

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri R. Gopalakrishnan for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current Session?

No hon. Member dissented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent granted.

I have also to inform Members that the following letter dated the 20th June, 1962, has been received from Shri S. C. Karayalar:—

"I have been advised by my doctor not to undertake a long distance journey at present. I am unable, therefore, to attend the current session of the Rajya Sabha. I request that the Rajya Sabha may be pleased to grant me leave of absence for the current session."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri S. C. Karayalar for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

No. hon. Member dissented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent granted.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MONEY BILLS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 162(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return by the Rajya Sabha of—

- | | |
|---|------------|
| (i) The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1962. | 30 minutes |
| (ii) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1962. | 30 minutes |
| (iii) The President's Pension (Amendment) Bill, 1962. | One hour |

including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to these Bills.

RESULTS OF ELECTIONS TO VARIOUS BODIES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The following Members being the only candidates nominated for election to the bodies respectively shown against each, I hereby declare them duly elected to be members of the said bodies:—

- (i) Council established under section 31 of the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961—Shri R. M. Deshmukh.
- (ii) Central Advisory Committee of the National Cadet Corps—Shri M. Govinda Reddy.
- (iii) Central Advisory Board of Education—Shri Satyacharan.
- (iv) All India Council for Technical Education—Shri Ram Sahai.

THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 3) BILL, 1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1960, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This Bill arises out of the Demands for Excess Grants relating to the year 1959-60, voted by the Lok Sabha on the 18th June, 1962 and the amount of expenditure charged on the Consolidat-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat.]

ed Fund of India and incurred in excess of the sanctioned appropriations for that year. The reasons which led to the excesses have been explained in the foot-notes below each Demand or Appropriation in the Statement of Demands for Excess Grants which has already been circulated to the hon. Members.

As the House is aware, these excesses are, in the first instance, required to be examined by the Public Accounts Committee and it is only after the Committee have looked into the facts of each case and recommended their regularisation that the matter is brought before Parliament. The Public Accounts Committee, have, in their Forty-first Report presented to Parliament on the 19th March, 1962, recommended the regularisation of these excesses. I do not, therefore, propose to take the time of the House to explain these excesses in detail.

Hon. Members may well enquire why these excesses arise and why they cannot be avoided. The payments on Government account are made by a large number of disbursing officers spread all over the country and usually there is a time-lag of a few months before the transactions relating to each Grant can be collated and brought to account against the sanctioned Grant or Appropriation. It does happen sometimes, when towards the close of the year, either as a result of rush of inevitable payments or book adjustments made by the Accounts Officers, the Grant for the year is exceeded, but these excesses come to notice when it is too late to go in for additional provision. Fortunately, these cases are very rare. I might mention that out of the total number of 144 Grants and Appropriations for the year 1959-60, excesses occurred in 14 cases only and constitute about .06 per cent of the total sanctioned Grants and Appropriations for the year. Nevertheless, I would like to assure the House that every possible effort is made to avoid or reduce such excesses to the minimum.

Sir, I move.

The question was proposed.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव "एक्सेस" को रेगुलराइज करने के बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी ने प्रस्तुत किया है उस के बारे में मैं कुछ निवेदन कर देना चाहता हूँ।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, अगर हम पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट और उस में दिये गये रिमार्क्स को पढ़ें तो यह मालूम पड़ता है कि हमारे शासन द्वारा जो काम किये जा रहे हैं उन में एक तो जो भिन्न-भिन्न विभाग हैं वे ठीक तरह से अपने एस्टीमेट्स बनाते नहीं, साथ ही साथ यह भी पाया जाता है कि जो खर्च पर नियंत्रण चाहिये और उसकी ठीक तरह से व्यवस्था चाहिये, वह भी होता नहीं। इसका यह परिणाम होता है कि सरकार द्वारा किसी भी योजना को कार्यान्वित करने के लिये जो ठीक से प्लानिंग होनी चाहिये वह होती नहीं। इतना ही नहीं, जो रिमार्क्स रिपोर्ट में दिये हैं उनको पढ़कर ऐसा लगता है कि हमारी पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी को इसके सिवा कोई चारा नहीं था कि उनकी तरफ इशारा करे। इन्सान को इशारा काफ़ी होता है और उसने सरकार को खाली इशारा कर के इस बात के लिये आगाह कर दिया है कि कम से कम आगे ऐसी ग़लती मत करना। माननीय सभापति महोदय, ऐसा लगता है कि फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट को जिस तरह दूसरों के सामने एक आदर्श उपस्थित करना चाहिये वैसे उसने नहीं किया। फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट को सरकार के अन्य विभागों के सामने आदर्श उपस्थित करना चाहिये लेकिन उसके बारे में रिपोर्ट में जो रिमार्क दिये गये उनको पढ़कर बड़ा दुःख होता है। सब से पहले

