

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज : चतुर्थ श्रेणी के लोगों के ऊपर जो हाउस टैक्स और पाखाना टैक्स लगाया गया है उस के बारे में आपने कुछ नहीं कहा।

श्री शाहनवाज खां : मेरे आदरणीय दोस्त श्री शीलभद्र याजी ने पाखाना टैक्स के बारे में कहा था।

श्री पां० ना० राजभोज : पहले मैंने इसका जिक्र किया था।

श्री शाहनवाज खां : पहले आप ने इसका जिक्र किया और बाद में श्री शीलभद्र याजी ने किया और मैं आपको यह खुशखबरी सुनाता हूँ कि अब यह टैक्स नहीं लिया जाता है।

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: May THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to the Railways?

SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN: Sir, that is up to the hon. Member to say, not for me to say. Generally, I have understood from hon. Members that the present departmental catering is a distinct improvement on the catering that was being done by the contractors. I am aware that there is plenty of room for improvement, and I can assure him that there is no complacency on that ground.

#### THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services, of the financial year 1961-62, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN) in the Chair.]

Sir, this Bill arises out of the Supplementary Demands of Rs. 51.71 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on the 19th March, 1962, and the expenditure of Rs. 64.19 crores charged on the Consolidated Fund of India. This is the third and the last batch of Supplementary Demands presented during this year. The total additional requirements amount to Rs. 45.88 crores on the revenue account, Rs. 10.51 crores for capital expenditure and the balance of Rs. 59.50 crores for disbursement of loans and advances to the States. The Supplementary Demands statement presented to the House on the 13th March, 1962, gives full explanations in support of these proposals. I would, therefore, content myself with referring to some of the more important items included in these Demands.

First I would speak about the Defence Services account as it requires an additional expenditure of Rs. 21.89 crores to meet their various commitments. This is mostly due to the increase in the strength of the army resulting from the expansion measures sanctioned during the year as well as of the strength of civilians employed with or for the army and expansion of the activities of the ordnance factories to cope with their manufacturing programme.

Of the other items of revenue expenditure, mention may be made of the payment of Rs. 4.6 crores to the States as their share of Union Excise Duties, and Rs. 4.13 crores for additional requirements of the Central Public Works Department. The increase in the share of Union Excise Duties follows the latest estimates of collections of these Duties during the current year and also takes into account a sum of Rs. 2.8 crores as arrear payments for previous years. The additional requirements of the Central Public Works Department are mainly for the maintenance of adequate stocks of building materials required for their construction programme and also for payment of arrears of house

tax and service charges on Union properties in Delhi and Calcutta. It covers also New Delhi.

A sum of Rs. 1·58 crores is required for the administration of the territories of Goa, Daman and Diu which have become Union Territories from the 20th December, 1961.

The payment of House Rent and Compensatory City allowances at enhanced rates to the staff stationed in Delhi and New Delhi consequent on these cities having been declared as 'A' class cities with effect from 1st July, 1961, and also the liberalisation of the rates of overtime allowance admissible to staff accounts for additional provision required in a number of Demands. The details in regard to the allowances admissible as a result of these decisions are available in the Explanatory Memorandum on the Budget of the Central Government for 1962-63.

Apart from the above items, additional provision is required for transfer of Rs. 3 crores to the Special Development Fund as a result of larger receipts of grants from the U.S.A. under P.L. 480 and for payment of Rs. 2·8 crores to the Renewals Reserve Fund from the increased surplus of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. The increase in the surplus of the Posts and Telegraphs Department is mainly due to the retrospective revision with effect from 1st April, 1959, of the rates of remuneration payable to the Posts and Telegraphs Department by the General Revenues on account of Small Savings work pertaining to Post Office Savings Bank, National Savings Certificates, etc. A sum of Rs. 2·15 crores is also required for payment to marginal producers and re-rollers as a result of increase in the retention prices of certain uncommon categories of steel and pig iron produced by steel companies but this expenditure will be simultaneously recovered from the Iron and Steel Equalisation Fund.

Of the additional capital expenditure, Rs. 7·14 crores are for the import of steel from the U.S.A. Under the various agreements with the Development Loan Fund authority, now known as the U.S. agency for International Development, steel of the total value of about Rs. 17·88 crores is expected to be imported in the current year with the loan assistance to be provided by this Fund for the various private and public sector projects. The total expenditure would be covered by recoveries from the sale proceeds of the steel imported. In addition, a sum of Rs. 3·27 crores is required for roads including National Highways and border roads.

The Demands include two token provisions for expenditure on the development of Mangalore and Tuticorin ports into major ports and for the acquisition and purchase by Government of the shares of Moghul Line, Ltd., which had earlier been acquired by the Western Shipping Corporation.

In addition, Rs. 59·5 crores are being asked for additional loan assistance to the States. As a result of rising tempo of developmental expenditure and temporary lags in their resources, some of the State Governments have been facing acute ways and means difficulties which had to be met by the grant of additional ways and means assistance of Rs. 21·5 crores. It was also decided to grant long-term loans amounting to Rs. 30 crores to four States to cover their overdrafts with the Reserve Bank at the end of the Second Plan. In addition, Rs. 8 crores are required for making arrear payments to the States for their miscellaneous development schemes relating to the Second Plan.

Of the total additional requirement of Rs. 115·89 crores included in this batch of Supplementary Demands, Rs. 23·45 crores will be met from additional receipts, recoveries, adjustments, surrenders, etc. The net outgo from the Consolidated Fund of India arising out of these Demands would

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.]  
 accordingly be Rs. 92.44 crores only. Taking the present batch with the two earlier batches of Supplementary Demands the net additional outgo will be of order of Rs. 113.65 crores. This does not, however, reflect the complete picture of the Revised Estimates for the year which is available only in the Budget papers presented on the 15th March, 1962.

Sir, I move.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): You want to speak? You should realise that we have got only 20 minutes for this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Minister has taken ten minutes out of that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): You may take ten minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyway, I do not wish to say much but I find an item Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers. Almost in every Supplementary Demand for Grants we find that a special provision is made for the privy purses of the Princes. Now, Sir, we are opposed to these privy purses being given. Therefore, I would ask the House not to sanction anything as an additional sum to be given to the Princes' privy purses. Why it is done it is stated here, and I now rise to say that, in principle, we should not sanction such a thing. This Government has taken a particular liking for the Princes. I find the hon. Prime Minister criticises the Princes for their advent in politics and so on and sees danger in it. But at the same time the Government sanctions money as privy purses to the Princes. Now, it may be said that the Constitution provides for it. But we have also the power to amend the Constitution and also not to make further grants or add to the grants that are being given.

