

Monday,
6th December, 1954

LOK SABHA DEBATES

VOLUME IX, 1954

(6th to 24th December 1954)



सत्यमेव जयते



EIGHTH SESSION, 1954

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

	(Vol. IX, Nos 16—32— 6th to 24th December, 1954)	Columns.
<i>No. 16—Monday, 6th December, 1954—</i>		
Death of Shri Girja Shankar Bajpai		1917—18
Motion for adjournment—		
Bank employees' strike		1918—25
Messages from the Rajya Sabha		1925—26
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Petition received		1926
Correction of answer to supplementary question on Starred Question No. 1468	1926—27	
Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House—		
Sixth Report—Adopted		1927—29
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—		
Consideration of clauses—Not concluded		1929—2042
Clauses 66 to 80		1931—41
Clauses 81 to 88		1941—86
Clauses 89 to 96 and 98 to 102		1986—2042
<i>17—Tuesday, 7th December, 1954—</i>		
Business of the House—		
Order of Government Business for the remaining part of the Session		2043—44
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—		
Consideration of clauses—Concluded		2044—2156
Clause 22		2044—59
Clauses 89 to 96 and 98 to 102 and New Clause 93A		2059—2114
Clauses 103 to 113 and 115, 116, the Schedule, New Clause 115A and Clauses 1 & 2.		2114—56
Motion to pass—as amended—Not concluded		2156—58
Dr. Katju		2156
Shri Datar		2156—57
<i>18—Wednesday, 8th December, 1954—</i>		
Papers laid on the Table—		
Statistical information re: Preventive Detention Act		2159
Declarations of exemption under Registration of Foreigners Act		2159—60
Report of Rehabilitation Finance Administration		2161
Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill—		
Petition presented		2161
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—Seventeenth Report presented		2161
Message from President of Grand National Assembly of Turkey		2161—62
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended		2162—2232
Shri M. A. Ayyangar		2162—71
Shri A. M. Thomas		2171—77
Shri H. N. Mukerjee		2177—86
Shri S. S. More		2186—90
Shri Datar		2190—98
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava		2198—2209
Shri N. C. Chatterjee		2209—14
Shri R. D. Misra		2214—20
Dr. Katju		2221—32

	Columns.
Hindu Minority and Guardianship Bill—	
Motion to nominate Members to Joint Committee—Not concluded	2232—76
Shri Pataskar	2231—41
Shri V. G. Deshpande	2243—57
Shri Tek Chand.	2257—64
Shri B. C. Das	2264—71
Shrimati Jayashri	2272—73
Shri D. C. Sharma	2273—76
No. 19—Thursday, 9th December, 1954—	
Motion for Adjournment—	
Violation of Indian Territory by armed Portuguese soldiers and kidnapping an Indian villager	2277—79
Indian Tariff (Third Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2279
Hindu Minority and Guardianship Bill—	
Motion to nominate Members to Joint Committee—Adopted	2280—2360
Shri D. C. Sharma	2280—84
Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani	2284—92
Shri N. C. Chatterjee	2292—2310
Shri Bogawat	2311—18
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava	2318—34
Shri P. Subba Rao	2334—43
Shrimati Uma Nehru	2344—46
Sardar Iqbal Singh	2346—48
Shri Pataskar	2348—59
Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider—Not concluded	2360—2408
Dr. Katju.	2360—93
Shri A. K. Gopalan	2399
Shri Deshpande	2399
Shri T. K. Chaudhuri	2399
Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy	2402—08
No. 20—Friday, 10th December, 1954—	
Paper laid on the Table—	
Notification under Sea Customs Act	2409
Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider—Not concluded	2409—74
Shri A. K. Gopalan	2410—27
Shri G. H. Deshpande	2427—35
Shri Veeraswamy	2435—39
Shri Asoka Mehta	2439—51
Shri M. P. Mishra	2451—57
Shri V. G. Deshpande	2458—66
Shri Tek Chand	2466—69
Shri N. M. Lingam	2469—74
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Fifteenth Report—Adopted	2474—75
Seventeenth Report—Adopted	2475
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill (<i>Insertion of new Section 109A</i>)—	
Introduced	2475
Army (Amendment) Bill (<i>Insertion of new Section 142A</i>)—Introduced	2476
Prohibition of Manufacture and Sale of Vanaspathi Bill—Motion to consider—	
Negatived	2476—81

	Columns.
Shri Dabhi	2477—79
Dr. P. S. Deshmukh	2479—90
Indian Arms (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Sections 1 and 26 etc.)—	
Motion to refer to Select Committee—Adjourned <i>sine die</i>	2492—2513
Shri U. C. Parnaik	2492—2502
Dr. Katju	2503
Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury	2504—05
Th. Lakshman Singh Charak	2505—09
Shri Kanavade Paril	2509—12
Women's and Children's Institutions Licensing Bill—	
Motion to consider—Not concluded	2513—34
Shrimati Uma Nehru	2513—14
Shri Pataskar	2515—17
Shrimati Sushama Sen	2517, 2520, 21
Shrimati Jayashri	2517—18
Shrimati A. Kale	2518—19
Shrimati Maydeo	2519—20
Shri Keshavaiengar	2521—22
Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury	2522—23
Shri D. C. Sharma	2523—27
Shri T. S. A. Chettiar	2527—31
Shri Dhulekar	2531—34
Electricity Supply (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Section 77 etc.)—Introduced	2534
No. 21—Saturday, 11th December, 1954—	
Motion for Adjournment—	
Retrenchment of Sepoy clerks of Army Ordnance Corps	2535—38
Business of the House—	
Allocation of time for Resolution re: Report of Railway Convention Committee	2538—39
Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider—Not concluded	2539—2676
Shri N. M. Lingam	2539—44
Shri N. C. Chatterjee	2544—60
Shri Ramachandra Reddi	2560—64
Shri Keshavaiengar	2564—70
Shrimati A. Kale	2570—73
Shrimati Renu Chakravarty	2573—82
Shri Kasliwal	2582—85
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad	2585—91
Dr. N. B. Khare	2591—98
Shri Datar	2598—2610
Dr. Krishnaswami	2610—19
Shri Chattopadhyaya	2619—24
Shri C. R. Narasimhan	2624—26
Shri Mulchand Dube	2626—30
Pandit K. C. Sharma	2630—36
Shri Raghavachari	2636—42
Kumari Annie Mascarene	2642—49
Shri R. C. Sharma	2649—56
Shri Sarangadhar Das	2656—63
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava	2663—76
Shri H. N. Mukerjee	2676

No. 22—Monday, 13th December, 1954—

Columns

Motions for adjournment—

Retrenchment of sepoy clerks of Army Ordnance Corps	2677—79
Tragedy in Newton Chikhi Colliery	2679—83
Alleged firing on election procession in Andhra	2683—85

Papers laid on the Table—

Air Corporation Rules	2685
Audit Report on Industrial Finance Corporation	2685

Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1954-55—

Laid on the Table	2685
-------------------	------

Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1954-55—Andhra—

Laid on the Table	2686
-------------------	------

Alleged association of Minister with a Bank

2686—92

Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider—Adopted	2692—2750
Shri H. N. Mukerjee	2693—2706
Dr. S. N. Sinha	2707—14
Th. Lakshman Singh Charak	2714—
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha	2720—27
Acharya Kripalani	2727—34
Dr. Katju	2734—47
Clauses 1 and 2	2749—88
Motion to pass—Adopted	2789—2802
Dr. Katju	2789
Shri Nand Lal Sharma	2789—94
Shri Lakshmayya	2794—97
Shri Punnoose	2798—2802

No. 23—Tuesday, 14th December, 1954—

Papers laid on the Table—

Appropriation Accounts of the Defence Services, 1952-53	2803
Commercial Appendix to the Appropriation Accounts of the Defence Services, 1952-53	2803
Audit Report, Defence Services, 1954	2803
Correction of answer to Starred Question No. 862	2804

Business of the House—

Statement re. order of Government business	2804—05
--	---------

Tea (Second Amendment) Bill—Motion to consider—Adopted

2805—30

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari	2805-07, 2826-30
Shri Tusbar Chatterjee	2807—12
Shri N. M. Lingam	2812—14
Shri Barman	2814—16
Shri K. P. Tripathi	2816—20
Shri A. M. Thomas	2820—22
Shri Ramachandra Reddi	2822—23
Shri Damodara Menon	2824—2
Shri K. C. Sodhia	2825—
Shri Punnoose	28

Clauses 1 and 2	2830—
-----------------	-------

Motion to pass, as amended—Adopted	2831—
------------------------------------	-------

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari	28
---------------------------	----

Indian Tariff (Third Amendment) Bill—

Columns.

Motion to consider—Adopted	2832—67
Shri Kanungo	2832—36, 2861—67
Shri V. P. Nayar	2836—43
Shri Tulsi Das	2843—46
Dr. Laoka Sundaram	2846—50
Shri Jhunjhunwala	2850—52
Shri A. M. Thomas	2852—57
Shri Kasliwal	2857—59
Shri V. B. Gandhi	2859—61
Clauses 1 and 2	2867—68
Motion to pass—Adopted	2868—74
Shri Kanungo	2868—69
Dr. Lanka Sundaram	2869
Shri T. T. Krishnamachari	2869—74
Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill—Motion to consider—Adopted	2875—2900
Shri Khandu bhai Desai	2875—76, 2897—2900
Shri Amjad Ali	2876—78
Shri Bimlaprasad Chaliha	2878—80
Shri Punnoose	288—84
Shri B. S. Murthy	2883—86
Shri Velayudhan	2886—88
Shri Keshavaiah	2888
Shri P. C. Bose	2888—89
Shri K. P. Tripathi	2889—93
Shri S. V. Ramaswamy	2893—96
Th. Jugal Kishore Sinha	2896—97
Clauses 1 to 3.	2900—02
Motion to pass—Adopted	2902
Shri Khandu bhai Desai	2902
No. 24—Wednesday, 15th December, 1954—	
Motions for adjournment—	
Alleged firing on election procession in Andhra	2903—07
Hunger strike of policemen in West Bengal and calling in of military	2907—11
Papers laid on the Table—	
President's Acts re : Andhra	2911—12
Statements showing action taken by Government on assurances etc.	2912—13
Notification under Central Excises and Salt Act	2913
Balance-sheets and Audit Reports of Delhi Road Transport Authority	2913
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Eighteenth Report—presented	2913
Business of the House—	
Order of Government Business	2914—15
Calling attention to matter of Urgent Public importance—	
Ban on export of tapioca starch and flour	2915—16
Resolution re : Report of Railway Convention Committee—Not concluded	2916—3028
Prevention of Disqualification (Parliament and Part C States Legislatures) Second Amendment Bill—Introduced	3028
No. 25—Thursday, 16th December, 1954—	
Death of Shri Jwala Prasad Srivastava	

Delimitation Commission (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	3031	
Resolution re. Report of the Railway Convention Committee—Adopted	3031—68	8
Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1954-55—	3068—3142	
Not concluded		

No. 26—Friday, 17th December, 1954—

Motion for adjournment—		
Hunger strike of policemen in West Bengal and calling in of military	3153—58	
Papers laid on the Table—		
Amendments to Mineral Concession Rules	3158	
Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1954-55.	3159—3193, 3215—22	
Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1954-55—Andhra	3193—3214	
Appropriation (No. 4) Bill—Introduced and Passed	3220—21	
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—Eighteenth Report—Adopted	3222	
Resolution re. statutory Body to control and supervise Government Industrial Undertakings—Negative	3222—71	
Resolution re. Department of Welfare for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes—		
Not concluded	3271—80	

No. 27—Saturday, the 18th December, 1954—

Resignation of Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi	3281	
Resolution re: Removal of Speaker—Negative	3281—3309, 3398—3456	
Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1954-55—Andhra	3309—33, 3378—82	
Delimitation Commission (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	3333—78	
Shri Pataskar	3333—45, 3374—75	
Shri Barman	3345—53	
Shri R. D. Misra	3354—55, 3365—74	
Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay	3355—56, 3359—65	
Andhra Appropriation Bill—Introduced and passed	3382—83	
Prevention of Disqualification (Parliament and Part C States Legislatures) Second Amendment Bill—Motion to consider—Adopted.	3383—92	
Shri Pataskar	3381—86	
Shri Dhulekar	3387—88	
Shri R. K. Chaudhri	3389—90	
and it Thakur Das Bhargava	3390—92	
Clauses 1 and 2	3392—94	
Shri Pataskar		
Motion to pass—Adopted	3394	
Tea (Amendment) Bill as passed by the Rajya Sabha—Motion to consider—Adopted.	3394—96	
Shri Karmarkar	3394—95	
Shri A.M. Thomas	3395	
Shri N.M. Lingam	3395—96	
Clauses 1 and 2	3396—97	
Motion to pass an amended—Adopted.	3397	
University Grants Commission Bill—		
Motion to refer to Joint Committee—Not concluded	3397—98	98
Dr. M. M. Das	3397—98	

No. 28—Monday, 20th December, 1954—

Columns.

Motion for adjournment—	
Violation of Indian territory by armed Portuguese soldiers	3457—59
Statement <i>re</i> Hunger strike by policemen in West Bengal	3459—61
Papers laid on the Table—	
Appropriation Accounts (P & T) 1952-53 and Audit Report 1954	3461
Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Bill—Introduced.	3461
Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Bill—Introduced	3462
Motion <i>re</i> Economic Situation—Not concluded	3463—3576

No. 29—Tuesday, the 21st December, 1954—

Statement <i>re</i> : Orders for Jeeps and other Defence Stores placed abroad	3577—78
Business of the House	3578—80
Calling attention to matter of Urgent public importance—	
Speculative activity in Tea Export rights	3580—82
Motion <i>re</i> : Economic situation—Adopted, as amended	3583—3693
Messages from the Rajya Sabha	3693—94

No. 30—Wednesday, 22nd December, 1954—

Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement <i>re</i> : Recommendations of Press Commission	3695
Notifications under Sea Customs Act	3695
Evidence on Untouchability (Offences) Bill	3695
Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House—	
Seventh Report—Presented	3696
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Nineteenth Report—Presented	3696
Estimates Committee—	
Minutes Vol. 3—Presented	3696
Motion <i>re</i> : Progress Report of Five Year Plan for 1953-54—Not concluded	3696—3788, 3788—3825
Delimitation Commission (Amendment) Bill—	
Report of Select Committee—Presented	3788
Message from the Rajya Sabha	3826

No. 31 Thursday, the 23rd December, 1954—

Motion for adjournment—	
Arrest of M.P. and Police raid on Praja-Socialist Party office at Imphal	3827—3.
Joint Statement by President of Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and Prime Minister of India	3832—3
Papers laid on the Table—	
Statement showing action taken by Government on various assurances etc.	3836
Statement on action taken on Recommendations of 36th Session of International Labour Conference held in June 1953	3836
Statement <i>re</i> : ratification of Convention No. 26 concerning Minimum Wage fixing machinery.	3836
Amendments in Reserve and Auxiliary Air Forces Act Rules, 1953	3837
Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—	
Supply of news to private enterprises by P.T.I. and U.P.I.	3837—40
Committee on Absence of Members from sittings of the House—Seventh Report—Adopted	3841—44
Appointment of Members to Joint Committee on Economic Bill	3844—45

Delimitation Commission (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider as reported by the Select Committee	—Adopted	3845—3900
Shri Pataskar		3845—51, 3891—3900
Shri N. M. Lingam		3853—56
Shri B.S. Murthy		3856—59
Shri Raghavachari		3860—62
Shri Sadhan Gupta		3862—65
Shri T. N. Singh		3866—70
Shri Bhagwat Jhe Aasad		3870—72
Shri Jangde		3872—75
Shri M. L. Agrawal		3875—78
Shri Kasliwal		3878—79
Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay		3879—83
Shri Kajrolkar		3883—84
Shri Naval Prabhakar		3885—87
Shri Kakkān		3887—89
Shri P. L. Barupal		3889—90
Shri Ganpati Ram		3890—91
Clauses 1 and 2		3900—12
Motion to pass—Adopted		3912
Motion re: Progress Report of Five Year Plan for 1953-54—Not concluded		3912—82
Arrest of Shri Rishang Keishing		3983
Messages from the Rajya Sabha		3983—84

No. 32—Friday, 24th December, 1954—

Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—

Columns

Opium cultivation in Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan

3985—87

Papers laid on the Table—

Appropriation Accounts of Railways in India for 1952-53, Part I—Review 3987

Appropriation Accounts of Railways in India for 1952-53, Part II—Detailed Appropriation Accounts 3987

Block Accounts (including Capital Statements comprising the Loan Accounts), Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts of Indian Government Railways, 1952-53 3987

Balance Sheets and Review of working of Railway Collieries and Statements of all-in-cost of coal, etc., for 1952-53 3987

Audit Report, Railways, 1954 3987

Statement re: decisions of second meeting of Central Flood Control Board 3988

Correction of answers to Starred Questions Nos. 876 and 1265 3988—89

Securities Contracts (Regulation) Bill—Introduced 3989—90

Motion re-Progress Report of Five Year Plan for 1953-54—Adopted as amended 3990—4012

Motion re Report of Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes—Not concluded 4013—69

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—

Nineteenth Report—debate adjourned 4069—75

Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (*Amendment of Section 497*)—Introduced 4075

Indian Converts (Regulation and Registration) Bill—Introduced. 4075—83

Women's and Children's Institutions Licensing Bill—

Motion to consider—Not concluded 4084—93

Shri Dhulekar 4084—88

Shri Pateshar 4088—93

Shrimati Uma Nehru 4093

Shri Tek Chand 4093

Debate adjourned 4093

Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (*Insertion of new section 294 B*)—

Motion to circulate—Not concluded 4094—98

Shri Nagabwar Parsad Sinha 4094—96, 4097—98

Dr. Karju 4096—97

Debate adjourned 4098

Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider—Not concluded 4098—4100

Dr. N. B. Khare 4098, 4099—4100

Shri Khandubhai Desai 4098—99

Debate adjourned 4100

Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to refer to Select Committee—Not concluded 4100—4117

Sardar A. S. Saigal 4100—12, 4115—16, 4117

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur 4113—1

Debate adjourned 4117

(五)

										Column
Prevention of Free, Forced or Compulsory Labour Bill—										
Motion to circulate—Not concluded										4117—28
										4117—26
										4127—28
Messages from the Rajya Sabha										4129—30
Hindu Marriage Bill—										
										4130
Laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha										

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

Date: 02.12.20

973

LOK SABHA

Monday, 6th December, 1954

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PREPARATION OF HORMONES AND GLANDULAR PRODUCTS

*751. **Shri V. P. Nayar:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have taken any steps to provide facilities for the preservation of the glands and organs of slaughtered animals known to be the base material in the preparation of Hormones and glandular products; and

(b) whether it is a fact that the Indian Pharmaceutical Industry is unable to extract the valuable products, because no provision is made in slaughter-houses for the preservation of these quickly deteriorating organs?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) Slaughter houses are controlled by State Governments. The Pharmaceutical Enquiry Committee has drawn the attention of the Government of India to the absence of facilities in slaughter houses for the proper collection and storage of glands and organs, and has recommended that modern slaughter houses with proper facilities in this respect should be established in the principal cities in India. This recommendation is under consideration.

(b) Certain glands and organs like liver, spleen, heart etc. which do not deteriorate very rapidly, are: now

534 LSD

974

being collected by pharmaceutical manufacturers from slaughter houses in big cities and their active principles are extracted. Smaller glands like suprarenal, ovaries, etc. which deteriorate very rapidly, are not, however, being processed now for want of proper facilities for immediate collection and storage. The overall picture is not satisfactory.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know whether Government are aware that in the case of glands which do not deteriorate as quickly as other glands, the slaughter houses mix up fat and water in order to increase the weight, so that when it ultimately reaches the producer, decay has almost started?

Shri Kanungo: That has been brought out by the report of the Pharmaceutical Enquiry Committee as well as the special committee appointed by the Government of Bombay regarding enquiry into slaughter houses.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Could I know for what annual value hormones and other products are imported into India?

Shri Kanungo: A large quantity is imported, but I cannot give him the exact figure now.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know whether the Central Government, in accordance with the recommendation of the Pharmaceutical Enquiry Committee, propose to co-ordinate any action in respect of slaughter houses which form the subject matter of States control, so that these vital base materials for hormones and other products, especially insulin and others, may be produced in India and India may become self-sufficient in this respect?

Shri Kanungo: That is exactly what is under consideration as I said in reply to part (a) of the question.

Dr. Rama Rao. In view of the large quantity of insulin that is being imported from foreign countries into this country, do Government propose to take active steps at any place in India to start this industry of producing hormones with the necessary cold storage equipment?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): The question has been dealt with in the first part of the answer given by my colleague. The whole thing is based on our capacity to have proper type of slaughter houses with refrigeration facilities. I am afraid we have not yet made a beginning, and all this must be a matter of hope that might be fulfilled at some future date.

KASHMIR

*752 **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the steps that Government propose to take for the solution of Kashmir problem by peaceful negotiation with Pakistan in view of the changed situation after the United States Military Aid to Pakistan; and

(b) whether any correspondence is going on between India and Pakistan in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). The Prime Minister, in his last letter dated the 29th September 1954 to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, once again stressed the desirability of solving the Kashmir dispute by peaceful methods of direct negotiation. There has so far been no reply to this letter.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: May I know whether the United States military aid to Pakistan has completely changed the basis of negotiation and if so, how does the question of negotiation arise now?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: The views of the Government are well known. We have also published the exchange of letters between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: May I know whether there is any change in the policy of the Pakistan Government after the recent reshuffle in the Pakistan Cabinet?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: How can I answer this question?

MAHANADI BRIDGE

*756. **Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether the judicial enquiry into the conduct of certain officials who were in charge of Mahanadi Bridge has been completed; and

(b) if so, what are its findings?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The report of the Enquiry Officer is under examination.

Shri Gidwani: How many officers are involved in this affair?

Shri Hathi: The enquiry was against two officers.

Shri Gidwani: May I know what action has been proposed to be taken against them?

Shri Hathi: The report has only been received in the last week or so. It is being considered by the Government.

Shri Gidwani: Do Government propose to take any action against the contractors and recover excess amounts from them?

Shri Hathi: The report is under consideration as I said. It was received only last week.

PRINTING PRESSES IN INDIA

*757. **Th. Lakshman Singh Charak:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state whether any provision has been made in the Second Five Year Plan, for the expansion of the printing presses in the country?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): The question of setting up a Govt. of India Press in South India, to cater to the growing needs of Govt. institutions in that area, and of adding Hindi Wings to some of the existing Govt. of India Presses is being considered for inclusion in the Second Five Year Plan.

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: In view of the fact that Parliamentary debates are not printed in time, will Government consider the desirability of having a separate press for Parliament in the Second Five Year Plan?

Sardar Swaran Singh: It is difficult for me to accept the first part of the question. I think the position has greatly improved. If there is still any complaint, I will try to remove that. It is not necessary to have a separate press for that purpose. The existing capacity of the press is quite sufficient to meet the requirements.

श्री गोविन्द दास : क्या यह बात सरकार के सामने बार बार नहीं लाई गई कि संसद का स्वयं का प्रेस होना आवश्यक है क्योंकि संसद का काम काज बढ़ता जाएगा और बिना प्रेस हुए वह काम ठीक तरह नहीं चल रहा है ?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : पार्लियामेंट के काम को काफी प्रायर्टी दी जाती है ।

श्री दत्त ठाकुर दास भार्गव : क्या मंत्री जी को मालूम है कि मई का जो सेशन था उसकी भी किताबें अभी तक मैन्युस्क्रिप्ट साहिबान को नहीं पहुँचीं, बीच के सेशन का तो कहना ही क्या ?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : मेरा ख्याल है कि मई के सेशन की सारी किताबें तो पहुँच गई होंगी ।

श्री दत्त ठाकुर दास भार्गव : नहीं, नहीं। अभी तक नहीं मिलीं ।

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: May I know whether the Government is aware that the Government Press, Madras, is one of the biggest presses in the East and whether they are considering to utilise the press in co-operation with the Government of Madras?

Sardar Swaran Singh: I take that information from the hon. Member that it is the biggest press in the East,.....

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: One of the biggest.

Sardar Swaran Singh:.... but I do not think it has got any spare capacity. If they have got any spare capacity, I will not hesitate to use it.

Bidi

*759. **Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state :

(a) whether the export of bidis to Ceylon and Nepal has decreased in 1953-54; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). Figures of exports to Nepal are not separately recorded in official statistics. Government do not, therefore, have any statistics to show that exports to Nepal have declined. In the case of Ceylon, exports during 1953-54 have been higher than in the preceding year.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: May I know whether the recent legislation on the banning of bidi manufacture by mac-

hine has had any effect on the export of bidis.

Shri Karmarkar: It is too early to say that, but the export now has not been influenced by that.

MEDICAL AID TO NEPAL

***760. Shri Bibhnti Mishra:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the extent of medical aid so far given to Nepal Government for controlling the epidemics which have broken out in the wake of floods in the Terai region; and

(b) the number of persons treated for various kinds of epidemic diseases and percentage of those who recovered?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) The Government of India have sent two fully equipped medical teams to Nepal to assist in controlling the epidemics. They will complete work in Nepal Terai for a period of four months by the end of December 1954. A sum of Rs. 40,000/- has been sanctioned to meet the cost.

(b) Due to prompt action there has been no large scale out break of epidemics except in one area where 54 cases of cholera were detected and attended to upto 31-10-54. The percentage of those who recovered is 40-74.

Protective inoculations upto 31-10-54 have been given as under:—

Small pox	15925
T.A.B.	6689
Anti-cholera	6528

श्री बिभूति मिश्र : भारत सरकार नेपाल राज्य में जो जनहितकारी काम करती है उसको हिन्दुस्तान और नेपाल के अखबारों में लोगों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित करवाया जाता है या नहीं ?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I could not follow.

Mr. Speaker: Do Government propose to give an account of the

measures which Government are taking in respect of Nepal for the information of the public both in India and Nepal?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा वैदेशिक कार्य तथा रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : क्या माननीय सदस्य चाहते हैं कि खास पर्चे छपवा छपवा कर हिन्दुस्तान और नेपाल में बाँट जाय ? इससे ज्यादा और क्या होता है ?

श्री बिभूति मिश्र : जो हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार नेपाल में काम करती है उससे बहुत बड़ा काम वहाँ अमरीका वाले करते हैं। लेकिन उनका प्रचार ज्यादा होता है और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार जितना काम करती है उसका बहुत कम प्रचार होता है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान और नेपाल के अखबारों में उसका काफी प्रचार किया जाय तो वहाँ की जनता को वास्तविक पोजीशन मालूम हो जाय।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : इस बात पर विचार किया जायगा।

Dr. Rama Rao: Two teams have been sent. May I know the total number of medical men in them?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: They were lent to us by the Ministry of Defence. There is one medical man in each group with eight O.R's.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: May I know if it is a fact that the Government of Nepal have requested the Government of India for a full-fledged hospital in Kathmandu proper and some suburban parts for the welfare of the people there?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: We have already offered them the equipment of a hospital of 500 beds.

REHABILITATION OF DISPLACED PERSONS FROM EAST PAKISTAN

***761. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to lay a statement on the Table of the House showing:

(a) the number of displaced persons from East Pakistan who have

by now been rehabilitated in the townships of West Bengal, Orissa, Assam and Bihar;

(b) the total amount spent so far on them; and

(c) the progress of work made with regard to rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan during the last two months?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) About 40,500 displaced persons have been resettled in four new townships set up in West Bengal for displaced persons from East Pakistan. No new townships have been set up in the States of Orissa, Assam and Bihar for displaced persons.

(b) Rs. 260 lakhs.

(c) At Habra Township, a modern market has been constructed. Construction of 1000 more houses has been started and a production centre for women is being set up.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: May I know if it is a fact that some of the families who were settled in the townships of Bihar and Orissa have returned to the suburbs of Calcutta or Calcutta proper? If so, what were the reasons given by them for their returning after being settled there?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: Quite a lot of families have gone back to West Bengal and some of the reasons are that the environments are not suitable to them and that they would like to be somewhere near Calcutta and a few more other reasons.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: May I know if it is due to the lack of some facilities that were not provided to them in these townships or to some other reason?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: No. Actually, the Governments of these three States have done their best. We have also made an inquiry to that effect and we found that so far as amenities and other things are concerned, they have done their best.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know, with reference to the answer to part (c), whether it is a fact that in the recent conference of Rehabilitation Ministers of the eastern zone held in Calcutta, the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation of the Union Government had occasion to draw the attention of the Government of West Bengal to the unsatisfactory nature of rehabilitation work there and to the fact that more Rs. 6 crores lay unspent? What has been the response of the West Bengal Government to that, and whether any further progress has been achieved?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: Progress is going on, but as regards the reactions of the West Bengal Government, we shall hear about them in due course.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The hon. Member has seen much that has been stated on this subject; perhaps he will be in possession of much more information. There have undoubtedly been some difficulties in spending money because, in some ways, there were legal difficulties in getting possession of lands. That is the chief difficulty. Anyhow, the West Bengal has gone into that, and, as the hon. Member knows, we have made very special arrangements to have a very senior officer stationed there with powers to do things immediately, and we are adding to the staff there.

अस्वास्थ्यकर मकानों (बालों) का गिराया जाना

*७६२. सेठ गोविन्द दास : क्या निर्वाज, आवास तथा संभरण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या यह सच है कि नगरों के अत्यन्त अस्वास्थ्यकर किराये के मकानों (बालों) को गिराने या बिना प्रति-कर दिये उन के राज्य द्वारा ग्रहण कर लिये जाने के लिये एक उपयुक्त विधान बनाने का विचार किया जा रहा है ?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): No such legislation is at present

contemplated by the Central Government.

सैठ गोविन्द दास : क्या माननीय मंत्री जी को यह बात मालूम है कि इन चालों की बहुत बुरी स्थिति होने के कारण हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी अपने एक दो भाषणों में कहा था कि इन चालों की कोई दुरुस्ती नहीं हो सकती और इनको गिरा देना ही इनमें पिछ छुटाने का एकमात्र रास्ता है ?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : यह ठीक है, मगर सवाल तो यह था कि क्या इस वक्त कोई ऐसा कानून ज़रूर ग़ौर है या नहीं ।

सैठ गोविन्द दास : अगर कोई कानून बनाया जाने वाला नहीं है तो फिर इन चालों को क्या इसी तरह रखा जायगा जिस तरह से कि वह अभी है ?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : यह कानकरेंट लिस्ट में है और इनके लिए स्टेट गवर्नमेंट भी कानून बना सकती है ।

सैठ गोविन्द दास : क्या माननीय मंत्री जी को यह बात मालूम है कि पुरानी चालों की बात तो अलग है, कई प्रान्तों में और कई स्थानों में इस तरह की नई चालें तक बनायी जा रही हैं, और क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार राज्य सरकारों को लिखेगी कि इस तरह की चालों के बनने की कोई इजाजत आगे को न दी जाय ?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आम तौर पर ये इजाजत से नहीं बनती । बन जाती है, कुछ ज़ोर से कुछ नाजायज़ कोशिश से । प्रान्तीय सरकारों को इस विषय का बख़ूबी अहसास है और वे इसको रोकने की मुनासिब कार्रवाई करेंगी ।

Dr. Rama Rao : If the Government want to take up any such measure, will they assure alternative accommodation or financial assistance before destroying these *chawls*?

Sardar Swaran Singh : It is a hypothetical question.

INDO-JAPAN AGREEMENT

***763. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao :** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to

refer to the reply to starred question No. 866 asked on the 13th September, 1954 and state :—

(a) whether details of the Technical Co-operation Agreement between India and Japan have been finally worked out;

(b) if so, whether a copy of the Agreement will be laid on the Table of the House; and

(c) if not, the stage at which the matter stands at present?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda) : (a) to (c). The details of the draft Technical Co-operation Agreement between India and Japan were considered by the Government of India and were in the process of being finalised when a revised draft of the Agreement was received from the Government of Japan. This revised draft is now under consideration.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao : May I know if this technical co-operation will include sending of some Japanese experts to India for setting up some factories here?

Shri Anil K. Chanda : I am afraid we cannot divulge the details of the proposed agreement at this stage.

PAINTS AND VARNISHES

***765. Shri Jhulan Sinha :** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the annual requirement of the country for paints and varnishes; and

(b) what part of it is met from indigenous production?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo) : (a) 33,000 tons.

(b) Practically all the demand.

Shri Jhulan Sinha : May I know, if all the demand is met from local production, the country may expect to get more requirements and be in a position to export?

Shri Kanungo: Yes, if the full capacity is utilised and the demand in the country increases.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know whether Government have made any survey of the possibilities of manufacturing paints in India?

Shri Kanungo: As I have said in reply to (b), all the paint requirements are being almost met in the country.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know whether it is a fact that a lot of basic materials for these paints like enamel, plastics and others are all imported?

Shri Kanungo: Some of them are.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know whether Government are aware of the possibilities of manufacturing paints in Travancore-Cochin State from the titanium products?

Shri Kanungo: One establishment is doing it.

IRON AND STEEL

***766. Shri K. C. Sodhia:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a private concern has been allowed to float a company for the manufacture of iron and steel,

(b) if so, what is the name of that concern and whether it is Indian or Foreign; and

(c) whether the collaboration of foreign firms is being attracted for this concern and whether Government have had the full scheme before them?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: May I know whether informal talks are going on with private concerns in this connection?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): With a development scheme of the

nature that we have in contemplation, all types of informal talks are being held.

Shri Sodhia: May I know whether the Minister has given tacit approval to such a talk?

Shri Karmarkar: No, Sir.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: May I know, in view of the Industrial Policy statement of 1948, whereby the question of development of steel factories is within the public sector, how does this private sector come into the picture?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think anybody can come and discuss anything, even those in the private sector and all this can ultimately be integrated into the public sector.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know if certain communications that are being carried on by certain private parties materialise and Government not having made their position clear right now, will that not lead to complications later on?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The question is based on a number of assumptions, which, I think are never likely to materialise.

COMMITTEE ON COKE

***767. Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to constitute a committee to enquire into the supply and demand of coke; and

(b) if so, when the committee is likely to be formed?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) A Committee which *inter alia* will enquire into this has already been constituted vide: Government Resolution No. PC(III)4/68/54 dated 18th November 1954 copy placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 75.]

(b) Does not arise.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether this Committee will explore grounds for the installation of new coke oven plants in the country?

Shri S. N. Mishra: That is also included in one of the terms of reference of the Committee.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether the West Bengal Government's scheme for the establishment of a Coke Oven plant at Durgapur was discussed by the Planning Commission and the West Bengal Government and has been decided upon or whether that has been referred to this Committee?

Shri S. N. Mishra: That is also referred to this Committee.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know when the Committee is likely to finalise the proceedings and likely to submit their report?

