

[Shri P. K. Deo]

represent the old British India and it has no relevance to our present reality. It says, "Punjab, Sindhu, Gujarat, Maratha"—there is no Sindh at all. Sindh has gone to Pakistan. So, there should be a timely change to it. (*Interruptions*).

Lastly, I would like to point out that the punishment should be made more rigorous and any attempt to insult or deface or destroy or mutilate or trample our National Flag should be more rigorously dealt with.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डे (राजनन्दगांव) : श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रीय षड्ज की प्रतिष्ठा और गरिमा के सम्बन्ध में जब हम विचार करते हैं तो 14 अगस्त, 1947 की उस रात के 12 बजे का स्मरण होता है जब राष्ट्र रत्न राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी की अध्यक्षता में हमारी कॉन्स्टीट्यूटिंग असेम्बली ने तिरंगे झंडे का निर्माण किया और शस्त्रधनि के साथ जत्र सत्ता हस्तान्तरित हो रही थी उस समय आकाश की ओर हमारा झंडा उड़ा और हवा के भोंके और देश की प्रेरणा के साथ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can continue tomorrow or the next day.

— — —

15.30 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: WORKING OF NATIONALISED BANKS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now we take up the discussion on the working of the nationalised banks

Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : Right in the beginning I would like to say that the time that has been allotted for the discussion of this important subject is totally inadequate. However, I would first like to emphasise that I am not raising this discussion ; in any spirit of carping criticism.

We have naturally some weaknesses for the nationalised banks, and therefore, if at all, we can accused of over-looking some of its deficiencies. We also recognise that in the initial phases of nationalisation there

are bound to be certain problems which would require some time for their satisfactory solution. So, if we try to examine the functioning of the banks, it is only with a view to improving it and making them into really socialist institutions. Otherwise, what Trotsky said might come out to be true : 'Means of production belong to the State and the State belongs to bureaucracy.'

Although my intention is also to go over to the other juicy aspect of the discussion, I would certainly not like to be accused of ignoring some of the important aspects of the economic functions of the banks.

15.31 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

We have now got some of the accounts of the nationalised banks and there are some other reports also which give us information to judge their performance.

In the first instance, we find there has been impressive increase in the opening of the new branches in unbanked areas ; there has also been diversification of credit. Some of the sections of society which were previously completely neglected are now being given the aid which they very much deserve. Although we have spent Rs. 300 crores or so on this branch expansion scheme—I would like to check up this figure with the Finance Minister—and although the amount spent has been so much, we have yet to cover a much large number of villages according to our scheme. But, at the moment, we find, we are overstressed both financially and managerially even to bring about the kind of expansion that we annually propose. So, what exactly is the scheme to make up for these deficiencies in respect of the managerial and the financial resources ?

We find that the growth in deposit rates has not kept pace with the growth in advances, and thus the resources have not been mobilised to the desired extent. It goes without saying that till the deposit increase we would not be able to fulfil the public policies we have adopted. Their has been no doubt significant increase in the overall deposits, but, however, it is difficult to say how much of this increase in the deposits has been due to inflation and how much

due to additional effort. It is possible that some of it has been due to the automatic spill-over on account of inflation. The parallel functioning of 'black money' is responsible for inadequate in flow of the deposits. What is being done in this connection? Probably, the Government seems to be hesitating itself to do something in that respect now.

But the more important and pertinent thing to ask is this. Why is the directive of the Reserve Bank of India prohibiting non-banking companies from accepting deposits, flagrantly circumvented? Unless that loophole is plugged the desired amount of resources would not flow into the banks.

A word with regard to profits. I find that profits, after bonus, remain very nearly the same as in the year 1968 in spite of a much larger turn-over. The rate of such net profits to the working funds has considerable gone down, and transfer of profits to the Government also has been meagre. It was stipulated that transfer of profits to the Government would be of the order of 5 per cent. But what we find is this. In the case of 3 Banks, the transfer has been of the order of less than 5 per cent; in the case of another 3, less than 4 per cent; and in the case of the Central Bank of India it has been only 1.8 per cent, that is, nominal.

As regards the United Commercial Bank, I do not know whether it is produced its final accounts.

Mr. Chairman, you must yourself have observed that in respect of the service to the general public, there seems to be a steep deterioration. There is inefficient service, there are inordinate delays and there is corruption also. We have been talking so much about corruption on so many occasions that it may well be that this corruption that the public is facing in respect of the functioning of the banks also might be taken rather less seriously. But may I say that now it has become much too popular in some of the areas that there are two-per cent-walah babus, 3 per cent-walah babus, 10 per cent-walah babus and so on? That impression must be somehow rooted out.

AN HON. MEMBER: What does walah-babu mean?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It means they get commission.

The labour situation also seems to have deteriorated. Strikes are more frequent, and work-to-rule also has become more frequent. So, we do not know how Government has been able to infuse the spirit of a socialist institution in the labour population. There seems to be enough of hesitation in taking action against lack of discipline or against the corrupt officials.

With regard to the differential rates of interest, there has been a report by a Committee that the majority view seems to be opposed to these differential rates. Recently, we came to read in the newspapers that the Government seems to have agreed or seems to be inclined to agree with the minority report...

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): No.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If that is so, Government should make it clear.

But one thing that must be emphasised is that at the moment even the poor people who are able to get loans are able to get them only after having incurred exorbitant and usurious rates in making available the required advance. That is, if they are required to make an advance of about 20 per cent, then this 20 per cent is available to them at exorbitant and usurious rates from the general market. So, unless something is done about it, the poor people would not really be in a position to benefit by the scheme.

Now, I would like to make a few suggestions to make the banks function as real instruments of planning. I would suggest that there must be specialisation by these nationalised banks, specialisation region-wise, specialisation industry-wise and specialisation trade-wise. If at all something is being done in that respect, we would like to know about it.

We have got many financial institutions functioning under the auspices of the Government which dispense large amounts of loans to industries. There could be a very fruitful collaboration between these financial institutions and the banks in order to serve the interests of planning. I would like to know whether there is any attempt to bring about this much-needed collabo-

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

ration and co-operation between the financial institutions like the IFC, the State Financial Corporation and so on.

It is also somewhat surprising that Parliament is not associated with the functioning of the banks in a proper way. I do not mean to suggest, even remotely, that Parliament should interfere in the day-to-day functioning and transactions of the bank. We have got the Public Undertakings Committee which goes into the functioning of the public undertakings. But this Committee is not expected to go into the functioning of the banks. Would it not be advisable that some kind of a parliamentary committee should come into being to go into the functioning of the banks? That is my suggestion.

Then, credit planning also seems to be quite unsatisfactory. Otherwise, we would not have found ourselves in the situation in which we are today. We know there is lack of coarse cloth. Why is not credit planning done in such a way that it is related to the production of particular items? That could have been brought about. Therefore, much requires to be done with regard to credit planning. Why so much of banking resources had been kept booked so far as sugar is concerned? Why was there not enough of foresight with regard to this? One can go on in this vein. But I would not like to go into all that just now.

I am now coming to the aspect which has been very much before, the public mind, that is what I mean by the juicy aspect of the functioning of the nationalised banks. This relates to what has been characterised as the most serious fraud in the century—the Nagarwala case. It is not only because of the imagination of some persons that such a characterisation of this affair has come about. Even the Finance Minister was pleased to say that it was a most fantastic and unbelievable story; the entire course of what had happened appeared to be a serious thing, and it is something that deepens suspicion. This is what the Finance Minister was pleased to say in the course of the call attention motion on the subject. He further said that the manner in which the operation was conducted and the money taken out of the bank's vault required serious consideration. Despite all this anxiety, shock and surprise exhibited by him, no effort seems to have been made to clear either his own

mind or the mind of the general public which is so full of suspicion. I hope the Finance Minister would be honest enough to say that his mind is also full of suspicion as to how all this happened in such a fantastic and unbelievable way. If he is not kind to others, he must at least be kind to himself.

The way in which the trial of Nagarwala was conducted on the 27 May by the subordinate court when the case was disposed of in less than five minutes is also perhaps a rare case in history. As has been suggested, the whole thing was done at supersonic speed. We have heard of justice delayed, but this is justice done with supersonic speed.

It is obvious that the submerged portion of the iceberg cannot be explored by any proceedings in the court. The need, therefore, for a proper probe by a Commission is clearly indicated. If this is not a case for inquiry by a Commission, one does not know what else is. The way in which the Government has been evading this demand of MPs and the general public deepens the suspicion that the Government is not interested, for reasons best known to it, to have all the facts brought to light.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA (Domaria-ganj): It is *sub judice*.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I know what I am saying; I am not referring to any matter which is *sub judice*. If you allow me two hours, I can go on speaking on this without touching on any matter which is *sub judice*.

No one can dispute that the procedural requirements were thrown to the winds when Rs. 60 lakhs were withdrawn from the Bank. The Finance Minister does agree with this, and yet we have not been told if any departmental action against the officers concerned has been initiated and completed by now. If they have not taken any action, it is a clear case of dereliction of duty on the part of the Government. If they have, they should share with us the results of the departmental inquiry.

The State Bank also must have got the report from the officers concerned in this matter. If so, the Government should be pleased to place all these papers on the Table.

What reports have they got from the senior officers? It is unbelievable that the Chief Cashier, Mr. Malhotra, would not have submitted any report to the bank, any explanation,—so far as his part was concerned. If he has, this also should be made available to us.

It is amazing that the Agent of the State Bank of India has not figured in the whole episode at all. To my mind, the primary responsibility rests with the Agent of the State Bank of India. He holds the key to the strong-room and it is he who has released the entire amount, this huge amount of Rs. 60 lakhs or so. What has this gentleman to say about this matter; whether any action has been taken against him? Whether he has submitted any report in this regard, is also extremely important.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Which gentleman?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : The Agent who is primarily responsible for the transactions in the bank; whether he has submitted any report in this connection. He holds the key to the strong-room, and it is he who must say something to clear our doubt.

It is also obvious from what Mr. Malhotra has said to the police that he got a telephonic message at 11.30 A.M. If that is so, it is clear that this amount was not withdrawn at the beginning of the office-hours. It must have been in the second withdrawal, and if it was done in the second withdrawal, there must have been additional justification trotted out by him for the withdrawal of this amount,—a justification convincing enough for the withdrawal of a huge amount of this kind,—because he himself says that it was at 11.30 A.M. that he got a telephonic message from somewhere.

We have got an important document with us, the reply of the hon. Finance Minister, to the letter of the hon. Mr. Basu, in this connection. In the first instance, it seems to me that this reply took inordinately long time. The Finance Minister took about 20 days' time. If the matter was so simple and the information to be shared with us was so ordinary, it could have taken only 10 minutes of his time. But he has taken 20 days. What flows from that letter is also extremely important.

The Finance Minister's letter says that

it was money out of the currency chest. One would like to know what the objectives of this currency chest are. What objective is this currency chest expected to serve? Who operates it? What has been the normal holding in the currency chest during the last one or two years? One would like to know about this.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is up. He has taken 20 minutes. It is a two-hour discussion.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Since he is initiating the debate, he may be permitted to continue for some time more. You may be strict with the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The time allotted is two hours, out of which you have taken 20 minutes already.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : You may extend the time by another half an hour or one hour. (*Interruption*).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : What have been the withdrawals from the deposits in the currency chest? Another question which arises is, what have been the withdrawals from deposits in the currency chest of the State Bank of India, Parliament Street Branch, during the course of the last six months? We would like to know about all that.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : About what?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Withdrawals from the currency chest during the course of the last six months or so.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Similar withdrawals.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Similar withdrawals from the State Bank of India.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Whatever it may be; similar withdrawals.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : What are the rules for the withdrawals? Can a cashier withdraw any amount without reference to any rules? Has he to get the

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

approval of any higher officers for withdrawal? Is there any rule for withdrawing large amounts and small amounts separately? If any withdrawal has to be made, is it not to be against some account? This is a question which the Finance Minister has been persistently refusing to answer. On which account was this withdrawn?

AN HON. MEMBER : Telephone call.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : From wherever it might be. Against which account was it withdrawn? That is a question which requires an answer, and the Finance Minister cannot be let off this evening if he is not able to give us an answer with regard to this.

SHRI PILOO MODY : And to which account it would have been debited.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : In reporting to the Reserve Bank, is there any proforma to be filled? If so, what are the heads of the pro forma? Is it not shown against some account? Against what account was this withdrawal shown, and was it communicated to the Reserve Bank on the 24th evening? Even if there is no head in the proforma to be submitted to the Reserve Bank, are we not entitled to know against which account it has been withdrawn as it must have been recorded in the State Bank Register itself? Is the amount in the currency chest unrelated to any account—what amount is there in the currency chest? Is all this money unrelated to any account? We must know about that.

