

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have read the rules. You read them. Now we go to Legislative Business. Further consideration of the Appropriation Bill, Mr. Raju to speak . . .

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, आपने हमको अपनी बात कहने के लिए कहा था . . . (व्यवधान) ।

श्री उपसभापति : अगर आप इस तरह से बाधा उपस्थित करेंगे तो मैं लंच के लिए कार्यवाही को स्थगित कर दूंगा (व्यवधान) ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, मेरा पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है . . (व्यवधान) ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. You are wasting the time.

Now, Mr. Raju on the Discussion. . .

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, मेरा पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है . . (व्यवधान) आपने कहा था कि मैं बोलूँ, लेकिन अब आप कह रहे हैं कि टाइम नहीं दूंगा . . (व्यवधान) ।

श्री उपसभापति : यह कोई पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं है । आप पहले रूल पढ़िये ।

Unless you read the rule, I will not allow it. You read the rule under which you are raising it.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, आप कहते हैं कि रूल कौन-सा है ? आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए कहा था . . . (व्यवधान) ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप पहले रूल बताइये । मैं ऐसे आपको नहीं सुनूँगा ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, रूल यह है कि जब चेयरमैन बोलने के लिए कहते

हैं तो चेयरमैन के ऐसा कहने के बाद हमको अपनी बात कहने का हक है (व्यवधान) । आप पहले मेरी बात सुनिये । मुझे सिर्फ दो मिनट का समय दीजिए ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप क्या कहना चाहते हैं ?

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, बंगाल के गवर्नर . . . (व्यवधान) ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Don't record this. This is no point of order. As a Special Mention I disallowed this. Yes, Mr. Raju.

SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH: * * *

THE APPROPRIATION NO. 5 BILL, 1981—contd.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, before you call Mr. Raju I have a point of order. And this is a point of order on the irregularities in presentation of the First Supplementary Demands for Grants for the year 1981-82 for expenditure of Central Government excluding Railways, which is for consideration of this House. If you see the Constitution, the Supplementary Grants are being taken under Article 115—Supplementary, additional or excess grants:

“The President shall—

(a) if the amount authorised by any law made in accordance with the provisions of Article 114 to be expended for a particular service for the current financial year is found to be insufficient for the purposes of that year or when a need has arisen during the current financial year for supplementary or additional expenditure upon some new service not contemplated in the annual financial statement for that year”

*Not recorded.

Then a Supplementary Demand comes. Article 114 deals with Budget for the whole year. If something is not available or not sufficient then you come with Supplementary Demands . . . Or, ". . . if a new service comes during the year . . .," then you come with Supplementary Demands. Sir, if you see the Supplementary Demand that has been presented, Demand No. 13, it starts on page 5, page 6, item C, three amounts are, being asked. One is payment under Section 8(1) of Jute Companies Nationalisation Act 1980, payment of interest under Section 8(2) of the Jute Companies Nationalisation Act 1980, and also on page 7, payments under Section 7 of the Jute Companies Nationalisation Act 1980: one is for 1,55,000; another is for 58,95,000; and the third is for 19,63,34,000. It comes to Rs. 20,23,000,00/-. If you go to page 8, you will see the explanation for this. On page 8, paragraph (c) they say:

"Five Jute Mills, namely, Alexandra Jute mills Ltd., Union Jute Company Limited, Khardah Co. Ltd., Kinnison Jute Mills Company Ltd. and RBHM Jute Mills Private Ltd. were nationalised on 21st December, 1980 under the Jute Companies (Nationalisation) Act, 1980. Necessary provision for payment of compensation to the erstwhile owners and other payments arising under the provisions of the Act could not, however, be made in the Budget for the current year."

My submission is that these companies were nationalised in December 1980. The Budget for this year was presented before March 1981. These things could have been included in the Budget. Now, nine months after nationalisation, they come before the House asking for supplementary grant. Supplementary demand is expected to be presented when the amount already provided for in the General Budget is

not sufficient or when a new scheme comes after the presentation of the Budget. Since this supplementary grant does not come under either of these, this is against the spirit of the Constitution and the Rules of Procedure relating to the preparation of the Budget. The companies were nationalised on 21st December, 1980. And for payment of compensation you are now claiming the money. What happened in between? You presented the budget for 1981-82. But the Budget did not make any provision into account.

My second point refers to another nationalisation that has taken place much earlier than the previous one. The explanation is given in paragraph (d) on page 9. It reads thus:

"Consequent on the nationalisation of the National Company Ltd, Calcutta, on 27th April, 1980, compensation amount payable to the erstwhile owners of the company and the amount payable for the deprivation of the company of the management, were paid on 31st March, 1981 to the Commissioner of Payments appointed under the National Company Limited (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1980. Under section 9(2) of the Act, simple interest on these amounts at the rate of 4 per cent per annum was also payable to the Commissioner. Pending the appointment of the Commissioner only a token sum of Rs. 3.35 lakhs for payment of such interest for one month was included in the Supplementary Grant obtained in March, 1981. The total amount of interest payable works out to Rs. 37.27 lakhs including Rs. 3.35 lakhs paid in March, 1981."

The amount of interest is shown on page 6. For this also they have made no provision in the General Budget. This is again an anomaly. This company was nationalised on 27th April 1980. On the last days of the last

financial year, a supplementary grant was obtained for Rs. 3.35 lakhs for payment of interest. In the General Budget no provision was made for payment of interest which again is against the spirit of the Constitution and the Rules or Procedure relating to preparation of the Budget. You kindly take the Budget Manual according to which this is a serious lapse. I hope the Minister will give some explanation for this lapse also.

My third point relates to Demand No. 48 on page 25. This is a different type. Mr. Pranab will be able to appreciate this point because when we were in the Lok Sabha I raised it and a decision was given there on this. This demand relates to the Commission which was set up by the Government of India in March, 1981 to examine matters relating to economic administration and its reforms. It is known as the Economic Administration Reforms Commission. This was already announced in March. And it was mentioned even in the Budget. But they answer that no provision for this could be made in 1981-82 Budget as according to them this was a post-Budget development. Still this was a decision taken by the Cabinet and announced at the time of the Budget.

These are pre-Budget decisions and not to provide for them in the Central Budget is wrong and misleading. Rs. 20 lakhs were taken from the Contingency Fund of India on 8th April 1981 for this Commission. This is a new service. As per the ruling given by the Papers laid on the Table Committee in the other House, whenever an amount is taken for a new service from the Contingency Fund of India, if the House is sitting the House should be informed by a Resolution. The House was sitting. Some amount was drawn for a new service. That amount was taken from the Contingent Fund of India. There is a directive by a Committee of Parliament-- a directive of the Parliament (*Interruptions*) On the 8th April 1981 the

Lok Sabha was in session. (*Interruptions*)

What is it? (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He said that the Lok Sabha has passed it. But Mr. Era Sezhiyan was not there to raise objection. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: We are part of Parliament. Whenever anything comes up, this House has to be equally responsible for it, before it goes to the President. (*Interruptions*).

Therefore, this is a new service. Rs. 20 lakhs have been taken. I object to that, because this is pre-Budget decision. They should have included it; they have failed to do so. I think they should have informed the Parliament. If they have informed them. I stand corrected.

Now, I come to my fourth point (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA): You called Mr. Faju but . . . (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: He is making a full speech. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can raise it

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: These are legal points.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI (Uttar Pradesh): These are valid points. They have to come forward with a valid explanation. You cannot proceed otherwise.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Then I come to Demand No. 59 on page 29. It is stated:

"During 1980-81, consequent of increase in coastal freight rates of salt shipped from Saurashtra region and Tuticorin to West Bengal from 9th July, 1980, it was decided to provide subsidy to salt shippers in respect of consignments which landed at Calcutta Port on or before 31st March, 1981. No provision

was made in the Budget 1981-82 . . .”

Sir, it concerns a much earlier period, up to 31st March, 1981, and the decision has been taken in July 1980. When they anticipated it, they should include it in 1981-82. They have slept over the matter. Now it comes before the House as a Supplementary Demand. This is wrong procedure they have adopted.

Then, I come to page 29—another item, (b) There, it is also said:

“ANDREW YULE AND COMPANY (Rs. 1,000): Togami Project Phase—I of Andrew Yule & Co. for manufacture of contractors, Overload delays and moulded case circuit breaker is proposed to be implemented with the technical Collaboration of M/s Togami Electric Manufacturing Co. Ltd. of Japan. The total cost of the project is estimated around Rs. 298 lakhs which will be financed by the Government to the extent of Rs. 209 lakhs. Of this, Rs. 30 lakhs would be required...”

For post-Budget decision no provision exists. Therefore, they are going to take out the savings there. Then, Sir, if you come to the last page, page 42, Annexure I—Particulars of additional investment/loans made to public sector undertakings during 1980-81, etc.—it is stated that Rs. 20 lakhs were released on 30-3-81 for new Togami Project and Rs. 39 lakhs sanctioned as short-term loan on 20-3-81. These two amounts have been taken not in this year but in the previous year, and I do not know how they can be visualized in this year's Supplementary Budget. I have one or two points more. But I would raise only one more point. On page 29, item (c) is also a big one. The erstwhile Bird and Co. was taken over by the Government under Bird & Co. Ltd., Acquisition, Transfer of Undertakings and other Pro-

perty Act. It was taken over from 26th of October, 1980 and the Government company was processed. In October 1980 you take over the company. Section 8 of the Act provides for an amount of Rs. 310 lakhs to be paid for the takeover of the undertaking. The Central Government is required to pay in cash the amount to the Commissioner of Payments who was appointed on the 20th of January 1981. This was nationalised in October 1980 and the Commissioner was appointed on 20th January, 1981. But no amount was provided in the regular budget. Now, they are coming before this House and seeking a supplementary grants of Rs. 310 lakhs of rupees. I want to know why there is this inordinate delay when it was nationalised in October 1980. When the Commissioner was appointed on the 20th of January 1981, why was it not included in the regular budget?

One more point, Sir. There is a serious constitutional flaw. The amount due to the Commissioner from 20th January to 31st March 1981 can never be regularised by a regular Budget or a supplementary Budget for the succeeding years. That should have been included in the supplementary budget of 1980-81 itself. Any amount that is paid in one financial year cannot be taken over to the next financial year. These are the two points. These are the technical points I have raised. Those who prepare the supplementary budget cannot take the House for granted that they can include anything and put it before the House and that they can draw any amount from the Contingency Fund for any length of time. This is a very bad practice. It goes against the spirit of the Constitution itself and the Budget Manual which should have been followed very correctly by the Government.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I will clarify the position after the other Members have spoken.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will reply at the end.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I can only make myself heard after the din and the dust has settled down. In fact, it is a very painful job. I cannot restrain myself from expressing that it is a very painful job for me to sit in this House and keep my mouth shut and bear the pain. I am sorry to say that the present behaviour of the house will definitely make it known that the Parliament has gradually become irrelevant. I am sorry to say this because I will be failing in my national duty if I do not express it. The scope for any participation in a debate or in a dialogue or in a discussion in an objective way in public interest is not possible here. Who is responsible? I am not going to apportion the blame. It is not for me, being a part of the House, to say so or to throw any aspersions. But the nation will decide and it will not be very long before the nation decides. I have to say these few words before the hon. Members of this House and before anything further goes wrong. In fact, I would expect the Government and the Presiding authority to take this matter seriously as to how they can help the House to function in an orderly way, in a business like way and also responding to the aspirations of the people of India. I am sorry to say these things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue after lunch.

सदन की कार्यवाही दो बज तक स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at three minutes past two of the

clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is the first Supplementary demand in this financial year asking for appropriation for Rs. 420.81 crores out of which Rs. 220.77 crores are put to vote and Rs. 200 crores are charged, and the main items are particularly transfers to the State Governments. About Rs. 200 crores are transfers to the State Governments, and then there are subsidies.