Shri S. N. Mishra: They have not started work as yet and so it is very difficult to say.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Will the hon. Minister kindly read out the terms of reference if it is not too long?

Shri S. N. Mishra: It is already placed on the Table of the House.

COCOON TESTING REGULATION

*768. **Shri Keshavalengar:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to introduce a central Cocoon Testing Regulation; and

(b) if so, when?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). Cocoon testing is an auxiliary to cocoon markets. The establishment of cocoon markets is under the consideration of State Governments. Mysore has introduced notified Cocoon markets in

specialised zones on an experimental scale recently.

Shri Keshavalengar: May I know whether the Central Silk Board has made any request for the passing of this Act on an All-India basis and has the Government accepted that representation?

Shri Karmarkar: The States were requested, on the recommendation of the Development Committee of the Central Silk Board, to examine the feasibility of enacting a suitable legislation for the purpose.

ATOMIC SECRETS

*769. **Shri T. K. Chaudhuri:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether any study of the provisions of the recent U.S. legislation on Atomic Energy has been undertaken by Government in order to explore the possibilities of obtaining U.S. help in the research for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

(b) whether any approach has been made to the U.S. Government in this regard; and

(c) whether Government have made any similar approaches to other countries also?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (c). The United States Atomic Energy Act 1954 has been fully considered. No approach has been made to the U.S. under this Act. But there have been contacts and some arrangements with the U.S. in regard to the supply of some materials.

India has a formal agreement with France in certain matters and has also contacts with the U.K. and Norway.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know what has been the reaction of the U.S.A. and other sponsors of the Seven Nation Atomic Pool resolution in the UNO to our offer of Uranium and Thorium for the peaceful development of atomic energy and whether

any new agreement is under contemplation on that basis?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There has been no offer of Uranium by India to anybody. We ourselves would like to get it from elsewhere, not to offer it to others. What the hon. Member perhaps refers to is a general statement in the course of a speech offering some sands and minerals—not uranium—something out of which possibly it may be processed—of which we have much.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: As far as I remember, that was the report; the offer was of Uranium and Thorium.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It may be; I have not seen the report. I cannot conceive of offering something which we have not got to offer. It was a general statement that we are prepared to offer what we have in plenty, provided always certain conditions were fulfilled. So, that is a vague statement. There is no question of dealing with any country about it. The statement that was made was that if any international agency is formed, that will be considered no doubt but it will also be seen by what party the international agency was started.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether India has been invited to serve on the Committee to arrange an international scientific conference by the U.S. and the western powers in connection with the peaceful utilisation of atomic energy?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

ENGINEERS' SEMINAR

*770. **Shri Jethalal Joshi:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether a sub-committee for the eradication of corruption was appointed by the Engineers' seminar which was held recently at Roorkee; and

(b) if so, what are their recommendations?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Sub-Committee has not yet submitted its report.

Shri Jethalal Joshi: May I know whether in the Seminar there was a section of individuals who expressed the view that the Engineers were not more corrupt than the employees of other departments? What has the Government to say in this connection?

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): This is an expression of opinion by an individual Engineer and goes no further.

Shri Jethalal Joshi: May I know whether it has come to the knowledge of Government that there is substantial collusion of interest and agreement whereby the Engineers continue to receive some commission from the concerned parties to the detriment of the construction work, right from the time of inviting tenders through all the intervening stages up to its completion? If so, how many such cases have been detected and proceeded against departmentally in the course of 1953-54?

Shri Hathi: Corruption involves many malpractices; and, this may be one of them. And, so far as the Government is concerned, no such case, on all fours as has been just mentioned, has come to their notice. But, some cases have come to their notice and actions have been taken. For the other part, namely, how many cases have occurred, I would require notice.

FIVE YEAR PLAN

*771. **Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to extend the Five-Year Plan to the former French Settlements which have merged *de facto* with India with effect from the 1st November, 1954; and

(b) if so, whether there will be any change in the financial aspect of the Plan?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). The Government have under urgent consideration the extension to Pondicherry, Karikal, Yanam and Mahe under the Five Year Plan of a programme of agricultural and industrial development. The Planning Commission will send at an early date one of its programme Advisers to examine conditions in this area and formulate suitable proposals for development.

Shri Sanganna: May I know whether all aspects or certain aspects of the Five Year Plan will be applied to these establishments?

Shri S. N. Mishra: It would be in consonance with the local conditions. It is exactly for this purpose that the Programme Adviser is visiting this area.

Shri Sanganna: May I know what is the amount involved over and above the Five Year Plan now existing?

Shri S. N. Mishra: I do not quite understand the import of the question. There is nothing existing at the present moment.

Shri Sanganna: I want to know whether there is any increase over the amount covered by the Five Year Plan.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know whether any additional amount has to be provided for.

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): The dimensions of the Five Year Plan are big enough to include anything that is required to be done on this point.

PURCHASE OF FERTILISERS

*772. **Shri Morarka:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government agree with the views of the Public Accounts Committee in para. 8 of their Twelfth Report that the procedure followed by the High Commissioner for India in London in the matter of purchase of fertilisers from Messrs, Kenbanks Limited was not correct and did not comply with the standing rules regarding purchase of stores from abroad; and

(b) if so, the action taken to prevent recurrence of such cases?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). The purchase in question relates to the year 1949. The High Commissioner did not act in contravention of any specific provision of the purchase rules then in force. As stated in reply to part (c) of starred question No. 2, dated the 15th November, 1954, elaborate rules regulating the policy and procedure to be observed by the India Store Department and defining the exact powers of the authorities concerned have since been promulgated.

Shri Morarka: May I know what were the reasons for placing this order worth Rs. 120 millions with a company whose paid up capital was hardly £1,000?

Sardar Swaran Singh: All these points have been gone into by Shri Rajadhyaksha in the course of Enquiry and there is nothing new that can be said. It is true that the authorised capital of the company was fixed at a much lower figure but there were references which gave good reports as to the capacity of the company in the matter of performance.

Shri Morarka: May I know whether the Government has suffered any loss in this connection and if so what is that amount?

Sardar Swaran Singh: I would require notice to answer that question.

NARMADA VALLEY PROJECT

***775. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 334 asked on the 24th February, 1954 and state:

(a) the estimated cost of the Narmada Valley Project; and

(b) when the work on this Project is expected to start?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). A statement giving the requisite information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 76.]

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether this project is confined only to irrigation or is it multipurpose?

Shri Hathi: This project envisages four different projects. Out of these, two will be for Irrigation and power and of the other two one for irrigation and one for power. It is not one project as a whole but it consists of four different projects.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Can I have an idea when this project will be completed?

Shri Hathi: This project will have to be considered by the Technical Advisory Committee appointed by the Planning Commission and after the report of that Committee it might be included in the next Five Year Plan. So, it cannot be definitely said, when actually the project will start.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know whether the position of the three participating Governments in this Bhakra-Nangal Project has now been verified.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The question is with reference to Narmada Valley Project.

VISAS TO PAKISTANI NATIONALS

***776. Mulla Abdullahbhai:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) how many Pakistani Nationals staying in Delhi have applied for Indian Visa on Pakistani Passport during the period ending the 30th September, 1954 since the inception of the Indo-Pak passport system; and

(b) how many Indian Visas on Pakistani passport have so far been issued in Delhi?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). Of the 472 Pakistani nationals staying in Delhi who applied for Indian E & F visas on Pakistani Passports during the period from 15th October, 1952, to 30th September, 1954, 440 were granted those visas; and out of 541 applications for long term visas during the same period, 79 were granted such visas.

HIMALAYAN EXPEDITIONS

***777. Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of mountaineering teams to the Himalayan peaks which were permitted to come to India during the last three years;

(b) the number among them which were organised by foreigners; and

(c) whether they submitted any report after their expeditions were over?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). Ten separate teams, all of them organized by the foreign nationals, were given permission to climb Indian peaks of the Himalayas.

(c) No, Sir.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: May I know, Sir, the nationalities of the organisers of such teams?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: It is a long list, Sir, I have the information with me and, perhaps, I can lay it on the Table by way of a statement.

Mr. Speaker: I think that would be better.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: May I know whether any information was obtained from such organisers regarding the mineral wealth existing in those mountainous regions?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: We have not received any reports from these mountaineering teams.

Shri Joachim Alva: As all sorts of foreigners applied for going into the Himalayas, have Government any proposal by which trained Indian personnel will accompany them and make their own report to our Government?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: In some of these expeditions Indians were also associated.

Dr. Rama Rao: When permission was granted to these expeditions, may I know why no condition was fixed to ask for a report; whatever report they could give?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not understand how a mountaineering expedition is to be asked to submit a report of its expedition; I just do not understand it. Of course, there is no question about it—whether it is an Indian or a foreign one—to ask for a report of its expedition, scientific and the rest. My colleague just now said that he will submit a statement. There is no question of any statement; I will tell you immediately what the expeditions were. In 1953 there were the French and the British-New Zealand Expeditions. In 1952 there were the British Expedition, Oxford University (British) Expedition and a fresh French Expedition. In 1951 there were the French Expedition to Garhwal, British Expedition to Kulu Valley, New Zealand Expedition to Tehri Garwal Himalayas and the Ceylon University Scientific Expedition to Garhwal Himalayas. There are many expeditions which may be

said to go to the lower mountains—we have no objection to that. Normally we do not allow any one to go beyond the inner line. What the hon. Members have been reading about are expeditions not in India but in Nepal on which we have no control if the Government of Nepal gave permission. All these high peak places are in Nepal and not in India. For the rest, to the inner line mountains, as I said, nobody is allowed to go at all. Perhaps hon. Members would remember that we have just started a special mountaineering institute to train Indians.

INTERNATIONAL FAIR AND EXHIBITION AT FRANKFURT

***778. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government participated in the International Fair and Exhibition held at Frankfurt in September, 1954;

(b) if so, the type of Indian goods exhibited there;

(c) who opened the Indian pavilion and how many prominent men attended the function; and

(d) whether the exhibits have been sold?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 77.]

(c) Shri B. P. Adarkar, Charge d' Affairs, Embassy of India, Bonn, was in ultimate control.

About 250.

(d) No. Sir.

Under (c) I should like to add that, to my knowledge, it was Shri Adarkar who made the opening speech.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know in which language the Ambassador there spoke when he gave his speech?

Shri Karmarkar: He spoke in German and in very good German.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the Government of India received invitation to join the exhibition in time to enable it to send a variety of goods?

Shri Karmarkar: I should think so.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know which of the things mentioned in the statement are in great demand?

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to have notice about that, though I understand that village handicraft products were particularly receiving notice of the visitors.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the things that were exhibited there have been returned or whether they have been kept with the Embassy there?

Shri Karmarkar: Normally, if there is any idea of disposing of them by sale, it is done. In this case two firms offered to purchase the entire consignment of exhibits but as the terms were not satisfactory we were not able to accept the offer. I am not in a position to say where the exhibits are at the moment.

PONDICHERRY

*779. **Pandit C. N. Malviya:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the administration of Pondicherry has banned all public meetings and Trade Union activities in Pondicherry; and

(b) if so, the circumstances which have forced the administration to resort to these measures?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). No orders have been issued banning public meetings or trade union activities in Pondicherry. The Chief Commissioner, however, pointed out to the political leaders that it would be advisable not to hold public meetings or demonstrations for

three or four weeks till the new administration had settled down. He suggested that trade union meetings could be held either in buildings or in large private compounds instead of public places. Nearly all the political leaders appreciated the Chief Commissioner's advice, though one was critical of it.

Pandit C. N. Malviya: May I understand that there is no order banning public meetings or other activities?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes; you may understand that.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Are the Government aware that the Administrator has recently issued orders for the prosecution of several political workers against whom proceedings were really drawn up by the French authorities?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir; that is a complete mis-apprehension of the situation. Perhaps, the hon. Member is thinking of Mahe. In this connection what has happened is, the Chief Commissioner knew nothing about it that the proceedings were pending and these persons were asked to appear in Court in order to quash the proceedings—to take some legal action to quash the proceedings and not to take further proceedings. When they received the notice they thought that something more was going to happen to them and, perhaps, they complained to hon. Members and others. Really, it was with a view to quash the proceedings that some formal steps were taken.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: In the course of the interview to political leaders by the Chief Commissioner it was represented to him that certain police officers should be removed. The Chief Commissioner agreed to transfer them, but they have not been transferred yet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no information as to what transpired at

an interview in Pondicherry, and even if I have that information, hon. Members would really agree that I can hardly talk about confidential talks here.

INDIAN MUSLIMS LEFT IN PAKISTAN

***780. Shri M. L. Agrawal:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indian Muslims still left in Pakistan, who are eligible to return to India under the Prime Ministers' Agreement of April, 1950; and

(b) the position with regard to their return to India?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). Under the existing arrangements, agreed to between the Governments of India and Pakistan in May 1950, following the Prime Minister's Agreement of the 8th April 1950, Muslims, who migrated from the State of Uttar Pradesh to West Pakistan between the 1st February and the 31st May 1950, are eligible for return to that State.

The agreed procedure prescribed for the repatriation of these migrants is that lists of intending repatriates are sent by the Government of Pakistan to the Indian High Commission at Karachi, who forward the lists to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, for verification. On receipt of the results of pre-verification and also of lists of eligible migrants who had applied to the State Government direct, the High Commission issue Repatriation Certificates in favour of persons eligible for repatriation to the extent of periodical quotas fixed from time to time by the Government of India. Under this procedure, 25,098 Muslim migrants have so far returned to India, the last batch having arrived in March 1954. Out of the lists received from the Government of Pakistan, about 5,000 persons, whose cases have been pre-verified, still remain to be repatriated, in addition to about 10,000, whose

cases are yet to be pre-verified by the Government of Uttar Pradesh.

The Government of India have no information of the number of eligible persons who are still in Pakistan and, in respect of whom that Government have not yet sent the required lists to the Indian High Commission.

Shri M. L. Agrawal: May I know why the progress of repatriation of these persons is so slow?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: We are not responsible for it. Unless the people over there are ready to come, we cannot assist in their transit.

Shri Amjad Ali: In view of the fact that there has been persistent demand on the part of Indian Muslims in Pakistan and no facilities are being given to them for repatriation from East Pakistan to Assam or West Bengal—Pakistan have no repatriation laws for East Pakistan—what steps are the Government of India going to take to repatriate them?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The hon. Member is referring to Assam or Bengal, but this is about West Pakistan an entirely different question. If the hon. Member puts a more precise question, we shall answer it in detail.

Shri Amjad Ali: I am talking about Assam and East Bengal, and the question of the Prime Ministers' Agreement is there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are many other things there too. Anyhow, I cannot give him any figures.

Shri Amjad Ali: There is no question of figures now.

JUTE ENQUIRY COMMISSION'S REPORT

***782. Shri L. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the report of the Jute Enquiry Commission has been examined by Government; and

(b) if so, which of their recommendations Government have decided to implement?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A copy of Government Resolution No. 14(3)-Jute/54 dated the 4th December, 1954 giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in the Library. See No. S-469/54.]

Shri L. N. Mishra: I want to know whether it is a fact that there have been general complaints from the growers' side that a fair balance of prices between raw jute and jute manufacture is not being maintained. If so, why is it that the appointment of the Jute Board and Jute Commissioners, which was suggested to end the anomaly, has been rejected by the Government?

Shri Kanungo: This matter comes in another question tabled by the hon. Member, but the point is that these complaints were gone into by the Committee and certain recommendations were made, and the Government in consultation with the State Government came to the conclusion that they will not be effective for the purpose that was aimed at.

Shri L. N. Mishra: The Resolution is silent about the recommendations of the Jute Enquiry Commission in regard to futures marketing. I want to know whether the opening of the phatka market is going to add to the speculative aspect of the jute world. If so, do Government propose to regularise it by the forward marketing board?

Shri Kanungo: The Resolution is not silent on that. The Resolution mentions that the Forward Marketing Commission is being asked to organise a single unified market to prevent tendencies of high speculation.

Shri L. N. Mishra: What are the decisions of the Government with regard to the modernisation of jute

plants as suggested by the Jute Commission?

Shri Kanungo: Government have decided to allow modernisation within limits.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether it is a fact that the licences of a number of Indian-owned jute business in East Pakistan has been cancelled by the Pakistan Government, and if so, how far it is going to affect the export of Pakistan jute to India?

Shri Kanungo: I would like to have notice of that because I have not that information in my possession.

TEA

*783. **Shri G. L. Chaudhary:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the export of tea to the Middle East countries including Egypt has recently declined considerably; and

(b) if so, the reason therefor?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). Exports of tea to Egypt and Turkey during the current year are slightly at a lower level compared to exports during the corresponding period last year, whereas exports to Iran are on a higher level. The position cannot, however, be fully judged until the close of the current financial year. Exports to all countries during the early months of this year were at a lower level due to paucity of stocks of tea.

REHABILITATION OF EAST PAKISTAN DIS-
PLACED PERSONS

*784. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that almost the whole of the amount allotted to West Bengal for rehabilitation of East Pakistan displaced persons during the current financial year has remained unspent till now; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know how much has been spent this year out of the total allotment of about Rs. 7 crores?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: Under two separate heads of grants and loans they have spent Rs. 66.28 lakhs, that is to say, booked by the Accountant General upto October 1954 and Rs. 123.34 lakhs upto October 1954 on loans.

Shri B. K. Das: I understand from the hon. Minister that about Rs. 5 crores remain unspent. What is the reason for that?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: As I have said, the greatest difficulty with the West Bengal Government is to find land for the displaced persons and that has become more so since the ruling of the Calcutta High Court, upheld by the Supreme Court, holding the West Bengal Land Development and Planning Act, 1948, *ultra vires* and secondly we have undertaken a lot of scrutiny in the allotment and expenditure.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know the allotment with regard to this particular item—and development?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: I have not got that figure now.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Of the Rs. 5 crores which remain unspent, does the total amount allotted for buying lands also fall into the category of business loans, etc.?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: It comes under three separate heads—urban loans, rural loans and housing loans.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: As the only difficulty is the question of getting lands—that is what the hon. Minister said—may I know why the other schemes have not gone through with the money sanctioned?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: Schemes are going through; it is not the end of

the year yet. They have spent about one third the amount.

HANDLOOM WEAVERS

***785. Shri Ibrahim:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of handloom weavers who are Members of Co-operative Societies enjoying Government aids and the number of handloom weavers not Members of such Co-operative Societies; and

(b) whether there is any scheme to help the weavers belonging to the latter category?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) There were approximately 765,000 weavers within the co-operative fold on 31st March 1954. Precise information regarding those outside the co-operative fold is not available.

(b) Yes, Sir. (1) A rebate of 1 anna in the rupee is given on sales of handloom cloth.

(2) Reservation of certain fabrics for the handloom industry.

(3) An Export Marketing Scheme for handloom cloth.

Shri Ibrahim: In view of the fact that weavers, not under co-operative fold, are getting yarn at high prices, may I know the measures that Government are taking to protect the interests of such weavers?

Shri Kanungo: As a matter of fact, due to the various steps that Government took in the course of last year, the price of yarn has come down considerably. The fact that a co-operative society, by its organisation, gets at a cheaper price should be an incentive for others to join it.

Shri Ibrahim: Is it a fact that the handloom industry is facing a crisis in spite of the financial assistance given by Government?

Shri Kanungo: It is a perpetual crisis. The worst is over, I suppose.

Shri R. K. Chandhuri: May I know whether there is any intention

on the part of Government to help the household weavers, particularly in Assam where every woman weaves her cloth? Is there any intention to make yarn available to them so that the looms may work?

Shri Kanungo: Yes. Special provision has been made so that yarn could be made available cheaper in Assam than it was before.

कोक ओवन प्लांट

*७८७. श्री टी० के० चौधरी : क्या योजना मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) दुर्गापुर में कोक ओवन प्लांट की स्थापना के सम्बन्ध में जो बातें केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पश्चिमी बंगाल सरकार से पूछी थीं, उन के क्या उत्तर प्राप्त हुए हैं ; और

(ख) उस की स्थापना में क्या प्रगति हुई है ?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) No specific queries were made by the Government of India to the West Bengal Government in connection with the installation of the Coke-Oven Plant in Durgapur, but a number of issues arising out of this project were discussed with representatives of the West Bengal Government on August 30th, 1954.

(b) A Committee has been appointed to enquire into the demand for coke and the by-products and the position regarding the demand and availability of electric power and other questions relating to the economics of the Project.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the Press reports published on the 1st of September and also on several days afterwards that the Bengal Government has been asked to supply further information about their proposed project? Has it been done or not?

Shri S. N. Mishra: When the whole matter has been referred to a Committee, there has been absolutely no

occasion for a thing of that kind recently.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Am I to understand that a Committee has been appointed to enquire into the Durgapur Coke Over project cum the gas project of the West Bengal Government?

Shri S. N. Mishra: I think the whole of the project of the West Bengal Government would come under the purview of that Committee.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Under what terms of reference?

Shri S. N. Mishra: As I said earlier in reply to a question, the Resolution according to which the Committee has been appointed has been placed on the Table of the House and that contains the terms of reference which number seven.

PATENTS

*788. **Shri V. P. Nayar:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state how many valid patents are worked at present by (i) Indian Firms, (ii) Foreign Firms and (iii) Indian Firms with foreign collaboration for (a) Sulpha Drugs and (b) Antibiotics?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): Statement showing patents in force relating to Sulpha Drugs and Antibiotics is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 78.] No information is available as to which of these patents are at present being worked in India.

Shri V. P. Nayar: From the statement I find that 168 patents are in force for antibiotics out of which 166 are in the name of foreign firms, and that out of 49 patents for sulpha drugs, all except seven are in the name of foreign firms. The remaining, according to the statement, are said to be with Indian concerns. My question was whether the Government will give detailed information regarding the patents held by foreign

firms, Indian firms with foreign collaboration. I do not find whether these Indian firms are firms with foreign collaboration. I would like to know whether the remaining few patents are held by Indian firms with foreign collaboration or by Indian firms as such.

Shri Karmarkar: I do not follow what exactly is required.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know specifically whether certain patents are held by Indian firms with foreign collaboration or not?

Shri Karmarkar: Yes. Some are. I could mention.....

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is not the point. My question is whether the Government will give us information as to the number of patents held by foreign firms, by Indian firms with foreign collaboration and by Indian firms. From the statement, I find that almost all the patents are held by foreigners except a few by Indian firms. I want to know whether the Indian firms are firms with foreign collaboration or Indian firms by themselves.

Shri Karmarkar: As regards sulphur drugs, in so far as licences issued to manufacturers are concerned, I can mention, at the moment, that three Indian firms with foreign collaboration, Messrs. Atul.....

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is necessary to give the names. He wants the number.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Will it be correct to assume that the two Indian patents supposed to be held by Indians in antibiotics and seven in sulphur drugs are held by Indian firms with foreign collaboration?

Shri Karmarkar: No. I should not think so; I am speaking subject to correction.

Shri V. P. Nayar: When we were discussing legislation relating to Patents some sessions back, the hon.

Minister promised to do something to break the monopoly of foreign firms in respect of patents for very essential drugs. May I know from the Government what steps Government have taken since that assurance was given in the House when the Patents Law was discussed?

Shri Karmarkar: I do not exactly recall my assurance. I remember to have advised my hon. friend to study the subject before he spoke again.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Shri T. T. Krishnamachari gave; not you.

MAHANADI BRIDGE COMMITTEE

*789. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether the report of the Mahanadi Bridge Committee has been examined; and

(b) if so, which of its recommendations have been accepted?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathl): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A statement explaining the position is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 79.]

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: May I know when this report will be finalised?

Shri Hathl: As I just stated in the previous question, the report of the Committee has been received only a few days ago. That is still under consideration of Government.

Shri Gidwani: Is it a fact that the Champekar Committee which has gone into this and other matters had come to the conclusion that financial and other procedural rules had been ignored and undue favours had been shown to the firm of contractors Messrs. Duggal & Co.?

Shri Hathl: That Committee's report is laid on the Table of the House. They have made that observation.

G. P. FUND ACCOUNTS

*792. **Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases of G.P. Fund Accounts that were referred to Pakistan Government for verification; and

(b) how many of them have been received duly verified by the Pakistan Government?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) 6,590.

(b) 1,883.

Shri Gidwani: What is the total amount of claim for G.P.F. by the displaced employees in India?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: I have not got that figure now.

Shri Gidwani: What is proposed to be done in the case of those whose accounts have not yet been verified by the Pakistan Government?

Shri J. K. Bhonsle: We hope that very soon we shall have a meeting with Pakistan officials and then we shall come to a settlement.

JOURNALS

*793. **Th. Lakshman Singh Charak:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a proposal to discontinue the journals namely *Indian Listener*, *Awaz* and *Nabhovani* to obviate losses on their publication;

(b) the present circulation of the three Journals at the end of October, 1954; and

(c) whether the programmes published in the Journals can be published in the respective papers?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) No, Sir.

(b) The present circulation of the

three journals at the end of October, 1954 is as under:

Indian Listener

(English) 8,765 copies.

Awaz (Urdu) 1,444 copies.

Nabhovani (Gujerati) 1,300 copies.

(c) No, Sir.

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: May I know what is exactly the expenditure on its publication and what is the actual income from the sale of these magazines?

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to have notice.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: May I know if there is any proposal to print such journals in Telugu?

Shri Karmarkar: Telugu and Kannada will be taken up together, I hope.

जड़ी बुटियां

*७९४. **सेठ गोविन्द दास :** क्या बाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) १९५३-५४ में कितने मूल्य की जड़ी-बूटियां भारत से बाहर भेजी गई थीं; और

(ख) काश्मीर तथा शेष भारत से झलग-झलग कितने प्रतिशत निर्यात किया गया ?

***The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) and (b). Figures of export of medicinal herbs are not recorded separately in official statistics. The statistics are maintained for all "Drugs and Medicines" exported from the country. The information is not being compiled with reference to the origin of the product, but only for the ports through which the shipment is made.

INVESTMENT IN OIL REFINERIES

*795. **Shri K. C. Sodha:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Indian Investors are allowed to subscribe to the maximum of 5 crores to the total

capital of the Oil Refineries in Preference shares only;

(b) what proportion does this investment bear to the total investments of the three refineries; and

(c) the total approximate financial assistance Government propose to make available to these refineries when they are in full production?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) The amount to be subscribed by Indian investors in the form of preference shares is Rs. 3½ crores according to the agreements, but may be raised to Rs. 4½ crores. In addition, there will be further Indian investment in the shape of debentures and local borrowings.

(b) The proportion of preference capital to the total investment, assuming that Rs. 3½ crores remain the amount of preference shares issued, is 6 per cent. of the total investment in the refineries. If however, total Indian investment in other forms like debentures and local loans is included, the proportion would be about 30 per cent.

(c) No direct financial assistance is being afforded to the refineries. Some of the assurances given to them in the refinery agreements, copies of which have already been laid on the Table of the Sabha, would however amount to indirect assistance. It is not possible to estimate the amount of such indirect assistance till after all the refineries are in full operation.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Is any definite proportion of Indian capital insisted on by the Government in the enterprises of foreign concerns in this country?

Shri K. C. Reddy: It depends on the particular case concerned. In respect of the oil refineries, I have already given the picture as per the agreement which has been entered into.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Has the Government any representation on the management of these companies?

Shri K. C. Reddy: If the hon. Minister means representation on the Board of Directors the answer is no.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

RELIGIOUS ANNIVERSARIES

***748. Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the total time allotted for noticing religious anniversaries of Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims and Christians in the All India Radio; and

(b) whether there are any set rules for appropriation of time for noticing these anniversaries?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) 9,565 minutes.

(b) No, Sir. But certain considerations guide All India Radio in prescribing broadly and without any rigidity the duration for special programmes on such occasions. These considerations are mainly related to:

1. Listener interest.
2. Programme possibilities of the occasion and availability of programme material including talent of the requisite standard.
3. The significant importance or appeal of the festival to the Community concerned.
4. The degree of appeal the same programme is likely to provide for all listeners irrespective of their religious persuasion and finally the requirements of the basic programme plan of each Station.

KASHMIR

***749. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Pakistan Government has lodged any protest with

the Government of India with regard to the financial integration of Jammu and Kashmir State with the Indian Union; and

(b) if so, the nature of the protest?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) No Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

क्लोज सर्किट टेलीविजन

*७५०. श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : क्या सचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्लोज सर्किट टेलीविजन के वे यंत्र, जिन का प्रसारण ग्राल इंडिया रेडियो के दिल्ली स्टेशन से शनिवार, ३१ अगस्त, १९५४ को किया गया था, किस देश से आये थे ।

(ख) इन का क्या मूल्य है ;

(ग) इन यंत्रों का सरकार क्या प्रयोग करेगी ;

(घ) क्या टेलीविजन के बड़े पैमाने पर प्रसारण के लिये ये यंत्र उपयुक्त हैं; और

(ङ) यदि हां, तो इन को किन स्थानों पर लगाया जा रहा है और ये कब काम देने लगेंगे ?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) The 'Close Circuit Television' equipment which was demonstrated by a commercial concern at the Delhi Studios of All India Radio is the product of the Radio Corporation of America.

(b) The cost of this equipment is reported to be about Rs. 12,000.

(c) At present there is no television project in execution; it is, therefore, too early to say whether these instruments will be utilised and if so in what manner. The sets shown here were only for demonstration purposes.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) Does not arise.

PROHIBITION

*753. **Shri Magan Lal Bagdi:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 477 asked on the 3rd September, 1954 and state :

(a) whether the Planning Commission propose to set up a committee to examine the working of prohibition;

(b) if so, when this Committee will be formed;

(c) the names of its personnel; and

(d) the terms of its reference?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) to (d). The Planning Commission proposes shortly to appoint a Committee to study the working of Prohibition. The terms of reference and the personnel of the Committee are under consideration.

TRADE WITH CHINA

*754. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether India is at present importing any commercial goods from China;

(b) if so, what are the items; and

(c) whether any Trade Commissioner's office has been opened by the Chinese Government in India?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) During the first half of the current financial year, the principal articles of import from China were chemicals, drugs and medicines, instruments, oils, cassia, raw silk and cocoons, silk manufactures, raw hides and fire-works.

(c) There is a Counsellor for Commercial Affairs in the Chinese Embassy at New Delhi.

CEMENT

*755. **Shri S. C. Singhal:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether Government propose to lift the control over cement?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): No, Sir; not until the supply position improves.

TINCTURES

***758. Shri Dabhi:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 341 asked on the 1st September, 1954 and state:

(a) whether any decision has since been taken regarding the enactment of a Central law regulating the export and import and the inter-State movement of different kinds of tinctures; and

(b) if so, the nature of the decision taken?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). The proposal is being examined in consultation with the State Governments.

SHORTAGE OF PERSONNEL

***764. { Shri Nanadas:
Th. Jugal Kishore Sinha:**

Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Planning Commission have collected data about shortages of personnel in the various Ministries and also in the various industries; and

(b) if so, whether a copy of the data available will be placed on the Table of the House?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) The Planning Commission's enquiry regarding personnel shortages was addressed to the Central Ministries and it referred only to development projects.

(b) The information received was qualitative in character and is being further studied. It is not, therefore, possible to place it on the Table of the House.

MUSTARD SEEDS

***773. Seth Achal Singh:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that large scale speculations in mustard-seed have been going on in Delhi; and

(b) if so, the steps taken or proposed to be taken by Government to stop these illegal activities?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Government have received certain reports in the matter from trade.

(b) Delhi State Government have been asked to enquire into the allegations and to take appropriate action in the matter.

भाखड़ा बांध

***७७४. श्री नवल प्रभाकर :** क्या सिंचाई तथा विद्युत मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भाखड़ा बांध के निर्माण के कार्य की प्रगति धीमी पड़ गई है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस के क्या कारण हैं ?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

TRIBAL REFUGEE FAMILIES IN TRIPURA

***786. Shri Dasaratha Deb:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Tribal Refugee families in Tripura which have been rehabilitated so far; and

(b) the number of families still to be rehabilitated there?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

AUDITION COMMITTEE

*790. Shri Dabhi: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have appointed an Audition Committee with a view to selecting and buying records of film music for broadcasting; and

(b) if so, the personnel of the Committee?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

भालड़ा नांगल परियोजना

*७९१. श्री एस० एन० दास : क्या सिबाई तथा विद्युत मंत्री १८ नवम्बर, १९५४ को दिये गये प्रतारकित प्रश्न संख्या १६१ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा भालड़ा नांगल परियोजना के लिये ऋण के रूप में दी गई राशि पंजाब, पेशू और राजस्थान के बीच किस प्रकार बांटी गई है ;

(ख) बंटवारे का आधार क्या है ; और

(ग) क्या सम्बन्धित राज्य सरकारों से इस बारे में कोई करार हुए हैं ?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 80.]

(b) The loans are given to the participating Governments in instalments based normally on the progress of expenditure incurred by them.

(c) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

U. N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S LEGAL COMMITTEE

*796. Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistani Delegate suggested in the U.N. General Assembly's Legal Committee that any definition of aggression by the U.N. should cover diversion of one country's water supply by another country; and

(b) if so, the reaction of that Committee to the said proposal?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) Yes.

(b) No other member of the United Nations has said anything on this proposal. The Legal Committee has decided to postpone the question of defining aggression to the eleventh session of the General Assembly which will be held in 1958.

MOTOR VEHICLES

*797. { Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:
Shri Sanganna:

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the demand for motor vehicles has recently decreased;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the steps taken or proposed to be taken by Government in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) The demand has been tailing off in recent years.

(b) Among the numerous reasons may be mentioned the high prices of motor vehicles, the present level of taxation on road transport, and the absence of a sufficient length of motorable roads.

(c) Government have already reduced the import duty on motor vehicles with a view to bringing their prices down and restricted the number of types and makes of vehicles to be manufactured in the country. The question of what other steps should be taken is presently under examination.

JUTE ENQUIRY COMMISSION'S REPORT

*799. **Shri L. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the State Governments have communicated their comments upon the report of the Jute Enquiry Commission, 1954; and

(b) if so, the comments made by each of the States?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) Comments have been received from three of the six State Governments who were addressed in the matter.

(b) It would not be in the public interest to disclose the contents of official correspondence with State Governments.

COSSAYE SCHEME

*800. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Cossaye Scheme adumbrated by the State of West Bengal has been submitted to Government;

(b) if so, what will be the estimated expenditure on it;

(c) when the work is expected to commence;

(d) how much area will be benefited by the Scheme; and

(e) what is the estimated loss due to floods in those areas during the last five years?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) The communication containing the State Government's proposal addressed to the Planning Commission has not yet been received.

(b) Roughly Rs. 23 Crores. Correct figure will be known when the project estimate is ready sometime in March 1955.

(c) The State Government propose to commence work in 1956-57 if the scheme is approved for inclusion in the Second Five Year Plan.

(d) Irrigation of about 8 lakhs acres and flood protection of about 390 square miles.

