

**Mr. Speaker:** Further discussion can be initiated by some member giving a notice. For the present, I have notice only for a half-an-hour discussion. The present notice is only asking the Minister to place all relevant papers on the Table of the House. On that, the Minister says that he cannot place them on the Table at this stage. So, we will have this half-an-hour discussion. So far as the observations of Shri Swaran Singh are concerned, certainly they would be kept in view as to what part can be discussed. It is certainly not possible to discuss what is under investigation. That will not be possible. We will see how the hon. Member initiates his discussion. Of course, I cannot allow anything that comes in the way or prejudices the inquiry or investigation. I will see to it.

12.20 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET 1964-65—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall now take up the General Discussion on the General Budget. Shri Banerjee.

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) :**

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कल अपने भाषण के सिलसिले में यह याद दिला रहा था सदन को कि यह बजट जो हमारे सामने आया है उससे मालूम होता है कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने सोशलिज्म में से सोशल को निकाल कर केवल इज्म रख लिया है और इस तरह से कैपिटलिस्ट्स को खुली छूट दे दी है कि वह इज्म के पहले अपने कैपिटल शब्द को जोड़ दें। यह मेरा ख्याल नहीं है। अभी बजट के सिलसिले में हमारे एक बहुत बड़े नेता श्री गाडगिल ने कहा था :

“Nothing of socialism in the Budget. Shri N. V. Gadgil, former Governor of Punjab in a press statement said today that there was nothing of socialism in the new Union Budget. A more favourable Budget to the capitalist

class could not have been presented, he said.”

और फिर उन्होंने कहा है :—

“The Finance Minister did not believe in control nor in nationalisation of banks and seemed to have forgotten Bhubaneswar, he said.”

अब गाडगिल साहब सेंटर में मिनिस्टर रह चुके हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जो कि सही ढंग से समाजवाद को देश में लाना चाहते हैं।

उन्होंने कुछ ऐसा इशारा किया है कि मिडिल क्लास को कम्पलसरी डिपॉजिट हट जाने के बाद काफी रिलीफ मिली है। आखिर आज उसे क्या देना पड़ेगा ? अभी हमारे सामने जो एक फाइनेंशियल मैमोरेण्डम आया है उसमें इस चीज की बतलाया गया है। ५००० तक जिसकी आमदनी है और २४९ रुपया जो देता था यानी १५० रुपया सी०डी०एस० और ६९ रुपये इनकमटैक्स और सरचार्ज देता था उसे आज ८४ रुपये देना पड़ेंगे यानी २४९ रुपये में से सी०डी०एस० का १५० रुपये अगर निकाल दिया जाय तो ६९ रुपये रहते हैं। अब आज उसे ६९ रुपये के बजाय ८४ रुपये देने पड़ेंगे। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि उसे ७ रुपये का सालाना फायदा होगा और अगर इसे महीने के हिसाब से जोड़ा जाय तो ६ आने महीने की रिलीफ उसे मिलेगी। लेकिन वह भी जब १०,००० की तरफ जाते हैं तो वह रिलीफ भी खत्म हो जाती है क्योंकि ६३० रुपये में से अगर सी०डी०एस० निकाल दिया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह ७०६ रुपये से कम होता है। आज उसे ज्यादा देना पड़ेगा। इसलिये मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री जी कुल चीजों का सही तरीके से इलाज करें। अगर कम्पलसरी डिपॉजिट को उन्होंने रिट्रीस्पैक्टिवली विद्वा किया है तो क्या वह है कि वह सी० डी०

एस० का पैसा लोगों को पांच साल के बाद मिलेगा ? कुछ ऐलान ऐसा हुआ था कि सी० डी० एस० का रुपया लोगों को अभी नहीं बल्कि पांच साल के बाद मिलेगा । वित्त मंत्री जी के द्वारा इस बात के स्पष्टीकरण की जरूरत है । क्या यह सही है कि ४००० रुपया सालाना जिनकी आमदनी है उनको तो पैसा फौरन मिल जाएगा लेकिन ४००० से ज्यादा जिनकी आमदनी है उनको वह पैसा पांच साल के बाद मिलेगा ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री जी इस के बारे में स्पष्टीकरण करें । यदि इस कम्पलसरी डिपोजिट स्कीम को हटा दिया गया और सही तरीके से हटाया गया है तो वह पैसा जमा करने वाले लोगों को फौरन वापिस मिलना चाहिये । यह नहीं कि आज तो उससे जबरदस्ती जमा कराया जाय और वह इसके लिये ऋज लेकर पैसा जमा कराये और वह पैसा उसको वापिस पांच साल के बाद हो । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह चीज गलत है और वह पैसा उनको फौरन वापिस होना चाहिए ।

इस के बाद वित्त मंत्री जी ने मोनोपलीज के बारे में कहा है कि वह ऐसा नहीं समझते कि देश में मोनोपलीज है । यह भी ठीक नहीं है कि देश में मोनोपली है, कंसनट्रेशन आफ कंट्रोल है, कंसनट्रेशन आफ आनरशिप है । दिख इज ओनली पारशिपली टू । उन्होंने कहा है कि कंसनट्रेशन आफ आनरशिप और कंसनट्रेशन आफ कंट्रोल देश में ज्यादा नहीं है । वित्त मंत्री ने यह भी कहा है कि यह देखने के लिए कंसनट्रेशन इन चीजों का है या नहीं, मोनोपलीज की ग्रॉथ है या नहीं, इस के लिये एक कमिशन की नियुक्ति की जाय । अब जहाँ तक एक और कमिशन बिठाने की जो बात मंत्री जी ने कही है तो मेरा कहना है कि एक इनकमटेक्स इनवैस्टिगेशन कमिशन जिसके कि चेअरमैन श्री विश्वनाथ शास्त्री थे, उस ने कभी की अपनी रिपोर्ट सरकार को दी हुई है लेकिन आज तक भी वह रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने या देश की जनता के सामने नहीं आई है । इसी तरह से

मैं बतलाऊँ कि विवियन बोस रिपोर्ट जो कि डालमिया जैन कंसर्नस के बारे में थी उसको अपनी रिपोर्ट देने में ६ साल का समय लगा था । उस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट को सदन के सामने रखा गया लेकिन रिपोर्ट आने के बाद भी नतीजा जो कुछ हुआ इस सदन को अच्छे तरीके से मालूम है । उसमें यह साबित हो चुका था और उस पर बहस करते हुए हम लोगों ने कहा था कि विवियन बोस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में यह एक इशारा है उस की तरफ कि इस देश में डालमिया जैन एक ही नहीं हैं बल्कि बहुत से डालमिया जैन हैं । दूसरे कई बिजनस हाउसेज हैं जिनके कि मामले में अगर ध्यान से देखा जाय तो वही चीजें यानी फालसीफिकेशन आफ एकाऊंट्स, मिसएप्रोप्रियेशन आफ फंड्स और मिसमैनेजमेंट एण्ड ग्रीस इर-रेगुलैरीटीज डालमिया जैन की तरह उनमें भी मिलेंगी ।

इसके बाद पंडित जी के इशारे पर प्रोफेसर महालोनबीस कमेटी बैठी । उसकी रिपोर्ट को भी आये चार साल हो गये हैं लेकिन अभी तक वह रिपोर्ट हमें देखने को नहीं मिली है और सदन में वह रिपोर्ट नहीं आई है । ऐसी हालत में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरा कमिशन जो बनाए जाने को कहा गया है उसकी जरूरत क्या है । क्या हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी को यह बात मालूम नहीं है कि देश में कंसनट्रेशन आफ वैल्य है ? क्या उन्हें मालूम नहीं है कि राष्ट्र की जो आमदनी है उसका तकरीबन ६० फीसदी कुछ लोगों के हाथों में और कुछ परिवारों के हाथों में जाता है ? अब इस चीज को जानने के लिये जो वित्त मंत्री एक और कमिशन बिठाना चाहते हैं तो मैं उनसे कुछ सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ । देश में जो मोनोपॉलिस्ट्स हैं और पूजीपति हैं उनसे क्या हम यह कहने वाले हैं कि देखो कमिशन की रिपोर्ट निकल जाने दो, उस के बाद हम तुम से बातचीत करेंगे ? मैं आपको साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि वह मोनोपो-

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

लिस्ट्स और पूंजीपति उस रिपोर्ट के आने तक इंतजार नहीं करेंगे और यकीनी तौर पर वह अपनी मोनोपली और कैंपेंटल को बढ़ाते ही चलाये जायेंगे। वह तो पहले की तरह अपने आधिपत्य को बढ़ाने की ही कोशिश करेंगे।

मैं यह समझता हूँ कि आज हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने विदेशी पूंजी को एक खुली छूट्टी दे दी है कि वह हमारे देश में आ जाय। उनका कहना है कि देश में विदेशी पूंजी लगाने की जरूरत है। देश का जो आर्थिक ढांचा है उसको देखते हुए हमें अपनी प्लानिंग को कामयाब बनाना है तो देश में विदेशी पूंजी लगाने की जरूरत है, ऐसा वित्त मंत्री जी ने कहा है। मैं उन का ध्यान कल के अखबार "पैट्रियाट" के एक न्यूज आइटम की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ "इंयोरेंस टु वलड बैंक टीम"। उस के बारे में शायद उन्होंने कल यह कहा है कि वलड बैंक को कोई चिट्ठी लिखी है। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ वाकई में कोई चिट्ठी इस बारे में लिखी गई थी या नहीं और यदि लिखी गई थी तो वह सदन की मेज़ पर रखी जानी चाहिये। वह कोई ऐसा सीक्रेट डीक्यूमेंट तो है नहीं जो कि सदन के सामने न आ सके। मुझे मालूम है कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने उसका खंडन किया है लेकिन अगर चिट्ठी लिखी गई है तो उसको सदन की मेज़ पर रखना चाहिये ताकि लोगों के दिमाग में इसको लेकर जो एक भ्रम व शक पैदा हो गया है वह कम से कम दूर हो जाय।

दूसरा सवाल मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि श्री एल० के० झा० जो कंसोर्टियम से बातचीत करने के लिए विदेश जा रहे हैं उन्हें सरकार ने क्या ब्रीफ दिया है? आखिर बातचीत वहाँ किस चीज़ पर होने वाली है? आखिर उनके पास कौन सा ब्रीफ है? मैं चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम इन चीज़ों का स्पष्टीकरण हो जाना चाहिए।

देश में किस तरह से कंसन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्य हो रहा है और यह इंयोरेंस और बिजनेस हाउसेज़ क्या कर रहे हैं इस का एक नमूना मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। डालमिया जैन इनक्वायरी रिपोर्ट के ऊपर जब बहस हुई थी तो मेरे दोस्त श्री दाजी ने रूबी जनरल इंयोरेंस और न्यू ऐशियाटिक की आर्डिट रिपोर्ट की एक सम्मरी सदन की मेज़ पर रखी थी जिससे मालूम होता था कि उन के जारिये किस तरीके से फ़ाल्सिफ़िकेशन आफ एकाउंट्स, मिसप्रोप्रियेशन आफ फंड्स वगैरह किये गये थे। अब हम ने बार-बार इस की कोशिश की, मैंने वित्त मंत्री जी को इस के लिये लिखा और इसके लिये मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी से भी दरख़वारत की थी कि वह पूरी रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने आनी चाहिये लेकिन वह नहीं आई है क्योंकि वह बिड़ला कंसर्न है और बिड़ला साहब से इस सरकार का चंत्ली दामन का साथ है और इस वजह से वह पूरी रिपोर्ट सदन की मेज़ पर रखी नहीं जा रही है। मुझे अफ़सोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने मुझे जो जवाब दिया उसमें यह कहा गया था कि किन्हीं खास कारणों से यह सम्भव नहीं है कि वह पूरी आर्डिट रिपोर्ट लोक-सभा की टेबल पर रखी जा सके। आखिर को वह एक आर्डिट रिपोर्ट है, वह ऐसा कौनसा सीक्रेट डीक्यूमेंट है जो कि सदन की मेज़ पर नहीं रखा जा सकता है। अगर यह बात सही है जैसा कि दिखाई देता है कि बिड़ला साहब का इस सरकार के ऊपर इतना असर है कि वह पूरी आर्डिट रिपोर्ट सदन की टेबल पर नहीं रखी जा सकती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सरकार कोई भी ऐक्शन मोनोपोलिस्ट्स को खत्म करने के लिए नहीं ले सकती।

हमारे सामने बर्ड कम्पनी का नमूना है कि किस तरह से वहाँ गड़बड़ की गई और किस तरीके से उन्होंने उन चीज़ों को दबाया।

लेकिन उनका हुआ क्या ? एक बर्ड तो बिलायत चले गये और दूसरे बर्ड को मिनिस्ट्री में अच्छी जगह मिल गयी । दूसरी चीज हम ने यह देखी कि बाजारिया की मकलॉड कम्पनी पर साढ़े १७ लाख रुपये का फ़ाइन हुआ लेकिन उस फ़ाइन का किस तरह से अदा किया जाय उसमें उनको इतनी सहूलियत दे दी गई कि वह जैसे चाहें अदा करें और अगर अदा न करना चाहें तो उसको इवेंट भी कर सकते हैं । मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह सही तरीके से इस बात को सोचें कि विदेशी कंपनल अगर हमारे देश में आ गया, उसमें आपात्त की कोई बात नहीं है, लेकिन उनको इस बात की सावधानी और सतर्कता अवश्य बर्तनी होगी कि समाजवाद क्रयम करने की कल्पना जो हम लोग करते हैं कहीं ऐसा न हो कि वह महज एक कारी कल्पना बन कर हा रह जाय ।

खामकर में उन सदस्यगण से कहना चाहता हूं, जो कि हमारे काग्रमी भाई हैं—विरोधी लोगों को छोड़ दीजिए—, जो कि सही तर के से समाजवाद में विश्वास करते हैं, जो देश में समाजवाद लाने की कल्पना करते हैं, कि यह बजट आने के बाद जिस तरीके से विदेशी पूजा हमारे देश में आ रही है और जिस तरीके से कन्सेशन उस को दिया जायगा, हो सकता है कि उस के कारण कुछ दिनों के बाद समाजवाद की हमारी कल्पना केवल कल्पना ही रह जाय और हमारे वित्त मंत्री उस को ताज महल बना कर छोड़ दें, जिस पर लिखा होगा :

“Foundation stone laid by Shri T. T. Krishnamachari on 29th February, 1964.”

बाद में हमारे बच्चे आ कर समाजवाद के उस ताज महल को देखें और फातहा पढ़ेंगे और मसिया गायेंगे । आज मुझे यह खतरा मालूम होता है ।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) : देश जिन्दा है । माननीय सदस्य इतने निराश न हों ।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : मैं तो यही चाहता हूं कि कहीं उन का नाम उस पर न लगे ।

प्राइसिज के बारे में उन्होंने साफ़ तरीके से कहा है :

“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. The problem is being examined at the highest level and with the greatest care.”

हमारे फ़ूड मिनिस्टर भी बार-बार कहते हैं, “हाइएस्ट लैवल एंड ग्रेटेस्ट केयर ।” वित्त मंत्री भी कहते हैं, “हाइएस्ट लैवल एंड ग्रेटेस्ट केयर” । इस पार्लियामेंट में भी कहा जाता है कि उस समस्या पर हाइएस्ट लैवल पर विचार हो रहा है । आज ऐसा मालूम होता है कि इस पार्लियामेंट से भी कोई बड़ी जमाअत है, जहां वह विचार हो रहा है ।

आज चीजों के दाम बढ़ते ही जा रहे हैं । आज एक मामूली इन्सान की हालत यह हो गई है कि कोई दलील उस को सहारा या भरोसा नहीं दिला सकती है । वह तो एक ही चीज जानता है कि किसी हालत में चीजों के दामों को बढ़ने से रोका जाय । मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि आखिर इस का इलाज क्या है । मंहगाई भत्ते के बारे में उन्होंने कहा है कि हम सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्पलाईज को मंहगाई भत्ता देने के लिये १० करोड़ रुपये खर्च कर रहे हैं । यह ठीक है कि १२५ तक न्यूट्रालाइजेशन हुआ है और दो रुपये, पांच रुपये, सात रुपये या दस रुपये दिये गये हैं । लेकिन मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह दिल पर हाथ रख कर बतायें कि क्या यह सही नहीं है कि १९६३ में जिस तरीके से मंहगाई के आंकड़े बढ़ गए हैं, उन के मुताबिक आज १३५ से ज्यादा हो चुका है । इस अवस्था में



[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

सरकारी कर्मचारियों को महंगाई भत्ते की दूसरी किश्त क्यों न मिले ? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उन की जायज मांग है और उस पर पूरी तरह से विचार होना चाहिए ।

मुझे अफ़सोस है कि बजट भाषण या रिपोर्ट्स में हमारे उन एक लाख भाई-बहनों के बारे में जिक्र तक नहीं है, जो कि पाकिस्तान से बढते हुए, मरते हुए, पिटते हुए इस देश में आये हैं । मैं आशा करता था कि जब बजट की स्पीच को पढ़ते-पढ़ते वित्त मंत्री की आँखों में बार-बार आंसू आ गए, तो शायद एक आंसू हमारे उन एक लाख बद-किस्मत भाई-बहनों के लिये भी बह जाता, जो कि हमारे देश में आए हैं । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सत्ता की शराब में डूबी हुई सरकार ने इस देश को काटा और बाँटा, लेकिन आखिर उस ने एक लाख आदिमियों को बसाने की कौन सी जिम्मेदारी ली है । उस ने उन लोगों को बसाने के लिए क्या इन्तज़ाम किया है ?

बंगाल की सरकार ने कहा है कि एक पैसा भी उन के लिये खर्च नहीं हो सकता है, एक इंच भी जमीन उन के लिये बंगाल में नहीं है । आसाम की सरकार ने भी यह कहा है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार हमें पैसा दे । इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री मेहरवानी कर के सही तरीके से हमें बतायें कि उन लोगों के लिये कौन सा इन्ज़ाम हो रहा है । पिछले साल से यह एलोकेशन कम है । खन्ना जी ने बार-बार भाषण दिया और आवेश में आ कर कहा कि मुझे खुशी है कि फिनांस मिनिस्टर, होम मिनिस्टर, प्राइम मिनिस्टर—वह एन्टायर कैबिनेट कहना भूल गए—ने मुझ को एशोर किया हुआ है कि पूरी मदद दी जायगी । लेकिन जब हम आंकड़ों के हिसाब से देखते हैं, किताबों में देखते हैं, तो वह मदद नजर नहीं आती है । तो क्या उन का वही हाल होने वाला है,

जैसा कि सियालदा स्टेशन पर बैठी हुई हमारी माताओं-बहनों का है, जो अस्मत् बेच कर अपना गुज़ारा करती हैं ? क्या हम अपने देश में ऐसे लोगों की तादाद बढ़ाने वाले हैं ? इसलिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में पूरी तरह से तय होना चाहिये कि किस तरीके से उन लोगों को बसाया जाए ।

चीजों के दामों को रोकने के लिये बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना ज़रूरी है । एक व त बड़े आफिसर ने मुझे बताया कि मान लीजिए कि सिहानिया या बजौरिया अगर अपनी कम्पन के लिये चार करोड़ रुपये मांगते हैं, तो इन्वेस्टीगेशन करने पर मालूम होता है कि उन को केवल एक करोड़ रुपये की ज़रूरत है ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब माननीय सदस्य खत्म करने का प्रयत्न करें ।

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :** मुझे कुछ वक्त और दे दिया जाय । मैं भीख मांग रहा हूँ आप से ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह बात मुनासिब नहीं है । यह मेम्बर साहब का अपना वक्त है । वह भीख क्यों मांगते हैं ? यह मेम्बर साहब का अपना वक्त है और वह अपना वक्त लेते हैं । मुझे तो मेम्बर साहबान के हुक्म के मुताबिक ही मल करना है ।

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :** मुझे दो तीन मिनट और दे दिये जाएं ।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि वे अपनी कम्पन के लिये चार करोड़ रुपये मांगते हैं, जब कि दरअसल उन को एक करोड़ रुपये की ज़रूरत है । लेकिन शिड्यूल्ड बैंक उन को चार करोड़ रुपये एडवांस दे देते हैं । एक करोड़ रुपये वे अपने कम्पन को देते हैं और तीन करोड़

रुपये की सट्टेबाजी करते हैं। अगर यह सट्टे-बाजी बन्द नहीं हुई, तो चीजों के दाम गिरेंगे नहीं।

बैंको के राष्ट्रीयकरण के बारे में कहा गया है कि हम बैंकिंग एमेंडमेंट बिल ले आये हैं और रिजर्व बैंक का उन पर काफ़ी कंट्रोल रहेगा। कम्पनी ला को हम ने एमेंड कर दिया है, लेकिन कम्पनी ला एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को खत्म कर दिया गया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण केवल एक स्लोगन बन कर रह जायेगा। और अगर वह स्लोगन ही बन कर रह जायेगा तो मालूम नहीं कि इस देश की क्या दशा होगी। कुछ आदमी इस कारण बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के खिलाफ हो सक्ते हैं कि इस से उन का ब्यूरोक्रेटाइजेशन होगा और नौकरशाही की वृद्धि होगी। इस लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर समाजवादी तरीके से बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जायेगा, तो नौकरशाही का बोल-बाना नहीं होगा।

जब भी स्टेट ट्रेडिंग के बारे में कहा जाता है, तो जवाब दिया जाता है कि अभी हमारे पास समय नहीं है कि स्टेट ट्रेडिंग करें। चीजों के दामों को सरकार नहीं रोक सकती है। जिन्होंने गांधी जी के इशारों पर, गांधी जी के चरणों में बैठ कर राजनैति सीखी थीं, उन्होंने कहा था कि आजादी के बाद रामराज्य आयेगा, लॉग खुश होंगे, उन को रोटी, कपड़ा और नौकरी मिलेगी, लॉग दिन का काम खत्म कर के, दिन भर मेहनत करने के बाद, मजे से अपने घरों को जायेंगे और सारा देश "रघुपति राघव राजा राम" की ध्वनि से गूँज उठेगा। लेकिन आज इस सरकार की वजह से, जिस ने गांधी जी के आदर्शों का हनन किया है, उन को कुचला है, उन जगहों पर, जहाँ फ़ाकाकशी से हमारे बच्चे मर रहे हैं, "रघुपति राघव

राजा राम" के बदले "राम नाम सत्य है" के नारे लग रहे हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पांडेय (गुना) :  
"पतितपावन सीता राम"।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : ठीक है, हम पतित-पावन हैं — वे पतित हैं, हम पावन हैं।

आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये और जेनेरल इन्वयोरर्स का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये इन्कम टैक्स के बारे में उन्होंने कहा कि डिफ़ाल्टर्स के नाम पब्लिश किये जायेंगे। मसानी साहब ने उस का विरोध किया, क्योंकि इस बारे में उन का झगड़ा है कि हमारे मालिक टाटा अच्छे हैं या उन के मालिक बिड़ला अच्छे हैं। पार्टी में इतना झगड़ा है कि जब मसानी साहब भाषण दे रहे थे तो रंगा साहब ने पहले कहा, "हियर हियर" और फिर कहा, "शेम शेम"। उन्हें मालूम नहीं कि इस वक्त पार्टी में क्या हो रहा है— वह "हियर हियर" की पार्टी है या "शेम शेम" की पार्टी है। इस बारे में जो पोलिटिकल कन्फ्यूजन है, वह दूर होना चाहिए।

मैं इस सदन के तमाम सदस्यों से, और खासकर रूलिंग पार्टी के भाइयों से, एक नागरिक की हैसियत से, एक हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत से, यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमें चीन का मुकाबला करना है, आज हमें पाकिस्तान की घुड़कियों का मुकाबला करना है। जब इन दोनों देशों की तरफ से हम को खतरा नजर आता है, तो अपनी आजादी को बरकरार रखने के लिये, अपने डिफेंस को मजबूत करने के लिये, जरूरत इस बात की है कि आज हम इन समस्याओं को समाजवादी दृष्टिकोण से देखें और देश को समाजवाद की तरफ ले जाने की कोशिश करें। वे भूल जायें कि हम विरोधी हैं और वे कप्रेसी हैं। आज एक राय हो कर, एक

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

झंडे के नीचे हम लोग खड़े हो जायें। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जिस समाजवाद की हम कल्पना कर रहे थे, वह सिर्फ एक कल्पना और तमन्ना बन कर रह जाए।

मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि इन बातों का स्पष्टीकरण होना चाहिये और वह गरीब को कुछ न कुछ रिलीफ देने की कोशिश करें। अगर गरीब को थोड़ा रिलीफ भी दे दिया जाय, तो बुरा नहीं होगा। आज १३१ करोड़ रुपया इनकम टैक्स का बाकी है। वैल्यू टैक्स और दूसरे टैक्स बढ़ाये तो जा रहे हैं, लेकिन अगर उन की वसूली ही नहीं होगी, तो क्या होगा? मैंने देखा है कि गरीब से सेल्ज टैक्स वसूल करने के लिए उस को जेल भेज दिया जाता है लेकिन वही सेल्ज टैक्स और इनकम टैक्स आफिसर्स जब सिद्धान्त साहब की हवेली की तरफ जाते हैं, तो उन का गुस्सा सलाम में बदल जाता है और वे झुक कर, आदाब बजा कर, चले आते हैं। इस नीति को बदलना चाहिये।

मैं अपने तमाम मित्रों से दोबारा कहूंगा कि हम लोग समाजवादी दृष्टिकोण रखें और जो शक्तियां समाजवाद के खिलाफ खड़ी होती हैं, उन को कुचलने की कोशिश करें और सफ तरीके से कहें कि उन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान में स्थान नहीं होगा। अज सर-मयादारी से सरमाया ले कर और गरीब की मेहनत ले कर हम को एक खूबसूरत और खुशहाल हिन्दुस्तान बनाना चाहिये।

**Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu):** Discussion on the General Budget is an annual routine, but it is an important occasion for the House to review the economic policies and programmes of the Government and to examine the fiscal measures proposed to implement the same.

