

[Shri Morarji Desai]

in the end. May I say that all the figures of external borrowings and repayments have been given to the hon. House from time to time?

As I said before, no under-developed country can develop without taking such help from other countries. It is also very clear that we have borrowed only within our capacity, always considering our capacity to repay in time. We are not borrowing anything where we find that it may not be possible for us to repay in time, and therefore there need not be any undue anxiety about it. It is good to have anxiety about it so that we do not over-run ourselves or over-reach ourselves and constantly keep within our limits so that in trying to improve ourselves we do not harm ourselves. I am therefore always grateful to hon. Members who keep us reminded of wisdom in this matter, and I can assure them that we are even more careful in this matter than they can be, because ultimately the credit of the Government depends on how these matters are worked, and if Government does not attend to this matter in as serious a manner as it should, it will not deserve to remain in power. May I say that we are very conscious of this responsibility and assure this hon. House that we will carry out this responsibility to the best of our capacity and with honour to this country?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Am I required to put any particular cut motion separately?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Cut Motion No. 2046—delay in the submission of the report of the Second Pay Commission—by Shri Prabhat Kar. We want to press this for a division.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has it been moved?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At 5 p.m. the other cut motions are to be put. Therefore ten minutes before 5 p.m. we will take this up.

Now we can pass on to the next item on the Agenda.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Incidentally we will get more Members.

14.09 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1950

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Finance Bill, 1950.

As the House is aware, 15 hours have been allotted for all the stages of the Bill. I would like to take the sense of the House as to how these 15 hours should be distributed among the various stages of the Bill.

Shri C. D. Fande (Naini Tal): May I say that the time may be increased by two hours because many people have to speak, and they could not get time during the discussion of the Demands? Ten hours may be allotted for the general discussion, and seven hours for the rest

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): I oppose it for this reason, that instead of speaking here, hon. Members might speak before stone walls!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Something is said and Members become sensitive, and they want privilege for themselves. That should be taken equally on both sides.

I was asking for Members' opinion as to the allocation of the 15 hours as between the different stages. We will have 15 hours for the present. As regards extending that time, we will see as the debate proceeds, and not decide at the very beginning.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): I would suggest 12 hours and five hours.

Shri Nanshir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Let us have 10 hours for general discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us have 10 hours and five hours for the present. As the debate proceeds, if we

find that there is some necessity, we will look into the question of extending the time.

The time-limit for speeches will, as usual, be 15 minutes for Members and upto 30 minutes, if necessary,—both qualifications are there—for Leaders of Groups.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to move.

“That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1959-60 be taken into consideration”.

Since the Bill was introduced in this House seven weeks ago, the proposals contained therein have been the subject matter of considerable discussion, both inside and outside the House. Some of the proposals have also come in for criticism. I have also received numerous representations on the various provisions in the Bill from Members of Parliament, chambers of commerce, trade associations and individual members of the public. Even though it has not been possible for me to reply to all these representations individually, I may assure the House that I have had examined carefully the various points of criticism and suggestions made in the communications addressed to me and I have also given much thought as to how I might afford relief where it was called for.

I do not propose, nor is it necessary for me, to dilate on all the provisions of the Bill. A detailed explanation of these provisions is contained in the memorandum on the Bill circulated with the budget papers. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to explaining the modifications I have decided to make to my original proposals and meeting some of the criticisms.

To take the indirect taxes first, in regard to central excise duties, the House will recall that a basic excise duty of Rs. 5.60 per cwt. with an additional duty of 70 nP in lieu of sales tax was proposed on *khandsari* sugar in the Finance Bill. During the general discussion of the Budget, this

impost was criticised on the ground that the *khandsari* industry in general was not in a position to bear this burden. I have also received representations from the industry. I have since had this matter thoroughly investigated, and I am glad to be able to announce some concessions for this industry.

It is proposed to make a distinction between *khandsari* sugar produced with the aid of sulphitation plant and *khandsari* sugar produced without such aid. The basic duty on *khandsari* sugar produced with the aid of sulphitation plant will be reduced to Rs. 5.04 per cwt. and on *khandsari* produced without such aid to Rs. 3.92 per cwt. Similarly, the additional excise duty on *khandsari* sugar produced with the aid of sulphitation plant will be reduced to Rs. 0.63 per cwt and on *khandsari* produced without such aid to Rs. 0.49 per cwt. This concession will cost the exchequer Rs. 61 lakhs during the year 1959-60 and Rs. 81 lakhs in a full year and will be now given effect to by executive notifications. It has also been decided that *khandsari* sugar should be deemed to be assessable only when power-driven centrifugals are used in manufacture.

In other words, it is of no consequence if ‘rab’ was made from out of juice extracted with the aid of power-driven crushers, *khandsari* sugar produced from such ‘rab’ with the aid of handdriven centrifugals or any other non-power contrivance will not be assessable. By way of simplification of procedure, I have also in mind prescription of compounded rates of duty in respect of the smaller units in lieu of standard rates. The details are being worked out and an announcement will be made in the near future. I do hope that the industry will have no further cause for complaint.

In so far as vegetable non-essential oils are concerned, some anxiety was expressed regarding the ability of the smaller units, which are now brought under excise control for the first time, to maintain a large number of registers and otherwise adhere to

[Shri Morarji Desai]

the standard procedure prescribed in the excise rules. Orders have since been issued simplifying considerably the standard procedure and dispensing with certain registers and returns. In the matter of clearance too, formalities have been reduced to the barest minimum. Under the new procedure, clearances, in fact, are permitted under Gate Passes signed by the manufacturers themselves, without waiting for an Excise Officer. By way of further simplification, orders are now under issue prescribing compounded rates of duty for units producing, without the aid of expellers, not more than 75 tons per year. I am sure that this further simplification will set at rest fears of harassment to the smaller units. This simplification will cost the exchequer Rs. 11 lakhs during the year 1959-60 and Rs. 12 lakhs in a full year.

So far as art silk fabrics are concerned, consequent on the increase in the basic excise duty from Rs. 0-0-6 to 6 nP per sq. yard, the rates of compounded duty in lieu of basic rates for powerlooms had also been increased to Rs. 50 for the first shift, Rs. 35 for the second shift and Rs. 20 for the third shift, the first 4 looms being exempt from duty. This exemption was really intended to benefit the owner-weavers, the truly cottage type, who normally work only one shift in their own cottages. But in extending this concession to the bigger units, such units, it is found, derive an unintended benefit by working the first four looms also for more than one shift. It is, therefore, proposed to restrict the concession to the truly cottage type employing not more than four looms and working not more than one shift. However, units employing not more than 9 looms will continue to enjoy the concession in respect of the first four looms provided they do not work the first four looms for more than one shift. It is proposed not to extend this concession to units employing more than 9 looms. To ensure that the medium size and bigger

units may not have to bear a greater burden of duty on account of this rationalisation and also by way of further relief, the compounded rates payable by them are being suitably reduced and readjusted. Suitable changes are also being made in the compounded rates in lieu of additional excise duty. These changes which are now being given effect to by executive notifications will cost the exchequer in basic excise duty Rs. 23 lakhs during 1959-60 and Rs. 25 lakhs in a full year and in additional excise duty Rs. 14 lakhs during 1959-60 and Rs. 15 lakhs in a full year.

In the field of direct taxation, I am glad to note that, by and large, the reactions to my proposals in the Bill, particularly those relating to the simplification of the company tax scheme, have generally been favourable, though there have been criticisms in regard to details

Shri Naushir Bharucha: No, no.

Shri Morarji Desai: I shall answer some of these criticisms. It has been alleged that the rate of 20 per cent income tax and 25 per cent super tax (i.e. 45 per cent in all) proposed for the collection of advance tax represent too high a burden as compared to the net incidence of tax borne by companies' profits at present, and will act as a disincentive to capital formation. This criticism has reference to my budget speech where I had said that under the new scheme, we would secure the same tax revenue from companies as before. I am sure the House will agree that at this important juncture of the economic development of the country, we cannot afford to reduce the present level of revenue from the corporate sector which is the most important single tax paying unit. The proposed rates of tax have been devised to ensure this. But subject to some rounding off, which is inevitable in any process of averaging, no substantial increase in the incidence of tax is aimed at or expected.

It is I think correct that, by and large, the net incidence on the profits of a large majority of companies following a prudent policy of dividend distribution is not likely to undergo any appreciable or significant change. It is, however, possible that due to certain peculiar circumstances pertaining to individual cases, for example, where the incidence of excess dividend tax or wealth tax has been low or where exemption is enjoyed by certain class of companies under wealth tax, or where the dividend distributions exhaust the bulk of available profits, an overall rate of 45 per cent may prove to be somewhat high. On the other hand, the rate may prove to be low in cases of companies where the incidence of the excess dividend and wealth-taxes was high. But such minor variations in incidence in extreme cases are inevitable in devising a scheme of uniform rate of tax applicable for all companies, which must necessarily be evolved with reference to the general and average state of affairs, and the overall tax effect on the corporate sector as a whole. The fundamental point to remember, however, is that in future, all companies will pay tax at the same standard and uniform rate, and to this no company can have any real or justifiable objection.

Again, fears have been expressed that the return to the shareholder will be substantially reduced under the new scheme. While I do not rule out the possibility of diminution in dividends in certain cases, it is not possible or even desirable to provide for extreme situations or for isolated cases. Companies which have been making moderate distributions of dividends will be in a position to ensure the full gross return to the shareholders as before without being put to the necessity of reducing the amount retained as reserves. The new scheme will indeed be favourable to companies which have been making prudent distributions.

I do not propose to go into details in regard to other criticisms. When a

new scheme is introduced, there are bound to be some difficulties of a transitional nature. So long as the House is agreed that the new scheme is itself desirable, nothing is gained by exaggerating its transient difficulties. One must also remember that the rates prescribed in the Bill are merely for purposes of advance payment of tax and do not represent the final rate for the assessment year 1960-61. As the scheme comes into operation we shall be able to notice its defects and we shall certainly take steps to correct them.

For the present, however, a few amendments are necessary here and there to clarify the provisions, so that there is no room for any doubt. I have given notice of these amendments to the House. These amendments are only of a minor character and will be self-explanatory. I do not think, therefore, there is any need for me to explain their purport at this stage.

Sir, I move

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Motion moved

"That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1959-60 be taken into consideration."

Shri Masani

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi—East). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are suffering under a disadvantage of not having with us the amendments which the Finance Minister has given notice of and which he just now mentioned. I hope, therefore, he will be patient enough not to misunderstand the criticism which may be made without knowing what these amendments are. I think it would have been happier if these amendments had been in our hands at least half an hour or so before the hon. Finance Minister made his speech. I am speaking subject to that and if I criticise something which the Minister himself has put right, he will, no doubt, understand this difficulty.

We also labour under this disadvantage that a measure that should have

[Shri M. R. Masani]

been sent to a Select Committee has not been so referred to. The Finance Bill, this year, does many fundamental things. It makes very basic structural changes in the system of income-tax in this country. Principles that have been part of our income tax law for decades and generations are being changed. It may be for the good; or it may not be for the good. But it is very desirable that when changes of this nature are made they are examined and scrutinised by a Select Committee of this House. That procedure, unfortunately, has not been followed.

The Finance Minister has claimed just now that, by and large, the scheme of simplification as it is called is not calculated nor intended to raise the quantum of income-tax or company taxation. And, I have no doubt, as I said on a previous occasion, that the hon. Minister is perfectly sincere in his intention. I do believe, however, that the facts do not altogether justify the Minister's confidence on this point. Basically, the scheme has offered that, in return for the shareholders giving up the privilege or benefit of grossing up, the general level of company taxation is lowered.

The Government have adopted a study made by the Reserve Bank of about 1001 companies in this country as being representative of the structure of our joint-stock enterprise in general. I think, there, they are labouring under assumptions which are not well-founded.

First of all, the Reserve Bank study was made in respect of two years, 1955 and 1956, and it was shown that in 1956 the average distribution of net profits, after paying tax, in the way of dividends was of the order of 60 per cent, while, by and large, on an average again, 40 per cent of the net profits were retained by the companies.

May I point out that in 1957 and 1958, the two years that have passed since the situation has undergone a

change? Owing to the unfortunate pattern of taxation which we have been indulging in for the last two years, it has not been found possible for companies generally to adhere to that rate of distribution. In order to maintain the same dividends that were paid in 1955 and 1956, it has become necessary for a large number of companies to increase the ratio of distribution to 80 or 90 per cent, or even, in some cases, to distribute the profits altogether. A proposal that is made arbitrarily on the basis of two years does not seem a very wise foundation on which to make fundamental changes in our income-tax

Then, again, the study covered only an aggregate capital of 58 per cent of the total involved in the joint-stock structure; 42 per cent was ignored. These are very doubtful assumptions on which to come to decisive conclusions, as the scheme seems to do.

Then, I would like to suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that this is a very important point and raises a matter of principle to which I would like the hon. Minister to apply his attention if he would be allowed to do so. The point I am making is this, that it is not a wise or sound thing to ask corporate enterprises to accept a fixed ratio of distribution of profits to undistributed profits. That is an artificial measure that will not be conducive to giving an incentive to enterprise.

As the hon. Minister knows, business follows a cycle of boom or prosperity and of depression. It does become necessary for companies to vary the ratio of distributed profits to undistributed profits from year to year. A company that may retain a larger share of profit in one year may have to distribute a large share the next year because of the change in the economic situation, even in order to maintain the same rate of dividend. Therefore, to ask the system of free enterprise to accept the idea of rigid ratio of distribution of profits to undistributed profits is to ask

the system to go against its own nature. Free enterprise demands elasticity and flexibility and this kind of governmental regulation or strait-jacket will act as a great disincentive to the production that we all desire. I therefore suggest that the very basis of asking companies not to distribute more than 60 per cent of the net profits after paying taxes is not a very wise policy in the country's broad interests.

Now, on a question of fact as to whether or not the shareholders will be mulcted more than they have been in the past, there are two studies to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister. One of these is a study made by Mr. G. P. Kapadia, the Chairman of the Indian Merchants Chamber, and in his own right a very distinguished accountant and auditor in our country, under the auspices of the Economic Research Foundation of the Indian Merchants Chamber. The other is a study of the same situation made by the Indian Institute of Public Opinion in its recent Quarterly Economic Report No. 20 of March-April, 1959. In these two serious studies made by Mr. Kapadia on the one hand and the Institute of Public Opinion on the other, an effort has been made to test the assumption made by the Finance Minister that, by and large, shareholders will neither gain nor lose as a result of these changes.

