

[Prof. Sher Singh]

(ii) Notification G.S. R. No. 290, dated the 6th March, 1972, publishing the Madras Coarse Grains (Export Control) Amendment Order, 1972.

(iii) Notification G. S. R. No. 194E, dated 17th March, 1972, publishing the Southern States (Regulation of Export of Rice) Amendment Order, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1607/72 for (i) to (iii)]

**THE SUGAR (CONTROL) THIRD
AMENDMENT ORDER, 1971**

PROF. SHER SINGH : Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table, under, sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Dept. of Food) Notification G. S. R. No. 100/Ess. Com./Sugar, dt. the 27th December, 1971, publishing the Sugar (Control) Third Amendment Order, 1971. [Placed in Library. See No. LT- 1556/72]

**I. ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED
ACCOUNTS (1969-70) OF THE SALAR
JUNG MUSEUM BOARD, HYDERABAD
AND RELATED PAPERS**

**II. ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED
ACCOUNTS (1970-71) OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
TRUSTEES OF THE VICTORIA
MEMORIAL HALL, CALCUTTA**

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE (PROF. D. P. YADAV) :—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) each of the following papers:—

1. (i) Annual Report and audited Accounts of the Salar Jung Museum Board, Hyderabad, for the year 1969-70.
- (ii) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying on the Table

the document mentioned at (i) above. [Placed in Library. See No. LT 1608/72 for (i) and (ii)]

- II. Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the Executive Committee of the Trustees of the Victoria Memorial Hall, Calcutta, for the year 1970-71. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1610/72]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

**THE ARMED FORCES (ASSAM AND MANIPUR)
SPECIAL POWERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972**

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report to the House the following message from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha.

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 28th March, 1972, agreed without any amendment to the Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers (Amendment) Bill, 1972, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th March, 1972."

**THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1972-73—
General Discussion—contd.**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA) : Now, we shall take up general discussion on the Budget. Yes, Mr. Kulkarni.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Sir, the Budget that has been presented has been by and large well received in this country. There are two sections of people now who have expressed their opinions on the Budget. One section says that it is encouraging so far as production

is concerned and the other says 'that it is not so and that a proper direction has not been given in respect of the policies of the Government in order to implement the promises given by the party which has come to power now with such a majority.

Sir, I am really grateful to the Prime Minister who has very recently, while replying to the Motion of Thanks to the President, said that there is need for re-thinking on economic priorities in this country. Sir, in her speech in the Rajya Sabha, Mrs. Gandhi said:

"I do have a strong feeling that the present economic thinking is not solving the problems of contemporary society anywhere not only in India but in the world. What other countries do is their concern but we in India must devise an economic system which makes sense to our social setting."

Sir, this should form the basis of the financial management and the economic management, as also the policies of the Government, and to devise a system which will meet the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, here the problems faced by the planner and the policy maker in a mixed economy are, first, that payments factor based on market prices would require extensive cross subsidisation which would not be warranted in terms of the existing cost price relationships and the technology adopted in terms of some set of 'accounting prices'. Secondly, as long as 'consumer sovereignty' is accepted, and unrestricted freedom of 'choice' given to the buyer, while the distribution of income is highly uneven, the flow of investment funds would continue to be in directions which may maximise neither welfare nor long-term growth. And, finally, even in relation to Public sector investments, the choice of techniques based on the concept of maximisation of welfare is likely to get into difficulties.

Why I say this is because I am amply convinced that in the present mixed economy pattern, attention is not given to these new challenges thrown up by the planning of the last three Plans. Sir, to me the most important problem seems to be, as I said, that there must be a highly egalitarian tax system so that the existing spread in incomes is sharply reduced and narrowed down. There must be strict control over the direction of investments by the private sector. There must be standardisation of simple consumer needs, and a very sharply accelerated production of such consumer goods, which may, if necessary be subsidised.

Sir, why I am bringing this matter before the House and before the Finance Minister is because the budget is an instrument for raising resources for the expenditure of the Government in the public interest. Sir, once you accept the mixed economy theory, it has been our experience that the lopsided development of monopolists has been created. There is another staggering problem, the problem of unemployment. There are protagonists of industry and big business saying that a free market economy should exist and fair play should be given to private sector. Now, Sir, I doubt these statements whether they will create an atmosphere and achieve the results which at least the Congress Party desires to achieve in the interest of the public.

