

नहीं आती। हम तो कहेंगे कि हमको 25 हजार की ही गाड़ी दे दीजिये और हमारा भी नाम सोशललिस्टों में गिन लीजिए।

मैं आपके जरिये सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम हर तरह से तैयार हैं। कलैक्टवाइजेशन कर लें, उसके लिए भी तैयार हैं। लेकिन आप एसेट्स लेते हैं तो लायाबिलिटीज भी ले लें। लेकिन लायाबिलिटीज आप हम पर छोड़ दें और एसेट्स ले लें, यह जुल्म आप हमारे ऊपर न करें। एजूकेशन का भार भी आप अपने ऊपर ले लें, हैलथ का भार भी आप अपने ऊपर ले लें, रहने के लिये दो, तीन कमरे जो हमें चाहिए, उसका भार भी आप अपने ऊपर ले लें, हम दो रोटी खाने लायक है तो दो रोटी और एक रोटी खाने लायक हैं तो एक रोटी देने का भार भी आप अपने ऊपर ले लें, हम उतना कपड़ा नहीं पहनेंगे जितना आप पहनते हैं और उतना नहीं तो एक चौथाई कपड़ा आप हमें दे दें, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। इस फेरे में आप न पडे कि माओ त्से तुंग किस तरह से रहते हैं। यह जो झगड़ा है कि रिवोल्यूशन कौन करेगा, प्रोलिटेरिएट करेगा या खेतिहर करेगा, इसमें आप न पड़ें। एक कहता है प्रोलिटेरिएट श्राफ दी बलडें युनाइट और माओ का जो तरीका है वह यह कि खेतिहर रिवोल्यूशन करेगा। यह जो झगड़ा रूस और चीन का है यह शुरू से चला आ रहा है। एक कहता है कि खेतिहर रिवोल्यूशन नहीं कर सकता है और दूसरा कहता है कि लेबर नहीं कर सकती है। आप यहां लम्पट प्रोलिटेरिएट बना कर रिवोल्यूशन करना चाहते हैं तो आप कर लें लेकिन जो कुछ भी करें सोच समझ कर करें। समाज में जितने बूढ़े लोग हैं, जितने समाज को बनाने वाले थे वे सब जेबकूप थे और सारी अक्ल हम लोगों में आ गई है, यदि यह कहा जाता है तो इसमें मैं विश्वास नहीं करता हूँ। उनको भी बहुत अक्ल थी और आपकी अक्ल भी समय के मुताबिक अच्छी है। उसको आप काम में लाएं, इगना ही मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ।

एक बात और भी है। आप कहते हैं कि

इरिगेशन स्टेट सबजेक्ट है, एजूकेशन स्टेट सबजेक्ट है, सीलिंग स्टेट सबजेक्ट है। फिर आप सेंटर में बैठ कर क्यों कहते हैं कि तुम सीलिंग करो। यह भी तो स्टेट सबजेक्ट है। क्यों आप डायरेक्शन देते फिरते हैं? आप इसको जान लें कि जनता सब समझती है। जब चुनाव होते हैं तो कहा जाता है कि स्टेट की वजह से गड़बड़ हुई है। अब स्टेट वाले कहेंगे कि सेंटर ने हमको डायरेक्शन दिया और हमने वैसा किया। इस वास्ते यह जो बला है इसको आप अपने मिर पर न लें। सेफ रहना चाहते हैं तो इस बला को अपने ऊपर न लें। आप इस पर विचार करें। आप वरिष्ठ नेता भी हैं। मिनिस्टर भी है। इन सब बातों के ऊपर आप चुपचाप बैठे रहे तो बहुत नुकसान होगा इसलिए आप लोग बोलिये।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** तिवारी माहब अब खाना खाइए जाकर।

13.05 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at two minutes past fourteen of the Clock*

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair)

FINANCE BILL, 1972—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri G. Vishwanathan.

Re. : ALLEGED MANHANDLING OF MEMBER BY WILLINGDON HOSPITAL STAFF—Contd.

**श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडे (गोरखपुर) :** मैं आपके माध्यम से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सुबह इस माननीय सदन के एक सदस्य श्री चन्द्र शीलानी के साथ विलिंगडन नर्सिंग होम के डाक्टरों और वाई ब्वायेज ने तथा दूसरे लोगों ने जो व्यवहार किया और जिस हालत में वह सदन में आये और अध्यक्ष महोदय ने भी कहा कि यह मामला बड़ा ही गम्भीर है और इस मामले की जांच करने के लिए उप-स्वास्थ्य मंत्री तथा स्वास्थ्य मंत्री उस हॉस्पिटल में गए, उसके सम्बन्ध में वहाँ के डाक्टरों के खिलाफ क्या कार्रवाई की गई ?

