

thought of. Then, you could give enough food to the country. As has been pointed out by the Prime Minister there can be no real stable industrial economy in this country without a stable agricultural basis.

For finding funds for further development in irrigation works, one would say that we are already lacking funds, we are already running into deficit and deficit economy has become the order of the day. I am not an economist to discuss the wisdom or otherwise of a deficit economy. I would only suggest diversion of certain funds from certain other aspects to irrigation.

**Shri B. S. Murthy :** From what sections?

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi :** My hon. friend Shri B. S. Murthy will kindly wait for a minute and hear me. The amount that has been provided in the Second Plan for irrigation is Rs. 381 crores. It must be possible if proper attention is paid and proper anxiety is shown to provide more funds for that. In regard to the N. E. S. a sum of Rs. 200 crores has been provided. Everybody who is acquainted with the work of the N. E. S. would feel that the money that is provided for them may not be properly spent. With so many factors working there, with so many faulty ideas and thoughts prevailing there, with mere publicity-mindedness that is going on in those areas, it may be a waste if this sum of Rs. 200 crores is going to be spent on them. Perhaps it will be more profitable even to those areas to provide more of irrigation facilities and communications than mere national extension schemes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** Is the hon. Member likely to finish or he would like to continue ?

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi :** I would like to have five more minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** He may continue tomorrow.

Private Members' Business now.

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

##### FIFTY-FOURTH REPORT

**Shri Negeshwar Prasad Sishu (Hazari-  
bagh East) :** I beg to move :

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd May, 1956."

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

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd May, 1956."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### RESOLUTION RE. CEILING ON INCOME OF AN INDIVIDUAL

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** The House will now resume further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri Bibhuti Mishra on the 27th April, 1956 :

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

Out of four hours allotted for the discussion of the Resolution, one hour and 29 minutes are still left. Shri N. Rachiah may continue his speech.

**Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes) :** The other day I was speaking about the implementation of Panch Shila to external affairs. I wanted the spirit of Panch Shila to be implemented internally in our society by way of according equal economic justice to the citizens of our country. Article 38 of the Constitution says:

"The State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social, economic and political, shall inform all the institutions of the national life."

Further, sub-clauses (c) and (d) of article 39 state :

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

(d) that there is equal pay for equal work for both men and women ;"

[Shri N. Rachiah]

I am quoting all this to show that the framers of the Constitution desired that in a poor country like ours there should be economic equality between man and man. It need not be absolute, but there must be an economic standard approved for all the citizens of the country, so that he should live peacefully and happily with a harmonious attitude towards his fellow citizens. And as such, apart from our Government and the Congress High Command declaring that there should be a socialist pattern of society, the Constitution itself aims fundamentally at the establishment of a socialist pattern of society. That means unless and until we achieve economic equality, our dream of realising a socialist pattern of society will be only in the air or in the document.

Next to that I would refer to page 32 of the booklet entitled "Indian Agriculture in Brief" issued by the Agricultural Ministry, where it deals with incomes and expenditure and indebtedness of agricultural labour families. The figures of indebtedness for a family are from Rs. 17 to Rs. 347. This debt is a burden on every agricultural family. The agricultural labourers form at least 50 per cent of our population. At least 18 to 20 crores of people are not earning enough to live upon, and they have to incur debts for their maintenance and livelihood.

In the Second Five Year Plan, while dealing with reduction in inequalities, it has been said :

"There are existing inequalities of income and wealth which need to be corrected and care has to be taken to secure that development does not create further inequalities and widen the existing disparities."

The process of reducing inequalities is two-fold : firstly to raise the income at the lowest level and secondly to reduce the income at the top level. My amendment refers to the latter part of this process. There must be a reduction of income at the top. My amendment seeks to reduce the salary of the officers in the country to only Rs. 1,000 per month. By all means the Government can pay Rs. 10,000 per month to them if the common man does not suffer. When the common man who is the source of all revenue of the country is not having even bare subsistence, with

what right or face can we pay Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 3,000 and sometimes Rs. 4,000 per month. Our own Prime Minister who is the head of the country, and who is very popular in the entire world, gets only Rs. 2,250 per month whereas some Governors get Rs. 4,000, Supreme Court Judges get Rs. 5,000 and even some I.A.S. officers, who might have failed several times in B. A. class, get Rs. 1,800 to Rs. 2,000 per month. Apart from that, they are officers. If I will not be mistaken, they are exploiters in our society. An officer should have a sense of self-sacrifice and service towards his fellow men. Simply because he is an officer, he gets such a high salary while millions of people are suffering for want of accommodation, employment etc.

In Mysore after the integration of the administrative and police services with the All-India Administrative Service and I.P.S., an officer who was getting Rs. 600 now gets Rs. 1,600 per month. An officer in the police department who was getting Rs. 500 now gets at least Rs. 1,200 per month. But he is doing the same work, and he is not even transferred from the State to another. I do not know what sort of all-India service it is. If it is an all-India service, he must have been transferred to some other place, because we must inculcate in the mind of such an officer that he belongs to the entire country and he must be prepared to go to any part of the country and serve. But an officer is kept at the same place, doing the same work, exploiting the poor people and he is being paid higher salary and increments and all that. What is this? If the national income is Rs. 4,000 crores instead of Rs. 400 crores, by all means let the officers including the I.A.S. be paid Rs. 2,000. I do not grudge. But we must look into the condition of the common man, the worker, particularly the agricultural worker, and as such I appeal to the Government to accept the principle of this Resolution. It is a very good Resolution.

In England, Germany and other countries, an agricultural worker is assured of employment all through the year except on Sundays and declared holidays. In England and Germany he gets Rs. 3 an hour and he has work for at least 9 hours. That means not less than Rs. 27 per day he gets there. In our country the vested interests are exploiting the poor people who form

the bulk of the nation. There is everything for one's greed. But we find nothing for one's need in our country. Here there is forced labour. There is free labour prevalent in our country; there is no minimum wage fixed for the agricultural labour. As such, while recognising the *per capita* income or the standard of living economically we must base our calculation with reference to the common man. When the people are suffering in this way, I am sure no officer should be paid more than Rs. 1,000 per month. The Mysore Assembly has passed a resolution that in Mysore State no officer should be paid more than Rs. 1,000 per month. That is a resolution passed by an elected representative assembly, and as such I very strongly support the resolution moved by Mr. Mishra and I hope the Government will accept the principles underlying this resolution and accept the spirit and the principle of it with immediate effect in the best interests of the country and the poor man of our society, or, I regret the Government to accept my substitute resolution.

**Shri Radha Raman** (Delhi City) : May I seek your permission to move an amendment which I have tabled to this resolution ?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker** : It is too late now.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to support the resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend Shri Bibhuti Mishra. On the last occasion when this resolution was discussed, I could not be present, but I have read carefully the proceedings of that day and I found that Shri Mishra had given quotations galore from Gandhiji's writings and at the same time he had shown in his attitude a down-to-earth realism which we have come to associate with those who have done work for the national movement in the countryside. I could not agree with all his suggestions as being immediately realisable, but, on the whole, I feel that he has done a service by bringing this resolution and trying to pin down Government to a definite statement in regard to the position.

I notice also that members from the Congress Benches like my hon. friend Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha had

referred to the very heartening phenomenon that on this resolution there was something like unanimity in the House and I am sure that if we can deduce from previous debates of a similar character like the resolution on a second Pay Commission demand which was brought forward by my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma and was unhappily defeated by a certain combination of circumstances, if we can deduce from previous resolutions of a similar nature, I can take it that on this occasion also there would be unanimity in the House. And that is why I want the Minister to come forward and tell us very definitely what steps, if any, Government are going to take.

