

[Shri Shah Nawaz Khan.]

The hon. Member, Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, spoke about the over-aged rolling stock. I should like to assure him that the Second Plan contemplates a substantial reduction in the percentage of over-aged rolling stock. Although it will not be possible due to limitation of resources, to eliminate over-aged locomotives completely, for the broad gauge stock, the number of over-aged locomotives is expected to be reduced to 18 per cent from the present 33 per cent and that of the wagons to about 10½ per cent from the present 18 per cent, and in the case of coaches to 14 per cent, compared to the present 32 per cent. In respect of the over-aged metre and narrow gauge stocks also, they are expected to be much lower than at present. Similarly in respect of track renewals, every effort is being made, consistent with the availability of material and financial resources, to wipe out the arrears. I would like to assure the hon. Member that there is full appreciation of the need for a scale of priorities in regard to projects undertaken.

The position in regard to the construction of new lines for under-developed areas is that the original proposal to construct about 3,000 miles had to be reduced to about 850 miles owing to paucity of funds, and new lines have had to be limited to those which are essential and urgently required to move the extra traffic connected with the higher steel and coal output during the Plan period.

In regard to other works, highest priority has naturally been given to safety works and these are followed by works urgently required for the movement of steel and coal traffic. The provision for passenger amenities is limited to Rs. 15 crores during the entire Plan period, which comes to less than 1½ per cent of the total expenditure of Rs. 1,125 crores, and even in respect of these every effort is being made to economise on the use of essential materials such as cement and steel.

Sir, with these words, I would like to assure the House that the railwaymen are fully alive to the great responsibility that has been placed on their shoulders for the successful implementation of the Second Five Year Plan and I can assure hon. Members and through them the country that the railwaymen are determined to do their duty by the country and the nation.

THE FOREIGNERS LAWS
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we pass on to the Foreigners Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1957.

THE MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Foreigners Act, 1946, and the Registration of Foreigners Act, 1939, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the House is aware that during the British regime, the word 'foreigner' was defined in a particular way so as to exclude members of the then British Empire, now to a certain extent the Commonwealth. This created certain difficulties. Recently, we have passed the Citizenship Act and it is open to every foreigner, if he desires to be a citizen of India, to seek admission under the Citizenship Act. It is now an anachronism to have on the Statute Book certain Acts which take away certain foreigners from the definition of the word 'foreigner' in these two Acts. Therefore, it was necessary that this definition should be widened. Foreigners should be defined as those who are not citizens of India. In the first Act, it might be found that the word 'foreigner' has been defined in such a way as to exempt those who are natural-born British subjects or who have taken British nationality under the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act which has now been repealed by the

Citizenship Act passed about a year ago. There is also another Act—the Foreigners' Registration Act. These two Acts were not made applicable to British people or to nationals of the Commonwealth. It was considered that this created certain difficulties. Now, whenever foreigners visited India or whenever they stayed in India or whenever they refused to go out of India, there ought to be certain powers vested in the Government for the purpose of regulating their entry or regulating their visits to this country and regulating their conduct, and certain rules should be there for the purpose of making it possible for the Government to ask these people to go away from India, and if they did not go, then they will have to be turned out. For this purpose it was considered necessary that the amendment of these two Acts was essential, because often-times certain other difficulties were created.

Now, for example, I might point out that a number of people came from Pakistan to India. They first came here under the permit system, and then we had an agreement under which it would be possible by mutual arrangement, to send back people who had over-stayed the authorised period of residence. That experiment also was not very successful, and especially after the passing of the Citizenship Act, it was considered that this definition should be widened so as to make it possible for us to include all those who are really foreigners and who are not citizens of India. For that purpose, Sir, the present Bill has been brought forward, it has been passed by the Lok Sabha and it would be found, Sir, the principal object of this Bill is to change the definition of the word 'foreigner' in the Foreigners Act and the Registration of Foreigners Act. According to the change now made, the word 'foreigner' is to mean all those who are not citizens of India, and power has been reserved to Government under clause 3A, which has been newly introduced, according to which it would be open to Government to give either general exemption in

the case of citizens of certain Commonwealth countries or to give individual exemption in the case of citizens of any other country. That power has been reserved because, as the House is aware, India is still part of the Commonwealth and as our Prime Minister has pointed out, this will continue to be so so long as it is in the interests of India. Therefore, the same principle has been followed and it has been stated that the members of Commonwealth countries would not be exempted as a matter of course. It will be open to the Government by a special order to exempt the citizens of any Commonwealth country as may be specified or individuals of any other country. This power has been kept to ourselves, and in proper cases such an order would be issued and people would be exempted. This is the main purpose of this Bill.

