

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

"In fixing the above rates, the Directorate allowed Rs. 400 which was claimed by the Store as loading charges at Muzaffarnagar station. It is now being alleged that the above amount was paid to the railway staff as illegal gratification and not for the loading purpose."

यह जो चीज है यह ब्रह्म प्रकाश जी ने खुद यहां इस सदन में कहा था कि उन्होंने घूस दी है। यह विधि मंत्री को भी मालूम है। यह बिलकुल साफ़ बात है कि हिसाब में गड़बड़ी की गई है। घूस दी गई है, ली गई है। चारों तरफ़ मामला बिगड़ा है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर कहें तो मैं उन को अभी यह लाभ कागज़ दिये देता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे उसकी जरूरत नहीं है।

Shri A. K. Sen: If that is given to me, I shall examine it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may pass it on to the hon. Law Minister.

Shri Nath Pai: He has the document already with him.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह तो उनको देने से कोई विशेष लाभ नहीं होगा। भलबत्ता अगर आप चाहें तो मैं आप को दे सकता हूँ। उन को देने से तो कोई विशेष लाभ होने वाला नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डा० साहब जानते हैं कि मैं इस को रख कर अपने बल्के में इस से क्या फ़ायदा उठाऊंगा। उस अधिकारी को जिसके पास अधिकार हो उसको अगर वे दें तो यह चल सकता है, उसके पास जाने से इस पर कुछ कार्यवाही हो सकती है लेकिन मेरे पास अगर वह चाहते हैं कि यह बतौर डा० साहब की तरफ़ से एक बख़्शीस की तरह से मेरी जेब में पड़ा रहे तो मैं इसे रखने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी पहुंच तो ख़ाली आप तक है और आप पर मुझे पूरा विश्वास है। उन को देने से कोई फ़ायदा नहीं है। उन पर मुझे विश्वास नहीं है।

Shri Nath Pai: Only one question remains. What was important about these sections which necessitated the asking for the special opinion of the Solicitor-General? What was the justification for a reference to the Solicitor-General about these ordinary sections of the I.P.C.?

Mr. Speaker: No more questions on this just now. I have called Shri A. K. Gopalan to speak on the General Budget already.

Shri Nath Pai: These are the most ordinary sections of the IPC. Where was the need for a reference to the Solicitor-General?

12.40 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Speaker: We shall now take up the General Discussion on the General Budget for which 20 hours have been allotted.

Shri A. K. Gopalan.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Speaker, we have before us the budget proposals, the Finance Minister's speech as well as the Finance Bill. First of all, before dealing with the budget proposals, I have to say what is the essence of the budget proposals.

This is a very clever budget and a very dangerous budget. It is not a blunt budget as that of last year. Tremendous capacity to manoeuvre has been displayed to create an illusion in the minds of the people. There are big words, about curbing monopoly as well as ending concentration. The reintroduction of the expenditure

3561

General

PHALGUNA 13, 1885 (SAKA) Budget—General 3562
Discussion

tax without any real positive step and effort to find out the black money is nothing more than an empty gesture.

12.42 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Gates are opened wide for the foreign investor. The common man is where he is, groaning under last year's back-breaking taxation. He is disillusioned and all hopes of a substantial reduction in indirect taxation has been thrown to the winds. There is no prospect of lowering of prices or lowering of the burden of taxation. The people had hoped for a reduction of tax on nearly 50 items of common consumption levied last year.

Acids, carbon dioxide and gramophone records have qualified for the total removal of indirect taxes. The CDS is scrapped—and that exhausts the Government's concern for the lower income and middle income group. Taxes on the rich have been reduced. The agrarian policy is as it is, and under the present condition, we cannot hope for any increase in the production in the near future. This is the essence of the budget proposals.

When the Finance Minister made his speech presenting the budget proposals for 1964-65, people were naturally anxious to know what reliefs would be given to them. They were also very much eager to know what steps Government was taking. The Finance Minister was proposing to implement the promise of democratic socialism made by the ruling party. Socialism today has become very popular in the minds of the people and the ruling party has been putting on the socialist garb to hoodwink the people and to cover up their policies which, far from being socialist, are opposite to it.

It is also no accident that the ruling party, when it finds itself in a crisis or feels that it is losing people's

support, shouts loudest about socialism. Politically-conscious sections of the people in this country were never taken in by this declaration. But it is true that there are large sections of people in this country who continue to have illusions in this ruling party and its promises of building socialism. A hard blow has been dealt to these illusions by the Finance Minister. It is a good thing that the masses get disillusioned; and I would consider that the Finance Minister has done a signal service by imparting this political education to the people. A few more lessons like this and the people will know what socialism really is and who can build it up and how they can achieve it in this country. The genuine socialists in this country will be thankful to the Finance Minister for this education of the masses by the negative example when the declared policy is socialism.

Before the Budget was presented, the people had very great expectations that they would be given a large amount of relief. After all, the only target that was overfulfilled is the taxation target, and it was naturally expected of the Government that a large measure of relief would be given to the people, on whom miseries have been heaped one after another making life itself unbearable for them.

It is true that the Finance Minister has scrapped the CDS—no doubt about it. Even there, he could have been a little more graceful. I want to ask whether it was necessary to force the people to make their contributions for 1963-64, and refund it only after 5 years. Why should he not have shown a little more concern to the income-tax payers in the small income groups hard hit by the scheme according to the Finance Minister himself? What prevents him from giving them immediate relief? Anyway, in our country today we have to be thankful for even small mercies. The CDS has been

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

scrapped, but that almost exhausts the concern which the Finance Minister has for the common people, apart from the relief to some categories of income-tax payers in the lower brackets. We know that this small relief was necessary for the common people because the Finance Minister wanted to make the bigger concessions and incentives he was giving to big business more palatable. To that I will come later, because I want to deal with it at length, but is this small concession all that was needed for the people? That is the question. The whole country has been crying aloud about the runaway prices prevailing today, very responsible Ministers of the Union Government have expressed concern over it, and even the Finance Minister in his speech has said that there is concern about it.

The Finance Minister himself is disturbed at the rise in the price level. The Third Plan Mid-Term Appraisal told us that over the period of 2½ years since the commencement of the Plan, the increase in the general price index would work out to about seven per cent. Everybody knew that this so-called seven per cent had nothing to do with reality. The Finance Minister now tells us:

“While the increase in wholesale prices of the order of 8 per cent over the first three years of the current plan period cannot be considered large by any standards and particularly against the background of the sizable step-up in outlays under defence and development, the fact that the general index of wholesale prices rose by as much as 7.2 per cent between the end of March 1963 and the end of January 1964 is certainly a cause for great concern.”

This also is far from adequate in representing the reality. To the common people percentage and base months have not much relevance. Statistics have never been known to feed hungry mouths. What is far more relevant to them is the amount of money that they have to pay to get things when they actually go to the market. That is the reality.

Recently I saw in the press in Kerala a study of the lower middle class budget. With absolute bare essentials, such a family had to spend Rs. 103 in October, 1957 Rs. 118 in August, 1959, and Rs. 155.81 in January, 1964—that is a rise of 40 per cent from 1957 and over 30 per cent since 1959. The same must be the pattern almost all over the country. In fact, in those areas where food prices shot up to abnormal heights in the recent period, the situation will be still worse, the percentage will be more. So, do not try to hoodwink the people with talk of seven per cent and eight per cent. The cost of living index fraud has already been adequately exposed and officially accepted. It is better that the Government does not play too much with the price fraud.

My contention is that the price rise is far more than what the Government admits, and that is also the experience of the people. Are the people being compensated for all this rise in prices? Far from it. There has never been full neutralisation of the rise in the cost of living. In many cases even recommendations for neutralisation by committees appointed by the Government itself have not been honoured. Recently the Finance Minister made an announcement increasing dearness allowance to Central Government employees—a grand sum of Rs. 2 for the lowest category! They are really bitter that the Government expects them to meet the rise in prices with Rs. 2 which would

hardly meet the rise in the price of any one of the items of household necessities. They would happily forego the Rs. 2 and save all that money for the exchequer if only the Government would take steps to hold the price line which would not cost the exchequer anything. The other day the hon. Home Minister also said that the Rs. 2 would be swallowed by the price rise and that was not much. The crux of the problem is the rise in prices. A paltry concession here or there will not help the people. The only thing that can save them is a policy to lower the prices and hold the price line. In spite of his being so disturbed about the price rise this is precisely what the Finance Minister refuses to do. He has very graciously removed the duty on gramophone records. He has removed excise duty on a number of items—hardly any one of them of avail to the common men. In the present situation we had expected the Finance Minister to withdraw at least all the additional duties that were imposed last year, specially duties on kerosene, cheaper varieties of cloth, matches, etc. That would have meant some relief. But the Finance Minister will do nothing of that sort. Not only will he not take any such steps but he is even against controls which will check prices. From 1951 to 1962 the excise duties on all the essential commodities had risen and I pointed this out last year. The duty on one item, kerosene has risen from Rs. 28 lakhs to almost a thousand lakhs a year. It rose almost every year and the climax came last year. People expected that at least as far as these essential commodities are concerned, there would be at least fifty per cent relief. As I said earlier, he is against controls which will check price rise in some way. According to the Finance Minister:

"In curbing profiteering, fiscal devices can be used much more

effectively than controls which lead to abuses."

This is the same concern for the welfare of big business which prevents him from introducing State trading in foodgrains.

Shri Ranga: Question. We oppose it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: My friend opposes it but all the other support. Once the price of a basic commodity like foodgrains is under check, other things will fall into place. Equally is this concern shown by the Finance Minister and his Government when they refuse to nationalise banks which have played not a small role in the matter of price-rise. It was said that only a small section of people backed it. It is not so. Many in the Party to which the hon. Finance Minister belongs have been pressing for it but it is the Government that have rejected it.

The possibility of considerable pressure on price during the Third Plan period was visualised by the Government itself. Yet no measures were taken. Prices began going up. Government itself. Yet no measures but did not do anything. Now, the attitude to prices and controls which the Finance Minister has taken, far from showing any concern for the price rise or the common man who suffers from it, can only lead us to believe that it is the Government's policy not to check the rise in prices, that this is being deliberately done in the interests of big business and private enterprises.

The Finance Minister ascribes the rising trend in prices essentially to the inadequate rate of growth in agriculture. From 1961-62, agricultural production has been declining. For the current agricultural season according to the Finance Minister's budget speech, crop prospects which seemed somewhat better to begin with have been adversely affected by the recent severe win-

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

ter conditions in some parts of the country.

Agricultural production is not only important for us from the point of prices alone. For underdeveloped countries like ours, development hinges very much on the development of agriculture. Not only for meeting our chronic food deficit, but for a growing internal market, for adequate raw materials for our industries and for capital formation, agriculture has to play an important role. Yet how is this all-important sector treated by the Government? Does it show any realisation that without the development of agriculture in the right direction, development of the nation is almost impossible?

Why is this so? For the simple reason that the Government has not done the one thing that is essential for the rapid development of our agriculture—that is, the breaking of land monopoly and making the tiller the owner of the land he tills. Despite all the land reform measures the Government has initiated, land monopoly still remains the same, though there is some difference. Twenty per cent of the rural landlords own seventy per cent of the land of whom the top five per cent own 37.24 per cent of the land. At the other end, seventy per cent of the peasant families hardly possess twenty per cent of the land. The top ten per cent of the rural rich account for 33 per cent of the entire rural income. What is the position at the lower rungs? The lowest ten per cent account for only 0.7 per cent of the rural income and the *per capita* daily expenditure of the lower rung is only 31 n.P. for food and other necessities. Does this not conclusively prove that monopoly in land far from being broken continues? Is it not evident that unless this is broken and the land actually distributed to the cultivators and they are given a stake in

the land our agriculture cannot really improve as rapidly as the needs of national development demand?

No one will deny that the measures which the Government have taken like building up capitalism in agriculture, community development and national extension, package schemes, irrigation programmes and fertilisers will not lead to some increase in production. But is that all what we want? Is that what our developmental needs demand? What we need is the rapid all-round development of agriculture and that can only be achieved by radical land reforms breaking the monopoly in land, making the tiller the owner of the land and giving him incentives, credit, etc. An assured price to the producer alone can save him from the clutches of the speculators and profiteers.

13.00 hrs.

Today, the consumer gives some price, and as far as the producer is concerned, the price that the producer gets is certainly very much different from the price that the consumer gives. The Government sanctions also credit for agriculture, but the actual cultivator, especially the tenant-cultivator, in most cases does not get it. As long as this policy is continued, our agriculture cannot have a planned development; it will depend on the vagaries of nature as it is today, and we will be importing food and relying on external assistance instead of helping the capital formation inside the country for development.

The Finance Minister also said about the package programme. Apart from the doubtful economics of this programme, if the Finance Minister thinks that by such tinkering with this problem he can

solve the biggest questions that face the development, he will soon be breaking his head against a dead wall. I only want to end on this question of increase in agricultural production and agricultural economy by repeating again that genuine land reforms which will radically change the land relations, incentives to the producer in the form of credit, an assured price, etc., and also State trading in food grains are absolutely essential if agriculture, instead of being a bottleneck, has to contribute its share to the nation's development.

The next point I have to say is, while the Finance Minister has been pleased only to give a very small concession to the lower income-groups, he has been quite generous to the big business. In fact, as I said earlier, in the paltry concession to the common man is only to make his bigger gifts to big business more acceptable. Super-tax is abolished and by that, the Finance Minister has accepted the demand of the big business. Sur-tax on company profits which has been introduced is accompanied by a rebate to companies engaged in industries occupying also an important place in the economy. The expenditure-tax has been reintroduced, and, as I said, what meaning has it got when the Government takes no steps or measures to unearth black money which even according to the estimates of the Finance Minister is Rs. 1,000 crores and according to the estimate of some of his colleagues, Rs. 3,000 crores? There is logic in all this.

17 years ago, when we won freedom, and more so when we started on planning 13 years ago, when we had the opportunity in the post-second world war period, to launch on independent development of our economy by abolishing foreign capital, liquidating feudalism and res-

tricting the growth of big business and monopolies in this country, Our ruling classes deliberately threw away this opportunity and they launched on the path of developing capitalism in our country, at a time when capitalism on a world-wide scale had been in decay. While the development of capitalism and an independent economy on capitalist lines is impossible to be built in an under-developed country in the present-day conditions, the launching out on such a path has inevitably brought out all the crises and all the evil manifestations of that system into our economy.

I will only here deal with the development of the monopolies in our economy. This is a subject-matter which has become subject to very furious discussions in various circles in recent days. A few facts, which have often been quoted, have to be restated. It is known that 0.5 per cent of the shareholders in all the companies have 56.45 per cent of the total value of the shares covered by equity, that is, half per cent of the shareholders hold more than half the total value of the capital. It is also known that out of the total capital which has grown from Rs. 900 crores to Rs. 2,500 crores, two top houses hold more than Rs. 600 crores. Is it not an indication of the growth of monopolies? It is also known that 13 per cent of the companies claim 45 per cent of the entire paid-up capital in the country. Is it not the man-eater getting stronger and stronger? It is also known from a study of 4,174 directorships, that 44 persons alone hold 2,000 directorships, while 502 others hold the remaining 2,174 directorships. This is not all. There is another dangerous aspect in this growth of monopoly; that is, the inter-linking of banking and industrial capital. Shri R. K. Nigam of the Company Law Administration has made a study

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

of it. He says that 20 leading banks have about 188 directors who hold 1,640 directorships. After eliminating the duplication among the companies, the number of companies besides banks, in which directorships are held is 1,100, and the distribution of directorships is financial corporations, 154; manufacturing and other companies, 1,227; trading corporations, 45.

Then five leading banks have 55 directors who hold 674 directorships, which work out to 40.5 per cent of the total, and the distribution of these directorships is: insurance companies, 33; financial corporations, 6; investment trusts, 25; manufacturing and other concerns, 584; trading concerns, 26. The manufacturing concerns in which these 55 directors have interest constitute nearly 48 per cent of the total number of manufacturing concerns in which directors of the 20 leading banks hold interest. This is the state of affairs today, as far as the condition of monopoly is concerned. Is this development in a wrong and disastrous direction necessary for the economic development? In my opinion, absolutely not. In fact, only by eliminating them can planning be put on the right lines and our national advance ensured.

Leave alone eliminating them or even restricting them. What has the Finance Minister done? He has given them more and more concessions in the name of incentives. There is no question of eliminating them but he has given them more concessions in the name of incentives. It has gone to the alarming extent of virtually giving up the industrial policy resolution of the Government to favour the monopolists. Many of the industries to which the Finance Minister has granted rebate on the sur-tax on profits should belong to the public sector under the industrial policy resolution. Far from extending the public sector on a democratic basis, and making it

the determining factor in the country's economy, the private sector monopolists are being given the green flag to make fresh inroads into the public sector. The public sector, far from becoming an effective weapon in the hands of the Government against foreign and Indian monopolists, is being transformed into a handmaid of the monopolists. This is a development which the people cannot but view with alarm. With this in actual practice, what value can be placed on the declarations of socialism, social equality and all the other things that had been explained?

All these facts about the growth of monopolies are known to the Government also. So many committees have been appointed. There was the Vivian Bose Enquiry Committee; the Income-tax Enquiry Committee; the Company Law Administration Report. All these reports are before the Government. The Mahalanobis Committee had been appointed specifically to go into the question of the concentration of wealth and the distribution of the national income, and it is reported in papers that it has also come to similar conclusions as far as the concentration of wealth is concerned. The report is yet to see the light of day. After all this, what was expected of the Finance Minister, when there are so many reports showing the concentration of wealth? What was expected of the Finance Minister of a Government which has pledged itself to socialism, was to take firm measures to curb and eliminate the monopolies. But what has the Finance Minister offered? The Finance Minister says: "A Commission to enquire into monopolies and the concentration of power in the Indian economy,"—all in the name of impartial and objective enquiry. The Finance Minister has only set up another Commission. Does the Finance Minister think that the enquiries till now made had not been impartial and objective? Is it because that they came to the conclusion which tallied with the

reality that there is concentration of wealth? It is not that the Finance Minister is not aware of the facts. The public clamour against monopolies has been rising, and he knows that there had been discussion in the country about the concentration of wealth.

The Finance Minister in this case also has resorted to the usual trick to sidetrack the demand, and that is, to appoint a commission which will sit for the next five years. When a Commission is appointed, it will take years and when pressed, a report will come and that report will never be implemented, and if it is implemented, it will be implemented only half, in the interests of those who ask for the report! It is said in the papers yesterday that it will take only one year. But we know what happened in the case of the Mahalanobis Committee and we have experience of other committees also. Meanwhile, the monopolists will be given more and more concessions and by the time the Commission's report is ready, the Indian monopolists getting fat on these concessions would have grown so strong and dominant that it is they who will probably decide what is to be done with such a report. There are already many reports with the Government which show that there is concentration of wealth and monopoly in the country. So, having another Commission is certainly sidetracking the issue and avoiding it.

The most dangerous aspect of the growth of monopolies is their collaboration with foreign monopoly. In 1950, when we launched our First Plan, private foreign capital in our economy was to the extent of Rs. 300 crores. By 1962, it has grown to as much as Rs. 850 crores. In 1958, there were 71 collaboration agreements with foreign monopoly capital; by 1962 the figure had gone up to 1442. Secondly it should not be forgotten that the foreign capital is mainly in the vital sectors of our economy. What should not also be forgotten is that the Government has made the economy so

dependent on western capital that we have reached a stage when the moment this is withdrawn the whole economy will collapse. Even an innocent child knows that in such a situation there will be political pressure and that pressure will follow from the imperialist countries who are giving aid and the Government will find it more and more difficult to resist the pressure.

Dangerous limits have already been reached in the matter of foreign capital penetration. There is a red signal. Yet, we are opening the doors still wider. The Finance Minister himself has said recently in a speech to the Joint annual conference of the Indian Economic Association and the Indian Society of Labour Economics as follows:

"I think the stage has come when we would be justified in opening the door even wider to foreign investment as long as the burden that such investment might put on our balance of payment in future is not disproportionate to its contribution to our economic growth."

Also, in today's paper there is a report "TTK gives assurance to World Bank Chief" which says:

"Finance Minister Krishnamachari is learnt to have given assurances to the World Bank that the existing policy of restricting, as a rule, foreign equity capital to minority participation in collaborationist ventures would be given up... Besides these major policy concessions the field for investment of foreign private capital has been expanded to include public sector ventures."

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): May I know from which paper he is quoting?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It is from the *Patriot*. If he does not like this paper

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

there are other papers also from which I can quote. The report adds:

"In addition, the World Bank Chief was informed of the tax concessions to foreign capital and foreign personnel embodied in the Budget proposals."

If he does not like this paper, I will quote from another paper. In an interview to the *Economist*, London—it was not reported in *Patriot* but in *Statesman* yesterday—a report of which has been sent back by Reuter, the Finance Minister says:

"I am hopeful that my appeal to the foreign *entrepreneur* to come to India will find an echo. Notwithstanding this matter of border trouble with China, there are few developing countries which offer such assurances of stability and such market prospects as India."

It was in the same interview that he told about nationalisation of banks. The Finance Minister is reported to have said in regard to the demand for nationalisation of banks,

"In the first place, the demand is being raised by a very small section and I do not think we need really bother about it."

Shri Ranga (Chittor): Hear, hear!

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It is not a small section, but all, except my hon. friend who has just said "Hear, hear", almost all the opposition parties except Mr. Ranga's party and large sections of Congressmen themselves have demanded it. It has become a national demand and not the demand of a small section. But because the foreign monopolists do not favour this idea the Finance Minister hastens to assure them that we need not bother about it. In the budget speech itself, the Finance Minister says "for some years to come, we must rely on continued ex-

ternal assistance." And, to ensure this continued external assistance the Finance Minister has been lavish with concessions, the most dangerous of which is opening the doors of the public sector to foreign private capital. According to all reports, and there is nothing to disbelieve in them, the Government is deciding to open up the oil, machinery-making industry and other basic industries both in the private and public sectors to foreign equity participation. The Finance Minister himself said in his budget speech:

"We should specially welcome foreign investment in the shape of equity capital which not only brings with it technical skill, know-how and managerial skills but has the special advantage of not adding to the heavy and growing burden of debt repayment. To attract private investment in appropriate fields, we have to offer some incentives....."

There was recently another report that the Government was likely to accept the arbitration clause in relation to foreign capital—a demand which had been rejected earlier.

