SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH: I am afraid I must have notice.

SHRI KRISHNA MOORTHY RAO: Will the hon. Minister inform the House what financial assistance has so far been given by the Reserve Bank through apex Banks?

Shri C. D. DESHMUKH: Well, the assistance given under section 17(2)(a), (2)(b) and (4) of the Reserve Bank of India Act is as follows. If the amount drawn is less than the amount sanctioned, it meant that the Bank which was asking for assistance did not need it to the fullest extent. The amounts sanctioned during the past four years are as follows:—

Rs.

1 948-49	1,80	crores.
1949-50	2,14	crores.
1950-51	7,26	crores.
1951-52	12,03	crores.

Interest on these advances is charged at 2% below the bank rate, i.e., it used to be 1 1/2% per annum for the period 1951-52.

BASIC EDUCATION SCHEME

*78. SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government appointed any committee to consider the question of giving effect to the Basic Education Scheme in all parts of India;
- (b) if so, whether the committee has submitted its report; and what action Government have taken in the matter?

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNA-MACHARI): (a) Yes, in May 1948.

(b) Yes. The Report was considered by the Central Advisory Board of Education at their 15th Meeting held in January 1949, and its main recommendation relating to the provision of universal compulsory education for children of 6—11 age-group within a period of ten years was approved. It was also accepted by the Government of India, and was brought to the notice of State Governments who were requested to give effect to it.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: May I know if the State Governments have sent in their approval?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, I am unable to answer that question.

Prof. N. R. MALKANI: In view of the importance of the Basic Education Scheme, has Government made any special provision for the training of teachers on a large scale?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am afraid, I want notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better for someone directly connected with the Department of Education to be here to answer questions.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: The hon. Minister could not come and that is why I had to take his place.

DISCRETIONARY BUDGET GRANT

- *79. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for Finance be pleased to state:
- (a) what was the discretionary budget grant for disbursement in the year 1951-52 for each Minister; and
- (b) the amount spent by each Minister, province-wise, out of that grant?

THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE (SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI): (a) The amount of the discretionary grant placed at the disposal of Ministers for disbursement in the year 1951-52, is as follows:—

The Health Minister Rs. 3,00,000

The Education Minister Rs. 2,00,000

The Rehabilitation Rs. 50,000 Minister

(b) The statement is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix II, Annexure No. 47.]

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Is there any reason why these three Ministers should be singled out for placing discretionary grants at their disposal? Why are no other Ministers included—

for instance, Communications, Production, and so on?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: These three Ministers are given these grants because their demands sometimes are abnormal and come by surprise. For instance, in the case of the Rehabilitation Minister, there are cases where, for instance, the head of the family has taken ill and is admitted to hospital, and the family needs some immediate help. would not be possible for the Rehabilitation Minister to give this help immediately if there was not some money at his disposal for discretionary disbursement. Likewise there are cases relating to the Education Ministry and the Health Ministry where there are demands from individuals or institutions, which demands could not be taken notice of in the beginning, at the time of the framing of the Budget. is therefore that these three Ministers have these discretionary grants placed at their disposal.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Are these grants given every year?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Yes, Sir.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: If they are given every year, they will not think of framing their Budget in a proper manner; is that not so?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: No, because the grant given to an individual or institution in one year is not repeated the next year. These are not recurring grants. Whatever aid is given is not recurring.

Shri M. VALIULLA: Has it come to the notice of the hon. Minister that the State of Mysore has not received a single pie from this grant?

Shri MAHAVIR TYAGI: It is not given State-wise. It is left to the discretion of the hon. Minister. Whenever any demand comes, the hon Minister concerned gets it examined, and the hon. Minister exercises his discretion in disbursing the grant.

I. N. A. PERSONNEL

*80.\ SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Will the Minister for Defence be pleased to state:

- (a) how many officers and men of the Indian Army joined the I. N. A.;
- (b) whether any of them later expressed his desire to be taken back into the Indian Army, if so, how many;
- (c) whether any of them has been taken back in the Indian Army; if so, what is their number; and
- (d) if the answer to part (c) is in the negative, what are the reasons for their not having been taken back?

THE MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI): (a) 19,386.

- (b) Yes, 16 ex-INA officers applied for de novo commissions. Information in respect of other ranks is not available.
- (c) Seven officers were granted commis sions and 1,127 JCOs and ORs were re- enrolled in the Indian Army.
 - (d) Does not arise.

Shri C. G. K. REDDY: Apart from those who have been taken back, would the hon. Minister kindly let us know why the other officers who had put in service were not taken back, those who had volunteered to come back?

Shri N. GOPALASWAMI: They were not taken up for various reasons: for instance, over-age or medical unfitness—reasons of that nature.

Shri C. G. K. REDDY: I would like to know from the hon. Minister how they could be over-aged when they have been in service. How can the question of over-age come in suddenly? They have already put in such a lot of service in the Army.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI: According to certain orders which were passed recently, they had to be reemployed. They had to conform to certain ages; and ages refer to ranks in the Army.