

[Shri Kalyan Roy] : it should be paid. So, my request to Mr. Patel is that he should meet the Union representatives and there should not be any further delay in paying the 15 per cent bonus and starting negotiations with the Union. Mr. Patel is here and he can say something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has heard.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Sir, if he prefers to be silent on all issues except the issue of non-payment of income tax by Mr. Biju Patnaik, then what to do.

SHRI N. K. BHATT (Madhya Pradesh) : Sir, the position with regard to the LIC employees is not at all difficult to understand. There was an agreement which was arrived at in 1974 at the instance of the Government of India and the Finance Minister had blessed it. Unfortunately this agreement was annulled by an Act. Now that the Janata Government has committed that workers will get their bonus, in accordance with this agreement they should be given their bonus and other fringe benefits which they are committed to give. I have myself written to the Finance Minister and the Labour Minister for their intervention. The workers have done their utmost for the prosperity of this industry and if an honourable settlement is not reached and if this agreement is not honoured, then I am afraid this unrest will spread to other financial institutions, banks and industries like coal, mining and all industrial establishments. In the interest of industrial peace in the country this settlement is urgently required and through you, Sir, I would urge upon the Government to intervene before it is too late because from tomorrow an all-India agitation is going to start.

**THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 3)
BILL, 1977—contd.**

SHRI C. P. MAJHI (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Appropriation Bill

actually deals with the expenditure incurred in the year 1975.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

There is not much scope to speak on this Appropriation Bill except to say that the expenditure which was incurred in the year 1975 actually should have been anticipated earlier before the expenditure was incurred.

This is simply a Bill to regularise the expenditure and that too out of Rs. 245 crores, Rs. 220 crores relate to the expenditure on Debt Services which is an inevitable expenditure. Sir, this Bill does not provide much scope for me to say except to say **that** the Government should have exercised monitoring of expenditure properly so that such unforeseen expenditure could have been very much avoided.

I want just to make a digression from the scope of discussion by observing about the performance of the Janata Party Government during the last four months, because I was not able to get an opportunity to speak at the time when the Appropriation Bill and the Finance Bill were discussed in this House. So, when the Finance Minister is here, I would like to make some observations regarding the performance of the Janata Government during the last four months.

Sir, after a long time, after 30 years, this Janata Party Government has come into existence. It is really a very great change in the country, a historical change has taken place. Of course, this change has taken place on account of, may be, the mistakes which we in the Congress Party committed during our existence in the Government, but during the last four months the performance of the Janata Party has not been able to inspire confidence in the people in general and the Harijans and Adivasis in particular. So far, what has come to pass has just been a tall talk. Tall promises have been made, but nothing categorical, nothing concrete has come to pass. As a matter of fact, the growing un-

employment, the price hike and all other things are going out of their control and the rumbling about these things is being heard in the streets. The Janata Party, it appears to me, has become so bold and so proud that they probably think that now since they have destroyed the giant, they could survive for all times to come. In this connection, Sir, I would like to say one thing. The Congress Party which came into existence with the blessings of Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel, could administer the affairs of the country for 30 years. It was very powerful, but in a democracy people are more powerful than the Parliament itself. People can change the Government if something goes wrong.

I only want to say that we have been indulging in so much of tall talk that we are not looking into the actual things. Sir, I belong to an area which is very much backward and I belong to a community which is still very much behind. I would only ask the Finance Minister to make some provision for those backward areas and also for backward communities. We had made several proposals for those areas when the previous Government was in position. All of a sudden, when the Janata Government came into power, whatever the previous Government wanted to do has been put in oblivion and something new is held out. If we will be simply just making a start, then again if some new Government comes and once again we start, we will really not be doing anything for the benefit of the country as a whole. Sir, when the previous Government was there, in the State of Orissa, we proposed to have a ferro-vanadium plant in the district of Mayurbhanj. And this had actually made a headway and we were about to start doing it. The Ministry of Steel and Mines was busy with processing the proposal and it was to pass through the Public Investment Board. But it stopped there. Now the Minister of Steel and Mines has started talking about the new coal-based steel Plant. Sir, I know these

things are not within the scope of this Appropriation Bill, but I only want to impress upon the Finance Minister that whenever we want to do a thing, let us not ignore the things which have already been started and start doing something new. My only point is that if we could create some infra-structure in those backward areas, it would very much help the people there, and they could be relieved of the life of the beasts of burden that they are leading.

I would, once again, urge upon the Finance Minister to consider all these points so that the backward areas and backward communities—about which he has spoken in his budget speech—would be taken care of. So long they have not been given any special attention to these areas I would request the Finance Minister to take care of all these things. With these few words. Sir, I finish.

श्री भीष्म नारायण सिंह (बिहार) :

उपसभापति महोदय, विनियोग विधेयक जिसे माननीय वित्त मन्त्री जी ने सदन में प्रस्तुत किया है वह पहले के खर्च से सम्बन्धित है। मुझे कुछ ज्यादा इसमें नहीं कहना है, पर आपके माध्यम से मैं सरकार का ध्यान देश के लोगों की समस्याओं की ओर आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा और विशेष कर देश के 60 करोड़ लोगों की जो आशाएँ और आकांक्षायें थीं और जो यह नयी सरकार गठित हुई है उससे जो उनको अपेक्षायें थीं उसके बारे में कहना चाहूंगा। आप जानते हैं कि 30 वर्ष के बाद एक नयी सरकार इस देश में बनी और यह स्वाभाविक है कि जब कोई नयी सरकार बनती है तो विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में उससे लोग उम्मीद करते हैं कि वह कुछ पहले की सरकार से ज्यादा अच्छा काम करके एक उदाहरण पेश करेगी। आप देखेंगे कि राजनीतिक क्षेत्र में, आर्थिक क्षेत्र में, सामाजिक क्षेत्र में, न्याय के क्षेत्र में, इन सभी क्षेत्रों में लोगों की जिज्ञासाएँ बनीं कि कुछ नये काम होंगे। लेकिन मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि

[श्री भीष्म नारायण सिंह]

लगभग 4 महीने इस सरकार के गठन को पूरे हो गये, वैसे तो इस सरकार का गठन भी पूरा नहीं हुआ है, लेकिन अभी तक कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम इन क्षेत्रों में उदाहरण के रूप में नहीं दिया जा सकता कि इन के आने के बाद यह काम पहले से ज्यादा अच्छा हुआ और मैं आपको बताऊं कि राजनीतिक क्षेत्र में तो मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि यह जनता पार्टी की जो सरकार बनी या मिली जुली कई घटक दलों की जो सरकार बनी या अकाली दल के सहयोग से जो सरकार बनी उसका एक ऐसा चित्र उभर कर देश के सामने आया है कि उससे एक कहावत याद आती है कि "कहीं की ईंट, कहीं का रोड़ा, भानुमती ने कुनबा जोड़ा।" जो एक राजनीतिक स्वरूप कांग्रेस के विकल्प में आना चाहिए था वह नहीं आया और ऐसा मालूम होता है कि अवसरवादिता की राजनीति की वजह से यह सरकार बन गयी। मैं तो बिहार से आता हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी के जो लोग हैं उनमें कितने ही अवसरवादी हैं। मैं वहाँ विधान सभा का सदस्य था। विधान सभा में पूरी अवधि के लिए आदमी चुना जाता है, 5 या 6 वर्ष के लिये, लेकिन दो साल भी नहीं हुए थे, ऐसे लोग जिनको कि हमारे क्षेत्र से कोई मतलब ही नहीं था, हमारा इस्तीफा लेने के लिये पहुँच जाते थे। जो तथ्यांकित जनता पार्टी के सदस्य हैं वे इस्तीफा लेने पहुँच जाते थे। किस बात का इस्तीफा। आप जनतन्त्र का डोल पीट रहे हैं, प्रजातन्त्र में आस्था रखने की बात करते हैं और जिस जनता ने हमें चुना है जबकि उसको भी रिकाल करने का अधिकार नहीं है, ऐसी हालत में आप कौन हैं, आप इस्तीफा क्यों चाहते हैं। वहाँ यह हालत रही, लेकिन मैं इस बात का जिक्र इसलिये करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों ने दल बदल दिया, इस्तीफा नहीं दिया और विधान सभा के सदस्य बने रहे वही लोक सभा के जनता पार्टी के उम्मीदवार बन गये और उनको ही ताजिया बना कर ले

चले। इसको अवसरवादिता के अतिरिक्त और क्या कहा जा सकता है। क्या इससे कोई अच्छी राजनीतिक मिसाल पेश की जा सकती है। कांग्रेस ने तीस सालों तक इस देश में हुकूमत की और इस देश के निर्माण और विकास का बहुत अच्छा इतिहास रहा है उसके समय में। लेकिन आप इतने दिनों के संघर्ष के बाद आये। आप को तो बहुत सबक लेकर जो उदाहरण पेश करना चाहिए था वह ऐसा होना चाहिए था कि जिससे हम विपक्ष में जो लोग बैठे हैं उनकी खामियां भी समाप्त हो जातीं। लेकिन खामियां क्या खत्म होंगी जबकि कोई अच्छा उदाहरण तो आप की ओर से प्रस्तुत नहीं हो रहा है। यह आप की राजनीतिक स्थिति का हाल चाल है।