A report of the United States Department of Commerce has pointed out that the return after foreign taxes on American investments in the manufacturing enterprises in India was among the highest in the world. The return in 1962 was computed as 20.6 per cent compared with 19.2 per cent in 1961. This was published in the *Economic Times*. The rate of return mentioned is substantially higher than the Indian claim. During 1962, according to official Indian statistics, return on US investments was 13.2 per cent while the American Government admitted a net income of 20.6 per cent. I do not know how this difference is there.

Besides, there is royalty payments also, as regards three or four projects.

as follows: American Refrigerators—5 per cent on sale of first \$25,000, 3 per cent on sale of next \$25,000 and 2 per cent on additional sales. Bharat Ball-bearing—Royalty at 4 per cent of net sales and initial fee of Rs. 4 lakhs. Shalimar Wires—5 per cent per annum as ex-works selling price of the product for 10 years from the date of start of manufacture. Isaac Holders—10 per cent of net trading profits upto 6 years. All these royalties are there.

What does all this add up to? This is how we are developing the economy of our country and this is what we are doing in order to attract private sector and also to attract foreign capital. I want to warn the Government that the people fought a hard struggle and won freedom not to mortgage it. The Prime Minister himself used to say that our political freedom cannot be stable without economic independence. Instead of marching towards economic independence, our march is to more and more economic dependence. The Government has no right to mortgage the country's future as it is so cynically doing in the interests of the Indian monopolists and their foreign collaborators. It is not as if there is no alternative path. The question will be asked, where is the alternative path? From where can we get money? How can we develop the economy of our country? How can we have these big industries? To that the Communist Party has many times put forward several proposals.

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear!

Shri A. K. Gopalan: But after hearing the proposals I put forward, he will not say "Hear, hear", but he will oppose them. The proposals are nationalisation of foreign trade, State-trading in foodgrains, nationalisation of foreign capital, nationalisation of banks and certain industries, stopping of privy purses, unearthing of black money, scrapping prohibition, etc., because prohibition today is only in name. In reality there is no prohibition. Instead of taking coconut toddy or some other toddy, they take some other things. Prohibition is not

only not a success but according to me, according to some reports that I have received—I do not want to go into the details now; if we have a special discussion we can go into them—it is actually ruining the health of the people. It is also leads to corruption. In every police station there is corruption on account of this. Every illicit distiller is asked how much money he would give. Therefore corruption in the villages is due to this prohibition. If that is removed, not only will we get more money, to the tune of about Rs. 60 crores, but it will also provide employment to many and it will solve the unemployment problem to a certain extent. Illicit manufacture of liquor which leads to corruption in the whole country from the constable right up to big officers will also be stopped.

Last year, when I spoke on the Finance Bill, I ended by saying that if the Bill was passed the wrath of the people would be against the Government. But the then Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, while answering, became angry and said that the wrath of the people will be against me.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not angry.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am not saying that you are angry. My point is, so many changes have taken place. The Finance Minister himself saw the wrath of the people and I think the wrath of the people has been responsible to see that the then Finance Minister is not in office today. So many things have happened. Because of some of the measures taken by the Government and also because of the pressure from the people he has been removed from office. Therefore do not say that nationalisation of banks has the support of only a few people and that these agitations are in any way less.

Sir, the people are in action. After the last year's budget, how many actions had there been in the country from the side of the people? How many strikes were there in the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

country? Even today I have seen in the papers that the RMS workers are taking action due to the Rs. 2 increase in allowance given to Central Government employees. There have been so many strikes in the country. A petition was presented by me in the Parliament. After that for three days in the whole of India under the auspices of the ITUC there had been hunger strikes in every State. There have been mass demonstrations and they are continuing. These things are there because the people in reality understand their difficulties because of the increase in prices and also due to the pressure put on them by indirect taxation. No relief has been given to them.

What I want to say is, if the Government has eyes to see the sufferings of the people and the struggles going on in the country, and ears to hear what different sections of the people and papers say—except Shri Ranga and others—then they would know the realities. They would then realise that as far as the proposals in this Budget are concerned they not only do not give any relief to the common man but they give more and more concessions to the foreign private capital—a very dangerous thing—and strengthen the hands of the monopolists. Instead of taking some measures to curb monopolists, it is said that a Commission will be appointed. Sir, we in the Parliament know what will be the fate of a Commission when it is appointed and what will be the fate of the report when it is presented by that Commission. There has been the Income Tax Enquiry Committee and many other committees. There are so many reports on which the Government has not acted. That is why I say, Sir, that this is a very clever but a dangerous Budget; it will not help the common people in this country.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to welcome the budget proposals presented

to the House by the hon. Finance Minister. I am sure that the House will wish the Finance Minister well in piloting the stupendous economic effort that this budget epitomises. Sir, it is after a few years of holiday from the taxing burdens of this office that the present Finance Minister has come before the House with these budget proposals. His proposals are eminently realistic, characteristically bold and moderately and realistically socialistic (*Interruption*). If you have the patience with which we listened to the hon. Member who spoke before me—whatever he spoke—you will certainly be able to understand why I claim on behalf of the budget proposals that they are moderately socialistic (*Interruption*). Unlike the hon. Member there, I do not have the mannerism of repeating the last words of my sentence.

I said, Sir, that it is a stupendous effort because we know that the country is faced with the tremendous twin tasks of raising the finances necessary for strengthening the defence of our country and at the same time, accelerating and intensifying the process of economic development in our country. It is true that the immediate impact of an invasion is not haunting our memories today but, nevertheless, it cannot be gainsaid that there is no reason to relax or to reduce the stupendous effort that we have to make. Two belligerent nations which believe in sabre rattling are facing our country on either side of our frontiers. They are not only inimical to us but friendly to each other. Nor is it possible for us to reduce the tempo or magnitude of our development because if we divert our resources from the processes of development we will be playing into the hands of our enemies proving that we could not successfully face the dilemma that they posed before our country.

Sir, it is, therefore, clear that the resources necessary for these twin tasks have to be raised. They can

be raised only from what is available in the country. It is known that in the last few years our revenue has shown unmistakable signs of buoyancy. From about Rs. 190 crores at the time of partition and the coming into being of this country, the revenue now is expected to go up to the Rs. 2000 crores mark. It will not be out of context, in this connection, to say that the House should remember that at a time when a tremendous increase had to be made in the effort to garner the internal resources the then Finance Minister—who according to Shri Gopalan had to leave office because of the wrath of the people invoked by the priests of popularity in the Communist Party—made the effort to see that the methods of collecting revenue are put on a firm basis. If the Finance Minister, Sir, today could come to this House without many additional proposals for taxation, it is because, as he himself admits in his speech, he realises that certain measures which were taken during the grim days of last year have been responsible for putting us on a firm footing as far as our revenues are concerned.

Sir, in the lucid address with which he introduced the budget proposals, the Finance Minister surveyed the growth, the problems and the trends of our economy. The hon. Member who spoke before me had very harsh words to say about the condition of our economy. He went so far as to say that this is a clever and dangerous budget. I wonder why he said it was clever. Is it because he found it was a little difficult to understand the intricacies of this budget? He said that the Finance Minister has shown infinite capacity to manoeuvre—I am quoting from memory. He said it is a good thing that this budget has disillusioned the masses of our country, and he congratulated the Finance Minister on educating the masses in disillusionment. With that sentence, Sir, I submit to the House, the hon. Member who spoke before me, let the cat out of the bag. This is nothing new for any one to hear from the Com-

munist Party. The very fundamentals of their political philosophy believe in intensifying misery, so that discontent may increase, so that they may have the opportunity to tell the people that they have drunk deep from and drained the cup of poverty and misery, that nothing can be expected from those who are in authority and that therefore they must break their bonds in revolution.

This portrays the kind of eternal dilemma which confronts a Communist who tries to function in a democratic set up who, on the one hand, has to convince the people that he is working for the amelioration of their conditions, asking for reduction in hours of work and increase in dearness allowance and, on the other, can with facility indulge in double talk and say that Rs. 2 should not be increased in dearness allowance because it is nothing; on the one hand, you must ask for betterment of the conditions and, on the other, you must pray for disillusionment. How these two things can be reconciled can only be understood by those who have been initiated into the esoteric mysteries of the dialectics which Marx and Khrushchev and, if I may say so with the approval of the hon. Member, Mao has propounded to the world.

The hon. Member said that the picture of our economy was bleak. The Survey which the hon. Home Minister presented to the House.....

An hon. Member: Finance Minister.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I am sorry, the Finance Minister, I hope it does not foreshadow anything.

The Survey which the hon. Finance Minister has presented to the House shows that the availability of power and transport and of basic materials such as coal has increased, that the generation of electricity has gone up by 16 per cent, that the goods traffic carried by railways has gone up, that

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

steel production has reached capacity level, that the production of aluminium, coal, cement, machine tools, electric machinery, transport equipments, production of wagons, trucks, all of them have increased, that the indigenous content of production has increased in engineering industries, that the industrial output has increased by 10 per cent, that the balance of payments position has improved, that our export has touched the high figure of Rs. 760 crores, that there has been better utilisation of external assistance, that the national income has gone up, that the *per capita* income has gone up even though not according to the targets, that small savings has gone up from Rs. 73 crores to 150 crores, and that indebtedness to the International Monetary Fund has been decreased by \$50 million as against an increase of \$25 million and \$122.5 million in the previous years. Nevertheless, it must be admitted, as the Finance Minister himself has admitted, that as far as agriculture is concerned, we have been lagging behind. Shri Gopalan sang the praise of agriculture. I am one with him in saying that this sector of our economy is a very vital sector and that unless this sector is taken care of, it is impossible to expect any rapid development or any chance of the benefits of progress percolating to the masses of our country.

It is true that our agricultural production has declined by 3.3 per cent. Nevertheless, it is true, too, that the minimum prices of wheat and sugar and the procurement price of rice have been raised, that a minimum price has been fixed for *jowhar*, that the policy of extending price support now applies to almost all the major food and commercial crops.

As far as agriculture is concerned, the hon. Member who spoke before me bemoaned the fact that our production is so low that we still have to depend on import from foreign countries. No one can differ from him when he says that the country must

make an all-out effort to see that our production in the agricultural front increases. But it is not a laughing matter to refer to the fact that the agriculturist has to depend on many other factors. It is not a mere excuse which the hon. Minister or a member from this side of the House may trot out in extenuation of the fact that agricultural production has not increased in India. In this connection, the hon. Minister referred to the vagaries of the weather. In China perhaps even the weather is not allowed vagaries. Therefore, they refer to "natural calamities", perhaps a more euphemistic and socialistic expression for the vagaries of the weather.

Now, if you look at many other countries in the world, countries which have had the advantage of planning for many more years than this country has had, if you look at Russia or China, you will find that they have had to go to the world market to buy additional food materials. I am not saying for one moment that we must emulate what they do because it has become sanctified; the hon. Member who spoke before me may say that it has become sanctified because it is something which is done by Russia or China; I do not say so. But I only point out this fact to show to the House that it may become necessary because of the exigencies and conditions that govern agriculture that one sometimes has to depend on buying stocks to support what one produces locally.

Shri Daji: You say 'sometimes'. That is right. But if this happens every year, then?

Shri Ravindra Varma: I should thank the hon. Member for allowing me to reinvigorate myself to meet his point. "Sometimes" is a word which is as well known to the hon. Member as to me. If it is a permanent feature, I will agree with the hon. Member that it is a sorry, saddening state of affairs. But if one hon. Member says

that China can do it, Russia can do it but not India, one finds it difficult to understand the logic behind that argument.

Sir, the hon. Member who spoke before me said that the production in the agricultural sector is lagging behind because of lack of effort to see that the tiller owns the soil. My party believes that all intermediaries should be abolished and that land should belong to the tiller. But, still; I want to ask the hon. Member who spoke before me a question. Could you say that the mere fact that the tiller becomes the owner of the land will immediately solve all the problems of agricultural production? Why is it so then that Russia had to import food materials to the tune of 14 million tons even though it is a Socialist country where land is not owned by intermediaries? I do not want to go into this argument at length. The hon. Member himself has admitted that the incentives necessary for increase in agricultural production are being provided by the Government. The policy may be inadequate, it may be said that it has not led to as spectacular and immediate results as we want, but the policy of supporting prices, fixing floor prices that take into consideration the increased cost of production and the prices of other necessary commodities, providing of fertilizers, irrigation, better utilisation of irrigation, providing of agricultural credit etc. are all meant to serve the very purpose that the hon. Member said the Government should have in mind to see that agricultural production does not lag behind.

As far as industry is concerned, if there is to be improvement in the rate of growth the economy must be geared to the needs of rapid economic growth. There can be no rapid economic growth without increased investment. The pattern of investment has to take into account the investment output ratio not only in terms of the quantity of production but also in terms of the

time consumed, the investment employment ratio, better control, better management to ensure that there are quicker returns from industry. If investment has to be stepped up, capital has to be found. One may not like "Capital," but every country which has got the responsibility to improve its economy realises that capital, by whatever name it may be called—it may be fair or foul—is a necessity, an economic necessity.

Now, how is this capital to be found? From internal savings, through savings from income. If there has to be savings, there must be difference between income and consumption. The profits that industries earn must be ploughed back to see that industries advance further. As far as external resources are concerned, one of the main sources is export, another is international economic institutions, a third is assistance from friendly governments and the fourth is private foreign capital. The Finance Minister has very clearly stated in his analysis that we will have to orient our policy, both of taxation and of economic direction, to ensure that we draw upon all these resources, increase the tempo of investment, control the direction and pattern of investment towards basic industries, lay stress on the industries necessary for agriculture and to relieve shortages by correcting whatever imbalances there may be in the production of consumer commodities.

The relief given to the different sections of the community that earn taxable income and to the corporate sector is only to provide the inducements that a society dedicated to democracy and socialism can provide. The hon. Member who spoke before me said that there was no need to provide these incentives. I shall come to his observations, as far as socialism is concerned and as far as the incentives and inducements provided by the budget are concerned, later. But I want to deal in passing with the question of prices that he has raised.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

As the Finance Minister himself has pointed out in his budget proposals and in the brilliant speech which he delivered while introducing the budget proposals this is a matter which should cause grave concern to all sections of the people in the country.

There is no gainsaying the fact that though the price level went up only by 8 per cent during the first three years of the Third Five Year Plan, in the last one year it has been going up in a way that should cause grave concern to everyone. It is one thing to talk from the point of view of pure economic theory and say that in a developing economy prices are bound to go up, that there will be some kind of an increase in the price level because there will be a time-lag between the locking up of capital, that is, investment, and the production of commodities which will answer for the total volume of money in circulation or the total volume of money that the community has at its disposal. It is one thing to argue these things from the point of view of the pure theory of economics but it is entirely another thing, as far as this House is concerned, for anyone to argue and say to the people of this country that they have to put up with a spiralling level of prices. Prices have to be controlled. They have to be controlled with all the fiscal and other measures that the Government is capable of taking. If State trading is to be resorted to, whether some hon. Members like it or not, it has to be resorted to. If by a policy of procurement and price fixation or through other means of controlling the stock and the prices of commodities this can be achieved, it should be achieved.

One of the reasons for the increase in prices is short supply of commodities, specially consumer goods. Many other factors that effect the cost of production, as the hon Member, Shri Karuthiruman, explained to the House yesterday when he spoke of agriculture and increase in the prices of agri-

cultural commodities. But it is not only the question of the existing scarcity—the real scarcity—but also that of the creation of an artificial scarcity, seasonal scarcity and regional scarcity which the trade channels are often responsible for. Therefore this House will certainly demand that the Government should take every necessary step to see that trade channels are not responsible for creating these artificial kinds of scarcities and to ensure that prices are kept at a level which does not nullify and efface the increase in incomes that comes as a result of the distribution of purchasing power in a developing economy.

In this connection I would also like to point out to the hon. Finance Minister that one very important factor which is not always taken into consideration is the impact of indirect taxes on prices. I would like the hon. Finance Minister, when he comes before the House next year, to tell us as a result of study and research in his Ministry how far the incidence of indirect taxation goes to inflate the prices of essential commodities, whether it is absorbed by taxation or whether the trader uses the tax as an excuse to inflate or increase the the prices at the cost of the common man.

As far as relief to the low income groups is concerned, it is clear that the Government has adopted some measures, like the linking of the dearness allowance with the price index. But what about the people in the rural areas who are not salaried people? They also have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I will take another five or ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can take five minutes.

An Hon. Member: He should be allowed more time. He is the first speaker on our behalf.

Shri Ravindra Varma: The hon. Member who spoke before me said that there was nothing in the Budget proposals which would prevent the concentration of economic power and wealth, that the hon. Finance Minister had used only empty words. If he had not used these words, he would have been blamed for not using them. It would have been said that words, like the mantra of socialism or some other word were not even mentioned. If he uses these words, it is said that they are empty words. The hon. Finance Minister is always on the horns of a dilemma. It is not as if I am trying to defend him. I know, he is capable of taking good care of himself. . . . (*Interruption*). I am very glad that the hon. Member appreciates my compliment to the hon. Minister for his ability.

As far as the Budget proposals themselves are concerned, it is very clear, if the House takes a look at the taxes that the hon. Minister has proposed, that they are a judicious combination of relief to the poor, inducement for investment and growth and measures to reduce the possibility of inequality being perpetuated either as a result of inheritance or as a result of monopoly. Since I do not have the time it is not possible for me to refer to each one of the tax proposals that he has made. I shall leave it to many abler men who will follow me. But as far as income-tax is concerned, it is clear that there is definite relief to the lower slabs and the hon. Member who spoke before me admitted that there has been relief. He was halting, hesitant, stammering when he came to it, but could not gainsay the fact that there was relief.

As far as the Estate Duty and the Gifts Tax are concerned, I want to ask the hon. Member who spoke before me whether he sees no signs of socialism or equalisation in them. He is not here, but I am sure he will be informed because he does not lack in informers. . . . (*Interruption*). I would like to ask him whether he does not

see any signs of socialism in the Estate Duty or in the Gifts Tax. There is an increase, higher rates have been introduced and they have been made applicable for lower slabs as far as the Estate Duty is concerned. The highest rate has been put up to 85 per cent. The justification for this is nothing except the belief that inequality should not be transferred from generation to generation. Those who believe, that there must be an equalitarian society must therefore support this effort to see that inequality is not bequeathed in this country. It is not only at Bhubaneswar that the Congress made a public statement that it does not believe in the perpetuation of inequality. As early as the Round Table Conference in London Mahatma Gandhi said that he did not believe in inherited riches, that he believed that every monopoly should be ended with or without compensation as the case may be. Therefore there is no new discovery of socialism as far as the Congress is concerned. If the incidence of the Estate Duty, the Gifts Tax, Wealth Tax and the Expenditure Tax together is not on the richer class, I want to ask Shri Gopalan whether the incidence of these taxes is on the lower classes.

Shri Gopalan referred to foreign investment and I have, therefore, to refer to this before I conclude. He said that foreign investment will mean a stranglehold on this country. If he could have his way, he would strangle the private sector; he would hound out every foreign investor and would create such conditions in this country that no international institution will be prepared to lend for this country. Then, he says that in spite of his warnings, if you depend on these loans, any time these loans may be withdrawn and your house will collapse like a house of cards.

As far as the necessity for inducing investment in this country is concerned, no responsible person can deny that the necessity of inducing this

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

investment is there. The question, as the hon. Finance Minister pointed out, is one of control. If we can ensure that foreign capital does not establish a stranglehold on the economy of our country, that it will operate within limits and it is not entitled to any kind of right to control the direction of economic policy in this country, this does not in any way constitute economic dependence that goes against our sovereignty, or the conception of democracy or socialism that at least we on this side of the House have.

If you look at the Budget proposals and the concessions that have been given to foreign investors, you will see that this is particularly done, as the hon. Finance Minister has explained, with an eye on the tremendous responsibility for repayment of loans which this country is confronted with, which is expected to go upto Rs. 825 crores in the Fourth Five Year Plan. Can you bridge this gulf entirely with your exports? If that is not possible, other ways must be found. The rebate of 10 per cent on the tax on dividends received from Indian companies, section 23-A companies, engaged in specific activities mentioned in the Schedule of the Memorandum and the personal concessions that have been offered to foreign personnel, technicians and professors, and the concession to the tune of Rs. 2,000 for the education of two children. If this House is asked to believe that these concessions constitute a surrender of our sovereignty, that this constitutes mortgaging of the freedom of this country to some other country, I must say that Mr. Gopalan is also asking this House to mortgage its intelligence to him.

In view of the limited time at my disposal, I do not want to go into the question of other proposals of taxation. But I must now refer to the question of tax-evasion. As far as tax-evasion is concerned, the Public Accounts Committee has very often told this House of the necessity to

ensure that there is no tax-evasion, to ensure that there are no arrears in assessment and to ensure that the tax on the assessed income is collected. It is saddening to see that out of Rs. 567 crores of the assessed income-tax demand, only about 50 per cent has been collected in the last year. Rs. 271 crores were still in arrears. The tax collection has been in arrear to the tune of Rs. 120 crores for three consecutive years. This is a high figure and, therefore, I would say that the Finance Minister is eminently justified in suggesting the five amendments to the Income Tax Act that he has proposed. I would not call them panchsheel because one has to be wary of the word now. But these five conditions that he has proposed, these amendments that he has proposed in the Income-Tax Act, are necessary. I may not defend every word and letter of what he has said. I would certainly not do so. They bear scrutiny. But unless a deliberate effort is made to plug the loopholes, to see that there is no evasion, to see that arrears are collected, it will not be possible for us to realise the revenue which Parliament sanctions.

Here again, I must say that there is another side of the coin. The Finance Ministers come before the House and say that the estimate is such and such, say, 'X'. Then, when the next year's budget is presented to us, we see that the income from these taxes has been much higher than what they told the House. There is an eternal argument as to whether this House, when it sanctions taxes, not only has the rate of taxation in mind but also the total yield from the taxation as announced by the Minister. This is a matter which I would like the Finance Minister to bear in mind. This kind of wide variation to the tune of 15 or 17 per cent is understandable; still less defensible. In a country, like, Great Britain, it has been brought down to 1.8 per cent. I do not want to quote the instance of other countries. But no-

where can you find such a wide variation as 15 or 17 per cent. To argue in defence that since ours is an under-developed economy, we will have to levy taxes and excise duties on commodities which are not on the list today and we do not know how these commodities will behave and, therefore, we cannot estimate correctly is to confess incompetence. The Government has got with it a big machinery. Committees after committees are appointed. The national sample surveys are undertaken. Why is it that the Ministry is lacking in the statistical intelligence necessary to see that before a certain duty is levied on any commodity, you know what the yield would be? I would like the Finance Minister to come before the House next year and say that measures have been taken to ensure that this variation is reduced.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I must be conditioned by the reflex that is created by the ringing of the bell.

