

[Shri H. P. Saksena.] everybody would be sending his entry money and all that *to* the newspapers which are published in that State and getting the prizes and so on and so forth; the game will continue to be played there unless that State is also brought under the jurisdiction of this Bill. So that was a serious lacuna which I wanted to point out. That is all.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: So far as this point is concerned, Sir, we shall informally bring it to the attention of Jammu and Kashmir Government. Just as the other States in India are coming into line and they are gradually passing resolutions so as to make this law applicable to their States as well, in addition to those several States we shall be requesting informally Jammu and Kashmir Government also to undertake legislation on these lines so that the evil that my hon. friend contemplates will be fully avoided and it would not prevail. In this paradise on earth. Certainly Kashmir is the real paradise on earth, but it will not be a paradise for gamblers at all.

(*Shri H. C. Dasappa rose to speak.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After his reply?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Is that the reply, Sir? I thought it was a reply to a question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."* The motion was adopted.

THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 3) BILL, 1955

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND DEFENCE EXPENDITURE (SHRI A. C. GUHA): Mr. Deputy Chairman, 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 service of the financial year 1955-56, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill arises out of certain Supplementary Grants voted by the Lok Sabha. I think a copy of the Grants as passed by the Lok Sabha has already been placed on the Table of the House with notes on the Grants, and the Members must also have seen in that printed pamphlet that there are footnotes giving some information about these Grants.

Sir, the Appropriation Bill is for an amount of about one crore and seventy lakhs of rupees out of which about Rs. 33 lakhs would be for revenue expenditure and about Rs. 137 lakhs for capital grant. About Rs. 24 lakhs of this total amount would be covered by savings or adjustments under other grants. So really the additional expenditure to be incurred would be to the tune of about Rs. 1,46,00,000 only. I think, Sir, I should make it clear that there may be savings in other items of the Demands passed by the Parliament during the Budget Session. So the additional requirement of Rs. 1-46 lakhs mentioned here would not indicate the net excess on the amount sanctioned in the Budget.

Then out of the capital demand of Rs. 1-37 lakhs near about Rs. 133 lakhs would account for one item, namely, Demand No. 115 regarding the Osmania paper currency. I think I should mention here that Members also must have noticed that the shortfall is more than offset by the interest realised by the Government of India on the securities before their transfer to the Reserve Bank. I think—I am not quite sure about the definite figure,—the interest accrued would be near about Rs. 1,90,00,000 or something like that. So on this item, that is, Rs. 1,32,63,000, in fact, in this total transaction, there would be rather some profits to the Government.

As for the other Demands, Sir, Members will find from the notes attached that there are two items from the Ministry of Home Affairs, one for Rs. 3,62,000 for meeting the expenditure on the Official Language Co-Pmission set up in pursuance of the provision of article 344 of the Constitution and also an additional sum of Rs. 3,00,000 for granting relief to those who have served the nation meritoriously in political, social and other fields and are in need of some special assistance.

There is one Demand on revenue account from the Ministry of Finance for the grant of Rs. 3,87,000 for the department of Companies Law administration. This department has to be set up according to the Companies Act that has been recently passed by the Parliament. It is at the suggestion of the Joint Select Committee as approved by both Houses of Parliament. The Government has to undertake quite a number of responsibilities and obligations for discharging their duties in the Company Law affairs and for that they would require about Rs. 3,87,000. Here also there would be some savings from another grant of the Finance Ministry. Certain officers would be transferred from other sections of the Finance Ministry to this department and there would be also some saving from the Company Law Administration which was attending to the Company Law work hitherto and the total new expenditure would be near about, I think, Rs. 33,000, or something like that.

On the capital side there is one demand from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry of Rs. 4,50,000 and that is to meet the requirement of an award by the Arbitrators. We have to respect that award and pay this amount to one party.

Then there is a token demand on the capital side and this is expenditure on a "new service". This token demand is for India's participation in the International Finance Corporation and it is Rs. 1,000 for the present.

There is another token demand for Rs. 1,000 for a hotel in Chanakya-puri. The total commitment in this Hotel venture would be to the tune of about Rs. 26 lakhs out of a total share capital of Rs. 1 crore. It would be a public limited company and the Government will have two directors on the Board of Directors of the Company and will have some other control also over the management of this Company.

I may add for the information of the House that the Grants originally voted by Parliament to which these Supplementary Grants relate have not been exceeded except in one case which is covered by an advance from the Contingency Fund which has been established by law made by Parliament under article 267(1) of the Constitution.

I think I have nothing further to say and I hope that hon. Members will be pleased to approve the Bill.

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 service of the financial year 1955-56, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The time allowed is two hours.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Though this Appropriation Bill is for a small amount as pointed out by the hon. Minister, I submit that it involves certain fundamental principles and I think we shall have to examine very carefully every one of the items that enter into this Bill. I will begin in the reverse order and start with the last item—Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply for a sum of Rs. 1,000. The hon. Minister in introducing the Bill just now pointed out that it is in connection with a hotel to be established in Chanakya-puri and that it involves a contribution by the Government of India of Rs. 26 lakhs towards share capital. It has been pointed out that

[Shri Kishen Chand.] the land for this hotel is being given at the rate of Rs. 50,000 per acre while the current value of land in that area is about Rs. 2 lakhs per acre. I do not see any reason why the Government should give land at such a low rate. That means that the Government is initially losing money. Then for special buildings like hotels and cinemas the Government has been normally charging an annual rent at the rate of 5 per cent.. I should like to know from the hon. Minister as to why he is charging only 2½ per cent. in this case. This means that the Government is going to lose money in two ways, firstly in the initial investment by charging a lower premium, nearly one-fourth the normal rate, and secondly the total value of the land will become less and the rent will be charged only on that at this rate of 2½ per cent. On both these points the hon. Minister will have to give justification.

I now come to the next point. This hotel is going to instal a brewery and it is going to sell liquor and various other narcotics. Probably it will permit late nights, have night clubs and all those things. I should like to know, in a country like ours where we have adopted a policy of prohibition—that is our aim and ideal— whether it is right on the part of the Government to promote any venture in which they will be directly going against the fundamental policy of prohibition. If the Government itself encourages the starting of brewery and provision of drinks at all hours, how is it possible for us to go and tell our countrymen that our aim and ideal is prohibition?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I ask hon. Member as to who gave him this idea that there will be a brewery and night club and all that? It is not here in this Bill.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If you read "the memorandum and articles of association of the hotel that is going to be established, you will find it there, and the Government of India is

not ignorant of the memorandum and articles of association of that hotel.

DR RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): In a hotel there is no brewery so far as I know.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The hon. Minister, when he is replying, can categorically state that the Government of India is satisfied that there will be no production of liquor or late distribution of liquor. Delhi, as you know, is going to come under the Prohibition Act in two years.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I think he is confusing the bar with the brewery.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I know the difference between a bar and a brewery. I do beg of the hon. Member that he should at least credit me with enough intelligence to know the distinction between the bar and the brewery. I may tell him that it is all given in the articles of association but the hon. Member will not read it. What can I do?

As I was saying, Sir, I am looking forward to an announcement by the hon. Minister that he had taken every care and precaution against such an eventuality. If he says that, I will be satisfied. I am giving facts which are contained in the articles of association of that hotel that is going to be established and when it is stated in black and white and you do not admit it, but pass these items out of ignorance, I do not see any justification for it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kishen Chand, before you proceed further, I have to tell you that you have 15 minutes only, because there are four speakers from the Opposition itself and I do not know how many will be from the other side.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Even if there are six speakers, each can have 20 minutes and you have been good enough to give 2½ hours.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes; one hour for the Opposition and one hour for the other side

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I have, taken only four minutes up till now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; five minutes.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: As I was saying, we should be very careful that in all our actions and in our policy we do not encourage anything which is against the Constitution. In our Constitution we have asserted that our ideal is to progressively bring about complete prohibition in the country and I do not want our Government to do anything which is contrary to that directive in the Constitution. With these remarks, Sir, I close this item.

Then I come to the next item—Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Finance. This item is also for Rs. 1,000 though we are going to pay nearly two crores and eleven lakhs of rupees. The rest of the money will come out of the savings. I am very glad that an international finance corporation is going to be established of which India will become the founder-member and this corporation is going to encourage investment of money in other countries by private sources. At present if you borrow money from the World Bank the Government of India has got to give a guarantee about the principal as well as the interest but in the case of this international finance corporation, if any investments are made in India, the Government of India will not have to give any guarantee about it. I will request the hon. Minister to be very careful to see that our becoming a founder-member of this international finance corporation will not lead to free investment of foreign capital in our country. Secondly, he should also see that in the organisation that is going to be set up the share of India in the matter of personnel like Governors, secretaries and other officers, is in proportion to our investment in that corporation.

Then I come to item 115—Capital Outlay on Currency. Here I have to submit that the Hyderabad State has

been a great sufferer. Under this integration of currency the dues of Hyderabad have not been paid in full. Whenever there is note circulation, a large number of the notes get destroyed. They are never returned to the currency chest for encashment. It is common knowledge that about ten per cent, of the notes do not come back. Now, the Osmania currency was to the extent of Rs. 35 crores and it had securities for a like amount. The hon. Minister has pointed out that the market price of these securities had come down and there was a short-fall of one crore and thirty-five lakhs which has been recovered from the interest on these securities. That means as far as the Government of India is concerned, they have recovered every pie of theirs. They have lost nothing at all. But consider it from the point of view of the Hyderabad State. When they have surrendered their currency to the tune of Rs. 33 crores, normally there would have been a saving of Rs. 3 crores on account of the notes which would have in the normal course got destroyed and would not have come to the treasury for encashment. It is only reasonable and fair that when Hyderabad has lost so heavily—it is a backward State struggling hard for industrialisation and struggling hard to find employment for its huge number of unemployed—some part of these savings accruing to the Government of India and to the Reserve Bank should be paid to the Hyderabad State. It is their due and they should really get it. Technically the Government of India may say, "Well, we have taken the currency." They are entitled to say that. If they were taking the currency as a whole, they should have taken the securities also at their face value. And before the transfer if any interest had accrued, that should have gone to Hyderabad. If that had been done, at least Hyderabad would have got a crore and thirty-two lakhs. But you have taken the arrears of interest and you adjust it towards the depreciation in the market value of the securities. And yet you do not give any credit to Hyderabad for notes

[Shri Kishen Chand.] which would not go back for encashment.

