

[Mr. Speaker]

more is now being added by Shri Masani because he wants longer hours for the discussion of the Finance Bill. So, it is for the House to decide whether it agrees to that or not. What is the view of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I am entirely in the hands of the House. As you know, Sir, the allotment of time was decided in consultation with, and with the consent of, the representatives of all groups, once with me and a second time with you. If the House wants to have another 5½ hours and sit on a Saturday, Government will have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: Then I will put it to the House.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I respectfully submit that as you were not present in the Business Advisory Committee, I am only asking for a clarification. I am not objecting to anything.

Mr. Speaker: The allocation of time is recommended by the Committee and approved by the House.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am not disputing the agreement. I am only seeking a clarification. What are the principles which govern the discussion, deliberation and decision of the Business Advisory Committee? If you were not present at that meeting, let somebody else explain to us, because I do not think this is the way in which it should be done. I have put forth my difficulties.

Mr. Speaker: He can come and discuss with me all the details. Regarding the principles that guide us, the most important principle is to arrive at unanimity where all parties agree. That is the greatest principle that we follow and we try to achieve it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: While you are on this subject, may I submit

that under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, 1931 the Finance Bill must reach the President within sixty days of the presentation of the Bill. Since it was presented on the 29th of February, it should reach him on or before 29th April. So, I suggest a way out to help my hon. friend, Shri Mathur, for whom I have every sympathy. I suggest that the Finance Bill might be passed by this House on the 22nd instead of on the 21st. There is plenty of time afterwards for the Rajya Sabha to consider it before sending it on to the President.

Mr. Speaker: That is not agreed to. I put it with this amendment of Shri Masani that so far as the Finance Bill is concerned instead of 12½ hours it might be 17½ hours and we might sit on the 18th April (Saturday).

The question is :

"That this House agrees with the amended Twenty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 4th March, 1964."

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I want to propose an amendment.

Shri Speaker: Now it is too late.

The motion was adopted.

12.21 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET 1964-65—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now take up the General Discussion on the General Budget. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey was on his legs.

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय (सलेमपुर) .
माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं सदन के सामने यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि देश एक संकट-कालीन अवस्था में से गुजर रहा

है। जब तक हम चीन से अपनी भूमि को वापस नहीं ले लेंगे, तब तक हम ने उस से लड़ना है। उस के साथ ही काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में भी, जो कि भारतवर्ष का अभिन्न अंग है, पाकिस्तान के द्वारा कभी कभी छेड़खानी होती रहती है। इस प्रकार देश को चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों की ओर से खतरा बना हुआ है और चीन तथा पाकिस्तान दोनों का एक सामरिक महत्व है।

इस सामरिक महत्व को देखते हुए यह आवश्यक है कि अपनी स्थल सेना, वायु सेना और जल सेना को सुदृढ़ किया जाये और इस दृष्टिकोण से धन इकट्ठा करना भी आवश्यक है। जब चीन ने हमारे देश पर हमला किया, तो उस ने सिर्फ हमारी मान्भूमि के एक भाग को ही नहीं लिया, बल्कि देश की संस्कृति, सभ्यता और विकास पर भी ठेस लगी। इस कारण यह भी आवश्यक है कि देश के विकास की तरफ भी अधिक ध्यान दिया जाये।

वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने जो बजट प्रस्तुत किया है, वह विकास के दृष्टिकोण से भी और देश की स्वतंत्रता और प्रतिष्ठा को कायम रखने के दृष्टिकोण से भी प्रस्तुत किया गया है। आज की परिस्थिति में यह आवश्यक है कि धन जुटाया जाये और धन तभी जुटाया जा सकता है, जब कि कर लगाये जायें और खर्च में भी मितव्ययिता की जाये। लेकिन इस के अलावा यह भी आवश्यक है कि देश के अन्दर समाजवादी व्यवस्था रहे।

कांग्रेस सरकार के ऊपर एक बहुत बड़ा उत्तरदायित्व है। उस ने यह निश्चय किया है कि हम देश में एक जनतांत्रिक और लोक-कल्याणकारी सरकार बनायेंगे और जनतांत्रिक सरकार के द्वारा समाजवाद को स्थापना करेंगे। भुवनेश्वर में जो संकल्प लिया गया, उससे सरकार की जिम्मेदारी और भी बढ़ जाती है। लेकिन इस जिम्मेदारी को पूरा करने में तभी सफलता मिल सकती है, जब कि

देश में व्याप्त आर्थिक असमानता को दूर किया जाये।

हमारे देश में एक तरफ तो अमीरी है और दूसरी तरफ गरीबी है। दोनों में बड़ा अन्तर है। हमारे यहां करोड़ों आदमी ऐसे हैं, जिन की प्रति दिन की आय चार, छः, आठ, दस आने है। इसकी तुलना में कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं, जिन की प्रति दिन की आय दो, चार, छः, आठ हजार रुपये है। कुछ लोग ऐसे भी हैं, जिन की आमदनी एक, दो लाख रुपये है। जब तक इस तरह की असमानता को दूर नहीं किया जाता है, तब तक हमारे देश में पूर्ण-रूप से समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता है और जब तक समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता है, तब तक देश का निर्माण, विकास और प्रगति नहीं हो सकती है। इस राष्ट्रीय सरकार का, जो कि अपने आप को समाजवादी कहती है, यह कर्त्तव्य हो जाता है कि वह राष्ट्र के प्रत्येक व्यक्ति के लिए भोजन बपड़े, रहने के लिए मकान और शिक्षा का समुचित प्रबन्ध करे। मैं समझता हूं कि यह व्यवस्था करना नितान्त आवश्यक है।

अब मैं आप का ध्यान कृषि की तरफ खींचना चाहता हूं—इसलिए कि कृषि इस देश का सब से बड़ा व्यवसाय है। इस व्यवसाय से देश की ५० प्रतिशत आय होती है और देश की लगभग अस्सी, नब्बे प्रतिशत जनता इस पर अवलम्बित है। कृषि उत्पादन में वृद्धि करने के लिए बहुत सी योजनायें बनाई जाती हैं, लेकिन १९६०-६१ में जो उत्पादन हुआ, वह १९६१-६२ में नहीं रहा और १९६०-६१ में जो उत्पादन हुआ, उस के मुकाबले में १९६२-६३ में नहीं हो पाया। १९६३-६४ का तो प्रश्न ही पैदा नहीं होता है, क्योंकि इस अवधि में तो ओला-पाला आदि कई विपत्तियां आ गईं और इसलिए फसल का नुकसान हो गया।

[श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय]

लेकिन मूल तत्व यह है कि आखिर कृषि-उत्पादन क्यों नहीं बढ़ रहा है। इस में सरकार रूपया भी खर्च करती है और नियोजन भी करती है। यह अच्छा है कि योजना आयोग में श्री अशोक मेहता पधारे हुए हैं। वह बड़े अर्थ-शास्त्री हैं और समाजवाद के विद्वान हैं। समाजवाद के तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान की गरीबी कैसे दूर होगी, इस का एक नक्शा उन्होंने देश के सामने प्रस्तुत करना है। आज उनके समाजवाद के सिद्धान्त परख पर हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि कृषि-उत्पादन में वृद्धि नहीं हो सकती है, जब तक कि उसूल पर विचार न किया जाये। उसूल यह होना चाहिए कि खेत उस का, जो खेत को जोते—जमीन उसकी, जो जमीन को जोते। जिस आदमी के हाथ में हल हो और कंधे पर फावड़ा, वही मेहनत कर सकता है और जमीन का उत्पादन बढ़ा सकता है। खाली रूपया इकट्ठा कर देने से कृषि-उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ सकता है। उत्पादन में वृद्धि करने के लिए खाद, बीज और सिंचाई की जरूरत है।

सरकार सारे साधन जुटाती है। उसने विकेंद्रीकरण भी किया है। केन्द्रीय सरकार है, प्रदेश सरकारें हैं, जिला स्तर है, विकास-खंड हैं, ग्राम पंचायतें हैं, लेकिन इस के बावजूद उपज नहीं बढ़ पाती है। आखिर इस की वजह क्या है? इसकी वजह यह है कि प्रशासन-तंत्र में कमियां हैं, ढिलाई है, जिनको दूर करना आवश्यक है। अगर इस देश में उत्पादन बढ़ाना है, तो यह आवश्यक है कि किसानों को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये, उन को इन्सैन्टिव दिया जाये। जब ओले-पाले से उनकी फसल खराब हो जाये, तो उन को सहायता देना जरूरी है। उसके लिए यह आवश्यक है कि फसलों का बीमा किया जाये। बीमा करने का लाभ यह होगा कि अगर किसानों की फसल का नुकसान हो जायेगा, तो उनको पैसा मिल जायेगा। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि फसल के बीमे की व्यवस्था की जाये।

जहां तक खाद का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे यहां बहुत सी फैक्टरियां बनाई गई हैं। लोग अपने खेतों में एमोनियम सल्फेट और अन्य अंग्रेजी खाद डालते हैं। लेकिन एक समय आयगा, जब अंग्रेजी खाद डालने से खेत की उर्वरा शक्ति निकल जायेगी। उस उर्वरा शक्ति को कायम रखने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि गोबर और पत्तों आदि की खाद का उत्पादन किया जाये। जब ये दोनों खादें खेत में डाली जायेगी, तो उसकी उर्वरा शक्ति खत्म नहीं हो सकती है।

देश के बाहर से प्रति वर्ष लाखों करोड़ों रुपये का अन्न मंगाया जाता है, जिस से विदेशी मुद्रा का ह्रास होता है। अगर हम अपना कृषि उत्पादन बढ़ा दें, तो हमारी विदेशी मुद्रा बच सकती है। हमारे देश में प्रति वर्ष बाढ़ आती है। मैं सारे हिन्दुस्तान के आंकड़े तो नहीं प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूं कि बाढ़ के द्वारा देश भर में कितना नुकसान होता है। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रति वर्ष वहां बाढ़ आती है और उसकी वजह से १९६३ में १८ करोड़ रुपये की फसल खराब हुई, १९६०-६१ में २० करोड़ रुपये की फसल खराब हुई और १९५५ में ३८ करोड़ रुपये की फसल खराब हुई। अगर हम बंगाल, बिहार, आसाम और अन्य प्रदेशों के आंकड़ों को देखें, तो पता लगेगा कि प्रति वर्ष अरबों रुपये की फसल खराब हो जाती है। अगर सिर्फ बाढ़ को नियंत्रित करने की योजना बना कर बाढ़ को रोक दिया जाये और उस से फसलों को नुकसान न हो, तो मैं समझता हूं कि गल्ले की समस्या बहुत हद तक हल हो सकती है।

जैसा कि मैं ने निवेदन किया है, कृषि के व्यवसाय से देश को ५० प्रतिशत आय होती है। इस आय को और बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अब भी २४ फीसदी लोग ऐसे हैं, जिन के पास एक एकड़ जमीन है, २३ फीसदी ऐ लोग हैं,

जिन के पास कोई जमीन नहीं है, लैंडलैस लेबरर्स हैं, लेकिन उन के लिए कोई उपाय नहीं हो पाया है ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोई माननीय मंत्री सदन में नहीं हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: There ought to be some Minister from the Finance side. Of course, there are other Ministers and they will convey to them. But there has to be at least one Minister from the Finance side.

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : अब मैं आप के सामने बजट के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने सदन के सामने जो बजट प्रस्तुत किया है और जो आंकड़े रखे हैं, उस में उन्होंने कहीं भी इस बात का समावेश नहीं किया है कि गरीबी और अमीनी में जो अन्तर है, उस को वह कैसे दूर करेंगे । आप देखें कि केन्द्रीय सचिवालय में, या प्रांतीय सचिवालय में, काम करने वाले चपरासी दरबान या छोटे क्लर्क की क्या तल्ह्वाह है और सचिव तथा उप-सचिव की क्या तल्ह्वाह है । उन में कितना अन्तर है । इस अन्तर को सरकार कैसे पाटेगी, इस बजट में इस का कहीं भी जिक्र नहीं है । यद्यपि इस में समाजवाद की तरफ जाने की बात कही गई है, समाजवाद की तरफ इसका रुझान है, लेकिन केवल उससे ही काम नहीं चलने वाला है ।

अगर समाजवाद केवल जुवान पर, प्लेटफार्म पर या कागज पर है, तो उस समाजवाद को किसान पसन्द नहीं करेगा । किसान और गांवों में बसने वाले लगभग अस्सी, नव्वे फीसदी लोग चाहते हैं कि समाजवाद शहरों से हट कर उन के गांवों में आये, गांवों में बसे, उन के झोंपड़ों में आये । आज स्थिति यह है कि गांवों में रहने वाले गरीब आदिमियों को आग के सामने बैठ कर जाड़े

की रात बितानी पड़ती है । माघ के महीने में गन्ने का रस पी कर और मक्के का गुंजा खा कर या जाड़े में आग ताप कर वे गुजारा करते हैं । उनके तन पर कपड़ा नहीं होता है, वस्त्र नहीं होता है, उनके पास घर नहीं है, जमीन नहीं है, मकान नहीं है । उनकी अभिलाषा है कि उनको भी समाजवाद की झलक दिखाई जाये ताकि जो आपके स्वप्नों का समाजवाद है, उसका कुछ उनको भी पता चल सके । समाजवाद को शहरों से निकाल कर, आलीशान मकानों में से निकाल कर, झोंपड़ियों और गांवों में आप ले जायें ताकि उन लोगों को भी मालूम हो कि समाजवाद से उनको क्या-क्या लाभ होंगे ।

आपने अनुमान लगाया है कि राजस्वगत आय २,०६५ करोड़ रुपये होगी और राजस्व व्यय २,०४१ करोड़ रुपये होगा । इस प्रकार से राजस्व कोष में ५४ करोड़ रुपये की बचत रहेगी । प्रतिरक्षा पर ७१८ करोड़ रुपये व्यय किया जायगा । असैनिक व्यय १,३२३ करोड़ होगा । १९६३-६४ में जहां रक्षा व्यय ६६३ करोड़ था वहां वह १९६४-६५ में ६१८ करोड़ होगा, यानी २५ करोड़ की उममें वृद्धि की जायेगी । यह बहुत अच्छी चीज है । यह बहुत खुशी की बात है । यह भी प्रसन्नता की बात है कि कुछ मामूली सामान के ऊपर कर घटा दिया है, जैसे साबुन, किसी प्रकार का कागज, ग्रामोफोन । साथ-साथ कुछ पर उन्होंने बढ़ा भी दिया है । कम्पलसरी सर्विंग को भी उन्होंने मुक्त कर दिया है और वार्षिक बचत को उन्होंने उसकी जगह पर लागू कर दिया है । यह सब कुछ तो ठीक है । लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत से भू-भाग ऐसे हैं जो बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं । उनकी तरक्की के लिए कोई धन की व्यवस्था की गई है, इस तरह का कोई भी संकेत माननीय वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने अपने बजट भाषण में नहीं दिया है और न ही यह बतलाने का कष्ट किया है कि कितना धन उनके लिए रखा

[श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय]

गया है। हरिजनों की भलाई के लिए इस सदन में सभी माननीय सदस्यों की ओर से आवाज उठाई जाती रही है। उनकी तरक्की के लिए, उनकी बह्वृद्धी के लिए कहीं भी कुछ नहीं कहा गया है कि कितना खर्च किया जायेगा। मैं चाहता था कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय जब बजट प्रस्तुत करते तो किसान के लिए क्या कुछ वह करने जा रहे हैं, इन पिछड़े हुए इलाकों के लिए क्या कुछ करने जा रहे हैं, इन हरिजनों के लिए क्या कुछ करने जा रहे हैं, क्या राहत इनको वह देने वाले हैं, इसका भी इस में समावेश करते उनको चाहिये था कि वह कहते कि मिट्टी के तेल के भाव बहुत कम कर दिये गये हैं, दियासलाई का भाव बहुत कम कर दिया गया है, नमक का भाव बहुत कम कर दिया गया है तथा इस तरह की दूगरी जो किसान के काम आने वाली चीजें हैं उनके भाव बहुत कम कर दिये गये हैं ताकि किसान उनको ले सके। लेकिन कहीं इसका समावेश नहीं हुआ है।

जैसा मैंने बताया है कि २४ प्रतिशत लोग ऐसे हैं जिन के पास केवल एक एकड़ जमीन है, जिन के पास विस्तृत अलाभकर जोत है। इस तरह के किसान जिनके पास अलाभकर जोतें हैं, उन के ऊपर से मैं चाहता था कि लगान माफ़ किया जाना। लेकिन ऐसा भी कुछ नहीं किया गया है। कहीं इसका समावेश नहीं है। अगर राजस्व कोष में ५४ करोड़ का लाभ है, ५४ करोड़ की बचत है तो यह आवश्यक था कि आप गरीब किसानों को कुछ राहत देते।

अब मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में थोड़ा सा कहना चाहता हूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश जनसंख्या के लिहाज से सब से बड़ा भारतीय प्रदेश है। लेकिन वह हर माने में पिछड़ा हुआ है, शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में वह पिछड़ा हुआ है, कृषि के क्षेत्र में पिछड़ा हुआ है, उद्योग धंधों के क्षेत्र में पिछड़ा हुआ है। उसके अन्तर्गत एक भू-भाग ऐसा

है जिसकी आबादी ठाई करोड़ है और जिस को पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश कहते हैं। इसके अलावा और भी बहुत से क्षेत्र हैं जो पिछड़े हुए हैं, जैसे बुंदेलखण्ड। इन पिछड़े हुए अंचलों के बारे में क्या कुछ हो रहा है, इसको आप देखें। एक पटेल कमेटी नियुक्त हुई थी जिसके लिए मैं सरकार का आभारी हूँ। और उस कमेटी ने चार जिले लिये थे, देवरिया, आजमगढ़, जौनपुर और गाजीपुर। उनकी आबादी सारे प्रान्त की आबादी का दसवां हिस्सा है। क्षेत्रफल के लिहाज से वह प्रान्त के क्षेत्रफल का चौथा हिस्सा है। इस क्षेत्र के बारे में क्या कुछ किया गया है, अभी तक इसका कुछ पता नहीं चला है। जो कुछ भी किया जाये इनको उपर उठाने के लिये, लेकिन एक बात मैं कह देना चाहता हूँ। जब तक आप ग्रामीण जीवन का औद्योगीकरण नहीं करेंगे, तब तक प्रगति नहीं हो सकती है, इन लोगों को तरक्की के अवसर नहीं मिल सकते हैं। मैं देवरिया से आता हूँ। उसकी आबादी २४ लाख है। एग्रिकलचरल लैंड वहाँ पर ११ लाख एकड़ है। इसका मूलतः हुआ कि एक आदमी के हिस्से में आध एकड़ जमीन आई। आध एकड़ में एक आदमी कैसे गुज़र बसर कर सकता है, इसको आप देखें। यह ना-मुमकिन बात है। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि खेती की जमीन पर ही निर्भर नहीं रहा जा सकता है। यह जरूरी है कि ग्रामीण जीवन में औद्योगीकरण किया जाये। जब तक आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तब तक समाजवाद सही मानों में भारत में नहीं आ सकता है। वहाँ कच्चा माल भी बहुतायत से मिलता है। देवरिया में बहुत से स्थान हैं जहाँ पर बड़े और छोटे दोनों प्रकार के उद्योग स्थापित हो सकते हैं। उन में से कुछ स्थानों के नाम मैं आप के सामने रखता हूँ। बरहज है, भटपार है, भटनी है, बेतालपुर है, सलेमपुर है, गौरी बाज़ार है, लार है, पड़रौना है यहाँ पर छोटे और बड़े उद्योग स्थापित किये जा सकते हैं। यहाँ पर रा-मैटीरियल बहुतायत से

पाया जाता है। इस ओर वित्त मंत्री महोदय ध्यान दें।

अब मैं भाषा के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दी राज भाषा घोषित हो चुकी है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप खत्म कीजिये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : बोले जाइये।

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : आपके पास कितनी जमीन है ?

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : हमारे पास दस पंद्रह बीघा है। वह भी बट जाये तो कोई हर्ज की बात नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उधर स्पीकर नहीं बैठे हुए हैं।

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : जब हिन्दी को राज भाषा बनाया गया तो मैं नहीं समझता कि किसी के साथ किसी भी प्रकार का पक्षपात हुआ। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब किसी राष्ट्रीय नेता को अपनी बात दुनिया के सामने रखनी होगी तो उसको उन्हें राष्ट्र की भाषा में, राष्ट्र की जवान में ही रखना होगा; उस देश की भाषा में रखना होगा जो उस देश की भाषा है। हिन्दी ही एक ऐसी भाषा है जिसमें किसी बात को देशवासियों के सामने रखा जा सकता है। महात्मा गांधी ने इसको अपनाया था, उन्होंने इसी जनवाणी से भारतवासियों को सम्बोधित किया था। २४-२५ करोड़ लोगों की यह भाषा है। २४-२५ करोड़ लोग इस भाषा को जानते हैं। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान के साथ हम अपना मसला तय नहीं कर सके हैं, जिस तरह से चीन ने जो हमारी भूमि हथिया ली है, उसको हम वापिस नहीं ले सके हैं, उसके साथ झगड़े का निपटारा नहीं कर सके हैं, उसी तरह से हिन्दी को समला भी हम आज तक हल नहीं कर पाये हैं, उसको

राज भाषा का आसन नहीं दे पाये हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि इसके लिए कोई तिथि निश्चित कर दी जाये, कोई तारीख निश्चित कर दी जाये, कोई समय निश्चित कर दिया जाये ताकि उस दिन से केन्द्र में सभी कार्यों के लिए हिन्दी का उपयोग हो सके।

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): Mr. Speaker, along with other hon. Members of the House, I should also congratulate the Minister of Finance on the lucid manner in which he has put forward his views in the Budget and the proposals.

एक माननीय सदस्य हिन्दी में बोलिये।

श्री के० दे० मालवीय : थोड़ा सा हिन्दी में भा बोल दूंगा, स्पीकर महोदय का आज्ञा ले कर।

His ability is well known to this House, and his tenacity to stick to the ideas which he has brought forward in this Budget should also be admired by those who may or may not agree with him. Pragmatism—of course, he is a well known pragmatist, and he believes that in our present difficulties, stress and strain, a pragmatic approach to problems is going to do the trick. Unfortunately, I am one of those who have always differed from such an approach. I believe that in the present difficulties it is all the more necessary that we should stick to those ideals to which we are committed, ideals which were not thought of in an ordinary or an easy way but after deep introspection and a perspective vision of those who had developed that vision. Sometimes it falls to those who are the leaders of the country, ideologues, to temporarily shift or deviate from the basic concepts which have been projected as ideologies. It is only the Leader who can take to certain deviations in a pragmatic way. It does not lie on all of us to do so.

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

I see in this Budget many deviations. These deviations have become all the more prominent because, of an abnormal economic situation which faces us in connection with prices, stagnation on the agricultural front and many other aspects like stagnation in the functioning of the services even. The Budget completely ignores the impact that the Bhubaneswar Congress session left on the minds of people and the ruling party, to which the Finance Minister and I are both committed in all respects.

An hon. Member: Neither of you.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Perhaps it was late for the Finance Minister to make amends because the procedure of laying down budgets takes a pretty long time. They start quite early; they started perhaps earlier than the time when the Bhubaneswar Congress session was held. But even then, those who know something about the formulation of the Budget would have been satisfied if the Finance Minister had stated or put in a brief paragraph that in view of the decision taken by Bhubaneswar some time later, the Budget could be revised in keeping with the spirit and instructions given by the Congress session to the ruling party. It has not been done. So, this Budget is characterised by ignoring all those directives that have been given by the Bhubaneswar session of the Congress.

Secondly, in paragraph 14 it reprimands the public sector. It says:

"It is of the utmost importance for our economy that enterprises in the public sector should not only make profits, but should make good profits. By that I mean that they should give a good dividend to the Exchequer and yet be able to build up reserves to finance their own future expansion. I know that some people think that public sector enterprises should work on no profits or low profits."

Here is a reprimand. Then, in paragraph 19 the Finance Minister

believes, and he has given expression to his views, that some of these big monopolies in the country, whose big concerns go by their family names, are not monopolies and that in terms of ownership they belong to the people.

Later, in paragraph 24 he invites foreign capital by what is known as the equity share scheme, to which I am not opposed in principle, but to which in certain respects I am opposed vehemently.

Lastly, there is the reshuffling of the tax system which adds a little to revenue, but it is a mere reshuffling.

