

Concerning the Rao Committee's report it was submitted to the department only 4 or 5 days before. I myself have not seen it. I assure the hon. member that I will go through the report. If we are convinced that certain persons are guilty of certain things, action would be taken against them. There is absolutely no doubt about it.

श्री मधु लिये : पी० यू० सी० की रिपोर्ट में साफ लिखा हुआ है कि पी० आर० नायक ने व्यक्तिगत जिम्मेदारी पर श्रीनिवास राव से कहा कि वह जांच जारी रखें।

कश्यप साहब पेंसिल से नोटिंग करते हैं ताकि उस को बदल सकें।

SHRI D. R. CHAVAN : After going through the entire record, if we come to the conclusion that certain persons are guilty, certainly there will be no hesitation on the part of both myself and my senior colleague to take action against those persons.

Shri D. N. Tiwary referred to the policy of recruitment, promotion and demotion. We are very much concerned about the recruitment policy and certain points were made in the consultative committee meeting also. The policy we have evolved is now applicable to all the public sector undertaking under my ministry. Much concern has been expressed in the House on many occasions that the ministry's public sector undertakings are not giving fair representation to local persons in employment under them. That is the main grievance about the Barauni fertiliser factory and refinery also. I would explain briefly the policy in regard to this matter. The standing instructions to public sector undertakings in the matter of direct recruitment to posts carrying a salary of Rs. 500 and below per month require that local persons should be given preference over others and amongst local people, priority should be given to oustees and scheduled castes. Recruitment to such posts should be made through the employment exchanges and only if 'non-availability certificates' are given by the employment exchange should other sources of recruitment be tapped. It is further required that selection committees for recruitment to these

posts should include a nominee of the State Government, who should be an officer of a status commensurate with the status of the Chairman of the selection committee. These instructions have been communicated to our undertakings and reiterated from time to time. In 1966, we fulfilled an assurance given on the floor of the House in connection with the employment of persons belonging to the States in which the undertakings or their constituent units are situated.

This matter was agitated a number of times by the hon. members from Bihar. It was taken up in the consultative committee and as a result of the deliberations there this policy has been evolved.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : विनय कृष्ण और सतीश चन्द्र के केस की जांच करेंगे ? मजबूर कर के उस को शर्तों पर बहाल किया गया है।

SHRI D. R. CHAVAN : Vinay Kishen has already been reinstated and there is no difficulty about it.

With these words, I request the House to pass the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."
The motion was adopted.

15.25 Hrs.

CONTINGENCY FUND OF INDIA (AMENDMENT) BILL

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C.
SETHI) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, be taken into consideration."

By virtue of the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, the Contingency Fund of India was established with a corpus of Rs. 15 crores to meet the requirements of unforeseen expenditure of the Central

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

Government (including Railways) pending authorisation of such expenditure by the Parliament.

The corpus of the Fund was fixed at Rs. 15 crores when the total size of the Central Budget (including Railways) was of the order of Rs. 500 crores. This total size of the Budget has now increased to over Rs. 5,000 crores, that is about ten times, necessitating reconsideration of the size of the Fund. Further, as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee, it has been decided that additional requirements for investments or loans to public sector undertakings and private concerns, grants to private institutions and certain types of subsidies, in excess of certain limits, should be treated as expenditure requiring specific parliamentary approval even when they can be met by reappropriation of savings. In all such cases, if here is not adequate time to seek supplementary provisions from this august House, we have to initially meet the expenditure out of advances from the Contingency Fund. The Administrative Reforms Commission were also of the view that the corpus of this Fund should be enhanced suitably to enable funds being found for urgent schemes and projects which cannot be postponed till the estimates for next year are placed before the legislature. It is, therefore, proposed to raise the corpus of the Fund from Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 30 crores by amending the Act.

The Contingency Fund of India (Amendment) Bill, 1969, involves a withdrawal of Rs. 15 crores from the Consolidated Fund of India for transfer to the Contingency Fund of India. The advances from the Contingency Fund will be sanctioned only as and when necessary. Supplementary Estimates for all expenditure so financed from the Contingency Fund are according to the rules, presented to Parliament at the first session meeting immediately after the advance is sanctioned. The advances are recouped to be Fund as soon as the Parliament authorises the expenditure. The increase in the corpus of the Contingency Fund at this stage, therefore, does not involve any real out-go of cash.