अब आर्थिक स्थिति का समाचार सुनिये। आर्थिक क्षेत्र में ऐसा मालूम हो रहा है कि देश चौराहे पर खड़ा हो गया है। कोई बेसिक सवाल नहीं हल हो पा रहा है। आर्थिक सवाल राजनीतिक सवालों से अधिक कठिन है। उस क्षेत्र में कोई नया ठोस कार्यक्रम आप के पास नहीं है। जो पहले हो रहा था वही सब चल रहा है और चारों तरफ एक अस्थिरता का वातावरण पैदा हो गया है। आप रोज समाचार पत्रों में देखते होंगे बड़े-बड़े उद्योगों में, कल-कारखानों में एक औद्योगिक अशान्ति है। बड़े-बड़े सरकारी प्रतिष्ठानों में अशान्ति है और लोगों में बड़ा असन्तोष बढ़ता जा रहा है। यह सब देख कर ऐसा लगता है कि जो बेसिक सवाल उनको हल करने थे गरीबी कम करने के, महंगाई घटाने के, बेकारी दूर करने के, नौकरी देने के, यह जो चार पांच आवश्यक बातें थीं जिनको हर सरकार को करना चाहिए था वह नहीं हुआ और रोजी रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान और स्वास्थ्य आदि के क्षेत्रों में कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम इन चार महीनों में हुआ नजर नहीं आता।

श्रीमान्, मैं ऐसे इलाके से आता हूँ जो बड़ा उपेक्षित है और पिछड़ा हुआ है, जो

छोटा नागपुर कहलाता है। 20 सूची कार्यक्रम के सिलसिले में काफ़ी इन्तज़ाम वहाँ पर हुआ, खास कर गरीब हरिजन और आदिवासियों के उत्थान के लिए बहुत ही पाज़िटिव काम हुआ तथा काफ़ी भूमिहीनों को ज़मीनें दी गई। आदिवासी क्षेत्रों में आप गये होंगे, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने देखा होगा कि वहाँ सूदखोरी की बड़ी भारी प्रथा है और वह वर्षों से चली आ रही है। आपको सुन कर आश्चर्य होगा कि मनीलेंडर वहाँ पर 1400 परसेंट सूद लेता है। आप अंदाज़ा कर सकते हैं कि क्या इसका प्रभाव किसी व्यक्ति के आर्थिक जीवन पर पड़ता होगा। अगर किसी महाजन के खाते में एक बार किसी हरिजन या गरीब का नाम आ गया तो फिर जीवन भर उसका नाम कटने वाला नहीं है। वह जीवन भर उसका गुलाम बना रहेगा। कई मनीलेंडर 20 सूची कार्यक्रम के अन्दर पकड़े गए और जेल में गए। कई डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट्स ने बड़ा अच्छा काम किया। गरीबों ने इससे काफ़ी दिनों के बाद एक राहत की सांस ली थी। अखबारों में भी इसकी सराहना की गई। उस वक़्त के ब्लिट्ज़ में से मैं आपको सुनाना चाहता हूँ। वह 20 नवम्बर, 1976 का है, इसके पेज 17 पर नारायण साहू का फोटो है जो बहुत बड़ा शोषक था। लाखों रुपये कर्ज़ में लगाया करता था और पूरा इलाका उसके शोषण से बिल्कुल गरीब बना हुआ था। लेकिन जब वह बन्द हुआ तो उसने खुद कबूल किया। श्री कृष्ण, सम्वाददाता ने उनका इंटरव्यू लिया है तो नारायण साहू ने खुद कहा इस बात को। मैं आपको सुनाता हूँ :—

"Narain Sau confesses that had it not been for Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's 20-point Programme, he would have never thought of returning the surplus land and would have never worried about the poor."

यह अंज़ाम चल रहा था। अब सरकार बदल गई। वही दुनिया फिर लौट आई है। सारे

इलाके में फिर उसी तरह से जो ज़मीनें दी गई थीं, जो पचें बांटे गये गरीब, हरिजनों और आदिवासियों को उन्हें ज़मीनों से बेदखल कर दिया गया है। मनीलेंडर्स ज़ेलों से छूट कर आ गये हैं, अब वे कहते हैं कि 14 सौ परसेंट नहीं, 28 सौ परसेंट सूद लेंगे। अब क्या कांग्रेस की सरकार है? हम यहां कुछ भी बतायें तो अणोजीशन पार्टी के नाम से सबका एक ही जग़ाब है कि आपने ही ऐसा किया। इससे आपका कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है। मैं आपको नेक सलाह देता हूँ कि आप समय रहते इहाँ चर्तेंगे तो कांग्रेस ने तो 30 साल तक शासन किया, आप तो 30 महीने भी शासन नहीं कर पायेंगे। आप देखेंगे कि देश में क्या हो रहा है। जब आप जायेंगे देश में तो आपको पता चलेगा कि किस तरह से असन्तोष व्याप्त है।

उपसभापति महोदय, आपके माध्यम से मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह ठोस आर्थिक कार्यक्रम बनाये, ठोस कदम उठाये जिससे गरीबों को राहत मिले। जो गरीबी की विभीषिका इस देश में है उसे समाप्त किया जा सके। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारा देश कहीं अतिवृष्टि से परेशान है, कहीं अनावृष्टि से परेशान है। लोगों के पास बहुत सारे इलाकों में खाने के लिए इस वक़्त अन्न नहीं है। मैं उस पिछड़े हुए इलाके की बात आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं उदाहरणस्वरूप पलामू जिले के बारे में यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं अभी दो-तीन दिन पहले वहाँ गया था। स्थिति ऐसी भयानक है कि कुछ इलाकों में अनावृष्टि थी जिसके कारण रबी की बुआई नहीं हो सकी। कुछ इलाकों में जहाँ पर महुआ के जंगली पेड़ हैं उसका फल सुखा कर लोग खाते हैं, वह भी नहीं हुआ। अभी भदई की बुआई होनी थी लेकिन लगातार वृष्टि के

[श्री भीम नारायण सिंह]

कारण अब आगामी फसल का क्या भविष्य होगा, कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता। तमाम इलाकों में एक भुखमरी की स्थिति है। पलामू जिले में भयंकर स्थिति पैदा हो गई है। इसके विपरीत बिहार सरकार में जो लोग हैं और जो सरकारी यंत्र है, अगर आप उसको देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि वहां पर अफसरों का डिमोरेलाइजेशन हो गया है। वहां पर जिस व्यक्ति को चीफ सेक्रेटरी बनाया गया है वहां बहुत जूनियर आदमी है। अन्य सीनियर अधिकारियों में कई बहुत अच्छे हैं, लेकिन फिर भी एक जूनियर आदमी को चीफ सेक्रेटरी बना दिया गया है। यह ठीक नहीं है। सीनियोरिटी के मुताबिक ही प्रमोशन होनी चाहिए। वहां पर आई० जी० को बदला जा रहा है और कुछ अधिकारियों के खिलाफ इन्क्वायरी भी चल रही है। राज्य का सारा प्रशासन जैसा चुस्त होना चाहिए, वैसा दिखाई नहीं देता है। प्रशासन को लोगों की समस्याओं के प्रति जिस तरह से जागरूक रहना चाहिए, वैसा प्रशासन दिखाई नहीं देता है। बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री ने खुद कहा है कि The Law and order situation in Bihar is not good. यह टाइम्स आफ इंडिया की रिपोर्ट है। गांधी के अन्दर और प्रत्येक देहात में अशांति की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है। सर्वत्र अशांति का वातावरण है। लोगों को हर वक्त इस बात का भय रहता है कि पता नहीं कब उनका घर लूट लिया जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि चाहे राज्य की सरकार हो या केन्द्र की सरकार हो, उसको सबसे पहले कानून और व्यवस्था की स्थिति को ठीक बनाये रखना चाहिए। अगर कोई सरकार कानून और व्यवस्था की स्थिति को ठीक नहीं रख सकती है तो वह सरकार अधिक दिनों तक नहीं चल सकती है। आपको शायद इस बात की जानकारी होगी कि बिहार में सारी यूनिवर्सिटियां और कालेज बन्द पड़े हुए हैं। सर्वत्र अशांति है। मेडिकल

कालेजों के छात्रों की हड़ताल के बारे में मैंने यहां आपकी आज्ञा से सवाल उठाया था। वह सवाल अभी तक हल नहीं हुआ है। जनता पार्टी के मंत्रिगण इस समस्या को किस प्रकार से हल कर रहे हैं और वे इस बारे में क्या करते हैं, इसका मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। यह भी टाइम्स आफ इंडिया में पी० सी० गांधी की रिपोर्ट निकली है। इसका थोड़ा-सा पोरशन मैं आपको पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ —

"Curiously, same Ministers, unable to find solutions to the problems facing them, are resorting to gimmicks. For instance, the Health Minister, Mr. Jabir Hussain, joined a *dharna* of the students of the Government Medical Colleges. He met the students. But after listening to their demands, he said that since he could not accede to these he would join the *dharna*."

