

I know some young people who have had brilliant degrees. They have had first class degrees at Oxford, Cambridge and other British Universities and American Universities and they are unwilling to come out to India because they have not got facilities which they have in those countries for advanced study and research. Another factor is that the pay is small but the more important factor is that the educationist in this country, even though it is our proud privilege to have an educationist as our President and it is also our proud privilege to have as our Vice-President an educationist, the fact of the matter is that the educationists in this country are not given the respect which is their due. This is not in accordance with our tradition and I think there should be a change in regard to this.

This is all that I have to say in regard to this matter and I thank you very much for giving me time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned for lunch till 2.30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock **THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

ENQUIRY RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, have you considered the privilege motion?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, it is being considered.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Today the House is adjourning.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I have told you that I will take time to consider that

motion. I am not able to say anything just now.

THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—
continued.

SRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I was hoping that, in the interval that we had, tempers would have cooled down and we would meet in a calmer atmosphere, in an atmosphere in which we can discuss the problems facing this House calmly and quietly. I hope no attempt will be made to restore the unfortunate situation that was there in this House during the earlier part of the session.

Madam, this is supposed to be a House of Elders and Elders might set an example to the other House in the decorum to be observed and the manner in which Members of the House should behave. It is very rarely that such things, as happened here this morning, happen in any parliamentary democracy. They have been very rare in this House and I hope, Madam, that we will not have any recurrence of such incidents again. I would appeal to hon. Members of the House to help the Chair in preserving the dignity of this House and particularly the dignity of the Chair. If Members do not co-operate in preserving the dignity of the Chair how can the Chair preserve order in the House? I hope all sections of the House will co-operate in this.

Madam, we have before us the Appropriation Bill today. We have discussed the Budget only a few days ago. The Appropriation Bill may very well be called. The Misappropriation Bill because it is for expenditure which though not approved by the Budget by juggling of figures the executive or the Ministry is able to get sanctioned and approved post-facto.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: *Post factum.*

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: *Post factum*; I stand corrected.

This inaccurate budgeting has become an annual feature of our Budget and therefore the large amount of grants obtained by the Ministry have to be reappropriated to other places and there are considerable savings. This is an unhealthy feature of our annual Budget. While speaking on the Budget last time I quoted figures from 1956 to 1960 and the figures of the following year do not indicate very much of an improvement. From 1956 to 1960, the total of voted grants charged to appropriation were 4,279, 5,499, 6,892, 7,022 and 7416. In 1961-62, it was 7496. The amount of saving—I am quoting in crores of rupees, Madam—in 1957-58 was 221, in 1958-59, 443, 1959-60, 255, 1960-61, 500 and 1961-62, 883 and the percentage is as high as 11.9 during last year. No wonder prices go up; apart from taxation it is this large factor of expenses granted but which are not utilised but taken in the Budget which provides a reason for higher taxation and causes an upward surge in prices. Therefore, Madam, it is a very unhealthy feature of our Budget which I would like to take this opportunity to point out.

Mr. Krishnamachari in his able address, unfortunately very much interrupted, made a defence, a clever and able defence, of what he was doing but I do not think his defence was convincing. Why should a match box which costs so little actually be burdened with taxation which is more than 60 per cent. of the price at which it is available to the customer? That is the most objectionable feature of the present stage of our finances. Ordinary things which the common man who is so very often referred to, needs his daily necessities, why should they be pushed up so high? Matches and kerosene were referred to by the Finance Minister. While we have to thank the Finance Minister for the small mercies, for instance, the abolition of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, has it really brought any relief? No; because

it is re-introduced in another form and there is no relief. There are the objectionable features generally in the Budget.

As regards the grants, I will refer to just a few of them. We have the grant for the Ministry of Defence. Madam, I am not convinced that all these additional grants that are demanded are necessary. Then there are grants-in-aid to the States. It is a very very large figure and there is no break-up given. One would like to know exactly how these grants are when they are broken up, on what basis they are given to the different States, whether it is just by pull or by majority of votes as Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra enjoy. If it is not so, why does Gujarat suffer so much? I am referring particularly to the lack that Gujarat suffers in the matter of electric power, of hydro-electric schemes, particularly when Gujarat has quarrels. Out of this large grant what is the share that is coming to Gujarat to help her to build her river valley projects, her hydro-electric schemes so much and so badly neglected all these years? There is a grant also for multi-purpose river schemes. What are these? Then I will not refer to the large grant for foodgrains because this has been discussed in one form or another. There is also a grant for capital outlay on multi-purpose river schemes; it is only a token grant of Rs. 1000. Why is it so? I would like to have a little explanation about that. Then there is the capital outlay on roads. It is a fairly large sum.

Madam, you hail from Bombay. I would like you to weigh the difference in the conditions of the road in Maharashtra on the one side and Gujarat on the other. What a beautiful road it is from Bombay to Poona? I had a drive on it only a few days ago and I congratulate the Government of Maharashtra which has built such a nice highway for the assistance that is given to motorist and truck owners for the check-post that are helpful to motorists in difficulties. These are all good features of that State's manner of treating

the transport industry and the motorists. Why are we not able to have similar facilities in Gujarat? After all, this is all one country and our principle is equality. Why are all the States not able to treat their tax payers in the same manner? This is a feautre which needs looking into. Is the Gujarat Government indifferent? Is the Gujarat Government not able to spend money? The Gujarat Government may be given a share out of this large grant that is available for building roads particularly taking into consideration the neglect that the roads of Gujarat have suffered during the bilingual regime.

Madam, I may also refer to the grant for ports. Where is the port of Kandla? It is only in the map. Is it the intention of Government to develop Kandla port? We are talking in terms of security and defence. The Kandla port was supposed to be a defence port. How much funds have been provided under defence or under development of ports for building the Kandla port which is so very necessary for transport as well as for defence? I would like, Madam, the Finance Minister to throw some light and to refute the charge that Gujarat is suffering step-motherly treatment at the hands of the Central Government. I have given concrete examples. I would like the Finance Minister to come out and tell us whether what I have said is not correct or to say that the Chief Minister of Gujrat does not plead strongly enough. If that is so, we, the Members from Gujarat from both sides of the House, may help him to strengthen his hands. But we have suffered neglect for too long and it is time that we got together and made the Government wake up. Thank you.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I specifically want to speak about two things today. One is about the Posts and Telegraphs and the other

is the position given to science in the reorganised state of things in the Education Ministry. First, I will take up the question of science.

All these years science has been having an important role to play since independence. First, it was under Natural Resources and Scientific Research. That was to begin with. Then it became Education and Scientific Research. Then, it became Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. And today scientific research finds no place in the reorganised scheme of things. So much so, in the Lok Sabha when cut motions were discussed in previous years about three hours were being devoted to the discussion of scientific research. This year hardly the subject has been touched and not more than twenty minutes were taken in discussing scientific matters when the Education Ministry's cut motions were being discussed. I would, therefore, request the Prime Minister and the Education Minister to reconsider and see if the Ministry of Education can still not be called as it was called earlier, viz., the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research. That is so in so many progressive countries. The U.K. has a Science Minister separately. The UAR has a Science Minister separately. Germany has a Science Minister separately. Several other countries have similarly Science Ministers.

Science has emerged as an instrument of economic and social change in our time and the developing countries are recognising more and more the importance of science and technology for national reconstruction and development, as with the help of scientific research the industrial pattern can be radically changed. The impact of research on industrial productivity is admitted to be profound and far reaching and it is certainly helping a great deal in the economic growth of the country. Therefore, I would suggest that greater emphasis should be laid on the applied side of industrial research so that the fullest and most efficient utilisation of the natural resources of the country

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]
for economic growth can be made. It is a matter of great satisfaction that the Government of India through the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, along with a chain of 28 national laboratories, is aware of these problems and is contributing its mite to solve them. Within a short span of about fifteen years the Council has been successful in establishing these laboratories covering almost every major field of science and technology. Nearly, 6,000 technical personnel are working in the Council, besides 1,300 research fellows and assistants engaged in research activities financed by the Council. This crop of research scientists and technologists has been built up in the country. More than 1,200 projects, 7,000 research papers and 700 patents have been taken out by these scientists during this short period. Recently, the Council has tried to come close to the real problems of Indian industries and it has reoriented its various programmes of research done in these laboratories in the various fields of science and technology. Under this reoriented programme quite a new approach has been taken. Previously the work of the national laboratories was done through their various divisions. But now every laboratory has launched a project-oriented programme where specific problems are being given to a batch of scientists for research on a co-ordinated and co-operative basis. This new technique has resulted in bringing down the hidden talents and their best utilisation in the service of science and industry. In my opinion these project-oriented programmes should also be extended to other fields of research and should be co-ordinated with the national plan of economic development.

I understand that many of the processes evolved by the national laboratories have not found immediate application because a good deal of additional work in designing machinery, provision of capital, labour and raw materials and the drawing up of production programmes is lagging

behind. A lot of planning is required for this and the Government should strengthen its machinery in this regard. In these times of emergency a strong industrial base is essential for defence efforts and a planned programme of research and development has to be pursued if the industrial advancement of the armed forces has to be substantially improved. I am glad that the Council has given urgent consideration to defence requirements by maintaining collaboration with organisations concerned with defence research, the armed services and defence production. It is a matter of satisfaction that several pilot projects were started with a view to evolving substitutes for several hundred items which were so far being imported by the defence organisation. This unit has succeeded not only in saving the much needed foreign exchange but also it has created an impression that the scientists of India are of no less calibre than that in the rest of the world. The precooked food, which can be utilised at heights of 14,000 and 15,000 feet, is very much helpful to our jawans who are fighting the enemy on the northern frontiers.

Now, I want to take the House into confidence and say that for the last two years a Parliamentary Scientific Committee has been working here and it has been doing some really good work as far as science is concerned. It brings out a quarterly magazine called "Science in Parliament" and from its editorial I will read out just a few words about the importance of science:—

"The barometer of the advance of any country should be the *per capita* expenditure on scientific research. Judging by this we find that the *per capita* expenditure on scientific research is:—

U.S.A.	Rs. 410
U.K.	Rs. 162
Sweden	Rs. 146
U.S.S.R.	Rs. 99
Australia	Rs. 40
China	Rs. 3
and India	Rs. 1.07

Now, the only good feature is that our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, is a man of vision and foresight who realises the great importance of science and its place in the national economy.

"It is because of him that soon after independence a string of National Laboratories specialising in various branches of science was set up all over the country."

It goes on like that and I will not take the time of the House in reading further.

Then I may tell the House that this Association has been organising symposia. The last symposium was held in September 1963 on the role science in agriculture. I plead with the hon. Members to take a little more interest in scientific affairs because it is after all science and technology which will pave the way for the rapid progress of the country.

So far I have spoken about scientific research. Now I come to the Posts and Telegraphs Department. I was one of those who pleaded for the formation of the P.&T. Board. I had thought that with the formation of the autonomous P.&T. Board the progress of the Posts and Telegraphs Department would be much more rapid and it would be in a position to give better service to the people and the country. But certain things have been happening in the Posts and Telegraphs Department which make me feel that probably the step of forming an autonomous Board may not prove as useful as probably it was considered. It is dismal reading, the Audit Report on Posts and Telegraphs which was given to both the Houses two days ago. They have pointed out that absence of a penalty clause in purchase orders has been responsible for quite a good many losses to the Department to the tune of several lakhs.

I will invite the attention of the House to paragraph 10 where this has

been dealt with, in the Audit Report, and they have shown how this has meant loss to the country. Similarly, in paragraph 12 they have very clearly written about the delay in repairs to serviceable stores. There is a lot of stores lying with the P.&T. Board since 1956 onwards, and it is rather surprising that this store has not been repaired all these years. While on the one side we say that there is a great scarcity of material, on the other side we find the picture where a lot of serviceable material is lying in the godowns of the P. & T. Board, and it is not being repaired and utilised.

Similarly, in paragraph 18 talking about workshops in the Audit Report they have said about the extra expenditure on purchase of tubes due to insufficient supply from workshops. In this connection, I would just read out two paragraphs from which it will be clear to the House how money which can be saved is being spent unnecessarily:

"It was decided in May 1962 to introduce a second shift in the tube-making shop in the Jubbulpore Workshop. But so far . . ."

