

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

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of State of Orissa for for the services of the financial year 1960-61, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

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

"That clauses 1, 2 and 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were added to the Bill.*

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

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

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

12.29 hrs.

APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS)  
NO. 2 BILL, 1961

**The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1961-62 for the purposes of Railways, be taken into consideration."

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

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the

service of the financial year 1961-62 for the purposes of Railways, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

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

"That clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 1 to 3, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were added to the Bill.*

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

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

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

12.30 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL  
DISCUSSION

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the General discussion of the General Budget for which 20 hours have been allotted. Under rule 207(3), I fix that fifteen minutes will be the time ordinarily allowed for every hon. Member except for Leaders of Groups who would be allowed up to 30 minutes, when necessary.

**Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central):** Sir, this is the first Budget for the first year of the Third Five Year Plan. Therefore, the basic indications of the policy that the Government will follow in the next few years are available in this Budget.

The Budget has had already some kind of reception in public and in the press. Of course, it is not always safe to rely on the immediate reactions either of one shop-keeper

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

or one newspaper as regards the effect of the Budget. But, they may, to a certain extent, give an indication of the general trends of the budget. Everybody knows that the Budget as such should, in a planned economy, try to shift incomes in a particular direction. When the whole of society is engaged in putting forth its maximum effort in industrialising the country and in strengthening its economy, the pertinent question that must arise always in framing the budget would be how this development and its fruits are being shared.

The Budget gives a picture of the achievements in the field of production. We have already had an occasion to refer to the achievements in the field of production. Production has increased; national income has increased; the *per capita* income has increased, and so in the sphere of production and the outlook for the economy, the achievements are quite sizable and are of a type of which everybody in the country including the Government and the ruling party should be proud. As I said once, some of the industries that are being built and have been built in the Second Five Year Plan have enabled us to break the blockade which was being imposed on us or which we had inherited historically from the previous conditions of subjection, and the basic lines of production in the direction of strengthening the economy are being developed, and developed in a satisfactory way. On that point, I have no difference, so far as the picture presented in the Budget in this sphere is concerned.

But the relevant question, which the Finance Minister also has raised is: What is happening to the fruits of this development? If we look at the fruits of the development, do we continue the direction in which they are being cornered, or are we going to change the direction? The fruits of this development are mostly being cornered by those who own industry in the private

sector, and even amongst them, by those who have monopoly hold on the economy of the country.

12.33 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO *in the Chair*]

The development of monopoly capitalism in this country, during the First Plan and the Second Plan, particularly in the Second Plan, has been already noted by several economists. In fact, the Panel of Economists, headed by Professor D. R. Gadgil, when it submitted its notes to the Planning Commission, pointed to this danger. The Panel pointed to three or four dangers, the first among which was that if monopoly capital seizes hold of the economic bases of development of the country then the fruits of development will not flow to the people, but will in fact harm them; secondly, development in the direction of monopoly capital will not lead to the desired results which we want to bring about through planned economic development; thirdly, there will be inflation in the price structure in the country; and fourthly, there will be political complications unhealthy for democracy. All these things were pointed out not only by the Communist Party but also by leading members of the Panel of Economists, who were certainly not by any means communists. Has this development come about in the economy of the country? It has. Does the Budget in any way try to correct it? It does not.

The drawbacks of the Budget are already being pointed out in the Press and have been the subject of discussion in the Rajya Sabha also. The Budget, in fact, frankly follows the direction of taxing the common man. Indirect taxation is increasing. These facts are not denied even by the Finance Minister. In fact, he says that it is a fact and he thinks that this direction is necessary and has got to be followed. Indirect taxation, for example, which in 1948 was 50 per cent of the revenue, went up to 67.3 per cent in 1960, and is now about 69 per cent in this Budget.

When the point is raised that this indirect taxation is hitting the common man, and generally that section of the population which is least fitted to be taxed so heavily, the reply is that consumption must be restricted. When somebody pointed out to the Finance Minister that 'You are taxing tea and coffee and *biri* and tobacco and cloth and so on, he, in fact, laid out a whole plan which shows the philosophy on which the Budget is conceived. If a thing is taxed it is being taxed either for the health of the person concerned or for the morals of the person concerned, or for some other motive, except the motive of helping the people to conduct a peaceful life on growing standards of living. It is accepted that the objective of the Plan is to raise standards of living. And the moment a man's standard of living just goes up a little, then, the Finance Minister says that 'since his standard of living is going up, he must pay me a price for taking the standard of living up', and that price must be such that his standard of living must come down. This is the contradiction which is being put forward in the Budget and in the speech that the Finance Minister made in the Rajya Sabha—if I have taxed tea coffee, then do not drink it; I do not mind if I do not get revenue; in fact, I shall be pleased if I do not get revenue; I shall find some other ways of taxation, but I do not want you to drink tea and coffee; if I tax *biris* or cigarettes, then, do not smoke; I shall be very glad if you do not smoke, and if because of that I do not get any taxes, I do not mind, I shall rob you in some other way, but then, for your health and for your morals, do not smoke; if your standard of living has gone up, and instead of wearing coarse cloth, you are wearing fine or medium cloth, then, for the sin of having raised your standard of living, you must pay me a tax, and for that medium or fine cloth, you should pay me a tax on cloth, and, thereby, again go back to coarse cloth, if you cannot go back to something less than that! So, the philosophy would be, do not smoke, do not drink tea and coffee, do

not wear cloth and so on; and population also is a problem, so do not go further in that line also. So, ultimately, why do you live with an ambition to raise the standard of living? I do not quite understand. The simple answer would be that the common man, to the Finance Minister, is a tax-paying machine; and if he has to live, then, he must live for taxes; otherwise, he must not live. This is the simple conclusion of the Budget and the reply that the Finance Minister gave in the Rajya Sabha.

In the face of such a philosophy, what criticism can you make against the Budget except to say 'Throw that Budget out'? There can be no other criticism. But, of course, we have not got the power to throw the Budget out. Even those who criticise the Finance Minister from his own Party ultimately will have to vote for it. Therefore, the Budget cannot be thrown out, but at least, let us tell the people what the philosophy in the Budget is, which he is propounding for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of the people, as he says. It was not a chance that as soon as the Budget was published, the prices started soaring up. When this thing was pointed out to the Finance Minister, he said, 'there might be some shop-keepers who do that, but I am not responsible for it, society should look into the matter'. Now, if society does start looking into the matter, the simple result would be that society would go at those profiteers who are doing this thing, and there would be a veritable civil war, which certainly is not what the Finance Minister wants. Therefore, his call to society to intervene against such profiteering and such prices, when he publishes his Budget, is not a call which fits in with his own philosophy, because whenever society wanted to resolve such problems on its own, he was the first man to run against that society.

**The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai):** Not your society.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** Therefore, I do not know why he gave that call; most probably it came out of his mouth inadvertently.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Nothing inadvertent.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** In that case, if it is deliberate, I shall be very glad if, when society organises itself against these price-racketeers and gives them the punishment that they deserve, the Finance Minister at that time, I hope, will join that side of society which does these things.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I will tell you what I will do.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** Since for the present he has occupied the Home Minister's seat.....

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I am in the Finance Minister's seat.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** I am just talking of the seat only, not the *portfolio*.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I am in the Finance Minister's seat.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** So, Sir, the Budget, in its total effect, is an anti-people Budget. Let me congratulate him on being very frank. He says that taxes are meant to restrict consumption. Kill consumption, where it starts to rise, and kill it by taxation. So I do not know whether to call it a killer's Budget or a builder's Budget, because the Budget is supposed to build up the economy of the people. Instead of that—it does not do that—it wants to kill consumption, in order of course to build the economy in the future. This is, in short, the general characteristic of the Budget.

Now, without going into the details of taxation—everybody knows what they are—let me point out one or two things. Does the Budget in any way help to reduce the price level? No. In fact the Finance Minister has made a

statement, a theoretical statement—he is one of the authorities on theories of finance; so I have to take note of it—that in a developing economy, price rise is inevitable. That is one statement which he has made. He also made another statement, which I will take note of later on, which is still more interesting.

Now as regards price rise in a developing economy, he does not say what kind of developing economy, socialist or capitalist. In India, if it is a capitalist economy which is developing, then he says price rise is inevitable. Is price rise inevitable even in a capitalist economy? If he goes into the history of the development of England, which was the first capitalist country to lay down the foundations of a capitalist economy in the world, he will find that when furious development was taking place, prices were falling and not rising. Even in a period of capitalist development, the economy does not necessarily lead to price rises. If you scan the history of economic development of England on the capitalist basis, you will find this, that prices rise and fall. In India, continuously prices are rising and never falling. May be here and there, a change of one or two per cent may be there, but the continuous trend for the last 13 years of development is a rise in prices.

Now, production rises. Should rise in production lead to rise in prices or fall in prices? If you again pay attention to the development of the capitalist economy, you will find that since the last 20 years, after 1930 and particularly after the Great Depression and the starting of the war, prices have continuously been rising throughout the capitalist world, the reason being that monopoly has seized hold of the machinery of money supply, banking, the whole governmental apparatus and main source of production. Therefore, they can peg prices in the way they like, and they refuse to allow the prices to fall. This is the phenome-



non of monopoly capital throughout the world. Therefore, we can say that prices rise continuously when monopoly capital seizes hold of the economy, and that is exactly what is happening slowly in our country.

Now, another statement which he has made, as an abstract statement, is that prices are bound to rise in a developing economy of any kind. I would like him to show any socialist economy where prices have risen when planned economy started. There is not one single example.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur):** What about the turnover tax? That is an addition to the price.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** Excuse me. I am talking of prices, not of taxes. Let him understand the subject and then ask. I am not talking of turnover taxes. What can I do? Therefore, the phenomenon of prices has got to be studied in the context of a given society, and you will find in a socialist society that prices do not rise. I am coming to taxation later on. Therefore, you find this statement, an abstract statement, which wants to condition the people in the belief that if they want development, if they want production and if they want rising standards of living, price rise is inevitable, and thereby he wants to demoralise them from struggling against the rise in prices, by putting forward a theoretical concept in their mind so that psychologically they cannot struggle.

May I submit and ask whether he would pay more attention to this problem and study the matter and not make a general statement like that, that necessarily, if you want to develop the economy, price rise is inevitable?

Another element in price rise, to which I want to draw his attention—he knows it already—is this. It was stated that in the five year plans, because of deficit financing, price rises take place. In the last year, deficit

financing was at the lowest, almost nil, very little. Production was the highest. Money supply from the governmental side was less. Yet prices shot up. In the previous year, I think the rise in prices was 4.1 per cent or something like that. In the last year, it went up to over 6 per cent. With deficit financing at the lowest and production at the highest, why are prices rising?

Then you will find that in the sphere of banking, more than necessary money supply has been poured into the system, and the banks have been the greatest criminals in the rise in prices in the last year. The *Economic Survey* frankly admits that speculative tendencies appeared, there was too much money in the market, in the private sector, and that it vitiated the price structure. Every year on the budget, I draw his attention to the fact that this banking system in this country ought to be taken over by the State, because it is the greatest criminal vitiating our price structure and money structure; and he has always been telling me that it is not possible to do so, not healthy to do so and not advisable to do and that it is my particular mania. But there is this perpetual mania in the *Economic Survey* exhibited by the banks, that they pump money into the system and hold society to ransom and price rises take place. Instead of referring to my mania which demands that banks be nationalised, why does he not refer to the mania of the banks which is recorded in the *Economic Survey*—that these are the culprits responsible for the rise in prices? When there was no necessity for deficit financing, there was plenty of injection of money into the system, and it has been raised by several economists as a question: why is it that in the last year when deficit financing was so low, when the food situation was not so very bad and when production was the highest, price rises took place? Why? The reply was: the banks, the criminals who poured money into the system for speculative and other purposes, which thereby led to price rises.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

What is the cure for this in the Budget? None. The cure for this in the Budget in fact is a greater encouragement for converting reserves into bonus shares by reduction of tax for floating bonus shares. For example, the money supply increased as follows: 1958 Rs. 21.8 crores, 1959 Rs. 128 crores and 1960 Rs. 246 crores. All this was not for business interest. No. Not for purposes of trade. The *Economic Survey* says that part of it at least was for speculation. The Finance Minister's speech itself mentions that speculative tendencies were there. What do they do in order to check this speculative tendency? Every year money supply is poured in. Then the prices rise, speculation grows. Then the Reserve Bank comes in and raises the rate of interest. Take July 1960. Till then, prices were shooting up. Speculation was taking place. After that, the Reserve Bank comes and says: 'Gentlemen, you are doing the crime on too high a level, too much of it. So raise the rate of interest'. Then equity prices break down a little and come down. But again the same course they follow later on, in the next year. This is an annual performance of criminals which cannot be checked up by the budgetary structure which the Finance Minister places before us. And, again, therefore, I would say that his Budget is not a Budget for the people. That is on the question of prices. Taxes I have already mentioned.

Then there is the question of some major measures taken. If you compare the two layers of taxes which he has provided for in the Budget, you can see why some of the financial papers were quite jubilant. In fact, this time the Finance Minister has got more praise from the business houses than he ever got. They have congratulated him on his courage, that in a year of election he has dared to tax the people and that he has shown what a strong man he is who can impose taxes even in the election year without caring for the votes. And then a particular journal notes at the same time that he has had to impose certain tax-

es on industry, for example on the machinery and so on, but that journal advises "Don't look at these taxes. He had to do that; otherwise he would have been accused of only hitting the people. Therefore, that is a smoke-screen, and industrialists should not be worried about it." This is the advice given to certain Chambers of Commerce by an eminent writer in the journal called *The Eastern Economist*, whose daily side—the *Hindustan Times*—was just debated five minutes back in this House. So, you will see that the Budget is definitely weighted in favour of the richer classes. I do not have to go into details. I do not have to discuss new points at all. These things ultimately reflect on the common man. The result is deterioration in the standards of living, while our ambition is to raise the standards of living.

There are one or two small things, to which I want to draw his attention. For example, I do not understand one or two of these figures. So, I hope will be enlightened later on if I am wrong. For example, what is this type of development that is planned? There is a Central Government Account No. 3—called Transactions in Commodities and Services and Transfers—Capital Account of Government administration in departmental commercial undertaking. We are told, and partly it is true, that development is taking place on right lines, but then there are certain drawbacks, and here I would like to point out one of these figures which pointedly draws attention to certain drawbacks. The Gross Fixed Capital for machines in Account No. 3 shows: Buildings and other construction: New Outlay Rs. 202 crores; Renewals and Replacements: Rs. 77 crores. So, buildings and other construction in the Gross Capital formation on Government account comes to Rs. 279 crores. I am just pointing out the relation between the two. Buildings and other construction: Rs. 279 crores; machinery and equipment: renewals and new outlay: Rs. 110 crores. So, in the Gross Capital formation of

Rs. 390 crores, nearly Rs. 280 crores go in for buildings and other construction. Is this ratio healthy for the economy? I should only like to put this question to the Finance Minister and to those who plan the economy, whether in the Gross Capital formation of Rs. 390 crores, it is advisable to put in so much amount on construction of buildings and so little on machinery and equipment. Of course, somebody is bound to give us an explanation for it, but I should like to hear that explanation.

One more thing I want to point out. The Finance Minister is worried about export-import, incomes and so on, and one of the methods he found for developing his export resources was not so much to develop the other ports in the country as to establish a new port called the Kandla Port. But it is an old port, and is new in the sense that recently a new qualification was conferred on that Kandla Port. What was that qualification—that an area called a free port area is to be built in that Kandla Port. And what would a free port area in that region be? It would be a smugglers' den and nothing else.

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur):** How?

**Shri S. A. Dange:** Everybody knows. In the conditions of today in that area, in the economy, in which we are subsisting, if you establish a port like that at Kandla with a free area, it would result in nothing but smuggling, and an indirect reflection on the development of other ports and certain other industries in other areas. Many economists have objected to the establishment of a free port area in that region, but no attention was paid. There are certain interests who want development, no doubt. Let them have all the encouragement that they legitimately should have for the development of

that port. That port we know. We know there is a ridge there which crumbles every time, which has to be maintained by dredging and nothing else. It cannot be a very healthy port for purposes of development, but it was to be built for strategic reasons or what I do not know. It was built. Instead of now allowing it to have a certain normal development, a new element of a free port area is introduced, which, I think, will ultimately affect the economy in that region also.

Such measures are carried out on the one side, and on the other side, when people want some share of the production that is developing, they are denied that share in the name of taxation and further development. For example, as I have already quoted once upon a time, the fact is that for every one rupee paid to the worker, he produces Rs. 2.39 as net addition to value. That is the way in which the working class is reproducing its wages. When he wants to tax, my suggestion would be: bring out all your sources of taxation from the Rs. 2.39 net value added. You need not go around casting your net wide on indirect taxes through excise duties, but if you go to the points of production and find out the net value added to the product, and take a certain percentage of that product into the State sphere, you resolve your problems of taxation and Budget.

At a certain stage he says that indirect taxation is unavoidable even in a socialist society. He referred to a certain speaker who was a Communist and he said even in those countries with which we have spiritual affinity, indirect taxes exist,—not in the countries with which the Finance Minister perhaps has his physical and spiritual affinity, but we are supposed to have spiritual affinity. As far as I am concerned, I have spiritual affinity with the whole world's people, and for this country particularly. Anyway, that is a side remark, that

[Shri S. A. Dange]

has nothing to do with the main problem. Even there, he said indirect taxes exist. He should know that indirect taxation in socialist countries goes on falling. Why? For this reason, that the main instruments of production, that is the main sources of production, are nationalised, and the surplus of that production enters the Budget, and thereby reduces indirect taxation. If the State sector in this country were to enlarge, if the main lines of production were to be transferred to the State sector, then the surplus from the State sector should enter into the Budget and the part played by indirect taxes would go down. This is just simple arithmetic, and simple financial theory. It is applied in the socialist countries, and that is why, if you permit me to mention, in the Soviet Union now taxes on income are being abolished, and taxation on commodities is going out very soon, because the whole social sphere of production is held by the State as yielding a certain surplus. The surplus can be calculated in a capitalist economy and a socialist economy, both, as they do in the State Sector. In the State Sector, as you know, we are proposing, I think, to take credit of about Rs. 450 crores for the Third Plan. These Rs. 450 crores come from the State Sector of industry. If the State Sector were to expand, this could be expanded to Rs. 1,000 crores, and thereby reduce the necessity of indirect taxation. This is what a simple remedy can be in order to do away with taxes on the commodities consumed by the poor people. But this involves a certain policy, a certain policy which means a policy will not allow monopoly capital to grow, a policy which will not allow two families in this country to control a capital block of Rs. 700 crores.

13 hrs.

The Finance Minister speaks of the power of money not getting concentrated to the detriment of society. But, here, a study in the *Economic*

*Weekly*, a financial paper in Bombay, shows very clearly that two families are controlling Rs. 700 crores of capital in this country. Is this healthy? And, when people ask that they should be allowed to buy instead of coarse cloth medium cloth, then he says that money is concentrated, that the poor man has raised his standard of living and he is earning too much and he should take it away. But, no, notwithstanding their taxation two families can have Rs. 700 crores and something more.

**An Hon. Member:** Rs. 600 crores.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** That is what is happening. What is happening to these two families in their relation to the Budget and the Finance Minister's concentration of wealth? He says: 'Well, I am taxing them through dividend taxation, through income-tax and corporation tax and so on'. But how is the mechanism of taxation made that in spite of the huge taxation on our part, this kind of multiplication of wealth in the hands of these two families goes on increasing? The money in the hands of the poor man is going on decreasing; but the money in the hands of the monopoly capitalists increases. And yet he says that he is taxing both equitably, and, in fact, the rich more. If such a claim is made, is that claim justified in the context of the figures we have got of the concentration of capital and money power, and in the context of the figures we have got about the standards of living?

It is a well-known fact that real wages are falling, and have fallen in the last two years. And, yet when the real wages have fallen and the prices have risen and the profits have gone up, yet, they are not taxed more. Corporate taxation does not yield income as much as it should or even on the basis of given taxation; and yet the Finance Minister claims that the Budget is an equitable Budget and it lays down the burden equitably on all sectors of society. I challenge his claim. Therefore, the

Budget, to my mind, cannot evoke any enthusiasm so far as the common man is concerned.

Neither the working class nor the peasantry will be enthused by seeing the Budget which is framed in this way. He has got several explanations as to how only inferior tobacco is being taxed but not biris. He, at the same time says that formerly we used to mix inferior tobacco in the biris and hence he will tax this. What will be the result? Inferior tobacco mixed in the biris will raise the prices of biris—a direct effect of the Budget. It is simple arithmetic and simple law of economics. He knows very well that there is a reflex action in economy, particularly in capitalist economy.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** And this is the reflex action!

**Shri S. A. Dange:** The reflex action is that if price rises in one place it goes on rising in other places also. He knows what reflex action of capitalist monopoly is. We are familiar with it. He says that he is not responsible for that. In that case I have a suggestion to make to him. When the Budget is introduced there should be a certain omnibus provision that until the thing has become effective no price rise will be legal. Let us at least have that provision immediately so that the prices in the market may not rise. When the proposals are made, the prices shoot up 2 months or more. Perhaps the prices may stabilise or come down later; but in a period of one month or 15 days hundreds of thousands of rupees are drawn from the purses of the poor people. We are not told by the Finance Minister that people must go and challenge, society should be roused to action. After all, stability might come. But, by that time they have lost hundreds of thousands. Why should there be not a provision when he introduces the Finance Bill im-

posing a prohibition in regard to any rise in prices whatever may be the provisions of the Budget? Why not introduce such a provision? They are capable enough to frame such measures if they want to; but that is not being done.

On the Budget day there is hectic activity and there is speculation. The prices first rise and stability might come later on. Why should there be this anarchic mechanism? Why not introduce some prohibition like that when we are introducing a taxation Budget? A taxation Budget must not lead to an immediate rise in prices. Why not do it? In short I may sum up the points which I made by making him an offer he might brush aside my remarks with some little criticism, some abuse, something like that and so on. But he cannot brush aside something which a sober economist says with regard to the developments that are taking place in the economy of the country. I am quoting this passage from a book by Prof. D. R. Gadgil. And, D. R. Gadgil, I think, is as well-versed in financial theory as the Finance Minister is. I do not say, 'more' because he is not a Finance Minister. Therefore he cannot be said to be versed more. But, looking over the Plan of the Government, its development, the way monopoly capital is concentrating and so on—unfortunately, he uses the expression 'monopoly capital' and he avoids all other words—he says this. He is not a socialist; he was a Chairman of the Panel of Economists, quite a respectable citizen, not a member of the communist party. He is discussing how the economy is getting disturbed, how the moral influence of the older leadership which inherited the great traditions of the national movement is not able to control this development from going in the wrong direction. He says, even this leadership is bit by bit being reduced in numbers. Therefore, the moral prestige of the old leadership and the new forces of a new developing economy are not acting together

[Shri S. A. Dange]

in such a way as to stop dissensions in our life. He says: "

"In the not-too-distant future, there is bound to be definite confrontation of the actual possessors of politico-economic power in the country, the larger business interests, the top administrative and professional groups and the political parties supported by them with the mass of the common people, and such a confrontation would have very serious results for the plan and for stability and order in the country. Such a situation could be avoided only if political leadership becomes more intelligent and more perceptive. The present crisis is essentially a moral crisis. If those in power can regain moral authority, which they can do only by showing some convincing overt any signs of their sincerity and sacrifice for planned development of India on democratic lines, the mixed economy may still prove practicable. If not, the last abortive strike of the central government employees may prove to have been only the first in a series of disturbances and conflicts that may shake the country."

This is the fear expressed by an eminent specialist and economist. And this the hope that I am expressing, the hope that the Finance Minister will help the country to avoid such a calamity.