[श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडे]

जो पार्लियामेंट्री अफेयर्स के माननीय मंत्री हैं उन्होंने भी कहा कि अगर पुलिस वहाँ न पहुँची होती तो शायद माननीय सदस्य की लाश भी न मिली होती। यह बड़ा ही गम्भीर प्रश्न है। इसलिए पहले माननीय स्वास्थ्य मंत्री को बुलाया जाय और इस मामले पर बयान दिलवाया जाये। उनको बयान देना चाहिए कि वहाँ के डाक्टरों के खिलाफ और दूसरे लोगों के खिलाफ क्या कार्रवाई की गई। आज व्यूरोक्रेसी द्वारा हम लोगों पर हमला करना एक ऐसी बात हो गई है जिसके ऊपर हमको सम्मर्पण से विचार करना चाहिए।  
.. (ब्यवधान)...

Sir, I would request you to adjourn the house to take note of this serious matter. This can not be tolerated. We cannot sit silent . . . (Interruptions) This is not an ordinary matter. This is very serious matter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I understand that. I believe, it is about the same question raised in the morning.

SHRI G. VISHWANATHAN (Wandiwash) : Let the Minister make a statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I think, it is desirable that the Minister should come forward with a statement. But I do not see the Health Minister here.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY : He should be summoned . . . (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Kindly listen to the Chair. I think, it is most essential that the Government should take note of the strong feelings of the hon. Members. The Government should come forward with a statement as early as possible. Let us give them some time. In the meanwhile, let us go with the business of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No sir.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY : The Health Minister himself must come and make a statement as to what action he has taken. We cannot tolerate this bureaucracy now. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, please. Let me enquire. Please give me some time. Please listen to me. (Interruptions) Order

please. Let us hear what the Government has to say. The Minister is not here. I think, it is most essential that Government should come forward with the statement. Let this be conveyed to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that he should come as quickly as possible to the House. (Interruptions) I have made this observation from the Chair. Mr. Singh, if you have something to say on this, you may convey it to your senior colleague. . .

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI KEDAR NATH SINGH) : I have conveyed to the hon. Minister. He has promised to come immediately.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Minister is coming. Let us conduct ourselves with a little dignity. Even anger should be with restraint in order to be more effective. The Minister is coming in a very short while. (Interruption)

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY : We cannot proceed with any business now. I move that the House be adjourned for half an hour. (Interruption)

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) : The matter is a serious one. Speaker himself said in the morning that the member of Parliament was about to be murdered if the police had not come. This was his own statement. That is why the matter is so serious.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha) : There is another aspect to the matter. May I make a submission ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yes, one by one. Mr. Stephen.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : Personally, my assessment is that this is not a matter in which the Chair could expect equanimity from the members of this House. We, from different parts of India, are here for the purpose of discharging our Parliamentary duties. We go to the hospital not merely as private citizens but in exercise of one of the rights bestowed on us as members of Parliament. When we are here in the Capital of India as Members of Parliament, discharging our duties as Members of Parliament, if anybody assaults any of us it is not merely an assault on a private individual but there is breach of privilege involved in it, and there is a sense of insecurity. Under the shadow of insecurity,

you may not expect us to maintain the sense of equanimity and to participate in the deliberations. Therefore, Sir, please do not call upon us to start our deliberations or discussions. We expect the Minister to come over here and explain the position to us, and it should be decided whether it must be raised as a matter of privilege or the doctor or whoever it may be should be called to the bar of Parliament. Then alone, we will be able to proceed with the business of the House (*Interruption*)

