

(c) whether he has submitted any report to Government on the subjects discussed at the Congress?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): (a) Shri Chunilal D. Barfiwalla was given a token grant-in-aid of Rs. 1,500 by the Government of India to enable him to attend the Congress.

(b) Shri Barfiwalla was not deputed as a representative of the Government of India.

(c) No, Sir.

AMOUNT DUE FROM AGENTS IN EGYPT TO INDIAN IMPORTERS OF COTTON

221. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) the amount due from agents in Egypt to the Indian importers of cotton which was held up during the last year by the Government of Egypt;

(b) what was the reason given by the Government of Egypt for holding up this amount; and

(c) whether any amount has since been released?

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): (a) If the hon. Member is referring to the amounts due to Indian importers in respect of cotton invoiced back by them to Egyptian exporters in 1949-50, the total amount involved was about £ 69,000.

(b) The Egyptian Government did not allow remittance of this amount as they held that Egyptian income-tax would have to be paid by the Indian importers concerned.

(c) It is understood that a part of the amount (£25,600) has since been released.

THE SHILLONG (RIFLE RANGE AND UMLONG) CANTONMENTS ASSIMILATION OF LAWS BILL, 1954

THE MINISTER FOR LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BISWAS): Sir, on behalf of Dr. Katju I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to assimilate certain laws in force in the scheduled areas to the laws in force in the Khasi and Jaintia Hills District.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to assimilate certain laws in force in the scheduled areas to the laws in force in the Khasi and Jaintia Hills District."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) BILL, 1954

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item is the Appropriation (Railways) Bill, 1954. The time allotted is 45 minutes.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1953-54 for the purposes of Railways, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

MR. 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 1953-54 for the purposes of Railways, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Sir, I found as part of that convention, which was expected to be revised and adopted for the current five years, that the Government at that time proposed to have a Standing Committee on Railways and consult that Committee in regard to the implementation of the convention, and also the need or otherwise for revising it for the next five years to come. We were told by the hon. Minister in this Budget, and also later on, that this convention was going to be revised, and, therefore, the Government were going to give some consideration to it. We would like to know the steps that the Government of India would like to take in order to take into consultation that House as well as this House and the stage of consideration for the extension of this convention for another five years. We would also like to know whether the Government are going to revise their own policy and have a Standing Finance Committee for Railways. Till now we have had no information at all. It formed part and parcel of the enactment made as a result of the Resolution passed by the House. Therefore under what authority—I speak subject to correction—have the Government of India thought it fit to abolish the earlier mechanism or the machinery for consultation, i.e., the Railways Standing Finance Committee? They have abolished it, and, they have got no machinery at all through which these two Houses can possibly be consulted except by direct consultation through a motion made in that House as well as in this House. Therefore, I do think that the Government of India somehow had missed their duty in regard to this matter—maybe by mistake and had abolished that Committee without proper authority from Parliament. Secondly, it is high time, I think, that they revised their own policy and thought of reconstituting that Committee. Thirdly, at some stage or other, they should think of devising some consultative machinery by which both these Houses will be given an opportunity of expressing their views more defi-

nately and more specifically in regard to any proposals that the Government of India might be having for the revision of this convention.

Then, secondly, they constituted a number of committees under a new nomenclature for giving an opportunity to the producers as well as the consumers to get into contract with the Administration at different levels and give them the benefit of their own reactions to the Railway Administration. Previously, on all those Railway Advisory Committees there used to be some representation for various interests, especially of the agriculturists, apart from whatever representation might have been given to them by the State Legislatures and also by the Union Legislature. This time the Government of India had not given to this House the opportunity either to nominate some people on behalf of the agriculturists or to ask Parliament here to elect some to represent specifically the interests of the agriculturists. I would like the Government to give some thought to this particular matter and then see whether the present machinery that they have is really adequate for the purpose or whether there is any need for what I have suggested now, namely, they should take for themselves the power to nominate some people or to get some people elected by both these Houses in order to see that agriculturists are adequately represented.