**Shri C. D. Pande** (Nani Tal): This is your hope, I think.

**Shri Asoka Mehta** (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wholly agree with the remark that Prof. Gadgil has made that political leadership should be more intelligent and should show greater insight. I am therefore somewhat sorry when my hon. friend, Shri Dange, more or less made the same mistakes with his figures that he made on the previous occasion. When he was speaking on the President's Address he gave certain figures about

production of steel in communist countries and those figures, you will recollect, were riddled through by the Prime Minister in his reply. Today there are two statements which he has made about communist countries which, I am afraid, are wholly untrue.

First, to suggest that in a developing economy in a communist country there is no price increase is to run counter to the facts of life. In the Soviet Union—I have not the figures with me just now; I am merely relying on my memory; and I hope and trust that my memory is not wrong—in the Soviet Union, during a similar period of development, the price increases were to the tune of 1,600 per cent.

Secondly, I am surprised and I am amazed to find that a responsible person like my hon. friend, Shri Dange, should not realise that the distinction that is sought to be made between the profits of the public sector and commodity taxation is distinction without difference. Even in the United States of America—as I shall give figures later on—a considerable proportion of investments in economy comes from what is known as 'corporate savings'. Now these corporate savings merely take the form of taxation. The only thing is that corporate savings permit the owners concerned to retain and expand the sphere of ownership. In a public sector you might say that the sphere of ownership which would be expanded would remain with the State. That is a very vital distinction. But to suggest that because profits are made, profits are retained and profits are used for the purpose of either expanding the economy, deepening the economy or for the purpose of meeting the requirements of Government and to say that it is something basically and fundamentally different from commodity taxation, is, I think, to miss the wood for the trees. But I am afraid, as I said on a previous occasion, I have got to

devote my attention mainly to the Treasury Benches.

Sir, a distinguished officer of the United Nations, Mr. Paul Haufman, who as you know has the assignment of providing aid to underdeveloped countries under the auspices of the United Nations recently said that the sixties is the "crucial decade" for the world. For our country it is even more crucial. Somebody else called this "the most dangerous decade." I have no doubt in my mind that we are on the threshold of what is both most dangerous from one point of view and most exciting decade from another point of view. And that is why whatever we may do, whatever we may say has a historical importance which transcends anything petty or anything irrelevant.

I can understand that the Finance Minister who exudes confidence should desire to evoke confidence in the country. When we realise that through this Budget we shall be collecting 7 naye paise per day from every single individual in India and when we realise that for our Plan we shall be asking for anything between 4 to 5 naye paise per individual per day as foreign aid, one can well realise the need to create a climate of confidence in the country and outside. But is it consistent with the policies that we seek to pursue that the climate of confidence that we are evoking should be confined only to certain sections of our people? Should the stock exchange alone be permitted to boom? Or should there be a feeling of satisfaction, should there be a better understanding and a better response in the fields and the factories of our country also? I hope we shall not do anything which will undermine this confidence that needs to be created in the country and the world. But at the same time, if we are to fulfill the targets that we have placed before ourselves, if we are to implement the pattern that we have sketched, that confidence should have a much wider impact than the one he has perhaps in mind.

Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the pattern of development that we have deliberately selected. There are two possible patterns of development. The first is what is known as the maximisation of the rate of return, a pattern wherein our whole attention is devoted on having the highest growth-rate in the economy that is possible for us. The other is maximisation of employment and income. There are many in this House, Sir, who favour that there should be maximisation of employment. Why have we selected the first pattern as against the other? Full employment, I suggest, is possible here and now. It would be possible to have full employment in our country. But it would be full employment at a low level of technique. It would result in raising the current income. But let us realise that while it is true that if an unproductive person is set to work he would add to the stream of income, if his consumption or wages exceed his output, the investment surplus will suffer. There is no doubt that it is possible to develop economy with full employment, but its cost will be greater than the cost of the other pattern that we have selected. It is comparatively simple to provide full employment at the static equilibrium as the Sarvodaya friends desire. To combine it with dynamic development involves many considerations to which the needed thought has not been given. If you have dynamic development with full employment, it will be necessary not only to maintain full employment, but raise productivity at a much larger base of our economy. What will be the result? Where a larger income goes into the hands of the poor in terms of wages, the propensity to save will go down. If the propensity to save goes down, the saving-income ratio will go down, while side by side the capital output ratio will go up. We shall have to put in more capital in order that we are able to have the output that we need where we want to maintain full employment.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

The consequences of this two-pronged impact on our economy would be that on the one side the saving income ratio will go down and the capital output ratio will go up. There will be a gap. This gap has to be filled up either by greater taxation greater commodity taxation, than is being levied today. This is the only way in which the larger income streams that are generated into larger sections of our people are prevented from being wholly used up in consumption, or it will mean forced saving which would mean rise in prices. It is inconceivable, Sir, that you can have the first pattern of development where you maximise employment and income and also not have much higher rate of commodity tax than you are having today. This is what Prof. Galbraith has elsewhere called 'conventional wisdom'. He has said how the conventional wisdom of the past is becoming an impediment in the understanding of the future.

May I point out that we still talk in static terms? We have not fully realised the implications of our dynamic development, what rapid transformation of economy from one stage of technology to another involves. Therefore, a new kind of conventional wisdom needs to be created and it is here that I find that in this House and through this House outside we are not shouldering our responsibility. The crucial decade that we face today, the most dangerous decade that we have entered, we shall be able to pass through properly only if we are able to substitute the right kind of conventional wisdom for the wrong and obsolete kind of conventional wisdom.

Irrespective of any system of development, if we want adjust ourselves with the technological world of widening wants, there are three things that have got to be done. There has got to be scheduling of production, whether Mr. Masani is in charge of it, or somebody else is in charge of it. There has got to be rationing of consumption. Rationing does not mean that

you go and issue coupons. It means there has to be a tax policy, there has to be an economic and fiscal policy, whereby consumption is ultimately restrained in certain places.\* Then capital has to be conscripted. These are the inexorable and inescapable consequences of development and intelligence is needed for finding out how best these things are to be done. We only dash our heads against the wall and we wish these three imperatives out of existence. We have deliberately chosen the maximisation of the rate of return because we hoped that that way quickly surplus will be generated. In our economy there are certain sections where we provide a lot of capital and we hoped that it would produce quick returns and these returns would be used to develop our economy further, so that we would be able to provide employment to a larger and larger number of our people at a higher level of income and output. Therefore, it is most important to see that these sectors in our economy which we are trying to develop very fast work efficiently and produce the maximum amount of results. It is here that we are failing.

We rejected the approach that Gandhiji taught us maximisation of employment and income—because we wanted to move on with the technological development. We, therefore, selected the alternate method but we are not able to live up to the demands and expectations and the iron laws of this alternate method of development. Our rate of growth has been only 3.5 per cent in the last 10 years. With two per cent increase in population, it is a miserably low rate of growth. We are not able to have a higher rate of growth nor are we able, therefore, to have the necessary surplus from which we can provide growing employment opportunities to our people. We selected a pattern but are unwilling to understand its implications, to accept the discipline of that pattern imposed upon us. We have increased our taxes at the rate of 14 per cent a year and we have also imposed forced savings on



our people because the prices have gone up. Yet the growth rate is low. The possibility of full employment at higher levels of income and output eludes us. At the end of the Third Plan, unemployment is likely to be greater than what it is today, by 5-6 million. That is where we are going to face a terrible situation. If we accept a certain pattern we have to see that its logic is fully realised and it is fully lived up to.

There are 72 industrial and allied concerns owned and run by the Government. They are all listed in the Budget papers. In them we shall be investing in all a total of Rs. 700 crores. What is the yield? The yield expected is Rs. 3.60 crores or the rate of return will be 0.51 per cent. I recognise that there is a longer gestation period. I also have given the fullest weight and consideration to the arguments that were put forward by the hon. Finance Minister in the other House on this question. Even then, what are we doing to improve the organisation and administration of the public sector enterprises? These public sector enterprises are shaped in the lack lustre image of the post offices. The giant corporations with built-in device for becoming bigger and with remote control administration are preventing us from achieving the kind of results that we desire. I will only invite your attention to chapter X in the annual report that has been made available to us by the Department of Company Law Administration. In this particular chapter, there have been listed together the various deficiencies and I tried to list them elsewhere in some articles I wrote. But may I invite your attention to the deficiencies that have been listed? There is absence of a proper price policy, absence of efficient internal accounting system and there is hardly any internal costing system. I have no time to quote from this and I would like every hon. Member of this House to go through it carefully and find out how things are going and the Finance Minister merely gets up and says: wait for time. Time is the rarest of com-

modities in this country; time is one thing that we cannot spare; we have no spare time and it is criminal to waste time. Therefore, when someone comes and says: give us time, all that I can say is that he is undermining the very foundations on which our future is going to be built.

When I look at the development of our private enterprises, there are certain favourable aspects. The number of small companies is growing and 85 to 90 per cent of the new companies that are coming up have an authorised capital of less than Rs. 10 lakhs. The undergrowth is very large. But I would like to know the rate of mortality. I agree with the Prime Minister when he said somewhere that there was some kind of creative response from the people today, the challenge of development was being taken up by the people. There is no doubt about it.

There is better regional distribution as far as formation of new companies are concerned. In the eastern region from 44 per cent in 1957, it has come down to 32 per cent in 1960. In the western region it has remained almost the same 21-22 per cent. In the northern region it is 17 per cent in 1960 compared to 22 per cent in 1957. In the southern region it has increased from 15 to 29 per cent. There is better regional distribution and everywhere our people are responding. In the eastern region the increase has been only 10 per cent; in the western, 60 per cent, in the northern region, 25 per cent and in the southern region, almost 200 per cent. May I compliment the people of the south for the amazing manner in which they are opening up their entrepreneurial talents. These are the things of which we should be happy and proud.

But there are unfavourable factors also and I would like to invite your attention to them. The proportion of the share of companies with authorised capital of Rs. 1 crore and more they are called the giant companies—are 60-80 per cent. Only ten per cent of the total public companies are listed

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

in the *Investors' Yearbook*, in the *Stock Exchange Yearbook* and in the *Investors' Encyclopaedia*. Only ten per cent of the public limited companies have their shares traded upon in the stock exchanges and these ten per cent of the companies among themselves have a capital of 46 per cent of the total capital in all the public companies. The top ten business houses have doubled between 1950 and 1960. Some of them have quadrupled and many of them have become even bigger. Two business houses have doubled, one has trebled and one has quadrupled and two have grown to a multiple extent. The number two business house has now become the number one business house. These ten top business houses between them have 67 per cent of all the total paid-up capital of all the companies that are listed in the yearbooks I referred to earlier.

13.28 hrs. :

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

This is the shape of the pyramid.

On a previous occasion I pointed out the rise that has taken place in one big business house in the country. I said No. 2 has become No. 1. Now, I find that I have received a letter from the business house concerned. It is said in that letter:

"But as you are very well aware, under the present Companies Act one managing agency house is not allowed to manage more than ten public limited companies."

I had said that one particular business house commands and operates 330 public companies and they refer to that and say in this letter.

"Our organisation which has got three or four managing agency companies is managing less than 40 manufacturing concerns. The total number of manufacturing companies, including those which have no managing agents, will not

exceed 60 but the records of the Government are fluctuating and showing the companies under our management from 280 to 300."

I do not know if the records of the Government are so bad that they do injustice to someone. But I should not be blamed for it. I would like the Finance Minister to look into these records. If the records can be challenged, it is a matter of deepest regret and shame for us. But, if the records are correct, as I believe the records are correct, then they should have to be challenged and for them it is a matter of deep regret and shame.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh** (Gorakhpur): Sir, the House must know the full contents of the letter. I suggest that it may be placed on the Table of the House.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** Why should the hon. Member know?

Sir, I would therefore further like to.....

**Shri A. P. Jain** (Saharanpur): Sir, is it not a rule that if any hon. Member quotes from a document that document becomes the property of the House and it should be placed on the Table of the House?

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I have read only extracts. I have scrupulously refrained from naming any business house in my previous speech as well as this speech. I would not like to put the letter on the Table because that would be naming the business house. I am willing to show it to you any time. I have scrupulously, on the previous occasion as well as this occasion, refrained from mentioning any names.

**Mr. Speaker:** He may give the extracts. He need not mention the name.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I am quite willing to give you the letter.

**Mr. Speaker:** Not to me, but he may place the extract on the Table of the house.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** That is already part of the record.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** Also the name of the person.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I am also willing to show the letter to the Finance Minister.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** May I submit, Sir, that the name may be omitted but we have to see the extract in the light of the contents of the letter and therefore the whole letter should be placed on the Table of the House?

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I shall be willing to put the relevant portion of the letter on the Table.

I would like to point out.....

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I seek your ruling, Sir, on the point that I raised.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** We want the Chair's ruling on the point of order.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** No point of order. has been raised.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** There is the usual practice in the House.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I would like to say.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Let the hon. Member go on; I will consider in the mean time.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** I would further like to point out what happens when this kind of growth takes place. It happens that the private sector, the apex of the pyramid becomes stronger and stronger, bigger and bigger. In the United States of America, between 1947 and 1957 three-fifth of the current business savings came from internal resources of the companies concerned, one-fifth came from bank credit and only one-fifth from the market. A similar thing is happening here. Because of the various procedures that we follow certain business houses tend to keep on becoming bigger and bigger, as they must. What are the countervailing resources we are operating?

If we do not do that, if these forces are allowed to grow unchecked, the result will be that our industrial economy will be taken over by a very limited number of business houses. This is the point which I have been raising over and over again and on which we must have a clear policy.

The Finance Minister has suggested one or two measures. He has, for instance, put certain handicaps for subsidiary companies. He has suggested certain modifications for bonus shares. While these things are important and I welcome them particularly as far as the handicaps placed in the way of subsidiary companies are concerned. I do not think these measures by themselves can expand the equity holders' base of our industrial economy.

Sir, I would like to point out that the structure of our economy has changed. Our consumers goods production has increased by 45 per cent while intermediate products and capital goods production has increased by 85 per cent. These two groups have some weight in industrial production and, therefore, there has to be a diversification of tax burden and tax structure. I have, therefore, publicly acclaimed, even at the cost of certain misunderstanding, the technical virtuosity of the Finance Minister in drawing up the Budget. While I applaud him for his sound economic tactics, what I want this House to find out is whether his Budget is equally satisfactory as far as the overall social strategy is concerned.

In the direct taxes, only one tax shelter is sought to be removed, and that is the greater scrutiny on expense account. There are a number of tax shelters. Not only tax dodging but legally certain things can be done. Professor Heller, who is now the Economic Adviser to the new Kennedy Administration, has said that in the United States laws there are so many tax shelters that it would be possible to cut down the rate of tax by about 20 to 25 per cent and still have the

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

present revenue or have a larger revenue. The Economic Adviser to the new American Administration says that he proposes to look into every tax shelter. My hon. friend Shri Tyagi was in charge of enquiring into this. I brought certain things to his attention, but to my regret the various points that I brought to his attention perhaps did not receive the consideration that I thought they deserved.

**Shri Tyagi** (Dehra Dun): I have reported on them.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** The nation's economy expands and as the nation's economy expands the budgetary field needs to be tilled by fresh inventions and innovations. There are certain innovations in the Budget. There is the innovation, for instance, that I have called the counter-cyclical appreciated depreciation. That has been introduced. But I find there is scope, there is need for more, many more innovations.

For instance, Sir, the Indian Statistical Institute has shown in a study it has brought out that the plant utilisation in India is only 40 to 45 per cent. Can we not have our tax structure so organised, that whoever is able to achieve greater plant utilisation may have certain benefits and whoever fails to have plant utilisation because of their own faults will have to pay higher taxes?

Then, Sir, there have got to be tax measures which would favour capital saving methods by production in this country. As has been shown by various experts—various studies have been carried out by them—there is a constant tendency to adopt capital intensive methods. Capital saving methods need to be given greater attention and greater support. These are some of the areas in which if we want to grow, if we want to develop we shall have to probe into.

The proportion of developmental to non-developmental expenditure has changed between 1951 to 1961 from 48:52 to 66:34. This is something very

satisfactory and for which we should be happy.

When we turn to the economic classification of the Budget we find that 48 per cent of the final outlays of the Central Government constitute direct demands for goods and services for consumption and capital formation. 52 per cent are for transferred payments—I will go into them a little more in a minute. I would like to point out, at the same time, that 50 per cent of net capital formation is mostly through loans, external assistance and loans and deficit financing. If prices will not go up, what else will happen? If practically the whole of the net capital formation has to be done through this internal source, either our savings drive has to succeed more, either our internal loans have to be increased much more or we must be able to raise more taxes or we will have to cut down the Plan; because if we do not do it, if a considerable portion of the net capital formation comes from some of the sources on which we have to rely, I think it is not fair for us to tell the Finance Minister: "you do this but also hold the price line in check". We cannot make inconsistent demand on our economy. Whatever demands we make have to have internal consistency.

When transfers are said to be 52 per cent it is only notional, because in fact when we analyse the majority of transfers we find that about 17 per cent or so of transfer payments are for paying interest charges, something like 26 to 27 per cent are grants to States and local bodies and only 4 per cent of our transfer payments are for helping the people.

Therefore the whole economy, if you see it, while we are giving considerable attention to investment, the investment pattern is permitted to become such that any effort at bringing about a greater social equality gets ignored. Neither through transfer payments are we able to achieve it nor are we restricting large incomes or preventing larger ownership from

distorting the whole structure of our economy. Therefore, as I said, in the limited sphere of economic tactics the Finance Minister has shown great virtuosity but in terms of overall social strategy there is something very much lacking about it.

The Prime Minister while paying his tribute to Shri G. B. Pant called him the anchor of the ship. I think the Finance Minister, Sir, is the ballast of the ship. His personality and his efforts provide a kind of ballast. The majestic and the stately ship of our State undoubtedly requires ballast. But, Sir, the Budget cannot be all be ballast. If it is all ballast there is no journey, there is no voyage. Ballast has to be only a limited part, the rest has to be imagination. The rest has to be vision; the rest has to have a sensitive perception of what needs to be done. May I point out that while I admire the ballast power that the Finance Minister brings to bear on the Government, I deeply regret that he is not able to impart to the budget and through the budget to the economy of the country as a whole that revivifying vision and that forward thrust and impulse through which alone we can move forward, in this dangerous decade, in our journey and reach our cherished goal.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before I call upon Shri A. P. Jain, I may point out that so far as laying of papers on the Table of the House is concerned, rules have been framed with respect to papers or documents which are referred to by Ministers. When a Minister refers to a particular document, the House can call upon him, through the Speaker, to place the document on the Table of the House. If he considers that in public interest it is not desirable to do so, he can withhold the document. That is so far as Ministers are concerned.

So far as any non-official Member is concerned, there are two portions. If he wants to lay any paper on the Table—every paper that he offers

cannot be laid on the Table—he has to submit a copy or the original to the Speaker for the satisfaction of the Speaker and for finding out whether the document that the Member wants to place on the Table is an authentic one or not. It is open to any Member to refer to a paper or a book. I am not yet able to lay my finger upon any particular rule under which I may call upon a Member to place the paper on the Table of the House; but normally, when he reads from a paper or document, if there is a demand that it should be placed on the Table, to assure the House that he reads an extract or a portion from an authentic document—he has to satisfy the House—it be good if he offers to place the document on the Table so that Members may look into it. If he does not offer himself, all that I can say is this: Whenever any Member reads from a document to enable the House to give credence to it and know whether it is an authentic document or not, he must be prepared to lay at least an extract from that one the Table of the House. Otherwise it will be only treated as something which he has quoted from his imagination.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** May I point out that I made certain observations here? I have been informed that my observations were faulty. In fairness to the party concerned, I read out those observations. Now, I am quite willing to agree and lay any relevant extract from the letter that I read out, on the Table of the House. My only point is, I have refrained from giving any name before the House. Therefore, provided, I am not asked to give the name of the party or the person concerned, I am willing to place any extract on the Table of the House. I said I was willing to show the letter to you and to the Finance Minister to establish my position. (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** I will be satisfied if the extract\* is placed on the Table of the House.

\*The extract furnished by Shri Asoka Mehta was identical to what he had already read out in the House (See Cols. 4805-06).

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** So the name is not required?

**Mr. Speaker:** No.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** About the point of order, surely, it was not my purpose, nor did I say, that the name of the writer of that letter should be disclosed to the House. You may have a look at the letter and see that the exact and such portions of the letter which are relevant to the extract may be placed on the Table of the House. The decision would be yours.

Sir, I have heard with very great respect the speeches of the two eminent Members and leaders of two Opposition parties. Before I come to matters arising from the budget of the Finance Minister. I would like to make a few observations regarding certain points which the two hon. Members have made. I was a little surprised to hear some of the thesis and basic theories enunciated by Shri S. A. Dange. Shri Asoka Mehta has already challenged the correctness of some of them. I also propose to challenge the correctness of the main thesis laid down by him.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** By whom?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** By Shri Dange not by you. The first thing that Shri Dange did was to challenge the statement of the Finance Minister to the effect that in a developing economy the prices have a tendency to go up. At any rate, it is not correct so far as the developments of a socialist countries are concerned. Fortunately, I have had two occasions to visit the Communist countries, and now despite the iron curtain which used to hang rather heavily in the past, certain facts and figures about the Communist countries are available to the rest of the world. What did I find? First, I went to Russia in 1939. The prices of all the commodities, particularly of the consumer commodities, were staggering. I shall relate to you a story which will interest the House. A large number of foreigners were stranded in Moscow when the war started in

Europe. I was among them. We could not get money from home and some of us were put to great difficulties. There were shops where you can sell your second-hand goods and some of us sold old clothes—used and worn-out ones—which, in India would cost very little, say less than Rs. 100 but in Russia they fetched Rs. 500 or even Rs. 600. There was a lady who wanted to fly back to London; she sold an old pair of shoes and got enough money to fly back to London! This was in 1939.

In 1955, I had again the occasion to visit another country, namely, Czechoslovakia. There, I found that price of one kilo of potato was Rs. 5 to Rs. 6. I looked into a shop and found that the price of a pair of shoes which in India would cost about Rs. 25 or 30 was marked a price equivalent of Rs. 250. I went into another shop and found that woollen cloth, which in India even today sells at Rs. 25 to Rs. 30 a yard, was selling at Rs. 250 a yard. So, these are the prices there. I am not relying on statistics. I am stating simply what I saw with my own eyes and I heard with my own ears. Prices in the Communist countries are phenomenally high, much higher than those prevailing in India. The life there for the citizen is much harder than the life of an Indian citizen.

Shri Dange made another equally astounding statement that in communist countries they do not place reliance on indirect taxes. What is turnover tax? Is it not an indirect tax? Is it a direct tax? Turnover tax is responsible for about 80 per cent. of the revenues raised in Communist countries. He made an equally amazing suggestion that the Finance Minister should have issued an order while imposing excise duties that the prices should not be raised. You can issue an order or a decree but can you enforce it

What is happening in the Communist countries? Side by side, there were two shops. One state-owned shop

where you can get commodities at controlled prices. Close to it is what is known as a co-operative sector shop, a sort of open market shop, which once upon a time used to be a black market shop prohibited by law. There, the price used to be three times or four times or even five times the prices of the controlled shop.

**Shri Tyagi:** It is known as a red market for them.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** At one time it was a black market. The Russians found that they could not control it. This market developed both in size and magnitude, and therefore they declared it a white market. Nonetheless, the basic factors remain namely: with its monolithic structure, with its power, with its authority to issue decrees and fiat, Russia has not been able to control the prices in the entire sector of economy. The prices in the open shops are several times higher than those in the controlled shops.

He made an another intriguing statement when he said that in future, in Russia and other communist countries, they are not going to place any reliance on indirect taxes, because the entire economy would be nationalised and the State would be run from the profits of the public sector concerns. There is a thing known as the price policy for the public sector concerns and it is the price policy that determines the profit of the public sector concerns. When the entire industry is owned by the State or when the State has the monopoly of distribution of a commodity, it can either impose excise duty or it can raise the price. Both will have the same effect.