There are certain other consequential changes made in the two Acts mentioned above. One is for purposes of making it possible for Government to take proper action whenever it becomes necessary. In the original Foreigners' Act, there was a provision for the purpose of arrest and detention. Now, after the passing of the Constitution, it is necessary that whatever is done in respect either of arrest or of detention, it ought to be under the Constitution or under an Act which has been passed in accordance with the Constitution, namely, the Preventive Detention Act. Therefore, it was considered that any reference to arrest or detention as occurs in the 1946 Act would not be correct. In that view, that provision has been removed. If any foreigner has to be arrested, then he will have to be arrested under the Criminal Procedure Code or if he has to be detained, he will have to be done so under the Preventive Detention Act. That is the reason why opportunity has been taken to remove certain provisions which are likely to be inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution.

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

I might point out here that provision has been made for this Bill to take retrospective effect once it is passed. This Bill was introduced in the other House sometime in October or November, 1956, and because Parliament went into recess, this Bill could not be passed. In the meantime, it became necessary for security reasons as also on highly important grounds to make immediate provision to enable Government to take necessary action. Therefore, an ordinance had been issued and the scope of the Bill has been made to go back so as to keep continuity. After this Bill is passed into law, the ordinance would naturally cease to have effect because of the provisions included in the Bill.

The two Acts that would be amended are the Foreigners Act of 1946 and the Registration of Foreigners Act, 1939. These Acts have the object of regulating the entry of foreigners into India, regulating their conduct during their stay in India and regulating also the procedure by which they can be asked to leave India. All these provisions, as I stated earlier, applied to the nationals of other countries except the former British Empire or the Commonwealth. Now, it was considered that these provisions should be widened and whenever any person who came to India on a permit overstayed or refused to go, Government should have powers to take effective action against the continued presence of that person on the Indian soil. That is the reason why this Bill has been brought forward, to amend these two Acts, and I am quite confident that the provisions of this Bill would commend themselves to the assent or approval of the honourable House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Foreigners Act, 1946, and the Registration of Foreigners Act, 1939, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, as the hon.

Minister has pointed out, during the last one or two years, certain foreigners have come to our country, especially from the neighbouring country of ours, abused the hospitality offered by our country and indulged in certain activities which were detrimental to our country. In so far as this Bill wants to give certain powers to the Central Government to regulate the activities of foreigners, in particular of our neighbouring country which is part of the Commonwealth, I fully agree with the hon. Minister's proposals. I would, however, take this opportunity to point out to you, Sir, that by one line the definition of a 'foreigner' has been changed and the revised definition says that a foreigner is a person who is not a citizen of India. That means all persons belonging to the Commonwealth or to neighbouring friendly countries like Burma and others will come under the purview of this new definition.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The result is that if a foreigner comes to our country, he has got to register himself and whenever he stays for more than three days, he has to go and report to the police and all that. This involves a great deal of hardship. They may be tourists who may have come to our country. As a matter of fact, we want to develop tourism. Whenever tourists come to our country, we have got to give them certain conveniences. If they are asked to go and report to the police or register themselves, this will mean harassment to them and I submit, Sir, that it will lead to a great deal of waste of time. They have come to see our country and instead of seeing our country, if they spend most of their time in going to the police station, reporting their movements, etc., this will not be a suitable method of encouraging tourist traffic in our country. I feel, Sir, that our Government give too many concessions at certain times and then, when they wake up, they try to take away all the concessions at the same moment. This type of swinging from one extreme to the other extreme is a very curious

phenomenon. In the former Act, there was a definition of 'foreigner' by which many people were exempted from the application of the Registration of Foreigners Act and now, according to the change made in the Act, nobody will be exempted. The result will be that anyone who is not an Indian will have to be registered under the Foreigners Act and the moment he registers himself, he will have to spend a great deal of his time in getting permission for his movements.

