

GENERAL BUDGET, 1958-59—
GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the General Budget for 1958-59.

Out of 20 hours allotted for general discussion, 4 hours 39 minutes have already been availed of, and 15 hours 21 minutes now remain.

Shri Mohiuddin may kindly continue his speech.

Shri Mohiuddin (Secunderabad): The General Budget which is under consideration at this stage has been called a pedestrian Budget. I think that as this Budget does not make any changes, it may be called the stationary or neutral Budget. It is what I might also say a wait-and-see Budget. The pedestrian, after all, moves either forward or backward, but this Budget remains practically stay put at the place where it was last year.

Now, what are the salient features of the economic situation in 1958? The *Economic Survey* circulated with the Budget papers gives a very penetrating and objective analysis of the development that has taken place during the last year or two in the economic sphere. It is also reported in that survey that the Planning Commission is taking stock of the achievements of the Plan, the difficulties encountered and the likely achievements of the Plan; and it is said that this report may be placed on the Table of the House in due course. The Prime Minister announced yesterday in the other House that a paper on the foreign exchange situation is under preparation and that might also be placed on the Table of the House by about next week. In order to enable us to have a clear picture of the economic situation as a whole, these studies and information like the appreciation of the progress of the Plan by the Planning Commission or the foreign exchange position etc., should have been placed in our hands before this debate on the general economic policy of Government began. It would have been more useful if

those papers had been with us, and we had had an opportunity to study them before we could discuss the Budget as a whole.

The most important factor that has made a very important change in the attitude of the mind of the people during the last one and a half years is the rise in prices of foodgrains and other essentials needed by the common man. The prices of articles like foodgrains have gone up more than those of other groups of articles. The Reserve Bank of India's report of 1957 has examined this special aspect and has said that whereas the rise in 1951-52 was in part due to the Korean war, the 1957-58 rise is primarily domestic, reflecting mainly the excess of demand over supply arising from a high level of investment activity in the public and private sector. The rise in prices has this special characteristic that it is mainly or primarily due to the impact of increased investments made in the economy of the country. The increased investments have, no doubt, stretched the economy, and are exerting pressure on the prices. The inflationary pressure on the prices is increasing every day. Deficit finance has been resorted to to the extent of Rs. 600 crores. The agricultural production in 1957-58, owing to drought and other conditions, might be less than what it was in 1956-57, and the private savings or voluntary savings are not responding under the present circumstances.

Now, these are important economic features which we have to take into consideration while discussing this Budget. There is an imbalance in the economy of the country. The *Economic Review* says that it is clear that if the increasing tempo of development in the country is not to be allowed to accentuate inflationary pressure seriously, a greatly increased measure of productivity and savings must be achieved, and our foreign exchange resources should be conserved. This is the general remedy suggested in the *Economic Survey*.

[Shri Mohiuddin]

Shri Asoka Mehta said yesterday that there was some contradiction between the conclusions arrived at in the *Economic Survey* and the budget speech. The conclusions in the *Economic Survey* have not been incorporated in the budget speech. That general criticism is to a large extent true, and I agree with that criticism. The present situation calls for some positive action for setting right the imbalance that is now growing seriously in the country. On the whole, industrial production has increased but the rate of increase has shown a little fall during the last six months; especially, the fall in the textile goods is very serious. There is no doubt that in the world as a whole there is a certain amount of recession, but we have got to think seriously of the development that is taking place in India in the economic sphere so that the economic stability is not jeopardised in any manner.

Now, what are the expectations regarding industrial production in 1958? Our industrial production has now come to depend on the import of important raw materials and semi-manufactured goods. Unless these raw materials and semi-manufactured goods are imported in sufficient quantities, the production is likely to go down; and for that purpose, our foreign exchange may be a stumbling block. If we want these industries to expand, we have to import machinery, and there again foreign exchange is required. In view of these important considerations, I am afraid that there is a potential danger of the production showing a still further decrease in the current year, and that is likely to affect our economy seriously.

Now, what are the remedies? Shri Asoka Mehta yesterday made an emotional appeal to carry out the Plan as a whole, and in picturesque language he suggested that the economy should be allowed a safe take-off. We entirely agree with that suggestion, and we hope the economy will be able

to take off safely during the next year as well as during the entire period of the Second Plan.

Shri S. A. Dange and Shri Somani joined hands in asking for reduction of excise duties on cloth and other articles. Now, the Forum of Free Enterprise, which has been flooding us with new and old pamphlets, has only one suggestion to make, and that is Prof. Shenoy's suggestion, that post-war experience has shown more conclusively than ever before that most of our economic ills are traceable to a policy of over-investment. The Forum of Free Enterprise, as argued by their representative only yesterday, is entirely opposed to over-investment, that is, investment over and above current savings.

Now, the nation has decided that the Second Five Year Plan should be carried through in spite of various difficulties and various sacrifices that have got to be made. Deficit financing is one of the important essentials for the execution of the Plan for any backward economy like India's. With deficit financing being essential, we expected that the representatives of experienced organisations like the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry or the Forum of Free Enterprise should make some constructive suggestions. Their suggestions which they have been repeating every year, that the Plan should be changed, priorities should be changed, taxes should be reduced or certain taxes should be abolished, show that there is a bankruptcy of ideas, and they have not adjusted themselves to the changing conditions of the country in this new period of developing economy of the nation.

There is no doubt that greater production all round, less increase in consumption and more savings are the three important items of the economic policy. These items of policy, if properly enforced, will induce more economy and it is likely to lead to more savings.

As I have said, deficit financing is essential. If indirect controls or strategic controls are not effective and if in order to carry through the programme of development we have got to incur more deficit financing, I suggest Government should consider adopting more direct control, by various methods of consumption.

I am afraid I cannot go into details, but the situation, as it appears to me, is that we have got to go through this accepted programme of the Second Five Year Plan. The resources are lacking. There is paucity of savings. In order that we may be able to put through the whole scheme of the Second Five Year Plan, it is not only necessary that our taxes should remain where they are—of course, subject to certain necessary modifications and alterations—but we should also consider introducing controls on consumption so that we may have increased savings for the purpose of investment.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Then we should have no production whatsoever.

Shri Mohiuddin: There cannot be any saving unless there is increased production. Increased production, less increase in consumption, and more savings—in order to achieve these ends, we must consider introducing direct controls on various aspects of our economy.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, many adjectives have been used about this year's Budget. I would like to say that I think it is a realistic Budget in the sense that it takes account of the very difficult crises, economic and financial, that we are facing today.

There has been a good deal of talk in this House since yesterday, and many alarmist views have been expressed regarding deficit financing. I think in the present structure of our society, deficit financing is absolutely essential if we are to cut through the

vicious circle that faces us and to go ahead with our plans of development.

Both the budget speech and the *Economic Review* have not hidden anything. They have tried to give us some idea of the ways and means through which we can overcome some of the difficulties, and the measures that Government are trying to take in order to find funds and resources for our plan.

There has been a tightening of import controls, conservation of our foreign exchange resources and selective credit controls through which improvement is discernible. The inflationary spiral has been checked and there is discernible a slight downward trend of prices. But as to whether that is going to be maintained is a matter which only the future can tell.

Some Members yesterday have spoken about one point—and it is a true one, no doubt—that the rise in prices in this country is much less than that, say, in the U.K. or U.S.A. But that is no cause for complacency because the rise of prices must also take into account the living standards and the income levels of the country. On the marginal income of India, the hardship caused by a lesser rise of prices may be such greater than the hardship incurred by those who may have to pay higher prices even while they have a high standard of living. Therefore we have to go forward with caution. While we must have deficit finance, as I say, we must be cautious and we must also not hesitate to bring in controls wherever necessary. This is a point which needs to be understood and it should be explained to the country that where it is necessary to check prices and the inflationary spiral to the extent possible it will be done and where we cannot check it in that way we shall bring in the controls that are necessary and urgent. I think that the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee's recommendation in this respect should not be ignored and should be taken into account.

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

Before entering into any other point I want to speak on one point, which, I think, affects this House very vitally and that is in regard to an aspect of Budget reform, which is involved in the presentation of the Budget itself. I know that certain concessions have been made to the new modern type of Budget, which is no longer a statement of expenditure and income, but which has to be an instrument for our social motives and our fiscal policies. But I feel that to this new trend not enough concession has been made. It is true that we have now received this economic review and planned economic classification is indeed something that we have. But I do feel that with the Demands for Grants of the Ministries concerned, the explanatory memoranda as well as those sketchy reports are not correlated to the Demands and do not give to this House or the country a proper perspective of achievements against expenditure. Unless we can get the proper picture of achievements of physical targets accomplished against costs, how on earth are we to really exercise our function in this House in a proper manner? "Eternal vigilance is the price of democracy" and it is Members of this House, who have got to exercise that vigilance as representatives of the people. I do hope that at least by next year we shall be given this material, for which the House has made demands time and again, in the past.

This leads me to a very important question and that is the fact that today industrial undertakings in the public sector are expanding—and we want them to expand. We have laid a pattern of the autonomous boards with the purpose that they will be able to get over the difficulties of the administrative machinery and that they will be run on business lines with proper annual budgets and balance sheets of their own. If that is so, I cannot understand that when the Budget is placed before us, why the budgets of these undertakings, which are on an

annual basis, with a proper account of their achievements correlated to that Budget, should not also be placed before this House, so that we can go into the matter in much greater detail. I do not think that what has been placed so far gives us adequate material to understand them.

I want to dwell a little more on the subject of the public undertakings and their management. This House is naturally extremely exercised in its mind over certain recent happenings and there are certain changes indicated in the set-up of these autonomous boards, which should be no longer discussed but which should be implemented. Before I make the suggestions in regard to them I should like to say that the archives of Government are stacked from top to bottom with reports of experts, of committees, of commissions and of what should be done, but somehow while our thinking is on the right lines, in action in some of these matters we seem to be utterly paralysed. For instance, if we want that these boards should be run on lines that are really autonomous and that they are fully liable and responsible so far as the internal working is concerned, then they must not be overshadowed by the Secretariat in the manner that they are. In regard to policy matters they should come directly under the Minister and the Chairman or the Managing Director or Directors of these Boards should have direct dealings. Only in matters which require inter-ministerial policy decisions, should the Minister require other advisers and all directives of policy should be given as written directives.

The Estimates Committee in its Sixteenth Report has given very many valuable suggestions. I do not understand why in spite of this a little more attention is not given to its recommendations. I am glad, however, that one of these recommendations the Government have recently decided to implement, i.e., the setting up of an Industrial Management Cadre, which

is vitally important. So far as the junior ranks of this Cadre are concerned, they can be recruited through the U.P.S.C., but for the senior ranks it will be necessary at the present juncture to draw from the administration those who have the requisite aptitude and also from those who have outside business experience, but only so long as they are not connected or give up any connection that they have with any undertaking in the private sector. In regard to this I would again suggest that those who are drawn from the administrative services should also give up any lien that they have in the higher administrative services. They must not have divided loyalty and must not look for their prospects to the administrative services. If this is to be effected, then their terms, their status, the position of the Industrial Management Cadre, must be on the same lines and on the same level. They must have the same rank as in the higher administrative services. In fact, there should be inducements given for those who carry out a project and finalise it in time and do it well. Some inducement may be given. I feel very strongly that if the nationalised sector is to be a success, if we are to expand in regard to the nationalised industries, then we must have a proper service, who can take charge of it in a proper manner.

I have not much time at my disposal. But there is one important item that I should like to discuss here first. That is in regard to the Finance Commission's recommendations about the State's resources. When the Second Finance Commission's recommendations came out, the Central Government said that it would be treated in the nature of an award and those State Governments which had legitimate grievances accepted it. In fact in this House a categorical statement was made that all the Finance Commission's recommendations including the consolidation of loans to State Governments were accepted. A Press communique came out to this effect and State Governments were informed accordingly. Unfortunately, at a later

stage this was withdrawn and State Governments were informed that they should include the interest on loan in the present Budget as the Government was reviewing the position. This was in connection with a provision which helps the State Governments as such. This naturally leads to a great deal of difficulties for State Governments. So far as West Bengal Government is concerned, it has had to bring a vote on account in the legislature this time to defer the budget as it does not know where it stands. That is not all. If the Central Government feel that they can change it, and do not treat the findings an award then surely the legitimate grievances of the State Governments have also to be considered.

Recently in the West Bengal State legislature, a unanimous demand was put forward by all parties asking for revision of some of the Finance Commission's recommendations. One of these is that so far as the distribution of income-tax is concerned, it has been suggested by the Finance Commission that it should be 90 per cent on the basis of population and only 10 per cent on the basis of collection. This affects the State very adversely as the population basis is on the 1951 census before the refugee influx in the State. It is, therefore, a very paradoxical situation that we face in that State today. People who come from outside to the city of Calcutta say, here are the large number of persons who accumulate wealth; why don't you tax the rich to help the poor? Taxes are levied on the rich, but that State gets little benefit from them and the slumps continue to exist. So, the State Government is blamed by those who do not understand the position. This is the legitimate demand of a State that has been put forward. Moreover, the little relief that the State was going to get by the consolidation of loans is to be denied. I would suggest very humbly that the Centre cannot work in the air and that if you cripple the State Governments through whom the develop-

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

mental plans are to go through, it will not benefit the country as a whole.

This leads me to a very important question and that is the proper utilisation of our resources, in view of the fact that we have to strain every nerve now to obtain them. In regard to the State versus the Centre, we find that the pattern that is being set up now is for the States to receive greater aid from the Centre, its own resources being inadequate. I have no quarrel with this except for the manner in which these resources are doled out.

The Planning Commission lays down certain over-all heads on which the expenditure is allocated. But the central administrative Ministry and the central Finance Ministry are going into every detail of every scheme. Files move to and fro and in the meantime, the work is held up. I think the time has more than come, in view of the stringency we face today, to make over to State Governments the money on those over-all heads and hold them liable and responsible for proper financial scrutiny. In their turn, they should also, when initially the schemes are prepared have proper financial and technical experts to draw up the schemes, so that from the secretariat down to those in charge of Field operations this kind of thing does not go on.

The main point which I have made before and which I reiterate today is that it is the outmoded administrative machinery which stands in our way. In recent years we have discarded certain customs and social laws which like weeds were choking up the lives of our society. I wonder how it is and why it is that in spite of the fact that we have so many real difficulties, we allow a difficulty which is of our own creation to spoil our own schemes and to spoil the work that we are intending to do. I would plead with the Prime Minister who holds the finance portfolio today, on whose efforts we are laying the pattern of the new India that is emerging, that

he should see that procedural and administrative matters which block progress should be done away with.

Today, as I said before, we have to strain every nerve to find the resources and after so doing, we must be able to utilise them to the best advantage. We must be able to utilise them so that poverty, disease, ignorance and their concomitant evils are banished from our land. We are fighting against the wall today and we should do it on a united basis, irrespective of party and factional considerations. We should be able to pool all our resources and we should work in such a way that posterity can indeed say of us that we left behind something worthwhile for them. It is not an easy task and as I said, we are fighting with our back to the wall. I would say that if we can succeed when we fought the battle of freedom against the might of an empire, then surely when we fight to bring economic salvation, we shall not retreat from it in any manner and we shall go forward with courage. But we must pay attention to details, because details are important.

While over-all policies may be right—they are right in most respects—why should we flounder because the details are not right? It is on this aspect that I have laid stress. I do not for a moment mean to say that we have not made great and rapid strides forward in the past few years. We have done so and I think it is all the more to our credit that we have done it in spite of these difficulties. We cannot deny that the efforts that have been put forward and the endeavours that we have made do not give commensurate results and that is where I would like to point out with all respect that we must make some changes and if we do so, no matter what our difficulties, we shall be able to override them and go ahead.

With these words, I support the budget.

Mr. Speaker: So far as this matter is concerned, as before, 20 hours have been allotted for the general discussion on the General Budget. I am allotting sufficient time—40 per cent—to the Opposition. First of all, I will give an opportunity to the spokesmen from each party of the opposition before I call upon to give a second chance to members of the same party.

Shrimati Bena Chakravarty (Basirhat): Does it mean that the smallest party also will be given a second chance, a third chance and so on and the bigger parties will have to wait for their second chance till all the other parties have had their second chance?

Mr. Speaker: The smallest party also will not be ignored. The smallest party will have one chance at least, but in respect of the balance, it will be distributed over the major parties and the smallest party would not have a second turn.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): If all the names and the time when they will be called are announced in advance, it will be better.

Mr. Speaker: If all the names and the time are announced, there will be no quorum in the House. Hon. Members must be here to hear other hon. Members and reply when they get their turn. Shri Khadilkar.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Before I turn to examine the budget proposals as they have been put forward before the House, I would like to make a few observations regarding the manner of presentation of the budget itself. We have before us the speech of the hon. Finance Minister. We have the economic review for 1957-58 and only yesterday we have received an economic classification of the budget. These papers, so far as information is concerned, are to some extent quite adequate. But what is wanted to determine a certain attitude to the Budget proposals is an overall picture of the economy and it is with that background that the Budget has to be presented.

13 hrs.

Unfortunately this conventional method is still adhered to. In Western countries like Britain since the war they present their budget with the full economic background, or full review of the whole situation and its appreciation, how the economy is working and in what trend or direction it is moving. The same case we find in the United States of America. There the Economic Council every six months gives a review and the representatives of the people are in a better position to judge the situation. Particularly at this period of our economic development this House must be taken into full confidence and the whole picture of the economy in relation to its working must be given to the House in such a manner that it will be easily appreciated. There is information, but there is no appreciation. There are statistics, but what is wanted is an expert analysis which is completely lacking in these papers. Therefore there is confusion, divided counsels, uncoordinated efforts, a situation in which nobody is likely to be held responsible for any act or any particular decision.

This is what has happened. The Asoka Mehta Committee points out very clearly this lacuna. In its Report the Committee said that they did not know who exactly were the final deciding authorities; the Ministry was deciding in one way, but the decision taken was something else. This is a very important matter which we have got to consider. This is not a technical aspect. Because if at all the plan in the present phase of it and the most critical phase of it is to succeed, certain prerequisites are necessary.

The Budget provides an occasion to the Government to put forward proposals of taxation and expenditure, so as to direct and regulate the economy and how Government is going to do that in a particular context is not clear from this Budget. When I say this is not a technical or conventional

[Shri Khadilkar]

matter, I want to emphasise this. We have not before us, as the hon. lady Member suggested casually, a review of the State budgets. Without a correct appreciation of the State budgets, we cannot pass a judgment on our efforts, in what direction we are moving. We have not been provided with the background of the State budgets.

As I suggested last year, in a developing economy, supposed to be building the initial stages of a welfare state leading to a socialist pattern of society, the most important thing is employment position. But in this budget the important missing point or loophole is the employment position. There is nowhere in the budget papers any mention of the employment position. We know what the tax-payer will have to pay. But what is the net result? That is not to be seen anywhere.

What is quite clear is that Government is trying in a *post facto* manner to rationalise without admitting mistakes and many mistakes are committed because *ad hoc* decisions are taken and nobody is held responsible. This is the present position. I shall point out a few instances. But before that I would like to touch on some other point.

We are preaching to the world, particularly to the Big Powers at large, that they should live at peace, and follow the doctrine of co-existence and *Panch Sheel*. But what do we find at home? Since the last Budget when certain efforts were made to raise internal resources, the vested interests, or a section of it at least, has taken an attitude of hostility. The atmosphere of an economic cold war has been generated in the country. After having succeeded in driving out—whatever the reasons I am not going into them—the Finance Minister, they are now bold enough to say: look here, these are the demands. The charter of the seven demands we are presenting in this capital metropolitan

city. There is a big gathering of industrial magnates going on and Mr. Birla says: we have fulfilled, or over-fulfilled our Plan. At the same time, while over-fulfilling the Plan they are talking of incentives. They say that the new taxation proposals must be withdrawn, must be whittled down. They want a categorical assurance from the Government here and now.

This is the position. What is the attitude that we are going to take? Today we find that our people are appreciating what little efforts are being made to improve their living conditions whatever the result. They are not out to fight out. There is no hot atmosphere on the side of the people, but the declaration of war on the people from the side of the vested interests is going on in a big gathering which is being held in this city.

This sort of conflict was foreseen by our former Finance Minister, Shri C. D. Deshmukh. I would like to quote from his Economic Review to show what suitable measures should be taken to fight the present campaign that is being launched in the Press and on the platform by the magnates of Indian industry. But before I turn to that quotation I would like to relate to this House a funny story.

The other day in a private gathering a great industrial magnate who has reached the mature age of eighty was celebrating his birth-day and a choice gathering was present. Some people, nearing 90, still more mature were invited and a couple of them were helped to the table, because, naturally, due to their age they could not go and reach it. In that celebration a gentleman, an industrial magnate, a close relation of the community, the industrial community, said: this Nehru (I am quoting him) is ruining the country and ruining our future.

Mr. Speaker: Whose future?

Shri Khadilkar: The future of the old man, aged 86.

Now these remarks are very significant and I am confident this House will rise to the occasion to take care of their future. He was so much worried at the age of 86. Let him hold his soul in peace and we will assure him that we will look after his legacies and other things.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): The estate duty.

Shri Khadilkar: About the estate duty a former Finance Minister has mentioned. I am very glad that the hon. Member has mentioned it. But I would like to know whether it is not a fact that people belonging to his party to escape the death duty and to keep their wealth safe have not followed dubious methods. They have deprived the exchequer to the last farthing. I do not want to mention it. You must search your own heart and find out; search your own party.

Therefore, I want to suggest as Shri C. D. Deshmukh has said.....

Shri M. P. Mishra (Begusarai): Will you please mention the gentlemen who are evading estate duty?

Shri Khadilkar: They are well-known figures. Let them rest in peace in Heaven.

Shri M. P. Mishra: Who are they?

Shri Tyagi: Every one who evades death!

Shri Khadilkar: I am prepared to give the names in private.

