

publishing the Central Commissions of Inquiry (Procedure) Amendment Rules, 1972, under sub-section (3) of section 12 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1512/72].

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS NOTIFICATION

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Home Affairs, under section 35 of the Defence of India Act, 1971:—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 1888, dated the 16th December, 1971, (in Hindi) publishing the Defence of India (Re-quisioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property) Rules, 1971.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 1958, dated the 23rd December, 1971, (in English and Hindi) publishing the Defence of India (Amendment) Rules, 1971. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1412/72 for (i) and (ii)]

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

I. THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971

II. THE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1972.

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

(I)

“In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation Bill, 1972, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 15th March, 1972.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India.”

(II)

“In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1972, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 15th March, 1972.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India.”

Sir, I lay a copy of each of the Bills on the Table.

THE ARMED FORCES (ASSAM AND MANIPUR) SPECIAL POWERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers Act 1958.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while taking part in the debate yesterday on the President's Address, Shri Bhupesh Gupta devoted almost all his time in making certain unwanted and baseless allegations against me in my absence. According to our convention, before making a personal attack, prior notice should have been given. I am really sorry that a senior Member of the House should have resorted to such a course. I will try to answer each one of his allegations.

Sir, he has stated that during the election campaign in Assam I stated that why should I go to Assam to become the Chief Minister there? and that I could become the President, Vice-President or the Prime Minister. This is an unfounded allegation based on a wild distortion of what I had really stated. As far as I know, only one newspaper, namely, the “Assam Tribune” of Gauhati which had

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury.]

started a tirade against a section of Congressmen, particularly myself, in this election, published such a news. No other newspaper published this kind of statement attributed to me. As soon as it came to my notice, I issued a contradiction on full which I will read now :

"My attention has been drawn to a publication in a section of the Press that I have said in some of my public utterances in Assam that if I had wanted to become the Chief Minister of Assam, there was none who could either challenge me or resist me and that I wanted to rise from my Present position to that of the Prime Minister and then the President of India. This is completely a distorted publication. With a view to rousing communal passions, a section of the opponents of the Congress has been persistently spreading rumours in Assam in the present electioneering that Shri Sarat Chandra Sinha was only a stop-gap arrangement and that I would be sent to Assam as the Chief Minister after the election by the Prime Minister. I repeatedly contradicted it in my public speeches including issuing a statement to the correspondent of the PTI at Silchar."

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आन प्वाइंट आफ इंफार्मेशन । यह केवल भूपेश गुप्त का ही जवाब क्यों दे रहे हैं ? यह प्राइम मिनिस्टर का जवाब दें ; क्योंकि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भी बयान दिया है कि हमारे दल में कुछ रिएक्शनरी अभी बाकी हैं, कम्युनल रिएक्शनरी, जिनको हटाना है । तो वह कम्युनल रिएक्शनरी हैं श्री मोइनल हक चौधरी ।

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, कल भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो बातें कही थीं उनके बारे में ही वे कह रहे हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : जो भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा है वही प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा है ।

श्री उपसभापति : उनका नाम लेकर भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा है ।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY :
"What I said was that as a voter in Assam

I had every right to be its Chief Minister and nobody could either resist me or challenge me from claiming it. What I object to was the communal and unfounded propaganda being carried out to cause harm to the Congress candidates. I further retorted the communalists saying that in free India every citizen including me could legitimately claim for the Prime Ministership or Presidentship and there could be no objection for me or anyone to have such an aspiration. In this background I further stated that I was not a candidate for the Chief Ministership of Assam . . ."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) :
It is an intelligent way of speaking . . .

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY :

"I would like to clarify once again that the Assam Pradesh Congress Parliamentary party had elected Shri Sarat Chandra Sinha as its leader and they would once again get a chance to elect their leader after the election. I am not a candidate for the Chief Ministership of Assam. I hope this will clarify the position."

This statement was published in many newspapers including the "Assam Tribune", dated 6th March, 1972, in the "Assam Express", dated the 6th March 1972 . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Did the "Assam Tribune" Editor express any regret in public that what he had published earlier was a wrong news? I am asking this.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY :
He can take it up with the Editor. It is not my business. That newspaper is a monopoly newspaper in Assam, I was fighting the tycoon.