I notice that questions have been asked in this House in recent months on two occasions : on the 23rd of November last year when the Minister of Finance replied that the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Commission regarding the fixation of a ceiling on individual incomes had not been taken a decision upon by Government up to that time; and then on the 2nd of March this year the Deputy Minister of Finance said that Government have accepted in principle the desirability of reducing the disparities in incomes and wealth and appropriate fiscal and other measures have been taken and will be taken from time to time in pursuance of this objective. Since then we have got the report of the Planning Commission and we have also got the speech of the Prime Minister in the other House.

It was rather surprising that in the other House the Prime Minister made, what he called an unpremeditated speech. He found that everybody who had spoken in the other House, with one minor exception, had supported a resolution substantially similar to the one before us, but he intervenes unpremeditatedly only in order to see that the resolution was withdrawn. I consider this kind of thing to be moral coercion. I consider that it is up to Government to tell us what concrete measures are going to be taken when there is so much feeling in the House and in the country and if the Finance Minister is serious, he has got a number of amendments also suggested on this occasion, he might tell us which of the amendments, perhaps with some

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

little modification, he can accept. I want Government not to get away from this responsibility. It is very important that on this issue a definite decision is taken by Government and announced to the country. As far as I am concerned, I would like not only a ceiling on income but also a floor.

The House is very well aware of the demand of industrial labour that no worker should get less than a wage of Rs. 100 a month. We all know also the distressful conditions of primary school teachers who get hardly Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 per month, for whom the Education Ministry in spite of a great deal of consternation can hardly find the necessary money. The Prime Minister told us only the day before yesterday that the road to equality is not by some artificial fixation, but by a hundred paths which gradually bring that about. He opposed the idea of an automatic ceiling. Now, if we are not going to have an automatic ceiling, let them let us know what exactly are the concrete measures they propose to take like capital gains tax, or the mopping up of dividend beyond a certain limit and that sort of thing. It is no good saying :

ज्ञानं पन्थाः ज्ञानं कन्या ज्ञानं पर्वतलघरा ।

How long are we going to move in this absolutely slow snail's pace, which will get us nowhere, and in the meantime all kinds of things are happening? The Prime Minister speaking in the Rajya Sabha said that it may be psychologically satisfying to see that some people who flaunt their wealth in a vulgar manner do not do it, but you have to raise the level of the people as a whole. And how can you do it? Only by much greater production of wealth in the country. I consider this harping on greater and greater production of wealth as the be-all and end-all of our activity to be a dangerous formulation.

Ever since we have read about socialist theory we have found vested interests coming forward to say that socialism is a system which removes all incentives towards production and since we cannot have a dead level of poverty, socialism is taboo. This is the classical argument against socialism. And now we find the Prime Minister, who is the exponent here of the idea of socialistic pattern of society, harping

merely on production. But he has to conceive that it would be psychologically satisfying to see that the vulgarity of wealth and the disparities of income are removed. Let us do something about that here and now.

The Pay Commission reported in 1947—my hon. friend Mr. Gadgil is there to give us much more information of a first-hand nature—that our services need not be paid more than a maximum of Rs. 2,000 a month. Now, what do we find? I looked up the Budget papers supplied by our Finance Minister this year and I looked up the Commerce and Industry Ministry and I found one Secretary gets Rs. 48,000; one Joint Secretary Rs. 36,000; five Deputy Secretaries 79,700 making a total of Rs. 1,63,700 for seven persons. And I found that 314 Assistants, Clerks, etc., get Rs. 6,45,700 and 137 Class IV establish get Rs. 59,100. Now, I may be told that they get a lot of allowances, but we know from the Audit Report which has come to us lately, how allowances are received by the higher officers and how the privilege is abused in so many flagrant cases. We find, therefore, that the Secretary gets Rs. 4,000 a month, while a Class IV servant gets a salary of less than Rs. 40 per month on an average. It is a ratio of 1: 100. This is vulgarity. This is something which gives rise to ostentatious living. How can we tolerate this kind of thing?

I know we have been told, and the Prime Minister has said that merit has to be rewarded properly. I know we have been told that if we want the right type of public servants, we must give them the proper kind of inducement. What is the kind of inducement which is necessary for the right type of public servants in our country? We do not want an approximation to what the British introduced in this country as a heaven-born service, and we do not want people with overweening ambition in monetary matters becoming high-up officers in our State. We want people who would consider service and recognition of their service as their real reward. We have been told that many officers of Government run off to the private sector, where they are much better paid. I would say it would be good riddance if those officers run away, because those who do not

have that kind of social responsibility have no business to function as the officers of the kind of State which we want to have. Our officers, even those who are high up the ladder have no right to anything more a comfortable living. And if in 1947, the Pay Commission could suggest that we should not pay our higher officers more than Rs. 2,000 at the maximum, then there is no reason why today a gesture is not made. It would be psychologically satisfying, to quote the words of the Prime Minister himself, and the main problem of the prosecution of the Plan is this question of psychological satisfaction. The Finance Minister may dismiss me as a person who talks all kinds of nonsense in an emotionally surcharged manner. But Shri Bibhuti Mishra is a highly respected member of the Congress Party, with direct contact with the people, and a long record of service to the people, and he comes and tells us...

**The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh):** The hon. Member also is highly respected by me.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I feel that after all when we find this demand being put forward from different angles by different sorts of people, Government should come and tell us what exactly is proposed to be done about it. I find that Professor Kaldor, whom presumably Government had invited to give his views in regard to the financial position of our country calculated that there is income-tax evasion to the extent of about Rs. 300 crores. Now, this might be a figure on which there would be controversy. Then, he suggested reduction of luxury goods consumption. He suggested that there was sufficient economic potential in India, and if only the tax-structure was modified, and if only the kind of imposition by way of excise duties, which the Finance Minister seems to be fond of, was altered altogether, then, we can have a very different kind of society.

We have tried to point out on many occasions how from different angles we can bring about a better redistribution of wealth, and how we can try to aim at having both a ceiling as well as a floor. It may be that we cannot have a ceiling fixed here and now straightway, but here and now, Government have got to make certain very definite decisions. In view of all these

things, I suggest that this resolution is taken more seriously than it has been. I wish also to refer to the glee, the jubilation, with which big business regarded the virtual renunciation by Government of the idea of ceiling on incomes. In the *Special Budget Number of The Eastern Economist*, there was a chapter entitled 'The taxes that failed'. They were expecting certain taxes to be imposed, but they were not. Then, there is another chapter called 'Ceilings on incomes'. It says in the first sentence:

"Among other things which failed to turn up in the budget..."

It was expected to turn up—

"...is the question of ceilings on incomes, which has almost become an accepted part of the programme of the socialist pattern to emerge under the Second Five Year Plan."

Then, it goes on gleefully to say how the arguments of the private sector have been accepted, and how Government are now behaving in a very different way.

I therefore wish to request the Finance Minister to be good enough to consider very seriously what are going to be the psychological repercussions on the country, if Government merely dismisses this kind of resolution. That is the most important part of it. It is no good merely having paper plans. You have got to get them executed through the co-operation of the people. You cannot enthrone the people, unless the people get the idea that something really serious is being done. And surely, there must be an attack on the vulgarity and ostentation which goes with the kind of income-making which prevails in certain sectors of our society.