Sir, you will be surprised to learn that a few months back a students' delegation was invited by the Osmania University from Dacca. Those students came at the invitation of the Osmania University and they were guests of the Osmania University but their movement was regulated. According to their itinerary they had to visit the archaeological sites in the Hyderabad State entirely from a research point of view but under this Registration of Foreigners Act as they had taken permission to spend about six hours at one particular place for seeing a particular site, and as bus arrangements could not be made and they had to overstay, they were mortally afraid of the steps that may be taken by our Government against them. Sir, I can go on multiplying such examples. By some changes we put extraordinary restrictions while only a few days before we were giving extraordinary concessions. Sir, this type of interpretation will cause great hardship. I know that the hon. Minister has taken certain powers under clause 4. He has added a section 3A but that only applies to the Foreigners Act and not to the Registration of Foreigners Act. By this power he can certainly exempt certain members of Commonwealth countries etc. from the application of the Foreigners Act but he cannot exempt them from the Registration of Foreigners Act because no such power has been taken by him. After all, I am trying to point out that this situation has arisen because certain Pakistani nationals have come to our coun-

try and indulged in subversive activities. Let us be fair and frank and let us openly say it. Let us say that any Pakistani coming to our country with ulterior motives will not be allowed to indulge in such activities and that his movements will be restricted. The partition has taken place only nine years back and I know, especially from Hyderabad, a large number of persons have migrated to Pakistan who have got their relatives in Hyderabad and a continuous traffic, especially of women, goes on between them. Young girls of Hyderabad have been married in Pakistan. They want to come and see their parents or their parents want to go and see them. In such cases if you apply this Registration of Foreigners Act very rigidly it will cause unnecessary hardship to persons who come with the best of motives and with the best of intentions to our country to see their parents, probably to leave a grandchild with the grandparents or take away a grandchild from the grandparents. In all such cases it will lead to hardship because the entire paraphernalia of the Registration of Foreigners Act will be applicable and they will be put to a lot of inconvenience. I, therefore, submit that the hon. Minister should also take certain powers about the Registration of Foreigners Act and in suitable cases give such exemption to persons who come to our country with the best of motives. Sir, I support the Bill but I request that it should be applied not with a harsh attitude but gently and in the proper spirit.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I generally support this Bill but subject to certain remarks which I am submitting before the House. The reasons given by the hon. Minister for these amendments to be introduced are very cogent and nobody would have any quarrel. They are necessary changes but these changes do not go far for the simple reason that though it is simple and non-controversial in nature, the Bill in the present form would perpetuate the distinction

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

between a foreigner belonging to Commonwealth countries and a foreigner belonging to other countries. The principle embodied in the Bill, to put it in simple words, is that the citizens of Commonwealth countries should not be regarded as foreigners except by way of exemption and citizens of countries other than Commonwealth countries should be regarded as foreigners unless there is this exemption. Here I do not want to introduce the question whether we should remain in the Commonwealth or not but it is a fact that Commonwealth countries are also foreign countries just as the non-Commonwealth countries. Certainly, we may either increase the sphere of our association with the Commonwealth countries or we may even form a new group with those countries that subscribe to our concept of Panchsheel and we may even exempt them from the application of the Act but the point remains that when we are defining who a foreigner is, it does not seem clear to me why a distinction should be made between Commonwealth countries and other countries, simply because we happen to be a member of the Commonwealth. So by this amendment we are not improving much upon this Act and it is not going to help in any way. Of course, we have taken powers whereby if a Commonwealth country is not friendly to us we can make exemption in that case but the point at issue is what has been pointed out by my friend, Mr. Kishen Chand. As he said, till ten years back Pakistan and India were one and today they are so much inter-connected in every possible manner that these contacts cannot easily be removed. It is unfortunate that our relations with Pakistan are, due to their own efforts, not as friendly as they should be, and we have to see that they do not indulge in sabotage and harm our interests but I do not understand at all why this distinction between Commonwealth countries and other countries should be there. If we want to exempt any country we can easily do

