

Cause 1

(2) That at page 1, line 4, for '1969' substitute '1970'.

Cause 9

(3) That at page 6, line 17, for '1969' substitute '1970'

Clause 16

(4) That at page 9, line 36, for 'ship' substitute 'vessel'

(5) That at page 9, line 37, for 'ship' substitute 'vessel'

(6) That at page 10, line 5, for 'ship' substitute 'vessel'

(7) That at page 10, line 8, for 'ship' substitute 'vessel'

Clause 19

(8) That at page 21, line 46, for '1969' substitute '1970';

Sir, may I say a few words. This Bill was already passed by this House on the 3rd December last year and in Lok Sabha that was passed on 8th May this year. It has therefore, been necessary to place the Bill before the House for considering and adopting the amendments. The amendments in question are minor in nature. Four amendments are necessitated due to the change of the year from 1969 to 1970. The remaining four amendments have substituted the word "vessel" instead of the word "ship" to make the wording of the Bill harmonious. As these amendments are of a verbal and minor nature, these may be adopted.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SARDAR IC BAL SINGH: Sir, I move :

"That the amendments made by Lok Sabha in the Bill be agreed to."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE CONTINGENCY FUND OF INDIA (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1970

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI): Sir, I move :

"That the Bill to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the Bill seeks to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, for the purpose of raising the corpus of the Contingency Fund of India from Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 30 crores. The Fund is meant to meet the requirements of unforeseen expenditure of the Central Government (including Railways) pending authorisation of such expenditure by the Parliament.

The corpus of the Fund was fixed at Rs. 15 crores when the total size of the Central Budget (including Railways) was of the order of Rs. 500 crores. The total size of the Budget has now increased to over Rs. 5,000 crores, that is, about ten times, necessitating reconsideration of the corpus of the Fund. Further, as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee, it has been decided that additional requirements for investments in or loans to public sector undertakings and private concerns, grants to private institutions and certain types of subsidies, in excess of certain limits, should be treated as expenditure requiring specific parliamentary approval even when they can be met by re-appropriation of savings. In all such cases, if there is not adequate time to seek supplementary provisions from the Parliament, we have to initially meet the expenditure out of advances from the Contingency Fund. Although, as stated by me, the Budget has increased by over ten times, the corpus of the Fund is being raised from Rs. 15 crores to only Rs. 30 crores which we consider the minimum amount necessary in the light of the new developments mentioned by me earlier. I may also mention that the Administrative Reforms Commission have also recommended that the corpus of this Fund should be enhanced suitably to enable funds being found for urgent schemes and projects which cannot be postponed till the estimates for the next year are placed before the legislature.

The Contingency Fund of India (Amendment) Bill involves a withdrawal of Rs. 15 crores from the Consolidated Fund of India for transfer to the Contingency Fund of India. The advances from the Contingency Fund will be sanctioned only as and when necessary. Supplementary Estimates for all expen-

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

diture so financed from the Contingency Fund are, according to the rules, presented to Parliament at the first session meeting immediately after the advance is sanctioned. The advances are recouped to the Fund as soon as Parliament authorises the expenditure. The increase in the corpus of the Contingency Fund at this stage, therefore, does not involve any real outgo of cash.

The question was proposed.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want a clarification as to what percentage of the Contingent Fund was actually utilised last year, for instance, so that we may know if there is some justification to increase it. Was it fully utilised or only partially utilised?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, actually we have only sometimes touched this figure of Rs. 15 crores. But now the position is this, as I pointed out, the Budget has gone up ten times. So sometimes it may require a bigger withdrawal from the Contingency Fund. That is why we are raising the corpus. It is only a fund the expenditure from which ultimately goes for the approval of Parliament. Therefore, the necessity has been felt.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: My recollection is that out of this Rs. 15 crores quite a lot remained unused in the past. If that is still going on, I do not know whether there is any justification to increase it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Muniswamy. He is not here.