The other day, Shri Tyagi asked, "What is the difference between imposing an excise duty and charging a higher price for the pool?" I agree with him that it is both the same. In the later part of my speech, if I have time, I will try to show to the House that some matters such as the fixation

of price where the Government holds the monopoly distribution as in the case of fertilisers and cement, should come before the House, because the raising of price in such case is as much a taxation measure as excise duty or customs duty.

Shri Asoka Mehta has made some constructive proposals which are worth considering. Everyone of us knows that the rich men is becoming richer and the richer is becoming the richest. Some facts and figures have been produced in support of that contention by economists. Shri Asoka Mehta also referred to them. The Government is not unaware of the fact either. It has been admitted on more than one occasion that in a developing economy of the type we have, there is a tendency for the wealth to concentrate into a few hands. That is a very dangerous symptom. A remedy has to be found. It is not for me here within the short time available to suggest the remedy, The Finance Minister is aware of the despatch and I am sure he will find a remedy.

Again, Shri Mehta was right when he said that there is a certain amount of conflict between advanced technology and full employment. We have to pay attention to both of them, because we cannot give up advanced technology in the interest of our future and at the same time, in a poor country like India, one cannot ignore the employment aspect. These are some of the constructive suggestions of Shri Asoka Mehta, which I very much welcome.

Now I come to the Finance Minister's speech. Both last year and this year, he has mainly relied upon excise duties. Last year he proposed excise duties amounting to Rs. 24 crores and this year he has proposed excise duties amounting to Rs. 60 crores. (*An hon. Member:* Excise and customs duties.) I mean both excise duties and customs duties; I stand corrected. The total imposition of direct duties is Rs. 3

[Shri A. P. Jain]

crores during the two years. I can appreciate why he has placed greater reliance on the indirect taxes. He has to do it. Yet, I am not quite sure if there is not yet scope for levying more direct taxes.

There are certain of direct taxes to which he should apply his mind. For instance, there is the excess profits tax. I also feel that as a result of the imposition of the customs and excise duties, certain windfall profits are bound to arise in the private sector here. I will give an example. The Finance Minister has proposed an increase of customs duty on certain types of machinery and parts from 5 to 10 per cent and from 10 to 15 per cent. There is no countervailing excise duty imposed. What would be the result? The result would be that every indigenous manufacturer of machinery will get 5 per cent more on his total production in the year. Let us assume that as in the case of machine-building industry, the ratio between investment and output is 1:2. In other words, if you invest Rs. 1 crore in setting up a machine-building factory, you turn out Rs. 50 lakhs worth of goods every year. Assuming that 6 per cent is a fair profit, on an investment of Rs. 1 crore, an entrepreneur would be justified in getting Rs. 6 lakhs. This extra imposition of 5 per cent duty on the production of machinery worth Rs. 50 lakhs, would give him a windfall profit of Rs. 2½ lakhs. Of this profit, the Finance Minister will take away 45 per cent as corporation tax, but 55 per cent will remain with the entrepreneur either for putting in the reserve or distributing as profits. It will amount to Rs. 1,40,000, or there will be an additional profit of about 20 per cent to the entrepreneur.

May I ask the Finance Minister how he justifies this windfall profit or how he is going to tax it? I am sure some means can be found by which this windfall profit can be taxed. It is not due to any efforts on the part of the entrepreneur that this profits has come

to him. I submit with all respect to the Finance Minister that he should give attention to this aspect of the problem and try to mop up these windfall profits.

There is another aspect of the budget proposals which has rather perturbed me. You will observe there are 10 commodities on which the Finance Minister has imposed customs duties and countervailing customs duties. These commodities are kerosene oil, paper, paper-board drawings, soda ash, plastic, cellulose, copper, copper alloys, etc. I think that is the right thing because if he has imposed a duty of about 20 per cent on refrigerators and refrigerator parts and air-conditioning units manufactured indigenously, he has to protect the indigenous industry and he must impose a countervailing customs duty. That is perfectly sound economics. But there is an equally sound principle that whenever a customs duty is imposed, in appropriate cases, a countervailing excise duty is imposed. I am not talking of protective customs duty; I am talking of revenue customs duty.

I have given the example of machinery. A part of the machinery used in India is imported from abroad and a part is produced indigenously. I do not know whether it is by accident or it is wilful. When the Finance Minister imposes an extra customs duty of 5 per cent—he has raised it from 5 to 10 and 10 to 15 per cent—on machinery, he should have imposed a countervailing excise duty, so that the windfall profits of the indigenous industry would have accrued to the State and not to the entrepreneur who does not deserve them.

14 hrs.

Sir, in regard to the countervailing duties I have another point. The revenue which will accrue from the principal duties, that is, from excise duties, on these ten items comes to Rs. 10 lakhs. On the other hand, the countervailing customs duties come to



about Rs. 12 lakhs. I have been a student of the Central budget and of the State budgets for the last 25 years and I have for first time come across a case where the yield of the principal duty is less than the yield of the countervailing duty. I object to it on principle because when you impose a principal duty you examine the case very carefully and through several stages: you study what effects it is going to have on production, what effect it is going to have on a commodity which could be a substitute, what effect it is going to have on the general economy of the country. But when you impose a countervailing duty, you do it as a matter of course in order to equate, in order to see that the indigenous producer is not adversely affected by the imposition of the excise duty. What I find is that where the Finance Ministry, its officers and the Finance Minister should have applied their mind, they have not applied their mind. Because, if it is a revenue duty, they should have duty; because, it gives a greater yield and not an excise duty, which gives a smaller return. I may be mistaken; I am not an expert in economics, but in all humility I suggest that this is something intriguing for me and I expect that the hon. Finance Minister will remove my doubts as also the doubts of some other hon. Members.

There is one specific duty about which I feel great difficulty, and that is the increase in the excise duty on kerosene. A statement has been given on behalf of the Finance Ministry in which it is stated "Well, this will mean only an addition of 2 nP on a bottle of kerosene". Now, if you glance through the relevant portion of the memorandum explaining the provisions in the Finance Bill, you will find that the object of increasing duty on kerosene oil is to inhibit the consumption of kerosene oil, because it consumes foreign exchange. The idea is good. But may I ask: does the addition of 2 nP. in the price of a bottle of kerosene, which may last in a poor man's home for about a week

or even 15 days, going to deter them from using kerosene? I say "No". Again, the excise duty on kerosene oil has been imposed only on the superior quality of kerosene oil and not on the inferior quality of kerosene oil. I agree with Shri Dange when he says that prices have a reflex action. If you increase the price of a commodity which bears a certain relationship, which is of the same genus as another commodity, the price of the other commodity also goes up. Therefore, I submit that the imposition of excise duty on superior kind of kerosene oil is going to raise the price of the inferior kind of kerosene oil. For these reasons, I very respectfully submit to the Finance Minister that he should give second thoughts to it.

**Shri Tyagi:** He will withdraw it.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I do not mean to say that he has not given full thought to his proposal. But there is always scope for wisdom. When the criticism comes from a lay man, who cannot be expected to possess the knowledge and the ingenuity of the Finance Minister—but who can assess the reactions of the common man.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I am also a layman

**Shri Tyagi:** I hope he will withdraw this duty Do not discuss it.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** As we are both laymen, I think we shall think alike and he will accept my proposals.

**Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat):** Laymen also differ.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** Is this the Government of laymen? Not of experts?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** It is not an expert government.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Experts' government will be a total failure.

**Mr. Speaker:** All that I can say is that some of the previous Finance

[Mr. Speaker]

Ministers used to impose some duties so that when the House request them, ultimately, as a matter of gesture, they may withdraw them.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I am not following that line.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Now I come to another point, and that is the relationship between the public sector and the private sector. From the outline of the Third Five Year Plan it appears that the investment in the public sector is going to be of the order of Rs. 6,300 crores and the investment in the private sector is going to be of the order of Rs. 4,100 crores. Now, the public sector always acts in manner as to assist the private sector. The State policies also encourage the private sector. Firstly, Government make foreign exchange available to the private sector. Secondly, there the Industrial Finance Corporation, the Re-finance Corporation etc. to help the private sector in raising rupee loans. Government also create the climate in which the private sector prospers. Now, should the private sector prosper? Now, should the private sector, particularly the corporate sector, play any part in the development of the public sector or not? This is a very important question.

We have no statement of policy as to what are going to be the responsibilities of the private sector, the corporate sector, in the development of the public sector. I have already told the House how as a result of certain taxation policies, imposition of customs duties and other taxation policies large amount of profits accrue to the private sector, to the corporate sector. Are they going to be left with them or is the Finance Minister going to find mechanism by which at least the unexpected profits could be mobilised for the development of the public sector? I am not talking of the normal profits. It may be said that the normal profits are taxed to the extent of 84 per cent. But what do we find? Despite this heavy taxation if we collect the figures of the wealth

possessed by, say, a few hundred top houses in 1939, 1950 and today, I have no manner of doubt that it will show revealing results—rich are becoming richer and richer are becoming richest. Therefore, we must find some device by which at least the windfall profits may be at least partially mobilised for the development of the public sector.

Sir, I note that you are looking at the clock. I will only refer to one thing more before I conclude, and that is the tax on bonus shares. I was a little taken aback when I heard Shri Asoka Mehta agreeing with the reduction of duty on bonus shares. The Finance Minister has proposed that the duty on bonus share should be reduced from 30 per cent to 12½ per cent. Why? Because he wants to broaden the equity base and he does not want large amount to remain as reserves. He wants them to take the form of shares. Now, how do the funds against which bonus shares are issued arise? That is the fundamental question. They arise in two ways. One source is the premium paid on the shares. Suppose a ten rupee share of a Company is quoted in the market at Rs. 25/- and the company issues right shares.

When the application for the issue of right shares goes to the Examiner of Capital Issues, he lays it down as a condition that the company shall not issue the right share at Rs. 10 but do so at Rs. 15 or Rs. 20. The sum which is recovered over and above the face value of the share goes to the reserves and the company may issue bonus shares against this reserve

There is another source and that is that bonus shares are issued against reserves built by the company out of its own profits. The profits made by a company can either be distributed in the form of dividends or they may be put in the reserve. If the scheme of the hon. Finance Minister is accepted, it will mean that there will be evasion of income-tax. I will explain how it will be so.

Suppose a company is in a position to declare a dividend of 25 per cent. Then on a share of Rs. 10|- it will give a dividend of Rs. 2|8|-. This Rs. 2|8|- will be subject to an incometax of 30 per cent which is not realisable from the company but is realisable through the company from the individual shareholders. Originally, tax of 30 per cent was imposed on bonus shares. So both the dividends and the bonus shares were equally taxed and there was no question of evasion. There could be no possibility of avoiding the income-tax. But now that it is proposed to reduce the tax on bonus shares from 30 per cent to 12½ per cent, the company, instead of declaring a dividend of 25 per cent., that is, a dividend of Rs. 2|8| on a share of Rs. 10|, may declare only a dividend of 10 per cent, that is, give only Re. 1 by way of dividend and transfer Rs. 1|8|- to the reserve. After five or six years the company can return the sum so accumulated in the form of a bonus share of Rs. 10|- on which the tax will be only 12½ per cent. Therefore, I submit that the scheme envisaged by the hon. Finance Minister will lead to avoid of income-tax. In all humility I want to suggest to him that he should pay a second and third thought to my suggestion, namely, that at least so far as bonus shares which are issued against the reserve built by the company out of its profits are concerned, the old tax of 30 per cent should continue.

I thank you very much for giving me more time than what I deserved. I would only say one thing more. I will repeat that the public sector is becoming more and more important. In the Third Plan the hon. Finance Minister envisages that resources for the Plan to the extent of Rs. 440 crores will come from the profits of the public sector. In other words, it means that if his expectations are fulfilled about Rs. 90 crores per year will accrue from the profits of the companies. Yet, we find that in the Budget literature and in the hon. Finance

Minister's speech there is no review to show how the public sector has worked. There is no mention of what new factories are going to be set up during the next year. There is no mention of the profits that they have made. There is also no mention as to how the price policy is going to be determined. I have already said that when certain trading monopolies which the Government is exercising raise the prices, it means that it is a kind of a tax or excise duty. We also know the case of oil refineries. The refineries reduced their prices. The total benefit out of that reduction in prices is about Rs. 18 crores per year, which is not a small sum. This benefit was not given to the consumer. I do not mind it because after all we need resources for the Plan and if Rs. 18 crores go for the Plan, I welcome it. But nonetheless this is a matter which should form a part of the Budget because it is a part of the budgetary sources.

**Shri Tyagi:** Parliament's sanction must be there.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I find that during the Second Plan the fertiliser pool had made a profit of Rs. 17 crores. During the three years of the Second Plan the cement monopoly which was in the hands of the State Trading Corporation made another profit of Rs. 9 crores. I do not say that these profits are hidden from the House. There is a public account where these sums are deposited. I also know that balance sheets of the companies are placed before the House and they are discussed in a way. I also know that in the explanatory memorandum there is a chapter which deals with public companies and their investments and profits. But these are disconnected things. What I really want is that in the hon. Finance Minister's speech there must be a definite mention of certain matters relating to the public sector and in the Budget literature there must be a separate conso-

[Shri A. P. Jain]

lided review of at least the following things and some things more, namely, to what extent and how the public sector is going to be expanded during the next year; what projects have been implemented; what the general condition of the running of these projects has been; a review of the working of public projects; their profits; price policy and similar things, so that a layman like me, who cannot collect everything from everywhere, may have a composite picture.

Before I end I will repeat that the hon. Finance Minister has done well. In the first year's budget of the Third Plan he has been able to raise 30 to 35 per cent of what he is expected to raise during the Third Five Year Plan through taxation. He is expected to raise about Rs. 1100 crores through taxation for implementing the Third Plan. The present taxation of Rs. 60 crores or Rs. 61 crores will mean about Rs. 350 crores. So he must be complimented for raising all this money. May I say that he has acted like a honeybee which sucks little pollen from many flowers but at the same time does not kill any flower. That is the virtue of his Budget and I congratulate him.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that even the hon. Leader of the Communist Party has complimented the achievement of the country during the last ten years or since the attainment of independence. We have done all these things by democratic method and that also should have been mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Communist Party. It is a great achievement that India has made so much progress following not a totalitarian method but a democratic method. We have made progress in industry, in agriculture, in social services and in everything.

Yesterday, I think the hon. Finance Minister was confronted with a question in the other House, namely, whether the benefits of development have reached every village in the country.

I cannot say that it has reached every village, but I can say from my own personal experience of my constituency, which is a very big one, that it has reached practically every village in my constituency in the form of better roads, better arrangements for drinking water, better arrangements for the education of their children better medical facilities and many other things. Also, in certain respects their standard of living has increased. At the same time, I am not unaware of the fact that certain sections of the people have not been able to get the benefits that they should have got.

The latest report of the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee is a revealing document. I think the hon. Finance Minister and the Government must have paid due attention and will be paying due attention to the findings of that report. If 25 per cent of the agricultural people have not been able to improve their condition during the two Plan periods, or rather if their condition of living has deteriorated, it is a matter of shame and regret for the Government, for this House and for the country. I think the Government will pay due attention to agricultural labour. An enquiry into the conditions of agricultural labour should not be delayed to be held very five years. It should be done more frequently so that the condition of these helpless people may be improved at an early date.

My hon. friend Shri A. P. Jain has also complimented the Finance Minister for the courage he has shown in putting this tax of about Rs. 6.3 crores and this would mean 33 per cent of the total tax to be collected. But I am not sure whether his calculation in this respect would be quite correct. Because, during the Second Plan period Rs. 450 crores were to be raised by the joint efforts of both the Centre and the State Governments. But I now find that the Central Government has raised Rs. 1041 crores instead of the half of Rs. 450 crores. Though in the calculation of resources there was a gap of Rs. 400 crores,

there was no indication of raising it by additional taxation. Even taking Rs. 450 crores plus Rs. 400 crores, that means Rs. 850 crores to be raised by taxation both by the Centre and the States, now the Centre has raised Rs. 1941 crores. So about this calculation of Rs. 1100 and odd crores to be raised by the Centre for the Third Plan, I am not sure whether that will stand to the end of the Third Plan, the responsibilities or raising tax revenues may be much higher.

The Finance Minister has stated in his speech that taxation is an instrument of economic policy. I fully agree with this. But that is not the whole thing;—the taxation policy should be co-ordinated with the basic principles for which the taxation is to be diverted. Taxation should be first evenly distributed. It has been more or less admitted even by the Government that in spite of all the development work and in spite of the attempts to reduce inequalities of income and to have decentralised economic development—it has been admitted even by the Prime Minister—that the rich has become richer and the poor has become poorer. An the Prime Minister was wondering where this extra income of the country had gone, and they have set up a committee to enquire into this question as to where this extra national income has gone.

So, taxation policy should be directed in such a manner that the increased income may be evenly distributed and the burden of taxation may also be evenly distributed. If one sector of the population is to get the benefits of the increased income and another only the burden of the increased taxation, that is not a fair thing. If taxation is to be taken as an instrument of economic policy, it should be seen that no such imbalance is created in the economy of the country.

The main thing is that the price line has to be held. There has not been any serious attempt to hold the price line, and that is the main reason why the poorer sections of the people are

feeling the burden of this development. If the price line could have been held, then the increased income would have benefited them. What is the position? Even in 1960 the price index has risen by 7.5 points. From 115.5 it has risen to 123. There should have been something wrong in the government policy and the administration and in the implementation of the policy which must be responsible for this.

In 1960 deficit financing was the least, and Government borrowing from the bank was the least. And Government investment was not also so large as in 1959. So what is responsible for this increase in the cost of living? I think I should agree with the Leader of the Communist Party that much of it was due to the manipulation of speculative forces through the bank advances. I learn 80 or 85 per cent of the bank deposits have been given as advances to different private parties. It is mostly to the private sector; Government borrowing from the bank has been less. The private sector has been borrowing from the bank at a very increased rate, and about 80 to 85 per cent of the bank deposits have been given as advances to private parties, and a considerable portion of that was devoted for speculative purposes. Yet, the Government have not taken any step.

It is regrettable that the Finance Minister has stated yesterday that if after his taxation proposals some shop-keepers have increased the prices of particular commodities, even though they are not taxed, he is not responsible for that. But that should not be the stand or the defence to be taken by the Finance Minister or the Government. Government is responsible to see that the consumer is not cheated or exploited by the profiteers. After the budget, I think the Finance Ministry issued a handout, a sort of press note—not officially announced as such but it was surely from the Government sources, and from the Finance Ministry. And in that press

[Shri A. C. Guha]

note they refer to this "profiteering at the expense of the consumers". So, the Government also noted that profiteering has been going on at the expense of the consumer.

What steps have been taken by the Government to prevent this? Is it that Government was impotent in this matter? It is not merely a question of the Government's intention. They might have said many things many times, that they are determined to hold the price line and so on. But the failure in this respect is so glaring that the public will not accept the *bona fides* of the Government in this regard. I would not like history to adjudicate on the Government that they have been professing certain high principles of establishing a socialist society and at the same time their administration is being run in a direction contrary to those high principles social equity and justice. The administration should be run in a manner so as to implement the social and economic principles enunciated and adopted by the Government. At present it seems that the Finance Minister opens the door for collecting revenue and burglars entered and robbed the household. That should not be the position. He should see that in addition to whatever excise duty he is putting, the consumer may not be taxed by profiteers and other anti-social elements. He should be careful about that. If he cannot check those profiteers, then I think the Government would lose the moral justification to put any more excise duty and add to the burden of the consumer.

There is, after all, a limit to what the consumer can bear. If the Finance Minister puts a certain burden before that he makes assessment "this much the consumer or the taxpayer would be able to bear". I agree with him that in the last twelve years, from Rs. 307 crores, the revenue has gone up to over a thousand crores of rupees. And this revenue has been collected without any police force or martial

law or totalitarian methods. People have been paying the revenue quite willingly. That is a credit to the Government. But they should also see that along with the revenue collectors the other people are not allowed to exploit the consumers and cut into the resources of the consumer which might be available for his own use or which the Government might have taken for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of the poorer section of the people. The exploiters take the money for their own benefit and they are not helping the consumer or the Government. The money practically goes underground and escapes even Income-tax.

So I humbly suggest to the Finance Minister and the Government that simply issuing a press note and also regretting that there is profiteering at the expense of the consumer, will not suffice. They should take some effective steps. The Finance Minister should not take his defence that if some shop-keeper has raised the price he is not responsible for that. Surely, he is responsible for everything that is happening in the country. As spokesman....

**Shri Morarji Desai:** It is a strange thesis, that I am responsible for everything!

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Surely, Government is responsible. When the Government claims to be a welfare government, surely it is responsible for the consumers' good.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta—East): Ill-fare government!

**Shri Morarji Desai:** We have not yet become a welfare government.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** You are aspiring and claiming to be a welfare government.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** We want to be.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** I know that indirect taxes will be the main sources

of collection of revenue. That, I admit. Even then, certain items, I think, the Finance Minister might have avoided to put under his taxation proposals. He has stated that there is no tax on biri tobacco and so, biri would not be sold at a higher price.

**Shri Tyagi:** It is unfortunate that he does not smoke.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** I also do not smoke. Still, I feel that though biri may not be taxed, the inferior quality of tobacco is taxed and that goes to the consumption of the poorest sections of the people in the form of *hooka* tobacco. That is taxed and that would pinch the poor consumer. There are other items also, which, I think, he should have avoided. I should claim that kerosene should get better consideration from him and get exemption. He makes a fine distinction between inferior quality and superior quality. That distinction will not be observed by retailers or even by the wholesalers. If a commodity is taxed, the other commodities in the same circle or the same genus will surely get a reaction from the taxation on that commodity and the prices of those commodities also will go up.

When the Finance Minister stated that taxation is an instrument of economic policy, he should also see how far his taxation policy has been able to put into effect some of the fundamental, basic policies of the Government and the Plan. I particularly mention the reduction of inequalities and decentralisation of economic power and production forces. On a previous occasion, I stated that about 12 commercial and industrial houses in the country control about 50 or 60 per cent of the private sector industries. I think that tendency is persisting still. The economic policy of the Government has not been able to put any check on that tendency. I hope the Finance Minister will also bear me out that concentration of economic power and productive forces has been going on and has not been checked.

In this connection, I should say something about the administration. If you want to implement a certain principle, the administration should be made to accept that principle as their own theory, as their own conviction. Otherwise, you cannot get its implementation. What do we find now, Sir, I think the Government officers are the greatest detractors and critics of the Government. They certainly do some things which go counter to the accepted policy. The issue of permits and licences and similar policies are administratively directed in a manner that concentration of economic power and resources is helped rather than checked. All these things require a serious examination. I think the Finance Minister should see that these two fundamental policies reduction of inequalities of income and decentralisation of economic power and production sources are implemented through the administration.

There was a proposal about excess profit tax. He has refused to accept the proposal. I am not sure what amount of revenue would come from this. Nor am I very much enthusiastic about this proposal. But, still, I feel that the logic that he has given in rejecting is not quite sound. There was no difficulty about the base year. Because, during the war-time, the base year was 1939. In a developing economy, the base year should be the beginning of the First Plan period. That may be considered as the base year. There should not be difficulty in finding the base year. Counting that as the base year, I think he could have charged Excess profits tax. There may be realised a good sum of money and that may not be tried. I am not sure what would be the revenue. It may or may not be considerable. But, it will have one value. People will feel that the richer people are also taxed. A sum of Rs. 60 crores from indirect taxes and only Rs. 3 crores from direct taxes: that would give a bad flavour about the entire economic policy of the Government. I request that he may again consider if some Excess profits tax

[Shri A. C. Guha]

could not be levied. Or, some other sources of direct taxation could be devised by him. It is not difficult to find some other sources of direct taxation.

