

**REFERENCE TO THE WORKING OF  
CHILDREN'S HOME, FEROZ SHAH  
KOTLA, NEW DELHI.**

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, आज एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय समाचार पत्रों में आया है और वह मैं पढ़ना चाहूंगा। इसमें लिखा है —

"12 inmates of the Children's Home, Feroz Shah Kotla, Delhi, who had run away by jumping the walls on May 5, are yet to be traced. The children, all under 18; found it difficult to adjust to the treatment meted out to them by the officials of the Home."

इसमें यह भी समाचार है —

"Last year also, 12 children had disappeared from this Home at Feroz Shah Kotla. Five of them are yet to be traced".

इसमें मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो 18 वर्ष से कम आयु के बच्चे पाये जाते हैं जो वहाँ पर भेजे जाते हैं, या जेबकनरे होते हैं या अनाथ होते हैं, इस प्रकार के बच्चों को उम्र होम में रखा जाता है और वही पर उनका फैसला कोर्ट करती है और जो इस प्रकार के कमखवार माने जाते हैं वहाँ रखे जाते हैं। तो इन बच्चों के मा-बाप की तरह ही जिम्मेदारी सरकार के ऊपर होती है। कहां के बच्चे हैं, कहां से आये यह पता नहीं चलता है। इसमें आगे दिया हुआ है —

"It is also noteworthy that for the last one year, the Home has no regular Superintendent. There a Probationary Officer has been officiating."

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair].

इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था इन घरों में है। मैं सरकार से इस प्रकार की बात जानना चाहता हूँ और उसका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि आप एक स्टेटमेंट दे या इस प्रकार की जांच बैठाये। इन बच्चों के साथ पहले भी घटना हो चुकी है। जो बच्चे यहाँ से भाग जाते हैं उनका पता नहीं चलता। इसमें लिखा है कि बच्चों को

बिचल किया गया कि कमरों के अन्दर सोयें। उन्होंने कहा कि हमको गर्मी लगती है, हमको चारदीवारी के अन्दर मैदान में सोने की अनुमति दीजिए। उनको अनुमति नहीं दी गई और इस बात से तंग आकर बच्चे भाग गये हैं। पिछले साल भागे 5 बच्चों का अभी तक पता नहीं चला, वे लापता हैं। जिन माता-पिताओं के बच्चे हैं उनके हृदय से पृथिये। इस प्रकार बच्चों के साथ सरकार खिलवाड़ कर रही है। तो मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इन तमाम घरों की विशेष रूप से जांच कराये और ये बच्चे क्यों भागे, कैसे भागे, इसके लिए जो जिम्मेदार अधिकारी हैं उनको दंडित करने का प्रबन्ध करे। गृह मंत्री यहाँ बैठे हैं वह जवाब दे सकते हैं।

**(1) THE UNION DUTIES OF EXCISE  
(DISTRIBUTION) AMENDMENT BILL,  
1974.****(2) THE ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF  
EXCISE (GOODS OF SPECIAL IMPOR-  
TANCE) AMENDMENT BILL, 1974.****(3) THE ESTATE DUTY, (DISTRIBU-  
TION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1974.**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Before I call Smt. Sushila Rohatgi to move the Bills, I would like to take the consensus of the House on one thing. We have three Bills here and I think we can have discussion on the three Bills together so that the Members can have more time. All the three are similar Bills.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala) : Sir, from our Party separate Members are speaking on the three Bills. They cannot be discussed together because there are three different subjects involved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If separate Members are speaking, each Member will get five minutes. So, what is the point? That is why I am saying that if you take all the three together, you will get more time to speak. So, you direct one of your Members to speak now and

one more can speak on the third reading. I think that will be better.

Yes, Minister, you may move.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRIMATI  
SUSHILA ROHATGI): Sir, with your per-  
mission I move :

"That the Bill further to amend the  
Union Duties of Excise (Distribution)  
Act, 1962, as passed by the Lok Sabha,  
be taken into consideration."

Sir, I also move :

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

Sir, I move :

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

Sir, the House will recall that the Report of the Sixth Finance Commission along with an Explanatory Memorandum on the action taken by the Government thereon was laid on the Table of the House on the 18th December, 1973. The Finance Commission was *inter alia* required to make recommendations to the President as to the distribution between the Union and the States of the net proceeds of taxes which are to be or may be divided between them and the allocation between the States of the respective shares of such proceeds. These three Bills seek to give effect to some of the recommendations of the Commission. The recommendations of the Commission in regard to distribution of income-tax and payment of grants-in-aid have already been implemented through Presidential Orders. Other recommendations of the Commission would be implemented by executive orders.

Sir, the first Bill seeks to give effect to the recommendations of the Sixth Finance Commission in regard to distribution of the net proceeds of Union Duties of Excise between the Centre and the States on the one hand and among the different States on the other. The Commission has not suggested any change in the existing arrangements in regard to sharing of the basic Union Excise Duties and the States' share would therefore continue to be 20 per cent of the total net proceeds as at present. The Commission has, however, recommended that the auxiliary duties of excise introduced from 1973-74 which are not shareable with the States at present should also be shared with the States as in the case of basic Union Excise Duties from 1976-77. Regarding principles of distribution as between States, the Commission has recommended that the States' share should be distributed among the States on the basis of 75 per cent for population and 25 per cent for backwardness, the *inter se* distribution of this portion being in relation to the 'distance' of a State's per capita income from that of the State with the highest per capita income multiplied by the population of the States concerned according to 1971 census. The weightage given to backwardness by the last Commission was 20 per cent and they had also adopted a variety of factors for determining backwardness of the States.

The second Bill seeks to give effect to the recommendations of the Sixth Finance Commission regarding distribution among the States of the proceeds of Additional Duties of Excise levied on sugar, tobacco and textiles. Hon'ble Members are aware that these duties are levied with the agreement of the State Governments in 1957 in replacement of States' sales tax on these articles. The net proceeds of these duties, other than these attributable to Union Territories, accrue to the States. The Sixth Finance Commission, like earlier Finance Commissions, had been asked to ensure that in the scheme of distribution recommended by it each State should receive a

sum not less than the revenue realised by that State from the levy of sales tax for the financial year 1956-57 in that State. The Commission has, however, felt that there was no need to set apart any guaranteed amounts to the States as in the Commission's opinion which is based on factual data, there is no risk of the share of any State in the net proceeds of Additional Excise Duties falling short of the revenue realised from the levy of the sales tax on the commodities subjected to Additional Duties of Excise in lieu of sales tax for the financial year 1956-57 in that State. The Commission has, accordingly, proposed that the entire net proceeds after deducting the portion attributable to the Union Territories be distributed among the States on the basis of population. State Domestic Product at State Current prices and the production of the commodities subjected to Additional Excise Duties in the ratio of 70 : 20 : 10.