Sir, the hon. Member who spoke before me concluded by saying that the divine wrath of the people will be on this Government. Perhaps, he exempted this Minister. I do not know why. Perhaps, there is some soft corner in him for the Minister. In any case, he said that the wrath of the people will be so great, because the Government has been exposed, that there will be strikes, that the Government will find it impossible to carry on. Now, is this a prognosis or is it a promise....

An Hon. Member: A threat.

Shri Ravindra Varma: May I use my own words? Is this a threat?

An Hon. Member: An empty threat.

Shri Ravindra Varma: Well, if you look at what the Communist Party is doing, last year and this year, coming to this House and voting for these grants, voting for these taxes and

then going to the people and organising the people against these....

Shri Daji (Indore): We never voted; we walked out.

Shri Ravindra Varma: You walked out because you did not want to register your vote. You were afraid that the people would say you did not vote for it.

Shri Raghunath Singh: You were not opposed at least.

Shri Daji: We did oppose. We were really opposing. At least, let us be frank and honest about it.....(*Interruption*).

Shri Ravindra Varma: If I have said one unparliamentary word, I would withdraw it. But temper and strong language are not the monopoly of the hon. gentleman on the other side. The last year, because the emergency was fresh in the minds of the people, because the invasion of China was still fresh in the minds of the people, the hon. gentlemen who shout now did not have the courage to use the same expressions that they have used this year. This year things are different. Therefore, they feel that they can get away with impunity and say that this budget will lead to the wrath of the people and go and organise strikes and agitation against taxes and the budget. With these words....

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Go through the last year's speech and you will find what we spoke. (*Interruption*).

Shri Ravindra Varma: ...I support the budget proposals that the Finance Minister has placed before the House.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wonder if the hon. Member who has just finished would permit me to congratulate him....

Shri Daji: Good company; hear, hear.

Shri M. R. Masani: ...on the ability that he has shown in dealing with Marxist dialectics. I would also like to thank him because he has lightened my burden. I need not spend any of my time answering the leader of the Communist Party and can concentrate on the Budget.

I would like to congratulate the Finance Minister and the Government that he represents on several sound propositions that are to be found in Part A of his speech.

Shri Nambiar: Cat is out of the bag.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: And here is socialism.

Shri M. R. Masani: There are several sound propositions which one can honestly welcome, for instance, the emphasis on the inter-relation of growth, prices and the balance of payments on p. 5; the futility of price control on p. 8; the deploring of the poor performance of the State enterprises and the need for making substantial profits on their part on p. 7; the need for incentives to generate savings in order to foster capital formation and growth on p. 8 and on p. 6 of Part B and finally the acceptance of the urgent need for incentives for foreign equity capital to come to this country in a big way on p. 12. I welcome the fact that even this Government has, as a result of the hard lessons the country has had to learn over the last few years, broken through the crust of dogma and faced the truth. If I had time, I would have drawn from the Statement of Policy of my own party to show how closely these statements would reflect....

Shri Daji: Hear, hear.

Shri M. R. Masani: ...what we on this side have tried to urge on the

Government of this country during the past four years.

Shri Nambiar: Strange bed-fellows!

Shri M. R. Masani: No doubt, the learning of these lessons has been encouraged by the lessons of bye-elections to this Parliament that followed the last year's Budget, bye-elections in Amroha, Dohad, Farrukhabad and Rajkot and the more recent electoral results in Goa, in Jaipur and in Mahuwa.

Having said that, one proceeds to say, the real question is this: To what extent the contents of Part B, the actual proposals, follow-through in action the thinking of Part A? I can assure the hon. Finance Minister that I have tried to examine this question with a very open mind and with every desire to believe that such a follow-through has, in fact, taken place.

14.00 hrs.

To start with, in regard to the additional tax burden of Rs. 40 crores, Rs. 25 crores on indirect taxation and Rs. 15 crores on direct taxes, I must frankly confess that I think that this is unnecessary. The country has been groaning under excessive taxation of the worst kind during the past year and the previous years. The safe margin of taxation, even according to the canons of the Planning Commission, has long since been exceeded. As the hon. Member who spoke before me has quite rightly condemned, there has been gross under-estimation of revenues to an extent that is unforgivable, year after year.

In the light of all that, I think the hon. Finance Minister would have been on perfectly safe ground if he had balanced the budget without any additional taxation, and that could have been done by not accepting this tremendous growth in civil expenditure of Rs. 191 crores which represents to a large extent the diversion of scarce resources from productive to

less productive or unproductive channels and is bound to result, whether we like it or not, in further inflation.

So far as indirect taxation is concerned, these Rs. 25 crores of additional revenue have dashed the hopes entertained by people. The only thing this budget could have done for the rural people, who are the big majority of the people and the poorest of our people, would have been to lift the excise levies on the bare necessities of life. One had hoped that the first benefit would have gone neither to business nor even to the middle class income-tax-payer but to those who are the hardest oppressed in our country, namely the rural masses. Kerosene, vanaspati, soap, matches on which half the price of 6 nP. represents the levy of tax, sugar, about one-third of the price of which represents the levy of tax, are the first objects that should have received the attention of Government. It is a great pity that no germ of relief has been given here. On the contrary, Rs. 25 more crores are sought to be squeezed out of the consumer who by and large is among the poorest of our people.

Then, we come to direct taxation. Rs. 15 crores more are to be obtained. The direct taxation proposals in the budget—and the House, I am sure will agree with me—are, I think, the most complicated that have come before the House ever since I came here first in 1945. I have tried to wrestle with the score of the major changes which the Finance Minister has embodied in this voluminous Finance Bill. I have wrestled with the Finance Bill and the Surtax Bill for the last two days and worked very hard at them. I must confess that, even now, I feel that this interval of two days was much too short to do justice to a measure of this nature. Therefore, I hope that the hon. Finance Minister will agree to refer both these Bills to a Select Committee of this House. We have got plenty of time between now and the 15th of April when the Finance Bill is due to come before us for

consideration, and I do appeal to him, not with a view to any factiousness but with a view to getting an intelligent examination by all parties in this House—and his party will be in a majority in the Select Committee—of just what these taxation proposals really amount to. I do hope he will consider this and give a favourable response when he replies to this debate next week.

Direct taxation can be broken up into two compartments, personal taxation and corporate taxation. Let us first take up the taxation on individuals. I welcome the simplification of the income-tax tariff. I also welcome the lowering of rates and the elimination of the compulsory deposit savings scheme for all assessees with incomes below Rs. 15,000 a year. There is no question about it that this is a welcome and material relief. It is a relief for the lower middle class salariat which has been very hard-hit along with other sections of the middle class who have been ground down between the mill-stones of higher price and higher taxes. For the first time, some little justice has been done to them. I do not think that this is adequate. With the inflation that is bound to proceed under this budget, I am afraid a large part of the few hundred rupees left in their pockets is going to be eaten up again. But let us accept the fact that something good has been done, and people with salaries up to Rs. 1,000 a month have been let off with some concession. I am very grateful to the Finance Minister that among the many other things that are wrong in this budget, we can certainly welcome this and wish that this relief could have gone further. My own party has consistently pressed for relief to the middle classes. It is true that this is not whole middle class, but only those who are with fixed incomes, but even so, let us be grateful.

But once you cross the Rs. 15,000 a year limit, there is very little to be said for the direct taxation proposals. The relief given is trifling and indeed

[Shri M. R. Masani]

illusory. Why is this so? It is because of the Annuity Deposit Scheme. The hon. Finance Minister in his speech has himself admitted that because of this scheme people will take home "slightly lower" retentions. But he would say that add this deposit is not a tax, and he might add 'It is not true that he will have the same amount, but the difference between the old tax and the new tax which I am taking as annuity deposit is your money and you will get it back'. This is misleading.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): How?

Shri M. R. Masani: I shall answer my hon. friend. I am here to try and answer the questions of my hon. friend Shri Tyagi, which are always most helpful. The difference is this that the old compulsory deposit was tax-free. Both the tax and the interest were free of tax. Unfortunately, the annuity deposit is taxable both on the deposit and the interest it earns. The only difference is this that instead of paying the whole tax today, you will pay the tax on the deposit part of your bill in ten equal instalments over the next ten years.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): That is a big concession.

Shri M. R. Masani: It is not a big concession at all. It is only postponing the day when the tax is paid, and I shall show why it is no concession at all. You will not only pay tax on that deposit and the 4 per cent that you will get back, but you are meanwhile being prevented from using your money for more effective purposes. Which of us who has any intelligence is prepared to accept 4 per cent as an honest return on investment or business risks? Everyone makes more; people get 6, or 8, or 10 or 20 per cent return on capital. So, your money is taken away and you are prevented from using it productively for yourself and the country, and when you get it back you are

taxed not only on the deposit but on this measly 4 per cent that Government have earned for you. Therefore, with all respect to Shri A. P. Jain, I would say that it is no concession at all. There is no concession whatsoever to any income-tax payer who has an income of more than Rs. 15,000.

On the other hand, there are definite disincentives. The position is aggravated by other features of the direct taxation. I may list them very briefly, for lack of time. The first is the lowering of the floor on the Wealth Tax from Rs. 2 lakhs to Rs. 1 lakh, which brings the middle class people within its scope because if you have Rs. 1 lakh, it is only Rs. 20,000 pre-war; and whoever thought of Rs. 20,000 in 1940 being a magnificent fortune that must be taxed? So, first of all, there is the lowering of the floor on the wealth tax.

Secondly, there is the reimposition of the Expenditure Tax which may not cost people very much but which involves harassment.

Thirdly, there is the very savage Estate duty and Gift tax. 'Savage' is the right word to use. I am not concerned with the fact that some millionaires will pay more and as much as 81 per cent on their assets; I could not care less. But the fact remains that these are the people who form capital; whether you like it or not, it is not the middle classes like ourselves who form capital. Capital formation takes place in the hands of those who have lots to spare after they live their own lives, and it is these classes who are going to be hit by the estate duty and the gift tax out of all proportion to what exists in other parts of the world. Compare the gift tax and the estate duty with those in the USA and the UK. There is not even an exemption for charity here.

Shri Tyagi: They do not have socialism.

Shri M. R. Masani: In the USSR—I listened with great amusement to my hon. friend over there—there is no duty on inheritance. And fortunes of millions of roubles are duly being transmitted in the Soviet Union to children of the ruling class without paying a rouble to the State. They recognise the part of human nature which is this that not only, as the Finance Minister has admitted in his speech, do people want to spend the fruits of their labours, but it is part of human nature to make provision for your children and your family.

Then, there is the Capital Gains Tax which is bad in three ways. First, it is bad in principle that the Capital Gains Tax should be graduated. It should have some ceiling which has now been removed. There should be some advantage for long-term investment as in the USA where if a man invests in the same security for about ten years, there is practically no capital gains tax. Here, even a stable investor who keeps the same securities for fifteen years, if he gets a little more for them, is considered to have made a capital gain. Lastly, the Capital Gains Tax applied to bonus shares is entirely unforgivable. This is objectionable because it is now levied when the bonus share is issued, as if the face value is the real market value—it may not be. Normally, that gain would accrue when the share is sold. That would have been all right. But to tax a bonus share when it is issued is to tax a gain that has not been realised.

And in this case, there is triple taxation. The reserves of the company are already taxed. The company itself pays 12½ per cent tax on the bonus share. And then the recipient of the bonus share is taxed a third time on the same amount.

Whom does the Finance Minister's proposals hit in regard to personal

income? With all respect, I suggest that it hits only the salariat and other honest tax payers.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): Whose income is known.

Shri M. R. Masani: Shri Saraf is quite right.

The Finance Minister has expressed the hope that this Budget will reduce evasion. I wish I could share that hope. I am afraid, however, my feeling is—I hope I will be proved wrong; but we shall be here next year and the year after to watch this—my fear is that the cumulative effect of the Capital Gains Tax and the Expenditure Tax in particular will be to encourage cash transactions. A premium has been put on the currency notes and when you put a premium on the currency note and not what you hold in bank honestly or openly, you are in fact, whatever your intentions or desires be, helping and encouraging people, such as they are, to keep more and more transactions out of their books, because of both the Capital gains tax and the Expenditure tax.

So I come to the conclusion that these particular taxation proposals are going to give incentive to hidden wealth. The businessman is faced with a dilemma by this Budget. Either he wants to remain honest, in which case he must cease to be rich and cease to operate in business, or he wants to remain in business, in which case he is driven to dishonesty.

The Finance Minister thinks that by abolishing the secrecy of income tax assessments, he will put the fear of God into dishonest people. But the dishonest people do not have income tax assessments. Only those who have fixed incomes and those who disclose their incomes go on paying tax. They can disclose them—I do not mind at all. But I warn him that for every honest case which is properly disclosed, the income tax officer will now have the right, on the applica-

[Shri M. R. Masani]

tion of any citizen, to disclose information about a particular assessee. Has the Finance Minister considered the dangers of blackmail? Does he not know of yellow journals in this country which abound and which may misuse this facility to blackmail people? Does he not know that if one businessman wants to get at the customers of another, he will only have to pay a little bribe to the income tax officer to get the information so that he may come to know of the customers of his rival, so that he may approach them direct? These things, Sir, are very dangerous. That is why secrecy has been maintained in most parts of the world.

I come back to this—what do you leave the investor with so that he can form capital? I am told—and this is a real case—that a man who earned Rs. 2.2 lakhs—no doubt a rich man who could form capital—paid last year in direct taxes Rs. 1.79 lakhs. A man who made Rs. 2.20 lakhs last year paid total taxes amounting to Rs. 1.79 or Rs. 1.80 lakhs. That is, he kept Rs. 40,000 out of his total earnings of Rs. 2.20 lakhs. And the new rates are not going to make very much difference to a man who is bled like this. He will not be allowed to form capital. Therefore, so far as the individual taxation proposals are concerned, I see no hope for believing that these are going to help investment or formation of capital.

I come now to corporate taxation. There is a Surtax in place of the Super Profits Tax. I do not understand—and I hope the Finance Minister will enlighten us in his reply—why he has not told us what was the realisation from the super profits tax last year? Again, why has he not told us what the proceeds of the Surtax are going to be next year? I notice that he has lumped them all together under an omnibus clause. This is the first time this unfortunate practice has been followed. Up to now we used to know what each

separate tax yielded, and I hope the Finance Minister will have no objection, while giving his reply, to let us know the actual accrual of the Super Profits Tax in these twelve months and the expected accrual under Surtax in the next twelve months. I think it is a perfectly fair request. The House has always had it all these years and we are entitled to this information.

The principle of a graduated tax on corporate profits is a bad principle, because the smallest shareholder and the biggest shareholder pay the same amount. If a company makes a big profit, the man who owns a Rs. 100 share pays the same tax as one owning Rs. 1 lakh investment. This is wrong. Graduation should not be on the company's profit, it should be on the man's own income.

There is no case made out for this tax. A super profits tax or surtax only becomes relevant when the companies in the country are making excessive profits. Is that the Finance Minister's understanding of the picture of the last twelve months? Is it not true that the Reserve Bank of India in its own survey only a few weeks ago has admitted that company profits have dropped and are at a very low level in India today? If that is so, is this the time for levying a surtax at all?

It is true that the incidence of the surtax is lower than that of the super profits tax and the handful of companies that were hard hit by the super profits tax will no doubt be let off more lightly. But the benefit of this for a small number is more than offset by the Dividend Tax which I consider the most pernicious part of this Budget. This is a dividend tax of 7½ per cent on all dividends. This is very unprecedented. In previous Finance Bills before this House, the dividend tax has been

levied on all dividends over 6 per cent or some base which is considered reasonable. For the first time, all dividends are to be taxed at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Is this considered fair or reasonable, that a company that announces a dividend of one per cent, or half per cent or two per cent, should also pay a dividend of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on that one per cent or half per cent or two per cent? Is not a reasonable dividend a part of the very operation of investment and business? Then why are dividend being penalised? Is it suggested that paying dividend is something wrong?

The Finance Minister in his speech has given an argument. He says: "These selected lists of industries, whose tax is being reduced by 5 per cent from 50 to 45 per cent, they should not be allowed to distribute this extra relief we are giving. So in order to make them plough back, I am putting on the Dividend Tax'. But the Finance Minister knows that for every one company in this selected list of industries, to which I shall refer presently, there are 99 companies which will not have this benefit which he is giving. Why is he penalising industries outside the selected list? I can understand Dividend Tax being put on that selected list. Do that. Modify it even now, if you want to be fair. But why are all the other companies, who neither have any relief under the surtax given to them nor any relief under the selected list of industries, being penalised now? A tax of this nature is immoral and bad. It discourages the formation of equity capital. It will force companies to go into the market and borrow instead of issuing shares and thereby creating a property-owning democracy which we all want.

There is another evil, the threat to remove the Development Rebate within three years. It is true it is a Democles' sword hanging over industries. I would like to suggest to the Finance Minister that if he wants industries to develop let him make up his mind as to how he is going

to exercise his discretion. Let him make a statement in the next few weeks or month saying very clearly that such and such industries will get the Development Rebate and such and such industries won't. Otherwise, all of them will stop, paralysed into fear that this rebate is going to be taken away after three years.

I come now to my conclusion about corporate taxation. My conclusion is this. I would like the hon. Minister to correct me; but I am absolutely clear in my mind about what I am saying. The effect of the substitution of the Super Profits Tax by the surtax will probably be to reduce the burden of taxation on a very limited number of companies, but the benefit would be more than countervailed when you take the imposition of a $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent Dividend Tax on the private sector as a whole. The effect of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent Dividend Tax would be to raise the level of corporate taxation from 50 per cent, which it is today, to an average of over 53 per cent.

I have got these figures worked out. According to the dividend you declare, your incidence of dividend tax varies. It varies from about 2 per cent to 3.75 per cent. Taking an average dividend of 4 per cent, you get an average incidence of Dividend Tax at 3 per cent. So companies which were paying 50 per cent so far, the large majority, will now pay a corporate tax of 53 per cent on an average. In the selected list of industries, the benefit of the reduction from 50 to 45 per cent will be neutralised partially by the imposition of the Dividend Tax and the net rate of taxation would be 45 plus 3 equal to 48 per cent against the present 50 per cent. Thus the large majority of companies will have less to distribute or less to plough back. The picture becomes worse when we take into account the threat to take away the Development Rebate.

In fact, the House does not have to accept my statement. The cat was let out of the bag yesterday

[Shri M. R. Masani]

when a spokesman of the Finance Ministry himself admitted that as a result of this Budget, the corporate sector would have to pay Rs. 11 crores more. This is a very funny way of trying to revive an animal that is dying for lack of food or sustenance. You put a little more burden on it and say that should revive it.

Compare this with what is happening in the United States or Japan today. In Japan, about the same time as this, tax relief is being given of 200 billion yen, and in the United States the relief that is being given to industry and incometax payers is of the order of 11.5 billion dollars. Corporate taxes are being reduced from 52 to 48 per cent, and in the case of smaller profits from 30 to 22 per cent. This is what you call a real incentive, a real boost, something that can revive it. Compared to this the present attempt, I am afraid, is going to fail.

The Finance Minister will say that selected industries are let off. That is true. Selective industries will pay 45 per cent in place of 50 per cent, and by the time they pay the dividend tax, they will come down from 50 to 48 per cent. A small enough concession, but it is a concession. Which are these industries? Steel, copper, aluminium, iron ore, coal mining, machinery and machine parts, cement, fertilisers, paper, tractors, equipment for generating electricity, tea, coffee and rubber. I have nothing against these industries. I wish them well, as I wish all other industries, but why should they be selected out of the whole gamut of production in this country? Who decided that these are more important than twenty other industries which may be equally important? They are important, all industries are important to the country. They give the people the wherewithal of life, they give the consumer what he needs. Why are these selected? Who decides it? This is a command economy at work. The real priority

is to be given by the consumer. In a free society the consumer is king. He decides what he wants before something else. Here, quite arbitrarily some benefit is conferred on some ten industries taken at random, which in Government's opinion, may be more important, but which, many of us may feel, are just as important as many other industries. I feel that this discrimination is objectionable. There should be an equal measure of justice and taxation for all industries and for all enterprise. Let the people decide by the market mechanism, by consumer preference and demand, which industries they want to reward. Therefore, while I do not grudge these industries the little concession given to them, I think that this arbitrary discrimination is unjustified.

All these industries are capital-intensive as the hon. Minister himself mentioned. Are we sure that capital-intensive industries are what the country needs first? Is it not true that unemployment is one of our biggest problems, that we want to put idle hands to productive work? I would have thought, following Gandhi's own thinking, that capital-intensive industries can take care of themselves, it is the labour-intensive industries that we want to help in this country first. Yet, a tax preference is given to the very industries which employ the least number of people, where the most capital is eaten up and the least number of people are put to work. I do feel that this is an objectionable principle.

There is one incidental change to which I refer before I leave this topic. It has been said that rules will be framed by which the decision as to what is essential expenditure for business purposes will be left to the income-tax officer. This is a very undesirable thought. Surely, the man who invests his own capital knows what he should spend for his business and what is necessary. An effort was made in the

Subject Committee on the Income-tax Amendment Bill in 1961. That effort failed. The good sense of this House prevented the then Finance Minister from putting in a clause to this effect, that the income-tax officer can sit in judgement on a business concern, deciding what expenditure is necessary. Now, by the back door, this is sought to be brought back. I think this is an entirely undesirable thing, and one that can be strongly objected to.

The conclusion to which I come is that neither of the two incentives to investment—a dividend or return on capital, and appreciation of capital—is anywhere rewarded in this Budget. The dividend is punished by the Dividend Tax; capital appreciation is punished by the Capital Gains Tax. I consider that this Budget fails completely in its purpose, the alleged purpose, the professed purpose, of giving a boost to saving and investment.

Why has the Finance Minister failed to follow through in Part B of his speech the sound thinking of Part A? I have been puzzling over this. I do not know. I can only make a guess. My guess is that, having thought clearly up to a point with the intelligence which undoubtedly is his, the Finance Minister then got intimidated by the thought of political pressures and political vilification.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Let him say that I had a black-out.

Shri M. R. Masani: He was no doubt worried about the criticism that would come from the Communist part of the House, but he should have known that it would come anyhow. Perhaps he was worried about the displeasure of his chief, the Prime Minister, I do not know.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am sorry, I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend. I am prepared to take whatever stones or other weapons that he is going to hurl at my head. Why bring in my chief at all? I think it is completely unwarranted.

