

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

3129

3130

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 3rd July, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past
Eight of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M.

DEATH OF GURU GOSAI AGAM
DASJI

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed further, I have to inform the House of the sad demise of Guru Gosaj Agam Dasji, a sitting Member of this House who died on the 28th June, 1952, in his native village in Raipur. He was a Member of the Constituent Assembly of India. He was elected to the House of the People from the Bilaspur-Durg-Raipur—Reserved—Scheduled Castes constituency in Madhya Pradesh.

The House will join with me in conveying our condolence to his family. The House may stand in silence for a minute and express its sorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM THE
HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform hon. Members that I have received the following letter from Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:

"This is to request you to grant me leave of absence from Parliament for the period (about a month) I shall be going to Berlin to attend the Peace Congress Bureau meeting. I shall be leaving on 28th June, 1952 and I shall be obliged if you will grant me this leave of absence."

Is it the pleasure of the House that she should be granted the leave?

Leave' was granted.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION
(SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947."

The motion was adopted

Dr. Katju: I introduce the Bill.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

Dr. Katju: I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and to provide for a more speedy trial of certain offences.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and to provide for a more speedy trial of certain offences."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. Katju: I introduce the Bill.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS
FOR GRANTS—concl'd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the discussion on the Demands for Grants under the control of the

[Mr. Speaker]

Ministry of Finance and the cut motions moved yesterday. I believe discussion on items other than Planning is to continue. Hon. Members will remember that today is the last date and guillotine will be applied at 1 o'clock. I think the hon. the Finance Minister will take about half an hour, or will he require more?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): About three quarters of an hour, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Then I shall call upon him at 12-15.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): May I rise on a question of procedure? Some of us have requested you, Sir, to give us an opportunity for a discussion on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I shall clarify the position when the Bill actually comes before the House.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: In the meantime hon. Members will do well to give some attention to what I had expressed in 1950 when the Appropriation Bill came up for the first time. They will find the same in the small booklet called "Decisions from the Chair".

An Hon. Member: Is it available?

Mr. Speaker: It is available, if Members wish to know.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): The decisions may not be followed every time.

Mr. Speaker: It is difficult to build traditions and democracy if expediency is the measure of the whole thing and not principle. And hon. Members will agree that even at inconvenience sometimes, it is better to follow precedents unless the circumstances require a change. That is a different matter.

Hon. Members will find certain rules also on the subject in the Rules of Procedure. I believe each one of them has got a copy of Rules of Procedure, and I would request them to read the rules also.

I would request further that Opposition Members, parties or groups, who wish to raise any points in the Appropriation Bill will do well to give me advance intimation of the specific points which they want to raise, so that I may be able to see as to whether the points are absolutely new and

important or whether they are covered by the previous discussions for the last eighteen or twenty days. The whole idea is that there should not be any repetition of the debate on the Demands for Grants. That will be tantamount to a waste of the time of the House. If there be any really new points which require any further elucidation or consideration, certainly I would consider them and then I shall be in a position to say as to what discussion and up to what time it should be permitted.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Can we not emphasize some of the points which we have already made?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will see the difference. He has perhaps in mind the Finance Bill, and he perhaps thinks that, as a discussion on the Finance Bill is permitted in respect of all points, so it is with the Appropriation Bill.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Would this privilege be limited to the Opposition Members only?

Mr. Speaker: Under the parliamentary practice, it is the practice to allow the Opposition to mention the points.

Shri Velayudhan rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The difficulty is each hon. Member thinks of his own point, not minding what other people are saying or what the Chair is saying. It will be better if they have a little patience.

As I was saying, the hon. Member must have been thinking of the Finance Bill. Now, the difference between the two is that, the Finance Bill authorizes the Government to levy taxes and the Members ought to have an opportunity of expressing all their grievances, because the saying is well known: "no taxation without representation." And they may have their say in respect of each tax which the Government propose to levy. But the position is entirely different so far as the Appropriation Bill is concerned. They have already passed all the Demands for Grants. And at the time or before passing them, they had ample opportunities of discussing each particular Grant, generally, and specifically by means of cut motions. It is always theoretically possible to say that something is left out. It is always possible that something may have been left out. But if that principle is accepted, we shall have an

interminable discussion. So here the real principle is that there must be something new, something of importance—and of very great importance. And I am sure, while discussing the Grants, the most important points could not have been left out. The hon. Members of the Opposition who were discussing, and who selected their cuts, and who made their speeches on Demands, could not be expected to have lost sight of the important points. Still, some might have escaped, possibly and they may be allowed to be discussed on the Appropriation Bill. That is the distinction so far as the scope of discussion is concerned, between the Finance Bill and the Appropriation Bill. The Appropriation Bill is only setting up a legal machinery to ensure that grants voted for a particular purpose are not utilized by the Government for any other purpose. The idea is to enact the whole into a law, so that they cannot withdraw from the Consolidated Fund anything at their pleasure.

So, the Finance Bill and the Appropriation Bill are two entirely different things. And, as I have said before, in theory, no discussion can be ruled out by the Chair. But in practice it can be, and should be, because it is no use wasting further time over the same points again. Therefore, the practice in England as well as here is that points are given for consideration, and if, in the opinion of the Speaker, they are really new points not covered during the eighteen or twenty days' discussion, discussion on those points may be permitted. The Speaker may then fix a time, an hour or an hour and a half or two hours. That is all. That is the position with reference to the Appropriation Bills. Hon. Members who wish to give their points may do so.

Now, we will proceed further with the Business.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East): Hurl ourselves as we may, like missiles, like light bombs or human bombs, without making any impression on the rocks opposite, that may not be the task to which we have been set by our constituents. The masses believe—a passionate lingering belief—that Pandit Nehru is good, Pandit Nehru is incorruptible. He cannot forget us so soon. But, he is surrounded by bad counsel. Could anybody go and fearlessly tell him our woes? He would respond; he would not refuse.

Were we to tell the people, like honest Opposition Members, as we

are, 'Wait for five years. Wait till the disintegrating process of the Congress is complete. Wait till there is a chance for a changeover of the Government,' the masses would not hear us. The masses would go into glooms and that would be exactly the position where many mischiefs might be coming into the country. Therefore I wish to make it clear to the hon. Leader of this day that though we might sometimes be using harsh words, it is only the task to which we have been set by our constituencies that we are trying to fulfil here.

And what do we find here? In a way we find that instinctively the masses are right, intuitively they are correct. Whatever sparkling ideas, beautiful ideas, may come from the leader in the Government, we find none of them being carried out. We are here on the last day of the Budget debate. The House will agree with me, the capitalists and socialists alike agree on this point, that he who controls the finances controls the State. What do we find here? On the last day of the general discussion of the General Budget, the Finance Minister told us, "We ourselves are very sorry for the slow snail pace which is envisaged in these programmes and plans of development of our country." Then he said, "But, I am sorry, I have to consider the effect of these things on the lives of, does the House remember, 35,68,29,485 people." I am glad he had left out the children, who come ten for every minute. Perhaps he had left the care of them to the Health Department. I am glad he said those things. Then, he said, "We can have no progress without investment, and if we go into investment on top of inflation, the result will perhaps be the opposite." This is an amazing theory placed before the House. The hon. gentleman himself has given the House the definition of investment. He has said that it is money taken from current consumption. Certainly, we agree that that is investment. What is inflation? Though he has not given the definition, I hope hon. Members remember the economic phenomenon of our age: we have money going down the right hand and goods coming up the left hand. That is the economic phenomenon of our age. There are two streams flowing in the body economic of the society: money flowing down the right hand channel and goods coming up the left hand channel. Whenever there is disparity between the two, there is pain in the body economic. Whenever the right hand chan-

[Pandit S. C. Mishra]

nel, that is money channel, is thicker, and the left hand channel, that is the goods channel, is thinner, we call that an inflation period. Certainly, Sir, I think that is a recognised thing all over the world, that Governments with their wide financial powers on the lives of the nations, with a judicious adjustment of their Budgets, with an unbalanced budget on the deficit side when there is inflation, and on the surplus side when there is depression, can to a large extent check this phenomenon of inflation and depression. I am surprised to find that in India, for five years, just the opposite has been practised. Even today we have heard of it. The Finance Minister gave us an assurance that the back-bone of inflation has been broken. Only a few days later, he sounded another note of warning, that he was not perhaps sure of that and would not embark upon investments. And, that was made to be supported by a higher authority. This year, if you go into the Budget, you will find that only three crores have been set apart for the Development departments whereas the deficit in the Budget is 75 crores. Look here again. Sometimes we are out of inflation; sometimes we are in inflation. We are having these amazing theories. We can now see why the nation has been stagnating for these five years. I maintain that those years of boom, those years of inflation, if you so call them, were the best period when Government ought to have gone in for investments. That was the best period when the Government ought to have made collection drive of the extra surplus money in the people's pocket and that would have helped to a great extent in reducing inflation. But, just the opposite has been going on. On the one hand, all the Development departments were told, "Go cautiously; you want to help the people, but you may be harming them." On the other hand, all our surpluses were spent out. I was astonished to find that he also supported it theoretically. Just as Captains of ships are accustomed to throwing oil on disturbed seas, perhaps, our Finance Ministers squander money. I do not blame this particular Finance Minister. There are people who may say, "Ministers may come, Ministers may go; but I saddle it on them for ever." All these five years, the balances that we held, the cash balances here in India and cash balances outside, have all been squandered. No development, no investment, on the one hand and squandering on the other. That has been going on for five years. At the

end of five years, it is clear we are still not out of the wood; perhaps the woods have not left us.

Now, according to these two theories that have been propounded by the Finance Minister, we can say one thing. I will not draw any corollary; corollaries have proved dangerous. I can say that if these two theories are followed, we are leading straight to a point. What is that point? When will the time come when we can go in for a policy of development and investment? The Finance Ministry may say one day, we are just coming to that stage. They may again say, we are not in that stage and caution is still required. When the country is in a depression, in deflation, at that time, we shall have additional impetus to go in for investments. It will be said, that the country lacks employment, so many people are unemployed and so this is the best time when we should go in for national investments.

[SHRI PATASKAR in the Chair]

And where will the money come from then? There, the cat is out of the bag. We shall have to enter into investment then, but where will the money come from? Perhaps from the World Bank we will get the money! Call it the World Bank, call it the Bank of California, it is the same thing. It is not the first time that India has breathed a short spell of freedom. India has breathed freedom many times, and many a time it has foundered or very nearly. We have seen throughout the history of the world that those clever people have always infiltrated into a country, mostly through economic devices. That was what happened in India, that was what happened in China, that is what is happening in Europe. Therefore, it seems, the invisible hands that seem to be guiding our destination to a particular point, are taking us to that position. We shall have to enter into investment, we must enter into investment, and we must enter into debts. The Finance Ministry have refused to take hon. Members opposite any more than us or the House into their confidence. They have never made a frontal attack; they have been side-tracking. That has been going on, and I do not know how long it will be going on. So much about policies, Sir.

Now we come to the day-to-day expenditure. I do not know if all the hon. Members in this House or how

many of them are aware of the fact that we are paying a huge debt interest every year. And do you know, what is that amount? It is Rs. 69 crores every year. We have to pay Rs. 69 crores, that is what I have been able to find out.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur—Keonjhar): You are talking of interest?

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Yes, interest is being paid. When the Britishers were here, they were charged with spending Rs. 60 crores on home and interest charges every year, and perhaps that was one of the things that appealed to the poor masses of the country most and now after these five years of grace of Swaraj, we are paying Rs. 69 crores. Hearing that we are spending Rs. 200 crores on defence budget, everybody was startled, and when these things come up for discussion—I know these are charged items, but I do not see why these should not be discussed in the budget. They should be. I say the country has a right to know, the poor masses of the country have a right to know who are those honourable men, now that the Britishers are gone, who are those that are taking Rs. 69 crores from our pockets every year? Could these debts be not liquidated? You always say there is no enthusiasm in the masses. You make a patriotic appeal or something like that. But it cannot come when the country does not know its financial position and when you do not take the ordinary man into confidence. I will say one thing: the power of the Government, the financial power of the Government to do good or to do bad, is directly in proportion to the amount that the masses understand about the financial position of the Government. Keep the masses ignorant of the financial policies, of your financial ways, and you will be only able to do them harm, never good. So I would appeal—this is an attempt that is being made in every country—I would appeal to the hon. Members opposite, not as members of the Government or as Finance Minister, but at least as our countrymen that they should really make an attempt: let them make a beginning to present their financial budget, the whole account of the nation, in a form that the masses can understand. What is it that is being placed before the House, and through us, to the country?

I ask one other question. Has this been specifically brought before the House at all, that within two years, on the procurement of grains from without, we have lost Rs. 55 crores?

Mr. Chairman: You can have two more minutes.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: The amount of Rs. 55 crores has been lost on procurement of foodgrains during the last two years, and even this year, we are having Rs. 151 crores for buying foodgrains in England or through England. What I stress is India is a very poor country. I say every item that goes beyond Rs. 1 crore should be specifically brought before the House and discussed. That is the only way in which you can make the masses take a definite interest, a living interest in the affairs of the Government, and only then can you get response from the masses. You skip huge items—Rs. 70 crores, Rs. 100 crores—and then you go on to say the masses are not enthusiastic. You do not tell them we are doing such and such a thing, and then you say the masses are not enthusiastic. They cannot, for the life of them, understand where you are driving them to.

I will mention one thing more. In the budget presented on 29th February, item 114, Finance Department was to be Rs. 4,000. Have we marked, Sir, why in two months it is Rs. 10,00,03,000? Well, I say some emergency might have arisen. The Finance Minister ought to have taken the House into confidence, he ought to have specifically said: "Look here, this Rs. 4,000 was not enough for that purpose. Under such and such circumstances we require now Rupees ten crores and three thousand." Nothing of that sort is done. Everything is skipped over.

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): I should like to know which item my friend is referring to.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: I hope this time will not be taken from me. It is either item 41 or 114.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member's time is nearly over, but he can give the information.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: It is item 41 or 114, you can just find out. Extraordinary capital outlay of the Finance Department which was originally Rs. 4,000 but is now rupees ten crores and three thousand.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): If we take the demand, I think it is the first item.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Yes, 114.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: What item, Sir?

Pandit S. C. Mishra: 114 of the demand. The total you had first shown was Rs. 4,000. Now you are presenting it as rupees ten crores and three thousand—other capital outlay of the Ministry of Finance, that is the thing here. And I would say one thing more. When presenting the budget, the hon. Minister said that the sale proceeds of the American wheat would go to a special development fund. And now perhaps these Rs. 10 crores are being met from that. We cannot have both things. On the one hand we understand those rupees are being put into a special fund, that they are being amassed for future use, and this is going on.

One minute, Sir, for this one minute that has gone. I will now examine the fiscal policy of Government. If we go through the rates of tariff, we see that whereas food items are charged almost like 37½ per cent. *ad valorem*—that is things coming from outside, ordinary things, fish etc., milk, milk products and other things. As soon as you come to wine, ale, whisky, etc., it changes into so many rupees per gallon or per bottle which, when you calculate it, turns out to be 10 per cent *ad valorem*. Coming to machines. If you take cinema machinery etc., the tariff is 10½ per cent. If you take knitting and sewing machines—the only two machines where there is perhaps no exploitation, you can find them in every village—there, the charge is 37½ per cent. These are very small things, but they show which way the wind blows, it shows the direction—whom you want to protect and for whom you stand. Whether your partiality is for the rich or for the poor! The masses have no enthusiasm. It is not the fault of the masses. This is what I have been able to gather in this one month after diving into the pool of overt and covert statistics and that is what I present through this House to the people of India to whom I apologise for having spoken English.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: On a point of information, Sir. I would like to ask the hon. Member where he got these figures of Rs. 69 and Rs. 55 crores, as less on procurement of food. If he is not immediately ready with the answer, he can send me a slip of paper on which it may be mentioned as to where these figures (on which page) occur?

Mr. Chairman: I shall give the hon. Member a minute's time to give the answer.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Rs. 69 crores can be found in Volume I of the De-

mands for Grants, as a charged item just after Demand No. 41, and Rs. 55 crores just before that...

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may send a note to the hon. Minister. I shall now call upon Mr. G. L. Bansal.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar—Rewari): I am really thankful to you for allowing me this early opportunity today to participate in the discussion. I would continue myself to some of the cut motions that have been tabled on the demands under discussion now, namely Cut Motion No. 1165 relating to technical co-operation and community projects, Cut Motion No. 534 relating to acquisition of Foreign Assets against sterling balances, No. 692 on foreign loans and No. 536 on reduction of indirect taxation.