एक माननीय सदस्य : कोई कार्रवाई नहीं होनी चाहिये । सदन स्थगित होना चाहिए ।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let me hear the hon. Members... (*Interruptions*) I think what the hon. Members say on this question will go on record and what has gone on record, will have to be taken notice of by the Government. Therefore, I will allow a few members to express themselves. Mr. Stephen has been pressing that it is a privilege issue. Let me hear a few more members also.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : The doctor must be called to the Bar of the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, there is a serious cause for concern. The matter was brought before the House and the Speaker, in his wisdom, had allowed it to be narrated during the question-hour which is never done. But, what surprises me more is that it happened around 10 a.m. and now four hours have passed. We were told that all the Ministers including the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, the Health Minister, both had been there and made an on-the-spot inquiry to find out the facts. We are anxious to know what is the correct statement and what has actually happened. Because this is very serious matter for the House, I suggest that since the Government has not come out with a statement although the Minister has repeatedly indicated in the House that he will come out with a statement, the Chair should consider the sentiments of the members of the House and, if it is not improper, may I suggest that I move that the House be adjourned for half an hour till such time that the Minister comes out with a statement.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur) : Under Rule 109 I seek your permis-

sion to move that the discussion on the Bill be adjourned.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY : I support it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : In the morning, it was an extra-ordinary, I should say, situation that arose in the House...

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : I have already moved my motion. How are you allowing him... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY : The motion is before the House.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Under Rule 109 I have asked your permission to move my motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please listen to me also... (*Interruptions*) No, it is not as if soon after you move the motion it must immediately be put to the House. I have to hear other Members also and in this case you first have to get my consent which I have not given.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Under Rule 109 I have sought your permission.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Please allow me to complete.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Guha is very anxious to express himself... (*Interruptions*) Here is my difficulty in running the House. I am not saying that you should not speak. I will hear all the hon. Members... (*Interruptions*) Order, please—because I thought that what the hon. Members say will go on record and that will be taken notice of by the Government. Then, a submission is made very strongly that 'We do not want to hear anything and the House be adjourned'. Now, when the Minister is here and I have called upon him to speak, the Members say, 'We also have got a right to speak. There must be a certain amount of consistency. Mr. Samar Guha... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in the morning the whole House was exercised by the ugly incident that took place in the Willingdon Hospital. It was not an assault on an individual only, it was an assault on the privilege, dignity and honour of the Member and the whole House. Not only that, Sir, the hon. Speaker who usually maintains a clam demeanour, was so much exercised that he used words and expressed

[Shri Samar Guha]

his indignation in unmistakable terms. Not only that. He asked the Government to come out with a statement as soon as possible and without delay. It is an extraordinary thing that no statement has been made. Even after the lunch recess we are in the same position as no statement has been made and the House is full of not only anger, but indignation. The Minister must come out immediately with a statement before any other business is taken up. I really regret the attitude of the hon. Minister. He should have come out earlier with a statement.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रकार दुर्घटन की कई घटनायें हमारे सामने आई हैं। यह मामला बहुत गम्भीर है। चिकित्सा के लिए अस्पताल में सदस्यों को जाना पड़ता है। इस प्रकार का दुर्घटन यदि राजधानी में किया जाये तो यह कोई मामूली बात नहीं है। यह घटना सुबह हुई थी, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता क्या मंत्री महोदय का यह कर्तव्य नहीं था कि पूरे तथ्यों से इस सदन को अवगत कराते ? यदि इसकी जांच में समय लग रहा था तो मंत्री महोदय सदन में आकर बताते कि हमको कुछ समय और चाहिए। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ मंत्री महोदय ने स्वयं यहाँ पर आकर कर्तव्य क्यों नहीं दिया ?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): Sir, I fully share the feelings of distress and anguish on this unfortunate incident. I have requested my colleague Shri D. P. Chattopadhyaya to visit the hospital. He has gone there. We are quite prepared to make a statement. But it will take some time as facts have to be ascertained. We want to make a good statement, a connected statement and we informed Mr. Speaker. He allowed that statement to be made at about 4 to 5 P.M. or at 5 O' clock. SHRI D. P. Chattopadhyaya has gone there.

श्री कूलचन्द बर्मा (उज्जैन) : इस घटना को हुए चार पांच घंटे तो बैसे ही हो गए हैं। इतना समय मफीगिण्ट होता है।... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : I have informed the Speaker about this. If this was not

communicated to Members. I am sorry for that.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj) : Let the House be adjourned till 5 O' clock. We are not in a mood to hear anybody.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING (SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT) : I am fully in the hands of the House. The facts are not known to me personally. The Minister of State has gone there...

