

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time. Mr. Saksena.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, just one observation. I will hardly take two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are only two minutes left. You can have only one minute.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Yes, Sir. The point that I would like the hon. the Deputy Minister for Finance to note is this that it should not be made a practice to come forward to Parliament with demands for supplementary grants. It should be rather an exception than a rule. Is it not possible to foresee all the expenses that one shall have to incur during the course of the year?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That point has been replied to, Mr. Saksena.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: With these observations, Sir, I resume my seat.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

5 P.M.

THE PATIALA AND EAST PUNJAB STATES UNION APPROPRIATION (No. 3) BILL, 1953

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): 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 the State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union for the service of the financial year 1953-54, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ' K. S. HEGDE) in the Chair.]

116 C.S.D.

! Sir, I do not think that I should say anything further than what is contained in the statement already circulated to the Members of the House. The explanatory notes are contained in that statement. Very small demands have been made which are absolutely necessary and I do not think that I should take the time of the House in going through those figures which are there in the statement already circulated.

Sir, I move.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE): Motion moved:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union for the service of the financial year 1953-54, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa): Sir, the Home Minister, Dr. Kailas Nath Katju, announced the other day that elections in PEPSU will be over by the end of March next year. It is gratifying to note that supplementary grants have been demanded for it and is embodied in the present Appropriation Bill. I am anxious to know about the preparations of the Budget of the PEPSU Government for the next year, 1954-55. I would like to know whether the elected popular Ministers will have a say in the preparation of the next Budget for the full year 1954-55. It is now more than a year, Sir, that PEPSU has been under the President's Rule. This Parliament passed the main annual Budget for PEPSU for this year as well as the present batch of supplementary demands crystallised in the present Bill. I wish to know whether this Parliament will examine the Appropriation Accounts of PEPSU for this year when they are prepared and published. I do not know whether the Minister caught my question.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: About Budget?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: I will repeat it. I wish to know whether this Parliament will examine the Appropriation Accounts of PEPSU for this year when they are prepared and published. How else are we expected to ensure that the moneys sanctioned in the Budget by this Parliament have been properly spent? By raising the above question, namely, the accountability of the executive for the moneys spent by it from the Budget passed by Parliament, whether the executive is to account for it to Parliament or to the PEPSU Legislature, I wish to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the answer given by him to a question of mine about the delay in the preparation and issue of the Finance and Appropriation Accounts of the PEPSU Government since 1st April 1950 from which date the Comptroller and the Auditor General of India became responsible for the preparation of these documents together with the connected Audit Reports. The Finance Minister stated that both the Appropriation Accounts and the Audit Report for 1950-51 were still under preparation and were expected to be ready shortly. That was in May last. Now, 7 more months have passed and I do not know whether these Accounts and the connected Audit Reports for 1950-51 have since been issued. It is now more than two years and the accounts for 1950-51 might have been closed. If these are issued by now or will be issued before the rule of the President and the Parliament ends, which Legislature will be deemed to be competent to examine them and take action on them? It is gratifying to note that the supplementary demands asked for PEPSU do not contain any request for grants on capital or on loans and advances accounts. I hope the debt burden of the PEPSU Government is not high only due to proper control over capital expenditure. On the 14th of this month the Finance Minister of Madras, Shri C. Subramaniam, was complaining of the rising debt charges of the residuary Madras Government due to that Government's improvident loans. PEPSU has not put the cart

before the horse by enforcing prohibi-i and so it has probably less need for incurring loans. PEPSU's financial position is in sharp contrast to the financial position of the neighbouring State of East Punjab. East Punjab owes about Rs. 100 crores to the Centre. It is being given new loans to pay interest on its past loans. Another gratifying item to note is that the Minister for Rehabilitation in his answer to my question of the 5th May 1953 excluded the State of PEPSU from the list of States which have represented to the Central Government their inability to bear the losses on account of loans which are not likely to be recovered from displaced persons. PEPSU and East Punjab, Sir, contain naturally a higher concentration of displaced persons from Pakistan and huge loans have been given to them for rehabilitation purposes. While East Punjab is unable to recover some loans taken by the displaced persons, PEPSU is obviously better placed in this respect.