2290 (Ai) L.S.D.—6.

Shri Ranga: Anyhow, it is the Government's Budget.

Shri M. R. Masani: I was trying to be fair, and not attribute any motives to the Finance Minister. I did not allege that he was trying to hurt, I was not going to allege that this was a mischievous or malicious set of measures. I am trying to point out that there is a contradiction between the sound principles of Part A and the very unfortunate proposals in Part B.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member can say this, that the Finance Minister had a black-out. I do not mind taking it. Other people will judge.

Shri M. R. Masani: I see in this contradiction the conflict that is going on in the ruling party between the dead hand of the past of Marxist principles and dogmas represented by the Prime Minister and the newer thinking that we are watching with some encouragement.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have again to tell him that the reference to the Prime Minister and his Marxist principles is completely wrong, and I suggest the hon. Member had better confine his remarks to the chief culprit, that is myself.

Shri Ranga: Are we to understand that the Prime Minister is not responsible? It cannot be his sole responsibility. The Government is responsible for the Budget. He is only one of the instruments of the Government.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is all right. Speak about the Government.

Shri M. R. Masani: I have a right to my own views. The Budget is the Budget of the Government. I have a right to consider the various pressures in the Government and to speculate on why the actual proposals do not follow through logically from the statement, and I do feel this that Finance Ministers may come and go, but so long as the dead hand of Marxism represented by the Prime

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Minister lies on the ruling party, nothing will change..... (*Interruptions*).

Now I come to another factor, foreign capital. As I said, I welcome the awareness of the need for capital. The reliefs given are good, but I do feel that they are very inadequate for the purpose which the hon. Minister has in view.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): May I interrupt the hon. Member? He has been unfair to the hon. Prime Minister, because the hon. Prime Minister has repeatedly said on the floor of the House that Marxism is out of date.

Shri M. R. Masani: I do not think that in this case this particular hon. Member has to announce again his loyalty to the Prime Minister, of which he has given many demonstrations in this House in the past.

What I was saying was that so far as foreign capital is concerned, I welcome the concession made, but any one who has read this very interesting study of foreign investment and tax reforms by the National Council of Applied Economic Research will realise how inadequate this is. India, in all these tables, is a country which is the least attractive of all the under-developed countries or even the developed countries for the investment of foreign capital. It is true the hon. Minister has done something in the right direction, I welcome it, I think he has moved in the right way, but I think he also probably must realise that we have a long way to go before we create conditions where we can really have equity capital on a large scale coming into this country. I feel, therefore, that while these concessions are worth while, we have not gone far enough in the right direction.

In this connection, I hope the Finance Minister will not mind my saying that in the interview that he gave to the *Economist*, he was not being very fair when he suggested that the biggest enemy to foreign

capital coming to India was not the Government or the politician, but the vested interests which did not want it. If there are any vested interests in India which do not want foreign capital, let us ignore them. They have not been in charge all these years. The same Government that is there today has been in power, and surely we all realise that the blame for not creating conditions which would facilitate foreign capital coming into India is entirely that of the Government which has been in office now for over fifteen years. Therefore, let the real culprit not point a finger at somebody else and try to find a scapegoat.

Now, Sir, I come to concentration of power and monopoly. As one who believes in the fullest competition, may I say that I am delighted at the proposal of the Finance Minister to appoint a commission of enquiry into monopoly and concentration? I think it is a very good thing. It is good for two reasons: One, because if there is any monopoly, it should be stopped, and I would welcome the bringing in of a genuine honest-to-God anti-monopoly legislation of the kind that exists in the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany. Therefore, I welcome it. Secondly, I welcome it because I think this commission of enquiry will be highly educative. (*Interruptions*). I am very much against monopoly. We believe in competitive free enterprise. We believe in the philosophy of Prof. Erhard, Chancellor of West Germany, in prosperity through competition, and anything that comes in the way of competition is bad. I welcome this Commission also for a second reason. I think it will be highly educative. There is a lot of hot air being let loose about monopoly and concentration of power. Let it come out in the open. Let evidence be led before the commission both by those who believe that there is monopoly and concentration and by those who say there is not. Let the facts be put on record and come out in the

open. I think it is, highly instructive in a democracy, which we all welcome.

But I have two reservations. One is that the terms of enquiry of the commission should be broad enough to include all monopoly, monopoly by private enterprise and monopoly by Government. Let not the S.T.C. and the L.I.C. be excluded from the scope of enquiry of the commission. Because monopoly works in the same way, and monopoly is anti-social, whoever practices it. Profiteering is bad whether it is done by one party or by another. (*Interruption*). There should be no monopoly; there should be competition between State enterprise and others, as everywhere else.

Secondly, let the composition of the commission of enquiry not be loaded. Let us not have professors who have gone on record in full support of the politics and economics of Communist China, as Prof. Mahalanobis has done. Let us have people with a somewhat more open mind.

On this point of concentration and control the hon. Minister said that ownership is diffused, it is true, but there is control. Who has the control today? What can those who are at the head of banks and companies do? Let me just mention that under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, a company is not entitled to hire a director without the permission of the Government. Having hired him, the company cannot either dismiss or pay the salary of the director without Government's permission. Any company with a capital investment of more than Rs. 25 lakhs cannot come into existence without the permission of the Government. Having come into existence, it cannot make any product other than one approved by Government. Then, again, this product cannot be sold at a price other than that approved by Government. No capital can be raised without the permission of Government. No machinery can be imported without the permission of Government and foreign exchange given by it. And raw

materials from abroad cannot be obtained except at the mercy of Government.

Who has control in this country? Only the people in Delhi who exercise this power. It is not an accident that we find the planes full of senior business executives, who ought to be devoting their time to creating wealth and production for the country, phasing minor officials around the corridors of the Secretariat, trying to get files moving. This humiliating and sickening situation shows who the real control is in this country.

A great deal has been said about the private sector. The private sector is not just one sector; there are lots and lots of kinds of people in the private sector. As in this House, or anywhere else there are good people, there are people who are indifferent, and there are people who are not so good.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): You are sure that there are good ones?

Shri M. R. Masani: Human beings being what they are, in every gathering you find people with different standards of behaviour. And it is no good lumping them all together and describing them as if there is one image. There are different images of entrepreneurs in this country. There is a small minority of enlightened practitioners of free enterprise. Many of them are our friends, and we are proud of them. We are proud of their friendship, because their hands are clean; they pay their taxes; they give us a good product; they are proficient; they bring down the cost of production; they take the country forward. It is six or seven years since I was associated with the House of Tatas. But I was very proud when a few weeks ago I read a statement made by Tata Chemicals, a company with which I happened to be associated as far back as 1941 or 1942. And what was it? On the 16th of December 1963 it was announced by the Minister in Parliament that the selling-price control was to be removed over

[Shri M. R. Masani]

a range of products, and among the products were soda ash and caustic soda, both of which are heavy chemicals playing an important role in our industrial development and both of which are in short supply. This permission to raise the prices was given. I was very proud that on the 17th of January this old company with which I had been associated in the distant past made a public statement announcing that in spite of this permission they would raise neither the price of caustic soda nor that of soda ash. Here, Sir, is an example of the private sector performing its obligations to the country and not just trying to grab a little profit because Government has given permission to them to do so.

An hon. Member: All are not Tatas.

Shri M. R. Masani: All are not Tatas. I am saying so. We are proud of our friends. But can people on the Treasury Benches say that they are also proud of their business friends? (Interruptions). Contrast this, Sir, with the attitude of the State Trading Corporation, a part of the nationalised sector, nationalised industry.

Shri Daji: The treasury bench is divided!

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: And I fall between two stools!

Shri M. R. Masani: Consider the case of the S.T.C. The S.T.C. imports caustic soda, which as I said, is in short supply. It imports caustic soda at the rate of Rs. 470 per ton. And would the House like to know at what price it sells it? It sells caustic soda to the public at a price of Rs. 760 per ton. (An hon. Member: Shame). Here is a profiteer, if you want it; here is an anti-social element, under the control of this Government.

Shri Tyagi: It is not profit but tax.

Shri M. R. Masani: It is profiteering.

The same is the case with cement also. This S.T.C. does not even distribute the cement. But, like a parasite, it levies a tax on the distribution

of cement which is of a very high order. In the very first year of the operation cement the S.T.C. made a profit of Rs. 5.49 crores.

Another point with regard to this S.T.C. is that it also makes exorbitant profits in cars. They corner all the cars brought in by diplomats at cut prices and sell them at a fabulous profit to those who want a posh car, although they make a distinction in favour of officials who belong to the new ruling class along with the politicians in office.

It is thus no good just lumping all businessmen together and talking of the 'private sector'. There is an honest private sector, and there is one that is not honest. And we know who these people are. As I said earlier, I for one am proud of my connections and of my friends in the private sector. I wonder if this Government and its members can claim the same pride in the friendship of their business friends. We all know the kind of people who surround those in office, people who in England are called "Spivs", people in this country who live on the quick rupee made by permits, licences and quotas which they get in return for favours granted, the people who make quick profits, the "compradore capitalists" as the Marxists call them—for whom I have nothing to say. Unfortunately it is that class of capitalists—and we saw the alignment between Mr. Malaviya and Mr. Serajuddin; this is the symbolism of the association between the ruling party and its members and the corrupt class of businessmen—this is the class which is going to benefit from this budget. The honest men will be mulcted and the others will get away because they are not the people who conform to any law.

Therefore, Sir, I come to my conclusion. In so far as the impact on growth and prices and balance of payments is concerned, I am afraid it is not going to be helpful in regard to any of these three. This budget is not going to help industrial

growth. And as for agricultural growth, it has no relevance at all. There is nothing in this budget, Sir, that can give a hand up to the agriculturist from whom we expect and require greater production. It is untouched. I do not say that the budget could do everything about it; the other policies of Government, the wrong methods of planning, the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution and so many other things get into it. But certainly this budget does nothing to mitigate that situation.

In regard to inflation, I am afraid it will continue and intensify because of the failure to stimulate production and the lop-sided pattern of capital-intensive industry which is still favoured as against labour-intensive industry. The hon. the Minister made a very good speech in Bombay, addressing the Conference of Agricultural Economists. He hinted that the beginning of the Fourth Plan would be the time for consolidating our gains. May I suggest that the time is here and now? We do not have to wait for the beginning of the Fourth Plan to do something good. Let the Minister, following his own principles and premises, put a stop to this huge expenditure of an unproductive kind that is going on—Rs. 191 crores of additional civil expenditure. Let him stop all new projects except those on which a quick and a big return is guaranteed. Let him try and get more out of the money we have already invested in these rather wasteful projects. It is only then that inflation can be stopped. Otherwise, I am afraid that by encouraging money being kept out from account, by encouraging unaccounted money, in its implications this Budget is going to encourage conspicuous consumption and will raise prices still further.

Finally, I mentioned in an earlier speech also, Gandhiji's test and I recall the phrase: the poorest and the weakest man whom we should remember and protect. "Is what you contemplate going to be of any use to him?"—I ask hon. Members to think

about this. I ask them to tell us; if they can, in what way this Budget will bring comfort or cheer to the poorest and weakest members of our community. This man—the poorest and weakest man—I consider the Forgotten Man of this whole Budget.

Shri Khadiolkar (Khed): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, just before me the spokesman of the corporate sector and the high priest of free enterprise in this House has spoken his mind regarding the financial proposals. Before him the spokesman of the Communist Party had his say. He complained that the Budget did not indicate progress in certain directions which would bring us nearer the socialist goal. During the last one year the Communist Party, I am glad, has lived and learnt; instead of strikes they have come to petitions and now to the method of fasting, so long considered by them ridiculous, to ventilate certain grievances. So, to that extent I feel that the Communist Party has kept an open mind and is prepared, along with the world communist movement, to learn certain democratic practices that are now emerging.

This year's Budget is perhaps the most cleverly presented statement and intricately woven with a philosophy in the first part of the Budget which, unfortunately for the Finance Minister, Mr. Masani characterised as 'sound'. Whether it is sound or unsound or contrary to the policies adopted by this House, needs to be examined on this occasion. The Finance Minister is a flamboyant intellectual sitting on the Treasury Benches, very clever and subtle in mind. He as well as the Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission are making certain statements during the last six months or so, the philosophy of which is interwoven in the first part of the Budget. What is that policy and is it in keeping with the policy that this House has adopted, and that has recently been enunciated and placed before the country, which aims at building socialist society in a democratic way?

[Shri Khadilkar]

Before attempting to analyse that, let us see what is the credit side of the Budget in brief. The budgetary proposals would not have an inflationary impact on the economy as such; that is a good thing at the present juncture. Some marginal relief is offered no doubt to the lower and middle-income group in the country. So far as it goes, it is some relief, though not substantial. A serious effort is made to rationalise the present tax structure—I think it is a good and right step because our tax structure is so complicated that sometimes certain men of legal profession help people to avoid or evade taxation. Certain measures are proposed here which will curb tax evasion to some extent, such as the removal of the secrecy clause and the power to search to unearth hidden wealth. Unaccounted or black money has thrown a serious challenge to the stability of our economy and I will come to that later.

14:47 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI *in the Chair*]

The steep scales of estate duty would shrink inherited wealth though it may not affect the dynastic control of the economy of established business houses in the country. He has made a distinction between control, ownership and management. Inherited wealth perhaps may shrink but the control of the economy by the dynastic houses well established is not likely to shrink by this measure. Lastly, the reintroduction of Expenditure Tax would perhaps strengthen the method of curbing ostentatious living and conspicuous consumption. This is the credit side.

There is the other aspect which is very difficult because it is intricately woven in his propositions which are placed before this House in the first part of his speech and I will now turn to that part because I feel that Budget is an economic instrument to mould the life and to reach the social objective. How far has that instrument been used for this pur-

pose? That is the main question. We should see whether certain policies are violated or a certain twist is given to the whole economic line that we pursued, our Industrial Policy Resolution, to the Plan and to the Bhubaneswar statement. I am not going to quote them but it is essential to refresh our memory. People see the taxation proposals and say they are not much; there is a little relief here; something is said about the monopolies. Then they keep quiet. This is dangerous. People who have passed certain resolutions at Bhubaneswar represent certain growing convictions in the minds of the people as to why we have come to socialism. If we want to sustain our democratic structure, the social base must be widened and people's urges must find a place there. If it fails to contain people's urges, the democratic structure will come down shattering and ultimately the social objective will be thrown aside; people represented by Masani and others will take control of our economy and the life of the people. That is a great danger. What have they said in the Second and Third Plans? I shall quote only one sentence from the Plan. It says:

"The basic criteria for determining the lines of advances must not be private profit....."

for which, just now, in the name of incentives, our friend Shri Masani pleaded—

"but social gains and that the pattern of development and the structure of socio-economic relations should be so planned that they result not only in appreciable increases in the national income and employment, but also in greater equality in income and wealth."

This is the definition which this House has adopted when we adopted the Third Plan. What we said at Bhubaneswar—I do not consider whatever Shri Ranga and company might feel—was this; the Bhubaneswar resolution was a

national objective, whatever we have decided upon; we might perhaps be halting; our steps might not be as firm and well-determined, but one thing is certain: the resolution represents the national will for social advance. We are going to build the emerging society, by throwing aside the dead weight of the past from our shoulders. That is the resolve that we have made at Bhubaneswar. What did we say in the Bhubaneswar resolution?

“...the public sector has to play a strategic and predominant role in the field of trade and industry. The public sector must grow progressively in large-scale industry and trade, particularly in the field of heavy and basic industry as well as trade in essential commodities.”

While elaborating the thesis of democratic socialism, the new President of the Indian National Congress.....

Shri Krishnapal Singh (Jalesar): Madam, on a point of order. Are we bound by any of these resolutions which have been passed at a party meeting? We are only concerned with the Government policy. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Khadilkar: The party runs the Government, and the Government is representing the people. You represent a minority section in the country. (*Interruption*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): What we represent is about 70 per cent.; and they represent only 30 per cent.

Shri Khadilkar: This mathematics does not carry us far.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should kindly address the Chair.

Shri Khadilkar: The President of the Congress, Shri Kamaraj, who comes from the masses and has deep roots in the soil, has explained his objectives in the following manner. That should be borne in mind by this House when I say the first part of

the speech is counter to policies that we have adopted. What did he say? He said:

“The question today before Congressmen is not whether socialism is good or right for the country, but whether the legislative and executive measures in this country are in furtherance of the socialist goal that the people have set before themselves.”

So, the point is whether it is implemented, whether it is reflected in Government policies. The socialist objective has been adopted. I do not consider that those who adopted and raised their hands and shouted slogans—I feel—were just doing it hypocritically, without having faith in it. I presume they have passed this resolution with full faith and with full confidence.

I will read just one more remark, that has been made by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri at Bhubaneswar in his speech. Shri Shastri, in his Bhubaneswar Speech, had promised that a watch would be kept over the activities of the Central and State Governments to ensure that progress towards a socialist State was being maintained.

So, we are the watchdogs. If the spirit of Bhubaneswar is not maintained, we must point out what is the drawback. If it is maintained, certainly we will congratulate the Finance Minister. This is our position here, and from that angle I will have to say something about the first part of his speech.

As I said earlier, the budget is an economic instrument. How that instrument is being used has to be considered. Is it in keeping with this policy, and are the utterances of the Finance Minister in keeping with this policy? I would like to quote one or two things here. The *Economist* of London, dated 25th January, 1964 said:

“But Finance Minister Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari gave a fairly

[Shri Khadilkar]

clear indication of his mind when he said earlier in a policy speech that past hesitations about foreign investment in "vital areas" were no longer justified because the public sector had established its 'vigilant presence' in most of them."

Then there is another statement which, of course, is made in rather a sarcastic way, but this House must take note of it. It is from the Capital, the leading financial weekly from Calcutta, and it had something to say about the Kamaraj plan and in what directions things are going. It has observed thus:

"There has been a speculative rise in share prices since the return of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari as the Central Finance Minister. Whatever one may say about the Kamaraj Plan, the stock market has been greatly benefited since the Cabinet reorganisation following the implementation of the Plan has installed Mr. Krishnamachari as the Central Finance Minister."

One more short quotation, and I shall finish with the quotations.

"Shri T. T. Krishnamachari said in a Press Conference at Madras on 22nd October that 'foreign collaboration in a way meant foreign domination.' He justified it on the plea that our technological knowhow were still poor."

I have given these quotations with one objective. As I said, the question is, in what directions the policy is being twisted. According to my understadnig, the policy is being twisted in two directions. Firstly, leaving aside the industrial policy resolution, we have opened our doors to foreign equity capital. I am not against foreign aid or capital as such, because

all countries including the Soviet Union at a certain stage have got to take technical and financial help from foreign imperialist countries. I am not ashamed of that, but in what form it should come in our economy? According to the proposals, foreign equity capital is going to strengthen the corporate sector in this country. On the one side, we want to control monopoly, but today, monopoly control becomes impossible; our economic policies are thwarted every time, because the corporate sector has the whip-hand of the situation, and there is another factor in this; there is another twist in this. If you read the speech very carefully, you will find that the public sector is to become sub-servient to the private sector. Panditji has said time and again, and the resolution has also said that the expansion of the public sector is to become the socialist sector. Just now, I said that State trading has made profits, but these profits do not go into the pockets of Tatas or Birlas. They are profits which ultimately go back to the community and that is perfectly permissible. No society can make advance in capital formation without such profits. So, we need not be deterred by his criticism. But, if the public sector is to be subservient, Panditji has said that it must reach a commanding height of the economy, and it must expand. In the mixed economic pattern that we have adopted, the public sector is supposed to help, and the question is, how to build up the national economy with the friendly help in certain sectors of the economy, by the private sector. These two things are dangerous. Why are they dangerous? We in this country remember that in old times, the rich princely families and some other people who wanted to imitate the rulers used to keep nannies to teach them how to use the spoon and fork and to teach them good manners; that was considered a civilised thing. She was a technician then to educate our people. The same hangover of psy-

chological dependence in this country still exists. When we are opening the floodgates to foreign capital and equity capital and that too in certain respects majority capital even in the consumption industries, I think that the psychological dependence on the west, a hangover of the past British rule, is still persisting in our economic policies. That is the only explanation. Therefore, in the *Economic Survey* it has been pointed out—I have no quarrel with the foreign aid. That must come and if we utilise it for public purposes, it is certainly good. But we must find out whether the local indigenous resources have been completely mobilised and optimum utilisation of them has been achieved. That is one pre-condition.

The second question is, if we look at the foreign capital, it is the enemy if the control is vested with the private sector ultimately making the public sector subservient. I will give you two instances of our growing dependence. In the *Economic Survey* it is said that last year we imported Rs. 60 crores worth of cotton and Rs. 10 crores worth of yarn. Over and above this, I learn that even to teach us how to have mass communication, some technician has been invited by our All India Radio. What does it indicate? Does it indicate an effort on our part to pick up the techniques and rely on our own people? Or, does this atmosphere which ultimately results in demoralisation and lack of confidence to continue? That is the question before the nation. There is this twist in the first part of the speech, opening the flood-gates of foreign capital, equity capital, making public sector subservient and giving greater latitude for corporate sector. Of course, I know productivity is important and we must have more production. The productive machinery must be geared to that end. But at the same time, that sector will become dominant. This House must take a very serious note of this complex in the budget and the thinking behind it and pass a verdict whether it accepts it or not or whether it is

contrary to the policies that we have so far placed before this House. That is one question which I want to address to this House.

Coming to public sector undertakings, he has stated in his speech, and rightly, that many of our public sector projects are lagging behind the schedule of their construction and what is more disappointing is that their contribution to our resources is nowhere near the planned estimates. This is a disquieting feature, because we should not hide the faults and shortcomings of our public undertakings. Recently a study was undertaken by the Indian Institute of public administration and one professor has published a study as to why there is a certain stagnation and certain draw-backs in the public sector. He has pointed out that we have not changed the outlook of the management. They look at it as a sort of occupation; they are not socialist-oriented. After making a long survey, the gentleman has come to the conclusion that public sector executives are searching for an opportunity for bettering their lots in the private sector. So long as this policy continues, I do not think public sector can show better performance.

Regarding public sector, the Finance Minister has rightly pointed out that profitability must be there. Even Mr. Khrushchev recently said it. If you want to make significant advance, we must make that distinction between profits that go to the private coffers and the profitability of the public sector. Its efficiency and profitability must be guaranteed. We must look into that aspect. In that respect, the Finance Minister is right in whatever he has stated about the profitability of the public sector. I have no time to explain it further.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Khadilkar: The spokesman of the private sector got more than 45 minutes. I am a spokesman of the socialist sector and I must be given some more time.

