

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]
shrewd middlemen also contributes to the destruction of forests which form 43.42 per cent of the State's land area.

The Government of India should provide more funds to the State's vigilance department to enable them to intensify their work in the forest areas and round up the illegal gangs. The vehicles and the guns used by the smugglers should be confiscated and stringent punishment should be accorded to them.

Destruction of forests not only causes permanent damage to the environment, but also hampers the schemes for protecting the sea coast from cyclones and tidal waves.

14.58 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1981—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall now take up further clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 36 (Insertion of new Sections 7A to 7B)

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 21, line 14,—

after "in advanced" insert—

"where the total chargeable amount exceeds the amount prescribed and shall be so payable" (11)

Page 25, line 8,—

for "eighty-three and one-third per cent."

substitute "seventy-five per cent." (12)

The corporate surcharge has been reduced from 7.5 per cent to 2.5 per cent. We thank the Government. But I fail to understand why this corporate surcharge has not been

totally abolished because this corporate surcharge was introduced in the wake of the Bangladesh war 10 years ago. I, therefore, hope that in future this point will be borne in mind by the honourable Finance Minister.

Sir, our tax structure is such that any reduction in the corporate surcharge results in an increase in the surtax. Further, it has now been provided that this surtax will be payable in advance. As a result, the meagre relief that has been given in reduction of corporate surcharge has been offset. This provision for paying the surtax in advance will adversely affect the liquidity of the companies.

15.00 hrs.

It will affect their cash position. As such, therefore, I have moved these two amendments in order to provide that this surtax should not be made payable in advance. I quite understand that there is provision for payment of income tax in advance. But then this position with respect to the surtax and income tax is as I have explained on different footings. I, therefore, urge upon the hon. Minister to extend his gracious approbation to the amendments that I have moved in the House.

I commend my amendments to the House and hope that the same will be accepted.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: In the present circumstances, as mentioned by Shri Banatwalla, the individual tax payer is liable to pay the tax in advance if it exceeds the exemption limit. The companies are on a different footing. But the Government desires to bring them on the same footing. Therefore, now the companies will be liable to pay the surtax in advance. When the individuals are liable to pay in advance, the companies should also pay the surtax in advance. The stand which the Government has taken is quite appropriate and reasonable.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur): Do you want to change because the two are on different footings?

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: We want them to be on the same footing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I put amendment Nos. 11 and 12 to clause 36 moved by Shri Banatwalla to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 36 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 36 was added to the Bill.

Clause 37 (Insertion of new Section 9A)

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: I beg to move:

Page 27, line 14,—

for "eighty-three and one-third per cent."

substitute "seventy-five per cent" (13).

Page 28, line 14,—

for "eighty-three and one-third per cent."

substitute "seventy-five per cent." (14)

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I am sorry these are not accepted. We stick to the stand which has been proposed in the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I put amendment Nos. 13 and 14 to Clause 37 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 37 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 37 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are no amendments to clauses 38 to 41.

The question is:

"That clauses 38 to 41 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 38 to 41 were added to the Bill.

Clause 42—(Insertion of new section 24AA)

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I beg to move:

Page 30,

for line 1, substitute—

"(b) foreign companies providing any services or facilities or supplying any ship, aircraft, machinery or plant (whether by way of sale or hire)". (40)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

Page 30,

for line 1, substitute—

"(b) foreign companies providing any services or facilities or supplying any ship, aircraft, machinery or plant (whether by way of sale or hire)". (40)

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 42, as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 42, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clauses 43 to 50 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 43 to 50 were added to the Bill.

Clause 51—(Amendment of Act 40 of 1978)

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 32, line 16,—

for "fifteen percent" substitute "twelve per cent". (15)

We are very grateful to the hon. Minister for having refrained from imposing any addition or any increase in the excise duties. However, the textile industry has been singled out by him for his wrath. The additional excise duty on textiles has been increased from 10 per cent to 15 per cent. I had earlier also raised this matter and I was given a history of this additional excise duty. I quite agree with the national objective of providing cheap cloth for the purpose of which this additional excise duty was levied on the textile industry.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think, the Finance Minister also replied to that. In spite of that, you are moving this amendment. You are not convinced by his arguments.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: My submission is that there cannot be an unlimited number of increases in this particular excise duty. It is a national objective and, in meeting this national objective, only the textile industry should not be singled out to bear this burden. It should then be borne by the general revenues.

There is one particular point which I wish to place before the House. I was told by the hon. Finance Minister day before yesterday that when I am opposing the increase in the additional excise duty on textiles, I am pleading for something for which even the textile industry has not pleaded. Exactly that is the position. I am not here to represent the interests of textile magnates. My point

is that the incidence of this additional excise duty passes on to the consumers. And there in lies the rub of the whole matter. Let the Government increase the additional excise duty. But let the Government provide further that the incidence of it shall not be passed on to the consumers and I will be one to support it. Otherwise, let the general revenues also be made to bear this social burden of this national objective. Therefore, though my amendment only seeks to reduce the duty from 15 per cent to 2 per cent, my appeal to the Government would be not to come forward with any increase in the additional excise duty specially in these days of cost escalations faced even by the textile industry and the inflation being borne by the common man.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, this point has been discussed in detail. But I would like to reply to a few points which have been raised by the hon. Member.

It is our desire, in the public interest, that the production of controlled cloth should be increased. Therefore, it is necessary that for the subsidy which is given at present, the Government will require more amount in fulfilling the requirements of subsidy which will be enhanced so that there is more production of controlled cloth. The Government has, therefore, proposed to raise the additional duty from 10 per cent to 15 per cent. I think, the stand taken by the Government is quite reasonable, in the public interest, and it should be accepted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I put amendment No. 15 to Clause 51 moved by Shri G. M. Banatwalla to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 15 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 51 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 51 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clauses 52 and 53 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 52 and 53 were added to the Bill.

First Schedule

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN (Adoor): I beg to move:

Page 39, line 23,—

for "60" substitute "65" (20)

Page 39, line 26,—

for "65" substitute "70" (21)

Page 40, line, 38,—

for "50" substitute "60" (22)

Page 40, line 41,—

for "70" substitute "75" (23)

Page 52, line 4,—

for "two and a half" substitute "eight and a half" (24)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Which are the amendments?

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN: Sir, I have moved amendments 20 to 24. I would like to speak only on amendment No. 24, regarding the special surcharge payable on income-tax.

Mr. Banatwalla has expressed his happiness over the proposed reduction of surcharge from 7.5 per cent to 2.5 per cent.

I should express my unhappiness over this proposed reduction because I find no justification for extending this concession which would amount to a gift of about Rs. 60 crores to the industrial tycoons of our country, and it has been done in the name of creating a proper investment climate in the private sector. My first objection is that there is no guarantee that the industrial tycoons would invest this accretion of Rs. 60 crores to

the coffers in investment since there is no effective control over the rate of dividend. The tycoons will enhance the dividend and the past experience shows that Indian private sector industrialists had not resorted to investment by way of internal resources which is the reserve generated from the industry itself.

Another point which I would like to bring to the notice of the Government and the House is that the climate of profitability in the industrial sector, the private sector, does not warrant such a huge amount of concession to the industrial tycoons.

I find from the latest study released by the Reserve Bank of India on 14th April, that the operating profits of 426 large selected public limited companies with a paid up capital of Rs. 1 crore and above rose by Rs. 203 crores to Rs. 1066 crores in 1979-80, registering a substantial growth of 23.5 per cent. This Study covers all non-Governmental and non-financial companies. The value of production and the sales of these companies stood at Rs. 14,286 crores and Rs. 14,090 crores respectively in 1979-80 registering an increase of 15.2 per cent and 15.3 per cent respectively. The comparable growth rates in the preceding year were 12.6 per cent and 11.6 per cent. The growth rate in gross profits of these 426 companies rose from 16 per cent in 1978-79 to 20.6 per cent in the subsequent year. The gross profits in 1979-80 amounted to Rs. 1,548 crores, that is, a rise of Rs. 241 crores. The dividend payment rose from Rs. 218 crores to Rs. 241 crores. Therefore, there is no justification for extending this vast amount of concession to the industrial tycoons when they are amassing huge profits and there is no dearth of capital for investment. The fact is that they do not invest; instead, they utilise it in the way of increased dividends, etc.