Then, Sir, I come to the "Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry." And here I am really surprised at the way such a big Ministry makes agreements with various people. Now, this is a thing which has arisen out of the import of paper. A particular party was engaged to handle that imported paper and that party was given a percentage of 91 by way of handling charges, charges for storing it, and commission for the sale of the paper. I suppose there must have been an agreement fixing an overall limit of 94 per cent, to be paid to that party. Now, the Government of India with all its legal resources and its able Ministry could not arrive at a proper agreement which might be beyond any dispute. The matter is referred to arbitration—through a High Court and the arbitrator awards Rs. 41 lakhs against the Government of India. Who is responsible for it? I certainly say, that there must have been some gross negligence on the part of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry or the Ministry of Finance or the Law Ministry

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Not the Finance Ministry.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I do not know. The hon. Minister transfers the responsibility from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Commerce or the Ministry of Law. I do not know if the Ministry of Law have made a mistake about the drafting of the agreement. But anyhow without knowing which department has blundered, all I can say is that some body has made a mistake and it has cost the Government of India Rs. 41 lakhs

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): The Government has blundered.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: So, the whole question is, that the agreements must be very carefully entered into. We are paying a big commission

of 91 per cent, on imported paper which is saleable and is readily sold. And on such a thing, if we cannot curtail our expenses to 91 per cent, and we have to pay damages to the extent of Rs. 41 lakhs, well, it needs very careful investigation and very careful scrutiny to apportion the blame

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is—
i
time.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: There are two more points, two minute 5 more, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. There are five more speakers.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Thank you very much.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I shall speak first on this grant for the Official Language Commission. I have no objection to the grant being made to the Official Language Commission. It is provided in the Constitution and it is also necessary that steps should be taken to replace English as the language of the administration at the Centre. But there are certain matters which should be borne in mind in this connection and which I should like to impress particularly upon the Official Language Commission. The first point is that taking note of the fact that even today the controversy over the adoption of Hindi is not yet over and there is a serious misgiving in the minds of non-Hindi speaking people, it would be better—indeed, it would be correct—to describe Hindi as the federal language instead of being called the national language, because the other languages of India are as much national as Hindi is and this view

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the wording used in the Constitution is "official language". It is not 'national language'.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: But unofficially it is described as the national language.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are *not* concerned with what is described unofficially.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: However, the Official Language Commission should take steps to see that these misgivings are allayed and one of the steps, will be to point out that the official language does not mean neglect or suppression or step-motherly treatment to other languages. Then, Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the proper forum is the Commission itself. You will have to lead your evidence there.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: That is true, I may give that evidence.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, they will welcome it.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: In this connection, there is another point which I wish to make, because this Grant is being considered. And that is the new terminologies which are being coined should be thoroughly examined, though I am fully aware that the learned and able gentlemen who compose the Commission will fully take note of this fact. Still I would like to draw their attention to this fact, that the terminology, the words which have been coined are not intelligible to the ordinary people, even to the Hindi-Speaking people. The essence of democracy is that the administration should be carried out in a language which is intelligible to the common run of people and understood by them. But in the name of coining new terminology, the words are such that the common people fail to understand them. The main purpose will be defeated. I shall give only one instance. I found in one railway station a big sign board "Janta Parivad Pustak". That was a Hindi-speaking area. I asked some of my friends, who were Hindi-speaking people, what is this "Parivad". And then they went to enquire and found on the other side of the sign board "Public Complaint Book". One

of them suggested: "let us go and write in the complaint book that the word "parivad" is not intelligible to the common people." That is one of the matters which should be kept in view.

There are also some other points, but I shall only briefly touch one of them. All these difficult words which have been coined are being coined on the theory that as Sanskrit forms the common base of all the major languages of India, "Tatsam" words would have to be used, to make them intelligible to non-Hindi speaking people. But it should be borne in mind that those "tatsam" words are intelligible only to the educated people. There are many words which though they have Sanskrit origin, are quite different from the language used by the common people. And in really developing a language and a terminology which will serve the official purpose, the purpose of running the Central administration, care should be taken to see that this is intelligible to the common run of people.

Then! Sir, I shall pass on to the question of the International Finance Corporation. I shall only deal with this question very briefly. In this connection, I do not like to bring in the old controversy-however much I am tempted to do so—, because I find Mr. Karmarkar sitting there. It is an old subject on which we have had clashes on many occasions and still the matter remains unsolved and both of us remain unconvinced of each other's point of view. What is necessary to be borne in mind, in this connection, as has very ably been pointed out by Mr. Khhen Chand. is that investment of private capital should be regulated. But this provision here—* through the International Finance Corporation may lead to certain consequences which will create serious difficulties. I hope this point will be*» later on developed by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. In fact, I did not intend to speak today and so, actually I did not go through the memorandum carefully. So, I do not propose to take much time.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I only want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister just a few points in connection with the last demand—that is the demand about the Chanakyapuri Hotel. First of all, I find that this sum of Rs. 26 lakhs is to be found out from the original demand and the demand made here is more or less only a token one. I would very much like the hon. Minister to tell me whether it is a case of over-budgeting so that as much as Rs. 26 lakhs are going to be found out of the previous demand, or it is a case that some other works which were already planned and proposed to be taken up are now being abandoned. I hope the hon. Minister will be able to throw some light on this point.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: What is the amount?

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Rs. 26 lakhs. That is what you yourself told me.

I would like to say, personally, on principle I would not consider it desirable that the Government should associate itself with this hotel business. As Mr. Kishen Chand has said, it will raise a question as regards serving of drinks. It is obvious, in this connection, that this Hotel is mainly meant for foreign visitors. But a hotel cannot differentiate and the question will arise as to how far serving of drinks and such things is going to clash with our known and declared intentions in the Constitution.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Is my hon. friend aware that the Air India International run by the Government of India are serving drinks?

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: That is a question of international convention. This is wholly within our own jurisdiction and has got nothing to do with any of our International obligations.

Next, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the point that, when the Government are finding

themselves ready to invest a big sum of Rs. 36 lakhs on this hotel, they should be able to give due priority to other much more imperative demands also. I hope they will do it. One standing disgrace is the way in which the Government are treating the Central Archaeological Library. The place—the hutments—in which we have kept those rare invaluable books here may be one of the reasons why the British scholars are scared to hand over the India Office Library to us.

I would very much wish that the hon. Minister would place on the Table of the House the agreement entered into by them with the other promoters. Again, I am specially interested to know as to why the special dividend of 5 per cent, per annum free of income-tax is allowed therein. Now, the cry is that all special concessions given in the past about being free of income-tax should be cut out. But here a new addition to that list is made.

My last point will be as to whether the directors to be nominated by Government will be able to exercise all due control. The reason why I raise this point is this. I have a little knowledge of this business. It is not a very paying business unless and until certain special advantages are given to it in some respects—especially in respect of bar. What I am anxious about is that if we are going to be very much hide-bound by our principles in this case we will have some real loss to bear in case of this investment. I hope the hon. Minister will throw some light on these points.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are creating a new Department—the Department of Company Law Administration under the Finance Ministry. This is being created mainly for the administration of Company Law and company affairs. This Department is going to be saddled with very great responsibilities. Its task is onerous. It has to cut a new path and organise from almost scratch. We have Ju«t

discussed the Companies Bill and we know that, under the Company Law, the Government have to play a very important role in almost all the aspects of company management. There are many penal clauses. There are clauses on which original initiative and action are required on the part of the Administration. Then there are clauses under which reference will have to be made to the Government. In short, I find that much greater burden is being placed on the Government here in India than under the corresponding law in England on the Board of Trade. The administrative set-up that we are going to have now must acquit itself well and must function in a business-like fashion. They have to be prompt in taking decisions on matters referred to them. In order to have a correct policy, their Research Department should be manned by competent and enough number of men, which I find is lost inadequate in the proposals put before us. The proportion of higher officials—that is to say, the Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries—to the subordinate staff must be higher than the ordinary proportion in the Secretariat, because they have not only to function quickly and efficiently, but also the integrity of the Department must be kept at a very high level, above all reproach. That is task No. 1 of this Department. Let us give no occasion when its integrity could be assailed. All this is possible only if we do not have a penny wise and pound foolish policy. If we have to err, we must err on the side of being over-staffed, of course, with experienced and honest men who feel that they have a mission to perform in ushering in a new era in corporate management in this country. Success or failure of this Company Law, to a large extent, depends upon this Department. In my opinion, the Minister's proposals are inadequate to meet the situation. You are definitely understaffed. You must increase the number of Deputy Secretaries in the interests of efficiency and quick disposal of work. I do not know how you

can manage with one solicitor and three senior and junior company accountants. Then in regard to the Research and Statistical Section, the senior and junior technical assistants need to be strengthened. You are not adequately staffed for this stupendous task that you have before you.

I draw your attention to Commerce Ministry's statement on the paper business. I find that this is a transaction and deal which must be looked into by an independent Parliamentary Committee like the Public Accounts Committee or the Estimates Committee. And a reference to such a Committee should not be barred on technical grounds as they have done here merely on grounds that the transaction had not resulted in loss and therefore the Government were not referring the matter to the Public Accounts Committee. This is a matter which I consider must be referred to the Committee, formally or informally. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister will be able to refer this transaction to a Committee nominated by the Chairman of this House and the Speaker of the other House, if he is not willing, on technical grounds, to refer the matter to the Public Accounts Committee. The reason why I want this transaction to be looked into and examined by a Parliamentary Committee is this.

Now, Sir, you will find that a consignment of 3,701 tons of paper arrived in India in March 1946, when, as this note suggests, there was no scarcity of paper in this country, and there was a glut in the market. Now on the arrival of this consignment of paper, the entire thing was handed over to one company—M/s. J. N. Singh & Co.—for storage and distribution of this paper. From the note that has been given to us we are not sure whether this was a monopolistic transaction or not. But because it was given to one company, I believe it was a monopolistic transaction. I would, Sir, like to know from the Government whether any tenders were

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] invited for giving this business to the various companies, as also, whether any tenders were invited in regard to the rates that were offered to this party. I do want to know whether this whole transaction was made on a competitive basis. We want to know exactly how this work was distributed and how the payments were made to the parties for doing this work. I want to know what objection is there to have this point examined by a Parliamentary committee.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): And at what prices was it sold?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I would just come to that. Then, Sir, the Government immediately after the arrival of this paper, was forced to get it liquidated, because there was no necessity of paper. Now in respect of the liquidation of this paper, I find from whatever little information that I have got, that the Government did not act in a business like manner. I would, therefore, like the Government to appoint a Parliamentary Committee in order to have this point examined and find out whether the liquidation of the stocks was done in a right and in a proper manner. You will find, Sir, that M/s. J. N. Singh & Co. started giving some discount. It is not very clear whether this discount was sanctioned by the Government or not, and also whether the discount was paid by that company to itself or not. This is very apparent, Sir, from the following sentences appearing in the Note:

"The firm expressed its inability to render account of discount allowed to different parties as the discount was adjusted in several ways and the parties would not acknowledge it in writing."

That is very clear, Sir. They say that the Government has not been put to a loss, but because of this discount paid I maintain that the Government's treasury did not receive all the money that it ought to have received. For >

every farthing of the money to be spent from the Government treasury you need all kinds of financial checks and financial sanctions. But here discounts are being given without the knowledge of the Government of India. The parties to whom the discount is given, are not known. Nobody knows all that. And nobody knows whether the discount has been given to M/s. J. N. Singh & Co. Sir, I know M/s. J. N. Singh & Co. They are big merchants in paper. They are not prepared to render any accounts, their accounts are not audited accounts. The Government wants only audited accounts. Sir, we want all the information as to how much they have spent on storage and what is the commission that they have been given.