There have been a number of references on several occasions to the technical co-operation agreement and community development schemes. I have gone through the agreement that was signed between the Government of India and the United States of America on this subject. This agreement has been a moot point of discussion particularly from the Members of the Opposition benches. I have taken some pains to go into those articles of this agreement which seem to mean so much to the Members on the opposite side, and after burning quite a lot of oil, I have come across only one sentence which may be taken objection to, on one ground or the other. That relates to Article 3 which says "The Director and other members of the party of specialists shall be selected and appointed by the Government of the United States of America but shall be acceptable to the Government of India." This, I think, arises out of the fact that American English has been used here and not English English. "But shall be acceptable" does not mean that whomsoever the United States Government may nominate would necessarily be acceptable to the Government of India. It only means that the persons who are appointed by the United States of America should be acceptable, and unless they are accepted, they will not be appointed.

I think that is the meaning of this phrase, because I had something to do with these things while I was in the United Kingdom last year. One or two agreements were shown to me, and one gentleman from the Board of Trade who was humourously inclined was comparing what was American English

with English English. Under this technical co-operation agreement, if I mistake not, some 11 operational agreements have been signed so far. One of them is that relating to community development projects, another is regarding the construction of 2,000 tube-wells in this country. My hon. friends on the opposite side spent quite a lot of time on these community development projects. I think it is the guilty conscience which is pricking them, because I have been trying to go into these projects, and really I do not find anything which should make them apprehensive. After all, what we are doing is that we are following the American methods of reaching extension services to our rural areas, i.e., whatever development and whatever researches are made in the Council of Agricultural Research and in other fields of agricultural research are taken to the villages for their benefit. In America this system has been perfected. Even before this agreement was signed, I was following with some interest the extension services scheme in America, and I should have thought that the time had now come—in fact, it ought to have been done long ago—when the extension services should be made available to our agriculturists. The fear of my hon. friends on the opposite side is that a number of Americans are coming to this country in great swarms and will infiltrate into our body-politic and make us do something which we do not want to do. I am one with them, if anything of this sort happens, to protest against such a thing. But so far, I have not seen anything of this kind happening. There are not many Americans, at least in these community development projects. If there is any such thing in these schemes, the Government will certainly know better, and will see to it that the management of these projects remains in Indian hands, and that no foreign country is allowed to lord it over us.

On the matter of community development projects, I have one specific point to mention. These projects are being allocated to areas where there are already facilities for agricultural development, in the nature of canal or tube-well irrigation. I come from a constituency which is a chronically dry area. It borders on Hissar, very close to it in fact, and is also in the same dry zone. But the soil of that area is very fertile, only some technical methods are required to make it productive. I understand America has developed what is called dry farming in places where there is only 10 or 12 inches of rain, and pro-

ducing good crops. I suggest that we must get some more information about this method from America and some community development schemes be located in those regions also, so that the recurrence of famines in chronically dry zones could be avoided.

As regards these 2,000 tube-wells, a fear has been expressed—and I invite the attention of the hon. the Minister to it—that because of this agreement, even those parts of the tube-wells which are being manufactured in this country will be imported from abroad. Now, Sir, I hold very strong views on this question that in no case, under no agreement, under no financial aid—whether it is by way of loans or it is a free aid—we should import anything that we are capable of manufacturing in this country or that we can manufacture in this country right now. The Finance Minister is no doubt aware of one or two other matters in this connection and I do not want to take more time on those.

I come to the cut motion regarding acquisition of British assets. Now, I am a practical man. Well, sentimentally every Indian wants that British interests should not remain here. I share that sentiment. But being one who wants India to develop economically as rapidly as possible, being one who wants new development to take place with whatever resources we have got in our hands, I want to know from my friends who have tabled this cut motion as to what advantage do they envisage by the purchase or by the taking over of these foreign assets with the sterling resources that we have got now. After all these sterling resources we accumulated by the toil and tears of our people during the period of a long war. Now, if we purchase these foreign assets which are in this country, we will be investing this money in industries which are already existing in our country. That means you are not spending this money on any new development.

There is another aspect of this question. All these industries which have been put up by foreigners here are fairly old now. They are badly worn out and depreciated, but on account of high capital costs their market value today is very high. I think the book value of it which was estimated at 320 crores in 1948 must be about 475 crores nowadays. Coupled with this 475 crores you have 292 crores worth of securities in the hands of foreigners. Which means that if we buy all these.

[Shri Bansal]

our entire sterling assets plus balances held abroad which amount to 603 crores and 79 crores would be wiped off.

Then there is another point to it. In our draft five year plan mention has been made that in case we are not able to get foreign aid to the tune of 292 crores, it may be possible to have deficit financing to that extent, because to the extent that sterling balances can be utilised to supplement domestic resources this strain will be diminished—this strain means the strain of deficit financing. Now I ask Members on the opposite side whether they want development to take place in this country or not. If they want development to take place, if they do not really mean under the guise of this cut motion to sabotage the plan, then what do they mean by asking Government to purchase these foreign assets from out of the sterling balances which may be used for various purposes including those of buying more capital goods from abroad, more technical 'know-how' from abroad and establishing new industries which we so badly need?

Sir, a sore point with my friends on the opposite side has been foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman: The hon Member's time is over.

Shri Bansal: Sir, I have got many minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: No, he has already taken 15 minutes. He can have two minutes more and finish.

10 A.M.

Shri Bansal: Now, Sir, I have been looking through the development plans of Russia with some care, and I have found that even in Russia apart from technical personnel which they imported to the extent of 4,000 odd—the figure was mentioned by my friend, Dr. Krishnaswamy yesterday—out of which 2,000 odd were high specialists, the Russian development plan also like our plan was divided into two parts; the first part, which was called the 'minimum variant' in pedantic language was based on local resources, and the other part which was called the 'maximum variant' was dependent on outside long-term credits. I read from Maurice Dobb—I am quoting him because he is an authority who is a great favourite of Members on the other side.

“That a considerably wider expansion of intercourse will be obtained with world economy”—it is one of the basic assumptions of the second part of the plan—“both as a result of the substantial export resources available and in addition and, more especially”—mark the words ‘more especially’ “as a result of a much greater increase in long term credits from abroad in the opening years of the Five Year Plan”.

When Russia at a time when she was trying to break away from the traditional economy of the rest of the world could depend or could hope to depend on foreign aid, I do not know what harm is there in our depending on foreign aid. In fact, I am one of those who would say that without foreign aid we cannot develop our economy as fast as we want to do. And that is another reason why I am totally against this idea of purchasing foreign assets by our sterling assets; also that is bound to have a very bad psychological effect not only on foreign investors but even on foreign Governments as also on the International Bank which are now trying to help us.

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai):

At the outside, I want to state that this budget is to be rejected *in toto*. There are some budgets in which some portions may be agreed to and some portions may be amended or modified to suit the circumstances. But the present situation is such that a budget of this kind cannot be accepted by the people at large. The foundation and formulation of the budget is such that relief to the poor man is kept at a distance for all times to come and relief to the rich is always made a certainty. During the last four or five years, the policy consistently followed by the Finance Ministers is deplorable. They went on making concessions in the way of abolition of taxes and reduction of taxes for the industrialists in this country; but I find that the tax upon the poor people, on the common man, in the way of tax on matches, tobacco etc., has been maintained. It is worthwhile to note that about 64 per cent of the revenue is being contributed from excise and customs.

Before I go into the details, I wish to make a specific request to the Finance Minister to consider the possibility of effecting a reduction in the tax on tobacco. I have received very serious representations from my on-

stiftency where tobacco merchants are large in number that unless a reduction in duty is made their condition would become very pitiable. I urge this with all sincerity, because during my election tours I visited those places also and I know to a certain extent the grievances they have. The tax on tobacco was raised from 1 anna to 2 annas, then from 2 annas to 3 annas and ultimately to 8 annas. Last year or some time before it was reduced to 6 annas. Now the reduction must be to the extent of 3 or 4 annas, i.e., the minimum must come to the point of imposing a tax of 3 annas. The price of tobacco has generally fallen because prices of other commodities and goods have also fallen. In the 'black market' or in whatever market it might be called, without paying the duty, tobacco is available at Rs. 10 per maund. But licence-holders are made to pay this tax of 6 annas per lb. which comes to Rs. 9-6 for 25 lbs. The price comes to Rs. 9-6 plus Rs. 2, i.e., Rs. 11-6. Thus the stock with these merchants, with these licencees, cannot be sold in the public market. This is a very great grievance. There was no justification for raising the tax from 1 anna to 8 annas and then maintaining it at that level without the least contemplation to reduce it. I do not want to go into further details, because the time at my disposal is short and I want to urge some more points. So, I would at first humbly make a representation, which must be very effectively heard by the Finance Minister, that some reduction must be made in the tobacco tax, or else the merchants will be ruined to a very large extent.

Secondly, when the tobacco which is purchased from Madura and other places is taken to the godowns and preserved there, it loses some of its weight because it gets dried there and on the way and its weight depreciates to the extent of 5 to 10 per cent. The local officers know this fully well. But, on the other hand, they impose tax also on the deficit. That is also injurious to the merchants. Deficit is allowed to the extent of 3 per cent., I am told; but the deficit must be allowed up to 5 per cent. Representations about the taxing on deficit were made; they were submitted to the higher authorities; but they were not heard at all. Appeals were made against the assessments; but they were decided after a delay of four or five months by the very same officers who had already found that the levy of the tax was justified. Government may be pleased to see that an independent appellate authority or tribunal is appointed for inquiring into these ap-

105 P.S.D

peals and the grievances of the licencees whenever those grievances are levelled against the officers concerned.

Now I want to make some general observations on the Budget. I have already submitted that the budget is to be rejected *in toto*. Of course it is quite clear that in the party system of Government, people who have a conscience to see that there are many things in the Budget which cannot be accepted, and those who have real and genuine grievances against the policy of the party, are not able to cast their vote against the Budget. That is the evil of the party system. But I am not worried at all about this matter. The people cannot sleep for all time. They have begun to wake up, they have begun to question: Is there any necessity for a constitutional Government with such a top heavy administration of highly qualified people who make the people starve not only for years but for decades together? I may tell you that I am not in a position to make any serious statements against any body. But this nation of great valour which had fought for nearly 50 years to attain its independence has as a matter of fact been insulted, has as a matter of fact been made to see its people starve, has as a matter of fact been made to see the people sell their wives and children for food and clothing. We have heard of Harishchandra who was forced to sell his wife and child. We have thousands and lakhs of Harishchandras in the country. I do not know what is the position in other parts of this country. I am confining myself to Tamil Nad. Tamil Nad is more or less an independent cultural unit. They have no business to tag us on to India if this Constitution is not going to help us to maintain at least our ancient culture and to look ahead in the years to come. I can tell you that we have been worst hit people. We have the Cauvery River. We can make it give the food we want. And yet we are not able to do it, and we are not able to give the people one square meal a day. I know as a matter of fact that I have done a great thing in choosing to come over to this Parliament. I could have confined myself to doing work in my constituency and carrying on propaganda amongst the people to rise against this system of Government, and to see that a thorough change is effected by popular, constitutional and peaceful methods which our Gandhiji had given to us as a legacy. Now, I may tell you—I have not much time left and I will not go into very great detail. Tamil Nad is thinking of seceding

[Shri Vallatharas]

from the rest of India. It is a deplorable thing. I do not want to secede. But if the present policy is continued without revision and the sufferings of the people grow, we may see that in the near future a great agitation will be led for separation of Tamil Nad from India, or at least for having only a small connection with the Centre. We are awaiting a decision by the Prime Minister on Kashmir to see whether the principle of self-determination will be followed to any extent. We want to wait and see at the present moment.

I may tell you that this budget is one which cannot be accepted *in toto*, I am reminded of Mr. Ginwalla's remarks in the Legislative Assembly about how the old budgets were prepared. He said that the Finance Minister would sit in his room with two or three assistants, Mr. Sim, Mr. Cook and an Ayyer. Do not misunderstand me that I refer to an Ayyer. These were the words used by Ginwalla. The Budget would be prepared and kept ready. Now one can say that the Finance Minister might have visited an Ayengar, a Sastri, a Singh or a Reddi to assist him. That is not the view I take. On one side of the Finance Minister, there is the Red Flag with the ensign of a sickle and a hammer. On his other side, there is another Red Flag with the ensign of a wheel and a plough. And we have got the other opposition parties also. They all want to end this system of administration because this administration has been resourceless and highly reactionary.

This administration has been unmindful of the agricultural population. Although the agricultural population is 80 per cent. in this country, the Government have preferred to industrialise the country by showing all sorts of concessions to the indigenous industrialists. I will not go into detail; I will simply state one or two things. The Government have inherited a certain tradition from the Britishers. The tradition is to maintain this country as a capitalist country in the interests of the Western Bloc. We have voted against having any connection with the Commonwealth. That is a just decision. We do not want to be anybody's enemies; but we do not want to be tied to anybody. We want to be free. Our sterling balances are there. It is useless for us to have them there. They are not liquid. They are not available for our national purposes. And the Plan-

ning Committee, under the presidency of our Prime Minister, had recommended that the British capital invested in this country to the extent of 400 crores of rupees must be repatriated and adjusted against the sterling balances. Did the Government have the courage to do it? Why should we allow the investment of so many crores of British capital in this country? Because of this, about 40 crores rupees of ours go out to the Britishers annually. Take the customs. That also is shared by the Anglo-American interests: that comes to about another Rs. 60 crores per year. And look at the industrialists: they have not at all cared to respond to the government's advances. The government have been caressing them, but, like the serpents, they will not come out in spite of all the attempts of the charmer to charm them. Compare the production during the last 12 years i.e. the post-war period 1939-1951. Production means wealth to the country. Production makes the nation strong. The increase in production during the last 12 years—from 1939 to 1951—the post-war period—has been at the rate of 1 per cent. per year. The production in 1951 had fallen very much low when you compare it with the production in 1944 and 1945.

Now, the incomes are not at all taxed. I think I am right when I say—I wish to be corrected if I am wrong—that the hon. the Finance Minister has been pleading that an effective levy of income-tax has not been possible because he is not able to muster the necessary staff. Is that correct? I want to make him an offer. If he says he is not able to do it, let him please take our help: some of us are prepared to come forward and work as honorary officers to levy income-tax. It is no use saying there are no competent officers. We have such a top heavy administration which spends several crores of rupees on the pay of the officers; and numerically also, it is unparalleled. And, in spite of this great strength of administrative staff, he is not able to find proper men to levy income-tax. It is because he has no intention of taxing the income of the capitalists. The capitalists have put in 0.2 per cent. in relation to the general national income of this country. Of course I can discuss the subject to any extent, but I do not want to do it here. I will take only two minutes, Sir, I will finish within the time limit.

Now, take the managing agency system. That system in our industrial

institutions is another source of injury to this country. I am glad to hear that the Company Law Committee has gone into this matter to see what evil effects have been produced by the managing agency system. But I would like to say that this question should be pursued further with a view to ultimately end the managing agency system altogether. The industrial institutions which exist in this country must be taken over directly by the Government so that the income arising out of them can be appropriated by the Government without there being intermediaries in the shape of managing agents. I understand that 70 per cent. of the income of these industrial institutions goes to the agents, and only 30 per cent. reaches the shareholders. Only one or two minutes, Sir. We get chances very rarely.

Mr. Chairman: There are many other hon. Members who are desirous of participating in the debate.

Shri Vallatharas: I crave your indulgence, Sir. I am not such a big boss as to take half an hour or more.

Then as regards decontrol, I welcome this move and all its implications. But another interpretation is also to be placed upon it. It is a cover to screen the chaotic condition which has resulted from the pursuit of the grow more food policy and the great loss that has been sustained in the purchase of food grains from outside. That is a point which I want to urge. In spite of the fact that decontrol has happened and that prices are a bit controlled, it should be seen that the grow more food campaign, as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee should be entirely entrusted to the States Governments.

Shri Mohiuddin (Hyderabad City): The hon. Member who preceded me declared at the commencement of his speech that the Budget should be totally rejected. His main argument apart from general observations was that the tax on tobacco is very high and has not been reduced in proportion to the fall in prices. Now, Sir, the premises that the tax is high lead my hon. friends on the other side to the demand that the Budget should be totally rejected which seems to me to be a disproportionate conclusion. There must be some relation between the causes and the conclusion at which one arrives. This conclusion of total rejection has no relation to the reasons which he has advanced.

