few case* •where the expenditure is not uniformly spread over the year and larger provision is required to meet the likely payments next month. The items where larger provision is required have been detailed along with the explanations for the additional requirements in para 4 of the Note to the Statement of 'Vote on Account'.

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that there is a little quiet in the House. I do not know what things have been said and what things have been taken down. Once again, 1 shall have to look through every word, full stop, comma, very carefully because 1 may not have fully followed everything. Therefore, I shall reserve the right of expunction when I have read through the proceedings of today.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam, if you would permit me to say a few words, I would like to say that I feel very sorry that such things took place in this House. We have been sitting down patiently and we would like order to be restored in this House. What I personally felt very hurt about was that a Member should ask the Chair to act in a particular manner. I think the Chair should take firm action about this; otherwise, there will be an end to every thing in this House.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : Madarn, I entirely agree with my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel I would like to know what has been your ruling. Either the words spoken by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should he expunged, or he should be asked to withdraw before he c'ome$_s$ ba^k again.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL; Nol expunged; he should withdraw them.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have asked him to withdraw and tlie words should be expunged. I am absolutely in agreement with the observations of the two hon. Members.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India far the services of a part of the financial year 19(54-65, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

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

Clauses 2 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: Madarn, I move;

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

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

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

This Bill arises out of the Supplementary Demands of Rs. 83-46 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on March 11, 1964, and the expenditure of Rs. 95-65 crores charged on the Consolidated Fund of India, as detailed in the Supplementary Demands presented to the House on February 18, 1964 Explanations in support of ihe Demands have, as usual, been given in th$_e$ foot-notes below the Supplementary Demand Statements. I shal. therefore, confine myself to a few introductory remarks.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.] Of the additional provision of Rs. 179' il crores asked for in the current batch of Supplementary Demands, Rs. 34-82 crores are on Revenue Account, Rs. 55*29 crores are for Capital Expenditure and the balance of Rs. 89 crores for Loans and Advances.

The major items of additional expenditure on Revenue Account consist of Rs. 7-92 crores for payment of the States' share of Union Excise Duties, arising mainly out of the current year's Budget proposals which were not taken into account in fixing the original Appropriation and also the arrears for last year and Rs. 7" 29 crores for the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Of the additional requirement of the Posts and Telegraphs Department, Rs. 49 lakhs are for payment of larger dividend to ■ General Revenues and Rs. 3-25 crores are for transfer to Reserve Funds following a larger anlicipated surplus. A sum of Rs. 4- 25 crores is also required for payment of additional grants-in-aid to States of which the bulk is for the new State of Nagaland and the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, as also for agricultural production programme in States.

On the Capital side, the largest single item is the additional provision of Rs. 25 crores consequent on the stepping up of imports of foodgrains and also internal procurement. Of the other items, mention may be made of Rs. 10'91 crores for large-scale acquisition and development of land and construction of residential and office buildings and of Rs. 5 crores for transfer to the Special Development Fund, following larger anticipated loan assistance from the United States of America under PL-480. A sum of Rs. 4-27 crores is also required for the purchase of additional stores by the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

Under Loans and Advances, Rs. 85 crores are required for payment of loans to State Governments, the DUIK of which comprises Central assistance to speed up the pace of development plans in certain sectors, notably power and agriculture. The rest of the provision for loans to States is mainly on account of additional short-term credit for purchase and distribution of fertilisers, seeds and pesticides and for meeting interest charges on loans for irrigation projects. A provision of Rs. 3"75 crores has also been made for loans for rehabilitation of displaced goldsmiths. In addition, a sum of Rs. 4 crores is required for being advanced to the Industrial Finance Corporation to enable it to meet the demands of industrial concerns for financial assistance.

I do not wish to take the time of the House in explaning these proposals further. I shall, however, try to meet points that hon. Members may wish to raise during the Debate.

The question was *proposed.*

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, यह जो पूरक अनुदान का बिल प्रस्तुत है उसके लिए निवेदन है कि मूल में जब बजट बनाया गया था उस बजट के मान से थोड़ा परिवर्तन होता तो खराब नहीं कहा जाता। किन्तु इस समय इतनी अधिक रकम के लिए मांग करना न्याय संगत मालूम नहीं देता है। मूल बजट में किसी आइटम के लिए रकम मांगना और फिर उस रकम को खर्च नहीं करना और बाद में पूरक मांग कर दूसरे मद में खर्च करना और फिर इतनी अधिक रकम मांगना यह अच्छे बजट का द्योतक नहीं है। वैसे तो हमारे टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी जो अपनी प्रशंसा में कुछ भी कहना नहीं भूलते हैं कि हम तो इतना अच्छा काम करने वाले हैं परन्तु यहां पर जो इस तरह की व्यवस्था की जाती है वह कुछ ठीक लगती नहीं है। इतना ही नहीं, जो हमारा सत्तारूढ़ दल है जिसकी वजह से जनता के ऊपर दिन प्रति दिन टैक्स का भार बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है, उस टैक्स को

वसूल करने के लिए वे खर्च तो बढ़ाते ही चले जा रहे हैं मगर काम उस हिसाब से नहीं हो रहा है जितना कि होना चाहिये था।

उदाहरण के लिए डिमान्ड नम्बर २७ है जिसमें सुपर प्राफिट टैक्स, सरचार्ज आन इन्कम टैक्स तथा सी० डी० एस० के कारण आपने खर्च की मांग की है और इसके लिए विशेष स्टाफ रखा है इसलिये रकम की मांग की है। मगर इसमें से सी० डी० एस० तो खत्म हो गया है जिसकी वजह से आपके पास काफी स्टाफ बच गया होगा किन्तु उस स्टाफ को आप कम नहीं कर सकते। खर्च बढ़ जाता है कह कर काम नहीं हो सकता। साथ ही इसका काम बढ़ने वाला था इसकी कल्पना मूल बजट के समय ही थी; अतएव मूल बजट में ही इसकी व्यवस्था की जा सकती थी। मगर आपने मूल बजट में इस चीज की व्यवस्था नहीं की और बाद में आपको नये अधिकारियों की संख्या बढ़ाने की याद आई और पूरक मांग पेश करके आप कर्मचारियों के लिए धन चाहते हैं जो कि एक अच्छे बजट बनाने का तरीका नहीं कहा जा सकता है। इतना ही नहीं जब सी० डी० एस० लागू किया गया था तो उसके लिए काफी कर्मचारी नियुक्त किये गये मगर अब सी० डी० एस० तो रवाना हो चुका है मगर जो उसके लिए स्टाफ था वह वहीं पर रहने वाला है। इस तरह से सरकार जब कोई नई योजना प्रारम्भ करती है तो उसके लिए नया स्टाफ नियुक्त करके खर्च बढ़ा देती है और जब वह योजना खत्म हो जाती है तो उसके पश्चात खर्चा कम करने की बात कर नहीं सकती है, इस तरह की जो सरकार की मनोवृत्ति है वह ठीक मालूम नहीं देती है।

इतना होने के बाद में हमारे यहां जितने इन्कम टैक्स के केसेज का असेसमेंट होना चाहिये था उतना नहीं हो पा रहा है। स्टाफ बढ़ने के कारण केसेज का असेसमेंट का बनाए रखना घटना तो दूर रहा बल्कि दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है और अधिकारियों के जो निर्णय होते हैं उनका भी परसैन्टज घटता ही चला जा रहा है। मैं आपको आंकड़े बताकर निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि किस तरह से असेसमेन्ट का परसेन्टेज घटता जा रहा है। १९५८.५९ में ७१.३ परसेन्ट केसेज असेस किये गये, १९५९–६० में ६९.६ परसेन्ट केसेज असेस किये गये, १९६०–६१ में ६६.१ परसेन्ट केसेज असेस किये गये, १९६१–६२ में ६४.८ परसेन्ट केसेस असेस किये गये, १९६२–६३ में ५९.४ परसेन्ट केसेज असेस किये गये।