अब आप एक दूसरे मंत्री की बात भी सुनिये—

"Senior officers too are not happy with the way some Ministers function. It is said, for instance, that the Finance Minister, Mr. Kailasha-pati Mishra, does not go through the files. He summons senior officials at short notice and at frequent intervals to read out to him the papers submitted to him. Some Ministers have cut a sorry figure, in the Assembly, having failed to do their home work."

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से कैसे काम चलेगा। बहुत मुद्दत के बाद और बड़ी मुश्किल से जनता पार्टी सत्ता में आयी है और दूसरी ओर कांग्रेस दल के रूप में आपको एक ऐसा विरोधी पक्ष मिला है जिसके नेता ने आपको रचनात्मक सहयोग देने का वायदा किया है और कांग्रेस दल ने अभी तक कोई ऐसा काम नहीं किया है जिससे आपके किसी काम में बाधा पड़ी हो। आपको पीपुल्स मेनडेट मिला है। अधिकांश राज्यों और केन्द्र में आपकी सरकार है। आपको लोगों की

समस्याओं को हल करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। लेकिन आप तो कमीशन ही बैठाने में लगे हुए हैं और कांग्रेस पार्टी पर इल्जाम लगाने में लगे हुए हैं। हमने तो यह देखा है कि जब सन् 1967 में बिहार में महामाया बाबू के नेतृत्व में मिलीजुली सरकार बनी तो उस वक्त शुरू-शुरू में कुछ ग्लेमर दिखाई देता था। लेकिन दो तीन महीनों के बाद वह ग्लेमर भी नहीं रहा और परिणाम यह हुआ कि 10 महीने बाद वह सरकार आगे नहीं चल सकी। लेकिन आपकी सरकार में तो वह ग्लेमर भी नहीं है। आज हमारे सामने देश की 60 करोड़ जनता का सवाल है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप ठोस कदम उठाएँ और ठोस निर्णय लें और अधिकारियों को स्पष्ट डायरेक्शन दें। आर्थिक क्षेत्र में और सामाजिक क्षेत्र में जो काम सरकार की तरफ से हो रहे हैं उनकी अगर में चर्चा करूँगा तो सारा समय उसी में चला जाएगा। यहाँ पर बेलची काण्ड की काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है। पिछड़े हुए लोगों पर जो अत्याचार किये जा रहे हैं वे किसी से छिपे हुए नहीं हैं। समाज विरोधी तत्वों द्वारा पिछड़े हुए लोगों पर जो अत्याचार हो रहे हैं उनकी चर्चा मैं इस वक्त नहीं करूँगा।

1 P. M.

इसी में सारा समय चला जायेगा।

इसलिये मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस कार्यक्रम के लिये आपको मंडेट मिला है, आप स्पष्ट रूप से और दृढ़ता के साथ उसके अनुसार देश की समस्याओं का समाधान निकालें और देश की समस्याओं को हल करें।

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही

2 बजे तक के लिये स्थगित की जाती है।

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

The House reassembled after lunch at four minutes past two of the clock,

Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, इस अप्रोप्रिएशन बिल के संबंध में मैं और बात कहने के पहले कर्नाटक में इस समय जो विशेष स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है, उसके संबंध में सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश में ऐसा ही हुआ था जब वहाँ बहुगुणा जी मुख्य मंत्री थे तो उनकी कैबिनेट के चार-पाँच मंत्रियों ने इस्तीफा दे दिया फिर बहुगुणा जी ने इस्तीफा देने के लिए कहा गया। उनको विवश किया गया तथा वहाँ पर राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया गया। आज वैसी ही स्थिति कर्नाटक में है। कर्नाटक के 6-7 मंत्रियों ने इस्तीफा दे दिया है और वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री भी अब सदन का विश्वास खो बैठे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में आवश्यक हो गया था कि भारत सरकार वहाँ इंटरवीन करे और वहाँ कुछ समय के लिए राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करके वहाँ चुनाव कराये। श्रीमन् एक शब्द और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ चूँकि वहाँ के 4-5 मंत्रियों ने यह आरोप लगाया है भूतपूर्व गवर्नर के संबंध में कि भूतपूर्व गवर्नर ने गवर्नर के पद पर होते हुए भी राजनीति में दखल दिया। इतना ही नहीं बल्कि अपना पद छोड़ने के एक दो दिन पहले उन्होंने ऐसा कार्य किया कि जो मंत्री एलान कर चुके थे कि वे इस्तीफा दे रहे हैं उन मंत्रियों को उन्होंने डिसमिस कर दिया। गवर्नर का यह कार्य बहुत ही अप्रजातान्त्रिक और परम्पराओं के विरुद्ध था और बहुत ही अनुचित भी था। इसलिए, श्रीमन्, कर्नाटक के 4-5 मंत्रियों (भूतपूर्व) ने उनके कार्यों की निन्दा की। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार इस मामले पर ध्यान दे।

अब श्रीमन् मैं जो प्रमुख विषय इस समय है उसकी ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वह विषय इस देश में बढ़ती हुई मंहगाई की समस्या है। सरकार ने यह बराबर कहा है कि मंहगाई कम करने के प्रयास किये जा रहे हैं। सरकार ने कुछ प्रयास किये भी

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

और कोशिशें जारी हैं लेकिन सरकार के प्रयास और कोशिशों के बावजूद, वित्त मंत्री जी के वित्तीय कदमों को उठाने के बावजूद, व्यापारी वर्ग को और उद्योगपतियों को उनके मामलों पर सहानुभूतिपूर्वक विचार करने के बावजूद, उनकी कठिनाईयों को दूर करने के बावजूद (Interruptions) जरा मुनिए। इन सबके बावजूद कि श्रीमती गांधी अब राजनीति में आना चाहती हैं, यह एलान करने के बावजूद कि अब वह राजनीति से दूर रहेगी, कीमतें, श्रीमन् बढ़ती ही जा रही हैं और इसके बावजूद कि कांग्रेस में दो गोल हो गये हैं एक एण्टी इंदिरा दूसरा प्रो इंदिरा, कीमतें बढ़ती जा रही हैं, इसलिए मैं कांग्रेस के लोगों से चाहूंगा कि जब मैं बोलू तो वे शांत रहकर सुने अन्यथा मैं बहुत कुछ सुनाऊंगा और आप परेशान होंगे।

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI (Assam): You are speaking on the Appropriation Bill. Do not speak irrelevant things.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: What I say is very much relevant to the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI PIARE LALL KUREEL urf PIARE LALL TALIB (Uttar Pradesh) : You have joined a Party which is nothing but a conglomeration of various groups. It is not a Party at all because it has no ideology.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: It is your Party which has pro-Indira group and anti-Indira group.

श्रीमती हामिदा हबीबुल्लाह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : कीमतें बढ़ने के बावजूद आप तारीफ कर रहे हैं।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इसलिए उपसभापति महोदय मैं आपके श्रुति निवेदन करूंगा कि यह लोग शांत रहे और मुझे कहने

दे। इन सबके बावजूद कीमतें बढ़ती जा रही हैं। मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता था कि जब जनता दल के अध्यक्ष ने यह चेतावनी दी कि अगर कीमतें व्यापारी लोग बढ़ाते जायेंगे तो उनके खिलाफ सख्त कदम उठाये जा सकते हैं।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील उर्फ तालिब : उठाईये ना फिर। अभी तो इन्स्टिटाए इष्क है रोता है क्या, आगे-आगे देखिये होता है क्या।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : कुरील साहब मैं बहुत देख चुका हूँ अगर आप मुझे छोड़ेगे तो मैं बहुत कुछ कह सकता हूँ। इसलिए आप शांत रहें... मैं श्रीमन्, से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब जनता पार्टी के अध्यक्ष ने उन्हें चेतावनी दी, सख्त धमकी दी और जब हमारे व्यापार मंत्री ने उन्हें चेतावनी दी कि व्यापारी हमें विवश न करें कि मीसा का इस्तेमाल करना पड़े, उस समय व्यापारी वर्ग और उद्योगपति वर्ग में खलबली मच गई और उद्योगपतियों ने तो यहां तक कहा कि साहब, हमको धमकाया जा रहा है जबकि मीसा का प्रयोग न करने का एलान किया गया था। ये सारी बातें उन्होंने कहनी शुरू की। लेकिन श्रीमन्, जब प्रधान मंत्री की अपील का उनके ऊपर असर नहीं होगा, जब वे जनता के हित का खयाल नहीं करेंगे और जब वे केवल शोषण का रास्ता अपनायेंगे तो कोई भी सरकार हों उसके सामने विवशता की स्थिति होगी कि वह उन व्यापारियों के खिलाफ सख्त से सख्त कदम उठाए।

श्रीमन्, मैं उन व्यापारियों के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ...

