

Revenue and Insurance) No. GSR 76(E), dated the 12th February, 1976 increasing the export duty to Rs. 800 per tonne on groundnut kernel, Rs. 600 per tonne on groundnut in shell and Rs. 300 per quintal on coffee, with effect from the date of publication of the said notification.²

There is no speaker on this Resolution. So, I would put it to the House.

The question is:

"That in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 4A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934 (32 of 1934), this House approves the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. GSR 75(E), dated the 12th February, 1976, increasing the export duty to Rs. 800 per tonne on groundnut kernel, Rs. 600 per tonne on groundnut in shell and Rs. 300 per quintal on coffee, with effect from the date of publication of the said notification."

The Motion was adopted

12.18 hrs.

TAMIL NADU STATE LEGISLATURE (DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL:

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now take up the Tamil Nadu State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, Shri Mohsin.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): The Minister is not here.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMIAH):

AN: Nobody expected that the earlier item would collapse.
 (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not the fault of the Minister. We had allotted one hour for the previous item. But it collapsed.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Shri Mohsin is coming.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: But he is late. He should be fined along with you!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr Mohsin, you have been saved by the Opposition Members. You must thank them. I was going to adjourn the House. Now you may move your Bill for consideration.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): Thank you. I beg to move.*

"That the Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Tamil Nadu to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha be taken into consideration."

Sir, the House is aware that the Proclamation dated 31st January 1976, made by the President under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Tamil Nadu provides *inter alia* that the powers of the State Legislature shall be exercised by or under the authority of Parliament. However, in view of the otherwise busy schedule of business of the two Houses, it would be difficult for Parliament to deal with the various legislative measures that may be necessary in respect of the State. It would be even more difficult institutions requiring emergent legislation. The Bill, therefore, seeks to confer on the President the power of the State La-

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri F. H. Mohsin].

gislature to make laws in respect of the State. It has been the normal practice to undertake such legislation in relation to the States which came under the President's rule and the present Bill is on the usual lines. Provision has been made in the Bill for the constitution of a Consultative Committee consisting of 60 Members of Parliament (40 from Lok Sabha and 20 from Rajya Sabha) in this regard. Provision has also been made to empower Parliament to direct modifications in the law made by the President, if considered necessary.

I request this honourable House to accept the legislative proposal before it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

'That the Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Tamil Nadu to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration.'

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): Sir, this Bill is another instance of how a wrong is followed by another wrong. By this Bill the entire democratic process, so far as one stage is concerned, is sought to be stalled. By this Bill, what is sought to be provided is to confer on the Executive the power of legislation in respect of the State of Tamilnadu and, by this measure, the Executive wants to arrogate to itself all the legislative powers also. This should be treated as being against all norms and tenets of a Parliamentary democracy. We know that Art. 357 provides that in the cases of government under President's rule, the legislative powers can be conferred on the Parliament and Parliament can delegate its functions to the President. But that should not be the normal way of functioning in this country. After all, legislation has to be considered and debated on the floor of the concerned Assembly

and, if the Assembly is not functioning, then on the Floor of this House. But, without our participation as people's representatives, laws are being passed by means of a fiat. This substitution of Executive legislation in place of normal legislation by debate and by discussion should not be the normal state of affairs. Now, with the liberal use of Art. 355 of the Constitution in this country, in so many States there is no participation, so far as law making is concerned, by any of the representatives of the people. Everything will now be done by the Executive from the North Block or South Block, by different Ministries in Delhi, so far as different legislations are concerned. I am raising a question of principle. You say that you have no time to discuss legislative measures with regard to States which are under President's Rule in the Parliament. We have time to pass laws like MISA, we have time to pass laws like the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act, we have time to pass laws like the Election Law (Amendment) Act, we have time to pass Constitutional Amendments for the sake of protecting somebody, but we have no time in this Parliament to consider legislation which is going to effect millions and millions of people in a particular State! You don't allow that State to hold elections and you don't hold elections; you have no programme to hold elections there. you don't allow the people to express their choice, you take up the administration of a particular State and then you also take upon yourself, by means of Executive orders, the right to pass legislation. This sort of abrogation of Parliament's functions should not be allowed. The provision is that if any amendment is sought to be made, later on, after the President's Act is passed, this amendment should be made on the floor of the House. But here, there is only the question of amendment, general discussions are not there. This is the position which you are finding in this country. On the plea of lack of time, especially when all sorts of Draconian laws are