(e) The State Government are unable to give definite figures of annual loss. It may amount to several lakhs of rupees almost every alternate year.

BASIC CHEMICALS

*801. **Shri V. P. Nayar:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have listed the Basic Chemicals which are to be manufactured in India within the next three years and if so, what are they; and

(b) how many firms have applied for permission to set up manufacturing units for Basic Chemicals since 1950 and how many of them have started production?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) Government have drawn up a list of priorities. But it will not be correct to say that any rigid time limit has been fixed. The more important of these chemicals are: Sulphuric Acid, Ammonium Sulphate, Soda Ash, Caustic Soda, Chlorine and its products.

(b) The Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, came into force only in May, 1952. Since then, 20 firms have applied for permission to set up manufacture of important basic chemicals. Out of these, 17 were found suitable for grant of licence and one has since started production.

EXCHANGE OF ENCLAVES

*802. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 348 asked on the 24th February, 1954 and state:

(a) whether the Governments of India and Pakistan have come to a final agreement regarding the exchange of enclaves between the two countries; and

(b) if so, when the decision will be implemented?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). No final agreement has yet been reached between India and Pakistan with regard to the proposed exchange of Cooch Behar and East Bengal enclaves.

BORDER INCIDENT

*803. { **Shri Gidwani:**
 { **Shri Bahadur Singh:**

Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Police Officer and twenty Indian villagers were captured by the Pakistan Police in the second week of October, 1954 and detained in Lahore jail; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The Pakistan Border Police trespassed into a Gatti (island) in the river Ravi within Indian territory and captured on the 12th October 1954 twenty-one Indian nationals including a Head Constable of the Punjab (I) Armed Police, who had gone to the Gatti to hunt wild boars which were destroying crops in the vicinity. They were released on October 19th.

JAFFNA TOBACCO

*804. **Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposal to ban imports of Jaffna tobacco has been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the decision taken in the matter?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

PISTON RINGS

*805. **Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have given licence to a firm to manufacture piston rings in India;

(b) whether any foreign concern will also be associated with the Indian firm;

(c) if so, whether it will invest some capital also or impart technical knowledge only;

(d) the estimated amount of capital of the project and the installed capacity of the plant; and

(e) when the plant will start its work?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): (a) and (b). If the reference is to the grant of a licence recently, the answer is in the affirmative.

(c) Both.

(d) The authorised capital of the firm is Rs. 50 lakhs and the issued capital Rs. 25 lakhs. It is regretted that information on installed capacity cannot be supplied in terms of the Collection of Statistics Act.

(e) The plant is expected to go into production by October 1956.

CATALYST

*806. **Shri K. C. Sodhia:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) the total quantity of catalyst produced at Sindri during the current year upto the end of September, 1954 and its money value;

(b) the value of the catalyst used by the factory during the above period; and

(c) the steps taken to increase its production and by what time the Sindri Factory will be self-supporting in this respect?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) 1,86,536 lbs. of Carbon-monoxide conversion catalyst valued at Rs. 2,32,943/-.

(b) Rs. 63,899/-.

(c) Sindri is already self-supporting in respect of this catalyst.

INDIAN EMBASSIES ABROAD

*807. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether all the Ambassadors, Charge-de'-Affairs and their Secretaries appointed in the various Indian Embassies abroad know the language of the place where they are appointed;

(b) if not, whether any time-limit has been fixed for them to learn the local language; and

(c) the names of the Embassies where we need no interpreters?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) No. Not necessarily.

(b) No.

(c) A list of countries where interpreters are not needed in our Missions is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 81.]

COMMUNITY PROJECTS IN WEST BENGAL

554. **Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state the names of new Community Projects and National Extension Blocks started so far, in West Bengal in 1954-55?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): The Government of West Bengal were allotted ten National Extension Service Blocks for 1954-55. These have been taken up on 2nd October, 1954, and are located in the following areas:—

1. Ratua . . . District Malda.
2. Harischandrapur . . . District Malda.
3. Kharba . . . District Malda.
4. Raigunj . . . District West Dinajpur.
5. Hemtabad . . . District West Dinajpur.
6. Kaliagunj . . . District West Dinajpur.
7. Armbag . . . District Hooghly.
8. Pursura . . . District Hooghly.
9. Khanakul . . . District Hooghly.
10. Bolpur . . . District Birbhum.

No Community Project Blocks have so far been allotted for 1954-55. This is proposed to be done early in 1955.

INDIAN COUNCIL OF CHILD WELFARE

555. **Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether any scheme for the survey of conditions of socially backward children has been sent by the Indian Council of Child Welfare to Government; and

(b) if so, whether the scheme has been implemented and if so, with what results?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). A draft scheme of a general nature was received recently but as this is a new field it was suggested that a pilot scheme for one State may be tried. Definite proposals for the pilot scheme are awaited.

OUTPUT OF ELECTRICITY BY PUBLIC ELECTRICITY UNDERTAKINGS

556. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state the total output of electricity generated by public electricity undertakings in the country during the months from May to October, 1954?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): The information is as follows:—

Month	Year	Output
		million Kw.
May . . .	1954	631.9
June . . .	1954	625.3
July . . .	1954	631.3
August . . .	1954	632.8
September . . .	1954	625.0
October . . .	1954	637.9
TOTAL . . .		3,784.2

GRANT TO PUNJAB

557. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of grant made available to the Punjab by the All

India Handloom Board during 1953-54;

(b) the manner in which it is proposed to be spent;

(c) whether there is any scheme for providing cheap yarn to weavers; and

(d) whether there is any scheme to help the weavers in times of slump by giving them a loan or an advance on their cloth?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). A statement is attached. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 82.]

(c) The schemes of the All-India Handloom Board provide for supply of such yarn through Co-operative Societies.

(d) Loans are given both for share capital and for working capital to Weaver's Co-operatives.

FOREIGN EXPERTS IN RIVER VALLEY PROJECTS

558. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) the number of foreign experts working as master mechanics and

foremen in the river valley projects under the control of the Central Government; and

(b) whether any Indians have been trained to take over from them?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathl): (a) 41.

(b) Indian understudies have been posted for such training.

FINANCIAL AID TO DISPLACED STUDENTS

559. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether any financial aid was given to displaced students in the Punjab;

(b) if so, the amount allotted during each of the years from 1949-50 to the 30th November, 1954; and

(c) the total amount spent on the rehabilitation of displaced persons from April, 1948 to March, 1954 in the Punjab?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) Yes.

(b) The amount allotted in each financial year is given below:—

Financial year	Loan	Grant	Total
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1949-50	33,00,000	19,55,000	52,53,000
1950-51	Nil.	18,63,600	18,63,600
1951-52	Nil.	28,00,000	28,00,000
1952-53	Nil.	28,00,000	28,00,000
1953-54	Nil.	28,00,000	28,00,000
1954-55 (upto 30th November 1954) .	Nil.	18,25,000	18,25,000
Total	33,00,000	1,40,41,600	1,73,41,600

(c) Rs. 18,19,23,581.

COMPENSATION TO DISPLACED PERSONS

560. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of displaced persons who have been paid com-

pensation in the Punjab upto the 30th November, 1954; and

(b) the total amount of compensation paid up to that date?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) 9233.

(b) The amount of compensation paid in the Punjab upto 30th November, 1954 was as under:—

	Rs.
(i) Payments made by Cash .	91,61,900
(ii) Payments made by transfer of property .	29,86,643
(iii) Payments made by adjustment of public dues .	14,43,715
TOTAL .	1,35,92,258

SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN

561. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether any suggestions for the construction in Punjab of works other than canals and railway lines during the Second Five Year Plan have been received from the State Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) Yes.

(b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 83.]

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

562. Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state the number of Scientists and experts working under the Atomic Energy Commission?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): About 270 scientific and technical personnel are employed under the Department of Atomic Energy. In addition, about 200 scientific and technical personnel are employed on research projects financed by the Department in the Universities and Research Institutes.

PRINTING PRESSES

563. Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state the number of printing presses in the country which are controlled by the Centre or State Governments?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): The number is 39, out of which 9 are controlled by the S. & P. Department of the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply.

SMALL SCALE INDUSTRIES

564. Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India have asked the State Governments to give encouragements to local small scale and cottage industries;

(b) if so, the names of the States where small scale and cottage industries of various types have already been started; and

(c) the nature of the assistance given to those industries by the Government of India?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):

(a) It is the policy of the Government both at the Centre and in the States to give assistance to Small-scale and Cottage Industries. The Central Government supplement the efforts of State Governments in the execution of specific schemes for the development of such industries with financial assistance.

(b) All States.

(c) Assistance is being given in the form of grants and loans for the execution of schemes for the development of cottage and small scale industries. Technical assistance is also given by officers of the Central Government.

CIGARETTES AND TOBACCO

565. Shri C. R. Chowdary: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of cigarette, pipe and cheroot tobacco imported from America in 1952-53, 1953-54 and in the first half of the current financial year; and

(b) the value in rupees, of the cigarettes imported from America and Britain in the year 1953-54?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):

(a) A statement is attached. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 84.]

(b) America..... Rs. 70,000/-.
Britain..... Rs. 13,76,000/-.

DOCUMENTARIES AND NEWSREELS

566. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state the names of the distributing agencies selected for exhibition of Documentaries and Newsreels abroad and the terms of agreement entered into with them?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 85.]

BABY CARS

567. Shri Nanadas: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have approved any manufacturing programme for Baby cars in India;

(b) if so, the names of the manufacturing concerns, their capital structure and whether they are foreign, Indian or joint enterprises;

(c) their manufacturing capacity; and

(d) the terms and conditions under which they have been permitted to manufacture these cars?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). A statement giving the information is attached. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 86.]

(d) The firms have been directed to adhere to the manufacturing programmes submitted by them.

LAND ALLOTMENT IN GANGA NAGAR DISTRICT

568. Shri Bheekha Bhai: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether any enquiry has recently been instituted by Government in the matter of cancellations of land allotment in Ganga Nagar District in Rajasthan; and

(b) whether it is a fact that old Harijan allottees have been deprived of their lands and the same has been re-allotted to non-Harijans?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) No. There was no occasion for such inquiry.

(b) Allotments of some Harijans were cancelled after due inquiry by a Senior Officer and fresh allotments made to displaced persons having verified claims.

NEEDLES

569. Shri Dhusiya: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of needles manufactured in India during the years of 1952-53 and 1953-54; and

(b) the quantity exported during the same period?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):
(a):

	1952-53	1953-54
Gramophone needles	308 million	74 million
Hosiery needles	knitting	Nil. 582,000 Nos. approximately.

(b) The information is not available, as statistics of exports of these items are not separately recorded in official publications.

STATE UNDERTAKINGS

570. Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that labour-management relations in State undertakings functioning under the Central Government formed an item of discussion in the Conference of General Managers and Managing Directors of such undertakings held in New Delhi on the 5th and the 6th November, 1954;

(b) whether the Managers of State-owned coal mine which have recently come under the Central Government were represented in this Conference; and

(c) whether the views of labour unions or employees unions of these undertakings were taken into consideration in this regard?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Yes. 'Labour relations and provision of adequate amenities' was one of the items included in the Agenda for discussion at the Conference of the Managing Directors and General Managers of State undertakings functioning under the Ministry of Production, held on the 4th and 5th November, 1954.

(b) and (c). The Conference was called primarily to exchange views and experiences of the officers-in-charge of the various undertakings run on company lines to have a proper appreciation of the problems that they had faced during the last two years. As no decision was expected to be taken the question of inviting any representative of the Managers of State-owned coal mines or obtaining the views of the labour unions or employees unions did not arise.

STATE UNDERTAKINGS

571. Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state the names of the registered trade unions in State undertakings functioning under the Central Government?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha as soon as possible.

LOCAL WORKS PROGRAMME

572. Mulla Abdullahai: Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) the amount sanctioned for Madhya Pradesh for the Local Works Programmes during 1953-54;

(b) the names of the schemes submitted by the State Government for Centre's approval;

(c) the estimated expenditure thereon;

(d) which of the schemes were approved; and

(e) the amount allotted for each scheme?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) The allocation for 1953-54 for Madhya Pradesh was Rs. 14.90 lakhs, of which Rs. 7.45 lakhs was actually placed at their disposal.

(b), (d) and (e). Under the procedure laid down, the State local works programme is not required to be referred to the Centre for approval. The Centre receives only quarterly abstract statements of progress of expenditure on works approved by the State Governments themselves.

(c) A total expenditure of Rs. 6.48 lakhs has been reported as shown below:—

Category	WORKS COMPLETED			WORKS IN PROGRESS		
	No. of works	Total expenditure (i.e. total cost)	Central grant utilised	No. of works	Total cost as approved	Expenditure upto 31-3-54 reported
		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
1. Water Supply . . .	40	36,150	18,075	34	1,55,253	41,041*
2. Improvements to Agriculture	1	2,000	2,000*
3. Improvements to sanitation	4	10,800	8,194*
4. Roads, bridges and culverts etc. . .	7	14,325	6,600	27	3,18,635	63,894*
5. Schools, dispensaries etc. . .	43	1,97,920	95,837	85	6,00,529	2,68,621*
6. Other schemes	6	55,800	16,280*
TOTAL . . .	90	2,48,395	1,20,512	157	11,43,017	4,00,030*

*Central grant utilised not yet intimated.

'ATOMS FOR PEACE' PLAN

573. Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether India has offered considerable quantities of uranium to President Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' Plan;

(b) whether any assurance has been given to Government that it will not be used for making destructive weapons; and

(c) the quantity of uranium that is proposed to be offered?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (c). No offer has been made to the U.S. of uranium. In the course of the debate in the First Committee

of the U.N. on International Co-operation in developing peaceful uses of atomic energy, our representative, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, said that in the event of agreements being arrived at for international co-operation India would be able to offer certain quantities of some minerals to the international agency.

BORDER INCIDENT

574. Shri M. L. Agrawal: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the circumstances under which the Indian Border Police had recently to shoot a Pakistani raider in Roranwala Village in Gharinda Police Circle in Amritsar District; and

(b) the measures Government are taking to stop these recurring Pakistani raids on Indian Soil and against Indian nationals?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Information has been called for from the State Government and will be laid on the Table of the House when received.

(b) When such incidents come to the notice of the Government of India, they lodge strong protests with the Government of Pakistan requesting them to issue adequate instructions to appropriate authorities to put a stop to such raids and to punish the persons responsible for them. Adequate measures are also being taken by the Government of India to protect Indian lives and property.

ABOLITION OF UNTOUCHABILITY

575. Dr. Satyawadi: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 2038 asked on the 26th April 1954 and furnish the details of the programme adopted by the various stations of the All India Radio in connection with the abolition of untouchability during 1953?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

INDIAN EMBASSIES RUNNING CAFETERIA

576. Shri G. L. Chaudhary: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the Indian Embassies abroad which are running cafeteria at present; and

(b) the amount of profit that accrued to them since their inception?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Indian High Commission, London.

(b) The information is given in the attached statement. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 87.]

OFFICE OF THE JOINT CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

577. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the number of employees who are permanent, quasi-permanent and temporary in the office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta;

(b) the number among them who are considered surplus; and

(c) whether there are any Gazetted Officers among those considered surplus?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):

(a) A statement is attached. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 88.]

(b) and (c). The staff position is under review.

INDEX

TO

LOK SABHA DEBATES—PART I

Vol. VI : No. 15
6TH DECEMBER, 1954

A

ABDULLABHAI, MULLA—

Question by—

Local Works Programme. 1032-34.

Visas to Pakistani nationals. 994.

ACCOUNTS—

Question re—

G. P. Fund —. 1009.

ACHAL SINGH, SETH—

Question by—

Mustard seeds. 1016.

ADMINISTRATION—

Question re—

Pondicherry. 997-99.

ADVISERS—

Question re—

Five Year Plan. 990-91.

AGENCIES—

Question re—

Documentaries and newsreels.
1029.

AGRAWAL, SHRI M. L.—

Question by—

Border incident. 1034-35.

Indian Muslims left in Pakistan.
999-1000.

AGREEMENT(S)—

Question re—

Documentaries and newsreels. 1029.

Exchange of enclaves. 1020-21.

Indian Muslims left in Pakistan.
999-1000.

Indo-Japan —. 983-84.

Investment in oil refineries.
1010-12.

AID(S)—

Question re—

Financial — to displaced students. 1026.

Handloom weavers. 1004-05.

Investment in oil refineries.
1010-12.

Small Scale Industries. 1028.

See also "Medical Aid".

ALL INDIA HANDLOOM BOARD—

Question re—

Grant to Punjab. 1024-25.

ALL INDIA RADIO—

See "Radio, All India".

ALVA, SHRI JOACHIM—

Question (Supplementary) by—

Himalayan expeditions. 995.

AMBASSADOR(S)—

Question re—

Indian Embassies abroad. 1023.

International Fair and Exhibition
at Frankfurt. 996-97.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF—

Question re—

Atomic secrets. 988-89.

Atoms for Peace Plan. 1033-34.

Cigarettes and tobacco. 1028-29.

AMJAD ALI, SHRI—

Question (Supplementary) by—

Indian Muslims left in Pakistan.
1000.

AMRITSAR—

Question re—

Border incident. 1034-35.

ANNIVERSARY (IES)—

Question re—

Religious —. 1012.

ANTIBIOTICS—

Question re—
Patents. 1006-08.

ARMY—

Question re—
Promotions in the ——. 970-71.

ASSAM—

Question re—
Handloom weavers. 1004-05.
Rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. 980-82.

ATOMIC ENERGY—

Question re—
Atomic secrets. 988-89.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—

Question re—
Atomic Energy Commission. 1027.

'ATOMS FOR PEACE'—

Question re—
— Plan. 1033-34.

AUDITION COMMITTEE—

Question re—
Audition Committee. 1017.

AUTOMOBILE(S)—

Question re—
Baby cars. 1029-30.
Motor vehicles. 1018.

AWAZ—

Question re—
Journals. 1009-10.

AZAD, SHRI BHAGWAT JHA—

Question by—
Rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. 980-82.
Question (Supplementary) by—
Medical aid to Nepal. 980.

BABY CARS—

Question re—
Baby cars. 1029-30.

BAGDI, SHRI MAGAN LAL—

Question by—
Prohibition. 1014.

BAHADUR SINGH, SHRI—

Question by—
Border incident. 1021.

BASIC CHEMICALS—

See "Chemical(s)".

BHAKRA NANGAL DAM PROJECT—

Question re—
Bhakra Nangal Pariyojna.
(भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना) 1017.

BHARGAVA, PANDIT THAKUR DAS—

Question (Supplementary) by—
Printing presses in India. 978.

BHEEKHA BHAI, SHRI—

Question by—
Land allotment in Ganga Nagar district. 1020.

'BIDI'—

Question re—
Bidi. 978-79.

BIHAR—

Question re—
Rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. 980-82.

BORDER INCIDENT(S)—

Question re—
Border incidents. 1021, 1034-35.

BRIDGE(S)—

Question re—
Mahanadi ——. 976-77.
Mahanadi — Committee. 1008.

BRITAIN—

Question re—
Cigarettes and tobacco. 1028-29.

BROADCASTING—

Question re—
Audition Committee. 1017.

C

CAFETERIA—

Question re—
Indian Embassies running ——. 1035-36.

CALCUTTA

Question re—
Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports. 1036.

CAPITAL—

Question re—
Baby cars. 1029.
Investment in oil refineries. 1010-12.

(See) Piston rings. 1021-22.

CATALYST—

Question re—
Catalyst. 1022.

CEMENT—

Question re—
Cement. 1014-15.

CENTRAL SILK BOARD—

Question re—
Cocoon Testing Regulation. 987-88.

CEYLON—

Question re—
Bidi. 978-79.

CHAKRAVARTTY, SHRIMATI RENU—

Question by—
Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports. 1030.

Question (Supplementary) by—
Rehabilitation of East Pakistan displaced persons. 1003.

CHAMPEKAR COMMITTEE—

Question re—
Mahanadi Bridge Committee. 1008.

CHARAK, JH. LAKSHMAN SINGH—

Question by—
Atomic Energy Commission. 1027.
Journals. 1009-10.
Printing presses. 1027-28.
Printing presses in India. 977-78.

CHAUDHARY, SHRI G. L.—

Question by—
Indian embassies running on meteria. 1035-36.
Tea. 1002.

CHAUDHURI, SHRI R. K.—

Question (Supplementary) by—
Handloom weavers. 1004-05.

CHAUDHURI, SHRI T. K.—

Question by—
Atomic secrets. 988-89.
Coke Oven Plant. 1005-06.
State undertakings. 1031-32.
Question (Supplementary) by—
Committee on Coke. 987.
Pondicherry. 998.
Rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. 982.

CHEMICAL(S)—

Question re—
Basic. 1020.

CHETTIAR, SHRI T. S. A.—

Question (Supplementary) by—
Printing presses in India. 978.

CHILD WELFARE—

Question re—
Indian Council of Child Welfare. 1024.

CHINA—

Question re—
Trade with. 1024.

CHOWDARY, SHRI C. R.—

Question by—
Cigarettes and tobacco. 1028-29.

CHOWDHARY, SHRI N. B.—

Question by—
Community projects in West Bengal. 1023.
Himalayan expeditions. 994-96.

CIGARETTES—

Question re—
and tobacco. 1028-29.

CLOSE CIRCUIT TELEVISION—

See "Television".

COCOON TESTING REGULATION—

Question re—
Cocoon Testing Regulation. 987-88.

COKE—

Question re—
Committee on. 986-87.

COKE OVEN PLANT—

Question re—
Coke Oven Plant. 1005-06.
(कोक ओवन प्लांट) 1005-06.
Committee on Coke. 986-87.

COMMISSION—

See "Jute Enquiry Commission".

COMMITTEE(S)—

Question re—
Audition. 1017.
Coke-Oven Plant. 1005-06.
(कोक ओवन प्लांट) 1005-06.
on Coke. 986-87.
Engineers' Seminar. 989-90.
Mahanadi Bridge. 1008.
Prohibition. 1014.
U.N. General Assembly. Legal. 1017-18.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS—

Question re—
— in West Bengal. 1023.

COMPANY(IES)—

Question re—
Iron and steel. 985-86.
Purchase of fertilisers. 991-93.

COMPENSATION—

Question re—
— to displaced persons. 1025-27.

CONFERENCE(S)—

Question re—
State undertakings. 1031.

CONSTRUCTION—

Question re—
Bhakhra Bandh.
(भाखड़ा बांध) 1016.
Second Five Year Plan. 1027.

CONSUMPTION—

Question re—
Motor vehicles. 1018.
Paints and varnishes. 984-85.

CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES—

Question re—
Handloom weavers. 1004-05.

CORRUPTION—

Question re—
Engineers' Seminar. 989-90.

COSSAYE SCHEME—

Question re—
Cossaye Scheme. 1019-20.

COTTAGE INDUSTRY—

Question re—
Small Scale Industries. 1028.

D

DABHI, SHRI—

Question by—
Audition Committee. 1017.
Tinctures. 1015.

DAS, SHRI B. K.—

Question by—
Rehabilitation of East Pakistan
displaced persons. 1002-04.

DAS, SHRI S. N.—

Question by—
Bhakhra Nangal Pariyojna.
(भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना) 1017.
Jaffna tobacco. 1021.
Kashmir. 1012-13.

DASARATHA DEB, SHRI—

Question by—
Tribal refugee families in Tripura.
1016.

DELHI—

Question re—
Mustard seeds. 1016.
Visas to Pakistani nationals. 994.

DHUSIYA, SHRI—

Question by—
Needles. 1030.

DISEASES—

Question re—
Medical aid to Nepal. 979-80.

DISPLACED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE(S)—

See "Government Employee(s)"

DISPLACED PERSON(S)—

Question re—
Compensation to —. 1025-27.
Financial aid to displaced students.
1026.
Rehabilitation of — from East
Pakistan. 980-82.
Rehabilitation of East Pakistan
—, 1002-04.
Tribal refugee families in Tripura.
1016.

DOCUMENTARY FILM(S)—

Question re—
Documentaries and newsreels.
1029.

DRUGS—

Question re—
Patents. 1006-08.

DUGGAL AND CO., MESSRS.—

Question re—
Mahanadi Bridge Committee.
1008.

DURGAPUR—

Question re—
Coke-Oven Plant.
(कोक ओवन प्लांट) 1005-06.
Committee on Coke. 986-87.

DWIVEDI, SHRI M. L.—

Question by—
Close Circuit Television.
(क्लोज सर्किट टेलीवीजन) 1013.

E

EAST PAKISTAN—

See "Pakistan".

EGYPT—

Question re—
Tea. 1002.

ELECTRICITY—

Question re—
Output of — by public —
undertaking. 1024.

EMBASSY(IES)—

Question re—
Indian — abroad. 1023.
Indian — running cafeteria.
1035-36.

ENCLAVES—

Question re—
Exchange of —. 1020-21.

ENGINEER(S)—

Question re—
— Seminar. 989-90.

EXHIBITION—

Question re—
International Fair and — at
Frankfurt. 996-97.

EXPEDITIONS—

Question re—
Himalayan —. 994-96.

EXPENDITURE—

Question re—
Cossaye scheme. 1019-20.
Financial aid to displaced students.
1026.

EXPENDITURE—contd.

Question re—contd.
Local Works Programme. 1032-34.
Rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. 980-82,
1002—04.

EXPERT(S)—

Question re—
Atomic Energy Commission. 1027.
Foreign — in River Valley Projects. 1025-26.

EXPORT(S)—

Question re—
Bidi. 978-79.
Jari Bootian.
(जड़ी बूटियाँ) 1010.
Needles. 1030.
Tea. 1002.
Tinctures. 1015.

F

FERTILISER(S)—

Question re—
Purchase of —. 991-93.

FINANCIAL AID—

See "Aid(s)".

FIRM(S)—

Question re—
Baby cars. 1029-30.
Basic chemicals. 1020.
Patents. 1006-08.

FIVE YEAR PLAN—

Question re—
Five Year Plan. 990-91.

FIVE YEAR PLAN, SECOND—

Question re—
Printing presses in India. 977-78.
Second Five Year Plan. 1027.

FLOODS—

Question re—
Medical aid to Nepal. 979-80.

FOREIGN COUNTRY(IES)—

Question re—
Documentaries and newsreels.
1029.
Indian embassies abroad. 1023.

FOREIGN EXPERT(S)—

See "Expert(s)"

FOREIGN FIRM(S)—

See "Firm(s)"

FOREIGNERS—

Question re—

Himalayan expeditions. 994-96.

FRANKFURT—

Question re—

International Fair and Exhibition
at —. 996-97.

FRENCH SETTLEMENT(S)—

Question re—

Five Year Plan. 990-91.

Pondicherry. 997-99.

GADILINGANA GOWD, SHRI—

Question (Supplementary) by—

Journals. 1010.

GANGA NAGAR—

Question re—

Land allotment in — district.
1030.

GATTI (ISLAND)—

Question re—

Border incident. 1021.

GENERAL PROVIDENT FUND—

Question re—

— Accounts. 1009.

GIDWANI, SHRI—

Question by—

Border incident. 1021.

G. P. Fund accounts. 1009.

Mahanadi bridge. 976-77.

Question (Supplementary) by—

Mahanadi Bridge Committee.
1008.

GLANDULAR PRODUCTS—

Question re—

Preparation of hormones and —.
973-75.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE(S)—

Question re—

Office of the Joint Chief
Controller of Imports and Ex-
ports. 1036.

Shortage of personnel. 1015.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE—

Question re—

Office of the Joint Chief Con-
troller of Imports and Exports.
1036.

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS—

Question re—

Mahanadi bridge. 976-77.

GOVIND DAS, SETH—

Question by—

Asvathakar mahanon (chalon) ka
giraya jana.

(अस्वास्थ्यकर मकानों (चालों) का
गिराया जाना)

982-83.

Jari Bootian.

(जड़ी बूटियां) 1010.

Question (Supplementary) by—

Printing presses in India. 977.

GRANT(S)—

Question re—

— to Punjab. 1024-25.

Local Works Programme. 1032-34.

Rehabilitation of East Pakistan
displaced persons. 1002-04.

GURUPADASWAMY, SHRI—

Question by—

Motor vehicles. 1018.

Narmada Valley Project. 992.

H

HANDLOOM INDUSTRY—

Question re—

Handloom weavers. 1004-05.

HARIJANS—

Question re—

Land allotment in Ganga Nagar
district. 1030.

HERBS—

Question re—

Jari Bootian.

(जड़ी बूटियां) 1010.

INDEX TO DEBATES, PART I, 6TH DECEMBER, 1954

HIGH COMMISSIONER—

Question re—
Purchase of fertilisers. 991-93.

HIMALAYAN EXPEDITIONS—

Question re—
Himalayan expeditions. 994-96.

HORMONES—

Question re—
Preparation of — and glandular products. 973-75.

HOUSES—

Question re—
Asvasthakar makanon (chalon) ka girdaya jana. (अस्वास्थ्यकर मकानों (घासी) का गिराया जाना) 982-83.

HUKAM SINGH, SARDAR—

Question by—
Output of electricity by public electricity undertaking. 1024.
Religious anniversaries. 1012.

I

IBRAHIM, SHRI—

Question by—
Handloom weavers. 1004-05.

IMPORT(S)—

Question re—
Cigarettes and tobacco. 1028-29.
Jaffna tobacco. 1021.
Preparation of hormones and glandular products. 973-75.
Tinctures. 1015.
Trade with China. 1014.

INDIAN(S)—

Question re—
Border incident. 1021.
Foreign experts in River Valley Projects. 1025-26.
— Muslims left in Pakistan. 999-1000.

INDIAN COUNCIL OF CHILD WELFARE—

Question re—
Indian Council of Child Welfare. 1024.

INDIAN EMBASSY—

See "Embassy(ies)".

INDIAN LISTENER—

Question re—
Journals. 1009-10.

INDIAN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY—

Question re—
Preparation of hormones and glandular products. 973-75.

INDUSTRIES—

Question re—
Shortage of personnel. 1015.

INSTRUMENT—

Question re—
Close Circuit Television.
(क्लोज सर्किट टेलीविजन) 1018.

INTERNATIONAL FAIR AND EXHIBITION—

Question re—
— at Frankfurt. 996-97.

IRON AND STEEL—

Question re—
Iron and steel. 985-86.

J

JAFFNA TOBACCO—

See "Tobacco".

JAMMU AND KASHMIR—

Question re—
Jari Bootian. (जड़ी बुटिया) 1010.
Kashmir. 975-76, 1012-13.

JAPAN—

Question re—
Indo-Japan Agreement. 983-84.

JOINT CHIEF CONTROLLER—

Question re—
Office of the — of Imports and Exports. 1036.

JOSHI, SHRI JETHALAL—

Question by—
Engineers' Seminar. 989-90.

JOSHI, SHRI KRISHNACHARYA—

Question by—

Exchange of enclaves. 1020-21.
Kashmir. 975-76.
Mahanadi Bridge Committee. 1008.

JOURNALS—

Question re—

Journals. 1099-10.

JUTE ENQUIRY COMMISSION—

Question re—

Jute Enquiry Commission's Report.
1000-02, 1014.

K

KASHMIR—

See "Jammu and Kashmir".

KENBANKS LIMITED, MESSRS—

Question re—

Purchase of fertilisers. 991-93.

KESHAVAIENGAR, SHRI—

Question by—

Cocoon Testing Regulation. 987-88.

KIDNAPPING—

Question re—

Border incident. 1021.

L

LABOUR—

Question re—

State undertakings. 1031.

LAND(S)—

Question re—

— allotment in Ganga Nagar district. 1030.

LANGUAGE(S)—

Question re—

Indian embassies abroad. 1023.
International Fair and Exhibition at Frankfurt. 996-97.

LICENCE—

Question re—

Piston rings. 1021-22.

LOAN(S)—

Question re—

Bhakhra Nangal Pariyojna.
(भखरा नंगल परियोजना)
Rehabilitation of East Pakistan displaced persons. 1002-04.

LOCAL WORKS PROGRAMME—

Question re—

Local Works Programme. 1032-34.

LONDON—

Question re—

Purchase of fertilisers. 991-92.

LOSS—

Question re—

Cossaye scheme. 1019-20.
Purchase of fertilisers. 991-93.

M

MADHYA PRADESH—

Question re—

Local Works Programme. 1032-34.

MAHANADI RIVER—

Question re—

Mahanadi Bridge. 976-77.
— Bridge Committee. 1008.

MALVIYA, PANDIT C. N.—

Question by—

Pondicherry. 997-99.

MANUFACTURE—

Question re—

Baby cars. 1029-30.
Basic Chemicals. 1020.
Iron and steel. 985-86.
Needles. 1030.
Paints and varnishes. 984-85.
Piston rings. 1021-22.

MASCARENE, KUMARI ANNIE—

Question (Supplementary) by—

Paints and varnishes. 985.

MEDICAL AID—

Question re—

— to Nepal. 979-80.

MINISTRIES—

Question re—

Shortage of personnel. 1015.

MISHRA, SHRI BIBHUTI—

Question by—
Medical aid to Nepal. 979-80.
Small scale industries. 1028.

MISHRA, SHRI L. N.—

Question by—
Jute Enquiry Commission's Report.
1000-02, 1019.

MORARKA, SHRI—

Question by—
Purchase of fertilisers. 991-93.

MOTOR VEHICLES—

See "Automobile(s)".

MOUNTAINEERING TEAMS—

Question re—
Himalayan expeditions. 994-96.

MUSLIMS—

Question re—
Indian — left in Pakistan.
999-1000.

MUSTARD SEEDS—

Question re—
Mustard seeds. 1016.

MYSORE—

Question re—
Cocoon Testing Regulation. 987-88.

N

NABHOVANI—

Question re—
Journals. 1009-10.

NANADAS, SHRI—

Question by—
Baby cars. 1029-30.
Shortage of personnel. 1015.

NARMADA VALLEY PROJECT—

See "River Valley Project(s)".

NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE—

Question re—
Community projects in West
Bengal. 1023.

NAYAR, SHRI V. P.—

Question by—
Basic chemicals. 1020.
Patents. 1006-08.
Preparation of hormones and
glandular products. 973-75.

NEEDLES—

Question re—
Needles. 1030.

NEPAL—

Question re—
Bidi. 978-79.
Medical aid to —. 979-80.

NEW DELHI—

Question re—
State undertakings. 1031.

NEWSREEL(S)—

Question re—
Documentaries and —. 1029.

O

OIL—

Question re—
Investment in — refineries.
1010-12.

ORISSA—

Question re—
Rehabilitation of displaced per-
sons from East Pakistan. 980-
82.

P

PAINT(S)—

Question re—
— and varnishes. 984-85.