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील उर्फ तालिब : इमरजेंसी लाइए तब व्यापारी ठीक होंगे।

श्री प्रेम मनोहर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जम नहीं आती है यह कहते हुए।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : ये इन्दिरा गांधी के लोग इमरजेंसी के अलावा दूसरी

भाषा जानते ही नहीं है। इतने गुलाम हो गए हैं इमरजेंसी के (Interruptions)

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील उर्फ तालिब : आपने सी० बी० आई० को इतने अधिकार दे दिए हैं कि जब चाहें गिरफ्तार कर लें। इमरजेंसी से भी खतरनाक हालात पैदा कर दिए हैं।

श्रीमती हामिदा हबीबुल्लाह : इमरजेंसी को थक कीजिए।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : बिना इमरजेंसी के उन व्यापारियों को ठीक किया जा सकता है। मैं कहने जा रहा हूँ श्रीमन् कि जिस दिन इमरजेंसी समाप्त हुई उस के 2 या 3 दिन पहले मैं गोरखपुर में एक दुकान में गया तो एक सामान की कीमत उस दुकानदार ने 95 रु० मांगी, मेरे पास रुपया नहीं था इसलिए मैंने उस दिन नहीं खरीदा। इमरजेंसी खत्म होने के तीन-चार दिन बाद उसी सामान के दाम उस ने 102 रु० मांगे 7 रु० दाम बढ़ा दिए। मैंने पूछा यह क्यों? उस ने कहा, कंपनी ने दाम बढ़ा दिया। मैंने कहा कंपनी के कागज देख लो। खोजने-खाजने के बाद उसने 1970 का कागज ढूँढ निकाला। मैंने कहा यह तो 1970 का कागज है, और तुम कह रहे हो कंपनी ने दाम बढ़ा दिया। आखिरकार उसने स्वीकार किया कि दाम उसने बढ़ाया है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि व्यापारी वर्ग कभी जनता के हित का खयाल नहीं रखता है। व्यापारी वर्ग तो सिर्फ यह करता है—नाजायज़ पैसा कमाएगा, जनता का शोषण करेगा और उसका कुछ हिस्सा नेताओं की पाकेट में रख देगा। यह धंधा इस देश के व्यापारियों का रहा है और यह ढंग इस देश के उद्योगपतियों का रहा है। वह जनता का शोषण कर के पैसा इकट्ठा करेगा। थोड़ा सा अंश वह नेताओं की पाकेट में रख कर उनका मुँह बंद कर देगा। मैं श्रीमन् से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के व्यापारियों के आचरण ने यह साबित कर दिया है कि ये केवल सक्ती की भाषा

जानते हैं। मैं तो अब यह कहने को तैयार हूँ कि जीवन के उपयोग की जितनी सामग्री है, वह हरगिज़ व्यापारियों के हाथ में न रखी जाए; उनके हाथ से सारा व्यापार लेकर उसको सरकारी और सहकारी माध्यम से किया जाए। जब तक इन व्यापारियों के हाथ में डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन सिस्टम रहेगा, जब तक कि वितरण की प्रणाली इनके हाथ में रहेगी तब तक ये शोषण करते रहेंगे चाहे प्रधान मंत्री अपील करें चाहे वित्त मंत्री अपील करें, उनकी अपीलों का कोई असर उन के ऊपर नहीं होगा यह साबित हो चुका है कि उनकी अपील का कोई असर नहीं हुआ है।

श्रीमन्, ये उद्योगपति आज बहुत उपदेश सुनाते हैं और ये ही खुले आम इमरजेंसी के दौरान इमरजेंसी का समर्थन करते रहे और आज ये जनता पार्टी को शिक्षा देते हैं कि आप मीसा की बात क्यों करते हैं। परन्तु ये मीसा की भाषा जानते हैं और मीसा के अलावा और दूसरे रास्ते को सुनते नहीं। मजबूरन सरकार को उसका उपयोग करना पड़ेगा। श्रीमन् सरकार को यह भी देखना होगा कि जो पुरानी पद्धति रही है उस को तोड़ना है। प्रदीप नारंग साहब जो कई चीनी मिलों के मालिक हैं उन की 11 मिलों के ऊपर एक करोड़ डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया गन्ना किसानों और मजदूरों का बाकी है, लेकिन उसकी रिकवरी नहीं हो पाती है और जब बी एम से हम कहते हैं कि क्यों नहीं उन को गिरफ्तार करते, क्यों नहीं उन की मिलों को अटैच करते तो वह कहते हैं कि दिल्ली से हम को रिकवरी सर्टिफिकेट नहीं मिलता क्योंकि प्रदीप नारंग संजय गांधी के बड़े दिली-दोस्त हैं। संजय गांधी को और कांग्रेस पार्टी के अन्य नेताओं को लम्बी रकमें देते थे। लेकिन वह रकम मजदूरों की थी, गन्ना किसानों की थी। उन को उन का बकाया न दे कर वह रकम वे नेताओं को दे देते थे। इस व्यवस्था को सक्ती के साथ तोड़ना होगा और अब आपको उद्योगपतियों के साथ

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

दूसरे ढंग से पेश आना होगा। श्रीमन् अभी हाल की मिसाल है, उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने बिरला साहब से कहा कि अब आप को बिजली का वही दाम देना पड़ेगा जो और लोग देते हैं। कांग्रेस सरकार के समय में जब कि किसान और सारी जनता परेशान थी बिजली के लिये उस समय बिरला साहब के कारखाने को आधे पैसे की फी धुनिट के हिसाब से बिजली सप्लाई की गयी। रिहन्द डैम बनाया गया उत्तर प्रदेश में और उसको बनाते समय स्वर्गीय पंत जी ने वायदा किया था कि इस से पूरा पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश उजाला हो जायगा और वहां घर घर में बिजली आ जायेगी। मगर रिहन्द डैम बना और उस की बिजली मिर्जापुर तक के लोगों को नहीं मिली। वह बिरला को दी गयी लागत से कम दाम पर। आज जब मौजूदा सरकार बिरला साहब से कीमत मांगती है तो बिरला साहब इस सरकार के खिलाफ प्रचार करते हैं। पक्कारों को अपने कारखाने में बुला कर उन के मैनेजर कोठारी साहब स्टेटमेंट देते हैं और प्रेस कांफरेंस करते हैं। आज भी श्रीमन् उत्तर प्रदेश के उद्योगपतियों के उपर बिजली निगम का 18 करोड़ रुपया बकाया है जब कि बिजली निगम इस समय बहुत आर्थिक संकट में चल रहा है। आज भी वहां के उद्योगपतियों पर उस का 18 करोड़ रुपया बाकी है और यह रुपया वे सारी कोशिशों के बावजूद नहीं दे रहे हैं। इस में साढ़े तीन करोड़ तो केवल बिरला साहब के पास बाकी है। जब रिकवरी की कार्यवाही होती है तो वे हाईकोर्ट चले जाते हैं और वहां से स्टे आर्डर ले लेते हैं और स्टे आर्डर कैसे मिलता है इसको सभी लोग जानते हैं। तो इन उद्योगपतियों के साथ हमें दूसरे ढंग का व्यवहार करना चाहिए और वित्त मंत्री जी को इस तरह के कानून बनाने होंगे कि वे इन सब मामलों में हाईकोर्ट में न जा सकें और अगर जाते हैं तो वे रकम जमा करने के बाद हाईकोर्ट में जायें। श्रीमन्,

सीमेंट की महंगाई के बारे में जब हम लोगों ने कहा तो मंत्री महोदय ने यह दलील दी कि 50 हजार इस के फुटकर विक्रेता हैं। उन के हाथ से लेकर इस को पब्लिक सेक्टर में नहीं डाला जा सकता। उन के हाथ से लेकर इस की सरकारी व्यवस्था नहीं की जा सकती। कोई कारण नहीं है कि क्यों इस की सरकारी व्यवस्था नहीं की जा सकती। गांव गांव में गांव सभायें हैं और सहकारी समितियां हैं। उन समितियों के माध्यम से और गांव सभाओं के माध्यम से सीमेंट, मिट्टी का तेल, कपडा और इसी तरह की दूसरी चीजों का वितरण किया जा सकता है। इन के माध्यम से वितरण करने से गांव सभाओं की आर्थिक स्थिति भी ठीक होगी और सहकारी समितियां भी ठीक होंगी और इन चीजों का वितरण भी ईमानदारी से होगा। लोगों को जीवनोपयोगी सामान उपलब्ध होता रहेगा। लेकिन व्यापारी इतने शक्तिशाली हैं, उद्योगपति इतने शक्तिशाली हैं कि आसानी से कोई सरकार उनके साथ छेड़छाड़ नहीं कर सकती है। जरा सी छेड़-छाड़ होने पर इतने जोर से वे उबलते हैं कि इनके जो अखबार हैं वह इनका साथ देते हैं। वह हर सरकार पर दबाव डालते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि वितरण प्रणाली को हर हालत में व्यापारियों के हाथ से लेकर पंचायतों के हाथ में और सहकारी समितियों के हाथ में देना होगा। अगर जनता पार्टी चाहती है कि जनता उसके साथ रहे तो उद्योगपतियों और व्यापारियों के हाथ से वितरण का काम हर हालत में ले लेना होगा अन्यथा यह 5 साल की जो शक्ति है वह शायद 10 साल के लिए न हो और 5 साल के बाद शायद जनता यह सोचे कि उसको क्या करना है। अगर यह वितरण जनता के हाथ में दे दिया जाए, व्यापारियों के हाथ से निकाल कर पंचायतों के हाथ में दे दिया जाए तो 5 साल 10 साल नहीं बल्कि जो अन्याय और जुल्म कांग्रेस पार्टी ने जनता के साथ किया है, जो धोखा और जुल्म कांग्रेस

