

[श्री नाथूराम मिर्षा]

वक्त में भी थी, हमारे वक्त में भी थी, लेकिन पिछले साल डेढ़ साल में जिस तरह से रेम्पेंट हुआ है, लोग पे और डीअरवेस तो समझते हैं कि हमारा अपना है और रिजवत पर अपना हक समझते हैं। किसी जगह पर भी बैठने वाला हो दिन में 100,50 रुपये एक्सट्रा जेब में डालकर उठता होगा। चाहे जुडिशियल अदालत में बैठा हो, किसी भी अदालत में बैठा हो, पुलिस में बैठा हो या कहीं भी बैठा हो। क्या होगा हमारे देश का? अगर मैं गलत कहता हूँ तो कोई भी आप में से साथ चलिये, एक-एक आदमी को चैक करवा दूंगा। जबदेस्त इस तरह के हालत आज देश में खड़े हो रहे हैं।

सभापति जी, मेरे खयाल से सदन का समय समाप्त हो रहा है, मैं तो इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि देश को ठोक करो और किताबें ही किताबें छापने में काम नहीं चलेगा।

सभापति महोदय : मिर्षा जी, अगर आप और बोलना चाहते हैं तो कल भी थोड़ा और बोल सकते हैं।

श्री नाथूराम मिर्षा : आप मेहरबानी करें, दो, एक मिनट मुझे दे दें, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा मैं राम धर्म की बात कहता हूँ, झूट नहीं बोलता हूँ। मैं यहां पोलिटिकल दृष्टि से अपनी बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ।

सभापति महोदय : अभी दो मिनट है, आप अपनी बात कह लें।

श्री नाथूराम मिर्षा : मैं अपनी बात दो मिनट में ही खत्म कर देता हूँ।

18.00 hrs.

मैं इस देश में लंबातंत्र के बारे में, गरीब और किसान के बारे में, उतनी ही चिन्ता रखता हूँ, जितनी कि मेरे मित्र रखते हैं। मैं ईमानदारी के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि भ्रष्टाचार को दूर करने के लिए सरकार पूरी शक्ति के साथ कदम उठाए। देश का उत्पादन कम गति से बढ़ रहा है, जबकि जनसंख्या बहुत तेजी से बढ़ रही है। बेकारी और ज्यादा फैलेगी और एक ऐसी स्टेज आयेगी कि कोई भी ग्रान्दोलनों को नहीं रोक सकेगा, और फिर क्या होगा, क्या नहीं होगा, इसकी हम और आप कल्पना भी नहीं कर सकते। इस की ज्यादा चिन्ता प्रधान मंत्री और मेरे मित्रों को हानी चाहिए, जो कि उनके भर्थांगी हैं।

आज मैं इतनी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि किसानों का आज का मंकट काट दीजिए, रेल-गाड़िया दौड़ा दीजिए, ताकि किसानों का माल मडियों में पहुंच सके, उसकी क्लियर करने के लिए पहली प्रेरेंस दीजिए, मवेशी देश के लिए अत्यन्त जरूरी है, उनका पहले क्लियर कीजिए। इस के लिए रेल मंत्री को टेलीफोन कर दीजिए।

1801 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

AGREEMENT WITH CARE INC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Indrajit Gupta. This is a half-an-hour discussion.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Mr. Chairman, this half-an-hour Discussion has arisen out of my question which was raised in this House on the 23rd of March and to which the hon. Minister of Education and Social Welfare had replied. I

was, of course, not satisfied at all with those replies and, therefore, I wish to raise some points in this connection.

This American expansion CARE is widely advertised and publicised as an organisation which is feeding approximately 15 million people in 14 States of our country is feeding the children with what is described as free food. Actually, what they supply and what is given to the children is a mixture of corn, soya flower and milk powder.

The Finance Minister had admitted in this House in reply to an Unstarred Question, No. 3632, on the 12th December, 1980 that between 1964-65 and 1979-80 this organisation, CARE has repatriated to the U.S.A., a sum of about six million dollars. The first question I want to ask is whether it is only a charitable and voluntary organisation which is helping to feed our children absolutely free of cost. From where did these six million dollars come, which CARE has repatriated, according to our own Finance Minister? For the year ending 1971 there are official figures to show that, for the so-called operational costs of CARE—these are mostly Government funds, that is, those of our State Governments mainly—funds have been provided to CARE, to an extent of more than ten million dollars.