Sir, before I go into the question of this demand, let me say a few words about the state of the economy. All the social tensions that we witness today in this country are not emerging merely from the social structure as has been handed over to this generation, but they are also mainly and in a large way due to the economic misery that the nation is passing through. This shall not be taken lightly. It is not merely a matter of criticism I am making. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the misery through which the middle classes are passing today, particularly the fixed income groups, is really causing anxiety. We may find some explanation to it. We may explain it away and we might find a scape goat also for that. It is not a matter of debate, it is not a matter of scoring a point. The present Government came into power, I mean the present ruling party came into power, I think the Ministry was sworn in on 14th January, 1980, and more than 18 months have passed. What has been the performance of the economy in the year 1980-81, and in fact, the Government claims a better performance than in 1979-80. There is no dispute about it. But the better performance of the economy in terms of agricultural production or power generation or industrial growth must reflect in something; say, in the availability of commodities, in the containment of

[Shri V. B. Raju]

prices, etc. It must reflect in some way, some indicators must be there. The Government has definitely some indicators. So, this House is interested in knowing the reality of the situation. As an example, I put it before the House and before the Finance Minister that it is claimed that 24 million tonnes of additional foodgrains have been available in the year 1980-81, compared to 1979-80, additional production of 24 million tonnes of foodgrains. If such a large quantity has been available to the nation, what has been the state of affairs as far as the free market price is concerned? Take, for instance, rice. Yesterday, a senior member of the ruling party belonging to my State was explaining to me, when I put the question why the last election was miserable to the Ruling Party in the corporation elections of Vijayawada and Visakapatnam. He quoted one instance that the price of a kg. of broken rice in the open market was Rs. 3. What has happened to all the additional production? Where has it all gone? And why the price in the open market is so high? Then we are parting with more than Rs. 200 crores, in fact, Rs. 235 crores under an agreement which has been entered into for the import of wheat. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for the last three years, we had no import of cereals. The Minister was good enough to answer these questions but they are not convincing. And Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is happening particularly at a time when the balance of trade is so adverse to us and I think the House knows about it. The adverse balance, the trade deficit, in 1980-81 was of the order of Rs. 5,000 crores, the highest in the economic history of this country, and the credit goes to the ruling party. If the ruling party would like the present Government wants to claim the credit for that, I have no objection. There were about Rs. 12,000 crores of imports as against only Rs. 7,000 crores of exports. With such a large

trade deficit in 1980-81, Mr. Deputy Chairman, what was the provocation to import wheat?

The Government have claimed that the sugar production had gone up to 52 lakh tonnes from some 38 or 39 lakh tonnes. While claiming actual increase of production by 21 per cent in oilseeds why do we still import edible oil? Then, you know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the last four years, we have imported more than Rs. 2,000 crores worth of edible oil and it was not so earlier. From 1977-78 we have been importing edible oil and, I think, last year we had imported more than Rs. 550 crores worth of edible oil. We can understand import of crude oil. We always take shelter under the international inflation as though that is being imported through the crude oil. No. We are importing almost everything at a time when there was a trade deficit of Rs. 5,000 crores. In one of the questions raised in the Lok Sabha, the Finance Minister answered that the reserves have come down to less than Rs. 1100 crores, which at one time went up to over Rs. 5,000 crores. In fact, our balance of payment position was being sustained by the remittances mostly and the invisible receipts, and from the Indians working abroad by their remittances. I think we should be very grateful to them that they have allowed our balance of payment position to be kept up in favour and not adverse. But those reserves have been drawn and now they have come down to less than Rs. 1100 crores. I would like the Minister to say something about it.

Now, when we consider our economy, our foreign trade position or our external trade position is very frightening. In the internal domestic economy, as I said just now, we find non-availability of essential items. I am happy that the sugar price is coming down. But this is no gratification to us. It had gone up sky high. It is just like raising the prices. Before

the Deepavali time by 100 per cent and giving a concession of 50 per cent so that we could be happy that prices have come down. It is not a question of the sugar price coming down. This has been the bane of the Indian economy that whenever the prices went up, the trade cornered the whole profit. It is not the industry which got the benefit. I was pleading in this House that a time has come for this Parliament to get seized of the matter and discuss whether these controls in terms of prices or movement or distribution, and the licensing system or the permit system that we have, have really achieved the objects. No doubt a developing economy many need some sort of controls. But three decades have passed and we have to examine this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more now.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: I just finished. And, Sir, in my opinion, these controls have worked in favour of corrupt trade, corrupt politicians and corrupt bureaucrats. These are the three institutions, the three new rich classes which have sprung up out of the working of this economic system today. We have been handed over a very corrupt system—so corrupt and so aggressive—mainly because of the mal-administration of these controls. I am told that Rs. 500 crores have been cornered by the sugar trade. I would have been happy if the industry had got the benefit of these higher prices. That would have come into accounting. The State would have collected taxes and the industry would have been able to build the reserves and plough them back for the development of the industry. It has not gone to the industry; it has not benefited the consumer. It has benefited the corrupt trade. I do not think in the world today, trade anywhere with the comparable situation, is as corrupt as ours in India. I do not want to degrade or derate ourselves. We are presenting one of the blackest pictures in our economic situation. This is the state of affairs.

At this point of time, we have the supplementary demands before us. Now, the external trade difficulties that are facing us and the inflation in the domestic economy are the two frightening factors, and I shall be happy to be told by the Finance Minister how this increased production has been appropriated, where it has gone, and whether the gap is getting widened between the rural and the urban areas, between the rich and the poor.

Coming to financial position, our Government has taken into consideration for resource position Rs. 84,000 crores plus Rs. 13,500 crores, that is, all put together, Rs. 97,500 crores for the public sector plan. Out of this Rs. 5,000 crores was the estimate in regard to deficit financing for the whole Plan period. But in these two years alone, 1980-81 and 1981-82, through which we are passing, deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 4,000 crores has been resorted to. About Rs. 4,000 crores of deficit financing has been resorted to. In this year's Budget, when it was presented, the Finance Minister had taken into account, in regard to the resources position, Rs. 800 crores from the sale of special bearer bonds. Rs. 800 crores plus the earlier year's Rs. 200 crores make Rs. 1,000 crores. But I think, the collection on account of special bearer bonds is just about Rs. 300 crores. On this one item itself, in regard to the resources position, there is a shortfall of nearly Rs. 600-700 crores. Now, deficit financing has been to the extent of Rs. 4,000 crores, as I said earlier. But only Rs. 5,000 crores has been budgeted for the whole Plan period. They may take shelter under the plea that this Rs. 5,000 crores was fixed at the price level of 1979-80. Whatever it is, our resources mobilisation position is not happy.

Then, the liabilities of the Government of India. The Government of India's liabilities are to the extent of Rs. 67,000 crores; total liabilities of the Government of India. Added to

[Shri V. B. Raju]

this, they have given guarantees to the extent of Rs. 5,000 crores, this was the figure at the end of 1978-79. This makes up a total of Rs. 72,000, Rs. 75,000 crores as far as the liabilities of the Government of India are concerned. The other day, the question was raised here, whether Parliament has any control over the executive in regard to borrowing. I was told—I was not present—the Minister took it casually. In fact, article 292 enjoins upon Parliament to make a law. It is the prerogative of the Parliament. Parliament can fix the ceiling, limiting the borrowings and guarantees. For thirty years, we have not done it. It is the failure of Parliament. Who should be blamed for it? We should be blamed. The executive can borrow any amount they can even mortgage the country. This Parliament, this Indian Parliament, is one of the weakest Parliaments, I would put it. The Government can enter into any agreement, they can sign any protocol, with any foreign country. But these things need not be placed on the Table of the House. The executive does not need Parliament's permission. They can enter into any treaty, any secret treaty. It is not a question of this party or that. It applies to any party which may come to power in future. Things can happen, as it has happened in Chad. Chad had entered into an agreement with Libya that Libya could provide military security and occupy Chad. The point is, we never discussed these matters. I do not want to repeat it. We are caught up in trivial matters. Big matters, we are leaving unattended here. This is a very serious situation. I would appeal to the Finance Minister and to the Government to bring forward a Government motion, fixing up a borrowing limits. Otherwise, I would appeal to all the opposition parties to bring forward an agreed non-official motion in the next Session, fixing up a ceiling to borrowing and to the giving of guarantees. More

than Rs. 5,000 crores have been given as guarantees. This is a contingent charge on the Consolidated Fund of India. This is an important matter.

Another important thing I would like to mention is about subsidies. Every year, subsidies are being given. This year, particularly, we are giving subsidies to the extent of Rs. 2,090 crores. In the Plan period, nearly Rs. 11,000 crores will go towards subsidies. Subsidies are increasing every year. The question is, whether these subsidies are really benefiting the common man? This is what I wonder.

Sir, I have already said about reserves and loans. I will just mention one more point, in regard to which Rs. 200 crores are now provided to the State Governments. What is the financial position of the State Governments? The State Governments are indebted to the extent of Rs. 19,000 crores to the Centre. Now, Rs. 200 crores are to be given towards clearing the overdrafts. The State Governments have become the debtors and the Union Government has become the creditor. The relationship between the State Governments and the Union Government is that of a creditor and debtor. This is the position. The State Governments have been reduced to this position. Not that I am disagreeing with the proposition of extending financial assistance to the State Governments. The State Government resources will not permit them to repay and the demand will come for writing off. We have got to determine, this Parliament has to determine, or the Finance Minister or the Finance Ministry has to tell us, what should be the relation in terms of percentage of our annual repayment or annual remittances in foreign currency to our exports? Our repayment of foreign debts must be a certain percentage of our exports if you have to keep the balance in the economy. Similarly, what is the capacity of the State Governments also? I am sure, all these matters will receive the consideration of the Finance Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Shiva Chandra Jha. He is not there. Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Karnataka): I would like to speak. Since Shri Shiva Chandra Jha is not there, I would like to speak on behalf of my party.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Shiva Chandra Jha's name is there. If he was not there, you should have sent your name. Anyway, I will allow you, but then I will not allow him to speak during the Third Reading because this has become the practice. You spare a few minutes for him also.

Yes, Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is the first supplementary demand for grants and we are considering the Appropriation Bill No. 5. I would not go into a theoretical discussion of the various aspects of the Government's fiscal policies or what ails the country's economy, except to, in the strongest possible terms and in the broadest generality, support the way in which my esteemed colleague, Mr. Raju, has spoken about the significant aspect of the erosion of parliamentary control over the finances of the country.

May I with your permission, take each of these demands? I shall raise a specific query on each of these demands and, therefore, I will be able to confine the discussion to limited questions and to the limited time available to me. Through You, Sir, may I draw the Minister's attention to demand No. 7? Here in demand No. 7, Rs. 10 crores are being sought on 'Sugar Price Equalisation Fund'. I have a specific question on this and I would seek your indulgence and support in eliciting specific replies from the hon. Minister because in each of the demands I have a specific question. My ques-

tion is: What is the landed cost of imported sugar in the country? I link this question with these Rs. 10 crores, which is the amount sought for this Price Sugar Equalisation Fund. I would request the Minister to relate the landed cost of imported sugar to the issue cost and enlighten the House of the quotient of subsidy as far as imported sugar is concerned; add to that, this subsidy, this amount of Rs. 10 crores, and the total cost of subsidising sugar sale to the nation through fair price shops is reached. What is that figure? That is on demand No. 7.

My next question is about demand No. 10. Here there is a very curious situation which I am unable to understand. Demand No. 10 relates to Civil Supplies. It says: for assistance to urban consumer Cooperatives. And subsequently, one institution is mentioned, which is the Delhi Fruits and Vegetable Consumers' Cooperative Federation. A sum of about Rs. 3,22,000 is being given to this Federation to open 23 retail outlets. Now, as a principle, one would not be averse to opening of 23 or 230 or for that matter 23 lakh retail outlets as long as essential items are supplied there, but you have chosen one Federation, one Cooperative Society, which has to be given a sum of Rs. 3,22,000 for the sake of opening a certain number of shops. What was the criteria by which you chose this Federation or this Society as against other societies? If you allow this as a precedent in Delhi, will you permit and will you grant such assistance to other metropolitan centres, other urban centres? I would be grateful for an answer.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: The other provisions you will find in the regular budget. This is a Supplementary Grant and this has been newly added. Therefore, it is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You note down all the points and reply at the end. Hurry up, time is very

short for you. He will reply at the end.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Demand No. 13 relates to textiles, handloom and handicrafts. Here the question is, how long are we going to continue sustain and bolster "suckness"? It relates to the question of taking over "sickness". How much have we spent till today on adopting "sickness"? What are we earning from these sick units? And what is the annual average assistance to these sick units? Demand No. 14—Am I going too fast for you, Mr. Minister?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, please go on. He is taking down.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This is about the Ministry of Communication.

Sir, because you are satisfied that it is all right...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You go on. No question of my being satisfied.

MR. SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Here we have sought Supplementary Demand for the Ministry of Communications. I would wish, along with the Supplementary Demand, there were also a supplementary requirement about improving the efficiency of the total Ministry of Communications, more specifically the telephone system.

Demand No. 30—It relates to the Department of Power. My first question is, there is a subsidy to the Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board to the tune of Rs. 1.46 crores. We have come to understand that the subsidy is to meet the gap between the imported machinery and that which would have been purchased from the Bharat Heavy Electricals. But whatever was being purchased from the U.K. as import was, in any case, by way of grant. Would the Minister Explain why it became ne-

cessary to import from U.K. and if it was grant, why this provision of Rs. 1.46 crores?

There is a second question, which is about the imported component in Bharat Heavy Electricals themselves. We are making a provision here of about Rs. 15 crores so that Bharat Heavy Electricals could import spare-parts and keep them. My question is, what is the inventory level today of Bharat Heavy Electricals? Do you consider the inventory level to be economic?

I then go on to Demand No. 41. This is about transfers to State Governments. This is the major aspect of the Appropriation Bill. I think on the question of the overdrafts of the State Governments, which is the bane of our total fiscal system, we have to come to a certain kind of permanent solution, because we are giving so much by way of grants etc. that I do not think that this either, or any future action that you may take, will solve the problem of overdrafts as such.

