

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : My submission is very clear. Through you, I am making a suggestion that the Speaker be requested to go into the record and find out the veracity of the statement made by Mr. Vyas.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: It is a serious charge. It is all right, during the election campaign, these charges have been made. We are not bothered. Elections are over. Now he is repeating it here and I am specifically challenging him. Let there be a Committee of the House appointed by the Speaker to go through the record of the House to find out whether any Member from the opposition had supported, during the last five years, during the pendency of the Seventh Lok Sabha.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS : Whatever I have said is correct.

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, he is opposed to enquiry.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has made an observation that it should be referred to the Speaker. We will see.

The question is :

“That the Bill be Passed.”

The motion was adopted.

15.26 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION
RE : DISAPPROVAL OF
FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION
(REGULATION) AMENDMENT
ORDINANCE
AND
FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION
(REGULATION) AMEND-
MENT BILL

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We now take up item No. 14, Statutory Resolu-

tion and item No. 15, Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Bill. Both these items will be taken up together.

Prof. Saifuddin soz.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : (Bara-mulla). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move :

“This House disapproves of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance No. 12 of 1984) promulgated by the President on the 20th October, 1984.”

The Foreign contribution (Regulation) Amendment Bill which has been presented here is a very good idea. There are certain provisions in the Bill to which I lend my support. It is a very good idea to see which political parties in India are getting contributions from foreign countries by way of donations, etc.

In this Bill, by making certain amendments, they have brought in many more political parties, particularly from Jammu and Kashmir State, which were not previously covered by law. We can have no objection to these provisions in the Bill. But my first objection is—that intention does not remain hidden—that when you go through the Bill, you will find that it is the ruling Party at the Centre which wants to arm itself with powers to check the records and political activities of other parties in the country. There are certain provisions in the Bill in respect of which I would plead for rejection or deletion of those provisions.

For instance, there is a provision that before getting a donation, before getting any money from a foreign country, a political party has to register itself with the Central Government and, in that registration also, the Central Government has arbitrary powers. There is no time limit within which the

Central Government can register that political party for getting any donation from abroad.

Again, in this Bill, an element of delay in registering or giving clearance to a political party to receive donations is institutionalised.

15.30 hrs.

[SHRI N. R. VENKATA RATNAM in the chair.]

I am speaking about the element of delay in the registration of political parties with the Central Government and clearing those parties for receiving donations. Delay is institutionalised in the Bill itself because nowhere is there any provision in regard to how much time Central Government will take in giving clearance.....

SHRI G. L. DOGRA (Udhampur) .
How can you say that delay is caused ?

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : Kindly read the Bill. Delay is institutionalised in the Bill. Arbitrary powers go to the Central Government. What is Central Government ? After all, it is a Government of the majority party. So it is the Government of the Congress Party. Therefore, you want to have a check only on the movement of other political parties and the greatest objection from my side would be to this element of delay. You might not go to any court. If one goes to courts it may take months and years. Reference to time is very important. You may be holding an election and a political party may require donations. Time element is very important and Central Government is not bound by any law, by any provision of the Bill, to grant registration to clear a political party for getting donations within a stipulated time.

SHRI G. L. DOGRA . Why do you want to go to court ?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I do not understand you. Do you want to get donations or not ?

SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY : You are saying that the Central Government assumed arbitrary powers in dealing with foreign contributions. No other State except the Central Government is dealing with external affairs. We have no objection to the political parties receiving donations. But this Bill aims at controlling and regulating political parties from receiving donations from outside the country.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : You want all political parties including your Party to get donations from abroad.

SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY : No.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : Then, you have not studied the Bill. There should be genuine checks. I say that the Central Government has arbitrary powers in deciding references from political parties. Time is very important and if you go to court, further time will be lost.

So, you are only applying checks on other political parties in the Opposition.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS (Bhilwara). The political parties of your state Jammu and Kashmir have been included in this Bill.

[English]

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : My second point is that it is an aberration. I do not know how it has been provided. Perhaps they want that a political party on first conviction should go scot-free and it is on second conviction that a political party will be debarred only for three years.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Home Affairs as to why on

first conviction a political party will go scot-free. If it has indulged in malpractices, how can it go scot-free and it is on second conviction that you will debar that political party for only three years.

Then the third objection is that when you had to promulgate Ordinances, you could very well ask other political parties and have consultations with them. Now, long after the Ordinance was promulgated by the President, only now, you come forward with the Bill. But still, you have not consulted other political parties. This is not the way in which democracy can function.

After raising these objections, I would like to bring it to the notice of the hon Minister of Home Affairs that the financial memorandum is incomplete. You are not certain about the expenditure which you require. You may kindly refer to the financial memorandum also because you have not given us the exact position and the estimate of expenditure involved in the Bill.

This is all I would like to say.

I oppose this Bill.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN) : Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Bill to amend the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976, be taken into consideration.”

The Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976, which seeks to regulate acceptance and utilisation of foreign contribution or foreign hospitality by certain persons or associations with a view to ensuring that Parliamentary institutions, political associations, academic and other voluntary organisa-

tions as well as individuals working in the important areas of national life may function in a manner consistent with the values of a sovereign, democratic Republic, has been in force for more than eight years. The Act provides that certain categories of persons and political parties shall not accept any foreign contribution, that no organisation specified by the Central Government as “an organisation of a political nature not being a political party” shall accept any foreign contribution except with the prior permission of the Central Government and that other associations, not being organisations of a political nature not being a political party, which are having a definite cultural, economic, educational, religious or social programme, shall give within such time and in such manner as may be prescribed intimation to the Central Government as to the amount of foreign contribution, the source from which and the manner in which such contribution is received and purposes for which and the manner in which such contribution was utilised by them. The Act also provides for certain categories of persons obtaining prior permission of the Central Government before they accept any foreign hospitality.