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पांडे (खलीलाबाद) : अस्पताल यहाँ से सिर्फ चार फर्लांग है उसमें चार घंटे लगा रहे हैं तो देहताते में जो मारपीट हो रही है उसमें चार हफ्ते लगा देंगे। (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I was at that time in the All India Institute of Medical Science to visit a patient. There was another case, a complicated case of operation regarding a former Member of Parliament and Minister. An operation had to be performed for heart trouble and so on and so I had gone there. After that I had another appointment and at that time I came to know about this and immediately I said that officers and the Minister should go and make on the spot enquiries and then come back and tell us what the position is. We have not yet got all the facts. This is not a matter on which there can be any controversy or difference of opinion at all I am one with every hon. Member of the House. It is not only a question of responsibility of the Minister, but it involves the privilege of the House, the privilege of every member of Parliament. There can be no question of controversy. I feel more distressed than anybody else can be.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore) : But the facts must be placed before the House at the earliest possible time.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : A responsible member, a Professor, a Minister, has gone there. A large number of people were present. The class IV establishment has gone on strike. There is a situation there. A large number of people are involved.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Why have they gone on strike ?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT :** The Director General has gone there. The Joint Secretary has gone there. Other officers have been sent there. The Minister has gone there (*Interruptions*). I would request them to listen to me and understand what the position is.

श्री सरजू पांडे (गाजीपुर) : तमाम केस कानकाबट किया जा रहा है कि मेम्बर ने खुद मारा ।

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA :** Why did he himself not go? Why did he send only his Secretary?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT :** I was busy with another engagement. The full facts were not known to me. Even now, they are not known. We will not necessarily wait till 5 O' clock. As soon as Prof. Chattopadhyaya returns, we will request your permission to make a statement (*Interruptions*). I may be allowed to complete my statement. After we make that statement, the House can take any decision it likes. I would request the House to wait till that statement is made. Afterwards, the House can take whatever decision it likes. We will consider it. Whoever may be responsible will be dealt with. May be this inquiry may not be enough. We will institute another proper inquiry, an official inquiry. We will try to fix responsibility and whoever is responsible, we will deal with it according to the measure of responsibility strictly and any penal measure necessary will be taken. I am really distressed at what has happened. I feel this with all my heart. I have the same feelings that members have. But my only request is : let that statement be made. After that, whatever else is to be done, should be done in all propriety.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS raise—**

श्री फूलचन्द वर्मा : माननीय मंत्री जी, आपको ही जाना चाहिए था, जब आपको पता लग गया । आप क्यों नहीं गये ?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Members will kindly listen to me. About shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, I do not think he has moved his motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** He moved it.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I do not think he has moved it.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** Rule 109 says that the Speaker's consent has to be obtained first.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** The rule says :

“At any stage of a Bill which is under discussion in the House, a motion that the debate on the Bill be adjourned may be moved with the consent of the speaker”.

I do not say I am shutting him out. He has not sought my consent ; I have not given him consent. He just moved it. Therefore, I say . . .

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** I have not moved it. You are putting something in my mouth which I did not say. I have also a right to defend myself against the Chair.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** In that case I ask the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs whether he has any objection to its being moved . . .

**SHRI RAJ BAHADUR :** Since the matter is going to be discussed, and should be discussed, after the Minister's statement, the motion need not be put now. I would request that this need not be put (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon):** Shri Raj Bahadur was prevented from going and making an inquiry.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I am now on the question of whether to give my consent or not to the motion for adjournment. Shri Jha has drawn the attention of the House to a particular rule. I sought the opinion of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. He is not in favour of this. In view of this, I think I will have to seek the opinion of the House in this matter.

**SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY :** Why ?

**SHRI RAJ BAHADUR :** Mr. Asad has made a statement which gave expression to the feelings of the entire House. (*Interruption*) After that, he listened to me and after that he listened to the hon. Minister of Health, and after that, if he says that he does not want to press the motion, he does not want to seek your consent, I would appeal, I would plead

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

with you, that this need not be put to the vote of the House. You need not give your consent to this, I hope I am within my right, and we on this side of the House are within our rights, to appeal to you, so that the question may not be precipitated. We do not make it an issue between the Class VI staff there and Parliament. (*Interruption*). We do not want to make it an issue of that type.