Mr. Kapadia's analysis shows that the Finance Minister's statement that these are peripheral and extreme cases to which we draw attention is not substantiated by the study of Mr. Kapadia. He makes a claim that all shareholders however situated, will lose as a result of this change. I suggest it is an authority that will have to be met and countered by the same kind of detailed analysis like that Mr. Kapadia has himself made. He provides the following figures. I would try to simplify them for my own benefit as a layman and that of the House. According to him, the present rate of company income and super-

tax is of the order of 51.5 per cent. If you add to that wealth tax and excess dividend tax, another 4.5 per cent, you get a total rate of company taxation of 56 per cent, leaving a balance of 44 per cent undistributed. If this 44 per cent is distributed, the grossing up which is at present enjoyed by the shareholder gives him benefit of the order of 20.24 per cent. Thus, Government retains a net 35.70 per cent. It is this figure of 35.70 per cent that has to be equated against the figure of 45 per cent which the Government now proposes to levy. I appreciate the fact that the Finance Minister has made a point that 45 per cent is not binding. The actual rate will be fixed next year. But 45 per cent is the indication of the burden to be levied. If that is so, then, according to Mr. Kapadia, the loss to the shareholder is of the order of 9.24 per cent because the Government today retain only, allowing for grossing up, 35.76 per cent and now it wants something like 45 per cent which would mean an additional taxation of 9.24 per cent on the shareholders of this country by and large. I think these figures need to be met. If they are not accurate, I hope the Minister will show where the flaw in these figures is when he replies to the debate two or three days from now. Mr. Kapadia's calculations further show that the smaller the shareholder, the bigger the additional burden that falls on him as a result of the simplification. A man with an income of less than Rs. 10,000 will suffer most acutely, while in the case of a man with an income of Rs. 70,000 or more the losses will be very small.

The study made by the Indian Institute of Public Opinion, by and large, bears out the conclusions of the other study to which I have referred. It points out that the average taken as a result of a study of 1001 companies is very misleading. Actually, no company is an average company; no company actually distributes 60 per cent and retains 40 per cent. That is a statistical average. To rely on this average is to be like the man who tried

[Shri M. R. Masani]

to plumb the average depth of a river and got drowned when he got to the middle! The Institute's study points out that there are many major industries where the distribution is much more than sixty per cent and those industries will therefore be prejudicially affected by this change. Among these industries are agriculture, processing, mining and the general range of manufacturing industries except for metallurgy, chemicals and a few others. Therefore, the Finance Minister's confident assumption that, by and large, no change is being made in the burden of taxation is not one that, on a reading of these documents, one can accept without questioning.

On the question of 'simplification again, the experts in the field doubt whether the result will be any better than it is today in terms of simplification alone. There is no more able tax lawyer in this country than Shri N. A. Palkhivala, a man whose opinions are respected by the Central Board of Revenue and by the Finance Ministry themselves. He has described the change that is being made and I shall read to you a passage from what he says. As he puts it, and for every step taken towards simplification, there are two or three steps taken towards further complexity. He gives an example about these exemption Certificates which are to be given to shareholders who are below the level of taxation. May I read a passage from his illuminating address on this subject, about the nature of the change that is being made. This is what he says:

The most drastic amendment sought to be made in the Income-tax Act by the new Budget is the abolition of the principle of the grossing-up of dividends. The proposed change requires to be considered at some length because it affects a very large number of middle-class people who have made investment in shares. Since the commencement of the Indian Income-tax Act in 1922, the law has been that any income-tax paid by a company is deemed to be

paid by the shareholders. This is the principle embodied in Sections 16, 18 and 49-B of the Indian Income-tax Act. But for those sections, the shareholders could not get credit for the tax paid by the company since the company is a legal entity independent of and distinct from the shareholders. Since the profits of the company ultimately find their way into the pockets of the shareholders, it would virtually result in double taxation if income-tax is recovered both from the company and from the shareholders. With a view to avoiding double taxation, the law wisely and reasonably provided that income-tax paid by the company was to be deemed to have been paid by the shareholders, with the result that the shareholders did not pay income-tax over again on those dividends which were declared out of profits on which the company had already paid income-tax. If the shareholders' income was below the minimum taxable limit or was not assessable at the maximum rate, he got full or partial refund of the income-tax paid by the company. The new proposal is that this principle of credit being given to the shareholders for the income-tax paid by the company should be done away with. The result would be that the yield on shares will now be reduced and the company and the shareholder between them will be paying more by way of tax than they used to pay so far."

This is the testimony of three persons who would normally be considered experts in this field and I think this House, or at least some Members of this House, would require a greater authority than the ipse dixit of the Finance Minister saying that in his view it is not so. I say that his advisors owe to him the obligation of satisfying the House in equal detail as these three parties have done that the results are not what they forecast.

and the imposition of a tax on dividend at thirty per cent in the hands of the company. Next year, the rate of tax on the companies will then be finally fixed. If I may say so, this is like putting the cart before the horse. The benefits are to be postponed till next year and the added burden or the threat of that burden has to be imposed this year. I suggest that nothing would be lost if the Finance Minister would agree to postpone even the first part of the scheme by one more year and introduce the whole scheme as one package next year so that we have the credit side to put against the debit side. As of today, the division into two parts means that the shareholders' loss is definite and the gain to the company is problematic and the extent of the gain is yet not known. Therefore, the Finance Minister is today trying to prejudice the position of the shareholder and the companies without committing himself to a rate of taxation which would compensate for this extra burden. I do appeal to him, even now, not to rush into this hasty and ill-considered scheme of the so-called simplification which none of the parties concerned welcome or want to accept, but to postpone this for one year, to withhold certain clauses like clauses 2, 5, 7, 9 to 18, of this Bill for one year, to refer the Bill to a Select Committee and let the House, in consultation with and after the examination of expert witnesses, come to a conclusion whether the change proposed in our income-tax law is or is not justified. I do believe,—if he did that—it would be an act of statesmanship for which this country would be grateful. Whether he does this or not—I cannot pretend to be very optimistic on this score, judging by the general rigidity and unresponsiveness of the Government to which reference was made by an hon. Member twenty minutes ago while speaking of "a blank wall". I know that the hon. Minister is certainly not a blank wall and I am trying very hard to make some dent in his resistance. I would like, therefore, if he does not accept this suggestion to postpone the whole scheme, at least to accept my amendment No. 12 which I have tabled in regard to clause 7.

This clause relates to tax reserves. I am very optimistic that on this point the hon. Minister will modify the position because I do not think the intention is to do what the Bill as at present actually does. May I explain that there are in this country today accumulated reserves in the hands of joint stock companies which have been estimated at anything from Rs. 200 to Rs. 500 crores; or Rs. 2,000 to 5,000 million . . . (Interruptions) I do not know. There are different estimates and I am not in a position to accept the one or the other. I say this is the range of the estimates given. These reserves have paid tax; they have paid tax at a higher rate than the one now sought to be imposed which is a lower rate of 45 per cent. They have borne tax at 56 per cent of company taxation. The companies which have followed the prudent policy of giving less dividends about which the hon. Minister is so fond, are in danger of being punished for having anticipated the advice of the hon. Minister if he does not rectify the position to which I am drawing his attention. There are companies which have paid small dividends and kept more reserves which have borne 6 per cent tax. Supposing the condition of these companies turns adverse, supposing they go in for expansion projects during which period they cannot produce, supposing they meet with adverse business conditions and they want to maintain even the modest rate of dividends, they will naturally have to draw on these reserves, and that is what the reserves are therefor. As the Bill stands today, these reserves would be taxed again in the hands of the shareholder, which would mean that the same profits are taxed twice. That would mean double taxation.

To put it in another way, the Finance Minister wants us to accept the scheme of giving up grossing up in favour of the shareholders by offering a lower rate of company tax, even if it is not declared today. But these profits have not borne a lower tax. These profits have borne 56 per cent. If they are distributed in the next few years, is it fair, is it equitable, or is it an incentive to a prudent dividend policy, if they are to be taxed a second

[Shri M. R. Masani]

time, while if they had been distributed last year or the year before, they would have escaped this additional taxation?

I am confident that the Finance Minister, with his sense of fairness, will not fail to respond to this plea, because I think this was not the intention with which this Bill was introduced. Therefore, I have moved my amendment 12 which seeks to add after clause 7 the words:

"provided that section 16(2) of the Income-tax Act shall continue to apply in respect of dividends declared out of profits of the company assessable for the year 1959-60 or any earlier year".

If the Finance Minister wants to restrict the *status quo* to a limited number of years like six, eight or ten, let him say so. I am not saying that for perpetuity this safeguard may be given, but certainly for a decade or so, during which time it would be legitimate to use these reserves partly for dividend purposes to meet adverse conditions. It is not fair that these profits which have already borne heavy tax at the higher rate should now be denied the privilege of grossing up which is being taken away.

That in fact would mean that those companies which were extravagant in their dividend policies were wise in not trusting the Finance Minister and the Government, while those who had faith in the stability of our fiscal policy were making a sad mistake. I do not think that the Finance Minister or the Government will their eyes on the future would like such lesson to be learnt by reason of the measure that they have produced before the House. Therefore, I would suggest that an amendment may be made. It may not be my amendment, but some amendment may be made by the Finance Minister. I am subject to correction, but if there is no such amendment, in the Finance Minister's amendments, may I suggest that he introduces an amendment which would safeguard that for the period of, say, ten years,

companies should be free to declare dividends out of tax reserves built up in the years before, before 1959-60, that they should not be required to deduct tax at the prescribed taxation for such dividends, and that the shareholder should get credit for the income-tax paid by the company. I think this is a proposal which, the hon. Minister would like to consider and give a reply to in detail later.

Before I conclude, there are one or two points to be made. The only other tax to which I wish to refer is the Expenditure Tax. I happened to be on the Select Committee which examined that proposal. Many other hon. Members of the Select Committee are here. I understood that what we have said two years ago was in the nature of a compromise. Various groups were consulted, the members of the ruling party, Members of the Opposition Group, and the expert witnesses who came before the Committee, were listened to and a scheme was prepared. The scheme was—it was unanimously accepted more or less by the House, though some of us were opposed to the principle of the Expenditure Tax—that nobody whose net income after paying tax was below Rs. 36,000 would come within the mischief of the law. Now, by a unilateral stroke of the pen, without so much as going back to another Select Committee of this House or the same one, it is sought to knock the very foundation out of that compromise by saying that the income of the whole family, wife and dependent children included, is to be computed as to whether it comes within Rs 36,000 or not. I do believe that this is not altogether a conscionable policy. I think if the Government wanted to shift the very nature of the Expenditure Tax, they should have made an amendment in the Expenditure Tax Act, brought it before the House, referred it to Select Committee and got the whole thing examined very carefully.

Similarly, the exemption of bullion, jewellery and certain articles of that nature which were excluded from the

purview of the Act are now sought to be brought within the purview of the Act by a similar amendment. May I point out that the Minister here is caught in a self-contradiction. The change proposed by sub-clause 2 of clause 25 is that bullion, precious stones and jewellery should be treated as items of expenditure, instead of being treated as items of capital investment. Now, I would recall that the Joint Committee, after hearing representative interests, was satisfied at the time when this measure was passed that these items are not really expenditure but capital investment. It was on that basis that they were excluded. Even now, under the Wealth Tax they are not considered as expenditure. For the purposes of Wealth Tax they are charged as assets. They cannot be both assets and expenditure at the same time. I do think Government owe that much fairness to the public in this country to decide whether these are capital assets or they are expenditure. You cannot tax them under the Wealth Tax as capital assets and then tax them also under the Expenditure Tax as expenditure. These are the ways which make one begin to wonder whether normal ethics are or not supposed to apply when it comes to a relationship between this Government of ours and the citizens of this country. If private industrialists or businessmen were to indulge in these quibbles, in these attempts to give words double meanings, they would be called black-marketeers and crooks and anti-social elements. But it seems that when Government does it, anything is moral and anything is legitimate, so long as it is only the private citizen who is adversely affected.

The plea that I am making is against this hasty legislation embodied in the Finance Bill. I have given two examples: in regard to company taxation and in regard to the Expenditure Tax, to show that the provisions of the Bill just now before us are hasty, ill-considered and ill-digested. I have made the plea that they be postponed for a year if the Government will consider that. If they do not, there is no doubt in my mind that to the many disin-

centives to hard work and enterprise which they have provided year after year through the disastrous series of Budgets which we have been experiencing in the last two years, they are adding one more.

There was an old saying that the Greeks passed their laws when they were drunk, but they reconsidered them later when they were sober. That I suppose is the basis of the proverb that one should appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. I do not know what one does in the case of our Finance Minister who is a total abstainer. In his case, all I can say is that I can only appeal from Philip sober to Philip a little more sober.

Shri Parulekar (Thana): I rise to oppose all the measures of indirect taxation as well as the measures which abolish the wealth tax on companies and the tax on excess dividends as amended by the announcement just now made by the Finance Minister. These measures of indirect taxation are estimated to increase the burden of indirect taxation by about Rs. 19 crores, taking into consideration the concession which have been made. These measures cannot be judged in isolation and in a piecemeal way. They have to be judged in the context of the structure of taxation as well as in the context of all the proposals of taxation contained in this Bill taken together.

This Bill raises some basic questions, and I will raise them and try to answer them because it will enable us to decide the attitude which ought to be taken in regard to the Bill. The first question is, how does Government spend its revenues? The second question is, who are the people who are called upon to bear the burden of additional taxation. The third question is, who are the people who have been let free. The last question is, besides the Government, who are the people who will be benefited by the proposals contained in this Bill.

15 hrs.

I will take the first question, viz., Government expenditure. The hon. Minister during the course of his

[Shri Parulekar]

speech said and he again repeated today that:

"We are doing our best to see that there is no avoidable increase in non-development expenditure and in the Planning Commission, we have a machinery for securing economy in non-planned and planned expenditure. I would, however, assure the House that I am fully conscious of the imperative need for tightening control over such expenditure and it is our constant endeavour to achieve the utmost economy without sacrifice of efficiency."

Let us assess the value of this assurance given by the Finance Minister in the light of some facts and figures. I will cite some figures of expenditure under three heads—civil expenditure, civil administration and miscellaneous: in 1950-51, the civil expenditure was 187.3 crores; in 1951-52 Rs. 216.3 crores; in 1952-53 Rs. 216.7 crores; in 1953-54 Rs. 221.2 crores; in 1954-55 Rs. 230.9 crores; in 1955-56 Rs. 291.7 crores; in 1956-57 Rs. 330.5 crores; in 1957-58 Rs. 427.0 crores; in 1958-59 Rs. 528 crores and in 1959-60 Rs. 596.5 crores. I will refer to the expenditure under another head, because he referred to expenditure on Parliament, in order to justify the increase in expenditure. Taking civil administration, the expenditure in 1950-51 was Rs. 48.30 crores; in 1951-52 Rs. 53.67 crores; in 1952-53 Rs. 51.71 crores; in 1953-54 Rs. 64.17 crores; in 1954-55 Rs. 75.11 crores; in 1955-56 Rs. 94.8 crores; in 1956-57 Rs. 122.29 crores; in 1957-58 Rs. 168 crores; in 1958-59, Rs. 197.92 crores; in 1959-60 Rs. 222.22 crores. The miscellaneous expenditure also has increased from Rs. 52.87 crores in 1950-51 to Rs. 100.62 in 1959-60.