Now, Sir, recently I have been somewhat amused by their solicitude for the Princes. Mrs. Kennedy came to this country, the wife of the President of the United States of America. She spent nine days and five days were allocated for the Princes. And she went to Jaipur, Jodhpur and other places and spent there 26 hours. Even the Government's representatives were not allowed to join some of the functions. I read in the papers that special secret dinners were organised, dance parties and so on, where nobody from the Government even was allowed to go. We see the Princess on an elephant's back with the Maharajas and similar things. Now, this is the attitude which the Government has adopted. . . . It is boosting the Princes . . . . . We would like to know, because this is no good. That shows that they put the Princes in a particular category. \*\*\* \*\*

How is it that such things happen? Now, I say this is their attitude, give the money to the Princes so that they can form the Swatantra Party, carry on elections with their privy purses, win seats by bribing people here and there and then when the wife of the American President comes, they take her to the palace, arrange boat sailings in the lakes, swimming in the special swimming pool of the Maharani of Jaipur and then special dinner parties and so on. Are we going to provide money for that? This is the question that I ask. Now, as you know, I say that this is no partisan thing. I read it in the newspapers that not even the Chief Minister was allowed to get near. The representative of the Ministry of External Affairs was not allowed to get near. These were special parties and overnight these parties went on and on. They calculated 26 hours.

\*\*\* \*\* Well, I raise this point on a question of principle.

\*\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Money is being given for that. Now, what is the use? Cannot we stop the privy purse? Yes, the Constitution is there. We can change the Constitution. It is no use trying to make out in the country that the Princes are coming into politics and that is something which spells danger to our parliamentary institutions and at the same time give money to the Princes. Do you know how much they have given? According to the White Paper, since independence, they have given up to now Rs. 77 crores as privy purse to the Princes and every year Rs. 5½ crores is being spent. And now we add to it. This is the position. And then we say we are upset by the Swatantra Party, the emergence of it. You are paying for the rise of the Swatantra Party.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa):** Has the hon. Member any information that there are also Rajas and Maharajas in the Congress Party? He does not speak a word about them.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I do. I am thankful to the hon. Member for reminding me of that. I know they have their share. Rajaji has taken some and Panditji has taken some. I know that. You are right. In Orissa you have divided some in the Swatantra Party and some in the Congress Party.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** But you have taken some share out of it.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** No, we have not. He has no sense of proportion. Now, I went to Rajasthan. Do you know that there were few at that time? Congress Party leaders visited the palace to get Rajas in the morning and the Swatantra leaders in the afternoon to get the Rani from there in the Swatantra Party. There was competition. The Maharani of Jaipur, Gayatri Devi, told the world at a Press conference that before she decided to prefer Rajaji and join the Swatantra Party, the Congress had approached her in order that she should join the Congress Party. I am

sorry for the Congress that such a glamorous lady could not be brought into the Congress Party. I am sorry for the Party. But what can I do about it? They are dividing. I am objecting to this thing in principle. This money that is being given is now feeding political reaction.

In the old days the privy purses were used for getting race horses. The privy purses were used for all kinds of things in Monte Carlo and other places in Europe for buying palaces and jewellery for these Princes and Princesses. Today this privy purse is being used for running reactionary political organisations, organising the Swatantra Party, buying up votes, influencing and corrupting elections in our country. We cannot stand this thing. If the Government does really mean to prevent this emergence of the rightist reactionary Swatantra Party, then we demand, in all fairness to their conscience, that this privy purse business should now be stopped. At the time when it was granted the Rajas were not joining politics with a view to corrupting the public life of the country or bringing about reactionary forces into the political arena of the country. Today the privy purse, apart from being wasted in Europe and other places in very many things which I need not describe here, is also being used simultaneously for corrupting the political life of the country and for the building up of a reactionary opposition in the country and for putting pressure within the Congress Party, so that the Swatantra, it seems, is against the Congress Party to become articulate, to become vociferous with encouragement from this side. This is the technique. I know that there are many people in the Congress Party who are seriously concerned about the rise of the Swatantra Party. But I also know at the same time that ideologically and politically there are many inside the Congress Party who are of the Swatantra breed. Politically speaking some of them come from the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] same stock as Rajas and Maharajas. Why must we then sanction privy purse? The country's money is not to be wasted in this manner, when we are asking the common man to tighten his belt. Why is the Maharani of Jaipur or the Maharaja of Jaipur, who may be sitting here in the Opposition, being given Rs. 26 lakhs as privy purse? Why is the Maharani of Gwalior or the Maharaja of Gwalior being given Rs. 22 lakhs and so on as privy purse? They belong to her party. Why is a privy purse of Rs. 26 lakhs or so being given to the Gaekwad of Baroda? Why is a privy purse of Rs. 50 lakhs being handed out to the \*\*\* \*\*\* Nizam of Hyderabad? Can you tell us? I do not know when the Nizam will be joining the elections. I know that he can put up candidates all over the world if he likes. He may have so much money.

Therefore, I say this business of privy purse should be reviewed today, whatever may be their use in the past. This privy purse business should be reconsidered and reviewed in the light of the political developments in the country because we do not like moneys from the public exchequer to go to the Princes and Maharajas in order to build up a blatant political reaction in the country as is being done. The Swatantra Party has no organisation today in the country. We know—for thirty years we have been running the Communist Party in the country—how difficult it is even to build up an organisation, to build up a challenge against the Congress and win seats. And here you get the Rajas suddenly setting up an organisation of their own, pumping money in lakhs and lakhs into the election campaign and getting, well, 18 seats under the Swatantra ticket in their very first general elections. Tell me, how does it become possible?