The next allegation Shri Gupta made was that I threatened that I would cut down newspaper quota. This was also published only in the Assam Tribune" and in no other newspaper in the whole of the country, to my knowledge. As soon as this came to my notice, I issued a contradiction on 7th March 1972, which I will read :

"My attention has been drawn to a news item that I had said that the Government of India would cut down the news-print quota of the newspapers which were indulging in anti-Congress activities in this election. This is absolutely baseless. On the contrary I had repeatedly said in my various public speeches

all over the country that in order to ensure democracy in this country functioning, we have guaranteed freedom of speech, association and press and that even those of the newspapers who depend on Government for newsprint and advertisements are not penalised by Government as is done in fascist countries for their free expression of views, whether those news are liked or not by the Government. I hope this will clarify my position."

Sir, this was published in the "Statement", dated 8th March, 1972, "Amrita Bazar Patrika", dated 8th March, 1972, "Hindustan Standard", dated 9th March 1972, and even in the "Assam Tribune" itself dated 9th March 1972. It is rather surprising that Shri Gupta did not care to read any one of these newspapers. I sent copies of both these statements to Shri Bhupesh Gupta on 8th March, 1972, by post, with a personal covering letter when I found that he was trying to fan something out of this at Gauhati during his election campaign. It is a pity that even after that he had mentioned about it on the floor of the Parliament obviously to play to the gallery.

The next allegation is that when I went to Calcutta, some Birla was seen travelling in the same plane and that Birlas and not Congressmen receive me there. I had not noted, nor am I expected to note, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, every passenger in a commercial airliner travelling. Nor can I dictate who should and who should not travel in the same airliner.

I cannot choose fellow-travellers as Shri Bhupesh Gupta can. However, I can categorically say that neither I travelled ever with a Birla in any of my visits to Calcutta nor the Birlas or their agents had ever gone to aerodrome or railway station to receive me. It is also equally baseless that the Cabinet is favouring larger Houses like Birlas and Tatas. I can reiterate that the Government have not deviated from the Industrial Policy Resolution in any manner.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta went on to make an astounding allegation that I had systematically refused to send income-tax and wealth-tax returns and for this reason, an officer of the Revenue Department had to meet me in the Gauhati Circuit House. On the contrary, I submitted all my income-tax returns up to

the assessment year 1971-72, that is to say, up to the year ending 31st December, 1970. In fact my grievance against the Income-tax Department was that they were not finalising my assessments for the income-tax years 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72 and the same were pending. Hence I requested them to finalise the same. Accordingly, a statutory hearing was fixed at Gauhati Circuit House on 18-9-71 in course of one of my visits to Assam.

That was how the Income-Tax Officer met me at the Gauhati Circuit House. After giving a statutory hearing, he wanted me to confirm what I had said orally in writing. That was how I sent a statement in writing. I can inform the House that all my tax due up to 31-12-1970, and even my advance tax for the current year, viz, the Assessment Year 1972-73 had been paid. Hence there is no basis about the allegation that I was not regular in this respect.

It may be pointed out that this letter and my assessment relate to a period up to 31-12-1970, in which period I was not a Union Minister. As a matter of fact, I was not a Minister in the Government of Assam also during the period in question, i.e. the Assessment years 1970-71 and 1971-72. I became the Union Minister on 19th March, 1971.

Of the total savings of Rs. 3,30,000/- shown by me in the aforesaid communication to the Income-Tax Officer, Shri Bhupesh Gupta has taken objection to three items amounting to Rs. 3000, Rs. 2000 and Rs. 23000, that is to say, Rs. 28000 in all out of a sum of Rs. 3,30,000. Before I go into it, I must say that it is an unfortunate thing that the income-tax returns or the papers connected with income-tax which are treated as secret, have been taken out by a senior Member of Parliament and used in the House and that too, to malign a person. The only comment I can make is that it is not healthy.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has commented rather sarcastically about these amounts shown there under a head 'windfall income.' Under the Income-Tax Act, and all the decisions of the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of India, mere casual payments and windfalls do not constitute income and I had shown these three amounts of Rs. 3,000 Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 23,000/ under the exempt list.