Now, Sir, there is another point also which is very important. Originally it was fixed that the payments will be made on a tonnage basis, so much for rent, so much for commission, on a tonnage basis. Now the Government, at a later stage, wanted to convert this tonnage basis into a commission basis. The only justification for this conversion was that the stocks would be liquidated. Now the Government also says that it could not enforce the decision about conversion, from payment on a tonnage basis to payment on a commission basis. Now, Sir, I want to know what exactly made the Government convert the previous payment basis into a new payment basis. Now I cannot understand why the party did not agree to receive the commission of 10 per cent. Then, Sir, this Note says that the Government were advised that the firm could not be compelled to accept the rate of 9 per cent., and the Government might have to revert to the earlier arrangements. This means that the whole transaction was made in a very unbusiness like manner, and no legal formalities were observed, and no financial regulations of the Government of India were observed. These are the matters, Sir, which must be looked into very carefully by a committee of Parliament.

Now, Sir, there is another funny thing that you find here. Sir, it has been stated that it was accordingly proposed that the matter should be settled by negotiation, and the firm was asked, in November 1948, to furnish its audited accounts in order to consider its claim for a higher rate of commission. But the firm did not send any reply for more than four years, and it accepted payments at the rate of 9½ per cent, under protest. In February 1953, the firm put in a claim of Rs. 4,06,628-4-9 as compensation for its loss. Now after four years—imagine it—the Government on its part, had paid the full and final payment at the rate of Rs. 9½ per cent, which the firm accepted under protest. Now, Sir, for full four years they kept quiet and did nothing. Then they put forward their claim, and arbitration was forced upon the Government. That means that the whole legal foundation of this transaction and of this agreement between the Government and the so-called company was weak. And whom should we hold responsible for this weak foundation, the very basis of this contract? The very fact that they are not prepared to put this affair into the hands of the Public Accounts Committee creates a suspicion with regard to this entire transaction. The Lok Sabha's Business Advisory Committee wanted this matter to be referred to the Public Accounts Committee, but it was refused. Why was it refused? Caesar's wife should be above suspicion. Well, if you think (hit the table) whole thing is clear, why should you not agree to refer this matter to a Parliamentary Committee? Why should you not agree to refer the matter to the Public Accounts Committee and erase yourself of the suspicion that might be created by the Note that you have circulated to us?

Sir, it is very funny. The claim is only for Rs. 4,06,628-4-9 and the award is for Rs. 4,50,000. And no explanation has been given by my hon. friend. How is it that in this case something more than claimed is sanctioned? I know always of a claim

being reduced, but not being increased. Therefore, Sir, I hope that the hon. Minister will be sporting enough, and will accept my suggestion to refer this matter to any Parliamentary Committee, formal or informal.

Then, Sir, about this hotel business which was talked about so much, I would like to submit something. Now, a company is going to be floated for one crore of rupees, in respect of the Chanakyapuri Hotel. Rs. 25 lakhs will be the share contribution by the Government of India.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I think it will be Rs. 26 lakhs.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: All right Rs. 26 lakhs. And then the Government says that if the full subscription is not forthcoming, Rs. 25 lakhs will be given by the Government as a loan. So, Sir, out of Rs. 1 crore, Rs. 50 lakhs will come from the pockets of the Government of India. Over and above that, Sir, as my hon. friend, Shri Kishen Chand, has said, the loan is being given at a very concessional rate, and there is going to be a concession in the matter of the ground rent and the premium money on the land. I do not understand, Sir, whether this whole thing was decided on a tender basis or some other basis. Did the Government ask for tenders from parties in order to put up a hotel there? This is not a big industry, Sir. It is not a very intricate industry. All these hotels are, as a matter of fact, flourishing in Delhi, and I am sure, a number of people would have come forward and would have taken on their shoulders the responsibility of financing the hotel to the tune of one crore of rupees. Why should the Government of India spend Rs. 26 lakhs which they can spend on other essential industries, instead of running this hotel?

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Ours is a mixed economy, you know.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: If you are having a mixed economy, why should not the Government of

[Shri Bajendra Pratap Sinha.] India spend this money on some other industries? Why should they spend their money in a business in which you can have the private sector to come forward and invest money? Why should you lose one and a half lakhs of rupees per acre on the ground premium and why should you lose 2i per cent, on the ground rent also? I would like to be satisfied on this point. You must remember that the work of the Government of India must be done in a manner which shows that there was no favouritism altogether. I would like to know whether tenders were invited for this hotel. What were the rates of the tenders? Were not parties available in India to start this business? What efforts were made to find out whether there were parties who could invest one crore of rupees in this business and pay two lakhs of rupees per acre as ground premium and 5 per cent, as rent?

I would like to say a word about this International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We are very happy that the Government of India has agreed to become one of the members of this body. This International body is Hemg floated for the purpose of assisting undeveloped countries to develop. ThTs Is a very laudable aim. I was not sure and, therefore, I went across ffre TSble to the hon. Minister and asked him whether the other countries in South East Asia like Indonesia, China, Laos, Cambodia and all these countries which are backward, which have not yet advanced industrially, could draw loans or money from this body or not. The hon. Minister told me that benefits could only be taken by the members of this body. Sir, I would like that the Government of India should maintain the tradition of helping countries in Scuth East Asia to develop and to go ahead in building up their industries. I would, therefore, submit that the Government of India should agitate in these international bodies that monetary assistance should be given to these countries in South

East Asia whrRWr they. were members of this body or not. I say this because the Governments of tho«e countries, that are members of this, body, are not required to give any undertaking for recouping the losses suffered by this body. Now, if the government of a particular country like Indonesia or Cambodia gives a guarantee alSout the loans given in that country, we should encourage such countries .to take advantage of this body.

श्री कन्हैयालाल दूँधू बेंचर : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ये जो डिपार्टमेंट्स हमारे सामने रखी गई हैं उन पर जो बातें विरोधी पक्ष की ओर से उठाई गई हैं और अभी माननीय सदस्य ने जो एक सम्भाव्य व्यय जे० एन० सिंह एंड कम्पनी के बारे में दिया है उसमें बहुत कुछ सच्चाई है। भ्रष्टाचार बहुत सारी कम्पनियों में है और उसके लिये अभी दो दिन दूर्य हम कम्पनी बिल पास कर चुके हैं लेकिन यह मंत्री समझ में नहीं आया कि इस बिल से उन सब बातों का क्या सम्बन्ध है। इस बिल में उसके सम्बन्ध में देखने की मंने बहुत कांशिश की लेकिन मुझे उस सम्बन्ध में कुछ मिला नहीं। वह तो बहुत पुराने जमाने की सन् १९४४-४५ की बात है, वह युद्ध का जमाना था और कागज के काम में उस व्यय लोगों ने करोड़ों रुपया जमाया था। उस कहानी को अगर बयान किया जाय तो मैं भी बहुत सी बातें सदन के सामने ला सकता हूँ लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि उस कहानी को यहाँ दहराने से कोई प्रयोजन सिद्ध होता है। हाँ, यह हो सकता है कि अगर ऐसी बातें हुई हैं तो डिपार्टमेंटल लेवल पर उन बातों को गवर्नमेंट के ध्यान में लाया जाय और भ्रष्टाचार की जांच करने के लिये जो डिपार्टमेंट्स हैं उनके द्वारा डिपार्टमेंटल लेवल पर कार्रवाही हो।

हिन्दी के बारे में एक माननीय सदस्य ने प्रश्न उठाया था और आपने भी स्वयं उनसे कहा था कि कमीशन अभी जांच कर रहा है। कमीशन तो हिन्दी के प्रश्न पर पक्षपात की कोई भी बात नहीं कर रहा है बल्कि जो प्रस्तावनी हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में जारी की गई है वह अंग्रेजी में जारी

की गई है और उसमें एक नोट लगाया गया है कि उत्तर देने वाले यदि चाहें तो हिन्दी में उत्तर दे सकते हैं किन्तु यह अच्छा होगा कि वह अंग्रेजी में ही उत्तर दें। तो जहां तक हिन्दी के प्रश्न का सम्बन्ध है विधान के अन्तर्गत सरकार पर एक जिम्मेदारी थी और उसी जिम्मेदारी को पूरा करने के लिये यह कमीशन कायम किया गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि कमीशन इस सम्बन्ध में पूर्ण रूप से जांच करेगा और तब सरकार के सामने अपना सुझाव रखेगा। सरकार का तो यह कर्तव्य है कि संविधान की जो धाराएं हैं उनकी पूर्ति करे और उसी के लिये इसमें यह रकम मांगी गई है। मैं नहीं समझता कि इसमें कोई आपत्ति हो सकती है।

इस बिल में जो दूसरी गांठ है वह कम्पनी ला से सम्बन्धित जो जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर आती है उसके लिये एक डिपार्टमेंट कायम करने के बारे में है। वास्तव में एक बहुत बड़ी जिम्मेदारी सरकार के ऊपर कम्पनी ला के अन्तर्गत आती है और जो नया डिपार्टमेंट खुलने वाला है उसके द्वारा यदि सरकार कम्पनी ला के नियमों का पूर्णतः पालन करा सकेगी तो देश का बहुत कुछ लाभ होगा लेकिन कानून के पास होने के बाद सरकार के डिपार्टमेंटों से उन नियमों का पालन किस तरह कराया जाता है उसका एक आदर्श नमूना हमारे सामने इस्टेट ड्यूटी बिल है। उसके अन्तर्गत हमें देखने को मिलता है कि सरकार ने एक बहुत बड़ा डिपार्टमेंट कायम कर रखा है और देश में बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति मर रहे हैं लेकिन जब कभी सदन में इसके आंकड़े पढ़े जाते हैं कि डेथ ड्यूटी से कितनी आमदनी हुई तो केवल माम मात्र की रकम ही बताई जाती है, जिसको कि सुन कर हंसी आती है। समझ में नहीं आता है कि ये पूंजीपति किस व्यवस्था से चला करते हैं कि डेथ ड्यूटी बिल का उन पर असर नहीं होता। तो कम्पनी ला के अन्तर्गत जो विभाग खुलने वाला है उसके नोटिस में, इस गांठ के सिलसिले में, कुछ बातें