\*\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That is because people do not like your ideology.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, he is fond of Maharani Gayatri Devi's ideology. I could have understood it if he is fond of her, but it is her ideology. What is this? It is no ideology. It is an ideology of blatant reaction organised and put up with the backing of big money, part of which is provided from the public exchequer of the country by this Government. It is no ideology which one can talk of in a decent, civilised, democratic society. After fourteen years of independence you find these exploiters, these agents of the British in the old days, these people whom Mr. Nehru described in his Autobiography as the fifth column of the British, organising themselves and coming into the parliamentary arena as a political force, and this Government is giving them money. What can be more shameful, what can be more disastrous from the point of view of the larger interests of the country? Tell me in which progressive country these reactionaries get money from the Government. Such things have been known in other countries as well, which have become free, but then their properties are confiscated, their properties are handed over to the national exchequer for the well-being and development of the people of the country. In some cases in democracy they have not even dissenting choice; they are not allowed to contest elections. But in our country they get every privilege and above all money from the Government. Therefore, I would tell Prime Minister Nehru before it is too late that the time has come to rethink about this business of the privy purse which is given to the Princes, because, apart from wasting and squandering in all kinds of debauchery and so on, today this money is being utilised to build up a rank, blatant reaction in the country which challenges the very fundamentals of our democracy, of our parliamentary institution. Are we to wait till a Maha-

raja sits there as the Prime Minister of our country or are we to stop it before it is too late? This is what I ask. This is something I pose before the country not in a partisan interest because I know that if Maharani Gayatri Devi sits there, Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha has either the choice to become a protegee of Maharani Gayatri Devi or has the choice to sit here on this side of the House. I do not know what the hon. lady Minister would like, but certainly I know that Members opposite would not like that spectacle in the country, and I know that it will not happen. We shall stop it, altogether. But now is the time to declare that steps shall be taken to stop it, and one of the steps that we can tell the country that we have taken in this Parliament is that the Government should give the lead by stopping this business of the privy purse. Even Mr. Bijoyananda Patnaik, the Chief Minister of Orissa, has demanded that allowances should not be given to the Princes. But they are still giving. What love are you in with these Princes and Princesses so that you must give enormous amounts every year to them? \*\*\*Let them go on elephants or whatever they like, helicopter or whatever it is. Panditji calls them a helicopter party, but you provide for the helicopter by paying money from the public exchequer. Why should we pay for the helicopter for the Princes and the Raja of Ramgarh to use it in the elections, I ask? Are they destitute? Are they suffering? Our Government employees do not get a fair deal. Here I say again that housing is no good for the Government employees. A ten per cent rise has taken place in the cost of living index. Yet the dearness allowance has not been increased as far as the Central Government employees are concerned, though the Second Pay Commission has recommended it. But when it comes to Princes or Rajas or Maharajas of the Swatantra Party, and so on, they give money with both

hands. This is what we strongly object to on moral grounds, on political grounds and on questions of principle. This is why I have risen on this particular occasion because this is the first opportunity that I have got to declare it, and I am setting the tone, I hope, in this country.

You will see now how Parliament develops. You see that in Rajasthan today the Swatantra Party is the biggest opposition party. Do you believe that it has got an organisation of this kind? How could it do so? Power, privilege and money have made them the first opposition party in the Rajasthan Assembly. And you see the Rani, Raja, son, grandson, uncle, all are in the political arena, putting their privy purse into the pockets of the Party or in its purse. I therefore say that I object to this kind of thing, and I hope that at least the hon. Members opposite, whatever may be their views, should ask their conscience as to why it should be so.

In addition, I would just point out to you that these Princes do not pay income-tax or super-tax on the incomes derived from their investments in Government securities or the incomes derived from outside their State according to the existing law. If the Maharaja of Jaipur earns some money, as he has no doubt been earning, from his investment in the securities of the Government of India, he does not have to pay any super-tax whatsoever. But if he earns in his own place, then of course he has to pay. Everybody knows that they invest all over the country, and they are exempt from payment of even super-tax; and you and I, those who get salary, pay income-tax and others pay super-tax. Why should these Princes not pay super-tax in this country? Exemption is given to them. On the top of it the privy purse is allowed, and I can show from various other things that they get a series of tax exemptions under his Government.

Sir, you had been good enough to give me this time, and I think I have

\*\*\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] spoken something and I am waiting for the Rajas and Ranis to come here, because I want to tell them what I feel about them, and I want to tell Members opposite also what they should feel about them and how they should treat them. Today in Parliament, believe me, Sir, the Praja Socialist Party, because of its disruptive policy, has become the fourth opposition Party, and our Rajas and Ranis have become the second opposition Party in the Lok Sabha. You should thank us that we have prevented them from taking the first opposition place. You should thank us for once at least, and Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is thanking us—thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFTISUL HASAN): The hon. Member has already taken more than fifteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you very much, Sir, for giving me this time, because it is a very exciting subject. You have been kind enough . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Your apprehension that they will have an upper hand in politics, I think, is not correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope, Sir, that I would be proved to be wrong. I would be very happy to be proved wrong at least on this point. My apprehension is this. They will sit here and in similar situations in the other House to put pressure on the Government so that it takes a reactionary turn and to activate the bureaucrats in the administration who are sympathetic towards them. The politicians in the Congress Party who are ideologically wedded to them and of course the Rajas and others and similar people would put pressure from within the Congress Party, and outside the Congress Party from the side of the opposition. This is what they are going to do. We will be

faced with a rather serious situation. But I know we shall face it and we shall fight them out here. That is why we are here. We will not be alone to fight them. If you want to fight them, we shall be with you. But you begin the fight by stopping the privy purse. We say that all our obligations with regard to the privy purse stand cancelled, null and void, in view of the fact that the privy purse is being utilised not in order to meet the needs of the families of the Princes and so on, because they have got plenty of money, but because the privy purse is being utilised to build up political reaction in the country in order to challenge the very fundamentals of democracy and the foundations of our institutions and thus to blight the future of our country.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, we have given our word of honour regarding the privy purse so far as these Princes are concerned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But these Princes were not meant to participate in politics with the privy purse in this manner. They said that the privy purse was needed because of the financial obligations of their families and so on. Today they have broken their word of honour by spending this money for political purposes, to build up a political opposition in the country, in order to frustrate the country's development. Therefore, they have broken, they have smashed to smithereens, all their pledges and commitments. It is jolly well the right of the Government today to tear into pieces the so-called agreement that was arrived at between them and the Princes. Tell them: Thus far and no further, no more of this privy purse.