In para 96 of his Budget speech, he has tried to put some curb on the entertainment expenditure of the companies. I welcome this measure. But, in this connection, I would like to draw attention to another aspect. Most of these firms and companies are keeping contact officials here at a high, almost unbelievable remuneration. Retired officials, Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, are getting into such posts. They do nothing except to keep contact with the officials, and in a way to help the corruption of the Government administration. I say, the Finance Minister is not unaware of high government retired officials taking up posts like this. They may be called contact officials; or whatever may be their designation, they do nothing for the companies except to keep contact with the Government offices and try to corrupt the government offices and get some undue advantage for those companies. He has to see this. There should be some curb on appointing contact officials. It will not only be something economic, but it will be something for the betterment of the administration.

In para 97, he has made a certain provision which, I think, will facilitate the conversion of public companies into private companies. I am not sure whether this will not go counter to the policy accepted by the Company Law Administration. During the discussions in the Select Committee of the Company Law Amendment Bill, I think the officials' main care was how to stop the privileges enjoyed by the so-called private companies. Any measure to help conversion of public companies into private companies, I am not sure how far.....

**Shri Morarji Desai:** What is there in the Budget?

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Para 97 it is proposed that a certain development rebate which was allowed to the public companies would be continued if they are converted into private companies.

**Mr. Speaker:** Public limited companies converted into private companies.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** If they are converted into private companies, this rebate would be allowed to them which they were not allowed so long.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** The hon. Member may go on. I will reply.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** An estimate has been made of an outlay of Rs. 7500 crores or Rs. 8000 crores for the Third Plan. This would be divided about half and half between the Centre and States. I do not know if, in this regard, the Finance Minister has already anticipated the findings of the Finance Commission, and thereby the Commission's labour may be some what superfluous. The Finance Commission will make certain allocations for the States and certain revenue will be diverted from the Centre to the States. While making available resources to the States, I would like to know whether he has taken into consideration what may be diverted by the Finance Commission to the States. If a certain amount more is given by the Third Finance Commission, that would cut into the resources available for the Centre. I would like to know whether all these things will be taken into consideration, whether the help that would be given to the States will be in addition to what may be given by the Finance Commission. Any allocations made by the Finance Commission to the States will be the States' own revenue and will not be an aid from the Centre and how the aid from the Centre will be regulated after the findings of the Finance Commission.

About Rs. 1041 crores have been raised by taxation in the Second



Plan period. But, out of this, only 24 per cent has been spent on Plan development.

And 76 per cent has been spent outside the Plan items. So, out of whatever revenue is raised, if only 24 per cent is spent on planned development and 75 per cent or more is spent outside the Plan, then, there is a natural suspicion in the mind of this House and also the public that the money is not being properly utilised. Any talk of extravagance in the government, I think, will irritate the Finance Minister, but I am sure that there is yet some scope for economy in government administration, and I think that that should be attempted. Whatever savings have been made are nothing compared to what might be saved yet.

There has been a sort of loose budgeting. In the 1960-61 budget, there is a variation of Rs. 63 crores, Rs. 40 crores more on the revenue side—that is, Rs. 40 crores more than what was estimated was earned—and Rs. 23 crores less on the expenditure side. So, the overall improvement in the budgetary position was Rs. 63 crores. In a planned economy, there should not be so much of loose budgeting. The budgeting should be more or less precise. Of course, I cannot expect that it would be quite accurate; there may be variations by a few crores of rupees, but not by Rs. 63 crores.

Before concluding, I should like to say something about matters other than finance, that is, about national integration. There has been a book published *The Most Dangerous Decade*, meaning the decade that we are entering. But it is not only for economic development that it is the most dangerous decade for India but from the point of view of national integration also, it is the most dangerous decade that we are entering.

Even after 12 years since the attainment of Independence, we have not seen much of national integration; 2182(Ai) LS—7.

rather, disruptive tendencies are growing up, and Government have shown lamentable weakness in suppressing these disruptive tendencies. I think I should not be out of order if I refer to what happened in Assam. The Home Minister, a man of stature and intelligence like the late lamented Govind Balabh Pant, went to Assam, with his old sagacity, with his experience and with the authority that he carried behind him, to give them certain advice. The Assam Government did not take that advice even while he was there, and as soon as he left, they further deviated from the advice. And the Central Government did nothing in this matter. If this is the way the Central Government are exercising their authority and maintaining the integrity of the country, I think worse things will happen in the near future.

I hope that the Central Government will see that national integration gets prior consideration at the hands of Government, and there should not be any tendency to encourage the disruptive tendencies. In this very House, a pledge was given that there would be a judicial enquiry into the cause of the Assam riots. That pledge has not been fulfilled.

**Shri Basumatari** (Gaolpara—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Is it relevant here?

**An. Hon. Member:** Yes, this is Budget debate.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** I might say another thing also in this connection. With the States that we have at present, either we should have more effective zones. I think these States. Big States, particularly, with a big Chief Minister have become a sort of menace to the integrity and unity of India. So, I would say that either they may make the zones more effective or have smaller States, as many as thirty to thirty-five States. If U.S.A. can

[Shri A. C. Guha]

have 50 States, India can also surely do well with thirty to thirty-five States. Practically, in every State, today, there are disruptive tendencies at large, and these disruptive tendencies are working within the States and also between the States and the Centre. So, I humbly suggest that national integration should get the first priority at the hands of Government and Government should either make the zones more effective or split up the States into smaller ones, numbering about thirty to thirty-five, so that no big State can challenge the authority of the Central Government.

Lastly, there should be a clean and efficient administration. If the Finance Minister says that the administration is clean or even efficient, I think he will not be true to himself. While collecting revenue, he must know that the revenue is properly utilised and that the poor man's money is not misused. But I can say this much that if the administration were clean, the administrative cost or even the cost on developments would have gone down by twenty to twenty-five per cent. The administration is not clean, and there is much room for improving the administration.

**Dr. Krishnaswami** (Chingleput): No Finance Minister, however eminent, can have a pleasant time in these hard days. The question that we have to ask ourselves is: What is the issue that is facing the community?

**Acharya Kripalani** (Sitamarhi): Unemployment.

**Dr. Krishnaswami**: As a community, we face a serious dilemma; either we subject ourselves to increased taxation, which to some extent raises prices, or else allow prices to rise to unconscionable levels because of excess demands. Everyone realises that if prices are allowed to rise to unconscionable heights, then the inflation that is brought about would promote greater inequalities than any

tax measures can achieve and damage the social structure.

In the *Economic Survey*, 1960-61, we have been warned against this danger overtaking our economy, and a significant passage in this particular document requires to be reconsidered.

"The higher prices of raw materials in turn affected the prices of edible oils and of cotton and jute manufactures. If oilseeds, edible oils as well as raw cotton, raw jute, cotton and jute manufactures are excluded, the index of prices of other commodities would show a rise of 2.2 per cent in 1960 as compared to a rise of 4.9 per cent in 1959 and 5.0 per cent in 1958."

Furthermore, we are reminded that

"Since the commencement of the Second Plan, wholesale prices have risen by about 25 per cent. The all-India working class consumer price index (1949-100) has also shown a rise of the same order. The level of wholesale prices (for the week ended January 28, 1961) is about 6 per cent higher than a year ago."

Now, I should like to point out to this House and through it to the country that owing to the vigilance of Parliament during the past three years, we have had moderate levels of investment expenditure. Of course, statistical prodigies in the Planning Commission suggested that we should have uncontrolled investment, without taking account of our real resources. But I am glad to find that owing to the pressure exercised by Parliament, we have moderated to a certain extent the investment expenditure. However, we must expect the rates of investment to increase in the coming years. Therefore, the alternative that is open to us is—and this is part of the price that we have to pay for increased development—to have taxes over a wide front, which

may be less inflationary, than allowing the gap to remain uncovered.

Having said this, we can legitimately charge the Finance Minister with carrying a good principle too far. One can save foreign exchange by not importing certain goods. But suppose the Finance Minister puts forward the theory—I do not say that he has done it now—that we should prohibit the import of all capital goods machinery, then, surely, the remedy would be much worse than the disease. May it not be that in some cases levels of commodity taxation have been carried to a more than desirable point? May not the present duties on superior kerosene and diesel choke off road transport, badly needed in our country, raise the costs of agriculture, and increase the cost of living too much for people in the rural areas? Here, let me point out that inferior kerosene is not available in seven States of India. The Finance Minister can verify this by asking his colleague the Minister of Mines and Oil, who is considered to be a fund of information on these matters, as to whether this is a fact or not.

When the time comes for reviewing some of these duties in connection with the Finance Bill, many will have amendments to suggest, and I hope that he will adopt a flexible attitude on these questions. What is necessary in this case is to carry the community with us, without sacrificing major questions of principle.

The Finance Minister, has propounded the principle that taxation should be in an instrument of economic policy. No one can quarrel with this statement. But may I add that along with increased taxation, we have also to see the directions in which expenditure goes? This is important, and I think it would be wrong on our part to charge only the Finance Minister with not having considered this problem. The Gov-

ernment of India must bear responsibility for what is being done. How is investment to be directed so that it meets the emerging demands of the community? Let us not use words like growth and capital-output ratio. Let us come rather down to *terra firma* and consider these things in plain and simple language. Any Government would have to decided how much of imbalance it can keep in the economy, and in what sectors it would be willing to accept the unsatisfied demands of the community. Surely—and I do not think anybody can quarrel with this principle—we would not like unsatisfied demands for raw materials or producer goods, shortage of which leads to under-utilisation of capacity. Similarly, one cannot have a large fringe of unsatisfied demand in respect of foodgrains or food articles and essential commodities such as textiles.

If this be accepted, Government will have to make up its mind as to how it is going to allocate resources. It is here that Government has been lacking a sense of proportion and no proper formulation of policy has been made. If resources are to be used for production of these commodities it would be obviously necessary to prevent or restrain the use of resources in certain other directions. For instance, if my hon. friend wishes to limit the import of non-ferrous metals to be used for cables and wires for power transmission, then they cannot be used for domestic air-conditioners. But this becomes extremely difficult to implement in practice since we have allowed or are allowing new units for manufacture of air-conditioners to come up. The basic failure in terms of policy has been that there has been no clear recognition on the part of the Planning Commission, a technical body which advises the Government of India, of priorities in licensing new capacity. The result is that every-time a question of using limited resources comes up, we are faced with the practical problem of what to do

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

with unused capacity in less essential industries.

Now, I wish to put this point of view before the House. We have been talking about austerity. But are we been serious about austerity? Austerity does not mean making only the consumer consume less. It also means that the Government should apply its mind as to what type of goods should be produced. Our austerity now takes the form of making things like refrigerators and transistor radios, which are expensive, rather than taking a long-sighted view and not allowing the investment or imports of certain commodities. In normal circumstances, this might have been a very correct policy. Certainly, in the case of mature countries—mature in their economic development,—this might be the right policy to follow. It is proper for a mature economy, which wants to restrict demands in certain sectors either in order to provide surpluses for exports or for reducing consumption domestically so as to promote savings, to use the tax instrument as the main, if not the sole, agency for achieving these objectives. This, indeed, was the logic of the policy followed by Sir Stafford Cripps, and post-war Britain, faced as she was with latent inflation and a strain on the balance of payments, necessarily had to adopt this policy of making goods expensive. But in the case of a country like India which is in its early stage of development and which has to step up its rate of investment by restraining growth in consumption, we must necessarily, in my judgment, devote greater attention to formulating the directions in which investment is to be permitted. This is a serious matter and one on which the Government of India and the Planning Commission will have to take a major decision. My hon. friend, the Finance Minister pointed out that the Report of the Planning Commission would come before us for discussion. I wish it would come before this House and I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, will give us considerable time and scope for examin-

ing the Planning Commission's recommendations in detail. We should like to examine them in detail so that the Government may be in a position to take account of our views to find out how far its technical experts have been technical and have understood the basic features of our economy, and also to formulate a policy which takes account of the needs of our community, which takes account of the long-term essentials of economic development.

Now, what is it that is said on cost of living in this House? Contrary to what is said by many of my hon. friends, I do not think that the prices of foodgrains have mounted up since 1952-53. If we examine the prices of foodgrains, we will find that the price of wheat today is about 10 per cent lower than what it was in 1952 or 1953. Historically speaking, it is not the prices of cereals that mount up so much and lead to a rise in the cost of living as the prices of food articles. This is what happens with growth in incomes. Now, we must expect this to occur and to keep the cost of living from rising over much naturally our investment expenditure should be directed towards the production of more of these articles.

The need for strengthening and widening our agricultural base is recognised in the economy survey. What is it that we have done in the matter of distributing investment expenditure, in the matter of increasing the amount of such goods? Expenditure in terms of money, effort and organisation is required. It is a mistake on the part of my hon. friends to think that organisation does not require an effort or expense in terms of money. When it is a scarce resource as in the case of our country, we have to devote more attention to the organisation of our administrative calibre. Let me point out that several Ministers who have been concerned with the reorganisation of our services, from the days of the late Sri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar down to the late Pandit Govind Ballabh

Pant, have, not applied their minds to the reorganisation of our districts. Let us realise that the best administrative talent in our districts is to-day looking forward for promotions outside agriculture and are moving to the secretariat. We have to realise that able executive cadres are casting their eyes on something outside developmental work. If this is a matter which is serious—and I think it is serious—we ought to have a thorough revision of our approach to the problems of administrative organisation. It may be that we will have to give more incentive payments to people to work in the districts.

My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, has spoken about how exports of tea will be encouraged.

15.09 hrs.

A financial measure has been devised to discourage the growth of inferior tea and thus give a fillip to the production of superior tea. But I suggest to him in all humility that this is not enough. What are the measures that the Tea Board has taken to promote the production of superior tea? Obviously, we are facing very severe competition from East Africa, a producer of superior tea, and unless we take care, we are likely to be wiped out of the export market in the coming five or seven years. Therefore, I think, from the point of view of considering these tax measures, we have also to consider how expenditure is devoted towards the production of superior tea, which would undoubtedly give us the opportunity of competing with other people who produce equally good tea.

A great deal of criticism was made about my hon. friend on the subject of his not having devoted enough attention to direct taxes. I have heretical views on this subject, and I hope I will be allowed to express them without running the risk of being misunderstood. In our country where there are 80 cities or more

with one lakh of population, it is rather odd that we should have only 10,000 or 11,000 people who pay wealth tax. I suggest that the Income-tax Department should not take a negative attitude. There ought to be a greater co-ordination between the different authorities, the Government spending departments and the income-tax authorities. In fact, there ought to be a card index of parties, so that we might realise how incomes are being earned. In this matter, I suggest that what we should aim at should be a sensible system of rates which are enforced rigorously and uniformly, rather than deterrent rates, formidable on paper but ineffective in practice, except for certain categories of earners who are in no position understate, or who are compelled to be honest by virtue of the position that they enjoy. It is necessary for the Central Board of Revenue to adopt a proper approach to this question, and to find out how we can have greater amount of revenue from these direct taxes. It is not, let me tell you, Sir, necessary for the Prime Minister to have a committee constituted and presided over by Prof. Mahalanobis. The Finance Minister here would probably, if he takes the initiative, have better opportunities of providing the House with more objective knowledge than what that committee can ever provide. There would be less temptation on the part of the Central Board of Revenue to play to the gallery, than for any committee which is appointed for the purpose of making an over-all survey of how incomes have gone into the pockets of some people.

These are some of the suggestions that I have to make. When the time comes for discussing the Finance Bill, I should like to make other suggestions. But there is one touchy subject which I should like to mention before I conclude.

My hon. friend is a fervent apostle of prohibition. On this question, unfortunately, I happen to hold divergent views.

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I sympathise with you.

**Dr. Krishnaswami:** I feel that where there are indigenous resources which are not scarce, there is absolute necessity for using them to provide the necessary income to our States. Only this morning I read an ominous news item to the effect that my hon. friend, along with three other members of the Government, is thinking of enforcing prohibition throughout India. May complete failure visit such attempts in the interests of our country, in the interests of providing better resources for the States! When we are starved for want of funds, when we are trying our best to find out ways and means of obtaining more funds, it is obviously right that we should abandon canons of old morality and adopt the new virtue of finding resources for the purpose of developmental schemes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that social justice?

**Dr. Krishnaswami:** I think so.

**Mr. Speaker:** Taxing the poor for paying the rich.

**Dr. Krishnaswami:** I am glad you have put that question. We are now taxing the poor in respect of so many other commodities, and the poor are demanding that they should have free education. If we do not have resources, and if these are indigenous resources which we can obtain it is a point of view which I am putting before the House—we should waive all considerations of old puritanism for the sake of finding revenues in order to finance developmental schemes which are being badly starved. That is all that I have to say on this matter.

I shall deal with other aspects of direct taxation when the Finance Bill comes up. But I should like to point out to my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, that the growth of an economy depends primarily on our controlling the inflationary spiral. That is the danger which is facing us, and all his measures of taxation,—indirect taxation, can be only justified on the

footing that they would act as a re-training brake to inflation. But along with these measures of taxation, let us realise that the Government has to make up its mind as to where investment expenditure should be directed, and directed quickly, so that we might have goods flowing in an ever-increasing measure, so that the community may feel that along with austerity there is also some degree of comfort for the present generation.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda):** The Finance Minister has given us a clear and lucid presentation of the Budget, and in the *Economic Survey* in recent years, and more particularly in this year, we do get a much better picture of achievement. At the same time, I would like to bring it to your notice and that of the Finance Minister that there are certain matters on which, although we have been asking for it year after year, concise and clear statements are not laid before us. The hon. Member, Shri A. P. Jain, drew attention to some of these features, and I would like to endorse them. We who are lay men should be given the facts, say, for instance, about utilisation of loans. The totality of loans we know, we also do get from time to time the picture of the public enterprises and what is being done, but when we are discussing the Budget, a concise and clear statement of achievement is desirable, and if that is placed before us, this House would be much better situated to appreciate the Budget as well as to understand its implications.

As we enter the Third Plan period from the Second Plan, we find that although much remains to be done, it is undoubtedly true that we are marching ahead. We have been fighting with our backs to the wall all through these years, and trying to get out of the economic decadence, social and economic decadence, and at last, I think there is a sign of hope for the future. This hope is seen more especially in the rural country side, where we see roads coming up, schools even for girls, though their

number is much smaller than they should be, coming into existence in remote areas, irrigation works etc., and in fact, there is activity humming throughout the country side, a picture to which we have been looking forward year after year ever since independence.

15.09 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

But there is no cause for complacency. If we enter into some of the administrative details, say, of the community projects administration, there is much that is still to be desired. I will take another occasion—I hope I shall get another occasion—to speak about these matters in detail, but I think it would be true to say that the over-all picture is more hopeful.

We have already discussed the Draft Outline of the Third Plan; and we are going to further discuss it later when it is finalised. But, I would say that before that Plan is finalised, there are some very essential matters which must be taken into account. This is just the first year of the Third Plan and we must do something about finding funds to start certain features of that Plan in regard to those measures through which the social and economic equality is possible in this country.

We are aiming at a socialistic pattern of society; and we are not yet a proper welfare State. We have to go step by step. But none the less it is a very disappointing picture that we find so far as education and health are concerned. There is not that much attention paid to them as should be, considering what our objectives are.

We are bringing in schooling for the children in the age group of 6-11. But we do not even stress the quality content of it. We do not even think of the health of the school child or

the pre-school child, although we say that child welfare is to have first priority. There is very little about it in the Plan Outline and I hope that before the final Plan emerges there will be a different picture in this sector. I do not wish to spend more time now on this because I have other points to make on the taxation proposals of this year.

Sir, I was really astonished to hear Shri Dange speaking about this theory of what he considers the socialistic or rather the communistic economy. He says that there is no rise in prices under such Regime. It almost takes one's breath away because the one thing on which this kind of economy is stressed is compulsory savings to a prohibitive degree as understood in democratic countries.

Shri A. P. Jain spoke from his own experience of the past. He was talking about shoes, how much they cost. We export Bata shoes and other shoes through the State Trading Organisation. We know what it costs in this country. But they cost Rs. 85 per pair even today in Russia. That is the information we have been given. These are trends which show what the position is. Through compulsory or forced savings and at great cost to the poor consumer, the economic development of the country must go ahead.

When I come to discuss this year's proposals, I am a little disappointed to find that the Finance Minister is taking too much *in toto* from the communistic—or what they call socialistic—theories of indirect taxation. It is a new theory today amongst economists that in an under-developed country like India indirect taxation, in a large measure, is inevitable. Indirect taxation which was held to be regressive before is today considered by some to be inevitable in a large measure. Because we have taxation broad-based. But, broad-based in what manner? Is it possible for the people who have not yet attained a minimum

[**Shrimati Renuka Ray**]

standard of living to pay taxes? Yet, this year we have so many indirect taxes the incidence of which is falling on those very people for whom we are attempting, through our Plans, to bring about a minimum standard of living.

Therefore, I would plead with the Finance Minister to reconsider some of the indirect taxes that are to be levied this year, I think it is a desirable object and I agree with him that Rs. 62 crores should be raised in the first year of the Third Plan. He has a good target that way. But I would also like to remind him—and assure Shri Asoka Mehta—that having accepted the pattern, we are aware of the logic behind it. Therefore, I do not quibble at taxes. I only say that so much of indirect taxation, the incidence of which we cannot deny is falling on the common man, should be avoided. By the common man I do not mean only the poorest sections of the community, but I mean the middle class, the salaried worker also who has to pay his income-tax while others evade it. All these people are paying more taxes than is equitable as a result of this indirect taxation.

Therefore, when the Finance Minister says that taxation is an instrument of economic policy, we find the measures that he is taking are to restrain consumption by introducing forced personal savings through these fiscal measures of indirect taxation. Why is he doing it? In order to bring down deficit financing and the rise in prices. Yet, we see before us that the prices are rising not only as a consequence of the taxes but also of the repercussion of these taxes on other allied commodities. I have not the time to go into details on this subject nor am I an expert. But, as laymen it is obvious to us that this is not bringing about the result that he wanted by disinflationary means.

We must not forget that indirect taxes have already been levied last year—I think about Rs. 24 crores. But indirect taxation was levied. With all

due respect I say that we have, perhaps, over-reached ourselves in having indirect taxation to the extent of 60 crores this year.

I do not want to go into all the items of indirect taxation. There are certain items of indirect taxation which are very good and very healthy, such as taxation of luxury articles like wines, spirits and cigarettes. But, what about kerosene? Other hon. Members have mentioned this. I would like to refer to this kerosene from another point of view. Finer kerosene is being taxed. But it is this finer kerosene that the villager is using in order to get better light. The marginal man goes out. His child goes to school and is able to study at home in the light of a little better type of kerosene. Now, he is forced to come back to use of crude oil. As a result, the child's eye-sight gets affected. We are raising money—net expenditure; as I think is desirable—yet some at least adequate for developmental activities such as health measures etc. We give by one hand and we take it away by the other. Practically, it comes to that, in so many of these items

I would, therefore, request the Finance Minister—in spite of what he has said—to go through these items again and give up the indirect taxes to some extent. I do not want to exaggerate things. I do realise that the incidence of these taxes is not very high. But the marginal consumers are feeling the effect of it. The price structure has gone up in spite of whatever has been stated. We have to think a new on that point also.

I referred a little while ago to the fixed salary earners, whether they are the working classes, or the poorer middle classes or the middle classes. It is a matter to which we have to give some thought. We have broad-based our taxes, to some extent the marginal tax-payer, the man who pays the income-tax, is being unduly taxed today. If he is a salaried worker he has to pay his full tax; he



does not evade it in any proportion; that is so even when the higher salaried incomes are concerned. But what of those who are evading the taxes in large proportions? It is to that end that we have to turn our minds. I must say that I am very disappointed to find that in this year's Budget, the social purpose—though raising the resources to cover the gap in expenditure over revenue is important—has not been fully taken into consideration. I hope the Finance Minister will take this into consideration because of its tremendous importance to our social objectives, so that we may attain the minimum standards of a welfare State. He has stated that he is against the excess profits tax and he has given two reasons, with one of which Shri A. P. Jain had dealt. The other reason is that we shall be penalising the more capable industries by having the excess profits tax. The price of a commodity is fixed more or less on the basis of the marginal unit. There is difference between the marginal unit that gets some little profit and the tremendous profit made by those who have almost a sort of monopoly over certain trades. For instance, there are certain people who control so many textile mills. Is their profit due to greater capability or is it because they can have much greater turn over and because they control so much. All these are to be taken into consideration. He should take these things into consideration and not sweep aside these remarks without giving them due consideration. The hon. Finance Minister is not present. I request the Deputy Finance Minister who is present here to give due consideration to these matters because the excess profits tax will be better than the wealth tax or expenditure tax from the point of realisation; It will be easier of realisation than the wealth tax or even the income-tax.

