

mittee contained in their Twenty-seventh Report on Appropriation Accounts (Civil), 1965-66, Audit Report (Civil), 1967 and Audit Report (Commercial), 1967, relating to the Ministries of Information and Broadcasting; Works, Housing & Supply (Department of Works Housing) and Food, Agriculture, Community Development & Co-operation (Departments of Agriculture and Food).

#### REPORTS OF PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS COMMITTEE

THIRTY-SECOND, THIRTY-FIFTH, FORTIETH, FORTY-FIRST, FORTY-FIFTH, FORTY-SIXTH AND FORTY-NINTH REPORTS

SHRI G. S. DHILLON (Taran Taran): I beg to present the following Reports of the Committee on Public Undertakings:

- (1) Thirty-second Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Ninth Report on Central Warehousing Corporation.
- (2) Thirty-fifth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations relating to the Hindustan Shipyard Ltd., the Fertilizer Corporation of India Ltd., and Hindustan Steel Ltd., contained in the Seventh Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on Audit Report (Civil), 1962—Chapters VIII and IX.
- (3) Fortieth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations relating to Public Undertakings, contained in the Twenty-third Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on Audit Report (Commercial), 1963.
- (4) Forty-first Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Sixth Report (Third Lok Sabha) on Fertilizer Corporation of India Limited.
- (5) Forty-fifth Report on action taken by Government on the recom...

... dations contained in their Thirty-first Report (Third Lok Sabha) on Alloy Steel Project and Coal Washeries Project of Hindustan Steel Limited.

- (6) Forty-sixth Report on Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited.
- (7) Forty-ninth Report on industrial Finance Corporation of India.

12.27 hrs.

#### FINANCE BILL, 1969

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : Sir, I move\* :

"That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1969-70, be taken into consideration".

12.27½ hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack): On a point of order. First of all, the question arises which Bill we are to take into consideration. There are two of them, one presented to us on the Budget Day, Finance Bill 1969, which was introduced on 28th February 1969, which was circulated first, and the second Bill which was later circulated. We do not know of any procedure by which amendments can be effected by simply circulating another copy of the Bill with the amendments incorporated therein. If the two Bills had been identical, there would be no doubt that we could consider either the one or the other. But here in the one line numbers are not given, while in the other they are given. Similarly, other amendments have been effected. A cursory glance will itself show that some changes have been effected in the meantime either in the office of the Finance Ministry or some where else. On a cursory glance, I have detected two, may be there may be more. It takes some time to compare the two word for word.

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Srinibas Misra]

The Finance Bill has to be interpreted by the tax officers and by the courts. We cannot play with it like this.

I will draw your attention to p. 42 of the Bill circulated for the second time, line 14—'Act, 1947 (18 of 1947) but excluding alcoholic drinks'. In the original Bill, the version given is....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I presume the original Bill is the same as the one later circulated without any change, except in regard to line numbers.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Of course, there is change.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He can point out the discrepancies.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : In the original Bill, p. 57, it is Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947, but excluding alcoholic drinks'. This is in the Bill which was introduced, whereas the other one from which I quoted was not introduced but later circulated. On page 57 it reads: "Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947 but excluding alcoholic drinks : "But when you compare it with the version in the new Bill, on page 42 you find—the Bill that has now been circulated. ".....Act 1947 (18 of 1947)....." Where does it come from ? What are we considering ? We are considering the Bill as introduced; we are not considering any other Bill : Somebody must certify that the other Bill is replica or a correct copy of the original Bill. Let the Finance Minister certify that this is the correct copy, although we find that at a cursory glance this is not a correct copy. After this doubt is removed, I have got two more points of order.

श्री मधु लामये (मुंोर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस के पहले कि मंत्री महोदय जबाब दें मैं एक बात की ओर आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। आप को याद होगा कि जब बजट पर चर्चा शुरू हुई उसी समय अड्डेडम की बात को ले कर मैंने आक्षेप उठाया था। उस वक्त आप ने उस बात को उड़ा दिया। अब यह मामला बराबर उठेगा। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि

श्री श्रीनिवास मिश्र इस पर बोलने वाले हैं या नहीं। अगर बोलने वाले हैं तब मुझे ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना है। लेकिन मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उस समय मैंने इस के बारे में आपत्ति उठाई थी कि यह अड्डेडम नहीं है क्योंकि इसका फाइनेंस बिल पर असर होने वाला है। श्री श्रीनिवास मिश्र ने जो बात कही है मैं उस की ताईद करता हूँ और जोर से निवेदन करता हूँ कि आज आप को एक एक बात को देखना पड़ेगा। उस दिन आप ने मेरे व्यवस्था के प्रश्न को खत्म कर दिया था, लेकिन आज यह बिल आया है और हम चुप बैठने वाले नहीं हैं। अगर जो नियम है उस के अनुसार कार्रवाई नहीं की गई तो आज श्री मोरारजी देसाई से जरूर झगड़ा होने वाला है।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : May I say that the second Bill which had been circulated is not circulated by me. It is circulated by the Lok Sabha Secretariat giving the number of the Bill. I have not circulated the Second Bill. Therefore, what is the use of finding fault with me ? Really speaking, there is no difference between the two. One mentions just the Imports and Exports Control Act, 1947; in the other the description is given Act 18 of 1947; there is no difference in substance at all. I do not see how there can be said to be any difference. Both are the same; there is no difference between the two.....(Interruptions).

श्री मधु लामये : वित्त मंत्री के गुस्सा करने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। अगर एक कामा भी बदलना है तो कानूनी ढंग से होना चाहिये। वित्त मंत्री इस में क्यों नाराज होते हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The original Bill is before the House. That is all.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : How can that be ? The amendments are moved in accordance with the new Bill.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the budget speech was delivered in this House originally, a particular para was added regarding the Wealth Tax on

agricultural properties. It was not there before. He got a slip from the official benches and we objected then and there because the script did not contain the note. At the time of the introduction of the Finance Bill also it was pointed out so ably by Mr. Limaye. At that time we were told that at the introduction stage this should not be brought. We were in doubt whether it was within the legislative competence of this House. Some technical objections were raised. We kept silent. But at the consideration stage, this Bill is quite different from the one which was originally introduced as Finance Bill of 1969. Supposing the Finance Bill of 1969 has to be amended. Who is to amend it? Can the Finance Ministry do it? It can be amended only by this House after an amendment is moved or accepted by this House. At the initial stage a mistake was committed under the very nose of the hon. Speaker; it was not objected to at that time. But anyhow, we kept mum. But now we find that there are two Bills before the House: is one meant for the Rajya Sabha and the other for the Lok Sabha? What is this? I cannot understand. Therefore, my contention is that this Bill should be certified by the Finance Minister as the original Finance Bill. Otherwise, the other Bill will become redundant. That has to be decided. I would urge upon you to uphold the dignity of the House and proceed. I want your guidance.

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : अभी वित्त मंत्री ने कहा कि लोक सभा सेक्रेट्रियट ने इस को सर्कुलेट किया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या लोक सभा सेक्रेट्रियट बिल को इम्प्रूव कर सकती है, उसमें संशोधन कर सकती है, बगैर मंत्री महोदय की इजाजत के ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The original Bill was introduced here. That is all. There is no question of its being amended or it being called "as amended". There is no such question. We are dealing with the Bill as it was introduced here.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Why two Bills then?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Perhaps for the convenience of Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

AN HON. MEMBER : No Convenience.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, we are dealing with the most important piece of legislation in this House. Various concessions are being given. Our rights cannot be treated like this. Even a comma or a full-stop cannot be changed. How can it be for convenience? Then I can move another amendment for my own convenience!

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, the explanation advanced by the Finance Minister was to the effect that so far as he is concerned, the Bill which he introduced "is the Bill". This is the Bill. Then, he added something, that the other Bill which we are in possession of has been distributed by the Lok Sabha Secretariat. It is rather an extraordinary situation. Are we to infer that the Lok Sabha Secretariat is distributing unauthorised, unauthenticated documents. Please apply your mind to it. Now, even in regard to the authenticated Bills, it is not the Finance Ministry which is distributing; every document is distributed by the Secretariat of the Lok Sabha. We have now two Bills. I therefore point out the lacuna in his statement. He stands by the first Bill. We are having this difficulty, and you cannot brush it aside by saying there is only one Bill. Every document, you try to remember, is invariably distributed only by the Secretariat of the Lok Sabha. We do not receive any other documents at all. We have, therefore, two documents now. We want to know which is the correct document. If he says that the first one is the document, who is responsible for the second document which varies with the first document? I am not expecting him to give an answer. I request you to enlighten us. हमारा झगड़ा उन से नहीं है, हमारा झगड़ा आप से है। आप हमें रास्ता दिखलाइये।

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER : May I point out to Mr. Nath Pai that only at one place some explanatory note was added: "18 of 1947." And the lines are marked here, for facility, because when we have a debate on the amendments, it will be easy when it is properly lined. Beyond that, if there is no change....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : There is a change.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : We do not know. Somebody should say it is correct.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : This is correct. I will say further that if there is any difference, we will be guided by the original Bill that was introduced. That is all.

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, you did not answer my question. Why do we have two Bills ?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : The two Bills are the same in substance.

AN HON. MEMBER : What did he say ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He is certifying that both are the same.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : It is amazing.

SHRI NATH PAI : If both are the same, then why have two documents ? Don't you see the inconsistency in what you are saying? If both are identical, why have two documents ?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : If it is for the convenience of the Members that the Lok Sabha Secretariat did this. If you object to that, in future it will not be done. (*Interruption*). It is done by the Lok Sabha Secretariat for the convenience of Members.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Is it open to anybody, whether it is the Secretariat of the Lok Sabha or any of us, for our convenience to make changes in an official document, howsoever formal those changes might be ? If it is a formal change, we are proceeding in a formal manner. We are laying down the law of the land relating to taxation and we are going to put in some more syllables and some more letters only because it is for somebody's convenience ! Mr. Nath Pai pinpointed the matter very clearly.

In so far as the Lok Sabha Secretariat is concerned, it has been accused, so to speak, by the Finance Minister; it has got to clear itself. Formally speaking, it is purely technical matter. You have got to take a stand which is in keeping with this matter, and the Finance Minister cannot perform a kind of trickery by saying "I certify this to be an exact copy" which it is not.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : Sir, I object to the word 'trickery' used by the hon. Member. I have made no charge on the Lok Sabha Secretariat. I have only said that this was not circulated by me; this was circulated by the Lok Sabha Secretariat. It was not at my instance that this was done. I think the hon. Member is used to doing tricks and therefore he is saying this.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Sir, I can take things as well as give blows. The words 'trickery' that I used relates to the Finance Minister saying that he is certifying something to be an exact copy of something else in view of a discrepancy having already been pointed out. If that is a definition of truthfulness he is welcome to it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I know how tricky you are.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : You have a face to show to the country.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : My face much better than yours. (*Interruption*).

SHRI NATH PAI : That only ladies can decide.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order, order. This is not fair. It has been said that except for that small explanatory two words there is no change in substance and the Finance Minister has assured the House that there is no change. If there is any change anywhere we will be guided by the original Bill that was introduced. This was done for convenience, that is my presumption. Therefore, on this point I do not think Shri Nath Pai or Shri Mukerjee should waste more time over it.

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, how can you say that I am wasting the time. I have never been guilty of that charge in this House (*Interruption*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : On this basis let us proceed.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, on what basis should I proceed? I have both the Bills with me. Tell me which Bill is my guide or Bible to me ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have already said we are guided by the original Bill as it was introduced. Therefore, there is no question of any misunderstanding or any thought of confusion. If somebody wants to refer to it for the sake of convenience—the second Bill—then I will allow him to refer to it. That is all.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Sir, shall we take it that the Finance Ministry will move amendments if there is any discrepancy between this and the other including this "18 of 1947" ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member should not indulge in—excuse me for using the word—dribbling on this point. It should not take place at this point. It is meant for understanding of the House. Therefore, if there is any substance in any point of order I am prepared to listen to it. If there is any amendment the House will be guided by the Bill that was introduced on the first day when it was introduced. When we start amendments we will refer to the text as introduced in the original Bill. So far as your first point of order is concerned that is over.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Are we to take that "18 of 1947" is not in the Bill ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am referring to the Bill as it was introduced. If it is not there, it is not there.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Sir, my second point of order is this. Please refer to rule 70 of the Rules of Procedure. It reads like this:

"A Bill involving proposals for the delegation of legislative power shall further be accompanied by a memorandum explaining such proposals and drawing attention to their scope and stating also whether they are of normal or of exceptional character."

Here, in this Bill, there are three clauses that delegate power of taxation to the Government. They are clauses 26, 28 and 32.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Have you seen the Memorandum regarding delegated legislation? Clause 26 is mentioned there.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Where are the other two—28 and 32?

Clause 28 deals with regulatory duties of customs. It reads like this:

"With a view to regulating or bringing greater economy in imports, there shall be levied and collected, with effect from such date, and at such rate, as may be specified in this behalf by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette .."

The Central Government is being given power to fix the rate and fix the date for collection of regulatory taxes. No mention of this clause 28 has been made in the Memorandum.

Clause 32 deals with regulatory duties of excise. It reads :

"With a view to regulating or bringing greater economy in consumption, there shall be levied and collected, with effect from such date, and at such rate as may be specified in this behalf by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette, on all or any of the goods mentioned in the First Schedule to the Central Excises Act as amended by this Act or any subsequent Central Act, a regulatory duty of excise which shall not exceed 15 percent. Of the value of the goods as determined in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Central Excises Act,"

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Clause 28 I understand, but I do not see any delegation of power in clause 32.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : A maximum of 15 per cent has been fixed but still power is delegated. Therefore a Memorandum under rule 70 must accompany the Bill. Please read the Memorandum. It says :

"Sub-clause (a) of clause 26 seeks to replace sub-section (2) of section 2A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, by a new sub-section so as to enable the Central Government to make rules for the purpose of determining the additional duty leviable on an imported article, such duty being on account of the excise duty leviable on raw materials, components or ingredients used in the production or manufacture of a like article in India.

The aforesaid matter in respect of which rules will be made is a matter of procedure and details and it is hardly practicable to provide for these in the Bill itself."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Here no rate has been mentioned and therefore there is delegation of power. Mention of it has been made in the Memorandum.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : There is a difference between these two cases of delegation of power. There is regulated delegation and unregulated delegation. In clauses 28 and 32, the maximum is fixed in clause 32 and it is not so in clause 28. There is delegation of power to regulate. In both 28 and 32 there is delegation of power to regulate tax. So Rule 70 applies. Why should they not come with a Memorandum in respect of these clauses.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : His contention is that you have fixed a certain maximum and by implication there is delegation of power. What was the other point of order ?

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, no second point of order can be raised before this is disposed of. That is the specific rule. So, we want your ruling on this. Otherwise, there will be confusion. So, let there be one at a time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have gone through clauses 28 and 32. By implication, there is some delegation of power.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : (Kendrapara) : Clause 28 is very clear.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Clause 32 is not so clear to me. So, I would request the Government to correct the memorandum. We can proceed further on that basis.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Sir, you must remember that this is a Financial Bill; not a normal discussion. I do not think you can permit them to proceed without a memorandum.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As Shri Srinibas Misra has pointed out, there is a certain nicety. I have gone through the clauses. In clause 28 there is, by implication, some delegation. I would like the Finance Minister to explain this.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I certainly give great credit to the hon. Member for his analysis. It is good because that keeps us

up to date. He has always been doing it. These are things which are technical. Yet, I cannot say that they must be overlooked. But, in this particular matter, what has been mentioned here is clause 26, where no rate is prescribed and, therefore, it is really delegated. In all other duties like this, the maximum is prescribed and within that the government always varies. That has been the practice throughout. Therefore, this is not delegated in that sense the maximum beyond that government could not go is prescribed. This has been the established practice in the House and that is why it has been done. If in future it is wanted that this also must be mentioned, certainly we can do so.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What about clause 32 ?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : There is no difference between clause 32 and clause 28.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Sir, do you agree with this view ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : By implication there is some delegation of power in clauses 28 and 32. That I have admitted. But he has said that it is of a technical nature; because formerly when we used to have a regular duty the maximum and minimum would be mentioned and with that certain powers were delegated which were not mentioned, because it was of a technical nature. That is the explanation given by the Minister of Finance.

SHRI DATIATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : Formerly it was not the practice of this House, is no valid reply. The hon. Finance Minister just now referred to the Practice obtaining in this House. Especially when we are dealing with a Finance Bill, we have to be very punctilious and careful about the language we use in the Bill itself. The hon. Finance Minister has, in a way, conceded that the maximum has been laid down but latitude has been left with the government to operate within the maximum; that is exactly what is called delegation. In clause 26 he admits that the delegation is unlimited. But, in this particular case, even in clause 32, the delegation is up to the maximum limit. But as long as the Bill does not specify what the House wants it to do and it

is left to the discretion, well, that is delegation and there can be no other interpretation. Coming to past practices, if we find that the past practice is not proper, then it is our duty to correct ourselves because we have erred in the past.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Already the Finance Minister has said that we were following a certain practice in this House for a number of years. I see the contention of Shri Kunte that even if we were following a particular procedure and practice, when it is questioned, it becomes very relevant. There is no doubt about it.—Therefore this memorandum needs a little amendment and that will be done.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : We cannot proceed without the amendment.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I accept that it can.....(Interruption).

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Let it be circulated today and we will take it up tomorrow.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : There are so many cases when the Bill was not proceeded with further. The past rulings in the matter were that. Where the Speaker ruled or upheld the objection raised by any hon. Member, the usual practice in this House has been that the Bill is either withdrawn or is not discussed the same day or the next day unless a particular memorandum was attached to it. The President's recommendation was not there in the case of many Bills.—One of them was raised by Shri Misra and ultimately the Speaker said, "I uphold this objection", and the Bill was sent back or thrown in their face for amendment. I would request you to uphold the dignity of this House. Nothing is going to be lost within two or three hours.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not see the point that it needs reintroduction. Amendment of the memorandum regarding delegation of powers will be introduced. That will be done.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : Let the Government take advantage of it and circulate the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That will be circulated after the Lunch Hour.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Now comes the most important and salient objection to the Bill and that is to clause 24 which seeks to redefine "asset" in order to include agricultural land under "Wealth-tax".

Firstly, the scheme of our Constitution is that agricultural land, its value and its income, are all State subjects and not Central subjects. Entry 82 of List I of Seventh Schedule says: —

"Taxes on income other than agricultural income."

That is a Union subject.

Entry 86 says:

"Taxes on the capital value of the assets, exclusive of agricultural land, of individuals and companies; taxes on the capital of companies."

Entry 86 says that the capital value of assets excluding agricultural land is a Union subject.

In his Budget speech the Finance Minister stated clearly that he had taken the opinion of the Attorney General that agricultural land could be brought within the term "asset" so far as wealth-tax is concerned. It is surprising. I do not know how this strange opinion the Attorney General gave, with due respect to him. It is necessary that the Attorney General be summoned before this House to give his opinion as to how he supports such an opinion. Clearly the Constitution is against it. Entry 86 clearly excludes the capital value of assets so far as agricultural land is concerned.

They may say that it will come under the residual entry. Coming to the State List, List II, entries 46 to 49 say:—

"Taxes on agricultural income. Duties in respect of succession to agricultural land. Estate duty in respect of agricultural land. Taxes on lands and buildings."

If it is a tax on lands and buildings, it is here in the State List and is clearly excluded from the Union List. So, how can this Parliament impose a tax on agricultural land so far as wealth-tax is concerned ?

13 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. This point was perhaps anticipated and, therefore, the Finance Minister has placed before the House the opinion of the Attorney-General on this point. Once we have before us the opinion given by the highest law officer of the Government, I do not think that this can be raised. Of course, you are free to move a motion that the Attorney-General be summoned. (Interruptions).

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose :

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He wants to oppose it.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI : You must dispose of this point first.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप को पता है कि यही नुकता फाइनेंस बिल यहां पर पेश करने के तुरन्त बाद उपस्थित करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हो गया था। नियम के अनुसार मुझे पूरा अधिकार था लेजिस्लेटिव काम्पिटेंस के बारे में बोलने का फिर भी आप को याद है कि उस दिन स्पीकर साहब ने जब मैं ने यह मामला उठाया मुझ को रोका। आप यह जानते हैं। अब इन्होंने जो कहा है उस की मैं ताईद करता हूँ। यह असल में इंट्रोडक्शन स्टेज पर उठाने की इजाजत हम को मिलनी चाहिए थी लेकिन चूँकि उस वक्त नहीं मिली इसलिए कंसिडरेशन स्टेज पर उठाना इन का बिल्कुल उचित है। मैं इन की ताईद करता हूँ और साथ-साथ एक और मामला मैं उठाना चाहता हूँ कि नियम 219 के अन्तर्गत जो फाइनेंस बिल होता है उस व्याख्या में यह फाइनेंस बिल आता ही नहीं। इसलिए इस पर चर्चा करने का हम को कोई अधिकार नहीं है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, फाइनेंस बिल की क्या डेफिनिशन है इस में, यह जरा देखिए :

"In this rule 'Finance Bill' means the Bill ordinarily introduced in each year to give effect to the financial proposals of the Government of India for the next following financial year....."

सरकार के जो फाइनेंशियल प्रोपोजल्स हैं उन को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए यह बिल होता है। सरकार के फाइनेंशियल प्रोपोजल्स किस में आते हैं? बजट के भाषण में-एन्युअल स्टेटमेंट आफ एक्सपेक्टेड रिसीट्स ऐंड एक्सपेंडीचर होता है, उस की व्याख्या कॉन्स्टीट्यूशन में भी है और रूल में भी है। अब इन के भाषण में जो इन्होंने वाक्य जोड़ा, ऐडेन्डम जिस को आप ने कहा है और हम पहले से कहते थे कि यह अमेंडमेंट है, ऐडेन्डम नहीं है, तो बजट भाषण का रेफ्लेक्शन होना चाहिए बिल में। इस बिल में उसका रेफ्लेक्शन बिल्कुल नहीं है। तो जो मैं ने रूल कोट किया है उस के अन्तर्गत यह फाइनेंस बिल हो ही नहीं सकता है क्योंकि वह ऐडेन्डम है अमेंडमेंट नहीं कहा उन्होंने, ऐडेन्डम का मतलब उस में गलती से रह गया था। अगर उन की बात को मानते हैं कि ऐडेन्डम था तो बजट भाषण में जो प्रोपोजल्स थे वह इस में रेफ्लेक्ट होने चाहिए। आप क्लाज 29 देखिए, क्या वह रेफ्लेक्ट होता है? इस के बाद उन्होंने कहा है कि मैं अमेंडमेंट लाना चाहता हूँ। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह दो-तरफा रूलिंग आप नहीं दे सकते। ऐडेन्डम वाली बात है तो बजट के भाषण का पूरा रेफ्लेक्शन इस में होना चाहिए। अगर वह नहीं है तो यह फाइनेंशियल बिल नहीं है हमारे नियमों के अन्तर्गत।.....(व्यवधान)  
.....फाइनेंस बिल और फाइनेंशियल बिल में बहुत फर्क है। हमारे कान्स्टीट्यूशन में जिस फाइनेंस बिल की चर्चा है, नियमों में जिस फाइनेंस बिल की चर्चा है, बजट के भाषण में जितने सारे मुद्दे आयोगे ज्ञान का रेफ्लेक्शन इस में होना चाहिए। हां, वह बाद में अमेंडमेंट के रूप में बदल सकते हैं। लेकिन बजट का भाषण और फाइनेंस बिल दोनों में कुछ मेल है क्या? अगर वह पहले से ही कह देते कि यह मेरा अमेंडमेंट है तब तो बात समझ में आती क्योंकि ओरिजिनल भाषण और यह बिल दोनों में मेल होता। लेकिन उन्होंने ही स्वयं कहा है कि वह ऐडेन्डम है, गलती से



बात छूट गई थी। वह उन्होंने पढ़ कर सुनाया रेकॉर्ड में है। तो यह बिल उस के अनुसार क्यों नहीं है ? और जब नहीं है तो इस पर विचार करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। यह नया बिल पेश करें। उन का बजट का जो भाषण है—और देखिए यह सब गलतियां इस लिए हुई हैं कि पहले से आप लोग बराबर मुझ को गैर-कानूनी ढंग से रोकते आए। मैंने इंडो-डक्शन स्टेज पर एतराज उठाया, मुझे बोलने नहीं दिया जब कि लेजिस्लेटिव काम्पिटेंस पर बोलने का अधिकार मुझे था, ऐडेन्डम पर बोलने का अधिकार था। फिर बजट पर चर्चा के वक्त उठाया। लेकिन आप ने कहा कि नहीं। तो यह कैसे चलेगा ? आप की बात तो मैं समझ रहा हूँ कि यह ऐडेन्डम है, भाषण में कुछ गलती से बात छूट गई थी, वह उन्होंने पढ़ कर सुनाया। जो बजट भाषण है उस में इनका वह वाक्य है। फाइनेंस बिल उस को रेफ्लैक्ट नहीं करता है। इसलिए इस पर यहां चर्चा नहीं हो सकती।

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : My submission is that Entry 86 in the Union list clearly excludes tax on agricultural wealth because it says: "... exclusive of agricultural land, of individuals and companies". No doubt, residuary powers are there under Entry 97 which says: "Any other matter not enumerated in List II or List III including any tax not mentioned in either of those Lists". Then there is Article 248 also in the Constitution. But my submission is that what has been specifically excluded by the Constitution cannot be taxed under any residuary powers under the Constitution, whether the Attorney General says it or anybody else says it. For that you will have to amend the Constitution of India and delete the words "exclusive of agricultural land, of individuals and companies". This is one point.

The second point is that in the Addendum the Finance Minister has added to his budget speech, he has stated that the agricultural wealth tax would not apply to genuine agriculturists. For instance, where a businessman or firm acquires a farm for the purpose of agricultural activity, then only these pro-

posals of taxation would be applicable. In cases where genuine agriculturists develop farms for agricultural activities, they would be excluded. Sir, that will amount to discrimination under the Constitution. On that ground also, this proposal is unconstitutional and it cannot be considered by this House. If it is adopted later on the measure will be declared *ultra vires* by the Courts.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am a little amazed when you say that the likely objection was anticipated by the Deputy Prime Minister when he made this proposal and having anticipated that, he took the natural course open to him, that is, to consult the Attorney General of India and the Attorney General's learned opinion was available in the light of it.

Sir, we are not likely to be impressed by this. Assuming that the consultation really did take place—I am making only an assumption—and that the opinion is what the Finance Minister told us, namely, the right of Parliament remains in tact, let me draw your attention to an earlier precedent in this House when the compulsory deposit scheme was evolved. We objected to it and your learned predecessor did a right thing in summoning the Attorney General—I would like to put it more politely and say—in asking the Attorney General of India to come. If you are going to continue with this thing that the Finance Minister had assumed this, that the necessary consultations did take place and therefore there is no necessity for that now, then I am afraid I am at least not impressed by what you say. I would suggest that in view of the fact that there are two opinions and they are clashing each other, you give us the benefit which the Constitution gives us, namely, that the Attorney General of India may address this House. This is a very vital point and this is one of the issues that will be coming to the fore again and again in the relationship between the States and Centre. Let me and my Party not be misunderstood because I do believe that the country has given something to agriculture and the country, therefore, has a right to mop part of it for itself. My Constitutional objection is not to be mixed up with my economic attitude regarding agricultural taxation about which Shri Dwivedy has already spoken. I am confining myself

[Shri Nath Pai]

absolutely to the Constitutional and procedural irregularity. Having said that, may I request you not to brush aside our request on the ground that he must have consulted the Attorney General on this point. We are the people who need to be satisfied and it is our right which you are called upon to uphold. I hope you will do the needful.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, I would only confine myself to the specific point raised by Shri Mishra. My friend Shri Nath Pai has already said that when compulsory deposit scheme was introduced in this House, objection was raised on the ground whether it was reasonable restriction or not. It has to be defined not by the Finance Minister and therefore the Attorney General was summoned. He made some observations and we were allowed to put questions, though we were not fully satisfied. Still we did it. Now the Finance Minister said that the Attorney General has been consulted. We want two things . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : From the Government ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : From the Government or the AICC, I do not know.

This particular question has created a furore within the Ruling Party. Some said that it is for the States to legislate on this particular point.

I would only say that in this case either the written opinion of the Attorney General should be laid on the Table and circulated—that will be something—or he should be asked to come to the House and explain it.

SHRI NATH PAI : At the earliest possible moment.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : There was another instance. You were a member of the House then, but not the Deputy Speaker.

SHRI NATH PAI : But you were a very distinguished member of the Opposition.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : That was in connection with the Land Acquisition Bill piloted by Shri S. K. Patil. There was a Supreme Court decision and this was in

connection with property which was taken over. Then the Minister said, 'I have consulted the law officer'. We put a specific question to him as to who was that law officer. There are so many law officers—yesterday we heard a statement from the Deputy Minister of Law who is also a law officer. We wanted to hear the opinion of the Attorney General on the point. Then a Committee was appointed and the opinion of the Attorney General was shown to the Committee.

Here a motion has been moved requesting Government to ask the Attorney General to appear before us, and I have seconded it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : If the House wants to hear the Attorney General, I have no objection. He will come and address it when the clause comes up for discussion.

SHRI NATH PAI : That was very good of him.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Another point remains. You have not given your ruling on the point of order raised by Shri Madhu Limaye. He asked what are we discussing? This is not a Finance Bill. Can we discuss *Ramayan* without Sita? We want your ruling on the point.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now adjourn for lunch till 2.15 P.M. when I shall give my considered opinion.

13.12 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till quarter past Fourteen of the clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at sixteen minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER <sup>6</sup> in the Chair.]