Sir, I was really very much surprised. Very recently I came across a report of the Commission set up by the Nixon Administration two years ago which had emphasized the policy of free market forces to promote the social welfare objective. It is something revealing. Sir, even the leaders of capitalism in the world have come to this conclusion: The Government should adopt a different type of system which will create such circumstances. Very recently there was an article and a speech by Mr. Roy Jenkins, Deputy Leader of the Labour Party in the U. K. wherein he has emphasised on the importance of

[Shri A. G. Kulkarnil removing the gross unfairness which disfigured British society in spite of half a century of effort, mainly capitalist-oriented effort. Here is also another indication wherein in the world these two systems had brought under focus the maladies of the capitalist-oriented systems.

Sir, perhaps the most serious obstacle in the way to a sustained and high level of economic development is the social attitude of the urban-based class in this country. Why I have given the examples of these two systems is, to compare the maladies in the systems. The entire social attitude of the people at large has also to be changed. I draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to this elite which mainly consists of the middle class—both urban and rural. This class has not been able to impose any self-discipline on itself and is highly consumption-oriented. This is evident from the accelerated growth of non-productive tertiary sector of services and administration. The combined non-developmental expenditure of the Centre and the States has more than doubled in the last six years. It is appropriating to itself a larger and larger slice of the additional income. I think, if a proper assessment is made of these different manifestations in the Indian economy and if some procedure is evolved by the Government to curb these evils, a larger section of the population will be benefited.

What I was hinting at is that once you accept that a new economic system has to be developed, then the problems of industrial growth and unemployment come up—and I find here staggering unemployment. It is found that during the last three Plans a capitalist-based industry has been developed in this country which actually is the pride of the nation. But that capitalist-based industry has not solved the problem of unemployment because, though employment is created, that employment is not commensurate with the population growth and the labour force available.

Sir, the economic policies of the Government and the taxation system have to be revised and have to be reviewed. I will just give an example. There is a talk going on between the Industrial Development Ministry and the Finance Ministry on the proper methods by which the industrial development policy of the Government will achieve maximum production. In this connection, we see that while investment priorities are discussed, they are never practised. I recently came across a case where the import of a highly sophisticated bakery plant was licensed. This shows how perverse a thinking has developed in the ministry because, when you have got such a staggering unemployment problem, here is some Secretary sitting in the Government and sanctioning the import of a highly sophisticated bakery plant. What I want the Government to consider is that there must be some coordination in the avowed policies of the Government in the economic ministries—whether it is the Finance Ministry or the Industrial Development Ministry.

If you look at the record of, what is called, industrial growth, it is also not so happy. For that purpose, I think, the necessary techniques and technology have to be encouraged and adopted. And the Budget has to be reviewed and revised in the sense that in this country you must make capital very scarce and very costly for such type of sophisticated industries; you will have to give certain subsidies and certain concessions to capital investment so that employment is generated and, at least by the Fifth Five Year Plan, the backlog of unemployment is wiped out. I P.M. In this connection I am fully aware that it is not only resources that are necessary. I see in this Budget a very encouraging feature that the public sector investment has been raised by 22%. I am fully aware that it is the view of the mouth piece of the private sector that funds are not available and resources are not available and they have no desire to invest because of the various controls and constraints imposed by the Government like the

monopoly restriction, licensing, etc. The Finance Minister has provided roughly Rs. 700 crores to be invested in the public sector. When you say that you are going to develop a system in this country whereby the public sector will have a dominating voice or performance, then naturally the investment in the public sector has to be stepped up and naturally a corollary of it will be that the ancillary sector, that is the private sector dependent on the public sector will naturally grow and that is why I feel that the fear expressed by the mouthpiece of the private sector industries that the public sector investment will be infructuous is not convincing.

About the provisions in the Budget, the only criterion is development. Some studies have been made of various schemes like crash programme for unemployment, etc. The experience at the field level is that unless there is an institutional organisation to spend the amounts of money provided it will not help. They are not spending. So I say you should realise that mere provision of funds does not make any impact on the growth of the industry itself.

There are various problems that have been raised in the Budget. There is one about black money. The Finance Minister has been given the report of the Wanchoo Committee. There are indications available that a staggering amount of black money is being used in currency. It is used for hoarding sugar, grains, raw materials like cotton, etc. I do not understand how the Finance Minister has not evolved any process whereby this black money can be checked. I do not think that by any legislation this can be checked. The Government has to devise very stringent measures. The point arises, what are those measures? So many suggestions like demonetisation, giving more concessions so that the persons who are having black money may invest it etc. have been made. A practical suggestion will be something else. The Government

made efforts by giving some concessions but the black money has not come up to the extent that was desired. Today we find black money to the extent of Rs. 7,000 crores which is used for unproductive uses. I suggest the investment of this can be made in the backward areas and in the sector where employment generation will be more. Some such inducement should be given to those who are holding such money. It will be quite palatable to the persons having this money; otherwise, giving all types of penalties like sending them to jail will not help. This problem of black money deserves to be looked into immediately. 'Shank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA) : The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA) in the Chair.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Sir, I was a little surprised and also a little sorry to find that when such an important issue is being discussed we have to wait for the quorum. There is so little enthusiasm amongst the Members whether they belong to the opposition or to the Treasury Benches.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA) : More Members from our side are present.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : That is all right.

