

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would request you not to use this language. Mr. Mavalankar, you are an honourable Member of this House, a Professor, nothing said in this floor of the House is a waste.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : beg your pardon. I withdraw what I said. Only this week the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power replied to me saying that the Prime Minister's award is expected shortly. This is the stock answer given every time. But I do hope during this inter-session period, this will be done, and the award will be satisfactory and in the best national interest. For the last six months, we in Gujarat, like many other States, of the country, are suffering from acute shortage of wheat. In succeeding months during last half an year the Centre's releases of quota are reduced in regard to wheat supply to Gujarat. May I request the Government to see that the allocation made to Gujarat is increased? Then again the problems of the Central Government employees living and working in Gujarat and in Ahmedabad need in particular, to be looked into and I request the Government to look into their problems and remove their legitimate grievances.

श्री भागीरथ भंडार (झाबुआ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने 377 के अन्तर्गत एक सूचना दी है। पिछली ता० 19 दिसम्बर, 1973 को पश्चिम रेलवे की जनता एक्सप्रेस रेल को सामूहिक लोगों ने लूट लिया। यह घटना नई नहीं है ऐसी कई घटनाएँ पहले भी हुई हैं। आम जनता इससे बहुत परेशान हुई। इस लिये मैं शासन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस क्षेत्र में यह लूट केवल इस लिये नहीं हुई है कि लूटेरे थे; बल्कि वहाँ पर भुखमरी फैली हुई है, बेरोजगारी फैली हुई है (श्रवधान) इस लिए शासन को रोजगार की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये ताकि ऐसी घटनाओं को रोका जा सके।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have drawn his attention. It has already come out in the paper.

श्री कमल मिश्र मधुकर (केसरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे खाद्य मंत्री जी यहाँ पर बैठे हुए हैं। पूरे बिहार में गन्ना उत्पादकों की हड़ताल है, इस बात के लिये कि 15 रुपया क्विंटल गन्ने का दाम हो। इस बात को आल इण्डिया फेड प्रोजेक्ट कन्वेंशन ने भी स्वीकार किया है। कल हम प्रधान मंत्री जी से भी मिले थे। हम चाहते हैं कि गन्ना उत्पादकों को 15 रुपये क्विंटल गन्ने का दाम मिले और गन्ना मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो।

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in the district of Burdwan, West Bengal, for the last ten years, floods and damages are caused to more than 60 villages involving 60,000 acres of paddy land by the river Kunur in Anagram P.S., Bahtar and Mongalkot in Burdwan District.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What should be done about it ?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER : These villages are facing acute shortage of food. So, I would request through you, the Minister for Irrigation and Power to sanction a scheme to control the floods caused by the rivers there.

13.27 hrs.

PUBLIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL*

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN) : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Development Bank of India Act, 1964 the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948, the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951, the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 and the Unit Trust of India Act, 1963.

*Published in Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 22-12-73.

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam) : Sir, it has been my painful duty once again to raise objection to the hurried way of introducing a Bill suspending the rules of giving two days' notice in this regard. They have done this once again.

I know the speaker has given his permission. But, in the memorandum submitted I do not see anywhere the reasons being given as to why this Bill could not be introduced earlier. The Bill has been dated 10th December. If you take the bulletin dated 1st November, 1973 the Bill has been mentioned therein. One thing which is perturbing me is this. This is the second occasion within 10 days that the Finance Ministry as come forward a Bill and is trying to suspend the procedure. I do not think that Shri Chavan wants to suspend some other Rules also and have this Bill passed into Act in this session itself. I am grateful to him when he says this, namely, in view of the complex nature of this legislation it is considered necessary for him to get this Bill introduced now. When the Bill is full of implications, it could have been introduced at the next session and enacted into Act. Before this is taken up, I want to know from him as to why it has been introduced now. If he wants to get it enacted now, then I have got a very serious objection to it. He can consider the complexities of legislation before he comes up before the house with the legislative proposal. He should have consulted the other ministries which are also involved in this. It requires consultation of the Reserve Bank of India at the highest level. When this is a complex legislation it is not proper for him to have this Bill referred to a select Committee before it taken up for consideration by this House? Suppose if he comes forward with the same proposition again then I shall raise the same objection.

I would appeal to him to refer this Bill to the Select Committee. And when it comes out from there it will come with very good suggestions. Therefore, I am making my objection for this hasty and hurried manner of introducing the Bill without giving an opportunity to Members.