That means, when this report was written in September 1963—

" . . . the second shift is stated to have been not introduced owing to non-availability of mild steel sheets."

In the next paragraph they go on to say:

"It is understood that the suppliers on whom orders were placed by the Director-General of Supplies and Disposals for supply of galvanised tubes obtained from him quota certificate and other assistance for obtaining the required supplies of mild steel sheets through the agency of the Iron and Steel Controller."

The next sentence is worth noting.

"While assistance is thus being rendered by Government to firms

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

which supply galvanised tubes to the P.&T. Department, the Department itself has not been able so far to obtain supplies for starting a second shift in the Jubbulpore Workshop where the cost of production is much lower."

So, this is the state of affairs as far as the Jubbulpore Workshop is concerned. While it could very usefully start a second shift any time after May 1962, nothing has been done for over a year. I do hope that the P.&T. Board will take up the matter seriously and see that this is started as early as possible.

I have been putting certain questions in this House about certain matters connected with the P. & T. Board, first of all about the membership itself. When the P. & T. Board was inaugurated, it originally had 7 members, and in the emergency it was made clear to almost all departments that no new appointments would be made and work would be carried on as far as possible with the existing staff. In spite of that what do we find in the P. & T. Board? The membership was increased by one not because the work necessitated it, not because of other reasons but because, according to the admission of the Deputy Minister, they had got a loan from some place and therefore the membership was increased by one. That is said to be the reason for increase in membership. But my information is that it was for something else that it was done. One of the favourites of the Chairman of the P. & T. Board was on the point of being reverted and therefore the P. & T. Board made out a case for the increase of the membership by one and went to Finance, and Finance agreed and a new post was created. Now my contention is proved by further developments. One of the members went on leave, and that post which was created was abolished. So, I fail to understand how Finance could be a party to the increase in membership

and after six or seven months to the decrease in membership again. What Mr. Bhagavati said in this House is to me a very ridiculous statement that because they managed to get loan from somewhere they could increase the number.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): The amount was probably spent in six months.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Well, the amount is a huge amount and it could be spent elsewhere in improving the services of the P. & T. Board. But these are the mysterious ways of the P. & T. Board.

Now, telephone service connections are given to officials who have to deal day to day with the public, and it is only meant for the tenure of their office. I have come across a case where one officer who had a service connection retired in 1956. The telephone continued to work till 1963 and that too in a house of a Member of the opposition in the other House. This is a case which can be verified. That telephone number finds its place up to the last directory which was issued by the Delhi Telephone Directorate. I would like to know from the P. & T. Board who was responsible for the service connection continuing for so long as six years after the retirement of the person concerned and in fact three years after 3 P.M. he had died also. That is a very sad state of affairs. Service connection means loss; you can make telephone calls all over the country free, the local calls are all free. It means a lot of amount to the exchequer, and especially if it is with a public man, you can well understand how the telephone was used for all these six years.

I have another case where an officer of the P&T Board went for training to another Ministry for a year, out of Delhi. In the normal course, the service connection should have been discontinued. But even today, I am sorry to say, the service connection continues, and is used by all the members of the family of the officer

concerned in Delhi, while the officer is having training elsewhere. This is the second case about things happening in the P&T Board.

Now, the third thing about which I have also put questions and about which some answers have been coming from the Minister concerned is about the tape-recording of the proceedings between the P&T Board officials and the unions in the P&T Department. Well, it was never done, it has not been practised in any other Ministry. I fail to understand why it is being resorted to when the unions have protested against it, and they say that they do not want this to be there. The thing does not end there. Tape-recording is resorted to in regard to departmental enquiries also. That is a very strange phenomenon. And when I put a specific question to the Minister about this, he simply said, 'I do not know'. Well, I request him to find out these facts and take action in this regard. We should not do anything which goes against fundamental rights.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): How will it go against fundamental rights? You are recording the correct things as given out.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Well, before tape-recording was introduced, there were departmental enquiries and it was always the shorthand writers who used to take them down. It is not a police State after all; it is a socialist welfare State where we do not want to use something said by the employees against them by tape-recording and all these methods.

Now, the fourth thing which I wanted to mention about the P. & T. Board was how the orders . . .

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: There all the speeches of Members are tape-recorded.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Well, I was speaking about how the orders of the Ministers and the high officials

are flouted by the officers. In one case, a specific recommendation was made by the then Transport and Communications Minister. That Minister left office. His successor came. That successor also recorded the same opinion as the old Transport and Communications Minister had recorded. After some time this Minister also went. Here is the opinion of two Ministers of Transport and Communications. This was a specific recommendation. The junior officers not only . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How long will you take?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I will just say one thing. They not only flouted it on the first available opportunity, but they also suspended the person concerned about whom the recommendation was made. I do not know how these things can be stopped. Probably, the Minister in-charge of Posts and Telegraphs does not find enough time to deal with matters in Delhi. I would request him to curtail his visits to Calcutta, devote more time in Delhi and see that the Posts and Telegraphs Board, which was born with high aspirations, functions properly and well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kureel, Please be very brief.

شری پھارے وال کرپل "طالب"

(اثر پردیس): مہدم قہگی چہرمن -

میں آپ کا زیادہ وقت نہیں لہا

چاہتا ہوں اور جو بات صحیح کہنا

چاہتا تھا اس کے متعلق دو ایک

باتیں آپ کے سامنے رکھا چاہوں گا -

جمہوریت میں عوام کے لئے اچھٹک

کرنے و قومستریمن کرنے کا ایک

بڑا بلہادی حق ہے - کچھ دن ہوئے

سولسٹ پارٹی نے پارلیمنٹ کے باہر

[شری پیارے لال کرپل «طالب»]

ایک ہوا ہاری ڈیمونسٹریشن کیا تھا - جس میں ہزاروں آدمی شامل ہوئے تھے - جہاں تک سوشلسٹ پارٹی کا تعلق ہے - سب اچھی طرح جانتے ہیں کہ ہمیں نال وائلف ایکٹیویٹرز میں دھواں ہے - اور ہم شانتی پوروک ڈیمونسٹریشن کرنا چاہتے ہیں - اس سلسلہ میں کچھ لوگوں کو گرفتار کیا گیا - جب سرکار کو یہ معلوم ہوا کہ ہمارا جو ڈیمونسٹریشن ہوا وہ بھی فل ہوا - شانتی پوروک ہوا تو پھر دفعہ ۱۴۳ جو لگائی گئی وہ بات مہری سمجھ میں نہیں آئی - جب یہ سرکار جانتی تھی کہ سوشلسٹ پارٹی کا جو پروسس ہوا اس میں ہزاروں آدمی ہوں گے وہ شانتی پوروک ڈیمونسٹریشن کرہنگے اور اس ڈیمونسٹریشن میں دھبے کے کونہ کونہ سے ہزاروں لوگ آئیں گے - تو پھر دفعہ ۱۴۳ لگانے کا کیا مطلب ہو سکتا ہے - اس کا ایک ہی مطلب ہو سکتا ہے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ سوشلسٹ پارٹی کے لیڈروں کو، مخالف پارٹی کے لیڈروں کو گرفتار کیا جائے - اس سلسلہ میں پارٹی کے جو سابق پریذیڈنٹ سری راج نرائن تھے ان کو جیل اور ورکروں کے ساتھ دیگر نے گرفتار کر لیا ہے - ایک اور ممبر ملو رام بانگو جو لوک سبھا کے ممبر ہیں ان کے خلاف وارنٹ جاری ہے -

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kureel, you are speaking on the Bill?

SHRI P. L. KUREEL URF TALIB: No, I am just referring to this matter. That is why I want to take this opportunity to speak about an important matter.

شری پیارے لال کرپل «طالب» :

ان کے خلاف وارنٹ جاری کیا گیا ہے اور پارلیمنٹ کے اندر ہی ہوں، باہر نہیں نکل سکتے -

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उनमें बाहर निकलने की हिम्मत नहीं है ।

شری پیارے لال کرپل «طالب» :

ان کا پارلیمنٹ میں پناہ لینا ایک بنیادی حق ہے - اس میں اعتراض کی بات نہیں ہے - میں سرکار سے چاہوں گا کہ ملو رام بانگو کے خلاف جو بلا وجہ وارنٹ جاری کیا گیا ہے اس کو واپس لیا جائے - اب میں اسٹیج کے متعلق یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس کے بارے میں یہ کہا گیا ہے کہ وہ ڈیفنڈر کیا گیا ہے میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ سوشلسٹ پارٹی کا کوئی ایسا ارادہ نہیں تھا کہ اس اسٹیج کو ڈیفنڈر کر دیا جائے - یہ ضرور ہے کہ ہماری پارٹی چاہتی ہے کہ جیلے بھی پوانے حکم دہوں گے اسٹیج میں ان کو ہٹا دیا جائے - مگر کسی اسٹیج کو ڈیفنڈر کرنے کا ہمارا کوئی ارادہ نہیں تھا - یہ تو سبھی لوگ جانتے ہیں کہ جب کوئی جلوس نکلتا ہے تو اس میں دو چار آدمی اس قسم کے ہوتے ہیں جو اس طرح

کی حرکتیں کرتے ہیں لیکن جہاں تک ہماری پارٹی کا سوال ہے اس کا کوئی ایسا ارادہ نہیں تھا کہ وہ اسٹیج کو صفحہ کرے۔ اس لئے میں آپ سے درخواست کروں گا کہ جن آدمیوں کو ہاؤس نے باہر ڈسٹریکشن کرنے کے سلسلہ میں گرفتار کیا تھا انہیں چھوڑ دیا جائے اور جس سب سے خلاف وارنٹ جاری ہے اس کو واپس لے لیا جائے۔

میں زیادہ نہ کہتے ہوئے صرف ایک بات کی طرف آپ کی توجہ دلاؤں گا اور وہ یہ ہے کہ شہدولت کاسٹ کی نمائندگی پبلک سروسز کے اندر بہت کم ہے۔ ہمارے سفودھان میں شہدولت کاسٹ لوگوں کو کچھ سیف گروہ اور کنسلٹنٹس دیئے گئے ہیں اور ان کو کچھ اسپیشل رائٹس دیئے گئے ہیں۔ ۱۹۴۳ء سے آج تک تقریباً ۲۰ یا ۲۱ سال ہوئے ہیں شہدولت کاسٹ لوگوں کی نمائندگی سروسز میں دو تہائی فی صدی سے زیادہ نہیں ہے۔ یہ بہت کم نمائندگی ہے۔ جہاں تک اعلیٰ ذات کے لوگوں کا تعلق ہے۔ آپ یہ بات اچھی طرح سے جانتے ہیں کہ ان کی تعداد سروسز میں بہت زیادہ ہے کہوں کہ ان کو تعلیم اچھی ملتی ہے۔ وہ لوگ ایسے وائارون میں رہتے ہیں جہاں پر ان کو ہر ایک چیز کی سہولت دہتی ہے۔ جہاں ہر چیز لکھ لوگ

رہتے ہیں۔ اس طرح کی سہولتیں میں وہ لوگ رہتے ہیں۔ لیکن جہاں تک شہدولت کاسٹ والوں کا تعلق ہے انہوں نے تعلیم بہت بعد میں اپلائی ہے اور نہ وہ اس قسم کے ماحول میں ہی رہتے ہیں۔ جس کی وجہ سے وہ دوسروں سے اچھی طرح سے کمپیٹ کر سکیں اس لئے میں سرکار سے درخواست کروں گا کہ شہدولت کاسٹ والوں کے لئے سروسز میں جو کوٹہ منظور کیا گیا ہے۔ جو تھوڑے سے کنسلٹنٹس انہیں دیئے گئے ہیں ضرور ان کو پورا کیا جانا چاہئے۔

