

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Now we will take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clause 2 to 8 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1 the Enacting Formula, and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI K. VIJAYA BHASKARA REDDY: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed"

The question was adopted.

# **I. THE UNION DUTIES OF EXCISE (DISTRIBUTION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1984**

## **II THE ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF EXCISE (GOODS OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE) AMENDMENT BILL, 1984.**

## **III. THE UNION DUTIES OF EXCISE (ELECTRICITY) DISTRIBUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1984.**

## **IV. THE ESTATE DUTY (DISTRIBUTION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1984.**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI S. M. KRISHNA): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to amend the Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Act, 1979, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I also move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Act, 1957 as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I also move:

"That the Bill to amend to Union Duties of Excise (Electricity) Distribution Act, 1930, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I also move:

"That the Bill to amend the Estate Duty (Distribution) Act, 1962, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the honourable Members are aware that the Finance Commission is required to make recommendations to the President under article 280 of the Constitution in regard to taxes and duties which are to be shared with the States and the *inter se* distribution among the States of the share of the States.

The four Bills which I have moved today arise out of the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission made in its interim Report for the year 1984-85. The Report, alongwith the Memorandum on action taken thereon was laid on the Table of the House on the 9th December 1983, as required under article 281 of the Constitution. In its interim Report, the Eighth Finance Commission has *inter alia* recommended that the existing arrangements in regard to distribution of the Union Excise Duties and Estate Duties on property other than agricultural lands may be continued in 1984-85 subject to such modifications as may be required in the final Report.

The final Report of the Commission was submitted to the President on the 30th April 1984 and it will take some time to process the recommendations in that Report and lay it on the Table of the House alongwith the Memorandum on action taken thereon. This will be possible only in the next session of Parliament. In the meantime, the first instalment for the current year of the share of States in the Union Excise Duties is to be paid in the month of May. Hence the need for these legislation. At this stage Sir, I do not wish to dwell at length on these Bills as no new principles are being introduced and the objective is only to continue the existing arrangement pending decisions on the recom-

mendations contained in the final Report of the Eight Finance Commission.

*The questions were proposed.*

SHRI ARABINDA GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, the four Bills relate to the distribution of the share of the States in the Union Excise Duties and Estate Duties among the States. Actually, while dealing with this Bill, the cardinal question that comes up before us is the question of the Centre-State relations. For the last one decade, Sir, we have been observing that overcentralisation of the economic power in the hands of the Centre has created imbalances resulting in deprivation of States of their revenues and also resulting in the backwardness of some areas and growing secessionist trends. While framing the Constitution, the framers had assured that the share of the taxes would be equally divided among all the States. But, gradually, concentration of all the taxes collected for the States in the hands of the Centre became the order of the day and that has become the salient feature of the Indian economy now. Article 270, which deals with sharing of taxes between the Centre and the States, makes it obligatory to the States. In 1959, the Finance Act of Parliament also, by and large, deprived the States of their share in Income-Tax and other taxes. In 1982-83, income from the corporate tax was Rs. 2,339 crores, but it could not go to the States. Whereas the Seventh Finance Commission had recommended that 85 per cent of the income from the Income-Tax should go to the States. Income-tax is not increasing; corporate tax is rising. So the share of income-tax, is decreasing for the States. In this way, Sir, the States' only source of income is sales-tax. Actually, the major share of taxes collected for the States is being shared by the Centre and the States and thus States' resources are going to be limited day by day. A part of the sales-tax on major commodities like man-made fabrics, sugar, tobacco, cotton fabrics, woolen fabrics, and also excise duty,

are not also coming to the States. It is not the cases of only West Bengal or Tripura, all the States are very much dissatisfied, and dissatisfaction is increasing day by day.

The resources are distributed in three ways: statutory grants, discretionary grants and loans. Statutory grants are coming down so far as the States' share is concerned; loans and grants are increasing, and that also depends on the whims of the Planning Commission which is mainly conducted and directed by the Cabinet. Actually, the Finance Commission has become redundant. Planning Commission is the most powerful to grant shares of taxes to the States. By and by, side by side, the States are concerned with the day-to-day life of the people—agriculture, special areas programmes, irrigation, flood control, social services, education and what not. The Central subjects are Communications, Defence, foreign trade and external affairs.

The development of the States depends on the States' assistance and the States' own contribution. But the States are deprived of their due share. This is the crying need of the State Governments. And suddenly we found that the Sarkaria Commission has been constituted by the Central Government—to delay the share of taxes to the States. We do not know when the report will come. Meanwhile, the gap in the revenue and expenditure of the States is widening. The States have to depend mainly on the Centre. They have to depend on the mercy of the Centre. The Centre want the States to toe their line through grants and heavy loans. In this fashion things are moving in the country. If there is any protest from the non-Congress(I) Governments, then the Finance Minister will come out with a threat to stop loans, grants cut in size of the plan. He is not present here. Last time while replying to the Finance Bill in this House he said many things. I am not going into details of what he said as he is a big man! When we raise our voice about loans, about the cut in

[Shri Arabinda Ghosh]

the size of the plan and about overdrafts, we are snubbed. These things are going on. Is it not confrontation? He is blaming us for confrontation and that we are trying to weaken the Centre. In this fashion, he talks and talks like anything. He thinks that the Central Government is the Zamindar and we are his tenants. The dealings between the Centre and the States are going on in this way. There is a difference about the sharing of tax between the Centre and the States. As I said earlier, even the National Development Council where the Chief Ministers are invited has also become a ritual. Still our Chief Minister has written recently to Prime Minister to convene the meeting of the N.D.C. to finalise the plans. For the Planning Commission the States have no say. The States are dependent on the Central assistance for their development. The development is not possible without developing the States. But the National Development Council has become a ritual. The Chief Ministers, especially the Chief Ministers of West Bengal, Tripura and some other non-Congress (I) States, voice some process of planning, against the defects against the form of planning, against the process of planning against the defectiveness of planning. But that voice is not heard. They carry out their decisions through planning through the allocation of funds and all sorts of things. (Time bell rings). The composition of Planning Commission is very defective. Why the representatives of the States are not there? States have many things to say. There are many experts who are not entertained in the Planning Commission. Everything depends on the whims and caprices of the ruling party. Generally, political considerations take priority. If you obey the decision of the Central Government and if you follow the anti-people policies of the Government, then you can get sufficient grants or loans from the Centre. If you criticise the Central Government, their policies and their planning, then you will be isolated. This is what the Finance

Minister said in a Calcutta meeting and in Parliament also. He can speak anything. He can criticise any State which is not falling in line with his policies.

Now, I come to overdrafts. That is the only remedy available with the State Governments for their development and for everything else. The State Government have no means of printing notes in Nasik which the Central Government has. By this means, they can have any amount overdraft. Last July, we have been told that there has been a deficit-financing of about Rs. 10,000 crores till the current budget year. These notes are printed by the Centre. But the State have no alternative like this. They have to take overdrafts from the Reserve Bank and they have to pay a heavy interest for the overdrafts. And our Finance Minister also said many times against West Bengal in regard to overdrafts because we raised our voice. We said that you can take loans, of thousands of crores of money from the Reserve Bank or treasury bill and you are not paying any interest but when we take loans from the Reserve Bank we have to pay interest. This is a gross indiscrimination between the Centre and the State Government which are not liked by us. And we have to pay interest for our overdrafts.

Now, I am coming to West Bengal because it has been a target of attack in several speeches of the Finance Minister. Is it not a fact that the pay scales of the school teachers were raised in West Bengal to the maximum which is higher than majority of the State Governments while during the Congress regime it was very poor. The expenditure which is incurred by our State Government on education is the highest in the country. Is it a non-plan expenditure? When Tamil Nadu spends on education that is plan expenditure. If you spend on providing medical facilities to the people, is it a non-plan expenditure? If the other Governments spend on this item, that is plan expenditure. In this way, with ulterior political motives, the State Government of West Bengal is being

attacked by our Finance Minister. And on this I totally disagree with him.

Now, take for example the dearness allowance. Our State Government is not able to pay the dearness allowance that is due to our State Government employees? What to do? Who is responsible for the rise in prices? Who is responsible for inflation? Today's "Statesman" has given the wholesale price index. For the week ending 21st April, the wholesale price index stood at 323.6 provisionally. In the previous year, it was 298.4 points. Who is responsible for this rise in the wholesale price index? And then the retail prices have no limit. And every State Government, including the Congress(I) ruled States also submitted a memorandum to the Eighth Finance Commission saying that the prices are not being controlled by the State Government but by the Central economic policies and that in regard to payment of dearness allowance, bonus and other things, the Centre should share the expenditure with the States. Yesterday, Sir, in a meeting, our non-Finance Minister said that the State Government of West Bengal are not able to pay the dearness allowance. Who is responsible for the rise in prices? Sir, we are waiting for the Report of the Eighth Finance Commission. Meanwhile, if the Central Government employees can get dearness allowance, why not a portion of the fund be diverted to the State Governments to meet their expenditure in regard to dearness allowance, bonus and other things?

[The Vice Chairman (Shri R. Ramakrishnan) in the Chair.]

Sir, even in regard to IRDP, during 1983-84, a successful performance of 170 per cent was made in our State. In 1983-84, 9 States were granted.... (Time Bell rings).

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): He is making very important points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): There is time

allotted, he has already exceeded by 8 minutes.

SHRI ARABINDA GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, in 1983-84, grants were provided to 9 States and the amounts granted to States like U.P., Orissa and Bihar were the maximum and West Bengal got the lowest. If we say something, is it meant that we want confrontation with the Centre? I quote from the budget speech of our West Bengal Finance Minister: He said: Our development expenditure has increased 3-fold. West Bengal is a state which is more frugal so far as sumptuary allowance is concerned. While it comes to some lakhs in case of other States, like Maharashtra. In case of West Bengal it is in thousands only. So, Sir, what I want to say is, you please show us where the State Government can impose a curb on expenditure. There is no way. We are paying loans and in this calendar year, we are paying 34 per cent loans, which is not our fault. The entire burden was thrust on us by the Congress Government, and we have to pay 34 per cent loans. All these constraints are there. I again quote what our Finance Minister of West Bengal, Shri Ashok Mitra said: It is a matter of equal satisfaction that a recent study by the Reserve Bank of India indicates that development expenditure as a proportion of the total expenditure during the past few years has been consistently high in West Bengal. If we look to expenditure of the Plan, it has nearly trebled during the Sixth Five-Year Plan period, 1977-78 to 1982-83 compared to preceding 5 years, 1971-72 to 1976-77. The proportion of plan expenditure to total expenditure has also gone up significantly since 1977-78.