Mr. Chairman: He may conclude in 2 minutes.

Shri Khadilkar: The setting up of the monopoly commission is good. But to my mind, it is extremely difficult by legislation to curb monopoly. The first step that is essential to check monopoly is the check on the corporate sector. In this connection, I would like to enlighten the House with a small quotation from an American Professor, who recently visited this country and made some interesting observations. Prof. Louis B. Schwartz of the Pennsylvania University, while speaking on the 24th February under the auspices of the Indian Law Institute, expressed surprise that India did not have any law to curb monopolies and "financial empires". Somebody has used the similar-expression "corporate empire managed by financial magnates in this country." Then it was criticised. This expression "financial empires" has been now used by the American Professor. He also said that the country also lacked legal power to control prices effectively. I am coming to the price problem shortly, but he has further warned that we must guard against oil monopolies. American politics is more or less being controlled by oil monopolists in that country.

I will just touch the question of prices. I must say frankly that in this country there is a certain congenital allergy to controls, particularly price controls, as we have observed in the last 17 years. Planned economy is meaningless if the State has no control over the price-level. It disturbs the common man; it irritates him because he cannot apply purposefully his energies for building up this nation. British economists have suggested a remedy which I would like to pass on to the Finance Minister, because he has courage, as he has shown courage in some respects regarding inherited wealth and other matters. The British economist has suggested that in a developing economy, first care should be

taken to build up a small sector of wherewithals of the common man, which is completely insulated from price fluctuations. Unless you create such a sector in our economy, there is no hope. In our economy, common man's living standards have been eroded by speculators in this country. Prices if not controlled will be controlled by free market economy. It leads ultimately to speculation. Rigid control of the wherewithals of life is the demand of the common man. Unless you translate it in your policy, I do not think you are doing justice to the Bhubaneswar resolution. Otherwise, it will remain on paper and the ordinary people will feel more and more frustrated.

I come to black money or unaccounted money. This is a serious problem. As a member of the Corruption Committee, I am not disclosing all the things . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Anti-corruption Committee, not Corruption Committee.

Shri Khadilkar: I am sorry. As a member of the Anti-corruption Committee set up by the Home Ministry, we had occasion to examine some business associations in Calcutta and Bombay. There are various estimates. Some say Rs. 1,000 crores; some say Rs. 3,000 crores. We do not know what are estimates. But this unaccounted money is ruining our economy, throwing a challenge to our economy like mercury uncontrolled. Therefore, if certain immediate steps are not taken all the fiscal discipline and monetary discipline will have no effect on our economic life. In the western countries some radical steps were taken. I do not propose steps of a confiscatory nature. The existence of unaccounted money has been proved recently. When there was a scare that hundred rupee notes were likely to be demonetized the Reserve Bank had to issue a statement. That shows the existence of this unaccounted or black money. You can mop them up by declaring

that on such and such day all these notes will have to be changed and new notes taken up. This is all that was done in Germany, and they mopped up all unaccounted money. Ultimately they have got to bring them to account. Do not confiscate them, but give them an opportunity to account for its possession. It does not matter if you do that, but let them be brought to books. If this measure is taken . . .

Mr. Chairman: I should like to remind the hon. Member that he has already taken 30 minutes.

Shri Khadilkar: Madam, I will finish with one sentence. With these observations, I would like this House to give a serious thought to the policy implications that are involved in the budget and to the financial propositions or the taxation proposals. In the end I say, let this House contribute to the emergence of a society in which development will supplant stagnation, in which growth will take the place of decay and in which culture will put an end to barbarism, as the noblest and indeed the only true function of an intellectual endeavour. I think the Finance Minister will direct his intellect in this way.

Mr. Chairman: Shri U. M. Trivedi— I would request hon. Members to cooperate with me and take only the time allotted.

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): Madam Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Is it going to be the system now that hon. Members will take as much time as they like?

Mr. Chairman: That is why I requested the hon. Members to cooperate with me.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Madam Chairman, my first impression about this budget, after the speech was delivered, from the language in which it was delivered, was that this budget did not hit the common man, that the common man will not have any cause

for complaint so far as this budget was concerned. But after reading the gloss published in the papers over the measures that have been newly propounded, I find that the Finance Bill is not as simple as it was made to look by the hon. Finance Minister.

On the one hand it says that it gives a sort of relief in that the compulsory deposit scheme goes, and on the other gloss has been added that the compulsory deposit scheme shall continue to work and that the deposits will have to be made which will not be returned for another five years. What type of relief has been granted by this taking away of compulsory deposit scheme passes my comprehension.

Madam, it is true that our expenditure on defence has increased and it should go on increasing also. This time it has shown to be a little less than what was estimated last year. But one is surprised to find how these figures get mutilated in the course of transmission from year to year. I will invite the hon. Minister's attention to the Demand for Grants relating to 1963-64. On page 1 of this the amount mentioned for budget estimates for defence is Rs. 756 crores. I do not know how this amount of Rs. 756 crores becomes only Rs. 728 crores when we look at the budget estimates that are presented for 1964-65. How is there such a big gap? How does it escape the notice of the Finance Department is a very mysterious thing? Is it that the figures have no value or is it that any figure can be put down as we like?

Sometimes it so happens that most of us are not in a position to study the budget with the care with which we would like to study it. Every time we are faced with this difficulty that on the last date of February the budget is presented and within sixty days of the presentation it must be ready for being passed as otherwise the provisional assessment or taxation which can be carried out by virtue of the Act of 1931 cannot be done. Either

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

the Act must be amended or some other method of allowing the Members to study the budget must be provided. We cannot study it. It is impossible to study the 34 books that have been supplied. Even if you apply your mind for days and nights together you are not able to study the whole of the budget. Thus, many things which could be brought to the notice of the hon. Minister escape the notice of hon. Members of this House and the net result is that we know nothing about the actual figures of the budget. That is so far as the budget is concerned.

Now I come to this proposition, which has been repeated over and over again. I am not an economist, not a student of economics also. I am an ordinary man in the street.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Layman.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): An able lawyer.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am a lawyer. That is true.

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Not a man in the street, but a man in the court.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am a layman. What else am I? I am a common man elected by the common people. I am here on the basis of being elected by the common people. As a lawyer it is my duty to analyse and probe into the things that appear to me to be unjust to the country.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Not probe, but plead also.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: After finding out the mistakes therein, it is my duty to place them before the House.

I was studying this morning the fine table that has been given of the investments made by us. We are talking of public sector, we are talking of private sector, we are talking of taxation from the private persons, we are talk-

ing of sucking the blood of the capitalists and all sorts of things. But do we not realise that by investing the huge amount of money belonging to us, belonging to the nation, we are sucking the very blood of the whole nation by investing it in such a manner that you cannot get any benefit out of it? The result of investing Rs. 2,700 crores has been that you are getting a net return of only 2 per cent. In another instance we find that the net result of investing in 38 undertakings, where we have invested Rs. 992 crores, is that the return to us is 0.25 naye paise per Rs. 100 per year. In one year the return is 25 nP. What is this? Whose money is it? It is the money of the public that you have invested and wasted. You have not made a proper use of this money. Then you talk in terms of socialism. I cannot understand it. If socialism means that you distribute all that you earn to all, all and sundry, well and good. We shall also take a share in it. But if it means that the Government corners all the money, puts it into the coffers of some people and does not allow any return to the country at large then there is no difference between a capitalist who exploits his labour and sucks the blood of his labour and you, who utilise the money of the public by putting it into the coffers of big men and then do not realise any money out of it; thereby, you are sucking the blood of the nation.

When I was at it, I went a little deeper into it and what did I find? Everyone wants to lend money to us. Perhaps they might be thinking that we are big bankers and that is why people are running to us to deposit their money, their surplus money. Not so. We have begged from them. We have taken loans from them, and what for? To carry on the programmes thought of and worked out by Professor Mahalanobis. I do not know who that gentleman is, but it is he who has processed it. He allows things to proceed in a particular manner, with a particular ideology and with a par-

ticular philosophy. Things are poured into the gutter with no result.

When we look at the list of countries that have given us loans we find that so many countries have lent us money, though some of them look poorer than us. We have taken loans from the United States, Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Switzerland, a small country, Czechoslovakia, another small country, Yugoslavia, Poland, Austria, Netherlands, France, Denmark, Belgium, Federation of Rhodesia and New Zealand and even from the small principality of Kuwait. Are we not ashamed that we are borrowing money from them? Why should we go on borrowing money like this and then utilize it in such a way that we do not derive any benefit out of it? It is high time that this fact must be looked into, and looked into properly.

I shall just refer to some of these public undertakings. Look at the Delhi Milk Scheme and the Kolar Gold Mines. Though they are called gold mines, they cost us yearly Rs. 3.13 crores, a waste. They do not pay us though they are called gold mines. People think they are gold mines.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: There is not much gold there.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Then do not work them. Do not spend money unnecessarily.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: What about the 20,000 people employed there?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: They can be employed elsewhere. Build a railway line for Rs. 3 crores and 20,000 people could easily be employed. If you use your imagination, there is not much difficulty about it.

When we look at the various departments of this Government, how are they working? Have we satisfied our employees? Have we satisfied the class 3 and class 4 employees that are under us? Is their faith in socialism as good as we think it is? Compare

their conditions of service with that of the mill workers of Ahmedabad. I was just reading a report about the dearness allowance that is paid to the mill labourers in Ahmedabad. It is Rs. 102.93 in the month of January and Rs. 96 and odd in the month of February. Do we pay the same dearness allowance to our class 3 and class 4 employees who are getting the same salary? If the prices of commodities have gone up, if the cost of living index has gone up and if we compel the capitalists, whom we abuse in season and out of season, to pay Rs. 102 as dearness allowance, what is it that prevents Government from paying the same amount of dearness allowance to its own employees?

How can any Government employee maintain himself? Is it not that we are driving him to dishonesty? Is it not that we are driving him to corruption? Six labourers, Class IV employees, working in Ahmedabad can earn about Rs. 800 a month but a middle-class man, a Government servant, getting a salary of Rs. 200, has to maintain six persons and his income remains stationary at Rs. 200. I consider it as a huge joke when you pay Rs. 2 or Rs. 5 as dearness allowance which goes away by the sudden shooting up of prices. We have never applied our mind to it.

The whole Government of India has got tentacles spread all over India. Naturally, they ought to. I do not grudge it. It is most essential. I am one of those who think in terms of a unitary form of government and do not want to waste money by the present form of government. But, however, we will wait for that day and till it comes what happens? Thousands and thousands of employees are there in the Government of India who are not confirmed, who are not made permanent, who are still kept hanging and are work-charged with the net result that the ordinary benefits that they must derive are kept away from them.

We have a small opium factory in my place. It is the biggest opium

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

factory in India which gives you a very great amount of foreign exchange.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: That also is in the public sector.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am just telling you that I have got a list of all the employees in this public sector concern who are there since 1935 and whom you would not confirm and allow the pension that is their due. If you like, I will pass it on to you. From 1935 Shri Nathu Lal, Shri Devi Lal and so on and so forth, all these employees have been kept on hanging. Some were confirmed only in 1959. From 1935 to 1959 is a long period to keep a man on a temporary basis and deprive him of the benefits which he is entitled to. Why? What is the reason? Why has your attention not been drawn to these things? I fail to understand this. It is the same fate in the Customs Department.

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): Are we responsible for the omissions of the past Government?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The Government is always responsible for the omissions of Government, not Shri Jyotishi. This Government has not opened its eyes to these facts and just talks in big terms of socialism and doing socialistic acts.

Look at the fate of the Posts and Telegraphs Department people. The Railway people are allowed the concession of travelling about. Certain other amenities are provided to them. In most cases houses are allotted to them. But what happens to the poor. In most cases houses are allotted to Postal employee? What is his position? Even in small towns out of a salary of about Rs. 120 he has to pay a rent of Rs. 25 or Rs. 30. The Government is not able to provide any accommodation for him. Why are we so callous about our own employees? It passes my comprehension. Last time also I brought it to the notice

of the hon. Minister and said that something in this direction must be done; but nothing seems to have been done up-to-date to ameliorate the poor conditions of the employees of Government. It is high time we did it.

Then, I ask the hon. Minister to have a look at the Home Ministry. Enormous expenditure of money is being incurred. There is no check upon it. Huge expenditure under the name of the Home Ministry goes on. There is a Central Reserve Police. It is also headquartered in the town to which I belong. What do we find? A man who is recruited directly to the Central Reserve Police and loses all chance of having service elsewhere gets bogged down. Then somebody else, a young boy without any knowledge of working, is recruited through direct recruitment over his head. Because he happens to be in the good books of somebody he comes in over the head of those who have got experience of 10, 15 or 20 years in the Central Reserve Police. Houses are built for C.R.P. which keep on leaking. Bungalows are built which keep on leaking. Money is paid and contractors are satisfied. Money goes into the pockets of the overseers and engineers. It is anybody's guess how much money is wasted over such things. Huge expenditure is incurred for the maintenance and supply of cloth to these people. It is a huge joke going about in my town that a tailor who became a tailormaster, getting a salary of Rs. 60, was able to build two big palatial buildings in his native place just by short-supplying the cloth that was supplied to him. No inquiry was made because many big guns, that is, big officers and not politicians, were involved in it.

An Hon. Member: Name them.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is no use my naming officers because they are not here to challenge my statement. It is this thing which brings me to the other picture and with that picture I will end my speech.

We had in the former days a ministry known as the Minorities Ministry. Slowly but surely that ministry has disappeared. It is no longer in existence. What has been the fate? We have very recently discussed this whole question of East Bengal. When we could rush to the United Nations on the question of Kashmir, I do not see any reason why we could not run to the United Nations on this question of atrocities committed upon the minorities in East Bengal. Our publicity has miserably failed, the money that we spend over foreign publicity is entirely a waste and is not made use of in any manner and the net result is that we are made to look wrong. Where we are in the right we have been made to look in the wrong. Thousands of people have been killed and we are not even able to give the correct figures.

I have got here many cuttings and was just looking at one report which says that one Father Novak, a U.S. citizen and Professor of Dacca Notre Dame College, was killed. Why? Because he wanted to save a Hindu girl who was being raped. This was not even brought to the notice of the United Nations when we went on discussing this thing. What for do we spend money for the United Nations? What for do we spend money for publicity which is of no help to us? If Pakistan can cry for the liberation of Kashmir, could we not cry for the liberation of East Bengal? Why not East Bengal be liberated from these monsters of people? I do not talk of minorities or anything. Even the Muslims who have met me have been telling me that they are being terrorised like anything. The poor Bengali Muslim does not want to remain under the control, as a colony, of West Pakistan. Have we raised our voice? What for have we been spending money?

I will close with one sentence. It is a shame that this Budget has not disclosed any audacious measure by virtue of which this nation can progress to the end that we all have in

view, namely, the greatness of our country. It has miserably failed in this.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Raghunath Singh. I will request hon. Members to take only 20 minutes each.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : सम्भाषित महोदय हमारे श्री द्विवेदी ने अपने भाषण के अन्तिम चरण में पूर्वी बंगाल के विषय में कुछ शब्द कहे। मैंने हम बजट को देखा, इसके मेमोरेण्डम को देखा। यह बजट २६ फरवरी को इस सदन में उपस्थित किया गया। लेकिन कलकत्ता में रायटस शुरू हुए ७ जनवरी को जिसकी प्रतिक्रिया स्वरूप पूर्वी बंगाल में रायटस हुए। उस समय से आज तक ताता बधा हुआ है लोगों के आने का। जब यह बजट इस सदन में पेश किया गया उस समय तक १ लाख ४० हजार रिफ्यूजी ईस्ट बंगाल से हिन्दुस्तान में आ चुके थे। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस बजट में उन १ लाख ४० हजार रिफ्यूजियों के वास्ते क्यों कुछ नहीं कहा गया। उनके वास्ते कहां से रफूया आयेगा। उनके लिये हिन्दुस्तान में क्या प्रबन्ध होगा इसके विषय में यह बजट बिल्कुल शान्त है, और यह बात कुछ ठीक नहीं मालूम होती। अभी थोड़े दिन पहले नन्दा जी ने आंकड़े दिये थे कि २५ हजार लोग असम में आये। कल श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन ने कहा था कि ५२ हजार आये, और मैं कहता हूँ कि ७५ हजार लोग असम में आये हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप ने दोनों को जोड़ लिया।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : दोनों को जोड़ नहीं दिया है। जिस समय से रायट शुरू हुए उस समय से असम में ७५ हजार, त्रिपुरा में ३५ हजार और पश्चिमी बंगाल में ३० हजार, इस प्रकार से कुल १ लाख ४० हजार आदमी एक महीने के अन्दर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से भारत-वर्ष की भूमि पर आये हैं। इसके अलावा १ लाख २० हजार लोगों ने, जिनको हम माइग्रेटिड कह सकते हैं ईस्ट पाकिस्तान

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

को, आवेदन पत्र दिये हैं कि वे हिन्दुस्तान में आना चाहते हैं। इस प्रकार आप देखेंगे कि अगर कानूनी बात को लें तो एक महीने में या दो महीने के अन्दर २ लाख ६० हजार आदमी हिन्दुस्तान में आने के लिये तैयार हैं। हमें अफसोस है कि इन २ लाख ६० हजार आदमियों के विषय में इस बजट में कुछ नहीं कहा गया। दंडकारण्य स्कीम के बारे में, जिसको आप इस बजट के पेज १६ पर देखेंगे, पहले जितनी धन राशि थी करीब करीब उतनी ही अब भी रखी गई है। यह बात भी कुछ ठीक नहीं है।

15.37 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

मैं आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ इस तरह कि अगर आज पाकिस्तान के ६३ लाख हिन्दू हिन्दुस्तान में आ जाते हैं तो आप का यह बजट चलने वाला नहीं है, आप की एकानमी चलने वाली नहीं है, आप की प्लेन चलने वाली नहीं है। आखिरकार मानवता के नाते, मनुष्य होने के नाते, भारतीय होने के नाते, नेहरू लियाकत पैंट के नाते और हिन्दुस्तान के पार्टिशन के समय हम ने जो कुछ कहा है उस के आधार पर यह हमारा फर्ज हो जाता है कि जो हिन्दू पाकिस्तान से यहां आने वाले हैं हम उनका प्रबन्ध करें।

श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी (सागर) : जिस प्रकार से वहां क्रिश्चियन्स परेशान किये जाते हैं वह भी तो आप बतलाइये।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : ज्योतिषी जी ने कहा कि मुसलमानों को परेशान किया जाता है।

श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी : मुसलमान ही नहीं क्रिश्चियन्स।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : क्रिश्चियन्स की बात को आप छोड़ दीजिये। उसको तो सभी

जानते हैं। कुछ भाई कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में माइनारिटीज के ऊपर बड़ा अत्याचार होता है। मैं आप को आंगड़े देता हूँ। कुल ३ लाख मुसलमान लोग हिन्दुस्तान से पाकिस्तान में गये और ६ लाख मुसलमान ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से हिन्दुस्तान में आये। तब अत्यचार कहां है। अत्याचार ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में है या अत्याचार हिन्दुस्तान में है। जब ३ लाख आदमी भारतवर्ष को छोड़ कर पाकिस्तान में जाते हैं और ६ लाख आदमी पाकिस्तान से यहां आते हैं तो यह इस बात का प्रमाण है कि कम से कम उन को इस बात का सन्तान है कि हिन्दुस्तान में उन के जान माल की रक्षा होगी। वे लोग यहां सुरक्षित होंगे।

आप देखिये कि वेस्ट पाकिस्तान से ४७ लाख ४० हजार आदमी आये और ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से ४१ लाख ५७ हजार आदमी आये। इस प्रकार हम लोगों ने सन १९४७ से लेकर जनवरी १९६३ तक ८८ लाख ६७ हजार रिफ्यूजियों का आवादा किया। यह ८८ लाख का फिगर है। और जो ६३ लाख आज पाकिस्तान में माइनारिटी के लोग हैं उनकी तरफ आप देखिए। जो लोग सन १९४७ के पश्चात् आए अभी हम उनको पूरा आवास नहीं दे सके हैं। अगर यह ६३ लाख की आबादी और हिन्दुस्तान में आ जायगी तो क्या अवस्था होगी वह आप समझ सकते हैं।

सन् १९४६ तक कुल ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से १६ लाख आदमी वेस्ट बंगाल में आए और चार लाख असम में आए, अर्थात् सन् १९४६ तक ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से बीस लाख आदमी हिन्दुस्तान में आए। सन् १९४६ से सन् १९५६ तक ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से बीस लाख आदमी और आए। इस प्रकार चालीस लाख आदमी आए। लेकिन सन् १९५६ से लेकर सन् १९६३ तक डेढ़ लाख आदमी ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से हिन्दुस्तान में आए, अर्थात् आठ वर्ष में

केवल डेढ़ लाख आदमी वहां से आए, लेकिन इधर एक महीने के अन्दर एक लाख चालीस हजार आदमी आए। आप समझें कि इसके पीछे पाकिस्तान की क्या पालिसी है। शायद आपने यह फिगर नहीं देखा है।

वैस्ट पाकिस्तान और ईस्ट पाकिस्तान की आबादी में केवल बीस लाख का फर्क है। पाकिस्तान में डिमाक्रेसी क्यों नहीं एस्टेबलिश की जाती। कारण यह है कि पाकिस्तान के बनाने वाले देखते हैं कि अगर डिमाक्रेसी कायम की गयी तो जैसा १९५३ में ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में हुआ, कि मुस्लिम लीग को फेंक दिया गया और दूसरे लीग एडल्ट फ्रेंचाइज की वजह से इलेक्शन में आ गए, वही फिर हो सकता है। वैस्ट पाकिस्तान वालों को डर है कि अगर एडल्ट फ्रेंचाइज के आधार पर पाकिस्तान में इलेक्शन किया गया तो ईस्ट पाकिस्तान वैस्ट पाकिस्तान के ऊपर शासन करेगा। तो क्या करना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान के एक बड़े नेता हैं उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट दिया इस स्टेटमेंट में उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी पालिसी यह होनी चाहिए :

“Kill, convert or compel the minority to quite the country”.