In conclusion, Sir, let me again emphasise the urgent necessity for the prompt issue of Appropriation and Financial Accounts of the PEPSU Government which are in considerable arrears.

I thank you, Sir.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have just finished the Appropriation Bill of the Central Government and the hon. Deputy Finance Minister pointed out at that time that the demands were very nominal and naturally in any administration, in any Government, such supplementary demands are asked for and that they were quite all right. In a Budget of Rs. 400 crores, a supplementary demand of about Rs. 2 or Rs. 3 crores, subtracting the capital outlay of about Rs. 11 crores, which comes only to about 1 per cent, of the total Budget, was quite all right. But what is the picture now in the case of PEPSU? The total Budget of PEPSU is only round about Rs. 4 crores and in a budget of Rs. 4

crores we are asked to agree to supplementary demands to the tune of Rs. 67 lakhs, which is nearly 16 per cent, of the usual budget. So we cannot consider this to be only a minor affair. I will not lightly pass over this supplementary Appropriation Bill. It looks like almost a frightful budget. A demand of Rs. 67 lakhs in a budget of Rs. 4 crores, being over 16 per cent., requires careful consideration and careful examination by this House. I am not satisfied with the explanations supplied by the hon. the Deputy Finance Minister in connection with this Bill. I maintain, Sir, that it was very easy and possible for Government, when they were preparing the original budget, to have foreseen these items of expenditure and there is no justification for coming forward with these isolated items of expenditure as supplementary demands. As far back as March 1953, when the Government of India declared President's rule in PEPSU, it was a known fact that elections to legislatures will take place. I am however very glad that this item is shown here, but it could have been easily shown in the original Budget.

Then I come to the item of Rs. 25,37,770 under 'Civil Works'. I should like to know from the hon. Deputy Finance Minister why such a big demand is made now and why it could not have been included in the original Budget. 'Stationery and printing' cannot be related to the elections because the election expenditure covers the preparation of electoral rolls, etc. The hon. Deputy Finance Minister must give full reasons for incurring such high expenditure on stationery and printing. And I will conclude by saying that this is a very wrong practice to come up with supplementary demands which are a big proportion of the total budget itself, and this is the third Appropriation Bill. If you take into account the second Appropriation Bill also it will make matters worse. With these words, Sir, I am drawing the attention of the Deputy Finance Minister.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA
<Bihar> Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have

before us the PEPSU Appropriation (No. 3) Bill and I endorse the remarks made by my hon. friend Mr. Kishen Chand that there is no justification for bringing forward in small bits appropriations which ought to have been included in the original Budget.

Sir, I find that there is an appropriation for Rs. 9,75,000 under the head 'Elections to Legislatures'. In this connection, Sir, I would like to urge one point. Sir, we know that it had been now proved more than once that the ballot boxes which were used at the last elections were defective. Various tribunals have also accepted that it is possible to open the ballot boxes without in any way disturbing the seals, and all kinds of corruption are likely to happen when such defective ballot boxes are used. We have, Sir, heard a lot of complaints and some of them have been accepted by the election tribunals.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):
Which are they?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I cannot give you the names just at the moment, but if my hon. friend wants, I can give him the names later. As I was saying, the election tribunals have accepted this proposition that the ballot boxes could be opened without disturbing the seals and the ballot papers tampered with. Now the elections are going to take place very soon in this State, I would urge upon the Government to devise some other ballot box which cannot be easily tampered with and if they cannot find out some other type of ballot boxes, they should agree to the proposal of sealing the ballot boxes. It may be expensive, Sir, because it will take a lot of cloth to wrap all the ballot boxes and then to seal them up, but under the circumstances I do not see any alternative, and if we want fair elections, then certainly we should not use the ballot boxes that we have been using so far. We must have some other ballot boxes or we must use the seal. This is what I want to say with regard to item No. 11.

