also my unpleasant duty . . .

*(Interruption.)*

Why you say your "unpleasant duty".

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Because I have to call you to order

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA How can it be your unpleasant duty?

Now, Sir, as far as the Wage Committee itself is concerned, it appears to me that it has already been subjected to pressure. That is my complaint. What happened to the principle they have fixed? I think they have set aside all valid principles of wage fixation while formulating its tentative proposals. For purposes of income-tax the company is treated as one entity, so also for wealth-tax or even for purposes of calculations of bonus for employees. But in this matter the Committee has sought to treat sub-units of an establishment separately for fixation of fair wages. What it will mean? The Amrit Bazar Patrika group will show that its Bengali paper is one unit. In Calcutta even their English paper will be one unit. The various language papers will be shown as separate units. An establishment should be taken as a whole and on the basis of the earnings of that establishment, wage should be fixed. That is an important point. I do not think that the Wage Committee has been right in departing from the accepted principle in the matter of fixation of wages, because if this principle were to be accepted in regard to other industries, say, petroleum or other industries, there will be crises and it will not be accepted by any one else, and should not be accepted.

Then, Sir, another point is about advertisement, revenue. It is said that in order to categories a paper, its advertisement revenue must be 50 per cent of the other revenue, circulation and all that. Now it is putting a premium on advertisement. Suppose the circulation of the papers goes down or suppose advertisement revenue does not keep pace and is less than 50 per cent of the other revenue. Am I to understand that the paper goes down lowering the scales? And that is what is sought to be done. The result will be that a good paper, a flouri-

shing paper, thanks to the good work of the journalists themselves, would not be called upon to pay the pay scales which should be paid by a paper in a higher category. They would take cover under the advertisement scheme. That is another point.

Then, Sir, about the consumption units (*Time bell rings*). Since you want me to finish, I would draw your attention to what the working journalists themselves have said —

We consider that the minimum wage recommended by the Committee is abnormally low. The Award of Mr Justice Rajadhyaksha in the dispute raised by postal employees recognized that, on the basis of the 1944 cost of living level, the minimum wage for an employee should be Rs 125, taking the family as composing of three consumption units. Mr Justice Divatia, in his adjudication of small banks dispute, took the basis as 2.25 consumption units. The Labour Appellate Tribunal, on the strength of the report of the Committee on Fair Wages, rejected the 2.25 consumption unit theory. Though Rajadhyaksha recommended a basic minimum of Rs 125 for a working journalist anywhere in India, the Wage Board fixed only Rs 90. We are sorry to find that the Wage Committee has gone below even this figure of Rs 90 (which may be taken to be based on 2.25 consumption units)."

I do not think that the Wage Committee has been right in taking an approach of this kind. Already their scales of pay are lower than what was given earlier. Now there is an attempt to pressurize them to make it still lower. Now, this is the position. Now, Sir, this is the situation we are placed in. I, therefore, suggest two things: that Government should intervene in this matter, prevent closure of papers and all that sort of things, and they should direct the Wage Committee not to allow itself to be bullied, pressurized and compelled by the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

employers to do certain things, and it should compel the employers to play the rules of the game. That is very important. As far as other allegations that had been made are concerned, they should also be gone into. I do not think that the Government can keep quiet by leaving the matters to the Wage Committee when powerful influences are at work to frustrate a fair fixation of wages or at least fixation of wages according to the needs of the situation or justifiable demand of the working journalists. This is the position which we are facing today and we must face the situation squarely.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh). Mr Deputy-Chairman, Sir, before going into the other Ministries I must say that after hearing the Leader of the Communist Party on the working of the Wage Committee, I also feel—Sir, I do not agree to all his adjectives and threat, etc . . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. Cut out the adjectives.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND. I also feel that the Wage Committee has not been able to act properly to solve the problem of the working journalists. It is admitted on all hands that the case of the working journalists is a good case. But what we find is that the proprietors are also playing a game of hide and seek and are trying to do away what the Wage Committee may be able to do. And this is a serious matter, and I think, the hon Labour Minister who is in charge of the Working Journalists' Wage Committee will look into the matter for the very simple reason that the *Amrit Bazar Patrica*, which was a paper in Allahabad, is now coming under the name *North India Amrit Bazar Patrica*. It means no change. It was in Allahabad, and the *North India Amrit Bazar Patrica* is also from Allahabad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. The same Editor and the same editorial.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND. You have said that I am not agreeing with your adjectives but the facts are correct and that is what I say. These papers, which are chain papers, have made a lot of working journalists unemployed. Not only that. The Hindi paper, according to the Wage Committee, is to be categorised in a different way like the other vernacular papers. These are matters with which we are also concerned and we do feel that the Information Ministry must also come into the picture by giving advertisements to these papers etc. I would like the hon Minister to consult the Information and Broadcasting Ministry also, although they have a representative on that Committee, to look into these aspects of the case.