ला देना चाहता हूँ। डेथ ड्यूटी बिल से बचने के लिये पूंजीपति अपनी जायदादों का बटवारा ही नहीं करते हैं बल्कि बैंकों से नये नये तरीके से कर्ज ले कर अपनी हालत को छिपाते हैं ताकि उनके रिकाइंग से उनके बच्चे, उनके उत्तराधिकारी यह सिद्ध कर सकें कि हमारे पुरखे तो बैंकों से कर्ज ले कर अपना व्यापार चलाते थे। वे लोग असली पूंजी को छिपाये रहते हैं। अगर जांच कराई जाय तो पता लगेगा कि डेथ ड्यूटी कानून पास होने के बाद से बहुत सी नई नई पार्टिज सामने आई हैं जिनके नाम से वे लोग बैंकों से रुपया ढ़ा करते हैं। इसीलिये मेरा कहना है कि सरकार कम्पनी ला के अन्तर्गत जो जिम्मेदारी ले रही है उसको तभी पूरा कर सकेगी जब कि कम्पनी ला से सम्बन्धित डिपार्टमेंट इन सब बातों की पूरी जांच करेगा। यदि वह डिपार्टमेंट इन सब बातों की जांच नहीं करेगा तो मैं नहीं समझता कि कम्पनी ला के अन्तर्गत जो जिम्मेदारी सरकार ने ले रखी है उसे वह पूरी कर सकेगी। अतः जो गांठ यहां रखी गई है वह मैं समझता हूँ कि उपयुक्त है और वह देश के लिये एक आवश्यक काम के लिये है। उसको मंजूर करने में हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये, केवल यही कहना है कि हम जो सुझाव आपके सामने रखते हैं उसके अनुसार कार्य करना गवर्नमेंट का फर्ज होता है। इस देश के संरक्षण के लिये जिन विभागों को हम कायम करते हैं उनके अन्तर्गत यदि हम देश की व्यवस्था को न सुधारे और कानूनों के पास होने के बाद भी देश में भ्रष्टाचार और शोषण करने वाले जो तत्व हैं वे शोषण करते रहें और भ्रष्टाचार पनपते रहें तो फिर इन विभागों की उपयोगिता ही सिद्ध होती है और लाखों करोड़ों रुपया बेकार खर्च होता है। हमारे सामने बिल रख कर उसको मंजूर करा लेने से ही तो देश का कोई कल्याण होता नहीं। कितना भी सुन्दर कानून हमसे पास करा लें और करोड़ों का खर्चा विभागों के लिये स्वीकार करा लें परन्तु यदि उनके अन्तर्गत देश के शोषण की जो व्यवस्था है उसका अन्त न हो तो सब बेकार है। यह एक विचारणीय प्रश्न है। मैं आशा करता

[श्री कन्हैयालाल दौंगर वैया]

हैं कि जहाँ हम इन खर्चों को करने की स्वीकृति देते हैं वहाँ हमारे जो मंत्रीगण वहाँ विराजमान हैं, बैठे हुए हैं, वे इस बात का भी अनुभव करेंगे कि हमसे जो वे खर्चें मंजूर कराये जाते हैं वे इसीलिये कराये जाते हैं कि देश से भ्रष्टाचार दूर हो। भ्रष्टाचार की व्यवस्था को खत्म करने के लिये ही यह डिपार्टमेंट कायम किया जा रहा है और उसके लिये हमसे खर्च की मंजूरी कराई जा रही है। तो मंत्रीगणों को यह ध्खना चाहिये कि इस डिपार्टमेंट का भी वही हाल न हो जो कि इथ इयूटी डिपार्टमेंट का हो रहा है कि हिसाब किताब सब बराबर हो रहा है, करोड़पति मरते हैं लेकिन उनसे एक काँड़ी भी नहीं मिलती है।

श्री डी० पी० करमरकर : बहुत नहीं मर रहे हैं।

श्री कन्हैयालाल दौंगर वैया : जो मर रहे हैं उनकी भी संख्या काफी है और उनसे जितनी आमदनी होनी चाहिये वह नहीं हुई है।

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

4 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are a number of Demands for Grants here,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta I would like you to take just half an hour. Less the better.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I was given only 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry but I cannot extend the time now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is about the Language Commission, I need not say much on the subject but it appears from the note that has been circulated to us in connection with Demand No. 61 that whereas 5 officers of the Language Commission, between them, will get about Rs. 55,000

8 year, 29 other employees there including Assistants would, between them, get only Rs. 37,000. This in itself shows how these things are organised. I need not make any comment here except that here again we find that one Joint Secretary will be given Rs. 3,000 a month and it is calculated on the basis of 8 months in all cases and it comes to Rs. 24,000 whereas most of the clerks will start at Rs. 89—typists and clerks. You see the discrepancy even when we appoint such Commission. We want a Joint Secretary in this administration but why must we have such high salaried people as the Heads of such Commissions—not as Members, but in the Secretariat of the Commissions "when better people can be found and at a much less cost? Beyond that I would not like to say anything on this subject.

Now let me come to Grant No. 25. I shall come to the others later. I come to the Demand for the Ministry of Finance for about Rs. 3,87,000 for running the Department for the administration of the Company Law. Here again it is a top-heavy department that is being created. The Secretary will get Rs. 4,000, then there will be a Private Secretary to him who will get again Rs. 275 to Rs. 500. Then there will be a Joint Secretary at Rs. 3,000 per month, a Deputy Secretary between Rs. 1100 and 1800, an Under Secretary getting Rs. 1,250 and then of course the others will follow. Here again it is a top-heavy, administration and if I look at the other personnel of this Department. I find that the clerks—Upper Division and Lower Division—will be given very small salaries, especially the Lower Division Clerks will be starting at Rs. 80/—. This is how the Department is being organised. It is clear now that they want this Department to be, another bureaucratic body to administer the Company Law of our land and these people at the top will be given high salaries. One can understand why the Union Minister in piloting the Companies Bill was so much insistent on giving high salaries

to the managing directors, managers and managing agents because the Department itself which is being started would be equally given, at the top, very high salaries. BuJs of the same feather flock together whether they wear the official plumage or non-official plumage. We are aware of What is happening in the Department of Registration where the smaller people—the Lower Division clerks and daftaries and others are getting the barest living. I should have thought that amounts will be sought for increasing their salaries and their allowances so that they can live well. It is necessary for the Government to ensure that these people are satisfied for the efficient running of the administration of this particular Department. Now in this connection, since for the first time we are dis-russing this particular Department, I should like to offer my suggestions. This is going to be a very important Department in the country. I know that many things in the private sector will be outside the scope of this particular Department. Yet, since ye are having a Department and ' have passed a Bill which gives ' Government ample powers to deal with certain matters, this Department will take on importance and significance but what we would like to urge, upon the Government is, that they must see that the Department is manned by incorruptible people. I have no names at the moment in mind but I have always feared that once the wrong type of people get into this Department, yo"ur Companies Law or whatever it is, when it comes into force, will be made a mockery. That is what I am going to tell you because, whatever good provisions are there, it depends very much on how the Department handles the matters. I must here say that we have got some very bad experience as far M such Departments are concerned because it is well known in the country that some of the Government Departments, especially the Commerce and Industry Ministry, have; got certain unholy connections with the

84 R.S.D.—4.

business world. I don't krtow whether they will be carried forward in thi« Department but I would ask the Finance Minister to rid this particular Department of that wrong type of connections. I can tell you in this connection one incident. You know that a big company boss had been arrested recently somewhere in India and i3 now out on bail. Just before he wai arrested, the Minister for Commerce and Industry appeared in Dalmla-nagar and made a speech and the report of the speech was flashed in 'The Times of India', a paper owned by that particular arrested person. Such things are not

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): Sir, such personal remarks should not be there. The Minister for Commerce and Industry is not here.....

(Interruptions.)

PROF. G. RANGA: I don't think that is quite correct. After all, the Minister! are there. Whether the Ministers are present here or not, we are entitled to make reference to them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Call your Minister. I request you, Sir, to direct the office. He should not be so sensitive. I can tell you that I have every right to criticise the Ministers of the Government especially when we are called upon to sanction funds. When we are dealing with company matters, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should be failing in my public duty if I did not draw your attention to that particular incident, which is public knowledge by now because the whole matter is reported in the press. It is no use trying to take cover behind the fact that the person is not present here. I think the hon. Minister who got up before me if a competent and an able person to protect his superior in this matter, if he so desires.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: All right.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One should not suffer from inferiority com-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] plex in such matters. Now, therefore, I say if you irritate me, then you get this kind of language.

Now what I wish to say in this connection is, let the hon. Minister, when he replies to this debate over this particular matter, give us an assurance that such things will not happen, that the Department you are going to create would not have any officer there, who has got any connection whatsoever, with things of that sort—wrong type of things—and with the company bosses. This assurance we want because we are sanctioning the money here and we are entitled to ask for this assurance. I may tell them that whatever measures they had for controlling the companies and these joint stock companies in our country have been set at naught and negated because of the fact that the Government departments developed certain most objectionable relations with certain company bosses. If you ask me to relate instances, Sir, I can relate many instances, but this probably is not the occasion for that. But I know how the Bengal Chamber of Commerce and Industry had discussions with the West Bengal Government and how they came to common conclusions against workers' bonuses and how a circular was then issued from the Commerce and Industry Department of the Government of West Bengal and an editorial was written in "The States man"

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The West Bengal Government is not represented here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The West Bengal Minister is not here, but the Department is here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Do not refer to the State Governments.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, Sir, Anyway, if the hon. Minister cares to find out the facts, we can help him In this matter. I have given you this one instance and the particular coincidence in point of time is of great inter-

est in that particular case. I am told that the hon. Minister said there that Dalmianagar is a fine place. Why he should have said that it is a fine place, I do not know. I do not know the reasons for such an inspiration. I know how the workers suffer there. I know they are driven to live a life of which one feels pained to speak in this House.

Therefore, I say, coming back to my point that you really have here the full paraphernalia of secretaries and other officers and all that. But how is the selection going to be made? I don't mind if the selections are properly made on the advice of hon. Members from that side of the House. I know many hon. Members on that side would be as much interested as I am in ensuring that this department is not filled with people who are not above board. This is what I say. Therefore let them have this department by all means, but let them make it a good department. Let them not turn it into a sort of lobby for big business, where they could come, confabulate and get things out. Let it not become another sink for corruption, favouratism and nepotism where the laws can be violat-ed and from where permits and all kinds of licences will flow. This much about this department.

Now about the hotel. This is a very amusing thing, for it appears from this memorandum given to us that the princes are becoming hotel keepers. It is very interesting, Sir, for you see here they state:

"In pursuance of the decision an Agreement has been entered into by the Government of India with the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar and Shri Harbans Lai CKadda of Dehradun for the promotion of a public limited company for the construction and management of a hotel in Chanakya-puri in New Delhi."