पार्टी ने जनता के साथ किया है, शायद 25 साल तक जनता इनकी ओर आँख उठाने को भी तैयार न हो। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this Appropriation Bill is a Bill which has come before the House for consideration in connection with the amounts which have been spent in the year 1975. Two items have been brought out. One comes under the Defence Services Pension Scheme and the other is regarding repayment of debts. This amount has come to this House because it is more than what was anticipated in that year's budget and there is nothing wrong in meeting it from the Consolidated Fund. The other thing is the repayment of debts. It is natural that a Government which is committed to create a new social order and a new economic order for the betterment of the common people has to take recourse to deficit-financing and borrowings for creating a new socioeconomic order and for creating infra-structure like railways, new irrigation potentialities, power generation, etc. It has to spend more to cater to the needs of the poor people. While we are discussing this it is very natural that we have to consider the basic approach at that time. Is there any change? Are we facing some difficulties in the new fiscal policies which have been formulated by the new Government. The main problem of the Indian economy and our fiscal policies is the eradication of poverty and creating a new social order and opportunities of employment. Sir I would like to submit humbly to the hon. Finance Minister through you that although a lot of stones have been thrown on the party which was in power, many of our friends who are sitting on the opposite benches—not all, I entirely agree—are also responsible for the philosophy of creating a new economic order and social order without which the maladies of the Indian economy cannot be solved. While

coming to this point, I would like to

submit that during the discussions on the Financial Bill which came before this House and the Parliament, we have been seeing that a twist has been made from the policies of creating a new socio-economic order. We find that there are different statements made by different Ministers on different policies. We find that there are discrepancies also. So it raises a natural doubt not only in my mind but also in the minds of the general people of the country about the new policies. Are the fiscal policies going to favour the capitalists in the country or the small common man? This is a very pertinent question about which every man thinks. I will just analyse the different points. Sir, we know that the new Minister of Industries is a great socialist thinker. He has been telling very often that we must see that the big houses do not grow and there should not be any preference for capital intensive industries in this country to grow. But in the Finance Bill, we see that we have given them more scope for investment of capital. That is how we have provided for the investment allowance in certain form in this Bill. Then, Sir, if we think of the rural development which should be taken up as the first priority, what is the new irrigation potentiality that we are going to create? What is the anticipated expenditure for this purpose in the Budget? Sir, we can say that deficit financing helps inflation. It is true that in certain areas, it helps inflation. But, Sir, have the prices, not increased within these four months? Do you think that we can go on keeping these backward areas backward and we will not create new infrastructure, new railway lines and new irrigation potentiality? On the other hand, Sir, what are we doing? We are taking the poor people. It might be argued that we are having additional excise on bidis. Bidi-smoking is not good. But this is the common need of the poorest man Bidi is not consumed by the richer sections of the society. Sir, if we read the reports of various commit-

[Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu]

tees, we shall see what the incidence of taxation is. A small pie at the Central level or one rupee per thousand might be a very uneventful taxation. But when we go to the bottom, it creates certain problems, the incidence is hundred times more on the common man. Not only that, Sir. Any taxation levied at any stage creates different repercussions in the price structure of the country at the bottom level. Coming to the other point, Sir what is the incidence of taxation in India? Unfortunately, Sir, not that our friends on the other side are to be blamed. Here, we are thinking of the country and no question of parties comes here. Sir, when a common taxpayer pays one rupee, he gets from the Government a benefit of 50 to 60 paise. So, again we touch the poor man. So, where do we stand now? Is the common man not bewildered? And this is the fundamental point.

Then, Sir, there are many discourse in the parliamentary debates. Different statements have been made by the hon. Ministers. Regarding exports, the hon. Finance Minister said that we should give preference to the engineering industries and that they must be given encouragement in the export promotion. But, the hon. Commerce Minister said that this should not be at the cost of the home consumption. Then the third thing is that hon. Home Minister said something to the effect that big industrialists must be permitted to export and small scale and cottage industries should cater to home consumption. Sir, does this not lead to confusion? I humbly say that we must have a long strategy on these issues. Has the Government laid down its fundamental policy on this?

Then, coming to another important aspect, Sir, fiscal policies as such are inter-linked with the social development of the common man. But, Sir, have we not seen how the Harijans and other backward classes have been neglected? Have the atrocities not

been committed against them? Not only that. The facilities on the economic front given by the past Government also seem to be eroded. Sir, we have heard about the Belchi incident in this House. It was one of the worst happenings. There the people were brutally assaulted and there was a delay in the arrival of the police. When the first report came, we were informed in the House that the incident took place between two gangsters as if it was like the events that take place in New York where underground gamblers and gangsters fight with each other. The point is that the common man has been deprived of his right. And, what has happened in Andhra Pradesh? It came in the newspapers. The surplus loans which were distributed to the poor Harijans were taken away by rich landlords. Only a small number of incidents comes to the newspapers. Many things are happening in this country. The poorer sections suffer a lot. They are at cross-roads. They think whether their property, their life is safe or not. We will not consider it very seriously. Does it not affect the economic development of the country as a whole? What is the progressive policy for the benefit of the common man, for the benefit of the poor man? Why has this House brought an amendment in the clause meant for the merger of sick units with healthy units? It has been done to ensure that the worker's interest is protected. Is it not our common goal in our new social ideology that workers must participate in management? Does this Government believe it or not? They must clarify it. It is a very fundamental question because it creates a sense of ownership in the minds of the worker: which results in greater production. Can you think that without these things we can move on the right path? These are the questions which are looming large on the horizon of our country.

Now, it is not a question of blaming this party or that party. What is the report of the I.L.O., the Interna

tional Labour Organisation on the question of our changing fiscal policies. An analysis made by the I.L.O. shows that while average labour intensity of the private corporate sector in India has declined, industries with lower than average labour intensity have enjoyed considerably larger relief in tax incidence than industries with higher than average labour intensity. Fiscal measures which can be expected to change this situation, which can be of help in a pro-labour policy include, complete withdrawal of all fiscal incentives related to the employment of capital. Sir, an answer had been given in the Lok Sabha which I read in the newspaper, wherein it had been stated that it was done because the Government wanted the units to be more productive. What do you mean by productiveness? There are many sick mills. They are no longer economic because of the new technique evolved. Let us take the case of jute mills, which the hon. Members have been discussing for a very long time. The cotton mills are the mills which employ a very large labour force. Can we not do a simple thing for them? When we merge sick units with bigger industries, shall we forget the poor workers who have worked for the whole of their lives for the survival of these industries? Not only that. If jute industry is not protected by the Government and naturally not nationalised if it is sick, what is going to happen? We cannot always think of transferring sick units to other industries. If we do that we do not see the common good of the labour and the cultivator.

Sir, we can see from the proceedings of this House and the other House that many hon. Members have observed that when the Commerce Minister visited West Bengal he told the industrialists that there should be no retrenchment, but no heed was paid to him and retrenchment is continuing in the jute mills. So, is it not right for the hon. Members of the House to say that whenever the merger of a sick unit with healthy unit is proposed,

there should be a social rule or philosophy followed whereby the rights of the labour force of the sick unit should be protected.

Now, coming to the next point, you can see that the prices are rising. What are the steps that are being taken to see that all the promises are fulfilled? Talks alone will not help us to keep the prices down. There must be a definite policy and it must be tangibly shown to the people that rise in prices has been checked. Without that nobody is going to believe the speeches. So, what we want is that the fiscal policy should be suitably adapted to the philosophy of just and equitable economic and social order. You cannot only say that deficit financing will help curb inflation, we are trying to balance the budget and we are trying to have a new levy of fees. Ultimately the incidence of these new fees will fall on the poor people. They will be much more affected by the price structure. Of course, I agree that we have to resort to a certain amount of deficit financing if we want to develop backward areas. We cannot solve this problem without resorting to it. So, while supporting this Appropriation Bill, I would like to say that this country is heading for a confusion. The fiscal policies which we are now following are going to create new problems in the social and economic order which we were following in the past. So, it is necessary that not only the Finance Minister, but also his other colleagues should consider and declare their respective policies so that a new idea, a clear idea, is followed in this country, which will be helpful for the improvement of the economic condition of this country.

Then, coming to the other problem, Sir, as you know the greatest problem in India is the problem of unemployment. How are we going to solve the problem of unemployment. It is related very much to the fiscal policies also. Sir, as you know, in the past it was said that young educated men, unemployed people should

[Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu] have financial help from commercial banks and other places for self-sustaining growth. What is happening about that? We are completely in the dark. Many commercial banks started setting up new branches and they started giving help to poor drivers to own taxis and start other industries. But now it is not so. Now they want some clear directions from the Centre. It can never be expected that institutions serving the richer sections will support poorer sections. As a result of this, there has been unemployment and the poor has become poorer. It is nearly to the tune of five million people unemployed to day which may be raised to 6.5 million in coming decade. Thus, we are facing a giant problem. We have to consider it very seriously.