اس طرح سے جہاں تک پرموشن کا تعلق ہے انکے کلیم کو نظر انداز کر دیا جاتا ہے۔ برٹش ٹائم میں آپ سب رگ اچھی طرح جانتے ہیں جو ذرا بھی بڑھے لکھے آدمی ہوتے تھے ان کو بڑے بڑے افسر اور بہاں تک کہ کسٹمرکٹ مینجسٹریٹ بھی بنا دیا جاتا تھا۔ مگر آج کل یہ بات دیکھنے میں نہیں آتی ہے۔ شہدولت کاسٹ کا آدمی خاص امتحان پاس کر لیتا ہے مگر اس کو پرموشن نہیں دیا جاتا ہے۔ اس لئے میں سرکار سے درخواست کروں گا کہ انہیں پوری نمائندگی سروسز میں ملنی چاہئے اور زیادہ سے زیادہ نوکریاں شہدولت کاسٹ والوں کو ملنی چاہئے اور انکو باقاعدہ پرموشن دیا جانا چاہئے۔

[شری پیارے لال کوریل دہلی] آپ نے جو مجھے دو ملٹ دیئے ہیں میں اس کے لئے شکریہ ادا کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ اور امید کرتا ہوں کہ سرکار شہدولت گاسٹ کے لوگوں کو نوکری میں مناسب نمائندگی دینے کے لئے پوری پوری کوشش کرے گی اور اس کے متعلق ایک ہائی پاور کمیٹی بنائی جائی چاہئے جو اس بات کی جانچ کرے گی کہ اتنا عرصہ ہونے کے بعد بھی سلودھان میں ان لوگوں کو جو گارنٹی دی گئی ہے اس کو کیوں نہیں پورا کیا گیا اس طرح سے سرکار کو ایک رجسٹر مہلتھی کرنا چاہئے جس میں ہر سال اس بات کے فیکٹس اپڈیٹ فیکٹس ہوں کہ مائٹرز یا شہدولت گاسٹ کے لوگوں کو کتنی سروسز میں نمائندگی ملی اور ان کی نمائندگی کے لئے کیا کیا قدم اٹھائے گئے ہیں۔ انگریزی دوران حکومت میں یہ سب ہوتا تھا۔ اب کچھ بھی نہیں ہوتا ہے۔ ہندوستان کے آزاد ہونے کے بعد بھی۔ اس لئے میں یہ درخواست کروں گا کہ ہر دفتر میں اس قسم کے رجسٹر اور رجسٹر مہلتھی کئے جائیں اور ساتھ ہی ساتھ ہر سال ان کی فیکٹس اپڈیٹ فیکٹس دی جائیں۔ ہمیں یہ معلوم ہی نہیں ہو پاتا ہے۔ بہت سے کوہسچن یا سوالات ہم کرتے ہیں لیکن وہ اس بلا پر رجسٹر کر دیئے جاتے ہیں کہ وہ کونسل میں۔ میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ شہدولت

گاسٹ کے لوگوں کو سلودھان میں اسپیشل حقوق حاصل ہیں اور ان کے لئے اسپیشل ریزرویشن ہے۔ اس لئے میں سرکار سے نویدیں کروں گا کہ ان کی کمونل فیکٹس جو مختلف سروسز میں ہوں وہ ہر سال دی جائیں۔ دستکرت لہول پر تو ان کی نمائندگی بالکل ہے ہی نہیں۔ دستکرت لہول کے آفسروں میں اور ضلع عدالتوں میں شہدولت گاسٹ کا نہ کوئی پیشکار ہوتا ہے، نہ کوئی اہلکار ہوتا ہے اور نہ کوئی اہل کار کلرک اور منشی ہوتا ہے۔ اس طرح آپ ضلع پولیس دفتر کو لے لیتے۔ اس میں بھی ان کی ایک یا دو پرسنٹ بھی نمائندگی نہیں ہے۔ تو ان سب باتوں پر غور کھجئے اور ایک ہائی پاور کمیٹی بنائیے جو ان کی نمائندگی کے بارے میں پوری جانچ کرے۔ شکریہ۔

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, मैं आपका जवादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता हूं और जो बात सुबह कहना चाहता था उसके मुतल्लिक दो एक बातें आपके सामने रखना चाहंगा। जम्हूरियत में अराम के लिए ऐजीटेट करने, डिमोस्ट्रेशन करने का एक बुनियादी हक है। कुछ दिन हुए सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने पार्लियामेंट के बाहर एक बड़ा भारी डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन किया था जिसमें हजारों आदमी शामिल हुए थे। जहां तक सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का ताल्लुक है सब अच्छी तरह जानते हैं कि हमें नानवायलेन्ट एक्टीविटोज में विश्वास है। और हम शांतिपूर्वक डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन करना।

चाहते हैं। इस सिलसिले में कुछ लोगों को गिरफ्तार किया गया। जब सरकार को यह मालूम था कि हमारा जो डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन होगा वह पीसफुल होगा, शांतिपूर्वक होगा तो फिर दफा १४४ जा लगाई गई वह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई। जब यह सरकार जानती थी कि सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का जो प्रोसेशन होगा उसमें हजारों आदमी होंगे, वह शांतिपूर्वक डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन करेंगे और इस डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन में देश के कोने कोने से हजारों लोग आयेंगे तो फिर दफा १४४ लगाने का क्या मतलब हो सकता है। इसका एक ही मतलब हो सकता है और वह यह है कि सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के लीडरों को मुखालिफ पार्टी के लीडरों को गिरफ्तार किया जाय। इस सिलसिले में पार्टी के जो साविक प्रेसीडेंट श्री राज नारायण थे उनको चन्द और वर्करों के साथ सरकार ने गिरफ्तार कर लिया है। एक और मेम्बर श्री मनीराम बागड़ी जो लोक सभा के सदस्य हैं उनके खिलाफ वारन्ट जारी है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kureel, you are speaking on the Bill?

SHRI P. L. KUREEL URF TALIB: No, I am just referring to this matter. That is why I want to take this opportunity to speak about an important matter.

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' : उनके खिलाफ वारन्ट जारी किया गया है और वह पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर ही हैं, बाहर नहीं निकल सकते।

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उनमें बाहर निकलने की हिम्मत नहीं है।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' : उनका पार्लियामेंट में पनाह लेना एक बुनियादी हक है। इसमें ऐतराज की बात नहीं है। मैं सरकार से चाहूंगा कि श्री मनीराम बागड़ी के खिलाफ जो विला वजह वारन्ट जारी किया गया है उसको वापस लिया जाए।

अब मैं स्टेचू के मुतल्लिक यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसके बारे में यह कहा गया है कि वह डिसफिगर किया गया है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का कोई ऐसा इरादा नहीं था कि इस स्टेचू को डिसफिगर कर दिया जाए। यह जरूर है कि हमारी पार्टी चाहती है कि जितने भी पुराने हुक्मरानों के स्टेचू हैं उनको हटा दिया जाए मगर किसी स्टेचू को डिसफिगर करने का हमारा कोई इरादा नहीं था। यह तो सभी लोग जानते हैं कि जब कोई जलूस निकलता है तो उसमें दो चार आदमी इस किस्म के होते हैं जो इस तरह की हरकतें करते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक हमारी पार्टी का सवाल है उसका कोई ऐसा इरादा नहीं था कि वह स्टेचू को डिसफिगर करे। इसलिए मैं आपसे दरखास्त करूंगा कि जिन आदमियों को हाउस के बाहर डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन करने के सिलसिले में गिरफ्तार किया गया है उन्हें छोड़ दिया जाये और जिस मेम्बर के खिलाफ वारन्ट जारी है उसको वापस ले लिया जाए।

मैं ज्यादा न कहते हुए निर्फ एक बात की तरफ आपकी तवज्जो दिलाऊंगा और वह यह है कि शिड्डल कास्ट की नुमायन्दगी पब्लिक सर्विसेज के अन्दर बहुत कम है। हमारे संविधान में शिड्डल कास्ट लोगों को कुछ सेफगार्ड और कन्सेशन दिये गए हैं और उनको कुछ स्पेशल राइट्स दिए गये हैं। १९४३ ई० से आज तक करीबन २० या २१ साल हो गए हैं शिड्डल कास्ट लोगों की नुमायन्दगी सर्विसेज में दो तीन फीसदी से ज्यादा नहीं है। यह बहुत कम नुमायन्दगी है। जहां तक आला जात के लोगों का ताल्लुक है आप यह बात अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि उनकी तादाद सर्विसेज में बहुत ज्यादा है क्योंकि उनको तालीम अच्छी मिलती है। वह लोग ऐसे वातावरण में रहते हैं जहां पर उनको हर एक चीज की सहायता रहती है, जहां पर पढ़े लिखे लोग रहते हैं

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब']

इस तरह की सोसायटीज में वह लोग रहते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट वाले लोगों का ताल्लुक है उन्होंने तालीम बहुत बाद में अपनाई है और न वह इस किस्म के माहौल में ही रहते हैं जिसकी वजह से वह दूसरों से अच्छी तरह से कम्पीट कर सकें। इसलिए मैं सरकार से दरखास्त करूंगा कि शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट वालों के लिए सर्विसेज में जो कोटा मंजूर किया गया है, जो थोड़े से कंसेन्स उन्होंने दिए गए हैं जरूर उनको पूरा किया जाना चाहिए।

इसी तरह से जहां तक प्रमोशन का ताल्लुक है उनके क्लेम को नजरअन्दाज कर दिया जाता है। ब्रिटिश टाइम में, आप सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, जो जरा भी पढ़े लिखे आदमी होते थे उनको बड़े बड़े अफसर और यहां तक कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट भी बना दिया जाता था। मगर आजकल यह बात देखने में नहीं आती है। शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का आदमी खास इन्तहान भी पास कर लेता है मगर उसको प्रमोशन नहीं दिया जाता है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से दरखास्त करूंगा कि उन्हें पूरी नुमायन्दगी सर्विसेज में मिलनी चाहिये और ज्यादा से ज्यादा नौकरियां शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट वालों को मिलनी चाहिए उनको वाक़ायदा प्रमोशन दिया जाना चाहिए।

आपने जो मुझे दो मिनट दिये हैं मैं उसके लिए शुक्रिया अदा करना चाहता हूँ। और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि सरकार शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों को नौकरी में मुनासिब नुमायन्दगी देने के लिये पूरी पूरी कोशिश करेगी और इसके मुतल्लिक एक हाई पावर कमेटी बनाई जानी चाहिए जो इस बात की जांच करेगी कि इतना अर्सा होने के बाद भी संविधान में उन लोगों को जो गारन्टी दी गई है उसको क्यों नहीं पूरा किया गया इस तरह से सरकार को एक रजिस्टर मेन्टेन करना चाहिए जिसमें हर साल इस बात के

फैक्ट्स एण्ड फिगर्स हों कि मानोरिटिज या शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों को कितनी सर्विसेज में नुमायन्दगी मिली और उनकी नुमायंदगी के लिए क्या क्या कदम उठाये गये हैं। अंग्रेजी दौरान हुकूमत में यह सब होता था। अब कुछ भी नहीं होता है हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद भी। इसलिए मैं यह दरखास्त करूंगा कि हर दफ्तर में इस किस्म के रोस्टर मेन्टेन किये जायें और साथ ही साथ हर साल उनकी फैक्ट्स एण्ड फीगर्स दी जायें। हमें यह मालूम नहीं हो पाता है। बहुत से क्वेश्चन या सवालात हम करते हैं लेकिन वह इस बिना पर रिजैक्ट कर दिये जाते हैं कि वह कम्प्यूनल है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों को संविधान में स्पेशल हकूक हासिल हैं और उनके लिए स्पेशल रिजर्वेशन है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि उनकी कम्प्यूनल फिगर्स जो मुख्तलिफ सर्विसेज में हैं वह हर साल दी जायें। डिस्ट्रिक्ट लेवल पर तो उनकी नुमायन्दगी बिल्कुल है ही नहीं। डिस्ट्रिक्ट लेवल के आफिसरों में और जिला अदालतों में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का न कोई पेशकार होता है न कोई अहलमद होता है और न कोई अहलकार क्लर्क और मुन्ती होता है। उसी तरह आप जिला पुलिस दफ्तर को ले लीजिये उसमें भी उनकी एक या दो परसेंट नुमायन्दगी नहीं है। तो इन सब बातों पर गौर कीजिये और एक हाई पावर कमेटी बनाइये जो उनकी नुमायन्दगी के बारे में पूरी जांच करे। शुक्रिया।]