जो रिमार्क दिया है वह बड़ा आश्चर्यजनक है। पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के पेज ७ पर वर्क्स, हाउसिंग एवं सप्लाय विभाग के बारे में लिखा है :

The Committee would reiterate their recommendation in para 7 (vi) of their 23rd Report (1959-60) that the procedure for budgeting and accounting of 'suspense' head should be reviewed and a new procedure evolved early so that the provision under this Grant is not subject to wide fluctuations as at present.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Will he point out on what page it is?

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: On page 7 of the 41st Report of the Public Accounts Committee. तो इसके पहले भी पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह सुझाव दिया गया था कि यह जो वर्क्स, हाउसिंग एण्ड सप्लाय मिनिस्ट्री है उसको यह सुझाव दिया जाये कि वह भी ओवर-बजटिंग न करे। उसने अपने बजट बनाने की इस समय जो व्यवस्था अपना रखी है उस में परिवर्तन किया जाना चाहिये ताकि भविष्य में इस तरह की गलती न हो। इस तरह की अनियमितता के बारे में पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कई उदाहरण दिये गये हैं।

अब मैं आपके सामने एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री के संबंध में कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री समझती है कि वह सारे लोगों के नियंत्रण से एक्सटर्नल है और हमारे ऊपर नियंत्रण करने वाला कोई नहीं है। इस विभाग में इतनी मनमानी है कि कहा नहीं जा सकता है। इस विभाग के लोग साल-साल पहले टी० ए० एडवान्स ले लेते हैं और वह बाद में भी वसूल नहीं हो पाता है।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): Question.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी

चौरङिया : इस तरह से वहां एडवान्स ले लिया जाता है और कोई इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं करता है। मैं इस संबंध में आडिट रिपोर्ट से एक नहीं, कई उदाहरण दे सकता हूं जिनको देखकर आश्चर्य होता है कि सरकार इस तरह के मामलों में कितनी मौन बैठी है। इस तरह के मामलों में ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे किसी की सिफारिश की गई है या किसी का कोई रिश्तेदार बैठा है। यही कारण है कि इस तरह के मामलों में कार्यवाही नहीं की गई, अन्यथा कोई कारण नहीं था कि जब पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने शासन के सामने इतने उदाहरण अनियमितता के रखे हैं तो क्यों नहीं उन के विषय में कार्यवाही की जाती है। आडिट रिपोर्ट में स्पष्ट लिखा है कि हाई कमिशन ने कराची में ३०३ लाख की जमीन अपने राजदूतावास के लिए कराची नगर निगम से खरीदी थी लेकिन वह अभी साल तक खाली पड़ी रही और वहां पर बीच में ही नये मकान खरीदे गये। दस वर्ष होने आये अभी तक इस जमीन की "टाइटिल डीड" पूरी नहीं की गई और न इस बारे में कोई ऐक्शन लिया गया। आखिर हमारे बड़े-बड़े अधिकारी विदेशों में नियुक्त हैं और उनको हज़ारों रुपये तन्खाह दी जाती है और फिर वे हमारे हितों की रक्षा क्यों नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारी बातों का असर तो दूर रहा, लेकिन जहां उन के स्वार्थ का संबंध होता है उस पर वे बहुत सतर्क रहते हैं। हमारे एक महानुभाव का अदीसअबाबा से बैंकाक को ट्रान्सफर हुआ था और उन्होंने टी० ए० ए० का एडवान्स इतना ले लिया था

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]

