

यदि उन्हें भी शेर खरीदने का अधिकार दिया गया, तो भविष्य में वे अपने पैसे के बल से अपने पैसे के जोर से दूसरे लोगों को, किसानों को अपने अन्दर मिला लेंगे, जिस का नतीजा यह होगा कि धीरे धीरे उस में उनका ही अधिकार हो जायेगा और वे नफ़ा कमाने के लिये कोई रास्ता ढूँढ लेंगे। मेरा मत यह है कि जो इस तरह की कम्पनीज बनी हुई हैं, उन को इसके शेर खरीदने का अधिकार नहीं देना चाहिये था। फिर भी अब माननीय मंत्रीजी का जैसा एक्सपीरियंस होगा, उसी के अनुसार वह कार्यवाही करेंगे। मुझे केवल इतना ही कहना था कि मुझे संदेह है कि इस अवस्था में किसानों को कुछ तकलीफ़ और नुकसान होगा। चन्प्यबाद।

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Sir, in conclusion, I have to perform the pleasant duty of thanking the hon. Members for the co-operation which they had afforded in the passing of this Bill. It is true that we have not been able to give as much time as a measure of this importance deserved. But, I have tried to accommodate as many points of view as possible. Many things have been said in this House. I can assure the hon. Members that we shall take action on those. We shall benefit by their advice. I also hope that in the implementation of this very important measure, I shall have a large measure of co-operation from the hon. Members.

As you were pleased to observe a new point has been raised Ladies are suited to look after warehouses; it has been said. They are more suited to look after 'houses'—excluding 'ware'. We have made a beginning and we have appointed a lady as the keeper of a warehouse. I hope more women will be coming forward and occupy more important places than it has been possible for them to occupy hitherto.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: "That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The motion was negatived.*

#### COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

##### FIFTY-SECOND REPORT

**Shri Morarka (Ganganagar—Jhunjhunu):** I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-second Report of the Committee on Private Members'

Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th May, 1956."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bill and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th May, 1956."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### RESOLUTION RE: CEILING ON INCOME OF AN INDIVIDUAL— *Contd.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now resume discussion on the Resolution moved by Shri Bibhuti Mishra on the 27th April, 1956 regarding ceiling on income of an individual. Out of four hours allotted for the discussion of the Resolution, 3 hours and 59 minutes are left for the purpose of discussion to-day. Shri Bibhuti Mishra may continue his speech.

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र (सारन व चम्पारन):** उपाध्यक्षजी जिस प्रस्ताव को मैंने सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है, मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार को १९४७ में ही, जब कि उसको वित्तीय का तत्त्व मिला था, उस प्रस्ताव के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार कर के उसे कार्य रूप में परिणत करना चाहिये था। लेकिन मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार ने इस बारे में इतनी देरी क्यों की है। जितने भी हमारे भाई कांग्रेस में रहे हैं या जिनका गांधीजी के साथ सम्बन्ध रहा है, वे नित्य प्रति आश्रमों और जिला और थाना कांग्रेस कमेटी में गांधीजी द्वारा बनाई हुई प्रार्थना शाम को गाया करते थे। उस प्रार्थनासे गांधीजी हम लोगों को तैयार करते थे। उस प्रार्थना में पहली बात यह थी:

न त्वम् कामये राज्यम् न स्वर्गम् न पुनरभवम्  
कामये दुःखं तप्तानाम् प्राणिनामाति नाशनम्।  
गांधीजीकी प्रार्थना में यह बात थी कि हमको राज्य नहीं चाहिये, हमको स्वर्ग की इच्छा नहीं है, हमको एक ही इच्छा है कि हम गरीबों का दुःख दूर कर सकें। इसी प्रार्थना के साथ हम गांधीजी की एकादश व्रत की प्रार्थना करते थे। उनमें एक प्रार्थना यह भी थी कि हमको अपरिग्रही होना चाहिये। हम लोग जो स्वराज्य के सैनिक थे और गांधी जी के उसूलों के अनुसार रचनात्मक काम करते थे उनको इन प्रार्थनाओं को रोज सुबह और शाम पाठ करना पड़ता था। गांधीजी ने इन प्रार्थनाओं के द्वारा देश में रचनात्मक कार्य

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

की भावना पैदा की। फिर गांधीजीने देखा कि हिन्दुस्तान का काम इस तरह से नहीं चलेगा तो उन्होंने एक दूसरी बात बतलायी कि ट्रस्टीशिप (न्यासधारण) होनी चाहिये। गांधीजी की ट्रस्टीशिप का क्या उसूल है, उसको गांधीजी के साथ रहने वाले प्यारेलाल जी ने अपनी पुस्तक "Gandhian Techniques in the Modern World" (गांधियन टेकनिक्स इन दी माडर्न वर्ल्ड) में इस प्रकार बतलाया है। इस किताब के पेज २६ पर उन्होंने लिखा है:

"Gandhiji did not believe that the ideal of peace could be realised in society so long as the wide gulf between the rich and the hungry millions remained."

फिर इसके बास्ते गांधीजी कहते हैं कि यह कैसे दूर होगा :

"To bridge the gulf between the haves and have-nots he suggested instead that the haves should use their talent and the bulk of their earnings not for themselves but as a trust for the good of society."

गांधीजी कहते थे कि जो कुछ हमारे पास शक्ति, बुद्धि या धन है यह समाज की सेवा के लिये है। फिर गांधी जी ने बतलाया :

"As 'trustees' they would be entitled to retain for themselves a reasonable rate of commission in recognition of their service or usefulness to society. In the transitional period this would be left to be determined on a reasonable basis by themselves in consultation with society."

फिर आगे गांधीजी ने कहा कि क्या होना चाहिये:

"This, however, did not mean that pending the necessary legislation the transformation of the capitalists into trustees would be left to the sweet will of the capitalists."

गांधीजी ने इस बात को उस समय कहा था जब कि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद नहीं था। उस समय गांधीजी ने कहा था कि हम सारी बार्ने कॅपीटलिस्ट्स (पूँजीपतियों) के हाथ में नहीं छोड़ देना चाहते हैं। मान लीजिये कि

हिन्दुस्तान का राज्य हमारे हाथ में न आये और हम चाहें कि ये बीजे कॅपीटलिस्ट्स (पूँजीपतियों) के हाथ में न रहें तो हम क्या करेंगे, इसके बारे में गांधीजी ने बतलाया था :

"If they did not accept the new basis of ownership voluntarily, or if they proved impervious to reason, the weapon of non-violent non-co-operation would be brought into play."

गांधीजी ने कहा था कि अगर ये बड़े पूँजीपति, ये धनी मानी लोग और बड़े बड़े सेठ साहूकार हमारे ट्रस्टीशिप (न्यासधारण) के आइडिया (विचार) को नहीं मानेंगे तो हम अहिंसात्मक असहयोग करेंगे। यह गांधी जी ने उस समय कहा था जब कि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद नहीं हुआ था। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि गांधीजी के ट्रस्टीशिप के मुख्य सिद्धान्त क्या थे। उनके मुख्य सिद्धान्त ये थे :

"Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one; it gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption."

यह पहला सिद्धान्त था। दूसरा सिद्धान्त यह था :

"It does not recognize any right of private ownership of property except inasmuch as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare."

तीसरा सिद्धान्त यह था :

"It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth."

चौथा सिद्धान्त यह था :

"Thus, under State-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interest of society."

और पाँचवाँ सिद्धान्त यह था :

"Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the minimum income that could be

allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so much so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference."

गांधी जी ने ये सारी बातें बतलायी थीं। लेकिन इन बातों के बतलाने के बाद भी मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारी सरकार आज तक क्यों चुप बैठ रही। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार चुप नहीं बैठ रही। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न की सोसाइटी (समाजवादी व्यवस्था का समाज) होनी चाहिये, लेकिन वे आज तक सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न (समाजवादी व्यवस्था) की परिभाषा नहीं निकाल सके। गांधी जी ने कहा था कि एक व्यक्ति के पास उतनी ही सम्पत्ति होनी चाहिये जिससे किसी जीविका चल सके। उन्होंने कहा था कि अगर किसी की सम्पत्ति का व्यवहार समाज के लिये नहीं होता है तो हम उसके खिलाफ नान-बायलेंट नान को-ऑपरेशन (अहिंसारमक असहयोग) करेंगे। उस समय हमारे हाथ में सत्ता नहीं थी लेकिन आज जब हमारे हाथ में सत्ता आ गयी है तब तो हमको इस काम में एक मिनट की भी देरी नहीं करनी चाहिये। मैं नहीं समझता कि हमारी सरकार क्यों चुप बैठ रही है। जो कुछ गांधी जी ने कहा था उसकी बुनियाद पर ही हमको स्वाधीनता मिली है लेकिन आज तक हमने इस ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया। मैं सरकार से कहूँगा कि यह सरकार गांधी जी की बनायी हुई है और उसे गांधी जी की टैकनिक (ढंग) से काम लेना चाहिये। अगर वह ऐसा नहीं करेगी तो टिक नहीं सकेगी और आगे चुनावों में हार जायेगी।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को इस देश में जल्दी से जल्दी ट्रस्टीशिप के आइडिया (न्यासधारण का विचार) के अनुसार काम करना चाहिये। आज समाजवादी ढंग के समाज की बात कही जाती है लेकिन किसी ने इसकी आज तक डेफीनिशन (परिभाषा) नहीं दी है। कराची कांग्रेस के समय गांधी जी जिन्दा थे। उस समय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी थे। उस समय वहाँ पर यह प्रस्ताव पास किया गया था कि देश का बड़े से बड़ा अधिकारी भी ५०० से ज्यादा तनख्वाह नहीं लेगा। लेकिन इस सब के रहते हुए भी, जब हमारे हाथ में सत्ता आयी हम उससे ज्यादा

पाने लगे। जो देश का संभालन करने वाला है अगर वह अपने प्रस्ताव पर कायम नहीं रह सकता तो दूसरों से हम क्या कहेंगे। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि हमको कराची कांग्रेस का प्रस्ताव मानना चाहिये। आज यद्यपि गांधी जी नहीं हैं लेकिन उनके समय के पुराने पुराने नेता तो मौजूद हैं। उनको उस प्रस्ताव को कार्यान्वित करना चाहिये। हमारी सरकार क्यों नहीं यह काम करती मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उस समय का ५०० और आजकल का २००० बराबर है।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : आज भी ५०० में काम चल सकता है। हमारी सरकार इस नीति को थोड़ा बहुत काम में भी ला रही है। हमारे पास जो डाफ्ट प्लान (प्रारूप योजना) धारा है उसमें लिखा है कि लैंड की सीलिंग (भूमि की उच्चतम सीमा) होगी और वह सीलिंग इतनी होगी कि पांच आदमियों के एक परिवार को १,६०० रुपये साल की आयदानी होनी चाहिये और यह भी कहा गया है कि इससे तिगुनी तक हो सकती है और इसमें से चौथाई खर्चा निकाल दिया जायेगा। इस तरह से १,२०० से ३,६०० रुपये सालाना तक की आयदानी एक पांच आदमियों के परिवार के लिये मुकर्रर की गयी है।

टेक्सेशन इन्वयरी कमीशन (कर जांच प्रायोग) की रिपोर्ट हम को दी गयी है। उसमें लिखा है :

"The fixing of a ceiling on personal incomes on the basis of a reasonable multiple of the per capita or per family national income is a matter to which we have given much thought and it is our view that there should be a ceiling on net personal incomes after tax which generally speaking should not exceed approximately 30 times the prevailing average per family income in the country. We do not suggest that this is capable of immediate implementation, but we think that it is important to strive by stages for its implementation over a period of time."

मैं कहता हूँ कि किसानों के लिये तो आपने ३६०० की सीलिंग रखी और इन बड़े बड़े पूँजीपतियों के लिये इतनी ज्यादा रखी। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्लान को जो चलाने वाले

## [श्री विभूति मिश्र]

होगे वे भी पूंजीपति ही होंगे। हमारी सरकार की रिपोर्ट बनाने के लिये भी बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति ही रख दिये जाते हैं। न मालूम स्वराज्य की लड़ाई के समय ये डिप्लोमा वाले लोग कहाँ थे। उस समय इन बड़े बड़े बैरिस्टरों और पी० एच० डी० लोगों का पता नहीं था और न ये लोग जेल गये। अब जब स्वराज्य मिल गया है तो इनकी इन्क्वायरी कमेटी बनती है और ये कमीशन इन्चार्ज होते हैं और कहते हैं कि इतनी आमदनी होनी चाहिये। एक आमदमी की पर कैपिटल इनकम (प्रति व्यक्ति आय) २८० रुपये मानी है, अगर पाँच आमदमी हुये तो १,४०० रुपये हो गये और तीस गुना कर दीजिये तो ४२ हजार हो जाती है, खर्चा काटने के बाद यह कहा है और वह भी धीरे धीरे होगा, यह भी नहीं कहा कि साहब यह जल्दी से जल्दी हो जाय, ऐसा कहा होता तो शायद मैं मान भी लेता। अब आप ही देखिये कि एक किसान परिवार को जिसमें कि पाँच आमदमी हैं उसको तो आप ३६०० रुपया देते हैं और जो बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति हैं उनको आप ४२ हजार रुपया देते हैं और मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यही आपका सोशलिस्ट पेटर्न आफ सोसाइटी (समाज की समाजवादी व्यवस्था) है? मैं मानता हूँ कि सोशलिस्ट पेटर्न आफ सोसाइटी की टैकनिक हमारे राष्ट्रपति और प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने देश के सामने सही रूप से पेश की है और समस्त देशवासियों को पूंजीपतियों और उच्च पदाधिकारियों को उनका इस दिशा में अनुकरण करना चाहिये। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जिनकी कि पहले माहवारी तनस्वाह साढ़े २२ हजार रुपये थी वे अब अपनी स्वेच्छा से केवल साढ़े ३ हजार नेट लेने लगे हैं। इसी तरह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय जिनको कि पहले ६, या ७ हजार रुपये तनस्वाह मिलती थी अब केवल वे १=५० रुपये ले रहे हैं, ऐसी हालत में मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उनके नीचे जो सेक्रेटरी आदि विभिन्न मंत्रालयों में हैं, उनको ४,४ हजार रुपये मासिक तनस्वाह किस तरह से मिल रही है। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहूँगा कि हमारे मिनिस्ट्रों की यह हिम्मत नहीं होती कि वे सेक्रेटरियों को इस बात के लिये कहें कि वे भी देशहित में कम तनस्वाह लिया करें और मैं यह कहूँ बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि हमारे मंत्रीगण उन उच्च सरकारी अफसरों से दबते हैं और उनसे कम तनस्वाह लेने के लिये कहने की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ती। मैं आपसे पूछता हूँ कि