Thirdly, from time to time my hon. friend Mr. Bhanj Deo has been putting questions here in regard to the amortisation measures that the Government of India have been taking for their various ventures, the rate of interest that they pay on the loans that they take, and the steps that they take in order to repay these debts. So far as the Railways were concerned, the hon. the Finance Minister told us that he had to provide funds for them through his ways and means measures, and a portion of the debt that he would be incurring in the course of the year through the floating of the treasury bills was intended for the benefit of the Railways. The House

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

would like to have information as to how much interest the Railways are paying, whether they pay more than what the Finance Minister is obliged to pay for the loans that he raises in the market on their behalf, or whether they pay less, or whether it is only a no-profit-no-loss basis. They have constituted, after the acceptance of that convention, a new fund known as the Development Fund. They have been setting apart large sums of money in this Fund, in addition to the other funds that they have—the Sinking Fund and various other funds. I would like to know whether it is absolutely necessary that the balances that they are keeping from year to year should not be utilised for any other purpose. In some years, of course, they are drawn upon to some extent; therefore, they are reduced. But nevertheless, there is always a huge balance to the credit of these funds that have been created by the Railways. I would like to know whether it would not be possible for them to draw upon these funds as loans and utilise those loans for the development of the Railways themselves instead of leaving these huge accumulations at the disposal of the Government of India, maybe, to the satisfaction of the Finance Minister—I do not know—or to the satisfaction of the Reserve Bank. We would like to have the necessary information in regard to that. But, nevertheless, I want the Government to explore the possibilities of utilising these funds. In the past they were not being utilised except for earning. I suppose, some nominal interest. A portion of such balances as they have been having in these funds could be made use of for development purposes, so that the Railways will be paying interest too. The Railways will of course always be liable to reimburse those funds whenever an emergency arises. I am aware of the risk that is involved in it, but nevertheless, I want the Government to study this matter. Now, these are the few points that I wanted to place before the Government.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, the previous speaker, Prof. Ranga, was asking the Government to create a convention as far as this expenditure was concerned. Regarding the Supplementary Budget, I want this Parliament to try to create another convention. Now in this Budget we are asked to sanction the expenditure of Rs. 33 crores. The year is almost closed. There remain only 20 days more when the year will be closed. And within this period of 20 days I do not think the Railway Board or the Railway Ministry can spend this amount of Rs 33 crores. We have to create a convention that not a single farthing will be spent before Parliament gives its sanction for it. We are now asked to sanction an amount of Rs. 33 crores—a few months after the amount has been spent. This Budget should have been presented before Parliament at least three or four months earlier—before the end of December at least—so that we could scrutinise the items and defer payment or defer any scheme which the Railway Board intends to implement or carry out during this financial year, should Parliament so desire; but Parliament's power in this respect has been curtailed, because all the schemes have already been executed and the amounts have already been spent. Now, after executing the schemes and after spending the money, the Government comes forward and seeks the sanction of Parliament. My appeal to the Government and to the Railway Ministry is that in future, they should not bring this in future at the fag end of the year when the amount has already been spent but before they start spending, they should seek the verdict of Parliament.

Now, I come to the provisions made in the Supplementary Budget. I am surprised to find that under almost all the items, there is a charge which is said to be by the Railway Ministry, labour welfare and staff welfare. In almost all the items, the excess is said to be due to the implementation of the Gadgil Committee's Report.

The Gadgil Committee recommended the conversion of 50 per cent. of the dearness allowance paid to the staff as their basic salary. Now, I want to know from the Railway Ministry whether this amount of 50 per cent. of the dearness allowance now paid as salary was also previously paid or not. I know—and other Members of the House also know fully well—that this dearness allowance came into being in the year 1941. Since then not only the Railways but almost every other Ministry has been paying this amount. Now, the same amount used to be spent either by way of dearness allowance or by way of salary. In the Budget for 1953-54 the Railway Board provided for the payment of this dearness allowance. They have not increased the dearness allowance by even a single farthing. The only difference now is that if an employee was getting Rs. 100 in April 1953 as dearness allowance, he will be getting the same amount in March 1954 but 50 per cent. of it as dearness allowance and 50 per cent. of it as salary. I think that most of the people in the Railways who are entitled to this dearness allowance are not liable to pay income-tax. So, it should not make any difference whether they get the amount by way of dearness allowance or by way of salary. But in order to misguide this Parliament, the Government have come forward with the statement that under every item the increase is due to the conversion of 50 per cent. of the dearness allowance as salary.