The task of the Finance Minister is not easy when he has to find revenues for the increasing expenditure of the State. It becomes more difficult when

he has to meet the dual demands of defence and development. More than this, the task of the Finance Minister needs special sympathy when he has to reconcile two apparently contradictory concepts, namely giving incentives to promote investment, and at the same time advancing towards the goal of a socialistic society.

The first task was made somewhat easier by the Budget of last year. As a result of that, an additional revenue of Rs. 380 crores was raised by his predecessor. This year the Budget proposes to raise an additional revenue of Rs. 40 crores. Looking to the additional revenues raised in recent years this modest effort in this Budget is a happy relief.

The Finance Minister is in a very unenviable position. If he levies tax, then the people who pay the tax criticise him; if he does not levy tax, those who never paid any tax criticise him. So, either way the Finance Minister has to face criticism. But the Finance Minister cannot frame his Budget on the basis of considerations of popularity, of what people would like or would not like. He has to face hard realities, he has to find revenues to defend the country and to develop the country economically.

As for the second task of reconciling the two incompatible objectives which I just mentioned, the Finance Minister, if I may say so with great respect, has done remarkably well. He has provided incentives for the corporate sector and for corporate investment, he has provided incentives for the much-needed foreign capital, and he has also provided some relief to personal incomes. Yet, he has not hesitated to raise the rates of death duty and the Gift Tax, he has not hesitated to reintroduce the Expenditure Tax. One may not agree with him about the actual extent to which these levies should be increased, but one cannot disagree or dispute the over-all strategy that he has planned.

In framing his Budget proposals, he has kept four guiding principles before him: to attune them to the needs of growth, to revive the capital market, to promote corporate and individual saving and to check unproductive spending. All these relate to direct taxes, and hence I propose to confine myself to an examination of the proposals of direct taxation.

The first is about the concessions to the corporate sector. Much noise has been made by the Members of the Opposition without understanding, if I may say so, and they say that a lot of concessions have been given to the corporate sector. May I say this, that before any criticism is made, they must realise that a result of the proposals in respect of the corporate sector, the Finance Minister has budgeted to raise an additional revenue of Rs. 11 crores? He may have given concessions in one direction, but he has also increased tax in another direction, and the overall position is that he has budgeted for an increase of Rs. 11 crores from the corporate sector alone.

The most important thing that he has done is to substitute the surtax for the existing Super Profits Tax. This surtax will give a little relief to corporations which are making high profits, there is no use denying that.

**Shri Daji (Indore):** Very good.

**Shri Morarka:** In order that these profits may not be frittered away by way of dividend, he has taken care simultaneously to impose a dividend tax of 7-1/2 per cent on the distribution of dividends. Secondly, he has exempted intercorporate dividends from the levy of super-tax. This is to encourage investment by one corporation in the shares of another corporation and yet it would prevent distribution of the dividend to the individual shareholders. The avowed object of the Finance Minister is to promote saving and encourage invest-

ment, and they are fully achieved so far as the corporate sector is concerned. In the selected industries, the development of which is considered to be of special necessity, he has given a further relief of 5 per cent in the super-tax. That is the third concession. At the same time he has increased the tax from 25 to 35 per cent on what are known as private companies or closely held corporations or companies coming under section 23A. The overall effect of all these provisions is an additional revenue of Rs. 11 crores. Let the critics, particularly the members of the Communist Party, not run away with the idea that the Finance Minister has given concessions at the cost of revenue. It is more a readjustment of the corporate tax structure in the interest of accelerating economic growth.

I will now come to the personal taxation. I heard the hon. Member from Rajkot, as I always do, with great respect. He said that there was substantial relief in the lower brackets of income and no relief in the higher brackets. I have studied the position carefully and I find the position is just the contrary. There is no relief at all; in fact there is a slight increase in the taxes in the income brackets up to Rs. 15-16,000. The misunderstanding or fallacy is like this. If you take the compulsory deposit also as part of the tax, then there is visible relief. If you do not regard compulsory deposits as tax but as savings—with great respect, I say it is a saving and not a tax—there is an increase in the lower income groups rather than any deduction. If you go beyond 15,000 and more, and when you reach the limit of Rs. 2 lakhs you will find that there is a relief of about Rs. 24,000. A person whose income is 2 lakhs was formerly paying a tax of Rs. 140,000 and he will now pay Rs. 115,000. The remaining Rs. 25,000 will have to be deposited under the annuity scheme. The annuity scheme is advantageous to those people who would have declining income in future; it is also good if the future rate of interest is going

[Shri Morarka]

to be lower than the present one. It cannot be said to be good or bad by itself; it depends upon the personal income of the person concerned and also on the future structure of taxes. Therefore, it is wrong to say that people in the lower income groups have got any relief; it is equally wrong to say that people in the higher brackets have no relief. In my humble opinion the position is just the contrary.

The other budget proposal is for increase in the gift tax. I beg to submit to the Finance Minister that this increase is rather steep. You have increased the maximum rate from 40 to 50 per cent. I have no dispute about it. Formerly, the maximum rate of 40 per cent was attracted by a gift of Rs. 50 lakhs and above, but now, a gift of Rs. 3,75,000 and above would also attract that.

**The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** Rs. 3,45,000.

**Shri Morarka:** I stand corrected. A gift of above Rs. 3,45,000 would attract the highest rate. That, I think, is a very steep rise. Similarly, in regard to the estate duty, the slabs are revised; the exemptions are lowered and the rates are made very steep. The sum total of the personal tax proposals of the Finance Minister is this: if I earn I pay income-tax and super-tax; if I save, I pay wealth-tax annually; if I spend, I pay the expenditure-tax; if I give a gift, I pay the gift tax; if I die, I pay a death duty.

**Shri Daji:** A very dismal picture indeed.

**Shri Morarka:** What incentive is there for any honest man to work and earn?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** No incentive to die!

**Shri Morarka:** It is quite nice! So, he cannot enjoy the fruits of his labour during his lifetime; he cannot

pass on the same to his son after his death. The Finance Minister, so far as personal taxation is concerned, has taken away all incentive including the incentive to die, as he says. (*Interruption*).

There is another point which I wish to make, and that is a point on which I wish to make an appeal to him. The present Finance Bill contains many important provisions for amending the various statutes. It seeks to amend the Income-tax Act, the Estate Duty Act, the Expenditure-tax Act, the Gift Tax Act, and the Wealth Tax Act, apart from customs duty, etc. Apart from the changes of a budgetary nature, there are changes proposed which are of a permanent and structural nature. Sir, it had been held by your illustrious predecessors that whenever a Finance Bill contains such provisions, then such provisions should not form part of the Finance Bill. I hasten to say this: while there is no technical difficulty, while there is no bar in the way of the Finance Minister for introducing the Bill, on the question of propriety and practice and procedure, the Speaker previously has been pleased to hold that any such change of a permanent nature must be brought before the House in a special amending Bill, so that the House can examine it more carefully and more leisurely. I do not say this thing just for the sake of saying it. There are important provisions, as I said, which are contained in the Finance Bill. One of the provisions reads as follows. It is in clause 33 of the Finance Bill. It proposes to amend the Income-tax Act. It says:

"Where a person makes an application to the Commissioner in the prescribed form and pays the prescribed fee for any information relating to any assessee in respect of any assessment made under this Act or the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, the Commissioner may, if he is satisfied that there are no circumstances justifi-

fyng its refusal, furnish or cause to be furnished the information asked for.”.

This, according to me, is a very important change which has been introduced. If the information is being given about persons who have defaulted and about those who have been penalised and who have been declared guilty of concealment and evasion, etc., I can understand. But, under this provision, it would be possible for anybody to ask the Commissioner to disclose who are the creditors of a particular person, who are the debtors of a particular person, from where the assessee is buying goods, to whom he is selling them, etc. A provision of this type.....

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** That information about buying and selling is not with the Commissioner.

**Shri Morarka:** It is. If the income-tax officer does not want it, it is a different matter. But he is entitled to ask for it and he has got all the books from which he can get it. How are you helping, and whom are you helping by a provision like this? The object of the Government is to expose to the public the people who are guilty of evasion of tax; punish them by all means; expose them to the public. But otherwise, every day, we hear that it is not in the public interest to disclose this and that. So too, in a modest, and limited way, it is in the interests of the business not to disclose information concerning its affairs to its competitors. The Government is the custodian; the Government and the Government officials have all the information they require. To pass on that information—as my hon. friend said yesterday—to the yellow journals or to competitors or to cantankerous blackmailers and so on would not help business. In any case it would harm them.

Similarly, there is another provision that a person must file his return, and within 30 days he must pay the full tax. If he does not pay the

full tax within 30 days, there would be a penalty up to 50 per cent. This provision would create unlimited practical difficulties. The people who have no knowledge of income-tax law, the people who have not paid income-tax—they do not know the difficulty of paying the income-tax.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** They also know the ways of evaders.

**Shri Morarka:** They know; they have to make contributions to stop it. (*Interruption*).

My only appeal to the Finance Minister about this provision is this. I do not say, do not have this provision. I say, let the House examine it carefully; and then let them bring in a separate Bill for that purpose. Then only we must give our consent. Otherwise, a provision like this, in our enthusiasm to achieve a smaller objective, may defeat that objective. Therefore, it is very essential that we must give full attention and greater care to a provision like this.

Another point, which is comparatively a small one, and about which I shall make an appeal to the Finance Minister, is his announcement about the development rebate. If he thinks that the rebate is unnecessary in certain industries or that people have taken wrong advantage of it, by all means, let him remove that development rebate and notify those industries. But to make a general announcement that this development rebate may not be available after 1966—this announcement applies to all industries—would create a great doubt, vagueness and uncertainty in the minds of the people, and the very purpose of the Finance Minister which is to accelerate growth, to give an impetus to the formation of new companies, will be defeated. Therefore, I hope the Finance Minister would find it possible to make some announcement about it.

Then I come to the question of prices. The Finance Minister has

[Shri Morarka]

shown great awareness of this deep-seated malady. If I may say so, the most damaging feature of our economy today is this rise in prices. The reasons for the rise in prices are many. First, there is the failure on the agricultural front; the expansion of the money supply. We invest every year Rs. 2,000 crores and our production increases by Rs. 400 crores. Then there is the failure to restrict consumption; population growth; under-utilisation of the existing capacity; high rates of the cost of production.

**Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda):** What about the freedom of the middle-man?

**Shri Morarka:** My hon. lady friend is very much worried about the middle-man. Then there is the commodity taxation. But the most important reason, as the hon. Finance Minister pointed out, is that our production is not commensurate with the demands of the consumer. I regret to say that the hon. Finance Minister, in his budget speech, did not indicate specific steps to increase the production of consumer goods. He has very rightly given his views about controls and I must congratulate him. Price control, without distribution control, helps nobody, except in creating black money or pushing the money out of the account. As the Finance Minister has said, under such circumstances, since there is no legal recognition of those prices, the profit is always pocketed by the middlemen, and the exchequer loses the revenue. Our control machinery being what it is, our trade channels being what they are, and with the human material with which we are endowed, I think it would be futile to expect that the benefits of any control would be passed on to the consumer; they would be absorbed by the trade channels or the middlemen, as the hon. Lady Member said just now. Therefore, without succumbing to the temptation of con-

rol or without in any other way hampering the production, the only sure remedy against price rise is to increase production.

13 hrs.

I cannot agree with the theory which is propounded that in a developing economy price rise is inevitable. That is not so. In the last decade, both in Germany and Japan, the national income increased by 12 per cent and the prices there rose only by 2 per cent. In Italy, the national income rose by 8 per cent and the prices actually fell by 1 per cent. Take our own case. During the first Five Year Plan, our national income rose by 18 per cent, but the prices actually went down by 3 per cent. In America during the last six years, the prices have been stable, though every year increase in production and national wealth and economic growth is taking place.

In this context, may I say, there has been a demand for the reduction of excise duties on consumer goods. Maybe for national satisfaction, the Finance Minister may reduce them. But the benefit of any reduction of excise duty in the present context, when there is scarcity of the commodity, would not be passed on to the consumer. Any increase in the excise duty would be passed on to the consumer straightway, but in a scarcity economy, the benefit of reduction of excise duty would never be passed on to the consumer.

**Shri Daji:** Very right.

**Shri Morarka:** I would like to say a few words about the corporate sector. The hon. Finance Minister said that there are three things—ownership, control and management. He says that he is going to keep a careful watch and bring necessary measures to control the situation. I wish

him well. With great respect, I fully agree with him that ownership and management are divorced from one another in the modern corporation. The bigger the corporation, the lesser would be the voice of the real owners in the management of the corporation. For that purpose, the Companies Act has been amended several times in the past and it would be amended again in the near future. But there are so many provisions in the Companies Act which are too detailed, discriminatory, discretionary and irksome. On the one hand, people feel that they are controlled everywhere. At the same time, the real control which the Finance Minister wants to have is still elusive.

I suggest, therefore, that the Finance Minister should now classify the corporations not according to their character of being public or private, but with reference to their paid-up capital, or with reference to the amount of production that a corporation controls or with reference to the number of people it employs or such other criteria. That would be a more realistic way, a more positive way, of controlling bigger corporations. The bigger the corporation, the higher the obligations it has to society, and a stricter watch is necessary from the Finance Minister. Suppose there is a big corporation and another ordinary corporation with a paid-up capital of Rs. 1 or Rs. 2 lakhs and doing a business of Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 lakhs. If you subject the two corporations to the same degree of control and restriction, the main purpose is defeated.

I would say a few words about the economy. Corruption is a stronger word. But as our expenditure on defence and development has increased from time to time, the wastage, leakage and extravagance in public funds also have increased in direct proportion. Despite the various checks and counter-checks and safeguards provided in our financial procedure, one finds that the public funds are managed

with a certain levity and laxity. This type of non-seriousness in the handling of public funds always leaves a feeling in the mind of the tax-payer that his money is not properly utilised. I have no time to give you specific instances. But I would only refer hon. Members to the various findings of the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee, whose reports serve as a reference catalogue of these instances. On a previous occasion, not dissimilar to the present one, I had made an appeal to you, Sir, namely, that you must devise some way of discussing these reports or making the findings of the committees more effective. Today what happens is the report is made, and it is sent to the Ministry. The Ministry sends some reply. Some action is taken and in rare cases some scapegoats are found. The responsibility is never located; the real culprits are never brought to book. The result is that repetition of the mistakes is not prevented. In fact, it is perpetuated. I think the time has come, when Government are taxing the people to this extent, when they make them sacrifice everything in the name of defence and development, for you to devise some way by which the findings of these reports could be made more effective and a fear could be instilled in the people responsible for this sort of administration and functioning.

I would like to say a few words about the public sector. The hon. Finance Minister said in his budget speech as follows:

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



[Shri Morarka]

This is a very re-assuring statement and a much-needed statement. Many of our public sector undertakings have been in existence for over a decade. They have gone into production. They have an assured market. Whatever they produce is sold. The price is fixed by them or by the Government. Yet, year after year, they make bigger and bigger losses. I think there is something wrong which merits the special attention of the Finance Minister. There is no reason at all why such undertakings like Bhopal Electricals, Sindri Fertilisers, etc., which are almost a monopoly should make any losses.

Before I conclude, I would like to read two quotations—one from the Estimates Committee's report and the other from the report of the Public Accounts Committee, which concern two public sector undertakings. One is from the Estimates Committee's report on the National Coal Development Corporation—NCDC, as it is called. Here what happened was:

"The contract entered into with Japanese firm was also defective as it did not provide for the performance guarantee of the integrated plant and hence they could not be held responsible for ensuring the rated throughput. Repairs and maintenance costing as much as Rs. 1.19 crores during the 2 years had to be carried out at the cost of the Corporation. It is significant to note that the total cost of the washery itself was Rs. 1.72 crores only. In addition, a period of over three years was spent in getting the defects and deficiencies removed resulting in loss of production and earnings. Even after this, the annual production is expected to be 3 lakh tons less than the original rated capacity."

The other one is from the recent Public Accounts Committee's Report—Nineteenth Report. It concerns the Tea Board. It says:

"The Committee doubt whether such an elaborate building costing Rs. 39.36 lakhs (more than Rs. 150 per square foot of built area) is consistent with the basic requirement of the Tea Board and justified by the prevailing standards of living in the country.

They feel that Government should take some concrete steps to curb the general tendency on the part of autonomous, semi-autonomous or departmental bodies to spend extravagantly on buildings."

I hope the hon. Finance Minister would definitely give his attention to these things and his statement:

"Economy in administration is fully compatible with efficiency; and it shall be my constant endeavour to ensure that the administrative machinery of the Government is reorganised so that it is fully responsive to this need."

Sir, this is somewhat on the same lines as what recently President Johnson in America said:

"Economy in such circumstances becomes the companion of progress."

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** Sir, when one goes through these budget papers, Bills etc., two things strike one's mind. One is, either the emergency does not exist or, if it exists at all, it has become a normalised emergency. The second thing is, there is nothing in

the budget proposals which can be regarded as significantly socialist in character.

I do not accuse Shri T. T. Krishnamachari for not referring even to the word 'socialism' anywhere in his speech, because if his statement of 16th December had been taken into consideration it would have appeared that his mind was working more and more for purposes which he had indicated.

13.13 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

He had stated that these economic proposals, whatever they are, have been designed to promote economic growth "I believe, with social justice." That was his belief. Therefore, he scrupulously avoided any mention of the word 'socialism'. And, you will find that neither in the President's speech nor in the reply that was given in the House by the Government on the debate on the President's Address, was any indication given to show that some concrete measures are being taken by the Government to shape its economic policies in the manner as would generate forces to break the present status quo and pave the way for socialism. That is where the Government differs from the party. The Government profess something and practise something. The party passes resolutions and the Government goes quite in a different direction. That is good in a sense, because the public are in a position to know today that so far as socialism is concerned, however much the Congressmen may shout, the Government is not prepared to take any positive steps in that direction.

My hon. friend, Shri Masani, while speaking on the budget, congratulated Shri T. T. Krishnamachari for sound thinking. But he disagreed so far as his conclusions are concerned. I might

assure my hon. friend, Shri Masani, that whether it is the financial brain of the Government or it is the brain of the Swatantra Party, their destination is the same. They may travel here and there, but ultimately they both reach Madras because they hail from Madras. Therefore, he should have no suspicion, no anxiety in that regard, that ultimately, whatever is done, however hesitatingly he may start, the ultimate purpose is that it will establish in this country a society which will be more to the liking of Shri Masani and other Swatantrites in this country.

Sir, when the Finance Minister was delivering his speech the "Kamraj" Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, was present in the House—I am sorry he is not here now. And, often, when any reference was being made to the CDS, the expenditure tax and other matters like that, naturally the attention of the hon. Members in this House was drawn to Shri Morarji Desai. There have also been comments in the Press that it is an "anti-Morarji Budget". But I must say that the objective of Shri Morarji Desai's budget was sound although its methods were wrong and foolish.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): You did not say so last time.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I did say that. The measures suggested, I would say, were ill-conceived and oppressive. But what is this budget? The objectives have been given a go-by. As I stated earlier, I do not accuse him, because in the preface to his speech he has stated:

"The budget bears testimony to our determination to strengthen our defences without slackening our developmental efforts or without resorting to unbridled deficit financing."

So the budget is more a reflection of his own philosophy, and this is nothing new. This country, for the last 17 years, has always faced this problem

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

that with the change of the Finance Ministers the entire budgetary policy is also changed. There is no steady budgetary policy, because the economic policy also changes according to the whims and fancies of the Finance Ministers. What happens is, it causes considerable dislocation. It is a sound principle of any taxation policy that there should be the least dislocation so that there is a steady development and the country's economy and the administration goes in a certain direction where it is stabilised and fruitful results are obtained. I would like the Government to give this House a report as to how much expenditure has been incurred by the Government by these frequent changes of the proposals by different Finance Ministers.

As I said, Sir, he has given emphasis more and more on economic growth. That is the imperative need today, according to him, and he has not bothered about what would be its impact on social justice. You will, therefore, find that there is increasing unemployment in this country and it is bound to increase further. He has not indicated anywhere whether any steps are going to be taken in this direction.

About the price policy much has been said. It has been disputed rightly by my hon. friend Shri Morarka that there is no question that in a developing economy you will always have a rise in prices. But there is the rise in prices; he says it is disturbing and he is concerned about it. But I want to know, is there any limit to this rise, is there any stability even at this highest level? Is the Government in a position to take any steps to have stability even at this present level? No; he has only repeated the oft-repeated slogans that they are doing this, there is no production etc. etc.