नाना फडनवीस, महाराजा रंजीत सिंह और शिवाजी किन स्कूलों और कालिजों में पढ़े थे लेकिन इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि उन्होंने अपनी कौंसिल आफ मिनिस्टर्स (मंत्री परिषद) की सहायता से बड़ी कुशलता से शासन कार्य चलाया। अंग्रेजों ने अपनी सुविधा के लिये इन आई० सी० एस० को हिन्दुस्तान में कायम किया था ताकि इनके जरिये वे हिन्दुस्तान पर हुकूमत चला सकें और इन आई० सी० एस० अफसरों का काम यह होता था कि हिन्दुस्तानियों को छोटी छोटी बातों में उलझा कर लड़वाते थे और इस तरह से अंग्रेजों ने इस देश पर अपना राज्य मजबूत किया, लेकिन आज तो जमाना बदल चुका है और हमारा देश स्वतंत्र हो चुका है और हमें इन आई० सी० एस० अफसरों को यह साफ साफ बतला देना है कि उन्हें आज की बदली हुई परिस्थिति की समझ कर अपने को उमके अनुरूप बनाना है और अब से अपने को जनता का शासक नहीं बल्कि सेवक समझना है और देश के हित को ध्यान में रखते हुए उन्हें अपनी मोटी मोटी तनस्वाहों में कमी करवा देनी चाहिये।

अब मैं आपको एक दूसरी बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ और उसके लिये मैं आपके सामने वित्त मंत्री श्री सी० डी० देशमुख की स्पीच का वह अंश पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जिसमें उन्होंने सीलिंग की बाबत कहा है :

"A limit on income, through ceilings on all property, is not at the moment a feasible proposition since it would involve payment of compensation."

हमारे देशमुख साहब ने फ़रमाया है और उनको इस बात की चिन्ता ब्याप रही है कि अगर उन्होंने सीलिंग रखी तो उन्हें मुआविजा देना पड़ेगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस में कम्पेन्सेशन (मुआविजा) कहाँ देना पड़ेगा। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि हमको छदाम भी मुआविजा नहीं देना है। हमें उन पूंजीपतियों और मिल मालिकों को बतला देना चाहिये कि तुम को सिर्फ इतना मुनाफा लेना होगा और बाकी पर हम इतना टैक्स लगाते हैं तो इसमें मुआविजे का सवाल कहाँ आता है। इसी तरह जो हमारे ऊँचे पदों पर सरकारी नौकर नियुक्त हैं और मोटी मोटी तनस्वाहें ले रहे हैं, उनको कह देना चाहिये कि अब वे केवल २ हजार तनस्वाह लें, उससे ज्यादा न लें और मैं तो कहूँगा कि उनको कह दिया जाये कि तुमको

हजार रुपये तनख्वाह दी जायेगी, तो मैं पछता हूँ कि उसमें मुभावज्जे का सवाल कहाँ पैदा होता है। सरकारी नौकरों के वेतन आदि के बारे में जांच करने के लिये जो कमेटी १३ अप्रैल सन् १९४७ को बनाई गई थी, उसने सारे मामले की पूरी तरह जांच करने के बाद यह रिपोर्ट दी थी कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा तनख्वाह सरकारी नौकर की २ हजार रुपये माहवार होनी चाहिये। मैं पूछता हूँ कि आज उस कमेटी को बैठे और अपनी रिपोर्ट दिये करीब ९ वर्ष होने को आये लेकिन सरकार चपचापा बैठी है और उसने उसकी वह २ हजार रुपये वाली सिफारिश को अभी तक कार्यान्वित नहीं किया है। उस जांच कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में इस तरह पर लिखा था :

"Civil servants have no risks; they have rather so many facilities."

उनकी तनख्वाह घटाने के लिये जब हम लोगों की ओर से आवाज लगाई जाती है तो कहा जाता है कि जब अंग्रेज जाने लगे थे तो आरि० सी० एस० सविसेज के बारे में हमारा उनसे एक समझौता हो गया था और इस कारण हम उनकी तनख्वाहों आदि नौकरी की शर्तों में परिवर्तन करने में असमर्थ हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपने पिछले सैंकड़ों वर्षों से जो राजे महाराजे रियासतों पर हुकूमत करते आ रहे थे और बड़े बड़े जमींदार जिनको कि अंग्रेजों ने कायम किया था, उन राजा महाराजाओं और जमींदारों को तो पांच मिनट में खत्म कर दिया लेकिन आप सिविल सर्वेंट्स के लिये कहते हैं कि चूंकि अंग्रेजों के साथ इस देश से जाते समय हमारा एक समझौता हो गया था, इस लिये हम उनकी तनख्वाहें कम करने में असमर्थ हैं, समझ में न आने वाली बात है और मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि वे अगर वास्तव में सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी को इस देश में पूरी तरह कायम करना चाहते हैं तो जहां उन्होंने राजा महाराजाओं को खत्म किया, जमींदारियां खत्म कीं, वहां इन बड़े बड़े सरकारी अफसरान की तनख्वाहों में भी कटौती करें।

आजकल एक लफ्ज "इन्सेंटिव" (प्रोत्साहन) की देश में बहुत चर्चा है और दूसरा लफ्ज जिसकी कि चर्चा है वह "गरीबी का बांटना है"। अब जहां तक इन्सेंटिव का सम्बन्ध है मैं पूछता हूँ कि अगर डा० विधान चन्द्र राय डाक्टरों का पेशा करते तो आज उनको कितनी आमदनी

होती, उसी तरह अगर पंडित जबाहरलाल नेहरू वकालत करते तो उनको कितनी आमदनी होती, लेकिन हमने देखा कि उन्होंने देशहित के खातिर अपने स्वार्थ की पर्वाह नहीं की। उसी तरह आज हमें देश के पूंजीपतियों को कहना चाहिये कि उन्हें देश की सेवा करनी है और उन्हें अपने में देशसेवा का इन्सेंटिव पैदा करना चाहिये और वे जो कुछ धन पैदा करें, वह देश के लिये पैदा करें। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि इन्सेंटिव नहीं आयेगा अगर पैसा नहीं रहेगा। मैं ऐसा नहीं समझता हूँ कि पैसा रहने से इन्सेंटिव आता है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि इस सदन में कम्युनिस्टों (साम्यवादियों) को छोड़ कर, यह जो सोशलिस्ट (समाजवादी) या कांग्रेस वाले बैठे हैं, उन्होंने गांधी जी के हुकूम पर किस तरह अपने घर बार और बाल बच्चों की मोह ममता छोड़ कर स्वाधीनता संग्राम में भाग लिया और उस लड़ाई में कितने ही मर गये और कितनों की जायदादें जब्त हुईं और अन्य प्रकार की अनेकों मुश्किलें पेश आईं। लेकिन इन सबका उन्होंने वीरतापूर्वक मुकाबला किया और सन् १९२० से लेकर आजादी मिलने के वक्त तक वह कमर कसे मैदान में डटे रहे और यह सब इस कारण हो सका कि उनमें देश के लिये कुछ करने का इन्सेंटिव था। आज पूंजीपतियों में हमें इस भावना को पैदा करना है कि उन्हें देश के लिये त्याग करना चाहिये और अपने धन को देश-हित के कार्यों में त्यागपूर्वक खर्च करना चाहिये।

अब जहां तक गरीबी बांटने का सम्बन्ध है वह तो इस तरह से बांटी जा सकती है कि मान लीजिये मैं और आप कहीं सफर कर रहे हैं और आपके पास यदि चार पुरी हैं और मेरे पास कुछ नहीं है तो हम दोनों दो-दो पुरी बांट कर खा लें और यदि चार आदमी हों, तो एक एक पुरी बांट कर खा लें और अगर किसी के पास कुछ खाने को न हो तो चारों उपवास करें, इस तरह तो गरीबी का बांटना हमारी समझ में आता है और इसमें भाईचारा मालूम होता है लेकिन यह भाई चारा और गरीबी का बांटना कहां हुआ जब हम देखते हैं कि एक तरफ तो हमारे लाखों किसान जो गांवों में रहते हैं और जिनके कि पास खाने को रोटी और पहनने को कपड़ा नहीं है और दूसरी तरफ जब मैं दिल्ली में घूमने निकलता हूँ तो बड़ी बड़ी कोटियों में जिनमें कि बाग लगे हुए हैं और जहां कि बड़े बड़े साहूकार लोग रहते हैं, उन कोटियों में बड़े बड़े कुत्ते सामने खड़े दिखाई देते हैं और वे साहूकारों के कुत्ते जाड़ो में बड़े बड़े कम्बलों

### [ श्री विभूति मिश्र ]

से बंके रहते हैं। और जब तक यह असमानता मौजूद रहती है तब तक यह नरीवी का बांटना और भाई चारा कहां हुआ ? आप बतलाइये कि क्या यही भाई चारा है, यही अपनत्व है, जो कि इस देशमें चलाना चाहते हैं ? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नाजामय बात है। आप को इस तरह का इन्सेन्टिव पैदा करना चाहिये जिस से कि अपने ऊपर हम अधिक रोक लगा सकें।

• “न त्वहम् कामये राज्यम न स्वर्गम् नाप्नुन-  
भवं ।  
कामये दुःख तप्तानाम् प्राणीनामातिनाशनम् ।।

यह गांधी जी की प्रार्थना है, इस की तरफ आप ध्यान दें तभी हमारा और आप का काम चल सकता है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि गरीबी को कैसे बांटा जा सकता है। आज बड़े बड़े सेठ साहूकार हैं, वह भी चार रोटी खाते हैं। अगर उन के पास कम पैसे रहें तो उन को चिन्ता करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं रहेगी। जब उन के पास पैसा होगा तभी उस की रखवाली की जरूरत पड़ती है। जहां मधु रहता है वहीं मधु निकालने वाला जाता है, जहां मधु नहीं रहता है वहां कोई नहीं जाता है। इस लिये यदि आप के पास से पैसा जा कर पैसा देश के लिये खर्च हो जायेगा तो आप का देश भी धनिक होगा और उस की कीर्ति भी होगी। विनोबा जी ने कहा है :

“वेद भगवान ने कहा है कि जो मनुष्य दान परायण है और अपनी सम्पत्ति का उपयोग सदा सर्वदा सेवा में लगाता है, उसके पास होने वाले धन संभय का किसी को मत्सर नहीं होता है।”

फिर विनोबा जी कहते हैं :

“हम अपने कुल उद्योग सेवा के लिये करेंगे, हम अपनी दमड़ी दमड़ी का हिसाब लोगों के सामने पेश करेंगे। पेट के लिये जितना मेहनताना चाहिये, उतना ही लेंगे, ज्यादा नहीं। उसका भी हिसाब हम जनता के सामने पेश करेंगे और उसपर भी जनता की टीका सुनना चाहेंगे और उस टीका में यदि सत्य दिखायी पड़ेगा, तो उसे दुरुस्त करने के लिये हम तैयार रहेंगे।”

विनोबा जी ने सेंटों को बारे में यह २० अप्रैल, १९५६ के ‘भूदान यज्ञ’ में कहा है। वह कहते हैं कि हम लोग सिर्फ अपने खाने के लिये ही पैसा लें। इसी तरह से गांधी जी ने भी हमें अपरिग्रह वृत्ति की शिक्षा दी थी।