Shri M. P. Mishra: Please give them here.

Shri Khadilkar: I do not want to give them here; it is below dignity.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Whenever such questions as who are those persons who evade income-tax and so on are put, it will be said by Government that it will not be right. 'After all, it is desirable not to humiliate a person; only money must be taken away.' So, why should an hon. Member here provoke Shri Khadilkar and

ask him to say who they are. It may be true; it may not be true. To the best of his information, it is true. I do not discredit any hon. Member of this House. His information is always correct. But, of course, it may be from a wrong impression also. The hon. Member promises to give the information privately.

Shri Tyagi: Why should he bring in the party? I want to know that.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: What has that to do with the party? (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: I would like hon. Members not to refer to parties. After all, there are good men and bad men in every community, or fold. You do not call thieves as belonging to any party. Therefore, individuals shall not be referred to as members of a particular party. It is not the policy of the party. If any party is based upon thieving or dishonest practices, by all means, such party ought not to be allowed in this House and reference can be made. But, there are many things to speak about policy, programme etc, instead of going to individuals. Nobody can guarantee—God Himself has not guaranteed—truth or honesty on the part of the children whom he has brought into existence.

Shri Khadilkar: If the prevailing atmosphere of hostility of the private sector to the public sector is not given up, a time would come to give a clearer definition and statement of preferences. This situation was, probably, foreseen by Shri C. D. Deshmukh, our ex-Finance Minister, in his review of economic development in India. He has clearly stated that perhaps necessity would soon arise to define the texture of our mixed economy. He clearly stated:

"For one does not really understand whether the mixed economy—with delimited but definite room for expansion given to organised private enterprise and self-employed persons—is accepted as an inherently desirable and

[Shri Khadilkar]

good thing or whether it is the only feasible thing at the present stage of our economic development. Perhaps, the present choice of continuing with mixed economy may be merely for pragmatic reasons or perhaps a mixed economy is inherently better than a single pattern economy. In any case, this matter should be brought into the focus of clearer discussion."

As I said earlier, the time has come. This matter should be very thoroughly discussed, looking to the attitude adopted by the private enterprise people, the attitude of open hostility.

What is their record? Let us try to examine. Who created this foreign exchange crisis, do you know? Of course, Government was a party to it. But, as Shri G. D. Birla is boasting now, in two years' time, they have over-fulfilled their task. But, at whose cost? At the cost of the national enterprise because what was allocated to them in foreign exchange for the Five Year Plan was swallowed up during 1½ years.

An Hon. Member: Whom do you like?

Shri Khadilkar: This is the position; and licences were issued at random. We laugh at Pakistan. But, we should also take lessons sometimes from Pakistan. In such a situation, what did Pakistan do? They declared all licences suspended and the licences were recalled. A further examination was made. Was anything like that done in this country by the present Government? On the contrary, as I said, after a particular situation, a certain rationalised explanation is given and they feel that their task is finished.

13.17 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Recently, the Reserve Bank of India made two surveys. About 500 and odd limited concerns were put

under review. And, what does that review indicate? That review clearly indicates that even after last year's tax proposals, all these private limited concerns under review made profits. Not only that; by ploughing back the profits, they have expanded. With all these things, the opposition of the private sector is there, it is out to declare a war on nationalisation, on public enterprise and the expansion of social services—on whatever little we are doing in that way. Fortunately, by his statement, Shri C. D. Deshmukh has, as I said, forewarned us. It is for the Government now to take a firm stand. Instead of surrendering, take a stand on which people will honour you. You will not be accused, that there was an opportunity given to the present Government after the recent election to implement their pledge and they failed. History will write that judgment if you take a half-hearted, surrendering and appeasing attitude towards the vested interests. (Interruption).

Then, the other factor is there. We have to face a situation regarding resources. I want to mention, first of all, our Defence expenditure. Of course, along with Defence, if we analyse the State Budgets, we will find that since independence, every year, the law and order expenditure is going up. From the Budget, what do we find? We started with the Five Year Plans after 1950. From the beginning of the Plan, I am taking the Budget figures.

In 1952-53, our Defence expenditure was Rs. 179.52 crores. And today, it has just risen by Rs. 100 crores. In 1952-53, the period of transition was over. We were thinking of national development. There was peace at home. And, now, fortunately for us, in the international field, our leadership has succeeded beyond measure. There is good will all round; friendship all over the world. India has acquired a prestige of its own in the

World Councils. Only the small question of our relationship with Pakistan, particularly the present Government of Pakistan, is worrying us. I do realise it. But that Government of Pakistan is not prepared to face its own people. They have faced no election during the last 10 years.

Without the sanction of the people, can you imagine that Pakistan can do any harm to our country whether it is with regard to Kashmir or other minor matters like the canal water dispute and other things and then imagine that this hundred crores addition of defence expenditure is justified? When we are short of resources, is it not our duty to economise from wherever we can and find out the resources to help the economy in the present critical stage. A time has come when India is asking the big powers to give up ballistic missiles and atomic tests and other things and she should, instead of getting weapons which would be outmoded next year, create an industrial base in this country which would be the real bastion of our freedom and the real defender of the people's freedom in this country. Nobody would be there to attack us. Therefore, at this critical hour, I submit that the defence expenditure is quite unjustified; it should be curtailed. We should not be taken in by fear complex. We should treat our neighbour as a good neighbour. Today or tomorrow, Pakistan Government will come round. It is a sort of a mental patient given to fits of violence. We must treat the Pakistan Government in this way, in a brotherly way. That is my submission.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think he was ending with this submission.

Shri Khadilkar: About our resources, I have just said that we can get some money if we curtail defence expenditure. But in a backward country like ours planning without definitely first procuring a certain amount of surplus in agriculture products is not possible. It is the basis of our Plan. On that we can raise the super-

structure. What have we done? We may look at the tenancy legislation, the food prices and the results of the last season. We find a state of anarchy. Can you imagine that anyone who is serious about the planning effort will take our country seriously when he finds that in a year or so, the variation in the food prices is between 87 and 112 points. They would laugh you out.

Who is to blame? We had sent two delegations to China. Have we learnt anything from them? It was recommended that we must definitely adopt a certain policy by which the primary producer, the agriculturist would be assured of a certain minimum price. People talk of inflation. I would like to state very clearly that inflation in small doses like medicine—there are some doctors here—under proper supervision and watch is a healthy tonic to a backward economy. It must be clearly understood. But at the same time, we will have to take care that inflationary pressure does not stifle the growth or the life of the common man, either the peasantry or the working class or the middle class. A certain insulated field of economy where this inflationary pressure will not be felt has got to be created. Unfortunately, the Congress Party has a certain amount of allergy for price-control and is brought up on the market economy and stock exchange atmosphere. That is the main crux of the situation. So, in the agricultural field, there is absolute anarchy. Social relations are disturbed but new relations are not established. Food is the main problem and for the last ten years we are wasting about 100 crores annually in the import of food. Can we make any progress in this manner?

Of course, I do realise sometimes when there is imbalance between the demand and the supply, it is unevenly expressed. What do we find? In textile today the situation is rather very critical. About 15 or 20 mills have closed and 25,000 workers have been

[Shri Khadilkar]

thrown out of employment. The stocks, I am told, are rising. On this policy of excise levy, one great authority on excise taxation has said....

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid I have got the limitation of time while the resourcefulness of the hon. Member is unlimited.

Shri Khadilkar: I am the first speaker from my group.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not mind if he takes more time but the other Members of his group would be deprived of their time.

Shri Khadilkar: Sir, I will finish soon. I would like to quote this authority because we are raising a good deal of finance this way. He is a recognised authority—Dr. A Smith. He says:

“Excise taxation should touch production as little as possible and should not stifle industry.”

while trying to raise revenue, we must take that factor into consideration. In the new proposals, Government is out to tax the powerloom industry.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): With 100 looms.

Shri Khadilkar: I know. But even below 100 looms there is a compound rise in duty. I know that. Is it advantageous? Is it the economic pattern of industry that we want to develop in this country? Let me ask you this question? The powerloom industry is situated away from the main centres of textile industry, in the interior. There it provides small employment to people round about. If this imposition is not modified, I am afraid powerloom industry will be wiped out.

There is another factor also. The textile industry is the biggest monopoly in the private enterprise. We have discovered these things after the

closure of twenty mills or so. They are laughing because in the public enterprise some things happen, something goes wrong, and they come to light. But why have all these 20 mills been closed? Because of mis-management. There were Mfndhras everywhere, trying to operate on the market at the cost of the mill. So, I would like the Government to appoint a committee to go into the question of textile industry and find out whether the management is done in the interest of producer or consumer or the nation as a whole. This aspect has assumed a special significance at the present critical juncture.

If we look at the Plan, we know that we are entirely dependent on foreign resources that we are going to get, small savings and whatever we can raise in the money market. So far as the international situation is concerned, yesterday Comrade Dange referred to one aspect. But there is another aspect equally important. We shall be getting less from our export in the international situation today. The raw material producing underdeveloped and backward countries are at a disadvantage. The prices of their produce are going down compared to the prices of finished capital goods. There are signs of recession but I am not sure because the advanced capitalist world has discovered so many devices to avert the crisis. Therefore, we will be paying much more to the finished products and get less for whatever we export.

How to face this situation? In this country export-import monopoly is exercised by a small group of people. My suggestion is that unless Government at this critical stage is prepared to take over completely the export and import trade and manoeuvre in such a way that in the international market, which has become now a buyer's market, a depressed market, our products will stand competition and get the proper price, the position will not

improve. The time has come for taking such a step. If you leave it to the private hands as it is being done now, things will not improve.

I will give you a small instance to show how the import-export policy is now managed. You know there are small pharmaceutical firms. They have their association. They approached the Ministry. They said that they need very little foreign exchange and they will earn something for some basic products and certain other things. The Commerce and Industry Ministry replied that the firms concerned cannot import aspirin and other things on their own, they will have to go through the traditional channels of importers. By that method the price of these drugs is being increased by 100 per cent. This is supposed to be the implementation of a socialistic pattern of society, Plan and what not.

These are the instances. With all these dismal pictures I would not for a moment say, as Shri Masani said yesterday, that let us go back. Going back is not possible. He glorified backwardness. I was surprised that a man who wrote almost a classical book *Our India* should now come forward and plead that there are dangers and, therefore, the Indian society must remain an agricultural society, manufacture fertilisers, water our crops and import whatever we like from other countries. This was the plea made. It is most unfortunate. It is not possible. People are looking at it from a different angle.

You are not translating the Plan into action. You write blue books, but the people understand them differently. The other day there was a small ceremony near Koyana project. We found that illiterate peasants in thousands gathered there. Why? They feel that along with water a certain power basis is essential for transforming society as Lenin said. They came with all enthusiasm. They saw that something new is being created.

He, my friend Shri Masani, was saying, "go to the people and the people will vote down the Plan". I will give him a challenge, I will give a challenge to any industrialist. Let us go to the people. We will go along with him and explain that these are the things, because there was a social urge in our national struggle. At the background of our national struggle there was a powerful urge for social change, social transformation, better life and better social freedom. Shri Masani and his friend have forgotten that social urge for freedom and that is why they are propagating this. If a small house is built, if a small school is set up or a small road is constructed—we know that there is lot of corruption—but people appreciate it. For matching grant they collect funds from house to house. This is my experience.

Therefore, if the Congress Party, voted to power, takes an attitude of half-heartedness, shows certain weakness, the masses will never forgive them. Those who have voted you to power have given you the mandate, and you should not forget that.

Shri C. D. Pande: You will have your chance.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, in the end, I would like to just say that along with the economic aspect there to a political aspect in the whole struggle.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member intend to draw more time from this quota of his party?

Shri Khadilkar: I will finish in a minute, Sir. At the present juncture, so far as the structure of the Plan is concerned there is almost unanimity. You must try to mobilise public opinion and, particularly, when Pandit Nehru, a man of his stature and prestige, is at the helm of affairs, if he mistakes country for the party that would be most unfortunate. Sometimes I feel he is mistaking that way. But, if he invites co-operation from

[Shri Khadilkar]

all elements I am confident that with all the difficulties in this particular period we can mobilise all our resources, raise further resources and fulfil the Plan as people expect it, and take the country to a higher level of production and industrialisation and create a basis for further socialistic construction.

Shri C. D. Fande: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is rather embarrassing for me to make certain critical observations on the present Budget, particularly when it has got the distinction of being presented to the House by the Prime Minister himself, but I shall be failing in my duty if I do not point out certain salient defects or shortcomings in the Budget.

I am rather constrained to say that the *Economic Survey* that has been supplied to this House is a very nicely written document, but it is a document which is rather depressing when we realise the implications of the development. The whole book is replete with theme that within last year, that is the year under review, there has been a depression, that we have come to a stationary point where progress and production has come to a stalemate. In cotton goods, in paper and in sugar we have now come to a stalemate. We were expecting that by this time cotton goods would have gone to almost 6,000 million yards, but they are stationary at 4,400 million yards. So is the case with many things. The food production is at a lower level than we expected it to be, or at least it is not keeping pace with the rise in population.

With such a tale, can we believe that we are on the threshold of an era which was promised to be ushered in by fulfilment of the Plan? We are also in the third year of the Second Plan. The results should have been there. We should be expecting that we are nearer the targets we have fixed for our consumer goods. After all, if within the Plan period we make certain river valley projects or establish a few steel plants that is not

enough. The river valley projects or steel plants are only a means to an end; they are not the end in themselves. What is most essential is that the production of wealth should increase. That alone will bring prosperity. I am afraid we are not nearer the target of prosperity.

Then, I have a special grievance about the manner of making the Budget. Year after year we in this House complain that the Budget is not what it should be. It should be a correct statement, as far as possible, of the estimated expenditure that is likely to occur and also, as far as possible a correct estimate of the income. For the last two or three years we have been observing that these principles are not adhered to. In one year there is a deficit of Rs. 32 crores and ultimately by working the whole year the deficit turns into a surplus. Occasionally we find that a surplus almost turns into a deficit. Therefore, we cannot rely on these figures. That makes a great deal of difference as far as taxation is concerned. There have been many occasions when a deficit budget has been presented and taxes have been voted upon. Later on we have found that those taxes were not called for and there was surplus even without those taxes being taken into account.

Thus, the same is the story with planning. The efficacy of planning lies in precise and pre-arranged scheme of things. Is it happening like that? No. Anybody who has got vast resources of the country at his disposal can do something and the Plan could be successful, but when we think that a steel plant which is estimated to cost Rs. 100 crores originally, would cost Rs. 170 crores when it is now nearing completion—we expect it to cost Rs. 170 crores—what is the position? Does it lie in the mouth of the planners that we did not foresee these things—that every project that we make and which is estimated to cost Rs. 100 crores ultimately would land itself into Rs. 150 crores or more?

The Bhakra-Nangal project was estimated to cost Rs. 90 crores. Now, today, the figure is almost Rs. 180 crores. So is the case with Bhilai; so is the case with Durgapur and so is the case with Rourkela. There are many other instances where the plan figures, as they were given originally and on which we based all the calculations, are belied and what is the picture that we find today? There is shortage of exchange. Can the Government disown the responsibility of at least can the planners say that they did not realise that after issuing so many permits for import there will be no shortage of exchange?

This is the defect in planning that I refer to. At the time of making suggestions, these points will be taken up by me later on. Today I am mostly concerned with what relief we are expecting from the budget. The least that we expected was that in the lower exemption limit of income-tax there would be certain consideration given. Last year, this House made a strong plea to raise the exemption limit from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 3,600 if not to Rs. 4,200 as it existed earlier. I feel that the adherence to that reduced exemption limit is a very hard blow to the low-paid servants of Government whose income is only Rs. 250 a month.

Recently, Government appointed a committee to look into the pay and allowances of the personnel of Government, and they came to the conclusion that those who are getting Rs. 250 a month deserve an allowance of Rs. 5 a month to compensate the hardship that is being caused to them. Do you think that those who are so poor, who need a compensation of Rs. 5 a month, ought to be taxed? I am told that certain members of the Government have strong views on this point. They feel that everybody should be aware of the Plan. It is said that there should be an awareness of the Plan so that even the poorest men in the land should have a feeling that they are contributing towards the success of the Plan. Have I to tell this House that every

man in this land is fully aware of the sacrifice that he is making for the Plan?

In the form of excise duty we are realising almost Rs. 300 crores or Rs. 280 crores. Do you think that a man, or whosoever, sips a cup of tea coffee is paying for the Plan? Do you want that he should be made aware of the Plan? He is fully aware of the Plan and its cost. Therefore, to tax these people whose income is Rs. 250 a month is not proper. I strongly plead that the exemption limit should be raised to Rs. 4,200 because this is the limit where it should properly start. Otherwise, if this lower limit is taken into consideration, then we have to make assessments on two lakhs of people. These two lakhs of people will contribute at the most Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 crores. If we do not look into their accounts, if those assesseees are not in the dossiers, then, it is likely that we might get more income-tax from those persons whose incomes are higher and whose cases are not looked into so properly and carefully. There are a large number of cases.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):
You were getting from them formerly.

Shri C. D. Pande: We want more from them. It is said that the rate of exemption in England is lower. But we know that and we know also that in England things are quite different. As soon as a boy is grown up, a girl is grown up, they become paying guests in their own parent's house. Do you think that in this country, where there are so many dependants, where a daughter has to be married, where the son's education has to be looked after and his family has to be maintained even after he has grown up, such a plea that because in England it is £200 here also it should be £200 or its equivalent is feasible? It is not feasible. In England there are social amenities. There are good means of transport. There is old age pension. There are many things for which people do not care. There is free medical treatment and aid. In the

[Shri C. D. Pande]

absence of these things here, is it possible that we should look to that which is done in England or any other country in the world? Therefore, I plead that the exemption limit should be raised to Rs. 4,200. The Government will not lose and will earn the gratitude of the very low-paid people of this land.

Then there is the question of wastage in the whole Plan expenditure of Government. Last year again this House made a strong plea for doing away with wastage and effect economies in the expenditure. I am sorry that no heed was paid to those suggestions.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It is never paid.

Shri C. D. Pande: On the contrary, the whole thing goes on as merrily as it was before. Instead of spending the same amount on services, we are spending Rs. 100 crores more this year than during last year. We cannot blame this country. The country is generous. We have given the Government Rs. 800 crores this year. I think to expect Rs. 800 crores from this country is a great thing and no blame can be laid at the door of the people that they are not good paymasters. They are paying well. Even the poorest people are contributing for the fulfilment of the Plan. But it is the duty of the Government to see that the money realised should be well spent. I doubt if anybody in this House will believe that there is no possibility of making at least five per cent of all-round saving on expenditure that we are making. We are spending Rs. 800 crores at the Central level. We will be spending almost Rs. 1,000 crores in the railways and we will be spending nearly the same amount in the State Government

sphere, and we will have almost Rs. 500 crores or Rs. 600 crores of capital expenditure in the shape of Plan projects. Then, with all this expenditure added, if an effort is made to reduce the expenditure even by two or three or four per cent, I think there will be enough margin for deduction. Would there be any difficulty in saving at least Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 70 crores? Rs. 70 crores is not a joke, and considering the amount of expenditure that they are incurring, this is not difficult, and there is no difficulty in effecting such an economy.

I personally plead that many things which are called frills of the Plan should be discontinued. I am not in favour of curtailing the Plan at all. In fact, the Plan is not ambitious. The Plan should be increased, and there is the possibility of increasing it. But the frills and the wastage and the un-economic way of doing things should be done away with. There are so many publications. I referred to this last year also. There are about 20 to 30 publications which are issued by this Government. They are very nice to see; their get-up is wonderful; but there is nothing to read inside. Therefore, you can do away with at least 50 per cent of the publications. I am sure you will be saving Rs. 50 lakhs a year this way. This is one thing.

There are conferences; there are symposiums; there are seminars, everywhere, at every level. This Plan has given us a new word—the "level". There is the Minister's level, the Secretary's level, the Deputy Secretary's level, etc. There are all-India seminars. People are moving from one place to another. People are so busy in travelling and making travelling allowance bills. So, is it not possible that there should be some reduction? I do not mean that this is the whole thing and that the Plan will be successful only because travelling could be curtailed. No. But this is what the

people object to. When the people see that they contribute Rs. 800 crores from their meagre incomes, then they have the right to ask and see that Rs. 800 crores, when they are entrusted to Government, should be well spent. People have got a keen eye. They see whether money is correctly spent. They have the eye to detect it. We may not know it. Therefore, the amount of Rs. 70 crores to Rs. 80 crores that is not well-spent may be negligible, but the amount of ill-will that we get from the public and the ridicule that we get from the public is enormous. The economy has got two aspects. One is to restore good-will and confidence in the public mind and the second is that we should save that amount and spend it for essential things; the frills should be done away with.

Then, it is not enough that the budget is not imposing new duties or levies this year. This is not a matter of jubilation. There are many omissions which we have not cared to look into. The first thing that comes to my mind is unemployment. What is the policy of the Government in regard to employment or unemployment in this country? This is a serious question. There are a large number of educated unemployed persons, who are moving from place to place with a bundle of applications in their pockets, trying to get the signatures of Members of Parliament as if that signature might bring them a job.

I may tell you that they are disappointed, and disappointment is a very pernicious psychosis that has been caused in the minds of the younger generation. Now there is cynicism and there is frustration. So they feel and they say: this is the age of approach, this is age of push; without push you cannot go anywhere. This is the most dangerous psychology that we are developing in the country, because we cannot give employment to our younger generation, those who are educated, those who have a right to be employed some-

where, because ours is a welfare State.

No mention has been made about it in the budget. It was not mentioned last year also, as if the problem does not exist at all. Unemployment is a major question in this country, and the Government should give more attention to it. After all, the steel plants can come into existence if you spent Rs. 200 crores. Anybody can make a steel plant. Of course, we are proud that this country has got four steel plants at a time, and we are undertaking many projects. The achievements are there. There is a big list of those achievements; we are not oblivious of that. But we have the right, at the same time, to know what is being done and say what is not being done. It appears to us that nothing is being done for the educated unemployed in this country.