Therefore, to my mind this budget is more or less a budget which wants to encourage economic growth and not give social justice to the people. And,

how is this economic growth to be achieved, in what respect and who will give this economic growth? Naturally, his attention has gone more to the corporate sector, to the private sector, to the industrialists. I say after a close study of the budget proposals, and I hope Shri Morarka will agree with me when I say that, that as a result of this new policy that is now operating the saving potential would naturally be more and more at the higher levels of income. As a result, there will be greater concentration in a few hands. Even the Mahalanobis Committee Report says "that there can be no doubt that in part at least the working of a planned economy has encouraged the process of concentration by facilitating and aiding the growth of big business in India". The report is not yet out, it has not been presented to Parliament, yet it has leaked out. I have no doubt about it that this policy will create greater imbalance in the society.

Let us consider the new devices that the Finance Minister has proposed. One among them is exemption of 10 per cent of gross capital at book value, which is called surtax. I do not want to discuss rebate etc. which are meant obviously for the purpose of encouraging economic growth. I say that his 10 per cent is very high. Even in the Fair Profits Committee of 1948-49, which was a tripartite committee, the industrialists wanted only 6 per cent. In the Bonus Commission, whose report was available yesterday, the industrialists wanted 8 per cent at the utmost. So, why is it that Government, whose sympathies are with socialism, giving them 10 per cent? This will again help people at the higher level of income in the country.

Then I will refer to the abolition of super profits tax. It was stated that it was an oppressive tax which

hampers industrial growth, there is psychological resistance and so it has been removed. This tax has been removed from inter-company investments. What is the result? The report of the Company Law Administration says that there is greater scope for interlocking that is going on, which has created a problem for us. On the one hand, we say that we are breaking monopoly. On the other hand, we remove all these taxes so that there is greater monopoly. Even in regard to monopoly he has distinguished between ownership, proprietorship, management control etc., and the steps proposed are halting and hesitant in nature. I do not think any greater proof is necessary about the existence of monopoly because even at Bhubaneswar they have said about monopoly:

"that these have a considerable bearing on the concentration of wealth, growth of disparities and of monopolistic trends, and which through its corrupting influences are tending to undermine the social and political life of the country and posing a threat to democracy and socialism."

So, what was wanted was not investigation but concrete action. Government should have taken some positive measures in this regard, but it has completely failed. Even in a capitalist economy, the Managing Agency System is an anachronism. Here he has not touched that system and so during these years of investigation the monopolies would continue to grow. The only assurance he gives is that:

"fiscal policies should lead to weakening of the devices, such as managing agencies and improvised selling agencies, through which dynastic domination of private industry is permitted."

This is a pious wish because these tendencies would have enough room to expand and grow.

Take, for instance, unaccounted money about which so much shouting was done. It has been estimated by various people as Rs. 3,000 crores or 1,000 crores. From the time Shri T. T. Krishnamachari took charge he has been shouting so much about it by saying "I am going to do this and that". An atmosphere is created that by the measures that he now proposes on all the unaccounted money, whatever be the figure, he will lay his hands on. But what are the proposals? It is just issuing threats and giving them advance notice, I should say. They say: we are going to take the powers of search. They are nothing new. They are there under the Defence of India Rules. It is not as if more powers are needed. Why are you not using them?

After that, what happens? If the unaccounted money is not accounted for or explained, it will be treated as income which will be taxed for the financial year. Why? Why not confiscate that amount? Then you give notice that you will search the lockers as if after this news has appeared they will keep everything in their lockers! Therefore, to my mind, he is creating a situation in which it would appear to the outsider as if he is going to take very stringent measures so far as this matter is concerned, while allowing them to function as they are doing till now. So, from this point of view, it is my considered opinion that for the sake of economic growth they have introduced measures which will lead to greater concentration and domination by the richer industrialist class in this country.

Now, many people have welcomed these proposals. The CDS has gone, which will give a little relief to the small income group; the expenditure tax is introduced, there is no imposition of fresh taxes; all these things are there. That is all right. But he has not done this because, so far as the people belonging to the low income group are concerned, their taxable capacity is limited; he has done it

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

because already with the estimated revenue his pockets are full. Therefore, he has been little considerate in this matter; not that he wants to help poor people, not that he has rationalised the whole tax structure in such a way that the burden will not fall on the common man. Again, so far as the rationalisation is concerned, if you take into account the benefits that would accrue, it will go to the upper classes. So far as the lower middle class and the peasantry are concerned, has he given any concession? No, nothing to the weaker section of the community, nothing to the peasantry, the lower middle class and the fixed income group. They are only consoled that if there is rise in prices it will be compensated by dearness allowance. We know very well what is happening as a result of it. Rs. 2 compensation is given, which is called a social security measure, which has no relation to the high cost of living which prevails today. Therefore, the common man is destined to suffer for the high prices and the distortions of the national economy.

I would say that people would have welcomed it and Shri T. T. K. could have done a great service to this country if in this emergency, even if he had failed to give any relief to the lower strata of the people, he had given at least an assurance to this country that he was going to take positive steps to stop wasteful expenditure, corruption and bring in economy in administration. Now, only a pious desire has been expressed at the end of his speech.

Sir, as you know, on 23rd November, 1962, I had the privilege to move a resolution in this House, urging for economy in administration, and reduction of the size of the Ministries. I also advocated the abolition of the post of Governor because in this emergency there is no need for such an institution. Shri Jawaharlal

Nehru, who replied to that resolution, said:

"I think that it is desirable at this moment that there is economy but economy and efficiency must be considered together and democracy must be in a position to prove that it is more efficient than any totalitarian country in facing the emergency."

He was in basic agreement with the resolution that I moved, but he was not in a position to accept the resolution as such. Now, what steps have been taken in that regard? He appealed to me to withdraw the Resolution and I withdrew it with the hope that since Government agrees with me basically, probably some steps would be taken to give effect to them. But no such thing has been done. I will give you one instance. What are the Governors for today? In an emergency, a Governor has no function to perform. We are spending lakhs of rupees on Governors.

And who are the Governors today? Most of them are either defeated Congressmen or Congressmen whose presence in their own States is not desirable or superannuated officers who are being appointed as Governors. They dance to the tune of the Chief Ministers; otherwise, there is a danger to their employment. Some of the Governors are acting almost as special technical advisers. In my own State the Governor has not forgotten that he was once in the service of Government. He still has that in mind. He is now chairman of certain control boards. He has an officer in the Secretariat. By all means have all these things. But why then this paraphernalia of Governors? He advises the Government and his advice is not criticized because he takes immunity as he happens to be a Governor. A controversy is going on over the completion of the project called Tikkerpara.



[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

amount taken by this gentleman will be about Rs. 17 lakhs. Is it for charity? Was jewellery meant for charity? You say, "Why throw dirty linen outside?" Then, why not refer this matter to a Commission of Inquiry. Such things are there and you take no steps in this regard unless it is pressed in the House. Then only something happens. If these affairs continue, do you think that people in this country will ever tolerate these things and have this Government?

Therefore I will suggest this if you want real co-operation. We have given you co-operation. We are not against taxation. We are not against planned economy. We want that during the emergency we must act unitedly. But in an emergency the main requirement is creation of confidence in the Government machinery. Since you are failing in that people have to react and have to say, "We will not give a single pie to this Government unless they take some concrete measures to remove these things". People will do it and will create a situation in the country when the Government will be completely paralysed. Even taxes would not be paid unless the Government positively take some steps in this regard.

It is said that if production is there then only things will improve. What are you doing about production? It is said that agricultural production is getting into bottlenecks. But all that the hon. Finance Minister has said is all about industrial production. He has repeated the same things for agricultural production, namely, that there will be the Agriculture Control Board, this and that—the same thing which Shri Swaran Singh here has been repeating times without number. You may increase the grants to the States, but that will not solve the problem. Where is the bottleneck? I think, the time has come, if the entire economy is being affected on account of low agricultural production, when the Centre should come forward and

take courage to ensure not only distribution but must take powers to ensure systematic agricultural production in the country. If the entire economy is going to be affected on account of this, it is necessary that that is done.

We find that in the years 1961-62 and 1962-63 the amount of money diverted from agriculture and co-operative programmes was about 11 and 15.3 per cent respectively in the States. Shri Bhagat will corroborate me, I think. You give them money. You give them more money. But what would happen? They will divert it to some other purpose. So, mere provision of money will not give you more agricultural production unless there are land reforms. Land reforms still remain on paper. When we ask here, the Planning Commission says, "What are we to do? The States do not implement it". Nobody can assure us when they are going to be implemented. So, if even the other agricultural practices which are needed for agricultural production are not properly being executed in the States, have you any machinery beyond the co-ordinating body which sits at the highest level with the Ministers and the Agriculture Minister to see to it that all plans are properly executed at the village level and all money is utilised? That is not being done.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is he taking the full time allotted to the Party

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** How much time have I taken?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You have taken 30 minutes out of 46 minutes.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I will conclude within five minutes or even less than that.

So, Sir, even the agricultural production, as I was saying, would never come to our expectations unless we take concrete measures to see that at the State level and the village level all programmes are properly carried

out. Nothing has been indicated in that regard. You must have seen that according to the Reserve Bank Report the rural indebtedness has increased. Even the Mahalanobis Report says that out of the benefits that we are having on account of planned economy, most of the people who suffer are the rural people. Even in the tax proposals which he has indicated, the Finance Minister has not touched the urban people. The urban tax earning is through the capital gains tax which is nothing. It is creating more imbalance. The rural sector is suffering and the rural industrialisation just remains on paper because electricity does not reach the people, it does not reach the villagers, it does not reach the agriculturists. The rates are high. When the rates are high, naturally they cannot use it. You should have found out some means by which you should have charged more on the industrial units and given a subsidy to agriculturists so that electricity is also utilised in the agricultural sector to step up production. No such steps have been taken. I feel, the economic position of our country and the situation as it is developing, is rather gloomy. With the increase of civil administrative expenditure, with corruption, with wasteful expenditure and extravagance and with high prices, with the imbalance between the urban and the rural sector, with the increase of private capitalist sections in this country, there is going to be greater and greater imbalance in this country which would ultimately lead us to a society in which, as I started saying in the beginning, you can never even create conditions for the socialist order which we want to achieve.

**डा० गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) :**

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कोई राजनीतिशास्त्री नहीं हूँ, न अर्थशास्त्री हूँ, न उद्योगपति या पूंजीपति हूँ और न किसी कारखाने में काम करने वाला मजदूर हूँ। मैं हूँ एक छोटा सा साहित्यिक, और इस दृष्टि से मैंने गत पचास

वर्षों दुनिया को और अपने देश को देखने का प्रयत्न किया है। यह बात केवल कुछ विद्वानों ने नहीं, बल्कि विद्वानों के सर्वमत ने स्वीकार की है कि यदि किसी समय के समाज के मन्चे चित्र को आप देखना चाहते हैं तो वह आप को साहित्य में ही मिलता है। आज दुनिया की क्या अवस्था है, हमारे देश की क्या अवस्था है। मैंने दुनिया में घूम कर दुनिया की इस अवस्था को देखने की कोशिश की है, इस देश में रहता हूँ और चालिस वर्षों से इस सदन का सदस्य भी हूँ। इस देश को भी देखने का प्रयत्न किया है। आज दुनिया के कुछ देशों के पाम विपुल धन है, जिसका कोई और छोर नहीं। अमरीका जैसा देश। वहाँ के लोग भी मझे मुखी नहीं दिखे। जहाँ गरीबी है, जैसे इस देश में या चीन में, वहाँ के लोग भी मझे मुखी नहीं दिखे। अमरीका के लोगों को स्वामी विवेकानन्द, स्वामी रामतीर्थ और इसी प्रकार के अन्य अध्यात्मिकों की आवश्यकता महसूस हुई। हमारे देश में जितना बड़ा प्रभाव गांधी जी का पड़ा उतना किसी दूसरे का नहीं पड़ा। आखिर इस सारे दुःख का कारण क्या है। यदि केवल गरीब दुखी होते अपने अभावों के कारण तो भी मेरी समझ में आ सकता था, लेकिन जितने गरीब दुखी हैं उससे ज्यादा अमीर दुखी हैं। गरीबों को यदि अपना पेट पालने की चिन्ता है तो अमीरों के पास जो कुछ है उसे किसी न किसी प्रकार, कोई भी पाप कर के, कोई भी षडयन्त्र करके, रखने की चिन्ता है। अमीरों के मुख जब मैं देखता हूँ, एक साहित्यिक के नाते, तो उन पर मझे केवल दुःख नहीं, पाप दृष्टिगोचर होता है, षडयन्त्र दृष्टिगोचर होता है और अपने धन को किसी न किसी प्रकार अपने पास रखने के लिये जो कर्म उन्हें करने पड़ते हैं उन कर्मों की छाया दृष्टिगोचर होती है।

**श्री कमलनयन बजाज (वर्धा) :**

पालीटीशियन्स को जब आप देखते हैं तो आप पर क्या असर पड़ता है।



डा० गोविन्द वास : पालिटीशियन्स के बारे में भी यही है, जो आप कहते हैं, लेकिन चूंकि यहां अर्थशास्त्र की बात हो रही है इसलिये मैंने पालिटीशियन्स की बात नहीं कही। मैंने मजदूरों और धनवानों की बात कही, अमीरों और गरीबों की बात कही। मेरा यह मतलब है कि अधिभूत का यह भव्य भवन जब तक आध्यात्मिकता और नैतिकता पर खड़ा नहीं किया जायेगा तब तक गरीब सुखी हो सकते हैं न अमीर सुखी हो सकते हैं। गांधी जी ने यह बात कही थी, हमारे बड़े बड़े महात्माओं ने, सन्तों ने, भक्तों ने, ऋषियों ने, मुनियों ने यह बात कही थी। मुझे आज यह दिखता है कि हमारे देश में सब से अधिक कमी इस बात की हो गई है। गांधी जी के बाद उन के जो सिद्धान्त थे उन पर हम ने कोई विचार नहीं किया। नैतिकता हम समाज में किस प्रकार से लावें यह हम ने कभी नहीं सोचा। आध्यात्मिकता की भी हम को अधिभूत के साथ आवश्यकता है इस पर हम ने कभी विचार नहीं किया। इसलिये इस बजट पर बोलते हुए भी सब से पहले मैं इस बात की आवश्यकता समझता हूं।

यह बात सत्य है कि ६६ भूखों मरें और एक व्यक्ति गुलछरें उड़ाये, ऐसी सामाजिक रचना नहीं रहनी चाहिये। कोई मतभेद इस से नहीं हो सकता, और जो बड़े बड़े पूजिपति हैं, उद्योगपति हैं, उन का भी इस से कोई मतभेद नहीं है। मैं आप को एक व्यक्तिगत संस्मरण बतलाऊं। हम लोग जमींदार थे, हमारे पास जमीनें थीं। माल-गुजारी गई। उसके बाद जमीनें जाने की भी जब बात हुई तो मेरी माताजी, जो कि रूग्ण श्रेया पर थीं, उन्होंने मुझ से कहा कि यह मालगुजारी चली गई, अब यह जमीनें भी चली जायेंगी। मैंने उन को एक ही उत्तर दिया कि ६६ व्यक्ति भूखों मरें और एक व्यक्ति गुलछरें उड़ाये, यह सामाजिक व्यवस्था रह नहीं सकती। एकाएक वे बोलीं, ६६ तो

भूखों मरते ही रहेंगे, यह एक और भूखों मरने लगेगा। यह हो सकता है। लेकिन ६६ भूखे रहें आर्थिक दृष्टि से और एक सुखी रहे, यह अर्थ व्यवस्था नहीं रह सकती। इसलिये समाजवाद का नारा आया। आज भी समाजवाद की इतनी चर्चा है। हमारे बहुत से सदस्यों ने कहा कि यह बजट जो पेश हुआ है वह समाजवादी दृष्टिकोण का बजट नहीं है। भुवनेश्वर में जो कुछ हुआ और भुवनेश्वर में कांग्रेस ने इस कांग्रेस सरकार को जो आज्ञा दी, कांग्रेस सरकार के वित्त मंत्री ने उस प्रकार का बजट पेश नहीं किया, जो कि समाजवाद के अनुसार होना चाहिये था।

इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा सब से पहले एक निवेदन है कि समाजवादी ही नहीं, साम्यवादी समाज की जहां जहां व्यवस्था है वे सब देश भी क्या एक में हैं। उन देशों में क्या साम्यवादी व्यवस्था एक प्रकार की है। रूस की आप लें, चीन की आप लें, यूरोप में वालकन राज्यों की व्यवस्था को आप लें। क्या वहां पर एक प्रकार का साम्यवाद है? नहीं। फिर समाजवाद लाने का तरीका भी तो एक नहीं रहा। हम ने जिस तरीके से अहिंसा के द्वारा स्वराज्य की स्थापना करनी चाही, उसी तरीके से हम समाजवाद भी लाना चाहते हैं। और समाजवाद के सम्बन्ध में आबड़ी कांग्रेस में या भुवनेश्वर कांग्रेस में ही प्रस्ताव पास नहीं हुए, हमारा सदा से वह दृष्टिकोण रहा है। जब हम स्वतंत्र नहीं थे तब भी हमारा वही दृष्टिकोण था। आप देखें हम ने उसका बराबर प्रयत्न किया है। जब अंग्रेज यहां से गये तो ६०० से ज्यादा राजे रजवाड़े थे। क्या हम ने प्रयत्न नहीं किया कि राजे रजवाड़े न रहें? उस वक्त ताल्लुकदारी थी, जमींदारी थी, मालगुजारी थी। क्या हम ने इस बात की कोशिश नहीं की कि ये सब चली जायें। उद्योगों के ऊपर क्या हम ने बड़े से बड़े इनकमटैक्स नहीं लगाये? और इस बजट को आप देखें। हम ने इस में

आर्थिक दृष्टि से समाजवाद लाने और एक के पास बहुत जमा न हो इसके लिए क्या क्या प्रयत्न किया है। हम ने वंश परम्परा से प्राप्ति होने वाले धन को बहुत कम कर दिया है। जितना कम हम ने इस बजट में किया है उतना कम पहले कभी नहीं किया था। एक खाम स्तर के बाद धन का संग्रह न होने पाये इसकी कोशिश भी हम ने की है। क्या ये दोनों बातें समाजवाद लाने की दिशा में नहीं हैं।

फिर हम ने बजट में समाजवाद लाने के साथ ही इस बात का भी प्रयत्न किया कि हमारे उद्योग धन्धे भी बढ़ें। इस समय की स्थिति में भी, जो कम्पनियाँ हैं, उनको सहूलियतें दीं। हमारी इस वक्त आर्थिक स्थिति अच्छी न होते हुए भी हम ने मध्यम श्रेणी के लोगों का बोझ कम किया। फिर मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारे वर्तमान वित्त मंत्री के विरुद्ध इतने भाषणों में यह बात कैसे कही गयी कि समाजवाद लाने की दृष्टि से यह बजट थोथा है। मैंने आप से अभी निवेदन किया कि हम ने अपना यह लक्ष्य केवल आवड़ी में या भुवनेश्वर में ही स्थिर नहीं किया था, समाजवाद हमारा सदा से दृष्टिकोण रहा है, और हम बराबर इस बात का प्रयत्न करते रहे हैं कि यह जो समाज में इतना बड़ा अमीरों और गरीबों का भेदभाव है उसको कम में कम किया जाये, और इस बजट में भी हम ने यही बात की है।

जहां तक हमारे व्यय का सम्बन्ध है, मैं अपने वित्त मंत्री को इस बात पर बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने हमारी सुरक्षा के लिए सात अरब से भी कुछ अधिक रुपया रखा है। हमारा देश गरीब होते हुए भी, सुरक्षा के व्यय पर कभी ऐतराज नहीं करेगा। हमारे देश की सुरक्षा, हमारी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा, यह सब से पहले आवश्यक है। उसके लिए चाहे हम को अपनी पंच वर्षीय योजनाएं समाप्त कर देनी पड़ें, चाहे हमारे देश को भूखा मरना पड़े, चाहे चालीस करोड़ में से केवल एक ही व्यक्ति इस देश में रह सके,

हमें उसके लिए सारे बलिदान करने को तैयार रहना चाहिए। इसलिए सुरक्षा के ऊपर यह व्यय बहुत ही अच्छी बात है।

चाऊ एन लाई की इस समय की बातों के फेर में हम को नहीं पड़ना चाहिए। चीन ने हमारे साथ बड़े से बड़ा धोखा किया, उसने हमारी पीठ में छुरा भोंका है। पाकिस्तान चीन के साथ है। इस समय एक नाजुक परिस्थिति हमारे देश के सामने हमारी स्वतंत्रता के सम्बन्ध में उपस्थित हुई है, और इस परिस्थिति में हम को चाहे कुछ भी क्यों न करना पड़े, हमें अपनी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिए बड़ी से बड़ी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए।

फिर योजना की सफलता के लिए भी इसमें काफी धन दिया गया है। इस योजना को मैं मोटी दृष्टि से देखता हूँ तो मुझे प्रधानतया इस योजना में दो बातें दिखायी देती हैं। एक तो योजना आर्थिक बातों से सम्बन्ध रखती है, हमारी आर्थिक उन्नति हो, और दूसरे हमारे बौद्धिक स्तर से सम्बन्ध रखती है।

जहां तक आर्थिक उन्नति का सम्बन्ध है, यह देश कृषि प्रधान देश है। यहां एक विशेष प्रकार की कृषि है, यहां जमीन का एक विशेष प्रकार का बटवारा है। मैं सदा कहता रहा हूँ, आज भी कह रहा हूँ और जब तक यह प्रश्न नहीं सुलझेगा तब तक कहता रहूंगा कि हमारी कृषि गोधन पर अवलम्बित है। आज भी गोधन की अवहेलना हो रही है। आज भी अच्छे से अच्छा गोधन कल्ल होता है। बम्बई के कसाई खानों को देखिये, कलकत्ता के कसाईखानों को देखिये मद्रास के कसाईखानों को देखिये। नस्ल सुधार के लिए जितनी योजनायें बनती हैं वे कार्य रूप में परिणत नहीं होतीं। इसलिए जहां तक आर्थिक उन्नति का सवाल है, वह हमारे देश की कृषि पर अवलम्बित है, और कृषि, अगर सम्पूर्ण रूप में नहीं तो

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

बहुत दूर तक, हमारे गोधन पर अवलम्बित है ।

जहां तक बौद्धिक मामला है, वह भी मेरा पुराना विषय है । उस पर भी मैं हमेशा कहता रहा हूं, आज भी कह रहा हूं और जब तक यह प्रश्न नहीं सुलझ जायेगा कहता रहूंगा कि जहां तक बौद्धिक स्तर की उन्नति का सवाल है वह भाषा की उन्नति पर अवलम्बित है । अंग्रेजी के द्वारा हमारा बौद्धिक स्तर ऊंचा नहीं हो सकता । हम क्या कर रहे हैं उसके लिए ? डा० लोहिया जी से मेरा उम विषय में थोड़ा मतभेद है ।

