

(1) THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1981**(2) THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1981****(3) THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL, 1981****(4) THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 3) BILL, 1981**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we will take up the Legislative Business—Bills for consideration and return. MR. SISODIA.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA): Sir, ...

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, on a point of order. (*Interruptions*) Sir, I will be very brief and pointed, and I require definite answer to this question. On the last two occasions also I raised this question, this point of order. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): It is a legal question. You know we are all lawyers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know there are all lawyers in this House. Law-makers are better than lawyers.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Regarding President's recommendation under Article 117(3) of the Constitution. I think I raise it when the National Security Bill was under consideration. I pointed out the error. The President's recommendation was dated 17th December, whereas the Bill was passed in the other House... (*Interruptions*). They said it was a typographical error. We made the plea at that time that the date of the recommendation given by the President should be specifically mentioned in the communication in this House, because we do not get the letter directly and only a communication from the Minister comes. I will read out for the benefit of the House and for record what was said on the floor of the House. Mr. Deputy Chairman said:

"I think it would have been better if he had mentioned in the letter the date of the recommendation of the President."

At the end you said two things:

"...for a Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha they should say 'as passed by Lok Sabha'. This will be sufficient. If the Bill originates in the Rajya Sabha, they should give the date"

Then, there are some interruptions. Then you said:

"...I think you can give the date".

In one of the Bulletins it has come. Sir, I take serious note of this. This is the third occasion when I am raising this point. This is against the direction given by the Chair. The date is not there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: "As passed by Lok Sabha is there. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: It is mentioned in all the four Bills.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants the date of communication of the President's recommendation (*Interruptions*). Your point is very clear.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: The implication is a very serious implication. Later on, I took the trouble of writing to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat. I wrote a letter asking them to give me a copy of the National Security Bill. (*Interruptions*) I say the position is serious. (*Interruptions*) That was the decision given by the Chair. I do not want that to be questioned. No date is given. Even in the communication written by the Minister, no date was given by Mr. Zail Singh. I have got a copy of his letter. If you like, I can pass it on to you. Then I wrote a letter to the President. By that time he had given his assent. Ten days later I wrote immediately that these are the inaccuracies. This is article 255 of the Constitution.

Sir, article 255 of the Constitution deals with requirements as to recommendations and previous sanctions to be regarded as matters of procedure only. It says: "No Act of Parliament or of the Legislature of a State, and no provision in any such Act, shall be invalid by reason only that some recommendation or previous sanction required by this Constitution was not given, if assent to that Act was given..... (c) where the recommendation or previous sanction required was that of the President, by the President."

Therefore, Sir, if I do not raise this question at this stage and once it gets passed and the assent is given by the President, then I am helpless even though the Constitution requires certain requirements for consideration of the Bill by this House. Therefore, Sir, the importance of this one at this stage is that we should settle the question whether all the things have been gone into. So, Sir, the first objection is that the date is not given. And, secondly, Sir, this is also incomplete and I shall show you how. Sir, for your benefit, I will take up the Supplementary Demands for Grants. You take the Bill circulated to us and as passed by the Lok Sabha. If you see the statement of Objects and Reasons, Sir, it is incomplete. I hope you got the Bill, sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which number?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Bill No. 32.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, the same Bill as introduced in Lok Sabha and as passed by the Lok Sabha.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: This Bill deals with Supplementary Demands for 1980-81. Let us take up Bill because it has a number of defects. Sir, as you know, article 115 of the

Constitution is an omnibus one. Article 115 of the Constitution laid down the procedure for bringing in Supplementary Grants and Excess Grants. I think, article 115(1) (a) deals with Supplementary Grants and article 115(1) (b) deals with the Excess Grants. If you see the Bill dealing with the Supplementary Demands for Grants, you will find, "laid before Parliament in pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause (1) of article 115 of the Constitution. That is the constitutional provision. Sir, if you take the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill, you will find, "This Bill is introduced in pursuance of article 114(1) of the Constitution of India, read with article 115 thereof." Sir, article 115 is an omnibus one. I think, Sir, you caught my point. Sir, if you take article 115 of the Constitution, sub-clause (a) deals with Supplementary Demands for Grants, sub-clause (b) deals with Excess Grants, and 115(2) deals with how the Bills are to be proceeded with. Therefore, Sir, if it is a Supplementary one, it is specifically mentioned here article 115(1) (a). If you take the second one, Sir, they put it correctly—"Laid before Parliament in pursuance of clause (1) of article 115 of the Constitution." When you come to the Objects, they simply put this omnibus article 115.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does it not cover the others?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: This is an omnibus one. Here they have said article 115.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Article 115 covers both.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA (Rajasthan): But one does not know whether it is Supplementary Grants or Excess Grants.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: You are putting three Bills here. One is Supplementary; the second one is Excess...

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): Article 115 contains both. Naturally, both are covered.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I got two Demands made here. One is Supplementary Demands and the other is Excess Grants. If you read this first one, it is said here, "Laid before Parliament in pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause (1) of article 115..." This is Supplementary Grants. If you take the Excess Demands one, there it is put, "Presented to Lok Sabha in pursuance of article 115(1) (b). Article 115(1) (b) means Excess Grants. And article 115(1) (a) means Supplementary Grants. Therefore, both of them cannot be confused with. And, when you make a differentiation in the demands for grants how can you go against that one when the Bill is being presented? Therefore, on that score also this supplementary demand is incomplete and particulars are not correctly given. These are the basic points for that one. Shall I speak on the third point also or will he reply to my first two points?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Make all your points first.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: They have to satisfy before consideration...

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Let him answer first.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has already stated two points. Let him state the third point also.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: On the merits of the demands, I think they are defective and they should not have been included here. It goes against the specific direction given on some of the demands earlier. Shall I make them also, now or shall he reply to the basic points because that bars the consideration?

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Let him answer that first because otherwise he will forget.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Sir, I will make only a short point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him dispose of these points and then you will speak. The point is now clear and let him speak.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Sir. I want to make only one point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister speak and then you can raise your point.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, I am very much thankful to Mr. Era Sezhiyan—I do recognise his expertise in looking to the minutest details—for making his observations and calculations on some technical points. But I would like to say, Sir, that as far as his objection regarding article 117 is concerned, it is the special provision as to financial Bills, and says that such a Bill shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the President. Sir, the recommendation of the President has been obtained on the 16th March, 1981. I think, the information may be before you also. So, all these three Bills which are pending before the House have been submitted to the hon. President and they have been recommended by him on 16th March, 1981. This is his first objection and I have cleared it and it is not acceptable. As far as the second point is concerned, regarding article 115...

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: What is the date of the President's recommendation?

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: It has not been communicated.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: It is 16-3-1981.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: The date of the President's sanction has not been communicated in the Bulletin.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: It has been communicated to the whole House.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, are they going to follow the direction given by the Chair or only when some Member raises the question, they are going to give the information?

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Sir, the objection is only regarding the communication and information to the House, and I have informed the House that it has been recommended by the President on 16-3-1981. That settles the matter.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Has it come in the Bulletin?

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Regarding his second objection, dealing with supplementary, additional or excess grants, article 115 covers all these matters, namely, supplementary, additional or excess grants. Therefore, this objection also is not tenable and it should not be accepted. The position is quite clear.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Sir, let me now have my say. So far as the contention of Mr. Era Sezhiyan on the question of notifying the date of the President's recommendation is concerned, please take care of it yourself, because it was your direction which is being violated by the Government and, therefore, you have to take care of it. I need not add to the contention raised by Mr. Era Sezhiyan on that point. About the second point submit very respectfully that Article 115 is very clear. If the Government wants to come for a supplementary grant, it must be specified in the objects that it is for supplementary grant and then they must say that it is under Article 115-1(a) and for excess grant, it must be under 115-1(b). Unless that is done and shown, as was pointed out by Mr. Era Sezhiyan, a difficulty will arise because you cannot discriminate. How do we know which part of it is supplementary and which part of it is excess? How is it possible to distinguish?

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Period is also mentioned there; you can draw the conclusion from it.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: The point is, in the original Budget we had sanctioned certain amount; we passed the Appropriation Bill. Now this is the Supplementary Bill. Which of it is supplementary and which of it is excess, should have been specified, and if they do not do it, it would be difficult to make a distinction. And this is a Constitutional irregularity which should not be committed by the Government. We do not want to stand in the way but this should have been specified.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far as the first point is concerned, earlier also this point was raised and I think, if I remember correctly, this was raised by Mr. Era Sezhiyan, based on certain apprehensions that the recommendation of the President is obtained simultaneously and it is not after the Lok Sabha has passed the Bill and before it is presented to the Rajya Sabha. There should be two recommendations from the President: one, when the Bill is introduced in the Lok Sabha, and second, when it is to be brought to this House after the Lok Sabha has passed, as the wording goes in the Bill. Therefore, it was necessary that the date should be given when the President gives recommendation. Rule 234 prescribes a form in which the Minister will communicate. It says: "Every recommendation or previous sanction by the President shall be communicated by a Minister in the following terms... and it shall be printed in the proceedings of the Council in such manner as the Chairman may direct." So, the form is there; there is no doubt about it. But the date of the letter from the President is not given. I think if a direction was there, that should be followed in order to remove the apprehension, although I do not believe that there should be any difficulty like that. But that will only clarify the position.

So far as the second point is concerned, I think they have used this Article 115 in order to cover both the contingencies, whether it is excess or

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

supplementary, or whatever it is. It may be covered under Article 115. There might be some doubt lurking in the minds of the hon. Members. Therefore, it has been placed under the wider Article 115 so that it covers both types of Bills.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA:

The direction of the hon. Deputy Chairman...

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: My objection is going to continue; because I have two or three points more.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA:

Let me move. Sir, the direction given by the Deputy Chairman will be strictly followed in future and there will be no such occasion for any complication to come up. Sir, I move:

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

4 P.M.

Sir, the House has had a general discussion...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You move all the Bills.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: I have to say something in regard to each Bill.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT (Uttar Pradesh): It will be better if he moves them separately.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Sir, the House has had a general discussion on the Budget, 1981-82, which was concluded day before yesterday. The Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill seeks approval of Parliament for two months to enable the Government to carry on until the completion of the procedure prescribed in article 113, for the voting of the Demands for Grants for the whole year and passing of the connected Appropriation Bills.

The total amount appropriated under the Bill is Rs. 15,578.52 crores of which Rs. 11,772.73 crores is charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and the balance of Rs. 3805.79 crores has been voted by the Lok Sabha. The necessary details of the Vote on Account are given in the relevant papers already circulated to the hon. Members.

Sir, I beg to move:

"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 1980-81, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill arises out of the supplementary appropriations charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and the demands voted by the Lok Sabha on the 16th March, 1981. These involve gross additional expenditure of Rs. 1,111.61 crores besides a notional provision of Rs. 3761.51 crores as required to cover adjustments in accounts connected with the discharge of treasury bills.

The additional requirement of Rs. 1,111.61 crores comprises of Rs. 210.22 crores for transfers to State Governments, Rs. 373.63 crores for release to public sector enterprises, Rs. 238.01 crores for Defence services and Rs. 284.75 crores for various other items. Details of Supplementary Demands are available in the documents laid on the Table of the House on 5th March 1981. The impact of these Supplementary Demands stands reflected in the revised estimates for the year presented along with the Budget for 1981-82.

Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1978, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by the

Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill arises out of the Demands for Excess Grants relating to the year 1977-78. These Excess Demands were presented in pursuance of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee in their First Report. The Committee had recommended regularisation of the excess expenditure under article 115(1)(b) of the Constitution and the Lok Sabha has already voted the Excess Demands yesterday. Details of the Excess Demands are available in the documents already circulated to the hon. Members.

Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1979, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This Bill arises out of the Demands for Express Grants relating to the year 1978-79. The Public Accounts Committee in their 24th Report had recommended regularisation of excess expenditure, under article 115(1)(b) of the Constitution and the excess demands presented on that basis have been voted by the Lok Sabha. The details of the excess demands are available in the document already circulated to the hon. Members.

Sir, I move that the Bill be taken into consideration.

The questions were proposed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the House will agree to discuss all these four Bills together.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, I will concentrate only on the Supplementary Grants. Last time, when you were in the Chair, I raised the question about the amounts being withdrawn from the Contingency Fund

of India because the Contingency Fund of India was meant for any unforeseen expenditures which are not contemplated, for which the House was not sitting. Suppose, they want to spend on anything on certain calamity. They can draw from the Contingency Fund and later on they can come before the House take the sanction and recoup the Contingency Fund. The Contingency Fund should not be used indiscriminately. There have been very many strictures from the Controller and Auditor General and also the Public Accounts Committee. They have maintained that whenever excess expenditure is required, you cannot use it as your current account. There should be real exigency which could not be overcome or which could not be anticipated or you could not wait till the Parliament is not there. Therefore, Sir, in 1975 when some of the Bills came in the other House, I raised objection to the Gujarat Bill as a Member of that House there on the Contingency Fund and withdrawals. The discussion went on for two to three days. Later on, the then Minister in charge wanted to delete those portions which offended the ruling given by the Chair and the Gujarat Appropriation Bill was passed deleting those amounts. At that time no lesser a person than Shri Pranab Mukherjee was in charge of this Ministry. Unfortunately, he is not here today. On that day, what he said, I quote. I raised the point only on the new services amount being drawn from the Contingency Fund during the session. I quoted one Committee's rule. They should bring a resolution and get it passed before they could draw it from the Contingency Fund. But here it is a ruling given in the House categorically stating that when the House is in session, you cannot draw that amount from the Contingency Fund. That means, there should be the same principle that when the House is in session you can come before the House and take sanction by passing a resolution. That means, keep the House aware of the amounts being withdrawn because we have got the

[Shri Era Sezhiyan]

complete control over the release of funds from the Contingency Fund. That is the basic principle involved. I quote, this is dated 20th March, 1975:

"This sort of indiscipline is happening because there is no real control in India." Something more was said. Then the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said. "I want only to submit for your consideration regarding unforeseen expenditure from the Contingency Fund. This was also a point raised by the hon. Member on earlier occasion as a result of which the Bill was ultimately withdrawn both on Gujarat and Pondicherry. We had some correspondence with the Speaker also and we tried to emphasize on the Speaker that at certain occasions expenditure from the Contingency Fund on unforeseen account may be necessary. Even in the latest communication that we have received from the hon. Speaker, he has directed us not to make any expenditure from the Contingency Fund when the Parliament is in session and we have issued the necessary instructions to that effect". This is dated March 1975. Afterwards, this emergency came, and they did not follow this thing. But to the best of my knowledge this ruling given in the House by the Minister in-charge was based on the letter written by the Speaker. Although it was not in the House, still a communication sent by the Speaker or any direction given on file by the earlier Speaker is the order of the House. Therefore, it has got all the validity of the ruling. This is my premise. Therefore, any amount withdrawn when the House is in session is against this ruling which I have quoted. If you have got the Demands for Supplementary Grants, you kindly see page 3.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which Bill are you referring to?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: It is the green book, Demands for Supplementary Grants.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't have the book with me.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: If you see the green book on page 3, the second sub-para says:

"In view of the urgency, an advance of Rs. 14,000 was sanctioned from the Contingency Fund of India on 6th December, 1980 which will be recouped to the Fund after the Supplementary Appropriation is sanctioned."

That means that the amount had been withdrawn on 6th December, 1980, when the both the Houses were sitting, from the Contingency Fund. This offends the ruling just now quoted by me. This is one instance.

Then you go to page 26.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not been able to locate it. Which page are you reading from?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Page 26, Demand No. 31. I am going to comment on the Supplementary Demands only. The Excess Demands have been scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee; so let us not go into those.

Under item (b), it is stated:

"To purchase residential building for the Head of Mission in Hong Kong, an advance of Rs. 1.87 crores was obtained from the Contingency Fund of India on 8th December, 1980."

Again on 8th December, 1980, both the Houses have been sitting and you have drawn the amount from the Contingency Fund of India, which offends the ruling which you gave just now.

संसदीय कार्य विभाग में राज्य मंत्री
(श्री सीताराम केसरी) : शिव चन्द्र झा जी देखिए, यह स्टडी है ।

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, the third instance is on page 84 under Demand No. 84. There also if you see the bottom portion, it is stated:

"The Supplementary Appropriation is required for recoupment of two advances totalling Rs. 72,033 drawn from the Contingency Fund of India on 9th December, 1980 and 17th January, 1981 for payment of decretal dues."

श्री मवाई सिंह त्रिपाठी : बहुत पुरानी बात कर रहे हैं ।

श्री आर० आर० सोरकारका : यह तो आज की बात है, बहुत पुरानी बात नहीं है ।

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: On 17th January, 1981, the House was not sitting; but on 9th December, 1980, the House was sitting.

So Sir, on all these three occasions they have violated the ruling given by the Speaker. That means the Parliament has given a direction which the executive has broken. As part of Parliament, we are very vigilant and I think this should not have been done. It follows that this Bill should be sent back to the other House for consideration before it comes before us.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Sir, the hon. Member has cited a very old position. The latest position is this. Such advances from the Contingency Fund can be sanctioned even when the Parliament is in session. Therefore, this question does not arise. He is talking of old position.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can it be sanctioned? Under what rules? You cite the rule.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: But he has not cited any rule.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has cited the Speaker's ruling.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: That was in 1975. The latest position is this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Under what law? (Interruptions)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) :
श्रीमन्... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Let him have his say.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Sir, I will call for that ruling and place it before the House. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will place it just now. Let him get it.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Meanwhile, Sir, give me two minutes. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will get it from the office.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I have got two more objections.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The ruling might have been amended.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I have two more objections. Let us turn to Demand No. 30.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it the same point?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: No, it is a different point. As you are aware, no amount can be spent on any item not covered in the Demands. That is the basic point. You follow me, Sir? No amount can be spent unless it has been...

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Sir, why not allow him to complete his whole speech and then I will reply. (Interruptions)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : आगे बढ़े के लिए सदन एडजर्न कर दीजिए... (व्यवधान) संविधान के खिलाफ काम नहीं कीजिए... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is raising preliminary objections. (Interruptions) Order please.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Sir, the hon. Minister should not treat it as an ordinary speech. He is raising important points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No speech in the House is ordinary. Every speech is extraordinary.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: If you see the constitutional provision, article 113(3), it says "No demand for a grant shall be made except on the recommendation of the President."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about the cases for supplementary grants and all that—the demands that are there?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I will give them. Expenses can be incurred by the Executive on the Consolidated Fund only after getting permission of both the Houses. If they do not get it and still spend, it is violation. They can take it from the Contingency Fund and not this one—new services. Therefore, I am going to quote two cases. We know they have apparently spent it but now they want the amount. Take page 12. Have you got this one—the green book. Supplementary Demands for Grants? Please keep it there till my speech is over.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At page?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Page 12.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Paragraph?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Item (c). "Consequent on the nationalisation of National Company Ltd., Calcutta on 27th April, 1980, Supplementary Grant is sought to meet the expenditure arising under various sections of the National Company Limited (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1980, as follows:—

"(i) Rs. 20,000 for pay and allowances etc. of the Commissioner of

Payments appointed under section 15(1) of the Act and his stenographer;"

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't read all these things.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Okay, Sir. I will confine myself to the first one. That means they are taking the supplementary grant only now. This is a new item of expenditure. If you see (c), that is also a new service. They have put it. Now take page 10 and see item C. You will see the asterisk mark. Down below that they have put it "New Sub-heads." That means it is a new service for which no sanction has been obtained earlier. You are obtaining a sanction on the 15th of March. This is the 18th of March.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): *Post facto*.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Yes, it is *post facto*. You cannot do it. This is a new service for which a supplementary grant is being sought now. You are going to take the sanction and pay it, but this company has been formed on 27th April 1980 and a Commissioner of Payments has been appointed. He has got a steno also. All these amounts are being sought to be recouped now. Wherefrom were they spending this amount? They have been drawing it from somewhere else, from the Consolidated Fund, without any sanction of the House. Therefore, it violates the basic constitutional provision. If you are taking the sanction now and if they are going to spend it within 12 days, I can accept it. Only after they take the grant they can spend it. That means, if they take the grant on the 18th and if the President signs today only, from tomorrow onwards they can draw the sum from the Consolidated Fund under that head. But here the company has been formed on the 27th of April 1980, and the Commissioner of Payments has been there. Now they want Rs. 20,000

paid to the stenographers and others. That means the stenographer and others have all along been there in employment. Then, from where could they have paid them? No Contingency Fund has been there. If it is taken from the Contingency Fund I can appreciate it. That means they clearly violated the provision. You have paid this one. They wanted to take the amount now and recoup it. This position is a wrong norm. For that also you owe an explanation. Otherwise, you delete that portion as you did it for Gujarat or Pondicherry in 1975, or return it to the other House. Do whatever you want.

Now, the same thing in demand No. 61 on page 63. There, Sir, if you see the last item under (e), it says, "the Advisory Committee for the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting set up during the year." It has been set up only during the year. When the Budget was presented in March and demands were passed in June, this was not there. Therefore, no amount was allotted there. It is evident there also. You can see this one, that the Advisory Committee for the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting is under the minor head, A.2(2) with an asterisk mark, which is a new sub-head. They themselves accept that this is a new expenditure. They say that the Advisory Committee for the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has been set up already during the year for which they want Rs. 53,000. The position is that they have not spent anything till today and they want to spend it between the 15th and the 31st of March. Obviously, it had been set up earlier. The expenses have been incorporated, but there is no indication that they had drawn from the Contingency Fund. That means, they can take it out of the Consolidated Funds. So this also violates the thing that is given here. One more point I have got and then I finish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All the points you say.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I think they should satisfy themselves I do not want the Bill to be passed like this. Whatever objection is there has to be seen. What they call as the lumpsum grant they have indulged in Demand No. 1 and Demand No. 54. Take Demand No. 1, page 1. Under A-3 Major Head, they want Rs. 1.5 lakhs. If they had put it as Additional D.A., I would have understood that, but lumpsum has a different connotation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are referring to Demand No. 1.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: It says "to meet the additional expenditure on DA" Lump provision for Additional DA has got a special significance. I go over to the second one. Then you would appreciate it better. You take Demand No. 54, page 58. If you take asterisk A, 11, 15; you find there is a lump provision for DA. Lump provision is a special category in the Grants wherein a single head or a single purpose is not shown. All the various things are put as a lump and you take the grant. This has been objected to in many audit objections. This should be sparingly made use of. I am not going into that. If they had said that, it would have been OK. But, Sir the lumpsum cannot come under article 115. Article 115 deals with the supplementary and additional or excess grants. If you take article 115, it is said:

"The President shall—

(a) if the amount authorised by any law 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..."

That means, it has to be specific. Unless it is very specific, you cannot

[Shri Era Sezhiyan]

take it as a lumpsum. Lumpsum provision is governed by article 116(1) (b). Those who know the audit know the position. Article 116(1) (b) says:

"to make a grant for meeting an unexpected demand upon the resources of India when on account of the magnitude or the indefinite character of the service the demand cannot be stated with the details ordinarily given in an annual financial statement..."