इस तरह से जितने अधिक कर्मचारी बढ़ाये गये थे उसके हिसाब से ज्यादा केसेज का असेसमेंन्ट होना चाहिये था। मगर देखने में यह आया है कि जितने अधिक कर्मचारी बढ़ाये गये उतने ही कम केसेज का असेसमेंट हुआ। जैसे जैसे स्टाफ बढ़ता चला गया वैसे वैसे केसों का असेसमेन्ट भी कम होता चला गया। तो मेरा निवेदन है कि वित्त विभाग और विभागों से यह अपेक्षा करता है कि वे कम स्टाफ में ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम करके दिखलायें मगर स्वयं के विभाग में जो गड़बड़ी चल रही है उसकी ओर वह नहीं देखता है। हमारे यहां जो टैक्स देने वाले हैं वह चाहते हैं कि हमारे केसेज का जल्दी से निबटारा हो जाय मगर सरकार की जो गति है वह बिल्कुल ही उल्टी चल रही है। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं शासन से निवेदन करूंगा कि सी० डी० एस० की वजह से जो स्टाफ बढ़ाया गया था वह अब केसेज के निबटारे की गति तेज करने में काम में लिया जाना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात मैं डिमांड नम्बर १७ के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं जिसके अनुसार आस्ट्रेलिया की सरकार २००० टन कागज टैक्स्ट बुक्स छापने के लिए देगी और यह कागज सब प्रान्तीय सरकार को दिया जायेगा।

उपसभापति महोदया, आस्ट्रेलिया सरकार के साथ जो इकरारनामा हुआ है उसके अनुसार इस तरह का जो कागज मिलेग

[बिमलकुमार मन्त लालजी चौरड़िया]

वह प्रान्तीय सरकारों को टैक्स्ट बुक्स छापने के लिए बांटा जायेगा। मुझे इस संबंध में एक कहावत याद आ गई है "इजीली बारोड, इजीली स्पैन्ड" "माले मुफ्त दिले बेरहम"। ऐसी नीति हमारी सरकार की भी है। हमारे मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने जिस तरह की टैक्स्ट बुक्स छापी अगर उसी तरह से इस कागज पर भी टैक्स्ट बुक्स छापी जायेंगी तो सारा अपव्यय होगा।

मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने जो टैक्स्ट बुक्स छापी वे गलत छापीं जिसके परिणाम-स्वरूप २६।। टन वजन की किताबें रद्दी के भाव बेचनी पड़ीं। आस्ट्रेलिया से जो कागज आ रहा है वह मुफ्त में आ रहा है और उसको सब प्रान्तों में बांटा जायेगा। तो मैं यह मालूम करना चाहता हूं कि जिस तरह कम-अक्ली का काम मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने टैक्स्ट बुक्स छापने में किया क्या उसी तरह से और भी प्रान्तीय सरकारें करेंगी? मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने गलत किताबें छापकर जो काम किया है क्या इस कागज का उपयोग भी इसी तरह की किताबें छापने में किया जायेगा जिसकी वजह से मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार को सब किताबें रद्दी के भाव बेचनी पड़ीं? जिस भयंकर रूप से मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने गलत किताबें छापकर कागज का दुरुपयोग किया है वह न्यायसंगत नहीं है और इसलिए मैं शासन को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूं कि मेहरबानी करके वह इस बात को देखें कि इस कागज का दुरुपयोग भी उस तरह से न होने पावे। मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने इन किताबों को छापने में, १,२६,१७६ रुपया खर्च किया और अंत में उन्हें रद्दी के भाव बेचना पड़ा। इसी तरह से जो कागज आस्ट्रेलिया से आ रहा है और भिन्न-भिन्न प्रान्तों को बांटा जायेगा उसका भी इस तरह से दुरुपयोग नहीं होना चाहिये। इस दृष्टि को सामने रखकर शासन को कुछ न कुछ कदम अवश्य उठाने चाहियें। उसको यह ख्याल नहीं करना चाहिये कि आपसी करार के कारण जो कागज मुफ्त में आया है उसका सदुपयोग हो या दुरुपयोग चिंता नहीं। अगर मध्य प्रदेश की तरह इस कागज का भी दुरुपयोग हुआ तो यह न्यायसंगत नहीं कहा जायेगा।

इसके बाद में डिमान्ड नम्बर १२० के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं जो करन्सी और क्वाइनेज के संबंध में है। उपसभापति महोदया, जब से नया पैसा शुरू हुआ है तब से ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में इस नये पैसे को एन० पी० की जगह "नेहरू पैसा" कहा जाने लगा है। जिस तरह से भिश्ती ने चमड़े का सिक्का चलाया था और जनता ने उसे उपेक्षा की भावना से ग्रहण किया था उसी तरह से नये पैसे को भी उपेक्षित मानती है और इसको नया पैसा नहीं कहती बल्कि वह "नेहरू पैसे" के नाम से ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में चलता है। यह सिक्का इतना छोटा है कि अगर जेब में पड़ा हुआ है तो हाथ डालने पर भी वह हाथ में नहीं आता है। इस तरह से ग्रामीण जनता ने इस नये पैसे को "नेहरू पैसा" कहना शुरू कर दिया है। इसलिए मेरी सरकार से यह प्रार्थना है कि जो छोटे छोटे सिक्के हैं उनकी इतनी छोटी साइज है कि जिसकी वजह से ग्रामीण जनता को काफी परेशानी का सामना करना पड़ता है। इतना ही नहीं, शहरों में इस छोटे सिक्के की कमी की वजह से काफी परेशानी होती है। जब कोई डी० टी० यू० बस में सफर करता है तो ये छोटे सिक्के नहीं होने की वजह से उसको नुकसान होता है और दिन प्रति दिन छोटे सिक्के की कमी की वजह से कठिनाई बढ़ती ही चली जा रही है। इसलिए मेरी आपसे यह प्रार्थना है कि आप जो डिमान्ड हमारे सामने लाये हैं उसमें

आपको तीन नये पैसे का सिक्का बनाने के बारे में जल्द से जल्द निर्णय करना चाहिये और इस सिक्के को जल्द से जनता के सामने लाना चाहिये ताकि उसे जो कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा है वह किसी सीमा तक दूर हो जाय।

इसके बाद में डिमान्ड नम्बर १२६ के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं जिसके द्वारा आप स्टेट्स को लोन देते हैं, योजनाओं को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए। इसमें मध्य प्रदेश की चम्बल योजना के लिए धन दिये जाने की बात लिखी हुई है। उपसभापति महोदया, चम्बल योजना का इतिहास बड़ा विचित्र है। यह निर्विवाद है कि यह बांध बड़ा मजबूत बना है और अच्छा बना है किन्तु इस बांध से पूर्व के शासकीय प्रशासन के अनुसार जो नहर १९५५ में निकल जानी थी वह अब तक १९६४ तक नहीं निकली। दस साल का समय व्यतीत हो चुका है मगर अभी तक यह नहर बनकर तैयार नहीं हुई। इसलिए मेरी सरकार से प्रार्थना है कि जो धन प्रान्तीय सरकारों को योजनाओं के लिए दिया जाता है उसका उचित तरह से प्रयोग किया जाता है या नहीं, इस चीज को केन्द्रीय सरकार को देखना चाहिये और उसी के हिसाब से प्रान्तीय सरकारों को लोन देना चाहिये।