एक बात हम को बहुत दुःखदायी मालूम होती है। हम अपनी पंच वर्षीय योजना को चलाने के

लिये या हिबस्तान का राजकाज चलाने के लिये कभी अमरीका के पास जाते हैं कभी रूस के पास जाते हैं, और उसके सम्बन्ध में कहते हैं कि उस में कोई स्टिंग नहीं रहना चाहिये, कोई बन्धन नहीं रहना चाहिये। मैं भ्रदब से कहता हूँ कि यह मेरे निजी अनुभव की बात है। एक बार मैं ने किसी आदमी से थोड़ा रुपया ले लिया था, मेरे पास एक बेल गाड़ी थी। जिस आदमी से मैं ने रुपया लिया था वह साल छः महीने में अक्सर बेलगाड़ी मांग लिया करता था। मैं क्या करता, बूक उसका कर्जा नहीं भ्रदा कर पाया था, इस लिये उस को बेलगाड़ी मुफ्त देनी पड़ती थी। इसी तरह से जो आदमी किसी का रुपया पैसा लेता है वह लाख चाहे कि कोई स्टिंग न हो, लेकिन उस को दूसरे की मुरीवत जरूर करनी पड़ती है। जिस ने किसी का पैसा लिया होगा उस को अनुभव होगा कि कर्जा लेने में स्टिंग जरूर होता है। हमारे देश को भी दूसरे देशों से कर्जा लेना पड़ता है इस लिये उस के ऊपर दूसरे का दबाव पड़ ही सकता है। आखिर, आज यहां पर इतने राजा महाराजा बैठे हुए हैं जिन के पास अपार सम्पत्ति भरी हुई है। इन के पास मिलें हैं, जिन स यह लाभ उठाते हैं। दूसरे अर्थ पर बड़े बड़े सेठ साहूकार हैं जिन के कारखाने चलते हैं, मिले चलती हैं उन से पैसा लिया जाये, यहाँ पर बड़े बड़े सरकारी नौकर हैं जिन को बड़ी तनख्वाहें मिलती हैं। भगवान ने सब कुछ भ्रलग भ्रलग बनाया, लेकिन पेट किसी का भी दूसरा नहीं बनाया। हिन्दुस्तान में मेरे जैसे बहुत से आदमी हैं जो मेहनत करते हैं। मैं ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक सेर, कच्चा भ्रनाज खा सकता हूँ, पक्का आध सेर से ज्यादा नहीं खा सकता, जो बड़े बड़े दफ्तरों में काम करने वाले हैं वह एक पाव से अधिक नहीं खायेंगे। तो पेट में भ्रगवान ने कोई अन्तर नहीं किया, लेकिन हम लोगों ने उन में अन्तर कर के किसी को एक हजार दिया और किसी को दो हजार दिया। कहा जाता है कि तनख्वाह से इज्जत होगी। तनख्वाह से इज्जत नहीं होती। विनोबा जी कहते हैं कि तनख्वाह से इज्जत नहीं होती, इज्जत सेवा करने से होती है। कांग्रेस के लोगों ने और नेताओं ने सेवा की सेवा की और जनता उन के पीछे मरी, गांधी जी की सेवा की वजह से जनता हम लोगों के पीछे दौड़ी। जब गांधी जी चम्पारन गये तनख्वाह लोगों को निकालने के लिये तो सत्तू खाते थे। यह सत्तू गरीब का भोजन है, लेकिन गांधी जी ने तो सेवा का ही व्रत लिया हुआ था, उन्होंने सत्तू खा कर हम लोगों का दुःख दूर किया, और वह भ्रमर

हो गये, महात्मा हो गये, इस लिये सरकार यदि पंचवर्षीय योजना को चलाता चाहती है तो उस को इस के लिये रुपये की कमी नहीं होगी, लेकिन सरकार को चाहिये कि वह जनता की सेवा में लगे। यहां पर कमी कमी कहा जाता है कि कैपिटल फार्मेशन नहीं होगा। मैं पूंजीपतियों से पूछना चाहता हूँ, कि, बड़े बड़े धनिक लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप के पास पैसा रहेगा तभी कैपिटल फार्मेशन होगा ? अगर वह पैसा सरकार के पास रहेगा तो क्या वह उड़ जायेगा ? यह कहते हैं कि कैपिटल फार्मेशन (पूँजी निर्माण) नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर सरकार उस पैसे को, दूसरे कामों में लगाये, उन्नति के कामों में लगाये, विकास के कामों में लगाये, जिस से देश की उत्तरोत्तर उन्नति हो, तो देश का ज्यादा लाभ होगा। कैपिटल फार्मेशन आप के पास होने से तो आपके पास ही वह पैसा बना रहेगा लेकिन सरकार के पास रहने से उस का सदुपयोग हो सकेगा।

दूसरी बात मैं आप को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि विनोबा जी ने कहा है कि पैसे से इज्जत नहीं होती इज्जत काम से होती है।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्या माननीय सदस्य और सदस्यों की बात अपने रेजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) पर नहीं सुनेंगे ?

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** मैं एक बड़ी अच्छी बात कहता हूँ। हमारे एक भाई श्री हिम्मतसिंहका हैं जो कि राज्य सभा के मेम्बर (सदस्य) हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को भी ज्यादा मिलता है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जान सकते हैं कि मैं अपर चैम्बर की बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ, लेकिन उनका चुनाव कैसे होता है। चीफ मिनिस्टर से कहा, मूबे के प्रेसिडेंट से कहा, उन की योड़ी बहुत आबभगत की और फिर चुन कर चले आते हैं।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** कोई ऐसी चीज किसी सदन का नाम ले कर नहीं कहनी चाहिये।

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** उन्होंने अपनी स्पीच (भाषण) में कहा है। साहब, मैं तो कहता हूँ कि अच्छा होता अगर वह ४०० का १०० रुपये कर देते। हम लोग जो लोक सभा के सदस्य हैं, ४०० रुपये पाते हैं, इनकम टैक्स बगैरह काट कर ३२४ रुपये बच जाता है, फिर हम लोग यहां रहते हैं। आप सोचिये, हम यहां आते हैं, अपनी कांस्टिट्यूएन्सी (निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र) में जाते हैं हम पर जिला कांग्रेस कमेटी की जबाबदेही

है, प्रांतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी की जबाबदेही है, राम सुभग सिंह की जबाब देही है, वह १७५ रुपये ले लेते हैं, फिर हम को चुनाव लड़ना पड़ता है, हम लोग कांग्रेसी ठहरे, पांच आदमी धायेंगे उन को खिलायेंगे, यह भी तो आखिर हमारी जिम्मेदारी है, लेकिन राज्य सभा के लिये ऐसी कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वहां के लोगों की तनस्वाह कम कर दी जानी चाहिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्या यह सीलिंग आप इनकम के साथ धायेंगे ?

**श्री० रजबीर सिंह (रोहतक) :** एलेक्शन (निर्वाचन) भी लड़ना पड़ता है और उस में खर्च करना पड़ता है।

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** आज के इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में निकला है कि दस स्टेट्स में जमींदारों के ऊपर सीलिंग लगाने से १,४०६ लाख एकड़ जमीन बचेगी। अभी सारे हिन्दुस्तान का फसला नहीं हुआ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सब की सीलिंग हो, यह नहीं कि सिर्फ जमीन वालों की सीलिंग हो औरों की नहीं, क्योंकि जमीन वालों ने ही स्वराज्य की लड़ाई लड़ी, और उस में मदद की, स्वराज्य कायम किया। लेकिन उन के लिये तो आप कहते हैं कि सीलिंग कर दी जाये, आप के खयाल से यह बड़ी जरूरी चीज है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या जो मिल का प्रोडक्शन (उत्पादन) है, उत्पादन के खर्चे हैं यह जरूरी नहीं है ? जमीन की, जो कि खेती की चीज है, उस की सीलिंग तो आप करते हैं, लेकिन आज हमारे बिहार की टाटा मिल में आयरन और (कच्चा लोहा) कहां से आता है ? वह भी तो जमीन से ही आता है, आप उसको नेशनलाइज (राष्ट्र कृत) क्यों नहीं करते हैं ? आज सरकार को सुल्ट जरूरत है, और मैं उस से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि साहब, यदि आप गांधी जी के उसूलों को मानते हैं और गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों पर चलते हैं और उन को राष्ट्रपिता कहते हैं, तो यह उन की धाती है, मैं ने आप को गांधी जी की टेकनीक बताई है, गांधी जी ने यह भी कहा है कि जो समाज के बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति हैं, या जो समाज में पैसे वाले आदमी हैं, उन को परिश्रम करना चाहिये। गांधी जी ने उन को ट्रस्टीशिप की बात बतलाई और यह भी बतलाया कि अगर वह लोग ऐसा नहीं करते तो हम को अधिकार है कि हम उन से नान-बायोलेंट नान-क्रोआपरेशन (अहिंसामक असहयोग) कर दें। जो किताब भरे पास है

### [श्री बिभूति मिश्र]

उस में गांधी जी ने इस नान-बायोलेंट नाम-कोआपरेशन की बात कही है। आज हम नान-बायोलेंट ना-कोआपरेशन की बात नहीं सोचते क्योंकि हमारी सरकार इस समय है। लेकिन सरकार को गांधी जी के इस उसूल को अविलम्ब काम में लाना चाहिये।

आज मैं चाहता हूँ कि जैसा कि हम ने कराची में तय किया था कि किसी आदमी की तनखाह ५०० से ज्यादा नहीं होनी चाहिये और १०० रुपये से कम नहीं होनी चाहिये, उस को भ्रमल में लाया जाय। किसी आदमी की तनखाह उस की इज्जत नहीं घटाती बढाती है, तनखाह से किसी आदमी के जीवन यापन में हेर फेर नहीं होता। बल्कि मेरा खयाल तो यह है कि कम पैसे वाला आदमी ज्यादा फूर्तीला रहेगा। जिस को ज्यादा पैसा मिलेगा वह ढीला हो जायेगा, उस का शरीर मोटा हो जायेगा और वह सुस्ती से काम करेगा। जो फौज में आगे फ्रंट पर जाते हैं वे कम पैसा पाते हैं और काम करते ठीक तरह से हैं और हमेशा चुस्त रहते हैं लेकिन जो सेठ लोग होते हैं, जिन के पास पैसा जरूरत से ज्यादा होता है उनके शरीर हमेशा ढीले ही रहते हैं और नाम को भी चुस्ती उनके अन्दर नहीं होती। हमारे यहां एक बड़े मिल के मालिक हैं, उनसे मेरी कुछ दिन पहले बात हुई थी। उन्होंने मुझे कहा कि साहब मैं ५० आदमियों का भरण पोषण करता हूँ। मैंने कहा कि आप कैसे उनका भरण पोषण करते हैं तो उन्होंने कहा कि मैंने उनको अपने यहां रखा है और उनको तनखाह देता हूँ। मैंने कहा कि आप उनको इसी तरह से तनखाह नहीं दे देते हैं, उनसे आप काम करवाते हैं तब तनखाह देते हैं। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह मेटेलिटी (मनोवृत्ति) .....

4 P.M.

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं भी आप से विनय करना चाहता हूँ कि जो ज्यादा से ज्यादा समय एक रजोल्यूशन को मूव (प्रस्तुत) करने के लिये मिल सकता है वह आपको दे दिया गया है। अब आप अपना भाषण समाप्त करें।

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** पांच मिनट और दीजिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** आपने काफी समय ले लिया है, अब आप खत्म कीजिये।

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** अभी खत्म किये देता हूँ।

अब मैं आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की एक रिपोर्ट मिली है जिसका नाम है ग्राल इंडिया इनकम

टैक्स रेबेन्यू स्टेटिस्टिक्स फार दी यीर १९५४-५५ (सन् १९५४-५५ के ग्रालि भारतीय आयकर राजस्व के आकड़े)। इसमें लिखा हुआ है कि ४,५५,७२० आदमियों के पास इनकम टैक्स, सुपर टैक्स, सरचार्ज इत्यादि सब कुछ ले लेने के बाद ५,८२,१८,८५७ रुपये बचे। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि तकरीबन ६ लाख आदमियों के पास सारे टैक्स अदा करने के बाद तकरीबन ६ अरब रुपये बचे। अब मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बजह है कि इतने थोड़े आदमियों के पास इतना ज्यादा रुपया चला जाता है जब कि कितने ही आदमियों को खाने को रोटी नहीं मिलती है। मैं आपको कहता हूँ कि आप इन से रुपया क्यों नहीं बँसूल करते हैं और क्यों इनके पास इतनी ज्यादा रकम छोड़ते हैं। इस में सरकारी कर्मचारी, रिजिस्टर्ड फर्म्स, अन-रिजिस्टर्ड फर्म्स सभी शामिल हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इनकम-टैक्स से बचने के लिये अमीर लोग कई तरीके निकाल लेते हैं और बहुत सा टैक्स इवेजन (कर अपवंचन) होता है। जब हमें रुपये की जरूरत है, जब हमें अपने प्लान (योजना) को एक्सीक्यूट (क्रियान्वित) करने के लिये बहुत सा रुपया चाहिये तो क्या बजह है कि हम टैक्स-इवेजन होने देते हैं। हमें चाहिये कि हम कड़ाई से काम लें और देखें कि कोई टैक्स इवेजन न हो।

अब यह जो इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रेजोल्यूशन (औद्योगिक नीति सम्बन्धी संकल्प) ३० अप्रैल १९५६ का है इसमें लिखा हुआ है कि यह चीजें हम देंगे :

"Justice, Social, economic and political;

Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;

Equality of status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all;

Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation."

अब यह चीजें जो हैं, ये सब की सब हमारे विधान में भी दर्ज हैं। लेकिन मैं पूछता हूँ कि यह सब चीजें आज कहाँ हैं और कैसे आप इनको काम में लाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और कैसे लाना चाहते हैं। एक आदमी तो रीटी के बगैर भूला मरता है जब दूसरे के पास इतना खाना है कि कुछ ठिकाना ही नहीं है। एक आदमी के पास तो रहने के लिये



एक कोटही भी नहीं है जब कि दूसरे के पास आलीशान मकान, और महल हैं। एक आदमी के पास दवाई खरीदने के लिए पैसा नहीं है जब कि दूसरे के पास अच्छे से अच्छे डाक्टर की सर्विसेज एवलेबल (सेवाएं उपलब्ध) हैं ऐसी हालत में कहां सोशल जस्टिस है, कहां फ्रंटरीनीटी है, कहां इक्वैलिटी है। जब हम ने इन चीजों को विधान में दर्ज कर दिया है तो हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि इनको ग्रन्ड में भी लायें। आप के इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी स्टेटमेंट को जब मैं और आगे पढ़ता हूँ तो यह लिखा हुआ पाता हूँ कि

"Equally, it is urgent, to reduce disparities in income and wealth which exist today, to prevent private monopolies...."