We remember very well when a leading financial wizard was suddenly in the bad books of the Finance Minister and a warrant of arrest was issued, and then he was taken to jug, what happened? His son-in-law suddenly popped up from somewhere, and he produced Rs. 2½ crores as security for that person's being out on bail. This kind of things happens. We do not know the amount of capital gains which these people are stowing away, heaven knows where: we do not know. This kind of thing is going on.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

We must do something in order to bring about a redistribution of the assets in our country. That is why I suggest that if the Finance Minister cannot accept the resolution—I do not think he can accept the resolution just as it is—there are so many other amendments, let him suggest a slight alteration perhaps in some of these amendments, and let him accept it. Let him come forward to make a gesture, without which the consequences on the country would be disastrous.

**Shri Gadgil** (Poona Central): I thought that no argument was really necessary for supporting this particular resolution. As stated by my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Government are practically committed to the principle of putting a limit or a ceiling on individual income.

The Taxation Enquiry Commission also had made certain suggestions. Perhaps, the House remembers that in 1953, 1954 and 1955, whenever I had the opportunity to speak on the budget and the financial proposals of Government, I insisted on this particular point. The general atmosphere in the country was so conducive that *The Eastern Economist* really felt surprised when it found that there was no mention of ceiling on individual income.

The House and the country have already voted the major premise of socialism. They have also voted the minor premise that inequalities in income are inconsistent with that high ideal of socialism. Courage and consistency require that effective steps should be taken to achieve this. Socialism is not a philosophy, so far as I am able to understand it. It may be philosophy in the initial stage, but today it is a programme.

Therefore, it is necessary that you must say that by these following methods, you are going to achieve it substantially year after year. Whether your annual plan is flexible or inflexible, I am not concerned with. It is dangerous, having once accepted the principle of socialism, to allow it to hang in the air, and allow greater and greater expectations of prosperity and a general feeling of equality in the country to grow up. That is what has exactly happened.

In the first place, it is not that Government or those who are responsible for economic thinking in this country

do not know how to effectuate it. It is not that at all. But somehow or other, some people, at any rate, are obsessed with the idea that if a ceiling is accepted, then the production will be affected, and they think that it might affect capital formation, it might affect incentive and so on. I have got a feeling, that whether consciously or unconsciously, the planners are trading social justice for capitalist production.

4 P.M.

The primary concern is social justice. And when I say that they are trading social justice for capitalist production, I hope that the House fully realises the implications of what I say. As regards the Plan, about which I shall speak tomorrow if I get an opportunity or later on, the fact remains that the common man is still confused and thinks that if the result of the First Plan is that the poor have at least remained poor or have become poorer and the rich have become richer—that is a certainty—he has no interest in it. Now, if the Second Plan is going to be the same, then what interest has he? If I find that I am where I was, that I was born with poverty, I live in poverty and if I am to die in poverty, what concern have I in this country and its prosperity, when it means the prosperity of the few? Out of the income tax-payers round about 6 lakhs in a population of 34 crores, about 160 or 200 earn so much that there is no limit. I cannot understand socialism except in terms of equality not only of opportunity but substantial equality of earning. This is exactly what is being prevented from effectuating in the present economic dispensation that has been, so to say accepted by the Government.

Is it impossible to put a ceiling on income? I suggested on one occasion Rs. 30,000 exclusive of taxes. Now, to that extent, Rs. 30,000 is itself an incentive. How many people are there in this country who are earning more than Rs. 30,000? Might be two lakhs or three lakhs out of a population of 34 crores. Therefore, do not make much of the proposition of incentive. Therefore, the approach must be two-fold. First, create conditions in which in the economic sphere of the country, there will not be concentration of wealth in a general way. The second approach is that individuals will not get beyond a certain limit, for any economic power or surplus in the hands of an individual is definitely anti-social. A rupee

surplus is, so to say, an order cheque on the labour of the community. If I have a rupee, to that extent I can order my hon. friend, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, to work as Finance Minister. If I have a rupee, I can ask a taxi-driver to run his taxi for me. In other words, this money is the power over social labour and in 99 cases out of 100 excess of it is used to the detriment of social welfare as a whole.

I am, therefore, submitting that in the Resolution which has been moved by Shri Bibhuti Mishra, he has just asked Government to take some effective steps. He has not said that Government should take this step or that step. But I am suggesting a little more than that. You must nationalise the main instruments and means of production. Otherwise, there is no meaning in socialism. It is no good telling me that they are old junk. If they are old junk, pay them compensation at that rate or no compensation at all. If they are really self-paying, take them over. I do not think there is a single industrialist who will run a junk concern unless he is certain that he is getting quite a lot out of it.

Vidoor, a well known writer, wrote only two days ago in the columns of the *Times of India*—I know him personally; he is not a socialist; if possible, I would describe him as completely indifferent to socialism—but a realist has come to the conclusion that the time has now come to have strategic industries, main industries, under national ownership and control; otherwise, what you have promised in the Constitution, what you have promised from time to time by various statements from Official Benches and from party platforms will never be performed.

Individually, therefore, you have to control, dividend, you have to control wages, you have to control rent. These are the three normal sources, as an economist would tell us. So far as rent is concerned, the problem of the landlord is being solved, though not very satisfactorily. So far as wages, earnings and salaries are concerned, I had the opportunity, while I was a member of the Central Pay Commission, just to see that some advanced thought, some progressive thought, was embodied in the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission. We, therefore, laid down that there should be a limit beyond which the government servant ought not

to get. What happened to those recommendations is certainly well known. But the time has come to revise that, not only in the interest of those who man the services, but in the interest of the whole country, in the context of certain ideals and certain principles which we have accepted in the Constitution and of certain moral responsibilities which are now laid on our shoulders.

We talk of our great preamble. May I tell you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that the latest book on political science by Sir Edward Barker has praised our preamble to the skies? We feel proud of it, that after two years of discussion in the Constituent Assembly, we could evolve a preamble to our Constitution which should be the object of respect and adoration all the world over. Now, let us implement that. If we are serious about implementing that, it is impossible to avoid nationalisation of most of the industries.

Therefore, when such a humble Resolution is put before the House, when the Government are morally committed to this principle, we should implement it. I was very sorry to read the speech of my great leader in the other House. I do not want to comment on it. Shri H. N. Mukerjee said that it was delivered just on the spot. Again, I should like to assure Shri H. N. Mukerjee that he is not dogmatic in the sense that he does not say that there should be no ceiling. He said it should come under the circumstances here and there and gradually. But the time has now come when from nebulous thinking, we must come to some precise statement so that people will have faith in our promise. We promised them this, we promised them that. After 8 years of independence, hundreds of villages are there without adequate drinking water supply. As regards literacy, we have done very little, though we have undertaken the responsibility to provide free primary education within a period of 15 years. Most of the period has gone. We are just a little ahead of what we were in 1947. Here is a test of earnestness of the Members of this House, whether they want to give a fair deal to the population which has remained in poverty over ages.