Now, the original agreement which was signed in 1950 between the Government of India and CARE — of which I have got a copy here—has explicitly laid down in Clauses 1 and 2(a) that no funds will be provided to CARE, except from non-Indian sources. Whether they are Government funds or non-Government funds, they must be funds coming from non-Indian sources. This is explicitly laid down in this agreement. Last time when I raised this point, the hon. Minister Shri Chavan had said that, "Yes. It is true. This was so in the agreement". But, he said that in 1968 at some time CARE had approached our Government saying that since they are not a profit making organisation, their administrative

expenses or operational expenses in this country should be met by funds from India. And, according to him, a decision was then taken at the highest level, according to which by an executive order, provision was made for bearing these expenses which CARE claims to be incurring in this country. The first point I wish to raise again today is, whether this type of basic modification or basic amendment of the agreement which was done by an executive order was correct, proper or in the interests of this country. First of all, I may say that the Minister has misled the House by saying that 1968 was the starting point of the Government payments to CARE. According to the agreement there should be no payments at all from Government in this country. Having modified that agreement not by amending the agreement but by some exchange between CARE and the Government authorities which led to a new executive order, my information is that these payments started not in 1968 but in 1963-64 or maybe 1964-65. Therefore, I wish to know today—he should throw some light on this—how this was done. Was it done simply by some exchange of letters which radically altered the whole basic complexion of the original agreement, or was it done by any other sort of supplementary agreement which has been kept secret from the country and from the House? I say this because I have come across a document which purports to be the transcript of the testimony which was given here in the court. There is a case going on in Delhi against this organisation CARE in the court of Mr. R. C. Jain, Additional District Judge, Delhi. In this transcript of the actual testimony given under cross-examination in this court by a gentleman, who is one of the Assistant Directors of CARE by the name of Mr. Desmond Ignatius, he says quite clearly:

"The agreement with regard to the reimbursement of administrative costs is a separate one. It

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

must have been executed in 1963-64. That agreement is signed by both the parties."

So, the Assistant Director of CARE, in his statement in the court made on oath, is saying that there was another agreement made subsequently to the original agreement and that it was signed by both the parties. The Minister here the other day said nothing about another agreement. He said that they had been approached by CARE and at the highest level, it has been decided. I do not know how—to agree to the payment of these operational or administrative costs.

The original agreement could have been amended. There was nothing to prevent it if the Government thought it necessary. But the question I would like to ask is, in March, 1950, when this original agreement was signed, at that time if the Government of India had known that later on it would be necessary to provide huge amounts from various State Governments for the administrative expenses of this CARE, would the Government have entered into that agreement? The agreement had clearly stipulated that no funds are to be provided from any Indian sources. However, they decided to do it later on. Now, after so many years, again I would like to know whether the Government of India is prepared to take a second look at this agreement at all or not. Once it was decided to budget amounts for CARE—these amounts are being allotted every year from the budgets of so many State Governments. 14 or 15 of them—why was it not clearly stipulated that there must be a proper system of maintaining accounts? The question of maintaining accounts was irrelevant earlier on because there were no accounts with which we were concerned. But once this Government has agreed that sums running into lakhs and crores are to be provided by the State Govern-

ments to CARE for their so-called operational expenses, does the question of maintaining proper accounts and financial accountability not come in? Nothing of that kind was done. Further, in 1963-64, perhaps by an executive order, CARE was allowed to repatriate a portion of its receipts which it gets in this country from the State Governments, to the headquarters of CARE in New York, in American dollars i.e. in foreign exchange which, we all know, is a commodity in short supply in this country. The result of all this, what I consider to be rather fishy business, is that CARE has virtually been exempted from all accountability. The State Governments are supposed to be paying for the entire cost of handling. Once the supplies enter the ports or docks of our country from that stage on to the cost of handling in-land transportation, storage, physical distribution, cost of maintaining Delhi Office of CARE, field offices of CARE, salaries of the employees including their travelling allowance and everything, emoluments of their American employees which are income-tax free, and along with that there are a number of perquisites including duty free liquor and so on all are borne by the State Governments. But there being no contractual commitment under this agreement for maintaining accounts, CARE does so, what is called, 'under their own regulations'. That means, the Government has to swallow whatever figures the CARE chooses to supply with. My charge is that there is no Indian apparatus whatsoever for checking up or regulating these accounts. This is scandalous state of affairs. And all this happens in the name of 'charitable organisation.'

I am sure, the Government is aware of the fact that the Chief Executive Director of CARE, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Louis Samia, less than a year ago, had been sentenced to imprisonment in the

Supreme Court at New York, on a charge of mis-appropriation of CARE's receipts towards its programmes. This is the kind of people who are in charge of this programme. Still the Government is not worried here about any account or accountability or anything. The actual expenditure which is incurred in this country by CARE apart from what they say, is not known to anybody. There is no way of checking it up or verifying it.

