

[श्री रामानन्द यादव]

इंस्ट्रक्शन बिहार सरकार को दे कि कांस्टीट्यूशन के द्वारा संविधान में जो पिछड़ी जातियों के संरक्षण की बात है उसको वह जल्दी से जल्दी लागू करे। इसको सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने अपनी रूलिंग में जायज बताया है। इस आरक्षण के खिलाफ लोगों ने केस भी किया सुप्रीम कोर्ट में और सुप्रीम कोर्ट के एक जज ने इसको सही बताया था। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी के मैनीफेस्टो में भी जो आरक्षण देने की बात कही गयी है उसको वह पूरा करे। मैं सरकार से यह अनुरोध करूँगा कि वह किसी भी तरह इस तरह के आंदोलनों के फेर में न पड़कर आरक्षण को जल्दी से जल्दी इम्प्लीमेंट करे। यही मेरी मांग है और दूसरी बात यह है कि इस तरह के जो पीसफुल प्रदर्शन करने वाले लोग हैं, जो पार्टियां हैं जिनके लोग सर्विसेज में नहीं हैं उन निहत्थों पर इस तरह से लाठियों और डंडों से प्रहार करना आंदोलन कुचलना नहीं है बल्कि यह जन आंदोलन ऐसा है जिसके बल से सरकार को यह ताकत होती है कि वह जनता के उपयोग के जो काम हैं उसको करे। इस प्रकार के प्रदर्शन जो जनता सरकार के कामों में होते हैं उस मदद को सरकार को लेना चाहिए।

SHRI PIARE LALL KUREEL URF PIARE LALL TALIB (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, kindly give me only two minutes.

श्री उपसभापति : किस बात पर बोलना चाहेंगे ?

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील उर्फ प्यारे लाल तालिब : रिजर्वेशन के मसले पर।

श्री उपसभापति : रिजर्वेशन पर बहस नहीं हो रही है।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील उर्फ प्यारे लाल तालिब : चंद बातें कहना चाहता हूँ।

(Interruptions)

SHRI L. R. NAIK (Karnataka): Give me one minute, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA): Are you going to create a new precedent, Sir.

श्री उपसभापति : अब बहस नहीं होगी।
सदन की कार्यवाही 2 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House adjourned for lunch at six minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at six minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the Chair.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL) 1978-79 GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, as far as this Budget is concerned, quite apart from the people on the Opposition side, even the Members of the Janata Party in their private party meetings have expressed their extreme dissatisfaction with the proposals. I am sure if a free vote is taken in this House the Budget will be thrown out by this House. This is the actual position. Now, I want to judge this Budget on the basis of what the Government of India itself had said in its Economic Survey in the concluding paragraph of Chapter I. It says:

"To sum up, while there is sufficient cause for satisfaction in the performance of the economy in the current year, the shortfalls in the production of commodities like edible oils, pulses and cotton, the low rate of increase in industrial production, the increased liquidity in the economy, the sluggishness in industrial investment and the accumulation of reserves are matters for concern. The emphasis of policy will therefore, have to be on increasing the output of these commodities,

providing incentives for larger investment in industry and formulating an overall strategy of growth which will utilise the increasing foreign exchange reserves."

This is what the Economic Survey has stated. I want to judge the Budget whether any of these objectives which they have stated are likely to be achieved.

Sir, yesterday a number of my friends from this side belonging to both the Congress Parties were thundering against this Budget. While I was hearing them I was just laughing within myself. I wish some wisdom had come to them earlier. I do not know if wisdom has come to them even today. I want to judge the Janata Party's Budget on the basis of the promises that the Janata Party had made on the eve of the elections. It is no use for them to go on saying that they have been left with the legacy of a very bad and shattered economy. All these things are known to the world and nobody expects that the Government within eleven months would be able to put the economy on even keel. The common people and we also want to know the direction in which the economy is going, whether at all there is any hope today that the difficulties from which this country is suffering are likely to be removed in the foreseeable future with the policies that they are adopting. My charge is that the same policies that were adopted by the Congress Party before are being adopted even now by the Janata Party. There is absolutely no change whatsoever in that direction. Why is it that our economy today is what it is today? Why is it that our economy today is in shambles after thirty years of independence? The Congress Party, when it came to power on the crest of the wave of the people's struggle, it promised so many things and adopted the slogan of socialism. Now every one has adopted the slogan of socialism. I do not want socialism now.—I want to make

it very clear. It will be surprising for many people in this House to know that ours is the only party which openly declares that we do not want socialism today. We do not want socialism today. Our charge is that as far as this country's economic development at this stage is concerned, the way in which the Congress Party had developed it all these years has led to concentration of wealth on the top and increasing poverty for the people on the other, what are the three or four pillars? The main pillars of the development strategy of the Congress Party all these years has been: (1) Finding resources by increased taxation on commodities used by the common people. (2) Deficit financing. Deficit financing means transferring the wealth of the country created by the common people of this country, from the poorer sections to the upper strata. This is one method in the capitalist society where the wealth created by the common people is transferred from the hands of the poorer sections to the richer strata. This is the second method. The third method was increasing dependence upon foreign aid. It is these methods which the Congress Party has been using all these years that brought this country to a situation where wealth had gone on accumulating at one end in the hands of the big monopolists and in the hands of their hangers-on, and also in the hands of the richer landlords in the villages and making the people poorer and poorer. This has been the continuous strategy of the Congress Party. Now my point is: Does the Janata Party Budget, which you have presented today, deviate an inch from this basic strategy that has been adopted by the Congress Party all these years? We are told that the economy is developing. Years ago we were told by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, at the end of the second Five-Year Plan, that the economy of this country was at the take off stage. It has been taking off and off. In reality it is running backwards instead of going forwards, let alone taking off the ground. And

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

toady also we are promised that the economic situation next year will be extremely beautiful, extremely good. All these things do not help us. The main question is, when you say that the progress of the economy has been fairly good, I want to judge it not from the point of view whether industrial production in a certain industry has increased or decreased but from the point of view of the common people of this country—how far the people of this country have benefited, how far their poverty has increased or lessened and how far their common consumption needs have been met or not met. This is the main consideration when we talk of the economy of the country. Otherwise, what does it matter if some big people get a huge amount of profit? How does it matter to the common people? It is from that point of view that I want to judge this Budget. And here are the figures given in the statistical talks of the Economic Survey. What does it show?

It shows that the net availability of cereals and pulses in the year 1977-78 was 438.7 grammes as against 457.9 grammes. The year before the net availability of cereals and pulses declined by 19.2 grammes per head per day. Therefore, the common people cannot get their basic necessities of cereals. Take cotton cloth. It was 15.2 metres per head in the peak period during 1964-65 and it declined to 11.4 metres in 1976-77. That means that during the Decade of Progress, the cloth consumption of the people of this country decreased from 15.2 metres to 11.4 metres. What happened last year? Last year, i.e. in 1977 according to the Economic Survey, cloth production in this country has declined over the total cloth production in the previous year. Therefore, if you take into consideration the increase in population of about 2 per cent and also the decline in production of cloth, it means the net availability of cloth for the people of this country has declined from 11.2

metres per year further down—I do not know how much. Actually, the statistics are not available. Therefore, it is from this point of view that I want to see the performance of the Janata Government. Are they thinking in terms of how to improve this condition? What does the Budget say? What is the strategy of this Budget? It is deficit financing of Rs. one thousand odd crores. Of course, it has concealed something. It is going to be more. An unprecedented deficit financing of more than Rs. 1000 crores! Again, there is tremendous increase in commodity taxation and foreign aid. Here are the figures given. In July, 1977, the Aid India Club pledged an aid to India which is about 623 million US \$ more than what it was in 1976-77. Therefore, what is the difference in the strategy of the Congress Party and the Janata Party? What is the difference with regard to the strategy for economic development between the Congress Government and this Government? It is the same policy of dependence on foreign aid. With a vengeance there is an increase in foreign aid. Why should you require so many millions of dollars more of the United States and the World Bank aid? We know what foreign aid means. This foreign aid has been a particular stratagem, a particular weapon by means of which these imperialists who have lost their political bower in the newly developing countries are imposing what we call neo-colonialism on these countries.

Therefore, as far as resources mobilisation is concerned, there is an increase in dependence on foreign aid. Again there is deficit financing and dependence upon increased taxation on the commodities used by all the common people. I do not want to go into details because everybody has talked about these things. And yet the Statistics Department gives out that there will be only an increase of 0.8 per cent in prices, and all that. Go to the bazar and find out how much increase in price is there. The

taxi drivers, the rickshaw-pullers and all other people are cursing the Government. This has been their reaction as soon as this Budget was announced. What is the remedy? Why is it that the industry in this country is in a state of sluggishness. Here is an answer by your own Economic Survey. What does it say? I quote::

"The lack of demand is due to different causes for different industries. In cotton textiles...." (which is the most common commodity needed by the common people) "...it seems to be..." (these are the wonderful economics; they cannot precisely say what it is due to)...." due to high prices of cloth and the lack of growth in the real incomes of urban consumers, both working and non-working class..."

The last impounded Rs. 1500 crores of DA to lessen the incomes of the working and the non-working class. To continue with the Economic Survey, what does it further say?

"Rural consumption of cloth does not seem to have increased adequately in spite of increases in incomes..."

Why is it that despite an increase in income in the rural sector there has not been an increased demand for cloth? It is for the obvious reason that the increased wealth in income in the rural areas has gone into the hands of a particular section, a small section of landlords and other hangers-on and the common people, the poor peasants, the agricultural labourers who form the vast majority of the people, have been further impoverished. Cloth consumption can increase in the urban section only if the purchasing power of the working class and the non-working class increases. But the purchasing power having gone down, cloth does not find a market. This is what they themselves say. Then they say:

"So far as consumer goods industries are concerned investment does not seem to take place because demand is not rising fast enough."

How can demand rise fast enough in these conditions? And then they say:

"This seems to be due to the fact that the demand for such goods comes from a small segment of society which is not growing sufficiently rapidly for a variety of reasons"

This refers not to the cotton cloth, the cloth used by the common people. This refers to goods like air-conditioners, televisions and all those things. The demand for them also does not go up because the number of the people who can purchase these things does not grow. How can it grow? Their market is dependent upon a tiny sector. Their industrial growth is dependent upon small tiny segment of the population. As far as the common people are concerned, they have no place in it. Therefore, they say:

"But further growth seems to have been limited because demand from other segments of the economy is not increasing as incomes have not grown fast enough and prices have risen sharply. Therefore, the need for incomes in these other sectors to grow is urgent if demand is to increase and lead to more investment"

The diagnosis is there. The disease has been diagnosed. The disease is that the vast majority of the people have no purchasing power. In the absence of the purchasing power by the vast majority of the people the industries are bound to be stagnant. There is going to be further and further stagnation. What are the policies of the Government today? Do the policies show a way out? Does the Government follow a different policy having diagnosed the disease? What is it that they are doing today in order to see that the pur-

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

chasing power of the common people, the working class, the wage earners the agricultural labourers, the poor peasants and other sections is increased? What are the measures that they have formulated here for the purpose of increasing their purchasing power? This is the main question, Sir. It is on this basis that the whole budget has got to be judged.

Then they say:

"In such a situation the role of exports of manufactures in sustaining domestic production is well worth noting. In many industries such as textiles, engineering, steel, leather manufactures, exports have accounted for a *substantial volume of production*. In the absence of such a market the viability of these industries would have been seriously affected."

Therefore, the viability of the existing industries is dependent upon the export market, the export market which we are sustaining by a subsidy of nearly Rs. 400 crores. That means that our cloth, the cloth produced in this country, is not for the consumption of the common people of this country but for the people of the richer nations like the Americans and the British. The common people of this country have got to subsidize the cloth consumption of those people. This is the kind of economy which we are having today. This kind of economy was developed by the previous Government and the same thing is today being repeated. Is there a departure from this policy? That is the basic question which I want to ask. So long as a departure does not take place, what is the use? Well, the previous Government has bequeathed a shattered economy. Nobody denies it. And we expected you to make a drastic change in the direction of the economic improvement of the country. But, where is that drastic change? Once again there is the same kind of raising the finances. What are the resources in this country?

Ours is the richest country in the world as far as the natural resources are concerned. As far as the labour power is concerned we are not able to utilise it. And why are we not able to utilise the labour power? This is the major question which we have to face today.

As a matter of fact, the Economic Survey points out that the private savings have been 2 per cent more than the investment. Why? Where is the question of lack of resources? Why do they not come and invest the 2 per cent more savings? Yet you are talking of further savings. Where is the possibility of savings by the common people? Therefore, Sir, I am judging this thing from that point of view and it is from that point of view that I want to point out that given this situation, there is going to be not only inflation but also stagnation. This Budget is going to lead to further stagnation. During the last two years more than 500 factories in this country were closed. More than half a million workers were thrown out of employment during the period of Emergency because of stagnation. And today that stagnation continues. Because you are going to follow the same policies, you are going to have not only inflation but also stagnation. What is called 'stagflation' by the American and European economists is now going to come to this country at the end of this Budget. And I warn this Government you will not be able to get out of it so long as you follow these policies.

Then they say, "As far as the rural sector is concerned, we are now very much interested in increasing employment and, therefore, we are developing, we are encouraging the small-scale industries, rural industries, handloom industries and all sorts of things". I want to point out that in an undeveloped country or a developing country like ours, we do require these small-scale industries and all these things as a transitory measure. But it cannot be a permanent measure.

As a transitional measure, we do require protection for these things. But ultimately we have to become a modern country, and in order to become a modern country, the highest technology has got to be developed in the country. That is quite all right. But then, we also know that the small-scale industries are not able to compete with the giants. What are the rural industries you are going to create? Who is going to be purchaser? Who will purchase all those goods? As far as the richer sections of the villages are concerned, in whose hands money is concentrated, they will go in for sophisticated goods not for these hand-made goods. And as far as the poorer sections of the people are concerned, they are already not able to buy the other goods; and these goods they will never be able to buy. Therefore, what is the use of talking of building rural industries and all that in the absence of the basic question that in order to tackle rural poverty, you have got to abolish altogether, without compensation, all the debts owed by the common people, owed by the peasants and agricultural labourers? Completely abolish them. Free them from the debt bondage, on the one hand and, on the other, break up the land holdings of these big people and distribute them to the common people, to the landless people and also assure a need-based minimum wage for the poor agricultural labourer. Without all these things, what is the use of saying that you are going to reduce the disparities in income between the higher sections and the lower sections? You have appointed that wonderful Bhoothalingam Committee, that gentleman...

SHRI N. H. KUMBHARE (Maharashtra): Why don't you do it in West Bengal?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We are doing it within the framework of your Constitution. You should understand that. You should understand that when we want to do it the Constitution comes in our way. That is why

we want to change the Constitution. You do not give us the powers. The Constitution stands in the way. We cannot abolish all that without compensation because the Constitution comes in the way. You have got to come to the Centre. That is the main question. For everything we have got to come to the Centre. That is why we want more powers for the States. We are doing whatever we can within the framework of our Constitution. We have begun a serious attempt to find out *benami* lands. Every attempt is being made, with the help of the peasants, to find out *benami* lands, take possession of them and distribute them to the peasants. Don't talk of what we are doing in West Bengal. You cannot do such things.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA (Gujarat): Your partner has promised the people to abolish the right to property. Request them to do it.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We can all join together on that, don't bother. I have no hesitation in joining any party on these questions. I want to assure you that on a democratic issue, I have no hesitation in joining any party which supports the democratic issue. I stand on principle, let me make it clear.

Therefore, Sir, from this point of view, when the price of every commodity is going to rise, these policies will again lead to concentration of wealth in the hands of the topmost sections. The same thing is going to happen again. Therefore, instead of leading to a lessening of disparities as promised in the Jana'sa Party's Election Manifesto it is again going to lead to concentration of wealth in the hands of the top sections of the people.

This is the first basic question. Now, I want to ask them: when the man-eater is there, when the maneater has been let loose long ago and the maneater has become strong—when I talk

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

of the maneater, I talk of the sharks in the market, I talk of the big monopolists—when those maneaters are there, how can these small people thrive at all? These maneaters gobble up everybody. They eat everybody. In this society so long as you allow the maneaters do continue to exist, all talk of developing small-scale industries and all those things will end in smoke, because we know the concessions that are given for the purpose of developing certain rural industries are also being globbled up by these big monopoly houses, these maneaters. This is the actual position. So long as these maneaters last, even the public sector undertakings are always under duress; they cannot function properly because they bribe them; they give them contracts, they get money; the officers get corrupted. All these things happen. So long as these maneaters are there, corruption can never be put an end to, whoever might come into power. I say even if our party comes into power, so long as these maneaters who are the breeders of corruption, are there—the Tatas, the Birlas, the Mahatlas, all these people—it is not possible for any Government or for any individual—even if Mahatma Gandhi were alive even if God were there in the Government—to put an end to this corruption. So long as these maneaters are there, no corruption can ever be put an end to. Even God would be bribed. This is the actual position. Are you prepared to attack them? Are you prepared to root them out? When you are talking of lessening the disparities in incomes, what is the biggest disparity in incomes, what is the biggest disparity in income? Is the disparity in income between a clerk in the public sector and a peon somewhere else the biggest disparity in income in this country? The biggest disparity in income in this country is the disparity in income between the big monopolists and the ordinary people, the biggest disparity in income is between the landlords and the poor peasants and agricultural

labourers. It is this disparity in income between these two classes which is the major kind of disparity in income. Are you prepared to attack that? If you are not prepared to attack that, then all this talk of reducing the disparities in incomes is just a shibboleth, just like the slogans given by Shrimati Indira Gandhi 'Garibi Hatao' and 'Bekari Hatao'. What is the difference between that and this? They are the same slogans but in different garbs. The people cannot live on slogans. This is the actual position.

Then I will just come to two or three concrete things, because I have not got much time. You talk of helping small-scale industries....

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Nothing has been done.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I quite agree with you. What is it you are doing? Here is the Finance Minister who has said....

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : कहां फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर हैं ?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am not talking of his presence here in the House. When I talk of the Finance Minister, I talk of the Finance Minister in the Government. I am not talking of his presence in this House.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : कहां हैं ?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: कुछ भी हो, कोई भी हो Whoever it be, it does not matter. Anyway, the important point is you have got accumulated so much foreign exchange. Over Rs. 4000 crores of foreign exchange has come. Now this accumulation of foreign exchange has become a headache to you, instead of having big resources for economic development. The Congress Government between 1946 and 1950 squandered the foreign exchange resources, the sterling balances, that our country had accumulated. They squandered them to please the British Government while purchasing

commodities. The Congress Government squandered the foreign exchange resources; they wasted them. What is the policy this Government is pursuing? Suddenly, a few months ago, polyester filament yarn was allowed to be imported against the export earnings of any commodity. Now, is it a commodity needed by the common people of this country? It was suddenly allowed to be imported. Then what happened? When I took it up with the Government of India saying, you are wasting this foreign exchange, they made some modifications. I do not want to go into the history of that now. But the STC had imported it, and today there is a Government-owned company manufacturing polyester filament yarn since the month of December called the 'Petrofil.' The break even price of this product for petrofil is Rs. 135 per kilogram. But the STC allots the polyester filament yarn to the cotton mills when all along the policy has been that the mill sector should not use this polyester filament yarn.