Sir, I move that the Contingency Fund of India (Amendment) Bill be taken into consideration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, be taken into consideration."

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : Sir, it is very strange that though from 1950 the Contingency Fund of India has been maintained at Rs. 15 crores, suddenly in 1970 the Government want to increase it to Rs. 30 crores, for the wonderful work they are doing for delivering the goods. I cannot understand the necessity for just doubling this amount. Already Parliament is voting on many demands without even having a chance to look at those demands. For some demands, we get a chance once a year to discuss them for 2 hours, 3 hours or 5 hours. From 1966 invariably half a dozen ministries' demands are guillotined. Some ministries have never been discussed in Parliament for the last four years. Even rotation is not maintained. Ministries like Works and Housing, Health, Family Planning, Rural Water Supply etc. have not been discussed here at all. Already Parliament is denied a chance to discuss those demands and they are just voted upon. We are only the sanctioning authority; like rubber-stamping, we are expected to vote whatever is prepared by the officials. Over and above that, they are now asking for another Rs. 15 crores, which would avoid the legislative processes of Parliament. This sort of situation is created by the present Government only to exercise patronage. There were Rs. 175 crores in the budget, which amount was primarily taken to provide patronage. I think the Government has become very clever in manipulation. They have now got another Rs. 15 crores through this Bill, which the Government would disburse, exercising its patronage, on the plea that Parliament is not in session, or there is no time even to pass important legislation. Therefore, the whole Bill looks very suspicious. I charge the Government that it is a deliberate attempt on their part to deny the Parliament and this country an opportunity to discuss those demands and to go into the merits of those demands.

Surprisingly I find in the original Act—
I read clause 4 of the original Bill :

"For the purpose of carrying out the objects of this Act, the Central Government may make rules regulating all matters connected with or ancillary to the custody of the payment of moneys into and the withdrawal of moneys from, the Contingency Fund of India."

In this Bill, of course, there is no reference to that but I take it Section 4 of the original Bill will be applicable to this. It is a clever Bill. Article 283 (i) makes it very clear that the rules and regulations about the disbursement, withdrawal or any matters connected or ancillary matters connected with this contingency fund shall be regulated by law made by Parliament and until such provision in that behalf is so made shall be regulated by the rules made by the President. Why has the Parliament had not been given this opportunity of making laws though it is specifically mentioned under Article 283(i)? It is for Parliament to make laws regulating this contingency fund and only when Parliament has not been able to make such laws then only the President comes into the picture. It shows that through back-door the Government have been cleverly avoiding Parliament. For the last twenty years Government has not brought forward a Bill, which could be laid on the Table of the House and which could have the concurrence of the House. I appeal to you and through you to the Government to bring a kind of charter of rules to be approved by Parliament. It is an omission in this Bill. Today is the time for us to rectify and take an undertaking from Government that they should bring a kind of charter of rules to be approved by Parliament.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : Having been once in the Finance Ministry I am rather aghast at the way things are being done today. In 1950 when this contingency fund was enacted the total budget of the Government was something about Rs. 400 crores. Today it is in the neighbourhood of Rs. 5,300 crores. Strictly speaking, therefore, if you feel that the contingency fund should be related to the budget it should not be only Rs. 30 crores

but something like Rs. 300 crores at least. What I am saying is this contingency fund is more or less a figment because it is hardly ever used. The Minister will point out what restraint this Rs. 15 crores has placed on the expenditure of Government. On the other hand, the Government are constantly coming forward, every session, with a supplementary budget and also an excess budget. There is, therefore, no justification at all for the contingency fund, as it stands, and certainly there is no justification for increasing the amount.

This is an occasion for us to talk about the budget. Our budget is like a loose jacket in which everything goes. I may just give you three instances how this budget leaves Government to do what it likes. After having given us an opportunity here to have a debate on demands for grants and even on the Finance Bill which we passed only yesterday, the Government goes on merrily on its own way.

I may give you, firstly, an instance of the number of officers increased in the current budget. There is an increase only in the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Home Affairs of a total of 1000 officers. Here are my good socialist friends who want the establishment to be increased and not the officers. (*Interruption*) There is an increase of 1000 officers in the two Ministries only.