Now, there has been a general demand from all sides of the House that the investment in productive en-

terprises is not sufficient and that the various productive projects and schemes have not been properly distributed all over India. Dr. Krishna-swami mentioned yesterday that the Plan does not specify the industries which will consume electricity that will be generated by the hydro-electric schemes and that the Plan does not show the net result after 5 years in terms of income and employment. Now, Sir, everyone would like India to invest more and more money, to create and to pursue larger and larger productive schemes. But the Report of the Planning Commission frankly admits that the resources are not encouraging. It appears that practically the whole burden of investment falls on the Government, and the resources of the Government are limited. Now, the investment can come only from the savings that we make. We do not know yet exactly or approximately the total National product in India. The National Income Committee has given some estimate which they themselves admit is approximate and very roughly approximate. It estimates the income to be about 9,000 crores. Now out of this total national income we should expect a very large saving. How large it should be, it would be rather rash on my part to guess. But what is the position in respect of actual investment in the private sector of industry and commerce. The Controller of Capital Issues in 1950 had given permission for the issue of capital to the extent of about 76 crores. In 1951 the permission was to the extent of about 58 crores. Now, I do not know how much of this amount was actually issued and subscribed by the public. I could not get that information. But the Planning Commission only six months ago had mentioned that the new capital from private sector is of the order of Rs. 15 crores. Now the amount of 15 crores out of which of course about 78 to 80 per cent. would be invested in industries is of a very small order. A very large sector of economy has been left to private enterprise. But the enthusiasm of the private enterprise is not what it should be. During the war we find that when there were expectations of high profits, the investment was very large. But now the investment seems to be of a very low order.

The other item of importance from the capital market is subscription by the public to the Funded Loans. The Budget this year gives the estimate of Funded Loans of only about 2 crores. This amount of 25 crores expected by the Finance Minister to be raised from the capital market is ex-

[Shri Mohiuddin]

tremely small. I shall not go into the reasons for this lack of flow of capital from the capital market. I do not know whether—as it was once said—the capital is on strike; it may still be on strike. The hon. the Finance Minister about a year or so ago had said that the constitutional changes that have occurred and other changes that are in train have apart from shifting incomes made a difference to the prospects of various classes among themselves and certain amount of time will be required before we quite know what the pattern of the investment market is going to be. I think that the time is ripe for us to decide what pattern of the investment market we should have.

There is a growing impatience among the masses of the people for removing illiteracy, dirt and disease, poverty and hunger. That impatience is gathering momentum every day. There is no doubt that this impatience among the masses has been created by the National Congress. It is a question of great importance and requires very great effort to overcome it. This impatience should be overcome and canalised into productive channels so that it may not burst into something which is not desirable.

Having dealt with the capital market I would like to draw your attention to other sources of mobilising our savings. The Government of India had introduced some time ago a small savings scheme. It however appears that perceptible progress has not been made in this direction. The traditional view about small savings that has been handed down to us by the Royal Commission on agriculture and the Central Banking Enquiry Committee was that the surplus left with agriculturists, who constitute the bulk of the population, is very little even in normal times. The Rural Banking Enquiry Committee that was appointed in 1950 came, after investigating the various factors, to a negative conclusion. As there is no time I will read only the last sentence of that negative conclusion:

“—It cannot also be categorically held that no possibilities of directing rural savings into channels of investment useful to the public exist at all.”

We have seen during the last two years that the Uttar Pradesh Government had collected only from tenants—I would like to emphasise that they had collected only from the tenants—about Rs. 30 crores, and I am told

that out of this Rs. 30 crores, over Rs. 20 crores came from the current savings. Though Uttar Pradesh is a specially prosperous area where the cultivation of sugarcane is spread over large areas, this, however, shows that there are savings in the rural areas. We should tap those savings and mobilise them for the economic improvement of the country which is so essential today for the future of the country.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to make a suggestion. As there are so many Members who are desirous of speaking and this is the last day of the Budget, hon. Members who are called upon to speak should as far as possible try to finish just a minute or two before their allotted time so that I would be in a position to accommodate a few more. With that request I would call upon Mr. Nana Das.

Shri Nana Dass (Ongole—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I rise to speak on behalf of the toiling masses of our great country. Speaking on the Presidential Address one hon. Member from Shantiniketan wanted Alladdin's lamp and another Member from Bombay wanted a magic wand for bettering the lot of the poor masses. Very fantastic wishes indeed! I tell them that public finance or the Budget is the magic wand. If the Government is really sincere to better the lot of the toiling masses the Budget can be used for their benefit. But we cannot have that benefit if the Government is not willing to use that Budget as a magic wand. Public finance is a great instrument which can be utilised to better the lot of the masses and to bring about the prosperity of the country. The aim of the Government should be to raise the standards of the millions of our people and taxation and public expenditure should be used towards that end. What has the Nehru Government done to achieve this aim? It is said that the *status quo* has been maintained in presenting the Budget. By maintaining the *status quo*, the Nehru Government is playing with the lives of the people. I say that the people are not going to allow the Nehru Government to play with their lives and with the lives of their children. It may be a very small matter to the Finance Minister or to the party in power if the *status quo* is maintained, but it is a matter of life and death to the common man. It is the Government's financial policy that decides the production and distribution of wealth in the country. It will also decide the fate of millions of

masses. During the last five years of our freedom there has been unemployment, under-employment, coupled with soaring prices and scarcity of consumer goods, leading to under-nourishment and suffering. People were subjected to gradual starvation and slow death. Some hon. Members from the other side declared on the floor of this august House that there has not been a single death due to starvation. What a travesty of facts it is! It is only when people have no food, when people are under-fed, when people are starved that diseases overwhelm them as they have no disease-resisting power and then they die. Such deaths are starvation deaths even if the Government and the Congress Party are not willing to accept them as such. If people are dying in the country it is due to unemployment and the negligence of the Government and the people at the helm of affairs are held responsible for those deaths. During the five years of freedom poverty, beggary, disease and squalor have been thriving unchecked. Many thousands of lives have been sacrificed because of the Himalayan blunders of the inefficient and impotent Congress regime. On the eve of the general elections people expected a better Government, a people's Government, which would save them from the haunting demon of hunger and from the clutches of the blood-sucking capitalists and landlords. But unfortunately for the masses, contrary to their expectations, the old capitalist regime has come to stay in our country for some time more. The old regime, hated by the masses, has come forward with the old bureaucratic financial policy under the plea that the *status quo* has to be maintained. What is the meaning of this *status quo*? It is nothing but extension of untold sufferings to which the people were subjected to for the last five years. It means continuation of unemployment, starvation, privations, sacrifices and finally deaths. Is it not a declaration of war on the people? I ask. The Presidential address has strictly speaking extended the hostilities against the common man and the financial policy of the Government has confirmed it for one more year.

Look at the taxation policy of the Government? It is nothing but robbing Peter to pay Paul. About 70 per cent. of the revenue is derived from indirect taxes—taxes like customs, excise duties etc. Indirect taxes rob the poor consumer. It is a tax in the dark and a bitter pill coated with sugar. The intentions of the Government are quite obvious. The

Government is bent upon squeezing the very life blood of the common consumer and the common man. Take for example the excise duties on cloth, sugar, vegetable products, coffee, tea, petrol, kerosene, tobacco and all such things which enter the common man's daily life. To make matters worse there are the provincial sales taxes on the necessaries of life. People living at the subsistence level or below it have to forego a portion of their food because of these taxes. Thus the middle classes and the poor masses are squeezed and starved to death. If the railway rate is increased it is again a tax on the poor traveller. If the rate of the post card is increased it is again a tax on the poor consumer. The Government without any sense of the difficulties of the masses have increased railway fares, railway freights, the price of post cards and have levied excise duties on all necessities of life. Thus the Nehru Government has made the common man and the poor consumer a scape goat of the capitalist and the big business of India, Britain and America. The tax burden on the common man is intolerable. The toilers are made to pay in blood, tears, limb, life and health. The taxation policy of Government is lop-sided, out-moded and out of date. The tax burden on the rich and the big business is only 7½ per cent. and the rest falls on the middle classes and the poorer classes.

Even with regard to income-tax, the tax burden falls on the higher middle classes, small traders and small industrialists. But the big business capitalists, landlords and black-marketeers are left scot free. Income-tax on crores and crores of rupees are evaded in the name of *binami* shareholders and partners in big business and industries. The burden of taxation on big business is only 7½ per cent. Why this soft corner for the capitalists—I fail to understand. Because they are the makers of the Government. Naturally our financial policy is made a mere tool in the hands of big business interests and the monopolist commercial interests of the Anglo-American bloc. It is made a pawn in the hands of Britain and America. Our production and distribution in their last analysis are controlled and shaped by the British and American business magnates. The interests of the common man have always been sacrificed for the sake of big business. On the other hand has the Government given any relief to the small traders and industrialists? None.

[Shri Nana Dass]

I do not find any difference between the financial policy of the Congress regime and that of the British regime in India. The old colonial financial policy has been scrupulously followed right from 1946. Government have never changed its financial policy or given any tax relief to the traders and industrialists. On the other hand much tax relief has been provided to the big business. The excess profits tax and the capital gains tax have been abolished; the rate of super-tax has been reduced. Recently the export duty on jute was lowered. What for has this been done? Is it to help the common man? Is it to help the small industrialist? No. It is to help Birlas and their like. It is to help the foreign capital invested in jute industry. It is to help America to get her jute requirements at cheaper costs. To make up this loss in export duty, Government has come forward with the withdrawal of the food-subsidy,—again at the expense of the common man, the Government is feeding the capitalist. The explanation offered for the lowering of the export duty on jute is that there is a slump in the jute market. Why should we not open avenues for our jute trade with other countries? What for is the Government robbing the poor man and the middle class people in this heartless manner? Is it to better their lot in the future? Never. It is to help the big business.

Now let us examine how the revenues have been allocated. It is seen from the table given in the Budget that interest and other obligations form about Rs. 6½ crores. Privy purses to ex-rulers and their relatives amount to Rs. 4½ crores; defence expenditure about Rs. 198 crores; civil administration about Rs. 55 crores. Again payment of interest is a burden on the people. If we pay interest to foreign countries it is a total loss to this country. But the Nehru Government with a childish glee hanker after American loans with a bowl in their hands. I pity Mother India with her vast resources go abegging like this.

If the Government is really sincere, if the Government stands for the welfare of the masses and if the Government stands for a classless society, let it be bold enough to levy the following taxes: tax on unearned income and windfall wealth; death duties; capital levy; betterment taxes; reintroduction of the excess profits tax, the business

profits tax and the rates of corporation tax, and super-tax should be increased and if necessary conscription of wealth. Lastly, if the Government is not going to guarantee the right to work and if the Government is not going to allow the toilers to enjoy the fruits of their labour that Government will perish.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुड़गांव) :

माननीय चेयरमैन साहब ; मेरे लायक दोस्त जो मुझे से पहले बोले थे, उनकी तक्रारों सुनने के बाद मैं जो छोटी छोटी बातें इंटरनल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (internal administration) के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): We could understand better if the hon. Member spoke in English.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : तो जो मैं छोटी छोटी बातें इंटरनल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ वह बिल्कुल डल (dull) मालूम होंगी। अपने अपोजीशन (opposition) के दोस्तों की तक्रार सुन कर तो मैं हैरान रह गया। एक तरफ़ एक साहब यह कहते थे कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर जाना चाहते हैं और एक ही मिनट में वह यह कहने लगे कि मैं इनकम-टैक्स आफिसर (income-tax officer) बनने के लिये तैयार हूँ। अभी मैं ने एक तक्रार सुनी जो कि बहुत जोर से की गई और जिसमें सुपरलेटिव डिग्री (superlative degree) का कोई शब्द इस्तेमाल करने से बाकी नहीं रहा। मैं उस तक्रार को सुन कर हैरान था। यह कहा जाता है कि यहां पर टैक्स कम कर दिया गया है साथ ही यह भी शिकायत थी कि यहां टैक्स बढ़ाया गया है। गर्जे कि वह इस तरह की स्पीच (speeches) थीं कि जो बिल्कुल कंट्राडिक्टरी (contradictory) थीं। उन को सुनने वाला

उनको पढ़ने वाला और उनको करने वाला कोई अपने हृदय से उन को सपोर्ट (support) नहीं कर सकता। ऐसी तक़रीरें इस मोक़े पर बिल्कुल बेमानी हैं और मैं उन की नक़ल नहीं करूंगा। मैं निहायत अदब से फ़ाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब की ख़िदमत में चन्द एक बातें अज़्र करना चाहता हूँ जो कि इंटरनल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन से और टैक्स से ताल्लुक़ रखती हैं।

पहली बात जो मैं अज़्र करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि इस बजट में चन्द चीज़ों के लिये और चन्द उमूर में पूरी रक़म नहीं दी गई है। मसलन् एक बात जो मैं खास तौर पर अज़्र करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि पंजाब के अन्दर पंजाब गवर्नमेंट को कुछ ऐसे अख़राजात करने पड़ते हैं जो कि फ़िलवाक़्रें सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को करने चाहिये। पंजाब या दूसरे ऐसे प्राविसेज़ (provinces) में जो कि बार्डर प्राविसेज़ (border provinces) होते हैं उनमें कुछ ऐसे ख़र्च प्राविस को करने पड़ते हैं जो कि प्राविस के प्रोटेक्शन (protection) के लिये नहीं होते बल्कि उन ख़र्चों को उन प्राविसेज़ को इसलिये बरदाश्त करना पड़ता है कि वह बार्डर पर हैं। दरअसल यह अख़राजात सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को करने चाहिये। चुनांचे अभी जब पंजाब के अन्दर बजट पास हुआ और बजट पर बहस हुई तो पंजाब गवर्नमेंट ने और मेम्बर साहिबान ने इस बात पर बहुत जोर दिया कि यह अख़राजात जो पंजाब कन्सटैबुलरी व ऐसे और हैं सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को बरदाश्त करने चाहियें और मैं अदब से अज़्र करूंगा कि इन्साफ़न सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को यह ख़र्च पंजाब गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर नहीं डालने चाहियें बल्कि खुद बरदाश्त करने चाहियें।

दूसरी बात जो मैं इस जिम्न में कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि जहाँ तक कि कहत

का सवाल है, हिन्दुस्तान में क़हत का सारा खर्चा गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया को बरदाश्त कराना चाहता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि फ़ूड (food) की रेसपांसिबिलिटी (responsibility) स्टेट्स (states) की गवर्नमेंट्स (governments) की है और सब स्टेट्स को मिल कर के अपने अन्दर फ़ूड का इन्तिज़ाम करना चाहिये लेकिन जहाँ तक ऐबनारमल सरकमस्टेंसेज़ (abnormal-circumstances) का सवाल है, जैसे बाढ़ या सूखा वगैरह वहाँ यह खर्चा स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के जिम्मे नहीं डालना चाहिये और सिवा इसके कोई चारा नहीं है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट उस खर्चों को बरदाश्त करे। चुनांचे ज़िले हिसार में जो क़हत पड़ा उसमें पंजाब गवर्नमेंट को बहुत ज्यादा खर्चा करना पड़ा और फिर भी वहाँ के लोगों को यह शिकायत रही कि उनके लिये क़ाफ़ी नहीं किया गया। इस क़हत में हिसार में क़रीब एक लाख गायें जाया हो गईं। आप साहिबान को मालूम है कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर एक हरियाना ब्रीड (breed) ही ऐसी है कि जिससे पंजाब, यू० पी० और दूसरे हिस्सों को मवेशी मिलते हैं और हरियाना ब्रीड से फ़ायदा सारे भारत वर्ष को होता है। चुनांचे इस ब्रीड के इतने पाया हो जाने से न सिर्फ़ पंजाब का नुक़सान हुआ है बल्कि सारे मुल्क का नुक़सान हुआ है। इसलिये इस मामले को सिर्फ़ स्टेट पर ही नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये बल्कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को भी इसमें हिस्सा लेना चाहिये। उसी तरह से सौराष्ट्र, अजमेर और रायल सीमा से—यानी जहाँ जहाँ क़हत आया है वहाँ से—यह आवाज़ें आ रही हैं कि हमें कोई इमदाद नहीं मिल रही है। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स इस तरह का खर्चा बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकती हैं और उनको ही यह खर्चा बरदाश्त करना पड़ रहा है। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को चाहिये कि वह ऐसे हालात

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागव]

में स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की मदद करे। अगर ऐसा नहीं हीगा तो लोगों की यह शिकायत नहीं हटेगी कि हम को पूरी पूरी इमदाद नहीं होती है। इस मतबा जो शिकायतें रहीं उनमें यह भी शिकायत थी कि स्टेट्स में मजदूरों को आठ-आठ, दस-दस और बारह-बारह आना मजदूरी दी गई जो कि बहुत थोड़ी थी। आज चरखे के जरिये जो मदद दी जाती है उसमें से ढाई आने की मदद पहुंचती है। इसलिये मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि जहां तक फ्रैमीन (famine) का सवाल है इसके लिये एक सेंट्रल फ्रैमिन फंड (central famine fund) कायम किया जाना चाहिये जैसा कि पहले भी था।