You have not been able to give it as an indefinite one. Article 116(1) (b) has got a definite purpose. In that case, the President's recommendation should be there and reference should be made to article 115(1) read with article 116(1) (b). They should have invited the attention of the President. Article 116 should also have been coupled with article 115(1) (a) because they have indulged in it at two places, in Demand No. 1 and Demand No. 54. They have taken a lumpsum grant which comes only under article 116 and cannot come under article 115. Therefore, I do not object to having this one, but they should have quoted the reference to the Constitution when getting the President's recommendation before presenting it to the House. (Interruptions). I think a proper scrutiny is needed when the figures are given wrongly. But I am not going into them.

These are the four or five points I have raised. They should satisfy me.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: Sir, the main objection of the hon. Member is that proper particulars have not been given. Sir, I do not think there is any item which creates some confusion or something which is not understandable. The items referred to by the hon. Member do not constitute any new service in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee

and no expenditure was incurred in excess of the grant which would have been irregular. Hence there is no question of irregularity.

He has referred to page 1, page 12 and page 63. He is insisting that in respect of the lump provision at page 1 for additional D.A., more information should have been given. But with this information there is no confusion left out, and I think the position is quite clear. Regarding 12 and 63, that does not amount to new service.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are not new services.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: What is 12, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You said about 12.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I did not say anything about 12.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: More information, if he requires, can be given later on. But there is nothing which creates any confusion. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sezhiyan, so far as the last point is concerned about lumpsum, I think that Article 115 clearly relates to supplementary, additional or excess grants. These are falling under these categories. Therefore, Article 115 applies to these grants, supplementary, additional or excess grants. Article 116 applies only to votes on account, votes of credit and exceptional grants. These three categories are covered by Article 116.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Just because it is included in supplementary grants, do not try to put it here. We should see whether this comes in supplementary grant. There I said that the amount authorised by any law made in accordance with Article 114, should be expended for a particular service. When you say lumpsum, it does not mean a particular service.

What is the significance of lumpsum? I ask the Minister. Why does he put it as lumpsum both in the case of Chandigarh and in these demands 1 and 54. Why does he think of lumpsum? Lumpsum has got definite significance in the parlance of audit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These are prescribed.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Let him explain. Regarding page 12, he says it is not a new service. Why does he say like this? I do not know whether I should take the Minister's word or the printed word here.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Regarding page 12, item (c) comprises of four items, of which the first is for the posts of secretariat and is not a new service.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Please take page 10.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: You will take each and every page. You asked about page 12. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have been very co-operative. I do not want to do anything. Then, he tries to make a mockery of me. Regarding page 12, I think he knows. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Deputy Chairman, the demands are given. They put the demand. They give original grants, then supplementary grants, then sub-heads, then major heads. Then they give explanation. I read the explanation given by them. If the Minister is very keen to go to page 12, page 12 gives this one. Have you got the book, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes, I have got it.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Page 10 is the basic one.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: There can be more than one . . .

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Mr. Sisodia, let us be very clear. On page 10, you have items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and so on. For instance, C.1(2)(1)(7)—Commissioner of Payments under Section 15(1) of the National Company Ltd. (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1980. You have got C-1, C-2, C-3 and so on. And asterisk marks are there. And on page 11 they explain why the asterisk marks are there. At the end of page 11, they say that the asterisk mark means "New Sub-heads". I think he knows the significance of why it is a new service. That is because it is not there in the original grant. That is, the service was not contemplated in the original grant. The Minister says that it is not a new service. Then why do you put a new sub-head? He cannot ridicule me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody is ridiculing you.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Here also for the first time they are taking the grant. Let them bring the detailed grants for 1980-81. If he shows that it has been already put there, then this is a wrong thing. But here it means that for the first time, they are taking the grant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The grant may be dealing with different subjects.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: In the original grant, for the take-over of the National Company Limited, no amount was provided. All the amounts are being provided now. They might have taken the decision earlier. But they have not provided for it in the original grant. In the supplementary grants, they are providing for it. That is why . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On page 10, C(1) (2) is "other industries". Under "other industries" there may be so many things.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: They are taking the amount for the first time now. If he contradicts me, I will bring the full grants and put them before

[Shri Era Sezhiyan]

the House. If there is anything wrong, it will fall upon the Minister.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, a new sub-head is not necessarily a new service. And so long as the expenditure is within the scope of the grant and it is not attracted by the limitations recommended by the PAC, no question arises. There can be two ways of explaining a thing. The matter is quite clear. It may not be clear from his angle. But anybody who goes through the contents of these items will see that it is quite clear. There is no confusion. He can insist that it must be as he desires, but that is not the position. It has been done since long and this has been passed by the Lok Sabha. It has been considered there also. There is no confusion at all. He is creating some confusion. Confusion can never be cleared. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it not a new service?

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: No, Sir, this is not a new service.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister says that it is not a new service

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: He says it is not necessarily a new service.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: It is not a new service.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): You will have to show the provision in the original grant.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Unfortunately I did not bring the Budget Manual and the General Financial Rules. I did not bring them because I thought the Minister would know everything. If he wants, in the next session I will bring it and I will prove that this is a new service. Now, if he contradicts me, let him contradict me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: From what I see, the service, taken as a whole, is not new. On page 10, in the "Revenue Section" under "Major Head", relating to the Ministry of Commerce, several industries are detailed and ultimately they say "Other Industries". It means that the service is covered under this head. Some new items may be added. But the service is already covered there. That is why they are coming for supplementary grants. On that item the expenditure might not have arisen earlier.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Mr Deputy Chairman, I fully endorse what you have said. Whenever there is a new item, they should come to the House for supplementary grants. [That is the constitutional provision. If the amount is authorised by law. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amount was not authorised by law. That is why he is coming forward now with this. (Interruptions) Now the point is clear

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: What is clear? I think the Constitution also says. . .

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, Mr. Era Sezhiyan will never be satisfied.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now let us proceed with this discussion.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: No, how can you proceed? The Bill is defective. I quoted the Speaker's ruling on three occasions. If it is a new service and they have to spend some amount from out of the Consolidated Fund of India. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But he says that it is not a new service.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: It is not a new service.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: At that time I raised an objection there and the Bills were withdrawn. The amount

is bound to be insufficient, but you cannot exceed that. If you need more money, then, you should come to the House. For example, if you want Rs. 1000 crores, and you have only, say, Rs. 580 crores which is not enough for the next two months, then you stop the expenditure and come to the House first. Here the provision is "If a need has arisen in the current financial year for supplementary or additional expenditure upon some new service not contemplated in the annual financial statement of the year, . . .". Therefore, this was not contemplated in the annual statement of the year. It is a new one. Therefore, . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the head was already there. All these have come under "any other industries".

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: In that case, Sir, all new items of expenditure can be put just under one head.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, let us consider at this stage and we accept the contention made by the Minister at this stage. . .

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: No, Sir. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just listen to me. At this stage I can accept this contention that it is covered under the services provided. . . .

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: You reserve your ruling at this stage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not a new thing. But if anything is found later on, the Public Accounts Committee can look into all these things and give its opinion to Parliament. In fact, on earlier occasions the Public Accounts Committee suggested certain modalities and certain formalities to be complied with. The Public Accounts Committee has already advised in pursuance of which certain Bills have been brought forward here; in these Appropriation Bills also the Public Accounts Committee has found out certain irregularities and they have

advised the Government to follow certain rules and procedures and modalities. And Government has come forward with certain provisions; those modalities can be complied with. In the same way I think it satisfies the requirements, and if anything remains, we can send the proceedings to the Public Accounts Committee to examine it and advise the Government accordingly. So now we go on to the business. . .

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: I am sorry I did not follow your ruling very clearly. I can understand your saying that what the Minister said was acceptable to you. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That I have already said.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: You have only provisionally said it. .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I have said it. . .

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA PANT: But when you bring in the Public Accounts Committee into this, it confuses the matter further. He raised a point here and it must be disposed of. Either you agree with the Minister or you agree with the Member, or, if you like, you reserve your ruling. The point is one of procedure. The honourable Member has taken a lot of trouble over it. It is not easy for a Member to bring all the facts and figures and bring out points which, if the Government looks at it from the point of view of procedure proper, may contain a lot of weight in them and may improve the whole procedural aspect of bringing forward supplementary Demands for amounts in excess of sanctioned demands. If it is looked at from that point of view and if any correction is needed the Government will not mind correcting it, because it will help in future also. Parliament Scrutiny of the Budget in any case, as we all know, is not fully satisfactory. Here are some cases where an attempt is made to exercise such a scrutiny. When it is pointed out that rules have been bent or violated while expenditure is incurred for

[Shri Krishna Chandra Pant]

which my friend is not personally responsible, it is a question of procedure that is being sought to be corrected. If a certain expenditure is found increasing which under the rules should have come before Parliament, I think it is in the interests of the House as a whole—this is not a party matter—it is in the interests of Parliament as a whole, that it should be enabled to exercise due scrutiny over the expenditure of the Government; it is in the interests of my friend opposite, it is in the interests of the people sitting here. From that point of view, from that procedural point of view he has quoted chapter and verse; he has raised three distinct points. I do not want to repeat them. And he has quoted chapter and verse in support of what he said. And it is for you to accept or not to accept it, you are the person who can best do that. But I would submit that it would confuse matters to bring in the Public Accounts Committee etc. You may take any view. But the House should be satisfied broadly that it is enabled to exercise due scrutiny over Government expenditure.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Mr Deputy Chairman, I will not take much time of the House. This is the concern of the entire House. Party differences do not come in. When I raised it in the other House, even the Speaker accepted my contention. The Minister also accepted it. And two Bills were accordingly withdrawn. In one Bill they deducted the amount and passed it. On the last occasion, that is on the 25th December, I raised a point. In this case also, there is no reflection on Mr. Sisodia's capacity. He is not responsible for this. Various Ministries have put in their demands. He is only holding the baby of some other person. But in the Parliament unless we enforce some financial discipline, we will never be able to bring about discipline in our national life. We have got the rules. The constitutional

provision is there and the Speaker's ruling is also there. If the Executive thinks that they can get away from this on the strength of their majority, let them do it. In that case we need not waste time on this. If they think that by just show of hands they can decide, obviously more hands are on that side. Actually we want to help them. In my humble opinion, you must take a clear decision. If the Bill is passed or not passed, individually I do not gain or lose. Individually we are equals. But we want to raise the prestige of the House. We want to exercise our control over the Executive.

Secondly, it should not be the prerogative of the Lok Sabha only. The Rajya Sabha has also a role to play. Our intention is only to raise the dignity of the House and to make the functioning of Parliament more effective. Therefore, you give your ruling. If you want to hold over till the 24th or 25th, I do not mind. I do not want to obstruct the passage of the Bill. I am only trying to help the Government. On many occasions, I have helped the Government. On the last occasion, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was there. They showed me a budget and asked me whether it could be presented in that form. I helped them. It is not my intention to obstruct the Government. I am only helping them. But if I have to do something for upholding the prestige of the Parliament, I will certainly prefer to do that. You can hold it over till the 24th or 25th. I do not mind. I am not here to block anybody. On the 24th morning you can decide this.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: More than once, on behalf of the Government, the position has been made clear. He has cited this ruling many a time. He is referring to the ruling of the Lok Sabha. In that ruling, it was admitted by the Minister that the service was a new service. Here it is under dispute to which he is drawing the attention of the House. I have stated previously also that the service

is not a new service. It was only a Secretariat expenditure and it does not come under the definition of 'New service. Therefore, that ruling is not applicable as far as facts of this. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him complete.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: As far as the facts of the present situation are concerned, this ruling is not applicable at all and it is only applicable in the case in which there is a dispute about new service. But I again deny that and I want to say that the service is not a new service and it is only a secretariat expenditure and it does not amount to a new service. And, Sir, this matter has been scrutinised by the Lok Sabha and it has been passed by the Lok Sabha and there is no ambiguity at all and it will be taken care of by the Public Accounts Committee as well. Therefore, there is no question of that, there is no confusion, nothing against the law and nothing against the rules. Therefore, I would request you humbly to reject it. It should be rejected and we should proceed with the debate on these different Bills.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Sir,...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just wait. He has not even finished.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, how long will this go on?