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, the Minister has not clarified the point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He will further clarify when he replies. Now, the next speaker is Dr. Mahavir. He is not here. Now, Mr. Mandal.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI (Haryana): Sir, I only want to make a brief observation. After all, it is only for contingencies, and what actually was utilised on anything contingent in the past has got nothing to do with making an adequate provision for the future. Tyagiji wanted details of the actual utilisation of the Contingency Fund. This Fund

is for meeting some emergency or contingency. The fact that we did not utilise the Fund fully for certain contingencies, which arose in the past or did not arise in the past, has nothing to do with determining whether the new size of the Contingency Fund is adequate or is warranted by the total volume of the Budget. As has been stated by the Minister, the volume of the Budget has gone up ten-fold and all that is sought to be done is that the Contingency Fund should be raised from Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 30 crores. I would respectfully submit that the question of Shri Tyagi does not arise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Mandal.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार): उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो बिल हम लोगों के सामने आया है, मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल को लाने की कोई जरूरत थी। अगर मिनिस्टर को इस तरह का बिल लाना ही था तो उन्हें साफ साफ और पूरी बातें बिल के संबंध में बतलानी चाहिये थीं कि सरकार को 15 करोड़ रुपये से अधिक अब 30 करोड़ रुपये की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी। इसके संबंध में उन्हें पूरा जस्टीफिकेशन देना चाहिये था। जस्टीफिकेशन के संबंध में उन्होंने सिर्फ एक बात कही और वह यह है कि पहले अपना बजट पांच सौ करोड़ का होता था और अब पांच हजार का होता है। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि यह कोई यथेष्ट कारण है जिसकी वजह से यह बिल लाया गया है। यथेष्ट कारण तब होता जब मिनिस्टर की ओर से या सरकार की ओर से यह दिखलाया जाता कि 15 करोड़ का जो कंटिजेंसी फंड है वह इन कुछ वर्षों में जो आकस्मिक खर्च सामने आये हैं वे पूरे नहीं हो सके और इसी वजह से सरकार को वैसी रकम यानी तीस करोड़ रुपये के लिये इस बिल को लाना पड़ा। इस तरह की बात उन्हें यहां पर बतलानी चाहिये थी कि 1950 से लेकर अबतक जितना रुपया आकस्मिक कोष में था और वह पूरा खर्च हुआ या नहीं हुआ, अगर खर्च नहीं हुआ तो क्यों नहीं हुआ और अगर बैसी खर्चा हुआ

तो उसके बारे में पूरी बात यहां पर बतलानी चाहिये थी, तब उस तरह की मांग करते, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं किया गया। इसलिये मैं समझता हूं कि इस बिल को लाने के जो कारण बतलाये गये हैं वे यथेष्ट कारण नहीं हैं।

एक दूसरी बात की ओर मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आंकलन इतना प्रेशर पार्लियामेंट के काम का बन गया है कि बजट की मांगों के सबंध में जो बहस हुआ करती है उन सब मांगों के सबंध में पूरी तरह से रोशनी नहीं पड़ पाती है।

कन्टिन्जेंसी फंड के बारे में भी कभी कोई डिस्कशन हो नहीं पाता है। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि जो अभी की सरकार है और जो उसका लीडर है वह अपनी पार्टी को मजबूत करने के लिए इस फंड को यूटिलाइज किया करता है। हम समझते हैं कि कन्टिन्जेंसी फंड के लिए जो वार्षिक रुपये की मांग की गई उस रुपये को यूटिलाइज करेंगे अपनी पार्टी को बढ़ाने के लिए राजायज तरीके से। उनको इस बात का भी पता नहीं है कि हम पार्लियामेंट में पकड़े जायेंगे क्योंकि जब सभी मांगों पर डिस्कशन हो रही पाता है तो उस छोटी चीज को कौन देखने के लिए जायगा। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार को इस कन्टिन्जेंसी फंड में और रुपये न दिया जाय और अगर दिया जाय तो पहले सरकार की ओर से इसका एक्सप्लेनशन आ जाय कि इयर टु इयर हमने इस बात की डिफीवेंल्टी महसूस की है कि कन्टिन्जेंसी फंड के अभाव की वजह से जो जरूरी काम रहते हैं वे रुक गए। ऐसा कोई उदाहरण आए। इसके अलावा हम हर साल देखते हैं कि सप्लीमेंटरी बजट और बजट से अधिक खर्च का बजट आता है और जब सप्लीमेंटरी बजट या एक्सेस बजट आता ही है तो फिर इस कन्टिन्जेंसी फंड को बढ़ाने की क्या जरूरत पड़ती है।

