

THE MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH): (a) and (b). A statement giving particulars of new projects involving foreign investment approved in 1952-53 is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 89.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI THAKUR DAS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a letter from Shri Thakur Das:—

“Due to illness I am still unable to attend this session of the Council though I was hoping all the time that I shall be able to join this session. I, therefore, request you to grant me leave of absence from this session”.

Is it the pleasure of the Council that permission be granted to Shri Thakur Das to remain absent from all meetings of the Council during its current session?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENTS re ACTION ON GOVERNMENT'S ASSURANCE, ETC.

THE MINISTER FOR PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS: (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given during the sessions shown against each:—

- (i) Supplementary Statement No. III—First Session, 1952 of the Council of States.
- (ii) Statement No. IV—Second Session, 1952 of the Council of States.

- (iii) Supplementary Statement No. III—Third Session, 1953 of the Council of States.

[See Appendix V, Annexure Nos. 90, 91 and 92.]

DURATION OF COUNCIL SESSION

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, have you formed any idea as to how long this House is likely to sit?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, for four or five days after we receive the Estate Duty Bill.

RESOLUTION ON CONTINUANCE OF PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION re. PEPSU—continued

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (PEPSU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, yesterday I was trying to give certain reasons and the necessity for the continuance of the President's rule in PEPSU. I want to deal with certain points which have been tried to be made out by Members of the Opposition because I feel that some justification can be found even from the points which are made out from the speeches of the hon. Members on the opposite side.

The first speaker was Mr. Mazumdar. He was very critical about the two agrarian Acts which have been passed by the President. He pleaded that these Acts ought to have been passed without any payment of compensation, meaning thereby that the property should have been taken away without payment of compensation. I do not know if any Member can make that suggestion in all seriousness. Since the Constitution is there, if any Legislature passes an Act by which the property of another is taken away without payment of compensation, that will in itself be bad, and the High Courts and the Supreme Court will at once come in and declare that law to be ineffective. My submission is that if such laws are passed, then no relief