

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.] States, where more than two or three States' Services have been amalgamated, the question of 'seniority, the question of their equation and all these things create a certain amount of discontent and dissatisfaction. For that purpose we have appointed an Advisory Committee and as he said, Mr. Sapru is there, but these Committees have to go into the cases, and take decisions. So far as I am concerned, I shall try to see that these pending cases—sometimes they are not pending, sometimes even new complaints come up but even then I shall see— are expedited as quickly as possible so that there is contentment among the people . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And a feeling of justice . . .

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: . . . and they feel that by the merger they have not suffered or their cases do not go by default or without any consideration.

I do not think I have much to say. I am thankful to Mr. Akbar Ali Khan and also to Mr. Khandekar for giving us the suggestion that in the five years next to come the Government should try its utmost to see that the people in the area become sufficiently educated and developed so that the reservation does not last any further.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

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

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill

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

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the-motion was adopted.

THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 3) BILL, 1964

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THAR
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI
TARKESHWARI SINHA): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1962, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This Bill arises out of the Demands for Excess Grants relating to the year 1961-62, voted by the Lok Sabha on the 24th April, 1964 and the expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and incurred 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 Statement of Demands for Excess Grants which has already been circulated to hon. Members.

As the House is aware, these excesses are, in the first instance, required to be examined by the Public Accounts Committee and it is only after the Committee have looked into the facts of each case and recommended their regularisation that the matter is brought before Parliament. The Public Accounts Committee have, in their Fourteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Reports (Third Lok Sabha) presented to Parliament on the 17th September^

1963, 6th December, 1963 and 15th December, 1963, respectively, recommended the regularisation of these excesses. I do not, therefore, propose to take the time of the House to explain these excesses in detail.

Hon. Member, may well enquire why these excesses arise and why they cannot be avoided. The payments on Government account are made by a large number of disbursing officers spread, all over the country and usually there is a time-lag of a few months before the transactions relating to each Grant can be collated and brought to account against the sanctioned Grant or Appropriation. It does happen sometimes that towards the close of the year, either as a result of inevitable payments or book adjustment, made by the Accounts Officers, the Grant for the year is exceeded, but these excesses come to notice when it is too late to go in for additional provision. Such excesses are, however, rare as is evident from the fact that out of a total of 148 Grants and Appropriations for the year 1961-62, excesses occurred under 15 Grants Only and constitute about 0.06 per cent, of the total sanctioned Grants and Appropriations for the year. Nevertheless, I would like to assure the House that every possible effort is made to avoid or at least to reduce such excesses to the minimum as far as possible.

Madam, I move.

The question was proposed.

श्री गिरराज किशोर कपूर (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, सदन के समक्ष यह बिल विचारार्थ आया है, इस संबंध में मैं अपने विचार रखने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। किसी देश का बजट उसकी बारीकियों को दर्शानेवाला होता है और वह बजट भी देश के अच्छे विद्वान् और बड़े बड़े अफसरों द्वारा बहुत समय लगाकर बनाया जाता है। जब इस बजट में इतनी खामियां रह जायं,

जो आमदनी की मद है या खर्चा है, उसमें भी काफी फर्क पड़े और सप्लीमेंटरी बजट आने के बाद हमसे कुछ डिमान्ड करें, यह थोड़ी सी कुछ एतराज की बात मालूम पड़ती है।

उपसभापति महोदया, यह बिल जो आज पास करने के लिए लाया जा रहा है यह सन १९६१-६२ के बजट से संबंधित है। इससे हाउस यह समझ सकता है कि हमारी सरकार कितनी एफिशियन्ट है, कितना क्विक बिजीनेस लेती है और उसके काम करने की कितनी प्रगति है। सन १९६१-६२ की चीज, जिसके लिए रुपया पहले ही हमारी सरकार खर्च कर चुकी है आज उसको रेगुलाराइज कराने के लिए इस सदन में बिल प्रस्तुत किया जा रहा है और कहा जा रहा है कि इसको पास कर दिया जाय। जरा ध्यान देखिये कि बिल में जो मांगने वाली मद है, १५ मांगों में रुपया मांगने की मांग की गई है और यह रकम कुल ५,१३,८८,०७८ रुपया है। इसमें कोई ऐसी मांगें हैं जो मूल बजट के समय सोच विचार कर इसमें शामिल की जा सकती थीं। हां, कुछ मांगें जरूर ऐसी हैं जो बजट के निर्माताओं के ध्यान से रह सकती हैं। फिर भी हुकूमत जो बजट बनाने वाली है, उसमें कोई ऐसी मांग नहीं जिसका बजट बनाते समय ध्यान में आना कुछ मुश्किल हो। सन १९६१-६२ की मांग की रकम खर्च कर दी गई है और सबसे बड़ी मांग पी० एन्ड टी० विभाग की की गयी है। उसका कारण मूलतः यह बतलाया गया है कि हमारे पास जितनी आमदनी थी, हमने जितनी आमदनी अनुमानित की थी, उससे अधिक आमदनी हुई और जितना खर्च हमने अनुमानित किया था उससे अधिक खर्च हुआ और जो रकम बची थी वह रिजर्व फंड में जमा कर दी गई जिसकी वजह से यह मांग प्रस्तुत करनी पड़ी है। हम लोगों का यह आरोप सरकार पर प्रारम्भ से ही रहा है कि आमदनी के अनुमानों और खर्च के अनुमानों को हमारी सरकार कभी ठीक तरह से नहीं आंकती है। आमदनी के अनुमानों से आमदनी

[श्री गिरराज किशोर कपूर]
बहुत अधिक होती है और खर्च के अनुमानों से खर्च भी अधिक होता है। पी० एन्ड टी० विभाग को ही ले लीजिये। इसमें ३,१३, ८१,००० रु० रिवाइज्ड इस्टीमेट से कुछ अधिक आ रहा है। मूल बजट मार्च में पास होता है और रिवाइज्ड दिसम्बर में आता है। तीन महीने जो बाकी बचते हैं उसका अन्दाजा हमारी सरकार न ले सकी और १७ लाख १७ हजार रु० की वृद्धि हुई तो यह कोई अच्छी व्यवस्था का द्योतक नहीं कहा जा सकता है।

सबसे जो बड़ा ऐतराज है वह डिमान्ड नं० ४७ के बारे में है जो कैबिनेट के खर्च के बारे में है। कैबिनेट के खर्च के बारे में जो मांग की गई है उस पर हमें ऐतराज है। मूल में ७ लाख रुपया खर्च करने के लिए कहा गया था मगर रिवाइज्ड में ८ लाख रुपये की मांग की गई है और जब खर्चा हुआ वह उससे भी अधिक था और यह सब रुपया कैबिनेट के लोगों में खर्चा हुआ। क्या यह खर्चा फाटा नहीं जा सकता था ?