I would make an attempt to confine myself to these four or five aspects. I have already said that the Bhubaneswar directions have been ignored. That is mainly so because I find that this Budget is an industry-oriented Budget, and not an agriculture-oriented Budget. Everybody is agreed that we are facing a great crisis in our agricultural programme. Congressman after Congressman stood up in the Bhubaneswar session and emphasized the fact that if we failed this time on the agricultural front, there would be ruination facing us, but I find that agriculture has been completely ignored. Perhaps, agriculture is not the strong point of the Finance Minister. Industry, business and trade are his strong points.

I heard a remark yesterday that a few hundred crores, five or six hundred crores, were earmarked for irrigation and power. That is not enough. I submitted before, and I wish to state here in this Parliament also, that we have gone into a stagnant stage on the agricultural front, from which it is difficult for us to come out unless we massively concentrate on the programme of agriculture on a do-or-die basis. We

have to modify the entire concept of our planning today if we really want to produce more foodgrains. Gone are those days when by marginal concessions of credit or by amending rules we could expect that the State Governments would do something in this respect. It is no use our blaming the State Governments. We advance them loans and complain that crores and crores are lying with them, and they are not returning it, but we also know that wherever irrigation schemes have been introduced, they are not fully utilised simply because the cultivator is not able to pay the rates. He has not yet become irrigation-minded. For the last six or seven years this question has been under the consideration of the Planning Commission, but they have not come to any decision. The simple conclusion to which they should have come—I am sorry to say that the great experts are not advising them properly and boldly—is that wherever irrigation facilities exist, the cultivator must get all those facilities even though he is not in a position to pay for a number of years. Millions worth of foodgrains would have been produced but for the fact that we have been too bureaucratic and too mercenary in our approach to these problems.

About five years back I had an experience, and I wish to state it here. I was then chairman of a co-operative society in my own constituency. Some of us succeeded in organising 40 tubewells after arranging a loan from the State Government, which was underwritten by the Central Government. In spite of all our efforts, we have not been able to persuade the Government to appreciate the fact that these tubewells are not being fully utilised by the peasantry merely because they are too poor to pay. Even today, not more than 17 per cent, if I remember aright,—perhaps it may be one or two per cent more—of the total capa-

city installed in that area of 4,000 acres is being utilised because more cultivators are not able to pay. In the meantime, all that money has been sunk, interests are not being realised, and nothing is coming out. The methods that were adopted a few years back on investment and return still rule the day.

Similarly, on the question of massive aid to the cultivator, out of six crores of cultivators, $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores have got two acres of land or less. They must get full credit, if we expect that they can produce more than what they are producing. Anyhow, this massive aid to cultivators, wholesale State trading in foodgrains and reorganisation of the irrigation system with a view to see that the cultivator utilises it more, are all found absent in these Budget proposals. I do not think that in any manner the hon. Food and Agriculture Minister can introduce them now in a big way.

Therefore, we have missed the bus for this year also, and the food programme will continue to be ignored. I am sorry for it. I want to repeat my warning here that food production will not be attained according to the targets that the Planning Commission has set before us. We have produced about 80 million tons. Our target is about 100 million tons by the end of the Third Plan. It will not be reached even if Nature is very kind to us, because, as I said, we have missed the bus.

We have, therefore, to have a new approach, a socialist approach to build up our agriculture, and that socialist approach is to take care to cater to the needs of the small man. We are making a great effort to invite capital from abroad. It is a good thing, I am not opposed to the idea of inviting as much capital from abroad as possible and proper. I, however, find that international experts are not very happy at the way in which we are conducting our affairs. Some of them say that we are good "planners" but

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

bad "doers". Let us do a little introspection. Even if we get Rs. 100 from abroad, we are not able to spend that Rs. 100. Year in and year out the Finance Ministry, the Home Ministry and the different Ministries interfere with those Ministries which want to go ahead faster; there is interference all round. Yesterday some hon. Members seemed to welcome the idea of the Finance Minister; I am not happy at the way hints have been thrown about how the Finance Minister proposes to deal with all these matters. The Finance Minister says:

"Our present arrangements for the choice of specific projects and programmes affect a detailed examination of the technical and economic aspects of practical alternatives leave much to be desired; and it is my intention to strengthen this aspect of the work of my Ministry during the months to come."

There has already been too much interference in the functioning of individual Ministries and independent units that have come to stay. Let them function independently; if necessary let them commit errors; they will learn by that. The interference from the Finance Ministry, Planning Commission and other Ministries is too much. It is these things which have disturbed the foreign collaborators; it is not lack of finance. Further, there are certain fundamental questions which have been responsible for the slow growth of developmental schemes. We have heard the phenomenon of "international communism"; it is a solid fact, but there is "international capitalism" also which functions in some such way that the rate of development is ultimately slowed down. Let us take Madras port. Every six months, perhaps a commission of the International Monetary Fund or other international agency comes and sees whether the programme can be taken up or not because it is in public sector. But I know there are big schemes of port development and rail-

way development, opening of Railway lines to get raw material in other parts of the world owned and taken up by the private sector—large consortiums. Too much money has been pumped in there because private consortiums are running them and building up those schemes. We will have to compete with them. 60,000 tonners, mineral ore ships will come to load the mineral ores. We cannot sell our mineral ores to Japan or to any other needy country on the same terms at which those countries can sell because of the siding facilities and other facilities provided by them, those consortiums. Then we are reprimanded: for slow progress. This is not very fair. All these heavy and basic industries which have gone under public sector will have to stay there under these conditions for some more time; they will not be able to make more profits. The consumer goods industries are utilising the raw material, whether it is power or mineral ore. Therefore, to say that the public sector schemes must show good return on the investment under the present conditions is not very fair; it is not understanding the situation properly. Whether it is the scheme of power or mineral ore, they have to depend on international factors. It is difficult to compete with international price also just because the price of raw materials are falling when we are building up these schemes. To expect good returns in a span of 3-4 years time is non-sense. There is another aspect to it. There are the railways to make profit, the port authorities to make profit, there is the taxation: all these go to make a complex of profit pattern which it is difficult for public sector basic industries to bear if it is to sell in international market. Take the case of iron ore: I learn that 41 or 46 per cent of the cost structure goes in railway freight alone after deducting other cost elements; there is only a margin of Rs. 3 left per ton to the mining project like Kiriburu. It cannot be expected to make any profits because Kiriburu project has been linked by the railway line in order to

open up that backward region. There are considerations other than economics such as the bringing up of a region; for that purpose plenty of money is sunk in heavy and basic industries, whether it is iron ore here or oil refinery in Assam or the Khetra copper project. They are linked up with strategic material or opening up of backward areas; this concept of profit making of 6—9 per cent is all non-sense. If you want to develop these heavy and basic industries in order to get strategic products or materials such as oil, power, copper, iron, etc. you must delink it from the concept of profit which is usually attached to all those heavy consumer goods like soda water bottles or textiles or medicines. All these are quick-profit returning; every day they are sold and earn a profit of 12 or 18 or 20 per cent. Why should we also not take heavy consumer goods industries also under the public sector? If the hon. Minister is keen on public sector schemes making profits, the only corollary is that the time has come to build up socialism by taking up the heavy consumer goods industries also in the public sector. What the hon. Minister says is unfair to the public sector and unnecessarily partial to the private sector.

I will now refer to the question of monopolies. Unfortunately, there is a big difference between me and the Finance Minister on the question of monopolies. He says in para 19:

"..... what is not often realised is that even the biggest industrial plants in the country today belong, in terms of ownership, much more to the people at large than to their original founders with whose names they are popularly associated."

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): *Indian Express* belongs to me now.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I will come to the Press later on. This is the view

held by my friend Shri T. T. K. My view is that it has nothing to do with the people's ownership. All these monopolists have ganged themselves up with international capital to build up monoliths in this country that is mainly responsible for the disparity that exists today in the economic sphere in the country. It is only the socialist method and socialist approach that can solve the problem. It is difficult here to define that. The monopolists are functioning almost as a parallel Government and something must be done to stop them. We are not satisfied with the sort of investigation promised. What is the investigation for? What is not known about them? If I had time I would have given the details and shown.....

Mr. Speaker: I assure him he has no time.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: So, it is in this context that a society which is wedded to a planned economy has to spell out its objectives more clearly. Planned economy is really intended to be a continuous process of evolution in which the gap between the haves and the have-nots is being constantly narrowed down. It has not narrowed down today because the monopolies are there and no effort is being made to reduce them except the promise here which is not enough. If the

13 hrs.

development programmes under planned economy do not lead to this goal, the consequences are menacingly dangerous, resulting in the common man suffering the most. There has been no outward and obvious benefit that the masses may have received and I am sorry to say that this ignorance of the agricultural programme is going to create a more serious situation for the Government, and that is why I suggested in the earlier part of my speech that we have to massively lean, and look into the question of modifying this Plan which is now more industry-based.

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

The small section of the people that has benefited from the impact of the plans poses the greatest danger to the economic well-being of the people. This section consists of crowning class of industrialists who have in their control the strings of most of the industrial production in the private sector, and their capacity to manipulate prices and corner the profits is unlimited. That is why these middle-classes have grown today. Round these kings of industrial empires have grown their other courtiers consisting of a large number of brokers, whose profession it is to play one industrial empire against the other and charge their commission and have their margin of profits. From this fountain-head of corruption start the other parasites consisting of managing agents, professional directors, contractors, suppliers of raw materials, middle-men, hoarders of stocks, big transport operators, financiers and bankers. These are all important functionaries of the private sector and they have their tentacles in every branch of activity.

Today, it is no use our trying to make regulations, make legislation, for controlling all these people. We have to own them; unless we own them nothing can happen.

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

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I will take only two minutes more. All this has created circumstances in which people could become rich overnight. They are becoming rich overnight. It is said that about Rs. 3,000 crores of unaccounted money is circulating in the country, and there is nothing more dangerous which faces the Government than this unaccounted money which nobody can control it unless drastic socialist measures are taken and unless they are taken it will completely wipe out the elements of our economy. A new code of conduct has developed which means an understanding for lending and borrowing

black money, trusting each other with hoarded wealth, smuggled currency, diamonds and gold and for evolving oral, shady transactions worth crores of rupees in which no businessman can ever complain that the word is not kept.

A large number of business-houses previously owned by Britishers and other foreign interests changed hands. Most of such business-houses had history extending over several decades and had been built with outstanding managerial skill for which the British are famous. Indian capitalism has grown in circumstances unlike the European capitalism which grew out of the struggle against feudalism. Here, profit, protection, soft attitude—all that has given a new complex to this capitalism which is now sitting tight over our shoulders. Therefore, I am afraid that this impetus which is being given with a view to invite foreign capital is going to create an imbalance in our society and in our economy which will hamper our ideals of socialism. It is high time that we should take care to stop it.

Then the question of monopoly was contested yesterday by my hon. friend, Dr. Singhvi. There are monopolies in this country. It is difficult to define, or to find out exactly the definition of monopoly. But there are monopolistic tendencies everywhere, in the press, in the banks, in the industries. Take even a small industry, like the matchstick industry. Let us see what is happening there. It is a small thing, where about 60 per cent of the industry is held by one group: Wimco. The rest, that is, 40 per cent, is held by thousands and thousands of small people. It is price monopoly. Wimco controls the price. The small producers cannot raise the price by a single naya paisa. Therefore, the price is imposed on these thousands of small producers of matchstick; by whom? by one firm, Wimco; by the monopolists.

Similarly, I know the Birlas and some others hold monopolies. Well, I

will even refer to that monopoly. Let there be an investigation. In the Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Ball Bearing Industry published in 1962, there is a significant reference. And they only stop at this. It says that "as at the time of the last enquiry, that is, 1960, National Engineering Industries, Ltd., Jaipur, still remained the only large scale unit in the country." Why the ball-bearing industry should be kept only with one man? There were many licences issued by the Government. They are all being purchased. They see to it that all these licences are purchased.

Therefore, to conclude, I hold that this budget has not given adequate attention to the resolution passed at Bhuvaneswar. To that extent, socialism is not being implemented. It is high time that we did it. Secondly, something must be done immediately to put a curb on the monopolies, to remove this disparity. Thirdly, the small man has to be cared for. This budget does not take care of the small man. Even the electricity rates are not very liberal for him. I went to Kota and I found that the electricity rates for the villagers was higher than the electricity rates for the bigger industrialists who are just about ten yards away from there. Everywhere in the country that pattern is there. The industrialists get lower rates because they want to produce more; produce more for whom? For giving comfort to about ten million people out of 446 million people. Therefore, I submit that during the coming months—three, four or five months—we should make another bold attempt to revise this budget in order to make it a more socialist budget.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, २० अरब रुपयों पर और एक मानी में ५५ अरब रुपयों पर हम लोग बहस कर रहे हैं कि वह इकट्ठा होने चाहिए और क्या कोई दूसरा जरिया उन के इकट्ठा करने का और अच्छा है और वह इतने खर्च होने चाहिए या किसी और अच्छे तरीके पर

उन को खर्च किया जा सकता है ? इसलिए यह बड़ा व्यापक सवाल है पूरे राज्य का ।

सब से पहले मैं आप का ध्यान इस सम्बन्ध में खींचना चाहता हूँ मंत्रियों और नौकरशाहों के सम्बन्ध में राजनीति और प्रशासन पर । राजनीति करने वालों की संख्या करीब ४,००० है अगर विधायकों को देखें और करीब ४०० है अगर मंत्रियों को देखें । प्रशासन में लगे हुए लोगों की संख्या करीब १ करोड़ है । इन में से जो नौकरशाह हैं उन का मंत्रियों के साथ कैसा सम्बन्ध हो । यह बड़ा गम्भीर सवाल है । इस सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ माननीय गृह मंत्री के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ । अगर वह यहां रहें तो अच्छा होगा . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : उन के रहने पर कहना अच्छा होगा ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं दुबारा तो मौका नहीं पाऊंगा ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : गृह मंत्रालय की बजट मांगों पर आप कह सकते हैं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब क्या हुकम होता है आप का ?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): The Home Minister is busy in the other House, Sir.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तो फिर मैं कहे देता हूँ उस को ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : माननीय गृह मंत्री उसे पढ़ लेंगे ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : गृह मंत्री ने इसी साल फरवरी में, एक सज्जन, सज्जन मैं यही कह रहा हूँ, उन को लोक सेवा आयोग का सदस्य बनाया । यह मार्च १९५६ तक बिहार में चीफ इंजीनियर रहे . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब फिर मैं आप से एक विनय करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर एक खास किसी व्यक्ति का कोई केस लाना हो जिसके

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

लिए कि मिनिस्टर्स से जवाब चाहिए तो पहले उसका नोटिस दिया जाता है ताकि वह उस पर सारी चीज दरियाफ्त कर के आये और जवाब दे सके। अब माननीय सदस्य जो एक इंडिविजुअल केस पर कहने जा रहे हैं तो उन्होंने इस के लिये प्रायर नोटिस तो दिया हुआ नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वैसे मैं ने माननीय मंत्री को कहा था और उन को मैंने अपने खतों में लिख दिया था कि मैं अपने बजट भाषण में इस सवाल को उठाना चाहता हूँ और उन्होंने इस पर मुझे खत वगैरह भी लिखे लेकिन वह तो मेरा और उनका सवाल है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप मुझे भी लिख दिये होते तो मैं आप को बतला देता।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मुझे पता नहीं था कि आप को लिखना जरूरी है वैसे मैं बतला दूँ कि आप को मुझे खत लिखने में ज्यादा खूशी होती है और मैं आप को जरूर लिख देता। लेकिन यह सवाल ऐसा है कि

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बिल्कुल वैसे ही आप का खत आने पर मुझे भी खूशी होती है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तो इस को आप मुझे पूरा कर लेने दीजिये, क्योंकि उन को यह बात मालूम है।

यह ५३ बरस के थे। इन की सेवा-निवृत्ति होने में दो बरस कम थे, लेकिन फिर भी बिहार की मंत्रि परिषद् ने अपनी एक बैठक में फ़ैसला किया कि इन को वहां पर और ज्यादा काम नहीं दिया जायेगा। इस सम्बन्ध में बिहार की विधान सभा में ६ मार्च, १९५६ को बहस भी हुई। लो० ने पूछा, बहुत लम्बे चौड़े सवाल हुए और

मंत्री की तरफ़ से जवाब दिया गया कि मंत्रि परिषद् ने फ़ैसला किया है कि इन की सेवाओं को खत्म किया जाये, इन को समय का और ज्यादा बढ़ावा न दिया जाये। ६ मार्च, १९५६ को खुल कर—कोई सरकारी कागज़ों पर नहीं—विधान सभा में यह बात हुई।

फिर जुलाई, १९५६ में—उस के दो तीन महीने बाद—आज के गृह मंत्री ने, जो उस समय सिंचाई के मंत्री थे, इन को दिल्ली सरकार में नौकरी दी बाढ़ नियंत्रण के चीफ़ इंजीनियर की हैसियत से।

अब मैं इन दोनों बातों को आप के सामने रखे देता हूँ कि फ़रवरी, १९६४ में जब माननीय गृह मंत्री आये, तब इस अफ़सर को लोक सेवा आयोग का सदस्य बनाया गया और जुलाई, १९५६ में, जब वह सिंचाई मंत्री थे, तब, हालांकि बिहार सरकार फ़ैसला कर चुकी थी कि इन को समय की बढ़ती न दी जाये, उन्होंने इन को अपने यहां चीफ़ इंजीनियर बनाया था।

अगर इस में यह कहा जाये कि श्री पाटिल अथवा श्री कानूनगो वगैरह ने इस के बारे में सिफ़ारिशें की हैं, तो मैं आप से कह सकता हूँ कि ये सिफ़ारिशें बीच की हैं, वास्तव में इन का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं रहता है। और उस के अलावा जब सिफ़ारिशें की गई थीं, तो बीच में जितने और गृह मंत्री रहे, उन्होंने तीन, चार, पांच और सदस्यों को लोक सेवा आयोग में भर्ती किया, लेकिन इन अफ़सर को नहीं किया।

मैं एक छोटी सी चीज़ और बताए देता हूँ कि माननीय गृह मंत्री की मौसी के लड़के के लड़के की शादी इस अफ़सर . . . (Interruption).

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद (नालंदा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रकार की व्यक्तिगत बातों को उठाना इस सदन की मर्यादा के खिलाफ़ है (Interruptions.)

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह इस हाउस के डेकोरम के खिलाफ़ है। (Interruptions).

श्री शशिरंजन (पपरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस अफ़सर के बारे में माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं, वह आई० ई० एस० ग्रेड के इंजीनियर हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन के बारे में इतना संकेत काफी है। (Interruptions). वह आई० ई० एस० ग्रेड के इंजीनियर हैं और वैसे इंजीनियर इस देश में उंगली पर गिनने की तादाद में हैं। (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। आप दोनों साहबान बैठ जायें।

मैं ने माननीय सदस्य को पहले ही कहा था कि वैसे ग्राम कवायद के मुताबिक़ यह सवाल नहीं उठाया जा सकता है, जब तक कि वह इस का एडवांस नोटिस न दें। उन की बात मैं ने सुनी और कहा कि अच्छा, वह इस को उठा लें। उन्होंने यह सवाल उठाया, लेकिन अब इस बात को इस हद तक ले जाना कि मौसी की मौसी की मौसी का लड़का . . . (Interruption). आर्डर, आर्डर। कुछ तो लिमिट होनी चाहिए। न कि जहां तक हम किसी को कनेक्ट कर सकते हैं, वहां तक कनेक्ट कर के बोई बात कह दें। इतना तो किसी न किसी तरफ़ से आदमी गठ जाता है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि मौसी के लड़के के लड़के या चचा के लड़के के लड़के में क्या सम्बन्ध है—क्या फ़र्क़ है दोनों में।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो व्यक्तिगत बातें हैं, उन का आप और हवाला न दीजिए। आप ने इंजीनियर का हवाला दे दिया है।

श्री शशिरंजन : यह उन की बदकिस्मती है कि

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य इस वक्त कुछ न कहें। इस का जवाब मिनिस्टर साहब देंगे।

श्री शशिरंजन : इन अफ़िसर की किस्मती है कि वह लोहिया जी के सम्बन्धी नहीं हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अब ख़ामोश रहें। मिनिस्टर साहब इस का जवाब देंगे।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : यह उन की ख़ुशकिस्मती है कि वह मंत्री महोदय के सम्बन्धी हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मुझे अफ़सर से मतलब नहीं है। मुझे मंत्री से मतलब है। मैंने पहले कह दिया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के मंत्री लोग . . .

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : आन ए प्वाएंट आफ़ आर्डर, सर। मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आप ने इस सदन में कई बार माननीय सदस्यों को यह निर्देश दिया है कि जहां तक सम्भव हो, और बिल्कुल न हो, तो बहुत अच्छा है, किसी भी प्रकार के व्यक्तिगत लांछनों या आरोपों की ओर सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित न किया जाये। लेकिन इस के बावजूद वह बात और क्रम तो चलता ही रहता है और हमें तब दुख होता है, जब आप की बात नहीं मानी जाती है। जब आप कहते हैं कि व्यक्तिगत आरोप और लांछन न लगाए जायें, तो इस सदन की मयोदा और प्रतिष्ठा यह होनी चाहिए कि उन बात को माना जाय। मेरा प्वायंट आफ़ आर्डर यह है ? हम निश्चित रूप से आप का निर्देश चाहते हैं कि इस सम्बन्ध में वास्तविक स्थिति क्या है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, निर्देश देने से पहले आप मेरी बात सुन लें।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): On a point of order, Sir. Are we justified in discussing the matrimonial alliances of people here and also the extra-marital alliances of people here?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अपना निर्देश देने से पहले आप मेरी बात सुन लें।

यहां हम लोग प्रशासन और राजनीति के सम्बन्ध, नेता और नौकरशाह के संबंध पर बातचीत कर रहे हैं। अगर इन चार सौ मंत्रियों का सम्बन्ध एक करोड़ सरकारी नौकरों के साथ पक्षपात और मनमानी का हो गया, तो सारे राज्य का सत्यानाश हो जायेगा। और पक्षपात और मनमानी के बारे में रिश्ते बड़े ज़बर्दस्त हुआ करते हैं। घर के रिश्ते, चचा, बहनोई, साले वगैरह, ये जितने रिश्ते हैं, और मैं ने जो रिश्ता बताया, वह बिल्कुल नज़दीकी रिश्ते हैं। मैं ने जो रिश्ता बताया है, वह बिल्कुल नज़दीकी रिश्ता बताया है। यह कोई मामूली रिश्ता नहीं है। अगर यह बात साबित हो जाती है कि

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जायें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं अपनी बात तो पूरी कर लूं।

. . . कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने इस अफ़सर को पक्षपात, मनमानी कर के, कानूनों को तोड़ कर, नियमों का उल्लंघन कर के नियुक्ति दी है और दो बार दी है—एक बार १९५६ में दी है और एक बार १९६४ में दी है—तब मैं साबित कर देता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान का राज्य बिल्कुल घिस चुका है, यहां कायदे-कानून नहीं रह गए हैं। यह कोई व्यक्तिगत मामला नहीं है। जहां तक इस अफ़सर का सम्बन्ध है, सब जानते हैं कि..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप ने अपनी बात कह ली है। अब आप बैठ जायेंगे ?