This had been reserved during the last 25 or 30 years for the art silk sector i.e. industries which are mostly in the small scale sector. Cotton mills had been allowed to use it only in condition that they export their entire products. Always these things have happened in the past. And today the Janata Party allows the cotton mills to use it. Are you helping small-scale industries by doing this or are you killing the existing industries? If not, why talk like that?

The Petroleum Ministry pleaded with the Commerce Ministry that the price at which they should sell it to those people should not be less than Rs. 135/- which is the breakeven price of petrofiles. They fixed the price. But the Commerce Ministry fixed the price at Rs. 120/-. Therefore, by importing this year and fixing it at Rs. 120/-, our foreign exchange is being wasted. You are killing on the one hand the small-scale industries that are there and on the other you are also finishing the public sector undertaking of petrofiles over which you have invested

a sum of Rs. 60 crores. What is this policy? The Finance Minister comes here and says:

"I have only one proposal for upward modification of the customs tariff, not so much as a measure of raising revenue but as a measure of protection to Indian industry."

He says that the upward revision of tariff is not for raising any revenue, but as a measure of protection to Indian industries and, therefore, he says:

I propose to increase the import duty on polyester filament yarn from 120 per cent to 200 per cent *ad valorem*. This will yield about Rs. 6.4 crores in a year.

Maybe, the Petroleum Minister had convinced the Finance Minister that if the *ad valorem* duty is not raised and the price of the imported yarn is not made at least equivalent or a little more than the price at which the Petrofil can sell it then that industry will collapse. What did the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports do? I do not know whether there is any co-ordination between the various Ministries of this Government. Here is the Finance Minister who says that the local product needs protection and for which he has made an increase in the tariff and has increased the import duty by 80 per cent *ad valorem* which would work out to nearly Rs. 18/- a kilogram. Now, the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports meets the Minister. I know it because I was present on that day in the house of Shri Bahuguna and Shri Bahuguna says it should be fixed at Rs. 138/-. But the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports fixes it at Rs. 125/-. What does this show? Are the Ministers working at cross purposes, I do not know. Or, I do not know whether the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports has completely sabotaged the policy that was decided by the Finance Minister and the Petroleum Minister? What is this kind of functioning? By this process

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

whom are you protecting? Is it not the Cotton mill magnates that are being pampered. Or, is the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports in league with the textile mill-owners? When a particular policy has been deliberately placed before the Parliament, how dare the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports fix the price at Rs. 125/-? What does it mean? It means that the loss caused thereby should be borne by the State Trading Corporation. They should bear it. What is this policy, I would like to know.

Now, take the question of handloom and handloom exports. What is happening here? The entire Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Tamil Nadu where the bulk of handlooms are located are now shouting against this. Now, what is it that has happened? There are two Export Promotion Councils. One is the Handloom Export promotion Council and the other is the Textile Export Promotion Council. The Textile Export Promotion Council consists entirely of the mill-owners and they look after the interests of the mills. But the export of the entire cloth, the guidelines, etc. are entrusted to the Textile Export Promotion Council. So, what is happening today? What has happened today is that out of the quota for the first six months of 1977-78, out of the annual quota, within the whole year, they have exported 75 per cent, and out of the 75 per cent, 65 per cent has been given to the mill sector and only 10 per cent to the handloom sector. This is a wonderful method by means of which they are encouraging the small-scale industries in the country by allowing the mills to go exporting at the expense of the handloom industry and the handloom industry is famishing in this way. Take, for example, coir. Coir has been reserved for handlooms. Now, suddenly one Mr. Karunakaran Nair, gets hold of an officer and is able to get an imported machine, a weaving machine, and on that he is making enormous profits and you are

now helping the small-scale sector in this way. You say that you are helping the small sector by allowing these people to import machines and this is a wonderful way in which you are doing it. I am told today, we are told today, that this Government is very much interested in improving the conditions of the common people in improving the small-scale sector and all that. But, when these things are taking place, when these things are taking place so glaringly, what is the answer? What is the answer that the Janata Government can give? What is the answer that the Janata Party members can give? This is what I want to ask. Therefore, I want to point out that from every point of view, what is happening is not good.

Lastly, Sir, there is only one more point which I want to touch upon, because I have no time and I am just talking of principles. I want to ask: Why is it that the defence expenditure is going up? Are you expecting an attack from Pakistan now? Are you expecting an attack from Bangladesh now? Are you expecting an attack from China now? What is all this? Today, Sir, our relations with our neighbours have improved. We have good relations with them. Our relations with all our neighbours have improved and we have every hope that our relations will improve still more and we have no cause for any quarrel with these nations and I do not think that anybody can dare to interfere with us. So, at a time when enlightened people of even the other countries, even the advanced countries advocate cutting down their expenditure on defence, why is it that our defence expenditure must go on mounting like this? As a matter of fact, our relations with China have improved and it would have improved long before and this is what we were advocating in 1964 and 1965, despite the border dispute, saying that we must improve our relations, that we must exchange ambassadors and so on. At that time you called us anti-national and you called us Chinese agents

and you put us in jail for just saying this. That is a different matter and we are not unhappy about it.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Then, are you not an agent?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Then I will have to call you some other agent. You called us Chinese agents and all that. But we do have our differences and we do differ on many fundamental questions, the whole world knows that we do differ on important issues and we do have our own stand on certain important issues and everybody knows it. The Chinese Party does not recognise our party. Even with the communist parties in the other countries we differ. So, we have our differences. That is a different matter. But this is a well-known fact and you don't know this simple fact.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Karnataka): Now he knows it.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Yes, now he may know it. Now, for the defence of the country, the simple thing to do is, in the interest of the country, to further improve our relations with our neighbours. It is necessary for us to improve our relations. We cannot lose this big market and we cannot go on spending huge sums of money on defence. This is what we said and despite that, at that time, you called us the Chinese agents, you called us anti-rational and you put us all in jail. We are not sorry for that at all and we are prepared to suffer.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Only one thing is there: The Chinese have built up big military bases near the borders.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: That is none of my concern. They have got so many borders, not only with India, but with other countries also. They have got their borders with the Soviet Union and they have got their borders with the other countries unfortunately they have their own quarrel with the Soviet Union.

But the whole point is this: As far as we are concerned, I am glad, and we are glad, that what we stated years ago has been accepted. We are glad that today at least the Government of India has realised it. May be, the Government of India has realised it because of the fact that the industrialists of our country, finding the exports sagging, finding the industries sagging, do not bother very much about the border dispute and all that and want markets for their exports and, therefore, the Government have responded to that. Nevertheless, it is very good. I am happy about it. So, our relations with all our neighbours have improved and when our relations with all our neighbours have improved, it is all the more necessary to reduce the defence expenditure and to work upon the theme of improving our political, diplomatic and socio-economic relations with all our neighbours so that our defence expenditure could much more drastically be cut down. Then we can tell the world, our Prime Minister can tell the world in the world forums, world assemblies: "Look here. We have set an example by reducing our military expenditure. Why don't you all do that?" Only then we can have the moral authority to go and tell the world: "You have to do something about disarmament." Without doing that, if we go on talking about these things and saying, "disarmament, disarmament" it will not be of any use. Therefore, Sir, if this huge expenditure of nearly three thousand crores of rupees is drastically cut down today, and if simultaneously efforts are made to improve our relations with all our neighbours, then there need be no fear of any war against this country.

And, therefore, that would mean that there would not be any need for deficit financing, there would not be any need for additional taxation on the common people and at the same time, if you look in a different direction, a different policy, a basically different policy of really attacking the

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

vested interests in the country, big vested interests, in land as well as in industry, and also their hangers-on, then only on the basis of that you can think of improving the conditions of the people. It is only on that basis that the country's economy can develop. We do not want slogans like Socialism etc. We want big business houses to go, we want landlords to go and we want rural money-lenders to go. If these three things are done today, we are extremely happy. We do not want a slogan like Socialism. 'Socialism' means the ownership of the means of production by the society as a whole. We want to help small holders. We want to help the common people. It is the need of the hour. It is on this basis that I judge this Budget. Otherwise, you are going to bring further inflation and further stagnation in the industry and you are going to bring further deterioration in the conditions of the people, as a result of which social tensions in this country are going to rise higher and higher. In the ultimate analysis, the basic cause of social tension is that there is tremendous despair among the people, particularly the youth who do not see any silver line. Therefore, if you want to avoid social tensions, bring about a transition in society, in that case, the basic attack must be made on the vested interests. But for the leaders of this Government nationalisation is anathema. How can you reduce disparities in income by allowing the Tatas to have 1300 crores of rupees worth of assets? Is this how you are going to reduce disparities in income? What is this all nonsense? Therefore, do not indulge in slogans. Do something practical. If you do not do something practical about this, the stock of the Janata people among the people will go down like anything. It has already gone down and very soon it will go down very badly. So, I warn you: Do not follow in the footsteps of the Congress Party but cut across a new path.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chair-

man, Sir, speaking about the Budget we will have to consider the basic facts about the economy in the country. The economic policy of the Janata Party is clearly stated, namely that the imbalance which has been in the economy during the past several years has to be corrected. We have seen in the past years that the urban sector has developed at the cost of the rural sector. In this country with a population of 60 crores, nearly 80 per cent of the people live in villages. And without a balanced development of the rural areas, as Mr. Ramamurti put it, there is stagnation in industry. He should know the exact reasons for this stagnation in industry.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I have already told you.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: He can imagine only one reason, and that is, vested interests, but nothing further. But, Sir, one will have to look at the whole picture. I am not defending the vested interests in the country, or the landed interests. I do not hold any brief for them.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: How are you going to touch them?

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: They are in many spheres, not only in the spheres of land and industry.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Regarding vested interests, even the previous Government had taken certain measures, they brought about land reforms and certain economic measures also to bring down the vested interests. But the major problem is: How are you going . . .

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: May I just point out that the wonderful green revolution that the previous Government had resorted to has only helped to strengthen the vested interests in the rural areas and impoverish the poor people—a fact ad-

mitted by the Planning Commission itself? In the rural areas there is the upper strata as well as there are vast poorer sections. There are two different stratas.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Yes, it is the poorer sections whom I am thinking about, I am not talking about the few landlords. When I say that 80 per cent of the people are poor, it is the poorer sections whom I am talking about. Regarding the landlords, I do agree that some of them have taken advantage of the Green Revolution much more than the common people. But it does not mean that we, the Janata Government, will continue that policy. We are going to see that any further steps for rural development are not snatched by the small vested interests that are still remaining. We are firmly committed to implement the land reforms and the little vested interests will disappear after the implementation of the land reforms. The only panacea that are you offering and which is not new to us is nationalisation. Nationalise everything. Nationalise the industries. Nationalise the lands.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I never said that.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: That is the meaning of your entire speech. You said about the man-eaters. The man-eaters are there. The man-eaters will have to be controlled. What has happened in the other countries after the nationalisation of the industries? The individual man-eaters have been replaced by the State man-eaters who are bigger man-eaters. The State man-eaters are controlling the economy. The State man-eaters are controlling the industry. You know it. That is not the solution. The solution which we are facing before the nation is this. It is very clearly enunciated that we want to develop the rural sector. That

means the poor people. (*Interruptions*) Please listen. You will understand. Don't be anxious. This rural sector comprises the small farmers, the middle farmers and the landless labourers. These are the main categories. The economic condition of these categories has to be improved. The basic problems that the country is facing are poverty and unemployment. How are you going to solve these problems? As you know, unemployment is rising at an alarming rate (*Interruptions*) I am coming to that. Why are you in a hurry? These problems will have to be solved. These sectors will have to be attended to. Mr. Ramamurti says that small scale industries, in his view, are only a temporary measure. We entirely differ. Small scale industry is not a temporary measure. It has to be a permanent measure in this country because if you develop only high technology and capital intensive industries, you can never solve the problem of unemployment in this country. You are still thinking of the old methods of western countries. These methods have landed them into so many problems. In this country where land is our main resource and the people are our main resources, we cannot imitate those countries. We have learnt that lesson after experience in various other countries and after experience in our own country. We must try to see whether this budget is a beginning in that direction. One budget cannot solve the problems. One budget cannot solve the unemployment problem. One budget cannot solve the entire problem of poverty. But let us see whether this budget makes a beginning in that direction. If it makes a beginning in that direction, let us welcome it. If it does not make a beginning in that direction, condemn it and criticise it.

Coming to this question of economic policy, as I have said very clearly, unless this new orientation is given, unless your entire planning process,

[Shri R. Narasimha Reddy]

entire planning approach or basic economic approach is geared towards the development of the rural areas, both industrially and agriculturally and also socially and educationally, and unless you develop these 80 per cent of the people and area, India can never develop. What happens to the industry? Today there is stagnation. You yourself said that there is no purchasing power of the small farmers, there is no purchasing power of the agricultural labourers, there is no purchasing power of the Harijans and all that. Have we to develop their purchasing power or not is the question. We will have to develop it, and whether a beginning has been made in this direction in this Budget or not has to be seen. Now, take certain facts into consideration. Let us take only a few facts because we need not go into all.

Sir, in this Budget, the allocation for major and minor irrigation projects is Rs. 1,166 crores. For minor irrigation projects, they have allocated Rs. 235 crores. I personally would have preferred a little more for the minor irrigation projects. I would have preferred Rs. 500 crores for the minor irrigation projects. I would request the hon. Finance Minister to reconsider it because in this country, Sir, we have had plenty of major projects, and the minor irrigation projects had been neglected. Sir, if you go to agricultural areas, all over the country, you will find hundreds and thousands of little tanks, hundreds and thousands of little channels. All these things have been neglected for the past so many years. Well, Sir, this has to be taken up. And under these projects, under these small tanks, under these small channels, it is only the small farmers who own the land. So, development of these things will help the small farmer. Sir, the previous Government passed land reform measures but we know

what has been done in the States. The implementation of these land reform measures has been entrusted to the officials only and the corrupt officials have completely sabotaged the land reforms. Now it is the duty of the State Governments with the direction from the Centre to see that the land reforms are properly implemented and nobody owns land more than the ceiling prescribed. Sir, in certain cases, in certain States, there is no uniformity in these land ceilings. Uniformity will have to be brought about on the economic consideration, and taking production also into consideration. And if necessary land ceilings will have to be reduced. I am for even reducing the land ceilings in certain areas, and the excess land has to be distributed. Sir, how much land has been distributed so far? In Andhra Pradesh, in such a big area where there are landlords, what is the excess land? The Government gave us the statistics. It is only 4 lakh acres. How is it so little? It is because of the sabotage by the officials. Sir, this aspect has to be looked into, the interests of the small farmers and the marginal farmers will have to be looked into if the green revolution or whatever you are doing should not go to the landlords.

Sir, there is the small farmers development agency. The Finance Minister has allocated Rs. 115 crores for it. In my view, even this is not enough. The allocation will have to be increased for the small farmers development agency. Sir, he has said that the development of irrigation potential will be about 3 million hectares. In these three million hectares we must see how much goes to which sector. The benefit will have to accrue to the small peasants, to the middle peasants and to the landless labourers. They will be benefited only if you increase the allotment to the small farmers development agency. It is very important. Other-

wise, much of it will be taken away by the top sections.

SHRI RAMAMURTI: Relieve him of his indebtedness.

SHRI R. NAFASIMHA REDDY: Moratorium has been declared in some States. Loans up to Rs. 1000 have been canceled.

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): They were cancelled in Andhra Pradesh by an ordinance, followed by a legislation.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Therefore, Sir, the small farmers development agency is one of the most important aspects of our entire rural planning. Now, please 3 P.M. see one more aspect of it. The Finance Minister in his speech has said that a massive dairy development programme will be taken up. He has said that but he has not given details of the programme. He has said that Rs. 500 crores is proposed to be allotted for a massive dairy development programme. Sir, if this is properly implemented, it is bound to help the landless villagers and the poor people in the villages. If each of them is provided with a facility of having a small dairy, with four or five milch cattle, his economy will improve, his purchasing power will improve. That is where development has to be done. This particular programme of dairy development is really a very revolutionary step taking into consideration the economic backwardness of the poor people in villages.

Now, Sir, the present Budget proposes to allot Rs. 160 crores for rural water supply and about Rs. 150 crores for rural roads. Today we go to villages. What is the condition of roads there? What is the condition of roads 30 years after independence? In the course of the recent elections

all of us would have gone—if we had not gone before, we were forced to go now—and seen what was the condition of these roads? The roads are not absolutely there. Even in a jeep you cannot approach these villages. How can these villages develop without proper communication facilities? So, proper communication facilities to each and every nook and corner of the country is essential. In many areas, especially poorer areas like Rayalseema and such other areas, there will be one revenue village but with that one revenue village there will be some 30 to 50 small hamlets connected. All these hamlets will have to be connected with a road and if there are just one or two houses, they will have to be regrouped and a proper road system will have to be developed. Sir, even here, I would request the Finance Minister to see if this particular allotment can be increased, i.e., towards rural water supply and rural roads.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV (Uttar Pradesh): But the money is in short supply.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Then comes the most important input, both of industry and of agriculture, and that is electricity. Sir, for electricity this Budget has allotted Rs. 2,217 crores and for rural electrification Rs. 297 crores have been provided. This is the allotment.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV: Very meagre.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Considering the overall picture of the Budget, I would say that the allotment is satisfactory. I would have preferred more but nevertheless it is a satisfactory allotment. (*Time bell rings*). Even here, I would request the Finance Minister to see if the allotment for rural electrification which is Rs. 297 crores, can be in-

[Shri R. Narasimha Reddy]

creased. It is very necessary when you say that rural development is the basic strategy and you will have to increase these allotments. Otherwise what we say will not be translated into deeds.

Shri Ramamurti's main point was what is the different strategy that you are adopting, what is the different approach that you are adopting; it is the same Congress strategy. I have to tell him that if he refuses to see the different strategy, If he refuses to see the different approach, that is a different matter, but there is a basic difference in the strategy, there is a basic difference in the approach because there is a basic difference in understanding the economic situation prevailing in the country. We are today reversing the whole thing. That does not mean, as somebody has alleged, that we are going to neglect the industry, that we are going to neglect heavy industry, which is already there in the country. But even the industry which is existing in the country, if it has to be saved from stagnation, it can be done only by developing the rural sector where the purchasing power of the millions of poor people will have to be increased. And then the basic strategy of the Janata Party and this Budget, in my view, is a step in that direction. It may not be a completely satisfactory step and, as I said, one Budget alone cannot do miracles. If it is a step in the right direction, we welcome it and in my view, it is a step in the right direction and I welcome it.