It is said that whenever money is withdrawn from the currency chest, entry is made in the Bank's Vault Register. What are the heads under which entries are made in this Register? Does it not show the names of the party for whom the amount is withdrawn, and also the account against which the amount is withdrawn? Even if the Vault Register is now in the custody of the police, the heads under which the entry is made must be mentioned to us, because there must be a standard pro forma for every Vault Register.

It is said that to account for the

shortage of the Currency Register balance—amount of Rs. 60 lakhs had been debited to the Bank's Suspense Account as is the normal practice when immediate recovery is not possible. So, the question arises: when any amount is debited to the Bank's Suspense Account, what are the rules for doing so? Under what conditions is the amount to be debited to the Suspense Account? Is it possible to debit this to the Suspense Account without mentioning the name of the party, the Account against which the withdrawal is made, the reasons for which the recovery is not immediately possible? These are the questions which we would like to be answered with regard to the currency chest and the Suspense Account.

It is said that the recovered amount was entrusted to the Bank under a "Supardari" Bond—may be it is a Urdu word—and entered in the Bank's sundry deposits register and the money is continued to be held under the "Supardari" Bond. Why is money continued to be held under this bond? If the money is related to some account, why is the money not transferred to that account? That is the real question.

We would also like to know how many times during the course of the last one year withdrawals made from the currency chest and debited to the Bank's Suspense Account. Were all the withdrawals, made during the course of the last one year, related to certain accounts? If not, in how many cases was it not so? The reply of the Finance Minister on this point has been extremely unsatisfactory.

Another thing which seems to us as extremely amazing is that it has not been treated as a case of conspiracy. It could not have been the solo performance of Mr. Malhotra or Mr. Nagarwala. There must have been a large number of persons acting in league and in perfect concert, but we do not know what happened to all those persons who had been working on this. There must have been a large number of persons associated with this operation in the Bank itself. Some colloies were employed to put the big box of money weighing about 64 k.g. in the staff car. Then, there were some other persons who must have been associated at various stages of the withdrawal of this amount.

But we really do not know whether all the officials in the State Bank are mere dolls ; they hear nothing, do nothing and perform nothing. Then, what are these officials for ? Why has this case not been treated as a case of conspiracy ? Why has the case been started only against one or two persons ? Why were both persons not prosecuted at the same time ? Why were they not impleaded and the case proceeded against them ?

One word more in this connection. According to newspaper reports two other persons were arrested along with Shri Nagarwala. But we really do not know who those two persons were. We had never been made to know about those two persons. If those two persons were arrested in the beginning, why were they released later on ? That is another question which has to be answered in this connection.

Finally, I would like to say one thing about the police. So far as this aspect of the matter is concerned, although I must say that I have not been able to go into full details of the functioning of the police, I feel that the police has behaved in the most extraordinary manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Here the discussion is about the functioning of banks and not about the functioning of the police.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I am referring to the functioning of the police in relation to banks. The police claimed in the beginning that they have got the tape-recording of the voice of Shri Nagarwala imitating the voice of a woman. Whosoever this woman might be, we thought it was necessary to produce this tape-record before the magistrate. But it was never done.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Now it has disappeared.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : The police have not permitted us to know, they have not disclosed, they have not told us who these two persons were.

Then, six taxis were engaged by Shri Nagarwala during the course of his operations. We do not know the details of these taxis and about the place where the money was taken. Shri Nagarwala was staying at a place in Defence Colony. We do not

know the identity of that place and what kind of persons were putting up there. So, the police has been behaving in the most extraordinary fashion.

Now, if the police behaves in this extraordinary fashion, if the trial is conducted in this extraordinary fashion, if the government do not take sufficient interest in it, would that not lend weight to the charge that they are interested in putting a cloak over the whole matter and that they are not interested in things coming to light ? So, I would again emphasize that it is extremely necessary that the government must agree to the appointment of a commission to fully probe this matter. Then alone would the public mind be satisfied on this account.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati) : Sir, the nationalisation of banks was one of the major steps taken by our government to implement its socialist policies. In fact it was the culminating point which led to the historic division of the Congress. It was one of our major planks on which we fought and won the mid-term elections recently. It is therefore just and proper that Parliament should consider the working of the nationalised bank provided we can do it without political motivations.

16.00 hrs.

Statistics would reveal that after nationalisation of Banks substantial benefits have come to the neglected sector of the economy. Prior to nationalisation of banks the banking facility was available primarily to the people in the urban areas and the rural areas, the small-scale industries and agriculturists were completely neglected. Before nationalisation, so far as the country is concerned, banking facility was available to the extent of only one banking office for 65,000 people compared to 4,000 people in Britain, 7,000 in USA and 15,000 in Japan. Prior to nationalisation we had only 5,000 banking centres in the rural areas out of the total of 5,64,000 villages in the country. But after nationalisation we have found that banking centres are coming up in rural areas—in neglected areas. During the period from 19th July 1969 to 30th April 1971 the banks have opened 2,934 branches, out of which 2,011 are areas wherein hitherto there were no banking facilities,

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

Also, Sir, we find that the percentage reflects that the rural area has been catered to almost 65.6 per cent of the newly opened branches. There has been rise in bank deposits to the tune of Rs. 461 crores and also the neglected sectors have come under the purview of banks and the proportion of advances in these sectors rose from 14.54 per cent in June 1969 to 21.19 per cent in June, 1970 and 22.81 per cent in March 1971. All these statistics amply reveal that the working of the nationalised banks taking the entire country as a whole is satisfactory. While saying so, with a note of regret, I have to say that so far as my State of Assam is concerned the working of the banks has not been satisfactory. I take this opportunity of placing some facts relating to my State before the Finance Minister. One of the objectives of the policy of nationalisation was to reduce regional disparity. Unfortunately nationalisation has failed to achieve this objective in my State. Upto the end of December 1970 if I am permitted to put the statistics of only one banking institution of my State there has been an investment of only Rs. 168 lakhs upto March '70 and that investment rose to only Rs. 194 lakhs, and the Banks' estimated increase in investment till December is Rs. 200 lakhs. That means the entire State has been given only the investment of Rs. 6 lakhs by one of the major banking institution, that is, the United Commercial Bank. The deposit-credit ratio is also depressing—Rs. 348 lakhs to 168 lakhs.

Also we have found that the persons who are managing these banks have not been able to guide themselves by the spirit with which they should have been guided after nationalisation. They are still trying to look at the entire matter so far as the credit-worthiness is concerned in the same light as it was done before nationalisation. No doubt, the banking institutions will be motivated or guided by financial principles but after nationalisation the persons who are running these institutions should be guided with a new spirit so that the neglected persons and the agriculturists may derive benefits.

May I also draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister in this context to the fact that so far as the Lead Role that is given to some of the banks in my own

State it has failed to play its desired role. For example in 1970 only 8 branches were opened by one bank which was asked to play the lead role and in 1971 no branch have been opened by it so far though 10 licences have been granted and are pending. This makes a sorry reading. When we go to the people and talk of nationalisation they say you are talking of nationalisation but we have not desired any benefit from nationalisation of banks. Only the policy so far pursued has been not to give credit to persons who have no banking facilities within a radius of 10 miles of their residence, and in my own State so far as the backward districts of Namerup and Goalpara are concerned, which have been identified by the Planning Commission as backward districts, the vast majority of the people are not getting any benefit because there is no banking facility within the radius of 10 miles of the residence of these people. Therefore, I have taken this opportunity to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to these facts so that those disparities may be removed and people from all walks of life and all parts of the country may get the benefits of the bank nationalisation.

So far as the Nagarwala case is concerned about which Mr. Mishra has spoken so much, he has posed himself both as the prosecuting counsel and the defence counsel. I leave it to the hon. Finance Minister to reply to the queries because I am not and cannot claim to be an expert on banking institutions.

With these words I close.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, recently the fourteen nationalised banks had been celebrating the second anniversary of the bank nationalisation, but we are sorry to say that the performance of these banks during the last two years has been such that it seems nationalisation of banks has become the end and not the means to an end.

The bureaucratic inefficiency, coupled with the fact that there is hardly any change in the attitude of those persons who are in the management, has denied substantially the real fruits of the bank nationalisation to the common people of this country.

The previous management of the banks not having been changed and the custodians remaining primarily concerned in serving, as before, the vested interests, the monopolists and the big capitalists, to the ordinary people like the agriculturists, the small traders, unemployed people like engineers, this bank nationalisation has still remained only as a slogan.

I shall draw the attention of this House to certain glaring facts as to the working of these banks which will show that the people of this country generally have not derived any real benefit from bank nationalisation. That is why we are very keen that nationalisation, which we have all supported, should yield real benefits to the people at large. I feel that primarily, due to procrastination, bureaucratic control and lack of faith in the fundamentals of welfare socialism, for which the party in power has to share and accept the blame, this sorry state of affairs has been reached.

I will give a few instances only as to how the functioning of these banks has not been to the real benefit of this country. So far as financing of agriculture is concerned, the declared policy has been to make credit available to small agriculturists. I give the instance of one bank, the United Commercial Bank. Its performance in the matter of agricultural advances in eastern India, for which it has been primarily entrusted, has been extremely poor. Probably, hon. Members are aware that in order to intensify agricultural advances the Reserve Bank has formulated a scheme, called the Lead Bank Scheme. So far as the United Commercial Bank is concerned it has been allotted 13 lead districts in four States in the eastern region—three in Assam, four in West Bengal, four in Orissa and two in Bihar. You will be surprised to know that up till 30th April, 1971 in West Bengal in the four districts the total amount of advances to the agricultural sector is only Rs. 13,530; to the two districts in Bihar only Rs. 11,730; to the four districts in Orissa Rs. 2,36,000—it is comparatively better—and to the three districts of Assam Rs. 1,40,000 by way of credit facilities

Further, all these nationalised banks have drawn up forms which have to be filled up by every agriculturist who wants a loan. Unfortunately, in view of the illiteracy in this country, these people are unable to fill up these forms which require so many particulars to be given.

Apart from these particulars to be given, which these people are hardly able to do on their own, landed property has to be offered as security before any loan is advanced. One can appreciate that whatever land these people may have is probably already encumbered due to loans that they had to take from the mahajans or the moneylenders in villages. Unless they can pay off those loans and those encumbrances are cleared, they cannot offer these properties as securities to these nationalised banks. As a result of this the policy of giving loans on easy terms to agriculturists has remained mostly unfulfilled.

Apart from the landed property, which is to be given as security, these agriculturists have to get hold of two persons who have to give guarantees. Which poor agriculturist in the villages can, apart from the difficulty of finding out landed property to be offered as security, find out two guarantors? Without giving those guarantees no loan application will even be entertained. This is the position. Then what they are forced to do is to go to the local rural rich and take the help of those moneylenders to give guarantees. The practice has been that these people at the instance of moneylenders, make applications to the banks. Their encumbrances are removed but the guarantors, who are really the moneylenders, take the money and give a portion of it to the agriculturists. Because the band is paid off by the moneylenders out of their own resources, the bank does not bother; they are happy to get back the money. But the money is not really going to agriculturists who require this money. Therefore, I would request the Finance Minister to give his thought to this matter. It is a matter which goes to the root of it in the sense that, undoubtedly, it is the agricultural sector which requires the greatest attention from the nationalised banks. I have got some of the specimens of the forms. There are so many particulars which have to be given. Landed property has to be offered as security; guarantees have to be provided and all that. It is impossible for agriculturists to get any benefit.

Apart from that, there is another very important factor which I wish to bring to the notice of the Finance Minister for his consideration. These forms require that an undertaking has to be given by the farmers who take loans that they will sell their produce through the agents to be nominated

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

by the banks. Who are the persons nominated as agents by the banks? Because they have to give security to the banks, they are the same old persons who have been controlling production, purchasing and selling the produce, the mahajans and the money-lenders, that are being appointed as agents by the banks. The agriculturists are forced to sell their produce through them. Therefore, the old system remains whether they get money from nationalised banks or not. If any real relief is to be given to the agriculturists, I submit, the entire procedure should be changed.