The Fifth Commission had recommended that the distribution of the balance after payment of guaranteed amounts shall be made 50 per cent on the basis of population and 50 per cent on the basis of Sales Tax Collection (excluding Central Sales Tax). The Sixth Commission has fixed the share of the Union territories at 1.41 per cent and for the balance of 98.59 per cent prescribed percentage shares in respect of each State.

The third Bill relates to the distribution of the net proceeds of Estate Duty in respect of property other than agricultural land among the States, as recommended by the Sixth Finance Commission. The Sixth Finance Commission, after considering various suggestions made by State Governments, came to the conclusion that the principles of distribution, enunciated by the Second Finance Commission and endorsed by all the subsequent Commissions do not call for any change. The only change that the Sixth Finance Commission has recommended, is the reduction in the share attributable to Union territories from 3 per cent to 2.5 per cent. This takes into account the population of

the Union territories as now constituted and the gross value of immovable property located therein and brought into assessment for the five years ending 1971-72. For the balance of the net proceeds, the sum apportioned to immovable property has been recommended to be distributed in proportion to the gross value of such property located in each State and brought into assessment in a year and the sum apportioned to other property in proportion to the population of each State according to the 1971 census.

The three Bills, before the House, are simple legislative measures, required for the implementation of the recommendations made by an expert body constituted under article 280 of the Constitution. The provisions of the Bills do not require detailed elaboration. The Central Government has so far implemented all the recommendations of the earlier Finance Commissions in regard to sharing of taxes, without any change and the same tradition is being followed in regard to the Sixth Finance Commission's recommendations also. I shall try to cover the points that the hon. Members may raise during the debate later.

With these few words, Sir, I move.

*The questions were proposed.*

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are discussing three Bills to implement the recommendations made by the Sixth Finance Commission. The work of the Finance Commission is to allocate funds or money to the States from out of the taxes collected realistically and in a judicious manner. In this respect I take the first Bill. The Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Amendment Bill. The Sixth Finance Commission has improved the weightage for backwardness of States by raising from 20 to 25 per cent the *inter se* distribution of Union Excise Duties in relation to the distance of a State's per capita income from that of the State with the highest per capita income. That is good but the balance of 75 per cent of the State's share will be on the

[Shri Sanat Kumar Raha.]

basis of population. Sir, I still think that even this will not meet the needs of the States in order to remove backwardness and imbalances in development. The imbalances in development of different States and different regions will still be there so long as the states do not have adequate finances and resources of their own. Much more resources, I think, should be mobilised by the States and the Centre for removal of these imbalances. As regards the removal

**12 Noon** of backwardness, the Commission has recommended that a proper machinery should be evolved and a mechanism should be there, so as to ensure proper utilisation of the money allocated to the States to remove imbalances. I do not know whether the Government has already taken such steps for ensuring the proper utilisation of the allocated money. The Government should come forward with concrete and positive steps to guarantee the utilisation of this fund meant for backward areas. Though the Finance Commission has accepted per capita income as the best possible indicator or yardstick for the measurement of the level of the economic position of States—whether advanced or backward—there are other special problems which cripple the States economically and also socially. I can cite the case of West Bengal. Since the days of partition West Bengal, though earning the highest foreign exchange is lagging behind other States like Maharashtra, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu. So, I think the allocation should be more realistic. The population basis alone is not sufficient.

As regards the additional duties of excise distribution, 70 per cent weightage on population has been given and the balance on the basis of consumption level. In this respect my question is, how to determine the level of consumption, whether it should be based on the average of the State domestic production or some other more scientific method should be evolved.

It should be cleared how proper co-operation and co-ordination between the Fi-

nance Commission and the Planning Commission can be established, so that correlation between Plan and non-Plan expenditure can be established. It is a sad thing that upto now the Finance Commission and the Planning Commission have not had joint meeting of their own to evolve such norms regarding allocation and for non-Plan expenditure.

The third point is transfer from the Centre to the States, as recommended by the Sixth Finance Commission for the period of the Fifth Five Year Plan, is Rs. 9608.85 crores as against Rs. 5315.99 crores for the Fourth Plan. It is higher than the Fifth Finance Commissions allocation by 81 per cent, but the rupee-value today has fallen to 20 or 30 paise. So, though the allocation is higher in amount, in a realistic manner it will not help the States in their development and they will always be in a crippled condition. Moreover, resources should be mobilised by taking some stringent measures, so that evasion of tax and other economic crimes will not happen and resources can be mobilised more and more for the development of the States. Thus the States could get some further allocation from the Centre. Since the Sixth Finance Commission has provided more than Rs. 800 crores for the five-year period for upgrading the standards of administration and social services in the backward States, I want to know from the Minister concerned whether the Finance Ministry has evolved any plan or machinery so that this upgradation can be successfully worked out. If all this does not mean a further and more allocation of funds from the Centre to the States, it will be a futile exercise.

**SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam) :** Sir, I do not have much to say on the Award of the Sixth Finance Commission. In a way, the Sixth Finance Commission has done a better job this time than the earlier Finance Commissions, and the resources of the States have been increased. It is a good thing that they have done. But perhaps there was still room for further justice being done towards at least the economically backward States. Anyway, I am not going into that. But the only thing that I would like to

*Additional Duties of Excise*

Bills, 1974

remind the hon. Minister is that last year while discussing the Finance Bill, I was speaking on it. And she might very well remember what I said at that time, that not only in the case of certain categories of duties and taxes for which statutory provision has been made for the States, but in the matter of several other matters also the share should be there. For example, out of the net transfer from the Centre to the States more than two-thirds are in the form of grants. I suggested that whatever was given in the form of grants at the discretion of the Central Government, that should also be brought under statutory provision. This was a very important suggestion that I made last year. Mr. Chavan did not react very favourably but I insist on it. And only then the States might stand on their own feet financially, and justice would be done to them. Beyond that, I do not want to discuss anything about the Sixth Finance Commission's recommendations.

I only wish to make some very important points and I hope the hon. Minister will take a note of them. The first is regarding the tea industry. In reply to a question on the 26th November, 1971, Shri K. R. Ganesh said in the Lok Sabha:—

“Varying rates of Central Excise Duty were introduced in September, 1958 with a view to spreading the total Central Excise Tax burden equitably among different tea-growing areas on the basis of their capacity to bear the incidence as measured by the price fetched and other natural factors which affected the quality, yield per hectare, cost of production per kg., price realisation per kg., etc.”