श्री फूलचन्द बर्मा : माननीय राजबहादुर स्वयं अस्पताल गए थे। इनको भी सेक्योरिटो वालों ने रोका था। यह बतायें कि क्या हुआ वहाँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, please.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : Nobody has prevented me. (*Interruption*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. My problem now is that it is not possible to conduct the House in this way. The House must come to some kind of understanding, some kind of an agreement, about what it wants to be done. Before I decide to give my consent to Mr. Azad, I sought the opinion of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Now Mr. Azad happens to a Member of your party. If you can persuade him not to press this matter, it becomes simple. But if you cannot, the feelings of the House are such that I cannot say that it depends upon me. I cannot run the House unless the House agrees to be run. You kindly decide about it. (*Interruption*)

SHRI K. N. TIWARI (Bettiah) : Sir, a point of order. When Mr. Azad says he has not moved the motion, and unless you give him the permission it cannot be moved, the fact is that it has not been moved. The hon. Health Minister has come before the House and has made a statement. He has enquired, and has come before the House to make a statement; so, I think it is up to you to decide, and I would like to appeal to the House also, because the Minister has also promised to make an enquiry and to make a statement. (*Interruption*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Everything is in order if the House wants order; nothing is in order if the House does not want order. I would like to know from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs whether Mr. Azad has agreed not to press it. (*Interruption*)

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : Supposing you ask for consent, we will all stand in favour of it because we feel hurt. But we do not want to press it in order to enable Government, the hon. Minister of Health, to properly deal with the whole situation. Therefore, we do not want to precipitate matters. Why should we precipitate it? If you ask for consent of the House, we will stand in favour of it. But we do not want to press it. So, I beg of you not to press it, and I would beg of Mr. Azad also, I would appeal to him, not to press it.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : Sir, the rule clearly says that the Member cannot move the motion unless he gets the consent from you. Now, it is left entirely to you to give permission to Mr. Azad to move it or not. (*Interruption*) The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs at this moment will not come into the picture. (*Interruption*) Please bear with me.

Secondly, the hon. Minister of Health has just now said that a statement is going to be made, and after hearing that statement, if the Member so desires that there should be a discussion, with your permission it can be done. The matter is so simple. I will appeal to you to use your discretion and ask the Minister to make the statement. And then, if you feel a discussion is necessary, then it is for you to say yes or no.

श्री शारदाम्बे राय (धोसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री क्षा ने जान्ते से सदन के सामने प्रस्ताव पेश कर दिया है। अब वह सदन की प्रापटी है। आपने उसकी आज्ञा दी है :

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have not given.

श्री शारदाम्बे राय : आपने दी है या नहीं, आप तय करें। हमने सुना कि उन्होंने प्रस्ताव जान्ते से भूब कर दिया है। अब वह हाउस की प्रापटी है। यह हाउस के ऊपर निर्भर करता है कि वह उसकी स्वीकार करे या अस्वीकार करे। इसलिए मंत्री महोदय कोई बयान दें, उससे पहले श्री क्षा के प्रस्ताव के ऊपर सदन की राय ज़रूर ली जानी चाहिए। यह केरा व्यवस्था का सवाल है, आप इस पर अपनी राय दें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has not moved ; I have not given my consent yet.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : An hon. Member of this House has placed certain facts before us. Now the Minister says that he will get the facts verified and collect information and then make a statement before this House which means that the Minister does not trust a respectable and honourable Member.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : I repudiate the insinuation.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : If it is not so, the hon. Minister must make a statement that he will take action against the concerned persons, against whom certain allegations and charges were made by the hon. Member. Otherwise, this House must be given the right to discuss the matter.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I have already said that an enquiry will be made and responsibility will be fixed and whoever is found responsible will be dealt with suitably according to the report. I have assured that if need be even penal action will be taken ; I repeat that assurance.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : It is not quite clear why the Government cannot come with a clear statement of facts, although hours have passed since the incident happened. This is a very important thing. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has moved the motion . . .

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : I have not moved the motion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Once it has come before the House, you cannot withdraw it. It should be left to the House to decide whether the House should adjourn till such time as the Minister makes a statement or not. If you do not do so, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we shall be sorry that you are not doing your job properly.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I must make it quite clear that Mr. Azad has not moved the motion yet. Under the rules, he requires my consent and before I give my consent I have to take many factors into consideration. We are at that point. He has not moved the motion.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : According to the Rules, at any stage of the Bill which is under discussion in the House a motion that

the debate on the Bill may be adjourned may be moved with the consent of the Speaker. Even if the consent of the Speaker is given, he may or may not move. The word is 'may' ; it is not 'shall' . . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Mr. Deputy Speaker, the debate on this issue is not an issue between the Government or administration ; it is an issue, which as has been rightly said by many friends, involved the honour, dignity and privilege of the House and the Members. From that angle, I want to submit one point. You have very rightly said that unless you give permission, Mr. Azad could not move the motion. You yourself said in your wisdom that you would like to take the views of the House into consideration. You were almost ruling that the views of the House should be taken on the question whether Mr. Azad should be allowed to move this motion or not. The position stands there. Therefore, I think there is no scope for any other controversy or discussion unless you yourself withdraw the ruling you gave