I don't know who the second person is. Of course, I have heard of this gentleman who bears the title of Jam Saheb

of Nawanager. But I never thought that he would start a hotel. But having started one, he should have found the resources for it from his own financial resources. He is a well-known rich person. Nobody knows how many horses he keeps. He is a fabulously rich person. He should have been asked to fork out the cost of starting the hotel, if he wanted to start one. But the Government of India comes and purchases preference shares worth Rs. 25 lakhs. What is all this? They take 25,000 preference shares and this will carry no voting rights, I suppose. And then, all manner of concessions have been given. We have seen many things. They have made Rajpramukhs out of the princes, and they are now making—shall we say—hotel bosses or hotel managers out of the princes? Let them do it by all means, if they want to, but let them not draw money from the public exchequer. Ask them to start hotels if they like. I do not care what they do, but they should find the money themselves. If it is to be a private concern, let private capital produce the money. If the Government is really interested in starting such hotels—I do not say that they should not embark on such things,—why should Jam Sahebs be approached for the cash? The country can provide them with the cash. The public sector can produce the money. They can borrow funds and put the thing under public control. We are told that there are to be two directors there. You will have two directors, we know; but the Jam Saheb will be the Jam Saheb. That is the point. Jam Sahebs will be Jam Sahebs. You cannot change the Jam Sahebs in our land. But I should like to have some particulars about — not the Jam Saheb, for the name Jam Saheb speaks for itself—but about the other person. I would like to know something about this Shri Harbans Lai Chadda of Dehradun, what sort of man he is, to which party he belongs and to which party he contributes funds. One would like to know these things we would like to know who this person is. This is most important for us to know, because he is in this joint

venture. This kind of a mixed economy and all that with Jam Sahebi and others is not a very good thing. Have mixed economy, if you like, but in the right direction. Here you are going to build a hotel. My hon. friend here asked the pertinent question, "Did you invite any tenders?" What is the answer? Why don't you get a number of private capitalists to start it? I want a satisfactory answer from the Government. This is the sort of thing that they are doing. The profits will all go to them. We will be content with the preference shares and a dividend of 5% per cent. Suppose they make enormous profits, all that does not come to you. It is all sealed because we the public are holding only the preference shares. Suppose they make 10 per cent profit. Everything will go to them, the Jam Sahebs. This seems to be a new way of pampering the princes. They are actually giving them, privy purses. In spite of demands on the Prime Minister, that a part of the privy purses should be voluntarily surrendered, this is what is happening. Whatever might or might not have happened under this regime, the princes have become the favourite children of the Congress Government.

We do not object to this hotel being started, but we object to this kind of an approach. Therefore I have spoken strongly on this matter. Not that I am opposed to such a hotel in this country. We do want such a hotel, but let it be started not in an objectionable manner but in a proper manner, by the Government. We do not like such ventures to be associated with people like these. If it is a private concern, let it be a private concern entirely. If it is a public concern, let it be a public concern in the true sense of the term.

And now about the International Finance Corporation. I do not want to say much about this. But I should have thought that the Minister of the Finance Ministry—I don't know whether that is the correct title, for it is a long title with something like Civil Expenditure and all that—would have been

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] good enough to tell us about the plans of the International Finance Corporation. I am told that certain memorandum had been there in the Library, but it seems that someone else had taken possession of it for the time being and I could not get it, much as I should have liked to read it, not only for this debate, "but for other reasons also. I would like to be enlightened on this subject. But one thing I would like to make clear. Certainly we want cooperation between countries. But we are opposed to foreign private capitalists investing money from the U.S.A. or Britain in this country. This is what we are opposed to. I wish to make this position clear. It is not as if we are opposed to mutual assistance between countries. We do not oppose such assistance. We endorse the declaration that has been made at the Bandung Conference and we are familiar with that particular clause in this connection. We stand by it. But what we are opposed to is—that the American and British imperialists should be allowed to come to this country to make private investments to exploit the resources and the cheap labour in this country. That is what we are opposed to. If you get money from them as loan, either for the State sector or for the public sector, I would support it provided it does not lead to the exploitation of our resources and labour power. In this connection, I would only like to read out a portion from the proposals of our Party with regard to the problem of national reconstruction. This is what the Communist Party has stated:

"However, foreign capital or assistance, if necessary, may be secured at governmental level and in the form of loans and technical know-how. Foreign loans may also be allowed in the private sector, but the private sector must not be permitted to negotiate" "these loans except for investments in such enterprises or for such purposes as may be approved by the State for promoting the cause of our economic advancement."

This is the broad view" we take in this matter. Consistent with this view, we should certainly like to have mutual cooperation with all countries in the world for mutual benefits and for mutual advantage. I have no quarrel with that but I would only like to request the Minister to enlighten us because I gather from the foreign Press that British and American capital which is surplus is interested in using such institutions for new penetration* into under developed countries. That is what we read in the papers. Therefore, one should be very cautious in such matters and take note* of the danger that is involved in such transactions.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, my hon. friends who have spoken already have referred to the various items I would like to confine myself to only one subject and that is with regard to the Official Language Commission. In regard to this, there are only two points that I want to make. The first is about the susceptibilities of the non-Hindi speaking areas. However desirable it may be to see that the article of the Constitution, namely, that Hindi becomes the official language of India is implemented, however desirable it may be to force the pace of that, still, I think, it is the path of wisdom not to ignore the emotions and the feelings that are now prevailing in certain parts of India where Hindi is not the regional language. I do not want to say more on this subject. I am appealing to my friends whose mother tongue is Hindi and who come from U.P., Bihar, Delhi, Punjab and so on—I do not know, there are so many places—, areas where Hindi is spoken. Even here, I am told that the Hindi of one place differs from the Hindi of the other; Mr. Saksena told me that he speaks the pure form. I am not concerned with all those but this is a point which we ought to take note of.

Secondly,— and this is important— I would come to what has been done by way of propagation of Hindi in non-Hindi speaking areas. I have got

here the latest publication relating to the year 1955.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Whose is it?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Published by the Ministry of Education.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: I have not seen it.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It has been circulated to every Member of Parliament.

The first thing is about the technical words. I do not mind who gets it. Probably the Hindi speaking areas are the best qualified to take up this work. The second thing is to make Hindi a compulsory subject in the secondary schools in non-Hindi speaking areas. I do not know whether there is necessity for such a thing. Anyway, let them take some interest. I do not know what interest they have taken. The third is the most important, propagation of Hindi among the people in non-Hindi speaking areas. The objects are further elaborated in pages 2 and 3 where they say, "Steps for the propagation of Hindi in non-Hindi areas and measures to provide facilities for learning Hindi to non-Hindi-knowing Central Government employees". I then turn over number of pages and come to this V item, Propagation of Hindi. Here they have given certain figures. The total comes to Rs. 3,54,500. On page 15 is given a list of the States to which grants have been made in respect of propagation of Hindi. Out of a total of Rs. 3,54,500, my friend* from U.P. have been given Rs. 2,33,000.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I do not know what he is talking about. I had better leave now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saxena is going out.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Bombay State has been given Rs. 10,000 for all these four or five years. Let me tell you that. Madhya Pradesh luckily has got because of the Hindustani Prachar Sabha, Wardha, and possibly because of my revered friend.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is it that is given to the four Southern States?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am coming to it, Sir.

Madhya Pradesh has got Rs. 96,000. Of all the non-Hindi speaking areas, Hyderabad gets Rs. 10,000. It is virtually a Hindustani speaking area though it is not in the Devanagari script. None of the States of Andhra, Madras and Mysore have got anything; Mysore after a Herculean effort, got Rs. 5,000 during this five year period. I make a present of it to them

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINH A.: What sort of propagation is being done in U. P. as far as Hindi is concerned?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I do not know. I want my hon. friends from U. P. to let me know whether there is any kind of justice in this kind of propaganda.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I entirely agree with my friend. I want to know what kind of propagation is being done in U.P.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. There is no time.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I have no quarrel with this. Every region is a good region and intention! are wonderfully good, but when it comes to a question of implementation, let me tell you. Sir, that it is an extremely unhappy position that we are in.

What I am saying is, are Government satisfied with their performance? Is this the way of implementing the constitutional provision? One thing is certain and that is the non-Hindi speaking area candidates are going to be handicapped when it comes to a question of the All India Services and so on. Therefore, I beg to submit that this is a wholly unsatisfactory position and they must, in expiation of their sin, do something very much more than what they have done.

PROF. G. RANGA: I only want to say that I am all in favour of what Mr. Dasappa has said in favour of Hindi

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I will take only Ave minutes, Sir.

To this extent I agree with Mr. Dasappa that in several cases, when it comes to a question of implementation it is not at all fairly done. I take up only one item, item 115 of the Appropriation Bill regarding Hyderabad currency. My submission is this. So far as the integration and federal finance etc., are concerned, we are all one with the question of integration; there is no question there of any difference as to this but my question to the Finance Minister is this: Is the principle of compensation followed in the case of Hyderabad—the governing factor in regard to integration? That is to say, when you take sources of income you should provide some other avenues for the State. You have taken the currency; you have taken the income-tax. Perfectly right? Our railway income has been taken. Perfectly rightly. Our customs and other things have been taken. Perfectly rightly. In return what have you given to Hyderabad? How is Hyderabad's administration to be run and how are the development programmes in Hyderabad to be carried out?

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: There was no income under the head 'Customs' as far as I know.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You must give me at least that much credit that I know, Hyderabad better than him; we had six crores of rupees of income from customs. So what I say is, while we agree to this item being taken over,—and I am sure the whole House will support me—that we should be treated fairly; we should be given the necessary funds for the development programmes of our State. We have given all these incomes to the Centre and we want to know/ what the Centre gives us in return Unfairness. There my friend Mr. Dasappa

or rather Mysore got considerable sums of money, and similarly Travancore-Cochin. The only unfortunate State among the Part B States is Hyderabad, and in view of those circumstances that *were* unfortunately existing at that time Hyderabad got an absolutely step-motherly treatment. At least In the future, when there is now the democratic set-up and the condition of things has changed and in view of the coming in of the States Reorganisation Commission's Report—we do not know what it will be but anyhow, Sir,—I do hope that the people of Hyderabad, wherever they are, either in Maharashtra or Andhra or Carnataka or Telingana will be helped and helped to the fullest extent.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SENHA: My hon. friend may remember the subvention that is given to Hyderabad State.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Absolutely inadequate. Further if Chief Ministers can go on conjecturing about future states why not the Members of Parliament conjecture, but anyhow I am one of those who even today think that if Hyderabad continues as an entity it will be a very good asset to India indeed. But that is a different thing. Now what I am representing on behalf of the people of Hyderabad which has existed for the last 6½ centuries now is that they have not been fairly treated in matters of finance and this must be made up. That is all that I have to say.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Bombay): I want to say something, Sir. Some misrepresentation has been made by Mr. Dasappa. He gave wrong information and a wrong impression has been created about Hindi here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He read them out from a pamphlet of the Education Ministry. Still do you want to speak?

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Yes, Sir, I will take only three minutes.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Hindi side has not been represented, Sir.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Only three minutes; I shall take no more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

श्री द्वैकानन्दन नारायण : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं बहुत ध्यानपूर्वक अपने मित्र दासप्पा जी का भाषण सुन रहा था और उनसे पहले मजूमदार भाई ने राजभाषा हिन्दी के बारे में जो कुछ कहा उसको भी सुना। मैं बिलकुल साफ साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी भाषाभाषियों का और सरकार का जो इरादा है वह यह नहीं है कि प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के ऊपर किसी तरह की कोई जबर्दस्ती की जाय। प्रान्तीय भाषाओं को उतना ही मौका दिया जायगा जितना कि हिन्दी भाषा को दिया जा रहा है। किसी तरह का भी ऐसा शक अपने दिल से निकाल डालिये कि प्रान्तीय भाषाओं या किसी भी प्रान्तीय भाषा के साथ किसी तरह का भी अन्याय होना वाला है। हाँ, राजभाषा का जब सवाल आता है तो वह इतना ही होता है कि अंगूजी की जगह पर हम राजभाषा हिन्दी को लाना चाहते हैं। आपको राजभाषा की जगह यदि अंगूजी चलाने में भ्रमण मालूम देता हो तो बात अलग है लेकिन यह शर्म की बात है कि हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद हो जाने के बाद भी हम अपने दृश में और परायें दृशों में भी राजभाषा की जगह अंगूजी में बाँट कर रहे हैं।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I do not remember having said a word like that about Hindi.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I am coming to that point.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Please do not misrepresent me.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I am not misrepresenting you.