RE. : ARREST OF MEMBERS

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : A grave contempt of the House has been committed. If Members of Parliament arrested while proceeding to attend the session of the House, it is a grave contempt of the House. Shri Gopalan, Shri Chakrapani and Shri Jyotirmoy Basu were arrested

this morning at 11.30 hours near Windsor circle while they were proceeding to this House and taken into custody by the police. They were proceeding to this House by the Raisina Road and in the corner where it meets the Windsor circle all the three were taken into custody.

Secondly, a batch of about 56 persons, unemployed youth who belong to the Socialist Youth Federation had come all the way from Kerala to represent to this House because this is the sovereign body. They had also been rounded up by the police and they are thus prevented from being able to make representation to this House. This question must be taken up seriously and the hon. Minister concerned should make a statement. You must direct the Government to release immediately all the three hon. Members who were arrested and they must permit them to attend the House. This should also be taken up as a matter of contempt of this House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : May I draw your attention to rule 229 ? "When a member is arrested on a criminal charge or for criminal offence or is sentenced to imprisonment by a court or is detained under an executive order, the committing judge, magistrate or executive authority as the case may be, shall immediately intimate such fact to the Speaker indicating the reasons for the arrest."

In this case, have they done anything ? When Mr. Biswas who was a Member of this House was detained in West Bengal this House took exception to it and even referred the matter to the Privileges Committee and the magistrate or whoever it was had to apologise to the House. Naturally, we have forgiven that. Now in this particular case, these men who have come from Kerala are unemployed youth; some of them are engineers, doctors, and so on. They wanted really to present a petition to this House. I would request you to consider this matter. Have you received any intimation about it, and if you have not received any intimation as yet,—it has happened in Delhi—it is a shame on the Members of Parliament. Today, there is voting taking place to the three Committees of Parliament. Should we take it that the Congress Government has deliberately

detained these three Members of Parliament and prevented them from voting ?

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat) : They have to come and vote in the elections to the Committees.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : So far as the three Members of Parliament are concerned, I shall find out from the Minister and ask them to place the facts before the House. Secondly, so far as the intimation part is concerned, I do not know, and I will have to find out from them whether they have received any intimation or not. About those who have come from Kerala, well-educated and all that, I am helpless because that does not fall within my province. You have brought it to the notice of the Government and the Government will take note of it.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR : Those three MPs should vote before 4-30 p.m.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall ask the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to look into it. What else can I do ?

SHRI UMANATH : It is not merely a question of a statement from the Minister. It is a question of three Members who are in Delhi and who were coming to attend the session this morning. They are being continuously prevented from attending the session. My question is, whether they are in custody and if so, they must be immediately permitted to attend the session. They must be enabled to attend the session. If you call for the statement of the Minister, that will not help us. Those Members should not be prevented from coming here; they must be enabled to be present in this House, and apart from the elections which are taking place and in which they should be enabled to vote, they must be allowed to participate in the proceedings of this House today. That question cannot be solved by a statement by Government and immediately they must be enabled to attend the session.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have to ascertain the facts. Otherwise, how can I give a ruling ? I will have to get the facts from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who is here. He will place the facts before the House. If something has happened which constitutes a contempt of the House, we shall take note of it.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) :** What about the three Members of Parliament ? If they are not enabled to come out by 4.30, they will not be in a position to exercise their votes in these very important elections to the three Committees of Parliament. The voting time ends at 4.30 p.m. They must be released before that time. Otherwise, it is a breach of privilege.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) :** The matter is really urgent if, as has been stated by Mr. Umanath, they were arrested while they were proceeding towards the House. If there was any cause of action in between that is a different thing altogether. But if they were arrested while they were proceeding to the House, then I think immediately some steps have to be taken to see that they at least come to participate in the proceedings of the House; and the other proceedings in respect of them may be carried on in due course.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** You know there is no immunity from arrest if they have committed any breach of the law. For breach of the law, there is no immunity. *(Interruption)* It may be outside the precincts of the House. Order, order. I am replying to the point made by Shri Dwivedy. If they were arrested within the precincts of the House then certainly no policemen could enter and arrest any Member. There is immunity, but outside, the House, in case they have committed an offence, is there any immunity ? I am not clear on that point. I do not think they enjoy that immunity from arrest.

As far as the question of intimation is concerned, so far I can say that no intimation has come. The Minister is taking note of it and he will take necessary steps.—That is a

**SHRI UMANATH :** Immediately, within 10 to 15 minutes.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** How long are we going to pay for the sins committed by the Sadhus three years ago ? These people who have come—are they never going to be allowed to go on the streets ? They are being arrested. *(Interruption)*.

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade) :** Sir, the point raised by Shri Indrajit Gupta is a wider one.—Is this not the House of the People ? The people are coming here to represent a vital and urgent matter and there is this Government, this satanic Government, which is suppressing the people. The Members of Parliament are arrested. What is going to happen ? It is not only a question of three MPs. Large numbers of People are coming from other places and they are arrested. What is happening in this country ?

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) :** How does the House reconcile itself to the fact that in the morning three Members of this House are arrested and no intimation is given, Ministers do not seem to know anything and we alone are keen that they must come to this House ? This House on principle should be keen that the information should have been made available.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Could you tell me what time this happened ?

**AN. HON. MEMBER :** At 11 O'Clock.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Under the rules they should have given intimation. That I can say very well. If in this city three Members of Parliament were arrested, for whatever reason, intimation should have been given to us immediately. There is no doubt about it. I am going to find out if there is any intimation.

**THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) :** May I say that the Home Minister, Shri Chavan, is out of station ? The Minister of State for Home Affairs, Shri Shukla, is just now replying in the Rajya Sabha to a Calling Attention notice. We have asked him to come here as soon as he is free so that he can say something about it. I myself do not know anything about it.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** When the Minister of State for Home Affairs is here, We will take it up.....*(Interruptions)*.

**SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) :** Sir, the proceedings of the House should stand

adjourned until it is taken up. The Minister can be called here even by telephone.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We can take any action against the authorities as they have not acted properly. But we will not adjourn the process for that. That is not possible.

श्री मधु लिमये (मंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसी के बारे में पहले मैं आप की मदद करना चाहता हूँ। मैं आप को सही बात बता रहा हूँ इस के बारे में। आप की यह बात सही है कि अगर कोई सदस्य कोई जुर्म करता है और उनको गिरफ्तार किया जाता है, या अगर उस को यह जो नजरबन्दी का कानून है उसके तहत अगर गिरफ्तार किया जाता है तो यह बात ठीक है कि विशेषाधिकार का मामला नहीं आता। लेकिन क्या आप यह नहीं मानते कि अगर उन को ऐसे अपराध और जुर्म के अन्तर्गत गिरफ्तार किया है कि जिस में जमानत हो सकती है तो क्या उन को तत्काल जमानत पर रिहा नहीं कर देना चाहिये ताकि वह बोट दे सकें। तीन बोट कोई मामूली चीज है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All these things have been said on the floor of the House. Everything will be ascertained and necessary action will be taken. Now, Shri Ranga.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN (Chamba) : Sir, you should look to this side also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already called Shri Ranga.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Baṣṭi) : Sir, you must listen to us also. We are also equally members of this House. Why do you allow them alone to say whatever they want ? (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I listened very patiently to that particular question which was raised.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : Sir, how could you be guided by their statement that

some Members of Parliament have been arrested ? Have you got any information from some magistrate ? (Interruptions)

SHRI K. ANIRUDHAN (Chirya-kil) : Sir, you should not allow them to behave as if they are in Faridabad. They should remember that they are now in Parliament.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : Sir, have you got any information from any magistrate about these arrests ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When this matter was raised, I made it very clear that if they were arrested outside the precincts then no immunity is involved. I will ascertain the facts from the Minister concerned. As the Deputy Prime Minister has said, he is in the other House and would be here soon.

14:30 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1969—Contd.

SHRI RANGA (Shrikakulam) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on the point of order that was raised by our friends saying that the wealth-tax on agricultural land ought not to be included in this manner, I would like to say these few words.

Sir, you may be a lawyer but I am not; but we were all there in the Constituent Assembly and we looked at those deliberations and proposals that were being placed before us as ordinary people would do with a bit of commonsense, some experience and also interest of the country at their heart. We understood at that time quite clearly that when land was put in the State List, all that pertains to land as property, as income-yielding property, source of living, source of employment, an avenue from which crops could be raised, and including residential buildings, cattle sheds and such other things were included in it. Therefore we thought that it was being kept within the province of the States.

What is more, we were doubly assured about it when we found in the Central List the clear expression "excluding taxes on land".

[Shri Ranga]

There is a third list where whatever has not been mentioned specifically either in the State List or in the Central List may later on come to be included in the Central List. But Government had an evil genius in the Finance Ministry and also in the Cabinet and somehow or other their eyes became green when the so-called Green Revolution began to show somewhere on the horizon and, therefore, they wanted somehow or other to bring the peasants and agriculturists within the mischief of the Central system of taxation. So, they have included it here.

I would like to assure the House and warn my friend that whatever may be the advice that he has received—and he thinks that the House would be given by the Attorney General—if by any chance you would not sustain our point of order and he would not listen to the warnings given by so many Members from different parties, including his own party, and insists upon getting this thing included in their taxation system, I for one speaking for the kisans would try my best to collect money—beg, borrow and raise subscriptions everywhere—and go to the Supreme Court and I feel confident that it would come to be quashed.

But, at the same time, the Chair has a special duty. It has got to look at these things not from the legal point of view but also from the commonsense point of view and then see, as we see it, whether really this can be construed to be coming within the purview of this Parliament and the Centre by any stretch of ordinary imagination, not a trickster's imagination or of an expert who would indulge in legal quibbles. That responsibility is on the Chair.

It is not as if I am asking the Chair to use this authority in an extraordinary manner. Vitthalbhai Patel had used it once. Several times later on your predecessors, the Speakers here, had used their influence and authority whenever they found that what was being suggested and proposed by the Government was not coming within the four corners of the ordinarily imaginable limits of their authority.

That Bill or that part of the Bill should not be treated as coming within the purview of this House and, therefore,

it should not be discussed here at all; it should not be passed at all. Therefore I would like to invoke the Chair's inherent authority to declare this part of it to be outside the authority of this House and, therefore, the Finance Bill excluding this part alone should be allowed to be discussed in this House and voted upon. So far as the wealth-tax on agricultural land, is concerned, I want the Chair to rule that it is beyond the powers of this House and this Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This point, I thought, was disposed of in the morning, because, a point was raised here regarding the competence of this House taxing agricultural wealth. The Finance Minister has acceded to the request and he is going, I presume, to.....

SHRI RANGA : I am not bothered about that. (*Interruption*) That does not justify this House going into it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : After listening to the Attorney-General, in case as you have suggested. (*interruption*) This will be when that clause will come before the House and not at this stage; that is not the practice. When that clause comes before this House, the Attorney-General is going to address. Even after that address, if the Chair is not convinced about it, then the Chair can exercise some judicial discretion in this matter, as you have said, but not at this stage. But you must bear in mind one thing. We have followed a certain practice. If it is *per se* something beyond the competence, then certainly the Chair exercises its authority, but if it is something beyond the competence of the Chair in the sense that ultimately the issue needs to be determined by the Supreme Court, then it will go to the Supreme Court. At this stage, I do not think that I am called upon to say something on this clause.

श्री मधु निमये : रूलिंग, देने से पहले उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप मुझे कृपया सुन लें। यह ठीक है कि बाकी तो सारे प्वाएंट ऑफ आर्डर खत्म हो जाते हैं लेकिन अभी जो मैं मुद्दा उठाने लगा हूँ उस पर मेहरबानी करके ध्यान दीजिये। उस के लिये आपको एक एक रूल और कान्टीट्यूशन की धारा को पढ़ना पड़ेगा।

अब रूल 219 देखिये : •

"In this rule 'Finance Bill' means the Bill ordinarily introduced in each year to give effect to the financial proposals of the Government of India for the next following financial year..."

संविधान की धारा 112 (1) देखिये। फाइनेंशियल प्रपोजल क्या है उस की डीफनीशन उस में है। 112 (1) में यह कहा गया है :

"The President shall in respect of every financial year cause to be laid before both the Houses of Parliament a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India..."

फाइनेंशियल बिल में जो बातें हैं उस से रिसीट्स क्या होंगी यह तय हो गया यह बात भी आप मानेंगे। अब यहां क्या मतलब है मैं बसु की किताब से आप को बतलाता हूँ कि यह ऐनुएल फाइनेंशियल स्टेटमेंट क्या होता है यह वाल्यूम फोर्थ एडिशन में है :

"This expression is borrowed from section 33(1) of Government of India Act, 1935. It stands for the popular word 'Budget'."

आगे चल कर यह कहते हैं :

"At present, the budget speech of the Finance Minister is given in two parts— A and B. Part B contains the budget proposals, the changes in taxation and other sources of revenue by means of which the estimates for the coming year are to be met."

यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बात है। अब मेरा यह कहना है कि इन के बजट भाषण में यह प्रपोजल था • वैल्यू टैक्स के बारे में फाइनेंस बिल में इस तरह का सुझाव देना जिससे जो सच्चे किसान हैं, नकली किसान नहीं, जोकि काले बाजार का पैसा सफेद बनाने के लिए किसानी करते हैं वह नहीं, बल्कि जो सच्चे काश्तकार हैं, असली काश्तकार हैं, उन के ऊपर इस का असर न पड़े, ऐसा प्रस्ताव हम दे रहे हैं। यह तीनों बातें साफ हो गयीं कि हर

साल इन को बजट पेश करना है, बजट में रिसीट और खर्च के बारे में इनको बयान करना है। फाइनेंस बिल वह बिल है जोकि भाषण के दौरान में जो प्रपोजल करते हैं उस के ऊपर अमल करने के लिए वह दिया जाता है। अब मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जो फाइनेंस बिल इस वक्त हमारे सामने है उसका जो 24वां क्लॉज है वह बजट प्रपोजल के अनुसार नहीं है और अगर उम में तबदीली होगी तो रिसीट्स के बारे में उन का जो एस्टिमेट है जो अनुमान है उस में जबरदस्त फर्क पड़ेगा। एक पैसे का भी फर्क पड़ेगा तो वह फर्क होता है। अब यह ध्यान में रखना चाहिए कि क्या एक मर्तवा बजट भाषण करने के बाद सरकार अपनी नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं कर सकती? जरूर कर सकती है लेकिन मैं बजट के बाद वाली नीति की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ, बजट के बाद जो नीति परिवर्तन हुआ है उस के बारे में तो वह अमेंडमेंट देकर करवा सकती है। लेकिन यह बजट भाषण के बारे में मैं कह रहा हूँ कि बजट भाषण के अन्दर जो प्रपोजल हैं वह प्रपोजल और दूसरी ओर यह फाइनेंस बिल दोनों में कोई ज्यादा मेल नहीं है और इस मानी में और संविधान के अनुसार यह फाइनेंस बिल ही नहीं है। इस को एकदम खत्म कर देना चाहिए। पहले तो आप यह रूल आउट कर दीजिये कि यह फाइनेंस बिल है ही नहीं उस के बाद वित्त मंत्री से कहिये कि कल वह वैल्यू टैक्स के कलाज में अमेंडमेंट करके बोलें तब वह फाइनेंस बिल बजट के अनुसार और संविधान व नियम के अनुसार ठीक हो जायेगा। आज आप उस पर चर्चा न होने दीजिये।

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I have very carefully listened to what my hon. friend Shri Limaye said. He, first of all, said that I added something to it and changed the whole thing. What I have said in my budget speech is as follows : What I have added is this :

"I shall, however, consider as to how genuine agriculturists can be exempted

[Morarji Desai]

from the purview of this measure and I will be moving necessary amendments to the Finance Bill at the appropriate time."

I had, therefore, at that time also contemplated only an amendment, not change immediately. If I added to the written speech, I was entitled to do so. There is no provision in the Constitution or the Rules of Procedure or anywhere else that the speech should be always a written one. It is done in order that the Members of the House have some convenience and they are able to follow it. If I do not distribute it tomorrow, nobody can raise any objection to it and nobody can say that I have not distributed it. I can change it to the last moment and I can say whatever I want to speak except that it must be consistent with what I put forward. This is what I have done. I have said that only in order to see that the Hon. Members do not get an idea different from the intention. I specified this, and that is all I did in that. If that slip came, it was in order to see that the words are not used loosely and any such thing may not happen. Even otherwise, I was going to say that. Even before that, I said that it was going to be done. Till the last moment, the Finance Minister is entitled to change it. Therefore, there is no question of Rule 219 being vitiated or that vitiating the Finance Bill or the finance proposals. Therefore, I do not agree with my hon. friend when he says that these are not proper finance proposals or Finance Bill within the meaning of that Rule. I cannot agree with it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Are you satisfied ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am giving my ruling because I have heard both sides.

श्री मधु लिमये : इन्होंने इतना ही कहा कि मैं अपने भाषण में तबदीली कर सकता हूँ तो उसके बारे में मेरा झगड़ा नहीं है लेकिन मेरा तो कहना है कि वह इन के मेन भाषण के अनुसार ही होना चाहिए ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : मेन भाषण के अनुसार हुआ है। उस में कोई दूसरा फर्क नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have referred to the Constitution also. It is very clear that the financial proposals contained in the speech should reflect in the Finance Bill that is placed before the House. All the proposals in the speech are reflected here, broadly. There is an inherent power of amendment to the Government at the last minute also. The question now have cropped up because a certain statement or addendum was circulated later on. While making the speech also he read it. In that also this is contained. That he has pointed out.....

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Is it addendum or amendment ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Addendum.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : If it's addendum in the speech, how can it be amendment in the Bill ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have understood these niceties, but even then, looking at the Bill as it is, does it constitute such a lapse on the part of Government....

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Very serious.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No.

श्री मधु लिमये : जैसा श्री बनर्जी ने कहा, बजट में आम है, लेकिन फाइनेंस बिल में इसली है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Does it constitute such a lapse that would invalidate this Bill and I should ask Government to reintroduce it ? I do not think his contention is borne out by facts.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Give some logical reasons.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He agrees with me that all the major proposals contained in the speech are reflected in the Bill except this one, but even there, the Finance Minister has stated that he would be moving the necessary amendments to the Finance Bill at the appropriate time. The time to move amendments is when we take up clause-by-clause consideration. Therefore, it is not of such an importance, as would invalidate the Bill.



**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE :** It is very important.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** He may consider it so. But I do not.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** सारे सदन ने, श्री रंगा ने, कहा है कायतकारों के बारे में ।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Therefore, let us proceed now.

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) :** On a point of order which is entirely different. That is about pumping sets and tube-wells. Kindly see the law about this. I would refer to sec. 3 of the Tenancy Act where the definition of 'land' is given. Are pumping sets and tube-wells covered in that definition of the word, 'land' ? I want your ruling.

**SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA :** Which Tenancy Act ?

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH :** Punjab Tenancy Act.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** If he has any objection to the imposts on those items, whether in terms of the Constitution or by way of a point of order, he can raise it at the appropriate stage.

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH :** This might help Government also.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI :** I am dropping the levy on pumping sets. He need not raise it.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** He has got his point now.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI :** I have already moved the Motion for consideration.

The important features of the proposals in the Bill were indicated by me in my budget speech and the details of the specific provisions have been explained fully in the explanatory memorandum circulated to hon. members with the budget papers. I shall not, therefore, take up the time of the House by going over this ground again, but shall confine myself mainly to explaining the changes I propose to make in the provisions of the Bill.

The valuable suggestions I have received both from hon. members and others, have been of considerable assistance to me in formulating these amendments, and I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to all those who have offered comments on the proposals. I have also had the benefit of consultation with my colleagues in the Cabinet.

In the sphere of direct taxes, the Bill contains proposals for the simplification and rationalisation of the scheme for payment of advance tax. It has, however, been represented that certain classes of companies closing their accounts on 31 December would suffer hardship if required to pay the last instalment of advance tax by 15 December. The hardship arises in cases in which the bulk of the sale proceeds is realised a few months after the close of the accounting year in view of the proposal that taxpayers will be under an obligation to estimate current income and pay advance tax thereon, where such tax exceeds the advance tax demanded by more than one-third of the latter. I therefore propose to make a provision enabling the Central Board of Direct Taxes to allow the last instalment of advance tax to be paid on 15 March instead of on 15 December by classes of assesseees to be notified in the official gazette.

I shall now refer to the proposal in the Bill for including in the net wealth of individuals and Hindu undivided families, the value of agricultural land and subjecting it to wealth-tax at the current rates. Hon. Members will recall that in the Budget Speech I had stated that Government would consider as to how genuine agriculturists could be exempted from the scope of this levy. The common concept of a genuine agriculturist is that of a farmer of moderate means whose main occupation is agriculture and who works on the land. Various alternative formulations for exempting genuine agriculturists from the scope of the levy have been considered and the constitutional validity of these examined carefully. It is considered that the most appropriate way of exempting genuine agriculturists from the scope of the levy would be to provide a separate exemption in respect of agricultural land.

[Shri Morarji Desai]

Accordingly, I propose to provide an exemption separately for agricultural land upto the value of Rs. 1.5 lakhs in each case. This would be in addition to the existing general exemption from wealth tax on the first Rs. one lakh of net wealth in the case of individuals and Rs. 2 lakhs in the case of Hindu undivided families. This would mean that a farmer who owns agricultural land worth Rs. 2.5 lakhs and does not have any non-agricultural investment or property, will be outside the scope of the levy. In the case of a Hindu undivided family in similar circumstances, no wealth tax will be payable unless the net wealth exceeds Rs. 2.5 lakhs. At present, a person who owns a residential house in an urban area with a population exceeding 10,000 persons is exempt from wealth tax on the value of such house upto a maximum of Rs. one lakh. In the case of such persons, my proposal is that the exemption for agricultural land will be reduced to the extent that exemption is given for the urban residential house. In other words, an individual dwelling in a city and having a residential house worth Rs. one lakh or more will be eligible for exemption in respect of his agricultural land only to the extent of Rs. 50,000. However, where the value of his urban residential house is less than Rs. one lakh, say, Rs. 60,000, he will be eligible for exemption in respect of his agricultural land to the extent of Rs. 1 lakhs less the value of the urban residential house, i.e. Rs. 90,000 in this example.

The Bill proposes to step up the scale of penalties leviable for defaults in furnishing returns of wealth and production of accounts and documents specifically called for by a notice, by relating these to the quantum of the assessed wealth instead of to the wealth tax payable as at present. It has been represented that the revised scale of penalties may cause hardship in cases where the assessed wealth exceeds the initial exemption of Rs. one lakh in the case of individuals and Rs. 2 lakhs in the case of joint Hindu families by a small margin. I, therefore, propose to provide that the base for calculating the penalty for such a default will be the assessed wealth as reduced by the amount of initial exemption.

I turn now to excise duties. There has been considerable criticism of the levy on fertilisers and power driven pumps. My Cabinet colleagues and I have given the most careful consideration to the various points that have been made in this regard in this House and outside. We have come to the conclusion that the proposal to levy excise duty on power driven pumps should be dropped, particularly with a view to giving relief to small farmers who may have to instal these pumps to secure the water needed to raise agricultural output. The estimated revenue of Rs. 2 crores from the excise duty on this article will not accrue.

We are of the view, however, that the levy on fertilisers should remain at the rate of 10 per cent envisaged in the budget proposals. There is no ground for the apprehension that it would inhibit the use of fertilisers, in view of the rapid increase in consumption in recent years and the remunerative prices of agricultural produce.

There has been some criticism of the levy on prepared and preserved foods, particularly from the cottage and small scale sectors of the industry manufacturing pickles, chutneys and certain other fruit and vegetable products.

It has already been decided to give some relief by excluding all nuts, most of the vegetable products and a number of fruit products from the purview of the levy and also exempting all dutiable fruit products cleared by any manufacturer up to a value of Rs. 50,000 annually. This would wholly exempt the cottage sector and also give adequate relief to the small and to an extent even to the large sectors of the industry. It is also proposed to give some further relief to products like 'murabbas' taking into account the fact that sugar bought in the free market is used in their production. These concessions would mean a revenue loss of Rs. 90 lakhs.

Representations have been received from the cotton mill industry as well as the decentralised sector of the cotton textile industry that the *ad valorem* duty imposed on certain varieties of cotton fabrics will increase the burden on some of the cheaper varieties of fabrics which are consumed mostly

by the poorer sections. It is accordingly proposed to reduce the duty on cotton fabrics falling under the new sub-item 1(1) of item 19 of the Central Excise Tariff from 15 per cent to 7-1/2 per cent in respect of all varieties except cotton blankets whose value does not exceed Rs. 2.50 per sq. metre and in the case of cotton blankets if the value does not exceed Rs. 4 per sq. metre.

Further, after carefully considering the large number of representations that I have received from the mills of South India, I propose also to reduce the excise duty on Cotton yarn in count groups 22—29 NF 14—22 NF and less than 14 NF by eight paise, five paise and three paise per kilogram respectively. The powerloom sector of the cotton textile industry has also been representing that the levy of *ad valorem* duty on certain varieties of cotton textiles is unduly burdensome. Considering some disadvantages that the powerloom sector suffers *vis-a-vis* the cotton mill industry especially in the matter of having to pay excise duty on yarn consumed in the making of powerloom fabrics, it is proposed to reduce the duty in respect of all varieties falling under sub-item I(1) of item 19 of the Central Excise Tariff when manufactured in the powerloom sector to two-thirds of the rate applicable to similar fabrics manufactured by the mill sector. A revenue of nearly Rs. 1.90 crores in a year will have to be foregone on account of these additional concessions given to the cotton textile industry.

The small manufacturers of rayon filament yarn have represented against the reduction in their margin of preference in the levy of excise duty over large producers. Considering that most of the small units are financially weak and have to face adverse competition from the large producers, it is proposed to enlarge the concession in such a way that the margin of reduction in the duty preference over the large producers is only 25 per cent of the pre-budget level, as against the 50 per cent reduction originally proposed. This concession would account for a revenue drop of Rs. 29 lakhs.

In the case of cement, the rate proposed in the Finance Bill is somewhat higher than was originally intended and, therefore, a reduction is being given so that the cumu-

lative incidence of the basic and special excise duty is 23.76 per cent as against the budget proposal of 25.2 per cent. This would result in a reduction in the duty of Rs. 1.86 per tonne at the current level of prices.

The overall effect of the various changes that I have proposed with regard to excise duties will be a reduction in revenue of Rs. 5.09 crores.

In the field of postal tariff, I propose to reduce the postage rate for a single copy of a registered newspaper weighing up to 60 grams from five paise to the rate of two paise in force before 15th May, 1968. I am proposing this change, which is estimated to result in a loss of Rs. 32.81 lakhs in a full year, in deference to the wishes expressed by several hon. Members. In order to help balance the budget of P.&T., I propose to raise the fee for registration of postal articles from the present rate of 70 paise to 75 paise; even so, the charge would be less than the cost of more than Re. 1 per article. Both these changes will be introduced by a notification and no amendment of the Indian Post Office Act or of the Finance Bill is involved.

Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1969-70, be taken into consideration.”

We have 15 hours : 10 hours for general discussion, four hours for the next stage and one hour for the final stage.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : One hour should be given extra.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We do not consider the extra time at this stage. I take it that you agree that it should be 10, four and one respectively. General discussion, 10 hours and clause-by-clause consideration, four hours.

15.00 hrs.

## RE. ARREST OF MEMBERS—(Contd.)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Sir, at your direction, I have collected whatever information was available at short notice. I have been informed that three Members of Parliament have been arrested while leading a demonstration of the Youth Federation of Kerala. They tried to enter the area where section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code is in force. When the magistrate on duty told them to disperse or not to enter the area where section 144 is in force, they did not agree to disperse; they tried to enter the area. While trying to enter that area these three Members of Parliament have been arrested.

I am also told that there was some scuffle while this attempt was being made to enter the area and in that scuffle a watch belonging to one of the MPs fell down to the ground. Subsequently, it was recovered and returned to him. They are being produced before the Magistrate in the Parliament Street court and they will be proceeded against under the law. The intimation under the rules has been sent by the authorities to the Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER : What are their names ?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : One is Shri P. Gopalan and another is Shri Jyotirmoy Basu. I am not sure about the name of the third M.P. This is the information which I have got. I have confirmed that the magistrate has sent the official information to the Speaker. It might have already reached the Speaker's office or it would be reaching them now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : One more point was raised. It is true that they have no immunity if they have broken the law. But they are supposed to vote today for election to financial committees.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : They have voted already.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am not prepared to take your word for that. Now,

is it possible to release them on bond or something so that they could come and vote ?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : Violation of section 144 Cr. P.C. is a criminal offence and no privilege is involved. They are produced before the magistrate and it is left to the Magistrate to decide it. We have to abide by whatever decision the magistrate gives.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I want to raise a point under rule 229.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : The Minister said that there was some scuffle and a watch fell down. But how did the scuffle start ? Our information is that some of them were injured. It seems that they were prepared to court arrest but the police pushed them and some of the M.Ps. fell down and got injuries.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat) : The Minister gave information about two M.Ps. What about the third one ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have given full latitude to raise the issue and the Minister has given a statement on what happened, what the actual facts are. Regarding rule 229, that information has already come or would be coming in course of time. That point does not arise now.... (interruptions). No I do not want to have any further discussion on this.

15.04 hrs.

## FINANCE BILL 1969—Contd.

SHRI C. C. DESAI (Sabarkantha) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir I have listened carefully to the speeches of the Finance Minister on the Budget and the Finance Bill. He seemed to be purring like a cat which has got a rotten fish and has safely gone home to enjoy it. He seems to be over-joyed at the performance of the government which he represents, little realising that the same Government and the same party which has the honour of forming the government, is concentrating vide attacks on him and against his policies, as we have witnessed not only during the last few days

but also during the last few months. And yet he seems to think that he has brought the Indian economy to a state of health !