I then go to Demand No. 42—Other Expenditure of the Ministry of Finance. I can understand the subscription to the share capital of Nationalised Banks. But kindly elucidate why this loan to Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation is needed?

Demand No. 48—I am skipping quite a lot, Mr. Deputy Chairman. There is here a provision made for about 20 odd lakhs of rupees for the Economic Administration Reforms Commission. I would like to know what the composition, charter, duties and organisation of this Commission are. Whom does this Commission report to? Does it report to the Finance Minister? Does it report to the Prime Minister? Whom is it answerable to? And what work has it done so far and what work is it likely to do in the rest of the budgetary period?

Demand No. 55—Not very many now left, Mr. Deputy Chairman. There is a grant that we have made here for the Andaman and Nicobar Pradesh Council of Rs. 8 lakhs. Is it a one time grant? Or are we going to continue to make this every year? Now I come to Demand Number 62—information and publicity. We have said that this is to meet the losses of the STC. My question is, when did the STC last make profits, what were their profits and what are their accumulated losses, if any?

Demand Number 70 is about petroleum and petrochemicals industries. Now, Sir, I have one question. I will read it out to save time. What are the profits of all the oil companies in the country, what is the percentage of petrol in the total oil bill of the country, of this percentage of petrol what component is used by the State sector—the public sector—enterprises, how much is the total public sector bill on petrol and, what is the total fuel bill of the public sector?

I am skipping Demand No. 98—Department of Electronics—though I have a question. But I have a question on Demand Number 108—Department of Ocean Development. Sir, I welcome the creation of such a department. But there is a mention made here that it is taken away from the Department of Science and Technology. Then, under whom is this Department of Ocean Development? Is it part of the Prime Minister's Secretariat or is it under Shri C.P.N. Singh? Who is the Secretary who is looking after the Department of Ocean Development, how many research vessels do we have, what work have these research vessels done, do we have plans for the acquisition of new research vessels, have we got a formulated plan for ocean research, if not in a general sense, at least in India's EEZ?

One more word, Sir. I would request the hon. Minister to please make as diligent an effort to answer

these questions as I have made in preparing them.

Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hegde. You will also have seven minutes.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, what are the signs of a healthy and growing economy?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After four I will call you. We have to save time.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Sir, I think you are setting up a very good precedent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because of shortage of time I am doing this.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Thank you very much. I hope you will continue to do like this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not possible always.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Because...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go to your point. Don't waste time.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: The Minister says whatever the Government has to say. It is not necessary to have other advisers.

Sir, the signs of a healthy and growing economy are price stability, equitable distribution of profit and full employment. These are the signs of a healthy and growing economy. Against this context if we examine the present situation in every field, I am afraid, the picture is very disappointing—not only disappointing but alarming. Take, for instance, the

prices. Before going to the prices, I would like to refer to the present value of the rupee. Sir, in 1966 when Mrs. Gandhi became the Prime Minister of this country—and ever since she has been the Prime Minister but for a short period of two and a half years—and nobody can accuse, even the best advocate of this Government, the Janata Party Government of ruining the economy, whatever Mrs. Gandhi might say for the purpose of public consumption—the value of a rupee was 60 paise and today, according to official sources, it has come down to 24 paise. Sir, similarly, compare the prices of some principal commodities of consumption between the years 1979 and 1981. The price of sugar in 1979 was Rs. 230; today it is Rs. 700 to Rs. 800 per quintal. The price of jaggery rose from Rs. 150 to Rs. 300; of mustard oil, from Rs. 975 to Rs. 1800—2000; of groundnut oil, from Rs. 850 to Rs. 1800; of coconut oil, from Rs. 1350 to Rs. 2500; of vanaspati, from Rs. 153 per 16.5 kgs. to Rs. 250; of wheat, from Rs. 123 to Rs. 300; of gram, from Rs. 210 to Rs. 500; and of cement, from Rs. 25 to the official price of Rs. 30—32, but in the open market in Maharashtra it is Rs. 170, even with the good wishes of Mr. Antulay.

Sir, next is the equitable distribution of profit. Mrs. Gandhi has won two elections on the slogan of 'Garibi Hatao'. Now she has made several statements recently—I am really astounded to hear them—that today in our country people are better fed, the children are better clothed. I do not know where it is that she sees these children. Maybe near about her own house or in the Rashtrapati Bhavan or in Public schools. Sir, in regard to poverty, in 1966, the percentage of our people below the poverty-line was 28 and today it has risen to 51. Again, I am quoting the official figures. Unemployment from 25 lakhs in 1966 has risen to over 3 crores today; I do not include half-employed or semi-employed people; it is the number of the totally unemployed people.

Sir, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our Prime Minister, has started a new practice of going round the States to inspect the working of the State Governments. Sir, even the State Ministers do not inspect municipal offices. Apart from being an anti-federal act, it is fraught with several other complications. And what does find? We do not get a report. Suppose Mrs. Gandhi goes round the country and says "Produce the results", Parliament should have a report on that. The other day, she went to Tamil Nadu. (*Interruptions*) Maybe; I do not know. In case of Tamil Nadu, it may be for giving a good chit. Or, if she goes to West Bengal or Kerala and openly she makes a statement like the one she made, it is improper. In Kashmir, for instance, when she went for this purpose, she made a statement which should not have been made by the Prime Minister of this country. She said in that statement that if she wants to remove the Government of a State, she can do it like this. Such a statement should not come from the Prime Minister. Sir, if she had gone to Maharashtra—I do not know whether she had inspected the Maharashtra Government working—she should have found how many crores of rupees have been collected by Mr. Antulay in the name of the trust. How could it be hidden from her if she had really made some inspection? Sir, this Government is called—or, at any rate, that was the election promise of the ruling party—a Government that works. And how does it work? I am giving you only a few instances. Take the communal incidents between January 1980 and July 1981. For the last two days my friends over there created such a big noise about the Jamshedpur riots inquiry commission's report asking that it should be discussed; yes, of course. But how many communal incidents had happened during these 15 months? From January 1980 to July 1981, 439 communal incidents have taken place in which 523 people have died and 4,293 have been injured. (*Time bell rings*). It is not even five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Eight minutes.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Take railway accidents. During the same period, 600 railway accidents have taken place and over 1,000 people have been killed. Take crimes on the railways. In 1979 the murders that took place on the railways were 28. In 1980 it rose to 37. The number of robberies increased from 185 to 352. Dacoities rose from 68 to 120. What about bank robberies? The other day a robbery was committed in the State Bank of India. Every day or at least every second day, there is a robbery and nobody is caught. What about murders? The Nirankari Guru was murdered in broad daylight. Till today nobody has been arrested. I am only mentioning a couple of names of prominent people. Every day murders take place in the cities and in the countryside. The other day Jagat Narain was murdered. Till today nobody has been caught. Is this a Government that works? May I ask them? In regard to public sector industries can give at least 40 undertakings which are topless today. If there is no Chairman, if there is no Managing Director, who is to look after them? Who will be responsible? Similarly banking institutions. (*Time bell rings*). In the majority of banks the boards have not been constituted. Do you call this a Government that works?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rameshwar Singh. आपका भी सात मिनट है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : तीन बज जाएगा।

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं, नहीं, जैसे सब बोले हैं, वैसे यह भी कृपा करेंगे।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : कृपा करके आप बीच में टोके नहीं। आप घंटी बजा दीजिए, मैं बैठ जाऊंगा।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, कृपया सात मिनट ही लें।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : उपसभापति जी, मैं इस अनुदान की मांग पर जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के व्यय के लिए मन्जूरी चाहते हैं, इस पर मैं थोड़ी चर्चा आरम्भ करना चाहता हूँ। यह किस लिये चाहते हैं? क्या इनका मकसद है? मैं डिटेल में नहीं जानना चाहता। मैं केवल समस्याओं की तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ और एक-एक समस्या की तरफ मैं ध्यान कम समय में दिलाने की कोशिश करूंगा।

श्रीमन, पहले, देश की जो आर्थिक अवस्था है, उस पर विशेष बहस की जरूरत अब नहीं है। अभी पूर्ववक्ताओं ने राष्‍ट्र साहब ने और हैगड़े साहब ने भी उस पर प्रकाश डाला है। मैं दो-तीन सवाल खड़े करना चाहता हूँ। मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज देश में 30-32 वर्ष लगातार कांग्रेस शासन हैं—आप दो अढ़ाई वर्ष जनता शासन को भी शामिल कर लीजिए, या उसकी जिम्मेदारी मैं अपने ऊपर ले लेता हूँ। जनता पार्टी के बरत में भी मैं चर्चा करूंगा, वह भी जिम्मेदारी मैं लूंगा क्योंकि कुछ साथी कहेंगे कि अढ़ाई वर्ष आपकी सरकार थी, आने क्यों नहीं इसके लिए कुछ किया?

तो मैं पहले लेना चाहता हूँ कि तीस वर्ष में क्या जो गांव में ग्रामीण लोग रहते हैं, उनकी बेकारों की संख्या आज कितनी हो गई है? पढ़े-लिखे बेकारों की समस्या अभी छोड़ दी जाए। मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो देश में लगातार बेकारों की संख्या बढ़ती चली जा रही है, गांव की तरफ से लोग शहर की तरफ चले आ रहे हैं, उनको रोकने की आपने कौन सी व्यवस्था की है? मैं यह जानना

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

चाहता हूँ उपसभापति महोदय, आपके द्वारा, कि 30 व 32 वर्षों में गांवों की तरफ से जो लोग शहर की तरफ आ रहे हैं उन को रोकने की कौन सी व्यवस्था आपने की ? मैं अगर एक-एक चैप्टर खोल कर पढ़ने लगूंगा तो आप भी इजाजत नहीं देंगे, आपने कह दिया कि मेरे लिए 7-8 मिनट का ही समय है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ क्या आपने उन के लिए गांव में जो छोटे-छोटे कुदौर उद्योग हैं--पहले मैं उनकी तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ, पहले कृषि की बात छोड़ दोजिए--छोट-छोटे जो दस्तकारी करने वाले लोग गांव में रहते हैं उनकी माली हालत को सुधारने की तरफ सरकार ने क्या काम किया है ? आप देख लीजिए, खेती से संबंधित जो काम हैं उनको करने वाले जो कारीगर हैं जिनको हमारी तरफ, पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में, लोहार की संज्ञा से संबोधित किया जाता है--माननीय मंत्री जी लोहार किस को कहते हैं अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, हो सकता है हमारे बहुत से साथी लोहार क्या होता है न जानते हों--लेकिन जो लोहार किसानों के इस्तेमाल आने वाले हल में फाल लगाता है, फाल बनाने का काम करता था, क्या वह काम आपने बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों के हाथ में नहीं दे दिया ? क्या गांव का लोहार जो खुरपा बनाता था, जो कुदाल बनाता था अपने भायी पर बैठ कर, क्या वह काम आपने बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों के हाथ में नहीं दे दिया ? मैं ठेठ भाषा में जो पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश की है उस में बोल रहा हूँ, क्या जिसको खुरपा कहते हैं, जिस को कुछुल कहते हैं, जिस को हंसिया कहते हैं, ये सारे का सारा सामान आपने विड़ला परिवार को और बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपति परिवारों के हाथ में नहीं सौंपा ? क्या

आपने उनका उन उद्योग को उजाड़ नहीं दिया ? उन के लिए आपने बजट में कौन सा प्रावधान रखा है ? यह तो मैंने बताया केवल लोहार के बारे में। अब मैं आप से जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ बढई के बारे में, जो लकड़ी का काम करता है। मैं छोटे सवाल उठाना चाहता हूँ। जो हल बनाता है--मंत्री जो आप मध्य प्रदेश के रहते वाले हैं, आप जानते हैं--हल बनाने में बढई को लकड़ी का इस्तेमाल करना पड़ता है और अगर हल न बनें तो इस देश में करोड़ों-करोड़ किसानों का हल नहीं चलेगा, वह बढई गांव में...