What do these figures demonstrate? They demonstrate that during the period of 9 years, between 1950-51 and 1958-59, the revenues increased by Rs. 310 crores; the civil expenditure increased by Rs. 234 crores and the miscellaneous expenditure by Rs. 48 crores. The administrative machinery

has swelled up to such an extent that it has started eating all the additional revenues that we are collecting by taxing the people. It has become inefficient and it has also become wasteful in expenditure to some extent. May I tell the Finance Minister that he has no moral right—legal right, of course, he has—to tax the vast mass of people, the toiling millions. He has no right to indulge in giving moral sermons that everybody should be prepared for sacrifices unless and until he establishes the fact that the revenues which are collected are spent most economically, that they are not wasted and that they are spent to the utmost advantage of the people and the country. Assurances are of no use and of no value. I may tell the Finance Minister that the value of such stocks has gone very low in the market

In this connection, I would like to read a para from the Taxation Enquiry Commission's Report, Vol. I, page 34

"Besides, it appears desirable at the outset of an enquiry encompassing among other things the investigation of possibilities of fresh additional sources or revenue, to underline the need of ensuring the most effective utilisation of existing tax resources for promoting the community's welfare and development, before new and higher burdens are imposed on the people. This last consideration emphasises the vital concern of a Commission charged to enquire into the tax system with the evolution of proper expenditure policies by Governments—Central and State. A detailed enquiry into public expenditure from this point of view, however, falls beyond our terms of reference. It is a large enough subject for full-scale separate investigation. The need for utmost restraint on the growth of non-development expenditure can hardly be over emphasised.

"Besides, during a phase of intensive development effort, when targets in terms of expenditure also assume a certain degree of significance, there is likely to be, even within the development sector of expenditure, some loss in effectiveness and possible room for economy and avoidance of waste. We are ourselves impressed with the need for thorough and careful enquiry both in the Central Government and the States into the whole question of public expenditure and suggest that such enquiries should be undertaken and entrusted to sufficiently high-powered bodies"

I would like to ask the Finance Minister what has happened to this recommendation. It has gone into cold storage. Government has perfected the art which was taught by the British imperialists. Whenever a problem became acute, a commission was appointed. By the time the Commission submitted its report, Government expected some long time to lapse, so that the sting of the problem would be blunted and people would forget the problem. When the report comes, if they find it inconvenient, they appoint some other committee to examine those recommendations of the Commission. In this way, time is allowed to lapse and many of the recommendations of the Commissions and committees appointed remain in cold storage. This was one such recommendation. I have already said that mere assurances are of no value, because the value of such stocks among the people has gone very low.

The next question is, who are the people who are being called upon to bear the burden of additional taxation. He has said in his speech that he wants to raise the revenue by indirect taxation, which means by taxing the common people. This question must be considered carefully. Do the common masses of the people, the toiling masses, have the capacity to bear the additional burden? In

the light of relevant facts, my submission will be that they do not have that capacity.

In this connection, I will cite some figures which show that the burden of indirect taxation has increased and has become unbearable. I will give some figures regarding excise duties on some of the necessities of life.

| Name of article | Excise duty (in crores of rupees) | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| | 1951-52 | 1958-59 |
| Kerosene | 0.26 | 4.20 |
| Sugar | 8.49 | 58.87 |
| Cloth | 16.33 | 63.85 |
| Matches | 8.61 | 17.70 |
| Vegetable oils | Nil | 8.60 |
| Vegetable products | 2.49 | 3.96 |
| Tea and Coffee | 5.09 | 7.40 |
| Soap | Nil | 1.85 |
| Motor spirit | 2.03 | 32.29 |

In 1949-50 the total revenue through the medium of excise duties was Rs 67.90 crores and in 1958-59 it was Rs 301.15 crores, an increase of Rs 233.25 crores.

It will be seen that the capacity of the people to bear additional burden in the form of indirect taxation does not exist. The burden has become unbearable. Perhaps the hon. Finance Minister will ask me: what is the proof? I have proofs in abundance, but the time will not permit me to place all the proofs here in the course of the discussion. But I will cite one. As a result of this phenomenon, the crisis of purchasing capacity has already started creeping in and the home market has started contracting. We find this phenomenon expressing itself in railways, where the earnings have gone down. Again, the people are not able to consume all the cloth that is produced; the people are not able to consume all

[Shri Parulekar]

the sugar that is produced in the country; the people are not able to consume all the cement that is produced in the country. The real income of the masses, the vast masses of people, has not risen. It is going down. In addition to that, the Finance Minister is increasing the burden of taxation on the people as a result of which we find that the crisis of purchasing capacity has started creeping in.

You cannot tap poverty for revenues. If we do that, it will recoil on ourselves and it will recoil on the system of which the hon. Finance Minister is the most ardent champion. I would like to ask him a question. Did he ponder for a minute before he decided to increase the burden of indirect taxation on this aspect of the question? I know he has not. Because, in the course of his speech he says:

"Our record in the matter of raising additional resources by way of taxation for the Plan has, I venture to think, been quite impressive, since the Second Plan came into operation."

Out of Rs. 100 crores of additional revenue, Rs. 75 crores to 80 crores were raised by way of indirect taxation, and yet the hon. Finance Minister says that this is an impressive performance.

Assuming for the sake of argument that these taxes were unavoidable and inescapable, even then, a normal man who has got some sympathy for the masses of the people would have regretted the burden of taxation which had to be increased, would have a word of apology for increasing his taxes, would have a word of compassion for the people whom he was going to tax. But he has no word of either regret or apology, or a word of compassion, to say to the people whom he is taxing. He says it is an impressive figure, an impressive performance, and that betrays an attitude of mind of callousness for the sufferings of the millions of people who

are today steeped in misery, poverty and wretchedness, and contempt for them. And it was also exhibited in this House a few minutes before.

I will now proceed to take up the third question, namely, who are the people whom he does not want to tax. He does not want to impose increased burden of taxation on the rich, that class of people who can afford to bear the additional burden of taxation. And his arguments are two. One of his arguments is that it is not necessary to tax them, because we have now got an integrated structure of taxation, the one which is now in operation. Another argument which he advocates is that as a result of the integrated structure of taxation, it will be possible to stop the evasion of taxes and, therefore, to increase revenue.

I would like to point out to this House in this connection that the percentage of direct taxes to revenues is falling. I will give the relevant figures which are very instructive. The following are the percentages of direct taxes to total revenue:

| Year | Percentage |
|-------------------|------------|
| 1949-50 | 45.1 |
| 1950-51 | 42.8 |
| 1951-52 | 35.6 |
| 1952-53 | 41.7 |
| 1953-54 | 39.2 |
| 1954-55 | 35.7 |
| 1955-56 | 34.1 |
| 1956-57 | 35.0 |
| 1957-58 | 33.0 |
| 1958-59 | 31.2 |

The figures definitely demonstrate the fact that the percentage of direct taxes to revenue is going down, is falling.

I agree with one of his statements—because generally I am not in a position to accept anything that he says, knowing him as well as I do—on this point I accept one of his propositions, and that is this: when the evasion of

taxes is stopped, the revenues of the Government will increase; I accept it. They will increase tremendously, by hundreds and hundreds of crores of rupees, if the evasion of taxes is stopped. But the question is: Will they stop the evasion of taxes? The question is: Can they stop it? They will not, for the simple reason that the Government is not prepared to take those steps which alone can stop evasion. Evasion of taxes is a very complex phenomenon. There is illegal evasion, there is legal evasion. Let me, for the benefit of the hon. Finance Minister, since he has taken up this portfolio recently, and for the benefit of many who are not aware of it, read certain observations made by a Commission which was appointed by Government. I will read a small paragraph from the Report of the Taxation Enquiry Commission (Volume II):

"Among the numerous devices employed for tax evasion may be mentioned the: (i) omission to report taxable income, (ii) fraudulent changes in account books, (iii) maintenance of multiple sets of account books, (iv) opening of bank accounts under assumed names, (v) securing of contracts in the names of dummies or figureheads, and (vi) keeping transactions out of account books."

Does he expect that the integrated tax structure will be able to tackle this problem in all its aspects? No. There is another recent report by Kaldor. Let us see what he says in this respect.

"Everyone is agreed that apart from manipulation of various kinds, which are broadly classified under the term 'tax avoidance', there is considerable amount of evasion in India due to fraudulent concealment of income secured through false entries in the account books and the accounts.

"It is fairly generally agreed also that such practices have become more widespread since the last War."

Then the Report proceeds to say—

"There is finally the question whether a great deal might not be achieved through more powerful deterrents to fraudulent practices. In India, as in Britain, tax-evaders are treated very leniently. Very few cases of fraudulent evasion are prosecuted before the courts, and the taxpayer is generally promised immunity both from prosecution and publicity, if he makes a full disclosure and is willing to pay the relatively modest penalty imposed. I suppose that, just as in Britain, this policy is based on the supposition that the Revenue will fare better and collect more if it allows the careless and sinful to come forward and confess their sins than if it threatens dire punishment."

Then it proceeds to say—

"I very much doubt whether the policy of 'softness' is of much avail, or whether, on the contrary, it tends to increase the scope of evasion. For it leads to a 'heads I win, tails I do not lose' attitude...."

Further, it says—I will not read the whole of the passage but only the relevant portions of it:

"Very different is the situation in the USA"—

of which the hon. Finance Minister is very fond and to which he is very much attached. I will quote what is done in USA so that perhaps he might accept it.

"Very different is the situation in the USA where the tax-payer is left to assess himself to tax but if he is discovered having concealed income, he can be charged to an enormous penalty

[Shri Parulekar]

(amounting to between 10 to 20 times the tax escaped) and is frequently dragged before the courts in a trial attracting a great deal of publicity and ending in long terms of imprisonment.... No case of this type has ever been brought before the criminal courts either in Britain or in India. I feel quite certain that very heavy penalties and prosecution with a great deal of publicity is an infinitely more effective method of dealing with tax evasion than the policy of deliberate leniency and avoidance of public disclosure followed in Britain and India."

It will be obvious that the measures which have been adopted in USA can be adopted in India. They do not have the taint of anything red in them and so the hon. Finance Minister need not be frightened by the measures which have been adopted in USA.

There is another aspect. Government do not collect arrears of taxes on income which are found to be due to them. In this respect I will draw the attention of the House to the Seventh Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Volume I), where the figures of arrears are given. They are—

| | Crores Rs. |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 1948-49 | 12 4 |
| 1949-50 | 12 4 |
| 1950-51 | 20 0 |
| 1951-52 | 20 2 |
| 1952-53 | 20 9 |
| 1954-55 | 27 3 |
| 1955-56 | 40 8 |
| 1956-57 | 85 2 |

I have not got the latest figures. Perhaps in reply to me he will cite the latest figures and show that some of the arrears—and a large amount of arrears—have been collected. But the question is not what amount of arrears is collected. The question is what is the total amount of uncollected arrears. It comes to about Rs. 262 crores. There is no reason why every

pie could not be collected. If these arrears of Rs. 262 crores had been collected there would have been no reason and no occasion for increasing the burden of taxation on the common mass of people, on the toiling people. He was the Revenue Minister and also a revenue officer before he joined the Congress and I would like to ask him a straight question. Can a peasant escape paying land revenue? Can a middle-class person escape paying income-tax on his salary? They cannot escape it. The only persons who escape are the rich classes. Perhaps, the hon. Minister might reply—I can anticpate his reply—saying that there are legal difficulties in recovering these arrears. But that is a lame excuse because the law can be amended. The reason why the arrears cannot be collected and the reason why the law is not amended is that the whole approach to those who evade taxes is wholly wrong.

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

Shri Parulekar: I will finish within five minutes.

Those who evade taxes cheat the State. Those who evade taxes hinder the progress of the nation. Those who evade taxes are the persons who are responsible for the increased burden of taxation on the toiling people. Yes, the law as well as the Government, which is today in power, consider these cheats, anti-social elements and scums of the society as respectable and honourable. That is why the law is not being amended. That is why it is not possible, to collect all the arrears of income-tax from the rich people as well as to stop all evasion of taxes.

I will come to the last point, namely, besides the Government, who are the people who are likely to be benefited by the proposals contained in this Finance Bill. The wealth tax on companies has been abolished as well as the tax on excess divi-

dends. Of course, here there is no question of benefit to the Government, but it will be very interesting to read what has appeared in the *Eastern Economist*. The Minister might say afterwards, "Why do you rely on others? Why do you not advance your own arguments?" I know that my arguments will not convince him, but perhaps the arguments which are advanced by his friends might carry some weight. That is why I am reading it. This is what the *Eastern Economist*, Budget Number, says. This gives a clue to understand as to why the wealth tax on companies has been abolished.

"Changes in the companies taxation particularly the abolition of wealth tax on companies and the excess dividend tax are hailed by all sections as the most redeeming features of this budget and, what is more, as an invitation to foreign entrepreneurs to come and invest in this country. It may be noted here that these aspects of the Indian income-tax system were being pointed out particularly inhibiting foreign investment in this country. It is to be hoped that the removal of these obnoxious features will enable more and more foreign capital to flow into this country, the need for which will, if anything, go on increasing in the years to come."

Here we find the clue. Why has the wealth tax on companies been removed? It is removed in order to invite foreign capital and in order to make it possible for the foreign capital to flow in this country. Whether it is right to do so or not it is not the occasion for me to discuss.

Secondly, it will enable the rich to evade taxes as it opens out one of the loopholes which was plugged. When the wealth tax on companies was being levied one of the arguments which was then given was that it was not a measure to yield more revenue—of course, if it brings, well and good—but the main purpose was that it should serve as a measure to stop

evasion. This measure was intended for that purpose. This was said only a year ago and here we find that one of the holes which was then plugged has been opened out so that wealth can flow through it and the State may lose its revenue.

As regards the tax on *khandsari* sugar, why was it levied? Whom will it benefit? Whose demand was it? Again, it is the same journal which says:

"The sugar industry has also had the additional advantages of seeing one of its long-standing demands (for the imposition of excise duty etc. on '*khandsari*' sugar) conceded."

So, it was the demand of the big business that this tax should be levied. Of course, he has now given some concessions which are of no substance. They make the machinery less rigorous. But apart from that it has to be remembered that this was a demand of the sugar industry which is making fabulous profits and the hon. Finance Minister has conceded the demand.

As regards reduction in the number of power looms for the purpose of levying tax that was the demand of the textile industry, because these power looms and handlooms were able to compete with the textile industry and they were able to sell a yard of cloth at a rate which was 15 naye paise less. Here also we find that the demand of the textile industry, big business, has been conceded while levying the tax and taking away the exemption.