Allegations had been made from time to time that foreign contributions received by some voluntary organisations were being misused for undesirable and sometimes even for anti-national purposes. There were allegations of involvement of foreign in communal and other disturbances in the country. In the circumstances, it was felt by the Government that the Act should be suitably amended to leave no scope for diversion of contributions for purposes other than those for which contributions have been received and to bring within the purview of the Act certain types of political parties which had been hitherto outside it.

A lacuna had been observed in the definition of the term ‘foreign contribu-

tion.' The definition covers the contribution received by the first recipient only. The same contribution could not be regarded as foreign contribution once it was passed on to another party. The definition of the term had, therefore, to be enlarged to cover the associations to which the foreign contribution or a part thereof may be passed on so that its ultimate utilisation may be traced.

The Act defines a 'political party' to mean an association or body of individual citizens of India which is, or deemed to be, registered with the Election Commission of India as a political party under the Election Symbols (Reservation and Allotment) Order, 1968, as in force for the time being. It had been observed that some associations were not only actively engaged in political activities but had also been fielding candidates for elections without having been registered with the Election Commission of India. Such associations as well as the political parties were not covered under the existing definition. In order to prohibit receipt of foreign contribution by such political associations and political parties, it was considered necessary that the definition of the term be enlarged.

As the preamble of the Act spells out, the Act covers only such persons and associations as are working in important areas of national life. The high place occupied by, and the importance of, judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts cannot be ignored. It was, therefore, felt that judges should also be covered by the provisions of the Act.

The Act provides that every association having a definite cultural, economic, educational, religious or social programme, which is free to accept foreign contributions, would send intimation about the receipt and utilisation of foreign contribution in the prescribed manner at periodic intervals. It was observed that intima-

tion was not being received from a number of them. It was felt that the receipt of foreign contributions would be better amenable to regulation if the associations are specifically registered for the purpose and the contributions are received through one account in a specified branch of a bank. For those who do not want to get themselves registered or who may get foreign contribution once in a while, provision should be available for them to accept such foreign contribution only after obtaining prior permission from the Central Government. Such associations would also be required to submit the intimations which the registered associations would submit. It is proposed that in respect of the registered associations which do not file intimations in time or in the prescribed manner or furnish false information therein, the Central Government should have the power to require them to take prior permission before accepting any foreign contribution.

The Government considered that it should also take specific power to audit the accounts of organisations from whom prescribed returns are not received in time or where they are not in accordance with the law or where their scrutiny provides reasonable cause to believe that the provisions of the Act have been contravened or are being contravened.

While the associations have freedom under the Act to receive foreign contributions for their programmes, they are expected to comply with the provisions of the law relating to utilisation thereof and submission of returns etc. If an association is convicted for contravention of the law more than once, obviously it should not be free to accept any foreign contribution. It is proposed to make a provision to this effect in the Act to bar acceptance of foreign contribution by such an association for three years after its second conviction.

A Bill incorporating the above amendments was introduced in May 1984 and passed by the Rajya Sabha during the monsoon session of 1984. It could not be taken up for consideration by the Seventh Lok Sabha for lack of time. As certain provisions of the proposed Bill needed to be given effect to immediately, an Ordinance was promulgated on 20th October, 1984. The Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Rules were amended in terms of the provisions of the Ordinance and the relevant notification was published on 5th November, 1984. The provisions of sections 4 and 6 of the Ordinance were brought into force with effect from 1.1.1985 through a notification published on 21.11.1984. These have already been laid on the Table of the House. To handle the workload generated on account of registration of associations and for grant of prior permission for acceptance of foreign contribution and for the effective monitoring of the receipt and intimations of foreign contribution and investigation and follow up action relating thereto etc., additional posts will need to be created, the estimated expenditure on which is likely to be about Rs. 11 lakhs per annum. The Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Bill 1985, contains the provisions of the Ordinance with a slight modification. The House will agree with me that the provisions contained in the Bill are necessary for keeping our national life unsullied. I, therefore, commend that this Bill be taken into consideration.

I think it would be proper at the end of the discussion that I should try to reply to the points raised by the hon Member. I think the entire opposition to the Bill is based on incorrect information and wrong reading of the Bill. I do not think that I can possibly say that he has not read the Bill. But at the same time he has not been able to get the correct information from the Bill. The intention of Government is never to allow any political party to get

foreign contribution. Let us be very clear on that issue. If you are to read Sec. 9, it deals with hospitality, the foreign hospitality that some persons may possibly get. In order to regulate all this and especially about the objection which the hon-Member has raised as to why a political party having been convicted once, we are trying to give them a liberal period of 3 years after second conviction. This complete is a misreading of the Bill. I do not think that we propose to do anything of this nature. If he were to go through the Bill, I am sure much of the misunderstanding which he has expressed in the House will not be borne out by facts. In fact all foreign contributions to any political party are prohibited. Let us be very clear.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Is it not on second conviction alone that they get 3 years? What about the first conviction?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: That is why I am requesting my hon. friend to go through the Bill once again.

There are many cultural, religious and other associations which either do not intimate to the Central Government in time or they do not intimate in the prescribed proforma in which they are supposed to inform or supply the information. These are the various counts. Now, suppose they are being convicted for the first time. Then what happens is, they have been given opportunity to correct matters. If they are convicted for a second time, then of course, very stringent action is laid down that for 3 years they will not be allowed to receive any foreign contribution.

During the course of the debate if hon. Members wish to raise any points. I will try to answer them to the best of my ability.

With these words, I commend this Bill for the consideration of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Statutory Resolution moved :

"This House disapproves of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance No. 12 of 1984) promulgated by the President on the 20th October, 1984."

Motion moved :

"That the Bill to amend the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976, be taken into consideration."