In this way our development expenditure or the Plan expenditure has been consistently high without any share from the Central Government. The State Government of West Bengal are trying their best for the development of the State. Here, I would also quote again from the Finance Minister's speech: Despite this major con-

[Shri Arabinda Ghosh]

straint, additional resources mobilised by the State Government in recent years have been among the highest in the country.

Sir, that day, the Finance Minister was saying that we are unable to manage the economy of our State. He says, we are not able to mobilise additional resources. This is not correct. As our Finance Minister has said, mobilisation of additional resources in our State has been the highest in recent times. Even the Congress I Governments have not been able to mobilise additional resources. It is the non Congress (I) Governments like West Bengal which have been able to mobilise additional resources. These things cannot be denied by propaganda. These things cannot isolate our people from the Left Front Government.

Now, the time has come to review the entire Centre-State relations In this connection, I would suggest that the scheme of additional duties of excise should be abolished. The provisions of article 268 and 269 of the Constitution should be fully taken advantage of. Then, 4 per cent of every increase in administered price should be passed on to the States. Even the Chief Minister of Bihar is demanding that they should get more royalty in regard to coal. Assam is also demanding more royalty in regard to its petroleum products. When this is the case, why should you blame the West Bengal Government alone when they demand more royalty in regard to coal? Our suggestion is that 40 per cent of every increase in administered price should be passed on to the States. A review should be made of the principle of guiding decisions as regards declaration of goods. The royalty payable to the States for their mineral resources should be determined on an *ad valorem* basis in consultation with the States. The States have no say in the Planning Commission. The States have no say in the National Development Council. No suggestions from the State are

taken when formulating plans for the benefit of the poor people of this country. I would also suggest that States should be represented on a rotational basis on the central and local boards of directors of the Reserve Bank of India and States should be permitted to open commercial banks to serve the interests of the people. Our demand has been that we should be permitted to open commercial banks in our States. But this has not been accepted. I would also suggest that an institutional forum should be set for consultation between the Centre and the States on fiscal issues. There is also the suggestion that Planning Commission should be reconstituted. In this way, you can avoid confrontation between the Centre and the States. If the States are weak, the Centre will be weak. If the States are strong, the Centre becomes strong. Our country is a Union of States. Therefore as our Party has been demanding, the States should have a say in the formulation of Plans, the States should have a say in the Planning Commission. But this is not being accepted. There has been a propaganda going on that we want to weaken the Centre. This is not true. I deny this charge. Our Party believes that the Centre and States should come together and work in unison for the development of the country and the welfare of our people.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this is a formal matter, the passing of these four Bills. But it does give us an opportunity to go slightly deeper into certain vital matters concerning the States and the Central Government. The founding fathers, at the time when the Constitution was drafted, envisaged a completely balanced federal structure for this country. The sphere of each wing was well-defined and adequately and not dependent upon the other to the extent that they would be asking for charity. Each was independent in its own sphere. The States and the Centre have had their list of activities

## ment Bill, 1984

well-drafted and listed and there was also a joint arena, joint area of action, for both of them. All the principles were well defined. But slowly and slowly we have seen that the independence of the State Governments in regard to their own developmental activities has been eroded, because the Centre enjoys absolute power in seeing to it that the State gets funds from the Central pool for its developmental activities. The only money which goes to the State from the Central revenues as a matter of right is their share "in the Income Tax collections. Apart from that there are certain corporation taxes now imposed. Certain items which did occur in the State List have been taken out for purposes of sales tax because it was thought that in the interest of better trade between State and State that was necessary. So, slowly and slowly the States have been made to feel famished. The States are famished in respect of funds.

Now, earlier when the Constitution came into force, these provisions were never tested because practically all the State Governments were of the same ruling group which was in power at the Centre. It is now for the first time in the last few years that we are experiencing that there State Governments which are on a diametrically opposed angles to the Centre on certain basic issues, and if the Central Government does not feel happy with the views taken by the State Governments, it is very easy for the Central Government to throttle the State Governments by not giving them their discretionary quota of loans, or by stopping grants, or even overdrafts. Therefore, I would suggest that now since we have the Sarkaria Commission, there should be a round table conference of the State Governments' representatives with the Central Government, to discuss these matters how best this could be avoided so that the States feel independent enough to pursue their own policies and programmes.

to feel that they also have an important hand in shaping the policies of the Planning Commission and that it is not easy for the Central Government to throttle the State Government whenever it does not suit the Central Government. So for sorting out all these matters, we should have a round table conference and by that time, I think the Sarkaria Commission would be well advised to give its report on the fiscal aspect of the matter also concerning the Central Government, because if we fail on this point, I am very apprehensive that a situation may arise any time that there will be such inbuilt hostility between the States and the Central Government that the fissiparous tendencies which are now so apparent in States like Assam or Punjab may acquire well-defined shape and they may have a feeling that they have been deliberately discriminated against, that they are not treated as equal partners in the federal structure. We have already encountered this feeling; that is why we find a violent agitation going on in Punjab and in so many other States regional parties have cropped up only to look after and see that their regional interests are well protected. If we do not at this time really take this matter seriously, we will be setting up a pace which will be later difficult to control. I am so apprehensive that in times to come, say, 10 years, 12 years, 15 years, 20 years—not a big period in the history of a nation—we may have laid the foundations for secession in the various parts of the country. Let us keep all of us together in a spirit of confidence, in a spirit that the Centre also helps the States, no matter what type of Government exists in the States the States owe full allegiance to the Centre, no matter what type of Government is there at the Centre. There is this feeling which crops up here now and then that the Centre discriminates against States because the States have a Government or have an ideology which is at variance with the ideology of the Centre.

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

tral Government. Therefore, this idea must go, this idea must vanish.

Now here is a case which has been just quoted by my learned brother who spoke just before me. He says that when they increased dearness allowance, they say this is not a Plan expenditure. It is very strange. Dearness has been increased for Central Government employees. If the State Government feels that in its own area, in its own domain dearness allowance should be increased, you want to penalise the State Government. Either you want the State Government to have a blackened face before the people whom it represents or, ultimately, the Central assistance would be lacking. In either case the State Government has to suffer. I am giving this just as an instance. Such things must not remain. Therefore, I personally feel that we should not now, at this stage, sit on points of prestige. There is no prestige involved here. The smallest State may have a problem. a larger State may not have a problem. But let us all sit together, have representatives from each State, discuss the matter as to in what manner this should be distributed, how the corporate taxes should be given out and how the grants should be given to the States and, in this manner, restore confidence amongst the various States, among the people in the various States that no matter how politically we function, for purposes of binding us together there are no chances of any discrimination between one State and the other by the Central Government. Otherwise, backward States, if they have a different political system, will become further backward and an advanced State, at one stage, would be prone to come backward. So, the distribution of Central assistance would be so topsy-turvy that it would disturb the whole balance which, I think, the founding fathers of our Constitution could never probably envisage. The

way we are acting, I can understand it because we Indians have a great ingenuity of giving the most innocent things a look of being the most pernicious. The beautiful Constitution that we have had, we had slowly and slowly made it look as if this is the most powerful instrument for being used against our own people, against our own State Governments which have a different form of Government or which, politically or ideologically, see or think differently from what the Central Government does.

Thank you, Sir.

**श्री कैलाशपति मिश्र (बिहार) :**

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल के ऊपर चर्चा करने की आवश्यकता इसलिए पड़ रही है कि जिस समय इसको लाना चाहिए था उस समय न लाकर इसको विलम्ब से लाया जा रहा है। अष्टम वित्त आयोग ने अपना काम पूरा कर लिया है। उसकी रिकमन्डेशनस देर से आई है, इसका पता नहीं लगा है। सरकार राज्यों को केन्द्र से धन दिलाने के लिए कौन-सी नीति अपनाने जा रही है, यह मुख्य प्रश्न है। राज्यों के बीच में तनाव है। तनाव केन्द्र और राज्य सरकारों के अंतर्गत है। अभी माननीय सदस्यों ने बताया कि संविधान निर्माताओं ने संविधान बनाया तो कहा कि भारत राज्यों का संघ है। लेकिन अभिप्राय यह नहीं था कि राज्यों की हालत केन्द्र के सामने ठीक नगरपालिकाओं जैसी हो जाय जैसी स्टेट्स के अन्दर नगरपालिकाओं की स्थिति दिखाई देती है? कई बार यह सवाल खड़ा हो जाता है कि सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट के अन्दर आबादी कितनी है? और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के अन्दर की आबादी कितनी है। दोनों की आबादी को बाइफ्रैक्ट नही किया जा सकता है। सभी राज्यों को मिलाकर जो आबादी होती है वही केन्द्रीय सरकार के अन्तर्गत की आबादी होती है। फिर काम करना है अलग अलग। कुछ काम केन्द्रीय सरकार के

हाथ में है, उन्हें केन्द्र सरकार को निभाना है और अनेकों ऐसे काम हैं जो कि राज्य सरकारों को करने पड़ते हैं, राज्य सरकारों को उस दायित्व का निर्वाह करना होता है। तीन संस्थाएं केन्द्र के अंदर काम कर रही हैं। नेशनल डेवलपमेंट कौंसिल, प्लानिंग कमिशन और फाइनेंस कमिशन। एक बात आप याद रखें कि नेशनल डेवलपमेंट कौंसिल फर्स्ट नेशनल डेवलपमेंट कौंसिल सैकेंड, नेशनल डेवलपमेंट कौंसिल थर्ड, नेशनल डेवलपमेंट कौंसिल फोर्थ नहीं होती। इसी तरह से प्लानिंग कमिशन फर्स्ट, प्लानिंग कमिशन सैकेंड, प्लानिंग कमिशन थर्ड, प्लानिंग कमिशन फोर्थ नाम की कोई चीज नहीं होती। लेकिन फाइनेंस कमिशन वन, फाइनेंस कमिशन सैकेंड, फाइनेंस कमिशन थर्ड होता है और इस समय आठवां फाइनेंस कमिशन काम कर रहा है। क्या होना चाहिए था? केन्द्रीय सरकार के ही हाथ में अपार धनराशि आने के साधन हैं, राज्यों के साधन पूरे तौर पर कम हो गये हैं। सेल टैक्स और कुछ राज्यों में रायट्टी, अगर इन दो मुख्य टैक्सों को छोड़ दिया जाए तो राज्य सरकारें बौनी बनी हुई है उनकी अर्थ व्यवस्था खराब हो रही है और ये दोनों टैक्स भी ऐसे हैं जिनके ऊपर भी एक प्रकार से केन्द्र का अधिकार दिखाई दे रहा है। अब राज्यों को आम जनता की सुविधा के लिये सारे काम करने हैं। 37 साल की आजादी के बाद दुनिया की प्रगति को देखते समय हम भारत की प्रगति को देखें तो अगर कोई यह समझे कि आज के भारत का कोई गांव 30 मील किसी मुख्य सड़क से दूर रहे और मुख्य सड़क से जोड़ने के लिये गांवों में सड़क की मांग नहीं उठेगी, वह विद्यालय खोलने की मांग नहीं उठेगी, वहां अस्पताल बनाने की मांग नहीं उठेगी, वहां रोजगार के लिए मांग नहीं उठेगी, लोगों के लिये सिचाई की