In the Lok Sabha, on 23rd May, 1972, Shri A. C. George said—

“Higher excise duty is levied on higher priced teas in order to distribute the tax burden equitably among different tea-growing areas according to the tax-bearing capacity.”

These are the statements made in the Lok Sabha the year before last and in

1971, and they make it very clear that the duty on tea was to be levied on the basis of the tax-bearing capacity of the particular tea-growing area. That is the principle accepted. Now, let us see what is the position about the tax-bearing capacity. Three major areas are there—Assam, Darjeeling in West Bengal and the Nilgiris. The average price realisation of Darjeeling tea estates worked out to Rs. 6380.10 per hectare in 1970 as against the average cost of production of Rs. 5640.60 per hectare. Thus the average gross profitability of Darjeeling tea is Rs. 739.50 per hectare. On the same basis, you will find that the average gross profitability of Assam tea is Rs. 12.87 per hectare; on the same basis again you will find that the average gross profitability of Nilgiri tea is Rs. 2274.84 per hectare. Now, these are facts given out by the Government, by the tea Board, they are confirmed facts. On the basis of these facts, it is very clear that the Nilgiri tea has got the highest tax-bearing capacity. But the excise duty per kg. on the Nilgiri tea is only Re. 1, while that on the Assam tea is Rs. 1.15 and on the Darjeeling tea it is Rs. 1.50. While the tax-bearing capacity of Assam is the lowest it is paying higher tax. Darjeeling's capacity is very low still it pays the highest. And Nilgiri's tax-bearing capacity is the highest still it is paying the lowest. This injustice is going on. I hope the hon'ble Minister will kindly take note of it and will do something to undo this injustice as early as possible.

The prices of oil have gone up and the reasons are well known. It is no use quarrelling about it. My grouse is that the price of oil is not uniform in this country and the greatest tragedy is that the areas which produce oil pay the highest price for it. Will you believe, Sir, that Assam which produced oil first during the British regime has to pay the highest price for it? The Thirty-first report of the Committee on Public Undertakings of the Third Lok Sabha pointed out this fact. It is said that while Barauni produced oil the man in Barauni paid more for its oil than the man in Calcutta. This discrimination is going on. What are the

[Shri Bipinpal Das]

reasons? The Oil Prices Enquiry Committee gave its reasons and said that because in the port areas there are industries where the consumption of oil is very high there cannot be equalisation of price in the matter of oil. If you do that the industrial development of the port areas will be upset. Therefore, there cannot be equalisation of prices in the interest of port areas like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta. So unequal prices are prevailing and the oil-producing areas are suffering.

Sir, in the case of iron and steel the Government adopted a different policy. And what is that policy? The Government of India justified the price equalisation policy in the case of iron and steel by saying that this was necessary for even distribution of industries in the country. May I submit, Sir, that if price equalisation in the case of iron and steel is necessary in the interest of even distribution of industries in the whole country, how is it that price equalisation in the case of oil is not necessary for the same purpose? You are taking a contradictory view in the matter of iron and steel. This Government has several contradictions. You follow one policy with regard to the price structure of iron and steel and you follow another policy with regard to the price structure of oil. Both policies are diametrically opposite. Both should be designed to serve the same purpose, namely even distribution of industrial development in this country. This is gross injustice so far as oil is concerned. I hope the hon'ble Minister will kindly take note of it. This discrimination against areas which actually produce oil—this is my complaint—should come to an end.

Sir, you will be surprised to know that we produce oil and supply it to the Barauni refinery to the extent of about 2.5 million tonnes per year but we do not get any share in the sales tax. The Finance Ministry tells the States all the time that they should raise their own resources. But how can they raise? You do not allow us to levy sales tax on the oil produced in Assam and supplied to Barauni. We are deprived of the share of our sales tax. Therefore, how

can you ask a State like Assam to develop its own resources?

The second point is about the royalty on crude oil.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Today you are speaking as if you are speaking in the State Assembly.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : We have been suffering for a long time. Goray Sahab, please listen to this story. During the British regime the royalty on oil that the Assam Government used to get was Rs. 10 per ton. But after independence it was reduced to Rs. 4.50 per ton. This is the justice done! The British paid us Rs. 10 per tonne and our Government lowered it to Rs. 4.50. After a number of representations, Prime Minister Nehru and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi raised it and to-day it is Rs. 15 per tonne. And what is Rs. 15 in to-day's market and what was Rs. 10 at that time? Sir, the price of crude is rising everywhere. In India also it is rising. The Government has levied an additional excise duty on it and they are getting extra income out of it. We demand that the Government of Assam and the Government of Gujarat should get at least Rs. 30 per tonne as royalty on oil.

SHRI UMASHANKAR JOSHI (Nominated) : You have spoken for me also.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Yes, the situation is the same in Gujarat and Assam.

Coming to jute, the story of jute is indeed a great tragedy. Now, Sir, I do not want to take up the time of the House by quoting the statistics given by the Government of India itself, by the Finance Ministry. On page 61 of the Economic survey, 1973-74 you will find that the production of every other item since 1955-56 till to-day has gone up. But in the case of jute, it is almost static or there is a marginal increase. Why is jute production not growing? The reason is the price. What is the price structure? Sir, it is not only a tragedy, but it is, I should say, a

great injustice done to the jute growers in this country. You will find from the table given in the Economic Survey on page 88 that the wholesale price of every single commodity has been increasing year after year since independence till to-day. Will you believe, Sir, if I say that only in the case of jute, there has been a decrease? In 1965-66, the index for jute was 160, if we take 100 in 1961-62 as the base. In 1971-72, the index came down to 135. Only in 1972-73, it picked up and came back to 160. That is, the index of 1965-66 and that of 1972-73 are at the same level. Can you believe it? The price of every other item in this country is going up every year. I need not quote statistics. Everybody knows it. We are suffering from that. But only in the case of jute, either it falls or it remains static. To-day in this country, due to price rise everybody is suffering. There are strikes and "bands" and so many things going on. But if any single individual has suffered most or has not benefited the least after independence, it is the poor jute grower. He is suffering and his suffering has to be taken note of. Recently the Government of India has raised the excise duty on some of the export jute goods. In 1971-72, the jute millers bought Bangladesh jute at rock-bottom prices and thereby depressed our own prices. In 1972-73, the price was raised just before sowing, because otherwise the growers will not sow at all. But after the sowing was over, the price was again depressed; it came down. This is the mechanism through which the jute millers are exploiting the jute growers in this country.