Therefore, I totally oppose this proposed reduction. I propose that the surcharge should be increased from the present rate of 7.5 per cent to 8.5 per cent.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I do not want to take more time of the House. The proposal before the House is to reduce the surcharge from 7½ per cent to 2½ per cent. The hon. Member desires that it must be increased to 8½ per cent. The rates of income-tax on companies in India are considered to be fairly high as compared to the rate of income-tax on companies in other developed countries of the world. The proposal to reduce the surcharge is intended to add to the internal availability of funds in the corporate sector and it is expected that this measure would improve the scope for investment financing from their own resources. Therefore, the amendment proposed by the hon. Member is not acceptable.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put Amendments Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24, moved by Shri Kadiyan, to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

The First Schedule was added to the Bill

The motion was adopted.

The First Schedule was added to the Bill

The Second Schedule, the Third Schedule and the Fourth Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill, as amended be passed."

There are nine hon. Members to speak in the Third Reading. The time allotted for the Third Reading is only one hour.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: For amendments 3 hours were given but we hardly took that time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is all over.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): It was decided that we will have 4 hours...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't go into details. Details will not be helpful to you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VEN KATASUBBAIAH): For Third Reading one hour has been allotted and there are 9 speakers. I request you to see that one hour is not exceeded because there is another Bill that has to be taken up. That was also agreed to yesterday in the Business Advisory Committee.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur): For that another Bill only one hour has been allotted. That Bill we will take up at 5 O'clock and we have agreed to co-operate with you on that Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Shrimati Pramila Dandavate...

Shri Motibhai Chaudhary....

Shri Ratansinh Rajda...

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu...

Now, Shri Satish Agarwal.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: They may come, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When they are called, they must be present here. Don't argue on behalf of the absentees.

Mr. Satish Agarwal. You will get the time allotted to your Party. That is 15 minutes.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Anyway that is for you to decide when you hear my speech.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur): Now we are at the tag end because we are going to pass all the stages of the budgetary process. After an hour or so, the total Budget of the Government of India will get through. On this occasion, before making my observations on this important matter, I would like to submit before the House that I am so sorry that I could not participate in the general debate on account of my prolonged illness and I could not participate at the second stage, that is the consideration of the Finance Bill, because I had gone to Cochin to attend the National Executive Committee meeting. Therefore, I requested the hon. Speaker yesterday to permit me to make a speech now.

To-day I intend not to indulge or not to go deep into various taxation matters or this measure or that measure or highlight certain problems facing the country. I do not want to go into all that. I would like to circumscribe my speech to only a very limited point and that is this—what is the budgetary process in this country and whether this Parliament has got effective powers to scrutinise the Budget proposals, what is the extent of control, what should be the extent of control, what is the practice prevalent in other countries and whether there is a need for a re-thinking on the total budgetary process in this country by hon. Members of Parliament. The points that I am going to make I have already discussed with my esteemed colleague, the Finance Minister who is unfortunately not here and who has gone abroad but he seems to be in agreement with many of these points. I had also occasion to discuss some of these points with my esteemed colleagues in the Congress Party also. With this preface I wish to make my observations.

The first Budget of the Government of India was presented to the Central Legislative Assembly on 1st March, 1921 for a total expenditure of Rs. 129 crores. After 1921, the

economy which was a colonial economy, converted itself into a national economy after 1947. The size, the volume and the dimensions of the activities have grown so phenomenally that to-day we have got an expenditure budget of Rs. 25,000 crores. Compared with Rs. 129 crores in 1921, now in 1981 we have got an expenditure of nearly Rs. 25,000 crores. Not only that, in the year 1925, nearly half a century ago, the activities of the Government were very limited. But at that particular point of time, there were various Standing Committees in the country during the British raj, to scrutinise the financial proposals, to allocate sums out of the demands granted and so many other things. But then what happened? After 1947, particularly with the beginning of the planning era, governmental activities have been increasing day by day in the interest of the national economy. Now we have got a huge public sector. We have got Government companies and Government corporations. We are giving aid to foreign countries. We are receiving aid from foreign countries. We are having grants, loans, advances, provision for flood, calamities, drought, so on and so forth. We have got life insurance corporation which practically has a business of Rs. 20,000 crores as on to-day. So, this is the position of the increasing governmental activities.

Not only that, since 1953-54 we have got three supplementary budgets. In 1964-65 we had four supplementary budgets and the supplementary budget is on an average a budget of Rs. 1500 crores which is ten times the first budget of the Government of India. This is supplementary budget and then that we have got Excess Demands. These are the dimensions, the size and volume of the governmental activities. I do not want to go into the figures of the Excess Demands figures which have reached Rs. 266 crores in one year. That is practically twice the sum of our annual budget of 1921.

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

In this condition, what was the position in the pre-independence era. There were Standing Committees for various Departments. To familiarise Members with the process of administration, record opinions on policy matters, new schemes involving expenditure there was a Standing Committee. There was a Standing Committee for Finance in 1921. There were 10 elected members. What was the scope of that Committee? To scrutinise the proposals for new votable expenditure in all Government department, to sanction allotments out of the lumpsum grants—that was their function—and to suggest economy and retrenchment and economy in expenditure and to assist in cases referred to by the Finance Ministry. That was the scope of that particular committee. Now, what is the position? To-day we do not have any Standing Committees. All those Standing Committees have been abolished. There is no Standing Committee.

Now, what is the process for the formulation of the Budget? Excuse me, Sir. So far as the present budgetary process and the formulation stage is concerned, it has become one of whims and fancies of one single individual—not the whole Cabinet even. The whole cabinet have got nothing to do with it. I remember in 1979, the budget was prepared twice. One was prepared by Mr. M. H. Patel and when Choudhary Charan Singhji took over on 24th January 1979, the whole budget was revised and a new Budget was prepared. With the change of one man, not change of the Government, the whole Budget was revised and twice the Budget was prepared. So, the whole budgetary process and the formulation of the Budget naturally depends on the bureaucracy, of course, with one particular Finance Minister who comes into the picture at the stage when some policy decisions have to be taken. So I humbly submit that so much secrecy is attached to Budget that not even the Cabinet is taken into confidence.

The House is not taken into confidence. The Parliament has no say in the whole matter. What allocations have to be made for what particular expenditure—for rural development, for agriculture, etc., there this House has got no say. We have got only a general discussion on the Budget and we simply ventilate our grievances whatever we feel our constituencies. Nothing more can be done to the Budget. The time for general discussion is very meagre—hardly 75 hours. The time allotted for Demands is also very meagre. Many of the Demands are passed. Guillotine is applied. Cut motions are only a ritual. That does not carry any weight. Appropriation Bill is a five minutes job. Finance Bill—15 hours. Everything is disposed of and the total process of the Budget is over in this House without any scrutiny by any committee of Parliament from both sections of the House. If this is the process, I say, with the increase in governmental activities, the House has to think whether we have to continue this process or we should have some change in the entire formulation and discussion of the Budget and scrutiny by Members of Parliament and what we should do.

Now, an argument is being given that we have got the Public Accounts Committee; we have got the Public Undertakings Committee and we have got the Estimates Committee. I do not want to go much more into the details. But, I can say that in so far as the Public Undertakings Committee is concerned, out of 190 public undertakings, this Committee was able to examine only 68 public undertakings so far.

121 public undertakings have been beyond the reach of examination or scrutiny of the Public Undertakings Committee because they cannot do the job as the job is so tremendous or so stupendous that one Committee, on behalf of Parliament, cannot scrutinise all the audit reports or all the audit paras of all the public undertakings. Till this date, the position as

on 16-8-1980 is this. 121 public undertakings have been beyond the reach of the Public Undertakings Committee.

So far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, there are 10,000 audit objections floated. Out of 10,000 audit objections, 1,000 are picked up by the Auditor-General and, out of 1,000, nearly 400 are mentioned only. And out of 400, hardly 35 are picked up by the P.A.C. for the scrutiny. What is the position? It is not even 10 per cent of the paras selected by the Auditor-General. It is only 10 per cent of the total audit objections. With such a huge budget and with such a huge expenditure, what is the scrutiny by Parliament? Who scrutinises? I think nobody scrutinises. Otherwise we would have done that. What is to be done under the circumstances? Now, the L.I.C. has got a business of 20,000 crores as on date. Banks have got a business of Rs. 30,000 crores; the G.I.C. has got a huge business or as on date. But, they are beyond the purview of the P.A.C., P.U. or E.C. There is no Parliamentary control over the L.I.C., G.I.C., Banks, Reserve Bank whatsoever, where thousands and thousands of crores of public money is invested. Has the Parliament throught about the whole question as for how to scrutinise and how to increase the effective control of Parliament over the governmental expenditure?