The Finance Minister thinks that he is on the point of take-off or leap-forward in the Indian economy. But being a vegetarian he does not know, or at least pretends not to know, that the fish is as rotten as the Indian economy and that the flesh round the bones is as little as round the half-starved and half-naked Indian citizen who has been the helpless victim of 20 years of Congress misrule and Congress corruption.

15.06 hrs.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR *in the Chair.*]

The Finance Bill is nothing but the fiscal policy of Government in legislative clothing. The fiscal policy of the Government has to be judged in its relation to the impact of the fiscal policy on the Indian economy. We have all accepted that the goal of the Indian economy is socialism and I say on behalf of the Swatantra Party that we are second to none in the acceptance of that goal. But there is a vast difference in the socialism that is preached or practised by the Congress Party and the Socialism in which we believe and which we consider is the true Gandhian style socialism.

What the Congress Party believes in is socialism which is bordering on Communism. They believe in confiscation, in exploitation, in the denial of the pledged word or in the dishonouring of the pledged word as in the case of abolition of privy purses and in the confiscation of property without payment of adequate and just or fair compensation.

On the other hand, we, who believe in Gandhian socialism, want that the rich should become less rich; the poor should become less poor; the gap between the rich and the poor should be bridged as early as possible; that there should be free economy, free agriculture and more production, better distribution, better transport and better facilities which are all symbols of an improved and sound economy of a welfare state.

Gandhiji would turn in his grave if he were to find that his disciples or his *chelas* or the gentlemen who wear the cap named after him only within 20 years of his passing away are proposing measures which amount to confiscation, to dishonouring of pledges given, such as I mentioned a minute ago, namely, the abolition of privy purses.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) :  
They are not abolishing it.

SHRI C. C. DESAI : I hope, not. I do not think this House will allow them to abolish privy purses as they want to do it or as they say in order to please certain elements in their own party of whom we are all aware.

They talk of nationalisation of banking, of insurance, of transport, of distribution—of everything; in fact, the nationalisation of the entire life of the country. This was not the sort of socialism that Gandhiji had thought of or what you find in the books written on socialism by Gandhiji at that time which is the socialism that we want, that is, free distribution, free economy and development and growth of the Indian economy in order that all people, rich and poor, may partake in its beneficial results.

You will find that the present Government has failed the people, the country and our national life. In this sentence I will almost repeat the words which were mentioned the other day by one of the Finance Minister's own personal and staunch critics. I shall show presently how the Indian economy has failed miserably during the last 20 years. The Finance Minister apparently wishes to pat himself on the back by starting off with a statement :

“The year that is now drawing to a close has been a good year for the Indian economy.”

It is obvious that he has neither read nor fully understood the import of the economic survey which was published and which was made available to the members of the House. According to the statements in this Survey, the *per capita* income of India is even today in 1969 about ten per cent less than what it was four years ago. Although the total amount of foodgrains

[ Shri C. C. Desai ]

is six millions more than what it was in 1964-65, the rise in population has more than offset this marginal increase. The production of rice has not yet reached the 1964-65 level. The production of pulses is less. The Finance Minister may derive what satisfaction he can from the fact that the production of coarse cereals has gone up by more than three million tonnes. The production of commercial crops has not yet reached the 1964-65 level and the *per capita* availability of foodgrains is still less than what it was in 1964-65. In what way is this a good year about which the Finance Minister spoke in his budget speech? All that one can say is that the year was not as bad as 1965-66 or 1966-67. But we are yet far away from what we were even four years ago.

The Finance Minister seems to find a great satisfaction in the fact that the general price level is somewhat lower than what it was last year. But he forgets that only during the last three or four months the price level has gone up by five per cent. But taking the period as a whole you will find that during the three months of 1968, prices did not continue to rise at the same break-neck speed at which they had been rising during the previous five years. The public cannot forget and has to realise every day of its life that according to Government of India's own figures prices have gone up by more than 60 per cent in the last five years and that during the great Plans of 20 years and of Control Licence and Permit Raj, the prices have gone up more than two and a half times.

Now I come to the question of disparity between the rich and the poor. The ostentatious way of living is still there. Everybody says, and I do not think that it has been questioned, that the gap between the rich and the poor is widening everyday. Monopolies are also growing. It may bring in a legislation to restrict monopolies, but the real trouble is that the Congress people themselves are sympathetic, are favourably inclined towards big industrial houses for reasons which I need not mention, for reasons which are obvious. And this was made evident during the last six months when they had to collect large sums of money for election purposes, for the mid-term elections in West Bengal, U.P., Bihar and Punjab. And that is the main reason

why even now, in spite of the pressure from the back-benchers of the Congress Party, Government does not seem to be keen on bringing forward that legislation of ban on donations by companies to political parties.

He will have no difficulty in finding that, 20 years of his plans, far from bringing the millennium he was fondly hoping for, have brought nothing but greater poverty and misery and greater social injustice than ever before.

And what has been the administrative performance of the Government during these years? In 1966-67, in which, according to the figures available, the recession was at its worst, the Government of India performed the remarkable feat of controlling their developmental expenditure but raised their non-developmental expenditure by as much as 18 per cent. If this is not extravagance, I would like to know what extravagance is.

The internal public debt of Government went up three times between 1961 and 1968. But it is in the field of external debt that the figures are really staggering. From an amount of nearly 1,000 crores of assets which we inherited in 1947 from the outgoing British, today we have a debt of 6,000 crores. In other words, during this span of 22 years, we have spent about Rs. 7,000 crores and all this has been done in the name of planning, welfare society, etc. the results of which are well known to everyone. What percentage of increase this means, I will leave it to the Finance Minister and his officers to calculate. The servicing of foreign debts will alone require an annual outlay of about Rs. 400 crores which is a substantial percentage of our export earnings. It will take away much of our export earnings which will be required to pay for servicing our essential import requirements.

The Deputy Prime Minister is going from capital to capital begging foreign Governments for rescheduling of debts and we know what effect this begging bowl has created in various countries of the world. They consider India is bankrupt and India is not worth giving any further loans. They doubt the credit of India which at times even repudiates honourable obligations.

A seasoned politician that my friend is, the Finance Minister has not referred to the wonderful achievements of the public sector. I do not have to go into it because he must have heard of the achievements of the public sector from his own Party President only the other day. It is admitted that in relation to the capital employed, gross profit declined from 4.3 per cent to 3.6 per cent. The over-burdened taxpayers of this country who have contributed to these foolish adventures of Government, will no doubt hope and pray that such measures as Government may take and not merely talk about as usual, will lead to some improvement in their working. I happened to be working on the Committee on Public Undertakings for the last two years and I have been a sorrowful spectator of wasteful extravagances due to bad planning from beginning to the end and mismanagement of personnel.—I have no quarrel with public sector as such. I myself happened to be the first Chairman ever of a public sector company in this country. Therefore, I have no quarrel with the public sector. Where private capital is not forthcoming, the country cannot wait for development. Public sector is, therefore, essential in such cases. But we must always ensure that the public sector is managed in a manner which will give an adequate return. These explanations such as long gestation period, rendering social services, etc. are all meaningless. The first and foremost duty of any public sector project is to give a minimum dividend of 10 per cent. Otherwise, if it was a private sector project, it will have gone bankrupt in no time. Public sector must be managed in the same way in regard to cost, profitability, etc. as the private sector projects. But they were established without proper examination either of capital cost or of capacity of production or of the cost of production. Forms of management and personnel continue to change with the changing whims of every Minister and this was particularly noticeable in the case of the Steel Minister whose election later on happened to be set aside. The desire to restrict salaries in public sector undertakings is obviously at variance with the attitude of Government in regard to the private sector. In the public sector, they fix the highest salaries at Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 but in the private sector they coolly

go on approving fancy salaries and perquisites when each case of paid directors comes, as it has to, before the Company Law Board. I know from personal experience that the Board practically sanctions anything proposed by the companies. The highest salary sanctioned in the case of a private sector company is Rs. 2,80,000 per year. I hope he will apply to the private sector—and I am saying this in spite of the fact that I belong to the private sector myself—the same principles as regards remuneration which Government apply and enforce in the public sector.

The Finance Minister has stated that there will be an additional expenditure of Rs. 49 crores on account of increases in salaries and dearness allowances. This increase has become inevitable because of the alarming increase in the price level. The usual explanation is : unkindness of the weather-gods. Weather is a changing phenomenon; it is never continuously favourable or unfavourable. To lay the blame on the weather-gods is to throw dust in the eyes of the listeners, but that is not the excuse that people would accept.

In this budget, the Finance Minister has coolly and without much explanation increased non-plan civil expenditure by more than Rs. 142 crores. This is a very large and stiff dose of deficit financing which a well-known economist has described as 'Nasik Press financing'.

Who is responsible for the phenomenal growth of personnel, manpower, in the Central Government ? From some 18 lakhs in 1956, it has risen to 27 lakhs in 1968. All the multi-storeyed buildings we see around to house this manpower, which seem to be coming up by the dozen, are even then hardly sufficient to house them.

There is, of course, increase in defence expenditure and that is inevitable. This has been brought about, I would say with a sense of responsibility, by lack of diplomacy or incompetent diplomacy on the part of successive Governments and Foreign Ministers. If other countries do not have to face the same problem, why should it be necessary for us to face it ? But because

[Shri C. C. Desai]

of the inaptitude of the Foreign Ministers and the wrongness of the foreign policy of Government, we have to bear a heavy dose of defence expenditure. I think the kindness of the weather-gods will not be able to save us from continuing inflation unless Government contain their reckless spending and take steps to prevent wastage of money on account of incompetence or inefficiency in management.

If it is inevitable from the defence and security needs of our country or the development of our national life, for or creating opportunities for better and more gainful employment for our landless labour and for the educated unemployed, the people of this country will, no doubt, be fully prepared to bear the burden gladly and cheerfully, but Government have not proved that they have practised the utmost economy in expenditure.

On the one hand, under the guardianship of the high priest of extravagance, the Finance Ministry goes on sanctioning expenditure, but their conscience is roused suddenly and they think of economy when a demand comes from MPs for a revision of their salaries, allowances and perquisites. Even the unanimous recommendations of a Joint Committee have not been given effect to, and the Finance Minister has the audacity to come before the House and ask for additional taxation without first meeting the obligations he owes to the members of this House.

The Joint Committee was representative of all groups. It had a majority of Congress Members and was presided over by a well known senior Congressman. I hope that the Congress Members will tell the Finance Minister that they are not prepared to support his taxation measures and the Finance Bill unless and until either he or the Prime Minister made a definite statement on the floor of the House that the recommendations of the Joint Committee will be accepted and implemented. It is surprising that these recommendations should be sent to some Under Secretary in the Finance Ministry for examination. Who are those persons in the Finance Ministry to sit in judgment over the Members of Parliament who had

deliberated and made those recommendations ? But that is exactly the procedure; for this I find fault not with anybody in the Finance Ministry but with the Finance Minister himself.

I must give one instance of extravagance to show that no attention is paid to economy simply because it is typical. There is an officer of the Indian Civil Service, the senior-most officer of the Indian Foreign Service who is drawing a salary of Rs. 4,000 per month. For the last eight months he has not been given any work! If he has done anything wrong, have an impartial enquiry and proceed against him and remove him from service. I find fault with the Government that while no action is taken against him, nor can be taken against him, he is simply kept in service and given a salary of Rs. 4,000 per month but without work. This Government, a prisoner of indecision, has not been able to find a suitable assignment for that officer. I wrote over this matter to the Finance Minister and I am sure he knows that the facts stated by me are absolutely correct. He raised the bogey of economy, little realising that the men who have suggested additional taxation and whose hands are, further stained with the blood of extravagance should be the last persons to sit in judgment over the decision of Parliamentary Committees.

Now I come to the taxes on agriculture proposed in the Finance Bill. They are the most mischievous, most pernicious and most obnoxious features of the Finance Bill, 1969. Some of these proposals have been modified by the speech of the Finance Minister today. But the gravamen of the charge remains the same. Just now for the first time, agriculture is looking up. They cannot just see anything in prosperity. The attitude seems to be : as soon as somebody makes some money, go for it; as soon as the agriculturist produces some thing, go for that. Why should the farmer be penalised for spending thousands of crores on projects such as Bokaro, which are not really required for the welfare of the country, or even for meeting the steel requirements of the country ? Thousands of crores of rupees have been spent on public sector projects because of the Communist obsession of a former Prime Minister. Why should



the farmer be penalised for this megalomania of a single individual, whatever may have been his status or popularity ?

I shall now refer to the tax on power driven pumps, motor spirit and superior kerosene. The Finance Minister in his lust for raising money to pay for additional and growing expenditure on the different Ministries has chosen to tax them.

So far as the power-driven pumps and motor spirit are concerned, they will affect the transport system. We know in Haryana and in Punjab wheat was rotting last year because it could not be moved from one centre to the other, from the centre of production to the consuming centre. If the trucks are going to be more expensive, if the transport by trucks is going to be much more expensive, food movement will receive a setback, and it will create further difficulties for the agriculturists and the farmers. This together will all the other levies on the farmer, on what he owns, on what he uses for production and on everything he consumes for his cultivation and production, is the result of our Government yielding to the pressure of those mad men in the Planning Commission who have already ruined our economy during the last decade and who now want to arrest our agricultural progress by taxing the farmer just when it is about to explode. But that is not all.

The Finance Minister's levy on the agriculturist, on the farmers, and on agriculture must be resisted here and now on the grounds that these levies are totally bad for the country, and particularly the agricultural wealth-tax is wholly unconstitutional that it is altogether unjust in principle and that it is bound to be inequitable in practice because the valuation for the purpose of the wealth-tax going to be a difficult matter susceptible to corruption.

India needs more prosperity in agriculture and not less. This is not the time to levy any taxes on agriculture. It may be in course of time that you might find it necessary and possible to think of taxation in some form or other in the field of agriculture, but certainly not now, so long as this country is importing foodgrains for the maintenance of its people.

About the agency of the income-tax department, no more scathing condemnation of this department can be made than that by the Working Group appointed by the Administrative Reforms Commission on the Central direct taxation administration, and I can do no better than quote from some of their findings. This is what they have said :

"The development of the Income-tax Service in India, we are sorry to record, has been a long story of ad hoc adjustments to meet from time to time the exigencies created by unprecedented increase in the volume and complexity of assessment work. No attempt was made to find out the special needs and requirements of this service on a planned long-term basis and base the recruitment, training and promotion policies to these needs and requirements."

The Committee have come to the staggering conclusion that "there is thus at present a complete sense of frustration and discontent in the Department and the whole Department looks more like a battle-field than an organised, disciplined force dedicated to the tasks it has undertaken." This description of the state of affairs comes not from me, not from an Opposition Member, not from an unfriendly critic, but from a Committee of which the Chairman is a leading Congressman, an ex-Minister, and included among its members a one-time Chairman, the then Chairman, of the Board of Direct Taxes.

What can the Government expect out of this disgruntled and frustrated lot of people ? How long can the fear of punishment and of the Special Police Establishment keep the efficiency and morale of these people straight ? And they are given unrestricted right, unrestricted discretion in the matter of assessment, whether it is income-tax, wealth-tax or any other tax.

Sir, I have done. I do not propose to take more time of the House because I know that comments, criticisms or suggestions that will be made will fall on deaf ears of my friend. Over the years, a large number of Committees, Working Groups, etc., have been appointed to advise on the form of administration. Their reports got buried and a few of them are

[ Shri C. C. Desai ]

occasionally dug out to defend some indefensible action of the Government totally irrelevant to the issue examined.

Lastly, with their hearts intent only on keeping themselves in office at any cost, with their eyes on the potential for money in the guise of party funds, whether it is a case of jute, sugar, cotton, cement or any other commodity, with their mind imprisoned in the control, licence, permit system and with their attention directed to the serious and growing dissensions in their own party, they are totally incompetent to do their jobs. There is no hope for this country unless the men at the steering wheel are replaced by those more competent to do the job. To this end, shall be our endeavour and the endeavour of all democratic forces on this side of the House, to strive ceaselessly. With these words, we oppose the Finance Bill lock, stock and barrel.

15.36 hrs.

RE. ARREST OF MEMBER—*Contd.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before I call Shri Asoka Mehta, I would like to read out the message from the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Parliament Street, New Delhi regarding the arrest of some Members. This message was received at 1.30 p.m. It reads :

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that I have found it my duty in the exercise of my powers under section 65 of the Criminal Procedure Code to direct that Sarvashri Jyotirmoy Basu, C. K. Chakrapani and P. Gopalan, Members of the Lok Sabha, be arrested for their defiance of the prohibitory orders promulgated under section 144 Cr. P.C. in the area of Parliament Street including Raisina Road, Rafi Marg etc. Sarvashri Jyotirmoy Basu, C. K. Chakrapani and P. Gopalan, M.Ps. were accordingly arrested under section 188 I.P.C. at 12.10 p.m. on 29-4-69 and are being produced before Shri A. C. Kher, Judicial Magistrate, for remand."

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : This matter was raised in this House after the recess at 2-15 p.m. It is said that

the message was received at 1-30 p. m. May I know why during all the discussions which went on here the Deputy-Speaker, who was in the Chair, was not informed about the receipt of the message ? When we asked him he said that no message has been received, when in fact it has been received one hour earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Deputy-Speaker did not make a categorical statement that it was not received.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It was the job of the Secretariat to inform him about the receipt of that message.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It was received in the Speaker's office and the Deputy-Speaker was sitting in the Chair. He did not say that it was not received. He only said that he did not know at that time that it was received. The fact is that it was received in the office at 1-30 p.m.

15.38 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1969—*Contd.*

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA (Bhandara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened to what Shri C. C. Desai had to say, very carefully. I thought he made nine main points in the course of his observations. About two of them I have nothing to say—his criticism of the Income-tax Department and his plea for higher salaries for Members of Parliament. About two other points which he made, his criticism of the functioning of the public sector and the need for greater efficiency in them, as well as his criticism about increase in non-developmental administrative expenditure, I have no desire to rebut what he said, though I would not agree with the way he phrased his criticism. About the five other points that he has made, I would very briefly like to say that either he made them purely for party political reason or, in spite of some changed perspective in which he tried to put forward the point of view of the Swatantra Party, he has not bothered to understand the facts.

In 1968 if agricultural production was not the same as it was in 1964 in rice, or this or that, one must realise that on the whole there has been a marked change in

our agriculture. In 1968 we are reaping the first fruits of the new strategy. While in 1964 it was a windfall, a windfall that exceptional climatic conditions gave to us, in 1968 from depending upon windfalls we are moving forward towards garnering the gains based on modern methods and modern technology, I think there is a distinct change. This has happened in wheat and this has happened in maize. That it has not occurred in rice is a matter that needs our attention. I have no doubt that in the next year or so even in rice, with the researches that have been made, we shall be able to show results.

Likewise, he is very critical about the increase in our debts, the increase in our rupee debts and in our external debts. May I point out that he must also see as to what has been the increase in our assets and that without these assets would the character of our economy have been exchanged? If we want to mobilise resources for the purpose of development and if all that mobilisation cannot be done—and should not be done—through increased taxes, is it not necessary to raise loans so that resources are diverted from current consumption to savings and investments? Are these elementary things to be taught to Shri C. C. Desai and his friends?

Then he talked about increased defence expenditure. We all regret the increased defence expenditure, mostly brought about by the assault that China committed on our frontier. He suggests that it was the result of a very poor foreign policy that our Government has pursued. I would like to know whether the United States Government and the Government of the Soviet Union have also been following very poor foreign policies, because they also seem to be ruling under the assaults of Chinese expansionism.

Then he has talked about the agricultural levies. Well, he himself pointed out the various difficulties that are coming up in the wake of agricultural developments. If agricultural production has to be expanded and the benefits of agricultural production are to be realised even for the producers themselves, a great amount of development of the infra-structure itself becomes necessary. Is it possible that without roads, without communications, without

developing various other facilities even those who are increasing agricultural production will be able to reap the benefit of it?

Likewise, if the impulse for increased agricultural production has to spread, surely those who are benefiting today have a responsibility to share a part of the load that is needed to carry this agricultural revolution throughout the rest of rural India.

Therefore, I find that the points that he has made are not such on which I should spend more time. I would, therefore, like to devote my time to some things which I had wanted to say earlier.

I had hoped that we would have in the course of our Budget discussions an opportunity to discuss our oil, fertiliser and chemical policies. Unfortunately, that particular Ministry's Demands never came up for discussion. I am really disturbed at the way our oil, fertiliser and chemical policies and our industrial policies are being carried on. If our economy develops and picks up and there are signs that it is picking up and it should be our effort to unleash the dynamism to the fullest extent—there is not the slightest doubt that we will have serious balance of payments difficulties because of the way we are pursuing our oil and fertiliser policies.

As far as oil is concerned, I think, the Oil and Natural Gas Commission has in the last two or three years shown a great deal of improvement and efficiency in its functioning. I think, the Oil and Natural Gas Commission is in a position in the next couple of years to produce 1 million tonnes of additional crude every year and thereby save about Rs. 10 crores every year of foreign exchange. But in order that it is enabled to do it, it must be given the necessary tools and the necessary facilities. Certain finances are needed; rupee finance is needed, some free foreign exchange is needed and some equipment is needed which the ONGC cannot obtain from the Soviet Union or from other East European countries.

I find that there is a great deal of reluctance in conceding to these requirements of the ONGC, with the result that the ONGC will not be able even to realise the produc-

[ Shri Ashok Mehta ]

tion that it is poised to achieve. If any further rapid exploration and development of oil has to be made by the ONGC, then it needs to be given the tools for it; it needs to be given the equipment that it needs. That also is being denied to it.

Secondly, as far as Oil India is concerned, Oil India's record has been very good. We have 50 per cent Government share in it. The whole management, to the best of my knowledge, has been completely Indianised. I would like to know why we should not permit Oil India to do exploration in some larger areas in the country. No organisation can survive if it is not allowed to grow. A good organised organisation like that of Oil India run by very able and brilliant Indian technicians should be given an opportunity to explore other areas in the country and develop the production of oil. But the really plentiful resources that are available to the country are probably off-shore. I would welcome very much the efforts made by ourselves to develop these resources if it was possible for us. Unfortunately, as yet, do not have the necessary technology; we do not have the necessary skill. But the technology and skill can be learnt by hiring the people concerned. Still the real question is that the exploration, development and production of off-shore oil, even in one limited field, would require a foreign exchange outlay of anything between 80 to 100 million dollars. I would like to know from the Deputy Prime Minister whether he is in a position to provide 80 to 100 million dollars. If that cannot be provided, there is no hope of off-shore development programme being undertaken by ourselves. Some way has to be found whereby this off-shore development is taken up. Otherwise we will have expanding imports of oil products and, as our economy picks up, I do not know how the Finance Minister, now and in later years, himself as well as his successors, will be able to find the foreign exchange needed. It is argued that if we have anything to do with any foreign oil company, we are likely to get into the clutches of oil imperialism. I do not understand this argument.

First, in India, today there are foreign oil companies. To the best of my

knowledge, the Burmah Shell has an investment of Rs. 100 crores and the Esso has an investment of Rs. 75 crores to Rs. 85 crores. Is it being suggested that these companies have a grip on the Government of India or the Government of India's policies are being influenced or being shaped or being determined by them or India's political life, in any way, is being hampered by the companies? If they are hampering it, why are we allowing them to continue?

Again, in a big country like India, for the purposes of having the needed technology and having the resources needed to attempt the initial break-through so that later on in the coming five years, we may be able to develop off-shore oil with our own resources; if we once cut down our import bill for petroleum products, we will be saving enough foreign exchange or we will not be spending additional foreign exchange and that we can divert for the purpose of developing costly submarine oil exploration.

We must realise that in the world of energy today there is a growing shift from old and traditional sources to the new sources of oil. The world over, more and more oil is being used for the purpose of producing energy. India must develop oil resources very fast. Because of our difficulties of foreign exchange, somewhere some kind of a decision has to be taken. We are told that these decisions must take time; we are told that they involve such far-reaching implications and complications that even 18 months is not long enough to come to a decision. May I ask the Deputy Prime Minister this? I have known him very intimately for 35 years; I have known him to be a man of quick decisions. I have admired the character of Hamlet in literature; I find it very difficult to admire the character of Hamlet in administration!

Let us look at fertilisers. One million tonnes of fertiliser capacity is already there on the ground; one million tonnes of additional capacity is under implementation. We need at least 3 million tonnes more of nitrogenous fertiliser capacity before the Fourth Plan is over. How do we propose

to achieve that ? I have had something to do with the fertiliser industry. I know the enormous difficulties in getting foreign exchange etc. for setting up plants. I do not blame the Deputy Prime Minister. Where can he produce foreign exchange. What will happen ? Whether it is in the private sector or in the public sector, the time taken is five years, six years, seven years, before a project can be completed. Again, I do not blame him. It is not within his power to find all the resources needed. If we do not produce fertiliser quickly in this country, either we must deny fertiliser to agriculturists or we must be prepared to increase our import bill. Staggering as it is, it is something like 280 million dollars of fertiliser even today. The Deputy Prime Minister can correct me if I am wrong. How much are we going to spend ? Fertiliser is a critical agent of our economic development. I want to know, are we flexible about ends and rigid about means or are we flexible about means and inflexible about ends ? I believe, the agriculturists in India want fertiliser at any cost. If the Government can give them fertiliser by quickly developing the public sector undertakings and undertaking the whole responsibility themselves, the agriculturists will be happy. There will be no quarrel about it.

15.50 hrs.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE *in the Chair*]

If they can do it through co-operatives, through Mr. Gurupadaswamy's agency, they will be happier still. But, surely, they want to know whether fertiliser will be available or not. This Government is responsible to see that in 1972 when the reins are handed over to the successor Government, the position about fertiliser is such that there is no occasion for any questioner cavil. I demand from the Deputy Prime Minister—he is responsible for the economic policy of the country—to tell us what is being done about fertilisers ? I went through the Ministry's Report very carefully, and excepting for the production of two million tonnes of fertiliser, there are hardly any concrete, any specific, projects. I have heard of many a project for a long time. I know of many things on the drawing board, but I want to know what concrete decisions have been taken, what steps are being taken. We want,

as far as fertiliser industry is concerned, a time bound programme. All those who talk about agriculturists, all those who are anxious that India should be free from famine, from hunger, from dependence for food on foreign countries, know very well that fertilisers should be produced in adequate quantities. We want more irrigation undoubtedly, but there is enough irrigated area in the country which can be fully utilised provided fertilisers can be made available in adequate quantities.

The same is the case with regard to pesticides. No decisions are taken. There is only hesitation, vacillation and indecision. Is that the way in which we are going to tackle a critical area of our life and activities ?

As far as the chemical industry is concerned, let us realise that the Soviet Union, under Mr. Khrushchev, discovered that it had neglected the chemical industry. It was said that 50s and the early 60s were the chemical age. But we, even now, when more advanced countries are moving towards space technology and computer technology, have not been able to do very much in chemical technology and in electronics. In chemical industry again, while I am happy that the Deputy Prime Minister and his colleagues have been able to sanction the public sector projects in the petrochemical complex that is being set up in Gujarat, the rest of it remains hazy and blurred. And I can assure you that, when the public sector projects come up perhaps Mr. C. C. Desai will bear testimony to what I say—there are going to be no customers for them. A project which would have given us a return of 30 per cent per year is going to remain unprofitable for the very simple reason that the downstream units are not being permitted to come up. All kinds of hesitation and vacillation are going on.

Then, what is happening in regard to polyester plant ? Even if you want to follow what is being done in the Soviet Union, in the Soviet Union today a single unit of polyester plant has a capacity of 24,000 tonnes. The world over, the minimum size today is 18,000 tonnes, if you are to compete in the export market, we must have units of equal size. We, on the other hand, are trying to fragment them

[ Shri Asoka Mehta ]

into small units, scattered in different parts of the country. Four units are to be set up today. There are 17 or 18 States and each one is clamouring and the Government of India are not able to decide where to set up these small "toy factories!" The result is this. In the advanced world today it is the comparatively poor people, who use synthetic yarn fabrics and the rich wear cotton and silk fabrics, but in India, thanks to our strange economy, it is the poorer people who have to use cotton and the rich are supposed to use synthetic yarn. That is because of our deliberately ignoring the implications of chemical technology. Here the process technology changes very rapidly. In chemical industry the "generation" is eight or ten years. The whole technology changes in eight or ten years. We should have a large enough chemical industry, a large enough unit for producing chemical products, I am referring only to the basic production; I am not referring to the end products. End products should be scattered all over the country on small scale. But where basic units are to be set up, they should really be large. If you do not want collaboration, I am not anxious for collaboration. But then the Finance Minister must see to it that as soon as any technological advance takes place, he finds resources to buy the new technology and assimilate it in our country. This country does not want to be condemned, in the name of some kind of purity or some kind of holiness, into a third rate country so far as technology is concerned.

I have been a socialist long before most people had even heard of socialism. But there is no reason why in the name of socialism one should deliberately adopt outmoded and obsolete technology. I am a socialist because I believe that socialism will help me to move forward very fast. I believe that it is the most powerful weapon for modernisation of my ancient land. If it is not going to be the most powerful method of modernisation, then there is nothing wrong with socialism, but there is something wrong with those who handle the policies. Therefore, I would like to point out that here in chemical industry, as in various other industries, it would be suicidal if we do not go in for improved technology.