इन बातों के साथ साथ और तीन बातों की तरफ मैं सरकार का ध्यान खींचना चाहता

हूँ। कहा जाता है कि जो सारे रुपये खर्च होते हैं वे जनता के हितों की हिफाजत के लिए खर्च होते हैं। जनता के हितों की हिफाजत कैसे होती है इसके तीन उदाहरण मैं आपके सामने रखूंगा। एक उदाहरण यह देखिए। एक हिन्दी अफसर है जिसका नाम के० बी० परसाई है। उसके बारे में लोकसभा में कई क्वेश्चन्स हुए। इस सभा में भी 3-4 स्टार्ड और अनस्टार्ड क्वेश्चन्स हैं, मैं कल रद्दूंगा नहीं, मैं पूछ नहीं सकूंगा लेकिन मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या के० बी० परसाई इतनी बड़ी पर्सनेलिटी हो गया है कि जिसके लिए आउट आफ वे जाकर बड़ा घर प्रोवाइड करने की जरूरत पड़ती है? क्या यह इसलिए किया गया है क्योंकि वह एस्ट्रोलोजर है? मैं समझता हूँ कि चूंकि वह एस्ट्रोलोजर है और प्राइम मिनिस्टर से लेकर जो बड़े-बड़े अफसर, बड़े-बड़े मिनिस्टर हैं उनके हाथ देखा करता है और उस हाथ देखने के सिलसिले में उसने इतनी पोजीशन जमा ली है कि आउट आफ वे जाकर पूजा करने के लिए उसे एक बड़ा मकान दिया जाता है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि उस अफसर ने एक हरिजन चपरासी को आफिस में जो पानी रखा हुआ था उसके छू लेने पर गाली-मुफ्ता दिया और अपमानित किया। इसकी दरखास्त दी लेकिन कोई सुनने वाला नहीं है। कोई हरिजन क्लर्क जो उसके डिपार्टमेंट का था उसको भी इनसल्ट करके निकाल दिया। जब उसको मालूम हुआ कि एक मुसलमान पियन आ रहा है तो तुरन्त जो अफसर उसको भेजने वाला था उसको कह कर उसे कैसिल करवा दिया। ऐसी हरकतें हुआ करती हैं।

इतना ही नहीं, पोल ग्राण्डी नाम का बैंकाक में एक आदमी रहा करता है। शायद वह एक इन्टरनैशनल स्मगलर है। उनसे इनकी चिट्ठी पत्ती चलती रहती है। जो चिट्ठी आई है मैं उसकी कापी नहीं लाया हूँ नहीं तो उस चिट्ठी को पढ़कर मुनाता। उससे ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि स्मगलिंग के बारे में कुछ

[श्री बी० एन० मंडल]

लिख रहा है। इसके बारे में हमने भी चिट्ठी लिखी एक होम मिनिस्टर को और दूसरी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर को लेकिन अब तक इसकी कोई इन्कावायरी नहीं हुई। कहा जाता है कि डिपार्टमेंटल इन्कावायरी होती है लेकिन सी बी आई इन्कावायरी के बारे में जब इनसिस्ट किया जाता है तो वह बात ओझल कर दी जाती है। इस लिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह सरकार पूरी तरह से इस बात को इस हाउस के सामने रखे। जब एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चलाने के लिए यह सरकार रुपया चाहती तो जो यह सब डिस्क्रिमिनेशन हरिजन के प्रति, मुसलमान के प्रति किया जाता है या जो स्मर्गलिंग का चार्ज आता है उसको क्यों नहीं देखते? इसके लिए पूरा एक्सप्लेनेशन इस सरकार को देना चाहिए।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like to make only one or two observations. Many people do not understand why there should really be a provision for a fund of this kind. When we are dealing with thousands and thousands of crores of rupees in the Budget, a small amount really makes little difference. But perhaps the Public Accounts Committee and others made certain observations that with a view to meeting expenditure outside the allocations in the Budget there should be some provision for allocation of this kind of money which should be used for meeting contingent requirements. Now, my friend, Mr. Tyagi, was asking again and again whether it was a fact that out of the amount already sanctioned only a small portion of it had been spent and the balance could not be spent. If it is a fact that the money could not be spent, then, there will be seen little justification for increasing the amount. We have no objection as such to increasing the amount because after all, if that money is not spent, it remains with the Government. But it is a matter of arranging the finances of the country.