I will not refer to section 10 of the Income-Tax Act 1961, which starts with "in computing

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury.]

total income of previous year of any person any income falling within any of the following clauses shall not be included." Then, Sir, I go to sub-section (3) . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: छोड़िये भाई, कहिए कि ठीक है।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Sub-section (3) says, "any receipts which are of casual and non-recurring nature . . ."

Then I go further to sub-section (7). I go further to sub-section (7):

"any allowance perquisites paid or allowed as such outside India by the Government to a citizen of India for rendering service outside India."

I showed under this head saving of a sum of Rs. 3000 out of the payment made to me in New York during my stay in the UN for three months in 1961 and a sum of Rs. 2000 for my two visits, one to UNO in 1967 and another tour visits to for East and Middle East in 1968 and paid outside India. This is covered under Section 10(7) of the Act. I could have as well not shown them, but I thought it would be honest to show them even though I knew they were exempted from Tax and leave it to the Officer to judge whether I was entitled to exemption or not under the Income-tax Act. If I had not shown it, Shri Bhupesh Gupta would have probably said that I had evaded it. Now that I have shown it, he is very angry about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then I would not have known.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: But he would malign me all the same. The Income-tax Officer had full authority to differ with me and take it as taxable. If he had differed with me, I had also full right to go to an Appellate Authority. I can tell the House that the Income-tax Officer did not differ with me. Instead of thanking me that I had disclosed my full income, Shri Bhupesh Gupta is condemning me and trying to build a mountain out of a molehill.

श्री राजनारायण: आन ए प्वाइन्ट आफ आईर। मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा, मंत्री जी इतना

लम्बा बयान पढ़ रहे हैं, सदन का समय नष्ट कर रहे हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन कर रहे हैं।

श्री मोइनूल हक चौधरी: इसमें सदन का समय क्या नष्ट किया है?

श्री राजनारायण: अगर माननीय मंत्री जी यह समझते हैं कि . . .

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: You go on maligning me.

श्री राजनारायण: हम मंत्री जी की मदद कर रहे हैं।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I am making a personal explanation. I hope the hon. Member will not mind it.

श्री राजनारायण: मैं यह निवेदन करूँगा, मंत्री जी खुद समझें कि वे खुद अपने आपको फंसा रहे हैं। यह जो विदेश में 2,000 या 1,500 रु० मिला, यह कैसे मिला? यह रुपया उसमें लिखा गया है, विदेशों में मिला. . .

श्री उपसभापति: यह पहले बता दिया।

श्री राजनारायण: यह कैसे मिला विदेश में। देखिए, अब सदन इन्टाइटिल्ड है यह जानने का. . .

श्री उपसभापति: आपने सुना नहीं होगा।

श्री राजनारायण: अब यह सदन इन्टाइटिल्ड है यह जानने का कि उनको किस सर्विस की खूबी में विदेश की सरकार ने इतना रुपया दिया। अब मैं समझ पाया, ये विदेश क्यों जाते हैं।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I hope it is known to an old Member like Shri Rajnarain that a UNO Delegate gets daily payment in New York. I was twice representing India in the UN delegations and I was the Leader of the Delegation of India in Saudi

Arabia in the Middle East. That is a separate issue but I am honest enough and I had shown this income and placed it before the Income-tax Officer. I was prepared to pay tax on that even if he would have decided otherwise.

The next amount of Rs. 23,000 I had shown was out of the savings of the money for my election in 1967. The whole theory build up by Shri Bhupesh Gupta here is—and I am quoting from his speech:

“I do not know how much money he has taken from the Congress Election Funds.”

Then referring to the savings, he said:

“it should go to the Congress Party’s Election Fund or it should go to the AICC.”