मांग नहीं उठेगी, यह तो संभव है नहीं। जागरण का बिगुल बजता जा रहा है आधुनिक जगत के स्तर पर आने के लिये विकास की जितनी प्रक्रियाएं हैं, उसके लिए उनकी मांगें नितान्त आवश्यक और नितान्त स्वाभाविक हैं। राज्यों के हाथ में आय के स्रोत क्या है? सारे स्रोत केन्द्र के हाथ में केन्द्रित हो गये हैं। यह तो सत्य है कि संविधान के अंतर्गत ये अधिकार, राज्यों के बीच में वितरण करने के लिये सेंटर के हाथ में ओब्लिगेटरी है। तीन प्रकार के धनराशि का वितरण होता है। स्टेट्युटरी, ट्रांसफर, डिस्-केशनरी, ग्रांट और लोन। ये जो तीन रास्ते हैं इन तीन रास्तों में से कौन सा रास्ता है जो राज्य सरकारों को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होने की हिम्मत बंधा सके और राज्यों को आत्मनिर्भर बना सके और कौन सा ऐसा रास्ता है जो राज्यों के हृदयों में, राज्यों के मस्तिष्कों में भय पैदा करता है। आश्चर्य इस बात पर होता है कि राज्य सरकारों को केन्द्र सरकार लोन देती है दे दिया, 30 साल के लिये लोन दे दिया, वह लोन जो कभी वापस होने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन दिखाया जा रहा है रिकार्ड में, फाइलों पर कि इतना लोन है। हां कभी कभी जब राज्य सरकारें कजा लेती है तो उसका सूद उनको चुकाना पड़ता है और अगर सूद चुकाने की स्थिति में राज्य सरकार नहीं रहती तो जो एंडवास देनी होती है उसमें कटौती कर दी जाती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस स्थिति की आवश्यकता क्या है। जो स्टेट्युटरी ट्रांसफर दिया गया है उससे पूरी ताकत के साथ राज्य सरकारों को काम करने का उपाय ब्यो नहीं किया जा रहा है। आप उनको ब्यो नहीं यह भरोसा द रहे हैं। उनके साधन कितने हैं, उनकी शक्ति कितने की है।

... (समय की घंटी)



[ श्री कैलाशपति मिश्र ]

उत्तमभाष्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आग्रह करूंगा कि मैं कुछ महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे उठाना चाहता हूँ। इसलिए मुझे थोड़ी देर बोलने दिया जाए। मैं जानता हूँ कि लोग थके हुए हैं। लेकिन दो तीन महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे उठाना चाहता हूँ। इसलिए थोड़ी देर मुझे बोलने दीजिए। एक्साइज ड्यूटी सब से बड़ा स्रोत है केन्द्र सरकार के हाथ में। आपने क्या किया केवल 20 परसेंट पहले एक्साइज के बांटने के लिये रखा था, 40 प्रतिशत नहीं था वह तो तब हुआ जब एक स्वतंत्र वातावरण में सेव्थ फाइनेंस कमीशन को काम करने का अवसर मिला। मुझे स्मरण है एक राज्य की ओर से सेव्थ फाइनेंस कमीशन के सामने मैं ही मेमोरेण्डम ले करके गया था। यह काम उस समय मेरे जिम्मे था। जब मेरी फाइनेंस कमीशन के चेयरमैन के साथ इस विषय पर बात हुई तो पहले तो वो उखड़ गये उन्होंने कहा कि हमसे इतना अमाउंट आप ने मांग लिया है तो मुझे कहना पड़ा कि अगर क्वांटम के बारे में बात करनी है तो मैं ऐसा ही उठ कर चला जाऊंगा, बात करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है लेकिन रुके अन्दर जो मुद्दे दिये हुए हैं उन मुद्दों पर बात करने के लिए आए हैं तो मैं चैलेंज करता हूँ कि एक भी मुद्दा ऐसा नहीं है जो अनावश्यक हो या जिसमें एगजरेटिव मांग हो। यदि ऐसा हो तो आप हमारे सामने रखें मैं वही सिर झुका लूंगा। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कमीशन के एक मेम्बर प्रोफेसर राजकिशन ने अपनी रिक्मेंडेशन में लिख दिया कि एक भी ऐसा मुद्दा नहीं है जिसको छांटा जा सके। बिहार की ओर से 3300 करोड़ रुपये का मेमोरेण्डम दिया गया था और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस समय उसको कुछ ठुठनाई रही होगी इसलिए 2300

करोड़ रुपये स्वीकार किया गया और उसी समय से एक्साइज ड्यूटी जो पहले 20 प्रतिशत राज्यों के हिस्से में आती थी उसको 40 प्रतिशत कर दिया गया। फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर या उनके बदले जो उत्तर देंगे वह कहें कि अडीशनल एक्साइज ड्यूटी से कितना आता है। मैं आपके सामने कुछ आंकड़े रखना चाहता हूँ। रेप्रेस-1, जहां केवल 40 प्रतिशत एक्साइज ड्यूटी बांटने से राज्य के हिस्से में आता है, उससे मिला हुआ है, उसके अनुसार वर्ष 1981-82 में 40 प्रतिशत राज्यों को दिया गया वह 2648.76 लाख रुपये और अडीशनल एक्साइज ड्यूटी से बांटा है 435 लाख रुपये (व्यवधान) इसी प्रकार से जैसे कि हमारे पूर्व वक्ता माननीय सदस्य ने हवाला कर दिया है इसके पहले इनकम टैक्स से मिलता था। 1959 में एक एक्ट बना दिया और उस इनकम टैक्स में से एक दूसरा टैक्स पैदा कर दिया कारपोरेट टैक्स। कारपोरेट टैक्स डिविजिनल नहीं है, वितरणीय नहीं है। उत्तर दिया जा सकता है कि इनकम टैक्स से इतनी राशि बंटती है लेकिन उसका भी आंकड़ा उन्होंने बता दिया, इसलिए दोहराने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। एक साल के अन्दर 1982-83 में कारपोरेट टैक्स का वितरण के लिए नहीं है वह 2339 करोड़ केन्द्रीय सरकार के हाथ में रहा और इनकम टैक्स से वही पर जो दूसरा पिकचर है उससे मात्र 1563 करोड़ आता है। फाइनेंस कमीशन को अगर स्वतंत्रता पूर्वक काम नहीं करने दिया गया और उसके सिर पर प्लानिंग कमीशन का टनटन बजता रहा तो फाइनेंस कमीशन क्या करेगा? अगर उसको गाइडलाइन पहले मिला गई, उसको सीमा पहले बता दी गई, उसके ऊपर रेस्ट्रिक्शंस पहले लाद दी गई और अगर स्वतंत्रता पूर्वक राज्यों के

दुख-दर्द को नहीं पहचाना, उसको अगर ध्यान में नहीं रखा तो फाइनेंस कमिशन कोई बहुत उपयोगी संस्था नहीं हो सकेगी ।

मेरा आग्रह होगा कि इस संस्था को उपयोगी करना चाहिए और सब बातों के अतिरिक्त जो एक चीज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि केन्द्र सरकार को पहले अपने मस्तिष्क में यह तय करना चाहिए—जो मैंने पहले भी कहा था—कि केन्द्र के हाथ में आने वाली राशि, चाहे वह रायस्टी से आती हो, चाहे वह इन्कानटैक्स से आती ही चाहे वह कारपोरेट टैक्स से आती हो, चाहे वह एडिशनल ड्यूटी से आती हो, चाहे एक्साइज ड्यूटी से आती हो—(घंटी समय की घंटी)—किसी भी प्रकार से आती हो, इन्हें इंटेन्सिवली जिम्मास्टिक करने की जरूरत नहीं है कि कौन डिजिजिबल है और कौन डिजिजिबल नहीं है । यह तय करने की आवश्यकता है कि प्रगति, विकास के मार्ग पर चलने के लिए केन्द्र को भी चलना है और राज्यों को भी चलना है, केन्द्र को भी अपनी जिम्मेदारी का निर्वाह करना है और राज्यों को भी अपनी जिम्मेदारी का निर्वाह करना है—केन्द्र के हाथ में आई हुई राशि का कितना अंश राज्यों में वितरण हो और कितना अंश केन्द्र में हो—मैंने विनियोग भाषण में कहा था कि जनता राज्य में इस पर विचार हुआ था ।

यह मैं इसलिए नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि पिछली सरकार का कोई गुण-गाण करना चाहता हूँ—पर विचार हुआ था और यह लकी बन गई थी कि राज्यों से अधिक केन्द्र के हाथ में खर्च करने के लिए नहीं रहेगा । बल्कि स्थिति यहां तक पहुंच गई थी कि 55, 56, 57 प्रतिशत राज्यों में वितरित होता था और 43, 44, 45 प्रतिशत केन्द्र सरकार के हाथ

में होता था । लेकिन आज मैं एक भाषण पढ़ रहा था और यह पढ़ करके आश्चर्य लगा, आक्षेप किया गया है कि 70 प्रतिशत केन्द्र सरकार अपने हाथ में धन रखती है और 30 प्रतिशत पर वह राज्यों को नचाती रहती है । इससे क्या निकलने वाला है ? आज राज्य सरकारें अपने बजट नहीं बना पा रहे हैं, जब-जब बजट बनाने का अवसर आता है ।

आप सभी राज्य सरकारों का बजट उठा कर देख लीजिए, शायद एक-दो राज्य भी ऐसे नहीं मिलेंगे, वह बोट आन एकाउन्ट करने के लिए विवश नहीं है । (समय की घंटी) वह एक वर्ष के लिए योजना पूर्वक अपना बजट पास कर रही है . . . . (व्यवधान)

उपसनाध्यक्ष (श्री आर० रामास्वामी) : अब समाप्त कीजिए ।

श्री कैलाशपति मिश्र : पहले बकिंग ग्रुप नहीं मिलता, उसमें से कुछ नहीं निकलता । प्लानिंग कमिशन जब तक यह तय नहीं करता कि कितना-कितना राज्यों को मिलने वाला है, ग्रान्ट-इन-एंड राज्यों को क्या मिलने वाली है, किस अवस्था में राज्य सरकारें हैं ?