I have sought an opportunity of speaking now only to make one or two submissions or suggestions in connection with the monies being spent out of this fund. My submission is for meeting a certain item of expenditure. This is with regard to the economic assistance to the political sufferers under the Bri-

tish rule. As you know, in our country many many people suffered under the British rule; many people spent years and years in jail and there are many others who were persecuted and who were crippled as a result of police attacks. I think this category of people should be given financial assistance and I have been saying again and again that there should be a national register of all political sufferers who had spent five years or more in prison, and each of them, should they need any help, should be given assistance. We should take it as a moral duty and even after twenty-three years of our independence it would not seem too late, and it is better we do it even now. We are getting reports from all parts of the country about the suffering and distress of many freedom fighters. Some of them are not well placed in life—either in business or in any other avocations of life or as Members of Legislatures or members of various other institutions that have come into existence in our free country. And we get almost harrowing tales of their suffering and sorrow. Some of them are living as beggars and it shocks us when we hear such stories of the people who had been respected by the entire nation, who had made contribution for achieving independence, and such people should never be forsaken or forgotten. After a lot of agitation, the Government has come to the conclusion that all political sufferers who had either spent their life in the Andaman cellular jail having been sent there for political reasons or who had been convicted for five years or more as freedom fighters, would be entitled to getting some economic assistance during their life-time provided they had served imprisonment sentence for five years or more. But unfortunately the matter is not being speeded up. The decision has been announced in this House, but I am told that only thirty people have been selected for this economic assistance and that a hundred and more applications are pending. Let me understand how the Government is viewing this matter. It should be a matter of two days to dispose of all the applications. Everybody *prima facie* should be entitled to get the assistance as promised by the Government. The Central Government should use this money and, if necessary, take a little more money, for this purpose.

We have been paying the Princes for twenty-three years or so nearly Rs. 110 crores as Privy Purse and these freedom

fighters, these political sufferers, have been neglected by us. There are many of them in Bengal, in Punjab, in Maharashtra and other places. Many had suffered imprisonment under sentences of conviction. Many had suffered imprisonment and detention without trial or otherwise. There are many such people. Now I think the Government should make this item of expenditure as a charge on the Contingency Fund. As I have suggested, the Government should take up this thing more seriously. The attitude of the Government today is queer. The attitude of the Government towards the freedom fighters is absolutely strange. I may give you one or two examples . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have brought out your point. Now you should please finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, I am ending it. I have brought out my point for you, but I have yet to do it for them.

I suggested that commemoration stamps should be issued in the name of Jorindra Nath Mukherjee who had fought in Balakrishna in a frontal battle against the British, and the Government agreed that these commemoration stamps would be issued on the 9th September this year. I also asked for a commemoration stamp to be issued in the name of Surya Sen, the leader of the Chittagong Armoury Raid case. But the Government rejected that suggestion. I do not know why. I am just giving you an example. This is the attitude of the Government towards these freedom fighters. Therefore before I sit down, I would earnestly appeal to the Government even at this hour to ask the State Governments to prepare a national register of the political sufferers in their States, those who have spent 3, 4 or 5 years in prison. This list should be compiled and kept here at the Centre and out of the Contingent Fund the Government should give financial assistance to every one of them who deserves to be assisted for his life-time. Sir, I make this point in all seriousness. I think, Sir, it does not speak well of our conscience when we know how we have given extra privileges and many other things; you know moneys are spent for holding grand parties, for holding evening parties. This is a most ostentatious expenditure made by the Government; this is a useless expenditure for which

no provision is needed. In fact the Government should economise considerably on such expenditure. As far as these funds are concerned, if at all they are to remain, they must be used for such purposes as are morally sustainable like the one I have suggested. When I was informed about it, I took up the matter with the Prime Minister and I told her that this question should be gone into. I should say that her response was sympathetic that a list should be prepared of such persons, but after that I do not know what happened. Actually it is the duty of the Government to prepare such a list. In Bengal, Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujarat, etc. you have got many such freedom fighters who are in extreme sorrow and are suffering from economic privations. I think the nation should take care of them. It is a matter of trust for us and it is our bounden duty in the name of freedom that we should make the necessary financial arrangements for them. Let it not be said that free India did not look after its freedom fighters and it helped only those who knew how to help themselves by climbing the ladder of social hierarchy or economy hierarchy. There are many more who are absolutely honest and because of that they are suffering and I hope the Government will take up this matter seriously and prepare a national register of all political sufferers under the British regime and make necessary financial arrangements for their life-time to relieve them of their sufferings, and I am sure the entire House will support a proposal of this kind. Thank you.