जितने में कि वे दो दफा अदोस अबाबा से वैकाक आया और जाया जा सकता था, और फिर भी उस में बकाया रह सकता था। और उन्होंने एक साल के बाद अपना टी० ए० बिल पेश किया लेकिन उसकी वसूली का कोई ठिकाना नहीं है। उनके ऊपर काफी रुपया बकाया पड़ा है। एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री में इस तरह के एक नहीं, कई उदाहरण रिपोर्ट में दिये हुए हैं। इस रिपोर्ट के पेज सात पर यह दिया हुआ है :

"The Committee are not satisfied with this explanation. Postponement of debits on the plea of lack of funds or provision is objectionable as it will vitiate effective Parliamentary control."

तो पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जो कुछ दिया है कि पार्लियामेंट का इस तरह के मामलों में कंट्रोल होता है, उस पर भी कुठाराघात किया जाता है। इस रिपोर्ट में आगे यह लिखा हुआ है :

"The Committee understand that instructions have been issued to the NEFA Administration to avoid recurrence of such lapses in future. They trust that these instructions will be duly implemented in future."

तो इस के सिवा पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी के पास कोई चारा नहीं है कि सरकार नेफा सरकार को लिखे कि भविष्य में ऐसी आशा की जाती है कि वह इस तरह की गलती नहीं करेगी। पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी को भी इस बारे में सरकार पर इतना ही विश्वास करने को रह गया कि वह नेफा सरकार को यह लिखे कि इस तरह की गलतियाँ फिर नहीं दोहराई जायेंगी।

एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री की जहाँ आपने इतनी अनियमिता देखी हैं, वहाँ जब हम फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट के बारे में इस तरह की बातें देखते हैं तो बहुत दुःख होता है कि हमारा फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट इस तरह की गलती कर सकता है। उसके बारे में भी पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी को इस तरह की बात लिखनी पड़े तो यह बड़े दुःख की बात है। हमारी सरकार तो कंट्रोल करने के लिए प्रतिदिन मिनिस्ट्रों की फौज बढ़ाती चली जाती है। सीमा के लिए फौज बढ़ायी जाये तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी—लेकिन सरकार जब अपने मंत्रियों की फौज इस तरह से बढ़ाती है और फिर उस पर पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी यह रिपोर्ट देती है तो यह बड़े लज्जन की बात है। इस तरह के रिमाक्स अगर किसी दूसरे विभाग के बारे में कहे जाते तो दूसरी बात थी लेकिन हमारी फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री के बारे में जब रिपोर्ट में इस तरह की बात कही जाती है तो बहुत दुःख होता है। इसी रिपोर्ट में यह कहा गया है :

"The three instances above disclose the lapses on the part of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel. The Committee deplore that in the matter of budgeting and control over expenditure such mistakes should have occurred in the Ministry of Finance, who are expected to set an example to other Ministries in financial discipline."

परन्तु इसके विपरीत ३,०३, ३६,०२५ रुपया जो एक्सेस खर्च हुआ है वह फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री की डिमाण्ड में शामिल है जो कि एक बड़े दुःख की बात है। इसके आगे यह भी बतलाया गया है :

"Subject to the above observations, the Committee recommend that the excesses referred to in para 4 above be regularised by Parliament in the manner prescribed."