Secondly, what are you doing in the matter of housing? In this country, next to employment the important problem is the question of housing. In every State in this country people are clamouring for houses. The greatest trouble to the middle class people is the problem of housing. It is possible to get a job in Delhi; but it is not possible to get a house in Delhi. It is the same in places like Lucknow and Bareilly and a small place like Haldwani.

Then, whatever may be the cost, the private sector has ceased to build houses, because it does not bring any returns, because people have lost faith in the future of properties. Therefore, except in Delhi where the rents are still very high, no houses are being built by the private sector for the purpose of earning rents. That class of rent-earning people has gone. Then, Government also is not coming forward to build houses in that number as required by the people.

So, there must be some serious effort on the part of somebody. Either the State must construct houses, or the

[Shri C. D. Pande.]

laws should be so changed that there will be some incentive for the people to build houses; at least one house for himself. For those who want to construct houses proper facilities must be given. Otherwise, a time will come when you will not be able to get any house, as the rents are steadily rising. Even if one per cent of the people from the rural areas migrate to the cities, then there will be about 30 lakhs of people every year moving from the rural areas to the urban areas. There may be employment, but there are no houses for them. Therefore, the utmost importance should be given to the problem of housing also.

Then, there is a slight change in the estate duty. Those of us who were in the Select Committee on the Estate Duty Bill were told then that because of the lower limit being raised from Rs. 50,000/- to Rs. 1,00,000/, therefore, many things should not be included there. There was a sort of bargain, a sort of compromise, that Rs. 1,00,000 will cover all sorts of difficulties that people will face. Rs. 1 lakh may sound very big, but when you see a house you will find that even a small house will bring Rs. 1 lakh or Rs. 50,000/- or Rs. 80,000/-. Now the lower limit has been lowered to Rs. 50,000/-. Therefore, through this financial measure the limit has been brought down to Rs. 50,000/-.

When the main Bill was brought forward, we discussed it for six months, there was a Select Committee where also we discussed it, and the limit was raised from Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1 lakh. Now, all on a sudden, by one stroke of the pen, the Government brings forward a legislation and reduces it to Rs. 50,000. And what for? What is the result? The lowering of the limit is likely to cause great hardship to a large number of people who are now gleeful. When a man is having one house, he may be earning perhaps Rs. 100 a month. He may have no income whatsoever except the rent. His successors are asked to pay

death duty or estate duty at the time of his death.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: How can he own a house, if he is getting only Rs. 100 a month?

Shri C. D. Pande: He will have no income whatsoever. I ask Mr. Braj Raj Singh whether he does not know cases of people who own one house and have no other income whatsoever. There are a large number of such cases. There are many shareholders who have no other income whatsoever.

By reducing the limit to Rs. 50,000/- you bring the taxation limit to a place where large number of people are involved. It is not proper that for the sake of Rs. 50 lakhs you should involve at least 10,000 to 15,000 men every year in that taxation. After all, how much are you going to get? Only Rs. 50 lakhs. And that also you have to distribute to 14 States in this country. As the estate duty is distributed among the States, this Rs. 50 lakhs will have to be distributed among the 14 States in this country. For that, to annoy so many people is not a good policy. Therefore, I strongly plead that this limit should be retained at Rs. 1 lakh, because after great consideration, the Parliament and the Select Committee and the leaders of Government at that time agreed that Rs. 1 lakh should be the minimum. So, that minimum sum should not be reduced so lightly.

About the gift tax, I have nothing to say. It came through the supplementary demand. It should have been there even earlier. But there are certain anomalies which are not understandable. In my opinion there should be no tax on gifts, provided they are not given to such persons who are likely to inherit the wealth. No person should be permitted to give gift to a person on whom the property will devolve later. There should be even higher tax on such gifts; e.g. gifts to one's own wife. Then, this limit of

Rs. 1 lakh is rather ridiculous. Because, you provided for scholarships to sons and nephews and all that. Then, in the case of wife, you provide Rs. 1 lakh. This is not sound. It is not scientific. It is neither expedient nor desirable.

If wife is not a shareholder in the property, then Rs. 1 lakh is not so much. But, according to the law, wife is a shareholder in the property. Therefore, she shares the wealth with her husband with equal right. Therefore, there should be no special protection for the wife. But there should be no restriction on such gifts which are given to non-inheritors and those persons who are poor. A gift from a rich man to a rich man should be prohibited or should be taxed heavily. A gift from a rich man to his own son or nephew or to one who is likely to get some inheritance from his own wealth should be taxed, because otherwise this will be taken as a device to evade the tax. But if the rich man wants to give a gift to a person who is very poor, then there should be no gift tax whatsoever on that amount. Therefore, I submit that some consideration should be given to this aspect of estate duty. There should be no gift tax on such persons who are poor and who have no beneficial interest in the property of the person who makes the gift.

There should be more attention on housing, more attention on the unemployment question and there should be greater economy in expenditure as a whole.

14 hrs.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have not the least doubt in my mind that there is a full awareness and even a realisation of the stern realities of the situation and the difficulties which face us in the development of our economy. I think, it is in realisation of this situation and these difficulties that heavy taxations were imposed last year. It is in realisation of the

situation that they have considered it expedient to retain these taxes as they were. There can be no denying the fact that heavy impositions were made both on the rich and the poor. During the course of the year, we have been able to see that the burden of the heavy taxations has been felt very much both by the poor as well as the rich.

The poor people have, of course, paid the taxes because they are realised in a manner where there is very little avoidance. The realisations from the Excise duty have gone up and will go up. The rich, of course, have been complaining, all the time. What we find is, we get from them most of the complaints and avoidance and evasion. Realisation from Income tax almost lingers where it was. May be, we may get a little more this year. But, even last year, we supported these taxations because we felt that the plan and programme as it stood before the country deserves the fullest support even at the cost of such a burden and inconvenience.

I have not the least doubt in my mind that even today the Plan and the programme before us is essentially sound. It is not only my opinion. That the Plan and programme is sound has been testified by all the various sections of opinion inside the country as well as outside the country. Whatever criticism may have been offered, there is an unmistakable and shutting answer to all that the criticisms and that answer is provided by one fact. That fact is the creditworthiness of India. It is not that we have bungled matters. It is not that our Plan and programme has been planned in thin air. It bears relation to the realities of life; it bears relation to the aspirations of the people; it bears relation to our future development. This is reflected in the support which it has received from all over the world.

It is not that the Dollar has thought it fit to smile on India. I can understand the criticism of the hon. Member, the Leader of the Communist

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Party. The only explanation for all that he said could be that he is allergic to the dollar. There is no other explanation, but his allergy. Because, it is not only the United States which has supported our Plan and programme. Canada supports it. Britain supports it; Germany supports it. More than that, the U.S.S.R. supports it; Poland supports it. All of them have tried to understand our Plan and programme and our aspirations and they have been satisfied with the soundness of these schemes and the Plan. They have felt themselves inspired and they have considered it in the best interests not only of this country, but of general development and they have rendered all assistance. We are grateful to all those countries.

May be there is recession in the U.S.A. We are not very much concerned with that. That country, I think, is big enough and strong enough to look after itself. But, it would be uncharitable to say that aid and assistance to this country has come only because of the recession. I have strong reasons to feel that there is a better realisation and appreciation of the economic policy of this country—not only of the economic policy of this country, but also of the foreign policy of this country. It is not only the economic policy which is reflected in the changed attitude from all over the world. There can be no better and sounder test of it. You read the speeches of the Prime Minister of the U.K.; you read the speeches of the various leaders, including Mr. Nixon in the U.S.A.; you refer to the speeches of leading persons in Germany, Poland and U.S.S.R. We had recently a delegation. They have all seen with their own eyes things here. There is a proper realisation of our foreign policy as well as our economic and development policy and that is why we are receiving all this support.

While I say that our Plan and programme is sound, I have also no doubt

in my mind that the implementation of the plan and programme is woefully bad. I have my grievances there. I will not labour this point very much. I will give you one or two concrete examples. At the present moment, there is nothing which concerns us more than the food situation. We all feel very much concerned about it. We all want that there should be a concerted effort in this sector. The hon. Minister for Food and Agriculture has been clamouring for more funds. The Prime Minister saw it from the very beginning and he made pointed reference to it that our target so far as production of food is concerned, must be much higher. When he asked for a higher target, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture started asking for more funds. May be quite reasonable, though I do not think personally that all that could be done is being done here. With this sense of urgency so far as food is concerned, there is shortfall in all the States put together, particularly in the agricultural sector. Not that we could have consumed additional funds for which there was such a clamouring demand. We have not been able to utilise even the funds which were placed at the disposal of the various States and the Centre. There is a huge shortfall. The other day, I asked a question on this point. The Deputy Minister for Planning made it obviously clear that there was a huge shortfall in the agricultural sector. This clearly indicates that even where the urgency is the utmost, we have not felt a sense of responsibility and there are so many administrative lapses and failures which are retarding the implementation of the Plan. I think Government has got to pay proper attention to this matter.

In this Plan, I have not been able to appreciate one thing. While we talk all the time about agricultural and rural sector, why is it that so little has been done? On the Community projects—the report is before us—we see that we have been able to do very little. Then comes small-

scale industries. I think the shortfall is the greatest in the small-scale industries. I have just now mentioned the food front. I think it is only with agriculture and small-scale industries that the entire rural area is concerned. Even this time, the hon. Leader of the Communist Party had his dig against the Ambar Charka. If I remember correctly, last time, the only cut which he mentioned and the field in which he wanted big economy was in respect of community projects and rural electrification. He thought a big saving could be made if we defer spending on the community projects and on rural electrification; and this time he had his dig at the Ambar Charkha. I think if practical and proper attention is not paid to the rural areas, a great imbalance will be created. We have seen the effect of such imbalance in many other countries. It is these people who are paying through their nose, it is these people who are contributing heavily to the Plan, and it is these people who are being ignored the most. The peasantry does continue to be the backbone and the strength of our country, of the economy of our country, and it will continue to be so, there is no doubt about it. And it is again in this sector that very little is being done, it is again in this sector that the leader of the Communist Party suggests big cuts. If it is done, it will completely dislocate the economy of this country.

I will next pass on to the industrial sector. So much has been said about the public and the private sectors. We all have our minds very clear about it. The Government of India has very clearly made a statement on industrial policy, but it should be clear to anybody that while we have assured to the private sector an honoured place in the economy of this country, they are not reconciled to that. I wish the private sector learns to behave, understand the times and reconcile itself to this new position.

We are giving them, the Government of India has assured them, a proper place. Even during the First Plan it was only in the public sector

that there was a shortage of 40 per cent. Again, during the Second Plan, the private sector has more than fulfilled itself, and it is again the public sector which is woefully behind the target, and I do not see any prospect of the public sector fulfilling itself. There appears to be no chance for it. In spite of it, the private sector is clamouring for more concessions and incentives.

It is true that there are certain industries which may have temporary difficulties. Those difficulties may be due to various reasons. The only pertinent point which impressed me was that there has been a sharp fall in the values of shares, and that is quoted by the private sector as an impact of this taxation. There is a lot of truth in it. There is not the least doubt about it that our taxation policy is responsible for this. Well, this has got to be examined, I do not deny that, but my feeling is that the returns at the present prices have come to almost normal. Previously they were enjoying a boom. They were having all the benefits which were not due to them. They were paying dividends which are unconscionable, and that is why the prices of the shares had gone up very much. Now they have come to their proper level. That is my feeling.

It is also my feeling that these prices have come down not because of the taxation policy alone. Of course, the taxation policy had its important impact on them, but they have not come down only because of that factor. There are many other factors which can be gone into, but the private sector must reconcile itself to the new position.

There must be proper regulation and control of the private sector. Of course, we have got all sorts of laws which provide for regulation and control which is very irritating. I think the administration of the control and regulation has got to be streamlined. Without causing unnecessary interference, without causing unnecessary irritation, we must have full control and regulation of the private sector.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Then, the private sector has also got to be watched in respect of small-scale industries. At the present moment I find there is a growing tendency in the large-scale industries to disperse their kingdoms. At present there is concentration. Now they are starting subsidiary industries. It is not feeding the independent small-scale industry. That would be very good and very necessary. As a matter of fact, small-scale industry can last only if they become subsidiary to the large-scale industry but in the sense that these small-scale industries are not directly or indirectly under the ownership of the large-scale industries. A new tendency is developing to disperse their kingdom all over and to give birth to small-scale industries which are directly or indirectly also owned by the large-scale industries. That is a very dangerous sort of tendency, and the Government will have to look into this matter.

In this respect I have only one more point to urge so far as the public sector is concerned. I still do not know whose responsibility it is to give a proper footing to the public sector, and to develop the public sector. At present you will find that the public sector or whatever you call it, our public enterprises and corporations are dispersed all over under the various Ministries. There is no one Minister who can even tell us what is the public sector, who can tell us who is responsible for it and if there is any co-ordinated policy and programme. Co-ordination must be brought about and somebody must be made responsible to see that the Plan targets are fulfilled. Who is going to be responsible we do not know.

In this respect I would like to read out of a few lines in my support from what has been said by even the Comptroller and Auditor-General. I think I will be taken very seriously if I quote him in support of what I say. He has made these observations:

"Planning has been undertaken on a quinquennial basis. The key-note of the second of the Five Year Plans is industrial development, organised and regulated in a more positive way by the State. This alone demands a major adjustment in the machinery of the Government. The control of the State enterprises and nationalised industries is now dispersed among several Ministries at present. The ordnance factories, with their vast productive potential, are with the Defence Ministry; the telephone industry is with the Communications Ministry; the State iron and steel units are with the special Ministry constituted for their development, and the residue is with the Production Ministry, but the formulation of industrial policy still remains with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Under the distribution it is difficult, if not impossible, to secure fuller utilisation of installed capacity, ensure a mere rational distribution of workload, and to formulate a common policy in the fields of employment, procurement and production.

In the U.K., the Ministry of Supply is the undivided controller of all production units, including ordnance and other defence installations. In India, too, during the war years, all the industries and industrial installations, private and public, were brought under umbrella of a single Department of Supply to secure fuller mobilisation of available resources in the war effort."

Now, I do not know who, at the end of the Five Year Plan, would be answerable for the performance of the public sector. Of course, we know the Government as a whole is responsible, but when we say that the Government as a whole is responsible, that does

not fix the responsibility upon either a co-ordinating authority or upon a particular Ministry. I think the Government should give proper consideration to this matter.

At the very outset, I had said that our implementation of the Plan was woefully bad. It will not be possible for me to go into details now, because the time at my disposal is very short. So, in conclusion, I would like to say that though we have appointed certain teams to go into the working of the various Ministries and to make their reports to us about the economies to be effected, that will never serve the purpose. We shall have to do something very radical in this matter. I can say without any hesitation that there is no climate of economy whatsoever anywhere. We talk of doing things in a big way, and that attitude has gone down in a very wrong manner into the administrative departments, and the big way of doing things on their part is not to bother about what they spend. Where the expenses are not necessary at all, we find that there are various important factors which have gone to increase our administrative expenditure. Owing to the short time at my disposal, I shall not be able to go into the details. But I have not the least doubt that at least ten to twenty per cent reduction could be brought about in the expenditure. Even in one individual State, namely Uttar Pradesh, they appointed a reforms commissioner, and he has submitted a report to say that Rs. 2 crores of recurring expenditure could be saved every year, and he has said that not only would this saving be there but it would increase the efficiency further and it will check the duplication that is there. Recently, I was connected with a particular finance enquiry committee in Rajasthan. We looked into the entire administrative set-up, and we found that there were so many unnecessary jobs and super-scale jobs created just to satisfy the urge of certain persons.

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

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I shall finish in one minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I might make clear one thing, because I heard a whisper here—the sound instruments are so sensitive that even whispers are carried here; some hon. Member remarked that personalities are also kept in view when time is allotted. But I might clear it that the Speaker has divided the time according to the strength of the Opposition Groups and the Congress. So, when a Member takes more time, he takes it out of the quota allotted to his party. Therefore, there ought to be no complaint so far as that is concerned. Members should also be aware that when they speak longer, they deprive their own colleagues, and they reduce their own numbers; they do not deprive any other Group.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am sorry, but I would finish in half a minute.

I wanted to emphasize this particular point about controls, because it has been stressed by certain hon. Members from this side and also from the other side that we must have controls. I can understand that planned economy does demand control. But the conditions in this country and a strong administrative sense demand that we should never have controls. We should have only administrative regulations. It was due to that strong administrative sense that the great Minister whom we always remember, Shri Kidwai, in no worse circumstances than those of today was prepared to do away with controls, and his doing away with controls had a great effect on our economy. I hope we will not fall a victim again to these controls.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (हिसार) :
जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं जिस घसन
बात पर बोलना चाहता हूँ उस पर आने

[वंडित ठाकुर शास आयेव]

से पहले आपकी इजाजत से दो तीन बातों के ऊपर जो कि फाइनेंस बिल और बजट से ताल्लुक रखती हैं, अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ।

अभी इस हाउस में श्री सी० डी० पांडे और दूसरे मੈम्बर साहिबान ने एस्टेट ड्यूटी के बारे में कहा है। मैं भी इसके बारे में दो तीन बातें इशारतन अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह है कि जो तरमीम इस वक्त एस्टेट ड्यूटी में की जा रही है वह एक बड़ी फंडेमेंटल तरमीम है और शायद इतनी जबर्दस्त तरमीम है कि ऐसी अभी तक इस हाउस के अन्दर या कंट्री के सामने नहीं आई है। इससे तमाम कंट्री के अन्दर एक दम बड़ी डिससैटिसफैक्शन पैदा होगी। आज तक जो एस्टेट ड्यूटी हिन्दू ज्वायंट फॅमिली पर लगती है उसके अन्दर जो एग्जैम्पशन लिमिट थी वह ५०,००० की थी। जब कोई शस्स मर जाता है उसका नोशनल पार्टिशन करार दिया जाकर जो जायदाद उसके मरने पर उसके वारिसान को पहुंचती है उसके ऊपर अज टैक्स लगता है। लेकिन जो नई तरमीम की जा रही है उसमें एक यह तरमीम भी शामिल है कि वह शस्स जब मर जाये तो उसकी जायदाद और उसकी भौलाद की जायदाद, उसके संस की जायदाद दोनों को मिला कर एक्जिगेट करके उसमें ऊपर एस्टेट ड्यूटी लगेगी यानी जो लड़के जिन्दा हैं जो बर्ष से ही उसमें राइट रखते हैं उन जिन्दा आदमियों पर भी एस्टेट ड्यूटी लगाने की तजवीज है। यह सवाल निहायत अहम है। इसका यह मतलब होगा कि जहां ज्वाइंट फॅमिली को ५०,००० की एग्जैम्पशन मिली हुई है, उसको हम एक हाथ से तो डे रट्टे हैं लेकिन दूसरे हाथ से उसका हम गला मरोड़ रहे हैं। अगर किसी आदमी के बेटे उससे जुदा हों या शामिल हों उस सुरत का भी तरमीम करते वक्त कोई ध्यान नहीं रखा गया। उसमें मरने के बाद उस के

बेटे की जायदाद जिसमें कि उसने बर्ष में राइट पाया है, सारी की सारी एक्जिगेट में ले ली जायगी। एक तो यह तरमीम की जा रही है। इसके अलावा दूसरी तरमीम यह की जा रही है कि जो गिफ्ट्स आज तक दो बरस पुराने या उससे ज्यादा पुराने हो चुके हैं, जो गिफ्ट्स आज इनडिफिजिबल (indefeasible) हो चुके हैं, जिन के ऊपर एस्टेट ड्यूटी नहीं लग सकती है उन पर भी आज अगर वह मर जाये तो लगेगी। दो बरस की जहां पहले लिमिट रखी गई थी, उसको आज बढ़ा कर पांच बरस किया जा रहा है। आज जो गिफ्ट्स एस्टेट ड्यूटी से इन्पून थे, उन सारे के सारों को अब शामिल किया जा रहा है। इस तरह से इस चीज को रिट्रोस्पेक्टिव बनाना तमाम कॅन्स आब ला के, तमाम उम्नों के, तमाम प्रिंसिपल के, इक्विटी के, इन्साफ के, में समझता हूँ बरखिलाफ है। जब विलायत के अन्दर इस तरह की तरमीम की गई थी, तीन साल से पांच साल तक इस पीरियड को बढ़ाया गया था, उस वक्त खाम तौर पर यह कहा था कि रिट्रोस्पेक्टिवली जितने भी गिफ्ट्स उसमें आते थे उन सब को उसके अन्दर में एग्जैम्पट कर दिया जाये। मैं चाहूंगा कि कम से कम इस तरह का तो कोई प्राविजन हमको इसके अन्दर रखना चाहिये था और हमें यह नहीं समझना चाहिये कि आज तो हम अस्तयार है कि इस बार तो हम इसको पांच साल कर दें, अगली बार सात साल कर दें और फिर दस साल कर दें। यह एक ऐसी चीज है जिसको मुल्क बरदास्त नहीं करेगा।

दूसरी चीज जिस की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान खिलाना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आम तौर पर मैंने देखा है कि अखबारों में या पब्लिक मीटिंग्स में जो कि इस काम के लिये बुलाई जाती हैं, इन दोनों बातों का कहीं जिक्र नहीं आता है जिसका मतलब