श्री कल्पनाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : क्या बोल रहे हैं बढई आप।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप बैठो भी थोड़ा।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : कायदे से बोलिए।

श्री उपसभापति : कल्पनाथ जी, कृपया आप अपनी जगह से बोलिये। इस तरह से नहीं बोला जाता। Please have some decorum.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं उस बढई का थोड़ा जिक्र करना चाहता था जिसका उद्योग बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपतियों, उद्योगपतियों ने छीन लिया है। उन्होंने शहरों में बड़ी-बड़ी मशीनें लगा कर वह काम अपने हाथ में ले लिया है जिससे बढई का काम गांवों में खत्म हो गया। पासवान जी बैठे हैं, हरिजनों के बारे में अधिक जानते हैं, उनको मालूम है, उन का उद्योग छीन कर आपने बाटा के हाथ में सौंप दिया। यह उन हरिजनों का हाल है जिनकी वकालत आप करते हैं। आप भी और प्रधान मंत्री भी वकालत करती हैं। हमारी भी वह प्रधान मंत्री है चाहे व्यक्तिगत हमारा

उनके साथ कभी झगड़ा हो जाता है क्योंकि व्यक्तिगत डिफरेंसेज हैं। उन्होंने हरिजननों की दुहाई देने की बात बराबर कही है। सीताराम केसरी जी, इधर उधर घूमें लेकिन सही बात नहीं सुनेंगे। हरिजननों के बारे में बात भी सुन लिया करें। अखबारों में उनके लिए लम्बी चौड़ी बातें जरूर छानवा देंगे। जो हरिजन भांड में जाता बनाता था, जो हल में चमड़ा लगा कर देना था, जो भायो बना कर देना था, जिसको रहट कहते हैं वह चमड़े का बना कर देना था, वह सारा काम छिन कर बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों के हाथ में नहीं कर दिया क्या आपने? क्या आपने इस तरह अपने देश में बेकारों को एक बड़ी फौज नहीं खड़ी कर दी? यह तो रक्षा कुटीर-उद्योगों का मामला।

अब मैं हैडीक्राफ्ट्स के बारे में कहना चाहूंगा। आप ने करघे की बात कही है। आप ने इस में जिक्र किया है कि जहां पर नुमाइश लगती है, मेला लगता है वहां पर बिल्डिंग बनाने के लिए आपने प्रवीजन किया है, यह पैसा उन लोगों को देने की बात कही है। मैं पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश से यहां आया हूं। सारे देश के जो लोग कुटीर उद्योग में लगे हुए हैं उन के ऊपर मेरी नजर रहती है। क्या आप ने उनका सारा धन्धा चौपट नहीं कर दिया है? बुनकरों की माली हालत को बर्बाद नहीं कर दिया है? क्या उनके करघों को बंद करा कर बिड़ला और बड़े कल-कारखाने चलाने वालों के हाथ में नहीं सुपुर्द कर दिया है? श्रीमन्, मैं इतिहास की तरफ भी आप का ध्यान दिखाना चाहता हूं। उस वक्त कोई कल-कारखाने नहीं थे, लेकिन आपने सुना होगा कि बंगाल में जो कपड़ा बनता था, जो

सिलक बनती थी—वह कपड़े की बुनाई हाथ से होती थी—उतना बढ़िया कपड़ा कोई मिल तैयार नहीं कर सकती। वह आप ने सारा का सारा चौपट कर दिया।

अब मैं कृषि की थोड़ी चर्चा करना चाहूंगा। यह जो आप पैसा ले रहे हैं यह केवल अन्तुले जैसे भ्रष्टाचारी और भजनलाल जैसे भ्रष्टाचारी को पैदा करने के लिए ले रहे हैं। मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि आप ने टी० एन० सिंह जैसे आदमी को बरखास्त किया। मैं इसलिए जिक्र कर दे रहा हूं कि आप मामाने गवर्नर नियुक्त करें, मामाने एम्बेसेडर नियुक्त करें। टी० एन० सिंह जैसे भले आदमी को पहले कहा कि इस्तीफा दे दो। हरिकृष्ण शास्त्री, लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के लड़के को—लाल बहादुर शास्त्री आज नहीं हैं, जवाहर लाल जी नहीं हैं, उनके बारे में मैं नहीं कहना चाहता—भेजा और कहलवाया कि इस्तीफा दे दो, नहीं तो उनकी भी हालत पटवारी जैसी होगी। यही नहीं, यहां तक उन्होंने कह दिया कि आप नहीं हटेंगे तो कुछ और हो सकता है, बंगाल की सरकार को बखास्त कर दिया जाये। इस लूट को रोकने के लिए सदन को इस धन को देने की इजाजत नहीं देनी चाहिए।

यह पार्लियामेंट, लगता है, पार्लियामेंट नहीं है। मैं 20 वर्ष पहले की बात कर रहा हूं। आज की पार्लियामेंट और 20 वर्ष पहले की पार्लियामेंट में जमीन आसमान का फर्क नजर आ रहा है।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : उप-उत्पादित महोदय, एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। पहले की पार्लियामेंट और आज की पार्लियामेंट में फर्क है। अब श्री रामेश्वर सिंह जी जैसे आदमी हैं।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : हम और यह दोनों आदमी हैं। मैं एक बात आखिर में कहना चाहता हूँ और वह कह कर खत्म कर दूंगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस मुल्क को आपने ले जा कर ऐसी जगह पर खड़ा कर दिया है कि अगर दो चार पांच वर्षों के अन्दर कोई हल नहीं निकलता है तो आज जनता आप के साथ ज़ाजुहद करने के लिए तैयार हो जाएगी, दो चार साल के बाद जनता हाथ में हथियार उठायेगी, आप नहीं रोक सकते। आप देखिये, बंगल के देशों में क्या हो रहा है, आप देखिये लंका में क्या हो रहा है, आप देखिये पाकिस्तान में क्या हो रहा है, देखिये बंगलादेश में क्या हो रहा है, ईरान में क्या हो रहा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुल्क में बेकारी की समस्या का हल निकालो, शिक्षा में आमूल परिवर्तन करने की नीति चलाओ, दो तरह की शिक्षा की व्यवस्था खत्म करो, राष्ट्रपति का नाती और प्रधान मंत्री का नाती जिस स्कूल में पढ़ेगा उसी स्कूल में कल्पनाथ राय का बच्चा पढ़ाने की व्यवस्था करो उसी स्कूल में सिसोदिया साहब आप अपने बच्चे को पढ़ाने की व्यवस्था करो। अगर व्यवस्था नहीं करते हो, ऐसी शिक्षा में परिवर्तन नहीं करते हो

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : यह विचार क्रांतिकारी है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : . . . तो उपसभापति जी, मैं बहुत विनम्रता के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ—आप के साथ मेरी हमदर्दी है, आप डांटे जाओ मैं नहीं चाहता, आप मारे जाओ मैं नहीं चाहता, आप अपमानित किये जाओ मैं नहीं चाहता। क्योंकि आप हमारे भाई हैं। आप पर हथियार चलेगा तो हमारे पर भी हथियार चलेगा। हथियार के इस्तेमाल का रास्ता खुल जायगा।

अभी जैसा कि हैगड़े साहब ने कहा है एक बुजुर्ग नेता की किस तरह से हत्या की गयी तो कल हमारे ऊपर और आप पर भी हमला हो सकता है और हथियार चल सकते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : हम तो बहुत कमज़ोर हैं।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप कुर्सी पर बराबर नहीं रहेंगे। कुर्सी पर रहने वाले लोग भी काटे जा रहे हैं। पुरी की पुरी कैबिनेट उड़ा दी गयी है ईरान में। तो इस रास्ते को इस देश में न लाया जाये। यह महात्मा गांधी का देश है यह बुद्ध और कृष्ण का देश है। यह लोहिया और जयप्रकाश का देश है। इसलिए आप वेंकटरामन जी से कहिये कि वे झूठ बोलना छोड़ दें। वे पाप करना छोड़ दें और अन्तुले जैसे भ्रष्टाचारी को और भजन लाल जैसे भ्रष्टाचारी को निकाल बाहर करें। यही मुझे कहना है।

श्री उपसभापति : श्री जैन। श्राप 15 निमट में समाप्त करिये।

श्री जे० के० जैन : (मध्य प्रदेश) : चार पांच स्पीकर बोल चुके हैं।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आप जैसे आदमी को कुछ ज्यादा समय दिया जायें।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप को मुझे 15 मिनट देना चाहिए था और उन को 5 मिनट अपोशिशन को ज्यादा समय दिया जाना चाहिए।

श्री जे० के० जैन : उपसभापति - महोदय, फाईनेम डिनिसट्री की जो एप्रो-प्रियेशन डिमांड्स हैं उनका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और जो हमारे माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि यह सरकार नहीं चल रही है तो इस बात पर मुझे एक शायर का शेर याद आ गया :

गिरते हैं शह सवार ही मँदाने जंग में वह
तिपल क्या गिरेगा जो घूटनों के बल चले।

यह जो एप्रोप्रिएशन डिमांड पैज की गयी है वह इसी लिए की गयी है और वे इस बात का सबूत हैं कि यह सरकार चल रही है और अगर सरकार न चल रही होती तो रुपये खर्च करने की आवश्यकता न होती। यह सरकार चल रही है और वह जमाना तो आप अपने हाथ लेकर चले गये कि जो ढाई वर्ष का जमाना था, जिसकी बात हमारे हेगड़े जी ने कही और रामेश्वर जी ने कही। 30 वर्ष तक कांग्रेस पार्टी शासन में थी। सिर्फ ढाई वर्ष वह शासन में नहीं रही।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : एक मिनट मुझे अपनी बात कहने दीजिए। ढाई वर्ष के लिये मोरार जी और चरण सिंह जी को जेल में भेज दीजिए और 30 वर्ष इंदिरा जी को जेल भेज दीजिए, उसमें 18 साल जवाहर लाल जी के निकाल कर 11 वर्ष उनको जेल में डाल दीजिए। मैं जेल जाने के लिए तैयार हूँ आप 11 वर्ष इंदिरा जी को जेल में डाल दीजिए (व्यवधान)

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : किसी घर को बनाने में ...

श्री क० क० जैन : यू सिट डाउन। मैं बोल रहा हूँ। मेरे तो बड़े भाई हैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ। आप को कुछ कहने की जरूरत नहीं है। तो उपसभापति जी, जो उन्होंने कहा कि 30 साल कांग्रेस पार्टी शासन में थी और वह केवल ढाई साल के लिए थे तो आप जानते हैं कि यह पार्लियामेंट की बिल्डिंग यह राष्ट्रपति भवन और यह इतने मंत्रालयों के भवनों को बनाने में कितना समय लगा होगा। किसी बिल्डिंग को बनाने में 3,3 साल लग जाते हैं लेकिन उसको उड़ाना ही तो तीन मिनट

में डायनामाइट लगा कर उड़ा दिया जा सकता है। तो हुआ क्या हमारे देश के साथ। हमारे देश के साथ यही हुआ कि तीस साल के अंदर जिस गति के साथ हमने प्रगति की थी वह सब ढाई साल के शासन में उन्होंने समाप्त कर कर दी। उस पल उस गति पर उन्होंने ब्रेक लगा दिया और जो हमारी रेल चल रही थी उस को उन्होंने उतार कर फेंक दिया।

श्री रामकृष्ण हेगड़े : इसी लिए एक्सीडेंट हो रहे हैं रोजाना।

श्री जे० जे० जैन : हेगड़े साहब आप की बातों का ही जवाब दे रहा हूँ आपने कहा कि तीस वर्ष यह सरकार रही और ढाई वर्ष हमारी रही। ढाई वर्ष में क्या हो सकता था। तो दूध का पतीला भरने में काफी समय लगता है लेकिन उस को खराब करने के लिये चुटकी भर नमक डाल दीजिए वह सारा दूध खराब हो जायेगा। सब बर्बाद हो जायेगा। तो आप ने यही किया है। इस में ढाई वर्ष में भरे। हुए पतले में चुटकी भर नमक क्या जहर को पुड़िया डालना काफी है। वही आप ने डालो दो। इन बातों को बोलने के पहले आप अपने गिरहबान में मूह डाल देखें कि आप कौन से लफ्ज इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं। पूरा देश जानता है कि आप ने देश की भोली भाली जनता को पिछले चुनावों में बरगलाया और उसे बरगला कर उस से वोट ले लिये। लेकिन देश को जनता इतनी जागरूक थी कि ढाई वर्ष के अंदर ही देश की जनता ने आप के मूह पर वह तमाचा मारा कि वह आँधे मूह जा गिरे और आज यहाँ बैठ कर चिल्ल पों कर रहे हैं। इन की चिल्ल पों में अब देश का नागरिक नहीं

[जे० जे० जैन]

आने वाला है क्योंकि वह जनता है कि और वह देख चुका है कि 30 वर्ष के इंदिरा गांधी के शासन में हो पोखरण का एण्डप्लोजन हुआ और उन्होंने उसी शासन में रोहिणो को आकाश में देखा। तुम नहीं जान सकते ऐपल क्या है। तुम्हारे सदस्य तो कहते हैं कि ऐपल खाने वाला सेब होता है। मुझे तो इसमें शर्क अती है जब तुम्हारे मंह से ऐसी बातें सुना हूँ। कच्चे मजाक करते हैं कि ऐपल जिसको सारा देश नहीं, सारा विश्व जानता है, जिसको वजह से विश्व में हमारे देश का सम्मान हुआ कि हमने ऐपल को लांच किया, ये लोग कहते हैं कि ऐपल किसका नाम है।

उपसभापति महोदय, हमारे माननीय हेगडे जी ने ऐसी बातें कीं कि जब से हमारा शासन आया है कम्यूनल राइट्स हुए हैं। आज सारे देश ने अपनी आंखों से देख लिया कि 1979 में जो इन्होंने बोज बोया था, जमशेदपुर के अन्दर काष्ठम कराया था और सैकड़ों हमारे भोले भाले लोगों को मार दिया था...