उपसभापति महोदया, इस खर्च के बारे में हमारे कैबिनेट के लोगों के उद्घाटन भाषण भी शामिल हैं। अगर आप देखें तो देश में हर जगह चुनाव होते हैं और जहां पर जाने की जरूरत नहीं होती है वहां पर भी हमारे कैबिनेट के लोग जाते हैं और इस तरह से बजट का पैसा खर्च किया जाता है। हमारे सेन्टर के लोग हर जगह जाते हैं और वे भी गलत तरीके से जाते हैं और इसमें हमें ऐतराज है। वर्ग के अनुसार मंत्रियों को बुलाया जाता है। अगर कहीं पर हरिजन मंत्री का संबंध हो तो हरिजन मंत्री बुलाया जाता है। अगर कहीं पर किसी और कौम/जात की बात आती है तो उस मंत्री को बुलाया जाता है। अगर कहीं पर जनता का बराबर रेश्यो हो तो तीन तीन मंत्रियों को बुलाया जाता है और इस तरह से शासन का खर्चा बढ़ता ही चला जाता है।

उपसभापति महोदया, यह चीज देश के लोगों को अखरती है और देश के लोग कहते हैं कि हमारे पैसे का दुरुपयोग हो रहा है। इस तरह का विरोध होते हुए भी आज सन् १९६१-६२ के लिए सप्लीमेन्टरी बजट की मांग की जाती है जो कि अच्छी बात नहीं है हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि सत्तारूढ़ दल का आज बहुमत है और यह बिल पास हो जायेगा मगर हम आपसे निवेदन करना चाहते हैं और आपके माध्यम से सरकार को बतलाना चाहते हैं कि यह जो परिपाटी है वह कोई अच्छी नहीं है जो कि आप बारबार बजट की मांग करते हैं। मैं यह समझता हूं कि आने वाले समय में हमारी सरकार इस बात पर ध्यान देगी।

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I had spoken at great length at the time of the discussion on the general Appropriation Bill of this year and I had dealt with some of the important Ministries at that time. So I do not want to refer to all the items that have been mentioned in this Appropriation Bill now before the House. I would like, however, to refer to one or two or three items.

First of all, I would like to take up the item "Cabinet" for which the sum now asked for is Rs. 87,278. Madam, you are aware that a few days back there was a lot of criticism in this House and outside also, that there is a lot of overcrowding in all the Cabinets, including the Centre and the States, and there was the demand for the reduction of the size of Cabinets and to have more compact and efficient Cabinets in all the States as well as at the Centre. Then on account of public pressure, or for whatever reason it may be—we do not know that—the ruling party decided to curtail the size of the Cabinets in the States and the so-called Kamraj Plan was implemented. Some of the Ministers Were asked to resign from here also. I hold no brief for any particular Minister. But after-

wards many people entered the Cabinet slowly and slowly. They are very good persons. I have no quarrel with them. They may be efficient. They are efficient, no doubt. But the whole approach to the question of the size of Cabinets, the working of Cabinets, needs re-thinking. What do we do? We decide on one thing and then act accordingly. And then slowly we again revert back to the same old position. In many of the States the target or number for the Cabinet was fixed. They said that up to this number there would be Ministers in the Cabinet in the States. But slowly demands came and in order to accommodate various groups which had supported a particular leader of the ruling party, they had to take in some more Ministers into the Cabinet. And then there were demands of the various castes and communities, and to satisfy them their representatives were also taken into the Cabinet. So a correct approach regarding the formation of the Cabinet, regarding the joint responsibility of the Cabinet is not there. The Cabinet should be efficient, it should be compact and the number should be small so that the affairs of the States as well as those of the Centre can run efficiently.

Next I come to another item— Labour and Employment. In fact, it should read "Labour and Unemployment" because there is a lot of unemployment. Now, as you know, there has been discontent in labour during the last few months, especially in many of the public sector industries. For example, you have it in Bhopal, Bhilai and Rourkela. There is labour trouble in these places. It may be mostly due to the faulty policy of the Government in giving recognition to this union or the other union. There is also the factor of the rise in prices. The prices of essential articles are increasing day by day and the Government has failed to control the price line. Therefore, in these industries which are most essential to our economy, to the progress of this nation, there is soothing discontent and

222RSD—5.

the Government should find out some method so that there may be good relations between labour and the management and the nation may not suffer loss. Madam, you are aware that on account of the closure of the Bhopal electric plant, several crores of rupees were wasted. There was loss of several crores. I had raised a question here and in reply it was stated that a few lakhs were being lost every day. That was the loss to the nation. Similarly, in Bhilai also, the labour unions there have gone in our strike ballot and many of the workers are arrested. The same conditions prevail in other industrial plants also. In the textile industry also there is a movement to go on strike. The reasons are obvious. The Government has failed to control the prices and no adequate compensation is given to the people. So, I wish that there may be cordial relations between labour and management everywhere and the Government should do something about that.

As regards employment, the Government has failed to solve this problem of unemployment. There is unemployment in the rural sector and there is also unemployment in the educated classes. This is the time of the examinations in our educational institutions and many new graduates and matriculates and intermediates will soon be coming out and they will throng the offices of the Employment Exchanges in the land and they will not be able to give them any employment. So, in spite of our Plans, unemployment has not decreased. On the contrary, it grows day by day. It has been held that by the end of the Third Five Year Plan, there will be employment provided to the extent of some 9 million or some such figure. I do not have the exact figure with me. But this is the present position. So, a positive programme to reduce unemployment in this country in the rural as well as in the urban areas should be there.

Lastly, Madam, I come to the item "Communications (including National Highways)". Madam, if you had travelled on these roads, you would

V.w]'

[Shri R. S. Khandekar]

have known how bad these roads are and how badly they are maintained. I happen to travel on them many times and even the so-called National Highways, the one from Delhi to Agra and also the Agra-Mathura road, they are in such a condition that they cannot be called National Highways. They are very narrow and two cars cannot pass each other. There are so many potholes and they are badly maintained. No effort is being made to improve them. Particularly, the tourists who want to visit near places of interest find it very inconvenient. We very much want foreign tourists to come. We want to earn foreign exchange, but we have not paid any attention to the maintenance of roads for these tourists. They have complained that their vehicles are damaged and all kinds of inconveniences they have to undergo. Only during the last monsoon, I had to go and travel on the road between Agra and Delhi and also on the road from Delhi to Mathura. This road was under three feet of water for completely one month and the vehicles had to be towed by some truck or some other device. A number of foreigners were put to great inconvenience while going on these roads. No attempt was made to remedy the defects. Fortunately the Government of Punjab made some arrangements. The other States did not do anything to remove the inconveniences caused to the passengers over this road at that time. The water was flowing over this road for days and practically all vehicular traffic was paralysed. So the Government should look into this also and they should maintain our National Highways efficiently.

With these words, I conclude my remarks.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, when I went through this Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, I found that our Government had become used to having a wide gap between estimates and actuals always. In the case of the Budget,

the gap is at times 2,200 per cent. In the case of the Appropriation, it is also wide. We have experts in the Finance Ministry and with all the experience over such a long number of years they must now be in a position to find out what would be the actuals. So, in future, I would request the hon. Minister to look into this matter.