Now, Sir, during the British regime, there was a principle accepted—it is on record, I am not saying it from my own knowledge—that the price of one maund of jute would be equal to the price of three maunds of paddy, so that the jute grower, by selling one maund of jute, could buy three maunds of paddy. That was the principle accepted by the British Government. After independence, the ratio accepted was that one maund of jute would be equivalent to 2.57 maunds of paddy. This was accepted by our Government. But what is the situation to-day?

What is the situation today? Again I do not want to take the time of the House by quoting all figures. Today the situation is a jute grower, by selling 1 kg. of jute, if I have to measure in terms of kgs., he can buy in the market only three-fourths kg. of paddy. So, tell me why the jute grower should continue to grow jute. Why should he? If tomorrow the jute growers of Bengal, the jute growers of Orissa, Tripura, Bihar and Assam decide not to grow jute any more because they do not get a fair price for their jute, what will happen to our foreign exchange earnings? The Government goes on increasing the duty. It was said formerly that the jute grower cannot be given a higher price because in that case the price of jute goods will increase. If the price of jute goods increases, then, it will fare unfavourably in the international market. That was the argument given, because jute goods have to face competition against synthetic fibre. But today what is the argument? Why have you raised the excise duty? You have raised the excise duty because the price of synthetic fibre is going up because of the oil crisis. Because of the oil crisis the price of synthetic fibre is going up and so you think that since the jute goods have now to compete in a favourable international market, the Government is justified in increasing the excise duty. I do not agree with it. When you earn money out of the jute goods, then, should not the jute grower get something out of that money when the jute grower pays that extra duty? Otherwise, ultimately the jute grower will lose his interest in jute growing. Whatever duty you are getting, it is not the jute miller who is paying it, ultimately it is the jute grower who is paying it. Mr. D. P. Chattopadhyaya, the Commerce Minister, I am very sorry to say, knows the problem, and still he seems to be quite indifferent. He has recently fixed the price, Rs. 157.50 per quintal wholesale price. This is the wholesale price in Calcutta. What is the actual price the grower is getting in the village? The farther you go from Calcutta, the lower is the price. The jute grower in Tripura, in Assam, is suffering the worst. When the

[Shri Bipinpal Das.]

situation today is that the price of rice is Rs. 250 to Rs. 300 per quintal, Mr. D. P. Chattopadhyaya has fixed the jute price at Rs. 157.50 per quintal. Now, tell, me, I plead with you most humbly, what right have you got to do this injustice to the poor jute grower? What is a jute grower's position? What is his contribution to this country, to the development of this country? Jute is the highest foreign exchange earner in this country even today. Even to-day jute is the highest foreign exchange earner. Since Independence upto now they must have earned about Rs. 3500 crores, approximately speaking. The man who grows, who puts in labour in the field—and the production of that labour you sell outside and you earn thousands and thousands of crores of rupees in foreign exchange—to that man what share are you giving? Can there be a greater injustice in this country? Today all employees say the price of everything is going up. Everywhere people say prices of essential commodities are going up. There is so much of talk about *bandhs* and all that. But did they ever look into this question of the jute grower in the eastern region? I plead most humbly, most emphatically, with the honourable Minister, please do something you have the right to increase the excise duty; do it; but see that the grower also gets his share out of it. Only then some justice will be done.

Thank you.

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA (Bihar): These three Bills introduced in our House today are in pursuance of the recommendations of Sixth Finance Commission. The honourable Minister, while introducing the Bills in the House, has accepted or rather informed us that the Government have implemented some of the recommendations of the Commission by way of essential orders, and some of the recommendations the Minister has brought here in the form of Bills to be passed by this House.

The recommendations of the Sixth Finance Commission on the whole have taken

into consideration the larger, rather increasing responsibilities of the States, particularly in view of the Five Year Plans. That is why the Sixth Finance Commission has allocated larger shares for the States. This is a very good thing. But you see this always raises another problem. In the minds of some of the States in our country, there is a feeling that there is discrimination at the political level on the part of the Centre. In other words they feel that the Centre discriminates against some States in the matter of allocations of funds. According to the recommendations of the Finance Commission which were accepted by the Central Government, in principle they should not have that feeling. But sometimes the attitude of the Centre creates this feeling in the minds of the States. Particularly I would like to draw the attention of the House to the demands in different parts of the country for statehood, and for changes in the present Constitution because of lopsided development and under-developed economy in particular zones. I think there are sufficient provisions in our Constitution, political and economical to give sufficient scope for the States and from that point of view there need be no such demand. But the political decisions of the Central Government create new situations. The framers of our Constitution would not have visualised the developmental responsibilities and larger commitments of the States in view of the Five Year Plans. Therefore, if the Finance Commission has recommended in larger share for the States, I would say it should be still larger. It should be still larger because sometimes the sources of taxation by the States are limited and so it becomes very difficult for them to make both ends meet. You know that sometimes the Central Government unilaterally increases the payscales of its employees. I do not want to go into the merit of the thing. The increase may be justified because of rising prices, etc. But such decision has a bearing on the State exchequers. Very recently, the Central Government decided to implement the scales recommended by the University Grants Commission for the



University teachers in the country. The States which were to implement the new pay-scales would get 80 per cent of the cost for the next five years.

And, after the next five years, the States will have to take full responsibility. If they give this guarantee, only then the Centre will be giving them 80 per cent as subsidy. This is just like giving by one hand and then taking it by another. This will arouse the expectations of the teachers in the States and the States will be put to jeopardy and difficulties because of this stand that after five years the Central Government will not give any help. Whenever the Central Government takes such decisions, it should take full responsibility for these decisions and it should take these decisions with full responsibility. Whether the States contribute or not after five years is a different matter. But when the Centre has taken a stand—and it is a very good stand and I welcome it—it should extend this without giving the time-limit of five years.

There is another thing to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. Sir, we have two types of States. One is the full-fledged State and the other is the Union Territory. Now, Sir, what is the justification for keeping these two types of units? Let there be an amendment to the Constitution. The Sixth Finance Commission and the other preceding Commissions have always had to take into consideration the question as to how much sum they should allot to the Union Territories and on what principle the remaining should be distributed among the different States. It is high time that we thought about this question because there is no necessity for keeping so many varieties of units. If we have to have States, let there be States all over. But, even then, you do it on political considerations. Himachal Pradesh was converted into a State, but Delhi was not converted into a full-fledged State. We have created so many States in the eastern region and Union Territories like Arunachal Pradesh and so on and so forth. But we are not prepared to listen to the demands of the people of Telangana. Now, Sir,

there is going to be a large number of demands for separate States because the principle for the allocation of money, whether from the Excise Duties or other duties, is on the basis of whether they are States or Union Territories. I think there is bound to be dissatisfaction and heart-burning whenever such a discrimination is made on this ground that such and such areas belong to the category of States and such and such areas belong to the category of Union Territories.