वह है कि एस्टेट ड्यूटी में हम जो तार्कीमें करने पा रहे हैं, उनका क्या भ्रसर पड़ने वाला है यह लोगों ने नहीं समझा है। मैं एक मिनट के भन्दर सारी उस बड़ी तबदीली का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ जो पिछले साल श्री कृष्णमाचारी ने जो उस वक्त हिन्दू ज्वायंट फैमिली के बारे में की थी। बीसों साल की लड़ाई के बाद हमने यह चीज पाई थी कि हिन्दू ज्वायंट फैमिली में जहाँ उसके मॅम्बर दो हैं तो उसकी जो एग्जेम्प-शन लिमिट है वह दुगुनी हो और अगर तीन या उससे ज्यादा हैं तो तीन टाइम हो। यह चीज श्री कृष्णमाचारी ने सारी बातों को छोड़ कर, सब फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर्स की बातों को छोड़ कर, टैकमेगन इन्कनायरी कमेटी की रिक्मेडेशंस को छोड़ कर, सभी तजावीज को छोड़ कर रुपये के लालच में घाकर हटा दी। जब मैंने उनसे कहा कि आपने यह क्या किया है, आप इतनी जबर्दस्ती क्यों करते हैं, तो उन्होंने उत्तर दिया कि पुराने फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर कुछ भी कहते रहे हों, मैं नहीं जानता। मैं आपको याद दिवाना चाहता हूँ कि गृशटर, ब्लैकट, लियाकत अली खाँ, मधारी, देशमुख इत्यादि जितने भी मिनिस्टर आये उन सब ने इस बात को माना है कि हिन्दू ज्वायंट फैमिली के साथ इक्विटबल ट्रीटमेंट नहीं हुआ है। लेकिन श्री कृष्णमाचारी ने फरमाया कि मुझे तो मनी कंसिड्रेशंस अपनी करती हैं, मैं इक्विटी का कायल नहीं हूँ। मैं उनका यह जवाब सुनकर हैरान रह गया। मैं ने फिर कहा कि यह मुनासिब नहीं है कि आप इस तरह का जवाब दें। तब आखिर मैं उन्होंने कहा कि मैं एक कमेटी बिठाऊंगा। यह उत्तर तब उन्होंने दिया जब उनका दिल पिचला और यह भी कहा कि इसकी मैं तहकीकात करूंगा। लेकिन इतना भी नहीं हुआ कि कमेटी बैठती कि हमारे नये फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक नया तोफा हमें दिया है। बजाय इसके कि मरने वाले की जायदाद पर ही टैक्स लगवा कर उन्हें लड़कों की

जायदाद पर भी टैक्स लगवा। वह एक बेसिक उसूल था जिस पर उनको चलना चाहिये था लेकिन अब वह इसमें बिल्कुल बदखिलाफ़ जा रहे हैं। इस मौके पर मैं इससे ज्यादा इस पर भ्रज नहीं करना चाहता।

अब मैं उन तकरीरों की तरफ धारा हूँ जोकि इस हाउस में की गई हैं। मैं ने उन दोस्तों की तकरीरों का बहुत ध्यानपूर्वक सुना है जिन की मैं बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उन में से चन्द दोस्तों की ऐसी तकरीरें थी, जिन का कि मैं दुःखत खयाल नहीं करना। आज जबकि हम दूसरे प्लान के तीसरे साल में से होकर गुजर रहे हैं और जो स्कॉमैं हमने हाथ में ली है, जिन तीन स्टोल प्लान्स को हम स्थापित करने जा रहे हैं, उन के बारे में यह कहना कि ये तो जंक है, उन से कोई फायदा नहीं होने वाला है, उन का फरटिलाइजर फेम्टो में तबदील कर दिया जाय या किनी और प्लान में तबदील कर दिया जाय, मैं हमिन्न मुनासिब नहीं समझता हूँ। हम ने सब मोच ममझ कर और पूरी जानकारी रखे हुए एक कदम उठाया है और उस में पीछे हटने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। आज जो हमारे दोस्त इस तरह की बातें कहते हैं वे उस वक्त कहाँ थे जब दूसरा प्लान तैयार किया गया था और हर किसी को उस के बारे में राय मांगी गई थी और हर किसी को इस बात का मंका दिया गया था कि अगर वह कुछ कहना चाहता है तो कह सकता है। अगर हमारे पास रुपये नहीं हैं तो हम कर्ज लेंगे। हम किसी से गिफ्ट नहीं चाहते हैं, हम तो कर्ज चाहते हैं जिस को हम वापिस भी कर देंगे। उस जमाने में जबकि पाकिस्तान ने गिफ्ट लिया अमरीका से उस वक्त भी हम ने कहा कि हम गिफ्ट नहीं चाहते कर्ज चाहते हैं और हम इस को धरा करेंगे, हम ने कर्ज लिया। मैं मानता

[पंडित ठाकुर राम भार्गव]

हूँ कि अगले दो तीन बरस तक हम को ज्यादा रुपा देना पड़ेगा। लेकिन जो भी मुश्किलें आ रही हैं वे लाञ्छनी हैं, वे धानी हो थीं लेकिन हम को धराने की जरूरत नहीं है। इस से मैं समझता हूँ कोई बड़ा भारी नुकसान नहीं होने वाला है। ये मुश्किलें ऐसी नहीं हैं जिन पर हम काबू न पा सकें।

मैं ने इकोनॉमिक सर्वे को पढ़ा है। वह कौन सी चीज है जिस की वजह से इतना वैशिक फेल रहा है। उस के अन्दर बड़ी खूबी के साथ, बड़ी सफाई के साथ, बड़ी कामयाबी के साथ यह कहा गया है कि हमारी ऐसी हालत है इस वक्त, और कोई बात इस के सिवाय नहीं कही गई है। सारे सर्वे को पढ़ कर मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ कि जिस रास्ते पर हम चल रहे हैं वह हमें कहां ले जायेगा, यह हमें मालूम है। हमें यह भी मालूम है कि हमारी मंजिल क्या है। उस मंजिल तक पहुंचने के लिये जो भी दिक्कतें आयें, उन का हमें मुकाबला करना है, उन पर हमें फतह पानी है। यह कहना कि हमें कर्जा बढ़ा करना पड़ेगा, या हमारी यह स्कीम पूरी नहीं होगी, इस से मैं ऐश्री नहीं करता। मुझे अपने मुल्क पर भरोसा है और मुझे एकोनामी पर भरोसा है। मिन साहब ने जो अपनी किताब पॉलिटिकल एकोनामी में फरमाया है कि ऐसे मुल्क में जहाँ एक एडीकल्चरल मुल्क है, उस के ऊपर कोई आफ्रत आ जाय, कूह्त आ जाय अथवा युमीबत आ जाय तो वह मुल्क बड़ी जल्दी उस से रिकवरी करता है—मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा मुल्क १०० करोड़ में भी ज्यादा रुपा अगले २, ३ साल में आसामी से ले सकेगा। दूसरे हाउस में जो हमारे फ्राइवेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने जनरल बजट के डिस्कशन का जवाब देते हुए तक्ररीर फरमाई, उस

को पढ़ कर मुझे खुशी हुई और मुझे यह विश्वास हो गया कि हमारी जो स्कीमें हैं वे चलेंगी और कामयाब होंगी और मुझे यह भी भरोसा हुआ कि हम उन दिक्कतों पर काबू पा लेंगे। इस विसतिले में मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यहां जो प्राइवेट सैक्टर और पब्लिक सैक्टर का मगड़ा चला, अगर वह न चला होता तो बेहतर होता और उस के बजाय मेम्बर साहबान को फ्राइवेंस मिनिस्टर साहब की अनील के जवाब में यह कहना चाहिये था कि हम उन के साथ हैं और जितनी हमारी स्कीमें हैं हम उन को मुकम्मिल कर के दिखलायेंगे। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं कहा गया और हम ने देखा कि यहां पर वहाँ प्राइवेट सैक्टर और पब्लिक सैक्टर का मगड़ा चलाया गया। यह खुशी की बात है कि हमारे फ्राइवेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने फेडरेशन आफ इंडियन चैम्बर आफ कामर्स के सालाना इजलाम में तक्ररीर करते हुए इस चीज को साफ कर दिया। बार बार यहां पर यह जिक्र आता है कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर और पब्लिक सैक्टर में फर्क है। पब्लिक सैक्टर कुछ और चीज है और प्राइवेट सैक्टर कुछ और चीज है। इन के बारे में फ्राइवेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो पोजीशन स्टेट की है मैं उस से मोनह अगरे मुतफिक हूँ और मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बारे में मुल्क को एक सही लीड दी है।

अब मैं असल बात की ओर आता हूँ। एक चीज में बिल्कुल साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह हमारा मेंकेंड फ्राइव इयर प्लान दिल्ली, बम्बई, कलकत्ता और अहमदाबाद की ही फ्राइव इयर प्लान नहीं है बल्कि यह हमारे पूरे देश का प्लान है और ऐसी जगहों का प्लान है जहां पर कि चिमनियां नहीं हैं बड़े कारखाने नहीं हैं और जहां पर कि बड़े बड़े शहर नहीं हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के लगभग लोगों के लिये यह प्लान है और यहाँ के शहरों के बास्ते भी यह प्लान है। इस प्लान के अन्दर जो मुझे सब से बड़ी

जापानी नजर आती है वह यह है कि यह प्लान सारे का सारा एक सर्वनाम्न सोसाइटी के लिये बनाया हुआ है। रूरल एकोनामी, रूरल सवाभाव के निबन्धों और रूरल सोसाइटी की बात इस में जबानी जमा-खर्च है लेकिन फिलवाक्या उन के बारे में इस प्लान में कोई ध्यान होता नहीं है। आप इस के अन्दर कई ऐसी गलतियाँ कर रहे हैं जोकि आप को दुःख देंगी। जितनी इस में इंडस्ट्रियल प्लानिंग की तरफ तबज्जह की गई है उतनी एग्रीकलचरल एकोनामी की तरफ पवाह नहीं की गई है। याद रखिये जब तक मुल्क की एग्रीकलचरल एकोनामी दुस्त नहीं होगी जब तक मुल्क की खुराक की पैदावार हम नहीं बढ़ायेंगे तब तक हमारा कोई भी प्लान और योजना उस हद तक कामयाब नहीं होगी जिस हद तक कि हम उसे कामयाब होते देखना चाहते हैं। आज हमारे गल्ले की समस्या क्या है? ३.६ मिलियन टन अनाज बाहर से यहां पर मंगाया गया है। मेरे खयाल में इस से ज्यादा गवर्नमेंट के बास्ते धर्म की बात कोई दूसरी नहीं हो सकती है। ४५ करोड़ रुपये की रूई बाहर के देशों से यहां पर मंगवाई जाती है। इतना अधिक फंड दिया जाता हो एक एग्रीकलचरल मुल्क में जिस के कि अन्दर इतनी अधिक जमीन, आदमी और जानवर हों, वह क्या उस के मुल्क के लिये धर्म की बात नहीं है? भारत जैसे एग्रीकलचरल कंट्री के अन्दर बाहर से गल्ला मंगाना यह जाहिर करता है कि हम नाअहल हैं और हम इस काबिल नहीं हैं कि हम अपने एग्जैम्स को खुद मैनेज कर सकें। मैं तो इस व्यु का हूँ कि सन् १९५१ से ही हमारे मुल्क में सेल्फ सफिशिएंसी घा चुकी थी। इस चीज को मैं पहले भी कई बार कह चुका हूँ और आज फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में हरमिज गल्ले की कमी नहीं है, अगर कमी है किसी चीज की तो वह अन्ध्या एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है। यहां पर ठीक इन्वायाम नहीं होता है लेकिन यह तसत है कि इस देश में काफी अन्ध्या पैदा नहीं होता। आज यह सुन कर

हरान होय कि ५ करोड़ रुपये का मुल्क पाउबर इस देश में बाहर से आता है। इस देश के अन्दर बाहर से भी आता है और रूई आती है जबकि अब रूई यहां बहुत उम्दा पैदा होने लगी है। अगर अकेले इन तीन चीजों का मंगवाना बन्द कर दें तो कम से कम १५० करोड़ रुपये का फर्क पड़ जायगा और यह जो १०० करोड़ रुपये का कर्जा देना है, उस के लिये क्या फिक्र रह जायेगी। हमारे मसानी साहब ने जो यह कहा कि फाइव इयर प्लान के पीछे लोग नहीं हैं और मुल्क इस गवर्नमेंट के पीछे नहीं है क्योंकि लोग हमारी स्कीमों के बास्ते कर्जा नहीं देते, तो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर मुल्क के अन्दर फिलवाक्या लोगों को इल्म हो कि मंगः फाइव इयर प्लान के अन्दर ये दिक्कतें हैं और इस तरह से यह गल्ला बाहर से आता है और अगर हर एक को अपनी अपनी जिम्मेदारी का इल्म हो तो मुझे पूरा यकीन है और इस में कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि लोग खुशी से कर्जा देंगे और हमारी स्कीमों को कामयाब बनायेंगे। जब सारा कंट्री पीछे हो तो यह नामुमकिन है कि यहां पर उतनी पैदावार न हो जितनी कि हम यहां पर चाहते हैं। आज जो किसान गल्ला पैदा करते हैं उन को इस बात का इल्म नहीं है कि इस मुल्क का सालबेशन उन के जरिये ज्यादा गल्ला पैदा किये जाने में है। वे इगनोरेंट हैं और उन को पता नहीं है कि मुल्क में गल्ले की पैदावार बढ़ाना किम कदर जरूरी है और उस की वजह से कितना रुपया हमारा बाहर के देशों में जा रहा है बरना मुझे इस में खरा भी शुबहा नहीं है कि वे अपनी जिम्मेदारी को समझेंगे और इस देश में अधिक गल्ला पैदा करेंगे।

मैं शिकायत के तौर पर अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले १० बरों से लगातार मैं इस हाउस के अन्दर इस के बारे में कहता रहा हूँ लेकिन गवर्नमेंट के कानों पर जू तक नहीं देवी। मैं बराबर यह कहता आ रहा हूँ कि जब तक गाय और बैल के रक्षण

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

को ठीक तरीके से हल नहीं करेंगे और ऊपर एकोनामी को ठीक नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस देश का कल्याण नहीं होगा। आज जो यह कहा जाता है कि इस देश में हर एक आदमी का दूध का भीसत कंजम्पान ५ गॉस है, यह बिल्कुल झूठ है और मेरे पास उस के सम्बन्ध में प्रीगर्स मौजूद हैं और मैं बिटेस में समझा सकता हूँ और साबित कर सकता हूँ कि यह गलत है लेकिन आज मेरे पास उस के लिये समय नहीं है। इतना मैं जरूर बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने जो हिसाब लगाया है तो पाया है कि इस देश के अन्दर ढाई गॉस से ज्यादा दूध का एवरेज कंजम्पान नहीं है और यह चीज बिल्कुल गलत है कि यहां पर ५ गॉस का भीसत पड़ता है। जहां ढाई गॉस दूध से ज्यादा का भीसत न पड़ता हो वहां कुछ ऐसी स्टेट्स भी हो सकती हैं जहां कि सिर्फ १ गॉस ही मिलता हो। हमारे देश में १६ प्रीसदी कुनबों को दूध का देखना तक नसीब नहीं होता। हमारे यहां पर साढ़े १० छांटक दूध का एक गाय का रोज का भीसत है जबकि डेनमार्क में साढ़े १० मेर रोज का एवेज पड़ता है। मुझे खुशी है कि हमारे हेल्थ मिनिस्टर साहब हम वक्त हाजम में तयारी के लिए हैं। मैं उनकी खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि वे इन मामलों में ऊपर अपने खास तवज्जह दें। हमारे कॉन्स्यूशन की दर ४७ में मिला हुआ है कि यह स्टेट की दूरी है कि वह लेवल आफ न्यूट्रीशन और स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग को ऊंचा करे और पब्लिक हेल्थ को इम्प्रूव करे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह लोगों को हेल्थ इसी तरह इम्प्रूव कर रहे हैं कि ढाई गॉस रोज की भीसत दूध की पड़नी है।

श्री स्याही : कुनन में इम्प्रूव कर रहे हैं।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : लोगों को दूध न देकर चाय पिलाना चाहते हैं। कुछ भेरे

इलाके में जहां कि लोग चाय नहीं पीते वे और जहां कि १६ गॉस के करीब प्रति आदमी को दूध मिलता था, आज वे दूध न पीकर तीन २ दफे चाय पीते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि पंजाब के अन्दर भी जहां तक फिजिकल ताकत का सवाल है, पंजाबी भी दिनों दिन कमजोर होते जा रहे हैं। असात और उड़ीसा का तो जिक्र ही क्या जहां पर आज एक आदमी के वास्ते ४ गाय भी काफी दूध नहीं दे सकती। हमारे यहां की बकरी उतना दूध दे देती है जितना कि वहां की एक गाय दूध देती है। दरअसल अब मोका है और वक्त आ गया है जब गवर्नमेंट अपनी सारी पालिसी को ठीक करे। गवर्नमेंट ने इस मामले में अब तक बहुत बड़ी मिनिमल नेगलेक्ट दिखाई है और गवर्नमेंट ने इस मद में काफी सपया खर्च नहीं किया। हमें अपने पशुओं की ओर विशेष ध्यान देना होगा क्योंकि किसानों और जानवरों के अन्दर अग्रडा बननाया जाता है कि उन के कन्फिक्टींग इंटेरेस्ट्स हैं। यह दुरस्त नहीं है लेकिन अगर दुरस्त हो तो मिनिस्टर साहब को देखना चाहिये कि हमारे इन इन्व जानवरों के साथ इन्फा हो। हमारे श्री अजित प्रसाद जेन को खुराक के मामले में फुरमान नहीं है और मैं ने अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर महोदय और होम मिनिस्टर की खिदमत में यह बहुत दफे अर्ज किया है कि इनके लिये एक अलग मिनिस्टर बनाया जाय अगर आप वाकई बिजनेस मीन करने हैं। हाउस में २, ३ दिन हम इस डिप्रेस्ड क्लामेज रिपोर्ट को बहम पर खर्च करते हैं और यहां पर शिकायत करते हैं कि फनों आदमी को नीकरी नहीं मिली और फलाने के साथ यह समूह नहीं हुआ लेकिन इन चीज की ओर किसी का ध्यान नहीं जाता और कोई इसकी शिकायत नहीं करता कि हमारे डिप्रेस्ड क्लामेज के आदमियों को छात्र पहले मुफ्त मिलती थी अब पहले के मुकामले में बहुत बड़ी मिलती है। छात्र बिस् पर कि गरीब आदमी की दुबरा होती है

यह अब मयस्सर नहीं है। मुझे सब में पहले यह चाहिए कि इस देश के अन्दर गरीब आदमी की सुराक में कमी न हो। मैं देखता हूँ कि जहाँ सुराक के मामले का सवाल है वृष तो काफी क्या मिलेगा अब छात्र भी नहीं मिलती।

एक सामनीय सचस्य : प्राप को भी तो छात्र नहीं मिलता।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : एक मेम्बर साहब कहते हैं कि प्रान्तेबल मेम्बर को भी नहीं मिलता, आवाज सराब हो गई है।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागवत : जनाब में भी यही भर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि मुझे भी नहीं मिलती तो औरों को क्या मिलेगा। वह मेरो ताईद कर रहे हैं। मेरो गुजारिश यह है कि आज अगर प्राप इस बजट को देखें तो अभी शोमबर्द्धन कौमिल बनाई गई है, जिम का मैं मेम्बर हूँ, फाउंडेशन मेम्बर एक तरह में, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने कौसी दुर्गति इस कौमिल की की है। कतई कोई अस्तयार इस कौमिल को हासिल नहीं है। और कोई माकून काम उस के जरिये नहीं होता। पढनी फाइव इयर प्लैन में सरकार ने लिखा कि ११०० करोड़ रुपये की ग्रामदनी जानवरों में होनी है और मॅन्ड फाइव इयर प्लैन वाली उमी कयम में लिखा कि ६६० करोड़ होती है। फिनवाक्या गाय और बैनों में कम से कम दो या ढाई हजार करोड़ रुपये की ग्रामदनी होनी है, कुन नेशनल ग्रामदनी का २५ परसेन्ट। मैं भर्ज करता हूँ कि ऐसी हालत है। मेरे अपने हाथ में रिपोर्ट है, शोमबर्द्धन कौमिल की आखरी रिपोर्ट है, जिम में लिखा है कि जहाँ तक वृष की पैदावार का सवाल है या जहाँ तक ड्राफ्ट पावर का सवाल है, वह कम होती जा रही है। मेरे पास और भी रिपोर्टें मौजूद हैं लेकिन वकन नहीं कि पेश करूँ, अगर उन के अन्दर यह अक्ष सुसल्लेमा है। हमारे

प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से सन् १९५५ में फरमाया था कि हमारे बैनों की हालत बिगारू है। कल पन्त जी महाराज कॅन्टस गो में गये और वहाँ बड़ा खूबसूरत लेक्चर दे कर आये, श्री प्रजित प्रसाद जैन ने बड़ा बड़ा खूबसूरत लेक्चर दिया, जितने एक्स्पर्ट जाते हैं बड़ा खूबसूरत लेक्चर देते हैं, लेकिन जब काम करने का मौका होता है तो न रुपया खर्च करना चाहते हैं और न देलना चाहते हैं अपनी ग्रांस से कि क्या काम हुआ है। एक्स्पर्टस ने एक सबक सीखा हुआ है और मैं देश को भी जिम्मेदार करार देता हूँ, आज एक्स्पर्टस का ही सवाल नहीं है, आज गावों का बेनेरेशन खत्म हो गया है, करोड़गतियों की गाय पत्ते चाटती फिरती हैं, देश में तो अब नारे ही लगने हैं, हमारे इन एक्स्पर्टस ने हाल ही में कहा कि देश में जरूरत से ज्यादा गाय हैं। अगर गावें जरूरत में ज्यादा हैं तो उन को खत्म किया जावे, जो तरकीब गवर्नमेंट ने गॉसडनों की बनाई है एक्स्पर्टस उसको ना काययाब बनाने के पीछे पड़े हैं। यूसनेस जानवरों को आयन्दा पैदावार न हो मकरब सांडों को कास्ट्रेट करने को कोशिश पूरी नहीं की जाती। बुस को हटा दो, एक्स्पर्टस सिर्फ नारे लगाना जानते हैं, इस वास्ते कि पब्लिक वालों में कह सकें कि तुम्हारे कुमूर को बजह में तरक्की नहीं होती। इस देश के अन्दर जब ड्राफ्ट पावर नहीं बढ़ेगी, बैनों के अन्दर ताकत नहीं बढ़ेगी, हगिज देश के अन्दर ज्यादा पैदावार नहीं होगी। अगर प्राप कंट्री में जायें और लोगों में कहें कि हमारो प्लैन फेल होता है, हमारा गुजारा नहीं होता, तो वह हूँगे। वह कहेंगे कि प्राप किस तरह के आदमी हैं कि एपीकल्चर को तो बढ़ाना चाहते हैं लेकिन जो एपीकल्चर को मां है—दोनों का नाम गी है, गो धरतों को भी कहते हैं और गाय को भी कहते हैं जिमसे सारी उन्नत होती है—उसकी तरफ प्राप कुछ तबज्जह नहीं करते तो कैसे प्राप को तरक्की मुमकिन है। मैं कहूंगा कि सारे चितरंजन, सारी सिवरी फॅटिलाइजर कॅन्ट्री और फूड डिपार्टमेंट