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Sir, there is a point...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it anything new?

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Yes, very new.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Sir, the honourable Minister has not answered the point raised. He says that it is not a new service. (Interruptions). But the point is whether you can withdraw from the Contingency Fund when Parliament is in session. The Minister quoted a ruling and said that he would place a subsequent ruling on the Table of the House. According to them there is a subsequent, ruling and he is now confusing the issue under the grab of the new service. The only point is whether he can withdraw, whether money can be withdrawn, from the Contingency Fund, when the House is in session.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK (Orissa): Yes. (Interruptions).

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: That is the point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: No, Sir. That is the point. (Interruptions).

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: Sir, I want to seek a clarification. If they can do this when the House is in session, they can do something more when the House is not in session.

SHRI ERA SEZHIVAN: Sir, I said that no money can be withdrawn from the Contingency Fund when the House is in session. Please read this one. There is no mention of any new service here.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, how many times will he be repeating the same point about new service and old service? The position has been made quite clear and that is not applicable at all here.

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: Sir, it is like issuing an Ordinance when the House is in session.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: Yes.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, I am on a different point. When the House is sitting, money cannot be withdrawn from the Contingency Fund. That is one thing. The point that I raised regarding new service, Demand No. 13, is entirely different. Whether it is a new service or not, you decide. That is a different point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: How can it be withdrawn from the Contingency Fund when the House is in session?

SHRI R. R. MORARKA: That is the point.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: He was mentioning about the Public Accounts Committee just now. But what happened at that time? (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far as the first part is concerned, regarding the "New Services" point that you have raised, I think I am inclined to agree with the Minister that it is not a new service and it is already contemplated in the original Grants and it is only an excess expenditure. So, that point, I think, we have disposed of.

The second point is about the withdrawal from the Contingency Fund when the House is in session. The reference made to it in the Lok Sabha is there. But I am not sure whether this point was raised in the Lok Sabha when these Bills were taken up because the Bills were passed by the Lok Sabha and the honourable Speaker has certified them to be Financial Bills. The power of this House is very limited and if we do not return them within fourteen days, they will be automatically accepted within fourteen days. So, I think, when the Lok Sabha has passed them...

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: But which is the last day for this to be passed?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That can be ascertained.

The power of this House is very limited in this and, therefore, I do not think we can defer this at this stage. The Lok Sabha is competent and they have passed it. (Interruptions) Just hear me please. The Lok Sabha has passed the Bill and the presumption is that they have complied with the relevant provisions of the Constitution. So, there is no infringement of that part of the Constitution. Therefore, I think the Bills can be taken up for consideration by the House. (Interruptions).

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have risen to speak on the Appropriation Bills presented by the Finance Minister here. But let me go back to the discussion which was taking place here. Mr. Sisodia in his personal capacity was a Minister in the State Government also. He knows the way and method of passing a Budget and how Heads of service in each Budget item have to be shown in the Budget papers. Now, the point which has been raised by Mr. Era Sezhiyan is a very valid point. I wished that you, Sir, in your wisdom should not have given a ruling on it; you should have reserved your ruling.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBAR NATH PANDE) in the Chair].

The excuse that the Bill has to be passed today, within 14 days according to their programme, is not our concern; it is the concern of the Ministry who should do their job properly and in the constitutional manner. If they bring the Bill in a manner which goes against the provisions of the Constitution, and Article 116 is not attracted along with Article 115, the fault lies with the Ministry, not with the Opposition or the Members of this House.

Sir, I have listened very carefully to the points raised by Mr. Era Sezhiyan. What was his objection? His objection was about the new heads in the Explanatory Memorandum. Now, ac-

cording to the provision of the Budget, if you do not show in the original Budget such sub-heads under which you can draw in the Supplementary Budget or in the excess expenditure budget, you cannot do it because the sub-head is not there ... (Interruptions) I do not know to whom I am addressing; the Vice-Chairman is talking to somebody and the Finance Minister instead of listening to the speeches is talking to somebody. Let them finish first and then I will resume.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please continue. I am in all attention to you.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: Thank you. The Deputy Chairman stated that the matter will be referred to the Public Accounts Committee. Sir, the Public Accounts Committee examines the accounts placed before the Public Accounts Committee; they do not make fresh rules. What they examine is the excess expenditure and whether the excess expenditure is justified, and if so, whether it has been referred back to both Houses of Parliament. That is the jurisdiction. And to say that the whole matter will be referred to the Public Accounts Committee is not correct. How can the P.A.C. have jurisdiction over new items which you have not shown in your original Budget- So it is superfluous. I think the Minister has not given it the proper attention. Neither any senior Member of the ruling party came to his help. Sir, it is a very difficult matter for the Minister himself to come to the House and to hear the arguments of Mr. Era Sezhiyan and give on-the-spot replies to the valid questions that Mr. Sezhiyan has raised in this House. Sir, repetition of a mistake is no excuse for going on repeating mistakes. If mistakes were done in the past, well, the mistakes have to be rectified. What Mr. Sezhiyan wanted is not to block the proceedings of this House. He wanted you to take a serious note of his objections which are valid objections according to the

financial rules and according to the constitutional provisions, so that they do not do it next time when they come up for supplementary grants. With this bungling, I think there is no excuse for the Ministry. I am not accusing Mr. Sisodia. He came unprepared here to hear the arguments based on the constitutional provisions and the ruling of the Chair. The Deputy Chairman should not have given an on-the-spot decision. He should have reserved his right for giving a ruling on this very vital item. And he said that it has been passed by the Lok Sabha and so we have to pass it. We are not the dittoing body here. If we have any valid argument against it, we must put forward that for the better functioning of the parliamentary system and better functioning of the Government. So, I would urge again on behalf of our Members that this point raised by Mr. Sezhiyan should be considered for the future guidance of the Ministry before coming up either with the Budget or the Supplementary Budget or any excess items. Sir, according to the Appropriation Bills presented before us, the Minister has mixed up the issues where the excess expenditure has taken place, and he has missed up the issue where the new items have been proposed. For new items even one rupee grant has to be shown in the original Budget so that with one rupee grant, you can take recourse to more withdrawals whenever you feel it necessary. So, the lump amount is a misnomer, under article 115. They should not have done it. They should have introduced a new item of either contingency or nationalisation. He said that it was done because nationalisation took place which was not envisaged. However, in the Government of India, as things stand today, many times will come when new nationalisation items will have to be taken up. So, there should be a main item under which even one rupee will give the Ministry the authority to spend even Rs. 2 lakhs or Rs. 2 crores or Rs. 20 crores. But without some such provision in the Budget itself or in the Supplementary Budget itself, how do you

[Shrimati Purabi Mukhopadhyay]

do it in future also? There also, there will be no contingency for that.

Sir, coming back to the Supplementary Grants and the Bills he has placed before the House, I have to make certain observations. Sir, the country is passing through a deep economic crisis resulting in great social injustice in the country. I do not think I will have to explain this point. Clear stagnation and even decline in many branches of the economy and growing economic disparities are very much evident. In real terms or in constant prices, both national and per capita income is declining. There is seasonal decline in the wholesale price index but not in the retail price. So, inflation has not decreased as claimed by the Government. There is the increasing suffering of the people due to high prices of all essential commodities of mass consumption. There must be a radical change in the credit policy of the nationalised banks to help the poorer sections, specially in rural areas and more so in the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe-concentrated block areas. The land reforms and the Ceiling Act have not been vigorously implemented. And we know why it is so. From 50 millions of agricultural labourers, the figure now stands at 60 millions, indicating the growing number of landlessness among the agricultural poor. The minimum agricultural wage is not implemented. The stranglehold of the big peasantry on the ruling party is one of the main reasons. Even when the Janata Government was here, the stranglehold of big peasantry was on them. And now it is on this ruling party. And that is how the vested interests, specially in the rural areas, always take the advantage of their position through the ruling party because of their capabilities manoeuvring. The Government has no policy to buy jute, cotton and tobacco through its own agencies. I should have elaborated this point if I had the time at my disposal and shown how the jute growers are being exploited

by big monopoly houses and how the Government till today is ineffective in monopoly procurement through Government's own agencies.

5 P.M.

Then, there should be freight equalisation. The rural indebtedness is increasing. The Government have not indicated any measures to combat this problem and exploitation of the poor by the rich moneylenders continues. No safe drinking water is available in rural pockets and the people are suffering not only in drought-prone areas but in ordinary rural areas also where each village has not yet been given a glass of potable safe drinking water.

No new industrial policy has been declared by the Government as yet. The Government declared the Industrial Policy as long back as 1965 and that Industrial Policy has been repeated this time also by the Industry Minister which does not take into consideration the prevailing situation in the country, namely, the question of raw materials, the question of multinationals, the question of big monopoly houses and the question of rural sector and industries. The same is applicable to the industrial licensing policy also. There is no check on unauthorised expansion of capacity by industrialists in violation of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. The trade and deficits are mounting. The special bearer bonds provision is, to give a premium on black money because the Government have stated that on the face value of Rs. 10,000 notes the person will be able to get after 10 years, Rs. 12,000, and the premium that they will be earning will not be taxed. No income-tax, no gift-tax and no wealth-tax will be levied on that, even though the Wanchoo Committee outright rejected this proposal.

The hike in petroleum prices and railway freight has resulted in consumers paying more for their daily necessities. Sir, in short, if I want to deal with all the items in a little detail, I do not have the time at my

disposal. Therefore, I will give you just one specific example of now the Government is dealing with industry, specially where the employment potential is there and how one or the other of the small-scale or medium scale industries are being closed down and how instead of coming to their rescue the Government is allowing the industries to be closed down by the management. I am mentioning the particular case of a company. This is the Calcutta firm of Braithwaite, and Jessops Construction Ltd. In short it is B.B.J. Unfortunately I had an occasion to meet some of their employees. I took up their case with Mr. Charanjit Chanana yesterday or day before yesterday. He was very sympathetic because I took it up but he stated that he does not know anything about it. Then I got a document from my State Government sources, a letter written by the Industry Minister to the Chief Minister of West Bengal, the Industry Minister himself suggesting closing down of this company where five thousand employees along with another eleven thousand casual labourers—forget about their family dependants—will be thrown out of employment. The Government, through Mr. Chanana's letter, I find, is willing to pay Rs. 2 crores to the employees as compensation but the Government is not willing even for paying Rs. 1 lakh or Rs. 1 crore, as juice, to run the machine. They can get rid of the employees by paying a lumpsum, whether it is Rs. 20 or Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 20,000. At the fag end of their life, after putting in so many years of life in this company, they will now be given some alms just to go back and sit at home. We demand, Government should come forward to nationalise this company and immediately take-over the management today so that it is not allowed to close down. And this demand for nationalisation of B.B.J. is a long-standing demand but the Government has not shown any interest in nationalising it. As a result, we find, this company's shareholders ate up all the money as their bonus, as their dividends, instead of ploughing-

back into the company's capital. Government should take over this company immediately. Give a fresh dose, so that they can stand on their own legs. They have done the original Hoogly Bridge, the original Howrah bridge, and they are having the second Hoogly Bridge. There is no dearth of order. It is only the callousness of the management which is forcing this company to go without taking any initiative in securing fresh orders. Without securing anything, without doing anything, they are getting fat salaries and conspiring to close down. I would request the Government to go to their rescue immediately so that things are not allowed to deteriorate further. The State Government Chief Minister, in his reply, has said for status quo to be maintained at least till the Hoogly Bridge is constructed which they are dealing with. I would, through the Finance Minister, urge upon this Ministry and the Prime Minister to go to their rescue and see that Bengal economy does not suffer any further.