इसमें सन्देह नहीं कि जितनी भाषाएं हमने अपने संविधान में स्वीकार कीं वे सब हमारी राष्ट्र भाषाएं हैं । उन सब की उन्नति हम को करनी है । लेकिन यदि हम इन बाकी भाषाओं और हिन्दी को एक स्तर पर ले जायें, तो यह सम्भव नहीं हो सकता । संविधान सभा में इस पर काफी चर्चा हुई थी । मैं भी संविधान सभा का सदस्य था । इस देश को एक सूत्र में बांधे रखने के लिए एक भाषा की आवश्यकता है । इसी को मान कर के हिन्दी को केन्द्र की राज भाषा का रूप दिया गया है । क्या आप समझते हैं कि केन्द्र का काम १४ भाषाओं में चल सकता है ? क्या आप समझते हैं कि केन्द्र की नौकरियों के इम्तिहान १४ भाषाओं में हो सकते हैं ? मैं यह मानता हूं कि जिन राज्यों की मातृभाषा हिन्दी नहीं है वहां की शिक्षा का माध्यम वहां की भाषा हो, वहां की भाषा वहां की अदालतों की भाषा हो, वहां के सचिवालय का काम वहां की भाषा में चले, वहां की सरकार का काम वहां की भाषा में चले, लेकिन केन्द्र का काम १४ भाषाओं में नहीं चलाया जा सकता । केन्द्र की जो नौकरियां हैं उनके इम्तिहान चौदह भाषाओं में नहीं हो सकते । वह एक भाषा में ही हो सकते हैं, और वह भाषा हिन्दी ही रहेगी और कोई नहीं हो सकती ।

हिन्दी इस देश के ४२ प्रति शत लोगों की मातृभाषा है । मैं यह सरकारी रिपोर्टों के आधार पर कह रहा हूं । यहां के अधिकांश लोग हिन्दी समझते हैं । जब हम ने वाद-विवाद करने के पश्चात् यह बात तै कर ली कि हमारे देश को एक सूत्र में बांधे रखने के लिए एक भाषा की आवश्यकता है, और वह भाषा हिन्दी ही हो सकती है, तब बार बार इस प्रश्न को उठाने का प्रभाव अच्छा नहीं हो सकता । लेकिन इस और सरकार बहुत धीरे चल रही है । आज ही नन्दा जी ने उत्तर दिया कि सरकारी नौकरियों के लिए हिन्दी वैकल्पिक माध्यम रखा जाये, इस प्रश्न पर सरकार विचार कर रही है । क्या विचार कर रही है ? सन् १९६० में इस विषय में राष्ट्रपति का आदेश निकल चुका है । हमारे जो भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री, श्री गोविन्द वल्लभ पन्त, थे उन्होंने भी हिन्दी के लिए कहा, शास्त्री जी ने भी इस बात को कहा । ये सन् १९६० की बातें हैं, जिस को चार वर्ष हो गये, और अभी तक सरकार विचार कर रही है । यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती कि सरकार क्या विचार कर रही है । इस बात का निर्णय होना ही चाहिए ।

जहां तक हिन्दी की उन्नति का सवाल है, जिस दिन हम ने हिन्दी को राज भाषा माना था यदि उस समय से योजना बना कर हिन्दी की उन्नति सरकार करती तो गये अप्रैल में जो एक बुरा काम हुआ कि अंग्रेजी को अनिश्चित काल तक के लिये चलने देने के लिये विधेयक पास किया गया, उसकी आवश्यकता न होती । सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई योजना नहीं बनायी । क्या कारण है कि सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई योजना नहीं बनायी ? खेर कमीशन के सामने कोई योजना नहीं रखी गयी । जो संदीय कमेटी उस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के लिए बनायी गयी, उसके सामने कोई योजना नहीं रखी गयी । सरकार अपना हर काम योजना बना कर

करती है। फिर क्या कारण है कि इस ने हिन्दी के लिए योजना नहीं बनायी? योजना तो प्रमुख चीज है। भाषा के सम्बन्ध में आज सरकार की क्या योजना है यह मालूम तो हों। आज तक उस बारे में योजना नहीं बनी, और आज भी सरकार योजना बनाने को तैयार नहीं है। ऐसा क्यों है यह समझ में नहीं आता। इसलिए मैंने स्वयं एक योजना बनायी है इस विषय में। मैं नहीं जानता कि मुझे इतना वक्त है कि मैं उस योजना को आप के सामने रखूँ। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि आप आज्ञा दें, संक्षेप में मैं उस योजना को सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और वह योजना यह है . . . . .

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो गया है।

**डा० गोविन्द बास :** पहली बात यह है कि हिन्दी को प्रयोग में लाने के विषय में अब तक जितने सरकारी आदेश निकले हैं उन सब का पालन कराना नितान्त आवश्यक है। यह सब आदेश पड़े हुए हैं लेकिन उन का पालन नहीं होता है। इसलिए जहाँ उन आदेशों का पालन सही रीति से नहीं हो रहा हो, उन कार्यालयों का ध्यान तुरन्त उस और आकर्षित किया जाय। हिन्दी अपनाने के बारे में जब तक गृह मंत्रालय स्वयं आदर्श उपस्थित नहीं करता तब तक अन्य मंत्रालयों तथा कार्यालयों से कुछ भी आशा करना व्यर्थ होगा। जहाँ तक गृह मंत्रालय का सम्बन्ध है सब से पहली बात यह है कि गृह मंत्रालय को केन्द्रीय सरकारी नौकरियों के लिए हिन्दी के वैकल्पिक माध्यम तुरन्त घोषित कर देना चाहिए। प्रत्येक सरकारी कार्यालय में कुछ उपकरण बहुत आवश्यक होते हैं, जैसे टाइपराइटर। मैंने कुछ कार्यालयों को देखा है। उन की शिकायत यह है कि वहाँ हिन्दी के एक भी टाइपराइटर मौजूद नहीं हैं। बिना हिन्दी टाइपराइटरों के वे कार्यालय हिन्दी में कैसे काम कर सकेंगे? एक भी भारत सरकार का कार्यालय ऐसा

नहीं रहना चाहिए जहाँ कि इस प्रकार के उपकरण काफ़ी संख्या में उपलब्ध न रहें। भारतीय राजपत्र में इस समय तक थोड़ी सी अधिसूचनाएँ अंग्रेजी के साथ हिन्दी में निकल रही हैं। गजट के जिस भाग को द्विभाषी रूप में निकालने का सरकार निश्चय कर चुकी है, उस भाग के लिए सरकारी मुद्रणालय में कोई भी सामग्री केवल अंग्रेजी में स्वीकार नहीं होनी चाहिए। अभी से लेकर जनवरी १९६५ के मध्य तक सरकार के कई कामों को द्विभाषी रूप में कराना आरम्भ किया जाय जिससे जनवरी १९६५ तक सरकारी कर्मचारी उन कामों को हिन्दी में करने के अभ्यस्त होते जायें। किसी भी कार्यालय में हिन्दी की गति इस आधार पर रुकने न दी जानी चाहिए कि वहाँ हिन्दी जानने वाले अधिकारी तथा कर्मचारी कम संख्या में हैं। उस कमी को पूर्ति मुख्य रूप से उन को हिन्दी कक्षाओं में हिन्दी सिखा कर होनी चाहिए परन्तु जब तक वे हिन्दी का अच्छा ज्ञान प्राप्त नहीं कर लेते तब तक के लिए वहाँ हिन्दी अनुवादक रखे जाएँ। जिन राजपत्रित अधिकारियों को हिन्दी नहीं आती उन को हिन्दी सिखाने में प्रोत्साहन दी जाय। विभिन्न विभागों में कर्मचारियों की नियुक्ति के लिए जो परीक्षाएँ होती हैं, उन सब का माध्यम तुरन्त वैकल्पिक रूप से अंग्रेजी के साथ साथ हिन्दी भी मान लिया जाय जसा कि मैं बार बार कह चुका हूँ। आज मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह उस योजना का अंग है और तुरन्त हिन्दी कर देनी चाहिए।

मैंने इस योजना को बनाया है और मैं इसे श्री गूलजारी लाल नन्दा और शिक्षा मंत्री के सामने पेश करने वाला हूँ।

अन्त में मैं एक छोटी सी बात अपने जबलपुर नगर के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। जबलपुर नगर के विषय में जो मुझे कहना है वह वित्त मंत्री की घोषणा से सम्बन्ध रखता है। वित्त मंत्री की घोषणा के अनुसार उसी नगर को बी० न्लास की श्रेणी दी जाती है जिसकी

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

कि आबादी चार लाख या उस के ऊपर होती है। गत मरदमशुमारी में जबलपुर की आबादी ३ लाख ६७ हजार लिखी हुई है। इस का पहला कारण तो यह है कि जिस समय जनसंख्या की गई उस समय जबलपुर में एक साम्प्रदायिक दंगा था और उस साम्प्रदायिक दंगे के कारण वहां के लोग डघर, उधर चले गये थे। दूसरा कारण उसका यह है कि वहां पर जो गन करेज फैक्टरी है और खमरिया फैक्टरी है जहां कि आबादी लगभग ५०,००० के है, उस आबादी को उसमें शामिल नहीं किया गया है। अगर उस आबादी को उस में शामिल कर लिया जाय तो वहां की जनसंख्या ४ लाख के ऊपर हो जाती है। मैं इसके सम्बन्ध में दो उदाहरण दूंगा। पूना शहर का जब वर्गीकरण हुआ था तब किर्की ग्राममेंट फैक्टरी की आबादी को उसमें जोड़ दिया गया था इसलिए उसकी आबादी चार लाख के ऊपर हुई थी और उसको बी० श्रेणी में स्थान दिया गया। इसी प्रकार बंगाल में ईशापुर फक्टरी की आबादी के साथ कलकत्ते की आबादी को जोड़ा गया। जबलपुर में का.सी बड़ी मैनिक छावनी है। सुरक्षा का वह स्थान है। इसलिए इन सब बातों को देखते हुए जबलपुर वालों को इस बात की बहुत बड़ी शिकायत है कि जबलपुर की इस तरह की स्थिति रहते हुए भी जबलपुर बी० श्रेणी के नगरो में नहीं आया क्योंकि वहां की आबादी कुछ कारणोंवश, एक तो वहां की कुछ आबादी शामिल नहीं की गई, दूसरे वहां दंगा हो गया था इसलिए वह चार लाख नहीं हो सकी। मैं आप से निबदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस पर पुनर्विचार होना चाहिए और जबलपुर का स्थान बी० श्रेणी में ले जाया जाना चाहिए।

इन सब बातों के साथ मैं वर्तमान परिस्थिति में, जितना भी अच्छे से अच्छा बजट रखा जा सकता था, उस बजट को पेश करने के लिए वित्त मंत्री जी को हृदय से बधाई देता हूं।

श्री व० प्र० सिंह (मुंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अर्थ मंत्री महोदय ने संतुलित बजट लाकर एक नया आदर्श हमारे सामने रखा है और उसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि कुछ राज्यों में संतुलित बजट पेश हुए हैं। दूसरा सब से जरूरी विषय खाद्यान्न की विशेष उत्पत्ति का है और उके जो साधन बताये गये हैं सरकार द्वारा, उन साधनों से हमारा अभीष्ट सिद्ध न हो सकेगा। कृषि उत्पादन में बढहोतरी के लिए अच्छे औजार और अच्छी खाद परम आवश्यक होते हैं। आज देश में फटिलाइजर्स कम्पनियां बहुत सी कायम की जा रही हैं और लोग ऐसा अनुमान करते हैं कि फटिलाइजर्स के जरिये पैदावार में वृद्धि होगी लेकिन यह गलत बात है। फटिलाइजर्स का प्रयोग करने के पहले सरकार को ऐसे संस्थान कायम करने चाहिए जहां मिट्टी का परीक्षण करके किसानों को इस बात की सलाह दी जाय कि किस तरीके से और कौन सी खाद उसमें प्रयोग की जाय जिससे कि पैदावार बढ़ सकती है। केवल उर्वरक खाद के प्रयोग मात्र से पैदावार बढ़ाने की जो बात है वह अंधे के शिकार के समान है। जहां की मिट्टी अनुकूल है वहां पर इस का लाभ हो जाता है और जहां पर मिट्टी अनुकूल नहीं हुई वहां पर उसका लाभ नहीं होता है। सलफेट एमोनिया का प्रयोग सरकार द्वारा किसानों को करने के लिए कहा जाता है। वहां पर उनकी जमीन की जांच नहीं होती है। किसान देखता है कि सलफेट एमोनिया के प्रयोग से पौधा बढ़ता अवश्य है लेकिन उसके जरिये पैदावार में वृद्धि नहीं होती है। जब किसान कई बार उसका प्रयोग कर चुकता है और जब उसकी पैदावार नहीं बढ़ती है तब उसे असंतोष होता है और वह उसे इस्तेमाल करना छोड़ देता है।

कुछ दिनों पहले मैंने पालियामेंट में एक प्रश्न किया था जबकि बिहार के एग््रीकल्चर के डाइरेक्टर ने एक मीटिंग में कहा था कि हम ने इतने फटिलाइजर्स का प्रयोग किया था।

उस समय हमने एक प्रश्न पूछा था कि इतने फर्टिलाइजर्स का प्रयोग करने के समय क्या आपने किसानों की जमीन की मिट्टी की जांच कराई थी तो वह चुप हो गये थे। इस शंका समाधान के लिए जब हमने यहां प्रश्न किया तो हमें यह उत्तर मिला था कि पहले वर्ष में १२,००० टन का प्रयोग किया था, दूसरे वर्ष में ६,००० टन का प्रयोग किया और तीसरे वर्ष ७,००० टन का प्रयोग किया। यह तमाम खपत दक्षिण बिहार में हुई। लेकिन जब किसानों को उसका कट्टा अनुभव होने लगा तो वह उससे दूर होने लगे। उसको किसान छोड़ने लगे। इसलिए अगर सरकार फर्टिलाइजर्स के प्रयोग द्वारा कृषि की पैदावार को बढ़ाना चाहती है तो उसको जगह जगह पर ऐसे संस्थान कायम करने चाहिए जहां कि मिट्टी की जांच की जाया करे और किसानों को इस बात के लिए सलाह दी जाया करे।

साथ ही साथ जब ट्रैक्टरों का प्रयोग होता है और उनके जरिए जो खेती होती है तो उस जमीन की उर्वरा शक्ति कम हो जाती है। उसके लिए वहां पर अच्छे बैल ही साधन हो सकते हैं। हमें उत्तम बैलों की आवश्यकता है जिनके जरिए हम अपनी पैदावार बढ़ा सकते हैं।

आज अखबारों से पता चला कि सरकार दस मंत्रियों की एक कमेटी बैठाने वाली है जो कि बाड़ों को रोकने के सम्बन्ध में विचार विमर्श करेगी। अभी जो प्रोटेक्टिव बंध बनाये गये हैं उनके जरिये हमारी पैदावार में कमी हुई है। अब उनके जरिए फसल की रक्षा भले ही हो जाय लेकिन जमीन की उर्वरा शक्ति कम हो जाती है और परिणाम-

स्वरूप उन जगहों पर हमारी पैदावार कम हो रही है और बाड़ के पानी का जहां फैलाव बहुत जगहों पर था उसके संकुचित होने पर जब वह बांध टूट जाते हैं तो किसानों की जान व माल की काफी क्षति होती है। इसलिए यदि आप पैदावार को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो किसानों से सम्मति लेनी चाहिये। आप भले ही प्रोटेक्टिव बांध बनाकर यह संतोष कर लें कि हमने हजारों एकड़ कृषि भूमि की रक्षा कर ली लेकिन वास्तविक रूप से आप उस तरीके से पैदावार नहीं कर सकते हैं। जरूरत इस बात की है कि आप गांवों को प्रोटेक्टिव बांध से बचायें लेकिन खेतों को खुला रहने दीजिये।

जो आपकी भूमि नीति है वह दोषपूर्ण है। उसके द्वारा आपने किसानों के जीवन को अस्तव्यस्त कर दिया है। आपने जो सीलिंग कायम की है, उस सीलिंग से कहां तक लाभ हो सकता है इसके ऊपर आपका खयाल नहीं गया है। मैं इस चीज को आज दस वर्षों से बराबर दुहराता रहा हूं और आज फिर सरकार और अपने प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप जीवन मान स्थिर करें और उसका अनुपात ठीक करें। आप किसान के वास्ते एक रीजनेबुल स्टैंडर्ड आफ लाइफ की गुंजाइश करें। जब तक किमी का दिमाग शान्त नहीं होता है, चित्त शान्त नहीं होता है तब तक वह अच्छे तरीके से काम नहीं कर सकता है। आपके पास कोई संतुलित योजना नहीं है जिसके कारण किसानों का जीवन अस्तव्यस्त हो रहा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश में जितनी जमीन है, सरकार उसका उपयोग नहीं कर रही है। हमारे यहां ३७ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन में पैदावार की जाती है। उस में से केवल चार करोड़ एकड़ जमीन ऐसी है, जो दु फसली है और बाकी की ३३ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन ऐसी है, जहां पर सिचाई की व्यवस्था करके और दूसरी मुविधायें देकर अन्न

[श्रा ब० प्र० सिंह]

की पैदावार बढ़ायी जा सकती है। लेकिन ये बातें सरकार के सामने नहीं हैं। सरकार तो किसानों के जीवन को अस्त-व्यस्त करना चाहती है।

आज हमारे देश में इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि पैदावार बढ़े। सरकार स्टैंड कल्टीवेशन करके पैदावार बढ़ा सकती है। जो किमान अपनी जमीन पर पूरी मेहनत करके पूरी पैदावार नहीं करता है, सरकार इंग्लैंड की तरह उसकी जमीन छीन ले। इसके साथ ही साथ यह भी आवश्यक है कि किसानों के गल्ले का इन्शोरेंस किया जाये। किसानों को कितनी मजदूरी देनी चाहिए, वह तो सरकार ने निश्चित कर दिया है, लेकिन उस ने यह निश्चित नहीं किया है कि जब बाढ़ और सूखे के कारण किसानों की खेती नष्ट हो जाती है, तो उसको प्रोटेक्शन करने के लिए उसको क्या करना चाहिए। ऐसी कोई व्यवस्था सरकार ने नहीं की। है जब बाढ़ या सूखे से किसानों की फसल नष्ट हो जाती है और उसकी सारी पूंजी गायब हो जाती है, तो उस अवस्था में सरकार उनका लगान भी माफ नहीं करती है।

सरकार ने आधे-आधे के आधार पर लगान लगाया हुआ है, जो कि ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी ने निश्चित किया था। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि मनु के समय में जमीन पर लगान की व्यवस्था शुरू हुई और मनु के समय में पैदावार का १२वाँ हिस्सा राजा को मिलता था। गौतम ने उसको घटा कर १०वाँ हिस्सा किया और चाणक्य ने छठा हिस्सा किया। विशेष परिस्थिति में मनु के समय में छठा हिस्सा और चाणक्य के समय में तासरा हिस्सा राजा को मिलता था, लेकिन इस सरकार की बुनियाद, इसकी रेशों, पचास परसेंट के ऊपर है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) सरकार ७० फ्री सदी ले रही है।

श्री ब० प्र० सिंह : यदि सरकार पुराने आधार पर लगान तय करे, तो किसानों को राहत मिल सकता है।

क्या सरकार चाहती है कि अनपढ़ लोग हों खेती का काम करें, या पढ़े-लिखे युवक भी खेती का काम करें? यदि वह चाहता है कि पढ़े-लिखे युवक भी खेती का काम करें, तो उसको सेन्ट्रेरियट में काम करने वाले और खेत में काम करने वाले के जीवन में समता लानी चाहिए। सरकार ने यह तय किया है कि सेन्ट्रेरियट में काम करने वालों का उच्चतम वेतन तीन हजार रुपया हो। लेकिन उसने किसान के लिये क्या तय किया है? उस ने फेमिली होल्डिंग छः एकड़ या तीस एकड़ रखी है। क्या वह बता सकती है कि एक एकड़ में कितनी बचत होती है? मेरा खयाल है कि एक एकड़ की ऐवरेज आय चालीस रुपये है। सरकार के पास जो फार्म है, वहाँ पर वह प्राइवशन कास्ट काट कर देखे कि किसान को क्या बच सकता है। सरकार को ऐसी व्यवस्था करना चाहिए कि पढ़े-लिखे नौजवान भी खेती के काम में जायें।

यदि सरकार चाहती है कि किसानों का जीवन सादा हो और उनको कोई प्रलोभन न हो, तो शासन में जो लोग हैं, उनको भी अपने जीवन में सादगी लानी चाहिए। गांधी जी ने कहा था कि मेरा सन्देश मेरा जीवन है। यदि हम सादगी का जीवन अपना लें, तो हमारी बहुत सी समस्याओं का समाधान हो सकता है और विदेशों से हम जो बहुत सा गल्ला मंगाले हैं, उस में भी कमी हो सकती है।

यदि हम चावल का भाड़ न निकालें, तो मन में तीन सेर की बचत हो सकती है। उसी तरह यदि आटा खाने वाले लोग उसका चोकर न निकालें, तो उसमें भी बहुत बचत

हो सकती है। इस तरह से अन्न की समस्या का समाधान कुछ हद तक हो सकता है।

सरकार बराबर विश्वास दिलाती रही है कि इनने समय के बाद वह विदेशों से नगला नहीं मंगायेगी, लेकिन फिर भी वह बराबर मंगती जा रही है। खेती की पैदावार में जो उन्नति हुई है, वह नगण्य भी है और उसका उन्नति नहीं कहा जा सकता है। यह भी समझ में नहीं आता कि पैदावार में जो वृद्धि हुई है, वह एकड़ के बढ़ने से हुई है या किसानों के काम में वृद्धि होने से हुई है। सरकार के पास यह जानने का कोई साधन नहीं है।

सरकार गरीबों से भी कर लेना चाहती है। वह कहती है कि किसान की पर-कैपिटल इनकम २९३ रुपये है। लेकिन एक किसान की आमदनी केवल ११० रुपये है। मैं डा० मोहिया के आंकड़े नहीं दे रहा हूँ। मैं सरकारी कागजात के आंकड़ों के आधार पर कहता हूँ कि एक खेत-मजदूर और किसान की आय चार आने है। इस देश में एक खेत-मजदूर और किसान की आय चार आने है और फिर भी सरकार सोशलिस्टिक पॅटर्न की बात कहती है। इस अवस्था में शासन में काम करने वाले का वेतन कितना होना चाहिए? जो आदमी गांधी जी के आश्रम में ७५ रुपये में काम करता था, आज केन्द्र में ६५०० रुपये में उसका काम चलता है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार किस तरह से समाजवाद का निर्माण करना चाहती है। सरकार में बैठे लोगों को अपने जीवन की सादगी से लोगों को प्रभावित करना चाहिए।

सरकार विदेशी पूँजी बढ़ा रही है। वह विदेशी पूँजी को अपने देश के कारखानों में लगाना चाहती है। वह विदेशी ऋण लेकर देश का उत्थान करना चाहती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि विदेशी पूँजी और विदेशी ऋण बहुत भयावह और हानिकारक हैं।

हम इनसे कैसे बच सकते हैं? अगर सरकार के लॉग शासन में मितव्ययिता लायें और अपने जीवन में सादगी लायें, तो यह देश विदेशी पूँजी और विदेशी ऋण से मुक्त रह सकता है और अन्न बढ़ सकता है।