Another instance is about deficit financing that takes place. At the Centre, the deficit financing is estimated at Rs. 225 crores. But nobody has provided for deficit financing in the States. In the States, there is deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 350 crores. This is not provided for. This will, therefore, come from borrowings that they will make from the Government of India on the Reserve Bank. This is a bad practice. The Central budget is so loose and so haphazard that it becomes a bad example to the States.

The third instance is illustrated by a budget of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Last year, when I had an occasion to speak on the Posts and Telegraphs Department demands for grants, I called the Minister as the greatest mail robber of all time. He increased the price of the post-

[Shri Lobo Prabhu]

card from 6 p. to 10 p.; that is, an increase of 66 per cent; he increased the postage of inland letters from 10 p. to 15 p., that is, an increase of 50 per cent and he increased the postage of letters from 15 p. to 20p. With all these increases, the budget should have provided for a return of Rs. 25 crores or nearabout that figure. But the actual return was only to the tune of Rs. 10 crores or so. That is because the number of letters used fell by about 20 per cent and of inland letter by 15 per cent. The people were compelled to reduce their correspondence because of the increase in postage. You did not get the revenue that you estimated. Your budget was a bad budget. You only made the common people suffer by increasing the postage rates like this, by having such bad budget provisions.

Now, there is a proposal that because the post-card costs 14 paise to the Government as against 10 paise to the public it should go by surface mail. I welcome this idea of providing surface mail because a number of persons just write letters in order to keep in touch. There is no urgency. Let us, therefore, think in terms of having surface mail. You can reduce the surface mail to the charge which was before the enhancement of postage rates last year.

I am only giving an illustration how public is made suffer because of such inaccuracies in calculations as to what the return will be when you raise certain rates. I fear such inaccuracies will recur in the case of excise duties and these inaccuracies will be in favour of the Government. The realisations will be much more. When the Government is taking this blanket provision to spend Rs. 30 crores as a contingency fund, I warn the Government that the time will come when the bad budget will mean not only the break-down of the administration but the break-down of the entire system of democracy.

श्री वेणी शंकररामा (वांका) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस छोटे से विधेयक के द्वारा एक छोटे से कानून में एक छोटा सा परिवर्तन करने की कोशिश की गई है। मंत्री महोदय ने जो आब्जेक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स का स्टेटमेंट दिया है उस में उन्होंने कहा है कि :

"Consequent on the increase in the size of the annual budget, the need for augmenting the corpus of the Fund has been felt."

जैसा अभी मेरे मित्र श्री लोबो प्रभु ने कहा, यदि हमारे बजटों के साइज के ऊपर इस फंड का निश्चित करना आवश्यक था तो यह करीब करीब 300 करोड़ का होना चाहिये था। मैं उन से सहमत हूँ। मुझ को तो लगता है कि इस संशोधन में न कोई हिसाब है, न कोई तर्क है और न कोई तुक ही है। यह केवल एक अन्दाजी टक्कर है, जैसा हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी बराबर करते आये हैं। मेरा इतना ही कहना है कि ऐसे संशोधनों के लिए मंत्री महोदय को कुछ अधिक अच्छा तर्क देना चाहिये था।

जब 1950 में यह कानून बना था उस समय तत्कालीन वित्त मंत्री श्री सी० डी० देशमुख ने जो कुछ कहा था मैं उस में से थोड़ा सा उद्धरण यहाँ देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने बिल को इंट्रोड्यूस करते हुए कहा था कि :

"The Fund is being set up in accordance with the provisions of article 267(1) of the Constitution and is being administered by the Finance Ministry on behalf of the Government. It can be used only for meeting urgent unforeseen expenditure not provided for in the Budget."

फिर आगे चल कर वे कहते हैं कि :

"..... it is necessary that it should be small, as it is intended only to meet unforeseen urgent requirements. There would be danger in keeping too much money in the Contingency Fund, from the point of view of parliamentary control, as there might be a temptation for the executive to increase expenditure in anticipation of parliamentary approval."

