

God for it. He has also reduced the export duty on tea, jute, decreased raw wool and mica. He has also raised the exemption limit for income-tax on dividends from Rs. 500 to 1,000 to give fillip to the share market, which is already in the throes of a mini-boom.

He has, however, chosen to increase the rate of personal taxation on the slabs above Rs. 10,000. When I heard the budget speech I was inclined to consider that this would cause very great hardship to the lower middle class people, but on analysing the budget proposals I found that he was out to his usual trick. While he has raised the tax level, he has shown some concessions in income-tax to those who own motor cars and who come in this slab. Under section 16 of the Motor Vehicles Act such employees who have a motor car are entitled to a deduction. So, if the two proposals are collated and juxtaposed with each other, higher levies on one side and higher deduction on the other. For an employee with an income of Rs. 10,000 the relief works up to Rs. 66, for an income of Rs. 12,000 the relief works up to Rs. 68, for an income of Rs. 14,000 it works up to Rs. 25 and on an income of Rs. 15,000 it works up to Rs. 4. Above Rs. 15,000 the tax burden starts increasing and above Rs. 20,000 each assessee will be required to pay an extra amount of Rs. 275 as a result of this enhanced levy. Therefore, those who are critical of these budget proposals especially this levy on lower middle class, would do well to bear this concession in mind before making any criticism.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : Give them a car before raising the rate.

SHRI NARENDRA KUMAR SALVE : Then I come to the agricultural wealth tax contemplated in the Finance Bill for assessment year 1970-71, which has come in for severe criticism.

16 19 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

The criticism of this measure is basically on two grounds. It is said that this type of levy, contemplated by the new legislation is likely to hit the agriculturists

and it is likely to disturb the rural economy. I am convinced that the inclusion of agricultural land and buildings within the purview of the wealth tax is one of the wisest and expedient steps as a starting point for several measures on the same lines to follow. To describe those people who will be within the purview of the new legislation as farmers or agriculturists is not merely a terminological inexactitude; I submit it is the grossest misnomer and it is, in fact, a deceitful misdescription, because 99 out of 100 assesses who will be hit by the mischief of the proposed legislation are not farmers or agriculturists; they are invest in agricultural property. It would be unfair to spare the investors in agriculture from the levy.....(Interruptions).

---

16.20 hrs.

RE : WEST BENGAL GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS TO BOTH HOUSES OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, under rule 340.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I know, you must have got some news, but I will permit only one from among you to raise it.

श्री जॉर्ज करमण्डीज (बम्बई दक्षिण) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अग्नी सदन के सामने जी काम है उसको प्राप स्वगित करें। पिछले तीन दिनों से लगातार हम इस सदन में इस मामले को छेड़ते आ रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is no question of adjourning the debate. I will allow Shri Banerjee to make his plea. He wants to raise a certain matter and plead under rule 340 that the debate be adjourned. After listening to him I will give my decision about the adjournment of the debate.

श्री स० लॉ० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रापको क्यास होगा कि कल जब प्रापने कुर्सी सम्भाली थी तब हम लोगों ने उसी

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

वक्त आपका ध्यान इस और आकर्षित करने की कोशिश की थी कि कलकत्ता में घ्राज जो वहाँ की विधान सभा का अधिवेशन होने वाला है, उसके बारे में हमें खतरा यह है कि वहाँ के राज्यपाल जो एड्रेस पढ़ने वाले हैं, उसको वह ठीक तरीके से नहीं पढ़ेंगे और कुछ ऐसी चीजें जिनकी वजह से वहाँ की असेम्बली को डिस्साल्व किया गया था और जिसके लिए वह जिम्मेदार थे, उसके बारे में जो कुछ एड्रेस में होगा उसको वह नजर अन्दाज करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

श्री मधु लिमये परसनल एक्सप्लेनेशन जब कल दे रहे थे उस वक्त मैं ने इस बात को उठाया था और आपको याद होगा मैं ने निवेदन किया था कि 340 के अन्तर्गत आप रेलवे बजट पर जो बहस हो रही है, उसको स्थगित करें। लेकिन आपने इसको नहीं माना था।