इसी सिलसिले में मैं एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि रिहैबिलिटेशन (rehabilitation) के सिलसिले में सरकार ने जो मदद दी है उस के बारे में सरकार का यह ख्याल है कि इस मदद से लोग रिहैबिलिटेड हो गये हैं। दरअसल बात ऐसी नहीं है। अभी तक रिफ्यूजीज (refugees) को गेनफुल एम्प्लाइमेंट (gainful employment) नहीं मिली है और सरकार की यह कम्प्लेंससी (complacency) कि रिफ्यूजीज का इन्तिजाम हो गया है, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि दुस्त नहीं है। अभी रिहैबिलिटेशन फाइनेन्स कारपोरेशन (Rehabilitation Finance Corporation) के वास्ते एक डेपुटेशन (deputation) फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में हाजिर हुआ था। उस वक्त हमने अर्ज किया था कि रिहैबिलिटेशन कारपोरेशन को १५ करोड़ रुपया मिलना चाहिये और मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि यह दरखास्त माफूल है। इस को मंजूर करना चाहिये।

इस हाउस (House) में बहुत जोर से यह शिकायत की गई है कि शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स (scheduled Castes) की ऐजुकेशन (Education) के लिये बहुत कम रुपया दिया गया है और मैं उस शिकायत को निहायत अदब से दुहराना चाहता हूँ। सन् २८ में लाला लाजपत राय ने यहां खड़े हो कर पुरानी गवर्नमेंट से कहा था कि गवर्नमेंट को इन लोगों की तालीम के लिये एक करोड़ रुपया देना चाहिये। हम ने भी कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाते वक्त यह कस्म खाई थी कि दस साल में हम इन का दरजा इतना ऊंचा कर देंगे कि उन को किसी फरदर रिप्रजेंटेशन (further representation) की या किसी खास रियायत की जरूरत नहीं रहेगी। अगर हमारा वही मीयार कायम है तो हम को उन की तालीम के लिये कम से कम एक करोड़ रुपया रखना चाहिये था।

अब इन बातों को छोड़ कर मैं चन्द बातें टैक्सेशन (taxation) के सिलसिले में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। एक बात जो मैं खास तौर पर अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि जहां तक टैक्स का सवाल है हमारा जो यह टैक्सेशन का सिस्टम (system) है वह दरअसल कई तरह से निहायत डिफैक्टिव (defective) है। यह टैक्सेशन का सिस्टम यहां पुराने जमाने से चला आ रहा है। जब कि ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट यहां थी तो वह यहां के लोगों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा टैक्स वसूल करना तो थी और उस ने ऐसी तरकीबें निकाली थीं कि जिन से यहां पर लोगों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा टैक्स वसूल किया जाये। वही सारा का सारा सिस्टम अभी तक चला आ रहा है। अब मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि यहां पर नीरन

एक टैक्सेशन इन्क्वायरी कमीशन (Taxation Enquiry Commission) बिठाया जाय और वह सारे टैक्सेशन के सिस्टम की जांच कर के बतावे कि यहां किस तरह से टैक्स होना चाहिये। चुनावे में सन् २८ से फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहिबान की खिदमत में अर्ज करता चला आ रहा हूँ कि हिन्दू जाइंट फैमिली (Hindu Joint Family) का टैक्स बिल्कुल नाजायज है। यह फंडामेंटल प्रिंसिपल्स (Fundamental Principles) के खिलाफ है और वैसे भी अनजस्ट (unjust) है। मैं इस के ऊपर बहुत दफा अर्ज कर चुका हूँ इस लिये मैं उन चीजों को दुहराना नहीं चाहता। इस के अलावा मुझे और भी बहुत सी बातें अर्ज करनी हैं। लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस सवाल को बराबर टाला गया है। आज तक मेरे सामने कोई ऐसा फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर नहीं आया कि जिस ने इस को डिफेंड (defend) किया हो कि हिन्दू जाइंट फैमिली का टैक्सेशन जायज है। हर एक फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने मेरे साथ हमदर्दी का इजहार किया। लेकिन रुपये का मामला है। हर एक यह चाहता है कि रुपया मेरी जेब में डाल जाइये। अभी तक इस सवाल पर कुछ नहीं किया गया। इस लिये मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप इस सिस्टम को जायज करार देना चाहते हैं तो आरग्यूमेंट (argument) से हम को हरा दीजिये क्यों कि हम रोज रोज आप को तकलीफ नहीं देना चाहते। यह हिन्दू जाइंट फैमिली का जो टैक्सेशन है यह बिल्कुल नाजायज है और इन्साफ के उमूलों के ही नहीं बल्कि फंडामेंटल उमूलों के भी खिलाफ है। क्या आप लोगों को मजबूर करना चाहते हैं कि वह जा कर सुप्रीम कोर्ट से इस को नाजायज करार दिलवायें। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना

चाहता हूँ कि खुद आप के इन्वेस्टीगेशन कमीशन (Investigation Commission) ने भी इस के बारे में जो सिफारिशें की हैं उन को भी आज तक आप ने मंजूर नहीं किया है। आप कहते हैं कि आप की आखिरी लिमिट ३,६०० है लेकिन जो आदमी ५०० या ६०० पैदा करता है वह भी इस नाजायज तरीके से टैक्स हो जाता है। इस के ऊपर गौर होना चाहिये। इस मर्तबा फाइनेंस बिल (Finance Bill) हमारे सामने नहीं है कि जिस वक्त हम को यह कहने का मौका मिलता। इस लिये मैं ने इस को यहां अर्ज कर दिया।

इस तरह से आप ने टैक्स के सिलसिले में कुछ तरीके बना लिये हैं। इस सिलसिले में एक कहानी कई बार सुनाई जा चुकी है कि :

हिसाब जू का तू, कुंवा डूबा क्यों।

आप कुछ ऐवरेजेज (Averages) मुकर्रर कर लेते हैं कि फलां ट्रेड (trade) में इतना फायदा होता है। इसी हिसाब से आप टैक्स वसूल करते हैं। यह जो आपने ऐवरेजेज का तरीका बना लिया है वह गलत है। इस के जरिये से आप यह बगंर देखे कि उस आदमी को वाकं कितना फायदा हुआ है अपना टैक्स वसूल कर लेते हैं। अगर यह चीज दुस्त होती तो इनकम-टैक्स (Income-tax) के लिये इनडीविजुअल केसेज (Individual cases) में जाने की जरूरत ही क्यों होती। मैं इस लिये आप की खिदमत में अर्ज करता हूँ कि इस को छोड़िये।

अब तम्बाकू की तरफ देखिये। इस हाउस (House) में कई साहिबान ने इस के बारे में शिकायत की है। मैं न तो सिगरेट

[पंडित ठाकुरदास भार्गव]

पीता हूँ और न बीड़ी, लेकिन मैं यह जानता हूँ कि इस पर टैक्सेशन का इंडीसेंस (Incidence) बहुत सख्त है।

एक बीघा की कीमत तकरीबन हमारे जिले के आस पास में १५०, २०० रुपये है लेकिन जहाँ पर तम्बाकू बोई जाती है वहाँ सिर्फ टैक्स १५०, २००, २५० रुपये एक बीघा का ले लेते हैं। कहां का इंसाफ है कि डाढ़ी से भी मूछ बड़ी हो, कीमत से भी ज्यादा टैक्स हो। एक गांव में ६ हजार बीघा जमीन है और उस की सालाना माल-गुजारी ८३० रुपये है। इंकम टैक्स के इंस्पेक्टर जाते हैं तो वह कहते हैं कि हम ६ या ७ हजार रुपया टैक्स लेंगे। मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि यह आप का टैक्सेशन किस तरह होता है। जब फसल खड़ी होती है तो लोग दरख्वास्त देते हैं कि इस की जांच कर ली जाये लेकिन तब कोई नहीं जाता बाद में आर्बिटररी (arbitrary) तरीके से जो रकम चाहते हैं लगा देते हैं। मेरे पास एक दो नहीं बहुत सी शिकायतें हैं और मैं ने चन्द एक डिप्टी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के पास पास आन (pass-on) भी कर दी है। एक शिकायत तो मेरे पास ऐसी जो कि एक रिटायर्ड इंकम टैक्स ऑफिसर की है जो यह कहते हैं कि इस के अन्दर बहुत ज्यादाती होती है और ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि इस के जांचने की जरूरत है।

इस के अलावा एक रिफार्म (reform) के बारे में मैं खास तौर से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि अपेलेट अस्सिस्टेंट कमिश्नर (Appellate Assistant Commissioner) को सी० बी० आर० की मातहती से हटा दें।

अगर वह सी० बी० आर० की मातहती में रहते हैं तो वह इंडिपेंडेंट (independent) तौर से काम नहीं कर सकते। अपेलेट अस्सिस्टेंट कमिश्नर इंडिपेंडेंट नहीं हैं। बाकी जितने आफिसर्स हैं वे खुद ही टैक्स लगाते हैं, तहकीकात करते हैं, खुद ही पुलिस हैं और खुद ही जज हैं। सारे मुल्कों में ऐसा ही है। इस के बारे में मेरी शिकायत नहीं है, मेरी शिकायत तो यह है कि ये जो अपेलेट अस्सिस्टेंट कमिश्नर मुकर्रर हुए हैं ये इंडिपेंडेंट नहीं हैं और जब तक यह शर्ख सी० बी० आर० के मातहत हैं तब तक वह इंडिपेंडेंट तरीके से काम नहीं कर सकता। इस का ट्रांसफर, (transfer) प्रोमोशन (promotion) और पोस्टिंग (posting) सब कुछ सी० बी० आर० के मातहत है। जो सर्कुलर (Circular) वह जारी करता है उसे इस को मानना पड़ता है। इस तरह इंकम टैक्स में इंडिपेंडेंट जुडीशियरी (Independent judiciary) कायम नहीं रह सकती और पूरा इंसाफ नहीं हो सकता। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि आप के इंवेस्टिगेशन कमीशन ने भी इस डिमांड (demand) को सपोर्ट (support) किया था। इस लिए आप को यह रिफार्म करना चाहिये। उन्होंने यह कहा कि अपेलेट अस्सिस्टेंट कमिश्नर को इस के अंडर (under) से इस की मातहती से, हटा कर इंडिपेंडेंट बना देना चाहिये। मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि यह ऐसा रिफार्म (reform) है जिस को आप को फौरन मंजूर कर लेना चाहिये। और अमल में ले आना चाहिये। यू० पी० में सेल्स टैक्स (sales-tax) के मुतालिक झगड़ा हुआ, वहां इस तरह के अफसरान मुकर्रर थे लेकिन उन को इंडिपेंडेंट बना दिया और उन का तजुर्बा कामयाब हुआ। जो पहले एग्जीक्युटिव आफिसर्स (Executive)

Officers) ये उन को एक इंडिपेंडेंट जुडीशियल आफिसर के मातहत कर दिया है। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ऐसा करना निहायत मुनासिब होगा।

मैं एक बात की तरफ आप की तवज्जह और दिलाऊंगा और इस मौके पर मेरा काम कुछ थोड़ा सा प्लेजेंट (pleasant) भी है। इनवेस्टीगेशन ऐक्ट (Investigation Act) जो सन् ४७ से हमारे देश में है उस की तरफ मैं हमेशा हाउस की तवज्जह दिलाता रहा हूँ और मैं कहता रहा हूँ कि ऐसा सख्त कानून शायद हिन्दुस्तान में कोई नहीं जैसा कि इन्वेस्टीगेशन कमीशन का। इतना ही नहीं जब कामयाबी नहीं हुई तो गवर्नमेंट ने एक ऐसा सिस्टम यहां पर जारी किया कि उन को इतने अस्तियारात दे दिये जो ज़रूरत से ज्यादा हैं। मैं इस का क्रिटिक (critic) हमेशा रहा हूँ लेकिन मुझे खुशी है और मैं इसी वास्ते कहता हूँ कि यह मेरा प्लेजेंट टास्क (pleasant task) है कि इंकमटैक्स और फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट ने जो काम किया वह इस कदर शानदार था कि मैं उस की तारीफ किये बगैर नहीं रह सकता। मैं किसी साहब की खुशामद नहीं करता लेकिन यह भी दुश्स्त नहीं होगा कि मैं हर एक शख्स को जो ड्यू मीड आफ प्रेज (due meed of praise) है वह न दूँ। हमारे श्री महावीर त्यागी ने जो काम किया उस को मैं क्या कहूँ। श्री त्यागी साहब ने तो इस के अन्दर बिल्कुल जादूगर का सा काम किया। इधर तो क्या किया कि अपने अफसरान में, कमिश्नर्स में और इंकम टैक्स अफसरान में, उन के दिल में, आग लगा दी कि तुम जाओ और रुपया इकट्ठा करो, यह कम्पीटीशन (Competition) करा दिया कि तुम जाओ और ज्यादा से ज्यादा इकट्ठा करो और वह

भी किस तरीके से ब्योरोक्रेटिक, (bureaucratic) तरीके से नहीं, बल्कि डेमोक्रेटिक एप्रोच (democratic approach) से जाओ, लोगों के पास जाओ और उन का काम करो और दूसरी तरफ क्या किया कि टैक्स इवेडर (tax evader) से कहा कि तुम्हारे चिमनी की आग नहीं बुझने देंगे एक तरफ आग लगादी और उधर बुझने नहीं दी। तो फिर क्या किया, जनाबवाला, ६९ करोड़ रुपया इस तरकीबसे हासिल किया कि टैक्स इवेडर खुशी खुशी इस को खजाने में डालते रहे। जादूगर क्या करता है, यही तो सोदेबाजी करता है कि देना मैं चाहूँ नहीं लेकिन मुझ से ले ले। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ६९ करोड़ रुपया का गबन ड्रैकोनियन मॅथड (Draconian method) से नहीं, स्टार चॅम्बर मॅथड (star chamber method) से नहीं, बल्कि सही तरीके से, मालूम कर लिया मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह काम ऐसा था जो सराहनीय है और इस के अलावा जो बड़ी बात है वह यह है कि आप के डिपार्टमेंट ने वह उसूल कायम किया जो कि सही उसूल था और यह जो डिपार्टमेंट का उसूल पोजिशन (position) था उस में किसी तरह से नुकसान नहीं पहुंचने दिया। साथ ही मेरे नुक्ते ख्याल वालों ने जो मुझाब रखे थे उन को (vindicate) कर दिया। मैं अपने फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब की भी तारीफ करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने ने (Assesors) यानी इन्कम टैक्स दे-वालों की मदद की है। उन्होंने ने अभी बताया कि पब्लिक रिलेशंस आफिसर्स (Public Relations Officers) कलकत्ता, बम्बई, और मद्रास में मुकर्रर किये हैं। उन का क्या काम होगा? उन का काम यह होगा कि वे इंकम टैक्स असैसी की मदद करेंगे। मैं यही चाहता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि

[पंडित ठाकुरदास भागंब]

11 A. M.

इस देश में कोई ऐसा नहीं जो यह न चाहे । मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में जो इंकम टैक्स देने वाले हैं वे इंकम टैक्स को इवेड न करें, वे इनकम टैक्स देना अपना फर्ज समझें, वे यह समझें कि यह नेशनल गवर्नमेंट है और जो कुछ उन्हें देना है वह जरूर दें । साथ ही साथ यह भी चाहता हूँ कि हर एक इंकम टैक्स आफिसर असेंसी का दोस्त हो और उस पर असेंसी का भरोसा हो कि जो कुछ रकम कानूनन दी जानी चाहिये उस से ज्यादा टैक्स नहीं लगाया जायेगा । कि जो कुछ हमें देना है वह उस लेगा यह चीज हर एक आजाद मुल्क में देखता हूँ, कि इमानदार असेंसी की अच्छे इन्कम आफिसर इमदाद करते हैं । जब आप ने मद्रास और कलकत्ते वगैरह में ऐसे अफसरों को लगाया है तो मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस पालिसी को जारी रखें और जहां तक हो सके ऐसे आदमियों को मुकर्रर करें जिन के पास इन्कम टैक्स असेंसी भरोसे से जाय और कहे कि आप हमारी मदद करें । गवर्नमेंट क्या है, पब्लिक की नौकर है अब गवर्नमेंट को उन को तरक्की नहीं देना चाहिये कि जो इंकम टैक्स आफिसर ज्यादा रुपया इकट्ठा करे उस को तरक्की दे दे बल्कि वह इन्कम टैक्स आफिसर जो कि सही तौर पर टैक्स लगाये वह आइन्दा तरक्की का मुस्तहक है । अच्छा अफसर वह है जो इंसाफ को कार्यवाही से हमारे सर को ऊंचा कर दें और हमारे खजाने को भी भर दें ।