जैसा कि मैंने अभी बताया, सरकार के वादों पर लोगों का विश्वास कम हो रहा है। उसका कारण यह है कि वह अपने वादों की पूर्ति नहीं करती है। सरकार ने संविधान में कहा कि १९६५ के बाद हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा हो जायेगी। आज वह कहती है कि जब तक नान-हिन्दी स्पीकिंग लोगों की राय नहीं होगी, तब तक अंग्रेजी बनी रहेगी। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब रूस में बारह भाषाओं में सरकारी कागज छप सकते हैं, स्वित्जरलैंड में एक से अधिक भाषाओं में सरकारी कागज छप सकते हैं तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान में भी ऐसा क्यों नहीं हो सकता है? जब तक यहाँ पर हिन्दी के बारे में मसैक्य नहीं होता है, जब तक देश के सब लोग हिन्दी को नहीं अपनाते हैं, तब तक जितनी प्रादेशिक भाषायें हैं, उन सब को हिन्दी की सहयोगी-भाषा मान लिया जाय और उन सभी भाषाओं में सरकार की रिपोर्ट्स निकलें।

जहाँ तक पार्लियामेंट में बोलने की बात है, यहाँ पर अभी लोग हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं। अंग्रेजी को हटा दिया जाये और हिन्दी के साथ दक्षिण भारत की एक भाषा रखी जाये। जिस भाषा को वे लोग चाहें उसको यहाँ पर हिन्दी के साथ इन्ट्रॉड्यूस किया जाये और पार्लियामेंट में बोलने की स्वाधीनता दी जाये।

मैं बहुत नम्रतापूर्वक अपने मंत्रियों से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वे १७ बरस से शासन में हैं, उन्होंने संविधान में हिन्दी को राष्ट्र भाषा बनाया है, लेकिन वे आज तक हिन्दी नहीं सीख सके हैं और हिन्दी ही में



[श्री ब० प्र० सिंह]

नहीं बोल सकते हैं। यह बड़ी शर्म की बात है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : सीखने का सवाल नहीं है। अंग्रेजी भूल नहीं पा रहे हैं।

श्री ब० प्र० सिंह : आज उत्तर भारत के लोग हिन्दी के अतिरिक्त एक भाषा सीखेंगे और उस भाषा का पालियामेंट में प्रयोग करेंगे। लोग कहते हैं कि यह भाषा सरल नहीं है और सीखी नहीं जा सकती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि शासन चलाना और परिवार चलाना बराबर होता है। मैं जिला परिषद का अध्यक्ष था। अध्यक्ष होने के बाद मैंने आर्डर दिया कि तीन महीने में सब लोग हिन्दी सीख लें। हमारे सब काम करने वालों ने तीन महीने में हिन्दी सीख ली और हिन्दी को जारी कर दिया गया गया। एक बरस में हमने हिन्दी में बजट पेश कर दिया। जहाँ कोई शब्द समझने में दिक्कत होती थी, वहाँ अंग्रेजी का पर्यायवाची शब्द रख दिया जाता था।

हिन्दी की जो प्रगति नहीं हो रही है मैं उसका दोष अहिन्दी-भाषा-भाषियों को नहीं देता हूँ, बल्कि उसके लिए हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी दोषी हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, राजस्थान और मध्य प्रदेश की सरकारों लोगों के सामने यह आदर्श नहीं रख सकी कि वे हिन्दी के जरिये अपना मारा काम-काज चलायें। यदि इन चार राज्यों के लोग हिन्दी में भारी कार्यवाही करने लें, तो दूसरे राज्यों में भी उसका प्रभाव पड़ सकता है।

मैं अंग्रेजी हटाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। अंग्रेजी रहे, लेकिन एक इन्टरनेशनल, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भाषा के रूप में और अपने देश में प्रयोग के लिए हिन्दी भाषा रहे। जब तक अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी लोग केवल हिन्दी को

स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं, तब तक अहिन्दी-भाषा-भाषियों की भी एक भाषा का प्रयोग हो। जब हम में बार भाषाओं में रिपोर्ट्स निकल सकती हैं, तो हिन्दुस्तान में भी चौदह भाषाओं में रिपोर्ट्स निकले और इसमें किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं होना चाहिए।

शराबबन्दी के बारे में मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि गांधी जी ने कहा था कि यदि एक घंटे के लिए शासन का भार मुझे मिले, तो सबसे पहला काम मैं यह करूँ कि शराब बन्द कर दूँ। सत्रह बरस के बाद भी सरकार नशाबन्दी नहीं कर सकी है, क्योंकि शराब के जर्ग से उनको पैसा मिलता है और उसको शासन चलाने में सहाय्यता होती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार गरीबों के नाम पर और स्वास्थ्य के नाम पर इतना खर्च करती है, लेकिन गरीबों का बीम मँकड़ा रुपया शराबखोरी में जाता है। अगर सरकार यह समझती है कि केवल शराबखोरी के जरिये ही उसकी आमदनी बढ़ेगी, तो मैं उसके सामने बम्बई का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर शराबबन्दी करने से सरकार को जितना पैसा कम मिला, बिस्की-कार के जरिये से उतना ही पैसा उसके पास आ गया। जब गरीबों के पास पैसा होगा, तो वे बाजार में सामान खरीदेंगे और उससे सरकार को लाभ होगा और देश की उन्नति होगी।

अन्त में मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार के लोग अपने जीवन में सादगी लायें, शराबखोरी को बन्द करें और गौरक्षा की तरफ ध्यान दें। यदि सरकार चाहे कि ट्रैक्टर के जरिये से खेती की उन्नति हो, तो वह सम्भव नहीं होगा। यदि ट्रैक्टर के जरिये से सरकार खेती करेगी, तो पैदावार में कमी होगी। उसके लिए उसको गी-संबर्द्धन की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए और अच्छे अच्छे बेल उपलब्ध कराने चाहिए। सरकार

शराबखोरी बन्द करे और इस प्रकार गरीबों के बच्चों के मुंह से रोटी छीनने की व्यवस्था बन्द करे। संविधान में जो वायदे किये गये हैं, सरकार को उनकी इज्जत और प्रतिष्ठा करनी चाहिए, वरना संविधान का कोई मल्य नहीं रह जाता है। सरकार संविधान के जरिये से कुछ बातें कहती है, प्लेटफार्म से कुछ बातें कहती है, लेकिन जब ब्यहार की बात आती है, तो वह मुकर जाती है। जनता का विश्वास आप खो रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम अपने जीवन में सादगी लायें। साथ साथ शासन के खर्चे में मितव्ययता लायें। आप विदेशी पूँजी से और विदेशी ऋणों से देश को बचायें। इतना ही मेरा निवेदन है।

**Shri S. S. More** (Poona): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, during my career in the first Parliament I was frequently intervening on behalf of the peasantry and my performance used to be sufficiently vitriolic; I am returning to the charge after a long break. Many Members of the Congress side have made an attempt to find some trace of socialism in the Budget but their attempts have failed like the attempts of the Arabs lost in the desert to find a water-oasis. I am not prepared to say that this is a Congress Budget, because there is hardly any connection between the Budget and the Avadi or Bhubaneshwar resolution. It is essentially a personal Budget of Mr. TTK. He is a man of personal convictions and does not require confidence to be borrowed from any foreign country. Naturally he has put forward a Budget which tries to concretise his own conception that the ways of capitalism must be encouraged in this country. The way to glory goes through the graveyard. His way to socialism goes through the sphere of capitalism. My submission is that it is wrong to suppose that this is a Congress Budget and Opposition Members who criticised it on that basis did a grievous mistake. It is a budget of the rich and for the rich. It is a budget

for the appeasement of the vested interests who were infuriated by our declaration at Avadi and Bhubaneshwar and our talk about the nationalisation of banks and other matters. We were very vitriolic and very enthusiastic about our socialism but there was hardly any meeting of minds between the Congress leaders and the mind of TTK; he is not prepared to change his spots. This is an attempt to please the capitalist and I do not see anything wrong from his personal point of view. There is hardly any connection between the Congress deed and the Congress words. Naturally we may be exposed to the fury of the masses. Some of the communist friends have tried to threaten us: the masses will rise. I believe the masses have to rise in the life history of every country and I would rather welcome the day when the masses are able to rise but not at the instance of the Communist Party, because when the masses rise, they rise constructively, not for the purpose of slaughtering. My communist friends never think of constructive socialism or even constructive communism.

The Budget is a clever Budget. It removes all the soft corners which in the former two budgets used to prick the capitalists. The cleverness of Mr. TTK lies in the fact that he has removed the soft corners so as to make the Budget soft and cosy as a ball of wool to the capitalists. In my part of the country there are certain weekly bazars held and the head of the family goes to those bazars. When he returns he will bring gifts for every child in the family and the moment he returns all the kids in the family surround him and start asking for some gift. Here Kaka Krishnamachari has brought gifts for every sector of the capitalist economy. He has some gifts for the corporate tax payers, some gift for the individual tax-payers, some gift for this industry or that industry. But what about the peasant? My greatest complaint about the budget is that it leaves a great void

[Shri S. S. More]

there is no room for the peasant. Our manifesto says that the peasant is the crux of our economy. This Budget goes not only against the Bhubaneswar resolution but against our manifesto in 1962. Our manifesto says:

"Industry and agriculture are closely connected and on the development of each depends the development of the other. It is through widespread industrial growth that higher standards in production and consumption can be reached. But industrial growth itself depends upon the improvement in agriculture. Agriculture is thus today and will continue to be the most important factor of our economy, and on its expanding production will depend progress in industry and other fields. Therefore, modern methods and techniques have to be applied in increasing measure, always keeping in view the conditions existing in India."

But the Budget of Mr. TTK is not prepared to take even notice of the peasantry. There are one or two short sentences saying that we wanted to lay emphasis on agricultural production but somehow we have not done so. He has mentioned that there is inadequate growth in food production. During the British days, the agriculturists suffered. British industrialists wanted to rob Indian agriculturist for raw materials for their own mills and fiscal instrument was the only instrument used against them. Prices were not allowed to rise. The Indian capitalists who have come to power are doing the same thing. They want to keep the peasant in depressed condition so that his raw material can be available to them. My submission, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, is that unfortunately the fate of the agriculturist is in the hands of persons who belong to the middle-class. The middle-class and the trading and industrial classes have been the traditional enemies of the peasantry. They have all along

robbed the peasant and taken advantage of his ignorance. The peasant is ignorant and unsophisticated and does not know to hoard his grains or money. He has no money. He does not know how to evade tax. Naturally, he has become the victim of the nefarious policies of the middle class who have come into our administration. Our administration and our Government is a Government of the middle-class and for the middle-class and they are giving the tune to the Government what should be done in the case of agriculturists and what should not be done. Therefore, my submission is that the peasantry is suffering like anything. It has been said that women are born to suffer. I would change the proverb to: peasants are born to suffer. Panditji himself once said: our peasant is the most neglected creature. The most neglected creature deserves our greatest sympathy. Agriculture is the largest, but most neglected, industry. If it is to be rehabilitated and put on proper footing, certain prerequisites are to be done to help the peasant. Past experience of western and developed countries shows that agricultural revolution must precede industrial revolution. But Mr. TTK is out to have an industrial revolution, forgetting that agricultural revolution must precede industrial revolution so that industries can get a steady supply of raw materials. So, agricultural revolution has to come to this country and for that we must give him the essential prerequisites. Take for instance, the western countries. Even Israel is travelling by the same route; Japan is travelling by the same route, and we too will have to go the same way.

What are the prerequisites for an agricultural revolution? A rich soil, a well-fertilised soil, good seeds, an assured water supply and mechanisation of the agricultural processes. By the end of the 19th century, the late Mr. Gokhale, speaking in the British

budget, once said, when depicting the plight of agriculture:

"The yield of the soil has been steadily diminishing excepting in irrigated tracts—about the lowest yield in the world."

It is the same plight now. The land has been completely exhausted; the peasant has been much more exhausted. Unless we supply fertilisers to the peasant, so that he can give full doses to the land, it is wrong to assume that the land can give us the yield we want.

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf** (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): What about the land policy?

**Shri S. S. More:** I am coming to that. My submission is, the whole land policy is lopsided and is much more in the interests of the feudal lords or landowners or money-lenders. The land reforms are being delayed by the States because it is going against the interests of some of the influential persons. Land reforms has to be first on the agenda. Unless the tenants are assured complete control over their land, not only barren land or arid land but all the land, they cannot yield even a blade of grass. But the land must be fertilised. Mr. Khrushchev has very lately said that land must be chemicalised and they are producing thousands of tons of fertilisers. Unless we follow what Israel has done, we cannot go ahead. They have conquered the desert by rich, abundant use of fertilisers. We will have to go the same way.

We are producing fertilisers in our country. The fertilisers, however, are going without a customer; the rates are so high, and due to the middlemen or greedy traders the agriculturist is not in a position to apply fertilisers

to his land. A man who is so economically poor that he is not able to give a full morsel of food to his own child, is not expected to purchase fertilisers for using them on his land. So, we must look upon whatever the peasant does is in the interests of the nation and as a national enterprise we must supply him fertilisers at the cost of the State. We must assure him possession of land. We must also supply him with good seeds. We must also supply him with all the modern implements and the means of mechanisation.

Take, for instance, electricity. Electric power is of paramount importance. I may quote from the Congress manifesto which says that "electric power is of paramount importance not only for the growth of large-scale industry but also for the development of agriculture and small and village industries." Now, like our middle-classes, our electricity has been completely urbanised. The villagers do not get electricity for their motors; they do not have electricity for their pumps. Not only that. In the budget I have found that the excise levy on diesel oil continues unabated.

**An Hon. Member:** It is the worst.

**Shri S. S. More:** My hon. friend says it is the worst. But there are many things which are much more worse than what he is thinking of. In this budget, there is no room for the peasant and unless we take the peasant by his boot-strings and lift him from the abject misery and penury, I do not think there is any future for the country.

It has been stated in the Mid-term Appraisal that agriculture is most rapid economic growth. This word "key to growth" is taken from

[Shri S. S. More]

Panditji's quotation. Panditji once said that agriculture is the key and base of all progress. We dare not to be slack, if we do not fail in agriculture it does not matter what else we have got." It is the right attitude which has been reflected in the budget, but my submission and my sorrow is that our professions are not heeded to by the Finance Ministers, and as Shri Surendranath Dwivedy said, our budgets continue to be the personal budgets of Finance Ministers who do not take notice of what the Congress has promised.

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

**Shri S. S. More:** My further submission is that we, the Congress people, are interested in keeping the peasantry alive. The peasant has been the backbone of the Congress. During the Independence fight, the peasant has been the only prop of our electoral campaigns. We came to power thrice and the peasant is the only person who continues to suffer. If, by our adverse or apathetic policies, we alienate the peasant, naturally he will be in the hands of somebody else who will use him as a sop for his own ends. So, my submission is, even in our party interests, we should be very sympathetic and favourable to the peasants. Why should we leave it do others? Unfortunately, the peasant does not happen to be sufficiently revolutionary to attract the attention of the communist party, because they feel that the peasant is wedded to property, and if he is wedded to property he cannot be a good instrument of revolution. The moment they realise that the Indian peasants have certain potentialities, very useful for revolutionary purposes, my submission will be that we shall lose the prop on which we have been depending for so many elections.

Since you have rung the bell, Sir, I would rather say that we should be

sympathetic to the peasants, in short. The peasant should be the base and the foundation of our whole economy and unless we modernise agriculture, it will be no good. We have to turn or convert the economy of the peasant which is now subsistence economy into a market economy. This transition from subsistence economy to a market economy is a long path, an arduous path, and we must go on that path unhesitatingly.

Another point which I would like to make is this. Unfortunately, our Finance Minister has not realised the gravity of the mistake that he has done. Ignore the peasant, and you do not get abundant food supply, and starvation will face us. We will have to go through the valley of death. You do not help the peasant, and you do not get sufficient raw materials. You antagonise the peasant, and you do not get enough sugar for sending it out. You displease the peasant and the result is that there is food deficit and you have to go to the doors of others with a beggar's bowl in your hands. Therefore, the peasant is bound to be the source and fountain of our good things of life and it will be the primary need to help him in our own interests as far as we can.

It is no use pleasing the industrialist; with all their tax evasion, and with all your provisions in the law, I do not think they will be prepared to pay you the taxes. There has been some increase in the estate duty. But I am quite sure that those who are versed in the art of evading taxes will evade death also and will not allow you to reap the estate duty. Instead of going after such fleeting elements, is it not much better to rely on the peasant? Therefore, I want to contend that it is high time that we revolutionised our agriculture. Unless we revolutionise our agriculture, revolution of some other sort may come our way with a nasty bang. Therefore, I submit with all humility that the peasant is most important. I have stated

something which has been topmost in my mind, seething and simmering in my heart. I thank you for the opportunity you have given me.

**Shri Daji:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this budget has been variously called, but the most apt description was that it was a jigsaw puzzle. That seems to be rather a correct description. I tried to piece together the jigsaw puzzle, and the version that emerged out of it shows the hideous face of an Indian and foreign monopoly grinning in a broad smile and showing its thumb to the common man and to the Congressmen for the puerile attempt at socialism at Bhuvanewar. That is the picture that emerges.

**An Hon. Member:** Is it only at them?

**Shri Daji:** Both the common man and the Congressmen. The danger inherent in the budget is, not that it does not lead us to socialist development, about which I have no illusions, but the dangerous pattern it reveals is that this budget strikes at the very root of the independent democratic development of our country.

Let us take the tax proposals. It would be wrong to discuss the tax proposals each one separately. This estate duty could be picked up and it may be said that 85 per cent is the duty on the highest slab and is it not socialism? That is not, I submit, the correct way of looking at this budget. We must take the totality of the tax proposals and see what picture emerges. Each tax proposal we shall examine separately later, when the respective Bills come up.

There are certain good proposals like the estate duty, gift tax, wealth tax and all that. But what impact do they have on the economy as such? The total yield from all these increases—so-called socialist postures of the Finance Minister—are only Rs. 6.5 crores a year. That was why I called it a goods train to Bhuvanewar socialism. If the goal of socialism is to

be reached at the rate of Rs. 6.5 crores per year, you will take a hundred years even to socialise the houses of Tatas and Birlas—only two houses. At this rate, I am afraid it is not only a goods train to Bhuvanewar, but it is an attempt to scale the moon in a bullock cart. You will never get at this rate anywhere near socialism and anywhere near breaking up concentration, to which partial acceptance has been accorded by the Finance Minister.

Credit has been taken that no new tax has been levied. True, but no credit can be taken for that, because as the mid-term appraisal of the third Plan showed, even on the existing level of taxation, you have taken Rs. 400 crores more than what you had budgeted in the third Plan. Therefore, the common man has the right to ask for the return of the Rs. 400 crores that he had taken. So, the point is that there are no new tax proposals, but there is no relief which is much-needed. Of course, the CDS has been withdrawn, again haltingly. I do not know why. I am sure the Finance Minister will have a second look at it, because you withdraw it retrospectively, but you make the payment only after five years.

The crux of the tax proposals is no relief to the common man and no break in prices. In fact, their responsibility of holding the price-line has been abrogated in a spurious economic theory that the question of prices has got to be integrated with growth, investment and everything. That means, Government is ready to shoulder no responsibility on the question of price increase. The result is even after the increase in Dearness Allowance recently given, the Central Government employees are getting, compared to what they were getting in 1947, only Rs. 87 instead of Rs. 100. That is, the real wages have fallen today because of the price rise and yet the budget says, no responsibility and no control.

[Shri Daji]

Wasteful expenditure and spending continues. There are no social welfare measures and all reliefs come to capital, as if only capital was the sufferer and the common man were not the sufferer. My quarrel is with the philosophy of the budget that there is stagnation in the growth because capital is not adequately rewarded. I quarrel with this philosophy and that is the main burden of my quarrel against the philosophy that economic growth is held up because capital does not have adequate fillip. The mid-term appraisal has clearly showed that investment targets of the private sector were more than fulfilled, but the pattern was not fulfilled. The investment which had to be made in basic industries necessary for national development was not made. Instead, the same amount was invested in light industries with quick returns. That is what the mid-term appraisal says. So, to say that capital requires any further incentive is absolutely wrong reading of the economic situation. That is my quarrel against the budget which seeks to give more and more concessions to capital, Indian and foreign.

I am repeating the Finance Minister's own description of the man-eaters. Man-eaters are never quenched by giving blood. Once they taste blood, they want more blood. Similarly, the capitalists are never satisfied with the profits they get. Ultimately the man-eater that has tasted blood will not rest till it tastes man himself. Any attempt to placate the man-eater by giving more blood will only stimulate his appetite and that is what the budget has done.

Let us take the whole pattern now. I am not going to discuss the individual proposals. This is not the time for that. Mr. Morarka very cleverly argued that what was given by one hand to the corporate sector was taken away by the other. I say, this is not relevant. It is not the Rs. 10 crores relief that is given that is relevant, but relief in what direction. Here I

say that the totality of the tax proposals goes against the very grain, the spirit of Industrial Policy Resolution, against the philosophy of the Plan and against everything that our national movement up till now stood for. What was the pattern envisaged in the Industrial Policy Resolution? It was, public sector to grow and private sector to be restricted to certain industries; and, foreign capital, when it is a must. We can have quarrel with speed of socialism—evolutionary socialism or revolutionary socialism. But if socialism is to have any meaning worth its name, it does mean continuous narrowing of the base of the private sector and continuous growth of the public sector.

My quarrel with the budget proposals is, first it gives a fillip to that very sector of the corporate sector which should have been reserved for public sector, namely, basic industries. 14 basic industries have been given concessions and the direction should have been to take over those industries absolutely from the private sector to the public sector. Then, a rebate has been given to inter-corporate investment. We have been talking about concentration of power. The eminent Professor Hazari has clearly shown that inter-corporate investment will not serve the economic purpose. They are only a vehicle for more and more concentration of control over industries. If you really wanted to break concentration of control, there was no case at all for giving a rebate on inter-corporate investment. By making inter-corporate investment more easy and more attractive, you have given up the premise of increased control over concentration of wealth that is going on.

I am not surprised at this. It is not for me to review the whole economy of the last. But let me review very rapidly what has happened in the last 8 months. The first point is, whom

does this Finance Minister represent? The *Eastern Economist* says, he is a man of profound thinking. Yesterday, the Finance sneered when Mr. Gopalan cited the *Patriot*. I think *Eastern Economist* is his friend, which praises him as a man of profound thinking, because the Finance Minister has stimulated the climate for foreign capital, both public and private.

May I remind the House that on the very day of his appointment, Tata steel increased by Rs. 5.5 and Century shares increased by Rs. 14? The *Capital* of December 19th says:

"There has been a spectacular rise in share prices since the return of TTK. Whatever one may say of the Kamaraj Plan, the stock market has been greatly benefited."

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** It is known that the share bazar has gone down.

**Shri Daji:** I am talking of his return to power. Have the Congress Members ever known that the Kamaraj Plan will be beneficial to many including the stock market?

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf:** Their hopes have been falsified.

**Shri Daji:** I do not think so. I will show you. The index of share price in 1963 was 111.1. On 1-3-1964 it was 119.9. That means an increase of 8.8 per cent within one year. This is a spectacular increase compared to any other period of the year. Sir, the *Commerce Annual* says "His policies have enured him to stock exchange". Why do they say so? Let us go through his policies—liberalisation of bank credit, over Rs. 150 crores more given to private sector between November and January, no use of any controls and have decontrol, no control over price rise, Development Bank and Unit Trust formed for aiding the private sector as has been owned by the Finance Minister himself in his speech, raising of exemption limit in licensing industries, sanctity for normal channels of

trade, philosophy of control given up and so on. What does his speech show? What does his statement say? He says: "control for distribution I do not believe; control for avoiding excess demand is the only type of control I believe." So the door is open to all Indian and foreign capital. This is his economic philosophy.