I will conclude. I oppose these measures because they will benefit foreign capital as well as the rich in the country. I oppose these measures because they increase the burden of taxation on those who have no two meals a day, not enough clothing to clothe them and no house to live. For these reasons, I oppose the proposals contained in the Finance Bill.

श्री बिहलाचाराय (सनेपुर) : माननीय पाष्यन्न जी काय राष्ट्र की इसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के तीन साल बीतने पर भी दो साल के बजट धरर काइनेस बिल पर

[श्री विश्वनाथ राय]

विचार हो रहा है। द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के तीन साल बीतने के बाद भी हमें अपने देश की पूँजी में कमी जान पड़ती है और उसने लिए हमको विदेशों से मुद्रा लेने की आवश्यकता पड़ रही है। इन कठिनाइयों के कारण जहाँ द्वितीय योजना के लिए ४८ अरब रुपया खर्च करने की बात थी, वहाँ हम उसने बदले केवल ४५ अरब रुपया ही खर्च करने वाले हैं। जब हमें अपने देश में पूँजी की कमी है, और विदेशी मुद्रा की माँग है, उस समय यदि किसी ऐसी चीज पर जिस पर टैक्स नहीं लगा हुआ है, अगरे टैक्स लगाया जाता है तो विरोधी पक्ष वाले और कुछ हमारे साथी भी उस पर शोर करते हैं, यहाँ तक कि प्रधान मंत्री के पास भी जाते हैं और वित्त मंत्री से भी मिलते हैं। अभी हमारे विरोधी बीच में सदस्य ने कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो बड़े बड़े चीनी मिल का मालिक है उनकी भाग के कारण खंडसारी पर कर लगाया गया है जो कि बहुत अनुचित है।

हमको इस मामले को इस दृष्टिकोण से देखना चाहिए, कि खंडसारी के उत्पादन से क्या किसानों को, जो गन्ना पैदा करते हैं, लाभ होता है, या जो देश का समाज है उसको लाभ है, या इनके द्वारा हमको विदेशी मुद्रा मिलने में सहायता मिलती है और इसमें जो लाभ होता है उसका कुछ अंश किसानों को मिलता है या केवल जो खंडसारी का रोजगार करने वाले हैं उनको ही इसका लाभ होता है। अभी हमारे एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि खंडसारी पर यह कर मिल मालिकों की भाग पर लगाया गया है। वह किसानों और मजदूरों की बात बहुत करते हैं। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस खंडसारी के रोजगार से किसानों और मजदूरों को कोई लाभ होता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह इस बात पर ध्यान दें। पिछले ६ सालों में इस खंडसारी पर प्रतिरिक्त कर नहीं लगाया था। इस बीच में इसका उत्पादन ४०० प्रति-

शत बढ़ गया है। सन् १९५२ में इसका उत्पादन एक लाख टन था वह १९५८ में बढ़ कर ४०,०००० टन हो गया है। जहाँ फॅक्टरी में सौ मन गन्ने में ९.९६ मन चीनी निकलती है वहाँ खंडसारी में सौ मन गन्ने में ७ मन चीनी निकलती है। इस तरह से तीन प्रतिशत चीनी का नुकसान होता है। यही नहीं है कि इस तरह शुगर कम निकलने से केवल उन्हीं का नुकसान होता है जो खंडसारी का काम करने वाले हैं बल्कि इससे सारे राष्ट्र और समाज का नुकसान होता है। इसके साथ ही साथ उन किसानों को भी नुकसान होता है जिनके बारे में हमारे विरोधी पक्ष वाले समय कुनमय आवाज उठाया करते हैं। जो लोग खंडसारी का अपने हाथ से काम करने हैं वे बहुत थोड़े हैं ज्यादातर लोग पावर मे यह काम करते हैं। या स्टीम से काम करते हैं। यही लोग ज्यादातर खंडसारी पैदा करते हैं इस काम में जो बचत होती है उसे उन रोजगार करने वालों को व्यक्तिगत लाभ होता है। जो गन्ने का उत्पादक है उसको उम लाभ में से कुछ नहीं मिलता। फॅक्टरी के जोन में जो गन्ने के उत्पादक होने हैं उनको अपनी खेती आदि की उन्नति के लिए जो रुपया मिलता है वह खंडसारी पैदा करने वाले क्षेत्र के किसानों को नहीं मिलता। मोटे तौर पर आप देख लें जो चीनी फॅक्टरी में पैदा होती है उसका दाम ३६ रुपये मन है। जो लोग पावर से खंडसारी पैदा करते हैं उनकी चीनी का दाम ३३ रुपया है। लेकिन जो फॅक्टरी में चीनी पैदा होती है उस पर गवर्नमेंट को १३ रुपये प्रति मन एम्पाइज्ड इन्टी आर सैन के और सेल्व टैक्स के तौर पर मिलता है। यह रुपया खजाने में नहीं रखा जाता है बल्कि वह किसानों को किसी न किसी रूप में लौटा दिया जाता है, जैसे उनकी खेती के विकास के लिए, या सड़क के विकास के लिए या किसी और दूसरे रूप में। फॅक्टरी एरिया में तो इस प्रकार प्रति मन १३ रुपया किसान की सहायता के लिए खर्च किया जाता है और मिल मालिक को केवल

२३ रुपया प्रति मन रह जाता है। उसके मुकाबले में जो लोग खंडसारी का रोजगार करने वाले हैं उनको पूरे का पूरा ३३ रुपया मिल जाता है। इस तरह से जो हमारे किरोधी पक्ष वाले किसानों की बात कहते हैं वे देखें कि कैक्टरी एरिया में जो १३ रुपया प्रति मन किसानों को सहायता के तौर पर मिल जाता है वह खंडसारी क्षेत्र के किसानों को नहीं मिलता। यह बात तो गन्ना उत्पादकों की हुई।

अब धाप सारे समाज की बात को लें। एक तो खंडसारी में जो तीन प्रतिशत चीनी कम निकलने के कारण नुकसान होता है वह तो है ही। इसके साथ ही साथ जो सेल्स टैक्स और प्रतिरिक्त कर गवर्नमेंट को मिलता है वह नहीं मिल सकता है। तीसरी योजना में शायद गुड और खंडसारी का ५० लाख टन का टारजेट रखा गया है। सरकार को प्रतिरिक्त कर और सेल्स टैक्स जो मिलेगा उससे वह वंचित रहेगी और इस खंडसारी से केवल उन लोगों को ही बढ़ावा मिलता रहेगा जो कि इसका रोजगार चलाने हैं। उनकी ही उन्नति होगी। अब यह उद्योग कोई छोटा मोटा उद्योग नहीं रह गया है। हिन्दुस्तान में चीनी का उद्योग दूसरे नम्बर का उद्योग है। हमारे देश में ५० लाख एकड़ भूमि पर गन्ने की खेती होती है जो कि दुनिया के दूसरे देशों की इस की लैंगों का ३५ प्रतिशत है। हमारा उत्पादन प्रति एकड़ १६ हजार टन ही है जो कि अन्य देशों के मुकाबले में कम है फिर भी हमारे इस उद्योग की यह अवस्था है कि हम हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर भी चीनी भेज सकते हैं। और उससे विदेशी पूंजी रैदा कर सकते हैं।

अब धाप विदेशी पूंजी के विषय में विचार करें। धाप देखेंगे कि खंडसारी की चीनी ऐसी नहीं है जो कि विदेशों को भेजी जाये। अगर हमारी कैक्टरी की चीनी का उत्पादन बढ़े तो हम अधिक चीनी बाहर भेज कर विदेशी मुद्रा कमा सकते हैं। लेकिन खंडसारी की चीनी से यह लाभ नहीं हो सकता। हम यह नहीं कहते कि जो लोग हाथ से काम करते हैं

उन पर भी टैक्स लगाया जाये। हम तो कहते हैं कि जो पावर से यह काम नष्ट करते उन पर कोई कर न लगाया जाये। लेकिन जो पावर से चीनी तैयार करते हैं या जो उसे खरीद कर बेचते हैं उन पर कर लगना चाहिए।

ग्रामोद्योग की रिपोर्ट के बारे में यहां शर्मा हुई और कहा गया कि उसका अनुपात खंडसारी के उद्योग चीनी और गुड़ ज्यादा निकलता है। हो सकता है कि यह उन लोगों के बारे में कहा गया हो कि हाथ से काम करते हैं। लेकिन यह उनके बारे में नहीं है जो कि पावर से यह काम करते हैं या मिडिल मैन बन कर इनका रोजगार करते हैं। जहां तक उनका सवाल है उनका उत्पादन मिल से ज्यादा होने का बात सही नहीं है। फिर इस उद्योग में जो भी लाभ हाता है वह सारा का सारा वह रोजगार करने वालों के पास जाता है इनमें पूरा ३३ रुपया रोजगार करने वालों के पास जाता है और किसानों के पास उसमें से कुछ नहीं मिलता। जो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इन किसानों को किस तरह से लाभ हो रहा है। इन मुकाबले में जो कैक्टरी से चीनी निकलती है उससे गवर्नमेंट टैक्स ले रही है और उसमें से किसानों का सहायता दे रही है जो इस उद्योग की नव है और जो इन उद्योग के लिए कच्चा माल पैदा करते हैं। किसानों को कई प्रकार से गवर्नमेंट इन टैक्स से सहायता करती है। सड़क के विकास के रूप में किसानों को सहायता मिलती है जिससे उनकी गाड़ियों का घाने जाने में सुविधा होती है, सहकारी समितियों के द्वारा उनको लाभ पहुंच रहा है। लेकिन यह सारा लाभ उभी एरिया में है जो कि मिज का एरिया है। जो खंडसारी का एरिया है उसमें किसान इन सारे लाभों से वंचित है। अगर उसकी मात्रा थोड़ी होगी, कमजोर होगी तो एक बात थी, लेकिन हम यह देखने हैं कि तृतीय योजना में अगर चीनी तैयार लाख टन बनाई जायगी, तो गुड़ और खंडसारी पचास लाख टन बनाई जायगी मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि खंडसारी

[श्री विश्वनाथ राय]

के नाम के कारण हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे नम्बर के व्यवसाय को, चाहे वह पावर से चले, चाहे बिजली से चले, यदि मुक्त रखा जाय और जन-साधारण और गन्ने के उत्पादकों का क्याल न किया जाय, यह उचित नहीं होगा। मैं दिग्गो बंटों के अपने साथियों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे किसानों पर भी ध्यान दें। इय टैक्स से कुछ हजार आयुधियों का नुकसान होगा, वह हो सकता है।

श्री स० म० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : हम चाहते हैं कि लाइसेंस हो।

श्री विश्वनाथ राय : यह तो प्रोमीड्यर की बात है, शासन के काम करने के तरीके की बात है। जहाँ तक पालिसी का सम्बन्ध है, जो भी उत्पादक या रोजगार अपना फायदा कर रहा है, उस पर टैक्स होना चाहिए या नहीं और अगर होना चाहिये तो किस हद तक होना चाहिये। जहाँ तक हद की बात है, खडमारी का मालिक ३३ रुपये की मन पा रहा है और मिल का मालिक २३ रुपए की मन पा रहा है। १३ रुपए समाज के किसानों और मजदूरों के लाभ के लिए जा रहे हैं। इसलिये यह बहना कोई अर्थ नहीं रखता है कि इस इंडस्ट्री को खत्म किया जा रहा है। इंडस्ट्री को खत्म करने की बात नहीं है। इस इंडस्ट्री को चलाने में जिनका बहुत बड़ा हाथ है, उनको भी इससे लाभ है। अगर बंस हज़ार या पचास हज़ार टन की बात होगी, तो बात दूसरी थी, लेकिन दिन-प्रतिदिन इस का टनेज बढ़ रहा है। यह कोई छोटा मोटा रोजगार नहीं है। आप देखें कि १९५६-५७ में १०६.४ करोड़ रुपये प्रोडक्ट्स की ईल पैदा करने वालों का गन्ने के दाम से मिले थे। उसी साल केन्द्रीय सरकार को २०.३६ करोड़ रुपए एक्साइज के रूप में मिले थे और प्रदेशीय सरकारों को ५.६६ करोड़ रुपये नैम के रूप में मिले थे। यह रुपया कोई थोड़ा नहीं है। यह काफी रुपया है और इसको और बढ़ा सकते हैं। संबसारी के रोजगार

को बढ़ाते हुए, उसका विकास करने के लिये उसको सुविधायें देते हुए हम इस रुपए को बढ़ा सकते हैं, जिससे हमारे रेवेन्यू में वृद्धि हो सकती है और अपने योजनाओं को चलाने के लिये जो पैसे की कमी है, उस को कुछ हद तक पूरा किया जा सकता है। पिछले बरस बंस बाईस बरसों में शूगर फैक्टरीज से केन्द्रीय सरकार को लगभग १३० करोड़ रुपए एक्साइज वॉरर के उदरिधे मिल चुके हैं और प्रदेशीय सरकारों को लगभग ५५ करोड़ रुपए मिले हैं। यह रुपया जो सरकार के पास आ रहा है, वह मालिकों के लाभ के लिये नहीं मिल रहा है, वह समाज और देश के लाभ और उन्नति के लिये और योजना को सफल बनाने के लिये आ रहा है।

श्री तिहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) : मिल मालिकों की भी यही मांग है।

श्री विश्वनाथ राय : हा, वह है, लेकिन सवाल यह है कि अगर कोई कह दे कि यह काम किया जाय, तो उसका मतलब यह है कि अच्छे काम को भी बन्द कर दिया जाय, यह ठीक नहीं है। इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए कि इसमें समाज और देश के कहां तक सुविधा है, इसका योजना की सकलता पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ना है और साथ ही साथ उन रोजगार के लिए कहा तक सुविधा है। हमारे विरोधी साथी कहते हैं कि वहाँ कर लगाना ठीक नहीं है, वहाँ कर न लगाया जाये। अगर कोई समझदार और धर्म और आदमी किराँत बात को कहे, तो उसको मानने से इन लिये इंकार नहीं करना चाहिए कि उस को किसानों की आदमी ने कहा है। यह अनुचित है।

किसानों के दृष्टिकोण से, इस इंडस्ट्री के दृष्टिकोण से, विदेशी मुद्रा के दृष्टिकोण से, उस व्यवसाय के दृष्टिकोण से, किसी भी दृष्टिकोण से यह ठीक नहीं है कि उस पर कर न लगाया जाय। ज्यादा से ज्यादा दो बार हज़ार आदमी होंगे, उनको जो सारी आमदनी

इस वस्तु हो रही है, उस को कोई क्षति न हो, इस दृष्टिकोण से भन्ने ही यह संगत हो सकता है। लेकिन अगर हम अपने देश के दूसरे नम्बर के इन व्यवसाय को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं या अपनी योजना को अपने बल पर, अपने ही देश पर ज्यादातर निर्भर रह कर सकन बनना चाहते हैं, तो यह जो रोजगार पनप रहा है, उसका लाभ का हिस्सा लेना जरूरी हो जाता है। इन इंडस्ट्री पर इतना कर नहीं लग रहा है, कि वह रोजगार ही खत्म हो जायगा।

आपको याद होगा कि हमारे माननीय सदस्य ने कैपिटलिस्ट्स की चर्चा की। माननीय सदस्य के यहाँ चार शुरुआती फीचर हैं। उसकी बगल में देवरिया में १४ फीचर हैं। वहाँ जो छोटे मोटे खड्गारी का काम करने वाले थे, वह बहुत पहले विदेशों के कार्पोरेशन से—मारेजस और जाया मे मान आने के कारण खत्म हुए। फिर हमारी यह इंडस्ट्री बड़ी और हमारे देश की रूढ़ि बनने लगी। अब वह इन अवस्था में आ गई है कि हम बाहर भेजें। अगर हमने सबकुछ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिस्पर्द्धिता में ठहरना है, विदेशों में मुकाबला करना है, विदेशों को चीन भेजना है, तो हमको किसानों को प्रतिमाहन देना होगा कि वे और अधिक पैसा करे और साथ ही साथ छोटे मोटे रोजगार भी चले।

अन्त में मैं यह भी चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया के मार्केट में हमें कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, लेकिन हमारा पड़ोसी नेगल हमारी चीन ले सकता है। जरा उस और भी सरकार ध्यान दे और उनको चीन खाने की आदत डालने। जैने चाय का प्रचार किया गया था, वैने ही चीन का भी वहाँ प्रचार किया जा सकता है और उसको वहाँ भेजा जा सकता है।

Shri J. R. Mehta (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am happy that you have been good enough to give me an opportunity to speak on the Finance Bill. I am happy because I

am told that one can talk on any subject under the sun while speaking on this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it a fore-warning to me that I should not interfere?