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] Then, Sir, we have Civil Works for which we have allocated Rs. 25,37,700. I do not know, Sir, exactly what the Civil Works denote, but I want to say one thing in this connection. Sir, in PEPSU we have got a huge area of land which is lying absolutely waste. They were previously owned by the big landlords. They have not been brought under the plough and when there is great scarcity of food it is but very urgent that immediate steps should be taken to reclaim all these waste lands. I am very happy, that the present Government in PEPSU had already taken steps to reclaim the waste lands there, but I understand, Sir, that the reclamation work has been given to private agencies. We know, Sir, that we have got a very big Central Tractor Organisation about which it is mentioned at page 7 in the Annual Report of the Food and Agriculture Ministry, and they have, it appears from this report, 250 tractors and they have been doing a lot of reclamation work in other States. I have been wondering, Sir, whether their hands were so full that they could not be utilised in PEPSU and so the PEPSU Government have decided to give the reclamation work on contract basis to private agencies, or whether now they have discovered that the Central Tractor Organisation did not work efficiently or cheaply for which account they have decided to give the reclamation work on contract basis to private agencies. You will agree with me, Sir, that the Government owes an explanation to this House as to why, when we have invested so much money over the Central Tractor Organisation and when we have got 250 tractors—many of them probably are lying idle—they are not making use of them. Then, Sir, the other question which arises is this that if we make use of these tractors, what does the cost actually come to per acre of reclamation. I am told, Sir,—I am speaking subject to correction—that the cost is prohibitive whereas the private agencies have quoted very much less than what is being charged by the Central Tractor Organisation per acre and the difference is very very great. I do not

[know much about it, Sir, and probably | my hon. friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy. sitting on the other side of the House ¹ may be in a better position to throw light on this subject because he was on some committee, but my information is that probably the cost comes to about Rs. 210 or Rs. 212 or Rs. 215 per acre.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: No, no.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am speaking subject to correction. I do not know the unit but it is Rs. 210. or thereabout, but for the same unit of work done, Rs. 150 or Rs. 160 has been quoted by the private agencies— what exactly is the unit I forget.

PANDIT S. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): It is Rs. 52 in Madhya Pradesh, Government rate.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The Government rate is somewhat fantastic. As I said I do not exactly remember the unit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE): Pandit Dube has said that it is Rs. 52.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: It must be per bigha.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am talking of the cost on comparative unit. For the same unit of work done, the private agencies quote less than the cost incurred by the Central Tractor Organisation. This is a point to be investigated. Now the point is: No State Government will agree to make use of the Central Tractor Organisation when their charges are so high, and, as very rightly pointed out by my hon. friend Mr. Bhanj Deo, there may be serious defects and probably another scandal will be discovered if you go deep into the Central Tractor Organisation. Why is it that now we are asking the private agencies to take up this work when we have such a huge organisation under our control? The other point that occurs to me is that when the Government agency calculates and quotes the rate, they do not calculate at all the overhead expen-

ses. They only calculate the direct expenses, and if they take into account the overhead expenses, which of course the taxpayers are paying, their charges must be still more fantastic. Therefore, I would like the Government to investigate these points and come forward with an explanation as to what are the reasons—they know it better than ourselves, and of course they might keep back the reasons from us and if they do so that is a different matter—but when the private agencies quote less the conclusions are obvious, and we find that it is more remunerative to go to the private agency than to the Central Tractor Organisation. This is the point I wanted to urge with regard to the working of the Central Tractor Organisation and with regard to the reclamation of waste lands in PEPSU.

Now another point I would like to submit with your permission is with regard to reclamation. As I said, there is a huge area of land which is absolutely lying waste. Now the Central Government is responsible for PEPSU as there is no PEPSU Government and they should see to it that this land is distributed among the landless people who are willing to take up to cultivation themselves, and in this connection I would like to point out that if simultaneous action is not taken for the distribution of this land to the cultivators, the reclamation work will be wasted. We know, Sir, that reclamation work has been started this month and the usual period for reclamation is—it is also stated in this book—between January and April or May. Now what I want to urge upon the Government is this that when they have given a contract for reclamation of probably 50,000 acres of land, they should simultaneously go on making arrangements for the cultivation of the land which is being reclaimed. I know from personal experience, Sir, that lands have been reclaimed at a huge cost and they have been allowed to remain fallow for one year or two years. This means that again the land reverts