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) :

مہدم - میں نو جمعہ ہر ہفتا ہوتا ہوں اور جمعہ پہلے سے خیال رکھتا رہے کہ آپ کا حکم ایسا ہوگا اور جمعہ ایسا کرنا ہی ہے۔

ایروہریشی ہل کے متعلق جیسا کہ
میں نے پہلے بھی عرض کیا تھا کہ
مجھے کوئی حکم نہیں ہوتا ہے ۔
دیپس کو بلانا ہے تو اس کے لئے سب
کچھ منظور کرنا ہی پڑے گا ۔ اس
دن بھی میں نے کچھ ترٹھیاں عرض
کی تھیں اور آج بھی ایک دو پوائنٹ
آپ کے دروازہ آنریبل منسٹر صاحب
کی خدمت میں رکھنا چاہتا ہوں ۔
ایک تو یہ ہے کہ اس دفعہ بھی اس
بجٹ میں ایسی کوئی مد مجھے دکھائی
نہیں دی جس سے یہ معلوم ہو کہ
نہیں میں اگر کوئی خطرہ پیدا ہو
تو اس کے لئے کیا کیا جائے گا ۔
دیپس میں اگر کوئی خطرہ ہے انقلاب
کا یا بد امنی کا تو وہ مہلتائی کی
وجہ سے ہو سکتا ہے ۔ مہلتائی کو
روکنے کے لئے کسی منسٹر صاحب نے
یا فائنلس منسٹر صاحب نے یہ نہیں
کہا ہے کہ وہ اس طرح کی بلڈشوں
لگانا چاہتے ہیں جس سے کھانے پینے
کی چیزوں کے بہار سارے دیپس میں
ایک ہوں اور ان میں کم سے کم فوق
ہو تاکہ نہ کوئی ذخیرہ اپنے پاس رکھ
نہ کوئی بلیک میں بھیجے اور نہ
لوگوں کو دکھ ہو ۔ اس بارے میں
سرکار نے کچھ نہیں سوچا ہے ۔ آپ
اپنے بجٹ میں سے آپ کچھ حصہ
اٹھ رہی ہو نکال دیں اور یہ کوفی
کریں کہ سارے دیپس میں فلیے کا ایک

بھاو ہو یا کم سے کم فرق ہو تو اس کا
یہ فائدہ ہوگا کہ ملک میں بد امنی
نہیں ہوگی ۔

دوسری بات جو میں عرض کرنا
چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ ہولی پر آپ
جانتے ہیں کہ لوگ ہولی کھلتے ہیں
اور اس میں کبھی کبھی کچھ زیادتی
بھی ہو جاتی ہے لیکن اس سے کوئی
فرق نہیں پڑتا ۔ ہوم منسٹر صاحب
اور ڈیپلٹس منسٹر صاحب کو یہ
سہی کر دکھ ہوگا کہ ابھی ہولی کے موقعہ
پر ہزارہ ایروہرام پر کسی فوجی
صدر ایسی بھائی نے ہولی کھلتے ہوئے
ایک سکہ بھائی پر رنگ ڈال دیا جو
وہاں کام کا منہجور تھا ۔ اس کے بعد
وہ صاحب چلے گئے اور وہ ترک بہر
کر لوگوں کو لے آئے ۔ ان لوگوں کو
شریف کہا جائے یا کہا کہا جائے میں
نہیں جانتا ۔ تو ان لوگوں نے ان
فوجیوں کو اس بری طرح سے پھٹکا
جھپٹے کے اس ملک میں جو اہل نہرو
کا راج نہ ہو نفددا صاحب کا راج نہ
ہو کانگریس سرکار کا راج نہ ہو بلکہ ان
فلڈوں کا راج ہو ۔ سرکار کو اس واقعہ
کی اطلاع آئی ہوگی اور اگر آئی ہوگی
پھر بھی کچھ نہیں کہا گیا تو اس کا
مجھے بہت صدمہ ہے ۔ اگر نہیں
آئی اور سرکار اتنی غافل ہے تو اس کا
بھی مجھے صدمہ ہے ۔ لیکن اگر
فوجیوں کا سارہل کر جائے گا تو اس
ملک میں کچھ بھی بننے والا نہیں

[شری عبدالغنی]

ہے۔ اتنا روپیہ خرچ کرنے کے بعد اگر اس ملک میں غنڈہ گردی بالکل ہو ہی نہیں تو وہ بہت ہی اچھا ہے لیکن اگر غنڈہ گردی کچھ ہو تو کم سے کم اس کا اثر ایسا نہیں ہونا چاہئے کہ فوجیوں کا ماریل کر جائے۔

تیسری عرض یہ کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ سولہ برس ہمارے شرنارتھی بھائیوں کو آئے ہوئے ہو گئے ہیں۔ انہوں نے اپنی جھونپڑیاں مندروں میں بنائیں جہاں کہ قبریں تھیں وہاں بنائیں اور کچھ کام دھندے میں لگ گئے۔

شری پھارے لال کریل : مطالبہ :

مرگھٹ میں بھی بنائیں۔

شری عبدالغنی : اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ انہوں نے سب جگہ بنائی مرگھٹ میں بھی بنائیں لیکن اب جہاں وہ پڑے ہوئے ہیں وہاں سے بھی ان کو اجازت جا رہا ہے۔ مہری یہ سمجھ میں نہیں آتا ہے کہ یہ روز اجازتے کا جو یہ کام ہے یہی کہا آپ کے ذمہ ہے۔ یہ آپ نے ہوا احسان کیا تھا کہ جو بھائی اجڑ کر آئے تھے ان کو آپ نے پڑا دی تھی لیکن اب منسٹری میں بیٹھے بیٹھے کہا لوگ یہی سوچتے ہیں کہ کس کو اجازت جائے۔ اور کہاں سے اجازت جائے۔ اس طرف توجہ دینے کی ضرورت ہے کہ جو روپیہ آپ خرچ کرنا چاہتے ہیں اس میں

سے صرف ایک آدھہ پرسنٹ ان کے لئے بھی خرچ کیجئے تاکہ ان کو دانت نہ آئے اور یہ ہر روز شرنارتھیوں کو اجازتے کی جو بات ہے یہ ختم ہو۔

اس کے بعد جو میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ ایسٹ پاکستان کو چھوڑ کر کچھ بھائی آ رہے ہیں۔ وہ خوشی سے نہیں آ رہے ہیں۔ وہ اپنی جائیدادوں کو خوشی سے چھوڑ کر نہیں آ رہے ہیں۔ ان کے لئے آپ کا انتظام کر رہے ہیں۔ کیا اسی طرح انتظام ہوگا کہ یہاں جو مسلمان ہیں ان کی بھی ہم حفاظت نہ کر پائیں۔ تو اس کے لئے پہلے سے کچھ فکر کیجئے۔ اس ایروپریشن بیل کی منظوری کے بعد آپ کو ہوا آدھکار ہوگا اور آپ ان کی حفاظت کیجئے ان کا خیال رکھئے جو آ رہے ہیں تاکہ یہاں جو پڑے ہیں ان کو تکلیف نہ ہو۔

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

آخری بات جو میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ تیلی فون اور تیلی گراف کا جو محکمہ ہے اس کے منسٹر جب رفیع احمد قذوائی صاحب تھے تو انہوں نے دیکھتے دیکھتے اس میں انقلاب کر دیا تھا۔ آج یہ حالت ہے کہ آپ کو کال تک کرنی ہو تو اس میں بہت پریشانی ہوتی ہے۔ سرکار کا جو فلڈ ہے وہ پبلک کا فلڈ ہے

لیکن اتنا پیسہ خر ہونے پر بھی ہوتا یہ ہے کہ کھلتی بیج دہی ہے اور کوئی سنتا نہیں ہے۔ یا تو ملازمین میں کسی کو دی گئی ہے اور ان کے پاس کام زیادہ ہے یا ان میں لاپرواہی آگئی ہے۔ ان دونوں میں جو بھی وجہ ہو اس کی طرف متعلقہ منسٹر صاحب کو دھیان دینا چاہئے جس سے لوگوں کو تکلیف نہ ہو۔

میں بھارگو صاحب سے اس بات میں بالکل متفق ہوں کہ پڈت جواہرلال نہرو نے سائنس کی طرف بڑی توجہ دی ہے لیکن آپ یہ اندازہ کیجئے کہ ہمارا ماریل کھانتک اٹھا ہے۔ آج ہی دھندوستان ٹائمز میں کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے ایک بڑے نیٹا منسٹر ڈانگے کے بارے میں چلند باتیں آئی ہیں۔ ان کو سرکاری نمائندہ ہونے کا شرف حاصل تھا اور اب بھی کچھ سرکاری نمائندہ ہونے کا شرف حاصل ہے۔ لیکن ان کے سلسلہ میں جو چلند دستاویز ہیں ان کے بارے میں یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ وہ فورجڈ ڈاکومنٹ ہیں۔ میں اسہد کرتا ہوں کہ ننڈا صاحب ان کفڈات کو خراب نہیں ہونے دینگے کہوں کہ اس سے اندیشہ ہوتا ہے کہ آج کی سرکار کس طرح سے بڑی بڑی سیاسی پارٹیوں کے نیٹاؤں کو خریدتی ہے۔ یہ ایک بڑا اہم سوال ہے جو آج دھندوستان ٹائمز نے اٹھایا ہے۔ سرکار

کی توجہ سب طرف جاتی ہے بے شک جائے۔ ہمارے ڈاکٹر رام منوہر لوبھا یا جو ان کے ساتھی ہیں ان کی طرف سرکار کی توجہ جاتی ہے لیکن ان باتوں کی طرف بھی جائے اور وہ دیکھیں کہ وہ ڈاکومنٹ فورجڈ ہیں یا نہیں۔ مجھے اسہد ہے کہ ننڈا صاحب کچھ مرتعہ نکال کر ان ڈاکومنٹس کو دیکھینگے۔

لائسنس کے متعلق جیسا کہ میں پہلے بھی عرض کر چکا ہوں کہ آپ اپنے آدمیوں کو دینا چاہیں تو دین اس میں مجھے کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہے لیکن کم سے کم یہ دیکھ بہال کر کے دیں کہ لائسنس ڈیزرونگ لوگوں کو ملتے ہیں یا نہیں۔ اگر آپ ایسا نہیں کرتے ہیں تو دیہی کو آپ خطرہ میں ڈالتے ہیں۔ دیہی کی حفاظت کو خطرہ میں ڈالتے ہیں۔ میں اسہد کرتا ہوں کہ منسٹر صاحب اس سلسلہ میں مہرا ساتھ دیں گے کہ دیہی کا اگر کسی طرح ایمان ہوتا ہو تو اس ایمان سے دیہی کو پہچانا چاہئے اور اس طرف دھیان دینا چاہئے۔ اس طرح سے جو فوج پر آپ اتنا روپیہ خرچ کرتے جا رہے ہیں اس میں آپ کسی طرح کی تمیز نہ کیجئے۔ دیہی دروہی اور دیہی بھگت میں ضرور تمیز کیجئے۔ لیکن اور باقی باتوں میں کوئی تمیز نہ کیجئے۔ ننڈا صاحب سے اس دن بڑی بھول ہوئی تھی۔ کھمبر کے

[شری عبدالغنی]