I will give you one instance. Take the steel industry. Our young friend, Raja Pant, told us what is the investment in terms of fixed capital for producing one tonne of steel. I asked him to make some further inquiries for me and we find today that whatever investment is there, it is 2 to 2½ times the investment in Japan and other comparable countries in the world. Why is it so? I am not talking of cost of production. I am talking of investment needed to produce one tonne of steel. Japan produced in 1956 6½ million tonnes of steel which we are producing today or are going to produce. In 12 years their production jumped to 65 million tonnes. The same thing is going to happen in India. Our steel production is bound to go up whether Shri C. C. Desai likes it or not. I am surprised at Shri C. C. Desai's not understanding the vital, creative role that steel plays in the economic transformation of this country. If steel production is going to increase decisively, are we going to carry on with the kind of projects that we have where the investment for a tonne of steel is 2½ times more than what it is in Japan? These are not unknown things. They are very well known. For us there are other considerations—I am not referring to socialism—which load the cost. My point is that if for ten years we are going to devote our attention to some of the key-sectors such as fertilizer and steel, the country's economy will be so transformed that the fall-out effect will be experienced by every part of the country. But if during these ten years, we are going to be twisted and turned, and are going to be victims of all kinds of outside pressures and within our own country, what will be the result? There will be no potential for growth. The potential for growth itself will get truncated and pulverised. That is why I would like to know from the Deputy Prime Minister who, as it were, is the custodian of economic policies of the country, what care is taken to see that this danger is averted.

I have only one or two points more to make. As far as our public sector is concerned, a number of decisions have been taken. Here again, I would like the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister to come forward on behalf of the Government and say that "the decisions

that we have taken are not only being implemented with alacrity, but if necessary changes will be made to achieve results—this is the pledge and promise that we give the Parliament and the nation". By 1972, that is, by the time we go to the polls again, there will not be any one who will be able to point an accusing finger towards the functioning of our public sector. Is it too much to ask from the Government that the known weaknesses which have been identified should be removed? Government have said that they have decided to remove them. The Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister should undertake the responsibility for this and should gear up the Government in such a manner that by 1972 no critic should be able to say that we have failed to do what was expected of us. I would not like us to be apologetic in 1972 but proud and confident about our socialised sector.

16 hrs.

It is said that the public sector is not for profit. I am surprised. The Planning Commission itself says that except for education and health—some parts of education and some parts of health—nothing, no services, must be given with a subsidy. In this poor country of ours where resources are needed, profit is not a dirty word. Every investment must show returns. Where prices are administered, it is very easy to show profit by raising prices. Therefore, one has to look into the cost. Constantly, it has to be watched. To what extent is cost consciousness evident?

The public sector has to be viewed from the point of improved management, cost and productivity. But if we cannot do this, with what face can we go and say that we are good socialists? 'Good socialists' does not mean that I am doing things badly, crudely, expensively and accepting all this expensive, wasteful method of my functioning in the name of socialism.

I have never understood that I can sell my poor wares with an attractive socialist label. The label has a meaning only to the extent the wares can show that they are better than the wares that anybody else produces.

Therefore, let us not, again in the name of socialism, try to be apologetic about inefficiency, waste, mismanagement. If these things cannot be set right, surely a Government like ours, with such able, competent men and women gathered together inside the Cabinet, should be able to give us this assurance that by 1972 there will be no occasion for anyone to point a finger at us.

I have only one more point—I would not like to take your time on other things—and that is, to refer to something that the President of the Congress said in the course of his address. He said that India has vast mineral resources. None can deny it. It is a tragedy that we have not even been able to identify those resources. We have accepted Soviet and American help also in this regard. We have been trying Operation Hardrock and some other 'Rock'. We were trying to identify those resources. I do not know how far we have progressed.

When it comes to a question of developing these resources, there is one thing to bear in mind. I am all for self-reliance, I am all for economic independence, I am all for doing things ourselves, but then Government must be able to provide a leadership under which the resources are mobilised in the country to move forward. Again we quote these wonderful concepts which I am sure each one of us accepts, which are very evocative, very illuminating. But these concepts have to be judged by the way they are translated into practice.

Are we able to get the maximum results out of our economy? Today every one knows about unutilised capacities? What about the unutilised capacities of the dynamism that has been generated in our economy? Shri C. C. Desai and his colleagues can be cynical about what we have done during 20 years of planning, because we have not been able to release the full dynamism and show the country and the world what India is capable of. Believe me, today we have built up in this country the base, the strength; only if it is allowed to move forward like Nataraj will we be able to show the full results. If you just free the limbs and let them show what they are capable of, this country will move forward with a rollicking speed.

[ Shri Asoka Mehta ]

But every possible occasion, we have doubts and hesitations. In our pursuit of perfectionism, we even give up what we have got, what can be achieved imperfectly. May I say : For God's sake, release this country, let it move forward, do not pursue perfectionism to avidity. Socialism comes when things move forward. When they grow, when they develop out of chapping and changing, the socialist ideal is realised. The socialist ideal is not like Minerva rising fully armed from the brow of Zeus. Socialism is the end product of a whole process of growth and change. Let that process be accelerated.

May I, therefore, ask of the Deputy Prime Minister this ? I have known him; I have respected him. But I am surprised that he has adjusted himself to the kind of style that has developed in the Government. Are we to expect that this is the style that he adopts and approves ? If he does not, one is entitled to know from him what he is going to do to see that the style is changed.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : Mr. Asoka Mehta, having been critical of Mr. C. C. Desai, and the Deputy Prime Minister, has opened the gates for his own criticism and I hope he will not mind it. I am glad that wisdom has at last dawned on Mr. Asoka Mehta and he has realised that there is a limit to taxation and increased reliance should be placed on borrowing (*interruption:*) when he was Minister he was responsible for the 10% surcharge on personal income tax and corporation tax. Three years ago, when Mr. Sachin Chaudhury was the Finance Minister, like *Sikhandi* from behind the scenes, he directed him and the surcharge was imposed. I asked him the other day in the Central Hall as to why this surcharge, which had resulted in diminishing returns, had been imposed. He said that if he had it in his power, he would impose it again and again. Thank God, he realises his mistake now.

What happened to the Third Plan ? It failed despite heavy taxation. They were able to obtain Rs. 2,982 crores as against Rs. 1,710 crores which was stated in the original scheme of financing. Perhaps that was the only target that was so well exceeded. It adversely affected production,

savings and investment. The indirect taxes, which were increased to a large extent, adversely affected production and exports and increased the cost structure in the economy to such an extent that exports became difficult ; the country was faced with a balance of payment, crisis and devaluation was forced on this country. Mr. Mehta himself was responsible for that and it was in turn responsible for his eclipse also. At the end of the Third Plan what is the position ? The economy is in bad shape. There is wide spread frustration on account of privation due to high prices, back breaking taxes and none-too propitious investment climates. It was a novel thesis of Mr. Asoka Mehta that in a developing economy we have to learn to live with rising prices. That is the basic features which has been responsible for the inflationary tendencies in this country. The real value of the rupee has declined to about 12 paise of the pre-war rupee and if the Fourth Plan is put into effect, it would probably result in another bout of deficit financing and additional taxation which would lead to the value of the rupee going down further, perhaps to about eight paise. The Planning Commission has received a legacy from him which it is finding it difficult to shake off. In its formulation of the Fourth Plan, the Planning Commission appears to be determined to practise 'growthmanship' without regard to the availability of resources. They have conceived of a need based plan, which may be good politics but is bad economics. We need a resource-based plan. In the context of resources, the Fourth Plan placed before Parliament appears not only to be over ambitious but also an exercise in planned fiscal recklessness. The validity of the assumptions underlying the estimation of resources at Rs. 10,839 crores is also questionable. The projections appear to be the triumph of hope over experience. Like Mr. Micowber the planners seem to live in the hope that something would eventually turn up. That was done during the period of the Third Plan produced by Mr. Asoka Mehta and his colleagues, that is still being repeated again in the case of the Fourth Plan.

When we come to the resources part of it, the balance from current revenues have



been taken at Rs. 2455 crores. In the Third Plan there was actually a minus balance of Rs. 419 crores. The three annual plan together have resources of about Rs. 362 crores. Where are Rs. 2,500 crores to come from? The fact emerges that there is an over-estimation of Rs. 1,500 crores with regard to resource on this one item alone. With regard to surplus of public enterprises, there again they have assumed at least Rs. 300 crores of excess resources. I have no time to go into details now. Rs. 1,500 crores plus Rs. 300 crores make Rs. 1,800 crores. The additional resource mobilisation is estimated at Rs. 2,700 crores by the Planning Commission to cover the shortfall admitted by it, and Rs. 850 crores is the target for deficit financing. So, the total comes to about Rs. 5,350 crores. With a shortfall of a gap of more than Rs. 5,000 crores, the Finance Minister would have year after year to face a big gap in resources this Sir. Plan is going to prove like the old man on the back of Sinbad the Sailor and the Finance Minister would become a prisoner of the Plan. He would have no alternative but to raise resources on a very big scale.

When you come to resources, there are only two things that remain: taxation and deficit financing. With regard to taxation, may I submit that every effort has been made this time to tax agricultural income. The Government have already run into difficulties. I do not know what would be the ultimate fate of the wealth-tax on agriculture, but coming to the tax on fertilisers and pumps, I am glad that the Finance Minister has withdrawn the duty on pumps the duty on fertilisers is still there. We have learnt in school days that the Indian agriculturist is born in debt, lives in debt and dies in debt. At long last, the agriculturist has experienced a glimmer of hope, a ray of light, but the Finance Minister has imposed on him a duty which would reduce his prosperity to an extent and also give a setback to the agricultural revolution in this country. That is something to which the Finance Minister must direct his attention. No doubt, incomes have gravitated to agriculture, but they must be mobilised through small savings schemes, life insurance must be carried deep into the rural areas, and there must be mobilisation by issue of rural debentures. A pro-

gramme of borrowing would be good, but to tax agricultural income heavily in the very first year of the Fourth Five Year Plan does not augur well for the future of these Plans.

Now, coming to the Planning Commission, it has failed to take cognizance of the distinct features emerging from past experience of overambitious planning and as I said, the conditions are set for another bout of large wasteful outlays, deficit financing and inflationary spiralling of prices. I would like to sound to the Finance Minister a very serious note of warning that if the fourth Five Year Plan is pursued in the manner in which it has been conceived and presented to this House, I am definite it is going to lead to inflation and it would be difficult to control it. We are talking about price stability, but already the wholesale price index has touched 212 to 213 points. It is steadily creeping up. If this is the position already, I wonder what is going to happen as the Plan progresses and as more and more taxes are imposed and a large volume of deficit financing takes place.

As I have said time and again, excise duties, enter into the cost of commodities. They lead to rigidity in the cost structure and higher cost of commodities, thus making it difficult for exports to be maintained or to be increased.

With regard to the allocation of outlays in the fourth Five Year Plan, I should like to say a few words. It appears that in allocating the plan target or outlay between the public sector and the private sector, ideological considerations have prevailed. In my opinion, it is necessary that in view of the tremendous gap in resources, the outlay in the public sector should be reduced by about Rs. 2,500 crores and about Rs. 1,900 crores should be added to the outlay in the private sector. Why I have taken Rs. 1,900 crores and a reduction of Rs. 2,500 crores is because the capital output ratio in the private sector is less than capital-output ratio in the public sector. That is a fact, and it is because of more efficient use of resources and better implementation of the projects. Therefore, as I said, if we cut Rs. 2,500 crores from the public sector and increase the private sector outlay by Rs. 1,900 crores, the target

[Shri S. S. Kothari]

of growth will be maintained and a balance would be imparted to the fourth Five Year Plan... The Jan Sangh at their party meeting at Bombay recently passed a resolution that every person must be provided with work. That was a very important resolution because, despite the various plans that have been made by this government unemployment has been on the increase. At the beginning of the Third Plan, unemployment was about 7 million people. That figure has risen to 12 million at the end of the Third Plan. If this is the rate at which unemployment is rising, I ask what is the use of planning. If this problem has to be solved, medium and small-scale industries which have great employment potential, should be encouraged. The Japanese model of industries, which are power-driven, should be considered. If it is applied here in this country, I think we could make some progress.

No doubt, public sector industries and big industries are also necessary. With regard to big and giant industries, I would submit that it is necessary that swadeshi technology, or our own technology, should be employed to the maximum extent. That is very important. No doubt, we need foreign sophisticated technology, but only in these industries were our own domestic technology is not sufficiently developed. Attempt should be made at self-reliance. But here again we find that the reliance of this Plan on foreign aid is more than that of the Third Plan. Budget receipts corresponding to external assistance are taken at Rs. 2,514 crores as against Rs. 2,423 crores during the Third Plan period. While legitimate doubts arise as to the availability of this quantum of foreign assistance, the talk of self-reliance and dispensing with foreign aid appears to be a hollow slogan, full of sound and fury but signifying nothing.

There are certain other assumptions in the Plan which are also not correct. A return of 15 per cent on capital investment in public sector undertakings and 11 per cent on electricity concerns has been provided for, which appears to be patently impossible according to present indications. Besides, industrial production would not

reach the levels which would match the considerable amount of outlays made and money pumped into the economy. In my opinion, the whole Plan is a blueprint for inflation and devaluation.

I now come to very important point and that is a big lacuna exists in the Fourth Plan. This Plan should have provided for "indicators of alert". Their function is to detect in advance areas of potential disequilibrium in the country and enable short-term intervention to operate more selectively and effectively. Even in France, where indicative planning is adopted, they have provided for certain indicators of alert in the Fifth Plan (1966-70). Here I would suggest certain indicators of alert. Firstly, an increase of 10 points in any one year in the wholesale price index; secondly, an increase in unemployment figures by half a million in any year, thirdly, fall in exports or rise in imports by Rs. 25 crores in any half year; fourthly, a decline in the index of industrial production by five points in any quarter over the previous quarter or the corresponding quarter in the previous year; fifthly, a similar indicator of alert for agricultural production and, finally, a decline in national income by 1.5 per cent in any year. These indicators are intended to warn the planners and the government in time as to what corrective action is needed. Therefore, I would submit that in the Fourth Plan these indicators of alert must be provided.

Now I come to the Finance Bill itself. The Deputy Prime Minister has been good enough to announce certain concessions. But I would like to make some remarks on this. With regard to advance payment, he has realised that 15th December for the last instalment payable would create difficulties for industries and assesseees. The legitimate right of the assesseees should be restored. Why complicate matters further by providing that the Central Board shall issue directives with regard to the class of industries which would be allowed to pay the final instalment in March. The privilege should be universally available. I would, therefore, request him to reconsider this matter and provide directly that the fourth instalment payable before 15th March shall be there for all assesseees.

With regard to wealth-tax, when he had increased the penalties last year, I for one said that I would not criticize them; my only plea was that he penalise the tax-evader but integrate those penalties with a reasonable tax structure so that more and more people may revert to payment of taxes honestly and are brought to the righteous path. But this year I am too critical of the new wealth-tax penalties for non-filing of return. Just because a person fails, to file a return, to provide for a maximum penalty of 100 per cent of his wealth is, in my opinion, not at all justified. After all, we are living in a democracy and the penalties and the measures must be reasonable, equitable and justifiable.

The unkindest cut in the Budget, is the imposition on the middle class. The middle class has hardly recovered from the burden imposed by inflation which had occurred and was of a severe type and taxes have been increased on incomes between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 20,000. On registered firms also, the tax has been increased between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 25,000. In my opinion, they should have provided for some relief with respect to the middle class and on direct personal earned incomes. I would describe the personal income taxes as surgery without anaesthetics.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you the only speaker from your party ?

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : No, there are two.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have already taken 15 minutes.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : I will take another five minutes. ●

Besides, we find that indirect taxes on sugar and petrol have been increased. These taxes also result in imposing a heavy burden on the middle class. Besides, taxes on cigarettes, electric fans, domestic electrical appliances all squeeze family budgets and hurt the middle class and the intellectuals.

A sophisticated tax structure like ours cannot afford to have the same rate of tax for earned and unearned incomes. I would

suggest a very simple remedy. Just as in the case of priority industries, you deduct 8 per cent from the corporate taxes, so also in the case of earned incomes, give a tax-free deduction of 8 per cent. Let that be a benefit to the man who works for his income. That would assist in production, savings and investment.

I should also like to point out that the process of simplification and rationalisation of taxes that had been initiated according to the Bhoothalingam Report, has now been almost abandoned. I shall give two instances. One is with regard to corporate taxes. The sur-tax on company profits is a tax on efficiency. It embodied the principle of progression in corporate taxes. I would submit that progression in taxes with regard to the corporate sector leads to inefficiency and poor utilisation of resources. It penalises efficiency. In my opinion, as Shri Bhoothalingam had also recommended, this tax should have been taken off. If you see statistics, you will find that out of 150 countries in the world at least 144 countries have corporate tax rates which are below 50 per cent. In our country they go up to about 66.25 per cent. That has to be taken into account if production, savings and investment are to be stimulated and if the capital market is to improve.

Instead of being used as an instrument of growth and economic recovery, the Budget has become an annual exercise in mobilisation of augmented revenues and in the process the tax load on the consumer goes on increasing year after year irrespective of the taxable capacity. Industries are indiscriminately selected for additional levies till they reach a critical point and then some relief is given. I would point to the cotton mill industry and say that this is an instance in point where excise duties and taxes have been increased to such an extent that many of the textile mills are on the sick list and some of them have closed down. Now some relief is given. But why carry taxes to such a stage that it leads to the industry being on the brink of disaster ?

I would strongly urge the Finance Ministry not to whittle down the development rebate. It is a powerful, positive, incentive for industrial capital formation. If the deve-

[Shri S. S. Kothari]

lopment rebate is whittled down, it will adversely affect industrial growth.

With regard to the tax on registered firms, I would like to make a special plea for professional firms, a large number of whom have approached me in Calcutta, Bombay and here. They cannot convert themselves into limited companies. The registered firms tax rests heavy on them. Either the tax should be taken off, as recommended by Mr. Bhoothalingam and also previously by the Law Commission, because it was a kind of double taxation or, at least, the surcharge and the special surcharge should be removed for professional firms.

The last point that I would like to make—I am glad Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is here—is with regard to the industrial licensing procedures. Tata's Fertilisers Project is not an exceptional case of licensing delays. It is only one of a number of projects which are strangled or party suffocated in his Department. The licensing procedures are cumbersome and they constitute almost a maze which many foreign entrepreneurs are not prepared to negotiate. If the country's industrial development is to be boosted, such licensing restrictions must be reduced to a minimum. Instead of too much licensing restrictions, we should have economic bureaus to give advice to industrialists whether to go in for a particular branch of industry or not. I would urge upon the Minister of Industrial Development to accept this challenge of development. Let him dynamise his Ministry and impart momentum to economic growth. Industrial development cannot brook any delay. If he cannot cope with the pace of development, let him select another Ministry, Education, Health or Community Development.

As my time is up, I have done.

16.27 hrs

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the Chair.]

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद (महाराजागंज): सभापति महोदय, मुझे अन्य मांगों पर बोलने का अवसर नहीं मिला इसलिये इस अवसर से मैं लाभ उठाने की कोशिश करूंगा और वित्त विधेयक पर थोड़े विचार रखूंगा। पहले मैं फाईनेंस बिल के बारे में ही दो एक निवेदन

करना चाहता हूँ। आय कर इस प्रकार लगाया जाना चाहिये कि कम आमदनी पर कम से कम लगे और अधिक आमदनी पर अधिक से अधिक लगे किन्तु बीच वाले जितने हैं, यानी दस हजार से 20 हजार सालाना आमदनी वाले, उन में 10 से 15 हजार वाले पर दो परसेंट और 15 से 20 हजार वाले पर 3 परसेंट कर बढ़ा है। मगर प्रभावी वृद्धि 2.2 और 3.3 प्रतिशत हुई है। यह चीज अच्छी नहीं लगती है। अगर बढ़ाना ही था तो ऊपर वालों पर बढ़ा कर के आप आमदनी को कमी पूरी करते न कि इन मध्य वर्ग लोगों पर बढ़ाते क्यों कि यह 20 हजार तक की आमदनी के मानें हैं आज से 20 साल पहले के बाजार भाव से हिसाब कीजिए तो यह आमदनी तब की 4.5 हजार की आमदनी के मुकाबिले में जाती है क्योंकि सब चीजों की कीमतों में वृद्धि और जीवन स्तर को उन्नति मिल करके चार गुना और पांच गुना का हिसाब लग जाता इसलिए यह अधिभार तब के चार पांच हजार वालों पर ही पड़ गया, ऐसा भी माना जा सकता है अगर 20 साल पहले के हिसाब से देखें तो। और अगर अमीरों पर ऊपर वालों पर अधिक अधिभार आप बढ़ाते तो हम को कोई शिकायत न होती।

इसी तरह से ऐग्रीकल्चरल सम्पत्ति पर जो सम्पत्ति कर लगा रहे हैं वह भी बहुत ठीक नहीं जान पड़ता क्यों कि अगर.....

श्री भोलू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : कितनी आमदनी पर ?

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : आमदनी की बात नहीं है, उस की कृषि के लिए भूमि, मकान की मालियत की बात है, वैल्यू टैक्स है, मैं कोई इनकम टैक्स की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ, ऐग्रीकल्चरल प्रापर्टी पर वैल्यू टैक्स की बात कर रहा हूँ।

श्री भोलू प्रसाद : कितने पर लगना चाहिए ?

**श्री मन्थुंजय प्रसाद :** मैं कह रहा हूँ, कहने दीजिए ।

एक बार संपत्ति की कीमत आप बांध दीजिएगा मगर उससे जैसी कि आमदनी होती है, उसी आमदनी से तो पैसा दिया जाएगा और आमदनी निर्भर करती है केवल किसान पर ही नहीं बल्कि बहुत चीजों पर—उसकी मेहनत पर, उस की अकल, उस की व्यवस्था, पानी खाद, अच्छा बीज, ट्रैक्टर, बाजार, फाईनेंस और इन सबके ऊपर से आसमानी सुल्तानी, इन सब चीजों पर उस की आमदनी निर्भर करती है जिनमें बहुतों पर उसका कोई जोर अधिकार नहीं है और जो हिसाब हम एक बार बैठा देते हैं वह बहुत दिनों तक चलता है क्यों कि वह तो प्रापर्टी की कीमत हुई, न कि आमदनी जो हर साल घटने बढ़ने वाली हुई और इसलिये यह टैक्स लगाया जा रहा है कि आप उस का मुकाबला मकान से करते हैं जिस का भाड़ा आता है । शहर में जो मकान का भाड़ा आता है, उस भाड़े के लिये परिश्रम नहीं करना पड़ता । उस मकान मालिक को घर बैठे भाड़ा मिलता है । मगर किसान खेती संबन्धी सब बातों पर ध्यान न दे तो उस की आमदनी मारी जाएगी । फसल कम हुई या बाजार दर गिर गया तो भी उसके लिये टैक्स भारी पड़ जायगा । दूसरी तरफ एक चीज और है कि वैल्यू टैक्स के रिटर्न को फाईल करने में अगर देरी होती है तो जुर्माना बढ़ा कड़ा पड़ जाता है इस अर्थ में कि अगर मैंने ठीक-ठीक समझा है तो वह जुर्माना सारी प्रापर्टी की कीमत के बराबर हो सकता है । अब तक यह था कि टैक्स जितना लगता था उसी के अनुपात में जुर्माना होता था । मैं कहूंगा कि जुर्माना का रेट आप भले ही बढ़ा दीजिए उसमें मुझे कोई उच्च नहीं है । मगर टैक्स के अनुपात में जुर्माना बढ़ाईये न कि प्रापर्टी के अनुपात में बढ़ाईये, नहीं तो कर-दाता मर जायगा । आप लीजिएगा किससे ? कानून की दृष्टि से भी यह वृद्धि

सन्देह से परे नहीं है । इस के अलावा अब मैं दूसरी दो तीन बातों पर आऊंगा । पटना के निकट गंगा पर पुल की बात 1913 से चल रही है । उस समय रेलवे के विरोध से कुछ न हो सका क्यों कि कम्पनी की रेलवे थी । उस के बाद सन 1945 में लड़ाई के बाद यह सवाल फिर उठा । जांच पड़ताल बहुत हुई । सर्वेक्षण हुआ और रेलवे को ध्यान में रख कर के 1947 में यह तय हुआ कि पटना के नजदीक अथवा भोकांमा में पुल बने या दोनो जगह बने । अन्त में जाकरके भोकांमा में एक पुल बना । बहुत अच्छा हुआ । किन्तु उतने से ही काम चलने वाला नहीं है और पटना के निकट एक पुल बनाना बहुत जरूरी है । इस के लिए बराबर जांच होती रही है और यहां तक हुआ कि हर समय में कुछ न कुछ काम होता रहा है । 1948 में प्रदेश सरकार को केन्द्र ने आश्वासन दिया था कि यदि पूरे सर्वेक्षण के बाद पटना में सड़क पुल बनाने के लिए उपयुक्त स्थान मिल सके तो सारा खर्च केन्द्र से दिया जायगा । उस के बाद से, 1949 में बिहार सरकार ने इस के लिये सर्वेक्षण आरम्भ कराया और पूना के केन्द्रीय नदी शोध संस्था ने पटना से बाठ दस मील दूर सदलपुर में इसके लिये घाट पसन्द किया । उस के बाद से भी बराबर इसकी जांच और अच्छे घाट की खोज होती रही । रूड़की कालिज में भी इस की जांच हुई । वहां माडल बना कर जांच हुई और फिर अन्त में जाकर सभी कोई पुल के लिए सबसे अच्छा घाट सदलपुर को मानते हैं । अब यह पुल 25 करोड़ का मामला है । 1965 के आरम्भ में तत्कालीन वित्त मंत्री श्री कृष्णमाचारी और श्री अशोक मेहता पटना गए थे । तब उन्होंने भी इसके लिए रुपए जुटाने का आश्वासन दिया था । उस के बाद से फिर भी बराबर इस तरह के आश्वासन मिलते रहे । अन्त में गवर्नमेंट ने इस काम को आर्थिक पहलू की जांच करने के लिये डा० लोकनाथन की अध्यक्षता में इंडियन काँसिल आफ अप्लाइड

[ श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद ]

एकोनामिक रिसर्च के जिम्मे यह काम किया। इन्होंने भी इसका गहरा अध्ययन किया आर्थिक दृष्टि से और उन का विचार भी यही हुआ कि यह योजना हर प्रकार से सफल होगी और इसे पूरा करना चाहिये। बिहार सरकार इसलिये आप से २५ करोड़ की मांग कर रही है पिछले दो वर्षों से चाहे बिहार में जो कोई भी सरकार रही है कम से कम इस मामले में सब की एक ही राय रही है। आप ने हाल में ही यह तय किया है कि कलकत्ता को बचाने के लिये कलकत्ता में हुगली पर एक और पुल बनाना जरूरी है और उसके लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार धन दे रही है।

बिहार सरकार आपसे प्रार्थना करती है कि जिस तरीके से जिस ढंगसे, जिस रूप में आप कलकत्ता में पुल के लिए रुपये दे रहे हैं, उसी तरह से पटना को दीजिए क्योंकि उत्तर बिहार और दक्षिण बिहार को मिलाना बहुत जरूरी है, वरना वह क्षेत्र हमेशा के लिए कमजोर रह जायगा। इंटरनेशनल बैंक आफ रिंकट्रक्शन एण्ड डेवलपमेन्ट के डायरेक्टर श्री हार्डी पिछले मार्च महीने में पटना गये थे—यह बार्डी महीने पहले की बात है—उन्होंने भी इसकी जांच पड़ताल की डिस्कशन वगैरह हुआ, सबलपुर की जगह को उन्होंने जाकर खुद देखा और जो तकनीकी डिटेल्स और आर्थिक पहलू बिहार सरकार ने उन के सामने रखे, उससे वे बहुत अधिक प्रभावित हुए। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की राय कुछ इसके पक्ष में है, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह राय पक्की हो जाय, सिर्फ विचार ही विचार में समय न बीत जाय, क्योंकि जितना समय बीतता है उतना ही हमारा नुकसान होता है, साथ ही साथ समय के साथ खर्चा भी बढ़ता जाता है, क्योंकि दिनों दिन हर काम की कीमत बढ़ती जाती है।

दूसरी चीज—आज से 125 वर्ष पहले गंगा और सरजू अथवा घाघरा पर जहाज

चला करते थे, तब से यह सर्विस बराबर चलती आई और 1957 के अन्त तक चलती रही 1948 में यह सर्विस कम होने लगी थी। जिस कम्पनी के हाथ में यह सर्विस थी, उस ने नये जहाज खरीदने में पैसा लगाना बंद कर दिया, पुराने जहाजों की मरम्मत पर खर्च कम करने लगी, नतीजा यह हुआ कि उस कम्पनी ने यह सर्विस घटानी शुरू कर दी दूसरी तरफ एक कठिनाई यह भी थी कि इस के जितने खलासी थे, उन को टैक्निशियन कहिये या मिस्त्री कहिये, यासेलर या खलासी कहिये वे करीब करीब सभी चटगांव के थे जो धीरे धीरे पाकिस्तान जाने लगे इस लिए कंपनी के पास आदमियों की कमी भी हो गई। मगर उस कंपनी ने स्थानीय आदमियों को लेकर उन को प्रशिक्षण देकर चलाने के बदले जहाज चलाना ही बन्द करना ठीक समझा और लेते देते 1 जनवरी, 1958 से उसको खत्म कर दिया।

इस संभावना से उस समय सरकार को चिन्ता जरूर हुई। 1955 में सरकार ने लोकुर कमेटी बैठाई जिसने इस समस्या पर विचार किया। उस के बाद 1957 में मित्रा कमेटी बैठी, उसने भी विचार किया फिर 1960 में यह सवाल कौन्सिल आफ एप्लाइड इकोनोमिक रिसर्च को सौंपा गया उस ने भी विचार किया। सब की राय थी कि इस चीज को चालु करना चाहिये और 1959 से 1962 तक भारत सरकार ने पायलट स्कीम के रूप में कुछ जहाज चलाये। लेकिन 3 साल के अनुभव के बाद यह कहकर कि इस काम में बाधा हो रहा है, इस को बन्द कर दिया। इस संबन्ध में मैं और मेरे जैसे बिहार में रहने वालों की शिकायत यह है कि यह घाटा कागजी घाटा हुआ है और इन्तजाम की खराबी से हुआ है, न कि इसलिये हुआ है कि वहां पर ढोने के लिए माल की कमी थी। बात यों है कि अफसरों ने जो कुछ लिख दिया, उसी को मान लिया गया। लेकिन यदि वास्तव में देखा जाय और हिसाब को जोड़ा जाय तो

तीन साल के भीतर मुश्किल \* से 8 महीने जहाज चले। व्यापारी घाट पर माल लाते और जब यह सुनते कि चार-छः दिन जहाज नहीं चलेगा, कुछ पता नहीं कब तक चलेगा, तो उसके लिये समस्या पैदा हो जाती थी कि उस लाये हुए माल को कहां लौटा कर ले जाय, उसकी सुरक्षा कैसे करे, चोरों से उसको कैसे बचाये, इन परेशानियों के कारण आगे के लिये वह कान पकड़ लेता था कि माल को जहाज से नहीं भुजना है। इन्हीं कारणों से जहाज पर माल आने में कमी हुई और घाटा हुआ। यदि ढंग से जहाजी सेवा चलायी जाती और इन्तजाम ठीक रहता तो कोई कारण नहीं कि घाटा होता।

इन सब चीजों के बारे में 1967 में काफ़ी पत्र-व्यवहार उस समय के मंत्री डा० राव साहब से हम लोगों का हुआ। हमारे गंगा स्टीमर सर्विस रिस्टोरेशन कमेटी के मंत्री बाबू फतह नारायण सिंह ने, जो पटना के रहनेवाले हैं—बहुत से खत मंत्री महोदय को लिखे और एक-एक चीज के जवाब उन्होंने डिटेल में दिये, लेकिन उसके बाद क्या हुआ, कुछ पता नहीं चलता है। जैसा आम तौर से सरकारी कामों में होता है, वैसा ही होता रहा, अफसरों ने जो जवाब बना दिया कि यह घाटे की बात है, उसको ही मान लिया गया। थोड़ी देर के लिये अगर हम यह मान लें कि यह घाटे की बात है, तो क्या आप घाटे के डर से रेलवे को बन्द कर देंगे। आखिर एक दिन युद्ध का संकट भी आ सकता है, पुल पर बम भी गिर सकता है, उस हालत में यहां से बंगाल और आसाम जाने के लिये आपके पास कौन सा रास्ता है? . . . .