To-day, the governmental expenditure is beyond the control of Parliament. P.A.C. brings so many matters to the notice of Parliament. I shall give you one classic example. Take Salal Project. Initially, Rs. 55 crores had been sanctioned for this project. Now, the cost of the Salal Project has gone up to Rs. 600 crores and the period that is taken is 15 years... Who is answerable to this? Who has to bear this burden? It is the taxpayers who have to bear the burden. Parliament is there. The P.A.C. submits the report to them. It cannot be discussed in Parliament. ActioTaken Reports are not discussed in Parli-

ment. The P.A.C. reports are not discussed; the Estimates Committee's reports are not discussed. Then, how are we going to have effective control? These are certain matters. Similarly, take for instance Metro Railways. Initially the cost was Rs. 140 crores. Now the cost has gone up to Rs. 1,000 crores. The time for completion should be 5 or 6 years but it has taken 15 years. Which officer is accountable to Parliament? How can you have effective control? That is what I am pleading with this House.

We should devise ways and means to have more effective control over governmental activity, over governmental expenditure. Parliament must be involved in this process. I would like to remind this House as to what our Prime Minister in her speech in the National Development Council relevant. I would like to quote her: This was what

"...that the Five Year Plan is not just a describing national targets and policy for the realisation. It represents more outlays and growth rates. It implies a to the objectives of development. "It is that we periodically give to ourselves to the course of our nation's progress. It our hopes and aspirations. It symbolises lution to dedicate ourselves, all our of eneagies, to forge ahead".

Now this is the approach. Now for another five years this country and this Parliament is committed to the Five Year Plan a copy of which has not been made available to hon. Members of this House.

The Five Year Plan has not been discussed in Parliament. Copies of the Plan have not been made available to the MPs. No discussion has taken place and Members have not been given opportunity to have some say in the formulation of the Plan which is a Charter of action for another five years and on the basis of which our Budget is formulated. Do we not have any say in the formulation of the Plan? It was discussed

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

long ago in Parliament. In this particular connection I would like to quote none else but the Finance Minister himself who while participating and Chairing a particular Committee had made certain observations and strongly pleaded that a standing committee for planning apart from others should be there. I would like to just quote four or five lines:

"Therefore, a discussion by Parliament before the Plan is finalised, in the draft stage, must take place [Shri Satish Agarwal] to decide whether the resource-mobilisation contemplated in the Plan is within the competence of the country...

Therefore, my suggestion is that before the Plan is finalised, Parliament must have a look at the very important aspects, the broad aspects, namely what is to be the size of the Plan and what is the principle on which the size of the Plan must be determined, what are the resources for the Plan and from where they can be raised in the normal course and, thirdly, what is the allocation as between the various sectors—the agricultural sector, the industrial sector, transportation and communication sector, social services sector and other sectors which are recognised for the Plan, right from the beginning."

"Standing Committees must be revived. If the Government do not revive the Standing Committees for all the Departments, at least it must be revived only for the Planning Department because this is the Department in which moneys are distributed over several sectors and any change in the distribution to any sector will vitally affect the total growth of the economy."

Now, Sir, in these circumstances my respectful submission before this hon. House is that time has come now that we as responsible representatives of the poor teeming millions of this country have to devise ways and means as to how to increase the effective

control of Parliament over various governmental activities including LIC, GIC, Reserve Bank, etc. At the moment except for asking certain Questions—twenty-five per cent of which are replied in the form that the information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House—there is very little control. In U.K., Sir, on whose pattern our system was based, they have introduced in 1979, twelve Committees for all the very important Departments, viz., Agriculture, Defence, Education, Science and Art, Employment, Energy, Environment, Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs, Industry and Trade, Social Services, Transport, Treasury and Civil Service.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): How do they differ in their working from the working of our Consultative Committees?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Prof. Ranga, I am prepared to come to your house and discuss these issues in detail with you. I have discussed this matter at length with the Finance Minister and he seems to be in agreement on many of these issues and aspects. I can give you the exact number of Members of the Committees and the quorum required. I have a complete Paper. I went on behalf of the Government of India in a Study Group to attend a meeting held in London in 1979, where six countries participated and on behalf of the Commonwealth countries a report was prepared and circulated. On the basis of that our Parliamentary Secretariat has prepared this booklet and in this booklet all these recommendations are contained. In Lusaka in September-October 1980 this particular subject "Parliament and Scrutiny of Public Finances" was discussed and consequently in U.K., Australia and Canada these standing committees are exercising effective control over various governmental activities. They are very effective and in one country in U.K. one committee is so powerful that it can stop the payment if it unauthorised. But here in this country even if Demands for Excess Grants are not

passed for two years the bureaucracy can go on spending money without authorisation from Parliament. The expenditure on any New Service cannot be incurred without prior approval of Parliament. The PAC has reiterated its views on several occasions on this important aspect of Parliamentary scrutiny but this is of no consequence to them whatsoever. Without taking more time of the House, may I most humbly suggest this? This is something which must cut across party barriers. We should make Parliament more effective. Sir, I am very much pained to see that even the Sixth Plan Document was not discussed in Parliament. Before adoption by the NDC it should have been discussed in Parliament but that was not done. It was not discussed and even copies of the document were not made available to Members. This is showing gross apathy towards Parliament and Parliamentary functioning. We should all see to it that Parliament exercises more effective control over all these things. Governmental spending has grown more and more in volume and it is Rs. 25,000 crores in 1981-82. There are cases like GIC, LIC, RBI and many others which should come within the purview of the financial committees. More committees should be formed; more standing committees should be there. The Informal Consultative Committee system should be abolished, because they have practically no role to play. We want more Standing Committees so as to have more effective parliamentary control over Governmental expenditure. Unless we do that, all the money will go down the drain. So, it is in the interest of the economy of the country, in the interest of development, in the interest of Planning, in the interest of Parliamentary democracy, that I plead with folded hands to all sections of the House, to consider my suggestions in a dispassionate manner. Let there be Standing Committees for all the Government Departments, in which all Members of Parliament would be associated which

will bring the total involvement of all the people's representatives in the entire planning process.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do You oppose or support the Bill?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: I have made my observations in a dispassionate manner.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस बिल विधेयक का जोरदार तरीके से विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before I call Shri Ramavatar Shastri to speak, I may inform the House that Shri Shastri has intimated to me that he would be making allegations against an official of Bihar Government and also against a Minister of that State.

It has been held that it is not right to refer to Members of other Houses or raise matters falling within the jurisdiction of a State Government. In Bihar, there is a popular Government and matters desired to be raised by Shri Shastri could more appropriately be raised in the State Legislature. I would request Shri Shastri to extend cooperation and not refer to these matters.

AN HON. MEMBER: If he wants, let him go to the Assembly!

(Interruptions)

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: उपाध्यक्ष जी, आपकी भावना का मैं आदर करता हूँ लेकिन आपकी बातों से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। मैं तो सारे अखबार कोट करना चाहूँगा। अगर किसी का अखबार में नाम छप सकता है, अगर किसी के बारे में अखबार लिख सकता है....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Shastri, on Third Reading you are speaking now.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: मैं अथारिटी से बोल रहा हूँ। मैं जब बोलूँगा तो अथारिटी से बोलूँगा।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, देश में कानून और व्यवस्था की स्थिति सबसे अधिक दर्दनाक है। सरकार का दिन-प्रति-दिन स्थिति सुधर रही है, ऐसा दावा कर रही है। मैं इस गव को पाबण्डपूर्ण

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

बाबा मानता हूँ। इसमें कहीं भी सच्चाई नहीं है।

दिल्ली में देखिये—चिराग तल भंडेरा—वाली कहावत स्वयं सिद्ध है। दिल्ली में क्या हो रहा है, इसके बारे में ज्यादा कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान के तमाम सूबों में, चाहे बिहार हो, उत्तर प्रदेश हो, हरियाणा तो मैं गया था।

प्रो० के० के० तिवारी (बक्सर) : केरल में क्या हो रहा है, वेस्ट बंगाल में क्या हो रहा है ? इसको भी कहिये।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : मैं वहीं बता रहा हूँ। हरियाणा में या कोई भी जगह आप लो लीजिए। तमाम देश में विधि-व्यवस्था बंद से बंदतर होती जा रही है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: During the Third reading of the Finance Bill you are speaking about the law and order situation. I think you want some more money to be allotted for meeting this situation. But enough money has been allotted. Please come to the point.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: Law and order situation also comes under the Finance Bill. They are connected with the Finance Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, you come to the point and conclude.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I will finish very soon.