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, सुनिये एक सेकिड के लिए... (व्यवधान)

श्री जे० के० जैन : आप बैठिये। ... (व्यवधान) शान्ति रखिये। श्रीमन्, अगर हम बबूल का पेड़ बोयें और इच्छा करें कि उसमें से आम निकालेंगे तो यह सम्भव नहीं, यह पायल आदमी बोल सकता है। बबूल से आम नहीं, कांटे निकालेंगे। 1977 में इन्होंने साम्प्रदायिकता का विष बोया। कहते हैं अलीगढ़ में दंगे हुए हैं, इलाहाबाद में दंगे हुए हैं लेकिन मैं उन कमोशन के जजों को मुबारकवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने भोड़िये के मुंह से नकाब हटाकर उस असलियत

को सारे देश के सामने खड़ा कर दिया है और दिखा दिया है कि आर० एस०एस० का भेड़िया जिसने देश के अन्दर बरले-आम किया है, साम्प्रदायिकता का बीज बोया है, वहीं ताकतें अलीगढ़, इलाहाबाद और चन्द शहरों के अन्दर सांप्रदायिकता की आग भड़का रही हैं। ... (व्यवधान)। नाई, नाई बाल कितते हैं? जजमान अभी सामने आते हैं भिन लेना। ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति महोदय, इन लोगों की तरह हम सोना नहीं बेचते देश का। इन लोगों को तरह हम चोरी से धन इकट्ठा नहीं करते। अंगुले ने तो ट्रस्ट बनाया ट्रस्ट के अन्दर बैंक से पैसा लिया। जरा जबब दो रामेश्वर सिंह जी क्या चरण सिंह ने रुपया इकट्ठा करने के लिए ट्रस्ट बनाया था ?

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : चरण सिंह ने तस्करी से पैसा नहीं लिया। ... (व्यवधान) चरण सिंह ने सोमेट से, पूजोपतियों और तस्करी से पैसा नहीं लिया।

श्री जे० के० जैन : मैं रामेश्वर सिंह जी से अपील करता हूँ कि जब ये बोल रहे थे तो मैं बिलकुल शान्तिपूर्वक इनका भाषण सुन रहा था। मैं कहता हूँ आप जरा ध्यान से सुनिये। इसलिए श्रीमन्, मेरा निवेदन है कि ये मेरा समय बरबाद कर रहे हैं, आप जरा समय का ध्यान रखिये। ... (व्यवधान)। चरणसिंह ने रुपया इकट्ठा करने के बाद ट्रस्ट बनाया, कोई ऐसा विधान है? ...

SHRI SANKAR PRASAD MITRA (West Bengal): Mr. Antuly or Mr. Charan Singh is not the subject-matter of this discussion.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: It is very much the subject-matter of this Bill. You

should have objected when Mr. Rameshwar Singh was mentioning all these things. (Interruptions)

कमो ऐसा हुआ है कि रुपया पहले इकट्ठा कर लिया, ट्रस्ट को स्थापना बाद में होगी। चरणसिंह ने 86 लाख रुपया या 90 लाख रुपया प्रकट किया, पता नहीं, कितना आया। मैं नहीं चाहता कि रामेश्वर सिंह जो इनकी पार्टी में हैं, उनके चेले हैं, इनकी मिला हो। इनको कहां मिला होगा, ये तो छोटे बर्कर हैं। इनको चरणसिंह पैसा देने वाला नहीं है। किसको पैसा दिया होगा, पता नहीं। ट्रस्ट बाद में बनाया गया पहले पैसा इकट्ठा किया गया। क्यों ऐसी अनियमितता बरती गई? अभी तक हमारी सरकार ने इस पर कार्रवाई क्यों नहीं की।

अब मैं अप्रोप्रिएशन डिमांड के उपर आता हूँ।

श्री राम लखन प्रसाद गुप्त (बिहार) : अब तक क्या बोल रहे थे।

श्री जे० के० जैन : जो बात आप बोल रहे थे मैं उसी का जवाब दे रहा था। अभी हमारे देश का करोड़ों रुपया बाहर चला जाता है। क्यों? हमारी जो सरकार थी सन् 77 तक वह बराबर बड़ी तेजी से इस बात का प्रयास कर रही थी कि आयल का सब्सिडीयूट निहाला जाए। सोलार एनर्जी पर बहुत से हमने एक्सपेरिमेंट किये। इन्होंने पिछले तीन साल में उसको भी बर्बाद कर दिया। लेकिन फिर से इस दिशा में बड़ी तेजी से काम चल रहा है। मुझे खुशी है कि सोलार एनर्जी में भारतवर्ष विश्व के बड़े बड़े देशों के सामने सबसे आगे है। इस बात की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हो चुकी कि सोलार

एनर्जी में जो विकास भारत ने किया है वह किसी देश ने नहीं किया है। बड़े-बड़े विकसित देश सोलार एनर्जी के विकास में आगे आने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि सोलार एनर्जी के विकास के लिये और सोलार एनर्जी के आइटम को कमर्शियल आइटम बनाने के लिये भारत को बड़े बड़े विकसित देशों के साथ कोलेबरेशन करना चाहिये जिससे कि भारत के अंदर सोलार एनर्जी से चलने वाले छोटे-छोटे आइटम चाहे कुकर हो, चाहे मोटरसाइकिल हो, रेडियो हो, टी० वी० हो, टेपरिकार्ड हो या घर में इस्तेमाल होने वाली अन्य चीजें हों, जल्दी से जल्दी चल सकें। इसलिये विकसित देशों के साथ कोलेबरेशन करना बहुत जरूरी है।

क्योंकि फाइनेंस की बात चल रही है मैं अपने कुशल वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि अगला बजट आने वाला है उसकी तैयारी हो रही है। बजट की तैयारी पांच-छः महीने पहले से शुरू हो जाती है। आपको यह देखना चाहिये कि हमारे अधिकारी भ्रष्ट क्यों हो जाते हैं। क्यों रिश्वत लेते हैं? क्या आप कभी इस गहराई में गये? एक अधिकारी जिसको तनख्वाह केवल दो हजार मिलती है आप उससे कहते हैं कि इन्कम टैक्स दे। जिस सेक्रेटरी को तीन हजार तनख्वाह मिलती है उसको घर ले जाते जाते 1800 रुपये रह जाते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ आपने क्यों ऐसा गंदा टैक्स सिस्टम रखा है। आपको इन चीजों के ऊपर कुछ विचार करना चाहिये। यदि आप भ्रष्टाचार को देश से हटाना चाहते हैं तो आपको जो हमारे अधिकारी हैं जो सेरोड क्लास है उनके लिये इस प्रकार का इन्कम टैक्स भले बताना होगा जिससे उनकी जो जरूरतें हैं वे

[श्री जे० के० जैन]

पुरो हो जाएं। जब उनकी जरूरतें पुरो हो जाएं उसके बाद बेशक आप टैक्स लगाएँ। मेरा निवेदन है कि जितने सेनरोड बनास है जब तक आप उसको टैक्स से मुक्त नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस देश से भ्रष्टाचार कभी हट नहीं सकता। आप उनको इनतों तनख्वाह दोजिए कि वह अपनी जरूरतें पुरो कर लें और उसके बाद टैक्स भो दें। मेरा निवेदन है कि सेनरोड बनास जिसको तीन हजार तक तनख्वाह मिलती है उसको टैक्स से मुक्त रखा जाए अगर आप भ्रष्टाचार को हटाना चाहते हैं।

मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि राजू जी कह रहे थे कि चीनी के दाम कम हो गये हैं। जब चीनी जरा ऊंचे दामों पर होते हैं तो सारे सदन में हाहाकार मच जाता है और जब चीनी के दाम कुछ कम होते हैं ठोक दाम पर मिलने लगती है तब इन लोगों को साँप काटने लगता है। मुझे खुशी इस बात की कि राजू जी पुराने कांग्रेसी हैं इसलिये कभी कभी तथ्य को स्वीकार कर लेते हैं। यह आशा मुझे अपने जनता पार्टी और भारतीय जनता पार्टी के भाइयों से नहीं है। वे तो कभी ऐसी बातों का जिक्र करेंगे ही नहीं। इन लोगों का धर्म आग में घी डालना है। लोगों को किसी न किसी प्रकार से भड़काना है। मैंने कल भी कहा था कि जिस तरह से बन्दर को अदरक की गांठ मिल जाती है तो वह पंसारी बन बैठता है उसी तरह से इनको अंतुले मिल गया तो यह समझ गये कि सत्ता मिल गई। (व्यवधान) भाइयो इस मुगालत्ते में मत रहो। सत्ता कभी आपके हाथ में आने वाली नहीं है। इस देश के वासी कभी आपके हाथ में सत्ता देने वाले नहीं है। तुमने जिस प्रकार से देश के साथ खिनवाड़ किया सारी सरकारी

मशीनरी को तुमने तोड़-मरोड़ कर रख दिया उसे जनता देख रही है। जिस तरह से तुमने देश को वरवाद कर दिया उसका परिणाम जनता को भुगतना पड़ रहा है। इसलिए ऐसे बन्दरों के हाथ में फिर इस देश की जनता सत्ता सम्भालने वाली नहीं है।

श्रीमन् मैं यहाँ पर इस बात का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार से पाकिस्तान डिफेन्स की तैयारियां कर रहा है वित्त मंत्रालय को चाहिए कि डिफेन्स की जो भी डिमान्ड्स हों उनके ऊपर वे फिराक-दिली से निर्णय लें। उनके अन्दर वित्त मंत्रालय ने जरा भी अड़ंगा लगाने की कोशिश की तो वह देश की सुरक्षा के साथ खिलवाड़ होगा। इसलिए यह बहुत जरूरी है कि जो हमारी सोमाग्रों पर प्रहरी बैठे हुए हैं उनको अधिक से अधिक सुविधाएं दी जायें। हमारे डिफेन्स के अधिकारियों की बातें सुनी जायें और उनकी जो मांगें हैं और सुरक्षा के लिए हमें जो उपकरण चाहिए उनके ऊपर भारत सरकार को अधिक से अधिक पैसा खर्च करना चाहिए हमारा देश और हमारे देश के निवासी इस मामले में बहुत पोछे हटने वाले नहीं हैं। हम अपना खून देने वाले लोग हैं। अगर जरूरत होगी तो इस देश का बच्चा बच्चा देश की सुरक्षा के लिए अपना खून देगा। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि डिफेन्स की जो भी डिमान्ड्स हों, जो भी जरूरतें हों उनके ऊपर वे फिराकदिली से विचार करें और अपने अधिकारियों को हिदायत दे कि डिफेन्स मिनिस्ट्री की किसी भी योजना के अन्दर वे कोई अड़ंगा नहीं लगाएंगे। इस संबंध में आए दिन अनेक बातें सुनने को मिलती हैं। बहुत से मंत्रालयों के अधिकारी मिलते हैं और कहते हैं कि फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री अड़ंगा लेकर बैठी हुई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री इस

अड़ंगा लगाने की प्रवृत्ति को छोड़ दें। उसके इस प्रकार से अड़ंगा लगाने से सरकार की बदनामी होती है। आपकी फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री अड़ंगा लगाने के लिए नहीं है। आप इम्प्लीमेंटेशन के लिए हैं। आपको चाहिए कि जो भी डिमान्ड्स आपके पास आती है उनको किस तरह से और कैसे तेजी के साथ इम्प्लीमेंट किया जा सकता है इसकी तरफ ध्यान दिया जाए।

उपसभापति महोदय, इन्होंने यहाँ पर ब्लैक मनी की बात कही है। इन्होंने कहा कि बियर बॉण्ड की स्कीम फेल हो गई। आप इस बारे में फिक्र मत करिये। यह स्कीम फेल हुई है या सफल हुई है, यह आने वाला समय ही बताएगा। लेकिन मैं अपने मौननीय मंत्री महोदय से जरूर यह निवेदन करूंगा कि जो लोग ब्लैक मार्केटियर्स हैं, जिनके पास काला धन है उनके यहाँ रेड्स तो ही जाती हैं, लेकिन यह पता नहीं लगाता कि रेड्स होने के बाद साल भर या दो साल में उन व्यक्तियों का क्या हुआ? हम अखबारों में पढ़ लेते हैं या 30 करोड़ रुपये हमने रेड्स में वसूल कर लिये। लेकिन होता यह है कि खोदा पहाड़ निकली चुड़िया और वह भी मरी हुई। बाद में कितनों को प्रोसीक्यूट किया गया, इसका भी पता नहीं चलता है। होता यह है कि प्रोसीक्यूशन के बाद 50 करोड़ की रेड्स में सिर्फ एक लाख रुपये मिलते हैं। क्या यही सब आपका काम है? ऐसे लोगों को नियुक्ति इस सैल के अन्दर की जानी चाहिए जिनकी करण्ट व्यापारियों और करण्ट उद्योगपतियों के साथ कोई सांठगांठ न हो। आज स्थिति यह हो गई है कि जब किसी के यहाँ रेड होती है तो वह कह देता है कि आज मेरे यहाँ रेड हो गई, इसको ठीक कर लेंगे। लोगों के अन्दर, उनके मनो में, जो इस प्रकार की धिकिंग चल गई