एक बात यह कही गई कि यू० पी० का हिन्दी प्रचार के लिये इतना रुपया दिया गया, हिन्दुस्तानी प्रचार सभा, वर्धा, को इतना दिया गया। मैं आपसे नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि यू० पी० में जिन संस्थाओं को रुपया दिया गया है वह आपके प्रान्तों में यानी नान-हिंदी प्रान्तों में प्रचार के लिये दिया गया है।

श्री हि० च० दासप्पा : एक दमड़ी भी नहीं है।

श्री ग० रंगा : एक पैसा भी नहीं है।

श्री द्वैकानन्दन नारायण : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ वह सच है आप समझे नहीं। यह जो रुपया दिया गया है वह किताबों के लिये या डिक्शनरी वगैरह के लिये और खासकर प्रचार केन्द्र चलाने के लिये.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Which we make ourselves.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: He has not read it. (Interruption.) Mr. Deputy Chairman, let me not be interfered with. Let me finish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should also not misrepresent him.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Only two minutes and I shall finish.

मैं आपसे यह कहने जा रहा था कि यू० पी० का हिन्दी प्रचार के लिये जो खर्च दिया जा रहा है वह यू० पी० में हिन्दी प्रचार के लिये नहीं हो रहा है।

श्री ग० रंगा : वहाँ कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री द्वैकानन्दन नारायण : मैं आपसे सहमत हूँ कि वहाँ जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि यू० पी० में हिन्दी भाषा के प्रचार

के लिये जो रुपया दिया गया है वह ५० पी० में नहीं बल्कि ५० पी० के बाहर हिन्दी प्रचार के लिये दिया गया है। इसी तरह से जो रुपया हिन्दुस्तानी प्रचार समिति, वर्धा, को दिया गया है वह वर्धा के लिये नहीं दिया गया है। वह वर्धा में काम नहीं कर रही है। मुझे पता है कि हिन्दुस्तानी प्रचार समिति, वर्धा, का ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम दीक्षण में हो रहा है और उसी काम के लिये रुपया दिया गया है। इसी तरह से बाहर के लिये ही बनारस को रुपया दिया गया है और आगरा की हिन्दी परिषद् को दिया गया है। तो कोई आनं दिल में यह शक पैदा न कर कि हिन्दी प्रचार का कोई काम सरकार की ओर से ५० पी० में, बिहार में या सी० पी० में हो रहा है।

श्री हि० च० वासप्पा : आपको पता नहीं है, आप पूछिये।

श्री वृंक्षकीनन्दन नारायण : मुझे पता है। सत्यनारायण जी को भी काफी रुपया दिया जा रहा है। आप सत्यनारायण जी से पूछिये। काफी रुपया दीक्षण भारत हिन्दी प्रचार समिति को वहां हिन्दी के प्रचार के लिये दिया जा रहा है।

श्री उपसभापति : वक्त जा रहा है।

श्री वृंक्षकीनन्दन नारायण : मेरी यह प्रार्थना है.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is time.

श्री वृंक्षकीनन्दन नारायण : मैं समाप्त ही कर रहा हूँ। मैं नमूनापूर्वक आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी किसी के ऊपर हम लादना नहीं चाहते। हम नहीं चाहते कि हिन्दी आपके ऊपर लादी जाय। आपके प्रेम से, आपकी मुहब्बत से और आपके सहयोग से ही हिन्दी का दीक्षण में प्रचार हो, और हो सकता है यही मेरी इच्छा है।

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Sir, it is for the third time that I make the attempt to reply. Try, try, try again and I hope snail succeed in this third attempt at least. Let me also begin from the tail—

sometimes the sting lies in the tail. I think some Members have mentioned about

PROF. G. RANGA: About Hindi?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: about hotel, about brewery and prohibition and so many other things, I can give them this assurance that any hotel, whether it will be partially or completely owned by the Government, or even if it is a private hotel, must conform to the general social and economic policy of the Government and it will act according to the policy regarding prohibition or any other social matter, and this hotel also comes under that policy. So there won't be any difficulty on that account.

Then about our participation in this Hotel, Sir, I do not like to enter into personal discussions or about the personalities of the two sponsors. Shri Bhupesh Gupta at least claimed his knowledge or acquaintance about one person, but about the other he does not claim any knowledge. I have no knowledge about any of these two persons.

PROF. G. RANGA: You may know the Jam Saheb.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I may know about Jam Saheb; but that is not knowing him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is how I know.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: They have sponsored this hotel and the Government thought that there was not sufficient hotel accommodation in Delhi, particularly in view of the large number of foreign commitments. There are international assemblies and conferences here every now and then which will be attended by foreign delegates. So the necessity of increasing the hotel accommodation in Delhi was felt, and it is quite proper the Government has taken part in this thing with adequate safeguards. If hon.

Members* would have cared to read the literature supplied to them, they would find that the Government have taken sufficient care to keep a sort of general control over this hotel. The general manager who will be in charge of this hotel would be appointed on y with the approval of the Government. Then there will be also some control over the financial matters of this hotel. The Government have agreed to take Rs. 26 lakhs worth of preference shares; the dividend would be 5 per cent income-tax free. This 'income-tax free should not confuse the Members. Income-tax would be collected at the source. The Income-tax Department won't allow any remission of income-tax to the dividend anywhere. The only thing is whether the shareholder will pay the income-tax or the income-tax will be deducted before the dividend is distributed to the shareholders. Here the income-tax will be deducted at the source and I do not think 5 per cent dividend is just anything abnormally low. Sir, Government also reserve the right at any time to convert the preference shares into ordinary shares. Some members have referred to the possibility of the hotel earning higher dividend. If the hotel continues earning enormous profits, then the Government will have the option to convert the shares into ordinary shares. I think Shri Kishen Chand mentioned that the Government would incur a loss of Rs. 1,50,000 on account of this land deal. I cannot understand how he has calculated this figure. Our information has been that there has been no special concession to this party in respect of the land given for the construction of the hotel. The usual terms which are available to others in that area have been given to the sponsors of this hotel also. So I do not think there is any cause for anxiety on this score.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About tender?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Where is the question of tender? It is not a contract,

it is a joint stock company and the Government is going to take some shares. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is a lawyer and I do not know how the question of tender arises to him.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I would like to ask one question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him continue.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Then the next thing is about the finance corporation.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I ask one question?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not now. You can ask him at the end if there is time.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Sir, even Shri Bhupesh Gupta has no objection to foreign capital participating in India.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINHA: He has not answered my point about over-budgeting.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: There is no over-budgeting. In a budget of Rs. 400 crores there may be some saving on some items, and Rs. 26 lakhs is not a very big amount.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINHA: Nearly four crores not four hundred.

PROF. G. RANGA: Four crores out of four hundred comes to only one per cent.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Then he has read out from some party statement or party thesis. We have taken enough precautions to satisfy almost all the conditions of his party. This corporation will not participate in any share capital either by itself or through private parties. It will not invest in any loan without the approval of the Government. Whenever there is to be any investment, the corporation must sound the Government whether the Government would like that investment to be made in that particular industry. So

[Shri A. C. Guha.] without previous sanction and approval of the Government no investment would be made, and there would not be any free flow of foreign capital for exploitation of Indian resources as apprehended by Shri Gupta. It will be a restricted—not flow—stream under the due control of the Government to instal some capital where it is felt necessary to get foreign capital. I should also remind the House that during the second Five Year Plan the country will have to find adequate foreign exchange for its implementation and this corporation may be of some help in that respect also.

Another question raised was about Hyderabad. It has been mentioned that a bad deal had been done to Hyderabad. Alter the financial integration, surely Hyderabad, like any other Stats, had to surrender some of their sources of revenue to the Central Government: but it is not without any compensation. In fact, in no case has it been without compensation. Rather, all the States have been generously compensated and the Hyderabad Government was granted Rs. 116 lakhs. Then under the Award of the Finance Commission, Hyderabad was granted another Rs. 2J crores.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Was it commensurate with the loss that Hyderabad suffered?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Hyderabad will be disintegrated; why do you bother?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I may remind Shri Kishen Chand that Hyderabad has been relieved of the liability of Rs. 9 crores of ad hoc securities which had been created by the former Hyderabad administration to expand its currency and this was voted by Parliament in the current year's budget—Grant No. 115—and mentioned in the Explanatory Memorandum. The point whether Hyderabad has suffered would be a point for the Hyderabad Government to represent to the next Finance Commission.

Then I shall come to tie paper controversy. I feel that hon. Members should have some sense of reality when they pour forth all their strong words and invectives. This matter happened in 1944 and I would not claim.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The paper arrived in 1946 and the payment was made in 1953.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: that everything in those days was done in a most regular and wise manner. There might have been something wrong. After all, we referred the matter to the arbitration of two important legal men and they gave this award. We must abide by that award and we must honour that award. (Interruptions.) I should also say that it was not a completely losing affair. They were given something; we have also got something from this deal.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: On the whole we have gained.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I think we have received Rs. 67 lakhs and paid Rs. 63 lakhs and we have some paper still in stock. That also would be worth about Rs. 64,000 or Rs. 65,000. Finally in this deal we have been somewhat of a gainer and not a total loser as the hon. Members have been suspecting.

PROF. G. RANGA: Possibly you could have gained more.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I do not claim that in those days everything was done in a proper manner and it is no use pursuing the matter which happened during war days or during days immediately after the war.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Was 1951 a war year?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Not 1953. Why do you confuse dates? Only the arbitration was in 1953.

Then there is the question of the Company Law Department. Mr.

Bhupesh Gupta has said that the Lower Division Clerks are paid very low, that it is top-heavy and all that. The Companies Law, as passed by the two Houses, has imposed enormous responsibilities on the Government; yet the total additional expenditure to be incurred by the Government on this account would be only about Rs. 3 3,000 or Rs. 35,000 in this year and for the whole year—next year—it would be about Rs. 55,000 or Rs. 60,000. The remaining amount will be found by readjustment. Certain officers from other departments have been or will be transferred. The Company Law Administration branches will be merged in this new Department. There is a certain amount of money sanctioned for this department and that will also come here. In this way the total additional expenditure for this year will be only Rs. 35,000. I claim that in view of the enormous duties placed on the Government in respect of the Company Law Administration we have done it very cheap.