जिस खतरे की चर्चा उन्होंने उस वक्त की थी मैं समझता हूँ कि आज भी वह खतरा ज्यों का त्यों मौजूद ही नहीं है बल्कि उससे ज्यादा बढ़ गया है।

कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने फाइनेन्स बिल का उत्तर देते हुए कहा था कि उन का दिमाग खुला हुआ है, लेकिन किसी स्थान पर तो वह बन्द होना ही चाहिये। मैं उन के दिमाग की बात तो नहीं करता, लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि कम से कम वित्त मंत्रालय का दिमाग तो शुरू में ही बन्द है। नहीं तो ऐसे विधेयक लाने की उन्हें कोई आवश्यकता ही नहीं होती।

मैं आप का ध्यान संविधान की धारा 283 की ओर भी आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। यह फंड में केवल 15 करोड़ के बदले 30 करोड़ ६० डालने का ही सवाल नहीं है। इस में जो रूल मेकिंग पावर है उस के आधार पर यह कैसे करते आ रहे हैं, मुझे पता नहीं, लेकिन रूल मेकिंग पावर के अनुसार बिना पार्लियामेंट के सामने लाये वह कोई रूल नहीं बना सकते। मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि कंटीजेंसी फंड को संचालित करने के लिये कौन से रूल बनाये गये हैं इस पर वे थोड़ा सा प्रकाश डालें। धारा 283 में कहा गया है कि :

“..... and all other matters connected with or ancillary to matters aforesaid shall be regulated by law made by Parliament, and, until provision in that behalf is so made, shall be regulated by rules made by the President.”

कंटीजेंसी फंड को संचालित करने के लिए कुछ नियम तो होने ही चाहियें और वह नियम इस विधेयक में आने चाहिये थे और इस विधेयक का रूप कुछ और ही होना चाहिये था।

अब मैं दो एक बातें इस मंत्रालय के सम्बन्ध में रखूंगा। आज स्थिति यह है कि गवर्नमेंट को जितना रुपया चाहिये वह उसे बराबर टैक्सों को बढ़ा कर मिलता रहा है। खर्च में कैसे कमी हो इस ओर उसका ध्यान ही नहीं है। सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम को आय और खर्च दोनों की तरफ

देखना चाहिये। हम अपनी आय की तरफ तो देखते हैं और टैक्स बढ़ा कर आमदनी बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते हैं, लेकिन जहां हम टैक्स बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते हैं वहां यह नहीं देखते कि खर्च को कम कर के भी हम बजट को संतुलित कर सकते हैं।

किसी भी बजट को संतुलित करने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि जहां हम आय के स्रोतों को बढ़ायें वहां खर्च के परनालों को भी कम करें। मैं आप का ध्यान 1969-70 की जो ऐक्चुअल बजट पोजीशन थी उस की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। हम ने जो अनेक कर्ज लिये हैं, विदेशों से भी और इस देश में भी, उन की पोजीशन बहुत खराब है। कर्ज ले कर आप कितने दिन जीते रह सकते हैं। ऋणम् कृत्वा घृतम् पिबेत वाली नीति से काम नहीं चल सकता। बराबर ऋण ले कर हम हम अपने काम को नहीं चला सकते। हमें अपनी खर्च की मदों में कमी करनी चाहिये। वित्त मंत्रालय में एक ऐसा विभाग होना चाहिये जो हमारा जितना खर्च हो रहा है, उस पर अंकुश एवं नियंत्रण रख सकें। एक छोटा सा उदाहरण में देना चाहता हूँ। आपने पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग में 3500 करोड़ लगा रखा है लेकिन आपको उससे 35 करोड़ की रिटर्न भी नहीं मिल रही है। यह स्थिति बहुत ही चिन्ताजनक है। कम से कम इतनी पूंजी से जो एक साधारण व्यापारी कमाई कर सकता है उतनी तो आपको करके दिखानी ही चाहिये। नेशनलाइजेशन का अर्थ यही है कि देश के खर्च के लिए जितने धन की हमें आवश्यकता है उसका कुछ अंश हम नेशनलाइज्ड सेक्टर से, प्राप्त करें। आज वह नहीं हो रहा है इस तरह से जो हमारा उद्देश्य था वह सिद्ध नहीं हो रहा है।

जब सरकार के हाथ में खुला रुपया आ जाता है तो वह उसको खर्च करने लग जाती है और इस ओर ध्यान नहीं देती है कि आय के भीतर अपने खर्च को किस तरह रखा जाए। इस-

[श्री बेणी शंकर शर्मा]