Thank you, Sir. I hope gentlemen opposite will kindly consider this because it is no use trying to justify yourselves on a lame ground. It would be still worse if you wait till certain bad things happen in the country. The time has come for a decision. A decision on this score should be taken. It should be a political and economic

blow to the Princes and so on, to show that we mean business to put an end to the advent of the Princely Order in the political life of the country.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have nothing much to say in this because, I think, although the hon. Member has spoken on this with such exuberant eloquence, the real purpose of the whole thing is not understood. It is just two thousand rupees a month that we are going to pay to the ex-Ruler of Bastar. This was really not a proper opportunity to indicate his feelings on this token Demand.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR):** I am very sorry, Sir. I should like to say a few words. So far as the privy purses are concerned, may I point out that they have been settled long ago? They have formed part of the provisions of the Constitution and therefore so long as they are there, we are bound to pay the privy purses.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** No.

**SHRI B. N. DATAR:** It is all right for you to say 'No'. Secondly, we should also note that whenever the amount of the privy purse is so large and whenever there are any further devolutions in respect of the privy purses either by death or by dethronement also, then the amount is substantially reduced. In all the cases wherever there have been such devolutions of interests, they have been reduced, and so far as the Rajah of Bastar is concerned, I might point out to this House that his privy purse was reduced, if I mistake not, by Rs. 40,000. What was done was when his brother was recognised as the ruler in his place, he got the reduced privy purse but he ceased to get the allowance that he was formerly getting as a brother of the privy purse holder. Under these circumstances, what is

done is that out of equitable considerations a sum of Rs. 2,000 is being paid to the deposed ruler. That is all that is being done. And as I have pointed out, the privy purse of the Bastar family has been considerably reduced, and it is being paid to the recognised ruler. All that is done is Rs. 2,000 is being paid to the former deposed ruler and the total amount does not exceed what was being got by the family of the Bastar Ruler.

Now, in respect of the privy purse it is often stated that the Government should immediately stop paying it. That is a very large claim to make. After all, we follow certain recognised principles. Immediately after independence when this question of the Princes was taken into account, there were agreements, there were covenants, and after that an agreement was reached so far as the quantum of the privy purse in respect of the five hundred odd Rulers of India was concerned. There was a graceful transfer of power also from the Rulers' side. That fact should also be understood. Otherwise is something untoward had happened, then the Government would have been compelled to take that step. But here in this case I might invite my hon. friend's attention to the very powerful plea that was put before the Constituent Assembly by the first Home Minister of India, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Then also this question was raised and he pointed out how the whole matter was carried through highly generously. When both the parties agreed to do a thing in a spirit of give and take, in as graceful a manner as possible, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel pointed out that it was done, to a certain extent at least, generously. So, the whole background was explained to the Constituent Assembly, and thereafter certain provisions in this respect were incorporated in the Constitution. Under these circumstances, it is absolutely idle, if not fruitless, for my hon. friend to go on repeating the same thing. After all, Sir, on those Benches there are hon. Members who



[Shri B. N. Datar.]

accept what has been agreed upon. It would not be proper to go on always talking of breach of promise or breach of agreement. We have come to certain agreements. We are also trying, wherever possible, to reduce the amounts of the agreements. But the whole thing is done in a proper and graceful manner and not in the way in which my hon. friend brings in such matters, in a thoroughly fruitless manner.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether it is not a fact that when the agreement was arrived at, certain calculations were made and the Princes gave some ideas as to why they required so much money? And this related to their personal expenses, family obligations and so on. Therefore, if they spend money now for other reasons, it shows that they do not need this money and they mispend this money for other purposes, for political purposes, which does not form part of the consideration of the agreements at that time. Why, Sir, in such a situation should not be open to the Government to revise these agreements, modify them, change them or cancel them? When he has broken so many agreements as far as the people are concerned, why can't you do it?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: We have never broken any agreement, may I point out to my hon. friend? And here in this case also, so far as the agreements or the covenants are concerned, they have to be followed, they are being followed. Therefore, there is no case of any breach of agreement at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not asking . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha, do you want to say anything?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: A little.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Say something.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Sir, after what Shri Datar has said, I have only to add that there is a little confusion in the mind of the hon. Member in regard to paying income-tax on the investment made out of the amount of the privy purse. Suppose a Ruler makes an investment out of the amount allotted to him as privy purse, the privy purse amount will be free from income-tax; but the yield from the investment part of that will not be free.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. I did not say that, Madam. For your information, suppose a Prince invests, shall we say, in a Government Security and he is earning one lakh of rupees, super-tax is liable to be charged or is he exempt from it? Is it not that they get certain exemptions which are not open . . .

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: The investment that any Ruler makes and the money that he earns out of that investment are not free from tax.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is not . . .

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Is not free from tax.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. After a while,—you have the super-tax and so on. Then they are not to pay.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: If the investment goes to that extent which brings him an income which is liable under the normal conditions to super-tax, certainly he will pay.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no, ask Shri Morarji Desai.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: That is why I say that if the investment goes to that point which brings him an income which is liable under normal conditions to super-tax, he will have to pay all the tax that comes under that.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Give me notice. I will produce documents to substantiate my point.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** It is on the money that he earns, out of the further investment that he makes from anywhere, either from the privy purse or from his own money. If he makes any further investment and he earns income out of that, then this earned income will come under the category of normal taxes being paid. Apart from that, they pay expenditure-tax, wealth-tax. Therefore, I think it is wrong . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** There are many exemptions.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** . . . to say that they do not pay any tax.

I have nothing more to say on this except that I appreciate the eloquence of the hon. Member but unfortunately it is always out of place. That is the only thing that I want to say and I have nothing more to add.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1961-62, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** 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:** Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

*The question was proposed.*

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Sir, I just want to say a few words at this last stage, because I was rather surprised by the manner in which the hon. Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs spoke, as if I was asking him to make a breach of faith with the Princes. I never asked it. All I said was that due to certain other developments in the recent period since the agreement was signed, it would be open to the Government to annual the agreement, because the grounds on which sanctions for the privy purses were given have proved to be no longer valid. That is why it is open to the Government to do so. It will not be a breach of faith. Why do the Government say that I am asking them to commit a breach of faith or breach of agreement? I would not ask this Government although I know this Government has become pastmasters in breaking agreements as far as the people are concerned. Even so I do not ask them.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar):** Question.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Yes, the question is everything is questioned, but the biggest question is yourself.

So it should be understood in that line. Baster question I did not raise although there also I am opposed to it. But this gave me an opportunity to ask the Government not to sanction anymore; on the contrary, to cancel this thing. That is why I raised it as a point of principle and we shall continue to pursue the point. I know that you have got the support of Members opposite—they will vote—but I equally know that many Members of the Congress Party do not like this business of privy purses even if they support you here, but then, if you have certain illusions about the support that you get here, well, you will come to grief some day or other, when you see that the ground is slipping away from under your feet. But do not go by what you see here, the show of hands here. It may be very pleasing to you, but the heat is beathing—as

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

far as many Congress Members are concerned—in a different way, and you should understand it. This is what I say.