Asoka came and he built *stupas*; the people continue to remain poor. The Mughals came and they built the Taj

[Shri Gadgil]

Mahal and red fortresses; the poor continued to be poor; The Britishers came; they built highways and railways with the result that poverty travelled from Bombay to Delhi, from Madras to Calcutta and so on, but poverty remained. Now, having given them franchise, having made every one of them politically equal to the other, are you going to tell them, 'You are equal when you cast your vote, but you are not equal as soon as you leave the polling booth?' Let us credit them with some sense of consistency; let us credit them with some political consequences. They are gradually awakening to the power they have. When they find Gadgil going to them, when they find the great Prime Minister going to them, when they find the great Finance Minister going to peasants at Roha and asking them, "Will you kindly vote for me, so that I may become a Minister?" it means that the power to make Ministers remains with them, with the electorate and not with anybody else. They have really become the masters of this country. How are you going to deny them their birthright of a decent living? That is for you to decide. Give them at least a proof that the tall poppies will not grow taller. I am non-violent enough not to say 'cut them off'—I do not want to say that especially in the context of the Buddha Jayanti celebrations. But the process of leveling up is so slow and there is no bar, no ban, on the other hand on accumulations by the rich that they continue to grow while there might be a little addition here and there at the lowest level. We are told that in the next five years Rs. 50 will be added to the average national income of the individual. As I have worked it out, it comes to half anna a day. This is the average. A considerable portion of the population is far below the average and a small portion is so much above the average that if you work at this rate, socialism will not be realised not only for 20 years but for 200 years. How long are you going to keep them in this way? Give them at least this little proof that you mean business, that whatever happens, we will put a ceiling. I have not suggested now that it should be Rs. 30,000, or anything else. While talking on one occasion, the Finance Minister stated that we have already taxed 14½ annas in the rupee. Why not tax a little more and make it 15½ annas?

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat)**: How does the figure of Rs. 50 a year work out to half an anna a day? It comes to 2½ annas, according to me.

**Shri Gadgil**: Rs. 50 is for five years, which comes to Rs. 10 per year, that is, 12 annas a month. If the hon. friend will work it out further, he will get my figure. I am not a great mathematician, but I am fairly accurate in this. The hon. Prime Minister stated the other day that the average national income will go up to Rs. 331 from Rs. 281. The main point is that the people want convincing proof that you mean business, that you want to give a fair deal and that you see that the economic institutions and political institutions in this country are not to work in such a way as to make the rich more rich and the poor, if not less poor, keep them as they are. That is the test.

This resolution is very simple and, particularly, the amendment of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad is so accommodating for the Government that they can just think about it. It is necessary that they must give up nebulous thinking and come with a definite statement and a programme when this will be implemented and how this will be implemented.

**Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru)**: I rise to support this resolution. In supporting it, I want to tell the Minister and the Government that the time has come when they should be bold to take courage in both hands and say that they are prepared to put into force the professions they have been making all these years. It was many years ago that the Congress passed a resolution in Karachi stating that nobody should get more than Rs. 500 a month. After having got our Independence, many of us thought that this resolution in some modified form will be brought into force. But unfortunately, as Shri Gadgil has now been telling us, the rich are being helped to become richer, and the poor are being repressed to become more poor. After all, the resolution does not ask for anything spectacular, anything grand. It only says "take suitable steps immediately to fix a ceiling on the income of an individual". In one sector, the agricultural sector, the Government has come forward asking all the State Governments to fix a ceiling for the ownership of land. Many

State Governments have already fixed the ceiling on land. Having asked the State Governments to proceed to fix a ceiling as far as ownership of land is concerned, Government, I do not think, will be justified in trying to skip over the other important sectors—trade and commerce. Therefore, having committed themselves to this principle of fixing a ceiling in some form or the other, as far as the cultivator, as far as the landlords are concerned, Government must do something as far as the other spheres of industry and commerce are concerned.

Again, in this country, we have poverty, disease, illiteracy and casteism—the most irrepressible enemies to human happiness. All these are due to the fact that there are 90 per cent of the people who are poor. My hon. friend, Shri Gadgil, was telling us that there are people who have not even two square meals a day. I say there are people in India today who are not even having one meal a day and not even a raiment to cover their shame. If this is the state of affairs, I do not know how the Finance Minister will be able to tell us that on the one hand they want us to work for more production and more employment in the Second Plan. We want more production, no doubt, and more employment also, but what is the idea of the Government? How are Government prepared to see that poverty is rooted out? Unless the ceiling is fixed, poverty cannot be rooted out; unless poverty is rooted out, disease cannot be rooted out. Again in India, casteism is being nurtured on capitalism. Therefore, somehow or other we must have an axe laid at the very roots of capitalism, and I hope that the Finance Minister will be able to tell the House, and through this House the 36 crores of people, who are looking to what sort of socialist pattern we are going to have, that Government are prepared to take courage in both hands and fix a ceiling. That ceiling must be such that in the course of the Second and Third Five Year Plans, people will not be beggars, but will be wage-earners, the wage being such that the worker in the factory and the labourer in the field will be feeling that they are not only in a free India but also have a real socialist pattern of life. I think Government should be prepared to come forward and say that what they meant about the First Five Year Plan and about the Second Five Year Plan was

not mere words but translating them into deeds. And the proof is by taking the decision to fix a ceiling on the individual income.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh :** I think it was necessary to have a perspective for a consideration of a resolution of this kind, and fortunately that perspective is furnished to us by the presentation of the Plan. What exactly is the Plan? It involves a process of production and investment, and a process of development, that is to say, the functioning of social services to the community in general and to the disadvantaged section of the community in particular.

Fortunately, we have been able to preserve the percentage of the Plan that is to be spent on social services, round about 19 or 20, although in absolute figures, 20 per cent of the new Plan will mean very much more than 19 or 20 per cent of the old Plan. To the extent to which we are able to devote sums to development, obviously we are taking positive measures to remove disparities of income, wealth and opportunity. That leaves us with the question of production. I think it is very necessary that we should discuss this question in an atmosphere which, as far as possible, is free from sentiment or undue zest or obsession; because, it is frightfully important that we do not make a mistake in regard to the processes of production that we intend to adopt during these next five years—taking the view only of the near future, so to speak, apart from any perspective that we can have.

It is in this context I think it is necessary to deal once for all with the various methods that have been advanced by my hon. friend, Shri Gadgil. The best thing to bring about equality of income and of opportunity is to nationalise most of the instruments of production. That means the socialism of a very very advanced kind in deed. We have given reasons in the plan why at the present moment we do not consider that it is practicable and why we feel that an integrated operation of the private and public sectors is the one that the country seems to need. That is a proposition which seems to have been accepted even by some of the Members on the opposite side. Therefore, I think for the purposes of this discussion, it is irrelevant to suggest that we better start on the high road to socialism and that everything will wall into its proper place. Obviously

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

it will be because then almost everybody will be a government servant of some sort or the other. In the other words we shall have a very extensive bureaucracy and a salaried class generally is more amenable to fixation of their emoluments than the class which operate in the private sector. But that is not the problem that we are dealing with today.

Incidentally, so far as salaries are concerned, there was some reference of the Central Pay Commission and some figures were given of extra-ordinary high salaries drawn by certain Government servants. The hon. Members are aware that the pay scales recommended were for new entrants and those have been adopted by the Central Government. It just happens that we have the residue and the remnants of the old service and they furnish these awful examples, so to speak, to Members of the Opposition. But, one should not lose sight of the fact that by and large the recommendations of the Pay Commission have been accepted and Rs. 2,250 is the highest pay, apart from the pay of Secretaries which is going to be about Rs. 3,000—I think so. According to the Central Pay Commission, Rs. 3,000 is the limit of individual pay or salary that has been recommended.