मैं जनाब की खिदमत में दो एक जरूरी बातें और अर्ज करूंगा । मैंने चन्द पिछले सेशन में कस्टम बैरियर (Custom barrier) के बारे में अर्ज किया था । कस्टम बैरियर जो स्टेट के अन्दर हमारे प्रॉविसेज के अन्दर होते

हैं उन के बारे में अर्ज किया था तो हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब मेरी उस तकरीर को सुन कर जरा चौकन्ने से हो गये थे । अगले रोज उन्होंने ने कहा कि पांच साल के लिये मुआहिदा हो चुका है । मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर वह मुआहिदा पांच साल का हो चुका है तो उस के पीरियड (period) को हटा सकते हैं । एक आजाद मुल्क में, आपस में, स्टेट्स में, कस्टम बैरियर का होना अनधिकेबल (unthinkable) है । मैं कहता हूँ कि टैक्सेशन में यूनीफार्मिटी (uniformity) होनी चाहिये । सेल्स टैक्स में यूनीफार्मिटी (uniformity) करते हैं, इन्कम टैक्स में यूनीफार्मिटी करते हैं तो इस में भी यूनीफार्मिटी होनी चाहिये । यह एक आजाद मुल्क की सभ्यता के खिलाफ है कि आपस में इस तरह की यूनीफार्मिटी न हो ।

एक बात और मैं अर्ज करूंगा । अब फाइनेंस कमीशन बैठा हुआ है । मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि हमारे पास जितनी तजवीज है, जो डेवलपमेंट (development) की तजवीज है, उनको हम जानते हैं कि बहुत असें तक स्टेट को चलाना है और सारे देश की उन्नति करना है । ऐसी सूरत में जरूरी है कि आप स्टेट्स को हर मामले में ग्रांट्स (grants) और लॉन्स (loans) न दें बल्कि स्टेट को वह रिसोर्सेज (resources) दे दें कि स्टेट अपनी ताकत से खुद उन रिसोर्सेज की आमदनी को निकाले और यह महसूस करे कि उस की आमदनी से जो एक एक पैसा खर्च होता है वह ठीक ठीक होता है । जो आप देते हैं उसे स्टेट्स इधर उधर खर्च कर देती हैं, स्क्वेंडर (squander) कर देती हैं, और वह यह समझती हैं कि यह कर्ज शायद फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर बसूल नहीं करेंगे । इसी

सम्बन्ध में मैं एक निहायत जरूरी बात अर्ज कर देता हूँ—और एक चौथाई मिनट में ही अर्ज कर देता हूँ—कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि डेमोक्रेसी (democracy) वर्क (work) करे, अगर आप चाहते हैं कि आप की सारी स्कीम (scheme) अच्छी तरह वर्क करे तो डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन (decentralisation) का काम सिर्फ यह ही न होना चाहिये बल्कि यह होना चाहिये कि उस के लिये स्टेट को मजबूर करे कि आमदनी में से हिस्सा हर एक जिले व ताल्लुके को हर एक विलेज को, ग्रुप को, हर एक गांव को, स्टेट दे जिस को ताल्लुके वाले विलेज वाले, गांव वाले, डिस्ट्रिक्ट वाले खुद खर्च कर सकें और महसूस कर सकें कि दरबसल आज हिन्दुस्तान में आजाद हुकूमत कायम हुई है और इस के बनाने में और इस के रुपये के इस्तेमाल करने में हम को भी अस्तिवार है कि यही सही नमूना है डेमोक्रेसी का, यही डेमोक्रेसी है ।

बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है । मैं आप का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आप ने मेहरबानी कर के मुझे एक दो मिनट ज्यादा दिया ।

Mr. Chairman: Today is the last day for discussion of the budget. There is a long list of names before me, and I have been getting notes from several Members that they would like to have an opportunity during this discussion to speak. I therefore think I have got to accommodate a few more speakers. That means the time should be reduced from fifteen to ten minutes. I think the time hereafter will be ten minutes for the speakers, thereby many more Member will have a chance to speak.

Shri Vallatharas: The session may be extended for another day instead of reducing the time.

Mr. Chairman: That is not possible.

Shri N. S. Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): Even now a speaker had gone on for 20 minutes, and now you turn to us and ask us to reduce the time.

Mr. Chairman: I think that charge is not fair, because there was another

Member of the Opposition who also took about 20 minutes. So there is no reason to complain so far as the distribution of the time limit between the two sides is concerned. Of course, if people co-operate it is different. I ring the bell a minute or two before so that they may think of winding up, but they do not do so, and I allow a minute or two more. I have been doing it. If Members finish within ten minutes, they will be able to help others who are keen on speaking. Therefore, I will now call upon Shri Tulsidas Kilachand to speak, and I hope he will finish within ten minutes exactly.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I wish to begin by making a few observations on the financial policy of the Government by complementing the Finance Minister on the sense of stability that he has created in the minds of the public. We are passing through times which are difficult in many ways, and we have to see that our financial policy is stabilised, and to that end, our Finance Minister has created a sense of stability.

The Five Year Plan is the sheet anchor of the economic policy of the Government, but it will depend on the Finance Minister's skill to find the resources for the implementation of the plan without disturbing the normal economic set up of the country.

The most striking feature of the budgetary policy of the Government is financing the development projects by surplus budgets. But we are told this is unavoidable as raising the funds by internal borrowings is not possible. We are not told precisely why internal borrowing is not possible—whether our savings are inadequate, or whether the people who have the saving, are not investing in Government securities.

An Hon. Member: There is no confidence.

Shri Tulsidas: I would request the Finance Minister to go into this as we have got no data and no statistics on this question. It creates a vicious circle: when taxation is high, borrowing is not possible, and when borrowing is not possible, we have to have heavy taxes. This is a vicious circle, and I hope the Finance Minister will certainly look into this and see why borrowing is not possible.

In this respect I would also like to mention and bring to the notice of the Finance Minister that for any kind of borrowing, we have to create confidence in the minds of the people, that

[Shri Tulsidas]

the expenditure which the spending departments of the Government are incurring are done in the proper manner. The Finance Minister has already mentioned in his last speech that industries should look into their cost structure. I welcome the suggestion, and I am sure industry will certainly look into the cost structure not only to see that the cost structure is reduced for giving the manufactured goods to the country at the cheapest possible price; also they have got to see that they will be able to compete foreign markets, but I would also request the Finance Minister that in a similar manner the expenditure on the Government side should also be looked into and should be properly checked.

We have been listening, and I have heard from at least one Minister, that now we are thinking of deficit financing, or deficit budgeting. In the Plan it is mentioned that if we do not get foreign aid, we should resort to deficit budgeting. But only last year we were talking of surplus budgeting; today, this year we talk of the idea of deficit budgeting. I do not say that we have not accepted the principle of deficit budgeting. Most of the budgets show deficit budgeting, but it has been done to the extent of our resources. We had our cash balances which have been reduced now to a very small amount. We have also reduced our sterling balances. Therefore, to the extent of our reserves, we have done deficit budgeting. But the idea of deficit budgeting which is now in the air is one of printed or created money. This is a very dangerous proposition, particularly when we have just got away from the inflationary trend and we are just entering—I may call it—either an adjustment of prices or to some extent depression or whatever it is. We have to be very careful of deficit budgeting. It is not so easy *viz.*, the idea of printed or created money. It is a very dangerous thing to do and I would request the Finance Minister to be very cautious and I am sure that he has at least in the budget for 1952-53 not embarked on this policy, but we may have to do it later on. We do not know how it will be done. But when deficit budgeting is to be resorted to, there are different principles, at least in the theoretical economic way, and those are that we have to do the deficit financing if our resources are exhausted or if we cannot get the foreign capital or foreign aid, and in our expanding economy, we have to consider sometimes also of deficit budgeting for nation building activities or such

similar objects. But, side by side, we have also to consider that when we adhere to deficit financing, we must also see that in certain spheres we get immediate benefits, and thereby whatever the adverse effect of deficit budget may be on long-term plans or on nation building activities, they are properly counter-acted by immediate benefits.

I now come to another point, and that is the question of the credit facilities in the country. Last year, we had raised the Reserve Bank rates by $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Reserve Bank also had stopped support of the Government securities. This has created a rather unprecedented position, and people have sometime even lost the confidence of investing in Government securities. If we have to give credit facilities generally in the country, we must see that the Reserve Bank supports constantly the Government securities, and unless it is done, I am afraid, success in getting funds by borrowing will be rather difficult.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has got two more minutes to finish his speech.

Shri Tulsidas: I shall finish in a minute's time Sir. Then there is the question of foreign capital. My hon. friends here have mentioned that if we get any foreign capital or foreign aid in any way, we should see that our indigenous industries do not suffer by the imports under these foreign aid agreements, or if any foreign capital comes, to see that our industries are not in any way adversely affected. I am sure, the hon. the Finance Minister will look into that point. I had to say a number of things, but as my time is up, I shall take another opportunity to mention them.

Shri N. S. Nair: I rise to speak on the various cut motions that have been moved on the floor of this House under the Demands for Grants moved by the hon. Finance Minister.

Before I go into details, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the actual situation that now exists in Madras after this recent decontrol. Some opposition Members have received a few telegrams to which I want to draw the attention of the House. One of them reads: "Erode rice price raised seven annas per measure in railway grain shop workers suffering supply old rate labour union", another telegram reads: "Rice price before decontrol Rs. 0-11-9 from 1st July Rs. 1-3-4 rail-

way workers unable to buy". A third telegram says: "Erode rice price raised 7 As. per measure in railway grain shop we suffering supply old rate Rly. machinshop staff." As this is a very important and debated point, I wish to draw the attention of the House to real conditions that are prevailing in Madras. To mention one of my own experiences when I was travelling through Madras last week, I had the opportunity to go to grain shops and ascertain the real prices obtaining there. It was then Rs. 1/2/- and now it has been raised to Rs. 1-3-4. I am just mentioning these things, so that hon. Members may realise what we are doing to the people at large and to the poorer sections of the people by decontrolling the foodgrains in this country.

I now come to the Finance Ministry's Budget. I must first of all refer to the utter confusion which prevails in the accounts in spite of the multitudinous and voluminous publications of the department; no two publications and volumes concur. As my hon. friend was just now suggesting, it has been shown that the charged account comes to about Rs. 65 crores, but in the final analysis, it is found to be Rs. 74 crores and odd. A small handbook showing what amounts have been passed during the last session of the provisional parliament, what are the new demands and what are the differences between the Budget estimates as presented in the provisional parliament and the present one, would have been very helpful to hon. Members here and also to the public at large, and would not have cost the Treasury very much. I am sorry to say that it was with very great difficulty that I tried to find out the real figures from the voluminous publications. After a good amount of efforts, I was able to arrive at the following figures: From the list of business dated the 5th June 1952, I find that the total amounts for routine expenditure comes to Rs. 42,47,60,000, the demands for capital expenditure comes to about Rs. 22,34,03,000. But the overall annual expenditure including recoveries runs to the tune of Rs. 143,40,39,000. The overall capital expenditure comes to Rs. 132,46,74,000. Thus the Finance Department has to handle this year a vast sum of Rs. 275,87,13,000 and plan, direct and control the entire income and expenditure of this Republic. The Ministry of Finance is the main artery through which the life-giving blood of finance flows to the various parts of the body politic of any government. As such it is the most important portfolio. The nature and trend of the entire government can

be assessed from the working of the Finance Ministry, and I am constrained to say that our Finance Ministry functions in a most erratic and quixotic manner than can be imagined. Dr. Jaisoorya pointed out during the discussion of the general budget that the Indian Budget does not conform to any accepted standards of capitalists economy. Neither the Prime Minister nor the Finance Minister contends that they are trying to evolve a 'Nation Welfare State' much less a socialist state. They envisage only some stop-gap arrangements to tide over the situation for the present and these hodge-podge measures have no rhyme or reason behind them. I have pointed out in my criticism of the general budget, the various vagaries and irregularities in it, and the indecisive and unwise policies behind the levy of customs and the income-tax duties. In their anxiety to satisfy the needs of the vested interests, the ever-increasing and never-appreciable greed of the vested interests, the Finance Minister has squandered the revenues of this Republic and also the reserves, with the result that we are now almost bordering on insolvency. The allotments for nation-building schemes have been very meagre and parsimonious. Due to the paucity of finance, the Grow More Food Campaigns have been a thorough failure. And I take this opportunity of warning the Government that by extracting compensation from the ryots for the abolition of the zamindars, we are not going to do any good to the country. We shall only be lowering down the capacity of the peasant to cultivate the land properly, and this will ultimately result in loss of production and further famines.

Then I come to the tone of the report which is one of self-complacency. It begins with a catalogue of achievements of the Department of Revenue and Expenditure in the dual spheres of administration and legislation. At page 4 in paragraph 4 of the report it is stated that the officers of the food department scrutinise the expenditure of the Ministries and there attached and subordinate offices. What this method of scrutiny is, is evident from page 11 paragraph 17 of the Public Accounts Committee First Report for the year 1951-52. With your permission, I shall read the relevant portions from it.

"There is at present a tendency on the part of the administrative authorities to inflate their budget by overestimating their requirements. This is so, because the Ministry of Finance impose arbitrary cuts on such estimates in the

[Shri N. S. Nair]

course of their scrutiny after the estimates are finally framed by the Ministries. Thus neither the administrative Ministry nor the Finance Ministry proceed on any planned basis and resultant budget is mostly wide of the mark. In no sense does it represent the requirements of the Ministries in any accurate form nor is the picture complete as to the policies and plans which the Ministry must undertake during the year for which the money is sanctioned".

Lower down it is written, "The Finance Ministry should assist the Ministries in coming to proper decisions rather than sit in judgement over their proposals".

From these pungent remarks we infer what is going on within the dark walls of the Secretariat buildings. The Finance Minister assumes the role of a Super Prime Minister and his minions, the role of *Chota Dictators*. There is no plan or system for the administrative machinery, nor is there any co-operation or co-ordination between the Finance Ministry and the other Ministries.

Now, I come to the question of Government employees. At the beginning of page 5 of the report of the Estimates Committee, it is said: "The estimates side of the Civil Expenditure Division deals with all the rules and regulations relating to the conditions of service of the personnel of the Government of India". How far fair and equitable these rules are can be just...

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has two minutes more. It is better if he does not quote, but puts his points.

Shri N. S. Nair: I have a long list of the pay rolls of officers and employees. The total pay in the General Division excluding all allowances of 48 officers comes to Rs. 6,43,600 and the total pay of 397 establishments comes to Rs. 5,78,800 only. I have got a long list, but without enumerating the pay scales of each and very department, I can safely assert that a considerable portion of Rs. 143,40,39,000 allotted for ordinary expenditure, is eaten away by the fat-salaried officers.

Now, I come to another question the necessity for re-introducing the privilege ticket order concession. In the Central Secretariat and other Federal departments there are employees from all over India. They are there by right. It is but natural that these people wish to go back to

their homes at least once a year. Denial of this right is tantamount to denying the people of the various States the right to be recruited to Central service.

I come now to the question of the integration of State Forces. I maintain that an injustice has been done to my State, Travancore-Cochin, whereas Hyderabad which fought against the Republic has got much better treatment and some officers even got compensation upto Rs. 50,000. But the men and officers of our State were discharged without even a make-believe attempt to utilise their services. Mysore State also has fared better and got much better treatment at the hands of the Centre.

Another matter which I wish to bring to the notice of the Government is the Income tax Department in Travancore-Cochin.

The Income-tax department, as we know, has been complaining that they are short of staff. But the complaint about the Income Tax Department of T.-C. State is that there are too many trained hands. This reminds me of famous lines: "Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink".

Another matter—which I would like to bring to the notice of Government—and which is very important—is the financial integration of the States and also the amount of subsidy that should be paid. We are entitled to get according to the recommendation of the Finance Commission 60 per cent. of the common pool of revenue. We must get this 60 per cent. on the basis of the population and not on any other consideration, and additional payments, based on other considerations may be made from the remaining 40 per cent.

With regard to my State, we have an additional claim for 75 per cent. food subsidy. We are entitled to it firstly because ours is a very serious deficit area and secondly because we produce the hill crops that contribute to a very great extent the dollar earning capacity of our country. Because of the High percentage of education and low standard of living in my State we also require special subsidies for Education and Health.

In conclusion, I would only say that the Government of India as it is at present administered now stands solely for the capitalists and if we go at this rate, we are on the brink of a revolution. To my mind there are only two parallels in modern history which

resemble the situation in India today. One is the Kerensky Government in Russia in 1917 and the other is the Chiang Kai-Shek regime of China two years back. I hope the Government will take necessary steps to improve conditions of the workers and the peasants or otherwise I foretell that a revolution is bound to come in the near future.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City-North): I shall try very briefly, and brief I must be in such a short time, to consider the financial policy of the Government of India and how far it has succeeded. As we know the inflationary situation is almost a worldwide phenomenon and in the context of such an inflationary situation, one of the first objectives of financial policy, to my mind, should be the provision of a monetary unit, the value of which is not subject to wide and frequent fluctuations. Translated in plain language, it means the aim of policy should be to check inflation. It is, therefore, with reference to the success or otherwise of the financial policy of the Government in checking inflation that we shall judge that policy.