Both the Statutory Resolution moved by the hon. Member and the Bill moved by the hon. Minister are now before the House.

Now, Shri Anil Basu.

SHRI ANIL BASU (Arambagh) : Mr. Chairman Sir, Government intends to bring about some changes in the existing Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976. The present Bill, as passed by the other House, has been introduced to amend the parent Act of 1976. Government wants to widen the definition of 'Foreign contribution' as well as of 'Political parties'. There are some requirements which have got to be fulfilled by these organisations receiving foreign contributions. Government is assuming some power to look into the cases where such organisations may seem to fail to provide audited accounts etc.

Now, Sir we cannot have any objection to such amendments. But we would like to put some questions. The Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Bill as proposed by the

Hon. Minister, contains some loopholes. Actually the intention of the Government is to plug whatever loopholes may be there; that is why this Amendment is being brought before the House.

In the parent Act of 1976 there is an Exemption Section, that is, Section 8. The organisations which receive foreign contributions have a wide opportunity of using this Exemption Section, that is, Section 8. There is no proposal in this Amending Bill to plug the loopholes of this Section 8. In recent years, the House has discussed about the role of foreign money and the danger they are posing to our national life. Unfortunately there are several instances in this country where foreign money has played an antinational role which is detrimental to our national interest.

In the case of multi-national corporations which are operating in this country, there is a wide scope for misuse of Section 8. In the name of normal trade and business they will be operating in our country and foreign money will be channelised through them. It is not possible for Government to find out the contribution which is channelised in this manner.

That is why we want to propose that Section 8 should be properly be looked into so that some restrictions on the activities of the multinationals can be imposed. In the High officials of the Government, we have come to know that there is influence of the foreign money and foreign agencies are extending their influence inside the country as well as in the Government. This definitely affects the security of the nation. Therefore I want to draw the attention of the Government to this fact that if the Government intends to regulate or to ban the foreign contributions, that should be done in a proper way because there are many loopholes in the parent Act. I do not

know how far the ruling party is prepared to go and whether they want to have a stick to beat the recalcitrants and oblige the loyal. This is a very vital question. I do not know whether there is a political will on the part of the Government to restrict all such foreign contributions. We have seen that the foreign agencies are operating in our country specially in the garb of social welfare measures. There are so many activities by the foreign agencies which have already been discussed in this House earlier. Therefore, if the Government really wants to have a control on the foreign contributions, they will have to take care of the multinationals' operations and the multinational corporations who are operating in this country.

It was said that the high Government officials enjoy hospitalities and foreign tours also. They are financed by the business and other interests. If foreign money with foreign thinking percolates into the highest officials of the Government, then it will create a very dangerous situation around us. Hence we plead with the Government that foreign contributions should be controlled in the proper manner and in a proper way. Necessary social, political and economic radical changes should be made to reach the goal.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I shall be brief. But as the Home Minister has pointed out, there have been some substantial lacunae in the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act of 1976 and all of us must congratulate him for bringing forward this piece of legislation in the House, which puts teeth into a law which has been uptill now rather toothless. Sir, the Prime Minister and again the Home Minister have, over the last few days, disclosed in this House the extent to which some foreign powers have been eating into the very vitals of this nation and of this administration by spreading money all around.

Now espionage by foreign power is an extreme form of involvement in the destabilisation of a country. But we all know, over the years, not only in this country particularly but in other developing countries also, the Foreign powers are at work to destabilise duly constituted regimes, particularly those powers who have now lost their colonial empires, and are up to the game of destabilisation, to the game of neo-colonialism and to the game of imperialism in its different forms.

An instance, comes to my mind as to why this control is essential. In 1975, there was the railway strike and attempts were made not merely to derail the trains, but to destabilise the whole economy. It was found out and it was revealed here that the leader of this whole movement, who later became a * * Minister in Janta Party Government, was getting foreign funds, foreign money for the purpose of destabilising the whole economy of this country, and bringing the railway services to disruption... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : What is this? It must be expunged from the records. It is all irrelevant. Let the Home Minister hold an enquiry....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : I have been deeply impressed for the last few days by the manner of the hon. Member, who is now standing, and who has been very forcefully taking up certain issues here, but permit me, in all humility, to correct him, that these allegations were made on the floor of the House, were made outside this House and in the newspapers, and these allegations were made against a person, who was named....(*Interruptions*). Now, if you want. I am constrained to name him, the person is* *.....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : That must be expunged....(*Interruptions*).

I am on a point of order. He cannot make an allegation against any individual without giving notice beforehand, and he is not here to defend himself. Secondly, the hon. Member belongs to the ruling party and his party has been in power for the last four years and more, and his party should be in power for at least five more years. We do not like to destabilise this Government through any tactics, or split, as they did in Kashmir and Andhra Pradesh.

The point I want to make is that your party is in power. Why don't you institute an enquiry? Why does the Home Minister not come forward to institute an enquiry? Why are the members of the ruling party merely content with making irresponsible, baseless and malicious allegation....(Interruptions).

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Banpara): It must be expunged from the records....(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Speaker will go into the record and decide.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : If the Home minister is prepared to come forward with an offer of enquiry into the allegations. I want this allegation to remain on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No interruptions please. Mr. Faleiro, you please continue and do not repeat the something....(Interruptions).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Why don't you request the Home Minister to come forward?

MR. CHAIRMAN No interruptions please.

16.00 hrs.