Here there is an item, item no. 50-Police. Left to myself I would not like to sanction even a rupee under this item because during the last two or three months I think the Police have entirely failed in this country. During the communal riots they did not function at all and I will hold them responsible for whatever happened either in West Bengal or in Bihar or in Orissa. The Central Intelligence was there but they did not bring the matter to the notice of the Government, either at the Centre or in the States. They did not warn the Government and the Government did not know the situation till things had actually happened. So much so, Madam, the Chief Minister of Orissa has mentioned it. Immediately after the communal riots, on the 3rd April at Sundargarh at a meeting of the representatives of the Panchayati Raj, he said that this was not a communal riot, but it was a commercial riot. And he goes on to say that the Adibasis were even given to understand that the Government had asked them to kill Muslims and to indulge in looting, arson, burning of homes. This is the statement coming from the Chief Minister of a State and if that is what the Adibasis were given to understand, how serious is this matter, you can realise. It is such a serious matter and this did not come to the knowledge of the Government. It was only after everything had settled down that they came to know of it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam, I would like to know one thing. Is the hon. Member in order, in referring to something said in a speech in 1964, when this Appropriation relates to the expenditure which had been incurred up to the end of

the financial year 1962? He can refer only to things which relate to the year ending 31st March, 1962. How can he bring in all these matters?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This is like saying that the stealing took place in 1962 and so you should not take the criminal to task in 1964. A criminal is a criminal whether in 1962 or in 1964.

We are here asked to sanction the money and I want to oppose this sanction because the police department has failed in its duty. Whether it is in 1962 or 1964, it is quite in order and my hon. friend who is an advocate himself knows that a criminal is a criminal, whether he has committed the offence in 1962 or 1964.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA RE DDY (Mysore): His duty is to defend the criminal.

SHRI M. GOVINDA RK3DY (Mysore): Here you are prosecuting him in 1962 for an offence committed in 1964.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Because it came to our notice. We do not know whether they have failed earlier also. If it is so, then they must be prosecuted for that also. That is why I am against sanctioning even a single rupee to them. Now, the Central Intelligence or the Central Vigilance, by whatever name you call it, must be made more efficient. Otherwise, we would be wasting money on that department. They are able to go after political leaders or the people in politics and report about them to their superiors but on a matter like this, on a communal problem on which hangs the future of India, they do not take any notice nor do they inform the Government about what is going on to happen. I hope the Finance Minister would intimate this to his colleague, the Home Minister, and intimate to him also about the inefficiency of the police.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : The inefficiency of the police, among other people.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Among other people, yes.

Now coming to the question of National Highways, I had put a question in this House asking whether any money was being sanctioned for repairs to National Highways or for their realignment. The Minister was good enough to say that no money was sanctioned for that purpose. We started constructing National Highways after independence and after our engineering skill had developed sufficiently. Nowhere, Madam, will you find two miles of a National Highway running straight. It is all zig-zag. Subsequently, probably, it has occurred to them that they must be straightened up as they straighten up everything in the Centre. Now they think that they should have a fresh alignment which should be straight, but money has not been sanctioned for this purpose. I would again press that money should be sanctioned both for repairs and for alignment and this question should be taken up early. Without repairs, these National Highways would be of no use because for long journeys people want good roads. If they do not have good roads, nobody would be using the roads and they would prefer to go by trains, and buses or trucks would not be able to ply because of heavy wear and tear. This is something which deserves serious and early attention.

One of my colleagues, speaking on the Appropriation Bill, mentioned about the Tikkerpara Dam. Here, in this Bill, there is Demand No. 128, "Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power". I would request the hon. Minister of Finance and the Minister of Irrigation and Power to supervise what is being done in Orissa by the State Government. A sum of eighteen lakhs of rupees has already been advanced to a particular person who is the wife of the Chairman of the Planning Board, without sanction and without knowing whether this Project would go through or not. How could money be sanctioned in such circumstances?

SHRI A. D. MANI: YOU cannot make , these wild allegations. Wife of whom?

AN HON. MEMBER: Wife of Mr. B. Patnaik.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What does it matter, somebody's wife.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: HOW was this sum of eighteen lakhs of rupees sanctioned before Government knew whether the Planning Commission was going to approve this scheme or not? This is a serious allegation but this is not the first of its kind in Orissa. There have been so many allegations and in spite of that, this thing is being repeated. This is because the Centre is not supervising, the Centre is not doing its duty in looking into these matters after sanctioning colossal sums of money for development projects. We need development projects, there is no doubt about it, but while sanctioning development projects we would not like money to go into the pockets of members of the ruling party or their relations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad that the trend of the general discussion that we are having on this Appropriation Bill has improved. I start with a little criticism of the Ministry of Finance itself because it handles our finances and has now come up with demands for excess grants. To begin with, I shall take up the case of Mr. C. B. Taraporewalla, the Chief Financial Adviser to the Nizam of Hyderabad and we shall presently see how leniently the Ministry of Finance is dealing with this gentleman in the matter of collecting the revenues, namely, income-tax. I am glad that she is taking notes. I hope she will do that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And you will be telling the same story again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know whether it is known to her that Khan Bahadur C. B. Taraporewalla was assessed at Rs. 60,527.87 for the

year 1957-58, Rs. 5,06,018.59 for the year 1958-59 and Rs. 9,01,035.10 for the year 1959-60. The assessment for the rest of the years has not so far been completed. Now, we are in the relevant year and Mr. Taraporewalla has not been assessed during this period at all, while the Revenue Board, according to information available, says that the amount due from him is one and a quarter crores of rupees. The Ministry of Finance is doing nothing in the matter. First of all, he is being under-assessed all the time and when the assessment is made, it is not being collected and for the last few years nothing has been done as if the gentleman has suddenly gone off. That is not true at all. You know, Madam, and you were in the Chair when in March last I related the story of Mr. Taraporewalla and disclosed to the House how he was guilty of a certain improper use of the Trust Funds of the Nizam of Hyderabad, and I gave very many facts, recited from the official papers; I do not know how I got them, somebody gave them to me and they were unassailable. The result was that the Government of India was at long last forced to launch a prosecution against him under that celebrated or rather well-known section 420.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It seems that your agency is more efficient than the Central Intelligence.

■ SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In such matters, the Swatantra Party will kindly note that I am a little more careful because after all you take Mr. Taraporewalla into your Party and I go after him to put him in prison.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: And you take his money.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not. The very fact that I am speaking against him shows that I am not interested in his money, but by the time you take him into the Swatantra Party, nothing will be left because the Government would probably have taken that from him.

As you know, Madam Deputy Chairman, after these revelations were made in this House by me on the basis of unassailable facts, the Ministry of Home Affairs was good enough to instruct the Government of Andhra Pradesh to launch a prosecution And Mr. Taraporewalla, 4 P.M. who has got very great pull, was landed in a court of law under the great section 420. Now, the gentlemen of the Big Money can be described as 420; no doubt about it.