Now, we might begin first by asking ourselves the question: Is there inflation in India? The answer is, 'Yes, certainly, there is inflation in India'. The general index number for the week ended 24th May 1952 is 365.6—we shall say it is 366. Now, what does it mean? In our daily life it means that a certain bundle of goods and services which in 1937 we could have purchased for Rs. 100 is going to cost us today Rs. 366. So that much is granted—that inflation does exist in India today. Now, we have seen at the outset that inflation is almost a world phenomenon today. We will, therefore, do well to take a look around the world and see how other countries stand in respect of inflation. Here I am going to give a few figures which will illustrate the condition of inflation in other parts of the world. But before we do that, I would say that the figures that I am going to give refer to March 1950, i.e., the latest month for which figures are available for all those countries, and in order that these figures should be made comparable, we shall take the figure for India as of March 1950. The general index for March 1950 in India is 392. Now, I should like this House to memorise this figure, because this is the key number—392. Now with this figure of 392 let us see how conditions obtained in other parts of the world. Now in Africa, I shall take only two countries, in the Anglo-

Egyptian Sudan the index for 1950 January was 504. That compares with our 392. In Morocco for March, 1950, it is 2,105. That compares with our key number 392. Now, let us come nearer home—Asia. My list is of course alphabetical and, therefore, China comes first. But you can forget China, because the figure that I have refers to an unfortunate period in China's history. But it will be interesting to know that the figure is 2,631,000. That refers to the Kuomintang rule; so we shall forget it. Now let us come nearer home—Indo-China. All these figures are based on the year 1937 equal to 100; and for March 1950, in Indo-China the figure is 1880. Japan, 18,010. That, of course, compares with our 392. Korea, before the war, 107,100. Thailand, 1485. Let us go to Europe. Austria, 782. Finland, 953. France, 2,354. Greece—in 1947—18,882. We shall also omit Greece. Italy, 5,063. Russia I will not take into consideration because it is a phenomenon altogether different. If we go to South America, Peru, has 625; Paraguay, 562.

Now, this is the situation that obtains in a great part of the world. I do not want to suggest that there are not countries that have done better than what we have done. For instance, here are some of the well behaved economies or, if you prefer, well-managed economies. Canada, the index for March, 1950, is 188. United States of America, 177. Denmark, 236. Netherlands, 291. Norway, 238. United Kingdom, 226. It will be seen, therefore, that this inflationary situation is a truly worldwide phenomenon. No country has escaped it—not even the best managed one. In fact we must always remember that some inflation is inseparable from every major war. Now, I am sure that against this background of the world situation in respect of inflation it will be conceded that the Government of India, with its present financial policy, has not done after all so very badly. I will finish in two minutes, Sir.

I am sure none here would like to suggest that this comparative freedom that we have had from a serious situation in respect of inflation is just a matter of luck, because we all know that our share of luck has been, in the recent past, only in the form of earthquakes, floods and famines—which help inflation rather than check it. We may, therefore, concede that our financial policy has proved right and it has worked well because it has been pursued with courage and with energy through a very trying period.

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

Now, when I say this I do not want to convey an impression that some of us here agree with all the points that are there in the Budget. After all, a Federal Budget, and particularly a Budget of a country like India, is a vast effort and it is easily possible to have points in it on which we may hold opinions different from those of the administration. For example, in the White Paper there are attitudes expressed which some of us may not approve. There is an approach which we would like to see modified. There are conclusions in the White Paper with which we agree, but the premises that are stated there and from which those conclusions are supposed to proceed are premises with which we do not agree. But, finally where there is so much to praise, it is churlish to be fault-finding.

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): During the period of nearly 4 or 5 weeks we have been hearing so much criticism against the financial policy of the Government of India. One party here has come with the avowed purpose and instruction to destroy the confidence of the masses on the rival party. That party must find any opportunity and avail of any opportunity for that purpose. That was the dictum given to the Communist Party by Lenin. (*Inter-ruption*).

Shri Nambiar: No. That is not correct.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I think it will be desirable if people do not carry on discussions.

Shri A. C. Guha: I am quoting here for the information of my friends the exact words translated in English:

“Destroy the confidence of the masses on the Socialist Party”

That was the rival Party then in Russia. So when the rival party is the Congress Party here, their tactics must be to destroy the confidence of the masses on the Congress Party. It has been the common experience that no party—let it be any party—would like to go to foreign countries for aid.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I find there is lot of noise in the House with the result that the hon. Member who is speaking is not audible.

Shri A. C. Guha: I think the correct answer to that has been given by the Finance Minister himself in his Budget speech. I will quote what he has said:

“The edifice of our prosperity cannot be built on props of out-

side assistance without sacrificing something vital in the nation's spirit but can be built enduringly only by the efforts of our own people.”

But at the same time we should remember that particularly in the reconstruction period no country has yet been able to do without any foreign aid. Soviet Russia was particularly anxious to get foreign aid. We have not created any special Ministry to secure foreign aid which the Soviet Russia did by creating a Commissariat of Concessionaires. In the year 1929 the foreign indebtedness of Russia was 415 million roubles, in 1930 625 million roubles, in 1931 855 million roubles and in 1932 975 million roubles. And then in 1922 the American Relief Administration undertook at the request of the Soviet Government to feed 12 million children and adults daily through their own agencies, whereas India has taken only some wheat loan without any political strings. It is not that the American agency is distributing this wheat here. But in Soviet Russia the American Relief Administration itself through its own agencies undertook to feed 12 million people daily. So what is good for Soviet Russia may not be quite suitable for us according to our friends on my right.

Now it has been particularly the misfortune of our Government during the last 4 years to have to change our Finance Ministers thrice. And I think the present Finance Minister has been consistently following a policy and that policy has brought some good results at least as far as bringing down the prices.

Now in this House there was a suggestion about deficit budgeting. Deficit budgeting correctly interpreted does not mean budgeting through loans internal or foreign. But deficit budgeting is really budgeting through the aid of created paper money or paper currency printed outside the resources of this Government. That is a very dangerous thing and I do not like that this question should have been brought before the House in a rather surreptitious way as if to canvass the opinion of this House. If the Government finally decides it, that decision ought to come to this House either through the Finance Minister or through the Prime Minister and not through any other channel.

Then another point has been made and which today also one hon. Member mentioned is about the direct and indirect taxes. He quoted that 70 per

cent. of our taxation coming from customs and excise is in the form of indirect taxes. I give you the figures, Sir. Taxes on incomes are 176 crores including the shares for the States, Customs and Excise are 251 crores. There has been some other income of the Government which comes to 50 crores coming from various items—say Mint, Civil Works, Interest, etc. So taking into consideration the taxes on income and the revenue coming from Customs and Excise I think the direct tax comes to about 41 per cent. of the whole taxation, of course excluding the other miscellaneous incomes of the Government.

I would like to mention one or two points particularly about the allocation of provincial revenues. Though it is now before the Finance Commission, I think the Government should make up their minds that the Provinces should have the stable revenue so that they may not look to Government every year for some grants-in-aid and be doomed to live in a state of uncertainty and in suspense. What will be their revenues, they should be able to know even at the beginning of the year. So instead of giving them grants-in-aid, there should be some fixed allocation to the Provinces whatever be their share. In this connection I must reiterate here the long standing grievances of West Bengal. As this question is now before the Finance Commission, I do not like to dilate on this point but I think the hon. the Finance Minister would realise—as he has tried in his Award, to some extent, to redress the grievances of Bengal—that Bengal's case should be very carefully examined.

Then I will say something about the disparity in the figures of the Budget Estimates in 1951-52 and the actual realisation in 1951-52 and also the Budget Estimates as presented in February and the Budget Estimates as presented in May. I find a wide disparity in the Budget figures and this does not add to the credit of the Finance Department. Budget figures should always be taken seriously and if there is such disparity, then the idea may prevail that the Government is deliberately attempting to fool the public and the House by giving false figures of which I think the hon. Finance Minister should not be accused. I am sure he will see to it that the budget figures have some connection with the realities.

Sri B. Das : I do not think within his short time of 10 minutes I will be able to say anything except give

the conclusions and recommendations to the hon. the Finance Minister and the Government of India. My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram drew the attention of the House that the Treasury control of the Government of India was not satisfactory. He pointed out the recommendations of the P.A.C. I wish to request my friend Shri Deshmukh that the Finance Ministry should exercise proper Treasury control. They have allowed too much freedom to the Ministers and the Ministries. There are two Committees—the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee—through which this Parliament usually controls the functions of the different Cabinet Ministers and the Government of India. I was surprised at a Minister laying charges against the findings of the Estimates Committee. The Minister of Planning is a new man. He does not know the parliamentary functions of the statutory committees and I hope the Finance Minister will request his colleagues not to repeat such mistakes and not to make such unfortunate statements on the floor of this House against a Committee which is appointed by this House and which contains 90 per cent. of the Party Members—eminent Members and financial authorities—of this Parliament. He never consulted the Estimates Committee before he made that statement here and I strongly condemn that attitude on the part of a Minister.

There is nothing wrong with the finances or the financial policy of the Government of India. Our financial position is quite sound. For five years we have trudged on against many difficulties and I congratulate the Minister of Finance Shri Deshmukh for having brought us to this happy position where we have come to the state of mixed economy and yet we have carried on. Upto now I have not heard any suggestions from any quarters of the House as to how the finances can be improved or how expenditure can be reduced.

My friend Shri Deshmukh suggested in Bombay that another Economy Committee should be appointed. God forbid. We find that the recommendations of the previous Economy Committee have not been given effect to except in a very few cases. So I suggest one thing. My friend Mr. Tyagi had received encomiums. I also join them. But I hope he will not allow the black-marketeers to go scot-free from paying the taxes that remain so far unpaid. He will also be good enough to confiscate the illegal earnings which our black-marketeers have stored in India and U.S.A. in gold and

[Shri B. Das]

diamonds. I suggest: Let Mr. Tyagi be given another task. Let him be the sole authority to cause economies in the huge expenditure on staff and I say that unless there is retrenchment and economy in expenditure, you cannot effect any economy in the general public expenditure. All the money goes in staff which could be reduced by 50 per cent. The Finance Minister knows that, my leader, the Prime Minister, knows it but they are helpless. They are thinking of the revolution of which my friends on my right here talk so often. I give them one word of advice: Revolution is very nice, I have heard it for 40 years. But there is another word, evolution. Some of them are very wise heads but very young heads—let them think of evolution in our public finances and financial control.

Then I would like to know something about loans advanced by us from the Finance Minister. What is the condition of payment by Pakistan and Burma of our money lying with them as public debts? Is there any chance of our getting anything of the reparations money from Germany with which we have now entered into a treaty? What was the necessity of entering into a treaty with her? Did Germany come down to us on bended knees saying, "Excuse us for the reparations money which was an obligation of World War I?" And what are the World War II obligations of Japan? I would like the hon. Finance Minister to tell us whether we have any claims on any warring nations and whether we will get anything.

I would also like to know from the Finance Minister whether he is watching our industrialists and black-marketers and capitalists *vis-a-vis* the situation in Korea. When the Korean war started it gave joy to the hearts of all the blackmarketers and all the exploiters in India. Prices shot up like anything. In view of the present situation in Korea, which I am glad my leader has condemned, I want to know whether the Finance Minister is watching the antics of the capitalist section in this House or outside this House so that they do not raise the price level and cause serious harm and irritation to the consuming public.

I would like to say one word about the Finance Commission to which my hon. friend, Mr. Guha has referred and about which he expressed something very big and very bright. Even my friend, Mr. Rohini Kumar Chaudhury alluded to it. I do not

know what the Finance Commission is doing or will do. But everybody wants a Taxation Enquiry Committee. We do not know what taxes are available to the States or to the Centre which can be pooled and re-assessed and re-distributed to the States. Getting a few lakhs from the income-tax in shape of grants here and there does not solve the problem. I agree with my friend from Rajasthan who spoke about the re-distribution of the income-tax to the States. Shri Nalini Sarkar was the chairman of the Finance Expert Committee of the Constituent Assembly which gave its expert findings on financial re-distribution and which my friend, Sri Deshmukh did not accept in his award. Bengal, I find, is very greedy today. Bengal wants re-distribution of everything not on population basis but on collection basis. These are theories which I have discussed on the floor of the House for the last twenty years, so I am not going to discuss them again here. Let the Finance Minister and the Government of India experts, whoever they may be, now give a departmental note about the various taxes that they think can be levied, that can be re-distributed. I know the Government of India is living from hand to mouth. They are not in a position to part with money. But to demand grants from Centre and say, what my friends on my right say that "no food subsidy is given", is not correct or fair. "If you take food subsidy you cannot get financial grants, you cannot get revision of financial allocation through the Finance Commission, however talented and expert that body might be" is my conclusion.....

12 NOON

Shri Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat) May I draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Members of the House to the fiscal injustice perpetrated on the poor State of Assam for a long time? I may be given five minutes.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid.....

Shri Sarmah: I will take only five minutes, Sir. I will not inflict a speech on the House.

Mr. Chairman: Then I allow him to speak.

Shri Sarmah: I will start with the tribal areas on the North-East Frontier of Assam. The tribal area, called N.E.F., constitute a big region of five sub-divisions. It is under the External

Affairs Ministry. What I want to talk about is in respect of the amount allocated to this area. Nearly Rs. 3 crores have been allocated for these tribal areas. I submit, it is not big enough considering the immensity of the works. But I would like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that small as the sum of Rs. 3 crores is, out of that, only Rs. 10,05,000 have been allocated for schemes that are in the offing for the improvement of the conditions of the people of this area. I wonder what can be done with that ten lakhs in an area where even as we are sitting and talking here, Government buildings are being hurriedly dismantled by the employees of the Central Government as the River Lohit is rapidly eating away into the town.

Next I will come to the financial injustice that is being done to this small State. This State was given by the Niemeyer Award only 2 per cent. of the divisible pool of income-tax. I can relate to the House on what basis it was given but it will take some time and I have not got that important factor at my disposal. At any event I must say that the Niemeyer Award of 2 per cent. was raised to 3 per cent. after the partition of India. Though the injustice of the Niemeyer Award as well as of the 3 per cent. award after partition was complained of by the State Government, even the Deshmukh Award did not go into the question of a comprehensive allocation of the divisible pool to this poor province and the percentage at 3 remained. Now it is difficult to understand how 3 per cent. only can be allocated to that State. Neither the population basis nor the basis of locus or origin of income, used for scientific allocation of grants-in-aid to the revenues of states, have been applied in our case with necessary correctives. Assam has got a big area of hilly tracts of about 27,000 sq. miles with a population of 1,73,00,000. The hill population is very backward in education, health and sanitation. There are no schools, no roads, no hospitals. Then again Assam produces tea and the Centre gets the excise duty and export tax on it. She produces tea at the expense of her land. She has to feed the tea labourers coming from all the other States. The Centre gets out of tea nearly Rs. 8 crores in the shape of foresaid duties and taxes. Assam grows jute on about 30 per cent. of the total area under jute and she gets only Rs. 10 lakhs while the Centre gets about Rs. 2 crores annually on her produce. Against all this we get a miserable outlay of Rs. 30 lakhs as subvention

and Rs. 40 lakhs on account of jute. This is a frontier and if you want to keep trouble off your door I would beg of you for fiscal justice and equitable and scientific allocation of grant-in-aid.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीर-पुर) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने आखिरकार मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया यद्यपि ऐसा हो गया है कि जिन महाशयों ने, सदस्यों ने कई बार बोला उन को फिर से बोलने का मौका दिया गया और जिन्होंने ने एक बार भी नहीं बोला, उन को मौका नहीं दिया जा रहा है।

Mr. Chairman : I think the best thing would be to put forth his own grievances.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : सब से पहले मैं अर्थ मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान एक विशेष समस्या की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ और वह समस्या है उन देशी राज्यों की जो कि भारतवर्ष के संघ में विगत तीन चार वर्षों के अन्दर सम्मिलित कर दिये गये हैं। हम सब को ज्ञात है कि इन राज्यों की दशा पिछड़ी हुई है, वहाँ के लोगों को बचन दिया गया था कि उन की दशा शीघ्र ही सुधारी जायेगी और वहाँ की शासन व्यवस्था ठीक की जायेगी, वहाँ पर यातायात के साधन ठीक किये जायेंगे, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ यह कहना पड़ता है कि उस तरफ कोई खास प्रगति नहीं हुई है लेकिन जहाँ तक कर लगाने का सवाल है, टैक्स लगाने का सवाल है या और जो बातें कर देने वालों पर लादने की थीं, वह तो सब हम ने उन पर लाद दीं और लगा दीं और उन रियासतों को भी दूसरे अन्य राज्यों के समान स्तर पर ला दिया, लेकिन जहाँ तक उन राज्यों को सुविधायें देने का सवाल है वहाँ के निवासियों के जीवन स्तर को ऊँचा करने का सवाल है या दूसरी ओर अन्य सुविधाएँ देने का सवाल है, मुझे यह खेद के