मैं यह कह रहा था कि स्थिति बहुत ही दर्दनाक है। इसके में एक-दो उदारण दूंगा। उदाहरण जी, हरियाणा तो बंगल में ही है। हरियाणा में करनाल जिले में घरोडा नामक स्थान है, जहाँ पर काना भी है। घरोडा थाने के एस० एच० श्री० ने सरपंच टेकचन्द को बुलाया और मार कर रास्ते में फेंक दिया।

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): Sir, he has mentioned the name of the Sarpanch. That portion should be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In regard to the mentioning of the names and all that, I will go through the proceedings and consider whether that will not go on record.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: You cannot prevent me quoting from the newspapers.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let it be. Even then if it is derogatory or any allegations made against anybody, I will not permit it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let it be established.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: Who will establish it? Government or Police will establish it...?

इतना रुपया यहाँ गया, इतना रुपया वहाँ गया, सिर्फ यही तो फाईनेंस बिल नहीं है। अब तक तो मैं अपनी बात समाप्त कर चुका होता।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि इस तरह से सरपंच की हत्या की गई। इसी तरह से आज और कल के अखबारों में देखिए कि पाण्डिचेरी में एक कम्युनिस्ट यूथ लीडर की हत्या कर दी गई है। आंध्र प्रदेश में एम० एल० ए० की हत्या कर दी गई और आंध्र प्रदेश में ही मेडक नामक स्थान पर, जो प्रधान मंत्री की कांस्टी-ट्यूएँसी भी है, वहाँ पर 3 किसानों को गोली मार दी गई। इसी प्रकार कल हम लोग यहाँ पर आंध्र प्रदेश के इन्द्रावली नामक स्थान पर 14 आदिवासियों की हत्या के बारे में चर्चा कर चुके हैं।

इस प्रकार पूरे देश में कानून और विधि-व्यवस्था खराब है। इन घटनाओं में एक विशेष बात है, जिससे ईश्वर और उधर, दोनों पक्षों को खतरा है और वह बात है कि आज राजनीतिक लोगों की हत्याएँ अधिक हो रही हैं।

Political murders are taking place daily. I would like to draw your attention to this. हमारे बिहार में पिछले एक साल से भी कम समय में, जून में सरकार बनी और उसके बाद सौ से भी अधिक पोलिटिकल मर्डर हुए हैं। सिर्फ बेगूसराय जिले में ही 36 मर्डर हुए। यह काम कौन करता है? पुलिस और जमींदार मिल कर एंटी-सोशल एलिमेंट्स का इस्तेमाल करते हैं।

SHRI C. T. DANDAPANI (Pol-lachi): Sir, in Tamil Nadu, D.M.K. workers were murdered by the Communists.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: रोहतासपुर जिले में 32 खेतोहर मजदूरों पर भी यही हुआ। जब भी मजदूर अपनी उचित मांगें मांगने जाता है, तो कह दिया जाता है कि मजदूर नक्सलवाइट हो गए हैं और कन्फेशन भी कहानी बना ली जाती है।

उसी तरह से हजारीबाग जिले में बलरामपुर में तीन आदिवासियों को गोली मार दी गई। वे यह मांग कर रहे थे कि उनको जमान का मुआवजा दिया जाए। सिंहभूमि जिले के गुवा में आपने सुना हीगा चौदह आदिवासियों को मार दिया गया है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि सौ से अधिक व्यक्ति मारे गए हैं।

हाल की एक घटना का मैं विवरण देना चाहता हूँ। मदन साहूज: ए.पोलिटिकल मर्डर। खगिरिया जिले के चौथम थाने के वह रहने वाले थे। वह जिला कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता, सफ्रेट-रिएट के मंत्री और जिला खेत मजदूर यूनियन के सफ्रेटरी थे। उनको सब इस्पेक्टर ने इतना मारा कि वहीं ढेर कर दिया।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now. I have to give chance to other Members also. There are 5-6 other Members who want to speak.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: How much time have you given to others?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not question me.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I will not question you, but let me speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: In that case it is better that I do not speak in protest.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right, I will call the next speaker.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: मैं कह देता हूँ कि यह गलत बात है।

I protest... **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Aspersions on the Chair will not go on record. This will not go on record.

Shri Mool Chand Daga.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA (Pali): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir...

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: यह कोई बात हुई? मैं ऐसे बोलता नहीं हूँ। लोग मर रहे हैं, पोलिटिकल वर्कर्स को मारा जा रहा है और ये बोलने नहीं दे रहे हैं।

I am very much agitated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are my good friend.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: किसी की परवाह नहीं करता हूँ। सारे को रिकार्ड से हटा दें, लेकिन यह कोई बात हुई? पांच मिनट भी नहीं हुए और बीच-बीच में मुझे टोकते भी रहे हैं लेकिन बोलने ही नहीं दे रहे हैं।

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA: You must abide by the chair. I want your protection, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI:
He will never give you protection.
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why don't you laugh or smile?

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I cannot laugh.

मैं समझ रहा हूँ।

You try to belittle the Members.
What is this?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have to do justice to all.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI:
How did you give 20 minutes to other speakers?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have called Mr. Daga now.

श्री मूल चन्द्र डगा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, संविधान में हमारे संविधान निर्माताओं में यह लिखा है :

"We, the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens, justice, social, economic and political..."

इसके अनुसार हमने सोचा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में आर्थिक विषमता नहीं रहेगी और यही आपके फाइनेंस बिल का उद्देश्य होगा। लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ लोग ऐश और इशरत को जिनन्दगी बिता रहे हैं और कुछ लोग हैं जो भूखे सोते हैं। अगर आर्थिक विषमता इसी तरह से बनी रही और हमने इसको खत्म नहीं किया तो आने वाले समय में मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें एक बहुत बड़ी क्रान्ति का मुकाबला करना होगा। और वह क्रान्ति अपने आप आयेगी। आखिर आयकर लगाने का परपज क्या है। हमने सोचा था कि टैक्स लगाकर जो लोग ऊपर हैं, जिनके पास धन ज्यादा है उसको कम किया जाय। यही बेसिक परपज था। लेकिन आयकर लगाने के बाद भी चाहे हमारे अधिकारियों की नेहरूवानी समझिये या अपने

डिपार्टमेंट की इनएफिशियेंसी समझिये धनवान और धनवान होता गया, और गरीब और गरीब होता गया। इस बार आपने 14 लाख लोगों को इन्कम टैक्स से छूट दी। मैं समझता हूँ कई बड़ी मछलियां इसमें से निकल जायेंगी और यह एक ऐसा ठीका होगा कि देश में आज 65 करोड़ कमाने वाले लोग हैं, उससे भी कम वाले बिली पावर्टी लाइन हैं। ऐसा लगता है कि जो बजट बनाने वाले लोग हैं वह कुछ पढ़े-लिखे लोगों के लिये, कुछ जनप्रतिनिधियों और थोड़े से पूंजीपतियों के लिये और सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिये ही सोच कर बजट बनाते हैं। यही हमारा सारा दायरा है। जो क्रांप्टी में रहने वाला गरीब आदमी है उस के बारे में कोई ध्यान नहीं देता। इस कारण जो बजट बनता है वह सही चित्त प्रस्तुत नहीं करता। आय कर विभाग को आज तक रेशनेलाइन नहीं किया। कितने कानून हैं, जो काला धन जमा करने वाले हैं क्या उनमें से पिछले 10 साल में आपने किसी को भी जेल में बन्द किया? आज कितने राजनीतिज्ञ हैं जो बड़े-बड़े उच्च पदों पर हैं या रहे हैं क्या उन्होंने कभी अपनी प्रापर्टी का डिक्लेरेशन किया है, जब कि पोलिटिकल पार्टी कहती है कि डिक्लेयर करो। एक मंत्री बनता है, छोटा सा घर उसका होता है, लेकिन ज्यों ही वह निकलता है वैसे ही उसका काफी बड़ा मकान बन जाता है। है क्या? किसी ने कभी इस बात की जांच की? हम राजनीतिज्ञ लोग न अपनी सम्पत्ति की घोषणा करते हैं न आय कर वालों ने आज तक बेनामी ट्रांजेक्शन करने वालों को पकड़ा, जब कि बेनामी ट्रांजेक्शन करना अपराध है। मैंने सवाल किया था और माननीय सिसो-दिया जी ने कहा था कि इस पर अगर उत्तर चाहिये तो समय लगेगा। आज लोग मकान बेचते हैं, खरीदते हैं और अन्डरवैल्यू उसको करते हैं, यह रेगुलर होता है, लेकिन किसी के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं होती। आप देखें आज टेलर्स, मोबर्न या न्यू टेलर्स किसना कमाते हैं? 300 करोड़ एक पैट की सिलाई,