At the same time, I will also have to say something about my misgivings. When we look at the taxation policy, we find that the indirect taxes amount to Rs. 500 crores; the direct taxes amount to Rs. 26 crores and the compulsory deposits come to about Rs. 25 crores. Sir, this is something alarming. In any country, indirect taxes are bound to affect the

common people, the consumer. As Mr. Viren J. Shah said yesterday, Rs. 500 crores of indirect taxes levied by duties and by increase in duties on almost all the consumer goods, will result in a burden of Rs. 1500 crores on the people. According to the taxation policy, those who can pay, should be taxed. When we have such a blanket duty, how can you say that you have taxed only those who can pay? It falls on all, and the majority in the country are not able to pay. So, you have gone against the very principle enunciated, by having a sort of blanket tax of this nature. You have increased the duty on electricity; you have increased the duty on coal and then there is a special duty. Hon. Members have already referred to these things. The Finance Minister assures us that in spite of all this, there is a deficit of Rs. 1050 crores. This is over and above the last year's deficit of Rs. 975 crores. This is something alarming.

Sir, I must say honestly that I cannot share the optimism of the Finance Minister that these duties and this deficit financing will not create an inflationary trend in the country. I cannot share that optimism. So, this aspect will have to be seriously considered and it has to be explained how this does not result in any inflationary tendency. He said in his speech that this is a bold step. I congratulate him for taking a bold step but I want to caution him to see whether it is going to be a risky step also. Therefore, let him look into this aspect of the matter.

Sir, finally, I would like to say one particular thing regarding the implementation. He said in his speech on the planning that there are going to be block development plans. In the Resolution that I moved here regarding the Plan, I emphasised the need for having planning from the bottom, planning from below. You will have

to have not only a planning strategy from the block level but its implementation also from the block level; otherwise the money that goes into it, will be a waste. It is the State Government that will have to do most of it for the rural development programmes. As things stand, if a part of it is wasted or if a considerable amount of it is wasted or frittered away and we do not develop the production potential, then this also will result in an inflationary trend. So, this aspect of implementation will have to be seriously looked into.

Finally, I would suggest only one point. I do not know why it did not occur to the Finance Minister and to the Government. And that is about rural housing. There are three needs of the poor people. One is the cloth. You will have to supply cloth at reasonable prices. The second need is the food, and the third one is the housing. Millions of people live only in huts. They do not live in flats or palatial buildings. Even to have a decent hut, the poor villager does not have money. Sir, the Government should have considered this aspect of rural housing scheme. Under the 20-point programme, the previous Government had given two cents of land to the Harijan. This has not been given to all the people. This has been given only to some people. This is not enough. I would suggest that you should give at least five cents so that a person will be able to have his milch cattle, his goat and his other small implements. Therefore, five cents of land should be given to all the landless poor.

The Central Government should also evolve a scheme, a rural housing scheme for the poor. Under this scheme each of these people should be given at least Rs. 500 by way of interest-free loan. If you sanction Rs. 50 crores under this head, you will be able to have nearly a lakh of hutments in this country. You will be able to do this in the first year

itself. This would be a great thing done to the rural poor because they have no house to live in. Why don't you do that? All your housing programmes are in the cities and in the urban areas. Why don't you think of a rural housing programme for these poor people and allot Rs. 50 crores for the same?

*SHRI B. V. ABDULLA KOYA (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is for the first time I am speaking in Malayalam during the last ten years of my membership of this House. First of all what prompted me to speak in Malayalam today is the fondness for Hindi of some of my friends in Janata Party which has reached its climax. When people like me belonging to small parties speak here, it is not getting due attention at all. That is why I have chosen to speak in Malayalam today. I do not have any feeling that I stand to lose in any way by speaking in Malayalam either.

Now speaking about the Budget my feeling is that for many reasons this Budget cannot be treated as a Janata budget at all. As a result of the hike in excise levy from 2 to 5 per cent excise revenue has risen to Rs. 499 crores. Excise duty on electricity has been raised by 2 paise per kw earning a net amount of Rupees 145 crores, excise duty ranging from Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 and 2 per cent tax on landed property not included in the Schedule are all, although indirect taxes, going to adversely affect the common man. When production goes up the cost of living also will go up. In other words contrary to the proclaimed objectives of the Janata Party, this budget contains many things which may ultimately curtail the employment opportunity. Moreover, it will create inflationary pressures also.

Sir, I have to very regretfully state that there is nothing in this budget

*English translation of the speech delivered in Malayalam.

[Shri B. V. Abdulla Koya]

to cheer up a person like me coming from a problem state like Kerala. Instead of studying the problems of traditional industries of Kerala like Cashewnut, Coir, handloom and finding solutions, our government has created more difficulties and obstacles for them. That is what I have to say when I go through this budget. The Kerala Government and all the Political Parties in Kerala had unanimously demanded that the Coir Industry should not be mechanised. But licence has been granted to a private Industrialist contrary to the declared policy and this has resulted in encouraging mechanisation of this Industry. Similarly the State Government has been demanding the setting up of Silent Valley Hydro-electric Project for a long time. Now, we understand that the Planning Commission is standing in the way of giving approval to that project.

Recently a new policy has been devised by the Central Government for the distribution of imported cashewnut. As a result of that policy 80 per cent of the industries in the field are facing difficulties and lakhs of people are going to face the prospects of unemployment.

Similarly as a result of the giving of licence to big capitalists and vested interest for using mechanised boats for fishing, lakhs of poor fishermen in the coastal area are likely to lose their livelihood. If small people were given licenses that could have been tolerated. But on the contrary they are giving licenses to big industries like the Indian Tobacco Company for fishing in the coastal areas. This is also one issue which is troubling the State of Kerala.

Consequent on the recent amendment to the Sales Tax Act, the State Government is going to lose Rs. 23 crores. When they lose such a huge amount the Central Government should have given something by way of compensation. Similarly as a re-

sult of the hike in the duty on electricity the State Government will lose Rs. 7 crores. Thus the State Government will have to bear a total loss of Rs. 30 crores. How the state can bear such a huge loss is something which we have to ponder over.

Now there are some other things which stand out as a monument of the neglect shown by the Central Government to the State Government. The Cochin-Alleppey railway line is one such neglected issue. Surveys were conducted in this regard and the Government was satisfied that it would be a profitable project. But for some reasons the Planning Commission did not approve of this Project. The entire money invested for this project could have been recovered in 5 or 6 years. And this railway line would have solved many problems of the State. If the loss on account of the amendment to the Sales Tax Act is Rs. 23 crores, the enhanced duty on electricity would cause a loss of Rs. 8 crores.

Another thing which I would like to mention is about the demand for an aerodrome in Kozhikode. About 60 per cent of the people going for employment to Gulf Countries are from the North Kerala. Many commercial and industrial associations and organisations had been making this demand for the last 30 years. The people and all the Political Parties were also making this demand.

My friend, the Hon. Minister who is a Keralite is here. I am very happy that he is also here.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV: He comes from another state not Kerala.

SHRI B. V. ABDULLA KOYA: But he has got sympathy, he has not forgotten the language, Sir, the people of this region under the leadership of the most revered Shri K. P. Kesava Menon have been demanding the setting up of this aerodrome for a number of years. The entire people

of northern Kerala wanted this aerodrome which was approved by the Civil Aviation Department also. Long ago when Dr. Karan Singh was the Minister of Aviation he had agreed to this demand on the floor of the Parliament. The present Minister Shri Kaushik also when he visited Kerala had promised to take up the work on this aerodrome. He had also promised that necessary funds will be earmarked for this purpose in this year's budget. In spite of all that the matter is not making any progress. On the contrary they have now come out with the plea that the Planning Commission is standing in the way and all that. Now what I have to request to my friend the hon. Minister who hails from Kerala and his colleagues that by doing things like this one after another they should not make the entire people of Kerala hostile to the Janata Government.

Now one or two small matters I have to mention here. I had mentioned it in my last year's speech also. That speech was in English. Sir, there is an important road in Kozhikode town though small. That road is not running straight. The reasons for that is that the customs department has a small piece of land there with an area of 3 cents. The customs department is not using that land for any purpose. If this land is given to the Kozhikode Corporation this road can be straightened. For the last several years the Corporation has been asking for this land. But the customs department is not parting with it. I hope the Finance Minister will be able to understand this problem and make the Customs Department part with this small piece of land so that the Corporation can straighten this important road and that will help reduce the number of accidents which take place there every year.

Similarly there is a Public Maidan which was being used by the Military during the British regime. That land also is not being used. In Kozhi-

kode there is not enough land for School Children to play. Therefore, this land should be given for making use as a play ground.

Another thing I would like to mention is about the Beypore Port. This Port has been included in the category of ports which are to be developed by the Central Government. Once an amount of Rs. 1 crore was sanctioned for this port. Thereafter we have not heard anything about that. This port had trade relations with the Gulf Countries even 2 or 3 thousands years ago. When I visited Kuwait, I happened to see boats made in Beypore in those days which they have preserved as their state emblem. But as a result of the neglect shown to this port of historic importance for centuries, even small boats cannot enter that port today.

Another thing is about the difficulties faced by tens of thousands of people who want to go out on search of employment to Gulf Countries etc., which has already been mentioned here by my friends. The Labour Minister of Kerala Shri Oommen Chandy had taken up this issue with the Minister for External Affairs. After the Visa and Passport are ready, simply on some technical grounds hundreds of people are prevented from going abroad.

Sir, before concluding my speech I want to say something about the plight of the Muslims which constitute about 12 per cent of the population. This 12 per cent is about 8 crores of the population. Their plight is becoming increasingly miserable day by day. They have no representation in the Police, Military, Post and Telegraphs, Education, Civil Aviation, Railway, Health, Banks, and also in the Central Secretariat. Their representation in these services is even less than 1 per cent. This is not an honour to any government. The Muslim community never agitated on this issue. We have only raised this matter in the State Assem-

[Shri B. V. Abdulla Koya]

blies and the Parliament. Now a Minority Commission has been appointed. If we wanted to feel that the heavy amount which we will be spending on this Commission has been properly used then a proper atmosphere should be created in which this community should not feel any sense of isolation. I do not say that they are being deliberately kept away from the services. If there is any sincerity in their utterances the Janata Government should do all that they can do for this purpose. So that the Muslim Community may feel a sense of security and participation.

Before concluding my speech I would like to mention one thing more which is troubling the minority communities like the Muslim Community. I especially invite the attention of the Home Minister. We have absolutely no objection to the R.S.S. which claims itself to be a cultural organisation to indulge in any legitimate activities. What we are worried about is what for they are doing this armed exercises. In colleges and Schools and religious place like temples, small children are being trained to use lathis and sticks. If the Muslims, Christians and the Harijans give similar training to their Children also what will be the plight of this country. Recently in a conference of an organisation called Vidyarthi Parishad the students attacked those who disagreed with them on some matters with knives, lathis and swords. If this is the trend I do not know where all these things will lead the country. We know that this sort of training is not sufficient to face any foreign aggression. Therefore, this armed exercise given to the Children should immediately stopped. Otherwise, I would like to take this opportunity to warn this government that other communities also will be compelled to resort to this sort of training for their children as well. Therefore, the training given to children in public schools and temples should immediately be stopped. I do not want

to hurt the feelings of my friends. If a particular community tries to arm itself with such para-military training it will only create division among major communities and this will naturally lead to mutual suspicion and hatred. Sir, with these remarks I conclude my speech.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is the second Budget by the present Government, and against the background of expectations which were roused by the party in Government, the projections made, the proposals suggested and also the programmes thought about are very disappointing to every section of society.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Shyam Lal Yadav) in the Chair.]

Sir, what is it that the present Government is committed to? It is not sufficient that we use some high-sounding phraseology, particularly for vote-catching or to distinguish ourselves from others. Those times have gone, when people could be fooled by words. The Janata Party which is now in power has been talking about Gandhian socialism. What does it mean? How is the thought reflected or translated into action? Through what programmes? Now, is this Budget merely an accounting exercise or, apart from collecting revenues, has the Government also in mind the point of aiming at distributive justice through taxation or through other fiscal measures?

Mr. Ramamurti, our respected colleague, had spoken for nearly 50 minutes. He has analysed and exposed the fallacies of this Government. I am happy that the disillusionment which already started elsewhere is now finding expression from the CPI(M) also which happens to be a friend in the journey with them. He has combined realism with idealism and said that at the moment the party does not talk about socialism or that it should now and here be actu-

lly established. To that extent he is a realist.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN (Kerala): The Fascist forces are still there.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: I am not criticising him; I am appreciating his approach. I hope the CPI(M) would realise further that their journey in the great march along with the Janata Party is only to the detriment of the high philosophy that all the democratic forces have been holding dear to themselves.

Now, does this Budget project any thinking behind the Government? What does it want to achieve in this country? It is not enough to deride or denigrate the predecessor Government and try to cash upon it. You can do it for a while—and only for once. You have done it for 11 months saying that you had a legacy which was a drag on you, that you were handed over and economy which did not permit you any manoeuvre. Whatever could be said as an excuse, you had said. It will be counter-productive in future if the Janata Party believes that it is going to pay them in political terms. I am just representing to them that these tactics have only a limited application. Now, coming to the realities or the facts, the Congress Government handed over power peacefully giving the new Government three great assets to start with: increased foreign exchange reserves, foodgrain reserves and bank finances. In the earlier decade, the absence of foodgrains to feed the millions of the country and the absence of foreign exchange reserves or foreign exchange facilities for importing machines or raw materials which were not available for the development of the economy of this country were the two great constraints for accelerated development. But this Government has been quite lucky and fortunate that its predecessor Government handed over these things. But we are so disappointed

with the Finance Minister, and the Finance Ministry for that matter. They do not know how to use them. It will be so interesting to take note of a particular slogan. As you will all remember, in 1974-75, the battle cry was: "Export or perish." So much was done for exporting things. At that time, it was said that if we did not export, we cannot develop. Now, from that slogan where have we come to, under the Janata Government? "Import or suffer." If you do not import, you are bound to suffer. Now, in so short a period, a period of three or four years, how has the pendulum swung from one extreme to the other? What does it mean? Why is it happening? Have all our export earnings which resulted in a surplus of foreign exchange reserves, or the remittances sent by the Indian nationals working abroad to this country, or the aid given by the developed countries, become a drag on us? Has it become a frightening factor? It is all because of the inefficiency of this Government not to make use of these valuable assets, useful assets, handed over to them.

The Finance Minister, in his earlier Budget speech, said that he was drawing upon these reserves to the extent of Rs. 800 crores to meet the Budget requirements, but now in his speech he says he is unable to do it. Let this Government take the help of more informed elements or forces which could really help this Government in discharging its functions correctly.

Now, what is it that is before us as "the state of the economy"? There has been, as is claimed, in 1977-78, i.e. the current year, an agricultural growth of 7 per cent. This agricultural growth or increased production in agriculture even till this day is conditioned by the south-west monsoon and our kharif crop. Though our scientists have helped us to make best use of nature's bounty by scientific cultivation, by improved seeds, by application of fertilizers, yet the major contributing factor is the mon-

[Shri V. B. Raju]

soon. Earlier it was so and even now it continues to be so. Now let us not gloat over the agricultural production too much. The main thing is the industrial production. There has been a decline. In the earlier year there was an increase of 10 per cent in production. From the 10 per cent growth, it came to 5.2 per cent as has been claimed in the Economic Survey. Why? Again we have some scapegoats. We always go in search of scapegoats and we use those terms without meaning anything. There has not been much investment. There have been certain constraints like power shortage. I am happy that the Economic Survey admits disturbed industrial relations also. The number of man days lost is much bigger than earlier. It might be a cumulative effect. But these are not new things for us. Shortage of power is not a new thing to us. At the same time it has been admitted that there is demand recession. Just now Mr. Ramamurti pointed out that the per capita availability of certain essential supplies—he read about only cotton cloth; there are man-made fibres also. The total availability was about 16.8 metres in 1964. In 1976-77 it was only 12.8 metres. It is 4 metres less. The population is increasing but the production is stagnant. Why? Is it because we do not have the capacity to produce? The cotton textile industry is one of our major industries. I think industry-wise the highest number of workers are employed in this industry. There is no purchasing power. It is not that we have been clothed sufficiently and reached a saturation point. I do not know the exact figure. In some of the countries the per capita consumption is round about 50 metres. It is not that everybody is clothed sufficiently in this country, nor that we do not have the capacity to produce and nor that we do not know the techniques of production. Why? No purchasing power.

I am happy that there is a bias in favour of transferring resources to the

rural areas. But this is nothing new. Ad mauseam repeating it does not make it new. Even the earlier Governments had been talking about it. And what is the new thing that this Budget has presented for the rural development? They talk about irrigation or land development or rural communications. They are nothing new. Every plan has provided for them. It is actually a question of more or less in terms of financial outlays. So, what has to be examined today is how to increase the purchasing power of the masses. Definitely this idea of distributive or redistributive justice should be in the forefront of our minds. Unless it is done, even if you provide for 20,000 crores of rupees, what is the guarantee that it will trickle down, filter down to these poor-hungry millions. What is your approach to institutional change? These things are not placed before us today. It is only a Budget of an accounting exercise to make both ends meet and to mobilise revenue.

I think the Janata Party had not had the time to think about the economy of the country because all these eleven months the Party members were more preoccupied in consolidation of political power, elections and other things. But these things are over now. Let them talk about economics now. In this Budget, there seems to be a deliberate deviation from the nationally accepted policy that the resources, the savings of this country, should be so channelised that they would be available for investment in priority sectors. For this purpose, we nationalised the banking organisation and we encouraged deposit mobilisation, so that the Government could lay hands on those resources and apply them to the priority sectors and to the weaker sections of the society. I think if you carefully examine these Budget proposals, you will find that there is a deliberate attempt to deviate from this policy

and compel the small savers to go in for deposits in companies and for equity in the private corporate sector. Now certain concessions which have been given do deliberately attempt to scale down or bring down the term deposits in the banks. What does this reduction in the interest rate on deposits mean? Yesterday the Finance Minister was answering questions here. I would like the Finance Minister to tell us—during Question Hour we could not get full information—what the policy is behind this. The interest rates on term deposits from 91 days up to three years have not been changed; they continue as before. But the interest rate for deposits from three to five years has been reduced from 8 per cent to 7½ per cent, and the interest rate for deposits above five years has been reduced from 10 per cent to 9 per cent. What does it mean? Do they not want long-term deposits? I tried to talk to economists and even certain administrators as to what the policy is. Sir, we are very much afraid that the term deposits in the banks may go down. What has happened even in this year? The increase in term deposits with the banks has been Rs. 2,172 crores this year as compared to Rs. 2,374 crores in the same period last year. So, even this year they have come down. Sir, this is a very dangerous situation. The party to which I belong cannot subscribe to this. Now, through bank nationalisation, through the policy of attracting deposits from small savers in this country and through many other instruments, we have been able to establish that in this country the savings are sufficient. Today it is not a question of lack of savings. I think the Economic Survey also admits this. It is a question of shortfall in investment. The savings are there. The foodgrains stock worth more than Rs. 2,000 crores, what are they if they are not savings? The foreign exchange reserve of Rs. 4,000 crores which we hold is something like lending our resources to other countries. They are savings. And the bank de-

posits are savings. The complaint is not about savings. They are available. But they must be invested in sectors which have got a priority. That is the basic question.