Then, Sir, I would also like to draw the attention of the House to another thing. How are these sums spent by the States and what control do we have over them? There are two different things. There are several items and the Central Government does not allot money to the States only from the Excise Duties or additional Excise Duties and other things. There are several other things and there is also a provision for grants-in-aid. How do the State spend this money? You take the case of Bihar, Sir. Every year there is either drought or there are floods and we have troublesome rivers which must be tamed and in connection with the natural calamities in Bihar and other States, the Central Government has been granting money. How do those Governments spend this money? I would like to tell you, Sir, that in Bihar that relief funds have been misappropriated by the Congress Government there.

Blankets were purchased for distribution from the relief fund and those blankets were not seen in the houses of the poor people. Some of them had their way into the bungalows of the Ministers. Some tarpaulin sheets were purchased. They were not found in the village over the houses of the poor people. But they were just converted and they had their way into the bungalows of the Ministers. Similar was the case regarding fodder purchased from Haryana. I do not know what happened. Fodder did not reach the cows and buffaloes of Bihar. I do not know whether this was also consumed by the Ministers in Bihar or not. I would request the Government to keep a vigilant eye over their expenditure.

[Shri Ramkripal Sinha.]

Now, there are certain areas in every State which are backward areas, under-developed areas. For instance, in Bihar we have Chhota Nagpur and Santhal Pargana, which is a tribal belt. Though very rich in natural resources, mines and minerals, yet we do not have cottage industries there. In Bihar, we have certain bases of industries. There is no network of cottage industries or subsidiary industries. What have you done for the development of that area? When you allocate a sum, do you guide the State Government or just tell them that the money which they take, they must apportion a certain amount out of that for the development of a particular area. They do not know that North Bihar is equally backward. North Bihar has a population of about 3 crores—equal to the combined population of Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir, all these States put together. That may be more than crores, but North Bihar is about 3 crores. But what have you done? It is a jute-growing area. What is your Jute Corporation doing?

Our friends, Mr. Bipinpal Das, who was speaking just before me, has drawn the attention of the House and the Government towards the plight of the farmers in the eastern region, who produce jute. The Bihar farmers are much more exploited. They have their Jute Corporation which is full of bungling and corruption. It harasses the farmers. And it purchases jute, not directly from the farmers, but from the middlemen. Whenever you give this, whenever you allot any money from the Excise Duty and things like that, has your Government—the Congress Government in Bihar and the Congress Government at the Centre—given any guidelines? What have they done for the improvement of jute production in that State?...*(Time bell rings)* . . . Just a minute, Sir. I would like to draw the attention of the Government, through you, Sir, to the recommendation of the Finance Commission regarding Income-tax. The apportionment of Income-tax revenue has been increased from 75% to 80% now.

There is a very pertinent question. There are States. In the States there are big companies. Their operations area is in one State and their head office is in another State. They pay their income-tax and other things through their head office. In the Bihar coalfields, there are many collieries. There are Tatas, many concerns of Birlas, many mills and factories and many private concerns which don't pay their income-tax in Bihar. They pay it somewhere else, either in Calcutta or somewhere else. Now what can be done about this? Their operation area and the area where they earn their income is in one State. They pay their income-tax in another State. There must be some provision for the allocation funds arising out of the income-tax earned in a particular State. Something must be done regarding this *(Time bell rings)* Sir, I will take half a minute more regarding the tobacco growing areas. Sir, Muzaffarpur, Vaishali and Samastipur are tobacco growing districts. Tobacco gives you a large amount of excise duty. Nothing is being done for the improvement of tobacco growing areas. The Government of Bihar is worthless. They cannot do anything. They are not doing anything.

Sir, I draw the attention of the Minister and the Government through you to these two very important things. They must provide for the improvement of the tobacco growing areas and the jute growing areas in Bihar which is the hen that lays the golden eggs. With these words, I would again like to tell the Government that they should not create political conditions so that certain States feel as if they are being treated as step-sons and step-daughters. There should be sufficient economic and political safeguards and provisions in our Constitution for the integration of our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will have to wind up now.

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA: With these words. I draw your attention to these things.

श्री जगदीश जोशी (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय उप-सभापति जी, मध्य प्रदेश उत्पादन शुल्क, अतिरिक्त उत्पादन शुल्क और सम्पदा शुल्क के संशोधन विधेयक जो हमारे समक्ष प्रस्तुत है उनके सिद्धांतों की बाबत मैं चर्चा करूंगा। असल में यह जो परोक्ष रूप में कर लगाये जाते हैं विशेष तौर पर उत्पादन के शुल्क उन का कोई स्पष्ट आधार होना चाहिए क्योंकि परोक्ष रूप में लगाये गये कर किसी भी देश में उस देश की दाम नीति का निर्धारण करते हैं। किन वस्तुओं पर कितना परोक्ष कर लगे, कितने परोक्ष कर की वृद्धि हो और उस का वितरण किम आधार पर हो यह दो मूल सिद्धांत हैं जिन पर इन का नियोजन होना आवश्यक होता है। प्रश्न यह है कि हम जक्कर पर, कपड़े पर, नमक पर, आवश्यकता की वस्तुओं पर कितना उत्पादन शुल्क बढ़ाये या उन का उत्पादन इनका बढ़ाये ताकि सामान्य लोगों के पास तक वह चीजें पहुँच सकें, सामान्य आदमी उन का प्रयोग अधिकतम ढंग से कर सके। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, स्थिति क्या होनी चाहिए अगर किसी वस्तु के उत्पादन का मूल्य क्या है इस बात का निरूपण हो जाय। कपड़े जैसी एक वस्तु के निर्माण पर कितना व्यय होता है, लागत खर्च कितना होता है और लागत खर्च के बाद उसको सरकार कितने में उपभोक्ता के पास पहुँचाना चाहती है, यह सिद्धांत अगर तय हो जाय तब परोक्ष कर के सिद्धांत अपने आप निरूपण किया जा सकता है।