بارے میں جب وہ کہہ رہے تھے کہ
موتے مبارک کی چوری کس نے کی -
تو انہوں نے پہلے غلام مصدق بہت کا
نام لیا اور یہ کہا کہ وہ پاکستان کا
ہے - پھر شام کو انہوں نے اس کی
تردید کر دی اور کہا کہ وہ غلام مصدق
بہت نہیں ہے بلکہ قادر بہت ہے -
اس ملک کے ۳۵ کروڑ بلنگان خدا
کی حفاظت کا تھیکہ لے کر کے آپ
اس طرح سے غلط اطلاع دیتے ہیں -
تو میں یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ کیا
نفاذ صاحب نے اس بارے میں کوئی
تحقیقات کی کہ کس نے یہ غلط اطلاع
دی تھی اور جس نے غلط اطلاع دی
تھی اس کے خلاف کیا کارروائی کی
گئی - اگر آپ سرورسز بڑھانے کے لئے
کہتے ہیں تو ہم کہتے ہیں ضرور بڑھانے -
آپ تھکس بڑھانے کے لئے کہتے ہیں تو ہم
کہتے ہیں ضرور بڑھانے تاکہ دیہی کا
بہلا ہو - لہٰذا اگر اس طرح کے
افسروں کو لے کر کے آپ چلتا چاہتے
ہیں جو غلط اطلاع دیتے ہیں تو صحیح
دور ہے کہ دیہی ترقی نہیں کرے گا
بلکہ دیہی گر جائے گا اور دیہی اگر
دوبارے گا تو ہم سب دہیوں کے - اس لئے
نفاذ صاحب نے جو اتنی غیر ذمہ داری
کی بات کسی کے کہنے پر کہہ دی
اس پر کچھ لکھی ہونا چاہئے -
آخری بات میں یہ عرض کرنا
چاہتا ہوں کہ دو سو ورش میں لڑے
ہستہنگز کے بعد یا لڑے کلانہو کے بعد یہ

پہلی انکوائری ہے جو شری اس - آر -
داس صاحب کی بیٹھی ہے - اس
میں سرکار کو دل چسپی لگتی
چاہئے - سرکار نے بتائی ہے میرے
عرض کرنے پر بمقامی مصدق لکھی
سرکار نے بمقامی ہے - ان کے ایڈووکیٹ
جنرل کو جانا چاہئے ان کے سولیسٹ
جنرل کو جانا چاہئے ان کی انٹیلیجنس
کو جانا چاہئے اور وہاں جا کر کس
کی رہنمائی کرنی چاہئے - میں اس
کوٹا میں کہ سرکار اس طرف بھی
کچھ نہ کچھ تھورا دھیان دے گی
کہوں کہ دو سو برس میں یہ پہلا
مولم ہے کہ چیف منسٹر کا ایڈجسٹ
ہو رہا ہو اس کو کٹھہرے میں کھوا کھا
کھا ہو - اگر وہ بے گناہ ہے تو اس کی
مدد کی جائے اور گناہ گار ہے تو اس کو
چلتا کھا جائے -

میں شکریہ بھی ادا کرتا ہوں
اور اسد کرتا ہوں کہ منسٹری میری
چھوٹی چھوٹی کھری باتوں کی طرف
ضرور دھیان دیگی -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) : मैद्य,
मैं तो हमेशा श्रीफ होता हूं और मुझे पहले से
ख्याल रहता है कि अपना हुकम ऐसा होना
और मुझे ऐसा करना ही है।

एप्रोप्रियेशन बिल के मुतल्लिक जैसा कि
मैंने पहले भी अर्ज किया था कि मुझे कोई
हुक नहीं होता है। देश को बनाना है तो
उसके लिए सब कुछ मंजूर करना ही पड़ेगा।
उस दिन भी मैंने कुछ ब्रिटिश अर्ज की थीं
और आज भी एक दो प्वाइंट आपके द्वारा

आनरेबल मिनिस्टर की खिदमत में रखना चाहता हूँ। एक तो यह है कि इस दफा भी इस बजट में ऐसी कोई मद मुझे दिखाई नहीं दी जिससे यह मालूम हो कि देश में अगर कोई खतरा पैदा हो तो उसके लिए क्या किया जायेगा। देश में अगर कोई खतरा है इन्कलाब का या बदअमनी का तो यह मंहगाई की वजह से हो सकता है। मंहगाई को रोकने के लिए किसी मिनिस्टर साहब ने या फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह नहीं कहा है कि वह इस तरह की बन्दिशें लगाना चाहते हैं कि जिससे खाने पीने की चीजों के भाव सारे देश में एक हों और उनमें कम से कम फर्क हो ताकि न कोई जखीरा अपने पास रखे न कोई ब्लैक में बेचे और न लोगों को दुःख हो। इस बारे में सरकार ने कुछ नहीं सोचा है। अगर अपने बजट में से आप कुछ हिस्सा इधर भी निकाल दें और यह कोशिश करें कि सारे देश में गल्ले का एक भाव हो या कम से कम फर्क हो तो उसका यह फायदा होगा कि मुल्क में बदअमनी नहीं होगी।

दूसरी बात जो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि होली पर आप जानते हैं कि लोग होली खेलते हैं और उसमें कभी कभी कुछ ज्यादाती भी हो जाती है लेकिन उससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता। हम मिनिस्टर साहब और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब को यह सुनकर दुःख होगा कि अभी होली के मौके पर हलवार एरोड्रोम पर किसी फौजी मद्रासी भाई ने होली खेलते हुए एक सिख भाई पर रंग डाल दिया जो वहां काम का मनेजर था। इसके बाद वह साहब चले गए और दो दूक भरकर लोगों को ले आए। उन लोगों को शरीफ कहा जाए या क्या कहा जाए मैं नहीं जानता। तो उन लोगों ने इन फौजियों को इस बुरी तरह से पीटा जिसे कि इस मुल्क में जवाहरलाल नेहरू का राज न

हो, नन्दा साहब का राज न हो, कांग्रेस सरकार का राज न हो बल्कि उन गुंडों का राज हो। सरकार को इस वाक्या की इत्तिला आयी होगी और यदि आयी होगी फिर भी कुछ नहीं किया गया तो उसका मुझे बहुत सदमा है। अगर नहीं आयी और सरकार इतनी गाफिल है तो उसका भी मुझे सदमा है। लेकिन अगर फौजियों का मोरेल गिर जाएगा तो इस मुल्क में कुछ भी बनने वाला नहीं है। इतना रुपया खर्च करने के बाद अगर इस मुल्क में गुन्डागिरी बिल्कुल हो ही नहीं तो वह बहुत ही अच्छी है, लेकिन अगर गुन्डागिरी कुछ हो तो कम से कम उसका असर ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि फौजियों का मोरेल गिर जाए।

तीसरी अर्ज यह करना चाहता हूँ कि १६ वर्ष हमारे शरणार्थी भाइयों को आये हुए हो गए हैं। उन्होंने अपनी झोंपड़ियां मंदिरों में बनाई जहां कि कबरे भी वहां बनाई और कुछ काम धन्धे में लग गए।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' : मरघट में भी बनायीं।

श्री अब्दुल गनी : इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि उन्होंने सब जगह बनायीं मरघट में भी बनायीं। लेकिन अब जहां वह पड़े हुए हैं वहां से भी उनको उजाड़ा जा रहा है। मेरी यह समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह रोज उजाड़ने का जो यह काम है यही क्या आपके जिम्मे है। यह आपने बड़ा एहसान किया था कि जो भाई उजड़कर आये थे उनको आपने पनाह दी थी। लेकिन अब मिनिस्टरी में बैठे बैठे क्या लोग यह सोचते हैं कि किसको उजाड़ा जाए और कहां से उजाड़ा जाए। इस तरफ तवज्जो देने की जरूरत है कि जो रुपया आप खर्च करना चाहते हैं उसमें से सिर्फ एक आधा परसेंट उनको

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

लिए भी खर्च कीजिये ताकि उनको दिक्कत न आए और यह हर रोज शरणार्थियों को उजाड़ने की जो बात है यह खत्म हो।

इसके बाद जो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि ईस्ट पाकिस्तान को छोड़कर कुछ भाई आ रहे हैं। वह खुशी से नहीं आ रहे हैं। वह अपनी जायदादों को खुशी से छोड़कर नहीं आ रहे हैं। उनके लिए आप क्या इन्तजाम कर रहे हैं। क्या इसी तरह इन्तजाम होगा कि यहां जो मुसलमान हैं उनकी भी हम हिफाजत न कर पाएं। तो इसके लिए पहले से कुछ फिफ्ट कीजिये। इस एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल को मंजूरी के बाद आपको बड़ा अधिकार होगा और आप उनकी हिफाजत कीजिए। उनका खयाल रखिए जो आ रहे हैं ताकि यहां जो पड़े हैं उनको तकलीफ न हो।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

आखिरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि टेलीफोन और टेलीग्राफ का जो यह महकमा है उसके मिनिस्टर जब रफ़ी अहमद किदवई साहब थे तो उन्होंने देखते-देखते उसमें इन्कलाब कर दिया था। आज यह हालत है कि आपको कोल बूक करनी हो तो उसमें बहुत परेशानी होती है। सरकार का जो फंड है वह पब्लिक का फंड है लेकिन इतना पैसा खर्च होने पर भी होता यह है कि घण्टी बज रही है और कोई सुनता नहीं है। या तो मुलाजिमीन में कमी कर दी गयी है और उनके पास काम ज्यादा है या उनमें लापरवाही आ गयी है। इन दोनों में जो भी बजह हो उसकी तरफ मुत्तलिका मिनिस्टर साहब को ध्यान देना चाहिए जिससे कि लोगों को तकलीफ न हो।

मैं भागव साहब से इस बात में बिल्कुल मुत्तफिक हूँ कि पं० जवाहरलाल

नेहरू ने साईंस की तरफ बड़ी तबज्जो दी है। लेकिन आप यह अन्दाजा कीजिए कि हमारा मौरेल कहां तक उठा है। आज ही 'हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स' में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के एक बड़े नेता मि० डांगे के बारे में चंद बातें आयी हैं। उनको सरकारी नुमाइन्दा होने का शर्फ हासिल था और अब भी कुछ सरकारी नुमाइन्दा होने का शर्फ हासिल है। लेकिन उनके सिलसिले में जो चन्द दस्तावेज हैं उनके बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि फोज्द डाकू-मैट है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि नन्दा साहब इन कागजात को खराब नहीं होने देंगे। क्योंकि इससे अन्देश होता है कि आज की सरकार किसी तरह से बड़ी बड़ी सियासी पार्टियों के नेताओं को खरीदती है। यह एक बड़ा अहम सवाल है जो आज 'हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स' ने उठाया है। सरकार की तबज्जो सब तरफ जाती है, बेशक जाए। हमारे डा० राममनोहर लोहिया या जो उनके साथी हैं उनकी तरफ सरकार की तबज्जो जाती है। लेकिन उन बातों की तरफ भी जाये और वह देखें कि वह डाकूमैट फोज्द हैं या नहीं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि नन्दा साहब कुछ मौका निकाल कर उन डाकूमैट्स को देखेंगे।

लाइसेंस के मुत्तलिक जैसा कि मैं पहल भी अर्ज कर चुका हूँ कि आप अपने आदमियों को देना चाहें तो दें। उस में मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है लेकिन कम से कम यह देखभाल करके दें कि लाइसेंस डिजर्विंग लोगों को मिलते हैं या नहीं। अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो देश को आप खतरे में डालते हैं। देश की हिफाजत को खतरे में डालते हैं। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर साहब इस सिलसिले में मेरा साथ देंगे कि देश का अगर किसी तरह अपमान होता हो तो इस अपमान से देश को बचाना चाहिए और इस तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये। इस तरह से जो फौज पर आप इतना रुपया खर्च करते जा रहे हैं

[श्री अवदल गनी]

उम्में आप किसी तरह की तमीज़ न कीजिये। देशद्रोही और देशभक्त में जरूर तमीज़ कीजिये लेकिन और बाकी बातों में कोई तमीज़ न कीजिये। नन्दा साहब से उस दिन बड़ी भूल हुई थी। काश्मीर के बारे में जब वो कह रहे थे कि मुवे मुबारिक की चोरी किसने की। तो उन्होंने पहले गुलाम मोहम्मद बट का नाम लिया और यह कहा कि वह पाकिस्तान का है; फिर शाम को उन्होंने इसकी तरदीद कर दी और कहा कि वह गुलाम मोहम्मद बट नहीं है बल्कि कादिर बट है। इस मुल्क के ४५ करोड़ बन्दगाने खुदा की हिफाजत का ठेका लेकर के आप इस तरह से गलत इत्तला देते हैं तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या नन्दा साहब ने इस बारे में कोई तहकीकात की कि किसने यह गलत इत्तला दी थी और जिसने गलत इत्तला दी थी उसके खिलाफ क्या कार्यवाही की गयी। अगर आप सर्विसेज़ बढ़ाने के लिए कहते हैं तो हम कहते हैं कि जरूर बढ़ाइये आप टैक्स बढ़ाने के लिए कहते हैं तो हम कहते हैं कि जरूर बढ़ाए ताकि देश का भला हो। लेकिन अगर इस तरह के अफसरों को लेकर के आप चलना चाहते हैं जो गलत इत्तला देते हैं तो मुझे डर है कि देश तरक्की नहीं करेगा बल्कि देश गिर जायेगा और देश अगर डूबेगा तो हम सब डूबेंगे। इसलिए नन्दा साहब ने जो इतनी गैर जिम्मेदारी की बात किसी के कहने पर कह दी उस पर कुछ एक्शः होना चाहिए।