माननीय सदस्य, श्री पाण्डेय ने, वायंट आफ़ आर्डर, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया था कि व्यक्तिगत ज़िक्र करना, किसी की नुबता-चीनी करना, जो यहां मौजूद नहीं है, उन के बरख़िलाफ़ कुछ कहना, यह इस सदन की मर्यादा नहीं है और नहीं कहा जा सकता है। इसीलिए मैं ने शुरू में ही माननीय सदस्य को कहा था। मगर इस डिस्कशन में ग्राम तोर पर हम इस बात की इजाज़त देते हैं कि अगर किसी व्यक्ति के बरख़िलाफ़ कहना हो तो मेम्बर पहले एडवांस नोटिस दे कि मैं इस बात को उठाना चाहता हूं डिस्कशन में, और मिनिस्टर को पता हो, ताकि वह तैयार हो कर आ सके। ऐसी बात में तो मिनिस्टर के लिए भी अच्छा है कि वह बात साफ़ हो जाये, बजाये इस के कि यूं ही इत्ज़ाम चलता रहे।

मैंने पहले एतराज़ किया था कि माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया, जब तक नोटिस न दें, तब तक वह इस बात को न उठाये। जब उन्होंने कहा कि मैंने मिनिस्टर को एडवांस नोटिस दे दिया है कि मैं इस बात को अपनी बजट की स्पीच में उठाऊंगा, तो मुझे मानना पड़ा, गो मेरे पास नोटिस नहीं आया था। यह किस तरह से हो सकता है कि माननीय सदस्य इस सदन में कोई बात कहें और मैं उस को न मानूं ? इस लिए मैं ने यह ज़ाज़त दी।

लेकिन मैं अपनी बात को दोहराता ज़रूर हूं कि अगर हम इस में बहुत दूर चले जायेंगे, तो इस से बहुत उलझन यहां पर हो जायेगी। अगर ख़ास तोर पर किसी ख़ास आदमी को ले कर कोई डिस्कशन करनी हो और उस का स्पेशल नोटिस हो, तो उस का ज़िक्र हो सकता है।

अब माननीय सदस्य ने उन का ज़िक्र कर लिया है, जो कुछ उन्होंने कहना था,

कह लिया है, इसलिए मेरा खयाल है कि अब वह आगे चलें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहली बात तो यह है कि इस बारे में जितना समय लगा है, वह मेरे पास समय में नहीं रहेगा और दूसरे, यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं यह भी कहे देता हूँ कि जब कोई साहब यहाँ पर तक्ररीर करें—यह सिर्फ आप की ही बात नहीं है—और जितना उन का समय हो, उस में इन्टरपोज़ हों, तो वे भी पाटें आफ़ दि गेम—खेल का हिस्सा समझी जाती हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य आगे चलें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं उस प्रश्न को छोड़ देता हूँ, हालाँकि मैं आप से अर्ज किये देता हूँ कि जितने सवाल हम लोगों की तरफ़ से उठाए जाते हैं, उन के उत्तर आप मंत्री महोदय से दिलवाने की कृपा करें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जरूर।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस के बिना इस लोक सभा का काम बिल्कुल मिथ्या हो जाता है।

मैं इस सिद्धान्त को उठा रहा हूँ कि राजनीति और नौकरशाह का सम्बन्ध क्या रहना चाहिए, क्योंकि अगर ये तीन चार सौ मंत्री अपने नौकरशाहों का इस्तेमाल करते हैं या तो खुद धन बटोरने के लिए, या अपने रिश्तेदारों के लिए धन बटोरने के लिए, या अपनी पार्टों के लिए धन बटोरने के लिए, और या मान लें कि धन न भी बटोरें, तो शक्ति का संचय करने के लिए, ताकि अपने

गुट को मजबूत बना कर राज्य पर कब्ज़ा कर लें—ये चार चीज़ें मैंने गिनाई हैं—, तो मैं उस को बड़े व्यापक रूप का भ्रष्टाचार कहूंगा। एक पड़ोसी देश के प्रधान मंत्री की बात मैं करता हूँ। वह बहुत अच्छे आदमी थे जहाँ तक मैं समझ पाया था। लेकिन उन की बीवी अनधिकृत व्यापार किया करती थी। अब वह उस देश के प्रधान मंत्री रह नहीं गए हैं।

माननीय गृह मंत्री जी यहाँ पर नहीं हैं। उप-गृह मंत्री जी यहाँ बनाये गये हैं कुछ दिन पहले, उनके बारे में मैं कह देता हूँ। वह लोक सभा की चीज़ है। श्री मिश्र जो अब उप-गृह मंत्री बनाये गये हैं, कुछ दिन पहले तक एक राष्ट्रीय निर्माण संस्था के सदस्य थे। उस वक्त ११० रुपया हजार मन मिट्टी खोदने के लिए इस निगम को मिला करता था। लेकिन उसके नीचे जो ठेकेदार होते थे उनको ७० रुपये मिला करते थे, फिर नीचे ६० रुपये और मजदूरों को जा कर कभी कभी पंद्रह और कभी कभी बीस रुपये ही मिला करते थे। उनको औसत जा कर ४० रुपया पड़ता था। कहां ११० रुपये और कहां ४० रुपये। इससे बढ़ कर ईमान की कच्चाई दुनिया में क्या हो सकती है? यह सारा ग्राम दरभंगा हवाई अड्डा बनाते हुए हुआ था। किस के पास गया, इसको मैं नहीं उठाना चाहता, कौन कौन ठेकेदार थे, किस किस के रिश्तेदार थे, इसको भी मैं उठाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन यह सारा कुछ होता है नौकरशाह और मंत्री के आपसी संबंध की वजह से और इस पर अगर निगरानी नहीं रखी गई तो हमारे देश का हिसाब बिल्कुल बिगड़ जाएगा।

मान लीजिये कोई मंत्री खुद पैसा नहीं इकट्ठा करता है, उसके रिश्तेदार करते हैं या वह पार्टी के लिये करता है या संचय करता है तो कभी कभी अपने को साधू समझने लग जाता है, हठी बन जाता है, उस के दिमाग

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

पर पर्दा पड़ जाता है और वह समझने लग जाता है कि मैं तो कोई बुरा काम नहीं कर रहा हूँ और धोती कुरते में रहता हूँ, बहुत सादा रहता हूँ, इसलिए उसके दिमाग में और ज्यादा जबरदस्त भ्रष्टाचार घुस जाया करता है बनिस्वत उस मंत्री के जो थोड़ा गद्दत शोकीन हुआ करता है। इस पर अगर हम निगाह नहीं रखेंगे तो काम ठीक से नहीं चल सकेगा।

मैं व्यापार और राजनीति के संबंध की एक बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ। मुझ पर कृपा की गई है यह कह कर कि मैं उन बातों को बताऊँ जिन का मुझ को जवाब नहीं मिला है। ऐसी तो बीसियों बातें होंगी अगर मैं उन बातों को बतलाने लगूँ और मैं बड़ा वक्त लग जाएगा। लेकिन एक किस्सा बताना चाहता हूँ इस व्यापार और राजनीति के संबंध के बारे में। एक साहब हैं जिन का नाम है श्री चिरंजी लाल बाजूरिया। एक बड़ी कम्पनी के कानपुर में वह मैनेजिंग एजेंट हैं। वह कम्पनी है ब्रिटिश इंडिया कारपोरेशन जो कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में बदनाम हो चुकी है। किस किस मंत्री का मैं नाम लूँ उस कारपोरेशन के यह मैनेजिंग एजेंट बनाये गये और जब बनाये गये तब तो जीवन बीमा निगम जो सरकारी संस्था है, उसके बोट के सहारे बनाये गये। उसके पहले मेघना और मैक्लयोग कम्पनी में विनिमय के मामले को ले कर सरकार ने उसपर जुरमाना कर दिया था। एक ऐसा आदमी जिस के ऊपर सरकार ने जुर्माना कर दिया था उसको बोट दे कर ब्रिटिश इंडिया कारपोरेशन की तरफ से मैनेजिंग एजेंट बनाया गया। यह व्यापार और राजनीति का संबंध है। इन हजरात के बारे में कल्ले वगैरह के भी मामले जुड़े हुए हैं और सारा कलकत्ता जानता है, कानपुर जाता है। ऐसे ऐसे लोगों को तरजीह दी जाती है। क्या वजह है? पार्टी चन्दा? क्योंकि २६ लाख रुपये इसने कांग्रेस पार्टी को चुनाव में दे दिये . . .

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : तीस लाख।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : २६ लाख या ३० लाख, जितना भी हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको याद होगा कि मैंने दो बार इसी सदन में कहा है कि आजकल मनुष्य के जीवन का मूल्य इतना गिर गया है कि इसी सदन के एक माननीय सदस्य का नाम भी कल्ले के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है। मैंने बार बार कहा लेकिन नाम नहीं लिया। कुछ लोगों को गलतफहमी हुई। अब मैं नाम लिये देता हूँ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या जरूरत है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तब उसमें गम्भीरता नहीं आती है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : गम्भीरता का सवाल नहीं है। अगर नाम जुड़ा हुआ है किसी का तो कोई तहकीकात हो रही होगी, किसी अदालत में केस होगा। सिर्फ नाम जुड़े हुए होने पर हम पार्लिमेंट में इस के बारे में क्या करेंगे? उस की कोई तहकीकात . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कुछ नहीं हो रही है, सब दबा दिया गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नाम जाने दीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मतलब यह होता है कि आखिर यह लोक सभा है किस लिए? अगर जीवन की सुरक्षा का कोई मूल्य नहीं रह गया है, महत्व नहीं रह गया है, सरकारी मशीनरी के कल पुर्जे इतने ज्यादा घिस गए हैं कि वे मनुष्य की सुरक्षा तक नहीं कर पाते, तो यह जो बजट है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह के केस को ले कर कि वहां पर कल्ले हो गया है, यहां चोरी हो गई है, इधर डाका पड़ा है . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं उदाहरण दे रहा हूँ सिद्धांत का। एक तरफ तो मैंने मंत्री और नौकरशाह के सिद्धान्त का उदाहरण दिया, दूसरा उदाहरण दिया व्यापार और राजनीति का। तीसरी बात मैं अर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि आप इस सदन में फौरन एक लम्बी बहस करवायें कि हिन्दुस्तान के जीवन का मूल्य बिल्कुल नहीं रह गया है, वह मक्खी से भी बदतर हो गया है, लोग अपने आपसी संबंधों को कत्ल वगैरह से तय कर लिया करते हैं। कभी रायचूर में इस तरह की घटनायें हो जाती हैं, कभी शिलांग में। इस पर बहस पूरी होनी चाहिये। कभी तो हम जीवन के मूल्य को, जीवन के महत्व को समझें।

मन्त्रियों की ओर से कई चीजों के मुझे उत्तर नहीं आये हैं। मैं नम्बर एक की बात बहुत कम उठाऊंगा। बहुत उठा चुका हूँ उन के बारे में भी मुझे कोई उत्तर नहीं मिलता नम्बर दो की बात मैं कहूंगा। नम्बर एक, प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में एक चीज की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिला देता हूँ। कर-चोरी का हमेशा यहां पर जिन्न होता है और कहा जाता है कि ३० अरब या ८० अरब रुपये बाजार में बिना हिसाब के रखे हुए हैं, लोग कर चोरी कर लिया करते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री का जो घर अलाहाबाद में है, उसके बारे में १९६२ तक मुझे पता है क्योंकि मुझे सरकारी खत मिल चुका है। उस घर पर कम से कम १८०० या २००० रुपये महीना के हिसाब से कर होना चाहिये जबकि उस पर १८०० साल के हिसाब से ही कर लग रहा है। साधारण आदमी कर की चोरी करता है तो कह दिया जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कौन कर लगाता है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अलाहाबाद का नगर निगम।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तब आप उस चीज को यहां कैसे उठा सकते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रधान मंत्री के पास यह सवाल जा चुका है। पांच साल पहले उन्होंने कहा था कि मैं अलाहाबाद के नगर निगम का कदंगा कि वह मेरे ऊपर अधिक टैक्स लगाये, लेकिन कहीं कुछ नहीं हो रहा है। कैसे हम हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिकों से उम्मीद कर सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर निगम नहीं लगाता है तो यहां पर बहस करके क्या हम उसको हुकम देंगे कि तुम लगाओ ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माननीय प्रधान मंत्री के लिए कह सकता हूँ कि इसके पहले कि वह दूसरों को कुछ कहा करें, अपने चेहरे की तरफ भी देत लिया कि—

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इससे कोई संबंध नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ये सब बातें उठाते हुए मुझ बहुत अच्छा नहीं लगता है। मेरा दिमाग तो बुनियादी बातों की तरफ ज्यादा जाता है। लेकिन जब कूड़ा इकट्ठा हो गया है (इंटरप्शंस) अगर यह झुंड सोचता है कि चिल्ला कर मुझे बिठा देगा तो यह असम्भव बात है। अपनी बात मैं कहूंगा चाहे मैं अकेला रहूँ और केवल अध्यक्ष महोदय यहां पर हैं जिन का हुकम मैं मानूंगा। झुंड का हुकम मैं हमिज नहीं मानूंगा। यह बात मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ। इसलिए मैं बुनियादी बातों की तरफ जाना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बात ठीक है अगर आपका मतलब उतना ही हो। लेकिन सारे हाउस को झुंड कहना और यह कहना कि झुंड की बात नहीं मानूंगा, मुनासिब नहीं है (इंटरप्शंस) मैं खुद जो कह रहा हूँ, तो आपको दखल देने की क्या जरूरत है ?

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

कितना ही हम एक दूसरे से नाराज क्यों न हो, नफरत भी क्यों न हो लेकिन हमें एक दूसरे की इज्जत करनी चाहिये कुछ बातों में। अगर हम यहां पर एक दूसरे के प्रति कुछ इज्जत रखेंगे तो हमारी भी लोग बाहर इज्जत करेंगे। अगर इस ज्ञान से हम एक दूसरे को पुकारेंगे या ऐसा करेंगे कि किसी को नीचा दिखलाया जाए या किसी को जलील किया जाए तो हम सब जलील होंगे, एक नहीं। आप जो कुछ कहना चाहते हैं, कहें लेकिन ऐसे शब्दों में नहीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैंने सारे सदन को कुछ नहीं कहा है, कुछ लोगों को कहा है। मैं उनकी इज्जत तभी करूंगा जब वे मेरी इज्जत करेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर वक्त आएगा जब आपकी नहीं होगी तो मैं उसी वक्त आपकी इज्जत की भी रक्षा उसी तरह से करूंगा जैसे बाकियों की करता हूं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अपनी बात मैं कह पाऊं यही इज्जत मैं चाहता हूं, दूसरी नहीं।

मैं बुनियादी कारणों पर जाना चाहता हूं। चूंकि वक्ती चीजों का बड़ा महत्व हो आया करता है, इसलिये मैं कोई बुनियादी चीज इतने अधिक विस्तार से नहीं कह पाता हूं। कहीं कई चीज हिन्दुओं में कम है। वह क्या चीज है, इसको आप देखें। हिन्दुस्तान में अधिक संख्या वाले हिन्दू हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि कभी भी पिछले १५०० बरस में हमारा सुधार नहीं हो पाया है। अभी मैंने एक किस्सा सुना है। मुक़्तवाजी में जो सब से बड़ा आदमी है कैशियस कने वह मुसलमान हो गया है। लोग कहेंगे कि अगर हो गया है तो इसका कोई खास महत्व नहीं है, मतलब नहीं है, इक्के दुक्के हो जाया करते हैं। लेकिन एक तक की बात मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि आज सारी दुनिया में लोग क्रिश्चियन होते हैं, मुसलमान होते हैं, कोई

हिन्दू नहीं होता है। जितनी बड़ी तादाद उनकी है, उसको देखते हुए क्या इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार नहीं होना चाहिये? कहीं कोई बुनियादी खराबी है। अगर उस बुनियादी खराबी को हम देखें तो हमें पता चलेगा कि हम लोग फटे हुए हैं, टूटे हुए हैं। बीस अरब या पचास अरब रुपये तो हम खर्च कर दें लेकिन अगर हमने अपने आपको सुधारा नहीं, समाज को सुधारा नहीं तो क्या होगा? उसका क्या फायदा होगा? क्या हमारा समाज ऐसा बना दिया जाएगा जो चौआलिस करोड़ आदिमियों के दिमाग को लेकर चले? यह सारा मामला टूटा हुआ है, गिरोहों में बंटा हुआ है। इतना नकली हो चुका है कि मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाऊं, क्योंकि यह काम तो सरकार करती है, कि रेडियो बगैरह पर क्या गाना सुनने को मिलता है।

“जरा आंख में भर लो पानी”

चीन के आक्रमण से मरे हुए सिपाहियों को, जो कि चीन के हाथों से मरे हैं, लेकर कहा जाता है कि “आंख में भर लो पानी”। क्या नकली संस्कृति है। अगर आंख में पानी आये तो बांध बना कर उसको रोक लेना चाहिये और गुस्से को दिल में बांध कर दुश्मन से मुकाबला करना चाहिये, और यहां हिदायत दी जाती है कि “आंख में भर लो पानी”। यह नकली अश्रु लोचन है। मैं समझता हूं, आप जानते हैं कि सारी दुनिया में शायद औरतें पिटती हैं, लेकिन जितनी हिन्दुस्तान में पिटती हैं उतनी औरतें कहीं नहीं। पहले तो मुझे इस पर सिर्फ गुस्सा आया करता था, लेकिन जब मैंने सोचा तो पता चला कि हिन्दुस्तान का मर्द इतना ज्यादा दिन भर सड़क पर, खेत पर, दूकान पर जिल्लत उठाता है और तू तड़ाकः सुनता है जिसकी सीमा नहीं है। उसका नतजा होता है कि वह पलटा जवाब तो दे नहीं पाता, दिल में भरे रहता है और शाम को जब घर को लौटता है

तो घर की औरतों पर सारा गुस्सा उतारता है। फिर जब औरतों को गुस्सा चढ़ता है तो वह किस पर उतारती हैं। औरतें बच्चों पर उतारती हैं। मुझे कई दफे लगता है कि बच्चों पर तो जुल्म

माननीय सदस्यों को देश से कोई मतलब नहीं, जिस तरह से उनका रुख है उसको देखते हुए इतना कहने का हक तो आप मुझे देंगे।

मुझे कई दफे लगता है कि जो जोर जुल्म शुरू से ही चलता रहता है आखिर उसका नतीजा क्या निकल पायेगा। २०, ५०, ५५ अरब रुपया खर्च करके भी कोई बुनियादी रोग को खत्म करने की तरह का काम नहीं किया जाता, क्योंकि यह हिन्दुस्तान का समाज इतना ज्यादा बेमतलब हो गया है कि तर्क से आप इसे चलाने को तैयार नहीं हैं। यहां विस्फोट होना चाहिये, यहां पर बिल्कुल उठान होनी चाहिये। हम लोग गिरोहों में बंट गये हैं पांच हजार, दस हजार और १५ हजार के, जाति के हिसाब से, आमदनी के हिसाब से। कहीं कोई राष्ट्र बन नहीं पा रहा है। दूसरी तरफ हर एक गिरोह मस्त हैं, अपने जीवन में, अपने राति रिवाज में, अपने पुराने धर्म, पूजा पाठ को लेकर मस्त पड़ा रहता है। आज रोग यह है कि सारा देश, समाज बिल्कुल बिखरा चुका है, बेमतलब हो गया है, लेकिन उसके अन्दर गिरोहों का मतलब अभी बाकी है।

इसी सन्दर्भ में यहां मंत्रिपरिषद आ जाती है। मंत्रिपरिषद करती क्या है। मैं एक बार जापान के शहर कोबे में सुबह उठा तो मैंने सामने देखा कि हजारों की तादाद में बच्चे चले जा रहे हैं, लड़के लड़कियां। सफेद कमीज और नीला लहंगा या जांघिया, जो कुछ भी आप उसे कहिये, पहने हुए थे। मैंने लोगों से पूछा कि यह क्या चीज है तो

पता चला कि सब के सब स्कूल जा रहे हैं। आप जरा किसी हिन्दुस्तान के शहर में चले जाइये। आप देखेंगे कि बिल्कुल तितलियों की तरह लड़कियों और लड़कों को सजाया जाता है अलग अलग पोशाकों में। फिर मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि यह तो विविधता में एकता है। यह हमारे हिन्दुस्तान की संस्कृति है। इस तरह से कहीं देश को बनाया जाता है। इस बुनियादी रोग की तरफ आप जायें और इस टुटान को देखें।

मैं बार बार कोशिश कर रहा हूं कि इस सदन में हिसाब रखूं कि २७ करोड़ आदमी यहां तीन आने रोज में जिन्दगी बिताते हैं, साढ़े सोलह करोड़ आदमी १ ६० रोज में जिन्दगी बिताते हैं और ५० लाख आदमी ३५ ६० रोज पर अपनी जिन्दगी बिताते हैं। इसको अगर दूसरे पहलू से कहूं तो उन्तालीस करोड़ आदमी हैं पिछड़ी जातियों के, और उसमें सिर्फ हिन्दू ही नहीं हैं, मुसलमान जां वगैरह भी हैं, सिर्फ हरिजन ही नहीं बल्कि और भी पिछड़ी जातियों के हैं। औरतों को तो मैं इसमें सभी को शामिल कर लेता हूं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : औरतें पिछड़ी जाति की होती हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माननीय सदस्य जरा रेणुजी से पूछ लें। अगर उनकी राय उनको मिल जाये तो ठीक है।

सढ़े चार करोड़ लोग हैं जो उंची जाति के गरीब मर्द हैं और ५० लाख वह बड़े लोग हैं जो ऊंचे लोग हैं। जउ तक यह समाज इस तरह से टूटा हुआ रहेगा, अर्थ के हिसाब से और जाति के हिसाब से और देश का बजट इसके बारे में कुछ दहीं सोचेगा, तब तक चले फगूल बरे में कुछ नहीं क्या पूंजीवाद है, क्या समाजवाद है, क्या

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

एकाधिपत्य है और उसके बारे में बड़ी रंगीन रंगीन बातें करना कोई विशेष अर्थ नहीं रखता। इसमें पूंजी निर्माण नहीं सकता। इसका बुनियादी कारण मैं बतला देता हूँ। आज ५० लाख लोग, मेरे हिसाब से, करीब ५० अरब रुपया हजम कर जाते हैं सारे राष्ट्र की आमदनी का। सरकार के हिसाब से भी कम से कम वह २५ अरब रुपया होगा। नफे की दर हिन्दुस्तान में ३० से ४० प्रति सैकड़ा तक है पूंजीपतियों की, जो कि व्यक्तिगत पूंजीपति हैं। यहां पर बार बार यह कहना ठीक नहीं है, मैं जानता हूँ कि उधर से ही नहीं इधर से भी यह बात कही जाती है, कि पूंजीपतियों को बहुत ज्यादा प्रलोभन नहीं मिलता कि वह अपना व्यापार चलायें। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ३० या ४० प्रति सैकड़ा मुनाफा साल भर में क्या किसी पूंजीपति को कहीं हुआ करता है। पूंजीपतियों के मुनाफे के लिये यहां कहा जाता है कि काफी प्रलोभन होना चाहिये। लेकिन जब मैं यह बात कहता हूँ तो उसके साथ दूसरी तरफ भी मेरा ध्यान खिंच जाता है। जो नौकरशाही में लगे हुए लोग हैं, अगर उनमें से किसी की तनखाह १ हजार रुपया है तो उसके ऊपर सरकार की तरफ से कम से कम ५ हजार रुपया खर्च हो जाता है और सारे लवाजमात में जैसे कि मकान है, भत्ता है, यह है वह है। एक तरफ तो इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान में ठाठ की दर बहुत ज्यादा है और दूसरी तरफ मुनाफे की दर भी बहुत ज्यादा है। जब तक इस पर नियंत्रण नहीं किया जाता तब तक न पूंजी का निर्माण होगा और न हम किसी तरह से करों का बोझ कम कर सकते हैं।

इसी तरह मैंने आप से मत्यु कर, खर्च कर और उपहार कर की बातें कही। इसका जिक्र किया गया है कि उद्योग धंधे कमजोर पड़ जायेंगे इससे। मैंने हिसाब लगाया है। राज्यों को जो मिलता है वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा ८ करोड़ रुपया होता है। इस बजट में

कोई नया कर नहीं है। केन्द्र का मुश्किल से ५ करोड़ होता है। जहां पर २० अरब या २५ अरब रुपये की बात हो, मान लो थोड़ी देर के लिये कि मेरा हिसाब बढ़ा हुआ है, अगर १० या १५ अरब रुपये की बात हो, वहां ८ या १० करोड़ रुपये को लेकर अगर हम इतनी लम्बी चौड़ी बहस बढ़ा लेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान के किसी प्रश्न को तय नहीं कर पायेंगे। हमेशा हमने देखा है कि करों के बोझ के बारे में जब कभी चर्चा होती है तो बजाय इसके कि हम एक मकसद या लक्ष्य तय कर दें, तरह तरह के झगड़ों में पड़ जाते हैं। आज चुंगी है। चुंगी पड़ती है मिट्टी के तेल पर, मोटे कपड़े पर, चीनी पर। चीनी के बारे में मैं थोड़ा सा अर्थ कर दूँ कि ६ आने सेर में चीनी बनती है लेकिन उस पर ७ आने सेर की चुंगी और दूसरे टैक्स पड़ते हैं। चुंगी और दूसरे टैक्सों के सरकार इतना मुनाफा कमाती है। इसी के साथ साथ करोड़पति लोग भी ३ आने सेर का नफा लेते हैं। जब तक इसका कोई इलाज नहीं निकलेगा और ५० अरब रुपया जो ५० लाख बड़े लोग हजम कर लेते हैं नफे की दर बढ़ा कर के या ठाठ की रफतार तेज कर के, जब तक उसमें से बचाया नहीं जायेगा, और मैं दावे से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में कम से कम १५ या २० अरब रुपया बचाया जा सकता है, तब तक करों का बोझ हलका नहीं होगा।