Coming to the various other Demands, I regret to say that I find the whole book of Supplementary Demands a sad and a bad reading for the very simple reason that when I scrutinise all these Demands, I wonder yet, whether they would be able to spend the amounts they want from this Parliament.

DR RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Pradesh). They must have already spent them.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND. They have not. When I say this, I say it with full responsibility and knowing that so many Supplementary Demands which have been brought forward previously, were found not utilized and I stand today only to bring it to the notice of the Finance Minister that from reports after reports, we have found that to the tune of 30 per cent and sometimes even 50 per cent. of these Supplementary and Original Demands are not utilised by the particular Ministries.

What I want to make clear to the hon Minister is, at one time you say that you want Rs 800 crores for your commitments of the financial year but you are not able to spend even Rs 600 crores. You are only able to spend

Rs. 600 crores and the result is, for the deficit gap, you have to impose more taxation. When you impose more taxation and you don't spend that money, there comes a feeling, in all concerned, that either your capacity of spending is not according to your estimates or there is over-budgeting.

Now, if we go through these Demands, I would like to point out about Demand No. 1, that four additional posts of Officers on Special Duty have been created. There are two Joint Secretaries. All these schemes which were with the Commerce and Industry Ministry are not new schemes. If there is a new scheme and if you come for a Supplementary Demand, that is acceptable, that is imaginable, but now if you see, it is for working of several schemes under Engineering Industries. Then you have one O.S.D. for the promotion of Khadi and Village Industries. This is not a new industry. The Act is there. Then another O.S.D. is for the development of Export Promotion and another for Revision of Trade Marks and Patents. Then there are two Joint Secretaries. These could have been thought over in the Original Grants. Supplementary Grants are only to be asked for when you have not anticipated the expenditure or when some extraordinary thing crops up.

The next item, I take up, is regarding 'India-1958 Exhibition'. This morning the Deputy Minister who was in charge of the Exhibition said that we have spent Rs. 57 lakhs, we have earned Rs. 54 lakhs and the deficit is Rs. 3 lakhs and probably to the tune of Rs. 20 lakhs of property, we would be getting. What I submit is that this whole Demand No. 5 does not agree with the statement of the Minister this morning because on page 4 we find that the total expenditure on the organisation of the Exhibition by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry is expected to be Rs. 64.46 lakhs. It is not Rs. 57 lakhs and the difference may not be much when we deal with a Budget of Rs. 800 crores or Rs. 1,000 crores but it is material for the very

simple reason that when we look at the Demands of the other Ministries, we find money given for the Exhibition. Those of us who have seen the Exhibition, have admired the Exhibition but felt sad that each and every Ministry has spent a lot of money and even then there is a deficit and there is a loss. That I have not been able to understand because, if you see the Grants for the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, the same story you will find. You look into the Demands of the W.H.S. Ministry and you will find the same story.

Then I come to the Defence Ministry. I was surprised to read the total amount shown for a very good reason. I may draw the attention of the hon. Minister to page 5 which says that the office of the Director, Military Regulations and Forms was, prior to 1952, an integral part of the Defence Ministry Secretariat. In 1952, the control of this Directorate was transferred to the Chief Administrative Officer in the Armed Forces Headquarters. Again in 1957 they have reverted it back to the Ministry and for that they have come with all these Demands. This work was being done in the Ministry or in the C.A.O.'s office and there was money provided for it but even then this comes. Then we find a new post of Private Secretary to the Defence Minister on page 6. I don't know if hon. Ministers can have two Private Secretaries at one and the same time. Probably, the idea might be to have an Additional Private Secretary to the Defence Minister but . . .