अगर इस अनियमितता को पार्लियामेंट में रेगुलराइज न किया जाता तो इसके सिवाय और कोई चारा भी नहीं था। मैं माननीय मंत्री जो से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अगर हमारे यहां प्लानिंग का अभाव है तो फिर शुरू से ही प्लानिंग को ढोल क्यों बजाये जाते हैं, प्लानिंग की क्यों चर्चा की जाती है और क्यों इतने पोस्टर लगाये जाते हैं कि हमारी योजना इतनी समृद्धिवाली है, इतनी प्रगतिशील है। इस तरह की सारी बातें आप प्लानिंग के बारे में पहले से करते आ रहे हैं। आपके प्लानिंग में बहुत बड़ी अव्यवस्था है। एक तरफ तो ओवर-बजटिंग की शिकायत की जाती है और दूसरी तरफ एक्सेस दिखलाया जाता है, एक्सेस ग्रान्ट्स होते हैं। किस तरह की बातें होती हैं, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। हमारे सदन में मंत्री जी साल में एक दो सप्लीमेंटरी डिमाण्ड पेश करते हैं, एप्रोप्रिएशन कर लेते हैं। टोकन ग्रान्ट्स की मांग पेश कर सकते हैं। जब उन्हें इतने अधिकार प्राप्त हैं फिर फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट में इस तरह का एक्सेस हो तो बहुत दुःख होता है। दूसरे विभाग के अन्तर्गत होता तो हम समझते कि उनको फाइनेन्स के बारे में ज्ञान नहीं है लेकिन जब वह विभाग जो सारे सरकार के फाइनेन्स को कंट्रोल करता है उसमें इस तरह की बात होती है तो ज्यादा दुःख होता है। इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जो बातें लिखी हैं, उन के ऊपर वे अवश्य ध्यान देंगे और उन्हें दूर करने की कोशिश करेंगे। जब हम ने पहले हंडिया से चावल निकाना यह देखने के लिए कि अच्छी तरह से चावल पक गया है या नहीं, तो हमें पहले फाइनेन्स डिपार्टमेंट का चावल हाथ आया जो इतना खराब था कि उसको व सबको ही ज्यादा दुस्त करने की जरूरत है।

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I understand, the amount, for which the Government has brought forward a Bill before this House for sanction, has already been spent. Although the Constitution provides for this procedure. I do not know whether it is in the best tradition to spend the money first and then ask Parliament for its sanction. My submission is that if the Government had foreseen these expenditures they would have included these demands in the regular Budget. I find that there are no reasons given in the Statement of Objects and Reasons in the Bill. Now, the hon. Minister has explained the reason, that on account of heavy rush at the year end so many expenditures had to be incurred. Amounts were disbursed by so many officers. When the year lapsed, the excess amounts were spent. That is precisely my complaint that it happens always in Government Departments, that the Government does not do anything for a whole year, does not plan and does not foresee what the expenditure would be. But at the end of the financial year, mostly in March and that too in the latter part of March, Government sanctions the amount and places it at the disposal of different institutions and departments.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Then, such heavy or excess expenditure is incurred. Therefore, my submission is that a strict control should be exercised over this matter.

Secondly, the hon. Minister gave a certificate that the cases were only fourteen. Even one case of excess expenditure without the sanction of Parliament is most objectionable. Therefore, to my mind, 14 cases are much more than what is usually expected from a democratic Government.

[Shri R. S. Khandekar.]

In the short time at my disposal I will deal with only three topics given in the Bill. Firstly, with regard to Himachal Pradesh, I would submit that this territory has been neglected and it is after fifteen years that the Government has awakened from its sleep and has spent so much amount. My submission is that Himachal Pradesh is a most important part of this country, because it is on the border land. So, the expenditure which has been incurred ought to have been in the regular Budget.

Similarly, the Health Ministry says that it is improving, but we see that malaria is growing and the danger of smallpox is in an epidemic form in most parts of the country. I do not understand how the Ministry is expected to incur such amounts of expenditure and with no results.

Lastly, I have not followed this item, 'Capital Outlay on Buildings', showing a sum of Rs. 840. It would be better if some explanation of this amount is given.

Thank you.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala):
Madam, this Bill is to regularise the excess amounts spent under various heads mentioned in the Schedule, according to the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee in its 41st Report. This demand for excess grants relates to the year 1959-60 and now after two years and three months we are asked to regularise the excess amounts spent. It is legitimate to ask why there has been such a delay. I feel that the Ministries, at least some of them, are not attaching that much importance that they ought to to the comments of the Public Accounts Committee. Hence there is this delay. I am aware that the Minister will reply that there has not been any undue delay and that the Report of the P.A.C. was submitted only in March, 1962. But let me refer to the P.A.C. Report itself. In

its introductory remarks it has drawn attention to its comment in the previous report, to its Thirty-second Report, about the delay on the part of Ministries in furnishing notes relating to the reasons or the circumstances leading to such excesses and has urged that the Ministry of Finance should impress upon all the Ministries that the prescribed time limit of two months should be observed strictly by them in the future. The Appropriation Accounts were presented to the House in May, 1961, and the explanatory notes should have been furnished by the Ministries by the 5th July, 1961. If we go through the statement in paragraph 4 of the P.A.C. Report, it will be seen that there has been undue delay in some instances at least in furnishing these explanatory notes. If they had been submitted in time, then the P.A.C. would have been enabled to consider the same and would have submitted its report earlier. So it is not right on the part of the Ministry of Finance to justify their stand that there has been no undue delay. The Ministry of Finance should reveal more promptness and instead of justifying this delay should ask them to abide strictly by the directives given by the P.A.C.