Even for the purpose of getting loans for sinking shallow tubewells, loans for small industries, loans for starting dairy and poultry farms, loans for purchasing taxis, etc., landed property is to be given as security. To sink a tubewell, a farmer has to offer landed property of equal value security. The whole has become a mockery. The entire procedure, the entire scheme, has become a mockery. This is really intended for the benefit of the agriculturists. But they are not getting any benefit. Therefore, the farmer, the small trader, whoever wants money, continues to remain in the grip of money-lenders. Further, the agriculturist has to secure two guarantors whom they can hardly obtain without surrendering themselves to the money-lenders and mahajans or rich landlords or the rural rich. The position is such that it requires very serious consideration.

Now, I am quoting from the report in the *Statesman* which is based on a survey that was conducted in the State of Tamil Nadu. It says :

"The poor peasant is exploited by the local money-lender who stands guarantee for his loan and after playing the farmer a part of the money, takes over the balance for his day-to-day lending business (at exorbitant rates of interest). Since the money-lender normally takes to care to repay the loan, the banks have little cause for complaint. But the money originally intended to help the small farmer and recorded as agricultural loans in the bank books is thus being diverted into business activities of money lenders."

This is the survey report which was published in the *Statesman* on 13th March, 1970, and which prompted the Government

of Tamil Nadu to frame a scheme, called, a guarantee scheme. But even this scheme is not being implemented, and the money is being diverted, as previously, to money-lenders, and the agriculturists are not getting any benefit.

This deplorable state of situation so far as agricultural financing is concerned is proved amply by statistics. Out of the total loan or advance given by the 14 nationalised banks of the extent of Rs. 4000 crores, in March, 1971, only Rs. 198.8 crores were given for the purpose of agricultural financing. It is less than 5 per cent for the purpose of agricultural financing that this loan or advance has been given.

I would like to give one or two instances as to how the ordinary people are being harassed by these banks because there is no proper attitude, on proper approach, in the matter. One gentleman by the name of Mr. Sen Gupta made an application to the State Bank of India, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta, in the middle of 1970 for a small loan to purchase a taxi. After about ten months he was told that unless he could furnish landed property at Calcutta as a collateral security, his application could not be entertained. Kindly imagine what sort of conditions are being imposed. Ordinary people who want to have some money for the purchase of a taxi to earn their livelihood are being asked to give security of landed property in Calcutta to enable them to give him a loan. Sir, this is not the solitary instance. I will give other instances.

The Federation of Small Industrial Units made an application to the United Commercial Bank in March 1970 for grant of a loan but that application has not yet been disposed of and nothing has been made available to them. A number of businessmen of Agartala on the 31st March 1970 made an application to the Agartala branch of the United Commercial Bank but because of reasons which I would like to disclose here that there are demands from the high-ups in the management to grants these loans and wanted money to persuade them to grant the loan which these small businessmen could not meet, because of that their applications were not entertained and they are kept pending and no decision has been taken,

Sir, there is a society called Chimanlal Sudhar Samiti . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : These cases you can send to the Minister.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I will give one or two instances only.

I know a person who made an application to the Allahabad Bank of the Jhansi branch but because of the demand of the agent of that branch which could not be met, he was held not entitled to the loan that he applied for.

I will give a very recent instance. A cheque was drawn on the Calcutta Branch of the United Commercial Bank. When we are discussing the working of the nationalised banks, we are entitled to expect that these banks should really cater to the public needs. That Calcutta cheque of the UCO Bank deposited in Delhi on 5th July, 1971 was encashed in Calcutta on the 29th July, 1971 and the account in Delhi was not credited even till the 2nd August. For four weeks the management of the UCO Bank branch in Delhi does not collect the money from Calcutta. This is the way the Banks are functioning.

As I find the time is not much, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to one other aspect only, which is very important, namely, the *per capita* bank credit which has been made available to my State of West Bengal. I am quoting from official figures—of the Gadgil Study of National Credit Council which is alarming. According to that study, the all-India average of *per capita* credit is Rs. 53.20 as in December, 1967. As against this, in some of the districts of West Bengal the *per capita* credit available has been 10 paise. Maldah—10 paise, Murshidabad—10 paise, 24 Parganas—50 paise, Birbhum—40 paise, Bankura 60 paise, Puralia—70 paise, Midnapur—40 paise and the highest amount is Rs. 21 only for the Burdwan District where a number of collieries are located. I am told that the old position still continues and the *per capita* bank credit available to West Bengal is the lowest in the country.

The other point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister is . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is up

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Please give me one minute more. I am not

going into the withdrawal of Rs. 60 lakhs from the State Bank. I am not going into that because of want of time.

The point that I wanted to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to was whether the Government is really going to consider the nationalisation of the foreign banks because there is really an unfair competition between the nationalised banks and these foreign banks. These foreign banks are allowed to have their branches in this country and they are mopping up a large amount of deposits and they are having the fullest benefit of the foreign exchange transactions while our nationalised banks hardly attract deposits from the foreign nationals in their branches in other countries. I would request the hon. Minister that because it has got a direct bearing on the actual working of the nationalised banks and their future, the question of nationalisation of foreign banks should be taken up seriously.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, because of limitation of time I will not speak on many matters relating to the nationalised banks in detail as I would have liked to. In any case, the nationalised banks have not been working for sufficient time to justify our going very deep at this stage. But one or two matters are certainly worth mentioning which could be attended to.

One is the credit squeeze which has been imposed by them, which affected industries very severely. Why this should be done, I do not know. For this one cannot blame the nationalised banks; it is the policy of the Finance Ministry and of the Reserve Bank. Secondly, as has already been mentioned here, these banks do not now function as efficiently as they were functioning before. For this again, the blame has to be attached to many things which I would not like to go into in detail at this stage.

I would like to confine myself to one matter and that is the withdrawal of Rs. 60 lakhs from the State Bank, because, to my mind, that typifies the working of the nationalised banks, to take it at its lowest, if you like. Why is it that the State Bank of India has not issued a statement indicating how and why this has happened, what has actually happened, etc.? After all, there are depositors and clients to be considered and their anxiety should be allayed regard-

[Shri H. M. Patel]

ing the money deposited with them and the money used in their transactions or business. It is quite evident that whatever has happened has not happened for the first time. This could only have been one of a series of operations of a similar nature. Were it not the case then things would not have happened in the way they happened, namely, telephoning, giving money without obtaining receipts and so on. Be really what intrigues me is this. It is quite clear this money did not come out of the State Bank's safe deposit vault. That has been cleared by the Finance Minister who has, in a letter to Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, made it clear that the money was drawn from the currency chest. Currency chest transactions are perfectly clear. What was withdrawn from the currency chest by the State Bank could only have been done by bringing them into the State Bank accounts. The money in the currency chest is not money; it is not currency in the exact sense. Only when it is taken out it becomes money. The State Bank takes it out. Obviously, when it takes it out, it is for the purpose of putting it in the general till for meeting customers demands; in this case it was handed over to somebody, which makes it clear that it was withdrawn for the purpose of giving it to that somebody, debiting the same account to somebody and crediting it to itself. The question is: Who is this somebody? What was the status of his account? What is the account? What is the account against which this money was paid out? That is still something which has to be known and the Finance Minister ought to explain, because, this is not merely a matter of procedure.

It is quite clear that the money was drawn out from the currency chest because the ordinary till of the State Bank for meeting the day-to-day demands did not have that much money. When this demand came—it came from somebody—and the person making the demand had presumably sufficient credit with the bank or the institution had sufficient credit,—if that person was speaking on behalf of an institution—in terms of money, amounting to at least Rs. 60 lakhs and presumably more. There was a credit in the State Bank, therefore, in respect of this amount in the name of this somebody. When the money came back, it is understandable,—since it was withdrawn improperly—the money would naturally be

held in suspense account till it was returned to the currency chest.

With all these things happening, why is it that the State Bank does not think it necessary to inform the public that this is what has happened? Has it even submitted a report to the Finance Minister or the Reserve Bank, to whomsoever the Bank is supposed regularly to submit reports on its activities?

Consider again this. When anybody wants some special service from a bank, whom does he go to? He would go to the top person. Who is the top person in the local branch of the State Bank? In the Banking Department of the local Head Office it would be the Chief Accountant. Here, they did not go to the Chief Accountant, but they went to the chief cashier. That does not really matter. It may be that the arrangement was that the individual who had account could contact the chief cashier. So, the chief cashier arranges to go to the currency chest. Obviously, he can open it only if accompanied by the chief accountant or one of his assistants. Therefore, it is clearly a transaction of the State Bank. And the State Bank drew that money out in order to pay someone to whose credit the money stood, a considerable amount, even for that bank. This is something therefore for which the Finance Minister himself ought to be most anxious. If these banks are going to function in this way, where moneys can be handed over without a receipt, it would be most unfortunate. It is evident that if moneys can be drawn as a result of instructions given over a telephone. The somebody giving the instructions must be very important indeed, someone whose orders could thus be complied with unquestioningly over the telephone.

Then, again consider this. How was the money handed over? It was handed over somewhere, not in a special place. It must have been handed over only because the person to whom it was handed over produced some credentials. What could those credentials have been? Obviously, some code word or something of that kind. Clearly this was not the first transaction of its kind. It must have been one of a series. We may hope that this is the last because if transactions are permitted in this manner by the nationalised banks, then we would

have to be very sorry indeed for the working of our nationalised banks.

I hope, therefore, that the Finance Minister will be good enough to explain how this kind of transaction came to be permitted by the State Bank and what report it has submitted to the Reserve Bank and to the Government, because this is a public matter now. In what way does it justify its actions, that is to say, the occurrence of this incident? What actions has it taken against its own officers? The Finance Minister is a masterly under-statement said that this was clearly a case of breach of procedures. But this was much more than breach of procedures.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Let me make the position clear. I never said that it was merely a breach of procedures. I remember to have said that the proper procedures were not followed; I did not merely say that it was a case of breach of procedures.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : I stand corrected.

SHRI N. N. PANDEY (Gorakhpur) : This matter is *sub judice* because it is in a court of law. He cannot go into it now.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : I do not think that what I am saying can ever affect anything that is to take place in a court of law. I am confining myself only to the working of the bank and the bank's procedures.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : The procedures of the bank have to be discussed.

SHRI N. N. PANDEY : On a point of order. Points of facts in the case which is under active investigation of the court are being mentioned by the hon. Member. I want to know what facts he wants to give. I submit that this is a *sub judice* matter.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : The court is not expected to pronounce its verdict on the rules and regulations which have been breached. Here, what we are asking is why all these rules and regulations were breached, and what action has been

taken. How does it attract the *sub judice* rule?

SHRI N. N. PANDEY : I raised on a point of order that a matter which is *sub judice* cannot be the subject matter of discussion in this House. But what the hon. Member has said relates to a matter which is before a court. I want your specific ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I agree with the point of order.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : Before you agree, may I make a submission?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Those persons against whom he is speaking are under prosecution.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : The rules are not under prosecution.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This has been the practice in this House that if there is a case pending in a court, it cannot be referred to here.

SHRI N. N. PANDEY : I request that, that portion of the speech in which he made this reference be expunged.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH (Hoshiarpur) : Otherwise, the case will be prejudiced.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will look into it.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : This is not correct. I have not referred to any individual. I have only referred to the working of the State Bank, the manner in which it functions, in what way moneys can be drawn out from the currency chest, under what circumstances a person can go to the currency vaults, what happens when he draws out the money. I think the Finance Minister is fully aware of this. This is not in the least concerned with any case pending in a court. It is the procedure of the State Bank when an amount of this magnitude is withdrawn that is being discussed.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : There are precedents.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): You have already decided the point of order. How can they challenge your decision.

SHRI H. M. PATFL: When money is taken out, it must be debited to some account. It has nothing to do with any case pending in a court.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given my decision.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What decision?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He should confine himself to the functioning of the Bank and nothing else.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I am speaking on the way in which the Bank functions. It is a nationalised bank. Is it not a subject which can be considered here? If this Bank does not carry out its transactions in a manner which will generate confidence in the public, is it not something I must discuss here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given my decision.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We will discuss this ruling to some extent because it lays down certain ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I will not allow my ruling to be discussed.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: How can you prevent me from examining the functioning of the Bank? What exactly do you object to?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am objecting to this portion. There are some persons who are being prosecuted in a case. Since it is before the court, it cannot be referred to.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: You have already given a decision. You need not give reasons.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What is the aspect to which you object?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: For future guidance, we want a clarification. I

am not asking what is the reasoning behind your ruling. I only want to make a submission. If in a particular discussion, no individuals are involved and general matters of procedure are being debated, can there be a ruling preventing it?

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: Why not?