अब मैं डिमांड नम्बर १२६ के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। एक फर्म को खाद के आयात के माल को छुड़ाने और भेजने के लिए एजेंट बना दिया गया। जब इस फर्म ने माल को छुड़ाया और भेजा तो खाद में १२४७ टन की कमी पाई गई। हमारी सरकार ने इस फर्म से खाली थैलियों, डैमरेज खाद की कमी तथा दूसरी रिकवरी के लिए क्लेम किया मगर इस फर्म ने इस क्लेम को नहीं माना और उल्टा काउन्टर क्लेम कर दिया और इस बारे में लम्बा चौड़ा हिसाब मांगा। वास्तव में हमारी सरकार की जो मांग थी वह वाजिब थी किन्तु हमारे सरकार के जो अधिकारी हैं उन्होंने इस फर्म के साथ क्या करार किया था वह तो भगवान ही जाने जिसकी वजह से उसने काउन्टर क्लेम कर दिया। जब कोई फैसला नहीं हो सका तो एक आर्बिट्रेटर मुकर्रर हुआ जिसने फर्म का क्लेम साबित कर दिया और सरकार को २,४८,११२ रुपया देना पड़ा। ऐसी स्थिति में किसकी गलती थी, यह बात अभी तक समझ में नहीं आई। हमारे अधिकारियों ने इस फर्म के साथ जो करार किया था अगर उसकी वजह से सरकार को इतना रुपया उस फर्म को देना पड़ा तो उन अधिकारियों के खिलाफ सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की? अगर इस तरह का करार नहीं किया होता तो फर्म को काउन्टर क्लेम करने की हिम्मत नहीं होती। यह तो वैसी ही बात हो गई 'पूत मांगने गए तो खसम भी खोया"। इसलिए मेरी सरकार से प्रार्थना है कि जिस अधिकारी ने उस फर्म के साथ करार किया था और जिसकी वजह से सरकार को इतना रुपया काउन्टर क्लेम का देना पड़ा उसके खिलाफ सख्त कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये और उचित सजा दी जानी चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जो मांग की गई है उसका उचित रूप से सदुपयोग किया जाएगा और जो गलती करने वाले कर्मचारी हैं उन्हें भी उचित सजा दी जाएगी।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Seeta Parmanand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I requested that Mr. Krishnamachari should be present in the House because I have to speak about him as the Finance Minister of the country. In this connection before the House started I asked the office to send a message to him so that he should be here so that I am not accused of making an attack when he was not present in the House. Not necessary for him technically anyway but I wanted to make a forthright attack

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

on him in his very presence and I would like to hear what he has to *my.*

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have very little to say at this time; though one could say a lot on every item this is not the appropriate time to say them while speaking on the Appropriation Bill. Yet I would not like this opportunity to pass without making one or two observations. When Government is so anxious to raise money for giving various benefits under its new schemes for doing social justice and especially in the sphere of giving family pensions and other things, when Government is anxious to provide for the defence requirements at all costs— and that has become more necessary— Government should see that wastage at every stage is stopped and wherever there is wastage the people responsible for it should be adequately punished.

I would like to refer to the observations of the Public Accounts Committee over trading in foodgrains in the last Report submitted. Nearly Rs. 27 crores loss has been incurred and it says further that loss in gunny bags alone in the Calcutta port is to the extent of Rs. 6 lakhs and odd. The lose in terms of money value today might seem to be a trifle, but what is important is that the Audit Reports should not be taken for discussion so late. Then three 'or four years elapse and then the officers responsible for those perticular actions resulting in great loss—or it may very well be that it is corruption—cannot be proceeded against. Time and again Ministries come forward with the excuse that the officer concerned has retired, ff the rules of service do not permit *dt* action being taken against an officer who has retired, then they should be changed. Very often Ministries know which officers are responsible while the case ig under investigation for three years, four years and sometimes seven years. Even when cases have been brought to the notice of the Pub lic Accounts Committee, and I am referring to the Works and Housing Ministry in particular and the Rail ways, Where these things happen on a large scale, the Ministries not only do not see that before the officer retires, a certain amount of his provident fund is kept aside or his full pension is not given or a note is made to that effect so that due to negligence the officer may not escape scot-free, but the officer sometimes is even given promotion during pendency of the inquiry. And it is left to the Pub-* lie Accounts Committee to point this out. This is a sad state of affairs and reflects very badly on the administration. One would have thought that with this kind of experience year afte luring the last fifteen years the state of affairs would improve, but it has not been so.

The second thing I want to point j out is this. Sometimes when a wrong officer has been proceeded against— maybe through a mistake, maybe through favouritism and in some cases in the Works and Housing Ministry it has been a case of favouritism—-the concerned officer was not promoted. His promotion was stopped and the other officer who really should have been punished and was guilty was actually given promotion. One after the other, three Public Accounts Committees brought this particular case to the notice of the Government and yet the reply was that already the case has been examine^ by Government and necessary action has been taken. Well, I thinie, even for this type of reply there should be a small enquiry by a Par. liamentary Committee. Neither tne Ministry nor the Minister who replies based on the information given by the Ministry should be allowed to get off with such replies. I feel if

Government i« serious about rooting out corruption, the Government should never say that the action for rooting out corruption for the time being will be restricted to certain classes of people and that is, the officers only. It should be against people in the public, that is, the business people and even the Ministers. Unless the dictum given in the 'Gita' is followed and Government ig shown io be aware of the fact, people will not take the Government seriously:—

"यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठस्तत्तदेवेतरः जनः ।
स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्तदनुवर्तते ।।"

People follow the example set at the highest level. Again and again it was pointed out in the Congress, in public speeches by Congress leaders and others that it is not enough to be honest, but it is also necessary to be seen to be honest. So, wherever there has been any public charge of any unfair or any suspicious behaviour on the part of anybody from the topmost to the lowest grade, ei 'chaprassi', that should be proceeded against. Reports of the Public Accounts Committee are replete with action taken against Class IV and Class HI people, but the Class I officers have again and again gone scotfree. What is the use? They become emboldened and these are the people who corrupt even people higher up.

Having said that, I do not want to take much time of the House. I will refer only to one matter and that is pibout the very hopeful promise given about holding the price line, particularly as far as labour is concerned by the then Labour Minister and now the Home Minister with the result that during the last eight months people have lost all hopes about getting relief in lowering prices. Instead of the price line being held, have gone higher. I feel that if not possible for Government to take up such a vast problem as the *di&irh*-but: on of foodgrains at fair prices or to stop hoarding and profiteering, Government at least should see tliat those people whose income is below Rs^ 300 a month are given—as was stated b.v INTUC as well as tne Hind Mazdoor Sabha yesterday before tha Government in the Labour Ministry— some subsidy until the Government is able to have a look around. The excuse is that due to the vagarie.s of the seasons the prices of foodgrains cannot be stabilised and, therefore, the movement of foodgrains is affected. These things will nol satisfy the people.