400 रु० सूट की सिलाई। क्या उनकी आप इन्कम टैक्स से बचना चाहते हैं। वकील लोग हैं, डाक्टर हैं, जो काफी कमाते हैं। क्या इन्कम टैक्स ऐक्ट उनके लिये नहीं है? जिस संविधान की शपथ आपने ली है उसका पालन कीजिये। कितनी कमेटियां इन्कम टैक्स को रेशनलाइज करने के लिये बनायी गयीं ताकि ऐक्ट में सुधार किया जा सके, लेकिन 1947 से इस बारे में बात करते-करते आज तक उसमें कोई सुधार नहीं हुआ। इन्कम टैक्स कानून एक जाल है। फाइनेंस बिल में कुछ इन्कम टैक्स में हेराफेरी कर दी जाती है। इसके अलावा और कुछ नहीं होता। कितने ही सालों से सुन रहे हैं कि आक्ट्रिय ड्यूटी माफ कर दी जाये। लेकिन आज तक नहीं की और वह बराबर चालू है।

अभी माननीय सतीश अग्रवाल जी बोल रहे थे मैं उनकी कई बातों से सहमत हूँ। . . .
(अवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have a clock here. Please do not question my patience.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How much you have spoken. You complete it.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not record.

16.00 hrs.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Shastri, I know that you don't care for the decorum of the House. All this should not go on record.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not prepared to argue with you.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Daga, you complete it.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA: What is he doing, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Daga, you should take only five minutes. You have already taken five minutes. I will have to call the next speaker.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA: The resources required on account of subsidy alone to cover 82 million small and marginal agricultural labour households will be Rs. 2460 crores. The corresponding requirement for credit will be Rs. 5280 crores.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please complete it, Mr. Daga. The rule is very clear at this stage, the debate is confined to arguments either in support, or in rejection of it. You have already talked; you have completed. This is the final stage; Third Reading.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA: I am only saying...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is all right. You have completed. Now Dr. Farooq Abdullah. He will take only five minutes.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Srinagar): rose.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA: One point, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not allowing. I will not allow even half a point.

डा. फारूक अब्दुल्ला (श्रीनगर) : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, फाइनेंस बिल में नून सेस नुक्ता निकालने की कोशिश की मगर निकला नहीं। मैं सिर्फ कुछ प्वाइन्ट्स पर आप को इशारा करना चाहता हूँ। एक तो यह कि जो

[डा० फारूक अब्दुल्ला]

पैसा इन लोगों ने रखा है और जो सरकारों को भी दिया गया है, वह बहुत कम है। कई प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, जैसे हमारे यहाँ एक बहुत बड़ा बिजली का प्रोजेक्ट बहुत जमाने से जम्मू के इलाके में चल रहा है, उसकी हालत यह है कि आज भी वह समझते हैं कि 1990 में करीबन वह तैयार होगा और हालत यह है कि वह 20 करोड़ का था आज उसकी पोजीशन 300 करोड़ से भी ऊपर जा रही है।

यही नहीं, बल्कि एक और सीमेंट के प्रोजेक्ट के लिये रियासत को हुकूमत ने बड़ी कोशिश की, एक्सपर्ट्स को बुलाया और उसके लिये भी रोज ठोकरें खा रहे हैं कि वहाँ पर वह प्रोजेक्ट शुरू कर दिया जाये। क्योंकि रथियन डैम बनने वाला है और उसके लिये जो सीमेंट चाहिये, वह बसौली से नजदीक हो जायेगा, मगर आज तक उसकी वही हालत है जो पहले थी।

तीसरी चीज यह है कि जब छठी योजना के लिये पैसे रबे गये, तो हमारी रियासत के लिये भी पहले 9970 करोड़ रुपये था। जब यहाँ पर प्लानिंग कमिशन में उसके बारे में डिस्कशन हुआ तो वह 800 कुछ था और फिर खींचातानी करने के बाद 900 करोड़ पर पहुँच गया।

मैं तो फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर से एक गुजारिश करूँगा कि रियासत बहुत पिछड़ी है, लद्दाख का इलाका लाजिये, जम्मू-काश्मीर के कई इलाके हैं वहाँ पर लोगों को पानी पीने को नहीं है, जमोनों को पानी देने को नहीं है। कई जगह ऐसी हैं, जहाँ पर सड़कें नहीं हैं, कई जगह डाक्टर नहीं हैं, डिस्पेंसरियाँ नहीं हैं। क्या ही बेहतर होता कि उसके लिये भी थोड़ा सा पैसा दिया जाता? वहाँ पर ऐसे इलाके भी हैं, जहाँ लोगों को इनस्पूमन फंडोमन्स में रहना पड़ता है। मेरी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर से गुजारिश है कि अगर कभी उनको

भीका मिले दिल्ली की गलियों को छोड़ने का तो वह उधर भायें और देखें कि वहाँ पर कौसी सूरत है और हालात क्या हैं?

मैं एक चीज और आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब मैं इस हाउस में नहीं था तो कुछ चीजें मेरी तरफ एट्रीब्यूट की गई थीं जो मैंने आज क्लियर कर दिया है। मगर एक बात जो इस सदन में एक एम० पी० ने कही थी वह यह है। उसने कहा फारूक अब्दुल्ला ने तो रूस के प्रेजिडेंट के बारे में भी कहा कि वह विलकम नहीं हैं। अगर मैं उनका विलकम न करता तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं सेंट्रल हाल में बैठकर तालियों न बजाता और उनके आँसू में खड़ा न होता। वह तो हिन्दुस्तान के मेहमान थे, वह सारे लोगों के मेहमान थे। वह किसी जमात के मेहमान नहीं थे।

यह भी कहा गया है कि मैंने रावलपिंडी के रास्ते के बारे में कुछ कहा है। जो एक हिन्दुस्तान था, उसके टुकड़े हो गए हैं और हमारे बहुत से भाई इस दीवार से अलग हो गए हैं। हमारे जो भाई वहाँ रहते हैं, उनके भाई यहाँ से उन्हें मिलने के लिए जाना चाहते हैं। ये भी चाहते हैं कि आस में ताल्लुकात बेहतर करने चाहिए, ताकि वे लोग आ जा सकें। इनके मेम्बर खुद कहते हैं कि इस बारे में सहूलियत देनी चाहिए।

मैंने जब रावलपिंडी रास्ते के लिए कहा, तो इसलिए नहीं कहा कि मैं पाकिस्तान-नवाज हूँ, बल्कि इसलिए कहा कि मैं इन्सान-नवाज हूँ। हमारे भी कई लोग हैं, जिनके भाई या बहन वहाँ हैं। इस तीस साल में कई लोग बूढ़े, बुजुर्ग हो गए हैं। कई मर गए हैं। या कभी किसी की बेटी की शादी होती है और वह उसमें शरीक होना चाहते हैं। एक गरीब आदमी के पास इतनी दौलत नहीं है कि वह श्रीनगर से जम्मू आए,

जम्मू से जम्मूतसर आए, जम्मूतसर से फिर लाहौर जाए, लाहौर से रावलपिंडी जाए और रावलपिंडी से मजफ्फराबाद पहुंचे। बारामूला से जो रास्ता है, वह कंट्रोल लाइन बन गई है। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के ब्रावजर्वर इस कंट्रोल लाइन से दिन-रात ऐसे आते-जाते हैं, जैसे कि वे घर के मालिक हैं। हमने उनसे कभी सबाल नहीं किया। वे तो जब चाहें आ जाते हैं, जब चाहें चले जाते हैं।

हमारे जो भाई इस तरफ या उस तरफ फंस गए हैं और जब अलग-अलग रहते हैं, वे किसी की शादी या खुशी में आना जाना चाहते हैं। उन्हें कहा जाता है कि वे बाधा से जाओ। मैंने गुजरािश की थी कि जब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के ब्रावजर्वर उस रास्ते से आ जा सकते हैं, तो हमारे लोग भी आ जा सकें। इससे सबको आसानी होगी। वह दस मील का फासला है, जिसको वे तय कर सकते हैं : (अवधान)

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh): This is a very vital point involving the question of line of actual control.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have not permitted you.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL: This is a very vital and sensitive point. This involves the international border which is a line of actual control.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You please sit down. If there is anything we will go through the proceedings. For anything you cannot get up.

