

THE FINANCE (NO. 2) BILL, 1977—
Contd.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have very carefully listened to the debate on the General Budget and consideration of the Finance Bill on the floor of this House. Practically the week-long exercise on financial proposals for the current financial year will be over soon.

Sir, when the hon. Finance Minister immediately after the General Elections presented the Vote on Account, he remarked—and very correctly so—that he had had no time to look into the details of the financial position and to come forward with such proposals as would reflect the aspirations of the people as given in the election manifesto. Again, Sir, when he made his observations in the Budget speech itself, he pointed out that he was not left with sufficient time and he had not the opportunity of having discussions with the newly-constituted Planning Commission, etc. etc. With regard to the proposals which are before us, I do not know whether he himself is satisfied with the point to which they reflect, namely, the aspirations of the people in terms of the election manifesto which they placed before the people of this country. Sir, instead of answering the question directly, I find in the reply of the Finance Minister on the floor of the other House that he accused the previous Government of mismanagement of the economy and went to the extent of using the words 'scorched-earth policy' followed by the Congresses so far as the financial management is concerned. I would simply like to draw his attention to this and request him to explain in "details as to what he means by the 'scorched-earth policy' which was followed by the Congress Ministry in the financial management. Sir, from the economic survey which has been presented to us under his guidance, and which is a very important basic document, he would find that there are

certain very favourable trends so far as the Indian economy is concerned. If I may be permitted to sum up, if you look at the important points, you will find that they are a source of some encouragement to the Indian economy, for you will find that the plus points are more and the minus points are less. Firstly, it would be found that the economy which he was entrusted to manage had a 10 per cent industrial growth for the year 1976.

It had a favourable balance of payments position. It had a large volume of buffer stock in food and foreign exchange. Similarly, there was a revenue buoyancy. If you just compare the figures of the budget estimates and revised estimates, you will find that the revenue receipt is more than Rs. 200 crores and odd for the current financial year. There is no denying the fact that there were some disquieting trends also so far as the price front was concerned. It is a fact that after March, 1976 there had been a steady rise in prices and in terms of percentage, perhaps, it was 11.9 per cent. There had been expansion of monetary supply and in terms of percentage it was perhaps 17.1 per cent for the year under review. But, if he wants to make a balanced judgement, would he come to the conclusion that the economy which was left and which they inherited was, in his own language, distorted? In his Budget speech, he has used some very important phrases and has tried to give policy directions. I would like to quote a few lines from his own speech. I quote:

"Even after 25 years of planning, we are unable to sustain an average growth rate of 5 per cent. Clearly, a phased examination of the planning practices and techniques is called for."

I would like to know from him, with reference to the proposals placed before the House and the Finance Bill, what fresh look he is going to have. I would like to know from him what new technique of planning he is going

to apply for improving the economy of this country. Perhaps, some of the press statements made by his colleague have the indications of the new approach. For instance, I would like to quote the press statement made by the Industry Minister in London which has appeared in the 'Financial Express' of the 25th June:

"No take over of any more industry."

Is it the new policy direction they are going to follow? In a press conference the Prime Minister has come forward with the statement:

"Banks will be provided with autonomous status."

The Finance Minister has gone a further step by saying on this very floor of this House that they have depoliticised the banking system. Sir, these are the phrases which are confusing to us, and I would like to have some clarification from the Hon. Finance Minister on these points.

Firstly, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister and particularly the Leader of the House to the fact that the Janata Ministers have resorted to the practice to ignoring Parliament not only on the floor of the House but even outside and they venture to make major policy statements outside and to the press when Parliament is in session. Sir, from my own experience I can say that once when Parliament was in session, when I just referred to the rationalisation of excise duty *in* my address to one of the Chambers of Commerce, I had to apologise on the floor of this House. But an important statement like this, that there will be no take-over of any industries, is made by the Industry Minister to the press when both Houses of Parliament are in session. Important statements are made, like the one made by the Prime Minister to the press that banks will be given an autonomous status, without taking into consideration the very fact that Parlia-

ment is in session. Sir, I would like to know from the Finance Minister what he means by de-politicalising the banking system. Does he mean by de-politicalising making the banking system free from political control in considering and granting the individual loan applications? One can understand that. But does he mean by de-politicalisation that there will be no political control over the most important financial institution of this country as to in which direction the credit will flow, in which direction the banking system is to play its role in the national economy?

Sir, when the banks were nationalised in 1969, it was uppermost in our minds to have the social control, to have the political control, over the financial institutions. Sir, it is known to the Finance Minister—his own records will show; I would not like to go into the jugglery of statistics—it is very well known to him that since the days of nationalisation, if you take any single aspect of the banking sector, its branch expansion, its credit to the erstwhile neglected sectors, its deposit mobilisation and even its profitability, you will find that under the social control, under the political control, the banking system has done well in improving the economic situation of this country. From where is he getting his authority? He is sitting here and making policy statements not as a retired bureaucrat. It is the political system which is giving him the authority to make policies for this country; it is the political system which gives him the sanction for what he says. I do not understand what he means by de-politicalising the banking system. Sir, if somebody comes to the conclusion that some high-ups in the country to-day did not like the idea of bank nationalisation and they are now trying to de-nationalise the banking system through these phrases, of giving the so-called autonomy to the Reserve Bank of India or of giving an autonomous status to the banking system, I think, till now the Minister has not

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee] done anything to disprove that belief. I would like to know from him what is wrong with the system itself. If there had been some violations of the normal rules and procedures of the banking system, you identify the areas of deficiencies, bring the guilty to book, take appropriate action against them, hang them, penalise them. But you cannot say that there will be no political control over the banking system which is the most important financial institution of this country. Who will control it? It is, after all, the Banking Department, through the Finance Minister, which will control it, subject to the control of this House, subject to the queries of this House. The other day,, the Finance Minister said that so far as the interest rate was concerned, it was done by the Reserve Bank; however, he was informed. Will this be the state of affairs that the credit policy will be determined by the Reserve Bank of India, that the interest rate will be determined by the Reserve Bank of India, and the Minister will come forward and say "Well, this is being done by the Reserve Bank of India; it is being done by the banking system in their autonomous capacity; however, the Ministry is informed"? And in the same breath you are talking of controlling credit, you are talking of making a fundamental change in the approach. But may I know, Mr. Finance Minister, what fundamental changes in approach you have brought in your proposals? You are talking in the same language in which Mr. Subramaniam or his colleagues used to speak, of controlling credit. You are talking in the same language of the economy of shortage. Therefore, why are you using such bombastic words that even after 25 years of independence we find that we are unable to reach the target fixed—5 per cent growth? We shall have to make *some* fresh look and try to find out a new technique to the planning approach. We will be glad to know from the honourable Finance Minister what fresh look they are going to

have. We are interested in that because we know our shortcomings and We expressed our shortcomings, that these are the things. He is talking of the economy and he says—I am quoting another line from his speech— "We have inherited a difficult price situation caused by the distortions in 1976-77." What is the distortion you are meaning? Distortion by monetary expansion? Distortion by shortage of edible oils and certain essential goods? By distortion do you mean non-availability of certain items in the international market? Are you not aware of the stresses and strains through which the Indian economy had to pass? Are you not aware of the fact that more than 50 per cent and sometimes 60 per cent of your entire import bill for the financial years 1974-75 and 1975-76 was on importing only three items: food, fertilizer and fuel, and that too on a much lesser quantum? Is it the distortion created by your predecessor or is it because of certain factors over which nobody had any control? You will have to be honest to yourself. If you say that there has been a certain distortion then you will have to come forward and say, look, this is the distortion and we are going to take such and such remedial measures. Therefore, I am sorry to say that though in his lengthy Budget Speech and his subsequent utterances he suggested that they are going to have a fresh look, they are going to have new approaches, yet unfortunately nothing is visible. He went to the extent of suggesting that Rs. 400 crores have been squandered by the State Governments since January. He has forgotten that the State Governments in January were quite confident that they were not going to have any election in May or June. The decision to dissolve the State Assemblies took place after the March election. Therefore, if the State Governments have' spent anything, it is not because of the consideration that in June they were going to be defeated, so they would have to follow the scorched-earth policy which he mentioned on

the floor of the House. I would like to have a break-up of the figures for Rs. 400 crores for January—March and after the decision on dissolution which took place. Could you give a break-up of these figures? Then we can understand whether the State Governments had resorted to the scorteh-ed-earth policy. Sir, I do not know whether the honourable Finance Minister is trying to deceive himself or whether he is trying to deceive us. The other day while answering a question on the problem of sales tax the Finance Minister said in the most casual way that he is going to have a discussion with the State Chief Ministers and Finance Ministers. Why does he not take the trouble of consulting his senior colleague, Babu Jagjivan Ram, who is the Defence Minister? And he can understand things without having to go to the Chief Ministers. What will be the reaction of some of the Chief Ministers who may even belong to his party? One can understand from a pure taxation point of view that perhaps it would be much more rational if we had rationalisation of sales tax and merged it with additional excise duty. It would have been an ideal proposition. But one point you will have to keep in mind, Mr. Finance Minister, when you are speaking on the floor of this House or the other House, you are saying that you are not going to take the responsibility for bridging the gap so far as the States are concerned. Where is the area for the State Governments to mop up or mobilise resources? Whatever distortions might have taken place in the area of sales tax, which is one of the most important items, which is flexible and which provides scope for manoeuvrability to the State Governments to finance their own affairs, you should have taken this factor into account. Now you are saying that you are going to rationalise it and going to talk to the State Chief Ministers and Finance Ministers.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPA-
DHYAY (West Bengal): There is no

other Minister on the Treasury Benches except the Finance Minister who is comfortably having a nap. Shri Pranab Mukherjee is making a very important point to which the Finance Minister has to apply his mind and later satisfy this House. Either we should have a recess so that the Finance Minister can finish his nap or somebody on his side should take notes.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Deputy-Chairman, I would like to appeal to the Finance Minister to come forward with a pragmatic policy which is practical and can be implemented. It is no use saying that he would be able to rationalise. From our own experiences and from the experiences of some of our very senior colleagues in the Ministry, we have seen how difficult it was to persuade the State Governments so far as sales tax is concerned. Therefore, instead of chasing a wild goose and making them agree to a proposition to which they did not agree in the past, the Finance Minister will have to find out some solution to this problem. Various State Governments have raised this point. What should be the approach to the State Governments? What should the areas from which they can mop up their resources to meet their own demands? I can understand the predicament of the Central Finance Minister because he will have to follow certain yardsticks so far as grants-in-aid are concerned. He will have to follow article 275 in this regard or follow the pattern of allocation recommended by the Finance Commission. He cannot go beyond these two. At the same time it is high time for all of us to think and And out the means by which you can enlarge the areas from which the States can mop up their resources and if necessary they should think seriously about the need to amend the Constitution in order to enlarge the fiscal power so far as the State Governments are concerned.