एक बड़ी भारी कमी रही है आज दामों के बढ़ने की जिसके लिये विन मंत्रालय पर दोष डाला जाता है। अगर विन मंत्रालय दाम नीति के निर्धारण में अपने रेट तय कर सकना तो परीक्षा कर के आधार पर सरकार के ऊपर महंगाई के लिये आरोप नहीं लगाया जा सकता। मैं एक-दो सिद्धांत आपकी इजाजत में प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ।

सामान्य तौर पर यह होता है कि कोई चीज जो प्रांमिक होती है, जो कारखाने से तैयार होकर आती है उसके निर्माण का भी एक सिद्धांत है। कच्चे माल का लागत मूल्य गुणा तीन होगा। सामान्य तौर पर 90 सैकड़ा यह सिद्धांत आम तौर

पर उत्पादक लोग अपने यहाँ तैयार करते हैं। अगर आप यह सिद्धांत लगा दें कि उत्पादक की हूण वस्तु बाजार में लागत खर्च के डेढ़ गुणा में अधिक में नहीं बिकेगी—इसमें माल भाड़ा, व्यापारियों का मूनाफा, प्रीर सरकार का उत्पादन शुल्क वगैरह सब शामिल रहेंगे—इस प्रकार का आधार निरूपित हो जाय तो सामान्य आवश्यक वस्तुओं के उत्पादन की तरफ हमारी दृष्टि जाएगी। उनके ऊपर टैक्स बढ़ाने की रोज-ब-रोज जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी।

मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। एक रिपोर्ट आई है—वेज बोर्ड की उसका पूरा करने के लिए सरकार ने पेट्रोल पर टैक्स बढ़ा दिया। मिट्टी के तेल पर टैक्स बढ़ाया। समझाया इस प्रकार गया कि यह इसलिए बढ़ाया गया कि इसका असर मांटरकार इस्तेमाल करने वालों पर ही पड़ता है। अब श्रीमान्, आपकी आज्ञा में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर पेट्रोल का सबसे बड़ा उपभोक्ता है कौन? इस प्रश्न का हमको देखना चाहिए। इसका सबसे बड़ा उपभोक्ता हिन्दुस्तान की सरकारें हैं। चाहे दिल्ली की सरकार हो या राज्यों की। उसके बाद तम्बर दो पर जो आते हैं वे हैं बड़ी कंपनियाँ—जो कंपनियाँ इन्कम टैक्स में अपना मोधा खर्चा देती हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इससे कोई बड़ी भारी बचन होने वाली नहीं है। इसका असर पड़ता है छोटे-मोटे टैक्सी चलाने वालों पर। अगर बड़े अदामियों पर ही प्रहार करना चाहते हैं तो आपको चाहिए था निजी कार रखने वालों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने और कहते कि सारी गाड़ियाँ टैक्सी के तौर पर चलेगी। जो पुलिस की, फौज की गाड़ियाँ हैं, जो बहुत जरूरी हैं, वे सरकार के पास रहें। इसके साथ एक-दो कारें, जो जरूरी कंपनियाँ हैं—जैसे कोई हथियार बनाने वाली है और ऐसी चीजें बनाने वाली कंपनियाँ हैं—वे रखें और बाकी सारी गाड़ियाँ टैक्सी के तौर पर चले। इन टैक्सियों को पेट्रोल सस्ता मिले ताकि सामान्य जनता उसका उपयोग कर सके हमारा उद्देश्य यह होना चाहिये कि जो वस्तु हमारे देश में पैदा होती है उसको अधिकतम लोग इस्तेमाल में लायें। जो समान इस देश में केवल

[श्री जगदीश जांजी]

मूठ्ठी पर लोगों के बिलाम के उपभोग के लिये पैदा होता है उस पर आप चाहे कितना ही टैक्स लगा दें और यह समझा दें कि हम एक विशिष्ट वर्ग के ऊपर टैक्स लगा रहे हैं। तो इसका असर आम जनता पर भी पड़ता है। श्रीमान् लोभ के समुद्र में बैठ कर आप बड़े-बड़े लोगों को लोभ छोड़ने के लिए नहीं कह सकते। विध्वंसित जैसे ऋषि, बड़े-बड़े महाऋषि सब लालच के समुद्र में आकर बह गए। मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि आप उत्पादन-शुल्क न लगाइए। लगाइए, लेकिन उत्पादन बढ़ाएँ, आवश्यक वस्तुओं का और उस आवश्यक वस्तुओं का अधिकतम उपभोग हो सके सामान्य जन के जरिए। नाबलन या फैब्रिकम पर आपने टैक्स बढ़ाया तो अच्छा किया लेकिन मे श्रीमान् के द्वारा भ्रष्ट करूँ कि एक एल० डी० सी० होता है सेक्रेटरेण्ट का, वह भी नायलन, टेरीकाट, टेरीलीन पहिना है भले ही तनकवाह से गुजारा न हो। तो वह दूसरे रास्ते भ्रष्टियार करता है—कहा मैं मेरे पास नायलन, टेरीलीन के लिए पैसा मिल जाए? और इतना भ्रष्टे चल गया है देश में कि हिन्दुस्तान ही में बने हुए टेरीलीन के ऊपर चोरी से छाप देते हैं—मेड इन यू० एस० ए०। हिन्दुस्तान का आदमी, जो विदेशी चीजों का भक्त हो गया है, आजादी के बाद, वह समझता है मेड इन यू० एस० ए० टेरीलीन खरीद लो, उसका पैट बना लो, कुर्ता बना लो। कहीं से काने धन से, गिणवन से धन हासिल करके वह कपड़ा खरीद लेगा। हम लोग आज 25 वर्ष के बाद इस हैमियन पर आ गए हैं कि स्वदेशी चीज के लिये हमारे मन में कोई आस्था नहीं रह गई है, श्रद्धा भी नहीं रह गई है। कोई विदेशी वस्तु आ जाए, चाहे नकली क्यों न हो। मुझे यह भी पता चला, ये चीन के बने जो फाउण्टेनपेन आया करते हैं, ये असमन चीन के बने नहीं होते हैं, ये हिन्दुस्तान के बने होते हैं, और हिन्दुस्तान के तस्कारी के आदमी “मेड इन चाइना” लगाकर नेपाल की सीमा से ले आते हैं और इसी तरह से और सामान भी बेचते हैं। तो आप उन उपभोग की तमाम वस्तुओं पर प्रतिबंध लगाइए और सामान्य उपभोग

की वस्तुओं का उत्पादन इतना बढ़ाएँ कि गरीब आदमी को, माधारण आदमी को, भी मोटा कपड़ा मोटा खाना मिल सके और आपके कर का बोझ भी कम हो। साथ साथ उसकी उपयोगिता भी काफी बढ़ जाएगी।