नतीजा यह होता है कि बजट अशुद्ध बनता है, खर्च का अपव्यय होता है पैसे का दुरुपयोग होता है और राज्य सरकारें जो बजट बनाती हैं और पैसा खर्च करती हैं, उसका भी सही अर्थों में जो उपयोग होना चाहिए, वह नहीं होता है ।

अभी आज बिल आया है और अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा कि मई महीने में इसका वितरण—हमें मालूम है कि बजट कब पास होता है, 31 मार्च, से पहले बजट पास होता है, अप्रैल से काम शुरू होता है । वित्तीय वर्ष के बारे

[श्री कैलाश पति मिश्र]

में काफी चर्चा हुई कि यह वित्तीय वर्ष भारत के लिए अनुकूल नहीं है। इस देश की पृष्ठ भूमि में यह गलत है। एक महीना भी नहीं बीतेगा कि वर्षा शुरू हो जाएगी और वर्षा शुरू होते ही ऐसे विकास के काम जिनका मिट्टी से संबंध है, जिनका खुले मैदान से संबंध है, कहीं सड़क, कहीं मकान, कहीं पर तालाब, बनाने का (समय की घंटी)— जून-जुलाई, अगस्त, सितम्बर और अक्टूबर— करीब-करीब भारत का यह ऐसा समय है कि वर्षा ऋतु में पैसे के खर्च का कोई उपयोग नहीं है और अगर खर्चा कर दिया जाए तो पानी में वह जाएगा। इस स्थिति में राज्यों को लाकर खड़ा करना बहुत आवश्यक है कि हर बार उनके दिमाग में संदेह नहीं बना रहे कि उनकी टोटल बजट आउटले कितनी होगी। पता रहे कि हमारे इतने साधन होंगे ही, इतनी आय होगी ही। एक-एक राज्य संकदी में फँसता चला जा रहा है। मैं इसका उत्तर चाहूंगा कि जनता राज में जो कार्य पीछे छुट गये थे उन के लिये 'इनकम-एडजस्टेड-टोटल-पापुलेशन' स्कीम रखी गयी थी, जिस के कारण पीछे छूटे हुए राज्यों को लाभ हो गया, वह आज कहाँ गयी, वह फार्मुला क्यों बदला गया ?

अन्त में मैं एक बात कर समाप्त करूँगा। रायल्टी के सम्बन्ध में बहुत अन्याय हो रहा है। मैं ऐसे राज्य से आता हूँ जहाँ कई मानने में सम्पूर्ण भारत के खनिज पदार्थ का—कई चीजों में—42 प्रतिशत होता है, बिहार में। समाचार-पत्रों में और दूसरी जगह आता है कि बिहार में इतना कोयला है, इतना लोहा होता है। लेकिन उस राज्य को कुछ उपलब्ध

नहीं होता है। कोयला आप के हाथ में है, पेट्रोल आप के हाथ में है, जब चाहते हैं दाम बढ़ा देते हैं। रायल्टी किस आधार पर दे रहे हैं ? रायल्टी का तरीका बदलिये जैसी कि मांग उठ रही है, खनिज पदार्थों की कीमत जैसे बढ़ती है उस के हिसाब से रायल्टी मिलनी चाहिए। केन्द्र को यह स्वीकार करने में कठिनाई नहीं होनी चाहिए। मैंने पहले भी कहा था कि बिहार से यूरेनियम भी निकलता है, लेकिन यूरेनियम जब बिहार की धरती से निकल जाता है, वह दुनिया के बाजार में कितने मूल्य पर बेचा जाता है या कितने मूल्य का होता है इसे केन्द्र सरकार सदा गुप्त रखती है, बताती नहीं। आप इस परदे को हटाइये और राज्यों को आत्मनिर्भर बनाने की कोशिश करिए।

मुझे, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, तरस आता है उन राज्यों पर जो कांग्रेस-शासित राज्य हैं। जहाँ गैरकांग्रेसी सरकारें हैं वहाँ का दर्द—अभी माननीय सदस्य नहीं हैं यहाँ तमिलनाडु से, उन के कई भाषण सुन चुका हूँ और वे भाषण उस राज्य के दर्द को प्रकट करते हैं। बंगाल के हमारे मित्र हैं उनसे बंगाल का दर्द पता लग जाता है। आंध्र और कर्नाटक के मित्रों से उन के राज्यों का दर्द पता चल जाता है। लेकिन जो कांग्रेस-शासित राज्य हैं उन का बड़ा दुर्भाग्य है कि वहाँ के माननीय सदस्य अपने राज्य का दर्द यहाँ पर नहीं रखते, उन को यह चिन्ता बनी रहती है कि पता नहीं किस की नजर में चढ़ जायेंगे, क्या परिणाम भुगतना पड़ेगा। मुझे उन पर बड़ी दया आती है।

अन्त में मैं यह कह कर समाप्त करूँगा कि केन्द्र सरकार साहस के साथ इस विषय पर विचार करे और इस पर खुल कर विचार होना चाहिए कि राज्यों को आर्थिक मामले में केवल केन्द्र के लोन

और डिस्ट्रीक्शनरी ग्रांट पर निर्भर न रहना पड़े, केन्द्र सरकार उन्हें आत्म निर्भर बनाये जिस से अपनी आवश्यकताओं के अनुसार राज्य अपने विकास का कार्य कर सकें।

श्री हुकमदेव नारायण यादव (बिहार) : उपभोक्ता महोदय, काफी विस्तार से माननीय सदस्यों ने चर्चा की है। मैं सदन में यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि संविधान में राज्य और केन्द्र में जो रिश्ते हैं उन के सम्बन्ध में परिवर्तन किया जाना चाहिए। वर्तमान स्थिति में केन्द्र सरकार रानी है और राज्य सरकारें नौकरानी हैं, केन्द्र जैसा चाहे वैसा करे। इसी लिए केन्द्र अपने हाथ में सारे अधिकार रखता है कि राज्य सरकारें हमारे पास भीख मांगने के लिए आएँ और जो कुछ वह उठा कर दे दे लेकर जायें, उन को लेने का हक न रहे। यह बात अच्छी नहीं है कि केवल केन्द्र मजबूत हो और राज्य कमजोर रहें। उस से देश मजबूत नहीं होगा। शरीर में जो मस्तिष्क है यह खूब बढ़ जाय और हाथ-पैर, पेट सब सुखते रहें, उसे स्वस्थ शरीर नहीं कहा जा सकता। स्वस्थ शरीर तब है जब सारे अंग स्वस्थ और सबल हों। जब राज्य आर्थिक दृष्टि से शक्तिशाली और सम्पन्न होंगे तभी वह सारी योजनाओं को कार्यान्वित कर सकेंगे। तब कहीं जा कर देश मजबूत बन सकेगा। इस पर गहराई से चिन्तन करके की आवश्यकता है, विचार करने की आवश्यकता है, निर्णय लेने की आवश्यकता है। हमारी बात में यह उठाना चाहता हूँ कि संविधान में राज्य सूची और संघ सूची बनी हुई है और दो ही तरह की सरकारें हैं जो कि विकास का काम करती हैं। संविधान में परिवर्तन कर के चार खंभा राज्य बनाया जाय और संविधान में ही तय कर दिया जाय कि यह होगी गांव सूची, यह होगी जिला सूची, यह होगी राज्य सूची

और यह होगी केन्द्र सूची और गांव के कर्तव्यों और अधिकारों को संविधान में ही तय कर दिया जाय कि यह विषय गांव के होंगे, यह यह विषय जिले के होंगे और यह यह विषय राज्य के होंगे और यह यह विषय केन्द्र के होंगे और जो विषय जिसको जिम्मे रहेंगे उससे संबंधित सारा पैसा उस सरकार के हाथ में दे दिया जाय। जैसे ग्राम सरकार के जो विषय हों, सिचाई का काम हो या सड़क बनाने का काम हो, उनका विकास हो उस के लिये सारा पैसा ग्राम सरकार को दे दिया जाय। वह केन्द्र के हाथ में न रहे। ग्राम सरकार ही उसकी योजना बनाये और उस पैसे को खर्च करे। लेकिन आज प्लानिंग आप करते हैं यहां योजना भवन में बैठ कर और उसका कार्यान्वयन होगा गांव की गलियों में, वहां की सड़क पर, वहां के खेत में, तो जो दिल्ली की योजना भवन में बैठ कर योजना बनाने वाले हैं उन्होंने तो कभी गांव देखा ही नहीं है। गांव में अब सूर्यास्त होने जा रहा है और हमारे बिहार में सौ में 99 गांवों में घर की औरतें अब सूर्यास्त होने के बाद 12 घंटे दिन में पाखाना अपने पेट में सड़ाती हैं और सूर्यास्त के बाद सड़क के किनारे बैठती हैं और जब रास्ते में मुसाफिर जाते हैं तो लज्जा के कारण आधा पाखाना पेट में लेकर ही खड़ी हो जाती हैं और फिर सड़क के किनारे बैठती हैं। जो योजना भवन के बैठ कर योजना बनाने वाले हैं उनको पता ही नहीं है कि गांव की जिन्दगी कैसे चलती है। तो मेरी प्रार्थना है कि गांव की योजना गांव में बने, जिले की योजना जिले में बने, प्रान्त की योजना प्राप्त में बने और केन्द्र की योजना केन्द्र में बनायी जाय और तदनुसार ही संपत्ति का बंटवारा हो और संविधान में तय कर दिया जाय एक बार कि जो आम होगी, जो राष्ट्रीय आय होगी उस का कितना हिस्सा गांव को

[श्री हुसमदेव नारायण यादव]

जायेगा, कितना जिले को जायेगा, और कितना प्रान्त को जायेगा और कितना केन्द्र को मिलेगा। उस के बाद न सेविथ फाइनैस कमिशन की आवश्यकता होगी और न ही एड्य फाइनैस कमिशन को बनाने की जरूरत रह जायेगी। एक ही बार आप संविधान में इस बात को तय कर दीजिये और हिस्सा बंटवारे के बारे में संविधान में संशोधन करके इस बात को तय कर दीजिये कि कितना कितना हिस्सा मिलेगा और उस के मुताबिक उन को खर्च मिलता रहेगा और वह उन से अपने विकास का काम चलाता रहे। जब तक यह नहीं किया जायेगा तब तक कुछ विकास नहीं होगा।