श्री मधु लिमये (बाका) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सेझियान साहब ने जो मुद्दा रखा है, उसको मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ, हालाँकि उन से मैं सहमत हूँ। लेकिन

मेरा आक्षेप और ज्यादा बुनियादी है। मेरी राय में यह विधेयक गैरजरूरी ही नहीं, खतरनाक भी है। रिजर्व बैंक वास्तव में होल्डिंग कम्पनी का काम कर रही है। इण्डियन डेवेलपमेंट बैंक आज उसीके तहत है। छोटे असें के लिये जो कर्जा दिया जाता है और लम्बी मुद्दत के लिये जो कर्जा दिया जाता है, इसमें एक सूचीकरण लाने का काम रिजर्व बैंक ही कर सकता है। इस लिये इनको बसा करना चाहिये था—बैंकिंग विभाग को, जो इनके मंत्रालय के तहत है, समाप्त कर के यह कर्जवाला जो मामला है, पूँजी लगाने का जो मामला है, इसको रिजर्व बैंक में केन्द्रित करना चाहिये था और रिजर्व बैंक में एक इन्वेस्ट-मेन्ट बोर्ड बनाना चाहिये था, जिसमें उन सभी वित्तीय संस्थाओं के प्रतिनिधि रहते जिन के नाम इन्होंने दिये हैं, और रिजर्व बैंक का निगरानी में यह सारा काम होता। मेरी तो यह भी इच्छा है कि लाइफ इन्श्योरेंस कापोरेशन के द्वारा इन्वेस्ट-मेन्ट का काम जो किया जाता है वह भी रिजर्व बैंक के तहत लाना चाहिए। रिजर्व बैंक को सरकार समय समय पर निर्देश दे ताकि जो आर्थिक और औद्योगिक निति के उद्देश और जो योजना है उसको हम लोग हासिल कर सके। इसलिए मैं मन्त्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस विधेयक को वापिस ले जैसा उन्होंने स्वयं फर्माया है बहुत ज्यादा गहराई में विचार की जरूरत है, तो मैंने जो मुद्दे रखे हैं उनके ऊपर भी गहराई में जाकर सोचे, और एक भिला-जुला नया विधेयक लाये जिससे रिजर्व बैंक जो वास्तव में सेंट्रल बैंक है, उसको हाथ में पूँजी लगाने का, इन्वेस्टमेन्ट का सारा निर्णय ही मंत्रिमण्डल उसके ऊपर जरूर निगरानी रखे निर्देश देने का अधिकार तो आपको है ही। रिजर्व बैंक ऐक्ट में कुछ परिवर्तन करना चाहते हैं, तो करें लेकिन यह

बैंकिंग डिपार्टमेंट बिल्कुल निकम्मा साबित हुआ है, इसकी निगरानी में 5 राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक चाटे में चलने लगी है इसलिए वित्तीय संस्थाओं की पुनर्रचना के बारे में इनको नये सिरे से सोचना चाहिए और उसके पहले बैंक कमीशन की रपट पर बहस करने का हमको मौका देना चाहिए।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : May I say a word? You were pleased to make some remarks with regard to the suspension of rules particularly in the matter of introduction of Bills earlier. We really do not know where we stand in regard to the rulings from the Chair, if they can be called rulings at all. This has become almost a staple food of the House that we are being told that the rule has been suspended by the Chair. But the rules should not be suspended so lightly by the Chair when the Chair itself gives rulings on occasions that it should not be done. Why does this contradiction persist?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall answer that point. Obviously, he has referred to the waiving of the rule regarding two days' circulation of Bills. The rules are very clear that with the consent of the Speaker, that can be waived. I am only mentioning the fact. I did say once with reference to a particular Bill that it was unfortunate, and that was with reference to a previous Bill. But with regard to this, of course, the Speaker made the decision, but I think the reasons are very clear. In the first place, they could not get the Bill ready. It is a very involved and complexed Bill and they had to consult so many agencies. They have given those reasons.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : The Bill was completed on 10th December.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Minister will answer that point.

There are two reasons here which I think are legitimate. The first is that they have to consult so many institutions because so many complex questions are involved and they were not really ready. Secondly, the hon. Minister says that this is the last day of the session and he would like the Members to be seized of this matter and to utilise the inter-session period in taking

a deep and very critical look at the Bill so that it may be properly discussed. I think that this is a good thinking.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : It was printed on the 10th December.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : The President's consent had been obtained earlier on the 10th December.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : The technical point has been explained by the hon. Deputy-Speaker himself. I can only answer the point about the date.