The explanations furnished by the Ministries concerned also reveal that proper attention is not being paid to the assessment of the requirements in the budget and also to the fact that close watch is not being kept on the progress of expenditure. This has been pointed out in the Report of the P.A.C. in paragraph 5, where it is stated that as in the previous years the excesses were primarily due to the defective assessment of requirements in the budget and in the revised estimates. This fact is brought out more glaringly in some cases in the Audit Report where funds were surrendered although there were excesses over the final grant. There are three instances at page 11 in the Audit Report in which you can find under Demands No. 35, 97 and 111 that there have been surrenders even though excess has been spent over the final Grant Appropria-

tion. Now take the example of Grant No. 55, Himachal Pradesh, item (b), Account 4. The excess is stated to be due to increased hiring charges of vehicles engaged during the potato season, that is October to December—mark this period October to December—for the transportation of potatoes and for the consumption of petrol, etc., etc. The season was in October to December. The administration had asked for additional funds. I hope when they requested for additional funds, they would have shown the reason as well, as to why they required the additional funds. But the Ministry without taking into consideration the trend of expenditure during the closing months of the previous year but considering only the actual expenditure in the nine months of that year did not support that demand. The expenditure was incurred already, but the Ministry was not ready to come to Parliament with an additional demand. Similarly, if we take Demand No. 57, that also reveals the same thing. I do not want to elaborate on these things, but all this shows that there has not been a proper watch kept on the expenditure, and the Ministry has not come in time for asking the supplementary demand. I think the usual explanation given in the P.A.C. Report is not sufficient. The Ministry owes an explanation to this House on the steps it has taken to avoid these mistakes in the future. Thank you.

श्री शिवानन्द रसौल (हिमाचल प्रदेश) :

उत्सभापति महोदय, मुझे इस एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल के बारे में पहले सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को धन्यवाद करना है जिसने यूनियन टेरिटरीज को और खासकर हिमाचल प्रदेश को डेवलपमेंट के वास्ते हर साल बहुत काफी पैसा देने की योजनाएं बनाई हैं।

इसके साथ साथ यह भी कहने की जरूरत है—जैसा अभी दो माननीय सदस्यों ने हिमाचल प्रदेश की तरफ इशारा किया और जैसा कि एक आइटम इस एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल में भी है—कि खर्चा किये जाने के बाद

उसके चैक का कोई साधन नहीं है। आया वह खर्चा ठीक ढंग से हुआ या नहीं हुआ, उसको चैक करने का कोई साधन नहीं है। और खासकर यूनियन टेरिटरीज में जहां कि लेजिस्लेचर वगैरह कुछ नहीं हैं। दूसरी स्टेट्स में लेजिस्लेचर हैं जहां उनके खर्चों की छानबीन हो सकती है। असेम्बलीज में सबालों के द्वारा और दूसरे मौकों पर मिनिस्टर्स से पूछताछ हो सकती है कि कहां पर वह खर्चा हुआ। लेकिन यूनियन टेरिटरीज में, खास तौर से जहां कि रेप्रेजेंटेटिव गवर्नमेंट नहीं है, यह मुमकिन नहीं है। इसलिए वहां के खर्च की देखभाल करने की, कि पैसा ठीक ढंग से इस्तेमाल हो रहा है या नहीं हो रहा है, यह ड्यूटी केन्द्रीय सरकार की फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री और होम मिनिस्ट्र पर आती है। एक क्रायटेरिया यहां पर ठीक ढंग से डेवलपमेंट होने का यह रखा गया है कि जितनी ग्रांट्स दी जाती हैं वे सारी खर्च हो जायें और उनके अलावा एक्सेस ग्रांट के वास्ते भी डिमांड की जाये, यह साधारण सैद्धान्तिक तरीके से ठीक हो सकता है। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ उसके निरीक्षण का कोई और जरिया भी होना चाहिये कि आया वह पैसा ठीक ढंग से खर्च भी हुआ है या नहीं हुआ है।