[श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी]

साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हम ने वचन देने पर भी उस को पूरा नहीं किया है। यह तो आप मानेंगे ही कि देशी राज्यों में सड़कें नहीं हैं, वहां पर साधनों की कमी है, और बहुत सी ऐसी बातें हैं कि जिन को शीघ्र पूरा किया जाना चाहिये था। कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स (सामूहिक परियोजनायें) हम ने निकाले हैं, इस में कोई शक नहीं कि यह कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स हमारे देश के लिये बहुत लाभदायक प्रमाणित होंगे, लेकिन हमें कुछ और विशेष बात उन रियासतों के निवासियों के लिये करनी थी जो पिछड़े हुए थे। जिस प्रकार से हम “ए” राज्यों के लिये कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स की सुविधाएँ दे रहे हैं, उसी प्रकार से “ख” और “ग” राज्यों को भी दे रहे हैं, लेकिन इस के अलावा “ख” और “ग” राज्यों के लिये और भी अन्य सुविधाएँ देना चाहियें थीं, क्योंकि वहां के निवासी “क” राज्यों के लोगों से पिछड़े हुए थे, इसलिये उन्हें कुछ विशेष सुविधाएँ देनी चाहियें थीं, लेकिन हम ने उन को कोई विशेष सुविधाएँ नहीं दीं और उन को “क” राज्यों के समान स्तर पर रखा और बर्ता, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उन के प्रति आप का अन्याय है। इसलिये मैं आप से यह प्रार्थना करूँगा कि आप इन राज्यों की ओर शीघ्र ध्यान दें और उन की दशा को सुधारने की कोशिश करें।

इस के अतिरिक्त मैं आप का ध्यान शासन व्यवस्था की ओर भी आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि हमारी शासन व्यवस्था इन चार सालों में बहुत ही सुन्दर तरीके से बढ़ती चली जा रही है, तो भी हमें कई बातों में सुधार करना है। उदाहरण के लिये मंत्रालयों में जो कार्यकर्त्ता लोग हैं, कर्मचारी लोग हैं आज के दिन उनके ऊपर काफी नियंत्रण नहीं है और वहाँ

पर काम में बहुत ढिलाई होती है और अगर ढिलाई को आप ठीक नहीं करेंगे तो हमारा शासन व्यय धीरे धीरे बढ़ता जायगा, इसलिए इस तरफ भी ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे विपक्षी लोगों ने शासन व्यवस्था की टीका टिप्पणियाँ कीं और मेरे मित्र श्री लंका सुन्दरम् ने फरमाया कि : The purchasing power of the community is having disastrous consequences. (लोगों की क्रय शक्ति के परिणाम बड़े विनाशकारी हो रहे हैं) सोशलिस्ट पार्टी (समाजवादी दल) ने बताया कि ६९ लाख रुपया और ५५ लाख रुपया प्रोक्योरमेंट (समाहार) वगैरह पर बिल्कुल बर्बाद कर दिया गया है, मैं उन से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने रुपया बर्बाद नहीं किया है, उस ने अन्न के खरीदने में और देश को खाद्य वस्तुएँ प्राप्त कराने में यह रुपया खर्च किया है। और उससे देश को बहुत लाभ हुआ है, विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों को चाहिये कि पहले उन आंकड़ों को ठीक तरह से अध्ययन करें और पता लगावें कि वास्तव में किस तरह से खर्च किया गया है और तब टीका टिप्पणी करें, तभी लाभ हो सकता है।

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member finishes in time, I can give chance to another hon. Member.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी: मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस ओर भी आकर्षित कराना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में होर्डिंग (अनुचित संचय) और ब्लैक मार्केटिंग (चोर बाजारी) आदि की कुरीतियाँ मौजूद हैं और उन कुरीतियों को दूर करने के लिये हम ने कोई विशेष प्रयत्न नहीं किया है। हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने चुनाव के समय जनता को यह वचन दिया था कि हम

जल्दी ही बुराइयों को दूर करने की कोशिश करेंगे, इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि शीघ्र ही हम इस ओर कदम उठावें ताकि यह जो कुरीतियाँ हमारे समाज में फैल गयी हैं, उन को जल्द से जल्द दूर किया जा सके, साथ ही साथ मैं आप से यह कहूँगा कि हमारा शासन पर बहुत ज्यादा खर्च होता है, नौकरियों पर बहुत ज्यादा खर्च होता है, टोप हैवी एक्सपेंडीचर (अत्याधिक शासन व्यय) हो गया है, उस को हमें घटाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और उस के बदले अधिक प्रतिशत खर्च हमें जन-सेवा कार्यों में करना चाहिये। एक आखिरी बात इनकमटैक्स (आय कर) जो हम ने देशी राज्यों में लगाया

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member should now resume his seat. Shri Rajabhoj.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बहुत दुख होता है कि आज इतने बड़े और महत्वपूर्ण विषय में हम लोगों को बोलने का इतना कम समय दिया गया है और पांच मिनट में मुझे समाप्त करने की आज्ञा दी गई है, तो भी मुझे जो यह समय पांच मिनट का दिया गया है उस के लिए मैं आप को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) में शैड्यूल्ड कास्टस् (अनुसूचित जातियों) के लिए जो लिखा है, मुझे बहुत दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस के मुताबिक आज काम नहीं हो रहा है। आज शरणार्थियों को बसाने के लिये भारत सरकार करोड़ों रुपया हर साल खर्च कर रही है, लेकिन शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोग जो आज हज़ारों वर्षों से गिरी हुई अवस्था में रह रहे हैं, उन की तरफ़ समुचित ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता, गांधी जी ने अछूतों को ऊपर उठाने की कोशिश की, यह सही है, लेकिन अभी बहुत कुछ होना बाकी है, आज की हुकूमत गांधी जी को मानने

वाली है, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्न-मेंट (सरकार) ने अछूतों की आर्थिक अवस्था सुधारने के लिये क्या स्कीम (योजना) बनाई है? सिर्फ़ लम्बी चौड़ी बातें ही करना जानते हैं। लेकिन अमल में नहीं लाते हैं। कांस्टीट्यूशन में लिखा है कि हमारे लिए जमीन, मकान और शिक्षा आदि का प्रबन्ध करने के लिये एक स्कीम बनानी चाहिए ताकि अछूतों के लिए मकान, आर्थिक और शिक्षा देने का समुचित प्रबन्ध हो सके, १७ लाख रुपया स्कालरशिप (छात्रवृत्तियों) के वास्ते रक्खा गया है, लेकिन काश्मीर और दूसरी अन्य स्टेट्स (राज्यों) के शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों के आ जाने के कारण यह १७ लाख की रकम बहुत कम साबित हो रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि शैड्यूल्ड कास्टस् के लिए एक सेप्रेट कमीशन (आयोग) बनना चाहिये जो हमारी अवस्था को ध्यानपूर्वक विचारे और उस को उन्नत करने की कोशिश करे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अछूतों की दशा सुधारने के लिये और उन की सामाजिक, आर्थिक और हर प्रकार से उन्नति करने के लिये बजट में एक अच्छी खासी रकम होनी चाहिये जो उन पर खर्च की जा सके। मैं जानता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की इस सम्बन्ध में एक स्कीम भी है और गवर्नमेंट ने कांस्टीट्यूशन में भी उन के लिए कई बातें लिखीं हुई हैं, लेकिन मेरी शिकायत है कि जो कुछ हमारे लिये विधान में लिखा है उस पर अमल नहीं किया जाता। यह बड़े दुख और खेद की बात है कि हम कुल ७२ कांग्रेस को हरिजन मेम्बर्स (सदस्य) हैं, लेकिन हम लाचार हैं और हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते। और हम अपोजीशन (विरोधीदल) में जो लोग हैं और उस पर अमल करना हमारी बात सुनना तो दूर, हम को बोलने का समय भी नहीं मिलता है। ताकि हमारी जो तकलीफ़ें हैं, हमारी जैसी हालत है और हम अच्छी प्रकार

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

जीवन व्यतीत नहीं कर सकते उन की तरफ ध्यान दिला सकूँ। मैं हाउस (सदन) से अपील करता हूँ कि वह हमारी तरफ ध्यान दे और अछूतों की दशा सुधारने का सवाल ऊपर उठाये और सरकार पर दबाव डालें। मैं और क्यादा बोलना चाहता था, लेकिन अब टाइम (समय) नहीं है। अन्त में मैं फिर आप से यह प्रार्थना करूँगा कि कांस्टीट्यूशन के अनुसार काम न होगा तो अछूतों की दशा सुधारने के लिये सेप्रेट कोलिनी और सेप्रेट कमीशन सरकार को बनाना चाहिये जो हमारी आर्थिक और सामाजिक अवस्था को उन्नत करे और अछूतों में शिक्षा का प्रचार करे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कांस्टीट्यूशन में जैसा लिखा है, उस के मुताबिक अमल होना चाहिये।

Mr. Chairman: The discussion so far as these Demands for Grants are concerned is now closed and the hon. the Finance Minister will reply.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The Finance Minister is the residuary whipping-boy in these Budget discussions and therefore it is only natural that there should have been a multitude of points raised in connection with the Finance Ministry's Demands. As you will realize within the time allotted to me it would be quite impossible for me to deal with all of them. For alphabetical as well as other reasons I think I better deal with the grievances of Assam first.

In regard to tea I think an answer was given to a question this morning which clearly explained what action the Government of India were taking in the way of investigating the conditions in which tea is being produced and investigating the extent to which relief, if any, should be granted.

As regards other assistance to Assam, we are aware that Assam has special problems and, more frequently than in other cases perhaps, special calamities. But I would like to point out that we have already decided to take active action in the way of finding out what could be done about this. A team of officers is proceeding shortly to Assam to study their special problems and, in particular, to devise measures for preventing further

damage to some of their towns, like Dibrugarh, which are threatened by frequent floods.

Shri Brohmo-Choudhury (Goalpara-Garo Hills—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): What about Goalpara town which is also being eroded?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Then, Sir, I would like to mention that the Five Year Plan of Assam is estimated to cost Rs. 12.5 crores, and the Central Government hopes to assist Assam to the extent of Rs. 11 crores out of this amount, by way of loan or any other suitable form.

Then I proceed to consider the grievances in regard to the scheduled tribes and the scheduled areas of Assam. I can assure hon. Members who have spoken on their behalf that their welfare and development is also very near the heart of the Central Government, and as funds become available active steps will be taken to see that these very vital areas on our north-eastern frontier are developed. Sir, one Assam Member. Mr. R. K. Chaudhury, moved me to tears and also to a limerick:

There was once a tribal of a Digboi
Who was every inch a big boy;

But when he spoke of Assam,

Even the Minister of Earthquakes and Floods shook, shed tears, said what an assam!

An Hon. Member: And what a big ass at that!

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I can proceed now to the needs of other States. I might take the earliest opportunity of saying that there is no going back on the financial arrangements that were made at the time of integration. Special needs do arise and they are taken notice of, as for instance in regard to Travancore and Cochin and their subsidy. It is possible that their desires in this matter are not fully met. But then the Government of India have to take an all-India view and, in particular, they are not very greatly impressed with the claims that have been frequently put forward that because much of the foreign exchange arises out of exports from Travancore-Cochin they are entitled to special consideration. That proposition is not as simple as it sounds. After all, in a country like this it is not always possible to draw up a foreign exchange balance for any section of the country, even a State. We have no information in regard to what claims Travancore

core-Cochin and their requirements make on the total foreign exchange resources. In any case I think it is a wrong way of approaching the problem, and if there are any special needs the best way is to try and consider them on their own merits and not on the basis of any vague theories.

As regards the general grievances of States that their resources are insufficient for their developmental requirements, I think there is a great deal to be said for it and I do hope that the Finance Commission will be able to find some way of satisfying their needs beyond the Deshmukh Award. That award was an interim award, the object of which was to hold the situation while the Finance Commission came along. And speaking for myself, I should not mind if their recommendations were in the nature of transferring additional resources to the States. I quite agree with one of the hon. Members who said that "by doing that you would be vesting the responsibility fairly and squarely for expenditure on the States" instead of trying to supervise the mode of expenditure and any assistance that might flow from the Centre.

Having got rid of that important subject on which one can only make general observations. I would now turn to some of the specific criticisms. And there my difficulty again is that the Opposition seems to be allergic to statistics. I have been accused of 'body-bowling' and yet have been threatened with an l.b.w. Now, it passes my comprehension how a bowler can be declared l.b.w. All I can say is that these remarks are not cricket! Actually I suspect that whereas our statistics are based on the theory of probability, some of the statistics which emanate from the other side seem to be based on the theory of improbability.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The hon. Member. Dr. Lanka Sundaram (the body-bowler!) quoted figures—mind you, although he accused me of quoting figures and said this is only an illustration, and that he was not dealing with the main point of taxation—that in 1949-50 and 1950-51, we gave relief of Rs. 6.50 plus Rs. 16.33 crores and then, in an unaccountable way, we reversed the process. I believe he perhaps forgot to point out that in the first year there was additional taxation to the extent of Rs. 18.58 crores, so that, on the whole, there was an increase in taxation of Rs. 12.08 crores. Therefore the picture of the inequity of the P.S.D.

present Finance Minister is not as gloomy as he tried to make out. I have, of course, no need to defend the additional taxation that was put on in 1951-52. It was fully debated on by a House which was also representative, and which sanctioned by means of the Finance Act all that taxation.

There is one point that I would like to make, and that is, in these matters, one is, in a way, bound by the historical, not assurances, but certainly observations. My predecessor, in the course of the debate over the 1950-51 taxation, said:

"I have brought the level of taxation now to a figure which I think the economy of the country can stand and ought to stand. As far as I am concerned, so long as I have anything to do with Finance Ministership, there will be no further reductions in the level of direct taxation except such minor adjustments as circumstances may call from time to time. So, those who are affected by direct taxation would do well to take this fact to adjust themselves to this level of taxation and settle down to them."

I quote this without necessarily implying that I agree with these observations.

My other difficulty is that hon. Members opposite do not always take notice of speeches that have been made even in this very session, either in this House or in the Council of States. For instance, this question of taxation, direct and indirect, was the subject of a somewhat prolonged observations on my part. But, there is nothing to indicate that any of the Government's critics have condescended to take notice of those observations. Then, there was, in one of the speeches, a reference to the non-appointment of a trade commissioner in the USSR. That matter also was explained by me at great length in the Council of States. The short point that I made was that since all the USSR trade is handled by the State, a diplomatic representation is quite enough and there is no need to have a sort of a commercial representation which is necessary when the representative has to get into touch with intending importers or exporters as the case may be.

The third difficulty is that the Opposition is still somewhat schizophrenic.

Shri Sarangadhar Dass (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): I could not hear.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Schizophrenic—split personality. Although I concede that it is honest, it is somewhat a hydra-headed affair. Therefore one does not know which of the criticisms to take as seriously meant or not. I was hoping that the experience of the affairs in this House would perhaps abate some of their initial fine frenzy. I have seen some evidence of it this morning. It is very difficult to reply, to observations when they are couched in terms of hyperbole, because, you have to go down so to speak to the fundamentals. We have not got the sort of common cementings between the two of us. These are the three difficulties which make it somewhat difficult to deal fully, in the time allotted, with the various criticisms.

I would like to deal next with the inaccurate although well meant observations of the hon. Member opposite, Pandit Mishra. He quoted certain figures. I gathered him to say that we remit Rs. 69 crores by way of dividends on profits abroad.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: No.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I may have mistaken him. If that is not so, I understand, he refers to the sum that we pay for repayment and avoidance of debt.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Interest on debt.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I do not know what his grievance is in this matter. I have been brought up with certain principles. One is to live within one's means; the second is to keep one's word; and the third is to repay one's debts.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: The Opposition differs on all these three points.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Then, the hon. Member said there was some figure of Rs. 55 crores which was lost in procurement operations, and thought that was a serious matter. Those of his party have been leading *morchas* in Bombay and elsewhere to protest against the withdrawal of subsidies. Although I must make allowance for his lack of familiarity with Budget figures, I say that we are always available to explain anything that is not plain on the surface. I think he should have realised that this Rs. 55 crores in one way or the other represents the subsidy on food. Therefore, here again I do not quite realise what his grievance is.