PAKISTAN—

Question re—
Border incidents. 1021, 1034-35.
Exchange of enclaves. 1020-21.
G. P. Fund Accounts. 1009.
Indian Muslims left in —.
999-1000.
Jute Enquiry Commission's Report.
1000-02.
Kashmir. 975-76, 1012-13.
Rehabilitation of displaced per-
sons from East —. 980-82,
1002-04.
U.N. General Assembly's Legal
Committee. 1017-18.
Visas to Pakistani nationals. 994.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES—

Question re—
Printing presses in India. 977-78.

LOK SABHA

PATENTS—

Question re—

Patents. 1006-08

PATIALA AND EAST PUNJAB STATES UNION—

Question re—

Bhakhra Nangal Pariyojna.

(भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना) 1017.

PHARMACEUTICAL ENQUIRY COMMITTEE—

Question re—

Preparation of hormones and glandular products. 973-75.

PISTON RINGS—

Question re—

Piston rings. 1021-22.

PLANNING COMMISSION—

Question re—

Prohibition. 1014.

Shortage of personnel. 1015.

PLANT, INDUSTRIAL—

Question re—

Piston rings. 1021-22

See also "Coke Oven Plant".

POLICE—

Question re—

Border incident. 1021.

PONDICHERRY—

Question re—

Five Year Plan. 990-91

Pondicherry. 997-99.

PRABHAKAR, SHRI NAVAL—

Question by—

Bhakhra Bandh.

(भाखड़ा बांध) 1016.

PRESS(ES)—

Question re—

Printing —, 1027-28.

Printing — in India. 977-78.

PRODUCTION—

Question re—

Catalyst. 1022.

PROFITS—

Question re—

Indian embassies running cafeteria. 1035-36.

PROHIBITION—

Question re—

Prohibition. 1014.

PROVIDENT FUND—

Question re—

G. P. Fund Accounts. 1009.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—

Question re—

Purchase of fertilisers. 991-93.

PUNJAB—

Question re—

Bhakhra Nangal Pariyojna.

(भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना) 1017.

Compensation to displaced persons. 1025-27.

Financial aid to displaced students. 1026.

Grant to —, 1024-25.

Second Five Year Plan. 1027.

PURCHASE—

Question re—

— of fertilisers. 991-93.

R

RADIO, ALL INDIA—

Question re—

Abolition of untouchability. 1035.

Close Circuit Television.

(क्लोज सर्किट टेलीविजन) 1013.

Religious anniversaries. 1012.

RAID(S)—

Question re—

Border incident. 1034-35.

RAILWAY LINES—

Question re—
Second Five Year Plan. 1027

RAJASTHAN—

Question re—
Bhakhra Nangal Pariyojna.
(भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना) 1017.
Land allotment in Ganga Nagar
district. 1030.

RAO, DR. RAMA—

Question (Supplementary) by—
Himalayan expeditions. 995.
Medical aid to Nepal. 980.
Preparation of hormones and
glandular products. 975.

RAO, SHRI T. B. VITTAL—

Question by—
Documentaries and newsreels.
1029.
Indo-Japan Agreement. 983-84.

Question (Supplementary) by—
Iron and steel. 986.
Pondicherry. 998.

RECOMMENDATION(S)—

Question re—
Engineers' Seminar 989-90.
Jute Enquiry Commission's
Report. 1000-02.
Mahanadi Bridge Committee. 1008.

REFINERY(IES)—

Question re—
Investment in oil —. 1010-12.

REHABILITATION—

Question re—
— of displaced persons from
East Pakistan. 980-82, 1002-04.
Tribal refugee families in Tripura.
1016.

RELIGIOUS ANNIVERSARY(IES)—

Question re—
Religious anniversaries. 1012.

REPORT(S)

Question re—
Committee on Coke. 986-87.
Himalayan expeditions. 994-96.
Jute Enquiry Commission's —.
1000-02, 1019.
Mahanadi bridge. 976-77.
Mahanadi Bridge Committee. 1008.

RESOLUTION(S)—

Question re—
Committee on Coke. 986-87.
Jute Enquiry Commission's Report.
1000-02.

RIVER VALLEY PROJECT(S)—

Question re—
Foreign experts in —. 1025-26.
Narmada Valley Project. 993.

ROORKEE—

Question re—
Engineers' Seminar. 989-90.

RORANWALA VILLAGE—

Question re—
Border incidents. 1034-35.

S

SAMANTA, SHRI S. C.—

Question by—
Cossaye scheme. 1019-20.
Indian embassies abroad. 1023.
International Fair and Exhibition
at Frankfurt. 996-97.

SANGANNA, SHRI—

Question by—
Five Year Plan. 990-91.
Indian Council of Child Welfare.
1024.
Motor vehicles. 1018.

SATYAWADI, DR.—

Question by—
Abolition of untouchability. 1035

SCHEME(S)—

Question re—
Cossaye —. 1019-20.
Grant to Punjab. 1024-25.
Handloom weavers. 1004-05.
Indian Council of Child Welfare.
1024.
Local Works Programme. 1032-34

SCIENTIST(S)—

Question re—
Atomic Energy Commission. 1027

SEMINAR—

Question re—
Engineers' —. 989-90.

SHARMA, SHRI D. C.—

Question by—
Compensation to displaced persons. 1025-27.
Financial aid to displaced students. 1026.
Foreign experts in River Valley Projects. 1025-26.
Grant to Punjab. 1024-25.
Second Five Year Plan. 1027.
Trade with China. 1014.

SINDRI FERTILIZER FACTORY—

Question re—
Catalyst. 1022.

SINGH, SHRI T. N.—

Question (Supplementary) by—
Iron and steel. 986.
Paints and varnishes. 985.

SINGHAL, SHRI S. C.—

Question by—
Cement. 1014-15.

SINHA, SHRI JHULAN—

Question by—
Cement. 1014-15.
Paints and varnishes. 984-85.

SINHA, SHRIMATI TARAKE-SHWARI—

Question by—
Atoms for Peace Plan. 1033-34.
Committee Coke. 986-87.
Piston rings. 1021-22.
U. N. General Assembly's Legal Committee. 1017-18.

Question (Supplementary) by—
Atomic secrets. 989.
Jute Enquiry Commission's Report. 1002.

SINHA, TH. JUGAL KISHORE—

Question by—
Shortage of personnel. 1015.

SLAUGHTER HOUSES—

Question re—
Preparation of hormones and glandular products. 973-75.

SMALL SCALE INDUSTRY (IES)—

See "Cottage Industry".

SODHIA, SHRI K. C.—

Question by—
Catalyst. 1022.
Investment in oil refineries. 1010-12.
Iron and steel. 985-86.

STATE(S)—

Question re—
Asvasthanakar makanon (chalon) ka giraya jana.
(अस्वास्थ्यकर मकानों (चालों) का गिराया जाना) 982-83.

Jute Enquiry Commission's Report. 1019.

Small scale industries. 1028.
Tinctures. 1015.

STEEL—

See "Iron and Steel".

STUDENT(S)—

Question re—
Financial aid to displaced —. 1026.

SULPHA DRUGS—

See "Drugs".

T

TEA—

Question re—
Tea. 1002.

TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AGREEMENT—

Question re—
Indo-Japan Agreement. 983-84.

TELEVISION—

Question re—
Close circuit Television.
(क्लोज सर्किट टेलीविजन) 1013.

TELUGU—

Question re—
Journals. 1009-10.

THORIUM—

Question re—
Atomic secrets. 988-89.

TINCTURES—

Question re—
Tinctures. 1015.

TIWARY, PANDIT D. N.—

Question by—
Bidi. 978-79.

TOBACCO—

Question re—
Cigarettes and ——. 1028-29.
Jaffna ——. 1021.

TRADE—

Question re—
— with China. 1014.

TRADE UNIONS—

Question re—
State undertakings. 1032.

TRAVANCORE-COCHIN—

Question re—
Paints and varnishes. 984-85.

TRIPURA—

Question re—
Tribal refugee families in ——. 1016.

TURKEY—

Question re—
Tea. 1002.

U

U. S.-PAK. MILITARY PACT—

Question re—
Kashmir. 975-76.

UNITED KINGDOM—

See "Britain".

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S LEGAL COMMITTEE—

Question re—
U. N. General Assembly's Legal Committee. 1017-18.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY ACT—

Question re—
Atomic secrets. 988-89.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—

See "America, United States of".

UNTOUCHABILITY—

Question re—
Abolition of ——. 1035.

URANIUM—

Question re—
Atomic secrets. 988-89.
Atoms for Peace Plan. 1033-34.

UTTAR PRADESH—

Question re—
Indian Muslims left in Pakistan. 999-1000.

V

VARNISHES—

Question re—
Paints and ——. 984-85.

VISA(S)—

Question re—
— to Pakistani nationals. 994.

W

WEAVER(S)—

Question re—
Grants to Punjab. 1024-25.
Handloom ——. 1004-05.

WEST BENGAL—

Question re—
Coke-Oven Plant.
(कोक ओवन प्लांट) 1005-06.
Community projects in ——. 1023.
Cossaye Scheme. 1019-20.
Rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. 980-82.
1002-04.

Y

YARN—

Question re—
Handloom weavers. 1004-05.

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1917

LOK SABHA

Monday, 6th December, 1954.

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

DEATH OF SHRI GIRJA SHANKAR BAJPAI

Mr. Speaker: As the House is aware, Shri Girja Shankar Bajpai, Governor of Bombay, passed away yesterday, the 5th December, 1954, early morning. He was a Member of the old Central Legislative Assembly from the 12th July, 1927 to 24th August, 1929, again from the 4th September, 1937 to 17th July, 1939, and for a short period from 6th April, 1940 to the 25th June, 1940. He was a man of great abilities and an administrator of ripe experience. He had served in many capacities in the Government of India.

We mourn the loss of this distinguished Member of the old Assembly and a public servant, and I am sure the House will join in conveying our condolences to his family.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I should like to associate myself with your remarks. During the last seven years, I came into rather intimate contact with Shri Girja Shankar Bajpai. Previously I had seen him or met him rather distantly, but these seven years made me realise his high qua-

1918

lities in many respects and, in some respects, which are rather rare particularly in India. We had often criticised him in the past because we differed from him. He was a very able servant of the old British Government in India and supported their policies in those days and naturally, therefore, there was, if I may say so, a certain prejudice against him in our minds because of his old association. But in late years, when we came into closer contact with him, not only did I and many of our colleagues realise his outstanding ability but also, if I may use the word, his sincerity. It is not that he transferred his allegiance from one to the other merely; he was a type of a good public servant who always expressed his opinions freely and frankly and then carried out the decisions that Government made. Such persons of such high quality and ability are always rare and certainly very rare in India. Therefore, his death is a serious loss to us, not only of a colleague but also in the public service.

Mr. Speaker: The House will stand in silence for a minute as a mark of respect.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT BANK EMPLOYEES' STRIKE

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from four hon. Members, Shri A. K. Gopalan and three others. The subject is: the situation arising out of the publication made by the Government of their Press Note dated the 4th December, 1954, in connection with the contemplated general strike of the bank employees all over India.

[Mr. Speaker.]

with effect from 10th December, 1954, in protest against the modification of the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal on bank disputes by the Government and also against the latter's failure even to protect the monthly emoluments of the bank employees in terms of their own modification order dated 24th August, 1954.

I have not read the Press Note and I do not understand really the exact point which is sought to be raised or discussed here. What is the point of the grievance in respect of the issue of the Press Note?

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: (Berhampore): May I submit that the Press Note to which we have referred in our adjournment motion gives a definite indication that the Government are not prepared even to see that the banks observe the terms of their own order of 24th August last for protecting the emoluments of bank employees including all allowances for one year at least, beyond giving any assurance, as the hon. Minister of Labour did, on the 19th of last month that he will give retrospective effect by passing the requisite law after the publication of the findings of the Rajadhyaksha Commission, making good any loss which the bank employees may be put to due to these things. He never denied that banks were giving effect to the modified award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal in such a form which had really affected their provident benefits, gratuity, and other allowances. It was an admission on his part, in the course of the statement that he made on the 19th of last month that the banks were not giving effect to that order. Now, I would further draw your attention to the fact that this Press Communique came at a moment when some of us, particularly the signatories, were trying to persuade—

Mr. Speaker: I wanted to know the specific point, to judge about the admissibility of the motion. I am not going into the merits.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: So far as admissibility is concerned, this is a definite matter of urgent public importance. They must give up the assurance that they have given. That has not been done.

Mr. Speaker: The point is failure to implement the assurance.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Order. It is not an assurance, but an order.

Mr. Speaker: Given by the Government in respect of the bank employees?

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to know what the hon. Minister of Labour has to say.

The Minister of Labour (Shri K. K. Desai): As I have stated a few days back, the bank employees have been assured that the total emoluments they were receiving in March, 1954, are protected up to the 26th August, 1955. If any bank has failed to carry out those modifications, we have given an assurance that if it is brought to our notice we will advise the banks that they have not carried out the award as they should have. Therefore it was a matter of advising them now and then, it is a breach of the award which is liable to be rectified even in a Court, if need be, but that is not a case for a strike.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I point out this. I would refer the hon. Minister to the exact terms of the statement that he made on the 19th of last month. There, he only said that he would give retrospective effect by passing a new law about the publication of the Rajadhyaksha Commission's Report in this regard and that he would make good the loss retrospectively. He never said that if any breach of the order is brought to their notice, then requisite action will be taken. He practically admitted that some banks—I know definitely that it was pointed out to the Labour Minister about three banks at least—had given effect to the order in such a way that it affect-

ed the emoluments of the bank employees, with regard to their increments, their gratuity, their provident fund, allowances and all that. It was brought to their notice, and the Government has taken, up till now, no action in that regard.

I would also further make two other points viz., that the terms of the Press Note are curiously identical with the Press Note that was issued about a week ago or about ten days ago by the All-India Banks Association from Bombay, threatening disciplinary action and all that against bank employees, and it has also come after the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister accusing a certain political party in this country of inspiring this strike. So, in view of all these things, it seems to us that the Government want to by-pass the actual contravention of the orders or the breach of the orders committed by banks, and are trying to make the whole thing a sort of political game. This thing ought to be discussed in this House.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): May I be permitted to say a word?

Mr. Speaker: I am concerned with the admissibility.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Only that.

There are two parts of the order that was issued by the Government. One part of the order said that the total emoluments would not be adversely affected. The other part of the order said that from 1st December, 1954, the salaries have got to be readjusted according to the scales laid down in the Government's order. Accordingly, the salaries are being readjusted. As a result of the readjustment, the employees stand to lose as far as bonus, gratuity, provident fund and overtime payments are concerned. These payments are not covered by the other part of the Government that total emoluments will not be disturbed.

It also needs to be remembered that on 1st April, 1954, the bank employees were entitled to an annual increment, and under the Sastri

Award and the L.A.T. Award they would have got the increment. Government's order refers to total emoluments as they were on 31st March, 1954 which means this additional increment which all the bank employees who have put in one year's service would have got as a matter of right has also not been given to them. These are the ways in which the bank employees stand to lose. The total emoluments cover one part. There is another part of their income structure which has been adversely affected and we feel that the Government could have, within the framework of the orders that they have issued, issued instructions whereby this adverse effect could have been avoided, and that way the strike could have been either postponed or called off.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): My name has been mentioned in this connection though it has no relevance, as what I said at a public meeting in Delhi has no relevance in regard to your admitting this matter.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Why not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Oh, yes. What I mean is what I said always has relevance only that particular thing has no relevance at this time. I do not talk, I hope, irrelevantly at any time.

One fact has not been brought to your notice, although no doubt you know it, that this matter is before a certain gentleman, Justice Rajadhyaksha, to whom it has been referred by Government with considerable powers to go into it, summon papers, and to advise Government as to what we should do. Government has given an assurance that whatever decision it comes to will be retrospectively applied, so that, finally, it is quite clear that nobody can stand to lose by anything that may happen in the course of a few months.

Justice Rajadhyaksha's report— I cannot precisely say when it will

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

dome—may take two months or three months. I mean it is not a long time when this matter comes to a head. This has a long history, but the present position is this, that we are committed to giving retrospective effect to any decision arrived at on the basis of Justice Rajadhyaksha's report. Therefore, nothing is lost; at the most, nothing is lost except delay of two or three months, or four months, if you like, in this matter.

Secondly, if the Government had decided anything in their part-modification of this award and if any bank goes against that, Government will come down heavily on that bank. I should like to see any bank go against a definite decision of Government. No bank dare do that. However, there is the possibility, of course, that within limits a bank may exercise its discretion, not against the Government's....

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): On a point of order, Sir. Are we discussing the admissibility or are we discussing the whole issue?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may just hold himself in patience for some time.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is certainly open to bank managers and others to use their discretion. For instance, it is quite open to them to come to any agreement with their employees as they choose. We do not come in the way provided it is not against Government's order, it is not less than what we have said. It is open to them. In fact, some banks have done so, and we do not mind their doing so, but the point is how far Government is concerned with this. We are waiting for the Rajadhyaksha award and we have promised retrospective effect to any decision taken thereon, and whatever we have said now about the total emoluments we shall give effect to now.

It is true—what the hon. Member Mr. Asoka Metha said—that within the total emoluments some changes may occur about bonus, gratuity etc. That is a possibility. Well, even that possibility does not take us very far, because in the final decision that can be rectified if any error has been committed because we have promised to give this retrospective effect. Even now if the banks so wish, they can do so. We do not come in their way. We welcome their acting in any manner so as to get rid of any anomaly of this type.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): May I point out one thing which has not been pointed out about the admissibility of the adjournment motion?

Since the Government has referred all the above points arising out of the order of the modification to the Commission, and since it is a well-established principle admitted by our Parliament while enacting section 33 and section 22 of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 and Industrial Dispute Appellate Tribunal of 1951 that the *status quo* should prevail till such time that the adjudicator gives his findings, it is but right and just that the Government order of modification of the above points should be kept in abeyance till Government comes to a conclusion on the findings of the Commission.

Here the bankmen have given notice of a strike. The strike will come on the 10th. It is the duty of every one of us to see whether it can be averted, and the general principle is that the *status quo* must be maintained when the matter is referred to a Commission for decision. If that is done, the strike can be averted. That is the reason why—because the strike which is to come on the 10th can be averted—we say this is a matter of urgent public importance, so that by discussion we can find out whether the *status quo* can be maintained, so that a possibility of averting the strike can be found out.

Sbri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I also point out, Sir.....

Mr. Speaker: Nothing further now. There has been enough discussion on the admissibility of this motion.

I need not go into the merits of it. But my own inclination—apart from the question as to whether this matter is really of such a great importance in the whole set up of Indian economy, a few months' delay or a few people on going on strike or not going on strike—is that the matter can be best settled by negotiations with the Government. Those hon. Members who have to discuss this matter may take up the matter with the Minister concerned and have negotiations. I am also afraid that a discussion might not lead to the desired consequence of averting a strike—but that is not my concern. I do not feel, for various considerations, into which I need not go at present, inclined to give my consent to this motion.

MESSAGES FROM THE RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following three messages received from the Secretary of the Rajya Sabha:

(1) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 2nd December 1954, agreed without any amendment to the Coffee Market Expansion (Amendment) Bill, 1954, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 23rd November 1954".

(2) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I

am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 3rd December 1954, agreed without any amendment to the Andhra State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill 1954, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 2nd December, 1954".

(3) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 3rd December, 1954, agreed without any amendment to the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Amendment Bill, 1954, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th November, 1954."

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL

PETITION RECEIVED

Secretary: Sir, under Rule 178 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha, I have to report that a petition, as per statement laid on the Table, has been received relating to the Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, which was introduced in the House on the 27th April 1954 by Dr. Katju.

Statement

Petition relating to the Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, which was introduced in the House on the 27th April 1954 by Dr. Katju.

No. of signatories	District or town	State	No. of petition
1	Delhi	Delhi	40

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION
ON STARRED QUESTION

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): On the 29th September last, Shri Kasliwal had tabled a Question—Starred Question No. 1468—enquiring whether the Government of Tanganyika proposed to amend the immigration laws of the territory. In my answer I had said that whereas formerly the husband of a permanent resident could enter the territory without a permit or pass, the Government of Tanganyika had already amended the Immigration Regulations thereby making it obligatory on the part of the husband of a permanent resident to obtain a pass or permit from the Immigration authorities before he could enter into the territory. In answering the supplementaries raised by Shri Kasliwal, it was stated that Government had no information as to whether the Governor of Tanganyika was considering at all, and if so, whether favourably or otherwise, the representation submitted to him by the Asian women of the territory urging repeal of the amendment.

I have since gathered that the correct position is that on behalf of the Governor, the Chief Secretary to the Government had sent a reply to the petitioners saying that the amendment of the Immigration Regulations should not be taken to imply that the husband of a permanent resident of Tanganyika was debarred from entering the territory. Such a person was in the same position as any other intending immigrant. The amendment was introduced, it was contended, because there had been cases where the privilege had been abused. It was for this reason alone that the amendment had been introduced. No racial discrimination was made in the granting of the privilege and there was no such discrimination involved in its withdrawal. The amending regulation, the Chief Secretary's reply stated, was first con-

sidered by the Immigration Control Board, an inter-racial body having an unofficial majority and subsequently placed before the Legislative Council. The Government of the territory, it is understood, would raise no objection to a debate being initiated at the next sitting of the Legislative Council on the immigration laws.

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF
MEMBERS FROM THE SITTINGS
OF THE HOUSE

SIXTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Sixth Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House presented to the House on the 3rd December, 1954".

Shri Gidwani (Thana): I want to say something about this motion.

Mr. Speaker: I will have to put the motion first. Shall I put the motion?

Shri Gidwani: You put it and then I will speak.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House agrees with the Sixth Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House presented to the House on the 3rd December, 1954".

Shri Gidwani: Since the salary system has been introduced, I would say that there should be a modification about the days of leave. If a Member is present only for three days in 200 days, under the rules he can continue to draw his salary of Rs. 400 per month. I find that certain Members have remained absent for long sessions. They come after 60 days or 55 days and then go away. It is very unfair to the poor taxpayer. Therefore, I would say that after the new system has been introduced, there should be some

change in the rules regarding absence of Members. In my opinion, if a Member remains absent for more than 60 days during the period of one year, then for every day's absence Rs. 20/- should be cut from his salary.

Mr. Speaker: I think that is a matter which the Committee might take into consideration at some later date and come with a fresh report on that point. The matter cannot be settled here.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): The Constitution would come in the way.

Shri Anekar: That is a proposal for the Committee to consider and place a report before the House. The House will then consider it.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Sixth Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House presented to the House on the 3rd December, 1954".

The motion was adopted.

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will today take up consideration of three groups of clauses of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 1954, for which two hours each have been allotted.

The first group consisting of clauses 66 to 81 will be disposed of by about 2-25 P.M. when the House will take up consideration of the next group which consists of clauses 82 to 88. The discussion on this group will continue up to about 4-25 P.M. which consists of clauses 82 to 88. vote of the House.

Thereafter, the House will take up the third group consisting of clauses 89 to 102, excluding clause 97 which has already been adopted. Only half an hour will be left for the consideration of this group today in which case the discussion on this group will continue tomorrow.

Hon. Members will now hand in at the Table within 15 minutes slips indicating the numbers of amendments to clauses 66 to 81 in their name which they wish to move.

Shri Kasliwal (Kota-Jhalawar): May I suggest that clause 81 may be put into the second group. Clause 81 is entirely different; it is connected with questions relating to appeal. Clauses 81 to 88 may be discussed together.

Mr. Speaker: He proposes that I should first put before the House clauses 66 to 80?

Shri Kasliwal: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I accept that.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): We have not voted on section 162.

Mr. Speaker: I think we may put that to vote. But I had said that a short discussion on Mr. Pataskar's amendment might be permitted if Members were.....

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): So far as the consideration of that amendment and other amendments is concerned, it may be postponed to a later time.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am saying.....

Shri Raghavachari: So my submission is that it would be better if you fixed some time when that matter would be discussed. It is better that we know when they will be taken up, rather than at once.

Mr. Speaker: He wants postponement of the discussion.

Shri Raghavachari: I want a particular time to be fixed.

Mr. Speaker: I think we might do that. If the hon. Minister is agreeable, as he wants time to be fixed specifically for the consideration of Shri Pataskar's amendment and amendments to that amendment, let us fix that time for tomorrow.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: We have it tomorrow in the beginning.

Dr. Katju: Immediately after 12 noon.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot say if we can have it immediately after the Question Hour. But that is the first point tomorrow.

Dr. Katju: Only a very limited time is needed; we discussed the matter very greatly.

Mr. Speaker: That was what I said before—a short discussion and not a long discussion. I had suggested at that time 15 to 20 minutes.

Dr. Katju: Very good.

Clauses 66 to 80

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—South-East): I beg to move:

In page 21, for lines 16 to 18 substitute:

“69. Amendment of section 371, Act V of 1898.—In section 371 of the principal Act,—

(a) in sub-section (1)—

(i) after the words ‘translation in his own language’ the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

‘if his language has been adopted by the State in which the trial is held for any official purpose under article 345 or has been recognised in the place where such Court ordinarily sits under article 347 of the Constitution of India and if his language is any other language, then in such language’; and

(ii) the words ‘in any case other than a summons case’, shall be omitted;

(b) in sub-section (2), after the words ‘charge to the jury’ the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

‘or, where a transcript of the charge forms part of the record under section 297, a copy of such transcript’; and

(c) after sub-section (3), the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:—”

In this group of clauses, the amendments are mostly consequential but I shall have some remarks to make on clause 69.

[**Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair:**

That is a clause which empowers and enjoins upon Courts to furnish copies of findings and judgments to accused persons. Now, when the British framed the Criminal Procedure Code, they laid it down that certain things, certain orders and judgments were to be given, as far as practicable, in the language of the accused. The words used were ‘as far as practicable’. Of course, a loophole was left for the Court to escape from the obligation of furnishing a copy of the judgment in the language of the accused.

Sir, it is time that we should make a change in that provision and we should provide that the accused persons should have the judgments against them given in their native language. There are certain languages in the case of which we need not make any exception at all. For example, if in Bengal an accused wants a copy in Bengali or in Bihar or U.P. an accused wants a copy in Hindi, there is no meaning in this provision, ‘as far as practicable’. It should be given to him. It is only where the language of the accused happens to be one into which it may not be feasible in that part of the country to translate, for example, if, in a trial in an outlying district of Bengal, the accused wants a copy in Telugu, it would be very difficult there. Then, of course, we may have the provision ‘as far as practicable’. Therefore, in clause 69, I have suggested, by my amendment No. 623, that a clause should be substituted which will provide not only for giving copies of sentences or findings but which will also amend the other provisions of section 371 so as to make it obligatory on the court to furnish to the accused copies of judgments either in the language of the State or in a regional language, if it has been adopted by that State or recognised by that State.

It is provided under the Constitution that any State may adopt any language for its official purposes, if a State but I shall have some remarks to why the courts of that State should

not furnish the accused with copies in that language, if it happens to be the language of the accused himself.

Secondly, it is provided by article 347 of the Constitution that any other language may be recognised by a State in accordance with the directions of the President. It may be recognised throughout the whole State or it may be recognised in a particular area. Therefore, I have suggested the other provision, that if there happens to be such a language which is recognised in the locality where the court sits, then the accused should have the right, the undeniable right to obtain a copy in that particular language. It is only in other cases, if the language of the accused happens to be one which cannot be translated readily in that part of the country, that, I think, the provision, 'as far as practicable' should remain.

Therefore, my amendment, in short, is to sub-section (1) of section 371 that if the accused's language happens to be the one adopted under article 345 of the Constitution or one of the languages recognised under article 347 of the Constitution in the place where the court sits, then he should be compulsorily given a copy in his own language if he desires. In any other case, it should be in his own language as far as practicable.

The second amendment I suggest to section 371 is to delete the exception in the case of summons cases in the matter of furnishing copies of judgments. Our British masters were not too much preoccupied with protecting our rights or doing us justice. Therefore, it was provided that in all cases other than summons cases the accused should have the right to obtain copies of judgments. I want to delete this particular exception 'other than in summons cases'. The reason is simple. First of all, when an accused person is convicted, or when an accused person is prosecuted and the case ends against him, particularly in conviction, he should have a copy of the judgment which has been passed against him. Even when it is a case

of acquittal he should be given a copy of the judgment because that shows that his honour has been unsullied. But, particularly, in a case of conviction, there is no case for denying him the judgment in a summons case. Because, to get a judgment in summons cases you do not necessarily have to spend less and you cannot be denied the right to proceed against the judgment in a summons case. That is one reason why I have sought to provide that he should get it in summons cases.

The second reason is even more important. Today, summons cases are not confined only to petty offences punishable with six months imprisonment. In summons cases you may be convicted and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. Formerly, if the sentence was of one year's imprisonment, you did have the copy, the right to get a copy of the judgment free of cost. Why should the accused be denied this right by extending the scope of summons cases. Therefore, I have sought to do away with this exception in the case of summons cases.

The other amendment which I have sought to introduce, I submit, is really a consequential amendment and without that amendment, sub-section (2) of section 371 becomes meaningless. So, sub-section (2) of section 371 makes it obligatory on the Court of Sessions to give the accused a copy of the heads of charge. Now, by our present amendment of the Code, we are seeking to provide that the Sessions Judge will record the heads of charge only when a transcript of the charge is not kept under section 297 of the Act as amended. Section 297 has been amended to provide that the charge should be taken down as far as practicable in shorthand and where it is so taken down, the transcript of the charge has to be kept on the records. Section 367 as amended, provides that where a transcript is kept—that is the proviso sought to be introduced—where the transcript of the charge is kept, then the Sessions Judge need not record the heads of charge. Therefore, I would ask the

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

Home Minister, supposing a Sessions Judge does not record the heads of charge, how can he give to the accused the heads of charge as required under sub-section (2). I have, therefore, sought to provide by clause (b) of the amendment to section 371, which I have proposed, namely 623, that in sub-section (2) after the words 'Charge to the jury', that is to say, heads of charge, the following words shall be inserted, namely,

"or, where a transcript of the charge forms part of the record under section 297, a copy of such transcript."

That is to say, where the Sessions Judge records the heads of charge, it should be supplied to the accused, but where the copy of the transcript of the charge is kept, the copy of transcript should be supplied to the accused. I think, the Home Minister will have no difficulty in accepting the amendment.

For rest of my amendment, it contains a printing mistake and whole sub-section which I proposed has been omitted. Clause (c) of the amendment says:

"(c) after sub-section (3) the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:"

And after that, in the printed list the sub-section itself does not appear. So I submit that the Home Minister can easily accept my amendment No. 623 to clause 69.

As regards the other clauses, I have not much to say, because those are really consequential. But I would request the Home Minister to give his support to the amendment I propose and to consider it carefully, particularly in respect of sub-section (2) as to how heads of charge can be furnished when they are not recorded by the Sessions Judge.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 21, for lines 16 to 18, substitute:

"69. Amendment of section 371, Act, V of 1898.—In section 371 of

the principal Act,—

(a) in sub-section (1)—

(i) after the words 'translation in his own language' the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

"if his language has been adopted by the State in which the trial is held for any official purpose under article 345 or has been recognised in the place where such Court ordinarily sits under article 347 of the Constitution of India and if his language is any other language, then in such language; and

(ii) the words 'in any case other than a summons case', shall be omitted;

(b) in sub-section (2), after the words 'charge to the jury' the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

"or, where a transcript of the charge forms part of the record under section 297, a copy of such transcript; and

(c) after sub-section (3), the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:"

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay (Pratapgarh Distt.—East): I think that this clause 79 now has become necessary. When any application is made either by the person sentenced or by any other person on his behalf, unless he is in jail, such application cannot be made. My submission is that sometimes there are chances that a person makes this application, so that he may have the advantage of not going into custody. In such a case it also happens that such application is allowed and a person avoids going to jail or avoids entering into custody. I think that was because of a special provision. Ordinarily such applications are not made. They are made only in very rare cases. This is not a provision for an ordinary application that we should be very particular that the accused, that the convicted person, must surrender himself and go to jail before any application can

be made on behalf of that convict. So, if it were an ordinary application and if it were meant ordinarily for convicts—all clauses of convicts—surely, I would agree. But in special cases where special provisions had been made, they should allow them to remain. If there is a modification on other lines, I would have really welcomed. But that subject is not being considered.

But then, as it stands to-day, the provision now sought to be made is that any person who is above the age of eighteen years, if he wants any advantage of the remission of sentence, all that he has got to do is that he must surrender himself and go to jail. It is only when he is in jail that this question can be considered. It may or may not be granted. But even for consideration, it is necessary that he must surrender, he must go to jail; because this provision says:

“Provided that in the case of any sentence passed on a male person above the age of 18 years, no such petition by the person sentenced or by any other person on his behalf, shall be entertained, unless the person sentenced is in jail, and—

(a) where such petition is made by the person sentenced, it is presented through the officer in charge of the jail; or

(b) where that petition is made by any other person, it contains a declaration that the person sentenced is in jail.”

So, it is absolutely necessary that before any application is made, the convicted person must have surrendered. Just as I have submitted in the beginning, these applications are made in very special cases. They are not made for ordinary cases. In the case of ordinary convicts, of course, this sort of provision was absolutely necessary; but when the provision is for special cases under special circumstances, I would submit that it should be treated as special. Therefore, this provision that he must surrender before his application is at all

considered, I think, is not desirable in certain special cases. Where the application is made, or the application is granted or is considered fit to be granted and the person is asked to go to jail, in that case the execution of sentence is suspended for some time. So, if the provision is meant for special cases, it should remain special and as it is not meant for ordinary cases, the amendment that has been suggested here, I think, is not very desirable.

Among those clauses that are now before the House, one clause is about the question of language and what Mr. Sadhan Gupta said is right.

Shri Venkataraman: Sir, the amendment which Shri Sadhan Gupta has moved, the second part namely, that where a transcript of the charge forms part of the record under section 297, a copy of the transcript should be given, seems to be necessary so that in the new amended procedure, the party may get a copy of his transcript of the charges. I want to support that proposition. The hon. Minister also is inclined to accept it.

There is another aspect about which my friend Mr. Upadhyay has said that in cases where the sentence is passed, a person may apply under section 401 for remission without going into jail. That, I think, is totally opposed to any sense of morality. You may probably be aware of a very famous case in Madras where a person was sentenced by the Sessions Court at Coimbatore. He was released on bail and thereafter he filed an appeal in the Madras High Court and the Madras High Court confirmed the conviction. But the gentleman never went to jail and he came over to Delhi.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He is hiding somewhere here.

Shri Venkataraman: That is why I thought I might bring it to your knowledge.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There was a scandal regarding that at that time.

Shri Venkataraman: That is what I wanted to draw your kind attention to.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: That is an individual case.

Shri Venkataraman: I am just developing an argument and my hon. friend should be a little more patient. Ultimately the sentence was remitted and there was considerable scandal about it. It is to prevent such things that this section is intended and I think it is a very wholesome provision. Where the Court finds a person guilty and sentences him to a particular term of imprisonment, it is not right for that person to evade the process of law and yet claim benefit under section 401. Therefore, I support the clause as it is.