Here, as I said, we are not really dealing with the problem of salaries. As the hon. Members have pointed out, even if you fix a pay ceiling and an income is left after taxation, I doubt, whether there will be any salary in the public sector which will come within the purview of that kind of ceiling. Because, in order to get your Rs. 30,000 or Rs. 36,000 or Rs. 40,000 you should have an income of Rs. 60,000. I do not know the exact figure. Therefore, I do not think we should draw a red herring across the path and discuss the salaries of public servants here.

There was a resolution in the Rajya Sabha which coupled this recommendation of fixation of a ceiling with another recommendation that the salaries of government servants should be fixed at a particular level. But that is not what we are dealing with here. Considering that our chief source of concern is production, we have to give all our thought to this particular problem. By what means shall we succeed in increasing production, is the first step, the

second being of course, distribution of the incomes and the amenities. Therefore, references to social justice, feelings that the common man has for capitalist production and incentives, appeals to the electorate, reference to tall poppies, appeal for a precise statement of what we are going to do, lack of earnestness or otherwise, our moral responsibility, our partiality to private enterprise or private uplift, are all really un-businesslike aspects, if I may say so. We should convert ourselves into a committee where all of us are of one mind that we want to maximise production and to maximise the equality of its distribution. If that is so, let us forswear all these suggestions and insinuations and so on. We are trying to address ourselves to this basic task with as much earnestness and certainly with greater fervour than the people who are not charged with the business of the executive Government. Because, after all the House will look to us for the implementation of the Plan. The House is certainly entitled to criticise the lines on which we propose to go but speaking on subjective attitudes, no one can be more anxious than ourselves to deliver the goods. Therefore, I would appeal to the House not to indulge in the suggestions that somehow or other we are partial or are overinfluenced by private capitalists.

It is in this light that I would like the House to read very carefully what the Planning Commission has said in detail under this head: 'Reduction in Inequalities' on page 32 in this full edition of the Plan—paragraphs 19 to 29. It is too long a section for me to go through but I am quite certain that some of the difficulties which the hon. Members have felt in this connection will be cleared if they read this impartially.

The next issue is this. If our pre-occupation is with production, necessarily we are concerned incentive. Whether you call that incentive or whether you call it material interestedness, it does not matter; it is the same thing. It is there that psychological considerations come in. Whether they apply to the rich or to the poor, that is equally the same thing. I am at one with the hon. Members when they say—I think Shri Mukerjee said—"consider the one fact which will have a psychological satisfaction on millions of our countrymen, that they are having a fair, square

deal". Certainly, that will lead to production and so on and so forth. Nevertheless, that does not absolve you from the duty of throwing incentive in the sector in which private enterprise operates. You must satisfy yourself that the sort of incentive that you leave there will be enough to draw the best of the men whom—if you like—reluctantly you are allowing to operate in the private sector. That is not a matter which can be decided by mathematical formulae, nor can it be decided once for all. It may be that their expectations of material reward are very important in the light of their past experience and as one goes along, as taxation measures develop, they themselves will learn to expect a lower order of reward. What is not possible today—I am talking of the possibility only in the light of incentive and production—may be possible two, three or five years hence. This is the principal difficulty in the way of our spelling out more elaborately what exactly we are going to do in order to lop off the tall poppies, if I may borrow that metaphor—in other words, what one is going to do in regard to taxation and, in particular, direct taxation.

One hon. Member—I think Shri Mukerjee—demanded that, in view of this near unanimity that is prevailing in regard to this Resolution I announce, concretely, here and now, what steps Government are going to take in order to remove inequalities. With all the experience that I have had of fiscal administration for the last six years, I cannot for the life of me think how I can satisfy the House in regard to all those measures that have been adumbrated in those pages by the Planning Commission. How do I tell them what exactly is the form that the taxation of wealth will take? How do I tell them what I propose in regard to capital gains? How do I tell them what amendments I may have in view in regard to the Estate Duty Act? Then, somebody complained—I think it was in the debate on the Plan—that no reference was made to the excess profits tax, tax on gifts, tax on expenditure and a hundred and one other forms of taxation. I consider, since we are dealing with a planned economy, there are proper occasions on which one elaborates one's ideas and puts forward concrete measures—and by 'concrete measures' I understand the Finance Bill. Do I put about 12 Finance Bills in

the course of my reply before the hon. Members of this House? That is not possible. The House will recall that in the course of my observations in the general discussion on the Budget, I said that it is not possible for me to sketch out very much in advance what the Government is going to do in regard to the modes of direct and indirect taxation. A statement was made this morning. . . .

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** May I ask a question, Sir? In view of certain doubts having arisen in people's minds on account of the Government's emphasis on production at the cost of a comparable emphasis on distribution, could you take the House into confidence regarding those steps which you have in mind and, could you from that point of view accept some of the amendments which are worded in such a fashion that you can conceivably accept them?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** Those amendments are not concrete proposals for taxation. The point I am developing is, we are all at one in wanting to maximise production. As far as I can see, distribution may be a direct distribution—that is not very much under our control except that incomes flow and transfers and exchanges take place in the community—but in addition we wish to spend moneys, which we take from those who can afford it, on those who need the amenities which we can provide out of those funds and those development expenditures.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareilly Distt.—East):** How would increase in income-tax affect the salaries of Ministers in Uttar Pradesh who get a salary of Rs. 1,250 free of income-tax, plus a car, plus a free driver, plus a cleaner, plus free petrol, plus a free house and another house free in Naini Tal?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** Well, it is a minor matter against this major perspective; nevertheless, this matter also. . . .

**Shri Feroze Gandhi:** Same is the case with private concerns.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** . . . . . has been brought to the front now by the Comptroller and Auditor General in regard to taxation on perquisites in general and, sometime or other, a reply is due. I should say, generally that there is a way now of assessing perquisites also. In other words, one can. . . .

**Shri Feroze Gandhi :** Tax would be paid by the State from the public Exchequer. The Ministers in U. P. do not pay out of their pocket. Whatever is assessed is paid by the Exchequer. Therefore, he gets what he used to get, no matter how much the tax may increase.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh :** I have not quite studied the Ministers' Salaries and Allowance Act in Uttar Pradesh. If what the hon. Member says is true, my only answer.....

**Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna) :** What about the Central Ministers ?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh :** I cannot answer another question before I have answered the first one. What I was going to say is that the State Legislature is supreme in its own field. The Central legislature is supreme in the field which has been allotted to it by the Constitution and it would be improper for me to criticise any legislation passed by a State legislature in regard to the salaries of its Ministers. That is all the answer that I can give and the same sort of answer applies to this legislature also, that constitutionally I cannot go into that particular question.

What I was going to say is—I have lost the thread because I was going on answering questions so long—that there is one thing that has been brought in forcibly as a conviction to my mind and that is, that this House, the legislatures in the States and the electorate, to which Shri Gadgil referred, will now be imposing a very very severe criterion indeed in regard to taxation. I am free to admit it. I can see the task of future Finance Ministers getting increasingly difficult only in this sense that they will have to make sure that they do not put a pie on indirect taxes, if there is any possibility of that same pie being recovered through direct taxation. Therefore, it is all a question of considering in the future how one would behave or how one would arrange these fiscal matters.

It is also true, what Shri Asoka Mehta said, that most processes of development lead initially to disparities of income. They have a tendency of making the rich richer and the poor poorer. Therefore, unless the Planning Department and the country are wide awake all these results will follow. It

follows even in socialist countries like Sweden. I am told—I think there is a reference to it in Prof. Kaldor's report—that is the case in socialist countries. Therefore, I realise the necessity of keeping a very wide eye open on how wealth is accumulating and how it can be tapped for purposes of better distribution among the community.