इसी तरह से आज मैं यहां श्री मान सिंह, पटेल जी का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि उन्होंने कहा कि लगान खत्म हो जाना चाहिये ५ एकड़ तक के किसानों को। मेरी तो खैर मह राय है कि कक से कम साड़े छः एकड़ तक के किसानों की खत्म हो जानी चाहिये लेकिन ५ एकड़ ही मान लो। जब इस तरह की बात कही जाती है तो उसमें बहस पड़ जाया करती है। जब यह सवाल उठा तो प्रधान मंत्री ने जवाब दिया कि कैसे इसे खत्म करें। अगर लगान खत्म हो जायेगी

तो सरकार का काम काज कैसे चलेगा। बहस चलाने का यह कोई बालिग तरीका नहीं है। अगर बालिग तरीके से यह बहस चलाई जाये तो कहा जायेगा कि ५५ अरब रुपये में से मुश्किल से ६० या ७० करोड़ रुपया इस साढ़े छः एकड़ वाले किसानों से लगान में आया करता है। इसलिये इसे तो खत्म हो ही जाना चाहिये।

इसी तरह से और जो बातें यहां हुईं उनमें से अनाज के दामों के बारे में मैं आपसे अर्ज करूं, और मैं बहुत प्यार दे रहा हूं कि अनाज के दाम दो फसलों के बीच में एक आने सेर से ज्यादा नहीं बढ़ने चाहियें। मंत्रियों की तरफ से कोई समूल नहीं आ पाता। मंत्री लोग, यह मैं मानूंगा, इतने चालाक जरूर होते हैं कि हमें आपस में उलझा दिया करते हैं कि अनाज के दामों को बिगड़ने न देने के लिए नियंत्रण हो या न हो, बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो या न हो। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि १ आने सेर से ज्यादा दामों का उतार चढ़ाव दो फसलों के बीच में न हो यह मकसद नहीं बन पाता। पहले मकसद बनाओ फिर इस पर बहस करो। लेकिन मकसद नहीं बनाया जाता।

इसी तरह से पूंजी निर्माण की बात यहां कही गई। इसको लेकर एक छोटी सी बात मैं यह बताए देता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान का समाज इतना टूट गया है कि आपस में जलन है, ईर्ष्या है, गिरोह का स्वार्थ है। आपने देखा होगा कि लोक सभा के सामने हमेशा कोई न कोई जलूस आया करता है। कभी बीमा कम्पनी का जलूस, जो आज ही आने वाला है, पुलिस के सताए खोमचे वालों का जलूस, कभी बैंक वालों का। हमेशा गिरोह आते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का जलूस बहुत कम आया करता है। इसका कारण क्या है। एक बड़ा कारण यह है कि वित्त मंत्रालय ने हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार के भौकरों के ग्रेड बना दिये हैं, कोई पांच, सात या दस हजार ग्रेड, थोड़ा थोड़ा फर्क कर के। कोई पता है १०५५२०

कोई पाता है ११०२०। थोड़े थोड़े से फर्क करके बहुतसे ग्रेड बना दिये हैं। जैसे यहां जातियां हैं वैसे ही ग्रेड हैं। इन ग्रेड्स के कारण लोगों में आपस में जलन है। और गिरोही स्वार्थ बन जाते हैं। देश की सारी तस्वीर लोगों के सामने नहीं आ पाती। उनके मन में यह भावना जाग्रत नहीं हो पाती कि जब तक पूंजी निर्माण नहीं होगा उस वक्त तक देश की उन्नति नहीं हो सकती। हर एक सोचता है कि केन्द्र क भंडार में से अपना हिस्सा बढ़वा लो। यह भावना आज चारों तरफ फैल गयी है।

मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि जब मैंने रेलवे के बारे में कहा कि सिर्फ तीसरे दरजे को रखा जाए और बाकी दरजे खत्म कर दिए जाएं, तो दासप्पा साहब ने रूस की नजीर दी। क्या रूस हमारे लिए एक नजीर है। मैं इंगलिस्तान की बात कहता हूं जो कि एक पूंजीवादी देश है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब डाक्टर साहब को खत्म करना चाहिए। उनका वक्त बहुत हो चुका है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं जल्दी अर्ज किए देता हूं वैसे बातें तो बहुत सी रही जाती हैं। मैं एक बात श्री अशोक सेन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। कल मुझे बहुत तकलीफ हुई जब उन्होंने यहां कानून सचिव की राय को पढ़ कर सुनाया और उसकी आड़ में वह खड़े हो गए। ऐसा किसी मंत्री को नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं आप से बताना चाहता हूं कि जो कुछ मैंने बचपन में पढ़ा है, उसके हिसाब से इस लोक सभा में मंत्री ही फैसलों के लिए जिम्मेदार है, सचिव नहीं। अगर फैसले अच्छे हैं तो उनका श्रेय मंत्री को मिलता है, अगर फैसले खराब हैं तो बदनामी मंत्री की होती है। मैं आप से भी अर्ज करंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डा० साहब आपकी इस बात से तो मैं इतिफाक करता हूं मगर

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

यहां पर मेम्बर साहिबान इस बात पर जोर दे रहे थे कि रिपोर्ट में क्या कहा गया है, सेक्रेटरी ने क्या कहा, इसलिए उसका जवाब दिया गया। अगर मेम्बर साहिबान सिर्फ मिनिस्टर की नुक्ताचीनी करते तो बात वहीं खत्म हो जाती। अब आप खत्म करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यहां पर श्री बनर्जी साहब ने दारा और शाहजहां का जिक्र किया। श्री बनर्जी ने और श्री इन्दुलाल याजनिक जी ने, जिनकी मैं बहुत इज्जत करता हूं यहां साबित किया कि चाहे किसी की कोई भी मातृभाषा हो वह हिन्दी में इतना अच्छा बोल सकता है जैसा बहुत हिन्दी वाले नहीं बोल सकते।

दारा और शाहजहां के बारे में मैं आपको औरंगजेब के इतिहास में से, जिसको कि यदुनाथ सरकार ने लिखा है, कुछ हिस्सा पढ़े देता हूं। वह इस प्रकार है :

“बिमारी बढ़ती गयी। उनके नीचे के अंग फूलते गए। उनकी जीभ सूख चली, बादशाह ने अपना चेहरा जनता को झरोखे से दिखाना बन्द कर दिया था जैसा कि वह हर सुबह किया करते थे। दरबारी लोग उनकी बीमारी के विस्तरे तक नहीं जा पाते थे वहां सिर्फ दारा और कुछ उनके विश्वसनीय अफसर जा पाते थे। लेकिन राज्य की जरूरतें जहुत बड़ी हुआ करती हैं इसलिए १४ सितम्बर को बीमारी से शाहजहां झरोखे पर गए।”

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप खत्म करें। मैं कई दफा कह चुका हूं। आपने १ बज कर मिनट पर शुरू किया था।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं इस जुमले को खत्म कर दूँ. . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बार बार घंटी बजा रहा हूं लेकिन आप परवाह नहीं करते।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप ऐसा नहीं कह सकते कि मैं परवाह नहीं करता।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं पांच बार घंटी बजा चुका हूं, आप बार बार कहते हैं कि खत्म किए देता हूं लेकिन खत्म नहीं करते। अब आप खत्म करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं सिर्फ इतना कह दूँ कि दारा की नीतियों में ताकत नहीं रह गयी थी। अगर वह राज्य को अकेला चलाता होता तो उसकी नीतियों में ताकत आ पाती। क्योंकि शाहजहां में शारीरिक और मानसिक ताकत नहीं रह गयी थी, इसलिए नीतियां ठीक नहीं रह पायीं थीं। मैं खाली यह कहना चाहता हूं कि दिल्ली की गद्दी में कुछ ऐसी बात है कि यहां पर नीतियां बिगड़ जाती हैं। यहां का काम तब तक ठीक नहीं चल सकता जब तक कि देश के साढ़े तैंतालिस करोड़ लोग बलवा या उठान नहीं करेंगे। मालवीय जी, बजट से समाजवाद नहीं आया करता। समाजवाद तो देश के साढ़े तैंतालिस करोड़ लोगों के बगावत से और उनके तूफान से आएगा।

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Mr. speaker, Sir, before I proceed I would like to raise one point. I have been here for quite a long time but I find that recently a new trend is coming up. The trend is to accuse a member of the Treasury Benches. No doubt, the men who are in power are in a vulnerable position and are, therefore, liable to be accused and shot at very easily. But the point is that those who accuse should not be in safe positions. When something is proved they become big heroes and when it is found out that there was no substance in their accusations they go scotfree. This should not be allowed. Therefore it is time that this Parliament is seized with this problem and thinks out of a procedure by which any responsible hon. Member when he wants to forward any accusation, whatever the merit of that accusation be, should speak with a sense of responsibility and should get all the

blame if he is not able to substantiate it.

13.45 hrs.

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

Coming to the Budget, when I was hearing the hon. Finance Minister while he was presenting the Budget I found that he gathered the threads where he had left off a few years back. He had given us a new edifice of taxation and the taxation that he had was such as had no parallel anywhere in the world—Communist, Capitalist or any other. Therefore I started trying to find out certain features. Taxation on bonus shares, gifts tax, wealth tax or bringing back expenditure tax were no surprises to me. But I was delighted to find that he has given a new dimension and has made a good difference between industry and trade on the one hand and between industry and industry on the other; thereby he has given a new orientation as to how to look at the various projects in the private sector. Generally, in the controversy between the private sector and the public sector we club the entire private sector together; but it should not be so. We have to make a difference and from that angle he had done very well.

The most important problem that we face today is the rise in prices. I feel that in the Cabinet there is nobody more well equipped than the hon. Finance Minister himself who knows the gravity of this problem. The fixed income group and the lower middle class are the most hard hit and he knows how hard it is. Therefore it is but natural that we have found in the various broadcasts that he has given, the statements that he has made and even in this Budget that he has very well under-

stood this problem and is quite seized with it. But when we see where is the remedy we come to the conclusion that he also could not give any remedy. The best that he has done is that he has not done anything by which prices would rise further; but he has not given any remedy by which prices would come down. I think, it was not in his domain. Certain criticism, particularly from my side, to the effect that it is industry-oriented Budget and not agriculture-oriented was also on the same point. In fact, he has not so much control; or, proper budgeting as such has not so much to do with agriculture as such. Therefore, I think, he was not able to grapple with this problem and bring down the prices.

If we look at the rise in prices, one thing is very clear; that is, the fixed income group is very hard hit. Recently, elections had taken place in New Delhi for the electoral college. If we pursue them and observe them, it is very clear that the localities or areas where the fixed income group people were living had voted against the ruling party; for no other reason but—I know it very well—for this very reason that prices had been rising continuously. The tendency of rising prices is such that it has shaken even the faith of the most steadfast persons. Recently, I came across an article written by Shri Viyogi Hari. You know, Sir, Shri Viyogi Hari is a constructive worker. He does not dabble in politics and has no axe to grind. He too feels that the entire situation has developed in such a way that he does not find any bright prospects for our country. In his article in the last issue of *Harijan Sewa* under the name "*Khandit Pritima Ka Poojan*", he says: The idol is broken but still we worship it. There he has mainly referred to the conception, to the theory, to the philosophy that Gandhiji gave to us. But if we just

[Shri Heda]

substitute Gandhism to Socialism, then again, I think, the anomaly that he has given there is very relevant to this Budget or to the entire situation as it is today. We should look at socialism mainly from two angles. One is to bring down the disparities to create equitable distribution of the wealth, to create an egalitarian society. The second aspect should be that our socialism should be production-oriented socialism. Only yesterday, in this very Parliament House, in the Committee on Science for the parliamentarians, a scientist was called and he gave us a discourse and he put forth a theory and said that under the conditions as exist in India, we should adopt, so far as technology is concerned, the most advanced technology, the technology that would give the highest production, whether it is labour intensive or whether it is capital intensive. In the nature of it, it will be capital intensive. We should adopt that. The scientist, Mr. Piel, gave that theory. It only shows that our main problem today is production. Unless there is production, the prices will not come down and the various problems will not be solved. As certain Members have rightly said, again as regards production, our main production should be in the agricultural sector.

I know that even in the agricultural sector, production is suffering for many reasons. I would mention two main dominant reasons. One is that whatever the investment in agriculture is, it is not again production-oriented. The process to get that investment, the credit, whether it is co-operative credit, taccavi loans or other things, the procedure by which one gets those credits, is such that the incentive is gone. You get it because you have got the political pull, because you have got certain association and there are not cases wanting when the peasant has to shell out anything between 20 to 25 per cent of the credit before he gets the actual credit and

the result is that the entire money does not go for the investment on agriculture. In many cases, it is diverted entirely to different channels. The amount of Rs. 575 crores which the Finance Minister gave us yesterday for agriculture and which Mr. Malaviya thought is still a small amount, most of that amount, does not go for the investment as such. In U.K. and U.S.A., I found out that the rural credit system is such that the credit goes only for the investment and for the improvement of agriculture as such. It does not go for anything else. It is not given in hard cash. It is generally paid for the bills for the oil, engines, tractors, whatever it is. It is given in that shape.

The first reason why agricultural production suffers is that our credit system, the rural credit or agricultural credit system, is such that it is not production-oriented. But it has got a political pull. It has got a pull of different types and thereby the entire credit does not go to the full length for the investment as such.

The second thing is that even in the agricultural sector, the man who is strong enough can make further advances and can make further progress. But the man who is famished, who is in a semi-starved condition, is not able to rise on his own feet and, therefore, he is not able to give that much results. In my own constituency which is a rich sugar cultivation area, I have observed that the farmer who has got less than 5 acres of land did get an increase in yield during the last ten years, but not more than double. But as regards the farmer who has got an area ranging between 5 and 15 acres, his yield has increased anything between 4 to 5 times. Then, those farmers who have got more than that, if they invest more, then only their yield increase is still higher, otherwise not. A farmer with 25 to 30 acres of land does not give so

much yield which a farmer who has got 30 or 50 acres of land can give unless he invests additional money and in that case his yield is far better. Hence, in my own constituency, I have found that there are farms which give only 20 tons yield per acre, while there are farms which give a yield of even 90 to 100 tons per acre. So, my now observation is this. When we give credit, we should give it to the farmer who has got the capacity to use this credit. If we throw away that credit to the farmer who has no capacity to use that credit, the net result is that most of the money goes in the process and for the agencies through which he gets that credit. This is another thing that we have to tackle. So far as small farmers are concerned, I think, we can better develop them through the cooperatives or other means, but not through the genereal means.

Now, I would like to refer to other matters which had been concerning us for a long time. The prices of the essential raw materials are increasing year after year. Take the case of iron and take the case of coal. Both these commodities are necessary for any industrial activity. Without these commodities, no industrial activity is possible and yet what do we find? We find that year after year, the Minister concerned comes forward and increases the price. Instead of the price going down, it goes up. We are told, whether it is Bhilai or Rourkela, that these plants are one of the best in the world. The countries who have lent us these plants have not got such nice plants. They are so good plants and yet, when we consider the prices of our iron with their iron, we find that our iron is costlier in spite of the fact that the labour cost in our country is far lower, not even 10 per cent of the labour cost that is obtaining in their own country and the cost of other material also

is far lower in our country. This has been a sorry spectacle for the last few years and I am glad that the Estimates Committee in their Forty-Fifth Report has touched this point when they were examining the Ministry of Railways and the Integral Coach Factory. I would read only one relevant paragraph from that Report. They have said that while we are exporting some of the Railway equipment, we are not exporting locomotives. We are exporting sleepers and other things which are not so important. We are not able to export locomotives. They give the reason that the prices of steel are high in our country. This is the relevant paragraph:

"Steel prices in India are generally higher than obtaining in foreign countries and as a consequence, prices of items like freight wagons are higher as compared to the international level. It is understood that at present manufacturers exporting Railway equipment are allowed steel and raw materials at concessional prices and are also allowed to import raw materials and components upto a limit of 40 per cent of the f.o.b. value of the order, 10 per cent of the value of such import licences can be used for capital equipment."

14 hrs.

In spite of this incentive, the price of steel being higher, we are not able to export locomotives. What applies to steel also applies to coal. If we allow every three months or six months or year after year a rise in the prices of steel and coal, the result would be that the cost of the end-product would be higher and not only would it be difficult for us to consume in our own country, it will become difficult for us to even export them abroad.

I would like to express my surprise at a few of the taxation measures. The hon. Finance Minister has said

[Shri Heda]

that he has levied an excise duty on the particular yarn, because that yarn is in the blackmarket and therefore, he wants to mop up the profit. That is a good thing, and that should be one of the objectives in taxation policy. But what about the other items where there is blackmarket? He has given concession in the excise duty on motor cars. Does he not know that motor cars are sold in the blackmarket today? Even the scooter has got a blackmarket price varying from anything between Rs. 700 and Rs. 1700. When these items have got a blackmarket price, they should not have been given any concession.

Then, he has given concession in regard to printing paper, writing paper etc. That again is in the blackmarket, and, therefore, the concession given would only add to the blackmarket price and not give any benefit to the consumer and will also result in loss to the exchequer as such.

In conclusion, I would say that the budget has disclosed a surplus, a phenomenon which we are witnessing after many many years, and when this surplus is there of the order of about Rs. 90 crores, the hon. Finance Minister should not have come forward with added taxation of Rs. 40 crores. He should have given at least Rs. 5 crores worth of relief by removing the levy on kerosene and some such items which have hit the consumer very badly. My hon. friend Dr. M. S. Aney made this point very strongly yesterday. It is really surprising that in spite of the surplus of about Rs. 90 crores, the hon. Finance Minister has come forward with proposals involving additional taxation which would bring in about Rs. 40 crores. Moreover, this figure of Rs. 40 crores would not remain just Rs. 40 crores, but it would become Rs. 65 crores or Rs. 70 crores. Therefore, he should have given some relief to the consumer by removing the levy on some items.

With these words, I support the budget.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): I must admit that it is a very cleverly constructed budget, but I am sorry that I cannot congratulate Shri T. T. Krishnamachari on this budget. I am sorry that the framers of the budget are not loyal to our national ideals. It has been framed by people who are not loyal to the aspirations of the common man in this country. Therefore, we have heard from Shri K. D. Malaviya the statement that it is an industry-oriented budget. Honestly, I would say that it is a monopoly-oriented budget. It is being boosted up by people who are carrying on propaganda. And who are they? They are the supporters of the monopolists.

When Shri K. D. Malaviya was speaking, a question was asked 'Where are the monopolists?'. Do you not know that in the city of Delhi there is a big industrialist who is controlling one of the biggest papers and also one of the biggest banks in India and also one of the biggest industries in this country? The press is not catering to democracy; the press is not today serving the cause of socialism; the press is not pursuing our national ideals, but the press is really subserving the interests of the monopolists in a very crude way, and that is the danger.

Nothing has been done by Shri T. T. Krishnamachari in his budget to advance the cause of either democracy or socialism which has been sponsored at Bhubaneswar. Surely, Delhi is far away from Bhubaneswar and Shri T. T. Krishnamachari's budget is just as far away either from socialism or from democracy as this city is from that place.

I am sorry the old Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, is not here at the moment. I am thankful to him that he was deputed by the Congress High Command to inaugurate the Congress election campaign against me. I have no personal grudge. I am thankful to him, because that helped me a lot. His name was allergic to the common man both in my district and also outside.

Actually, what was the achievement of Shri Morarji Desai? Shri Morarji Desai has inflicted tax burden upon tax burden upon the common man, and actually, you know that the Third Plan target of taxation itself had been overfulfilled by over Rs. 400 crores by him. Naturally, there was a great deal of resentment because of the compulsory deposit scheme and also the Gold Control Order.

I remember that I was here in Parliament when Shri T. T. Krishnamachari relinquished his Finance portfolio some years back, and then he made a statement, and a very significant one. He said, 'The man-eaters are after me, and they are at large'. Today, somehow, he has done the trick. He has pacified and has appeased the man-eaters and they are no longer after him. They seem to be satisfied. Why are they satisfied? How has this appeasement taken place? It has taken place by pandering to the monopolists.

Of course, the hon. Finance Minister has given some concessions. For instance, the compulsory deposit scheme has gone. But if you study the annuity deposit scheme, what do you find? I have taken some trouble to study it, and I find that under this scheme actually you will have to pay much more later on when the annual instalments are coming back to you, for, that will be added to your total income and you will have to pay more by way of taxation. Anyhow, for the common man, the relief has been less.

Therefore, I must say that although Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has very cleverly pacified the vocal and the active middle class by giving some concession to the lower income brackets and there has been some relief as a result of that, still the budget is disappointing from the point of view of national growth and economic development. But what is most disappointing is this, and that

is the danger ahead, namely that he is bringing in the foreign monopolists. The participation in equity capital by the foreign monopolists is a great danger. When the British gave us freedom they fettered our freedom in three ways. First, they created Pakistan by keeping a foothold of imperialism just outside our border. Secondly, they created the Princely India and maintained them as the fifth column of imperialism inside us. Thirdly, they had safeguards for the investments by the British, and that was inside our own economy, for, an imperial capital was functioning there. Thanks to the sagacity and patriotism and the great and courageous leadership of Sardar Patel, Princely Indian or 'Princethan' was liquidated and the fifth column of British imperialism has been completely finished. But British capital still maintains its sway to some extent.

What did the Prime Minister and other great leaders say? They said 'We are not going to nationalise them, because why should we pay for the old British junk and pay through our nose the Indian taxpayers' money? We shall build up our industries'. It is true that we are building up our industries. We had only one Tata-nagar and only one Jamshedpur, but now we have got four. But, Sir, as a person coming from Bengal, I should tell you that you will be amazed to know that in Durgapur, the writ of the West Bengal Government or the writ of Delhi does not run; they are having it in their own way. You must be very careful before you allow foreign capital to dominate our economic life. And what is Shri T. T. Krishnamachari going to do?

The Britisher came as a trader, the Britishers came here as the East India Co. and then became the conquerors, and then exploited us thoroughly. This is economic exploitation. The hon. Finance Minister is today bringing in the Americans, the Germans, the Japanese and so on. It will be

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

worse slavery. You can fight against pontical slavery, because it is patent, because it is apparent, because you can understand, because you can fight against it, and psychologically you can rouse the people, but economic slavery and economic domination by the foreign monopolists or foreign capitalists is much more insidious.

Therefore, I say that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari is giving a bad twist to Indian economy, which must be resisted by all thoughtful people and by all patriotic citizens. Therefore, I enter my emphatic caveat against this policy and I say that this should not be done.

I have got one more thing to say about this. I am greatly disappointed because in this Budget, in the statement of the Finance Minister, there is absolutely no indication of the grave danger ahead, the grave danger ahead which confronts 92 lakhs of people in East Bengal who are suffering from the calculated policy not of minority-baiting but of something much worse. We all know that they are in mortal danger.

I had the privilege to appear as the spokesman of the all-parties convention in Bengal before the Home Minister. Fortunately, Shri Krishnamachari was also there and there was also Shri Mehr Chand Khanna, the Rehabilitation Minister. Sir, I am thankful to one Congress Member, Shri Raghunath Singh, for his very categorical speech. He has said that he is deeply grieved because there is no policy, no symptom, of appreciation of the grave danger ahead. Nothing has been specified in the Budget for the new refugees.

What was our demand? I placed the demands of the Calcutta Citizens' Convention before the Ministers, and they accepted our main demand. I will read to you only one paragraph from that. The Resolution said:

"Apart from the incalculable human miseries that these distur-

bances have caused, they have also put in jeopardy the struggle of the people in both the countries for human conditions of liberty, also for democracy and progress, and have strengthened reactionary forces. Therefore, we are of the unanimous opinion that patchwork, piecemeal or *ad hoc* measures would be altogether inadequate to stem the tide of the tragic events in the two countries or to prevent their recurrence. Therefore, in order to bring about a lasting solution, we demand from the Government the removal of all restrictions for those members of the minority community who intend to come over to India, ensure their safe transit and provide all other facilities necessary for migration."

We also demanded that the Government of India, then represented by the three Ministers must, therefore, accord to them unfettered rights of citizenship and guarantee rehabilitation, and this must be treated as an all-India responsibility.