Now, I come to another item—coal and freight on coal. I had been pressing the Government and the Railway Minister on previous occasions also, that they should be very careful about coal consumption on the Railways. Now, in his Budget Speech this year, the hon. the Railway Minister has stated that they have diverted the movement of coal, instead of by rail, by sea and, therefore, they have incurred more freight charges. But they have incurred these charges in order to release more wagons for the use of the commercial community and for other purposes. If so, that would

mean that they have earned more revenue, but I find that they are not getting the amount that they budgeted for the year 1953-54. Therefore, it goes to show that they did not obtain the amount that they expected but still they have incurred more expenditure on this diversion. I do not know whether this increase was actually due to the diversion of shipment by sea or to some other causes.

I find also that the coal production in the Railway collieries has been reduced. They did not produce as much coal as they wanted or expected. They have lost in this respect also an amount of Rs. 11½ lakhs. Since they have produced less coal, the freight charges also should have been reduced in the same proportion, but the freight charges have increased. I fail to understand how, when the production is less, the freight charges increase, while the rate remains the same. I want a clarification in this respect also.

Before I resume my seat, I will again appeal to the Railway Minister to be more careful about coal consumption and about coal freights. If you use less coal, the commercial community would be getting more wagons and if they use more wagons for their commodities, then you should earn more revenue, but this was not so. I want to know how the expected earnings in this respect have not materialised.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the remarks of the two previous speakers and the hon. the Railway Minister will give suitable answer to them because most of their criticism is based on incorrect information. However, my point is that under the Constitution we have a general discussion on the Railway Budget but for these supplementary demands, there is no statement for general discussion in this House. We only get an Appropriation Bill and we have got somehow or other to get information from the memorandum on Supplementary Demands supplied to us. My complaint is that it will be much better if according to section 115 of the

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

Constitution, wherein whenever Supplementary Demands are made there should be a statement supplied to both Houses of Parliament and at least in this House, there should be a general discussion on the Supplementary Demands; they we can better understand what is the nature of the Supplementary Demands and how they come in.

Coming to this Appropriation Bill I do not say that the hon. the Railway Minister has intentionally mixed up the items under various heads in such a way that it is very difficult for any man to find out the exact expenditure incurred therein. For example under Demand No. 9—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses—Rs. 17,68,37,000 are demanded. If we see the Explanatory Note it is stated there that there were certain Suspense Accounts with the Reserve Bank of India and that the Railway Board has changed the system of accounting and transferred the Suspense Accounts from one head to their relative heads. I would ask the hon. the Railway Minister to be a little more clear and to give in greater detail an explanation of what amounts were transferred from one Suspense Account to another Suspense Account. I admit that out of this Demand of Rs. 17,68 lakhs it is quite possible that Rs. 15 crores may be only a book adjustment but in the absence of any clear indication of this fact, it is difficult for anybody to understand whether it relates to some additional expenditure or only to a book adjustment. Similarly under item No. 16—Open Line Works—Additions—there is a demand of nearly Rs. 8½ crores and the explanation given is that it is mostly a book adjustment. Leaving aside this book adjustment for which I have requested the hon. the Railway Minister to give a more detailed explanation, I would like him to show why it was necessitated and why such large amounts were carried forward in Suspense Accounts under various heads, because from the banking principles, it is fundamentally wrong

to have large Suspense Accounts. When the hon. the Railway Minister is carrying on such large Suspense Accounts under various heads, there is a chance of giving a wrong picture of the actual expenditure by transferring some portion of the expenditure to Suspense Account. Leaving aside all these Suspense Accounts, even then there is really a net increase of expenditure to the extent of Rs. 8 to 9 crores. Though this Appropriation Bill demands Rs. 33 crores, as I have explained, out of these Rs. 33 crores nearly Rs. 24 crores are accounted for by adjustment of Suspense Accounts. Assuming that those adjustments of Suspense Accounts do not lead to any real expenditure on the Railways, even then there is a net balance of Rs. 9 crores for additional expenditure on Railways. Only a few days back we discussed the Railway Budget and we found in it that the anticipated surplus in the Revised Budget Estimate of 1953-54 is only Rs. 3 crores. If that surplus is only Rs. 3 crores and we are involved in an additional expenditure of Rs. 9 crores, it will mean that the estimated surplus of Rs. 3 crores will be converted into a deficit of Rs. 6 crores. Therefore, I have been asking the hon. the Railway Minister that whenever he comes for a Supplementary Appropriation Bill, he should come forward with the complete picture and give us some information as to the effect whether this additional expenditure is going to lead to additional income or to only book adjustment. Is this Appropriation Bill going to lead to additional expenditure thereby converting the surplus into a deficit? Now coming to the detailed adjustments, I again find under Demand No. 5—Working Expenses—Repairs and Maintenance—there is a demand for Rs. 2,31,30,000. Some sort of an explanation is given in this Memorandum. It is stated that due to the Kumbh Mela, some additional provision had to be made to the extent of nearly Rs. 80 lakhs. Probably the total income of the Kumbh Mela from the passenger traffic did not exceed Rs. 50 to 60 lakhs. For that we had to incur an