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार ने कौटुंबिकी फंड-आकस्मिकता निधि-को बढ़ाने के लिए यह विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया है। 15 करोड़ का जो अधिकार सरकार के हाथ में था उस को दुगुना कर के 30 करोड़ की राशि इस प्रकार के आकस्मिक खर्चों के लिए सरकार अपने हाथ में लेना चाह रही है जिन खर्चों के लिए पहले संसद से स्वीकृति लेना संभव नहीं होगा। इस के लिए कारण यह बताया गया है कि जब पहले यह राशि तय की गयी थी उस समय से बजट की राशि आज 8 गुना बढ़ गयी है और इस लिए हम बहुत मेहरबानी कर रहे हैं कि आठ गुना बढ़ाने की मांग नहीं कर रहे, केवल इस को दुगुना करने की मांग की जा

[डा० भाई महावीर]

रही है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि सरकार इस बात के लिए विश्वास दिला सके और सरकार को अपने मन में भी विश्वास हो कि देश के गरीब और मध्यम वर्ग के लोगों की कमाई पसीने की कमाई में से जो एक एक पैसा सरकार लेती है उस को खर्च करते हुए उस को यह, लगेगा कि जैसे वह अपनी कमाई खर्च कर रही है, किमी और की या लूट का माल नहीं खर्च कर रही है तो आकस्मिकता निधि को दुगुना ही नहीं, आठ गुना भी बढ़ाने की माग सरकार करती तो सदन को कोई आपत्ति न होती और हम भी उम का सहर्ष समर्थन करते। परन्तु कठिनाई यह है कि जब केवल आंकड़ों से सिद्ध किया जाता है कि क्योंकि बजट आठ गुना बढ़ गया इस लिए इस को दुगुना बढ़ाना चाहिए तो यह तर्क वैसा ही है जैसे कोई कहे कि क्योंकि रेलों की जाल बिछ रहा है इस लिए दुर्घटनाओं की मरुया भी बढ़नी चाहिए। दुर्घटनाएँ बढ़ रही हैं, बढ़ती हैं, अगर यह बात सच हो तो कम से कम हम इसके लिए यह तर्क तो न दें कि क्योंकि रेलों का विस्तार हुआ है इस लिए दुर्घटनाएँ बढ़ना भी स्वाभाविक है। विस्तार के साथ कार्य क्षमता भी बढ़नी चाहिए। रेलों के फैलाव के साथ दुर्घटनाओं को रोकने के बारे में जो कुशलता है वह भी बढ़नी चाहिए और इसी लिए खर्च करने के लिए सरकार के पास अधिक धन आता है तो सरकार को उस धन को खर्च करने में अधिक कुशलता दिखानी चाहिए, उस में अपनी क्षमता दिखानी चाहिए। और सब से बढ़कर जनता के दिल में यह विश्वास भी उसे बढ़ाना चाहिए कि जो पैसा सरकार के पास जाता है उस का सदुपयोग होता है, वह बेकार में जाया नहीं किया जाता और, महोदय, यही बात है जिस के बारे में आज सब से ज्यादा संदेह देश की जनता के मन में है और हमें भी है क्योंकि हम यह देखते हैं कि बहुत शारे व्यर्थ के खर्च होते हैं कि जो होते जाते हैं, किये जाते रहते हैं। सरकार बेकार के खर्चों पर जो कटौती की जानी चाहिए, उस में जो बचत करनी चाहिए उस की तरफ