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee]

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to another aspect. It is known to you that since 1974 when we had the crash-down operation against smugglers and foreign exchange racketeers, the House was very much interested to know the details of the figures and the progress that had been made in that direction. Many a time *on* the floor of this House, various questions were answered and figures given. I was surprised to read a remark of the Finance Minister on the floor of the House to the effect that the smugglers were released by the previous Government. Who does not know, Mr. Finance Minister, that they were released by the previous Government because of the fact that their detention was linked up with the emergency. For argument's sake if we take it for granted that these people were not released, would you say that you would have detained these people? Because their detention was linked up with the period of the emergency, when the emergency was not there,, they had to be released. I do not know what satisfaction the Finance Minister derives by saying that these people were not released by us, but by the previous Government'. What prevents him from arresting these people now? COEEPOSA is not repealed yet. The Act is there. Could you tell us how many people have been arrested under COFEPOSA since you took over responsibility for this Ministry? Or, have you come to the conclusion that smuggling has been completely stopped? Is it because of the magic wand of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and his blessings that these people have completely become saints and they have stopped smuggling? There is no foreign exchange racketeering at all now? There is no bringing of contraband goods into this country by some people? We are surprised to hear all these things. There is a provision in that Act itself to have Income-Tax raids to unearth the black money. Can Mr. Patel enlighten this House as to how many

raids, Inocem-tax raids, have taken place since he took over the responsibility of this Ministry? We would be glad to know this, because it is a continuing process and it is not a question of the whims of individual Ministers and individual personalities. Parliament, in its wisdom,, passed these Acts and placed them on the Statute Book and these are to be followed strictly and seriously and we will have to see that there is no generation of black money. Now, you have come forward with a series of concessions. I won't mind these concessions. But, Sir, the Finance Minister has forgotten the very basic principle and he has forgotten the story of the carrot and the stick. He has provided the carrot only to the industrialists and he has extended the benefit of the investment allowance to all and sundry industries. Sir, in the morning, while making his introductory remarks,, he dwelt at length on the rationale behind including all the industries,' almost all the industries, in the list for giving investment allowance. But, as a veteran financial man, Mr. Patel knows that this is basically a measure which is to be applied in a restricted way. You have not abundant resources. When the resources are limited, when you want the investment to go in a particular direction and when you have the national priorities before you, you ought to see that your fiscal measures and the scarce resources are diverted through the proper channels in the priority sector. But you have come forward with a negative list. Are you sure that this negative list is going to help you? Are you sure that the very basic purpose of this investment allowance for the replacement of machinery and plant,, which is very much needed for the modernisation of the industry and for ensuring accelerated rate of growth, will be fulfilled? It is not going to be and it is known to Mr. H. M. Patel. For more than a decade, the development rebate went on. Later on, it was replaced by depreciation allowance. Now, *the new name* of invest-

ment allowance is being given. But it has been found that in spite of all these things, many of our industries till today are suffering for lack of modernisation. Therefore, you have to see that the reserves which have been created,, that the resources that you have which are limited and the concessions which you are giving them are really ploughed back for the replacement of the machinery and plant and I do not find in this any mechanism for this and I do not know what mechanism they are going to have and, Sir, if they have some details with regard to this, I think the honourable Minister should enlighten the Members of this House.

Sir, I would like* to know the reaction of the honourable Members of this House particularly to the policy statement, major policy statement, which the Industry Minister has made. If the Finance Minister wants to create a climate of confidence because Mr George Fernandes, a firebrand, has taken over the Industry Ministry, if he wants to assure the industrialists that there will be no take-over or that there will be no nationalisation, can he put it in such a blanket way? He himself would find that some amount of compulsion would be needed for this. He is talking of amalgamating the sick units with the healthy and the sound units. Would he not compel the sick units, particularly the recalcitrant sick units,, if they refuse to merge with the sound and the healthy units in their own self-interest, to merge? Would he not like to compel them? Would he not like to adjust the policy with the prevalent situation if it so demands? They are talking of having a fresh look, of having anew approach and of adopting new techniques for solving the problems of the country. Perhaps, Sir, another version of the new approach is appealing to the traders for restricting the prices and for reducing the prices. I think half a dozen appeals they have made, right from the Finance Minister down to

all the important leaders of the Janata Party. What has been the result? What has been the effect of the selective credit policy? 'Have you been able to do it? Are you not coming to the floor of the House with some sort of argument: Look, there is deficiency, there is shortage and money supply could not be checked? Is it not known to you,, Mr. Finance Minister, that one of the major reasons of monetary expansion last year was the large buffer stock in food? Have you given a thought to what you are going to do with this 70 million tonnes buffer stock of food?...*(Time bell rings)*... Would you really require it? If not, are you going to release it and have some sort of relief so far as the monetary expansion is concerned. Therefore, Sir, I am sorry to tell you that both in his budget speech and in his reply to the debate Mr. Patel has tried to give a picture which is not true. He has failed to depict the picture of the economy in its correct perspective. About the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, I can tell you with some amount of confidence that if there was no persistent resistance from the floor of this House, he would have continued the same and perhaps would have said: Look,, we are taking a fresh look and we are making a departure from the policy pursued by the previous Government, You will have to keep in mind the subtleties of the Indian economy. You may be emboldened enough to say as you mentioned in your Budget speech. I quote:

"We are determined to bring the situation fully under control and we have the will as well as the necessary instruments to stabilise prices at a reasonable level within a period... .".

Where is the will?

You are talking of agricultural development. Have you looked into the serious problems of rural credit? If I understand correctly, 40 to 45

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee] regional rural banks were established by the previous Government. Now you are coming forward and saying; Look, there is no need of proliferation of the institutions—a new idea. Are you aware of the fact that till today 50 per cent of the entire rural credit comes from the non-institutional arrangements. Banks and co-operatives, all taken together, are enabled to meet 50 per cent requirements of the rural credit. But you are saying that there is no need of regional rural banks and that cooperatives can take care of the problem. How can co-operatives take care of the problem? Have you not seen the experience of the co-operative movement in this country for long 25 years? Is it not a fact that a new vested interest has developed in the co-operative sector? Still the membership is not universalised. Still the co-operatives are not provided with sufficient expertise and whole-time management.

Sir, I would request the hon. Finance Minister to have a look into the report which was appended by the Reserve Bank and to look into the credit problem of north-eastern region. Even the latest type of co-operative arrangements made by the State Governments in Assam have failed to produce the desired results. Though the whole State was divided into 500 or 600 odd co-operative societies, areas were earmarked, they were attached to various bank branches, they have failed to deliver the desired results. Therefore, in that context you will have to keep in mind that merely by saying that we would like to lay emphasis.... (*Time bell rings*)

Sir, I am going to conclude. It is to use saying that you are going to have larger investments in industry. Sir, I do not know the details of the most important thesis provided by the Home Minister for the economic regeneration of the country. I understand that he has a fixed idea

about the development of larger industries. But I do not know if you can take care of the problem of the rural credit if you cannot create the necessary infra-structure. Every time you are coming forward and saying— even today, this morning, you discussed in detail—how much concession you are going to give to the industrial enterprises if they invest in the rural development. Have you forgotten the basic fact that one of the biggest maladies of the industrial sector of this country is bad management? Many of the units have become sick not because of dearth of finance, not because of lack of orders or market but because of the fact of inefficient management. You are expecting that those who cannot manage their own undertakings, will come forward in a big way for rural development through the approved schemes. They may come forward for having some tax concessions because they know very well that after all here is a Government which has a tremendous weakness—I am using the word 'tremendous'—for the big business. Therefore, they may come forward and take the advantage of concessions. But I can tell you that it would not be possible for them to deliver the goods in that area. You yourself will have to come forward with a comprehensive rural development programme. Have you made an assessment as to what has been the effect of the budgetary allocations made last year? Have you made an assessment as to what has been the effect of the comprehensive area development programmes enunciated by the various State Governments? Or have you just *come* forward with new ideas of giving some concessions to these industrial enterprises for their investment in the so-called rural development programme? Sir, before I conclude, I would like to point out to the hon. Finance Minister and through him to the whole Government that though one of the important Marxist leaders of this country has expressed his confidence in the efficiency of the mixed economy, we have to

think very seriously, at the crossroads of our development, as to what extent we can allow the mixed economy to paly in this country, particularly in respect of certain most important old industrial sectors like jute, textile and sugar. I do feel it is high time for us to take decisions and instead of assuring them through a blanket pronouncement that there will be no takeover and no nationalisation, the Government should seriously think about nationalising the textile industry, the jute industry and the sugar industry. Even if you look at the performance of the N.T.C. mills, it is no use saying that they are still incurring losses. Yes,, they are incurring losses. But you will have to see at what stage or in which condition they were taken over. At the same time, you will have to make a comparative study whether after being taken over by the Government, they have improved their efficiency and whether the losses incurred by them have been reduced. Many of the sick mills taken over the Government have improved their efficiency. So far as the industrial growth rate is concerned, he is himself well aware that the growth rate of the public sector is 12 per cent if We exclude the N.T.C. mills. In this context, I would request the Government, through you, Sir,, that they should not come forward, make a blanket statement and create a situation which is absolutely stagnant, by saying that there will be no takeover. There will be takeover if it is necessary, if there is inefficient management, if public money is involved and if banks' money is involved. It has been clearly established by the managements of the public sector units that all these years they have acquired sufficient expertise to manage the public sector units. But unfortunately this Government is accepting a deliberate policy. Otherwise, I do not know how a responsible leaders can come forward and say that all the big industries will be given to the private sector. You are going to hand over the steel industry, fertiliser industry,

power generation and all the basic industries to the private sector. If they think they can give them to the private sector and improve the lot of the economy, I am sorry, Sir, they are utterly mistaken. Sir, we have little to do so far as the Finance Bill is concerned. That is the constitutional deficiency of this House. But at the same time, Sir, he can take note of the suggestions made by us and if possible at least recommend to the Lok Sabha some of the amendments which will be moved by the hon. Members of this House. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, before I come to the subject matter I would like to tell my hon. friend who has just preceded me that he has been sadly mistaken in expecting too much from the Janata Government. Let us, Sir, analyse for a moment what Janata Government consists of. It is an unprecedented event in the history of democratic institutions that a party attained majority in the Parliament first and came into existence afterwards. Let us also not forget the fact that various constituents of the Janata Party have not merged themselves completely. If we call them like an urban agglomeration, an agglomeration of parties it will not be wrong. They speak with different voices, and the Prime Minister has said it repeatedly, at least twice as far as I know, that there is no collective responsibility in his Government, the Minister can only speak for his Department and not for the entire Government. To expect something which is going to be of lasting benefit to this country, to a man like myself, seems to be more Utopian than a fact. Now the Finance Bill is to raise resources for the Government to meet its obligations set out in the various Budget proposals which have been accepted by this House and the other House. But, Sir, even a cursory glance of the various clauses would convince any-

[Shri Triloki Singh]

one that this Bill is not a Finance Bill but a Bill for tax evasion. It provides so many loopholes to the rich to evade taxes which they had to pay so far. My friend, the previous speaker, made a passing reference to the moneys spent by the companies on rural development, and such moneys will be exempt from the imposition of income-tax.

Sir, rural development has a history in this country. Long before Independence, rural development activities started in 1935, and since then there have been so many changes and additions and alterations and amendments and so on and so forth that now it is given to the Janata Party to bemoan that much remains to be done in the country-side. Sir, to leave the rural development to the tender mercies of the rich is not good. If the Government before Independence and if the Governments after Independence and all the State Governments and the Governments with which the present Prime Minister had been actively and closely associated as the Chief Minister of the erstwhile Bombay State and as Finance Minister here, if they have not been able to achieve much. I wonder whether a tax concession to these capitalists would be able to make a headway in so far as the rural development part goes. But, Sir, it is a device to provide tax concessions to the rich, the few rich, and I am sure the Birlas will be the first to tax advantage out of it and might very well provide a few crores of rupees for rural development without spending a single pie actually on it. Therefore, Sir, as I submitted earlier, I find so many loopholes in this Bill, which provide for evasion of taxes.

Then, Sir, there is a reference to the capital gains tax in this Bill. I am not an economist; I am a layman and you can very well call me as of laity. I know very little about financial problems. How does this capital gains tax accrue? Sir, to a layman like

myself it accrues as a result of the difference in costs and prices, which affect the poorest most. The few rich who are assessed to the capital gains tax are only a handful of people as compared to the millions who suffer as a result of the rise in prices. They have not been provided any relief. It is the rich who have been provided relief, if they spend the money, the gains on their capital, in any one of the authorised investments, say, invest it in a bank or in a co-operative society or invest in national savings certificates, and so on and so forth. Millions suffer as a result of the increase in prices and a handful of people, who are liable to pay capital gains tax, will escape if they invest the money so gained in certain securities or in banks. And, Sir, what is there to stop these people from taking back this money? I invest a few lakhs of rupees in a bank today which I earn as a result of capital gains. I can take an advance tomorrow from the bank. Has the hon. Minister ever given any thought to it? Suppose Rs. 50 lakhs have accrued to a firm on account of capital gains tax. He gets relief on it. He then invests this money in securities or in the Allahabad Bank or in the State Bank and then next morning takes an advance on it. I really cannot understand how a financial expert, a man who has been the Secretary of the Finance Department for along time and who has also been a Member of Parliament for a still longer period, comes forth with such a proposal and claims that these proposals are for the benefit of the *janata*, which means the millions and millions of poor people, and not for the rich few, in this country. The previous speaker made a passing reference to the investment policy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):
It is only for the benefit of the Janata Party.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I thought that the Janata Party also included the *janata*.