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागवत]

तीनों का काम गौ करती है। लेकिन इस तरफ गवर्नमेंट कोई तबज्जह नहीं करती। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यूजसेस कैटल के बारे में बन्द ऐसे ख्यालात जाहिर किये कि सारे मिनिस्टर गाय का नाम लेते हुए डरते हैं। कम्प्यूनेलियम धौर गाय उनके लिये एक ही चीज है। मैं ऐंभीकल्चर मिनिस्टर्स को देखता थाया हूँ, उन की जुरंत नहीं होती कि वह कह सकें कि हम इस कैटल बेल्च को धामे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। जब मैं ने पंडित जी को धौर पन्त जी को चिट्ठी लिखी धौर कहा कि ऐंभीकल्चर के वास्ते धालाहवा मिनिस्टर बनाया जाय तो जबाब थाया मेरी बात का कि उस से खर्च बढ़ जायेगा। मुझे कानिदास का एक फिकरा था व धाला है :

“भल्पस्य हेतोः । बहु हापुमेभिच्छन,
विचारमूढो प्रतिभामिमेत्वम्।”

एक छोटी सी चीज के वास्ते बड़ी चीज को छोड़ना भकलमन्दी नहीं है। धाप की जहाँ ढाई हजार करोड़ रुपया नैगनल इनकम बढ़ती है, उस के लिये कहना कि एक मिनिस्टर का खर्च बढ़ जायेगा, यह दुष्टत नहीं है।

मैं कुछ अफ्फाज बैलों के वास्ते भी भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ। गाय तां दूध देती है, उस की तरफ शहर वाले तबज्जह करते हैं, भास पास गांव वालों का सारा दूध दिल्ली जा कर बिकता है। पचास पचास घोल, सी मो घोल का दूध दिल्ली में धाना है। यही हालत बम्बई की है, धौर कालांगी तो दूर रही, वहाँ २४ घंटे चल कर दूध पहुंचता है। धानन्द से सारा दूध, जिस मे बछड़ों को पाला जाना, गांव के बच्चों को पाला जाना, वह शहरों में ध्रा रहा है। गवर्नमेंट जितना रुपया भ्रब लगाना चाहती है वह नस्तें मुधारने के वास्ते नहीं, दूध को बढ़ाने के वास्ते भी नहीं, दूध के शहरों में कलेक्शन के वास्ते लगाया है, जिस मे सारी की सारी ब्रांडिंग पालिसी श्कत कर दी। धगर ध्राप देखें कि हमारे प्लैनिंग कमिशन ने

कितना रुपया बिया तो ध्राप हीराल हुंभे, बोड़ी भाषा की ही बात नहीं है, काम करबे के तरीके व उनकी तबज्जह का बढ़ा सत्ताल है। ध्राप बैलों की तरफ देखिये। एक दफा का बिक्क है, नैशनल प्लैनिंग कमेट्री ने कहा था कि बैलों को बड़ी तकलीफ है। बैलों की जितनी कैरींग कैरीसिटी है, उतनी न रेलों की है न बाटरबैज की है। धगर ध्राप दोनों को मिला कर भी सुमार कीजिये तो जितना बोझा बैल डोते हैं उतना कोई नान मीन्स ध्राक कम्प्यूनिकेशन नहीं डोता है। एक करोड़ बुलककार्ट्स इस देश के अन्दर हैं। एक करोड़ बुलककार्ट्स के होते हुए सारे के सारे देश का काम बुलककार्ट्स से होता है, व पैसन्जर के जाती हैं, माल डोती है, सारा काम करती है, उन के लिये गवर्नमेंट ने क्या किया ? गवर्नमेंट ने एक दफा हमारे इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोग्राम के लिये तजबीज दी, प्लैनिंग कमिशन ने सफा २८२ पर लिखा कि धगर कार्ट्स में न्यूमैटिक टायर धौर ट्यूब लगा दिये जायें तां लंगों का बड़ा धामानी हो जायगी। यह बात सही है कि भाज जो बैल १६ मे २५ मन तक का बोझ डोते हैं, धगर ध्राप उन की कार्ट्स में टायर धौर ट्यूब नगा दें, तो वहाँ कम से कम ५५ से ६५ मन तक बो सकेंगे। धगर ऐसा कर दिया जाय तां किना फर्क पड़ जायगा। चुनांचे क्या किया उन्हाने कि दा करोड़ रुपये का मबाल उठाया गया कि यह रकम इस के वास्ते दी जाय। तब रोड्स कमेट्री ने कहा कि यह प्रापर काम नहीं है, रोड्स कमेट्री का काम नहीं है। उस का काम सड़क बनाना का है न कि बैलों के वास्ते ऐसा इन्जाम करने का। चुनांचे नीगल ध्राव्जैक्शन हुआ। ला मिनिस्ट्री ने लंगन ध्राव्जैक्शन को हटा दिया। डेढ़ या दा लाख रुपये का पाइन्ट प्रोजैक्ट बनाने को फिर तजबीज हुई। लेकिन इस पाइन्ट प्रोजैक्ट में मे दो लाख रुपये में मे एक पैसा भी खर्च नहीं हुआ। भाज पंडित नेंहू के कहने के बावजूद, प्लैनिंग कमिशन के अन्दर धाने के बावजूद, सारी चीजों के बावजूद ध्राज तक एक पैसा इस पर खर्च नहीं हुआ।

किसी भी तरह से इन बँलों के वास्ते कुछ थोड़ी सी सङ्कलित हो जाती तो वह भास को भासाभी से डो सकते। आप बाटलनेक का सवाल उठता है। जिस के लिये अशोक मेहता साहब बै फरमाया था, वह जो बाटलनेक है रेलवे पर उस का बोझ हल्का हो जाता। श्री मोहन लाल सक्सेना जी ने तजवीज की थी, जिस को गृह गृह कर दिया गया, कि ३० मील से २०० मील तक माल लारी से डोया जाय, २०० मील से ऊपर का बोझ रेलों से डोया जाय और ३० मील तक बुलककार्ट्स के वास्ते रक्सा जाय ताकि अच्छी तरह से काम हो सके और लोग काम भी सीखें। लेकिन उन्होंने बँलों को बिल्कुल गैरजरूरी चीज समझा। मुझे तो वह दिन देखा न दूर मालूम होता है जब कि इस देश के अन्दर ट्रैक्टर्स प्रायेंगे, लारीज प्रायेंगे जिस से काम चल सके। इस देश के अन्दर एग्रीकल्चरल एकानमी में जमींदार को अपने बैल बेटे से भी ज्यादा प्यारे होते हैं क्योंकि वह उन के जरिये ही काम करता है, उन्हीं के ऊपर उस का इन्हेसार है। अगर इस देश के अन्दर गायों और बैलों के वास्ते काफी खर्च किया जाय तो जो आप की एकानमी है, जिस के धारते इतनी दिक्कत हो रही है, वह सारी की सारी एकानमी दुरुस्त हो सकती है। जैसा मैं ने अर्ज किया कम से कम १५० करोड़ खपया सालाना आप को महज गायों और बैलों को दुरुस्त करने में धामदनी बढ़ सकती है। न आप को बाहर से माला मंगाने की जरूरत, न कई मंगाने की जरूरत। मेरे पास फिगर्स मौजूद हैं, लेकिन मे उन को किसी और वक्त के लिये रिजर्व रखता हूँ, उन के अन्दर दर्ज है कि ८० लाख खालें इस देश से दूसरे देशों के अन्दर जाती हैं। कई लाख जानवर सतलज के जरिये स्मगल हो कर पाकिस्तान को लुटा दिये जाते हैं और उन की कीमत हम अपनी नोज में से देते हैं। लेकिन इस एकानमी की कोई परवाह नहीं करता। जहाँ तक इन कैटल्स का सवाल है गवर्नमेंट का रवेया

यह है। और अगर यही रवेया रहा तो मैं अर्ज करता हूँ कि आप लाल कोशिश करें, प्लैन कामयाब नहीं हो सकती। इस देश के अन्दर न प्लैन कामयाब होगी और न वह ऐग्रिकल्चरिस्ट्स की अपील करेगी एकानमी को बेहतर बनाने के लिये। देश के अन्दर किसी तरीके पर सीटिफिकेशन नहीं होगा। कम अशोक मेहता साहब ने फरमाया कि आप ऐग्रिकल्चरल पापुलेशन को १५०० करोड़ खपये से महकूम न करते तो १००, २०० करोड़ खपया स्माल सेविम्स में भा गया होता। मैं जानता हूँ कि अगर उन लोगों के पास होता तो ५०० करोड़ खपया ही भा जाता। आज जा कर जमींदार के पास कहेँ कि आप की स्कीम के वास्ते इतनी जरूरत है तो इतना बड़ा रिस्पान्स होगा जो कि पालिटीशियन्स से नहीं हो सकता और न प्राइवेट सेक्टर से ही, जो कि मुनाफे के पीछे पड़ा हुआ है, आप उतना ले सकते हैं। रिस्पान्स मिलेगा उन से जो यकीन रखते हैं अपनी गवर्नमेंट में, जो यकीन रखते हैं इस एकानमी में, जो यकीन करते हैं कि जो कुछ गवर्नमेंट करती है वह दुरुस्त करती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि तीन बरस के भीतर क्या दिक्कत हो जायगी। राज्य सभा में फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस दिक्कत का चिक्र किया। तीन साल में आप की एकानमी, अगर आप सही तरीके से उसे चलायेंगे, इतनी मजबूत हो जायेगी कि १०० करोड़ खपया आसानी से कर्जा अदा करने के लिये और इस बीच का भी कर्जा अदा करने के लिये भा जायेगा, मुझे इस में शुबहा नहीं है। शर्त यही है कि सही मानों में इस एकानमी को ठीक किया जाय और सही मानों में लोगों के पास पहुंचा जाय, लोगों के पास पहुंच कर कहेँ कि आप को यह जरूरत है। मुझे कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि हमारी फाइव इअर प्लैन सबसेसफुल होगी और सारी चीजें सबसेसफुल होंगी वशर्त हम करल एकानमी की तरफ देखें और जनता के ट्रस्टीज होने

[वंदित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

के नाते उनकी तरफ़ माप का जो भी कर्ष है उसे भदा करें। और पूरी तबज्जह अपने गऊ और बैलों की तरफ़ दें।

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, now that so much about cows and bullocks has been said, I would like to take some time in talking about human beings. It seems that human health and animal husbandry are inseparably united and I suggest that the hon. Minister of Health can be entrusted also with animal husbandry.

While considering about human beings in India, I would invite the attention of the House to a statement made by our hon. Prime Minister in a conference of the Indian Chamber of Commerce in Delhi. They are very inspiring words and it is worthwhile to quote them. The hon'ble Prime Minister said:

"So long as I have any strength in me, it is my function in life to fight for India's economic progress and independence and the welfare of the Indian people."

In our younger days, we took the Prime Minister to be the symbol of India's political freedom and we welcome him today as the symbol of India's economic freedom. But it is worthwhile now to analyse and examine the realities behind the facade of these utterances. After having finished our first Five Year Plan and after having covered two years of our Second Five Year Plan, it is worthwhile and more realistic today to undertake a bold analysis of our achievements, of our progress, of the people's march and of assigning new milestones.

What do we find now? I have been frankly confused to find that these budget documents which have been supplied to us should speak in two

voices. Here is the hon. Prime Minister's speech and here is the economic survey. The hon. Finance Minister, at pages 2 and 3 of his speech, states that wholesale prices have gone down, that agricultural production has increased, industrial production is expanding and so on and so forth. But I do not know for whose consumption it is meant. May be, it is meant for public consumption. But the economic survey that has also been circulated to us tends to give indeed a dismal picture. I will now attempt to tabulate the economic picture that emerges from the pages of the economic survey that has been circulated.

It has been conceded by the Government that the national output is decreasing. Production is slowing down both in the industrial sector and in the agrarian sector. The white paper also warns that the strains and stresses are on the increase, and they are bound to increase during the Second Five Year Plan period. The rate of industrial production is less than the previous two years. The average index of wholesale prices for the 12 months of 1957 works out to 109 which is some 6 per cent. above the average for the preceding year. The all-India living cost index also continues to increase. Pockets are pinched and it is reflected in the dwindling quantum of market borrowings. Imports are increasing while exports are dwindling. As regards exports, the total for the first two quarters of 1957-58 works out to Rs. 267 crores as compared to Rs. 288 crores for the corresponding period of 1956-57. Now the prospects are also too bleak so far as exports are concerned. We are told that attempts are being made to increase our earnings from export, but that can be done at the cost of consumers in this country. In this country, increase in exports can only be possible at the cost of the consumers.

Then, taxation has reached its zenith. Even the Prime Minister has said that there may be some need for some readjustment. Only during last year new taxation proposals were brought in to give a total sum of Rs. 108 crores during a year. There is not much scope to tax the people further. The State Governments too are not lagging far too behind. If the winter has come, the summer has not also lagged behind. This, in a nut-shell, is the peculiar economic background against which we have to consider this pedestrian budget sponsored by the most debonair politician of India.

The most dangerous thing against this context is that the cost estimates of half the plan projects are on the increase. We are caught up in a controversy between the private sector and the public sector, between the core of the Plan and the fringe of the Plan and we are yet considering whether we will rephrase the Plan or we will maintain it in its entirety. To me it seems there is a need for a total review, a need for a bold appraisal and a need for admission of the mistakes that we have committed. It is not merely a pedestrian budget. To me it is a gambler's last throw and it is a leap into the dark. I think it is our misfortune that behind the facade of the Prime Minister, everything in this country is going on unchallenged. It is high time, therefore, the hon. Prime Minister himself took the initiative in examining the situation and finding out some remedy.

This long dismal list of achievements, in the words of the Prime Minister, the march towards economic prosperity and emancipation of India, ought not to leave any doubt in the minds of anyone that our plans have failed. Why have the plans failed? I have been able to assign three reasons for it. The first is deficit financing. The deficit financing has been at the root of our economic ruination. The second during is that this deficit financing has given rise to inflation and rise in cost of food prices. The next thing, of course, is the depletion

of foreign exchange resources rather much too dramatically. I propose to examine these three aspects of our Plan.

First coming to deficit financing, I would like to submit before the House, on whose authority the Government of India could resort to deficit financing which was not contemplated by Parliament, which was not sanctioned by Parliament? If there is any sanctity in presenting the First Five Year Plan before the House and getting a sanction, I would like to know of the Finance Minister on whose authority deficit financing was indulged in during the First Five Year Plan beyond the ceiling that was specifically stipulated in the Plan. In the First Five Year Plan, the deficit financing was stipulated at Rs. 290 crores; that was the ceiling fixed corresponding to the drawal of sterling balances. But during the first Plan period, the deficit financing at the Centre amounted to Rs. 428 crores and at the States it amounted to Rs. 48 crores. So, the amount of deficit financing increased cent per cent and it amounted to Rs. 476 crores.

During the last two years of the second Plan period, the deficit financing has been of the order of over Rs. 600 crores. Barring, of course, current deficit financing of which I have no knowledge, the total comes to Rs. 1,676 crores. And then, if we are going to conform to the ceiling laid down in the second Five Year Plan, again we have to incur deficit financing of the order of Rs. 600 crores to make it Rs. 1,676 crores. My allegation is that this chaotic, this unplanned, resort to deficit financing has resulted in the ruination of the life of the man at large.

15 hrs.

I will try to give the break-up of this deficit financing, how it has been resorted to and what impact it had had on the food prices in this country. I am grateful to the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee Report. But, my only grievance is that the report is much too anaemic. Had it been more

[Shri Mahanty]

outspoken, it would have done public service by pinpointing the attention of this country to the fact that this kind of unplanned deficit financing which has gone on unabated and unchecked, without being mitigated by the other remedial measures has been the cause of our downfall and it is time that we think of some immediate check.

The House knows the rise in food prices took a steep turn from the year 1955-56. The reason is that in that year we resorted to deficit financing of the order of Rs. 180 crores. In 1954-55, the previous year, the deficit financing was of the order of Rs. 93 crores. In the year 1953-54, the deficit financing was of the order of Rs. 78 crores. But, in the last year of the First Five Year Plan, the Administration woke up. For four years they were suffering from post-lunch resilience, to put it in economic jargon. Be it post-lunch or after-dinner resilience, certainly, the Administration woke up and they wanted to spend the whole money and they took to deficit financing of the order of Rs. 180 crores and that resulted in increase in food prices. In 1956-57, the deficit financing was of the order of Rs. 253 crores. Therefore, it is stated very properly in the Food Enquiry Committee report on page 38 that:

“The increase in production has tended to moderate and absorb the inflationary impact of investment expenditure to a considerable extent, and the rise in prices would have been greater but for the increase in production.”

The devil of the drama in not the Food Ministry. Speakers, one after the other, have tried to hold the Agriculture Ministry or the Food Ministry in the dock and they have tried to assert that on account of the failure of our targets in the agricultural field—that we could not produce more—our Plan is going to be floun-

dered. But, as has been stated very authoritatively in this Report, production has been increasing. But it is the unplanned deficit financing in the public sector as well as the private sector through bank loans has resulted in this kind of chaos.

I would also like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister and I would request him to give some explanation, if he so condescends, if he would kindly listen to me—listening to us is after all instructive. Sir,...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am all patience.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: But he wants the hon. Minister to listen.

Shri Mahanty: All along it has been an act of faith to address those vacant benches. I have always drawn inspiration and consolation from you, Sir. (Laughter.)

To mitigate the impact of this deficit financing, as laymen, we could always recommend some remedies—There are some. I am not against deficit financing. Like a good peg of whisky, which is always good, it does good to the system.

An Hon. Member: Even in these days of prohibition!

Shri Mahanty: It is good; I am not against it. But the question is, it must be taken as a medicinal dose. (Interruptions.) The remedies are as follows:

Expanding the outlay on projects promising quick yield; increasing the supply of consumer goods like food-stuffs and cloth; controlling the expansion of credit and its diversion into speculative activities; preventing undue rise in the expendable wages in labour; and, curtailing administrative expenditure.

When I come to the curtailing of administrative expenditure, I would like to have some explanation from

the hon. Minister as to why while revenue has increased by 80 per cent. in 1958-59, as compared to 1952-53, expenditure has increased by 101 per cent. On the one hand, we say that there must be curtailment of expenditure. In the name of economy in expenditure, we chop off a few class IV employees, peons and chaprasis from the Central Secretariat; but, we are going on incurring this kind of administrative expenditure.

Since the time at my disposal is very short, I am not going to analyse and explain each of the suggestions I have made. If I had the time I would have proved to the satisfaction of the House that even though....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's party has got 28 minutes and he has written to me that he is the sole spokesman. He can have all the 28 minutes.

Shri Mahanty: There are other aspects too. Therefore, I need not go into them. I will come to this when we consider the Finance Ministry's Demands. It is time that somebody should tell them that this kind of chaotic financial thinking should not go unchallenged and unquestioned.

I would like to know how they are going to mitigate the impact of this kind of deficit financing. We have already had it to the other of Rs. 1076 crores and we have got another Rs. 600 crores to be restored to. But, what steps are taken to mitigate the impact of that? I hope the hon. Finance Minister, when he replies, instead of giving us another homily on foreign affairs and Panch Shila, would let us know what is happening about it.

Then, there is another aspect, foreign exchange. Regarding the foreign exchange crisis, the Government is of the view that the crisis was inevitable, as inevitable as human destiny. And, the reasons were: increased import of iron and steel; increased import of foodstuffs and increased import of capital goods.

I would like to invite the attention of this House and of the Government to a very serious matter. I hope the hon. Minister would listen to it because I expect a reply from him on this point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the hon. Minister is having consultations with his colleagues about the observations that the hon. Member is making. (Laughter.)

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): I am giving him notes.

Shri Mahanty: Unfortunately, his consultations are post-lunch gossips and....

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I think the thing is very obvious.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps, the hon. Member may not be disappointed when he gets the reply.

Shri Mahanty: I would invite the attention, not only of this House but also of the country, to the correspondence which Shri C. D. Deshmukh, ex-Finance Minister, had with the Prime Minister. I saw excerpts of it in the *Hindustan Standard* of Calcutta, dated 10th February, 1958. It seems that Shri Deshmukh, who has always been unerring in his diagnosis and who usually does not indulge in any kind of light talks, wrote to the Prime Minister that this foreign exchange crisis is completely man-made. And, he also offered to inform the Prime Minister about the persons who are responsible for it. The Prime Minister replied back by saying: "I wonder how under your stewardship of the Finance Ministry this is happening." Then, Shri Deshmukh replied by saying that in many cases the import licences had been issued without reference to him as the Finance Minister and that he knew two or three persons who were directly responsible for it. This is public now. The Finance Ministry has not contradicted it. It is no good just evading facts like this

[Shri Mahanty]

by just producing a kind of document about the empirical basis of which the world is in the dark.