ध्यान नहीं देती और अंत में यही कह कर पीछा छुड़ा लिया जाता है कि सरकार ने फलों कमेटी बना दी, फलों जांच के लिए सरकार ने किसी को नियुक्त कर दिया। क्या आप कोशिश करेंगे कि प्रशासनिक व्यय जो अन प्रोडक्टिव व्यय है, अनुत्पादक व्यय है वह कम हो, उस को कम करने के लिए जांच करेंगे। बहुत दिनों से ऐसी जांच होती आयी है लेकिन खर्च जिस प्रकार से बढ़ रहा है, उस को देख कर ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार दिल लगा कर ऐसे खर्चों को रोकने की कोशिश नहीं करती है। मंत्रियों के ऊपर जो खर्च होता है या बाकी के जो सरकार के खर्च होते हैं उन के बारे में यहां चर्चा हो चुकी। मैंने उस दिन भी पूछा था और जिस का जवाब सरकार की तरफ से नहीं दिया गया कि यहां पर सरकार ने जो जवाहर ज्योति नाम की एक अग्नि शिखा गंभी हुई है, 3000 रुपये के करीब महीने में उस पर खर्च पड़ता है, जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि एक मंत्री के खर्च के बराबर होता है, उस को हम ने किस लिए जारी रखा हुआ है? क्या नेहरू जी इस प्रकार के विचार रखने वाले व्यक्ति थे? क्या वे इस तरह की चीजों को पसंद करते थे? क्या वे पसंद करते कि उनके नाम पर एक ज्योति बनाये रखने के लिये उस पर इतना खर्च किया जाय? मैं समझ सकता हूँ कि देश के लोगों में अगर उन के लिए ऐसी भावना हो और उसे जारी रखने के लिए वे अपना पैसा खर्च करें, अथवा कोई संस्था खर्च करे तो मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं, लेकिन सरकार अगर ऐसे खर्च करती है, इस तरह की चीजों पर अपना पैसा खर्च करती है तो आम जनता को लगता है कि जब उस का पैसा सरकार ऐसे खर्चों पर गंवाती है तो अगर वे भी कुछ फिजूल खर्च करें, या थोड़ी बहुत करों की चोरी करें या सरकार से कोई गलत फायदा उठाये तो उससे उन के दिल में कोई कष्ट नहीं होता, उन को उम की कोई पीड़ा नहीं होती।

पाकिस्तान के साथ हम ने ममझौता किया। उस को 82 करोड़ रुपया दिया और दस साल

तक देते आये, लेकिन आज जब दस साल बीत चुके तब, जब हम एछते हैं कि यह रुपया देने के बाद जो पानी आप रोक सकते हैं कानूनी तौर पर उस को रोकने की क्या व्यवस्था की गयी है तो सरकार कहती है कि उस के लिए पोंग डैम बनेगा और उस के लिए इतना समय और लगगा। इतने साल बीत गये, क्या यह बात हम पहले नहीं सोच सकते थे? अगर सोच सकते थे तो हमें इस की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए थी। हमें ये लगता है कि यह पानी देश में रहे या जाय इस से सरकार की दृष्टि में कोई फर्क नहीं पता। ऐसा लगता है कि वह इतनी उदार है कि अगर पानी पाकिस्तान को ही जाता रहे तो उस को उस से कोई चिन्ता नहीं। अगर वह डम का इंतजाम इस बीच में नहीं कर सकती थी तो यह बात वह दस साल पहले ही सोच सकती थी। अगर यही बात थी तो ऐसा फैसला क्यों किया गया? ज्यादा समय होने पर शायद कम पैसा देना पड़ता। लेकिन जहां पाकिस्तान के साथ या किसी दूसरे देश के साथ कोई बात होती है हम इतने उदार हो जाते हैं कि अपना दिल खोल देते हैं और अपना पैसा लुटाने को तैयार हो जाते हैं, लेकिन जहां अपने देश की बात आती है हमारी सरकार खर्च करने में तमाम सावधान विचार शुरू कर देती है। अभी हमारे मित्र भूपेश जी ने एक सवाल उठाया और जब यह सवाल उन्होंने पहले उठाया था तो मैं ने भी उस का समर्थन किया था कि देश की आजादी जिन लोगों की वजह से मिली, जिन के खून मीचने से आजादी का पौधा लगा और जिन लोगों की हड्डियां इस देश की आजादी की मीनार के बीच में रोड़ी बना कर ढाली गयीं उन की हम ने कितनी उपेक्षा की है और हमने समझा कि हमारी आजादी का संघर्ष केवल गांधी जी और जवाहर लाल नेहरू तक ही सीमित है। हमने श्री लोकमान्य तिलक तक की उपेक्षा की, हमने श्री सुभाष चंद्र बोस की उपेक्षा की और हमारे जो क्रांतिकारी थे, जिन्होंने आजादी की लड़ाई में अपना मिर हथेली पर रखा था, उन सब की उपेक्षा की और हमने जब उन को सहायता देने का सवाल