So, if hon. Members agree on two things : firstly, that we should maximise production, and, secondly, that on every occasion on which a taxation measure comes forward they will be entitled to ask what measures we propose to take in regard to the profits that are going to this first category of profits—that is, dividends, and not wages and rents—then certainly the Finance Minister concerned will have to give a satisfactory answer.

The reason why all these have not been brought in today is (1), that we only needed a certain sum of money, and (2) there are certain forms, I understand, which have still to be examined. It is quite certain—if I may refer back to Prof. Kaldor—that it is at our instance that Prof. Kaldor was asked to come to this country. We knew he had written a 'Minority Report' in the Taxation Enquiry Commission. He was placed for convenience in the Indian Statistical Institute, but he has submitted a report to me, to the Finance Minister, and it is my intention to place that report before the House before the end of this session, because I am anxious that hon. Members should consider everything that that report contains and be prepared with their observations when we take up the question of Plan. I am sorry this debate is getting mixed up between the Plan and the ceiling. Both things are one, practically parts of the same discussion. That is why I am saying, I am anxious that hon. Members should share the burden of consideration with me. I am considering Prof. Kaldor's report and I would like suggestions of hon. Members. I am quite certain that we shall be able to hammer out something which will give some little satisfaction to the House, to all sections of the House I should say, when the time is ripe for bringing forward further measures of taxation. That is all in a general way that I can say in order to allay the anxiety of the House that, somehow or other the Finance Minister has sworn himself only to raising revenues

by indirect taxation. I have never said so. What I said was that one will have to remember all the time that the people who have incomes over Rs. 4,500 in this country are, say, 1 per cent or a little less than 1 per cent. People who have incomes of over Rs. 60,000, after payment of taxes, would hardly exceed 450. We can deal with them. Therefore, I say, that after we have done all we want to do with these people, who are, so to speak, our commission agents in increasing production, it may be that in view of the large volume of taxation that we have to raise, we may have to ask the common man to spare some promised current consumption in the way of either taxation or borrowing or saving. That is all I have said. I have never said that we shall confine ourselves exclusively to indirect taxation and that I feel that the limit of direct taxation has been reached. In my own mind, there is not even a vestige of feeling of that kind. I very readily accept the fact that there will be larger and larger surpluses in the hands of the well placed and advantaged individuals, companies and firms which the community is entitled to tax.

While I have the opportunity, I might say that so far as the method of raising surpluses is concerned, it is no good deluding ourselves with the feeling that if some gets into the hands of a few people as surpluses, or if it gets into the hands of a few people as surpluses, or if it gets into the hands of a very large number of people in small dribbles, both are the same thing. They are not. So far as surpluses are concerned, it is easier (a) to locate them and (b) to tap them if they go into the hands of a few persons. Therefore, the process that I have indicated should not be difficult. If, on the other hand, surpluses or these additional incomes—these get distributed in very small doses or dribbles or thimblefuls all over the community, it is almost certain that it will be absorbed in additional consumption. Therefore.....

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal):** Monopoly should be developed.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** That is not the argument. The argument is, therefore, one should not have an oversimplified feeling in regard to this tragic dilemma to which the hon. Member referred. One should take steps. If incomes or amenities are being distributed, to that extent, one should make up

one's mind that it will be almost impossible to tap them except through small savings or voluntary acts of self-abnegation on the part of the holders of these incomes. But, so far as these surpluses are concerned, I say that I do not anticipate any great difficulty in either locating them or devising suitable measures, if a little time is given to us, to tap them for the purposes of the community. This is the general philosophy of this matter.

In view of this, my difficulty is, I cannot accept the resolution in the form in which it has been put forward. I need not make it clear, I hope, that Government wholeheartedly accept and intend steadily to pursue the objective which underlies the Resolution namely a progressive reduction in economic inequality, and if there is any satisfaction to the House that we should give at least token indication that we are at one with them in spirit, I am prepared to accept the amendment which has been suggested by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad so that we at least stand committed to the principle. The gap has been narrowed a little, shall we say, between the advanced thinkers and ourselves.

**Shri Gadgil:** I will still go ahead next time.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** It is possible to spin out this matter and go into platitudes which are well known as to what planned development means what capital formation means, and how man was not born equal, how his capacity, etc., are unequal and so on. But, I shall not take the time of the House by stating most of these platitudes. Nor shall I mention, except very briefly, the steps that have already been taken by the Government in the same direction: land reforms, although many hon. Members find fault with them, regulation of rents, control of money-lending, re-organisation of rural credit, amendment of the Company law, nationalisation of the Imperial Bank, life insurance and so on.

The only other issue is this question of the expansion of the public sector or expansion of state-trading and so on in order to tap some of these profits. There, again, dimensionally, we may not be able to satisfy the House. I am a great believer in Chanchupraves, in making a small beginning which

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

could be broadened and widened as opportunities offer themselves—thin and of the wedge. There has been some reference made to the Taxation Inquiry Commission's report. I do not think hon. Members have really studied it because, otherwise, they would not use the word immediately. I would like to read—I do not know how much time I have.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** His time is up.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh :** In that case, I would not read. I would only say when I place the report of Professor Kaldour on the Table, which I hope to do in about two or three days, hon. Members should study not only what he says about taxation, but also what he says about ceiling on income. I have no time to read it today. When they read it, I think they will agree with me more than ever that all that we need do at the moment, is to accept the amendment moved by the hon. Member Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad.

**श्री विभूती मिश्र (सारन व चम्पारन) :** मैंने जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया उसका जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने समर्थन किया है उनको मैं हादिक धन्यवाद करता हूँ और साथ ही मैं अपने वित्त मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस समय जो उनकी वानप्रस्थ की जिन्दगी है उसके अनुसार उचित कारवाई करने का बीड़ा उठाया है और जो उन्होंने चंचु प्रवेश न्याय की बात कही यह गांधी जी के शब्दों में अहिंसात्मक न्याय है। गांधीजी भी धीरे धीरे काम करते थे। जब गांधी जी चम्पारन में गये तो उन्होंने कोठी वालों से २६ परसेंट और २० परसेंट मुआवजे में कमी कराई थी। उस समय आज जो हमारे राष्ट्रपति हैं उन्होंने कहा था कि "यह आपने क्या किया"। गांधी ने जवाब दिया था कि मैंने किया तो थोड़ा है परन्तु इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि अंग्रेज लोग चम्पारन से चले जायेंगे। वही बात हुई। वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो चंचु प्रवेश न्याय की बात कही है उससे असमानता धीरे धीरे ही दूर होगी, और मैं समझता हूँ कि जो काम धीरे धीरे होता है वह माकूल होता है। परन्तु एक बात मुझे कहनी है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दूसरे हाउस में कहा और हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने इस हाउस में कहा कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाइये। मैं इनसे कहता हूँ कि आप मेरे साथ देहात में चलिए और देखिये कि प्रोडक्शन (उत्पादन) बढ़ाने के लिए देहातों