दूसरी बात, वितरण का आधार क्या होगा। जहाँ जनसंख्या ज्यादा है—उत्तर प्रदेश की जनसंख्या 11, 12 करोड़ है और उन के मुकाबले महाराष्ट्र की जनसंख्या कम है और दूसरे प्रांतों की जनसंख्या कम है और मैं यह नहीं कहता कि दूसरे प्रांतों को यदि अधिक मिल रहा है तो हम उनका विरोध करते हैं, मैं तो कहता हूँ कि उन को अधिक दिया जाय, लेकिन अनुपात में जो जनसंख्या का आधार है उनको भी ध्यान में रखा जाय। आप देखें कि आप बिहार को कितना देते हैं और उत्तर प्रदेश को कितना देते हैं। आप क्या अपनी मर्जी के मुताबिक जब चाहे उसको काटते जायेंगे? यह सब उत्पादनशुल्क (विद्युत) वितरण अधिनियम के मुताबिक 1979-80 में बिहार को दिया गया 6.88 परसेंट और उसके बाद 1980-81 में दिया गया 6.66 परसेंट, और फिर 1981-82 में दिया गया 6.80 परसेंट और फिर 1982-83 में दिया गया 6.55 परसेंट और 1983-84 में दिया गया 6.64 परसेंट और इस बार दिया जा रहा है 5.74 परसेंट। क्योंकि घटा

दिया? क्या इस बीच में बिहार ज्यादा खुशहाल हो गया? क्या उस में इस बीच ज्यादा समृद्धि आ गयी? क्या इस बीच उस को संपत्ति ज्यादा बढ़ गयी? क्यों घटा दिया? इस लिये कि वहाँ बिहार में कांग्रेस की सरकार है। कोई बोलने वाला नहीं है। बोलेंगे भी तो दबी जवान से बोलेंगे। जहाँ कांग्रेस की सरकार है उन की गर्दन पर जितनी बने छुरी चलाते जाओ। कोई बोलने वाला नहीं है। हम लोग बोलेंगे भी तो विरोधी की बात बोलेंगे और हमारी बात को विरोधी की बात की तरह से उड़ा दिया जायगा। इस लिये बिहार की जनता को सोचना चाहिए कि बंगाल के जैसी, आन्ध्र के जैसी और महाराष्ट्र के जैसी विरोधी दल का सरकार ही उन राज्यों में रखी जाय जो कि अच्छी लड़ाई लड़ती है और केन्द्र में जिस की सरकार है उस पार्टी की सरकार राज्यों में होने से लड़ाई नहीं होती, वह बात मान लेती है। दूसरी तरफ महाराष्ट्र में जहाँ 1979-80 में दिया गया 13.26 परसेंट वहाँ आ कर इस बार हो गया है वह 19.38 परसेंट। उन को बढ़ा दिया गया और बिहार को घटा दिया गया। जहाँ मन में आया बढ़ा दिया और जहाँ मन में आया घटा दिया। जहाँ मन आवे बढ़ा दो, जहाँ मन आवे घटा दो। महाराष्ट्र में इसलिए बढ़ा दिया कि वहाँ अंतुले और पाटिल का झगड़ा चलता था। बिहार में अन्दरूनी कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। इसलिए जो भी चाहते हैं दे देते हैं क्योंकि कोई बोलने वाला नहीं है। इसीलिए मैं आपसे प्रार्थना कर रहा हूँ कि जब चाहे बढ़ाइयें, जहाँ चाहे घटाइयें ऐसा नहीं चल सकता। इसलिए जनसंख्या को आधार बनाया जाना चाहिए। जनसंख्या का आधार नहीं रहेगा तो देश में विकास नहीं चल सकता। महाराष्ट्र को जहाँ दिया है 19 परसेंट वहाँ उत्तर प्रदेश को आप दे रहे हैं 11 प्रतिशत।

12 करोड़ की आबादी का जो राज्य है इसको आप 11 प्रतिशत दे रहे हैं जब कि महाराष्ट्र को 18-19 प्रतिशत दे रहे हैं जब कि उत्तर प्रदेश की आबादी महाराष्ट्र से ढाई तीन गुनी है। कहते हैं कि— 'अधेर नगरी चौपट राजा, टकें तैर भाजी, टके सर खाजा'। जहां जो भर्जी आई आप कर देते है। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जनसंख्या को आधार माना जाए। जब तक जनसंख्या को आधार मानकर खर्च नहीं करेंगे तब तक अविकसित राज्य अविकसित रह जायेंगे। अतः अविकसित राज्यों के लोगों को ज्यादा देना चाहिए।

आखिरी बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा अभी माननीय कैलाशपति मिश्र जी बोल रहे थे, जनता पार्टी की सरकार में वह वित्त मंत्री थे जनता पार्टी की सरकार बनाने का जब हमें सौभाग्य मिला था, उस समय वे फाइनेंस कमीशन, 7वें फाइनेंस कमीशन के सामने उपस्थित हुए थे, तो छठे फाइनेंस कमीशन तक जो पैसा बिहार को मिलते थे उससे ढाई गुना पैसा वित्त मंत्रालय ने बिहार को दिया था कि मोरारजी भाई प्रधान मंत्री थे। बिहार में कारबार चलते हैं, समय कोश्या वहाँ पैदा होता है, खनिज पदार्थ बिहार पैदा करना है लेकिन उन सबको हैडक्वार्टर बिहार से बाहर है, दिल्ली में हैडक्वार्टर होगा, कलकत्ता में होगा, बम्बई में रहेगा और वहाँ से जो उत्पादन होना है उसका वितरण हैडक्वार्टर दिल्ली से, कलकत्ता से, बम्बई से होता है और बिहार को जो पैसा मिलने चाहिए वह उसके खाने में न डालकर दूसरे राज्यों के खोतों में डाले जाते हैं जहाँ कि उनके हैडक्वार्टर हैं। इस तरह से हमारा शोषण हो रहा है। तो आप जितने मुख्यालय है, बिहार में खनिज पदार्थों का उत्पादन

होता है तो उनका मुख्यालय भी बिहार में होना चाहिए। अगर बिहार में मुख्यालय नहीं ले जाते हैं तो जहाँ कहीं भी उसका मुख्यालय रहे, जिस चीज का उत्पादन बिहार में होता है उसका वितरण वहाँ से होना चाहिए और उस पर जो सेल्स-टेक्स लगता हो या ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी लगती हो या जो टेक्स लगते हों वह बिहार के खाते में दर्ज हों। तब बिहार का विकास होगा। माननीय कैलाशपति मिश्र जी ने सारी बातें सामने रखी हैं। मैं विश्वास करता हूँ कि अगर आप देश को मजबूत बनाना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि राज्यों और केन्द्र में विवाद न हो, उनमें झगड़ा न बढ़े तो कृपा करके जनसंख्या को आधार बनाइये और इस आधार को अपन लिये सब कुछ अपने हाथ में मत रखिए। ऐसा मानकर मत चलिए कि आप स्वयं भू हैं, सारे प्रान्त आपके सामने हाथ जोड़कर खड़े हों और वहाँ—हे देवाधिदेव, हमारी गरीबी दूर करने के लिए हमको कुछ दे दो। उस डंडे को आप दिखाकर कभी काश्मीर को, कभी आंध्र को, कभी किसी गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकार को डराते रहेंगे और कहेंगे कि हमारी बात को नहीं मानोगे तो तुमको डिमिस कर देंगे, बर्खास्त कर देंगे, तुमको जो एड देते हैं वह नहीं देंगे, तुम्हारी गारदन पर तलवार चला देंगे, तो यह जो तलवार है वह एक न एक दिन देश को तोड़ेगी। अगर आप देश को बचाना चाहते हो तो संविधान में संशोधन करके, निश्चित आधार पर कानून सम्मत विधान के जरिए तय कर दीजिए कि राज्य और केन्द्र के क्या हिस्से होंगे। ग्राम सरकार, जिला सरकार, राज्य सरकार और केन्द्र सरकार, इन चार खंभों पर सरकार खड़ी करिए, उन चारों को हिस्से बांट दीजिए तो देश मजबूत होगा। मुझे आशा और विश्वास है कि सरकार इस पर विचार करेगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Mr. Kalyan Roy. I want to remind you that your Party has got just four minutes.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Yes, I know. I will follow your instruction exactly as others have followed it.

My job has been lightened by the Hon'ble speakers who took part in the debate. The issue is very simple, on the face of it. There is the sharing of resources like taxes and duties between the States and the Centre as per the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission.

And, Sir, the Finance Minister has stated that the existing arrangements are to continue and no new principles are involved.

Sir, here is my first point—and I say it with anguish and regret and sorrow—and it is this that either the Ministry is absolutely careless about the problems which have arisen in our country or perhaps completely oblivious of its own responsibilities. Sir, the whole issue of Centre-State relations, as you would have seen from the speeches made by Members from all the parties who took part in today's debate, whether it is from the Communist Party of India (Marxist) or the Lok Dal or the Janata, and also from what I heard from the AIADMK's Member in other debates, has been vitiated because of the calculated discrimination, discriminating

policy of the Centre towards the States, particularly towards those States whose Governments are run today by the leftist parties. Their policy is one of a partisan, hostile and biased nature. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee perhaps is aware of it, aware that his policy is just based on discrimination. That is why, Sir, you will find that every week he rushes to West Bengal and every day he comes out with a Press statement that they are not discriminating against the West Bengal Government or against any non-Congress (I) Government and every day he cooks up some facts in order to confront the Finance Minister of West Bengal. It is unfortunate. I thought he had bigger responsibilities than to answer the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu or the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh or the Chief Minister of Karnataka. And, Sir, the Chief Minister of Karnataka, Mr. Hegde, who is not a communist, has lashed out against the policy of the Centre towards the States or against the Finance Minister of West Bengal.

Sir, the very fact that he goes on denying every week makes the people believe that perhaps he is repeating something which he himself does not believe. And, Sir, now I am on a serious point. What was an economic problem so far has now taken a political shape today because of your persistent refusal to reopen the issues of sharing the resources, sharing of taxes, and the whole thing is in jeopardy now and that fact you have to face. It has basically an economic problem, and the political parties which have come to power which have captured power through democratic elections, have raised this issue and said that unless you give them power unless you give them more taxes, unless you give them the power to impose taxes and give a proper share, which has not been given to them, they will have to think in other terms. You know what they mean by other terms.