आया तो उस में भी कंजूसी की। किस तरह की हम जांच करते हैं? मैंने पहले भी कहा था कि सरकार इस को मेहरबानी न समझे। यह अगना कर्तव्य समझे और श्रद्धा के फूल आजादी के सेनानियों के चरणों में भेंट करने में हमारी सरकार को गौरव महसूस करना चाहिए। मेरा, महोदय, यह निवेदन है कि इस तरह के खर्चों में सरकार उदारता बर्ते और उस के अपने जो व्यर्थ के खर्च हैं, उनमें बचत करे और प्रशासनिक व्यय में कम से कम 7 प्रतिशत की कटौती की जा सकती है। अगर सरकार यह स्वीकार करे तो इस तरह के खर्चों के लिए सदन अपनी अनुमति देने में कोई कंजूसी नहीं करेगा, परन्तु मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस बात का आश्वासन दें कि ऐसे खर्चों में कमी की ओर वे ध्यान देंगे और जहां कंजूसी नहीं चाहिए, वहां उदारता बर्तेंगे और गलत लोगों तक और दूसरे देशों के मामले में उदारता सीमित रखेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस पर अपना अभिमत प्रकट करें।

SHRI S. D. MISRA : I consider this an unnecessary Bill. This Government is getting funds from various Appropriation Bills, Supplementary Bills, etc. In the Appropriation Bills themselves, some amount is provided for unforeseen expenditure. From the Civil Audited Accounts circulated to the Members, which will be available to the country and the Finance Ministry, it will be evident that 6 or 7 per cent. of the total amount budgeted in the Appropriation Bills and the Supplementary Bills has not been utilised. If I take the rough figure of Rs. 3000 crores of last year, about Rs. 200 crores sanctioned through the Appropriation Bills and the Supplementary Grants were not utilised by the Finance Ministry and the Government of India. Then there is provision for appropriation within the same types of Departments or in the same Department there can be appropriation from one head to the other. That is the authority given by the Planning Commission and the Finance Ministry. On the one hand the Government is surrendering the money and on the other, it comes and asks the Parliament to increase its Con-

[Shri S. D. Misra]

tingency Fund which is generally being used according to my information—and I agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—on entertainments, air-conditioners for the officers for which sums are not normally available and I am told that once the PAC went into the matter.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Opening ceremonies, laying the foundation stone etc.—for all these extravagance...

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): For glorifying the Ministers...

SHRI S. D. MISRA: There would be some justification for this Bill if the ceiling of Rs. 15 crores had been at any time, during the last 20 years, been pierced, but at no time had it been pierced. Therefore there is no point in the Minister's coming up with this Bill only on the argument that because the Budget has increased 20 times or 15 times, therefore, we should give sanction for at least twice the amount. It would have been a good gesture if they had not come for this and if at all, they should have come for a cut from Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 10 crores. So this Bill is completely unnecessary. They have already provision in the Appropriation and Supplementary Bills and they have also the authority in the various Ministries. For example, the Agriculture Ministry and the Irrigation Ministry together—because they are of the same sector—can appropriate, I am told, from one head to the other if there is any surplus and there is a surplus of 6 to 7 per cent. A sum of Rs. 200 crores was surrendered last year and 2 years back, it was hardly 1 or 2 per cent. of the amount which was surrendered but since the last two years this Finance Ministry, rather the Government of India have been complaining that there has been no proper utilisation of the funds and there are more surrenders. So there is no point in bringing forward this Bill.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I take this opportunity to refer to a matter, which the House will agree, is really of a contingent nature. I do not agree with the Government that they should have money in excess of the budgeted amount. As has been rightly pointed out by many Members, the Government cannot spend the amount which has been properly budgeted. The Minister has come with only one ground that

because the Budget amount has increased, so the Contingency Fund's size also should be increased. That is not valid.