I think that there is some improvement in preventing evasion of taxes. Some improvement has taken place.

But it is not sufficient for the Finance Ministry to congratulate itself in any way. A great deal more can be done in this. If it is done, this contention which is here today—that the very rich are getting richer and very wealthy are getting wealthier—can be stopped. It is our objective and our Government's objective that the disparities in wealth should go. We do not say that all men are equal and must be equal in every way. But equality of opportunity must be given to every one of the citizens. There are two ways in which it can be brought about. The tax that we have to raise should be placed upon those who can best afford to bear it and by these means we should bring down the disparities. More especially, we should put our minds towards the Third Plan which is just unfolding itself and which is bound to bring about those conditions and opportunities for the citizens of the future, whether they be economic opportunities or social opportunities so that whether they are children of the rich or of the poor, they will get equal opportunities of education, health and other social amenities. It is no use having these ideas merely in the Preamble in our Constitution. It is time that we go further and make this into something which is a reality. I think that we can go further than we have done in the past, if we go boldly forward. The Finance Minister is courageous and bold. He has shown that he does not play to the gallery in any way. General Elections, to the disappointment of the Opposition Parties, have not counted with him. The need for raising the standard of living of the people and for bringing about a reduction in the disparity of wealth will, I am sure, count with him and before this Budget is finally approved I hope he will take away some of the indirect taxes.

Last, but not the least, there is one point which I want to bring to your attention. I want to know this. Why is it that this House, which, under the Constitution, is the House which

[Shrimati Ranuka Ray]

endorses and has a right to confirm the Money Bills, should not be the first House to discuss it? In any case why should the Finance Minister make a statement in the other House, rejecting certain proposals which have not yet been made in the lower House, the Lok Sabha, which is the House to whom consideration has to be given. I would therefore, suggest to the Finance Minister—again he is absent—that he should kindly give consideration to what the representatives of the people in this House are saying because it is this House which does discuss details and which will ultimately pass the Money Bills. As such, I think, that much courtesy is due to it.

**श्री अनिरुद्ध सिंह (मधुवनी) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश में वर्तमान शासन पद्धति के अन्तर्गत शासन चालू होने के कुछ ही दिनों के बाद देश की सर्वांगीण उन्नति के लिए पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाई गई। अभी द्वितीय पंच वर्षीय योजना के बीतने को केवल दो सप्ताह रह गये हैं। परन्तु हमें देखना है कि विगत दस वर्षों में प्रति वर्ष करोड़ों रुपया खर्च करके हमने देश के सामाजिक आर्थिक तथा सांस्कृतिक जीवन में क्या परिवर्तन किये हैं। राष्ट्रीय विकास का काम देश में क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन लाने के लिये है। अभी तक राष्ट्रीय विकास सेवा का प्रसार देश के करीब करीब तीन चौथाई भाग में हुआ है और सम्भव है कि १९६३ तक तमाम देश में यह फैल जाये। जहाँ तक आंकड़ों का सवाल है इतने बड़े पैमाने पर इतने बड़े देश में राष्ट्रीय सेवा का प्रसार हो जाना कोई मामूली बात नहीं है और कोई भी सरकार अपने लिए इस पर गौरव अनुभव कर सकती है। राष्ट्रीय विकास योजना गांवों में क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन लाने के लिए बनाई गई है। राष्ट्रीय विकास का अर्थ है कि गांवों में अच्छी खेती हो, पैदावार बढ़े, अच्छी अच्छी सड़कें बनें, स्कूल खुलें, अस्पताल खुलें और छोटे छोटे कल-कारखाने चालू हों ताकि लोगों को रोजी

मिले। अब देखना यह है कि इतना खर्च करके हम अपने लक्ष्य की पूर्ति में कितनी दूरी तक पहुँच पाये हैं।

देहाती क्षेत्रों से आने वाले माननीय सदस्यों को स्वयं का अनुभव होगा कि राष्ट्रीय आय के बढ़ने के बावजूद भी देहातों में बसने वाले और खास तौर पर मध्यम श्रेणी के लोगों की आर्थिक दशा दिनोंदिन नीची जा रही है और वे भविष्य के लिए शंकाशील हो उठे हैं। वे विकास के कार्यों में गति चाहते हैं किन्तु गति आ नहीं पा रही है। मुश्किल तो यह है कि हमारी सरकार योजना की सफलता कागज़ों पर तथा उसके खर्च के अनुपात पर कूतती है, उसके भौतिक रूप को देख कर नहीं। हमारे देश की आबादी का करीब ८३ प्रतिशत भाग गांवों में बसता है और आबादी के आधे से अधिक भाग में राष्ट्रीय विकास सेवा का प्रसार हो चुका है किन्तु गांवों के जीवन में, उनके आर्थिक, सामाजिक तथा सांस्कृतिक जीवन में कोई महत्वपूर्ण परिवर्तन नहीं दिखाई पड़ता है। यही कारण है कि शहरों की आबादी धड़ल्ले से बढ़ रही है। राष्ट्रीय विकास के कार्यों में जहाँ जन-सहयोग की आवश्यकता महसूस होती है वहाँ सरकारी अफसरों की मनोवृत्ति में भी परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता है। इस काम में कोई प्रगति न देख कर लोग क्षुब्ध हैं। बेचारे देहातों में रहने वाले लोग भारत सरकार की ओर बड़ी आशाभरी निगाह से देख रहे हैं। राष्ट्रीय विकास कार्य के लिए जो अफसर नियुक्त हैं उनका काम विकास कार्यों से कम रहता है किन्तु प्रशासनिक कार्यों से अधिक रहता है। अगर यही ढांचा राष्ट्रीय विकास कार्य के प्रशासन का रहा तो भगवान ही जाने, इसका भविष्य क्या होगा।

सब से पहले यातायात की सुविधा को आप लें जो ग्राम्य जीवन के विकास के लिए परम आवश्यक है। मैं सरकारी आंकड़ों के आधार पर नहीं किन्तु निजी अनुभव के आधार पर कुछ उत्तर बिहार और खास कर दरभंगा जिले की समस्या सरकार के सामने

रखना चाहता हूँ। सभी जानते हैं कि उत्तर बिहार की आबादी बड़ी घनी है। उस के २१,१५६ वर्ग मील में सवा दो करोड़ लोग बसते हैं, उस की आबादी आसाम से दूनी, उड़ीसा, पंजाब और केरल से अधिक है, किन्तु अन्य राज्यों के विकास पर जितना खर्च हुआ है उस का १००वाँ हिस्सा भी उत्तरी बिहार में खर्च नहीं हुआ। उत्तर बिहार में तो हर जगह पर रेल है भी नहीं। वहाँ की व्यापार की बड़ी बड़ी मंडियों जिला और सब डिवीजन के सदर मुकाम से पचासों मील पर बनी हुई हैं। पहले तो मंडियों को अच्छी अच्छी सड़कें जिला और सब डिवीजनों के सदर मुकामों से मिलती थीं, लेकिन जब से देश में विकास का कार्य प्रारम्भ हुआ है, उन सड़कों की मरम्मत भी नहीं हुई है। फलतः उन की दशा इतनी खराब हो गई है कि बैलगाड़ियों का चलना भी मुश्किल हो गया है। परिणाम यह हुआ है कि देहाती बाजार गिर रहे हैं और उन की चिताओं पर बड़े शहरों तथा रेल हेड के नजदीक बाजार पनप रहे हैं, जिस से देहातों में बड़ी बेकारी फैल रही है, उन का जीवन स्तर नीचे गिर रहा है, उन की आर्थिक दशा चिन्तनीय हो रही है और वह दिन दूर नहीं है जब वह अपना धैर्य खो बैठें। दरभंगा जिले के मधुबनी सब डिवीजन की आबादी १६ लाख है, जो कि आबादी के खयाल से देश का सब से बड़ा सब डिवीजन है। उस के तीन चौथाई लोग मधुबनी सदर मुकाम से पूर्व की ओर बसते हैं, लेकिन हालांकि विकास कार्य प्रारम्भ हुए दस वर्ष, हो गये, एक बालिशत अलकतरा की सड़क पूरबी इलाके को मधुबनी से मिलाने के लिए नहीं बनी है, यद्यपि वह सीमा क्षेत्र है और मधुबनी के बाद नेपाल ही है।

सन् १९६० में रेलवे प्रशासन की ओर से बिहार में ८ रेलवे आउट एजेन्सीज खोलनी मंजूर हुई थी, जिस में से पांच केवल मधुबनी के पूर्व के इलाकों के लिये थीं, कारण यह

इलाका बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ है और सीमावर्ती क्षेत्र है। लेकिन रेलवे प्रशासन के बार बार विज्ञापन देने के बाद भी कोई ठेकेदार आगे नहीं आया क्योंकि वहाँ सड़कें नहीं थीं। मोकामा में गंगा नदी पर पुल बन जाने के बाद जहाँ उत्तर बिहार के बड़े बड़े शहरों का विकास होना सम्भव है, वहाँ सड़कें न होने से दिहात का बहुत बड़ा भाग विकसित होने से वंचित रह जायेगा और पीछे तो मुकाबले में कभी पनप भी नहीं सकता है। इस सिलसिले में एक बहुत बड़े मार्क की बात यह है कि विदेशी विनिमय की दिक्कतों के बाद तथा स्वेज नहर के मार्फत माल की दुलाई बन्द हो जाने के बाद भी, जहाँ रेलवे प्रशासन ने निर्धारित समय के अन्दर मोकामा का रेलवे पुल बना दिया, राजेन्द्र पुल, वहाँ उस के बाद भी उत्तर बिहार वालों को उस का पूरा लाभ नहीं मिल रहा है कारण यह है कि राजपथ नं० २८ जो दलसिंह सराय को बरौनी से और राजपथ नं० ३१ जो बरौनी को पूर्णिया से मिलते हैं, बन कर तैयार नहीं हुए हैं हालांकि न उसके लिये कोई सामान विदेशों से मंगाने की जरूरत है और न ही किसी विदेशी विनिमय की जरूरत है।

सन् १९४३ में नागपुर रोड कांग्रेस में कहा गया था कि २० वर्षों के अन्दर देश का कोई भी विकसित भाग किसी भी पक्की सड़क से ५ मील से ज्यादा दूरी पर नहीं होगा। अभी सन् १९५८ में जो दूसरी रोड कांग्रेस हुई है, उस में कहा गया है कि देश का कोई भी भाग किसी भी पक्की सड़क से चार मील या कच्ची सड़क से डेढ़ मील से ज्यादा दूर नहीं होगा। आज नागपुर रोड कांग्रेस को हुए १८ साल हो गये। कहा जाता है कि नागपुर रोड कांग्रेस में जो लक्ष्य निर्धारित किया गया था वह पूरा हो गया, परन्तु आज नागपुर रोड कांग्रेस को १८ वर्ष के बाद भी मैं बिना किसी प्रतिवाद की आशंका के यह कहूंगा कि कम से कम दरभंगा जिले में हालत

[ श्री अनिरुद्ध सिंह ]

यह है कि वहां के जो हिस्से आज से पचास वर्ष पहले जितनी दूरी पर पक्की सड़कों से थे वहीं पर आज भी हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : छपरा की भी वही हालत है।

श्री अनिरुद्ध सिंह : अगले दो हफ्तों में द्वितीय पंच वर्षीय योजना समाप्त हो रही है, लेकिन इस में बेकारी मिटाने के जो प्रयास हुए हैं, उन से बेकारी मिटती नजर नहीं आती, यद्यपि योजना का मुख्य उद्देश्य आर्थिक विकास करना और गरीबी मिटाना ही है। कहा जाता है कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना की समाप्ति के बाद भी कुछ लोग बेकार रह जायेंगे, और तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी प्रायः डेढ़ करोड़ लोगों को रोजी देने का प्रबन्ध करना होगा। देहातों की हालत बहुत भयंकर हो चली है। लोग धड़ले से शहरों की ओर, जहां पर नये कल कारखाने खुल रहे हैं, भाग रहे हैं। इस से शहरों की बेकारी बढ़ रही है। अतः लाजिमी है कि इंडीरिअर में और भी ज्यादा कुटीर शिल्पों की स्थापना हो, जिस से लोगों को रोजी मिले। सहकारी समितियां बना कर उन के सामान को बेचने का भी प्रबन्ध हो, नहीं तो यह समस्या हमारे लिये आगे चल कर बहुत बड़ा सिर दर्द बन जायेगी।

अब आप खेती की हालत सुनिये। प्रति वर्ष करोड़ों रुपये खेती की उपज बढ़ाने और कृषि में सुधार करने के लिये खर्च किये जाते हैं। कागज पर तो सब प्रबन्ध ठीक है, किन्तु मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूं कि सुदूर देहातों में क्या अभी तक उन्नत बीज या खाद पहुंचाने का प्रबन्ध सरकार की ओर से हो सका है? सन् १९५६-५७ से देश में बीज वृद्धि अथवा सीड मल्टिप्लिकेशन का कार्य प्रारम्भ हुआ। बिहार के जिलों में प्रत्येक थाने में भारत सरकार के रूपों से सीड मल्टिप्लिकेशन फार्म बनाया गया है। सन् १९५६ में बिहार राज्य में कुल ३७२ सीड

मल्टिप्लिकेशन फार्म थे। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि अभी तक किसी फार्म में क्या एक छटाक बीज भी पैदा किया गया है? कहा जाता है कि पिछड़े इलाकों का विकास पहले होगा। लेकिन बात बिल्कुल उल्टी है।

श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह (छपरा) : इतनी बातों के होते हुए भी आप कांग्रेस में हैं?

श्री अनिरुद्ध सिंह : I am proud of my association with the Congress, and I am telling the facts to the Government which is responsible to the Congress.

इसी प्रकार उत्तर बिहार में अभी तक सिंचाई का प्रबन्ध नहीं हो सका है यद्यपि बाढ़ की रोक थाम का काम प्रायः समाप्त हो गया है। हां, जहां तहां बिजली से सिंचाई के नलकूप गड़े भी हैं पर फील्ड चैनल के अभाव में उन का भी उपयोग नहीं हो रहा है, और यही कारण है कि उत्तर बिहार में जो कि हिन्दुस्तान में सब से शस्य श्यामल भूमि कहा जाता था, क्योंकि हम अपने जिले में एक साल में बिना पानी के तीन फसलें उपजा लेते थे, आज कल इतना कष्ट है। पहले इतनी आबादी भी नहीं थी। अब हमारे जिले की आबादी करीब ४२ लाख के है। पहले इतनी आबादी नहीं थी और नेपाल में जंगल होने की वजह से काफी पानी पड़ता था जो कि अब नहीं हो रहा है। यही कारण है कि पिछले दस वर्षों में तीन बार उत्तर बिहार को भीषण अकाल का सामना करना पड़ा है, और मैं समझता हूं कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को फूड सर्विसेस देने के लिये और हाई मैन्युअल लेबर के लिये करोड़ों रुपये देने पड़े हैं। अतः उत्तर बिहार देश का सब से बड़ा समस्याग्रस्त क्षेत्र हो गया है। अनेक समस्याओं में ये इतनी ही समस्याएँ मैंने सरकार के सामने रखने का प्रयास किया है। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि वह उन पर ध्यान दे कर उन्हें हल करे और यश का भागी बने।

## Discussion

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri** (Berhampore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, one statement that has been repeatedly made in this House, is that in course of the last few years the rich become richer and the poor poorer. It was even said that the richer had become the richest. But to my mind that is something like an algebraic statement and conveys no concrete meaning.

In order to emphasise what it has concretely meant at the other end of the scale, that is for the poor section of the community—and most of our people are generally poor—I cannot but help mentioning one case which came up for comment by one of the Judges of the Calcutta High Court recently. It is known as the “Ramdas Turi’s case”. This unfortunate Ramdas Turi was an unemployed tea garden worker who waited for about a month in the plantation area of North Bengal for getting some job. Then, disappointed in not having found any employment there, he came down to Calcutta in search of work. As the poor generally do in all big cities like Calcutta or Bombay or Delhi, he made the pavement of the streets his home. He was accompanied by his small motherless child; and every day he went out in the morning in search of a job, and came back at noon to give food to the child and again go in search of a job. In this way he spent about a month on the streets but he could not find anything for himself. One day, at noon? time, when he returned to the spot where his child was, that hungry child was weeping. He had no food for two days and was begging of his father to give him some parched rice which he could see in a shop nearby. But the father had no money; not even two naye paise. In a moment of mental imbalance, he caught hold of the hand of the child, lifted him up and dashed him against the pavement. Of course the next moment, when he realised what he had done, he immediately lifted the body of the dead child and went with it to the police station and surrendered himself to the guardians of law. The

law had its own course. That man was given the life sentence in the lower court, and by way of an appeal—certain lawyers appeared for him in *amicus curise*—the honourable high court reduced the sentence to one year’s imprisonment, because the law of the land had to be respected. But the high court was moved to make the comment that events like this make the two five year plans that we have passed through meaningless so far as the common men are concerned.

I do not want to overdramatise the thing. It is not that every unemployed man is committing suicide or killing his children, but the fact is that for the overwhelming majority of our people who belong to the category of the poor, life is still an unbearable burden. It is not only a question of industrial workers. I can refer to the report and to some bare indices which have been published only recently in the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report. There, it has been stated that about 47 per cent of the total agricultural households in the country own less than one acre. We carry on excited discussions and debates about land ceiling, but we have to bear in mind that for 47 per cent of our agricultural households, the ceiling laws have hardly any meaning. Coming to those who have no land and who are just agricultural labourers who work in other people’s lands, the committee has found that their real income has gone down by 15 per cent; their work by six per cent and their indebtedness has grown by 118 per cent. When the Finance Minister therefore, says that taxation is an instrument of economic policy, one is tempted to ask, “Economic policy for whom?”

It may be claimed on behalf of the Government that the two plans that we have passed through and the third Plan which we are entering are for the common man, and for the raising of the incomes and standards of living of those people. But these claims are made only for giving some sort of socialistic frill to our economic policy.

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

I might also say here that in their more lucid moments, when they see things in clearer perspective and also want to put things plainly before the people, at least before the limited audience which they have in view, Government spokesmen make more outspoken statements which sometimes are not noticed by the general public.

So, I was very much intrigued when I saw in the papers the other day—in one of the responsible daily papers of Delhi—*The Statesman*—the report of a speech that the Finance Minister made at the time of the inauguration of the Investment Centre. He is reported to have said that persistent efforts made by him and his predecessor in office to remove misunderstandings in foreign countries about India's economic policies—"he was happy to say"—had now borne fruit; that for a long time the Government's efforts to develop the public sector were misunderstood as an attempt to run down the private sector, which we all know is only a euphemistic name for the capitalist sector and that the facts had now proved this theory to be wrong. He is reported to have also said that the rapid expansion of the public sector had been mainly responsible for a fivefold increase in the private sector within the past few years. Sir, the Finance Minister was speaking plain unvarnished truth. This is really the general direction of the economic policy pursued by this Government through these plans.

Reference has already been made in this House, and by some eminent speakers on this side, as to how the concentration of wealth and economic power has grown. But the fact that has not been underlined properly is that the concentration of economic power, the concentration of capital, this phenomenal growth of the private sector, the capitalist sector, this process of making the rich richer and richest, have come about precisely as a result of the policies deliberately followed by this Government. That is why when the Finance Minister says

that taxation is an instrument of economic policy, he might be more frank and say that not only taxation, but the entire structure of the budget is an instrument of economic policy, which is nothing other than the policy of capitalist growth and capitalist development in this country. Whether we take the budgetary policies in the limited sense of taxation and expenditure or whether we take the monetary policies, policies with regard to credit and other related things, all move in the same direction, with the same purpose and same aim in view.

That is why I was not surprised when the taxation proposals were announced and the Government indicated that it was going to rely more on indirect taxes for covering a sizeable part of the deficit that would accrue in our planned expenditure. This year, the Finance Minister has planned to cover the entire revenue deficit, at least a major part of it, by indirect taxation. As everybody knows, indirect taxation is bound to be regressive. So, that being his deliberate and declared policy, I can only plead with him not for any fundamental structural change in the budget that he has placed before the House, but for small mercies for persuading him to re-examine some of the taxation proposals that he has laid before the House for its approval.

I would not go into the question whether this indirect taxation has been evenly distributed, whether the taxes that have been imposed on particular commodities like tobacco or kerosene lead to any increase in the prices or have caused any inflationary spurt. But I would like the Finance Minister to re-examine the change caused by the excise duty put on such commodities like glassware, ceramics, power-looms and proprietary patent medicines, particularly when it is imposed on very small production units. For example, take the case of excise duty put on small power-loom units with a complement of four looms. The rate of taxation imposed on these units of four looms is almost

as high as on 24 looms. A large number of small power-loom co-operative societies would actually go out of existence if some consideration is not shown to them.

Similarly with regard to the pottery and ceramic industry, which are run on a small scale, he should examine—some consideration should be shown to them as well. I do not think either the exchequer or the general policy of taxation or the revenues will suffer much if these small mercies are shown to those sectors of small-scale industrial production, which are least able to bear these burdens.

So far as the general outcry against indirect taxation is concerned, I have to remind the House and also the Finance Minister that it is not only this complement of indirect taxes and excise duties under which the people are groaning. Side by side, there is the effect of deficit financing. However much he might propose to increase his tax revenues and cover a part of the deficits by these revenues, it is obvious that he has to rely in the end on deficit financing to a considerable extent as he has been doing so long. So far as the average man is concerned, he is today caught between two pincers or between the jaws of two vices so to say and is being crushed under their pressure. In almost all commodities, particularly consumer goods, it is a scarcity market and a sellers' market that operates today. Any indirect tax under such circumstances would immediately be shifted to the purchaser or the consumer and would have to be borne by the common man.

Similarly so far as deficit financing is concerned, which means simply printing of notes or expansion of bank credit or whatever it is, all-told there is bound to be an unchecked rise in prices, which again impinges hardest on the poorer sections of the community. Government policy being what it is, it is futile to expect that there would be any fundamental

change in the main direction of that policy. But at the same time, this House and the Government must consider whether some of the effects of this inflation and indirect taxation could not be neutralised by counter-vailing measures. If that is done for the present, that would be enough for us to thank our Lord. Otherwise, it is no use referring to the Government's professions of socialism which are good only for paper resolutions. As the Prime Minister said on an earlier occasion, when the first budget of the present Lok Sabha was presented by Shri Desai's predecessor in office, not only one budget but even scores of budgets will not transform our economy into one of socialism. So, we do not expect the Finance Minister by this one budget to transform India into a socialist country. We know it and we are reconciled to the fact that we remain a capitalist country. But some of the rigours of capitalist exploitation and some of the rigours of indiscriminate taxation and the monetary policies that the Government have been pursuing may be lessened, may be reduced, if they show some mercy for that section of the community from which the poor fellow, Ramdas Turi, whose case I mentioned at the outset, comes.

16 hrs.