We are firmly for the unity of India and we have said that and we have said umpteen times that we want a strong Centre, but equally strong States also. But the Finance Minister has to explain particularly—I am very sorry because Mr. Pranab Mukherjee happens to be a good friend of mine—and he has to explain this because the whole criticism has been raised during his period mainly and because we are unfortunately facing a situation of confrontation which we want to avoid. No explanation, no wishy-washy statements no repudiation, and no condemnation would help us because this has been raised by all the parties, whether inside or outside. Now, what is the present position? I will only quote from a reply given by the Minister, on the 1st of May 1984, in the Lok Sabha, by Shri Krishna regarding the details of the amount which the Government has collected as Income-Tax, Excise Duties, Corporation Tax and other sources from West Bengal during the year 1983-84 and the amounts which have been given to the Government of West Bengal during the year 1983-84. You will find, Sir, that the collection is Rs. 1,214.23 crores, and what was given to West Bengal Government under Income-Tax, Basic Excise Duties, Additional Excise Duties and Estate Duties, comes to Rs. 333.92 crores, which is not even 25 per cent! This is the latest statement which has been made in the other House. Percentage-wise we should get more. But this year you have given us less than 25 per cent of the total amount which you have collected from a poor State like West Bengal. And this is not the grievance of West Bengal alone. Poor Jagannath Mishra, ex-Chief Minister of Bihar, raised the same issue. When you have increased the coal price from Rs. 48 per tonne to Rs. 185 per tonne in your regime, why poor Bihar should not get royalty on the basis of ad valorem price? You only answer: we are not giving you royalty on the basis of ad valorem price. Why? When the price of coal has

increased without consultation with State Governments, why do you deprive the States which produce coal? Naturally Mr. Hukimdeo Narayan Yadav is correct. The biggest amount of coal you get from Bihar. Similarly, Telugu Desam has raised the issue. AIDMK—Miss Jayalalitha—has raised the issue. I am not going into that. You have to understand one problem, Mr. Krishna: We have our commitments; we have not been elected on the Congress votes; we have our programmes and we have to implement them. Where is the excess to come from? Your present attitude, your principles and your present arrangement of sharing come in the way. It has to go. We do not want 80 per cent, 90 per cent or 100 per cent. Let there be a dialogue. Let there be a share. Let there be a talk. Even the request of West Bengal Chief Minister to call the National Development Council to finalise the Budget allocation for West Bengal has not been accepted. Mr. Mukerjee who just came from Calcutta held a Press conference and said. No use of calling N.D.C. Why? What was the harm? What was the harm in having a dialogue? This smacks of arrogance. And the arrogance is not going to pay you, because the whole of Punjab is on fire. Assam is smouldering, we do not know what will happen in Tamil Nadu and Telugu Desam has captured the entire Andhra Pradesh—a regional party. But this is another issue. You cannot treat our Chief Minister the way you have been treating your own Chief Ministers, dismissing them, reinstating them, re-employing them and so on. This can't go on for ever. But you are doing it, because the crux of the policy is that you are following a particular policy to make the States totally dependent and subservient to you. And your entire policy has been so far to see that the Chief Ministers rush to Delhi plead for funds, fall on their knees and then you will be kind enough to give them an interview and a few crores either to fight drought or floods



[Shri Kalyan Roy]

or some other things. This is unhealthy and no decent Chief Minister who has come to power on the basis of his programme would face the humiliation. Let Mr. Krishnan understand it. He would rather resign than come and beg for interview. Even your Congress Chief Minister today are grumbling. We have been grumbling so far. But even your own chief Ministers are grumbling. They have refused to be cheated like this. You should take note of it.

Then, Sir, what I was developing it is the only point I will make, nothing else—Mr. Krishnan, please understand the Cabinet should understand that the powers to levy tax is the biggest political issue in India today. This is the biggest political issue. It is a first class, top political issue which you have to answer. Of course, we have come with a different programme, totally against you. Even your own Chief Minister are making an issue of it: Of restructuring the whole Finance Commission and its share its entire past and future. For example, take corporate tax. Corporate tax. Corporate tax has been increasing. States are debarred from gift tax, from wealth tax—one after another. Then, how would you explain the situation to the people who have voted for you? You have got to tell us. We want to compromise but you are not compromising. We want understanding, we want settlement but your attitude has come in the way of settlement.

I am prepared to give you the right to levy taxes. Mr. Krishna I concede this point also. You mobilise the resources. You levy the Wealth Tax or Estate Duty or Excise Duty or Income-tax or Corporate Tax or whatever tax you want and mobilise the resources. But what is the result? We charge you for failure to mobilise resources. Since you have been constantly failing to mobilise resources, I want to mobilise and there lies the difference. I will give you only two or three figures. The budget estimate of the Income-Tax of which I get the share or my state gets the share was

Rs.1559 crores in 1981-82. And what was the collection? Rs. 1475 crores. You say, year after year, the Estate duty collection has had a very low figure. In this Budget the collection of Estate Duty, Wealth Tax and Gift Tax together has been fixed at Rs. 117.50 lakhs. Why have you failed to collect? Your collection of Estate Duty, Gift Tax and Wealth Tax has remained more or less constant for the last ten years. (Interruptions) I asked a question. Now, G.D. Birla must be a very poor persons in the country. How much Estate Duty his family has paid? The reply was given by Mr. Krishnan in this House in this session. How much has this poor man paid? Rs. 3,58,470. Is it the Estate Duty of G. D. Birla? He has got away by paying 3 lakhs while he should have paid Rs. 30 crores. So, I am charging you for failing to mobilise Excise Duty Rs. 200 crores are locked up in the Supreme Court, in the High Courts and in other courts. Your officers say, "What can we do? We have not got any instructions from the Centre. Our lawyers are not present" Now, what answer do you have? Mr. Prem Shanker, writing in the Times of India on 5th March, stated,

"What is most disquieting is the performance of the personal Income-Tax. In the last two years, its yield has increased miserably, less than half of the growth of G.N.P. The Yield of sales Tax, States Duty and Gift Tax together has gone up in the same miserable proportion. It clearly shows that so far as direct taxation is concerned evasion has become a way of life."

This is Times of India. I have given you full powers to mobilise resources. You have failed and because of your failure to collect money for the Aluminium Regulation Account—the Bill which is coming tomorrow in this House—the Government of India has lost Rs. 39 crores. I raised this issue in an Half an Hour Discussion. There are four aluminium concerns. There is HINDALCO of Birla. There is the Aluminium Company of India belonging to the multi-nationals. There are NELCO,

MELCO and the BELCO. Where there is a difference between the retention price and selling price of when the cost of production is higher than the selling prices in that case the company whose cost of production is low will have to pay the money to the Aluminium Regulation Account. Now, HINDALCO's cost of production is the lowest and under the Aluminium Regulation Control Order, they will have to deposit money to the Aluminium Regulation Account so that the money is given to those whose cost of production is high. Since this Act was promulgated till January this year, Birlas did not pay any amount. So, a question was put to Mrs. Ram Dulari Sinha when she was the Minister, then to Mr. Salve and then to Mr. Pranab Kumar Mukherjee asking as to how much is due from poor Birla whom the Congress have brought here. The reply was Rs. 38 crores. And ultimately there was a settlement. The settlement was not in the Supreme Court but outside the Supreme Court when Birlas had no case at all. The Government could have collected Rs. 38 crores. They did not collect Rs. 10 crores from the HINDALCO on the ground that it has been paid to the UP State Electricity Board. We do not know whether the UP State Electricity Board has actually received Rs. 10 crores from the HINDALCO. But to another question asked by me whether any interest has been charged on these Rs. 38 crores, Mr. Krishna, you have replied—since February, I am getting the same reply—that is under consideration. Do you give that facility to Mr. Ashok Mitra, the Finance Minister of West Bengal? Do you give that facility to Mr. N. T. Rama Rao, the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh or to Mr. Hegde? When he takes overdraft, don't you charge interest? Are you not charging on the loan or grant or additional money given to the State Governments? But when it comes to the HINDALCO who have misappropriated, who have misused and refused to pay, on the basis of the facts given here in spite of

that, you are not charging interest.

Mr. Krishnan you have been entirely relying on deficit financing. Sir, the deficit of the Central Government covered by inflationary means in 1977-78 was Rs. 1,016 crores. In 1978-79, it was Rs. 1,506 crores. It rose to Rs. 2,433 crores in 1979-80 and Rs. 2,577 crores in 1980-81. Then again, Sir, it rose to Rs. 3,369 crores in 1983-84, and in the Budget, it was remaining at Rs. 1,586 crores for 1984-85. Naturally after this at the time of introduction of the Finance Bill, you have given further concessions. So, between these years, the deficit financing has been to the tune of Rs. 10,000 crores, if not more. And because of the situation in Punjab today or in Assam or in other States, your deficit will not be reduced. It will go up.

So, you have a recourse to deficit financing. Would you give that right to the State Governments? You have a right to go to the IMF to get money paying exorbitant interest. Do you give the States the same right? I would like you to explain. How would you expect me to fulfill my assurances, my commitment and even my programmes? We have a Left-Front Government in West Bengal. We have a right to introduce pension to the widows. We do not want the widows to become prostitutes. We want the old-aged people get a pension as a means of living. We have young people who are engineers, doctors, teachers and miners. They have a right to get unemployment allowance which was introduced not by the socialist Governments but by the capitalist governments in Europe in the late 19th century in order to stem the tide towards socialism. When I want a job, if you cannot give a job to a skilled worker or a young fellow who has come out from the college with high hopes, don't you think that he should get some allowance, something to spend instead of being a burden on his family? What have I done wrong? Are they wrong in introducing free tiffins for the children in Tamil Nadu? You have

[Shri Kalyan Roy]

to explain. I have been voted to power on this as you have been voted to power on the question of Non-alignment. You are committed to Non-alignment. You are not going to give it up. I have been committed to the working class, to the peasant, to the agricultural labour, to the rickshaw-wala, to the miners, to the jute grower. How do you expect me to function? Then, you might think it is easy for me. But instead of making it easy, you are putting obstacles, hindrances, and all kinds of barriers. The result is misunderstanding. The result is that the chasm is becoming bigger and bigger. The further result is that I would say that when I cannot get properly in a legitimate, legal way, let me resort to straight action. What else can I do? You give me an answer to that.

So, Sir, I would say in concluding that I am not giving a threat. As I said at the very beginning, I am speaking with deep anguish and regret. I am unhappy about it. You have brought us to the brink of disaster which you cannot see. This is what exactly happened in many other big countries. These kinds of grievance took ethnic shape. You know that whole history of Nigeria; they fought against each other there was a civil war. Something happened in Sudan, North and South Sudan. Same thing happened even in England and now Scottish people are demanding homeland on the basis that profits out of Scottish high, the sea petrol, should be shared equally between Scotland and rest of the States. So, I say, think twice before you make arrangement speeches like your finance Minister open a dialogue it does not hurt you. Please understand this is the biggest political issue of the country and if you cannot try to settle it, then future is disintegration. Thank you.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Eighth Finance Commission Report which ought to have been submitted in November, might have been submitted on 29th as claimed by them, with the result that we were denied of the opportunity of having the benefit of the recommendations of the Finance Commission.