उनकी यह पालिसी इस वास्ते है कि जब तक यह माइनारिटी पाकिस्तान से बाहर नहीं जाती तब तक उनका शासन ईस्ट पाकिस्तान और वैस्ट पाकिस्तान के ऊपर ठीक से नहीं जम सकता। इसलिए उन्होंने सोचा कि और कोई रास्ता नहीं है। जो मुसलमान ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में हैं, वे तो वहां रहेंगे ही। कांनसी एंभी चीज है, कौनसा ऐसा तरीका है जिससे कि ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में माइनारिटी को माइनारिटी में बदल दिया जाए। उसका तरीका यह है कि ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में जो ९३ लाख की माइनारिटी है उसको हटा दिया जाए, ताकि वैस्ट पाकिस्तान का ईस्ट पाकिस्तान के ऊपर शासन चल सके।

इस वास्ते मैं मन्त्रतापूर्वक निवेदन करना

इहता हूं कि यह सवाल कांग्रेस का नहीं है, 2290 (A1) LSD—7.

यह सवाल विरोधी पार्टियों का नहीं है, यह सवाल संसद् का नहीं है, यह सवाल सारे हिन्दुस्तान का है। बल्कि यह सवाल केवल हिन्दुस्तान का ही नहीं है, यह सवाल सारी मानवता का है, सारे विश्व का है।

मैं पाकिस्तान के लोगों से कहना चाहता हूं कि हिटलर ने भी यही सोचा था। उसने सोचा था कि ज्यूज को हम नहीं रहने देंगे। गाठ लाख ज्यूज मार डाले गए, लेकिन हिटलर का क्या हुआ? हिटलर का आज पता नहीं है। नाजी लोगों का पता नहीं है। आखिर कार जो बेचारे ईसाई ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से भाग कर आए हैं, जो बौद्ध भाग कर आ रहे हैं, जो हिन्दू भाग कर आ रहे हैं, उनका क्या दोष है। उनका यही अपराध है कि वे किसी हिन्दू या ईसाई या बौद्ध के घर पैदा हो गए और उनको अपने धर्म से प्रेम है। इसी वास्ते उनके ऊपर अत्याचार किया जाता है। यह बात मानवता के विरुद्ध है, और मैं संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से और हयूमन चार्टर डाफ्ट करने वालों से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह ह्यूमैन चार्टर किस दिन के वास्ते है, यू० एन० ओ० किस दिन के वास्ते हैं?

अगर कहीं छोटी सी बात हो जाती है, अगर कहीं कांगों में कोई बात हो जाती है, तो उसमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ इंटरफियर करता है। काश्मीर का मामला रोज चलता है। लेकिन यह जो ९३ लाख से अधिक लोगों की माइनारिटी पाकिस्तान में है और जिस पर अत्याचार हो रहा है, उनके वास्ते आज दुनिया में कोई राष्ट्र ऐसा नहीं है जो आवाज उठा सके। यह सबसे बड़े शर्म की बात है। अगर यू० एन० ओ० समझती है कि उसमें जनता का विश्वास हो, ह्यूमैनिटी का विश्वास हो, अगर ह्यूमैन चार्टर के फ्रेम करने वाले यह सोचते हैं कि उस चार्टर में लोगों का विश्वास हो, तो उन्हें आज खुल कर सामने आना चाहिए और कहना चाहिए कि दुनिया की ह्यूमैनिटी एक

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

दुनिया के मनुष्य एक हैं, हम सब एक हैं। अगर कहीं भी मनुष्यों के ऊपर अत्याचार होता है तो उनकी रक्षा करना हमारा कर्तव्य है।

मैं बहुत नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम भी कामनवैलथ में हैं, पाकिस्तान भी कामनवैलथ में है और इंग्लैंड को कामनवैलथ का हैड कहा जाता है...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is the budget discussion.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Therefore, I am referring to it. There is not a single word about these 93 lakhs of people who intend to come to India; not a single word is there, and not a penny is there for them.

Shri Kapur Singh: Therefore, the budget is bad.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: So, the budget is bad.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह मैं कहता हूँ कि कामनवैलथ में हिन्दुस्तान है, कामनवैलथ में पाकिस्तान है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कामनवैलथ में रहने से हमको क्या फायदा है। आज कामनवैलथ के लोगों का यह कर्तव्य था कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दोनों के नेताओं को बुला कर कहते कि जो यह अत्याचार हो रहा है उसको बन्द होना चाहिए। आस्ट्रेलिया, कनाडा और जितने कामनवैलथ के देश हैं आज कान में तेल डाल कर बैठे हुए हैं। हम शोर करते हैं और चिल्लाते हैं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय शान्ति, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग। इससे काम चलने वाला नहीं है। भारतीय जनता कुछ ठोस चीज चाहती है। भारतीय जनता चाहती है कि यह जो मनुष्यों पर अत्याचार हो रहा है यह बन्द होना चाहिए।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। अगर ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में हिन्दुओं पर अत्याचार है तो हम उसका बदला हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं लेना चाहते। हम धर्मनिरपेक्ष राज्य में

विश्वास करते हैं। हमें किसी मुसलमान के ऊपर हाथ नहीं उठाना है। हमने उनकी जिम्मेदारी ली है। वे हमारे भाई हैं। हम नहीं खाएंगे लेकिन उनको खिलायेंगे, हम मरेंगे लेकिन उनको बचाएंगे। इस दृढ़ता से भारतीय जनता को अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभानी है।

आप पूछेंगे कि क्या इस तरह आप इस समस्या का हल कर सकते हैं। मेरा कहना है कि इसका हल सिर्फ यह है। पाकिस्तान में एक करोड़ ४० लाख हिन्दू थे। उसमें से करोड़ ५७ लाख हिन्दुस्तान चले आए। हिन्दुओं की आवादी ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में ४२ परसेंट थी। चटगांव के पहाड़ी एरिया में हिन्दुओं की आवादी ६० परसेंट थी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां हिन्दुओं की रक्षा तभी हो सकती है जब पाकिस्तान में उनको अलग स्थान दिया जाए कि हिन्दू इस स्थान पर रहे। और हमको डिमाण्ड करना चाहिए कि हिन्दुओं के रहने के वास्ते पाकिस्तान में स्थान मिले, और अगर पाकिस्तान में स्थान नहीं मिलता तो वहां हिन्दुओं की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती।

अन्त में मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। लोगों ने इस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया है। जलपाईगुडी और कूच बिहार में कुछ एनक्लेव हैं। ये पाकिस्तान के हैं और हिन्दुस्तान के भी हैं। १२१ एनक्लेव हिन्दुस्तान के हैं और केवल ७६ एनक्लेव पाकिस्तान के यानी मुसलमानों के हैं। कहा जाता है कि इन १२१ एनक्लेव पर हिन्दुस्तान का शासन है, लेकिन इनमें आप जा नहीं सकते अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक हैं। सन् १९६१ में उनका सेंसस करने की भी आपकी हिम्मत नहीं हुई। जब वे एनक्लेव हिन्दुस्तान के माने जाते हैं तो क्या कारण है कि उनकी सेंसस भी नहीं ली गयी। कारण यह है कि आप वहां जा नहीं सकते। और जो मुसलमानों के एनक्लेव हैं वहां पाकिस्तान का शासन है। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह राष्ट्र के स्वाभिमान का

प्रश्न है। जो १२१ एनक्लेव विभाजन के समय हमारे पास आए उनकी रक्षा का प्रबन्ध करना हमारी सरकार का दायित्व है। हमको उनकी सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। अगर शासन ऐसा नहीं करता तो हमारा शासन कैसा है। आज हालत यह है कि कोई आकर हमको चपत लगा कर चला जाता है। कोई भी हमारी बात नहीं सुनता। हमको यह ढिलाई त्यागनी होगी, हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना होगा। अगर हमारी सरकार के लिए इन एनक्लेव का प्रबन्ध करना कठिन है तो इन को पाकिस्तान को दे दे और पाकिस्तान के एनक्लेव खुद ले ले ताकि वहाँ के लोग तो आ जा सकें। आज हालत यह है कि इन १२१ एनक्लेवस के लोग हिन्दुस्तान नहीं आ सकते, अपने रिश्तेदारों के पास नहीं जा सकते क्योंकि उनके चारों तरफ पाकिस्तानियों की आबादी है। अपने रिश्तेदारों के यहाँ नहीं आ जा सकते और अगर हिन्दुस्तान में आ गये तो हम उनको रैफ्यूजीज ट्रीट नहीं करते। अजोब अवस्था है? नागरिक हिन्दुस्तान के हैं मंगस उनका नहीं होता। हमारा उनके ऊपर कोई शासन नहीं फिर भी वह हमारे अंग समझे जाते हैं अतएव मैं बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ यह प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी इस माइनारिटी की समस्या तभी हल हो सकती है जबकि पाकिस्तान में डमाक्रेसी कायम हो और ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में डमाक्रेसी कायम हो। जिस दिन माइनारिटी को वोट देने का अधिकार हासिल होगा जिस दिन माइनारिटी को शासन में अधिकार हासिल होगा उस दिन वहाँ की समस्या हल हो सकती है नहीं तो कोई भी समस्या वहाँ की हल करने में हम असमर्थ रहेंगे।

दूसरा एक और उपाय यह है कि पाकिस्तान में यह जो ६३ लाख माइनारिटी के लोग हैं इनके वास्ते पाकिस्तान में अलग स्थान दिया जाय। दो डिस्ट्रिक्ट, तीन डिस्ट्रिक्ट उनको एलाट किये जायें ताकि वह लोग वहाँ पर जायें और आबाद रहें।

श्री याज्ञिक (अहमदाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो नीति बजट में अंकित हुई है उसका मैं समर्थन नहीं कर सकता हूँ। बजट में हांशियारी बहुत देखी जाती है और ऊपर से कई लोगों ने यह भी मोचा है कि हाउस में कोई लाल धब्बा है, स्पॉट है मगर मुझे बहुत शर्म के साथ और आपर्ति के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि बजट पक्का पूंजीवादी बजट है।

हम भूतपूर्व अर्थ मंत्री के बजट को देखें तो हम को मालूम होता है कि उसमें करीबन २४५ करोड़ रुपये के नये कर लगाए गए थे, ११६ करोड़ की नयी ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी लगायी गई थी। कई चीजों पर यह ड्यूटी लगायी गयी थी। जनता के जीवन निर्वाह की जो जरूरी चीजें हैं जैसे कि किरोसिन आयल, डीजल, टुबैको, सिग्रेट, चाय, काफी और मॉटे सूत आदि पर यह ड्यूटी लगाई गयी थी। इन के अलावा और भी कई चीजों पर यह ड्यूटी लगायी गयी थी। इस से आज तो साफ दिखाई पड़ता है कि फरवरी मस १९६३ से आज तक होलसेल जो प्राइस है उसमें ८ फीसदी बढ़ोतरी हो गयी है। जब यह बजट हमारे सामने आया था तो हमने साफ कहा था, कई लोगों ने कहा था कि यह आप लोगों की जरूरी चीजों पर कर लगाते हैं। उनके भाव का बढ़ना अनिवार्य हो गया मगर हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी ने कहना नहीं माना। हम आज के अर्थ मंत्री जी को साफ कहते हैं कि एक साल जो यह कर की वसूली हुई है इस दरमियान ८ फीसदी तो उसके हिसाब से होलसेल प्राइस में बढ़ोतरी हुई और हमारे हिसाब से जो रिटेल प्राइस है उसमें भी कुछ और बढ़ोतरी हुई है। सारे हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत असन्तोष और रोष फैला है। कामदारों ने और जनता ने अपना रोष बहुत तरीके से प्रदर्शित किया है। आज हम इस नए बजट को देखते हैं तो इस बजट के आने के पहले हमने सोचा था कि हमारे अर्थ मंत्री सब चीज से वाकिफ हैं। वे जानते हैं कि यह जो इनडाइरेक्ट टैक्सों के बढ़े हैं उन से लोग

[श्री याज्ञिक]

रिलीफ चाहते हैं। उस के पास से कोई आश्वासन चाहते हैं कि गए साल में १०० करोड़ से ज्यादा यह जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी बढ़ गयी तो उसमें से २५ या ५० करोड़ कर कम होगा। मगर हम क्या देखते हैं? अनिवार्य बचत योजना रद्द होगी। यमुना नदी में उसको बहा दिया गया। यह कमनसीबी की ही बात है कि उसकी दूसरी योजना, सोनाबंदी की, वह हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी की अलमारी में पड़ी है। मैं उनसे बिनती करूंगा कि यह सोनाबंदी योजना का जो शव आप की अलमारी में सड़ रहा है उस को निकाल कर यमुना नदी में डुबो दीजिए।

जो पुरानी एक्साइज ड्यूटी थी वह सब कायम रखी जा रही है। कुछ छोटी सी तबदीली अवश्य की है जैसे कि ग्रामोफोन रेकार्ड के सम्बन्ध में, तो उस से ग्राम जनता से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। हाथ साबुन में कुछ राहत दी है लेकिन सोडा ऐश पर कर बढ़ा दिया है तो उस से कुछ ज्यादा फायदा नहीं होता है। हम तो यह देख कर शर्मिन्दा होते हैं कि यह जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी थी उस में और भी २५ करोड़ की बढ़ाहत्तरी हो गयी। हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जानते हैं कि कर की बढ़ाहत्तरी होती है तो भाव की भी वढ़ाहत्तरी होती है। गए साल का जो कर कायम है उसमें भी वढ़ाहत्तरी की गयी है। उस का क्या नतीजा होगा वह हम साफ देख सकते हैं। मुझे याद आता है कि सन १९६२ के चुनाव के मौके पर हमारे अर्थ मंत्री ने मद्रास में कोई एक व्याख्यान दिया था। उस में बारबार उन्होंने यह कहा था कि ग्राम जनता की जो जरूरी चीजें हैं उन पर कर नहीं लगाना चाहिये। डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेशन का जो आयकर है वह ज्यादा बढ़ा दिया जाय और उस की वसूली तेजी से की जाय। यह हमारे जो आज के अर्थ मंत्री हैं उन्होंने बार बार कहा था। हम सोचते थे कि उस में कुछ फायदा होगा लेकिन फायदा कुछ नहीं हुआ और जो सीधा

कर, डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज हैं उसमें भी क्या तबदीली हुई यह हम देखते हैं। तो भी हमारे दिल में बहुत रज पैदा होता है।

कारपोरेशन टैक्स में सिर्फ ११ करोड़ रुपये की बढ़ाहत्तरी हुई है। व्यक्तिगत जो कर है उस में तो कोई ज्यादा बढ़ाहत्तरी नहीं की है, कोई छोटी मोटी तबदीली ही की है। बड़ी चीज उन्होंने कुछ शुरू की तो एस्टेट ड्यूटी में की। उस में उन्होंने ३ करोड़ बढ़ाया है मगर हम चाहते थे कि जो सम्पत्ति कर है जिसको कि वैल्यू टैक्स कहते हैं उसमें कुछ ज्यादा टैक्स लगाने का मौक़ा रखते। मगर हम देखते हैं कि वह जो आधे फीसदी से ढाई फीसदी तक पहुंचा है। उस से हम को इस साल १० करोड़ रुपया मिला है और नए साल में उस से २० लाख रुपये की ज्यादा आमदनी होगी। मैं पूछता हूं कि हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में जो सम्पत्ति साल-पर-साल बढ़ती रहती है, क्या हम उस पर कुछ ज्यादा कर नहीं लगा सकते हैं। हम ने उस पर आधे फीसदी से ढाई फीसदी तक ही क्यों कर लगाया? ज्यादा क्यों नहीं लगाया? जब हम जनता पर और जनता के उपयोग की जरूरी चीजों पर इतना भारी कर लगाते हैं—जब हम केरोसीन आयल पर बीस सौ और तीस सौ फीसदी तक कर लगाते हैं—, तो फिर सम्पत्ति कर में बढ़ाहत्तरी क्यों नहीं की जाती है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है।

हमारे कई दांस्तों ने भुवनेश्वर की बात कही है। मैंने देखा है कि सन्त विनोबा जी ने कहा था कि जो भ. करना है, वह जल्दी करो—अगर समाजवाद के रास्ते पर आगे बढ़ना है और पूंज.वाद पर कुछ अंकुश रखना है, तो यह काम तेज से करो और अगर यह काम तेजी से नहीं किया, दो तीन साल में इस बारे में कोई कदम नहीं उठाया, तो फिर आप को पश्चाताप करना पड़ेगा। मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि आज हमारे सामने क्रिटिकल कंडीशन है। आज हम पर इस

इस बात की जिम्मेदारी है कि हम देश की सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था करें और विकास के पथ पर आगे बढ़ें। इन दोनों कामों के लिये बहुत टैक्स लगाये जाते हैं।

प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो वैल्यू टैक्स है, क्या हम उस में आधे से ढाई फ्रीसदी तक ही जा सकते हैं? हम उस में पांच दस, पन्द्रह, बीस फ्रीसदी तक क्यों नहीं जा सकते? आज हमारे देश में पूँजीपतियों की जो सम्पत्ति है, वह तो पांच, दस, बीस, पचास फ्रीसदी के हिसाब से साल-पर-साल बढ़ता रहती है, क्या हम यह नहीं जानते हैं? जो कल एक मोटर रखता था, आज वह दो चार मोटरें रखता है। जो कल एक बंगला रखता था, आज वह दो चार बंगले रखता है। जो कल एक कारखाना रखता था, आज वह दो चार कारखाने रखता है। और यह सब बढ़ता ही रहता है। सरकार दस बीस फ्रीसदी कर लगा सकती है और भी पूँजीपतियों को सम्पत्ति साल-पर-साल बढ़ता रहेगा और आखिर में इस की वजह से उस में कोई ज्यादा फर्क नहीं होगा।

मगर मेरे दिल में इस बात का दर्द है कि हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी बातें तो बड़ी करते हैं, इक्वालिटि का बात करते हैं, आर्थिक असमानता को दूर करने की बात बड़े जोर से करते हैं, लेकिन आर्थिक असमानता का निवारण करने के लिये जो ठोस कदम उठाना चाहिये, उस को वह नहीं उठाते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि यही एक समस्या है, हमारे सामने यह एक बड़ा कूट प्रश्न है। हम को आगे चलना होगा, नहीं तो हम पछे हटेंगे।

गिफ्ट टैक्स को भी कोई ज्यादा नहीं बढ़ाया गया है। थोड़ा सा, सिर्फ दो कोटि, बढ़ाया गया है। डाइरेक्ट और इन-डायरेक्ट कर में इस साल जो फर्क रहा है, वह नए साल में भी रहा है। इनडाइरेक्ट टैक्सज २५ कोटि बढ़ाये गये हैं, जब कि डायरेक्ट टैक्सज सब मिला कर १५ कोटि ही बढ़ाये

गए हैं। इस से मेरा यह ख्याल पक्का हो जाता है कि इस साल में भी कोई आश्वासन मिलने वाला नहीं है और भावों में कोई कटाई होने वाली नहीं है। मैं तो यह सोचता हूँ कि अर्थ मंत्री जी ने देश के सामने जो बजट रखा है, उस से जीवन की जरूरत चीजों के दामों में और भी बढ़ोत्तरी हो जायगी और जनता का जीवन और कष्टमय हो जाएगा।

मंहगाई के बारे में बहुत सी बातें हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी ने कही हैं। मगर मंहगाई में कटौती किस तरह से हो, इस के बारे में उन्होंने कोई बात नहीं बताई है, कुछ सोचा नहीं है। कंट्रोल किया जाय या न किया जाय, यह अनग बात है, लेकिन उन को कोई रास्ता तो बताना चाहिये, जिस से मंहगाई कुछ कम हो सके। मंहगाई किस तरह से कम हो। वह कहते हैं कि काले धन के कारण बाजार में दाम बहुत बढ़ते हैं। क्या उन्होंने उस के बारे में कोई बन्दोबस्त किया है? हमारे भाई, थोड़ा खालिलकर, ने यह सुझाव रख दिया कि जो आज के नोट हैं, वे सब रद्द किए जायें। और नये नोट छपाए जायें। एक दिन मैंने भी यह सोचा था कि हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी बड़े हुशियार हैं और वह बजट में ऐसा कोई प्रबन्ध करेंगे, ऐसी कोई बात हमारे सामने पेश करेंगे। मगर मुझे अफसोस है कि ऐसा कोई ठोस कदम उठाया नहीं गया है। काला धन तो सारे हिन्दुस्तान में बढ़ता ही रहता है और इस से भावों में बढ़ोत्तरी होना है, स्पेकुलेशन होता है, सट्टेबाजी, हीतां है, जमाखोरी होती है, और इससे जनता को बहुत नुकसान होता है। लेकिन काले धन को पकड़ने के लिये, उस को रद्द करने के लिये कुछ इन्ताम नहीं किया जाता है, यह बड़ी शोचनीय बात है।

मंहगाई जो बढ़ती है, उस का असर जरूर सारी जनता पर पड़ता है। देहात के जो कोटि कोटि लोग हैं, किसान हैं, खेत-मजदूर हैं, गरीब हैं, कारीगर हैं, इन सब

[श्री याज्ञिक]

लोगों को बड़ी मुसीबत होती है। इस लिये यह बजट देख कर निराशा होती है।

सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिए सिर्फ एक लफ्ज हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी ने कहा है। उन्होंने १० कोटि रुपये का प्रबन्ध किया है। दो हजार कोटि का सरकार का यह बजट है और उस में सिर्फ १० कोटि वह रखती है अपने कर्मचारियों के लिए। सरकार जानती है कि महंगाई कितनी बढ़ी है, लेकिन फिर भी वह अपने कर्मचारियों के लिए सिर्फ दस कोटि रुपये रखती है। इस से केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के दिलों में, जो कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में सेवा करते हैं, बहुत रोष और रंज है और मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारी-वर्ग में इस कारण जरूर बहुत आन्दोलन होगा और सरकार को फिर इस बारे में सांचना पड़ेगा।

हिन्दुस्तान के अर्थ-तंत्र में जो सब से महत्वपूर्ण चीज है, हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जी ने उस का ज्यादा विस्मरण कर दिया है। उन्होंने औद्योगिक प्रगति के लिए इन्वेस्टमेंट, सम्पत्ति, की बात बताई, कंट्रोल की बात बताई और मैनजमेंट, व्यवस्था, की बात बताई। लेकिन उस का चौथा पैर है कामदार, कर्मचारी, और उस को वह भूल गए। रेलवे बजट में रेलवेज के कर्मचारियों के लिए कुछ इन्सेन्टिव दिया गया है। लेकिन अर्थ मंत्री जी ने केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के लिए कुछ भी इन्सेन्टिव नहीं दिया है।

जो कामदार सारे हिन्दुस्तान के छोटे-मोटे कारखानों में काम करते हैं, उन के लिए भी कोई प्रबन्ध नहीं किया गया है। अपने मालिकों के साथ उनकी लड़ाई हमेशा चलती रहती है। कोई मालिक देता है और कोई नहीं देता है और उस से असंतोष पैदा होता है, काम बन्द होता है, हड़ताल होती है। आज जब हमारे अर्थ मंत्री जो सारे हिन्दुस्तान की औद्योगिक प्रगति

के लिए इतनी चिन्ता करते हैं, तो क्या वह कामदारों के बारे में कुछ नहीं सोचेंगे? प्राविडेंट फंड, ग्रैटुइटी, हेल्थ इन्शोरेंस, आदि बहुत सीस्कीम्ज हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार कुछ ज्यादा रुपया उन के लिए क्यों नहीं दे सकती?