I back to a state of barrenness, and again reclamation has got to be done. Now if the people are definitely brought and settled on those lands on condition that they will cultivate the lands from the next rainy season, then, simultaneously with the reclamation work going on, these people will make their own arrangements for their settlement and cultivation there. If they are put there from now onwards, it means a good deal of saving to them in that, that they will not have to spend much on first ploughing or first cultivation in the first year which will otherwise be the case if they are asked to come after a lapse of time. They can make use of the ploughing that is being done by the tractors, but if that is left for some time to remain fallow, they will have to again re-cultivate it. So simultaneously with the reclamation work, the work of distribution of land among the landless labour should continue. That is a very important fact and 'o this the Government has given no attention altogether. Sir, we know that we are all for Vinobaji's Bhoodan movement and here the Government will be the biggest donor. They should now come forward and fulfil the mission, which Vinobaji has started, here in PEPSU. The huge tracts of land which they are reclaiming should be made over to the landless poor peasants. People from Punjab or PEPSU or from other places should be brought down and they should be asked to take up cultivation immediately, otherwise all the money will be wasted and the land will revert back to barrenness.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I did not want to participate in the discussion on this Bill but for the fact that the hon. Mr. Sinha has named me here. I feel that he is evidently under a misconception about the Central Tractor Organisation. Sir, I will come direct to that question. He was pleased to observe that the Government are interested in hiding certain facts about the Central Tractor Organisation and that the rates that they were charging were fabulously high

[Shri Govinda Reddy.] and that because they could not manage, they had given contracts to private firms and so on and so forth.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: If the hon. Member is in possession of facts, what is the cost?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE): Possibly he is going to tell you.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Let him tell what is the cost for cultivation of one acre by the Central Tractor Organisation, what is the tender that has been received and at what rate it has been given.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I was coming to it. Well, Sir, I must inform the hon. Member that, as he has said, I have some knowledge of the working of the Central Tractor Organisation. There have been wild rumours about the Central Tractor Organisation that it has not been functioning successfully, that it has been incurring heavy expenditure and that it has been responsible for high wastage. So the Government appointed a committee to go into this question. In fact there are two committees, one on the technical side and.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Have they submitted their report?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Please listen, Mr. Sinha. I will come to it. There is nothing hidden. The Government is not interested in hiding what is taking place. The Government itself has gone into this question and to allay public suspicions on the one hand and to see how far the Organisation could be improved on the other and also to see whether the Tractor Organisation is necessary or whether its work could be done in any other way, the Government has constituted two committees and I have the honour to belong to one committee which is not on the technical side. All these questions are engaging the attention of the Government. Well,

Sir, there has been a history* of the Central Tractor Organisation, and I also know something about it. I was on one of the committees which went into its working. The Central Tractor Organisation, conditioned as it was, has done very good work. The only criticism advanced against it is that a lot of machinery that could not be put into immediate use was got and that a lot of machinery is now idle. Well, Sir, that is a thing with which we are not concerned now.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Should we not go into the question as to how much has been pilfered?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE): That is not relevant.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I will answer the hon. Member that there is no pilferage at all. The only criticism was that those who were responsible for the indenting of the machinery should have seen to it that they indented for the right type of machinery. If they had done so, why did they not use it? It is a different matter, it is not relevant here.

So far as the rates that the Central Tractor Organisation was charging, they were charging, it has been alleged, Rs. 270 or Rs. 260; this is fabulous. They were charging Rs. 74, I believe, if my memory serves me right. That was last year and the year before last. But the Government and the Central Tractor Organisation itself were considering very seriously the question of reducing the costs. This question has been examined at length and it has been found that those costs would be reduced somewhat, and they have now reduced those costs.