Now, let us keep politics aside. Let us come to the objectives first. And all these objectives are national objectives, not party objectives. In the last 30 years of Congress rule, many of the things have been national objectives and not partisan objectives. Of course, in the short time that is available I may not be able to go into the details. But I would only plead, and very earnestly plead, with the Government and with the Finance Minister to rethink and to revise the policies. Now, there is a big credibility gap between the precept and the practice, between the promise and the performance. What is it that the Janata Government said a year ago? No deficit financing. In the Budget proposals there is one small item—capital gains tax. In eight months you have changed it. If the capital proceeds are deposited in the bank, as a term deposit, they were not attracting the tax. Now you withdraw it. And you say the concessions will be available if they invest in the equities of new companies. I do not know which man is going to take the risk of investing in companies without knowing the head or tail of those companies. The people all over the country particularly do not know about the corporate activity. They do not know what type of companies these are. Supposing there is a company being promoted for manufacture of cosmetics, and you say, if we purchase shares of that company, then we get the concession. What has happened to the concept of priority? I am afraid again a clandestine activity will come up. The people have begun to feel that the Janata Government has no mind of its own. What it does today, one is not sure whether it is going to stick to it tomorrow. No doubt, there is this lack of investment. There is no investment. Why are

[Shri V. B. Raju]

savings not put into investment? The people do not know the mind of the Janata Party about its pattern of industrialisation. The Janata Party has brought about a caste system in industrialisation. What A produces, B shall not produce. And what B produces, C shall not produce. What is this? Does it happen anywhere else in the world? About employment requirement, for the purpose of promoting small industry, for encouraging cottage industry, for the past 30 years we have been drawing up programmes, we have been talking about them. Labour intensive programme is not a new thing. In fact, almost in every district in India there is an industrial estate for small industrial units; there is a very big sector of handloom industry which is almost a cottage industry and which was getting all encouragement. Why denigrate large scale industry? You talk of agricultural development as though agriculture prospers on its own without industrial support. You want to deny the rural areas the benefit of science and technology. You want them to continue to live in the bullock-cart age. Why do you make it a controversy? If you are going to provide for small industry do it. Who is coming in the way? Why do you say that Pandit Nehru had given a wrong lead to this country? Why are you denigrating his image? Why do you bring in politics here. In fact, in 1965, not today, I was touring Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia was reputed for its development of small industries. In fact, at that time the *per capita* export was the highest in the world. I discussed with them about developing small industry. Their experts told me, if a small industrial unit wants to enter a consumer sector, if it wants to take up consumer activity or produce consumer goods, then it must be more sophisticated, because it has got to compete with the large industry. What can best be done by a small industry is it can be an ancillary to a large-scale consumer in-

dustry, at the best. Particularly in handicrafts where hand alone can do things, it can be a small unit, but not in consumer products where the large-scale units can produce at a lower cost ...

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI BRIJ LAL VERMA): Your past policies have eliminated the village industries.

DR. V. B. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): The Census shows the opposite.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: In fact we did nothing in that direction. The point is that I do not want to enter into an argument. I am only pointing out the truth. Do support small industries. There should be decentralisation. It is necessary. But the question is what product should be taken up by small industrial unit and what should not be taken up. It is not a question of the size of the unit. I know something about this. Not today. I knew it earlier also. Possibly you are on the Ministerial benches today. I was there in 1950 and I handled this then. I will request the Janata Party leaders to learn to take other Party leaders into confidence. This is a national question. It is not a partisan question. We are for small industry. I will take you to the industrial estates in various States. What is their fate? Many such units came up only because of imported raw materials at that time. We have made a survey about it. Therefore, let us not have any rigid view about it. Let us not develop a climate which will prevent investment. Who will invest in such units without knowing whether the Government is going to support them or not? Nobody would take risk. You do not take risk with your money if it is hard-earned money. How do you expect people to subscribe to equity capital of a new company? I think the Finance Minister has applied both his feet simultaneously—one foot on the accelerator and the other one on the brake. He is pressing both simulta-

neously. The car does not move, but only makes noise. Now he is prepared to part with gold also. For one year he can do that. The next year you have to mortgage the Janata Party. This is not the way of doing things. You should not scare away investors. On the one side you say there is no investment. On the other side, you take to such taxation measure which actually discourage investment and prevent savings. You read and re-read these proposals. They are so contradictory that they do not reveal any policy. I do not want to make a criticism for the purpose of criticism. I am only trying to understand the kind of co-operation you expect from us on this Budget. This taxation is a very crude operation of the Finance Minister. The method he has employed is to simply apply the percentage without any regard to the recommendation of the Jha Committee, that first of all the tax structure should be rationalised. Without doing it, you apply uniform percentage. This is a common man's Budget in the sense that it has hit every common man. Your own Party people will not like it, if I talk to them privately. This is such a horrifying Budget. What is it that it has brought to us? It has brought to us huge deficit and rigorous taxation. This Budget we cannot support. This is anti-national, I will say, in the sense that it will retard the economy of the country and put the block back as far as the nation's progress is concerned. One day you will be condemned for retarding this nation's progress. There is not a word about urban unemployment. What is it that is happening in Patna? We have been discussing it this morning. Unfortunately it has assumed a caste colour. But beneath that, there is the problem of unemployment. It has happened in Patna. But tomorrow it will happen in every city of India. I may tell you that.

4 P.M. This is actually the thing.

There is no word about the unemployment in the urban areas and no programme for it.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Nothing.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: They only say that the block development programmes will actually bring the heaven here but they make only a token grant for that, for area development. How are you going to tackle the problem of rural unemployment? How do you go about it? You have done nothing. Already, eleven months have elapsed. Therefore, Sir, these are all dangerous things. No word about disparities, either about income disparities or about the regional disparities. Nothing about them. So, it is simply an accountant's Budget, who has worked on some figures and who has presented it to us saying that there will be a deficit of Rs. 1,050 crores. So, Sir, I thank you for the time you have given me and I would only say that I hope that the experts in the Janata Party and in the Finance Ministry will re-think on this and revise their attitude. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: Sir, I am in general agreement with the criticisms that have been made against this Budget. At the same time, we must also look at it from an ideological point of view. I am neither for State industries nor for public sector industries nor for monopolies. I find myself in agreement with my friend, Shri Ranbir Singh, and another friend who spoke from there yesterday as well as Mr. Narasimha Reddy today, and I find myself in the position of a centrist. Sir, for a very long time, I have been pleading for priority to be given in our planning to the rural interests and the rural people, who are known as the ruralites. So little has been done for them. At long last, Sir, this Government has come forward with their support for this conception of rural priorities. But, 20 years ago, I think about 25 years ago, I published a brochure called "Planning and the Peasant". Afterwards, there was another book by me, "The Credo of the World Peasantry". In both of them, I pleaded against Jawaharlal Nehru's priorities at that time and in favour of giving

[Shri N. G. Ranga]

priority to the peasant agricultural workers, self-employed masses in the country and the rural India as a whole and its people. Planning meant fixation of priorities from time to time, and, therefore, we cannot blame Jawaharlal Nehru for having given priority at that time to the development of heavy industries and medium-scale industries. They are also needed. Even at that time, as my friend, Mr. Raju, has just now stated, importance was given, but not enough importance was given, to the development of the cottage industries and the handloom industry and also the handicraft industries, the small-scale and the medium-scale industries. But it was not enough. Some provision was made even at that time for the rural development and for the agricultural workers, peasants, tribal people, etc., but not enough. At that time, the highest possible priority was given to these big industries which would help the urban people and the urban interests. My honourable friend has drawn attention to the absence of any provision for tackling the urban unemployment. It is true. But, all this time, attention was being paid to those people and to the extent it was paid at all, it was good. But no attention was paid to the problem of rural unemployment and unemployment that was growing from time to time in all our villages. So, it is a matter of priorities. Today, a new set of priorities has come to be accepted. It has also come to be implemented by this new Government. It does not mean that they are opposed to State enterprises or large industries or science and technology and industries based upon them. Just as in those days cottage industries and rural industries were also given some place in the planning, today also some place is given to these bigger industries, which had their prime days during the last 25 or 30 years. It is not necessary to condemn anyone in the manner in which the Home Minister has done it. It was very unwise of him to have done so.

What is the use of condemning Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru or anybody else? At that time we condemned the British Government in the Central Assembly for their failure to develop large-scale industries and making us dependent upon the rest of the world for imports of even ball bearings. Therefore that development was needed. But not enough attention was paid to the rural interests, the rural people and the rural industries. So I had my quarrel with Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, whereas my hon. friends at that time were quite comfortable in their ministerial positions. I had the courage, I had the necessity, to differ from my old friend and revered leader, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. I parted company with him and went into the wilderness but afterwards I found my own political allies headed by no less a man than Rajaji and we founded the Swatantra Party and then fought for the kind of priorities to which this Government is paying some attention.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE
(SHRIMATI RENUKA DEVI BARKATAKI): Thank you.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: This Government is trying to do something. But then it does not seem to be doing it in a satisfactory manner. Where should it start from? Even the condition in the villages of those people whose holdings are just below the ceiling is such that they are considered to be big landholders; they are not big enough. They are self-employed. They need encouragement from the Government. They need appreciation from the Government in every possible manner. But even below that there are medium scale holders. They are also poor peasants. There are agricultural workers. But this Government has shown only lip sympathy for them. What is needed is to consider what living

wage they would like the governmental workers to come to have. They should fix the minimum wage for them—per day, per month or per year also—according to the various operations that they would be engaged in. And based upon that, let them fix the minimum price for various agricultural products and also a remunerative price, so that the agricultural workers, self-employed peasants, small, medium and good enough peasants would be able to have decent enough standard of living. Based upon those prices of agricultural produce, let them reach the urban people. What has been happening uptill now is continuous process of pauperisation of agricultural workers, the peasants and the rural people, for the benefit of industrialists and urban people. Sir, there are about 10 million people—may be, a few more—employed in urban industries. They constitute 5 per cent of the total population. Now, these people have been insulated from the terrible poverty and penury from which our masses have been suffering all this time. They are being protected in every possible manner. Provisions are being made for them in the matters of health, hygiene, housing, sanitation, family planning and what not—and on top of that, dearness allowances and wages which are considered to be 'too low' but which are found to be too high so far as agricultural workers are concerned. These people have been pampered till now. All the wonderful things for which the Janata Party is taking pride for having done during the last about one year consist of only pampering these people and nothing else. They are paying back the dearness allowance, paying all the things which had been impounded during the years of the emergency and placing at their disposal hundreds of crores of rupees out of the General Revenues, both at the State level as well as here. They are called the non-gazetted officers at the State level and here you have the Lower Division Clerks, the Upper Division Clerks and then the officers. There are peons

also. There are many number of grades and selection grades and so on. All these people are being pampered for the sake of politics and the elections. Is that fair and correct? I rise here to raise my voice against this kind of partiality that the earlier Government had shown and this Government is continuing with a vengeance while appearing to be doing something special for the rural people. That is where the shoe pinches. If they had not said that they are all in favour of the rural areas and that they are going to help them in every possible manner, then I would have felt that they are as bad as the others. But they have this particular profession and yet they continue the earlier partial policies with a vengeance, as I have said. Therefore, I condemn this Government for this partiality that they are showing and they are continuing to show with a vengeance to the urban people.

SHRI MAHADEO PRASAD VARMA. (Uttar Pradesh): You do not stand for State control and bureaucratisation of the industries. You do not stand for monopolisation. What is the way out? What are your concrete suggestions for the industrialisation of this country?

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Allow him to speak. We want to listen to him. Don't waste the time.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: My friend wants concrete suggestions. They have themselves given them. They have said that they would like to reserve certain processes of production for the small scale industries and handicrafts, some other type of industries for the medium-scale industries and the top industries have to be given every possible assistance. That gradation has been given. I think it is academic. But how are they going to implement it? That is where my hon. friend, Shri Raju, has suggested to them to have consultations with the other political parties and social and economic interests also and then they should reach some de-

[Shri N. G. Ranga]

cisions. Otherwise you may reserve something, for instance, for the handloom industry or handicrafts. But supposing there is no market for their products. What would happen? You have got to think of providing markets, technological assistance, sufficient funds by way of credit as well as sale proceeds for them. Are they raising all these things? Have they made any plans? They have not so far indicated anything. It is in that direction that they have got to move. It is not a new idea. It was Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Kumarappa and several of us who were members of the Cottage Industries Special Committee and the Economic Programme Committee of the Indian National Congress established in 1946-47 who formulated this idea and who suggested it. Now, 30 years afterwards our friends come and say that wisdom has dawned on them and, therefore, they are going to implement it. All credit to them at least for coming forward and saying this thing. What are the provisions that they are making in order to develop our industries on these lines in a healthy and wholesome manner so that they can be dovetailed with the auxiliary industry or the ancillary industry, whether it is independent or subsidised? How can they fix them into each other as the dovetailing of one spacecraft with the other in space? They have not begun doing anything as yet.

SHRI MAHADEO PRASAD VARMA: What do you suggest?

SHRI N. G. RANGA: Has anybody gone to the farmers and contacted the sugarcane growers of U.P., Bihar, Punjab and Haryana? Has anybody asked the tobacco growers of Madras, Gujarat and Karnataka? Has anybody asked the paddy growers and rice producers of Andhra, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and other places. Ask them as to what sort of prices are being offered to them. They are uneconomic. They are not the

prices which have been suggested by the Agricultural Prices Commission. They are not even the prices which have been agreed upon through the good offices of the local Government between the mill-owners and the producers. That includes the jute producers also. They are all being exploited. Tens of millions of them are being explained. Is this the way in which you are going to implement your programme of ruralisation and encouraging the rural people? Then, we come to the agricultural workers and their wages. The other day, information was given that it was a State problem. They said that it was left to the tender mercies of the State Government. What steps are you going to take to see that the State Government and the Union Government come together and work together in order to raise the wage scale of these people and in that way help them to have a higher standard of living? Already some figures have been produced by some hon. Members to show that their standard of living is going down and not going up in spite of all this planning. It was quite true that earlier more and more was spent on the towns and their industries. Therefore, there was some reason for the poor 'rural workers' suffering. Now, during the last one year, what is that that has been done by this Government. Sir, this Government can be styled as a kind of "ABCDEF Government". What is this B? It is bidis. Who uses them? Except for a few rich people of Gujarat who stealthily smoke their bidis and offer cigarettes only when they invite a guest, the rest of the people all over India who use them are the poor people. And this poor man's Government raised the duty on bidis last year and increased it this year also. In what way are you showing any kind of consideration for the poor people. Then, Sir, there is 'C'—coal. That is the basic factor for all industries and you raised the tax on it. Then Sir, 'D'—the deficit financing. My hon. friend, Mr. Ramamurthi, has already said and I agree with him

that the most important thing about deficit financing is to make the rich people richer and the poor people poorer. And you allowed that without saying so. Sir, deficit financing is something like a leech, getting into you without your knowledge and taking away all your blood. And you are increasing it. And increasing to what extent? With a vengeance you are doing it? Last year you told the House that you are going to indulge in it to the tune of Rs. 89 crores, but you actually ended up with Rs. 975 crores. This year you have come forward to increase it. This time you show and confers your own bankruptcy in public financing by saying that you are going to indulge in deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 000 crores. Who is going to pay all this money? Wherefrom does it come? Does it not come from even the poorest people to the largest extent? And in what way do you consider yourself to be a poor man's Government?

Then, Sir, there is this polyester filament. That is 'F'. There is a tax on that also. Then the gold operations.

Finally, Sir, there is 'AE'. It is supposed to be a vitamin and a wonderful vitamin. It rejuvenates people. But here this a negative instrument. All has not been thought of by any other commodities are to bear 5 per cent excise duty, over and above whatever excise duty they may be paying till now. This extraordinary omnibus duty has not been thought of by any other genius, and a special privilege has been given to this Government to impose this thing to this extent. Yes earlier it was 3 per cent and much earlier, it was one or two per cent. When they thought of it they were fighting shy. But this Government has no fears. Therefore, it has simply straightway raised it from $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or 3 per cent to 5 per cent. And it makes no apologies at all.

Then, Sir, so many friends have talked about land ceilings and land reforms. By all means, put ceilings.

But should we not put ceilings on everybody? They talk of distributive justice. Where is the distributive justice? Let there be a ceiling on urban properties, housing, incomes and accumulations. Are they prepared to do it? Have they done it? Are they capable of doing it? Possibly, they are waiting for their Communist allies, the Marxists, to take over the administration of this Government when they become completely bankrupt of statesmanship in order to impose that kind of a ceiling. When they have not been able to impose any ceiling on any other sector, why should it have been imposed on the agriculturists at all? That is what I want to know first of all. On that I broke away from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But, at the same time, I was in favour of putting a ceiling. Therefore, I accepted the ceiling on agriculturists. Let it be implemented honestly and when it is implemented whatever surplus land there may be, let it be distributed amongst the agricultural labourers, not on payment of some compensation, but freely. If some compensation has got to be paid to the landlords whose lands are being taken away in this manner, then that money should come from the General Revenues and not from the poor people to whom this land is to be given over. My hon. friend, Mr. Patel, has made some provision for helping these rural people to have some kind of property and employment. As a matter of fact, I have suggested that a sum of Rs. 20 or Rs. 30 crores should be set apart every year and constituted as a fund, to which another Rs. 25 crores or anything up to Rs. 50 crores from the States should be contributed. All that money should be put into a fund and that fund should be made use of in order to purchase such land from as many of these bigger people as possible by paying a kind of tapering rate of compensation to the owners and then placing this land at the disposal of the landless people in their respective States according to some kind of a system which would be agreed upon by all the political parties. Are they prepared to do it?

[Shri N. G. Ranga]

I would like them to consider it. Unless they do it, there would be no justice.