में बांगड़ और दूसरे लोग आज इस कड़ी धूपमें कितना परिश्रम करते हैं। ये लोग हल चलाते हैं और दूसरे काम करते हैं और सुबह से शाम तक प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने का यत्न करते हैं। लेकिन इतना सारा काम करने के बाद उनको शाम को खाना नहीं मिलता। इसका आपको कोई उपाय निकालना होगा। आप बार बार कहते हैं कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाइये, प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाइये। लेकिन डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन (वितरण) करने का भी तो कोई तरीका निकालिए। प्रोडक्शन तो बढ़ रहा है। अगर यही हालत रही तो मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग गांधी जी के शिष्य हैं और प्रधान मंत्री के सिपाही हैं, हमको कोई दूसरा रास्ता खोजना पड़ेगा कि क्या करें।

मैं अपने वित्त मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि साहब यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर बड़ा घोखा है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर के अर्धन आज जितनी फेक्टरीज और कल कारखाने व उद्योग हैं और उन उद्योगों से जो फायदा होता है, उस मुनाफे का आपने जनता में वितरण कराने के लिये क्या व्यवस्था की है? आज हम देखते हैं कि इस सेकेंड फाइव इयर प्लान (द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना) में प्राइवेट सेक्टर को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिये सरकार ने २३ अरब रुपये के खर्च करने की व्यवस्था रक्खी है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हमारे देखने में आता है कि इन प्राइवेट उद्योगपतियों द्वारा सरकारी टैक्सों (करों) का द्रवजन (अपवंचन) किया जाता है और मैं आपसे यह प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्राइवेट सेक्टर के लिए कोई इतजाम कीजिये और याद रखिये जब तक यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर अपने वर्तमान रूप में विद्यमान रहेगा, यह देश का नाश करता रहेगा। जिस तरह से एक घर में दो, तीन भाई एक साथ रहते हैं और अगर किसी एक भाई का अपना प्राइवेट मनी होता है तो वह भाई अपने काम पर ध्यान देता है और वह दूसरे काम पर ध्यान नहीं देता है, वह घर के इतजाम पर ध्यान नहीं देता है और उसका सारा ध्यान अपने प्राइवेट मनी को आगे बढ़ाने में लगता है और इसके कारण घर का नाश हो जाता है, उसी तरह से जब तक आपके घर में यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर रहेगा, तब तक आपके देश की उन्नति नहीं हो सकेगी। असल में यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर ही सब झगड़े फसाद की जड़ है और जब तक यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर मौजूद रहेगा तब तक यह आपके आफिसर्स (अधिकारियों) वगैरह को करप्ट (अपष्ट) करता

रहेगा। मैं अपनी ही बात बतलाऊँ कि अगर मैं पालियामेंट का मेम्बर न होता तो मैं दिल्ली न आ पाता और एक मामूली किसान होने के नाते दिल्ली आना मेरे बूते की बाहर की बात थी, दिल्ली आना तो दूर रहा मेरे लिए अपने खर्च से डिस्ट्रिक्ट टाउन पहुँचना मुश्किल होता था और पैसे की किल्लत की वजह से साइकिल की शरण लेनी पड़ती थी, लेकिन चूंकि अब पालियामेंट का मेम्बर हो गया हूँ इसलिये दिल्ली आ गया। कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि मामूली किसानों की आप तक पहुँच नहीं हो पाती जब कि हम देखते हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर के बड़े बड़े पूँजीपति लोग बड़ी आसानी से प्राइम मिनिस्टर (प्रधान मंत्री) और वित्त मंत्री महोदय के पास पहुँच जाते हैं और दूसरे बड़े सरकारी अधिकारियों के पास उनकी पहुँच हो जाती है जब कि गरीब किसान की पहुँच आपके दरवाजे पर नहीं हो सकती और अगर हिम्मत करके वह वहाँ पहुँच भी जायगा तो दरवाजे पर बंदूक लेकर पहरा देने वाला सिपाही उसको वहाँ से हटा देगा.....

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh :** During the last month or so, about a thousand peasants have been to me and I do not believe that a single captain of industry has been to my place.

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** मंत्री महोदय ने बंदूक वाला सिपाही नहीं रक्खा होगा।

**श्री विभूति मिश्र :** मैं वित्त मंत्री महोदय को इसके लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उनके दिल में गरीब किसानों के लिए इतनी जगह मौजूद है।

प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने राज्य सभा में सीलिंग (आय की अधिकतम सीमा) के ऊपर बोलते हुए जो अपने विचार प्रकट किये, उसको अखबार वालों ने कुछ इस तरह से पेश किया है कि सहसा उस खबर को पढ़ने वाले को भ्रम सा हो जाता है और चूंकि यह अखबार वाले घनिक आदमियों के हाथ की कठपुतली बने हुए हैं इसलिए उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के वक्तव्य में से इधर उधर से निकाल करके अपने मन की बात लिख दी लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने जो यह शब्द कहे थे कि आज देश की भवस्था यह हो रही है कि कुछ लोग तो बहुत दरिद्रता और कष्ट का जीवन बिता रहे हैं जब कि कुछ लोग बहुत लक्ष्मरी (ऐशोइशरत) में रहते हैं, यह आर्थिक असमानता है, उसके बारे में कुछ

नहीं लिखा। मैं अपने उन अखबार वाले भाइयों से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उनको देशहित का ध्यान सर्वोपरि रखना चाहिये और उन्हें देश के गरीब कास्तकारों का साथ देना चाहिये। आज पूँजीपतियों का पैसा खाने से उनका दिमाग बिगड़ गया है और जिस गलत तरीके पर उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की राज्य सभा की स्पीच को कोट किया है, उससे एक गरीब कास्तकार यह समझेगा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के दिल में गरीबों के लिए कोई दद नहीं है। हालाँकि मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के दिल में हम गरीबों के लिए जितना दर्द है उतना हिन्दुस्तान में किसी के लिए नहीं है। मेरा उन अखबारी बंधुओं से अनुरोध है कि वे अपने कर्तव्य का ठीक ठीक तरह पालन करें और पालियामेंट में जो कुछ कहा जाय उसको ठीक ठीक उसी रूप में आप अपने अखबारों में उद्धृत करें।

सेक्रेट फाइव इयर प्लान की रिपोर्ट में यह जो कहा गया है कि : "Ceiling on incomes in the end-product rather than the beginning of a process." मैं इससे सहमत नहीं हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि तीन हजार की सीलिंग काफी ऊँची है और उसकी बजाय २,२५० रुपये की सीलिंग फिक्स (निश्चित) कर दी जाय।

आज लोगों में इंसेंटिव (उत्साह) पैदा करने की बात कही जाती है, ठीक है लोगों में इंसेंटिव पैदा करने की जरूरत है ताकि वे अधिक मेहनत से काम करें और देश की सम्पत्ति बढ़ायें लेकिन इंसेंटिव बढ़ाने के साथ ही आज देश में इस बात की बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि हमारे व्यापारियों में नैतिकता का भाव आये, हमारी इस प्लानिंग (योजना) में देश में नैतिकता कैसे लाई जाय, इसका कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं है, आज इस बात की बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि हमारे देश और समाज में नैतिकता का भाव आये और इसके आने पर हम देखेंगे कि हमारा देश काफी प्रगति करेगा। आज यह बड़े खेद का विषय है कि हमारे व्यापारी समाज में नैतिकता का संबंध आभाव है और याद रखिये जब तक हमारे बीच में अनैतिकता कायम रहेगी, तब तक देश का कल्याण नहीं होगा।

आज हमारे देश में दो महान् शक्तियाँ देश का उद्धार करने में लगी हुई हैं। एक है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू और दूसरे आचार्य विनोबा भावे। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू सरकारी स्तर पर देश का उद्धार करने

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

का काम कर रहे हैं और आचार्य विनोबा भावे गैर सरकारी स्तर पर गांव गांव घूम कर देश उद्धार का काम कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने "भूदान यज्ञ" नामक अखबार में सामूहिक चिंतन की आवश्यकता पर इस प्रकार लिखा है: "यहां के लोग अपनी अपनी चिन्ता करते हैं, दूसरों की नहीं। यह एक बड़ा भारी दोष है। सामाजिक चिन्ता का अभाव हमारे यहां है। इसलिए आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि लोगों को सामूहिक चिन्तन की सीख दी जाय...