SHRI A. D. MANT: All gentlemen?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And gentlewomen of the Big Money if you like to call them 420.

Now the position is this. The case was started and I disclosed to the House how the Andhra Pradesh Government and certain officials were responsible for hushing up the case. It is a good thing that the Central Government intervened in the matter and Shri Lai Bahadur iShastri, the then Home Minister took the initiative in getting the prosecution started. After that I received—that is by the way—many letters of congratulation from Hyderabad, the place from which my esteemed friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan' comes. And now what is happening? It seems the Chief Minister, Shri Brahmananda Reddy, has written a note to some people responsible for the prosecution instructing to withdraw the case on technical grounds. So, 420 is not 420 when it comes to Mr. Taraporewalla.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): How did you get this Chief Minister's note?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, you ask your Chief Minister to be a little more vigilant about this. If they hobnob with Mr. Taraporewalla and make a public scandal of it, we come to know of it. For that you may punish us if you like. But may I know from the hon. Minister whether she is aware that the Chief Min-

ister of Andhra Pradesh has written now a note recommending the withdrawal Of the prosecution on the flimsy pretext that it is only a technical offence and that Mr. Taraporewalla need not be prosecuted? And I am told that Mr. Taraporewalla has promised to the Government that he would make good the loss the Government suffered as a result of the defalcations of the Trust funds that related to the sale and purchase of certain Telco shares. May I know whether it has become the rule of the Government to let off the dacoits of Madhya Pradesh if they come and tell certain Minister that they will reimburse the Government for the losses suffered or is it the policy of the Government to continue prosecution? Now, I think the dacoits of Madhya Pradesh would be regarded as perfect gentlemen compared to these high-placed culprits and criminals who indulge in defalcation of public funds. I therefore ask the Government to take note of this matter because otherwise I will bring other stories. I am in possession of them but I tell . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Concoc-ed stories.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . the Treasury Benches that they should now write to the Government of Andhra Pradesh not to withdraw the prosecution against him. And you know what they have done? They have permitted Mr. Taraporewalla to go abroad. I think the P Form has been sanctioned by the Finance Ministry. Mr. Taraporewalla will go now to England to help the Government of India in certain matters, I am told but he has not been even assessed for his income-tax yet. He is under certain charges, standing trial in a court of law and that court is, I think, the City Magistrate's Court No. 6. This is what they are doing in such matters. Therefore I would ask, Madam Deputy Chairman, that the hon. Lady Minister should look after Mr. Taraporewalla a little before she

LSHri Bhupesh Gupta.] looks after the finances of the country. This is about Mr. Taraporewalla. The rest of the case will be deferred, should be deferred, till the next session.

There is another case and I come back to the Bennett Coleman & Co. We were told that the Chopra Report would be given to us by the month of February last, but up till now we have not got this Report, I do not know if the Government has got this Report. There is no mention about this Report so far and yet I have before me a copy of the letter addressed to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, by the General Secretary of Employees' Union of Bennett Coleman & Co., in which the General Secretary of the Union has pointed out how Mr. Jain was bringing pressure to bear upon various people including Ministers so that Mr. Chopra could not get on with the investigation; and I have it on reliable information that certain records have already been destroyed—large amounts have been paid to persons not connected with the business of the company and these records have been destroyed—and certain other material documents are not within the reach of the investigating authorities. That is what they are doing and everybody knows it. I have my own views with regard to Mr. Chopra but I am not concerned with him now. But what I want to state before this House is that for the last few months pressure is being built up on various people by Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain so that Mr. Chopra gets frustrated in his investigation. Anyhow, the Report has not yet come before us. Now this is a matter which should be taken note of by the hon. Minister and I would like to know exactly when we are going to get that Report about Bennett Coleman & Co. and about the five S. P. Jain concerns. Madam Deputy Chairman, we were all concerned about it and I think the entire House was unanimous in making the demand that the matter be dealt with according to law

and seriously, and the Government is not doing anything. Well, it is possible for the Government to act very promptly in such matters. Why not arrest these people? Why not carry out raid on Bennett Coleman & Co., and seize every single material paper? Seal them up; put your officers there and do not allow Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain to take any such single paper from that office. Why not raid the residences of the gentlemen of the S. P. Jain concerns and recover such materials? What is your Intelligence Department doing? When the papers are stolen from the files and other places, you are not in a position to discover them. When it comes to Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain, the Ministry of Finance goes very slow. Imagine what they would have done if some small people would have done such a thing; they would all have been arrested. Mr. Krishnamachari is haranguing the country and telling so many big things but he does not have the courage to touch a hair of that multi-millionaire, Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain and his friends. Why are not they being arrested? You have got plenty of material. You should arrest these people. You are arresting people on flimsy grounds under the Defence of India Rules for carrying sugar from one place to another place or for doing this thing or that thing, or for demanding more relief for rehabilitation of the East Bengal refugees. Here are some financial criminals of the worst type but they are allowed to go soot-free. I would like to know what the Ministry of Finance is doing in this matter.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to refer to one matter connected with certain other Ministry and that concerns the hon. Lady Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, I was rather amused—shall I say to begin with—when we read in the newspapers that Shrimaiti Indira Gandhi while in New York made a Press statement. In that statement she volunteered to say that Mr. Krishna Menon did not have much in-

fluence either on herself or on her father.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON): How does it concern the External Affairs Ministry?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad you raised the question; because it is an external trip. And she said that Mr. Krishna Menon did not have —she is alleged to have said; shall I put it in a proper form, or reported to have said to be more exact—much influence either on her or on her father. We are not concerned with the quantum of influence each individual has on another, but was it right for her to make a statement of that kind?

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra): She is not a Member of this House and anybody from outside the House is entitled to make any statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But she went on public money. I do not mean any discourtesy to her. I can very well understand.

(Interruptions)

I will tell my friend it 'was not right for Shrimati Indira Gandhi to say such thing;. And she went on and said that Mr. Krishna Menon did not have much influence on the Congress Party either. Why should all these things have been said?

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, 'order.

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of order. Madam, there is no reference to any Demand relating to the External Affairs Ministry in this Appropriation Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Indirectly for foreign travel finance they have to give the *P' Form.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever you speak should be in the context of the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill. Please be brief.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: On a point of order

SHRI G MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Why do hon. Members opposite get excited whenever Mrs. Indira Gandhi's name is mentioned?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is irrelevant.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have set the ball rolling.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: The very fact that they get excited shows how relevant it is.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: On a point of order, Let me put it. We are discussing the Appropriation Bill relating to the period ending on the 31st March, 1962. Now, the scope of the discussion on such a Bill is limited by the convention and practice of this House. If there is any additional item and that additional item raises some pertinent question, that can be raised. What Shrimati Indira Gandhi said in 1964 or what the Prime Minister said in 1964 or what A, B or C said is not relevant.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinha, I think you have made your point.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It is public money.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, please close your speech and speak in the context of the Appropriation Bill No. 3.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: This should not form part of the proceedings of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIEMAN: Yes, please continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I should be the last person to be unkind to her. I can tell you that much. Because I am a good friend, I am saying it.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Then, why not discuss it privately?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not belong to your Congress Working Committee. I speak in Parliament. You should go and tell her.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Is it within your right to discuss such things?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I tell you, Mr. K. K. Shah, do not bring that in.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Find out a *via media* for discussing it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will give you the *via media* if you are in need, of it. The *media* is very simple. Advice is given. You have understood it, but you are being troubled by the hon. Member.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I have to bring this to bear on you that the time allotted to this Bill is one hour and, therefore, you must come back to the point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me come back to the point. You are quite right. Now, lest I should be misunderstood I say this thing, because such things should not be said. Even if you want to pander to the American gallery, such things should not be said. It is not necessary at all. I think the Ministry of Finance are very particular about who says what abroad when they give their 'P' Form or sanction money. I think they should take a little interest. I think

the non-official travelled from the airport in Calcutta. Shrimati Tarkesh-wari Sinha was there to see her off. I saw that many Cabinet Ministers were there, to see a non-official going abroad.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, come back to the Bill.

-SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good. Go there to see her off. I have no objection. We travelled by the same plane to Calcutta. It is a good thing. Now, having gone there in connection with the Industries Fair, what was the need for indulging in the internal politics of our country? It is no good. I am not making any reflection on anything except that such statements should not be made even if you want to humour your American friends. You should not do such things. This *J&* all that I say. I hope my advice will be taken in the right spirit.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): She did not make the statement without any reason or occasion for it. She was appearing in a television interview. She was asked this question and she replied as she thought it proper. Why are you concerned with Mr. Krishna Menon?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For once, Mr. Pande, you are right. She must have made the statement for some reason of her own and I am also, criticising it for some reason of my own.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): On a point of order, this has been stated again and again. I think it is an irrelevant discussion. The learned speaker should confine himself to the Appropriation Bill itself. Again and again by round-about methods he is coming back to the same point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not coming back here. I hope I will not be misunderstood with regard to that.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: You do not observe the rules, but you want Others to observe the rules.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not try to provoke quarrel between us. It is a friendly advice which I have given and I am sure the hon. Minister will convey the advice to her.

SHBIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: No, I will not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, with regard to the Cabinet, well, Mr. Lai Bahadur Shastri announced one day: I will not take any money; I will not charge anything from the Government for the high electricity and water bill. As you know, he made a very brave statement. We hoped that economy would be practised. But now we find that it has gone up by Rs. 1 lakh or so, *i.e.*, expenditure on account of Cabinet tours and so on. I do not know who actually toured and who was personally responsible for this additional expenditure. I think here in this connection we would be justified in telling the Government that the Cabinet should set an example.

But then we have a Finance Minister in our country, who says that the bungalows given to the Cabinet Ministers are not good. They are good for pigs. Why do you join? You get out of it. He said they are pigsties. That is what he said. Imagine the cynicism. There should be a limit of the cynicism. Such huge bungalows, the like of which many Western Ministers have perhaps never seen, are given to the Cabinet Ministers of this Government, and the Finance Minister of the country, who is supposed to give us proper lessons in this matter, tells us that it is not good enough for him. It is not even good for pigs and so on. Well, I was shocked when I read that statement. For that one statement he should have been castigated in this House and the other House. It was an irresponsible

statement. A statement of this kind demoralises the country and shows not only bad taste in public life but brings down public morality to a very low level. On the contrary, we should like the Ministers to occupy smaller houses instead of the huge houses they have. He wants to make tout before the public that it is no good. Then, what is the harm if others are saying such things? At the same time, it did not occur to the Finance Minister that the Government employees, Grade IV and Grade III, do not have even a roof to live under. Many of them have no accommodation. Was it a humour? Then, I say it was a very bad humour. Did he speak in seriousness? I think if he did speak in a seriousness, the Congress Party should call him to account for it. If you say such things, how are you going to economise? The Cabinet should set an example.

I am not asking them to reduce their pay, but certainly some of the perquisites and incidental expenditure could be reduced. I find some of the Ministers making a tour of the country for nothing. Absolutely for nothing they go round. And I find that those, who should be touring a little more, do less. Expenditure on them is less. But people who had better sit in Delhi go round the country and spend a lot of money— some of them, not all. I think the matter has to be gone into. Well, as far as travel is concerned, I am not opposed to it, opposed to spending the requisite amount. But it should be properly organised. Sometimes I find that the Ministers combine their party functions with the Government functions in so beautiful a manner that the money is paid not by the AICC, but by the public exchequer. They go to open a dam or shall we say a public school or a small school or do some such thing. After it, the photograph comes. And then they hold so many meetings, propaganda meetings, election meetings and other meetings and the travelling expenses are charged to the Central Budget and

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] the public exchequer. Therefore I think there should be a proper scrutiny. Some of the Ministers needlessly travel by chartered planes. They take the plane from the AICC or other places in order to travel. When it is necessary and there is enough space and so on, go by all means. But one should be very careful with regard to the expenditure and so on. The trouble with our Ministers is that they preach so much and they practise so little. That is the trouble. And I think that it would be a good day if some of the Ministers would practise what they preach. I would feel reluctant to sanction this sum of Rs. 1 lakh under the head Cabinet. Somebody mentioned about the Kamaraj Plan? Why do you talk about the Kamaraj Plan? Nobody talks about it, not even Mr. Kamaraj talks about it. Some bright idea came some day and certain Ministers went. Some are coming. Control and decontrol is the order of the day Kamarajing and de-Kama-raj ing is the order of the day. Therefore, do not bother about all these things.

Regarding the size of the Ministry, I do not know how big it is going to be. We thought in August last year that the size would be small, tidy and compact. But I find to the merriment of some Members opposite and to the discomfiture of Members of this side that the size is being enlarged again. I do not know where it will end. Therefore, I say that the size should be restricted but at the same time not at the cost of efficiency. I agree there. I am not one of those who are trying to have a Deputy Minister...

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : Deputy Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will not have a Deputy Minister. Your target is very high, big game hunter as you are, therefore Deputy Prime

Minister. Well, everybody knows really that they want another Prime Minister. Therefore the demand is a "Deputy" demand. The "Prime" demand will come a little later.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: What is wrong about it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nothing wrong about it. That is your lookout. Why not say that we do not like to have a Deputy Prime Minister? Why bring in the Deputy Prime Minister? I do not understand.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Congress Members are demanding a Deputy Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are those who share more your views than those of others. That I know. Without them you will not succeed in getting many things done. I am afraid that you will succeed in getting a Deputy Prime Minister. I am not in need of a Deputy Prime Minister. Give us Deputy Minister, that is enough. Do not give us Deputy Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Madam, may I humbly submit that the discussion the hon. Member is carrying on is off the line and the time is also passing?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please wind up?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that she is a Deputy Minister. I want you to cease to be a Deputy Minister. Something higher up you should go. You have my blessings.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must try to wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am winding up, Madam. You are thinking in terms of reducing expenditure. They want a Deputy Prime Minister. But really it is a political game. It is a political strategy of certain forces within the country. When they make

e demand for a Deputy Prime Minister, it is not as if they want to improve the functioning of the Prime Minister and develop the system better. Everybody knows it. Even Mr. Pande is nodding his head. Normally he should not. Therefore, I say that this is a political strategy. I say that Deputy Prime Minister should be forgotten for the time being. Let the Prime Minister be hale and hearty and co-act his functions well. We wish him godspeed in this matter. Therefore, as far as the Cabinet is concerned, let us have one Prime Minister, and no Deputy Prime Minister, because that sums up a political line and a demand of certain sections of the people. Anyhow, if you had a Deputy Prime Minister, he should be made so powerless and so helpless that nobody would like to be Deputy Prime Minister under the present set-up at all.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, there are two matters to which I should like to make a little reference. Probably they are not questions of a financial character. Nevertheless they are questions which have a direct bearing on our entire life.