Again I will briefly refer to the testimony of Mr. Desmond Ignatius:

"So far as my knowledge goes CARE does not submit any other account than the final accounting to the Government of India.

I do not know if CARE submits any statement of account to the State Governments but we receive payments from them towards the administrative costs... We do not have direct touch with the State Governments . . ."

"I cannot say if we are informed about the costs approved by the Ministry of Social Welfare . . . The costs are worked out by us and it is for the Government of India to approve the same or not. The budgets are prepared by our CARE State office and submitted to the CARE headquarters in Delhi who in turn submits to the Government of India after approval by the head office. We are not required to submit the statement of actual expenses when we receive instalments of payments from the State Governments."

Here it is clear that they are receiving money, large sums of money, from the State Governments. They are spending that money. They are giving some final account to the Government of India each year and the figures that they submit, are not subject to any accounting or verification by our Government. There is no such system, no such machinery or apparatus, nothing. I may say that in 1971 alone, the amount which

was supplied to CARE by the various State Governments came to more than \$ 10 million. These figures are given in the CARE's own journal which they publish.

Then there is another curious thing. CARE has entered into separate agreements with some of the State Governments. In 1971 in Punjab 3.75 lakh children received CARE food and the operational cost for it which Punjab had to pay was Rs. 7 lakhs. In comparison with that, for feeding 3.61 lakhs poor children in Maharashtra that State paid to CARE Rs. 92 lakhs, that is, more than 13 times what Punjab did, although the number of children involved in Maharashtra was much less than in Punjab. One would have imagined that Maharashtra with a seaport like Bombay would need to incur smaller expenses than Punjab, which would need to haul the food over long inland distances.

Again, Haryana spent Rs. 10 lakhs for the feeding of 3.25 lakhs children but Gujarat spent Rs. 25 lakhs for 2.83 lakh children. Once again, the coastal State was paying more. Kerala spent Rs. 58 lakhs for 16.5 lakh children, whereas Tamil Nadu spent a staggering Rs. 2.73 crores for 18.4 lakh children.

So, anything goes; whatever they are demanding and claiming, which has no basis, no logic, no accountability behind it that is being agreed to and that is being paid.

I may point out the result of this curious agreement that we have entered into. In the Rajya Sabha on the 10th March 1981 the Finance Minister said that "the understanding with CARE was that foreign exchange remittances"—I do not know why they were allowed foreign exchange remittances at all; but, anyway, they were allowed it. I believe, CARE claims that this is for some administrative expenses of its head office in New York, or something like that anyway the Finance Minister said that:

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

"...the understanding was that for every 1,000 pounds of foodstuffs which they will supply, they will be allowed to take out and remit one American dollar".

But we find, for example, in 1979-80 the food supplied by CARE was 330 million pounds and, according to this rate the approved remittances should have been 3,30,000 dollars. But, actually, they were allowed in that year 1.1 million dollars to be repatriated.

So, I think these things, to say the least, require, some explanation. Very few people in this country know what is going on about CARE. Some people think it is a very benevolent, charitable, generous, voluntary organisation, which does not cost us a single pie, and the poor Americans are giving thousands of tonnes of foodgrains and feeding our children free.

I would like to know whether this is a *bona fide* relief organisation, or it is a United States Government agency, because it is an organisation which comes under, what is called, USAID and USAID itself is functioning under the overall control of the United States Department of State. Is CARE a *bona fide* relief organisation, or is it a United States Government agency, which is being set up for the purpose of disposing of some surplus stocks of foodgrains, surplus stocks of milk powder, surplus stocks of corn and surplus stocks of soya flower? That is their investment in these countries, as against that investment, they are allowed to make money, just like a business organisation, and take this money out from this country. So, they are supposed to be a charitable organisation, and our State Governments are paying crores of rupees to them, when they were not supposed under the original agreement to pay a single pie.

So, I do not want to say very much on this. I only want to say that I

think that a colossal scandal has been perpetrated, and the Government of India, instead of doggedly and persistently trying to defend what is happening now, should review the entire position. For the last 30 years this agreement has been in force. So, they should take a second look into it in interest of the country, in the national interest.