being passed on the floor of the House, through the means of this House, we should not give up our right to frame legislations, even with regard to States which are under President's rule. My submission is this. Article 357 may be there. But there are so many provisions of the Constitutions that are not being followed by this Government. We have got the Directive Principles in our Constitution. The Directive Principles lay down so many laudable objectives which, the founding fathers of our Constitution wanted, should be implemented as early as possible 27 years have passed, but nothing has been done with regard to these. And now you say that, when article 357 is there, we should follow that. My submission is that the process of democracy should not be stifled in the manner in which it is sought to be done by this Government. You take away the people's right of participation in the election of their representatives—choice of representatives, you take away the right of the people to participate in law making through their elected representatives and now you want to go on foisting executive decisions through the means of legislative processes upon the people of a State whose rights you have already stifled. Therefore I oppose this Bill in principle. Let Parliament consider at least the important Bills. Why should they not come up here? And consultation with the Consultative Committee is not even compulsory, they may consult it or may not. Therefore where is the protection? Thus the people's representatives have no voice there their decisions will not be mandatory and binding on the executive. They can pass any law. Therefore, on principle, I am opposing this Bill.

I want the Minister to state when they propose to hold elections in Tamil Nadu, how long this will continue in Tamil Nadu, whether they will continue the President's rule of infatigum or whether there is a time limit thought of or whether the plea of Emergency will continue to be taken

for the purpose of perpetuating the President's rule in Tamil Nadu.

*SHRI S. A. MURUGANANTHAM (Tirunelveli) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I welcome this Bill seeking to delegate the powers of the State Legislature to the President in respect of Tamil Nadu. I have to point out that the imposition of President's rule in Tamil Nadu has been the inevitable consequence of wide spread corruption in administration, malpractices and regrettable encouragement to separatist tendencies perpetrated and perpetuated by the DMK Government in Tamil Nadu over a long period of years.

Sir, this Bill seeks to establish a Consultative Committee comprising of 40 members of Lok Sabha and 20 Members of Rajya Sabha for the purpose of assisting the President in the administration of the State of Tamil Nadu. Sir many meaningful and constructive steps are to be taken during the President's rule in the State. Now, famine is striking many areas of Tamil Nadu. In Coimbatore, Madurai, Tiruchirappalli, Tirunelveli and Ramanathapuram district of Tamil Nadu the people are undergoing manifold miseries on account of famine. In particular in my Constituency of Tirunelveli in Hapidaran taluk people are walking many miles for getting drinking water. I request that immediately effective steps should be taken to contain the famine in Tamil Nadu.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER We are not discussing the situation in Tamil Nadu; we are discussing the proposal to confer on the President the power to legislate. The hon Member may confine himself to the limits of the Bill.

SHRI S. A. MURUGANANTHAM: Sir, as the House is aware, in Tamil Nadu there are so many textile mills and some among them are sick. Something has to be done immediately for rejuvenating these sick textile mills. Textile Mills in Connerinagar and Wallijabad have been closed, throwing some thousands of workers out of em-

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

[Shri S. A. Muruganatham]

ployment. These milks should be re-opened immediately.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please be relevant. Please speak on the Bill. I am not preventing you from speaking. I am only requesting you to speak on the Bill.

SHRI S. A. MURUGANANTHAM: Under the President's rule in Tamil Nadu, a new impetus has to be given to the 20-point economic programme. In Tamil Nadu the land ceiling has been fixed keeping individual as the basic unit which in consequence has led to non-availability of Surplus land. As pointed out in the 20 point economic programme, the family should be the basic unit for land ceiling. Sir, under the President's rule in Tamil Nadu this kind of land ceiling should be ensured.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We had a discussion before on the situation in Tamil Nadu. It was fully discussed. This is a very limited bill.

