

(b) out of the amount spent on the purchase of stores during the three years ending on the 31st March 1954, how much was spent on Indian Stores?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI SATISH CHANDBA): (a) The accounts for the year 1953-54 have not yet been finalised. However, from the actuals so far available with us, the amount spent on the purchase of stores during the year ending the 31st March 1954, is Rs. 81 crores (approx.).

(b) Particulars of expenditure separately for items of Indian manufacture and those of foreign manufacture are not available. The following amounts were spent on stores procured other than through the India Store Department and the India Supply Mission : —

					Rs. in lakhs
1951-52	*	*	*	*	6,330.88
1952-53	*	*	*	*	6,326.06
1953-54	*	*	*	*	5,299.62

12 NOON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MOULANA \I. FARUQI

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that the following letter has been received from Moulana Mohammad Faruqi: —

"I have the honour to inform you that under orders from the President of the Republic of India I came here on deputation. Unfortunately on 15 August 1954 I fell victim to a motor accident in which I was travelling and sustained injuries. Ever since I am in bed in a hospital. I am afraid that I may not be able to attend the Parliament session before 20th September 1954.

I therefore request you kindly to excuse my absence from the session for that period."

Is it the pleasure of the House that
^permission be granted to Moulana

Mohammad Faruqi for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR., CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

THE PREVENTION OF FOOD ADUL- TERATION BILL, 1954—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pandit Tankha was speaking yesterday.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, when the House rose for the day last evening. I was dealing with sub-clause (9) of clause 10 of the Bill. My hon. friend, Mr. Bisht, had expressed the fear that the insertion of sub-clause (9)(b) in the Bill will deter the food inspector from performing his legitimate duties in the way he should perform them, because he will constantly be having the fear in his mind lest his actions should be challenged and he may be convicted and fined Rs. 500 under this sub-clause. But the answer that I gave to Mr. Bisht at that time was that this sub-clause should be read with clause 22 of the Bill, which runs as follows:

"22. Protection of action taken in *good faith*.—No suit, prosecution or other legal proceedings shall lie against any person for anything which is in good faith done or intended to be done under this Act."

Therefore, Sir, I was submitting that this clause having been provided in the Bill, gives ample protection to officers including the food inspectors who have to discharge their duties under the Act. And therefore, with this protection, the food inspector need have no fears which according to the hon. Member may deter him from the discharge of his duties under clause 10, sub-clause (9). I was also submitting, Sir, that it was yet not necessary that sub-clause (9)(b) should have been