Then, coming also to fiscal policies followed, we have allowed certain investment allowance. I humbly submit before you, Sir, that it is only the richer sections of the society, the big industrialists who will take advantage of it. The small industry will be benefited even if it produces certain items which are not on the priority basis. We are now planning for the sixth five-year period. We are at cross roads. Even the honourable Ministers differ in certain cases in their line of approach in public utterances. Whatever we may say, the fiscal measure as a whole is more for the market economy than subsistence economy which is more important in this country. We cannot ignore people who live below poverty line. Richer sections are getting more benefits and the poorer sections do not get concessions. We think of having more capital-intensive industries but we do not think of the poor manufacturers who manufacture in his house. Not only this, there is the question of unemployment. By levying a tax on bidi, the Central Government may not be able to collect much but the incidence of this levy will certainly be felt in greater proportion by the poor people. It is at the cost of the poor

man that the Government may raise a certain amount by this levy. In fact, we need other methods to raise resources ...

MR, DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Please be brief.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: So, my humble submission is that we cannot go on like this saying that the past Government did some mischief. We have emerged out a clear perspective of our economic and social order. We cannot bifurcate these two things. The poor people's economic development also depends upon the social order that we visualise. Now, it must be pointed out in clear lines by the Government, otherwise, this country will plunge more into darkness. With pains in my heart I have to say that the poor people, the Harijans, the Adivasis, the backward people in backward areas have not been looked after as much as they were cared for by the Previous Government. This Government is yet to give a clear policy. They must come out with implicit and explicit clarification as to what is their view and what is their philosophy. They will say that some Assembly Committee or some other committee is sitting. The country will not wait for long. We must be told what their policy is and what their philosophy is. Let us not try to have a negative attitude. This Government, up till now has tended to wards right of the centre. As an underdeveloped country, we cannot have the luxury of going towards the right.

With these words, Sir, I think the Government will come out with clear and implicit policy to be pursued on the economic and social development of the country. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I should like to start on a few issues in connection with the debate on his Appropriation Bill. Since our friend, Mr. Charan Singh, is here, may I start with him? Sir, the Government is committed to releasing the political prisoners...

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI CHARAN SINGH): I think I am not proving provocative to you. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ... and steps are being taken in some States, though not satisfactorily, in that direction. As far as West Bengal is concerned, many have been released but some could not be released, like Naxalite prisoners, like Ashim Chatterjee, Kanu Sanyal and others. This is because cases are pending in other States against them. I would ask the Central Government and Mr. Charan Singh in particular, to help in this matter, in persuading the States to withdraw the cases in consonance with the policy which is being pursued by the West Bengal Government. The West Bengal Government has adopted a very broad and forthright policy in this matter as far as I can see. But they have been handicapped by the fact that some of these people, Naxalites and others, have got cases pending against them for years in the courts of other States. I hope his intervention will be available, not with a view to interfere with the affairs of the State, but to help in the process of release of all these political prisoners.

Sir, many Commissions of Inquiry have been appointed, some by the Centre and others by the States. We read in the newspapers that some kind of a conflict is developing between the Commissions of Inquiry appointed by the Centre and those appointed by the States. Currently, we are reading something about the controversies that have arisen in regard to the Commissions of Inquiry that have been appointed in Karnataka and in Andhra Pradesh. This should also be sorted out and settled. This is one thing I would suggest. In this connection, Sir, I bring to his notice a very interesting memorandum which was submitted by the Executive Committee of the IPS Officers' Association to the Chief Minister of West Bengal. This has not been published. Somehow, I had come across the document.

There, the Police Officers' Association, the IPS' Officers' Association, says something in regard to the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry. Welcoming the decision of the State Government to appoint a Commission of Inquiry, the memorandum goes on to say—I quote:

"In the general condemnation of the police which followed in the wake of the withdrawal of the Emergency, the basic fact has been all too often lost sight of that the police is a part, and a subservient part at that, of the general administration structure and the actions of the police cannot be regarded in isolation from the motives and designs of the political powers that be transmitted at least at the State and district level through the general administration."

Then, it goes on to say—this is a very important point—which concerns the All India Services—I quote:

"The foregoing consideration bring us directly to a point which has been exercising the minds of the members of the Association for a long time—the question of the independence and status of the police revealed at the district level in the relationship of the Superintendent of Police to the District Magistrate and at the State level of the Inspector-General of Police to the Home Department."

Then, the Association says that it is preparing a document on it. This is a very interesting thing. The IPS Officers' Association in West Bengal is trying to make out a case, and understandably so, that whatever had happened was largely due to the political direction and guidance from the Government. This is the suggestion. Whereas the police officials should not be allowed to go scot-free, the Ministers responsible should also be questioned on how the police officials behaved. Here, we should, I think, take

[Shri Charan Singh]

a little interest in it. Not that we should interfere with the administration of the State. But it should not appear as if the Ministerial responsibility for the crimes, tortures, excesses and other things, is being ignored by us. It should not happen. But at the same time, to my surprise, this memorandum by the IPS Officers' Association does not name any policy officer—also in West Bengal—belonging to the IPS cadre who have been responsible for the excesses, killings and so on. They should have done it. But they have not done it. I have given the names and particulars of those people who have committed crimes during the emergency and before the emergency. Mr. Charan Singh should know that the point I raised there related to what happened before the emergency from 1970 to 1974 or so. This I am dealing with.

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRABARTI (West Bengal): What about people in the administration, subordinate to I.A.S.?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He cannot deal with that perhaps.

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRABARTI: You are neglecting them who have an equal responsibility... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI "BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, this has to be gone into. The memorandum is quite interesting. I would ask the Chief Minister of West Bengal, if I may say so, and if Mr. Ramamurti permits, that this memorandum should be published, so that the people should know that the police is trying to put the blame on the Ministers and Ministers are trying to put the blame on the police. We would like the blame to be correctly apportioned. Neither the Ministers nor the police men responsible for all that happened in West Bengal should be spared. That is one thing. Sir.

Then Sir, we wanted a statement by the Prime Minister as to what

happened. With a lot of fanfare the Chief Ministers' Conference took place. It seems that a mountain of talk has produced a mouse of result.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): What has this to do with the Appropriation Bill. This is not an 'Appropriation of Blames Bill'... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is what I find. Nothing much has come, except that we are told that the public distribution system has been agreed upon and would come into operation after Mr. Dharia has finalised the scheme, everything has been processed and the Planning Commission has gone through it. By that time what will happen, we do not know.

Now, Sir, at that Conference many other things were discussed. What about the bonus issue? The session is going to end. The bonus cut is not being restored. The Government is committed to it. Many of you are committed to it. You are committed to the restoration of the bonus cut of 8.33 per cent. It was given by an Act of Parliament in 1973. Arbitrarily, an Ordinance was issued in September 1975 to take away that right to bonus. You yourself in your Janata manifesto have said this. Then what is the difficulty in restoring bonus? Sir, festivals are coming in West Bengal—Puja and others. Festivals are coming in other places also. It must be done here and now. Otherwise, Sir, there will be agitations, demonstrations and strikes. Everything will be absolutely legitimate. The right of the working class has been taken away. You are committed to restore it. That you are not doing. But any action in defence of the rights and gains of the working people is not only legitimate but it is honourable also. That is what I say. We find nothing and no decision taken about this in the Chief Ministers' Conference. We are surprised. I am glad

that nobody in the Chief Minister's Conference recommended the use of MISA even for economic offences. None. What happens? Why is the Bill not being brought. You strengthen the Essential Commodities Act and other measures to deal with economic offences. But the MISA should be repealed. Mr. Charan Singh told in this House that the MISA would be repealed. He should bring the Bill before we go. Other things are coming. Many things are coming. But not this "Bill. Why? Explain this conduct. You say that you have appointed a committee. What is the committee doing? We are entitled to know this. What is the progress of the working of that committee? There is no need for a committee. Never did I hear that a committee is going into the question of repeal of a measure. To repeal a measure is very simple. You can do it easily. It was brought in 1969 when the Indira Gandhi Government did not have the majority and we insisted that unless the Preventive Detention Act was allowed to lapse we would vote against the Government. It went in a day. I am not threatening you because of any majority. But why should it not be brought to honour your own pledge to the people? Mr. Chandra Shekhar, even today's papers say, is against it. All of you are against it. Why should MISA remain? So, I urge upon the Government to take this step immediately.

Sir, then the question of Centre-State relations has come up. I think the matter should be gone into and it should be discussed. I would urge upon Mr. Charan Singh and the Prime Minister to discuss this matter. We have a new set-up, a new situation and the question has come up from a number of States. And I do hope that it would be done in a proper, *democratic* manner through mutual consultation. The States do require more economic powers and they also require to be strengthened.

Mr. Morarji Desai has said that the States should be strengthened and the Centre should be strengthened. I agree. We want the principle of unity in diversity to be given flesh and blood at both the ends—at the Centre and in the States. We are for strengthening the basic unity of the country. We want to see that the States are also strengthened and they have their legitimate due and rights. Therefore, there should be a discussion. Tamil Nadu has raised it; Kerala issue has come up; West Bengal has raised it. Other States have also raised it. Here is the time for the Government to take the initiative in this matter and see what changes are needed. Finance Commission is not enough and nothing much will happen. It seems the Government wants to go ahead with prohibition and all that very speedily. But these are other questions. The Centre-State relationship is a very urgent issue.