SHRI S. A. MURUGANANTHAM: Sir, as I have pointed out, land ceiling in Tamil Nadu should be effected having family as the basic unit. Recently, in Tamil Nadu the bus fare has been raised. This should not have been done as it is detrimental to the interests of common people. Under the President's rule in Tamil Nadu such activities which would lead to the cumulative good of the people should be undertaken.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I welcome this Bill whole-heartedly and I will tell you why.

The consultative status that has been accorded to the Committee that is going to be constituted with sixty members, it should not be a consultation in form only, but I hope, it will be in content also. We have had our own experience of President's rule in other

parts of the country, in my State in particular, and it was our experience that whenever President's rule is proclaimed and the Governor with the help of advisers begins to administer that particular state, it becomes a State administered by civil servants. We have no quarrel with the civil servants—I have been a civil servant myself, but there are certain impulses which have got to be generated and these impulses cannot be found in a civil servant who is cloistered in his own chamber. Under the circumstances, we must have certain alternative apparatus in order to deliver the goods, to assess the aspirations of the people and respond effectively to the extent possible.

As usual, I will be asked that this is a limited Bill, but Sir, in my five years' experience, I have yet to come across a Bill which was unlimited. What I am trying to stress is that we have a Federal Constitution in this country. There are many countries in the world which have federal constitution, for example United State has a Federal Constitution. There are State Governments and there is the Federal Government. USSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, not only has a Federal Constitution, each State is an independent Republic which is governed by Moscow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What are you driving at?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Our Federal Constitution has certain handicaps and one of the handicaps is that our Federal Constitution has been limping on the stilts of linguistic States. Under the circumstances, what I am driving at is, that what we need in this country is a strong centre so that the heterogeneity of the linguistic nature is reduced as much as possible.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): That has nothing to do with the Bill.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: If you read the Bill, you will understand this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have read it, now I have started doubting myself, whether I have understood it.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: What I am trying to say is that most of these consultative committees tend to forget the real problem, particularly the people coming from the other States. We had our experience in the State of Karnataka, where our friend, Shri Filoo Mody, who is presently a State Guest, was only interested and trying all the time to put off the lights in Sansad Soudha. I would, therefore, urge upon the Minister to give a fair modicum of representation to the people and representatives from the State of Tamil Nadu so that they understand the aspirations of the people and they are able to fulfil those and make a success of the President's rule.

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER (Nilgiris): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am not in a position to welcome this Bill seeking to delegate the legislative powers to the President in respect of Tamil Nadu. 25 years after Independence, for the first time the President's rule has been imposed in Tamil Nadu. The argument advanced for the imposition of the President's rule there is that some Ministers of the D.M.K. Government had been indulging in corrupt practices. I would like to point out here that in other Congress-administered States also the Congress Party members themselves had made allegations of corruption against the Chief Minister's.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All this had been discussed before.

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER: No action was taken and we happen to see the Chief Minister, against whom allegations of corruption had been levelled, in the Central Cabinet. The very fact that the President is being empowered to legislate for the State of Tamil Nadu shows that the people of the State have been denied their democratic right to have their representative Government. It is a denial of

democratic system of representative Government. None, knows, including the Ministers, for how long this will continue. The wonderful symptom of the President's rule is that the Governor of Tamil Nadu has started saying that all the malpractices, misdeeds and corruption seen in Tamil Nadu during the past 25 years beginning from the Congress Party rule to the end of D.M.K. rule have been wiped out within one and half months. It seems that the President's rule is the panacea for all maladies of corruption etc. and the bureaucrats would eradicate such evils within the shortest time. If that is so, the representative Governments in all other States should be dismissed and the President's rule should imposed so that corruption and such other evils can be eradicated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The only question before us is: whether the legislative power will be exercised by Parliament or whether the Parliament will delegate the power to the President.

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER: To make the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: To make the law. Should we do it ourselves or should we delegate it to the President?

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER: The President is being empowered to run the administration in the State. I am wondering how the President would be able to run the State of Tamil Nadu from here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Not for running the administration but for making the laws.

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER: For what purpose? To run the administration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It does not matter. This is a limited Bill, only to confer on the President the law-making power. Whether he runs the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

administration all right or not is a different matter. Please come to the provisions of the Bill.