सुश्री मणिबेन पटेल (आनन्द) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस दफा के बजट में इस तरह से टैक्स लगाया गया है कि किसी को शोर मचाने की कोई गुंजायश नहीं है। अगर अपने देश का विकास करना हो, तो सब को कुछ न कुछ देना पड़ेगा ही, क्योंकि जब पैसा हम को चाहिये, तो कोई न कोई रास्ता पैसे का निकालना पड़ेगा। हम को परदेशी शासन के नीचे कई साल रहने से ऐसी आदत पड़ गई है, हमारा ऐसा स्वभाव हो गया है कि हम को सरकार को कर देना अच्छा नहीं लगता है और हम कहते हैं कि गरीब आदमी कर कहां से दे सकेगा। बात सही है, परन्तु अगर हम

[ सुश्री मणिबेन पटेल ]

सब लोगों को सहूलियतें चाहिए, तो सब को कुछ न कुछ देने की आदत लगानी पड़ेगी और इस प्रकार का मानस तैयार करना पड़ेगा ।

जो टैक्स लगाये गये हैं उन के बारे में कुछ दिक्कतों की चर्चा की गई है । अगर हम को यह कहना है कि यह टैक्स ठीक नहीं है, तो उस की जगह दूसरा टैक्स हम को बताना चाहिए कि अपने प्लान को पूरा करने के लिये कौन सा टैक्स लगाने से कितना पैसा हम जमा कर सकते हैं । मैं इस बारे में सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ़ खींचना चाहती हूँ कि जो छोटी छोटी दुकानें हैं, जैसे पान वाले हैं, जो रेकड़ी चलाते हैं, वे शाम तक बीम पच्चीस रुपये कमा लेते हैं । उन को न दूकान का भाड़ा दे पड़ता है और न कुछ और देना पड़ता है, परन्तु मैं जानती हूँ यहां तक वे लोग एक कौड़ी भी टैक्स नहीं देते हैं । बात यह है कि टैक्स देने से इतनी तकलीफ़ नहीं होती है । ज्यादा तकलीफ़ इनकम टैक्स वालों के परेशान करने में होती है । अगर उम में से निकलने का कोई रास्ता निकाला जाये, तो मैं मानती हूँ कि काफ़ी लोग टैक्स देने में झिझकेंगे नहीं । परन्तु आज स्थिति यह है कि हर उम आदमी को, जिस पर इनकम टैक्स लगाया जाता है, चोर माना जाता है और हर इनकम टैक्स लगाने वाला अफ़सर अपने आपको माहूकार मानता है । यह मानस बदलने की ज़रूरत है ।

एक बात सोचने की यह है कि परदेशी कम्पनियों को यहां पर अपने कारखाने डालने के लिये या अनेक प्रकार के उद्योग बढ़ाने के लिये काफ़ी सहूलियतें दी जाती हैं । यह बात ठीक है । परन्तु जो उद्योग हमारे देश के लोग चला सकते हैं उन्हें परदेशी कम्पनियों को चलाने देना और उन को सहूलियतें देना कहां तक ठीक है, यह सोचने की बात है । मेरी विनती है कि इस बारे में उद्योग मंत्रालय और वित्त मंत्रालय को ठीक ठीक सोचाना चाहिए । हमारे ऊपर तो ऐसा आभास पड़ रहा है कि आज-कल परदेशी

कम्पनियों को और परदेशी लोगों को हमारे यहां उद्योग डालने के लिये प्रोत्साहन दिया जाता है, ज्यादा शीघ्रता से सहूलियतें दी जाती हैं, जब कि हमारे लोगों को लाइसेन्स मिलने में काफ़ी परेशानी होती है । हमारे लोगों को कहा जाता है कि इस उद्योग के बारे में आप कुछ कीजिये, आप इस बारे में परदेशी से कालैबोरेशन कीजिये, कहां करेंगे, किस तरह करेंगे, सब बात तै हो जाती है, लेकिन आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि पीछे वह काम हमारे देश के आदमी को न दे कर परदेशी को दिया जाता है । इस बारे में और सोचने की ज़रूरत है कि क्या यह सरकार की नीति है या किसी कारण से या गलती से यह चीज़ हो रही है ।

एक दूसरी बात यह सोचने की है कि एक तरफ़ हम कहते हैं कि हम को सहकारी ढंग से काम करने के लिये लोगों को उन्नेजन देना चाहिए, को-आपरेटिव ढंग से काम करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए और दूसरी तरफ़ मैं देखती हूँ कि जहां तहां जो डेयरी का उद्योग खोला जा रहा है, वह सरकार की तरफ़ से हो रहा है और सहकारी ढंग में नहीं हो रहा है । इस का परिणाम यह होगा कि जो फ़ायदा देहांत में गरीब किसानों को मिलना चाहिए, उन को वह नहीं मिलेगा और डेयरी चलाने वाला केवल यही देखेगा कि हमारी डेयरी किस तरह अच्छी चले और कैसे मुनाफ़ हो । इस को सहकारी ढंग से करने का लाभ यह होगा कि गरीब किसान जो गाय भैंस रखेगा, उस में उम को नफ़ा होगा, फ़ायदा होगा और उस को खेती के साथ एक दूसरा उद्योग मदद देने वाला होगा । सरकार जिस नीति पर चल रही है, उस से ऐसा नहीं हो सकेगा । इस तरह से एक बड़ी कालोनी गाय भैंसों की रखी जायगी और उसके पीछे हड़ताल और दूसरे प्रकार की जो समस्यायें खड़ी होती हैं, वे होंगी, परन्तु जो फ़ायदा किसान और देहांत को होना चाहिए, वह नहीं होगा । इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि इस नीति में जो फ़र्क़ दिखाई देता है, उस



पर फिर से सोचने की जरूरत है और डेयरी के उद्योग को सहकारी ढंग से चलाया जाना चाहिए ।

अपने यहां से और राज्यों में भी कई चीजों के लिये ग्रांट्स दी जाती हैं—कालेजों को, स्कूलों को, मकान बनाने के लिए और कम्प्यूनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स के लिये ग्रांट्स दी जाती हैं । परन्तु ये ग्रांट्स देने में, जिन को ग्रांट्स दी जाती हैं, उन को काफी तकलीफ होती है और तब उन को मिलती हैं । अगर रुपया मार्च की १५, १७ या २० तारीख को दिया जायगा, तो वह ३१ मार्च तक किस तरह खर्च किया जायगा ? क्या आप चाहते हैं कि वे गलत हिसाब रखें यह चाहते हैं कि वे किसी से कर्जा लें या और खर्च कर लें या फिर आपको गलत वाउचर्स दिखा दें कि मार्च में उनका क्या खर्चा है । इस तरह की चीज वे करें, यह ठीक नहीं होगा । दिसम्बर के आखिर तक जितना पैसा भी आपको देना है, दे ही देना चाहिये । उसको रोक कर और ३१ मार्च को या २८ मार्च को या २० मार्च को देने में क्या मज्जा आता है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है । इसके बारे में खास तौर पर सोचने की और खास तौर पर ध्यान देने की जरूरत है ।

आज सबेरे यहां पर वनस्पति के बारे में काफी प्रश्न पूछे गये हैं । इस प्रश्न को बार बार यहां उठाया जा रहा है । अगर सरकार के दिल में यह हो कि वनस्पति में किसी प्रकार के रंग का संशोधन हो और आप चाहते हैं इस रंग को बतलाने के लिए कोई आगे आये तो इसके लिए आपको इनाम देने की घोषणा करनी होगी । कोई भी प्राइवेट कम्पनी या प्राइवेट संस्था जो भी इस काम को करना चाहे, उसको ऐसा करने का आपको प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये और कहना चाहिये कि जो भी इस रंग को बतलाने में सफल होगा उसको इनाम दिया जायेगा । ऐसा करके ही यह चीज सफल होने वाली है । मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि

2182 (A1) LS.—8.

वनस्पति में रंग का संशोधन होने के अन्दर बाधा डालने में काफी पावरफुल इंस्टिटेयूट्स का हाथ है । वे इस काम में रुकावट डाल सकते हैं और उन्होंने डाली है । अगर ऐसी बात न होती तो आज तक रंग न मिलता ऐसा मैं नहीं मानती हूं । अगर सचमुच आपको इस काम को करवाना हो तो आपको इनाम निकालना होगा और लोगों को बतलाना होगा कि जो इस काम में सफलता प्राप्त करेगा उसको इतना इनाम दिया जायेगा । यदि ऐसा किया गया तो इस काम को आप सफलता के साथ पूरा कर सकते हैं ।

एक बात अब मुझे मद्यनिषेध के बारे में कहनी है । अभी एक भाई ने इस के बारे में शिकायत की है । देश में इस समय श्री डेबर भाई की अध्यक्षता में एक बैंकवर्ड क्लॉसिस कमिशन घूम रहा है और उसके कुछ सदस्यों को मिलने का मुझे दो चार बार मौका मिला है । उससे मैंने सुना है कि आज तक कोई भी आदिवासी या हरिजन जो उनसे मिला है उसने यह नहीं कहा है कि हमको मद्यनिषेध हटाना चाहिये या इसको लागू करके उनको कोई फायदा नहीं हुआ है । जितने भी लोग उनसे मिले हैं उन्होंने यही कहा है कि कृपा करके आप दारू फिर से यहां चालू न कीजिये । मद्यनिषेध से उनको बहुत से लाभ हुए हैं । यहां पैसे की बात कही गई है । परन्तु आप सोचें कि जहां जहां मद्यनिषेध का कार्यक्रम है वहां वहां सरकार को और तरह से कितना पैसा मिल रहा है । परन्तु बात यह है कि हम को जो कर और तरह से मिल रहे हैं, सेल्ज टैक्स के जरिये, प्रापर्टी टैक्स के जरिये, उनको यह सोग देना नहीं चाहते इस लिये दारू से जो आमदनी होती है, रखना चाहते हैं । गरीब आदमी दारू पियें और हमको पैसा मिले, इस तरह की बात हमका नहीं करनी चाहिये । आदमी को हवान बनाकर, टैक्स लेना अच्छी बात नहीं है । आदमी को इन्सान बनाकर, आदमी

[सु श्री मणिबेन पटेल]

बना कर टेक्स वसूल करना हमारे लिए ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। अहमदाबाद में, बम्बई में जहां मद्यनिषेध सफल हुआ है, वहां जा कर देखें कि लोग किस तरह से खुश हैं। वहां पर जा कर आप मजदूरों को देखें, मध्यम वर्ग के आदमियों को देखें तो पता नहीं चलेगा कि कौन मजदूर है और कौन मजदूर नहीं है। उनके घरों को, उनके कपड़ों को उनके बच्चों को, वे कैसे पढ़ते हैं, इसको आप देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि कितनी तबदीली उनमें आ गई है। एक अंग्रेज मैनेजर ने बम्बई में कहा है कि जब मद्यनिषेध नहीं था तब दुपहर को खाना ले कर मजदूर की स्त्री आती थी तो रोज झगडा दोनों के बीच में होता था और खाना भी ठीक से बना नहीं रहता और आज हमारा यह अनुभव है कि दोनों शान्ति से बैठते हैं, खाना भी अच्छा होता है, स्वास्थ्य भी अच्छा है और उनका काम भी अच्छा है। जो पढ़े लिखे आदमी हैं उनको पीना हो तो पियें, मगर मैं नहीं चाहती कि वे भी पीयें। परमिट ले कर वे पीना चाहें तो पियें। लेकिन गरीब लोगों को दारू देना, उनको दारू पिलाना, मादक पदार्थ देना और ऐसा कहना कि हमारे यहां देश में शिक्षण के लिए पैसे की आवश्यकता है और हमें उसे हासिल करना है, इसलिए हमें दारूबन्दी नहीं करनी चाहिये, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। अगर आप शिक्षण देना चाहते हैं तो दारू और शिक्षण का आपस में कैसे मेल बैठता है? इनका मेल नहीं बैठता है। जो पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं और जो दारू पीते हैं और दारू पी कर हैवान हो जाते हैं, उनकी हालत को आप देखें। कोई भी स्त्री, कोई भी मध्यम वर्ग की स्त्री, कोई भी शिक्षित स्त्री आप को नहीं मिलेगी जो ऐसा कहेगी कि दारू निषेध नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं कई बहनों को जानती हूँ जो पढ़ी लिखी हैं जिन के पति पहले पीते थे लेकिन इस तथ्य को वे खुले तौर से तो नहीं कह सकती थीं क्योंकि बेचारी ऐसा कहते हुए शर्माती हैं, पर आज मद्य

निषेध के फलस्वरूप उनके घर सूखी हैं और आपको वे आशीर्वाद देती हैं, भगवान को धन्यवाद देती हैं कि उसने उनको घरों में मुख से रहने का मौका दिया है। इसलिए जो यह हठ ले कर हम बैठे हुए हैं, इसको हमें छोड़ना होगा। जो लोग पढ़े लिखे हैं और जिन की इस प्रकार की सोचने की आदत है, वे जरा कृपा करके ठीक तरह से सोचें और जहां जहां मद्यनिषेध हुआ है वहां वहां जाकर अच्छी तरह से देखभाल करें और फिर उनका जो हठ है दारूबन्दी के खिलाफ, ओपन माइण्ड (open mind) रखें तो बात समझ में आ सकती है। लेकिन मैं समझती हूँ कि आपको इस हठ को छोड़ना चाहिये और मद्यनिषेध के लिए कदम उठाना चाहिये।

अब मैं परदेशी कम्पनियों के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ। वे भी यहां हमारे देश में कारखाने चालू करती हैं। वे भी जो हमारे देश के लोग हैं वे कर सकते हैं या करते हैं, उन्हीं कामों को करती हैं। जब एक ही क्षेत्र में परदेशी कम्पनियाँ और देशी कम्पनियाँ चलती हैं तब हमारे लोग जो इस उद्योग में काम करना चाहते हैं या करते हैं, वे उनके सामने कैसे टिक सकते हैं। परदेशी कम्पनियों के जो रिसोर्सिज होते हैं, जो साधन होते हैं, जो सम्पत्ति होती है उसका मुकाबला हमारे लोग नहीं कर सकते हैं, उनकी प्रतिस्पर्धा में हमारे लोग नहीं टिक सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरा मुझाव है कि जिस जिस क्षेत्र में, जिरा जिस उद्योग में हमारे लोग काम कर सकते हैं, उस क्षेत्र में, उस उस उद्योग में परदेशी कम्पनियों को काम करने की छूट नहीं दी जानी चाहिये। मुझे लगता है कि दिन-ब-दिन हमारे यहां कारखानों में परदेशी लोग नौकरियों में, कारखानों में ग्रधिक्राधिक संख्या में आ रहे हैं और जो हमारे कारखाने भी चल रहे हैं उनके अन्दर भी उनकी संख्या बढ़ रही है। परदेशियों को आप ज्यादा सहायित्वें देते हैं लेकिन यहां वालों को नहीं देते। जब कारखाने

यहां लग जाते हैं तो देखा जाता है कि यहां के जो टेक्नीशियन होते हैं, क्लर्क होते हैं या दूसरे लोग होते हैं उनको तो १००, १५०, २०० या ३०० रुपया दिया जाता है और जो परदेशी आदमी वे लाते हैं उनको पांच हजार, सात हजार और आठ हजार दिया जाता है। उनकी जरूरत है या नहीं, सचमुच वे लोग इतने काबिल हैं या नहीं, एक्सपर्ट हैं या नहीं, इसके बारे में ठीक से छानबीन होनी चाहिये। मेरी विनती है कि इस के बारे में भी आपको सोचना चाहिये।

**Dr. Vijaya Ananda** (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I support the Budget proposals wholeheartedly. I can assure you that you will have no occasion to ring the bell while I am speaking because I believe in brevity.

May I congratulate the hon. Finance Minister for his excellent Budget that he has presented to this House. It is because of the needs of the country and we have an ambitious Plan ahead of us that the Budget is made accordingly.

The hon. Finance Minister has had to play on a very difficult wicket. He has batted admirably and his placing of the field has been superb. His bowling has been so excellent that he has not allowed his opponents to score.

I do not belong to the business community. I belong to the sphere connected with sports. Even so, I happened to look at some of the Calcutta newspapers and one paper, which represents the business community of Calcutta, said the following which I would just like to quote. The name of the journal is *Capital*, a weekly journal of commerce, industry and finance. It says:

"The general verdict on the Indian Budget for 1961-62 has so far been remarkably favourable. The Finance Minister must be gratified at the lack of serious protest with which his proposals to relieve the public of no less than Rs. 60-odd crores have been

received. Even the Budget forecasters appear to be satisfied; for once their predictions have not been hopelessly wide of the mark. All this is an impressive tribute to the country's willingness to shoulder almost any tax burden in the name of development provided some care is taken to ensure that it is fairly distributed, it appears designed without too close attention to ideological considerations, and it makes at least a gesture towards improving incentives. Somehow, despite its many contradictions and lost opportunities, Mr. Desai's Budget has succeeded in creating this impression, partly, no doubt, because past experience tells us it could have been much worse. It is the relief felt on this score which seems to account for much of the apparent enthusiasm for the Budget as a whole, and for the comparative absence of carping comments on its many blemishes. The country considers it has got off lightly, there is general satisfaction at the buoyant state of the economy and few appear to feel they have been hit unfairly. Mr. Desai would appear to have achieved the virtually impossible."

This paper represents the business community of Calcutta and this is the view taken by them.

I was very happy to see that associations connected with sport are to be exempted from Income-tax. Indeed this is a great thing, because it will just do that very thing which was required for these associations. They were very badly off and it was difficult for them to make both ends meet, and by his concession in letting them off the Income-tax, Mr. Desai has done a great thing for sport in general.

I was not here at the time when the President's Address was discussed and debated; I was away at Banaras in connection with the Queen's visit. So I take this opportunity of saying

[Shri Vijaya Ananda]

something in general, because when the Budget discussion is on, during the general debate one can talk on anything under the sun. Of course I will not discuss anything that is not exactly to the point.

I had in view that in India a fund should be created, so that every citizen of this country has to go through two years' military training. Whether he be of this community or that community, big or small, he must go through that training for two years. In France, every man born in that country has to go through a period of two years' military training. It also means that it teaches you discipline, how to obey your commander. Apart from that, my suggestion is not for the purpose of conquering any country, but for the safety of the country and also to bring about a feeling in the people that they must obey their commanders. And it will be a great day to see every man having such a training.

In addition to that, I would like to see more funds allocated for compulsory education.

I would also like to see stadia go up in every town of this country and sports encouraged. I am no lover of Hitler or his ways or methods, but he brought up Germany from scratch to a height which, if alone he had done the right thing, Germany would not have lost and gone down the way it did. It was all due to physical training. He insisted that every boy from school level should go through a course of physical training. Thus the body was trained and the mind played its own part. So it is absolutely essential that we should have compulsory physical training in schools also, physical drill, so that the boys are made to go through that an hour or two. And unless they do that, the boys should not be allowed to appear for any examination. That is one way of keeping the boy away from evil. And that would be a great day to see the Indian boy going through his physical drill and also

having military training. For that funds are required, and I feel that the hon. the Finance Minister should give more and more funds so that we have stadia and more sports in this country. That is one way of keeping the youngster away from evil. If he plays healthy games, he will have no time to dabble in other things.

Since we are building up this country and we look forward to be the foremost country in Asia—and so it is—I feel there is another thing that is necessary, because we want quick transport, and transport is the main thing as they have in Italy and Germany. These countries have very big roads, so that transport moves quickly from one end to the other. We find in this country level crossings at various places. They are an infernal nuisance, you have to wait for an hour before the gates open. It would be a very nice thing if some of these matters are taken into account and bridges are made so that traffic could be quickly got through and transport could be a thing that we could be proud of. So these things have to be attended to.

There is one other thing, and that is this. Japan has given yen credit and the United States have given dollars for the purpose of building a railway line to take the iron ore from Madhya Pradesh to Visakhapatnam. This, I understand, has been lying idle, and it is high time that something is done in this direction, so that the stuff that lies at Visakhapatnam is taken away quickly. And what I do want is that the Visakhapatnam port should be developed to be the envy of all other ports of the world. I look to the Finance Minister to help the port of Visakhapatnam and the district of Visakhapatnam also. I know he has to deal with the whole of India and to ask him to do that particularly means that he would have to set aside something else. But Visakhapatnam being a port, I do feel that he could easily do something to make that port the best in India.

I was also very happy to see that the hon. the Finance Minister has been encouraging tourism by not taxing the new hotels that would come up in the next five years. Indeed, it is a great thing, because that will give enough encouragement for people to build hotels. When tourists come in great numbers, foreign exchange is coming in, and that is very helpful to the country. So this was a great idea on the part of the Finance Minister to exempt the new hotels from tax.

In the concluding remarks of Mr. Desai which I happened to read, he said:

"We have chosen for ourselves certain social and economic goals. We must do our utmost to achieve them. This will mean hard work and sacrifice for sometime to come. But there is promise of a rich reward in the shape of higher standards of living, more employment opportunities and a better socio-economic system."

Well, these were the words of the Finance Minister and I have very great pleasure in supporting the budget and wish more strength to his elbow.

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कर और करदाता की बात जब हम सोचते हैं तो खयाल आता है कि हमारे सदन में हर साल बजट पेश किया जाता है, लेकिन अब की मर्तबा हम आशा करते थे कि शायद करदाता की कमर टेक्स के बोझ से नहीं तोड़ी जायेगी। लेकिन हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान की पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं और दूसरे दूसरे निर्माण कार्यों को सफल बनाने के लिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि करदाता कर देता रहे। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि किसी देश के निर्माण कार्य को सफल बनाने के लिये कर की जरूरत है। लेकिन अ.ज. में सदन का ध्यान हिन्दुस्तान में बढ़ती हुई बेकारी की तरफ ले जाना चाहता हूँ और इस के साथ साथ उस कर के लगने के बाद एक मध्यम वर्ग के या मामूली इन्सान

की हालत क्या होगी, इस का भी कुछ नकशा खींचना चाहता हूँ। मैं उन व्यक्तियों में से हूँ जो यह कहना नहीं चाहते कि देश में कोई भी उन्नति नहीं हुई है। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि उन्नति हुई है। और उन्नति होगी और हिन्दुस्तान का स्थान एक दिन दूसरे देशों के मुकाबले में ज्यादा ऊंचा होगा। लेकिन आज टेक्स के बोझ से लोगों की कमर टूट चुकी है। कुर्बानी करनी चाहिये और जिन्दगी की कुछ आहूति देश के निर्माण में लगनी चाहिये, यह बात सही हो सकती है। लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ हमें यह भी सोचना है कि क्या करदाता की हालत ऐसी है कि वह और कर दे सके। कहा यह जायेगा कि यह रुपया आयेगा कहाँ से? मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय शायद इस देश के बारे में मुझ से ज्यादा सोचते हैं और उन के सोचने की शक्ति भी शायद मुझ से ज्यादा है, लेकिन क्या यह बात सत्य नहीं है कि देश को आजादी मिलने के १३ साल बाद भी एक तरफ महलों में रहने वालों ने अपने और महल बना लिये और दूसरी तरफ जिस की आमदनी १०० ६० थी उसके पैसे की कीमत मंहगाई की वजह से ६० या ७० रुपये रह गई? ७० रुपया पाने वाले की आमदनी ४० रुपया रह गई है और यह हकीकत है कि कुछ घर ऐसे भी हैं जहाँ कि फाकाकशी की नौबत आ गई है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले कलकत्ते में एक दुर्घटना हुई जोकि अखबारों में सुर्खी की शकल में आई थी और वह इस प्रकार है कि एक होम्योपैथिक डाक्टर जोकि क्वालिफाइड थे उन्होंने ८ महीने या ९ महीने मुतवातिर कोशिश की कलकत्ते जैसे शहर में कि किसी तरह से वे अपना और अपने परिवार का भरण पोषण कर सकें। ८ साल का हंसता खेलता हुआ बच्चा, उनकी धर्मपत्नी और दो और भी दूसरे आमदमी उनके परिवार में थे। कलकत्ता जैसी जगह में उसको एक मुट्ठी आटा नहीं मिला और अन्त में यह हालत हुई कि उस शस्स ने तेजाब पिला कर अपने बच्चे को मारा,

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

अपनी बीवी को मारा और खुद मरा

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक पिता हो कर अपने पुत्र को किस तरीके से जहर दे सकता है यह सोचने की बात है। क्या यह इस बात का सबूत नहीं है कि आज बेकारी इतनी बढ़ चुकी है कि एक नौजवान की जीविका धारण करने मौका जब नहीं मिला तो उसने अपने हंसते खेलते हुए बच्चे को मारा। अभी मेरे एक दोस्त ने कहा कि "ही मस्ट बी वैरी इनकौम्प्टेंट" अब इस सदन में बैठ कर मैं जानता हूँ कि हम लोग ज्यादा कौम्प्टेंट बन चुके हैं...