जब आप कामदारों से अपेक्षा करते हैं कि वे सहकार करें, औद्योगिक प्रगति को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए अपना पूरा सहकार दें, तो आपका यह भी फर्ज हो जाना है कि आप कामदारों की भलाई के कामों में काफी पैसा खर्च करें। तब कामदारों को यह संतोष होगा कि उनकी भी इस देश में कोई कीमत है, उनको भी आप पहचानते हैं, हमारे अर्थ मंत्री उनके महत्व को भी स्वीकार करते हैं और तब वे और तेजी से और जोश के साथ काम करेंगे।

आखिर में एक बात मैं कह देना चाहता हूं। जब हमारे अर्थ मंत्री ने इस्तीफा दिया था तो उन्होंने कहा था कि मानव भक्षी यानी मैनईटर उनके पीछे पड़ा है। आज क्या हालत है। जिस को उन्होंने मैन-ईटर कहा था उसी की तरफ उन्होंने लक्ष्य किया है, सारी बजट स्पीच में शुरू से लेकर आखिर तक उसकी ही चिन्ता उनके दिल में रही है, यही उनका लक्ष्य रहा है कि किसी तरह से उद्योगों में ज्यादा पैसा ये पूंजीपति लोग लगायें, इनकी तरफ से ही उद्योगों के लिए ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैसा मिल जाए। मैं अब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान के पूंजीपतियों की सहायता के लिए विदेशों के पूंजीपति भी आ रहे हैं और आप भी दोनों का सहकार अभी पसन्द करते हैं और उनके लिए आपने दरवाजा भी खुला कर दिया है, लेकिन आप समझ लीजिये कि आज देशी ही नहीं विदेशी भी मैन-ईटर हैं, ये भी इनके ग्गथ आ गए हैं और दोनों मिल कर ऐसी एक मुसीबत हिन्दुस्तान में

पैदा करेंगे कि सारे देश में असन्तोष की लहर दौड़ जाएगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कुछ इस तरह भी अर्थ मंत्री महादय ध्यान दें, इस पर भी सोचें। अगर उन्होंने नहीं सोचा तो फिर ऐसा आन्दोलन होगा कि हमारे अर्थ मंत्री तो क्या, यह सारी हुकूमत ही खतरे में पड़ जाएगी। इसलिए मैं बिनती करता हूँ कि इस पर गम्भीरता से वह विचार करें और इसका कुछ प्रबन्ध करें।

Shri T. Abdul Wahid (Vellore): I join the chorus of encomiums paid to our able Finance Minister for the most scientific, rational and at the same time socialistic Budget which he has presented to this House. The taxation policy which he has proposed has been welcomed by every section of the people of this country, and also of this House. The reliefs he has given to the lower income groups and trade and industry will have a great effect in the development of the industry of this country. The steps that the hon. Finance Minister has taken and presented will, at the same time, implement the policy of the Congress Party of achieving a socialistic pattern of society and breaking the concentration of wealth in a few hands, which are supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. His proposals regarding Estate Duty, Wealth Tax and Expenditure Tax will definitely break up concentration of economic power and wealth in the country.

There has been some criticism of his proposals encouraging development of industries and inviting foreign capital to this country, but we must know what the position of the country is at present. The country needs an immediate, vast, industrial development, and with our small resources and meagre foreign exchange, we cannot undertake this vast expansion. We therefore require foreign capital, so that they can bring their know-how and also foreign exchange which will be of much use to this country. The small reliefs that he has given to the

small industrialists will go a long way in the development of industry.

There has been criticism of the private sector, but private sector does not exist by itself, it is part of the public sector inasmuch as by our taxation laws, regulations, Companies Act and various measures we are having for strict control of the private sector. As the Finance Minister pointed out in his Budget speech, in the corporate sector, the major portion of the capital belongs to the LIC and the people. As such it is almost a public sector. The expansion of the public sector will be a slow process. In the meantime the development of the country cannot wait. The private sector is being controlled in every way while the country also benefits from the enterprise, initiative and knowledge of the private industrialists. If they create wealth in the country, that wealth is taken away by various taxes. The trade unions and all those things can take away all the benefits which they want for the labour class. In these circumstances, I do not think there is much of a distinction between the private sector and the public sector.

Regarding the payment of taxes, I have to make a small submission to the Finance Minister. The proposal is that provisional assessment of taxes should be paid within a month of the submission of the return. Sir, I think it will cause a great hardship to the business community, especially industrial units. The profits accrued in a year are all ploughed back in expanding the industries. If the tax assessed is to be taken out in one lump, it will retard the growth of the industry. This will greatly affect the industries manufacturing purely for exports. They expand their export commitments on the strength of their enlarged capital formed from out of the profits. Hence, I suggest that provisional assessments may be collected in twelve monthly instalments.

Coming to the economic development of the country, it is gratifying

[Shri T. Abdul Wahid]

to note that industrial production has gone up by ten per cent in 9 months of the year compared to 8.5 in 1962-63. The export performance of the country during 1963 which has shown an increase of over Rs. 100 crores over 1962 is also a matter of considerable satisfaction. I congratulate the hon. Ministers of Industries and Commerce for the excellent performance and I am sure under the dynamic leadership of the Minister of International Trade, we will be able to achieve greater results in 1964. One thing we have to watch is the unhealthy competition which threatens to grow from Pakistan due to their system of bonus for exports. This is enabling Pakistani exporters to quote considerably lower prices and undersell us in international markets. I am particularly anxious about our exports in tanned hides and skins. Already our tanners are undergoing considerable difficulties because of a slump in international markets. Now I have detailed knowledge that Pakistani exporter is under-selling us tanned goat and sheep skin. There is great danger to our export trade and Government should come with some kind of relief and incentive for the exports of tanned hides and skins.

In the international scene the daily worsening relationship between us and Pakistan is really a matter of greatest concern to every one in this country, especially to the Muslims of India. It is a matter of greatest concern to the Indian Muslims that Pakistan's attitude towards our country and specially her stand regarding Kashmir undermines the position of Muslims in this country. I do not mince matters. It may be that the country was partitioned on the basis of religion but was it a right thing? It was the result of sheer helplessness. I strongly hold that this was in the worst interests of the Muslims of united India. Hundred or more millions of Muslims with five Muslim provinces would have been a source of pride and strength to the whole community. Now, we are more

than 50 million left here with a new province, that is, Kashmir, in which the Muslims are in a majority. It is a matter of satisfaction or even strength to the Indian Muslims that they at least have a province where they are in a majority. What is the population of the Indian side of Jammu and Kashmir? It is 3.4 million, out of which 2.3 million are Muslims. In the rest of India there are over 50 million Muslims, Pakistan says that since the Kashmir valley has got 2.3 million Muslims in one place, it should go to them. I humbly ask the Muslim rulers of Pakistan and the people of Pakistan whether these 2.3 million Muslims are the only Muslims whom they care for. We who are more than 50 million, spread all over India,—are we not Muslims? (*Interruption*). I appeal to them to have consideration and sympathy for us. I appeal to the Pakistan Government and the Muslims of Pakistan to have consideration and sympathy for us. They should think seriously and deeply how they are weakening our position by their actions. If they persist, as they have all along been doing in their policy regarding Kashmir, it is quite clear that they want Kashmir not for the sake of giving protection to the Muslims of that State but to possess that State for their strategic purposes.

This is a simple, logical conclusion. If that is so,—as it is—I appeal to the great world powers to consider who should possess that valley. If Pakistan thinks that it is strategic to them . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Written speeches are not allowed.

Shri T. Abdul Wahid: I am only referring to the points which I have noted down. I appeal to the world powers to consider, to whom the Kashmir valley is more strategic: is it to Pakistan or to India?

The other day, the High Commissioner for Pakistan in the United

Kingdom, in a press interview, was saying that when Kashmir goes away to them, they will see to it that no enemy passes through Kashmir and invade India. My reply to the High Commissioner and the Government of Pakistan is, let Kashmir remain with us. We have got the greatest goodwill and sympathy for Pakistan. We have never had any idea of attacking Pakistan, and we will see that Pakistan is safeguarded by us. We will guard Pakistan and they can be sure and certain that India will never invade Pakistan. That is absolutely sure and certain.

I now proceed to refer to the Indian Muslims. There is a sense of frustration in the minds of the Indian Muslims; because of the action and attitude of Pakistan, they feel that they are being distrusted and suspected. It is because of Pakistan's aggression on the Hindus in East Pakistan that we Muslims in India are suffering. Pakistan should have consideration for the Indian Muslims. They should change their attitude not only towards us, not only towards Kashmir and India, but towards her minorities. They must see that the minorities in East Pakistan are fully safeguarded so that the Muslims in India will be safe and respected. I do not have the slightest doubt that the Hindus in India will ever retaliate. Just now, Shri Raghunath Singh has said that the Hindus in India will not retaliate because some mad people in Pakistan were harsh to their own minorities. But still, good treatment, human treatment of the minorities will have a great effect, will have a salutary effect, on the attitude of the Hindus towards the Muslims in India.

I appeal to the Pakistan Government and the people of Pakistan to be considerate to their minorities and to treat them in the way we are being treated in this country in a secular State, where we are enjoying the same status as the other people are enjoying here. But still, there is a feeling in the minds of the Muslims. I cannot hide it; it will be hypocritical on my

part to say that the Muslims are completely satisfied. They have a sense of frustration, but it is because they feel that the Hindus distrust them. I am a realist. I do not think that the distrust which the Hindus have got are justified. After partition, after all that has been happening in Kashmir, the Hindus naturally have developed some kind of suspicion and distrust of the Muslims in India. This is because of the attitude of the Pakistani Muslims and what happened in 1947 when the country was partitioned. But my submission to the Muslims in India is that they should be patient; things will change. This is only a passing phase and this distrust and suspicion will disappear. At the same time, I plead with the Hindus here and the Government to be more generous towards Muslims. I can assure you that Muslims are as patriotic as anybody in this country. I know it from my personal experience. I have talked to many Indian Muslims. They love their country as much as anybody else.

To me my country is dearest. I am an Indian first and an Indian to the last. I was born in this country and the place where I was born is dearest to me. For all the wealth of the world, I will never leave my hometown. My motherland where I was born and the soil that has brought me up is dearest to me. Every Indian Muslim loves this country very much. I know so many Muslims went to Pakistan, but they were disgusted with the treatment they got and they came back to India.

I know a big Muslim industrialist in Madras. He is also a good friend of our Finance Minister; I do not want to name him. I was astonished when he told me that not only should Kashmir remain with us, but even Pakistan should come back to us. It is a natural feeling. Anybody born in this country would like to remain in India. That is why I feel that it is the biggest crime which Pakistan is committing in driving away the Hindus of East Pakistan. The Hindus

[Shri T. Abdul Wahid]

of East Pakistan were born there and to them that land is dearest. So, to drive away the Hindus from there is the biggest crime against humanity which Pakistan is committing.

I appeal to the Hindus here not to have any kind of distrust or suspicion against the Indian Muslims. They are one with them in the love of their motherland. Take the fight that is going on between Malaysia and Indonesia. Both are Islamic countries. It is a political fight. So also, in the matter of Kashmir, it is a political fight. That does not mean we should support Pakistan. There are as many as 40 Islamic countries. Does it mean that we want to support every Islamic country? We were born in India and the soil which brought us up is dearest to us. We will serve this country and we will die in this country, which is dearest to us. Pakistan cannot change our views in this regard.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur)
Sir, while I welcome the speech and the budget proposals of my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, I would like to make a few observations. He has made a dynamic approach and very boldly framed the proposals this year. He did not have a short-term view in his mind while he prepared the proposals. He has taken a long-term view, i.e. the needs of the country not for the fourth and fifth year of the third Five Year Plan, but also the earlier part of the fourth Five Year Plan. The budget proposals reveal our Finance Minister to be a very practical man, who understands the psychology and the feelings of the people. I would like to congratulate him on some of the bold steps that he has taken this year, specially the removal of the much criticised compulsory deposit scheme. There may be some criticism that for five years this amount will not be refunded. But, all the same, after 1963-64 this scheme will be replaced by the annuity deposit scheme for which the limit is also

raised and it applies only for income earners above Rs. 15,000 per annum. It means he has taken into account only those people who after meeting their legitimate expenses would be in a position to put back some savings in this annuity deposit. He has also said that there will be a small rate of interest and that it could be paid in instalments over a period of ten years. This is really a welcome measure.

The other important feature of his proposals which he mentioned during his speech is about the appointment of a commission of enquiry into the monopolies, as mentioned in the speech of the Congress President, Shri K. Kamaraj at the Bhuvanewar session of the Indian National Congress. It is in keeping with the policy of the party to which my hon. friend the Finance Minister and I have the honour to belong.

There is a lot of criticism that this budget has not proceeded far on the road to socialism as adumbrated in the resolution that was passed at Bhuvanewar. I would like to reply to such of those critics, that it is only the beginning on the road to socialism, but our socialism is not the kind of or the mixture of socialism of the party of which Shri Gopalan is the leader or the party to which my hon. friend Shri Masani belongs. Our socialism is based on democracy. It is based on democratic principles. To usher in a socialism of that pattern it will have to grow gradually and changes cannot be brought overnight.

I am glad the Finance Minister has a word or two to say about the farmers in this country, and also suggest in his speech that they should be given a fair price for what they produce. The agricultural community form more than two-third of our population and the economy of our country is dependent to a large extent on that sector. He has rightly stressed that they should get a fair deal. I am

sure he and his colleague the Minister for Food and Agriculture would be able to bring home to the Chief Ministers of the States the importance of this and see that a fair and economic price is given in respect of the procurement that is to be launched very soon for wheat and rice. After all, the farmer has to meet his daily requirements and he should be given a fair price for his labours. He has also to educate his children. All these things have to be taken into account by the Government, and I hope a fair deal will be given to the farmer.

Coming to the taxation proposals, the Finance Minister has taken a rational stand and he has streamlined both the direct and the indirect taxes.

He has clipped the frills of some of the customs and excise duties and has modified to some extent the income-tax and the super-tax at all levels. He has not discriminated one class of income earners from another; he has done it in such a way that the effect of his proposals will be beneficial to all the income-tax payers. There may be criticism that he has not brought down the level of taxation on the higher slabs. That may be so; but in a developing economy like ours and in the face of criticism by not only Shri Gopalan but some of our friends in the Congress Party also who think that the hon. Finance Minister has got a soft corner only for big business, he could not but retain the tax below the level at which he has retained it now for the highest slab of income earners. But by these Budget proposals he has infused a modicum of saving among the income-tax payers and this is a step in the right direction. We should appreciate the efforts of the hon. Finance Minister in this respect.

Even though he has been able to cover less than a quarter of the shortfall which is about Rs. 176 crores—Rs. 25 crores by way of indirect taxation. Rs. 15 crores by way of direct taxation and, as he expects,

Rs. 50 crores from the annuity deposits—I would like to give him a friendly suggestion, that is the Price Cell in the Planning Commission and his advisers in the Finance Ministry have to keep a watchful eye on the price question and see that prices do not rise unduly high. Why I am saying this is because already the cost of living is going up from day to day unless prices are kept under check, I am afraid, whatever reforms or steps we may take, it will not be beneficial to the masses in our country. This point I would like to bring home to the notice of the hon. Finance Minister and I am sure, he would bear this in mind and see that the price level does not rise very high.

There are one or two points that I would like to mention in regard to some of the pending projects in my State. There is the Noyyal River irrigation scheme in Karur Taluk. This has been pending for a long time. I do not know why, for some reason or the other, this was not included in the Third Five Year Plan. It costs about Rs. 3½ crores and if this scheme is taken up, it will irrigate large tracts of dry land in Karur Taluk of Madras State. I would like the hon. Finance Minister to look into this and, if possible and if it is not too late, to have the same included in the Third Plan itself, or if that is not possible, at least to have it included definitely in the Fourth Five Year Plan.

Then there is another small scheme the Kodaganar irrigation scheme nearby. That is in the Trichinopoly District adjoining Madura District. If that scheme also could be taken up, it could irrigate some of the dry lands in the Kulitalai Taluk of Madras State. Both these river schemes fall within my parliamentary constituency and I would like these two schemes to be taken up. I am sure, through the good offices of the

[Shri Ramanathan Chettiar]

hon. Finance Minister and the Planning Commission, these schemes will be taken up soon so that those dry areas could be benefited.

Then, there is the Sethusmudram project which has already been sanctioned. I would only urge upon the Finance Minister to allot sufficient funds and complete this scheme in the Fourth Five Year Plan itself.

There is only one other matter to which I would like to refer and that is that the oil has been found in the Cauvery basin near Pattukkottai taluk in the Tanjore district and that the Finance Minister should see that the scheme is taken up in right earnest so that our petroleum and other needs could be met.

With these words, I would like to say that I support the Budget proposals whole-heartedly and I thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, for having given me an opportunity to participate in this debate.

श्री पाराशर (शिवपुरी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी चाहता था कि अभी अभी जो सज्जन बोल रहे थे उन्हीं के समान मैं भी यह कहता कि मैं सम्पूर्ण हृदय से इस बजट का स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं उम्मीद कर रहा था कि इस बजट का स्वागत करने के लिए मुझे तैयार रहना चाहिये। लेकिन मुझे मुसीबत आ गई और वह मुसीबत यह आ गई कि बजाय स्वागत करने के मैं इस बजट में क्या देखता हूँ? मेरा प्रतिक्रिया इस बजट के सम्बन्ध में यह है। भारतवर्ष में एक प्रथा है। उस का सजीव चित्र मुझे यह बजट प्रतीत होता है। वह प्रथा क्या है? जब किसी की मृत्यु होती है तो गाजे बाजे के साथ उस के शव को शाल दुशाले में लपेट कर उसे शमशान घाट ले जाते हैं। इस बजट में मैं समाजवाद का जनाजा देख रहा हूँ। यह समाजवाद का

जनाजा गाजे बाजे के साथ और शाल दुशाले में लपेट कर शमशान घाट ले जाया जा रहा है।

अभी हमारे खाडिलकर साहब ने कहा कि इस की कोई क्रेडिट साइड है लेकिन वह क्रेडिट साइड नहीं है बल्कि वह तो शाल दुशाले हैं जोकि शव पर डाल दिये गये हैं जिससे कि हम भुलावे में पड़ जायें कि यह बजट बड़ा समाजवादी बजट है। मैं जब बजट के लास्ट पेज को देखता हूँ। स्पीच बी० के आखिरी पेज २० पृष्ठ पर जब यह बताया गया कि ऐक्सपेंडीचर टैक्स लगाया गया है तो मैंने समझा कि यह बजट बड़ा समाजवादी और क्रान्तिकारी बजट है। लेकिन जब मैं उस २० पृष्ठ को उठा कर देखता हूँ तो उसमें क्या पाता हूँ? पहले ऐक्सपेंडीचर टैक्स १७ था और अब ५ पर आ गया है। अब केवल ५ ही रह गया है। मुझे पता नहीं कि क्या बात है लेकिन जो मैं उसमें आंकड़े देखता हूँ तो १७ की जगह मैं उसमें ५ देखता हूँ।

श्री रवीन्द्र वर्मा : १५० लाख है।

श्री पाराशर : मैं तो ५ ही देख रहा हूँ।

श्री रवीन्द्र वर्मा : आप एक बार और देख लें।

श्री पाराशर : रवीन्द्र वर्मा जी को बड़ी फिक्र है क्योंकि उन्होंने इस बजट का अनुमोदन किया था। लेकिन मुझे तो फिक्र है कि यह जो समाजवाद का जनाजा निकल रहा है, मैं किसी तरह से यह देख सकूँ कि कहीं समाजवाद में कुछ दम बाक़ी रहता है ताकि उसका जनाजा मैं न उठने दूँ। मैं भी इसे देख लूँ और दूसरे भी देख लें कि कहीं इसमें जान तो नहीं बाक़ी है क्योंकि कभी कभी ऐसा हो जाता है कि मुर्दा समझ कर लोग शमशान घाट में जनाजा ले जाते हैं और वहाँ पहुँच कर

वह हाथ पर हिलाने लगता है और जिंदा हो जाता है। मुझे इस की पूरी पूर्ण उम्मीद है कि समाजवाद का जनाजा नहीं निकलने पायेगा। जिन्होंने भुवनेश्वर में प्रतिज्ञा ली है, आबडी में प्रतिज्ञा ली है और जिन्होंने इस बात की प्रतिज्ञा ली है कि हम अपने देश को ऐसा बनायेंगे कि न केवल अपने यहां अपितु सारे संसार में शांति स्थापित करने वाला बने, और हमारे पूज्य बापू की जिस प्रतिज्ञा रूपी धरोहर को लेकर हम लोग इस पार्लियामेंट में आये हैं, हम उस समाजवाद का जनाजा कदापि नहीं निकलने देंगे। यह इस बात को हम पुरजोर शब्दों में कह देना चाहते हैं।

अब मैं बजट में क्या देख रहा हूं। बजट के आंकड़ों को अगर न देखूं तो फिर किस को दम् ? बजट के आंकड़ों को देखिये तो उसमें उद्योग का खूब भरपूर जिक्र है। उसके आंकड़े हमारे सामने मौजूद हैं। उसमें क्या जिक्र है ? उद्योगों का जिक्र है, विदेशी पूंजी का जिक्र है लेकिन उसमें क्या कहीं पानी का भंडा कोई जिक्र है ? सन् १९६२ की अपनी बजट स्पीच में मैंने शासन को यह याद दिलाया था कि पन्द्रह वर्षों के बाद भी वह अपनी जनता को पानी नहीं पिला सका है। आज तो १७ वर्ष हो चुके हैं। दो वर्ष और निकल चुके हैं। मैं एक बात और कह देना चाहता हूं कि सन् ६२ में मैंने हेल्थ मिनिस्टरी में रुलर वाटर सप्लाई स्कीम के अन्तर्गत अपने क्षेत्र के उन स्थानों का जिक्र किया था जहां महिलाएं अपने बच्चों को बगल में लेकर, सिर पर पानी का भरा घड़ा रख कर ७ मील जाती हैं और रास्ते में उन्हें शेर और चीतों का भी मुकाबला करना पड़ता है। मुझे मालूम है कि वहां पर क्या हालत है और हमारे द्वारा वहां पर व्यवस्था करने के लिये कहने पर भी क्या बना है। जब कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी में मैं इस प्रश्न को उठाता हूं तो उसका उत्तर यह आता है कि इस गवर्नमेंट ने मध्य प्रदेश की गवर्नमेंट को लिखा है और ए रिप्लाई इज एबेटेड, सर। मई १९६२ को चिट्ठी गई