Then there is some kind of a feeling voiced by people from all parties in regard to those who have just that much of land which is an economic holding, which is just close to the ceiling, that they are being dubbed as kulaks. Our people have no imagination. They must borrow from Russia even this word. Are they kulaks? Are they not entrepreneurs? Are they not self-employed? Are they absentee landlords? If they are absentee landlords, by all means you have a tenancy legislation and protect the tenants in every possible manner so that there would be no exploitation of tenants. But so long as they are self-employed people, so long as they cultivate their own lands, so long as they are entrepreneurs and go on producing, as our friend, Shri Ranbir Singh and various other people have been saying, with the co-operation of the medium scale peasants, small scale peasants and also landless workers, 120 million tonnes of foodgrains for the benefit of our nation with the result that we are able to claim and be proud of the fact that we have stored 18 million tonnes of foodgrains in our granaries, why should we disturb them? To protect us and also to provide a buffer so far as our own economy is concerned, are these people to be discouraged? I say they should not be discouraged. If they are to be discouraged, then you discourage all the tradesmen, all these business people, then you nationalise all these industries and eliminate all these capitalists. But, so long as you allow these big capitalists, these small capitalists and smaller capitalists and entrepreneurs and middlemen and all the rest of them to have their way, you have no justifiable reason for discouraging and disparaging the real constructive role that the self-employed millions and millions of these farmers, peasants and agriculturists are playing in the economy of our country.

Then, I come to the smaller people the small peasants. I refer to the need for the economic price and the remunerative price. Would that be enough? It would not be enough because their holdings are much too small. Therefore, they have got to be helped in every other way. One of the things mentioned is the dairy farming industry. Now Rs. 500 crores, which has been provided, is not enough. Thousands of crores would be needed for poultry farming, beekeeping, sericulture and various other subsidiary occupations attached to agriculture so that it would be possible for the small farmers to have a decent living for themselves as self-employed people. Sir, I come to this question of self-employment. I am sorry to say that there is no mention at all of self-employment in this Budget. They claim to have framed it in the light of Gandhism. Sir, Gandhism is nothing if it is not for its stress on or its belief in self-employment. And what is self-employment? Self-employment is a kind of status for every self-respecting unexploited and non-exploited worker, which would come after Sovietisation is completed; when the so-called Chinese and Russian communism finds its own fruition and thereafter all those wage-slaves who are working now under their State-managed farms and State-managed industries, would then come out as self-employed. 'Sir, that is a status, which I do not know, how long it would take for Soviet Russia and China to achieve. Possibly, it may be 100 years, because they have taken 60 years in order to reach the kind of economic self-reliance that we have achieved so far as our industries are concerned. Yugoslavia has already begun to make an experiment on self-employment. Our Governments also—previous Government as well as their Government as they touch everything offered to. They could give encouragement to self-employed engineers, doctors and other technicians but they forget the need. First of all, to appreciate the role that is being played by more than 20 crores

of self-employed peasants and artisans and craftsmen. We all ought to be proud of those people but not a word is said in this Budget about them. I think, Sir, they would mend their fences and they would make good this very important and inexcusable omission.

Then, Sir, my friends have talked about national rural employment policy. My hon. friend, Mr. Raju, would like to have urban employment policy also. They have been having that urban employment policy; everybody knows it. I also want that; I do not want them to be neglected. But what has been dropped or what has been neglected till now is the national policy for rural employment. My friend Mr. Narasimha Reddy suggested rural housing. For that, we have seen how only lip sympathy expressed by the earlier Government and the present Government. But I do not find any provision for it at all. Even Rs. 100 crores would not be enough. Towards rural employment, they want to make some experiments in a few blocks. Why is it necessary to make experiments? Sir, the British Government, in those days was a useless Government, as you know. That was not a welfare State Government at all. That was only a police Government. And yet, they used to have—those who are in touch with the district administration would bear out what I am saying—programmes being prepared by the district authorities. If and when any scarcity condition prevailed or there was a famine, they used to take up those plans for employment of the famished people and for other relief works. That is our earlier experience. Unfortunately after this Panchayati Raj has come, we have given up all these practices and I think now we have to bring back that practice but we are doing it as if it is something new. It is an old practice and it ought to be taken up. Let this special duty be given to the District Collectors to develop these plans in co-operation with the local

M.L.As and local Panchayat Raj officials as well as the Panchayat Raj leaders and other co-operatives. Let there be plans to provide employment to those people in the rural areas and let the people get ready-made food, two meals everyday at least, and two or three rupees per day. If the Government is able to do that, it would be justified in its claim that it is giving a new lead indeed in regard to ruralisation.

Then, Sir, for the time being, I come to my last point. Only the other day we discussed about these backward classes and the need for reserving jobs upto 50 per cent for the backward classes, tribals, the Scheduled Caste and other such socially and economically disabled people, including the religious minorities also.

Sir, I want the Government to provide, say, Rs. 10 crores from the Centre, to begin with, and another Rs. 10 crores with the co-operation of the States. This total amount of Rs. 20 crores should be used for two things. Firstly, towards the marriage expenses in full, but in a standard manner, for those people who would agree to have inter-caste marriages. Secondly, towards providing special training for all those people who hail from the disabled classes and who are recruited to Government services. Some amount should be spent on providing these people with special training so that within a period of three or four years, they would be able to rise from Class IV to Class III, from class III to Class II and from Class II to Class I. This would enable these people to rise in their official position from the bottom so that in a phased manner, within a period of ten years, it would be possible for all these people, at least for as many of them as are sufficiently gifted, to rise to the highest positions in their official careers through promotions and so on. If we can do this, there would not be any need for our backward class people to feel agitated. Various pro-

[Shri N. G. Ranga]

fessions have been made. But no real and effective action has been taken to lift these people up.

In conclusion, I cannot say that I agree with this Budget. At the same time, I cannot also say that I condemn this Budget. The Finance Minister happens to be one of my friends. He was my junior at Oxford. Afterwards, he was also my colleague in public life in the Swatantra Party. He has been realistic enough not to stick to the policies of the Swatantra Party. He has been sensible enough to make certain provisions for the development of our State owned industries, large-scale industries as well as medium-scale industries. These Janata people are being condemned for their obscurantism for their anti-scientific orientation and so on. He has shown, by the provision he has made for space exploration, that he has no prejudice against science. He is also science-oriented. Therefore, I am not prepared to condemn him. But at the same time, it is not possible for me to congratulate him because his party has not been able to pay even half as much attention to the rural poor as it claims.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to make a few remarks on the Budget which is being discussed here. I would certainly like to support the Budget, but I find that the area is very limited. Like my friend, Mr. Ranga, I would certainly say that within the limitations, which are available, my friend, Mr. Patel, has tried to do his best. I do not want to go further into it because this has been very ably, as well as in detail, put before the House by my predecessor, Mr. N. G. Ranga. To start with, the points on which I commend the Budget are with reference to the manifesto of the Janata Party where they have stated that more emphasis would be laid on the agricultural sector. So far as this is

concerned, the Budget proposes sectoral allocations which I certainly commend. Now, they have proposed certain increase allocations. I would not go into the details of these figures because these have been mentioned before. I would just mention, in passing, that I support and commend these allocations which have been made. For example, on irrigation, on rural electrification, the greater emphasis on agriculture and so on. Of course, I would have liked more allocations to have been made in these fields. They have provided less than Rs. 500 crores. Even the previous year, I think, it was about Rs. 1200 crores. Most of it goes towards the ongoing projects which have been there from the time of the previous Government.

But, Sir, they have made an effort and I commend that. There is also another point with regard to extra emphasis on dairy farming—what you call it the project for food—and also with regard to the fisheries. They are all commendable and then, with the money which was available, with the resources that they could raise, the Finance Minister has tried to do what he could. Another feature in which he deserves appreciation is that at this time the overall Plan budget for the States and the Union Territories is more than that of the Centre. This is a good beginning because the agricultural sector, the implementation part of it, comes under the State jurisdiction and I appreciate that he has been able to provide far greater percentage of the Plan allocation for the States and the Union Territories. But here I would like to utter a word of caution because we are already seeing the stresses and strains and the objective will not be achieved unless there is a proper dialogue between the Centre and the States with regard to the utilization of these allocations. I am sure it will be very difficult to achieve what this Budget has proposed to do unless there is a proper dialogue between the Centre and the States in the near future. In his Budget speech he has said:

"For the first time in many years, the States and Union territories' Plans together will be larger than the Central Plan".

So, in order to implement this, a proper dialogue with the States will be necessary. Also have already said about the allocation part on agriculture, dairy farming, etc. etc. It has been done. Then I come to the difficult part of it. If you go back to the last year's budget, I fully supported the last budget. There were many renovations in it, but at that time the anticipated deficit was only about Rs. 85 crores and they expected to make it up by drawing from the foreign exchange reserves, which unfortunately they could not do. That really shows that there was no infrastructure or there was no will to do it. Hence instead of Rs. 85 crores, the total deficit financing became of the order of Rs. 900 and odd crores. To add to it, again this year another deficit financing of Rs. 1050 crores had to be resorted to and nobody can say that this will not have any inflationary effect. It can always be seen that such a high deficit financing—whatever other efforts are made for mobilisation of other resources—is going to have an inflationary effect and it will be very difficult to control the situation. I just looked into certain newspaper reports which say that the implication of this is that it is sure to give rise to inflationary tendencies and in the next one year the control of that will become almost impossible. Also, even though the wholesale price index has shown a declining trend, it has not been properly reflected in the retail prices in the past, so that we cannot say that the wholesale price index itself can be an indication that can control it, that too with nearly Rs. 1000 and odd crores of deficit financing. I am really confused as to what is going to happen. That is rather a matter of concern and I certainly cannot approve of this, particularly with reference to the fact that one of the basic ideas in the

Janata manifesto or at least when the last budget was presented before the House, was that the intention of the present Government was to see that they would reduce the deficit financing to the utmost extent possible. But they have not been able to do it and how they are going to resolve it I do not know. Then there are many features in the Budget with which I am not in line with. In order to cover up the deficit, the first thing to be resorted to is the indirect taxation. Many of my hon. friends have talked about it and I do not want to repeat it. But even in mobilising resources through indirect taxation, the main resort has been taken to excise levies. As my friend has mentioned just now, the overall excise levy goes up to 5 per cent. It will be an increase of about 2 per cent. And also, there is another special excise levy on the existing excise levy. I do not know how they are going to implement it. I find that so far as coal and electricity are concerned, they will not be affected by the special excise duty. But if there is going to be a special excise levy, there should be a process of drawback from item to item. It should not be an overall levy like this, so that they could sort out and see which commodity has the tendency to rise in the market. Unfortunately, that has not been done. I just read in the morning newspapers that with this increase in the excise levy, the price of aluminium is expected to rise by 10 per cent, polyester fabric by 6 per cent, tyres by 5 per cent, soaps and detergents by 5 per cent, paper by 2 to 6 per cent, containers etc. by 5 per cent and aluminium products by 6 to 7 per cent as a direct result of the new budgetary provision. So this gives an indication that the tendency will be for the retail prices of almost all consumer goods to rise and, that being the case, I cannot appreciate these overall excise levies which have been resorted to in this Budget.

Then, again after these resource mobilisations, certain reliefs have

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

been provided. One thing which I would like to particularly refer to here is the withdrawal of the interest tax which was levied on the banks, which will result in a loss of about Rs. 130 crores in the whole year and Rs. 75 crores in a part of the year. This has been resorted to in order to reduce the lending rate of the banks. I do not think this is a proper thing to be done. This loss of Rs. 130 crores has been made up by the increase in the excise levies. Where was the necessity for doing it? If lowering of the interest rate was to be done, that could have been done without resorting to this. Probably, there might have been a pressure from the Reserve Bank, or the industrial sector might have been pressing for a reduction in the lending rates. This is an unfortunate thing that has happened. Along with this, we find that there has been a drastic cut in the bank rates on deposits. I cannot see the rationale behind it. Last time the bank rate on deposits of over 5 years was 10 per cent and then progressively it was 9 per cent, 8 per cent, 7 per cent etc. The idea was to see that the banks could mobilise the deposits. But now the Prime Minister has come out and said that he wants a low cost economy. I do not understand what is a low cost economy, with particular reference to this, means. At the same time, if that was the intention, I cannot understand how many of the large industries and big houses are allowed to borrow and take deposits at 12 to 14 per cent interest rate per annum. Kirloskars, Tata Oils and many of these companies are accepting deposits at 12 per cent for one year. If the deposit is for more than that period, they are ready to pay upto 15 per cent. Therefore, why should the bank deposit rates be brought down from 10 to 9 per cent and for three years and less to 6 per cent and 5 per cent? What about the small deposit holders? How do the banks mobilise their deposits if this is the case? Also there seems to be no restriction on

the finance corporations which are springing up like mushrooms. There is no stability and guarantee about repayment. I do not know how these finance corporations are working. All of them are offering such high interest rates on deposits. When that is the case who would like to deposit money in nationalised banks because he would be deprived of earning on his small deposit? So this is not correct. It seems that in order to cover reduction in lending rates they have done this. Since the banks found it difficult to manage with lower banking rates they have removed the interest taxes on banks. I do not think this will help the growth of banking industry in this country. If you want to reduce the deposit interest rates there must be some restriction on public limited companies and finance corporations restricting more than so much per cent over and above the bank deposit rate they could pay otherwise all the deposits will be diverted to private finance agencies. Only larger houses will borrow from the banks at a lower rate of interest and the depositors will get only smaller return on their deposits.

So far as capital gains tax is concerned, there are certain other things. Mr. Ranga has already made the point. Last time any capital gains deposited in the banks was exempted from tax. But that facility has been withdrawn, and now available only for investment in equity shares of new industrial companies. How can the small person who wants some return on his meagre income wait for five or six years for dividend to come from new companies? So if there has been any malpractice in the earlier scheme it could have been corrected. But instead the facility which was available earlier is sought to be withdrawn. I am not happy about it.

Sir, we have been talking in this House about the agricultural sector and the industrial sector. I am fully one with my other friends, Mr. Ranga, Ch. Ranbir Singh and others, when

reference was made about accent on agriculture. I do welcome accent on agriculture. But see even within the Government certain doubts have arisen. I have seen certain statements coming from their party meetings that Members have said that any extra earnings, from investment going into the agricultural sector will only help a certain section in the village sector.

Now what is the position with regard to ceiling whether the legislation was implemented or not? In all the States agricultural ceiling is 10 standard acres. That is, the means of production is restricted to 10 standard acres. Again you come back and say there is a rich farmer and a small farmer. Where is the limit? There have been suggestions to reduce the ceiling again. If that is the attitude of the Government how can you expect the farmer to take any interest in producing more? Where is the security for him? There have been references in the Janata Party and from friends on the other side to reduce the ceiling. I think it is very immoral because you took a certain stand at a time after lot of deliberations and, finally, it was fixed at 10 standard acres. If you have not implemented it, it is your mistake not a case for reducing it further. You reduce the ceiling further and create uneconomic holdings and then cry out that you would not like to have uneconomic unit and then come out to subsidise. I cannot see the relevance of it.

My friend, Mr. Ranga, was referring to the comparison of urban land ceiling. Where is the urban ceiling? It started, as I said, two years ago. It was the greatest joke of the 20th century. (Interruption by Dr. V. P. Dutt) Your Government had started it. It was ceiling for urban property and all that. Finally, it came round to vacant land in urban area. Then what happened? The man might have raised a house of Rs. 20 lakhs. . .

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Even that is not implemented.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA:
You never implemented it. The whole thing, if the word is not unparliamentary, was bogus. It was because the agriculturists retaliated by saying that when there was a ceiling on agricultural land, why not a ceiling on urban property, incomes and all that. My friend, Mr. Raghu Ramaiah—I do not know where he is now—brought forward a most complicated Bill and within two days he had to bring in half a dozen amendments to it. Even then it was not a successful Bill. I do not know what the present Government is going to do about it. I would only hope that they would take some sensible stand on that and rectify it to the best extent possible. One anomaly in that Act, is, whereas agricultural land in urban areas is exempt from the ceiling, land used for dairy farming is not. These are some of the anomalies in the Urban Land Ceiling Act. But people who construct buildings worth Rs. 20 or 30 lakhs are safe because only the land comes under ceiling and not the money spent on construction. So, that is one point.

So far as the Economic Survey is concerned, we see that the industrial growth rate has come down. It was 10.6 per cent last year and now it has come down to 5.6 per cent and everybody including the Finance Minister are bemoaning about it. I think one of the principal causes of that is the unsettled conditions so far as industrial relations are concerned. The second one is lack of proper direction in the industrial policy. The other day my friend, Mr. George Fernandes, spoke for about one hour on the new industrial policy, referring to the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956. I agree with him that it was only on the book and that it was everything for everybody, but I thought he would correct it in his time. But what happens now is, here also different sections speak differently.

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

Now these cottage industries and small-scale industries are supposed to take over the manufacture and supply of consumer goods. I do not know what would be the fate of the consumers if this decision is implemented without making available the proper infrastructure. When there is not even a proper distributive system, how are you going to do it in the next two years? I saw a statement the other day that some of the large houses like Hindustan Lever have already been asked to stop producing small consumer goods which will be supplemented by the small-scale and cottage industries. My only humble appeal is: Please try to build the necessary infrastructure, get these projects going and then try to supply these small scale industrial products to every one. Otherwise the consumers will not be in a position to get their daily consumer requirements.

Sir, definitely something must be done about this policy with regard to the public sector and also the private sector. I know that the public sector was not doing very well; it had a lot of difficulties; it was eating out the resources and ending up with losses; but there has been some recovery also. But in this country where we have accepted mixed economy as our standard, I do not think there will be any question of denigrating the public sector, and I am glad that nowhere can I find it specifically stated by Government that they do not want to encourage the public sector. If there is any such intention in their mind, I think it is better they give it up and accept the mixed economy standard which has been with us and then give sufficient encouragement at least to the core industries in the public sector. By all means encourage the private sector to compete and then encourage them in the production of essential goods.