इस किताब को आपने अभी हाल ही में प्रकाशित किया है और आपने कहा है कि इतनी डिसपैरिटी इनकम में नहीं होनी चाहिये। तो मैं सरकार से कहता हूँ कि वह इसको कार्यान्वित करे और जब वह इसे कार्यान्वित करेगी तभी हम समझेंगे कि वह गांधीजी के बतलाये हुए उद्देश्यों पर चलती है। गांधी जी की विरासत को हमें चाहिये कि हम ठोक से काम में लायें। हमें चाहिये कि इक्वैलिटी लाने का हर सम्भव उपाय करें। अगर हम ने गांधी जी के बतलाये हुये उद्देश्यों पर अमल नहीं किया तो हम जनता का विश्वास खो बैठेंगे। लोग कहेंगे कि कांग्रेस वालों ने विश्वास भंग किया है। मुझे विश्वास है हमारे प्रधानमंत्री इस और अवश्य ध्यान देंगे और उनके रहते रहते हमारा देश स्वर्ग बन जायेगा। मैं उनसे भी प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस और ध्यान दें और हमारी जो भावना है, उसकी जल्दी पूर्ति करें।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Resolution moved.

"This House is of opinion that Government should take suitable steps immediately to fix a ceiling on the income of an individual."

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"Having in view the objective of the socialistic pattern of society, this House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of five persons to examine the question of putting a ceiling on individual income with

instructions to report by the end of August, 1956."

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea cum Santal Parganas) :** I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House recommends to the Government to take appropriate measures to reduce the disparity in income prevailing between the different sections of society in the country."

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South):** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that Government should take suitable steps to fix Rs. 7500 per mensem as ceiling on the income of an individual."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** Shri Rachiah. All the hon. Members have collected together at one place!

**Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore—Reserved—Sch.—Castes) :** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that Government should introduce legislation for fixing a ceiling on the income of an individual and provision may be made that no officer in the country should get more than one thousand rupees per month as salary."

**Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha (Gaya West) :** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that in view of the Socialistic Pattern of Society that the Government is committed to achieve, it is necessary to fix a ceiling on income of an individual and for that purpose, Government should appoint a Commission consisting of experts and publicmen to go into the question in order to suggest the different stages and the various measures for achieving this objective."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri N. B. Chowdhury.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal):** I beg to move....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Certainly the hon. Member wishes to move, but his amendment seems a little out of place.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** I amend it in this way that I seek restrictions on individual earnings in a particular manner.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He may give suggestions when he speaks, but so far as his amendment is concerned, it is out of order. What has this to do with the revision of the agreements with the ex-rulers? Non-payment of compensation to big landlords for acquisition of their estates, limitation of dividends of corporate bodies, increasing the resources of the public sector—these are things that are outside the scope of the Resolution.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** So far as compensation is concerned. I had in mind only the Centrally-administered areas. There are zamindars there also.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There were zamindars. Now, the Resolution is that there should be a ceiling placed on incomes. It may be something connected with that but not quite relevant. The hon. Member may speak.

I will give him an opportunity and then he may make his suggestions.

The above amendments and the Resolution are before the House. Shri N. B. Chowdhury's amendment is out of order.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** This is a very important Resolution that has been moved by my respected colleague Shri Bibhuti Mishra. The Resolution has been moved due to the fact that the measures contemplated by the Government are rather towards making a discrimination between the rural and urban economy, and therefore we feel that the glaring inequalities in income and wealth that has been engendered by the capitalist society have become by now a distinct eye-sore to the world and especially to us in India. We feel this has caused the inefficient working of our economy. Sacrificing the superior and real satisfaction of the common man this capitalist society which has brought about these inequalities has been every day going on devising certain ways and means of expanding the income of the rich. The rich are in search of ways of spending money, while the poor are hardly able to keep their body and soul

together. Therefore, politically and economically, this is working havoc on the present society.

We have got no figures to show how the national income of our country is divided among the different groups. Though we cannot say what the concentration of income is in the different groups as the figures are not available, nonetheless the fact remains that inequality is greater in our country, not only greater but the greatest compared to other countries in the world.

It has been brought home to the country and the Government for a pretty long time that measures should be adopted to bring about equality in the country, giving full scope to the differentiated abilities and tastes of individuals. I for one do not plead for a dead level of absolute equality. But I would like to point out that when the disparity goes beyond a certain dimension, it becomes perilous. We know the usual argument that is advanced regarding the different abilities and tastes of different individuals. But the point is that when it goes out of control, it becomes perilous, and so is the case in India today. It is admitted on all sides that the position has become all the more so in our country.

The Taxation Enquiry Commission in their report, in Vol. I have pointed out at pages 154 and 155:

"The disparity in consumption levels prevalent at present in this country is a matter of common observation and there can be no doubt about its demoralising effect on the large masses of workers in the country as regards their willingness to accept higher tax burdens and yet work harder."

So, it works both ways. They have to pay more tax on the one hand, and on the other, they will have to work harder also. It has got a very bad and demoralising effect on the general masses in the country, who constitute nearly 80 per cent of our population.

It must be remembered that even with the present comparatively so-called high rate of taxation, we have not been able to bring about the desired measure of equality, whereas in other countries, as for instance, England they have been able to bring about a disposal of the incomes of the rich few to the poor many, and thus they have been able to bring about some sort of

equality. The result is that the number of persons drawing high salaries is comparatively small, and the gap between those drawing lower salaries and those drawing higher salaries is in fact very much lower than here.

We have no precise figures in this connection I have been hunting for these figures for a number of days, but I could not get them. Yet, I could give just a few examples to show what the position is in other countries. In the U.S.A. so far as the lower income group is concerned, a filing clerk gets Rs. 625 a month, whereas the pay of a typist is Rs. 1000 a month. So far as the person in the services is concerned, in the case of Foreign Service, he gets Rs. 5625 a month, and in the case of the civil jobs, he gets Rs. 4304 a month. In UK—the figures that I am giving are only comparative figures, the actual figures may be a little this way or that way—a clerk gets Rs. 189 a month, and the permanent secretary to the treasury gets Rs. 4012, and the other secretaries get Rs. 3791. In India, we find that a third division clerk gets Rs. 60 a month, a lower division clerk Rs. 55 while our Secretary-General to the Ministry of External Affairs gets Rs. 4500 a month, and the other secretaries get Rs. 4000 a month. That shows the extent of inequality that still prevails in our country in the services. If we compute these figures in terms of the whole income and on the basis of the income groups, the position becomes even more disastrous.

Whenever we raise this matter, we are asked to point out at least one example of a country in the world where the inequality of income has been removed. Instead of reducing the inequality by the adopting of measures for making the present disparity less and less, this what we are told. I have gone through the system that is prevalent in Canada, or in UK or in USA, and I would suggest that we can at least adopt the fiscal measures that are being taken on hand or have already been taken on hand in those countries, for achieving this objective. If that is not possible, then I would suggest that we can follow the system that is obtaining in UK. In England, after the taxes are realised, they are transferred to the people by way of social securities, divisible expenditure and so on, and this goes a long way to lessen the inequality. They collect the money from one group by means of taxation, and they transfer it to the

other group by way of social securities. I would like to quote in this connection figures regarding the divisible expenditure that was incurred by the Labour Government in England in 1948-49. We have no figures available after 1948-49.

So far as the distribution of transfers is concerned, we know that the money collected by way of taxes is passed on to the people again in three main ways. Though it is not possible to find out what is the *per capita* expenditure regarding individuals, yet I can say that so far as transfers and divisible expenditure is concerned, it is possible. So far as the distribution of transfers is concerned, we find that in UK for the income range below £135, the figures are as follows:

Pensions	86·90	(Million Pounds)
Health	7·24	"
Unemployment	11·29	"
Miscellaneous	4·32	"
Total Social security.	109·75	"
Other transfers.	27·63	"
Total transfers.	137·38	"

Then, the figures are given likewise for the different ranges of income. I need not quote the figures for all the income ranges, but I shall content myself with quoting the totals in respect of the various items, which are as follows:

Pension	332·72	(Million Pounds)
Health	66·30	"
Unemployment	22·18	"
Miscellaneous	94·95	"
Total Social Security	514·15	"
Other transfers	150·84	"
Total transfers	664·99	"

This is the position so far as transfers are concerned, that is to say, so far as social security and other measures are concerned.

So far as divisible benefits are concerned, the subsidy given by the Labour Government to the income range below £135 was 29·13 million pounds in 1948-49, in respect of education it was £5·84 million, in respect of national health service, £16·05 million, in respect of housing £11·14 million, in respect of miscellaneous £8·16 million, and the total was £70·32 million.

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

Then, the figures in respect of the different income ranges are given. I need not quote all those figures. I shall only give the totals which are as follows :

Subsidies	471·10	(Million Pounds)
Education	171·57	"
National Health Service.	253·84	"
Housing	69·60	"
Miscellaneous	43·74	"
TOTAL	1009·85	"

Therefore, I would say that though no precise formulae have been prescribed for reducing the inequality between different sections of society, yet here is an example of what the Labour Government in England has done in 1948-49. By a process of graduated income-tax and other measures, they were able to take the money from one section of society which had more than what it required, and distribute it to the other sections, that is to say, the lower income groups.

But so far as India is concerned, we find that there are no such measures on which we can count for the lower income groups to get relief by way of unemployment benefits or social security measures. In the case of Britain, the inequality has been reduced by resort to fiscal measures. But unfortunately, in our country, no such thing has been done. We are confronted with the argument that there is no example of a country in the world where such equality has been brought about on the basis of the socialistic pattern. But we can say here is a case in which we find that by resort to fiscal measures, inequality of income and wealth between different sections of society has been reduced.

In this connection, I would like to point out one other thing. In the USA, the aggregate net distribution of income amounted to 5·4 per cent of the national income in 1938-39, and it rose to 7·5 per cent in 1946-47. In Britain, in 1937, it was 8·8 per cent, but in 1948-49, it rose to 13·1 per cent.

I would like to know what percentage of our national income is being distributed to the lower income groups by way of this divisible expenditure or transfers so that the inequality in our country—the highest in the world—is at least slightly lessened. We know that

in Great Britain and USA in the pre-war period, the inequality had the same pattern. After the war, Great Britain adopted measures according to which we find that, compared to USA, it advanced more towards equality by way of distribution of this divisible expenditure and transfers and also by way of revision of the entire tax system. In the USA, we find that the inequality still persists in the same way after the war as before the war.

The other day I had an opportunity to hear Prof. Kaldor when he addressed one of our Committees. He was saying how the rate of income-tax in their country, compared to our country might be called less regressive. I do not want to go into the details of the system just now, nor will time permit me to do so, but I can say that we are expecting his report, though it may be made available to us or may not be. In Prof. Kaldor's opinion, the tax system in India is the most 'regressive' reactionary and out of date—I am quoting his words. In his view, the Report of the Taxation Inquiry Commission is much less than ordinary.

**Shri A. M. Thomas** (Ernakulam): That he did not say.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** That he did not say in the meeting. But when we talked to him, he said so. It was there open, nothing secret.

Time only will show how far, according to that report that we are expecting, or in the light of other measures that are being adopted in this country, we can effect a lessening of the inequality. Whether we go in for income-tax, whether we go in for expenditure tax or whether we go in for a capital levy or not, the fact remains that our economy is more stressing in bringing about inequality between the rural and urban sectors. We are now going out for a land ceiling. What will be the position? For an optimum holding, the income that a family of five will derive may be Rs. 3600. The maximum will be 3 times that, which will come to Rs. 7800.

**An Hon. Member:** Maximum is Rs. 3600.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** He will be allowed to keep 3 times the optimum holding. It will come to Rs. 7800.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** I am referring to one unit of five. It will have Rs. 3600. If he has got 3 units, it will be 3 times that (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I should also be taken into confidence in that private talk.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** I say, let it be Rs. 3600. The capital that we expect in the countryside may be about Rs. 1½ lakhs or less.

Coming to the urban side, we find concentration of wealth and concentration of economic power. Concentration is not only in the income that is derived but also in wealth. It has been said that in the most industrially advanced countries in the world, concentration is more of wealth than of income. It is essential, if we want to bring on the same level the rural and urban economy that we must adopt means by which we can reduce this great disparity between the rural ceiling and the urban ceiling.

I feel that so far as this equality is concerned, we cannot go to the dead stop level; none the less, the fact remains that by fiscal measures, by enforcing a capital levy and other measures, we can go ahead. It is now being said that capital levy will be confiscation of property. In that case, income-tax is also confiscation of income. As far back as 1946-47 even the Colwyn Committee and Miss Kathleen had suggested that it was essential that, in those countries where the concentration of wealth was more, and concentration of capital was more, than of income, we should have a capital levy.

If we want that the majority of the population of this country, the teeming millions of India, should not feel that pinch of having a small ceiling, thereby having a small income and small capital compared to the urban economy, where people have big income, whereby people everyday devise ways and means to spend on their luxuries, if we want to stop this state of affairs, it is essential that we must radically change our fiscal measures. We must have a capital levy, we must have an annual tax on wealth; we must have a system of steeply graded income-tax. By these measures we can remove this disparity between the incomes and also wealth in the different sections of society. With these words, I commend my

amendment to the acceptance of the House in place of the motion moved by Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I congratulate my hon. friend, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, on pinpointing a very important problem that is before our country at present. He placed his arguments on a very high moral plane. I think in the land of the Buddha and Gandhi and great spiritual prophets, the moral argument should have the greatest amount of weight with us. None can question the validity of that argument and those who have ears to hear will pay heed to it. But I want to leave that kind of argument out for the present, because that has been done in a most excellent manner by my hon. friend. I want to place my arguments on the sociological ground.