Sir, I wanted to begin by saying that this particular Budget is likely to prove deceptive unless we look at it from the proper angle. Firstly, as the Finance Minister himself has pointed out in his

[Shri N. G. Gorayl

speech, he had approached the House not once or twice but thrice during last year and this is the fourth time that he is coming before the House within a period of a year. Sir, as a result of the three demands, the supplementary demands and the demands contained in the original Budget, the taxation in a full year comes to nearly Rs. 500 crores. Some Members in the House had remarked that those of us who had observed during the election campaign that there would be a massive 'dose of taxation had been proved wrong.' Perhaps they neglected [to 'take note of this fact that already there was enough of taxation and, Sir, the fact is as a cartoon in the 'Eastern Economist' has pointed out, the Finance Minister is saying that "I have already harvested the field three times in a year and there is hardly anything left now to harvest." So, Sir,] we must look at this Budget as the fourth attempt to mop up as much finance as possible for the implementation of our plans. The second point, Sir, is that another slogan has been raised; even the President in his Address has talked of *Aniilc Swaraj*. I do not know whether this is another sophisticated way of relegating the slogan of *Gharibi Hatao* to the background and now presenting the people with a new slogan *Arilik Swaraj* which has not been defined anywhere. What does this *Arthik Swaraj* mean? *Arthik Swaraj* must mean that we stand on our own legs within a reasonable time, and must mean what was said repeatedly in this House and in the other House about ten years back that after the Third Plan we shall reach the take-off stage. This only can be the meaning of *Arthik Swaraj*. From this point of view I would like to judge the promises that were held out by the Finance Minister. Sir, last time the Finance Minister himself gave us the criteria, and without going into details I would only draw his attention to paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 of his speech last year. Sir, he had suggested that the four pillars which will

decide the success or otherwise of last year's Budget were that there should be no shortfalls in our projected plans and the Plan should be fulfilled *in toto*. The next criterion was that there should be price stability. The third criterion was that there should be reduction in the number of unemployed, and the fourth criterion was that sizable yields should flow from the public sector. Sir, I would like to request the Finance Minister to apply these yard-sticks and to tell us frankly whether any of these has been fulfilled. Sir, I make bold to say that none of these criteria has been fulfilled, the projects have not been completed, and a very eloquent testimony to this was supplied a few days back in this House by the Minister in charge of irrigation while replying to a Calling Attention Notice on the failure of electricity supply. It is a very long statement and in that he has said that project after project has failed, *viz.*, the Idikki project, the Dhuvra-ran project, the Bhatinda project. In respect of Koyna, Tarapore and Nasik, all these are running in such a way that there is not an adequate supply of electricity. There is a regular crisis so far as Maharashtra and Gujarat are concerned. The consequence is that in a State like Gujarat alone the loss incurred is to the tune of Rs. 55 lakhs per day. Most probably the loss incurred in Maharashtra will be on a larger scale. Therefore, so far as the completion of the projects is concerned and their efficient running is concerned, there is a shortfall not only in a few projects but almost in all projects, while electricity is in demand everywhere. The Irrigation Minister is now thinking of having a sort of all-India body to supervise the work of power generation.

Now, Sir, so far as prices are concerned, the less said the better. Only a few days back there was a discussion here about the price of sugar. The Minister had to admit that these are runaway prices and

that the Government was really at a loss to know how to control the price of sugar. I am referring to only a single commodity because this is a commodity which has been deluding us for the last twenty years and in spite of all our attempt to check it, regulate it and control it, we have not been able to do so.

The unemployment problem is there growing every day. So far as sizeable yields from the public Sector are concerned, we are in the doldrums. The only difference between the position obtaining last year and this year is that it is not only the public sector which is facing difficulties, but the private sector also. The rate of growth has fallen so much that the President in his Address, the Finance Minister in his Speech and also the 'Economic Survey' which has been given to us, all of them have voiced their concern. Nobody knows how to deal with this problem. We are talking of increasing productivity, but what is happening is that year after year it is coming down. The highest peak of production or the rate of growth that we ever had reached so far is 71 per cent. If you look at other countries, you will find that 71 per cent per year is no growth at all. It is some sort of growth. When a country says that 71 per cent is the peak of its growth rate, it means that its performance is very poor indeed. Now, Sir, I was trying to find out whether any diagnosis in depth has been made of the stagnation that is taking place. Why is it that continuous stagnation is taking place? The ready alibi or excuse is there was a war and the Bangla Desh problem was there. I would like to state that many times it has happened that war has not slackened growth, but it has given encouragement to growth. There were two world wars, the first and the second, and perhaps you will agree with me that our industrial development was faster during these two periods. So far as our war with Pakistan is concerned, I do not think there was much of a destruction here. So, this should not be used as an alibi. There

are other causes and it is these causes which we should try to probe into.