So far as agricultural production is concerned, I agree with Mr. Ranga

that in spite of the fact that industries have been sluggish in this country, it is only the agriculturist—thanks to the weather, work of the farmers, fertilizers and other inputs—who has increased his production and came to the rescue of this country. If there had been one or two failures, I do not know what would have happened to the price situation in this country. And for having achieved that, the agriculturists should be entitled to sufficient incentives, which, I do not think, are available at present. Now these Plan programmes will take years for implementation. In the meanwhile, I would like to see more reduction in the prices of the inputs, fertilizers, chemicals and all that, and some taxation relief on all agricultural lands. Sir, yesterday, Mr. Patel when discussing about the incidence of taxation, mentioned here that, so far as other countries are concerned the highest marginal rate of tax is 48 to 52 per cent and we have got 55 per cent only in the central and corporate sector. I would like to give you a comparison of what is happening in some of the States, with which they should also have a dialogue. You take, for example, Kerala and my own State Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. Now the agricultural income-tax rate is flat 65 per cent over the first lakh and upto a lakh it is 38—40 per cent. So that is a matter to be considered. There are people who say that the rural wealth is generated and no tax effort is made. If that is so, where does this money come from? Mr. Patel gets a share of it because there is a merger of agricultural income-tax with the Central income-tax for rate purposes. If you have some Rs. 25,000 or Rs. 30,000 of Central income and Rs. 50,000 of agricultural income, the rate applicable on Rs. 80,000 is applied on Rs. 30,000, and you lose 75 per cent of it on tax. So this is the situation. To say that the agriculturists do not pay any tax is not correct. They pay various taxes, starting from land revenue. At least in the Southern States, there is a high incidence of agricultural income-tax. Something

has to be done with regard to this thing. When the Centre has a dialogue with the States, they must come to some arrangement with regard to this also. Now, take for example Kerala. In Kerala the highest agricultural income-tax rate comes to 75 per cent. It is unheard of anywhere else. And here, on Wanchoo Committee's recommendations, the Central income-tax has been slashed down from 97 per cent to 65 per cent. So something has to be done so far as agricultural taxation is concerned. (Time bell rings) I won't take more time.

The same is the case with regard to the wealth tax limit. If I get time at the time of the Finance Bill, I would go into those details. The particular facilities which were available to agriculture, with subsequent amendments and complications, seem to have been given up. In earlier times, when wealth tax was introduced on agricultural income, a basic exemption of Rs. 1,50,000 was specially available for agricultural wealth. Now it has got merged with the general exemption and people who do not have agricultural wealth get greater benefits than the people who have agricultural wealth. It is not fair. There are many other things which have to be looked into. I thought the Taxation Enquiry Commission will bring out many of these facts. But now we find that only a few recommendations of the Jha Committee have been referred to here and most of the other things have been left out. One of the Members—I think Prof. Chalia—has said that this Budget does not seem to have taken into consideration any recommendation of the Jha Committee. I hope something will be done in the near future about the simplification of the tax procedure. As he has said, it is most complicated now. Advance tax, self-assessment and then the final assessment and the penalty clauses—all these things are there. If the idea was to simplify the

whole tax structure, why have they not been able to do by this Budget? I cannot understand it. So much was talked of at the time of the last Budget. I hope the Finance Ministry will look into these matters.

With all these mixed feelings, I give my support so far as the earlier portions are concerned, where you have made allocations for agriculture and laid accent on agriculture, but so far as the other taxation and other measures are concerned, where you have put an unnecessary burden on the common man, I am sorry I cannot extend my support to those proposals.

Thank you, Sir.

5 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Mr. Kalp Nath Rai.

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated): I would like to ask you one question. How can you go in that order? It is not a fair order. I do not understand.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Let me tell you the time that is available here to the parties. The time for your party has almost been taken, only half an hour is left. So, it can be taken tomorrow. This party has got more than two hours and only one Member has spoken.

DR. V. P. DUTT: So, there will be no speaker from this side.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): I do not think that there can be any today, there can be tomorrow.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जनता सरकार द्वारा जो यह बजट प्रस्तुत किया गया है, यह बजट पूँजीपति ताकतों की मदद करने वाला, किसानों का विरोधी और मजदूर विरोधी बजट है। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जनता सरकार के आने के साथ

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

देश की जनता के मन में एक आशा का चिराग जला था, लोगों के दिलों में आशा के अंकुर प्रस्फुटित हुए थे कि देश में कांग्रेसी सरकार खत्म हुई और जनता की सरकार आई। मगर आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वर्तमान सरकार की दिशा बिल्कुल पूँजीवाद को मदद करने वाली दिशा है। इस बजट को देखने से लगता है जैसे वर्ल्ड बैंक के चैयरमैन मैकनामारा साहब के निर्देश पर हिन्दुस्तान के वित्त मंत्री ने इस बजट को बनाया है। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, दुनिया की साम्राज्यवादी, उपनिवेशवादी, नव उपनिवेशवादी और पूँजीवादी ये सारी ताकतें चाहती हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान दुनियावादी रूप से एक कृषि या एग्रीकल्चरल कंट्री रहे और दुनिया के पूँजीवादी जो सोफस्टीकैटेड टेक्नालाजी डेवलप कर रहे हैं, दुनिया के उन साम्राज्यवादी मुल्कों का हिन्दुस्तान एक मार्केट बन कर रहे और बेसिकली हिन्दुस्तान को एक एग्रीकल्चरल कंट्री रखा जाए। हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया के इन मुल्कों का एक बहुत बड़ा मार्केट रहे, इस योजना के तहत लगता है कि यह बजट बनाया गया है। इस बजट को बनाने के पीछे वर्ल्ड बैंक के चैयरमैन मैकनामारा का दिमाग है, इस बजट को बनाने के पीछे चौधरी चरणसिंह, एच० एम० पटेल जैसे स्वतंत्र पार्टी का दिमाग है, जो हिन्दुस्तान को पूँजीवाद की तरफ धकेलना चाहते हैं। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश में कैसे बजट बनेगा? जिस देश का वित्त मंत्री सरकारी नीति का वक्तव्य अलग देगा, जिस मुल्क के कैबिनेट के मंत्री अलग नीतियों का विश्लेषण करेंगे, जिस मुल्क के प्लानिंग कमिशन की अलग राय होगी, तो वहाँ क्या होगा? जिस जनता सरकार के प्लानिंग कमिशन की एक अलग राय, वित्त मंत्री की अलग राय, कैबिनेट की अलग राय है, तो क्या आप समझते हैं हजारों टुकड़ों में बंटे हुए दिमाग किसी राष्ट्र का, किसी देश का निर्माण कर सकते हैं।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अपने 30 साल के शासन काल में कांग्रेस सरकार ने क्या किया? इस काल में आजाद हिन्दुस्तान और नया आजाद और शक्तिशाली हिन्दुस्तान को बनाने का सपना जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने देखा और ऐसा नया शक्तिशाली हिन्दुस्तान को बनाने का सपना देखने वाले जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इस मुल्क में प्लानिंग कमिशन के माध्यम से, प्लान्ड इकानामी के माध्यम से हिन्दुस्तान का विकास किया।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार के मंत्री कहते हैं कि हमने पिछले 30 वर्षों में कोई कार्य नहीं किया और इसी सरकार का इकोनॉमिक सर्वे कहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थव्यवस्था सुदृढ़ है और हम उस सुदृढ़ अर्थ-व्यवस्था के आधार पर नये हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण कर सकते हैं। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की सरकार ने हिन्दुस्तान के बजट में दो हजार करोड़ रुपए का फोरन एक्सचेंज और गोदामों में सड़ता हुआ गल्ला छोड़ा। जब यह हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ तो हम अमरीका से गल्ला मंगवाते थे। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेशी मुद्रा जीरो के बराबर थी। हिन्दुस्तान के खजाने में सोना नहीं था। हमने हिन्दुस्तान को एक सुदृढ़ अर्थ-व्यवस्था इस सरकार को दी। लेकिन जिस अर्थ-व्यवस्था को जिस सुदृढ़ इकोनॉमी को हमने इन्हें दिया, जिस नेहरू जी की नीतियों पर प्लान्ड डेवलपमेंट की नीति पर हिन्दुस्तान को पिछले 30 वर्षों के अन्दर सरकार ने चलाया, मेरा आरोप है, कि सरकार नेहरू द्वारा प्रतिपादित सभी बुनियादी आर्थिक, सामाजिक, राजनीतिक नीतियों को बजट कर हिन्दुस्तान को सीधे अमरीका के सुपुर्द करना चाहती है। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वर्ल्ड बैंक के चैयरमैन मैकनामारा साहब का कहना है कि हिन्दुस्तान बेसीकली बुनियादी रूप से एक एग्रीकल्चरल कंट्री रहे, राँ मैटीरियल सप्लाई करने वाला देश रहे, और अमरीका, साम्राज्यवादी, उपनिवेशवादी, नौ उपनिवेशवादी पूँजी-

वादी ताकतें हिन्दुस्तान में सोफिस्टिकेटेड मैटीरियल सप्लाई करें और हिन्दुस्तान अमरीका की फिनिश और सोफिस्टिकेटेड गुड्स का मार्केट बने। मैकनामारा कहते हैं Agricultural development is the need of India. तो मैकनामारा की आवाज में बोल कर चौधरी चरण सिंह बोलते हैं Agricultural development and rural development is the need of India.

यह एक बहुत बड़ा पड़ताल है जिसका खतरा हिन्दुस्तान को है। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बजट के पीछे वर्ल्ड बैंक के चेयरमैन श्री मैकनामारा का दिमाग है। क्या यह गरीबों के लिए कोई बजट है। एक तरफ कहते हैं हम रॉयलिंग प्लान चलायेंगे। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बुनियादी बात है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री मोरारजी देसाई लगातार कहते रहे हैं डेफेसिट फाइनेंसिंग बजट नहीं होना चाहिए। एक हजार करोड़ रुपये का आपने डेफेसिट बजट दिया और प्लान एक्सपेंडीचर 31% से घटा कर 17% हुआ। एक तरफ आपने प्लान डेवलपमेंट में जो इनवेस्टमेंट है वह 31% से घटा कर 17% की और दूसरी तरफ एक हजार करोड़ रुपये की डेफेसिट फाइनेंसिंग किया। इसी का परिणाम होगा, हिन्दुस्तान का औद्योगिक उत्पादन घटेगा, हिन्दुस्तान का कृषि विकास घटेगा, मुद्रास्फिति बढ़ेगी, देश में तबाही और बर्बादी आएगी, हिन्दुस्तान जिस गति से आगे बढ़ रहा था, वह गति पीछे चली जाएगी। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके सामने यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की इसी पार्लियामेंट में इस देश की नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने बोलते हुए कहा था "India once did not join the Industrial Revolution. It was the reason for the slavery of India. If India will not

join the technological revolution, India cannot protect her freedom."

यह दृष्टिकोण है जिसको सामने रख कर नये हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण कर सकते हैं। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सरकार का क्या दृष्टिकोण है। यह लगातार इस सरकार की तरफ से आरोप लगाया जा रहा है कि कृषि के विकास के लिये पिछले 30 वर्षों में कुछ नहीं हुआ। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ 6 करोड़ टन गल्ला 1947 में और 13 करोड़ टन गल्ला 1977 में, क्या यह कृषि विकास नहीं है। भाखड़ा नंगल डेम से ले कर नागार्जुन सागर तक नेहरू और कांग्रेस की सफल कृषि नीति के गीत गाए जा रहे हैं। क्या भाखड़ा नंगल ने पंजाब और हरियाणा के उजड़े हुए इलाकों को हरा-भरा नहीं बनाया? क्या नागार्जुन सागर ने, कृष्णा कावेरी के खेतों में बसे हुए गरीब लोगों की जिन्दगी में हरियाली नहीं लाई? यह हिन्दुस्तान की कृषि नीति का परिणाम है। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सवाल आज बुनियादी है कि कृषि का विकास कैसे होगा। क्या हिन्दुस्तान की माडर्न कृषि बिना इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट के संभव है? कृषि और औद्योगिक विकास यह दोनों एक ही सिक्के के दो पहलू हैं। कृषि से इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट को अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है और इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट को कृषि के डेवलपमेंट से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है। इस तरह कृषि का डेवलपमेंट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट और टेक्नालाजिकल डेवलपमेंट एक ही सिक्के के पहलू हैं। यह सरकार टेक्नालाजिकल डेवलपमेंट के नाम पर विदेशियों के ऊपर मुनहमिर कर रही है, यह सरकार इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट की गति को धीमा कर रही है, यह सरकार प्लांड इकानामी के रास्ते को छोड़ कर प्राइवेट सेक्टर की इकानामी को बढ़ावा दे रही है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कृषि के विकास के लिए क्या

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

चाहिए? कृषि के विकास के लिए सिंचाई चाहिए, नये बीज चाहिए, पस्टिसाइड्स चाहिए, उर्वरक चाहिए, ट्रैक्टर चाहिए, लैंड रिफार्म चाहिए, किसानों को लोन चाहिए, गांवों में भूमिहीनों को जमीन चाहिए, मारजिनल फार्मर्स को लोन चाहिए, स्माल फार्मर को ट्यूबवैल और पम्पिंग सेट चाहिए और इसके अलावा हिन्दुस्तान की करोड़ों करोड़ जनता को पैसा चाहिए। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या इस बुनियादी सवाल को हल करने के लिए पिछली 30 वर्ष की सरकार ने इन कामों को नहीं किया? मैं आपसे पूछता हूं क्या कृषि का विकास बिना उर्वरक के संभव है, क्या उर्वरक बिना कारखाने के संभव है, क्या कारखाना बिना लोहे के संभव है, क्या कारखाना बिना हैवी इलेक्ट्रिसिटी के संभव है, क्या टैक्निकल नो हाऊ के बिना संभव है, क्या बिना टैक्नालाजी के संभव है? अगर यह संभव नहीं है तो फिर अपने खेतों में हम कैसे उर्वरक देंगे, नलकूप कैसे लगायेंगे, कैसे हम एच० एम० टी० के ट्रैक्टर को दोड़ायेंगे, कैसे फसल को रक्षा के लिए पेस्टिसाइड और इन्सेक्टिसाइड का इस्तेमाल करेंगे। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछली सरकार ने हिन्दुस्तान की कृषि के विकास के लिए जिस दिन अथक प्रयास से ही हिन्दुस्तान को दुनिया के औद्योगिक नक्शे पर खड़ा किया। यह सरकार पूरी नीति को उलट कर हिन्दुस्तान को तबाह करने के लिए बजट को लाई है। क्या बजट में प्राविजन किया गया है। बजट में 200 करोड़ का प्राविजन ज्यादा हुआ है। पिछले साल बजट की प्लानिंग में जो एलोकेशन था उसका यूटिलाइजेशन इस सरकार ने नहीं किया। इस साल बजट में उन्होंने जो एलोकेशन किया है उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे। फिर किस बात था बुनियादी फक है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सरकार जो आयोगों की सरकार है, चरित्र हत्या की सरकार है,

कमेटियों की सरकार है, शाह आयोग, रेड्डी आयोग, गुप्ता आयोग ये सब देश के उन नेताओं की जिन्होंने इस देश का निर्माण किया, मुल्क को दुनिया के नक्शे पर खड़ा किया, उन नेताओं की चरित्र हत्या अमरीकी साजिश से, फासिस्टी तरीके से अपना कर उस पूरी बुनियाद को खत्म करना चाहती है, जिसके कारण हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ था।

आर्थिक फ्रंट पर यह कमेटियों की सरकार है। डाइरेक्ट टैक्स चौक्सी कमेटी, इनड इरेक्टर टैक्स झा कमेटी, भूतलिंगम कमेटी, अलैकजेंडर कमेटी य दुनिया भर की कमेटियां इन्होंने बनयी है। भूतलिंगम कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आ रही है कि हमारा वेज स्ट्रेक्चर ठीक कर दिया जाय, अलैकजेंडर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आ रही है कि टैक्स के तरीके ठीक नहीं हैं, झा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत नहीं है; क्योंकि सरकारी नीतियों का एवं सिद्धांतों का कब्रिस्तान बनाया गया है।

इस सरकार के कृषि मंत्री जगजीवन राम जी कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान ने पिछले 30 वर्षों में कृषि के क्षेत्र में जो तरक्की की वह आज तक अपनी वैज्ञानिक नीति के कारण ही की। और राष्ट्रपति नीलम संजीव रेड्डी बम्बई में कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान ने जवाहरलाल की नीतियों पर चल कर कृषि के क्षेत्र में चतुर्दिक तरक्की की। चौधरी चरण सिंह जो बड़े किसानों के नेता हैं यह कहते हैं कि पिछले 30 वर्षों में कोई काम नहीं हुआ। मोरारजी देसाई कहते हैं जवाहरलाल नेहरू की औद्योगिक नीति ही हमारी नीति है—इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी आफ नेहरू इज माई पालिसी। जनता पार्टी के अध्यक्ष कहते हैं कि—दि इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी आफ नेहरू इज दि ओनली बेस्ट पालिसी। जार्ज फर्नान्डेज माहव कहते हैं—“भई, वह कोई नीति है। मैं नहीं इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी को बनाऊंगा।

मेरा अंदाज है कि नेहरू की पालिसी खराब थी।" तो जिस सरकार का दिन टूटा हुआ है, जिस सरकार का दिमाग टूटा हुआ है, जिस सरकार के विचार टूटे हुए हैं, जिस सरकार की कृषि नीति पर, औद्योगिक नीति पर विचार टूटे हुए हैं, क्या वह सरकार इस देश को कोई दिशा दे सकती है। यह सरकार दिशाहीन सरकार है, इस सरकार का कोई डाइरेक्शन नहीं है।

A lifeless and directionless Government is today in India.