आखिरी बात मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि दो सौ वर्ष में लार्ड हेस्टिग्स के बाद या लार्ड क्लाइव के बाद यह पहली इन्क्वायरी है जो श्री एस० आर० दास की बेठी है। इसमें सरकार को दिलचस्पी लेनी चाहिये। सरकार ने बिठाई है, मेरे अर्ज करने पर बिठाई सही लेकिन सरकार ने बिठाई है। उनके एडवोकेट जनरल को जाना चाहिए, उनके सीलीमिटर जनरल को जाना चाहिए, उनकी

इन्टेलिजेंसिया को जाना चाहिए और वहां जाकर केस की रहनुमाई करनी चाहिए। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि सरकार इस तरफ भी कुछ न कुछ थोड़ा ध्यान देगी क्योंकि दो सौ वर्ष में यह पहला मौका है कि चीफ मिनिस्टर का इम्पीचमेंट हो रहा है, उसको कटघरे में खड़ा किया गया हो। अगर वह वेगुनाह है तो उसकी मदद की जाय और गुनाहगार है तो उसको चलता किया जाये।

मेें शुक्रिया भी अदा करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर मेरी छोटी छोटी गहरी बातों की तरफ जरूर ध्यान देगी।]

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am sorry that this Supplementary Grant debate has been utilised for so many general observations. Some of these observations have been very unfair. The Finance Minister, Sir, does not need my protection at all. He is capable of defending himself courageously, boldly and with conviction. The hon. Member should have really seen, and should have been really touched by, the spirit behind the speech of the Finance Minister yesterday. What happened yesterday and this morning has not made anybody happy. But I would only submit through you to the hon. Member that if he really expects this kind of objectivity and consideration from this side of the House, in all fairness to us he should show the same consideration and, sometimes, indulgence. I am not trying to attack him in any way. I would not do so, and I am sure he will also not give me any cause for provocation because I would refuse to be provoked. All the same I think he should not have taken the sheer meaning of the word.

Sir, let us go back to the history of the incident which happened this morning. I think everybody is sorry and the Finance Minister also would be rather unhappy about this incident. But I would only submit this that some hon. Member from his party

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.] made certain remarks very humorously. But at that time the temper of the House was a little high and the Finance Minister, when he was replying to the debate, was replying in a very serious mood to the debate. When he wanted to explain certain phenomena and when he was explaining the reason and the basis behind the criticisms that had been levelled against him, namely, that his Budget was not enough of a socialist Budget, he was trying to explain—so that he need have not to prove his *bona fides* again and again to this House or anybody else because he is convinced about the policy of the party to which he is responsible primarily.—certain points. He made certain remarks. The hon. Member opposite immediately got up and made certain other unfortunate remarks and said something in relation to black, what colour he had and so on. (Interruption). Please allow me to speak. I am sorry. The hon. Member may not have meant that. But the impression that he created was rather an unfortunate impression, and the expression used by the hon. Member was quite a provoking expression. After that some other remarks were made by the Finance Minister. Now, if the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta feels that the Finance Minister made a remark which was not very fair to his party, is it not also obligatory on his part, as the leader of his party, to check his own Members not to use such remarks about anybody else in the House, maybe a Minister, maybe an ordinary Member, because the privileges of the Members and the Ministers are not different in this House? Therefore, in all earnestness I would beg of the leader of the Communist Party to be as generous with other Members of the House in remarks as he is to his own Members. He should, as leader of his own party, have really got up and said that he did not welcome the remark and he should have requested the Chair that both these remarks, the remark by his own party Member and probably the remark, the after-effect as it came

out from the Finance Minister, were unfortunate. If he had done that, I think he would have done a service to the House by giving example of decorum and dignity.

I know the hon. Member is a very nice person, straightforward, honest, and a man of deep conviction, a person who is very, very courteous. All the same I would certainly say that he is as much responsible for this unfortunate incident as anybody else and it is, I think, obligatory . . .

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: He is primarily responsible, not "as much responsible".

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Sir, I think the hon. Member should not really take to his heart that the hon. Finance Minister meant really that all these people who are sitting opposite are traitors. He should not really go by the word as it has been expressed but by the inner meaning, by the expression, by the genuineness of his remarks which followed afterwards. Therefore, in the midst of his speech he also said that ultimately he had made Mr. Bhupesh Gupta smile. A person with some sort of vengeance, as the hon. Member pointed out this morning, could not have really made this remark, namely, that ultimately he has been able to make Mr. Bhupesh Gupta smile. So while feeling that the whole incident has been rather unfortunate, that heat has been generated in the House, I would submit to him to forget about the whole thing and to accept the spirit of the whole incident, the genuineness behind that because probably it was nobody's intention to have this kind of incident in the House. I think now that he has cooled down, he would himself probably think that he has not been very, very generous to the Finance Minister in his remarks.

He started digging the back history. The pages of the back history can be uncomfortable to anybody and everybody if you present those facts:

out of context We were really not having a debate on the Mundhra affair We were not bringing in the issues which followed Therefore, to raise something out of context and present it before the House is not really very fair Let us really not dig back the history because the moment we start indulging in this many things can be said about many people which will not be very palatable and comfortable to anybody including the Members of his party

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Do say whatever you find

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA I would not like to .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I welcome it

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA because I feel that it would be very unfair on my part also to go and indulge in such things as it is unfair on the part of the hon Member opposite We were not indulging in any such debate

It has been explained time and again—it is not for me to explain because it has been already explained—that the Finance Minister had no responsibility in the Mundhra deal

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA It was said by Mr Chagla I did not say That is what I read And he said that it was most unfortunate that while answering questions the Minister did not think it proper to place all the facts fully before the Lok Sabha

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA Minister, unfortunately because the Minister is always considered technically responsible for all that the department does

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I did not say that Mr Chagla said that

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA It is his misfortune or fortune to be the Minister of a particular department And if something happens,

technically he is also responsible And it is because of the technicalities that he resigned and went out It was not that he was sacked This expression also of Mr Bhupesh Gupta was rather unfair He used the expression "sacked" Nobody ever sacked him He went out on his own because he thought that technically he has been responsible for that

Then, Sir, I would like to clear the misunderstanding of Mr Bhupesh Gupta (*Interruption*) Please He said that he gave licence to foreign investors and he gave an assurance to the President of the World Bank, Mr Eugene Black, that minority participation would be given May I remind the hon Member, who is so vigilant in his expression, why he did not read the statement which came from the Ministry of Finance the next day when the news appeared? Immediately after the allegation was published that the Finance Minister had given an assurance to the President of the World Bank that minority participation will be given, the next day the clarification was issued from the Ministry of Finance that that particular news was incorrect No assurance has been given to the World Bank that the minority participation would be given up I think in his reply to the Budget .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Did Mr Jha one of the Secretaries, write the letter?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA We are always in constant contact with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund I do not think it is at all improper and nobody can question the right of the Government of India to have correspondence with the World Bank because we are in constant touch with each other to understand the economic problems, possibilities and prospects The World Bank has taken the initiative about foreign participation and foreign investments The World Bank has taken initiative in bringing the friendly countries and forming an 'India Consortium'

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha] and therefore we are in constant touch with the World Bank authorities, and there is no inhibition I should say that we are in constant touch with the World Bank but what is there to be ashamed of? I think it is the right of the Government to have proper contacts with the World Bank and such other international agencies which are helpful to us in financial aid being available to this country

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA That is not the point. The letter was giving an assurance that I have referred to. I am not challenging your right to keeping contact with the World Bank or for that matter with anybody.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA A contradiction which has been issued from the Ministry has categorically denied that any such assurance has been given to anybody that the minority participation would be given. The hon Member should have read this and then he should have come prepared about that.

Secondly, I do not think that if any authority gives encouragement to foreign participation, while preserving the Industrial Policy Resolution of our country, there is anything wrong in it. What wrong has been done? It is the duty of the Finance Ministry to assure the countries which are really giving us financial assistance to make them feel that their money which will be invested here, the participation that would be available to them, would be safe in our hands and that is an assurance which the Government not only has to give today but the Government has to fulfil its obligations for all times to come.

I would also like to inform the hon Member that Mr Krishnamachari has made it very very clear that the financial participation that will be discussed and considered would be on the basis of those industries where the financial participation is very necessary or the foreign investment is very necessary for the fulfilment of the

objectives of our Industrial Policy and which will be very necessary for the general prosperity of this country. He also said this that he would be very careful in making a selective approach whereby the foreign participation should be allowed. I think this should have satisfied the hon Member. I think the hon Member would not have really raised his point because he did not raise it in the Budget debate but this was because of provocation. There is something very nice about the hon Member but sometimes when he gets provoked, he becomes a very combustible object. I think he was in a bad mood, I think it was momentary and it would not remain with him for very long.

Coming to the other points which the hon Members have raised, Shri Patel raised the point that Gujarat has not been given full justice in regard to financial assistance. I would like to inform him that the allotment of Central assistance for the current year is Rs 18.50 crores and for the next year it is Rs 21.95 crores. This includes assistance for power and other schemes included in the Plan outlay agreed to for the respective years. The allocation which has been provided by the Government of India has been made after mutual discussions and consultations. The demands of all the States are much larger than the availability of funds and therefore when we have to share, we have to share keeping in view our own limitation or lack of resources at our disposal. There has been no unfair treatment so far as Gujarat is concerned.

Then Shri Patel mentioned about the provision under Demand No 133. I would like to tell him that this Demand has been asked for because the expenditure involved a new service and hence the Supplementary Demand was required. At the same time the expenditure can be met—he will see from the Demand itself—from the savings within the Grants of the Ministry and hence it is not a new Demand. It is a token adjust-

ment of one sum to another channel and therefore this is a token Grant that has been sought.

شروی عبدالغنی : کیا کجرات سے انصاف کرنے کے لئے سواراجی ڈیسائی کو پھر کیبلٹ میں لیا جا رہا ہے -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : क्या गुजरात से इन्साफ करने के लिये मरारजी देसाई साहब को फिर कैबिनेट में लाया जा रहा है ?]

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : मैं तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर हूँ नहीं कि मैं इसका जवाब दे सकूँ।

शروی عبدالغنی : خدا کرے آپ پرانے مینسٹر بلین اور سواراجی ڈیسائی صاحب کی بے انصافی دور ہو -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : खुदा करे आप प्राइम मिनिस्टर बनें और मरारजी देसाई साहब की बेइन्साफी दूर हो।]

श्री ती त. रफ़ेद्वरी सिन्हा : इससे तो आपकी बात का कोई ताल्लुक ही नहीं था इसलिए इस बात को छोड़ने की ज़रूरत ही नहीं थी।

Then Shri Sapru and one other Member raised about water-supply schemes. I would like to inform the hon. Member who is not at present in the House, that though this matter is primarily the concern of the State Government, the next year's Central Budget includes a provision of Rs. 7 crores for Grants and Rs. 15 crores for Loans to the States for water-supply schemes. The schemes, I am sure, will form a part of the plans which are annually reviewed during the annual plan discussions and most of the State Governments would really keep to the schedule of allotment of expenditure

on water supply schemes and they would not delay the extension of the water supply schemes.