One point which pertains to what Mr. Sinha said is this, that the overhead expenditure of the Central Tractor Organisation is high. Sir, in establishments run by Government, the overhead expenses are always higher than in private firms which economise in all sorts of ways. The Central Tractor Organisation was not working

en the basis on which a private firm was working; it was working on the basis of service. So, whenever the units were not used economically, the rates did go up. Sometimes, blocks of 500 acres or 600 acres at least should be provided and blocks of 2,000 or 3,000 acres should be provided if a certain unit of tractors have to work. If a certain block has to be ploughed say less than a particular size, the tractors have sometimes to move from block to block. The contractor undertake? <° ""^L^inlv whpq p_>^mic ~,tts are provided; but uovern-ment do not say that they do not undertake that work; it is for service. When the States promise to offer blocks to the Central Tractor Organisation, the C. T. O. undertakes to work on these blocks; later on the State Governments find some difficulty in their way.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

In some States, they had demarcated the blocks; there was 'kharif crop in some blocks and they could not have been tractorised. But the tractors have to move from block to block covering the intermediate distance. Naturally, when a unit of tractors move from one block to another, moving a distance of five or seven miles consuming heavy petrol and oil, wastage results. I was just showing that, as my hon. friend remarked, the Tractor Organisation was not working at such an exorbitant cost. But it is true that its cost is a bit high as it is a service organisation, and as it could not. I believe work on a commercial basis. As the hon. Member was pointing out, some private contractors have been given this work. The contractors have been entrusted with that work. The other day we had an occasion to go into the accounts of these contractors, how much they have invested on their machinery and what rate they are charging. I may tell you that they are charging the same rate as the Government had fixed, nothing lower, that is, Rs. 62, which the Government have fixed for their own tractorisation. Even this

rate is a concessional rate. The Government have agreed to show them some concession, and the concession is that the Government are advancing some money on the investment that they are going to make in the machinery that they are going to put. And that will have to be recovered from the Tractor Organisation. They are charging a concessional rate of interest. After enjoying these facilities these two firms have agreed to work on the rate which the Government are now charging, which the Central Tractor Organisation is now charging. And the other Government are really using, see whether this work could be done on another basis instead of having a large Department to go about it. They are trying to find out in what way the Tractor Organisation can economise and whether it could be possible to eliminate it altogether. Government have agreed to try that as a basis, and the hon. Member must remember that the States are free to do their own tractorising. It is a State subject. The Central Tractor Organisation can work only if the States agree to it and so it is the States that have given the contract.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The PEPSU Government and the Central Government is the same.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Now of course. But another State also has given the contract. The State is free to give a contract on any terms it likes. So here what the two firms have agreed to do in PEPSU is the same as what the Tractor Organisation is doing now.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: My point is this, Sir. If the hon. Member can satisfy me, it will be very good indeed. The hon. Member says that the Central Tractor Organisation is charging a revised rate. Now can they meet their cost of operation from the rate that they are charging? The hon. Member just said

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, Sir, the charge is based on the cost accounting basis. It means the revenue expenditure of the department. The department means the engineers and the technical men who are operating tractors. All that expenditure is included. But the other things are not included. (Interruption.) It is perfectly on the cost accounting basis just as in other commercial firms it is on the cost accounting basis, I believe, Sir, he is satisfied.

About the Government's expenditure as this. This expenditure, Sir, can be divided into two parts. One is development expenditure and the other is expenditure which has been necessitated. Now, Sir, both these the Government could not have foreseen because the Government of the day was not there. Now, the Administration has been assumed by the President and the Central Government is in charge of it. And therefore, the Central Government had to take up necessary development works. I do not believe that any Member of this House can object to the development expenditure. And the other necessary expenditure was in relation to elections and stationery. Of course, the hon. Members can quite see that an election based on adult franchise results in some cost and the stationery. (Interruption.) I will come to that. And therefore there can be no objection to this. That was not foreseen evidently during the last Budget and that was a thing of later occurrence. As far as the ballot boxes are concerned, Sir, hon. Members on the opposite side who lost in the elections, although they tried their very best, have come out against the Government with an allegation that the ballot boxes were not fool-proof.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : Even the Congress members have come forward with such complaints.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I did not interrupt the hon. Member when he

was speaking, and I do not know why he should interrupt me. Well, Sir, there were some allegations made that the ballot boxes were not fool-proof.