हुई है लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट से अभी जवाब आना बाकी है। इसका मतलब है कि हमारे बाकी के ३ साल भी जवाब के इंतजार में ही गुजर जायेंगे। और हम वहां की पानी की आवश्यकता को भी पूरी नहीं कर पायेंगे। मैं साफ साफ कह देना चाहता हूं कि यह बजट इस देश की समाजवादी शक्तियों के लिए एक चुनौती है और हमें यह चुनौती स्वीकार करनी चाहिए और उस चुनौती को स्वीकार करके उसका हमें उत्तर देना चाहिए।

श्रीमन्, इस बजट में पानी का जिक्र नहीं है। प्राइसैज का जिक्र है कि वह बढ़ रही हैं। मेरे साथियों ने उसका जिक्र किया है मैं उसका जिक्र नहीं करूंगा। लेकिन यह जो हर एक स्पीच में कहा गया है कि हम उन को कंट्रोल करने की कोशिश करेंगे वह कंट्रोल आज तक नहीं किया गया है। मैं दशहरे पर गल्ले वाली दुकान पर स्वयं जाता था और १९ रुपये का मन भर गेहूं लेता था, ४ आने उसकी सफाई के लिए देता था, १२ आने उसकी पिसवार्ड के देता था और ४ आने घर पर उसे पहुंचाने की मैं मजदूरी देता था और इस तरह से मैं सवा २० रुपये का मन भर आटा लेता था, वही आटा आज मैं ३० रुपये का मन भर लेता हूं। आप कहते हैं कि मूल्य केवल ७ परसेंट बढ़ा है। मैं देहाती इलाकों से आता हूं, देहाती आदमी हूं और मैं आंकड़ों को हाथ में गिनता हूं। मैं दफतरो में बैठे हुए अफसरान जो आंकड़े फाइलों में से दे दिया करते हैं उन पर मैं विश्वास नहीं करता हूं। मैं तो प्रैक्टिकल आदमी हूं और अपने स्वयं के अनुभव के आधार पर यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सात परसेंट जैसा कि कहा जाता है बढ़ा है उससे कहीं ज्यादा बढ़ा है। इसलिए प्राइसैज बढ़ने की तो यह बात रही।

इस बजट में एजुकेशन यानी शिक्षा के नाम का कहीं जिक्र कहीं मिलेगा। इस बजट में आप को कोई ऐसी एक क्रान्तिकारी योजना नहीं मिलेगी जिसको कि देख कर इस देश का

[श्री पाराशर]

जनमानस तड़प उठे, प्रफुल्लित हो उठे और वह यह समझे कि समाजवाद की ओर फलां कदम उठाया गया है। लेकिन इसमें कोई ऐसी चीज़ नहीं दिखाई देती है मित्रावरुण इसके कि यह दीखता है कि हम ने रक्षा में ७०० और कुछ करोड़ रुपये खर्च किये हैं। वह भी मूले शब्दों का एक बहुत बड़ा गोरखबंधा नज़र आता है। वह भी शब्दों की बाजीगरी है। आप देखिए उसमें क्या है? आपने पहले जो बजट बनाया था लास्ट इयर, उसमें रक्षा संबंधी कार्यों में ७६ करोड़ रुपये इस देश में कम खर्च हुआ है। आपने जो योजना बनाई थी पिछली बार, पिछली बार जो आपने ऐस्टिमेट दिया था कि रक्षा में हम इतना खर्चा करेंगे तो उसमें ७६ करोड़ रुपये आपने कम खर्च किया। अब ७६ करोड़ में तो एक मोर्चा महीने या पन्द्रह दिन लड़ा जा सकता है। आप यह कह देंगे कि हम उसे खर्च नहीं कर सके। इस का साफ मतलब यह है कि अपने देश को तैयार करने के लिए वह तड़प आप में नहीं थी जिसकी कि देश आप से तमन्ना करता है वरना यह ७६ करोड़ रुपये का सरप्लस हम शो नहीं करते। आपको तो और उलटे ऐंड़ीशनल ग्रांट लेनी चाहिए थी ७६ करोड़ की। आप कहते हैं कि हम क्या करें, हमारा काम चयना नहीं है। इतनी तेज़ी के साथ हम रक्षा व्यवस्था को बढ़ा रहे हैं हम को ७६ करोड़ रुपये और दीजिये। अगर आप सप्लीमेंटरी बजट लाते तो हम आपको इसके लिए मुबारकबाद देते और आपको उसके लिए पुष्पमालाएं पहनाते। यह खेद का विषय है कि रक्षा के मामले में ढील-ढाल चलती है। हमारी योजनाओं को सफल बनाने के लिए बहुत बातें की जाती हैं। बातें हम काफ़ी सुन चुके हैं और सुन कर एक से अधिक बार बेइज्जत हो चुके हैं। अब हमें और अधिक बेइज्जत नहीं होना है। यहां के नौजवान जान हथेली पर लेकर मोर्चे पर जाते हैं और जब वह मोर्चे पर जाते हैं तो उनके लड़ने के लिए जिन चीज़ों की

ज़रूरत होती है वह उन को वहां पर मिल नहीं पाता है - अर्थात् क्या है? हम दूसरों से उसके लिए भीख मांगते हैं कि हमें हवाई जहाज़ दे दीजिये ताकि हम मोर्चे पर अपनी फौज को आवश्यक सामान वगैरह वक्त पर पहुंचा सकें। मैंने सन् ६२ में भी यह कहा था और मैं फिर कहता हूँ कि पतिस्कर साहब की जो हमारे पास डिफेंस की थियरी है उसमें साफ कहा है कि केवल हथियार से, केवल नौजवान में या केवल सिपाही से आप देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते हैं तावकते कि आपकी जो आन्तरिक कम्युनिकेशन की, ट्रान्सपोर्ट अर्थात् यातायात की व्यवस्था है वह इतनी मजबूत न हो कि वह कठिन से कठिन परिस्थिति में स्टैंड कर सके। मैं साफ साफ आप को कहता चाहता हूँ कि आप को जो बड़ी कम्युनिकेशन लाइंस हैं जैसे उत्तर से पश्चिम और पश्चिम से पूर्व को जां जानी है उस को ही डेवलप करने में काम नहीं चलने वाला है। सारे देश में आप को रेलों खनने के रास्ते में गुजरना है लेकिन आप उन की सुरक्षा के लिए कुछ सोच नहीं रहे हैं। दुर्गम पहाड़ों के बीच में, जंगलों के बीच में और खंडकों के बीच में आपके रणवाहुरों में तब जोकि आपके देश का गौरव रहे है, जोकि लोहा हाथ में लेकर, तलवार हाथ में लेकर दुश्मनों के दांत खट्टे करने वाले रहे हैं और जिन्होंने कि वीरता-पूर्वक शत्रुओं से लोहा लिया है और जिन्होंने कभी विदेशियों से हार नहीं मानी है, आप को चाहिए कि आप उन तमाम स्थानों को यातायात की दृष्टि से विकसित कर दें, वहां पर कम्युनिकेशन व्यवस्था डेवलप कर दें। उत्तर प्रदेश को फौरन सीधे पंजाब से जोड़ें, राजस्थान से जोड़ें ताकि आपको यदि उत्तर के मोर्चे पर लड़ना पड़े, पश्चिम से पूर्व को, या उत्तर से दक्षिण के मोर्चे पर शत्रु से लोहा लेना पड़े तो आप हर दिशा में जहां भी ज़रूरत पड़े तत्काल अपने जवानों को आवश्यक साज़ सामान मुहैया कर सकें और उसको भेजने के लिए आपको विदेशियों का मूंह न ताकना पड़े। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि

आप उसके लिए सोच ही नहीं रहे हैं। हम यदि सुरक्षा के हेतु कोई स्कीम देने भी हैं तो वह अरण्यरोदन होकर रह जाती है, जैसे जंगल में कोई रांये तो उसको कोई नहीं मुनता है। ठीक वही हालत इस बारे में हो रही है। मैं नहीं चाहता कि इस तरह को कोई चीज आगे से हो। हम अपनी बातों का जवाब चाहते हैं, उत्तर चाहते हैं। अलबत्ता अगर हम कोई ऐसी बात कहते हैं जोकि न करने काबिल है तो कृपा कर के हम का समझाने का कांशिया तो कीजिये। कि वह क्यों नहीं अमल में लाई जा सकता है लेकिन आप कुछ नहीं कर रहे हैं।

मैं आप से यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक देश की आन्तरिक व्यवस्था शान्ति और सुख की नहीं होगी, तब तक हम बाहरी दुश्मनों का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारी आन्तरिक व्यवस्था ठीक न होने के कारण ही तो हमारे दुश्मन उत्साहित हो जाते हैं और उन को यह सोचने का मौका मिल जाता है कि इस देश में तो बड़ी गड़बड़ी है, हम इस पर हमला कर सकते हैं। चोरी यहाँ, डकैती यहाँ। रास्ते पर चलने की बात तो छोड़िये, जिले के हेडक्वार्टर पर चोर आये, ट्रक में बैठ कर, गैंग का लीडर ट्रक चलाता हो और वह सेठ को बाँरे की तरह उठा कर रख ले और ले जाये, डेढ़ महीने तक सारी पुलिस और सारे छानबीन करने वाले उस का पता न लगा सकें, जब मैं चीफ मिनिस्टर से और पुलिस के लोगों से पूछ पूछ कर परेशान हो जाऊँ, तो कहा जाये कि इन्तजाम हो रहा है और दो महीने के बाद उस की सूखी लाश जंगल में मिले, ऐसी बातें आज हमारे देश में हो रही हैं।

क्षेत्रों के विकास का यह हाल है कि कहीं तो पैसा अनाप-शनाप खर्च किया जा रहा है, पानी की तरह बह रहा है और कहीं जिस क्षेत्र का कोई कहने वाला नहीं है, वहाँ—एक कोड़ी भी खर्च नहीं की जाती है। डेढ़ सौ मिल

एक ऐसा क्षेत्र है, जहाँ सरकार ने एका भी स्कीम नहीं चलाई है, जहाँ रेल पर एक लाख रुपये भी खर्च नहीं किया है, न सड़क पर किया है, न विजनी पर किया है, न याता-यात पर किया है, न अस्पताल पर किया है, किसी चीज पर नहीं किया है। वह इलाका ऐसा है, जहाँ तांतिया टांप्पे ने फांसी पर लटक कर अपना जीवन इस देश के लिए दिया। आखिर सरकार उन क्षेत्रों के बारे में सोच क्यों नहीं रही है। सरकार को उन क्षेत्रों के बारे में विचार करना चाहिये। उस को य काम करने होंगे और अगर वह नहीं करेगी, तो वह अपने कर्तव्य से च्युत रहेगी।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं पुरजोर शब्दों में माननीय मंत्री जी का समर्थन करूँ और समर्थन कर के कम से कम अपने हृदय के उदगार निकालूँ लेकिन दो बरस के इन्तजार के बाद आज मुझे मजबूर हो कर ये शब्द कहने पड़ रहे हैं कि सरकार अपना कर्तव्य नहीं कर रही है, वह अपने कर्तव्य से च्युत हो रही है।

सरकार हम को देती क्या है? उस ने मोटर का टैक्स घटाया, साबुन का टैक्स घटाया और ग्रामाफोन रिकार्ड का टैक्स घटाया। क्या हमारे फिनांस मिनिस्टर साहब यह सोचते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के आदमी अच्छे धुले कपड़े पहनें, मोटर में बैठें, ग्रामाफोन के रिकार्ड सुनें और घूमते रहें? उन्होंने इस बजट में हम को ये तीन वरदान दिये हैं। वह चाहते हैं कि घोबी के यहां कपड़े भोजने के बजाय अपने यहां धो लां, स्वावलम्बी बनां, क्योंकि साबुन सस्ता हो जायेगा। और मोटर भी शायद सस्ती हो जायेगी। मोटर में बैठो और उस के बाद आराम से ग्रामाफोन के रिकार्ड सुनते हुए बेफिक्र हो कर रहो, रक्षा की सारी व्यवस्था सरकार करेगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान अब ऐसी बातों में आने वाला नहीं है। और ऐसी बातें सुनने को तैयार नहीं है। आज हिन्दुस्तान कुछ और चाहता है। हिन्दुस्तान कोई आन्तिकारी

[श्री पाराशर]

कदम चाहता है। हम रेवोल्यूशनरी कदम चाहते हैं। हम नहीं चाहते कि मिनिस्टर साहब इस तरह की बातें कहें।

श्री भागवत झा छायाव (भागलपुर) : कमीशन बिठाया है। और क्या चाहिये ?

श्री पाराशर : इस में लिखा हुआ है कि सरकार ने एग्रीकल्चरल इम्प्रूवमेंट के लिए एक कमीशन बिठाया है। और उस कमीशन का अध्यक्ष कौन होगा ? सरकार ने सोचा कि कहीं पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर नान-आफिशल अध्यक्ष के लिए न कह दें और इसलिये उस ने पहले से ही यह किया है—पेशबन्दी कर दी है—कि अध्यक्ष होगा सरकारी अधिकारी। खुदा के वास्ते क्षमा कीजिए, सरकारी अधिकारी और कृषि सम्बन्धी कमीशन का अध्यक्ष! अगर सरकार तेजी का काम तम्बोली से लेगी, तो फिर देश की दुर्दशा नहीं होगी, तो क्या होगा ?

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस कमीशन का अध्यक्ष बनाए किमी किमान को, ५५ साल के किमी किमान को, जिस ने अपनी जमीन के एक एक एकड़ में अनाज की पैदावार को पांच मन में पच्चीस मन कर के दिखाया हो। इस देश में ऐसे नौजवानों और बूढ़ों को कमी नहीं है। सरकार उस को पूछे कि उस ने यह काम कैसे किया है और उमी को अध्यक्ष बनाए इस कमीशन का। मैं ने इस और चैकम्प्लेवाकिया में स्वयं अपनी आंखों से देखा है कि उन्होंने ने ऐसे ही लोगों को इस प्रकार के काम सीपे है और उमी का नतीजा यह है कि वे लोग प्रैक्टिकल स्टैप्स ले कर अपने देश की तरक्की कर रहे हैं। लेकिन यहां पर हम को कहना पड़ रहा है कि सरकार ऐसा करे। ये इस सरकार के काम करने के तरीके हैं। उन से देश की तरक्की में बाधा पड़ती है।

इस बजट में कहा गया है कि सरकार ने व्यवस्था पर २५ करोड़ रुपये ज्यादा

खर्च रखा है और सिविल साइड में १९९ करोड़ रुपये ज्यादा खर्च रखा है। ये आंकड़े मैं रिवाइज्ड एस्टीमेट्स के दे रहा हूँ, जो कि पेज २० पर दिये गये हैं। मैं सरकार से यह उम्मीद करता था कि वह रक्षा के लिए १९९ करोड़ रुपये ज्यादा रखती और सिविल साइड के लिए कुछ कम रखती। हम परेशान रह सकते हैं, हम दुखी भी रहने को तैयार हैं, हम को चीजें महंगी को भी शिकायत न हो लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि हम अपना मस्तक गौरव के साथ उठा सकें और यह दिखा सकें कि इस दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान पर उंगली उठाने वाला कोई नहीं है।

आज हम देखते हैं कि पाकिस्तान हमारे सिपाहियों को पकड़ कर ले जाता है और हम प्रॉटेस्ट नोट भेज दिया करते हैं। पाकिस्तान धड़ाधड़ हमारे यहां आदमी भेज रहा है और हम उसके बारे में कुछ भी नहीं सोच रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब वह समय आ गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान को यह कह देना चाहिए कि अगर एक भी रेफ्यूजी आयेगा, तो उसके लिए हम घर मांगेंगे और अगर एक करोड़ आदमी आयेंगे, तो जमीन मांगेंगे—भेज दीजिये आदमियों को, हम बसाने को तैयार हैं। पाकिस्तान को ये शब्द कहने की जरूरत सामने आ रही है। वह वक्त आ गया है कि हम पुरजोर शब्दों में पाकिस्तान को कह दें कि अगर वहां से रेफ्यूजी आयेगा, तो उस को बसाने के लिए पाकिस्तान को जमीन देनी पड़ेगी। इस से सारी समस्या हल हो जायेगी। सरकार को यह बात हिम्मत और ताकत के साथ कहनी चाहिए।

जब हिन्दुस्तान के पास फ़ोज नहीं थी, हवाई जहाज़ नहीं थे, विज्ञान नहीं था, तब हम ने अंग्रेज से कह दिया था कि निकल जाओ। हमारे बापू ने कहा था कि निकल जाओ, क्योंकि उसके पास ताकत थी—'नैन

छिन्दन्ति शस्त्राणि नैनं दहति पावकः” । हम “सत्यं शिवं सुन्दरम्”—शाश्वत, शुद्ध, सनातन, सत्य पर विश्वास करके, परम् पिता परमात्मा का आशीर्वाद ले कर, उस का नाम ले कर, आगे बढ़े और हम ने स्वराज्य प्राप्त किया । वह सारी शक्ति हम भूल गये । ब्लैक-मार्केटिंग, चोर बाजारी, भ्रष्टाचार और तरह तरह की बातें करने वाला आदमी गर्व के साथ आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है । गर्व के साथ वही आगे बढ़ सकता है, जो निष्कलंक हो, निष्कपट हो और जो हिम्मत के साथ परमात्मा पर विश्वास करता है । अगर अकिञ्चन भी होगा, तो भी वह आगे बढ़ेगा और कहेगा कि जिस में ताकत हो, वह मेरा मुकाबला करे । यह सरकार भी वैसी ही बने और अपने सामने वाले दुश्मनों को हिम्मत के साथ कहे कि यह देश झुकने वाला नहीं है, इस देश ने कभी हार नहीं मानी है और न मानने वाला है ।

फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज की हालत के बारे में मैं क्या कहूँ ? भगवान् का ही नाम है । गूंगे के गुड़ के समान मामला है । जो गूंगा गुड़ खाता है, वह बता नहीं सकता है कि क्या दिक्कत है । मैं भी बता नहीं सकता कि क्या दिक्कत है । इसलिए मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ ।

फ़िनांस मिनिस्टर साहब से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह अब भी बजट में क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन कर के हमारे सामने रिवाइज्ड रूप में लायें, ताकि हम उन को हार पहनायें और हमारे हृदय उत्सुकता से आगे बढ़ें और हम ने समाजवाद की जो कल्पना की है, जो प्रतिज्ञा की है, उसको पूरा करने के लिए हम आगे कदम बढ़ायें ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ ।

श्री रामेश्वर टांटिया (सीकर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । एक्सपेंडीचर टैक्स का रीयलाइजेशन

१५० लाख है, ५ लाख नहीं है । माननीय सदस्य, श्री पाराशर ने शायद भूल से ऐसा कहा है ।

योजना मंत्री (श्री ब० रा० भगत) : ऐसे ही सारा बजट पढ़ा है ।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : माननीय सदस्य, श्री पाराशर, यह करेक्शन मान लें ।

श्री पाराशर : अच्छा, मान लिया ।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता था कि चूकि पिछले साल इतने ज़बर्दस्त टैक्सज़ लगाये गये थे, इसलिए कम से कम इस मर्तबा बजट में कुछ छूट दी जायेगी । हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने कोशिश यह की है कि वह किसी तरह लोगों को यह समझायें कि आज कुछ न कुछ कन्सेशन मध्यम-वर्गीयों को दिया गया है । जहां तक अनिवार्य बचत योजना, कम्पलसरी डिपॉजिट स्कीम की बात है, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि उसके खत्म करने से लोगों को कुछ सहारा मिला है । लेकिन उसके साथ ही साथ आज हमें यह देखना है कि जिन लोगों की कमर टैक्सज़ ने तोड़ दी थी, क्या वाकई उन को कुछ रिलीफ़ मिला है या नहीं । मेरे पूर्ववक्ताओं ने यह भी कहा है कि चीज़ों के जो दाम बढ़ाये गये थे, क्या वे वाकई घटाये गये हैं या नहीं ।

माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में बेकारी का जिक्र नहीं किया । दूसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना में यह कहा गया था कि हमारे देश में ८० लाख आदमियों को नई नौकरी मिलेगी । दूसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना के खत्म होने के बाद देखा यह गया कि ८० लाख लोगों को काम नहीं मिला, इतना ही नहीं, बल्कि लगभग एक करोड़ आदमी बेकार हो गये । तीसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना में कहा गया है कि उसके दौरान १,१० लाख आदमियों को नौकरी मिल जायेगी, लेकिन उसके खत्म होने के बाद १,२० लाख आदमी बेकार हो जायेंगे ।

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

आज हमें यह देखना है कि यह बजट किस का बजट है। पहले हम लोग यह समझते थे कि वाकई रूलिंग पार्टी में, कांग्रेस में, भी कुछ व्यक्ति ऐसे हैं, जो समाजवादी दृष्टिकोण से अपने आर्थिक ढांचे को बनाना चाहते हैं। भुवनेश्वर के बाद कम-अज़-कम यह तो मालूम हुआ था कि समाजवाद की आपकी परिभाषा क्या है। वहां पर जो भाषण लोगों ने दिये थे उन को पढ़ कर हम लोगों के दिलों में भी अरमानों की किस्ती कुछ झूमती सी नज़र आने लगी थी और मैं समझ रहा था कि अब कम-से-कम वे ताकतें जो समाजवाद को

पूजीवाद या सामन्तवाद की तरफ ले जाना चाहती हैं, उनको कमज़ोर किया जायेगा और समाजवाद की स्थापना करने की एक शिला, एक फाउंडेशन तो डाल ही दी जायेगी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

17.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, March 4, 1964/Phalgun 14, 1885 (Saka).