and not to my own. Shri Gupta seems to be labouring under the Impression, without talking to me and I am sure, or to anybody in the AICC or the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee, that all this money belongs to the party. I can tell the House and Shri Gupta that I did not get any more from the Congress Fund for the 1967 election of mine nor did I collect any money for the Congress Election Fund either for me or anyone else. Shri Gupta conveniently forgot to mention the source of the money written in the said letter to the Income-tax Officer which included friends and relations . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I read it out.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: If my friends and relations include . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Minister should not be unfair to me. I read out from his statement—savings from 1967 election fund, collections from public, friends and relatives amount Rs. 23,000—public also.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: If my friends and relatives including my father and others helped me in the 1967 elections . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ‘Public’ is not cut your brother.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: ‘Public’ does not mean that it is ‘Congress upFn. my constituency friends may help me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He raised from the public. Mr. Choudhury, I would like you to make this statement. It is public. That is why I raised it. If it is relatives, it is one thing. Even so, you were given funds as a Congress candidate, not as a candidate or Mr. Choudhury himself.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I am clarifying. Sir, it is a well known fact that it was a time when I was not in the grace of Mr. Chaliha, the then Chief Minister of Assam and a strong section of Congressmen in Assam and in fact, after elections in 1967 I ceased to be a Minister in Assam. It is a well known fact in this country. Since then till I was elevated to this position I was not a Minister. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should know my position in this period.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not saying that you were a Minister.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: And if there is anything given to me by my own relations, friends and well-wishers, where was the question of returning it to the Congress Party or to the AICC? I could make a donation to the AICC but that is a different matter. But why should Mr. Bhupesh Gupta say that I should have returned it to the AICC? It was a help given to me personally by my friends and relations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we seem to have a set of politicians who contest the elections by raising money from . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. This is a very serious matter. They raise money from the public and after fighting the election, which is a public political act—and here it is said that money was raised from the public—it was the bounden duty of Mr. Choudhury to return the money to the Party to—which he belonged, otherwise . . .

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Why does he not read the next two words ‘friends and relations’?

(Interruptions)

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): The problem is this. Funds to the extent of Rs. 23,000 are shown as windfall income, having been contributed by relations and friends . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And the public.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Leave aside the public now.

SHR BHUPESH GUPTA: Why? It is mentioned there.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Let me argue my case. Now, Rs. 23,000 is the sum shown. The point is, what is the total limit of expenditure for a person seeking election to a legislature? Why should anyone try to collect so much money from friends and relations even?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, Rs. 12,000 is the maximum expenditure admissible and if any money is got over and above Rs. 12,000 it should be returned. It cannot be taken . . .

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Again confusion is sought to be created. This is not expenditure; this is the saving in my hands. If there was any hanky-panky about it, I would not have come out and disclosed it to the Income-tax authorities.

श्री राजनारायण : तो उनके भी मित्र रहे होंगे ।

श्री मोइनूल हक चौधरी : जी हाँ, आप जैसे हैं । मेरे भी मित्र हैं और हम अकेले चलने वाले नहीं हैं दुनिया में । It was a help given to me personally by my friends, relations and sympathisers; it was not the Congress Party which had paid it to me. I should have thought that Shri Bhupesh Gupta would have made some enquiry before making this kind of insinuation in the House from the Congress Party itself. Shri Bhupesh Gupta had asked for an enquiry by the AICC about it. I am glad that he is taking so much interest in the internal affairs of my party. I invite him to join my party, this only will give him the right to meddle in its internal affairs and make such demands.

I do not know why Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is suddenly so angry with me. He should not try to make up for political losses by personal

attacks on me. There was no electoral alliance in Assam with his Party and as a result thereof the CPI is almost obliterated there. All his wrath should not be on me, after all I am not the only person who took the decision for Assam, there were others also who took decisions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of personal explanation. You have allowed a strange thing by permitting the Minister to make a lengthy statement, taking up longer time than I did on this particular point. Anyway, you will have noted every time the hon. Minister read the relevant portion he omitted the word 'public' deliberately. But it is definitely here; can he deny that he wrote this:

"Savings from 1967 election fund, collections from the public, friends and relatives—roughly Rs. 23,000."

Now, Sir, this is a matter of great importance. Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury should not introduce politics. I know he is anti-Communist anti-Soviet, and all these things. I know that but that is not the issue here. Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury said that I did not consult him. That is true, he can rightly accuse me of that but did he consult us when he accused the Communist Party of India? He never did it, so it is quids that way.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you had made certain allegations yesterday and he has given his explanation and I think it should end there now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me explain this. This statement here should be subjected to investigation. I contested an election. Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury contested an election, as a party-man, as a Congress candidate. It follows therefore that those who gave money loving Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury, also loved the Congress Party. Therefore, Sir, the Congress Party was the constructive recipient of the funds that fell into the hands of Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury, a Congress candidate in the election. The attraction was that the Congress was contesting and so the money came. Otherwise, the public does not come and give money like that. Therefore, did Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury report to the A.I.C.C. leadership that he had collected so much money and this was the saving? This