Shri J. R. Mehta: Then the proposition will not be correct, Sir, which I have just mentioned.

Sir, this august House has now passed the Budget for 1959-60.

An Hon. Member: Not yet.

Shri J. R. Mehta: The Demands at least have been passed. This meant a whole month or so of strenuous labour on the part of everybody in this House. Each Minister has got all he wanted, thanks to our system of parliamentary democracy, but not without having passed under piercing searchlight from all sections of this House.

While there are a few Ministers who have come out with distinction, there are others who have not fared so well. It may be a matter of mere coincidence that all those Ministers who are present here are not among those who have not fared well.

But, be that as it may, this House has left none of them in doubt as to what is expected of them and in what direction their performance has fallen short of expectation. Let us hope that each one of them will take care to see that they are able to make up and give a better account of themselves when they seek the vote of this House on the next occasion.

I believe, Sir, I can say without fear of contradiction that the two broad considerations that emerge out of this discussion on which we are all agreed are: firstly, that the tempo of our development should not be allowed to slow down, and we should be prepared to tighten our belts and carry all the burdens that would be necessary in order to be able to advance as speedily as possible towards the socialist objective which we have all

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

set for ourselves; and, secondly, that all wasteful expenditure must be avoided and all possible economies should be effected in the administration. I am very happy to learn from hon. Shri Morarji Desai this morning that there is a special establishment in his Ministry to look after the question of effecting economy in expenditure in the administration, and that serious efforts are being made to effect economies in the administrative expenditure. May I submit, Sir, that this is a very wide problem and that this question is intimately linked up with the question of the reorientation and overhaul of our entire administrative machinery, decentralisation, simplification of procedure, cutting out of red-tape etc. The machinery that we have got today is a machinery which we have inherited from our erstwhile foreign rulers. It was conceived to serve an imperialist order and it is high time we changed it to serve the objectives which we have now embarked upon. Therefore, I submit that a special committee or a special commission should be asked to go into this question. It is necessary that we should have a fresh approach and a new outlook in regard to these problems. With due deference to our able and competent officers in the administration, I would like to point out that the official mind is apt to look at matters from a certain bias. It is natural for them because they have lived and they have developed and grown in that system. I plead with the hon. Finance Minister to give consideration to this suggestion.

I would like to talk about another important matter. This does not relate to profits and Income-tax. I have no profits to seek or distribute. I have no other tax to pay except the income-tax which I pay through this House. But I would like to invite the attention of this hon. House and the hon. Finance Minister to certain considerations which are vital for getting the maximum advantage of the moneys we are getting from the

tax-payers. Certain vital considerations have to be looked into if we are to ensure the success of our budgetary policies and programmes and the fruition of the Second Five Year Plan and the Third Five Year Plan. I believe it will be agreed on all hands that the most salient feature of our budgetary position is the ever-increasing gap between our estimated expenditure and actual expenditure and between our resources and our needs. We raise additional taxation from year to year, try our best to get financial assistance from friendly countries, and try to supplement our resources by internal loans and savings; campaign and we tighten our belts in all possible ways. Yet we find as time passes that our resources are not able to keep pace with our needs. The situation is described diversely by diverse people. Some call it a crisis of resources. There are others who say it is a crisis of faith. There are still others who are inclined to call it a crisis of planning. My humble submission is that it is essentially a crisis of prices.

What I wish to emphasise—and emphasise with all the earnestness that I can command—is that many of our ills on the economic and financial front are due to the fact that we have failed to hold the price-line in check. In other words, we have failed to keep the prices of essential commodities in check and on an even keel. It is not a new proposition that I am putting forward. The fact remains that the importance of this problem has not been properly appreciated and that we have not taken timely action and the best possible action to secure the object in view.

Now, Sir, let us see what happens at the moment. We prepare our budget. We lay down targets under the Plan—monetary targets as well as physical targets. Prices go up as time passes. As prices go up, monetary targets go up, and physical targets go down. That means need of more money if the physical targets are to

be realised. And, if we cannot find the additional money required, the Plan has to be pruned, and we have to be satisfied with the mere core of the Plan. That has been the story of our budgets in the past.

I plead with all the earnestness that I can command that it is time we realised the urgent need to hold the price-line. We should not only realise the need, but we should make a serious attempt to hold the price-line in check. Otherwise, I dare say, the present race between our resources and our actual expenditure will continue and it will be a perpetually losing battle for us from the point of view of resources and realisation of our objectives. I have no doubt in my mind that it was mainly due to our failure to hold the price-line that we had trouble with our Second Five-Year Plan. We should take effective steps in time to ensure the success of our Third Five-Year Plan.

The hon. Finance Minister, in his opening speech, while speaking on the economic review, has himself referred to the need of recourse to "curbs and countervailing measures". Shri Asoka Mehta wanted to know what curbs the Finance Minister had in mind. I humbly submit that holding the price line is the main curb to be resorted to without which all other curbs will be of no avail.

It is not for me here and now to propound a detailed scheme as to how this is to be done. I would only like to emphasise that this is a very vital matter and I do hope that the hon. Finance Minister will evolve a machinery in order to achieve the object which we have in view. We have just adumbrated a scheme for State trading in foodgrains. I welcome the scheme so far as it aims at the stabilisation of food prices.

Another point I would like to draw the attention of the hon. House to is that of food production. All are agreed that food production must be increased. We talk of so many ways

of increasing food production. We talk of co-operative farming, better seeds, better manure, better irrigation facilities and so on and so forth. All these steps may be good in their own ways. But there is one important matter to which I am afraid we have not given sufficient attention so far. The majority of our cultivators suffer from the malady of contentment. Unless we are able to remove from the mind of the Indian peasant this attitude of contentment, we will not be able to achieve any great success in our food production. If I may put the same idea in a more positive manner, I would say that unless we can create in our peasants a feeling of self-consciousness, or ambition, or craving for a better standard of living, we will not succeed very much, whatever other measures we might adopt.

I hope hon. Members will agree with me that the yield per acre is not uniform all over the country. There are disparities from region to region, from class to class and from individual to individual. If we analyse these matters, we will find that the craving for a higher standard of life always goes with higher yield per acre. Let me illustrate this. Take the Punjabi farmer. As a rule, he is a better producer of foodgrains than others. That is the case wherever he goes. He came to my State of Rajasthan, and everybody knows that in Ganganagar, he is producing far more than other peasants there. I can multiply instances like this. You will be surprised to learn that in some parts of my division, the Jodhpur Division, which is supposed to be more or less an arid area, some of these peasants have produced more than what others produce perhaps in Kotah, where the land is better and the rain-fall is greater.

16 hrs.

I shall give another illustration before I conclude. I am a little interested in a new mine in my State. There was a labourer who used to live on the outskirts of the mine. When I went there last time, I found

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

that he was not coming to the mine. I enquired why he was not coming, and I was told that we had hired his pair of bullocks, and, therefore, he was not coming for labour, and he was getting Rs 3 to Rs 3-8-0 by way of hire charges, and this, he thought, was enough for his living.

What I would, therefore, submit is that we have to shake this mentality, and we have to produce a craving for a better standard of life among other people, if our food production drive is to be successful.

श्री अजित सिंह (भटिण्डा—रक्षित—
अनुपस्थित जा तथा) जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर
साहब, मैं इस बिल को सपोर्ट करने के लिए
खड़ा हुआ हूँ। चूँकि वक्त कम है इस वार्से मैं
सब चीजों को एक्सप्रेस नहीं कर सकूँगा और
अपने मुझव पेश करके ही अपने भाषण को
समाप्त करूँगा।

सब से पहली बात जो मैं कहना चाहता
हूँ वह डिफेंस बजट के बारे में है। इसमें जो
कमी की गई है, वह मेरे खयाल में ठीक नहीं है।
बेशक हमने डिफेंस बजट को डिमांडम को
पास कर दिया है लेकिन आजकल जो हालात
हैं उनको देखें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह
कमी न की जाये। हमारे सम्बन्ध पाकिस्तान
से पहले ही से अच्छे नहीं हैं और अब दलाई
लामा की वजह से पना नहीं चीन के साथ
हमारे कौसे सम्बन्ध रहें हैं। इस वार्से मैं
समझता हूँ कि डिफेंस में कमी करने हमें
ठीक नहीं किया है और वह कमी नहीं की
जानी चाहिए।

अब मैं खडमारी और कोहनूमो के बारे
में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मानने पर विन भत्री
महोदय ने खडमारी पर लेको कुछ कम की है
और इसमें लागू म उनको घटायवा देता हूँ।
लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता
हूँ कि इस इंडस्ट्री को बढावा देने के लिए
और ज्यादा कमी करने की गुशाइश है और
बहु की जानी चाहिए। काहलूमो पर जो

हमने टैक्स लगा रखा है, वह भी हम को कम
करना चाहिए, वह काफी ज्यादा है। कोहलू
पर, मैं समझता हूँ यह टैक्स बिल्कुल खत्म
कर दिया जाना चाहिए चूँकि यह बिल्लेज
इंडस्ट्री है और इसे हमें तकबीयत देनी चाहिए।
हम कहते हैं कि हम स्माल स्कैन इंडस्ट्रीज
को बढावा देना चाहते हैं और चूँकि यह भी
उनमें से एक है, इस वार्से इन पर कोई टैक्स
नहीं लगना चाहिए। गरीब किसान या हमारे
गरीब लोग अपने घरों में एक एक दो कहलू
लगाते हैं और अपना गुजारा करते हैं और
इस टैक्स से उनको नुकसान होगा। यह
घरेलू धंधा है

श्री० रणधीर सिंह (गंहतक) गन्ने के
कोहलू पर कोई टैक्स नहीं है।

श्री अजित सिंह मैं उन कोहनूमो की
बात कर रहा हूँ जो सरसो का तेल बनाने के
लिए लगाय जाते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन तरह
का जो टैक्स है वह छूटे छूटे चीजों पर नही
लगाया जाना चाहिए।

हमने डोजन पर भी टैक्स लगाया है।
इसमें ग्राम जनता पर, पैंजर्स पर असर पड़े
बिना नहीं रह सकता है। यही लागू है जैक
सफर बरगे। जा गांडीजो वाला है जो
धाने हैं वे उन से ज्यादा किराया लाना शुरू
कर दे। इस तरह के टैक्स लोगों में कुछ
इस तरह की भावना पैदा कर दे, है जैसे कितने
जमाने में कारू बादशाह के जमाने में हुआ
था। कारू अरब दुनिया में एक लम्बा देश
था। वह एक मुस्लिम देश था। वहाँ एक
बड़े राजा हो गुजरे हैं। उस जमाने में कन्न में
जब घादमी का दबाया जाता था तो उसके
मुंह में एक खपया डाल दिया जाता था।
कारू बादशाह ने ऐसा हुषम दिया कि जो यह
खपया मुँह के मुँह में रखा जाता है, इसको भी
निकाल लाया जाये और उसको भी निकाल
लाया जाता था। उस वक्त हमारे गुरु नानक

साहब ने उसको समझाने के लिए यह बात कही थी

बीजे नेक नामी जो देवे खुदाए ।
जो जिसे जमी पर सो हो सी फनाए ।
दग्नी उजाहे फेर न बसाये ।
पूके पुकारे तो दाद न पाये ।
जानत है तैकू व तैड़ी कमाई ।
दगे बाजी करके दुनिया लूट खाई ।
पिए प्याले खाए कबाब ।
देखो रे लोको कारू होता खगब ।

अगर इस तरह की भावना भ्राज लोगों में घा गई तो बहुत मुश्किल हो जायेगी। लोग इस तरह के टैक्सों को बरदाश्त नहीं कर पायेंगे। बूक इस तरह की भावना लोगों में घा गई थी, इस वास्ते इतने बड़े गुरू को वहा जा कर यह कहना पडा था। मैं चाहता हू कि भ्राज इस तरह की भावना लोगों में पैदा न होने दी जाये।

भ्राज हम यह भी देखते हैं कि बहुत ज्यादा टैक्स इन्वेंशन होता है, काफी टैक्स इन्वेंशन किया जाता है। बड़े-बड़े पूजीपति यह काम करते हैं मैं कहना चाहता हू कि इसको रोकने के लिए हमें एक ऐसा महकमा कायम करना चाहिये जिस तरह से कि मी० बी० डी० का महकमा है, जो मजूरियों को पकड़ने के लिए गवर्नमेंट की मदद करता है, ताकि वह इस तरह के इन्वेंशन को रोकने में आपकी मदद कर सके। इस तरह से टैक्स इनबेस्टीगेशन डिपार्टमेंट अगर फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री कायम करे तो बड़े-बड़े पूजीपति जो बच निकलते हैं, वे बच नहीं निकल सकेंगे।