**श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी :** दिल्ली से कलकत्ता तक पुल बनवा दीजिये।

**श्री मृत्युन्जय प्रसाद :** यह आपके राज में हो सकता है, जब यहां बैठियेगा तब बनवाइयेगा।

**श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी :** उसका उद्घाटन आप से कराना चाहिये।

**श्री मृत्युन्जय प्रसाद :** जब आप बनवा लीजियेगा तब उद्घाटन के लिये बुला लीजियेगा, लेकिन उस वक्त तक मैं जिन्दा नहीं रहूंगा, मेरी जिन्दगी मैं तो आप यहां आनेवाले नहीं हूँ।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि आज के समय में सबोटज करनेवालों की कमी नहीं है, करनेवाले कर गुजरते हैं और आज जो बन्द का रास्ता निकल पड़ा है, उसमें तो हर किस्म के आदमी शामिल हैं, वे कब क्या कर गुजरेंगे, कोई नहीं कह सकता। दूसरे, इस तरफ ट्रेफिक भी दिनों-दिन बढ़ रहा है—माल का भी, यात्रियों का भी, इस बढ़ते हुए ट्रेफिक में मिलिट्री ट्रेफिक और स्ट्रैटिजिक ट्रेफिक के लिये भी कठिनाई पैदा हो सकती है। एक बात यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि पटना से लेकर हावड़ा तक आपके पास गंगा पर एक ही पुल है—मुकामा का। अब अगर उस पर कुछ हो जाय और न भी हो, तो भी एक पुल से काम चलनेवाला नहीं है। इसलिये इस दृष्टि से आपको इस समस्या पर विचार करना चाहिये।

मगर एक दूसरा प्रश्न भी यहां उठता है—वहां पर जहाज अवाध रूप से चल नहीं सकते, जब तक कि गंगा का ड्रेजिंग न हो और कैनॉल एक्ट, 1964 के अनुसार यह जिम्मेदारी आपके ऊपर है कि आप नदियों का ड्रेजिंग करें, बंडलिंग करें, जिससे कि उनमें जहाज चल सकें। इस काम के लिये आपने 40 लाख रुपया खर्च करके एक बहुत अच्छा ड्रेजर “बद्रीनाथ” खरीदा था, जो वहां गया, मगर न मालम किसकी बुद्धि में क्या हुआ कि उसको पटना से कलकत्ता ले जाया गया और वहां से ट्यूटिकोरिन ले जाया गया और ट्यूटिकोरिन के नजदीक वह समुद्र में डूब गया। मगर सवाल यह है कि वह पटना से ले जाया ही क्यों गया? क्या गंगा में ड्रेजिंग करने की जरूरत नहीं थी क्या यह आपकी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है इसके अलावा जो दूसरा ड्रेजर वहां पर था उसको भी पटना से कलकत्ता ले जाया

[श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद]

गया। ड्रेजिंग न होने से वहां पर बड़े जहाजों के चलने में कठिनाई हो रही है, इसलिये मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है कि इस काम को वहां पर शीघ्र पूरा कराया जाय। ड्रेजिंग से एक बहुत बड़ा लाभ यह भी होता है कि उससे तटों की सुरक्षा होती है, नगरों की सुरक्षा होती है, गंगा के किनारे-किनारे जितने नगर हैं उनकी सुरक्षा होगी।

अब मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि कौन्सिल आफ एप्लाइड इकानामिक रिसर्च ने इसके बारे में क्या कहा है—उन्होंने सन् 60 में ट्राफिक पोटेन्शियल 55,71,000 मन (टन नहीं) जोड़ा है। लेकिन बरौनी फर्टिलाइजर के बन जाने पर बहुत कुछ कोल और फर्टिलाइजर बरौनी से नदी के रास्ते ही आया जाया करेगा। टिम्बर इत्यादि का हिसाब उसमें नहीं जोड़ा गया है।

उनका जो निष्कर्ष है वह मैं आपके सामने पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ :

“The Ganga and its tributary the Gogra provide fairly good navigation for all forms of water transport and can be kept open for navigation throughout the year for shallow draft vessels. In Bihar particularly 400 miles of water ways can be utilised for the distribution of agricultural produce and movement of consumer goods from South to North Bihar.”

That means *vice versa* also, North Bihar to South Bihar.

“Besides, inter-state traffic between Bihar and the districts of adjacent States can be developed.....”

आगे है :

“In order to facilitate this traffic the navigation channels of the Ganga and the Gogra require constant dredging and bandalling from October to May.”

अब यह जो ढिलाई हो गई है उसका ध्यान रखना होगा क्योंकि ध्यान न रखने से यह काम चल नहीं सकता है।

इसके अलावा एक बात यह है कि इन जहाजों के चलने से आपके पास एक जबर्दस्त कोर जहाजी जत्था आदमियों, सेलर्स, खलासियों का तैयार हो जायेगा। भले ही आज वे नदी के जहाजों में काम कर रहे हों लेकिन बाद में उनको समुद्री जहाजों में कामाने में बहुत दिनों की देर नहीं लगेगी। आज भी आपके पास उस तरह के आदमी नहीं हैं—अगर हैं भी तो बहुत कम हैं। मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा जिला इस काम में बहुत आगे है। सौ वर्ष से भी अधिक समय से पूरे बंगाल, बिहार और आसाम का गंगा, ब्रह्मपुत्र पर फेरी का काम छपरा वालों से चलता था और आज भी उनके लड़के, पोते और परपोते उस काम को कर रहे हैं, सीख रहे हैं और जान रहे हैं। उनको सिर्फ थोड़ा सा प्रोत्साहन देने की ही दरकार है। यह अगर हो जाये तो फिर यह काम बहुत आगे बढ़ जायेगा और खलासियों के लिये पाकिस्तान का मुंह जोहना न होगा।

मुझे कहनी तो और भी बहुत सी बातें थीं लेकिन समय नहीं है। जैसा मैं पहले अर्ज कर चुका हूँ कि पहले मौका न मिलने से जो बातें मुझे पहले कहनी थीं वह मैंने आज कहीं हैं क्योंकि अब और कोई दूसरा अवसर नहीं था। धन्यवाद।

श्री योगेंद्र शर्मा (बेगुसराय) : सभापति महोदय, वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने जो वित्त विधेयक पेश किया है, अगर सच पूछा जाये तो वह वित्त विधेयक भारतीय संविधान के तमाम प्रगतिशील सिद्धांतों का गला घोटता है। हमारे संविधान के प्रगतिशील सिद्धांतों में एक सिद्धांत यह है कि आर्थिक शक्ति का केन्द्रीयकरण नहीं होना चाहिये, इजारेदारी की बढ़ती नहीं होनी चाहिये। लेकिन वित्त विधेयक में जो भी प्रस्ताव हैं, वे प्रस्ताव आर्थिक शक्तियों का केन्द्रीयकरण और इजारेदारी को मजबूत करने वाले हैं। इसी प्रकार से हमारे संविधान का दूसरा प्रगतिशील



सिद्धान्त यह है कि आर्थिक और क्षेत्रीय विषमता को कम किया जाये। लेकिन इस वित्त विधेयक में जो बातें कही गई हैं यदि उन पर अमल किया गया तो यह आर्थिक विषमता और क्षेत्रीय विषमता घटने के बजाये और भी बढ़ेगी। इसी प्रकार से हमारे संविधान का एक प्रगतिशील सिद्धान्त यह है कि स्वदेशी और आर्थिक स्वतन्त्रता की स्थापना की जाये लेकिन अभी माननीय वित्त मंत्री ने यहां पर जो बताया है उससे मालूम होता है कि स्वदेशी और आर्थिक स्वतन्त्रता के दिन और भी दूर हैं। इस प्रकार से यह वित्त विधेयक भारतीय संविधान के तमाम प्रगतिशील सिद्धान्तों का गला घोटने वाला है। दूसरे इसने एक अच्छा काम भी किया है और वह यह है कि इसने इस रहस्य को प्रकट कर दिया है कि बिरला के व्यावसायिक भ्रष्टाचारों और दुराचारों की जांच को मोरारजी भाई और इस सरकार ने क्यों ठुकरा दिया है। उस रहस्य का भंडाफोड़ इस वित्त विधेयक से हो जाता है। अब तक सरकार इजारेदारों के साथ अपने चोली दामन के साथ को छिपाने की कोशिश करती थी लेकिन इस विधेयक से और उससे भी स्पष्ट रूप से शासक दल के अध्यक्ष ने अभी अभी शासक दल के फरीदाबाद अधिवेशन में अपने अध्यक्षीय भाषण में जो कहा है उससे यह चोली दामन का सम्बन्ध बहुत ही साफ साफ प्रकट हो जाता है। बहुत दिनों तक वे समाजवाद के नाम पर और कुछ ऐसे ही दूसरे आकर्षक शब्दों की आड़ में, इस सम्बन्ध को छिपाने की कोशिश करते रहे लेकिन चोली दामन का सम्बन्ध जो शासक दल ने और इस केन्द्रीय सरकार ने इजारेदारों के साथ कायम कर रखा है, अब वे उसको छिपा नहीं सकते हैं। शायद इसका कारण यह है कि आज चोली और दामन के सार्वजनिक प्रदर्शन की जो पद्धति है वह आधुनिक फैशन हो गई है और उस आधुनिक फैशन के अनुसार उन्होंने भी इस सम्बन्ध को साफ साफ दिखलाना शुरू कर दिया है। अब जरा हम देखें कि किस तरह से इस विधेयक के जरिए

इन्होंने इजारेदारों की सेवा करने की कोशिश, इजारेदारी को बढ़ाने की कोशिश, भारतीय संविधान के सिद्धान्तों का गला घोटते हुए की है? ये जो बड़े-बड़े इजारेदार हैं, चाहे देशी या विदेशी इन इजारेदारों को नये उद्योगों को स्थापित करने के नाम पर जो कर-अवकाश दिया गया था, उस कर-अवकाश की अवधि पांच साल और बढ़ाई जा रही है। गरीबों पर तो आप टैक्स बढ़ाते हैं और वह इस नाम पर बढ़ाते हैं कि साधन चाहिये लेकिन ये जो बड़े-बड़े इजारेदार हैं, चाहे टाटा, बिरला हमारे देश के हों या उनके साझेदार अमरीका और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन के हों, उनको आप छूट देते हैं—छूटी दे देते हैं।

**श्री ठुकरा चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) :** मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। सदन में गणपूर्ति नहीं है—इतना सुन्दर भाषण चल रहा है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may resume his seat, as the quorum is being challenged. The bell is being rung.. Now, there is quorum. He might continue his speech.

**श्री योगेंद्र शर्मा :** सभापति महोदय, एक तरफ़ ये वित्तीय साधनों की कमी का रोना रोते हैं और इस नाम पर साधारण मेहनतकश जनता के कमजोर कंधों पर टैक्स के बोझ को बढ़ाते हैं दूसरी तरफ़ जो बड़े-बड़े इजारेदार हैं उनको डेवलपमेंट रिबेट जो देते रहे हैं उसको जारी रखना चाहते हैं। यह डेवलपमेंट रिबेट जो जारी रखना चाहते हैं उसके क्या माने हैं जरा उसको सुना जाय। यह डेवलपमेंट रिबेट, औरों को छोड़ दिया जाय, मोनोपलीज़ कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक जो सात सबसे बड़े मोनोपलिस्ट हैं उन्होंने 1954 और 1960 साल के बीच 12 करोड़ 13 लाख रुपये कमाये, और यह रकम 1961 और 1965 के बीच 25 करोड़ 47 लाख हो गयी। सात जो बड़े बड़े मोनो-पलिस्ट हैं उनको तो यह इतने रुपये देते हैं डेवलपमेंट रिबेट के नाम पर और जब आज

[ श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा ]

गांवों में कुछ प्रगति हो रही है, हरियाली दिखाई देती है तो ग्रामीण जनता पर टक्सों का बोझ लादने के लिये दलील देते हैं कि जिसकी प्रगति हुई है उसको भी कुछ न कुछ टैक्स देना चाहिये। विकास के टैक्स की जिम्मेदारी से बरी टाटा और बिड़ला हैं। बाकी सब के कंधे पर चढ़ कर देश की प्रगति की बात की जाती है। मोरारजी भाई नाराज हो जाते हैं जब हम यह कहते हैं कि वे उन सिद्धान्तों का गला घोट रहे हैं जिनको हम सबने और देश ने मिल कर भारतीय संविधान में स्वीकार किया है कि इजारेदारी को नहीं बढ़ने देंगे, आर्थिक विषमता को कम करेंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने ठीक उसके विपरीत काम किया है इन कदमों से। और इस डेवलपमेंट रिज़र्व का नतीजा है कि 1954 और 1960 के बीच नैट बर्थ पर जो उनको मुनाफ़ा होता था वह 9.3 फ़ीसदी था जो 1961 और 1965 आते आते बढ़ कर 12.1 फ़ीसदी हो गया है। तो वे इस तरह से इजारेदारों के मुनाफ़े बढ़ाते हैं और बात करते हैं कि इजारेदारी को कमजोर करना चाहते हैं, कहते हैं कि आर्थिक विषमता को कम करना चाहते हैं, बात करते हैं कि हम साधन को जुटाना चाहते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, एक तरफ़ यह साधनों की कमी की बात करते हैं और साधनों को जुटाने के नाम पर जनता पर नये टैक्सों को लगाने का प्रस्ताव करते हैं, दूसरी तरफ़ हमारे देश के जो दो सबसे बड़े इजारेदार घराने हैं, टाटा और बिड़ला, उनको ऐसी सहूलियतें दे रहे हैं। जिनका नतीजा है कि तीन साल के भीतर टाटा के असेट्स 417 करोड़ से बढ़ कर 555 करोड़ हो जाते हैं और बिड़ला के 290 करोड़ से बढ़ कर 510 करोड़ हो जाते हैं। और इस तरह से तीन साल के भीतर टाटा को 138 करोड़ और बिड़ला को 320 करोड़ के असेट्स बढ़ाने में मदद करते हैं।

जो प्रस्ताव वित्त विधेयक में माननीय वित्त मंत्री ने रखे हैं वे इस सिलसिले को और भी तेज करेंगे। ज़रूरत इस बात की थी कि मेहनतकश जनता को रियायत दी जाती, इंसेंटिव जिसको कहते हैं वह उनको झिलना चाहिये। हम पूछना चाहते हैं कि क्या आर्थिक प्रेरणा सिर्फ़ टाटा और बिड़ला को ही मिलनी चाहिये? या उन मजदूरों और किसानों को मिलनी चाहिये जो सही मादों में उत्पादक हैं। हमारे देश में दौलत को पैदा करने वाले कौन हैं? वह मजदूर हैं किसान हैं। क्या वह आर्थिक प्रेरणा के पात्र नहीं हैं? उसके पात्र सिर्फ़ टाटा और बिड़ला ही हैं? मेहनतकश लोगों को आप इंसेंटिव नहीं देते। और इस विधेयक के जरिये से उन पर 122 करोड़ 57 लाख ६० का अतिरिक्त कर बोझ लादने जा रहे हैं। इजारेदारों के माथे पर से कर के बोझ को हल्का करना और मेहनतकश जनता के कंधों पर कर बोझ को बढ़ाना, यह है इस वित्त विधेयक का सच्चा स्वरूप।

इतना ही नहीं। इनकी जो कर प्रणाली है वह ऐसी है जिससे मेहनतकश जनता पर विकास का अधिकाधिक बोझ पड़ता है। लेकिन जो मेहनतकश जनता नहीं है, जो जनता के शोषक हैं, इजारेदार हैं उन पर बोझ हल्का होता है। और यह बात बहुत स्पष्ट हो जाती है यदि हम देखें कि पिछले 17 वर्षों के भीतर प्रत्यक्ष कर, तमाम करों में, 36.3 फ़ीसदी से घट कर 24.5 फ़ीसदी हो गये हैं लेकिन अप्रत्यक्ष कर 63.7 फ़ीसदी से बढ़कर 75.5 फ़ीसदी हो गये हैं। अप्रत्यक्ष कर बढ़ते जाते हैं और प्रत्यक्ष कर घटते जाते हैं। और इसका एक ही मतलब है कि मेहनतकश जनता पर बोझ बढ़ता जाता है और जनता के शोषक हैं, इजारेदार हैं उन पर हल्का होता जाता है।

17. hrs.

टैक्सों के सिलसिले में मैं एक विशेष टैक्स की चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ और वह है फर्टिलाइज़र।

खुशी की बात है कि पम्पिंग \*सैट पर जो प्रस्ताव था उसको वापस ले लिया है।

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : What is happening there ? They are sitting in a circle and talking.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Objection is being taken to the conversation of hon. Ministers.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Is it an extension of Faridabad ?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Hon. Members are not showing tolerance to my looking this side even for one minute when I have been sitting here for the whole day and listening to their speeches.

श्री योगेंद्र शर्मा : तो मैं कह रहा था फ़टिलाइज़र टैक्स के बारे में। फ़टिलाइज़र पर टैक्स के औचित्य के बारे में कहा गया है कि हम टैक्सों का आधार विस्तृत करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जो इजारेदार हैं उन पर टैक्सों का बोझ हल्का करके। इसके एक ही माने हैं कि इजारेदारों पर से टैक्स घटाओ और आम जनता पर टैक्स बढ़ाओ। यह टैक्स के दायरे को विस्तृत नहीं करना है, बल्कि इनके जो राजनीतिक और आर्थिक साझेदार हैं, इजारेदार, उनको सहूलियत देना है और जनता पर शोषण का चक्कर और तेज करना है।

कहा जाता है कि कृषि विकास की सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता फ़टिलाइज़र है। कृषि उत्पादन जितना बढ़ेगा उतनी ही देश की प्रगति होगी, आत्म निर्भरता बढ़ेगी और पी० एल० 480 से हमें निजात मिलेगी। इसके लिये इस बात की जरूरत थी कि खेतिहरों और किसानों को ज्यादा सहूलियतें दी जायें। लेकिन आप उस फ़टिलाइज़र पर टैक्स बढ़ा रहे हैं और उसको महंगा बना रहे हैं और इसके जरिये से किसानों के लिये वह फ़टिलाइज़र दुर्लभ कर रहे हैं जिसकी खेती की प्रगति के लिये बहुत ही आवश्यकता है।

पिछले दो वर्षों में फ़टिलाइज़र की कीमत बढ़ा दी गयी है। जरा आप देखें कि कितनी और किस हद तक बढ़ा दी गयी है। 1965-66 में अमोनियम सल्फ़ेट 374.60 पैसे प्रति टन था। वह 67-68 में बढ़कर 492 रुपये 2 पैसे पर टन हो गई यानी 118 रुपये टन दो साल में अमोनियम सल्फ़ेट की कीमत बढ़ाई गई है। इन्हीं दो सालों के भीतर यूरिया की कीमत 225 रुपये प्रति टन बढ़ाई गई है। जब फ़टिलाइज़र्स की जरूरत खेती के विकास के लिए इतनी आवश्यक है और जब फ़टिलाइज़र्स की कीमत पिछले दो वर्षों में इतनी बढ़ गयी हों तब ऐसी हालत में यह 10 फ़ीसदी का उस पर और टैक्स लगा कर आप खेती की प्रगति में सहायक हो रहे हैं या बाधक हो रहे हैं? दरअसल आप बाधक हो रहे हैं और बाधक आप जानबूझ कर होना चाहते हैं क्योंकि पी० एल० 480 को आप हमेशा के लिए देश के गले में बांध कर रखना चाहते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, इस बार के वित्त विधेयक की एक विशेषता है। अब तक बहुत बड़े बड़े इजारेदारों की मदद करने के लिये और रियायत देने के लिये आम जनता पर ये टैक्सों का बोझ लादते थे। लेकिन यह सिल-सिला यहां तक बढ़ गया कि अब उससे काम नहीं चलता है। इसलिए इस बार उन्होंने शहरी मध्यम वर्ग और देहाती पूंजीपतियों पर भी हमला किया है और इस गरज से हमला किया है कि इनके दोस्त जो बड़े-बड़े इजारेदार हैं उनकी मुनाफ़े की अनन्त भूख को तृप्त किया जाय। यह रहस्य है।

अभी जो डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेशन में इन्होंने परिवर्तन किया है अर्थात् 10,000 से लेकर 20,000 रुपये की आमदनी वाले पर तो इन्होंने टैक्स की दर बढ़ा दी है लेकिन 20,000 से ऊपर की आमदनी वालों को ज्यों का त्यों रहने दिया गया है। सबसे अधिक मुनाफ़ा कमाने वाले यही 20,000 से ऊपर

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

की आमदनी वाले हैं। लेकिन उन पर तो आपने टैक्स की दर नहीं बढ़ाई है। लेकिन 10,000 से 20,000 वालों के ऊपर टैक्स की दर बढ़ा दी है। यह कौन सा तरीका है? यह सिवाय इस फिलासफ़ी के और क्या हो सकता है कि जो जितना ही बड़ा है आप उसकी उतनी ही मदद करना चाहते हैं और जो जितना छोटा है उस पर आप उतना ही अधिक बोझ लादना चाहते हैं?

इसी तरीके से आपने देहातों पर कृपा की है। देहाती कर व्यवस्था के बारे में मैं साफ़ साफ़ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी जो हमारे देहात में कर व्यवस्था है वह बहुत पुरानी व्यवस्था है और इसलिए उसमें आमूल परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है। अभी जो लगान की प्रथा है उस लगान की प्रथा को खत्म करना चाहिए और उसकी जगह एक प्रगतिशील भूमि कर और आय कर की व्यवस्था लागू करनी चाहिए। प्रगतिशील कर प्रणाली का यही तकाज़ा है। समय का तकाज़ा है कि पुरानी कर प्रणाली को बदला जाय लेकिन मैं यह नहीं चाहूंगा कि इसके जरिए से मोरारजी भाई जिन्होंने कि देश के वित्तीय साधनों का अधिकांश अर्थात् कोई 75 फ़ीसदी केन्द्र में संचित कर रक्खा है उसमें और इस तरह से वृद्धि कर लें और राज्यों के वित्तीय साधनों का समेट लें। मैं चाहूंगा कि राज्य सरकारें यह काम करें न कि मोरारजी भाई अथवा केन्द्रीय सरकार करे। मैं उन माननीय सदस्यों के विचार से सहमत हूँ कि भूमि पर कर लगाने का कोई संवैधानिक अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार को नहीं है और यह काम राज्य सरकारों को करना चाहिए। इस तरह से केन्द्रीय सरकार ने राज्य सरकारों के वित्तीय साधनों पर नया छाप मारा है जब कि आवश्यकता इस बात की थी कि राज्य सरकारों और केन्द्रीय सरकार के जो वित्तीय सम्बन्ध हैं उन पर पुनर्विचार किया जाता।

उन पर पुनर्विचार करने की बड़ी आवश्यकता है। तमाम राज्यों के जो वित्तीय साधन हैं उनको यदि मिला दिया जाय तो उनसे अधिक सिर्फ केन्द्रीय सरकार के वित्तीय साधन हैं। स्थिति यह है कि तमाम राज्यों के जो वित्तीय साधन हैं उनसे केन्द्र का 1955-56 में सवैया और 1967-68 में दूना है। वह 1967-68 में आते आते दुगुना हो गया, यानी जो वित्तीय साधन केन्द्रीय सरकार के हाथ में पहले से ही अधिक थे वे और भी अधिक हो गये और होते जा रहे हैं। अब जो नया छाप उन्होंने देहात में मारा है उससे और भी अधिक कर लेंगे, अब शायद वह ढाई गुने से भी ज्यादा जायेंगे। ऐसी हालत में राज्य सरकारें परावलम्बी हो जायेंगी। वह केन्द्र के अनुदान पर जीवित रहेंगी, उनकी मर्जी पर जीवित रहेंगी। यदि उनकी मर्जी के खिलाफ चलना चाहेंगी तो चल नहीं पायेंगी।

इतना ही नहीं, आज राज्यों की हालत यह है कि उनको अनुदान यदि नहीं मिलता तो उनके लिये जिंदा रहना मुश्किल है, कोई काम करना मुश्किल है। 1950-51 में राज्यों को कुल केन्द्रीय अनुदान केवल 16 करोड़ मिलता था, लेकिन आज हालत यह है कि 1967-68 में उन्हें 460 करोड़ अनुदान लेना पड़ा है। यदि इस हद तक राज्य सरकारें केन्द्र पर अवम्बित हो जायें तो वह अपने राज्य में स्वेच्छापूर्वक कैसे कोई व्यवस्था कर सकती हैं? केवल इतना ही नहीं है, आज राज्यों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार का करीब 5,500 करोड़ 80 कर्ज हो गया है। इस कर्ज और सूद की अदायगी में राज्य सरकारों के राजस्व का निम्नाना बड़ा हिस्सा खत्म हो जाता है, इसका एक ही उदाहरण मैं पेश करूंगा। इस साल बिहार सरकार के राजस्व का 70 फ़ीसदी केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्ज और सूद की अदायगी में चला गया। ऐसी हालत में राज्य सरकारें क्या कर सकती हैं? इसलिये आवश्यकता है कि केन्द्र और राज्यों के वित्तीय सम्बन्धों के ऊपर

पुनर्विचार किया जाये और इसके लिये केन्द्र और राज्यों की एक वित्त कौंसिल बने तथा जो फाइनेन्स कमिशन समय समय पर बनता है वह स्थायी रूप में बने ताकि इस सम्बन्ध में जो नये सवाल पैदा हो रहे हैं उनको देश की एकता और प्रगति के हित में ठीक ढंग से समय पर हल किया जा सके।

वित्त मंत्री ने जो वित्त विधेयक उपस्थित किया है वह हमारे भारतीय संविधान तथा प्रगतिशील सिद्धान्त का गला घोटने वाला है। चाहिये तो यह था कि इस वित्त विधेयक को आग लगा कर खाक कर दिया जाता, लेकिन हमें अफसोस है कि जो आग लगनी चाहिये थी वित्त विधेयक में वह लगती है कांग्रेस के महा-अधिवेशन में। काश यह आग वित्त विधेयक में लगती और वह जलकर खाक हो जाता और नया वित्त विधेयक पास होता।

**श्री शिवनारायण (बस्ती) :** सभापति महोदय, यहां पर संविधान की बड़ी दुहाई दी गई है लेकिन मैं अपने मित्र श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह और उनकी पार्टी उसका कितना सम्मान करते हैं ? नो गवर्नमेंट विघाउट टैक्सेशन। मैं फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर के फाइनेन्स बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं श्री शर्मा से कम क्रिटिकल गवर्नमेंट का नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मैं फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश के कोने कोने में और देश के तमाम पत्रकारों ने जब पार्लियामेंट मेम्बर्स की अमेनिटीज की बात छापी तो सब जगह हमारी बड़ी बदनामी हुई। नेकनामी नहीं हुई, बदनामी हुई। श्री सी० सी० देसाई ने भी इसके बारे में कहा। फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर का कहना है कि जो चीज युनैनिमिटी से आयेगी उसे हम मान लेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले बीस सालों में इस हाउस में और इस गवर्नमेंट के सामने ऐसी कौन सी चीज आई है जो युनैनिमिटी से आई हो ? कोई भी बिल,

कोई प्रस्ताव कोई भी चीज युनैनिमिटी से पास नहीं हुई, हमेशा मैजोरिटी से पास हुई। इसलिये फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर का यह कहना उचित नहीं है और मेम्बर्स को अमेनिटीज दी जानी चाहिये।

आज हमारे मित्र जो चाहते हैं कहते हैं। वह भी उस कमेटी के मेम्बर थे और मैं भी था। हमारे मित्रों ने गलियारे में मेरे हाथ जोड़े कि हमारे केस को प्लोड करो। मैं किसी पार्टी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। हमने हर पार्टी की वकालत की। आप वहां मौजूद थे। यह कोई छिपी हुई बात नहीं है। मैंने अपनी रेसपांसीबिलिटी को समझा और खुले तौर पर अपने विचार प्रकट किये। हमारा उद्देश्य यही है कि कोई भी सदस्य टाटा या बिड़ला की जेब में न रहे, सब ईमानदारी से और आनरेबली अपना काम करें और पब्लिक भी यह महसूस करे कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर्स की कुछ डिगिनिटी है। (व्यवधान) इन लोगों के मुंह में पानी आ रहा है कि कब इनको कुछ मिलेगा और ये लोग हम पर एटैक करते हैं।

पिछले फिनांस मिनिस्टर, श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी, ने यह एशोरेंस दिया था कि बस्ती और बलिया को पटेल कमिशन में ले लिया जायगा। मैं इस विषय पर बोलना चाहता था, लेकिन श्री भगत ने आकर मुझे मना किया और कहा कि श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी जाने वाले हैं। उस एशोरेंस के बावजूद आज गवर्नमेंट के कान पर जूं भी नहीं रेंग रही है। आज देश में एक सबसे जरूरी काम है मीन्ज आफ कम्प्यूनिक्शन्ज की व्यवस्था करना, एक गांव को दूसरे गांव के साथ सड़कों और छोटी-छोटी पुलियों द्वारा जोड़ना। भादों के अन्त में हम अपने गांव, रघुनाथपुर, में आलू तैयार करते हैं, लेकिन हम उसको शहर नहीं पहुंचा सकते हैं, क्योंकि रास्ते में इतना पानी होता है कि उसको त्रास नहीं कर सकते।

[श्री शिवनारायण]

शेरशाह ने पांच बरस में हिन्दुस्तान भर में सड़कें बनवा दी थीं, लेकिन इन बीस बरसों में हमारी सड़कों की दुर्गति हो गई है। मैं नेपाल के बार्डर से आता हूँ। मिलिटरी स्ट्रेटेजी की दृष्टि से वह क्षेत्र बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। वहां पर सड़कों की व्यवस्था करना बहुत जरूरी है। सड़कों के सम्बन्ध में जो मास्टर प्लान बनाया गया था, वह ठप्प पड़ा है। फिनांस मिनिस्टर साहब को इस आवश्यक काम के लिये रुपया देना चाहिए।

मैं टाटा, बिड़ला वगैरह बड़े बड़े कैपिटलिस्ट्स के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी का दो बरस तक मेम्बर रहा हूँ। अमीचन्द प्यारेलाल की तरफ़ 95 लाख रुपया बाकी था और उस को ब्लैकलिस्टिड कर दिया गया था, लेकिन फिर भी उसको परमिट दे दिया गया। मैंने पिछले फूड मिनिस्टर श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम, से यह सवाल किया था :

Is it a fact that the order was passed in hurry ?