The difficulty came about getting the Bill printed in a proper way. That was our main difficulty. The time-lag is larger, and there is no doubt about it. But the technical difficulty was in getting the Bill printed in a proper way. The other objections which hon. Members have raised are objections about the merits of the Bill. I do not think that we can go into the merits of the Bill at this stage. We can discuss this when the debate takes place. Government are convinced of the necessity of having this Bill. I do not think that you would like me to go into the merits of the Bill at this stage and I do not think, therefore, that it is necessary to go into them now.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का सवाल है। बुनियादी सिद्धान्तों की चर्चा तो हो सकती है, आप जो नियम है उसको देखें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The select committee question will come only at the discussion stage, when the Bill comes before the House.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : On a point of order.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : When we come to that stage, we will consider it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When the motion for consideration comes before the House, you can raise this point. This is only introduction.

श्री मधु लिमये : नियम किया कहता है जिसका तहत मैंने नोटिस दिया है, उसको आप देखें। रूल 72 :

"If a motion for leave to introduce a Bill is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the member who moves and from the member who opposes the motion, may, without further debate, put the questions. Provided that where a motion is opposed on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the House, the Speaker may permit a full discussion thereon".

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What can I do ?

श्री मधु लिमये : इन्होंने वह वहाँ किया है ? मैंने जो आज्ञाप, आब्जेक्शन उठाया है उसका संक्षेप में जवाब देना चाहिए, बहस नहीं होनी चाहिए, यह इसका मतलब है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will put it.

श्री मधु लिमये : इस नियम का अर्थ, इन्टरप्रिटेशन क्या है, उस पर आप व्यवस्था दीजिये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Tell me. Let me understand what is the point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : इसकी शब्दावली बिल्कुल साफ है कि विरोध करने वाला संक्षेप में अपना आक्षेप बताये और मंत्री महोदय उसका जवाब दें। इसमें बहस की कोई गुंजायश नहीं है। (व्यवधान) इसमें कहीं नहीं लिखा है मेरिट्स में नहीं जा सकेंगे।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is no point of order. Certain points may be answered. It is the privilege of the Minister.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : He was prepared to answer. You stopped him.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I did not stop him.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Let him answer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Have you anything to say ?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : No.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) : I have only heard the point of order raised. It seems to me a substantial point in so far as it requires of the Minister to reply to the specific points raised at this particular stage against introduction. I have been noticing a tendency on the part of Ministers, particularly the Finance Minister, some what to disregard what is said on that side. If a point was specifically made, under the rules it has to be specifically met, though in very short without a discussion. If this House is to be disregarded to the extent of the Ministers saying they merely oppose what is said on that side, this is wrong and against the letter and spirit of the rules of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Will you kindly listen to me ? We are considering introduction. Opposition may be taken to the motion for introduction. Now the rules are very clear. As far as the Chair is concerned, there are only two grounds on which you can oppose introduction of a Bill. First, if the Bill is outside the legislative competence of the House....

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : No, Sir. The rule does not say that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is my interpretation.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : You read it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I read it. I know.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : A full debate is permitted if the question of legislature competence is involved.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. One of the grounds for opposing introduction of a Bill is its being outside the legislative competence of the House. If that is the position, the Chair may permit some discussion or even a full discussion on that, whether the Bill is really within the legislative competence or not. The second ground is, if there are certain

procedural lapses, for example, non-inclusion of the financial memorandum or non-submission of the President's recommendation if it is a Money Bill and matters like that. But then the merits of the Bill themselves cannot be the reasons for opposing introduction, because the merits are to be discussed at the time when the Bill is discussed. On this ground, I could have stopped Shri Madhu Limaye from raising this point.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : How could you stop ? You are a just man.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : By saying that this relates to the merits of the Bill.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I am sorry. On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am on my legs. When I am on my legs, you are talking. That is the point of order ?

Let me finish my observation.

I have told him that the points made by him relate to the details. I could have stopped him and said, "Do not raise it." (*Interruptions*) Order, please. It is difficult to tell the Members to be very relevant and all that. We do all certain elasticity; and if he has raised certain merits, they are on record, and as the Minister says, "I do not want to discuss the merits because we will discuss them at the time of the general discussion of the Bill, I think it is quite legitimate.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Sir, could I have your guidance ? There have been occasions, when, for example, in regard to the law on preventive detention, we opposed it at every stage, first, second, third reading—everywhere we did so with reference to the merits of the Bill. Fundamentally to the merits of the Bill, at the introduction stage, I have opposed umpteen times in this House the preventive detention legislation, and I have referred to the merits in the matter. I have not heard what Mr. Madhu Limaye said earlier, but since you have permitted him to say something which goes fundamentally to the merits of the Bill—and you opposed it for Heaven knows for what reasons—the Minister must come forward to say something.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is under no obligation.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : He is.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : The spirit of the rule is there for you to administer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, please. I have made the position very clear. (*Interruption*) Order, please. I have made the point very clear; that if any opposition is taken on the ground of the merits of the Bill, I have said these are irrelevant to the motion for introduction. However, since he has raised the point, it is up to the Minister. But what I am saying is that the Minister is under no obligation to reply.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : He is.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN : The point that I made was that the objection raised by Shri Madhu Limaye was an objection on the merits of the Bill. It is not my attitude not to reply, or not to explain or try to evade the issue. Therefore, I said that if you permit me I will go into the merits. You have said "You cannot go into the merits", and that is why I sat down.