As for the lady Minister, she gave me the compliment of being eloquent.

(*Interruption.*)

You need not get up just at this stage. She gave me the compliment of being eloquent and then she said I was out of place. Well, Sir, what can I say? I paid her the greatest compliment, as you know, when I asked her why she was not photographed with Mrs. Kennedy. But I should have thought that she would take into account and at least understand something of what I was saying. Here again privy purse is the question and you are the Minister in-charge. Therefore, I was asking you to stop payments of privy purse. It was absolutely relevant to the Bill. It may be Rs. 2,000; it may be Rs. 2 lakhs. But I raised the question of principle and I gave the grounds as to why you should stop it. You may or may not agree, but how—well—the speech becomes out of place just because it is displeasing to you. Therefore, I say: "Scratch many Congressmen and you see the Swatantra blood flowing." This is what I say. My greatest fear today is not the five or six Swatantra gentlemen who will be sitting here, or a few more perhaps in the other house. My fear is this that the Swatantra blood inside the Congress will warm up . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You are mistaken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They will feel enthused and encouraged, and some of them will try to do all kinds of things from within the party. That is my greatest fear.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, on a point of information. Time and again Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is referring to our relations with the Maharajas and the Maharanis.

Let me tell him from this side of the House that we may have one or two Maharajas or one or two Maharanis, but like the Swatantra Party we neither woo the Maharanis nor coo the Maharajas.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If this is another of my beloved friend's and learned gentleman's illusions, what can I do? He thinks that he is not doing anything. In West Bengal the Maharani of Burdwan has been brought into the Ministry straightway.

(*Interruption*)

I do not know if she ever sat at a desk of any kind except in her dressing room at the dressing table. And now she is a Minister. Similarly, you have brought not one or two but, as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru says, a bucketful . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You know whether she is a Rani or a Maharani, but when she accepts the democratic form of Government and socialism, what is the harm in her coming.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Likewise the Jaipur Maharaja and Maharani are also there, and if she says, "I have accepted Rajaji's philosophy", what is the harm?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: What about your party? Is not the Mymensingh Raja's son a member of your party—the Communist Party?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee is a very gallant man. I know this thing.

Now, if you allow things to drift in this manner, you will see that this gallantry will not stop; what they are up to I can only imagine. That is what I can tell you. Now it is not two or three; many are inside the Congress Party; it is not two or three. I have asked the Prime Minister on another occasion to give us a list. Shri Rajagopalachari and the leaders of the Congress Party should sit together and prepare a list and tell us how

many each of them has taken. How many are in the Congress Party and how many are in the Swatantra Party? I ask them. There are many in the Congress Party also, and I do not know what will happen to our lady Minister if Ranis invade the Congress Treasury Benches in this manner because, if too many of them come, Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha, betimes you should be careful; you may not be there. I would like you to be there rather than a Maharani. I may differ with you in many matters although you are not a Maharani. Yet some people think you are a Maharani well, that is a different matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): I may tell the hon. Member that we have passed the time; we have crossed the limit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, Sir, all I say is my point has not been understood and the Ministry is evading an answer to a question of principle; they should answer whether, in principle, what they are doing is right, and if right, let them say these things to the country and the Parliament and let the people judge.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय वाइस चेरमैन महोदय ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): I can give you only three or four minutes, not more. We have already passed the time.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : अभी कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त ने बड़े जोश व खरोश के साथ राजाओं, महाराजाओं और रानियों का प्रिवी पर्स बन्द करने की हाउस के समक्ष अपील पेज की है। मैं झमझता हूँ कि यद्यपि हमारी सरकार ने उनको वचन दिया है, लेकिन उसी के साथ जब हमने सोशलिज्म स्थापित करने का प्लान किया है तो उन राजाओं और महाराजाओं का प्रिवी पर्स बन्द कर देने में बीच आफ ट्रस्ट नहीं होगा जब हमने

राजाओं, महाराजाओं के सिस्टम को और जमींदारी को खत्म कर दिया, चन्द्रवंशी और सूर्यवंशी राजाओं को खत्म कर दिया तब यह प्रिवी पर्स बन्द कर देना कैसे बीच आफ फेथ होगा ? पिछले इलेक्शन में राजाओं और महाराजाओं ने जिस तरह का नंगा नाच किया है उससे हम जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग हैं वे भी यह अनुभव करने लगे हैं कि राजाओं और महाराजाओं का यह प्रिवी पर्स जरूर बन्द कर दिया जाय । उनके पास हजारों एकड़ जमीन है । उनके पास हाथियों के इतने हौदे हैं कि उन्हीं को बेचकर वे काफी समय तक जिन्दा रह सकते हैं । इसके अतिरिक्त उनके पास बहुत से गहने आदि भी हैं ।

श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो यह कहा कि हमने जनता को जो प्लेज दिया है उसको तोड़ने की हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं, यह निरर्थक बात है । हमने जनता को यह प्लेज दिया है कि हम हिन्दुस्तान में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करके गरीबी को खत्म करेंगे । हमारी कांग्रेस पार्टी और जो हमारा शासक दल है वह इस प्लेज को पूरा करने के लिए प्रयत्नशील है । यदि कोई राजा या रानी हमारी पार्टी में आते हैं तो वे कांग्रेस के प्लेज को मानकर और सोशलिज्म को मान कर आते हैं । कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में भी राजे-महाराजे हैं ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do they know how to spell socialism?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: They know how to spell it if the Maharajas who are members of your party know how to spell socialism.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय वाइस चेरमैन महोदय, मेमन सिंह के राजा के लड़के भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के मेम्बर हैं और वे हमारे ला मिनिस्टर से चुनाव में लड़े थे । जब उनकी पार्टी में ऐसे लोग आ

[ श्री शीलभद्र याजी ]