AN HON MEHBER: Very remotely.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Maybe, very remotely; but then that is the claim that they are making. Let us not dispute their claim at this stage. We can very well judge them after their performance because they have been repeatedly telling people both in this House as well as outside that they had very little time at their disposal to grapple with the problems. They forget conveniently that when they fought elections they came out with their election manifesto which went into great details in these matters but the repeated statements that have been made by their leaders not only in this House and the other House but even outside, generally speaking, give rise to the feeling that there is some rethinking on the commitments made. Whether they are able to get out of the commitments made by them, is for us to see. I might tell you Sir, and through you, the Janata Party Government that they should not take the responsibility of going back on the promises that they have made. If the Congress, after thirty years of continuous rule, for one or two mistakes was wiped off from areas north of Narmada, the Janata Party, which has yet to become a party, will be wiped off in no time, not in thirty years, not in thirty months, may be in thirty weeks. (*Interruptions.*) What did you say? Will you repeat it again?

SHRI PREM MANOHAR (Uttar Pradesh): In the last thirty years the number of monopolies has increased five-times.

श्री त्रिलोकी सिंह : हुजूर, अगर वह दुहरा दें अपनी ज़बान में और मेरे जैसे मामूली आदमी के पल्ले पड़ जाए ताकि मैं आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज कर सकूँ।

Sir, I am sorry I have not
3 P.M. been able to follow the interruption made by the hon. Member; otherwise, I would have

certainly liked to answer in my own limited way.

श्री सुजान सिंह (हरियाणा) : उन्होंने कहा कि हजारों गलतियाँ की हैं कांग्रेस ने। हजारों गलतियों से कांग्रेस गई है। एक गलती नहीं हजारों गलतियों से।

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Maybe, there may be thousands of mistakes in thirty years but there are hundreds of mistakes in less than thirty weeks. The hon. Member should not forget it

Now, Sir, coming to the subject matter, I am sorry that the Finance Minister, maybe due to some reason beyond his control.....

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI H. N. BHAUGUNA): Yes, exactly; that is why, I am here.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Not only the Minister of Petroleum, but an other Minister is also here. But how I wish, Sir, that the hon. Minister of Petroleum and the hon. Minister of Education were fully empowered to function here and act here on behalf of the Finance Minister, because that goes against the statement made by the Prime Minister the other day that a Minister is empowered to speak only about his Ministry and not for the whole Government. The Prime Minister said it; let them not refute their leader.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: We are only listening for communication to the proper quarter. I can assure Triloki Babu that I will not interfere in whatever he says.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Accord-in, to Janata curriculum, Petroleum Minister plus the Education Minister is equal to Finance Minister. This is quite understandable.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: So far as the relief upon investment is concerned, formerly the law was—and I believe it still is, unless amended by this

[Shri Triloki Singh]. Bill—that rebate on investment was given in areas which were declared as backward areas by the Government. And now the proposal is that it be given for any rural area. The result is that instead of developing Ballia and Jhansi—I am talking of U.P.—or other remote areas like Pilibhit . . .

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You say Srikakuiam; I add to your knowledge.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Yes Srikakuiam; I add to my knowledge provided by the honourable Shri Bahu-guna. Nothing will happen. As a result of these concessions, industries will be set up round about big cities like Lucknow, Allahabad and Kanpur and nobody will look at Ballia, whereas they say repeatedly that they stand "n rural development which has been neglected. They conveniently forgot that half the members in the Ministries of the Janata Government were for some time—not for small time but for years—connected with the Government which they are condemning today in responsible position. My friend Mr. Bahuguna was the Chief Minister of U.P.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You did not permit me to last there.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I do not know. For the little time that he was there, he gave full attention to rural development. It is not that when he became a member of the Janata Government that he has thought of rural development. He had rural development in mind then also and he has rural development in his ideas now also. The only difference is that they condemn their past and hope for the future.

What is this Government, Sir, here for? Eversince they came into power, they are only condemning the past. They have forgotten conveniently their election manifesto and their promises they made at the time of elections. They are bemoaning the past and the only achievement to their

credit so far is the restoration of civil liberties and democracy. If you, Sir, analyse it and have a closer scrutiny, who was responsible for holding the elections? Did Shri Morarji Desai even from jail say? Did Chaudhuri Charan Singh who had been outside the jail for more than fourteen months before the elections make a demand that elections should be held? Did any element of the Janata Party say that the House of People should be dissolved and elections ordered? The elections were held as a result of the decision taken by the leader of the Congress Party.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: No, no; the Communist Party of India, I beg your pardon, asked for it long ago.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I agree with him and to that extent I just accept the suggestion made by him—but it was not asked for by any element in the Janata Party. But the constituents of the Janata Party did not ask for the holding of the elections.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Triloki Singh, would you kindly allow me to interrupt you?

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Why does he interrupt me? I am a small fry. Let him interrupt his leader.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is but natural that when elections are talked about, defection will speak.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: For the information of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—this is not a personal explanation—I have not defected. I got elected on the Swatantra Party ticket which merged into the B.L.D. The B.L.D. ultimately merged into the Janata Party. Therefore, I have come back to my original party. This is for his information.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I accept this. This is like our intermediate journey.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Since you are such a great leader, I leave it to you.

Mr. Triloki Singh gave an argument saying that Congress was responsible for holding the elections. They were also responsible for the Emergency. " He gave that as one of the most solid arguments. If that be so, India should be beholden to the Britishers because they gave independence to India. Therefore, shall we vote for the British Governments or the Britishers?

SHRI HIMMAT SINH (Gujarat): We fought for it.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: This argument befits not only a member who represents the Janata Party, but one who began his political career, as a member of the Ganga Tantra Parishad which later merged into the Swatantra Party. The Britishers did not give independence to India out of their own sweet free will. Long before I was born and my friend, Mr. Loknath Misra, was born, the struggle for independence began and there was 1857 struggle. What it was fought for, if not for driving away the Britishers from India? Then, the Indian National Congress emerged on the scene. Later on, in 1906—my friend will correct me if I am wrong the revolutionary movement came into existence in Bengal and Punjab, the two distant provinces. There was not much in U.P. There was not much in Bihar and Orissa, to which my friend belongs. Then, the Indian National Congress launched non-cooperation and civil disobedience movements. Let us not forget the fact that it was Gandhiji—he was not only the leader of India, but he was also one of the greatest leaders India has ever seen— who made the demand 'Quit India'. Let me remind him, Sir, about his present leader, Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan. When Louis Fischer met Gandhiji and told him 'Jayaprakash says that India will not be free unless there is a revolution, "Jayaprakash is a scientific revolutionary who believes in total revolution",

Gandhiji said, the person who wanted the Britishers to quit India said, 'India will not remain slave; so let Jayaprakash have his revolution. Let him not talk like that without checking up the records. I was in the freedom struggle in my own humble way and we know how much and how little did we contribute to the achievement of freedom. It was not that it was dropped from above. The freedom that we gained was wrested out of the unwilling British hands. Therefore, the analogy does not hold good. In regard to the elections, I would like any person from any constituent of the Janata Party to come and prove it here, not today, but tomorrow or the day after. Let them come out and show it to you, Sir, if they believe in you more than they believe in a humble man like me, that they made the demand for the holding of the elections. I still repeat that Congress was responsible for the proclamation of the Emergency and Congress suffered for it. We suffered for it. We did not escape the responsibility. We are not sorry for it. We have rightly been punished, let me tell the hon. Member. I do not grudge it. I knew it. I knew it even before my hon. friend knew it and some of them sitting opposite in the treasury benches knew it. I had repeatedly told the leaders of the Congress Party T would not be surprised if you have a precipitous fall some day.

“चरमरा के बैड जायँ ।”

So, I am not one of those sycophants and I do not repeat things which I do not know. I check it up first and then come here. Even in my casual remarks I am very particular about making a statement.

So, about, this investment policy, with this tall claim of rural development they are confining the development of areas round about big cities and ignoring and leaving the places which have so far been called as backward areas or backward districts.

I would not take much of the time. I would not give you the trouble of ringing the Bell to remind me that I have had my time. I would like to

[Shri Triloki Singh]

make only) one point. The capital gains tax provision applies to the surcharge and corporate tax. If five per cent of this is deposited in the bank, 3 man gets rebate upon income-tax. Sir, this Party has been saying day in and day out that it stands for not only checking the rise in prices but also for bring them down to a level which will be within the reach of the poor. I need not remind them about their own document, I have got a copy of the election manifesto with me. It is written there in specific terms, but what does one find during the last four months? Prices have been rising. Now they say that it is because of the legacy of the past Government. Did they not know that they were going to inherit this legacy if they came to power, or did they come to power, as rightly pointed out by Mr. Lokanath Misra, unexpectedly? They did not expect to be returned in such a big number and, therefore, they were not particular about putting down specific things in their Party election manifesto. (*Interruptions*).

Now Sir, the salestax will be substituted by excise duty. As everybody knows, imposition of any duty results in the rise in prices. Sales-tax is one of the main sources of the State Government's revenue. I do not know in what flash of mind they made this commitment that they would be abolishing sales-tax altogether in the States in which they came into power. The hon. Home Minister is not here today, but he made a statement, a press statement, that he was ordering the elections in some of the States for the simple reason to enable the Janata Party to fulfil its pledges. Now that has been done in the north of India. Does the Janata Party mean not to fulfil its pledges in the south of this country? That is Mr. Charan Singh's statement, repeated off and it was one of the main arguments for taking action under article 35.6 and dismissing so many State Governments. What fate does the Janata Government find themselves in? They cannot imple-

ment their programmes in Tamil Nadu, in Kerala, in Karnataka, in Andhra, in Maharashtra, in Bengal and in Jammu and Kashmir also.

AN HON. MEMBER: Goa.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Goa is a tiny State. That means about 45 per cent. . . . (*Interruptions*). Pondicerry and Assam also. So, it comes to 50 per cent, may be 49 per cent. Can this Government have, for a moment, a right to exist, which according to their own admission, have no power to implement the pledges that they gave before the elections in half the country? The platform upon which they fought and sought the mandate is only for 50 per cent of the country and the remaining 50 per cent is outside their fold. God knows, they might find some excuse for dissolving the Governments in those States also. I think they will be wiser after the results in West Bengal, Jammu and Kashmir and, to some extent, in Punjab also where they the non-communal people, are collaborating with the Akali Dal. That has been the bane of the Congress Party also. But they say—and they have been claiming that they are saints, that they are for the restoration of not only civil liberties but democratic institutions, that they are nationalists to the core, and that they want to build an India of Mahatma Gandhi's dreams. Let us not forget, Sir, that those who rejoiced at the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi and those who mourned at it are together today and before assuming office, they marched to the Samadhi of that great man to pledge to they would be led and guided by Gandhiji in all their activities.