The other day when we were on the third reading of the Hindu Succession Bill, our Prime Minister gave one of his most lucid and illuminating expositions of the social philosophy that the India of today needs. We had several times listened to his speeches on political philosophy and on economic philosophy, but I must say that that was one of the few occasions on which I heard him on the social philosophy which the present day India needs. If I understood him aright, he said that we want to build up a good society, and the basis of that society is equality, equality between the sexes, and not mere sentimental equality, not mere platitudinous equality, but equality all along the line—equality in practice.

We should have equality so far as proprietary rights are concerned. I think in India, to whatever party we may belong, we are all embarking on the venture of building up a good society. For that good society, the biggest hurdle is the disparity in income that we face today in India.

Of course, we talk about the socialist pattern of society and we are trying a great deal to bring it about. For instance, we have adopted some fiscal measures to reduce the disparity in income. We have increased the income-tax at certain levels and we have our Estate Duty also. There are other measures which are under contemplation. These are fiscal measures. But the average man in India does not understand the conception of the reality of this idea as long as he sees glaring and

monstrous inequalities of income in this country. Therefore, something has got to be done.

My friend says that we should put a ceiling on incomes. That may be one of the ways. But, I would say that we should do something to bridge the gap between the highest and the lowest incomes in the country. This exists all along the line. We see it so far as our Government services are concerned. We see it so far as our private sector is concerned and we see it also so far as the public sector is concerned. We see it in the living conditions of the average farmer and we see it in the living conditions of the average city-dweller. All these things have got to be ironed out, smoothed out, if we are to build up a good society of which the Prime Minister has given us a vision and of which Mahatma Gandhi also gave us a vision.

My friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad was referring to the UK and other western countries. I want to refer to Japan. It is one of our neighbours; it is an Asiatic country. I would draw the attention of this House to what is happening in Japan. In Japan, the national income is, *per capita*, Rs. 295. The wages of urban unskilled labour are Rs. 675. The lowest clerical salary is Rs. 650 and the highest administrative salary is Rs. 8,800. You can understand what the proportion between these and the national income is.

**Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha:** Are these the latest figures?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am quoting the figures which I have been able to get. (*Interruption*). I do not want to quote figures. Whenever I quote figures there is some trouble in this House. I only want that I should be permitted to quote my figures and...

**Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha:** I am not challenging the figures.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sure there won't be any trouble now.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** As long as you are there, I know there would be no trouble.

I quote these figures to show the proportion between the national income and the highest administrative salary. My friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has given some figures and I do not want to quote them again but I would say

that here in India the gap is very very big and that has got to be bridged in some way.

I proposed a resolution for the appointment of a second Pay Commission which was not accepted by this House. Therein I made a suggestion so far as the permanent services are concerned. I also made a proposal with regard to the income of our private sector people. This is something which goes all along the line. It is a resolution which covers every aspect of our life, every department of our activity every sector of our endeavour. It concerns the average villages as well as the cities; it concerns unskilled labour as much as skilled labour; it concerns the fourth division clerk as well as a Secretary to our Government. I would say that on sociological grounds, there is no reason why we should not accept the resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend.

This morning an hon. Member of this House put a supplementary question. I do not want to repeat the very words of that question. What he wanted to say was this: Why not have the identification of the common man with our planning? So long as this disparity in income persists, I think that identification of the average man will not be there.

Some hon. friend said that we have done something with regard to the abolition of the zamindari. I think that is something good that has been done. Some friends will say, abolish the zamindari without paying compensation. We do not want that. We have abolished the zamindari. But, I would ask one point. Have we abolished slum landlordism; have we abolished the landlord system in the cities? Those of my friends who have read George Bernard Shaw's play will remember that he delivered a very vigorous attack on slum landlordism and he said that that kind of landlordism was the basis of many of our social evils. What we have done with regard to the zamindari, we should do with regard to landlordism in the city also and we should do the same with regard to the services of our country.

At the same time, you should do something with regard to the private sector. There are some persons in the private sector who have fabulous incomes in spite of the deductions made by the Income-tax department and in

spite of other things. Their incomes are very very high and they live in splendour, which, I think, does not fit in with the socialist pattern of society that we proclaim from our housetops. As Bernard Shaw said in one of his plays, poverty and inequality are the two worst things in life. He denounced poverty and said that he wanted a socialist State in which everyone will have at least an income of £500 a year. That was Bernard Shaw's vision of good society. I would like that in our country also we should have a society where everyone has an income of Rs. 500 per month at least. That will be a good sign. But, as long as we cannot bring that into being, we should try to reduce the gap between the highest income and the lowest. That is necessary from every point of view.

We have the spectacle of the cities and the villages. Even amongst the villages, we have more developed villages and less developed villages. We have backward classes in our country as well as backward areas in the country.

Those backward areas are such as have not felt the impact of progress that is going on somewhere. So, all these kinds of disparities have to be abolished. People who come from the hilly districts of Tehri-Garhwal, Kangra, Hoshiarpur, Himachal Pradesh, etc., suffer from backwardness which is not only territorial but which is also social and economic. Therefore, if we want to build a good society as we all want to do, we should have this kind of disparity eliminated. But it cannot be done on an *ad hoc* basis.

Therefore, I would suggest that the Government of India should appoint a committee which should consist of some persons who are well-versed in Gandhian economics, and some persons who know the traditional economics to which my hon. friend referred. That committee may have other representatives also, and it should phase out a programme for the abolition of these disparities in the cities as well as in the villages, in the private sector as well as in the public sector. That should be done on a scientific basis and should not be left to persons only of one way of thinking. There should be persons of all ways of thinking also to thrash out this problem and to solve it. I do not think there is anybody in this House who is not in sympathy with the spirit of the resolution moved by my hon. friend. Everybody will endorse the spirit of this

resolution, but the question is how it is to be implemented. For that purpose I would say that we should appoint a committee consisting of different types of persons so that we can have a programme for bringing this about, for bringing a good society into being, of which we talk a great deal.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury :** I welcome the resolution brought forward by Shri Bibhuti Mishra. He has given us this opportunity to discuss a very important question on the eve of the discussion of the Second Five Year Plan.

It has already been discussed to some extent in the other House and now we have also got an opportunity here to discuss the resolution. Certainly it is an advantage for us so far as the crystallization of opinion in this country with regard to this very important question is concerned. In our constitution there is a Directive Principle that the Government shall direct its policy in order to prevent the concentration of wealth in a few hands. It will be seen from the Preamble to the Constitution itself that there shall be social, economic and political justice.

So far as the question of economic justice is concerned, we know that in our country the vast majority of the people do not get it. Recently the ruling party has adopted the socialist pattern as its goal. We have welcomed it. So far as the declaration of this objective is concerned, there is hardly anybody who will oppose it if he has the interest of the vast millions of the common people in his heart.

In the draft of the Second Five Year Plan supplied to us, it has been enunciated that the objective of the Plan is, among other things, a reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power. It has also been stated that there will be removal of disparities within the shortest possible period. With this objective before us, we find it very difficult to reconcile ourselves to the concrete policies which are being adopted with regard to many matters by the Government. I tried to move an amendment, but that has been ruled out of order. So, I would in this connection offer certain suggestions. If we really want to achieve this objective, we have not only to make these formulations and enunciations but also adopt concrete measures for the implementation of the provisions of such resolution or

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury]  
 legislation. When formulating our economic policies, we should adopt concrete measures which would really lead to the removal of appalling disparities in incomes that exist now.

So far as existing conditions are concerned, in our country there is a population of about 37 crores by this time and the vast majority of the people are getting far less than the average national income of India. Our average national income is, according to the latest calculation, about Rs. 280. There are about 18 million agricultural working families and their number is about 8 crores. What is their income? According to the survey that was conducted by the Government of India some time back—at that time the income was a little higher than it is now—the income in some cases was only Rs. 100, that is, less than half the average national income. That was stated by the hon. Labour Minister some time back. The average income of an agricultural labourer is less than half the average national income. We find that so far as the vast majority of the people are concerned, their income is very low. Take the case of other people, the 70 per cent of the people who depend on agriculture. It has been stated that 75 per cent of those people have less than economic holdings, which means that their income is in many cases less than the average national income. On one side we have the picture of the agricultural workers and others who are the vast majority of the poor peasantry. Along with this, we see the conditions of the low-paid middle-class employees and other workers in factories and industrial concerns, and their income is also very low. Unemployment is increasing, and that means that its effect on the income of the low-paid employees is deteriorating living conditions of the people. Here is a clear picture of the vast majority of our population having a very low income, finding it difficult to make both ends meet, and on the other side there is this picture of a very high income. I was going through the report of the Government of India Central Board of Revenue, which has already been referred to by the Mover of the resolution. There I find that a few lakhs of people in India are having a high income. If you analyse the figures of persons who are paying income-tax, it will be found that the income of persons, who earn above, say, Rs. 30,000 or even if you take

Rs. 80,000, has gone up during the last few years, whereas the income of those who earn less than Rs. 20,000 or so, has gone down in most cases. From all these, it appears that the benefit of the increased production as a result of the working of the First Plan or the increased national income, has not gone to the vast millions of our people. In these circumstances, the imposition of a ceiling on individual incomes is essential. The hon. Mover has rightly pointed out that the poor people in the villages are not in a position to make both ends meet but there are so many high salaried ICS officers, some of whom are drawing Rs. 4000 and more.

**Shri K. K. Basu** (Diamond Harbour): There are 15,000 bank managers.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury**: I am dealing with salaried officials. You are asking poor agricultural people to do *shramdan* in order to make our Plan a success and intensify the nation-building activities. These high officers who are drawing three and four thousands—should they not be asked to make some sacrifice? Then, why not there be an imposition of the ceiling? Why should not they make some sacrifice for the development of our country?

It has been observed by the members of the Pay Commission that the ICS people would take sometime to break away from certain prejudices and adjust themselves to the new conditions. Nine years have passed. Has not the time come for them to change their outlook and adapt themselves to the new conditions? In the present circumstances, when we are trying to find out resources and create enthusiasm in the country for the rapid economic reconstruction and development of our country, it is essential that there should be a ceiling so far as high salaries are concerned.

We are not in a position to fix a minimum wage of Rs. 100 per month. It has been demanded by the trade union workers in the country. We have not been able to fix a reasonably minimum salary for the primary school teacher. Frequently, questions are being put in this House regarding this. Now, they are talking of paying Rs. 40 or Rs. 50 to these teachers. The primary school teachers, the matriculate teachers are going to get only Rs. 50. Even that has not come into effect in certain States but there are officials drawing Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000. This is an intolerable situation. To allow this



to continue and at the same time to say that we are working for a socialist pattern of society, is something which could not be understood by the people.

Consider the salaries of other people. The other day while replying to a question in the other House, the hon. Minister gave some figures regarding the salary of the Chairman of the State Bank. I criticised it when it was discussed in this House. But the hon. Finance Minister said that if we knew the qualifications of the man, if we knew his name, then we would not grudge the salary.

**The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha):** I hope there is some confusion about the salary of the Chairman of the State Bank and the salary of the Managing Director of the State Bank. It is the salary of the Managing Director that was discussed in the other House the other day, not that of the Chairman.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** I correct myself. But, so far as the point is concerned, it remains: How many thousands per month are being paid? It appeared in the papers; everybody knows. It is Rs. 7,000 or Rs. 8,000. The hon. Minister here will give the correct information as there are several figures appearing in the papers. The managing directors are being paid such huge salaries. At the same time, other people who are engaged in doing similar work are not even given the reasonable minimum that is needed today.

Now, I come to the private sector. Very often it is said that we cannot say anything with regard to the private sector. In this report, I find that there are persons who are earning fat amounts. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Unauthorised voices should not be so loud.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** Some of them are earning as much as two lakhs or so per annum. Why is it that the Government does not put any restriction on the salaries of people in the private sector? The question of salaries paid by the foreign companies to their employees has been raised here several times. They are paying thousands of rupees per month. Some concerns, like the Tatas, etc., are big firms and they go on paying to their employees Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 15,000. If you do not put any restrictions on such things, you have certainly no justification to

claim that you are working for the socialist pattern of society. (*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There can be only one hon. Member on his legs.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** If they are allowed to pay such huge salaries, we cannot get large amounts for the public works that we want to undertake nor can we reduce the inequalities. It is necessary that the Government should put some restrictions in the interest of the country on the salaries of persons working in the private sector.

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

**Mr. N. B. Chowdhury:** I shall mention only two other points. In order to have resources for our Plan and also create enthusiasm in the country, it is necessary to put a ceiling on the income of the individual. With that object in view I have given some suggestions in my amendment, such as non-payment of compensation to big landlords and zamindars. Those persons who have income from other sources than land and those who have some business interests, will not suffer if compensation is not paid. If compensation has to be paid, it will be realised from the peasants. This will cause hardship to the peasants and will not remove the disparity or raise the standard of living of the people.

[**SHRI RAGHAVACHARI in the Chair**]

I have also asked for the revision of the agreements with the ex-rulers. According to these covenants or agreements, they are allowed to retain whatever private money they had to a great extent. At the same time, we guarantee the payment of certain allowances. It is necessary that these agreements should be revised in the new set-up. When this agreement was entered into, there was no talk of socialist pattern of society. If we do not think of revising these agreements but think of honouring them in the changed circumstances, where will it lead to? Is it going to be something eternal? In that case, you cannot even dream of a socialist society in this land!

In this way, I have also asked for the limitation of the dividends of corporate bodies. There are also certain other measures, by which we shall be in a position to remove the appalling disparities that are prevailing today and thereby we will have resources also. It has already been pointed out by Kaldor

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury] and Baran, professors from America who assessed the resources in India, that there are sufficient economic potential and resources in the country, if we reduce the consumption of luxury goods by these high-salaried officials and people in the upper strata of society. If you pool your resources together and utilise them, if you collect the income-tax which is being evaded to the extent of Rs. 300 crores according to Mr. Kaldor, then, certainly there would be more resources in the public sector. Thereby we shall be able to spend more money in the public sector and thus raise the standard of living of the common people and restrict the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. If we do not agree outright to put any absolute figure as the ceiling on the income of a particular individual at least let us have such restrictive methods. We can restrict the income of an individual and thereby have more resources without imposing heavy taxes on the common people.