सकते हैं तो कांग्रेस पार्टी में सोशलिज्म को मानकर ऐसे लोग क्यों नहीं आ सकते हैं ? यह एक अजीब दलील है । यदि कोई रानी या राजा हमारे प्लेज को मानकर कांग्रेस में आता है तो हम उसको वाच करते हैं और यह देखते हैं कि वह हमारे सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार चल रहा है या नहीं । हम चाहते हैं कि सारा हिन्दुस्तान सोशलिज्म का सिद्धान्त मान ले और राजे-महाराजे भी उसका अनुसरण करें । इसलिये यदि सारी की सारी हिन्दुस्तान की जनता समाजवाद को स्वीकार कर ले तो कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त को तो बहुत खुश होना चाहिये । उनका यह कहना बहुत सही है कि अब समय आ गया है कि इन राजाओं-महाराजाओं को पैसा देना बेकार है और उसको जल्दी से जल्दी बन्द करना चाहिये ताकि वे हमारे समाजवाद के विरुद्ध कोई मोर्चा खड़ा नहीं करें । इसके लिये उन्हें कभी मौका नहीं होना चाहिये ।

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या मैं एक मिनट बोल सकता हूँ ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नफीसुल हसन) : जी नहीं, अब वक्त निकल गया है ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, give me just a few minutes, only two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Give him, Sir, We have time.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री नफीसुल हसन) : इस बिल के लिये टाइम चेयरमैन साहब ने फिक्स कर दिया है ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, you allowed him to abuse our party for about twenty minutes and I am not getting even two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is how you will miss the bus.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Do you want to say anything, Shrimati Sinha?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: No, no. I have already moved.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): He represents Swatantra Party. He may be given some time.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Kindly allow me two minutes. I will speak on behalf of the Swatantra Party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): No, please. Not today.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I should get justice. He has been abusing us for twenty minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): The hon. Member will have another opportunity. The next item is the General Budget. The hon. Member can say whatever he likes then.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When the Rajahs come.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I am not a Rajah. I want to speak on behalf of the Swatantra Party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): You ought to have informed me earlier. The Chairman had fixed half an hour for discussion on this item. We have taken at least fifty minutes already. The next item is the discussion on the General Budget and everything can be said then.

The question is :

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

## THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1962-63

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thought the Budget Discussion would be taken up tomorrow. Any way, since we have finished the earlier business we have to take up the next business. Still I would like to make some observations on the present Budget proposals and the speech by the hon. Minister leaving many contentious points for the next Session when the Parliament meets.

Sir, we have before us the Economic Survey given by the Ministry of Finance, and the Budget Speech of the hon. Minister is based on the economic data supplied to us by the Economic Survey. I have carefully studied this thing as also the speech made by the hon. Minister in the other House. In the beginning I should like to make certain general observations about the political and economic situation in the country, and then I shall deal with some aspects of the economic situation.

Sir, there are no new taxation proposals. Therefore, we have to wait till the hon. Minister comes down upon the public, the Minister, whoever he is—it seems there is competition—comes out with his taxation proposals.

Sir, the general elections are over and the other day at a press conference on the Holi Day the Prime Minister very rightly pointed out the menace that is spelled by the rise of the reactionary right wing and communal parties. I entirely agree broadly with his warning to the nation. Now, Sir, when the Prime Minister speaks on such subjects in this manner, what is expected of a leader of his stature to say is what steps he is going to take as the leader of the ruling party to balance his words with practical actions and to meet the situation that has arisen as a result of the emergence of the right wing and the communal forces in certain parts of the country. We do not get any light from the Prime Minister on that score

as yet. Naturally, Sir, the economic policies of the country cannot be separated from the political and administrative set-up that comes into existence. What kind of set-up is going to come as far as the Central Government is concerned? It is not for me to suggest who should be the Minister or who should not be the Minister. I am not concerned with that. But it would be a mistake if we of the Opposition were to view it as if it were the domestic concern of the Congress Party and Congress Party alone.

Sir, we are quite conscious that the Congress Party will elect its leader and its leader will be called upon by the President to take the responsibility and form a Cabinet, and that the Prime Minister will nominate who shall be in the Cabinet or in the Council of Ministers. Sir, in this connection, naturally, I think if the Prime Minister means business in the sense that he wants to fight and counteract the growing influence of the right wing and the communal forces, he should see to it that the people who are closely connected with the big business or with people with a communal bent of mind—there are many in the Congress Party—do not get high positions either in the Cabinet or in the Council of Ministers because they could demoralise the country. People will feel what is the meaning of your giving a warning to the country when you put such people in such high positions. It is known, Sir, how some leading Congress Members—I would not name anybody here—have been elected with the backing of the big money openly given.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some of them have been really sponsored by the big capitalists and so on. Whether it may be a transport monopoly in Madras or the big business in West Bengal, they have been directly sponsored by these people to the Congress Party and their election campaign had been openly and unashamedly financed by these people.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

There are some others who are known to be closely connected with the big business. Sir, I have in mind, for example, one Congress Member who has been recently elected from the Ghatal Parliamentary constituency in West Bengal. Up to the British time he was with the British, a member of the Calcutta Bar, a prosperous millionaire of Calcutta. I know, Sir, that he did not speak in Bengali, though he is a Bengali, lived in Calcutta until the time we became free. At that time when the juniors wanted to join the Chamber for training, he made it a condition that such juniors should not take part in any way in the National Movement or be associated with it. That gentleman, prosperous Barrister, will now sit in the other House. He was always on the side of the big money, Calcutta Tramway Co. and so on in the matter of industrial disputes. He is a partner of the Shaw Wallace & Co., associated with them for many, many years, and that gentleman was put up by the Birlas and the English big business in order that he can come to Parliament and then become Minister. I tell you we are told by very, very responsible quarters that the financial loss that he may suffer would be compensated by a kind of allowance to him, that is, a kind of retention fee will be paid. Such a thing we have heard. Such people should not be there in the Ministry. I am not concerned with individuals at all. If someone has been openly financed and supported by big business, he should not find his place. All people who are known to be closely associated with big business should not be placed in important positions. This is one of the ways we can discourage the right wing forces in the country. There are many others in the Congress Party who can be taken up into the Cabinet and in the Council of Ministers who are not known to be so closely associated with big business or had been supported in the elections or put up in the elections by certain business houses and so on.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: He should join the Congress and advise the Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am advising the Prime Minister. It is the function of the Opposition to tell the Prime Minister and your party too because your party will bear the direct responsibility in this matter. I know that many of you would not like these people to be pitchforked into high positions. If they by chance get their way into the Ministry, then what happens? Then the reactionaries in the Congress Party get strengthened. Outside they get strengthened and encouraged, the bureaucrats and those who are right wing elements and who are against the public sector, who are against genuine planning and progressive development of our economy or democratic institutions, these officials in the civil side or military side of the administration—these people—get encouraged and emboldened. Therefore, in the larger interests of the country, if you mean well by the parliamentary institutions, such people should be kept out. I do not care who else is taken so long as other qualifications are there. I say this in all seriousness. Likewise, the people who have a communal bent of mind—by now it should be known to the Prime Minister as to who have got a communal bent of mind or who are sympathetic to the Jan Sangh or similar other parties—should not also be placed in high positions in the Council of Ministers. I give this advice as a Party and I know the position of our Party in the country. We come next to the Congress and we should be failing in our duty if we show utter disinterestedness in the formation of the Cabinet or of the Government.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Why has the C.P.I. joined with the Akali Party in the Punjab?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyway, when we are on the Treasury Benches you give us the advice as to what we should do. We have not joined the Akali Party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a very serious matter. Speculation is going on in high business circles, as to who should be the Cabinet Minister. Why are they so much interested? In Washington, discussions are going on in the journals as to who should be in the coming Cabinet and you know how the Americans interfered in the internal affairs of our country, in the North Bombay Parliamentary elections there. It was directed against Nehru and against a particular Minister—the Defence Minister—and the Government. You know this very well. The same forces today are banking on the fact that there is a strong right wing pressure on that side of the House which is coming into existence. They think probably the Central Government would keep it in mind and accommodate certain right wing elements in the Government and in the Ministry. It would be disastrous in the present situation. The Prime Minister cannot protect everything. I grant him all the good intentions on earth. If the key positions pass into the hands of the right wing reactionary politicians of the Congress Party or the proteges of big business or communal elements, this will be the surest way of putting the country on the road to ruin. Therefore, this should be borne in mind.