SHRI EDUARDO FALBIRO : Sir, there is no reason for the hon. Member

from Andhra Pradesh, and of the Janata Party, to be so agitated, because I have submitted that these allegations have been made here before, and they have been made outside and a Commission of Inquiry to specifically prove those allegations against the hon. friend who is not here now in this House, was instituted by the Congress, but unfortunately withdrawn by his own Government, that is the Janata Government.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Their Government is here for the last five years. Why have they not taken any action?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : They had forgotten the 18 dark months of emergency. .. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't repeat. I would request you not to repeat controversial things.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : I would respectfully submit to you, the disclosures made by people like Philip Agee, a very senior operative of the CIA and other people who have been inside the CIA, made in their books and in their revelations before the United States Senate Committee. In their books, which have been published, they have pointed out how the CIA works not only through their operatives and through their special network, but it also works mainly through organisations which apparently are very respectable cultural organisations, labour organisations, organisations of professional people, etc. and Philip Agee, for instance, has listed dozens of such organisations by name, which until then were talked to be very respectable organisations of academicians, of newspapers. It reminds me of such an important magazine 'Encounter' which was such a respectable magazine all over the world, which was found to be CIA-backed. And similarly, so many organisations of academicians, of wor-

kers, of cultural organisations were found to be financed by these international networks of intelligence.

Now we have experience here and the Home Minister has said it today and his predecessors had said it before that attempts at destabilisation of this very country, whether it is in the North East or whether it is in the North or whether it is in any other place, have been financed to a substantial extent by agencies, very innocent on the face coming not merely from the United States but from several other Western countries (it is relevant in the context of today) which have been proved to be just organisations for siphoning off money and illegal funds from the United States.

Now, we are at the political parties. I will definitely endorse what has been said earlier by my friend from the Opposition that now the time has come Sir, to have a control of the expenditure by political parties.

SHRI ERASU AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnood): A point of clarification, Sir. He has mentioned so many organisations. Through the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister also, are they operating?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : After what the Prime Minister has stated yesterday in this House commending the Principal Secretary for maintaining the highest standards of conduct in submitting his resignation, though he himself was in no way involved, you see, that commendation should have driven home the point to all the Members of this House.

Now, Mr Chairman, I was submitting on the point of expenditure that the political parties incur, particularly at the time which we have just now passed through, i. e. the time of elections. Now, it has been said here earlier by a leading light of the Opposi-

tion that we all start our parliamentary career by making an untrue statement that we spend only thirty or fifty thousands or one lakh of rupees, when the actual expenditure is much more. Now, the Prime Minister in his very vigorous and forthright assurance yesterday has made this point that the Government is concerned about electoral reforms. I would urge the Government to keep this vital aspect of electoral reforms in mind, namely, that there is a need to have control on expenditure on election and let us do as some other countries do for instance, West Germany, that if a political party obtains a particular percentage of votes at the previous election, that political party will be funded by the Government themselves to fight the elections.

That is a clean way. Contributions from foreign countries to political parties should in no case be allowed, because it is a blatant way in which foreign powers will decide the destiny of this nation. It should in no case be allowed.

Hospitality has been mentioned by hon. Members. One way in which people are won over is by giving them jaunts abroad—all expenses found. They come back praising that country and its regime, as also speaking about the deep and longlasting friendship with it which very often crosses the boundaries of propriety. This should, to begin with, apply to Members of Parliament themselves. Surely, if Members of Parliament know that under the law, they must obtain prior permission from the Home Ministry and give prior intimation to the Home Minister before accepting foreign hospitality, I have no doubt that every single MP will abide by it. But it is necessary that the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs or the Secretariat should bring these facts to the notice of MPs at the very outset, that if at all any MP were to accept such a hospitality, it must be done with prior permission from Home Ministry.

This must be done through a circular. I know many MPs have accepted this hospitality unknowingly, without the knowledge of the Home Ministry; and sometimes a lot of embarrassment to the Government and the country is caused thereby.

One way in which subtle and widespread interference takes place in the country from outside is through what are called the rural development agencies. A lot of unrest is being caused in rural areas by some kind of self styled rural development agencies. It should be made clear by the Government that voluntary agencies are welcome; they are welcome even in rural areas, but that they must function within the parameters--social, economic and political--laid down by the elected representatives of the country. These organizations cannot, and should not be allowed to spread discontent, social discontent and a situation which destabilizes social, political and economic systems in the country.

it becomes pertinent to mention here what the Kudal Commission of Enquiry has got to say about some of these agencies. One such agency which has come up before this commission of enquiry is AVARD i. e. Agency for Voluntary and Rural Development. Even the Gandhi Peace Foundation has come in for adverse comment from the Kudal Commission; and before my friend from the Janata Party jumps on his feet, may I say that even the former Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai has come out very strongly against many office-bearers of that Foundation and against many of the office-bearers of AVARD ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I agree with you.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : A lot of money which had gone to that Foundation and to AVARD is

found to have been misused. Reports have been sent about our rural areas to west Germany it is a matter for the Government to find out.

I am one with Mr Soz when he says that there should not be any harassment, under the guise of this law, of particular political parties. The purpose is not even to impede the flow of foreign money in this country, but it is merely to have an eye on how this money is coming, from where it is coming and how it is spent. There should be no harassment, and I am sure Government has no such intention. This Government has proved it.

I recall how Indira Ji was harassed by the Janata Government. But as soon as she came back to power, she showed her generosity. There were many reports against Kanti Desai made by the Commission headed by Justice Vaidyalingam. But she said, 'We will not go by these reports. Let bygones be bygones.' We all stand witness to this attitude of this Government. For its enormous capacity to forget and forgive with an enormous capacity not to be vindictive. This period, I have no doubt, will continue. But in all this House must be one and I am sure I am one in saying that whatever. He dispute may be, we shall settle it through our own institutions and will not bring people from outside who will manipulate the voice one way or the other. It is in this spirit that I fully and strongly endorse this legislation and request all the back benches to support it so that the government is strengthened when it brings it forward before the House.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Sabarkantha) Mr. Chairman, I consider that the foreign Contribution Regulation Act was necessary and this amendment also is desirable. What I would have to say

relates really to the manner in which it is proposed to carry out this Act. What surprises me is that we go in for so much delegated legislation. Quite large powers to make rules under this Act are given. Why is this necessary when there is so much of time to incorporate the rules in the Amendment Bill? They could have quite easily indicated within what period of time and in what manner the return shall be submitted. They could quite easily have been incorporated in this bill itself. Then we could have commented on them whether the time given was adequate, whether the manner in which it is proposed to collect the required information needed to be given. All this could have been clearly indicated and the members here would have had an opportunity of commenting on them, whether it was adequate, whether it was inadequate, whether it would create any practical difficulties for associations or parties in submitting which need to submit these returns.