लिए इस फंड की निधि से 15 करोड़ से बढ़ा कर आप 30 करोड़ करना चाहते हैं उसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ। यह तो ग्रेट मुगलपन है और वह बढ़ता ही जाएगा। हर काम के लिए सरकार को पार्लिमेंट के सामने आना चाहिये। अगर इनके पास तीस करोड़ कंटीजेंसी फंड में दे दिया जाएगा तो वे और बेरहमी से खर्च करने लग जाएंगे इसलिए मैं इस विधेयक का कड़ा विरोध करता हूँ।

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : The contingency fund, as the name indicates, is to be used very sparingly and only in extraordinary circumstances and Parliament has got to replenish the money drawn from the contingency fund. From our past experience of the tendency of the Government I am afraid we cannot give our consent to increase the corpus of this amount of Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 30 crores. Because, Sir now the tendency has been in the recent part of the Government always to promulgate ordinances even when they are not strictly relevant. After all, it has no bearing on the budget that we know and whether it is Rs. 30 crores or Rs. 300 crores, it is going to be replenished again. But there is a difference when Government comes with certain financial proposals to the House to get its approval and when they come after the money is spent to get ratification of the House. There is a vital difference between these two. So, I am afraid, the tendency being what it is, the increase of the corpus of this amount will only lead to more extravagant and more careless spending because parliamentary check is not there, and they need not bother about approval of Parliament.

I would also urge another argument for opposing this proposal. The inter-session periods that we have today is roughly of the order of 2 months, may be, a little more or a little less. It is not very convincing to me that it would be beyond them to manage the financial affairs within those Rs. 15 crores. I do not think there will be so much of unforeseen circumstances within that short period where they would need a corpus of Rs. 30 crores.

So, on both these counts, it is very unconvincing to me and the reasons advanced

by the Minister, to my mind, appear to be something different from what he has in mind.

We all know, of course the contingency of the Government and their natural anxiety to increase this corpus. If the logic that he advanced, namely, the increase in our total budgetary expenses of the order from Rs. 500 to Rs. 5,000 crores is true, then I think this corpus should be increased to ten times or even more from Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 150 crores to Rs. 200 crores. This is not a convincing logic at all to me. Shri Sharma rightly pointed out that it should be kept at the minimum to curb any unhealthy tendency on the part of the Government to adopt recourse to this fund often by passing the Parliament. So, on this ground, I oppose this and I expect the Minister to explain the real reasons as to why we should increase the corpus?

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : कंटीजेंसी फंड को बढ़ाने के बारे में जो बिल आया है, देश की स्थिति को देखते हुए नम्बव है कि इसकी आवश्यकता हो, लेकिन एमएंडमेंट में जितनी वृद्धि की जा रही है, एमएंडमेंट को दुगना किया जा रहा है, मेरा ऐसा मत है कि इसका कोई औचित्य नहीं है। इसलिए माननीय श्री शर्मा ने जो संशोधन पेश किया है कि 25 करोड़ इसको कर दिया जाए और 30 करोड़ न किया जाए, अगर सरकार इसको मान ले तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। ऐसा करके कुछ राशि हम बढ़ा भी लेंगे और साथ साथ जो सदन में बात उठ रही है कि इसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है या विरोध हो रहा है, वह भी शायद कुछ कम हो जाएगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस संशोधन को स्वीकार कर ले।

यह ठीक है कि हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा है, है, यह विशाल देश है। यहाँ इस तरह की स्थिति पैदा समय-समय पर हो जाती है जब सरकार को मदद के लिए आगे आना पड़ता है। इससे सदन के सदस्य अवगत हैं और जनता भी अवगत है : कहीं किसी तरह की बिपत्ती आ जाती है, कहीं प्राकृतिक प्रकोप