16.35 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was speaking about the way in which the State Bank functions, and indicated the procedure in such circumstances, what kind of procedure one would have expected the State Bank to have adopted (*Interruption*).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Instances will have to be quoted. Incidents have taken place.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is *sub judice*.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: If a large amount is to be drawn from the bank such as the State Bank which has a currency chest—a currency chest is not held by every bank but it is because the State Bank functions as a treasury, it also has a currency chest—if a large enough amount is asked of that bank, it is wanted either for the State Bank's own business or for giving it against somebody's demand. And if there is not enough money in the till, the State Bank would draw it from the currency chest following the procedure which is well known and well laid down. When that money is drawn, then it is drawn either for the State Bank's own requirements or, if it is against anybody's demand, against—

SHRI N. N. PANDEY: Sir, on a point of order. The Chair's ruling has already been given, and this particular case which is under the active consideration of some court, is being referred to. And then it is being repeated. The working of the nationalised banks is alone the subject matter of this discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: I am quite aware of the proceedings. Of course, when we

decided to take up this subject for discussion, all of us made it a point that we will not touch upon those matters which may somehow or other influence the proceedings elsewhere. But I am very cautious about it, and whenever one trespasses, my attention would be invited to it, but we cannot be too touchy over small things.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : He is not doing that at all. Why should the same thing be raised again and again ?

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please. He is quite a senior Member.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : My purpose at the moment—I will be very brief—is that this withdrawal of this amount could only have been for giving a certain amount to somebody—and in this case we know it was so handed over. Therefore, it must have been debited to the account of that somebody, and all one ought to know is what that account is. From the point of view of the State Bank, I would be anxious to see that proper procedures are followed. There should have been even a public statement to say what exactly happened and why it need not cause any anxiety in the mind of the general public, because the withdrawal of large sums of money and handing them over without compliance with proper procedures—which has happened in this case—must naturally cause anxiety—

MR. SPEAKER : May I request him to proceed in a general way and not to specify it like that...*(Interruption)*.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : I am endeavouring to keep it as general as possible.

MR. SPEAKER : You were going to refer to a particular case.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : I will put it just this way...*(Interruption)*.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : We have discussed so many cases and we have not found the discussion restricted in this manner. You should be more zealous of the rights of members. We are careful not to say anything which will prejudice the administration of justice.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : If I may conti-

nue and complete, it is really necessary that the State Bank should be called upon to issue a public statement explaining the way in which such operations take place. The State Bank should indicate clearly that it does not under any circumstances cater to demands on the telephone, that save under written instructions it does not hand over moneys and that too only after obtaining proper receipts in the proper form. These are things which it ought to say. If it has happened in any case at all, it must say that it was an exception and that adequate disciplinary action has been taken in the matter. Surely such a thing is necessary. I think all hon. members will agree that this is in public interest. There can be no objection to this. Departing from normal procedures under any circumstances whatsoever should not be permissible in an institution such as the Bank, which lives on credit, which lives on the confidence it inspires. Once that is broken, it can create very great harm indeed. It is for that reason that I have emphasised only the procedural aspect and said that it has been gravely departed from in a manner which is not explicable. It becomes a matter of much more interest and importance if a series of cases is involved, but we hope this is only an isolated case.

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा (जयनगर) : अध्यक्ष जी, सभी जिन बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो चुका है उनके कार्य कलापों के बारे में हम लोग बहस कर रहे हैं। इसमें मैं इस बात की ओर खास कर वित्त मन्त्री जी और सदन का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि जो बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ उसमें जो प्राचार्य थी, जिन बानों की आवश्यकता है बैंकों से, उसकी पूर्ति नहीं हो पा रही है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण एक अच्छा कदम हुआ, कुछ प्रगति भी सभी बानों में हुई है, और वह स्वागत की चीज है। लेकिन वह इतनी नगण्य है, आवश्यकता के मुताबिक कम है, सम्भावना के मुताबिक भी इतना कम है, कि जिस से निराशा और असंतोष बड़े पैमाने पर फैल रहा है।

पहली बात यह है कि जिन बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ और जो 50 करोड़ की

[श्री भोगेन्द्र झा]

सीमा तय की गयी, विदेशी बैंकों को छोड़ा गया, तो क्या वक्त नहीं आ गया है कि सभी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिया जाय। विदेशी बैंकों के मुकाबले में हमारे देशी बैंक, जिन का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ है वह भी कुछ माने में नुकसानदेह स्थिति में पड़ जाते हैं। ऐसी हालत में मैं वित्त मन्त्री जी से कहूंगा कि वह साहस को और जो रोक बचे है, विदेशी बैंकों सहित, उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण कर ले।

जिन बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ है उन की नीतियों के बारे में कुछ परिवर्तन करना चाहिये। यदा कदा ऐलान होता रहा है वित्त मन्त्री महोदय की तरफ से, रिजर्व बैंक की तरफ से, प्रबन्धकों की बैठकों के जरिये, लेकिन उन ऐलानों के बारे में जो कदम उठाया गया है वह नगण्य है। जो खास मकसद था कि देश के पिछड़े इलाकों में ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में ज्यादा शाखाएँ खोली जायें प्रगति के रास्ते पर उनको लाने के लिये, वह उत्साहवर्द्धक नहीं है। बड़े गर्व के साथ सरकार की ओर से कहा जा रहा है कि इस साल फरवरी, तक 3200 शाखाएँ देहातों में खुली हैं, जिन में "लगभग साढ़े 65 प्रतिशत 10,000 से कम आबादी वाले क्षेत्रों में खुली हैं, और 35 प्रतिशत 10'000 से अधिक आबादी वाले क्षेत्रों में खुली हैं, तो इसमें कोई गर्व की बात नहीं है। क्योंकि 10,000 से अधिक आबादी वाले इलाकों में एक तिहाई बैंक शाखाएँ खुलती हैं और बाकी सारे देश में दो तिहाई खुलती हैं तो उनका जो पिछला पिछड़ाव है वह तो पूरा नहीं होगा। आगे के लिये भी हमारे देश का बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा पिछड़ा बना रहेगा। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार अभी इस बात का निर्णय करे कि देश में जो विकास खंड हैं, जो बिक्री, विकास सिंचाई और छोटे-मोटे ग्रामीण कार्यों के लिये केन्द्र बन चुके हैं, उन प्रत्येक विकास खंडों में इस वित्त वर्ष के अन्त तक निश्चित रूप से एक-एक शाखा खोल दी

जाएगी! वहां अगर एक बैंक की शाखा खोल दी जाती है सारे देश भर में तो अच्छा होगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बीज को इस वित्त वर्ष के अन्त तक पूरा किया जाय। अभी स्थिति सारे देश के पंमाने पर बहुत ही असन्तोषजनक है।

पिछली बार एक सवाल के जवाब में बताया गया था कि अभी भी सारे देश में एक बैंक की शाखा के ऊपर 17,000 की आबादी पड़ती है, पूरे शहर और देहात को मिलाकर। इसको कम करने की जरूरत है। इसको 25,000 तक ला सके तो अति उत्तम होगा ताकि लोगों को कर्जा लेने में और पैसा जमा करने में सहूलियत हो।

अभी आसाम और बंगाल का जिक्र हो चुका है। मैं आपके सामने बिहार की बात रखता हूँ। जहाँ सारे देश में 47,000 की आबादी पर एक बैंक की शाखा होती है, वहाँ बिहार में एक लाख 35 हजार है। तो यह लगभग चार गुना फर्क है। जहाँ इतना पिछड़ापन है, और उसमें भी उत्तर बिहार में जैसे दरभंगा में 2 लाख 29 हजार की आबादी पर एक बैंक की शाखा पड़ती है, सारन में 2 लाख 62 हजार है और मुजफ्फरपुर में 1 लाख 84 हजार की आबादी पर एक बैंक की शाखा पड़ती है। ये मार्च 1971 तक के आँकड़े हैं। तो इस पिछड़ेपन को दूर करने के लिये, खास कर पिछड़े इलाकों में ज्यादा प्रयास की आवश्यकता है। जो प्रयास जरूरत के मुकाबले में नहीं हो रहा है।

इसी तरह जो समाज का पिछड़ा तबका है, जो अभी तक दबा हुआ रहा है, आज उनको जहाँ तक कर्ज देने का मामला है, उसमें बहुत ही नगण्य प्रयास हुआ है। पिछले साल जून के अन्त में प्रबन्धकों की बैठक में ऐलान हुआ कि प्रीफेरेन्शियल रेट आफ इंटेरेस्ट लागू किया जायगा, वामी भी बहुत कम सम्पत्ति वाले

श्रावणी हैं वे अग़र किसी उत्पादक कार्य के लिये कर्जा लेते हैं तो बैंक से कम दर पर कर्जा मिलेगा, और ऊपर के लोगों के लिये ज्यादा दर कायम रहेगी। इस साल से ज्यादा हो गयी है। मैंने जानने का प्रयास किया है, अभी तक सरकार ने उसको लागू नहीं किया है। वित्त मंत्री खुद इस बात को कह चुके हैं, हमलिये मैं चाहूँगा कि वह ऐलान करे कि वह प्रिफ़ेरेन्शियल रेट आफ इन्टरेस्ट लागू करने जा रहे हैं उन लोगों के लिये जिनकी आर्थिक स्थिति बहुत ही खराब है, देहात में भी और शहर में भी।

दूसी तरह से हमारी कृषि पिछड़ी हुई है। अगर उसके बावजूद भी राष्ट्रीय आय का लगभग आधा कृषि में आता है। वंसी स्थिति में क्या समय नहीं है कि जिन बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो चुका है उन बैंकों का आधा कर्जा कृषि क्षेत्र में जाय। अभी उसका बहुत ही नगण्य हिस्सा कृषि में जा रहा है। इसलिये मैं आग्रह करूँगा कि इस बात को वित्त मंत्री विचारें। इसमें हिम्मत करने की जरूरत है। जो देहात का पिछड़ापन है, उसको दूर करने के लिये कुछ करने की जरूरत है। हममें हमारे उद्योगों के लिये देश में फीलता हुआ बाजार मिलेगा फ़ाय शक्ति बढ़ेगी और तभी वह बढ़ाव भी समन्वित रूप से सम्भव हो सकेगा।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे (राजनदगाव) : पहले तो 2 परसेंट इन्वेन्टमेंट ही था। अब ज्यादा है।

श्री भोगेन्द्र भ्वा : क्या 2 परसेंट का मुकाबला ही हम करेंगे। मैं यह मुकाबला नहीं करना चाहता। क्या इसीलिये हमने राष्ट्रीयकरण किया था ? इसको ज्यादा होना चाहिये था अब तो बहुत कम है, नगण्य है। अभी भी जिन लोगों को कर्जा मिल रहा है वह देहातों में काफी ऊपर का तबका है। जो व्यापारी हैं, जिनके पास कोरी का रुपया है जिनमें बड़े-बड़े फार्म खोल रखे हैं, उनको ही कर्जा मिलता है। चाय बागान के लिये जो

कर्जा होता है वह भी इसमें ही गिना जाता है। चाय बागान वाले खेतीहर नहीं हैं, मामूली किसान नहीं हैं। इसलिये हम आकार के भुलावे में न आये। जहाँ तक वास्तव में खेती करने वाले किसान का मवाल है वह अभी भी उपेक्षित है। एक प्रतिगन कर्जा भी उनके पास नहीं जा रहा है।

इसके अतिरिक्त कुछ ग्राम आवश्यकतायें हमारे देश की हैं। राजस्थान गहर है, गढ़क नहर है और बड़ी योजनायें हैं, जो पैसे के अभाव में पड़ी हैं जिनके कारण देश का कृषि उत्पादन पिछड़ा हुआ है। मैंने इस साल कई बार प्रयास किया, लेकिन चार महीने के अन्दर बार-बार जवाब आया, कई तरह से बहस उठाई गई, लेकिन सब बार जवाब आया कि राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंकों में या दूसरे बैंकों से इन योजनाओं के लिये कर्जा नहीं दिया जायेगा।