May I just recall, Sir, in passing, the interview given by the Finance Minister to the *London Economist*? What does he say? Six Chief Ministers spoke in Bhuvaneshwar in favour of bank nationalisation. Whether the Finance Minister agrees with it or not is a different matter. The question is, how he sneers at bank nationalisation. When the foreign correspondent of the *London Economist* asked him a question as to whether there is a growing public opinion in favour of bank nationalisation, he said: "No". "In the first place", says the Finance Minister, "the demand is being raised by a very small section". So, all those who spoke in favour of it at Bhuvaneshwar including the six Chief Ministers represent only a small section of public opinion in the view of the Finance Minister.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Why don't you speak about your own meetings? Why do you speak about Bhuvaneshwar?

**Shri Daji:** Why is the hon. Minister so touchy if I speak about Bhuvaneshwar?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** You have to speak about China and Russia.

**Shri Daji:** Why is he so touchy about it?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It is our business. Speak about your politics, and your politics are very wide.

**Shri Daji:** I will be satisfied for the present if you implement the policies adopted at Bhuvaneshwar. My quarrel is that you have thrown over-board even the Industrial Policy Resolution.



**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It is my business and not yours.

**Shri Daji:** Certainly not. The ruling party's policies are national policies and it is the business of every citizen to see that they are put into effect.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Your policies are those of other nation's. The ruling party's policies are national policies, the Communist Party's policies are those of other nation's. We agree.

**Shri Daji:** Sir, if my remarks hurt the Finance Minister, it only means that they are going home.

The Finance Minister has propounded a new theory. There are three elements in industries: ownership, control and management. He says there is no concentration of ownership. I challenge him on this, and I challenge him based on figures not from any Communist journal but from the Reserve Bank bulletin of May, 1962. Therein it is said that out of the total shareholders 0.5 shareholders control 56 per cent of the total share value. If this is not concentration of ownership, what is? There is half a per cent of the total shareholders owning 50 per cent of the share holding.

**Shri P. R. Patel (Patan):** Do you desire that the directors should have more shares, more than 50 per cent of the shares?

**Shri Daji:** It is the other way round. I will repeat what I said. Out of the total amount of shareholders 0.5 own more than 56 per cent of the total share value. If this is not concentration of ownership, what is? I have got many other figures about banks and other things in connection with the ownership concentration, but I will skip over them. Secondly, the Finance Minister has accepted—this is what the Reserve Bank of India says and not my verdict—that at least there is concentration of control. I want to ask, what concrete steps he has come forward with to check even this con-

centration of control. The rebate on inter-corporate dividend will only increase concentration of control. Admittedly, it will increase.

The only solution suggested is a Commission of Enquiry. I give all palms to the Finance Minister. He has out-Churchilled Churchill himself. Churchill said: "If you want to avoid an issue, refer the matter to a Committee". We have already had a committee sitting for more than three years. The report has not yet come. I know that the report of the Mahalanobis Committee is the most damaging to the Government, to the financial and economic policies of the Government. That is why he wants to shelve that report. That is why even before that report is placed on the Table of the House, he wants to place before the country and the House a promise for a further Enquiry Commission headed by a Judge. It will take another three years to submit its report. The Government will take a year to consider it. The House will then debate it for three days and then the Government will take its own time to implement it. Till that time, this concentration will continue. I want to know what steps the Government have taken on the known, exposed concentration of wealth? What steps have been taken on the results of the Dalmia-Jain enquiry over which the debate in this House was concluded a year back? No steps have been taken. What has happened to the Royal Asiatic Insurance Company enquiry? No steps have been taken. What has happened to the report of the Company Law Administration? No steps have been taken. What has happened to the opinion of Shastri and Daftary? No steps have been taken. Now you again come forward with a promise for a further enquiry. It only means that you do not want to tackle the issue of concentration of wealth, you only want to postpone it.

Then comes the question of foreign capital. I do not agree. I not only

disagree, but I think Shri Masani was more loyal than the king. Shri Masani said that foreign capital should be encouraged more, more incentives should be given, because it is not sufficiently remunerative now. It is not a question of my opinion versus Shri Masani's opinion. I am giving certain facts published by the U.S. Department of Commerce—from the horse's own mouth. Let us see how America looks at investment in India. This is what the U.S. Department of Commerce says: "Return after taxes on American investments in manufacturing enterprises in India was the highest". The return in 1962 was 20.6 per cent compared to 1961 when it was only 19.2 per cent. Then they have given a comparison. They have said that in western Europe American investment brought a return of 11.5 per cent, in Australia 7.1 per cent, in North America 4.3 per cent and Pakistan 3.5 per cent as against 20.6 per cent in India. This is what the State Department of Commerce in the United States says, and it was left to Shri Masani to be more loyal than the king and say that they want more encouragement. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has fallen in line with Shri Masani's thinking and he has given further concessions to foreign capital in India. What worries me more is not the tax concessions given, but the new policy orientation that he seeks to give.

About this, Sir, I have two quarrels before I come to my substantial quarrel with the proposals. My first quarrel with the Finance Minister is—I say it with the greatest respect but with all the confidence I possess—that he has not been honest with the House.

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** What do you mean by "honest with the House"?

**Shri Daji:** I can understand the opinion that foreign capital should be invited more and more in the country. If that is so, a detailed policy statement should have been laid before the House and an opportunity given

to this House to discuss it. It should not have been left vague in his Budget speech saying that more concessions will have to be given. How much more are sought to be given? We want to know that. There are various other things also. Our Industrial Policy Resolution lays down certain things. Various things crop up from the policy statement of the Finance Minister. Are we going to invite foreign capital in the public sector?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Would you be happy if the Finance Minister gets investments from Communist countries (*Interruption*)?

**Shri Daji:** Are you going to invite foreign private capital in our public sector? Last year a question was put to the then Finance Minister. Shri Morarji Desai, whether Government was going to allow private Indian Investment shares in the public sector. He said: "No". He also added: that was not the intention of the Government because that would go against the very spirit of public sector. Now, if foreign private investment is invited in the public sector, will it be in consonance with the spirit of public sector?

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf:** Selected industries.

**Shri Daji:** Have you decided it then? If the answer is in the affirmative, to what extent is it going to be done? Thirdly, on what terms is it going to be done? Fourthly, on what conditions of repatriation is it going to be done. Fifthly, what about possible nationalisation?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I will tell Mao all that.

**Shri Daji:** You will tell all that to Mao, but you dare not tell it to the House. That is what I call dishonesty. You cannot side-track the issue by again and again calling Mao and Chou. Chou and Mao are simmering in their own juice, and very soon with your policy you and your economic policies

[Shri Daji]

will also go in their juice if this continues. I say, come forward honestly before the House with a policy statement; let us discuss it.

15 hrs.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** So you deny your God.

**Shri Daji:** Another paper of the big bourgeois, *The Eastern Economist*, referring to the Finance Minister, says; we understand that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has got to do certain things under political pressure from the Congress Party. Therefore, says the editorial of the Annual Number of *The Eastern Economist*, you can achieve it through the by-way, if not through the high way. So, instead of doing it through the high way, they want to do it in the budget through the by-way and thereby subvert the Industrial Policy Resolution through the backdoor. That is why I say the Finance Minister has been dishonest to the House. Let him be honest enough to come forward with a separate industrial policy resolution, let us discuss it and take a decision; let us not subvert it quietly through the backdoor. That is what we object to.

Then, with regard to his philosophy, I join issue basically with his concept that more inflow of foreign capital will help the nation. I say: No. I am reading from the report of Shri G. L. Mehta, an eminent man.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** When did he become eminent in your eye?

**Shri Daji:** I meant eminent in your eyes. He says:

"We have come across cases where attempts have been made by collaborators to sell out-dated machinery including items of unnecessary equipment in the essential machinery line and making exaggerated claims regarding the potentialities of the plant."

I have so many examples before me. Take the oil industry. Do you know

the amount of profit that is taken out? It is accepted that 60 per cent is taken out by them. The saving of foreign exchange because of the oil companies being in India is Rs. 8 crores whereas the amount sent out on the crude oil that we bring is Rs. 200 crores. Therefore, it is not an unmixed formulation that foreign capital will always save you foreign exchange. It has got to be studied in detail as to in what industry you are allowing, in what form you are allowing, for how long you are allowing and what safeguards you are providing. For example, we hear these days that a lot of tomtomming is going on about Bokaro that there is a demand by a private American interest. . .

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Nothing of that sort. I think it is a fabrication by you and your friends.

**Shri Daji:** Very well. I am thankful to you for the information. Then, I want to say one thing. The Finance Minister has contradicted a statement adduced to him about a letter written to the World Bank. I have read his contradiction.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** You inspired it, naturally.

**Shri Daji:** Very good. I want to pose certain points. You say you did not leak out the budget. I take it and I accept your word as a gentleman.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** What is it? I want to know.

**Shri Daji:** You said you did not, and I accept it.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** What is it that you are accepting?

**Shri Daji:** There was a report which you have denied and I accept your denial.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** But that report is your fabrication.

**Shri Daji:** I accept your denial. But why are you so afraid of my referring to it? Why are you so afraid of my speech.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Because it is all your fabrication.

**Shri Daji:** But I want to know one thing. Is it not a fact that in a note prepared by the hon. Finance Minister and submitted to the Economic Sub-Committee of the Cabinet it was mentioned that even the consumer industries were thrown open to private foreign businessmen. Is it not a fact that there was reference to it in the Sub-Committee? Is it not a fact that the letter to the World Bank...

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** (Nagpur): Sir, on a point of order. I want to know how my hon. friend has come into possession of this information. What is his source?

**Shri Daji:** It is not in the public interest to disclose it.

**Shri Raghunath Singh** (Varanasi): Public interest can be invoked only by the Government, not by the opposition.

**Shri Daji:** If I am wrong, I am open to correction. Is it not a fact that this letter to the World Bank was written even before the Economic Sub-Committee meeting?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** What is the letter that was issued?

**Shri Daji:** I want to know that. If you place the whole thing on the Table of the House, the entire country will know it. That is my demand. I think that public interest requires that you do it. Further, is it not a fact that a lot has been said nowadays about the Finance Minister discussing about the purchase of aircraft?

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha):** I would invite the attention of the hon. Member to a newspaper

report this morning, which was a denial by the Finance Ministry, which says that no such letter has been issued. He should accept it.

**Shri Daji:** Perhaps, the hon. Deputy Minister was not very attentive to my speech. I said that my attention was drawn to it. What I say is that he has not denied that a letter has been sent. The statement merely says that what is reported is not correct. Therefore, what I would urge on the Finance Minister is to lay all the papers on the Table of the House.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I write many things.

**Shri Daji:** Then it is stated that the Finance Minister is negotiating about the purchase of aircrafts. What is this? Even the Defence Minister has not got that power. All powers are concentrated in one man. I take this opportunity to make this point—it has come up again and again in this House during this session—that the Government seems to be absolutely in sixes and sevens, with Ministers at cross-purposes and cross-policies, Government moving forward like a rudderless ship because the captain has taken leave. That appears to be the position, the picture..... (*Interruptions*). More and more powers are being usurped by the so-called Economic Ministry, subverting all other Ministries and their policies.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He should conclude.

**Shri Daji:** I will take another five minutes.

Before I close, I will only read out a warning given by a member of the Congress Party.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** By whom?

**Shri Daji:** Please bear with me for a minute; have patience.

"A country may appear to be free and independent if you consult geography or Atlas but if you look behind the veil you will find that it is under the grip of

[Shri Daji]

another country. It is this invisible empire that US possesses. This ingenious method is known as economic imperialism. The map does not show it. Through the control of wealth...

Please note the words "through the control of wealth"

"...it is easy enough to control the people of that country and indeed the land itself."

These are the words of a great Indian, no one less than the Prime Minister of India, and these are prophetic words.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Others can also quote scripture, is it not?

**Shri Daji:** Yes, as you are trying again and again to quote Mao's name.

PL 480 has proved how powerful it is because a large chunk of our fluid currency is controlled by USA, a discussion on which we had only during last session. When more and more investments are coming in, what is going to happen? There is one other aspect that I want to place before the House. Professor Mahalanobis Committee report has pointed out that one of the causes of increased concentration of control is the foreign collaboration obtained by big business in India. The more foreign collaboration we obtain, the more we become under the grip of....

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Sir, on a point of order. The report of Mahalanobis Committee has not yet been published.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** It came in the papers.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may leave it to the Finance Minister to reply.

**Shri Daji:** Foreign collaboration by local big business results in increased

concentration of wealth and concentration of control. So, even from this point of view, this influx of foreign capital, this subversion of the Industrial Policy Resolution, is dangerous.

Have we forgotten the factory of Surat? Have we forgotten Fort St. William? Have we forgotten that from holy marriage between indigenous and foreign capital are born Mir Kassims and Mir Jaffers of history? By throwing open the flood gates for foreign capital to come to India, by permitting the local big business to enter into collaboration with foreign concerns, by permitting them to have concentration of wealth and concentration of control and not only economic but political power you are creating a situation where modern Mir Jaffers and Mir Kassims will come to the scene, who will not flinch from selling the independence and democracy of our country for their own benefit.

Therefore, I submit this is a budget of despair, this is a budget which admits failure. The basic task before the nation is, how is this economic growth rate to increase. That is the basic and crucial thing. Even for bringing our country's starving millions away from the starvation development level by 1967, the economic growth rate has to be increased by 7 or 8 per cent, as the Ooty Seminar has pointed out. We cannot achieve this 7 per cent increase by the present policies.

There are two paths clearly laid out. One is the path of socialist orientation of our policies, broadly discussed at Bhubaneswar, a path which goes forward, a path of attacking monopoly, expansion of the public sector, land reforms, socialist orientation of the consumer goods production, distribution, wages and prices. The other method is inviting foreign capital because we cannot do the job.

Therefore, I say this is a negative budget, a budget of despair, a budget

which accepts Government's failure to raise the necessary internal resources, power and strength from the nation itself for building up the climate or atmosphere for the necessary economic growth. It is a budget which abrogates the responsibility to the people, it is a budget which subverts the Industrial Policy Resolution and the national policies. Here the issue is not between the so-called Left and the so-called Right in the Congress. The issue is not between socialism and no socialism. Here the issue is between independent development and dependent economy, mortgaged, and pledged to foreign capital.

Therefore, this is a Budget which connives at and fosters concentration. In its totality this Budget endangers not only the socialist objective but our very independent national development and, therefore, democracy itself because growth and concentration of economic power are bound to have an impact on the political power. To the people it gives the shadow, to the capitalists it gives the substance.

Therefore, a new perspective is opened out—the perspective of broad unity irrespective of ideology. I recall, as a part of the entire national movement we fought against the British Imperialism not only to drive out the political power but also to unseize their economic power. Let us not bring back that economic power through the backdoor. Therefore a new perspective is opened for a broad democratic unity between all persons who want to defend India's independent economic development, infant democracy and social justice to the people. That, Sir, is my quarrel with the Budget.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Subodh Hansda. Absent. Shri Shiv Charan Gupta. Absent. Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj.

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with the Economic Survey and the policy statement which the hon. Finance Minister presented to the House I do not think anybody can find any fault. But as

far as the implementation of those statements and the policy for giving re-orientation to the fiscal measures are concerned, to my mind the hon. Finance Minister has proceeded reluctantly and rather haltingly. The drastic changes in the basic fiscal structure which are being brought about every second and third year result in a lack of confidence in the taxpayer's mind and also hampers the general growth and development.

The hon. Leader of the Communist Party while talking the other day mentioned about monopolies. I would agree that if there is a monopoly, it has to be seen, properly controlled and directed in a manner so that it does not become injurious to the interests of the nation and the people. But in a planned, controlled and protected economy where is the monopoly? When the country can plan out first and then all the industries are controlled and licensed, other industries if they are smaller are also protected then the injury of monopoly is not there. Moreover, prices are also controlled and distribution can also be directed and controlled. Under these circumstances, the injury of monopoly does not exist and we can take advantage of people who have the talent, the gift and the necessary knowledge for building up the country for the growth, progress and development of the country. If people are only to be frightened by the word 'monopoly', I have nothing to say. But whatever worse things monopoly can carry, let us examine whether they are free to do it. In spite of that the hon. Finance Minister has appointed a commission and I am very happy that he has done that. If there is concentration anywhere and if the policy needs to be changed as far as planning, control and protection to rival industries are concerned, that has to be remedied. But the hon. Finance Minister and the Government are quite alert to that; that is very apparent.

I have no quarrel whether it is a leftist Budget or a rightist Budget;

[Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj]

whether it is a socialist Budget or a capitalist Budget. People may name it any way they like.

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar):**  
Or midway between the two.

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** It may be midway or even the third way. I would like to see whether the Budget can enthuse the spirit and create a favourable atmosphere so that goods are produced in the country and development goes ahead. We have two enemies on our borders and, as it has been said, they are friends today. There is a danger all the time and within whatever time that is available to us if we can build up our industries to strengthen not only our defence but also for our general economic welfare, we must not lose that time. I would like to judge the Budget from the point of view of whether whatever talent that is available in the country for developing the country is given full scope and impetus so that we can develop our country fast. If you want to take away wealth from them, it can be taken away any time, the day you like. That is entirely different. But if the talent that is available is frustrated and is not given the scope, the time and opportunity to develop our nation, I think, not only the general growth will be impaired but it will lag behind and also our defence and our resources will not be built up to the extent we ought to build in the face of the danger from the Communist country and also from Pakistan.

Therefore, to my mind, whether the objective before our country is socialism or whatever ism it is, there are two things, namely, whether our priority is for fighting poverty, ignorance, illiteracy and disease of whether we should give priority to removal of disparity. We want to achieve both the things and we should achieve them. But disparities cannot be removed altogether; complete disparity has not been removed even in Russia. But it can be lessened. Now,

should we take that as the foremost step and should priority be given for removal of disparity as far as that is possible, or should we take the first step to remove poverty, disease and ignorance? Where is the emphasis? When one section of people in the Congress place the emphasis on the one thing and another section on the other thing, our friends in the Communist Party think that there is a division in the Congress. It is a question of emphasis and priority. To my mind, we should remove poverty first and if we can take the help and assistance of those people who can help us in removing that poverty, there is nothing wrong about it.

Seth Govind Das made a very valuable point which I have also been saying many times and that is that real happiness is not found anywhere, whether it is among the poor or the rich. To my mind, the ills of life are because mostly our economy is money-oriented, materialistic, developing economy. Unless some moral and spiritual values are added and we reorientate economic development accordingly so that the spirit of sacrifice and contentment is there, I do not think we can really get real happiness, peace and contentment in the country because we will have only material progress and if there is only material progress and the emphasis is there, it naturally leads to corruption and malpractices because in such an economy and in such an atmosphere people think that wealth and money value are the most important and other things are relatively less important. If Gandhiji had succeeded, more than anybody else it was in creating a climate of spiritual thought and he gave moral fibre to the country. I think, where we are failing is that we are losing that moral and spiritual fibre that we should have in the atmosphere. If we could do that, I suppose, many of our ills will be removed.

Now I come to the Budget proposals. The Super Profits Tax has been

removed, but instead the Surtax has been brought about. While for the Super Profits Tax the base was smaller, that is, only the capital and the reserves, in the case of the Surtax the base has been made a little wider and 10 per cent has been allowed in respect of this. While it appears to be 4 per cent it is not exactly 4 per cent because the base is wider. If you take the interest paid on loans and other things, these days you have to pay interest which amounts to  $7\frac{1}{2}$ , 8 or  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent or whatever it is. So, the difference is only the additional advantage or the facility that has been given. As regards the S.P.T., when the base was calculated 10 per cent of the taxable profit was also allowed to be calculated. But that facility is not there in respect of the Surtax. Also, in S.P.T. if there was a deficiency in any particular year, that deficiency was allowed to be carry-forward next year. This is also not provided for in this Surtax. As regards 23A Companies, the super tax has been increased by 9 to 10 per cent and because of those selective industries where the Finance Minister has given some facility under Part IV of the Schedule I of the Finance Bill, the taxes of those 23A Companies have not only been increased but they have also to pay the dividend tax. So, both ways the taxes have been increased. Apart from that, the tax on dividend, according to me, is non-ethical tax. If according to Vinobha Bhave or Sarva Sewa Sangh, money should not earn anything, it should not be allowed to earn interest, if the Government takes that view and enunciates a policy of that kind that only the human labour alone should be rewarded by money and that money should not be allowed to earn interest, I would entirely agree with that. But as long as that policy is not accepted, you might as well have a tax on salaries and say that of the salaries Bill that you pay in a particular company, certain percentage will be taxed. Now, people have made investment with the knowledge that this investment is to give them some return. Even without paying that legitimate return, you tax. It is a non-ethical tax, accord-

ing to me. I agree that after whatever you think is reasonable, after providing that reasonable return on investment, if the higher return was given and if you were taxing it, it was quite in order. Last time when the Finance Minister introduced the dividend tax, 6 per cent of the dividend was allowed tax-free. But this time—I do not know why—he did not think it proper to do so.

Now, Sir, the Compulsory Deposit Scheme has been discontinued and in place of that the Finance Minister has brought in the Annuity Deposit Scheme. The removal of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, as far as the lower slabs are concerned, is a distinct relief. The lower-middle class and the middle-class has benefited by it. I think, they needed the relief much more than anybody else. To that extent, I am very happy. But under the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, the interest was tax-free. Here, under the Annuity Deposit Scheme, the interest is not made tax-free. While it is said that under the Annuity Deposit Scheme, whatever you deposit is exempted from the tax but when you receive the instalment, that instalment is added to your income and it is taxed at that stage. Instalment should be exempted from tax. To my mind the Annuity Deposit Scheme is a redundant tax and unnecessarily it will involve administrative work. After ten years, supposing somebody's income is stationary, in the eleventh year, he will be paying to the Government the same amount and receiving the same amount from the Government because of the instalment that he has to receive back. In that respect, it will be redundant or as is called in Hindi *gorakh-dhandha*. It is the administrative difficulties that he has taken on his hand. If he really wants to have the Annuity Deposit Scheme, let him have it. But why pay the instalments annually? Why not fix a particular year, or at the age of 60, or whatever it is, or at the time of death, when you can pay it in one



[Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj]

instalment or in five instalments or whatever the number may be? If you do so, it will be much more helpful to the assessee and also to the administration because lot of clerical work will be removed.

Then, Sir, Expenditure Tax has also been introduced this year. It was there already. As I have said, if every two or three years the fiscal policy is re-oriented in a different way, it creates a lack of confidence in the minds of the taxpayer. Last time, when the Expenditure Tax was introduced, the previous year's expenditure was not included. But this time, apart from the highest slab, the previous year is also included. The expenditure incurred in the current year will also be taxed which, I think, is not quite right or proper. It is not going to yield much of the tax either, but instead a lot of clerical work will be involved.