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER: The President's rule in Tamil Nadu has been imposed for political considerations and not for the welfare of the people of Tamil Nadu. It is not that the atmosphere is not conducive for holding elections in Tamil Nadu. The Governor himself has stated that the people of Tamil Nadu have not taken to violence and there is absolute peace. Sir, the elections should be held in Tamil Nadu so that representative Government can be established there. One wrong has been committed in Tamil Nadu to suppress one political party. I only wish that that wrong should not be passed on to the shoulders of the people of Tamil Nadu and such a wrong should not be allowed to multiply. I oppose this Bill empowering the President to legislate for Tamil Nadu with the request that elections should be held there for establishing representative Government.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN (Tiruttani): I confine myself to the merits of the Bill. All that has been said by the hon. members from the opposition who spoke just now, would have been relevant if they opposed the introduction of the President's rule itself. As you know, the House has approved with a unanimous vote the introduction of President's rule in Tamil Nadu and this is only a corollary. This has been done earlier also i.e. wherever there was President's rule such Committees have been appointed and such legislative powers have been conceded to the President. Certain warnings have been uttered and my hon. friend has desired that the Members coming from the State of Tamil Nadu should have greater say in the Committee. I think the hon. Minister will take care of that. There is no difficulty about it. Everything that has been wanted has been provided for under Section 3:

"Any Act passed by the President, will be placed before the Parliament and if any amendment has to be carried out, it can be done within a stipulated period."

So, there is no substance in the various arguments that were advanced against the Bill.

The Committee will consist of 60 Members—40 from this House and 20 from the other House. This will act as a sort of alternative legislature for the State. As there is no State Legislature, the jurisdiction of the whole Parliament is substituted and the Members of the Committee coming from this House and the other House will act as a legislature of the State for the time being.

I was enquiring from the hon. members how these Committees used to function earlier when there was President's Rule. I was told by some hon. members that the working was not satisfactory. The Committee(s) hardly met. I was told that once a Committee was supposed to meet in Delhi, but the Committee did not meet at all. I would only request that the fate of this Committee should not be as it was earlier and the Committee should meet as often as possible. Any legislation that has been prepared or is about to be presented, may be placed before the Committee. The whole Parliament may not be able to take care of it which the Committee can do.

For carrying on administration, certain laws have to be passed. The chief objective of the President's rule has been to avoid and to remove mal-administration. Mal-administration was not only at the State Government level, but it was in the municipal councils also. Their terms were over. They were over, living. It has been proved that mal-administration was the rule of the day. Several cases in local bodies

**Leg. (Delegation of Powers)
Bill**

have come to our notice in this regard. It may be necessary to pass an Act removing these local bodies and entrusting them to different hands. When I say 'different hands' I mean officials or officers who may for the time being be appointed for the purpose. Legislation may be necessary in that connection.

If the object of introducing President's rule has to be fulfilled, passing of the Bill by the House becomes absolutely necessary. There can be no objection on the matter of principle. Shri Somnath Chatterjee started saying his objection was on a matter of principle. When the principle of President's rule is accepted, this cannot be opposed on a matter of principles. It is only a corollary. I hope the House will pass the Bill.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI F. H. MOHSIN):** I am thankful to the Members who have taken part in the debate. The members from the Opposition have spoken against the Bill as if this is an unusual measure. After the proclamation of the President's Rule in Tamil Nadu, the powers of the State Legislature are exercisable by the Parliament. This has been laid down in Article 357 of the Constitution:

It is permissible—

“(a) for Parliament to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State to make laws, and to authorise the President to delegate subject to such conditions as he may think fit to impose, the power so conferred to any other authority to be specified by him in that behalf;

**Leg. (Delegation of Powers)
Bill**

It is only under this Article that this measure has been brought in. As the hon. Members are aware, now as many as four States/Union Territories are under President's rule, Tamilnadu, Pondicherry, Nagaland and Gujarat. If all the legislative work need to be taken up by Parliament then will we find the time for all these things? The 20 point programme enunciated by the hon. Prime Minister and to be implemented by the State Governments has generated many laws in the various States as well. It is therefore impossible for the Parliament to find so much time to pass all these necessary legislations. Besides this, there may be some emergency when the Parliament may not be meeting. We may have to have some legislation of emergent kind or emergent nature. So, it is not possible to do that unless....