additional expenditure of nearly Rs. 80 lakhs. Leaving that aside, even then, there is a balance of Rs. 1½ crores. When this figure is considered in the original picture where a demand for Rs. 68 crores is made, it will be realized that our expenditure on Repairs and Maintenance is mounting up from year after year, that the hon. Minister has adopted the incorrect policy of coming with these Supplementary Demands and going on increasing the expenditure on Repairs and Maintenance. Similarly there are other additional items demanded. In the various explanations it has been said that due to the transfer of part of the dearness allowance to basic salary this additional expenditure is incurred. In so far as the transfer of 50 per cent. of the dearness allowance to basic salary and the corresponding increase in the allocation of Provident Fund due to it is a reason for this increase, I do not mind. But any other expenditure which does not arise on account of this additional grant to Provident Fund must be explained here. Therefore, I find that this additional expenditure cannot be justified by the hon. the Railway Minister till he has shown that this additional expenditure has led to a similar increase in the revenues of the Railways.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY (Mysore): Sir, I should like to speak a few words on this Bill.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Does the 45 minutes limit include the reply also?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know he will be very brief. Then you can reply.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY: Sir, the hon. Railway Minister has asked for a sum of Rs. 33 crores which is no doubt in the interest of the public at large. Out of the Consolidated Fund, I would like to request the hon. Minister to set apart at least Rs. 3 lakhs for the survey of Kadur-Sakleshpur line via Chikmagalur because now they have taken up Hassan-Mangalore

survey. So it is very easy for them to invest a small sum and at the same time carry on the survey work. The hon. the Minister for Railways in the course of his reply to the debate referred to Kadur-Sakleshpur link via Chikmagalur and said that this project would be considered after taking a decision in regard to construction of the Hassan-Mangalore line. This reply has caused great disappointment to the people of my constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shetty, all that does not arise here.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY: No, but the survey of the line is important. So I request that out of the Consolidated Fund a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs may be set apart for the survey work along with Hassan-Mangalore line. So I am referring to this question. Last time when the deputation from Chikmagalur waited on the Minister, he was pleased to assure them that the project would be included in the first Five Year Plan and later on he said, if not, it would be definitely included in the second Plan. Now his reply says that the question would be considered. The consideration of this question has been pending for the last 30 years. The Mysore Government had sanctioned the line in 1926 and the people had become disgusted with this consideration. I don't know how long the Government are going to consider this question. Therefore, under the circumstances the Kadur-Sakleshpur link via Chikmagalur deserves top priority. So I request the hon. the Railway Minister to take this up, because the line passes through the plantation areas where coffee, cardamum and pepper are grown extensively and the nearest seaport in the neighbourhood is Mangalore to which place all these commodities are transferred for export to outside countries. So this line is very very important and I know the hon. Minister is visiting Shimoga shortly to attend the Malnad Conference when this question will be discussed threadbare and I am sure he would give due consideration to this. Because when I go to my

[Shri Basappa Shetty.]

constituency, the people flock to me and ask me, 'What have you done for our Railway?' And it is very difficult to answer them. I am very much perturbed as to what to tell them. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister at least now to give us an assurance that the project would be included definitely in the second Five Year Plan. With these words, I resume my seat.

3 P.M.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, I think I shall deal with the last speaker first. He seems to sit in this House with a mission, and that mission is to have the railway connection that he has just now mentioned. Other hon. Members touch upon other subjects, but this particular hon. Member beats and beats upon only one subject and from what he has said in the concluding portion of his speech, I have no doubt in my mind that they will take some steps to coerce the hon. Minister when he goes there to attend the Malnad Conference and get a definite assurance from him.