I opened the discussion. I represented all the political parties. I was their spokesman. They heard us with great patience, and then they accepted our basic demand that the door shall be opened and any member of the minority community who cannot possibly stay there due to insecurity, persecution or molestation of women or other torture, shall be allowed to come to India.

What has happened? Shri Raghunath Singh has given the figures. What are the figures? The figures are: 1,20,000 members of the minority community have already come in. Actually applications are pending for 1,40,000. This makes 2,60,000. Still more are wanting to come. The latest reports are that the queue there at the door of the migration office of the Deputy High Commissioner is half a mile or a mile long. But here there is in the Budget absolutely no indication of the solemnity of the danger

ahead or of the obligation they have undertaken. Shri Nanda definitely 'I give you my word that the Govt told me as the spokesman of Bengal, ernment of India will undertake this as a national responsibility.' A national responsibility for resettlement—resettlement of whom? Do you realise that today Shri Khanna who has just been to Assam has issued a statement there wherein he has clearly stated that the minorities are being deliberately squeezed out. I will quote his language.

"Mr. Khanna said here today that the considered policy of the Government of Pakistan is that they want only Muslims to live in the border areas. The Pakistan Government is determined to squeeze out all others, both Hindus and Christians, living there'.

Living there. Not merely on the borders. Shri Khanna does not know East Bengal. I know East Bengal, and those who know East Bengal know that neither Dacca nor Narayanganj is a border area. But they are determined to drive them out. The Pakistan Rifles are shooting down Christians in large numbers, they are shooting down fleeing migrants.

On the 29th January, Shri Nanda and Shri Krishnamachari and Shri Khanna received our deputation. We went on till midnight. At midnight, they declared their policy and the policy has been reiterated on the floor of this House, that they shall be allowed to come. I am sorry that their plighted word is being broken, that they are not carrying out their obligation. I have received reports, which I have sent on to the Home Minister of India, that our brothers and sisters are being ill-treated at the office of the Deputy High Commissioner at Dacca. Our boys and girls are insulted, they are kicked at, they are being assaulted by our own Indian officers, I am sorry to say by Hindu

officers, I am still more sorry to say—ashamed to say—by Bengali officers. They are being assaulted. I have received reports from men who have not left Pakistan but are still there, accepting Pakistani citizenship. They are saying that it is a degrading thing that our own migration officers are doing it. Our own officers are doing it. You will be amazed to know that they are charging Rs. 4 and Rs. 5 as bribe for the purpose of issuing the application form for migration certificate. You will be amazed to know that agents have been appointed there with the connivance of our officers who are going down the city of Dacca, and unless you pay them heavily, bribe them, you cannot get these migration certificates.

What is the policy? Did you tell us something just to hoodwink us? Did you tell us something in the Government House in Calcutta before the Chief Minister, when we all met—all the representatives of the 12 parties in Bengal—which you did not mean to carry out? If you really, honestly meant it, why did you not translate it in actual budgetary figures? Where is the indication? Don't you realise that at least a million people will immediately be at your door? Is your open door policy meant simply for the American monopolist? Is your open door theory meant only for the German imperialist? Is your open door theory meant only for the Japanese multi-millionaires? Or is it also meant for the poor, tortured Hindus of East Bengal?

Today we are hearing America talking, Mr. Adlai Stevenson talking, and Sir Patric Dean talking, of self-determination for the Muslims in Kashmir. May I demand self-determination for the Hindus in Pakistan? Why can't they demand self-determination for these tortured people, these poor people subjected to minority-baiting? Minority-baiting by them is a strategic art and it has now developed into a State-genocide. Why

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

can't they demand that they give us Jessore and Khulna? Why can't they give self-determination for Hindus and Christians in East Pakistan? Why don't they give an autonomous area to them, as they are demanding in the Kashmir Valley for the Muslims of Kashmir. Why can't they think of these poor, tortured millions, these thousands of Christians also who are being butchered, tortured and thrown out? They want to make it a 'pure' Pak State. That is, one who does not profess the State religion shall not be allowed to be there. They have completely sabotaged, they have completely torpedoed, the basic principles of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact.

You know, on our part we have implemented that Pact. My Chief Minister at that time, Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy, told me: 'Chatterjee before the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, 10 lakh Muslims left West Bengal. After the Pact, 9 lakh have returned. We implemented it. But Pakistan has not implemented it'. Why don't you scrap that Pact deliberately proclaim that the Pact has been sabotaged, trodden under foot by the Pakistan Government which does not respect human rights, which does not respect international obligations? I demand that we go to the UNO and expose them thoroughly, their savagery, their butchery, their calculated genocide of the minorities.

Anyhow, I am disappointed. This will be a very great shock to the millions of our tortured, persecuted brothers and sisters across the border to whom Sardar Patel said this on the eve of partition—we received this telegram from him for the Convention of East Bengal delegates:

"Our hearts naturally go out to those who are of us and who are with us so long but who are now being separated. You can realise the bitterness and the sorrow which partition is bringing to those who cherished unity and who lived to fashion it . . ."

"But let not our brothers and sisters across the barrier feel that they are neglected or they are forgotten. Their welfare shall claim our vigilance, and we will follow with abiding interest their future."

That is the pledge that was given. That pledge is being violated. There should be some drastic modification of this Budget to implement that pledge and to implement the pledge which Shri Nanda, Shri Krishnamachari and Shri Khanna gave us, to united Bengal, on the eve of this crisis.

श्रीमती सहोदराबाई राय (दमोह) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कई माननीय सदस्यों को मौका दिया जा चुका है। दो को उधर से मौका दिया और दो को उधर से मौका दिया। महिलाओं को भी तो मौका दिया जाना चाहिये। उनको वयों नहीं दिया जाता।

Shri Basumatari (Golpara): At the outset, I must extend my whole-hearted support to the Finance Minister's Budget which aims at democratic socialism, which is the Congress goal. Many hon. Members referred to the resolution passed at Bhubaneshwar and criticised the Budget stating that it was not going in the way as it was intended. But I do not think there is any disappointment in it. So far as was possible for him, the Finance Minister has tried to go on the path indicated. To begin with, he has abolished the Compulsory Deposit Scheme which had raised great criticism in the country. He is wise to have abolished it. He would have been much more appreciated by the people if income-tax would have been exempted up to salary of Rs. 500 per month, but it was not done. Looking at the taxes he has levied on the companies, we cannot say that he is not trying to find out resources the way he had replaced Annuity tax deposit scheme which applies only to those with an income of Rs. 15,000.

When we achieved independence, our national income was not more than Rs. 400 crores, but now he has placed a

Budget for more than Rs. 2,000 crores. Therefore, he has found out many ways and means to develop our country. If you visit the various projects in the country, you will be surprised that our country has been developed so much in the short period of 15 years since independence. So, I do not know how the hon. Members who preceded me were disappointed. Of course, there may be a few things disappointing here and there, but there is no reason to be disappointed with the Budget as such, because he has been able to find the necessary resources, and has also introduced some reforms in the tax structure like replacing the Super Profits Tax by the more equitable surtax; also he has reintroduced the expenditure tax.

The Planning Commission intended to remove the disparities in the different regions of the country, but we find to our surprise that developmental activities are taking place only in areas which are already better developed, and where the people make a hue and cry. In a State like Assam, where is none to make a hue and cry, you will find the progress to be very disappointing. I am very glad that Dr. K. L. Rao, the Minister of Irrigation and Power is here. He knows very well how rich Assam is in resources for power and industry, but still we have not been able to develop them in our State. So, I request the hon. Ministers, and especially the Finance Minister, to look into the case of Assam.

Assam is rich in resources of oil. She has many oil fields, and it is well known, two refineries have been constructed at Barauni and Gauhati where we are refining the crude oil from Naharkatiya and Moran. In spite of all this, I do not know why the Government of India is not looking on Assam with the same interest as on other parts of the country. This is not my word, but the people in Assam have been saying that Assam has been treated in a stepmotherly way.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: How?

Shri Basumatari: This is not my version, and I do not go to that extent, but this is the version of many people from inside and outside the State, and belonging to many parties. It is the popular feeling that Assam is being badly neglected, that it has not received sufficient attention at the hands of the Government of India. I hope the Minister will not be very touchy about it. Anyhow, the country as a whole has been developed very much since 1945, we cannot deny it.

Just now Shri N. C. Chatterjee spoke about the refugees, which is a burning problem at present. We have been getting report after report how Christian tribals numbering about 45,000 and also other tribes are coming into India, and how they have had to leave their, young wives and daughters in Pakistan. Therefore, this refugee problem is a very burning problem, and we must see how we can rehabilitate these people.

Assam faces not only the refugee problem. She also has to face quite often the problems of floods, earthquakes, draught, immigrants, Naga hostiles etc. So, the problem of Assam should not be treated as a local problem concerning only the State Government, but should be treated as a national problem, as a problem of India.

You know what difficulties the Government of India had to face at the time of the Chinese aggression. And I was surprised and very sorry when some friends asked me how to go to Assam, as if it was not in India. Such is the plight of Assam. When the country was partitioned, Assam was isolated from the rest of India. Not only Assam. The area isolated comprises Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland and NEFA also. So, this eastern zone should be treated very carefully, and should be developed like other parts of the country. The resources are there awaiting exploitation. The Minister of Irrigation knows it very

[Shri Basumatari]

well, and I hope that he will try his level best to utilise all the resources there for producing hydro-electric power. There was one big hydro-electric plant to be constructed at Kopili, but now I understand that there is going to be some delay on account of some difficulty. I hope this difficulty will be surmounted by the Minister.

You know, as regards communications also it is very bad. We have got only a strip of thirty-five miles at the foothills of the Himalayas, and only one railway line from Siliguri to Digboi. There is no other railway line touching other areas. From all these difficulties we had to suffer at the time of the last Chinese aggression. So, I request the hon. Minister concerned, and all the other Ministers also, to see their way to give us another railway line along the foothill of Himalayas and a network of roads in Assam from the strategic point of view.

In this connection I want to make one suggestion. If you want to develop the strategic State of Assam, then you will have to construct another road to Mishamari—that is from Jambuduar to Mishamari via Gurubasha and Sidli and Bijni of Goalpara and Baroma and Tamulpur of Kamrup district in Assam. You now that from Mishamari there is a road under construction to Bomdila of NEFA. Unless this northern side is made, easy excess with the communication of net work of roads and Railway line, you cannot manage the war. You do not know what is the attitude of Pakistan or China. Either of them may attack anywhere in Assam when an opportunity comes. We should not think that the danger is gone. We should not forget that any time China or Pakistan may attack us. So we should not think for a moment that there is no danger. We must be very alert. And if you want to be alert, there must be communications, there must be railway lines, there must be roads as suggested. I am glad and thankful that the work of broad gauge has been started. It is the back-bone line. But it is not that broad-gauge has been granted, so

it is enough for Assam. It is only the back bone line.

For want of strong railway line food could not be brought there and people have to suffer from food scarcity in Assam.

Assam suffers not only from scarcity of railway lines but from natural calamities also, like floods and other things. In regard to the control of floods I must draw the attention of the Minister of Irrigation and Power to the fact that unless the Brahmaputra is controlled and unless this river is trained, floods cannot be checked. You know, the loss as a result of the last floods was about Rs. 37 crores, the highest flood in Assam. It was Rs. 27 crores the previous year, and 20 crores the year before that. It is mounting up year by year. This is an inherent disease so far as Assam is concerned. So I wish that this Brahmaputra should be trained somewhere. I am not an expert. Sir, When I visited NEFA I saw that the Brahmaputra stream in NEFA is very small; it goes in a zig-zag way. Comparing it with the other projects, which I have visited all over the country, like Bhakra-Nangal, it will be a very powerful project, and I think this project itself will cover the whole of India, if it is done.

You know, average consumption of Assam is only 2.46 KW. If you compare, the all India consumption is 32 KW, but we are getting only 2.46 KW—in spite of the fact that we are having so many rivers and rivulets passing through our State. Therefore, I request the Minister of Irrigation and Power to consider this. In this modern age without power you cannot do anything, without power you cannot have an industry, without power you cannot exploit anything else. And when we approach any private company or industrialist friends like Mr. Tantia, they point out these difficulties of transport. So, though there are rich resources in Assam,

they cannot be exploited; nor is Government prepared to exploit them.

In regard to the Budget, our Finance Minister was expressing some regret about the public sector. We are talking of the private sector and the public sector. Having had an opportunity of visiting all the public-sector undertakings, I was not at all disappointed. But one thing I must say. This public sector is bureaucracy-ridden. The Finance Minister himself regretted that the public sector is much lagging behind. It is true. It should not have been lagging behind, and if you go into it carefully and in detail you will see that the public sector suffers from so many lapses, lapses in lavishly spending on cars, lavish spending on tools, lavish spending on trucks, lavish spending on palatial guest houses in city. So we should check this luxury, we should check this lavishness. Then I think the improvement will be much more than what we are having now.

I am not against the private sector. It is said that the private sector is squeezed. My predecessor was saying that they have to pay Rs. 65,000 on one crore, on less than a crore they have to pay several thousands, and so on. They should not object to it. What is socialism? Socialism means that the rich man must earn. My friend Shri Morarka was saying yesterday that we are killing the incentive of the individual. It is not that. It is the policy of a socialist State that the rich man and the intelligent man should earn and contribute for the development of the country.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): And also, the poor man should enjoy.

Shri Basumatari: And the condition of the poor man should be looked into. What I mean is, the common people should not be taxed for essential commodities like kerosene, match, and other things. I do not mind the Government taxing people, but relief should be given to the poorer people.

So I say that our aim and our object should be to give relief to the poorer people and not to the rich man or big business magnates. Thank you Sir.

Shri D. D. Puri (Katithal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I believe there are three extremely formidable threats to the Indian economy at the present time, and I shall make certain very brief observations in regard to all the three of them.

The first one is that agricultural production is on the decline. According to the Government figures it has registered a decline of 3.3 per cent in a single year. When the rapidly-increasing population is taken into account, this is an extremely serious matter. The point, I am making, is that the Government of India, and the policies of the Government of India as they are reflected in the Budget, do not seem to be aware of the magnitude of the problem and of the magnitude of the steps and the unpostponable urgency of the steps that are needed to meet this problem. For any problem to be solved, first of all there has to be an awareness, an assessment of the problem. The most disquieting feature where agricultural production is concerned is that the Government of India do not seem to be aware of the size of the problem.

I will make a very brief reference in regard to sugar. Persistently, again and again, and yet again, they have been warned in this House and outside this House, and every time we get a statement that the sugar situation is all right, we will reach the target, we are very close to the target. I have a statement here of some sixteen statements made inside Parliament and outside Parliament by Government, every one of which was miserably incorrect in the assessment of the seriousness of the problem. I am very glad that my hon. friend Shri Thomas is here. The first statement that I wish to make a

[Shri D. D. Puri]

reference to is the one which he made in the Rajya Sabha on the 13th March 1963. The late Shri Pannalal Sarogi asked him whether he was aware that the Industry had estimated the output of sugar around 21.5 lakh tonnes. Shri Thomas was very very angry, and this is what the proceedings say about it. He said, "I do not know which section of the public the hon. Member is serving by saying that production is 22 lakhs or 21 lakhs and then by saying that by such large releases we are going to burn our fingers. I refuse to answer the question of my hon. friend." He was very angry. And yet at the end of the year....

An Hon. Member: He was not angry.

Shri D. D. Puri: He was angry. And at the end of the year, when the day of reckoning came, the production was 21.3 lakhs.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): In the previous December the industry's assessment was 24 to 25 lakhs.

Shri D. D. Puri: I am talking of the 13th March when a specific figure had been put to him. I shall utilise another occasion when I shall give fuller details; but the last statement made by the hon. Food Minister in this House on 11th February, 1964 is as follows:

"though there was diversion of cane for gur making, production this year would be close to the target of 30 lakh tonnes."

There are in all 17 statements, each one of them incorrect. The most disquieting part is that they are not only ignorant but they do not want to learn. It has happened again and again. How are we to tackle this problem if we are not aware of the magnitude of the problem. To my way of thinking, 80 package programmes are not going to solve the agricultural problem. The

essential thing is that we should recognise the magnitude and urgency of the problem.

The other important thing is implementation and co-ordination between the Government of India and the State Governments. It seems to me that every State Government moves in the direction it chooses at any particular time. There should be better co-ordination.

The second threat to the Indian economy is the rising prices. I do not quite know how these price indices are prepared, whether they take into account the controlled price, or the actual price the consumer pays; even then though there is a wide gap between what I may call the *de jure* price and the *de facto* price of foodgrains, sugar, etc., even assuming that the figure of 7.2 per cent increase is the correct figure, it means that the rate of acceleration has tripled in the previous year. It is a very serious state of affairs. Then again, a characteristic feature of our economy is, that the rise in prices does not go to the producer. The consumer pays it; the producer does not get it; it is pick-pocketed by the middlemen. If the increased price went to the agricultural producer, it would produce quick results; there would be incentives and he would provide more irrigation, fertilisers, etc. But that does not happen. There is another feature, somewhat unique about prices in India. There is an imbalance. According to my way of thinking, the grower needs an incentive, a higher price than what he gets today. At the same time, the price of article which the grower needs should be lowered. We are talking of holding the price line. In less than one month, railway freights were increased, not to meet railway deficit, but to give a larger return to the exchequer. It is idle to believe that it will not be reflected in a direct increase in prices. This morning, we heard the coal prices were increased. There is another serious matter which has not received sufficient attention at the hands of the

hon. Members; steel has been decontrolled. The producer is going to increase the prices all the way through; decontrol also means that the middlemen will be allowed to make his killing while the going is good. It is going to affect every part of the Indian economy. The plough and the shear everything that the grower uses is going to cost more. From him, right up to the Defence Minister in so far as the Defence Minister purchases his hardware within the country, it is going to cost him more. I remember a furore was caused in United State there was no control at that time; there has never been any control—when the steel magnate increased the price of steel; President Kennedy brought the skies down and they did retreat. The price increase was revoked and Kennedy said: you are stabbing the economy of the United States by unilaterally increasing the steel prices. This is the position about steel, coal and railway freight in our country. Everything that the grower has to pay for will cost more.

The third important threat to the Indian economy is the vast mass of unbooked wealth, hard cash or smuggled gold that is going round under the table all over the country. Various estimates have been prepared; some put it at a thousand crores, some, at 2,000 crores and some, at 500 crores. Whatever it be the fact remains that it is a serious menace which completely frustrates whatever fiscal measures the Government may take. The Finance Minister proposes to take stringent measures and I say that all of us must give him fullest support in this. We must recognise that the man who has unbooked wealth is the enemy of our country as much as enemy as the agents of Pakistan or China as he is a threat to our economy and national security. The Defence of India Rules or other powers must be mercilessly used against these people. If you do not have sufficient powers, come to the House and the House will not grudge them. But please, for heaven's sake,

bring this vast mass of wealth into the books of the country.

As compared to this man, whom I called a traitor, there is the man who has saved money honestly and after duly paying his tax is able to invest his money in the productive effort of the country. He is a friend of the country. It is in this context that I make my first observation on estate duty. It has been raised to 85 per cent above Rs. 20 lakhs and to 40 per cent in respect of assets above 10 lakhs. This is all money on which tax had been duly and honestly paid, while the other fellow had not paid any tax. In actual effect, taking into account the fact that the payment of the duty will have to be made in cash on the basis of the assessment made by officers, I believe that this 85 per cent would really be equivalent to 100 per cent and this 40 per cent, to 60 per cent. In actual effect, when you take into account that the Central exchequer is only going to make Rs. 5 lakhs out of this duty, I do seriously suggest that the bark is very much more than the bite. The game is not worth the candle. I think some other way could have been found to collect another Rs. 5 lakhs from the fellow who owns so much money.

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

Shri D. D. Puri: I would now rapidly cover the remaining points. Another point that I wish to make is, provision is made for the voluntary declaration of wealth, and the provision is that if the declaration of wealth is shorter than 90 per cent of the income as actually assessed, then that would attract penalty. The only observation that I wish to make in this connection is that this penalty should be levied or collected after the appellate stage and not earlier, because frequently, the income-tax officers make very much larger assessment at first and then later on the amount is reduced in appeal.

[Shri D. D. Puri]

In regard to taxation, the broad scheme of things as they emerge from the budget is that that part of the corporate sector which is engaged in industrial production of national importance which have been specified in the Bill will be able to plough back more money into the business as distinct from being able to distribute it to as dividend. They will certainly not be able to distribute any more to the shareholders but will be able to plough more money into the productive effort. It is a very welcome thing. It is a wrong impression that the corporate sector as a whole has been given relief. The only point which we must realise is that it is going to pay between Rs. 10 crores and Rs. 15 crores more than last year. Nevertheless, the rationalisation is a step in the right direction. 23A companies have been exempted from distributing dividend as laid down in the old Act so that they should be able to plough back more into productive effort. But, on the other hand, this has been set off by an increase in direct tax, besides, the tax on dividends, so that what has been given by one hand has been taken away by the other.

My suggestions are two in this regard: classify all companies whose production adds to the strengthening of the nation's economy as companies in which the public is substantially interested. The classification should attach to the product that they make rather than to the shareholders' register, apart from private companies. Also, a certain minimum dividend should be recognised as the cost of money and the seven one and a half per cent tax should exempt the basic level.

I then make one observation in regard to the surtax and that is, the deficiencies under the Act should be carried forward from one year to the other and also that the deficiencies created by the old super-profits tax should be allowable before the surtax is levied.

As my time is short, the other brief observation that I wish to make is this; a great deal has been said about foreign participation in the equity capital of the Indian companies. There has been a lot of controversy in the press; some statements have been made and some contradictions have also come in. I would like the Finance Minister to make a clear and unequivocal statement in regard to the policy of the Government in this respect. In any case, I believe that equity participation on a majority basis should not be allowed to any non-Indian national.

I will now wind up by saying that the most serious threat to our economy is the imbalance in the prices. There is no point in talking about the take-off stage in the economy or of the self-generating stage being reached as long as this imbalance is not removed.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is neither an easy nor an enviable job to be a Finance Minister and this year, particularly, I must say that the Finance Minister had a very hard task and a very uphill one too. He not only had to extricate the country's economy from the morass into which it had fallen but also to let it get going at an accelerated pace so as to recover lost time. I must also say that in spite of all the arguments put forward by so many hon. Members to the contrary, he tried to meet the ideological pressure within the party to start a process of reducing the disparities in wealth, income and social justice.

May I say that taxation is not only to produce the money for current expenditure but also must be geared,—the economy must be geared—to the paramount duty of producing more and promoting growth. To this twin objective, the Finance Minister has tried to focus his attention, and to quote his own words:

"Taxation has to be used as a sensitive and multi-purpose tool to encourage production, to keep

a measure of restraint on rising levels of consumption, to ensure that people get the fruit of their labour, to induce savings and to prevent profiteering so that the inherent ills of scarcity economy are not multiplied."

No thinking or reasonable person will have any grudge against such principles. No doubt there may be some people who will not even appreciate him for these things, but I do congratulate him wholeheartedly on his bold and encouraging lead with regard to economic policy.

I must say that the Finance Minister has courageously discarded the shibboleths of meddlesome controls, shortsighted pleas for indiscriminate nationalisation every now and then, irrespective of efficiency, administration and profitability. He has adopted measures to prevent corruption and blackmarketing and to deal firmly with blackmarketers and profiteers. I must also welcome his stringent measures by which he wants to deal with the tax-evader. Though I may comment on it later if I have time, I must say that I must congratulate him for saying that he is going to have a Commission to look into the monopolies.

I would like to say a few words about the question of taxation before I deal with the major effects of planning and their policies, during the past 15 years and more of freedom of the country. Coming to the specific proposals, I would like to say one word, knowing fully well that his task has been made much easier by too much of taxation last year by the former Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister has turned his special attention to simplification and rationalisation. Though he has abolished excise duty on certain items of minor consequence, and has simplified the tax structure on items of major importance, I do not understand why he has abolished the duty on gramophone records.

If he had abolished the duty on kerosene or matches, items which have a direct bearing on daily life, that would have been some direct relief and would have been much better than the abolition of tax on gramophone records. I do not know whether he wanted to give some relief to some people like me who are always fond of gramophone records; I do not know of any other reason.

Then there is another thing. Why should there be this reduction from 150 per cent to 60 per cent in respect of the tax on motor cars which only multi-millionaires use as a luxury, and in respect of which large amounts of black money are utilised? I do not understand the justification for this. (Interruption).