Thirdly, he referred to a difference, which he said was unexplained, between the provision of Rs. 4,000 under one head in the interim Budget and Rs. 40 crores now.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Ten crores.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am sorry; it was a slip of my tongue. Ten crores now. There, again, the explanation is very simple, although we have not given it there. There are so many things to explain in regard to the changes between then and now. This particular sum represents only a transfer of the American loan when sale proceeds to the Special Development funds, in accordance with the procedure already explained to Parliament. We expected the entire wheat to be received last year and took a vote for the transfer of Rs. 71 crores to the Fund last year. But, actually, only Rs. 61 crores would probably be received in 1951-52. Therefore, we have had to provide for the remaining ten crores in this year's Budget. I think, with this explanation, he will remain a little more reassured than he was when he made his observations.

Then, I come to this question of direct and indirect taxation. I dislike reiterating what I said before. There are a few additional facts which I would like to adduce. Although tax concessions were given in 1949-50 and 1950-51, in the lower slabs, that is to say, below Rs. 15,000 incomes, they amounted to 25 per cent. whereas in the top slabs, they amounted to 11 per cent. Therefore taxation was progressive. I have already quoted figures to show how continuously the tax that has been taken from the higher slabs has been increasing. In my last speech I have been reminded in this matter by one of my hon. friends of what the taxation policy of our old *smritikars* was, a policy which my colleague compared with the policy and technique of the busy bee.

पुष्पं पुष्पं विचिन्वति मूलज्छेदं न कारयेत् ।

मालाकार इवारामे न यथाङ्गारकारकः ॥

which means that the King or Government should act like a gardener who plucks the flowers only, and not like a coalman, that is to say a charcoal burner, who uproots the trees and reduces them to charcoal, because the latter altogether destroys the source. In other words, this is the old parable of killing the goose that lays the golden egg. So, all these measures, of capital levy, increasing taxation will be for a little while, but the

cannot be depended upon to work for ever. So, it does not mean that, as I said, the tax should not be steeply graded, and what grade the tax structure should stand at must depend on the circumstances from time to time. I think I have already noticed signs on the part of the industrial community, of lesser anticipations, shall we say, of profit in their ventures, a greater awakening of responsibility towards the body politic, the community, and it may be that they themselves will one day acquiesce in a higher rate of taxation, but these are matters which must lie in the lap of the future, and it would be only raising a hypothetical question to refer to them here.

In regard to indirect taxation I would like to point to one thing, to which I referred before, and that is much of our income from indirect taxation last year was due to export duties, and that certainly does not bring privations to the common man. But I would go a little further and I would like to join issue in a fundamental sense, and that is, I do not accept that in a country like this the common man should not pay any taxes. Students of recent programmes in other countries will find that prominence is given to the duty of paying taxes which lies on the citizen. And, in the course of my budget speech last year, I made reference to a letter which I had received from a common man who said that, looking around, he could not see that he contributed anything to the maintenance of the State which did so much for him, and therefore, declaring his intention to pay Rs. 5 per year.

Shri Nambiar: Who is that common man?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I received a letter from the same common man this year, and he says: "May I remind you of my undertaking to send Rs. 5 every year to the State. So, please accept"—this is the money order coupon—"this small gift of a poor man." Then he goes on to say: "I am just a poor peasant, so please forgive errors in writing." I think that is very touching, and he has written it himself. I hardly like to add that he is from my part of the country.

Shri Nambiar: Is it in English?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It is in Marathi. You can read it if you like. If the House insists, it will be available for inspection. I would like to add he is from the constituency of my hon. friend from Ratnagiri.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): There is Ratnam there?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: These things require some hardness like that.

Then, I was going to say that in a country where the common man is so poor, to believe that the State can carry on a taxless existence, is to live not in a very wise person's paradise.

Then the next important matter that was raised—and I must apologise to Members who have raised various other issues in regard to taxation, for my inability to deal with them; there would be other occasions, as I was admonished, when they could be raised again. I refer particularly to the chronic huff, the Hindu united families, undivided families—that is a chronic huff into which the hon. Member opposite often finds himself in. Well, Sir, the next point I would like to refer to is that of financial control. I do not know how this impression has got about that the Finance Ministry does not exercise any control.

An Hon. Member: Too much.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I hear grumbles and murmurs even now behind me that too much control is exercised, and I am perpetually being blamed of being obtuse, obdurate and obstructive. Actually therefore, I can infer that we are doing our duty fairly and tolerably effectively. We have a Financial Joint Secretary and other officers attached to various Ministries, and as proposals take shape, they are scrutinised by them. Therefore, the sort of problem that was referred to by one of the hon. Members does not really arise—I think by Shri B. Das—that is to say after the budget is framed, then the Finance Ministry goes down with a heavy hand and says: "No, your share shall be so much cut." That does not happen usually because expenditure is either of the regular kind, in which case it requires a lesser degree of scrutiny, or it is of a special kind, what is called new expenditure and new schemes which are thoroughly scrutinised. But it did happen in connection with our economy measures, or, shall we say, our attempts to institute economy measures. The hon. Member has referred to a report of the Retrenchment Committee. I am not in a position to say why it did not see the light of day, but I think what happened was that by the time Government thought of introducing those economies, the financial situation changed for the worse, and therefore they had to superimpose some additional econo-

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

mies. Unfortunately, that took the somewhat odious form of an arbitrary cut on every Ministry, or every Ministry's budget. And as any experienced Finance Minister would have said, perhaps that stood no chance of succeeding. That is to say when you are faced with a situation as, say, famine or food shortage, and the Food Minister has to go round the country, it is impossible for any Finance official to say: "No, you shall not go because you have finished your travelling allotment", and it is the same, in another sense, with stationery and printing. With our apparatus of democracy expanding every day, a great deal more paper is required, almost every year, and it would be very wrong, I think, to say that that apparatus will not be given full play, mainly because the Finance Ministry has said arbitrarily that the budget for stationery and printing shall be limited to such and such a sum.

Shri B. Das: I was referring to the report of the Economy Committee. There was quite a lot of very valuable material in the report, and I suggest that it be made available to the Members of the House.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I shall consider that suggestion very carefully. I can only say we have made full use of all the available material that was contained in that report, and the present suggestion is that we should let other Members of Parliament also partake of that material.

In regard to some of these major works, it was stated that we have no control and we have no means of finding out whether the achievement is commensurate with the expenditure. Although cases do come to prominence where there appears to be an apparent failure of financial control, I can assure the House that by and large that control is being constantly improved and almost every unit of a big work has its own accounts and audit report, and a statement of its economic implications, and these are scrutinized properly and very carefully. It is also true that while in the earlier days we were rather over-anxious to develop and entered on many schemes without what can be regarded as a proper project estimate and some of the necessary detailed estimates, that omission is being corrected now. And indeed the purpose of appointing one of the two committees for Hirakud was firstly to find out in what particulars financial control was imperfect on account of the arrangements made and

how it could be improved. We have received an interim report, and we have had one or two discussions with the authors of the report, and I am quite sure that in about a fortnight's time or a month's time, that report will be submitted to us in its final form.

Then some references were made to pre-audit. Pre-audit is not a thing which the Comptroller and Auditor-General recommends for these transactions of such great dimensions. Nevertheless, we have evolved a compromise system and that is of pre-check of payments in a Central Accounts Office; that is the system which was adopted for the Lloyds barrage; that is the system which is being adopted for the Tunghabhadra project and which we are told is working very well. I might add here parenthetically that I am seeing the Chief Engineer this afternoon in order to discuss this very problem with him, and after discussion with him, I do hope that we shall be able to evolve a very satisfactory system of control of expenditure on some of these big items. I have confessed it last year that if one is not vigilant there are more chances of money slipping through one's fingers as a result of these schemes than on any other account. (*Interruption*). So long as the Finance Minister is keenly aware of it I do not think it matters very much, not that I accept the charge.

I have just time enough for dealing with two important points. One is foreign aid on which I think we heard some very cogent observations from one of the hon. Members there—I think it was Mr. Bansal. This charge that we are accepting foreign aid for no reason whatsoever seems to be repeated frequently as though almost like a gramophone disc, in spite of the fact that we have explained again and again that we have not the slightest intention of losing our freedom of judgment although we receive foreign aid. I cannot see what an undeveloped country can do when its own resources are limited without such foreign assistance as that country can receive without detriment to its self-respect and dignity. There is no need to refer to the examples of other countries, because I cannot think of any country which has scorned the receipt of such assistance, including some of the countries which have undoubtedly achieved a very great deal in the wake of the national planning. So in this matter our conscience is

quite clear. If once we decide that we shall receive foreign assistance of whatever form it may be, whether it is State assistance or whether it is a loan from the International Bank or whether it is private capital, I do not see why we should not get them; if we have to receive them, we must create conditions in which the flow of that assistance will continue. Although some sneering remarks were made about a wider flow of foreign assistance, I repeat that phrase, I do not see what is wrong with receiving assistance on those terms.

A point was made about the fact that we have to remit dividends on foreign investments. It is hardly worthwhile speaking in a historical sense. It may be that much more in the way of dividends has been remitted over a long series of years, but the general principle is that we have given a guarantee that if there is any foreign capital we shall create facilities for the repatriation of that capital, whenever it is wanted and there shall be no bar in the way of the remittance of the dividends. Actually out of the Rs. 30.7 crores or Rs. 31 crores which represents the remittance, the earnings of dividends are Rs. 9.82 crores and the profits of the foreign firms and companies are estimated at Rs. 26.98 crores. Apart from ethical considerations, if we were to stop the remittance of dividends, then we might as well be driven to sequester the payment of dividends to the Indian shareholders also. That is to say, it takes you on to quite a foreign conception, a conception quite foreign to accepted theories in this matter. The principal result of that would be that you might say good-bye for ever to any hope of receiving foreign assistance in the future. There again, it is a question of degree of optimism. Whether it is based on experience or whether it is based on inexperience, hon. Members opposite seem to think that a country like India with its resources—whatever label one might give, vast or inexhaustible—actually they are neither vast nor inexhaustible—would be able to carry on without any kind of foreign assistance either in the way of technical knowledge or capital. Well here, we must agree to differ from them, and we think that for many a year to come, if other countries have surpluses of capital, we shall be glad to use them on our own terms.

That leads me to the next question, and that is finance for the plan. It is too early, I think, to try to prognosticate whether the extent of the revenue expectations on which the plan is based are likely to be fulfilled. So far as

the Centre is concerned, I think we are on the right side in the way of establishing the surpluses on which the Plāhnnig Commission has counted.

As regards the States, the last year was not a very easy year. But this year there is already evidence of the anxiety of several State Governments to raise their own resources.

In regard to the general level of taxation, I would like to say this, that the belief that there is no scope for further taxation—either direct or indirect—is a narrow one and not based on a study of the facts of the situation. Here are some statistics which might interest the House. Taxation is represented here as a per cent. of the national income. In Ceylon it was 21.5 per cent., in Egypt it was 16 per cent., in Cuba 15.5 per cent., Chile 15.1 per cent., Colombia 14.4 per cent., Brazil 12.5 per cent.; Philippines 9.5 per cent. and India 7 per cent.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: In Timbuctoo ?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Well, I have not the figure here. The research staff did not attach such importance to Timbuctoo as the hon. Member opposite does. I shall draw their attention to this omission.

Shri B. Das: Is this 7 per cent. Central Government taxation or State...

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Total taxation in the country. I think it is just as well that we face this fact, although it is not my purpose to say that taxation will fill the gap between what we want for carrying out a minimum programme of development and what we are now raising. There will still be a gap. How it should be filled and with what degree of impunity or risk we could resort to deficit financing must form the subject of a speech by itself, and it is one of those subjects on which I think it would be wrong to indulge in a very succinct observation because that is likely to create greater misunderstanding than remove any misunderstanding.

Now, Sir, a last word. Whatever it may be, I think even if we are a bit doubtful, it is better to try than to lie supine. I would remind the House of a Persian saying:

کوشی بپورده به از خدنگی

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Very good.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: ...which in simple language means:

श्रेयान् सुप्तैस्त्वंहीनोऽपि यत्नः ।

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Quite right.

Shri Velayudhan: In simpler language what is it?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: It means that it is better to indulge even in a senseless effort than to lie asleep or supine.

Hon. Members in their jeremiads talk of a coming revolution. I am quite certain that a good deal of that is wishful thinking. In my mind, the country is in very good heart and the revolution that they are so fond of foretelling is not going to come for many a year to come. Therefore, they must reconcile themselves to living in political wilderness for a long period.

Shri Velayudhan: Many have said like this in the past.

Mr. Speaker: Before I put the demands, I have a large number of cut motions. I do not think I need read out the numbers of the cut motions, but if necessary, I should have no objection. Well, I may give the numbers.

(Cut motions Nos. 270, 534, 535, 536, 670, 671, 821, 824, 973, 1215 and 1218 to Demand No. 25;

Nos. 537, 672, 673 to Demand No. 26;
No. 675 to Demand No. 27;

Nos. 422, 423, 424, 466, 539, 677 to Demand No. 28;

Nos. 680, 681 to Demand No. 32;

No. 596 to Demand No. 33;

No. 682 to Demand No. 35;

No. 685 to Demand No. 36;

Nos. 686, 687, 1202, 1203 and 1204 to Demand No. 37;

No. 467 to Demand No. 38;

Nos. 468, 692, 693, 974, 1165 to Demand No. 41; and

No. 977 to Demand No. 114).

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Re. 1."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Union Excise Duties' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Audit' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Audit' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Currency' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Territorial and Political Pensions' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Extraordinary Payments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Extraordinary Payments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Extraordinary Payments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Extraordinary Payments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Finance' be reduced to Re. 1."

"That the demand under the head 'Extraordinary Payments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Finance' be reduced to Re. 1."

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax' be reduced by Rs. 100."

"That the demand under the head 'Grants-in-aid to States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motions were negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all the outstanding Demands to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the respective sums, not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper in respect of Demands Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 77, 102 and 103 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by the Speaker the motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND No. 25—MINISTRY OF FINANCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 80,77,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Finance'."

DEMAND No. 26—CUSTOMS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,74,11,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Customs'."

DEMAND No. 27—UNION EXCISE DUTIES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,49,79,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Union Excise Duties'."

DEMAND No. 28—TAXES ON INCOME INCLUDING CORPORATION TAX

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,85,36,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the

sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax.'

DEMAND NO. 29—OPIUM

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 23,01,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Opium'."

DEMAND NO. 30—STAMPS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 67,14,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Stamps'."

DEMAND NO. 31—PAYMENT TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS, DEPARTMENTS ETC., ON ACCOUNT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS AND MANAGEMENT OF TREASURIES,

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,55,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Payment to other Governments, Departments etc., on account of the Administration of Agency Subjects and Management of Treasuries'."

DEMAND NO. 32—AUDIT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,02,62,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Audit'."

DEMAND NO. 33—CURRENCY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,36,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Currency'."

DEMAND NO. 34—MINT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 65,03,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Mint'."

DEMAND NO. 35—TERRITORIAL AND POLITICAL PENSIONS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,33,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Territorial and Political Pensions'."

DEMAND NO. 36—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,07,75,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

DEMAND NO. 37—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,05,79,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance'."

DEMAND NO. 38—GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,85,96,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Grants-in-aid to States'."

DEMAND NO. 39—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE UNION AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 85,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Union and State Governments'."

DEMAND NO. 40—PRE-PARTITION PAYMENTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,05,85,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Pre-Partition Payments'."

DEMAND NO. 41—EXTRAORDINARY PAYMENTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,16,35,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Extraordinary Payments'."

DEMAND NO. 109—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON THE INDIA SECURITY PRESS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,39,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on the India Security Press'."

DEMAND NO. 110—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CURRENCY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Currency'."

DEMAND NO. 111—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON MINTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,01,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated

Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Mints'."

DEMAND NO. 112—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 66,43,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Commuted Value of Pensions'."

DEMAND NO. 113—PAYMENTS TO RETRENCHED PERSONNEL

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,52,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Payments to Retrenched Personnel'."

DEMAND NO. 114—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,00,03,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Finance'."

DEMAND NO. 115—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,37,38,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Loans and Advances by the Central Government'."

DEMAND NO. 77—DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the

31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Department of Parliamentary Affairs'.

DEMAND NO. 102—PARLIAMENT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,19,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Parliament'."

DEMAND NO. 103—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Parliament Secretariat'."

APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. I. Deshmukh): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53.*

Mr. Speaker: the question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53."

The motion was adopted

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I introduce the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The House now stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 4th July, 1952.

*Introduced with the recommendations of the President.