यह तो मैंने कराधान के मित्रता के बारे में कहा। अब कराधान से प्राप्त अंतराणि का विवरण आप किस तरह से करने हैं उसका मित्रता क्या होना चाहिए, उसका भी निर्माण आपको करना चाहिये। मुझ से पहले बोलने वाले सम्मानित सदस्यों ने कई बातें गन फाइनेम कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को बाबत कहाँ कि कमीशन ने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है देश के पिछड़ेपन को दूर करने के लिए, आर्थिक असंतुलन को दूर करने के लिए। उन्होंने कुछ नए मुझाव दिए हैं जिनके बारे में सरकार असल कर रही है। मैं निवेदन यह करना चाहता हूँ कि आर्थिक असंतुलन केवल राज्यों के अनुदान से दूर होने वाला नहीं है। हर राज्य में कंगाली के गढ़े हैं और कुछ तो सम्पन्नता के कमल फूल हैं। तो जो केन्द्र से पैसा जाएगा वह सम्पन्नता के कमल फूलों की खेती है लग जाएगा या वह फूल कंगाली के गढ़ों में पड़ने दिया जाएगा जहाँ आदमी पीढ़ियों से गुश्न दर गुश्न से, सैकड़ों हजारों सालों से, कंगाली और भुखमरी से संघर्ष करता चला आ रहा है। तो जो अर्थ का विकेंद्रीकरण हो वह केवल राज्यों के आधार पर न हो। केंद्रीय सरकार का यह दायित्व होना चाहिए कि केंद्रीय सरकार जो पैसा दे रही है वह जितना गांवों की सतह तक जाए। यह गंगोत्री से निकली गंगा केवल गंगोत्री के पास फिर से जा कर शिवजी की जटा में समाहित न हो जाए, यह सीधे जाकर गंगा सागर तक पहुँचे, इसका प्रयाम हो। इसलिए आप केन्द्र से जो धनराशि दे उसके लिये आप निर्धारित करे कि उसका अनुपात, उसका रेशियो, क्या हो पिछड़े जिलों के लिये, पिछड़े ग्रामों के लिए और ग्राम पंचायतों और जिला पंचायतों के माध्यम से इतना प्रतिशत खर्च हो। नहीं तो होगा क्या, मध्य प्रदेश में आपने रुपया भेजा, इंदौर, भोपाल, जबलपुर, रायपुर इन जगहों में खर्च हो जाएगा, लेकिन कौन पृच्छता है मरगुजा में कितना खर्च होगा, रीवा में

कितना खर्च होगा, दूसरे पिछड़े क्षेत्रों में कितना खर्च होगा ? यू०पी० में आप भेजिएगा तो लखनऊ, इलाहाबाद, कानपुर में आपका भेजा रुपया चला जाएगा और पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश का जो पिछड़ा हुआ आदमी है जो जाकर के आड़ लगाता है, जो कुलीगिरी करता है, जो रिकशा चलाना है, जो मजदूरी करता है, उसको कुछ नहीं मिल पाएगा। तो अर्थ का विकेंद्रीकरण आर्थिक अवस्था के ही आधार पर होना चाहिए। अगर आप आवश्यक जमने तो संविधान को इस प्रकार से संशोधित कर दें कि अर्थव्यवस्था का विकेंद्रीकरण एक निश्चित आधार पर हो और जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके हैं उनके लिये विशेष अवसर के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार करें। जब तक आर्थिक विकेंद्रीकरण के सिद्धान्त को केन्द्र स्वीकार नहीं करेगा तब तक आप इस देश के आर्थिक असंतुलन को दूर करने में समर्थ हो ही नहीं सकते। सारी राज्य सरकारों को केन्द्र से जो अनुदान मिलता है वह मुख्यतः तनख्वाहों के भुगतान में ही खर्च हो जाता करता है। हमने 20 सालों में मफेद-कालर वालों की एक सेना खड़ी कर दी है जो इस देश पर भ्रमामुर की तरह चढ़ी हुई है। आवश्यक है कि आप उस सेना को वहां से निकालिए, उनको 300 देने है तो 400 दीजिए, लेकिन कहिए कि नहरी सेना में काम करिए। हमारे देश में नहरों की कमी है, नहर खोदने के लिये उनको 300 चाहिए तो 400 दीजिए लेकिन वे नहर बनाए। तनख्वाह में कमी करने के लिए मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ। उनको खूब तनख्वाह दीजिए, भरपेट दीजिए, लेकिन कहिए नहर बनाने के लिए इतने फुट मिट्टी निकाल कर देनी पड़ेगी, तब तनख्वाह मिलेगी। अब दिल्ली, कलकत्ता, बम्बई के अन्दर आपका मकान नहीं रहेगा, आपका मकान जंगलों में, देश के मैदानों में रहेगा। आपको लोगों को पानी देना चाहिए, मिर्चाई की सुविधाएं देनी चाहिए। जब तक आप अपने सारे अर्थतंत्र को उत्पादन के आधार पर उन्मुख नहीं करेंगे, पैदावार और विकास के आधार पर उन्मुख नहीं करेंगे तब तक जो आप रुपया देते हैं उसका उचित उपयोग नहीं हो सकेगा।

समाप्त करने के पूर्व में एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं बहुत पिछड़े हुए राज्य में आया हूँ। अभी