Much has been said about Gandhiji, Gandhian philosophy, Gandhian polity, Gandhian economics and all that. I have been very closely associated with Gandhiji. Some of my friends might be surprised to know that for a time I was in ashram also. And, Sir, I really fail to understand what philosophy can be called Gandhian philosophy. Mahatma Gandhi was a seeker after truth and he him-

self said, "My Experiments with Truth". He did not lay down any dogma or philosophy. If somebody approached him and said that garlic was good for health, he began to experiment with garlic. If somebody said if we take to kutcha leaves, it would improve health", he began to take kutcha leaves and became a victim of blood-pressure which lasted till his last days. If some Swami—not like the one in the Yoga Ashram here—approached him and said: "Pranayamas are good for the people", he asked his real nephew to learn all the Pranayamas and asans and he learnt them in six months and became a patient of TB. Gandhiji was a man who lived by what he said, who tried to identify himself with the masses, who just stood for the good of the humanity at large, whose nationality and philosophy know no bounds, who equally loved the Brahmin, the Khasatriya and the Chamar. If he were to adopt a daughter, it was the daughter of a Mahtar and not the daughter of Brahmin. He could very well have got so many Brahmin girls to adopt as daughters. Perhaps there would have been a queue and it would have been difficult for him to make a selection. But Gandhiji was a man of action. How I wish that these worthy people who now adorn the Treasury Benches, who swear in the name of Mahatma Gandhi and Gandhism were to follow even one per cent of what that great man said and died for. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad Mr. Bahuguna is applauding.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Why not? It is the Gandhian people who appreciate what is being said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know what you applauded, but you did applaud.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Your presence here in the House.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have been hearing the speeches of the eminent leaders of the Opposition party and I was rather amused to hear some of their statements—particularly some of the statements of Mr. Triloki Singh about Mahatma Gandhi. So before I give my comments on the Finance Bill, I would like to deal with the points raised by my previous speaker.

It is really surprising that on the one side Mr. Triloki Singh said that Mahatma Gandhi was a believer in truth, that he experimented and he never, therefore, thought that there was something like an idea or a person who could never change. Gandhiji believed in experimenting to the length that he believed in converting the greatest opponents to him. He would like to transform them, change them win them over and he would not come out with a kind of statement of condemnation of a particular section of our countrymen for years and years and decades and decades together saying, "these are the people who are to be condemned for life in our national life". You are, Mr. Triloki Singh, suffering from a little misconception about the Gandhian way of life. Let me tell you. You are an elderly man and I am a much younger man. Even then, I dare say that Mahatma Gandhi never was that kind of rigid man as some people of your party who have been so rigid, so doctrinaire, so sloganish and so make-believe for the last five or ten years or even longer. If he was a seeker after truth, he was so with an open mind, with an open heart and with a willingness to adapt and work with anybody once he found an agreement with the basic ideas. He never hurt anybody just because of one's sport. He looked to the future. So, for God's sake, forget those old things. How long, for how many decades, are you going to harp on these old things?

The Janata Party, Sir, has come into being. The Congress Party is still

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh] dreaming that Janata Party will break. Please do not harbour these dreams anymore. The fact is that there is now a Janata Party which is one indissoluble, inseparable entity which nobody in the country can break whether inside or outside. (In *terruptions*). . . whatever may be the stage we are passing through, every step we are moving ahead is a step towards more integration, towards more strengthening of the party, towards getting more and more near to each other. We may be passing through a struggle. After all, the Congress Party was not built up over, night and you cannot say that the Congress Party had no dissensions and no groups. Simply because you *are* one party, nobody can say from your record that you were in any way better than the other parties. The question is that the Congress was such a divided house—and is still divided—that any other party would be much better and more united than that. The question, therefore, is that the Janata Party has come into being after a resolve, made in a spirit of sacrifice in the prisons. This party is born out of suffering. So don't entertain this idea that it will break down and suddenly you will come back to power. This is not going to help you in any way in retrieving or recovering your position. Therefore, let us, as friends, at least accept this that now there is a Janata Party in India—and that is a fact and reality which nobody can deny. On this basis we have to work for restructuring our economy, restructuring our political order restructuring our social system and here now is a fresh opportunity of thinking afresh on all these issues. So, let us all, with a fresh vigour think about how we can come out of the morass, out of the mess which the Congress Party had created in this country during the last five or ten years. Therefore, I very humbly say that the relevant question now is not what would happen to the Janata Party, what had happened in the past or who were where in the past. The

Question is: What is going to happen

in the future? There are very nice prospects of what is going to happen in the future. That Finance Minister has come out with some of the very practical, workable and dynamic ideas about recovery of our economy. It may be said that all the measures in this very first year of the Budget are not adequate. One can say that. He has himself conceded that it is a beginning, but a right beginning, a bold beginning, a courageous beginning in a direction about which the Congress shouted from the house tops but never implemented and never meant to implement.

Now they claim that they are wedded to Mahatma Gandhi. But when the question of rural development comes, I am surprised at their opposition to the idea of rural development or such other important matters. The Congress Party could not disown the idea of voluntary rural development in this country. We all know that these 5^{1/2} lakh villages in the country cannot be developed just by the Government. What happened to the Community Development Scheme? What happened to the National Extension Service Scheme? We have to learn from our past experiences. If we have not succeeded in developing our villages only through a State mechanism, we have to find out some alternative mechanism of developing initiative of the people, developing a people's movement. Now, how is this possible? The Finance Minister so sincerely said that it can be through the will of the people to develop themselves with their own initiative, with their own power, with development at the grass-root level. And he has reflected it in the Budget. There may be some quarrels, there may be differences on a number of things. That is a different matter. But I do not think we can dispute his programme of rural development. That is something which everybody in the country would share. When he has come out with certain proposals aimed at accelerating the progress of the rural areas without depending on the top heavy machinery of the Plann-

ing Commission, he should be congratulated.

Now, Sir, there are a number of other points which have been made, particularly about the industrial policy. I am simply unable to comprehend the amount of distortion which a former State Minister in the Finance Ministry, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, could make out. What did Mr. Fernandes said about the Industrial policy in his statement. He said that there would be no further nationalisation; but there would be no de-nationalisation either. He made it categorically clear. When he spoke on the floor of this House, he made it very clear that We are committed to, and we stand by, the 1956 industrial Policy Resolution, and that we have no idea of revising it. Therefore, after all this categorical, unambiguous, unequivocal clarification, it is amazing that simply because we have political differences we try to distort a very sincere statement made by the Minister. Sir, the Janata Government has no dogmatic approach about any of these things. It does not mind taking over wherever it is necessary. But it also wants to ensure that whatever we have taken over is managed properly and not that mismanagement by one is replaced by other. That is not what we are seeking. We are going to fulfil the commitments with regard to the public sector also. But we want to ensure that whatever we have taken over We must be able to manage in a better and proper way. I would not agree that the State has the monopoly of a better management and that nobody outside the State sector will be competent to manage the economic affairs. That is a theory which in this country cannot work.... (*Interruptions*). It was during the Congress regime that monopoly had increased. It has not been done now. It has been established beyond doubt. Let us not go into that. Let us not quarrel over that.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH
(Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir,

I do agree with him that in the name of managing in a better way the inventory of the public sector under-takings in the last three months has gone up. I agree with him that they are better managed that way.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I do not think that is a correct statement. Nobody had the opportunity to go into the question of improving the management of the public sector.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Whatever I have learnt, I have said. Let him contradict me with facts and figures and I shall accept his position.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I do not think that will be a correct statement because the economic policy is just being shaped. We are discussing the Finance Bill. Without even passing the Finance Bill, how can we assess its impact?

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: I talk on the basis of what has happened in the last three months. If he contradicts me with facts and figures, I will say 'I am sorry'.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: If anything has happened in the last three months, it is a hang-over of the past. It is nothing else.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, they are always dwelling on the past, talking of the hang-over of the past. Sir, let him contradict me with facts and figures. If he contradicts me with facts and figures, I will accept before the House that I am wrong. But I know that I am correct.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: One more point that was made out was about the de-politicalisation of the banking system. I do not think that the Janata Party ever would think of denationalising the banking system. There is no question of denationalis-

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh] ing it. What was intended to be stated here was that in the name of nationalisation what happened in the banking system was that there was an unwarranted and unlimited interference of the political workers of the Congress Party during the Emergency. I have myself witnessed that small workers of the Congress Party could write a note to the Managers of the nationalised banks asking them to give So much amount as loans. They had to give. So, when the Finance Minister stated that the idea was that we wanted State control over the fiscal instruments, there is no doubt about it that we also wanted to ensure that this State control is not utilised for any partisan ends, and this was the meaning of depoliticalisation of the banking system.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Maqsood Ali Khan) in the Chair]

Now, Sir, about the question of the rural banks and the co-operative movement. I am really surprised that these two institutions should necessarily be interpreted as running against each other. Both can supplement each other. If the co-operative banks can fulfil certain role, let them fulfil it. If they cannot fulfil their role in some cases, then, of course, the rural banks can take their role also. I do not see any contradiction. I do not see any opposition between the two systems and both may have to work according to the local conditions.

It has been said that the prices were rising. It is true. The Janata Government has also said that it was concerned about the price-rise and was trying its best to stop it. But this also has not happened suddenly. It was rising during the Emergency also, and we have seen" that this phenomenon of rise in prices could not be checked in spite of the Emergency and in spite of the heavy price the country had to pay in allowing the curbing of the civil liberties. Now the Government is coming up with a very effective long-term planning about holding the prices of essential

goods. Our Civil Supplies Minister has already said. . .

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: I would like to seek a clarification through you, Sir. What is long-term planning? Is it 5 years, 15 years or 30 years? If long-term planning is 10 years or 15 years, they must have mentioned in their manifesto that their manifesto is good for 10 years, 20 years or 30 years, "I would have accepted that.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: It is about five years. Five years is not a short term.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Long-term means 30 years, not five years. If they had mentioned in their election manifesto that it was good for 30 years to come, I would have accepted it. If they show that they have mentioned in their manifesto that it was good for 30 years, I will accept it and resign from this House and go out. It is good for five years only, but they are talking of long-term planning.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Please remain here. We want you to be here.

(Interruptions)

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I am sorry, unlike them, I am not taking it for granted that we will be here for decades and decades to come. That is the habit which they have formed before. We are not going to assume like that. Every five years the people are free to determine their mandate; they can retain or change their representatives as they like. We do not have that kind of assumption with us at all. The question, therefore, is Sir, when I am saying about some of these points which were raised on the price question, there are three aspects. One is the aspects of production. The Finance Minister has to ensure that production receives Incentive. He has tried to do it through the budget proposals. The second is to ensure that the essential goods which the people require for their daily survival, are not

exported to the detriment of their interests, and we have taken a decision that the basic essential goods will not now be exported but will be used within our country. The third thing is to ensure that a distributing system is established in which there is an extensive distribution of essential goods for the poor and for the Restitutes. Now, all these three things are there. The Janata Government is working on these, and I have no doubt that it is a very rational, a very systematic and a scientific method by which we are trying to tackle the price problem.

Now, sir, I come to some of the positive points of the Finance Bill. The Finance Bill has done two or three very good things. One is, as I said, about the promotion of rural development through voluntary non-government effort, which is very important in our country. No Government, whether of this party or of that party will be able to completely handle by itself the magnitude of the problems of the villages. Therefore, Sir, it is very commendable that this kind of an effort has been made. It will have to be further accelerated, it will have to be further strengthened by decentralising the powers for sanctioning rural development schemes. Enough care has been taken in the Finance Bill to ensure that this provision is not misused for any other end. The schemes are to be submitted to the Rural Development Board or some agency which will have to be created, which will approve the schemes and only then the expenditure will be allowed for deduction. Therefore, I think the Finance Minister has been very cautious. In fact, according to me, he is over-cautious. He will have to . . .

(Time bell rings).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN): Your time is over.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I would try to complete as quickly as possible.

Therefore, he will have to delegate the authority of the Central Government to the State Governments and to the district machinery also so that the schemes are very expeditiously cleared and very expeditiously approved, so that we do not lose a whole year in approving and deciding a scheme. That is very important.

The most important thing is that the small-scale industries have been given, very rightly, a very prominent place and a very good priority. I think this priority will go on increasing continuously and it is through this sector that we will be able to involve a large number of masses. Mahatma Gandhi has stated that it is not mass production which is so important in this country, but production by masses. And this very idea of Mahatma Gandhi is being implemented through the Finance Bill. Therefore, I think we can look forward with great hope for its results which will certainly ameliorate the difficulties of the poor people.