एक बिषय में बड़ी चर्चा सुनी जाती है। यह कहा जाता है कि गवर्नमेंट डिपार्टमेंट्स में काफी बेस्ट्रुक्च्युर एंस्ट्रुक्चर हुआ है। गवर्नमेंट की तरह से यह कई बार कहा जाता है कि हम एफिशिन्सी का बन बने रखने के लिए खर्च में भी नहीं बरतते हैं। प्रशासनिक को बच करने के लिए, मुझे खुशी है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने एक बड़े धक्के खुलते हुए आदिवासी की अजेंटा बनाई है जो इस चीज की जांच करेगी। मैं चाहता

हू कि इसके अलावा एक इंडिपेंडेंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी और बनाई जाए जिस में सभी पार्टियां शामिल हो ताकि इस तरह की चीजों को बच किया जा सके।

हम हिन्दुस्तान में कम्युनिटी डिवेलपमेंट भी करने जा रहे हैं। हम कहते हैं कि ग्राम लोगो के लिए, उन लोगो के लिए जोकि गावों में रहते हैं और जो ७०-८० परसेंट हैं, हम ने सब कुछ करना है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हू कि हम ने एनविरनमेंट्स को ध्यान में नहीं रखा है। हमें चाहिए कि हम उनके दिलो को बँच करे ताकि वे लोग अपने आप सोच सकें कि उनको किस-किस चीज की जरूरत है। उन लोगो को हमेशा ही गवर्नमेंट पर डिपेंड नहीं करना चाहिए और हमेशा ही गवर्नमेंट के पास घ्रा कर पैसे की माग नहीं करनी चाहिए, सडक बनाने के लिए, स्कूल बनाने के लिए या कम्युनिटी हाल बनाने के लिए। मैं भ्रज करना चाहता हू कि हम लोगो को उन्हें ऐसे ढग से एजुकेट करना चाहिए कि वे खुद अपनी रिसपामिबिलिटी को महसूस करे और खुद ही इस बात का फ़ैसला करे कि किस तरह से उन्हें रहना चाहिए, उनके रहने सहने का क्या ढग होना चाहिए। इसके लिए हमें उनके अन्दर उत्साह पैदा करना होगा। उत्साह पैदा करने के लिए कई चीजों की जा सकती है। भ्राज हम जो रिफ़ूटमेंट करते हैं और जिन घ्रादमियों को रखते हैं, वह शहर वालो को रखते हैं और उन्हो को गावों में भेजते हैं। जितने भी बी० डी० घो० होते हैं, ग्राम सेवक होते हैं, ग्राम सेविकायें होती हैं, या विलेज लेवेल वर्कर होते हैं, उन्हें हम शहरो से गावों में भेजते हैं। मैं भ्रज करना चाहता हू कि गावों में से ही ऐसे लोगो की भरनी होनी चाहिए न कि शहरो में से। शहरो से हमें लोगो को गावों में नहीं भेजना चाहिए।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हू कि जो ब्लाक डिवेलपमेंट इत्यादि कमेटीज होती हैं, उनके मान-आधिकार्य ही बेधरपैत होने चाहियें न कि आधिकार्य।

[श्र. प्रवीर सिंह]

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे स्टाफ में बहुत इनसिफ्योरिटी है। उनमें ऐसी भावना है कि थोड़े दिन के बाद, एक साल या दो साल के बाद उनको नौकरी से अलग कर दिया जायेगा। ऐसी भावना जब वर्कमें में पैदा हो जाती है तो कोई भी काम अच्छी तरह से नहीं चल सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की भावना स्टाफ में पैदा न होने दी जाये।

हमारी जो प्रोपैगंडा मशीनरी है, उसके बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। देयर इज लैंक ऑफ प्रापैगंडा। हम हमेशा इसी पर डिपेंड करते हैं कि मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ इनफार्मेशन और ब्राडकास्टिंग जो है वही हमारे लिए सब प्रापैगंडा करनी रहे। मगर हम देखते हैं कि गावों के जो लोग हैं उनके पास आपके जो जनलम्स हैं जैसे योजना है, कुशक्षेत्र है, भूगिर्य है, स्वास्थ्य है, पहुँचने नहीं है यहाँ पर पढ़े लिखे लोगों तक वे रूठ जाते हैं। उस मामले में अज्ञान करना चाहता हूँ कि जो प्रापैगंडा का हमारा ढग है, उसको बदल जाना चाहिए और उसको बदलने के लिए हमें कन्वैनिटी भेजे करने चाहियें, जिन में कबड्डी कुश्ती तथा दूसरी ऐसी गम्भिर कर्तव्ये ताकि इन गैडरिग्स में गवर्नमेंट द्वारा बनाई गई स्कीमों का प्रचार लोगों में किया जा सके और वे इन स्कीमों से लाभ उठा सकें। हमें मिनेमा विस के जरिये से भी लोगों को अपनी स्कीमों के बारे में जानकारी करानी चाहियें। इसके करने चाहियें और म्यूजिकल पार्टीज तथा एम्बीबिदास के जरिये से भी लोगों तक अपना प्रोग्राम पहुँचाना चाहिये।

सै यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हम काम करते हैं, उसको रीजनल मैगुएजिड में छपवा करके हम लोगों में मुफ्त बाँट दिया करें तो इससे लोगों में यह भावना पैदा होगी कि हमारा मुल्क तरक्की कर रहा है और उनको बता चलेगा कि हमारे मुल्क ने कितनी तरक्की की है।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा जो पैटर्न ऑफ डिवेलपमेंट है वह एक ही तरह का है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि केरल में या मद्रास में या बंगाल में सबकें बनाने की क्या जरूरत है? वहाँ पर इतनी ज्यादा जरूरत नहीं है जितनी कि पंजाब और राजस्थान जैसे प्रदेशों में है या मुल्क के दूसरे हिस्सों में है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो कॉन्डिशन जिस जगह पर प्रिवेल करती हैं, उनके मुनाबिक ही हमारा पैटर्न ऑफ डिवेलपमेंट होना चाहिए। हम एक ही दबाई में अलग-अलग बीमारियों का इलाज नहीं कर सकते हैं, अलग-अलग किस्म के मरीजों को फायदा नहीं पहुँचा सकते हैं।

अब मैं कोषापरिटिव फार्मिंग के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। इसके बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने बहुत सी जगहों पर जमीन पर सीलिंग लगाई है। ता सीलिंग करने का जो ढग है वह विन्कूल खराब है। ठीक ढग नहीं है। हम पहले अनुमान कर रहे हैं कि आज से फरा तारीख तक सीलिंग होगी तो जिस जमीन की हमें सीलिंग करनी हैनी है उस जमीन का मानिक पहले से उस जमीन का बच देता है या अर्धन रिक्वेस्टों का बाट देता है। क्या कोई भी आदमी यहाँ कह सकता है कि कितनी जमीन गवर्नमेंट ने सीलिंग करने के बाद किमी न ली और कितनी जमीन को हम ने बाँगी में बाँटा? मेरा खयाल है कि कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं है जो यहाँ पर पूरे घाकडे दे सके कि हम ने कितनी जमीन देश में पाई।

कोषापरिटिव फार्मिंग का जो हम ने रेजोल्यूशन नागपुर में पास किया है उस के बारे में हमारे यहाँ बहुत बड़े-बड़े किटिसिज्म होने हैं। कोई कहता है कि यह क्ली बन्दी सिस्टम है, रशियन टाइप ऑफ फार्मिंग है, कोई कुछ कहता है, कोई कुछ कहता है। लेकिन यह बात विन्कूल गलत है। यहाँ पर रशियन टाइप ऑफ फार्मिंग नहीं हो रही है। यहाँ पर यह बीच जालन्टी बेसिस पर ही

रही है। लेकिन मैं धर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हालांकि हमारे नेता प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि यह वालन्टरी बेसिम पर होगा और वह डोर टु डोर जमींदारों के दरवाजों पर जा कर दर्खास्त करेगा कि वह कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग में आ जाये लेकिन कुछ जमींदारों के दिमन में डर है। उस डर को दूर करने के लिए हमें चाहिए कि कुछ न कुछ करे। एक तो यह कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब या गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से एक डेफिनिट एंड कंटेगोरिकल स्टेटमेंट होना चाहिए जिस में वह यह कहें कि लैंड अधिनियम गेबालिज नहीं की जायेगी, दूसरे यह कि वह कहे कि वालन्टरी बेसिम पर आप इस में आ कर ज्यादा हो जाये लेकिन आपको प्रस्थार होगा। आप चाहे आप कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग में निरत कर सकत हैं और तीसरी बात इस में यह होनी चाहिए कि जमींदार को पूरा हक हो कि वह अपनी जमीन को बँक में या मार्केट में बँके। अगर हम यह तीन बातें कर सकते हैं तो मैं मन्सूना हूँ कि हमारा कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग का प्रोग्राम काफी भोजवती में चल सकेगा।

इसी तरह में मविम कोआपरेटिव की बात है। उस को तो हमें चलाना ही पड़ेगा। जब तक हम कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग को अच्छे पैमाने पर नहीं चला पाते, जैसा कि हमारा रेजोल्यूशन है, जिनको हमारी मन्सूना जमीन है उस जमीन को लैंडलेस एग्जिकल्वरिस्ट्स को दे कर उस में कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग गवर्नमेंट को करनी चाहिए। मैं चाहूँगा कि वह कम में कम तीन साल तक चले ताकि लोग उस में तजुबां हासिल करे। सीलिंग के बारे में एक प्वाइंट मेरे मन में है। जब मैं ग्राम जमींदारों से बात करता हूँ तो पता लगता है कि उन के अन्दर यह भी फीलिंग है कि हमारी जमीनो पर सीलिंग कर के तो गवर्नमेंट ने उसे ले लिया, लेकिन जो पूजीपति हैं उन की पूजी पर पता नहीं कोई सीलिंग लगने जा रही है या नहीं। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि ३००० २० तक की यह सीलिंग लगाई जावी चाहिए। इनकम टैक्स कुछ ऐसा हो कि ३००० २० के

वाद जो कुछ भी हो वह सरकार के कब्जे में खुद ही आ जाय। जहा तक तन्स्वाह की बात है, सीलिंग आन पेमेंट भी होनी चाहिए। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ज्यादा में ज्यादा तन्स्वाह हो १५०० २० और कम से कम तन्स्वाह हो ११० २०। अगर इस से ज्यादा तन्स्वाह हम रखते हैं तो लोगों में यह भावना पैदा होगी कि हम गरीब को मारना चाहते हैं।

हमारे यहा ७० या ८० फीमटी लोग गावों में रहते हैं। क्या हम सबकुछ हम हिमाव में उन के लिए अपने अजट से पैसा देंगे? मैं मन्सूना हूँ कि बिल्कुल नहीं देंगे। मैं धर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सारे टैक्स का कम से कम ८६ परसेन्ट लैंड रवेन्यु से आता है जो कि आज कल के हिमाव में ७० करोड़ २० दनता है। वह कम में कम आप गाव पचायतों को दे। यह कौट बहुत ज्यादा खपया नहीं है। उस में गाव पचायत अपना काम कर सकेगी। पचायतों के मनाल्लिक मैं धर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इन का पचायतों को डेवलप करन के लिए बहुत कोशिश करनी है। हमारे गाव पचायतों के जो मरपच होत हैं उन के लिए एक मिनिमम स्टैंडर्ड आप एजंशेशन रखना चाहिए साथ ही एक मरपच को बराबर बहुत दिनों तक नहीं रखना चाहिए। उस को हमेशा के लिए मरपच नहीं बनाना चाहिए। मरपच का दुबारा दो साल के बाद एलेक्ट करना चाहिए। इसी तरह में जो मरपच होता है उस को कर्टैक्ट और एग्जिक्यूटिव दोनों अथारिटीज नहीं होनी चाहिए, बल्कि जो फंशनल कोआपरेटिवज हैं गाव में, वह साग काम करे और वह पचायतों के मातहत हो। मैं मन्सूना हूँ कि इस तरह से पचायतों का काम बहुत ठीक ढंग में चल सकेगा। पचायतों में हरिजनो और औरतों के लिए रिजर्वेशन होना चाहिए। जब तक हम यह नहीं करेगे तब तक हमारे मनो में यह भावना चलती रहूँगी कि हरिजनो और औरतों के साथ बिल्कुल अच्छा मुलूक नहीं होता। मैं गवर्नमेंट से यह भी धर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि नोबो को कड़ा मन्सूना ले है।

[श्री मणित सिंह]

कुल्ली, गुल्ली और जुल्ली। हम ने बड़े-बड़े प्लैन्स बनाये हैं। हमारे मुल्क की जो बड़ी इन्डस्ट्री है वह है ऐग्रीकल्चर इन्डस्ट्री। हमारा मुल्क ऐग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स का मुल्क है। हमारी एकानमी इसी पर केस करती है। ८० फी सदी लोग ऐग्रीकल्चरल एकानमी में रहते हैं। इसलिए मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि हम को ज्यादा से ज्यादा फर्टिलाइजर फैक्ट्रीज बनाने पर जोर देना चाहिए। हम जो भी बाहें प्रोजेक्ट्स बनायें लेकिन साथ-साथ इस तरफ भी ध्यान देना हमारे लिए अजहद जरूरी है।

आखिर में मैं जनाबवाला, आप का बहुत-बहुत बन्द्यवाद करता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया और जो बिल हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय यहा लाये हैं उस को तने दिल से सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Immediately after the hon. Finance Minister moved for taking the Finance Bill into consideration, we had two speeches from the opposition side, one speech opposing the other, if I may say so.

Hon Member, Shri Masam, in substance, complained that the corporations were being taxed too much, that the new grossing system would affect badly the small shareholder. So, on the whole, he was against taxing corporations. On the question of income-tax also, he more or less expressed opposition.

Immediately after that, the hon. Member who spoke on behalf of the Communist Party complained that the common man—I do not know what exactly is meant by that phrase—was very heavily taxed; and he was against indirect taxation. I would like to say a word or two on these aspects of the question before I suggest a few points and argue in their favour.

In this country, if we are to omit taxing the common man—because evidently, by that they mean the

average people with average income—I do not know whether we will be able to raise any taxes. The extremely poor section I know cannot be taxed; they have no capacity to pay at all. But can we omit taxing the common man? After all, the country is comparatively poor. Most of the people are common. The uncommon men with large incomes are very few in number. This position has to be realised, unless our friends go to the extent of saying that we should give up not only the Plan but should also say that the administration also should not go on. With all respect to Members on the other side, I would request them to consider this aspect of the question, whether this country can have sufficient resources without taxing corporations. After all this country has only got a large population of common men with average income. If we consider this aspect, I submit the excise duty and the indirect taxes are absolutely necessary.

Shri M. B. Thakore (Patan): How much?

Shri Achar: I did not catch what the hon Member said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: An interruption that does not reach the hon. Member is not intended for him.