I feel, in short, if we are to have a socialist pattern, or whatever pattern it may be called— because there is nothing much in a name— what is required by the common man is that ht- must feel that after a period of fifteen years he is able to live a little better. We ourselves, Madam, felt when we joined or when we came into politics and we started working that we would produce a wonderful pattern of society and bring about happiness. But for some reasons, which, of course, we do not know, things have become otherwise. It is, therefore, necessary for the Government to take a right about turn and begin putting its house in order by doing some of the things that I referred to just now.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, after what has happened in the morning 1 would not have liked to participate in this debate but for the fact thai today ig the last day of the Session and t thought that we shall be failing in our duty if we do not declare in this House before we adjourn that the economic destiny is in very unsafe hands m the hands

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

of Mr. Krishnamachari. I will presently make out why I say so and I think betimes we must wake up to the dangers ahead or else we will have to pay a heavy price. Mr. Krishnamachari was in charge of the Finance Ministry between 1956 and 1957. As we all know, he *s back to his post again in the empire of Finance Ministry, but witn a difference. In 1956-57 the Prime Minister was in his full stature of active leadership. There was also Shri Govind Ballabh Pant and there were other leaders also. We did not agree with the policies of the Government and the leaders at that time nor do we agree with them now. But the fact remains that the set-up at the top today in point of fact at least is—why I mention this thing is because it has a bearing on the psychology and bearing of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari and a bearing on policies also. He can give certain orientations in a given set-up, if it is favourable to him within the framework of the policies of Government no doubt, but within the coterie of the ruling top-notchers today. Before, when he was the Minister, before he was sacked or got himself sacked, whatever it is, at that time there was a situation where some of his ambitions could be bridled, because of the fact that certain factors were not so favourable to him, and I have mentioned those factors. Today Mr. Krishnamachari has captured his empire when there is little to bridlo him. The leadership is in a state of terrible chaos. We do not know what the trinity is for. We have a trinity leadership today, we are told, of Mr. Nanda, Mr. Lal Bahadur and Mr. Krishnamachari. The celebrated trio constitute the *de facto* leadership of the country. But the more we see of this trio the greater we feel disappointed, especially the one who is in-charge of the finances of the country and in that capacity of many things, the economic destiny of the country. The more we see of it, the more we are reminded of his past antecedents and the more we feel apprehensive of what lies in store for us in the future. Therefore, I say that when this Minister comes before the House for grants or supplementary grants, we have to make our voice known.

Today, therefore, I say that this setup is changed to some extent and leadership is at a heavy discount, and Mr. Krishnamachari is nothing if he is not an opportunist. He knows how to flourij:, in that situation, the confusion in th$_e$ leadership; he is a past-master in that thing. If I look back upon the career of that gentleman, I see that he had flourished in situations which were favourable to him at the cost of others. I need not go into the far past, but that is how we see that from the Cadburys and Lever Brothers he comes to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and issues licences right and left so much so that a Secretary of the Commerce Ministry had to admit by publicly writing in the "Economic Times" that as a result of the policy the country lost foreign exchange heavily and so on, that foreign assets were dissipated. That is what was said by the Secretary of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry at that time. An article appeared in the "Economic Times" of London. Now today he is back again. Very well, he is there to call us traitors and so on. Let him say so, but I ask hon. Members opposite not to be carried away by political diversions but to look at Mr. Krishnamachari straight in the face, assess him c'orrectly and see what he is and what he is going to be, and come to your conclusion.

Madam Deputy Chairman, anyhow as far as th$_e$ Finance Ministry is concerned, the Finance Minister is not just one of the Ministers and the Finance Ministry is not just one of the many Ministries. It has ample powers. It has a kind of veto over various other Ministries. It directs tha policies in many ways of planning, of

the economy of the country. Therefore, it is a pivotal Ministry that way as far as the internal affairs of the coutnry are concerned. Here we find that Mr. Krishnamachari, having got back to the empire he had lost al'ier the infamous Mundhra deal, is in a frenzies drive today to recapture his empire, and he is not restrained in his drive to establish personal control over it, within the framework of the broad Government policy. That is the position we must take note of.

Now the collective responsibility of the Cabinet has long become a con-0titutional fiction. It bas become a :myth in our public life. Where is the collective responsibility? Does the Finance Minister care for collective responsibility? He is an egotist, a conceited individualist, in every fibre ■of his being. Collective responsibility is anathema to him. He does not understand it nor does he believe m it. When the Prime Minister was an active force, well, perhaps there was some kind of supervisory control. Today he is one of the trios, one of the three musketeers of the Government. He is one of them, but the worst type of musketeer is perhaps Mr. Krishnamachari .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, on a point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No point of order. Please do not disturb me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order, Mr. Sapru?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It is not my babit to interfere with my friend when he is speaking. But what I would like to know is, where is the evidence that there is no collective responsibility of the Cabinet today? We cannot go by newspaper reports <xr by gossip in the lobbies, but we must have some evidence before us to show that there is no collective responsibility. That, I think, is a matter he must keep in mind.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can well understand Mr. Sapru's enquiry. I shall try to satisfy him. I do not know if I will succeed.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the hon. Congress Members are in the habit of applauding the Treasury Benchej irrespective of merits. They applauded when Mr. Krishnamachari took over from Mr. C. D. Deshmukh. They applauded Mr. Krishnamachari also ohen. They applauded when Mr. Morarji Desai came in. They applauded when he went out under the Kamraj Plan. They applauded again Mr. Krishnamachari when he came in. They are in a perpetual state of applauding him now. This is what they do, our Congress Benches. May I ask: Are you satisfied with the role of Her Majesty's bodyguards in the Buckingham Palace who have nothing to do except to salute the sovereign when she passes in and out of that palace, no matter who that sovereign is? That is what they are doing, applauding the Minister, forgetting all his past. Mr. Sapru, for whom I have got the greatest personal respect, will remember his speech on the Mundhra deal when he had the courage to say veTy strong things against Mr. Krishnamachari. I do not know if he remembers that, but I do.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I remember.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These words resound in my ears, brave words, forthright words, honest words. Therefore, we must recall that to mind because we cannot forget that Mundhra deal and the Chagla Enquiry Commission. I have got the Commission's report here today.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, on a point of order.

[Shri M. R. Sherwam.l We are discussing the Appropriation Bill. We are not discussing an individual Minister or an individual person. So Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech is absolutely irrelevant for the purposes of the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. It is appropriate here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is his introduction.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the speech. If I do not have faith in that Minister, it is my right to say-that. Please do not take away my right. This is not the introduction. This is the theme of my speech. Let me recall the Mundhra deal, 12 NOON because I do not have faith in these gentlemen. Therefore. I have to point out to the House the facts and carry the House with me.

Madam Deputy Chairman, may I remind you of some of the things that happened? I have got, as I have said, the Chagla Commission's Report and the accounts of the evidence are there also. And the sad history is this that Mr. Chagla, the judge, is sitting on the Treasury Benches as the Leader of the House; Mr. Krishnamachari, the accused, is sitting in the same House and also in the other House as the colleague of Mr. Chagla on the same Treasury Benches. One of the principal accused Mr. Krishnamachari, was indicted by a Congressman the late Mr. Feroz Gandhi. He is now a colleague in the same Cabinet. I do not know how they feel about each other but it is an embarrassing sight to many of us. I do not know what Mr. Feroz Gandhi would have felt had he been alive.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): He was not one of the accused, but only a witness.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know but the only missing link is Mr. Mundhra. Bring him here, put him up. We can get a trinity cf the Mundhra case. On one good side ls Mr. Chagla, there are the two accused. The central figure, the shooting star, is Mr. Mundhra. The star of Mr. Mundhra has fallen in the financial world but the star of Mr. Krishnamachari never falls, it seems, thanlcs to the Congress regime. It is shooting up all the time, well, under all kinds of blessings. Madam Deputy Chairman, we have the Enquiry Commission's Report. Both the accused and the judge are together in the same Cabinet, and tbe other accused. the central figure, is not there, if we put it perhaps in that way. Mundh-ra's spirit pervades this Ministry, that is what I say. Mundhra may not be physically present as the others are, but his spirit pervades this Ministry. I say this thing because the Finance Minister is opening the door wide open to monopolists out of which class comes that little Mundhra. Mundhra was not dropped, from the heavens, Mundhra came from these monopolistic circles. He corrupted the Government, he corrupted the Minister, he corrupted the officials, and ran away after giving one lakh. of rupees to the Congress fund, with one crore and twenty-five lakhs . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : He was sent to jail.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Such is the bargain.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: He went to jaiL and suffered for his deeds.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Went to jail? When you sent him to jail, he could get out of the prison van and then was put in again. Why should it not be . . . *(Interruptions)* Mr. Krishnamachari is made the Finance