Sir, I do not propose to deal with other items of taxation in the Supplementary or in the Appropriation Bill. Our party colleagues dealt with them. There must be no direct taxation in the Budget; already the people are suffering. Housewives are in tears when they get their daily necessities at a very high cost, and where the disparity in incomes is so much, where the gap between the rich and the poor is so much. Government should find out new fiscal measures through which these disparities can be removed.

श्री सैयद सिब्ते रज्जी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपभाध्यक्ष जी, चाहे फाइनेंस बिल हो या एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल हो या बजट हो, या किसी और तरीके का मुद्दा, हमेशा हमारे विपक्षी पक्ष के लोग इस बान की कोशिश करते हैं कि हम उन तमाम उपलब्धियों पर और तमाम उन अचीवमेंट्स पर जो हमारे नेता, हमारी पार्टी के नेतृत्व में इस देश में आई हैं, उन पर अंधेरे डाल ।

[श्री सैयद सित्ते रज]

हम इतराजात से नहीं घबराते हैं । लेकिन कुछ इस देश में हुआ है और तरक्की के जो निशान बने हैं, उनके ऊपर जैसे अभी स्पेशल मेशन के अन्दर भी इस बात का प्रयास किया गया कि उस पर कटाक्ष किया जाए और हमारे साथी माननीय रामेवर सिंह जी ने बहुत ही वेग शब्दों में अपने इतराजात यहां पर रखे । उसके संबंध में तो मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा आपके माध्यम से कि—

पत्ता-पत्ता, बूटा-बूटा हाल हमारा जाने है,
जाने न जाने गुल ही न जाने, बाग तो
सारा जाने है ।

मान्यवर, इतराजात से हम घबराते नहीं और समस्याओं को हम नकारते नहीं । समस्याओं से झूझने की क्षमता और दक्षता हमारी नेता में है और जब-जब जिस-जिस समय इस देश के सामने समस्याएं आई हैं, इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि हमारे सक्षम नेतृत्व ने उन समस्याओं का समाधान किया है और समस्याओं का बहादुरी से मुकाबला किया है । रामेवर सिंह साहब ने बड़े ही गलत अंदाज से हमारी बहिन श्रीमती सरोज खापर्डे की तरफ इशारा करते हुए कहा कि अपनी मालकिन से पूछ करके बताओ और मैं स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि इशारा हमारी नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की तरफ था । मैं कहना चाहूंगा, हमारी पार्टी में नौकर और मालिक का कोई रिश्ता नहीं है । रामेवर साहब की पार्टी में हो सकता है क्योंकि जो जैसा तजुर्बा करता है उसकी रोशनी में बात करता है । इतनी बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहूंगा, वह हमारी मालकिन नहीं है लेकिन वह हमारी मां है, इस देश के करोड़ों इन्सानों की जीती-जागती तसवीर हैं—

उनकी आकांक्षाओं की, उनकी तमन्नाओं की, उम्मीदों की और देश के करोड़ों दलितों और पीड़ितों की मां है, ऐसा इस देश की जनता समझती है ।

मान्यवर, जब उनके ऐतराजात सुने जाते हैं तो हमें याद आता है सन् 1978 का वह जमाना जब हमारी नेता ने और हमारी पार्टी ने कहा था— भारत बचाओ । हमने कहा था, भारत बचाओ, इसलिए नहीं कि हमारे देश की सीमाओं पर दुश्मन लगे हुए थे बल्कि इसलिए कहा था कि हमारा देश दिशा-विहीन हो रहा था, देश की राजनैतिक और आर्थिक प्रगति का जो चक्र था वह रुक रहा था और इसलिए कहा गया था भारत बचाओ । लेकिन हमारे विरोध पक्ष के, उस समय सत्ता में बैठे हुए लोगों ने कहा कि यह भारत बचाओ का नारा इसलिए दिया गया है; क्योंकि इसके पीछे ही छपे हुए हैं तस्वीर है, इन्दिरा बचाओ । यदि इस देश में मोशलिज्म को खतरा हो, यदि इस देश में जनतंत्र को खतरा हो, यदि इस देश में योजनाओं को खतरा हो, यदि इस देश की प्रगति और तरक्की को खतरा हो और हम यह कहें, भारत बचाओ और आप कहें भारत बचाओ का नारा इन्दिरा बचाओ के लिए लगाया गया है तो हम इस बात पर फख्र करते हैं । भारत केवल कंदराओं, पहाड़ों, जमीनों और दरियाओं पर मुश्तमिल नहीं है, भारत को हम उन आकांक्षाओं, उन उम्मीदों, उन तमन्नाओं और उन नीतियों से जिनका शिलान्यास महात्मा गांधी और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू से हुआ था, उनके नेतृत्व में हुआ था, उन से जोड़ते हैं । आज अगर हम भारत बचाओ को इन्दिरा बचाओ से जोड़ते हैं तो इसका मतलब है कि इन्दिरा गांधी खड़ी हैं उन उम्मीदों के लिए जिन के लिए हम ने संघर्ष किया ।

मान्यवर, सन् 1978 में किस तरह से इस देश की जनता का विश्वास और ऐतमाद लेकर, आज जो विरोध पक्ष में बैठे हुए हैं वे सत्ता पक्ष में आए थे, किस तरह से उन्होंने हमारे मूल्यों का, हमारी कीमतों का, हमारी कद्रों का और इस देश के अवाम के जजबे का मजाक उड़ाया—मैं पूरी रिपोर्ट की तरफ मान्यवर, आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा, उसकी साक्ष्य यदि देखें तो उस से स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि वह सोना जो इस देश की मान्यताओं का प्रतिनिधित्व कर रहा था—वह चंद लोगों के जाती मकासिद को पूरा करने के लिए बाजारों में नीलाम कर दिया गया और यह नीलामी सोने की दो-चार किलो की बात नहीं थी, टनों सोना जो इस देश के खजाने में देश की सुरक्षा की नीयत से रखा गया था उसको नीलाम कर दिया और यही नीलाम इस देश के अवाम के विश्वास की नीलामी थी और हमारी उन आकांक्षाओं और हमारी उन कीमतों का और कद्रों का मजाक उड़ाया गया जो अवाम ने इस देश की अवाम ने, हम देश के, राष्ट्र के, सत्ताधारी पक्ष को दिया :

“हमारे आशियां के तोते चार दिन के, चमन लुट गया आशियां आते आते।” शाह कमीशन का हर जगह प्रचार किया गया, रेडियो और टेलीविजन में उपयोग किया गया। उन आकांक्षाओं और उन मुद्दों की तरफ जिनको लेकर जवाहरलाल जी चले थे और इस कौम के सबसे बड़े मेमारे-आजम, नए हिन्दुस्तान के कर्णधार, नये हिन्दुस्तान में नीतियों की बुनियादें डालने वाले जवाहरलाल नेहरू पर भी आक्षेप किए गए। यहां तक कि रोलिंग प्लान लाया गया। इस देश में जो योजनाओं की पद्धति से, एक सुनियोजित ढंग से करोड़ों इन्सानों की समस्याओं

के समाधान के लिए हम आगे बढ़े थे उम को भी रोक देने का प्रयास किया गया।

मान्यवर, वह सोना कैसे बिका ? इसके पीछे कौन लोग थे ? वे थे जो ढिंढोरी थी इस बात के कि हम नैतिकता में विश्वास करते हैं, वे थे जो कहते थे कि हम महात्मा गांधी के पैरोकार हैं, महात्मा गांधी के रास्ते पर चलने वाले हैं, वे थे जो राजनीति में मारल की बात करते हैं। और आप जानते हैं, सारा देश जानता है, वह सोना बेचा गया मोरारजी देसाई, प्रधान मंत्री, और उनके जेवी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर एच० एम० पटेल की साठगांठ की वजह से।

मान्यवर, मुझे बहुत अफसोस है कि उस समय की सरकार का नेतृत्व करने वाले प्रधान मंत्री ने और उनके फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने अपने निहित स्वार्थों की पूर्ति के लिए उस वक्त की कैबिनेट को भी पूर्ण रूप से अपने विश्वास में नहीं लिया और 1978-79 के बजट प्रयोजन के साथ सोने के बेचने के मामले को गढ़मढ़ करके इस देश के आवास के सामने पेश दिया गया यह कैसा था ? यह वह सोना था जो चीन के साथ 1962 की लड़ाई में और पाकिस्तान के साथ 1965 की लड़ाई के वक्त हमारी माताओं और बहिनों ने—जो उन के गले में पड़ा हुआ था, उन के सुहाग की निशानी था, उन के हाथों में खनखना रहा था—उतार-उतार कर देश की स्वतंत्रता, देश की मान और मर्यादा की रक्षा के लिए इस देश के कोप में दिया था। उस सोने की नीलामी चंद लोगों के फायदे के लिए कर दी गयी यह सोना पूरे देश के व्यापारियों ने नहीं खरीदा। इस सोने की नीलामी केन्द्रित कर दी गयी बम्बई के आदर और मुछ

[श्री सैयद सिद्दिक जी]

सोना बेचने वाले व्यापारियों—को, जिन्होंने एक सिंडिकेट बना लिया था, यह सारे देश की धरोहर, जो दान के रूप में, कुर्बानियों के रूप में देश के कोष में आयी थी, बेच दी गयी। देश की मुसीबत के वक्त काम आने वाला यह सोना चन्द खुदागाज लोगों के मकसिद के लिए बलि के समान रख दिया गया। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से और इस देश की सरकार से कि ऐसे देशद्रोहियों के खिलाफ, उन लोगों के खिलाफ, जिन्होंने जनता का विश्वास लेने के बाद उस के साथ विश्वासघात किया, आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं ?

सोने की इस विकवाली के बाद मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहूंगा इनकम टैक्स कलेक्शन्स की बात, एक्साइज की बात; किन्तु तरह आडर-असेसमेंट हुआ एक्साइज पेमेंट हुआ, एक्साइज में कैसे एग्जेंप्शन्स दिये गये, कैसे जो एग्जेंप्शन्स स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज के लिए थे बड़े-बड़े व्यापारियों ने हासिल कर लिए। अती-अमी हमारे कंट्रोलर एंड आडिटर जनरल आफ इंडिया ने 78-79 के सत्रितले में एक रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत की है। मैं उस के कुछ उद्धरण आप के सामने रखना चाहूंगा। यहाँ लाइट ठीक करवायें, लाइट बहुत खराब हो गयी है।

I quote:

"The Controller and Auditor General of India has found under-assessment of tax amounting to Rs. 93 crore—Rs. 62 crore under customs and Central excise and Rs. 31 crore under direct taxes—in 1979-80.

In its report presented to the Lok Sabha today, CAG says there was excess payment of drawback of Rs. 41.91 lakh on cut and published diamonds exported through a major port. This resulted from the payments being continued to be made even after the withdrawal of a

drawback rate by issue of a public notice in April, 1978.