पिछली बार सिंचाई मन्त्री ने यहाँ जवाब दिया था कि विभाग सरकार ने गंडक के लिये और राजस्थान सरकार ने राजस्थान नहर के लिये बैंक से कर्जा मांगा ही नहीं। इस पर मैंने दोनों सरकारों को पत्र लिखे। विभाग के सिंचाई मन्त्री केदार पांडे का मेरे पास पत्र आ गया है। उसमें लिखा है कि इस बीच यहाँ और केन्द्रीय सरकार से पूछ-नाछ करने में पता चला कि बैंकों से राज्य सरकार या राज्य राज्य सरकार के किसी विभाग को इस तरह के काम के लिये कोई कर्ज हासिल नहीं हो सकता। यह उन के पत्र का जवाब है। ऐसी अवस्था में नागरवाला केस के बारे में श्री मोदी कह रहे थे हम सब जानते हैं कि उस काण्ड पर ध्यान दिया गया है लेकिन हमें शक है कि सारी कार्यवाही नहीं हो रही है, नहीं तो ज्यादा लोग इस गिरोह में होने चाहिये थे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हजारों ऐसे नागरवाला हैं जो बैंकों से रुपया खा रहे हैं, राष्ट्रीयकरण होने के बाद भी खा रहे हैं। ऐसे नागरवाला श्री मोदी की जमात में हैं जो टेलीफोन पर रुपया पा जाते हैं।

[श्री शोभेन्द्र भा]

में चाहता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय हिम्मत करके मासूम करे कि कैसे दो मिनट में इतना-इतना रुपया ले कर लोग चले जाते हैं जब कि शहर और देहात के ग्राम लोग छः-छ महीने, साल-साल तक परेशान होते हैं लेकिन उनको कर्जा नहीं मिल पाता है। यह पूरे नागरवालों की जमात है जिनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही करने के लिये हमारी नीति बदलने का सवाल है, बैंकों के कड़े नियम बनाने का सवाल है।

एक बात की ओर मैं अवश्य ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक कर्ज में घूमखोरी का मामला है, जितने परिमाण में कर्जा बढ़ेगा उतने ही परिमाण में घूमखोरी बढ़ेगी। मैं यह यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि पहले लोग घूम नहीं लेते थे। वह पहले भी लेते थे लेकिन पहले वह बाहर नहीं आती थी। अब चूँकि मध्यम और नीचे के लोगों को भी घूस देना पड़ता है इसलिये वह बड़े पैमाने पर फँस गई है। इसका कारण यह है कि कोई भ्रष्टाचार निश्चित नहीं है कि जो भ्रष्टाचार करेगा उसको इनमें भ्रष्टाचार के अंदर भुगतान कर दिया जायेगा। इसलिये मेरा आग्रह है कि आप यह नियम बना लें कि जब भ्रष्टाचार भ्राये उसके दो महीने के अंदर कर्ज का भुगतान कर दिया जाये। अगर वह नहीं किया जायेगा तो उसका इलाज करने का हम प्रयास करेंगे, लेकिन भ्रष्टाचार निश्चित हो जाने पर लोग निश्चित हो जायेंगे कि उनको बेकार में दौड़ना नहीं पड़ेगा और लोगों को घूस नहीं देना होगा।

सारे देश में जो बैंक कर्मचारियों से सम्भोता हुआ था उसमें कहा गया था कि प्रबन्ध में बैंक कर्मचारियों को लिया जाये। मैं आप के जरिये यह आग्रह करूँगा वित्त मंत्री से कि चुनाव के जरिये युक्त मतदान द्वारा समिति में लोग लिये जायें, जिससे स्थिति बेहतर हो

होगी और कम से कम लोगों की शिवायन खरम हो जायेगी।

एक शिक्षाव्यत की बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। कुछ नये लोगों को बैंकों के लिये नियुक्त किया गया था। उसमें ट्रेनिंग हुई थी। प्रशिक्षण के बाद उसमें से लगभग दो हजार लोगों को निकाल दिया गया था। इस बिना पर कि उन्होंने 15-17 या 19 दिन काम किया है। मैं चाहूँगा कि वित्त मंत्री इस बात को जांचे कि जो लोग प्रशिक्षण पा चुके हैं, इस प्रकार उन्हें छोटे जाने में क्या गलती हुई है और उनको फिर से नौकरी में लेने का प्रयास करे।

*SHRI THA KIRUTTINAN (Shivaganja): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy that the working of 14 nationalised banks is being discussed in this august House and I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in the debate and to say a few words.

The hon. Members, who preceded me, have pointed out the drawbacks and the deficiencies in the working of these 14 nationalised banks during the period of two years after nationalisation. I would request the hon. Finance Minister not to threaten them as mere criticisms but to give life to them by formulating effective measures for the purpose of improving the working of these 14 nationalised banks.

While inaugurating a branch of a private bank, Sri Madhavan, the hon. Minister of Industries of Tamil Nadu, made a pertinent reference to the way in which these nationalised banks have been functioning and how they have not come up to the expectations of people. He regretfully referred to the fact that these banks have not come to the rescue of small farmers and small scale industrialists of Tamil Nadu as was anticipated at the time of nationalisation. The purpose of nationalising these banks has been completely defeated and the hopes and aspirations of small farmers and small industrialists have not so far been realised. I would like to apprise the hon. Finance Minister of the

appalling failure of the nationalised banks in fulfilling the expectations of the people.

Many hon Members have no doubt made many worthwhile suggestions for bringing about the much-needed improvement in the working of these banks. But, we would be well-advised to go into the basic cause for this malady. The Managing Directors, under whose unbridled sway the banks functioned before nationalisation, are continuing to be in charge of the nationalised banks in the colourful name of custodians. The nationalisation has brought in a change in the ownership and in the name of Managing Directors. But the pre-nationalisation banking policy continues to be the main plank of the working of Banks and its execution also is under the charge of the very same top people who are now known as Custodians. I do not question their administrative talent and capacity, but I do question that they are being allowed to operate the same old policy detrimental to the interests of common people. Under such circumstances, how do you expect the nationalised banks to function for the progress and welfare of the weaker sections of the society?

It should be obvious to everyone that the root cause for the inefficient working of these banks and their failure to serve the social objectives for which they were nationalised lies nowhere else except in the top echelons who continue to be entrenched in perpetuating the old banking policy. You are, aware, Sir that crores of rupees have been entrusted to be administered by these people. If a man finds himself to be free for managing millions of rupees, naturally he gets inebriated with autocratic inclinations. He feels, rightly so, that what he decides in the matter of administering such huge funds is beyond reproach and he is least bothered whether the objectives of nationalisation have been served or not by his actions.

Whether it is the Congress Party or other parties like the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam wedded to social welfare policies, all the progressive political parties advocated nationalisation of banks because they sincerely believed that the vast bulk of deposits in such banks should not go to serve only 75 monopoly houses and the handful of millionaire families. These banks were nationalised with the noble objective of utilising the crores of rupees

for the social and economic progress of poor people, middleclass people, agricultural families and small scale industrialists, striving hard to stay alive. This progressive step resulted in a revolutionary split in the Congress Party and even led to the premature dissolution of Lok Sabha. It is highly regrettable that after all this fanfare the nationalisation of 14 major banks has not yielded the desired results. It should not be beyond the competence and talent of our energetic Finance Minister to ensure effective functioning of the nationalised banks

17.00 hrs.

I would humbly suggest that a Board should be constituted to prevent the peremptory exercise of power by the top management. In fact there should be regional boards to guide and supervise the activities of the nationalised banks in different regions of the country. I am pained to see that corruption and malpractices are widely rampant from top to bottom in these banks in distributing credit facilities. Bribes are offered and taken in broad daylight if a loan is got to be sanctioned. The favourites and the family members of the top management have the field day in availing themselves of the credit facilities. As an instance, in Tamil Nadu, the management of Indian Bank unreservedly advanced lakhs of rupees to a family member for the purpose of constructing a hotel. It did not end there. It was ordered that the Bank Officers selected for re-orientation training at Madras should stay only at this hotel and thus the proprietor of the hotel was enabled to pay back the advance to the bank from the earnings he had from the Bank Officers. If the Government want to put an end to such malpractices, the State Governments also should be associated with the Boards that I have suggested earlier. I would also urge that the labour representation should be taken on the Boards.

Now, I would briefly refer to the recruitment policy of these nationalised banks. More than 20000 persons have been recruited by these banks. I do not know whether there is any sound recruitment policy for these banks. I would like the hon. Minister to clarify this point. In the matter of recruitment to Central Government services,

[Shri Tha Kiruttinan]

there is reservation for candidates belonging to scheduled castes and other backward classes. I wonder whether these banks have any such rules in the matter of recruitment. I would appeal to the hon. Finance Minister that he should initiate immediate steps in the matter of framing recruitment rules for these banks, to ensure adequate reservation for scheduled castes and other backward classes

It is common knowledge that huge sums of money running into many thousands have been advanced to the high officials of these banks for the purchase of conveyance and for the construction of costly mansions. The advances are also recovered in easy instalments. In addition, the banks provide cars and bungalows to these top officials. If the Government want to mobilise enough resources for the purpose of implementing social welfare programmes, then this kind of extravagance on the part of nationalised banks must be ended forthwith.

With these words, I conclude

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) :
बैंको का राष्ट्रीयकरण होने के बाद गावों में एक आशा जगी थी। आशा यह जगी थी कि छोटे किसानों को पैसा कम सूद पर और जल्दी मिल जाया करेगा। किन्तु दो साल का तजुर्बा यही बताता है कि गाव वाला तो मारा मारा भटकता रहा और नागरवाला फौन करके पैसा ले जाता है। यह जो नगरी और गावों में खाई थी इसको मिटाने के बजाय राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंको ने भी आखिर प्रेफेस नगर वालों को ही देना जारी रखा। इसके ऊपर आपको विचार करना पड़ेगा। यह बड़ी गम्भीर बात है।

हम समझते रहे हैं कि सरकार जो भी चीज अपने हाथ में लेती है, उसका उद्देश्य, उसका हेतु हमेशा अच्छा होता है। छोटे उद्योग वाले को पैसा मिले, छोटे किसान को पैसा मिले, कुम्हां खोदने के लिए काश्तकार को पैसा मिले, कोई काम या उद्योग धंघा खड़ा करने के लिए पैसा मिले और वह यह सोचे कि कोई भुक्त को पैसा लेने से रोक नहीं सकता है, ऐसी भावना

लोगों के दिलों में पैदा होनी चाहिये थी। सबाल यह है।

Whether that policy has been honestly implemented to the lowest levels?

हम दो साल का तजुर्बा देखते हैं तो पता चलता है कि बैंकों में कोई खास बदल नहीं हुआ है। शुरू-शुरू में इसका प्रचार तो बड़ा किया गया कि साइकल वाले, रिक्शा वाले, तागे वाले, टैक्सी वाले, ठेले वाले को पैसा मिलेगा किन्तु आज किसी को जा कर आप पूछ लें वह यही कहता हुआ आपको मिलेगा कि नहीं मिलता है। आखिर यह क्यों हुआ है? क्यों नहीं मिलता है।

मेरे मित्रों ने सबाल उठाया है अगर कोई बहा में पैसा मागने जाता है तो उससे सिम्बोरिटी मांगी जाती है। क्या सरकार का हेतु यह था? जो आदमी गरीब है वह किस तरह से सिम्बोरिटी दे सकता है। जब आप प्रापर्टी राइट ही खत्म करने जा रहे हैं तो

How can you demand property for security?