The first question to which I would like to make a reference is that of Rourkela and Jamshedpur. Terrible things happened there, things of which, speaking as an Indian, who is proud of the culture that he has inherited, I feel ashamed. We have had a strong condemnation of what happened at Rourkela and Jamshedpur, from Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, and I think what happened there cannot be entirely explained in terms of what happened at Khairpur and other places. We have to go deep and analyse the causes of why things such as those that occurred at Rourkela and Jamshedpur did, in fact, occur. Mr. J. P. Narayan has paid a tribute to 30 young Muslims, who sacrificed their lives in order to save Hindu lives. I should like to know whether there were any Hindu

men who gave up their lives to save Muslim lives. There must have been some. There has been no reference to the sacrifices that people might have made in order to save the situation from getting as bad as it did. I think, therefore, there should be some way of making known our appreciation of those who act in moments like this with courage and valour. I should like also, Madam Deputy Chairman, to say that the matter is one in which not only this Parliament but the entire country is interested. It is a matter which cannot be left to the investigation of official authorities alone. The matter is one which requires certain enquiry by the supreme sovereign body in this country—Parliament—and a deputation of Members of Parliament drawn not from any particular party but from all parties, drawn not from any particular community but from all communities, should go and visit these places and report to Parliament. We should make an earnest effort to ensure that things such as those that took place in Rourkela and Jamshedpur do not disgrace our civilisation.

Then, the second matter to which I would like to make a brief reference is that of the laws' delays. I think I took the opportunity of making a reference to it in my speech on the Appropriation Bill in March last. I do not know whether Government has given any serious thought to the question of the laws' delays. There are more than 41,000 arrears in one High Court, that is the Allahabad High Court. There are about 28,000 arrears, I think, in the Calcutta High Court.

Now, in the district courts too, the figures are of an enormous character. These arrears do not tend to bring quick administration of justice. Parliamentary democracy and the rule of law go together. They have a close connection between them. If the rule of law is discredited, parliamentary

[Shri P. N. Saprū.] institutions are bound to get discredited. The matter, therefore, is a serious one which requires consideration by a Commission. We have a Law Commission. I do not know what to say of the Law Commission. They are all distinguished members of the Law Commission sitting, and I do not think that they have ever applied their minds to the question to the manner in which it should have been reduced. There should (be a law Commission to go into the question whether the existing system of justice requires adjustments and, if so, in what way. This question cannot be tackled without a study of comparative jurisprudence.

There are few people, if I may say so with all respect to the eminent lawyers whom we have in this country, who have cared to have acquaintance with comparative jurisprudence. There are systems of jurisprudence other than the British system and we should study them, we should try and find out whether it is not possible for petty cases to be disposed of in a shorter time than at present. I was in the Soviet Union in 1962, and I was struck by the fact that in the peoples' courts not only have they provided for the active participation of the community in the administration of justice by the appointment of two lay judges but also the cases could be disposed of within about a fortnight. And I asked questions of a searching character and the impression left upon my mind was—I think Mr. Akbar Ali Khan was also there, he would bear me out—that all the principles of natural justice were observed in the investigation and disposal of these cases. Now, I do not say that that system is an ideal one for all types of cases, I do not say that that is the system that I would go in for in every respect but in regard to these matters one should have a receptive mind and if you want to find out what will suit the genius of your country, you should be able to study, with an open mind, the systems of law other than

the English law. I was myself brought up in the traditions of British law and of course, I have a very great veneration for those traditions. It may be that so far as the small cases are concerned, we should make a departure from those principles and we should approach the question from a new angle, and I would like thought to be bestowed on this question. Thought cannot be bestowed on this question if you appoint a Commission of retired men with fossilised mind* or if you appoint a Commission of men who know only what Lord so and so and Mr. Justice so and so said in such and such a case; they must have a wider view of the vision of law. I am afraid we have not approached this whole question of the arrears of justice in the manner in which it should have been done.

The third thing that I would like to mention before I close is that the Kashmir situation is getting a little complicated. Today the Prime Minister will be having talks with Sheikh Abdullah whom we are glad to find in New Delhi, I am not going to anticipate the results of that conversation, I am not going to say what my views are in regard to the question of Kashmir. But there should be greater zeal and greater dedication to the cause of secularism than we have had so far. We pride ourselves in being a secular country. Now, I have many friends and I have often talked to them on matters affecting the country. I read my newspapers and I come into contact with the youth of the country but I often begin to wonder whether we have understood the real meaning of the word 'secular', whether we have or we have not bothered very much about it. We want to develop, in this country a spirit of tolerance, a spirit of respect for human values, a spirit of charity and we want therefore to approach the young men. And we should have in our cities and in our universities boards or committees, whatever name you choose to call them by which will

bring together the young men of all communities so that they might be able to judge questions from a broad, tolerant angle. We have had migration of Christians on a vast scale and they will have to be rehabilitated. The Muslims who have suffered at Rourkela and at Jamshedpur and other places may be victims of reprisals. I do not believe in this business of reprisals. They have suffered a great deal. They too are entitled to rehabilitation, and I hope that the Ministry of Rehabilitation under the dynamic leadership of Shri Mahavir Tyagi for whom I have very great respect, will not be a Ministry of Rehabilitation only for those who are victims in East Bengal of Ayub Khan Government's intolerance, but also for those who have suffered as a result of our intolerance, of which we Indians should be ashamed. I should like therefore, this Rehabilitation Ministry to undertake the work of rehabilitation of those Muslims who had been uprooted by our action. Of course, the Christians too have suffered a very great deal. More than 1,25,000 Christians are supposed to have migrated into our country. They need our sympathy. Their problems do need to be understood by us. Therefore, I thought that this was an appropriate occasion which I should utilise for giving expression to my feeling which has been oppressing me, the feeling that perhaps everything is not all right with us, that we do a little bit of self-analysis, that we are not as virtuous as we claim to be and that we must put our house in order, that we must begin to respect certain human values.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak.