When was this allegation made? It was not made at the time of the elections. It was not made at the time of counting. It was made only when counting was finished by the candidates who lost. If, hon. Members had any reason to believe that the ballot boxes were not fool-proof or that they could be tampered with, this would have been known long before. > -----

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: This was brought to the notice of the Election Commission before the elections started.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Before the elections started, these boxes were publicly examined and only then they were given on a tender basis for manufacture. Authorities on these things were asked to confirm, they tried many experiments and only when the Government was fully satisfied that these boxes were fool-proof they were used.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: It was proved to the Election Commission that it could be tampered with without breaking open the seal.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: The Government threw a challenge and that challenge was not accepted. It is entirely natural for members who have lost the elections, who have lost confidence and who have no future, to say.....

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin): What authority have you to decide our future?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: The country has decided your future. Where is the doubt about it? The country has now decided their future. So, Sir, these allegations are baseless and if hon. Members sincerely believe that the ballot boxes are not fool proof, then they should have.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with ballot boxes now.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I had to refer to it, because Mr. Sinha made some complaints on that score.

With these few remarks, I support the Bill.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Sir, I am not concerned with the Central Tractor Organisation, because there is no supplementary demand for the same. I do not know why this matter came up. There were two points raised by Mr. Bhanj Deo. One was whether the Financial Accounts have been prepared and where they will be placed, whether they will be placed before Parliament or before the new Legislature. I find that the Financial Accounts for the year 1950-51 are under print, and that for 1951-52, they are under preparation. I understand that, before the printing is completed and they are ready, if a legislature is duly elected, these Financial Accounts will be placed before the new Legislature. Another question was whether the Budget will be prepared by the Administration or by the newly elected Legislature. As I understand that the elections would be over on the 7th March and a Ministry will be formed soon after that. I believe that the newly elected Ministry will prepare the Budget.

Now, my hon. friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, had raised one or two points. He asked why there should be a Supplementary Demand in a Budget of few crores—he said about Rs. 4 crores or so. Really speaking the Budget of PEPSU is Rs. 8½ crores, (revenue) and Rs. 10 crores capital. If you just look at the figures given in the Appropriation Bill, you will see that all these items—Rs. 6 lakhs for a medical college, Rs. 25 lakhs for Civil Works, payment of arrears of water rates to the Punjab Government, etc.—all these items cropped up after the President's Rule, which came on the 4th or 5th March—I am not sure about that. The Budget had to be rushed through and presented to Parliament by the

end of March 1953 and therefore it is quite possible that all these things could not be anticipated. Certain decisions were taken by the Administration about the office buildings, starting of medical college, about 10 per cent, revenue receipts to be paid to the Gram Panchayats and also certain arrears to be paid. If he looks into all these things.....

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: There are no demands for the capital budget, there are only for revenue budget and even if I accepted the figure of the hon. Minister of Rs. 8½ crores, even then this demand of Rs. 67 lakhs is approximately 9 per cent.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: It is 9 per cent. There is no doubt about it. The President's Rule came in about March or so. Then the Budget was to be presented to Parliament by the end of March and naturally the Administration was busy with preparing the Budget. They could not prepare certain schemes to be put through about the office accommodation, buildings, starting of the medical college, giving of 10 per cent, revenue receipts—all these things came later on and so it has been necessary to present these supplementary demands and I don't think there is anything unusual in the matter. One point was raised about the stationery grant being rather heavy. Certain orders for paper were placed in 1952-53 and a budget provision was made for the same article but before the end of that year the paper did not arrive and therefore the budget provision made in 1952-53 was surrendered or rather lapsed and therefore the paper came in 1953-54. So a provision had to be made. That is the only reason why there is a heavier demand for stationery. These were the only points which were raised in the debate and I hope that the House will take this motion into consideration.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.] further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union for the service of the financial year 1953-54, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

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

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

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

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Sir, I move that the Bill be returned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be returned."

