

we approached every person I believe the last person that was left was the Prime Minister himself. We approached the Prime Minister yesterday to see whether he could do anything as the leader of the Congress. Even now, I want to tell the Congress Party, which is the majority party, the party that is running the Government, that if they want parliamentary democracy to be working, they should give us an opportunity and not disperse us to every corner of Delhi making it not possible for us to function.

SHRI B K MUKERJEE What about the money?

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA The money is our money. What is wrong about it? I strongly protest, Sir, I want him to withdraw.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH We are not detaining the money, as soon as he wants to take it he can have it.

MR CHAIRMAN Mr Mukerjee had no business to interfere.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA It is an insinuation, it should be withdrawn.

SHRI B C GHOSE It is an insinuation which should be withdrawn.

MR CHAIRMAN I said Mr Mukerjee had no business to interfere.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Before you proceed to the next business, Sir,

MR CHAIRMAN I don't think you should proceed further. There was a statement and you made corrections. I have called Mr Kidwai to speak.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Just half a minute, Sir, and then you can have the proceedings coolly and calmly.

Since our office is dispersed, since we are not prepared because of the dispersal of our office and since sitting here and participating in this House is useless—since we cannot function—as a matter of fact the preparation of our Budget speeches is dislocated—our

group are going to withdraw from the House which may then coolly and calmly go on.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI) For ever?

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA We will consider. It depends upon us.

MR CHAIRMAN Order, order.

SHRI T S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) You can go to Moscow.
(Some Members of the Opposition then walked out)

STATEMENT RE ALLEGED OFFICIAL INFLUENCE IN A BYE ELECTION

MR CHAIRMAN Mr Kidwai

THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI RAFI AHMAD KIDWAI) Sir, I understand, yesterday one of the Members of the group that has just walked out made some allegation against the Deputy Minister for Food, Mr Krishnappa that he used his official influence in favour of the Congress candidate in a bye-election. I want to say a few words on it.

The Communist Party disclosed a reply that Mr Krishnappa gave in this House about the food situation there. About the distribution of food that had come from Russia he was represented to have said that the people of Mysore did not need Russia's help for food. He was also reported to have ridiculed the Russian aid. It was further alleged that Mr Krishnappa used his influence with the Congress President to get a new name substituted for the nominee of the Pradesh Congress Committee. Now, when all these things were being said and widely broadcast in the constituency some of the members of the constituency wrote to him about this. It was also alleged that Government stocks were exhausted and therefore there was going to be difficulty about feeding the people there. Naturally Mr Krishnappa first contented himself with replying to persons

who had written to him about it, and then he thought it was necessary to place what he had said before other people in the constituency also, because Mr Krishnappa himself represents that area in Parliament. If that is called interference, then he may be guilty of interference. But he did nothing that the law or the rules do not allow. If there was any doubt about the law and if hon Members opposite thought that he was interfering, they had the usual remedy of an election petition.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin) There was another allegation—the use of service stamps.

SHRI RAFI AHMED KIDWAI When the Deputy Minister writes letters in reply to complaints that he has received, naturally service stamps are used.

SHRI C G K REDDY (Mysore) If I may have your indulgence just for two minutes, Sir, I would say that it is exceedingly unfortunate that our friends are not here and it is even more unfortunate that our friends opposite should have taken with such great levity what the hon Member had related about the whole situation. As you have already pointed out, it should have been very clear to the Members opposite that this was not a Communist Member who was involved, but a Member of the Council. It was heart-rending to me, because the privileges of a Member of the Council were concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN No, no.

SHRI C G K REDDY and I would submit to you that the Council should examine the whole question, because I feel and our Party also feels.

MR. CHAIRMAN Order, order. I am sorry, but the matter is closed.

SHRI C G K REDDY If you think so, I have nothing to say. At least I would request hon Members opposite not to take such things with such levity and make political capital out of it.

BUDGET (GENERAL), 1953-1954— GENERAL DISCUSSION—continued

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin) Mr Chairman, I concede that the Budget presented is the result of honest financing, and I might even congratulate the Finance Minister on the pluck or courage he has taken in both hands in beginning the first chapter of deficit financing rather than wait on bended knees at foreign doors. But all the same I am constrained to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to two or three discomfiting features in the Budget. First and foremost, I refer to the accommodation given to the Travancore-Cochin State in respect of the financial aid. Sir, under articles 275 and 278, this State, whose revenue-gap is arbitrarily fixed at Rs 280 lakhs, is allowed a total grant-in-aid of Rs 425 lakhs. This means that there has been a woeful lack of appreciation on the part of the Government at the Centre of the special and peculiar circumstances obtaining in that State.

Sir, with economic depression all over the country, coupled with mass unemployment and recurring seasonal failure in the paddy-growing South, this State deserved a fair deal at the hands of the Centre, on the lines meted out to West Bengal, Bihar, Assam, and Orissa. Large sums have been allotted to these four States under article 273 by the Finance Commission. What for are these sums allotted to these four States under article 273? Let me quote the Finance Commission themselves. The last sentence on page 87 of their report reads:

“... as jute is grown in some of the other States also, it could not have been the intention of the Constitution to limit the payment of the grants-in-aid to these four States, except on the basis of compensation for the loss of an item of revenue which had accrued to them in the past.”

Mark the last clause of this sentence, Sir, Justice is done to these four States in respect of export duty on jute and