है उसको रिमूव किया जाना चाहिए। हमारे नेताओं का यह फर्ज है कि इस तरह के विचारों को रिमूव करने के लिए कारगर उपाय अपनायें।

जहाँ तक मकानों का सवाल है, ग्रेटर कॅलेश के अन्दर आप देखिये कि जिस मकान की कीमत पहले 3 लाख रुपये थी, अब उसकी कीमत 30 लाख रुपये हो गई है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : यह एशियन गेम्स की दृष्टि से हुआ है।

श्री जे० के० जैन : एशियन गेम्स के बारे में तो यहाँ का बच्चा बच्चा बताएगा कि कितने लोगों ने एशियन गेम्स का सेबोटिज किया है और आप जानते हैं कि इनके नेताओं ने कहा कि हम हिन्दुस्तान में एशियन गेम्स नहीं कराएंगे। आप लोग यह भी नहीं जानते हैं कि एशियन गेम्स की वजह से दिल्ली को बड़ी बड़ी चीज उपलब्ध हो जाएगी। आने वाले समय में हमारे नौनिहालों को ऐसे स्टेडियम और सर्व मिश्र पूल मिलेंगे जिनमें जाकर वे अपनी बड़ी बिल्डिंग का काम कर सकते हैं। अंधर दिल्ली में एशियन गेम्स न हों तो इस देश के बच्चों को इतने अच्छे स्टेडियम नहीं मिलते।

श्रीमन्, एक चीज मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे देश में जो प्राइवेट बिल्डर्स हैं वे बिना किसी एप्रूवल के एनाउन्स कर देते हैं कि हम फ्लैट्स बना रहे हैं। वे इस संबंध में न तो कारपोरेशन की एप्रूवल लेते हैं और न ही डी० डी० ए० की एप्रूवल लेते हैं। बिना किसी एप्रूवल के एनाउन्स कर देते हैं कि हम फ्लैट्स बना रहे हैं। बीस-बीस मंजिली मिडिले टायर के लिए करोड़ों-करोड़ रुपये इवेंटुअर के बैंकों में डाल देते हैं और फिर उस रुपये से अपना धन्धा चलाते हैं। मेरा यह

[श्री जे० के० जैन]

निवेदन है कि जितने भी बिल्डर्स ने इस तरह के कुकर्म किये हैं। इस बात को जांच कराये कि कितना रुपया उन्होंने पब्लिक से एकत्र किया और उस रुपये को फौरन सरकार अपने कब्जे में ले। जिन लोगों ने वह रुपया जमा कराया है उनको बाकायदा ब्याज दे।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक और चीज आखिर में कहूंगा ... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष : रामेश्वर सिंह जी, कृपया समाप्त करने दीजिये।

श्री जे० के० जन : उपसभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि हमारे जो दूर-दराज के इलाके हैं, उनमें माल ट्रकों से जाता है और उन ट्रकों की बात देखिये, टाटा कम्पनी जिसकी ट्रकों में मोनोपली है, उसने सारे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर लाखों ट्रकों की एडवांस में बुकिंग कर रखी है और 120 करोड़ रुपया टाटा ने उन ट्रकों के एडवांस में अपने पास जमा कर रखा है। जरा कल्पना कीजिये कि अगर 120 करोड़ रुपये पर 20 प्रतिशत भी ब्याज लगाया जाय तो इस हिसाब से 24 करोड़ रुपया ब्याज होता है हर साल का। तो 24 करोड़ रुपया हर साल टाटा उन गरीबों का, उन ट्रक ड्राइवरों का जिन्होंने न जाने कहाँ कहाँ से इकट्ठा करके दिया है ... (व्यवधान)...

ठहरो, बताता हूँ चन्दे की बात। आप चन्दे को बात करते हो। इंडियन एक्सप्रेस की बिल्डिंग गीयतका साहब ने बतई। मोरारजी देसाई ने उनको परमोशरीफ और उस बिल्डिंग के नीचे जो अरबन आर्ट्स कमीशन है उसने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि उसके नीचे नाला

है और वह जो जगह है उसके ऊपर मल्टी-स्टोरीज बिल्डिंग नहीं बना सकते हैं क्योंकि चंदा मिलता था तो इंडियन एक्सप्रेस की बिल्डिंग को बनाने के लिये उस नाले को ही डाइवर्ट कर दिया गया। अरबन आर्ट्स कमीशन की ... (व्यवधान) ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rameshwar Singh, please allow the business to proceed. Please conclude now, Mr. Jain.

श्री जे० के० जैन : आप मुझे मत बोलिये, आप उनको कहिये। बीच में टोकते रहते हैं तो उनको जवाब तो देना होगा।

श्री उपसभापति : जवाब इधर दीजिए।

श्री जे० के० जैन रुपया मिला जनता पार्टी को और वह बिल्डिंग खड़ी हो गई। उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जो 120 करोड़ रुपया टाटा कम्पनी ने गरीब ड्राइवरों का अपने पास जमा कर रखा है ... (व्यवधान) ... तीन साल पहले यह कायदा था कि टाटा का ट्रक लेने के लिए जो एडवांस दिया जाता था, 10 हजार या 20 हजार वह रुपया नेशनलाइड बैंक में जमा होता था ... (व्यवधान) ... मेरा सरकार से निवेदन है कि ...

SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH:

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jain, please conclude now. You will go on record, he will not go on record.

श्री जे० के० जैन : अभी बताता हूँ। देश का सोना बेचने वालों को जेल में डालेंगे चिता मत करो। तुम लोग ने माता-बहिनों ने चीन के आक्रमण के समय जो अपने शरीर से जेवर सतार कर दे दिए थे, उनका तुमने नीलाम किया। शर्म से, अगर पानी नहीं मिलता तो मोरारजी देसाई जिस चीज का संघन रकरते हैं उसमें छजांग लगा दो। ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा निवेदन सिर्फ यह है कि जो 120 करोड़ रुपये टाटा को पास जमा हैं, उस रुपये को फॉरेन नेशन-लाइज्ड बैंक में जमा करने का आदेश देकर आइन्दा ऐसी पालिसी बनाई जाये कि अगर कोई भी व्यक्ति देश के नागरिकों से एडवांस में पैसा लेता है इस तरह से, तो वह नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक में ही जमा होना चाहिये, न कि उनके कोष में। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इन एप्रोप्रिएशन डिमान्ड्स का अनुमोदन करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Joseph. You have seven minutes, five plus two, seven minutes.

SHRI O. J. JOSEPH (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in the last Budget Session our Finance Minister stated that he is implementing his party's policies and he is going in for all round development. Now what is the position? He can be proud of what? Of increasing all round development in several sectors. What are they? The consumer price index has increased. Unemployment and under-employment have increased. The number of agricultural workers has increased. Poverty and misery have increased. And, the number of railway accidents has also increased. Then corruptions has also increased. And these are the things you are proud of. What is the position of our foreign exchange? To an extent, foreign exchange position has shown a deficit and that deficit has increased. And he can be proud of it! Then there are some increases in other sectors. What are they? The Tatas and the Birlas have accumulated huge profits; their earnings have increased. Number of sick mills has increased. Lay offs have increased. Landless peasants have increased in number and so many other increases have taken place. That is the position. When the policy of the Congress Government had been implemented.

On the other side there are some decreases also. What are they? Value of the rupee has decreased. The real

wages of the workers and the salaried people have decreased. There is yet another side of increase and that is, import of wheat, sugar, edible oils, rubber, cocoa, pepper and so many other articles which we in our country are producing. What is it for? Is it for the common people? I don't think so. It is for the monopolists and the landlords. Why are they importing all these articles which we have got here and which we are producing ourselves? Our Minister of Agriculture while replying to a question stated that we are giving subsidy and we are giving rice to Bengal and Kerala. And that the Central Government cannot afford this subsidy. Will the Minister please tell us how much money is foreign exchange are they getting from Bengal and Kerala? Are these States of Bengal and Kerala not a part of the country? Is it not the liability and the duty of the Government to provide rice or food items to these States? What is your position?

Now, the Government is demanding so much money for the appropriation. I want to ask at this stage: What is your position or what is your attitude towards Kerala and Bengal? I may say you are showing a step-motherly attitude. I am not saying that you are taking the attitude of an imperialist, as the British imperialists took towards our country, As a matter of fact, when we require in Kerala 1,94,000 tonnes of rice per month, you allotted only 1,35,000 tonnes and actually, you have sent to Kerala only 98,000 tonnes. Is it not a stepmotherly attitude? How much money in the form of foreign exchange are you getting from Kerala compared to other States? Then, what is the position in regard to other food items? Take, for example, wheat. Kerala was getting 10,000 tonnes of wheat. Now, you are allotting only 4,000 tonnes, when you are importing from America. Why? You have said in the last Budget Session that you are going to export food articles to the Soviet Union and other countries. Our

[Shri O. J. Joseph]

people are not keeping their belly full. What is the consumption rate of the Indian people? What is the consumption rate in India as compared to other countries? I am not going into those questions. When we asked some amount of money for the Civil Supplies Corporation of Kerala for the better distribution of food articles in Kerala, you did not give it. In the same way, the prices of our raw material like rubber, cocoa, papper and so on have gone down because of your imports. For what purpose? Is it for the benefit of the Tatas, the Birlas, or, is it for the benefit of the people of Kerala? You are treating the States, whether it is West Bengal or Kerala, just like colonies. The raw materials in the States are exploited for the benefit of the Indian monopolists. The feeling in Kerala is that they are being treated just like colonies of the Tatas, the Birlas and other monopoly houses.

Sir, in the end, I would say only one word. Our hon. Minister, Mr. Makwana, whenever he comes to Kerala, threatens that he will dismiss the Government or do something. I would humbly tell Mr. Makwana what our people feel in Kerala. In the rainy season, frogs will cry very fiercely. But nobody cares. Hence, please, Mr. Makwana, do not take this attitude and do not threaten the people of Kerala.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramakrishnan, You have five minutes.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in this Bill; we are discussing appropriations worth about Rs. 420 crores. I do not attach any significance to the figure 420. But still, I will confine myself to just a few points which I would like to make.

One is the reported closure of many tea gardens. A news item in regard to this has appeared in the 'Statesman' of 11th September, in its Calcutta

edition. Recently Sir, there was a national conference on the tea industry in which the Secretary of the Commerce Ministry, Mr. Kaul and the hon. Minister, Mr. Mukherjee, participated. In this conference, the whole matter was discussed. Why am I referring to this industry, the tea industry? The position of the tea industry should be viewed in the context of the loan from the I.M.F. and the difficult balance of payments position, which India is likely to face over the next few years. We can improve the balance of payments position only if we are able to achieve the Sixth Five-Year Plan target of Rs. 2,080 crores from tea exports. This, in turn, can be achieved only if we give as much incentives as possible to the tea industry. The Tandon Committee on export strategy has already suggested several remedial measures. I would only like to raise a few issues in connection with the tea industry which is now suffering quite a lot. I would suggest that both the State Governments as well as the Central Government should take an important lead in giving the necessary reliefs. Sir, what has happened is that, Mr. Mukherjee has written to the States to find out what they can do. But he has not made any suggestions of his own. He has not given out his mind as to what the Centre is proposing to do. According to the industry sources, the main reasons for the plight of the tea industry are: the continuous wage increase, the heavy burden of taxation, the higher costs of inputs, and the restrictive land laws as well as the low yield of the land. Also, they are not having sufficient cash resources because of the tight financial policy followed by the banks, in which case hon. Mr. Sisodia can help them. Sir, plantations, though they are recognised as agro-based industries, are subject to severe credit restrictions. The interest rate is nearly 20 per cent. For their day-today borrowings they can ill-afford this percentage. Secondly, Sir, this is something which is within the direct purview of the

Finance Minister, i.e. in the Income Tax Act there should be a depreciation allowance for tea bushes as it is there in the case of rubber in the Kerala Agriculture Income-tax Act. It is rather paradoxical and while all industries are entitled to liberal allowance on their main assets, in the case of tea no such depreciation is given on the main asset which is the tea bushes, which has got a limited life of 30 to 40 years. All this has to be replaced by higher yielding bushes and we have to keep pace with the technological advance.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Dinesh Goswami), in the Chair].

The second thing where the Finance Minister can definitely help is, taking into account the present plight of the industry there can be a sort of waiver or reduction in the excise duty which is now as high as Rs. 1.37 per k.g. This along with various other cesses which the State Government levies, is rather too stiff to compete with the new competitors. Sir, India is still the largest producer of tea, producing nearly about 570 million kgs. of tea and we are exporting about 225 million kgs. Originally we were the largest exporters, but now we have been placed in the third or fourth position. Even smaller countries like Sri Lanka and the East African country like Kenya, have overtaken us. So, this is the point which has got to be attended to with as great haste as possible. I am sure the hon. Finance Minister will definitely take note of this.