5 P.M.

**Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha :** Mr. Chairman, Sir, the resolution moved by my friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra is unexceptionable and I congratulate him for the unique privilege of having moved a resolution on which the entire House is agreed.

**Shri K. K. Basu :** Except your Minister.

**Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha :** Except perhaps the Minister, not with the principle of the resolution, but with respect to time.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra in moving the resolution referred to the philosophy of Gandhiji on this question, his views and that of Acharya Vinoba Bhave. He spoke with great vehemence and emotion on the subject and I think he is entitled to congratulations from every section of the House for this.

My task, Sir, has been rendered very easy, on account of the fact that two of my colleagues who preceded me have already quoted figures from different countries to show to what extent the disparity exists in our country. The resolution which has been placed before this House, is in my opinion, a natural corollary of the objective of the socialist pattern of society that we have set before the country, and is a logical development of the ideas and ideals which have informed our efforts, so far, in re-building this country.

80 W.P.M.  
A voice was raised just now that except the Minister everyone is agreed. Perhaps, the Minister might find it difficult to implement the resolution straight-away. But, with respect to the principle of the resolution, I do not suppose they have any difficulty in accepting it. After they have already imposed a ceiling on land-holding, I cannot understand how they can escape the obligation of imposing ceilings on incomes in other sectors of life. I would urge upon the Government to recognise the necessity for taking immediate steps to set up a committee, as recommended in my amendment, to go into the entire question and to suggest the various measures that ought to be taken in order to achieve this objective.

I was a little surprised to find in the papers—~~unfortunately, I was not present in the House~~—that the Finance Minister referred to the difficulty in implementing the idea of a ceiling on personal incomes and said, that he thought it to be not a feasible proposition because the Government would be called upon to pay heavy compensation for which the Government do not have enough funds. But they have already imposed ceilings on land. They have already acquired zamindaries. There also they were required to pay compensation. We have already passed the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, whereby we have given the power to the Government to fix any amount of compensation they like; it may be only a notional compensation which will not be justiciable in any court. Therefore, the amount of compensation should not deter the Finance Minister from proceeding with this laudable objective of imposing a ceiling on personal incomes.

I do not suppose anyone can blame the Government for being altogether unaware of the feelings of the Members on this question. The Prime Minister has so often criticised the vulgar display of wealth in which the few privileged indulge. He in doing so, has hit at the crux of the question. When he condemned the ~~(costumations)~~ living, he was aware of the feelings of the general public that the real difficulty is not with the possessions that you have, but the display of it in wasteful expenditure, on luxuries and other shows. From time immemorial, this question has been here. In fact, the real dissatisfaction produced is not by what people lack, but by what others have. ~~Even Aristotle once suggested that it is the desires of men and not their possessions~~

~~that ought to be equalised, which incidentally, meant that we should cut down the levels of consumption. The Taxation Enquiry Commission also has referred to this. They have said that it is a matter of content and large mass of people feel hurt at the way the rich few indulge in wasteful expenditure, and when you want them to work harder for the reconstruction of the country, it is much more than what they are expected to do. So, we have got to do something at the present moment.~~

It is generally said that if you are going to impose ceilings on incomes, you will kill incentive to save and invest. My friend has already referred to it. Most of the economists have also referred to it. Most of the persons who characterise this demand for ceiling as being slogan-mongering have no knowledge of economic theories or the different forces of economics that have come into play. I may remind the House that the Taxation Enquiry Commission was headed by no less a person than Dr. John Mathai, who is a well-known authority on economic theories. He was also, at one time, the Finance Minister of the Government of India. The membership of the Commission included distinguished economists and politicians. They also went into this question and they have come to the conclusion that the time has come when we should think of imposing ceilings on incomes.

They have not given any figures, nor are we suggesting any particular figure as limit on personal incomes. It has got to have a certain relation with the average ordinary income of a family. The disproportionate disparity that exists today in the incomes of different people is something which is shocking. And, if you really want to enthuse people and enlist public co-operation for the successful execution of your projects, you have got to do something to recapture their faith and their confidence in the protestations of Government. That you can do only by an act of Parliament fixing the ceiling on incomes. That will really create enthusiasm among the people. You cannot for long put it off. The clamour for this will grow in content and volume every day. As I have already said, when in other sectors of life you are going to impose ceilings, you cannot jolly well say that it is impracticable or not feasible in this case. It is no longer an emotional idea. It has already been examined, as I said, by economists.

5—121 Lok Sabha/65

That was so in the old, 19th century economic school of thought when people believed that any kind of interference with "laws of market" will prevent the supply of capital, will reduce the national income and would result in the hardships for the labouring classes. Those ideas have already been abandoned.

You can also reduce the disparities by some other measures. I do not mean to suggest that the Government of India have not been doing so. They have already taken measures, some fiscal measures, as my friend pointed out some time ago, to reduce disparities and to increase the welfare of the people. We are spending a lot of money over social services, and if you are able to provide more of social services in the form of health insurance, education and housing, then the disposable income which an ordinary individual earns, increases. His purchasing power increases and thereby you can avoid that shocking difference which you find today—the ability of a few persons to spend as they like and the disappointment of a large number of persons who are not able to meet their needs. So, the Government of India are taking steps, but the effects of the economic policies which have been adopted by the Government of India cannot be felt by the general public so soon. The results have not been quite manifest yet.

Now, I should like to know from the Finance Minister how far the expenditure on social services has been reflected in increasing the disposable income of the ordinary individual. The other day I did question the Finance Minister as to how far the rise in the national income has been reflected in the rise in the standard of living of the people. Likewise, I would like to know how far they have been able to find out and to what extent has been its effect upon the general increase in the disposable income of the ordinary individual. We have got to find that out. We must have some sort of an indicator by which we may be able to know that you can create that kind of satisfaction among the people by which we can get their faith and confidence in our protestations and our professions.

Another method by which we can achieve our objective is by levying a tax on expenditure. I have already told you that in the demand for this kind of ceiling, you will find in the ultimate analysis that there is a sort of every or

[Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha]

dissatisfaction in the mind of the people at their not being able to spend as much as others do. Therefore, if you resort to taxation on expenditure, perhaps you will be able to change the pattern of expenditure today. The type of expenditure in which the privileged few are indulging today changes the whole production pattern. Some spend so much on trifles. For instance, in a land of poverty, as we call it, we want to have refrigerators, motor-cars, etc., whereas 95 per cent of the people cannot afford even a bicycle. We spend so much money over other luxury goods. Therefore, I say that a tax on expenditure will be able not only to change the production pattern but will be able to secure the best utilisation of those resources which we have today at our disposal.

Then, I must refer the Finance Minister to another method of tapping the surplus wealth. It is by levying a tax on capital gains. I can refer to one instance which has come to my notice recently. Recently there was a proposal to impose a ceiling on land holdings in my State of Bihar and the compensation provided therein has been nominal. So, a lot of *benami* transactions are taking place and the money which has already been earned in the black market is now being found in the white market. People who had earned money through the black market and who had not the courage to bring it forward in the open market will now very well bring it forward through this way. They will get somebody to buy the land and they will pay the money before the Sub-Registrar, so that it may pass off as a *bona fide* transaction. That black money will be converted into white money. It will not be subjected to taxation by the Government because that will be considered a capital gain; they have sold the land and they have got this money. Likewise you will find that if the Government really goes into this question, it will be found by taxing the capital gains you are not going to make capital shy and the cry and fear-psychosis that has been created in our mind that investment will suffer, the savings will suffer and the resources that we need for the successful implementation of our Five Year Plan will contract, will turn out to be a bad dream or a false cry. That is why I am supporting my amendment before the House that the Government might if it

finds that it is not possible straightaway to accept the resolution appoint a committee of experts on which public men may be represented to go into this question and phase out a whole programme of fixing of ceiling and detail the measures to be adopted by the Government in order to achieve this object.

I once again thank Shri Bibhuti Mishra for having brought forward this Resolution before the House.

Shri A. M. Thomas : Mr. Chairman I am very glad that all the previous speakers have supported the Resolution although they have introduced certain amendments which also are in keeping with the objective of the original Resolution.

At the very outset, I want to make it clear that I am in entire agreement with the spirit of the Resolution. Had it not been for the consideration of the difficulties in the way of its implementation and the immediate results which may adversely affect our development programmes, I would have urged on the Government for its immediate acceptance. This question of putting a ceiling on incomes which was thought of only as a distant goal, and which was not considered within the range of practical politics, has been given, according to me, an altogether different touch by the Taxation Inquiry Commission's handling of the question. The portion of the report in which this question has been dealt with has been read before the House more than once, so that, I do not want to take the time of the House by reading it again. It has been definitely stated in one of the amendments that a committee should go into this question of fixing of ceiling on incomes. I do not think there is any necessity for appointing a Committee at all, because the Taxation Inquiry Commission is definite. They have said:

"The fixation of ceiling on personal incomes on the basis of a reasonable multiple of *per capita* or per family national income is a matter to which we have given much thought, and it is our view that there should be a ceiling, and net personal incomes after tax, generally speaking, should not exceed approximately 30 times the average per family income in the country."

I do not think there is any necessity for a committee to go into the question again. They have thought over the matter and it is their considered opinion.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury :** There was no socialistic pattern then.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** That also is there. This report was submitted before this House adopted the objective of a socialist pattern of society. Even then, this high power Commission which was presided over by an Ex-Finance Minister of the Government of India reported on these lines. It may be recalled that before this report was out, Members of this House like Shri Gadgil expressed concern over the composition of this Commission and they said, having regard to the personnel of this Commission, we cannot expect anything radical in the report. But, that has not been the case. They have in a way anticipated the objective that we have placed before the House by the adoption of a resolution that the objective of our policy would be a socialist pattern of society. All the same, there is some force in the contention put forward that there may be some difficulties in the implementation of this objective. Even the Taxation Enquiry Commission which has recommended a ceiling on incomes has sounded a note of caution. They have said :

"We do not suggest that this is capable of immediate implementation, but we think it is important to strive by stages for its implementation over a period of time."

The Taxation Enquiry Commission would have done well if they had also detailed a scheme for implementation of this objective of putting a ceiling on incomes. They are also of opinion that regulation of the tax structure is not enough. That is often put forward as an argument, that by taxation we can achieve the same object. They are definitely of the opinion that by taxation it is not possible to achieve that object. So that, my first submission is that the Government should come forward now itself with a policy declaration that the objective of the Government is to put a ceiling on incomes. Perhaps it may not be possible for the Government to take steps immediately, but even then, I should think that the Finance Minister, when he replies to the discussion on this Resolution, should

come forward with a categorical statement that one of the objectives of the Government would be to put a ceiling on incomes.

The Finance Minister's declarations on this subject when this identical point was raised during the time of the discussion of the budget were, I regret to say, rather evasive. He said it would not be feasible to achieve this object. He also said that the question of putting a ceiling on land and the question of putting a ceiling on income were different and he dealt in detail with regard to that aspect. But I say although we can draw theoretical distinctions between the two, practically the principle that we adopt in the case of ceiling on land has to be adopted in the matter of ceiling on incomes too. In actual practice if we put a ceiling on land and we do not put a ceiling on income, there will certainly be discrimination. We are limiting the source of income of the individual who depends upon land if we put a ceiling on land. Of course, it may be theoretically said that there is no bar for a person owing land to possess other wealth also, run an industry or draw a salary and that there is nothing to restrict the income that he can get, but if we take practical considerations....

**Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara) :** That will not be possible because when there is ceiling on holding, personal cultivation will be one of the ingredients of it.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** That is right. So that, I submit that the distinction that has been drawn by the Finance Minister is not quite correct, although it may be possible to draw a theoretical distinction.

Figures have been quoted by the previous speakers to the effect that our *per capita* income is very low and that at the same time the disparities existing in this country are greater than the disparities that exist in any other country of the world. In this booklet issued by the Economic and Statistical Advisor to the Food and Agricultural Ministry, Government of India, at page 15 we are given the *per capita* income of as many as 18 countries. You will find the *per capita* income in India is Rs. 267 on the basis of calculations made in 1953. The only two Asian countries which have an income below India are

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

China and Burma. In China according to the calculations made in 1949 it was only Rs. 129.

But I should think it would have doubled because of the steps that they have taken, and in 1956 perhaps the figure would be quite different. In Burma, it was Rs. 206 in 1953. Even in Ceylon, one of our neighbouring countries, it is Rs. 541. I am leaving alone other countries like the USA where it is Rs. 8,789, UK where it is Rs. 4,057, New Zealand where it is Rs. 4,877 and so on. We can ignore those countries and take the case of Asian countries. Barring one or two exceptions, which perhaps would by now have kept pace, no other country has got such a very low *per capita* income as ours.

It has also been pointed out in this House that the difference between the lowest salary and the highest salary is also really staggering. Attempts have been made on the floor of this House to emphasise the fact that there must be a rationalisation of the salary structure. But I do not think any practical steps have been taken by Government so far to effect any such rationalisation. I am afraid Government are not realising the demoralising effect that is caused on account of such great disparities existing in the salary structure both in the public and in the private sectors.

I would also say that it is not enough if we merely have rationalisation of the pay structure of public servants only. Coupled with that rationalisation, if we do not have rationalisation in the private sector, then the whole thing becomes ineffective, and we may not in that case be able to attract the requisite talent to the public services. So, both these things have to go hand in hand.