श्री राधे लाल शर्मा (उज्जैन): मेरा मतलब था कि अगर वह डाक्टर होशियार होता तो बीमारों की संख्या तो देश में बढ़ रही है वह कुछ न कुछ कमा ही सकता था।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : यहां सदन में तो यह बात है और बाहर देश में यह धारणा है और रूलिंग क्लास के पेपर्स के एडिटोरियल्स देखिये उन में लिखा है कि हमारा सम्य समाज कहां जा रहा है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे लोग जिन के कि हाथों में शासन की बागडोर है, इस के बारे में ध्यान करें। देश में बेकारी निरन्तर बढ़ती जा रही है और उस के साथ जो कुछ भी लोगों की हड्डियों में खून का आखिरी कतरा रह चुका था वह भी कर की शकल में निकाला जा रहा है। यह तो ठीक है कि करों से वसूल हुआ रुपया इस देश के निर्माण कार्यों में लगाया जायगा लेकिन यह तो देख लिया जाय कि लोगों में अब और अधिक देने की शक्ति रह भी गयी है अथवा नहीं।

हम इनडाइरेक्ट टैक्सेशन के जरिए देश के रिसोर्सेज को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं लेकिन इसी के साथ दूसरी तरफ फिजूल-खर्ची का आलम अगर देखा जाय तो मैं उसको देख कर कभी कभी दंग रह जाता हूँ। मेहमान नवाजी में करोड़ों रुपया हमारे देश में खर्च होता है। यह देश की एक परम्परा है कि मेहमाननवाजी की जाय। यह बात सच है। मैं जानता हूँ कि अगर मैं इस सदन में कहूँ कि हमारी इंग्लैंड की महारानी के स्वागतार्थ जरूरत से ज्यादा खर्च हुआ तो यह कोई गलत बात न होगी। उस दिन कहा गया कि महारानी के स्वागत पर भारत सरकार ने २५ करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया जिस के लिए कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि यह फीगर फैनटास्टिक है लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं बताया कि आगिर २५ करोड़ नहीं तो फिर कितना रुपया खर्च हुआ, १५ करोड़ रुपया खर्च हुआ या २ करोड़ रुपया भी खर्च हुआ या नहीं हुआ। कलकत्ते में जाकर जब मैंने महारानी के स्वागत का इंतजाम देखा तो मैं तो दंग रह गया। मुझे वहां जाने पर मालूम हुआ कि जिन जिन इलाकों से वह गुजरने वाली थीं उन इलाकों के जितने भी फकीर थे, जितने भी बैगस, गरीब आदमी थे, अपाहिज थे, और जो बेचारे भीख मांगते थे उनको वहां से कोसों दूर हटा दिया गया ताकि हिन्दुस्तान में भिखारी भी रहते हैं यह शकल कहीं महारानी की आंखों के सामने न आ जाय.....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य की तकरीर से आ जायेगी।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : अब अगर महारानी पूछ बैठतीं कि तुम्हारे देश में फकीर क्यों हैं तो हाथ जोड़ कर हम उन से यह कह देते कि यह देन तुम्हारी और तुम्हारे

पिता की है जो कि हमारे देश में आज भी भिखारी हैं लेकिन जहां एक तरफ भिखारी हैं वहां दूसरी तरफ भाखड़ा नंगल भी बना है। लोगों की हालत सुधरी भी है। इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि आज अगर ६० करोड़ रुपये में पूरा प्लान आपका काम-याब हो जाता है तो मैं लोगों से यह जरूर कहूंगा कि उन को कर देने चाहिए। लेकिन आप देखिये कि छोटे छोटे उद्योग और दस्तकारी के धंधे बंद होते जा रहे हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी कल मैं कानपुर में था। वहां पर जो लोग बर्तन बनाने का काम करते हैं उन्होंने कहा कि इस एक्साइज ड्यूटी के बाद यह उनका बर्तन बनाने का धंधा चाहे वह कानपुर में हो अथवा मुरादाबाद में, वह चल नहीं सकेगा। स्मॉल कोटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को आखिर किस तरीके से आप प्रोत्साहन दीजियेगा? अगर इस तरह से टैक्सेशन से जमा करते हैं तो मैं माननीय मंत्री से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस बात को सोचें कि आखिर यह छोटे छोटे उद्योग को चलाने वाले जन को कि प्रोत्साहन देना हमारा फर्ज है किस तरीके से यह सफलतापूर्वक चल सकते हैं।

मुपारी के ऊपर, किरोसीन आयल के ऊपर एक्साइज ड्यूटी बढ़ा दी गई है। मैं जिस प्रदेश से आया हूँ उस प्रदेश में कोयले का संकट है। अब उत्तर प्रदेश की हालत ऐसी है कि जब वहां पर अन्न की कमी थी तो कोयला था और जब अन्न मिलने लगा तो कोयला नहीं मिलता और कोयले का वहां पर संकट है। कोयले के संकट को देख कर वहां पर लोगों ने जनता स्टोव और दूसरे स्टोव खरीदने शुरू किये अब यह मट्टी के तेल पर टैक्स बढ़ा देने के कारण मेरे खयाल में स्टोव भी नहीं जला पायेंगे। अब स्टोव भी न

जले और चूल्हा भी न जले ऐसी उपाय तो हमारे घर में नहीं हैं जो बगैर तेल और कोयले के खाना पका लें। मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं पर तो लोगों को सहारा मिले। उनकी कमर टूट चुकी है और मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या जनता की कमर तोड़ने के बाद हम देश को आगे बढ़ा सकेंगे?

डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेशन की बात जब भी आती है हमारे माननीय मंत्री कहते हैं कि क्या डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेशन इस सीमा तक पहुंच चुका है कि अब उसमें और अधिक बढ़ोत्तरी की गुंजाइश नहीं है और उससे ज्यादा रुपया आखिर आयेगा कहां से। लेकिन मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी भी उस दिशा में गुंजाइश है। मैं जब अपने प्रान्त में देखता हूँ तो मैं आश्चर्य में पड़ जाता हूँ। इनकम टैक्स कहिए, वैल्यू टैक्स कहिए, गिफ्ट टैक्स कहिए या सेल्स टैक्स की बात अगर आप लें तो हमारे पूंजीपति और धनिक लोगों ने किसी भी चीज का पेमेंट करना सीखा ही नहीं है और हमारे सरमायेदारों ने तो कसम खा रखी है कि कोई भी टैक्स उनको देना नहीं है क्योंकि टैक्स न देना ही वह ही उनका मलघन है। वही उनका कैपिटल है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज उन टैक्सों की बसूली अगर सही तरीके से हो, लूपहोल जितने भी हों उनको जोड़ा जाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कुछ पैसा आ सकता है।

मैं कहता हूँ कि आज देश में मेहमान-नवाजी करने के लिये बंगाल के मुख्य मंत्री ने एक सवाल के जवाब में कहा कि मलिका मुअज्जमा जो हमारे देश में आई खास कर कलकत्ते में उनके स्वागत पर जो रुपया खर्च हुआ उससे ज्यादा रुपया श्री बुलगानिन और शुश्चेव के आने के समय हुआ था। क्या

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

सांत्वना है ? अब यह क्या बात हुई कि हमने तब रुपया ज्यादा खर्च किया था और अब महारानी के स्वागत पर कम रुपया खर्च किया है । मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारा देश एक गरीब देश है और गांधी जी के आदर्शों पर अगर ईमानदारी के साथ हम चलना चाहते हैं तो हमारे देश की मेहमाननवाजी की वह परम्परा होनी चाहिये जो कि हमारे नेता ने हमको बतलाई थी और जो कि देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को देखते हुए हो ।

मैं समझता हूँ कि जिन चीजों पर वित्त मन्त्री महोदय ने टैक्स लगाया है उनके बारे में दुबारा विचार किया जाय । राज्य सभा में उन्होंने जो तकरीर की उसको मैंने गौर से पढ़ा । वैसे मैं कोई अर्थ-शास्त्र का पंडित नहीं हूँ और विद्यार्थी भी अच्छा नहीं था । मैं उन तमाम चीजों को समझने की कोशिश करता हूँ जिस तरीके से कि एक विद्यार्थी समझने की कोशिश करता है लेकिन मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है कि आखिर यह इनडाइरैक्ट टैक्सेशन के आधार पर अगर इस तरीके से लोगों की कमर तोड़ दी जाय तो देश को चलायेगा कौन । मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान अच्छा भी बन सकता है और बनेगा लेकिन वह इस तरह से बन सकता है कि सरमायेदारों से सरमाया लें और गरीब की मेहनत लें । ऐसा करने से मैं समझता हूँ कि दोनों को मिला कर एक नया हिन्दुस्तान बन सकता है । विदेशी पूंजी हमारे देश में आ रही है । उस के लिये कोई ऐतराज नहीं है लेकिन कभी कभी मुझे खतरा पैदा होता है कि कहीं राजनैतिक तरीके से हम किसी बंधन के अन्तर्गत न चले जायं । विदेशी पूंजी हमारे देश में आये लेकिन उसी के साथ कोई बन्धन कोई जंजीर की आखिरी कड़ी जो कि हिन्दुस्तान से हम लोग दूर कर चुके हैं, कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जंजीर की आखिरी कड़ी की शकल में हमारे गिर्द पड़ जाय । यह विश्वास किया जाय कि जब मैं यहां पर इसकी चर्चा करता हूँ

और खास कर अपने देश के प्रधान मन्त्री की आलोचना करता हूँ तो बहुत सोच समझ कर करता हूँ और देश के भले की खातिर करता हूँ वरना मैं तो उनके चरणों की धूल के बराबर भी नहीं हूँ . . . . .

चौ० रणवीर सिंह (रोहतक) : यह आप कैसे स्वप्न देखते हैं ?

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : अब जनता की आपने कोई मनोपली नहीं ले रखी है । मैं भी जनता में काम करता हूँ और जब मैं जनता में एक हाहाकार देखता हूँ और असन्तोष पाता हूँ तो एक नागरिक और खास तौर से संसद् का सदस्य होने के नाते मेरा यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि मैं सही तस्वीर इस सदन के जरिए सरकार तक पहुंचाऊँ और आप इसका विश्वास करें कि जब मैं जनता में सर्वत्र हाहाकार देखता हूँ तो मुझे उससे कोई खुशी नहीं होती है और मेरी यह कदापि मंशा या इच्छा नहीं होती है कि मैं उस असन्तोष और हाहाकार से कोई नाजायज फायदा उठाऊँ । मैं तो यह सोचता हूँ कि अगर हमारे देश में लोगों का विश्वास प्रजातान्त्रिक उसूलों से उठ गया, तो फिर इस देश का क्या होगा ।

अभी हमारी मुअज्जिब बहन, सुश्री मणि-बेन पटेल, ने बम्बई की हालत बताई कि वहां शराब बन्द होने से खुशहाली आ गई है । यह तो ठीक है, लेकिन जिस बस्ती की बात उन्होंने इस सिलसिले में कही, वैसी बस्ती मुझे तो बम्बई में नहीं मिली, जहां लोग खुश हैं, अच्छा कपड़ा पहनते हैं, जिनके बच्चे अच्छे स्कूलों में पढ़ते हैं । मैंने उन इलाकों को देखा है, जिन को मजदूरों की बस्ती कहा जाता है, लेकिन मुझे यह सब देखने को नहीं मिला ।



मेरा ख्याल है कि इन टैक्सों के बढ़ने से जो परिवार सत्तर रुपये में चल सकता था, अब उसको पचासी या नब्बे रुपये खर्च करने पड़ेंगे। सबाल यह है कि ये पन्द्रह या बीस रुपये कहां से आयेंगे। होगा यह कि अगर हमने बच्चों की फ्रीस दे दी, तो मकान का किराया रह जायगा और अगर किराया दे दिया, तो बच्चों की फ्रीस रह जायगी और कर्ज का बोझ धीरे धीरे बढ़ता जायगा। अन्त में इस कर्ज से परेशान होकर लोग आत्म-हत्या करेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान में आत्म-हत्याओं की तादाद और बढ़ेगी।

जब हम लोगों ने सरकारी कर्मचारियों की तरफ से कहा था कि सरकार प्राइस लाइन को होल्ड नहीं कर सकती है और वह चीजों के दाम घटाने में नाकामयाब हुई है, तो इस पर नुक्ता-चीनी हुई थी। आज मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्राइस लाइन को होल्ड करने के लिये और चीजों के दाम बढ़ने से रोकने के लिये क्या योजनाएँ अपनाई जा रही हैं। आज हम देखते हैं कि चीजों के दाम उसी तरीके से बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। उनके रुकने के आसार नजर नहीं आ रहे हैं। इस हालत में अगर सरकारी कर्मचारी कहते हैं कि हमारा महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ना चाहिए, तो सरकार की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि यह राष्ट्र-विरोधी मांग है, यह मांग मत करो।

अभी कल मर्दुमशुमारी से मालूम हुआ है कि अब दिल्ली की आबादी छब्बीस लाख हो चुकी है, लेकिन अगर आज सदन में यह कहा जाय कि चूँकि दिल्ली की आबादी छब्बीस लाख हो गई है, इसलिये उस को "ए" क्लास सिटी कर दिया जाय, तो कहा जायगा कि इसके लिये फ़ाइनेंसिज नहीं हैं। आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि जब वकिंग क्लास

या मध्यम वर्ग के लोग कोई आर्थिक मांग करते हैं, तो सरकार की ओर से उन मांगों को राजनैतिक तरीके से डील किया जाता है। चीजों के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं और हमारी कमर टूट रही है और अगर लोगों पर साठ करोड़ रुपये का बोझ और डाल दिया जाय, तो वे कहां तक चल सकेंगे? आज समय आ गया है कि अपने रिसोर्सिज को हासिल करने के लिये हमें कुछ और कदम उठाने चाहिये।

इस विषय में जब बैंक्स वे: राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग की जाती है, तो कहा जाता है कि वह मुमकिन नहीं है। पालाई बैंक और लक्ष्मी बैंक के फ़ेल होने पर सरकार ने यह महसूस किया कि बैंक्स का रेशनलाइजेशन होना चाहिए, उन का एमलगमेशन होना चाहिए, ताकि बैंकों में लोगों का पैसा महफूज रहे। लेकिन यह एमलगमेशन की बात कैसे आई? जब पालाई बैंक फ़ेल हुआ, तो वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने यह सोचा कि डिजाजिटर्स को ऐसी प्रोटेक्शन, शोर्टी और सिक्योरिटी दी जाये कि उन के दिमाग में बैंकों वे: फ़ैल्योर की बात न आये। वित्त मंत्री महोदय मुझे जवाब दें कि बैंक्स का राष्ट्रीयकरण क्यों नहीं हो सकता है। इसी तरह यद्यपि लाइफ़ इन्शोरेंस को नेशनलाइज्ड किया जा चुका है, लेकिन जेनरल इन्शोरेंस के बारे में कहा जाता है कि उस को नेशनलाइज्ड करना मुमकिन नहीं है। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे इन तमाम प्लानों को कामयाब बनाने के लिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम सरमाये का इन्तज़ाम करें—जहां पर भी सरमाया है, उस को खोज कर वहां से निकालें और करदाता पर कर का बोझ डालते वक्त यह सोचें कि वह ज़िन्दा रहे, खत्म न हो जाये।

इन शब्दों के साथ अन्त में मैं यह कहूँगा कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय टैक्स एग्जैम्पशन के

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

बारे में फिर से सोचें और मैं नम्र निवेदन करता हूँ कि उन के पास जो रिप्रेजेंटेशन आये हैं—चाहे वे बर्तन वालों के हैं और चाहे हैंडलूम वालों के— उन पर वह विचार करें और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अगर वह विचार करेंगे, तो कुछ न कुछ उन को रिलीफ़ दिया जायगा।

**Shri Achar (Mangalore):** Most of the speeches have been concentrated on the question of taxation. No doubt, that is probably the most important aspect. I too would like to say a few words on that, but before that, I would like to draw the attention of the House and of the Finance Minister to another important aspect which does not seem to have attracted the attention of most of the Members. No doubt, new taxes immediately attract us, but if we take up the Budget as a whole, one very important aspect is with regard to the capital expenditure of Government. If the revenue budget is somewhere about a thousand crores of rupees, the capital budget, that is, the budget of the Government as a borrower, as a lender to the several States, the several organisations, corporations and also the State treasuries, is almost equal to it; that is, the amount of expenditure in the capital budget is almost equal; it is of the order of a thousand crores of rupees, if I am not mistaken. If we look at the Budget papers, we find that sufficient importance does not seem to have been given to this side of the problem. Of course, I have tried to understand the problem, but it is rather difficult to find out exactly where we stand, how the amounts are lent, how we realise the interest and so on. As I said, this is a very important side of the Budget involving a thousand crores of rupees. I wish we had more information on this summarised in a way which the ordinary layman can understand.

After visiting some of the important projects, I have begun to ask myself whether we are not spending too much on them. So much is said

about economy, about the pay of Government servants and so on. But, to me, the more important question appears to be this, namely, how these amounts are spent, and whether they are being spent economically. I remember that the Finance Minister appointed a special officer for this purpose, namely to go into this question and find out where economy could be effected. But when an ordinary layman goes to these several projects or other important places, he begins to feel whether these amounts are not spent as economically as they could be.

Take, for instance, the river valley projects. I had been to some of these projects. For example, when I went to the Tungabhadra project, I found Kailas on one side, and Vaikuntam on the other. I am given only one instance, but it is not only there; wherever we go, one thing that strikes a layman most is the vast expenditure on buildings. So far as office accommodation etc. is concerned of course, buildings are absolutely necessary, and persons will have to be protected from sun and rain. But I want the Finance Minister to consider this aspect of the question, namely whether there cannot be considerable economy on this side.

Take, for example, even the many engineering colleges and other institutions that are started. Are such huge buildings necessary for them? Of course, buildings are necessary; I do not deny that. For instance, we hear about Japan; what is spent on buildings there is very little; probably this may be due to their physical conditions, that is, the volcanic conditions prevailing there, and, therefore, they want only buildings of paper and cardboard. All the same, the more important aspect is the imparting of instruction in colleges and other institutions in buildings which are just necessary for protection from sun, water and rain; I think such types of buildings may be sufficient, especially in a poor country like ours. The point is whether it is necessary that

the amounts that are being spent now should be spent at all, and whether we are not spending too much. But the fact is that a layman like me often feels that in these directions, we are spending too much.

I request in all humility that this question be gone into and, if necessary, a careful scrutiny made as to how we are spending on these buildings. Anyhow, what has already been spent has been spent; nobody can do anything about it. But at least in regard to this matter in future, we should do something. For example, at the end of the Third Five Year Plan, our loans would amount to Rs. 10,000 crores, if I am not mistaken. I would appeal to the Finance Minister to consider this aspect of the question. If countries like Japan could get on with very small buildings and can manage things in that manner—for example, as I pointed out, in several institutions, colleges and things like that, they give the best of instruction, without at the same time sending much—we should be able to do so.

Now, I would like to pass on, as others, have done, to the taxation question. About a few months ago, I happened to read an article by Shri P. S. Mahalonobis who, if I am not mistaken, is our economic adviser. The sole argument in that article was that the income in the agricultural sector has increased considerably, they have reaped the benefits of one or two Plans and so some method must be found out to tax this section of the public. I felt while reading the Budget proposals this time regarding taxation whether the underlying principle was not this theory that the agricultural section has gained very much on account of these Plans and so they should be taxed more for the purpose of resources. I beg to differ on this question, that the agricultural section as a whole has made such profits and there is capacity to pay there and methods should be devised for taxing it.

It may be that in the agricultural sector, some of the bigger landholders, people who are having some industries also there, may be having higher income. But I am afraid that that does not represent the exact situation of the agricultural population. I have tried to investigate this matter in a few villages surrounding my own village. If we collect figures, what we find is that a few families in a village of 500 people, some 10 or 15 families, have a higher income, better fertilisers, better modes of cultivation etc. But if we take the population in the village as a whole, as the Agricultural Labour Inquiry Committee has also reported, we find that the income of the ordinary villagers out of a population of 500, except for 30 or 40 persons, in the villages I have examined, is less. On this question, the Second Report of the Agricultural Labour Inquiry Committee may also be considered in the Finance Ministry.

As regards indirect taxation, I do not deny that for the Third Plan we have to find resources. I am not arguing indirect taxation as such, but we have to see this aspect of the question, whether in imposing this indirect taxation on the agricultural section, who constitute more than 80 per cent. of the population, we are not imposing a higher taxation on the agricultural people. Let us take even this year's budget proposals. Take, for example, cloth, mill-made cloth, woollen cloth, copper, zinc, betel-nuts etc. Many of these things are purely affecting the village population. So out of the taxation, the major portion will have to come from the agricultural people.

As I said, we want resources for our Plan. In fact, I congratulate our Finance Minister on coming out with proposals to completely cover the deficit of Rs. 60 crores, even giving a talking point at the time when general elections are coming which I find al-

[Shri Achar]

ready the Communist leader has taken up, the question of the common man and taxation. Conceding even that, I would submit that we have to find resources. There is no doubt about it. I congratulate the Finance Minister on coming out with a bold budget even though the elections are coming. But at the same time, we have also to look at the other aspect of the question whether the proportion of increase as between direct and indirect taxes is fair. So far as direct taxes are concerned, the new proposals would yield only about Rs. 3 crores whereas the amount expected to be realised from indirect taxes is Rs. 57 crores. No doubt, everybody must make sacrifices for the Plan, but I want to know whether it is also not necessary that people with higher incomes, of more than Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 3,500, should be taxed more. Even in the rate, there may be an increase. We know, for example, that in Britain whenever they wanted—at least in the earlier days—more money, the easiest method was to raise the rate of income-tax. When we are thinking of taxing people who are living from hand to mouth in the villages, when we are thinking of taxing betel-nuts—in our parts, people say that arecanut has become more costly than coconut—I only submit that the question of taxing the higher income groups, who have the capacity to pay income tax, who have at least more capacity to pay than the village people, is an important question that should be considered. Most of the people in villages have an income which probably is not even Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 per month.....

**An Hon. Member:** Per year.

17 hrs.

**Shri Achar:** Per year.

Of course, it is a well known fact that the income of an ordinary agriculturist is, except for a few rich people in the villages. Even the income I estimated probably is too much. But when we are taxing even these

people, and there is an increase and they are to sacrifice, is it not necessary, I submit, that people with higher income also must be made to pay something more? Three crores and 57 crores are certainly disproportionate. I would appeal to the Finance Minister to consider at least some of the items once again, and see whether some relief could not be given in those directions.

As you have rung the bell, I would only mention a few of them and I will conclude. I would also like to say, so far as newsprint is concerned, that it is a very important and essential item. There also, the income from the new taxation is very little. I would appeal to the Finance Minister to omit that. And then the few items that I have in mind are especially, cloth, betel nuts, coffee, tea and kerosene oil. I would appeal that extra taxation on these must go, and that should be made up by having a little higher rate of income-tax. Thank you.