मुद्दों का जमवट है। इसमें मिद्धातों और नीतियों का कोई रिश्ता नहीं है। आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मे प्रापमे पूछना चाहता हूं, इस सरकार के प्लानिंग कमिशन को लीजिए। प्लानिंग कमिशन ने कहा—वी शैल हैव रीलिंग प्लान अब क्या हुआ? जो हमारा प्लानिंग में इन्वेस्टमेंट था वह 30 परसेंट से घट कर आ गया 17 परसेंट और 17 परसेंट से घट कर चला गया जीरो परसेंट, और 90 परसेंट जो रक्रीमें श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के जमाने में थी वह 90 परसेंट उनके इस बजट पर खर्च होगा। तो इन्होंने जब हमारे नार्म को स्वीकार किया—क्योंकि उनके पास कोई नया योजना नहीं है—इन्होंने श्रीमती गांधी की नीतियों और उन्हीं की योजनाओं को स्वीकार किया, उन्हींने योजनाओं पर 90 परसेंट रुपये खर्च करने के वास्ते एलोकेशन किया था लेकिन जो इन्वेस्टमेंट की गति थी अब वह 30 परसेंट से घटा कर 17 परसेंट कर दी गई। और फिर राजनारायण ने भाषण देना शुरू कर दिया कि 30 परसेंट से कुछ नहीं होगा। चौधरी चरण सिंह बोले कि 30 वर्षों में कुछ काम नहीं हुआ है। फिर जार्ज फर्नान्डेज बोले कि नेहरू की नीति ने काम नहीं किया; फिर हमारे वित्त मंत्री अमरीका की गोद में जा कर बैठ गए। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कैसे इस देश को कोई दिशा मिल सकती है? हाऊ दिस कंट्री कैन गो फॉर्वर्ड एंड डेवलप? मेरा कहना है कि यह सरकार प्लानिंग की दुश्मन है।

चूंकि जनता की ताकत प्लानिंग के साथ है, इसमें वे हिम्मत नहीं कर पाते हैं कि प्लान को खत्म करें लेकिन ये प्लानिंग को सेबोटेज जरूर कर रहे हैं। स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के माने हुए व्यक्ति और लेसेज फेयर की इकानामी के समर्थक एच० एम० पटेल जो सरकार का वित्त मंत्री हो, वह और प्राइवेट सेक्टर के टाटा, बिड़ला, डालमिया, सिधानिया, मफतलाल और अमरीका का मैकनामारा—ये तीनों मिल कर बजट बनाए हैं, यह जो टाटा बिड़ला, डालमिया इत्यादि प्राइवेट सेक्टर के समर्थक और वर्ल्ड बैंक के चेयरमैन मैकनामारा ने मिल कर बजट बनाया है और एच० एम० पटेल ने मैकनामारा और रूजीपतियां के एजेंट बन कर जो हिन्दुस्तान के बजट को प्रस्तुत किया है उसने 140 करोड़ रुपये इस साल पंजीयतियों को टैक्स रिलीफ दी गई। 200 करोड़ रु० की टैक्स रिलीफ पिछले साल दी गई। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस सरकार ने रेफरिजरेटर के दाम, टेलिविजन के दाम कम किए, लेकिन जिन चीजों को हिन्दुस्तान की ग्राम जनता इस्तेमाल करती है, उन के लिए क्या रिलीफ दिया इस सरकार ने? इस सरकार का वृष्टि कोण क्या है, इस सरकार का एटीट्यूड क्या है, इस सरकार का दिमागी नजरिया क्या है? इस सरकार की नीतियों से इस देश में कृषि उत्पादन घटेगा, इस सरकार की नीतियों से इस मुल्क का औद्योगिक उत्पादन घटेगा। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, औद्योगिक उत्पादन जब इंदिरा गांधी प्रधान मंत्री थीं तो 12 प्रतिशत था, उस की ग्राथ रेट 12 परसेंट थी। महान क्रान्तिकारी जार्ज फर्नान्डेज जब औद्योगिक मंत्री हुए तो वह ग्राथ रेट घट कर 12 परसेंट से 4 परसेंट हो गयी और अगले साल जब वह बजट पेश करेंगे तो वह ग्राथ रेट शायद जीरो रह जायगी। तो औद्योगिक उत्पादन लगातार घट रहा है, और कृषि उत्पादन क्या है। जो इस सरकार ने पिछले साल प्लान्ड एक्सपेंडिचर तय किया था वह रुपया तो यूटिलाइज नहीं हो पाया।

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

एक तो प्लान्ड एक्स्पेंडिचर कम किया और जो किया भी उस का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया तो कृषि की योजनायें इम्प्लोमेंट नहीं होंगी और परिणामस्वरूप कृषि का उत्पादन भी घटेगा। एक तरफ कृषि का उत्पादन लगानार घटेगा और दूसरी तरफ औद्योगिक उत्पादन घटेगा लगातार। एक तरफ प्लान्ड एक्स्पेंडिचर कम होगा, इन्वेस्टमेंट की गति कम होगी, एक तरफ एक हजार करोड़ की डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग होगी तो उस का परिणाम क्या होगा? क्या इस सरकार का कोई मंत्रो इस का जवाब दे सकता है। इसका साफ परिणाम है इंफ्लेशन, मुद्रास्फीति, महंगाई, भुजमरी, तबाही, परेशानी। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, गांव की बात की जाती है। गांव के दुश्मन गांव की बात कर रहे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के दुश्मन ग्रामीण विकास का नाम ले रहे हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो ठगवा भगवा को कहानी है। जनता के खिलाफ देश के साम्राज्यवादियों ने, फिरका-परस्तों ने, मुल्क के सरमायेदारों ने एका कर लिया है और अपना नाम जनता रख लिया है और जनता ने समझा कि अब तो जनता का राज हो गया और जनता ने उन को चुनकर यहां भेज दिया। मुल्क के पूंजीपतियों ने इस राज को सम्हाल लिया। अब अमरीका में इशारा आया है कि कृषि विकास का नाम लो। रेडियो बोलना है—ग्रामीण विकास के लिये यह सरकार निरंतर कोशिश कर रही है ग्रामीण विकास के लिये तरह-तरह को योजनायें बनायी जा रही हैं और गांव का किसान फूल कर कुप्पा हो रहा है और दूसरी तरफ हिन्दुस्तान के गांव के गांव उजड़ रहे हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान के गांव का किसान परेशान है। उसका दस गुना लगान बढ़ाया है इस जनता सरकार ने और मेरे इलाके में तो 80 फीसदी गांव के लोगों को पकड़ कर तहसीलों में बन्द किया जा रहा है। और उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, 12 रुपये गन्ने का दाम तय किया और 5 रुपये क्विंटल पर

गन्ना नहीं बिक रहा है। आज पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में गन्ने के खेतों में आग लगायी जा रही है और लोग कहते हैं कि—बोलो बेटा चरण सिंह की जय, गन्ना बिक रहा पौने छः। आज किसान के दुश्मन किसानों की रैली करा रहे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के दुश्मन मैकनामारा के इशारे पर यह सरकार आज योजनायें बना रही है। मैं पूछता हूं कि क्यों आज हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति को धोखे की राजनीति बनाया जा रहा है। आज पार्टी का नाम जनता पार्टी है, नाम है किसान रैली लेकिन काम करती है वह पूंजीपतियों का। नाम किसानों का लिया जा रहा है और काम शहर वालों का हो रहा है। जैसे रावण ने सीता का हरण करने के लिये साधु का रूप धारण किया था और सीता ठग गयी थी रावण के चक्कर में वैसे ही हिन्दुस्तान के सरमायेदार और पूंजीपति हिन्दुस्तान को तबाह करने वाले और हिन्दुस्तान की इस जनता सरकार ने आज अपने ऊपर यह जनता पार्टी का मुखौटा लगा लिया है। आज जनसंघ के अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी और एच० एम० पटेल ने पहन लिया है वाना जनता पार्टी का और वे ही गांव के विकास की, ग्रामीण विकास की नयी-नयी योजनायें बना कर हिन्दुस्तान में नया जमाना ला रहे हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह ट्रेन्ड हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति में बहुत खतरनाक ट्रेन्ड हो रहा है। A very dangerous trend is coming in the politics of this country. तो मैं जनता पार्टी के उन बहादुर लोगों से अपील करता हूं कि जो अर्थ व्यवस्था हमने बनायी थी उस को चौपट मत करो। Can you think of small-scale industries without heavy industries? Can you think of medium-scale industries without heavy industries? Can you think of village improvement without technological development?

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या इन बातों का कोई जवाब है। रुरकेला,

भिलाई, दुर्गापुर आज हिन्दुस्तान के औद्योगिक उत्पादन की कहानी कह रहे हैं। रांची का हैवी इंजीनियरिंग और त्रिची का हैवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स हिन्दुस्तान के नये विकास का कहानी कह रहे हैं। You cannot separate the industrial development from agricultural development, लेकिन इस पूरे बजट के अन्दर सरकार का दृष्टिकोण क्या है? 5 परसेंट यूनिफार्म ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी। 5 परसेंट हिन्दुस्तान की 60 करोड़ जनता को ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी देनी पड़ेगी। बिड़ला साहब को 5 रुपये और बिना घर वाले को भी 5 रुपये, हरिजन को मेरे गांव वाले को भी 5 रुपये ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी में देना पड़ेगा। टाटा साहब को भी ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी 5 रुपये देनी पड़ेगी और उस गरीब को जिसके पास रोटी की व्यवस्था नहीं है, सोने की व्यवस्था नहीं है उसे भी उतनी ही ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी देनी पड़ेगी। . . .

(Interruptions)

डा० रामकृपाल सिंह : माननीय सदस्य को पता है कि ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी किस पर लगती है, सामान पर या आदमी पर?

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जानता हूं, ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी सामान पर लगती है। आप कहां के प्राफेसर थे। I am talking of the uniform excise duty on all the materials which will be consumed by all sections in the country. That is the tax proposal by your Mr. Patel—the same tax on the Birlas, the same tax on you and the same tax on the poor people.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): On the goods used by the Birlas.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहाँ तो ऐसी बात है :—

सोचा था, बहार देखेंगे,

हर कली, बुलबुल का प्यार देखेंगे।

लेकिन लगता है आलम ऐसा कि हम अपना ही मजार देखेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहस बजट पर हो रही है। लेकिन मंत्री जी नहीं हैं।

डा० राम कृपाल सिंह : मौजूद हैं।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : क्यों उन बेचारों को मजबूर कर रहे हैं। वह तो मंत्री बन गये हैं। लेकिन यहाँ तो एच० एम० पटेल को रहना चाहिए। आप भी मंत्री हैं जो कह रहे हैं कि ऐक्साइज ड्यूटी क्या होती है।

डा० राम कृपाल सिंह : क्या कहा जा सकता है कि माननीय सदस्य-सदस्य नहीं हैं?

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : ऐसा कह कर आपके साथी मंत्री हंस लेंगे, लेकिन इससे कोई फर्क पड़ने वाला नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, पांच प्रतिशत यूनिफार्म टैक्स हिन्दुस्तान की 60 करोड़ जनता को देना पड़ेगा। त्याग करना पड़ेगा। This Government is a prisoner in the hands of the capitalists. This Government is a prisoner in the hands of the multi-nationals. This Government is a prisoner in the hands of the Americans, the imperialists, neo-colonialists and colonialists, who want to destroy the country, who do not want technological development of India.

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बुनियादी सवाल है। इसके पीछे कांसिपिरेसी है अमरीका की। रूरलिज्म, गांव का विकास, जनता का विकास और गन्ना पांच रुपया क्वेंटल। (Interruptions) अब मैं नई बातों पर आ रहा हूं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : कृपया समय का ध्यान रखिये।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले साल इस सरकार ने 84 करोड़ रुपये का डैफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग किया। इस साल इस सरकार ने 974 करोड़ रुपये का डैफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग किया। क्या दुर्भाग्य है? कहा जा रहा है कि हम सोना बेचेंगे। हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के खजाने में 500 करोड़ रुपये का सोना है और 500 करोड़ का डैफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग है उसको इससे पूरा करेंगे। मान लीजिए डैफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग में आपने इसको खर्च कर दिया तो अगले साल क्या होगा? क्यों हिन्दुस्तान की इकानामी को नष्ट करना चाहते हैं? क्यों हिन्दुस्तान को इकानामिकली बैकप्ट करना चाहते हैं। इसे बेचने के पीछे हिन्दुस्तान को दिवालिया बनाने की सरकार की साजिश है जो इस सरकार के बजट के माध्यम से किया जा रहा है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछली सरकार के लैंड रिफार्म का क्या हुआ? क्या हुआ है रूरल बैंक्स का? हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ व्यवस्था को ठीक करने के लिये 20 सूत्री कार्यक्रम के माध्यम से करोड़ों लोगों के दिल में आशा का चिराग जला था और उन करोड़ों लोगों को कहा गया था कि सदियों से जो कर्जदार थे उनका कर्ज खत्म और जमीन पर मकान बनाने के लिये बैंक्स से सस्ती दर पर यानी

चार परसेंट पर गरीबों को कर्जा देने के लिये कहा गया, लेकिन अब उन रूरल बैंक्स की कोई चर्चा नहीं की गई। क्यों? क्योंकि आप हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ व्यवस्था को ठीक नहीं करना चाहते।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आज कौन लोग सत्ता में है यह आपको पता है। बैंकों को राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध करने वाले जनघाती, राष्ट्रघाती, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के दुश्मन आज हिन्दुस्तान के मालिक बन बैठे हैं। यह वही मोरारजी भाई हैं जिन्होंने बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध किया था। यह वही चौधरी चरण सिंह हैं जिन्होंने बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध किया था। यह वही अटल बिहारी वाजपयी हैं, जिन्होंने बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध किया था। आज यह मालिक बन कर बैठे हैं। जिन बैंकों के माध्यम से हिन्दुस्तान के लाखों गांव में लाखों ट्रक हैं, लाखों नलकूप हैं, लाखों रिकशाचालकों के पास रिकशा हैं, आपने इन्हीं बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध किया था। आपको पता है इन्हीं बैंकों के माध्यम से लाखों, करोड़ों गरीब लोगों को घर बनाने के लिये कर्ज मिला, अपनी खेती को तैयार करने के लिये कर्ज मिला, अपने देश का नव-निर्माण करने के लिये कर्ज मिला। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि इन बैंकों के माध्यम से सामाजिक उत्पीड़न को समाप्त करने के लिये, आर्थिक उत्पीड़न को समाप्त करने के लिये 20 सूत्री कार्यक्रम के माध्यम से हिन्दुस्तान की करोड़ों जनता के मन में जो आशा का चिराग जला था, इस सरकार ने उस चिराग को बुझा दिया ग्रामीण विकास का नाम लेकर।

यह एक बुनियादी सवाल है कि हिन्दुस्तान का विकास कैसे होगा। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आप गांव के रहने वाले हैं और मैं भी गांव का रहने वाला

हैं। आप खुद अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि इस सरकार के पास मार्जिनल फार्मर के लिये कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम नहीं है। स्माल फार्मर के लिये इस सरकार के पास कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम नहीं है।

अन्तिम बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में सम जवाब के लिये रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान, दवा और शिक्षा इन पांच चीजों की जरूरत है। मोटी-मोटी पांच चीजों के आदमी के लिये जरूरी है—रोटी, सब्जी, सूखी रोटी और रात में सोने के लिये मकान। 60 करोड़ लोगों के रहने के लिये इस हिन्दुस्तान के दिल्ली शहर में आवास की समस्या है। बम्बई में आवास की समस्या है, कलकत्ता में आवास की समस्या है, इलाहाबाद में आवास की समस्या है, गोहाटी में आवास की समस्या है, पटना में आवास की समस्या है, गांव में आवास की समस्या है। इस मूलक के कम से कम पांच करोड़ लोग सड़क पर, पटरी पर सोते हैं। दिल्ली में एक लाख आदमी स्टेशन पर, बस अड्डों पर सोते हैं। यह हमारी राजधानी है। यह हमारे देश का प्रजातंत्र है। कहते हैं लोकतंत्र आया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस के लिये प्रजातंत्र आया है? स्मगलर्स के लिये प्रजातंत्र आया है। जमाखोरों के लिये प्रजातंत्र आया है। लोकतंत्र का नाम लेने वालों तुम आजादी लाये हो जमाखोरों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो चोरबाजारी करने वालों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो स्मगलिंग करने वालों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो मारकाट, खून, कत्ल करने वालों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो ट्रेनों में तोड़-फोड़ करने वालों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो बस लूटने वालों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो मूलक को तबाह करने वालों के लिये, तुम आजादी लाए हो असामाजिक तत्वों के लिए तुम आजादी लाए हो,

बखिया, हाजी मस्तान के लिये। जो आजादी का नाम लेकर हिन्दुस्तान को लूट रहे हैं, वे जनता पार्टी के मालिक बने हुए हैं। जमाखोरी, रिश्वतखोरी, भ्रष्टाचार, पापाचार, अनाचार, लूट लगातार बढ़ती जा रही है। आप उनके लिए आजादी लाये हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव):
अब आप समाप्त करिये।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मैं अन्तिम बात कह रहा हूँ। हाउसिंग के लिये इस बजट में कोई प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है। इस मुल्क की पांच करोड़ जनता के रहने के लिये मकान की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई। गांव में रहने वाले लोगों के लिये मकान की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई। शहरों में रहने वाले लोगों के लिये मकान की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई। छोटे कर्मचारियों के लिये मकान की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई। बैंक के कर्मचारियों के लिये कोई मकान की व्यवस्था नहीं की गई। करोड़ों, लाखों कर्मचारियों को जिनको पांच सौ रुपये तनख्वाह मिलती है, उन्हें दिल्ली में छः सौ रुपये किराये के देने पड़ते हैं। इस दिल्ली के अन्दर आपके पास हजारों कर्मचारी मिले होंगे, जिन्होंने यह कहा होगा कि हमारी पांच सौ रुपये तनख्वाह है, मगर हमें छः सौ रुपये किराये के देने पड़ते हैं। यह रूप देना हमारे लिये मुश्किल है। बताइये हम कहाँ रहें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश में आवास की इतनी बड़ी समस्या है कि उसकी तरफ तुरन्त ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। जिस देश में बिना आवास के रहने वालों की इतनी बड़ी संख्या हो और जिस देश में आवास का इतना बड़ा संकट हो कि उतना बड़ा संकट और किसी भी देश में न हो, उस सरकार के वित्त

[श्री कल्प न.थ. राय]

मन्त्री आवास के सम्बन्ध में बजट में कोई व्यवस्था न करें, यह बड़ा हास्यास्पद लगता है। मैं स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हाउसिंग के लिए इस बजट में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है। यह सरकार पूंजीपतियों की सरकार है। यह सरकार अमेरिका के इशारों पर चल कर हिन्दुस्तान को केवल एक एग्रीकल्चरल कंट्री बना कर रखना चाहती है। यह सरकार इस देश में सोफिस्टिकेटेड टेक्नोलॉजी का विकास नहीं होने देना चाहती है। यह सरकार हिन्दुस्तान को अमेरिका और दुनिया के साम्राज्यवादी मुल्कों के लिये एक मार्केट के रूप में रखना चाहती है। यह सरकार प्राइवेट सेक्टर की समर्थक है, मल्टी नेशनल कम्पनीज की समर्थक है। आज हमारे देश में यह स्थिति हो गई है कि दुनिया के साम्राज्यवादी और हिन्दुस्तान के पूंजीपति इकट्ठा होकर हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ व्यवस्था पर कब्जा करना चाहते हैं। यह सरकार नेहरू की वैज्ञानिक प्लानिंग और आर्थिक नीति को उल्टा करके लैज फायर की नीति पर चलना चाहती है। यह सरकार इस देश की करोड़ों-करोड़ गरीब जनता की दुश्मन है। यह सरकार समाजवाद और लोकतंत्र की दुश्मन है और इसकी नीतियां इस मुल्क को बरबाद करने वाली है। मैं आज इस सदन के माध्यम से इस देश की करोड़ों करोड़ जनता का आवाहन करता हूँ कि श्री नेहरू और श्रीमती गांधी की नीतियों का विरोध करने वाली इस सरकार को तुरन्त उल्टा दिया जाये और इस देश में एक ऐसी शक्तिशाली, समाजवादी और मुल्क को सेकुलेरिज्म तथा डेमोक्रेसी के रास्ते पर ले जाने वाली सरकार की स्थापना की जाये जो इस देश को एक शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र के रूप में और एक वैज्ञानिक राष्ट्र के रूप में तथा एशिया और अफ्रीका के देशों के नेता के रूप में प्रस्तुत कर सके।

SHRI V. P. MUNUSAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this is my maiden speech in this House and therefore, apart from commenting on the General Budget I would like to say a few words about the Union Territory of Pondicherry from where I represent in Rajya Sabha. Sir, I would not take more than fifteen minutes and I hope the hon. Members will listen to my speech without any intervention.