Now, in regard to scientific knowledge also, the Finance Minister has come out with certain concessions and tax reliefs which, I think, are very good. Science will spread and its application will spread; not only fundamental research, but the application of scientific knowledge also will spread. So these are some very positive and good points.

Now, there two points to which I would like the Finance Minister to give his attention a little bit more, particularly about the simplification of income-tax laws. He has tried to simplify the laws, but he will need to go further and try to codify, simplify and integrate the various income-tax laws and amendment in such a manner that an average person, a layman, is able to understand it. Today the laws are very complicated because they have gone through frequent amendments. So we have to rely on certain professionals whom we have to pay. We must come out of this situation.

Secondly, on the question of charitable trusts, it is important that the Income-tax Act is further amended to provide for the charitable trusts' activities being fully encouraged. Owing to a recent Supreme Court judgement, there have been some difficulties in securing tax exemption for the charitable trusts. Here I am speaking of the registered charitable trusts whose purposes are approved in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. They also need to be helped and relieved of the unnecessary interference of the Government.

The third thing, which is very important, is the matter about the assessability of the political parties. Now this is also a matter which seems to be engaging the mind of the Finance Minister but he has not come out with a solution just now that a political party's activity cannot be considered a profit-making activity and it cannot be treated as an industry. Now, the income-tax authorities seem to be confused over this. They are not clear whether the political parties should be assessed. They are trying to assess some, they are not trying to assess others. And there is a lot of confusion. I think a political party, as its activity is an activity of public purpose, must be exempt from income-tax. The Finance Minister must come out with a suitable amendment to remove this anomaly so that political parties also are made to keep their accounts properly and publish them, so that there is open accounting and an open financial system rather than the kind of hidden economy which the Congress Party has developed in the last several years. Therefore, with these few comments I would say that the Finance Bill is a very clear reflection of the Budget proposals and the aims and objectives set for the recovery of our national economy the growth rate of which had gone down to less than 2 per cent in the last two or three years. Now the economy is being lifted, is being recovered and is being committed to the poorer masses, to

the rural masses. This is the most important thing. Here is a categorical commitment . . .

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Sir, on a point of order. My dear honourable friend said that his Finance Minister's Budget is committed to the poor masses. The Finance Minister in the Lok Sabha decreased the duty on stainless steel. But after they felt the money-bag pressure they increased the duty. And who are the people who put that pressure? They are the people whom the last Congress Government kept at bay. But now under their pressure they increased the duty by 100 per cent. Is it a Budget for the poor masses I would like the Finance Minister to tell me. He is unfortunately absent here. He should have been here. It is not the people's Budget. It is anti-people Budget.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN): Prof. Parikh your time is over. I am calling the next Member . . .

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I will just wind up.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN): I will give you just one minute.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: From the totality of the Budget proposals and from the provisions of the Finance Bill I would suggest without hesitation that this is a bold effort in implementing the Janata Party manifesto and this is also a bold effort in laying a very sound foundation for a new national economy based on the interests of the proletariat, the weakest and the poorest. Thank you.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Sir, ask the Finance Minister to be here. There is a lot of confusion . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN): Mr. Anandam.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Sir, there is a lot of confusion . . .

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: All the confusion is being taken note of, especially the confusion that my friend, my learned friend has, and it shall be replied to at the appropriate time. It is only a question of patience.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Bahuguna, you say all that is taken note of. But I do not see anybody taking notes. Mr Vice-Chairman, will you kindly ask Mr. Bahuguna to submit the notes to you?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: That I shall do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am afraid your memory is not that strong. I should like to ask why note is not being taken of what is being said. Nobody is taking any note. Are we living in a regime where Education Minister understands economics or Finance Minister understands education? I do not know.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: We do not claim to understand anything except the English language, the Hindi language and other languages which are being spoken here. But we were noting, you were resting your head a little bit the other way. You did not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It was good for an explanation. But I say it is better you call your Minister in charge . . .

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: He is busy in the other House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All of you are here. But all of you do not report to your Finance Minister.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: He will faithfully report to the Finance Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are all estimable people, knowledgeable people; except when you do not quar-rel you are very good. I know.

SHRI M. ANANDAM (Andhra . Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I share with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta the opinion that on an important matter like this— discussion of a Finance Bill—the Finance Minister must be present here. While I do agree with the contention that any Minister can act for any other Minister in the Cabinet, when a serious matter like the Finance Bill is being discussed, it is necessary that the gentleman dealing with the portfolio should be present throughout, though he may for some time go out for some purpose or other.

Now coming to the subject in question, there is a lot that is said about the achievements of the Janata Party. There is one thing and that is my predecessor was frank in saying that Janata Party is just building up and has not yet begun cleaning its house. Taking the cue from that, I find that this Finance Bill is only a hotchpotch of various types of ideas that have come to the mind of the Finance Minister during the formulation of his budget speech. There is nothing in this Budget on the basis of which I can call it a common man's Budget or a Budget intended for the masses. Various concessions are given. These concessions are all intended only for the capitalists, for the well-to-do classes of people and for the various big industrialists and monopolists. Whether it is a question of giving concessions on amount of capital gain, or whether it is a concession with regard to investment or with regard to charitable trust or whether it is intended to give incentive for investment—all these are intended to help capitalists, industrialists or monopolists in harnessing their investment in a proper manner so that they can enrich themselves.

When I went through this Finance Bill and the Budget speech, the first impression that I got was that there is lot of *ad hocism* in the manner in which the Finance Bill has been formulated by the Finance Minister. The

[Shri M. Anandam]

second impression that I got was that there is a lobby outside Parliament which has been able to influence the Finance Minister more than what the Members of Parliament have been able to do.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, you must have seen that during the last few days both when the Budget was being discussed or when the Finance Bill was being discussed in the Lok Sabha and here, various suggestions were made by the Members of Parliament, but none of these suggestions were taken care of in the various amendments that were proposed by the Finance Minister in the morning here or earlier in the Lok Sabha, but some of the amendments proposed by him will indicate that there is a very powerful lobby outside Parliament which has tried to influence the Janata Party and their Government because they were obviously the amendments sponsored by that lobby. Whether it is the concession with regard to the film industry or whether it is the enhancement of levy on stainless steel or whatever it is, the lobby outside Parliament has been able to make a better and greater impact on the Finance Minister than what the Members of Parliament have been able to do.

I can cite one instance. Most of the members of the Congress Party and some from the Janata Party wanted the tax on bidis to be reduced or completely removed. The Finance Minister did not care to do anything like that though bidi is a necessity for the poor man and though the bidi industry employs thirty lakhs of people. In spite of all these requests and appeals, the Finance Minister was not kind enough to pay heed to what the Members of Parliament had said. This is my impression about the attitude of the Finance Minister.

Before I actually go to the contents of the Finance Bill, to which I have

had the occasion to move a number of amendments, I would like to mention about the unabated rise in prices of commodities. The official source has indicated that the price wholesale index has risen to 189.1 per cent during the week ended July 9, 1977 reflecting a fresh rise of 14 per cent compared to the 12 per cent of last year. It is most disturbing that the price rise is more prominent in respect of essential commodities than in respect of the other commodities. The Janata Government has not so far evolved any policy to arrest the phenomenon of rising prices. We should realise now that we have to take both short-term and long-term measures to arrest the price rise. You know, Sir, as somebody has just now mentioned, that we have a huge buffer stock of foodgrains, nearly 22 million tonnes, and since we have this huge buffer stock, it will only occasion the money going into the purchase of unproductive items and causing inflationary trends. Therefore, it is necessary that, if the Government wants to arrest the price rise, it has got to realise that it should release the buffer stocks so that through the supply of these foodgrains the demand of the people will be met and the prices will automatically come down. There is another thing also which the Janata Government has got to do immediately. We know that there is a reserve of foreign exchange of nearly Rs. 3,250 crores and we are seeing that these reserves are going up week after week by eighty to ninety crores and very soon we will have such a huge reserve that we would not know what exactly we should do with this. You know very well that this mounting of the foreign exchange reserves will only mean expansion of money and that itself would be another reason for inflation and price rise. Therefore, it is necessary for us to make a proper utilisation of these foreign exchange reserves. I would, therefore, suggest that the Government should immediately take action to see that these reserves are utilised for the purpose

of importing essential commodities and also capital goods necessary for stepping up our production. These are the two things which the Government has got to do and has got to take care of now to that the inflation that is there now may be curtailed, if not completely arrested.

Sir, there is also another thing which I would like to mention here. In spite of the Congress Party saying, that the Compulsory Deposit money should not be returned in cash, the Janata Government has made bold to release the first instalment of the CD money in cash. It comes to about Rs. 235 crores. That means we are putting Rs. 230 crores into circulation. That also is another factor which would contribute to the price rise.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Karnataka): May I seek one clarification from you with regard to this? I think the Congress Party oppose the Bill and they are insisting that it should be paid in cash. When it was suggested by the Government that it should be credited to the Provident Fund Account of the employees, your party insisted that it should be paid in cash. But now you are saying that your party was insisting on the money not being paid in cash. Let me have some clarification from you. Or, you have consultations with your party members.

SHRI M. ANANDAM: Whatever my party might say, the position is that nearly Rs. 235 crores would be put into circulation and it is necessary that the Government takes this factor into consideration while taking measures to arrest or curtail the price rise. That is what exactly I want to say. Probably, the Congress Party, when it said that it should be distributed in cash, had in mind the original promise made at the time of introduction of the CD Scheme. But now, when we are saying that the prices are spiralling like anything, it is necessary that this factor is also taken into consideration before we take any action with regard to controlling the prices.

Sir, I would now like to come to some of the important provisions of the Finance Bill. I have moved a number of amendments. The purpose of these amendments is to see that the Janata Government does not proceed with making amendments to the Finance Bill to help the capitalists and the monopolists. The very first amendment suggested by the Government is about capital gains. Clause 3 of the Bill reduces the period of long-term capital gains from 60 months to 36 months. In other words, if any person holds an asset for more than 60 months, earlier he was liable to long-term capital gains at a concessional rate and now this period of sixty months is being reduced to 36 months thereby enabling the persons who have kept capital assets with them for even three years to dispose them of at a concessional rate. This is a very retrograde step, I feel. It is the Wanchoo Committee which had recommended that if you want to arrest speculation in properties and if you want that really concession should be given to an investor in long-term capital gains, it is necessary that the period should be at least five years. I do not know why the Wanchoo Committee's recommendation has been given the go-by. I do not know why this amendment has been brought forward. I would, therefore, suggest the Finance Minister to accept my amendment. I have moved this amendment to restore the five-year period so far as capital gains are concerned and it should be restored.

Then, Sir, coming to clause 13, I would like to say that there is an obnoxious provision contained in this clause which says that any capital gains in respect of capital assets, if they are invested in specific assets, there cannot be any tax on capital gains. This is a Very obnoxious provision and I must say that it is intended only to help the monopolists and the capitalists, because capital gains are purely unearned income, and the person who holds property or assets is not entitled to it because he gets the gain only when there *is* market fluctuation.

[Shri M. Anandam]

With regard to the exemption from Capital Gains Tax, this provision is not in consonance with the socialist principles and I suggest that this provision should be completely deleted.

Then, there is also a provision with regard to closely held companies. The law as it is now, says that a company must distribute its distributable profits. It is a statutory obligation. Now what the provision says is that even the distributable profits need not be distributed and may be kept within the company itself. Sir, I need not mention that there are also companies more or less held by certain family members. It is always convenient for these family members who control these companies to retain their profits in the company itself. Now according to this provision the profits will be allowed to accumulate in the companies and ultimately after four, five or six years, the company will issue bonus shares. They will escape from the clutches of corporate tax. I, therefore, suggest that this provision with regard to closely held companies should also be deleted.