Here is a categorical statement that the foreign exchange crisis was on account of two or three persons whom Shri C. D. Deshmukh knew only too well. I demand of the hon. the Prime Minister, let him take courage in both hands and order an enquiry into this. We are not going to be satisfied with a kind of anaemic enquiry conducted behind the secretariat walls of the Planning Commission. No, we would like to have a full enquiry into it in view of the clear admission made by the Finance Minister in the correspondence that he had with the Prime Minister. So, that is that about the foreign exchange crisis. The myth should be exploded that the foreign exchange crisis was inevitable in its nature.

I now come to another aspect, namely to income-tax evasion. Government wants to have the cake and eat it too. Whenever it suits their purpose, whenever it is necessary for levying Expenditure Tax, Gift Tax or Wealth Tax. Professor Kaldor is coolly brought in from the academical bowers of some British University; when it comes on the other side Professor Kaldor is very casually dismissed. Government cannot have both the cake and eat it also, They can either have the cake or eat it, but not both ways. Professor Kaldor's estimate was that income-tax evasion was of the order of Rs. 200 crores. My scheme is that there is a need for some tax relief, and instead of taking resort to this kind of taxation, if we only plug our existing sources, we will have enough resources without taxing the people and disrupting the economy. Professor Kaldor's estimate was that income-tax evasion was of the order of Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 crores. Mr. Deshmukh, while he was Finance Minister, said that it may not be of the order of Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 crores but was only of the order of Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 crores. That means it is only the revenue of three States like my State,

namely Orissa; it is only Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 crores. The other day the Deputy Finance Minister in reply to a question in this House said that all the amounts of income-tax settled by the Income-tax Investigation Commission had not been realised from the assesseees due to various reasons. What were the reasons, he did not state. Here you see an alarming situation. And what are the arrears? The arrears are of the order of Rs. 7-93 crores. My direct allegation is—and I do not hesitate to make it—that this kind of income-tax evasion has been going on with the clear abetment of the Income-tax Department.

I will give now an incontrovertible fact, and I would challenge the Finance Minister to contradict this statement. When I say this I say it in all seriousness and with full responsibility that this kind of evasion has been going on with the abetment of the Finance Ministry, if I may say so. Here is the Mundhra Enquiry, the full story. Mr. Vaidyanathan was asked by Mr. Justice Chagla, "Now that the sale proceeds of your shares have been attached by the Income-tax Department, how could you get a withdrawal of that attachment?" This is an alarming story. Shri Vaidyanathan said that he knew that the Income-tax authorities had attached the properties of Shri Mundhra but that the Income-tax Commissioner subsequently told him that the L. I. C. could go ahead with the transactions. I would like to know under whose authority it was done. This gentleman, Mr. Mundhra, owed the Income-tax Department to the extent of Rs. 49 lakhs. But according to Mr. Mundhra's calculation he owed only Rs. 1 lakh to the Income-tax authorities. Therefore, at this point of time the Income-tax authorities had attached the sale proceeds of Mr. Mundhra's shares. Sir, you are more conversant than myself with Income-tax laws.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not claim that.

Shri Mahanty: I would like to know from the hon. the Finance Minister his answers to these specific questions, I have formulated them. The fact is that the attachment order was withdrawn. I would like to know on whose authority. For, we know that the Income-tax Department is.....

Shri B. R. Bhagat: He should read the evidence given by the Commissioner of Income-tax who also gave evidence before the Commission. He has clarified that point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That he leaves for the Finance Minister.

Shri Mahanty: I have seen Mr. Nadar's evidence, and I can refresh my hon. friend's memory. Mr. Nadar sought refuge under the secrecy of the Income-tax Act: he said that whatever he had done, he has done of his own accord and not under any instructions from the Central Board of Revenue. I am extenuating the Central Board of Revenue, only imputing the fact that the Income-tax Commissioner functions as much under the Board as Mr. Vaidyanathan functions under the Finance Ministry. Mr. Nadar has done it of his own accord, and I am stating the legal aspect.

I would like to know from the Finance Minister whether the assessment of Mr. Mundhra was under section 23(1) or section 23(3) of the Income-tax Act. Sir, I cannot waste time, I can only give the references, I cannot expand the point here. I would like to know whether the assessment of Rs. 49 lakhs in respect of Mr. Mundhra was made under section 23(1) or section 23(3) of the Income-tax Act, or whether the assessment was made under section 23(4). That is my first question. My second question is, when the cancellation of the assessment was done, whether any cause was shown by Mr. Mundhra or by any of his authorised representative, or it was done *suo motu*. My third question is whether there was any mistake in the previous assessment of Rs. 49 lakhs—because, Mr. Mundhra said, "One lakh I owe you, another eight lakhs is disputed

amount, but not forty-nine lakhs". See the enormity of it. Unless the gentleman, the assessing authority was living in a moon land of his own, how could he assess Mr. Mundhra for Rs. 49 lakhs while Mr. Mundhra says that he can be liable for only Rs. 9 lakhs, I would like to know from the Government. This is a very serious matter. It should not be taken in a spirit of levity and the hon. Minister should not just smile. I want to know whether the mistake in the assessment of Rs. 49 lakhs was rectified by the Commissioner himself under section 35.

These are my specific questions. Unless these questions are satisfactorily answered, it will be open to us to say that this tax evasion has been going on with the full abetment of the Finance Ministry.

In conclusion, may I say that there is a need for tax relief, and it can be brought about by plugging all this kind of sources, a specimen of which I have brought to the notice of the House just now.

Shri Bhagawati (Darrang): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this year's budget does not cause so much excitement or controversy. It seems this budget has set up a pattern for a normal budget. In that way it is very welcome.

Last year some novel methods were introduced for taxation. So it is meet and proper that this time no new measures of taxation have been introduced. As a matter of fact, we now need to tighten up our machinery for the realisation of our taxes, rather than have new tax measures.

We do not know whether Prof. Kaldor was right in saying that in India income-tax evasion was of the order of 200 or 300 crores per year. But there is no denying the fact that there is a good deal of evasion in this country and revenue collection machinery is not as efficient as it should be. I would urge that we should realise

[Shri Bhagwati]

the maximum amount under the existing taxation laws. For that purpose, the revenue collecting machinery should be reorganised and the personnel therein must be given due training.

Yesterday, some of my friends, Mr. Masani, particularly, pleaded for the reduction of taxes. He depicted a very gloomy picture and opined that unless some relief is given to the industrialists in the shape of reduction in tax, things may go worse. But in a developing economy, the Government cannot help taxing the richer section to the utmost capacity. More particularly, if we really want to usher in the socialist order of society, we must find out a method by which we can reduce the gap between one section of the people and another. At present it cannot be denied that there is a gap between the richer section and the peasantry and the working class on the other. That gap is certainly very big and we have got to reduce it. If we want to have a socialist society, it must mean that there is some economic equilibrium between the different sections of the population.

How can we achieve that? Either by revolution or by peaceful methods. If we want to achieve it by peaceful methods I think taxation is the only way. In that way the Government has done the right thing. The Budget has to be judged from the financial stability point of view, from the balance of payment position and also by its impact on the production and productivity. As regards financial stability, the rise in price was a great headache. It is a welcome feature that prices have come down a little. While we want a reasonable price, we should not also think that the price should come down to the level which was prevalent in the old days.

Somebody seems to think that it is better to bring back the price of those days. I remember in the good old days, for a rupee sixteen seers of rice

were sold in Assam. That was very good for the consumers or those who had cash money to purchase but that was not a very happy situation for the cultivator. He toiled so much to produce sixteen seers and got only one rupee. What was the consequence? I know instances when the cultivators sold their land or leased for Rs. 10 or so a year. So we cannot expect that the prices should go down to that level. It will not be good for the economy of the country as a whole or the agriculturists. We should see that the cash income of the working class as a whole, who remain the purchasers, rises. I, therefore, plead that a sound wage policy should be followed. We have not paid much attention in that regard. So the working class has not the requisite financial capacity to purchase enough goods at the market price.

It is necessary that we should have stability of prices on the one hand and keep a wise wage policy on the other so that we can have a balanced view and all sections of the people may benefit.

As regards the balance of payment position it is gratifying to know that some loans have been received from the foreign countries. Mr. Dange yesterday spoke some unkind words about our loan from U.S.A. I do not think that we can escape the compulsions of a backward economy. In the present state of things, we have got to borrow from foreign countries; that is inevitable. As Shri Asoka Mehta has said yesterday, we benefit thereby and a day will come when we may be in a position to help others. In that way; the world may come to a stage when all the countries are equally developed and the imbalances between the different countries are removed.

We have also seen that production has gone up in this country. And for future production and productivity we have a planned programme. There

are very many questions and doubts about the size of the Plan. It is very reassuring to know that the Prime Minister has announced his intention to maintain at least 95 per cent. of the Plan. Yesterday, Mr. Masani said that it would not be possible to keep to that percentage and that the Government would be compelled to reduce the Plan and cut the expenditure further. When I heard him I thought he was making an arithmetical criticism. I was very glad to hear the reply from Shri Asoka Mehta. In an eloquent manner, he described the real situation. This is the developing stage in our country and as a matter of fact we are in a war. Different forces are working against each other. Those who want to maintain *status quo* are feeling in one way, and those who want to bring in a new society, a new social order are feeling in another way. Therefore, there will be some strain. There will be some risk. We have to face them and overcome them. There is no other way.

I think the Plan must be worked out. In that connection also we hear in Parliament that emphasis from industry should be shifted to agriculture. I do not see any conflict between agriculture and industry. If we do not develop industry. I do not see how agriculture can be developed in a modern sense. In a modern sense agriculture is also to be industrialised. If we want to introduce modern implements, tools, pesticides, insecticides and water pumps, it means that some sort of industrialisation has also to be introduced in agriculture. We cannot help that. So, there is no conflict or clash between agriculture and industry; both should be developed in a planned manner.

In formulating plans and policies for agriculture I would only submit that more attention should be paid for production of nutritive foods. We lack qualitative foods more than quantity of foods. As a matter of fact, we get cereals in a reasonable quantity, but

they lack in quality. Therefore, I think Government should pay more attention in that respect.

Lastly, we have undertaken big programmes and plans. In spite of that if there is some discontentment here and there, it is only because we have not yet found out a method for satisfying the individual needs or attending to individuals problems. We can only do that by introducing a scheme which other countries have introduced, like the national insurance scheme in the United Kingdom. There is a man who has not got any employment, there is a man who has lost his job, there is a man who has fallen ill and there is nobody in his family who is earning and so on and so forth. These are individual problems. No Plan can, I think, solve these problems. For these problems I think there should be some insurance scheme and these individuals should be insured against all these adversities.

Again, there is the agriculturist. He is always suffering from insecurity. He may grow a very good crop; but even then he may not be certain about the harvest. At the time of harvest a hail-storm may come and his crop may be destroyed. I know that cultivators plough two or three times and transplant three or four times. Even then they do not get the paddy due to flood, drought etc. In the same way pests also destroy the crop. He should be insured against all these eventualities. There should be an agricultural insurance scheme. That is very necessary. I realise that this would be a very big thing for a population like ours, but that is the only way in which, I suppose, we can solve the individual problems in the country.

Shri Kasthwal (Kotah): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister in his budget speech mentioned about our objective of realisation of a socialistic pattern of society, and he said that this prevents us from thinking or acting along the old groove

[Shri Kaaliwal]

I welcome that statement. I am aware that budget proposals alone do not usher in socialism, but I do believe that budget proposals are a necessary concomitant to other steps necessary towards such a goal.

Sir, last Budget Session this Parliament in its wisdom and good and sound judgment was pleased to enact two important measures, the Expenditure Tax Act and the Wealth Tax Act, which are under fire again today from certain quarters. Many hon. Members here have mentioned about that and I need not go into that in great detail. When these tax proposals were under discussion last time, many of us had raised doubts as to whether without a gift tax these proposals would remain sound enough, whether without a gift tax these proposals would be able to bring in the necessary income they were designed to bring in. Today we have seen that the rich are giving away their fortunes more and more before death as gifts and they would continue to do so more and more if a gift tax of this nature had not come in. In that context I welcome the gift tax.

We know, and it has become a truism that the State has the first title upon the estate of the deceased, and all those who take afterwards take only a subsequent and subordinate position. In that context I welcome the higher death duties. Today our tax structure stands integrated and, I believe, if there is no tax evasion—and I also believe that there is now less possibility of tax evasion—we will be able to bring in larger revenues to the State.

Sir, the agricultural production has loomed large in this debate. Many hon. Members have referred to it. The hon. Finance Minister himself has pin pointed as he says about the relative inelasticity of food production, that there is instability in prices and there is instability in production. It is true that our agricultural produc-

tion is increasing although very slowly. But, it is also true, that more people eat food today than ever before, more people eat more food than ever before and more people eat more of the same kind of food than ever before. That is my conviction. One hon. Member, Dr. Krishnaswami I believe, said that we must try to change the food habits of the people. I do not know how far we can change the food habits of people, the food habits which have come to them from generations and centuries. But I do believe that agricultural production can be increased enormously. What steps have been taken for that purpose, that is the question I would like to ask. We were told that land reforms would come. Have the land reforms come? We were told that land reforms were necessary for social justice and for achieving greater food production. What has happened to those land reforms? Many enactments for land reforms have been passed in the States, and the Minister for Planning has written a pamphlet on land reforms. What does he say there? He says that land reforms have not yet come. Why? Because there are social stresses, there are political influences, there are conflicting attitudes which prevent land reforms coming in.

Why are there conflicting attitudes? Our goal for land reform is clear. I do not know why there should be social pressures and political pressures against land reforms. The reason is obvious. The reason is that we have not succeeded even today in creating that atmosphere in which land reforms can come in. We have not succeeded even today in creating that social milieu in which people themselves can come forward, accept social reforms and proceed along the road for their betterment.

That is the whole difficulty. What shall I say? There are many other laws that we have passed. There are many other resolutions which we have adopted. I know that. I am reminded of that infamous incident

which occurred recently in Ramana-
nathapuram. We have passed the
Removal of Untouchability Act. Our
Constitution itself prohibits un-
touchability. What happened when
these outrageous attacks were
made on the Harijans?
What happened to these laws and
the Constitution? The only thing that
is there today is, we have not suc-
ceeded in creating that social atmos-
phere in which people will adjust
themselves and accept these laws and
where people will themselves realise
the injustices of wrong actions. That
is where I question how far the Gov-
ernment have succeeded in creating
that atmosphere which would usher in
a socialist pattern of society.

I come back to agricultural produc-
tion. My friend Shri Asoka Mehta
made an eloquent plea for a price
policy. I entirely and wholeheartedly
agree with him. Unless the cultivator
gets a reasonable price for his pro-
duce, I am sure he will not produce
much and make his best efforts. What
is happenings? So many other friends
have mentioned the difficulties. One
hon. friend says that the prices vary
from 87 to 112—a variation of 25 per
cent. I believe it is very necessary
that we should have a price policy
for our food production. The Food-
grains Enquiry Committee went into
more details in this matter, and I
am happy, and I am one
with them when they suggested
the establishment of an organisation
called the Foodgrains Stabilisation
Organisation. I believe that if such an
organisation was established, agri-
cultural production would be better
off than what it is today.

What will that organisation do? It
will purchase when the prices are
going down; it will sell when prices
are rising. The result will be that
there will be greater stabilisation of
prices, and the poor cultivator will
be definitely assured of a fair price
for his produce. Not only that. I
believe that as time passes, the Food-
grains Stabilisation Organisation will
be in a position to control a sub-

stantial portion of the wholesale trade
in foodgrains. I welcome that very
much. I believe today that private
trade in foodgrains is something which
is reprehensible. They hoard in a
manner—well, the less it is said about
it the better. I am confident that if
Government took measures for the
socialisation of the wholesale trade
in foodgrains, it would be a far better
thing for our country than what it
has been up to now.

We have accepted the principle of
mixed economy in our industry.
There is the industrial policy resolu-
tion which puts in category A some
industries in the public sector. There
is another category, category B, for
what one might say the joint sector,
and then there is another category
which is left entirely to the private
sector.

The hon. Prime Minister, in another
place, said that today there was no
public sector and there was no private
sector and that today is the people's
sector. Very well. I welcome his
statement. But if it is told that it is
the people's sector, I believe that there
are certain responsibilities devolving
on private enterprise. I believe today
that private enterprise can no longer
be actuated by profit motive alone. I
believe that the private sector today
will have to be actuated and moti-
vated by social attitudes. I do not
believe at all that if the private sector
is to prosper they will have to continue
in the way that they have been
continuing, merely being actuated by
the profit motive. That is why I plead
for a humanisation of the private
industry. I know that today no private
industry worth its name is capable of
standing on its feet. It demands loans
from the Industrial Finance Corpora-
tion; it demands loans and grants from
the Government and demands so many
other concessions. I ask; if this is so,
why should they have the profit
motive alone behind them? Why
should they not consider public
service? Why should they not give
better wages, better employment, etc.,
to their employees and so on? I do

[Shri Kasliwal]

not want to go into greater detail because I have seen the clock is going very much against me, and I shall be brief.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My eyes are also on the clock.

An Hon. Member: It goes in your favour.

Shri Kasliwal: There is to be a humanisation in the private industry. I have been thinking of it a bit, and I say that all these lead me to one thing. What are our basic socialist aspirations, I would like to ask, and how are we going to achieve them. Our Constitution says, justice—social, economic and political; equality of status and of opportunity; belief in liberty and democracy. It is all very good. But let me take only one instance. How far have we progressed on the road to social equality? That is what I want to ask. The Constitution assures us equality of opportunity. But I very much question whether equality of opportunity alone could usher in social equality. May be there are other factors, and the Government and the party as a whole,—the Congress Party to which I have the proud privilege to belong—will have to think in what way equality of opportunity can go along with other measures.

When I talk of the equality of opportunity, I very much question whether we have given equality of opportunity. Take the case of education. In the educational field today, there are vast and wide gaps. Public schools are still being catered for by public funds. Why? Those who want to give a good education, those who want to give exclusive education to their children, let them pay for it. Why should the public funds pay for it? There are universities also where such things are going on. Those who want their boys to have higher education, technical education of a type, let them pay for it. Why should the public funds pay for them? If public funds are to pay for such things, the public funds will have to be utilised for the sons of the

underdogs, for the children of the downtrodden and not for those who could pay for it. That is why I question where is equality of opportunity.

We are talking of equality of opportunity. But I believe there is no equality of opportunity elsewhere also. Let alone other fields. In the educational field itself there is no equality of opportunity.

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

Shri Kasliwal: Since you have rung the bell, I will not take the time of the House any more. I believe in the socialist pattern of society, and my leader, the Prime Minister, at some other place said that we are wedded to the socialist goal and that anybody who tries to check us from achieving that goal will be dealt with with a firm hand.

With these remarks, I have done.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : उपाध्यक्ष जी, संसार के जो खुश-किस्मत देश हैं....