it without having this distinction. Take the case of Nepal. As far as I understand, we do not need any visa or passport for either the nationals of India or for those of Nepal to go into each others' country. We are on the friendliest of terms with Nepal; not only that, we have the happiest possible relations but under this measure unless we exempt Nepal specially, they will be subject to all this inconvenience. Similarly, take the case of Burma. Burma is not a Commonwealth country but we are on the friendliest of terms with Burma. On the other hand here is Pakistan which is not only a member of the Commonwealth but till ten years ago we were one. The contacts between the nationals of the two countries are so close and intimate that any restriction whatsoever would harm the interests of the nationals on either side. But even then we have to take very great precautions in the case of Pakistani nationals. Take East Bengal and Calcutta and other neighbouring places. There the nationals have to cross the international border quite frequently. The same is the case here in West Pakistan also especially in my own State of Rajasthan and the border areas of Bikaner from where I come, the nationals have to cross the international border, oftener but at the same time we have to be very very cautious. All the same I do not understand at all why this particular distinction has been made between Commonwealth countries and non-Commonwealth countries. Every foreigner is a foreigner and in the case of countries with which we are on the best of terms we can make an exemption irrespective of whether they are members of the Commonwealth or of any other group of which we are also members. Therefore, in principle, I would say that this distinction that has been made in this Bill between Commonwealth countries and non-Commonwealth countries is a very artificial and superficial one which would not help us much and in course of time probably we may have to make this change. Sir, the argument may be advanced that in certain

of the Commonwealth countries our nationals enjoy special amenities. They enjoy some facilities and if we remove this distinction our people residing in large numbers in other Commonwealth countries will be put to hardship. I would submit that in that case also, wherever we have got large interests and our nationals are residing in large numbers in other countries, and if they are adversely affected, we can easily make exemption for which provision has been made. Therefore, I do not particularly appreciate this distinction. Therefore, I feel there is no justification for any distinction being made between foreigners of Commonwealth countries and of other countries.

Subject to these remarks, I generally support this Bill. Thank you.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND (Madhya Pradesh): I would like to use this opportunity, while the Bill is before the House, to put before the hon. Minister the existence of a certain state of affairs in some of the States. It would have been necessary—especially as section 4, sub-section (1) and section 4, sub-section (4) are being dropped, where the Government had with it under section 4, sub-section (4), the power to regulate the conduct of the persons—to make sure that foreigners in our country, particularly in foreign companies with vast amounts of capital, are not in a position to indirectly interfere in the policy and political affairs of the country by giving large amounts of funds so as to bring about a state of affairs which will affect the existing Government's whole structure. There are very many companies, there are even managing companies of Indian companies where the managing directors of the company are foreigners and it is being noticed particularly in this election that they have been helping.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with elections in this Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: No, I am referring to the policy of the Government, and the subversive activities of foreigners against the existing Government. I will just give an instance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with elections here. Please hear me. This is to regulate the admission and the registration of foreigners—not the managers of concerns.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: May I say that as section 4(4) is being omitted, which left with the Government the power to regulate their conduct, something else.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not conduct.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: That is what I am pointing out that something should be done by Government, by rules, to see that this unworthy state of affairs does not spread.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have heard the hon. Minister. Please confine your remarks to the Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: I am just saying that clause 5 says that sub-section (4) of section 4 will be omitted and that section 4(4) reads: "The Central Government may, by order, provide for regulating access to, and the conduct of persons in, places....." etc. So, what I am saying is this: as this is being omitted, Government will wish to see that some rules are made in its place.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please read sub-section (4):—

"The Central Government may by order provide for regulating access to, and the conduct of persons, in places in British India where internees or persons on parole are detained or restricted, as the case may be, and for prohibiting or regulating the despatch or con-

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

veyance from outside such places to or for internees or persons on parole therein of such articles."