भारत के अन्दर टेलेट की कमी नहीं है, ब्रॉन की कमी नहीं है। लेकिन फिर भी ब्रॉन ब्रॉन होता है, टेलेट ब्रॉन होता है। टेलेट बहुत बाहर जा रहा है। इसका क्या कारण है? कारण यह है कि यहाँ स्कोप नहीं है। बैंको के अन्दर कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था रहे कि अगर कोई टेलेंटिड आदमी अपना ब्ल्यू प्रिंट ले कर आता है या छोटा-मोटा उद्योग धंघा खड़ा करना चाहता है और बैंकों को पता चलता है कि यह आदमी टेलेंटिड है, उद्योग खड़ा कर सकता है, उसको यदि पैसा दिया जाएगा तो वह देश के हित में होगा, उद्योग का विकास होगा, देश का भला होगा तो उसको पैसा दिया जाए। ऐसी व्यवस्था न होने की वजह से जो पुराना महाजन करता था वही यह नया महाजन करता है। यह भी उसकी तरह से सिम्बोरिटी मांगता है। जिस के पास सिम्बोरिटी नहीं है और कैबल

मुद्रि है और वही उसकी पूजी, वह क्या करेगा, इसका ये बैंक अभी तक कोई हल नहीं निकाल सके हैं।

जो कर्मचारी है उन में आपस में जो असन्तोष की बात थी यह भी कम नहीं हुई है। दिल्ली के स्टेट बैंक के प्रदर पदोन्नतियों को ले कर या नीचे के पदों पर लाने की बात को ले कर अब भी असन्तोष बना हुआ है। जिनके पास क्वालीफिकेशन नहीं थी, जो परीक्षा में पास नहीं हुए थे ऐसे लोगों को भी पदोन्नतियां दे कर कर्मचारियों के अन्दर असन्तोष बढ़ाया गया है। जिनको सन्तोष चाहिये, उनको सन्तोष भी नहीं मिला है। जो काम करने है, जिन के महयोग और सहकार के बलबूते पर यह बैंक अपना साग कारोबार चलाते है उनके मन में भी इतना असन्तोष रहा तो आखिर जो काम है वह किस तरह स ठीक हो सकेगा ? इसके ऊपर भी ध्यान देना बहुत आवश्यक है।

पुराने जितन बैंक थे उन में घपले होते थे, घोटाले होते थे, पैसा का ठीक उपयोग नहीं होता था, राष्ट्रीय कामों में पैसा नहीं लगता है, इस बास्ते सरकार ने बैंकों को अपने हाथ में लिया। किन्तु मुझ को लगता है कि यह उलटा विधान हुआ है। पहले अगर लड़के को कोई बाप गोद लेता था तो लड़का बाप को सूटता था। लेकिन अब बाप न बच्चे को गोद में लिया और बाप ने लड़के को लूटना शुरू कर दिया। यह जो बात हो रही है, यह समझ में नहीं आती है। अभी कई वकील मित्रों ने एक बात कही है। यह कहा है कि मेटर सब जुड़िस है। मैं ला नहीं जाता हूँ। मैं बैचलर इन ला नहीं हूँ। फादर इन ला तो हो ही नहीं सकता हूँ। मैं ले मैन की तरह पृच्छना चाहता हूँ। अभी जो कांड हुआ है उससे सामान्य आदमियों के मन पर बैंकों के व्यवहार के बारे में क्या विश्वास की भावना पैदा होगी ? क्या वे चाहते कि हम बैंकों के अन्दर

पैसा रखें ? क्या वे समझेंगे कि यह पैसा देश के हित में इस्तेमाल होगा ? क्या इस तरह का विश्वास इस कांड में पनपा है ? हमारे अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने एक बात कही थी। उन्होंने कहा था कि अहमदाबाद बैंक में भी एक ऐसा ही घपला हुआ है। उन्होंने स्वयं वित्त मंत्री को इसके बारे में पत्र लिखा। अपने पत्र में उन्होंने कहा कि 0 लाख का यह घपला है। वित्त मंत्री ने अपने जवाब में कहा कि 80 लाख का नहीं, 42 लाख का है। यहा तो लाखों में बात होती है...

वित्त मंत्री (श्री यशवन्त राव बख्खारण) .
लेकिन नेशनलाइजेशन के पहले का है।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी इसका मतलब है पहले भी घपले और बाद में भी घपले, तो अन्तर क्या हुआ ? कोई अन्तर तो हुआ नहीं। नेशनलाइजेशन के बाद अन्तर तो कुछ होना चाहिये था। इसलिए मैं पूछ रहा हूँ। आखिर इनने बड़े भारी घपले में जिस में एक बड़े व्यक्ति का नाम भी घसीटा गया था, एक ही दिन के अन्दर यह मामला समाप्त कर दिया गया। मतलब यह कि उसकी जो पूरी छानबीन और जांच होनी थी, वह नहीं हुई। अभी मैं जेल में था। नागरवाला मेरे साथ था। काफी बातें हुईं। सब मैं सुनाना नहीं चाहता। एक वाक्य जो बड़ा अर्थपूर्ण है, वह सुना देता हूँ। उन्होंने यह कहा

Why do you want to take the bull by its tail and not by its horns ?

इसका मतलब क्या है, मुझे पता नहीं। एक दिन के अन्दर न्यायालय में भी उसकी पूरी जांच न हो और इस सदन के अन्दर भी उसके बारे में पूरा विचार न हो तो आखिर

Is it not a form of a totalitarian regime where we cannot discuss this ?

न्यायालय में भी सुपरेसानिक स्पीड में मामला खत्म हो जाता है। बहा भी पता नहीं अथवा है। नागरवाला यही कहता है कि ज्यादाती हुई

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

है। उनका जो कनफेशन था वह प्रौर पुलिस का कनफेशन अलग है। इसका क्या पता कि पुलिस ने क्या कहा प्रौर इन्होंने क्या बताया। यह पब्लिक ट्रायल नहीं था। बड़ा क्या हुआ हमें मालूम नहीं। अगर इस सदन में भी सब बुद्धिस का हवाला दे कर हमारा मुह बन्द किया जाये, तो यह उचित नहीं है। It may have happened in the old days when Parliament was not considered to be supreme than the Supreme Court. But now we have established that Parliament is supreme than the Supreme Court.

जब हम सर्वोच्च है प्रौर यह मामला एक राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक में सव्य रखता है, तो हमें उसके बारे में पूरी जानकारी मिलनी चाहिए। मेरा भी स्टेट बैंक में एकाउंट है प्रौर इसलिए एक डिपॉजिटर के नाते मेरा यह अधिकार है कि मुझे इस विषय में सब जानकारी दी जाये। मैं कानून की बारीकियों में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन जय इतना बड़ा घपला हो जाता है, तो सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि वह सदन को इस बारे में पूरी जानकारी दे। जैसा कि बिद्वान सदस्य, श्री एच० एम० पटेल, ने कहा है, इस सदन को यह जानकारी दी जानी चाहिए कि नागरवाला को जो रुपया दिया गया वह किम व्यक्ति के एकाउंट से दिया गया प्रौर उम समय उस एकाउंट में कितनी राशि थी, आदि। अगर यह सब जानकारी दे दी जानी, तो माननीय सदस्यो प्रौर जनता के मन में इस प्रकार के सन्देह पैदा न होते। लेकिन जब इस मामले में हश-हश की नीति अपनाई जाती है, तो कई प्रकार के सवाल उठाये जाते हैं। सब से ज्यादा इन्ट्रीनिंग प्रौर मिसटीरियस बान यह है कि इतना बड़ा घपला होने के बाद भी उसके बारे में पूरी जांच नहीं की गई। आखिर एक ही दिन में उस मामले का फैसला क्यों कर दिया गया? मान लीजिए कि नागरवाला ने रुपया

बेने के लिए टेलीफोन किया, तो वह बोधी क्यों है? बोधी तो वे लोग हैं, जिन्होंने रुपया दिया। अगर कोई व्यक्ति किसी के घर के सामने कुछ मागत है। प्रौर घर का मालिका उस को वह दे देता है, तो बोधी मांगने वाला नहीं है, बल्कि बोधी वह है, जो उसको दे देता है। यदि इस बारे में सारी जानकारी लोगो के सामने आ जाती, तो उनको विश्वास हो जाता कि सरकार द्वारा बैंकों को अपने हाथ में लेने के बाद उन के पैसे का उपयोग देश के कामो के लिए, छोटे उद्योगो प्रौर किमानो के लिए होगा।

जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, एक आदमी टेलिन्टिड है, उसकी बुद्धि है, लेकिन उसके पास पूजा नहीं है, यदि ऐसे आदमी को भी बैंको से ऋण देन के बारे में कुछ व्यवस्था की जाये, तो देश में बैंको का उपयोग खूब होगा।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur). On 19 July, 1969 when Government took the decision of nationalising 14 banks with deposits not less than Rs 50 crores, there were certain objectives that were formulated to bring about the nationalisation of commercial banks. One of the objective was to ensure rapid development of banking facilities in the rural and other neglected areas. The second was to ensure a more effective mobilisation of the deposits and the third was to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of these sections of society which had not received their due share in the benefits of economic growth and whose share in the institutional finance had been negligible.

I would like to remind the hon. Minister that an amendment was moved and accepted which sought to introduce the principle of workers' participation in the management of nationalised banks.

It is now worthwhile to examine whether the present functioning of the nationalised banks conforms to the objectives which were formulated when the nationalisation of these banks took place.

First is the problem of deposit growth. Those who wanted the *status quo*, criticised

nationalisation, saying that nationalisation will inevitably mean less incentive for more deposits and therefore deposit mobilisation will suffer. Statistical facts indicate that after nationalisation of the banks there has been a growth of deposits. Of course, it is not commensurate with the general development of the resources, but it is a fact that the scare that was created that immediately after nationalisation mobilisation of deposits would suffer has not come out to be true.

On the last Friday of May 19, 1971, the aggregate deposits were Rs. 5101.1 crores. These are Rs. 773.9 crores more or 17.9% more than those in the previous year. With a bold and imaginative approach and effort towards deposit mobilisation growth of deposits would have been still more.

There have been branch expansion programmes. Before nationalisation there was one banking office for every 65,000 persons. The statistics show that after nationalisation there is one bank office for 47,000 people. There is therefore some progress, but I find that though apparently there is progress, there is a lot of regional disparity as for as the banking industry is concerned and that regional disparity can be borne out on the basis of the facts provided by Government themselves. That is another point that has to be taken note of.

The growth is no doubt quantitative, but there is no qualitative change. The question can be posed: Is there any effective functioning of the nationalised banks? Here, I would like to make a reference to one point which has been very sharply brought out by a group of professors from the Allahabad University. They studied very carefully the working of the public corporations in the country and at the close of the book they have drawn their inference and they say that as regards many of the persons who are managing the public sector, there is a paradox that they function with the mentality of the private sector. This paradox continues, and as a result we find that a number of officers are put in the charge of various banks, but their mentality is still not in tune with the public sector.

Let me refer to workers' participation also. A procedural wrangling is going on still. The nationalisation of banks has taken place, and there are various schemes which have been put forward by the trade unions, but still Government have not been able to

resolve them amicably. Therefore, the principle of workers' participation in the banks only remains on paper, as a result the workers do not feel the sense of participations which they should have as far as the nationalised bank are concerned.

Now, I would say a word about the norms of credit-worthiness. We were repeatedly told that one of the social motivations of nationalisation of banks was that the traditional norms with credit-worthiness should be changed. I do concede that the norms are being changed but there is still room for a radical revision of the norms. If you just go round and meet sections of the peasantry and the backward sections of small industries, you will always find that even the revision of the norms of credit-worthiness that has been introduced has not been adequate enough to see that adequate credit facilities could be made available to the backward sections of the community.

Then, there is the Credit Guarantee Corporation of India. The Government of India set up this corporation to cover the risk of banks against individuals borrowing in neglected sectors; we find, however, that due to corrupt practices and inefficiency of functioning, adequate results have not been produced at all. I would like the Finance Minister to give us the facts as to how much has been done in this sphere.

Now, I would say a word about differential rates of interest. Under the chairmanship of a very eminent economist Dr. Hazare, a committee had been set up as early as September, 1970 to recommend a scale of differential interest rates for helping the small borrowers and the weaker sections. The report has already been submitted. But we would like to know from the Finance Minister what concrete steps are being taken to see that there is speedy implementation of the fine report that has been prepared by Dr. Hazare.

Now, I shall say a word about corruption. There is so much of corruption in these nationalised banks. Only the agency has changed. I can quote a number of instances from my own constituency where a number of peasants have had to give considerable amount of bribes in order to get loans. I have those instances with me, and I do not want to spell them out in detail here. I am prepared to hand the name over

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

to the Finance Minister. I have found, for instance, that if a loan of Rs. 5000 is to be extracted from the nationalised bank, then there are peasants who have been required to give bribe to the tune of Rs. 1000 to Rs. 1500. That is what is happening.

In conclusion, I would only say this. I do not want to refer to individual cases. If there are cases like the 'Nagarwala case' or any other case of that type, then we must consider them seriously. I do not want to enter into something which is already before the court. But I would say that the question is not only how the individuals in the nationalised bank have behaved; the most important point, as my hon friend Shri H. M Patel has raised, is that there is a crisis of confidence. I would like to ask the Finance Minister plain and simple question. If such a situation were to take place in Britain, I have not the least doubt that consistent with the democratic traditions of Britain, the Finance Minister would have offered his resignation and said 'I now leave it to my colleague whether the resignation should be accepted or not'. But, unfortunately, such a thing has not taken place in this country.

I would request the Finance Minister to see, that if the image of the public sector is to be sharpened still more, the norms of credit worthiness be revised and more facilities be made available to the rural folk through the implementation of mobile bank services, and implementation of the principle workers' participation in the management of banks ensured. With all these measures, the results will be much better. It is not that the nationalised banks have failed to produce results; they have been able to produce results which are quite comparable to the results that Banks produced when they were in the hands of a few. But as a socialist I expect that the image of the public sector should be sharpened still further so that we should be able to get better benefits for the people not only in terms of economic benefit but in terms of social justice.