Then, Sir, in regard to Delhi I have said—and I repeat it again—that Delhi people are justified in their demand that they should have a Legislative Assembly and a fully responsible government. Here in Delhi the multiplicity of authority is working to the detriment of the interests of the people of Delhi. Therefore, I fully support the demand which has been voiced, among others, by our party in Delhi in a resolution... (Time-bell rings)... I am just finishing. Surprisingly enough, Mr. Kedar Nath Sahni, who is the Chief Executive Councillor of Delhi, and who, before the elections, gave the pledge that he stood for a full Legislative Assembly for Delhi and a responsible Government, now seems to be falling in line with Mr. Charan Singh and going back on the pledge that he gave during the elections. So, this question should engage the attention of the Government. Delhi is certainly entitled to have their demand met for a Legislative Assembly and for a responsible Government.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Then, the question of Haryana's capital is also hanging fire. That should also be settled in a proper manner. Here, Sir, I should like to say that I don't know why the P & T Department, for example,, is trying to bring in the cross-bar system again. They seem to be placing an order for the cross-bar equipment. They want to import this equipment from the Nippon Electric Company in Japan. This matter has been discussed in this House and the other House. The cross-bar system was found not suitable for our country. Much was said here and in the other House. And now we find that this Government is placing an order for the cross-bar system for about 30,000 lines and so on. I must say what is happening.

It does appear that the Secretary, Communications, has had a longstanding personal relation with the Nippon Electric Company for several years and, some how or other, he seems to be interested in helping this Nippon Electric Company of Japan. This matter should be investigated as to why it should happen when the Houses and the Government have rejected this cross-bar system. Sir, I demand that the cross-bar system may not be introduced. Even in Japan, it is being given up. The company has cut down production because, it is not suitable in Japan. Now we find the Government of India is placing a new order for the import of the cross-bar system. The Finance Minister should no sanction any money. He should put a stop to it and cancel the order that has been placed. Here, Sir, is another thing and that will be discussed tomorrow. But, for hon. Members' information I will just read out from the White Paper about the conduct of the House which concerns us. On page 29 the White Paper says:

—
"All these guidelines were framed with the approval of the Minister of I & B. He wrote to Shri Raghu Ramiah on January 1, 1976 to obtain clearance of the Speaker of

the Lok Sabha and the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha to pre-censor-ship. There is nothing available to show what happened thereafter. Shortly afterwards, a room in Parliament House was set aside for this purpose."

Now, Sir, you see how we feel. A room in Parliament House was set aside for censoring our utterances. They did it. We brought it to the notice of the House from time to time. Nothing happened. I would like to know from the appropriate authority—whoever is there—what the speaker and our Chairman said. Was any clearance given? If any clearance was not given and if Mr. Raghu Ramiah or anybody had created the impression as if he had got the clearance from the Chairman and Speaker, he and other Ministers concerned,—the authorities concerned—had definitely committed a gross breach of privilege and even contempt of the House. Sir, I should like—on the verification of the fact from the Speaker and the Chairman—the matter to be considered as to whether we should bring in a privilege motion against Mr. Raghu Ramiah, Mr. Shukla and others who evidently, according to it, had violated the privilege of the House. *(Time bell rings.)*

Sir, before I sit down, Mr. Charan Singh is both interesting and a little provocative. He always tells me what I did when I raise all these questions.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE; If you don't mind, I would just like to seek some information. It is very good that you are demanding that a breach of privilege issue should be raised. I just want to know for my information because then I was not in this House and that House also. During the emergency, did anybody try to raise the breach of privilege issue?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; I am very glad. Prof. Dandavate is always

very helpful to me and I congratulate him. Here are the proceedings.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You raised it, I know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Everyday we raised, every day we went to the Chamber to protest. Mr. Raghu Ramiah called a meeting. We protested against it to the Speaker—at every point. We know that we had some differences but on this I don't think Prof. Madhu Dandavate and I differ. These are there. These are testimony to our *bona fides* in this matter. The proceedings of Parliament—the fingerprints of the culprit Bhupesh Gupta and other Communists—are there. Sir, nothing was listened to.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: The country is interested in knowing—just like his speeches and going into the Chamber, etc.,—whether the Communist Party continued to co-operate with the Congress...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is why I wanted to enter into a little dialogue with Charan Singhji there because he is so amusing. Charan Singhji every day says such thing because that seems to be his only talking point. Did we join the Government in U.P.? We did not join. Did we commit a crime then? We did not join that Government there. There we were in the Opposition. Yes, in certain matters we did support—in foreign policy and certain other things also; you can say. You can even say we supported the emergency but, Mr. Charan Singh, we fought all excesses. May I ask him now, since he has always been asking me...

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: Not only that. You voted with the Congress. That is the point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Charan Singh, you were not here.
(Interruptions)

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND: (Punjab): He was ignorant because he was not here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Charan Singh, you were not here. Sir, I am glad that Mr. Charan Singh always provides enlivening things for this debate.

You were not here. May I ask you, Mr. Charan Singh, when had 3 P.M. been in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly, did you utter a word against the excesses committed, against the Naxalite killings between 1970 and 1975 till April and May. In June you were not there. Is there anything in the proceedings there to give an answer to these questions?... (Interruptions). You did not... (Interruptions). I say this because you only invite such remarks.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Do you try to settle that account by supporting that fraud of Emergency? Is that your contention to try to support the fraud of Emergency?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Charan Singh asks us what we did. You know very well. As regards our stand on Emergency, that we can discuss later. You can condemn us, if you like; you can praise us if you like. That is for you to decide. But, what I am saying is: Who had put up a threat to democracy? Who had decided that things will be settled by bullets? From Lucknow and other places, who had put that threat? And who incited the kind of action that you catch hold of MLAs and make them at gun point resign? Was it democracy? Mr. Charan Singh is fortunate enough. He was not in jail for long. He came out soon. I was happy that he had come out. After all, he is my old friend. But, when he came out did he utter a word against the excesses against the workers, excesses against the Naxalites and others? Never did he make a

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

demand that bonus should be restored. Never did he do that. . . . (Interruptions). I was very much interested to know his speech. Mr. Charan Singh may correct me if I am wrong. Now, Mr. Charan Singh,, I think we should come to a gentleman's agreement—Mr. Charan Singh and myself. The esteemed Home Minister of the country lives in such a glass tower—such a vulnerable glass tower. Out of the 30 years of Congress misrule, Prof. Madhu Dandavate, almost for 25 years he was with it. He has been the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh and what not. I was not a Minister. I have been sitting here, here and here—these three places. But you were there for 30 years, So let us not go into that. Therefore, I tell you. . . . (Interruptions). Mr. Charan Singh, being in such a glass tower, should not throw too many stones at others all the time. It is not wise for you, Mr. Charan Singh. That is all I would say. Sir, it is all right, Mr. Charan Singh, the Home Minister of the country, has understood me. I have given some constructive suggestions, and so on.

Again, I give a note of warning to our friend Mr. H. M. Patel. Up to now he has not yet formed the Consultative Committee for Finance. I have been a member of that Committee ever since I came here; others are also there. Why has he not formed it so far? And I think whatever our friend Mr. George Fernandes may say, or others may say, he seems to be dead settled with the business of offering concessions after concessions to monopoly capital. Well, that is a very ominous symptom, as far as this Government is concerned. Sir, I do not wish to say anything more. I have given some very good suggestions and have brought certain facts to light. We also find that some retired ICS officers are being brought in to occupy new posts; and some of these retired men have been connected with big business houses. That is also disturbing us a little. One of

them—I am not giving out the name—has been connected after retirement as ICS with a multi-national corporation. So, Sir, all these things are happening. The Peace Corps is also coming here. So many things you are doing now. The Finance Minister is a mild-mannered man, does speak very softly, does not get agitated like my friend, Shri Charan Singh, does not believe in politicking all the time, but he seems to have a real mercantile approach on the whole subject, going full-steam ahead,, giving concessions galore to the monopoly capital to their heart's content. Sir, I protest against this abject surrender and sell out of national interest to the monopoly capital.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have already exceeded the time allotted to this Bill. Only one more speaker remains.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR (Karnataka): Sir, in this august House. I feel that I am one of the youngest men. Though I took the oath on the 21st, I made a very brief speech on the appointment of the Civil Rights Commission, and subsequently I was eager to make a speech on the working of the judiciary. There have been —

श्री चरण सिंह : श्रीमान्, मैं यह मोशन मूव करना चाहता हूँ कि ज्वाइंट कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में 15 मेम्बरों को शामिल कर लिया जाये। इस लोकपाल विधेयक के बारे में मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि सुबह 2.30 बजे का टाइम रखा गया था।