may be two things. One, he wants to legalise illegal money by showing it under this head in which case it is bad, or, alternatively, he has appropriated to himself funds which are the public funds of the Congress Party. Surely, in either case, Sir, this is absolutely bad and improper on the part of the Minister. Take the case of Mr. Pratap Singh Kairoa. He collected money. He admitted he had put it in his bank. And he was called upon to pay income-tax, and Mr. Krishnamachari, as a result of the allegation in this House, started a kind of inquiry against the funds which he had admitted to have been collected for the election. But here is a strange thing shown as a windfall income of Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury. Sir, this is a strange thing. If that standard is set, then every Congress candidate can go and collect funds. People out of affection for the Congress may give funds, and then he can say, "I have kept it in my personal account, because it is my fund; it is not the Congress Party fund."

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I repeatedly say that it was not Congress collection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is morally reprehensible and it is an atrocious misappropriation of funds or, in the alternative, evasion of tax. Let us know what it is. I therefore refer the matter to a Committee of the House. The Prime Minister should come and tell us as to what is the matter behind it.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I once again say that it is neither Congress collection, nor did the Congress Party give it to me. Mr. Gupta had no authority to meddle in Congress matters. If my father gives me money, if my brother gives me money, I am not going to give it to the Congress. I can make a donation to the Congress; I have made many donations.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा एक व्यवस्था का सवाल है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या संसदीय प्रथा में यह उचित है कि एक व्यक्ति 'सेविंग फ्राम इलेक्शन फंड' यानी चुनाव कोष से बचत करके अपने नाम से पैसा जमा कर ले और उसको अपनी आमदनी में लिखा कर इनकम टैक्स से बरी करा ले। अगर

इस तरह दिखाया जायगा तो आपने सुप्रीम कोर्ट की रूलिंग पढ़ी होगी. . .

श्री उपसभापति : उसका यहाँ क्या सवाल है ?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं उस पर आ नहीं रहा हूँ, मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि यह तरीका जो रहा है करप्शन को बढ़ाने का।

श्री उपसभापति : आपका प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर क्या है ?

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि यथा यह उचित नहीं होगा कि आप यहाँ पर व्यवस्था करें कि सदन की कमेटी बैठे और मोइनूल हक चौधरी ने इलेक्शन फंड की सेविंग की तो इन्होंने किससे चन्दा लिया, इन्होंने इलेक्शन फंड का ठीक हिसाब किया या नहीं। जब पब्लिक मनी है तो पब्लिक देख सकती है। वह पूरा एकाउन्ट सदन में पेश करें और सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य उस कमेटी के जरिए उसकी जानकारी प्राप्त करें।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had made certain allegations yesterday against the Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not allegations. It is his own Statement. Kindly read it. Let him deny the Statement. I never made any allegation. This is his own Statement. Let him read it.

श्री राजनारायण : सुनिए. . .

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, बैठिए।

श्री राजनारायण : आज वे हमारे मन्त्री हैं, आज जनता का पैसा उन पर खर्च हो रहा है, अगर कोई आदमी इतना भ्रष्ट है जो अनफेयर मीन्स से पैसा लेकर उस पैसे को टैक्स से बरी कराना चाहता है. . .

श्री उपसभापति : आपकी बात समझ

[श्री उपसभापति]