हो जाता है, कहीं सूखे की स्थिति पैदा हो जाती है, कहीं बाढ़ आ जाती है और दूसरे भी तरह-तरह के संकट हमारे देश के सामने उपस्थित होते रहते हैं। उस समय मदद देने की आवश्यकता पड़ती है। लेकिन दुख की बात तो यह है कि कोष रहते हुए भी वक्त पर लोगों को मदद नहीं मिल पाती है और इस कारण हजारों लोगों को तकलीफें बरदाश्त करनी पड़ती हैं और कितने ही लोग अर्थाभाव के कारण, मदद की कमी के कारण मर जाते हैं और उनकी रक्षा की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं हो पाती है। जब आप 15 से इसको 30 करोड़ करने जा रहे हैं तो इस राशि को सही ढंग से खर्च किया जाए, इसकी व्यवस्था भी आप करें। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि पैसा आपके पास हो फिर भी हमारे देश की जनता अभाव में, तकलीफ में मारी जाए और वक्त पर उसकी मदद न की जाए। कहीं बाढ़ आ जाती है, सूखा पड़ जाता है, साम्प्रदायिक दंगे हो जाते हैं और हमारे देश में इस तरह की घटनायें अकसर होती भी रहती हैं लेकिन हम देखते रहते हैं और कुछ करते नहीं। यह बात नहीं होनी चाहिये। यह जो मन्द्हे माननीय सदस्यों ने उठाया है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि आज देश की जो स्थिति है उसमें हमारा शासक वर्ग इस पैसे का दुरुपयोग करने लग जाए और अपने दल को मजबूत करने में ही कहीं इसको खर्च न करे, इसको भी निर्मूल किया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह का विश्वास दिमाग में पैदा होना स्वाभाविक है। जो राशि आप बढ़ा रहे हैं, जो पैसा आप ले रहे हैं, इसका सचमुच में सदुपयोग होना चाहिये और तकलीफ में जो लोग हों, उनकी आप वक्त पर मदद करें।

आज भी हमारे देश में आप देखिये, पढ़े लिखे इंजीनियर्स तक हजारों की तादाद में बेकार फिर रहे हैं। हमारे बिहार में सत्याग्रह चल रहा है। 400 इंजीनियर्स जेलखानों में बन्द हैं। तो क्या यह इस तरह की कंटी-जेंसी नहीं कही जा सकती कि जिस में ऐसे लोगों की मदद आप कीजिए, उन्हें उस पैसे

को दीजिए, उन को उद्योग धन्धे खुलवाने में मदद कीजिए। इस तरह के बहुत सारे उदाहरण पेश किए जा सकते हैं हमारे देश की स्थिति आज ऐसी है। लेकिन उसमें सरकार मदद नहीं कर पाती है पैसा जरूर ले लेती है। तो इसकी जानकारी हमको होनी चाहिए कि इस का उद्देश्य क्या है? आप इस फंड को कैसे खर्च करना चाहते हैं कम से कम इतना तो बताइए और इस के कुछ कायदे कानून बनाइए। आज एक मनमनीपन जो उत्पन्न हो गया है इस सरकार में वृ नहीं होना चाहिए। इस की कोई व्यवस्था, कोई हिसाब किताब होना चाहिए। इन शब्दों के माथ में चाहूंगा कि सरकार इस बारे में स्पष्ट अपनी नीति बतलाए।

श्री शिव चंद्र झा (मधुबनी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मदन की जो आवाज है, सदन की जो भावना है, इस का अन्दाज मिल गया आप को। सब नहीं चाहते कि हैं यह फंड बढ़े। सरकार को पूरा हक है कि संविधान की धारा 267 के मुताबिक वह फंड बनावे। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि उस धारा में संशोधन करें संविधान में और इस धारा को डिलीट कर दें। मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि इस तरह का फंड रहे अनफोरसीन सर्कमस्टासेज के लिए लेकिन यह बढ़ाने की बात जो है, 15 करोड़ से डबल जम्प जो कर रहे हैं 30 करोड़ के लिए यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है। यह समझाने की जरा कोशिश करें और संतोषजनक जवाब उन का तभी होगा जब कि यह बताएं हम लोगों को कि पिछले पांच सालों में या दस सालों में या जब से फंड की शुरुआत हुई तब से इस का इस्तेमाल कैसे हुआ? किन किन मदों में हुआ? किन अनफोरसीन सर्कम-स्टांसेज के लिए, किस कंटीजेंसी के लिए इस्तेमाल हुआ? यदि हम को उस का विवेचन मिल जाता है तो हम कुछ हद तक समझ सकते हैं कि हां यह फंड बढ़ाना चाहिए ताकि भविष्य में भी इस का इस्तेमाल अच्छा होगा अब यह जो बढ़ाएंगे, उस का इस्तेमाल कैसे करेंगे, यह टीक ही कहा शास्त्री जी ने, उस की