SHRIMATT TARKESHWARI SINHA: Madam Deputy Chairman my difficulty is that most of the points which have been raised on the floor of this House today have been out of context of the Appropriation Bill. Well, I do appreciate the feeling of the last speaker who is so genuinely concerned, full of conviction, and I would

like to assure him—though it is not my portfolio—that nobody is looking at this problem with unconcern. Everybody is anxious. Everybody is concerned about this problem, how best to solve the problem of rehabilitating the refugees. But all the same, this problem cannot be solved by just feeling diffident about it. We have to measure ourselves and we have to inculcate within ourselves the feeling that we are confident to solve this problem to the best of our capacity. We should not start having a feeling of frustration that our house is not in order. Madam, sometimes mass frenzy is not normal. Things have happened in a very abnormal mental condition. We should not say that this country and the citizens of this country have not been wedded to the ideal of secularism. Everybody is as concerned as the hon. Member. Whatever caste and community, whatever religion one may have as a faith or belief, this problem has aroused a genuine concern in the whole of the country and we should give more confidence to each other so that we can come up to the expectation of solving this problem to the best of our capacity. Let not we undermine our capability and our convictions because once the feeling of frustration starts coming in within self, the self becomes defeatist. We should not make our own self feel weak that we are unable to face the situation, that we shall not be able to solve this problem. We shall be able to solve this problem. Feeling deeply about whatever happened in this country, let us join together and determine that we are going to solve this problem and by our own example we shall teach a little sense to our neighbour Pakistan.

Madam, the hon. Members have made my task very difficult. I do not know what to say about all the points which they have mentioned. If I myself go on breaking the precedents and mention those points, I would be charged that I have myself not kept up to the Bill. And if I do not answer

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.] those points, then the hon. Members would say that I did not want to answer. But, Madam, you will probably share the feeling of mine that as a member of the Government I should not be a party to break the precedents. However, there are two or three points which have been raised, which pertain to this Appropriation Bill. I will try to clarify some of the misunderstandings which have been created in this House. I know it is genuine misunderstanding and not intentional misunderstanding.

The hon. Member, who spoke first, raised the point about this demand of excess all the time being brought in the House. The hon. Member is new. If he would have been here in the House, he would never raise this point because we have already answered this point. The hon. Member is not here available. I wish he could have been here so that he could have heard what procedure we follow about demanding this excess grant. I have myself in my speech said that excesses have occurred only in 15 Grants out of a total of 148 Grants. The total excess has amounted to Rs. 5.14 crores as against the total Grant and Appropriation of Rs. 7,974 crores. I also quoted the percentage—probably the hon. Member was not quite attentive—that the proportion of the excess comes to 0.06 per cent. Madam, there have been some of these developments which have accrued in the shape of excess demand because of the saving. The hon. Member has shown very serious concern about reducing the Government expenditure, having more returns from a particular financial expenditure in regard to a particular commodity. And when we come up with some adjustments of demands, and by having additional savings we adjust this demand from one head to another under the Parliamentary Budget system we have to come before the House to take sanction where we can even transfer our demand from one head to another even if there is a saving.

The hon. Member mentioned about the Posts and Telegraphs Department. That is where I would like to point out that there has been an increase towards General Revenues from the Posts and Telegraphs Department. The honourable House should have commended this performance of the Posts and Telegraphs Department that they have been able to save more, that we have come before the House only to get the sanction for making big adjustments of transferring one amount from one head to another. That is under the head of "General Revenues". That is a thing which criticism should not be made against the Government. Rather, that is a thing on which compliment should have been given to the Government.

There is another excess of coalmines labour employment. The hon. Member completely talked out of context. Well, what can I say? He started talking about the general employment problem. Well, I probably appreciate the hon. Member's words because probably he did not get time at the time of the Appropriation Bill. I do not know. I was not in the House. He could have said anything during the Appropriation Bill or the Finance Bill. Instead he has taken this opportunity to say whatever he wants to say on this small Bill which covers a period about which the hon. Member need not have said all this. That should have been more appropriate occasion so that his voice could have been heard with more effectiveness. If I reply to the hon. Member at this point, the hon. Member himself would not feel very much satisfied. Therefore, I would request him that if he wants to raise basic problems, let him raise it at the appropriate time so that the authorities may really take into account all his comments.

However, I would like to point out about the demand that he has criticised, namely, labour employment. Actually that demand has been also another demand out of saving. The

hon. Member probably realised that the excess under labour and employment is on account of transfer of coal cess collection. Actually coal cess is collected by our own agency, the Central Excise. The coal cess collection goes to the Coalmines Welfare Fund. We collect the coal cess and transfer it to the Coalmines Welfare Fund for conducting the welfare activities for the coalminers. A bigger proportion was collected for the benefit of the coalminers, and that has been transferred from this account to that account. I should have thought that the Government would have received compliments for giving more funds for the increased amenities for the labour who work in coalmines.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

But I think probably the hon. Member did not quite go into the Demand and he wanted to convey some general things which he said.

There is another thing which some Members mentioned, namely, about highways. There is a Demand no doubt, and a very small amount, has been asked for the maintenance of the highways. I do appreciate the hon. Member's concern that the highways should be maintained and not only for the benefit of our own motor transport but for the general economic uplift, the national highways should be very, very smooth so that transportation could be much more swifter—I do realise—and also for meeting our defence needs. However, the hon. Member mentioned one road and that is the Mathura Road. I have travelled also on that road. Now, the Government is not responsible for the flood which came very late—I think it was in October that the flood came and a beautiful road was completely damaged because the flood water came and stuck on the road as much as 3, 4 or 5 feet and; that is why some of the transport stopped plying on that road. Till the flood water receded, we

could not do anything because there was no drainage and at some spots, the road was a little below the neighbouring ground and that is how all the water accumulated there. Not having a good system of drainage the Government authorities had to wait—the P.W. Department—for the water to subside and then to take up the repairs. I know, I have travelled on the road myself many times. The moment the flood water left the road, the repair work had started and great improvements had been made. Actually, if the floods would not have come, if nature had not been so unkind to us, it would have been one of our most beautiful roads, a road on which we could really take pride but I can assure the hon. Member that the Government itself is very much concerned about good national highways to be maintained and I appreciate the hon. Member's suggestion that there should be more concern and attention given to the maintenance of the highways. I do realise that once the roads are constructed, sometimes maintenance is not provided as efficiently as the construction." Therefore, the maintenance should also be given as much importance as construction.