Regarding election, materials are being collected to find out objectionable posters and so on. I may tell you that there are Ministers who indulged in communal propaganda. We cannot disbelieve our ears. If you think that we are saying anything wrong, all right, call the Ministers—they believe in God—to state on oath what they spoke in the public meetings. Let a Commission be appointed to find out who behaved in which manner when elections took place. Communal propaganda was let loose by certain Ministers and as far as our Party is concerned, one of the main planks of their agitation was that the Communists do not believe in God. How God

came into the elections? They brought it in. We are called atheists and non-believers and in the name of religion the Congress Ministers made appeals. The Minister for S.R. and C.R. who is a Member of this House indulged on a large scale in this kind of agitation in order to rouse the communal passions of a certain community against us.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: This is a personal aspersion about a Minister that he was preaching communalism. He is not here to defend . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not tell me that. Then we cannot discuss the Budget. No Minister is here. Go and get them here.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHAN GHOSE (West Bengal): Is it communal to say that the Communists do not believe in God? Where is communalism there?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Ghose is a wise man. He would agree that as a Congress Party wedded to secularism, you cannot ask for votes by saying that some other Party did not believe in religion. You should not do it. Let the Jan Sangh do it. You cannot do it. Let the Prime Minister say that he can do it and it should be done. Then I will accept it. He would never say so. I may inform the House that a Pastoral letter in Kerala was issued by 16 Bishops and Archbishops when I was in Salem. Immediately I sent a telegram to the Prime Minister who was on his way to Kerala that he should condemn the Pastoral letter which wanted the people—the Roman Catholics—to vote in a particular way and not to vote in a particular way. The Prime Minister was good enough to condemn such issuance of Pastoral letters in Quilom and other places when he went to Kerala and he himself wrote to me saying—on the 8th February when he returned to Delhi—what else he could do after he had publicly condemned it. I said that something else could be done. In this connection we saw that article 125 of the Constitution



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

empowers us to consider measures in order to prevent such propaganda to prevent intrusion of religion into politics. It empowers us. The founders of the Constitution foresaw that a situation might arise in which in the name of religious freedom, religion might intrude into the political field and in such a situation it might be necessary to put certain restrictions to prevent the intrusion of religion into politics. Now, the time has come when all secular-minded people and parties should put their heads together and devise ways and means to separate religion from politics and bar the way of its intrusion into politics.

As far as posters are concerned. I have got plenty of them in which you will see how Congress Ministers and their leaders made religious appeals, all kinds of things they said in the name of religion in order to catch votes. This is not a good example. That is why I would like you to consider this.

Let me come to another aspect of the matter. We want communalism to be combated by all secular-minded people and secondly, no one party alone can do it. It is the task of all secular parties and secular-minded citizens of this country to join in a common front in fighting communalism in the country today, or its advent into the political arena. That should be done.

As far as the economic situation is concerned, Shri Morarji Desai, in his speech in the other House when the charge was made about corruption, accused the smaller Government employees of corruption and said that in the higher levels things were all right. I dispute that statement. I am not saying that in the lower levels there is no corruption but by and large the Government employees at the lower levels are honest people. I want to pay a tribute to them because they have displayed great honesty and patriotism in conditions which are not congenial, when the economic condi-

tions are bad, when their needs and wants are growing almost every day. Our Government employees have displayed a very great patriotism and honesty. Shri Desai should not get away by blaming them in this manner. What about the higher services? He said that nothing has happened there. I would not accept that suggestion. Why does the Government not then accept the suggestion made by Mr. Chintaman Deshmukh that a Special Tribunal should be appointed which can go into the cases of serious allegations about corruption and improprieties in the higher circles of administration? Why should he be asked to give evidence to the Prime Minister or members of the Government? Why should these left to a Tribunal?