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:
You can issue an ordinance which can come before the House later on. You can have this ordinance.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: Sir, even that has to be brought before the Parliament again. This is done in order to save the time of the House and it is issued on the usual lines. Whenever the President's rule has been brought in in the States, delegation of power is also taking place. The power of Parliament is delegated to the President and that is on the usual lines. After the promulgation of the President's rule in Tamil Nadu some ordinances have been promulgated like the following:

- (1) The Tamil Nadu Indebted Agriculturists (Temporary Relief) Second Ordinance, 1976.

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

and this brings me to the point that, in spite of the various other efforts that have been claimed to be made since the Emergency, the Railways are still going to be in the red. In spite of the recommendations of the Railway Convention Committee of 1971 and though the Task Force has reported to the Government what is being done about reviewing and reorganising the railway finances, we are still in the tunnel. May be the Minister sees the light through the tunnel. But certainly by going through his speech, there is very little that one can discover as to what reorganisation has been done about the finances of the railways, what is proposed to be done, what is the perspective that we have before us. Because we have seen, time and again, reports have been placed before Parliament and the reports of Parliamentary Committees such as the Railway Convention Committee and the Public Accounts Committee, are just so much of waste paper as far as the moribund Railway Board is concerned because, as I said last year itself, something more drastic has to be done for changing the old face of the railways and bring about a new look. Just new Ministers are not enough.

Till 1965-66 we have had surplus budgets and we are now steadily going down. Now we have got this so-called surplus budget. But what is the net financial position? It is the same and at the same time we are told about shortage of funds and therefore the new lines that are necessary for the development of our rail network, the new lines that are necessary for the development of our national economy, have to be cut down till there are mini-lines and we are having a sort of mini-railway system developing in this country.

For instance, one of the things that is holding up the development in the Southern Railway—that is leading to lose in earnings—is that you have got a tremendous delay in transshipment from metre-gauge to broad-gauge.

When we ask what has happened to this, they say "Oh, we will have to go to finance, we will have to go to the Planning Commission". But they do not go there themselves, they send their people in the Railway Board. God alone knows what they do and get there, because we in the South continue to remain jogging along in the metre-gauge and having these bottlenecks with the result that road transport is gradually pinching from the railways whatever is possible in terms of foreign.

Therefore, what I want to say and what the PAC has said is that the Railway Board, which is supposed to consist of experts, had not till now been able to put the financial management of the railways on a scientific basis nor is there any scientific and rational procedure which they follow. The PAC has particularly drawn attention to the fact that the railways have been in a great hurry to introduce various prestigious trains like the Rajdhani and they have not yet come forward with a long-range perspective plan, that a tremendous amount of ad hocism is continuing, etc.

The budget, in spite of a few silver linings, continues to reflect the same ad hocism.

What has been done about the suburban railways? You are losing heavily on season tickets. We are not saying "Raise the fares". The Railway Board is never tired of telling us in how many countries the government is reimbursing the railways for the social burdens they bear. I want to ask, why is it that the Central and State Governments cannot provide quarters to the employees near their places of work or reimburse the railways for the losses on account of these social burdens? Why is it that big monopolistic concerns and multinational corporations such as the Lockheed cannot provide quarters to their employees near their places of work or reimburse the railways for the tremendous loss incurred year after year?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Lockheed to reimburse the railways?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: I am saying that companies like that whose employees have to travel by suburban railways on season tickets should make good the loss the railways are incurring on those season tickets.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): Do you want the railways to take money from Lockheeds?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: I am not at all saying you as an individual should take money from Lockheeds. I have explained my suggestion and if that is accepted, in that case, the railway's losses could be brought down by about Rs. 40 crores. There are companies like Sharp Dohme, Sandoz and other companies whose employees travel for work by suburban trains. So also Central Government and State Government employees. I suggest that such companies and the Central and State Governments should reimburse the railways for this loss. In their 195th report the PAC has said:

"A long range perspective plan should be drawn up in place of what appears to be an ad hoc approach as at present. Clear-cut priorities for future investment both in respect of passenger and goods movement should also be laid down. The committee trust that our railways, realising that Rajdhani and similar trains, while by no means unwelcome, cater to a limited and privileged section of the travelling public, will leave no stone unturned till a truly people-oriented service is made available to all."