[श्री शिवचन्द्र झा]

रूपरेखा भी दें। क्या इस फंड से जो 6 तारीख को बिहारी लाल शहीद हुआ लाठी चार्ज से, उस के स्मारक के लिए, उस के परिवार के लिए आप कुछ देंगे? यदि आप यह कहेंगे कि बैयनितक नहीं देते तो उत्तरी बिहार के विकास के लिए क्या आप पैसा देंगे? दरभंगा जिला अकालग्रस्त हो रहा है। वहां पर लोगों की हालत बहुत खराब हो गई है। क्या इस में से उन के लिए एक दो करोड़ रुपया आप देंगे? वहां की सड़कें खराब हैं। मेरा क्षेत्र दरभंगा जिला बोर्डर एरिया में है, क्या वहां यातायात के लिए 2 करोड़ रुपया आप देंगे? यदि आप यह कहें कि छोटे कामों के लिए नहीं देते तो आज बिहार में एटामिक एनर्जी प्लांट की सख्त जरूरत है। दस करोड़ रुपया स्टार्टिंग एमाउंट चाहिए। क्या उस के लिए रुपया आप देंगे? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आने वाले दिनों ने इस का कैसे आप इस्तेमाल करेंगे? कहीं इस का मैनी-पुलेशन किसी दूसरी मद के लिए अपनी पार्टी के परपञ्च के लिए न हो जाय यह हमें शक है। आखिर में मैं कहूँगा कि फंड इस तरह का रहना चाहिए। देश गरीब है। देश गरीब नहीं है, कहा जाता है कि देश गरीब है। हिन्दुस्तान गरीब नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता गरीब है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता गरीब नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता गरीब बनाई गई है। किन के द्वारा गरीब बनाई गई है? कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि हैब को देना चाहिये, हैब नाट्स के लिए। टाटा हैब है या हैब हैब है या हैब नाट है। उन के पास तो पैसे हैं? उन को क्यों नहीं लेते हैं? मेरा सवाल है उन को आप नेशनलाइज क्यों नहीं करते हैं? टाटा आयरन को नेशनलाइज क्यों नहीं करते हैं। बिरला की फर्म है... (ब्यवधान)... मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। संविधान के मुताबिक आप की जो यह धारा है, वह रहेगी, आप का यह फंड भी रहेगा और साथ-साथ बढ़ाने की भी जरूरत नहीं रहेगी जब ओरसीन सर्कमस्टेंसेज के लिए

उस को इस्तेमाल करेंगे। लेकिन यदि आप ऐसी नहीं करते हैं तो शक होता है कि कहीं मैनीवरिंग के लिए मैनीपुलेट न करने लग जायं। इसलिए मेरा यह संशोधन है कि 25 करोड़ बढ़ा दें, उस से ज्यादा नहीं क्योंकि अभी आप ने देखा कि सदस्यों की भावना क्या है।

16.00 Hrs.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : According to art. 267(1), provision for a contingency fund has to be made and that is made according to what Parliament provides. When the contingency fund was established in 1950, as I said in my opening remarks, the budget of the Central Government was about Rs. 500 crores. The very fact that our budget is now ten times that figure indicates the necessity to enhance the corpus of the fund.

I was surprised to hear Shrimati Tar-keshwari Sinha asking, what about the rules. She was a Deputy Minister in this Ministry. Therefore, I thought she knew about the framing of rules. The legislation was enacted in 1950 and rules were framed in 1952. Therefore, there is no question of using this fund without the rules framed for the purpose.

As for the necessity for this, it is not as if no contingency fund is required. Sometimes certain provisions are not made and certain contingencies arise. Therefore, it has to be drawn from this fund. Certainly when the provision has been made in the budget, a new service is involved. Then also it becomes necessary because when a new service is involved even with a budget provision, owing a vote on account period, an advance is necessary. From this point of view, money has to be provided in the contingency fund.

Shri Jha asked if money would be given for drought and other things in Bihar. These are being looked after during the normal procedure of expenditure through budget provisions and that is outside the purview of this Bill.