Then I must say, now that you are in the Chair, that you have very rightly pointed out about the importance of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. A token demand they had asked for previously. Due to the emergency they had asked for a smaller sum but later on they realised that the requirements for conducting research is very necessary—and you have yourself pointed out how it is very necessary—and some very useful work is being done. I am grateful to you for making such commendatory remarks about the researches being conducted. The Grants which were reduced have been asked to be restored and therefore some additional Grant has been asked for. The position was reviewed from time to time so as to enable the C.S.I.R. to meet its essential requirements and that is why their Budget estimates were raised to Rs. 678 lakhs for recurring expenditure and Rs. 434 lakhs for capital expenditure in November 1963. To meet the increased expenditure a Government grant of Rs. 630 lakhs (Recurring) and Rs. 430 lakhs (Capital) was found necessary and there have been various details and I would not like to take the time of the House in indicating all those branches in which the expenditure is likely to be incurred but they are very useful details and the hon. Member probably would also know from the various reports of the Ministry how much useful work has been done under this.

I would only like to say one thing and that is, during the First and Second Five Year Plan periods the Council established 26 national laboratories and institutes. For the Third Plan period, provision has been for 26 laboratories and institutes, etc.

I would also like to inform the House that a Scientists' Pool has been set up. It has been set up for quite some time—in 1958—with an initial

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.] strength of 100 posts. This limit was raised by the Government of India from time to time and it was last fixed at 500 in June, 1962. Even this limit has since been removed by the Government of India with the direction that as many suitable persons as may return from foreign countries should be absorbed in the Scientists' Pool. The number of persons actually working in the Pool as on 1st February 1964 is 487. And really this Ministry has kept the open-door policy about providing all facilities for the scientists who want to come back home and work in this country.

There is another point which was raised by some hon. Members and that is about what they call these under-estimating of revenues and the over-estimating of expenditure. I would like to explain to the House that time and again this remark is made as if we are at fault. The actual position is that the Budget estimates are framed on the basis of data, the best that can be available, about fourteen or fifteen months in advance of the close of the year to which they relate. In between what happens is that some times there are changes in the import policy, changes in the flow of trade, in the production levels, and also in the rates of clearance. These vary and sometimes the consumption levels fall or rise, and profits from trade and industry also vary. All these variable factors make the proposition not very definite and some variations are natural in these circumstances. Therefore the actual position as it turns out later on might be very much different from what was anticipated at the time the Budget was being framed and these cause consequential repercussions on the realisation of the revenues. Similarly, there are other factors affecting the estimates in the Budget. For instance, there is the recruitment of technical staff, the procurement of supplies and materials especially from abroad which do not depend on us only. There are also so many variations in the price levels and all these affect

the accuracy of our estimates of revenue and of expenditure. Therefore, I would like to assure the House that there has never been any deliberate attempt on the part of the Ministry to under-estimate revenues or to over-estimate the expenditure.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If the hon. Deputy Minister will permit one interruption, I was only quoting from the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. Minister laboured to show that these estimates are made a long time before. But I want to know whether any estimates of expenditure are ever made which are less? Everytime it has always been the other way round and that is why this spiral of prices goes up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Give her some time.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: This really takes us back to the question of prices and I cannot deal with that just now. Yesterday, the Finance Minister had replied to this particular point and he devoted considerable time to this subject. I do not want to add anything to what he has said. I was myself coming to the comments of the Public Accounts Committee. It is only in deference to the views of the Public Accounts Committee that we have made special attempts to increase the revenue receipts and reduce the expenditure relating to the coming year. I would like to take the hon. Member back to the speech of the Finance Minister in which he has made a reference to this point. It is hoped that the variations to which the hon. Members have referred will be considerably reduced in the coming year.

I think, you, Sir, when you were speaking, made some remarks relating to the Posts and Telegraphs Department. So far as the larger expenditure items are concerned, this expenditure has been on account of the pay and allowances and also the increase in the expenditure on contingencies and increase in the expenditure on petty and other works

debitable to revenue. And last but not the least important is the matter to which I myself made a pointed reference when I was introducing this subject, namely, the larger contribution to the Telephone Development Fund. That is why this Supplementary Demand is being asked for. This is also due to the new additional posts in the P. & T. Department justified on the basis of the standards which have been prescribed for the Department. Travelling allowance is not the only item under which the expenditure has increased. There is also the children's education allowance, the reimbursement of medical expenses, overtime allowances and so on. These have gone up and the amount which was anticipated originally could not be adhered to because the expenditure under these items has been more than what was actually anticipated. But I think this House would not grudge the expenditure under these items because they are items of human interest and the House always welcomes provision for additional facilities to the members of the staff. There is also increased expenditure on compensatory and house rent allowances admissible to the staff stationed in eight big cities. Since the notification about these cities was done, additional funds had to be provided for giving compensatory and house rent allowances. These are reasons why there has been an increase in the expenditure.

So far as the other things you have mentioned, Sir, I am not in a position to say categorically what have actually been the facts of the case. I will certainly ask the Ministry to examine the facts you have mentioned and try to verify the truth of the thing and if it is necessary, take appropriate action.

With these words, I express my gratitude to hon. Members and once again I submit through you to the hon. Member not to really take that word of the Finance Minister to heart, but to forget and forgive about it. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1963-64, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments.

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: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to speak again with no remorse for what had happened, no regrets whatever I would have expressed it had the Finance Minister come and expressed his own regret. What did I do yesterday? I asked for the expunction of the words uttered by the Finance Minister which were patently under the Rules unparliamentary *per se* defamatory under Rule 220. Even that was not done. Not only that, but the Finance Minister persisted in his utterance and that is why we had to hit back, and we Communists would be worth nothing if we did not know how to hit back when we are hit upon. That is why I say I would not like to bear the card of the Communist Party if that party does not teach us how to deal with a situation of this kind in the militant spirit of the working class. That is what I say.

I appreciate the manner in which the hon. Deputy Minister has spoken, but that was missing altogether yesterday. Even now I have not got

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
that word expunged. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel spoke about the dignity of the House. Yes, there is the dignity of the House, but you cannot have the dignity of the House if you attack the Opposition in this manner. We are here by the will of the people. In three general elections we have been returned to Parliament as the first Opposition Party. We are entitled to some measure of courtesy. I must say, as far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he never uses such expressions. In these twelve years we have had occasions to annoy him, to seriously contradict some of his things, cause irritation in him; but I must say that he never used such an expression. But with people of much lesser calibre, not so sure of their ground, this sort of a thing comes. Anyhow, that is how things happen.

Well, as far as the word uttered by my colleague is concerned, it was not unparliamentary. You may say it was improper, but it certainly was not unparliamentary. And what the Finance Minister said, was it in a serious mood? He said there were red Communists, pink Communists, pale pink Communists and so on. He said there are some pink people in his own party. Is this the way he deals with his own party in a serious way? He was frivolous in the extreme and naturally frivolity was met with a repartee which went home and he lost his temper. I thought Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari had intelligence enough to find some parliamentary language, but yesterday he could not do so and he used a thoroughly impermissible unparliamentary language. But we know that every time Mr. Krishnamachari abuses us our stock goes up. We know that if a class enemy like that praises us, then there is something wrong with us. If that class enemy criticises and attacks us we at least know that we are on sure grounds. I spoke in the interests of the House. If he had withdrawn it nothing would have happened; if it had been expunged, nothing would have happen-

ed. Read what he said yesterday. I heard it but somebody said that he did not say it but the proceedings of yesterday bear out what I said. Exactly what I said he had said, he had said. I heard it correctly. Others I do not know whether they heard it correctly or not but they opposed me. Do you think that that is the way to maintain the dignity of the House, to allow a leading member of the Government to say such things and then when I object to it to say that I am not correctly reading his words? Here I have the proceedings of the House to substantiate what I had said and I must say that word for word I have been proved to be correct, as far as yesterday is concerned.

Now, I am surprised at the hon. lady Deputy Minister. Did this House reject the Chagla Commission's Report? No, we did not. In this House and in the other House we discussed it and on the whole we accepted it. Remember it. The hon. lady Deputy Minister said that I was not right in what I said, that Mr. Krishnamachari was only technically responsible, not really responsible for the Mundhra deal. Well, you had your Attorney-General, advised by the Government, to argue on behalf of the Government before the Chagla Commission and since the hon. lady Deputy Minister said it, I will just read out a few words. Referring to Mr. D. L. Mazumdar's evidence before the Chagla Commission Mr. Setalvad said:

"He (that is, Mr. Mazumdar) told us in categorical terms that the Finance Ministry knew about the antecedents of Shri Mundhra, about the way in which he was trying to build up an industrial empire and the dubious methods he was resorting to further his end."

Then Mr. Setalvad, the Attorney-General, said:

"These two gentlemen, the Finance Minister and the Principal Finance Secretary, played an important role in finalising the deal of June 1957."

Am I right or am I wrong? I am only repeating what the Government representative, the Attorney-General of India, said in his argument on behalf of the Government before the Chagla Commission. Why blame me of misleading the House? You forget what you have done, what you instructed him to say. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I regret that the lady said such things. I read this and kept it for seven years. I have treasured this document and I will continue to do so as long as I live because this shows the stock that we have some times in the Treasury Benches. I wish Mr. Chagla were here. He said, in his final judgement:

"It is difficult to believe that when the Minister was in Bombay and easily available and when Shri Patel was advising the Corporation to enter into the largest transaction it had so far entered into in history and that too with a man whose antecedents Shri Patel knew, he would act on his own responsibility without obtaining the approval of the Minister."

Not my words. Again, not my words. Then again he said that the full facts had not been placed, the Attorney-General and Mr. Chagla said that the full facts had not been placed. Again, these are not my words. These are the words of the Attorney-General. sometimes, Madam Deputy Chairman . . . Oh, I am sorry. She is in my mind too much, Madam Deputy Minister, why blame me? I cannot understand it. Here is Mr. Setalvad who says,

"I have a feeling that the whole truth has not been told to us about the deal".

These are the words of the Attorney-General, on your instruction. What does Mr. Chagla say? He said:

"I have the same feeling from the beginning to the end".

After that, the hon. Minister comes here and tells that I am trying to mislead the House. No, I was not. Therefore, I am sorry that I have to refer to it but if Mr. Krishnamachari continues in this phase this shall be brought to your notice time and again, a reminder to the nation that such men occupy such important positions. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not wish to say much about the other things. She tried to answer some of the points. Now, these are non-provocative subjects, perhaps.

Here, a letter has been written and according to our information, an assurance was given that facilities will be given to the private foreign investor. According to us Mr. Jha had taken the initiative in the matter. She is going to consult somebody. Do it. According to our information, Mr. Bhoothalingam and Mr. Jha are the two officers now who are building up Mr. Krishnamachari in the new phase but may I ask Mr. Jha and Mr. Bhoothalingam to remember their colleagues, Mr. H. M. Patel and Mr. Kamat? Mr. Krishnamachari will drop them like hot potatoes if need be, if such a course is needed, to save his skin. It is their business, that of Mr. Bhoothalingam and Mr. Jha; they know it better but I think they should learn a lesson from the past. Here, I said, in his letter to the President of the World Bank, in September, 1956, the Finance Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, assured the foreign investor:

"We are undertaking a comprehensive review of the policies and procedures that inhibit foreign private investment".