This has nothing to do with the elections or the managing of companies.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: But I feel this indirectly did provide some sort of a check on the behaviour of these people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with it. It is not relevant.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of making certain rules while these two clauses are being removed so that people do not get away with the generosity the Act is extending to them by giving them citizenship in a very liberal manner, that is, by widening the definition of 'foreigner'.

With regard to the point raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh I just wanted to say—though he has answered the question himself—that the reason for making the distinction is that we are still member of the Commonwealth of Nations and there is reciprocity to our citizens in those countries. That is involved.

प्रो० डा० रघुवीर (मुम्बई): उप-सभापति महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करते हुये केवल एक ही बात की ओर मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। जो भी सुविधायें भारतीयों को इंग्लैंड में अथवा कामनवेल्थ के दूसरे देशों में दी जा रही हैं उनका ध्यान रखते हुये हमको उन देशों के निवासियों को वही सुविधायें, यदि वे हमारे देश के हित के विरुद्ध नहीं हैं, देनी चाहियें। यदि मंत्री महोदय इस भवन को इस बात की सूचना देंगे कि कितनी कितनी सुविधायें इंग्लैंड में, आस्ट्रेलिया अथवा कनाडा अथवा पाकिस्तान में हमारे राष्ट्रियों को मिलती हैं और

हम उनको वही सुविधायें किस प्रकार से देंगे, और यदि उनके लिये संभव हो कि उन सुविधाओं का निर्देश इस विधेयक में भी कर दें, तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

इसके अतिरिक्त एक विशेष बात और है, जिसकी ओर मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उनके भाषण में उसका कोई निर्देश नहीं हुआ। वह यह है कि जो हिन्दू पाकिस्तान से यहां आ रहे हैं, और केवल हिन्दू ही नहीं बहुत से मुसलमान भी इस देश में आते रहते हैं पाकिस्तान से, उन पर इस विधेयक का, जब यह नियम बन जायगा, तब क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा और जिन लोगों को इस नियम के बनने से कष्ट होगा, उस कष्ट का निवारण कैसे किया जायगा?

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy-Chairman, I should like the Home Minister to clarify certain points in regard to this Bill. My friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, has raised those points. I have the Bill before me and I am just going to give you my reactions to them. This Bill, as far as I have been able to understand, seeks to amend two existing Acts—there is the Foreigners Act, 1946, and the Registration of Foreigners Act, 1939. Now, the word 'foreigner' has been defined to mean a person who is not a citizen of India. I am not raising any objection to this definition in section 2 of the Act. But under clause 4, we are asked to give to the Central Government complete power to declare that all or any of the provisions of this Act or of any order made thereunder shall not apply, or shall apply only in such circumstances or with such exceptions or modifications or subject to such conditions as may be specified in the order, to or in relation to—

- (a) the citizens of any such Commonwealth country as may be so specified; or

- (b) any other individual foreigner or class or description of foreigner.

Now we can exempt Commonwealth citizens and we can exempt, as far as I can see, individual citizens of Burma or a class of Burmese or any other individual foreigner or class or description of foreigners—Burmese, Indonesians, etc., with whom we are friendly. There is no difficulty about that.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Which description of a foreigner means a tourist? Can they include the word 'tourist'?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: That will be a reasonable category. There is no difficulty about that. You can describe a foreigner as a tourist. But the real difficulty is this. So far as the clause 8 is concerned, it deals with the Registration of Foreigners Act, and there too a foreigner is described as a person who is not a citizen of India. Now, I have not got a copy of the Registration of Foreigners Act before me, but my recollection is that under that Act it is obligatory on every foreigner to have himself registered and to report to the police or other authorities once a week or whatever be the time fixed in the Act itself. We have not taken any power in the case of a person whom we treat as a special person under clause 4 to be exempted from this harassing requirement of submitting himself to police inquisition or surveillance every week or ten days or three days, whatever be the period fixed in the Act. I think it may be that this is not a deliberate omission. I do not think that this is a deliberate omission and I should like, therefore, the hon. Minister to throw some light on the interpretation to be placed on clause 8. One possible view is that clause 4 applies both to the Foreigners Act and also to the Registration of Foreigners Act.....