There were years when money was spent to the tune of Rs. 13 or Rs. 14 crores,

with the result that very little was left for other contingencies. From this point of view also, enhancement of the corpus from Rs. 15 crores to Rs. 30 crores is absolutely necessary.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2—(Amendment of Section 2.)

SHRI SHIV CHANDRA JHA : I beg to move :

Page 1, line 6,—for "thirty" substitute—"twenty-five". (3)

मैंने पूछा था कि जब से यह फंड शुरू हुआ कैसे इस का इस्तेमाल हुआ जरा इस को बता दें तो हम लोगों को अन्दाज मिल जाय कि आने वाले दिनों में भी इस का अच्छा इस्तेमाल होगा ।

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : उस का इस्तेमाल कायदे से हुआ और वह मैंने बताया ।

श्री जिव चंद्र झा : किन किन मदों में हुआ, कायदे से तो बहुत सी बातें होती हैं । सब सड़क पर चलते हैं, कायदे से चलते हैं । इसलिए किन किन मदों में इस्तेमाल हुआ यह बता दें? बाढ़ के लिए हुआ या फारेन टूर के लिए हुआ काहे के लिए इस्तेमाल हुआ?

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह मैंने बता दिया । और बाद में वह पार्लियामेंट के सामने आता है । पार्लियामेंट उस को अप्रूव करता है । इसलिए उस के अंदर ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है जो माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put amendment No. 3 to vote:

Amendment No. 3 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1—(Short title.)

Amendment made

Page 1, line 4, for "1969" substitute "1970". (2)

(Shri P. C. Sethi)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill".

Enacting Formula

Amendment made

Page 1, line 1, for "Twentieth" substitute "Twenty-first". (1)

(Shri P. C. Sethi).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Title stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

The Title was added to the Bill.

suggest that this may be continued on

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I move :

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

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

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

The motion was adopted.

16.05 Hrs.

MOTION RE : REPORT OF THE STUDY TEAM ON PROHIBITION

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We now take up the motion on the Report of the Study Team on Prohibition.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Dabhoi) : I move :

"That the Report of the Study Team on Prohibition, laid on the Table of the House on the 2nd June, 1964, be taken into consideration."

This Report which was submitted on the 15th April, 1964 and laid on the Table of the House on 2nd June, 1964, has not been considered for six years, which is a surprise to us. This Report was submitted by a Study Team which was appointed by the Government itself. Not only that, the name of Justice Tek Chand was suggested by the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Shri S. R. Das and it was on his advice that this study team was appointed under the Chairmanship of Justice Tek Chand on 29th April, 1963. There were specific terms of reference. I am referring to this because it was not the programme of some non-official agency, it was the programme of the Government. Today also the same position stands good that Government is committed to this programme. This is not the programme of anyone party, it is not the programme of the Government alone, it is a national programme, and the whole edifice of our Swaraj was erected on the foundations of four pillars, one of which was the programme of Prohibition.

This Study Team under the Chairmanship of Justice Tek Chand came into existence after a long history, and it was the logical conclusion of the consistent steps taken by the Government from long back. It was in 1954 that the Government of India appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Shriman Narayan whose recommendations were accepted by the House unanimously by a Resolution on 31st March, 1956. That Resolution was :

"This House is of opinion that prohibition should be regarded as an integral part of the Second Five Year Plan and recommends that the Planning Commission should formulate the necessary programme to bring about nationwide Prohibition speedily and efficiently."

So, as a result of that Committee's recommendations and the Resolution of this sacred House adopted unanimously, the programme was accepted as an integral part of the Second Five Year Plan.

16.06 HRS.

[SHRI SHRI CHAND GOYAL *in the Chair*]

In the Second Five Year Plan, Chapter XIX, paragraph 20 says :

"In pursuance of these suggestions, State Governments have been requested to evolve phased programmes and at the same time to ensure that the programme for implementing the policy of Prohibition is drawn up with a view to completion within a reasonable time. The policy of Prohibition was discussed on a non-official Resolution by the Lok Sabha which passed the following Resolution on 31st March, 1956 (quoted above). The Resolution was accepted by the Government of India."

It did not stop there. It went further, and in the Third Plan it was observed :

"In pursuance of this Resolution, a number of recommendations were made in the Second Five Year Plan. It was pointed out that Prohibition had already been accepted as a Directive Principal in the Constitution and there was need to