That is what Mr. Krishnamachari is saying today and so this is nothing new. He had said this thing in a letter which I have just quoted, that they were changing the policy of the Government, taxation and other policies in order to make it easier for foreign private investment to come in. Now, having done this thing, he is having now another greater scheme.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

That is our complaint. It had been going on all this while. Now, taking advantage of the difficulties of the Third Five Year Plan, especially in the sector of foreign exchange resources, Mr Krishnamachari thought that 'now is the time to fully implement this policy and get them to come in'. The country is always told that unless we allow them we are not in a position to carry through the projects and so on. Well, we cannot accept that argument. I think we should explore the possibilities for getting state aid, not the kind of private investment. You have been a Member of this House. Mr Vice-Chairman and you know that the oil companies wanted permission to expand their refining capacity, Mr Malaviya did not allow it and we, from both sides of the House, opposed permission being given to them for expansion. Permission sought by Burmah-Shell and other companies. Now, we find that they are being allowed to expand and not only that but the private foreign investor is being brought into the public sector in Cochin, Madras and other places. Negotiations are going on in the petrochemical industry to allow foreign private capital to come in and participate in the public sector even. We were opposed, all of us many here, to private sector investment in the public sector even when the investor was Indian. Today, we have modified that policy also in favour of the foreign investor. That is the new thing. I had participated in the Consultative Committee discussions when the First Plan was being framed, when the Second Plan was being framed and when the Third Plan was being framed and the Prime Minister formed a small committee as you know, consisting of representatives of all the parties where the basic policies were discussed. We were given to understand exactly the opposite of what is happening today that the public sector will go on as a public sector without having anything to do with the private sector by way of equity parti-

cipation and so on. Mr Krishnamachari tries to make out from the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 as if there is no basic departure from it. He has twisted the word in such a manner as to justify equity participation. I have carefully read that Resolution and I can tell you—and all hon members can read it—that if you read it, it certainly is flexible to some extent but it does not allow equity participation of foreign private capital in the public sector of India. You may have parallel development. You may allow certain things to be undertaken simultaneously in both public and private sector but the Resolution did not envisage at all that in the public sector private investment will take place. It is a serious modification, I say. Then he said 'well, minority participation, we control it'. Yes, we know that when the State power is in our hands we are in a position to exercise some control. I agree with that but that control becomes nominal. And why should I allow minority participation? Suppose we have 51 per cent and the foreigners have 49 per cent and we make a profit of Rs 1 crore. On an average calculation the foreigners will take away Rs 49 lakhs and we shall be entitled to Rs 51 lakhs. Out of our resources, out of our labour, from our mines, from our oil fields and so on they will take away such huge profits. Therefore it is not just a quantitative proposition from the point of view of equation of capital holding. It is a question of earning and as you will see, these are our capital accumulations, this one crore, if the whole thing will come into our hands is our capital accumulation. Out of that capital accumulation Rs 49 lakhs will be in the hands of the foreigners. We have given them a guarantee that we shall not touch it and that they can take it away. These are the terms. Would it not affect our industrial development, restrict capital formation in the country, and dissipate our resources? If it had been in our hands we could have reinvested it for

industrial expansion in this very line or in other desired channels. Therefore I would ask hon Members to consider it from this angle. Today in the total paid up company capital of India foreign holding is 20 per cent. It is not a matter of joke. Out of every five rupees of shareholdings in the country one goes to the foreigner of the country. Such is the position. Must we increase it? Or must we diminish it? Mr Krishnamachari, I regret to say, has taken the line of increasing it and that causes the greatest concern in the country.

Yesterday there was a report in the 'Patriot' that certain defence industries and other things also are going to them. So an all-out effort is being made and they are told, 'come and take as much as you can' whereas we are committed to build the entire defence potential in the public sector. Now talks are going on in that sphere also to make over certain sectors of defence industries to the private sector and that too foreign private sector. Mr Vice-Chairman these are important policy questions. You always think that we speak with some malice. I speak with no personal malice, I tell you I speak on the basis of policies. I am opposed to Mr Krishnamachari not because Mr Krishnamachari is a Tamil brahmin or I am a kayasth or I come from some other part. I am opposed to him because of his policy. Mr Krishnamachari symbolises the spirit of monopoly in our economy and he encourages the depredations of monopolistic concerns in our economy. He is the symbol of monopoly capital which has already become very powerful in the economy of India. Therefore we are opposed to him. We want to storm that centre of monopoly capital whether in the economic life or in the political life of the country. That is why we criticise him. So please do not misunderstand. You know that he called our entire party traitors. I never use such word against Congress members. Why should I call them traitors? Even if I had something to say against Mr Krishnamachari I

will never say that against Congress Members as such whatever may be the provocation. We are younger in age, Mr Niren Ghosh was young in age but did he say that the Congress Party is a party of traitors or the Congress members are traitors or every Congress member is a traitor? Never will we say such a thing. We are not politically trained that way. We know how to fight but we know how to fight with clean hands standing on principles. We criticise the Ministers on the Treasury Benches all the time and certainly we concentrate our attack on Mr Krishnamachari because he holds the portfolio of Finance. Mr Krishnamachari says it is the Prime Minister's policy and he has his blessings. True, we know that it is the Prime Minister's policy. For the Government policy the Prime Minister is responsible but in that set-up he is the Finance Minister and he must have a specific responsibility. In this matter the collective responsibility is of the Government and the Prime Minister is answerable for it but the Finance Minister in matters of finance is personally responsible. Well as you have seen, when Christian Keeler appeared on the horizon, it was Mr Profumo who went first and then went Mr Macmillan. That is how it happens. Nobody said that the Prime Minister should resign first. Naturally when we criticise, we criticise the Government policy but in various other respects the Finance Minister has initiative in his hands and therefore we criticise him as well.

Mr Vice-Chairman I do not wish to say anything on this but still I should strike a note of warning. Well again I am reminded of Shakespeare 'Yon Cassius has a lean and hungry look such men are dangerous'. Mr Krishnamachari has a lean and hungry look and in our economic and political life such men are dangerous. Well let the Congress members and others in the country take note of it. I know that he has tried to please the vocal section of the community by some kind of manipulation in his

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] budgetary proposals and let us not be carried away by it. Somebody compared the Budget to the Mona Lisa smile. What else could be a more atrocious analogy than this? The Mona Lisa smile attracts everybody. I have seen the Mona Lisa portrait in Paris and whatever meaning you read into it all are attracted by that smile. Mr Krishnamachari's Budget is not a Mona Lisa smile for the common people and the country. It is a Mona Lisa smile no doubt but it is a Mona Lisa smile for the monopolist and the foreign monopolist. It is a cynical sneer at the common man and it shows contempt for the intelligence of the common people. He thinks he can bribe away a section of the community by giving some little relief, some allowance through the Budget proposals but we have greater faith in the patriotism, good sense and understanding of our people and that is why in all parts of the country today the working people are rising in protest against high prices, asking for dearness allowance and for rise in wages, for nationalisation of banks, constituting a challenge to the policy of the Government and the policy of Mr Krishnamachari in particular. That battle is going to be fought and I once again appeal to the House that Mr Krishnamachari should be watched with eyes open and maximum vigilance should be exercised against him. I do not mean anything personally. I have not said anything about his personal matter. I do not say anything about his friendship with Mr Goenka at all. Not at all, I won't say anything about it. Everybody knows that when he was not in the Ministry he spent his evenings in Mr Goenka's house playing cards and so on. I do not mention it at all. But we have to deal with Mr Krishnamachari as the former Finance Minister and as Finance Minister even now.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: We are not mentioning your relations with China also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have mentioned all kinds of things in the last two years. You have mentioned it many times but the trouble is you have not gone very far. I shall see how you do in Kerala. We are waiting for it. Have the election, don't postpone it. We shall meet there.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: You have already embraced the Muslim League.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is all right. We are ready for it because the Kerala Congressmen, some of them, need a lesson.

Therefore, Mr Vice-Chairman, I am grateful to you. Under your Chairmanship at least my part of the debate has gone very smoothly always. I have always thought that you know how to deal with a person like me. I may be a bad man and perhaps many of you have to deal with bad men also sometimes. Do not always deal with good men like Mr Krishnamachari. That is all I can say. As you know we demanded his presence in the course of this debate but throughout the day he never bothered to come here. That is how he treats the House. It is not disrespect shown to me but shown to you. You spoke on this subject. He was not even good enough to come here for five minutes at least to see what you say, at least to make a gesture. Never will he come, he knows he has got on the top of the world and he shall sit there as long as some scandal or something or other comes and drags him down and puts him back from where he has come. That is the position.

Therefore, Mr Vice-Chairman, I say that Mr Krishnamachari calls for the utmost vigilance. He is a danger signal. His very existence is a challenge in the Government, challenge to the wholesome forces of democratic public opinion in the country, of patriotic public opinion in the country. I do not mean any party here. And I think that challenge has to be met with unity and courage, unity of

all those who stand for progress and progressive orientation in our policy courage on the part of those who know how to fight such manoeuvres and contrivances that Mr. Krishnamachari is capable of producing before the country in order to mislead the people and get on with his policies. His policies spell disaster to the country. Therefore, I say it has to be fought every inch. There will not be a Session when Mr. Krishnamachari will not be fought. We have taken the challenge from our party and we propose to fight him, no matter whether it is in the factories and fields, in the streets and villages, in Assemblies and in Parliament. The Communist Party will carry forward this struggle against all that Mr. Krishnamachari stands for and seek the unity of all right minded people in order to see that the country is rid of this great danger and threat that he poses because of his policies because of his affiliations with the monopolists . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Your challenge is not to Mr. Krishnamachari but to the whole Congress Party and we take that challenge.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Pande, I tell you, I shall not be provoked by you.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: That is very good of you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never do that. I know there are in the Congress Party many honest, decent men democratically-minded people. These sentiments were expressed in Bhubaneswar. It is the leadership, which tramples under foot the noble sentiments of the rank and file of Congressmen. I never do that. But forgive me if I do not put you in that category of that type of Congressmen. Forget me. I know that you have been educated in France, but I do not know in which part of France you were educated.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Paris.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In Paris there are all kinds of centres of education. I do not know whether in the Sorbonne University it was during day or night. (*Interruption.*) Nevertheless, forget it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Gupta, please finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, I say the sentiments are there. I am not blaming the Congressmen. Please understand it. I know the country cannot be saved from the danger that is posed by Mr. Krishnamachari to the Communist Party or the Opposition. The country has to be saved from the manoeuvres, intrigues, conspiracies and dark forces by the combined efforts of all those who stand for progress, whether they belong to a party or to no party. I count upon the right-minded and progressive people in the Congress Party just as they count upon the right-minded people in other Parties. Therefore, my appeal finally before I sit down with a note of warning is one of resolution is one of dedication to our principles and to the cause of the country and, above all, this one of unity, common struggles and common efforts. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Any reply?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I never expected at this stage of the discussion on the Supplementary Grants that the hon. Member Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, would raise all these policy matters. The forum should have been different and the Government could have properly replied to all the points. Once again I would like to repeat this: Why is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta suffering under this kind of misconception that the policy has been the individual policy of Mr. Krishnamachari? It has been the policy of the Finance Minister with the approval of the Cabinet and with the approval of the Prime Minister. Let him be clear. We are very clear in our minds about this and the party is also very clear that it is not the

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.]
personal policy of the Finance Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All the more tragic.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Once again I would like to say with all the strength of my conviction that it is very uncharitable on the part of Members opposite to say that it has been the personal policy of the Finance Minister. Everything has been done with the approval of the Cabinet, with the approval of the Prime Minister and it has not violated the industrial Policy Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So far I never said 'personally'. I said he has initiated it.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Bear with me please. I have borne with his speech when I had enough provocation to comment and make remarks. I have shown him that much indulgence and why should he not do the same? (*Interruption*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Let her continue please.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: It is in no way the Minister's policy. In regard to foreign participation it does not violate the Industrial Policy Resolution. We are aware of it more than the hon. Member.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) No. 2 BILL, 1964

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI S.
V. RAMASWAMY): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain

further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1963-64 for the purposes of Railways, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

In moving that the Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1964, as passed by the Lok Sabha be taken into consideration, I may briefly refer to what is more fully explained on the first three pages of the book of supplementary Demands for Grants for Railways, 1963-64.

At the very outset it should be remembered that the Supplementary Demands aggregate Rs. 55 crores nearly in relation to a total original Budget grant of Rs. 1180 crores. A sum of Rs. 6.75 crores out of the Supplementary Demands covers increased net surplus over the budgeted surplus, which is really not additional expenditure as such but for which a vote is necessary as it is an amount being appropriated to the Development Fund. Even the balance of the Supplementary Demands, aggregating Rs. 48.25 crores, represents a gross amount which is what is taken for the purpose of securing the vote of Parliament, even though the net expenditure after allowing for credits is only Rs. 38.68 crores. The gross budget for instance, covers freight on railway coal and other materials, which is balanced by credits under different Demands.

An analysis of the Supplementary Demands for Grants is as under:—

- (i) Aggregate of Revenue Working Expenses (Supplementary Demands Nos. 4 to 10)—Net additional provision asked for is Rs. 11.97 crores, against the gross amount of Supplementary Demand of Rs. 15.92 crores.
- (ii) Aggregate of the capital Budget covering works (Supplementary Demands Nos. 15 and 16)—Net additional pro-