श्री उपसभापति : एक घण्टा इस विधेयक के लिये निर्धारित किया गया था परन्तु यह समय से आगे बढ़ गया। इसलिये इस विधेयक को खत्म होते ही आपका विधेयक लाया जायेगा। Please be short.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: The salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court are paid but of the Consolidated Fund of the Union, and the constitution and organisation of the Supreme Court and the High Courts are under the control of the Central Government. We will discuss today about the appointment of the Lok Pal who would have powers to go into the allegations of misuse of power or allegations of corruption made against the Members of Parliament, the Prime Minister and the Chief Ministers of the States. But I do not find any such provision being made to go into the allegations of favouritism, nepotism or casteism against the Judges of the Supreme Court and the Judges of the High Courts. In India, as elsewhere, we regard the courts of law as temples, and the Judges as the high priests. We expect that the courts should be surrounded by an atmosphere of solemnity. We are treating the courts with greater reverence and awe than Parliament, though it is Parliament which is ex-presive of the supreme will of the people. Our Parliament, representing the whole nation, has given the Judges the highest prestige and power. We pay them the highest respect. We address them in the most reverential manner. We approach and address the Judges with the utmost humility and submissiveness. All these things indicate the highest esteem in which we hold the judiciary and the Judges. All these things also indicate that we, constituting the Parliament, subordinated a part of our sovereignty to the Judges and the judiciary. We have given the Judges wide and unfettered powers and have surrendered ourselves even at the risk of becoming victims of judicial displeasure and condemnation. We have abrogated certain of our powers or delegated a part of our sovereignty to the judges in the hope that they would act and wield their power in a fair and judicious manner, without taking sides with political parties or individuals. They are expected to be impartial to be worthy of the confidence we have

reposed in them. We have given a judge,, either of the Supreme Court or of the High Court, the power to issue prerogative writs against any authority) and in some instances, against individuals also. The judge automatically receives the highest title of "Lordship", though it is not recognised by law. Judges are the arbiters of disputes between the Parliament and the people, between the people and the executive, and so they should not create or enter into any public controversy. They should impose restrictions upon themselves. But a feeling has grown in the recent months that there has been a decline in the calibre of some judges of the Supreme Court and of the High Courts. The British judges, and till recently the Indian judges, had maintained, as a rule, a tradition of isolation and aloofness. Of late some judges have reached an extreme position in the other direction. We hear of instances where a Supreme Court judge involved the Acting President of India and the Chief Justice of India in the decision of cases. We hear of cases where the Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court belied the allegation of a puisne judge of the same High Court in a case involving the former Prime Minister. We hear of cases where another judge of the Supreme Court also introduced the name of the former Prime Minister. And the present Chief Justice of the Karnataka High Court dragged in the names of two Ministers alleging attempt to influence some judges of the High Court in a criminal case in which another Minister and a Member of Parliament were involved. In all these cases, the utterances of some judges have the effect of stigmatising the President of India, the Prime Minister of India and Ministers and Members of Parliament. Those accusations have exposed those members to public ridicule, contempt or hatred and have injured their reputation. Every person has an inherent and absolute right to keep intact and to enforce respect for, the reputation of his character which he has earned

[Shri L. G. Havanur]

at immeasurable cost and long years of struggle and sacrifice in public life. Indeed, for men in public life, loss of character occasions much more pain and mental embarrassment than the idea of loss of life itself. Some of the judges are playing fast and loose with the reputation of high dignitaries by casting aspersions...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member,, I would suggest you may not make such observations. You can avoid it.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Why not?

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: These things have been discussed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us discuss it on a substantive motion but not on a Bill of this nature.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: It is his privilege.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is my duty to say what his privilege is.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: I am coming to the relevant portion some of the judges are playing fast and loose with the reputation of high dignitaries by casting aspersions upon their character and suggesting moral obliquity. What is outrageous is that those judges without ascertaining the accuracy of facts, without disclosing . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Hon. Member, these are very general and, I think, uncalled for observations. Please do not make observations which are so general and sweeping. You can leave this topic, I would suggest, please. You can continue but you can leave this point.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: Yes. Without disclosing the source of information and violating the principles of

natural justice they are misusing their high station in life which is invested with an amount of terror sufficient to cowdown any opponent of theirs. Those who opposed such judges have been victimised in one way or the other. The allegations of some of those judges against the other judges and the political administrators, if true, tend to interfere with the course of justice and thus constitute an offence of contempt of court. But no proceedings have been instituted against anybody. The necessary inference that can be drawn is that those allegations of interference are not true. Take the case of the present Chief Justice of Karanataka...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; You are passing judgements here, I do not know of what nature. I do not think you should proceed in this manner.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: I want to make out a case of impeachment against the present Karnataka Chief Justice...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are very vague and general in nature.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: No, these are facts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, they are not facts.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: These are facts . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please. I will not allow like this. I request you, you may drop the subject. If you want to continue, take some other topic, otherwise, I will close the debate at this stage.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: My sub. mission is yesterday, I listened to the discussion in the Lok Sabha where the Minister of law and Justice had discussed this very subject. Even on the 16th June the same topic was discussed in that Lok Sabha. I went through the proceedings . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us discuss it as a subject, but not make general and vague observations of this nature. (*Interruptions*) Order, please. If you have nothing to say on the Bill here, then I will call the Finance Minister to reply.

SHRI L. G. HAVANUR: On the 25th of last month a written statement of the Minister of Law and Justice was placed here relating to the conduct of the Chief Justice of the High Court and two Ministers. My submission is the absence of law providing for the manner in which judges should conduct themselves has given scope for judges to come out publicly and make irrelevant and sometimes irresponsible utterances...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Therefore, the Member can raise a discussion on that. It is within the Rules. I am not debaring discussion. But at this time we have no notice and Government have no notice. To make such observations against the judiciary is not proper at this stage. If you have nothing to say on the Bill, I am calling the Finance Minister, Finance Minister, please.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND REVENUE AND BANKING (SHRI H. M. PATEL): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the question that we were considering was demands for excess grants relating to the year 1974-75 voted by the Lok Sabha on the 25th July 1977 and the expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of India in excess of the sanctioned appropriations for that year. The reasons which led to the excesses have been explained in the footnotes below each Demand or Appropriation in the pamphlet circulated to the honourable Members on the 16th June 1977 and summarised...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the honourable Minister is reading out his speech. Obviously it is a speech written before we spoke. Is he replying to the debate? The writer of the speech did not know what we would be speaking here...

SHRI H. M. PATEL: The honourable Member spoke not one word on the subject-matter that was brought before the House and I had to tell him to enlighten him as well as other Members of the House what the subject-matter was which I had brought before the House. All that I can say is that none of the Members made any suggestion with reference to this motion and I would, therefore, ask that the Appropriation Bill be approved.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No on a point of order. This is again bad. The Rule is this...

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I will not yield. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not going to yield.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Rule is...

SHRI H. M. PATEL: No, I am not yielding. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then you read out.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I think I must explain what the subject-matter of this particular motion was. Now, the sanctioned grants and appropriations revealed in the annual Appropriation Acts are first scrutinised in the Public Accounts Committee and it is only thereafter that it comes before this House. And in this case the various items of excess expenditure during 1974-75 were scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee, Fifth Lok Sabha who in their 227th report recommended regularisation of the excess expenditure. The excess expenditure during 1974-75 amounted to Rs. 248.56 crores spread over 24 grants and one appropriation. Of these, three items amounting to Rs. 220.34 crores are charged on the Consolidated Fund and the balance excess of Rs. 28.22 crores on the voted side. The bulk of the excesses, namely, Rs. 207.40 crores in the charged portion relates to premature cancellation of treasury bills issued in favour of the Reserve Bank

[Shri H. M. Patel]

and was notional, having no budgetary impact. The rest of the excess expenditure constituted 21 per cent of the sanctioned grants and appropriations. I thought, Sir, I should give this information to the House and it is for this purpose that I have come before the House. I do not propose to say anything further. Since no other points were raised, I have no further observations to make.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When we discuss the Finance Bill of that type general issues concerning various departments and other things are raised and it is not strictly and technically an occasion when only financial matters are discussed. You know it very well. The normal practice is that the Government or the Finance Minister, in particular, says something. At least he should have said that these will be considered or brought to the notice of the Government. Sometimes other Ministers intervene. The Home Minister was present and he could have intervened . . .

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has come for some other Motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nothing like that was done. It is very difficult to deal with Shri H. M. Patel. Nothing can provoke him and he goes on giving concession after concession to monopolists.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): Normally, when there is a debate in the House the hon. Minister takes note of what we say and refers to them while replying to the debate. Last time on the Finance Bill also we 'howled' for three days. It was just a 'howl' for him. In the end he came with a written speech in which he covered only the points raised by Shri Pranab Mukherjee. In the course of his speech at least he would have referred to Shri Pranab

Mukherjee by name three dozen times. This courtesy may kindly be given to others in this House. At least kindly touch upon the points raised by us. We are simply shouting for nothing.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I shall touch upon what the hon. Members say the day when they speak relevantly on the subject.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I referred to the consultative committee. He did not reply to it.

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA (Bihar): This Appropriation Bill relates to three years back. What is there to reply to?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants at least the names to be mentioned. The question is:

"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, 1975, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill. Clause 1, the Enacting Formula, and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Sir, I move: "That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.