I also find it somewhat surprising, that they consider that as large a sum as Rs. 11 lakhs would be needed in order to implement these amendments. I cannot understand this at all. There is a cell already in the Home Ministry. That cell already receives under the unamended Act of 1976 returns from all the concerned individuals and associations. The only new ones now added are the political parties. The number of political parties cannot be very large; they are only small in number. All other associations etc, are already covered under the previous Act. Therefore, the number of new return etc, would be relatively small and the existing cell could easily have coped with them.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur) : They want to enquire whether the information is correct or not.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : I am pointing out certain ways in which the new

Prime Minister's desire for administrative reforms could be achieved. He wants clean administration. I am endeavouring to point out that one way of achieving this is not to go on multiplying the staff unless it is absolutely unavoidable. I am not suggesting that no staff may be necessary. On the face of it, I find it somewhat difficult to understand why so much additional staff is needed as to cost Rs. 11 lakhs.

There are certain things which we multiply quite unnecessarily. It is proposed that in future contribution shall not be received except through a specified branches of a bank, etc. everything has to be specified. In fact through this arrangement you got a very good agency through which you can have all the information recorded. Why is it necessary to have it recorded somewhere else also? If necessary; then have it by all means, but as it is, it seems we are doing the same thing twice unnecessarily.

Now you say that you are going to audit accounts of political parties. In fact, the previous Act already enables you to do so. There are quite adequate provisions for going into the returns. If there is reason for any doubt or suspicion. But if you consider audit to be absolutely necessary, by all means have it. But is it necessary to have a 100 per cent audit? In fact, If you want to have a check, it is a well-known principle that a random sample check is far more effective than a 100 per cent check.

I would, therefore, say that this aspect should be borne in mind by the Home Minister—who is not here at the moment—but he would certainly find it—to my mind—unnecessary to have a special staff in the Ministry itself to carry out the audit. You can select firms of auditors to carry out audit of randomly chosen parties as and

when necessary only. That would provide a much more satisfactory check. I wish really to point out that these are the aspects into which, after all, you must give careful consideration so as to avoid recruiting more people whom you will later on find it difficult to discharge.

It is again a fact, because the present legislation is such, the present rule is such that you cannot discharge anybody even if he is surplus to your requirement. This being so, it is always desirable that you are extra careful before you recruit more staff than is necessary.

The point really is, as the Statement of Objects and Reasons says, the Foreign Contributions (Regulation) Amendment Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha in May, 1984 mainly with a view to effectively monitor the receipt of foreign contributions and to include within its scope certain political parties which were not already covered. Now, it is only the monitoring duties that are sought to be performed by this additional amendment. Because the Bill could not be passed by both the Houses of Parliament in the Winter Session of the last Parliament. Ordinance was issued. That Ordinance is now being converted into an Act. There was thus ample time for the Government to have known what rules they would need in connection with the implementation of the amended Act. Why then have recourse to the device of delegated legislation? When these rules are made, undoubtedly they will be laid on the Table of the House, but at that stage they are usually not carefully studied. If they had been submitted here along with this amendment, we would have been in a position to offer some criticism, some constructive criticism. Even when the principle of the Bill is acceptable, the question of the manner of implementing is also of considerable importance and in the working out of that manner the opposition can also be of assistance. I do submit that greater care should be taken to the maximum extent possible

to avoid the necessity of delegated legislation. I have no other remarks to offer.

16.19 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD SHANKAR
 DIGHE *in the Chair.*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA (Pali):
 Mr. Chairman, Sir, Shri Vasant Sathe has written a book entitled "Towards Social Revolution". He has stated in this book that black money to the tune of Rs. 34,000 crores was in circulation in 1967-68 which increased to Rs. 54,000 crores in 1981-82. Black money has poured into India from foreign countries. Who is there to inquire as to which are the institutions which are getting money from abroad. A lot of black money was coming into India from Gulf countries. You know it well that black money poured into India from foreign countries to vitiate the political atmosphere in Punjab. This Bill has been brought to check such black money but the laws on the subject already exist and they must be implemented strictly. I will quote from the Act.

[*English*]

It is the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976. Section 23 of this Act says :

"Whoever accepts, or assists any person, political party or organisation in accepting, any foreign contribution or any currency from a foreign source, in contravention of any provision of this Act or any rule made thereunder, shall be punished with imprisonment... to five years or with fine or with both "

[*Translation*]

After 1976, you have taken up this matter only now. I would like to know the name of the organisations

[Shri Mool Chand Daga]

which have been punished for violation of this law. In 1985, I am asking you whether this law was meant only for keeping on the shelf or whether it was meant to be enforced. This question has been asked by a number of Members of Parliament. But in reply to this, organisations punished for violation of this law were never mentioned. The hon Member who spoke earlier has rightly said that first you make a law and then you bring amendment to it while the implementation of the law is ensured only through rules made thereunder. You never bring rules along with the Bill and that is why we do not know as to what is your intention? If rules are also brought simultaneously, it can be known as to what your intention is. In 1983 the following question was asked here :

[English]

“Whether it is a fact that foreign funds are pouring into Punjab to finance subversive activities in that State.”