डा० कारुक अब्दुल्ला : हिन्दुस्तान यह मानता है कि वह लाइन आफ कंट्रोल है या लाइन आफ एक्जुअल कंट्रोल है। जो कुछ भी हो, काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का एक हिस्सा है और जो भी वहां का रहने वाला है, वह हिन्दुस्तानी है।

सबको एक बात याद रखनी चाहिए कि हम जो हाउस में आए हैं, हम सब हिन्दुस्तानी हैं और हम सब को हिन्दुस्तान के लिए सोचना चाहिए, अपने लिए नहीं सोचना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Don't see towards Mr. Namgyal. You see towards me and address me. You please look towards the Chairman. Therefore, he is getting up every now and then.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: I am looking towards the Chair. I am not looking towards Mr. Namgyal.

भाइर में मैं फ्रिनांस मिनिस्टर साहब से सिर्फ यही विनती करूंगा कि वह मेहरबानी कर के रियासत के लिए ज्यादा से ज्यादा फ्रिनांस दें, क्योंकि काश्मीर और लद्दाख में बकिंग सीजन बहुत कम होता है बाद में बर्फ आ जाती है। सीमेंट का इस्तेमाल नवम्बर तक ही हो सकता है। मैं उनसे गुजरािश करूंगा कि सीमेंट, स्टील और दूसरी चीजें ज्यादा से ज्यादा वहां भेजी जाए इस सीजन में, क्योंकि बाद में रास्ते बन्द हो जाते हैं, और सप्लाईज वहां नहीं पहुंच सकती है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. A.K. Roy.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL: rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not permitting you. You have not given your name. Mr. A. K. Roy. (Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Anything that he says will not go on record. (Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please take your seat. You must help me. Mr. A. K. Roy. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You know the rules. This will not go on record.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Farooq Abdullah, please sit down. Mr. Namgyal, please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Whatever they say will not go on record.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Namgyal, please sit down.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Farooq, please take your seat.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. This is not proper. Mr. Namgyal, please take your seat.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not on record. Nothing without my permission will go on record. This is all without my permission.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not permit you to say anything.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Tewary, this is not correct.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Farooq, Abdullah, you must address the Chair.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am controlling now. Everybody, I am controlling. I am controlling.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Roy, you can speak now. Mr. A. K. Roy.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Lakshappa, this is not correct. Please sit down. Mr. Roy, you can come still closer.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not the proper way to solve problems.

SHRI A. K. ROY (Dhaubad): The Finance Bill is only meant to legitimise certain economic proposals that were given in the Budget. When the Budget is passed, we can presume that this Bill also will be passed. But this gives us an opportunity to make some observations on the general character of the Budget, the character of the economy, and the policy that the present Government is pursuing. I will not go into the details and invite your bell. I want to say that and I want to emphasise that mixed economy cannot be a fixed policy. You will have to move. This is just a transitional stage. You can stay there for a few minutes. But you cannot make it a fixed policy or a permanent policy. We inherited a colonial economy—draining of the economic resources. The surplus value generated in the country has to be utilised in one direction. That is the most important thing. And now, we want to convert it into national economy. National economy means nothing but a self generating, re-circulating economy which will re-vitalise all the economic points of the country. For that reason, you must take the national economy forward, to a socialist structure, a socialist economy to achieve a socialist goal. I want to know whether your Budget proposals take us even an inch forward towards the socialist goal, whether you are curb-

ing capitalist activity, or you are opposing them, whether your policy is for associating capitalists, whether your policy is to expect money where it is there or to exempt where it is not there. I am sorry to say it is in the opposite direction. I am opposing this Bill not because it is unable to give us bread, butter and employment, not because it is unable to have control over the uncontrollable LIC or banks, etc. I am not going into those details. I am opposing this Bill because it has failed to ensure the direction in which the financial economy of our country should march.

I will give one or two examples. Self-reliance is one of the basic points of any national economy. One by one in every industry we are retracing our steps from self-reliance, whether it is coal, steel or fertiliser. Nothing could be discussed in this House because all those were guillotined. In my constituency, all these three vital public sector industries are situated. I could see very closely step by step we are stepping back from self-reliance. Take fertiliser industry. Previously we used to make fertiliser plants with hardly 20 per cent dependence on foreign imports. After that, we were gradually retracing. In Sindri, we have auctioned the first public sector industry based on coal. You would be surprised that in Sindri-Dhanbad Coal-belt, they have installed an oil-based fertiliser plant, which will always for ever depend on oil-producing countries. This is the economy they are developing. We were self-reliant. In Ramagundam and Talcher, we have got expertise to construct coal-based fertiliser plants. In today's paper we find that the Central Fuel Research Institute have developed a better method for producing fertiliser from coal. But Government are paying no attention to it. They do not look to the nation. They look abroad. They want to import everything. The Planning & Development Division of Fertiliser Corporation of India was established to make

us self-reliant in establishing fertiliser factories. But now they are dis-integrating it, devaluing its and selling it. For establishing steel plants, they are importing technology. We imported technology from Russia for Bhilai, from West Germany and from UK for Durgapur. We have imported technology again from Russia for Bokaro. How long will go on importing? Can we not make a lateral transfer of technology from one plant to another. Japan, even in a capitalist way imports one machine but they completely dismantle it, study it and start their own. Why can't we do it? They are going to establish steel plants in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa, but again the Ministers are flying abroad. Instead of flying abroad, we should look to our own soil and consult our own indigenous technology and move towards that direction.

Now, what are they doing? This is a matter for concern. Just now I have had a talk with the steel ministry people. They are going to retrench 7000 miners in Delhi Rajasthan in MP, who are adivasis of Chhatisgarh, because they have imported machine from abroad. The same thing is happening in the collieries. They are importing machines from abroad. The profit is going to the manufacturer abroad, but our poor people, the miners, the adivasis, Harijans, the tillers and toilers are losing their job. This is the economy you have brought. This is the economy you want to bring through this Finance Bill. That is why I oppose the Finance Bill lock, stock and barrel, as I consider that it will take our nation not towards a national economy but towards a naked stark, commprador economy.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am taking this opportunity to highlight one of the projects in my constituency. For the last four years I have been trying to do it. I have given about 76 questions. Unfortunately all of them became unstarred. That is all about the unfortunate aluminium project at Ratnagiri. In the last session I made a mention under 377.

[Shri Bapu saheb Parulekar]

Even in this session I made a mention about it. But, unfortunately, upto this day, the hon. Minister probably did not find time to reply to that. This project was sanctioned in the year 1966 with Rs. 80 crores. This was to be commissioned along with the aluminium project at Korba. The Korba project is on stream. But there is nothing as far as Ratnagiri aluminium project is concerned. Hundreds of acres of agricultural land had been acquired. But out of this hundreds of acres, only one dilapidated building stands on same policy. You will be surprised to know that two officers drawing a salary of Rs. 3000 each have been stationed there. They are doing the work of selling grass and mango fruits from the land acquired for the project. That is all that they are doing. We are paying Rs. 3000 to each of them just to show that the aluminium project is there. I have repeatedly been told that due to financial constraints, this project could not be taken up. But I do not know from where the Government got the money for the new aluminium project in Orissa. Of course, it is with French collaboration. Retnagiri project was to be with Hungarian collaboration. I asked the question to this effect also. But answer that I got was that due to financial constraints nothing could be done. Initially when the project was sanctioned, the original schedule of expenditure was Rs. 7 crores in 1976-77, Rs. 16 crores in 1977-78, Rs. 24.90 crores in 1978-79. Out of all this, so far only Rs. 20 lakhs have been spent. You will be surprised to know that on 2nd of October, 1974 we were given invitation cards of laying the foundation stone of this project at the hands of the hon. Prime Minister when Mr. Vasantdada Patil was the Chief Minister. I do not know what happened to that. The Prime Minister did not find time to come. And the project is practically dead. I would therefore, request the hon. Minister to let me know as to why even this year you have not made provision of more than a few thousand rupees and that too for paying salaries

to those two officers who are doing the work of selling grass and mango fruits from the land. If you are not going to start this particular project, I would request the Government to give back hundreds of acres of land to those agriculturists who have neither been given money nor jobs. They are all jobless. So you are not building the industry and you are only grabbing the land of the poor agriculturists.