उन्होंने जवाब दिया, “नो”। फिर मैंने पूछा :

When you passed the order in 1955, did you take the trouble to see what is the case there ?

इस सवाल का जवाब भी “नो” मिला। मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसकी कथनी और करनी में अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिए। वह जो कहे, वही करे। हम लोग टैक्स देने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन गांवों के साधारण किसानों पर बोझ डालना उचित नहीं है। अगर बड़े बड़े फार्मज़ पर टैक्स लगाया जाये, तो हमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। लेकिन फर्ट-लाइजर तो दो बीघे वाला भी लेता है और सौ बीघे वाला भी लेता है। इस प्रकार फर्टलाइजर पर टैक्स लगाने का अर्थ कामनमैन पर बोझ डालना है। इसकी तुलना में हम देखते हैं कि जिन लोगों पर सौ सौ करोड़

रुपया बाकी है, वह भी वसूल नहीं किया जा रहा है।

एक नौजवान वकील ने मुझे कहा कि मास्टर जी, अपनी गवर्नमेंट से कहो कि वह अपने एक ही डिपार्टमेंट—कस्टम्ज़ विभाग—को ठीक कर ले, तो एक बहुत बड़ी बात हो जाये। आज डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट और एस० पी० वगैरह बड़े बड़े अफसरों के घरों में जो विदेशी ट्रांसिस्टर, रेडियो और दूसरी चीजें हैं, उनको वे कहां से लाते हैं ? क्या ऐसे लोगों को लायल कहा जा सकता है ? वे लायल नहीं हैं। आखिर इस सरकार का सी० आई० डी० और इन्टेलिजेंस डिपार्टमेंट कहां है ? एक जयचन्द ने इस देश को बारह सौ बरस के लिए गुलाम करवा दिया था। आज तो लाखों जयचन्द पैदा हो रहे हैं।

मैं मुल्क का एक सिपाही हूँ। मैं देश को बचाना चाहता हूँ। आज देश की जनता चाहती है कि सब योग्य व्यक्ति, सब जीनियस, इकट्ठे बैठें और देश के हित में कोई फ़र्म डिसिजन लें। मैं फिनांस मिनिस्टर साहब से दरख्वास्त करता हूँ कि वह देश को बचाने की कोशिश करें। हमने बड़ी कीमत देकर स्वराज्य लिया है। उसके लिए हमने कोई मामूली तपस्या नहीं की है। वह हमारे बुजुर्ग हैं। वह पुरानी पीढ़ी के हैं। जो अनुभव उन्हें हैं, वह हमें नहीं है।

एक रिटायर्ड मिलिटरी आफिसर ने मुझे कहा कि पी० एल०-480 के अन्तर्गत बाहर से अनाज मंगाना गलत है। अगर आज बाज़ार में गेहूं रुपये का दो सेर मिलता है, तो सरकार श्री रणधीर सिंह जैसे लोगों को बह सब गेहूं खरीदने के लिए कह दे और उन्हें चार आने मन का मुनाफा देकर उसको स्टोर कर लिया जाये। इस काम के लिए सरकार नोट्स को फ्लेयर अप कर दे। आज देश में अनाज की कमी नहीं है।

ले लीजिये और अपने गोल्ड को बचाइए । न मैं अमेरिका को क्रिटिसाइज कर रहा हूँ न रशिया को ।

हो ? . . . . . (ब्यवधान) . . . . . अरे भाई, सुनो . . . . .

तमीजे न वासत कमन्दे हवा ।

उलटने को रोटी उलट दिया तवा ॥

कर वहियां बल आपने छांड पराई आश । हम यह चाहते हैं । लेकिन हमारे देश में आज जब किसान ने जरा हिमन्त किया, सीना तानकर चला तो आपका जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है, आपका जो आफिशियल क्लास है वह उनके साथ लूट मचाए हुए है इस देश के अन्दर, इसमें कोई डाउट नहीं है । खुले आम लूट रहे हैं । किसी भी दफ्तर में जाइए, बिना पैसा दिए काम हो नहीं सकता है । इससे बेसी मैं क्या कह सकता हूँ । अगर सरकार इनको चेक नहीं कर सकती तो सरकार जाने, सरकार का काम जाने । संविधान में आप ने फंडामेंटल राइट दे रखा है, लेकिन आज इस देश में 10 करोड़ आदमियों का जीना दूबर हो गया है । रोजाना उनको मारा जाता है, पीटा जाता है, गालियां दी जाती हैं, उनके घर और बस्तियां फूँकी जाती हैं । अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे लड़के एम० ए० पास होकर गलियों में घूम रहे हैं । रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी ली थी इनकी महर्षि दयानंद ने, महात्मा गांधी ने और जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने । मैं कहता हूँ यह हमारी बदनामी नहीं है, यह आपकी बदनामी है । हरिजन समाज आज दुखी है, बहुत परेशान है । माइनारिटी को आज पीसा जा रहा है मुल्क के अन्दर । हिन्दू मुसलमान की बात तो छोड़ दीजिए, वह तो बहुत दूर की बात हो गई । आज आपस में लड़ रहे हैं । जहाँ बामन है, बामन को रखेगा, ठाकुर है ठाकुर को रखेगा, बनिया है बनिया को रखेगा । मैं इसलिए यह कह रहा हूँ कि आज समाज में एक बड़ा विकराल विष पैदा हो रहा है । मैं आज सबेरे ट्रैवेल कर रहा था, मेरे साथ एक प्रोफेसर थे, डेलही यूनिवर्सिटी के प्रोफेसर । उनकी बातों को आप सुनिए । वह कहते थे कि आप लोग क्या कर रहे हो, मुल्क को कहाँ ले जा रहे

यह उनमें से हैं । इनको कोई फिक्र नहीं है देश की । हमको फिकर है मुल्क की । मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ, आई वाज बानी इन वेस्ट इंडीज—जब स्वराज्य का नारा इस देश में लगा तो हमारे बाप और मां, सब वहाँ से भाग कर देश में आए और देश को आजाद करने में भाग लिया, आजादी की लड़ाई में शामिल हुए । हम उस आजादी को बचाना चाहते हैं और इस देश को ऊंचा ले जाना चाहते हैं । इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूँगा अपने बुजुर्ग लीडर से, वह केवल हमारे फायनेंस मिनिस्टर ही नहीं हैं, हमारे लीडर भी हैं, वह इस चीज को समझें—अशोक मेहता जी के उस अन्तिम सेंटेंस का मैं भी समर्थन करता हूँ जो उन्होंने आपसे कहा । उस पर आपको गौर करना है और विचार करना है । अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश में क्या होने वाला है, भगवान ही मालिक है ।

एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर थे यहाँ पर, वह खिसक गए । मैं उनसे भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अध्यापकों को अगर आप इस तरह इग्नोर करेंगे, जो हमारे समाज की रचना करने वाले हैं, जो हमारे मुल्क के कुम्हार हैं, जो इस देश को बनाने वाले हैं, कहा है :

कुम्भकारो भूमौ तिष्ठति सा दण्डेन चक्रं ध्रामयति . . . . .

कुम्हार चाक घुमाता है तो उससे बढ़िया बढ़िया बर्तन बनाकर बाजार में देता है, ऐसे ही हमारे जो अध्यापक बन्धु हैं वह समाज के रचयिता हैं, वह हमको गांधी देते हैं, वह हमको नेहरू देते हैं, तपस्वी देते हैं, अच्छे अच्छे प्रोफेसर देते हैं, अच्छे अच्छे मैजिस्ट्रेट देते हैं, उनको आज रोटी के लाले पड़ रहे हैं, उनको आज स्ट्राइक करनी पड़ रही है और उनको आज

[श्री शिव नारायण ]

जेलों में बन्द कर रहे हैं हमारे एजूकेशन मिनिस्टर साहब । यह आप क्या कर रहे हैं ? चाहे स्टेट हो या सेंटर हो यह रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी सरकार की है । उन टीचरों के साथ आप अन्याय कर रहे हैं और आपके समाज की गाड़ी इस तरह ठीक चलने वाली नहीं है । मैं प्रोफेसर राव से कहूंगा वह इस बात को भूलें नहीं । शिक्षा में टीचर का आज वह स्थान नहीं है जो पहले हुआ करता था । हमारे शागिर्द आते हैं कहते हैं मास्टर जी, यह बात है, गुरु जी यह बात है । लेकिन आज का स्टूडेंट छुरा लेकर बैठता है इम्तहान में । इन बच्चों को बिगाड़ा है आपने । आप इन बच्चों को बिगाड़ रहे हैं । इसलिए भगवान के लिए मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जो चीज दो, कायदे से दो और इस शिक्षा विभाग पर नेकनीयती के साथ, दिल की सफाई के साथ विचार करो । यह हमारा ददं दिल है जो मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूँ ।

**श्री मोलूह प्रसाद :** जब फरीदाबाद का पंडाल जल रहा था तब आप कहां थे ?

**श्री शिव नारायण :** तब यह रावण के दरबार में थे और उस षडयंत्र में यह लोग शामिल थे । मुझसे इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ने कहा कि मझे खुशी हुई, कांग्रेस के लोगों ने यह नहीं कहा कि कम्युनिस्टों ने फूका है । जरा हमारे मारल को देखो । यह तुम्हारे आदमी ने कहा, हमने नहीं कहा है । हमारा मारल कैरेक्टर देखो और अपना देखो । कांग्रेस की ऊंचाई को देखो कि कांग्रेस के लोग कितने टालरेंट हैं, यह गांधीयन फिलास्फी है । हम जान कर ठीक बात कहते हैं, लूज टोक नहीं करते हैं, लूज टोक आप कर रहे हैं ।

**श्री योगेंद्र शर्मा :** आपको मोरारजी भाई से कहना चाहिये, हमको क्यों कह रहे हैं ।

**श्री शिव नारायण :** आप क्यों टैंट कर रहे हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्राइवेट सैक्टर और पब्लिक सैक्टर दोनों में कम्पीटीशन चल रहा है । मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सैक्टर में नुकसान क्यों हो रहा है ? क्या पब्लिक सैक्टर हमने इसलिये खोले हैं कि अफसरों को भर दें, मशीनरी स्टार्ट कर दें, काम कुछ हो या न हो । अफसरान दो फाइलें भी नहीं लिखते हैं । उन लोगों को एप्वाइन्ट किया जाता है जो रिटायर्ड हैं, इनवैलिड लोग हैं, जो किसी काम के नहीं हैं जो रिजेक्टेड लोग हैं । ऐसे आदमियों को नहीं भेजा जाता जिनके पास ब्रेन है, जो 55 और 60 के बीच के हैं, जिनमें एनर्जी है, जो ठीक टाइम दे सकते हैं, वर्क कर सकते हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस कन्ट्री की पोलिटीकल सीचुएशन बड़ी डेन्जस है । मिड टर्म पोल के बाद हमने देखा बंगाल में क्या हुआ, बिहार में क्या हुआ, उत्तर प्रदेश में क्या हुआ, कहां कहां क्या हुआ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह सरकार सावधान हो और सोचे । मैं कांग्रेसवालों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कलेजा थाम कर बैठो, हमारी भी बारी है, अपोजीशन में बैठने की जुरंत रखो । हम घबराते नहीं हैं, बंगाल तुम्हें मुबारक हो, लेकिन वहां पर जो कुछ हुआ है सब को मालूम है, सरोवर पर क्या हुआ है सबको मालूम है । जैसा बोओगे वैसा काटोगे ।

मैं फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ—आप भले ही टैक्स लगायें, लेकिन पी० एल० 480 का समर्थक नहीं हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क के किसानों की रक्षा करो, विद्यार्थियों और शिक्षार्थियों को सुविधा दो । हरिजननों की हालत को देख कर हमें दुख होता है, हम रोज गालियां सुनते हैं लोग कहते हैं कि हरिजननों की फीस माफ है । हम कहते हैं कि आप सबकी फीस माफ कर दो ।



जैसा काश्मीर में है नीचे से ऊपर तक फीस माफ है, उसी तरह से आप भी करें, लैंग्वेज की प्राबलम को हल करो, माइनार्टीज की भाषा चाहे उर्दू हो, संस्कृत हो, फारसी हो, अरबी हो, मुल्क में आजादी हो जो चाहे वह पढ़े, इस सम्बन्ध में गवर्नमेन्ट को मदद करनी चाहिये ।

अन्त में मैं इस फाइनेन्स बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार अपनी जिम्मेदारी को समझे । मुल्क की पोलीशन आज बड़ी क्रिटिकल है, आज हम क्रिटिकल दिनों से गुजर रहे हैं । हमारे चारों तरफ दुश्मन हैं, इन दुश्मनों से हमें अपने देश को बचाना है । मैंने मिड-टर्म पोल के मौके पर अपने नौजवानों से कहा था जो 20 वर्ष के लड़के हैं उनको अपने कन्धे पर बन्दूक रख कर अपने देश को पाकिस्तान और चाइना से बचाना है, उसके लिये तैयारी करो । इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं पुनः इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर, जिन्हें उपदेश हुआ है कि संविधान की रक्षा की जाए, मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ, इस गवर्नमेन्ट से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो फ्रीडम आफ् स्पीच का अधिकार दिया गया है, जो फण्डामेन्टल राइट्स संविधान में दिये गये हैं, उसके अन्तर्गत हम हरिजनों को प्रोटेक्शन मिलना चाहिये ।

SHRI A SREEDHARAN (Badagara) : When I rise to speak on the Finance Bill, the powerful speech by Mr. Asoka Mehta is echoing in my ears. He has learnt from his mistakes, from the frustrations and the agony he has suffered as a Member of the Treasury Bench. But the tragedy of our times is that we have a Deputy Prime Minister who refuses to learn any thing new and refuses to forget anything that he has learnt. Probably the inexorable law of nature is that people on the wrong side of sixty take wisdom only in doses. When the Budget was presented there was scathing criticism on the levy on fertilisers and the excess levy

on power driven pumps. He struck an adamant posture and it took him more than a month to realise that the excess duty on power driven pumps was uncalled for. I am citing this as an example that through the policies the Government are trying to implement this country is being driven to the verge of disaster and economic collapse.

Sir, there is a big contradiction in this country. Some of the hon. Members have pointed out the growth of monopoly in this country : The gulf that is growing wider between the rich and the poor. The hard-hit sections of society are engaged in a titanic struggle to make both ends meet. I do not want to repeat the story, but there is yet another bigger contradiction in this country. If you turn back to the history of the last 20 years, it will be crystal clear that the towns have grown prosperous; that the industrial octopus has grown wider while the villages have grown poorer. The vast sections of the rural population have been completely left at the mercy of this Government and hard taxation. While defending the excise duty on fertilisers, the hon. Deputy Prime Minister said that the peasants have received the benefit from this Government in the form of irrigation, in the form of electrification, in the form of agricultural credit. I need not tell the hon. Deputy Prime Minister about the various levies the poor peasants have to pay. Wherever they have built up some irrigation projects, wherever they have built up dams, they have levied a cess on the poor peasants; wherever they have given agricultural credit, they have levied an exorbitant interest of eight to nine per cent. At the same time, interest-free loans are given to Tatas and Birlas. Villages have been paying very heavily for the upkeep of this Government. This contradiction is eating into the vitals of our economic system and it will go against the interests of agriculture in this country.

Similarly, a stage is passing by when a sedulous attempt is being made of taking away the initiative of the States. I support the wealth-tax in any form; the principle of wealth-tax is a laudable and welcome one. But agricultural taxes are the responsibility and the right of the States. The Deputy Prime Minister takes the pose of a godfather. He says, "I will collect

[ Shri A. Sreedharan ]

the tax and then distribute it to the States." Whatever is legitimately due to the States must remain in the hands of the States. The State Governments are not here knocking at the doors of the Central Government for doles as beggars. These two predominating factors are a very disturbing feature of this Finance Bill.

What has happened in this country during the last 20 years has resulted in a serious culmination of the economic policies, where the small entrepreneurs are hit. Every attempt is made to block their growth. Take, for example, the compound levy on the powerlooms. In Mysore State, I am told that this duty is going to hit the small powerloom entrepreneurs, the small man who is already driven to the wall by the big industrialists. No doubt the Deputy Prime Minister has made some concessions but those concessions do not even touch the fringe of the problem. We are living in stirring times. When the country is passing through a critical period, we are spending enormous amounts on our defence. I am proud of it; I would unhesitatingly say that every pie spent on defence is usefully spent, but there are certain considerations which we have to bear in mind. We are called upon to pay so heavily for defence now. There were times when countries became independent, and no attempt was made to bring the backward countries of Africa and Asia together, to create a front against the enemies who are threatening us across the frontier. Defence was neglected. There was no defence preparedness on our frontiers, and nobody ever thought in terms of defending the frontiers of this country. Due to that negligence, today we are called upon to pay very heavily for defending the frontiers of this country. Similarly, in External Affairs also no new innovation has been made. India, which began as a powerful country in Asia, today we are being assailed in almost every country because we never took a brave posture. In the matter of external affairs there have been complaints that our external affairs units in other countries, our Foreign Legations are not functioning properly.

There is no mobilisation of man-power to run these institutions. This is not a

story which is confined to one department alone. Take, for example, the story of our public sector undertakings. We have invested about Rs. 3,500 crores. in the public sector. If we could realise at least five per cent return from the public sector undertakings, the levy on fertilizers could be withdrawn. But, then, why have these public sector undertakings gone down the drain? It is because of wasteful expenditure. I support public sector undertakings and I stand by them. But what has been done during the last so many years to eradicate wasteful expenditure in public sector undertakings? On a number of occasions, on the floor of this House the acts of omission and commission in the public sector undertakings are brought to the notice of this government.

Because there is no proper man-power mobilisation in this country, some of the most brilliant doctors, engineers and technicians do not serve this country and they are going abroad in search of service. About 800 doctors and engineers from this country have gone to other countries, because no attempt is being made to put our economy in proper shape. This lack of man-power mobilisation, this lack of imaginative approach to public sector undertakings has brought our public sector undertakings to a stage of near collapse.

I know that there are forces in this country which want to run down our public sector undertakings. We have come to such a pass because of our projected economic policy of half-heartedness. India is facing a contradiction today. Where does this government stand, I would like to ask. There are no half-way methods in socialism. If you want to implement socialism, you have to go the whole hog for it. You cannot build a socialist society if you are allowing the growth of monopoly in this country.

So, the final question that confronts the Finance Minister is this. What is the approach of this Government to these problems? Are you prepared to nationalise the basic industries of this country? Are you prepared to nationalise the extraction of mineral wealth of this country? Are you prepared to nationalise the top banking industry in this country?

I know the big contradiction that is taking place in the Congress itself. A report was presented to the Faridabad session of the Congress and the Congress could not adopt that report. That report was not prepared by anybody from the opposition; that report was submitted by somebody who was the colleague of the Finance Minister. Why was that report not adopted? Because, the Congress is still not decided and definite on this basic policy question. The laws of economics are inexorable and the laws of economics would not wait for anybody. So, while speaking on the Finance Bill, I could like to point out to the Deputy Prime Minister this. Here is a challenge before you. If you are really a patriotic person, if you think that this country should be taken forward, if you think that this country should be given a new dimension, the only way out is to present a socialist budget, for which new innovations have got to be found out in the methods of taxation.

I come from a State where our resources are very poor, thanks to the attitude adopted by the Central Government. Many of the industries which were to be located in my State have been taken away. The Precision Instruments Factory at Pudukkottai and the Phyto-Chemicals at Neriamangalam have been shifted to other parts of the country. Our resources are scarce and our density of population on land is very high. Still, the Finance Minister of Kerala did not hesitate to arise resources for the State by resorting to novel methods. For the first time in the history of this country, it was the State of Kerala which inaugurated the public lottery system. I know that it is pooh-poohed by many people and parties in various parts of the country saying that it is not going to bring enough into the coffers of the State Government. Now I am glad to say with pride and confidence that the trail blazed by the Finance Minister of Kerala has been followed by the Finance Ministers of many other States. This is not the only new experiment tried by the State Government of Kerala. The State Government is going to start a new scheme of hire-purchase and another scheme of starting small-scale industries. So, there are other ways of augmenting the income of the Government. We do not depend entirely on tax-

tion. In modern countries other methods are being used.

But here is a government which believes in 18th century economics, which believes that taxation is the only means to fill the coffers of government. I would like to ask why the Government has not thought of other innovations. Such innovations have got to be taken into consideration because India is one of the most highly taxed countries in the world. If you go on taxing the poor peasants any more, the economic structure of this country will break.

So, new methods have got to be adopted. The public undertakings have got to be put on a sound footing. Where we do not have enough wealth and capital, we will have to find resources in manpower. We have tremendous wealth in manpower and a scheme for manpower utilisation should be initiated.

All these should be linked together so that a new break-through can be brought about and new methods can be evolved. These methods have not been evolved by this Government; so, I oppose the Finance Bill.

श्री क० गो० सेन (पूर्णिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, वैसे ख़ास मेरी इस वित्त विधेयक पर बोलने की इच्छा नहीं थी बाकी उपप्रधान मंत्री महोदय तथा वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो वित्त विधेयक रक्खा है मैं उसका आम तौर पर समर्थन करता हूँ लेकिन उसमें जो दो, चार तकलीफ़देह चीज़ें हैं उनको मैं सामने रख देना चाहता हूँ।

यूँ तो वित्त मंत्री जी ने ट्यूबवैल्स और ख़ास कर इरीगेशन फेसेल्टीज़ के लिए टैक्स में माफ़ी प्रदान की है लेकिन यह फर्टिलाइज़र्स के ऊपर उन्होंने टैक्स रख छोड़ा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक, दो साल के लिए खेतिहर किसानों को कुछ राहत दी जाय, कुछ दिनों के लिए टैक्स लगाना रोक दिया जाय ताकि वह सम्हल जाय। आज उन्हें अनेकों समस्याओं का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। खेतिहर

[ श्री फ० गो० सेन ]

किसानों की आवास की समस्या है, मिर्केनाइज्ड फार्मिंग करने की समस्या है, साथ ही साथ खेती के उत्पादन का खर्चा बढ़ रहा है, लेबर नहीं मिलती है, ट्रैक्टरस नहीं मिलते हैं यह और दूसरी अनेकों समस्याएं उनके सामने मौजूद हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह फर्टिलाइजर्स के ऊपर और वह जो अच्छी क्वालिटी के बीज लेते हैं और उसके साथ जो इरिगेशन के लिये पानी लेते हैं तो यह सब मिला कर काश्तकारों का कोई 150-200 रुपया पर एकड़ उन लोगों का खर्चा पड़ जाता होगा। यह मैं अंदाज से बतला रहा हूँ। ऐसी हालत में जबकि हम लोग देख रहे हैं कि कुछ खेती के ऊपर हम लोगों का ध्यान आकृष्ट हुआ है और खेतिहर लोग भी कुछ ज्यादा आगे बढ़े हैं और यह खुशी का मुकाम है कि इधर पढ़े लिखे लोग भी खेती करने की तरफ झुक रहे हैं और वह ट्रैक्टरस से खेती करने लगे हैं तो उन लोगों की आर्थिक पाकिट में इस तरह से जल्दी हाथ न दिया जाय तो अच्छा रहेगा। इस बात की आज बड़ी जरूरत है कि सरकार खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए काश्तकारों को सभी संभव सहायितयें दें। आज आपको अनाज की कमी है और अगर उन्हें प्रोत्साहन दिया गया तो वह इस अनाज की कमी की पूर्ति कर देंगे और जैसा कि मालूम पड़ता है वह हो ही जायगा।

जूट की इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ावा देने के लिए आपने जो ऐक्सपोर्ट ड्यूटी माफ़ कर दी है वह एक अच्छी बात की है। लेकिन जहां मैं उसके खिलाफ नहीं हूँ वहां मैं यह अवश्य कहना चाहूंगा कि मैं एक जूट पैदा करने वाला आदमी हूँ तो जूट के उत्पादकों को भी सरकार को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए था लेकिन आपने फर्टिलाइजर्स के ऊपर टैक्स लगा दिया है। अब न्याय का तकाजा है कि हमें भी थोड़ी बहुत राहत मिलनी चाहिए।

अभी यह प्राइवेट सैक्टर और पबलिक सैक्टर की बहुत सी बातें हमारे सामने आती हैं बिड़लाज को यहां आये दिन कोसा जाता है। मैं इस समय उस पचड़े में नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन मैं इससे इंकार नहीं कर सकता हूँ कि बिड़लाज भी कुछ काम कर रहे हैं। अब हम बिड़लाज को गाली देते चले जायं तो यह भी ठीक नहीं लगता है आखिर वह भी देश के विकास का काम कर रहे हैं। साथ ही हमें इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि हम लोगों ने मिक्सैड एकोनामी की पालिसी अपनायी हुई है... (व्यवधान) मेरे मित्रों का इस तरह से अधीर हो उठना ठीक नहीं है और याद रखिये कि यह आप लोगों को चौपट कर देगा। यह चीज किसी भी पार्टी को नहीं रहने देगी। यह आपको और आपकी पार्टी दोनों को चौपट कर देगी, हमको नहीं, क्योंकि हमको तो आप गाली देते ही रहते हैं। मेरा कहना है कि जिसको गाली देनी आती है वह अपने मां, बाप को भी गाली देगा इसलिए गाली में हम कभी विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। इस बारे में हमें विद्यासागर से शिक्षा लेनी चाहिए कि जब विद्यासागर एक मर्तबा घर से निकल रहे थे तो उनके रास्ते में बीच में एक कुत्ता बैठा हुआ था तो उन्होंने उस कुत्ते को सम्बोधित करते हुए कहा कि आप जरा हट जाइये इस पर सब लोगों ने उनसे कहा कि वह कुत्ते को क्यों कह रहे हैं कि आप जरा हट जाइये तो विद्यासागर जी ने जवाब दिया कि जबान की जैसी आदत हो जायगी वह वैसा ही बोलेंगे इसलिए कुत्ते को मैं आप कह कर सम्बोधित कर रहा हूँ जिससे आदमी के लिए भी मेरी जवान से आप शब्द निकले। इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि यहां जो चीज हुआ करती है और जिस तरीके से आज सदस्य लोग हमारा चित्र उतार रहे हैं, अपने मुंह और चेहरे को उतार रहे हैं, उससे ऐसा लगता है कि हम पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर नहीं हैं। अगर पार्लियामेंट की इज्जत रहेगी तो

