

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS UNDER UNAUTHORISED OCCUPATION

111. **SHRI M. VALIULLA:** Will the Minister for WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Government-owned buildings under unauthorised occupation at the end of 1951-52 and 1952-53 and at present in Delhi; and

(b) the total amount of arrears of house rent due to Government from unauthorised occupants?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH):

(a) At the end of 1951-52 ..	679
At the end of 1952-53 ..	270
On 1-8-53 ..	281
(b) Rs. 1,33,074.	

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO STATES FOR MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCES

112. **SHRI M. VALIULLA:** Will the Minister for REHABILITATION be pleased to state:

(a) the amounts so far sanctioned by the Central Government to the various State Governments for giving maintenance allowances to displaced widows and old and infirm persons and the dates on which these amounts were sanctioned (figures may be supplied State-wise);

(b) whether Government have received any complaints to the effect that the State Governments are not regularly paying these allowances; and

(c) if the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative the number of such complaints received from each State; and what action Government have taken in the matter?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR REHABILITATION (SHRI J. K. BHONSLE):
(a) statement giving the information asked for is being laid on the Table of the Council.

(b) Yes.

(c) The number of complaints received so far since the scheme was sanctioned in 1950 is not readily available and the collection of this information will involve labour which will not be commensurate with the results to be achieved.

The amount required for payment of the allowance is remitted by the Custodian General of Evacuee Property, New Delhi, to disbursing officers in the various States every month. Steps have been taken to ensure that remittances are made by that officer in time every month so that the payment is made to the grantees regularly on due dates.

Statement

Name of State	Amounts remitted to disbursing officers in the States		
	Rs.	A.	P.
1. Assam . . .	1,352	0	0
2. Bihar . . .	11,794	0	0
3. Bombay . . .	15,05,766	0	0
4. Madhya Pradesh . . .	1,68,616	0	0
5. Madras . . .	15,737	0	0
6. Punjab . . .	12,46,946	8	0
7. Uttar Pradesh . . .	18,68,253	13	0
8. West Bengal . . .	11,310	0	0
9. Hyderabad . . .	3,900	0	0
10. Madhya Bharat . . .	2,83,785	0	0
11. Mysore . . .	54,485	0	0
12. PEPSU . . .	71,741	8	0
13. Rajasthan . . .	4,29,156	0	0
14. Saurashtra . . .	1,77,284	0	0
15. Ajmer . . .	3,13,393	0	0
16. Bhopal . . .	26,039	0	0
17. Himachal Pradesh . . .	11,940	0	0
18. Kutch . . .	15,945	0	0
19. Madhya Pradesh . . .	24,189	0	0
20. Sikkim . . .	135	0	0
21. Delhi . . .	42,85,000	0	0
TOTAL . . .	105,26,767	13	0

The amounts are remitted monthly to disbursing officers in various States on different dates extending over a period of about a week.

MERCANTILE SHIPS BUILT AT HINDUSTAN SHIPYARD

113. **SHRI M. VALIULLA:** Will the Minister for PRODUCTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether any mercantile ships are being built by the Hindustan Shipyard at Visakhapatnam;

(b) if so, when the orders were placed; and

(c) how far the work has progressed?

THE MINISTER FOR PRODUCTION (SHRI K. C. REDDY): (a) Yes. Two cargo ships are under construction on the berths. One cargo ship is being fitted out on the jetty.

(b) The construction of two of the ships was authorised by the Government in October 1951 and have since been sold. The third ship is one of the five ordered by Scindias in January 1952.

(c) The ship on the jetty is likely to be ready in April 1954. One of the ships on the berth will be launched in November 1953 and will be ready in May 1954. The third ship is expected to be launched in March 1954 and will be delivered in July 1954.

INDIANS IN PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA

114. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have sent any representation to the Portuguese Government regarding the hardships faced by Indians in Portuguese East Africa; and

(b) who is looking after the interests of Indians in Portuguese East Africa?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): (a) No.

(b) The British Consul-General in Portuguese East Africa.

INVITATION TO INDIA TO TAKE CHARGE OF P.O.W. IN KOREA

115. SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether India has been requested to take charge of the prisoners of war in Korea as a result of the Armistice agreement signed between the United Nations' command and the Commanders of the Korean Peoples Army and the Chinese Peoples Volunteers;

(b) if so, the kind of action India has to take in this regard; and

(c) the obligations involved in such action?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): (a), (b) and (c). Under the Korean Armistice Agreement, India has been invited to be Chairman, Umpire and Executive Agent of the Neutral Nations' Repatriation Commission responsible for the disposition of those prisoners of war who are not directly repatriated. The other members of the Commission are to be Sweden, Switzerland, Poland and Czechoslovakia. India is also to provide sufficient Armed Forces and other operating personnel for assisting the Commission in carrying out its obligations.

The Prime Minister made a statement in the House of the People on August 17, 1953 in which he referred to our responsibilities in Korea. A copy of this statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix V, Annexure No. 58.]

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION RE: WORKING OF SINDRI FERTILIZERS LTD.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Before we proceed further, may I raise an important point which has arisen out of the answers given by the hon. Minister for Production. He said that because Sindri was more or less a private company, the figures which are essential for the control of Parliament over this nationalised industry cannot be placed on the Table of the House. If we are not to know what the terms of the agreement between our nationalised industries and their contractors are, if we are not to know what the cost of production is, in what manner does the hon. Minister and the Government expect Parliament to have any control over the activities of such industries? This is an extremely important point, and I do not think that