Then, with regard to amalgamation of companies, *prima facie*, it looks it is a very good measure. That is, if an affluent company is prepared to take over a sick unit, it must be able to do so on certain concessions being given to it or else nobody would take over a sick unit. What exactly is the indirect effect of this? The indirect effect is that if there is a carry forward of the loss of sick units or its set-off against the profits of affluent companies, 65 per cent of the corporate tax which a company has got to pay, it will be escaping it.

That means that in every rupee of the profit that the company makes, 65 per cent goes to the Government and 35 per cent is retained by the corporate sector and if this is done, indirectly it means that 65 per cent of the cost of the sick units is borne by the Government. I just want to know why a sick unit should be taken over by the private sector. If you allow this concession, it means that 65 per cent of

the cost of the sick unit is indirectly borne by the Government. Why should the Government not take over the sick unit from its own Consolidated Fund, thereby getting the control of the management of the sick unit. Therefore, I would suggest that though this provision is there, he must see that in future when the sick units are taken over, greater care is taken to see that only units which are viable and which could be added on to the holding unit are taken over. There is also another thing which I would like to point out on this particular aspect of amalgamation of the companies. There are various provisions made and conditions imposed for companies being amalgamated, but there is no provision with regard to the taking over of the staff and labour when a sick unit is taken over by the holding company. I suggest that a provision should be made in the Finance Bill that while a sick unit is taken over, it should be ensured that the labour and staff are taken over in toto by the amalgamating company. There is also another thing which I would like to say with regard to amalgamation. The Finance Bill has permitted amalgamation only if the specified authority permits it. There is no definition of the specified authority excepting that the Government by notification would prescribe the authority which would be the specified authority. Sir, you will be very well aware that so far as the amalgamations are concerned, amalgamations are permitted only with the permission of the court. Before an amalgamation takes place, the companies have got to approach the High Court and the Company Law Board and it is only after the court agrees to the amalgamation, that amalgamation takes place. Now, if the court goes into the question of amalgamation and permits amalgamation and if the specified authority under the Income-tax law does not allow the amalgamation, what would happen to the sick unit? Will it be taken over or not? Secondly, suppose the specified authority agrees to the amalgamation, but the court does not

agree to the amalgamation, what would happen in such circumstances? In this connection, my suggestion would be that there must be one authority for both the Company Law as also the Income-tax Law which sanctions the amalgamation and that is why I have moved an amendment to say that it is the Company Law Board constituted by the Companies Act, 1956. or any institution to which the Company Law Board delegates the authority which would be the specified authority for the purpose of amalgamation. It is one suggestion which I wanted the Finance Minister to consider.

Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as I said earlier, many requests have been made for the abolition of duty on bidis. Apart from its being a necessity for the poor man, 30 lakh workers are engaged in this trade. It would affect this trade and create a problem both for the management and the workers. So, I request that at least at this stage, the hon. Finance Minister should consider the abolition of duty on bidis.

Then, Sir, the increase in sur-charge rates and also the payment of compulsory Deposits do not leave any surplus with the middle class income group. Therefore, there is necessity for granting exemption of payment of Compulsory Deposits at least in respect of income up to Rs. 50,000. I would suggest that the Finance Minister may consider this aspect also.

Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, before I conclude, I would just make one more point. Sir, you are aware that a number of units in the small-scale sector and the medium-scale sector have become sick. Thousands of such units are there. And there is a ban on the non-banking non-financial institutions taking deposits from others. They cannot even take loans from third parties because even the loans come under the definition of a deposit. What is happening is that when a unit becomes sick, the scheduled banks or the nationalised banks have not been

giving any loan even with regard to the working capital. So, the promoters or the management go to them and say that they would not be able to make the unit viable and this also becomes impossible for them because of the present provisions of the law in regard to taking of deposits or loans from outsiders. So, it has created a very anomalous situation so far as these units are concerned. So, I want to suggest to the Finance Minister that where the unit has become sick and the unit requires some working capital and if it wants to take loans from a third party apart from the banks and the financial institutions, taking into consideration the position of the company, it must be permitted. Otherwise, all the sick units will not only be closed down but they will also create a big problem both for the management and the workers. The unemployment problem would also mount up considerably.

Therefore, Sir, I suggest that the Finance Minister should take this into consideration and see that at least deposits or loans are allowed to be taken from third parties instead of the banks because the banks are not prepared to help these units with loans, and it should not be treated as a loan or a deposit so far as these sick units are concerned if they are obtained from third parties willingly.

Six, in conclusion, I would once again reiterate what I said earlier that this Finance Bill does not reflect any policy of the Janata Government which is to alleviate the common man's position.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN): Shri S. S-Sisodia.—not here. Now, Shri B. N. Pande.

श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे (नाम-निर्देशित) :
 नाथब सदर साहब, इम फाइनेंस बिल पर
 जनता पार्टी के सदस्यों की तरफ से जो तकरीरें
 हुईं, उन में इस बात पर जोर दिया गया कि

[श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे]

इस फाइनेंस बिल की खूबी यह है कि इस में रूल बुकलपमेंट के तमाम भौके शामिल हैं। यह भी कहा गया कि यह बिल गांधी जी के उम्मीदों के बहुत करीब है। इस फाइनेंस बिल के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान की ग्रामीण जनता को एक नयी तस्वीर उभरेगी। यह भी कहा गया कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जो कि गांव में रहती है उसमें समृद्धि का एक नया सैलाब आएगा। दूसरी बात यह भी कही गई कि अगर जनता पार्टी की गवर्नमेंट में इस वक्त कोई खराबी है तो उसके लिए पिछली सरकार जिम्मेदार है। नाथ सर साहब बंगला में एक कहावत है। 'जतो दोष नंद घोष' कि जितना कसूर है सब नन्द घोष का। यह नन्द घोष की लीजेन्ड्री फिगर कब से पैदा हुई, कहां से हुई इसके मुताल्लिक तो मैं कोई जानकारी नहीं दे सकता हूं। लेकिन यह है कि अगर कोई काम खराब है तो नन्द घोष का, अगर मधु दंडवते जी की रेल डेर से चल रही है तो उसके लिये जिम्मेदार नन्द घोष, अगर स्ट्राइक हो रही है और घेराव हो रहा है तो उसके लिये जिम्मेदार नन्द घोष, अगर बजट ठीक से तैयार नहीं हो पाया तो नन्द घोष की जिम्मेदारी (Interruptions) तो सवाल सिर्फ यह है कि आखिर हम कब तक नन्द घोष पर जिम्मेदारी डालेंगे। हमें अपने ऊपर जिम्मेदारी लेनी चाहिये। फिर यह भी कहा गया है कि कई लोगों ने जनता पार्टी की तारीफ की कि यह जनता पार्टी है। शुरू किया राजनारायण जी ने, उन्होंने कहा कि जनता पार्टी एक ऐसी दुल्हन है। ग्राइड है कि जिसकी शबल आप घूँट हटा कर देखिए अगर उसका कारनामा अचना है तो उसका समर्थन कीजिये और गलत है तो उसको त्याग दीजिये। मगर यह दुल्हन कोई मामूली दुल्हन नहीं है। यह द्रोपदी है पांच पतियों की पत्नी। अब जाहिर है कि इसमें जो यधिष्ठिर या बड़े भाई हैं वह तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं उनकी कोई जगह नहीं ले सकता है। लेकिन इसका आप तय कर लें कि कौन अर्जुन है,

कौन भीम है; कौन नकुल है और कौन सहदेव है। दूसरे साहब, मोहन धारिया ने यह तारीफ की कि जनता पार्टी ने जितने दल थे वह सब एक साथ मिल गये और दल मिलने के साथ-साथ लोगों के दिल मिल गये। तो धारिया साहब कहते हैं दल बदल गये और उसके साथ-साथ लोगों के दिल बदल गये। फर्नांडीज जी ने फरमाया कि अब यह चमन बदल गया। तो ठीक है गुल बदल गये और चमन बदल गया। फिर जनता पार्टी के एक दूसरे साहब कहते लगे कि गगन बिल्कुल बदल गया, आसमान बदल गया हिन्दुस्तान का तो सितारा बदल गया। लेकिन क्या कहा अभी जगजीवन वावू ने। जगजीवन राम जी कहते हैं कि लाश बही है सिर्फ कफन बदल गया। लोग कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस अब एक खंडहर है और जितनी बुलबुलें थी वहां, अब उनकी सदा नहीं सुनाई देती है और अब वहां उल्लू बोलते हैं। ठीक है, आप कह सकते हैं। मुझे याद आता है जान आईट ने एक त्वाव लिखी है 'माई सीजोरन् इन लखनऊ'। उसमें उमने लिखा है कि जब वह यहाँ आया ग्राम-फउद्दौला के जमाने में तो उसने देखा कि जो उम जमाने के रेजीडेंट थे उन्होंने उससे फरमाया कि नवाब साहब यह तो बुलबुल है उस को पालते हैं इसलिये हर आदमी यहां बुलबुल लेकर आता है। बुलबुल तो एक रिश्कशनरी पक्षी है। योरोप में उल्लू की बड़ी कदर है। ग्राऊल इज ए सिम्बल आफ विजडम। और मधु दंडवते जी जानते होंगे कि जो वेलिंगटन स्टाफ कालेज है उनका सिम्बल ग्राऊल है। तो जान ग्राइव ने सोचा जब आ गये हैं और वहां के लोगों ने कहा कि अगर आप दरबार में रसाई चाहते हैं तो आप उल्लू लेकर जाइये। उस जमाने में लखनऊ में उल्लू के बाजार लगने लगे थे। तो वे बाजार गये उन्होंने उल्लू देखा, एक मोटा ताजा उल्लू देखा। उन्होंने सोचा यह खरीद लें। क्या कीमत इसकी, जवाब मिला इसकी कीमत दो रुपये है। उस जमाने में दो रुपये की कदर बहुत हुआ करती थी

और उन्हें यह लगा कि यह बहुत ज्यादा कीमती है तो उन्होंने सोचा कि छोटा उल्लू ले लो। उसकी क्या कीमत? कहने लगे, इस की कीमत 4 रुपये। उस ने कहा क्या 4 रुपये? इतने बड़े की 2 रुपये और छोटे की 4 रुपये। कहने लगे, बड़ा तो खाली उल्लू, छोटा उल्लू भी है और उल्लू का पट्टा भी है इसलिये 4 रु०। अब क्या करें, साहब? उस जमाने में जो उर्दू शायर थे उन्होंने एक नज्म लिखी कि :

“कद्रदानों का अजब रंग है जमाने में
बुलबुलों की यह तमन्ना है वो उल्लू न हुए”

अब आप कहते हैं कि यहां से लोग उधर चले जा रहे हैं डिफेक्शन हो रहा है, तो क्या किया जाय डिफेक्शन हो रहा है तो। अगर कद्रदानों का जमाना है, अगर बुलबुलों को यह खयाल होता है कि वे उल्लू ही हो जायें तो यह तो कद्रदानों का सवाल है।

श्री के० बी० अस्थाना (उत्तर प्रदेश):
डिफेक्शन में तो चमगादड़ों की ज्यादा वैल्यू होगी।

श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे : अब सवाल यह है माननीय फाइनेन्स मंत्री जी, आप कहते हैं कि गांधी जी के उसूलों को आपका यह ब्रजट चरितार्थ करता है। गांधी जी के क्या उसूल थे। गांधी जी का पहला बुनियादी सिद्धान्त यह था आत्म स्वावलंबन दूसरा उन का सिद्धान्त था आत्म स्वावलंबन के बाद ग्राम स्वावलंबन और ग्राम स्वावलंबन के साथ-साथ वह यह चाहते थे कि हम अपनी हरल इकानामी को ग्रामोद्योगों के द्वारा इस तरह से स्थापित करें कि शहर के लोगों से गांव वालों को कोई