मेम्बरों की इज्जत रहेगी। अगर हम अपनी इज्जत बचाना चाहते हैं तो पार्लियामेंट की इज्जत बचाई जानी चाहिये (व्यवधान)।

यहां पर शंकराचार्य के ऊपर बहुत बौछार हुई है। मैं भी उसके खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। जिस तरीके से उन्होंने बात कही है, वह ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन आज से 59 वर्ष पहले हमारे कवि रवीन्द्रनाथ टैगोर ने एक कविता बनाई थी। वह बंगला में है, मैं उसका हिन्दी अनुवाद प्रस्तुत करता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था :

हे मेरे दुर्भाग्य देश, जिन्हें किया अपमान  
अपमान में होना होगा उन सबके समान।

मनुष्य के अधिकार से  
वंचित किया जिसे

रख खड़ा सामने उसे दिया गोद में स्थान,  
अपमान से होना होगा उन सबके समान।  
मनुष्य के परश को रोक हर रोज दूर रखे जो  
घृणा किया तुमने मनुष्य के हृदयेश्वर को,  
विघाता के रुद्र रोष में  
दुर्भिक्ष के द्वार बैठे

हिस्सा कर खाना होगा सबके साथ अन्न पान।  
अपमान से होना होगा उन सब के समान।  
तुम्हारे आसन से ठेल दिया उन्हें जहां  
अवहेला से शक्ति को तेरे दिया निर्वासन वहां।

चरण से दलित हो

धूलि से बह जाय वह—

उसी नीचे उतर आओ नहीं तो नहीं त्राण।  
अपमान से होना होगा आज तुझे सबके समान।

जिन्हें तुम फँकोगे नीचे  
वे तुम्हें बांधेंगे नीचे,  
पीछे रखे हो जिन्हे  
वे तुम्हें खींचेंगे पीछे

अज्ञान के अन्धकार के आड़ में ढकते हो जिसे  
तुम्हारे मंगल ढंक कर गढ़ते वे घोर व्यवधान।  
अपमान से होना होगा उन सबके समान।  
शतेक शताब्दी लेकर आते शिर पर यह  
असम्मान भार,  
मनुष्य के नारायण को तो भी नहीं करते  
नमस्कार,

तब भी नत कर आंखें  
देख नहीं सकते के  
उतर आते हैं धूलि के तल पर हीन पतित के  
भगवान।

अपमान से होना होगा वहां सबके समान।  
देख पाते नहीं तुम

मृत्यु दूत आ खड़ा है द्वार परं  
अंकित कर दिया अभिशाप  
तुम्हारे जात के अहंकार पर  
सभी को यदि न बुलाओ  
अभी भी हट कर रहो  
बांध कर रखो निज को

चारो तरफ से लिपटे हुए अभियान—  
मृत्यु मांझ होगा तब चिता भस्म में सबके  
समान।”

यह रवीन्द्रनाथ टैगोर ने 59 साल पहले लिखा था। हम देखते हैं, सरकार देखती है कि अपने स्टेटमेंट में शंकराचार्य बहुत खिसक गये हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग उनके ऊपर से बहुत ज्यादा आगे न बढ़ कर केस को विघड़ा कर लें। ऐसा हो सके तो मैं बहुत खुश हूँगा क्योंकि वह काफी अपमानित हो चुके हैं।

इसी तरह से हम लोग यहां बहुत सुनते हैं बिड़ला के नाम पर, मोरारजी देसाई के नाम पर, कांति देसाई के नाम पर। इस तरह के नामों को लेकर यहां बार बार बातें उठा करती हैं। उससे उनके बूदवाश का कुछ पता नहीं चलता है। आज तो हाउस में बैठना मुश्किल हो गया है। इस तरह की बातें चलती रहती हैं, चाहे इधर से हो चाहे उधर से हो, चाहे उधर के लोग हों चाहे इधर के। मैं कांग्रेस बेंचेज को एक्स्क्लूड नहीं करता। सवाल यह है कि यहां बैठ कर हम लोग कैसे बात करें। अगर हमारे स्पीकर साहब को कहना पड़े कि आई इन्वाइट हल्लाज, अगर यही लास्ट कोर्स रह जाय, तो फिर बाकी क्या रहा? मेरा तो इतना ही कहना है कि डिमोक्रेसी के इस फैंब्रिक को बिगाड़ो मत। तुम्हारा चेहरा बिगड़ जायेगा, हमारा चेहरा

[श्री फ.० गो.० सेन]

बिगड़ जायेगा तो फिर रह क्या जायेगा ? इसलिये आप सोच समझ कर काम करें। हम एक खतरनाक पोजीशन में हैं। मैं किसी पार्टी या लीडर का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, लेकिन हम सब अपने सीने पर हाथ रख कर सोचें कि यह कैसी पोजीशन है। यह कोई अच्छी पोजीशन नहीं है। हम हैरान हैं कि हम किधर जायें। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हम क्या करें। आज एक वैकूअम सा है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारे यहां के खेतिहर किसानों के घर जो हैं वहां फूस के छप्पर हैं।

**श्री मोलू प्रसाद :** जरा खेतिहर मजदूरों की बातें भी कह दीजिये। आज-कल पछुआ चलता है और आग लगने से गांव के गांव भस्म हो जाते हैं, उजड़ जाते हैं। कार्गोटेड शीट्स को डीकंट्रोल कर दिया गया है और उनके दाम इतने बढ़ गये हैं कि उन्हें खरीद कर छप्पर तैयार करना सम्भव नहीं है। फिनांस मिनिस्टर से मेरा आग्रह है कि अगर कार्गोटेड शीट्स की समुचित व्यवस्था कर दी जाये, तो लोगों के लिए छप्पर बनाने में सुविधा हो जाये। हाउसिंग प्रबलम को जरूर साल्व करना चाहिए।

होम मिनिस्टर से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमने अपने न्यायालयों को बचाना है, तो किसी भी हाई कोर्ट के जज को उसके अपने प्रदेश में नहीं रखना चाहिए। पता नहीं, इंडियन जूडिशल सर्विस का क्या हुआ है। उसका निर्माण होना चाहिए।

डा० वी० के० आर० वी० राव चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी रहे। मैं भी यही चाहता हूँ हमारे बिहार में अंग्रेजी एक आप्शनल सबजेक्ट है। वहां हम देखते हैं कि 90,95 परसेंट विद्यार्थी अंग्रेजी ले लेते हैं। इस

से मालूम होता है कि अब भी लोगों का झुकाव उसकी ओर है। अगर वे अंग्रेजी पढ़ना चाहते हैं, तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए। हां, उसको मीडियम आफ इस्ट्रक्शन नहीं बनाना चाहिए, लेकिन जो आप्शनल सबजेक्ट के रूप में उसको पढ़ना चाहे, उसको वह सुविधा देनी चाहिए।

हमने सुना है कि पचास बरस की आयु प्राप्त करने के बाद जिन अफसरों को सरकार हटाना चाहेगी, उन्हें वह हटा देगी।

ए० आर० सी० ने भी कहा है कि सरकार के एम्प्लॉयज को स्ट्राइक करने का हक नहीं होना चाहिए। मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर सरकार अपने अफसरों को पचास बरस के बाद हटाने का विचार रखती है, तो उसे एक ऐसी कमेटी बना देनी चाहिए, जिस के सामने एग्जीक्यूटिव पार्टी अपनी बात कह सके।

पिछले दिनों इस सदन में एक प्राइवेट मेम्बर के इस प्रस्ताव पर बहस हुई कि बिड़ला के मामले की जांच की जाये। प्रस्ताव तो बिड़ला के विषय में था, लेकिन श्री मधु लिमये उस अवसर पर श्री मोरारजी देसाई और कान्तिलाल देसाई वगैरह के बारे में बोलने लग गये। हम भी बिड़ला को क्रिटिसाइज करते हैं और अपने मंत्रियों को भी क्रिटिसाइज करते हैं, लेकिन हम लोगों में इतनी डिसेन्सी होनी चाहिये कि जो लोग इस सदन में रिप्रेजेन्टेड नहीं हैं, उनकी आलोचना नहीं करनी चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिनांस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

17 54 hrs.

#### ARREST AND CONVICTION OF MEMBERS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have received the following communication from

Shri A. C. Kher, Ist Class Magistrate, New Delhi :—

"I have the honour to inform you that Sarvashri Jyotirmoy Basu, C. K. Chakrapani and P. Gopalan, Members of Lok Sabha, were tried at the Parliament Street courts before me on a charge of defying the prohibitory orders promulgated under section 144 Cr. P. C. in the area of Parliament Street including Raisina Road, Rafi Marg, etc.

On 29th April, 1969, after a trial, I found them guilty of offence under section 188 I.P.C. and sentenced them to undergo simple Imprisonment for ten days each. At present they are lodged at Central Jail, Tihar."

17.55 hrs.

FINANCE BILL 1969—Contd.

SHRI BADRUDDUJA (Murshidabad) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the proposals in the Finance Bill presented by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, do not raise hopes in the minds of millions of the poor. It is really very unfortunate that during the 22 years of Congress stewardship of the country, the poor have grown all the poorer and the rich, all the richer. Nearly 80 per cent of our wealth is concentrated in the hands of 75 families and as a result of this there is not only no economic improvement, but there is crisis after crisis in the country. These few families have enjoyed, all the amenities, all the comforts, all the advantages. Even now they get tax-free loans when millions of poor people in the country-side are knocking about the streets for a morsel of food. 34.6 per cent of the people are now living in abject poverty and misery. They can spend only Rs. 15/- per month in the rural areas and Rs. 24/- in the urban areas. There are also millions of people in the country-side who have not the purchasing power to purchase even essential commodities. The inflationary policies pursued by this Administration have caused the prices to soar higher and higher to a level which is far beyond the purchasing power of millions of people in the country. As I said, only a few people have greatly benefited as a result of concession after

concession being granted to them. It is very unfortunate also that our country is one of the highest taxed countries of the world. Where the poor people are taxed, and concessions after concessions are granted to the rich. The Finance Minister has imposed an additional excise duty of Rs. 127 crores on the poor. Our national indebtedness has increased beyond all proportions. After partition, at the time of Independence we had a foreign exchange to the tune of Rs. 1,700 crores. But we have wiped them off completely and our debts have mounted up to Rs. 5,666 crores and odds at the present moment. The position, therefore, is very disappointing. While people of a few families indulge in all fashionable dissipations, midnight orgies, wild revels and mild sensations of the ball-room, millions of poor people live in hovels and amidst squalid miseries...

• श्री वाल्मीकि चौधरी (हाजीपुर) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन में कोरम नहीं है ।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The bell is being rung.

17.55 hrs.

[ MR. SPEAKER in the Chair ]

18 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : Now there is quorum. He may continue.

SHRI BADRUDDUJA : If Japan and West Germany, smashed to smithereens, pulverised in the second world war, could have an unprecedented economic recovery during the last 24 years, I do not see any reason why India, with all the resources, all the talent and materials, at her disposal, with the goodwill of various nations of the world, East and West, with the huge assets at her disposal, could not improve the economic condition to that extent where the poor people of this country could have benefited. But that is the unfortunate position in which we stand at the present moment.

Under the Constitution, the Centre has got all the financial powers concentrated in its hands. Naturally the States are being starved. The States cannot tax wealth and income. They can tax only

[Shri Badrudduja]

commodities. Even in the list of commodity taxes they have sale taxes only the central excise duty lies in the hands of the Centre. Naturally the States have got to come to the Centre for help, and assistance.

Unfortunately, however, after the last general elections, relations between the Centre and some of the non-Congress States have been strained further and further. I do not see any reason why, after general elections of 1967, the Centre took into its head to set up several parallel police and security forces of the Central Government, like the Border Security Force, the Central Reserve Police Force and the Industrial Security Force.

We saw how, during the last countrywide strike of the Central Government employees, the Central Reserve Police was deployed in Kerala without consultation with the Kerala Government. I know the Centre has got the power, and nobody can question the right of the Centre to deploy its police force to protect its installations and properties, but courtesy demands that it should be done in consultations with the State Government concerned. Our federal structure is like an organism. An organism must live, grow develop and expand and the organs (States) should contribute to the growth and evolution of the organism, the organism in its turn conditioning the growth and development of the organs. In fairness, the Central Government should not ignore the fact that the States are a part and parcel of the organism.

Sir, we have here a man of the wisdom and sagacity of the Finance Minister. He is the last of the Romans who had close association with Mahatma Gandhi. Therefore, he inspires confidence. Whatever might be my political differences with him, whatever might be his approach to political problems, I cannot but have my admiration for his sagacity and wisdom. I would therefore, look to him for some sort of guidance in this matter so that Centre-States relations might improve considerably. In the interest of India's security, in the interest of India's safety, in the interest of India's integrity, in the interest of the balanced

development of all the regions of the country, it is necessary that there should be no conflict between the Centre and the States.

The objective should be the delegation of some financial powers to the States. Otherwise, they will have to come to the Centre for assistance and help in times of emergency and difficulty.

Take the case of agriculture. For agricultural improvement, we are thinking in terms of family planning. I am not conservative enough to shut my eyes to family planning when there is a population explosion. But in this scientific age when people are scaling the sky, the Moon and Venus, when man is out to conquer the energies and forces in the physical world and these energies are sought to be utilised, organised, disciplined, arrayed and pressed in the service of man, for his edification and development, I do not see any reason why we should have this fantastic nonsense of family planning. Hundreds of crores of rupees that have been spent on family planning might have been gainfully utilised for irrigation facilities which would have ushered in, long before the so-called green revolution, food self-sufficiency in the country. I had a talk with an agro-economist in West Bengal. He said: 'we do not think about the technical know-how, we do not care for better seeds or better fertilisers; We want only irrigation; give us irrigation facilities and we shall give you three crops; we shall give you jute; we shall give you rice and rabi crop as well India would have become self-sufficient long before the green revolution which is talked about so glibly today. But even now what is the position? Due to bumper crops thanks to the bounties of nature, we have had some sort of improvement in the wheat position—on account of better seeds having been used. But in regard to rice, even now it is less than what it was in 1964-65. There should, therefore, be no complacency in this regard. We belong to the mofussil areas; I represent a mofussil constituency; I have been there only recently. Our agriculturists, who constitute 75-80 percent of the population have no employment for five months in the year. When uneducated employment stares us in the face, what is the position of the educated? Our graduates, B.As and B.Sc. M.As,



and M.Sc. B.Coms. and M.Coms., brilliant engineers,—when they compare their lot with the lot of the Ministers, pitchforked in the highest positions of trust in the administration of the country, what is the reaction? Reaction is of rebellion which bursts into flames all along the line. The educational authorities should try to diagnose and remedy the disease. They must have some remedy for this deep sense of frustration due to insufficiency of employment opportunities which stare our youths in the face after their having spent a lot of time and money. When I see lawlessness, I am inclined to ask the education authorities to tap it at the root, go to the root of the case. Our educated youngman and women want some employment. They are the future hope of our country they will shape the destinies of the nation; they will control the growth of our economy; they will contribute magnificently to art, architecture, music, painting, philosophy and the polity of Hindustan; they will shape and reshape, mould and remould, integrate and reintegrate the fissiparous tendencies and forces towards political, social and economic reconstruction. We must give them opportunities. We have failed them most miserably. But in Russia authorities have not failed. We talk of family planning. Here I wish to refer to what Mao Tse-tung says. I do not belong to that school of thought; I am not a communist and do not subscribe to their philosophy. Mao Tse-tung observes that every man and woman born is an asset. He says he does not believe in nuclear power. If necessary he would hurl against a nuclear power a million people and that will be enough. I believe in the potency, in the creative power, in the dynamism, in the vitality of youth that throbs with emotion and pulsates with new hopes and aspirations for a brighter, greater and happier India in which all classes and communities would be adequately represented each one contributing according to his own light and convictions to the political, social, cultural and economic reconstruction of the common motherland.

Coming to my own State of West Bengal, I would invite the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to one point. The main objective of our fiscal policy should be to utilise the financial resources in a way that

will lead to a balanced development of all the regions. There are developed and undeveloped regions; there are strategic regions and regions which are not so strategic. But unfortunately, in spite of all tall talk about reduction of regional disparities and imbalances, the reality is that even now the bulk of investment, production, industrial employment and disbursement of resources remain concentrated in a few selected industrially advanced regions.

But it does not mean that all the so-called industrialised regions are getting equal treatment from the Central Government. On the contrary, in the matter of disbursement of financial resources and the issue of industrial licences, the western region, particularly, Maharashtra, is getting the most favoured treatment. The Central Government is showing this stepmotherly attitude towards another State, West Bengal. West Bengal is one of the foremost regions of industry, particularly heavy industry. The shares of West Bengal in the total Income-Tax and Central excise duty collections of the Government of India are 30.33 and 25 per cent respectively. Of the total income-tax collection of Rs. 338 crores in 1968-69, West Bengal contributed not less than Rs. 112 crores. Similarly, of the total Central excise duty collection of Rs. 1,320.45 crores, she contributed as much as Rs. 330 crores.

West Bengal jute is one of the largest foreign exchange earners, earning as much as Rs. 122.6 crores in 1967-68. The Central Government realised Rs. 31 crores as jute export duty in 1968-69. This, in brief, is the place of West Bengal in India's economic set-up. But since 1949-50 West Bengal has been gradually, but steadily losing her position to Maharashtra.

The following facts will prove this: in 1949-50, in respect of per capita income, West Bengal occupied the first highest place among the States of India, and Maharashtra the fourth highest place. But in 1964-65, Maharashtra came to occupy the second

[ Shri Badrudduja ]

highest place, but West Bengal went down and occupied the fifth highest place.

This is the position. I do not know the reasons for it. West Bengal is going down. Is it because we lack talent. Is it because we lack imagination? Is it because we lack the material and moral resources? Is it because we are not capable of building up the State of West Bengal? We want your sympathy; the sympathy of the Central Government, the co-operation of Central Government; little more sympathy, a little more consideration, a little more helpful attitude to improve the relations between the States and the Centre.

Coming to the report of the Home Ministry, we find the following. The significant aspect is that the Central expenditure under the head "Police" has been stepped up from Rs. 18.76 crores in 1961-62 to Rs. 31.83 crores in 1965-66, to Rs. 61.27 crores in 1967-68 and to Rs. 71.91 crores in 1968-69. And yet, we find to our dismay all over the country that our Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe brethren are being burnt to death. The helots of Greece, the Plebeians of Rome, fought and attained positions, but these poor untouchables, groaning under the iron heels of caste domination, are being denied even the elemental human rights; they are being burnt to death.

Sir, during the last 22 years, there have been more than 1,000 riots all over the country. Muslims have been butchered and massacred in cold blood in thousands and hundreds of thousands in the riots all over the country. Their properties have been devastated on a colossal scale. Their mosques have been profaned and defiled. During 1966, the number of riots that occurred was 136. In 1967, the number went up to 209, and during 1968, it went up to 331. Any administration, the Home Ministry,—would be ashamed of this performance. If there had been just half a dozen such deaths in England, due to the inefficiency, the complacency of the administration, if there had been devastation of properties on such colossal scale, if the

people had been burnt to death, the people of Britain would have provoked a first-class crisis, would have demanded the heads of those at the helm of affairs on a charger, and razed the Government to the dust. But this barbarous state of things in only possible in our administration where wanton loot, this barbarous state of things, loot and massacre of innocents has been allowed to go on unchecked, undeterred, unthwarted Sir, in this administration, I have not much faith. But I have faith in the noble souls of the Congress. There are noble souls in the Congress who sympathise with us. In the hour of our greatest need, they have stood by us and taken up the cause of the Muslims, the unfortunate Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the most humane, statesman like and generous fashion. We appreciate the sympathy, the generosity, the nobility, the magnanimity of noble souls, like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, Syri Nabah Kishore Chowdhari and others who have so courageously espoused our cause. Here I am reminded of the words of Mahatma Gandhi, who declared in the Nagpur Session of the Congress: "I am a man of peace. I believe in peace. But I do not want that peace which is in a piece of stone or in a grave. But I want that brand of peace which is imbedded in the human breast and exposed to the arrows of the whole world and protected from all harm by the might of the Almighty God. I also believe in the dispensation of God, as revealed in the Quoran.

"Qul Inna Salati Nosoki

Mohyaa O Mamati.

Lillahi Rabbie Alaamin...."

My prayer, my fasting, my life, my death, my sufferings and miseries, my trials and ordeals, my misfortunes and vicissitudes of life are all for the Lord of the worlds.

We are grateful to the DMK Party of Tamilnadu and to the great Communist Party of India; they have stood by us in the hour of our greatest need. In 1964, 1965 and 1967 they took up cudgels on our behalf when we had no quarter, no shelter, no recognition, no appreciation, no encouragement, no facilities and no opportunities and we were being pursued to the bitter end. They took up our cause so heroically

and that is why we lined up with the DMK Party in Tamilnadu and the Communist Party in Kerala and West Bengal in throwing out the Congress administration.

Sir, I would appeal to all progressive-minded friends on all sides, Muslims, Christians and people belonging to all systems of religion, people representing various shades of political opinion in this country, various Schools of political thought to rise to the occasion, maintain the traditions of India which are very great, very noble, very high, very inspiring, very encouraging, very much consistent with ordered progress of human society.

Sir, those who struggle, suffer and bleed for the cause of righteousness, truth and justice on earth, never die, they never perish; they live a newer life, a fresher life, a nobler life, a higher life, a sublimer life in the life of communities and the nation. They serve as a sheet-anchor in the lives of millions of Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Buddhists and Sikhs. We have got to forge ahead to an ever-widening horizon of thought and action. Midnight gloom and darkness threads the horizon; clouds are gathering fast over our heads, threatening to burst upon our shoulders any moment. But have faith in God and confidence in your mission. Then and then alone we can create a new India which will be full of hopes and possibilities of growth for all sections of the people in the country.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very thankful to your goodness for giving me an opportunity to advance my views on the Finance Bill before the House. The Finance Bill in any country is an event wherein the people of the country judge whether the government is carrying the economy forward or it can be held responsible for, what may be called, putting a spanner in the wheel. The Finance Bill of a welfare State is looked upon by ordinary citizens of the land to see whether that Bill going to further the interests of social welfare, whether that Bill is going to remove the existing inequalities, if any, and whether that Bill is going to help the economy to grow and prosper. And if any of these touchstones is applied to the present

Bill before the House, even though the Bill may, broadly speaking, answer to these requirements, I think it can hardly be described as a distinct improvement over the series of Finance Bills which this House had the privilege to consider.

We belong to a fraternity who have accepted democracy and socialism as its objectives. If we look at the provisions of this Bill from this angle, whether it enhances the interests of socialism, there is hardly anything to commend for thought that this is helping the process of nationalisation, the process of public ownership of essential means of production. There was a proposal that import and export trade of the country should be nationalised.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : Progressively taken up; not nationalised.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH : I am sorry. If it is to be judged from this angle whether it is to be progressively nationalised, we have to satisfy ourselves as to what progress we have made in the nationalisation of export-import trade.

Very little economies, almost insignificant countries, in the interest of their economy have nationalised both the export and the import trades and their economies have been benefited. But our present operation of the export-import trade only goes to benefit that class of society which indulges in overinvoicing and underinvoicing, with the result that the economy loses not only millions and billions of rupees but also its self-respect.

The economy is the breeding ground for corruption and it unnecessarily gives in the hands of those whose job it is to issue what are described as import licences the power to decide the fate of many moneyed people. The moneyed people in this country specialise in this; they know when to strike and how to obtain what they have to obtain.

In this light I am sorry to say this Finance Bill has not helped the economy either to progressively nationalise the import-export trade or to implement even the limited proposal that the export trade being left as it is the import trade should

[Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh]

be nationalised at a stretch. If that had been done, the economy would have prospered if not by getting proper prices for the goods which we import at least by stopping underinvoicing and overinvoicing.

This racket of underinvoicing and overinvoicing has to be broken at whatever cost that would be necessary to be paid. It is most unfortunate that even the moneyed people in this country think that import licences should better be auctioned than routed through dubious means where certain bonds are formed and certain big business houses flourish at the exercise of discretion of petty officials who either do not understand the economics of the country or who are interested in furthering the economic interests of the moneyed class.

In this background this Bill has nothing to offer. In the background that India is an agricultural country, 80 per cent of India lives in villages, poverty in India is concentrated in villages and the majority of people whose income is less than even one rupee are living in villages in the country, this Finance Bill has nothing to offer.

We talk of the Green Revolution. Whether it is a green revolution or a red revolution or it is a revolution, it is certain that it has not reached the common people and the villages of India. The Green Revolution has arisen in the minds of air-conditioned thinking, of drawing-room socialists and of those who administer policies and want to toy with the idea that because of their policies production on the agricultural front has increased. If at all production on the agricultural front has increased, it has not increased by what we do here and by what we decide here but it has increased only because of the act of God and the sweat which an average cultivator has put in. Cultivators in India literally by the sweat of their brow and, if I may say so, by shedding their blood in the form of sweat, grow more and more. In that act neither this Government nor this House has anything to contribute; on the contrary, we come out with the proposal that there should be 10 per cent *ad valorem* duty on fertiliser or 20

per cent *ad valorem* duty on power-driven pumps.

We toy with the idea that the Green Revolution has created a class of rich peasants and poor peasants. I beg of you to consider that in a country where land reforms have been enforced, where there is ceiling on land holdings, where there is no ceiling on urban holding, how can we talk of the creation of a richer class of people in the villages? If there are richer classes of people, I must say that the so-called richer classes are the poorest compared to the urban property holders.

We have nothing to offer for monopolies; we have no means by which we can curb monopolies. We do not have any policies undue profits can be stopped from going into coffers where already money has accumulated to a dangerous proportion. We have nothing to offer to poor villagers who grow only 10 per cent more than what we did in the last series of droughts. We come and tell them that this is a Green Revolution. It is better if only we do away with this idea of a so-called revolution because revolutions have not been wrought by idle policies; revolutions do not come up merely by accepting or praying to God or performing Satyanarayan Puja. Revolutions have to be wrought by the people themselves and the people of the country have to be helped in order to bring about revolutions. We have no claims to say that we have either helped the process of revolution or we have even thought that farmers will use modern means of production. When we speak of researches in agriculture, when we speak of our scientists being the sole force behind agricultural development, we forget that the cultivators in India have started their march on increasing production or, the basis of researches conducted not in India but in the distant Mexico. It is a matter of history that in Mexico certain seeds and cattle were taken centuries ago on the ground that the Mexican climate and the Indian climate have much to compare and have much similarity. It is an irony of fate that the Mexican economy is supposed to thrive on the basis of seeds and cattle imported from India and, after centuries, India is supposed to import seeds and cattle from Mexico in

order to help the poor agricultural economy in India. If at all Indian cultivators have to be congratulated, they have to be congratulated for bringing, by their own efforts, seeds and research from the distant Mexico. In fact, our scientists have started working with indigenous strains and whereby the production will increase.

We say that a rich class of agriculturists has developed. But we forget that it is common experience no economy of the world has ever progressed unless it has got, what is called, surplus from agriculture. Agriculture is not like an industry. If I put a plant manufacturing cigarettes with a capacity of 1,000 cigarettes an hour, the moment the plant goes into production, I get 1,000 cigarettes an hour. But if I cultivate a *bigha* of land and I expect one quintal of cotton from that, I may put in all efforts at my command, I may literally do whatever is humanly possible, and yet at the end of the season, I may not get a grain of cotton. So, in an economy where it is mostly dependent on mother nature, in an economy where neither the Government nor the Parliament can claim to have helped in the process, to say that a green revolution has started and that the policies emanating from the Centre are responsible for that, to say the least, is most unjust to the Indian agriculturist.

Let us compare the price of fertiliser in any economy of the world. I would like to point out, for your consideration, that the cost of fertilisers in India is twice or thrice the international price. It is a pity that we cannot manufacture fertiliser at a cost comparable with the international markets. It is a pity that we pay for the plant and equipment for manufacturing fertiliser at a cost which is almost twice or thrice the prevalent cost published in international journals. That we do either to help certain officials whose job it is to okay the agreements of so-called technical collaboration or to help the moneyed class who thrive by exploiting the poor cultivators of India by charging undue high prices for fertiliser. That is most unfair. In this process, we have nothing to offer. When we see that the fertiliser capacity in India is limited and we have to import fertiliser, we levy a countervailing duty to make

fertiliser dearer for the Indian farmers\* and we come out to say that we have provided fertiliser to the farmers.

Agriculture in India contributes to the extent of 50 per cent of our net earning in foreign exchange. Do we contribute 50 per cent of our foreign exchange for developing fertiliser industry, for developing pesticides industry, for importing agricultural machinery, on the basis of which alone agriculture can thrive? We forget that intensive agriculture is the only key not only to the progress of economy but for the solution of unemployment which is most prevalent in the rural-side. We have not devised any means by which unemployment in the village can be gauged. We have no information at our disposal by which we can say that landless labourers in India are being gainfully employed. Yet we talk of increasing unemployment. When we talk of unemployment, we talk unemployment as registered in employment exchange registers. We have nothing to say about the volume of unemployment that is prevalent in the countryside.