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA (Maharajanj) : I do not want to discuss the Nagarwala case as it has already been discussed by previous speakers. I only want to say one thing. There were three objects of nationalisation of Banks. First, rapid development of banking facilities in unbanked and rural

areas; second, mobilisation of deposits and thirdly to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of sections of society which had not received their due share in the benefit of economic growth.

Before nationalisation, there was one banking office for 65,000 people; now the figure has come down to 47,000. But in U.P. even now it is one bank office for 82,000 people. This shows that backward areas have again been neglected. I would request the Finance Minister to see that the growth in banking facilities all over the country is uniform. In Bihar it was one bank to 1,20,000 people. This ratio must be made uniform throughout the country.

The amount of deposits in all nationalised banks has increased from Rs. 3,900 crores in 1969 to Rs. 5,100 crores in Dec., 1970. But how is it distributed? The share of the priority sectors is only Rs. 885 crores or 17.7%. Agriculture has received Rs. 201 crores, small scale industries Rs. 420 crores, road transport operators Rs. 37.09 crores, retail traders and small businessmen Rs. 14.47 crores, self-employed persons Rs. 8.57 crores and needy students only Rs. 3.47 crores. Thus since nationalisation, the share of advances made to the priority sector has increased from 10% to about 18%. This is shameful. This is not a proper distribution. I hope the Finance Minister will see that more resources are diverted to the priority sectors.

SHRI JAGANATH RAO (Chhatrapur) : Two year have passed since the 14 banks were nationalised. Have these banks since then published their annual report and accounts and if so, would these be laid on the Table so that Parliament can have an idea of their progress and discuss it?

Earlier there was question about the amounts given as loans to small farmers, small entrepreneurs and self-employed persons. What is the number of such persons, what are the rates of interest charged and what are the difficulties experienced by banks in recovery. This will give us a correct picture. My information is that in some cases they are not able to realise the loans given to small people. Therefore, the Finance Minister may give us a break up, if not now, but at a future date, so that we know how the bank are functioning in this sphere,

There are some employees in the State Bank who joined service before it was nationalised in 1953. They had opted for the old regulations of service; they had made provident fund contributions. But the SHI is not making a matching contribution. I am told that they are not even paid interest on their deposits.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN) : I thought the discussion was going to be in a rather constructive way because the first three or four speakers made quite constructive suggestions. Shri Mishra made certain comments and gave certain suggestions which certainly are worth considering, but it appeared a little later that the main thrust of his speech was somewhere else, not on the constructive part.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : It was "main" because he felt it.

MR. SPEAKER : He always is very constructive except sometimes when he gets angry (*Interruption*).

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : He himself said and it was right that the deposit mobilisation has shown an increase. Many Members have also conceded that there is a diversification of credit because so far neglected sectors have been taken into account and we are trying to reach them. There is expansion of branches also so that we are trying to cover unbanked or under-banked areas and that process of expansion is being continued. Of course, another point has been made by many hon. Members, namely, whether we have done as well we could have done. Particularly the point was whether we have tried to do enough for the so-called priority sectors—the small agriculturists, the small traders, the small businessmen, the self-employment seeker, young men, the intelligent young men who have nothing else to give as security. These are the priority sectors for which nationalisation of banks contemplated. I would like to say that it continues to be the objective and the policy of the nationalised banks. There is no doubt about it. I would certainly like to assure the hon. House that the criterion of credit-worthiness is being changed, and as Mr. Dandavate has said, certainly some policy changes are taking

place. Certainly, there were some practical difficulties in the way.

PROF. S. I. SAKSENA : Only 18 per cent has been advanced to them.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : The real problem and the real difficulty is that the demand for credit from this neglected sector, which has been neglected for centuries together, is so vast that immediately we have not been able to meet it in a satisfactory manner. That is the problem. Of course there are the problems of attitude in this matter which are coming in the way. There is at least a feeling; there are allegations of corruption also, as hon. Members said. I cannot say that there are no cases of corruption, because, that is really speaking a general problem in Indian life. It is not merely confined to nationalised banks, but the programme and working of these nationalised banks has been completely exposed to public criticism, which is a good thing. Some of these things are openly talked out, discussed and criticised. Much is being said about it, but it is not as if corruption started only with nationalisation. One cannot say like that. Naturally, it can be rightly expected that after nationalisation there should be some check on that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Nationalisation of corruption

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : I would certainly make a request to Mr. Dandavate—he has given some specific cases—it is much more desirable that we try to follow such individual cases to see that ultimately there is a feeling of deterrence in this matter. I have myself taken up this question with the custodians of banks. At the very first meeting, when I met them, I told them that it is not good for the new programme of nationalised banks that there should be a feeling of corruption being prevalent, and we have decided to take preventive measures and certainly started vigilance centres in several banks.

As far as reaching the neglected sectors is concerned, I have given in many replies to the questions certain statistics about it. If I had enough time, I could give the details. I have got a wealth of information with me which I can give again to the hon. Members, about the increase in the number of offices of commercial banks after

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

nationalisation. I can give the figures. In the State Bank, the increase is 993 offices, and in the case of the 14 nationalised banks, it is nearly 2,113. I can give according to the States also; I have got the information. For example, Shri Bhogendra Jha mentioned Bihar. In Bihar, the number of offices, as on 30th June, 1969, was 273. At the end of July, 1971, the number of offices increased by 127. He wanted to know the percentage to the population. There also there is improvement. I know that it is not satisfactory, but you cannot say that there is no improvement. In Bihar the population coverage has come down from 2.07 lakhs in June, 1969 to 1.2 lakhs in May, 1971 and will be around 1 lakh at the end of December, 1971.

PROF. S. I. SAKSENA : What is the average per branch in the country.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : This is much less than the rest of the country, but I am telling you that an effort is being made.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : We do not dispute that there is an all round improvement, but it is negligible.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : My only plea to the hon. members is that we are making a very sincere effort in this matter.

As far as the performance of the Banks in the priority sector is concerned, you can employ two tests. One is whether we are trying to reach the areas where so far they had not ventured, or secondly whether the Bank has become at least approachable to the smaller man. I can say that more than 60 per cent of the additional deposits is made use for the neglected sector.

The other thing also will have to be seen, whether the bigger accounts are still being allowed to be benefited in the old manner. I would like to assure the hon. House that we have taken enough care in this matter to see that the bigger accounts of Rs. 25 lakhs and above are very carefully scrutinised by the Banks, by the Reserve Bank itself. As I have many times explained in the House, they have laid down a pro-forma on the basis of which they very carefully scrutinise the purpose for

which the loans are required and whether they are made use for the purposes for which they are taken, to see ultimately that they are not manipulated for purposes for which they are not meant, that at least they are not utilised for speculative purposes. But one cannot say that we should completely starve the the bigger accounts, because ultimately we will have to see that the genuine economic productive activity must go on. For example, the textile industry will have to be given proper credit facilities because it certainly provides employment. The only question is whether additional amount that becomes available by way of deposit mobilisation is made available to the smaller sector, to the priority sector, in an increasing manner and I can assure the hon House that this is exactly what we propose to do. It will take some more time.

The most important point that was made by Shri Shivamandan Mishra was whether the nationalised Banks are having certain plans or programmes linked with the planning of country. I entirely agree that the nationalised Banks will have to play a very important part in the economic planning of the country, and it is from this point of view that we have started this Lead Bank Scheme. The idea is that the Lead Bank should have a co-ordinating role in having a development programme in the district and take a lead in this matter of co-ordinating the activities of other Banks. The country is divided into different areas and different Banks are given responsibility for the areas. An hon. member from West Bengal said that a certain Bank did not fulfil its functions in its district.

While some banks have, some banks have not. Some banks have done better in some areas and some banks have not. One fact however stands out, and that it is really a challenging problem. There is a large disparity in the functioning of the banks, as far as the different regions are concerned. There is considerable regional imbalance in the functioning of the banks. I must concede that eastern India particularly is much more neglected in banking activity. It must be conceded. In order to find out facts I myself went to Eastern Uttar Pradesh and my fears were confirmed. I made certain statements about it there also. In doing so my idea was not to condemn anybody

but to have self-criticism. I do concede that we have not risen to the expectation of the people in this matter, because I was myself not satisfied with the progress.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj) : You could have gone a step further and visited North Bihar. You would have found the position much worse there.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Let us not try to have competition. I can understand your feeling about it. I am myself stating it. I am after the banks which are the lead banks in the eastern sector. I want them to be a little more active in this matter and I would like to assure the hon. House that I still propose to go into some of the areas and discuss this matter.

SHRI N. N. PANDEY : Visit Gorakhpur also.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Gorakhpur is also part of UP. So, let us not discuss every district

Here I must say one thing. We must show patience. I do not think we can work out miracles and get things done overnight. The first task is to see that the areas are properly covered. Then good surveys and development plans for every district will have to be prepared. Then we have to campaign continuously for mobilisation of resources. If we merely say that let the lead banks go on distributing money, it cannot be done

श्री इयामनन्दन मिश्र : सदाव्रत ।

श्री यशबन्तराव खन्हारण : हां, सदाव्रत नहीं हो सकता है ।

Naturally, it will have to be a banking operation and banking operation depends upon certain financial proprieties. If not security, at least certain credit-worthiness will have to be there. I quite agree with Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi when he says that when an intelligent person says that he has got an economically viable operation for which he wants money, naturally it should be given. But it is the responsibility of the person concerned to prove that he has got an economically viable proposition to work. If a person merely comes and says that he has got a diploma and on the basis of the

diploma he should be advanced some money, it will not be possible to do so, because it will be tempting them in a wrong way.

The point which the hon. Member made about specialisation is very very important. Today we have not got that. Now the people who are sent to the rural areas and who are expected to grant loans to the agriculturists they are the people who have been functioning in the urban areas and dealing with only commerce and trade. They do not know how to assess agriculture as a proposition. So, it is a question of training of personnel also ; it is a question of re-orientation of the person who goes there.

So, after nationalisation we have to undertake a task which is qualitatively different. Quantitatively also it is terribly different and it is a vast operation. Therefore, I would plead with hon. Members for patience and understanding. But I would not plead with them for protecting me for faults. I will never ask them to do that, but I would certainly plead with them for patience because the leadership of nationalised banks is certainly making progress.

Here I must say a few words of appreciation to the leadership of the nationalised banks for their present attitude because they had to function in a different atmosphere before. Now they are showing a sense of dedication for the objectives of the nationalised banks and I think they are ready to go ahead. But they also need instruments.

Ultimately only the custodian by himself or a couple of people round about him cannot deliver the goods. This is the basic approach. As far as the point of the hon. Member is concerned that there is no participation of the employees in the banks, this Parliament in its wisdom has decided,... (Interruption) I am really keen to have regularly constituted new boards, but my difficulty or stumbling block is the representation of the employees.

AN HON. MEMBER : Parliament has accepted certain procedures in this regard.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Now, the wranglings in the trade union movement, that is also a fact of life. What can we do about it ? That wrangling is there. I am not blaming anybody. This also has to be faced. This particular phase

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

of trade union movement in this country is also a fact of national life, a fact one has to find solution to, and I am trying to find a solution early. I will be the first man to feel happy when we will have the new boards. That will be again another test of our policy in regard to the nationalised banks. Then the new Board of Directors will guide the implementation of the nationalised banks' policy towards the new social objectives. When the representatives of the working classes, of the artisans, of agriculturists, of employees and of depositors will sit there I am sure there will be a new approach to the problem. If it is there, certainly things can be much more improved.

The hon. Member, Shri Mishra, has made good suggestions. I can only tell him I have taken note of them.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
What about having a Parliamentary Committee ?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
Let me say at the beginning, my idea is not to have a Parliamentary Committee for the control of banks. Parliament is there and the accountability of the nationalised banks is not questioned. We can discuss the matter in the Parliament. In the Consultative Committee you can put any number of questions. We can have many discussions here, but I do not propose to have one more committee so that instead of being helpful to the functioning of the banks it might possibly be.. (*Interruption*) I leave the word to you.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY : This can be put under the Public Undertakings Committee.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
There are so many Undertakings under the Public Undertakings Committee that if banks are also there, the Committee may only get a chance once in 10 years to discuss this subject. You had been the Chairman of the Public Undertakings Committee. I am not taking any final view in the matter, but certainly this question can be considered a little later. At the present moment I am not for it, because for me it appears to be still premature to consider this matter, because we have yet to see the working of

the new type of boards, and unless we see the functioning of the banks for some more period I think it will be difficult to say : let it be handed over to the Public Undertakings Committee.