Sir, I am representing Pondicherry, a place that reminds the French domination in India, and to the world. the French Revolution which is, perhaps, the fore-runner of all the revolutions in the world. To India, Pondicherry has been a spring-board in the fight against the British imperialism. It also provided asylum to the great patriot and philosopher, Shri Aurobindo, and the great poet who had sown the seeds of freedom and equality among the Tamil speaking people, Shri Bharati. Above all, Pondicherry is the birthplace of the revolutionary and modern poet, Shri Bharathidasan. Even today Pondicherry retains its unique feature in selecting a Harijan for the first time to represent its people in Rajya Sabha. It really provides an actual example of the firm conviction of our great leader, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, hon. Shri M. G. Ramachandran, whose interest in the welfare of Harijans adivasis and other weaker sections remains upper-most.

Sir, coming to the Budget, I would like to say that the Budget presented by the Finance Minister displays an incorrigible faith in applying traditional and worn-out remedies to modern problems. The approach is naive and unintelligent. The contents of the Budget and the taxation proposals are anti-poor and pro-rich. In a country where medium and large farmers constitute only 15.2 per cent of the total population of farmers, but own 60.6 per cent of the area cultivated, and where 51.4 per cent of the national income is from agriculture, the inabi-

lity and unwillingness of the Government to tax the rich farmers who constitute the vested interests in the rural economy is a significant failure of this Budget.

The illiterate but intelligent masses are interested in and they have opted for radical changes both in the political and economic spheres but the Budget formulated by the intelligent, media and the bureaucracy is found to be change-resistant Budget. The Budget has provided for disincentives to save by reducing the rates of interest on deposits. Crores of depositors have been affected and only a few hundred industrialists and businessmen belonging to the private enterprise will be benefited. It is a tragedy that the Government aspires for creating more savings and capital formation by reducing the interest rates on deposits whereas in countries like South Korea, which has registered remarkable economic growth rates, the interest rates on deposits range from 20 to 24 per cent. This shows that the Government is interested only in encouraging extravagant and conspicuous expenditure by the private sector, which is completely irresponsible to its social responsibilities. It would have been more intelligent and profitable if the interest rates on deposits had been raised so that public savings could help the growth of the public sector instead of relying upon the inefficient private sector.

Any Budget which consists of tax proposals relating to indirect taxation is certainly anti-people and anti-democratic and this Budget of the Janata Government is the master example of such a Budget.

The approach outlined in the Budget to promote rural development is also a defective one and it is an approach which was tried and which failed the country during the past two decades. There is no progressive element in the approach to rural development even though the Government claims that it is giving top priority to rural development. Perhaps the Government really feel that rural deve-

lopment, according to it, is the development of rich, farmers, who are supporting it in this country.

With these words, Sir, I condemn this Budget which is presented by the Janata Government.

As I pointed out to you earlier, I would like to express my views on the Union territory of Pondicherry. As a representative of the depressed classes community and true follower of our great leader Thiru M. G. Ramachandran it is my primary duty to highlight the socio-economic situation of the long-neglected people of this country. Even though India has won freedom, the promises of our national leaders still remain only on paper. We have no foreigners to blame and the invisible grip of vested interests appears to be more pernicious than the British.

As regards Pondicherry, I may say that prior to the transfer of power from the French Government, the Harijans were occupying the highest positions in the Army as well as in the Civil Services. What is the position in respect of Civil Services after the transfer of power. It is really a pathetic one. I feel ashamed of expressing in this august House that out of nearly 50 officers working in the P.C.S. cadre, which is the highest cadre in the State Service, there is not even a single Harijan now. That does not mean that there is no qualified hand available from the Harijan community. There are. But unfortunately the legitimate claims of the Harijans are deliberately neglected in all respects by the Administrative bureaucracy in Pondicherry State.

Similarly, Sir, in the case of promotions to the posts of Executive Engineers from the posts of Assistant Engineers, the orders of reservation have been thrown to the winds by the Government. These are only a few examples of promises and assurances of the Government of India who are the custodians of the constitutional rights of the weaker sections in our society.

[Shri V. P. Munisamy]

Leaving aside the service conditions, the poor and the weak are being strangled to the level of starvation and death. The rural economy has been completely shattered with no alternative and no hope for the future.

The so-called science and technology have only created pockets of affluent and draw all the resources with no benefit flowing from it to the rural people. In this process, the weakest is the most oppressed one and atrocities by these affluent sections grow day by day in size and frequency supported by accumulation of wealth and concentration of power, political, economic and administrative. Obviously, the tempo of these atrocities has increased by the inhuman and untold miseries of these people, particularly in northern parts of the country, where burning alive has become a regular feature. Cutting the hand, removing of an eye of a woman has become the right and privilege of the high-class in society. Belchis are very common nowadays. All these happen in the very State where a prominent Harijan leader and Lok Nayak Shri Jayaprakash Narayan come from.

Pondicherry is no exception to such atrocities. Pondicherry also had its share in evicting 72 Harijan agricultural tenants from the lands they were cultivating for years together in a village called T. N. Palayam on a flimsy ground. In another village called Puranasinga-Palayam, the entire Harijan families numbering more than 90 migrated from their own village due to the torture and atrocities committed on them only last month by the dominant caste and they have not returned to the village till today.

All these happen in a situation where democracy is fully restored and the individual rights and privileges in the name of safeguarding are respected and honoured. When we shout at the top of our voice in the international forum about the atrocities and inequalities elsewhere, we should be equally conscious of what is happening in India, where the human beings

are treated like wild animals, where women's honour and dignity is treated with scant respect, where there is no equality even at the burial and cremation grounds. All these things happen because a man was born in a particular community, which is not of his choice.

My humble submission to the present Government is to make as much promise as they could fulfil and to make as much claim as is due to them. A sincerity of heart and commitment to action and concern for others, particularly the weak and the needy are a few things which the Government is capable of ensuring. My appeal to all my colleagues in this House and to the people of this country is that at least we should mean what we say and in this respect, the weaker section should receive the consideration and sympathy. Our educational institutions should really educate the people to change their heart and attitude so that every human being should be treated as a human being.

Before I conclude my speech, I would like to submit that the Union Territory of Pondicherry has been long neglected. The people there want a university and an airport to be established. Pondicherry State is gaining international importance, because of Aurovil, the international city coming up and I hope the Government of India will come forward to set up a university and also establish an airport at the earliest opportunity.

Thank you all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Dr. V. P. Dutt—not here. Shri Tilak—not here. Shri Kali Mukherjee—not here. Shri Parashar—not here. Shri Hashmi—not here. Shri Prem Manohar—not here. Dr. Siddhu—not here. Yes, Mr. Syed Nizam-ud-Din.

SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have had the opportunity of hearing Prof. Ranga who is a learned person and who has been

advocating the cause of the rural areas for a pretty long time. Then, I heard another member, Mr. Kalp Nath Rai. He was very sentimental and vocal about certain matters.

Sir, I, personally, may not be in favour of the Budget proposals, in regard to the funds which have been earmarked for rural upliftment. But nobody can deny the fact that, for the first time, this Budget has drawn the attention of this country to the plight of the people living in the rural areas. This was very much evident in this House also. All the speakers, to whichever Party they belonged, whatever their ideologies and their commitments were, have spoken in favour of rural upliftment.

Sir, nobody can deny that this country, during the last 30 years, has made progress and has been progressing. It is going step by step towards economic development. There have been great advances made in the economic development of this country. Nobody can deny this fact. Large-scale industries are very important. Establishment of large-scale industries is very important for this country. We cannot do without a public sector. In my opinion, the improvement and the development of the public sector is much more important than the improvement and the development of the private sector. Keeping also in view the backward economic condition in certain parts of the country, we cannot deny the important role of the public sector. There has been an increase in the national income. There has been some growth in the economy. But one thing everybody realises is that the growth and the development has been concentrated in certain areas, in the hands of certain individuals and in certain sectors. Therefore, the actual strategy of the Budget and the actual strategy of the economists in this country should be to see which are the sectors and which are the areas and which are the communities which have been callously neglected during the last 30 years. May be, it was because of some undue emphasis on a particular sec-

tor that another sector got neglected. May be, it was because of some ideologies. Mr. Ranga was saying that he is not going to speak on ideologies. But when he actually spoke, he was himself speaking about some ideologies. He was speaking on the ideology of *laissez faire*, the ideology of the private sector, the ideology of the rural peasantry and so on. Therefore, I would say that we should not get lost in ideologies. There are certain practical problems in this country. These problems are not peculiar to our country alone. These problems are faced by every developing country. It may be because of some reasons or it may be because of certain historical facts. But the fact remains that the rural population is very poor. It is a recognised fact that the people in the rural areas are very poor. They are engaged in agriculture and certain other allied occupations.

I would say that this Budget has not taken a very bold step. This may be a good beginning. But this is not a bold beginning. What we expected from the Janata Government, was something different. What have they provided for the rural sector? Of course, they have started to do something in this respect. They have provided increased allocations, more allocations in every respect than were provided in the Budget proposals of last year. This year, we will be having more funds for rural roads. We will be having more funds for provision of drinking water in the rural areas. We will be having more funds for rural electrification. I do not derive any satisfaction from this. What I want to make clear is that it is very important that we must know what the maladies of the economy of this country are. It is not that the country does not have enough income. The difficulty is, there is no proper distribution. The wealth is concentrated in a few hands. There is a large bulk of population, more than 50 per cent, in this country which lives below the poverty line and I am hundred per cent sure that 99.5 per cent of these people who are living below the po-

[Shri Syed Nizam-Ud-Din.]

verty line are either residing in villages or have come from the villages to the towns to find jobs.

Sir, Prof. Ranga has said that the present Government is doing all this in vengeance. I wish the present Government should have done in vengeance and should have given full direction to the economy towards upliftment of the rural people. There should be no objection to it, because we know what the plight of the people who live in rural areas is. Then again something was said about the people living in the rural areas, who are rich peasants than other people. Even then if you compare the rural economy as a whole, you must not confuse issues. There may be some rich people, rich peasantry. Again an issue was raised with regard to the economic holding. Sir, I do not hold the view that there should be no distribution of land because we will have to take into account the manland ratio in this country. But there is no other alternative but to distribute land among those people who are landless people, who have no land to construct even their own houses. Therefore, land reforms and land distribution are very important. Sir, what I am actually submitting is that there are certain sectors, certain areas and certain communities in this country which deserve preferential treatment, not to the neglect of other people, but because they have so far been neglected. Therefore, a preferential treatment is very much essential.

Sir, I draw your attention to the fact that this country has hilly areas. This country has rural areas and this country has certain communities who are backward, educationally, socially and otherwise. Therefore, I would like to submit through you, Sir, to the Government that they have not taken note of these facts. They do not make any mention of the development of hilly areas. I come from a State

which is also a hilly area and if we compare the I per capita income at the national level, it is much more higher than what the per capita income in my State is. So is the case with all the hilly States. Hilly States have their own problems, the problem of transport, the problem of their own industry. The people living in hilly areas are mostly forest labourers and the forest labourers have their own problems different from that of the labourers working in other industries. Therefore, these things must be kept in mind.

The present Budget, what I expected, should have done much more for those people living in those areas and again for those people who are called tribals and backward people. But I am not satisfied with what has been done. It may be said that this is only the second budget of the present Janata Government. That is true. Within one year's time no miracle could be done. But at the same time 6 P.M.

the Government must keep in mind that one-fifth of the life of the Government is also over. The present Government had come to power at a historic juncture amidst slogans of total revolution and other things. Therefore, we expected much more from the present Government. I am highly thankful to the Government at least for drawing the attention of his country towards the problems of the rural people.

Secondly, as I have already said, there are certain communities which deserve special treatment. I belong to a community which is the largest minority in this country. I do not claim that exclusive attention should be given to this minority alone. But this minority comprises 1/12th of the total population of this country. I do not blame the present Government because they have not created problems for this community. But this community has been living in perpetual fear for the last 30 years—dismal and disappointed.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : पहले भी यह ज्ञान आया था या नहीं ?

شری سید نizam الدین : تبہ ہی

آیا تھا -

†[श्री संयद निजामुद्दीन] : तब भी आया था ।]

I had spoken about this. I say this is not a problem created by the present Government. I say this is a problem inherited by the present Government. For the last 30 years, there has been total, callous negligence on the part of the Government. There has been a substantial decline in the share of this community in the services. It is not the making of yesterday; it is the making of the last 30 years. They are not in the IAS cadre. Out of about 9,400 clerks, only 26 belong to this community. Why should you feel irritated about this matter? It is a problem inherited by this Government. I cannot blame Mr. H. M. Patel that he has done this. All those people who were ruling this country for the last 30 years have done this. Therefore, there is nothing to feel irritated about. (Interruption) I do not know what is there to be irritated about. I am stating facts. Of the 9,400 clerks, there are only 26 who belong to the Muslim community. There are IAS officers and the percentage of Muslims in that cadre is very low. Candidates are available. I do not say that they are being discriminated against at the Public Service Commission level. But we have to see what is the basic problem. Was this the condition before partition also? When India was not divided, what was the ratio of Muslims in the services? I do not mean to say that service is the only panacea for the Muslims in this country. But because the Government is directly dealing with this matter, therefore we would like that the Government should give due attention to this problem. I will plead

†[] Devnagari transliteration.

that even if there has to be a constitutional amendment for reservation, heavens are not going to fall if we do that. If we feel that there is really some difficulty with a particular community which constitutes about 1/12th of the total population of the country, we should do that. Sir, they are not properly represented in Parliament. By 'properly' I mean to the extent they should have been represented in Parliament. There are about 29 Muslim MPs in the Lok Sabha while their due share at least must be 55. So they are not duly represented. I did not want to come to this; but because of an interruption from that side, I have to say this. They are not properly represented in the legislatures. They are not properly represented in the local bodies. What wrong will be done even if a constitutional amendment it made? May be, it is communal in nature and not desirable that way. But practically, there is no other way out.

Sir, I wanted to make some more submissions with regard to the Budget, but at this late hour I do not want to...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): You may kindly take a few minutes more and conclude because the list is very long and tomorrow is the last day. So you take a few more minutes and finish it.

SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN: So, I was submitting through you, Sir, that this community deserves urgent, immediate and proper attention. I do not say it deserves exclusive attention. If we keep such a large bulk of our population economically backward and unattended that will not help this country. This country cannot progress unless 12 crores of people living in this country become equal shareholders in the benefits of the economic development of this country. We are the second largest Muslim population of the world. Also, they are hard-working people but they are back-

[Shri Syed Nizam-Ud-Din.]

ward. If we cannot do something in the name of Muslims we should do it in the name of backward people. They are weavers. They are agriculturists. I have travelled in Western U.P. where they are slightly economically better off but they are educationally backward. No effort is being made to bring them up for modern education with the result that they are nowhere in services.

I appreciate the Budget proposals with regard to agriculture. I really appreciate the Government effort for the uplift of the rural areas. I really appreciate the Government's proposals with regard to the uplift of the common man. At the same time I do not appreciate the policy about tax structure. I do not find rationalisation there. I, therefore, hope that the hon'ble Finance Minister will have a second look upon the tax structure before he passes the Finance Bill. It is a fact that 5 per cent, increase in excise duty is going to hit everybody in this country, rich and poor alike. But the rich can bear it while the poor cannot bear it. The poor man who needs only few consumer goods is also required to contribute towards this excise duty.

Thirdly, unless the Minister really realises the problem of the agriculturist he would have no relief. He has to appreciate what the agriculturist gets for his produce. The irony is that somebody else fixes the prices. I mean the Agricultural Prices Commission. Is there any relevance between the prices fixed by the Agricultural Prices Commission with regard to the inputs and the labour put in by the agriculturist? It is true that this year sugarcane was sold at a very low price. Therefore, can we expect the agriculturist to produce the same quantity of sugar next year? Since we did not pay him properly for pulses he shifted from pulses to wheat.

There is then the problem of marketing of agricultural products be-

cause the product comes at a time when it is in bulk and the law of supply and demand works. It works against the interest of the agriculturist. That thing we must keep in mind. The Government must come forward to look after the interest of the agriculturists in this country. It cannot be that the prices of sugarcane will remain the same throughout the year and the agriculturist will get much less for his production of cane. So these are the main problems. Unless we translate our policies into real action, merely programmes and policies will not help the agriculturist in this country. We must translate those into action and to translate those into action we must know what are his real problems. The real problem is of minor irrigation. We have laid some emphasis this time on the irrigation problem, but the main problem is that of minor irrigation where smaller sums will be invested and the gestation period also will not be that long. That will also help the agriculturist and there will be some relief for him. What is to be done? It is the conservation and storage of rain water in this country; it is the exploitation of underground water; it is construction of channels for providing proper irrigation facilities.

Sir, so long as the agriculturist is wholly dependent upon the monsoon, his economic lot is not going to be better off. He must be secure about his crops and he must be secure about whatever labour he puts in. Therefore, it is only necessary that he gets water at the proper time and in proper quantity. We should also try to solve other problems like provision of fertilizers, electrification in the rural areas and so on and then only can we talk of small-scale industries and village industries. The main industry of this country is agriculture and it is only after it that the other industries come.

Thirdly, Sir, this Government has been talking about Mahatma Gandhi's policies. Whether one agrees with the

economic policies of Mahatmaji or not—that apart—nobody can deny the merits of Mahatmaji's plea for decentralisation. Our main problem is that planning takes place at the highest strata of this country. The Plan is framed in Delhi and therefore they do not know what is the difference between minor irrigation projects and major irrigation projects, how much a minor irrigation project will help a farmer and so on. Therefore, decentralisation is very essential. Planning must start at the block and district levels because a planning body sitting at the district headquarters or block headquarters can also understand what are the real problems

and what are the remedies to be suggested.

Sir, with these words I thank you for the time you have given me to speak on the Budget.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री स्वामि लाल यादव) :

अब सदन की कार्यवाही कल 11 बजे तक के लिये स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at thirteen minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 16th March, 1978.