एक माननीय सदस्य : अभी चिन्तामणि उषर हैं।

श्री सी० डी० देशमुख : हम तो मन भर चिन्ता करते हैं।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : आगे विनोबा भावे ने लिखा है: "वस्तुतः मनुष्य का सारा ध्यान प्रेम संपादन करने में लगना चाहिये। लेकिन लोग कमाते हैं पैसा और परिणाम में पाते हैं एक दूसरे का द्वेष। कोई किसी की परवाह नहीं करता। विनोबाजी ने देशवासियों को सलाह दी है कि लोग बांट बांट कर खाएं और अगर लोग इस भाईचारे की भावना से मिल कर रहेंगे और ईमानदारी से मिल कर बांट कर खायेंगे तो कोई झगड़ा पैदा नहीं होगा और इस सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने एक सत्पुरुष की कहानी भी उसमें लिखी है जो इस प्रकार है। एक सत्पुरुष की मशहूर कहानी है। एक छोटी सी जगह बहू सो गया और बाहर जोरों से बारिश आ रही थी। ठंड में ठिठुरता हुआ दूसरा मनुष्य वहां आया और उसने आश्रय मांगा। एक ही मनुष्य के सो मकने की जगह वहां थी। सत्पुरुष ने कहा, "आ जाओ दोनों बैठ तो सकते हैं"। फिर एक तीसरा शख्स आया और उसने भी आश्रय मांगा। तीनों बैठ नहीं सकते थे, लेकिन खड़े तो रह सकते थे। उसे भी बुला लिया गया और तीनों ने खड़े खड़े रात बितायी। सार यह है कि तकलीफ भले ही हो, लेकिन सहूलियत सबको होनी चाहिये।

यही मुखको कहना है कि जो कुछ भी हमारे पास हो उसको बांट कर खाना चाहिये, यह नहीं कि एक आदमी को ज्यादा मिल जाय और दूसरे आदमी को कम मिले, मेरे प्रस्ताव का यही मतलब है कि आप आमदनी के ऊपर एक नियंत्रण कीजिये कि उसके ऊपर किसी की आमदनी नहीं होनी चाहिये। हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने उसको इस तरह से नहीं माना लेकिन उन्होंने

यह बतलाया कि हम बहुत से टैक्स (कर) लगाने जा रहे हैं और सिद्धान्त : हमारे श्री भागवत झा आजाद का जो अमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) है उसको कबूल किया है। मैं इसके लिए वित्त मंत्री महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और सरकार को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। राज्य सभा में जो हुआ सो हुआ लेकिन यह हमारी लोक सभा है और यह जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों की सभा है और यहां ऐसा सुधार करके हमने बिलकुल ठीक काम किया है और यह हमारा कार्य लोक कल्याणकारी सिद्ध होगा। मैं अपने मित्र श्री एच० एन० मुकजी से कहना चाहूंगा कि देखिये हमारे इस प्रस्ताव के अन्दर जो सिद्धान्त निहित है, उसको सरकार ने किस खूबसूरती के साथ माना है। चूँकि आप लोग जो बात कहते हैं वह सच्चे दिल से नहीं कहते और आपके मन में और बात रहती है और मुंह से दूसरी बात कहते हैं, इसलिए सरकार आपको बात को नहीं मानती है। आपने देखा कि सरकार ने हमारी बात को किस तरह से माना।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Now there is the main Resolution and there are the amendments. I am going to put amendment No. 3 standing in the name of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, and if this is carried, perhaps there would be no need to put any other amendment to the vote of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat) : This is absolutely different from the Resolution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : But this is in substitution of the original one, and if this is accepted....

Shri V. G. Deshpande : On a point of order. The amendment which is substituted for the Resolution should have some relation to the original Resolution. The original Resolution refers to ceiling on income, and this refers to only the removal of disparities. I think this is a separate Resolution and not an amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : This question cannot be raised now. The Speaker has accepted it and it is too late now for me to give any ruling. It has already been accepted : therefore that question does not arise.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor) : The fact that the Speaker has admitted the amendment as an alternative does not in any way commit him ; nor does it mean that it is in order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** Not only has the Speaker admitted it; the various amendments were moved and the one that was out of order was ruled out as such.

**Shri Nambiar (Mayuram) :** Generally such motions or amendments used to be admitted subject to further scrutiny. Now, on scrutiny, we find that it cannot be admitted as an alternative resolution. Therefore, you can give your ruling at this stage.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon) :** My first submission is that when the mover of the resolution himself says that it is quite germane and he is prepared to accept it as an alternative, who are the others to say that it is not germane?

Secondly, when a resolution is moved that a ceiling should be fixed, in essence it means that the disparities in income should be removed. It is on the same plane with the resolution.

Thirdly, whenever an amendment or a resolution is moved, the proper time to object is at the time, is moved. When it has been moved, discussed and a reply has been given, it is not correct to say that it is not in order at the final stage.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi :** My contention is briefly this. The original resolution has been moved by the mover and it is in possession of the House, though the mover may desire to withdraw it, it is for this House to allow him to withdraw it or not. If the House is not prepared to agree to that, it is none of his concern to say that he would like to have this amendment. We also feel that the amendment that is sought to be moved today is different in nature entirely from the main resolution which has been moved by the mover. In these circumstances, the House is not prepared to agree to this proposition that the mover may be allowed to withdraw the resolution. We do not agree to that course.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** Enough discussion has taken place. The first objection is that, ordinarily we admit these amendments subject to their admissibility otherwise. This is not the case in the present instance. The Speaker applied his mind, as it appears from the record, and one that was out of order was ruled out of order. Therefore, that objection does not hold good.

The second objection is that the original resolution was quite a distinct one and the amendment should have some relation to the original resolution. This is also not of much importance, because one that substitute another must certainly be distinct. Then again there is relation. It was intended by the original resolution that a ceiling should be placed on income; the amendment that is before us, the substituted resolution, though it does not go to the whole way is a step in that direction, but seeks to narrow down the disparity. Mr. Azad's amendment wants that we should move in that direction, though we may not reach the goal immediately. Therefore, it is a step in that direction and certainly germane to the resolution that we have been discussing.

Thirdly, the mover also accepts that it satisfies him to some extent. Therefore, I rule that this is perfectly justified and in order and I am going to put it to the vote of the House.

The question is :

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."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Nambiar :** The 'Noes' have it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** So half-hearted was the voice, that it cannot be taken seriously. At any rate they are not against reducing disparity.

All other amendments are banned. Now we pass on to the next resolution.

#### RESOLUTION RE ENQUIRY INTO WORKING OF INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) :** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, a curiously unexpected thread of harmony has run, Sir, through this day's proceedings, right from the official resolution on the Second Five Year Plan, through the earlier resolution on the ceiling on incomes and now, Sir, this last one of the day.