Sandy Sir, fertilizers, pesticides and insecticides which are required by the tea plantations should be made available at subsidised prices either by abolishing excise duty or through sales tax or through direct subsidy. Here again I know it is not entirely within the purview of the Centre, but we are sure the State Governments like Kerala, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal will cooperate to save tea industry.

Now I would like to come to another important point which unfortunately, we could not discuss during the discussion on the Sixth Plan. This is about the importance of accelerating family planning programme. In this connection, recently Shri Sat Paul Mittal, one of our hon. Members, held a seminar in Madras on population control, in which the Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Mr. Balram Jakhar, also participated. At this seminar our Chief Minister, hon. M.G. Ramachandran, made a very sensible suggestion for giving incentive to family planning programme. He said that every family with more than 2 children should be disfranchised. The hon. Union Health Minister is here. I would like to ask the Health Minister, Shri Shankaranand, whether the Centre would consider the suggestion to see that this programme is accelerated (*Interruptions*). Please do not interrupt, Mr. Gopalsamy. This is very bad. I do not want him to interrupt me unnecessarily. He will create a bad precedent. We lost two seats in Tamil Nadu on account of this. We have got 39 seats, whereas we should have got 41 seats. Still we want to implement the family planning programme. So, Shri Shankaranand is here, I will ask him to give his earnest consideration to this suggestion.

Now, Sir, since my hon. friend Gopalsamy is so fond of interrupting, I will give him some room for thought. Recently, Shrimati Indira Gandhi came to Tamil Nadu. We are not afraid of any inspection. She had full talks with the Chief Minister. The Chairman of the Planning Commission and all other Ministers and officials also had a talk with the Chief Minister. She gave a very good chat and on most accounts she said that the performance in the field like power, planning, etc. was very good. She said that Tamil Nadu is always known for good work and it can do better. We are thankful to her. But in this connection I would only appeal to my friends like Gopalsamy not to

[Shri R. Ramakrishnan.]

indulge in unnecessary agitations..
(Interruptions).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Certainly, we would like to see that India goes forward and not backward.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Bhola Prasad.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The view that has been expressed by Mr. Ramakrishnan. (Interruptions). The proposal given by MGR about family planning is the greatest joke of the century.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Sir, this is very unfair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Bhola Prasad. आपको 4-5 मिनट में खत्म करना होगा।

श्री भोला प्रसाद (बिहार) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सबसे पहले एक बहुत ही अहम सवाल की ओर सरकार का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ और आपवासन चाहता हूँ। खेत मजदूरों के अधिकार के सम्बन्ध में एक काम्प्री-हेसिव बिल बनाने और सदन के सामने विचारार्थ पेश करने का सवाल पिछले वर्ष से पेंडिंग है। अब तक सरकार उसको पेश नहीं कर सकी है। उस पर विचार न होने की वजह से हम देख रहे हैं कि खेत मजदूरों को जो भी छोटी-मोटी सुविधायें या कानूनी अधिकार दिए जाते हैं उनको अमल में लाने की न तो कानूनी गारन्टी है, न उसके लिए प्रशासकीय व्यवस्था की गारन्टी है। उदाहरण के लिए आप न्यूनतम मजदूरी

के सवाल को ही ले लीजिए। 74-75 से ले कर अब तक हालांकि महंगाई काफी बढ़ गयी है, खेत मजदूरों की न्यूनतम मजदूरी का पुनर्निर्धारण नहीं किया गया है, जहां रिवीजन हुआ है, वहां वह अमल में नहीं आता है और मजदूरों को मजदूरी नहीं मिलती है। इसके लिए बहुत ही कानूनी खामियां हैं। खेत मजदूर मांग भी करते हैं कि हमको निर्धारित मजदूरी नहीं मिलती तो भूस्वामी कहता है कि यह मजदूर हमारा है ही नहीं। अगर कोई कानूनी मजदूरी नहीं देता है तो उसको कोई कानूनन जुर्म नहीं माना जाता है, वह कागनीजेबिल जुर्म नहीं माना जाता है और इस वजह से खेत मजदूरों के लिए न्यूनतम मजदूरी कानून के बावजूद अमल में नहीं आती है। उसको अमल में लाने के लिए जो कारगर प्रशासकीय व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये वह नहीं है। इसी तरह खेत मजदूर जिसके पास धर नहीं, आवास के लिए जमीन नहीं, कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की जा सकी। खेत मजदूर हमारे देश की आबादी का बड़ा हिस्सा है। गांवों में 30 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा उनकी आबादी है और वह बढ़ती जा रही है। और तो और, वह देश का सबसे शोषित, पीड़ित और मेहनतकश नागरिक है। उसके रहने के लिए मकान नहीं, रहने के लिए जमीन नहीं। उसके लिए अभी तक व्यवस्था नहीं हो पायी। इसके लिए जरूरत है कि ऐसी कानूनी और सांविधानिक व्यवस्था की जाय जिससे जल्द से जल्द अमल हो सके।

इसी तरह से खेत मजदूरों को बंधुआ बनाने से भुक्ति का कानून बना है, लेकिन उसके बाद भी आज लाखों-लाख बंधुआ मजदूर मुक्त नहीं हुये हैं। जो मुक्त होते भी हैं वह फिर बंधुआ हो जाते हैं। साल भर में छः महीने से ज्यादा काम मिलने की व्यवस्था नहीं है, रोजगार की व्यवस्था नहीं है। जब वे भूखे मरने लगते हैं तो

उन्हें महाजनों के चंगुल में जाना पड़ता है। आज बिहार में लाखों मजदूर घर छोड़कर, हरियाणा, पंजाब और दूसरे राज्यों में जाते हैं और वहाँ बंधुआ बनाए जाते हैं। जब तक इन तमाम बातों की व्यवस्था नहीं होती है, खेत मजदूरों के हित की हिफाजत नहीं हो सकती है। खेत मजदूरों के अधिकार सम्बन्धी एक काम्प्रीहेसिव बिल लाने का सरकार पहले से वादा कर चुकी है, लेकिन अभी तक नहीं ला रही है। क्यों नहीं ला रही है? हम चाहते हैं कि इस साल जो अगला नवम्बर-दिसम्बर का सेशन हो उसमें इस बिल को सरकार लावे।

DR. MALCOLM S. ADISESHIAH (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the consideration and return of the Appropriation (No. 5) Bill. I have two sets of comments to make. One is of a general order and the other is on some of the specific demands in the supplementary demands for grants. On the general side may I say, first of all, that I am a little allergic to supplementary appropriations because, as the Government says in this document—the supplementary demands for grants—in the first sentence, this is the first batch of supplementary demands I think we will have at least one, if not two, more supplementary demands coming and one could see that for a large country like India with its complex economy it is not possible for the Ministry of Finance to forecast, precisely, all the demands that will arise during the 12-month period and, therefore, in so far as there are unforeseen demands there must be provision for supplementary grants. My point here is, some of these demands are not unforeseen. In regard to unforeseen demands, yes, there should

be supplementary grants. But not all the demands are unforeseen.

My second reluctance is that a supplementary demand, by tradition—not only here but everywhere, wherever this system of budgeting in followed—is not accompanied by indication as we did in the May Appropriation Bill, of the source of financing the appropriation. Now, it is true that the Government points out that out of Rs. 420 crores only Rs. 145 crores would be the additional expenditures. The rest would be recoverable by the Government. But I take it that theoretically, at least at this stage, these Rs. 420 crores or the Rs. 145 crores have to be added to the deficit of Rs. 1,539 crores which has been noted and voted at the Budget Session of Parliament. For these two reasons I have some reluctance to supplementary demands. The first thing is, all the demands are not unforeseen and, secondly, the source of finance is never indicated so that in theory at least it simply adds to the budgetary deficit which all of us deplore.

My second general comment is, I am not able to decide from the justification given as to which extent these Rs. 420 crores represent development expenditure as against non-development expenditure. On the basis of the detailed statements made at the time of the appropriation resolution, what we voted for the year 1981-82 involved an increase of a little less than 2.5 per cent of the total expenditure within which the development expenditure increased by 7.2 per cent. Now, looking at the appropriation resolution that we approved, 60 per cent of total was developmental expenditure. I am not able to analyse very clearly from the description here a similar or dissimilar trend because it is very brief—I suppose it has to be brief—and does not give the details. But when we look at the original appropriation resolution, we see which are develop-

mental expenditures and which are non-developmental expenditures.

My third point is related to the inflationary situation in the country which is only partially reflected in some of the demands that are before us. Now I agree with the Finance Minister that the rate of inflation has declined. These are agreed figures. On the basis of annual average it was 17.1 per cent and on the point-to-point basis it was 21.4 per cent. In 1980-81 it was 18.1 per cent on annual average and on point-to-point basis it was 16.4 per cent. Now for this year, 1981-82, in the first five months, that is to say, from April to August, the wholesale price index has risen by 6 per cent. Now, what, I think, affects the Government operations, the Budget, the outlay for the public sector and the private sector is that this 6 per cent rise which has taken place this year in the first five months—may be for the whole year it will be 10—12 per cent is over and above the 35 per cent rise that had taken place during the last two years. Now it is true that the rate of inflation has declined. But what we have to realise, and what is really holding the economy back, eroding development bearing very heavily on the poor, eroding the resources of plan and bringing in obsolescence in industry, is that the 6 per cent increase in the first five months which is much lower than in the previous years is over the 17 per cent the year before last and 18 per cent last year. I think this could mean that at the end of this year we will find that the annual plan which we have voted, will not be able to attain the targets against which resources were made available.

Now, with regard to specific questions, my friend Mr. Jaswant Singh has asked the Finance Minister, I think, all the questions on individual Demands. So I will not go over that

and I have doubts as to whether the Finance Minister will have the time and even his staff will have the ability in the short time available to answer all the detailed questions that were asked. I will only confine myself to four questions. First, Demand No. 7 on Sugar. Because different figures re coming out from the Government and from the trade circles, I would like to know the total sugar production for the sugar year which has just ended. I had different figures being given. I do not know whether the Finance Minister will be able to answer it. What is the total sugar production? I think, against that we can judge the kind of other questions that have been asked by Mr. Jaswant Singh, including the question that the fall in prices which has taken place, as was pointed out by Shri Raju, is nowhere near what prices were three years ago with regard to sugar. Then, in relation to this question of the total production of sugar for the sugar season now ended, I would also like to ask the hon. Minister if he is able to answer what appeared in the papers that the levy sugar stocks ran out and that the Government tried to borrow sugar from the co-operative sector, which was difficult. Now, with regard to Demand No. 13, cloth, on which my friend Mr. Jaswant Singh has asked some more detailed questions, my question is about the findings that we have with regard to the controlled cloth and Janata cloth. Though it is supposed to be for the benefit of the poor people, it is not only selling in the black market but is also going to various non-poor people who are using this kind of cloth. And this kind of thing leads me to question the whole scheme of subsidies that we have, because we are giving subsidies everywhere, saying that these are going to help the poor people, but are actually helping the non-poor people. (Time-bell rings) Since you have rung the bell, I will be brief. On Nationalisation, again—I again refer to Mr. Jaswant

Singh's question's—there are two Demands. I do not know the policy that the Government is following in regard to nationalisation. Then, only two more things briefly. I agree with Mr. Jaswant Singh's comments on Demand No. 30, import of generation sets. I think it is a wrong policy that we are following in not ordering the generation sets from the Bharat Heavy Electricals, our own company. Its order books are beginning to empty. And for us to order these from the United Kingdom because it is a gift is a kind of distortion with regard to our own Plan priorities and production. And on top of that, to ask for Rs. 140 lakhs, as Mr. Jaswant Singh has said, as subsidy is not satisfactory.

Finally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, on the ways and means advances for the States of Rs. 200 crores, I think that that again is part of the problem of the management of the States' finances, on which I have many comments to make, which for lack of time I would not make. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee. You will have to conclude within seven minutes.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would start from the point where Dr. Adiseshiah left it, that is, the question of transfers to States, the circumstances in which this has become necessary. I do not know whether our thinking would be quite alike on this point. He has said, as I understood it, that the weak finances of the States are perhaps responsible for this particular head being there—augmentation by Rs. 200 crores. That is not important. The important thing is the basic weakness of the finances of the States, which are responsible for almost all the welfare activities, which are responsible for health and education and diverse other activities, but which are really starved, with the Centre

holding the strings of the entire power, holding the key to the national economy as a whole. Now it is high time that this aspect was gone into rationally, logically, without just feeling touchy whenever the question of the States' rights comes to the fore. The powers that be at the Centre should not be touchy on the question of the States' rights. There is no basic conflict between the rights of the States and of the Centre in a federal set-up, if ours is one, and it should be the responsibility of all to see to it that the States can function properly within their assigned area. The fact remains that the States are unable to do it, and out of it comes the problem of overdraft and other things.