Now, some mention was made about the Commerce and Industry Minister's visit to Dalmianagar. I do not like to take up the defence of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. Had he been present here, he would have been able to defend his case fully and properly. Still, I should remind this House that he is in charge of 'commerce' and industry and in the framework of the Government's policy there is still place for private sector for industries. In the second Five Year Plan also some importance has been given to the private sector of industries. And I do not think there is anything wrong in the Commerce and Industry Minister going and looking into some of these private industries. Certainly, Dalmia nagar, however much one may dislike this name, is an important industrial centre. That place contains a number of industrial units

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whose guest was he?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: and I do not think that Mr T. T. Krishnamachari

did mention anything about Mr. Ramakrishna Dalmia. I think the paper has made some mention about Mr S. P. Jain. But as Minister in charge of Commerce and Industry there is nothing wrong in his going and seeing any private industry. Rather, I think, it is his duty to see the private industries how they are being run, how the labour conditions are prevailing. I do not think the hon. Members on the other side would mind the Labour Minister going and seeing the labour conditions there. Even I as the Minister in charge of excise duty can go there to see whether arrangements for excise are adequate or not. It is part of our duty to go and see these things. Moreover, I do not think it is quite fair to cast aspersion on the basis of such a small incident, which incidentally coincided with the arrest of another man. He did not know that this man was going to be arrested, or what he was doing with his insurance company. Sir, in the other House there was a short notice question and the Prime Minister in his reply also took this attitude, that it is the duty of the Commerce and Industry Minister to go and see the private industries and none except the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister—I think that is what he stated—had any idea about the charges and allegations that were being enquired into about Mr. Ramakrishna Dalmia or about his imminent arrest. So, the Commerce and Industry Minister had no idea of what was going on

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sounds a little strange that he went to inspect an industry when the charge was not known to him!

SHRI A. C. GUHA: The charge was against another concern

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May be another concern, but the person involved is the same.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: If there is a charge against somebody being enquired into secretly by one department nobody can know that. Only the officer of the department concerned who is to enquire into these charges (Interruptions)..... should know that.

Then, only the question relating to the Official Language Commission remains. Shri Dasappa has quoted

PROF. G. RANGA: Fellow sufferer and fellow traveller.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Shri Dasappa has quoted some figures of grants given to different States. But I think besides these, there were certain other grants given not to the States but to some organisations which have undertaken the duty of propagating Hindi in different areas, particularly in non-Hindi speaking States. So, I think, in all fairness that amount should also be taken into consideration

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Who are those good people? They have done nothing in that area.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the demand relates to only the Language Commission, not about Hindi propaganda.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I quite realise that point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is irrelevant.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Sir, other grants have also been given by the Central Government for the publication of certain dictionaries and grammar. Hindi has been adopted as the official language by the Constitution and it is no use now objecting to Hindi being used more frequently in official business.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He did not object.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It is adopting a hostile attitude towards Hindi.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: No, very unfair. Why should I be? I have pleaded for Hindi

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not mentioned it, he is the President of the Hindi Prachar Sabha in Mysore.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am glad to hear it. But his attitude here in this House did not represent it.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am sorry, he left the House when I started speaking.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Dasappa. I cannot allow this cross-conversation.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Two hon. Members have mentioned something about Hindi and this Language Commission. I would like to take this opportunity to remind my Bengali friends

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a wrong impression. I never said any thing.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mazumdar did not say anything against Hindi.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are for encouragement of Hindi.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I can only say this that at a particular period the Muslims of India decided to boycott English and for that they suffered educationally, economically, culturally and in other matters

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (TraVancore Cochin): There is no relevancy to such things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: If the people of Bengal or any other non-Hindi speaking areas decide to neglect the cultivation of Hindi.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, you may drop it.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: People of Bengal

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The people of Bengal are not in *net d* of this sermon.

SHRI A. C. GUHA :that region would suffer. I come from a non-Hindi speaking area, i can share the feelings of the people of those areas.

(*Interruption.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: They should look into the terms of reference of this Commission. This Commission will surely take into consideration the difficulties of the non-Hindi speaking regions and one of the terms of reference is to prepare a time schedule as to when the Hindi language should take the place of English, It is not going to be a hasty thing. Every region, every linguistic unit has been represented on that Commission. So, I do not think anything hasty would be done by this Commission or by the Government in this matter. But we should all be ready and prepared to adopt Hindi as the official language in the near future.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1955-56, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments.

Clauses 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Sir, I be* to move :

"That the Bill be returned."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is

(*Interruptions. Some hon. Members rose to speak.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It is true. If time is over, you are perfectly right, but I understand that two and a half hours were allowed and we have not covered two and a half hours now

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I did say that (*Interruptions*). What do you want? Five more minutes?

All right. Let us sit on. Motion moved:

"That the Bill be returned."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, with regard to this item of paper transaction, the hon. Minister said that it was all done in war time, i find from the notes that have been circulated that the payment was made in the year 1953 and the payment was made without sanction from Parliament. And the only point that was made in this connection was, in order to avoid interest, they have made this payment. So, the responsibility is that of the present Government for making that payment

Now, Sir, the other point is this. I find that the claim was also put forward after four years, that is to say,

somewhere in 1952. He says 5 P.M. that profits have been made.

He said that we should not look into this matter. I want to specifically know how the discount was allowed to J. N. Singh & Co.,

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] without a prior reference to the Government of India? The price was to be fixed by the Government of India. How is it that they come forward and say that M/s. J. N. Singh & Co. would refuse to disclose the name of the party to whom the discount has been given? I do not remember the figure of gain mentioned by the hon. Minister. Supposing it is x, if the discount was not there the gain would have been x-*, and it would have gone to the Government Treasury. Was the discount given according to the Financial Regulations of the Government of India? These are the points on which I wanted information. But the hon. Minister is absolutely silent. Therefore, I asked: what is the objection to refer all these matters to a Parliamentary Committee? He has not given us any argument as to why this matter has been kept away from the purview of the Public Accounts Committee.

Regarding the hotel business, he says that no tenders were invited because the company was promoted with the help of the Jam Saheb and others. Quite right. I would have come forward in helping in promoting, if I were given a chance. Was I given a chance? I want to know. Quite right. The company was promoted, Why was it done in a secret manner with the help of these two people? They ought to have found out whether there were other promoters or not, who could have offered better terms to the Government of India. How are they satisfied that no better terms than those offered by these two people were available? The hon. Minister is silent on these points and I want clarification on these. Why was not this done on a competitive basis? Why were negotiations undertaken? They could have called for tenders—if people were willing to make tenders and if so, what their terms were.

PROF. G. RANGA: How much time is there? If there is some time, I would like to make some observations.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, may I intervene?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall sit a little longer and I hope the House will co-operate.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: My friend gave expression to some misapprehensions. He wants to know about the Committee. In fairness to the House, we have circulated the details. Now, my friend will see that all the matters happened by about November 1946. The then Government tried various expedients. These things appear on page 2 of this note. The additional 1% per cent, on sales was paid to the firm. The charges were settled in consultation with the Ministry of Finance in respect of the new scheme, on the basis of the previous scheme. The firm was permitted to sell the paper in retail without specific orders from the Government in respect of the distribution of paper. My friends will have noted that the difficulty appears to have arisen on account of the loss sustained by the firm. They expressed inability to render account in regard to discount alleged to have been given to the purchasers in retail. That was a doubtful point. So, Government wanted to give 9% per cent. The firm claimed 12% per cent, because they said they had suffered losses on account of storage. We had the best legal advice.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Was discount paid out of the commission?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Apart from the commission. Anyway, if my friend has to use the same voice, he only uses that voice with reference to the Government that was in existence in 1944, 1945 and 1946. We do not mind that.

That is the position. We took the best possible legal advice. We were told that we would have to revert to

the earlier arrangements. That was the advice which would have entailed a loss because that was a nebulous condition; this sort of vague condition about the discount to be given for the retail purchasers might lead us to loss anyway because the firm refused to show the a'ccounts. We were not prepared, because the parties were not willing to show the accounts.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: You have forgotten that it was in 1953.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I have not forgotten. Anyway we are in 1955. It is no use repeating the dates again and again, irrespective of the relevance of the dates, I wish my friend reads this document. If he is not reconciled, he can revert to the charge on some other occasion. We do not insist on strict relevance. For example, my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta often does this. We do not mind it. Let us be fair to the whole transaction. We referred the case to arbitration and we got this award. We were parties to an arbitration and we have to abide by it. We may have made that payment.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Who were the arbitrators?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are all in the papers.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sometimes people forget. My own experience is—I study a thing very carefully and the more carefully I read, the more I forget sometimes. That is apart.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not deliberately, unconsciously sometimes.

However, on behalf of my colleague, Sardar Swaran Singh I would speak about this hotel affair. I give the greatest credit to my friend over there who was repeatedly saying that tenders ought to have been called for. Are tenders called for in case of formation of firms? Do we go out for tenders? We want to start a hotel.

We are going to start companies. Let people who propose to start these come with tenders.

Here in Delhi, there is dearth of hotel accommodation. Repeated complaints have been made that people have been charged very high prices. Delhi is of late in need of a good hotel, as I can testify from my own personal experience. Guests come here and we cannot send them to costly hotels.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: What are the charges here?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: It is a little different. I may tell my friend that there will not be black-market rates, but only reasonable rates.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: White market rates?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: For reasonable accommodation. Anyway he is never going to the hotel. So, he need not worry. There was a need for a good hotel. I might also tell the House that we thought that in a venture like this, and in a place like Delhi which was growing to be a touring centre we would be able to take some pride and say "Here is a decent hotel coming into existence." And I also thought that because various types of conferences and conferences of various colours may have to be held in Delhi, such a hotel would be able to serve every colour, every creed, every opinion and every conference. So, Sir, I should think that the Government, Instead of being criticised for nothing, should have been congratulated for putting up such a decent hotel. In fact, we have got a very good instance. In Mysore — Mr. Dasappa probably knows very well — there was no good hotel. Under the regime of Shri M. Visveswaraya, the then Dewan of Mysore, one hotel came into existence which was handed over to private enterprise later on, and that hotel is enjoying the blessings of all the people and is flourish-

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.] ing quite well. I am sure that every one here will feel proud in the same way of this hotel and will contribute more and more so that it may be able to afford better facilities to the public. In any ca'se, I will request the hon. Minister for Works to invite all the hon. Members at the inaugural ceremony of the hotel when it comes into existence, so that they can give their valuable suggestions. I think there was a lot of misconception about this subject, and that is why I intervened in the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish to make one thing very clear. Neither in the North, nor in the South, are we opposed nor are the people opposed to the propagation of Hindi. We want to get rid of this English language. I can tell the hon. Minister

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So from tomorrow you will have to speak in Hindi.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I want to tell the hon. Minister that in our programme of the Party we have* included 'Encouragement of Hindi' as an important item. But unfortunately, Sir, we have got some false heroes of Hindi language. These false heroes are doing disservice to the cause of propagation of Hindi. And that is all that I wish to tell him.