मैं हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहूंगा। यह ठीक है कि वहां खर्चा काफी हो रहा है और डेवलपमेंट भी चारों तरफ हर प्रकार से हो रहा है। लेकिन वहां जनता का यह अनुभव जरूर है कि जितना पैसा हमारे ऊपर खर्च किया जा रहा है, उसके मुकाबिले में अगर अदावा लगाया जाये तो उतनी डेवलपमेंट नहीं हो रही है। इस तरह बैकवर्ड इलाकों के डेवलपमेंट के वास्ते जो पैसा खर्च किया जा रहा है, उससे ठीक ढंग से डेवलपमेंट किया जा रहा है या नहीं, इसका निरीक्षण करने के लिए, जैसा कि मैं ने अभी अर्ज किया, वहां कोई रेप्रेजेंटेटिव गवर्नमेंट नहीं है। इसलिए यह केन्द्रीय सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि वह उसका निरीक्षण करे।

[श्री शिवानन्द रमौल]

मेरे मित्र ने जो ट्रांसपोर्ट डिपार्टमेंट का जिक्र किया, उसके बारे में कहने को तो बहुत सी चीजें हैं, लेकिन इस वक्त कहना मुश्किल है। हिमाचल प्रदेश में हमारा नेशनलाइज्ड ट्रांसपोर्ट है। आलू के सीजन में, जिस वक्त का यह जिक्र है, वहां पर ट्रांसपोर्ट डिपार्टमेंट २५ परसेंट एडिशनल चार्ज पर ट्रक्स इंगेज करता है। लेकिन जो प्राइवेट ट्रक्स होते हैं उन पर तमाम खर्चा प्राइवेट ट्रांसपोर्टर्स का या ट्रक्स के ओनर्स का होता है और जितने ट्रांसपोर्ट डिपार्टमेंट के ट्रक्स हैं वे हमेशा ही इस्तेमाल होते हैं और उन पर ज्यादा खर्च की आवश्यकता है ही नहीं। जो प्राइवेट ट्रक्स हैं वे पचासों और सैकड़ों की तादाद में वहां पर इंगेज किये जाते हैं और वह सब खर्चा उन ओनर्स का होता है। इसके साथ साथ यह समझ में नहीं आता कि जब हमारा हिमाचल प्रदेश ट्रांसपोर्ट डिपार्टमेंट २५ परसेंट, उसे मुनाफा समझिये या यह समझिये कि एडिशनल रायलटी, लेता है तो नुकसान होने का कोई सवाल ही नहीं है। कैसे यह नुकसान होता है? ये चीजें हैं जो वहां फार्मर्स मिनिस्ट्री या होम मिनिस्ट्री को देखनी चाहियें।

इसके अलावा एक और शिकायत है। तमाम स्कीमों की मंजूरी शुरू साल में न मिल करके, जब साल क्लोज होने को आता है तब मिलती है और जितनी स्कीमें होती हैं उनकी मंजूरी यहां से मिलती है। उसका नतीजा यह होता है कि मार्च के महीने में वहां के अफसरों की दौड़ हिमाचल प्रदेश से दिल्ली को लगी रहती है। तो इसका मतलब यह है कि उस वक्त अगर उनको मंजूरी मिले और पैसा मिले तो फिर महीने में, २० रोज में या तीन हफ्ते में किस तरह से वह पैसा खर्च करेंगे और कितना पैसा खर्च करेंगे? लेकिन मुहकमे की कोशिश यह जरूर होती है कि वह पैसा खर्च जरूर कर दें। अब वह कैसे खर्च करेंगे, इसका अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है। तो मैं आशा करूंगा कि हिमाचल प्रदेश या दिल्ली या और दूसरी जगहों के बारे में जहां कि रेप्रेजेंटेटिव