Anyway, I would like to take this opportunity to refer to a very serious condition in certain districts of Bengal, namely, Purulia, Bankura and a part of Midnapur, where you would be very sorry to learn, people have died of starvation. It appeared in the Press that by this time almost 10 persons have died of starvation and a delegation from those districts met the Prime Minister. They also met the West Bengal Government to-day but the irony of the position is, the Bengal Government adheres to the technical approach to the problem and they say: 'You prepare schemes and we shall advance money against the schemes prepared by the District authorities.' It is not a question of preparing schemes or spending money against them. You have the Government here and you can prepare schemes in a leisurely manner but the question is, the people are starving and dying. In fact 10 persons have already died and you are talking of schemes and you propose to spend only against certain schemes of yours. Instead of dilly-dallying over the matter, you should rush relief to the area, without waiting for the so-called schemes. In this connection I would say that when the UF Government was there and when a similar kind of famine stalked that part of Bengal, several crores were spent in a few months on relief. I find from the records now that only a few lakhs, not more than Rs. 5 lakhs have so far been spent on relief in that particular area. It is very regrettable and inhuman. I think the House will agree that if the Government has this sort of Fund with them, it should be properly utilised. The Government should look into this important aspect and rush relief wherever such kind of contingencies arise. I do not mean that money should be spent only in Purulia, Bankura or a part of Midnapur. The object of this kind of Contingency Fund should be to rush relief to the people who are suffering from this kind of natural calamities of any kind. It may be due to famine or drought or other natural calamities but it has been our experience that the Government continues to have a callous and indifferent attitude towards genuine kind of contingencies. May I ask the Government whether the Government will utilise this Fund for this kind of genuine relief in a State?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Has the Bengal Government written about that?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is for the Government here to enquire but I know that several Members have already written to the Prime Minister and I have met the P. M. also. She said that the matter will be looked into by the Bengal Government. If you are going to have this Fund, why are you depending on the report of the Bengal Government? And even if you rely on the report of the West Bengal Government, that Government is run by you, not by any popular party.

1 P.M.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : No, no; your Governor. He became Governor because of your suggestion.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You asked for it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Have you finished, Mr. Chitta Basu?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Whether he is your Governor or my Governor is a different thing. The West Bengal Government today is not sufficiently alive to the problem and the West Bengal Government has been pursuing a callous and indifferent attitude towards the famine-stricken part of that State. Why should not the Government of India take immediate steps to rush relief there? This is the proper contingency head; this is the proper time; this is the proper place where the money is to be spent without any grudge and without any kind of so-called report or so-called scheme whatsoever.

Then, Sir, I join Shri Bhupesh Gupta, Dr. Bhai Mahavir and other friends in stating that the condition of the freedom fighters should also be sympathetically viewed by the Government. As you know, not only the freedom fighters but other people are also in a very pitiable condition. The Government should take a sympathetic view of these people's conditions because it is because of their sufferings and struggles that we are free today and we owe them a good deal and I think the Government should not hesitate in regard to this matter of having a definite programme for the relief and resettlement of the freedom fighters and other people.

5—36 R. S./70.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि पहले 10 साल कांतिजेंसी फंड किस किस तरह से कैसे खर्च हुआ उसका एकाउंट हमें दिया जाय इस विधेयक पर पूर्ण विचार होने के पहले, क्योंकि इस विधेयक द्वारा सन् 1950 के एक्ट में सरकार संशोधन कर रही है, तो संशोधन क्यों कर रही है, कांतिजेंसी फंड में क्या कमी थी और किस ढंग से खर्च हुआ जब तक उसकी पूरी जानकारी मदन को न दी जाय तब तक—मैं संसदीय व्यवस्था के अनुसार आपसे अपील करूंगा—आप इस पर फर्दर डिसेकशन रोक दें, नहीं तो हमको यह जानकारी दिलवायें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The House stands adjourned till 2.00 p. m.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, the VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

REFERENCE TO ALLEGED MISINTERPRETATION OF A BILL INTRODUCED BY SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA FOR PROTECTION OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS BY A SWATANTRA MEMBER OF LOK SABHA IN CONNECTION WITH ABOLITION OF PRIVY PURSES

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would invite your attention to a matter which concerns this House. Several years ago I introduced in this House a Bill when there was emergency and when jurists were demanding that certain matters concerning the infringement of Fundamental Rights and the attack on Fundamental Rights should be taken up in the House only after the Government obtained the opinion of the Supreme Court. Mr. Setalvad and others were among those who voiced this kind of a demand. Then I introduced a Bill in those days of emergency in order to protect the Fundamental Rights of the citizens against any attack under the D. I. R. And that was more or less