Now I shall deal with some of the other points raised by hon. Members in the course of this short discussion. Shri B. K. Mukerjee, who should be better informed, almost created an alarm in this House by saying that we were coming forward now with a demand for Rs. 33 crores when there are not even 33 days ahead and he wondered how these people would spend this huge amount. He raised a big doubt, though he did not succeed in creating a doubt of equal magnitude in the minds of other hon. Members. This huge figure is, more or less, a technical one. The question of suspense was also raised by the hon. Member Shri Kishen Chand, I think.

PROF. G. RANGA: Or somebody else.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: No, it was Shri Kishen Chand who raised that question. Sir, the net increase in the ordinary working expenses comes to only Rs. 6.64 crores. Out of the gross

increase, about Rs. 16½ crores under Demand No. 9 and Rs. 8½ crores under Demand No. 16, are of a technical nature and that has come about because of certain decisions that were taken in the course of the year in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General that the outstandings under the Reserve Bank suspense should be cleared by transfer to other suspense heads. Until these amounts are disbursed under the various suitable heads, these will be under the Suspense Account. What has been done now is to bring these Suspense Accounts under these two Demands instead of keeping them under the Reserve Bank suspense head. That is purely of a technical nature and the real increase is only Rs. 6.64 crores. And this sum is explained like this. Rs. 3.15 crores goes to the implementation of the Gadgil Committee's recommendations. My hon. friend Shri Mukerjee also raised the point that these people were already drawing these amounts and so, how could there be an increase now? It is only a sort of paper transaction. This applies to all retirement benefits, gratuities provident fund, etc. This amount is distributed like this. There is the provision for provident fund. Once half of their dearness allowance—that which is called dearness pay—is added to their basic pay, then to that extent their contribution to provident fund increases and the equivalent amount that the Government have to pay also increases. So also in the case of gratuity. So the provision under provident fund comes to Rs. 178 lakhs. And provision under gratuities and special contribution to provident fund is Rs. 44 lakhs. Then there is the provision under allowances—all the allowances. Travelling allowance comes to Rs. 30 lakhs, house rent allowance Rs. 27 lakhs, compensatory allowance Rs. 25 lakhs, overtime allowance Rs. 11 lakhs. That is how it has been accounted for.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: Sir, may I have a little clarification? Demand No. 9 alone deals with gratuities and Provident Fund contribution and not the other Demands. But similar

increased provision is shown under other Demands as due to conversion of dearness allowance as pay.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: This sum of Rs. 3.15 crores has been dispersed under various items. If the hon. Member will add them up—or I can help him in adding up all the figures—they will come to Rs. 3.15 crores.

Again, diversion of coal by sea, that comes to an additional bill of Rs. 1.39 crores.

PROF. G. RANGA: Is sea communication more costly?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Certainly. And for the Kumbh Mela, which has been discussed sufficiently in this House, additional works had to be provided for and that takes about Rs. 45 lakhs. And there are certain other items of expenditure through which I don't think I need take the House. That is how this extra demand for Rs. 6.64 crores is explained, and there is no need to take an alarmist view of this and to paint a picture as if we are trying to do something behind Parliament.

Prof. Ranga referred to the Convention Committee. In fact, there is a paragraph about this in the budget speech of the hon. Minister and I need not repeat all that is said there. It is para. 25. As per the original convention resolution, it was contemplated that after five years there should be a review. "The Resolution laid down that a Committee of the House shall review the rate of dividend towards the end of the aforesaid period and suggest for the years following it, any adjustment considered necessary, having regard to the revenue returns of the undertaking, the average borrowing rate of the Government and any other relevant factors." The Minister added, "I shall, therefore, be inviting the House in this session to set up a committee to go into the matter." So this committee will be duly set up and it will examine this convention which is at present obtaining and

suggest any changes that they may consider necessary.

Prof. Ranga raised also the question of the Standing Finance Committee. As he is aware, and as other hon. Members also may be aware, these committees were attached to each Ministry and they were Advisory Committees. Of course, there was one Standing Finance Committee for General Finance and another Standing Committee for the Railways. All these committees were abolished and.....