And the answer is :

“The information received by the Government regarding remittance of funds to Punjab from abroad is scrutinised under the Act... under the law.”

[Translation]

What was the unaccounted money which poured into Punjab at that time? When this question was asked, the reply came that the Government was collecting the information. But that information was never supplied later on. Thereafter, Shrimati Maimoona Sultan asked a question in Rajya Sabha. I am quoting here the reply given thereto.

[English]

“According to the computerised results, foreign contributions amounting to Rs. 182.35 crores and Rs. 177.08 crores were received during the year 1976-77

and 1978 respectively. The data contained in the returns for the year 1979 onwards is under computerisation.”

[Translation]

I want to know the names of the foreign powers which have remitted unaccounted money to our country. I have no objection to your taking resort to any Section. You may also say that the institutions which bring foreign money into this country for specific purpose deserve encouragement, but if such institutions do not give account of that money and in this way violate the law, I would like to know whether they have been punished. I would also like to know the number of cases pending against them and also the names of the institutions against which such cases are pending. Will the Home Minister be pleased to state names of the institutions against which action has been taken under the law since its enforcement? At one point you assured that investigations will be made into it. But unaccounted money is still pouring into our country in spite of that. I would like to know whether you have taken any steps to check remittance of such foreign money.

The object with which you have brought this Bill is under consideration here. You said that the Government wanted to make the existing provisions more stringent; and that steps were being taken to enforce the existing law. You also said that the Government wanted to bring judges also under the purview of the Bill but I would like to draw your attention to this point. Suppose a judge of the Supreme Court goes to some foreign country and a gift is presented to him there; he will not be aware of the nature of that gift. So how can you implicate that judge? That judge will have to explain the purpose for which the gift was given. Is it necessary? Will it be in accordance with the dignity and decorum of his office? What do you mean by the word ‘Judge’ here? This has not been made clear. I have moved an amend-

ment to this effect. If somebody has presented a gift to me in some foreign country and I am not aware of the fact as to who has originally offered this gift or the purpose for which it was given, then what will be my position, because I do not know the full details about that gift? If some Indian association abroad accords welcome to me and a gift is given to me on that occasion. At that time I will not be in a position to know the origin of that gift. Will you include the Chief Justice and whether judges of High Courts will also be brought within the definition of 'judge'? What provisions do you want to make in this law. As far as I understand, you want to make a provision for different political parties working in India, which may use foreign money in election. Do we, the M.Ps, give correct account of what we spend in the elections? You know it well. But the position is that even after giving the account in accordance with the existing law the circulation of black money has increased to Rs. 56,000 crores as at present and these institutions are thriving on that black money. Even the extremists and terrorists in Punjab received money from foreign powers for creating a separate state of Khalistan. I would like to know from the Home Minister what action has been taken by Government against those who have violated the law which is in force for controlling such kind of activities as also the names of the individuals and organisations against whom action has been taken for violation of Section 23. You have punished none. But you are bringing a new legislation for the purpose and saying that you want to make the existing law more stringent as you had promised. Our Prime Minister has categorically stated that the political culture thriving on black money will prove dangerous for the country, and he has taken a firm decision to see that such a political culture was not allowed to grow. You have brought this Bill to check the political culture thriving on black money. I want to know the way in which you are going to enforce this law?

A very good suggestion has been mooted by an Hon. Member from the other side. He said that there are certain laws, for enforcement of which rules become essential. You do not bring the rules along with the Bills so how can we know as to how the law will be implemented.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, you yourself know that a law is enacted and rules thereunder are framed after six months. The law cannot be enforced until the rules required for the purpose are framed. So, it would have been better if rules were placed before the House along with the Bill and then we in Parliament could have played our role effectively.

While replying, the Minister should tell us as to what the nation had gained through the amendment to this law and whether the defaulters had been given punishment for violation of the law?

[English]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN) : I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have supported this Bill. While supporting, some of the Hon. Members also wanted clarifications on certain issues.

I must first refer to Shri Daga, who has been always very eloquent on matters which, in fact, he should have sought clarifications from the Minister in charge. I do not think that this is going to be in consonance with the kind of ideal that we have been following. I will request him to avoid this in the House as far as possible. It would be better if we can avoid raising issues of this nature. First of all, be wanted to find out...

SHRI SUDINI JAIPAL REDDY :
I am on a point of order.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : I am not yielding. Please sit down. I do not know if on every issue you have a point of order.

SHRI SUDINI JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, the Home Minister cannot tell a Member of the House as to what he should speak. This impinges on the freedom of the Member of the House.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : Under Rule 349 he can.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is a senior Minister, he can advise.

SHRI SUDINI JAIPAL REDDY : To whom?

MR. CHAIRMAN : To his own Party Member.

SHRI SUDINI JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, I am not able to follow the Minister.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : The hon. Member, Shri Daga referred to the black-money, which is now in circulation in the country. He referred to a book written by one of the Members of the House. I do not propose to dilate on that issue at all. If the hon. Member feels that the unaccounted money which is coming into the country should be accounted for by the Government, I am at a loss to understand as to what is the logic behind all this. If it is accounted money and this is a measure which, in fact, is an attempt on the part of the Government to see that money, which otherwise would have become unaccounted, at least some portion of it, if it can be accounted in the shape of registering themselves, filing returns, and the Government getting the information, what is the harm. Thereafter if we suspect that some of the parties have indulged in anti-social or anti-national activities, then there is a scope for auditing of the accounts. And if there is a *prima-facie* case, then the party can be prosecuted.