I for one feel that one of the causes in that we have not as yet decided which model we want to follow. There are two clear-cut ways. One is free economy as they are practising, for instance, in Japan or in Singapore or in other nations. Then there is the totalitarian economy, as they are practising it in China or in Soviet Russia. We want to have a judicious mixture of the two. I would like to ask the Government whether they have really come to a stage where they can now say with confidence that they have found the third alternative. I feel that I will not be wrong if I submit that we are still groping and because we are now groping, nobody is feeling assured. The industrial community is not feeling assured; we are not able to gear up the public sector, and an atmosphere of suspicion and suspense hangs over the entire economy of India. I would like to request the Finance Minister to spell out whether they are going progressively in the direction of economy in which the Government will control the entire industrial sector or whether they really want to have a middle course where free enterprise will be there to a certain extent and the commanding heights will be controlled by the Government.

If this is not so, then I would say that it is time that the Industrial Policy Resolution should be really recast in the light of what is happening today and what we want to achieve tomorrow. There should be no suspense at all. I have seen representatives from the biggest houses saying that they do not feel enthusiastic. The capital has become shy. Why is it so? Let us try to find out. Therefore, I would certainly welcome a clear-cut definition or enunciation of the Government's policy so far as the economic policy is concerned.

You will find and you will be surprised perhaps, as I was surprised, that even in the Monopoly Commission there are differences, some members holding a particular view and

ISHRI N. G. Goray] others holding another's view, and they have now come in the open, and people are discussing freely as to what should be the function of the Monopoly Commission.

Sir, I think that capital has become shy and we are finding ourselves in a stage of stagnation because there is another avenue in which capital can be invested and where the returns are bigger. I am referring to the black market. Sir, so many Members here have expressed their concern about black money. And even my friend, Mr. Raju, yesterday was frank enough to say that if the black money is not controlled or eliminated, it may even go to the extent of corrupting the politics of this country.

AN HON. MEMBER : It has already corrupted.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Well, I was happy to find out that he was bold enough to say that. Now, Sir, how this black money affects our life, has been very well expressed by one of our prominent journalists, Mr. Romesh Thapar, in the Economic and Political Weekly of 18th March, 1972. He says—

"An economist urges that black money must be hit or else the system will flounder. The ruling politician agrees wholeheartedly. But the truth of today is that black money is the fuel that keeps the ruling party dominant."

This is the comment of an every distinguished journalist like Mr. Romesh Thapar. Sir, we have to go to the root of the matter. I had mentioned this particular fact in my speech on the Budget last year also as to how you are going to put an end to this parallel economy which is corrupting our social and political life and asked : How do you propose to do that ? I had suggested that there should be demonetisation. Wherever, this suggestion has been made, the Government has said that it is not possible for various reasons. All right.

If this is not possible, please tell us how you are going to tackle this problem. If you do not do so, then you will find that everywhere the black money will be in conflict with the good money and the good money will be thrown out. And there may be more and more people participating in this underground economy which you just cannot control. Prices of land are being pushed up. Prices of commodities are being pushed up. Smuggling of gold and other things is going on on such a vast scale that only a few days back when I had occasion to talk to some naval officers, they said that it was only during these 14 days of war with Pakistan that we could stop this smuggling on the western coast. Now again the sea-lanes are open and smuggling is going on merrily.

Sir, I would like to suggest to the Finance Minister that if at all we have to come to this conclusion that gold is one of the main commodities which are leading to this black market and people cannot be persuaded not to buy gold, then why not the Government itself purchase gold outside and sell it here to the people ? There will be a big margin between the purchase money and the sale money. Instead of these smugglers getting all the advantage by selling it at Rs. 250/- while they purchase it at Rs. 60/- or Rs. 70 per tola, why should the Government itself not bring gold and here sell it to the people and have the money for themselves ? The money so earned can be used for many industrial and other projects. This would be one of the good ways of stopping smuggling in commodities like nylon, wrist watches, fountain pens, transistors and, above all, in gold. Instead of the people buying it somewhere else, let the Government itself do this business and get money out of it.