Dr. Katju: Sir, I think my hon. friend Shri Sadhan Gupta is perfectly right in saying that when there is no such document of the charges, there will only be a transcript of the charge originally referred to, and then a copy of such transcript should be given to him. I have, therefore, no objection in accepting his amendment, part (b) in so far as it relates to the giving of a copy of the transcript.

So far as the other matter is concerned, my hon. friend Shri Venkataraman has referred to what he calls a "well-known case". When I was a Minister in U.P. fourteen years back, in about 1937 and afterwards, I had two or three cases of this description, namely, people just running away evading law causing a lot of corruption, making false applications and trying to dodge the law. I think Shri Venkataraman put it very well, that: "If you want to apply for remission; well, obey the Court first and then do it." Please remember that we have taken care in this amendment to protect really needful persons—females and all males below the age of 18. If a young lad of 16 or 17 is sentenced to an imprisonment of six months and there are grounds for remitting that sentence,

this section does not apply to him. Nor does it apply to any female. I had a case where a girl was sentenced to imprisonment and when an application was made for remission we entertained it. But this should not be allowed to people who are sentenced to six months or eight months and then rushing about making applications. They do it on false pretensions. I think, therefore, that this is a very useful and salutary provision which should stand.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I will put the amendment to the vote of the House.

Shri Venkataraman: Only part (b) of the amendment may be put.

Dr. Katju: I am only referring to part (b) of amendment 623. That says:

"In sub-section (2), after the words 'charge to the jury' the following words shall be inserted."

That is accepted.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: As regards (c), I do not know what happens, I think (b) and (c) should be together. I do not know in what way it can be taken away.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What Mr. Sadhan Gupta says is that (c) is only a consequential one and if (b) is accepted, it should automatically come.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: That is a provision in the Bill.

Shri Venkataraman: In the original Bill it is there and therefore no amendment is necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I will put the amendment to the vote of the House, as accepted by the hon. Minister.

The question is:

In page 21, for lines 16 to 18 substitute:

"69. Amendment of section 371, Act V of 1898.—In section 371 of the principal Act,—

(a) in sub-section (2), after the words 'charge to the jury' the following be inserted, namely:—

'or, where a transcript of the charge forms part of the record under section 297, a copy of such transcript'; and

(b) after sub-section (3), the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:—

The motion was adopted

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 69, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 69, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 66 to 68 and 70 to 80 were added to the Bill.

Clauses 81 to 88.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the next group of clauses numbers 81 to 88. As usual hon. Members may send in slips indicating the numbers of amendments which they would like to move.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Sir, this group of clauses deals with a very important matter—the right of appeal. Of course, the Government, in order, perhaps, to take away the edge of the other provisions which they have sought to introduce in the Bill, have introduced in particular sections, some salutary changes. We welcome the change by which District Magistrates have been divested of appellate powers and everything has been transferred to Sessions Judge, Addi-

tional Sessions Judge and even to Assistant Sessions Judges.

The only objection of a very fundamental kind that we entertain is to clause 85. Clause 85 seeks to substitute a new section 417. This section 417 is a section which is an embodiment of British tyranny and the suspicion which the British had even of the Courts set up by them. We all know, Sir, that in England, there is no right of appeal against an acquittal, but here, our masters did not feel themselves very much safe to leave the whole discretion to the Courts of law. They wanted to try their luck in a higher Court. Again the normal rule in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence is, that, when there is an acquittal there should be no appeal on it and once the decision of acquittal is arrived at by a competent Court of law, there is a finality about it. That is the law, also in England, but they did not consider it a good enough law for us. Therefore, they provided that the Government can prefer an appeal against acquittal when the Government thinks it necessary. That was a bad enough clause. It was put in in the Criminal Procedure Code, I think, in order to ensure that, if some people whom the Government did not want to escape, did escape by some means, they would try and secure conviction from a higher Court. But, Sir, we should not have been a party to the continuation of such a clause. What the Government have done, is to go even further. It is now provided that not only the Government, but even a complainant can in some cases prefer an appeal. It is a most extraordinary thing that criminal prosecution which is primarily the concern of the State should be allowed to be prosecuted to a vindictive end by a private person. Therefore, I think this particular clause should not have been there and the proper course for a Government which can lay any claim to be progressive should have been to delete section 417 altogether. I have, therefore, proposed deletion of section 417, but if that course is

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

not acceptable to Government, I would at least suggest that the old position be restored.

1 P.M.

Next amendment I have proposed is to clause 86. There the appellate power of the appellate courts is sought to be increased by giving them the right of enhancing the sentence. It is only provided that an opportunity to be heard should be given before a sentence is enhanced. I would seek to introduce the phrase 'a reasonable opportunity' instead of the word 'opportunity', because it often happens that when you are prosecuting an appeal, you are not really much to argue on the facts and particularly, as you know, in jury cases the appeal is on question of law, and in such cases what we seek to concentrate on is the legal aspect of the matter and we do not prepare ourselves with the facts. In a case of enhancement of sentence, the most important part is the facts of the case—whether certain witnesses should be disbelieved, whether certain witnesses are creditable or not—and these questions do not arise at all in a consideration of points of law. Therefore, if you are simply given an opportunity of arguing against the enhancement of a sentence, that is to say, the accused is present in the Court, his lawyer is present in the Court and the Court says "What have you to say against the enhancement of the sentence?", that is hardly an opportunity in reality. It may be an opportunity in accordance with the letter of the law, but in accordance with the spirit of the law, it is hardly an opportunity, because he is not prepared for it. Therefore, it is to be provided that he is given a reasonable opportunity before he is asked to argue against enhancement. Let us not forget that appeals would lie not only to High Courts, but when convictions are by Assistant Sessions Judges, appeal would lie even to District and Sessions Judges, who may not be so much

aware of the rights of the accused and may not be so much conversant with law as to give them the proper opportunity which the accused would require. I do not find any objection for including the words "a reasonable opportunity". After all, you should give the accused a reasonable opportunity for showing cause against enhancement. There can be no reasonable objection to it at all. Therefore, I would ask the Home Minister to accept this amendment if he has the interest of justice at heart. That is my amendment No. 627 to clause 86. I would also ask the Home Minister to remember that the present procedure is that when an appeal goes, the Court, when it wants to enhance the sentence, exercises its revisional powers and issues a rule to show cause against enhancement. The rule takes its own course, is returned, and meanwhile the accused has an opportunity to prepare himself with the facts. The facts may be very voluminous and evidence may go to hundreds of pages and the preparation can never be made in the course of just a few minutes or few hours; the accused would have to be given a reasonable opportunity.

The next submission I want to make is with regard to clause 87. Clause 87 seeks to amend section 426, and instead of saying "other than a person accused of a non-bailable offence, I want to have the words "other than a person sentenced to death or imprisonment exceeding two years", that is, convicted of a non-bailable offence. My objection is this. There is nothing particularly serious in this word 'non-bailable offence' as such. We know certain offences are bailable and certain offences are non-bailable, but the real crux of the offence lies in its seriousness. It may happen that a person may be convicted of a minor type of non-bailable offence and if section 426 remains as it is, then the court which convicted him would not be able to release him on bail as it can do in a bailable offence after conviction.

What I seek to do is to specify the gravity of the offence rather than the description of the offence. The gravity of the offence I am seeking to emphasise by providing a maximum period of sentence which would enable the Court convicting, to release him on bail. What I have sought to provide in my amendment No. 628 is that instead of the words "other than a person accused of a non-bailable offence", the words "other than a person sentenced to death or imprisonment for life or imprisonment exceeding two years" shall be substituted. If an accused person is convicted by a Court to imprisonment up to a period of two years it will be open to the discretion of the convicting Court to release him on bail if it is satisfied that no harm will be done. It does not mean that the Court, after sentencing an accused for two years, would automatically release him on bail. It does not mean that. It only means that in a proper case if the Court is satisfied that it is in the interest of justice to release him on bail, it will do so. Suppose he might be wanting to prefer an appeal, the appellate Court may be pleased to hear it but it may take time to go to the appellate Court after taking copies of judgment and therefore it may take time to prefer the appeal; meanwhile it may be desirable not to send him to jail and the convicting Court may release him on bail. What I want to say is that power should not be restricted to bailable offences, but it should be allowed for every offence of a minor nature in which the sentence is not for a very long time. That is what I propose to introduce by my amendment No. 628.

Therefore, I would request the Home Minister to consider these two amendments, number 627 introducing "a reasonable opportunity" and amendment No 628 specifying a limit on the releasing on bail by the convicting Courts with reference to the sentence, because I know that I will never persuade the Home Minister to give up the Government's right of

appeal or even to modify the complainant's right of appeal. With these few words, I take my seat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The numbers of amendments which the Members have indicated to move are as follows:

Clause 85.—624, 407, 625 and 626;

Clause 86.—627; and

Clause 87.—628 and 629.

Clause 85.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

In pages 23 and 24, for clause 85, substitute:

"85. Omission of section 417 in Act V of 1898.—Section 417 of the principal Act shall be omitted."

Shri Rane (Bhusaval): I beg to move:

In pages 23 and 24, for clause 85, substitute:

"85. Substitution of new section.. for section 417 in Act V of 1898.—For section 417 of the principal Act, the following section shall be substituted, namely:—

'417. Appeal in case of acquittal.—The State Government or the complainant may present an appeal against the order of acquittal:—

(1) to the Sessions Judge, if by a Magistrate; and

(2) to the High Court, if by any Court or Judge other than a Magistrate;

and the appellate Court after hearing, may either confirm or set aside the acquittal and convict and sentence the accused."

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I beg to move:

(1) in page 23, line 45, omit "or appellate".

(2) In page 24, omit lines 7 to 19.

Clause 86.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

In page 24, line 27, for "an opportunity" substitute:

"a reasonable opportunity".

Clause 87.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

In page 24, for lines 31 to 33, substitute:

"(a) in sub-section (2A), for the words 'other than a person accused of a non-bailable offence' the words 'other than a person sentenced to death or imprisonment for life or imprisonment exceeding two years' shall be substituted;"

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I beg to move:

In page 24, lines 31 and 32, after "non-bailable" insert "or bailable".

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): I have got a few observations to make regarding the amendments in this particular group of sections.

I do appreciate that by these clauses 82 and 83, a much needed change has been made. Up till now, appeals against orders of conviction passed by the Magistrates of the Second class and Third class were being heard on appeal by the District Magistrate or the Sub Divisional Magistrate and these District Magistrates and Sub-Divisional Magistrates were bureaucratic to their bones, with the result that whenever any appeal went to them against the orders of their subordinates, who belonged to the same fraternity, justice was invariably denied. There was not only justice denied, but the District Magistrates and the Sub-Divisional Magistrates used to refuse to apply their minds to the facts of the case. Some clerk in their office, who is in charge of this particular criminal work, used to write practically the whole of the judgment and these Magistrates used simply to sign on the dotted line. I had the misfortune to argue a good

many appeals before such Magistrates. After having joined this profession, in my young enthusiasm, I went to a Magistrate with a number of law books. He looked with contempt at me and the books that were with me.

Shri Venkataraman: Rightly.

Shri S. S. More: He said, Mr. More, what do you mean, are you going to quote all these books for me; what is going to happen to my other executive work; I won't give you so much time; you better give me in a nutshell the point that you want to agitate and then I shall see what I can do. What he did was to confirm the conviction and nothing else.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Did the hon. Member expect a different result even after quoting the books?

Shri S. S. More: He was a man who wanted to economise his time. Possibly, the result would have been the same. Or, possibly, being exasperated by my quoting all these books, he would have gone to do something more serious to my client. Fortunately, time was saved and my client too was saved because he did not get anything other than what the lower Magistrate had inflicted upon him. This is a welcome change and I do appreciate it. It is very rare for us to compliment the Government, because the good things they do are as scarce as oases in a vast desert. But, these few oases give us some good occasion for complimenting the Government.

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Many oases.

Shri S. S. More: Many asses, but not oases. I was saying that I compliment the Government for this useful change.

Then, I go to clause 85. As the previous speaker has stated, this clause is an undesirable clause, and it indicated a sort of distrust of the executive Government even in the decision of the Magistrate who acquitted the accused. The Britishers believed that an accused person in this

country is something like a poison, something like a poisonous viper and so he must be trampled under feet in a ruthless manner. Even if the lower Court acquitted such a man the Government did not like to allow that acquittal to stand in effect, and they used to go in appeal to the High Court, and the High Court used to apply its mind. We have been condemning this attempt on the part of the executive Government to pursue the acquitted accused even in the High Court. But, now, a further change is being introduced. Even in a private complaint, particularly when the complainant is a rich man, he will succeed in securing a conviction, even at the lower Court. Although he does not succeed there in securing a conviction, he can use his long purse to go to the High Court for permission to appeal, engage an eminent lawyer and persuade the High Court to entertain that appeal. Then, he may pursue the accused on legal grounds. My submission is that in this country, most of the crimes are committed by a certain order of society who are harassed and persecuted by the present inequitable economic conditions. Take for instance, the landlords and tenants. The tenants have their own grievances. There is no hope of getting those grievances peacefully and legitimately redressed. In this exasperation like a hunted beast, he turns round and does some criminal act. The police are quick to rope in such a man. Some evidence is there; some reliable evidence is not there. The Magistrate, in spite of his desire in the opposite direction, proceeds to acquit after appreciating the evidence. This poor man who has somehow secured an acquittal will be persecuted by the prosecuting complainant and it will be a sort of war of attrition. The accused will be completely exhausted and he will be dragged from one forum to another. Even if he is not punished by any criminal court, the fact that he is required to undergo the expenses and undergo the necessity of standing such a trial, will be enough punishment for the man. He

will be economically ruined. If he cannot fight in the High Court, possibly his case will be re-heard and again he will have to run the whole gamut. That should not happen. If on certain occasions, the Magistrates act in a wrong manner, and acquit persons, I feel that we should allow such acquittals to stand rather than give a weapon in the hands of the complainant to pursue the acquitted persons in the High Court. I am not prepared to welcome this change. I feel that it is pregnant with so many mischievous implications that the Home Minister will have to come possibly after some time with proposals for abolishing all these things.

Another clause that I want to comment upon is clause 86, where an appeal from conviction lies to the High Court and it may enhance the sentence notwithstanding, anything inconsistent therewith contained in clause (b) of sub-section (1). In the old Criminal Procedure Code, there is a power of revision, there is a power of appeal. When a man goes in appeal to a High Court, unless it has also issued a notice to the accused in exercise of the powers of revision, the High Court has no power to enhance the punishment. The utmost that they can do is to dismiss the appeal. It is necessary to put these two powers in two different compartments. The power to revise is a restricted power. The power of appeal is also restricted to some extent. But, according to the present amendment the power of revision and power of appeal will be lumped together and the High Court will be using their power of revision at the time when they are hearing appeals. What will happen? This will first discourage appeals on the part of the accused, and particularly persons who are illiterate and ignorant will be very much averse to go in appeal, because there were instances when a mad man went in appeal and came back not with an acquittal or reduction of the sentence, but with an enhancement of the sentence and that will act like a wet blanket against a good many persons. Then, Dr.

[Shri S. S. More]

Katju has written a book in which he has given some of his experiences at the bar. He has quoted a case where he was defending the accused. When the matter was taken up before one Bench, they said—I am putting it as Dr. Katju has said—they were not convinced by the argument. They said, "Well, Dr. Katju, this is a matter in which notice ought to be given for enhancing the sentence". A notice was issued. Subsequently, the matter went before another Bench, and they said, well, this is a fit case for being acquitted. The result was that the notice was set aside and the man was acquitted. If these provisions were in operation, the Judges who were hearing the appeal would have, at the same time, formed their own opinion about enhancing the sentence. They would have taken much serious view of the gravity of the offence and they would have straightaway gone to punish the accused with a higher sentence. Then, it might be argued on behalf of the Government that they have given a proviso, which says that an opportunity shall be given to the accused for showing cause. Now, what is the nature, what is the character of this opportunity which will be given to the accused? Let us try to visualise the scene when the matter is being argued. The lawyers for the convicted accused are arguing the matter. The Judges are applying their mind. Straightaway after the arguments are finished, they ask the counsel for the accused, well, what have you to say about our enhancing the punishment? This will be a question which will take him by surprise. I would say that the appeal should be heard at one stage. After appeal has been heard, some time should elapse. There should be a definite notice, to the accused as to why the sentence should not be enhanced. After such a notice, he should be permitted to engage a lawyer to show cause before such and such a date. Otherwise, the hearing of the appeals and the use of the revisional powers will be

simultaneous, with great hardship and great harm to the accused himself. These are some of the points on which I think very seriously. I do not think these changes, instead of doing some good to the litigants that happen to be hauled up under the Criminal Procedure Code, will do more harm and will cause further mischief and therefore they are undesirable. That is my submission.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:
I welcome the provision so far as the making over appeals to Sessions Judges is concerned. I have to say a few words on the District Magistrates, A. D. Ms., and other Magistrates of the First Class who are invested with appellate powers, and about the Sessions Judges or the Assistant Sessions Judges who shall decide the appeals from the order of Second and Third Class Magistrates. It is common knowledge that these cases were not heard with the care and attention that they deserved and in many cases, the judicial officers never applied their minds. It has happened like this, so far as these District Magistrates were concerned. They knew of certain Magistrates who were not corrupt, the appeals against their orders were rejected; whereas, in cases which were decided by certain Magistrates whose reputation was not good, the appeals from their orders were accepted. I know of even Commissioners behaving like this. Thirty or forty appeals were all rejected in one district where the Commissioner was pleased with the collector whereas in another district where the Commissioner was not pleased with the collector all the 30 or 40 appeals were accepted. This was being done. I do not want to waste the time of the House. Otherwise, I could give very many instances of cases which were decided by the District Magistrates according to their whims and vagaries without going into the merits of the questions. Now that the change has been made, I am very happy about it.

In regard to clause 85, and the matters relating thereto, I have something to say. In regard to appeals a new provision has been made especially in respect of private complaints. Previously, according to section 417, it was the State Government which made the appeals. In proper cases, when the case was based on a complaint, the State Government directed the Public Prosecutor to go into the question and the Public Prosecutor could file an appeal. Now, it appears that the new provision has been made where on a complaint case also an appeal is made competent. The High Court has been given the powers just like the Supreme Court, so that, first of all, there will be an application for leave to appeal and if the leave is given, then, in that case, an appeal will be filed. I have not got much experience of the way in which such powers are exercised by the Supreme Court or perhaps, in some other jurisdictions, by the High Court also. But I know that so far as leave for application is concerned, usually speaking, in more than 80 to 90 per cent. of cases such applications are rejected. In the Privy Council appeals we know that it was in very rare cases that the application for leave to appeal was granted. They had certain principles fixed on the basis of which they provided for it. But, all the same, we know from the decided cases that it was very rare that such leave was granted. I think so far as these cases are concerned, they will be very few and far between. Even now, in such cases, in which complaints are the basis of further proceedings, they only come in when the police has discarded them, when the police does not care to bring about what the complainant wants and when they do not challan of when the complainant is dissatisfied. It is only in these cases that the complainant brings a case before the court. But in the case of an acquittal, it would be very, very rare indeed in which an application will be made. At the same time, it is so clear that if the

police handle a case and spoil, the case, everybody knows that in 99 out of a 100 cases, it is impossible that that case can succeed. As a matter of fact, in all these provisions which we have considered so far we have considered one aspect. There are many cases in which a corrupt police officer spoils a case, and against that corrupt police officer nobody has ever thought it was possible to succeed, and no provision has been made for meeting such a situation. When I was speaking about the statement made in section 162, I submitted for the consideration of the House that if the statements are written in such a manner that a police officer is out to spoil a case, then, that statement will be accepted by the Court for the purpose of contradicting the prosecution witness. Now, the prosecution will also take its chances and in such cases, it will be impossible for the accused to prove that the evidence of any person who has made that statement can be accepted on his behalf. Therefore, my humble submission is that we are really not justified in allowing this appeal on complaint. If we omit these provisions no harm will come. I have submitted my amendments that so far as these provisions are concerned, the provision of appeal should be omitted. As I read out sometime ago in this House when the Preventive Detention Bill was before the House the provision for similar kind of appeal, and said that in no civilised country such an appeal is allowed against acquittal. Had these provisions under section 417 not been in force for a long time in this country. I would have given amendments to the effect that no appeal at all from acquittal should be allowed. The only purpose for an appeal for acquittal is that we do not have full confidence in our judiciary. Otherwise, when a person described in section 3 of the Evidence Act has decided a case and regarded it as unproved, we ought to be content with that.

The principle of law that a person

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

is presumed to be innocent is too deep-rooted to be dislodged in any manner except the one which the law provides. Now, in appeals against acquittals we know that the higher courts have also established two or three principles. Number one, that is the presumption of innocence must be dislodged on appeal. At the same time, when the first Court sees the demeanour of the witnesses and the impression that it gets is the final thing, and no appellate court should rightly interfere with the opinion of the Judge who tried the case and who had the benefit of seeing the witnesses in the witness box. Even in such cases, very few appeals succeed, and our judiciary will improve in due course leading to more confidence in them. The reason why the Britisher wanted this sort of recourse to the High Courts etc., was for purposes of getting the judgments reversed in political cases etc. That reason is also fast disappearing. Therefore, we would have been well-advised if this provision relating to section 417 disappeared from the Criminal Procedure Code. Anyhow, I do not find any justification whatever for enlarging the scope of section 417, and therefore I must submit with all the emphasis that I can command that these new provisions which are sought to be put in—the new sections 3, 4 and 5 of section 417—are not justified.

Moreover, I can understand that the State or the public may be anxious to have an appeal against an original order of any Court when it acquits an accused. What is the sense in having two appeals, and then a third appeal. Even an appeal against an appellate judgment of acquittal is provided. I should think we are justified in omitting the words "or appellate" also.

Apart from that, I come to clause 86. The powers of enhancement to my mind are very drastic in this sense—not that I do not want that in any proper case the powers of enhancement must be in the High Court. But in cases of appeal I am

loath to have these powers given. It means many people will not go to appeal.

Shri S. S. More They will be discouraged.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: They will be discouraged from appealing. After all, in a criminal case it is most difficult to say beforehand what view the appellate Court will take. I remember of a case in which transportation was given in a section 302 case and when I appealed to the High Court, the Judges at first sight said: "What is this? This is a very brutal murder. Only transportation?". I said there is no appeal on behalf of the Government. The Government advocate was there, and he said: "All right, tomorrow I will file an appeal". They said: "No, no. The time has gone". But, at the same time, the next day he brought in papers and said: "I am going to file an appeal or revision". But the High Court said: "It is too late". Ultimately, the High Court was pleased to acquit all the accused.

So, my submission is that very ignorant people will be discouraged from appealing. They go with the hope that their sentence may be remitted or reduced or they may be acquitted but if you give these powers, then poor ignorant people, especially the poor people, will, as a matter of fact, think twice before appealing.

I also remember a case in which a person was sentenced to transportation for life, and I told him it was a good case and he should appeal. He told me, "No. It is possible I may be hanged there." He would not appeal. So, I do think that if these powers are given it may be that they may go to discourage appeals.

In regard to clause 87, I have put in an amendment. The powers are practically in the nature of powers enabling persons to make an appeal. At present in regard to bailable cases only the powers are being exercised by Courts. I have submitted that in non-bailable cases also these powers may be given, so that in proper cases

the Court may be pleased to suspend the sentence for the time being and allow the person to appeal. We should not determine the question of bail by the nature of the offence. Even a Court which sentences a person to imprisonment or others know perhaps that it is likely that the judgment may be reversed in appeal, and therefore, in such cases the Court should be empowered to enlarge the person on bail. Whether the case is of serious nomenclature is not a matter which should be considered on that occasion. After all, in a serious case also, the equities of the case may be that the Court may come to the conclusion that if the man was enlarged on bail, he may get the benefit of appealing himself and instructing his counsel and doing all that he can. But if it is only applied to ballable cases, then the benefit of this provision will not be given to those people. Even this bailing is quite discretionary. It is not in every case the Court has the right to use this power. Moreover, the provision is that security to the full satisfaction of the Court may be taken. More security may be taken, I do not mind, but in a proper case the person should be enabled to make an appeal. It is not every person who has got his friends and relatives to appeal for him. This is a beneficial provision and the benefit of this should be given in every case.

It may be argued that when a person is sentenced to death, he might become desperate and commit some other murder etc. In that case, the amendment which has been moved by Mr. Sadhan Gupta should at least be accepted, i.e., in cases where the sentence is two years or less, the Court may be able to exercise these powers.

Shri Rane: My amendment No. 407 to clause 85 is very simple. I do not agree with the views expressed by the hon. Members Shri Sadhan Gupta, Shri More and Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava that there should be no appeal against acquittal. My amendment seeks to expand the prin-

ciple of appeal against the order of acquittal. I do not agree with the view that a hundred guilty persons may escape but one innocent person should not suffer. I think this is a conservative view.

Shri S. S. More: What is your progressive view?

Shri Rane: I am coming to that.

The hon. Members who preceded me think that justice is always lying on the side of the accused. I do not subscribe to that view.

Dr. Katju I think for once truth is being spoken here.

Shri Rane: My view is that justice should be meted out to the complainant also. If he is wronged, his wrong must be done away with. If really the accused is innocent, he must be acquitted. There is no doubt about it. Of course, my experience at the bar, as compared with my learned friends, is not very much. I have been practising for about 25 years at the bar, but I find I am not alone in my opinion. I have heard even High Court Judges say that they are morally convinced that the accused is guilty, but that they cannot convict him legally. Now, we must change our attitude and must find out a *via media* to do justice to the complainant. I do not say that the innocent person must suffer. Therefore, my amendment is that the Sessions Judge should also be invested with powers of appeal against the orders of acquittal by the Magistrate, and if it is by the Magistrate, then the Sessions Judges alone should be invested with these powers of appeal.

Shri S. S. More: Enhancing?

Shri Rane: I am speaking only about appeal against acquittal. I am confining myself to section 417 only; if the acquittal order is by any other Court, that is, the Sessions Judge or the Assistant Sessions Judge etc., then the appeal should lie to the High Court.

My amendment is in consonance with the object of this amending Bill also. The hon. Home Minister has stated that he wants that justice

[Shri Rane]

should be speedy and that it should be least expensive.

My amendment seeks exactly to do the same thing. Sub-clause (3) says that the complainant should first seek the permission of the High Court if he wants to appeal. So the poor complainant from the village has to go Bombay, Delhi, Calcutta etc. He must engage eminent lawyers of the High Court whose fees, of course, will be exorbitant—there is no doubt about it. Therefore to give this right to the complainant to run to the High Court for seeking permission is most expensive and against the spirit of our present amending Bill. So, my suggestion is that if the powers of appeal are given, they must be given to the Sessions Court if the order of acquittal is by the Magistrate. I am not alone in this view. I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the hon. the Home Minister also to Group D of the Opinions on the Amendments of the Criminal Procedure Code, page 283. Here is the opinion of the Chief Presidency Magistrate of Bombay:

"If the acquittal is by a Court of the First Class Magistrate in some small town, the right of appeal should be to the Sessions Judge of that District, and the party should not be troubled to go all the way to the High Court. On the other hand, the right of appeal from orders of acquittal should be limited and restricted by certain well defined provisions..."

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etah Distt.—North East cum Budaun Distt.—East): Many other persons have said that.

Shri Rane: I am quoting them. On page 285, there is the opinion of the Bar Association of Sambalpur (Orissa). It says the right of appeal against acquittal should be provided in all cases. Now, here is the opinion of a Bar Association. My friends, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, Shri Sadhan Gupta and Shri More say: "No, no. This order of ac-

quittal should be final. There should be no appeal". Against this view here is the opinion of a Bar Association of Orissa. It says:

"Right of appeal against acquittal should be provided in all cases to the respective appellate Courts and there should be no provision for non-appellable sentence in the Code".

Shri S. S. More: Is there any civilised country where such an appeal against an acquittal is provided?

Shri Rane: I shall come to the civilised countries.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In some form, appeal has been allowed. That is so in the present Code. It is only extended. Is it that the present Code is uncivilised?

Shri S. S. More: It was uncivilised because it was framed by the Britishers. But we are carrying their tradition forward.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): That we are.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): They want to carry it.

Shri Rane: On the same page one retired Additional District Magistrate of Bihar says...

Shri S. S. More: Additional District Magistrate? Then we know his opinion.

Shri Rane: He is retired now and we should consider his view as most dispassionate because he has got that experience...

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Of British times.

Shri Rane: He says: that the provision must be there and he has suggested an amendment which is practically incorporated in my amendment—though I had not seen his amendment.

Then there are some other views to the same effect. What I am pointing out is this: that this is not my view only; but it is supported by many

Bar Associations. My friend, Shri S. S. More, may perhaps be knowing that the Poona Bar Association has passed, or recommended at least, such amendments to the Select Committee. I do not know whether he has read it or not, but from the Press I understand that even the Poona Bar Association has suggested this.

Shri S. S. More: I am not prepared to believe that the Poona Bar will be so reactionary.

Shri Rane: But that is what it is!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Notwithstanding that kind of remark or opinion, does the hon. Member feel that so far as the Poona Bar is concerned, it cannot be reactionary?

Shri S. S. More: They used to be reactionary in old times.

Shri Rane: My friend has asked about other civilised countries where there are such a provision. We must adjust ourselves to the circumstances in our country. Because there is one view always enunciated in the different jurisprudence, that does not mean that we should always stick to it. We must change according to the times whether it is in some civilised countries or not; we should not always be guided by that. I submit that we must take into consideration—whether my friend agrees or not—whether justice is to be denied to the complainant. I think many will accept this view that in many cases wrong is done to the complainant by acquittal and we must remedy this. Therefore, I submit that this principle of appeal against acquittal should be extended and extended as I have stated in my amendment. I commend it to the acceptance of the House.

Shri S. S. More: Under the present procedure, even complainants who feel a wrong can go to the Government and persuade them and convince them that a wrong has been done to them; so that Government can go in appeal.

Shri Raghbir Sahai: That will be very difficult.

Shri S. S. More: It is open to them.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central): I rise to support the amendment moved by my friend, Shri Rane. I was very glad to notice that at least there was one Member from the Bar who had some concern for the poor complainant and some concern for the conditions that prevail in the society. During all these days on the discussion of this measure, I was rather surprised to find out that hon. Members, one after another, used to get up and show a very large and great concern for the accused, as if the conditions are that many innocent people are convicted for nothing or for want of evidence in this country. That is not the thing. The society has lost all sense of security. Many complainants find out that it is useless to lodge a complaint for under the present circumstances, it has become almost impossible to bring an offender to book. Some remedy must be found out. That is the clamour in the society everywhere, wherever you will go. The sense of security is being lost and our progress also is withheld on that account. Some sense of security must prevail and every offender must be brought to book. Nobody is interested in seeing that innocent people should be convicted for nothing; at the same time, there must be some concern for the complainant. It is not that all the complainants are bad people, just as nobody would like to say that every accused is a convict or should be convicted. He must have all opportunities to defend himself; at the same time, the complainant must have several opportunities if he can prove that his complaints are true, and the offender ought to be brought to book. That is why, I support this amendment.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Although I agree with my friend, Shri Rane, when he says that we should not necessarily be inclined towards defence and it is not justice always to think that the accused must have sufficient opportunity or he must be help-

[Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay]

ed in every manner by the legislation that we have in respect of criminal laws, still I am opposed to the suggestion that he has made, that the appeal should be filed in the Court of Sessions. I think that is highly improper. On principle, I would like to discourage appeal against acquittal. We find that a number of complaints come before the Court; sometimes these complaints are absolutely baseless, and when a Magistrate has gone into them and has dismissed the complaints, it is no use wasting time over them.

Therefore, this principle of having no provision for appeal against acquittal, I think, is the right procedure. Up till now, our law allowed appeals on behalf of Government. That too, I think, was not proper on principle. But, as we have seen, there are some cases, where sometimes we find that injustice has been done, that a true case has been thrown away on no ground almost or that the particular magistrate happens to be prejudiced against certain complaints and he throws them out. So, there should be some sort of provision. That is why, probably, it was thought necessary that at least the Government should have a right. Sometimes an application used to be filed in revision before the District Magistrate and he used to refer the case to the High Court for taking steps in the matter where grave injustice was done.

But, the suggestion that has been made by my hon. friend Mr. Rane was, he said, in consonance with the suggestion made by my hon. friend the hon. Home Minister in the Statement of Objects and Reasons to the Bill that the trial should be speedy, it should not be cumbersome and that it should not be expensive. But, I want to tell him that it is going to be all against it. The suggestion that is made by him will be very expensive, very cumbersome and also there will be no expedition which he wanted to have there. His argument was that a person whose complaint has been dismissed has to run to a big lawyer, he has to engage an eminent lawyer and

pay him heavily, take him to the High Court, file an application for leave and then get leave and all that. If the complaint is dismissed, he has to file an appeal to the Court of Session and if he fails there, he may go ahead and might try for leave in the High Court and if he gets leave he might file another appeal there. That might be the process. If he has to choose between the Sessions Court and the High Court, then, in every respect, the High Court would be preferable. Once for all, if he makes an application for leave and gets the leave, he might file an appeal before the High Court and have the question finally decided.

So far as the proposal of the hon. Minister is concerned, it is far superior to the proposal made by my hon. friend here. The provision which the hon. Minister has made that in complaint cases also there should be a provision for appeal is a new thing. I would submit that if in complaint cases he suggests that there should be leave for appeal, then in government cases also there should be that leave. Otherwise, in cases where some officer of Government or somebody is very keenly interested, he tries to take the case to the High Court without getting leave. So, if restrictions are to be placed—although that provision should be there—in respect of private complaints that restriction should be also in respect of Government appealing against acquittal.

It has been expressed by some hon. Members here that to file an appeal against acquittal means no confidence in the judiciary. Mr. More says that these magistrates are absolutely unreliable because if cases go to them they do not pay any attention to them; judgments are written by Readers and they simply sign the judgments; they do not take pains to study the cases. Then, he says the magistrate should be relied upon for the dismissal of private complaints and no appeal should lie against their decision. I could not understand that

logic. If the magistrates are such that they cannot be relied upon for attending to cases honestly, efficiently and diligently, then, I think, they should not be relied upon for dismissing complaints and there should be some remedy after the dismissal. If those persons are not reliable for one purpose, then, I think, there should be some provision against their orders in respect of private complaints also, if you want that justice should be done in all cases. Therefore, this argument does not in any manner serve the cause that he means to place before the House.