I would recommend that they should review the whole working of this agreement and scrap it. We are not beggars, going with a beggar's bowl. Even if we need voluntary organisations, there are many other organisations working in this country. There is the OXFAM; there is some other international organisation—I forget its name. There are various organisations working in this country, doing similar type of work, I do not think anybody else is provided with huge funds like this, which is against the very principle of the original agreement. And therefore, I would suggest that after all these years we were priding ourselves—justifiably priding ourselves—that we have now become self-sufficient in food and this and that. Of course our Children need care, there is no doubt about that. For that it does not mean that we shall berter away all our self-respect in this way. Therefore, I would suggest that this agreement should be scrapped. The sooner it is done, the better it is.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): Sir, the honourable Shri Indrajit Gupta has raised this discussion in consequence to the reply that was given on the floor of this House. On that day I did say that the 'figures that we are supplying to the House are correct and if there has been any discrepancy between the figures supplied by the Government and the figures which the hon. Member has been pleased to supply to the House, I am prepared to look into the matter.' That day also I did say that

the CARE organisation approached the Government through the Education Ministry in 1968 and through the Social Welfare Ministry in 1971 for formalising the entire thing which was going on and a kind of list of provisions for which agreements with the respective State Governments had to be entered into was formalised in the Education Ministry in 1968 and in 1971 in the Social Welfare Ministry.

Sir, in 1971 and thereafter, the Social Welfare Ministry was supposed to be a nodal Ministry so far as this CARE organisation is concerned. But when I enquired from the Finance Ministry, I have been able to get the information, though not the entire information that I wanted, that right from 1963-64 they have been allowed to collect the administrative charges. Honourable Shri Indrajit Gupta is emphasising on clause 2(A) of the agreement. I have carefully gone through clause 2(A) and in order to make myself sure that the interpretation which my officers are putting on clause 2(A) ...

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** We want your interpretation, not the officers' interpretation.

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN:** In order to make myself sure of the interpretation which has been put on this clause 2(A) is correct legally or not, I had the benefit of getting the advice from the Law Ministry also as to whether this clause 2(A) precludes CARE from recovering the administrative charges which, in fact, has been a main point of contention.

Sir, about the interpretation that has been given to us and on which I am also satisfied—I have carefully gone through the entire clause myself and I am more or less satisfied that this clause 2(A) does not preclude CARE from recovering the administrative charges, though it is a fact that it is not part of the agreement. It would have been a happier position if a supplementary agreement has been

prepared. Unfortunately, as I have stated earlier, I could not locate all those papers of 1963-64 where even today Mr. Indrajit Gupta said that there was a formal agreement and he was quoting from the evidence which was given in a court. I do not know and I have not seen it. I have to go through the entire thing, but I have tried my best since yesterday till this afternoon to locate the file to find out whether there was any such agreement, but I could merely get one letter, I could not get the entire file. So, I would not be able to say authentically as to whether this kind of an agreement was there or not. The first point which hon. Shri Indrajit Gupta is saying—'in fact they are not entitled to recover this amount'. I do not think that this agreement can be relied upon for that kind of interpretation and what he is referring to, the donations and other things which they have to collect outside India. In the shape of food articles they have to send those commodities to India and for purchases of foodgrains and other articles no donations are being collected from Indian sources. That, of course, is a clear point.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** For the benefit of the House would you read 2A on which you are harping too much? Please read that out and let us see how your interpretation stands. If you like, I can read that out?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I want to know why did you agree to reply? When you yourself have not been able to get the entire file, why did you agree to reply so soon? You could have got the file and then replied.

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN:** On that day Shri Indrajit Gupta said that he had addressed his question to the Finance Ministry and I had to reply that question yesterday also. Had the Finance Ministry replied, I do not know whether they would have located the file or not. Since the notice was given to

[Shri S. B. CHAVAN]

the Education and Social Welfare Ministry ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: In this situation when the Minister himself admits that he does not have the entire file and he feels that it would have been proper that the question should have been addressed to Finance Ministry, Shri Indrajit Gupta, would you like to postpone it?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I do not think I ever said that this notice should have been given to the Finance Ministry. I am merely saying that I have tried my best along with the Finance Ministry to locate the file, but I have not succeeded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is what I am saying. The question is very important. In view of the fact that you have not been able to locate the necessary file, I do not think you will be able to give proper reply.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Why? I am prepared to give the reply. I am giving the reply.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: He says that he is quite confident of giving a reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He says that the files are not available.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Files are not everything in the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you press your point, then it is all right.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Are they going to locate the agreement and is it in the country's interest?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: There was the writing in the file and orders have been issued. Copies of the orders we have been able to locate. Whether we have been able to locate the file or not is not very much material issue here.

2A: "Issue against payments made by individuals and organisations but only outside India gift remittances representing commodities to be delivered to individuals, groups and lawfully existing organisations in India designated by or on behalf of the donor".