DR. RAGHUBIR SINGH. I think the Additional Private Secretary gets less pay.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I am not concerned with that. What I am concerned with is this. When there is a post in the Ministry of a Private Secretary to the Defence Minister, how has this come in the Supplementary Demand? I don't grudge it. The Minister may have one or two or three Private Secretaries but there will be only one Private Secretary and the



[Shri Amolakh Chand.]

others will be Additional Private Secretaries. What I wanted to know was whether—on page 6—because of the transfer of the Military Regulations Directorate, it has become necessary to have another Private Secretary to the Defence Minister?

If we refer to page 8, I really feel that it is a very sad reading. Either the Law Ministry is not advising the Defence Ministry properly or the advice of the Law Ministry is not being followed. On page 8 there are 4 cases—(a) to (d)—which are under 'Charged' category. Case (a) is a sad case. It says that a Leading Fireman on his reversion as Fireman, refused to accept the orders of reversion. This is sad thing as far as Defence Ministry is concerned. Then we find that he was placed under suspension and discharged from service but when the matter went to the High Court, there was a direction against the Government. So also you find in the cases referred to in (b) to (d). I would not like to take the time of the House because hon. Members must have read these cases but one thing that struck me was that there does not appear to be any co-ordination between the Law Ministry and the Defence Ministry. Either the Law Ministry is not giving the right advice to the Defence Ministry or the Defence Ministry is not following the right advice.

SHRI B. GOPALA REDDI: Sometimes the High Courts take a different view of the matter.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: If there had been only one case, we can feel that way but now I am telling you and the House that there are cases after cases which have been advised by the Law Ministry but even so, the arbitrators have also rejected the view of the Law Ministry. Therefore, I say that either the Law Ministry is not giving the correct view or the correct view is not followed by the Defence Ministry and there should be more coordination.

Then we come to the Information and Broadcasting Ministry. We find that on page 23 the rent of the building which was Rs. 8,000 per year before, is now being assessed at Rs. 65,000 per annum. That is only eight times.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: More than 8 times.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Dr. Raghubir Singh wants to be very particular but I give only approximation and am not going into details. The point is, who is the landlord and who is the tenant? The Government of India is the landlord and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting is the tenant and by adding all these things, by adding 8 or 9 times, you encourage the private persons to increase their rents when they deal with private persons. And this means inflation of the Budget. Therefore, what I suggest is that it should be dealt with on a *pro rata* basis by book transfers and these things need not come before the House in this shape.

Then on page 24, I find another entry and I cannot understand what an amount of waste there is in the Information and Broadcasting Ministry. Here they say under item (g):

"Increase in printing charges (Rs. 4,000) use of supercalendar paper instead of newsprint".

So where newsprint had to be used, the Government of India used not newsprint which is the cheapest paper, but they used supercalendar paper and what is the difference? It is Rs. 73,000. Sir, I would say, that this may not be too much in a Budget of crores and crores. Still these are items towards which the people should pay attention and these things should not come before the House and create a feeling that all this money is being wasted. As I was saying, for participation in the 'India-1958 Exhibition', the All India Radio spent Rs. 80,000. On page 31 you find that the Ministry of Transport and Communications has spent a sum of Rs. 1,70,000 on this 'India-1958 Exhibition'.

What I submit is, many of these items which have been brought in these Supplementary Demands are not items which can be said to be new items or items which could not be foreseen. I submit that when Supplementary Demands come, we as Members of the Party always vote for them and we have to vote for them. But all these questions do come otherwise and have relation to taxation. All that I respectfully suggest, is that more care should be taken.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I find most of the points I wanted to speak on, have already been dealt with by my hon. friend Shri Amolakh Chand. First of all I would take up item No. 5 on which my hon. friend also spoke, the expenditure on the 'India-1958 Exhibition.' This exhibition must have taken the Government something like six months to plan. The exhibition started on 1st October, 1958 and the work on an exhibition of this magnitude must certainly have started somewhere in the month of April, for it will easily take about six months to complete the work on an exhibition of this magnitude. And the Budget was passed in March 1958 and then suddenly we find this expenditure. There must be some planning before. The Ministry which deals with such big responsibilities and which has the responsibility of spending crores and crores, cannot say that the 'India-1958 Exhibition' was started on the spur of the moment, that one evening the Ministry just dreamt that they must start an exhibition and next day it was started. There must be a proper planning and only after considering all these factors can an exhibition of this magnitude be held in any country. Therefore, to say that the expenditure for this exhibition could not be provided for in the Budget for the year is something which cannot easily be conceived. The expenditure on this item is to the tune of Rs. 64.46 lakhs. But the money asked for is only Rs. 35 lakhs and this is confusing. The reason for this is that something