Minister, you cannot expect the policeman not to be very corrupt.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: To charge him with corruption is very unfair. And moreover, is it not a fact that there was a time when people like Shri Bhupesh Gupta used to adore him. as the man who destroyed the man-eaters i.e. the capitalist class?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: He was supposed to be the destroyer oi man-eaters. *(Interruptions)* People adored him and the late Feroz Gandhi . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, for a diversion, please make your speech on the Bill a little.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please don't try to advise me. This is an Appropriation Bill. I have no ::'aith in that Minister. (Interruptions) Madam Deputy Chairman, Mr. Krishnamachari appeared before the Chagla Commission. This is the man with whom we are concerned, we are concerned about the money matter. And in his evidence before the Chagla Commission he said that he had no knowledge of the entire purchases of the Mundhra shares bj- the LIC, and that is what he said: —

"Shri Chagla: Was it correct that Shri Mundhra saw you in February, 1956?"

Then, Shri Krishnamachari said:

"It might be that he saw me in my capacity as Commerce Minister."

And he says here:

"It is not so simple, my Lord. It is rather complicated."

He did not at all give any indication of it. Then he said in reply to another question that it would be necessary in the interest of getting at truth to separate the identity of hra from the identity of the concerns connected with him. That would help to clear the atmosphere. He wanted the identity of Mundhra to be separated from the identity of the Mundhra concerns. This is the subtlety of Mr. Krishnamachari before the Chagla Commission. He wants to play that subtlety again here *(Interruptions)* when he makes those Budget proposals. Therefore, I say it makes interesting reading that he wanted to make Mr. Patel, Mr. Kamath and so on as scape-goats and wanted to get away. That was the situation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your object of referring to all this, Mr. Gupta?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is wasting our time.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): May I ask you whether it is in order? You said that it was only an introduction but he says that this is the main theme.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The main theme of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech is irrelevancy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, vou cannot say so. How can you? When the Budget . . .

(Interruptions)

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): On a point of oraer.

(.Interruptions')

I know that my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, will permit me to raise a point of order. The point of order is in relation to rule 200. Would you

[Diwan Chaman Lal.] kindly look at page 103 of your copy of the Manual? And you will find the second portion of rule 200 saying:

"A member while speaking shall not—

* * * *

(ii) make a "personal charge against a member:".

What I find now from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech is that he has entirely devoted—as hp himself says—his speech to making a personal charge against the Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I ask you to leave it out because Ministers are liable to personal charges. The other day you saw what a personal charge was made on the Profumo affair in the House of Commons. It is there. I am making a charge not. on the per-spn of a Minister but on a Minister of the Government. All that I mention relates to him as a Minister of the Government, when he was a Minister there. No personal charge as such is there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, Mr. Gupta the Bill has been allotted one hour. You have taken fifteen minutes. Now, wind up.

SHM BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Madam, I will not. I am not going to do that. *(Interruptions)* I said, I will speak on that.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of order. I have been hearing this whole exchange of words from the morning, but I have to make one submission. You have been very generous to say that it is only a digression or it is a speech of irrelevance. I fully support the point of order raised from the other side of the House because any Minister can be censured only by a substantive motion. *(Interruptions)* Yes, every Member. A Member has the right to criticise the policy of a particular Minister, pertaining to the Bill that is under discussion or that is on the anvil of the House. But il he has to censure the Minister for any particular conduct of his. whether that o'f the past or of the present, he can criticise the Minister only on a substantive motion of no confidence or censure. Therefore, I want a clear ruling from you, because it is . . . *(Interruptions)* I have not finished, and I hope that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will not behave with me as if he is behaving with the Congress Members. (Interruptions J There may not be much difference. But the only difference is that I cannot allow that bullying with me. So, I would • submit . . . *(Interruptions)*

SHW BHUPESH GUPTA: You are allowing Rim to speak like that on a point of order, accusing me of bullying him. Is that a point of order?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed him to speak.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Madam Deputy Chairman, I would submit that it is a question of the decorum and dignity of the House. I hold no brief or I have no very high words about anv Minister whosoever the Minister may Ii 3 but I only want that the rules of procedure of this House must be maintained, and I want your clear ruling whether any Member can charge any Minister or any other Member. He can criticise his policies pertaining to the Bill but if he wants to censure him, he must bring forward a motion of no confidence or a censure motion. I want a ruling on that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will speak on that rule.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I am in the Chair, you are not in the Chair. There is some substance in what Mr. Chandra Shekhar has stated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. Leave that out. Please listen to me, Madam.

(Interruptions i

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, if you put less of passion and more of reason then . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You never allow me to . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you must come to the Bill that is under discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should not argue. *(Interruptions.)* In any case> I will not give you more than five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why not? I will speak on both. You want to silence us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yon have taken . .

Sim BHUPESH GUPTA: You are not going to silence me, you will have to expel me from the House today. You have to explain to me; you cannot silence me. From our group nobody will speak; I am going to speak. That is the position.

First of all let me clear the point of order. Madam Deputy Chairman, the hon. Member said—I can understand his point of order—he could have even said that in this the Ministers are not technically responsible to this House at all. I cannot say anything; he knows the Constitution perhaps well; he need not be bullied by me. But he knows it; now Ministers can always be criticised as Ministers, and even allegations may be . made; anything we may ₛay-

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now don't branch off into another subject altogether. You come to the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will; now I am speaking on the Minister; it is my inherent right to speak about a Minister.