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, here is this Appropriation Bill introduced at a time when the elections are about to take place in PEPSU. We were not given in the course of the debate any idea as to how the Administration was going on in PEPSU and when the elections were to take place. We were not also told that the conditions were made congenial for this. The high election cost that is put into this Appropriation Bill is not properly explained in the information supplied to us. A sum of Rs. 7,70,000 out of Rs. 9,70,000 is shown as for other expenses. They should have stated what these other expenses are that will be incurred for the elections. The Deputy Minister, while sponsoring the Bill, or while winding up his speech at the first reading stage did not give us any idea as to what it was intended for. For sixty seats we are to spend about Rs. 9,70,000 and I think it is a great waste of money. We have a right to know how this expenditure is being incurred. What causes this expenditure? And in the absence of a cogent explanation for this, we are at a loss to understand it also. The times are

so bad and there are allegations of maladministration from PEPSU and certain arrests are taking place there all of which suggest political tension. In these circumstances, in a State where the President had to introduce his rule, because of continuous dacoit-ies and continuous existence of circumstances which were uncongenial for the ordinary life of the people, we should have been given all these explanations before this Bill was passed. It was the special responsibility of (he Government of India now, having, governed this State for the last so many months, to have explained at every stage what was taking place. We hear that there are complaints that several Sikh officers employed in banks were sent away and certain officers were posted in particular parts in order to suit the election conveniences of one of the political parties. All these are allegations and rumours, spread over the whole of the country and when there is such political tension, it was not worth while considering this Bill without getting a proper explanation. The hon. Minister said that there is nothing to be said. But why nothing to be said? Everything about PEPSU has to be told here. We should have understood what was going on there. We should have been satisfied that with the President's rule enacted in that area, things were taking a better shape. But nothing was said. And now, over and above all this, we are not able to understand why such a big supplementary Appropriation Bill has been put forward. So many people have objected to it. Nine per cent., the Deputy Minister said, was nothing. But this is really something very serious that at this stage, they should have come up like this. So I would like to have the Deputy Minister explain to us before he gets away with this Bill, what are the circumstances" under which a sum of Rs. 7,70,000 is going to be spent on these "other purposes" of elections. That, I feel, is a very important matter to which his attention has not been paid.

It is not necessary for me to go into the other details of this Bill as appa-

rently they are all for public purposes. But at this stage, without proper explanations, you can understand that we are not prepared to take all this for granted. There might be strings in everything and our minds have to be disabused in this matter. I submit Sir, therefore, that explanations on these points should be forthcoming.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much time does the hon. Minister want?

SHRI M. C. SHAH: There are only three minutes left, Sir.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Six minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes. Mr. Vaidya is also standing up.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: If he wants to speak, I have no objection.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only for two minutes.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Then I will take only three minutes after that.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat):

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० वंश (मध्य भारत):
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विरोधी पक्षों की ओर से जो कुछ विरोध हो रहा है वह कुछ समझ में आने योग्य बात नहीं है। वास्तव में विरोधी पक्ष को तो इसका स्वागत करना चाहिये था। पेप्सू की जो हालत थी और वहाँ जो अशान्ति की स्थिति थी उसमें ही प्रेसिडेंट (President) को वहाँ का शासन हाथ में लेना पड़ा और शासन को हाथ में लेने के बाद वहाँ की जनता की समस्याओं को हल करने में, जनतन्त्र की व्यवस्था को कायम रखने में, जनता की भलाई तथा प्रगति में जो आवश्यक खर्च करता था उन पर यदि उचित खर्च की व्यवस्था नहीं करते तब उस स्थिति में मैं समझ सकता था कि शिकायत करने की कोई

गुंजाइश थी। परन्तु जब से राष्ट्रपति ने अपने हाथों में शासन को लिया, तब से वास्तव में वहाँ शान्ति स्थापित हुई है और वहाँ काफी प्रगति की गई है। वहाँ के अधिकारियों ने उन तमाम तत्वों पर, जो कि जनतन्त्र के लिये खतरे थे और जो कि डेमोक्रेसी (democracy) को चैलेंज (challenge) देने वाली ताकतें थीं, काबू पा लिया है और ऐसा वातावरण बना दिया है कि वहाँ इलेक्शन (election) हो जाय और डेमोक्रेसी सफलतापूर्वक चल सके। इसमें उन्होंने पूरी सफलता पा ली है। तो यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है कि वहाँ चुनाव का कराना और जनतन्त्र की पूर्ण स्थापना के लिये जो सारी व्यवस्थाएँ होनी चाहियें, उनको करना राष्ट्रपति के शासन का पहला काम था और उस काम को कर के एक बीच की नई व्यवस्था के चाल रखने के लिये जो यह अधिक खर्च के लिये हमारे सामने बिल (Bill) रखा गया है, उसका मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें स्वागत ही करना चाहिये। यह तो स्वागत करने की ही चीज है और जो रकम इसमें रखी गई है वे ऐसी नहीं, जिनमें वाद-विवाद होने की कोई गुंजाइश हो।