Then, may I know whether it is not a fact—I say it is a fact—that a member of the Tariff Board, after retiring from the Tariff Board, joined the Birla Brothers? What are we to think when members of the Tariff Board who are supposed to settle the question of prices, after they give up their assignment in the Tariff Board, become functionaries in the Birla House? I would like to know what they have to say on this. If I say that the gentleman, when he was on the Tariff Board, or when such people are on the Tariff Board and when they expect that they would be absorbed after retirement in the big business houses, well, if in such expectation, they do certain wrong things against the interests of the country as members of the Tariff Board, in deciding things, am I very wrong? Or would my suspicion be absolutely groundless? I would ask you that question. I can give names. Can they deny it when I say that a former member of the Tariff Board today is an employee in Birla Brothers? Even some civilian officers of the Government of India, members of the I.C.S., even before they retired, they had negotiations with certain big business concerns and after their retirement, they immediately joined a big business concern. Hardly is the

retirement notice in their pocket, when they are already functionaries in some big business concern, like Martin Burns or Birla Brothers. Who does not know that a Secretary General of the External Affairs Ministry is today an employee and functionary of Martin Burns with Biren Mukerjee? Who does not know that Mr. C. C. Desai is an employee of Birla Brothers now? Who does not know that Mr. Nabagopal Das, also an I.C.S. like Mr. Desai, has also found employment in such a big business concern? Therefore, these things raise very serious doubts about the honesty and efficiency of the administration in such matters. That is why we raise this point. It is a very important point. Tell us how many civil servants today after their retirement, have found jobs with the big business concerns of the country? Tell us also whether during their service they had not negotiated for those appointments in view of their future retirement and so on? I would like to know how many sons of Ministers have got good jobs, on Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 4,000. Lists could be given. We have been asking for them. When they are qualified they should not be discriminated against and they should get the jobs. But when they are not qualified and if we find, say, the son of a Minister who is not so qualified, suddenly getting a job and earning Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000 in a concern, there is the question of impropriety. That is a matter which raises suspicion in the public mind.

The Administration must not only be honest, but it should also look honest. Here on that score, the Administration is neither honest at the higher levels, nor does it look honest. This is what I would like to say. We all know that. I do not wish to deal with such subjects any more. But serious allegations have been made about the malpractices in the elections and the pouring in of money. Mr. Justice Chagla who will soon be coming here, I am told, and Mr. Justice Tendulkar and Justice P. B. Mukerjee, of the Bombay and Calcutta High

Courts, advised the Government that political donations from companies should not be paid for election purposes. But the Government seems to have brushed aside that advice and lakhs and lakhs of contributions were received from them into the Congress election funds. The Prime Minister the other day said he did not know how much money came. Well, I must say, the Prime Minister has chosen to be ignorant in this matter. Everybody knows how money came. Ask Dr. B. C. Roy and he will tell you how Birla gave Rs. 20 lakhs to the West Bengal Congress elections. Is it not a fact that when the Prime Minister went to Kanpur, after delivering the homilies against such political donations, he collected Rs. 2 lakhs from the Kanpur merchants and put that money into the Congress elections? Therefore, these are serious matters. Today big money is playing a part. It is bad when it is in the hands of the Swantantra party. It is equally bad when it is in the hands of any other party, and more so when it is in the hands of the ruling party. I was informed that in the mid-term elections in Orissa, the All India Congress Committee wrote to Mahindra & Mahindra and 140 constituencies bought 136 new jeeps, each costing Rs. 13,000. I had it from the horse's mouth. I do not want to give the names. Where did that money come from? Did it fall from the heavens? No. It came from the rich, and now big money is becoming a menace. In these elections votes have been bought and also some people with social influence were bought over.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA): May I inform the hon. Member about those jeeps that they were not a free gift at all? They were bought by the All-India Congress Committee.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I entirely agree with you. But you please calculate it. Rs. 13,000 multiplied by 136, how much does it come to?

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** May I inform the hon. Member that they sold it back and we did not pay all the money?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Yes, everything you are selling back. That I know. First of all there is the election expense of Rs. 12,000. Then there is the jeep costing Rs. 13,000. The hon. Lady is quite right for once. You paid for them and then you gave them to Dr. B. C. Roy to put them to use again. Well, Sir, it is no good saying all that. Where did the money come from? Did it come from the valet or the cook or attender in Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha's house? Where did it come from?

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** Sir, I object to this sort of language here. What has my house or my cook or my valet to do with all this here?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I mean a poor man.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** Sir, I submit this kind of expression should not be allowed.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** They are poor people and . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** Mr. Gupta, you could have said: Did the money come from the pocket of a poor man or from a common man? Why refer to Mrs. Sinha's cook or anybody else?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** But there is no . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** No, no.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Is it absolutely parliamentary or not? If it, then . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** No, I will not allow any personal remark. No, no.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** How did the money come? It is not a personal remark.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** No, no. You cannot say that.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Then call the Rules Committee, Sir. Adjourn the House now and call the Rules Committee. Can't I ask if the money came from the cooks of the Members of Parliament or the poor people who work in their houses?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** Yes but you mentioned the cook working in her house.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I thought she would understand it better. Don't you say poor people? Why grow touchy about that? I don't know her cook. It was just figuratively speaking.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** Why speak figuratively? You could very easily have asked: Did it come from the poor?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Sir, I am entitled to say this. Every time my right is denied to me. Every time you are in the Chair, you take away my right. Call a meeting of the Rules Committee.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** I cannot tolerate all this. The hon. Member should know that as long as I am in the Chair, I have never taken away any right from him.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Did I say anything unparliamentary? Tell me that and I will correct it.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** I object to a pointed reference to an hon. Member here in that way.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** You were good enough not to object. But when Mrs. Sinha got up then it occurred to you to object.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN):** Of course.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why should you listen to her in this matter?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Cannot my attention be drawn to anything?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Kindly tell me, under which rule it is objected to, which rule of May's Parliamentary Practice. Sir, if I may submit it, before we elect to this House our Vice-Chairmen and the Deputy Chairman, they should go through a course of May's Parliamentary Practice. Otherwise it would be very difficult to function in this House. Tell me under which rule . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): I call Mr. Gupta to order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What order? What rule have I violated?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): I may be anything. But as long as I am sitting in the Chair, I do say I am entitled to a little consideration.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Kindly tell me what I have violated?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I submit that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's remark that before the Vice-Chairmen and the Deputy Chairman are elected to the Chair, they should go through a course of May's Parliamentary Practice, is a reflection on the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, it is not a reflection.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Mr. Gupta is not entitled to give a ruling. You rise up whenever a Member raises a point of order. It is for the Chair to decide.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But I contest the point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Yes, after taking the permission of the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I contest that point and say it is no reflection. I did not say, "Those in the Chair". I said, in future, those who are elected, they should read it. I did not mean you. It is no reflection. I did not mention, I never mentioned that they should read it now. Had I said that, then it would have been a reflection. I said about the future when they are elected. If you elect me, can I not be advised that I should read May's Parliamentary Practice? It is no reflection. If you don't take it like that, I am sorry. I did not mean you personally at all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said it only figuratively. I am sorry, I should have thought that Mrs. Sinha had a good sense of humour. I am sorry, if that departs, nothing would be left.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): We adjourn now to meet tomorrow at 11 A.M.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 27th March, 1962.