SHRI B. N. DATAR: May I point out to my hon. friend that in the Regis-

tration of Foreigners Act, there is already section 6 corresponding to the proposed section 3A in the Foreigners Act? "The Central Government may by order declare that any or all of the provisions or the rules made under this Act shall not apply or shall apply with such modifications", etc.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have not had a look at the Foreigners Registration Act. I was speaking from recollection. What the Minister says completely answers my point. The power is already there and it would have been redundant on his part to take that power. After his clarification of the position, I can see no objection to this Bill.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): There are just two points, Sir. The first thing that I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister is the case of the fairly large number of Moplah residents from Malabar who have been for the last so many decades eking out their existence in Pakistan, most of them are casual labourers who have been employed there as 'biri' workers, and a number of them are also employed as hawkers and vendors, and being illiterate they have often not been able to conform to the various provisions of this Act. They come back to their villages in Malabar just to visit their families whom they have left here. So, there have been instances of their overstaying a little longer. The cases of such people require to be considered very sympathetically. For security reasons, we have to be very vigilant in regard to certain nationals, but, as has been pointed out, there are Pakistani nationals who come for *bona fide* reasons, and so far as the cases of these poor people are concerned, who are there in Karachi and so many other places, when they come back, some consideration must be shown to them in the matter of issuing permits, extending visas and other things.

Then, I endorse the point made by Shri Jaswant Singh. I can say that

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.]

it is good that power is vested with the Governor under the provisions of this Bill to exempt foreigners through notifications as and when the Government consider it necessary. But there is this blanket exemption given to the Commonwealth countries, specially Great Britain. Now, it has been sought to be justified on the basis of reciprocity. I know that a very large number of nationals of our country reside in Britain and they enjoy certain privileges, but apart from this reciprocity, specially in the present context of the world situation and from our own security point of view, we have to consider whether it is desirable that this blanket exemption should be given to these people. We know that, though the senior member of the Commonwealth, Great Britain, is seeking to build up military pacts threatening the security of our country. We know that Great Britain and certain other members of the Commonwealth are rushing up military aid, piling up armaments, right on the other side of the borders of this country. So, from the point of view of security I just appeal to the hon. Minister to see whether it is desirable that this blanket exemption should be granted to them. Again, the senior partner of the Commonwealth, with all her long association with our country, is so anxious to make friends with countries who have acted so inimically to our interest. All these things are to be considered. I say this strictly from the security point of view of our country, and that is why this blanket exemption given to these Commonwealth countries makes some of us anxious. We had instances of nationals from Britain coming to this country with very high recommendations. They had come here ostensibly for the purpose of making botanical studies. They had been invited to go to the Naga Hills, and we had reliable reports that these botanical research people who had been allowed to go there had been doing work other than botanical research. These instances make us think—I am not raising the question of quitting the

Commonwealth—but the security of our country must be dominant in our minds, and strictly from that point of view, in the present day context with the Kashmir situation assuming such proportions, I just put it to the hon. Minister whether it is not time that we considered about this general exemption granted to nationals of the Commonwealth countries, including Britain.

That is all that I can say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Datar can reply after lunch. Mr. Shah.

1 P.M.

THE KERALA BUDGET, 1957-58

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): Sir, I beg to present the statement of estimated receipts and expenditure of the State of Kerala for the year 1957-58.

Sir, the General Elections are just over and it would be some time before a new Government is formed and is able to present its Budget to the new State Legislature. Meanwhile, it is necessary to vote funds before the close of this month to enable the State Administration to carry on until the new Government is in a position to get the Budget for the full year passed by its Legislature. This is, therefore, an interim Budget in which Parliament is being asked to vote supplies for the first three months of the coming year.

Before dealing with the Budget for the ensuing year, I would like to mention that the Revised Estimates for the current year are not being shown in the Budget documents as the Kerala State came into being only on the 1st November 1956 and the figures for the last five months of the year will bear no comparison with the estimates for the whole year.

The revenue of the Kerala State for the year 1957-58 has been esti-