Then, probably it was Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava who said that it shows that we have no confidence in the judiciary. He also said that the magistrates who once go into complaints should not be disturbed, once they have heard the complaint, they have gone into the facts and looked into the evidence and have also seen the demeanour of the witnesses, the manner of behaviour of the witnesses when they make statements before the courts. That was the argument that was placed before the House when the question of trial *de novo* was under consideration. It is thought that it is the succeeding magistrate who is the proper person to say whether a witness has already gone into the witness box and made a statement before the court should be recalled and re-examined and it is he who is the competent person to say whether there should be a *de novo* trial or not. Therefore, we do not, of course pay any attention to that principle. I do not think that we pay attention to that principle here; though the best of magistrates can go wrong, they do not generally all go wrong. I do not agree with that view. I suggest that there should be provision for appeal in the High Court against the dismissal of complaints.

Shri S. S. More: May I clarify one thing? I observed this in the case of executive magistrates, who are saddled with executive responsibility. Where the judiciary has been separated from

the executive, there are magistrates in whose honesty and integrity we have great confidence. What about an appeal against the orders of the sub-divisional magistrate or the District Magistrate, who are still in the executive.....

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:

If the complaints are dismissed by the sub-divisional magistrates—I think they can do it even now—the observations of my hon. friend will not apply.

The other point I wanted to submit was regarding the enhancement of sentences, I used to think about this provision even formerly. When the accused goes on appeal before a High Court, the accused approaches the Court for being acquitted, if he is convicted by the subordinate court. But, on account of his own action of filing the appeal before that court, he sometimes has his sentence enhanced. That discourages the filing of an appeal very much.

Dr. Katju: I think it is good.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:

Sometimes, it may be good; sometimes, it is very bad also.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friend is forgetting that there is always a revision application filed by Government for enhancing the sentence.

Some Hon. Members: Not always.

An. Hon. Member: Very rarely.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:

If it is on the application of the Government for enhancement that it is enhanced, then it is a different matter.

Dr. Katju: Sometimes it is on the notice issued by the High Court itself.

Shri Raghurib Sahai: That is not so always.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:

It is only when there is an appeal that an application for enhancement is also made. If there is no appeal, then we find only in very exceptional cases that

[Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay]

an application for the revision or enhancement of the sentence is filed. But, if there is an appeal, we find that Government generally make an application for enhancement of the punishment. That opportunity need not be given. It should be done by a separate provision and when there is a special prayer separately made by Government for enhancement of the sentence. Otherwise, if during the hearing of an appeal an application is made and the enhancement is done, then it discourages appeals which is very much detrimental to the accused.

2 P.M.

The last point that I would submit is in respect of provisions that had been made regarding the appeals being now heard by either the Sessions Judge or the Assistant Sessions Judge. Really, it is a very welcome provision that the magistrates have been relieved of hearing appeals from convictions by subordinate magistrates. I think this provision was long overdue and now it has rightly been made here in this Bill.

But then, a provision has been made that a certain class of cases should be tried by the Additional Sessions Judges and Assistant Session Judge. I think that provision may create a little trouble. Therefore, cases that are filed in Courts of Sessions, the Sessions Judge, who is the really presiding judge, may send them over to the Additional or Assistant Sessions Judge and they might be tried by them. I think that would be a better course.

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Dist.—North): The solicitude that has been shown by the House generally to the interest of the accused has the effect of ignoring the complaint or the victim of aggression altogether. The interests of the complainant have also to a certain extent to be safeguarded. So, I do not agree with my friend Mr. Sadhan Gupta when he says that the provisions of section 17 should be altogether abolished. There are cases

which must have come to the knowledge of every one who has practised on the criminal side where they do not take into account the real matter at issue and for that reason it becomes necessary to have appeals against acquittals. I think ordinary appeals to a certain extent should be discouraged. There should not be a plethora of appeals against acquittals. But for that reason, the State Government does not also ordinarily permit an appeal to be filed. The matter has to be taken up by the legal remembrancer, and by the Government advocate. It is only after that, that the Government files an appeal or instructs the advocate to file an appeal. My submission is that the provisions in section 17 are necessary provisions and should be there.

In regard to right of complainant to file an appeal, the complainant goes to court when he is not helped by the police or in cases which are not cognizable by the police or in which police investigation has not taken place. I admit that certain cases are not true, but then, it cannot be said generally that all complaints are false and the general tendency of the magistrates about the complaint cases is to dismiss them. They do not take that interest or that care which they take in a case which has been challaned by the police. Therefore, the complainant also should have the right of appeal, but I do not agree with my friend Mr. Rane that the appeal should be filed before the Sessions Judge. It is only after the High Court has given sanction for filing an appeal against acquittal that appeal should be filed. I think the provisions in 417 should be left as they are.

In regard to the question of the power of enhancement given to the High Court in an appeal on a conviction, my submission is when the High Courts want to enhance a sentence, powers under section 435 are in the High Court and it is not necessary that anybody should move the High Court in revision.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): Sir, at the time of the general discussion, I have already pleaded for the complainant for justice being done to him without bringing any difficulties for defending the case of the accused. Now, clauses 85 and 86, as they stand here, are for the protection of the complainant. They do not bring any sort of difficulty in the way of, or do any injustice, to the accused. If, in any case where a sentence is pronounced after convicting the accused and the High Court thinks that that sentence is inadequate, I think it should have the power to punish the convicted person, the offender, adequately and sufficiently. It is quite a salutary provision and I would like to support it. It is necessary in order to have a sort of proper atmosphere in favour of peace and in favour of order, that the accused, if guilty, must always be brought to book. He will be severely dealt with; and when he is convicted, he should get punishment which is quite in consonance with the gravity of the offence. Therefore, I whole-heartedly support clause 86.

In connection with clause 85 I would like to say that appeals against acquittal should be there. It is said that to allow an appeal against acquittals is to show want of confidence in the judge or the magistrate. I would like to point out that if a Sessions Judge sits there deciding a criminal case and if on acquittal the complainant feels that no justice has been done and that there should be the right of appeal—to say so is in the opinion of some hon. Members, to say that there is no confidence in the judge. But if the same person sits as District Judge and decides the case then, according to these very Members, there should be an appeal to the High Court. Are we to say here that this betrays want of confidence in judiciary? Whenever a judge comes to a certain conclusion, he uses all his abilities and the knowledge of law. But even eminent judges are apt to commit errors. Why should there be no provision for ap-

peal against acquittal? I do not in any way agree with that line of thinking which is shown here by the champions of the accused in this House. I want to approach the problem from the standpoint of social justice.

It is said that it may be regarded as a concept of civilisation that there should be all sorts of privileges for the accused only. I would rather think that civilisation is there where there is morality and peace, where the culprits are brought to book, where all offenders are punished and where no guilty person can run without any sort of fear in the society—if such a society is established, if there is such an atmosphere created in the country, then alone there is civilisation. What do we find in the so called civilised countries? We find that science and all sorts of modern methods are being used to perpetrate offences. All traces of offences are being removed and it is very difficult to find out and punish an offender. When such is the civilisation prevailing in a country, I am not in any way prepared to say that such countries are civilised countries. Where there is peace, where offences are controlled and people can live without fear of other people robbing them, then alone there is civilisation. We read in *Upanishada* when King Janaka was asked, he said:

“नमस्तेनो जनपदे etc.”

In that he says: “There is no theft in my country. There is no one who commits any sort of offence. In my country all are happy. They are going by the proper and moral method.” When that sort of State is there, then alone we can say it is a civilised country. Any country where there is no peace, where science and all sorts of modern methods are used there for the sake of perpetrating offences and for the sake of bringing misery upon others, I am not at all prepared to call that a civilised country. Civilisation, I would like to urge, is that which will eradicate all sorts of offences, eradicate all sins, and all sorts of aggres-

[Shri Altekar]

sions upon others. If these things are entirely done away with; if these things are removed from the country then there is an atmosphere of peace; there is great flourishing of all sorts of various industries and occupations. Everything will go on peacefully when there are no offenders. When there are no persons who are stealing and robbing others, a country will flourish. If anyone goes amiss and commits any wrong or offence, he should be properly punished. Then alone, there is civilisation in the country. In order to have peace in the State and society offenders must always feel that they will be brought to book and punished. They must know that no portals will be thrown open to them to escape if they commit any offence. From that point of view I would like to support both clauses 85 and 86 that have been placed before the House.

One other point I would like to support Shri Rane's amendment. So far as appeal against acquittals—orders of Magistrate—is concerned, it should be to the Sessions Court because if the appeal lies with the High Court, it will be difficult for many poor persons as they cannot go to such long distances and cannot spend so much money. Therefore, if at all, there is really injustice in the decision that is given by the Magistrate, the remedy must be easy. The remedy must be at a place which is easily approachable to the person to go to Court and a Court which has got that full sense of justice. For that purpose Sessions Judges enjoy the confidence of the general public. They are experienced and endowed with high sense of justice. They are also well grounded in all laws. Therefore, in these circumstances, if that appeal is made preferable in the Court of Sessions, then ordinary and poor persons will have easy remedy and a remedy that they can avail of. I, therefore, support Shri Rane's amendment and I would say that the House should agree to the clauses that have been placed before it.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र (जिला कुलन्दशहर) :
मैं भाई राने साहब ने जो अपना अमेंडमेंट
नम्बर ४०७ दिया है मैं उसको सपोर्ट करता
हूँ। गवर्नमेंट ने इस बिल में यह बात रख कर
कै कि कम्युनलेंट्स को भी हाईकोर्ट में अपील
करनी चाहिये, इस उद्देश को मान लिया है
कि जो कम्युनलेंट्स होते हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में
न्यायालय अक्सर गलती करते हैं और गवर्नमेंट
ने ऐसा महसूस किया कि उनको कोई मौका
अपील का देना चाहिये। मेरा यह कहना नहीं है
कि मजिस्ट्रेट जो हैं वह एक गलत काम करते
हैं और जब ज्यादा बंदिया करते हैं। बात यह
है कि इंसान गलती करता है। "टु अर इज
ह्यूमन"। मजिस्ट्रेट से भी गलती होती है और
जब से भी गलती होती है। मुल्जिमाओं को सजा
होने पर अपील करने का हक दिया हुआ है
केवल इसलिये कि हो सकता है कि मजिस्ट्रेट
ने उनको सजा करने में गलती की हो या जब
ने गलती की हो तो वह आगे जाकर अपने लिये
न्याय प्राप्त कर सकें। इसी तरीके पर यह जरूरी
हो जाता है कि जिन लोगों ने इस्तगाला दायर
किया और कम्युलेंट दायर की, उनका फैसला
करने में अगर मजिस्ट्रेट ने या जब ने गलती की
है और मुल्जिमाओं को कानून का गलत इस्तेमाल
करके छोड़ दिया है तो वह न्याय पाने के लिये
ऊपर को जा सकें। ऐसी ऐसी रीलिंग्स सामने
मौजूद हैं। यहां मैं पास पंजाब की एक रीलिंग
है जिसमें आप देखेंगे कि एक औरत है जिसका
नाम पलवन्द कौर है और जिन पर मुकदमा
चलाया गया कि उसने एक आदमी से मिल कर
अपने पति को मरवा दिया। उन्होंने इकबाल
किया था और पुलिस ने उसका चालान किया
और जब ने कालेपानी की सजा दफा २०२ में कर
दी लेकिन जब वह मुकदमा हाईकोर्ट में पहुंचा
तो हाईकोर्ट ने कहा कि २०२ उस स्त्री पर
साबित नहीं होता, बल्कि २०९ साबित होता है
कि उन्होंने लाश को गुप्त किया और इसलिये
हाईकोर्ट ने उन्हें दफा २०९ के अन्दर सात वर्ष
की सजा कर दी। हाईकोर्ट से मुकदमा आगे
बढ़ कर सुप्रीम कोर्ट में पहुंचा। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने

कहा हाईकोर्ट गलत हैं। यह कनफेशन नहीं हैं और उस औरत पर कोई मुकदमा साबित नहीं होता हैं और कत्ल बिल्कुल गलत हैं और नतीजा यह हुआ कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने हाईकोर्ट के जजों की राय को गलत बतलाया और कहा कि हाईकोर्ट ने २०९ में जो सजा दी वह गलत हैं, उसे कनफेशन मान लिया हालांकि वह कनफेशन नहीं हैं। हाईकोर्ट ने सेशन जज की अदालत के फंसले को गलत बतलाया और कहा कि इसमें कत्ल के जर्म में सजा नहीं हो सकती, इसमें तो सिर्फ लाश को छिपाने की सजा हो सकती हैं। मेरे कहने का यह मतलब नहीं हैं कि जज ने कोई बड़मानी की या हाईकोर्ट के जज ने गलती की। गलती तो हर एक से होती हैं। सेशन जज ने गलती की, ऊपर के कोर्ट ने हाईकोर्ट ने उसको दुरुस्त किया। हाईकोर्ट ने उस मुकदमे पर जब गौर किया तो उसको दूसरी तरफ पर पहचाना और उन्होंने उस गलती को दूर किया लेकिन तब भी उसमें गलती रह गयी और उसको फिर आगे जा कर सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने दूर किया। तो गलती का जहां तक ताल्लुक हैं, गलती तो हर इंसान से होती हैं। हो सकता हैं कि मुलाजिम को छोड़ने में अदालत से गलती हो जाय, ऐसी हालत के बावजूत गवर्नमेंट ने यहां पर इस बिल में यह रक्खा कि कम्प्लेंट केसेस में जो मुस्तगीज हों अगर उनको कोई शिकायत हो तो वह जाकर सीधे हाईकोर्ट में जायें। यह बात जरा समझ में नहीं आती कि मुद्दई लोगों को जरा जरा सी बात में और अवसर दौड़ दौड़ कर हाईकोर्ट अपील के वास्ते जाना पड़े। अगर आप अपील का मौका दते हैं तो क्यों न वहीं हेडक्वार्टर में बिल का जो जज होता हैं उसके पास वह अपनी अपील दायर करके उससे फंसला करवा सकते हैं। हाईकोर्ट तक जाने में और बड़े बड़े वकीलों को पैसा देने में और सफर आदि करने में काफी खर्चा होता हैं और बड़ी परेशानी होती हैं। जब हमें जनता को आराम पहुंचाना हैं, तब हमें उनको वहीं अपने हेडक्वार्टर पर अपील करने का मौका देना चाहिये ताकि अगर किसी मीजस्ट्रेट ने कोई गलती की हैं तो सेशन जज उस गलती को दूर कर दें। उसके बाद आगे अपील का मौका नहीं

होना चाहिये। हां, अगर कोई संगीन मामला हो तो वह उसको हाईकोर्ट में ले जा सकते हैं। ऐसा सोचना कि हाईकोर्ट में बड़ा न्याय हो जायगा और सेशन जज के यहां नहीं होगा यह गलत हैं। गलतियां सब जगह होती हैं। हाईकोर्ट्स में भी गलतियां होती हैं। हाईकोर्ट में आपने यह जो अपील का मौका दिया हैं, इससे हाईकोर्ट में काम बहुत बढ़ जायगा। हाईकोर्ट्स के पास बैसे ही काफी काम करने को पड़ा हुआ हैं और आपने खुद अपनी जो रिपोर्ट दी हैं उसमें लिखा हैं कि हाईकोर्ट्स में काफी काम का एरियर पड़ा हुआ हैं और जजों की तादाद काफी न होने के कारण वहां काम पूरा नहीं हो पा रहा हैं और इस पर आप यह जो हर इलाके को एक्स्प्टल के खिलाफ हाईकोर्ट्स में अपील करने का मौका दें रहे हैं इससे नतीजा यह होगा कि वहां काम और ज्यादा बढ़ जायगा जो आलरंडी ज्यादा हैं। आप हाईकोर्ट्स के जजों की तादाद बढ़ा नहीं सकते क्योंकि आपके पास पैसा नहीं हैं इतना कि उनकी तादाद बढ़ायें। इसलिये जरूरी हो जाता हैं कि आप सेशन जज को अख्तियार दें कि वह उन अपीलों पर फंसला दें और मीजस्ट्रेटों के फंसलों के खिलाफ जिन लोगों को एतराज होगा वह सेशन जज के पास अपील करके न्याय ले सकें और मैं समझता हूं कि इससे उनको तसल्ली हो जायगी कि जज ने हमारी बात सुन ली और लॉजर कोर्ट की गलती को दुरुस्त कर दिया। अगर हम ऐसा करें तो हम देखेंगे कि हाईकोर्ट्स में जाने वाली हजारों अर्जियां में सिर्फ दो, चार ही बाकी रह जायेंगी जो हाईकोर्ट्स जा सकेंगी और बाकी को सेशन जज के वहां से तसल्ली हो जायगी और सारा मामलत सेशन जज के वहां से फंसला हो जायेंगे। हमें हाईकोर्ट्स के जजों के काम को और बढ़ाना नहीं चाहिये, हमें उनके काम को हलका करना हैं, हाईकोर्ट्स और सुप्रीम कोर्ट्स के ऊपर हमें भार नहीं हालना चाहिये बल्कि यह चाहिये कि वहीं हेडक्वार्टर में सेशन जज की अदालत में उन अपीलों को तय करवा दें। मैं गवर्नमेंट से अपील करता हूं कि आप इस न्याय के लिये जिसकी जिम्मेदारी आप पर हैं, मेरे सुझाव को स्वीकार करने की कृपा करें आप पर सिर्फ यही

[Shri R. D. Mishra]

जिम्मेदारी नहीं है कि मुल्जिम और डाकू लोग सजा पा जाय। सुप्रीम कोर्ट तक पहुँचने का हक कुछ कॉगनिजेंबल केंसेज के अन्दर मुस्तगीसों को देना ही चाहिये जिनमें पुलिस मुकदमा नहीं चलाती और नान-कॉगनिजेंबल केंसेज में पुलिस मुकदमा नहीं चलाती है दस्तअंदाजी नहीं करते हैं, उन सब में इस्तगासे को ऊँची अदालतों में अपील करने का हक दिया जाना चाहिये। बहुत से दस्तन्दाजी के मुकदमे होते हैं, लेकिन आप के रूल्स के मुताबिक पुलिस उन में देखल नहीं दे सकती। वहाँ मुद्देइयाँ को स्वयं पर इस्तगासा देना पड़ता है। तो मारपीट आदि जितने जिस्मानी नुकसान पहुँचाने वाले जुर्म हैं, सिवा कल और संगीन बलबों के जितने जरायम हैं वह सब इस्तगासे के ऊपर ही चलते हैं। मान लीजिये, मारपीट हो गई, हड्डी टूट गई या और कहीं चोट लग गई, तो मुद्देई इस्तगासा दायर करता है, पुलिस नहीं करती। जब आप पुलिस को अपील का हक दे रहे हैं तो इन बच्चों को भी वह हक क्यों न दिया जाय। मारपीट हो गई, हड्डी टूट गई, आदमी मर रहा है लेकिन कानून के मामले में गलती कर के मीजस्ट्रेट ने दूसरी पार्टी को कुछ फायदा दे दिया। किसी वकील ने कोई पुरानी रूतिग उठा कर दिखला दिया कि इस रूतिग के मुताबिक मुकदमा चल ही नहीं सकता और उस रूतिग को देख कर मीजस्ट्रेट ने कोई गलत फैसला दे दिया तो कम से कम मुस्तगीस को यह मौका तो देना ही चाहिये कि वह कह सके कि इस तरह से उस का मुकदमा गलत तय किया गया। जो वाकई मुल्जिम हैं, जिस ने मारपीट की है, चोरी की है, डाका डाला है, उस को सजा होनी ही चाहिये और मुस्तगीस को इस का मौका जरूर देना चाहिये कि वह गलती की ही ऊपर की अदालत से दुरुस्ती करवा सके। असल में इस की जिम्मेदारी तो गवर्नमेंट की ही होनी चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट के न्यायलय में, कानून आता है जिस के घर चोरी होती है, जिस के साथ ज्यादाती होती है, डाका पड़ता है।

तो वह इस्तगासे पर चलते हैं। इस में आप को जनता की मदद तो करनी ही चाहिये अगर उस को न्याय ठीक से नहीं मिल पाता है। जो कोई आप के यहाँ न्याय लेने के लिये आता है उस के साथ आप न्याय कराने की कॉशिश कीजिये। अगर मीजस्ट्रेट या जज कहीं पर गलती कर जाय तो उस गलती की दुरुस्ती होनी ही चाहिये। न्याय की अदालतें इसीलिये होती हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मीजस्ट्रेट की अपील जज के यहाँ होनी चाहिये और जज की अपील हाईकोर्ट में होनी चाहिये और इस तरह से न्याय होना चाहिये। आज कल समाज की हालत बहुत बिगड़ी हुई है। चारों तरफ चोरी डकैती, जुल्म, मार पीट, हर तरह की वारदातें हो रही हैं। हमें ला एंड आर्डर कायम करना है और गवर्नमेंट की जिम्मेदारी है ला एंड आर्डर कायम रखने की। जो जनता के आदमी कम्लेनेन्ट की शब्द में आ कर आप की मदद करना चाहते हैं कि आप उन की सहायता करें। अबल तां गवर्नमेंट का फर्ज है कि सब जुर्मों की तहकीकात करे और मुजरिमों को सजा करायें। लेकिन अगर किसी बजह से कॉगनिजेंबल और नान-कॉगनिजेंबल का फर्क हो गया है तो जो मुद्देई और मुस्तगीस अपना इस्तगासा दायर कर के आप के काम को हल्का करना चाहें, मुल्जिमों को सजा कराना चाहें और कहें कि आप की अदालतों से उन के साथ न्याय होना चाहिये तो आप का फर्ज है कि आप उन को मौका दीजिये। उस के रास्ते में जो कानूनी रुकावट हो जिस की वजह से वह न्याय नहीं पा रहा है, उस को भी आप को दूर करना चाहिये। यही मेरा निवेदन है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस की तार्हद करता हूँ। आप ने जो यह बात रखी है कि एक्विटल के खिलाफ अपील होनी चाहिये, यह मुझे पसन्द है और आप ने यह निहायत माकूल चीज रखी है।

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): I rise to support this amendment which provides for appeal against acquittals to be laid before the Sessions Judges. It is really a good and happy departure. to which the hon. Home Minister has agreed, that there must be provision for appeals against orders of acquittal. It was a great handicap so far against informants and against complainants. It was a daily occurrence that Magistrates sitting in mofussil generally controlled by the executive—in 99 per cent. of cases controlled by the executive—afraid of displeasing the party in power, deliver judgment according to the dictates of such persons, and if the poor complainant fell foul of any such person, his case, however strong it might be, was sure to be a failure and the one sentence which is easy for the Magistrate to use is "benefit of doubt". Even for the purpose of benefit of doubt, the man would be left off and it was a very process. I do congratulate the Home Minister for having provided this salutary appeal, but it is not enough. You should also provide for this appeal to lie before the Session Judge, because High Courts are situated very far away. Only on one occasion Government agreed—perhaps on political grounds—that the High Courts should be nearer and that was only for Travancore-Cochin where the High Court was provided for the Trivandrum district. But it was not so in Rajasthan and in Madhya Bharat where worse conditions are obtaining. In Rajasthan, if a complainant has to file an appeal from one end of the Southern Rajasthan, he will have to travel practically for 48 hours before he can reach the seat of the High Court. Even the Courts of the Sessions Judges are very far away from the interior. Under those circumstances, it would be quite fit and proper that the amendment so considerably moved may be accepted. I do not know if the words of my predecessors have produced any effect on the mind of the Home Minister. If he has already made up his mind and does not want to listen to anything, he will not agree to any amendment; but sometimes he also sees reason

and I hope he will see that on this occasion also.

The difficulties are very great as I have enumerated. The client has got to go to the High Court and engage a senior counsel. The moment the counsel comes across such a client, who has travelled all the way for 48 hours for filing an appeal, his is tempted to ask for a greater amount of fee than would have been asked if the man came from that locality. Therefore, for safeguarding the interests of such clients and to provide not only a speedy but also a cheap remedy, it is desirable that the Sessions Judge may also be empowered to hear such appeals. If such power is given, there will be another effect which is likely to result, namely, that the accused person will also derive some benefit, because as the clause now stands, the appeal in all such cases under section 417 would lie to the High Court and the accused person would have to go, on receipt of a summons, to the High Court. If the Sessions Judge is provided with this power to hear the appeal, the accused also will get this benefit and he may not have to travel long distances and may not have to incur very huge expenses to conduct his defence. On that principle also I say that this salutary amendment, which has been suggested by Shri Rane, may be accepted. The right of appeal which has been given to the Government, without any difficulty whatsoever, without putting any obstacle in the way of the Government, namely, that the Public Prosecutor may just file the appeal, has not been conceded to the ordinary complainant.

Difficulty is created by the provision of sub-section (3) of section 417. Such an appeal would lie only if the High Court gives special leave to appeal. If a man wants to appeal against an order of acquittal, he will have to go twice to the High Court. First, he must obtain leave to appeal. After leave is granted, he will have to file an appeal. After the appeal is admitted, he will have to go for the hearing.

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

That would be an expensive business. I therefore submit that the provision that he must get special leave to appeal before filing an appeal should also be dropped. This measure is not very necessary. On the contrary, it is highly discriminatory. It would be better if the High Court were to dismiss the case in limine. That would be a different thing. You allow Government officers to file appeals without any consideration whatever, as a matter of course. While their appeals will be entertained and notice will be issued, in the case of the ordinary complainant, this handicap would be placed, which is very discriminatory. I submit that even if the Government is not prepared to accept the amendment which has been suggested by Shri Rane, it must accept this proposition that there should not be any discrimination between a litigant and litigant, even if a litigant happens to be Government. In that case, an appeal may also be allowed to be filed as a matter of course. With these words, I support the amendment.

Dr. Katju: In so far as the arguments against appeals against acquittal are concerned, completely, I think it is too late in the day to put forward that proposition. Even our Constitution accepts the position that there can be appeals against acquittal. I wish to draw your attention to article 134 of the Constitution which confers jurisdiction on the Supreme Court to entertain appeals in criminal matters and article 134(1) (a) says that the Supreme Court can entertain an appeal where the High Court—

“has on appeal reversed an order of acquittal of an accused person and sentenced him to death;”

The Sessions Judge acquits an individual in a murder case under section 302. The Government appeals against that acquittal. The High Court sentences him to death. Against that order sentencing him to death, an appeal to the Supreme Court is provided. This whole pro-

cedure is based upon the supposition that there is an appeal against an order of acquittal. The High Court entertains it, hears the appeal and allows it and sentences the man to death.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Against conviction: not against acquittal.

Dr. Katju: The appeal to the Supreme Court lies against the conviction of the High Court. The High Court had entertained an appeal against acquittal by the Sessions Court. That is what I am saying. In India, an appeal against acquittal has been accepted for the last 100 years or more than that. Please remember also that an appeal against acquittal is not merely filed on facts, but very often, it becomes the machinery for obtaining an authoritative judgment of the High Court on important questions of interpretation, particularly of local laws. A Magistrate may acquit a prisoner under the Excise Act or other Acts. Then there is an appeal and the High Court may sentence the man to a fine of Rs. 5/-, but it entertains the appeal. Therefore, I say that it is too late in the day to expect that appeals against acquittals should be abolished completely.

Now comes the reverse proposition. Many Members have put forward the desirability of allowing a right of appeal to a private complainant. My hon. friend Shri S. S. More, who is not here, suggested that a private complainant should be left to go to the District authorities, to go to the local Government and try to persuade them that he has received no justice, that he has been a victim of injustice in the hands of a Magistrate and therefore the Government should file an appeal against acquittal in his case. That is one way of looking at it. That is exactly what happens these days. Private persons who suffer from a sense of injustice, knock about from door to door, they go to the Superintendent of Police, to the District Magistrate, to the headquarters of the Government and I know it for a fact that all these re-

quests are seldom accepted. They are summarily rejected. I suggest that this sense of frustration is no good. My hon. friends put forward a lurid picture of the enormous expenses. When I heard this, I thought to myself, where the enormous costs come in. If a man from Sholapur has to go from the Bombay High Court, I imagine a third class ticket will be about Rs. 5/- or Rs. 6 or say Rs. 10.

Shri Rane: Advocate's fees.

Dr. Katju: I shall come in a minute to that. I am now on the question of going from one place to another. One picture is this. He goes to the district headquarter and perhaps he may have to spend eight annas or one rupee.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Why not take going from Thana to the High Court? He can walk. I was talking of from Kushalgarh to Jodhpur. The fare is Rs. 18/-.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friend is forgetting that in the total of the law costs, the travelling expenses is a very small and insignificant proposition. The picture that was being painted reminded me of the old days, 100 years ago, when a man wanted to go from Saharanpur to Allahabad, he had to undertake a month's journey on a bullock cart. Those days are gone. You can now go by rail within three hours.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You are lucky..

Dr. Katju: What is the good of your standing up? It is not a point of order. I am sorry. (*Interruption*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I only say you are lucky in this side.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member said many things. The hon. Minister is replying to those points.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am only giving information.

Dr. Katju: I do not want it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister is aware of the conditions in India. Order, order; both the hon. Members must sit down. There is no good of the hon. Member inter-

rupting. Hon. Members on all sides are fully aware of the conditions in this country. There is a desert in one portion of Rajasthan. Possibly, a client has to go on a camel's back or in a bus or he has to walk. These are all small points for the consideration of the hon. Minister.

Dr. Katju: I was suggesting that the best thing is one appeal to the highest court.

My hon. friend said, if you go to the District Court, you will get a cheap advocate; but if you go to the High Court, you have to engage an expensive advocate. I do not agree. In the High Court, you can get competent, clever, experienced advocates for reasonable fees. The man who wants to file an appeal, goes so far as his purse permits, engages an advocate and gets the matter done. The point is, do you want two appeals or one appeal. If the man goes to the High Court, the matter is finally disposed of. If he goes to the Sessions Judge and if the application is dismissed, he will feel that the Sessions Judge has not understood his case and that if he had gone to the High Court, he would have had better justice. It is much better to send him to the High Court straightaway rather than after a sense of injustice and frustration, that he would have got justice in the High Court and not here, there or anywhere else.

Secondly, two appeals are to be avoided any way. There is no question of reflection on any Magistrate. But, I was rather amused to hear this. If a Magistrate convicts, we have been hearing for the last two or three weeks of the Magistrate being under the thumb of the police, incompetent and their judgment being entitled to no weight. But, their judgment of acquittal bears the hall mark of competence, impartiality, commonsense and everything.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: In spite of the police.

Dr. Katju: The point, therefore, is there is a presumption of innocence. That presumption becomes strengthen-

[Dr. Katju]

ed by an acquittal. The High Court looks at it in that way. In acquittals by Government, we know that the Government is impartial in such matters. The Government have no personal predilections, and the Government is advised by the Legal Remembrancer, the judicial officers and the Government Advocate. All of them are independent persons. When there is an appeal filed under the Criminal Procedure Code, it is open to the High Court to dismiss it straightaway without issuing notice to the respondent. Sometimes they do it. So far as the private complaints are concerned, it is a matter of justice or it is a matter of expediency so that there may not be frivolous cases. We say, apply for leave to appeal. And when leave is granted, there is no further hearing under what you may call order 40 and the rules thereunder, under the Civil Procedure Code. It is a summary hearing, and the matter does not go further, though the High Court appeals its mind if there is something to be said there against leave being granted. I am, therefore, unable to accept the suggestion on the one side that there should be no appeal against acquittal by private complainant, and on the other side that there should be an appeal before the Sessions Judge, because, I submit, this will be laying down a very false precedent.

Lastly, something was said about clause 87, about the accused on a non-bailable offence and convicted of a non-bailable offence. This thing was inserted in the interests of the accused, because I was told that sometimes what happens is that a man is accused of a non-bailable offence but the Magistrate does not convict him of the offence on which he is charged but convicts him of a less serious offence which is bailable in nature. When the Magistrate convicts a man with, say, three charges framed against him: an application is made to the Magistrate, saying, "Please allow me a bail for two or three days to enable me to file an appeal." The

Magistrate says, "I am very sorry, I am powerless, because this man was accused of a non-bailable offence. It is true that I have convicted him for a bailable offence, but there is a restriction." What I wanted was, after conviction, every accused person will be entitled to intermediate bail, provided he is convicted of a bailable offence. If he is convicted of a non-bailable offence, then, it is only the Sessions Judge who can give him bail. I submit there must have been some misapprehension. It is really in favour of the accused person. I submit, therefore, that these proposals should be accepted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the amendments to the vote. I shall first take up clauses 81 to 84.

The question is:

"That clauses 81 to 84 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 81 to 84 were added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I now come to clause 85.

Shri Rane: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put the other amendments to the vote.

The question is:

In pages 23 and 24, for clause 85, substitute:

"85. Omission of section 417 in Act V of 1898.—Section 417 of the principal Act shall be omitted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 23, line 45, omit "or appellate".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

In page 24, omit lines 7 to 19.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

"That clause 85 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 85 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

In page 24, line 27, for "an opportunity" substitute:

"a reasonable opportunity".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

"That clause 86 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 86 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

In page 24, for lines 31 to 33, substitute:

"(a) in sub-section (2A), for the words 'other than a person accused of a non-bailable offence' the words 'other than a person sentenced to death or imprisonment for life or imprisonment exceeding two years' shall be substituted;"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, amendment No. 629.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It does not arise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Oh, it is barred. All right.

The question is :

"That clause 87 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 87 was added to the Bill.

Clause 88 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 89 to 96 and 98 to 102

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we shall take up clauses 89 to 102, except clause 97. Amendments to these clauses may kindly be passed on to the officer at the Table. In the meanwhile discussion will go on.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: In this group of clauses, there is one very important clause which concerns the civil rights not only of the accused persons but of the citizens as a whole in a country like ours where the investigation machinery is so corrupt and where the police and the executive are so callous about the rights of citizens. That is the clause which seeks to amend section 497. Section 497 is the section which empowers the Court to grant bails in non-bailable cases. As it is well known to every one who knows anything of criminal procedure, under section 496, any person accused of a bailable offence has a right to get bail from the Court. But in non-bailable offences, the right is discretionary in the Court to allow bail. We find that in our country, even though there is a right to get bail in a bailable offence, yet in several cases the police manage it in such a way, they influence the Magistrates in such a way, that they impose such a heavy bail that it is impossible for the accused to take it. This happens in many bailable cases, but in non-bailable cases, all sorts of impediments are put before the accused in the matter of obtaining bail, particularly when the police have a grudge against the accused, particularly in political cases and cases of that kind where the police are interested in harassing the accused persons. As I have stated, I have seen cases going on for four years, the accused being kept in custody on very serious charges which were only put in in the police papers in order to justify the keeping of the accused in jail. This is the background, this is the situation in which

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

we must give thought to the section empowering Courts to release accused persons in non-bailable cases.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

There are many non-bailable cases, many offences of a minor nature which are non-bailable offences. Even in those offences, there is a potent machinery in the hands of the police to harass the accused, to harass persons whom they choose to implicate in connection with cases and against whom the cases may not succeed in the end, but the object of harassing is achieved. Therefore, there should be some definite checks in the matter of refusing bail.