His main point was, instead of the Government taking over this under the Department of Banking, it is better to leave the matter to the Reserve Bank and allow them to continue in the same manner. After looking to the experience of functioning of the financial institutions, and again, looking to the volume of work they have started dealing with, it is very necessary that they should be separated from the Reserve Bank of India, because the Reserve Bank of India in addition to its functioning as the central bank of the country, also looks into the other aspects such as the development of agriculture, agricultural finance, etc. We thought that for the activity of industrial development which is assuming bigger and bigger proportions, it is much better for that purpose to have a separate company, and the functioning of all the financial institutions be brought under one umbrella. That is why this Bill was necessary. We are convinced that it is basically in the interests of integrated development of the country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Development Bank of India Act 1964,

[Mr. Deputy speaker]

the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948, the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951, the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956, and the Unit Trust of India Act, 1963."

The motion was adopted

SHRI YESWANTRAO CHAVAN :
I introduce the Bill.

13.44 Hrs

MOTION RE WORKING OF FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee on the 12th December, 1973, namely :—

"That this House do consider working of the Food Corporation of India".

Shri Shankar Dayal Singh was speaking on the last occasion. He may continue.

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह (चतरा) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं उस दिन जब भाषण दे रहा था तो अपने भाषण को समाप्त किया था कि आज जो मूल्य वृद्धि है, खाद्यान्नों का जो अभाव है, ऐसी स्थिति में भारतीय खाद्य निगम के कार्यों में कसावट की आवश्यकता है।

13.45 Hrs

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

हमारे पहले के वक्ताओं ने भी उस दिन इस बात पर बल दिया था और माननीय वाजपेयी ने भी बहस की शुरूवात करते हुए यह कहा था कि खाद्य निगम में भ्रष्टाचार है, अनुशासनहीनता है, गैर जवाबदेही है और लोगों में काम करने की भावना की कमी है। कुछ हद तक हम लोगों ने भी इन बातों को सपोर्ट किया था और इसलिए किया था कि जो भारतीय खाद्य निगम के कार्य हुए हैं इधर उन को देखते हुए हमें यह कहना पड़ता है कि भारतीय खाद्य निगम को

एक शक्तिशाली और सक्रिय संस्था होने के लिये कसावट की आवश्यकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में जो कदम उठाये हैं कृषि मंत्री जी ने और राज्य कृषि मंत्री ने वे भी सराहनीय हैं। लेकिन उस के साथ साथ यह कहने के लिये बाध्य होता हूँ कि उन कदमों से अभी तक बहुत कुछ लाभ नहीं हुआ है। कुछ आंकड़ों में ने उस दिन आप के सामने रखे थे मैं नहीं चाहता कि बहुत से आंकड़ों के माया जाल में आप को फसाऊँ, लेकिन बहुत संक्षेप में कहना चाहता हूँ जैसे भारतीय खाद्य निगम में आज गड़बड़ घोटाले की और चारियों की बात ही ले लें, इन की शिकायतें कब आयी, किस तरह से आयी और किस साल में कितनी आयी, इस को जरा देखा जाय।

सभापति जी, भारतीय खाद्य निगम में चोरियों से जो क्षति हुई है केवल तीन साल का ब्यौरा रखना चाहता हूँ, 1958 में 63 घटनायें चोरी की हुईं जिन में 2,42,275 रु० का नुकसान हुआ, 1969 में 69 घटनायें हुईं चोरी की जिन में 4,92,637 रु० का नुकसान उठाना पड़ा, 1970 में 62 घटनायें चोरी की हुईं जिन में 5,04,739 रु० का नुकसान उठाना पड़ा। और यह नुकसान वास्तव में किस को उठाना पड़ता है? क्या वहाँ काम करने वालों को उठाना पड़ता है? नहीं बल्कि यह नुकसान उठाना पड़ता है भारत की उस गरीब जनता को जिस के लिये भारतीय खाद्य निगम कृत-संकल्प है, जिस के लिये इस की स्थापना की गई थी, जिस के लिये भारतीय खाद्य निगम का दावा है कि हम उस के लिये यह काम कर रहे हैं।

मान्यवर, यही बात नहीं है, पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार भारतीय खाद्य निगम ने 5 सालों में जो