My second point is about the Ministry of Law and Justice. That Ministry was not debated. I find in the report that in the Supreme Court there are 36,000 matters, in High Courts six lakhs, in Sessions' courts four lakhs and in Magistrate's courts 53 lakh matters pending. If we read the report with reference to the number of judges, we find that with these judges we will require at least 15 years to dispose of these cases which are pending on this particular day.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY:
What about fresh cases?

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:
I am not taking it to consideration fresh cases. I would like to know as to what provision the Government intends to do. No provision has been made in the Budget of the Ministry. I would, therefore, request the Government to take this into consideration because these are initial stages. 72,000 sessions cases are to be disposed of by 2000 sessions judges and if one case goes on at least for 10 days, you can imagine what would be the plight of the people who are charged under 302 I.P.C. which is non-bailable offence and the persons charged are in jails for more than 10 years. The period of punishment is five years for some of the offences. This is what the Supreme Court has observed. This is a crude joke on the under-trials who are rotting in jails. I would like to know what the Government intends to do.

We have trying with this Government to get income tax relief to sea-areas under Section 80 RRA of Income Tax Act. But the Government is not taking any cognizance. In other countries it is granted. Especially in respect of overseas allowance, prolonged

service abroad allowance food supplied on board, the provision of Section 80 RRA should be made applicable. To that extent, exemption should be granted because this is the demand which has been repeatedly made.

With these words, I also support the submissions made by my esteemed colleague, Shri Satish Agarwal. That is absolutely necessary especially when we are not in a position to discuss so many Ministries every year.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: Sir, the speech made by Shri Satish Agarwal is really a patriotic one. He has risen about party consideration and made very constructive suggestions. If the opposition leaders are really interested to the welfare of this country, they should emulate his example.

Every word of what he said is correct. Out of the money that we are spending, we are getting benefit only to the extent of 40 per cent; the rest is going down the drain. I do not know how the Minister is going to control spending. If Parliament and the State Legislatures vote the demands and give money to the bureaucracy, if it is not properly spent, if it is spent in some other way, the country will remain poor. So, some effective steps should be taken to ensure that the sanctioned money is properly spent.

This is happening in the field of education, PWD and other areas. As Shri Agarwal has stated, no project is completed within the financial or time schedule. But when Shri Bansi Lal was the Chief Minister of Haryana, all the projects were completed within the time and budgetary allocation. If Shri Bansi Lal could do it in one State, why not the other Chief Minister in other States do it? When the Government of India is liberally giving money to the States, it should be ensured that the money is properly spent.

In my own State so many big projects are coming up and they are taking a lot of time. I want the Government of India to take up big projects like Nagarjunasagar and Srisaillam. We are already self-sufficient in electri-

city. So, if we produce more, we can supply it to the other adjoining States.

Recently, we had droughts in Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and parts of Karnataka. It is now becoming a recurring feature because we have destroyed trees and not replanted them. In Gujarat they have a very big programme to plant trees all along the sea coast. The other States should follow that. Unless and until we grow trees we will not get sufficient rains.

In Rajasthan and other places the sand is advancing. Though the Central and State Government do not admit it, the people say that it is eating away fertile lands of the country. In order to arrest the advance of the desert, there should be planting of trees in a large scale for which the State Government should be liberally assisted. The Rajasthan Canal is a must for containing the sand.

The Minister's reply is short, sweet and to the point. I wish him well. With these words, I support the Bill.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Sir I rise....

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: I want him to follow Shri Satish Agarwal; he should not talk politics.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is professor; he knows what to talk.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I represent a party and we are politicians. If we do not talk politics, we are betraying our electorate.

I rise to oppose this Bill. Sir, at the very outset, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that you allowed one Member from Raiganj to utilize this this opportunity of speaking on the Finance Bill to malign the State Government of West Bengal. He spoke virulently against the State Government and demanded the toppling of the Government. I do not know how you permitted. When we speak such things, you say—"nothing will go on record". I draw your attention to this fact, I do not want to utilise this opportunity to give him a rebuff.

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

To declare a war against a constitutionally elected Government is not proper. People should not come here and shout. People who organise violence should not come here and shout. *Interruptions*). It is for the people of West Bengal to decide. Hon. Members from the Treasury benches should not try to malign the State Government.

When this Budget was presented, I saw that most of the Members from the treasury benches shouted and we were given to believe that a new economic era was dawning under the very dynamic leadership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi and only yesterday our hon. Minister told that the Budget received support from all sections of the people. This is wrong. The whole Budget is an exercise in deception. The people are being deceived. You have increased the prices. You have increased the taxes. You have given relief to the big industries and big landlords. More burden has been imposed on the people.

Whatever Shri A. K. Roy said I think, there is no difference of opinion in regard to that. We should have a strong economy, a self-reliant economy. We must produce things which we required. We should not depend on any country economically. All these things we know, I presume. But what is happening? Recently, even our Sixth Plan had to be submitted to Mr. Mc Namara for the approval of the World Bank.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: It is not correct.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: It is the World Bank which is dictating how to shape our policies because of our dependence on World Bank, because of our dependence on these imperialist countries and we accept whatever they dictate. This is a very dangerous trend. Even in 1948 and in 1956 whatever policy was adopted by the Congress Government has been watered down. Now in the name of technical know how, the multinational companies are being invited. Whatever Shri A. K. Roy told is 100 per cent true. We have got our own

technical knowhow. We have our expertise. But we refuse to utilise those. After so many years of planning, after so many years of economic development, why is it that we are becoming more and more dependent on foreign countries, particularly the imperialist countries? Why is it that we have to submit our Plan to the World Bank? We have to get approval from the world Bank because we have to get money.

Professor Ranga was telling and you also said that we must rise above party politics. I would like to ask the Government to rise above party politics and think of the nation. How these imperialist countries are robbing us, how we are becoming more and more dependent on them is very well known. It is history which tells that a country which becomes economically dependent on others, becomes dependent for food, for shelter, for clothing, that country cannot remain politically independent for a pretty long period. Their independence also gets eroded. I request the hon. Minister to kindly let us know what they are proposing to do.

My last point is that we are emphasising on export, export base industries. It is not a suggestion of the World Bank? Why are you doing it? We are exporting our essential commodities and then we are importing. But we are not trying to stop conspicuous consumption. We are not trying to stop ostentatious living. In such a poor country, it will be appalling to know how people squander away money and show their wealth. Then, we go to foreign countries and say, "Give us help" and we squander our scarce resources. Can any developing country have this luxury of ostentatious living, of allowing people to amass money and spend like this?

Who are actually bearing the burden? More and more burden is on the people. You go to the market and see the galloping prices, the skyrocketing prices, particularly of essential commodities. What is happening? What is the rate of inflation? I am sure, it is not 15 per cent. It is 20 per cent. Taking the consumer price index of essential commodities, I would like the

hon. Minister to realise the difficulties of the common people. More and more burden is being imposed on the common people and you are giving tax relief to the rich people in the name of production. Why? It is the general maxim of economics, public finance, that the heaviest burden should be on the broadest shoulders. But you are not imposing the burden on the broadest shoulders. You are putting the burden on the common people.

You revise your economic policies. The policies that you have been pursuing have landed you to economic disaster. You are now in economic quagmire. There is no way out. The only way out is to change the economic policies, make them pro-people, to fight the monopolists, to fight the landlords, to fight the exploiters and have a real people's plan whereby you can assure livelihood to common people.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have very few things to say. I am glad, Shri Satish Agarwal has highlighted a very important need of our country and our financial system and I would like the hon. Finance Minister as well as the Cabinet as a whole to pay special attention to the suggestions made and also, not only the Treasury Benches but also the leaders of the Opposition parties, then have an occasion when they can all meet each other and thrash out some solution to this very important problem of how to control, energise, inspire and encourage our bureaucracy which is absolutely essential, but, at the same time, which is becoming unmanageable even for itself. So big it is. It has got to grow but, at the same time, it has got to be controlled. How to do it? They have to think of it.