में आ गई, अब बैटिए । Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has made certain statements . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a statement by the hon. Minister which he has not disowned. Let him read it . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As the hon. Minister has clarified his position and as he has given his explanation to the House, now let the matter be finished there and we proceed further.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): I wish to submit, when you are trying to finish up the matter, that you should not say that Mr. Gupta made a certain statement and that has been answered. It is not merely that. The answer that the Minister has given relates only to the fact whether those funds belong to the Congress or not. He has not satisfied the House whether these funds were from the public or not. If they are public funds, let it be cleared up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. It is for the House to take any further notice of the statement made by the hon. Minister. If he has made certain statements regarding . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will you permit me to lay it on the Table of the House?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the statement of Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury himself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has gone on record. Why do you want to place it on the Table of the House? The hon. Minister has clarified the position. (*Interruptions*). I have heard you. Please do not get up. If the House wants to take up this matter in any other manner, the House is at liberty. The hon. Member can take up the matter in any other way. This is not the time to raise the question. He has clarified his position.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a serious matter. I have brought it to the notice of the House in the public interest. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can do it in any other manner afterwards. Mr. Kanchi Kalyanasundaram.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So, we have set the ball rolling. Let us see where it ends. I shall return to the subject again and again. This statement contains other things. It should be examined, I say, by the Revenue Board. Mr. Chavan should personally look into it and other experts should see it. It will be revealing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It hides more than it reveals. What it discloses is horrifying. It is misappropriation of public funds or alternatively an attempt to legalise illegal money by saying that it is a fund for elections. For twenty years, as the hon. Minister has said, I have been a senior Member of Parliament. I have made criticisms, but never have I come across such a case in which a member of the Government wants to wash away or wants to dilute facts. It is in his own statement. I am not making the allegation on my own. Let him deny that this is not his statement and I shall apologise to the House and retract every word. The statement is on the files of the Finance Ministry and the Government. The statement is in the hands of many friends. Therefore, for the first time in the country a Minister is known to have misappropriated Congress funds.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I take strong objection to this kind of statement. This is a wild charge and the Member seems to have become mad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not make any charge without any basis. You send it to the Privileges Committee. If the Privileges Committee says that I am making an unfounded and baseless charge, I shall come in sack cloth and ashes before the House and bow to the will of the Privileges Committee. Let us go to the Privileges Committee over this matter and let them thrash out this matter. I am not saying anything on my own. I am bringing to the notice of the House Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury's own statement. . .

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. I have already said that if you want to take up the matter in any other manner, you can do so according to the Rules of Procedure. Let us go to the next business.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We, in the opposition, want to be treated with some amount of respect. It is for the Prime Minister now to have the next say. She should come and tell us whether she is going to tolerate such things. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We know of other minor charges or even suspicion, but here is a self-condemnatory document of the Minister Mr. Choudhury and yet he would like us to be silenced by him. I would like to hear the Prime Minister of the country and the Finance Minister on the very subject I have raised before you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kalyanasundaram.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*contd.*

***SHRI KANCHI KALYANASUNDARAM** (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, on behalf of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam Party to which I belong, I would like to express my views on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

The attitude and the method adopted by some Members while the President was delivering his address in the Joint Session of the two Houses is regrettable. It is the right of every Member of Parliament to hear the address of the President in a clear manner. Those Members caused a lot of disturbance by shoutings. They did not bother about the impact of their behaviour on the mind of the public. Whatever it may be, the behaviour of those Members is regrettable.

In his address the President has referred to the establishment of a sovereign and independent Bangla Desh. The President has paid glowing tributes to the three wings of the armed forces who are responsible for the establishment of Bangla Desh. The President has rightly praised the bravery of our armed forces. In the same way the President has also paid tributes to the Indian people for their

great sacrifices in their contribution to the establishment of Bangla Desh.

The people of Bangla Desh, unable to stand the repression in their own country by Pakistan took refuge in the Indian sub-continent. The Indian people welcomed them with burning enthusiasm and gave them food, clothing and shelter. This clearly shows the broad-mindedness of the Indian people.

The President in his address has emphasised the need for land reforms and ceilings on land. He has also referred to the problem of unemployment and the steps taken by the government to eradicate unemployment. The Government and the Planning Commission should take concrete steps to reduce unemployment.

The prices of commodities of daily necessity consumed by the people are rising particularly that of food. In this connection it is necessary to state the bare truth that the steps taken by Government to reduce prices have not been successful.

The President has referred to many proposals in his address. But it is disappointing to note that in his address, the President has not referred to the powers of the Central Government and the distribution of Powers between the Central and the State Governments. The demand that the State Governments also should share the powers of the Centre is a long standing demand. An Hon. Member of this House—the Member who is leaving once for all after the expiry of his term—while referring to this demand in his speech stated that the demand of the D.M.K. Government for State Autonomy is a demand for 'Complete State Autonomy.' A new term 'complete State Autonomy' has been given to this demand.

But it has not stopped there. It has been further stated that the D.M.K.'s demand for complete autonomy was akin to self-determination under the cover of a threat, and it should be nipped in the bud. This is the charge made by the Member. The demand of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam for State Autonomy is a reasonable and justified demand but some insinuations have been made and motives have been imputed to it.

* Original speech in Tamil.