Then let me say one or two things about the corporate sector. We have been saying that he has been very generous as far as the corporate sector is concerned. We have been preaching socialism and the socialist objectives, but suddenly he has been very favourable to the private sector. But one thing I would like to say. If his reasons are that his only aim is to increase production, that it is the sole purpose of inducing people to produce more, and then to see that whatever has been produced should go back into the national exchequer, that is, to productive efforts, I will support him. We are after all wedded to a mixed economy and we want to encourage both the fields, public and the private sectors. The hon. Members opposite and so many other Members also sometimes have a wrong impression or meaning about socialism,—public versus private sector—and so on. I want to ask them, in a developing economy, when we are in imminent danger from the neighbouring countries, how can any sector be ignored or deficit financing be largely indulged into. That is why the Finance Minister has taken these measures.

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

I am not of the same opinion as Shri H. N. Mukerjee's. He said that this budget has "burst the bubble of Bhuvaneswar socialism." Certainly not. My understanding of socialism is different. In the present day context, we should not have a water-tight compartment between private and the public sector. We should try to make the best of both the sectors for public benefit. I know some of my hon. friends, especially from the communist side, hate capitalism.

15.00 hrs.

What is capitalism, I would like to ask. Economists say it is a relative word. The communist countries have an inherent hatred to capitalists and they would not even hesitate to kill the goose that lays golden eggs. What we have been trying to do is not to kill the goose that lays golden eggs, but we are trying to see that the golden egg is used for the purpose of development of our country. Some of my communist friends say this is not socialism. The system which they want is not socialism, but communism. What our hon. Finance Minister is trying to do is to succeed in beheading capitalism and establishing socialism without the danger of getting into communism. That is all I want to say about the corporate sector. For that specific purpose, I will support him as far as the concession he has given in regard to super-tax, etc. is concerned.

The Finance Minister has also brought an imaginative approach to the problem of personal taxation, especially by the abolition of the compulsory deposit scheme, reducing the income-tax at the lower and middle levels, though not sufficiently to satisfy his own objective of rewarding initiative and hard work. I would specially congratulate him for the rebate on super-tax, insurance and provident fund for the professional and salaried income groups. This shows that the Finance Minister appreciates the importance of incentives to the professional and salaried

classes, who have been hitherto ignored.

The sharp increase in estate duty is only a move towards socialism. We all agree that unearned income inherited by people without any hard work has to be taxed heavily without any mercy. Mr. Morarka jocularly said that when we live, we have to pay; when we die, we have to pay. Maybe we will have to do that if we want socialism and social justice. But let not this attempt be defeated by partitions, benami transfers and other devices which were adopted when we introduced land reforms.

The Finance Bill has very salutary provisions dealing with tax evaders, particularly the abolition of the provisions prohibiting the disclosures of information relating to assessment of income-tax, estate duty, wealth tax etc. Mr. Morarka was pleading that it may cause some harassment to good people. Certainly, every law causes some harassment to good people. But drastic provisions relating to concealment of income and punishment for false statements and assumption of power for search and seizure are quite justified under the present conditions, because of the number of tax-evaders and the number of people who are doing great injustice to the Government and to the people in general. We may consider murderers are criminals. But a murderer commits sin against one man. But tax-evaders are killing the community, the society and the nation. They are greater traitors and any law is not too harsh enough for them at present.

One thing which the Finance Minister should check is this. As far as the administration is concerned, there have been many criticisms, but the most important criticisms are delay and red-tapism and waste. Indian planning by far has been very good, but the implementation has been hopeless and it has failed. Delay and red-tapism have become a headache. These have proved a stumbling block at every place. About corruption, my

friends are talking. Our Prime Minister sometimes says there is no corruption and India is far ahead compared to other countries in this respect. But sometimes when he is in an understanding mood he says there is corruption, though it is much exaggerated. Maybe we exaggerate it, but we should not forget there is corruption.

"There are many kinds of corruption," said Mr. Nehru. The open acceptance of bribes is perhaps the least important... There are other forms of corruption which eat into the moral vitals of our nation. They are rampant in all circles; practically no one is free from them. Nepotism, favouritism, clanishness, provincialism—these are corrupt practices."

Which of our publicmen can honestly say that he is completely free from these vices? This is what is happening. When I supported Mr. Kamath in regard to the disclosure of assets, I was only saying this. When we Congressmen, have the privilege to rule the country, it is our obligation to be above suspicion.

About declaring assets, the other day Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari replying to the debate, said that it was practically impossible; legally it is not possible; no Parliament has had it; it is not a parliamentary practice to declare the assets of the Ministers to the public and only sanyasins could do that. Some such thing he said; I cannot quote him exactly. But I say every Congressman must surrender the privacy of his private life and daily account. He has to do this, not because it is good jurisprudence, but because he claims to govern and guide the nation, and to that privilege must be attached this liability. So, if we claim our privileges, we should also be sure about our liabilities and moral principles.

In spite of its tall claims and pious platitudes, what has our Government done to the common man? Maybe

there is artificial prosperity. Maybe we have increased the industrial sector; maybe we have succeeded in building better palaces. But as far as the common man in the rural side is concerned, is he getting the five essential things of life, namely, food, clothing, shelter, education and medicine? Are they given to him free or even at reasonable price? These are the fundamental things which should be provided by any Government—monarchy or diarchy, dictatorship or democracy, socialist pattern or communist pattern. I am not bothered about private and public sectors. As long as we are not able to give them food at minimum price, cloth at minimum price and medicine and education free, I do not think we have fulfilled our fundamental policies. In Egypt—I speak subject to correction—they have shops where food is available to the common man at the cheapest rates. There are shops providing cloth at cheapest rates. There the Government has controlled the housing system in such a way that for a nominal value, people are able to get houses. Maybe the wealthier class may go to other places to get better food by paying higher cost. But they have provided these basic things of life to the common man cheaply. They are getting them direct from the producer, giving him extra price and sell them at a subsidised price to the consumer. The State has acted in such a way that it does not hurt the consumer or the producer. Why not our Government do it? If I had more time, I would explain it. If Government uses its own imagination—it has got so many people at its command—it can certainly do it.

The wealth of a State consists not in great treasures, solid walls, fair palaces, weapons and armour; but, the best and noblest wealth of a State and its truest safety is its citizen, the man, and the man has to be considered.

About the food problem, I will elaborate it if I get time during the

[Shri Yashoda Reddy]

discussion on the Food Ministry's demands. India is supposed to be an agricultural country. The whole danger is the mistaken priorities between food and agriculture. There has been false transposition of priorities between food and agriculture. The very name by which the Ministry is called—Food and Agriculture Ministry—is innocently indicative of the mistaken priorities. We have been so long thinking and planning about food, the distribution aspect; but, the production aspect has not been given thought. Agriculture and the agriculturist have been pushed into the background. A great deal of time has been lavished on devising controls, cordons, procurement operations and the rest. It is wrong to suggest that none of this was necessary or useful. But the problem did not disappear. How to solve the problem of production is the question. I sincerely request the Government that our agricultural production should attain a level of productivity which insures it against all vagaries of monsoon. No good purpose is served if the administration gets itself bogged down by food controls,—it must focus its attention on production—nor is its continued dependence on PL.480 going to solve the problem.

Ultimately, Sir, I would like to say, in spite of all this, I would like to support the budget proposals presented by the Finance Minister.

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on behalf of my party on the budget that has been presented by our hon. Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. I think this is a peculiar budget. It has created reactions inside the House as well as outside. The reactions are varying and at times contradictory. To illustrate my point, I can take the reaction of Shri Raghunath Singh, the Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party. He has said: "The budget is neither leftist nor rightist, but it is centralist." I think a responsible Secretary like Shri Raghunath Singh does not want

the Finance Minister to be dragged either left or right, but he wants to fix him at the centre. Probably he may be thinking that that is the only safe and sure place for the Finance Minister to dwell. Another prominent Member from the ruling party, my esteemed friend Shri Morarka, said: "It is a purposeful budget". I am convinced every budget has got its own purpose. But subsequently he said: "What Morarji has done has been undone by T.T.K." It might be true. Another comment came from—a fiery comment indeed—another Congress Member from Madhya Pradesh who said: "It is a funeral for socialism". Yet another Member, the most sober-minded man of the ruling party, Shri Khadilkar, said: "It is a clear departure from the bureaucratic socialism, the resolution passed at the Bhuvan-eswar Conference".

But I think the budget invariably reflects the mind of the author. If so, I think it is not a straightforward budget, because if we analyse the mind of the ruling party, we find that the much heard of talk about socialism is nothing but an empty talk. I want to illustrate that. In 1954, I think, if my memory is correct, at Avadi in the Madras State, the Congress confused thinking brought out a child, what is called socialist pattern of society. Of course, very many people immediately doubted the survival of the child because the duty to cradle and lullaby the child was given to no other person than Vadavadinangalam Thyagaraja Mudaliar, who is a landed aristocrat having thousands and thousands of acres of land. Ever since Avadi the ruling party has journeyed ten years to reach Bhuvan-eswar where the second child was born and that was christened as "democratic socialism". I doubt very much about the survival of the child because the responsibility to cradle the child was given to no other person than Shri Patnaik, the Orissa Chief Minister who is a multi-millionaire. Naturally, therefore, the citizens of this country have got every doubt and they have

got a right to question the *bona fides* as well as the interest of the ruling party so far as their so-called professional talk about socialism and socialistic society is concerned.

Sir, in the Constitution the basic policies are set forth as the directive principles of State policy. Among those principles we find:

"The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing—

(a) that the citizens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood;

(b) that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good;

(c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment;"

These are the directive principles of State policy. I hope the House is aware of the fact that the very same principles have been adopted by this House in 1954 and thereby they have assured the country that they want to create a society based on social justice, equity and fairplay offering equal opportunity to all the citizens of the country. Permit me to doubt again the nobility of thought or the honesty of purpose or the earnestness of conviction of the ruling party, because if we analyse the tax structure we can find that the ruling party has not implemented anything in the way of creating or building a socialistic state of society.

Our Finance Minister in his speech has very rightly pointed out that the "tax structure itself, which has grown

in a somewhat haphazard manner, needs a closer look and in this task one has to remember that direct taxes provide the means through fisc for change in the nature and direction of society towards the goal of removing inequalities in income distribution." That is what the Finance Minister said while presenting the Budget. He said that the Government want to resort more and more to direct taxes which is considered to be one of the best instruments for achieving the socialist pattern of society.

My hon. friend, Shri Gopalan, while he was analysing the budget said: "It is a clever budget, but dangerous". Then the hon. Member opposite, Shri Ravindra Varma could not tolerate Shri Gopalan calling the Finance Minister as clever because a clever budget can be had only from a clever Finance Minister. It is, therefore, dangerous. I want to explain this aspect of the issue. I want to analyse the tax structure from 1948-49 to 1962-63 and show how the Government of India have resorted to taxation. I am giving these statistics to the House from the estimates of national income published by the Central Statistical Organisation. The net revenue that accrued to the Government of India in the field of direct taxes in 1948-49 was to the tune of Rs. 239 crores whereas in 1962-63 the Government was able to get Rs. 484 crores. By way of indirect taxes in 1948-49 the Government of India got Rs. 362 crores whereas in 1962-63 the Government got Rs. 1,334 crores. I want to analyse it still further. Taking the percentage, the revenue from direct taxes in 1948-49 was 34.4 per cent and in 1962-63 it came down to 24.2 per cent, whereas in the field of indirect taxes it was 52.2 per cent in 1948-49 and it went up to 66.8 per cent in 1962-63. I want to say, basing on the very philosophical contemplation of the Finance Minister that the tax structure has grown in a somewhat haphazard manner, it needs a closer look and in this task one has

[Shri Manoharan]

to remember that direct taxes provide the means through fisc for change in the nature and direction of society towards the goal of removing inequalities in income distribution. From 1954 to 1964, about ten years. I think it is very clear from this table that the Government of India have resorted more to indirect taxes than direct taxes. I want to know whether the ruling party is very sincere to the ideology which it has professed and is still professing, called the socialistic society as its goal. If so, from 1954 to 1964 what measures have the Government of India taken, what Bills the Government have piloted and what schemes the Government have formulated to create a society which is called the socialist society according to the ruling party? Therefore, I do not want any cleverness or astuteness in framing the budget; on the contrary, I want to see that in formulating the budget sincerity of purpose, honesty and earnestness of conviction are there. Unfortunately, I am thoroughly disappointed with the budget presented by the Finance Minister because these are all nicer qualities and nobler sentiments which are conspicuous by their absence.

Then, as we all know, the people of this country have been terribly fleeced by the previous Finance Ministers; the credit should specially go to the previous Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, who has fleeced the people to the maximum extent possible. Indirect taxes have been imposed on the people of this country and the back of the country has been broken down and the taxable capacity of the people has been reduced to the point of saturation. In this context, the Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, has come forward with a budget which he claims is a socialist budget.

There is yet another thing. Our Finance Minister has very emphatically and confidently stated the field that he will take. Yet, in the field of agricultural production, the Finance

Minister himself admitted there is a steady fall, for he says:

"Essentially, the rising trend in prices is explained by the inadequate rate of growth in agriculture. After increasing by 1.2 per cent in 1961-62, agricultural production declined by 3.3 per cent in 1962-63."

I want to draw the attention of the House to this one step forward and three steps backward policy and say that such a policy in a vital sector of our economy like agriculture is highly dangerous and detrimental to the further growth and security of this country. Yet, in another way, the Finance Minister himself admitted it when he was not either the Finance Minister or Minister for Economic and Defence Co-ordination. He said:

"...that the whole fiscal policy followed by the Government of India has lessened the value of the rupee which is going down, that 95 per cent of the people are on a marginal or sub-marginal level of subsistence and that more money is getting concentrated in the hands of a few."

This is what the present Finance Minister said some months ago before he became the Finance Minister.

Another statistics which I want to give to the House is from the National Sample Survey, Agricultural Labour Enquiry, which says:

"27 million people have work for one hour a day, 20 million people have work for two hours a day and 45 million people have work for four hours a day. At other times they have no work at all."

Whatever Shri Malaviya might have stated in his speech today morning, this is the position of the agricultural sector, the small man of the country, the peasant. While inaugurating the Ludhiana University the Prime Minister has correctly

pointed out how the Government of India has progressed in the field of agriculture. I have quoted this in this House some time back but, for the benefit of the House, I want to quote it again. This is what the Prime Minister had to say:

"I often hang my head in shame when I think a nation with 70 per cent of its population engaged in agricultural production depends on foreign countries for its food requirements. The nation's failure to establish self-sufficiency in food even after 15 years of independence disturbs my mind more than the Chinese aggression."

In spite of Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, in spite of my hon. friend, Shri Thomas, this is what our Prime Minister said. The food problem of the country could not be solved and the peasantry is in utter penury and poverty, the majority of the people have no work, the purchasing power is considerably low, which is coming down and down, the unemployment problem is becoming serious and, finally, the people of this country are groaning under the burden of heavy indirect taxes.

No doubt, the Finance Minister has given some relief in this budget. In the place of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, he has brought in the Annuity Deposit Scheme. It is a welcome feature of the budget, yet it has a thorn to prick. I have received so many telegrams from all over the country, requesting the retrospective removal of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme. As the Finance Minister is a practical and sympathetic man who is prepared to replace CDS, I hope he will consider this matter and try to see that people belonging to the lower strata as well as middle income group are not forced to pay for a scheme which has already been scrapped. If the interpretation of the spokesman of the Finance Ministry, which I consider is callous, is going to be implemented, I think

there is no justification or logic behind scrapping CDS. Once CDS is scrapped, it is scrapped for ever; it is dead. So, it should not have any past or future, so far as this proposal is concerned. I hope the Finance Minister will use or exercise his powers in a sympathetic way and see to it that it is altogether removed, thereby giving some relief to the lower and middle income brackets.

Coming to the *per capita* income, as we all know, the *per capita* income in India is very low, appallingly low. In the United States the *per capita* income is Rs. 10,000 and in the UK it is Rs. 8,000 whereas in our country it is Rs. 294.7. Of course, the Finance Minister may immediately say that our country is having a developing economy or our economy is underdeveloped or something of that nature, yet, all the same, I want the House to remember that while in USA it is Rs. 10,000 and in UK Rs. 8,000 and Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 4,000 in other countries, in India it is only Rs. 294.7. It is an oceanic difference and unless it is made up I doubt very much whether we could prevent our country from a catastrophe.

Another problem is the value of the rupee. I have already said what Shri T. T. Krishnamachari mentioned about the Government of India lessening the value of the rupee, with

"95 per cent of the people on marginal or submarginal existence"

This is what he said before he became the Finance Minister. An international currency commentator, Mr. Pick, has issued a threat regarding the position of the Indian currency by saying that Indian currency is very very sick. I hope the Finance Minister will consider that aspect also.

Then I want to refer to the problem of **tax evasion**. The Finance

[Shri Manoharan]

Minister has provided some checks or deterrents so that the tax evaders can be caught. I think the Finance Minister is inspired by the ideal of Kaldor, who has given some suggestions in the field of tax evasion. I request the Finance Minister to consider them.

The welcome features of the budget are the introduction or increase of expenditure tax, gift tax and estate duty and the scrapping of CDS. Of course, we welcome these features.

15.30 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

I request the hon. Finance Minister to consider this also because there are people who are deliberately cheating the country in the field of business. They are keeping three or four books with the determination to cheat the Government of the day also. Regarding these people Kaldor said:

"I very much doubt whether the policy of 'softness' is of much avail or whether, on the contrary, it tends to increase the scope of evasion."

He has suggested this and I think the hon. Finance Minister will look into that.

In the United States of America, he has said, the situation is different. He said:

"Very different is the situation in the USA where the taxpayer is left to assess himself to tax but if he is discovered having concealed income, he can be charged to an enormous penalty (amounting to between 10 to 20 times the tax escaped) and is frequently dragged before the courts in a trial attracting a great deal of publicity and ending in long terms of imprisonment."

He has given some illustrations also.

"Before the last War, no lesser personalities than the Vice-president of one of the biggest New York banks (The National City Bank) and the Chairman of the New York Stock Exchange were prosecuted for income tax evasion in trials attracting newspaper headlines for weeks on end; and only a few months ago the Head Porter of the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York was dragged before the court for having declared tips amounting to \$33,000 in his income tax returns over a five year period, whereas his bank account disclosed that he made over \$60,000 in tips. No case of this type has ever been brought before the criminal courts either in Britain or in India."

He says:

"I feel quite certain that very heavy penalties and prosecution with a great deal of publicity is an infinitely more effective method of dealing with tax evasion than the policy of deliberate leniency and avoidance of public disclosure followed in.... India."

This is what Kaldor has suggested. I think, the hon. Finance Minister will pay some heed to it and focus his attention on it and see that tax evasion is immediately stopped.

According to Kaldor Rs. 300 crores are in the field of evasion. What have the Government of India done to collect that amount, nobody knows. That is why we, the Members of Parliament, either in the Opposition or in the ruling Party, are forced to doubt the *bona fides* of the Government of India. They are shouting slogans, Shibboleths aplenty, from the house-tops for a socialistic society and saying that socialistic society is our goal, dream and everything. I am sorry to say that it still remains a dream and there is no step so far taken either by the hon. Finance Minister or

by any hon. Minister of this Cabinet or the Government of India to make socialistic society a reality. I hope, at least the hon. Finance Minister, having heard some condemnations, persuasions and some praiseworthy remarks, will consider this matter sympathetically and see that it is done.

There is a talk about this Budget that the hon. Finance Minister did not impose any indirect taxes. For that my reply is that the hon. Finance Minister cannot do so. Why can he not do so? He cannot do so in the sense that there is no scope for indirect taxes at all. For that he should thank his predecessor, Shri Morarji Desai, because he imposed all the indirect taxes possible and has seen that the back of the country is thoroughly broken. Now Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has a high road to walk upon. Therefore, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari cannot impose indirect taxes. A sound Budget, specially which concerns a socialistic society, should, I think, reflect more of a provision for direct taxes and a revision in the field of indirect taxes. How far the hon. Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, has succeeded in that is my question. He has removed the excise duty on gramophone records, gases or something, which he has said, have given relief to the people. I doubt very much whether the people are going to appreciate that. Why could they not fact the spiralling of the prices? Every time this Budget is particularly silent so far as the spiral of prices is concerned. I do not know why the hon. Minister is keeping quiet. I do not know why the Government of India is keeping quiet or snoring. Unless the rise in prices is stopped, I doubt very much whether the declared policy of the Government of India to create a socialistic society can be a reality in future. Therefore I request the hon. Finance Minister to consider that aspect also.

I request the hon. Finance Minister to consider another thing also. He

has said that a commission to inquire into monopoly will be there. As some hon. Members have said, the intention of the hon. Finance Minister might be good but my doubt is about the implementation of the scheme because we have already got so many commissions to inquire into so many problems and matters and what happens finally and ultimately is that nothing happens. Therefore if Shri T. T. Krishnamachari is sincere and honest in his purpose, I will request him to do something concrete immediately without fail and without any reservation. I think, he will do that.

I think, he is very silent about how the black money or the unaccountable money can be brought to book. will be taken. He has taken so many measures already and the net result is that there are Rs. 300 crores by way of income tax evasion. Here also Kaldor suggested one method and, I think, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari can consider it, namely,—

"In the case of cash, the risk is that the Government might call in the existing note issue and replace it with a new issue (as happened in 1946), in which case the cash hoarding will have to be disclosed; or failing disclose, it will become valueless or else can only be sold to other persons for purposes of encashment with difficulty or at a considerable discount."

If there is any possibility, I suggest to the hon. Finance Minister to see that the existing currencies are withdrawn and thereby all the black money and unaccountable money which is buried deep somewhere will automatically come out. I do not know whether the suggestion can be digestible to the hon. Finance Minister or his Ministry or to the Government; but our Finance Minister depends purely on Kaldor for his tax proposals and that is why I suggest this also.

[Shri Manoharan]

Finally, I think, the hon. Finance Minister being a concealed capitalist could not provide a very good socialist Budget. I do not want to cheat myself and thereby I do not want to cheat the House and the country by saying that the hon. Finance Minister is a pucca socialist. I doubt very much. Because he is a concealed capitalist....

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): Concealed?

Shri Manoharan: Yes, concealed capitalist. He is a concealed capitalist from whom, I think, this is the only Budget we could think of. Within that limit I request the hon. Finance Minister to consider all this and do some justice to the country and thereby to do enough justice to the so-called resolution that has been passed in the Bhubaneswar Congress, that is, democratic socialism, and see that the country is infused with courage and confidence about the Government of the day.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am intervening in this debate fully realising my responsibilities to the House and also the earnestness of the points that have been raised. I would not venture to answer all the points which have been raised because the hon. Finance Minister himself, when he will have the opportunity of winding up the debate, will reply, to those points but I will try my best to reply to some of the points regarding taxation and saving which have been raised.

It is not easy for me to concentrate on the arguments when I see the maze of many arguments in front of me. When I go from one argument to another from the same party or between two hon. Members of different parties, I find that there is a lot of contradiction in their own analysis of the problem. Some hon. Members have simultaneously spoken with two voices. On the one hand,

they have said that there should be a definite high rate of economic growth and that they have not been very much satisfied with the present ratio and tempo of economic growth. In the latter part of their arguments, they immediately venture to say that any measures which are likely to help in increasing the tempo of economic growth should not be taken up, like, increase in taxation. The Finance Minister has tried his best to see that the hardship is caused as less as possible. But that is not with the intention of undermining the problem of hardship which is being faced by the country. There are problems and there are hardships also which are being faced by the countrymen. The problems are quite complicated. I think, more than all of us, he is realising it more because he is facing it every day and every hour of his life as he has to find some solution to the problem. Therefore, I do not think the hon. Members have to make him realise that the problems are serious. But I do not understand why these problems should overwhelm us. It does not provide any solution when we are ourselves overwhelmed with the problems. The problems are many. But those problems are the problems which we have to overcome by various means that we are adopting. Some argue that the level of direct taxation should not be raised and some others argue that the level of indirect taxation should not be raised and that it should be reduced. I am really not able to see how the best solution can come between these two views which are making us feel apart and also taking the arguments apart. The hon. Members, with all the seriousness that they have shown towards this problem, have still not accepted this Budget with the amount of understanding that they should have shown to the limitations and the problems facing this Budget itself. Therefore, I would in my own humble way like to submit before the House the proposals as they have come and what has been the significance of

those proposals which have been brought forward before the House in the present Budget.