Then, Sir, with regard to hotels and other things, we certainly want hotels, but we want hotels for all classes of people. I am not going into the whole matter minutely. But we ask the Government one question. When the Government decided to have a hotel of that sort—it was naturally guided by certain very important considerations—who was it that took the decision that there should be a hotel? If it was decided to have a hotel, then two ways were open to the Government. One, to leave it to the private enterprise. In that case it should have seen that the proper ele-

ments came from the private sector and for that purpose tenders were necessary, because, Sir, we are interested in seeing that a proper thing is done. I am not dealing with this matter as if I am dealing with the Government tenders and contracts. But the whole thing is this. Since the Government is putting public money in that venture, we are entitled to ask whether it has satisfied itself about the promotion of such a hotel and about the personnel who are sponsoring it. I was amazed when the hon. Minister got up and told us that he did not know anything in detail about all these things. I say that the Minister must know about the sponsors with whom the Government is entering into partnership. I have known of many types of partnership in the world, but I have never known of a partnership in which one partner would not care to know the other party, and they become bed-fellows. Therefore, Sir, this kind of attitude is quite wrong, because you are spending the Government money. When you are putting in the Government money you must be satisfied as to the particulars and antecedents of these people, and as to the financial position of these people. And when we on this side of the House, or for that matter on that side of the House ask you questions with regard to these personalities, you should be in a position to give some satisfactory answer. Here, innocence is shocking, as far as the Ministry is concerned. I do not know whether in any other country a Minister could have spoken like that when the Government had entered into partnership with two individuals. Sir, I may not be entitled to know anything about Jam Saheb or the other fellow, because I am not putting in the Government money. But they are putting in the Government money and they have entered into a contract with them. And for that reason, they are supposed to know everything about them. I think that the hon. Minister has done not a good service to the Ministry, and I hope the Finance Minister will regret it.

Now, Sir, I want to say to Mr. Karmarkar who intervened in the debate, and who deliberately forgets things even after a good deal of reading. But I do not forget things deliberately. That is the distinction of the Ministers to deliberately forget things, and that is their privilege. Now I submit, Sir, that we do want hotels, but do not try to bring in other issues and say that Delhi has got a housing problem, people do not have houses *skid* all that. I want to know how much money you are spending for housing the Government employees, the officials of the Government who are not well-paid, and various other people and the refugees. They are there in Delhi without housing

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Crores of money they are spending.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He says, Sir, 'crores of money'. I am glad he always draws inspiration from me. But when the Government is thinking in terms of housing, it should go into the question of housing the common man in Delhi. Now do you think, Sir, that Chanakyapuri will be the place where the common people are going to live? Do you think that they can live in the Imperial Hotel and in the Ambassador Hotel? Charges there are prohibitive and they cannot even think of crossing the threshold of such places. Even the hon. Ministers' purse, I know, would not allow them to go to such places, unless, of course, they are invited by some people. You cannot think of common people going to such places. Yet I feel, Sir, that for the foreigners who come here we should have some good hotels. But it is all the more reason that they should be under proper control and they should be well-run. They should be ideal institutions rather than institutions placed into the hands of Jam Sahab and similar other fellows. About him we have got so much experience in the past. Probably the tourists will come to the hotel and will see several photographs of race-84 R.S.D.—5.

horses. But that is not our culture. I am giving you merely an example. Therefore proper types of hotels should be there and good hotels should be there. But they should be properly run and Government control over such hotels should be effective. That is all that we wish the Government should do. But here you have entered into a wrong type of contract, and we have objection to the partners whom you have chosen. I wish all luck to the hotel. I do not know whether a Deputy Minister will be looking after Jam Sahab, but nevertheless, I wish all luck to the hotel.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I will take only three minutes or so.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the far end of this debate, when we are going to return this Appropriation Bill, I feel it my duty to tender a piece of advice on behalf of the Members of this House to our Finance Ministry. In this Appropriation Bill, Sir, they have provided for the creation of two departments in the Government of India. One department might be termed as the temporary department which will be attached to the Official Language commission, and the other one which is likely to be a permanent department, will be concerned with the administration of the Companies Act.

Now, Sir, they have provided for very big amounts for the class of people like the Princes of this country. The hon. Ministers want these places should be taken up by some of our service men. Now we find in this Appropriation Bill that the amounts like Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 4,000 are provided for Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries. In this connection, Sir, I request the hon. Minister in charge of this Bill to refer to the recommendations made by the Pay Commission in the year 1947. Their recommendations have been implemented so far as the subordinate staff is concerned and

[Shri B. K. Mukerjee] so far as the low¹-paid staff is concerned. But in the case of officers the hon. Ministers do not care to look at the recommendations contained in the Pay Commission's Report. I wish the Ministers, and especially the Finance Minister, to go through the recommendations made by the Pay Commission in the year 1947. And they will find that the Commission recommended not to exceed the limit of Rs. 1,800 as pay of any Government servant under the Government of India. Now the hon. Ministers might refer to the constitutional provisions in order to safeguard the interests of the existing officers.

But, these are *new* Departments that we are going to create and I do not know why this sort of fabulous-sums have been provided for them. I wish to tender a piece of advice to the Minister to look at this particular recommendation made by the Pay Commission regarding salaries and to accept Rs. 1,800 a month for any officer anywhere.

PROF. G. HANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad that my friend, Mr. Karmarkar, has cleared some of the doubts raised by some of our friends behind for which we thought that there was some real substance. I wish to say that, although I was very much impressed by the charges framed by Mr. Sinha in regard to this paper affair, in the end the answers given to us are not unsatisfactory. After all, the whole affair started some time during the War and in the end so many other things had happened. Government did not make any secret of what had happened. They gave us full information and the matter was referred to arbitration. What more could we do? In the end, as Mr. Guha has pointed out, we have not lost. We could have gained more but we have not lost anything. Therefore, I think it is right for the House not to feel dissatisfied over the manner in which this affair had been managed.

Secondly, there is this question of the hotel. Now, I do not know whether my hon. friends are aware of what is known as hotel sale value of some of these Princes. That is so in the West. If you were to have a Prince or a Princess or Anyone like that in charge of any hotel, there will be a very big custom for it. Therefore, I do not think our Government has done anything wrong.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am frightened of these customers.

PROF. G. RANGA: Anyhow, fortunately or unfortunately, neither myself nor my friend, Mr. Gupta, is going to get into these hotels except when we are underground, when, of course, we may have to spend money. I do not think that there is anything fishy in regard to this hotel. To the best of my knowledge, this matter was thought of years ago. This question was being mooted in the Provisional Parliament and the need for a hotel of this type was felt very badly. Members of Parliament themselves brought pressure to bear upon the Government and the Government undertook to take early steps to establish a hotel like this. It is a surprise to me that there has been so much delay about this. We have to remember one or two other things also. This Chanakyaपुरी is still to come into existence and it needs courage for anybody to take this kind of risk and establish a hotel there. After all, when Government has to go about encouraging people who have a lot of money to invest in a venture like this involving great risks, we must be prepared to repose a certain amount of confidence in the Government.

Then, with regard to the complaint about not calling for tenders and things like that, if it had been possible for private enterprise really to be competitive in regard to this matter, it would not have been necessary for the Government to have taken this step at all. All these years this question has been on the tapis and we have

not heard that anybody was really keen on coming forward to construct a hotel like this. That was the reason why the Government had to take some initiative in this matter. Therefore, I am not prepared for myself to condemn the Government for not calling for tenders or anything else like that. This is a very good beginning and let us hope that as time goes on many more big hotels which are today paying very good dividends would also come more and more under similar control or regulation by the Government itself.

One more observation I would like to make, because what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said hurt me a little, [if we were to indulge in arguments like this, it would really misrepresent the Government]. The Government is not constructing this hotel because it is not keen on building houses for the poor people. Recently, when we were in Soviet Russia, we found that the Government there had built a number of splendid hotels which would do credit to any country in the world. Why did they build them? It was not because there was no housing shortage for the ordinary folk, the middle classes and the working classes. There is acute housing shortage. In fact, the Supreme Councils of Leningrad as well as of Moscow told us with great regret that there was terribly acute housing shortage there, but nevertheless they have built a number of splendid first class hotels. Therefore, merely because our Government has thought of building a new hotel at long last, we should not be offering this other argument and say 'Look here, these people.....'

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: It was Mr. Karmarkar who introduced that topic.

PROF. G. RANGA: I hope, therefore, that this hotel will become a great success and that the Government, by learning from their experience regarding this hotel, will build more and more of such hotels in different parts of the country also.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: In short, nationalise the hotel industry.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Sir, I think hardly any new point has been mentioned by hon. Members. My colleague, Mr. Karmarkar, has replied to some of the points and my esteemed friend Prof. Ranga, also has clarified some of the points, I would like only to draw the attention of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to this document which has been supplied to them. From that he will find:

"All important matters involving policy affecting the financial position of the Company will be decided by the Board of Directors with the prior approval of the Government for which a suitable provision will be included in the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Company.

The Company's business will be managed by its General Manager whose appointment will be subject to the approval of the Government."

So, the House will find that we have taken every precaution.

About the persons, I confess that I have no knowledge about the other OMH,

PROF. G. RANGA: It is your duty to know.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: I do not think it is so. Government has entered into some agreement only with the Jam Saheb and the other gentleman is primarily just an associate or nominee of the Jam Saheb. (*Interruption*). I hope I shall be allowed to continue uninterrupted. Government has taken only one precaution that none of the sponsors should be associated with the hotel industry so that the monopoly ring in the hotel business can, to a certain extent, be broken. It is good that the Government has taken this precaution. I think it is a salutary precaution.

As regards paper, I would still ask Mr. Sinha to read this literature carefully. If he does it, he will find that.

[Shri A. C. Guha.] the paper really arrived in India somewhere in 1944.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: No. no. It was in 1946.

MR. ' DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All these, dates and figures have already been given.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: The whole transaction was completed in 1946 and then this question of the settlement of their dues, etc., arose. That does not mean that the present Government was in any way responsible for this transaction. I again wish to say as I said before, the Government have recovered sixty-seven lakhs of rupees and a further sum of Rs. 64,217 is yet to be recovered from the firm. As against the 59 lakhs of rupees (*Interruption*). There must be an end to their enthusiasm. As against Rs. 59 lakhs and this Rs 4:5 lakhs—it is Rs. 63-5 lakhs,—the Government has got Rs. 67 lakhs and hopes to get another Rs. 64,000. In all this transaction has not been a loss to the Government. It has, on the contrary, earned a few lakhs of rupees to the Government.

I therefore, hope that this House would be pleased to return the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is a message from the other House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE RIVER BOARDS BILL, 1955

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Friday, the 30th September,

1955, has passed the enclosed motion concurring in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the River Boards Bill, 1955. The names of the members nominated by Lok Sabha to server on the said Joint Committee are set out in the motion.

MOTION

"That this House concurs in the; recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the establishment of River Boards for the regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 15th September, 1955 and communicated to this House on the 19th September, 1955 and resolves that the following members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the-said Joint Committee, namely:

1. Shri Piare Lall Kureel
'Talib'
2. Shri Sohan Lai Dhusiya
3. Shri Sunder Lall
4. Shri Vyankatrao Pirajirao
Bawar
5. Shri R^mappa Balappa.
Bidari
6. Shri Chadrashanker Bhatt
7. Shri G. R. Damosadan
8. Shri M. Sankarapandian
9. Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva
10. Shri M. K. Shivananjappa
11. Shri Laxman Shrawan
Bhatkar
12. Shri Nand Lai Joshi
13. Shri P. Ramaswamy
14. Shri Anirudha Sinha
15. Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra
16. Shri Nay*i Tara Das
17. Shri Ranbir Singh Chau-
dhury