It was really a regrettable thing to know what the position is in regard to the State Bank as disclosed in an answer to a question in the Rajya Sabha recently. With regard to the salary of the managing director of the State Bank of India, it was pointed out in the Bill itself security of service was given to the *ex-Imperial* Bank staff, excepting the managing director and the deputy managing director—the reason given for this that it was not possible for Government to pay them the high salaries that they were drawing—that though a reduction was made nominally subsequently in the shape of various allowances and so on, the original salary

to the extent of about Rs. 7500 to Rs. 8,000 has been restored, and even the sumptuary allowance of Rs. 500 which had been refused earlier has also been allowed now. I do not understand how Government could have given consent to such a measure, even though such a thing might have been adopted by an autonomous body like the State Bank of India.

Besides emphasising the necessity of coming forward with a clear declaration that the objective of Government is to put a ceiling on incomes, I would submit that one or two further steps also have to be adopted by Government without further delay. Although Shri C. D. Deshmukh has evaded this question and said that to put a ceiling in incomes may not be feasible, it is well worth recalling what the president of the party in power has said very recently at the Amritsar session of the Congress.

He said :

“The application of ceilings on private incomes is inescapable.”

So, that is the point of view that the president of the Congress has put forward. And he has mentioned several reasons also for that, among which one is as follows :

‘No country that wants to work out a democratic state can tolerate wide disparities without risk to its freedom, to its unity and to its development’.

Government have stated that they are keeping in view the question of a tax on the entire wealth that an individual possesses. But it is not enough if Government merely say that they have kept that point in view. They must immediately take steps to levy a tax on total wealth. We have already found that inflationary tendencies have set in, and we are making desperate attempts to get the necessary resources for the Second Five Year Plan. The dissenting note, which has been reported in the papers, of Mr. K. C. Neogy, a member of the Planning Commission, is really disturbing. He says that if we want to achieve the targets that are now laid down in the Second Five Year Plan, inflationary tendencies will certainly step in. He fears that in this process the hardest hit people will be the fixed income groups like government servants at all levels, teachers and other non-government employees, numbering over

5 million. So that if we have to find resources, without resorting to the printing press at Nasik, we have to adopt all available steps. We cannot cut down the targets, but we have to find the necessary resources. I would even submit that Government have to resort to the step of compulsory savings. As a first step in effecting a rationalisation of the pay structure, I would say that Government servants should be asked to compulsorily save and deposit with the Government in return for bonds the amounts that they draw beyond a certain amount. Otherwise, it is not possible to find the requisite amount.

Once it was reported that the Finance Minister had in view the adoption of abnormal measures, if resources were found wanting, I would like to know what are his abnormal measures. Certainly, this method, even though it may be said to be abnormal, is a legitimate method and in keeping with the socialist pattern of society that we have adopted.

Sir, I support the Resolution broadly and I urge that the spirit of the Resolution should be accepted by Government and implemented in due course.

**Mr. Chairman:** So far I have been hearing only those Members who are supporting the Resolution. Now, I want to call upon a Member who is opposed to the Resolution.

**Shri N. Rachiah:** (Mysore-Reserved—Sch. Castes) : Some of us have moved amendments. We have not been called.

**Mr. Chairman:** I will call them later.

**Shri Mathew** (Kottayam) : I am afraid it is my unenviable lot to disagree with the Resolution.

**Shri N. M. Lingam :** Why does he not change his view?

**Shri Mathew :** I would like to change the point of view of Shri N. M. Lingam who seems to be in agreement with the Resolution.

Let me not, however, cause an unnecessary shock to anybody. I am not in disagreement with the ultimate point of view of the mover or his motive. But I am in disagreement with the precise Resolution as it is worded. I will explain what I mean.

I fail to see why it is necessary for the ultimate aim that we have in view to put an absolute ceiling on income.

I would suggest an alternative—I said this at our party meeting—let 15 annas out of the rupee be taken by way of tax or a levy on wealth or whatever it is in the case of large earnings. That, I think, has an obvious advantage. It is feasible whereas the other course is hardly feasible or desirable. I will explain what I have in mind. People speak of the salaries of Ministers or Secretaries or State Bank managers and so on, to illustrate their point.

**An Hon. Member:** And Judges.

**Shri Mathew:** But take the income of a very good doctor I was in Madras a few months ago ; I happened to see some very eminent doctors there. I did not ask them what their average monthly income was. But I was told there are good doctors who easily earn something like Rs. 15,000 per month or even more. If you place a ceiling and say that they ought to earn only Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 7,000 or Rs. 10,000, per month, what would those doctors do? You may say that they will naturally reduce their fees and that will be a great advantage to the patients. I wish it would work out in that way. But it need not necessarily work itself out in that way. If you put an absolute ceiling on their monthly income, some of those good doctors would work for the first ten or fifteen days in the month when they would easily make the Rs. 5000 or Rs. 7,000 or Rs. 10,000 that we specify, and then they might go to a hill station, if it is summer season, or they will sit comparatively quiet at home for the rest of the month.

It is easy to wax eloquent and indignant over the Rs. 10,000 that is given to the State Bank manager or director or other officers. It is easy to taunt that the Secretary of a Department draws Rs. 4,000, while the Minister draws only Rs. 2,000 and that it is all very iniquitous and so on. But we have to face the facts. Very good lawyers, very good doctors and others easily earn more than Rs. 8,000 or Rs. 10,000 per month. There are such people and if you say that they should not earn more than Rs. 10,000 a month, as I already hinted, it would have only this consequence that they will sit quite after the first few days, for the rest of the month. What do you gain thereby? Leaving aside the feelings of envy that we may have, let the man who earns Rs. 20,000 per month do so; but let him be taxed

[Shri Mathew]

15/16 of that. Fifteen annas in the rupee you take away from them by way of this tax and that tax. But let there be some small incentive left for them !

**An Hon. Member:** Ceiling is taking away the income.

**Shri Mathew:** It does not exactly mean that; that is my complaint or criticism. By the actual wording of the resolution, as I understand it, you put an absolute ceiling on the income. you absolutely restrict the figure, whereas my suggestion—it is not my original suggestion; it has been put forward by so many others—does not specify an absolute figure but allows them to earn even Rs. 100,000 a month; but they will have only 1/16th of the income that they earn and the rest will go to the State. Therefore, my contention is that instead of putting a certain figure as the maximum, if you have the highest imaginable kind of taxation whereby some little fraction only will be left with those who have enormous earnings and the rest will go to the State to be spent on all kinds of public welfare enterprises, it would be really a more effective way of achieving the ultimate end we have in view. Therefore, I say the resolution as it stands is hardly feasible or desirable. Even if you enforce it by some rigorous means, it does not serve any good purpose. On the other hand, it will spoil many of the good purposes we have in mind.

Again and again, it is said that in this country there is a wide gap between the highest income and the lowest income and that it should be narrowed down. I am in complete agreement with that; everyone in this House is in agreement with that. But that has to be narrowed down by raising the standard of the poor people. I fail to see how you can raise the standard of the poor people by simply putting a ceiling on the incomes of those who are earning a good deal.

In one thing I am at a disadvantage. I failed to follow the Hindi speech of my hon. friend who moved the resolution. I could make out only some words here and there. I heard Gandhiji's name again and again. I like everyone else, have some acquaintance with Gandhiji's theories on these matters. As the mover himself, perhaps, said, Gandhiji held that people of wealth should hold their wealth as a kind of public trust and that, certainly, is a sentiment with which we do not dis-

agree in the least. But, how far certain inoral attitudes can be enforced is a matter of doubt. We are not concerned in legislation with high moral ideas, with high spiritual ideas which can be approached only at the high moral and spiritual level. At the voluntary level they have to be preached and to be imbibed as much as possible. But, when we consider the question of enforcement of law, when we consider legislation, we should not mix that high moral, voluntary attitude or outlook on life with what can be enforced by law. The two should not be mixed up.

Therefore, I said that though I am in agreement with the ultimate object that the State should be enriched as much as possible by these people who have high incomes, I am in disagreement with this resolution which seeks to impose a certain kind of absolute ceiling on the income. This is not the way it seems to me, to serve that ultimate outlook or object we have in view.

**पंडित श्री० एन० तिवारी:** सभापति महोदय, १९२० में स्वराज्य का आन्दोलन गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में शुरू हुआ। उस वक्त जब हम लोग देहातों में जाते थे और लोगों को उस आन्दोलन में—स्वतन्त्रता की उस लड़ाई में—शामिल होने के लिये आवाहन करते थे, तो लोग पूछा करते थे कि इस लड़ाई में भाग लेने से हमें क्या फायदा होगा ? हम तो गरीब हैं।

“कोउ नुप होउ हमहिं का हानी।

चेरि छाड़ि अब होब कि रानी॥”

अर्थात् हम लोग तो गरीब हैं। हम मेहनत भी करें और रूस लड़ाई में शामिल भी हों, परन्तु हमें इस से क्या फायदा होने वाला है ? वे पूछते थे कि स्वराज्य से हम गरीबों का क्या फायदा होगा। हम लोग उन को जवाब देते थे कि आज-कल तुम देखते हो कि कहीं महल हैं और कहीं झोपड़ी हैं, कहीं लोग खाते खाते मरते हैं और कहीं बिना साये मरते हैं, स्वराज्य मिलने के बाद यह अबस्था नहीं रहेगी, इस समय जो बहुत डिसपैरिटी (भेदभाव) है, वह कम हो जायेगी और तुम लोगों को सुख-चैन की जिंदगी बसर करने का मौका मिलेगा। यह हमारा इल्लेक्शन-प्लेज (निर्वाचनप्रतिज्ञा) नहीं था, बल्कि स्वराज्य की लड़ाई में शामिल होने के लिये आवाहन करते हुए हम ने लोगों को ये आश्वासन दिये थे। चैयर-मैन साहब, उस समय जब आप भी अपने देहातों में गये होंगे, तो आप ने भी लोगों से यही बात किया होगा, जिस तरह कि हम ने किया था।



१९४७ के बाद देश का सीमाय उदय हुआ । देश आजाद हुआ, लेकिन उस वक्त कुछ ऐसी प्रवृत्तियाँ पैदा हुईं कि हम अपने मतव्य को कार्य रूप में परिणत नहीं कर सके और अपने बादों को पूरा न कर सके । देश में हिन्दू-मुस्लिम रायदूस (झगड़े) हो गये, देश का बंटवारा हुआ और कई समस्याएँ पैदा हो गईं, जिनको तुरन्त हल करना आवश्यक था । लेकिन आज जब हमारा देश शान्ति के समय से गुजर रहा है और हम अपनी पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं को चला रहे हैं, तो हमें सोचना होगा कि हमारे समाज का गठन कैसा हो, देश में किस तरह की अर्थ-व्यवस्था हो ? हमें इस बात का निश्चय करना होगा । सभी लोगों के दिलों में असोसा पैदा होगा और वे देश के लिये काम करेंगे । मेरे पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा कि सिर्फ सीलिंग (उपरि सीमा) तय करने से देश की गरीबी कैसे दूर हो जायेगी । मैं मानता हूँ कि बड़े बड़े अफसरों का वेतन ५०० रुपये कर देने और बड़े बड़े धनिकों का धन कम कर देने से भी गरीबों को बहुत कुछ मिलने वाला नहीं है । लेकिन एक बात हमको याद रखनी चाहिये और वह यह है कि ऐसा करने से गरीबों में जो उत्साह पैदा होगा, उन में जो भावना आयेंगी, वह देश को बहुत आगे ले जायेगी और हर हिन्दुस्तानी को—हर एक देशवासी को आगे बढ़ने के लिये इस से प्रेरणा मिलेगी । ऐसा करने से लोगों में जो जोश उत्पन्न होगा, जो यह विचार पैदा होगा कि हमारे लिये कुछ किया जा रहा है, हमारे भाई हमारे लिये अपने को नीचे ला रहे हैं और हमारे दुःखदर में शामिल हो रहे हैं ताकि हमें कुछ राहत मिले, हमें कुछ सुख-सुविधा मिले, वह देश को बहुत आगे ले जा सकता है और उस से हमारी द्वितीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना बड़ी आसानी से कार्यान्वित हो सकती है ।

मेरे पूर्व वक्ता श्री भागवत झा आजाद और शर्मा जी ने हिन्दुस्तान में लोगों के धन में या आमदनी में विभिन्नता को बतलाने के लिये विदेशों के आंकड़े बतलाये हैं । मैं उन से कहूँगा कि निर्जीव कागज के पत्रों में जो आंकड़े दिये हुये हैं उन से आप नहीं समझ सकते कि हिन्दुस्तान की वास्तविक हालत क्या है । आप रेलवे स्टेशन पर जाइये और वहाँ देखिये कि एक मुसाफिर खाना खाता है और वहाँ लोग तैयार रहते हैं कि उस के मुँह से तरकारी या रोटी का टुकड़ा छूटे और वे उस को खा जायें । इस देश में लोग मवेशियों के गोबर से बिना पचे हुए दाने—अन-डाइजेस्टिड कार्बन्स—निकाल निकाल कर खाते

हैं । आंकड़ों से आप को यह पता नहीं चलेगा कि देश की क्या हालत है । अगर आप आँख खोल कर चलेंगे तभी आप को पता चलेगा कि देश में कितनी जहालत है, देश की कितनी बुरी हालत है । ऐसी हालत में उन गरीबों को क्या पढ़ा हुआ है कि वे आप को योजनाओं को सफल बनाने के लिये योग दें । आज स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के आठ बरस बाद भी जब यह हालत है तो किस तरह से हम यह आशा कर सकते हैं कि आप के आवाहन करने पर वे आप की मदद करेंगे ।