THE EIPUTY CHAIRMAN:YOU can refer to th^ Minister in connection with the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On every Bill and also on this Appropriation Bill, but you are not allowing me to speak now as if this is the first time when a Minister has been spoken on in this manner in this House. We have even spoken on the Prime Minister; we have criticised other Ministers, and why can't I criticise Mr. Krishnamachari? Has he become above everything? *(Interrwptions)* Now, Madam, iₑt me proceed please. I cannot carry on with these interruptions. You are avowing more time for interruptions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will not be able to finish in five minutes, nor am I going to sit. If that is so I am not going to sit here.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Why do you sit then?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you saying 'five minutes'? You are allowing fifteen minutes for the interruptions as against the five minutes you say you are allowing me now. Are we here for that kind of treatment? You can certainly give a ruling.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Apart from chivalry to a lady there must be respect for the Chair, and some decency, dignity and decorum in the tone of his speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore allow me to continue the speech. I have said nothing against the Chair. *(Interruptions.)* I have not said anything against the Chair. Did I say any such thin'g?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: On a point of order, Madam. I apeak with all seriousness.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are hardly any points of order. So you may put your question.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: It is a vital »oint of order. Now, assuming that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari used often- ■ *ive language, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has outdone him in vileness of the lan guage, and the intensity of it. It does not behave him to imitate a bad thing—I am not going into the merits of the case—and spoil the fair name of the House, and create a scene the like of which the House has not witnessed since its inception; I am sorry to say, Madam, that a scene was enacted this morning in your presence. *(Interruptions).* Something was done by a section of the Opposition which cannot be undone. Now the hon. Member is abusing the privilege he has by singling out a Minister for personal abuse. Is this fair? He may speak of the policies, but he is singling out a Minister and attacking him as you have been showing great indulgence to the hon. Member. ,-T want to make ft clear that we on this side will not tolerate for a minute this indulgence shown by you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, Madam, you are allowing all this interruption.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: You please put a curb on him. *(Interruptions.)* We will walk out if such a thing would be repeated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Come and fight us here. You are allowing all the interruptions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to say this; ji do hope, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that you know the meaning of dignity, decency and decorum of this august House, and I do feel that you must think over it a little andl behave in the proper way not only by your words but by your demeanour ag well.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I wish these words were uttered yesterday aliso, and with regard to them. If I have, you will please tell me which word is unparliamentary or undignified; you kindly tell me and il will stop it—I assure you. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, I was not abusing Mr. Krishnamachari here. I was questioning some of his policies, and I should be allowed to do so, and here I was not quoting anybody; ,1 was going to quote Mr. Chagla, and if his words are undignified, I cannot help it.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: That previous incarnation, is it relevant? That happened in circumstances which *no* longer exist.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is another point which you can make in your speech. Certainly you can say if I am using any undignified language. When a thing Js true, don't you say sometimes things that happened in the past when you deal with the present?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: ,lf it is relevant. But it is not relevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is relevant, because Mr. Krishnamachari happens to be the present Finance Minister; that is the greatest relevance. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, as I told you, I leave it in your hands; please save me a little; J am not goiing to be silenced like this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no further time for you in my hands; you have taken twenty-five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But so many interruptions have taken up most of this time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall ■till grant you time provided you talk *on* the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am entitled to speak; here on Matthai I was allowed to speak. We spoke *on* Mr. Krishnamachari before—we were allowed to speak. Things we say, but where you find it is undignified or unparliamentary you will please say, and I will obey, but I do not know what I am up against today.

Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I say time will have to be allowed to me; I demand the time' for our entire group, for all our speakers; at the rate of five minutes for each how much it comes to, that you will please allow me. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, here I say that we cannot have much faith in him. It is not unparliamentary. Why do I say so? It is because it is there, Mr. Chagla has said it in his report on the Mundhra deal:

> "Therefore clearly there is acquiescence on the part of the Minister in the part played by Shri Patel in bringing about the transaction of the 24th of June. The lack or repudiation on the part of the Minister would go to support Shri Patel's story that the Minister had approved of the transaction in Bombay of the 24th June."

Then here is a parliamentary thing:

> "In a parliamentary form of Government, Parliament must be taken into confidence by the Ministers at the earliest stage, and all relevant facts and materials must be placed before it. This would avoid difficulties and embarrassment being caused at a later stage when Parliament gets the necessary information from other sources."

I submit that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, in many matters, is not even giving full information to Parliament, even with regard to this Bill if you like this Biil. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, the Attorney-General of India got up and said that he was not satisfied with the evidence of Mr. Krishnamachari—the Attorney-General, Mr. Setalvad, in his evidence before the Chagla Commis sion. Also Mr. D. L. Mazumdar re vealed before the Commission that Mr. Krishnamachari knew Mr. Mundhra from 1953 because he had written a note °n Mr. Mundhra in 1955. Despite that he en- tered into that deal with Mr. Mundhra. Therefore these ar$_e$ the antecedents and I say the same line is being followed today. I wilf tell you how. Mr. Chagla we cannot forget; this is why I refer to you that Mr. Krishnamachari is called upon to give up this habit. And the indications are that he has not only not given up but tries to flourish on this habit; he has thrown the door wide open to the foreign monopolists today. It was one Mundhra; now to all the British and the Americans the door is thrown wide open.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are far too many hon. Members to speak on this Bill. You must now wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me finish.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish soon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many times have you been saying that, telling me to finish? It is almost from the start, when I got up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will ring the bell and cal! another hon. Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You call the Marshal then and stop me, cut out the pound of flesh from me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken io much time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Eut much of the time has been taken up by-the interruptions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Provided you are relevant you can speak for a short while more and finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: 1 am going to be very relevant now, Madam Deputy Chairman; always relevant and now also. Therefore the question today . . .

(Interruptions)

Again interruptions. Now you stop them. I know that my numerical strength is my greatest weakness I wish 1 had a greater number, the number with which a motion was tabled by Mr. Jyoti Basu in the West Benga] Assembly. Well, now I do not say about that. Pleas$_e$ allow me to deal with the policy question. Therefore I say that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari's policy today is a policy which throws the door wide open to tbe monopolist sections, foreign and Indian, and here somebody said about his reference to the man-eater. Yes, he said, but he has invited all the man-eaters today, not only from the Rajasthan jungles but even from the American jungles. He has enough man-eaters today. That is the difference between now and then.

Madam Deputy Chairman, here I should point out to you one thing, again Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari's own statement—I hope this wi[1]? not be called unparliamentary, because it is a policy matter, and he has made that statement himself.

While speaking, I think. in the other House on the 23rd March, 1957, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari said: —

> "We have served the country well and in doing so. we have served the poor man ill because we served the vested interests extraordinarily well, because we wanted the wealth of this country to grow. I knew that money was going into the black market. I knew that taxes were not being paid. I knew huge profits were being made before we gave quantitative protection of a blanket nature."

This is what he said in the other House. Has this policy changed? Na This policy has not changed. And here, you see, I do not blame hirn alone for this policy. This policy *a* being pursued and Mr. Krishnamachari has pursued it with much. greater vigour. That is my complaint. against him.

Here, Madam Deputy Chairman, I draw your attention to $_a$ news item. In 1956 Mr. Krishnamachari wrote *> letter to Mr. Eugene Black, President of the World Bank, in which he said that the policies were being reversed or modified with a view to inviting: foreign capital. Today I find that he is pursuing the same policy with a vengeance. Let us see what he writes to the foreign people. These are his own words. Therefore, I hope hon. Members will not take exception to' this thing. He informs the World Bank that they are going to have really the old facilities for investment" and so on. Just I will give one little quotation from him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think: that will do, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sorry that will not do. I am very relevant.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot give you more time and you must listen to the Chair. Be reasonable. The House is granting you indulgence. There are other speaker* also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Should you speak against me every time?' We will sit longer. Madam Deputy Chairman, I am reading out the quotation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall' give you time finally up to 12-30.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know. I will try. I know that.

Madam, today what has happened to you and to me . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No reflection on the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Good thing has happened to you and bad to me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No reflection on the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I concede all good things have happened to \ou.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; You cannot reflect on the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot say even that? Nothing has happened to you Madarn. Only to me bad things have happened.

Here Mr. Krishnamachari said: —

"I am hopeful that my appeal to the foreign entrepreneur to come to India wiH find an echo. Notwithstanding this matter of border trouble with China, there are few developing countries which offer such assurances of stability and such market prospects as India "

Then in his Budget Speech also he repeated the same thing. In an interview to a foreign press, published in the papers of the 3rd March, TTK Rives assurance to World Bank Chief", the report says:

"Finance Minister Krishnamachari is learnt to have given assurance to the World Bank that the existing policy of restricting, as a rule, foreign equity capital to minoritv participation in collaborationist ventures would be given up . . . ■ Besides these major policy concessions, the field for investment of foreign private capital has been expanded to include public sector ventures."