We know so many devices by which bail is refused or bail is not granted. Whoever has practised in Criminal Courts is aware that Magistrates, even in a case where there is a good case for granting bail, postpone the granting of bail, keep on harassing the accused by calling for the investigating officer's report. I have seen many cases myself where the Magistrate has first given about three days time to the investigating officer to report. Then after three days, the investigating officer has not submitted any report, he has got another four days, then perhaps another two days. In this way, the bail application has not been disposed of. It is being kept pending and the accused has been kept in custody for no fault of his. The investigating officer in his turn takes his time and thinks that he will get away with it in the Court of the Magistrate. This is what happens. That is one device to defeat the provisions as regards bail.

The other device is to ask for excessive bail or for a excessive number of sureties and that way to defeat the bail. I have seen in many cases there has been perhaps a bail of Rs. 500 but it has been provided that he should furnish two sureties of the like amount. The result is that he has to pay the sureties the same

amount of money as he would have to pay if he had taken a bail for Rs. 1,000. This is another way.

There are many ways, but I can only think of two or three ways just at present. The third way, of course, is to refuse bail on very flimsy grounds.

The accused and the citizens as a whole should have a definite guarantee against this atrocious manner of keeping them in custody and depriving them of their liberty for no rhyme or reason.

Therefore, what I have suggested in my amendment Nos. 569 and 570 is just and reasonable, that is to say, that bail should be granted except in exceptional cases, when it is clear that the hearing of the case cannot be concluded within sixty days from the date of the first arrest of the person. Here, what is provided is that bail should be granted if the case cannot be concluded within sixty days from the date fixed for commencement of the trial. That is an absurd provision. That provision has no meaning at all, because very few cases perhaps last for sixty days from the beginning of the trial, but the problem is not that the accused are kept in custody during the trial because in most cases when the charge sheet is given, the trial is finished in sixty days, and even in cases where trials are not finished before Magistrates in sixty days, bail is usually granted after the charge sheet is given. The point is not that the trial lasts sixty days, the point is that the accused may have to spend months, or sometimes even a year or two in custody, although finally it turns out that he can be only put up for a very slight offence for which bail should have been given on the very first day. Therefore, I would submit that it must be provided that the length of time to be fixed for detaining an accused person in custody must be fixed not with reference to the length of his trial, but with reference to the period between his first

arrest and the conclusion of his trial. It must be provided that in no case, excepting in very exceptional cases, the accused must be kept for more than sixty days after he has been arrested without releasing him from custody.

Let us remember that this provision applies not to very serious cases. It applies only to cases where Magistrates try the accused. It does not apply even in commitment proceedings, because the provision is that his trial must finish, not his enquiry. Therefore, there can be no argument that this provision would let off people guilty of very serious offences. I would strongly urge upon the Home Minister to show at least this much consideration for the civil liberties of the citizens and to save them from interference by the callous executive and the corrupt police machinery. Therefore, I have proposed that if the trial cannot be completed within sixty days of his first arrest, he should be released on bail if he has been in custody for any part of the period. In the Bill it is provided that he must be in custody for the whole of the period. I do not see what the meaning of this provision is. Why should we insist that an accused should undergo an unsentenced imprisonment of two months before he is released on bail. Therefore, if he has been in custody for any part of the period, if he has been in custody say for a day even and it is found that his trial cannot be finished in sixty days' time, he should be released on bail. There is a good case for releasing him on bail.

3 P.M.

I have no amendment to that clause, but yet there is a clause which provides that the evidence of Chief Inspector of Explosives and the Director of the Fingerprint Bureau may be given on affidavit. I cannot for the life of me see why such a peculiar provision should be made. I can understand about the Chief Inspector of Explosives, but regarding the Director of the Fingerprint Bureau, I am absolutely at a loss to understand. The Director of

the Fingerprint Bureau will give precisely that very evidence which will establish the identity of the accused, and you can always expect that his evidence will be very hotly challenged and there can be no question of his evidence at least being let off without a cross-examination. In these circumstances, I do not see what purpose will be served by making that his evidence should be given on affidavit.

There are other minor clauses on which I might have had to say something, but I am not going to take the time of the House with them. I shall only submit about the other clauses to which I have amendments. There is clause 105, to which I have an amendment which seeks to restore the position as it was in the Bill as it was presented before the House. Now, in the Bill as it was presented to the House, it was sought to be provided that when a case triable by jury was tried without a jury, if the accused took objection before the Court recorded its finding, then the trial would be vitiated and illegal and there would be a jury trial. It is now sought to be provided that the accused must record his objection before the Court proceeds to record evidence. Now, I submit it is meaningless. The very idea of enacting such a provision is that when the accused is aware that a case that should be tried by jury is being tried without a jury, he should make his objection with utmost expedition. Now, we know that in a Sessions case, the recording of the evidence starts at once. Therefore, before the accused has had any opportunity to realise what is happening, he is asked to take the objection. That is grossly unfair; that is absolutely subversive of a jury trial and I oppose it hammer and tongs. I, therefore, suggest the acceptance of my amendment No. 639 which seeks to restore the position as it is at present and as it was even in the Bill when it was presented before the Select Committee. I am sorry, there is a mistake. I think the number of the amendment is 638, to clause 100.

Mr. Chairman: The words are "in which such affidavit is affirmed or sworn".

Shri Sadhan Gupta: My reference was to clause 100, insertion of new section 510A.

Mr. Chairman: It is all right. It fits in there.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: That is the amendment, i.e. No. 638, which I recommend for acceptance in clause 100. That is all I have to say.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): I do not know whose brainwave is clause 90 which incorporates a new section, 479A, and lays down a special procedure in certain cases of false evidence. My experience, and I hope, your longer experience, will support what I am saying. There is absolutely no difficulty today in making a complaint in case of perjury under the procedure which we have now got. What is the point of having a special procedure for prosecuting a man for perjury or for giving false evidence in a Court of law? We have got some high-sounding expressions. If you kindly look at page 25, lines 5 and 6 you will find: "for the eradication of the evils of perjury and fabrication of false evidence and in the interests of justice, it is expedient that such witness should be prosecuted by him, the Court shall at the time of delivery of the judgment order the prosecution of that man without making any inquiry". So far as I can find out, the only difference is that there should be no preliminary inquiry, which is now required under section 476. I would have liked some explanation for this procedure. You know in the original Bill of Dr Katju, one of the most controversial and one of the most criticised measures or provisions was the old clause 92 which purported to prescribe a summary procedure for punishment for false evidence. That was a wonderful provision, and I am happy that the Select Committee had turned it down. It was impossible for any man with any sense of responsibility

to accept that kind of summary procedure for punishment. The Court was authorised to try a man summarily. If he is in the witness box and said something and the Court warns him and he says 'Yes, that is true', immediately the Magistrate or Judge can punish him and sentence him to simple imprisonment. That was a very extraordinary, almost startling, provision, and I entered my caveat against such a provision being made. I pointed out that anybody who had anything to do with the administration of law and justice, knew that in a particular stage of the trial, a particular witness might come to the witness box and might deny the signature which, *prima facie*, might seem to be his. Naturally the Judge is bound to infer, *prima facie*, he is impelled to infer, that the man was telling an untruth. If a Judge is given extraordinary powers of inflicting summary punishment and conviction on him, he would immediately do so. But after a number of witnesses come and public documents are brought into the picture, he might conclude that his original impression was naturally wrong and that the man was telling the truth. You have seen in your experience and we have also seen in our experience—that sometimes a witness who has never been in a Court of law or never been in the witness box before, seems to prevaricate, but is actually not telling anything untrue. He is not used to that atmosphere. Of course, professional witnesses behave better because they know the art and the science of giving evidence. So it will not be right to clothe the Court with such extraordinary powers to inflict punishment for perjury straightway in the midst of the trial.

Now the Select Committee in its report has said that that provision was no good and that procedure recommended in the original Bill of Dr. Katju was not helpful. Therefore, they have inserted a new provision. May I ask my hon. friend, the Home Minister, whether the new procedure in clause 90 is a little more helpful? What is the necessity for initiating

this particular procedure? The only thing that I find is that certain very catchy expressions, as I said, are put down therein and the only other thing is that you eliminate the preliminary inquiry. You know that Court after Court and Judge after Judge have referred to this. I will read one judgment which is reported in 37 Cal. 250:

"Great care and great caution are required before the criminal law is set in motion and there must be reasonable foundation for the charge in respect of which prosecution is directed".

They have always pointed out—I think there was at one stage a difference of opinion, but later on the different High Courts came round to the view—that a preliminary inquiry is practically mandatory. It is essential in law and without that the complaint would not be legal.

What I am pointing out is this. Will it be fair to adopt such an extraordinary procedure? Would it be right to initiate such an extraordinary procedure against a witness. I can understand that in the case of a plaintiff who has fabricated a document and on the basis of that document comes to court and it has been proved and demonstrated that that document is forged for the purpose of being used in a court of law and to snatch a decree against the defendant. Supposing a particular witness comes to court in a particular suit, say, for a plot of land or for some coparcenary property and the question is whether there was legal necessity or not. You will find two sets of witnesses coming. They may be giving contrary evidence. You have to discard the evidence of somebody and you have got to accept the evidence of the other side. Simply because you find that some person has given false evidence, would it be right, when he is merely a witness, that you immediately order, at the time of delivering your judgment that that man should be prosecuted? We know from experience and men of experience have also cautioned us against this. When a High Court Judge, sitting on

the original side and trying a large commercial suit makes a complaint or makes a finding that a particular man in the witness box has deliberately perjured himself or has intentionally produced forged documents, he is practically condemned and it is very difficult for him afterwards to get an acquittal even if there is a reasonable chance or if some reasonable defence could be put up, because, after all, the Presidency Magistrate or any other magistrate is, to a large extent, influenced by the deliberate finding and careful verdict of a High Court Judge, who is much above him in the official hierarchy. Therefore, I am submitting that there should be no departure from the cardinal principle of jurisprudence. What is the cardinal principle of jurisprudence? It is *audi alteram partem*; that is, no man should be condemned unheard. You are certainly condemning the witness when you initiate the proceedings, when you make an order under section 476 or make an order under 479A proposed by the Joint Committee. Would it be right at that stage without giving them a chance, without any preliminary enquiry that you straightaway order that man to be prosecuted? I am asking Dr. Katju to enlighten us, if he can, what is the point in this new procedure. So far as I know, no magistrate or no judge who wants to punish a man for perjury has found or finds any difficulty in taking proper steps under the existing procedure. Now, in order to suppress perjury, in your anxiety to suppress perjury—and no doubt perjury has increased and you should diminish it and every effort should be made to penalise perjury—you are doing this and it may create hardship in some case.....

Dr. Katju: Is my hon. friend in favour of summary punishment?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I have already forwarded a memorandum to the hon. Minister incorporating my view that summary punishment should not be inflicted.

Dr. Katju: If that is unsuitable and this is unsuitable, then it will be lies,

[Dr. Katju]

more lies and still more lies. How will that be stifled? Is he in favour of that?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It is very unfair on the part of the hon. Minister to say this. I may assure him that I am at one with him that perjury should be suppressed. As a matter of fact, I am asking him how this particular clause, section 479A help him in suppressing perjury.

Dr. Katju: You give us a suggestion.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What has happened till now? What is wrong with the existing code? Has any Judge reported about any difficulty? From my experience, I can tell you, whenever I wanted to prosecute a man, there was absolutely no difficulty. I simply gave him a chance to come before me. I hold an enquiry and then immediately start a complaint. The only thing is, you should give him a chance. With all due deference to Dr. Katju, I would tell him that it will not be fair to a witness, particularly to deprive him of the opportunity of having a preliminary enquiry. As a matter of fact, that has been held always to be essential. That preliminary enquiry would give him a chance to clear himself of the charge if he has some document or something to say.....

Dr. Katju: He will certainly get a chance before the magistrate.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What I am pointing out is this. Dr. Katju should realise, as every lawyer of any responsibility should realise, that when a High Court Judge or a Sessions Court orders a prosecution, that man is practically condemned. (Interruption). Should you not at least give him a chance?

Dr. Katju: No. The Magistrate or the Judge has found him to be guilty; and has actually pronounced judgment in the main case, disbelieving his evidence. What more do you want?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: As a matter of fact, you know that in some cases

although a Judge has made the complaint, the complaint has been quashed and the accused let out by the Appellate court and sometimes he puts forward some defence and he is acquitted by the trial magistrate. (Interruption). What I am pointing out is that it is only fair that he should get a chance at that stage. The principle is that no man should be condemned unheard. You are practically condemning him; you are sending him to the magistrate with the finding in the very interesting phraseology of this clause, for the eradication of the evil of perjury, for the eradication of the evil of fabricating false evidence, in the interests of justice etc....

Dr. Katju: Would you like to have this language?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: He would say, I hold this man, this witness has intentionally given false evidence in my court in this case or has intentionally fabricated false evidence and therefore I forward this case to the magistrate and so on and so forth.

Dr. Katju: Very fair.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Very unfair. This is the executive mind working and not the legal mind, I am sorry to say. (Interruption). This is not the mind of a great lawyer, this is not expected of a lawyer of great eminence. What I am to point out is this; was there any difficulty felt? Has any High Court Judge or any Supreme Court Judge said that he is paralysed because of the absence of such a provision? I have heard one thing of that great commercial Judge, Lord Justice Macaulay. He said, perjury in commercial cases in England has increased and is increasing and ought to diminish. But, he was always very firm in suppressing it by making complaints; but, never did the English judge require any special procedure for immediate condemnation along with the judgment. What I am saying is, what is already there in our Code is quite fair. The

courts have held that when a complaint under section 476 is made, it has to decide whether any offence of the kind contemplated appears to have been committed and whether it is expedient in the interests of justice that it should be further enquired into. The court, therefore, should hold an enquiry. Of course, the nature of the enquiry is in the discretion of the court. I submit that no grounds have been really put forward for having a summary procedure for punishment. It would be very dangerous. At the same time, for this innovation the Joint Committee has given no reason. The Joint Committee only states:

"When any person appearing as a witness before any Court gives or fabricates false evidence and the Court is of opinion that such person should be prosecuted for the offence committed by him, the Court which sees and hears the witness should, at the time of the delivery of the judgment, record a finding to that effect and make a complaint to a Magistrate of competent jurisdiction."

Now, the real rub is in the next sentence. No enquiry is required in any such case. I am pointing out that is not fair. As a matter of fact I remember a great judge, Mr. Amid Ali who became Rt. Hon. Amid Ali and became a judge of the Privy Council, he held that a man had perjured himself and condemned him in very strong terms. He wanted to prosecute him and then he gave certain explanations during the stage of the preliminary enquiry before sanction. You know there was the sanction and then the man gave some explanation and the judge had to change his mind. Therefore, it is fair that at that stage there should be some enquiry and the special witness should be given a chance. Now, I am against taking away all rights of appeal. I think in the new clause there is a sub-section which eliminates all appeals. I appreciate

the anxiety of expediting the disposal of cases and of punishing perjury.

If you will look at sub-section (3) of the new section 479A, it is provided:

"No appeal shall lie from any finding recorded and complaint made under sub-section (1)".

Then in sub-section (4) it is said:

"Where, in any case, a complaint has been made under sub-section (1), and an appeal has been preferred against the decision arrived at in the judicial proceeding out of which the matter has arisen, the hearing of the case before the Magistrate to whom the complaint was forwarded or to whom the case may have been transferred shall be adjourned until such appeal is decided...."

Therefore, in such cases it must automatically adjourn and must be kept pending. What I am pointing out is this. Supposing a witness had come into the witness box and he is held to have perjured. A complaint is made under sub-section (1). Assuming some parties do not come back, then the poor witness will not have any chance. It is not fair for the defendant, if he is ordered to be prosecuted and a complaint is made against him and there is no proceeding actually going on in the police court or in the magistrate court under sub-section (4). But if the witness is there and the parties do not want to prefer an appeal then he is finished. Therefore, I am asking for some real cogent grounds that the present procedure should be kept untouched.

With regard to clause 94, I am endorsing the suggestion made by the previous speaker. You will notice, Sir, that section 3A is going to be inserted at page 26, line 35.

"If, in any case triable by a Magistrate, the trial of a person accused of any non-bailable offence is not concluded within a period of sixty days from the

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

first date fixed for taking evidence in the case, such person shall, if he is in custody during the whole of the said period, be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Magistrate, unless for reasons to be recorded in writing, the Magistrate otherwise directs."

This is a salutary provision, but I am very strongly urging the hon. the Home Minister to seriously consider one amendment. The object is that men should not be kept under trial for an indefinite period of time. He must be released on bail within sixty days from the first date fixed for taking evidence in the case. But the real delay is not in taking evidence. The delay is not there. The period of sixty days should be from the date he is taken into custody.

You can have a perfect Criminal Procedure Code. That will do no good unless you expedite the improvement of your investigating machinery, unless you improve your police machinery. One object is to make the police active. That is the object behind this new section 3A. Hundreds of men are now in jail waiting there for the trial to take place. There should be a time limit fixed from the date a man is taken into custody and it should not be sixty days. Sixty days should not run from the first date fixed for taking evidence. The whole trouble is you never get the stage of taking evidence. After that it is very rarely that people are rotting in jail without any bail. Therefore, I strongly urge that the Hon. the Home Minister should take into consideration our suggestion that some period should be fixed and that period should be fixed from the day of the person being taken into custody, so that the police would be more vigilant. Then the scandal of hundreds of persons rotting in jail for days and days, weeks and weeks and months and months, the whole jail population being crowded with under-trial prisoners, under-investigation prisoners—that scandal would be abolished.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:

There is no doubt that perjury is the greatest evil and the hon. the Home Minister tried to amend the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Code. It appears he was very much disgusted with the entire idea that he had of falsehood prevailing in the courts and he made very drastic suggestions in the original Bill. I am very glad that he did not stick to those suggestions and the Select Committee has amended that provision considerably.

As it is now, it does not remain in the hands of the Magistrate before whom the witness is making a statement. He finds that that statement is false. Immediately he takes proceedings and punishes the witness summarily. It is very likely that courts should go very wrong. The changes that have been made upon the original Bill are of very great importance. Still, I would submit, Sir, that the provisions that are there in clause 90 have also number of drawbacks. So many things here are omitted that some of them are very deliberate. Going through this provision, as Shri Chatterjee has just now mentioned, we find that two things are badly lacking. Preliminary enquiry may not be unavoidably necessary. The witness is before the Court; the Court finds that he is making certain statements or he made certain statements formerly and now in cross-examination he is making a different statement or that he is being confronted with certain documents from which it appears that he is telling lies and on that account the Court may think that preliminary enquiry is not very necessary and the Court may, when delivering judgment, record something regarding this evidence also and might file a complaint against him. But, then, the other provision which is lacking is very serious. As regards opinion of the Magistrate before whom he had made the statement and that Magistrate thinks that a complaint should be filed against

him, if he wants that, that order of the Magistrate should be questioned in any higher court, it is not possible for him to do so. If there is any possibility that rests in the hands of others and that is his helplessness. What steps can he take? The poor fellow, even if he wants to do it, even if he is worried about it, he can take no steps and he is absolutely helpless in that respect. If none of the parties goes to higher courts, no steps can be taken by him and the man is punished. Then, of course, he goes before the Court, before the Magistrate to whom the complaint has been sent and it may be argued on behalf of the Government that the full proceedings are to be gone through before the Magistrate before whom the complaint has been filed. But, our experience is that, after a certain Magistrate has given his findings and reasonings, if the party files a complaint, that complaint is not a complaint like so many other complaints that are dismissed. Not much weight is attached to that. It is not like the prosecution by a police source. There is the opinion of a Magistrate and that opinion has weight over the mind of the Magistrate who is trying the case. My experience has been—and I think it may be the experience of other hon. Members who had been in practice for some time—that most of these cases end in conviction. I do not think there may be even 5 per cent. acquittals in such cases. So, if the opinion of the Magistrate has that force, when it goes before another Magistrate, that Magistrate thinks that already another Magistrate has come to a particular conclusion and that conclusion should not be disturbed unless there be very serious grounds or very serious reasons to disturb it. Therefore, there must be some remedy for this man, this poor witness, who happens to annoy the Magistrate on account of which he thinks that a complaint should be filed against him. There should be some remedy for him to go in appeal and to see that, that order—if the parties do not go up in appeal—is

set aside, if he has got cogent evidence to get it set aside. But, that provision is lacking. I think that is a very serious drawback and to that I want to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister.

Then, the other point that I find here is with regard to sub-section (5) under clause 90. It says:

"In any case where an appeal has been preferred from any decision of a Civil, Revenue or Criminal Court but no complaint has been made under sub-section (1), the power conferred on such Civil, Revenue or Criminal Court under the said sub-section may be exercised by the appellate Court;....."

In this the appellate Court also is being authorised to file a complaint against a witness if it finds from the statement of the witness that he has perjured or told lies. I think that is going a little too far. The Magistrate before whom the statement was made should alone have the right of filing a complaint. The appellate Court should also not be authorised to look into the records and after looking into the records try to find whether that person has told lies and whether a complaint should be filed or not. That right should not be given to the appellate Court; it should be confined to the Court before which the statement has been made.

Then, I could not follow one provision here. It might be argued that there is already a provision by which an appellate Court can withdraw a complaint and therefore, there should be this provision also that if the appellate Court wants to file a complaint, it should have the right to do so. In that case, I would submit that even that provision may be withdrawn and the person against whom the complaint has been filed or such remarks have been made in the order of the Court, should have the right to go in appeal against that order which has been passed against him. That will provide a remedy for him and in case nobody goes up in

[Pt. Munishwar Datt Upadhyay]

appeal, he can himself get the order set aside. These two provisions of the appellate Court withdrawing or the appellate Court filing a complaint in case there is no complaint by the original Court, are also avoided.

Sir, I could not follow this remark in this Report of the Joint Committee, which says:

"The Committee have made it clear that for the prosecution of a person who appears as a witness and gives false evidence, the provisions of this section shall apply and the provisions of sections 476 to 479 inclusive shall not apply."

That is not my reading of the section. At the bottom of this clause 90, in sub-section (6) it provides:

"No proceedings shall be taken under sections 476 to 479 inclusive for the prosecution of a person for giving or fabricating false evidence. . . ."—now the most relevant word: come—" . . . if in respect of such a person proceedings may be taken under this section."

Proceedings under section 476 are barred only when proceedings have been taken under this section.

Mr. Chairman: It is not 'have been taken', it is 'may be taken'.

Dr. Katju: It is open to be taken. It can be decided whether action can be taken or not.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: If that be the case, the position is worse: that position is deplorable. There is no doubt that enquiry is barred, but there is no such enquiry. I was going to suggest, as I submitted just now, that if this provision of withdrawing a complaint and also filing a fresh complaint by the appellate Court be dropped, then that provision might remain, that any person who is aggrieved or any person who wants to make an application that such and such a person has perjured, he may do so and enquiries be made

under section 476 of the Criminal Procedure Code. What I mean is, that Courts are also barred if this provision in the Report means—as was just now suggested by the Chair—that it is only open and not if the proceedings have been taken.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

So far as these drawbacks are concerned. I would submit that unless these drawbacks are removed, this provision is a provision which makes a witness appear before a Court almost helpless in certain circumstances. It is likely to discourage persons going to the witness box. Already there is an antipathy against going to the witness box. People do not like at all to go there. They think that respectable persons should not go into the witness box before a Court. Now, if such provisions are there, it might further discourage the right sort of people going into the witness box, which might mean deterioration in the administration of justice in the Courts in our country. Therefore, my submission is that these drawbacks should be looked into and corrected wherever it may be possible, according to the views of the hon. Minister.

The other provision to which I wanted to refer is the provision under clause 91. I would submit that it is a very welcome provision. A suggestion was made, if I remember rightly, that in this case also, a complaint should be filed by the Magistrate whose orders are being disputed by the person who does not appear when he is asked to appear as a witness and when he does not turn up when summons have been served upon him to appear as a witness. The suggestion is made that in such cases also a complaint should be filed, but I do not agree with that suggestion. My submission is that here not much is to be enquired into and not much is to be seen. If a person has been summoned and if he does not appear, or if he appears but meticulously

avoids coming to the Court and he has left the Court before he was called for evidence, in those cases the Magistrate, whose orders are being disobeyed, is the proper person to deal with it. But the provision made here appears to be rather lenient; it is only Rs. 100, and I think the provision of Rs. 100 may not meet the need of the situation.

The other thing that has been criticised by some hon. Members is this. After the period of 60 days if the case is not finished, the person who is in custody and has not been released on bail, should be released on bail. Now, it is argued that the case does not take more than 60 days. Shri Sadhan Gupta said so and all along we have been hearing from hon. Members on that side that the cases go on for years and months.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: What I stated was that it is the investigation that really takes a long time and the trial does not usually last too long. Therefore, what I suggested was that the investigation period should be taken into account, not only the period during which the trial takes place.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: I listened to him quite closely. I am not referring to his statement of today, but I am referring to his statement of other days when the discussion on the Code of Criminal Procedure was going on and almost all of them said that it takes one, year or two years—when I was speaking, some hon. Members said it takes even three years sometimes....

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Due to investigation.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Investigation also is taken along with the trial of the case. If the trial and investigation take three years, then at least the trial should take one year.....

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Not necessarily.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: That must be the proportion if you give a longer period to investigation.

As regards the granting of bail, I think in ordinary Courts, the bail shall be granted to the accused and it is only in cases where bail is not granted and the accused is compelled to remain in jail if sixty days have passed after the trial has started, that this question comes in. Sometimes in sixty days the case is not finished, and if bail is allowed, it is quite a reasonable period. To say that investigation takes a very long time is a separate question altogether. I would submit that if bail is not granted and the accused has to live for a year or two in custody because investigation is going on, that is very wrong and there is no doubt about it, and the period of investigation should be shortened. We should make a provision so that the investigation may not take too long a time. I think we should have made it in the beginning of the Criminal Procedure Code and we failed to do it. Now, when the next instalment of clauses comes in, it may be possible to make that provision and it is very essential no doubt. So far as the trial of the case goes, sixty days' times is more than enough for the purpose. This provision, I submit, cannot very much improve upon what is already mentioned in the amendment that has been suggested by the Government.

The other provision that has been made under clause 96 is a welcome provision. There provision has been made that for the purpose of determining whether the sureties are sufficient, the Court may accept affidavits. Our experience has been that sometimes when we got sureties and the sureties were present in the Court—sureties having a good deal of property also—even then, because the bond which the sureties execute has to be referred to the Tehsil Board or other places for verification, it used to take a long time and sometimes the people had to go in spite of the fact that they had sureties who were propertied people or monied people. It could not be verified and it was

[Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay]

physically impossible for the bonds to be verified within that period and therefore they had to go to jail. This provision is a welcome provision. If affidavits are relied upon by Courts, that person who has got sureties shall not have to go to jail. Affidavits shall be relied upon by Magistrates and he shall be released on the basis of affidavits. Of course, if afterwards it was found on investigation that the sureties were not sufficient, again he might be taken into custody, and I think there is already provision for it.

The only one thing that I wanted to suggest is that if these five words are dropped, namely, if it so thinks fit, the provision would have been much better. That much of discretion, if left to the Court, may sometimes create difficulties, and as regards the further enquiry as it deems necessary, it is already provided. Why should you make a double provision for that? I shall read out the provision:

"For the purpose of determining whether the sureties are sufficient, the Court may, if it so thinks fit, accept affidavits in proof of the facts contained therein relating to the sufficiency of the sureties or may make such further inquiry as it deems necessary."

Dr. Katju: It makes no difference.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: It makes no difference, but I think the wording lays a little emphasis and it may be that the Magistrates might be inclined the other way, namely, that they have the option and probably it would be proper that they should not release on the basis of an affidavit. If those five words are dropped, it might help matters further.

The provision that has been made under clause 100 is also a good provision: "the Court may, if it thinks fit and shall, on the application of the prosecution....."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: For the extent of properties, they get a certificate from the village *patwari* and affidavits

are normally accepted except in cases where they are challenged or impeached.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Now it is a very helpful provision. No emphasis appears to be laid on this side on "if it thinks fit". It may be that the Magistrate might be led to think that he should not generally accept affidavits. Therefore, I say that.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is only an alternative.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: The latter provision is quite enough and these five words "if it so thinks fit" might be dropped. The provision is:

"The Court may, if it thinks fit, and shall, on the application of the prosecution or the accused, summon and examine any such person as to the facts contained in his affidavit."

This provision now having been made, the complaint that I made in the beginning has no ground now. While speaking on the general discussion, I submitted that this sort of evidence of affidavit was not enough. This provision having now been made, I think it is good enough.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am very sorry, I do not like this provision in section 479A which has been inserted here by the Select Committee. There is no doubt that the original provision was much worse. I am very glad that the original provision has been substituted. I am referring to the summary trial by the same Court. We took exception to that because we thought that the same Judge before whom the evidence was given was not the proper judge because he has to be the Judge in his own cause. At that time, we thought that justice could not be given in a summary trial. Now also, the position has not improved. In fact, the original provisions in sections 478 to 479 dealing with the subject are much better and more sound. I do not

know what has led the Select Committee to practically overrule these provisions in respect of perjury and fabrication of false evidence. Section 479A(6) reads like this:

"No proceedings shall be taken under sections 476 to 479 inclusive for the prosecution of a person for giving or fabricating false evidence, if in respect of such a person proceedings may be taken under this section."

I understand it only means this. If it is possible to take proceedings under sections 476 to 479 of the principal Act, to that extent they are repealed. I hope I am correct.

Dr. Katju: I do say that for a living witness or a witness whom the Court considers to have told the untruth, this should be the procedure and no other procedure.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: In such cases section 476 becomes nugatory.

Dr. Katju: This is a comprehensive procedure laid down in the case of witnesses alone and nobody else.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Suppose a witness instead of committing perjury, commits forgery, what happens to him?

Dr. Katju: I think he will come under sections 476 to 479.

Shri Venkataraman: Will not "fabricating false evidence" cover that?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It does not mean forgery alone.

Dr. Katju: The wording is "has intentionally fabricated false evidence".

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It does not mean forgery alone. It may happen in many ways.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a comprehensive thing which includes forgery also.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: With great deference, Sir, I must submit that forgery under section 471 is different from perjury, under section 191.

Dr. Katju: If I may intervene, this is intended to cover the case of an individual who has given false evidence in the case or who has fabricated evidence for the purpose of that case, which matter has been investigated by the learned Judge who hears the case and has come to a definite conclusion. Sections 476 and other sections are very general.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Those general sections relate to perjury and fabrication of false evidence also. In those general sections, the language used is fairly wide to cover 479-A and at the same time, fairly cautious. Here, the fate of that witness has been practically sealed by the hon. Home Minister. That is my complaint. Section 476 says:

"When any Civil, Revenue or Criminal Court is, whether on application made to it in this behalf or otherwise, of opinion that it is expedient in the interests of justice that an inquiry should be made into any offence referred to in section 195 sub-section (1), clause (b) or clause (c) which appears to have been committed in or in relation to a proceeding in that Court, such Court may, after such preliminary enquiry, if any, as it thinks necessary, record a finding to that effect..."

It means that now action can only be taken in such cases where an absolute finding is given that this man has committed perjury or has been guilty of fabrication of false evidence. Here, the words are: "...the Court is of opinion that any person appearing before it as a witness has intentionally given false evidence..." Here, the Judge commits himself to a certain finding and leaves no loophole. Therefore, it will be applicable only in cases where the judgment is absolutely *pucca*, leaving no loophole for the accused to get out. It applies only to these cases. Where a Judge comes to the conclusion that an offence appears to have been committed, that would not be covered. It means that in a very large number of cases, a

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

person can go on with impunity speaking falsehood, committing perjury and fabricating false evidence. This is a very retrograde provision. It takes away the power of the Court. This will not remove perjury. This will only strengthen the hands of those who commit perjury and fabricate false evidence. This goes against the declared purpose of the hon. Home Minister which is to stop perjury and fabrication of false evidence. In ninety-nine out of hundred cases, no court will be able to say for certainty that perjury has been committed or fabrication of false evidence has been made. In many cases which are on the border line, in more than 50 per cent. of the cases, the Court can only say that probably this has been done or appears to have been done. He can say, I am of opinion 75 per cent. that this has been done. Unless the Judge is of opinion that 100 per cent. this man is guilty, he will not be able to proceed. It takes away the powers of the Court, Civil, Revenue or Criminal, to stop perjury in those cases where the Court is not certain that that has been committed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is notwithstanding what is contained in sections 476 to 479.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If these words were there, it is all right. If you were there, you would have got these words.

Some Hon. Members: These words are there.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: No. The words are:

"No proceedings shall be taken under sections 476 to 479 inclusive for the prosecution of a person for giving or fabricating false evidence, if in respect of such a person proceedings may be taken under this section."

This practically repeals sections 476 to 479.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Not only repeals, but does greater mischief.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: At least 90 per cent. of the cases of perjury and fabrication of false evidence, which it was the intention of the framers of the original Criminal Procedure Code to put down, are taken from the purview of the Court.

Shri Raghub'r Sahai: It is only an opinion.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: But, the opinion must be certain that perjury has been committed. If it is doubtful, he cannot take action.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would it meet the purpose if, in respect of such a person, instead of the wording 'proceedings may be taken', it is said, 'proceedings have been taken under this section'?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It would have been quite different, I agree.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Proceedings have already been started. There is no purpose in proceeding under section 476. All that the hon. Member wants is.....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I do not want an amendment. I am going to submit for your consideration many other reasons why this section should be abrogated and should not be taken into consideration. I have also given 4 or 5 amendments. This is not all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I only wanted to clear the position. Government wanted to do something speedy. We will assume that those persons who forswear in the witness box will be very few. There must be a summary procedure to deal with them. The original Bill contained a provision that straightaway the man on the spot, as if it were some small contempt case, can punish the witness.

Shri Datar: After conclusion of the trial.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can do so. An exception was taken to that because he was the prosecutor himself, and so he ought not to be the Judge. Therefore, it was thought that an independent mind should be brought:

to bear upon that. So, in the Select Committee this was modified. I do not think that the original framers of the Bill intended to do away with or abrogate that provision in sections 476 to 479. Those provisions are there.

Shri Datar: This is independently of that. Those provisions are of wider import.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any person can invoke those provisions. Hitherto only sanction was taken. Sanction has been taken away under the new provision. If the Court finds it necessary in the interests of justice, it will send a complaint. It is not abrogated. I think inadvertently, this word 'may' has crept in. Hon. Members are aware that where a revision is allowed, say, before a District Magistrate, the revision before the Sessions Court is not competent though a revision lies to the District Magistrate and the Sessions Judge. The point is, two Courts ought not to try the same matter twice. The hon. Minister will consider that it is not the intention to take away the provisions of sections 476 to 479.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The hon. Home Minister said just now that that was the intention.