Shri Achar: Yes, I will try to ignore it, the more so because I have got only a limited time at my disposal

With regard to income tax or corporation tax, no doubt we have to have them. If we look into the figures, especially with regard to income tax, we find that they are getting static. The income is not showing any progressive trend whatsoever. We are for a socialist State. In fact, we want to bring down the income of the richer classes while we raise the income of the ordinary man. From that point of view, I do concede that our income from income tax and corporation tax

should increase. Specially when we see the income tax figures, we feel very much disappointed. I find hardly any progress made in this respect. The figures of income-tax receipts are as follows: 1955-56 Rs. 76 crores, 1956-57 Rs. 92 crores, 1957-58 Rs. 90 crores and 1958-59 Rs. 86 crores. The income from this source budgeted for this year is only Rs. 87 crores. It ought to make more progress.

I have heard the argument often put forth that the minimum in the slab should be reduced. I do not agree with that proposition. After all, if we take the average income of a person in our country, it is poor. In fact, people getting an income of Rs. 3000 or Rs. 3500 per year are probably small in number, and people with a higher income are much less. The former Finance Minister, while introducing the new system of taxation often repeated that we must have a system which will be very elastic and he suggested this system of taxation so that we may have a very elastic source of income. By raising half a per cent or one per cent we must be able to raise the money required. There must be machinery ready to collect it, so that if there is a contingency or extraordinary circumstance arising, the country must be in a position to tap that source and get the money. From that point of view, the persons with higher incomes are very few and those who could be considered as very rich are still fewer in number, and the country will not be able to get all the resources it wants from taxing them. At the same time, we have to remember this fact that these richer people should be taxed more. There is no doubt about it, though we cannot go to the extent of cutting down all incentives. If we look into the budget, we find that our total deficit is something like Rs. 222 crores. Even the revenue account deficit is Rs. 82 crores. By the taxation proposals of this year, we are hardly making Rs. 23 crores. I am not thinking of the overall deficit, but even if we think of the revenue account deficit, it is something like Rs. 58 crores. When this

is the position, I ask with all respect: is it ever possible for any Finance Minister to reduce the indirect taxes, whether it be excise or customs? In addition, we have the problem so far as customs revenue is concerned, on account of reduction of imports. Licences cannot be issued and on account of that the income from import duty is going down. When that is the position, unless we are to be driven to the position of giving up the Plan—which nobody advocates—it is not possible either to avoid this indirect taxation or the taxes on income.

One important feature which I would like to mention regarding the present Finance Bill is with regard to an increase in wealth tax rate of only half per cent. This clearly indicates the elasticity which the former Finance Minister was probably thinking of. By increasing the rate by only half per cent—the incidence of this falls on people with fairly big property—we get an income of Rs. 2.5 crores. No doubt, we have not realised from other taxes, the estate duty, expenditure tax and other forms of taxes as much as we ought to have, probably because the machinery for collection is not sufficiently equipped as yet; but all the same, we see this indication that by raising the wealth tax by only half per cent, we are able to realise Rs. 2.5 crores. I would consider this aspect of the Bill a very important aspect and I think this will give us more scope in future years.

Then I would like to mention that we have to be a little careful about taxing the poorest. When we got a windfall of about Rs. 10 crores in respect of oil, specially petrol and petroleum products, I plead with our Finance Minister that some relief must be given. With regard to kerosene oil, I also submitted last time that it is one of the most essential items specially required in the village parts. The Finance Minister was very sympathetic. He said he would have given that relief but for the fact that it would not reach down the poor man. With all respect, I submit that that may not be a very correct posi-

[Shri Achar]

tion. In fact, his own junior colleague, Shri K. D. Malviya, when arguing that point said that they did not want to reduce the tax because that would increase consumption. If I may submit, practically one argument cuts the other. If the price goes down, Shri K. D. Malviya says that consumption will increase. That means the benefit goes down to the poorest man. The benefit is not taken away by the middleman. That has been the history not only of this kerosene oil. I will give the instance of salt. In our country, salt is such an essential thing—now, of course, no tax is there on that—and an increase of even 2 or 3 pies meant that the poor man could not purchase his salt. Consequently, consumption decreased and such a life-giving material could not be purchased. That is the reason why Mahatmaji took up salt as a symbol of satyagraha and marched to Dandi. Similarly, I would submit that some relief should be given on such essential items like kerosene and others.

There is only one more point which I want to deal with. There seems to be a school of thought that people in the agrarian parts are not substantially taxed. I find that even Prof. Mahalanobis, our economic expert, seems to be of that view. In a recent article in the *Hindusthan Standard* he writes that agriculture contributes more than 50 per cent of our national income but it has not been possible yet to tax the agriculturist to realise adequate resources to pay for the Plan. I submit that this proposition seems to be that of a city dweller.

I do submit that the villagers are sufficiently taxed—taxed to their capacity. I am not thinking whether it is more or less. So far as excise and customs are concerned, everybody is taxed. So far as other items like income-tax and others are concerned, the richer people are taxed. But, look at the agriculturist. His income is not taken into consideration. Even if he has a small amount, hardly an income of Rs. 200 to Rs. 300, he is made to pay the land revenue. Income is not the consideration.

Take the result of the recent land reforms. Even with regard to small landholders with an income of Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,500, or even Rs. 2,000—the hon. Finance Minister coming from Bombay knows it very well—the rent from property has been reduced to one-sixth whereas it was formerly one-half. Consequently, what has happened this year? The small landholder is taxed so highly—even 30 per cent or more—much more than what is levied from the bigger landlords or other people living in towns.

As I said previously, it is not the amount that matters. It is really the capacity, the income of the people and what they can afford to pay and what source of living they have got. From that point of view, I submit that this theory of so eminent an economist as Prof. Mahalanobis that the villagers are not taxed highly does not seem to be correct. I hope his idea that a new scheme of taxation must be brought in to tax the agrarian people will not do him credit.

श्री रामजी वर्मा (देवरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आपसे यह निवेदन करना है कि आज मुल्क में कर भार बढ़ रहा है। जब हम देखते हैं पढ़ते हैं और सुनते हैं कि इस मुल्क का औसतन कर भार उतना ही है जितना कि बड़े-बड़े मुल्कों में है तो आश्चर्य होता है कि एक गरीब देश की जनता और लोगों की पाकिटों से इतना पैसा निकालना कहाँ तक उचित है? लोगों पर कर लगाने से सरकारी खजाना जरूर बढ़ता है और उससे सरकारी कार्य भी होते हैं किन्तु क्या जनता में इतना दम रह जाता है कि वह अपने कर भार को लेकर चल सके? मैं समझता हूँ कि बुनियादी यही शक्ती है कि जब से स्वाधीनता प्राप्त हुई है सरकार ने अपने खजाने को निरन्तर बढ़ाया है। सरकार ने बड़े-बड़े काम किये हैं। जनता से रुपये लेकर और बाहर से कर्जा लेकर काम किये गये किन्तु जनता इस योग्य नहीं रह गई कि वह अपने कार्य को सन्हाल

सके। उसमें सम्मिलने की क्षमता और इनिशियेटिव दूर होता जा रहा है। यह बड़े स्तरों की बात है क्योंकि यदि जनता में लूट भी उत्साह न हो, उमंग न हो, इनिशियेटिव लेने की भावना न हो तो चाहे बड़े से बड़ा कोई प्लान बाहरी मुल्क की बढौलत प्राप इस मुल्क में लाया कर दीजिये, उससे इस मुल्क की तरक्की नहीं हो सकती। एक दूसरे प्रकार की गुलामी होगी जिससे कि नीचे हम दब जायेंगे। इसलिए मैं प्रापसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार चलाने के लिए प्राप कर भार उताना ही रखिये जितना कि जरूरी हो और जैसे कि गाय से दूध लेते समय उसके बछड़े के लिए दूध छोड़ देना चाहिए जिससे कि प्रागे भी दूध मिलता रहे और गाय के बच्चों से तमाम दूध एकदम न निचोड़ लेना चाहिए।

अब यदि सरकार की क्षमता बढ़ी है तो जनता की क्षमता किस प्रकार घटी है इसके लिए एक ही उदाहरण मैं प्रापके सामने देना चाहता हूँ और वह देश में अनाज का उत्पादन है। प्राप कहेंगे कि इस मुल्क में गल्ले का उत्पादन बढ़ा है लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बढ़ा है? जब सन् १९४७ में हमारे देश में स्वराज्य आया उस समय २६ लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से आता था। स्वाधीनता के बाद सन् १९४८-४९ में प्रापने प्रो मोर फूड कैम्पेन के लिए करोड़ों रुपये खर्च किये लेकिन खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन कितना बढ़ा? चाहे कुछ भी बढ़ा हो लेकिन सन् १९४९ में प्रापको ३७ लाख टन अनाज बाहर से मगाना पड़ा। सन् ५० में कुछ कम हुआ। फिर १९५१-५२ में प्रापको ४७ लाख टन अनाज विदेशों से मगाना पड़ा। हकीकत यह है कि हर साल प्रापको बाहर से गल्ला मगाना पड़ रहा है और मालूम ऐसा देता है कि बिना बाहर की सहायता के प्राप जी नहीं सकते। लेकिन मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि इन्विपेंडेंस के पहले यहाँ के लोग अपने गल्ले और बाहर का कम गल्ला मगा कर जीवित रह सके तो कोई कारण नहीं दिखाई देता कि स्वाधीनता के पश्चात् प्रापको बाहर से यह करोड़ों टन

गल्ला क्यों मगाना पड़ रहा है? मैं सदन को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि २ करोड़, ८५ लाख और ५८ हजार टन अनाज हम ने आबादी के बाद से इस देश में मगया है और उस पर कई अरब व करोड़ों रुपये खर्च किये हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि प्राप भी इसको अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। मेरा यह कहना है कि प्रापका प्रो मोर फूड कैम्पेन फेल हुआ और प्राप इस देश में किसानों द्वारा खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन काफी तौर पर नहीं बढ़ा सके और इसका कारण यह है कि इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने जो करोड़ों रुपये अपने अफसरों के जरिये खर्च किये वह किसानों तक पहुँच भी नहीं सके। किसानों में उन से दम नहीं आया, दिलासा नहीं आया, उत्साह नहीं पैदा हुआ और उनमें इनिशियेटिव पैदा नहीं हुआ। इस तरीके से योजनाओं के पीछे प्राप जब किसानों की दबाते जायेंगे तो वे उभर नहीं पायेंगे। अगर प्राप यह समझते हैं कि इस मुल्क को हम दिल्ली, लखनऊ, कलकत्ता और बम्बई आदि बड़े-बड़े नगरों में बँट कर बना लेंगे तो प्राप गलती पर हैं। मुल्क को बढ़ाने के लिए और देश में खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए प्राप अपने मौजूदा काम के तरीके और पालिसी को बदलिये और ऐसी नीति अख्तियार कीजिये जिससे कि गरीब किसान और मजदूरों में काम करने के लिए उत्साह प्राये और वे खुद प्रागे बढ़ कर कमर कस कर मुल्क को बनाने में जुट जायें और वे यह समझने लगे कि उनको यह काम करना है।

मैं अगर वक्त मिला तो सहयोगी खेती के बारे में भी कुछ कहूँगा। लेकिन यहाँ पर इतना जरूर कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इसके जरिये अफसरों की खेती न बना दीजियेगा जिससे कि किसान और तबाह हो जायें। सहयोगी खेती अच्छी चीज है। उस का हम समर्थन करते हैं और वह होनी चाहिये लेकिन वह किसानों की ही साइड से उन से एक प्रकार से सहयोग करके ही अपनी खेती चलाते हैं। इस मुल्क में प्राप जानते हैं कि एक-एक गज के जमीन के

[श्री रामजी वर्मा]

टुकड़े पर किसान खेती करता है और उसको जोतता है और बे भापस में एक दूसरे से सहयोग करके खेतीबाड़ी करते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भापस में किसानों की इस सहयोग की भावना को डेवलप किया जाय, उनकी सहायता की जाय। उनके हाथ पकड़ कर उन्हें ऊपर उठाइये ऐसा यदि आप करेंगे तो देश आगे बढ़ सकेगा अन्यथा नहीं।

मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करूँ कि इसी गलती के कारण कि इस टैक्सेशन से सरकारी खजाने में अभिवृद्धि होती है और आगे भी हो और उसी गलत खयाल को लेकर हमारे एक साथी ने खंडसारी के सवाल को उठाया और उन्होंने कहा कि यह टैक्स लगना चाहिये उन्होंने उसके लिए दलील यह दी कि चीनी जब ३६ रुपये मन बिकती है तो उससे १३ रुपये का सरकार को मुनाफ़ा होता है और खंडसारी ३३ रुपये प्रति मन बिकती है तो क्या सरकार को उससे मुनाफ़ा नहीं मिलना चाहिये? अगर बात इतनी ही सी हो तो यह बहुत मुन्दर जंचती है कि उनसे जरूर टैक्स लेना चाहिये किन्तु मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ कि १३ रुपये टैक्स देने के बावजूद भी २२ रुपये पर जो यहाँ मिलों की चीनी बिकती है तो खाद्य मंत्री महोदय ने एक मर्तबा अपनी स्पीच में कहा था कि हमको विदेशों में जो चीनी बेजनी पड़ती है वह विदेशों में अन्य देशों के मुकाबले में १७ रुपये पड़ती है। २२ रुपये पर भी पैदा करके उनको मुनाफ़ा है तो क्या आप मिल की चीनी और खंडसारी शक्कर को एक ही तुला पर रख देंगे? उत्तर प्रदेश में खंडसारी बालों का एक प्रसोसियेशन है जिसका कि नाम यू० पी० गुड एंड खंडसारी प्रसोसियेशन है उनकी तरफ से एक पैम्फ्लेट छाया हुआ है जिसमें उन्होंने सरकार से अपील की है और सब बातों की तकलीफों का रोना रोया है। उन्होंने दिखाया है कि हमारी खंडसारी का जो उत्पादन है वह ३१ रुपये और २६ नये पैसे पर बांड पड़ता है तो अब जिनका कि