This unemployment problem can be solved by simple means which do not require any foreign exchange, which do not require any ingenuity and which do not require any serious amount of planning. If we can, at one stroke, decide that every acre of land in India will be contour-banded, if every litre of water lying below the surface will be pumped up and if every drop of water that flows in Indian rivers will be harnessed for agriculture, it can be solved. We do not require any foreign exchange for doing that. And yet we do not place means at the disposal of concerned people either to execute river valley projects in an adequate manner or to exploit underground water resources or to do soil conservation work. When we talk of this, we say that in the First Plan this much of amount was earmarked, in the Second Plan so much was earmarked, in the Third Plan so much was earmarked and in the Fourth Plan we are going to do this. We forget that if we take into account the rise in prices, actually what we contribute to agriculture is much less than what we used to contribute some years back. More than that, I would say that if Indian agriculture earns 50 per cent of our foreign

[Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh]

exchange, if Indian agriculture contributes to the growth of 50 per cent of our gross national product, it is reasonable to expect that a minimum of 50 percent of the total Plan expenditure should be diverted to agriculture. As long as we are not going to do that, no cultivator in the country is going to believe us seriously when we say that agriculture receives that top priority. I fail to understand what topless priority is this. When we speak of top priority being accorded to agriculture, when it comes to increasing the amount for agriculture, we say that industry has also to prosper. We forget that industry can only prosper on the basis of the surplus generated in agriculture. Industry can only prosper if we contribute what is reasonably due to agriculture. I must say that we are not only not doing anything for helping Indian agriculture but, on the contrary, we are actually reducing our outlays on agriculture under the distant goal of industrialisation of the country, with the result that we are neither getting industrialisation and nor is agriculture progressing.

When it comes to produce in agriculture, we are not short of persons who go on saying that the income in agriculture has increased so much that, on an average, an Indian agriculturist gets Rs. 1,000 per acre. Multiply the culturable areas in India by thousand and the figure would come to astronomical proportions. Is this the total income in agriculture? Actually, the income in agriculture is not even a microscopic fraction. Therefore, this has to be properly looked into. I would say that the largest single injustice is perpetrated on Indian agriculture.

Coming to our urban approach, I say that on the basis of our own policies, on the basis of our own declared aim, we have done absolutely nothing, if I may say so, next to nothing, to curb the monopolies, to progressively nationalise the means of production or to assure even the urban dweller of the minimum needs of life which we say, is due to every citizen of this country. We are not only neglecting rural housing, we are not only neglecting rural water

supply, we are not only neglecting everything that has to go to the villagers, but even for the urban population we have done almost nothing. Whatever we have been doing is only distributing salaries and dearness allowances to government employees. Every time we are talking of minimum wages for government employees, I am not opposed to minimum wages being given to government employees. The government employees constitute an insignificant part of the total population of this country. Let us not forget this. If this insignificant part of our population is to be given minimum wages, a need-based minimum wage, what about those whom we are denying the minimum wage? Are we in a position to give need-based minimum wages to landless agricultural labourers? Are we in a position to give need-based minimum wages to poor Harijans, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and backward classes in our country? If we are not, then it is a sin to talk of minimum wages being given only to government employees. If the salaried portion of governmental spending is removed from this budget, then we would come to realise that we have hardly anything for the general progress of the economy.

It is said that even salaries and wages have something to contribute, on this basis, perhaps, that when you pay an Indian engineer to undertake a river valley project, you are supposed to contribute to the cost of that project. But at what cost are we paying those salaries? That has to be looked into. After all, the salaries have to be productive. Salaries have some relation with the results. What are the results? If a citizen of this country wants to get a grievance redressed, he has to scribble one thousand papers in the form of petitions, and approach thousand and one government servants and in the end he finds that the remedy is denied to him. What sort of administration are we running? What sort of cost are we incurring in this type of administration? What sort of picture of the countryside is painted when we speak of need-based minimum wages being paid to government employees?

Sir, if we talk of socialism, we say that there should be equality of income. What

equality of income is in this country. A man in the village has to starve or has to live on an income of less than one rupee a day where as a man living in the city talks of need-based minimum wage which goes to provide adequate shelter which goes to provide education for his children, which goes to provide the minimum health which provides him protected water supply, etc. We must compare at every stage as to what we are doing for rural people. In that context alone our help to the urban population will be appreciated by the people of this country. So, on this score also, we have nothing to show.

We have been talking of nationalisation of banking industry and ultimately decided that there should be social control on banks. What type of social control they are having. We have the same bankers who with their outmoded means of calculation show the amounts of advances to agriculture. According to the Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank, they can advance only 10 percent of their target and for small-scale sector they cannot go beyond 15 percent. What sort of unsocial control we are inflicting on them.

Then the deposit advance ratio rural areas is adverse. Are we not grabbing from the people in the country-side for purpose of erection of factories in the urban areas? Are we not thereby contributing for exploitation of rural people for the benefit of the urban population? We are enabling the urban people to exploit the rural population. Now a time has come to cry halt to all these types of exploitation. We describe our socialism as Indian brand of socialism. What is this Indian brand of socialism? We have inequality of incomes and the poor man is condemned to be poorer and the rich man is expected to be richer. If this is the sort of Indian brand of socialism, I say that those sitting on this side do not stand for that type of socialism. In this respect I would appeal to the Hon. Finance Minister to tap resources by fleecing monied people to benefit the poor people. But we are more bent upon taxing poor people. We are more desirous that agriculturists should be made to share the burden of development of agriculture. At the same time,

whatever we are collecting from agricultural sector, we are not giving them back. How can we expect agriculture to develop in India? I will urge the Finance Minister to do a great service to Indian agriculture by removing the so-called duty on fertiliser and if he fails to do it, we would have no reply to those who insist on this House refusing to vote for this Bill.

18.34 hrs.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the Chair]

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ) : सभापति जी, दुनिया में जितने देश हैं, उनके मुकाबले हमारी प्रगति की रफ्तार सबसे मन्दी है और टैक्स की रफ्तार बहुत तेज है। सन् 1950 की योजना से पहले जितने टैक्स और जितना बजट सूबों का और केन्द्र का था, उनसे साढ़े आठ गुना आज बजट बढ़ गया है, हालांकि राष्ट्र की आमदनी साढ़े आठ गुना तो दूर दो गुना भी ढंग से नहीं बढ़ पाई है। कहीं न कहीं बजट बनाने में बुनियादी खराबी है—मैं उसी बुनियादी खराबी की तरफ आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ।

पहली योजना में योजना चलाने के नाम पर जितने टैक्स लगाये गये थे, दूसरी योजना में उन टैक्सों की आमदनी सरकार चलाने का साधारण खर्च बन गई और दूसरी योजना के लिये नये सिरे से नये टैक्स लगाने पड़े। ठीक इसी तरह से दूसरी योजना के टैक्स तीसरी योजना में सरकार चलाने का साधारण खर्च बन गये। यह जो एक क्रम चला है कि जो टैक्स लगाये गये वह उस योजना को तो चलायेंगे उसके बाद उससे आमदनी आनेवाली नहीं है और यह सरकार चलाने का साधारण खर्चा बन जायेगा। यह एक ऐसा कारण है जिससे हमारे बजट बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं लेकिन हम उसमें से बचत करके कैपिटल फार्मेशन, पूंजी संचय नहीं कर पाते। बहस यह चलती है कि कौन चीज जरूरी है और कौन चीज जरूरी नहीं है। यह बहस इस मुकदमे में बेमानी है अगर आप अपनी

[श्री महाराज सिंह भारती]

हैसियत के हिसाब से कोई सीमा नहीं बनाते हैं। क्या जरूरी है और क्या जरूरी नहीं है, यह अमीर का अलग हिसाब होगा और गरीब का अलग हिसाब होगा। आज जितने मुहकमे चल रहे हैं, जरूरी के हिसाब से सब जरूरी हैं और फिर जितने भी कायम करो, वह भी जरूरी हैं लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि हमारी हैसियत है या नहीं इन सब जरूरी कामों को करने की? प्रश्न इसी बात का पैदा होता है और इस पर इस मुल्क में बहस नहीं होती है। दूध पीना बहुत जरूरी होता है फिर भी गरीब आदमी दूध का एक एक बूंद बेच लेता है। इसलिए सवाल जरूरी और गैर जरूरी का नहीं है बल्कि सवाल यह है कि हमारी हैसियत दूध पीने की है या नहीं है। यह बहस आज तक इस सरकार ने इस मुल्क में चलाई नहीं। उस सन्दर्भ में आपने कभी बजट बनाया नहीं। इसीलिए हमारे खर्चे बढ़ते चले गए क्योंकि बहस यह होती रही कि क्या जरूरी है, क्या जरूरी नहीं है।

गैर सरकारी दिवस पर जो प्रस्ताव रखे जाते हैं, मैंने भी एक प्रस्ताव रखा था जिस पर बहस नहीं हो पाई। उसको मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ। आज वह समय आ गया है कि सरकारी पक्ष और विरोधी पक्ष, दोनों को मिलकर कम से कम एक लक्ष्मण रेखा खींच लेनी चाहिए। बजट का हिसाब बना लिया जाये कि एक चौथाई से ज्यादा किसी भी कीमत पर आपके राजस्व का, रेवेन्यू का डिफेन्स के ऊपर नहीं जायेगा, एक चौथाई में हर सूरत में आपके सारे मुहकमों की गतिविधियाँ चलेंगी और राजस्व का कम से कम आधा हिस्सा परिसम्पत्ति बनाने में खर्च होगा और जो कैपिटल बचत है, कर्ज वाली, उसका सौ फीसदी हिस्सा परिसम्पत्ति बनाने में खर्च होगा। परिसम्पत्ति को भी हमें डिफाइन्ड करना चाहिए कि परिसम्पत्ति का मतलब क्या है। परिसम्पत्ति का मतलब वह कारनामा लिया जाना चाहिए, वह धंधा लिया जाना

चाहिए जो ज्यादा से ज्यादा दस साल के अन्दर अपनी आमदनी में से सारा व्यय और मूल चुकता कर देगा। अगर इस बात का हिसाब हम बना लें तो कहां टैक्स लगे, कहां टैक्स न लगे, वह सरकार का काम है, सरकार किस मुहकमे पर कितना खर्च करे, यह उसका काम है लेकिन जब एक सीमा बंधी रहेगी तो कम से कम इस देश का नागरिक यह समझेगा कि एक रुपया टैक्स का तुम्हारे ऊपर पड़ा तो है लेकिन उसमें से 8 आने असेट्स बन जायेंगे जो कि तुम्हारे और तुम्हारे बच्चों के काम आयेंगे—एक चवन्नी मुल्क की सुरक्षा में चली जायेगी और एक चवन्नी मुनीमगीरी की, सरकार चलाने में चली जायेगी—चलो मुनीम की चवन्नी ही है, कोई हर्जा नहीं। लेकिन आज जो हालत चल रही है, चाहे जितना बजट बढ़ता चला जाय वह मुनीमगीरी में खर्च हो जाता है। आज समय आ गया है जब हमको ऐसी सीमाएं बांधनी चाहिए। कौन खर्चा हो, कौन न हो, क्या जरूरी है क्या जरूरी नहीं है, यह बहस बिलकुल बेमानी है। अगर वह सीमा हम नहीं बांधते हैं, तो हम अमरीका वालों के हिसाब से जरूरीपन की बहस इस मुल्क में चला नहीं सकते जहां एक रुपये रोज की भी आमदनी ज्यादातर लोगों की नहीं होती। हमने एक महत्वपूर्ण सवाल तय किया था कि खेती पर से एक बड़ा बोझ उठा कर दूसरे धंधों पर उसको भेजेंगे लेकिन उसमें सोलह आने यह सरकार नाकामयाब रही है। जो यह बजट है और वित्त विधेयक है वह भी इस बात को तस्लीम करता है कि वह काम हम अब कर ही नहीं पा रहे हैं। सीधी बात है कि आप क्यों नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। आप इस मुल्क में किसको खेती से हटायेंगे? जिसके पास सौ एकड़ का फार्म है उसको आप नहीं हटा पाएंगे। अगर हटाएंगे तो उसको जो कि खेत मजूर है या जो गांव का कारीगर या और वह आज खेत मजूर की श्रेणी में आ गया है। पहले कुम्हार बर्तन बनाता था, जो कि अब फैक्ट्रीज बना रही हैं। आज



बाबा ग्लास फैक्ट्री के सामने उस कुम्हार के बर्तन कौन पूछेगा ? जो कारीगर आज खेत मजूर बने हैं उन्हीं को आप हटाएंगे। लेकिन इस मुल्क में अब तक हो क्या रहा है और आप का यह बजट भी क्या करने जा रहा है ? जिनके पास बढ़िया जमीन है उन्हीं लोगों को शहर में भी आने का मौका मिलता सरकारी नौकरियों में भी मौका मिलता है। जिसकी बढ़िया दुकान चल रही है उसी को शहर में आने का मौका मिलता है। उसको और नौकरी मिलती है, जिस के बड़े धंधे चल रहे हैं वही सब सरकारी नौकरियों में भी चले आते हैं। नतीजा यह होता है कि जिसके पास कुछ नहीं है, जो सर्वहारा है, जिसके पास सिवाय अपना श्रम बेचने के और कुछ नहीं है, उसका मुकाबला उन लोगों से हो जाता है जिनके पास सब कुछ है, परिणाम यह होता है कि जिनके पास है उन्हें और मिलता चला जाता है और जिनके पास कुछ नहीं है उन्हें कुछ नहीं मिलता है। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि खेती के ऊपर से बोझ हटाया जाय तो सरकार को कोई नीति बनानी पड़ेगी जिसमें यह तय किया जाय प्राथमिकता नम्बर एक नौकरी देने में सरकार की, लाइसेंस, परमिट और दुकान देने में, मोटरों के परमिट देने में, आपका विषय नहीं है लेकिन केन्द्र के प्रशासित क्षेत्र में आपका है, ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहूलियत उनको मिले जो शोषित हैं, जिनके पास कुछ नहीं है। बाद में और लोगों का नम्बर आ सकता है। ऐसा अगर कर लिया जाय तो उसका नतीजा निकलेगा कि खेत पर से बोझ हट सकता है।

ट्रैक्टरों का मामला है। जिस वक्त सवाल आता है मोटर बनाने का, पूरी दुनिया की बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनियाँ एक होती चली जाती हैं ताकि कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन घटता चला जाय, कम पैसे में मोटर तैयार हो। लेकिन इस देश के अन्दर जब सवाल आता है ट्रैक्टर बनाने का तो जिन लोगों को साइकिल की मरम्मत की दुकान खोलनी चाहिये थी वे

सब ट्रैक्टर बनाने वाले इस देश में बना दिये गये हैं। कैपिटल उनके पास नहीं है, ट्रैक्टर बेचने का धंधा शुरू किया था, ट्रैक्टर बनाना शुरू कर दिया, मतलब असेम्बल करना शुरू कर दिया। कोई तीन हजार बना कर बैठ जाता है, कोई पांच हजार बना कर बैठ जाता है, और 15,000 तक क्षमता आकर बैठ जाती है। जितनी नगरपालिकायें हैं सबमें कूड़ा ढोने के लिये ट्रैक्टर लगे हुए हैं। मालूम होता है जैसे ट्रैक्टर इस देश में सरप्लस हो गये हैं, गांवों में उनके लिये जगह नहीं रही। इनको सोचना चाहिये कि ट्रैक्टर की कम से कम 50,000 की यनिट बने। एक भ्रान्ति मैं इस सरकार को निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। आई० सी० एस० अफसर जो अंग्रेज हमारे लिये छोड़ गये हैं जिनको कुछ पता नहीं है कि इस देश में क्या हो रहा है, वह बैठे बैठे हिसाब लगाते रहते हैं कि इस मुल्क में इतने किसान इतनी जोत वाले हैं और इतनी जोत को एक ट्रैक्टर चाहिये। लेकिन मैं उनको अपने साथ ले चल कर ऐसे लोग दिखा सकता हूँ कि जिनके पास एक बिस्वा भी जमीन नहीं है लेकिन ट्रैक्टर लिये बैठे हैं, किराये पर चलाते हैं और भाड़ा कमाते हैं। जिस प्रकार शहरों के टैक्सी लोग चलाते हैं उसी तरह से गांवों में ट्रैक्टर लोग किराये पर चलाते हैं। लेकिन इस पर अभी ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। इसीलिये ट्रैक्टर की मांग को नजरंदाज किया गया है। अगर वह मांग सचमुच में दो लाख की है तो कागज पर 50,000 की होकर रह जाती है। अगर एच० एम० टी० को काम नहीं मिला होता, अगर उसकी पचास सैकड़ा क्षमता बेकार नहीं गयी होती और घाटा नहीं हुआ होता तो मेरा खयाल है कि यह सरकार कभी भी पब्लिक सैक्टर में ट्रैक्टर बनाने की बात नहीं सोच सकती थी। लेकिन अच्छा हुआ इतनी योजनायें फल रही, मशीनों की मांग घट गयी, एच० एम० टी० को काम नहीं मिला, तब कहा कि चलो ट्रैक्टर बना लिया जाय। लेकिन जब चौथी योजना का प्लान

[श्री महाराज सिंह भारती]

देखते हैं तो उसमें बताया गया है कि कुल मिलाकर 50,000 ट्रेक्टर बनायेंगे। मंत्री जी से जब कहते हैं कि 50,000 ही बना रहे हैं तो वह कहते हैं कि 50,000 तो अकेले पिन्जौर में बनायेंगे। तो आप सही स्थिति क्यों नहीं लिख देते हैं। सही बात कहने में क्या शर्मा रहे हैं।

ट्रेक्टर के मामले में दिमाग से यह गलत-फहमी निकालनी पड़ेगी, जब पूरे मुल्क में रिसेशन था, तुम्हारी मशीनरी नहीं बिकी, उस वक्त भी ट्रेक्टर प्रार ब्लैक था 6,000 रु० का ट्रेक्टर बाजार में 25,000 रु० का बिक रहा था। किसान आपको क्या कहेगा। टैक्स आप लगाओ हम देंगे हम किसान हैं, लेकिन 6,000 रु० का ट्रेक्टर 25,000 में बेचेंगे और ऊपर से टैक्स मांगेंगे इसलिये कि वैअक्ली से सरकारी चला रहे हो तो कौन देगा ?

इसी तरह से उर्वरक का सवाल है। बहुत से मेरे साथियों ने कहा है कि उर्वरक पर टैक्स नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ। आज दुनिया के अन्दर डिबेलुएशन होने के बाद हमारे रुपये के, जो दुनिया के अन्दर इन्टरनेशनल मार्केट में उर्वरक की कीमत है वह 1500 रु० टन के हिसाब से नाईट्रोजन की बैठती है। और हिन्दुस्तान में बिना टैक्स के वह ढाई हजार रु० टन की है।

1500 रुपये वाला उर्वरक वह हम को 2500 रुपये में बेच रहे हैं। उस पर आप हमें कहते हैं कि 10 सैंकड़ा टैक्स दे दो। अरे मोरारजी भाई हम 10 सैंकड़ा नहीं 20 सैंकड़ा टैक्स आप को देने को तैयार हैं लेकिन 1500 रु० टन का दाम हम से लीजिये। लेकिन दोनों काम आप करके अर्थात् 1500 के बजाय उसे आप हमें 2500 में बेचोगे और ऊपर से टैक्स मांगते हो तो इसके लिये आप को तो शर्म आनी चाहिये। यह कहा गया है कि इन्टरनेशनल मार्केट पर हम तुम्हें दे रहे हैं लेकिन वह क्यों नहीं मिल रही है? उर्वरकों

की जितनी अधिक मांग आज हुई है उस को देखते हुए कांग्रेस पार्टी की सरकार जो कि केन्द्र में चलती चली आई है वह केन्द्रीय सरकार दरअसल उस मांग को सही सही अंदाज नहीं कर पाई। थोड़े दिन पहले, कोई पांच, सात साल पहले विदेशियों ने आप से कहा था कि आप हम से गारन्टी कीजिये कि कंट्रोल प्राइस पर आप हमारा सारा उर्वरक ले लेंगे। उस समय हमारे आई सी एस अफसरों ने कहा कि उन को सबसिडी देनी पड़ेगी और सारा बजट चला जायेगा। उन दिनों सबसिडी दी जाती थी। अब क्या हालत हो गई है? वह कहते हैं कि खुली छूट दे दो जो चाहे, जिस भाव में बेचे तब हम यहां आएं। बदल गई स्थिति आप सोच नहीं पाए, आप हिसाब नहीं लगा पाये। आप स्थिति का एसैसमेंट नहीं कर पाये कि आज के जमाने में उर्वरकों की कितनी जरूरत है? आज के जमाने में बिना उसके खेती नहीं हो सकती है। क्या आप उस के लिए तैयार हैं? जिस मुल्क में अमोनिया बनाने के लिये हाईड्रोजन की बड़ी भारी प्राबलम खड़ी हो गई हो उस मुल्क में आप असम की जो गैस है उसको जला रहे हैं जिसमें कि लाखों टन उर्वरक बन सकता था। उस गैस का आप इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं काहे के लिये? बिजली बनाने के लिए आप उस को फूंक रहे हैं। उस से आर अमोनिया बनाते माने यह हैं कि आप अमोनिया से हम फिर उर्वरक बनाते लेकिन वह बिजली बनाने में सारा फूंक रहे हैं। ऐटोमिक प्लांट क्यों नहीं आप वहां पर लगाते हैं?

भूटान के अन्दर दुनिया की सर्वश्रेष्ठ जिप्सम मौजूद है। उस से हमारे पास जिप्सम की जरूरत पूरी होकर बढ़िया खाद हम बना सकते थे। जिप्सम के लिये लोग मरते रहें। सिंदरी फर्टिलाइजर्स का सारा सिलसिला हम को बदलना पड़ गया लेकिन अब तक उस की माप तौल चल रही है। कई

साल हो गये उस का हिसाब चल रहा है उसका हम इस्तेमाल नहीं कर पाये। उस जिप्सम की खान को अगर हम डेवलप कर सिर्फ 4 करोड़ रुपया लगाते उस से टू वे ट्रैफिक होगी, इधर से उधर सामान जायगा और उधर से जिप्सम आयेगा उन की हमारी एकोनामी एक बनेगी, लोगों को काम मिलेगा और उन की सरकार को रायलटी मिलेगी लेकिन इसको नहीं किया जा रहा है।

इसी तरीके से हमारे जो आणविक संस्थान है उन का बाकायदा सर्वेक्षण किया है और उनका वह छपा हुआ भाषण मौजूद है जहां एक सौराष्ट्र में और एक नरोरा में अलीगढ़ में संस्थान बनाने की बात कही है। उस में उन्होंने कहा है कि अगर यह बड़ा एटोमिक पावर स्टेशन बन जाय अलीगढ़ में तो इतनी सस्ती बिजली हम दे सकते हैं अर्थात् 8 नये पैसे में हम उन्हें एक यूनिट देंगे जिस किसान को कि आज 15 पैसे में वह मिलती है। साथ ही अल्यूमीनियम फैक्टरी को बहुत सस्ती देंगे और उर्वरक बनाने के लिये बहुत सस्ती देंगे क्योंकि हमारे सामने हाइड्रोजन वाली प्राबलम बहुत बड़ी समस्या है। अब या तो हम पानी को तोड़ कर अमोनिया बना सकते हैं या कहीं से तेल आयेगा तब बना सकते हैं। अब अगर एटोमिक बिजली सस्ती बना लें तो यह काम हो सकता है। इस बजट में कहीं पैसे नहीं निकलता है सारी चीजों में हम आत्मनिर्भर हैं। हमारे पास वैज्ञानिक हैं वह सारा कुछ बना सकते हैं। टैकनिकल नो हाऊ हम जानते हैं। क्या नतीजा होता है? हम छोटा सा बनाना चाहते हैं लेकिन होता यह है कि जिस कम्पनी ने हम को दिया है उसी कम्पनी ने अमरीका के अन्दर भी लगाया है और उन की जो लागत आती है फी यूनिट वह हम से आधि से कम है। अब जितना बड़ा एटोमिक प्लांट लगावोगे उतनी ही लागत कम हो जायेगी। जितना वह बड़ा हो जायेगा अर्थात् 10 लाख यूनिट से ऊपर वाला हो जायगा तो उस की पूंजी अर्थात्

उस की लागत उतनी कम हो जाती है। जितना थर्मल लगावोगे सिर्फ उतनी ही लागत बनेगी और वह उत्पादन की लागत आकर बैठेगी। वह उत्पादन की लागत बहुत ही कम बैठती है। लेकिन पैसा नहीं है, पैसा कहां से आये ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : May I know whether you are taking all the time of your party ?

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : अभी तो मुझे बोलते हुए थोड़ा ही समय हुआ है। बस मैं दो, एक मिनट में खत्म किये देता हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Almost all the time has been already taken by you. There is very little time left for a second speaker from your party.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : आधा मैं ले लूंगा आधा मैं अपनी पार्टी के दूसरे माननीय सदस्य के लिये छोड़ दूंगा। एक और मेरी पार्टी के इस पर बोलेंगे। वैसे बातें तो मुझे अभी बहुत कुछ कहनी थीं लेकिन चूँकि एक को अभी और मेरी पार्टी से बोलना है इसलिए मैं और बातों को छोड़ कर केवल एक, आधा बात कह कर खत्म किये दे रहा हूं।

मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि यह जो पेट्रोल का मामला है थोड़ी सी इस सिलसिले में हम पर कृपा कर दी जाय। पूरा मुल्क वित्त मंत्री की नीतियों से पेट्रोल के मामले में चौपट है। मैं आप को गिनाना चाहता हूं कि हमारे यहां जो पेट्रोल है उस में साल्वेंट को मिलाया जा रहा है। साल्वेंट पर टैक्स कम है। वह आधे दाम में पड़ता है। जो ज्यादा उस्ताद कारीगर हैं वह खालिस साल्वेंट बेचते हैं पेट्रोल के दाम पर। वह कोई लेबोरेटरी टेस्ट तो करते नहीं। आप साल्वेंट पर इतना टैक्स क्यों नहीं बढ़ाते कि पेट्रोल के दाम के बराबर बराबर वह आ जाये ताकि कोई मिला ही न सके।

इसी तरह से जितने हमारे डीजल के

इंजिन है वह पूरे देश में खराब हो रहे हैं क्योंकि डीजल जो है वह बनाया जा रहा है मिट्टी के तेल से। घटिया किस्म के मिट्टी के तेल को लिया दस गैलन और एक गैलन रद्दी मोबिल आयल में मिला दिया, डीजल तैयार हो गया। इस तरह से सारी मशीनरी खराब होती जा रही है। आप मिट्टी के तेल इतने तो बढ़ा नहीं सकते, क्योंकि उस से आम जनता एफेक्ट होगी, लेकिन आप डीजल के तो घटा सकते हैं। उस को घटा कर उस लेवल पर लाइये जिस पर किरोसिन आयल है ताकि आपस का सिलसिला खत्म हो जाये।

मिनरल आयल जो है आज वह पूरे राष्ट्र की तन्दुरुस्ती को खराब कर रहा है। उसका भाव 12 आना किलो है और जो खाने का तेल है वह 4 रु० किलो है। जो ज्यादा उस्ताद लोग हैं वह खालिस मिनरल आयल में पूरियां उतार कर स्टेशनों पर बेचते हैं, जो कम उस्ताद हैं वह 50 परसेंट मिलाते हैं। ऐसे बहुत कम लोग हैं जिन के यहां वह न मिलाया जाता हो। वह आप के ट्रांसफार्मर आयल की शकल में काम आता है और दूसरी तरह से भी काम आता है। आप उस के दाम इतने क्यों नहीं बढ़ा देते कि वह 4 रु० के हिसाब से पड़ जाये ताकि लोगों की तन्दुरुस्ती खराब होने से बच जाय। आप आमदनी बढ़ाने की बात तो नहीं करते, घटाने की बात कीजिये। कम से कम देशकी तन्दुरुस्ती बचेगी और हमारी मशीनरी भी बचेगी। इतना तो आप कर ही सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री अचल सिंह (आगरा) : सभापति महोदय, राष्ट्र पिता महात्मा गांधी हमारे देश में ऐसा स्वराज्य चाहते थे जहां न कोई गरीब हो न भिखारी हो, न कोई ऊंचा हो न नीचा हो, न करोड़ों का मालिक हो और न अघपेट भूखा मजदूर हो, और न नशीली वस्तु

या पेय न हो, स्त्रियों का उतना ही आदर हो जितना पुरुषों का, जहां उन की सच्चरित्रता और पतिव्रत का पूरा ध्यान रखा जाय, जहां एक पत्नी को छोड़ कर प्रत्येक जाति और धर्म के पुरुष सारी अन्य स्त्रियों को माँ और बहनें और बेटियों की भांति देखेंगे, जहां छुआ छूत को स्थान नहीं होगा और प्रत्येक धर्म का समान आदर होगा, जहां सब के सब खुशी खुशी और स्वाभिमानपूर्वक स्वेच्छा से श्रमजीवी होंगे। इस किस्म का स्वराज्य महात्मा गांधी चाहते थे और उन्हीं के अनुयायी हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी हैं। लेकिन दुःख इस बात का है कि आज हमारा देश महात्मा गांधी के आदर्शों के बिल्कुल विपरीत चल रहा है।

हमारा देश एक गरीब देश है, एक कृषि प्रधान देश है और इस में ज्यादातर आदमी गांवों में रहते हैं, जिन की आय एक रुपये से कम है। हमारे स्वर्गीय नेहरूजी ने उद्योगीकरण की तरफ ध्यान दिया और उद्योगों को काफी बढ़ाया। हम देखते हैं कि एक तरफ हमारी गवर्नमेंट अन्डरटैकिंग्स हैं और दूसरी तरफ प्राइवेट अन्डरटैकिंग्स हैं। प्राइवेट अन्डरटैकिंग काफी धन उपार्जन करती हैं और 25 परसेंट 30 परसेंट और 35 परसेंट तक पैदा करती हैं, जब कि गवर्नमेंट अन्डरटैकिंग बजाय फायदे के नुकसान करती हैं। यह बड़े खेद की बात है। सोशलजम तो इस लिये होना चाहिये कि आम जनता को राहत मिल सके और आम जनता पर टैक्स का भार कम हो जाये।

MR. CHAIRMAN I think the hon. Member will take some more time. So, he may continue his speech the next day.

19 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday April 30, 1969. Vaisakha 10, 1891 (Saka).