An Hon. Member: In English.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : मैं हिन्दी में बोलूंगा। मुझे दूसरी भाषा आती नहीं है।

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): Let him speak in Hindi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him take his own decision.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : संसार के जो देश आज खुश-किस्मत हैं, उन को अपनी तरक्की—अपना विकास—करने का तब मौका मिल गया, जब लोक-राज्य का सूर्य अपनी पूरी रोशनी से धरती पर नहीं उतरा था। हम एशियाई देशों का यह सौभाग्य कहिये या दुर्भाग्य कि हम मंदान में बहुत देर कर के आये हैं, और आये भी हैं, तो

अपने साथ लोक-राज्य का पूरा सामान लिये हुये । ऐसी स्थिति में हिन्दुस्तान ने एक और बड़ा काम किया है कि लोक-राज्य के सारे सामान रखते हुये उस ने अपने विकास की योजना के अनुसार विकास का रास्ता लिया है । इस रास्ते पर चलने वाला हिन्दुस्तान शाब्द पहला देश था । और देश भी अब इस रास्ते को अक्षर्यार कर रहे हैं । हिन्दुस्तान ने प्रजातंत्र यानी लोकराज के भीतर रहते हुए विकास योजनाओं को हाथ में लेना तय किया । इस के साथ ही पिछले सात आठ वर्षों के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान ने जो उन्नति की है, जो प्रगति की है, जो आगे का रास्ता तय किया है, वह ऐसा जरूर है कि जिस पर हर हिन्दुस्तानी को चाहे वह किसी जाति का हो, चाहे वह किसी दल का हो, अभिमान होना चाहिये क्योंकि उस में उस का भी हिस्सा है ।

हमारे कुछ दोस्तों ने कल भी कहा और आज भी कहा कि यह योजना ऐसी है कि जो हमारी हैसियत से बहुत बाहर चली गई है । किसी ने कहा कि जो दूसरी योजना हमारी है यह पांच साल के बाद भी पूरी नहीं होगी । किसी ने कहा कि इस में १५ प्रतिशत की कमी होगी और मेरे मित्र मसानी साहब ने कहा कि शायद २५ प्रतिशत से भी ज्यादा की कमी हो जायगी । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह जो बजट है यह उस योजना का पूरा प्रतिनिधित्व करता है । इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि किसी योजना की सफलता, किसी योजना की कामयाबी इस बात पर निर्भर नहीं करती है कि हम उस योजना के सभी निशानों तक पहुंचते हैं या नहीं, सभी टारगेट्स की छू लेते हैं या नहीं या उस से भी आगे बढ़ जाते हैं या नहीं । ऐसी योजना-बाजी तो कम्युनिस्ट देशों में होती है । हमारे देश में, प्रजातंत्र में योजना की सच्ची सफलता इस बात में है कि हम समझें कि पांच बरस

की मंजिल तय करने पर, हम ही नहीं समूची जाति, समूची कौम यह समझे कि हम ने इस योजना में मिल कर पसीना बहाया है, हम ने इस योजना को पूरा करने में मिल कर कोशिश की है, हम ने इस यात्रा में मिल कर सुख-दुःख उठाये हैं ।

लेकिन मुझे दुःख के साथ यह कहना पड़ता है कि इस योजना में इसी चीज की कमी है । फारेन एक्सचेंज की कमी उतनी बड़ी चीज नहीं है, देश के भीतर से पूंजी जुटाने की बात भी उतनी बड़ी नहीं है, जितनी बड़ी यह चीज है कि इस योजना ने अब तक देश में उतना उत्साह पैदा नहीं किया है जितना कि जनता के भीतर, मुस्लिम बगों के भीतर होना चाहिये था । अगर लोग यह कहते हैं कि योजना का प्रचार नहीं हुआ है तो यह बात भी गलत है । योजना का काफी प्रचार हुआ है और अकेले एक भादमी ने ही इस योजना का इतना प्रचार किया है कि कुछ ठिकाना नहीं । वह एक भादमी है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री । उन की हर सांस में या तो योजना है या पंचशील । हर रोज लाखों भादमी उन को सुनते हैं या उन के दिये हुए भाषणों को पढ़ते हैं । केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, प्रान्तीय सरकारों ने, देश के अखबारों ने, देश की दूसरी संस्थाओं ने, कांग्रेस ने, सभी ने इस योजना का प्रचार करने के लिये काफी कुछ किया है और मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि आज इस का इतना प्रचार ही चुका है कि गांव का हलवाहा भी, खेती पर काम करने वाला भी एक शब्द जानने लग गया है और वह है "विकास" शब्द । लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ वह यह भी पूछता है कि मेरे लिये क्या हो रहा है ? दूसरे लोग भी यह जान गये हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री के हर सांस में योजना तो है जरूर लेकिन देश की जनता के सांस में योजना नहीं समा पाई है । इस का एक बड़ा कारण है । इस कारण को मैं अपनी तरफ से न पेश कर के अभी जो हमारे वित्त मंत्री थे, श्री टी० टी० कृष्णामाच .रि

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

शिक्षण ने बहुत बड़े टैक्स का बोझ मध्य-वित्त वर्ग के लोगों पर लाया है, उन की जबानी आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ। वह कहते हैं :-

"It may be because of the fact that the class from amongst which the intelligentsia is drawn has been the biggest victim of the economic upheaval of rising prices with their incomes rising not quite so far. The economic position of the middle class in India is certainly not one that can be considered by any standard as satisfactory, and these happen to be the thinking part of the public. May be that we have neglected them in the sense that we have not made any approach to them in the proper way. It may be that the relief that they have to get was only promised and not fulfilled."

श्रीर वही कृष्णमाचारी साहब उन लोगों पर एक टैक्स लगा गये हैं जिन की आमदनी २५० रुपये मासिक है और उस १९५७-५८ के साल में लगा गये हैं जबकि चीजों की कीमतें इतनी तेजी से बढ़ीं हैं। अब उन को भी इनकम टैक्स देना पड़ता है। एक तरफ उन की यह बुरी हालत और दूसरी तरफ यह टैक्स जोकि देश के मध्य-वित्त के लोगों को, जो पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं उनको देना पड़ता है और उनके साथ यह गैरइन्साफ़ी और उस के बाद हम यह कहें कि हमारी योजना देश के लोगों में उत्साह पैदा नहीं करती है, तो यह दोनों बातें बेरी समझ में नहीं आती हैं।

मेरे दोस्त श्री च० द० पांडे ने कहा कि अभी भी समय है कि इनकम टैक्स की यह जो हद है २५० की, उसे फिर पुरानी जगह पर पहुँचा दिया जाय यानी ४२०० या ४५०० तक। एक बात उन्होंने और

कही। उस को मैं सिर्फ़ दोहरा देना चाहता हूँ और वह है पढ़े लिखे लोगों की बेकारी की। उस की तरफ भी हम उसना ध्यान नहीं देते हैं जितना ध्यान कि हम को देना चाहिये।

एक बहुत बड़ा और भी कारण है जिस की तरफ मैं आप का और इस सदन का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि हमारी सरकार या योजना आयोग के दिमाग में सिर्फ़ देश के शहर ही शहर हैं, देश के गांव नहीं हैं। वह उन गांवों की फिक्र नहीं करता है जहां पर हिन्दुस्तान के सात में से छः लोग रहते हैं और उन शहरों की फिक्र करता है जहां पर सात में से केवल एक आदमी ही रहता है। इन शहरों के लिये सब कुछ होता है। इस के बाद जब घबराहट पैदा होती है और यह पता लगता है कि क्या हो गया है, क्योंकि चीज ठीक नहीं हो रही है तब निदान खोजते समय पता लगता है कि हम ने गांवों का तिरस्कार किया है और गांव का एक ही मतलब है और वह है गांव की खेती। इस के मानी है देश की खेती। पहली योजना में खेती को जो स्थान दिया गया था वह बड़ी अच्छी चीज थी और यही कारण है कि पहली योजना कामयाब हुई। यह नहीं समझ लिया जाना चाहिये कि मैं प्रौद्योगिकी-करण के विरुद्ध हूँ। देश में उद्योगों की जरूरत है लेकिन उद्योग और खेती इस ढंग से इस देश में चलने चाहिये कि देश में संतुलन कायम रहे। देश में जब एमबैनेंस पैदा हुआ, जहां संतुलन टूटा वहां देश की प्रगति नहीं हो सकती। दूसरी योजना में यह गड़बड़ी पैदा हुई कि हम ने उत्साह में आकर देश में उद्योगों को बढ़ावा देने की सातिर, उनको प्राथमिकता दे दी। उद्योग चाहिये, कारखाने चाहिये, लेकिन जरूरी नहीं कि रातोंरात वे हो जायें। इस में समय लगेगा। हम ने यह समझ लिया खेती की उपज इतनी बढ़ गई है कि शायद अब और अधिक आवश्यकता नहीं। अब फिर सरकार कोई दो

चार बस नहींनों से वह सोचने लगी है कि खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाई जाय। नेशनल डिवेलपमेंट काउंसिल व प्लानिंग कमिशन में भी उस ने इस के बारे में कुछ फैसले किये हैं। लेकिन होता क्या है? हम उसी वक्त देखने की कोशिश करते हैं, जब गड़बड़ पैदा होती है, यह तो उसी तरह से है कि एक भादमी का जब पेट कराव हो जाता है तो वह कहता है कि मैं ने ज्यादा खा लिया और जब वह ठीक हो जाता है तो फिर पुराने तरीके पर चलने लग जाता है। यह अपराधी की मनोवृत्ति है। वह अपराध करता है और जेल पहुंच जाता है तो सोचता है कि मैं ने यह काम अच्छा नहीं किया। और अब नहीं करूंगा लेकिन फिर जब बाहर आता है तो फिर वही काम शुरू कर देता है।

आप देखें कि खेत के बारे में क्या हुआ है। हमारी इतनी बड़ी योजना है, और इतना ज्यादा रुपया हमारा खर्च हो रहा है लेकिन आप देखें कि चार सालों में खेती की क्या तरक्की हुई है। १९५३-५४ में ५८० लाख टन अनाज इस देश में पैदा हुआ यानी आज से चार पांच साल पहले। १९५४-५५ में वह हुआ ५५० लाख टन। १९५५-५६ में वह हुआ ५४० लाख टन और १९५६-५७ में ५७० लाख टन। इस का मतलब यह हुआ कि १९५५-५६ में पैदावार सब से कम थी। और १९५६-५७ में १९५३-५४ से कम थी। १९५७-५८ के आंकड़े इसमें नहीं दिये गये हैं। लेकिन यह बात सरकार ने मान ली है कि १९५७-५८ में १९५६-५७ के मुकाबले देश में खेती की उपज घटी है। यह जो गवर्नमेंट प्राऊ इंडिया की इकोनॉमिक सर्वे की पुस्तिका है, इस के पेज २० प लिखा है :—

16 hrs.

"The relative inelasticity of food production over the last two or three years is also responsible for some of the difficulties that have

arisen in the course of the implementation of the plan. Food prices hold a key position in the Indian price structure. To the extent that food prices are higher, the saving capacity of the urban middle-class diminishes. Even a small rise in food prices is apt further to induce withholding of supplies. The task of limiting well in time, and to the requisite degree, the claims of consumption in a low-income economy presents difficulties. It is particularly important, therefore, that in the adjustments being made in the Plan, there should be greater stress on increased food production."

लेकिन यह बात मानने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा। जब फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज की कठिनाई आती है तब आप दूसरी चर्चा चलाते हैं। जब देश के भीतर ही रुपये की कमी होती है तो योजना में कुछ कमी करने की बात की जाती है। अब योजना में कमी क्या करी जाय और उसके लिये कहा जाता है कि इतना तो कम से कम जरूर करो कि जो योजना की रीढ़ है, उस का जो कोर है वह बचा रह सके। सरकार बार बार यह कहती है कि योजना की रीढ़ लोहा, इस्पात और बिजली है लेकिन एक बार भी इस का नाम नहीं लेती कि इस योजना की रीढ़ की एक हड्डी कम से कम खेती भी है। अपनी कृषि की पैदावार में बढ़ोत्तरी कर के ही हम फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज को रोक सकते हैं। आज हमारे देश का सब से अधिक रुपया विदेशों से अनाज खरीदने में लग जाता है जो कि हम अपने देश में अन्न की पैदावार बढ़ा कर के बचा सकते हैं। इतना ही नहीं बल्कि ४५, ४६ करोड़ रुपये साल की रई भी हम दूसरे देशों से खरीदते हैं। पिछले सप्ताह हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने जो लिस्ट पढ़ी कि कौन कौन सी चीजें कोर आऊं वी प्लान मानी जा सकती हैं, उस में उस चीज का जिस से कि खेती का गहरा

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

ताल्लुक है वह चीज उस में नहीं थी और वह है खाद के कारखाने, फर्टिलाइजर का नाम नहीं दिया गया। खेती की तरफकी के लिये इस देश में खाद के कारखाने खोलने की आवश्यकता है लेकिन वह न कर के बाहर से खाद मंगाई जाती है। सरकार यहां पर खाद के कारखाने खोलने की स्वीकृति नहीं देती और उस के लिये प्रोग्रामेंट यह दिया जाता है कि फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज चाहिये और बाहर से खाद मंगाने पर भी रोक लगाती है। जब कृषि मंत्री से पूछा जाता है कि आप बाहर से खाद क्यों नहीं मंगते हैं तो उन की तरफ से यह जवाब दिया जाता है कि हम क्या करें, वित्त मंत्रालय हमारे रास्ते में खड़ा है।

एक बात और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ध्यान देने की है और वह यह है कि जब पहली योजना चल रही थी तब न सिर्फ केन्द्र में अपितु राज्यों में भी कृषि मंत्रालय सबसे चोटों के लोगों के हाथ में होते थे और सरकार उसको महत्व देती थी लेकिन अब दूसरी योजना में आकर हम लोग यह देखते हैं कि क्या केन्द्र और क्या सूबों में कृषि मंत्रालय का भार दूसरी और तीसरी श्रेणी के लोगों के हाथों में दिया हुआ है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि जिनके हाथों में यह मंत्रालय है वे क़ाबिल नहीं हैं और योग्य नहीं हैं लेकिन एक बात यह भवश्यक होती है कि जब एक वजनदार लोगों के हाथ में वह मंत्रालय होते थे तो वे अपनी चीज करा सकते थे और करा ले जाते थे। आज चूक बैठे लोग नहीं हैं इसलिए वह उस प्रकार नहीं करा सकते हैं और जिसका कि परिणाम यह होता है कि कभी तो उन्हें प्रधान मंत्री डांट देते हैं और कभी वित्त मंत्री डांट देते हैं। इस कारण आज हम कठिनाई में पड़ गये हैं लेकिन इसके प्रतिरिक्त एक कारण हमारी कठिनाई का और हो गया है और वह है औद्योगिकरण का नारा जिसकी कि रट हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई लगातार लगाये रहते हैं। अब हमारी

सरकार पर कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के नारों का बहुत असर होता है हालांकि वह उनको स्वीकार नहीं करती। सोशलिस्ट लोग जब कोई बात करते हैं तब सरकार पर उसका असर ज्यादा नहीं होता। इसका कारण यह है कि कम्युनिस्ट लोग जहर में बुसी हुई गालियों के तीर चलाते हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर सोशलिस्टों को बैठे ही गाली देनी या जाय तो उनकी बात भी सुनी जा सकती है.....

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty: So, the public votes only to 'gali'? Remember, we are the major opposition.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्टों की ओर से यह बराबर कहा जाता है कि कार फ़ाऊ दी प्लान में स्टील को रखो। मिड्डले प्रिविजेशन में डांगे साहब ने कहा था कि कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स पर, गांवों पर और सब्जियों पर खपा खर्च न करके शहरों में बड़े बड़े कारखाने लगाये जायें लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा करने से हमारे देश की एकोनामी में अनबैलेंस पैदा हो जायगा, देश में असन्तोष पैदा हो जायगा, लेकिन हमारे वे कम्युनिस्ट भाई तो चाहते हैं कि ऐसा असन्तोष इस देश में पैदा हो जाय ताकि वे उस प्राग में अपने हाथ सेक सकें और इपीलिये वे ऐसी बातें कहते हैं। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार इन नारों के भ्रम में न पड़े और फर्टिलाइजर खरीदने को उतना ही महत्व दिया जाय जितना कि इस्पात के कारखाने को दिया जाता है। हमें यह कहना चाहिये कि हमें इस्पात भी चाहिए और साथ ही गेहूँ भी चाहिए और जब तक सरकार की तरफ से यह चीज नहीं कही जायगी तब तक योजना सफर नहीं हो सकती है।

एक और मरा निवेदन है। मुझे खुशी हुई कि अभी कल प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने इस बात को कबूल किया कि यह जो आसमान का देवता है

यह जब नाराज होता है तो खेती खराब हो जाती है लेकिन कुछ की बात है कि १० वर्ष हो गये, इस दस वर्ष में आसमान के देवताओं से हम कुछ भी राहत नहीं पा पाये। खेती की उपज बढ़ाने के लिए पानी चाहिए और सिंचाई की उचित व्यवस्था चाहिए और जूँ सिंचाई की हम अपने देश में उचित व्यवस्था नहीं कर सके इसीलिये सन् १९५४ से १९५८ में हम खेती की उपज १०० टन भी नहीं बढ़ा सके।

दूसरी बात यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय जो कि सन् १९५१ में कहते थे कि इस देश में आबादी की समस्या नहीं है, इस देश में पापुलेशन की प्रॉब्लम नहीं है और यह देश ७०, ८० करोड़ की पापुलेशन को सम्हाल सकता है, बूझे आज उनके मुँह से यह सुन कर बड़ी खुशी हुई कि वे भी अब योजना कमिशन के तथ्यों के रास्ते यह मानने लग गये हैं कि इस देश की बढ़ती हुई आबादी उसकी बड़ी समस्या है और मैं भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की सब से बड़ी समस्या उसकी आबादी है। सरकार बराबर इसको कबूल करती है और योजना में भी इस बात को कहा गया है लेकिन सरकार इस चीज को बतलाने में झंपती है और हम देखते हैं कि इस बढ़ती हुई आबादी की समस्या पर नियंत्रण करने के लिए योजना कमिशन द्वारा इस मद में बहुत कम रुपया दिया गया है और जितना रुपया दिया भी जाता है वह पूरे का पूरा खर्च भी नहीं होता है, न तो पहली योजना में हुआ और न इस दूसरी योजना में हो रहा है। आखिर इसका कारण क्या है? इसका कारण यहाँ कम्युनिस्ट्स हैं। सरकार के आलोचक इस बढ़ती हुई आबादी पर सरकार द्वारा नियंत्रण करने के विरुद्ध यह कहा करते थे कि पूँजीवादी लोग अपने सुख के लिए गरीबों की आबादी को कम करना चाहते हैं लेकिन मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्टों की वह गाली जो उसी वक्त टूट गई जब कि चीन में कम्युनिस्ट सरकार पूरी ताकत से और पूरे बल से कमिनी प्लासिम और आबादी को बढ़ाने से

रोकने और कम करने का आन्दोलन चला रही है और ऐसी हालत में आपको इस काम को करने में क्या झंप है। अब वे गाली नहीं दे सकेंगे और सरकार की इस सम्बन्ध में आलोचना करना बंद कर देंगे। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस पर गवर्नमट को और ज्यादा बल देना चाहिए।

आखिर में मैं सिर्फ़ दो बात कह कर समाप्त करूँगा। मेरा समय खत्म हो गया है। पहली बात तो यह है कि हमारी फौज पर खर्चा बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ता जा रहा है। वह खर्चा जरूर कम होना चाहिए। यह हमारी पंचशील की नीति के खिलाफ़ है। सारी दुनिया को तो हम यह कहते हैं कि शांति से रहो और सेना में होने वाले खर्च को कम करो लेकिन आज किसी भी देश के सैनिक खर्च के अनुपात से हमारे देश का फौजी खर्च कम नहीं है बल्कि ज्यादा ही है। वे देश जो कि लडाईं के लिए चिल्लाते रहते हैं उन देशों से भी हमारा सैनिक खर्च किसी ऊँचर कम नहीं है। इसी सम्बन्ध में एक बात और कहूँगा और बहुत धीमी आवाज़ में कहूँगा और वह है पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा ताल्लुक। उसको लेकर हमारी तरफ़ से कोई घबड़ाहट नहीं होनी चाहिए। पाकिस्तान की हालत कोई अच्छी नहीं है। मुझे तरस आता है और मैं घबड़ाता हूँ कि एक पड़ोसी मुल्क की हालत ऐसी बुरी है और इसलिए दुखार की हालत में वह आज मुस्लिम है। मेरा सरकार से निवेदन है कि काश्मीर के मामले में सरकार द्वारा पाकिस्तान के प्रति विशेष सहृदयी का रुख अख्तियार करने की जरूरत नहीं है जो कि हम लोग कर रहे हैं।

आखिर में मैं एक शब्द अपने सूबे के बारे में और कहूँगा.....

उपाम्यज महोदय : सबसे पहली बात आपने आखिर में रखी जब कि अब उसके लिए वक्त नहीं रह गया।

जी नं० प्र० विध : बस में खत्म किये जाता हूँ। हमारी बिहार गवर्नमेंट बरोनी में एक बनेल पावर स्टेशन ५ करोड़ रुपये की लागत पर लगाने जा रही है लेकिन उसके लिए फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज नहीं दिया गया और जब लिस्ट में उसका में ने नाम नहीं देखा तो मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ। उत्तर बिहार में २ करोड़ लोग रहते हैं जब कि वहां पर सिर्फ ८ हजार किलोवाट बिजली पैदा होती है और वह भी डीजल से पैदा होती है। लेकिन यह ३० हजार किलोवाट की योजना, ५ करोड़ रुपये की जिसमें मुक्तिल से २, ढाई करोड़ का फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज लगेगा, वह नहीं दी जा रही है और यह वहां के २ करोड़ लोगों के साथ गैरइंसाफी है और यह चीज की जानी चाहिए।

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput-Reserved-Sch. Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my distinguished friend and Finance Minister, in introducing his Budget last year, said that the Plan is the thing and consequently. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member shall have to speak a little more loudly or move forward to some Bench.

Shri Siva Raj: My voice is such. (Coming to a front Bench).....the Plan is the thing and consequently....

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandedesh): Now, we can't hear.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the hon. Members who can't hear can move forward.

Shri Siva Raj:the Plan is the thing and consequently the Plan must be hitched on to every Budget, not only this year, but the Budgets to come as well.

I am not taking the view of a partisan in the discussion of this question. I consider that this Plan must be treated as a national affair, and I feel that every party and every Member in this House must give his support to the Plan as an Indian, not as a party man.

It is so easy to pick holes in the Plan from any point of view. It may be from the point of view of the Government, it may be from the point of view of the capitalists or it may be from the point of view of the workers, but it is my view that unless all these parties, the Government, the capitalists, the private sector and the workers, all join together in a co-operative effort, the Plan will not be such a great success as we think it should be.

Personally I have felt that our Prime Minister, who had been able to generate so much of enthusiasm and energy in those days when he was fighting the battle of freedom against British imperialism, is not able to create the same energy and enthusiasm amongst the masses and it is very essential for the Plan in its later stages to succeed that the people must co-operate in the execution of the Plan. But I find that the people naturally, and probably justifiably, have taken a sort of indifferent attitude, if not an attitude of hostility to the execution of the Plan.

There are some reasons for this in my opinion. First of all, the Congress Party, the party in power, has treated this Plan as its own party programme.

Secondly, the impression has been created that the Plan is meant for certain areas, to the exclusion of other areas in the country. It is very difficult to remove that impression from the minds of the people. It may be by accident or by design that these investments are taking place in certain areas, but that is the second reason.

The third reason is that many people feel that the Plan is only for urban areas and not for rural areas. It may be the result of many of the factors of development that certain areas like Rourkela, Bhilai and Durgapur, by reason of the steel factories, may become towns in themselves. Nevertheless, the impression is created in the minds of the people,

in the large majority of the people of India, that this Plan is meant only for the development of urban areas.

These are some of the reasons that are responsible for the people not taking interest in the Plan.

There is yet another reason which somehow I think the States also have. The various States feel that the Plan, after all, is the burden of the Central Government and that they need not put in so much of work and worth into the execution of the Plan projects. Some of them feel that certain States have been treated more favourably and they themselves have not been treated well. That is one of the reasons why some of the States are rather indifferent in the matter of the execution of the Plan.