उत्पादन खर्च ३१ रुपये २६ नये पैसे पड़े उनसे भी ४ रुपये टैक्स लिया जाय और जिनका कि उत्पादन खर्च २२ रुपये पड़े, उत्पादन खर्च २२ रुपये के भी कम पड़े उनसे भी इतना ही लिया जाय यह कोई हिसाब है? मैं समझता हूँ कि जिसके कि हाथ में शासन की बागडोर है उसको इसी तर्क और इसी हिसाब से चलना होगा। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि ३१ रुपये और २६ नये पैसे उनके कहां तक जायज हैं लेकिन आपके जरिये में वित्त मंत्री महोदय से इतना जरूर निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उनके इस हिसाब में अगर कोई गलती है तो मंत्री जी कोई कमेटी बना कर या किसी और तरीके से इसकी जांच करा लें और जो सही उनका उत्पादन खर्च हो उसके अनुसार टैक्स लगायें नहीं तो नहीं लगाना चाहिये। मैं तो आपसे कहूँ कि खंडसारी पर टैक्स नहीं लगाना चाहिये। मिलों पर, बड़े-बड़े जो उद्योग बंधे हैं बड़े बड़े आमदनी के जरिये हैं उन पर आप टैक्स लगाइये लेकिन खंडसारी पर, छोटी-छोटी स्मिल स्कैल इंडस्ट्रीज पर और कौटेज इंडस्ट्रीज पर भी यदि आप टैक्स लगाते हैं तो मेरा कहना है कि उसमें छोटी और बड़ी और इंडस्ट्रीज में टैक्स के बारे में कुछ भेद तो होना चाहिये। उनका कुछ हिसाब तो होना चाहिये, कोई तारतम्य तो होना ही चाहिये। आपको टैक्स लगाना है तो बड़े बड़े उद्योगों और कारखानों पर लगाइये। लेकिन आपको यह याद रखना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में जो छोटे-छोटे गृह और कुटीर उद्योग चलते हैं और जिनमें कि हमारे लाखों लोग रोजी कमा रहे हैं उन पर आप बजाय टैक्स लगाने के उनको पनपने और प्रोत्साहन देने की कोशिश कीजिये। यह बड़े सारे की चीज होगी अगर आप इसके विरुद्ध आचरण करते हैं। धनी मेरे एक मित्र ने ख' कहा उसको सुन कर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ। उन्होंने कहा कि वे उस जिले से आते हैं जहाँ कि १४ चीनी कैंटरीज है। मैं भी उसी जिले के आता हूँ जहाँ कि १४ चीनी मिलें हैं और आज हमारा उनका यही सबका है। पता नहीं हमारे-आमरे-

बुल सवस्य कैसे इन १४ फेक्टरियों से प्रभावित हो गये ? किन्तु मैं तो कहता हूँ कि यही झगड़ा है हमारा । हम कहते हैं कि ऐ मिल वालो तुम यह २२ रुपये पर जो चीनी पैदा करने हो उससे कौस्ट ग्राफ प्रोडक्शन जनता के सामने रखो क्या तुमने कभी बतलाया कि तुम्हारा सही मायने में क्या कौस्ट ग्राफ प्रोडक्शन है ? इसी बात पर बड़ा हमारा झगड़ा शुरू होता है । इसी तरह से गन्ने की कास्ट ग्राफ प्रोडक्शन और उसकी प्राइस का सवाल है । इसके लिये हर साल हड़तालें होती हैं, घनशन होता है, लोगों को जेल जाना पड़ता है, साधारण किसान को, मेम्बरस को, एम० एल० एज० को और एम० पीज को । यह सब सरकार का इस और ध्यान दिलाने के लिए किया जाता है लेकिन कभी कभी सरकार इसको पोलि-टिकल मवाल बता कर टाल देती है और कहती है कि यह पार्टियों का झगड़ा है और इसके पीछे पोलिटीकल स्टेट है । मैं आपसे नग्नता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, मन्त्री जी, कि यह पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, यह किसानो का सवाल है, यह गन्ने का सवाल है और यह उठते हुए हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब लोगों का सवाल है और यह उस उद्योग धंधे का सवाल है कि जिसमें हजारो नही, लाखों नही बल्कि करोड़ों लोग लगे हुए हैं । यह उनकी जीविका का सवाल है । मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूँ कि आप एक कमेटी बनायें, इसकी जांच कीजिये और उसी में तै कीजिये कि खंडसारी वालो को क्या पड़ता है अगर उनको बहुत मुनाफा है तो उनसे ले लीजिये, और उसी में यह तै कीजिये कि गन्ने वालों को क्या पड़ता है और गुरुर केन फेक्टरिज उनको कितना बुरा रही हैं । तो, मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे यह बहुत ही नग्नता के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सवाल टालने का नहीं है । आप खंडसारी पर यह कह कर टैक्स लगा सकते हैं कि यह ३६ रुपये पर बेचते हैं और यह ३३ रुपये पर बेचते हैं और उनसे हम को १३ रुपया मिल जाता है । आप इन से भी १३ रुपया ले लीजिये और ये छोटे लोग हैं इनसे आप २१ रुपया ले लीजिये और उनके लिये

१० रुपया ही छोड़ दीजिये क्योंकि ये ज्यादा बोल नहीं सकते । लेकिन इस तरह से टैक्स लगाने से और इस तरह से अन्धाधुन्ध करने से काम नहीं चल सकता । इस हाउस को भी यह देखना चाहिए कि यह हिन्दुस्तान के गरीबों की बात है, इस तरफ आपको तवज्जह देनी चाहिए । मैं तो आप से बहुत ही नग्नता के साथ पुन यह निवेदन करता हूँ कि यदि हो सके तो आप उदारता के साथ इस खंडसारी के टैक्स को स्थगित ही कर दीजिये और हम बात की जाच कीजिये कि इसकी कास्ट ग्राफ प्रोडक्शन क्या है । इसमें हमारा मवाल भी हल हो जायेगा । हम गन्ने वाले हर साल जेल जाते हैं, हडताल करते हैं किसानो के आग्रह पर उनके हित के लिये हमारा प्रश्न भी इस तरह से हल हो जायेगा । उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने इस दिशा में कदम उठाने का विचार किया था । वह एक ट्रिपारटाइट कानफरेंस बुलाना चाहती थी जिसमें मिल वालों गन्ने वालों और सरकार तीनों के प्रतिनिधि हो । लेकिन पता नहीं वह स्कीम कहा दब गयी । इस समय प्रधान मंत्री जी भी हाउस में मौजूद हैं । मैं आपसे और प्रवान मन्त्री जी से नग्नता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस मुल्क की खाद्य समस्या बिगड़ी और आप कहते थे कि नही खाद्य समस्या हमारे हाथ में है, उस समय जब भाव बढे और पोलिटीकल पार्टिज के लोग जेल जाने लगे, तो हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने आगे बढ कर सब पार्टिज की एक कमेटी बुलायी थी और इस समस्या के बारे में सबसे राय ली थी । मैं समझता हूँ कि गन्ने और खंडसारी का सवाल भी कोई छोटा सवाल नहीं है । यह उस उद्योग से सम्बन्ध रखता है जो कि छोटे लोगों का उद्योग है । इसलिये आप इसे टालिए मत । यह राष्ट्र निर्माण में बहुत ही सहायक चीज है । इसलिये मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूँ कि आज इस टैक्स को स्थगित कीजिये और एक कमेटी बनाईये कि जिसके जरिये से इस मसले को हल किया जाय ।

मैं कुछ और भी आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ । हम लोग देहात में रहते हैं । हम

[श्री रामजी वर्मा]

जानते हैं कि अगर देश का उत्पादन बढ़ेगा तो तो आपको भी टैक्स मिलगा। मैं आपका ध्यान खाद्य समस्या की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। खाद्य समस्या से घबरा कर आप कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग की तरफ जा रहे हैं। कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग बहुत अच्छी चीज है। हम लोग भी उसको सपोर्ट करते हैं, लेकिन एक बात मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ और वह यह है कि इस मुल्क में क्रेडिट कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज ने जो काम किया है उसे उनको बहुत बढ़नामी मिली है। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ है कि लोग आज कोआपरेटिव का नाम सुन कर घबराते हैं। इस मुल्क में कोआपरेटिव मार्केटिंग फेडरेशन बना था और गन्ने के बारे में सोसाइटिया बनी थी। इन सोसाइटियों ने गन्ना बढ़ाने का काम नहीं किया बल्कि गन्ने की बेचकर नफा उठाने का काम किया जैसे कि ठेकेदार करते हैं। तो इस कारण लोग कोआपरेटिव शब्द से घबराते हैं। फिर भी चूँकि यह चीज मिडान्त में अच्छी है और चूँकि आज मुल्क के लिए यह जरूरी है कि जिन किसानों के पास छोटी छोटी जमीनें हैं उनको मिलाया जाय और फिर उस पर खेती की जाये, इसलिये हम इसका समर्थन करते हैं। लेकिन इस दिशा में कदम उठाने के पहले बहुत समझदारी से काम लेना चाहिये और देहात के लोगों के सहयोग से ही इसको धागे चलाना चाहिए। अब तक जो कोआपरेटिव को चलाने वाले लोग रहे हैं उन्होंने विदेशी सिद्धान्तों को मोटी मोटी किताबों में पढ़ा है। लेकिन जो काम इस दिशा में मुल्क में हुआ है उसमें उनको नेकनामी नहीं मिली है। लेकिन मैं अभी भी कहता हूँ कि इस मुल्क में कोआपरेटिव का तत्व है। यहाँ पर गाव गाव में, घर घर में, पड़ोस पड़ोस में लोग स्वयं सहकारी खेती करते हैं। अगर ऐसा न करें तो वे खेती कर ही नहीं सकते। अगर पानी चलाना होता है, सिंचाई करनी होती है, या बीज देना होता है तो सब एक दूसरे से मिस कर काम करते हैं। तो जो यह तत्व देश में है उसका भी आपको अध्ययन

करना चाहिए। क्या आपने कोई कमेटी बिठायी है कि जो देश के इन कोआपरेटिव तत्वों का अध्ययन करे। आपने ऐसा नहीं किया यह समझ कर कि यह तो गुलाम मुल्क रहा है इसमें कुछ है नहीं, यहाँ तो बेद है, शास्त्र है और बड़े बड़े ग्रन्थ हैं, कल्चर हैं, और इस पर आप लक्ष्म करतें हैं। लेकिन मैं बताऊँ कि इस मुल्क में कोआपरेशन का भी बहुत तत्व है। उसका आप अध्ययन कीजिये। गाव गाव में, जाति जाति में, समाज समाज में यहाँ यह तत्व काम कर रहा है। उम्मी को बढ़ाने में आप सहयोग कीजिये। और उसके बाद विदेशी तत्वों को भी आप लें लें। मैं इससे इंकार नहीं करता। आप विदेशी सिद्धान्तों की भी लेकर यहाँ पर कोआपरेटिव के काम को बढ़ायें। यह उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए जरूरी है और जब तक उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ेगा तब तक देश का कल्याण नहीं हो सकता। हम अमरीका से, आस्ट्रेलिया से, जापान से और रूस तथा दूसरे देशों से गन्ना मंगा कर बहुत दिनों तक यहाँ के लोगों का पेट नहीं भर सकते। आप जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान एक खेतिहर देश है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय . क्या माननीय सदस्य और दो तीन मिनट में खत्म कर देंगे।

श्री रामजी वर्मा बहुत अच्छा।

तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह मुल्क एक खेतिहर मुल्क है किन्तु आज कल यहाँ सबसे बड़ा सवाल हमारे सामने यह है कि यहाँ की आबादी बहुत बढ़ रही है और यह एक प्राबलम हो गया है। आज सरकार के सामने यह प्राबलम है कि इस मुल्क की आबादी को किस तरह से घटाया जाये क्योंकि अन्यथा यहाँ की खाद्य समस्या का सवाल हल नहीं हो सकता, यह बुद्धिमान लोगों की बातें हैं, यह उन लोगों की बातें हैं जो कि बड़े बड़े रिसर्च करते हैं। किन्तु मैं एक चीज आपके से निवेदन करना

चाहता हूँ, मंत्री जी, कि इस मुल्क में जो ३६ करोड़ लोग रहते हैं वे कर्मठ हैं, कार्यशील हैं, वे लोग कमजोर नहीं हैं और इम्पॉटेंट नहीं हैं। वे सब कुछ कर सकते हैं। किन्तु जब तक इन ३६ करोड़ लोगों की इनर्जी को आप किसी योजना के अन्दर नहीं लगायेंगे जिसमें देश का उत्पादन बढ़े, तब तक ये लोग अपना उत्पादन ही बढ़ाते रहेंगे। और इसको आप नहीं रोक सकते। तो मंत्री जी गुस्ताखी माफ हो तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह दो प्रकार का सघर्ष है। खेती आपके हाथ में है, रोजगार देना आपके हाथ में है, इन्स्ट्रिज आपके हाथ में है, बिना सरकार के हाथ लगाये कोई इन्स्ट्रिज इस मुल्क में नहीं चल सकती। जब प्रादमी किसी काम को पकड़ना चाहता है, कोई रोजी रोजगार करना चाहता है, काम लेना चाहता है, कोई सरबिस लेना चाहता है तो वह अपने को घसटाय पाता है। उसमें आप उसकी मदद नहीं कर सकते।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप अपना भाषण बाद में जारी रखें।

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd

MINISTRY OF FINANCE—contd.

16.58 hrs

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker: I will now put cut motion No 2046 moved by Shri Prabhat Kar The question is

“That the Demand under the head ‘Ministry of Finance’ be reduced by Rs 100 (Delay in submission of Report of the Second Pay Commission)”

The Lok Sabha divided Ayes 25; Noes 106

Division No. 11]

[16.58½ hrs.

Banerjee, Shri Pramathabath
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Bharucha, Shri Naushir
Chandramani Kalo, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri T. K.
Daulta, Shri P. S.
Elias, Shri Muhammed
Ghose, Shri Subman
Godsora, Shri S. C.

Iyer, Shri Easwara
Kaz, Shri Prabhat
Majhi, Shri R. C.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Nair, Shri Yasudevan
Panigrahi, Shri
Patulekar, Shri
Patil, Shri Balasaheb

Pillai, Shri Anthony
Rajendra Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal
Seth, Shri B. C.
Singh, Shri L. Achaw
Tangamani, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Warrior, Shri

NOES

Abdur Rehman, Molvi
Achar, Shri
Agarwal, Shri
Ajit Singh, Shri
Alva, Shri Jochum
Ashanna, Shri
Ayyakkannu, Shri
Barmen, Shri
Basappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagwan Das, Shri
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Budari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chavda, Shri
Das, Shri K. K.

Das, Shri N. T.
Das, Shri Shree Narayan
Dasappa, Shri
Desai, Shri Morarji
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Eacharan, Shri I.
Gandhi, Shri Ferose
Harvani, Shri Anwar
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hukam Singh, Sardar
Jhulan Sinha, Shri
Jhunjhunwala, Shri
Karmarker, Shri
Kaulwal, Shri
Kotaka, Shri Liladhas

Khan, Shri Sadath Ali
Khawaja, Shri Jamal
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lachi Ram, Shri
Madhusudan Rao, Shri
Mati, Shri N. B.
Malaviya, Pandit Govind
Masaen, Shri
Mandal, Shri J.
Mathew, Shri M.
Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra
Mehdi, Shri S. A.
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri R. D.
Misra, Shri R. R.
Morarka, Shri