सभापति जी, अभी यहाँ पर बताया गया कि हमारे देश की प्रति व्यक्ति आमदनी २६० रुपये सालाना है । इस में उन लोगों का हिस्सा भी शामिल है जो ऐसी चीजें खाते हैं जिनका मैं जिक्र कर चुका हूँ तथा जिनका जीवन बहुत ही बुरी तरह से व्यतीत होता है । मैं आप को एक बात बताना चाहता हूँ । मैं एक बहुत बड़े आदमी को मिलने के लिये गया । उस ने एक कुत्ता पाल रखा था और वह उस की बहुत सेवा किया करता था । उस की खातिर उस ने नौकर रखा हुआ था । मैंने देखा कि वह नौकर कुछ सोच रहा था । मैंने पूछा कि क्या सोच रहे हो । उस ने कहा कि देखिये इस कुत्ते को दूध मिलता है, गोस्त मिलता है, साबुन से इस को नहलाया जाता है और बहुत आराम से रखा जाता है । मैं भी ईश्वर से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि दूसरे जन्म में मुझे भी कुत्ते का जन्म मिले और किसी धनी पुरुष के यहाँ रहूँ और इसी तरह की आराम की जिन्दगी बसर करूँ । तो यह हिन्दुस्तान की दशा है । जापान, अमेरिका, रूस इत्यादि के आंकड़ों से यहाँ की परिस्थितियों का पता नहीं चल सकता है । अगर आप सीलिंग लगाते हैं तो यह बात नहीं है कि आप को बहुत ज्यादा धन मिल जाएगा, या गरीबों का बहुत उत्थान हो जायेगा । लेकिन इस वास्ते हमें सीलिंग फिक्स (निश्चित) करनी चाहिये कि हम गरीबों के साथ हैं, उन के दुःख में हमारा दुःख है और उन को हम ऊंचा उठाना चाहते हैं और यहाँ तक उठाना चाहते हैं कि अपने धन को लगाकर और खुद गरीब हो कर भी हम उनका भला करने के इच्छक हैं । इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे लिये इकम्स (आय) पर सीलिंग लगाना बहुत जरूरी है ।

हमारे एक भाई ने कहा कि रुपये में १५ आने टैक्स लगा दो । अगर वह लायर (वकील) है तब तो वह जानते होंगे कि जो धनी लोग हैं और जो टैक्स देने वाले लोग हैं वे कई तरीके टैक्स भ्रदा न करने के निकाल लेते हैं । बहियों

## [पंखित डी० एन० तिवारी]

को वे मैनिपुलेट कर लेते हैं, इनकमटैक्स डिपार्ट-  
मेंट (प्रायकर विभाग) की घांखों में धूल झोंक  
कर या वहां के कर्मचारियों से मिलकर, (कुछ  
टानिक के जरिये) वे अपना इनकमटैक्स  
बहुत ही कम करवा लेते हैं। अगर लीकेज न हो  
तब मैं समझता हूँ इनकमटैक्स के जरिये से हमें  
८०० करोड़ रुपये प्राप्त हो सकते हैं। लेकिन  
आज उन की तरफ से इनकम कम दिखाई जाती  
है और इस तरह से इनकमटैक्स का इवेजन  
होता है। मैं तो यहां तक कहता हूँ कि आप  
१५ आने रुपये में तो क्या साढ़े पन्द्रह आने रुपये  
में इनकमटैक्स लगा दीजिये इससे कुछ होने  
वाला नहीं है। इस वास्ते मैं आप को कहता  
हूँ कि आप हद कायम कर दीजिये। मैंने एक  
संशोधन दिया है जिस में मैंने कहा है कि ७,५००  
महावार या ८४,००० रुपया सालाना (टैक्स  
काटकर) इनकम निर्धारित कर दी जाए।  
इस पर बहुत से लोगों को आपत्ति है और वे चाहते  
हैं कि इस हद को और भी कम कर दिया जाये  
मैं भी मानता हूँ कि यह हद ज्यादा है और इससे  
कम होना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि  
एक आदमी जिस को आज लाखों की आमदनी  
है होती उस को आप एक व एक वक्त बहुत नीचे  
नहीं गिरा सकते। यह एक मिडिल स्टेज (मध्य  
अवस्था) होगी और आगे चल कर अगर आप  
चाहें तो इस सीलिंग को और भी कम कर सकते

अभी कई भाइयों ने एक इन्क्वायरी कमिटी  
(जांच समिति) बिठाने के लिये कहा। मैं सम-  
झता हूँ कि किसी इन्क्वायरी कमिटी की आवश्यकता  
नहीं है। सब लोग जानते हैं कि क्या हालत है।  
हां इन्क्वायरी कमिटी बनानी हो तो इसलिये  
बनाइये कि वह आप को बताये कि किस तरह से  
इस को काम में लाया जाए। इस के लिये अगर  
आप चाहें तो एक एक्सपर्ट कमिटी की नियुक्ति कर  
सकते हैं। यह जरूरी है।

आप देखेंगे कि प्लानिंग कमीशन (योजनाआयोग)  
की तरफ से एक डायरेक्शन (निर्देश) सब राज्यों  
को गया है जिसमें कहा गया है कि जमींदारी को उठा  
दिया जाए और जमीन पर सिलिंग फिक्स कर  
दी जाए। बहुत से राज्यों में यह कार्यान्वित भी  
हो रही है। हमारे बिहार प्रान्त में जमींदारी  
उठाई गई है और वहां जो कम्पेंसेशन (प्रतिकर)  
दिया गया है वह एक सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ  
सोसाइटी (समाज वादी ढंग के समाज) के  
मवाफिक दिया गया है।

जिस की कम आमदनी है, २०० या ४०० रुपये  
की, उस को बीसगुना दिया गया। जिसकी लाख से  
उपर है उसकी त्रिगुना दिया गया। इस तरह से  
वहां पर रास्ता निकाला गया। अब लैंड (भूमि) पर  
सीलिंग हमारे यहां हो रही है। वहां पर भी कम्पे-  
न्सेशन (प्रतिकर) दिया जा रहा है, जैसा कि  
आपने कानून पास किया गत सेशन में, उसी के  
अनुसार, जिन के पास बहुत अधिक जमीन है उन्हें  
१५ रुपये एकड़ या ७५ रुपये एकड़, अर्थात्  
बहुत नामिनल दिया जा रहा है। लेकिन हमारी  
दिल्ली की दशा विचित्र है। हम ने इम्पीरियल  
बैंक लिया और कम्पेन्सेशन में दिया मार्केट  
वैल्यू (बाजार भाव) से भी ज्यादा। जिन का  
कैपिटल (पूजा) उस में ५०० रूपये था उन को  
हम ने १७०० रुपये दिया। यही नहीं कि एक  
भाष शोर वालों को यह दिया गया बल्कि  
जिन के पास एक हजार शोर थे उन को भी  
उसी तरह से दिया गया। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से  
कहूंगा, (मैं नहीं जानता कि वह मेरी हिन्दी  
समझते हैं या नहीं) कि इम्पीरियल बैंक लेने  
में आप ने जो कम्पेन्सेशन दिया है, वह आप के  
सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी को जेब  
(शोभा) नहीं दे रहा है। आप सोशलिस्टिक  
पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी की बात बिहार में जा कर  
देख लीजिये। देखिये कि वहां पर किस प्रकार  
कम्पेन्सेशन दिया जा रहा है और देने की कोशिश  
की जा रही है। अगर यहां से कोई इंटर-फिय-  
रस (हस्तक्षेप) नहीं हुआ तो जरूरत से ज्यादा  
कम्पेन्सेशन किसी को भी नहीं दिया जायेगा।  
जो बड़े लोग हैं उन को कम मिलेगा और जो  
छोटे लोग हैं उन को अधिक मिलेगा।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता था कि  
क्यों आज जरूरी है। इनकम पर हद कायम  
करना। दो आदमी थे जिन के पास दो दो लाख  
रुपये थे एक ने तो जमीन में लगाया या जमींदारी  
में लगा दिया और उस का रुपया आज खत्म हो  
गया। दूसरे ने बिजनेस (ब्यापार) में रुपया  
लगा दिया, फैंक्ट्री इस्टैब्लिश (कारखाना  
स्थापित) करने में लगाया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि  
जिस ने बिजनेस में रुपया लगाया उस का तो  
मूल्य और बढ़ गया, लेकिन जो आदमी जमीन  
में लगा चुका है, वह देहात में रहता है, उस का  
सब रुपया खत्म हो गया। फैंक्ट्री वाला जो  
कि शहर में रहता है उस के पास पैसा बढ़ता गया।  
इस तरह से आप शहरों को तो रिच से रिच  
बना रहे हैं, जो धनिक है उस को और धनी  
बनाते जा रहे हैं, और जो देहात वाले हैं उन को  
गरीब से और ज्यादा गरीब बनाते जा रहे हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह लोग शहर में चले आयेंगे।

पंडित श्री० एन० तिवारी : हां, ग्राम तो वकालत करते हैं, इस लिये ग्राम की ग्रामदानी बढ़ गई है।

इसलिये मैं कहूंगा कि ग्राम का दृष्टिकोण एक होना चाहिये, देहात और शहर को, जमींदार और मिल-मालिकों को, सभी को एक आधार पर चलाइये और उसी के मुताबिक सब की ग्रामदानी की सीलिंग करना बहुत जरूरी है।

कुछ लोगों ने कहा है कि हम लोग गरीबी को बाट लेंगे। मैं इस से सहमत नहीं हूँ। सभी मेरे दोस्त ने विनोबा जी को उदाहरण दिया। विनोबा जी जब जमीन मांगने जाते हैं तो केवल धनिकों से ही नहीं मांगते। उन से भी मांगते हैं जिन के पास एक या दो एकड़ जमीन है। आज वे जमीन इस लिये नहीं मांगते हैं कि जिन के पास अधिक जमीन है उन से वे ले लें, बल्कि वह देश में एक मनोवृत्ति पैदा करने के लिये, एक लहर पैदा करने के लिये, मांगते हैं जिस से लोग त्याग की तरफ जायें और समाज के लिये काम करना सीखें। इसलिये गरीबी बांटने का सवाल नहीं है। जैसे मैंने कहा था कि यह बहुत आसान बात है, यह ठीक है कि हम कितना ही उपाय करें, सब बराबर नहीं हो सकते, बराबर करने का प्रस्ताव भी नहीं है, लेकिन एक बहुत बड़ा काम होगा जिस से देश में एक त्याग की भावना पैदा होगी और लोगों में एक उत्साह पैदा होगा। साथ ही आप के काम में भी बड़ी सहूलियत होगी और प्रगति आजायेगी। इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि अगर वह अभी कोई ऐमेंड-मेंट स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं, या तुरन्त सीलिंग करने की घोषणा नहीं करते हैं तो कम से कम प्रिंसिपल आफ दि रेजोल्यूशन (संकल्प के सिद्धांत) को मान कर एक कमेटी बना दें, या अपने एक्स्पर्ट्स (विशेषज्ञों) की ही कोई कमेटी बना दें।

साथ ही मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि हाउस की जैसी राय है कि जो बड़े बड़े आदमी हैं जिनकी तनखाह बहुत अधिक है, उन की तनखाह को भी कम करने की कोशिश करें। मैं मानता हूँ कि इस में दिक्कत होगी क्योंकि जो ४००० रुपया में अपना काम चलाते हैं उन की २००० रुपया तनखाह कर देने से उन को कष्ट होगा, लेकिन उन को भी कभी न कभी तो दिक्कत उठानी ही पड़ेगी, क्योंकि देश गरीब है और ऐसा नहीं किया जायेगा तो देश तरक्की नहीं करेगा।

6—121 Lok Sabha

Shri N. Rachiah: I rise to support this resolution which has been brought by Shri Bibhuti Mishra. This is a resolution of supreme importance. I am moving my amendment also. My amendment No. 5 reads like this:

"This House is of opinion that Government should introduce legislation for fixing a ceiling on the income of an individual and provision may be made that no officer in country should get more than one thousand rupees per month as salary".

We are in a socialist pattern of society. I am sure our country is on the threshold of a socio-economic revolution. The other day our Prime Minister said that our country is on the threshold of an industrial revolution. Taking all this as the background, you must realise that unless we fix a limit on the income of an individual we have no salvation and we will have no proper source of income and the ideal of a socialist pattern of society could not be achieved. Our Constitution contemplates or envisages equality, fraternity, equal justice and equality of opportunity. More than all, our Constitution provides that concentration of wealth would not be allowed to be in the hands of some few persons in society. Taking all this as the background, I would like to know why Shri Mathew has been pessimistic in his observations.

In a booklet called *Social Order*, the President of the Indian National Congress, Shri Dhebar, has said that unless and until we achieve economic equality political and social equality will be only a dream or a talk in the air. Unless we achieve this economic equality among the citizens of our country and our society, we cannot speak of any achievement or progress in any field, particularly in the field of politics and in the social field.

Just three days back, this august House passed the Hindu Succession Bill and that is going to become an Act and that Act is going to bring a revolution in our social field. That has been expressed so and very frankly too by many Members of our House. As such, and when we have also got so many ideals to achieve the objective of our Constitution and also the ideal of Gandhiji, we must not agitate against bringing a limit on the income of an

[Shri N. Rachiah]

individual. I hope that the Government as Shri A. M. Thomas said, will not hesitate to accept this Resolution. By accepting this Resolution we will be implementing the doctrine of *Panch Shila* in the internal field of our country. We have achieved success in implementing the doctrine of *Panch Shila* in the international field. I want that this doctrine of *Panch Shila* should be implemented in every house, in every individual, within the country so that

the progress of our country should be based on a firm footing.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. Member will take some more time.

Shri N. Rachiah: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The House will now adjourn and meet again on Monday.

6 P.M.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 14th May, 1956.*