4 P.M.

Shri Datar: He is making a reference to sub-section (6) of the proposed section 479A under Clause 90.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The position is this. So far as sub-section (6) is concerned, the intention of the Government seems to be a speedy punishment of the person who commits perjury. Originally, the hon. Minister intended that the very Judge before whom the perjury was committed should have the right at the close of the trial to fine that person if he comes to the conclusion that he committed perjury. That was modified.

Dr. Katju: It was slightly different. It was for a matter not under issue; it was for a collateral matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Objection was raised on the ground that the

person who wishes to bring some prejudice may do it, and therefore, an independent mind will be brought to bear upon the case.

Dr. Katju: If you question the prosecuting witness while the trial is going on, the truthful witness may not come in. There may be great injustice done to the parties, and so on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The only point is, there are other provisions—sections 476 and 479—under which, the Judge, in a calmer mood, looks into the whole matter when the complainant brings it to the notice of the Judge and asks him to initiate proceedings in a Court of law. Many things are taken into consideration in the interests of justice—whether it is the correct method, or whether it is a method of blackmailing and so on. Those provisions are not abrogated but the hon. Minister will kindly see that in all cases where proceedings could be initiated under these sections, the proceedings cannot be taken under section 476.

Dr. Katju: That is for the benefit of the witness.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In all cases where proceedings have been taken, let sections 476 to 479 be there.

Dr. Katju: Then we shall have a saving clause. It is better to have a saving clause. I shall have a saving clause to say that in the case of proceedings pending, they shall be protected.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The suggestion is that that it may be an alternative. If the Judge conducts proceedings under this section, then, no proceedings can be started under 476, or, for any reason, if proceedings have already been started under section 474, this shall not be invoked.

Dr. Katju: Supposing this Act comes into force, then, two years later, proceedings start, and then, as the object is—it can be done only under this section and not under the other one. The reason is, speed; good or bad, it does not matter. After the decision of the Magistrate, that man goes away. There are six

[Dr. Katju]

months' stay. Then, there is the appeal against the order. Then another six months' stay comes about. That was the object. I may tell you for your information and for the information of the House that 49 witnesses of the Select Committee have approved of this. The object was that when the Judge comes to deliver the judgment, at that time, he considers the whole case. He considers the evidence of every witness and if at the time of delivering the judgment,—by that time—he has come to the conclusion that witness A and witness B have told nothing but lies, then, he should send the case to the Magistrate without making any further enquiry, because he has been making an enquiry all through. He has been making enquiries from the very hearing of the case. There is no appeal, so that the lying witness may have to face an enquiry before a Magistrate within two or three weeks and the case is protracted. As lawyers we all know that if a Magistrate sends a complaint, an enquiry starts which takes six months. Then there is the appeal against the order. That takes nine months. So, we have now provided that if there is an appeal against the judgment by any of the parties, then, the proceedings will stop, because the appellate Court will then consider whether the evidence was correct or false, whether it is good or bad. But the whole procedure has been most carefully considered in the Select Committee.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I accept what the hon. Deputy-Speaker has been pleased to say. It is perfectly right. If they had written the words "having taken", the whole thing could have been saved. But the hon. Home Minister has himself made a statement that his purpose is to exclude those sections. Your amendment is not acceptable to him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not my amendment. I only made a suggestion.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I like that amendment. You have suggested it, as a result of your wide experience. We are all impressed by it. I am very much impressed by it. You have really taken away my criticism in a minute. If your suggestion is accepted it will be good, but the hon. Home Minister is not in a mood to accept it. He is always citing before my eyes the 49 Members of the Select Committee whom he has now called witnesses. He says that whatever wrong has been done, those 49 witnesses or persons are responsible. I wish those Members were here and heard what the hon. Minister is saying by implication.

My submission is that, even apart from that, the hon. Home Minister says it is a question of speed. Let me examine the speed. He says that a witness who will be examined will not be prosecuted on the basis of his own statement. On the contrary, he says, when the Judge has heard the entire evidence in the case, heard both the parties and come to the settled conclusion that the evidence was false, then, he will make a complaint! Without hearing that man against whom he wants to prosecute, without any preliminary enquiry, proceedings are to take place. The safeguard given in the original section 476 was very good. Without that provision, now, the thing would become like this: supposing I appear in the witness-box. Two years after, a Civil Court judgment involving Rs. 3 lakhs is delivered, after two years, without hearing me, without my knowing what my evidence is, without my knowing what the other persons have spoken in evidence against me, without knowing how the mind of the Judge has worked against me, the Judge wants one fine morning to deliver the judgment in a civil case and condemns my evidence. After that civil case, one of the parties—not the witness but one of the parties—takes the case to the High Court. Four years are spent there in the first appeal. The

case is not decided. Then the appellate Court will not call me. How should I know? I am not a party to that case, now. They will not hear me; will not hear my point of view. If the parties are fighting for four years, my case shall remain pending, and so, it will be hanging like a sword of Damocles. Supposing the case is then decided and the matter is taken to the Supreme Court, another four years may lapse, and the man might die within this period, and sword of Democles will still be there. So, what is the present provision? This the Home Minister calls, speedy trial. Shri N. C. Chatterjee has been kind enough to read out to us the decisions of some of the learned Judges who have been pleased to say that this preliminary enquiry is a very great safeguard.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What happens? There is an appeal against the original judgment and it is going to the Supreme Court.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Then, the prosecution will be kept pending.

Shri Datar: The complaint will be held up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, it will be held up.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: After the appeal is over. I may also read the section, that is, sub-clause (4) of clause 90 in respect of section 479:

"(4) Where, in any case, a complaint has been made under sub-section (1) and an appeal has been preferred against the decision arrived at in the judicial proceeding out of which the matter has arisen, the hearing of the case before the Magistrate to whom the complaint was forwarded or to whom the case may have been transferred shall be adjourned until such appeal is decided; and the appellate Court, after giving the person against whom the complaint has been made an opportunity of being heard, may, if it so thinks fit, make an order directing the withdrawal of the complaint;

and a copy of such order shall be sent to the Magistrate before whom the hearing of the case is pending."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What happens under the present Code?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Under the present Code, as soon as a complaint is made, he is allowed to have an appeal. Whatever may happen to the original case, as soon as the complaint is made, the person against whom the complaint has been made can go to the higher Court and pray that the complaint be withdrawn, and he may be exonerated. That is the present provision.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it not open to the Magistrate before whom the offence was committed to say: "All right, pending the appeal, I shall keep it pending."

Shri Datar: Yes, they can. Usually when the appeal is made, the file goes there. Unless the appeal is decided, the proceedings are stayed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The same thing is done here also.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Here it can be done. I have given an amendment to that effect. I knew you are bound to make that suggestion when you are in the Chair. But that amendment is not accepted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My point is it seems to be already there.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: When a complaint is made against a witness and no party lodges any appeal, then the poor witness has no chance of filing an appeal or of being heard.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: There is no appeal because he says the appeal will be in the hands of the parties. There will be no appeal no *vakil*, and no *daleel* because our reasons are not attended to by the Home Minister. Just as in the case of Rowlett case. This is a piece of Rowlett Act.

Now, I was submitting ordinarily when you send a man for being tried by another Magistrate, in that judicial

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

proceeding the accused can hope certainly: "I will be acquitted if I can prove my case, if I can prove that whatever is stated was not untrue, was not untrue to my knowledge". I believed certain things, and I had reasons to believe them. Then also, he will be acquitted. The words in the original section are "offence... appears to have been committed"—very cautious words. Now, he says definite finding—one hundred per cent finding that this man is guilty and he should be guillotined. I think it is unfair. First of all, he is not heard by the Magistrate who passes the order, and then there is no loophole left for him to escape. If the words "appears to have been committed" are there, then he has a chance. Supposing a High Court Judge or a Sessions Judge says "this man is found to be guilty of perjury", in an honorary Magistrate's Court, he will not be heard. My submission is that there also under section 476 the finding was to be recorded on a preliminary enquiry, but that finding is not that the man has committed perjury. The finding is that an offence appears to have been committed, and that is the reasonable thing. Either finish him here, or give him a reasonably good chance. Here what has been done is he has been strangled by the section and sent as a dead corpse to another Magistrate. He is not allowed to appeal; for years together this thing may hang on his head and he may not have occasion to take free breath. What for is he making this provision? What is the difficulty? What is wrong about sections 476 to 479 which have been for so long in the Criminal Procedure Code. A person who can proceed under this section can similarly proceed under section 476. If this gave more rights, if really this was an improvement, I would have welcomed it. Under section 476, if the Magistrate or the Judge of a Revenue Court or any Court comes to the conclusion when evidence is given that an offence appears to have been

committed, it can hold a preliminary enquiry and record its finding and forward it to another Court for trial. There is absolutely no difference. The present provision was very good, and our misfortune is that some brainwave came and because the summary jurisdiction that was there has been taken away, it has been thought that something must be substituted whatever may happen.

Shri Datar: Does the hon. Member desire that in place of the words "without making any further enquiry" there should be some further enquiry or show cause notice before a complaint is filed? Is that what the hon. Member wants?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The hon. Member wants to know why the change is necessary.

Shri Datar: That is the hon. Member's first contention. Assuming that this section has to remain, do I understand him to say that there ought to be some further enquiry before a Court files any complaint?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I want four things. Firstly, the Magistrate or Judge when he sends the case, should not send it in a sealed cover. He should send it in an open cover. He should say: "According to me it appears an offence has been committed", without giving a definite finding that it has been done. Otherwise, the fate of that man is sealed, especially when it comes from a High Court Judge. This is not the way judicial proceedings are taken.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Of course, the hon. Member is reversing the order. Let us start from the very beginning. I understand that the hon. Member wants that the witness against whom proceedings are sought to be taken or initiated by the Court should have an opportunity of showing cause why he ought not be prosecuted, as in section 476.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he wants also that the Judge should not come to a conclusion, but only say that in his opinion there is a *prima facie* case and say that the matter may be looked into.

Shri Datar: That itself is the meaning here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is the meaning of this expression here. It is a provisional finding and does not bind the Criminal Court at all.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It actually binds. The King is dead, long live the King.

Shri Datar: He wants to make it clear.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not the intention evidently.

Shri Datar: He will record his opinion.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Whereas it ought to be that in his opinion an offence appears to have been committed. Further, I want the right of appeal.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: "After such preliminary enquiry as the Court deems fit" would serve the purpose.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am quite clear in my mind that an appeal to that person must be provided.

Shri Datar: Two suggestions have been made. One is "finding" should not be there. It should be "opinion", and not the word "finding" as it is here.

Dr. Katju: I have no objection.

Shri Mulchand Dube: In section 476, the word "finding" is there.

Shri Datar: That we shall accept. The second objection is to the expression "without making any further enquiry".

Dr. Katju: That is a matter of vital importance.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If you are sending the man to be tried by a Magistrate, what is the harm in hearing the man? There is no question to delay. There and then he will be heard.

Dr. Katju: You are very persuasive, but you have been practising, I have been practising. It is not such a simple matter. He says: "I want to produce five witnesses." Then the summons is not served on him. He says "My mother is ill". I do not want all that.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Supposing a document is interpreted in one way, and his counsel says it should be interpreted in another way.

Dr. Katju: This is one way, the persuasive way of putting the thing. The other way is to prolong it for ages, for months.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: In a preliminary enquiry, no evidence is heard.

Dr. Katju: Let me just put it before you. The procedure which has been devised by the Select Committee is this. It is not procedure. They say that for the purpose of delivering the judgment, the Judge has to consider the whole case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why? Mr. Chatterjee seems to say that an opportunity should be given to the witness to explain why he made a false statement.

Dr. Katju: He will never come.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There and then.

Dr. Katju: Where? He should be there. He may have been examined ahead. Please remember that according to the procedure as it stands, it will be on the day of judgment. If the witness is present, have no objection, but he may have been examined two months ahead, three months ahead. He may be a plaintiff witness. In a civil case the plaintiff witness is examined in March, let us say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As soon as a false statement is made before a Magistrate or a Sessions Judge, let him take the statement of the witness there and then as to why he made a contradictory statement.

Dr. Katju: Please remember that it was strongly objected to when the Bill was referred to the Select Committee.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: At present, the wording of section 476 is very clear. The words are these: "... may, after such preliminary inquiry, if any, as it thinks necessary,..."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Home Minister feels that further preliminary enquiry may lead to delay.

Dr. Katju: That is it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Should not the witness for this purpose be asked as to why he changed the previous statement.

Dr. Katju: Suppose the point in controversy between the parties is—I am taking a random illustration—whether a boy was given away in adoption or not. There are five witnesses produced who swear that the actual ceremony of adoption, giving and taking, took place. On the other hand, it is suggested that no adoption ever took place, that the boy was not there and so on and so forth. After considering all the evidence in the case, the Judge records the clear finding that in his opinion the whole thing was bogus, there was no adoption and the witnesses had been lying.

Now, what is the preliminary inquiry?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not the only instance that will come before the Court.

Dr. Katju: There are others. I was only giving one. As my friend put it, these witnesses will be there. Please remember one thing. There are many cases where a Judge delivers judgments and he is transferred. If a date is fixed by that interval and the Judge is transferred, who will do it?

An Hon. Member: The next man.

Dr. Katju: The man who delivers judgment and on the day he delivers judgment. Either he says it in his

judgment or he records it in a separate note. He says, 'Having delivered judgment, I have recorded a finding in the judgment that this evidence is untrustworthy. In my opinion, there should be a fresh complaint'. In a preliminary inquiry, the man has got the Magistrate before him. He will go and prove his own innocence, if he is innocent.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: With your permission, I will read the words which exist in the present section which is very good. The words are:

"The Court may, after such preliminary inquiry, if any, as it thinks necessary".

What is the harm—I do not understand. My hon. friend, the Home Minister, wants that in every case one party should be challaned. Supposing he comes to the conclusion that there was adoption, then the other party says, 'no adoption', is that what he wants? The case cannot be decided in this way.

Dr. Katju: Men will go on with flourishing lies.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: There is no question of flourishing lies. When the case is being made, he must be asked, 'Why do you make this statement? What is the reason?'. After all, he must be heard like this. If he thinks that a preliminary inquiry is necessary, no oral evidence will come, but only interpretation of documents. He will show cause. What is the harm? First of all, if a Sessions Judge or a High Court Judge writes a judgment of this nature without his being heard, he is not allowed to be heard when the case is being made. I understand that the first and fundamental principle of criminal law is that when you proceed against a person, you must hear him. No order can be passed to his prejudice unless he is heard.

Dr. Katju: He will say 'I have given you my evidence. It is correct'. That is what he will say.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I will say a hundred other things. I will give an example. Here there is the question of interpretation of documents. This is the meaning of the document. I will say: 'No, this is wrong'. I will say further, 'It is very difficult. Another Judge comes after two years who has never seen the witness's demeanour. He will be able to make a case against me'. It is against all principles, I should say. If perjury is to be avoided or punished, then proceeding must be taken in rarest of cases. It is not of everyday occurrence.

Now, suppose he has accepted these two things. First of all, that it may be a preliminary inquiry or this one, that this finding is not so definite. The words are "appears to have been done", and he provides for appeal. What is the difference between section 476 and the proposed section 479A? Does he propose to take away the right of appeal? It is most unjust. I am accused of perjury by him. I am not given the right of appeal. This case will hang on my head for ten years or more. Even criminal cases—murder cases—may not be decided, according to my hon. friend, for two years. What would happen? This will go on. It is most unjust. In the other case, forgery and other offences etc. will be governed by sections 476 to 479, but in this particular case this will be governed in some other way. This is not the way of making laws.

Now, I come to the other sections. As regards appeal case, I have to submit a word.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How can there be other cases after this section is enacted?

Shri Venkataraman: This applies only to witnesses and not to complainants.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all right.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Unless the party himself is a witness.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The complainant is a witness.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: In civil cases and in criminal cases also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The accused is not a witness.

Shri Raghavachari: Even he is a witness now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can be a witness, but he may not be.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): Generally he can be, but he may not be.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Accused can be a witness now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This can be applied in civil cases where the written statements are verified. There can be perjury.

Shri S. S. More: They will give a false statement on oath.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If you kindly see section 191 of the IPC, all these verified complaints and written statements etc. come under it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as witnesses are concerned, this will be the only procedure—witnesses who are not parties to...

Shri S. S. More: Even parties will be treated as witnesses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Witnesses who are not parties will be governed hereafter only by this section.

Shri Raghavachari: Even parties will be governed.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Any person appearing as a witness in this sense—these are the words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All witnesses who are not parties will be exclusively governed by this section. If the party is also a witness, he will come under it.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: That is perfectly right.

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

At least so far as he is concerned, he will be quite immune because he will take his case to the Appeal Court—four years in a big case. For years together he will not be proceeded against.

I have done with this section. I very humbly beg of the hon. Minister to kindly consider this section in the light of the criticism of Shri Chatterjee and others and please take it away and restore sections 476 to 479, which are much better, more cautious and better considered sections.

Now, I come to clause 91. At the time when the general discussion on this Bill was on, I submitted that it was not right to make more than one provision on the same subject. Now, we have already got in the Penal Code a section whereby if a person does not come before the Court when he has been served with a notice or goes away etc., then he is liable. I do not understand why this section has been put in. It gives power to that very Court. Again, the same objection is there. After all in a criminal case, it is much better that it should be taken to another Court so that the person may have some confidence. I understand under section 191 of the Criminal Procedure Code there is a provision like that. An accused is asked whether he would like to be tried by the same Court or some other Court. I should have liked a provision like this, but the 49 blessed Members of the Select Committee came to different conclusion.

Now, I come to clause 93 which deals with section 488. I have given an amendment to substitute Rs. 300 in place of Rs. 500. I think so far Rs. 100 is concerned, it errs on the side of being a very small amount and Rs. 500 is rather on the side of being very excessive. We should not give such excessive powers.

Now, I come to clause 94, on which I want, with your permission, to take some time of the House. Now, so far as these bail provisions are concerned, I am thankful to the hon. the Home

Minister because he has put in sub-clause (3A). If the trial is very much protracted beyond 60 days, then he says that ordinarily—unless for good reasons—the man is to be bailed out. I would have liked this provision to be extended to investigations also. But even if he does not want to give this concession to the accused in the matter of investigation, so far as it goes it is an extent beneficial, because in some cases the trials also go on for a greater number of days than 60. Anyhow, if the amendment is accepted, it would have helped the accused very much. All the same, I say this, that the hon. the Home Minister is helpful to the accused in at least this matter that he may not have to undergo a long trial, though he does not seem to accept the other amendments which I have tabled in reference to sections 497 and 496. I brought in a Bill in this House several years ago which has not come up for discussion before this House. That was for the amendment of sections 496 and 497. I have taken this occasion to refer to it because section 497 is now being amended. I maintain that so far as the liberty of the subject is concerned, though we should see that no person takes undue advantage, we ought to see that an innocent man is not also injured by the fact that today the police is not what it ought to be. This is common ground that even today people are very much afraid of the police. A person would actually come before the Court and stand his trial, but for the fact that he is afraid of the police, of going to the *hawalat* and remaining sometime in jail. I have argued very many times here, and I do not want to repeat it. I have got a vast experience of these cases. I know in not one case but many cases in which people would not be unwilling to go to the Court just for the fact that they have to go to the police for some days and remain in *hawalat* and go to jail also.

In Ferozepur, where there are so many murders—it is the most notorious district in the Punjab for mur-

ders—there is a regular choki No. 2 where, while in custody people are subjected to third degree methods and are beaten. Everybody is afraid of that and many people have become dacoits and have run away. They do not want to come there. If this could be assured, innocent persons can come to court and get bail, they would certainly not fly away from justice.

Some years ago, I had the misfortune to appear in a case where an innocent person was involved. He was held to be innocent by the Sessions Judge and he was really innocent, so far as I came to know. That man was a very influential man, a moneyed man and a man of lakhs. He was implicated by his adversaries, in a 302 case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a murder case.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yes, it is a murder case. In that case, he ultimately flew away from justice and went to a renowned doctor whose name I do not want to mention. That doctor said, 'All right, I shall see that for three months you are here in the hospital'. He was suffering from hernia for the last 15 years and there was no need for undergoing a surgical operation. The doctor said that it would be a very minor operation and that he will be all right. He was operated upon and two days after he died. The Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate, both of them knew that the case was false but they were afraid to take bail because they thought that they would be suspected of having taken bribes. I appeared before the Magistrate and asked him to grant anticipatory bail. There are a number of cases—one from the Calcutta Weekly Notes case where it has been held that anticipatory bail could be taken. Here the conflict comes in. The Lahore High Court, that is now in Pakistan, held in a Full Bench case that anticipatory bail could be taken in proper cases. But the Simla Court is not of the same view. By the time I brought in

this Bill, the Simla High Court had not given this decision. I brought in that Bill to set at rest this doubt. I maintain that if a person comes to court and wants to give bail, in proper cases anticipatory bail should be accepted. Therefore, I have sought to amend section 497. You will be pleased to see my amendment. In any case, when the accused is there either as accused or who is complained of or suspected or is brought before the Court as being the accused or complained against or suspected, in both these cases the Court may grant bail. It is not obligatory on the Court to give bail in all cases. It will be only in one out of one hundred cases that the bail would be given. I beg of the hon. Minister to kindly enlarge our liberties. What is the use of having a Criminal Procedure Code like this wherein all the liberties of the people are taken away? It is only in the interest of the enlargement of the liberties of the people of India that I want to have this provision of anticipatory bail accepted by the House. This is not the only case; I have known many other cases. I have myself got anticipatory bail for many persons. I have given two amendments, which I hope the hon. Minister would accept.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What are the numbers?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: One is for the addition of new clause 93A and the other relates to section 497 itself which is sought to be amended.

Dr. Katju: You are moving a new clause?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yes, 93A and that relates to section 496 of the Act.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment is No. 635.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The other amendment is 636 relating to clause 94. My humble submission is that this provision should be made in the Code of Criminal Procedure so that people may get anticipatory bail in proper cases.

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

I now come to clause 100. When an expert comes in the witness box, especially a technical expert, a finger print expert, many questions are put to him. As you know very well, finger print experts are also subjected to cross-examination as handwriting experts and it is proved that there was not that loop or parabola and all other things, which are generally spoken about by the experts.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Would they come under the definition of formal witnesses or technical witnesses?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I think Mr. Chaudhuri will kindly excuse me and look at clause 99 where the words used are that after the words "Examiner to Government" the words "or the Chief Inspector of Explosives or the Director of Finger Print Bureau or an officer of the Mint" shall be inserted. The Court shall, on the application of the accused or the prosecution, summon these witnesses. My humble submission is that it is not only the right of the accused or the prosecution to apply for these witnesses to be called, but it is the duty of the Court also to do justice. In all cases, these persons should appear before the Court and be liable to be cross-examined. It is the duty of the Court to see that the accused is not deprived of the benefit of cross-examining these witnesses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not prevented here.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is not prevented. Ordinarily, they will not come unless an application is made. There is no obligation on the Court to call them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The word used is 'may'. You want that it should be 'shall'? Otherwise, how can the Court take it upon itself?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is not only the accused or the prosecution that is interested in this. The Court would not be doing its duty

conscientiously if it does not call these people.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am unable to understand this. How can the Court do it if you change the word 'may' into 'shall'? 'The Court shall, if it thinks fit'. If it thinks fit, it will.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am not objecting to the language. You may use, 'may' or 'shall'. (*Interruption.*) I am submitting what is ordinarily happening today. The experts etc. should all be produced before the Court as witnesses and they should be allowed to be cross-examined. I have known many formal witnesses making statements which go to the very root of the matter. I do not understand why these persons should not be produced before the Court.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is only a question of summoning.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Summoning and producing. They will not be produced unless the prosecution or the accused specifically wants it.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Their report would be evidence.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I would submit that in the interests of justice, it should not be discretionary with the Court, though it is obligatory on them to call them on the application of the accused. There is no obligation on the Court to go into the matter *suo motu*.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I have got two amendments 463 and 464 in my name. Before I come to these amendments, I want to advance one small argument about this new clause 90, that is the new section 479A. By this new Criminal Procedure Code, we have practically done away with the provision of a *de novo* trial. In other words, as this law stands, any magistrate before whom a witness has not appeared, may, at the time of passing the judgment, pronounce a judgment making comments and coming to the conclusion that the witness has done any of

the particular wrong: enumerated in the section without calling upon him to explain anything and without hearing anything, send him up for trial. If this procedure is accepted I do not see any reason why this exception and discrimination is made in favour of the accused when he goes before the appellate Court, because when he goes to the appellate Court as provided for in sub-clause (5), the power conferred under sub-section (1) may be exercised by the appellate Court; and where the appellate Court makes such complaint, the provisions of sub-section (1) apply accordingly, but it is provided that no such order shall be made without giving the person an opportunity of being heard. When he goes to a higher Court, it becomes incumbent that notice must be given and the man cannot be prosecuted without such notice. Why is a similar provision omitted where the lower court or the original Court is concerned. I see no reason behind it except that it may be argued that here in the appellate Court the man does not go before the Court, but the man may not have appeared before the lower Court also and yet without seeing him while pronouncing judgment by reading the material before it, the Court may pronounce orders of having come to the conclusion that the man has done such and such wrong thing; and then prosecute him.

I submit that there is some force, nay there is very great force in making this suggestion that no such order shall be made without giving the person affected thereby an opportunity of being heard. The hon. the Deputy Minister was probably agreeable to this, but I do not know whether the Home Minister will agree to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both of them have got only one mind.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: An adjusted mind.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: There is very great force in the arguments advanced by a very great experienced lawyer like Pandit Bhargava. A very small

change has been suggested by the Deputy-Speaker about substituting the words "have been" instead of the words "may be" in line 51.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like Hon. Members to know that wherever I intervene to make some suggestion, it is not my own suggestion. I explain what is passing on this side and try to interpret it to the other side. I have no views at all so long as I sit in the Chair.

Dr. Katju: It is a two-way traffic.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is very helpful.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: It was a very helpful and welcome suggestion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Interpretation.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The hon. the Home Minister being out when I was speaking on that amendment, has not grasped the point and instead, he has taken us—in an irrelevant manner—over the whole scheme of this Criminal Procedure Code which we have been hearing *ad nauseam* day after day. But the very serious problem is, that the word 'may' as it stands to-day would only mean.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In what sub-clause?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In sub-clause (6) of clause 90. As long as this word 'may' stands in its present position, this would only mean that prosecution under 476 to 479 will be completely denied. That is why my submission is that only because this suggestion has come from the opposition, he should not refuse to accept it. This suggestion has come from every moderate speaker and loyal Members who do belong to the Congress Party and thus there would be no loss of prestige in accepting this. That would be a very wise thing. But, as we know, at the end of the show, with all the nice arguments, when it comes to voting the whip will work and they will say "no, no". That is why I submit that you please do realise that this is a very sensible suggestion and you may accept it.

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

I then go over to the amendments which I have suggested—amendments 463 and 464 in clauses 94 and 96, in page 26, line 32.

Add at the end.

"Provided further that any person either by himself or through a pleader appears before a court and makes a statement on oath that he has been accused of a non-bailable and/or cognizable offence and desires to stand his trial in a court having jurisdiction to try such offence and is prepared to furnish bail to the satisfaction of the court for his appearance in any court of law if and when so required to attend the court may if the offence does not relate to one under section 302 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 (Act XLV of 1860) admit him to bail and thereupon such person shall be deemed to be on bail for the purposes of this Act and with relation to the accusation for which a prosecution may be launched thereafter."

Many times it happens that accusations are levelled against very respectable persons. Unfortunately, in our country even to-day there are people who do not like that they should be heard cuffed and carried through bazaar to the police-station. I have seen hundreds of cases where on every false and flimsy accusations with absolutely no basis, extortions have been made up to Rs. 2000/-. This happens in non-bailable offences. The man is accused of a non-bailable offence and then the mischief begins and this is always the case. The provisions of 496 and 497 are such that money is extorted from the people who are prepared to stand their trials. They are prepared to go before courts. They want to surrender themselves before the courts, but are not prepared for humiliations before the police and the public.

One of the judges in the Madhya Bharat High Court held that anticipa-

tory bail must be accepted, because the word 'appear' does not mean that he must appear in person. The appearance may be through lawyers and yet it must be accepted. Then the Division Bench came to the conclusion after the Simla ruling that 'the Simla ruling holds good'. Whatever it may be, there would be nothing wrong in accepting this amendment. It will only help some persons to stand their trial without any fear. They say:

"We are prepared to stand our trial. We like to undergo every trouble that may arise in the court. We do not want to go to a lock-up in the custody of the police."

They are not only beaten, but they are also humiliated in a thousand and one ways. There have been cases, which I do not think the hon. Home Minister is unaware of, where people have hanged themselves inside the lock-up. Very recently, only about two years back, there was a case of a suspected dacoit who was arrested in my native town. In the lock-up he was beaten; people heard his cries, and the next day, early morning he was found dead hanging by a rope. Perhaps it was a case of suicide, or perhaps the rope round the neck was an afterthought: God alone knows, because there was no subsequent enquiry about it. Under these circumstances, it is meet and proper that some provision must be made to prevent this sort of atrocities against such persons who are prepared to stand trial. After all, bail is provided for to enable one to stand his trial. One of the fundamental principles of law is this, that a man must stand his trial. I quite agree with the views expressed by several Judges of High Courts that bail must be a rule rather than an exception. The exceptional provisions are there. You go to those exceptional provisions when it is a question of life and death. A man may do a heinous crime for

which he would not like to stand a trial. But, ordinarily, when a man wants to stand trial, it is up to us as legislators to provide facilities so that he may stand his trial and make his defence. Under these circumstances I agree with Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava who has put down the question of anticipatory bail which also is a form of bail which a man must be allowed to tender if he comes to know that an accusation of a very serious nature, of a cognizable or a non-bailable offence is made out against him.

Then I come to amendment number 464 to clause 96. I will not take a very long time on it, but it has been my experience for the last at least 25 years that whenever a bail is accepted; whenever a Magistrate orders acceptance of a bail, the police, lawyers and various other persons—bailiffs etc.—always try to grab money out of the whole business. My amendment reads like this:

"but such enquiries shall not be left in the hands of ministerial officers and no officer of the police force shall be asked to conduct such enquiry, and the Magistrate shall always accept the affidavits in proof of the facts contained therein if an advocate of the court of not less than seven years standing certifies to the correctness thereof."

My submission is only this. The Magistrate may order: "Here, accept the bail." As soon as the order is passed for acceptance of the bail, and if this mischievous sentence is there: "If it so thinks fit", this discretionary order—generally there are inexperienced Magistrates—in some cases and in some cases they are not very straight also—then what happens is, the Magistrate will think it fit to make enquiries. He knows that by ordering this enquiry he will allow his underlings to make some money. This happens daily in Delhi Courts—I do not know what it is in other places, but Delhi is very notorious for it. You go there and

see. Immediately bail is ordered, it has to be verified and this verification business always costs Rs. 20, Rs. 30 or Rs. 50 rising according to the amount of bail that is being offered.

Shri S. S. More: It is always *ad valorem*.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes; It is *ad valorem*. Whatever good that we want to do to help the poor accused person, the poor litigant, is washed away by this provision. The desire at the bottom of this amendment of the Criminal Procedure Code has always been that we must have a speedy trial and also an honest trial as the new provision in section 479A is suggestive of it. I say that the underlying desire is really *bona fide*. It is just possible that our phraseology may not be very good and the provisions that we have made are not very good, yet the desire is very transparent. The desire is that a man must get not only speedy and fair trial, but that our Courts must dispense honest justice. But, when we make such a provision and we are for it, we should also be careful that no loopholes must be left whereby dishonest people may still try to make money out of poor ignorant persons. Therefore my suggestion is that a man sitting on the bench may be dishonest, yet he has his dignity and as he sits on a higher pedestal, people look upon him as something high. Therefore, they trust him and are prepared to satisfy him in one way or the other. They say: "Here is the surety that is being offered and it is a proper surety for the amount of the bail that you have asked for." But, what he does? He does not accept that version. What we have provided is only, that for the purpose of determining whether the sureties are sufficient, the Court may accept an affidavit. Why should the provision be 'may' and 'if it so thinks fit'. These two discretionary things are in his hands. My humble submission is, that under such circumstances, if there are advocates—advocates are always present in such places—of long standing

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

the Magistrate may verify from them—I mean some other advocates, and not necessarily the advocate who may appear for the accused person or the person offering the bail—regarding the surety offered. That advocate may be able to say: "Yes, Sir; I know him. He lives at such and such a village in such and such a mohalla. He is quite good and is worth the bail." I remember, in a case at Rangoon, there was one very good Magistrate, the Eastern Sub-divisional Magistrate named U Ba Kya. He always insisted upon having the sureties produced before him and he would only enquire from Indians who had not even residential quarters of their own: "What business you are doing?" Even if he were a *pan-gumtiwala*, a betel seller, he would only ask that question. If the man replied: "I am a betel seller worth Rs. 1000 or Rs. 2000", he used to accept his bail without going into further details. That is a salutary way of doing things. So long as he was the Eastern Sub-divisional Magistrate, it changed the whole atmosphere so much that the police, perhaps, forgot the methods of extorting money from the poor accused persons. I say that a similar provision must be made here. If an affidavit is filed and if the correctness of such an affidavit is verified by substantial witnesses; persons of a reputable type and who know our present law, it should be accepted. If persons who have seven years standing as advocates of Supreme Court, say that what is stated in the affidavit is correct, then that version must be accepted.

Dr. Katju: Do you want an affidavit from the advocate?

Shri S. S. More: Even a certificate will do.

Dr. Katju: I do not understand the meaning of the word 'verification'.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I have not used the word 'verification'.

Dr. Katju: The second point I

would like you to deal with is: do you want now that an advocate should, in addition to practising before a Court, become a verifier of affidavits?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: He cannot do it under professional etiquette.

Dr. Katju: You are dragging up the profession or you are dragging it down?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not want to drag it down or raise it up in the manner the hon. Minister wants.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Home Minister does not know the practice in Madras. In Madras an advocate is competent to register a *vakalat* and is also competent to register an affidavit. All that he is responsible for while registering an affidavit is whether the statement has been made on oath; he is not responsible for the correctness of it.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friend is suggesting that verification should be made by the advocate whether the statement made in the affidavit is correct.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think any lawyer ought to take that responsibility.

Dr. Katju: Just ask my hon. friend.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not want to say that the advocate himself will make the verification. My learned friend has not followed me. I have merely said.....

Dr. Katju: You may now deny that statement because the Deputy-Speaker said that. But, the sense of what you said was that the advocates should verify whether the facts stated in the affidavit are correct. It is in writing here.

5 P.M.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Everything is in writing; what you said is also in writing. Anyhow, what I was saying.....

An Hon. Member: The time is up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is likely to take some more time. He may continue tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 7th December, 1954.