In this connection, I would bring to your notice a very sad thing which has happened very recently in relation to the State from which I come, that is, West Bengal, regarding the institution of Governor. Today's *Times of India* contains a reported statement by Dr. T. N. Singh, till recently Governor of West Bengal, on how he was removed from the State, under very strange circumstances. We are not supporters of the institution of Governor in its present form where the Governor acts just as an agent of the Centre, and also his mode of appointment. But so long as it exists, the post has a certain dignity; it has a certain constitutional status. You see the manner in which this office has been tampered with. He has related the sordid tale in detail—how a Member of the Lok Sabha, a son of his old friend, a former Prime Minister of the country, was sent to him with an alluring offer perhaps that he would be made Chairman of a big Corporation. Let him quit the governorship of West Bengal. Then it was proposed, let him go to Rajasthan. If he could continue as Governor of Rajasthan, what prevented him from continuing as Governor of West Bengal? Had there been no ulterior motive with which the office of Governor would be utilised,

what was the logic behind such a proposal? Can a Governor be treated in such a sordid manner? I wanted to make a special mention of it, but the Chairman, in his wisdom, withheld his consent. I am anyway thankful to you for this opportunity when I am able to draw the attention of the House and through the House, or the entire country which is, of course, already seized of the matter, of the sordid and unethical manner in which the office of Governor is being misutilised by the powers at the Centre.

In the Appropriation Bill we heard of a higher extra-constitutional authority. There is a reference to a commission, a commission set up for some unspecified purpose. This is in Demand No. 48. A commission was set up by the Government in March, 1981 to examine matters relating to economic administration and its reform. So it could not be anticipated in the original Budgetary Grant. Obviously this reference is to the Jha Commission. What are the exact terms of references of the Jha Commission and what is the area of its operation? These things are not clear. There are certain well-defined, well-constituted bodies. Over and above that and besides the Planning Commission, what is this particular commission expected to achieve, expected to do? It is not clear to anybody. But a monetary provision has been made for this commission.

Next, there is provision for sick industries in this Appropriation Bill. Now, a very interesting argument was presented by the Finance Minister, Mr. Venkataraman, in the other House, as was reported in the press. He raised a point, a point which we repeatedly raised: How is it that sick industries have to be taken over even though the industrialists get rich? Why is there this clamour for take-over of sick industries? The answer must be known to Mr. Venkataraman: In the interests of

national production and in the interests of the people working there. But the other question the question that has repeatedly been posed to the Government at the Centre is: Why should not the owners of those sick industries, who operate other industries, be taken over by the Government when taking over their sick industries? A reference was made in this connection to JK Group of industries, Jai-puria Group of industries; there are other industries run by the top industrial houses of the country. So, this is a question which Mr. Venkataraman should have addressed to his own Government, instead of addressing it to the members of the Opposition or other Members of Parliament. This was the height of hypocrisy. This sort of a hypocritical policy is responsible for the economic ruination to which the country has been brought by the uninterrupted rule, so to say, of the representatives of the capitalist class in this country.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA:
Sir, as many as eleven honourable Members have taken part in the debate arising out the Appropriation Bill under consideration before the House. I am very thankful to all the honourable Members who have raised very valid and important points, more so, to those honourable Members who have wholeheartedly supported the Appropriation Bill. Sir, the debate was on general 4 P.M. lines as if we were considering the whole economic and political situation in the country. Considering the scope of the Bill which is before the House, I think it will be most appropriate and reasonable if I will be brief and try to reply only to the very relevant and important points raised by hon. Members.

First of all, my friend Mr. Era Sezhiyan has raised some technical points. I am sorry he is not here. I will certainly like to place the factual position before the House.

The other points raised by hon. Members were inflation, foreign exchange reserves, foreign debt, Government borrowing, IMF loan, rural unemployment, production of foodgrains, import of wheat and sugar, rise in prices, law and order, problems regarding tea industry, necessity of supplementary demands and vacancies in public undertakings. There may be many other points which were raised, but I will not be able to reply to all the points in the brief time at my disposal.

I will say something regarding technical points raised by Mr. Era Sezhiyan in respect of Demand No. 13, c(i), c(ii) and c(iii). Provision for nationalisation of jute mills was not made in the 1981-82 budget as action for incorporation of the said provision could be initiated only after the actual nationalisation of the mills. The amounts were to be deposited to the credit of Commissioner of Payment only after the appointment of the Commissioner. The first appointment was made in March, 1981 and on his resignation the other Commissioner was being appointed. The funds will be needed only after his appointment and, therefore this amount was not provided in the regular Budget.

The second point raised by him is regarding the Economic Administration Reforms Commission and the connected expenditure. Provision for this Commission could not be made in the 1981-82 Budget because, as the House is aware, the 1981-82 Budget was presented on 28-2-1981 whereas the Commission was set up by the Government of India on 5-3-1981. Therefore, it passes beyond one's comprehension how provision for this Commission could have been made in the Budget presented on 28-2-1981.

The other point regarding payment of subsidy to salt shippers for salt shipped to West Bengal comes under the same category. Report of additional capital and loans released to

public sector undertakings till 31-3-1981 had been in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. This is for the information of the House. Therefore, Sir, it was not proper that these technical points were raised. I would like to make a submission to the House through you, Sir, that as far as this House is concerned, we cannot go in depth and in detail into the various grants. According to the constitutional provisions, it is only the Lok Sabha which can examine the demands in detail and in depth. Therefore, Sir, the discussion and the reply automatically narrow down and this point should also be taken into consideration before this kind of technical points are raised and considered.

Regarding inflation, Sir, I think during this Session itself, during the Question Hour and also on other relevant occasions, many questions have been raised regarding inflation and replies have been given by the Finance Ministry as well as by the other Ministries also. Since the present Government came to power, top priority has been given to moderating the inflationary pressures on the economy. Consequently, the annual rate of inflation in terms of the wholesale price index has come down from 22.2 per cent as in the week ending 10th June, 1980 to 14.8 per cent as in the week ending 10th June, 1981 and to 10.3 per cent as on the 8th August, 1981 on a point-to-point basis.

Sir, a question was raised about agricultural production and about sugar production also. Sir, we must compliment our agriculturists and the labour who are involved in the agricultural operations...

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Very good.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: ...because due to their efforts and the planning of the Government agricultural production has gone up and the position with regard to food pro-

[Shri Sawai Singh Sisodia]

duction has also improved. So is the case with sugar production also.

Regarding inflation, I would like to point out one more thing. It has been said that the inflation rate is very high in our country. Sir, I have got the figures relating to inflation published in the World Development Report of 1981 and these are the figures of average inflation during 1970-1979 in the various countries and the rates are: Burma—12.1 per cent; Sri Lanka—12.3 per cent; Pakistan—13.9 per cent; Bangladesh—15.8 per cent; Japan—8.2 per cent; U.K.—13.9 per cent and India—7.8 per cent. Therefore, the whole argument that inflation is going very high in this country is not correct. Then, Sir, as far as the other points are concerned,...

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : हो गया ।

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया : अभी तो बहुत कुछ बाकी है, कहां हो गया ।

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Let him reply, please.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Regarding foreign debts, Sir, the total amount of our foreign debt, as on 30th June 1981, was Rs. 15,360 crores. Regarding the IMF loan also, many points were mentioned.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : 53 सौ करोड़ ।

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया : आपको बाहर कोई बुला रहे हैं ।

Many points were raised and discussed in this House and the position is this:—

The IMF loan of Rs. 5,000 crores will be drawn over a period of three years. In the first year, we will draw Rs. 1,200 crores; in the second year, we will draw around Rs. 1,600 crores; and the balance in the third year.

Sir, regarding sugar production, the honourable Member, Dr. Adishesiah wanted to know the estimated sugar production during this year. Sir, during this year, the sugar production up to the 30th September, 1981 is 51.4 lakh tonnes. The sugar production during the sugar year ending 30th September, 1980 was 38.6 lakh tonnes. The foreign exchange reserve as on 26th August 1981 was Rs. 3763 crores, and on 11-9-81 it was Rs. 3759.15 crores.

Regarding the points raised by Mr Raju about ceiling on Government borrowings and guarantees on the security of the Consolidated Fund—these matters have been discussed in Parliament, and the most important point for consideration is this that as part of the annual Budget adopted every year, this approval is taken on borrowings of the Government from the House.

Sir, regarding this general six-monthly report, the economic growth in our country is very bright. Power generation, coal production, production of fertilisers and other items have gone up. Sir, Mr. Jaswant Singh wanted to know...

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र) :
सब चले गये भाई ।

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया : सब चले गये, तो आपही मुनिवें सबकी तरफ से ।

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: He wanted to have some information regarding the Economic Reforms Commission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Minister, I do not want to interrupt. But you have got the second Bill also, the Income-tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1981.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I will hardly take five minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I am not interrupting.

श्री जे० के० जन : आप सब अच्छी तरह से बताइये ।

संसदीय कार्य विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सीताराम केसरी) : गलत बात है ।

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: On the question of proper institutional arrangement on certain problems, the Government constituted this Commission. The Chairman is Mr. L. K. Jha. He wanted to know the names of the members. The Commission will be within the administrative purview of the Cabinet Secretariat and will submit reports to the Prime Minister. That is what he wanted to know.

Sir, I am very much thankful to my dear friend, Shri J. K. Jain, and I want to assure him that the Government is also quite conscious and quite alert about the defence problems of our country. He should not have any misunderstanding or understanding in his mind that the Government will in any way be reluctant to accept or approve the proposals forwarded by the Defence Ministry. The Government is very much conscious and is taking all the necessary steps for the defence and security of our country whenever it is necessary. (Interruptions) There is no question of any bar on the expenditure on that account.

He has also given some suggestions regarding these operations and their consequential benefits to the society. I will not go into the details at this stage. About deposits also there are very good suggestions and necessary action will be taken by the Government at the proper time.

Lastly, Sir, my friend, Mr. Rameshwar Singhji, is there. He has raised very valid points. For his informa-

tion I would like to give this information that the Government has resolved to take necessary action for removal of rural unemployment in the villages in our country and the Sixth Five Year Plan would cover...

जो आपने सुतार, लौहार, वढ़ई, कुम्हार और बाकी सबके उद्योगों के बारे में कहा है, उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए वर्तमान शासन ने उनकी तकलीफों को ध्यान में रखकर इस प्रकार की योजनाओं का छठी पंच वर्षीय योजना में समावेश किया है कि जिससे निश्चित रूप से उनकी अन-एम्प्लॉयमेंट में, उनकी बेरोजगारी में कमी होगी, आर्थिक स्तर ऊंचा उठेगा और जो हम उनकी तकलीफ महसूस करते हैं, वह दूर होगी ।

The Sixth Five Year Plan would cover nearly 300 families per block under the Intensive Rural Development Programme. There are altogether 5000 blocks in the country and this programme intends to cover nearly 75 million people which is more than 13 per cent of the rural population. The total assistance set aside for this purpose is Rs. 1500 crores over the Sixth Plan period supplemented by 3000 crores by institutional finance. This is specially for the purpose for which you have shown great anxiety.

श्री जे० के० जन : रामेश्वर जी को एक खुरपा जरूर दिलवा दीजिए . . .

श्री सीताराम केसरी : क्यों देरी करा रहे हो जन साहब । बैठ जाइए ।

श्री जे० के० जन : वह बहुत चिंतित हैं । उनको जरूर खुरपा दीजिए ।

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया : रामेश्वर सिंह जी का मैं बहुत आभारी हूँ, उन्होंने बहुत अच्छा सुझाव दिया और आशा करता हूँ, ऐसा ही कंसट्रक्टिव सुझाव देते रहेंगे ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : हमसे हमेशा यहो आशा रखिए ।

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया :

Lastly, regarding the tea industry and tea cultivation, the Government is quite serious about this matter and we are considering to give some relief to the tea industry so that they can develop this cultivation and may get relief to export tea to foreign countries. I am thankful to the Members for their contribution.

श्री भोला प्रसाद : मैंने पूछा था कि खेतिहर मजदूरों . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विनेश गोस्वामी) : ठीक है, उन्होंने जवाब दे दिया ।

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया : यह खेत-मजदूरों पर भी लागू होता है ।

श्री भोला प्रसाद : "भी लागू" का क्या मतलब हुआ ?

श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया : मैंने बताया अभी आप के सामने छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना विचारार्थ थी उसमें यह बात कही गई थी ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1981-82, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Now, we shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments

Clause 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जरा ठहरिये । मैं एक क्लेरिफिकेशन चाहता हूँ . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): If you want to speak on the Third Reading, you should give me in writing that you want to speak.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : नहीं, मैंने नाम दिया था . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I do not have it before me.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : थर्ड रीडिंग के लिए नाम दिया हुआ है । यह बहुत बेइंसाफी हो रही है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): You want to speak on the next Bill also. We have to finish the next Bill before six o'clock.

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: That is not the point.

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1981 (NO. 8 OF 1981)

II. THE INCOME TAX (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Now, we take