चीज नहीं खरीदनी पड़े बल्कि गांवों की चीजें शहर के लोग खरीदें और जब तक हरल बायस्ड इकानामी नहीं होगी—और मुझे खुशी है जनता पार्टी के मेनिफेस्टों में बहुत से लोगों ने इस बात की नाईद की कि हमारी इकानामी जो है वह हरल बायस्ड इकानामी होनी चाहिये और हरल बेस्ड इकानामी होनी चाहिए—लेकिन हरल बायस्ड इकानामी किस तरह से हो? हरल बायस्ड इकानामी इसी तरह से हो सकती है कि आपका एग्रिकलचर दो पैरों पर खड़ा हो—एग्रिकलचरल मस्ट स्टैंड आन टू लेग्स। पहली चीज तो यह है कि एग्रिकलचर उस वक़्त तक अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि लैंड रिफार्म ठीक तरीके से न हों। आज छोटे-छोटे किसान हैं ऐसे किसान कि जिनको अपनी जमीन से कोई लाभ नहीं है। आप के ज़बर्दस्ती लैंड रिफार्म करने से तो बहुत छोटे-छोटे किसान हो गये हैं। मैंने सुना है कि चौधरी चरण सिंह जी एक पुस्तक लिख रहे हैं जिसमें माओ त्से तुंग ने जिस तरह से कम्यून्स को आर्गेनाइज़ किया, उसकी प्रशंसा की है। अभी मैं महीना भर चीन में रह कर आया और मैंने वहां कम्यून्स का अध्ययन किया, वह क्या चाहते हैं? उन्होंने कहा पहले, हमने लैंड रिफार्म किये, लैंड रिफार्म के बाद हमने जो दूसरा कदम उठाया वह कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग का था, तीसरा कदम जो उन्होंने उठाया वह कलेक्टिव फार्मिंग का था मुझे चार-पांच महीने सोवियत रशिया में भी रहने का मौका मिला, वहां भी मैंने देखा है कि ठीक उसी तरह से उन्होंने हरल इकानामी को ऊंचा उठाने की कोशिश की। अब पहली चीज तो यह है कि अगर आपकी प्रेडिसेसर गवर्नमेंन्ट लैंड रिफार्म का काम पूरा नहीं कर पायी, तो आप उस का उठाइये लैंड रिफार्म के द्वारा; दूसरा कदम कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग का आप को उठाना होगा। आपने तारीफ की है कोऑपरेटिव की। कोऑपरेटिव

[श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे]

के जरिये आप कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग की बुनियाद डालिए। एक दम से क्यूबन या कलेक्टिव फार्मिंग पर अभी नहीं जा सकते। उस के बाद तीसरी स्टेज होनी चाहिये। फिर आज एग्रिकल्चर के मेकनाइजेशन की जरूरत है लेकिन सवाल यह है कि ट्रैक्टर, थ्रेशर, इन सब में इतनी बलैक मार्केटिंग चलती है, दूसरी तरफ पावर इतनी मंहगी हो गई है, डीजल मंहगा हो गया है। उस में भी किसानों को काफी दिक्कत होती है। आप कहते हैं आप फर्टिलाइजर की कीमत घटायेंगे और अपने बजट में इस बात को इंगित किया है कि कोशिश आपको यह होगी कि जितने एग्रिकल्चरल इनपुट्स हैं वे आप किसानों के लिये मुलभ बना देंगे। बहुत अच्छी बात है अगर ऐसा आप कर सकें फिर दूसरी चीज यह है कि *agriculture should stand on two legs; rural economy should stand on two legs*. पहली चीज तो मैंने जैसा कहा आपको लैंड रिफार्म में क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा। दूसरे आप काटेज इंडस्ट्री की बात करते हैं। काटेज इंडस्ट्री के जरिये आप विलेज इकोनामी को मजबूत बनायें। लेकिन काटेज इंडस्ट्री के जरिये विलेज इकोनामी को मजबूत बनाने के लिये पुराने तरीके की काटेज इंडस्ट्री से काम नहीं चलेगा। मैंने देखा हरियाणा में और दूसरी जगहों में कि पावरलूम बना कर उन्होंने काफी तरक्की की, लेकिन वहां भी मजदूर को लाभ नहीं मिलता। जो लोग दस, बीस पावर लूम लगा लेते हैं वही सारा लाभ अपने में समेट लेते हैं और मजदूर तो मजदूर ही रह जाता है। उस के पास कुछ बजत नहीं होती; वह फाकाकश ही रह जाता है तो सवाल यह है कि बीज का एक्सप्लोएटेशन कैसे हटे? उसके लिये आपको या तो उन की कोऑपरेटिव आर्गनाइज करनी होगी या फिर उन को ऐसे लोन देने होंगे इस तरह की मदद बेनी

होगी कि जिससे वह अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकें और अपने पावरलूम के मालिक बन सकें। अब सवाल यह है कि गांधी जी का नाम लिया हमारे प्रो० रामलाल जी ने। मैं उन से ज्यादा एणी करता हूँ और हमारे विलोकी सिंह जी ने जो थीसिस रखी गांधी जी के मुतालिक मुझे खेद है कि मैं उन की राय से सहमत नहीं हूँ। गांधी जी ने जो कुछ बुनियादि उसूल बना दिये थे। और वह बुनियादि उसूल यह हैं कि हम जो कदम उठायें उस में हम यह सोचें कि हमारे इस कदम से इस देश के दरिद्र नारायण का कितना फायदा होगा। अगर उस से देश के दरिद्र नारायण फायदा होता है तो वह कदम ठीक है अगर उस के लिये हमारा दिल भी गवाही देता तो और अगर उस से गरीब से गरीब छादमी को फायदा नहीं होता तो वह हमारा कदम ठीक नहीं है। यह समझ लेना चाहिये। तो कई चीजें कही गयीं। गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों के बारे में कई बातें कही गयीं। मैं उन को ही कोट कर रहा हूँ :

"The real implication of equal distribution is that each man shall have the wherewithal to supply his natural needs and no more."

"Economic equality is the master key to non-violent independence, for economic equality means abolishing the conflict between capital and labour. It means levelling down of the few rich in huge hands is concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth on the one hand, and a levelling up of the semistarved naked millions on the other. A nonviolent system of government is clearly an impossibility as long as the wide gulf between the rich and hungry millions persists. The contrast between the palaces of New Delhi and the miserable hovels of the poor labouring class nearby

should not last one day in free India. A With the single exception of one violent revolution is a certainly one day bidi magnate? unless there is a voluntary abdication of riches and the power that riches give and sharing them for common good."

देना चाहते हैं, मुझे मालूम नहीं पटेल साहब संपर्क में आये कि नर्री बल्लभ भाई पटेल बीड़ी पीते थे।

Shri Vallabhbai Patel was a bidi smoker, Shri Kamraj was a bidi smoker.

आपें को याद होगा कि राउन्ड टेबिल कांग्रेस में गांधी जी ने यह फरमाया था :

"The title to property will be examined and it would be seen whether it has been acquired for nation's good or not. Such property that have not been acquired for the nation's good will be confiscated."

गांधी जी कहते थे परमूणेशन के बाद लेजिस्लेशन और लेजिस्लेशन के बाद कान्फिस्केशन । अगर आप का बजट गांधी जी के रास्ते पर चलना चाहता है तब फिर आप को कोई ऐसा कदम नहीं उठाना चाहिये जिससे कि मोनोपली हाउसेज को, बड़े बिजिनेस को, बड़े लोगों को उस से फायदा हो ।

तो मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि आप अपने इस फाइनेंस बिल को गांधी जी के बताये हुए आदर्शों के मुताबिक फिर से जांच करके देखें और एग्जामिन करने के बाद जो इसमें खामियां जो मैं देखता हूँ उन को दूर करने की कोशिश करें ।

मेरे भाई ने अभी एक बात करते हुए कहा कि बहुत से लोगों ने आप से कहा कि छोटे आदमियों की सिफारिश में तो आपने बीड़ी के ऊपर से टैक्स नहीं हटाया । क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कि इसलिये नहीं हटाया—

With the single exception of one bidi magnate all the bidi magnates are Congressmen. क्योंकि कांग्रेस के साथ उन का ताल्लुक है

तो आप को बड़े-बड़े लोग, बड़े नेता कांग्रेस के और मैं तो देख कर हैरान हूँ मेरा कांग्रेस से 1919 से संबंध है, तब मे मैं देख रहा हूँ कि कांग्रेस के बड़े नेताओं को देखता था कि वह सिगरेट नहीं पीते थे, वह कहते थे पीओ तो बीड़ी पीओ । बड़े लोगों को कंसेशन देना आपने पसन्द किया टैक्स में, दूसरे लोगों को कंसेशन देना मुनासिब समझा, लेकिन बीड़ी को नहीं दिया । तो आप का यह दावा कि आप का बजट गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों के नजदीक है, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस दावे में कोई सच्चाई नहीं है । आप का यह दावा कि करल इकानामी सुधरेगी, बढ़ेगी, यह दावा भी गलत है । इस बजट में वह वूनियादें नहीं हैं जिनसे इकानामी सुधर सके । फिर आप का यह दावा कि इस से इकानामी आप की चमकेगी, वह भी मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत बेहतर दावा नहीं है ।

आखिर में, मैं सिर्फ आखिरी बात कह कर खत्म करूंगा । वह यह है कि जब बजट के दौरान तकरीर हो रही थी तो यहां फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर की मदद के लिये बीजू पटनायक साहब आये और बीजू पटनायक साहब ने बड़े जोरदार तरीके से फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर की हिमायत की । मैं अपनी फाइलों में देख रहा था कि मुझे टाइम्स आफ इंडिया के 16 अक्टूबर

[श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे]
1976 की एक कटिपत्र मिली। उस में यह लिखा है—

This is what the Bharatiya Lok Dal leader, Mr. Biju Patnaik, has said, I quote:

"Highlighting the gains of the emergency, Mr. Patnaik said that nearly Rs. 2,000 crores of floating money had been brought to account, trade balances had improved to Rs. 1,100 crores, the buffer foodstocks had risen to an all-time high, smuggling curbed, inflation arrested and the rupee made stronger day by day. In addition..."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What you are reading are Mr. Biju Patnaik's five points.

SHRI BISHAMBHAR NATH PANDE: "In addition general discipline had been enforced and thousands of inept officials removed."

इस्पात और खान मन्त्री (श्री बीजू पटनायक) : उस के पीछे क्या बोला था वह नहीं पढ़ा।

श्री विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे : वह उस दिन यहां बोल दिया आप ने। अब वह कहते हैं अपनी पूरी राय बदल दी। बदलिये, आपको बदलने का पूरा हक है। तो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता था कि हम में से इस दृष्टिकोण से, सिवाय एक उसो ईश्वर के जो पूर्ण हो सकता है बाकी कोई पूर्णता का दावा नहीं कर सकता न वह गवर्नमेंट कर सकती थी और न आप की गवर्नमेंट कर सकती है। क्योंकि मैं गांधी जी के बहुत करीब रहा, इसलिये उन के सिद्धान्तों पर मैं अमल करने की कोशिश करता हूँ। जब आपने कहा था कि आप गांधी जी के बहुत नजदीक है, गांधी जी के असूलों पर चलना चाहते हैं, गांधी जी के नक्से कदम पर चलना चाहते हैं तो मेरे दिल में कुछ तसल्ली

हुई कि कम से कम एक गवर्नमेंट तो ऐसी आई जो गांधी जी के कदमों पर चलना चाहती है।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप किसी के साथ फ्राड कीजिये, आप इन्दिरा गांधी के साथ फ्राड करते रहे बीजू पटनायक जी, आप जवाहर लाल जी के साथ फ्राड करते रहे, मगर ई वर के लिये उस संत के साथ फ्राड मत करिये। उसकी आत्मा को तकलीफ होगी। वह मर चुका है, वह समाप्त हो चुका है आपने उसकी समाधि पर जा कर शपथ खाई। क्यों शपथ खाई, कोई जबदस्ती नहीं थी आप को शपथ खाने की। मेरी आप से अर्ज है कि एक दफा आप अपने गिरेबान में मुंह डाल कर देखिये, हर बार देखिये, पचास बार देखिये कि गांधी जी की समाधि पर जा कर जा आपने वायदे किये उस रास्ते पर आप कितनी दूर तक चल सके, कितने कदम उस तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं। जैसा गांधी जी कहते थे कि मुझ से कसूर हुआ, गलती हुई उसी तरह आप भी अपनी गलती मानिये। आप कहिये कि यह हम से गलती हुई इसलिये हम वापस चलते हैं और दूसरे कदम उठाते हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि जितनी भी गलतियां इस फाइनेंस बिल में हैं हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब उन को कबूल करें और गांधी जी के असूलों के मुताबिक उसमें वह सुधार करें। वे ही सुधार करें जो उन के रास्ते पर चलने के लिये जरूरी हैं।

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I take this opportunity to speak something about the freedom fighters in this discussion on the Finance Bill.