Now, take the system of corporate tax. The corporate tax has been criticised by Mr. Masani and some others as to why the industries have been discriminated, as to why the industries have been selected for giving a little special treatment or a little concessional treatment to those industries. But the hon. Member himself, as a student of economics, should realise that in a planned economy priorities are as important as the plan itself. The sense of proportion should be there to fix up what are the objects which really should command our priority attention and priority effort. That is exactly why the Finance Minister has taken this initiative in providing a base for selectivity in the approach towards taxation. I could not understand Mr. Masani's argument when he questioned the need for this selectivity when he himself says that we require a very sound investment base for the further prosperity of our country. Then I ask; How the sound base is to be built up without those basic industries which are necessary veins of this economic body of our nation? Unless and until we provide strength to them to grow, to prosper, we cannot build up a powerful base with weak economic growth. He does not realise that this Budget has been conscious of those industries which are labour intensive. We have a problem of labour also. We cannot rationalise to a certain extent because we just cannot afford to have unemployment. Therefore, sometimes we allow the industries to function in an outdated manner and allow the industries to function in a primitive stage because we just cannot allow the problem of unemployment to grow, a new problem to be created. The Government's policy has been towards that end and the present Budget has given an indication of

that and that the selection has been made on the basis of important industries as well as the labour intensive industries. The Budget provides for exemption of unsized yarn in hanks from the increase in special excise duty since such yarn is primarily used for the decentralised and the labour intensive sector. But once again, may I repeat that the growth of basic industries, such as, steel, aluminium, fertilisers and industrial machinery, is vital to the economic growth and we cannot progress on the basis of an import of capital equipment and basic raw materials in ever-increasing quantities. That is also being criticised as to why should we go on accumulating loans and why should we go on increasing our imports. We do not really want to burden our economy further and yet at the same time the argument comes that the industries should not be built up or geared up in the sense that these basic industries which are going to provide the nerve centre of all the other industries should not be really encouraged. I do not understand this argument. We shall certainly need to step up our exports and also our imports. Therefore, in order to build up a good export oriented economy, we have to provide strength to these basic industries which produce vital material for our economy and also the facilities have to be provided for exports. We must also realise that the share of imports in our national economy and investment must be a declining one if we are to achieve really an adequate healthy rate of progress. Therefore, the production of basic things and material should find encouragement and it is good that the Finance Minister has seen the propriety and the importance of this problem and he has chosen this opportunity of giving this kind of selective concessional treatment to those basic industries so far as the corporate taxation is concerned. Why should what the Budget proposes really give the heartburn to Mr. Masani? I do not under-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha] stand it. The Budget proposes a reduction in the rate of corporate tax from 50 per cent to 45 per cent and there will also be a reduction of 20 per cent in the Surtax. It will certainly raise the profitability of the basic industries and the profit of those basic industries will again go rightly to the savings and the investment into those sectors that are of the higher priority to the sound economy of the country. What is wrong in that? If the Budget has provided for a commendable purpose, the Budget should also have been commended. But unfortunately even some Members did not show that generosity which they show to their own arguments to the proposals that have emanated from the Finance Minister. Mr. Masani was very reluctant about the selectivity of the industries. But I may also tell him that the stimulus to general investment has also been provided and that has not been only confined to the priority industries. The replacement of Super Profits Tax by surtax will help the industries in general. The hon. Members would recall that the Super Profits Tax had been criticised in the past on the ground that the profit rate allowed before tax liability was attracted and it was really unduly low and that the rate of tax on that was too high. That is the reason why care has been taken to see that in the present structure of taxation a wider capital base has been brought where the proposal is to levy a lower rate of surtax, and certainly, it is going to give relief to a larger number of companies in various fields of industries.

I am sure that hon. Members would agree that given the large requirements of resources needed for defence and development, the burden has to be shared by the people generally, more by the people who can pay and less by the people who cannot pay. That should be the equitable justification for any tax proposal. It is no use pleading for a cause which does not have that kind of cogency in itself.

We just cannot put the burden on the common man instead of putting that kind of burden on the people who can afford to pay, such as industries, business, persons of the high income group etc. Therefore, I do not see in these budget proposals any loss of the capital base or any discouragement to investment in general.

The provision that the so-called 'Section 23A' companies should distribute a large part of their profits in the past—my hon. friend knows it, and, therefore, I need not explain it—had hindered reinvestment by those companies, and that is the reason why this provision is proposed to be replaced in regard to industrial 'Section 23A' companies; the rate of tax on the profits of these companies, is, however, being raised from 50 per cent to 60 per cent, as they are owned by a limited number of shareholders who may be liable to a relatively high rate of personal tax. The dividend tax would, of course, also be applied to dividend payments by these companies. In the past, the experience has been that the resources of companies have been sometimes frittered away in dividend distribution. Instead of being ploughed back for further expansion of investment. The share of profit after tax, which is reinvested is significantly less in our country than in many other countries. The fiscal concessions to promote growth must, therefore, be balanced by measures to check dividend increases, and hence this proposal of the dividend tax. I am sure the hon. Member Shri M. R. Masani would agree that the profits should not really be frittered away in useless expenditure and even in the private sector, profits should be ploughed back for something constructive, something useful and something for the betterment of the economy.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): Without payment of a single pie as dividend?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Who is saying that dividend will not go? But a large proportion of dividend will not go, and, therefore, a certain

amount of tax will be paid by the people who would earn dividend.

Shri Himatsingka: Even the first rupee of it will be taxed.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I am sure my hon. friend will agree—and this will answer probably the criticism of my hon. friend who is sitting behind me—that in the case of companies which have pursued and will pursue sound financial policies, particularly in these fields of priorities, the net effect of these measures will be to increase the availability of resources for their own expansion. My hon. friend is associated with some such companies, and, therefore, I think that he should know better.

Shri Himatsingka: That is why I am saying it.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I do understand the desirability and the propriety of the lower income group being given protection against the increase in cost of living and that a larger contribution has to be expected from the well-to-do. Comparing the tax plus the compulsory deposit rates of last year with the tax-cum-annuity deposit rates proposed in this budget, it will be seen that up to an income of about Rs. 15,000 a year, the proposed rates are lower; for higher incomes, there is no doubt a substantial increase in the rates proposed, and I am happy that the House has welcomed generally this proposal.

Another criticism has been made about the increase of gift tax and estate duties. But the hon. Member must accept this fact that inequalities of wealth are more serious than the inequalities of even income, and there is all the more reason, therefore, to see that a comprehensive scheme is devised to reduce the inequality of wealth. The increases in estate duty and in the rate of gift tax are such measures as will really bridge the gulf of the ratio between inequality of wealth and also income which is earned and income which is unearned.

ed. I think that there is every justification in the case of income which is unearned and which goes into a particular hand that the person should have a social liability to pay a higher ratio of taxes on it.

The higher taxes on long-term capital gains also accruing to the rich will secure to the exchequer part of the rises in property value in recent years. Who does not know that property values have risen tremendously? The increase in value of property has reached huge dimensions, and the property is passing from one generation to another without any efforts being made for it, and, therefore, there is every justification and it is also equitable that there should be higher rate of taxes on them. I think that that is a very good move. Even as a non-official, I would really have welcomed this proposal.

The rates of expenditure tax proposed are no doubt modest but the revival of this tax is itself a part of an overall strategy of inhibiting increases in consumption of the well-to-do. Time and again it has been mentioned also here that the people with higher incomes are maintaining a very high ratio of expenditure. All kinds of things are bought and sold in the market. Anything that comes in the market is sold. Even costly percolators, transisters and air-conditioners etc. are sold easily. In fact, what is not sold? And the highest price is being paid for those things. When I go to the shop, what do I find? Of course, nowadays, you do not get those things. But once I had gone to a shop and seen a tea percolator, a small one, being offered for sale at Rs. 110. The next day, when I went to the shop, I found that the thing was not there, because there is money to buy even such a costly thing. A thing which will cost ordinarily about Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 could be sold, because it was an imported item, for as much as Rs. 110. That shows that there is that kind of wasteful expenditure in the higher income groups. Therefore, in order to inhibit this kind of increase in consumption

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.]

and also increase in expenditure, the expenditure tax has been brought in.

There is also a case for the regulation of perquisites.

Shri R. Barua (Jorhat): What is the limit for expenditure tax? It is Rs. 36,000.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: All right. The hon. Member may bear with me and listen to the sentences which I am going to speak. I myself have said that these rates have been modest, but this is a revival of an overall strategy of inhibiting increase in consumption. This is a start, and it is going to check also some of the useful perquisites which go at the cost of companies today and which do not cost anybody anything in order to enjoy them. Therefore it has been very necessary to regulate perquisites and also to treat that income as part of the income of the assessee, and I am sure that if this is treated as part of the income of the assessee, it is bound to check consumption and enjoyment of large-scale perquisites by the individuals.

An hon. Member has rightly pointed out that tax evasion as such is a serious problem. I do not think that reasonable argument would ever criticise taxes as such because taxes are necessary for a growing economy. But I can see the very genuine concern of the House towards this problem of tax evasion which is a serious problem. I could not agree more with the hon. Members who have said that it must be dealt with effectively. I would like to assure the House on behalf of the hon. Minister who is sitting before me that everything possible is being done and will be done. I should really say this with conviction that our efforts are proving fruitful. I would not be so pessimistic as to say that whatever efforts we have been making at present and in the past have not borne fruit; on the other hand, whatever efforts we have made, realising the urgency of the problem have been able to secure

for us a larger revenue from the taxes.

16 hrs.

That is one of the reasons why generally it is said that the revenues are buoyant. If the revenues are buoyant, the credit for that buoyancy must also go a little bit to the Ministry concerned.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Therefore, Ministers are also buoyant.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I do not think the hon. Member dislikes the buoyancy of the Minister who is just now speaking.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Shri Tyagi is over-buoyant.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I would like to repeat that everything possible will be done to check this tax evasion. Indeed, exactly for this reason, additional powers are sought to be taken in the present Budget to increase the penalties for concealment, to secure affirmation of the correctness of returns, to search more effectively for concealed wealth and to remove the secrecy provisions.

References have been made to the need for proper collection of tax dues. The proposed requirement that tax due according to return must be deposited by the assessee within a month of submission of return will also be of great help in this regard. Recovery proceedings in pending cases will also be vigorously pursued.

Now, I come, Mr. Deputy-Chairman

...

Mr. Chairman: This is not Rajya Sabha.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I am always conscious of being 'Deputy'. I am sorry—it is just a slip of the tongue.

Now I come to the commodities consumed by the lower income group.

I would repeat that care has been taken not to subject them to any additional taxation. I think the first reaction in the Press and among Members of Parliament has certainly been having of a sigh of relief. I also met some of the common men like servants and shopkeepers. The general impression, and the genuine impression, in them was that this Budget has given some sense of relief to them, psychological and emotional—much more important is the psychological relief.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar): In what way?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: When I say this, he should understand that the items of common consumption have not been taxed. That itself is a great relief.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Oh! That is no consolation.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: They could have been taxed, but they have not been, primarily for this reason that the cost of living is high and therefore, they must not be touched. The additional levies on the textile industry are not on coarse yarn but on the finer yarns and also on artificial fibres and not on coarse and type of cotton made goods which are consumed by ordinary people.

Some hon. Members have suggested that a substantial reduction should have been made in the excise duties on articles of mass consumption. Just now an hon. Member asked what relief was given. When we propound a budget, we are conscious simultaneously of the problems which the economy faces which demand a solution. These problems have to be solved. I agree that wasteful expenditure has to be avoided. Nobody can disagree there. All the same, the dimension, the magnitude of the problem, cannot also be minimised. We have made a policy that we have to step up our development effort. We have also to put in additional effort in order to shoulder the burden of the defence programme.

2552 (Ai) LSD.—7.

Shri Masani suggested. . .

An Hon. Member: But he is not here.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: His arguments are here.

He made the point that levies on items like kerosene and sugar should be withdrawn. As a student of economics, he must realise that sugar being a scarce commodity, the removal of excise duty will only result in the middlemen making more money and prices will go up further. Therefore, he should not be the person who should ask for a reduction of the excise duty on such articles of consumption which are scarce. As regards kerosene, does he not know that it is consuming very precious foreign exchange and in order to conserve it, though we cannot really reduce its consumption to that quantum, we have to see that the consumption does not go up very easily? This is a problem which has been facing us for some time past. Therefore, the argument that these duties on these items should be completely dropped is, not, I think, sound.

Then I come to the aspect of savings. I agree that the importance of savings cannot be minimised in our economy. It has often been said—no development without investment and no investment without savings. Thrift, saving and investment are vital in any economy, more so in an economy which has been backward, like ours, and which is trying to develop. It is all a chain reaction. Savings only can create investment, and investment only can create further savings. In that aspect, I think personal saving has a very important role to play. Personal saving does provide two basic solutions to the problem. Reduction in personal expenditure and increase in personal savings also reduces inflation to a considerable extent. The less we spend on scarce articles of consumption, the lesser inflation there is felt. Apart from that, it is also very necessary to build our economy from the savings we ourselves can build up. After all, we cannot go on increasing

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

the quantum of obligations by way of foreign loan or the quantum of taxation. We have to provide a certain important base to our economy from savings.

16.06 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

In that, small savings, which concern individuals in bulk, the large masses of people, are very important indeed. It is perhaps not widely known that the small savings have helped to finance 11.4 per cent of the First Plan outlay, 8.4 per cent of the Second Plan outlay and during the current Plan, we hope it will finance nearly 8 per cent of our total outlay.

In the current year, despite the difficulties posed by the introduction of compulsory savings, the small savings collections have shown a very encouraging trend. That shows that though people may criticise, and Members may also criticise, they are very chivalrous; they have done their duty; they have fulfilled their obligation showing to this country and to the world that they are conscious of their obligations and have taken practical steps to discharge them, much more this year than they did last year or the year before.

During the first ten months of the year, the collections have amounted to Rs. 81 crores as compared to Rs. 37 crores in the corresponding period last year. We hope to end the year with a record collection of Rs. 115 crores. But as FM himself has said in his budget speech, even at this rate we are not going to reach the target of Rs. 600 crores for the Plan.

The compulsory deposit scheme has been withdrawn completely and the burdens on the lower income group have not increased, rather they have been reduced appreciably. I hope that the voluntary savings will help to augment further the collections; I am sure the performance of the volun-

tary savings scheme will be much better in future.

Then I would like to say something about the refugee problem. I am sure the Finance Minister in his reply will touch on this aspect. But mention was made that no indication was given in the budget about the problem facing us. Apart from the grants covering the Ministry of Rehabilitation, which hon. Members would have seen or may see, the problem has not been neglected. On the day the situation got aggravated, the Finance Minister made a categorical statement in Calcutta, if I remember aright, that the responsibility for rehabilitating these refugees would be ours. What stronger words are needed to indicate his earnestness and seriousness towards this problem? After that, on many occasions in answer to questions and debates, the Government has shown its seriousness towards this problem and their earnest approach to meet this obligation. The mention of it in the Budget Speech is not the only indication of the sincerity of the Government. There are other indications which should be accepted with the same graciousness and seriousness. If one wants to criticise for the sake of criticism, many points can be found for it but let us be fair not only to the Government, but also to the Finance Minister who has himself spoken on a number of occasions. It is a little bit embarrassing for me to defend my Ministers in his presence, but he has indicated a number of times his earnestness in this respect, and the magnitude and the complexities of the problem have not been minimised by any member of the Government at any time. All the Ministers concerned with this problem have shown the same amount of seriousness to meet the situation.

Before I conclude, I would say two or three words about Kolar Gold Fields. Shri Trivedi raised this point, and asked why we were taking the

responsibility of working these mines at a loss. There are two points in this. One is that gold is a very scarce commodity. It provides the base for foreign exchange, and we are already facing a great shortage of foreign exchange. So, we should conserve whatever gold we can through our own mining. Apart from that, we are under an obligation to the International Monetary Fund. One of the basic reasons for this loss is that we are compelled to buy or sell gold at the rate fixed by the International Monetary Fund, and hon. Members know that the rate fixed by the International Monetary Fund is much lower than the prevailing market rate. If there had not been any international obligation as such before the Government, probably our pockets would have been full with profit, because gold is selling at a very high rate in the market, but we cannot do that. The Mysore Government was selling at that rate, and in order to meet these losses of the Mysore Government, we were paying them a big subsidy. Now we have taken over these mines because we were already paying a subsidy to the Mysore Government. We took the opportunity to form a committee to see how these mines and their working could be improved. My colleague, Shri Bhagat, who is now Minister of Planning, was the Chairman of that sub-committee under the Board. That sub-committee has recommended that there should be amalgamation of Mysore Mines and the Champion Reef Mines, centralisation of workshop services, civil engineering and sanitary services. They have also gone into the question of the surplus labour, and they have recommended that action may be taken to absorb the surplus labour in the Kolar Gold Fields.

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): You mean in the earth-moving plant?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Yes.

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): So many people of Indian origin want to come back to India from Africa. If they want to bring gold, will you give them any concession?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: This is an entirely different point, and I think the Finance Minister would like to answer it in his reply.

The hon. Member asked how many persons would be unemployed. Out of a total strength of 16,604 persons, probably 3,914 persons are surplus. About 1,000 of these workers are anticipated to take advantage of the voluntary retirement scheme with normal retirement benefits, because they are in any case retiring very soon. Another 1,000 may be the normal wastage in the course of the year leaving nearly 1,900 persons to be retrenched. In order to find alternative employment to this surplus labour, Government has decided to locate, as the hon. Member just now pointed out, heavy earth-moving equipment factory and a new mint at Kolar gold fields. With these words, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity. I have not covered all the points, primarily for the reason that the Finance Minister will take up some of these important points and try to meet the arguments.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I was feeling weary and a little despondent and you have come as an oasis in a desert. I thank you for calling me. Before I say a few words in the form of my observations, I should like to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister who has been playing a very difficult wicket. It is actually a thankless job. He has come out with a glorious hundred, not out, already and may be hoping for a double century for all I can say.

Many hon. Members here have dabbled in figures and also other

[Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda]

things and I shall bypass them. I have only one observation to make—the reimposition of the expenditure tax. In the past that was not a successful thing. I wonder if that could be a wise move to put it back. However, I wish the Finance Minister success in that.

This is one occasion when an hon. Member can talk about all aspects of Indian life and I wish to deal with one aspect. For nearly 16 years we have been free, we have really not done anything in the countryside. We are always looking for bigger things and we have actually let the tenants, tillers of the soil down. We have not seen to their needs which should have been the first and foremost thing that our Government should do. They have not got roads; they are marooned during the monsoon; they have no bridges; they have no medical attention, no doctors to attend to them. We have always given them a low priority which we should not have. You should bring down the prices of primary needs, such as food, cloth, etc. If these two things are not done there will be uprising of a type that you will never be able to combat against. Government should realise that this is going to be the biggest headache and the sooner they tackle this problem, the better for them.

I am connected with sports. It brings to my mind Adolf Hitler whose ideology I never followed, nor do I agree with his world-conquest theories. But I do agree with one thing he had done. He built Germany from scratch to hundred per cent physical fitness, by giving them nourishment, by introducing compulsory physical drill, compulsory military training. As I said, I do not agree with his ideology—I did not ever—but one cannot help admiring how he was able to bring that nation back to its

100 per cent fitness. Of course, he misled them; that is another matter.

Last year, I had the honour of moving a Motion for compulsory military training. I am afraid it was treated lightheartedly although later on there were several moves in that direction, of making the NCC training compulsory and some other things also. But it was not really taken up seriously. I do feel that when a youngster comes out of from his examinations, he should be asked to produce two certificates: one that he is absolutely fit, and the other that he has had some military training or other. These are the two very important things that we must see to, as we have two very dangerous enemies who are bordering on India: one is that steam-roller, China, and the other is a scorpion. And we must be careful and we must get our young men trained not only in the military way but also physically fit, so that any time they are called they would join straightway.

In order to have that, you must also have sufficient playgrounds and stadia so that a youngster who comes out of his office, or even a middle-aged man who comes out of the Secretariat will have a chance of some recreation that he likes, anything that suits him. But he should be made to have some sort of game so that when he comes out after his work in the office or in the mill or factory, all that he will do is that he will go in for a game and a man who plays games at the end of a day's work has no time for loafing about. He is dead tired and what he would like at this time is, to have a square meal and to go to bed.

16.22 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Thus, I would like to see in this country more funds allocated for sports and compulsory training of a type that Germany had. That is the only way in which we can deal with

these two great enemies of ours. As for Pakistan,—as I said, this is the only occasion when a Member can talk about all aspects of Indian life—Pakistan's propaganda has risen to dizzy heights as you all know. But what really pains me is this. They say that we are not a secular country and that just passes my comprehension, because Jinnah, who was in the Central Assembly—and so was I in those days—said that what he was aiming at was an Islamic State. He made no bones about it. He said he wanted an Islamic State and he would have it. And consistent with that, he has been driving out—also his Government and his successors—all the non-Muslims who are now coming to India. These non-Muslims were and are still our brothers. We must extend to them a very warm welcome; give them all the facilities and not only that: give them more than they had in Pakistan, so that they have a home to look to.

When Pakistan says that we are not a secular State, I would like to say that Pakistan should just see how we run our country. The Muslims have every opportunity; they are in every service, whether as magistrates or judges or as our ambassadors; so much so that a great Muslim,—Shri M. C. Chagla,—I say M.C. because when another C is also added, it becomes his initials, MCC,—MCC member—represented us at the Security Council and he put our case. He put our case so admirably that it should have been an eye-opener to Pakistan. We are so secular in our ways that even in the game of cricket, we have a Muslim as our Captain—Nawab of Pataudi.

As I said, Pakistan's propaganda has even beaten Dr. Goebbels, who was known for his propaganda in Hitler's cabinet. There is the old saying, "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy". So, I do hope that the Finance Minister will find sufficient funds to build up the physical fitness of the country.

I wanted to touch on the aspect of tourism also. I have travelled quite a bit in my life and I cannot help saying that when tourists come to this country—it really brings foreign exchange to us—they are treated in none too courteous a way. At the port of disembarkation, their luggage is opened, their clothes are thrown about and ordinary courtesies are not shown to them. I suggest that there should be a radical change. When a man produces his passport and he is coming here as a visitor, he should be given all the facilities. A certain amount of courtesy should be shown to him, as is done in other countries. In countries like America, U.K. and all over Europe and Japan where I have travelled, the moment the customs know that you have come as a visitor and not going to be a permanent resident, they at once give you all facilities. They say, "go ahead; we shall not check your baggage", because they know that you have gone there for the purpose of spending foreign exchange. Your own money you are going to spend in that country. So, I feel that when tourists are on the increase, our Government should at least look to this aspect that they should be given more facilities, more comforts and courtesy, which is the main thing. If that is given, I am sure we shall be getting a lot of foreign exchange.

I would also like to suggest that if possible, let us take away from the statute-book the words "Hindu" and "Muslim" and call everybody an Indian national only. If that is done, this business of secularism and non-secularism will not arise.

Before I conclude—as I said, this is the occasion when one can say a few things other than the budget—I would like to say that I have not found a statue of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya near about.

An Hon. Member: In the Central Hall, there is one.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda: There is a painting there. I am talking of a statue. He was known as the silver-tongued orator in the British days. He was a great personality, a man who has done tremendous national work for India. He built that university—I shall not call it a Hindu University—which really is the envy of many a university and I think his name should be perpetuated. As we have statues of some great men here, he should also figure amongst them.