There is a complaint made that the States have not been able to utilise the money allotted for these plans. The reason is the States have been made to look to the Centre all the time for any move that they might make in this direction. So, it is very essential for the Prime Minister as a national leader to take interest in the matter of generating enthusiasm and interest amongst the people towards the Plan.

I feel that people in India today are more scandal-minded than Plan-minded. So, it is very essential that it should be done.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Because there are more scandals than plans.

Shri Siva Raj: In other words, people begin to love scandals more than they love truth.

This is a very important aspect of the Plan. There must be a psychological basis for the Plan to succeed, and that is why I am appealing to the Government, and more particularly to the Prime Minister, to see that the people are encouraged to take interest in the Plan.

It is quite possible for people to take either an optimistic or pessimistic view of the ultimate result of the Plan, but I am not taking that attitude. I feel that whatever be the attitude of any particular person, it must be seen to that the Plan is executed in a perfect manner.

From my little experience of one or two committees in which I have served, I find that the Government spending is different from the way any individual or any private institution will spend, because there seems to be a sort of recklessness about the manner in which they handle the funds that are placed in their possession for the execution of these plans. That is one of the fears that I entertain about this Plan.

We find that in many cases there is overstocking of stores and a lot of needless spares is accumulated. In many places where the administration requires a man with real capacity and knowledge, favouritism and nepotism have brought in people who cannot handle the management. Things like this happen in the public sector. I should like the Government to see that the people who can execute the works and who can carry on and manage all these big projects are really selected. It is not necessary that in every case there should be a man from the ICS or a man from the Secretariat. There are many others who could be drafted.

Another thing I notice is that more often than not there is greater provision made in these projects than they can consume within the year, and that is what my friend Shri T. N. Singh referred to yesterday. There is needless over-budgeting, and that causes unnecessarily a search for sources of revenue, thereby involving people in needless taxes.

While we are all talking about the Budget, it is very natural for every one of us to refer to the Plan, but let not people get away with the impression that the Plan is the only thing that concerns the administration

[Shri Siva Raj]

or the people. There are other things which I am afraid will suffer on account of the over-insistence upon the execution of the Plan. As it is we see signs everywhere. For instance, take the position of law and order. From the many instances that have occurred in the recent past, I personally feel that law and order is gradually giving way, and that there is deterioration in the maintenance of law and order.

Secondly, we find that the discipline amongst students is also getting bad. Some of the students have taken it into their heads that if they strike or carry on some demonstration, they can get their grievances remedied. For instance, I read the other day that in order to reduce the ticket charges of some cinema, students carried on a demonstration which involved breach of law and order.

Thirdly, we find that university education suffers. I have seen very often appeals made by the Chairman of the University Grants Commission that in spite of the Plan, greater amounts ought to be allotted for the advancement of university education.

While this is so, somehow the people in the villages feel that their interests are neglected. The landless labourers and the poor cultivators all feel that the Plan is a matter of no interest to them or a matter of no concern to them. In fact, I heard some people say in the villages: "What does all this Plan mean? After all, the Americans pay and the Congress Party plays with that money. What have they done with it otherwise?" That is the sort of impression that has been created in the minds of the villagers.

I hope that the Government will take care to see that side by side with the Plan, and even, if I may say so, at the sacrifice of a certain portion of the Plan, the interests of the villagers are looked after and protected. Very often, we find that in the community

projects, the real results do not arise, and people do not get any returns from these community projects. I was told that in many places what are called community projects really mean community projects in another way, that is, going to the benefit and the advantage of particular communities. It should not be said that these community projects exist for the sake of a certain section of the people. It is very essential that those in charge of the execution of the community projects should see that the man that has been denied these amenities all these years should get the first benefits of the community projects, and as I said the other day, the lowest should be the first people to get the benefit of these projects, and the people who have been enjoying all these amenities all these days must get these benefits only later. It is this aspect that I want to place before Government.

Again, there is a lot of talk about the public sector and the private sector. There is a tendency on the part of many to place them as competitors and say that each is hostile to the other. But I personally think that in a matter like this, namely the Plan, both the private sector and the public sector should use all their knowledge and their resources in a co-operative way for the purpose of the Plan. It is such an easy thing to criticise the private sector or to call a man a capitalist or to call a man a *marwari* and so on. Very often, we find amongst that category also very intelligent people, and I am sure that there will be equally honest people in the private sector as there are in the public sector of Government. So, co-operation is very essential. After all, what is this private sector? To my mind, they have not been industrialists in the past. All these so-called big businessmen, whether of Bombay or of Calcutta, were merely the agents of British trade in the east and that was how they were businessmen. They were never responsible for the establishment or the

introduction of any big industry, except probably the famous Tatas. Otherwise, they too have no experience in the management of industries. It is only recently, for the past twenty-five years or so, that the private sector people have started industries and have been running them. So, even they must acquire knowledge and experience. Just as an appeal has been made to them by some of our colleagues here, the private sector must know its duty towards the public, and I believe, as my hon. friend who spoke earlier said, that the private sector is now realising its exact purpose in the public life of this country, and I am sure they will co-operate with Government in the fulfilment of that objective. They too have an idea of social justice.

I am a great believer myself in social justice, but I do not consider the one-way traffic in the matter of labour legislation or in the matter of amenities as social justice. There must be social justice not merely as between the private sector and the public sector, but also between the employer and the employed, between the landlord and the tenant and between the landless labourer and the cultivator. That is the real social justice I am aiming at. I am not the man who suggests that only one section of the population should advance at the expense of every other section. It is in this view that I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister particularly to see that all these objectives are kept in view and no man should have a feeling that he has been neglected under this Plan or under this administration.

Shri Jhunjhunwala (Bhagalpur): I wonder if we are not deceiving ourselves when we say that our policy is a policy for a socialistic pattern of society. When I look to the result of the implementation of this policy and the steps that have been taken to implement it, I find that we are intrinsically wrong there. As such, I would say that we should change the phase

of our Plan. We should so plan that we should build our economic policy from below and not from above. If we go down and if we look at the condition of the masses, those above them, and those who are again above them, and the highest, we find that the highest are not in any way affected, and they are progressing day by day, while the condition of the middle class people, the lower middle class people, the landless labourers and the general masses is becoming worse and worse.

I am sorry I cannot support this argument of mine by facts and figures. The facts and figures which are being supplied by Government are themselves not very reliable and accurate. Government themselves have admitted many times that the statistics which are prepared are not so reliable. As such, it will be useless to quote any facts and figures and say that the figures are like this, for, in that case, Government would say that their figures are something else, and then we have to keep quiet. We have not got such a big staff and such a big machinery whereby we can collect facts and figures ourselves and place them before Government saying that these are the facts and figures and they show that the condition of the people is going worse.

It is said that our national per capita income has gone up by 3 per cent. On the other hand, there has been inflation to the extent of 6 per cent. So, if I take the national per capita income as the right criterion, then I should say that there has been no prosperity. This deceptive national per capita income does not give us any idea as to how it has been divided amongst the people, how it has improved the position of the lowest and the highest and so on. That figure is not before us here. We do not know it because Government do not prepare that figure. The best way of measuring the prosperity of the people is to find out whether the people have got more purchasing power, and of which class the purchasing power has

[Shri Jhunjhunwala]

increased. This year there has been a great drought in my State. Recently, prices have gone down. Goods are lying in the villages, but the people have got no money, no purchasing power, to buy those goods. I would request Government to give this House an idea as to what this state of affairs is and how the increase in national income by 3, 4 or 5 per cent really affects the people. So far as the lower middle class people are concerned, leave aside the question of higher standard of living; they have no means even to make both ends meet. There are many families whom I see and meet who go with only one meal a day. This is the state of affairs which we see, while on paper we find quite a different picture.

I would request Government to look into this state of affairs, as to how far this increase in national income is going to affect all classes of people. It is all right to say that the core of the Plan may succeed. It does not mean that we have really succeeded by establishing a few steel plants or a few river valley projects or this or that. The real success of our plans will, in my opinion, lie in increasing the purchasing power of the people. To my great regret, I say that this aspect is not attended to.

Everybody says that our agricultural production is the core of the Plan. Unless this is attended to, unless agricultural production is increased, our economy will not survive. This is so. But with great regret, I have to say that this is most neglected. One of the main causes for less agricultural production at least so far as my State is concerned—I do not know of other States—is the uncertainty of land policy. I would request Government that they should take the earliest possible steps in order to remove this uncertainty about land policy. If any change in the Constitution is necessary, for this purpose, I would suggest that Government should take the earliest opportunity to do so.

The second thing which strikes me most is that Government are only looking to big things. They do not see and go to the root of the thing. Just as Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has been pleading in every speech of his, I would say that unless animal wealth is improved—production of cereals, milk and other things are the mainstay of our people—our agricultural production will not improve. He was quoting our Minister of Agriculture who, replying to an argument of his, said that he had to take care for feeding men instead of feeding animals. But he does not realise that by feeding animals, he will be feeding men, he will be getting more production of cereals. 70, 80—some say even 90—per cent of our agricultural holdings are small holdings. Those small holdings are said to be uneconomic. But in my opinion, they are the most economic holdings. Taking them to be uneconomic units, they do not care at all for them.

I was going through the world figures in respect of agricultural holdings. In our country, it is about 6 acres per family. In Japan also, the figure is the same. Agricultural production in Japan is the highest per acre in the world. Similar can be the case with us. Simply blaming our agriculturists and saying that the small holding is uneconomic is not the right thing. If they are supplied with all the wherewithal of the means of production, they will be able to give you much better results—this is my personal experience—than large-scale production. I myself had been in charge of cultivation of 4,000 acres of land. There were surrounding villagers holding about 10,000 acres of land. I used to supply the wherewithal to holders of two, three and four acres of land. I used to send my people to them to see whether they had got all the means—good seeds, manure and other things. I found that the result with 4,000 acres of one farm was poor when compared with the produce of small cultivators—provided they were supplied with all the wherewithal. Bu

I do not think Government are taking any step towards that.

The small holders have poverty. They have got no means. Neither have they money nor have they animal power nor any other thing by which to produce better. They can produce better. So far as manures—cowdung and other things—are concerned, they are said to be the best . . .

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

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I have taken only ten minutes—even less.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That may be left to me. He has taken 13 minutes. He began at 16:25 hours.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I was saying that the Government should pay more attention, particular attention, to the needs of small cultivators. They should provide them with the wherewithal to produce and in that case alone we shall be able to get more production from our agriculture. We shall then be able to save a large amount of foreign exchange because in importing cereals from outside, we have to spend a large amount of foreign exchange.

As I said in the very beginning, our economy should begin from below. Now what happens is that those who are producing at a cheaper rate and economically are competing with the villagers who produce their goods in the villages. Government should adopt such a policy as to see that the villagers are not exploited.

Such a step should be taken by the Government and the villagers and others should be educated in such a way—propaganda should be carried on—that they use their own produce.

Then there is one point more about which I want to speak. There is a lot of talk going on about corruption and everybody says that this corruption must go. It is because of corruption that the Government cannot get its

dues by way of income-tax and other taxes. There is so much tax evasion. There is so much corruption on all sides. How to stop this? That is a great problem and unless corruption is removed, I do not know how our country will progress.

I am not entering into any discussion about the Mundhra deal or anything of the kind. Whether it was right or wrong, that is a separate question. We have decided that under the circumstances the best was done. But there is one thing which I want to say and that is that everybody knew long before that Mr. Mundhra's activities were most undesirable. I do not understand, when the Government knew and the hon. Finance Minister . . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh: They know about Birlas also.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I do not know about Birlas. One of the instances given was that of Mundhra. There might be many others also.

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

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I am finishing, but for these interruptions. You should come to my help.

What I am driving at is this—this is a very important point—that if we just encourage people by entering into deals with such people or encourage in other ways people who are of undesirable habits and if we co-operate with them in an encouraging spirit just as it was said that it was done with a view to save Mundhra, then I should say—if that was even the faintest motive of the Government—that was wrong. If the Government comes to the help of some undesirable people—I do not say whether this deal was right or wrong or was with *bona fide* motive or any thing of the kind but the Government should keep their hands off such undesirable activities—and co-operates and encourages them, in that case the removal of corruption will remain a dream.

An hon. Member: How will they win elections?

Shri Jhunjhunwala: So many things have been said about monetary problems, inflation and other things, but the main thing which we should see and find out is as to how the purchasing power of the people is going down day by day. It is said that we feel complacent. So far as we are concerned, there has not been much inflation in our country. The least inflation is in Switzerland, but in more developed countries there has been too much of inflation. But inflation by itself is not a bad thing. If there has been inflation but if the country is developing in other ways, i.e., there is more production, people's purchasing power is increasing, then it is not so bad.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But inflation in allotted time is certainly bad.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: All right, if it is bad—when you say that it is bad—I resume my seat, but if things which I have said are good, they should be adopted by the Government and you should press for them on my behalf.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this Budget, for the third year of the Second Five Year Plan, is a budget, whose difficulties and dangers nobody can underestimate except at his peril. Unfortunately, however, it does not seem to be reflected in the empty Treasury Benches that have remained empty all the time from Question Hour till now leaving the brunt of hearing our speeches and gathering what little wisdom that they may gather from it to the young Deputy Ministers.

However, we have heard certain attacks on the Plan and its targets, by Shri Masani specially. He has very frankly stated the case of the big capitalists. He has openly stated: Do not steel because in that Shri Tata is doing quite well. We should not

go into basic industries. Not only that he has tried to spread a feeling of pessimism and defeat and he wants that we should go down on our knees and say that we have failed. That is he wants legal sanction for the erosion of the Plan that has already taken place from the sector to which he belongs and which he represents.

It is true that many Members of this House have stated that the majority of the people want the success of the Plan and that it is ambitious. It is also true that in an under-developed country, in a poverty-stricken country, where the masses are underfed and under-clothed, the Plan targets are not overambitious. It is true that we have to storm the mountains and herald the dawn across it. That is why it is necessary that not an individual or a party but the entire nation must come forward with its best efforts and try to see that the erosion of the Plan is stopped. This does not mean that they are not for it. We have to be clear not only about the perspective which has been stated in the Budget, in the economic survey and in the hon. Finance Minister's speech, but also we have to see and circumvent the dark crevices that have appeared—not only those that are old and that we know but new crevices and dangers which are looming ahead.

Shri Mishra, whose business is to preach anti-communism, seems to think that the Communist Party has not paid enough attention to the agricultural front. Sir, we do stand for basic industries, we do want them to develop, we want that the strategic items must be controlled, but at the same time we do believe that the majority of the people of this country are agriculturists. Our prosperity depends on our raw materials and it is on this aspect, specially in the background of the recession that has set in, that we have to take a very very careful note of two important factors. One is the decline in the prices

of industrial raw materials. The fact of recession has already affected most countries in the western world and the effects on under-developed countries in the background of world recession and the trends that have developed already have to be taken timely cognisance of if we do not want the crisis to engulf us, without being unnecessarily panicky. We have to take note of the serious fall in the prices of industrial raw materials. This is one of the most disconcerting features of the present people. I am afraid that both in the economic survey as well as in the hon. Finance Minister's speech we do not see him taking full cognisance of this aspect of the economic crisis. This is a matter of life and death for a country whose wealth lies in industrial raw materials. For instance, I was looking through the All-India index number of wholesale prices. It showed that while manufactures had maintained their prices, industrial raw materials had fallen from 118 in November, 1950, i.e., a year ago, to 116 in 1957.

I have also been reading the speech of the Finance Minister of Kerala, a State which, as you know, depends to a great deal for its wealth on foreign exports in these industrial raw materials. And there the cash crops have shown a marked decline. For instance, pepper which stood at 117 in January, 1957 has slashed on to 59 in January, 1958; ginger which was 55 in January, 1957 has now come down to 32 in January, 1958; lemon grass oil which was 72 in January, 1957 has now fallen with a thud to 53 in January, 1958.

That is why when we read in the Reserve Bank of India report that exports have decline by Rs. 21 crores as compared to the corresponding period of the preceding year, and by as much as Rs. 82 crores as compared to October, 1957, we have to take very serious note of it.

And now tea has declined in volume as well as in price. Actually, I think we have lost to the tune of Rs. 20 crores. That is what is said in the

Reserve Bank bulletin. The U.S. demand for burlap has declined by 16 million yards and has recorded a fall of nearly Rs. 10 crores. Vegetable oils have also fallen by Rs. 5 crores. It is true that ores, iron ore and manganese ore, have not yet recorded a decline; but if the U.S. recession in steel goes to 50-55 per cent we will automatically find that in our traditional markets there will be a recession also and lack of demand for our export earning commodities like iron ore and manganese ore.

These are dangerous implications. And actually at a time when we are crying for foreign exchange, at that time it is interesting that the United Nations figure gives that the primary producers lost 600 to 700 million dollars in export income in 1957 alone. And this figure is more than half the total of the American aid given to the Asian friends since 1949. So this aspect of the crisis in the under-developed countries in the background of the recession is something which we have to fore-see and we have to plan for.

An interesting letter has also recently appeared in the *Times*, in October, 1957, by our friend, the well-known economist, Mr. Nicholas Kaldor and several other British economists. This is what had appeared in October, 1957, when most of us had not noticed the recession that had set in in the Western world:

"Each shipload exported by under-developed countries now buys fewer industrial goods. It is not surprising therefore that these countries are running into exchange crises and their development programmes are being seriously jeopardised. It is not always realised that a comparatively small fall in commodity prices is equivalent in its effect to a cut of billions of dollars in aid to under-developed countries."

This is a very remarkable quotation which I came across, and I feel that this is being borne out today. Only the early trends are to be seen. But

[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]

if this recession should develop, then the under-developed countries like India should see to our export earnings on which will depend the bulk of our foreign exchange earnings. That, I think, is a point that we have to bear in mind. What is the way out? Export trade has to be kept up for an under-developed country. I do not say that the Export Promotion Councils which have been set up have not done a certain amount of good work. But a new orientation of policy for export trade has also to be developed. For instance, we will have to think, in the background of the recession, in terms of long-term commodity agreements for fixed prices and the quantum. This has to be explored more and more in the context of foreign prices. One of the weaknesses in the agreements with the Eastern Socialist countries has been that the items of trades have been set out in the schedules, but the private industrialists have not made full use of the trade possibilities.

Another thing has been that state trading has to come forward and take up more commodities. Many criticisms have been made in this House regarding state trading. But state trading with all its faults, which have been shown in this trading in respect of manganese ore, etc., has on the whole shown good results. And we feel that they should take up other commodities like tea, coffee, and especially engineering goods about which the Export Promotion Council has already stated that there is a good chance for a good market in Asia.

One other point which I should like to make is that recently in the ECAFE, Japan put forward the plea for the development of inter-regional trade. India at that time supported the idea. But this has to be further developed, because it is clear that we will have to find out new markets. Already the European Common Market with certain countries in Africa which are the

colonies of France, etc., will be a serious danger to us; and unless we are able to build up these intra-regional trade agreements and areas of trade, especially in the Asian countries, West Asian countries, South Asian countries and others like Africa, it will be very difficult for under-developed countries to actually fight back this recession as well as the European Common Market.

The political implications of Bandung have borne fruit in Asia, but the economic implications have yet to be worked out. The same idea was broached with great success and found ready response among the people who attended the Cairo Conference; and it is an arena of economic policy which Asia and under-developed countries like India must have if we have to survive.

Having said this, I want also to say that the industrialists will cry and say that "the recession is going to hit us too; the jute industry is down, the tea industry is down". But I want to point out that as yet manufactures have remained at the same level. Whilst the industrial raw materials have shown a decline both in volume in certain commodities as well as in prices in certain commodities, we have seen on the whole the manufactures prices have remained the same. As a matter of fact, the fall in industrial raw materials is such that even the foodgrains prices remaining high, even that is more or less counter-balanced by this fall in cash crop prices. Therefore it is clear that the brunt of the taxation will have to be borne, to a great extent, by the industrialists. And I would like to point out to Mr. Masani and others, the F.I.C.C.I., etc. who have been clamouring that they should not be asked to pay so many taxes, that as yet if one sees the all-India index of profits, they have not fallen, they have been high. The index of industrial profits which stood at 191.6 in 1947 rose to 334.3 in 1955—almost fifty per cent. more than what they earned in 1947. Therefore, I feel that,

as a matter of fact, if they were to see the relation, the higher incidence of indirect taxes which an ordinary person has to pay, they will find that there is absolutely no reason why there should be even one moment's hesitation in our saying that it is the industrialists and the richer classes that have to accept this incidence of direct taxation.

At the same time I should like to take up the second point, and that is a very important thing which has been mentioned by many friends over here. That is the question of the price policy, especially in the context of food production, in the context of the rise in prices. We have been given various figures. I do not want to go into the figures. But one thing is very noticeable. When you compare the consumer price index with the all-India cost of living indices one thing is sure, that until the food prices come down there can be no reduction in the cost of living indices. As a matter of fact, even in the Economic Survey Report it has been admitted that there has been no fall so far as cereals go. If you take wheat separately, because there is such a huge amount of import, to a certain extent there is a little lessening of the prices. But as far as rice goes, rice has made a huge jump between December, 1956 when it was 94, and December, 1967 when it has risen to 102. Therefore, in our country all the rice-eating areas are facing

tremendous suffering. That, I think, is a point which many up in the extreme north do not realise, that is as to how much the rice-eating areas are suffering. It is no use asking the village people, "Diversify". Actually they have been forced to diversify. The point is that this question of rise in prices and rise in their cost of living is chiefly linked up with this question of food.

17 hrs.

The hon. Prime Minister has said that imports are very difficult, luxury for our country. True. As Thakur Dasji has pointed out, for a country where the majority, 70 per cent. of the people are agriculturists and where we have so much land, it is a shame that we have to import such large amounts for giving a minimum bare meal a day to the people.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the hon. Member likely to conclude soon?

Shrimati Eema Chakravartty: I may take about 7 minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then the hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

17-01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 13th March, 1968.