गवर्नमेंट नहीं है और जहां एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है लेकिन उसको चैक करने का कोई साधन मौजूद नहीं है तो सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी आती है। वहां जरा सावधानी के साथ उनके एकाउंट्स वगैरह को वह चैक करेगी और जो वेंस्टेज वहां पर होता है उसको रोकने की कृपा करेगी।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad that the House has done a keen scrutiny of the Demands for excess Grants and some very pertinent and relevant points have been raised. Also, the remarks of the P.A.C. particularly about the Ministry of Finance have been quoted. I very much regret that such a lapse on the part of the Ministry should have taken place. But may I point out to hon. Members that this is one of the very rare occasions when a lapse on the part of the Finance Ministry has been pointed out by the Public Accounts Committee. In this matter, of the three instances cited, one is in regard to item (i), that is, interest on Canadian credit for purchase of wheat and that was because the payment by the India Supply Mission Washington was made on the due date but the debit for that amount of payment was made only in the year 1959-60. The intimation about this adjustment was sent to the Ministry by the A.G.C.R. in September, 1959, and if the Ministry of Finance had been alert, it could have come for appropriation before the House but somehow or other it was lost sight of when the Appropriation for Interest on Debts, etc. for 1959-60 was finally determined, and that resulted in the Demand for Excess Grants. I admit that the Ministry should not have lost sight of it and I very much regret it but this is a very solitary instance.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :

आदर्श पुरुषों के जीवन में एक भी ऐसी घटना हो जाती है तो वह उन्हें गिरा देती है।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: But I think that no institution, no person, no organisation is absolutely 100 per cent. perfect. If it is near perfect, I think the hon. Member should be satisfied.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
मैंने कहा कि आदर्श पुरुषों में ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Is Mr. Chordia infallible?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
आप जरा जोर से बोलें । वहां से गड़बड़ करेंगे तो वह समझ में नहीं आता है ।

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Maharashtra): Mr. Chordia is not perfect in his own dealings.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: So far as the other items are concerned, one is about the interest on the loans from the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to the Hindustan Steel Ltd., that is, Rourkela. First it was decided that it would be paid from the Hindustan Steel; later on for accounting and other purposes, it was decided that the Government should pay. And it was only on the 23rd April, 1960 that the Accountant General, Central Revenues, informed the Ministry that the necessary adjustments amounting to Rs 2.05 crores had been carried out in the accounts for March, 1960, which resulted in the excess. So, this could not have been anticipated because the intimation came only, as I said, in April, 1960 after the financial year.

Also about the Depreciation Reserve Fund (Railways)—this is only about interest and debt charges—the actual adjustment of expenditure was made on the basis of entries opening in the Depreciation Reserve Fund as on 15th August, 1947, which resulted in an excess over the final appropriation. This came to notice only at the time of carrying out the adjustment in the accounts for 1959-60 after the

close of the year, when no action to provide additional funds was possible.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
यह आपके आपस के झगड़े की बात है । इससे मुझे मतलब नहीं है ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: The hon. Member should try to understand it. It is not a question of आपस के झगड़े, but it is a question of the complicated procedure of accounting which I would like to enlighten the hon. Member. I have done so previously.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
मुझे इलाइटन न कीजिये, इलाइटन कीजिये एकाउंटेंट जेनरल को, इलाइटन कीजिये पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी को ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I know that the hon. Member is the repository of wisdom. But I think hon. Members would like some information to be given to the House. My main point is that this is a very solitary instance which I very much regret. But so far the performance of the Finance Ministry has been commendable. And as I pointed out, from year to year, this figure of excess grant is coming down and the excess amount here is infinitesimal, it is .06 per cent. of the Budget.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
मत दोहराइये, समझ लिया आपको ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Before I go to the general question of the procedure of accounting, let me answer one or two points that have been raised. One point was raised about the hire charges in Himachal Pradesh. The explanations given in the footnote clearly indicate that this could not have been anticipated because the bulk of the expenditure was incurred after September. The hon. Member perhaps knows that when winter sets in and when the crop is ready, trans-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

port from Simla and the interior parts of Himachal Pradesh to the plains—either by road or by rail—becomes very difficult, and sometimes when there is heavier snowfall as happened last year or the previous year, all the calculations of charges go wrong. So, it is due to one of these uncertainties that the excess had occurred, which could not have been anticipated earlier. Therefore, this is unavoidable and the blame could not be fixed upon anybody except the situation. (*Interruption.*)