SHRI M. S. RANAWAT (Rajasthan):

श्री एम० एस० रानावत (राजस्थान):
शासन की व्यवस्था के बारे में क्या आपके पास कोई अलग से रिपोर्ट आई है। हाउस (House) के सामने तो पेश नहीं हुई।

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA:

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० वंश: पेप्सू के ऊपर हाउस के सामने जो रिपोर्टें बराबर रखी गई हैं उनको अगर माननीय सदस्य पढ़ने की कृपा करें तो उनसे काफी मैटीरियल (Material) मिल जायेगा। इसके अतिरिक्त राष्ट्रपति अभी वहाँ गये हुये हैं और दो तीन रोज़ से उनके वहाँ जो भाषण हो रहे हैं उनसे

[Shri Kanhaiyalal D. Vaidya.]

भी पता चलता है कि वहां शासन में काफी प्रगति हुई है और प्रगति के चिन्ह हैं और इसी कारण से उन्होंने चुनाव कराने के लिये निश्चित तारीखें घोषित कर दी हैं। यदि प्रगति नहीं होती और शान्ति स्थापित नहीं होती, तो वहां चुनाव कराने की घोषणा अभी नहीं होती इसलिये मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिल स्वागत करने की चीज है और इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूं।

[For English translation, see Appendix VI, Annexure No. 155.]

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Sir, I thought that at this stage it was not proper for Members to object to the demand which has already been passed. I found that two Members from that side had welcomed this provision for elections and nobody asked for any particulars. I had all those particulars and I would have gladly supplied all those particulars but nobody demanded them. I feel that Members opposite and my friend Mr. Manjuran also must be happy that we are holding elections soon, in March, and he ought to have congratulated the States Ministry or the Home Ministry for holding elections very early as was promised by the Prime Minister. Now, at the third reading he is asking for those items. He knows that in a democratic set up and with adult suffrage, we have to provide for polling booths, the staff have to be provided with salaries, their dearness allowances, travelling allowances, the printing charges, the conveyance and so many other things have to be provided for. Therefore, there cannot be a break up here now when we are considering the Bill at its third reading. I feel that the objections raised now are not proper and that the House should throw them out and return the Bill to the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The objection is.

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

6 P.M.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION RE. TRAVANCORE-COCHIN MINISTRY

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, on 10th December, in reply to Starred Question No. 23S, the Minister for States informed the Council that there was some agitation in Travancore-Cochin regarding the continuance of the Ministry then: by parties opposed to it. He also informed us that he had not tendered any advice to the Ministry or the Rajpramukh there, but later, confronted by supplementaries, he had to admit that he had said at Ernakulam on the 1st November 1953 that he had not only given his consent but also his full support to the continuance of the Ministry. On a question by Mr. C. G. K. Reddy he informed us that he had consultations with the Travancore-Cochin State Ministers and that he had advised them to go ahead.

The disturbing conflicts or discrepancies in these statements are fraught with serious consequences on an issue of such a vital nature. I crave your indulgence to present you the background of it chronologically. After the last general elections, the Congress could secure only 44 seats in the Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly consisting of 108 members. Although initially they were diffident to accept office, owing probably to higher persuasions they did accept office and nominated one Anglo-Indian member to swell their strength. Later they found that it was not possible to work with that precarious minority and made a coalition with the Tamil Nad Congress Party of nine members. Thus their total strength came to 54 in a House of 109. This coalition was destined to be terminated with the break-down of the negotiations between the leaders of the Indian National Congress and the Tamil Nad Congress in Delhi and it really broke