Sir, I come from an agricultural State. I come from a State which has switched from Congress-I rule to Telugu Desham rule. As a result, we are at a disadvantage on both counts. We were one of the Congress States; we were taken for granted and many things which ought to have come to Andhra Pradesh did not come our way. Now it has been much worse since Telegu Desham Government has come to power. Centre has been discriminating in every aspect. The Mangalagiri Tyre Factory which ought to have come long time back is still nowhere in sight. Kakinada Fertilizer Factory which is so needed for agricultural State is still nowhere in sight. The Medak Ordnance Factory meets the same fate. I am saying this because when we came to power, we were told to bring in financial discipline. As I stated earlier, ours has been one of the few States which tried to meet the demands of the Union Government and wiped out the overdraft, with the result that we are put to a great disadvantage.

Sir, the interim report of the Eighth Finance Commission says that they have given some list of 13 States which have been told to have financial control and which have complied with, and therefore, they will not be entitled for Central assistance. They also say that it has been on the basis of some considerations. What are the

considerations? The target for mobilisation in 1983-84 of additional resources fixed by the Planning Commission for financing annual plans has been kept in view. Here is a big snag. Here is a statutory body which was supposed to look into the financial allocations for the States, takes into consideration the proposals by a body which is not statutory, the Planning Commission. The Finance Commission takes into consideration Planning Commission's proposals and when we ask for another statutory body to discuss namely, the National Development Council, they say, we don't discuss; we don't want to discuss. What is this? How long should we be pushed hither and thither. We demand that the National Development Council should be convened to discuss the various outlays that are likely to be made in the Eighth Finance Commission whose report might have been submitted to the Government; otherwise, we will be giving scope for a non-statutory body like the Planning Commission to come to gain an upper hand continuously and their dictates become the dictates for the States and for the Governments who have come to power by the overwhelming choice of the people. The State Governments are pushed hither and thither (*Interruptions*) The interim report says that certain norms have been tentatively used. We do not know what are those. But still, they have recommended certain allocations. As a result of this, we have been getting a little less than what we were getting earlier. I do not know, ultimately, what would be the picture.

Sir, we know, the law and order situation in the country is not very good. We know certain improvements have to be made in the administration and in the field of development administration. But the Finance Commission in its interim report, had no time to make any provisions. It says that no provisions have been

made for expenditure on the following two items and that their recommendations thereon would be made in the final report. One of the items is, fresh proposals for upgradation of standards of administration. In my State, we have set up a Police Commission. The Police Commission has given its report. They have suggested certain improvements in the police administration. This necessitates greater outlay. But where from should we get the money? Should we get the money for financing the mid-day meal scheme? Should we get the money for supplying rice at Rs. 2/- per kg. to the people, to the poor people, in our State? Should we get the money for doing other things? For instance, we have got the Yuva Shakti programme. We have got the pension programme for widowed women. We have got other programmes for women. Should we get the money for these things or should we get the money for this? The money ought to come from the Union Budget, from the Union Government. But there was no proposal because that is not very convenient.

Then Sir, another point which I would like to bring to the notice of the august House is the disparity in the scales of pay and allowances of the employees of the State Governments and the Union Government. Some times, Sir, a peon in a Central establishment gets much more than a clerk in the state Government. When we ask for money to meet this, they say that this will be adjusted subsequently when the next Finance Commission gives its report and so on. I would like to ask, why there should not be a certain amount kept apart from the Central fund, for the States also to meet the requirements of raising the salaries, of raising the dearness allowances and so on, which are conceded by the Central Government? If price rise warrants increase in the dearness and other allowances of Central Government employees, there is a justifiable case for doing the same thing in the case

[Prof. C. Lakshmanan]

of the State Government employees as well. The money for this should come from the Union Government, but it does not come. In the interim report, it is the same thing. This is not taken into consideration.

Finally, Sir, I would like to say some thing about the natural calamities. The Seventh Finance Commission, in its wisdom, has stated that they have made adjustments in the figure for 1977-78 to moderate the effects of the extraordinary large expenditure necessitated by the unprecedented cyclone in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu in 1977. But has there been a similar recommendation in the case of Andhra Pradesh which had met with not one, but two unprecedented, much larger, calamities than what happened in 1977-78? There is no answer for this. The Union Government does not come forward and tell us what exactly is the position.

Sir, we have four districts in Andhra Pradesh which are the worst-affected drought areas in the country as a whole. If we do not take adequate steps, these four districts will one day become a desert. Of course, we are trying our level best to do something there. We have taken up the Telgu Ganga project, as I mentioned earlier, to give water to the parched lands of Rayalaseema and to the parched mouths of the people of Madras city, in Tamil Nadu. We have been asking the Central Government to recognise this as a national project. This is because this project is going to benefit not merely the drought-prone, famine-stricken, and very backward, four districts of Andhra Pradesh, but the people of Tamil Nadu also. But still nothing has been done. Neither the Finance Ministry nor the Planning Commission comes forward and says . . . "Look, you are trying to do something which others have not done". It is because two State Governments

come to an agreement, come to realise what has been before us for a number of years and they want to, as a result, do benefit to the people. But the Union Government does not do anything about it. Even till today we have not received the sanction. On the other hand, we said, "we will not wait until such time as we get the sanction". We have been able to make some adjustments within our resources. We are going ahead with it. In some places again we have to cut a few trees here and there. There is the reserve forest policy coming in the way. But that is a different matter. None the less several things are there; several things have already been said. All that I would plead with the Union Finance Minister is you please look at the problems of these States not as though they are problems of somebody else. We are a part of you. We may be having a different type of government as a fulfilment of the desire of the people as they voted us to power. But please do not treat us as different people.

Once again, I want to emphasise that this country will be strong only when there will be strong States. You can never have an edifice on a sandy foundation. Therefore if you want to have a strong edifice, a strong building, a strong Centre or a strong Union, make it sure that you have given adequately to the States which are legitimately claiming their share which has been eroded over a period of 25 to 30 years, because, as I was mentioning in an earlier intervention, there has been a continuous erosion in terms of Central revenues and also in terms of public borrowings. Therefore, I once again plead with the Finance Minister to keep these points in mind and do justice to States like Andhra Pradesh and others who are legitimately asking for their share, their due share, so that they can progress, and in their progress you can see the progress of the country as a whole. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Mr. Matto, Last speaker.

SHRI GHULAM RASQOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this subject. The Statement of objects and reasons appended to each of the Four Bills is that it is based on the Eighth Finance Commission's interim report dated 14th November, 1983. So it is because of the interim report that these Bills were framed. But, Sir, I understand that the Finance Commission has submitted its final report about 15 days back. I would like the Finance Minister to come out with the final report and final recommendations so that we can vote them accordingly instead of just interim recommendations on the basis of an interim report.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of the Union duties of Excise (Distribution) Act. As my hon. friends from West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh have stated out of the total Union excise duties, a sum equal to 40 per cent only of the annual net proceeds are to be distributed to the States. To my mind this criterion of 40 per cent fixed by the Union Government is completely arbitrary. This amount should have been equitably distributed, and if it is to be distributed on the basis of 40 per cent, it is a gross injustice and I would submit to the hon. Finance Minister that a fresh look should be given and that the distribution of 40 per cent should be raised to an equitable percentage so that the States get their due share out of the Union excise duties.

The second point that I have to make is this. The hon. Finance Minister has stated that he has more or less kept in tact the share of Union excises duties, particularly so far as the Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. But I would like to ask him a pointed question. That is, on page 124, paragraph 5, sub-clause (2), the Seventh

Finance Commission has stated—and I quote:

7 P.M.

"The percentage of the net proceeds of taxes on income except the portion representing the proceeds attributable to Union territories to be assigned to the States should be 85 per cent."

This is a mandatory provision so far as the Seventh Finance Commission is concerned. So far the figures before me show—the amount of 85 per cent has not been paid to the States. It is not more than 60 per cent or so. I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister why the clear instructions of the Seventh Finance Commission have been violated in respect of distribution of income-tax.

Now, the third point that I have to make is that nowadays when excise duties are being levied, there is a tendency on the part of the Government to levy a surcharge on these excise duties. This is being wilfully done to take cover under article 271 of the constitution. Article 271 of the constitution stipulates:—

"Notwithstanding anything in articles 269 and 270, Parliament may at any time increase any of the duties of taxes referred to in those articles by a surcharge for purposes of the Union and the whole proceeds of any such surcharge shall form part of the Consolidated Fund of India."

So, this surcharge is not distributable to the States. No. I would like the hon. Finance Minister to please see to it that in future whenever there is a revision in excise duties it is for the total excise duties and not in the form of a surcharge.

Similarly, Sir, my friend from West Bengal has stated that under article 270 the taxes on income do not include corporation tax. Shri Kalyan Roy has given the staggering figure of over Rs. 2,200 crores that have accrued to the Government of India on account

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

of corporation tax. If an amendment to the Constitution is needed so that the States could get a share from this corporation tax, it should be done so that equitable distribution is made to the States from corporation taxes.

Sir, here is something very interesting about the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Amendment Bill. Again, in the case of my State, more or less, the position is the same. It is 0.744 per cent for this period also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): All these points have already been covered.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: No. Sir, kindly listen to what I have to say. What is the criterion for the distribution of additional excise duties?.. (interruptions).. Please bear with me. It has been stated there that in the case of sugar—kindly look at it average despatches of sugar to the Union territories and to each State during the three years ending 1976-77. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Your State does not produce any sugar at all.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: It is despatches to the State. But the criterion fixed is 1976-77. And, in the case of textiles and tobacco, the population taken is according to the 1971 Census and average per capita State domestic product. I would like the hon. Finance Minister to tell me how 1976 figures are valid for current distribution, how the 1971 Census is valid for this current distribution. I would request him. I would beg of him, to have a look at it. The distribution of the proceeds of the additional excise duties on special categories should be done on a rational basis, upgrading it to the 1984 level and also doing it on the 1981 Census basis. This is a very important thing because we are getting a very bad deal, a very raw deal as a result of this.

Now, another point is about the grants-in-aid. Grants-in-aid of the revenues in the respective years under the substantive part of clause 1 of article 275 of the Constitution are being granted under the Seventh Finance Commission—paragraph 7—to Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland Orissa, Sikkim and Tripura.

Now under the grant-in-aid scheme which is granted under article 275 of the Constitution, we have to get 80 per cent as grant and 20 per cent as loan. But the reverse is being done in the case of Jammu and Kashmir. We are being given 80 per cent as loan and 20 per cent, or even less, as grant. It needs to be rectified in the light of the Seventh Finance Commission recommendation as also recommendation as per the articles of the Constitution.

Now, Sir, with regard to the financing of relief expenditure for national calamities, again the Seventh Finance Commission has put a margin money of Rs. one crore and thirty lakhs per year for the Jammu and Kashmir State. This money has not been paid to the the State of Jammu and Kashmir since 1982-83, and I would request the hon. Finance Minister to look into this case and reimburse to the State of Jammu and Kashmir this margin money if it is dues to them.