In this year's budget papers, there is very little picture of any people-oriented service coming into being!

The hon. Minister said that the 20-point programme is being vigorously implemented in the railways. I do not know where that vigour is being directed, because one of the points in

that programme is that workers should be taken into participation in management. The railway authorities will again and again tell us, "Yes; we have our usual railway unions whom we recognise and love. We have periodical consultations with them." One of the examples once given to me in regard to workers' participation in management is, the workers are associated with the organising of boy scouts! Even in the International Women's Decade, they have forgotten girl guides! These are the footling little things we are told. Where was the participation, for instance in bringing down the rate of accidents; where is it in bringing down ticketless travel? Have you done any job analysis; have you taken the workers into confidence in working out as to where and how economy measures are possible? To-day, bonded labour is there in the Railways; because in many places, the railway officers use the employees as their cooks, malis, butlers or valets. Ask the railway employees. They will tell you. Have you done anything to remove it? But the economy measure means removing one worker here and one worker there, while the top continues as it is. Retirement is being used as a stick to get rid of unwanted people in the Railways, people who have the courage to speak up against the fossilized bureaucracy who cannot brook any criticism. And, therefore, you find this. In one place for instance, a worker was retired compulsorily on the charge of absenteeism; and he has been absent for only 3 days in that year. I can give you any number of examples; but I think you would not give me the time to give all the examples. So I have to do it with the Minister privately.

Such ridiculous things are happening. Uniforms are issued to railway employees. Obviously, when you make uniforms by the rule of thumb, they are all different thumbs: they are bigger, smaller, longer or shorter. And now suddenly, a notice is put

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

"That Clauses 3 and 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted

Causes 3 and 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted

13.55 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET, 1976-77—
GENERAL DISCUSSION

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We now take up general discussion on the Budget.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, during the last two days our Finance Minister has received a much larger share of bouquets than he is probably usually accustomed to for the budget which he has presented. On a closure study of his budget proposal I find that there are some new features in it undoubtedly which merit attention but the new features are both positive and negative. There is of course, much larger than usual increase in the outlay for the Plan. This is welcome. There is 31.6 per cent additional allocation for the Plan outlay, and as he has stated in his speech, this is higher than in any other one year during this period in which we have been going in for Five Year Plans.

Moreover, it is also a good thing that this big increase in the Plan outlay has been proposed at a time when prices are not rising. Previously due to the terrible inflation that was going on any

Plan outlay was proving illusory because the physical targets which were represented by those budget allocations were being heavily eroded by the fact of inflation. This time because at this moment at least prices are not rising—I do not know what will happen if the rains fall again but that is all beyond even the Finance Minister's control—therefore this increased budget outlay in terms of physical targets will be much more meaningful than it was in previous years.

The second new feature is that on the face of it at any rate there is no sort of sweeping attempt—as was done in the past—to put burdens on the Common man in the form of a heavy increase in excise duties on articles of mass consumption or popular consumption. Excise duties had become in the previous years the major source of collecting revenue and very large amounts were sought to be collected by imposition of excise duties. This time that position is not there. Some excise duties have been lowered, some excise duties have not been changed and a few excise duties have been raised also. But there is not that kind of general pattern of trying to raise a large amount of revenue by means of a sweeping increase in excise duties, that is, indirect taxes. That is also a new feature. Thirdly, there is also another new feature and that, in our opinion, is the absolutely unwarranted and dangerous concessions which have been made, which are proposed here in the budget proposals, to the industrial and business community, to big business to the monopoly sector in our country in the private sector. These three factors are all new, in a sense. Not that concessions were not made in the past also, but the range of concessions, the extent of the concessions, the volume of the concessions this time is such that certainly it represents something which is a break with the past.

14 hrs.

Now, as far as the Plan outlay goes, I would say that this is rather like going to the tailor and ordering a very