So, the position is absolutely clear that the donations and other gifts which they were to procure from either individuals or organisations, but only outside India are to be remitted—where to Gifts, remittances representing commodities to be delivered to individuals, groups and lawfully existing organisations in India. So, the donations have got to be collected outside India and paid to India. With the donation that they receive they will have to make purchases of foodgrains and other non-food commodities and deliver it to India.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Who pays for this?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: That is exactly the point.

The interpretation that you put on it 'that in fact this Clause 2A precludes CARE from recovering administrative charges' does not flow out of Clause 2A. That is the only point which I wanted to make.

The second point which Shri Indrajit Gupta raised here was, and he tried to paint a picture, as if this is not a charitable organisation and, in fact, they are making huge profits out of it. For that, he quoted the figures of 1978 from their Plan Programme, which they had prepared in 1971 and also the budgeted figures of different State Governments—he referred to Punjab, Maharashtra and other places. First of all, I have also enquired from the CARE and I have also tried to locate as to how far this contention is correct. The Plan Programme which the CARE prepares is never published. It is being sent to their head-office and then, they take a decision. So, this is the kind of a draft programme which

they have prepared. The hon. Member, Shri Indrajit Gupta, most probably assumes that the entire amount is being paid to the CARE. It is a fact that right from the point of transportation, stocking, processing and, thereafter, for delivering the entire food commodities and non-food commodities to the respective beneficiaries, the entire amount is being spent by the State Governments. This is not being paid to the CARE.

Actually, these budgetary provisions definitely contain a part of it as an administrative charge. But my hon. friend is quoting all the figures as if these are all administrative charges which, in fact, is not the correct position. The correct position is that it includes all these items. Even if the Indian food is also to be supplied to different areas, barring the administrative charges required for their head-office, all the expenses are bound to be incurred by the State Governments.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Why should food items purchased in India be supplied through the CARE? You can set up your own Indian CARE.

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN:** Even if Indian food items purchased in India are to be supplied to the respective State Governments, the transportation cost, the storage cost, the processing cost and the distribution cost, all these expenses are being incurred by the State Governments. It is not going to make any difference. The only difference is that a part of the expenditure is being charged to these different States as administrative charges for the maintenance of their head-office in New York and their office in New Delhi. In fact, the amount was being collected and it is being collected with the full authority of the Government of India and the State Governments. There is nothing surreptitious about it; there is nothing hidden about it. The whole thing is done in a very clear manner.

At any rate, the relevant point would be as to whether the Govern-

ment is prepared to reconsider and apply its mind afresh to this problem. Certainly, we will be too happy to apply our mind to this matter. If there are any procedural irregularities, they will have to be set right. Why unnecessarily by an executive order? If certain things or the list of provisions which, in fact, is also in the nature of a supplementary agreement, if that is to be resorted to, according to me, the better course would be, instead of that, to have a regular supplementary agreement entered into with the CARE and formalise the entire thing without giving any scope for any kind of mis-interpretation ...

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** That means, you have been committing irregularities all these years.

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN:** You may call it "irregularity" or whatever it is. The list of provisions is definitely being signed by the State Governments. There is no difficulty about it. At the same time, the happier position would have been instead of signing the list of provisions, to formalise the entire thing by having a regular supplementary agreement with the CARE so that there is no scope for any kind of mis-interpretation.

Another point which the hon. Member raised was as to why have this from the CARE at all. It was in 1978 that this kind of an exercise was done. The Planning Commission and other respective Ministries advised that a total amount of foodgrains that we got from the CARE was of the order of Rs. 760 crores. And if we are to substitute this by Indian food, it is beyond our capacity. If Rs. 500 crores are to be provided in the Sixth Plan out of the Plan resources that we have, it is going to be almost impossible. That was the decision which was arrived at and we have to continue the entire thing.

The only point will be that Government will certainly look into the matter and instead of signing these lists of provisions, will take up with CARE



[Shri S. B. Chavan]

sign regular supplementary agreement with them and provide for all the charges that we are recovering under different administrative orders and formalise the whole thing.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I would like to ask one point for clarification. Till now have you any means of checking or verifying the final accounts which CARE provides for showing their operational costs in India or, are you to accept whatever figures they give?

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN:** That is also a correct position. We have been accepting the figures supplied to us by CARE. But, now they will have to file returns to which they have agreed. Under the Foreign Assistance Control Act—I do not exactly remember,—foreigners will have to file returns for the assistance which they give. They were under the impression that they need not file returns. But we have told them to file returns to which they have also agreed. That will definitely provide an opportunity for scrutinising the entire accounts and the amount which they are repatriating for their Head Office charges. That sort of thing will definitely be done hereafter.