That is what he said. And in the Budget Speech he repeated the same thing. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, our country shall be up against serious financial economic problems when foreign capital is given such opportunity in this matter.

In 1961, 361 collaboration agreements were signed with the imperialist countries and other Western countries. In 1962 their number was 234 and 275 in 1963. Now in this background Mr. Krishnamachari says, "Come and take more and I throw the door still wider open for you to come in." He is trying to bring them in the pub[1] ic sector as well. Is it not a change of policy? I submit. Madam, it is clearly a modification of the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956. The Industrial policy Resolution of 1956 did not envisage that private participation, foreign capital participation, will be allowed in the public sector much less in such an important industry as the petro-chemical industry and so on. Mr. Krishnamachari has allowed the Bokaro cement project to fall into the hands of the A C.C. Previously he was being supported by Mr. H. M. Patel. Today he is supported by Mr Bhootalingam and Mr. Jha. I have got very great material. But I do not wish to go into it. Somg day somebody will take it up. Therefore, I say that the entire policy of the Government has been reorientated towards giving more concessions to the monopolists on the ground that we are not in a position to build our economy.

Now, the Economic Correspondent of the 'London Dailv Telegraph' writes that it was now quite a nice thing to participate in the Indian protected market and also enioy the prestige of planning. And he asked the foreign nrivate investor to *PO* and invest in India. Anrl Mr. Krishnamachari is opening the door That was said in 1961. In 1964, in spite of the policv having been changed he is asking them to come in greater numbers,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta J with more money and investment. Madam Deputy Chairman, what has happened to this country? *Li* we go on allowing such investment to come here, this would mean anoihe$_r$ form of neo-colonialism. Today the Americans and the British want to invest in our country to exploit our cheap labour, to plunder our resources and also to put pressure on the political life of the country. And given the right type of men from their point of view to the Cabinet, we know they can play havocs on the political life of our country. That is why they are now indirectly doing thi* thing and it will take very serious proportions.

Madam Deputy Chairman, therefore, I say that this is neo-colonialism. And these ventures Mr. Krishnamachari fcj encouraging. He is partisan in this matter. When the Finance Minister should fight for economic independence by eliminating foreign monopolists from the country, by putting our economy on an independent basis, at such a time we find this Finance Minister bringing in more and more foreign private investment. Underline the word "foreign private investment". Such is the position today. (Time bell rings). It spells disaster for our country. Krishnama-charis will come and go, so will many of us. But the country will remain. But we have no right to mortgage our country's economy in this manner to the neo-colonialism of the Americans and the British. It is said that otherwise we cannot develop a self-reliant economy. Now we are trying to develop a self-reliant economy depending simultaneously on foreign private investment. After all. some of the maior industries are in the hands of foreign monopolists and they are getting greater and greater advantage. We are telling the country that the inflow of capital is less. Ye?. But what about the outflow of profit, dividends, royalties, commission charges and so on? According to our calculations it comes to not less than Rs. IOO crores annually. *(Time bell rings).* As against that how much are we getting? Apart Irom that we lose on account of unequal competition because our jute and tea fetch less price for the same quantity than they used to do before, whereas we are paying more price for the implements and other things that we import from the United States of America and Britain. We suffer on that score. Therefore, aj you see, Mr. Krishnamachari i9 consciously and deliberately pushing this country in that direction.

Now monopolies. He has appointed a Monopoly Commission. What is it going to be? Now Mr. D. L. Mazumdar was heading the Company Law Administration. He accused the monopolists to some extent and he deposed before the Chagla Commission. And the first thing that Mn Krishnamachari did after taking over the Ministry was to sack Mr. D. L. Mazumdar, virtually sacked him because he abolished his department and so on. He wreaked vengeance against him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing now. I do not want to quarrel with you on the last day. You have forced me to do that. The Members opposite, I regret, have said many things. Last year when I spoke against Mr. Morarji Desai I was interrupted. Nobody would listen to me then. But before the year was out Mr. Morarji was out. I do not know when Mr. Krishnamachari will be out. That shows that I was right. The Compulsory Deposit Scheme went. It went under your leadership. We did not come to scrap it. Today I am speaking in the sincere belief and this belief should be shared by all . . .

SHM ABID ALI (Maharashtra): No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a party matter. He says 'no'. I know

he shares only the American dollars and nothing else. Now the position is this . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I put it in a non-partisan manner. I say, 1 would implore the Congress Members to reconsider this thing. Today we cannot ensure planned development and promote social objectives or their realisation if Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari of the Chagla Enquiry Commission fame is allowed to have a free run. Let Mr. Chagla say whether he is unsaying what he said against Mr. Krishnamachari. The Chagla Enquiry Commission report we cannot forget. Therefore I say again . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I ask the Congress Members to read the report again. Let us not be unjust to ourselves. You read the report again and you will see what according to a person, now a Cabinet Minister, was Mr. Krishnamachari, the Finance Minister . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. I am calling on the next speaker.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He called others 'man-eaters' but he is the biggest of all man-eaters, Indian, American or British . . .

SHRI ABID ALI: Listen to the Chair . . .

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Should that man of the man-eaters be allowed? I say it in a figurative sense. That man-eater has to be called to account.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I move that all these insinuations and abuses ■should be expunged.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No insinuations.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Sapru.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Krishnamachari should be expunged from the Cabinet.

SHRI ABID ALI: All these irrelevant things should be expunged and also traitors.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam, I regret very greatly the speech which my friend Mr. Gupta . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It is very unfortunate that you have such a friend.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am very fortunate in having him as a friend. I regret the speech Mr. Gupta has delivered this morning. I think it is not fair to attack a Minister in the language in which he has done. I know that on an Appropriation Bill you can talk almost anything that you like but we have to be careful to see that we do not abuse the privilege which is accorded to us by our Rules so far as Appropriation Bills are concerned. The statement which Mr. Gupta made was that we have a triumvirate of three governing this country. I do not know where he has got this idea from. Of course, I read the daily press and the daily press occasionally talks of this triumvirate. I read some weeklies. They are talking of this triumvirate and axe indulging in these speculations regarding the future but I do not think that Members *41* Parliament should take their facts from the daily press or from the weeklies of a doubtful character. I think we need some evidence to support the view that the Cabinet is not functioning at **all.** I thought that there was collective responsibility for the Cabinet to the House of the People and that Mr.

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] Krishnamachari cannot be held solely responsible for the Budget which has been presented to this Parliament.

So far as the Budget itself is concerned, I wish to reserve my remarks on it for the discussion on the Finance Bill. I am not going into the larger question which this Budget raises but 1 would like to say that a feature of the economic situation which distresses one is the high rise in the prices. The price mechanism is almost getting out of control and the common man is very much the sufferer because of this rise in the prices. I should like, therefore, in framing our financial arrangements, to keep the picture of the common man before us. I should like the picture of the mother, who had to feed her babies, or the father, who has to find shoes for his sons or fees for their education, who is getting Rs. IOO or Rs. 125 or Rs. 200, kept in view. Looking at the question from this broad perspective, I must say that I have a feeling that we have been interpreting this democratic socialism in a rather narrow sense. Democratic socialism means socialism plus democracy. Tt means the achievement of socialism by the democratic process and I wonder if it is realised that it is not fair to the common man to finance our plans or finance our national expenditure by taxes, the main burden of which falls upon him. As I said, I am reserving my remarks on the Budget for a future occasion but I think there are some good features in the Finance Bill and speaking personally I think it represents a definite improvement over the Budget which was presented to us last year. For one thing, the C.D.S. has gone by the board. For .another thing, the Expenditure-tax has been levied and I am not sorry that the incidence of death duty about which I have been talking in the previous years, is going to be as high as 85 per cent, on fortunes above Rs. 5 lakhs. What I want to draw the attention, however, of the House to certain observations which the Twentieth Report of the P.A.C. for the year 1963-64 has made on the way that some of our Ambassadors and staff behave. On page 24. the statement is made:

> "Instances of irregular purchase of car were noticed in the Missions in Jeddah, Khartoum and Gangtok".