The report points out that during 1979-80, the Government granted 97 exemptions from customs duty totalling Rs. 205 crore. The corresponding figures for 1976-77 were Rs. 9 crore, for 1977-78 Rs. 15 crore and for 1978-79 Rs. 60 crore.

The report mentions a number of cases where excise duty concessions meant for the small scale sector were also allowed to manufacture who could not be categorised as small scale units.

The collections from income tax including corporation tax totalled Rs. 2,732 crore during the year. Over 90 per cent of the amount represented pre-assessment collection, namely payments of tax by way of deduction at source or advance tax or on self-assessment by the assesses; the collections on regular assessment by the income tax authorities represented less than ten per cent of the total."

मान्यवर, आखिर में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि पूरा महाशरा उन तीन सालों में इस तरह से बर्बाद हुआ है कि आज भी उस की काली परछाइयां हमारी आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर पड़ रही हैं और मौजूदा हालात की बात अभी हमारी माननीय सदस्या महोदय ने कही। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि यदि आप को इस देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था को ठीक बनाना है, यदि देश को प्रगति के रास्ते पर ले कर चलना है, यदि आर्गूमेंट फार आर्गूमेंट शेक ही नहीं करना है तो ऐसे एग्जेंप्शन्स कि जो गुजरात में किये जा रहे हैं, ऐसे काम रोको आंदोलन जो कि कारखानों में किये जा रहे हैं उन को आप को रोकना पड़ेगा। यदि हिन्दुस्तान की नयी पीढ़ी के साथ आप को कुछ मुहब्बत है तो आप को उन को रोकना पड़ेगा और आज राजनीतिक के बदले राजनीति लाने के लिये यदि गुजरात के ग्रंदर सांप्रदायिक शक्तियाँ खो उभार कर उन आंदोलनों को सरकार के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल करने के लिये और केवल सरकार को बदनाम

करने के लिये जो आंदोलन किये जा रहे हैं तो मेरी गुजारिश है कि कम से कम राजनीति के लिये घरों को बर्बाद न करिये। सिर्फ राजनीति के लिये खाली सड़कों पर चाकूजनी न करिये और ऐसा एक माहौल बनाइये कि जिस में सुख और शान्ति का भरोसा लोगों में पैदा हो सके और हम सब उस आर्थिक व्यवस्था को बना सकें कि जिस को महात्मा गांधी ने देखा था। मुझे यह आता है कि जब गुजरात आंदोलन की बात करते हैं तो सियासत की बात करते हैं क्योंकि 1974 में पहली बार इस देश के अंदर चुनी हुई असेम्बलियों को गिराने के खिलाफ तकरीरें की गयी थीं और गुजरात की धरती से एक ऐसा वातावरण पूरे देश में फैलाने की कोशिश की गयी थी कि जिस से हमारा सारा तानाबाना इस देश का तानाबाना जो पिछले 25, 30 सालों की मेहनत के बाद बना था वह बिखरता हुआ नजर आया। आज फिर उसी रास्ते पर इस देश को ले जाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। कृपया राजनीति के वह हाथ जो लोगों का गला घोट रहे है, राजनीति के वह हाथ जो हमारी प्रगति के बढ़ते हुए पहिये को रोक रहे हैं, उन हाथों को बदलिये। उन हाथों को बदलिये और देश की तरक्की की जो शाहे राह है उस तरक्की की शाहे राह पर देश को कराड़ों लोगों को ले कर चलिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल का स्वागत और समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK:
Sir, I rise to oppose this "Misappropriation Bill." That it is so has already been amply established by our hon. friend, Shri Era Sezhiyan. The Government is not in a position even to present the papers as per rules. That only shows in which way they are managing or mismanaging the affairs of the country.

Anyway, I am here only to make some observations which might benefit not only us but the entire nation in the future. Sir, it is actually al-

most beating about the bush whether one hon. Member supports this Bill or another Member opposes it. The question is that during the last 33 years, whether it was one party or the other which was actually in power, the real political party which has taken position in the process is "Sarkari Kala", or the Government machinery. At the time Independence, where there was only one person, today there are 10 persons, but the efficiency has become less than one-tenth of what it was at that time. The hon. Member who preceded me said that in Gujarat, some political parties are putting their hands in the agitation. May I ask the hon. Member to which political party the Government officials of Gujarat belong? Officials in one department after another have started joining the so called students in the so called agitation that is going on there. Actually during the budget, we are only providing for the services. Is it the job of parliament to only put its rubber stamp so that the people who are serving, only they will be getting their bread and butter without serving the cause of the nation. May I ask the hon. Minister to put on record that at the end of the financial year when they are making budget provisions and appropriations, he will see that before the financial year ends we will also have a chance to see how much of this money has been spent or mis-spent, whether it is properly appropriated or misappropriated? I am sure I am not blaming the party in power or supporting the party that was in power. As another hon. Member pointed out, Parliament should exercise its authority and sovereignty on every paisa that is spent or misspent. So it is time for us to see that all the loopholes are plugged. To the hon. Minister here I wrote an elaborate letter under the headline "Anomalies in our payment system" but in return I only got an acknowledgement. That is all. And from the budget that has been laid before the House this year, you will find that not a single action has been taken. Rather I find that

[Shri Harekrushna Mallick]

he has words only for the rich to become richer, and the poor are completely ignored. It is for the first time during the history of our freedom that the Finance Minister utters the name of the middle class before he could have uttered the name of the poor. Just as he codified the financial provisions, he wants that there should be stratification to continue, not only to continue but to be perpetuated till eternity. I condemn the Finance Minister and the Finance Ministry and the Government on this score. They must withdraw such a budget and revise their attitude. They have deliberately stated that the middle class is getting depressed and that they are giving a lot of things and all that. I wonder why there should be a middle class, why there should be a lower class and why there should be an upper class. Why should we not have a classless society? I condemn the slogans they are raising. Socialism, socialism, socialism! Actually in the name of socialism the party sitting in power is perpetuating this and they are supporting the government machinery. I am astonished and ashamed that each time a party is in power, either at the State or at the Centre, they are embracing the people in the services as if they are their own. But I will not be misunderstood by anybody because I am not saying anything with vendetta against any individual. Whatever I say here I say as an Indian for the benefit of all Indians and India for eternity to come.

Perhaps it was Chanakya who said in some context, "What is friendship with a neighbouring State?" Well, you have always to keep your powder dry because any moment if your neighbour attacks you you have to attack back or defend yourself. Similarly, another thing he has said: "What is love for a harlot?" In Sanskrit he said:—

"Vesyanaam poojyah premah"

Well, it is futile and vague if anybody thinks that so and so harlot is in love with him or vice-versa,

because she is there only to squeeze money of youth. The moment money and youth are gone, no more. Therefore, the question now in this country is, there are two groups who are raising their head higher and higher. Now the Government has become a cancer cap on the rest of the nation as also the business community. Now we find that in this budget there is no attempt, either before or after or during the utterances, of an assurance to hold the price line. In many countries, to develop them, they held the price line for ten years. I demand that prices of essential commodities like rice, wheat, coarse cloth and edible oils should be held in the same price line for one decade. That is number one. I hope all the parties will support me in this. If anybody opposes me in this, I will condemn him or her as agents of somebody else. Number two is, we have to plug the loopholes in the Exchequer. Now, whatever be the form of the pay of the employee is, or their D.A., T.A., C.A., E.A. or whatever it is, we should now fix a ceiling for all categories of officials who draw this kind of allowances. Similarly, the lower classes should get nothing less than others. Therefore, it can be seen. My letter is with the Finance Minister. How is it that the monthly pay and D.A. of an official is more than the rent that he gets from the house that is built by taking loans from the Government which is Government money? These officers who have built houses by taking Government loans and house plots are living in Government houses on nominal rent or practically no rent but they let out their own houses either to the Government in the State or the Centre or to business houses for high rents. So any house built with a loan from the Government should be acquired by the Government for office purpose or should be given to some other person who has no house. In this case, they have only been shedding crocodile tears. Then, we have given reservations for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the Adivasis, but we have not reached the quota.

In case there is reservation in service for them, it consequently and automatically follows that in respect of allotment of accommodation reservation should be there. If any quota has been fixed in the service cadres, how is it that many people belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes at the Centre and in the States are without houses? Not only this. Even in the matter of allotment of house building plots, a quota should be there. In Delhi, every State must have its rightful share proportionate to its population. For example, the population of Orissa is 4 per cent of that of the entire country. Therefore, 4 per cent of the house building plots must belong to the people of Orissa in the Capital. Similarly, in the District Headquarters or in the State Capitals also every State must have a similar proportion. While one area has a dominant position, the other areas have no representation as if there is colonialism. We feel as if we are in a foreign land. I have already said that while my party was in power, without bothering for the Minister's opinion, I had said that Delhi should really be the *dil* of Hindustan and he should see to it. Every inch of land in Delhi must be properly managed. The DDA has become another feudal lord in the process. They are taking over small holdings under this plea or that plea without proper construction as per the urban plan and they are selling plots to whosoever they want. Without utilizing the land they have acquired they further go on acquiring the land. I had already said while my party was in power that this must be the State Capital. One half of it in Punjab and the other half is Hariana and we are like refugees here. It is a place where dead men live in luxury compared to living people. I wonder why the elections in Delhi have not been held so far. One year you have already completed. I demand that proper elections for the Delhi Municipal Corporation and the NDMC should be held. I am saying this not in any sense which will injure your feelings; I am speaking for

the benefit of the country.

The eastern sector is burning. In the western sector, in Gujarat and other places, there are bomb-shells. Has the Finance Minister cared to make any provision to remove what is called the regional imbalance? No. He has closed his eyes to the eastern sector as if it is a colony of the mainland. Therefore, I want that every attention should be given to the eastern sector. The four eastern States going without Governors must be provided with Governors. One cannot be the Governor of five States. The Governor is lodging with his headquarters in Meghalaya. I had already pointed out to this when the party came into power.

In Orissa, there have been devastating floods and all that. The main river basin was completely in water for weeks. So also in Tripura. There has been no provision for the river valley development.

Unemployment is mounting up. In the form of a Calling Attention the matter came up here. But there is no provision for concrete programmes. The Minister has given relief in income-tax to those who are earning money. I have nothing to say against that. We are giving so much money not to be paid...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please conclude now.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: Two or three minutes more. We have not provided for a single pie for the educated men and women who are remaining unemployed. They are the unemployed educated youth. So, if the Finance Minister has given exemption to so many people from taxes, I demand that immediately he should come out with allotment to provide for jobs to the jobless or give unemployment allowance, and they can set up rural development camps and so on and so forth. Regarding some of the social reform...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please conclude. You have already taken more than the allotted time.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: We have done nothing about social reforms. We talk of national integration, and we have done nothing about it. I wonder why there should be no provision for development of all the languages when it has been more than once ventilated that many genuine languages of the country are off the Eighth Schedule. I demand that languages like Maithili, Konkani, Manipuri, Santhali and also English should be in the Eighth Schedule, and English should be accepted and adopted as one modern Indian language because it will help many States where English is the only language. like the State of Nagaland, etc. There are many countries which have adopted English and English characters.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please conclude.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: I will take a minute.

Regarding education and health, I demand that in Orissa, in Bhubaneswar a Physics laboratory and a Biology Laboratory should be established, and one of the four or five cash grants that are being obtained from the Canadian Government, should be allotted to the Cuttack Regional Cancer Centre.