**सभापति महोदय :** श्री रामावतार शास्त्री । सिर्फ सवाल पूछिए ।

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री :** आप तो जानते हैं कि अभी तक क्या होता है ।

**सभापति महोदय :** सिर्फ सवाल पूछिए ।

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना):** सभापति जी, यह इन्डो केयर समझौता सन् 1950 में हुआ था और यह हम सन् 1981 से गुजर रहे हैं। 31 वर्ष गए हैं और यह आश्चर्य की बात है कि सरकार ने इतने दिनों तक इन्हें समझौते पर पुनर्विचार करने की आवश्यकता नहीं

समझी। इतना पुराना एग्रीमेंट है और केयर का रोल तो आप देख ही रहे हैं—आए हैं मदद देने के नाम पर, दातव्य संगठन के नाम पर और पैसा लूट कर लेजा रहे हैं। इतने दिनों तक एग्रीमेंट पर पुनर्विचार करने की आवश्यकता क्यों नहीं समझी गई?

दूसरी बात सभापति जी, केयर को लेकर हमारे देश में बहुत भ्रम है और लोग समझते हैं कि इसका काम केवल रिलीफ या दातव्य सहायता करना ही नहीं बल्कि यह अन्दर ही अन्दर ब कुछ और काम भी कर रहा है। तो क्या सरकार इन बात का पता लगाएगी कि इनके कुछ और काम हैं या नहीं और केयर के पूरे कार्यों-कलापों की खुली जाच पार्लियामेंट की एक कमेटी बना कर इन के बारे में जो घुटाले सुने जाते हैं उन की जाच करवाएगी। इस जाच से सरकार अंतरात्ता क्यों है?

**सभापति जी, 1975--79 तक**  
11 करोड़ 70 लाख 52 हजार 996 ६० विभिन्न राज्य सरकारों ने इस के प्रशासनिक कार्यों में खर्च किए, जैसा सरकार स्वयं कहती है ।

अभी हम 1981 में है। इन दो सालों में भी कुछ खर्च हुआ होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि 16-17 करोड़ खर्च हुआ होगा। क्या जो काम केयर कर रहा है इसको समाप्त करके यह काम यानी बच्चों को पीछटक आहार देने का काम सरकार स्वयं अपने हाथ में लेकर या किसी एजेंसी के द्वारा इसको करवाने में अपने को सक्षम नहीं पाती और अगर नहीं पाती तो ऐसा क्यों?

**श्री एस० बी० जश्जान :** सबसे पहले एक बात की वजाहत में करना चाहता

हूँ। पहले मैंने कहा था कि पाँच सौ करोड़ का एग्जिमेन्ट दिया गया था। 250 करोड़ का ही पचास करोड़ पर ईयर के हिसाब से मांगा गया था और इस तरह से ढाई सौ करोड़ ही मांगा गया था। यह धजाहत मैं करना चाहता हूँ।

सवाल उन्होंने उठाया है कि 30-31 साल में जो एग्जिमेन्ट 1950 में हुआ था उसको फिर से देखने की आवश्यकता करने की जरूरत क्यों महसूस नहीं हुई। इस एग्जिमेन्ट के तहत जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव चार्ज वसूल करने की बात चल रही थी और कीमते बढ़ती जा रही थी लेकिन उसको फ्रीज कर रखा था एक हजार पाउंड के पीछे एक डालर चाहे उनका खर्चा कितना भी हो और एक हजार पाउंड के पीछे एक डालर के हिस्सा से ही पे किया गया और इस हिस्सा से सारा कारोबार चलता रहा। तीन चार बार यह चीज अलग-अलग मिनिस्ट्रीज का तरफ से देखने के बाद और देश के अन्दर जो हालत थी उम्मा देखने हुए यह महसूस किया गया कि फारा एजेंसीज को तरफ से यह सारा न्यूट्रिशन का प्रोग्राम चलाने के लिए यह चीज दी जाती है तो उसको बन्द करना ठीक नहीं रहेगा। यह आज तक की राय रही है।

थोड़ी देर पहले मैंने कहा है कि हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि जिस ढंग से यह सारा काम किया जा रहा था उसकी लिस्ट आफ प्राविजंज स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का तरफ से साइन करवाने के बजाय यह अच्छा होता अगर गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की तरफ से रेग्युलर सप्लीमेंटरी एग्जिमेन्ट ड्राफ्ट करके केयर के साथ दिया जाता। उससे पोजीशन बहुत ही सन्ती थी। लेकिन उस वकत वह माना गया कि

जहाँ लिस्ट आफ प्राविजंज के ऊपर बीनों एग्जी हो जाएं तो इसकी जरूरत नहीं रहेगी। फिर भी इस बात को करना ज्यादा मुनासिब हाता, ऐसी हमारी राय है।