like Rs. 28.7 lakhs have been taken as credit because of the savings amounting to Rs. 28.7 lakhs that was available under other sub-heads. So it is not as if only Rs. 35 lakhs have been spent on the 'India-1958 Exhibition'. The amount spent is no less than Rs. 64.46 lakhs and the revenue that accrued from rent for stalls, admission fees, etc. comes to Rs. 48 lakhs. So on the whole, we are on the deficit side to the tune of Rs. 16.46 lakhs. What I submit is that items of this magnitude should have been foreseen. It was not as if overnight the work was started. So if it was a proper Budget, all these items should have been properly scrutinised and they should have found a place even in last year's Budget.

Similarly, take the case of item No. 84 relating to the Ministry of Transport and Communications. A sum of Rs. 3 lakhs is required and the Explanatory Memorandum says:

"The excess is due to the creation of additional posts during the year to cope with the expansion of the activities of the Ministry".

Here, if we see how many posts have thus been created, we find that there is one Joint Secretary on Rs. 3,000, and there are three Under Secretaries, one Section Officer, and then there is the upgrading of a Deputy Secretary to the post of Director General and the upgrading of five officers into Assistant Directors and three Assistant Directors being appointed and so on. Here also, it cannot be believed that this expansion in the work had suddenly come about. It should have been in the process of expansion for some time and Government should have foreseen that this much of work would be coming up, that the work would get expanded and for that all these posts should have been provided. After the presentation of the Budget, to come here with demands for such huge amounts is rather surprising.

Next, I have to make a few observations relating to Demand No. 9 which is a rather serious matter. Some remarks were made by my hon.

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

friend Shri Amolakh Chand also on this Demand relating to the Defence Services. There were some five or six cases for which a Demand of Rs 95,000 by way of additional sums is required. Sir, some of these cases are very serious. I do not understand why either the Government did not follow up the cases or if they followed them up, then why all these cases should have gone against the Government.

DR B GOPALA REDDI: Out of some hundred cases some four went against the Government.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If they had been ordinary cases, I could have understood it, but these five cases, which have been given here, are of a serious nature. Even the Government's orders had been flouted by the officer against whom action was taken. Whether they go to the lower court or High Court or arbitrator or even an umpire, these cases are lost. In the Army this rather affects discipline also when officers or military personnel are punished and then they come back to the Government demanding damages for the period they did not work and their salaries and allowances, and then come back to occupy the same senior posts from which they had been degraded. This is a rather serious thing. Therefore, I would submit that so far as the Defence Ministry is concerned, this is a serious matter. I have been seeing it for the last three or four years and I have been finding fault with the Defence

Ministry for not following up the cases and then finally losing them. And then they pay damages. This is repeated year after year. I do hope that the Government would put a stop to this and they will pay more attention, for it is due to the negligence of the Government that they had to suffer. It is not as if this is a legitimate expenditure incurred in the usual course. For instance, in the case of some other Ministry, we find some new posts had been created and so on, subsequent to the passing of the Budget. That is only miscalculation or want of proper planning on their part. But with regard to this, in the case of the Defence Ministry, the position is different. Here in a dictatorial manner, they punish certain officers and then those officers do not obey their orders and they are suspended. Later they are reinstated. Or they fall foul of the contract and then Government has to pay them damages and this is worse than the other case. Therefore, I would submit that the attention of the Defence Ministry should be particularly drawn by the hon. Minister of Finance to this matter and they should see that such cases, in future, should be put a stop to.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 3rd March 1959.