We should make some provision to see that there occurs no social unrest as in Gujarat or elsewhere. It is a matter of shame that actually in the name of reservation, all other people who have come under the spectrum of the Bakshi Commission Report, are getting reservation.

At the end I want to get a clarification whether the Scheduled Castes or the Adivasis are getting reservations or whether other people are

benefiting from it. It do not want to foment casteism. To be priests in the temples is the reservation of the Brahmins. To cook in all public places is the reservation of the Brahmins in Gujarat.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): You have already exceeded your time. Please conclude. (Interruptions).

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: I demand that if there is any doubt about reservation, there should be a consensu on the question. Dr. Ambedkar had an agreement on this question of reservation. One minority community has gained political rights. Dr. Ambedkar did not want that the country should be divided. He only wanted that the country should be kept integrated, all the communities should live together and prosper and that these reservations should be given so that they can work together. For three decades and three years the reservation has not been observed. (Time bell rings.) (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please conclude.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: I do not want them to suffer. These reservations have to be seen in a proper form, and we should see how best their demand can be accepted, not like what is happening in Gujarat. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE): Please conclude. You are repeating the same arguments.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK: I oppose this Bill and demand that the Finance Minister should come forward with these provisions and see that all the loopholes are plugged and see that the money earmarked for the financial year is spent properly.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री बिशम्भर नाथ पांडे)
श्री बी० एम० देशमुख, आपकी पार्टी ने आपको
दस मिनट का समय दिया है। कृपया दस मिनट

के भीतर समाप्त करें और मेहरबानी करके चेयर को मदद दीजिये ताकि समय पर यह कार्यवाही समाप्त हो सके ।

श्री बापूरावजी माखतरावजी देशमुख : (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जनवरी 80 में कांग्रेस (आई) सरकार अधिकार में आई। उस समय देश की हालत और देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था बहुत ही बिगड़ी हुई थी। राष्ट्रीय उत्पादन में 4-5 की गिरावट आई थी और कीमतों में भी 21 प्रतिशत वृद्धि हुई थी। कोयला, बिजली और रेलवे जैसे महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों में संकट की स्थिति पैदा हुई थी। ऐसी हालत में सर्वोपरि अर्थ व्यवस्था को रोक जाय यही एक मात्र उद्देश्य था और एक बार अर्थ व्यवस्था में स्थिरता पैदा करना यही हमारी सरकार का उद्देश्य था। इस बजट को ऊपर से देखने से ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार अपने इस उद्देश्य में सफल होगी।

1979-80 के भयंकर सूखे और आधार-भूत ढांचे की व्यवस्था की एक टेढ़ी समस्या की काली छाया 1980-81 में भी व्याप्त रही। इसमें सुधार लाने के लिये सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता दी गई और आवश्यक तालमेल बैठाया गया। इस शासन के प्रयत्नों से राज-कोशीय वर्ष में, बिजली, कोयला और रेलवे ऐसे क्षेत्रों में स्पष्ट सुधार हुआ दिखाई देता है।

1980-81 में बिजली का उत्पादन कम हुआ। कारण 1979 में भयंकर सूखे का परिणाम था। जलाशयों के पानी का स्तर नीचा चला गया था। जुलाई के बाद अच्छी मानसून होने के कारण जलाशय भर गये और बिजली के उत्पादन में वृद्धि हुई। तापीय बिजली के भी उत्पादन में ज्यादा सुधार हुआ। कोयले की पूर्ति में सुधार होने के कारण, रेलवे द्वारा प्राथमिकता के आधार पर कोयला पहुंचाने की व्यवस्था हो गई। इस तापीय बिजली का उत्पादन 1979 के मुकाबले में 1980 में 21 प्रतिशत अधिक होगा किन्तु 1980-81 के उत्तरार्ध में बिजली का उत्पादन इससे

पिछले वर्ष के उत्तरार्ध की अपेक्षा लगभग 13 प्रतिशत अधिक है। 1976-77 में कोयला लिगनाइट का उत्पादन 1060 लाख मेट्रिक टन था, वर्तमान सरकार ने इस निराशाजनक गतिरोध को दूर कर दिया है और 1980-81 में कोयले और लिगनाइट का उत्पादन 1150 लाख मीट्रिक टन से अधिक होने की संभावना है।

औद्योगिक उत्पादन 1979-80 में 1.4 प्रतिशत था। इस वर्ष में लगभग यह 4 प्रतिशत रहेगा। बिजली के उत्पादन में सुधार के कारण और पूंजी लगाने के लिये दिये हुये प्रोत्साहन के कारण और औद्योगिक नीति के बारे में वित्त मंत्री के वक्तव्य के कारण इस के उत्पादन में सुधार होगा।

खाद्यान्नों की स्थिति 1980-81 में संतोषजनक रही। कुल उत्पादन 1320 लाख मीट्रिक टन से अधिक होगा। 1979-80 के उत्पादन से यह 230 लाख मीट्रिक टन अधिक है। ऋण वितरण की नीति आर्थिक और सामाजिक प्राथमिकताओं के आधार पर होना चाहिए और कमजोर वर्ग को खास तौर पर मदद मिलनी चाहिए। इसलिये 20-सूत्री कार्यक्रम निर्धारित करके 40 प्रतिशत भाग कमजोर वर्ग और कृषि क्षेत्र के लिये रखा गया और इसके अलावा लघु उद्योगों को दिये जाने वाले ऋण का 12.5 प्रतिशत भाग देहाती कारीगरों और कुटीर उद्योगों के लिये रखा गया है। यह नीति रिजर्व बैंक ने निर्धारित की है। इसीलिये देहाती क्षेत्रों में बैंकिंग की सुविधा देने के लिये वहां पर बैंको की स्थापना हो रही है और मार्च तक यह संख्या 100 तक हो जायेगी। सरकार ने यह भी निर्णय लिया है कि कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास के लिये एक राष्ट्रीय बैंक की स्थापना की जाय। इससे ग्रामीण समुदाय की ऋण संबंधी आवश्यकताओं को पूरा किया जा सकेगा।

तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग और आयल इंडिया लिमिटेड के लिये एक महत्वकांक्षी कार्यक्रम बजट में रखा गया है। सरकार ने

[श्री बापुरावजी मारुतरावजी देशमुख]
हमारे स्वदेशीसामर्थ्य के साथ विदेशी पाटियों से कान्टेक्ट किया है ताकि संभावित तेल क्षेत्र की खोज और उसका विकास किया जा सके। इसका भी काम 1981-82 में शुरू होने जा रहा है।

देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था में कृषि की भूमिका बहुत ही प्रभावशाली है और इसके विकास की गति समूची अर्थ व्यवस्था की गति को निर्धारित करती है। इसीलिए केन्द्र और राज्यों की वार्षिक आयोजना में कृषि पर किये जाने वाले खर्च की राशि 1980-81 के बजट में 925 करोड़ रुपये बजट अनुमान की तुलना में बढ़ाकर 1047 करोड़ रुपये कर दी गई है। सिंचाई के अन्तर्गत, इस क्षेत्र में वृद्धि एकमात्र ऐसा सर्वाधिक महत्वपूर्ण तत्व है जिससे देश का विकास हो सकता है। इसीलिए 1981-82 में 25 लाख हेक्टर भूमि में सिंचाई कराने का प्रस्ताव है। 1981-82 में मध्यम सिंचाई के लिये 1408 करोड़ रुपये की व्यवस्था की गई है कि जब कि 1980-81 में 1213 करोड़ रुपये थी। छोटी सिंचाई की योजना के लिये 1981-82 में 301 करोड़ रुपये रखा है जब कि 1980-81 में 299 करोड़ रुपये रखा गया था।

कृषि के उत्पादन को बढ़ावा देने के साथ साथ भूमिहीन मजदूर, छोटे और सीमान्तक किसान, ग्रामीण कामगीर, अनुसूचित जातियों तथा अनुसूचित जनजातियों और ग्रामीण समाज के कमजोर वर्गों को लाभ पहुंचाने के कार्यक्रम पर वार्षिक आयोजना में बहुत जोर दिया जा रहा है। इस आयोजन के लिये सरकार ने राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार योजना में 180 करोड़ रुपये की राशि रखी है। महाराष्ट्र में ग्रामीण रोजगार योजना का काम चल रहा है। महाराष्ट्र में ग्रामीण मजदूर की बराबर काम दिया जाता है। इसलिए यह प्रावधान यहां भी किया गया है, इसका मैं स्वागत करता हूं। एक दो बातें मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री महोदय के समक्ष रखना चाहता हूं और उनका ध्यान

आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। मैं जिस एरिया से आता हूं वह विदर्भ एरिया है। यह महाराष्ट्र का बैकवर्ड एरिया है। बैकवर्ड एरिया निर्धारित करने के लिए कमेटियों की स्थापना की गई थी। उन कमेटियों की रिपोर्ट्स भी आई है कि उसको कैसे डवलप किया जाए, लेकिन अभी तक कोई भी कदम इसके बारे में नहीं लिया गया। एक शिवरामन कमेटी अप्वाइंट की गई थी। उसका रिपोर्ट शायद अभी तक नहीं आया। यह कमेटी इसलिए अप्वाइंट की गई थी कि वह यह सुझाव दे कि बैकवर्ड एरिया में कैसे सुधार किया जाए। इस के बारे में मैं वित्त राज्य मंत्रीजी का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि अगर कमेटी के बारे में उनको कोई जानकारी हो तो वे कहें। दूसरी बात यह है कि मैं जिस एरिया से आता हूं वह सेवाग्राम है। सेवाग्राम ऐसा है जहां पर हम राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी का नाम हमेशा लेते हैं। राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने इस देश को स्वराज्य दिलाया जिसके कारण हम आज इस पार्लियामेंट में बैठे हैं। सेवाग्राम ऐसी जगह है जिसका बराबर विकास होना चाहिए और वह टूरिस्ट सेंटर बहुत अच्छा बनना चाहिए जहां देश और विश्व के सभी लोग पहुंचें। वहां पर बराबर रहने की सुविधा होनी चाहिए और उसका बराबर टूरिस्ट सेंटर के रूप में विकास किया जाना चाहिए। इसलिए मेरी यह मंत्री जी से मांग है कि सरकार को सेवाग्राम टूरिस्ट सेंटर सुन्दर बनाना चाहिए। सेवाग्राम महात्मा गांधी जी की कर्मभूमि रही है ताकि उसको देखने के लिए देश और विश्व के सब लोग आएँ और वहां देखें। टूरिज्म की व्यवस्था वहां पर सरकार करे, यह मेरा सुझाव है। इन सुझावों के साथ मैं अपनी बात यहां समाप्त करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विश्वभरनाथ पांडे)
श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेलवाल जी आप अपना भाषण 10 मिनट में समाप्त कीजिये।

श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेलवाल (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस विनियोग विधेयक का विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हूं। इस समय