At this stage, after the 1976 Act, I can merely inform the House that 13 cases have been entrusted to State Governments and CBI. I cannot give any more detail. I cannot also divulge as to what are the charges. I can merely inform the House that 13 cases have been entrusted to State Governments and CBI for investigation and, after a thorough investigation, if the State Governments or CBI is convinced that there is a *prima facie* case, then there will be no hesitation on the part of the Government to proceed against the parties concerned. But at this stage, it will not be prudent and advisable on my part to say anything more.

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN (Cooch Behar) : Mr. Chairman, when we may expect the report?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : No report is going to be placed on the Table of the House at all. It is a State Government or CBI enquiry and it is a wing of the Government. They are enquiring into the matter and after full investigation if there is a *prima facie* case, then they have the full right to proceed against the parties concerned. It need not be brought before the House at all.

Sir, another point to which the hon. Member referred, is about the judges. I was totally under a wrong impression I was under the impression that how is it that only the High Court and Supreme Court judges are included why not other judges; because I have not been able to follow the amendment as it has been worded. I can merely clarify the issue. Judges of the High Courts and judges of the Supreme Courts, because of integrity and high eminence in the public life, have reached certain position. In fact; there is no intention to cast any aspersion on any high dignitary. So far as the gift is concerned, if it is even thousand rupees or so there is a limit laid down, if it is below that level, then, of course, it is allowed. But all dubious methods are being used not by the

recipient but by those who are interested in getting the information from different sources by influencing them. Unfortunately, being a developing country, it will not be correct on my part to generalise the same. But there are people who fall a prey to such kind of machinations and temptations. So, this is an attempt just to plug these loopholes and see that nothing of this nature is being attempted by the foreign donors or foreign contributors in order to influence one section of parliamentary life or other institutions which have been mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. Member, Shri H. M. Patel referred to the delegated legislation. Powers of making rules are being given and according to the practice obtaining in this House, rules as soon as they are finalised are laid on the Table of the House. There is a specified time limit and within that time, rules are open for discussion in the House, if hon. Members are interested. And if no objections are raised within the stipulated period, then they become final and the rules are thereafter made effective. I do not know as to why the hon. Member is objecting to this kind of delegated legislation unless the Committee on Subordinate Legislation feels that there are certain provisions under the rules which, in fact, contravene the provisions of the substantive Act. If anything of this nature is pointed out by Shri H.M. Patel, I am prepared to discuss it with him. But I do not think anything of this nature is pointed out by him. He has merely, in a general form, taken objection that this tendency itself is not correct. He will appreciate that a large number of rules, he himself had to frame and for that matter, whosoever is in the ruling Party frames them because while undertaking a particular legislation, there are a large number of eventualities which you cannot possibly visualize and you have to frame rules in order to meet certain conditions. I don't think that we can get away with the idea that there is no necessity of giving powers to Government to frame rules.

I have not been able to understand the other point which the hon. Member, Mr. H.M. Patel, made. I am sorry to say that he is not here. Having raised the point, at least he should have been here to listen to what I have to say in reply. Unfortunately, he is not here. He said that there is too much of staff which is being contemplated. That a cell is good enough. He has asked why we should have additional staff for the purpose.

The provisions have been made slightly stringent by which if the Government feels that some accounts have not been properly kept or they have given false accounts, then it becomes obligatory on the part of the Government to send some officer to audit the accounts properly and, thereafter, if we were to come to a conclusion that a party has been intentionally or deliberately trying to mislead the Government, then it becomes a fit case for launching prosecution against the party concerned. But in order to get ourselves convinced that the party has not deliberately done so—sometimes, during the course of their transactions, it becomes very difficult to maintain the accounts in a particular manner—we have made a provision saying if the party is convicted twice and that kind of a provision has been made deliberately with a view to give protection to genuine parties which during the course of their transactions might commit some mistake here and there. I think we are reading too much into it and reading too much between the lines. The Government has no intention of harassing any party. But at the same time, we cannot allow any kind of scope for getting foreign donation or contribution and not accounting for the same.

Hon. Members will notice that it is not the first recipient alone, but thereafter also there is the second, the third and the fourth recipient. If they were to get any foreign contribution, they should not get away with the fact that they never knew what was the source from which the amount came.

[Shri Amar Roypradhan]

They ought to know fully that it is a foreign contribution which is being given as a kind of aid to some people in order to get certain information or influence the judgment in certain matters. Nobody is prepared to give anything for charity. A large number of people are interested in getting some kind of a return for the money which is being passed on to different parties.

This is the reason why we thought that some more tightening of the rules was necessary and we have tried to tighten the same. I am aware of the fact that, in spite of this also, the hon. Members can point out that there can be different occasions which require more stringent measures, more tightening of even the existing Act or the Amendment Bill which I have brought before the House. I can well understand it. But in the circumstances in which we work, this was the Ordinance which was promulgated and the Ordinance had to be replaced by this Bill. That is why this Bill is before the House. I hope that with the kind of explanation that I have given, the House will be pleased to consider the provisions of the Bill and pass it.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Home Minister that he reacted to some of the suggestions that I had made earlier. But among other things he complained of my misreading the provisions of the Bill. There is no question of misreading the Bill. I have supported the intention of the Bill. It is a very good idea to regulate foreign contributions. The provisions relating to auditing of accounts of particular parties and associations are also necessary. But the point is that he never reacted to my suggestion that neither when the Ordinance was promulgated nor when they came forward with the Bill, the other political parties were not consulted at all. After all, the Central Government and the ruling party are not the only custodian of wisdom in the country. There has to be

a cordial atmosphere whereby you consult whatever has remained of the national opposition.

What would have the hon. Home Minister lost if he had consulted other political parties on this matter? Let us suppose that he has taken care of associations, individuals, etc. What about the political parties which have been brought under the purview of this Bill?

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : There is total prohibition.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I agree that by amendments you have improved the Bill. But, so far as these amendments and this Bill is concerned, you have not taken the political parties into confidence.