Then, about Demand No. 111 regarding the Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs, it is explained in the footnote—hon. Members will have perhaps read it—that the excess under the former head was due to the adjustment during the year 1959-60 of debits in the supply of rice which the Ministry had expected would be adjusted in the following year. The excess under the latter head was attributable chiefly to an unanticipated increase in the contract rates of the Central Purchasing Organisation, the receipt of demands for additional allotment from outposts after the determination of final grants and omission to include the value of rice purchased direct from Manipur by the Deputy Commissioner, Kohima. This has resulted in the excess. Some such thing could not be avoided.

Let me briefly explain the reason why such excess Grants are inevitable in the system of our accounting because, as I said, the appropriating body is one, sanction is made at one place, demands are made at another place and the account is kept at another place. There must be one organisation which makes all these things. Parliament votes the Appropriation. The Ministry of Finance comes up with the Bill for the appropriation. But all payments are disbursed throughout the country. Numerous agencies are engaged in spending that money and numerous checks and other things are coming

and criss-crossing always. So it is very difficult to know, particularly at a point, how much money is spent, and much more difficult to know at the end of the year when the appropriation, when the money authorised, is exceeded or is finished. That can only happen if all payments in the country are made by cheques so that there is an automatic adjustment, as you have in the banking system, where you have an account and you have the cheques. The same person makes the payment; the same person keeps the account and, therefore, as soon as your appropriation or your account is over, you get a notice, you get a notice even a few weeks earlier, or on a monthly basis, that you have only so much left in your account, so that you are careful, you do not any more make any payments by cheque. There is no such unified procedure in our system. Ours is a federal system. We have a number of authorities, and the whole payment is disbursed all over. So, in such a complicated situation, of numerous authorities making payments, of appropriations made at different times, it is difficult to find out the exact position of the disbursements or the moneys appropriated at a particular point of time. We have 144 Grants in this particular year. This year it may be more, and under each Grant it is difficult to know when the amount is exceeded. It is impossible for any person or any agency to know the exact position. We cannot get over the difficulty under the present system. This question was examined by the Auditor-General at the instance of the Public Accounts Committee. In the past various bodies have gone into it, to see how to unify the system of making payments adjustments and accounting so that excesses do not occur. But they have not been able to find a solution to the question of payments, the question of separation of audit and account, and to the other questions and mainly because of the cost of the personnel and other things we have not been able to institute a

unified system for making payments and for an automatic adjustment. So we are not able to do it, and I should like the House to remember that to eliminate completely any excess payment is impossible in the situation. This should be realised. (*Interruption.*)

Let me finish before the hon. Member wants to intervene or interject.

My main point is that in a system like this it is impossible to eliminate excess payments hundred per cent, but if you see the record, subject to this limitation we are making all efforts to minimise the excess, and we have come to a figure of .06 per cent. What a better record can there be? Only a few instances have been pointed out, just to make a mountain out of a mole hill, and that way it will not be a proper assessment of the situation.

I am one with the hon. House that such lapses should not occur. The hon. Member raised a point that the Ministries take time more than two months. It is regrettable. We have sent circulars that they should give their memoranda to the Public Accounts Committee in time, and we are going to remind them again to impress upon them that they should not make undue delay in such things, in any case not beyond the period of two months within which the Public Accounts Committee has asked them to do. In co-operation, in streamlining, in every thing, we are trying to do, and we have reduced excess payments to the minimum extent. It will be our constant and continuing endeavour that such excesses should not occur, such lapses should not occur but, as I said, in a system like this, the House should not expect that excesses would be completely eliminated. No system, no organisation is perfect; the Finance Ministry is not perfect. May be the hon. Member who is sitting opposite; he claims that he is perfect. He may

be, but neither we are, nor the organisation is.

With these words, Madam, I move.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1960, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE 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.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 3 BILL, 1962.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN): I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services for the purposes of Railways during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1960, in excess of the amounts granted for those services