The Estate Duty has been enhanced by more than double, about 85 per cent and so on. If it is necessary, it should be done. I have no grievance because there will be hardly few people who will be paying death duty at that rate. It has been calculated in the Budget itself that the share of the Estate Duty to the Central Government will be Rs. 5 lakhs only. So, if it amounts only to that, it will only lead to a certain amount of discontent and bitterness and if such a heavy tax is levied, it will only induce people to go in for more mal-practices and corruption. When we want to remove corruption and so on, why are we driving people to take to more methods of corruption and mal-practices and so on and so forth? If you want to take away the money, it should have been done in a gradual way. But this, to my mind, is a legalised expropriation or confiscation of money. You can do that because you are empowered in every possible way. But it is not fair to do so. In the Lok Sabha, I think, hardly about two or three people would be, if at all, in a position to pay when they die. Under these

circumstances, I think, if we want to remove corruption . . .

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Gurdaspur): Who are they?

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** I do not think it would be proper to name them. The Finance Minister would be a more proper person to tell about them because I do not know the details and it would not be proper on my part to give those names.

The main thing is this. We would like to generate the climate and atmosphere and enthuse the spirit by which our country can develop faster industrially and economically. If that is to be done, whatever the readjustment has been done, on the whole the Finance Minister has not given that much of impetus to the whole atmosphere. It is apparent because the share bazaar, on the whole, has gone down. If certain selective scrips have gone up, it is because of some of the concession which have been given to the selective industries. In this respect, I think the Finance Minister has done very well. He has chosen some industries which are more important from the country's point of view. There we may differ. That is a different thing. But the principle to select industries which are more important from the country's point of view and given them some more relief is a good principle. Apart from the industries that he has added, I would like him to add to that list the transport industry, the engineering and chemical industries and also the sugar industry because there are some of the industries which are really going to help us in many ways. The sugar industry will help in the cooperative sector and also the cane-grower and also the engineering and the chemical industries deserve more than anything else.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** The budget which is before us was introduced by the

Finance Minister with a speech in which he had laid down the general principles which those who have got some knowledge of economics would easily accept as the correct ones. And probably, his idea in introducing all those big principles of economics in his speech was that his budget should be judged by the people in the light of those principles which he had enunciated therein. That may have been his idea, but I find that people come with their own ideas whenever they approach the question here, and we find that those who take a different view do not try to understand the view put forth by the person who has made the proposals, but he brings to bear certain other considerations. That is the difficulty.

In my opinion, the speech at least, apart from the proposals which he has made, has given us a correct idea of the approach which the Finance Minister has got while framing his proposals.

15.32 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

But what I find is this that it is rather difficult for a layman to appreciate the budget proposals. I am not an economist in the true sense of the term, but I am a layman, and I want to approach this budget from the point of view of a layman. Some people want to approach it from the point of view of the resolution on democratic socialism which was passed at Bhubaneswar. Some others want to approach it from some other point of view, but I want to approach this budget from the point of view of a layman and nothing more than that.

The one thing that strikes me most in this budget is this that the hon. Finance Minister was really lucky when he accepted this job and had to present this budget, because he had not to face the deficit of about Rs. 16 crores that was anticipated in the budget by the former Finance Minister who had framed the proposals for 1963-64, but on account of certain

things that have happened we find that there has been a tremendous increase on the revenue side and a decrease on the expenditure side, so that he got a considerable windfall, so to say, which made it convenient for him to get a good surplus or to show a good surplus in his budget. For example, he has stated that instead of the deficit of about Rs. 16.22 crores at the end of the current year, he will have a surplus of Rs. 88.34 crores according to the revised estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, which means that there has been a net increase in revenue and a decrease in expenditure in 1963-64. This was indeed a very lucky thing for him.

With this big surplus that is expected in 1963-64, what do we find in the budget estimates? The budget estimates for 1964-65 place the total revenue receipts at Rs. 20,95,12,28,000 and the expenditure figure at Rs. 20,41,30,96,000. This shows that without having recourse to any measures of additional taxation, he could have got the money needed for the whole expenditure that he wanted to incur, because according to the figures supplied he would have a surplus in his hand of about Rs. 53.81 crores, or to be exact, Rs. 53,81,32,000. On account of the additional taxation proposals which he has made and placed before us, he would be able to get about Rs. 40.27 crores more. That means, that, so to say, there is a surplus of about Rs. 94.08 crores in his hands. Lest there should be any possibility of my having misunderstood him or misinterpreted him on this point, I would quote the relevant portion from his own budget speech. At page 18 of Part B of his speech, the hon. Finance Minister has stated:

“As a result of all the changes I have proposed in the direct taxes, there will be an additional revenue of Rs. 15 crores to the Centre. The abolition of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme and the introduction of Annuity Deposit Scheme will result in a net credit of Rs. 50 crores in 1964-65 on the

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

capital side after allowing for a drop of Rs. 7 crores in the accretion to the Iron and Steel Equalisation Fund.

The combined effect of the changes in taxes and deposits will be a net gain to revenue of Rs. 40 crores and to capital of Rs. 50 crores . . . . .".

So, there is a net gain of about Rs. 90 crores on both capital and revenue sides put together.

Then, he proceeds to say:

"Given the present economic situation, to which I have referred earlier, this order of deficit, I think, should serve the best the requirements of growth as well as reasonable stability in prices."

My point is that the fact that there is this extraordinary surplus of about Rs. 94 crores means that Government are taking from the people so many rupees more than is needed by them for the sake of running their administration according to their own ideas. This is what it means. This sum of Rs. 94 crores is a burden upon the people of India. Taking the population of India as about 43 crores, it works out to a burden of about Rs. 2.3 per man. That is the burden that each person has to bear not for the sake of running the administration, not for getting a proper administration of the country but for the sake of allowing in the hands of the hon. Finance Minister a surplus of about Rs. 94 crores.

What does this burden of Rs. 2.3 per man mean? The average income of an individual has been variously described in various reports, but I shall give the figure from the Government's own publication which I have got in my pocket, and which places it at about Rs. 326 per year. Rs. 326 is the *per capita* annual income on an average. This works out to a daily income of about nine annas. So, we find that a person whose daily

income is about nine annas is called upon to contribute to the treasury Rs. 2.3 per year for the sake of allowing the Finance Minister to have a comfortable surplus in his hands to manipulate on. As every hon. Member knows, there has been a debate in this House several times on the high prices, on the rise in prices and so on. This sum of nine annas daily is not enough for a person to feed himself properly, and is not enough to enable him to have even one good meal, not to speak of other things. Leaving aside the big classes and the common man who may have benefited in some way, the bulk of the population consists of those people whose income is evidently much below nine annas a day, because the figure of nine annas is only on the average. So, it is the famished and starving people of India who are called upon to bear this burden of Rs. 2.3 a year. So, what we would have expected from the hon. Finance Minister was this. His sympathies should have gone towards those people, in order to give relief to them, instead of trying to add to the treasury balances to the extent of Rs. 40 crores or so. These Rs. 40 crores could have been obtained by streamlining the administration or by effecting economies in administration. We hear that these poor people are intending to have *morchas* and so on, and this kind of situation could have been avoided, if only relief could have been given to them. This is what I would like to urge

So, I would submit that the budget, though framed with the best of intentions and with a proper and scientific approach also has failed to give relief to those persons to whom such relief was very much necessary.

On this point, I also want to draw the attention of my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, to a dictum of the late Prof. Gokhale. I was glad that in today's debate a reference was made by my hon. friend, Shri S. S. More, to Prof. Gokhale. I have not got the full text of what Prof. Gokhale

had said, but I remember the gist of it. He used to say that nothing is more dangerous than to have in the hands of the Government a big surplus, because that takes away from the spirit of running the administration and carrying on economically and using the money for the benefit of the people and effecting retrenchment in expenditure. A surplus in the hands of Government goes against that spirit.

Now one of the principles which the hon. Finance Minister has enunciated is the need for Government, along with an attempt to find resources for the nation's needs, to observe the principle of strict economy and try to retrench unnecessary expenditure. That may be there. But with such a big surplus in the hands of Government, this incentive for economy goes away.

We already find in the running of so many institutions and corporations—I have not the time to go into details; if I had time, I could have read from the reports of the Public Accounts Committee several cases—that most of those persons in charge of those corporations have been reckless in dealing with the money placed at their disposal. So when this big surplus in the hands of Government goes to those people, there is more chance of their being lavish in expenditure than being economical in their use for the welfare of the people.

Here I want to make a reference to one principle which has been laid down in our ancient tenets of economics and polity.

प्रजानामेव भृत्यर्थम्, स ताम्यो बलिभंगहीत्,  
सहस्रं गुणं मुत्सुष्टुम् आदत्ते ही रसम् रविः ।

The principle of taxation has been recognised and sanctified in our ancient economic tenets. You realise taxes from the people for their own welfare, not for your glory. And how was it to be used? It was to be used as the sun takes the waters from the seas and returns it a thousand fold to

the earth. It is in that spirit that taxes have to be realised from the people. A cultivator sows one seed in the land; in return he gets a hundredfold. It is in that spirit that the ruling party, the administration, has to manage the money taken from the people. That is why it has been stated:

तन्मिना शोभन्ते गलित विभवाः चार्थिषु नृपाः

'Kings look more graceful when their treasures are emptied for the welfare of the needy and poor'. This is the principle which we want the ruling party to observe. We are the persons who created a democratic body. We want them to keep in view these old principles of economy along with the principles of modern economy. Ancient Indian economy requires them to use public money in such a way as to enable them to return it a hundredfold or a thousandfold to the people in the form of benefits and welfare schemes. That is the idea.

While on this point, there are two or three small points of an administrative nature which I wish to make before winding up my speech. The first is this. If we have to run government properly, we have to see that not only the people are pleased but those whom they employ to run the administration are also pleased. I find that most of the servants in technical lines who have taken up government jobs want to run away and find jobs in the private sector. There is a great tendency in that direction. The result is that at a time when Government stands in need of the largest numbers of technicians for the various projects, the men they have trained for the purpose try to run away and join elsewhere. So they must look into the matter and see what are the grievances of the persons who are serving as technicians in the public sector and remove those grievances. One of the things which has come to my notice and which I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister is that the

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

Atomic Energy Department, which has been in existence for the last 15 years, is still treated as a temporary department. Not being a permanent department, many of the benefits and privileges which go to the employees of permanent departments, are denied to the employees of the Atomic Energy Department.

There are several other departments like this. I say this is bad economy. It is a bad policy to keep your servants who function in these big projects in a state of suspense in regard to their future, so much so that they feel it is better to go away and join some private master. This is a point which I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Finance Minister.

There is another thing. In the present situation confronting us on our borders, Pakistan and China are thinking of doing something which constitutes a potential of great danger to India. What is the way for us to get out of it? Recently, we have found that our old friends, the UK and US, who came to our help at a critical time during the Chinese invasion, have been now lukewarm in their attitude. Why is it so? My own idea is that it is the attitude of the Government of India which is responsible for this. It is the attitude of the Government of India itself towards undoing the wrong which has been inflicted on us by China, the way we are trying to proceed in that matter, that has created the impression that India does not want to fight to undo the wrong done to us but want others to do that for us. There the difficulty comes. Unless you are yourselves prepared to shed your own blood to regain your position, there would be no enthusiasm among people who are your friends to come to your rescue. This is the reason why the UK and US, which came to your help at the critical time are now showing a very peculiar attitude, an attitude about which we feel so much anxious.

I want the Government to take note of this situation. Also in administering the country, greater attention should be paid to create a live interest among the people, create a patriotic attitude of giving something for the country. At the same time, they should see to it that the surplus that is there in the hands of the Government, the money that the Government has taken from the people, should be better and more usefully spent, for the benefit and welfare of the people.

**Shrimati Vijaya Raje** (Chatra): Madam Chairman, at the outset, I would like to say that I am not an economist, nor do I profess to be an expert on financial matters. But I claim to know the acute hardships and abject poverty of those who have elected me to represent them here. It is with this aspect in view that I would like to say a few words on the budget proposals. We were anxiously looking forward to the Budget, and the rural population too had been eagerly looking forward to some relief by way of cheaper food and cheaper clothes. But I regret that the Budget in this respect has proved to be both a great disappointment and a betrayal of the hopes and aspirations of the common man.

Unfortunately, the Finance Minister has not given any express indication of controlling the prices of daily necessities, the burden of which is reacting sharply on the common man.

The food prices have not declined, and the price of cloth has already registered an upward rise, and threatens to rise even further.

The abolition of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, reduction of the rates of income-tax on the various slabs, abolition of Super Profits Tax and certain excise duties are no doubt welcome features of the Budget, but on closer scrutiny it is apparent that the Government has taken much more by the left hand than what little it has given by the

right hand. The drastic upward revision of the Estate Duty, the Gift Tax, the Wealth Tax and the new Surtax, rob the charm of the over-all relief given to the tax-payer. The Budget, therefore, is a poor attempt at mitigating the seething discontent with little doses of mercy. Unless the impact of economic growth is felt by a considerable section of the people, these Plans and surveys will carry little conviction with the people.

Whether the Government explains the shortfalls by statistics or tries to make them up by increased taxation, the fact remains that the lot of the common man will still remain unchanged. The common man is being deprived of the basic necessities of life and is being slowly and systematically crushed under the increasing indirect taxes levied by the Central Government. He is a victim, I should say, of all the ill-advised thinking of the Government.

Instead of producing food, the Government is wasting its time in socialisation of food distribution and controls, which have been the bane of our economy. Even the Minister of Community Development is said to have complained that the lack of progress in the rural sector is due to too much centralised planning. It is a thousand pities that in an agricultural country like ours, agriculture should have been so criminally mismanaged for the sake of the Government's planned economy.

However, I am glad that the Prime Minister has, even at this late stage, changed his views on the subject at least. Addressing a meeting of the National Development Council on 8th November last year, he said:

"People seem to think that an industrial plant solves all the problems, which it does not. At the present moment in India, whichever way you start, you come back to agriculture. We dare not be slack about it as we have been. I am afraid."

Even Mr. Khrushchev, in November 1962, said at the Communist Party Central Committee that it was old-fashioned to regard steel as the only measure of modern economy.

Industry seems to have fared no better. Here, too, because of the Government's socialistic policies, the State sector is pitched against the interests of the country. Though the performance of the State sector leaves much to be desired, yet the investment in this sector seems to be on the ascent. In the First Plan it was 46 per cent, in the Second it was 54 per cent, and in the Third it is estimated at 61 per cent. I am afraid that with the new taxation measures, the Finance Minister will be accelerating the speed of State monopoly in all economic fields, and will eventually succeed in completely eliminating private enterprise from the industrial map of India.

It would be interesting to pause for a moment to think whether the performance of the State sector has been commensurate with the progressively increasing investments in that sector. Apart from incurring huge losses, there is hardly anything worth mentioning on the credit side. By way of illustration, I would like to quote a few instances.

According to a news item in February, 1963, the State Trading Corporation and the Atomic Energy Commission had created a muddle trying to outbid each other in Japan over the export of ilmenite, resulting in a loss of one crore of rupees worth of foreign exchange.

In the NCDC, another major public sector concern, while the sales went up from Rs. 282.30 lakhs to Rs. 1,317.65 lakhs between 1956-57 and 1961-62, profits in the same period declined from Rs. 25.92 lakhs to Rs. 11.89 lakhs.

The Comptroller and Auditor-General of India, in his Audit Report (Commercial), 1963, has stated, after analysing the financial result of 46 Government companies as on March, 1962,

[Shrimati Vijaya Rajé]

that on an employed capital of Rs. 1,090.75 crores, the net result of operation of all these companies shows a loss of Rs. 10.60 crores.

According to the same report, the three steel plants of Bhilai, Durgapur and Rourkela had together incurred a loss of Rs. 40 crores.

The yield of the public sector is therefore a matter of concern, since the resources employed there would have yielded better results elsewhere, had the money remained with the people.

In comparison, the private sector has to its credit the development of a wide range of industries. We learn from responsible quarters that during the first decade of planning, not only has the private sector developed various industries, but it has provided additional employment for over one million persons. In the first two Plans, the whole of the private sector undertook 50 per cent of the national investment and produced more than 80 per cent of the additional income in that period. So, private enterprise has proved to be not only an essential, but an effective part of our economy, and, therefore, I hope the Government will not continue to take an unfriendly attitude towards this sector. Mr. Eugene Black has rightly observed that people must come to accept private enterprise not as a necessary evil, but an affirmative good.

I would now like to turn to a very disturbing factor which is greatly agitating the public mind. That is the growing corruption that is spreading like cancer and destroying whatever good that is left in us. Today, there is not a single department of administration at the Centre or in the States which is free from this malady. I feel that there are two major factors which promote this evil, the system of control and the plethora of laws and regulations which result in the concentration of power in the hands of the administration at all levels. My

submission, therefore, is that in order to eradicate this evil we should do away with the licence-permit-quota system as this is the breeding ground of all corruption.

16 hrs.

**Shri Tyagi** (Dehra Dun): May I know to which Party this hon. Member belongs? (An Hon. Member: Why? Swatantra Party). She is too good to belong to the Swatantra Party.

**Shrimati Vijaya Rajé:** Even Gandhiji was against the idea of controls. If the ruling party is really serious about ending corruption, they must get at the root of this trouble. Unless we remove controls or reduce them upto the level called for by international trade and exchange pressures, no amount of pious resolutions are going to yield the desired results. Secondly, we must have men of unquestionable integrity occupying places of big positions. They must be persons to whom people could look to with genuine respect. Unfortunately our Ministers and Deputy Ministers have not set any shining examples in this respect. It is an open secret that some of the Ministers and more so their deputies enjoy a standard of living which will put to shame even the most ostentatious living in our country. I hope and trust that the Finance Minister will be able to successfully apply the provisions of the expenditure tax to his colleagues and high officials in order to curb the mode of living which is obviously far beyond their legitimate means. We have seen how an innocent Bill like the one moved by Shri Kamath calling for a periodical declaration of the Ministers' assets was defeated though it drew powerful support from some of the eminent Members of the Congress Party. It is all very well to say that these declarations are made at the time of elections; some may even have the knack to explain their gains to the Congress High

Command but would this deceive the general public? Standards which are incompatible with the salaries of the ministers and their deputies do tend to give rise to doubts that money from doubtful sources go to swell the coffers of these ministers. It will remain a curious fact of history that this Government has failed to find a satisfactory solution to any of our major problems in spite of sixteen years of undisturbed rule. The only redeeming feature of this regime is the inexhaustible patience of the poor docile tax payer which has helped him to survive in the face of sixteen years of democratic tyranny.

**Shrimati Savitri Nigam:** There is no doubt that the hon. Finance Minister has won the appreciation of the common man by putting a very cautiously arranged and cleverly woven budget before the country. The overall reaction of the people at large has been that of 'relief'. But before throwing too many bouquets on him we who are supposed to be the watchdogs of this democracy and whom the teeming millions of our country have their trust to mould the policies not only for the governing of the country at present but to take the country on to the path of peace, progress and prosperity in future have to examine and scrutinise every aspect of this Budget very carefully to ensure that this Budget is not a juggler's paradise which gives temporary happiness or relief but is economically and ethically a sound budget and is capable of producing a self-generating economy. In my opinion there are four tests to justify the soundness of a budget. Let us first see whether this Budget is in complete consonance with the declared and accepted policies of the Government and how far and how effectively it takes the country to that direction of fulfilling the plan of growth of a socialist economy. Another important feature of a useful budget which could be a strong economic instrument is its revolutionary capability of removing, curbing and eliminating economic evils such as vulgar

2307 (Ai) LSD—8.

monopolies in the industrial and financial sector, greedy controls of the three fourth of the national wealth of the country by seven or eight families as well as the black money which circulates in the underworld and creates a number of economic hazards like speculation in food-grains and other essential goods which makes a sort of prize gods who dictate prices, which has made this country a middle man's paradise. If the hon. Minister thinks that the mere imposition of slightly higher rates of tax on gifts and estate duty is going to remove ageold disparities and inequalities, he is very much mistaken. If he is under the impression that a few reforms in Income-tax Act are going to change the ferocious lions into honest milch cows and their ageold habit of tax evasion could be changed overnight, he is very wrong in his assessment. I wish that an intellectual and a great economist and an eminent administrator like him should have incorporated some effective steps to unearth this black money. He should have taken more stern steps to curb the economic evils of Chronic types such as hoarding, speculating, misuse of the money by the bankers, etc. He should have taken some stricter steps to break these monopolies and imperialistic control of a couple of people of the entire wealth. Are we going to establish a socialistic society without getting these tremendous resources released? I am unable to understand how this Commission is going to remove monopolies unless some declarations about concrete steps to be taken by the Finance Minister are announced just now. I am sure that an experienced and mature politician like him knows which are the monopolies and how to break them. By this Commission, action will only be delayed. So, I request him not to indulge himself in the formation of these Commissions and omissions. He should directly and immediately taken action to break these monopolies.

I would like to submit very humbly that the hon. Finance Minister has



[Shrimati Savitri Nigam]

made a very half-hearted effort to fulfil the tall claims and bold declarations which were made at Bhuvanewar. No mention has been made as to what the special steps are that would be taken to provide these five minimum needs; how much more money is going to be provided to create more jobs for the unemployed people. Unless we start it now, how are we going to fulfil the need before the end of the fifth Five Year Plan? What are those special steps which will be taken to utilise the vast manpower and untapped material resources to establish a prosperous and self-generating economy? I would like to submit that no financial provisions have been made in this budget to utilise the vast manpower which is just wasting itself.

I would cite only one example. There are about 90 lakhs of physically handicapped and crippled people in our country and they are a dead-weight on our economy. No care has been taken to rehabilitate them. I was surprised to see in this budget that while the amount of money that was earmarked for this purpose formerly was Rs. 20,000, it has been decreased to Rs. 19,000 for this year. I would like to suggest the pattern which has been adopted by many developed countries. Take the case of America. In America, they are spending 23 billion dollars for the rehabilitation and education of the handicapped people and they are realising about 25 million dollars from these handicapped people in the form of income-tax. If such steps could be taken in our country, I am sure a lot of gain could be made and the production could be increased a great deal, and all these people who are a dead-weight on our economy could become productive units.

In the same way, I would also like to mention that there are thousands of our neglected sisters who are just victims of the worse type of exploitation. If these people could be rehabilitated in industrial homes and suitable

jobs provided to them, production could be increased and these units which are just wasting themselves could be made productive units.

The fourth and the most important test of an economically secure budget should be as to how revolutionary and how effective it could be in raising and releasing the national and international resources for fulfilling the obligation and responsibilities before us, of course within the framework of our policy and its directives.

The last important test of the budget should be as to how far it provides an incentive to the people for sacrifice, saving and investment, and how far it encourages the capital formation and economic growth.

Several things which stand like the road engine in the way of new and young industrialists have been mentioned by my hon. friends, and I do not want to repeat them. But the most harmful thing which is killing the trust and enthusiasm of investors and industrialists and which has not been mentioned by anybody should be mentioned by me, and that is administrative delays. These delays cause a great waste of wealth, time, energy and manpower, and make the life of the common man and the investor and the industrialist very, very difficult. These delays could be removed if some drastic steps are taken. There is no doubt about it. I would like to mention that at present the Finance Ministry and the departments under it are also very largely responsible for these delays. The Ministry is working like an octopus with its several claws. Every file in every Ministry has first to go through these claws and these claws do not want to release anything quickly. I would suggest that some very effective and radical change should be made immediately.

We are very lucky to have such a Finance Minister who is a man of profound thinking. He is a man of

experience in the political and economic field. I am afraid that all his good qualities will not go far enough, if some radical changes are not brought in the administrative set-up to remove these delays. We are not allergic to foreign capital or foreign investors, but we should be very cautious and careful to see that this foreign capital and foreign investors work within the framework of our accepted directive policies and they do not get much freedom as to dictate their terms and attach strings to those investments.