PROF. G. RANGA: But under whose authority was it abolished? Was it not by mere executive order? What right have Government to do that especially in regard to this particular matter? I am not speaking of an *ad hoc* committee. That does not refer to a new convention.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: A very experienced Member like Prof. Ranga should know the background of the abolition of this committee. In the olden days these committees were purely advisory. When power really did not rest in the hands of the people's representatives, the old device was to have a sort of association of the Members of the Legislature in the working of the various Ministries and they were purely advisory bodies. They did not really carry any power, except the satisfaction of Members of being the members of a particular committee.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): With your permission, Sir, may I interrupt the hon. Deputy Minister? I think the hon. Deputy Minister is quite inexperienced in the working of these Standing Committees of the previous era. The Standing Finance Committee, for instance, was one of the most important of these committees and it had full powers to reject any proposals for new expenditure moved by the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That question does not arise here. It is a larger question pertaining to other standing committees also.

PROF. G. RANGA: We are not concerned with other committees here. It is this committee we are dealing with which was specifically mentioned in this convention. It is not an *ad hoc* committee.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: The hon. Member is mistaken. As you rightly pointed out, Sir, this does not pertain to the Railways alone. It in fact involves the entire field of Government and I have nothing particular to say. Why should I be called upon...

MR. CHAIRMAN:to explain? It is time.

PROF. G. RANGA: I am only talking about this committee and I am concerned with this committee only.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I shall finish in a minute, Sir.

Mr. Ranga referred to the point about representation of agricultural interests. We know that he is the redoubtable champion of agricultural interests in this country and we have provided for representation of agricultural interests. For the Railway Users' Consultative Committee, there are two representatives to be selected out of a panel to be sent by State Governments of agricultural associations and other bodies not included in or affiliated with the Chambers of Commerce etc., referred to in the previous item. There are two representatives of agricultural associations on the six zonal committees that have been constituted.

PROF. G. RANGA: What about the Centre?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: About the National Consultative Council, there is provision for one representative of agricultural interests.

PROF. G. RANGA: For 70 per cent. of the population?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: The difficulty here, Sir, is that agriculture

is so widely dispersed in this country and it is difficult to pitch upon a proper representative. The only representative we can alight upon is Professor Ranga.....

PROF. G. RANGA: No, no.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN:and he does not consider it worth while to serve on the Committee. That is our difficulty.

Then, he referred to the development fund—I am sorry I have to hurry—and asked why we should not dip our hands into those reserves and use them for development purposes. I think it is well understood that general finance are our bankers; all these accumulations in the various reserve funds—they are in the region of more than about Rs. 100 crores—are kept by general finance for us and it is not easy to plan or think only of the railways. Now we are living in the Plan period; we have to plan as a whole for the whole sector and not only for the sector that represents the railways. As such, the allotment for capital expenditure is done taking all the interests into consideration and in that railways also have a share. Certainly what hon. Members have been saying in the course of this discussion will strengthen our hands in getting more funds from general finance and I hope we will succeed in this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Alagesan. Time is up.

MR. 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 1953-54 for the purposes of Railways, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

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 O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

THE HINDU MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE BILL, 1952

THE MINISTER FOR LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BISWAS): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to marriage and divorce among Hindus be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses, consisting of forty-five Members, fifteen Members from this Council, namely:—

1. Dr. P. V. Kane,
2. Shrimati Rukmini Arundale,
3. Dr. Raghu Vira,
4. Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati,
5. Diwan Chaman Lall,
6. Shrimati Maya Devi Chettry,
7. Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal,
8. Shri Govinda Reddy,
9. Shri T. S. Pattabiraman,
10. Shri P. T. Leuva,
11. Shri S. Mahanty,
12. Shri K. Suryanarayana,
13. Shri Amolakh Chand,
14. Shri S. N. Mazumdar, and
15. The Mover,

and thirty Members from the House of the People;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee, the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of Members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this Council relating to Select Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

that this Council recommends to the House of the People that the House do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this Council the names of Members to be appointed by the House to the Joint Committee; and

that the Committee shall make a report to this Council on or before the last day of the second week of the next session."

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): What about Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand? Her name is not on the list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Her name is not on the list.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: I may mention, Sir, that the names which were on the Select Committee on the Special Marriage Bill have been omitted excepting.....

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA: May I suggest a name now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wait, he is giving an explanation.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS:those of Mr. Amolakh Chand and the Mover.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Where is the need for the Law Minister as well as for the Deputy Chief Whip to be on it?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: I have given the names and it is for the House to accept them or alter them.