उन्होंने यह शंका व्यक्त की है कि सिर्फ न्यूट्रिशन का प्रोग्राम और स्कूल फीडिंग का प्रोग्राम करने के बजाय दूसरी चीजें भी उनकी तरफ से होती हैं और इसकी पूरी जांच करवाई जानी चाहिये और इसके लिए उन्होंने पार्लियामेन्टरी कमेटी मुकर्रर करने की मांग की है। हमने 30-31 साल का पूरा ब्योरा देखा है और देखने के बाद हमने पाया है कि हमारे पास ऐसा कोई भी प्राइमा फेसाई केस नहीं है जिम्मे इस बात का सबूत मिल सके कि वे फूड वाटने के बजाय कोई दूसरा काम बना जाकर करते हैं। अगर कोई इसका सबूत गवर्नमेंट के पास होता जा प्राइमा फेसाई इस राय पर लाने के लिए गवर्नमेंट को मजबूर करता और पता चलता कि उनकी तरफ से बहुत सी धाधलिया की जा रही हैं, बहुत सी ऐसी चीजें चल रही हैं जिनको बन्द करना बहुत जरूरी है तो उन स्टेज पर इस सवाल के बारे में सोचा जा सकता था। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट के पास ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं है जिम्मे यह कहा जा सके कि इसमें कोई प्राइमा फेसाई केस बनता है या प्रोब करने का या जांच कराने का बेस बनाता है। इस बास्ते गवर्नमेंट इस बात के लिए तैयार नहीं हो सकता है।

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum):  
I submit to you that the entire CARE business seems to be reeking up a scandal. Politics is also involved in it. I do not know whether espionage is also there. The Executive Director Mr. Louis Samia, has revealed in court that it is not a relief organisation. I quote:

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

"CARE is constituted as a firm for doing business under the laws of the District of Columbia (USA) under which it is incorporated."

So, it is not a relief organisation. That is what has been revealed before court.

From 1964 upto a certain period, up to 1973, Rs. 11 crores have been netted by CARE, paid by the State Governments. What about the period before 1964? Can the Minister give the figure, enlighten the House as to how many crores have been netted by CARE, have been paid to CARE, as a sort of administrative charges or administrative costs, this or that, whatever he has said.

I would also like to know this. Is there any other relief organisation, OXFAM or any other organisation, where this organisation takes administrative charges from the State Governments or from the Central Government or even repatriates moneys in dollars, in hard currencies, from India? If there is none, then why is Government willing to give this special concession to CARE only, why this favoured treatment to them only? Is there something under this?

Now, if you say that you cannot dispense with CARE because they have paid Rs. 700 crores—that is the figure if I am not mistaken—under this food programme, if that is the position and now when all these things have come up—that day also I demand—why should you not conduct a probe into the activities of CARE—when so many issues are at stake? Can you give us the figure from 1950 onwards uptill now as to how many crores of rupees worth of food CARE has distributed in India? And if they could do all this, why should they charge repatriation charges in dollars? There is a paltry sum of six million dollars—that is what we know at present. They could bear this also.

Is it a fact or not that AFL-CIO and American Relief for Poland are

also member-agencies of CARE engaged in dubious political activities? This is the character of CARE.

On top of this, when there is no proper means of checking, whatever CARE submits has got to be met towards administrative costs. I do not know whether anywhere else in the world an independent Government, a sovereign Government, allows this sort of thing in its own territory, that whatever they say must be accepted and paid back as administrative charges and all that.

So, all these things are there. I again demand that a probe should be conducted. Why is Government fighting shy of having a probe into the affairs of CARE, into all these aspects, to see if there is something delicate, something fishy or otherwise about it? I demand that a probe should be conducted into the affairs of CARE.

You will be astonished to learn how it is politically motivated. Just now it is spending the greatest amount of relief in Kerala, a small State—that is obvious—with some political charges, I charge.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I will not be able to say whether there are any other organisations from which the administrative charges are allowed to be collected or not. In fact, that is not the main issue of the discussion to-day. What I have been trying to find out is this. Is it that the CARE is recovering the administrative charges only in India and not from the other countries where the CARE organisation works? There are thirtyeight countries where the CARE programme is being implemented. According to information given to me the administrative charges are being collected from all the countries and India is not an exception to it. In fact, that was one of the reasons why they persuaded the Government of India that we should allow them to collect the administrative charges. This being a charitable organisation we do not have funds—we cannot possibly

spend that amount required later on for this purpose. In fact that was the main reason why the Government of India also took a decision that they were entitled for such a kind of administrative charge.