One hon. Member asked about the differential rate of interest and what Government is doing about it. The report is there. As you know, there are two different views there and I wanted that there should be a debate here because I would like to have some guidance from the Parliament also. There are two views. But there is one common point. Even the majority report has accepted the principle that there should be differential rate for certain sectors. Now the point is what that differential should be. That, really speaking, is the main question.

They have suggested something like 8.5 per cent. The minute of dissent has taken another extreme line. I am not criticizing either the minute of dissent or the majority report but certainly we will have to go into this matter. Government proposes to discuss this matter further among ourselves and also, if necessary, with the Planning Commission and take a final view about this matter. This report is under critical and active consideration of the Government of India.

As far as the principle of differential treatment is concerned, it is accepted. In nationalisation itself we have accepted that it is necessary to have differential treatment. When we say that there are certain priority sectors, that itself means that there is differential treatment.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI :
Preferential treatment.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
Preferential treatment means differential treatment.

Hon. Members said that there can be specialisation in trade etc. At the present moment I can say that by accepting the lead bank scheme, we have certainly accepted in principle the idea of a specialised area office. At least the area approach is emphasized so that some responsibility is fixed. Those banks which are in charge of the undeveloped areas can certainly be held responsible at least to prepare programmes.

This is about the general question. About other questions that hon. Members have raised, you yourself have given a ruling... (Interruption).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
We have asked certain questions about which you cannot escape responsibility.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I am not escaping because I cannot escape.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : Why not advance credit for Rajasthan, Gandak, Kosi etc. ?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
Sometimes we do not know what the banking function is like. Do you want the banks to undertake the responsibility of the States' budgets ?

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : No, not the responsibility.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
They certainly contribute to the loans ; they give loans to their State Finance Corporations, the electricity boards, the housing corporations etc. But you cannot expect the nationalised banks to go and undertake a certain project.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : As the World Bank does, they can give loans for these big projects.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
That type of thing the nationalised banks cannot do. Possibly, you have misunderstood the functioning of the commercial banks.

SHRI PILOO MODY : About Nagarwalla ?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I am not going to go into the case of Nagarwalla at all because these cases are before the courts and I do not want to give an opinion about it. As far as the suspicion in the public mind is concerned, what more answer can there be than this that the whole matter is before the court. The courts can decide.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
You are proceeding with it in a very cavalier

fashion. Government has the responsibility to conduct the case properly and Government is not doing that. We are not saying anything about the court but we have to say something about the Government.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
We have placed it before the magistrate. How the magistrate conducts it is a judicial matter.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
You are not processing the case properly.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I do not agree.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
What about the rules and regulations ?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
As far as the procedure about the withdrawal of money is concerned, I think, I have given the information even before and I would like to give further information about the procedure as to how the money is withdrawn.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
And the account against which it was withdrawn. Please begin with that.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I am not going to speak about that particular case.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
Against which account were these Rs. 60 lakhs withdrawn.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
Please, for God's sake, hear what the procedure is. This is all that I can say. I am not going to deal with any individual case, because the hon. Speaker has given a ruling about it.

SHRI PILOO MODY : You had a tacit understanding with the Speaker.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I think; that is very unfair.

The cash is kept in the State Bank of India on behalf of the Reserve Bank. The State Bank functions on behalf of the Reserve Bank. The money is Reserve Bank's money and it does not become currency till it comes out.

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

What is the procedure about it? The cash and currency chest balances are always kept in the strong room in the joint custody of the Chief Cashier and an authorised supervising official called the Officer-in-Charge of Cash. This is in the joint custody.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
How is that done? Both the officials are of the State Bank.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
Both of them are of the State Bank. This is in the joint custody.

The Chief Cashier is assisted by the Deputy Chief Cashiers and the Deputy Head Cashier. Every morning, when the Bank opens for business, both the custodians of cash (the Chief Cashier or his Deputy and the Officer-in-Charge of Cash) enter the strong room together. You understand it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
I understand it. Who holds the key of the strong room? (*Interruption*)

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
Then, the Chief Cashier or his Deputy takes out the normal requirements of cash in various denominations in the presence of the Officer-in-Charge of cash. The entries relating to the withdrawal are made in the Vault Register which is kept inside the strong room and both the Custodians authenticate the entries. They make the entries and they authenticate them. The cash is then put in boxes which are duly locked and handed over to the Deputy Head Cashier against his receipt. The Deputy Head Cashier then disburses the cash to various paying cashiers according to the requirements, against receipt in a special book throughout the day. The paying cashiers after verifying the cash, take it to their counters and make payments as and when cheques/vouchers duly passed by the authorised officials are received. If during the day further cash is needed for payments, the Chief Cashier or his Deputy requests the Officer-in-Charge of Cash to open the strong room and the cash is taken out in the manner referred to above.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
There can be many withdrawals.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
There can be many withdrawals.

Then, this is what happens at the close of business. At the close of business, the Chief Cashier accounts for the cash withdrawn from the currency chest during the day; the balance in the hands of the paying cashiers along with the cash received by the receiving cashiers is deposited in the currency chest jointly by the Officer-in-Charge (Cash) and the Chief Cashier. The net position arising out of the day's withdrawals and deposits in the currency chest is credited or debited as the case may be to the Reserve Bank of India.

This is the procedure. I think, I have given you all the details as far as the procedure is concerned. (*Interruption*). You wanted to know the procedure. I gave you the procedure.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
We require some elucidation to understand it. Would you kindly help us to understand a little further?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I am prepared to help you as much as I can without going against the ruling of the Chair. I am subject to his ruling. I cannot help it.

SHRI H. M. PATIL : The point is this. If further cash is required, you withdraw it. By whom is it withdrawn? Now, you need money. It is the State Bank which wants money in order to disburse it, either through a large number of cashiers or otherwise. There must be some explanation whom some person leaves the bank premises with money to be delivered, how it is going to be debited, to whose account... (*Interruption*).

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN :
You are, really speaking, keeping in mind an offence which is against our rules. This is the procedure. Supposing a certain thing happens against our rules, a certain offence is committed, now you are asking me to explain how an offence has taken place. When an offence has taken place, you want me to explain the offence.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :
I want to understand. I have raised certain points...

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : You wanted to know one more thing. You asked whether there was any such similar withdrawal before. Never. Never. If you want to know that fact, that never happened.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Could you give us the normal daily holdings in the currency chest during the last course of the last one year? That we are entitled to know.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Why do you want to know it? Normally, really speaking, Rs. 15 to 20 lakhs.

SHRI PILOO MODY : A puerile exercise.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : On an ordinary day, the withdrawal is about Rs. 15 to 20 lakhs. On the last day of the month and the first day of the month, it can be between Rs. 80 to 90 lakhs.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : 24th is not the last day.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : It was not the last day.

SHRI H. M. PATEL rose.

MR. SPEAKER : No more questions please.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I had asked whether any departmental inquiry has been instituted and any action taken. This is a very important thing, otherwise, what are we discussing for?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Departmental action has been taken and the person concerned has been suspended and now as the case is before the court, departmental proceeding have to be kept in abeyance.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : How many are suspended?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : Subject to correction, two persons have been suspended.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I would like to make a submission.

When we asked for this discussion, we said that we wanted to discuss the Nagarwala case among other things.

MR. SPEAKER : No, please.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Please let me make my submission, then you say what you like.

At that time you said that the matter is *sub judice*. We wanted to point out to you that there are certain aspects of the case which are *sub judice*—whether Nagarwala was guilty, whether Malhotra was involved and whether some other people also are involved. What is not *sub judice* is the procedure by which the Nagarwala money was removed. What is not *sub judice* is the procedure by which the Nagarwala money was withdrawn.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : That is an offence. That is what is *sub judice*.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Mr. Chavan says that the Nagarwala money was withdrawn by offence and that it is an offence.

SHRI N. N. PANDEY : On a point of order, Sir. Why do you allow questions?

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Pandey.

SHRI PILOO MODY : So, what I feel is that as a result of your having kindly permitted this discussion, what Mr. Chavan has accepted in doing is compounding the mystery and worsening the crisis.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : This is very unfair.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : What is the account against which it has been withdrawn? Why don't you say that?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : It is a matter before the judiciary. Why should you have suspicion about it. Sir, I think, some people, really speaking, are suffering from a chronic suspicion and the only treatment can be a psychiatric treatment... (Interruptions).

(H.A.H. Dis.)

SHRI PILOO MODY : Unfortunately, parliamentary procedures ..

MR. SPEAKER : No, please Mr. Pandey.

SHRI P. K. DEO : I submit item No. 19 should have been taken now.

MR. SPEAKER : First you ask for extension of time and then you deprive the other Member of his right.

We will now take up the half-hour discussion which will be over by 6.30 and then we take up the discussion under Rule 193 for an hour. As we are at the flag end of the session, I hope you won't mind sitting a little late.

Mr. Pandey.

18 hrs.

HALF AN HOUR DISCUSSION RE:
CRASH PROGRAMME FOR PRO-
VIDING EMPLOYMENT TO
UNEDUCATED UNEMPLOYED

श्री एन० एन० पान्डे (गोरखपुर) : श्री रण बहादुर सिंह जी ने एक प्रश्न किया था 1597, 25 मई को और यह 50 करोड़ रुपया जो फ्रैंश प्रोग्राम था उसके सम्बन्ध में था। कुछ भ्रांतियां रह गई थी जिनकी मंत्री जी ने सफाई नहीं दी। यह नहीं बताया कि उस पैसे का कौन कौन से प्रदेशों में और किन किन प्रोजेक्ट्स में इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है। अठारह प्रदेशों में से कुछ एक के नाम लिये गये थे।

मैं आपका ध्यान बेकारी की जो समस्या है उसकी ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। पहली योजना में 5.3 लाख श्राद्धी बेकार थे...

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

दूसरे प्लान में उनकी संख्या बढ़कर 7.1 लाख हो गई। तीसरे प्लान में 9.6 लाख हो गई और चौथे प्लान में वह बढ़ कर 12.6 लाख हो गई। ज्यों ज्यों

योजनायें बनती गईं ज्यों-ज्यों बेरोजगारों की संख्या भी बढ़ती गई और बढ़ती जा रही है। हिन्दुस्तान के पांच लाख गांवों में आज किस तरह की परिस्थिति है? वहाँ जो लेबर है, जो एग्जिक्यूटिव लेबर है, वह बेकार है। उसको रोजगार की जरूरत है। हमने वादा किया था कि जब हमारी सरकार बनेगी तो हम प्रोग्राम बनायेंगे और उस प्रोग्राम के अंतर्गत ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में मड़के तथा दूसरे कार्य करेंगे ताकि लोगों को वहाँ पर काम मिले। हमने कहा था कि हम ऐसे कार्यक्रम हाथ में लेंगे जिनसे एजुकेटिड तथा अनएजुकेटिड दोनों तरह के लोगों को काम मिले। वह एक ऐसी बात थी जिससे सारे देश के लोगों में उत्साह की लहर पीड़ गई और खास तौर से गरीब लोगों में दौड़ गई।

इस वर्ष जो फ्रैंश प्रोग्राम पचास करोड़ रुपये का बनाया गया था आज तक मैं कह सकता हूँ कि किसी भी प्रदेश में चाहे वह उत्तर प्रदेश हो, बिहार हो, हरियाणा हो, उस पर काम नहीं हुआ। आपने कहा है कि दस प्रतिशत हमने "ईयरभार्क" कर दिया है जो सामान होगा उसकी परचेज के लिए। मैंने अपने जिले गोरखपुर में वहाँ के जिलाधीश महोदय से मेरी बात हुई है और इस प्रोग्राम के बारे में मीटिंग हुई। मैंने उनसे जानना चाहा कि आप क्या कार्यक्रम अपनाने जा रहे हैं तो उन्होंने कहा कि मेरे पास सुपरवाइजरी काम के लिए, जिस काम को चलाया जा सकता है, उसकी देखभाल की जा सके इसके लिए सरकार ने कोई पैसा नहीं दिया। इस बात को मन्त्री महोदय ने स्वीकार किया है कि बहुत से प्रदेशों ने अपने प्राजैक्ट्स नहीं भेजे हैं। इस बात को भी स्वीकार किया गया है कि उनको सैकशन नहीं किया गया है। इस तरह से कैसे आप बेकारी की समस्या को हल करेंगे, कैसे हमने देश की जनता के साथ जो वादे किये हैं उनको पूरा कर पायेंगे।

मैं कैंटेगोरिक जवाब और स्पेसिफिक जवाब