अभी जो खबर टेलीप्रिन्टर पर आई है और टेलीफोन से जो खबर हमें प्राप्त हुई है उससे मासूम होता है कि तीन बजे वहाँ सदन की बैठक हुई और गवर्नर साहब ने भाषण पढ़ना शुरू किया। एक पैरा पढ़ने के बाद या दूसरा पैरा पढ़ने के बाद चार पांच लाइनें जिनमें आरोप लगाया गया था श्री धर्मवीरा के खिलाफ, उनको उन्होंने स्क्रिप्ट ओवर करना शुरू किया। उसके बाद वहाँ के मुख्यमंत्री श्री प्रजय मुखर्जी ने इस पर एतराज किया और कहा कि आप उसको पढ़ नहीं रहे हैं ठीक से। लेकिन उसकी कोई सुनवाई उन्होंने नहीं की। दुबारा उन्होंने वही किया। कुछ अंश जिनमें उनका जिक्र किया गया था, उनका आचरण जो हमारी नजरों से खराब था और जिससे गणतन्त्र की हत्या वहाँ पर हुई थी, उसको उन्होंने नहीं पढ़ा और आगे पढ़ने की कोशिश की।

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : अच्छा किया नहीं पढ़ा।

श्री जार्ज करनेम्बीज : शर्म करो, क्या प्रश्न किया।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : अच्छा किया या बुरा किया, इसका कोई सवाल नहीं है।

16.24 hrs.

[अध्यक्ष महोदय पीठासीन हुए]

मुझे खुशी है अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप आ गये हैं। मैंने कल भी इस मामले को उठाया था। मेरी इस मामले में एक प्रार्थना गृह मन्त्री जी से है। साफ तरीके से तीन चार दिन से यह साजिश, यह कंस्पिरेसी गृह मन्त्री और गवर्नर के बीच चल रही थी और कोशिश यह हो रही थी कि वहाँ पर ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा कर दी जाए ताकि फिर एक बार गणतन्त्र की वहाँ पर हत्या करने की कोशिश की जा सके। यह मेरा चार्ज है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं धारा 340 के अन्तर्गत यह प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि आप इस डिबेट को एडजर्न करके, इस मामले के बारे में बहस करने की इजाजत दें। गवर्नर ने जो कुछ किया है वह बिल्कुल गलत है और जो कुछ भी वह कर रहे हैं दिल्ली के इशारे पर कर रहे हैं। उनको वहाँ जनता नहीं चाहती है एक मिनट के लिए भी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस पर बहस की इजाजत दें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न केवल पश्चिमी बंगाल का नहीं है, प्रश्न केवल श्री धर्मवीरा का नहीं है। प्रश्न संविधान का है लोकतन्त्र की परम्पराओं का है। राज्यपाल संवैधानिक प्रमुख हैं। क्या उन्हें इस बात का अधिकार होना चाहिए कि वह लोकप्रिय सरकार द्वारा तैयार किये गये अभिभाषण के कुछ अंश पढ़ने से इन्कार कर दें? यह अधिकार यदि हम राज्यपाल को देते हैं तो क्या उसको यह भी अधिकार होगा कि वह कुछ अंश अपनी तरफ से जोड़ दें? अगर यह अधिकार राज्यपाल को दिया जायेगा तो क्या केन्द्र में राष्ट्रपति महोदय को भी यह अधिकार होगा कि वह केन्द्रीय मन्त्रिमण्डल

द्वारा तैयार किये गये अभिभाषण के किसी हिस्से को न पढ़े। यह संविधान की दृष्टि से एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मामला है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस पर चर्चा करने का मौका दें आज या कल।

MR. SPEAKER : What I say is, before we start a discussion or anything like that, if necessary, we must have facts before the House. May I request the Home Minister to make a statement before we adjourn today ?

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : We have not received an official report. As soon as we receive one can talk about it.

MR. SPEAKER : It is a constitutional point : it is a very relevant point. I am sure the Government agrees.

श्री रबी राय (पुरी) : स्पष्ट न्यूज में आ गया है। इसमें सन्देह की क्या बात है ?

MR. SPEAKER : We will have to find sometime to discuss it. It is not only about the President or the Governor, who ever it is, it is a ticklish point, a constitutional point. Mr. Tenneti Viswanatham has written to me : Mr. George Fernandes has written to me : Mr. Vajpayee has written to me ... (Interruption).

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : The fact is that he has omitted certain paragraphs, as already announced in the radio.

अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप गृह मंत्री को वक्तव्य देने के लिए कहें।

MR. SPEAKER : My point is, instead of off-hand discussing it immediately, I think, you should have the facts and the time to study the legal position. The Government also should have time to study the legal position. Let us discuss it in such a way that it will be discussed more authoritatively and more legally. We will fix some time. If the facts are there, whatever it is ... (Interruption).

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : The Home Minister can get the facts in no time. We can discuss it at 6-30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER ; On behalf of the whole House, I am saying that let the facts come. After all, this side also would like to know what happened to the Governor, whether he was assaulted ... (Interruptions).

SHRI RABI RAY : He is quite alive !

MR. SPEAKER : I do not know the facts. We will get the facts and, after the facts are available, we will fix time.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : As you said, you may fix some time for the discussion. But we must have a statement from the Home Minister before we adjourn today.

MR. SPEAKER : Whatever the statement, before 6 O'Clock, before adjourn for the day, let the facts come so that you can study the legal position, whether the Governor can skip over something or avoid something. Whatever arguments you want to put forth is at your liberty. You can prepare the case. Let the Government also do it. It is a constitutional issue which deserves consideration. After whatever information is available, before we adjourn for the day, I shall fix some time.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डिस : स्पष्ट प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करके इस मामले को आप सदन में आने दीजिये।

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam) : May we, therefore, expect that either the Home Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister will make a statement, say, at about 5.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER ; On behalf of all of you, I have requested the Home Minister to make a statement today.

श्री रबी राय : आपका फाईर होना चाहिए।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : If you so direct, we can collect all the information and make a statement tomorrow morning.

श्री रवी राय : नहीं, प्राज। (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Whatever information is available, you make a statement. All the information may not be available. After all, these are days when we have quick communication.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : At 6 O'Clock.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : Is the adjournment motion admitted ?

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing as admitted. We await the statement of the Home Minister.

---

16.29 hrs.

#### GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, Mr. Salve may continue his speech.

SHRI NARENDRA KUMAR SALVE : Sir, I was in the midst of my speech on the Budget. When the murder of democracy and constitution was being discussed, it was impossible for me to evoke the same interest in my speech. You would appreciate, who would like to drink *rasam* when Scotch Whisky is available.

Sir, I was making my submission in respect of the levy of wealth tax, under the Wealth Tax Act, on agricultural properties.

I was making a point that to say that the proposed levy would hit the agriculturists or the farmers is an utterly erroneous proposition to make. To describe those people who will be within the purview of the new legislation as farmers or agriculturists is not merely a terminological inexactitude, it is rather the grossest misnomer, because 99 out of 100 assesses who will be hit by the proposed legislation are

not agriculturists by any means or manner but are those who have invested in agricultural properties. There is absolutely no mistake, there is no error, in the Finance Minister taxing these people and bringing them within the purview of the Wealth Tax Act. I can appreciate what Mr. Masani said ; he advocates the Swatantra philosophy and, therefore, he wants to save those investors from taxation ; this is something which I can understand. But what I cannot understand is that those who swear by socialism are opposing this type of measure.

However, I may point out that, of late, it has been seen clearly in Bombay that two sections of the society are showing increasing interest in investing in agricultural properties ; one section is the film artists who own fabulous agricultural properties and are amassing further wealth ; and the second section are the Ministers in the Maharashtra Cabinet, specially those who come from Vjdarbha region. I know that, before they became Ministers, they were briefless lawyers and moved about unknown and unheard of in the District Court of Vidarbha ; they hardly ever did any farming, but after they became Ministers they blossomed into great Krishi Pandits ..

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : This is highly objectionable... (Interruptions).

SHRI NARENDRA KUMAR SALVE : Why is he objecting ? He is not a Minister either here or in Maharashtra..... (Interruption). Anyway, I can say that they were the most brilliant lawyers but were not patronised unfortunately ; that is to my knowledge. At any rate today some of the finest vineyards, orange orchards and agricultural farms are owned by these Ministers. Is there any justification to exclude these people from the purview of the Wealth Tax Act ? I submit that it would not be fair to exclude these investors in agricultural properties from the purview of taxation merely because they masquerade as agriculturists.

However, I am not willing to minimise the legal difficulty which the legislation is likely to encounter. Entry 86 of the Union List in the Seventh Schedule, which entit-