**श्री राधेलाल व्यास :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो बजट हमारे सामने पेश हुआ है, और उस के द्वारा जो देश की स्थिति सामने रखी गई है, उस को देख कर सभी को प्रसन्नता होगी। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि पिछले दस वर्षों में हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था के प्रायः सभी क्षेत्रों में अच्छी प्रगति हुई है। औद्योगिक उत्पादन में जहां ६६ प्रतिशत वृद्धि हुई है वहां खाद्य की उपज में भी ३३ प्रतिशत वृद्धि हुई है और हमारी योजनायें प्रथम और द्वितीय, दोनों काफी सफल रही हैं। दूसरी योजना समाप्त हो रही है और हम अब तीसरी योजना को हाथ में लेने वाले हैं। इन योजनाओं का उद्देश्य, जैसा कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा, मुख्य रूप से जो हमारे करोड़ों लोग गरीबी में जकड़े हुए हैं उन को गरीबी के चंगुल से छुड़ाना है, और इसीलिये जो तीसरी पंच वर्षीय योजना है वह बहुत बड़ी योजना के रूप में सामने रखी गई है।

योजना को सफल बनाने के लिये टैक्स भी लगाने की जरूरत है क्योंकि पैसा भी चाहिये, और यह भी सही है कि हम हमेशा नोट छाप कर उसे पूरा नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस दृष्टि से जो टैक्स आदि लगाये गये हैं उन को कोई गैर वाजिब नहीं कह सकता। यह भी सही है कि हमारे देश की आबादी काफी है और करोड़ों गरीब लोगों के लिये यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि वे भी अपने ऊपर कुछ कर का भार उठायें। इस दृष्टि से टैक्स के जो प्रस्ताव रखे गये हैं, मैं समझता हूँ, वे बिल्कुल उपयुक्त हैं। जहाँ तक लोगों का सवाल है, उन को टैक्सों के देने के बारे में उतनी शिकायत नहीं है, बल्कि अगर देश की गरीबी को मिटाना है, लोगों को सुखी बनाना है, तो लोग और भी अधिक त्याग करने को तैयार हो जायेंगे। गरीब भी कुछ न कुछ धन दे देता है। यह हमारे देश की परम्परा रही है कि अपने समाज के लिये, अपने देश के लिये लोगों ने अपनी जान तक दे दी है, इस लिये वे थोड़ा टैक्स देने में गुरेज नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन लोगों को जो शिकायत है वह यह कि जो पैसा लिया जाता है, उस का कहीं दुरुपयोग तो नहीं हो रहा है। लोगों का ऐसा अनुमान है कि इस पर जितनी देख रेख रखनी चाहिये, जितनी निगाह रखनी चाहिये कि वह पैसा फिजूल खर्च न हो, अनुत्पादक कार्यों में खर्च न हो, और उस का ठीक रिटर्न मिले, एक एक पैसे का सदुपयोग हो, उतनी रकबी नहीं जा रही है। इस के बारे में लोगों को शंकायें हैं और उस के लिये कारण भी हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने और दूसरे मंत्रियों ने बार बार यह कहा है कि हमारे देश में चपरासी वगैरह की जितनी संख्या है, उतनी दूसरे देशों में नहीं रहती है। ठीक है आप टैक्स लगाइये, पैसा उगाहिये, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या समय नहीं आ गया है जब हम को विचार करना चाहिये कि हमारे यहां की एकानमी कहां ऐसी है जिस में खर्च कम किया जा सकता है। उस खर्च को कम कर के हम करोड़ों रुपया अपने परिश्रम से बचा कर योजना के महत्वपूर्ण कार्य में क्या नहीं लगा सकते हैं ?

कहा गया है कि नया रिफ्रूटमेंट हम ने बन्द कर दिया है और इस पालिसी को हम जारी रखना चाहते हैं। लेकिन यही काफी नहीं है। जब हम देखते हैं कि हमारे कर्मचारियों के घरों में बच्चों को रखने के लिये चपरासी हैं, खाना बनाने वाले चपरासी हैं, बाजार का काम करने वाले भी चपरासी हैं, तो हमें बड़ा दुःख होता है। जिन लोगों को बड़ी बड़ी तन्स्वाहें मिलती हैं, वे ऐसे काम करते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि केवल डाइरेक्शन्स इश्यू कर देने से काम नहीं थलेगा, इस के लिये कानून बना देना चाहिये कि जुर्माना होगा अगर कोई अधिकारी सरकारी कर्मचारियों से ऐसे काम लेगा, उन के इस काम को अपराध माना जायेगा और इस के लिये चालान हो कर न्यायालय से सजा भी मिल सकती है। इस बात को साफ कर दिया जाना चाहिये क्योंकि केवल डाइरेक्शन्स से या सर्कुलर इश्यू करने से यह चीज रुकने वाली नहीं है। मेरा विश्वास है कि चपरासी और दूसरे लोग काफी जागृत हो गये हैं, और मैं ने ऐसी जगहें देखी हैं जहां उन्होंने इस तरह के काम करने से इन्कार कर दिया है। वे घर का काम नहीं करेंगे भले ही वे वहां पर बैठे रहें। अगर उन की जरूरत न हो तो आप को उन की संख्या को कम करना चाहिये।

इसी तरह से कई जगहें ऐसी हैं जहां पर आप ने इन्स्पेक्टर वगैरह रखे हैं। हर एक डिपार्टमेंट अलग अलग उन को अपने काम के लिये मुकर्रर करते हैं। इस के बारे में भी जांच पड़ताल करने की जरूरत है कि क्या एक ही आदमी दो तीन महकमों का काम नहीं कर सकता। अगर इस तरह जागरूकता में काम किया जाय और काफी प्रयत्न किया जाय तो मेरा विश्वास है कि बहुत कुछ रुपये की बचत हो सकती है और खर्चा कम हो सकता है, और आप जो टैक्स का भार गरीब आदमियों पर अधिक डालते हैं, उस में भी कमी हो सकती है।

## [श्री राधेलाल व्यास ]

अपनी पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं के बारे में हम सब को अभिमान है, और जितनी प्रगति हुई है वह सराहनीय है। बाहर वाले भी जब यहां आते हैं तो उन को आश्चर्य होता है। लेकिन आखिर हमारी योजनाओं का उद्देश्य क्या है? आखिर लोगों को सन्तोष देना ही तो? आज कई ऐसी बातें हैं जिन की ओर ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। हमें केवल इस से सन्तोष नहीं करना है कि हम ने जो आंकड़े पंच वर्षीय योजना के लिये निर्धारित किये हैं उन को पूरा करना है या उन को पूरा करने के लिये रुपया जुटाना है या आज हमें टैक्स द्वारा या विदेशों से कर्ज ले कर वह करना है। यही काफी नहीं है कि हमारे आंकड़े पूरे हो जायें। देखना यह है कि जिन लोगों के लिये यह काम किये जाते हैं उन को पूरा सन्तोष होता है या नहीं।

एक चीज और मैं रखना चाहता हूं। हम ने कहा कि लोगों को न्याय मिलेगा। लेकिन आज हम क्या देखते हैं न्यायालयों में? न्याय महंगा हो गया है। कोर्ट फीज, प्रोसेस फीज वगैरह काफी बढ़ गई हैं और अदालतों में मुकदमे महीनों चलते हैं। मैं आप से आज की हालत क्या निवेदन करूं? आज से कुछ साल पहले जब हम अर्जेंट काफी के लिये ऐप्लाई करते थे तो २४ घंटों में वह हमें मिल जाती थी, लेकिन अब १५ दिन में वह नकल मिलती है। मामूली नकल में तो चार चार महीने लग जाते हैं और वह नहीं मिलती है। लोग पूछते हैं कि आखिर यह क्या स्थिति आ गई है। लोगों में यह चर्चा का विषय होता है और राजनीतिक तथा और तरह की टीका टिप्पणी होती है। चाहिये तो यह कि न्याय सुलभ हो, सस्ता हो और जल्दी मिले। लेकिन आज तो वर्षों तक मुकदमे चलते रहते हैं। आवश्यकता इस चीज की है कि अधु-

निक साधनों के द्वारा या पंचायतों को और अधिकार दे कर लोगों को न्याय दिया जाय।

इसी तरह से शिक्षा के क्षेत्र को लीजिये। काफी प्रगति हुई, काफी विद्यार्थी पढ़ रहे हैं और असंख्य कालेज, हायर सेकेंडरी स्कूल और हाई स्कूल, टेकनिकल स्कूल और कालेज, इंजीनियरिंग कालेज वगैरह खोले गये हैं। लेकिन इस सब के बावजूद हम सुनते हैं कि हमारी शिक्षा का स्टैण्डर्ड गिरता चला जा रहा है, चरित्र निर्माण जो मनुष्य और बालकों का होना चाहिये वह नहीं होता है। क्या यह एक महत्वपूर्ण बात नहीं है? क्या हमारी डिमाक्रेमी सफल हो जायेगी जब तक ठीक तरह की शिक्षा लोगों को नहीं मिलेगी? अब यह आसाम और जबलपुर के कांड क्यों हुए? यह लोगों को ठीक तरीके की शिक्षा न मिली होने के कारण घटित हुए। यह भ्रष्टाचार क्यों होता है, यह इन-एफिशिएंसी क्यों होती है? यह रीजनलिज्म, कस्टिज्म वगैरह क्यों फैलती है? यह सरकारी नौकरियों आदि देने के मामले में पक्षपात क्यों होता है। नौकरियां अपने अपने मिलने वालों को दे देते हैं। हालत यह हो गई है कि जुडिशिएरी भी उन से बची नहीं रह सकी है। जब मैं भावनगर गया था तो मुझे एक रिटायर्ड डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेशन जज ने बतलाया कि पहले डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेशन जज के लेवल तक कोई भी उंगली उठा कर नहीं देख सकता था लेकिन अब यह पक्षपात और करप्शन डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेशन जज की लेवल तक पहुंच गया है ऐसी लोग शंका करते हैं। पहले हाई-कोर्ट के जज की तरफ कोई उंगली नहीं उठा सकता था लेकिन अब वहां मिफारिशें वगैरह चलने लगी हैं। अब क्या यह सब बातें हमारे लिये अच्छी हैं? इन सब की रोक केवल सरकारें और कानून पास करने से ही नहीं हो सकेगी। इस के वास्ते हमें लोगों के दिल और दिमागों को तबदील करना

पड़ेगा। यह तब तक संभव न हो सकेगा जब तक कि ठीक तरीके से लोगों को शिक्षा न दी जाये और वह भी बचपन से। इसलिये इस और विशेष रूप से ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। यह तभी सम्भव होगा जब लोगों को मोरेल एजुकेशन भी दी जायेगी। जब ज्यादा से ज्यादा बोर्डिंग हाउसेज बनाये जायेंगे जहां कि विद्यार्थियों को रक्खा जायेगा और मुबह से शाम तक जो उन का दैनिक कार्यक्रम होता है उस पर ध्यान रक्खा जायेगा।

आज हमारे देश में सुरक्षा का सवाल भी सामने है। हम देखते हैं कि हमारे एक पड़ोसी राष्ट्र चीन ने हमारी सीमा का अतिक्रमण कर के हमारा कुछ भाग अनधिकृत रूप से दबा रक्खा है। उस के लिये यह कहा जाता है कि उस की रक्षा के लिये केवल आदमियों की ही जरूरत नहीं होगी अपितु अन्य तैयारियां भी करनी होंगी, यह बिलकुल ठीक है लेकिन यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि लोगों का मोरेल एक बहुत बड़ी आप में ताकत होती है। बगैर मोरेल के और बगैर मोरेल फोर्स के कोई भी युद्ध जीता नहीं जा सकता है और कोई भी कामयाबी हासिल नहीं की जा सकती है। पुराने जमाने में इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि यहां के लोग सावधान नहीं थे और तैयार नहीं थे और जिस का कि नतीजा यह हुआ कि मुट्ठी भर लोग बाहर से यहां आये और उन्होंने ने देश पर कब्जा कर लिया था। आज समय आ गया है जबकि हम को तमाम कालिजेज और हायर सेकेंडरी स्कूलों में कम्पलसरी मिलेटरी ट्रेनिंग की व्यवस्था करने की जरूरत है। हमें अपने नौजवानों को इस बात के लिये तैयार करना चाहिये कि देश में जबलपुर आदि जैसे कांडों को ले कर जो झगड़े वगैरह हो जाया करते हैं उन की रोकथाम करें और लोगों की जान और माल की हिफाजत करें। हमें उन को इस तरह से शिक्षित करना चाहिये कि समय पड़ने पर वे अपने आप को जोखिम में डालने को भी

तैयार हो जायें। अपने देश के नौजवानों को इस तरह की शिक्षा देने की आज बड़ी आवश्यकता है और इस और सरकार का विशेष रूप से ध्यान जाना चाहिये। अगर हम ने इस और ध्यान नहीं दिया तो जैसा कि कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने बतलाया एक समय ऐसा आ सकता है कि हमारी सारी करी कराई मेहनत पर पानी फिर जाय और एक गड़बड़ी और अव्यवस्था की स्थिति पैदा हो सकती है और जिस उद्देश्य के लिये हम आगे बढ़ रहे हैं वह बेकार हो सकता है।

एकमाइज ड्यूटी के बारे में मैं ने आप से निवेदन किया कि मैं उन का समर्थन करता हूं। हमें रिसोर्सेज बढ़ाने की जरूरत है। जैसेकि पहले कुछ राज्यों में ममलनू मैनूर, ट्रावनकोर-कोचीन, बीकानेर, ग्वालियर और इंदौर में सरकारी कर्मचारियों का लाइफ इश्योरेंस कम्पलसरी किया तो क्या हम अपने रिसोर्सेज को बढ़ाने के लिये, आमदनी को बढ़ाने के लिये इस लाइफ इश्योरेंस को सारे देश भर के सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिये कम्पलसरी नहीं कर सकते हैं? मेरी समझ में वह कम्पलसरी होनी चाहिये। उस का प्रीमियम भी कम हो और जो एजेंट को कमिशन दिया जाता है वह उस में से काट कर के यह कम्पलसरी इश्योरेंस की स्कीम लागू कर दी जाय तो मैं समझता हूं कि सरकारी नौकर इस का स्वागत ही करेंगे। यह योजना सरकारी कर्मचारियों के हित में ही होगी। इस के साथ ही देश में विकास कार्य करने के लिये आप को करोड़ों रुपया भी मिल जायगा। एक कम्पलसरी सेविंग हो जायेगी। मैं चाहता हूं कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करें और इस दिशा में कुछ न कुछ प्रयत्न करें।

इसी तरीके से इस इश्योरेंस को जितने भी बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं उन में भी इस को लागू कर देना चाहिये जिस से कि करोड़ों रुपयों की आमदनी हम को मिल जाय।

## [श्री राघेलाल व्यास]

दो शब्द मैं लोगों की हेल्थ के बारे में भी आप से कहना चाहूंगा। हमारे यहां अस्पताल बड़ी संख्या में खुलते जा रहे हैं और करोड़ों रुपया उस के लिये खर्च भी हो रहा है लेकिन उन बातों की तरफ कम ध्यान है जिन में कि पैसा खर्च करना नहीं होता है। अब नदियों का पानी गन्दा होता जा रहा है, तालाबों का पानी गन्दला हो रहा है, कुओं का पानी खराब है। इस गन्दगी को रोकने के लिये अभी तक कोई बात नहीं की गई है। मैं ने अखबारों में देखा कि अभी थोड़ा समय हुआ हैल्थ मिनिस्टर्स कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी और उस में इस पर विचार किया गया लेकिन बात तो तब होती जब इस नये साल में कोई उस के वास्ते नई चीज या कोई कानून सामने आता। अमरीका आदि देशों में गन्दगी को रोकने के वास्ते कानून बने हुए हैं। अगर पीने का पानी और हवा भी लोगों को शुद्ध न मिल सके तो यह हमारे लिये बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात होगी। इसलिये इस और भी ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये जिस से कि लोगों का स्वास्थ्य बेहतर हो और जो करोड़ों रुपया आज अस्पतालों में दवाइयों पर खर्च हो रहा है उस में बचत हो जायगी।

अन्त में मैं एक शब्द और कहने के लिये आप से क्षमा चाहूंगा और वह यह है कि हमारे यहां खालियर में ए० जी० का आफिस है। वहां कुछ कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल की थी। यह तो ठीक है कि अगर जिन लोगों ने हड़ताल की थी तो उस को सजा उन को मिलनी चाहिये लेकिन इस सिलसिले में मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि दूसरी जगह हड़ताल करने वालों के साथ जिस तरह से पेश आया गया है वैसा ही बर्ताव वहां के कर्मचारियों के साथ भी होना चाहिये। अब वहां कुछ नौजवान कर्मचारी गुमराह हो गये और उन्होंने हड़ताल कर दी। उन हड़ताली कर्मचारियों को बर्खास्त कर दिया गया है जबकि दूसरी जगह इतना 1 कदम नहीं उठाया गया और उन पर

जुर्माना कर दिया गया और उन को वार्निंग दे दी गई। मेरा कहना तो यही है कि इतना सख्त कदम नहीं उठाना चाहिये। अगर दूसरी जगह भी इतना सख्त कदम उठाया गया हो तो मैं नहीं कहता। यह मेरा निवेदन है कि इस पर गौर किया जाय और उन के मामलों पर ध्यानपूर्वक और सहानुभूतिपूर्वक विचार किया जाय खास कर उन लोगों के बारे में जिन्होंने कि माफी भी मांग ली है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपने जो मुझे समय दिया उस के लिये धन्यवाद करते हुए अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

**Shri Kulkarni Krishnan Nair (Kozhikode):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Budget proposals. This is the Budget of the first year of the Third Five Year Plan, which is really symbolic of the Third Five Year Plan. It is an ambitious scheme. The Budget has also to be framed according to the objective of our Third Five Year Plan. We are emboldened to have this big venture because of the success of our First and Second Five Year Plans. There is an increase in production, both in industry and in agriculture. There has also been a large amount of facility afforded for employment. That warrants a scheme which is more ambitious than the prior two schemes.

Regarding the taxation policy, we have to congratulate the Finance Minister because there is a general approval of it. It is well-balanced, well spread so much so it would not be felt as a burden, and, as such, people are prepared to bear the sacrifice by supporting it. There is bound to be an increase in the proportion of indirect taxation when the State functions as a Welfare State. Direct taxation is a legacy of the colonial system of administration; and indirect taxation will be followed more hereafter in our socialistic pattern of administration. I have to congratulate the Finance Minister for the bold step he has taken in this line.



More stress is laid in the Five Year Plan, as also in the Budget, on industrialisation. It is admitted that the difficulties of India can be got over only by rapid industrialisation. Major allotment is made in the Third Five Year Plan by allotting 24.1 per cent. for industrialisation. But we find that in the implementation of the industrial policy due weight is not given to regional balance, nor substantial help to undeveloped portions.

On a perusal of the Second Five Year Plan you will find that the total outlay on industry was Rs. 1094 crores; but, actually, it came to Rs. 1450 crores. Out of that Rs. 775 crores was given to Centrally owned industries. Annexure XVII of the Explanatory Memorandum given along with the Budget papers will show that these things, excluding expenditure on Finance Corporation and such other corporations comes to about Rs. 505.55 crores. You will find no attempt to adjust it regionwise or to bestow more money on undeveloped areas. Kerala gets Rs. 1.22 crores—Rs. 25 lakhs for Travancore Minerals and Rs. 97 lakhs for Hindustan Insecticides. Kerala's population is four per cent. You will find what a disparity is there and what injustice has been done to it.

I have to congratulate the Government for having given Kerala the second shipyard to compensate for the injustice done in the Second Plan. During the Third Plan period, the public sector will get Rs. 1500 crores and the Central undertakings will get Rs. 1470 crores. But my appeal is that if the regional disparity is to be avoided, the undeveloped areas must be substantially helped. Annexure I to the Draft Outline of the Third Plan will show that there are many industries which are to be installed in various parts of India. The Kerala Government had put up their claim for a heavy electrical plant. Two such plants are proposed to be set up. The technical committee studied the sites and substantially approved the site at

2182 (ai) LSD—9.

Cannanore. But unfortunately, the Czech experts did not visit that place; they visited Andhra and Madras and they did not visit Kerala. Why? There is a misgiving that Kerala may have the same fate as it had during the First and Second Plan periods. Kerala deserves proper attention. It is a very small State, double the size of ordinary districts. The density of population is 907 per square mile as against 312 for all India. The average number of workers is 90 per factory. 46 per cent. of the factories are seasonal factories and agricultural labour constitutes 21 per cent. as against 13 per cent. (all-India). The unemployment of agricultural labour is 125 days in a year as against 82 days for the whole of India. Educated and uneducated unemployment is rampant.

I wish to make it clear that Kerala is also doing her utmost and not merely requesting help to be given to her. The Budget of the Kerala Government will show that they had come forward with taxation proposals for Rs. 1.98 crores out of a total budget of Rs. 54 crores. You will be surprised to find that taxes are levied on land—it is now double the rate. The food stuffs are also taxed. I do not think that any State in India is taxing the food stuffs. But all other avenues are lost and as such they have shown their willingness for the utmost sacrifices. It is the duty of the India Government to come and help such States which are prepared for doing their part with greater sacrifice than the rest of India.

The present Kerala Government has the backing of the people there. The Industries Minister there is very popular and he was able to get applications for 75 industries. Out of them only 20 were given licence. I hope the Ministry here will see that there is no undue delay in these cases.

Another important thing which we have to think of is the food problem. The hon. Food Minister by his magic

[Shri Kuttikrishnan Nair]

hand has made it less complicated than it was before. Kerala is a chronic spot; it is over populated and there is always deficiency. But the Kerala Government has been doing its mite. In 1951-52, they produced about 6.01 lakh tons of foodgrains, in 1955-56, they produced about 8.61 lakhs. In 1960-61, they produced 10.85 lakh tons.

They are doing all these things. But I submit, Sir, the Central help is not as large as it ought to be, because on a perusal of the Second Plan you will find that the contribution by the Centre to the State fund in respect of Kerala was only 45 per cent. For the State of Bombay it was less—41 per cent.—but all the other States got more—Madras got 49 per cent, West Bengal got 54 per cent, Uttar Pradesh got 55 per cent, Bihar got 60 per cent, Mysore got 66 per cent. and others got more than that.

Before concluding, I would like to say a few words about the Kerala banks. Unfortunately, on the eve of the framing of the Third Five Year Plan there was the crash of the Palai Central Bank. It was a major bank in Kerala. These private banks were the only source of funds for the merchants and others there. After the crash of that bank some five or six other banks were also in difficult situations and moratorium was granted. The Government of India has taken a policy of amalgamating some of them so as to make them substantial. Sir, I do admit that the Finance Minister is taking interest in it, but our anxiety is that it is not being speeded up as it ought to be. My request is that the Finance Minister may bestow more attention on it and see that the integration of these banks is properly attended to and at a speedier rate.

Sir, I thank you for having given me this opportunity.

**Shri N. R. Muniswamy** (Vellore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the outset, before dealing with certain salient features of the General Budget, I

may be permitted to say something in general about this Budget.

The Finance Minister was uniquely placed in the sense that he has had enough of encomiums and bouquets and also odiums. He has had odiums from a certain section and bouquets and encomiums from another section of the people.

When we examine this Budget from a proper aspect of the question we can only sympathise with his lot. Sir, he has been enjoined with the responsibility of seeing that the Third Five Year Plan is completed successfully and that it starts with a good beginning. That is an essential burden that is cast on the Finance Minister, and he has to discharge it in spite of the various difficulties.

Sir, the approach that he has made in respect of this General Budget is really a magnificent one, because in an undaunted manner he has resorted to levying taxes on certain commodities for which there is a hue and cry from all over the country.

When one examines the position in that fashion one has to give a patient thought to the background of his mind. I am sure the Finance Minister must have spent a good lot of time thinking whether to levy a tax, whether it should be a direct or an indirect tax, and what type of tax he has to resort to to get the necessary resources to see that the huge Third Five Year Plan is implemented.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I hope the hon. Member would like to continue tomorrow?

**Shri N. R. Muniswamy:** Yes. Thank you, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This discussion will continue tomorrow.