You have not consulted them.

I feel the Central Government has the total responsibility of registration. Now a political party comes forward with an application and, you will take your own time. But the time factor is very important. Suppose the elections are close at hand. Some political party wants donations. Therefore, you should specify the time. You have not reacted to this point.

SHRI G.L. DOGRA (Udhampur) : Are there any political parties which are getting money from foreign countries?

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I am referring to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs. He does not require any advocate.

SHRI G.L. DOGRA : I want you to be clear. Don't mislead us.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : There was a suggestion by Mr. Patil to effect economy of expenditure.

I feel that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs will react very favourably to Mr. Patil's suggestion which I suppose will effect economy and will not advise additional expenditure so far as this institution of the Cell is concerned.

I have supported the intention of the Bill.

But as the Bill stands, I have to oppose it. I support the intention behind the Bill.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I do not support the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you proseeing your resolution ?

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I am not withdrawing.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now I shall put the statutory resolution to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"This House disapproves of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance No. 12 of 1984) promulgated by the President on the 20th October, 1984."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I put the motion of the hon. Minister to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That the Bill to amend the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now we shall take the Bill into consideration clause by clause. There is an amendment by Shri Mool Chand Daga.

Clause 2 (Amendment of Section 2)

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : Sir, I beg to move :

Page 1, line 15 after "source" insert "of which he has knowledge:"(1)

If a person who receives any gift from a foreign source says "I do not know who has given it to me", how can he be punished ? He must have knowledge of it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : I explained the position in the beginning before the hon. Member moved his amendment.

Hon. member will be able to appreciate the fact that having received the personal gift which is beyond the limit prescribed, there is a reasonable chance to suspect that if it is more than Rs. 1,000 why is it that such a valuable gift is being given to a particular person. The hon. Member should be able to understand the situation. We merely want that he should inform the Government that this was the gift that he was offered and this is the source. Why should he try to shift the blame on the Government to prove that he did not have the information ? It should be the other way about. It will be the responsibility of the party receiving the gift to know the source from which he was getting the gift. Government cannot accept this responsibility. If Government were to accept the responsibility, it would mean that in a large number of cases, because of default, people will get scot-free. So, I would request the

[Shri S.B. Chawan]

hon. Member not to press his amendment; I would request him to withdraw his amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is the hon. Member pressing his amendment ?

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : No, Sir. I want to withdraw it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now I shall put Clause 2 to the vote of the House. The question is :

“That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 (Amendment of Section 4)

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : Sir, I beg to move :

Page 2, line 19,

for “Judge,” substitute

“Judge of a Civil Court or District Court,” (3)

My amendment is to the effect that the Bill should not include the Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts. These dignitaries should not be included.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do you press your amendment ?

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : (Ponnani) : What does the Home Minister say about it ?

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : I have already explained the position.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Does the hon. Member press his amendment ?

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : No, Sir. I want to withdraw it

Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no amendment to Clause 4. So, I shall put Clauses 3 and 4, together, to the vote of the House.

The question is :

“That Clauses 3 and 4 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clauses 3 and 4 were added to the Bill
Clause 5 (Amendment of Section 9)

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is an amendment given notice of by Mr. Mool Chand Daga. This is also about judges. Is he moving ?

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 and 7 were added to the Bill.

Clause 8 (Insertion of New Section 15 A)

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : Sir, I beg to move :

Page 3, line 33,—

add at the end—

“and the audited account may be seized if any violation of law relating to foreign exchange or any provisions of this Act is found.” (5)

Suppose the accounts are audited.

273 *St. Res. re : Disapproval of Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Ordinance and Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Amendment Bill* MAGHA 3, 1906 (SAKA) *Calcutta Metro Railway (Operation and Maintenance Temporary Provisions Bill* 274

Even then, if it is found that there are certain violations of the Act, they may be seized. This is my amendment.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : This is a very simple proposition wherein the powers of auditing the accounts have been given to certain officers and they have powers of a definite nature. I do not think we should provide under the Act that the auditing officer should have the right to seize the accounts. If it is required, then, of course, the authorities concerned will consult each other and they will be able to confiscate and seize the accounts which, according to them, seem to be of a suspicious nature. I do not think any purpose will be served by incorporating the same in the Act. If you make a provision for the same, it will create difficulty latter on. In different Acts the same provision is already there. So long as your purpose is served by recourse to provisions which already exist, I think you should not insist on making a specific provision under this section. I do not think the hon. Member will insist on this.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : I am not pressing my amendment.

MR CHAIRMAN : Is it the pleasure of the House that the amendment moved by Shri Mool Chand Daga be withdrawn ?

Amendment No. 8 was, by leave withdrawn

MR CHAIRMAN : Now, the question is :

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

Clouses 9 and 10 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the

Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : I beg to move :

"That the Bill be passed."

MR CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

16.57 hrs

**CALCUTTA METRO RAILWAY
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE)
TEMPORARY PROVISIONS BILL**

[English]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI BANSI LAL) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill to make temporary provisions for the operation and maintenance of the Calcutta metro railway for and for matters connected therewith, pending the making of regular arrangements for such operation and maintenance, be taken into consideration."

The project for the construction of Rapid Transit System from Dum Dum to Tollyganj covering a distance of 16.43 Kms. to meet the ever-increasing demand of urban commuter traffic in Calcutta was sanctioned by the Government in 1972 and works commenced in October 1973. The project could be allocated only a sum of Rs. 49 crores upto 1979. The position of funds having improved from the years 1980, the work is making satisfactory progress.

To alleviate the sufferings of citizens of Calcutta who have been put to inconvenience due to inevitable delay in completion of the project, efforts were made to complete part sections of Metro-Railway and open the same for commercial operation. One single