The second point which my hon. friend, Shri Ghosh was pleased to raise is this. He said the same thing that day and he has repeated it to-day. I was carefully listening to him as to whether he had made out a point as to why he would like us to set up some kind of a probe. I do not think that he himself had been able to establish anything. So, I don't think it will be proper on my part to say that we would like to set up an enquiry committee. There is no question of any probe. Government does not think in terms of having such a probe.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL (Ernakulam): Sir, this discussion is rather over a vital subject for the consideration of this House. Listening to the answer given on the 23rd and to-day by the hon. Minister as also the questions put forward by the hon. Members, I have formulated rather three propositions for the consideration of this House.

First of all, are we against the aid from abroad either from voluntary or non-voluntary organisations?

In this context, what is the quantum of assistance/aid received by this country and how far it has gone to the deserving objectives of this programme?

My second point is: if some irregularities/malpractices or violation of terms and conditions are committed by this organisation or association, then what prevents this Government to go into it and compel this organisation or association in this respect?

My third point is: of course Shri Gupta also referred to the terms and conditions of this agreement of 1950. While considering the renewal of this agreement of 1950, will Government take concrete steps to see that

proper accounting system is adopted in the matter? Shri Inarajit Gupta had very clearly stated about the payments/remittances or repatriation of the amounts. These are not small matters which can be bypassed by us. But, this is one thing on which the House was not convinced. When conclusive evidence is there of malpractices or irregularities, what is it that has precluded us from going into the activities of this or any other organisation? I say that quite a few organisations in his country are receiving aid from various foreign countries and using it for many purposes and the hon. Minister has said that over Rs. 760 crores worth of foodgrains are given in this matter as aid. This takes me back to my own State. Here for the primary education children, CARE is giving food. There is no substitute for this system. May I ask a question from Shri Inarajit Gupta...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You ask the question from the Minister—not from Shri Inarajit Gupta.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: The question was put and the discussion came out of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you please ask the question and do not discuss it.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: I am asking the question and I am not giving a lecture on this. Are you against the aid which is given? Or do we have a system or method through which we can meet the needs of our people here? This is the first question I put forward. My submission is during the cyclone time or other occasions, various organisations have ploughed money in this country. Why should we be ungrateful to them? We should appreciate the goodwill of these people. Calamity in any country is a calamity of the humanity. Many of these organisations are coming here or giving aid out of humanity. These are the points which I would like the hon. Minister to take into consideration. I would

[Shri Xavier Arakal]

like to know when the negotiations start to renew the agreement of 1950 will the hon. Minister take into consideration the feeling of this House? Also a proper supervision should be imposed from the Central Government on these activities.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Sir as far as the various points raised by the hon. Member are concerned I can say that we as a nation are not against receiving any foreign aid. Might be some Members are having that point of view that they would not like India to accept any foreign aid in whatever shape it may come. The second point was about whether the food articles and other things are going to the deserving beneficiaries. Actually the whole work is being done in an extensive manner and the State Governments are fully involved. It is not that CARE is distributing. It is through the State Governments that these food articles have been distributed and we have not heard of any such complaint against the State Government that either they have misutilised or not given to the deserving people which were contemplated by the donors themselves.

Sir, a little while ago I said that certainly Government is going to look into the matter of formalising the entire thing after negotiating with CARE to enter into some kind of a supplementary agreement. Sir, it is not the proper accounting but it is the proper check on behalf of the Government. Actually, the whole thing is being implemented through the State Governments and we would like to see as to whether this also requires to be gone into and certainly Government would like to go into it.

The last point raised by the hon. Member was as to why we should not go into the affairs of any voluntary organisation even if there is no case

against it. At least I have not been able to convince myself as to why should we go into the details of any voluntary organisation unless Government has a *prima facie* case that there have been some kind of mis-handling or mis-appropriation or violation of the purpose for which the organisation has been working in the country....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: How will you know when you have to accept their figures?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: We know through the State Governments. Sir, even from the States where in fact the ruling parties are different from the ruling party at the Centre I have not received any such complaint that they have been misutilising or mis-appropriating the funds. That is a clear proof that they have been working all right. It is a matter of opinion whether we should pay or should not pay administrative charges. It is a matter which, in fact, Mr. Indrajit Gupta has raised here. As far as Government are concerned we think that administrative charges will have to be paid and that is why they are being paid. It is a question of merely formalising the entire thing.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I hope you will be able to find the missing files.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Sir, I did not say 'missing'. I only said that I have not been able to locate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, you will try to locate the files. The House stands adjourned to meet at 11 AM on Thursday the 15th April 1981.

19.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, April 16, 1981/Chaitra 26, 1903 (Saka)