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have not withdrawn anything and I have not given any ruling.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : When the Deputy-Speaker says anything from the Chair, it amounts to a ruling. You sought the consent of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No ; I do not need to take the consent of the House. I have only to take the views of the House.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : You said that as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs could not persuade the member belonging to his party to withdraw his motion, you will ascertain the views of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have misunderstood me altogether. For giving consent to the moving of the motion, I do not have to take the consent of the House. I take the views of the House. Before I give my consent and before I put the whole thing formally to the House, I wanted to hear the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Sir, you would kindly recollect—and the record will bear me out—that when the House re-assembled, I said that under Rule 109 I seek your permission to move ; I never moved it. Unfortunately you have been accusing me

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

of having moved the motion. At that time neither the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs nor the Health Minister was here and the Finance Minister was not in a position to make a statement. What the member wanted was adjournment till the Government comes out with a statement. Now the two ministers are here—the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and the Minister of Health. They have promised that they are making a statement by 5 o'clock or even before that. In the light of this, I do not propose to ask for your consent to move the motion.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Since the statement is coming latest by 5 o'clock or any time before that as soon as it is ready, my ruling is that we may continue with the discussion on the Finance Bill. (*Interuption*). Shri Viswanathan.

14.39 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1972—*Contd.*

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash) :** Sir, speaking on the Finance Bill, when the Government is talking about liquidation of poverty and removal of disparities day in and day out, I would like to take up the question of the financial policies, the fiscal measures, the five year plans, etc., and their effect on the poverty, particularly their effect on the disparity of income in the society. The National Council of Applied Economic Research in its study reveals that the top 10 per cent of the house holds account for 42.4 per cent of the aggregate income in the urban areas and 34 per cent in the rural areas. At the same time, the bottom ten per cent of the households have only 1.3 per cent of the aggregate income in the urban areas. Compared to the rural sector, the inequality in the urban areas seems to be going up. In spite of our direct taxes on the affluent sections of society, in spite of our high rates of taxation, definitely the concentration of income and wealth in the urban areas is increasing. The 75 larger industrial houses, which are monopoly houses, command nearly 50 per cent of the total assets.

I would like to deal with this point, which has been already dealt with by other hon. Members. But I do not want to take much time on this point. In spite of the fact that we are saying that we want to curb monopoly,

the total assets of these 75 houses is going up year by year. In 1963-64 it was Rs. 2,606 crores and by 1967-68 it has gone up to Rs. 4,032 crores. Not only that, Birlas have recorded an increase of 96.0 per cent, Shri Ram by 96.4 per cent, Mafatlal by 95.9 per cent and Parry and Company, incredible though it may look, 360.5 per cent, most probably because it is directed by a former Governor of the Reserve Bank.

Of course, the licensing policy is there. After all, why do we have a licensing policy? Because, we want to curb the monopoly. But the same licensing policy, whose aim is to curb monopoly, is giving more licences to monopoly houses and thus accentuating the disparities between the small-scale sector and the larger monopoly houses. Out of the 195 licences given in 1971, 114 have gone to the same big houses.

Then, let us take the case of bank advances. In 1969 the amount outstanding against these 75 big houses was Rs. 440 crores. After this much talked of nationalisation, after this great leap forward, in March 1970 it has gone up to Rs. 491.73 crores. It is the same sordid story in the case of advances by the LIC. There was the Monopoly Enquiries Commission, there was the Licensing Policy Enquiry Committee, the Hazari Report and the Sarkar Commission. All these commissions and committees come and go but the monopolies remain for ever.

When we look at the achievements of the Three Five Year Plans which we have completed, there is no proof of reduction in inequalities. These three Five Five Year Plans have completely and miserably failed to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. They did not achieve the objective of redistribution of income, wealth and power in the whole society.

During these three Plans the public expenditure increased considerably, to an extent of 250 per cent. The expenditure on education, agriculture, health and some other subjects also increased considerably. But what is the effect of this increased public expenditure on the income distribution of society? Normally any public expenditure influences ability of the people to save and invest. But the Government spending on health, housing and education affects the income distribution directly. For example, in the West European