Secondly, we have now passed the Budget. Money is there with the Government. What would they do with this money? My hon. friend, Sri Ram Gopal Reddy, has made in his own quite way some very constructive suggestions that whatever money you sanction for any particular thing to be done, see to it that it is done, that it is achieved within

the period in which it has been sanctioned. Now, that is exactly where, till now, not only now, before freedom, as well as after freedom, our Governments have been remiss. There was a Committee on Expenditure. They dissolved it. It would be a good thing to have a Committee like that.

I have one amendment to suggest to what Mr. Satish Agarwal has said. He wanted the Public Accounts Committee, the Estimates Committee and so on also to be discussed here. That is not the idea at all because they are themselves the Parliament in miniature. Once they come to a conclusion, it is accepted as a conclusion of the Parliament and it has got to be implemented. There would be reports from time to time to Parliament from the Committees concerned to state how their recommendations are being implemented by the administration and where they could not be accepted, the reasons therefor and so on.

Similar Committees have got to be organised and established. How they are going to be distinguished from the functions of the present Consultative Committees has got to be studied also. We cannot very well have both the sets of Committees. If we have these Standing Committees, then there would be no need for Consultative Committees. Once we have Standing Committees, we must ensure that they would not obstruct the administration; they would not obstruct the control exercised by the Cabinet over the administration, but on the other hand, they would be an additional arm, a weapon, in the hands of Ministers concerned in controlling the administration, in encouraging and inspiring administration.

One good suggestion was made yesterday by Mrs. Vidya regarding financing. She made it clear that many concessions are given in the face of rising prices. She, therefore, suggested that exemption limit

[Prof. N. G. Ranga] for gift taxes should similarly be raised from Rs. 5,000 to 10,000 or Rs. 15,000 whatever it may be and whatever is considered suitable for the time-being by the Government. But that involves a principle, a healthy principle and it has to be given effect to. I do not know how they can do it whether by an executive order or by amendment of the Gift Tax laws.

We have so many projects under execution. All these projects have to be fulfilled. We have to utilise our money towards this end. As Mr. Reddi has put it, we are getting 40 per cent of the results. Can we not try and see whether we cannot raise this percentage to at least 60? That means economy and better use of time and money also. That is exactly where the British Parliament had succeeded. Today, Parliament's control over the administration is not so effective. Indeed, the control that the Ministers are able to exercise over the administration is itself not so very effective. Now we have devised ways and means by which we can possibly strengthen the hands of the Cabinet and the Ministry as a whole and also the functions and activities of our Parliament.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA):
Sir, I am very thankful to all the Hon. Members who have participated in the Third Reading of the Finance Bill.

As you have very rightly pointed out in the beginning, the scope of the discussion at this stage is very limited and, therefore, I will not deal with these points which are beyond the scope of discussion at this stage.

Mr. Satish Agarwal is an experienced parliamentarian (*Interruptions*). He has got the experience for a limited period of the working of the Fin-

ance Ministry and he has very rightly given his valuable suggestions regarding effective control by Parliament of budgetary provisions and expenditure and various Governmental activities. They are very vital points and they deserve deep study and consideration at length. I can only say at this stage that the valuable suggestions made by my friend Shri Satish Agarwal and very well supported by our learned and esteemed colleague Shri Rangaji and by my friend Shri Reddiji will be taken into consideration by the Government at the appropriate time.

My friend Shri Mool Chand Daga has very effectively drawn the attention of the House to the economic conditions of our country and he wanted to have several years' figures in regard to the prosecution of the tax evaders. I do not know whether he is present here now or not. But it is my duty to place the information before the House.

During the financial year 1975-76 and for the subsequent years, the number of cases of conviction is as follows:

Year.	No. of cases of conviction.
1975-76	15
1976-77	13
1977-78	13
1978-79	17
1979-80	29
1980-81 till date.	18

He wanted to know regarding the acquisition proceedings in cases of transfer of immovable property which is under-valued. The number of acquisitions of property made up till now is 16. He was under the impression that no conviction had been made, no prosecution had been launched; the cases, under the new provision of acquisition of property, of property where under-valuation is suspected have not been gone into; it

has not been implemented. I want to correct the record and say, for his information and for the information of the House, that this is not the position; the position is otherwise; and the figures are put for consideration before the House.

Hon. Member, Shri Rainavatar Shastri raised the law and order situation, specially in connection with Bihar. This is not the subject which is relevant at this stage and should not have been raised. I do not want to take more time of the House on this. This is a State subject. Also the law and order situation has been very often discussed in Budget discussions and other Resolutions and discussions under different Rules.

Dr. Farooq Abdullah wanted to say that there must be some special provision for the backward areas of his State and some other parts of the country. I can point out at this stage that, in framing the Sixth Five-Year Plan, special care has been taken to allot special provisions for backward areas of our country—not only of Kashmir but also all the backward areas of the country. There is a general principle for allotment in the Sixth Five-Year Plan; keeping in view the backwardness of some parts of our country, special amounts and special consideration have been given, and I can assure him that not only about Ladakh or any other part of that area but about all the parts of our country which are backward, Government is very much concerned and is careful; special attention has been given.

He wanted to know something regarding one project which he mentioned. I can only say that, from my Ministry, his suggestion will be forwarded to the concerned administrative Ministry.

Shri A. K. Roy and Shri Bapusaheb Parulekar have mentioned about aluminium project at Ratnagiri. Here also I can only say that I can forward this suggestion to the concerned administrative Ministry for early implementation and necessary action.

Prof. Ranga has mentioned about some suggestions made by Mrs. Vidya

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Their intention, when they mention these things, is to get some money sanctioned by your Ministry.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: Respected Prof. Ranga has made some observations regarding Mrs. Vidya's suggestion...in connection with...

SHRI A. K. ROY: I requested for a coal-based fertiliser factory in the coal-belt of Dhanbad.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: ... the wealth tax and gift tax. This is also a very sound suggestion. At this stage I can only say that it will receive Government's consideration at the appropriate stage.

I am happy to note that the budget proposals this year have been very well received...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): You have forgotten Mr. Ram Gopal Reddy.

SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: I have not. How can I forget him? He

[Shri Sawai Singh Sisodia]

has mentioned something about me also—that I am sweet and short. I do not know whether I am sweet, but I will try to be short.

The budget proposals this year have been very well received by the people, at large, of our country. There have been no doubt certain criticisms but these proposals are in line with our Party's basic philosophy.

There is a mixed economy in our country where both the public and the private sectors have a role to play. Both these sectors have, therefore, to contribute to the production and employment generation of the country.

Within its framework the private sector will be allowed to play its legitimate role. Incentives and concessions provided in the Budget are strictly within this framework and justified according to our philosophy. These are meant to encourage production which would enable us to check the inflationary pressures. These are also expected to boost savings and investment in this sector.

We are proud that our country is self-sufficient and I do not agree with the hon. Member who says that we depend upon foreign nations. This is absolutely wrong. We do not depend upon any country, not even on the World Bank aid or assistance. I can say with all emphasis and I am sure the country will march forward to achieve the economic goal under the dynamic leadership of our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

16.52 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: RUNNING OF A SPECIAL TRAIN FROM AHMED-ABAD TO DELHI ON 26-4-81

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the Railway Minister, Mr. Kedar Panday will make a statement.

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : (हिसार) : सपाध्यक्ष महोदय, वह किस आधार पर स्टेटमेंट दे रहे हैं, यह हमें बता दीजिए।

आचार्य जगवान देव : यह आप किस आधार पर बोल रहे हैं ?

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : आप तो मुझे बाजार में मिलें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Speaker announced this morning that he is making a statement.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: On a point of order. There is a notice of privilege given under Rule 222 by Mr. Paswan and myself.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This morning this was raised by Mr. Paswan.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: This was raised by Mr. Paswan and me, on a point of privilege.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Speaker said that the Railway Minister is going to make a statement.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: On what point?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Speaker said that he is going to make a statement.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: On what ground?

प्रिविलेज मोशन अपनी जगह पर है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Kedar Pandey.