Sir, Government is giving a substantial amount as pension to the freedom fighters, but at the same time.

discrimination is being made among the freedom fighters when they decide as to who are all the freedom fighters. No proper study has been made to recognise who are all the freedom fighters in this country. In this connection, Sir, I should like to draw the attention of the House to a statement of the Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai. Recently he has said that he did not consider the Mopla revolution of 1921, which had been considered by the Britishers as Mopla rebellion, as a movement of freedom fighters; he considered it as a communal movement. This is not at all correct. First of all, let me point out to this House that the Kerala, Government, after considering all the aspects of this movement, have considered the Mopla movement, the so-called Mopla rebellion, as a freedom movement and now a pension is being given to the victims of this movement. As far as the Central Government is concerned, members belonging to different political parties—the Congress, the Janata Party, the Marxists and the Muslim league—have represented to the Government to consider this question and find out whether this movement was a communal movement. It should not be brushed aside as a communal movement. This had been considered as a rebellion only by the Britishers. We all know that it was the practice of the Britishers to divide and rule. So they wanted to make Muslims and Hindus fight on those basis.

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

As a matter of fact, this movement had been inspired by the Khilafat movement—by Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Mohammad Ali. The speeches made by Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Mohammad Ali at Erode in 1921 inspired the Moplas of Malabar to rise against the Britishers. They asked the Britishers to quit India and it was the Khilafat movement and the Non-co-operation movement which inspired the so-called Mopla Rebellion of Malabar. Even Mr. Madhavan Nair, who in those days

was the President of the Kerala Provincial Congress, also took an active part in the Non-Co-operation Movement. He was with the Moplas and was giving them guidance in the Khilafat movement. Mohammad Abdul Rahiman Saheb and many other leaders of national character and national image were there to make the Moplas rise against the Britishers. But, unfortunately, this movement has been classified as a communal movement, as a movement by the Muslims against the Hindus.

In this connection, Sir, I may also quote a portion of the speech made by Sir William Vincent, hon. Home Member, on 9th March, 1922, in the course of a debate in the Central Legislative Assembly on the Resolution to inquire into the causes of the Mopla outbreak. He said:—

"But in truth the causes of this rising are well known. I do not want perpetually to drag into prominence the Khilafat agitation. I do not see any use in perpetually forcing the subject before the Assembly; but the Khilafat movement was the cause of the rising is well known and there is no getting out of it. I said before that anyone has only to read the speech which Hazrat Mohni made the other day at Ahmedabad."

Sir, I have quoted from a speech which was made by Sir William Vincent, hon. Home Member in the Central Assembly. Hazrat Mohni was a well-known Congress leader and President of the Congress. Such prominent leaders had inspired the Moplas of the Malabar region but unfortunately the caste Hindus joined the Britishers to suppress the tenant classes of the Malabar region who were the poorest of the poor and ignorant of anything. Some writers have classified this movement as a kisan movement, as a Revolution by the peasantry for their rights on land. This cannot be classified today as a communal movement. I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister and the Janata Government to consider whether the

[Shri Hamid Ali Schamnad] Mopla Rebellion cannot be classified as a national movement and the victims given pension as freedom fighters. This is a very important matter.

Sir, what were the atrocities that were committed on the Moplas in those days? They were inhuman. And there is the well-known wagon tragedy. Even today it pains us to read about the wagon tragedy in which many poor Moplas were killed. After all, the Moplas are also human beings. Some Moplas, brave people, were put in a railway wagon at the Calicut station and were being taken by a goods train. When the goods train carrying the wagon containing the Moplas reached Podanur, it began to stink. When the Reserve Police guards went and opened the wagon, they found some of the Moplas dying in human conditions, some of them suffocated and one man biting the nose of another. And it is said that nearly 25 persons died of suffocation in the wagon train and a few were removed to a hospital, and so on. Such a tragedy it was and such an inhuman treatment was meted out to these brave fighters of the Mopla movement in 1921! Now you consider them as communal people. The movement has been considered by some as a communal movement. That is not correct. If it were so, how could the Kerala Government consider them as freedom fighters? The Kerala Government consider them so and no party has opposed it—neither the Janata Party nor the Communist Party. All parties have unanimously agreed that the victims of the Mopla rebellion should be considered as freedom fighters. I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister and the Home Minister to consider this aspect. They should discuss this matter with the leaders of all political parties and give pension to the victims who have suffered during the Mopla rebellion. It is a very important thing. Do not consider this as a Hindu-Muslim fight because there was nothing like a Hindu-Muslim fight. It is only the caste Hindus, the big land-lords, the big zamindars who joined

with the Britishers to suppress their tenants, to suppress the poorest people there. There was nothing like a Hindu-Muslim fight in Mopla reform. This should be considered very seriously and I would appeal to the Government again and again in the name of justice, equity and good sense to concede the demand.

Sir, another matter to which I should like to draw the attention of the Finance Ministry and the Government is about the havoc done in Kerala by heavy rains. The rains are so heavy there, especially in the Malabar region. The loss is a very heavy. A number of hutments are taken away in the tides of the sea. In a number of places, land is washed away by the sea. In my own place, Kasargod, in one house, having husband, wife and five children, all the five children died because of heavy rains. The house was washed, away by the sea. They ran out. The father and the mother climbed a tree and stayed there, but the children could not stay there. They were swept away by the flood. The father and the mother remained on the tree for long and when they got down the next day they found all their children taken away by the cruelties of flood. I appeal to the Prime Minister to give them some relief from the Prime Minister's Relief Fund.

Another matter is about the allocation to the land reforms. I appeal that more allocation should be made for the implementation of the land reforms. For implementation of the land reforms, money is necessary to give compensation to the land-holders—and many of the land-holders today in Kerala are no better than respected beggars because their land is being given to the tenants and the tenants become the owners of the land. These poor land-holders and landlords, especially the landladies, do not have anything except a little land and that land is rented out and the tenants become the owners of the land. The land of the landladies, the poor, old people, is taken away in the name of the land reforms. It is in the interest of justice, equity that compensation be given to these poor landlords. So

the Government should give attention to proper implementation of the land reforms.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश): आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वर्तमान सरकार के वित्त विधेयक पर बोलने के लिये खड़ा हूँ। आज 30 वर्ष के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के राजनैतिक मंच पर परिवर्तन हुआ है। कांग्रेस पार्टी और श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व के बाद जनता पार्टी की हुकुमत कायम हुई है। एक मजबूत अर्थ व्यवस्था का हमने निर्माण किया था : 3,200 करोड़ रुपये का फारेन एक्सचेंज हमारी मजबूत अर्थ व्यवस्था की देन है। 18 मिलियन टन का बफर स्टॉक बना कर हमने हिन्दुस्तान को खाद्यान्न के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर किया है। लेकिन यह वर्तमान सरकार जिस दिशा में हिन्दुस्तान को ले जाना चाहता है उस से यह साबित होने वाला है कि हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ व्यवस्था अमरीकी अर्थ व्यवस्था का एक अंग बनने जा रही है। The Indian economy is going to be the satellite economy. हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ व्यवस्था अमरीकी अर्थ व्यवस्था का अंग होने जा रही है। हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरार जी देसाई ने कहा कि अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति फोर्ड साहब की बुनियादी नीतियों के समर्थक हैं। श्री एच० एम० पटेल साहब स्वतंत्र पार्टी के नेता रहे हैं। धन, धरती, धर्म की रक्षा और लैंड रिफार्म के सब से बड़े विरोधी रहे हैं। यह गुजरात में हर पार्टी के नेता जानते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में जमींदारी, रजवाड़ों और हिन्दुस्तान में प्रतिक्रियावादियों, टाटा, बिरला के मोनोपली हाउसिज के समर्थक श्री एच० एम० पटेल रहे हैं। उन के दिमाग की उपज ही वर्तमान जनता पार्टी का बजट है। इस बजट के माध्यम

से हिन्दुस्तान में गरीब और अमीर की खाई बड़ेगी और उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पार्टी की नीति देखें

(Interruption)

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD: On a point of request, Sir.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman,, he cannot make a request. He can rise only on a point of order and speak.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD: The Hon. Members who speak in Hindi, speak so loud that we are not able to get the translation. Therefore, I would request them not to speak loud because there is a mike there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): please speak

slowly.

धीरे-धीरे बोलिये ताकि ट्रांसक्रिपशन हो सके।

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): The Interpreter himself does not talk loud enough.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: On a point of order. I agree with you as well as the Hon. Member that he should speak slowly, but then you must allow him more time, otherwise he cannot finish his speech. At least 100 per cent more time you should allow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): If you are so keen, the Congress Party can allow more time.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Sir, you can do it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): No, it cannot be done.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप का ध्यान आज जनता पार्टी की नेता श्रीमती सुमित्रा कुलकर्णी के द्वारा उठाये गये ध्यानकर्षण प्रस्ताव की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो कि आर्डर पेपर में है।

'CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Shrimati Sumitra G. Kulkarni to call the attention of the Minister of Industry to the reported variance in the declared Industrial Policy of the Government of India arising out of the alleged acceptance of over Rupees eighteen thousand crores of foreign private investments for setting up of three export-oriented gigantic steel plants in the country and also allowing a multinational corporation to invest in the manufacture of radio receivers in Punjab."

यह है जनता सरकार और जनता पार्टी की नीति, हिन्दुस्तान में मल्टी नेशनल कारपोरेशन और हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर 18 हजार करोड़ रुपया स्टील प्लांट को बनवाने और हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति में पूँजीपतियों का वर्चस्व कायम करना।

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister is going out of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Other Ministers are there. Don't worry.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ व्यवस्था को पब्लिक सेक्टर की इकनामी से प्राइवेट सेक्टर की इकनामी में बदलने की बहुत बड़ी साजिश है। हिन्दुस्तान के पूँजीपतियों का मल्टी नेशनल कारपोरेशन के पूँजीपतियों से साँठ गाँठ.
(Interruption)

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: May I raise a point of order? Sir, this morning Calling Attention Notice was tabled which the hon. Member was pleased to read out. The Chairman postponed the discussion.

SHRI IRENGBAM TOMPOK SINGH (Manipur) : He is a Lok Sabha Member. He cannot raise a point of order here.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I can raise. You do not know the rules.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Yes, please go on.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: The Chairman was pleased to postpone it because Shrimati Sumitra Kulkarni was not present. She has written a letter to the Chairman. Whether what she brought up through the Calling Attention Notice was correct or not, has not been discussed. The hon. Member refers to the Notice and presumes that it is correct and then goes on making his speech. I think he is trying to mislead the House. I would like to know whether this is in order. If not, all that he has said arising out of that Notice should be expunged.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): I do not think there is any point of order. A Member can speak on any item whether the concerned Minister is here or not.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: The Notice was postponed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): That does not matter. A Member can raise any point he wants during the discussion on the Finance Bill, whether it is there or not.

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: It cannot be expunged.