It is a very welcome move that civil expenditure has been curtailed and sur-tax has been levied. But I would like to say one or two more things. But the people who have suggested scrapping prohibition are neither the friends of the people nor of the country. The nation will never forgive such people who say that because prohibition laws are not implemented properly, it should be scrapped. Why not they suggest that murder should be legalised because in spite of the fact that under the CrPC the man who commits murder is punished, still there are a number of murders? More drinking means more crimes; more liquor consumption means more diseases and more accidents and more deaths. So, I would request the Finance Minister not to be misguided by such suggestions.

I am very glad that an increase has been made in D.A. and some cities have been upgraded. But I would like to suggest that this increase is very nominal, keeping in view the rising prices. I am sure the Finance Minister will come forward with some other proposals for upgrading other cities and increasing this D.A.

In conclusion, I would request the Finance Minister to provide as much money as is required for the information and broadcasting service, because in this ideological age, we have to increase and improve our information and broadcasting department. It has been tremendously weak. When I get time, I would point out what are the

shortcomings and why we have not been able to win the various nations in our favour.

I would conclude by making another suggestion. If we want to remove this tax evasion, instead of taxing individual income, the Finance Minister should come with a proposal to tax the entire family income. That will be a very effective step to remove the tax evasion.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur):** Madam Chairman, we are familiar with the rapier-like thrust and the seasoned adroitness of the Finance Minister and we have fresh evidence of this in the budget proposals which he has placed before us and which bear an unmistakable imprint of his personality. It appears to me that these budget proposals represent a very skilful economic fencing and a dexterous combination of strategy and tactics. It is, if I may be permitted to say so, the special annual rope-trick *a la* TTK.

In fairness to the Finance Minister, however, it must be said that if the budget proposals harbour many illusions they also contain an earnest of his awareness of the social purposes to which our financial policy must of necessity be committed. They also contain an earnest of his determination to grapple with the economic realities of our country. I would like to pay him a tribute for his studied effort to pierce the veil that hid the face of economic realities, as they came to be discussed by the successive Finance Ministers in this country.

In his budget speech, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has treated us to an excellent discourse on the economic problems which confront us. I cannot resist the temptation of quoting a particular passage. It says:

"In the ultimate analysis, the three problems of prices, growth and balance of payments so far are inter-related and we cannot solve any one of the them without the fullest attention to the other two. Indeed, it is only to

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

the extent that all these problems are tackled within the framework of an integrated policy, in regard to incomes, wages and investment that we can hope to ensure that the necessary investment potential is available for the development of the economy."

16.21 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

The question I should like to pose before the Finance Minister and before the House is whether these budget proposals could fairly be construed as a blue-print of such an integrated economic policy for the nation. I am sorry to say that the answer for the time being would have to be in the negative. It does appear that the most we can say in respect of these budget proposals is that the Finance Minister has begun an exciting romance with economic thinking but that there appears to be no firm proposal for wedlock and that there appears to be no definite planning for regular matrimony at least from so far as we can judge from the budget proposals before us.

The dragon of inflation is threatening the very fabric and foundation of our national economy. The Government have often shown themselves passive, inert bewildered, open-mouthed, gaping spectators of the spiralling rise of prices and this monster of inflation roars and roves at will across the national economy with impunity. The pace of industrial progress has been disappointing and has indeed been languishing in the prison-house, if I may say so, of certain stock ideological bogeys which are raised from year to year.

The agricultural policy has been, during these years, an aimless, wandering, groping, hand-to-mouth adjustment. I am afraid, Sir, that our foreign exchange reserves, as has been rightly admitted by the Finance Minister, stand at a very low ebb, and a great deal of effort would be required to strengthen them.

The Third Plan visualises an increase of 30 per cent in agricultural production, 70 per cent in industrial output and 30 per cent in national income. The inputs for achieving these targets have been staggeringly colossal. I am afraid, in spite of these large inputs we have no firm assurance that the output in the national economy would increase at the desired level. It appears to me that the average annual rate of increase in national income during the first two years of the Third Plan has been only around 2.35 per cent as against the target of 6 per cent. What I would like to know is, in what manner and with what methods and to what extent the Minister expects that these targets would be fulfilled.

We have often felt that there is an acute and dire need for co-ordination. We were happy when the present Finance Minister as the Minister of Defence and Economic Co-ordination began some path-breaking work and made a remarkable contribution in the field of overall co-ordination. My fears are that as soon as co-ordination began to make some headway in the administration, it also began to tread on certain departmental toes and ministerial shoes, as I had occasion to observe earlier, with the result that the task of co-ordination, which is one of the most compelling and imperative tasks of this administration, is again being ignored and neglected. I think that the results of such neglect may indeed be disastrous. It seems to me that after he ceased to be the Minister of Economic and Defence Co-ordination, the cards have been shuffled so often that the pivotal consideration for co-ordination has tended to be eclipsed. I hope that the Finance Minister, when he rises to reply to the general debate, would be able to re-assure the House that he does not propose to allow the tasks of co-ordination to suffer in spite of the fact that he now holds charge of the Finance portfolio, because it is basically through the financial powers and through financial administration that the task of co-ordination can be

effectively achieved. I would like the Minister to tell us as to in what manner and through what methods and agencies he proposes to do this work of co-ordination.

I would like to congratulate the Minister for making certain candid confessions in his budget speech. One is that our present arrangements for the choice of specific projects and programmes leave much to be desired. I think this House has felt the same thing quite often and has given expression to this particular phenomenon which has assumed alarming proportions in planning and implementation of Plans in our country. The Finance Minister has, in his budget speech, assured us that he intends to strengthen this aspect of the working of his Ministry in the next few months. We should like to know in somewhat greater detail as to how he proposes to do this.

Another confession he has made is in respect of the relatively poor functioning and performance of public sector undertakings. If I were to quote the Finance Minister, he has admitted:

"that many of the public sector projects are lagging behind the schedule of their construction and, what is more disappointing is that their contribution to our resources is nowhere near the Plan estimates."

If I may be permitted to add, it is nowhere nearly proportionate to the investments that have been made. The public sector projects paid a dividend of Rs. 1.3 crores in 1962-63 and it is expected to pay now, in 1964-65 a dividend of the order of Rs. 2.32 crores, only. On an investment of Rs. 806.47 crores in share capital, the return is about 0.25 per cent! It may be that it is possible to compute these returns in a somewhat different manner and to arrive at a somewhat different figure, but it is undeniable that this poor performance of our public

sector undertakings casts a profound shadow of doubt on the public sector understanding as the instruments of Congress Socialism.

For we do not want in the name of socialism to allow inefficiency or malfunctioning in public sector units. We do not want that the Finance Minister should fall a prey to any such dogmatic and orthodox thinking. He is a practical economic thinker and I am sure he would live up to the reputation that he enjoys in this country by endeavouring to induce the organisation to which he belongs to re-define socialism in terms of social justice and in terms of building up an equitable economy, of which he has shown such unusual awareness. In this he would have to liberate economic thinking in his party from orthodox grooves. In this he would have to give substance to the ideology of socialism by fulfilling certain objects of social justice. I am glad that he has shown greater awareness of these objectives and I do hope that he would match this awareness by equally eloquent actions.

I am glad that the Finance Minister was able to reiterate, as he has done in his budget speech, that we owe it to the development and expansion of our national economy that resources should continue to be made available to the private sector, for expansion and for fulfilling the role which is assigned to it in our Plan. Private initiative, skill and enterprise can be invaluable assets to the national economy and I am glad that the hon. Minister proposes to continue to harness them for the cause of building up the nation within the framework of social regulation.

I am glad that the hon. Minister has also announced that a Commission would be set up to enquire into monopolies and concentration of economic power in the Indian economy. Unfortunately, it is a measure of the complete lack of co-ordination in this Government that on the very day the

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

hon. Finance Minister made this statement in his Budget speech, during the Question Hour a Minister of the Government of India, Shri Nityanand Kanungo, said that it was not proposed to investigate the existence of monopoly or concentration of economic power in the country.

**An. Hon. Member:** How could he know the Budget?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It shows that Budget secrets are well kept.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I did not know that the setting up of a commission such as this or the undertaking of investigation into the existence of monopolies and concentration of power was really a Budget secret and if this were so, then the hon. Minister should have said that it was under the consideration of the Government or that it was not in the public interest to reveal what is proposed to be done. He had given what is down-right, wrong, misleading answer to this House. As a matter of fact, I would like the House to call him to account for such a misleading reply to a question.

I would like to say that in this case there is a lot of misapprehension about the existence of monopolies and concentration of economic power in this country. It has been said, and rightly, that this particular issue ranks very high when it comes to its controversy value but it ranks very low when it comes to the understanding and collation of the vast facts which are required to study this matter. I am glad that the hon. Minister is inclined to appoint a Commission so that an objective and impartial study of the subject may be made and so that . . .

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

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I am the main speaker for my Group and I am entitled to at least 60 minutes as you have given to other groups.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is he the only speaker from his group?

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I am the main speaker.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is up to him to adjust the time.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I hope that this Commission would be utilised for an impartial and objective study of the facts as they are and for providing the necessary correctives in a constructive spirit, that it would not be allowed to be subjected to any political bogeys, that political conclusions and prejudgements would not be allowed to be built up without economic data.

I would like also that at least until then the Government and hon. Members of this House would refrain and desist from giving quack prescriptions for the solution of the problem of concentration of economic power and the existence of monopolies in this country. I am myself of the view that most of these conclusions are based on an ignorance of the anatomy and physiology of the economic organisation of our country. I feel that perhaps there is hardly any monopoly in existence in this country as monopoly is understood in economic thinking. At any rate, I am glad that an effort is being made to study these matters in an impartial, objective spirit and I would like to compliment the hon. Minister for making this announcement. I feel that it would be in the interest of the private sector itself to have such an investigation and to have correctives because the soul of private sector enterprise is competition. Once an effort is made to curtail monopolies or to curb the concentration of economic power private sector enterprise could give an even better account of itself than it has given hitherto.

At the same time, I hope that the public sector undertakings are not allowed to be immune and exempt from the operation of the basic thinking which impels the appointments of such a commission. The concentration of economic power in the public sector enterprises, unless

it is properly regulated, may also be as much a threat to democratic functioning in the country. This should be kept in mind. The other day, Mr. Kanungo said categorically, if I may return to Mr. Kanungo, that there was no concentration of productive capacity in the country. He was not sure that there was any other type of concentration in the country. One feels that perhaps it would have been better, before the appointment of such a commission, to have the necessary data and necessary preliminary investigation in the matter so that there would have been a justification or appointing a commission under the Commission of Inquiry Act. At any rate, I suppose, now the Commission would perform both the preliminary and the full-fledged task of going into this question.

I should like to say that it is true that the Finance Minister has not wholly forgotten the common man. But the common man had expectations far greater than he has been able to satisfy through his Budget proposals. It must be remembered, each year, that the taxation in this country has reached almost a saturation point. The target for the Third Five Year Plan for additional taxation was Rs. 1100 crores. That target has been exceeded already and according to the proposals of the last Budget, there was an additional taxation of the order of Rs. 1900 crores. It seems to me that Prof. Kaldor is writ too large on the Budget proposals and that his theories have been utilised almost with vengeance in not considering the curtailment of the previous heavy burden of taxation under which the country and the common man were already groaning.

I should now like to make a reference to certain particular aspects of the Budget proposals. In particular, I should like to say that such heavy taxation may actually pollute the investment climate. I should like to say that the invitation the Finance Minister has extended to foreign capital may remain unhonoured if sufficient incentives are not given

to foreign capital. At the same time, it is true that we have to work out a proper framework for the functioning of foreign capital in this country. The Finance Minister had admitted that the Super Profits Tax produced a psychological resistance and it had retarded the industrial growth to a certain extent. It has now been substituted by Surtax on profits of companies. It seems to me that it would have been fairer for the assessee companies if he would have at least provided for the fluctuation of the fortunes of the company in realising this tax. In the same way, the proposal to levy a dividend tax on equity capital also, in my humble opinion, runs contrary to the declared policy of the Government to boost up investments and to build up a proper investment climate. I hope the Minister would have occasion to explain this.

The reintroduction of Expenditure Tax has a parallel in the history of India inasmuch as an emperor of medieval India decided to change the capital of this country and then returned to Delhi after he found that the change of Capital was not suitable. The abolition of Expenditure tax and its restoration has been a little too swift and we would like the Finance Minister to tell us in somewhat greater detail about the rationale which has impelled him to reintroduce Expenditure Tax.

Before I conclude, I should like to make an observation about the working of the Planning Commission. It can now be heard in various sections of the country that Planning Commission is progressively proving to be a stumbling block to our progress. Sir, I am not opposed to planning. I feel that planned development is the only way for development in this country, but I do feel that the way the Planning Commission has been functioning is not conducive to co-ordinated economic thinking or to an efficient implementation of our economic programmes. I would not like to go to the extent to which Mr. C. H.

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

Bhabha did in an address he gave to a Rotary club, wherein he said:

"The Planning Commission was, at the beginning, a small compact high-powered body, costing the country only a few lakhs of rupees a year; but, today, it is a vast organisation functioning from a huge structure called the Yojana Bhavan and costing the Indian exchequer no less than a few crores a year. It should really and truly be said that, apart from anything else, this institution has proved to be an avenue of employment for a particular type of civil servants, for some devoted followers of the party in power who had to be rewarded for some reason or other, and for a special species of experts and professors who could not make much headway in their own spheres of activity. The one outstanding result noticeable to all intelligent people of this country (however) is that it has worked out some grand basic ideas for inspiring great hopes of the future to our countrymen. At times, the Planning Commission has, because of the nature of its constitution and composition, also assumed itself to be a super-Government and voiced, in advance, the efforts and expectations of our national leaders."

It is true that this is a statement which contains some uncharitable observations, but it is also true that the Planning Commission has shown itself quite unequal to the task and assumed proportions and dimensions which are much too big for us to approve of, if parliamentary democracy is to function smoothly in this country. After all, it is not to the Planning Commission but to this Parliament that Government are responsible, and when we see that the Planning Commission runs almost a parallel Government, we feel that to that extent parliamen-

tary democracy in this country is being undermined and abridged.

I feel that not enough has been said in the budget speech about the possibilities and the hopes of price stabilisation in this country. I would like to know whether it is proposed to establish a separate price stabilisation board with ample powers for the entire country and whether it is proposed to deal with the gigantic problem of unemployment in this country in a really effective manner.

I should like, before I conclude, to suggest that each year we should attempt an appraisal of our Plans rather than attempting it in the mid-term to find only in the mid-stream that we have not done satisfactorily. I wish the Finance Minister god-speed, and hope that he will be able in a realistic manner to take account of the various submissions I have made here and to reply to some of the objections and apprehensions to which I have given expression.

**Shri Man Singh P. Patel (Mehsana):** No doubt, this is a budget of my party, but I feel that it contains a tinge of personal individuality and that too, of a changed individuality. There was an impression with me before I entered this House that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari was a terror to the trading community. Instead of that, while going through the budget proposal, I feel satisfied that here is a changed person who has, after long experience of trade affairs, of trade intelligence etc. has been a little fairer to the trading community rather than to the agricultural community as a whole. I could say that here is an honest and sincere attempt to satisfy some of the sections of the society and the psychologically of the country as a whole.

Last year, we were under the depression of an emergency and the heavy taxation which was required because of the unscrupulous action of the

neighbouring State. We were feeling that the taxes were so high, and that the industrial growth and the development of trade in the country were stagnant somewhere. But when I see the Economic Survey for 1963-64, I find that there is a specific statement made in this connection at page 14. It says that industrial growth is definitely more, 10 per cent as against 8.5 per cent in the previous year. That being so, what was the necessity of giving broad concessions to the trading community especially when another section, namely, the agricultural community is completely forgotten? As for the high ideals enunciated in the same pamphlet, I would like to read them:

"The success of the agricultural programme, however, depends ultimately on what happens at the farm level or whether or not adequate arrangements exist to provide the individual farmers with the knowledge, resources, and above all, the incentives needed for additional production".

Now what are the additional incentives as understood by the hon. Minister? Only the Agricultural Production Board and some study teams of the officials to survey the production of the States? Am I to understand that when there can be a rebate of 10 per cent on corporation tax of income tax and surtax—and also some concessions for foreign investment in the country, no incentive is being found as a special concession for additional agricultural production in the country?

It is an accepted fact that about 50—55 per cent of the total national income is from the agricultural sector. 60 per cent of the agricultural population are holding below 5 acres of land. Should we not give incentives to this majority class of 60 per cent holding below 5 acres in order to ensure additional production? In his speech earlier in the day, Shri

S. S. More has given a sharp warning. Am I also to understand that because the man in the trade is somewhere nearer to him and the man in agriculture farther away, these concessions are not being found for the latter?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** May I tell my hon. friend that Rs. 559 crores are set apart for State plans, the bulk of which goes to agriculture and power? That is the contribution of the Centre for the next year.

**Shri Man Singh P. Patel:** I am thankful for the information. I do agree that a major amount might be going to agriculture, because it constitutes a major share.

But I am trying to argue the point about incentives. What direct incentives are being proposed in the current Budget to increase agricultural production at the farm level, incentives to those who hold less than 5 acres?

Granting for argument's sake that there are irrigation facilities, in certain States there is no flow irrigation in Gujarat at all. We want electricity to be given to the agriculturists. Is it being subsidised by each State for agricultural production?

The second point is about the excise duty on diesel oil being utilised in oil engines. Hardly 10, 12 or 15 per cent of the total diesel oil consumption in the country is on account of oil engines. We are not trying to give a minimum remunerative price for each category of production, especially in the rabi season. Should we not consider giving some concession, some subsidy, for diesel oil used or utilised for enhancing agricultural production? I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not here. Recently, two months ago, he had been to Gujarat. This point was placed before him in a conference that in Gujarat there is no flow irrigation of any nature except a new scheme called the Ukai project. I come from an area where



[Shri Man Singh P. Patel]

there are 17,000 oil engines in a small area with a population of 6 lakh in three or four tehsils.

Electricity has not reached every village, but there is a restriction that unless a village is electrified, there will be no electric connection given for agricultural purposes. So, if there had been a special concession in the excise duty on oil which has increased its price by 40 per cent by the last years increase in excise, I would have considered it an incentive to the farmer class.

Not only this. Let us look into the fundamental policies being announced repeatedly by my party. We had given a pledge to the people in the election of 1962 that there would definitely be a ceiling on urban incomes. Where do I find it in this Budget? This is the Budget for the fourth year of the Third Plan. Neither in Part A, nor Part B of the Finance Minister's speech, nor in the Economic Survey do we find any mention that there is a possibility of a ceiling being placed on urban incomes. On the other hand, special concessions are being given. The import of motor cars may be very much less now, but the import duty of 150 per cent is being reduced to 60 per cent. For whom? But there is no concession in the excise duty on oil used by agriculturists.

Concessions are given to the trading community and industrialists. I do not grudge them. I am glad we want to accelerate the pace of industrial production. But do we have the same anxiety or desire to have a similar growth in agricultural production? Are we taking steps to give incentives to the small agricultural holders working in their distant farms, because of whose efforts alone agricultural production is likely to rise? The increase of about two per cent in the first year of the Third Plan has been wiped out in the second and third

years. So, there is no improvement in agricultural production, while the increase in industrial production has been 13, 12 and 10 per cent respectively for the three years of the Third Plan. Should we not expect some incentives to this agricultural class? Let there be incentives to all classes.

The Compulsory Deposit Scheme, which was a psychological hardship to the lower and upper middle classes has been scrapped, but indirectly and cleverly a little more of income-tax is likely to be recovered from people with an income of Rs. 7,500 per annum and above, because, after all, CDS was a compulsory saving. I have calculated, and I find that persons with an income of more than Rs. 7,500 will definitely have to pay more income-tax. So, excepting the removal of this psychological embarrassment there is no concession.

16.57 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Who are the persons who pay income-tax? They are those who get an income of more than Rs. 3,600. If they deserve concession, am I to understand that in the case of agriculturists with less than five acres of land, who have no other income, land revenue should not be waived in principle? No doubt, land revenue goes to the State Exchequer, but why should there not be such a definite policy by this Government which wants to attain a socialistic pattern of society? For below 5 acres holding, there should be no land revenue. Such measures should be taken. There is a concession on an income of Rs. 3600 to Rs. 7500 but it is not a real concession; it is only in order to get a good name. Certain concessions have been provided to the trade community as a whole. I do not want to enter into a controversy about the trading in agricultural commodities. But if we have to maintain the pace of growth

and achieve the Plan target, special incentives which I enumerated earlier, such as the concession on oils, agricultural implements, etc. should be given. Farmer is our backbone and this Budget is not earnest in giving him concessions but gives concessions to city-dwellers and trading communities.

I congratulate with my heartiest emotions the Finance Minister on the strict measures that he is taking to reduce tax evasion. In papers we read that there are raids on the houses of some capitalists or big industrialists and the police recovered gold bars worth Rs. 14 lakhs and currency of Rs. 6 lakhs and so on. The hon. Minister should give us a quarterly or half-yearly statement of such raids and the money found and what action has been taken against this type of persons who possess such unaccountable wealth.

17 hrs.

श्री विनय पाण्डेय (सलेमपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सामान्य बजट के ऊपर कल से चर्चा चल रही है। माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने अपने दृष्टिकोणों से इस पर अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने इस बजट को बहुत कुशलता, योग्यता तथा निपुणता के साथ इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों को इस बजट में समाजवाद का कहीं समावेश हुआ हो ऐसा दिखाई नहीं दिया है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि यह पूंजीवादी बजट है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस को समाजवादी बजट कहा है : मैं इन दोनों झगड़ों में नहीं पड़ना चाहता। मैं तो ऐसा समझता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने पूंजीवाद और समाजवाद के बीच का, यानी मध्यम मार्ग का अनुसरण किया है। वे इस बात को महसूस करते हैं कि राष्ट्र के निर्माण के काम को जब मध्यम मार्ग से कर चलायेंगे तभी वह हो सकता है। इस लिये उन्होंने इस मार्ग का अनुसरण किया है।

वास्तव में यह जो बजट आप के सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया है उस के लिये माननीय वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि वह प्रतिरक्षा और विकास के लिये है। अभी देश के ऊपर संकट है। भारत की सीमा के ऊपर चीन का हमला हुआ है। आप की स्थल सीमा ६ हजार मील से अधिक होती है, सामुदायिक सीमा ३ हजार मील से अधिक होती है और आवश्यक है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिरक्षा के काम को आज सबल और पुष्ट बनाया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य कल जारी करेंगे।

17:01 hrs.

RE: AIR CRASH NEAR CALCUTTA

Shri Tygai (Dehradun): Sir, there is a sensational news that there was another air crash. I would like you to ask the Defence Minister to make a statement.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): We have heard outside of some crash.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Swaran Singh may make his statement about sugarcane.

17.01½ hrs.

STATEMENT RE: SUGARCANE PRICE

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Swaran Singh): As the House is aware, Government have had under consideration the question of fixation of minimum price of cane for the crushing season 1964-65 under the Sugarcane Control Order, 1955, issued under the Essential Commodities Act. After a consideration of the relevant factors and taking into account the trend of recoveries during the current year, Government have decided that the basic minimum price at the factory gate at the recovery point of