देश की आर्थिक और कानूनी व्यवस्था की हालत बहुत खराब है। अभी मेरे पूर्ववक्ता ने कहा कि बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम की सफलता के लिए यह बजट लाया गया है। मैं उन्हें एक ही बात याद दिलाता चाहता हूँ। बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम का पहला सूत्र अभी भी पूरा नहीं हुआ। बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम का पहला सूत्र है आम जनता को सस्ते मूल्य पर जोड़नीययोगी वस्तुयें दिलाना लेकिन 15 महीने हो गये इस पार्टी की सरकार बने फिर भी हालत यह है कि आज महंगाई दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ती जा रही है। कांग्रेस के सत्ता में आने से पहले सब जानते हैं कि तेल का भाव क्या था लेकिन बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम का प्रभाव यह हो गया कि अब खाने का तेल 14—15 रुपये किलो मिलता है। चीनी के भाव बढ़ गये हैं। साबुन के भाव बढ़ गये। गरीब आदमी के उपयोग में आने वाले कपड़े के भाव बढ़ गये हैं। ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं रही जिस के भाव न बढ़े हों। यह बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम का पहला प्रभाव इस देश की जनता को पिछले 15 महीनों में देखने को मिला है। केवल आर्थिक सवाल ही नहीं 15 महीनों में देश की कानून और व्यवस्था की हालत क्या हो गई है। सारा देश जानता है कि पिछले 15 महीनों में देश में कानून और व्यवस्था के कारण कितने परेशान हैं। आज आम आदमी सड़क पर निकलता है तो यह सोचकर निकलता है कि वह जिन्दा घर पर जायेगा या नहीं। मैं और कहीं की बात नहीं करता हूँ। इस दिल्ली की बात करता हूँ। जहाँ संसद बैठती है, केन्द्रीय मंत्री परिषद् है। अभी पिछले दिनों मुझे माननीय गृह मंत्री के द्वारा जवाब दिया गया। मैं उस के आंकड़े यहाँ प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ।

मुझे बताया गया है कि दिल्ली में, राजधानी में यह सब लोग जानते हैं कि

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के मंत्री मंडल के एक राज्य मंत्री श्री भगवत झा आज्ञाद के अंगरक्षक को उन के घर के अन्दर गोली से मार दिया गया लेकिन अपराधी आज तक पकड़े नहीं गये हैं। क्या कारण है इसका, यह कौन सी कानून व्यवस्था है। सब जानते हैं कि यह सरकार और पुलिस पूरी तरह से निकम्मी हो चुकी है इन 15 महीनों के अंदर इतना ही नहीं इसी दिल्ली की बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। केवल दिसम्बर, 1980 से जनवरी, 1981 तक इन दो महीनों में कितने अपराध इस देश की राजधानी में हुए हैं। उस के आंकड़े हैं जो इस सदन में दिये गये हैं। दो महीनों के अन्दर श्रीमन्, 39 हत्याएँ हुई हैं, करीब करीब प्रति महीने 20 हत्याएँ इस दिल्ली के अन्दर हुई हैं। 4570 चोरी की घटनाएँ हुई हैं, 17 बलात्कार के काण्ड हुए, 129 अपहरण हुए हैं और 346 जेब कटी की घटनाएँ हुई हैं, दो डाके डाले गये और 42 लूट की घटनाएँ हुई हैं। इसी के साथ साथ छोटी मोटी वारदातों की तो अलग बात है लेकिन 1146 साइकिलों की चोरी दो महीनों में हुई हैं और कार स्कूटर की बात अगर करें तो 10 कार और 10 स्कूटर रोज यहाँ से चोरी गये हैं। कुल मिला कर 294 कारें और 302 स्कूटर दो महीनों में दिल्ली से चोरी हो गये हैं। यह हालत कानून और व्यवस्था की है।

गुजरात के आन्दोलन की बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आन्दोलन किसने शुरू किया? गुजरात का आन्दोलन एक आरक्षण विरोधी आन्दोलन था। आन्दोलन के लिये जो एक्शन कमेटी बनी है इस में कौन हैं। इस में अहमदाबाद के इंदिरा कांग्रेस के टिकट पर चुने गये कारपोरेटर चुनाव में लड़े गये विधान सभा के टिकट पर उस के एक नेता और कारपोरेशन में हारे हुए शाह, थे तीन नहीं पांच व्यक्ति

[श्री प्यारेलाल खंडेलवाल]

उस कमटी में है जिन्होंने आरक्षण विरोधी आन्दोलन चलाने के लिए एक्शन कमटी बनाई थी।

मेरी पार्टी का बहुत साफ मत है कि जो कानूनी अधिकार, जो संवधानिक अधिकार हरिजनों को आदिवासियों को मिले हैं, वे कायम रहने चाहिए, उस में कोई समझौता नहीं किया जा सकता है लेकिन यह नहीं हो सकता कि एक तरफ यहां खड़े होकर सत्तारूढ पक्ष के लोग यह कहें कि हम आरक्षण के समर्थक हैं लेकिन वकीलों के सम्मेलन में जाकर देश की प्रधान मंत्री जी कहें कि हम मैरिट वालों की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते। यह दो प्रकार की बात नहीं चल सकती हैं। साफ शब्दों में कहना होगा, जो नीति निर्धारित करनी होगी, वह साफ शब्दों में कहनी होगी और मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूं कि इस प्रश्न पर दो प्रकार की बातें कहना आन्दोलन वालों को उकसाना है और इस लिए गुजरात के संबंध में सब पक्षों की एक राष्ट्रीय नीति बनानी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि इस सम्बन्ध में एक टेबल पर बैठ कर सब पक्षों को एक नीति निर्धारित करके गुजरात के आन्दोलन को समाप्त करने के लिये कोई विचार किया जाना चाहिए। आन्दोलन केवल इस लिए नहीं हुआ। आन्दोलन में वहां की राजनीति फंसी हुई है। सत्तारूढ पक्ष की राजनीति है। वहां के मुख्य मंत्री श्री माधो सिंह सोलंकी और केन्द्रीय सरकार के माननीय गृह मंत्री श्री मकवान जी इन दोनों की आपसी सत्ता का संघर्ष है और यही वहां के आन्दोलन का मुख्य कारण है और मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को इनके बीच बीच में हस्तक्षेप करके इन दो दिग्गज नेताओं में समझौता करना चाहिए जिससे गुजरात में सुलभती हुई आग को ठंडा किया जा सके। यह तभी हो सकेगा जब कांग्रेस का यह आपसी संघर्ष समाप्त हो जायेगा,

इस आन्दोलन के पीछे और कोई दूसरा कारण नहीं है सिवाय कांग्रेस के आपसी सत्ता के संघर्ष के।

श्रीमन्, मैं कानून और व्यवस्था की बात पर फिर से आना चाहता हूं। सब लोग जानते हैं कि राजस्थान, मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश में क्या हालत है कानून और व्यवस्था की अभी कुछ दिन पहले भिड़ और ग्वालियर जिले में डाकू पान सिंह का नाम आया। वह अन्तराष्ट्रीय ख्याति प्राप्त खिलाडी था, डाकू क्यों बन गया, यह सवाल है। लेकिन अभी कुछ दिन पहले उस ने ग्वालियर में एक साथ पांच लोगों को बांधकर गोली से भून दिया। कानपुर जिले में, उत्तर प्रदेश में फूलन देवी डाकू है, उन्होंने 20 लोगों की एक समय में हत्या कर दी। यह कानून और व्यवस्था की हालत है। आदिवासी और हरिजनों पर जो अत्याचार हो रहे हैं इस से भी सारा देश परिचित है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले मध्य प्रदेश में झाबुआ जिले में, मुरैना जिले में हरिजन आदिवासियों की महिलाओं का शीलहरण हुआ, इतना ही नहीं शीलहरण होने के बाद उनमें से ~~हत्या~~ हत्या कर दी गई। पिछला पूरा वर्ष महिलाओं पर बलात्कार करने में बीत गया और ये किसने किया, कहाँ हुआ? सब जानते हैं पुलिस थाने बलात्कार के केन्द्र बने हुए हैं। और पुलिस थाने में पुलिस अधिकारियों ने बलात्कार किया। कई दर्जनों घटनायें देश के अंदर पिछले साल भर में हुईं।

श्रीमन्, इस के बाद में एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं कि आज यह जो सारा बजट इस देश की जनता के सामने लाया गया है, इस बजट में जो सबसे बड़ी कमी है, जो मुझे लगती है, वह ग्रामों की उपेक्षा की गई है, गांवों में पीने का पानी, गांवों की सड़कों से जोड़ने की बात, पिछड़े इलाकों में पिछड़े प्रदेश में उद्योग धंधा

खाने की बात, इस सम्बन्ध में इसमें जितनी तबज्जह दी जानी चाहिए थी, उतनी नहीं दी गई है। आज भी हिन्दुस्तान में हजारों गांव ऐसे हैं कि जहां पर पीने के पानी की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। दो-दो, तीन-तीन मील दूरी से गर्मियों के दिनों में पानी लाया जाता है। महिलाएँ पानी लाती हैं। सड़कों का विकास नहीं हुआ।

देश में 1977 और 1980 के बीच में जो काम के बदले अनाज की योजना का कार्यक्रम शुरू हुआ था, गांवों को सड़कों से जोड़ने की योजना बनाई गई थी, मुझे मालूम है कि मध्य प्रदेश में अठ्ठाई वर्ष के अन्दर 27,00 किलोमीटर सड़क बनी थी।

काम के बदले अनाज की योजना की इस वजह में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है और इस लिए मैं मांग करता हूँ, विशेषकर मध्य प्रदेश को ध्यान में रखकर जहां एक-तिहाई जनसंख्या आदिवासियों और हरिजनों की रहती है, वहाँ पर उद्योग धंधों को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय, सड़कों को जोड़ने के लिए, ग्रामीण विकास के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार अधिक पैसा दे और पीने के पानी की भी अधिक व्यवस्था की जाये। यह सारी बातें होंनी चाहिए।

अब आखिर में मैं एक और बात कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करूँगा। श्रीमन्, मध्य-प्रदेश में—कानून और व्यवस्था की बात कर रहा था—उस में मैं एक और बात आखिर में कहूँगा, वह रह गई थी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कानून और व्यवस्था सरकार सुधारने के लिए बहुत उत्पुष्ट है, लेकिन पहले उसको अपने मंत्री मंडल के लोगों को सुधारना होगा। मंत्रीमंडल में ऐसे लोग हैं—मैं आरोप नहीं लगाता—सत्तारूढ पक्ष के वक्ता आरोप लगा रहे हैं कि केन्द्रीय मंत्रीमंडल में ऐसे लोग हैं जो सम्स्यावादी

तत्वों को प्रोत्साहन देते हैं। यह वे तत्व हैं जिनका संविधान में विश्वास नहीं है और इस लिए मध्य प्रदेश के उद्योग मंत्री श्री अर्जुन सिंह मंत्रीमंडल में मंत्री, सुभके लाल केडिया ने खुलेआम यह आरोप लगाया है कि केन्द्रीय मंत्रीमंडल के सदस्य श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल मध्य प्रदेश में नक्सलवादी तत्वों को पनाह दे रहे हैं और यह बात उन्होंने खुलेआम कही है।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन सारी बातों का, जो एक जिम्मेदार मंत्री के द्वारा आरोप लगाया गया है, इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए और जांच होकर अगर कोई गुनाहगार है, तो उसके ऊपर कार्यवाही की जानी चाहिए।

आखिर में मैं कहूँगा कि सरकार—यह जो सरकार बजट लेकर आई है, इसमें किसानों की, गांव की, किसानों के खेतों में पैदा होने वाले माल की, माल से अधिक मूल्य देने की उपेक्षा की गई है और इसलिए ग्रामीण-विकास के लिए, पीने के पानी के लिए और सड़कों के लिए—और पूरे एक शब्द में कहना हो, तो पूरे ग्रामीण-विकास के लिए जो बजट रखा गया है, उसको और बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर से इस विनियोग विधेयक का विरोध करते हुए अपना कथन समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री विशम्भर नाथ पांडे) : इसके पहले कि अंग्रे के वक्ता इस विषय पर भाषण दें सार्वजनिक कृषि मंत्री एक वक्तव्य देंगे।