जुट की बात कही गई, पैट्रोलियम की बात कही गई। हमारे कई माननीय सदस्यों ने उस बात को कहा। उनका कहना अपने स्थान पर जायज है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मध्य प्रदेश सबसे बड़ा कोयला का राज्य है, लेकिन उस कोयले की गयल्टी के रूप में मध्य प्रदेश को कुछ नहीं मिलता। हमारा राज्य उपभोक्ता राज्य है। बहुत सा सामान बनता ही नहीं है। सारी कंपनियों ने बम्बई, कलकत्ता, मद्रास को अपने हेडक्वार्टर कर रखा है। चाहे वे बिड़ला माहब की हो या ओर कोई हों। सारा इनकम टैक्स मध्य प्रदेश में नश दिया जाता। मध्य प्रदेश गेहूँ और चावल देता है। जो भूखे इलाके हैं बम्बई, मद्रास, कलकत्ता उनको मध्य प्रदेश का गेहूँ और चावल न मिले तो वहां के बाबूओं की जिन्दगी दूसर हो जाय, चाहे काले बाजार से जाये मध्य प्रदेश से या मफेद बाजार से या सरकारी तौर पर। उनको दो जून का भोजन मध्य प्रदेश से ही मिलता है—हरियाणा से भी मिलता है—लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश को क्या मिलता है? आप इस बात पर गौर नहीं कर रहे हैं जो केवल कच्चे माल को तैयार करने वाले राज्य हैं वे राज्य बड़े गरीब हैं। मध्य प्रदेश के अन्दर अनाई कोई बन्दरगाह भी नहीं है। आन्ध्र का आबादी बढ़े, उत्तर प्रदेश की आबादी घटी हो, राजस्थान की आबादी, बिहार की आबादी, महाराष्ट्र की आबादी मिट्ट कर मध्य प्रदेश में बसने आ जाती है, वह हमारे यहाँ रहे, हम उफ नहीं करने। जो प्रदेश आपको भोजन देता है, मदद करता है उस प्रदेश को आप सबसे कम दे रहे हैं, जो राज्य कच्चा माल तैयार करना है, दूसरे राज्यों का पैट भरता है उसको इतना कम दे रहे हैं कि उसके विकास कार्य भी रुकते जा रहे हैं कहीं-कहीं। बिजली के लिए मध्य प्रदेश से कोयला हुनवाने है हरियाणा को, तमिलनाडु को। मेरा निवेदन है कि मध्य प्रदेश में ही हरियाणा और तमिलनाडु अपने धर्मल खोल ले। हम तैयार हैं इस बात के लिए। हमारी मुख्य मंत्री से बात हुई। उन्होंने कहा कि आप कह सकते हैं कि जितने राज्यों को बिजली चाहिए हम में ले, हम सरप्लस हैं बिजली में, मर्याद बिजली देंगे। रेलवे हड़ताल है, कोयला ढोने में परेशानी

[श्री जगदीश जोशी]

है। थर्मल का कोयला रही किस्म का कोयला होता है, तीन चौथाई उसमें राख होती है। राख को ढुलवाने में राज्य की शक्ति का अपव्यय हो रहा है। आप थर्मल स्टेशन मध्य प्रदेश में बनवा लीजिए। इस सबके बावजूद मध्य प्रदेश के दोनों पड़ोसी राज्य बिहार और गुजरात मध्य प्रदेश के दोनों नदियों पर कब्जा किए बैठे हैं ताकि पानी न मिल पाए, सोचते हैं कि आदिवासी हैं, हरिजन हैं, बैकवर्ड लोग हैं क्या कहेंगे। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि जो आपने यह आधार बनाया है कि हमको आर्थिक असंतुलन को दूर करना है यह कोई

1 P. M.

मामूली सवाल नहीं है। इन सारे सवालियों को ठर्रे पर देखना पड़ेगा और इस प्रकार देखकर नीति में कुछ मौलिक परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा, आमूल परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा। तब जाकर देश की गरीबी मिटाने की एक नयी दिशा मिल सकती है। धन्यवाद

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : After lunch, Shri Nawal Kishore will be the first speaker

THE HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED TILL .  
2.00 P.M.

The House then adjourned at  
one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at one minute past two of the clock. The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. B. Raju) in the Chair.

#### REFERENCE TO HARASSMENT OF RAILWAY WORKERS AT THE KISHEN- GANJ RAILWAY COLONY

श्री लाल आडवाणी (दिल्ली) : माननीय उप-सभापति जी, बहम की कार्यवाही आरम्भ हो उस से पहले मैं आप की अनुमति से एक विषय उठाना चाहूंगा। यदि अव्यावश्यक न होता तो मैं इस को नहीं उठाना और आप से अनुमति भी नहीं लेता। अभी अभी सूचना मिली है और घटे, डेढ़ घटे से टेलीफोन कात्सम आ रही है इस संबंध में। यहाँ एक रेलवे कालोनी है किशनगंज पर काफी रेल कर्मचारी

रहते हैं बहुत बड़ी संख्या में। शायद हिन्दुस्तान की या एशिया की सबसे बड़ी यह रेलवे कालोनी है और उस कालोनी में इतना हैरेममेंट हो रहा है रेलवेमैन का, इतनी परेशानी हो रही है उनको कि यहाँ तक कि वह महिलाओं के साथ भी दुर्व्यवहार किया गया है और मैंने इस बात का उल्लेख इसलिए किया है—मैं वातावरण को उत्तेजित नहीं करना चाहता क्योंकि मैं यह जानता हूँ कि कल प्रातः काल प्रधान मंत्री जी की विरोधी दल के नेताओं ने जो बात चीत हुई, उस बातचीत में चाहे कोई एग्जिमेन्ट न हुआ हो, उस में दोनों के अलग अलग दृष्टिकोण थे, लेकिन उस का वातावरण सद्भावनापूर्ण था और सब की इच्छा थी कि कोई न कोई रास्ता निकलना चाहिए, कोई न कोई तरीका निकलना चाहिए कि जिस के कारण सम्मानपूर्वक रेलवे कर्मचारियों के लिए सरकार के लिए भी सम्मानपूर्वक कोई समझौता हो जाय और जो गतिरोध उत्पन्न हुआ है वह समाप्त हो जाय। मुझे इस बात की आशा है कि एक तरफ प्रधान मंत्री के स्तर पर यह प्रयत्न हो रहे हैं, इतने उच्च स्तर पर यह बातें हो रही हैं और उस में वह और विरोधी दल के नेता प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ इस तरह से ही चलता रहा तो वह सारे प्रयत्न निरर्थक हो जायेंगे, अगर एक्जीक्यूटिव लेवल पर यही चलता रहा तो वह सब बेकार होगा। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि बहुत बड़ी तादात में कल युथ-कांग्रेस के लोग बहा गये और बहा के लोगों को, कर्मचारियों को काम करने को काम पर जाने को कहा। मैं समझता हूँ कि पोलिटिकल लेवल पर और एडमिनिस्ट्रिटिव लेवल पर ऐसी गलतियाँ अगर हुई और ऐसा दुर्व्यवहार हुआ तो उस के दूरगामी परिणाम होंगे और इसलिए मैं आप की आज्ञा से यहाँ पर हमारे समक्षीय मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं, उन में निवेदन करूँगा कि तुरन्त इस संबंध में वह कार्यवाही करें और कार्यवाही कर के ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि जो वहाँ के रेल कर्मचारी हैं उन के साथ किसी प्रकार का दुर्व्यवहार न हो और अगर किसी अधिकारी ने उन के साथ कोई दुर्व्यवहार किया है तो उस के खिलाफ तुरन्त कार्यवाही की जानी चाहिए।

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Order please. Please bear in mind there can be no discussion. I do not allow any discussion on this.