With these words, I once thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak this afternoon.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो वजट सदन के सम्मुख उपस्थित किया गया है, मैं उसके सम्बन्ध में निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि माननीय कृष्णामाचारी जी ने जो लेखा जोखा पत्र देश की आर्थिक समीक्षा के रूप में देश को आमदनी और व्यय के रूप में और कराधान लगा कर जो चित्र सदन के सामने उपस्थित किया है उसकी समीक्षा करने में कुछ संतोष होता है और कुछ चिन्ता भी ।

इसके पहले कि मैं अपने विचार वजट के सम्बन्ध में आप के सम्मुख उपस्थित करूं, मैं आप के द्वारा इस सदन का ध्यान माननीय लोहिया जी के अभी हाल के भाषण की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं ।

प्राइम मिनिस्टर का जो मकान इलाहबाद में है, उस का हवाला देते हुए लोहिया जी ने अपने भाषण में प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर यह लांछन और आक्षेप लगाया कि वह उस मकान के टैक्स से बचना चाहते हैं और जो १८०० रुपये टैक्स लगाया गया है, वह कम है । उस ऐतिहासिक मकान के लिए, जहां से स्वराज्य के लिए बड़े आन्दोलन चले, जहां बड़े बड़े विचारक उपस्थित होते थे और जहां आज प्रधान मंत्री रहते नहीं हैं, उन को

पुराने किराये के आधार पर १८०० रुपये देने पड़ते हैं । इस स्थिति में अगर यह चार्ज लगाया जाये कि वह इवेजन करते हैं, तो यह बहुत मनामिब बात नहीं है ।

मैं से ज्यादा दुःख की बात उन समय हुई, जब उन्होंने औरंगजेब के अन्तिम दिनों की बात कही

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : शाहजहां के ।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : श्रीराम उम के लड़के की एक कहानी सुनाई और उमका इतिहास दिल्ली से जोड़ा । वह इशारा किनकी ओर था, क्या वह कहना चाहते थे, इसके पहले भी उन्होंने क्या कहा है, इस का एक अत्यन्त बीभत्स चित्र उन्होंने इस सदन में उपस्थित किया, जिसे मैं दुःख ही हो सकता है । प्राइम मिनिस्टर दो रोज़ से बीमार हैं । स्वास्थ्य उनका अच्छा नहीं है । मुगल साम्राज्यवाद के एक सम्राट की कहानी सुना कर और दिल्ली में उन का सम्बन्ध जोड़ कर जो बात वह कहना चाहते थे, मैं जाने उसके पीछे क्या कल्पना थी, लेकिन इस में सन्देह नहीं कि उन भावना में एक प्रकार की दुर्गन्ध आती थी । इस सदन के किसी माननीय सदस्य को यह शोभा नहीं देता कि प्रधान मंत्री की ओर उँगल करते हुए इस प्रकार की हल्की और गिरी हुई बात कही जाये, जिस में दुर्गन्ध आती हो ।

हमारे भारतीय जीवन के बारे में उन्होंने कहा कि इस देश में स्त्रियां बेची जाती हैं, दूसरे देशों की अपेक्षा ज्यादा बेची जाती हैं । फिर उन्होंने कहा कि यहां पर हमारी जो बच्चियां एक यूनिफॉर्म पहन कर कालेज जाती हैं, वे तितलियां जैसी बनती हैं । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस प्रकार की भाषा, इस प्रकार का अमर्यादित व्यवहार, इस सदन के एक ऐसे माननीय सदस्य को शोभा नहीं देता, जो अपने आप को डाक्टर, विद्वान, फ़िलामफ़र और राजनीतिज्ञ कहते हैं ।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सदन इस देश की सार्वभौमिक सत्ता का प्रतीक है, इस में नगरपालिका के स्तर की—नगरपालिका भी मैं क्यों कहूँ ?—एक ऐसे छोट स्तर की बात कहना शोभा नहीं देता है। माननीय सदस्यों को “झुंड” कह देना, “गिरोह” कह देना, ये बातें ऐसी हैं कि मामूली इक्के और तांगे वाले भी नहीं कह सकते हैं, ऐसी बात वह कहते हैं। उन का एक इरादा है—जब वह बाहर लायी में जाते हैं, तब भी उन का इरादा यह होता है—कि सब से बड़े आदमी के व्यक्तित्व पर आक्रमण क्यों न करें।

जो हमारी राजनीति का सब से बड़ा नेना है, प्रणेता है, देश के भाग्य का निर्माण करने में जिसका सब से बड़ा हाथ है, . . .

श्री किशन पटनायक : तारीफ करने का रोल तो माननीय सदस्य अदा कर रहे हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : . . . जिस के नेतृत्व में यह देश स्वतंत्र हुआ, जिस के नेतृत्व में आज देश का निर्माण हो रहा है, उन की दो दिन की बीमारी के कारण यदि शाहजहां के अन्तिम जीवन की कल्पना कर के उसका सम्बन्ध दिल्ली के इतिहास के साथ जोड़ा जाये, तो मुझे इस पर दुःख है और मैं समझता हूँ कि सब साथी मेरी इस भावना के साथ सहमत हो कर दुःख प्रकट करेंगे

एक माननीय सदस्य : जरूर।

Shri Tyagi: He was speaking in the language of a divorced wife.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : . . . और आशा करें कि हम इस सदन की मर्यादा रखेंगे।

अब मैं बजट के सम्बन्ध में अपने कुछ विचार उपस्थित करना चाहता हूँ। दो हजार करोड़ रुपये का बजट हमारे सामने रखा गया है। हमारे देश का यह दम

कि एक तरफ हम को गरीबी से लड़ना है, जिस के लिए हम ने प्रतिज्ञा की है, जिस के लिए हम प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, जिस के लिए हम ने समाजवाद के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार किया है, और दूसरी तरफ अपनी उत्तरीय पश्चिमी सीमाओं की रक्षा का प्रश्न है, हमारी स्वतंत्रता का प्रश्न है, देश की आजादी का प्रश्न है। उस ओर हमें ध्यान देना है और इस देश की रक्षा करनी है।

सीमा-रक्षा और रक्षा उत्पादन के लिए मान मौ और कुछ करोड़ रुपये निर्धारित किया गया है। पिछले वर्ष टैक्सिज ज्यादा लगाए गए। वह संकट-काल था और सारे देश ने साथ दिया। इस वर्ष हम चाहते हैं कि धीरे धीरे हमारी सेना का उत्पादन और रक्षा की तमाम सामग्री प्रचुर मात्रा में हमारे देश में उपलब्ध हो, ताकि जब कभी खतरे का अवसर आए, तो हम डटकर मुकाबला कर सकें। इस लिए हम चाहते हैं कि जो धनराशि इन कार्य के लिए सुरक्षित रखी गई है, उस का ठीक तौर पर उपयोग हो, ताकि हम अपने रक्षा के काम में द्रुतगति से आगे बढ़ें।

इस बजट के बारे में यह कहा गया है कि हम भुवनेश्वर के प्रस्ताव से बहुत दूर हट जाते हैं, समाजवाद के सिद्धान्त से बहुत दूर हट जाते हैं, और देश को हम ने जो वचन दिया है, उस से हम दूर हट जाते हैं। यह बात ठीक नहीं है। हम ने जनतंत्रीय समाजवाद की जो प्रतिज्ञा की है, जो प्रस्ताव पास किया है, अगर व्यावहारिक तुला में रख कर उस की आर्थिक समीक्षा की जायेगी, तो यह अनुभव होगा कि श्री कृष्णमाचारी ने सेंटोमेंट से काम नहीं लिया है बल्कि व्यवहार से काम लिया है।

जहां तक उत्पादन का सम्बन्ध है, देश दो तरह के उत्पादन चाहिए—एक उत्पादन घरेलू का और दूसरा प्रासेस्ड गुड्स का।

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद, (नालंदा) : बच्चों का ।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : बच्चों के उत्पादन में आप सहायता कर ही रहे हैं। जब यह देखा गया कि पिछले वर्ष ज्यादा कराधान के कारण हमारा प्राडक्टिव एपेरेट्स स्टैंड-स्टिल हो गया, ढीला पड़ गया और प्राफिट को प्लो बैक न करने से पहली, दूसरी और तीसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजनाओं में औद्योगिक उत्पादन की गति धिमी पड़ गई, तो इस बारे में कुछ कदम उठाने आवश्यक थे। इसलिए, माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो कन्सेशन दिये हैं, वे समाजवाद से हटने की वजह से नहीं, या अपने मिद्धान्तों से हटने की वजह से नहीं, बल्कि इकानोमी को जैनीरेट करने के लिए, आर्थिक दृष्टि से इस प्रकार की शक्ति पैदा करने के लिए और गाधारण इन्वेस्टर्ज, कामनमैन इन्वेस्टर्ज, को आगे लाने के लिए, दिये गए हैं।

उन्होंने जो सुपर प्राफिट्स टैक्स की जगह पर सरटैक्स लगाया है और कुछ और कन्सेशन दिये हैं, वे केवल इस दृष्टि से दिये हैं कि हम थर्ड फ्राइव-यीअर प्लान के टारगेट्स को पा सकें। जब हम ने अपनी आर्थिक व्यवस्था में मिक्चर्ड इकानोमी के मिद्धान्त को स्वीकार किया है, तो उस में न चाहते हुए भी कन्सेशन देने के अलावा और कोई चारा नहीं है, ताकि इकानोमी को जैनीरेट किया जा सके। हमारे देश में सैल्फ-जैनीरेटिंग इकानोमी को लाया जा सके। इस से उत्पादन बढ़ेगा। इसके साथ ही इंडस्ट्री के मुनाफ़े को भी प्लो बैक करने की आपरटूनिटी दी गई है, अवसर दिया गया है।

विदेशी पार्टिसिपेशन के सम्बन्ध में भी यहां पर काफी चर्चा हुई है। आप देखें कि आज संसार की सीमायें सिकुड़ गई हैं। एक वक्त था जब ऐसी बात नहीं थी। एक वक्त था जब ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी ने जो

यहां व्यापार करने आई थी, सी डेढ़ सी बरस तक हमारा शोषण किया। गुलामी के दिनों में आर्थिक क्षेत्र में जिन जिन मुसीबतों का हमें सामना करना पड़ा, जिन तरह से हमारा व्यापार खत्म हुआ, वह आप से छिपी हुई बात नहीं नहीं है। लेकिन आज नीति का निर्धारण हम करते हैं, जो श्रेयर हैं, वे कितने हो सकते हैं, इसका पैमला हम करते हैं, टर्म्स एण्ड कंडीशज हम तय करते हैं, पूंजी पर इंटिरेस्ट, उमका व्याज, उमका पेमेंट, कॉलंबोरेशन, कोओप्रेशन आदि सब हम पर निर्भर करता है। ये सब बातें एक कागज़ पर लिख ली जाती हैं। सरकार की एप्रूवल से ही पत्रक तैयार किया जाता है। हम देखते हैं कि किन चीजों की आवश्यकता है। तब जा कर कॉलंबोरेशन मजूर किया जाता है, स्वीकार किया जाता है। यह सब कुछ हमारी शर्तों पर होता है। अपनी ही शर्तों पर हम बाहर की पूंजी लाते हैं। हमारी माहूकारी की माख को आप देखिये। संसार के सभी देश इस बात को कह चुके हैं कि जो पैसा हमारे देश में लगा है, वह ठीक लगा है, ठीक इन्वेस्टिड है। हमारे मुल्क में बाहर का पैसा आया है, उसका यहां पर इन्वेस्टमेंट हुआ है। उस इन्वेस्टमेंट से हमारी प्रभुसत्ता पर, हमारी आज़ादी पर कोई आंच नहीं आई है। जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि हमने अपनी आज़ादी गिरवी रख दी है, उन के साथ मैं सहमत नहीं हो सकता हूं। जिन दिमागों से इस तरह की बात निकलती है, मैं समझता हूं वे दिमाग और बुद्धि गिरवी रख दी गई है, उसको मार्टगेज कर दिया गया है। जो इस तरह के चार्ज लगाते हैं कि हम ने अपनी इंडिपेंडेंस को मार्टगेज कर दिया है, उन्होंने इस चीज को ठीक तरह से समझा नहीं है।

वित्त मंत्री जी ने सी० डी० एस० को जो हटाया है, मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूं। लो इनकम ग्रुप की जो उन्होंने मदद की है, वह भी स्वागत योग्य है। एक बात हमारे बजट

साहब ने कही है जिसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। जो पैसा सी० डी० एम० में आ चुका है बजाय इसके कि वह पांच बरस बाद लौटाया जाए और लोगों को पांच बरस तक इंतजार करने के लिए मजबूर किया जाए मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह उनको अभी वापिस दे दिया जाए। जब आपने एक मेशर को ही विदड़ा कर लिया है। और जब आप इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं कि उसको जारी रखना आपके तथा लोगों के हित में नहीं है तब मैं समझता हूँ कि पांच बरस तक उस पैसे को रखने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं होनी चाहिए, उनको उनका रुपया वापिस मिलना चाहिये। एन्डटी स्कीम आपने चालू की है जो कि पंद्रह हजार वार्षिक आमदनी के ऊपर वालों पर लागू होगी। उसमें आपको फायदा होगा लेकिन जब सी० डी० एम० आपने हटा लिया है, वापस ले लिया है, तो उनका पैसा जो जमा हो चुका है, वह वापस कर दिया जाना चाहिये।

खेती के उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहना के सम्बन्ध चाहता हूँ। साम्यवाद की बात हमारे साथी कम्युनिस्ट कहते हैं। वे यह नहीं जानते हैं और अगर जानते हैं तो इसको स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहते हैं कि ४०-४२ बरस रूस की क्रांति के बाद भी, इतिहास को देखा जाए, तो रूस में अनाज पूरा नहीं पैदा होता है। एग्रिकलचरल इकोनोमी वहाँ पर उतनी प्रोफाउंड नहीं हो सकी है, जितनी कल्पना की गई थी। यदि हम समाजवादी लक्ष्य की उपलब्धि चाहते हैं, अपने उस लक्ष्य को प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं तो सब से पहली आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम अपने तमाम साधनों को एक मोड़ दें, कृषि की ओर मोड़ दें। गांव की तरफ जहाँ किसान रहता है, उस तरफ मोड़ दें। यही हमारी इकोनोमी का बेस है। हमारे देश में ३६५ मिलियन एकड़ धरती है और ७० प्रतिशत परिवारों के लोग उस पर

लगे हुए हैं। हमारे जितने भी साधन हैं, हमारा जितना भी पैसा है, उस सब को अगर हम गांव वालों की ओर मोड़ दें तो हमारा उत्पादन बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ जाएगा।

हम अपने देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं। हम इस लक्ष्य की प्राप्ति के लिये यह भी चाहते हैं कि हमारे जो विरोधी साथी हैं, वे हमारा साथ दें। अगर उन्होंने जहाँ पर उत्पादन होता है, वहाँ पर मजदूरों को भड़काया, यह कह कर कि उत्पादन की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है, देहातों में जा कर अगर उन्होंने उनको इम्पीटस (उत्साह) नहीं दिया, उनका उत्साह नहीं बढ़ाया तो उनका और हमारा लक्ष्य जो समान है, वह प्राप्त नहीं होगा। उन में और हम में कोई मतभेद नहीं है, जहाँ तक समाजवाद का सम्बन्ध है। हम सभी विरोधी दलों से, विरोधी सदस्यों से आशा करते हैं और उन से प्रार्थना भी करते हैं कि देश में ऐसा वातावरण निर्मित करने में वे हमारा साथ दें जिस में उत्पादन बढ़ सके। एक फखर पैदा हो सके, शक्ति और उत्साह का संचार हो सके, हाथ पैर चल सकें किसानों के और वे धरती से अधिक अन्न पैदा करने के लिये रत हो जायें। धरती से ही हमें खनिज पदार्थ मिलेंगे, तमाम वह मैटीरियल (सामग्री) निकलेगा, जो प्राप्ति होता है, जो एक्सपोर्ट होता है और जिससे हमें फारेन एक्सचेंज (विदेशी मुद्रा) प्राप्त होती है। यह सब काम किसान के माध्यम से ही हो सकता है। लेकिन आज किसान की स्थिति क्या है। उसकी स्थिति खराब है। इस समाजवादी व्यवस्था की मैं यहाँ पर आलोचना करना चाहता हूँ। समाजवादी व्यवस्था में किसान को जितना सुख, सुविधा, जितने साधन मिलने चाहिये, वे उसको नहीं मिले हैं। उसको उत्साह भी उतना नहीं मिला है, जितना मिलना चाहिये था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसको अधिक से अधिक सीड, अधिक से अधिक फर्टिलाइजर (खादया) अधिक से अधिक

[श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय]

पानी, अधिक से अधिक ऋण, पैसा आदि सब कुछ दिया जाना चाहिये ताकि जो आपका तृतीय योजना के तृतीय वर्ष के उत्पादन का लक्ष्य था, वह पूरा हो सके। वह आज पूरा नहीं हुआ है। उसमें तीन प्रतिशत की कमी है। पिछले तीन वर्षों से यह कमी चली आ रही है। हमारी आबादी भी ३.२ प्रतिशत के हिसाब से बढ़ रही है। इस तरह से सात प्रतिशत अनाज कम हो जाता है। पापुलेशन (जन संख्या) जिस हिसाब से बढ़ रही है, उसके अनुपात में हमारा अन्न का उत्पादन भी बढ़ना चाहिये। बढ़ती हुई आबादी को हमें खिलाना है, उसकी रक्षा करनी है। इस दायित्व से हम बरी नहीं हो सकते हैं। इस वास्ते इस ग्रोर आपका विशेष ध्यान जाना चाहिये और किसान को प्रत्येक सुविधा आपको देनी चाहिये।

कीमतों में जो वृद्धि होती है, उसके बारे में थोड़ा सा मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। पिछली फरवरी से आज तक के जो भाव हैं, उनका आप जग देखें कि किस तरह से वे बढ़े हैं। अनाज, चावल, ज्वार बाजरा के भावों में २० प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। दालों के भाव २५ प्रतिशत बढ़ गये हैं। तरकारी, अंडों आदि के भाव १६ प्रतिशत बढ़ गये हैं। दूध और गृह के १८ प्रतिशत बढ़ गये हैं। दाम जो बढ़े हैं, वे हमारे तीसरे प्लान की जो लागत है, उसका बढ़ायेंगे। लेबर है, वह अधिक पैस की मांग करेगी। उसको करनी भी चाहिये। यह उचित ही है। मध्यमवर्गीय जो क्लास है और नीचे की क्लास है, उसकी महंगाई की वजह से कमर टूट जायेगी। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस महंगाई के मसले को आपको सब से पहले हल करना चाहिये।

छिपे हुए रुपये (अनएकाउन्टिड मनी) के बारे में एक बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। लोग कहते हैं कि अनएकाउन्टिड मनी ३०० करोड़ या ४०० करोड़ या ५०० करोड़

है। वित्त मंत्री जी से यह आशा की जाती है कि वह कोई ऐसा मैशर लायेंगे जिससे रुपया बाहर आ सके। हमारा सामाजिक जीवन बिल्कुल असन्तुलित हो गया है। खर्च बढ़ गए हैं। शार्पियों में एक एक, दो दो और तीन तीन लाख खर्च कर दिया जाता है। बड़ी बड़ी रोशनी की जाती है, बड़ी बड़ी पार्टियां दी जाती हैं। इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस प्राप्त करने के लिये घूस दी जाती है। ये जो चीजें हैं, इनकी तरफ भी हमारा ध्यान जाना चाहिये। अनएकाउन्टिड मनी का हमें पता लगाना होगा। अगर इसके बारे में कोई मैशर नहीं लाया गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे नन्दा जी जोकि सदाचार समिति के द्वारा भ्रष्टाचार का उन्मूलन करना चाहते हैं, उस में वह कभी सफल नहीं हो सकते हैं।

Shri Manabendra Shah (Tehri Garhwal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to some major fundamental points. But before that, I think, a background of the Party's policies should be enumerated. The policy to which the Congress Party is wedded is well-known. It was mixed economy, renamed as socialistic pattern of society and now clearly defined as democratic socialism at the Bhubaneshwar session. The name looks different, but the aims and the objects of the Party are the same, namely maximisation of production, equitable distribution and general welfare of all classes.

Sir, in India, we seek to achieve these aims not through totalitarian methods but through democratic ones of legislation, persuasion, fiscal measures and financial policies. What type of financial policies should, therefore, be followed is very clear to us. The financial policies are one of the methods of bringing into being a greater equality, social upliftment through industrial and agricultural advancement and providing essential ameni-

ties, like free medicines and education. It is also conceded that the principle of proportionate sacrifice should be the basis for the maximum in the taxation structure. It has yet to be seen whether they will be a success or not. I shall not dilate on the Expenditure Tax or the Gift Tax or, for that matter, even the Estate Duty. Instead, I want to point out the inconsistencies of the Government policy. It is surprising that the Finance Minister and the Government belonging to the same Party find it once necessary to introduce a particular tax and soon after find it unnecessary and again find it necessary, and we the Members of the Party have been endorsing this fluctuating policy of the Government. It is a little baffling, not only to me but to many others also, the following of this shifting policy. The only inference that can be drawn from this is that anything and everything is justified when we are in a position to implement it; or it means that we have not got any proper statistics on which to base our policies, or as Shri S. S. More said yesterday, that the policies are of personalities and not of principles. I strongly believe that this sort of policy is harming our party not only in India itself but outside. It is, therefore, high time that we give some stability to our policy, and the people will only then be able to really participate in all our projects. I, therefore, hope that the hon. Minister will throw some light on this aspect.

One of the aims, as I said, was for a welfare State. With this as our aim, two activities stand out prominently. One is education, which can be even free education and health services which may be free, or may be on the basis of insurance, or may be providing good quality medicines at a cheaper rate. We have not as yet been able to give education of the type that we want, that is, free education. The same is the case with

health. In fact, I understand that some committee of the Senate of America have given a finding that the prices of medicines in India, if not the highest, are at least on the high side. As yet, Government is not able to provide these facilities, and yet they want to tax these items by the deletion of these two from the scope of exemptions under the expenditure tax. Apart from other considerations like the policy of Government etc., it is on humane grounds that I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this. On humane grounds I would request the hon. Minister to reconsider this matter.

Yet another example of our not keeping to our policy is shown by the concessions provided in taxation to the corporate sector. The layman's meaning of the corporate sector for the purposes of the proposed concessions is big organised industries with a lot of capital investments. My presumption, therefore, is that the medium and small-scale and even cottage industries, most of which by their very nature are organised mostly on private limited basis, or small units are ineligible for these concessions. If this presumption is correct, may I ask how far the policy of giving concessions to the corporate sector only, tally with our policy of encouraging other types of industries which are smaller in nature?

In fact, one of the guiding principles of giving loans etc. to smaller units was to break the stranglehold of the big industrialists. Therefore, keeping in mind the policy of the party, it is essential that the concessions given to the corporate sector should be extended to the medium, small-scale and cottage industries.

If I mistake not, the sphere of exporting goods is not confined to major industries; if I mistake not, the big industries alone are not labour-employing industries; if I mistake not, even without the concessions to the big

[Shri Manabendra Shah]

industries are already able to compete with the smaller units by selling things at cheaper prices. Therefore, I have strongly to recommend to the Finance Minister that the discrimination be removed, or if there are some other proposals in this regard, they may kindly be told to us.

If, on the other hand, the concessions are primarily being introduced for the public sector, then it is understandable. If these concessions are really for the public sector to enable them to stand on their own legs or to make more profits, then also it is understandable. But I think that the genuine intention of the Finance Minister is to help the country to industrialise. Therefore, I am confident that my suggestions will be viewed by him in proper perspective.

The Finance Minister even in his budget speech has thrown hints further to enormously increase the powers of the tax-collecting authorities and the police to search the premises and lockers of the people, to ensure that no tax evasion takes place. There can be no two opinions about it that tax evasion is a crime to the society as a whole. But we have, at least ever since the present Home Minister took over, heard again and again of the large-scale corruption in government services. An impression, luckily or unluckily, but at least to our shame, has been created that the whole nation is corrupt. If it is really a fact that corruption is rampant in government services, the setting up of various organisations and bureaux for anti-corruption proceedings is not of much use. Why should we give so much power to them? I hope the hon. Minister will be able to assure the House that those to whom these powers are given will be really honest people. I am sure he will tell us ways and means he is adopting to implement the suggestion of the Tyagi Direct Taxation Enquiry Committee, that harassment to the people should decrease and should be discouraged.

This is by the way. But the main point and the real danger that I want to bring to the notice of Government lies elsewhere. As a Congressman, if I do not say it or do not highlight it, I think I would be failing in my duty. Even conceding for argument's sake that we will have 100 per cent honest government servants doing the work of anti-corruption, even then I fear we are endangering democratic socialism, the achievement of which is the implied intention of the Bhubaneswar session.

In this dynamic age, no single political party, howsoever strong it may be today, should think that it can continue to hold power always. This is what I want the hon. House to bear in mind. Those very powers can be misused or abused for annihilating democracy, if and when the ruling powers pass on to persons, party or parties which may have no faith in human values and no scruples whatsoever. We shall then have to face this dangerous position, and will have no ground to criticise the institutions or the working of the institutions because these institutions would be our own creation.

It is, therefore, that I would like to request Government through the hon. Finance Minister to review this matter. Let us not leave for posterity something different from what we are aiming for. Let us take such steps as will build democratic socialism on strong and sound foundations and will ensure that there is no danger of the creation of a police state.

The hon. Finance Minister has stated that States finances are causing him terrible concern. More than Rs. 3,000 crores are in arrears. It clearly shows the inability of the States to raise funds even after successive Finance Commissions have increased their share of the Central pool of revenue. It shows the States have failed to enhance agricultural output, for after all 70 per cent of the population is