Why was it so? Why should there have been any irregular purchases of cars? Why could the cars, if they were wanted, not have been purchased in the regular manner?

Again on page 36 I find a statement which gives food for some thought to us:

> "The Committee are unhappy to note that financial irregularities have been committed even by Ambassadors. In the second case particularly the Committee fail to see why the Ambassador, who drew advances to the extent of Rs. 57,000 in all on two occasions did not refund forthwith Rs. 7,246 saved by him out of the first advance of Rs. 26,667 and Rs. 5,630 saved out of the second advance of Rs. 29,058."

And further it says:

> "The Committee recommend that such cases, as soon as they are detected ... ".

So it is not as if the Ambassador had brought that case to their notice. The irregularities were detected by the Committee and so they say:

> "The Committee recommend 'that; such cases, as soon as they are detected, should be brought to the notice of the higher authorities in the External Affairs Ministry so that prompt action can be taken. The Committee would also like to invite attention in this connection to their earlier recommendation contained in para 39 of their 8th Report."

These observations constitute a serious reflection on some of our Ambassadors and administrators abroad, and I think on the material before it, the Committee was justified in making those

observations. Our Ambassadors, as our Ministers abroad, are getting fairly decent.salaries and they are getting fairly decent allowances, and they are occupying positions of dignity. They are not Ambassadors oi small countries who might indulge in gold smuggling. They are the Ambassadors -and representatives of a great nation and they must represent in the lands to which they are accredited, the best traditions of our country. I am sorry that the Public Accounts Committee should have been forced to make these observations about some •of our Ambassadors.

In another Report, ia their 18th .Report, tne Public Accounts Committee had something to say about the Delhi Development Authority. It is on page 17 of the Report:

> "It being a well-established procedure that before any schemes are sanctioned, the details as well as the estimates of expenditure are prepared and scrutinised, the Committee fail to understand why the delays and difficulties in execution of the schemes costing Rs. 8 crores cculd not be foreseen by the experts tn the Delhi Development Authority and' the C P.W.D, before the schemes were sanctioned. Since the initial difficulties ar3 now being gradually overcome, they hope that tlie progress of work on th? execution of the schemes will now be accelerated."

J think this is a reflection on our experts that they were not able to foresee the difficulties in the execution of these schemes an^ an explanation is needed as to how and why they came to overlook a matter which they should not have overlooked

Then Madam. Deputy Chairman, T would like to say a word about the administration of justice. We need to improve the machinery for the administration of justice in our country, but law's delays are proverbial and Shakespeare spoke of that in 'The Merchant of Venice'. We find in our country long delays taking place in the disposal of cases. I know that our subordinate courts as also our superior courts are a very harct working lot and I know that they do the best they can to dispose of cases as early as possible. But the fact oi the matter is that the number of cases instituted has gone up and the number of judges is not proportionate to the number of cases instituted. But apart from that, the problem or question which has often occurred to me is whether there should not be any change in the system of recruitment of our judges whether of the superior courts or af the subordinate courts. This, of course, is not the place or the occasion when I should give expression to what has been parsing through my mind. But I think the time has come for us to consider seriously, in the light of dievelopments in modern jurisprudence in other countries, not only in Britain, but in other countries also, changes in the administration or judicial procedures which are in force in our courts. Our judicial procedures are based upon certain concepts of English law. I was brought up in the traditions of English law and I have very great regard for those traditions. But there are svstems of law other than 'those which obtain in Britain which also merit our consideration. There is the French contribution to law and legal procedure and that too should be considered by us with an open mind. I happened to be in the Soviet Union in 1962 and I saw something of their administration of justice. I do not sav that I am an undiluted admirer of their system of jurisprudence. I rather like to read the judgments of the older British Judges or of the younger . British Judges, but I think for petty cases, small pettv cases, their system of people's courts, with a judge and two assessors who have the same function as the judge but who are there only for a vear while the judge functions for three years, has something to commend itself. Also, there has been no effort on our part to devise a system of judicial administration

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] which in criminal cases at all events will associate the lay public with it. We had at one time the assessor system but we have given up that system also. We had the jurors in many provinces for the trial of certain cases but we have given up the jury system and courts are against the jury system. I cannot understand this antipathy towards the jury system. 1 think that we must associate with the administration of justice the common man. The common man must be made to feel that he is an active participant in tha administration of justice and the value of the jury system u that a man's liberty and a man's honour are matters on which twelve jurymen or nine jurymen occupying respectable positions in life are the judges. I think there is a good deal to be said for the jury system and it is not impossible for us to devise a jury system suited to the genius of the Indian people. I think we were in too great a hurry to abolish it. We should have considered the question from a broader angle. We should have considered how jurors work in France and other continental countries and we should have endeavoured to find out how the jury system could be made effective in this country before abolishing it.

Then again, some of our State Governments do not understand clearly what the functions of a superior court of justice are and there are movements for transfer of benches of the High Court to big industrial or big commercial centres. For example, in Uttar Pradesh, there is talk of some of the work of the High Court being transferred to benches in Lucknow. Meerut and Agra too are laying claims to have benches of their own. I think it will be rather an unfortunate day when our High Courts do riot cease to function as one court. It is of enormous advantage to have an integrated court which sits at one place and which has an able andl efficient Bar to assist it.

Madam Deputy Chariman, I do not wish to take more time of the House but before I close I would like to say that attention should be paid by Government and by Parliament to the question of public health in this country. I do not think that you will be able to improve your public health unless your sanitation improves and your villages have clear water. Water supply in our villages is a disgrace to this country. There is no system of filtered water in some of our smaller towns and villages and for much of the incidence of disease in this country our sanitary conditions are responsible. My esteemed friend, Mrs Maya Devi Chettry, reminds me that there is scarcity of water in many places. You find it hard to get water even at railway stations. Another system which we must visualise for the future is a system of contributory health services. Now, we have such a scheme in Delhi. I am rather glad that it is there because it helps me to save part of my money but I do not understand why the scheme should be limited only to Government servants or Members of Parliament. I think it is not right to discriminate between one section of the community and another section of the community. You may start with a region, I can understand that. You may say tha't you cannot cover the entire country but start in a particular region and give free health services or nearly free, health services for the entire population living in that particular region but to place Government servants or Members of Parliament in a privileged position is, I think, unfair. I do not like to use the word 'socialist' because I think the word 'socialism' is not understood often by those who talk about it. I think it is not fair, it is not just, it is not in accordance with our concepts of social justice that a thing like that should be done.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just two minutes more.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: This is the last point, Madam.

We must ensure that we make it possible for the more talented scientists in our country to stay in our country.

I know some young people who have had brilliant degrees. Thay nave 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 educationst, 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

SHBI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Madarn, 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.*

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: (Gujari lam Deputy Chairman, 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 Houe 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 tMs 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 Membrrs 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 cooperate in this.

Madam, we have before us the Appropriation Bill toda". We have discussed the Budget only a few days ago. The Appropriation Bill may very wen be called. The Misappropriation Bill because it is for expenditure which though not approved by the Budget by jugglise o'f figures the executive or the Ministry is able to pet sanctioned and approved *post -facto.*

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL; *Post factum.*