Then, some of the Members raised the question of Cabinet expenditure. If the hon. Members had been genuinely concerned about Cabinet expenditure; they could have gone into the Demand and they would have seen that it is not for additional work that this money has been demanded. It was for actual reimbursement of the amount which had been spent by the Railways previously and they made a demand on the Comptroller and Auditor General and that demand was reimbursed to the Railways, and that is why this excess of Rs. 1 lakh has been demanded. It is only for the reimbursement of the amount which has already been spent in the previous year. It has not cost the exchequer, as a misunderstanding has been created by the hon. Member,

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.]

that Cabinet Ministers have toured more, and more amount has been demanded for conducting their tours. It was because of the adjustment of past accounts 'that this Demand has been made. All the same, I would like to submit this before the House as a very humble hon. Member of the other House and I am also a very humble person before the House. I think the House is entitled for all the respect and all concern from the Government. Therefore, I am not really submitting before the House with any sense of arrogance but I would like to really say this. If the Ministers go on tour, it may be that they have to open something or they may have to perform a function, but apart from performing that function which may be of a minor nature, in democracy public education plays a very important part. That is one way that they come into contact with the public. They hear their grievances, they hear about their problems, they come in direct contact with the public. If a Minister goes and visits a particular area, the problems of that particular area come face to face with the Minister and the Minister himself or herself gets educated about those problems and can give more attention to those problems, and also that is a way of public education. If the public authorities or the Government do not come into contact with the public directly, then we will be another branch bureaucracy, another branch of the Civil Service, completely aloof, sitting in the Secretariat and having nothing to do with the public. How can a watertight compartment line be drawn' of a Minister taking a tour and a Minister not taking a tour? I do appreciate the concern of the House that all wasteful and all useless expenditure should be avoided. We should always weigh about a particular tour to be taken: 'What is the value of that tour', but only the criterion or opinion or sometimes a very cynical statement is made that just we go and open and do *shilanyas* or lay a foundation stone and come

back and spend all the money of the Government. This misunderstanding should not be created. After all the Ministers do perform a useful function but I would certainly assure the hon. Members who have raised this point that not one Minister takes a tour for election purposes at the cost of the Government money. The hon. Members should verify before they really level such a charge. No Minister has gone for election campaigning at the cost of the Government money.

SHRI S. S. HARISWAMY (Madras): The hon. Deputy Minister for Railways had been to Madras State very recently to do electioneering campaign in the Aruppukottai by-election. This point I made in my speech before. I would like to have a clarification from the Deputy Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAB ALI KHAN): He must have had some other work also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. The only work was this.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I again repeat that the Minister had gone for some official work and during his stay . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Official work is the ostensible reason . . .

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I deny . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर : क्या ऐसा नहीं है कि इलेक्शन के ही टाइम पर टूर बनाये जाते हैं। कागज पर तो टूर दूसरे नाम पर बनाये जाते हैं मगर मेन परपज इलेक्शन में शामिल होना होता है।

उपसाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : आपने कह दिया है।

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I do not accept the charge at all. We do not utilise the Government money for election purposes and I stand up to my statement which I have made.

Another point was raised about some investigation being done by the investigating authority into the Sahu-Jain affair. Well, the hon. Member has already known that three months' extension was given because we wanted to bring all these things to our attention so that if the decision could be taken, the decision could be taken on full authority and I think if I remember aright, the hon. Member himself asked a question about this, about Mr. Chopra, and he was informed that up till June the time has been extended because the party was not very cooperative and in order to collect more material, in order to expedite this matter, the extension has been sanctioned to it, but I can assure the hon. Member that no . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did you hear any complaint from Mr Chopra that obstructions were being created in his investigations and that Bennett Coleman and Company, the management, was not supplying him the material but, in fact, were hiding some of the things?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: That is why we extended the time-limit. Mr. Chopra did inform us that he has not been able to expedite this matter because he did not get the cooperation of the concern. That we have ourselves said but that is exactly what I said that in order to *get* the full material so that we could arrive at a conclusion with great authority, the Inspector's time has been extended.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : How much more time will you take?

SRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Not more, I am finishing in two minutes. About the other thing which the hon. Member mentioned, I do not know what happened to the hon. Member. It is a treat sometimes to hear Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He speaks so much sense, with so much intelligence and conviction, but to-day I do

not know what happened to him. He came only . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : He is very much disturbed.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Very much disturbed—that is what I was going to say and I probably sympathise with his turmoil and tension and a feeling of frustration which he is having, and we can provide a little indulgence for his statement of to-day because the hon. Member himself is feeling very disturbed about the split in the Party and whatever he has said is not in his own normal brilliant, intelligent manner but with a feeling of frustration which he is having towards his own Party. That is a reflection of his own turmoil which he has given vent to on the floor of the House. I would submit to the hon. Member, I have great appreciation, whatever political Party he may come from, I have great respect for the intelligence and conviction of the hon. Member. I would therefore request him . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman . . .

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : She says that she appreciates your intelligence and you have always appreciated her intelligence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She always appreciates.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : There is mutual compliment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What was wrong? I mentioned about a particular case, the trip of a certain distinguished lady from this country to the United States of America. And I have very great personal regard for her. Now, tell us whether it was right or not. Don't get embarrassed by this.

5 P.M.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I think it was not right.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The hon. Member is suffering from the split in his party.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I think it was very unchivalrous on the part of the hon. Member to raise this point without going into the context. Now, why anybody in this country should have any influence over me or over her or anybody else? I would not like to be told that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has influence on me

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no, you please never say that. I beg of you, don't say that.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: A person has independence; a person is honourable by himself or herself unless the contrary is proved. If somebody puts me a pointed question and asks me whether I have any influence on Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I would say, "No, I have no influence on Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, nor has he on me." I think on my own and I have my own conviction; I have not to be guided. Therefore, this was an unchivalrous and uncharitable remark made by the hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, to make about a distinguished person, who made a statement about our foreign policy in America, of which we are all proud. We have seen her statement of which we are proud. We are proud that she made a very convincing statement about our policy on Kashmir and about the attitude of the United States of America towards her.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I would like to ask under what authority or in what capacity did Mrs. Indira Gandhi make a statement on the foreign affairs of this country. Secondly, I fail to understand how the Minister justifies the statement made by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. If it was the argument that she was also an ordinary citizen and has the right to say what she pleases, I have no objection. But how could

she say that she was speaking on behalf of the Government? She says 'We are proud of Mrs. Indira Gandhi's statement made in the United States of America.' So I would like to ask her in what capacity Mr. Indira Gandhi is authorised to speak on behalf of the External Affairs Ministry of this country?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Like any other . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Be quiet.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You cannot address the Minister; you should address the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sometimes, as you know, we are fallible in such matters. All that I ask is this; I did not at all raise the point about the foreign policy statement. Some of the statements were good. I only said, "Why did she entertain questions of this kind: 'What kind of influence Mr. Krishna Menon has on her, or on her father, or on the Congress Party?'" She said: not much; but why did she entertain this at all? She should have snubbed them not to ask such silly questions. That is what I am saying, and I say this thing for her to take note of; it is a friendly advice to Shrimati Indira Gandhi, which should be communicated to her. Therefore, do not introduce other things. I know some of you get frightened at the mention of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. But this is a friendly gesture, and you can do me a favour by conveying what I have said to her.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He has had his say. I think it was irrelevant; so you need not answer that point. You can go to the next point.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Well, Sir, I think I have covered all the points, which have been raised during this debate. The other points which have been raised and which I have not replied to and the other suggestions of other hon. Members,

I shall convey to the Ministers concerned for appropriate action.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): 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, 1962, 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.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): We shall now take up the 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.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:
I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at II A.M.

The House then adjourned at six minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 1st May, 1964.