My last point so far as this is concerned is, again under the Seventh Finance Commission, 0.74 per cent of railway passenger fare has to be paid to Jammu and Kashmir State. This has not been done. It is because the railway passengers have not been charged. I would request the Finance Minister to see why this could not be charged. We should also get a share out of it.

The last point is with regard to the additional Excise duties on goods of special importance. I do not know whether it is a clerical mistake or what I would request the Finance

Minister and the officials sitting there to clarify. I have counted the total in the table and it comes to 99.98 per cent. Where has 0.02 per cent gone? That should be explained.

**SHRI S.M. KRISHNA:** Sir, there are some basic question which have a tendency to keep cropping up every now and then in every debate, which has any reference to finance. They have again cropped up today. Debate about the Central-State relationship has gone on for the last one year and three months in great stridency, and in the recent months there has been a fairly well-orchestrated cry or bogey which is being raised by the Opposition parties trying to accuse the Government of India of being discriminatory in their attitude towards the States on the basis of shares of governments that are in existence in our federal polity. Sir, let us be very clear that it is not an uncommon phenomenon in our country. In the last 34 years different governments have existed at different times. The Central Government and the State Governments are not necessarily the same. The first non-Congress (I) government came into being in Kerala. Since then, even taking 1967 into account, there have been non-Congress (I) governments.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** And they were pulled down.

**SHRI S. M. KRISHNA:** So it is not as if non-Congress (I) governments came into being only yesterday or day before yesterday for the first time. They have been there before; they are there today; and there might be the possibility of their continuing for some more time. So let us not try to camouflage the basic issues.

Now, hon. Shri Ghosh, who initiated the discussion, said that the National Development Council has become a ritual. I am quoting Mr. Ghosh. Now I am a bit confused as to how

we start reconciling the views of the learned Members of the Opposition. My good friend, Mr. Kalyan Roy, accused the Finance Minister of being arrogant, being callous, being oblivious etc. etc. Now how I reconcile the views of Mr. Ghosh and those of Mr. Kalyan Roy? Mr. Ghosh has gone on record to say that it was only a ritual. And Mr. Kalyan Roy has taken objection to a purported statement of the Finance Minister, wherein he has said that to discuss the Annual Plans the convening of the meeting of the National Development Council was not warranted. Well, there are very fairly well-established conventions on what the role is of the National Development Council, what the role is of the Planning Commission, what the role is of the State Governments. So, when these parameters are fixed, there is no point in trying to stretch a point beyond certain logical limits.

Now, the overdraft question has been answered. Calling-Attention debates have taken place in this House as well as in the other House. The same points you have been repeating. The same points I will be tempted to repeat. But it is now ten minutes past seven in the evening. And I am sure there is a limit to the patience of the hon. Members also. There is now point in repeating all these things. The fact, is, all of us have to be reconciled to one feature, one basic fact, that the economy has to be managed by the Government of India, the economy of the country, the management of the economy of the country, is the basic responsibility of the Government of India. And the States have got to play a complementary role, a supportive role, a role which would add strength to the national economy. The States should bring strength to strengthen the national economy. And it is in this endeavour—it is a great endeavour—in this great endeavour, we fully value. We fully respect the role that the State Governments have got to perform, and they are performing that role.



श्री कलशपति मिश्र : मैंने यह प्रश्न उठाया था कि क्या आपने इनकम एडजेस्टेड टू टोटल पीपुलेशन फामूला स्कैप कर दिया है या छोड़ दिया है, इस पर भी मंत्री महीदय प्रकाश डालने की कृपा करें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आर० रामकृष्णन) :  
पहले आप पूरा जवाब सुन लीजिये।

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Now, this is not a proposition which is being made for the first time.

Then, Mr. Ghosh also said that the Central Government was behaving like a zamindar, and he also reeled out some figures about the commitments which the previous Government in West Bengal had made, for which the present West Bengal Government has got to pay interest. Well, whatever you have been doing today, I am sure, the next Government which is going to come to power in West Bengal, will have to honour that commitment. There is no point in questioning this. These are some of the basics, the contractual obligation of a previous Government passes on to the successor Government. So, there is nothing new about it.

But, what I am surprised is the venom with which my friend, Mr. Kalyan Roy, spoke. He said, "Calculated discrimination, partisan, hostile, biased. The chasm is becoming wider and wider." And then in between he brought in Mr. Jagannath Mishra of Bihar also. If I am to accept your argument that the Government of India is being very discriminatory in its approach, it is hostile, it is becoming biased against the non-Congress Governments, why do you bring in the Congress Government to buttress your argument? If the Congress (I) Chief Ministers have also the same grievance, if the Congress (I) Finance Ministers have also the same grievance, that the non-Congress (I) Chief Ministers and the non-Congress (I) Finance Ministers have, it is only a

testimony to the fact that the Government of India is not pursuing a policy of discrimination against the non-Congress Governments. When there is a basic fallacy in your approach to this problem, I am sure some of you at least would realise it. So, for heaven's sake do not wage any war against the Government of India that we are being discriminatory or biased against non-Congress (I) Governments. For heaven's sake please do not bring the Congress (I) ruled States into the picture. We will take care of them. There is no party involved in that.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): There is nothing illogical about it. The argument is at two levels. one is about the relationship between the Union and the States and the other is discrimination between the States.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Well, each one of us looks logic from one's own angularities. If I have nurtured a particular angle I see total logic in that and if I do not nurture that kind of an angularity then I see no logic in it. Perhaps you might have honest differences of opinion. Now, let it marks at least from this House we must be responsible. I refute totally the charge of Mr. Kalyan Roy, charging the Finance Minister with arrogance and callousness. I said the other day in the other House that some of the Congress (I) Governments are Government. We are being accused, accusing the Government of India for being soft towards the West Bengal not be said and whenever we make re- The only fault of the Congress(I) Chief Ministers and Finance Ministers is that they are not trying to become as vocal as some of you are becoming here. Just imagine if they also become as vocal as some of you are, what would be the repercussions in the other States. Yes, there has been a deficit financing. The Government of India resorted to deficit financing. Well, defence is in our charge and various other things are in the charge of the Government of

India. We have also taken into account the States' needs and their necessities. Now, that is the reason why we provide for over-drafts also. Any Finance Minister who does not draw attention of a particular State Government which is going beyond certain permissible limits which have been agreed upon then he will be failing in his duties. For this, there is scope for mutual dialogue and I am sure that the dialogue has been going on between the Government of West Bengal and the Union Finance Ministry and things are being sorted out. While we are sorting out things and at the same time you are trying to make much grievance out of this particular thing, certainly it does not help matters. It only vitiates the atmosphere. I would only plead with my hon. friends from West Bengal to look at the financial management of the country from the national perspective. Please do not try to look at it purely from the State's perspective. Because when you talk here you talk as representatives of the nation, not necessarily as representatives of the West Bengal. So, it is in this perspective that I am trying to approach this particular debate. The proposition which I have enunciated is certainly not that you can take exception to that proposition. I am sure you will agree with that proposition.

Now, one general complaint which has been aired is that the Centre has taken away all the sources of revenue and the States are left with very few sources and that they are not being able to tap their own resources. Well, the point has been made earlier also in many debates. Now take the agricultural sector. Well, whatever you see in the agricultural sector is your own. The State Electricity Boards, the States Road Transport Corporations, the irrigation tax and the water rates which go with that, these are all exclusively the preserve of the State Governments. But what is lacking is the will power to tax in some of these

areas. Well, that is left to your wisdom. The West Bengal Government can decide whether to tax to the agricultural wealthier class or not. The Andhra Pradesh Government can also make up its own mind whom to tax and whom not to tax, or what would be the power tariff for industry. (Interruptions). Well, if you have done well, there is no quarrel between you and me.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): You should appreciate that.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Wherever any particular State has managed its economy well, its finances well, we have never failed to appreciate that. Let me go on record to say that we appreciate it. We thank them for not bothering us any further. Our point is only with reference to those States which do not manage properly. Well, they say "commitments". Well, all of us have commitments. Now, if all of our commitments are going to be honoured, then the country is going to become bankrupt. The point is made as if the Government of India can go on getting currency notes printed in the Nasik press, Sir, we should also become students of monetary economics. It is not as easily done as it is said. It cannot be done. It has to be backed up by other power. So it is not as if the Government of India can print currency notes and just distribute it to the States and it is not doing it. That only shows that we have very little appreciation for grass-roots economics.

Now, about the corporation tax, Sir, if corporation tax is, according to the Constitution, not sharable, what is it that we can do? And the same point is being made in every debate, in debate after debate.

Then about income-tax and 85 per cent to the States it was said that the Finance Commission has become redundant. That was one of the points

[Shri S. M. Krishna]

made that the Finance Commission has become redundant. Sir, it would be very uncharitable to make that remark against the Finance Commissions. I think the successive Finance commissions have made a great contribution for a better Centre-State fiscal relationship over a period of time. The previous seven Finance Commissions plus the Eighth Finance Commission which has just submitted its final report, all of them have done yeoman service to put the Centre State fiscal relationship on an even keel. So let us not try to denigrate institutions. By denigrating institutions, none of us is going to gain; on the other hand, all of us are going to become poorer.

Sir, I need not cover the other points which have been made in the debate. The Sarkaria Commission is there. Now, all of us are free to go before the Commission to place all our points of view and the Commissions will consider the various points that are placed before it by political parties, by State Government, by the Union Government and ultimately, as the Prime Minister has said and the Finance Minister has said, a national consensus has got to emerge. Towards this national consensus, let us try to understand each other better, and as a first step, let us stop suspecting the bona fides of each other.

These four Bills cover a very limited objective and that limited objective certainly did not warrant a full-dress debate on the Centre-State relations. Sir, with these few words, I commend all the Bills for the acceptance of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): I shall now put the first motion moved by the hon. Minister to vote.

SHRI TARVATHANENI UPENDRA: On a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Quorum is not raised generally.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Why, Sir? I want to raise it. It is the responsibility of the Treasury benches to ensure quorum at the time of passing such important Bills.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): If you insist on the quorum I will have no objection to ring the quorum bell. But the convention of the House is that quorum question, is not raised.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I am not insisting, but I am reminding the Treasury Benches that they should remain in the House and ensure quorum at all times. That is all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Act, 1979, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): We shall now

take up the clause-by clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Act, 1957, as passed by the Lok Sabha be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): We shall now take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Union Duties of Excise (Electricity) Distribution Act, 1980, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): We shall now

take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Estate Duty (Distribution) Act, 1982, as passed by the Lok Sabha be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): We shall now take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*