I have another suggestion to make. I had suggested last time, and I would like to repeat, that some ten or twelve commodities which are needed by the poor throughout the country should be provided to them by the Government at fixed prices throughout

the land. Some of those commodities are cotton goods, rock oil, cereals, sugar etc. It is very easy to find out what these commodities are. And this practice is being followed in other countries. I have seen this practice in Eastern Europe. There so far as bread and some other essential commodities are concerned, they are all controlled and sold at cheaper prices. If we do the same thing here, then something in the nature of *garibi hatao* can be achieved. But if we do not do it and if the prices go on increasing, then our promise to the common man, whether we belong to the Opposition or to the ruling party, will be really a fraud on the people, and I do not want this Parliament to indulge in such a malpractice.

Then I would say a few words about the social aspect of our Plan. Sir this *garibi hatao* is a good slogan. I would not like to make fun of that. And now we have reached a stage where our representatives in the Human Rights Commission have persuaded the organisation to accept next year or some other year as the *garibi hatao* year. So we have raised the slogan to an international status. Only the people will ask whether we are really serious about it. It only proves that our friends in other countries are quite gullible and just as people here have swallowed it without knowing what it means, perhaps the world also has swallowed it without knowing that we mean by it. What do we mean by this slogan *garibi hatao*? I would like to point out here that in their thesis on 'Poverty in India', Dr. Dandekar and Dr. Rath have told us in unambiguous words what poverty in India is and what will have to be done if you want to eliminate poverty. Sir, I would just read a few sentences. This is what they say :

"The richer sections of the population which today enjoy levels of living much higher than the minimum to be assured to the poor, must bear the burden of this programme. A 15 per cent cut in the consumer expenditure of the richest, 5 per cent of the rural and the

urban population and a 7 per cent cut in the consumer expenditure of the 5 per cent rich below them is all that is needed. The burden is not great if the rich will see reason."

That is the most significant sentence — "if the rich see reason"; I would add, "If the Government also sees reason". The rich are not going to surrender voluntarily their riches. It is for the Government to take action. The Finance Minister has very rightly pointed out that the Budget is one of the means of bringing about social change. But I would like to ask him: Has the massive mandate, which they got last year and which was renewed this year given them the courage to follow Dr. Dandekar's advice? It may not be literally followed. There may be some modifications here and there. But I would again ask him whether the Budget that he has presented has any relation whatsoever with the high promises that they have held out to the people during the elections. I see no connection at all. It is the same old Budget, only with a little flavour of socialism added to it. Sir, this is not going to solve the problem. The problem is very deep. Unless the Government has got the courage of its conviction and it is ready to displease some sections, it will not be possible to eradicate poverty and it will not be able to translate the slogan of *garibi hatao* into a reality.

Sir, in this regard I would like to conclude by reading out to you what Gandhiji had said on one occasion. I know that Gandhiji is out of fashion now. But still many times when I read what he has written, I feel that it has great relevance to what we are doing to-day. He had said :

"I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt or when the self becomes too much with you, try the following expedient. Recall the face of the poorest and the most helpless man whom you may have seen and ask yourself if the step you

[Shri N. G. Goray] contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he be able to gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to Swaraj or self-rule for the hungry and also spiritually strayed millions of our countrymen? Then you will find your doubts and self melting away."

To my mind, Sir, it is a very significant pregnant passage. If what the President said in his Address means anything—that we are trying to reach *arthik swamj*—then this is what it should mean. This has already been defined by Gandhiji. I would only ask whether the treasury benches, the Finance Minister, the Cabinet have the courage to follow what the Father of the Nation had said.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (राजस्थान) :
 उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, गत वर्ष जो बजट वित्त मंत्री महोदय लेकर आए थे उस बजट के आधार पर वह कह सकते हैं कि देश में इस प्रकार के कारण उत्पन्न हुए, इस तरह से बंगला देश के शरणार्थी आए और जो युद्ध पाकिस्तान के साथ हमको लड़ना पड़ा उसके कारण से जिस प्रकार की प्रगति की अपेक्षा उनको थी या जिस प्रकार से बजट में रखे गए प्रावधान का उपयोग करने की उनकी इच्छा थी वह नहीं कर पाए, लेकिन पिछले वर्ष के बजट के लागू होते ही जो स्थिति देश में पैदा हुई थी उसका बंगला देश से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था। बजट के लागू होते समय एक साधारण चर्चा इस बात की चली थी कि बजट के कारण मंहगाई बढ़ी है। वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने बार-बार इससे इनकार किया और मंहगाई बढ़ने का कारण बंगला देश की समस्या को बताया। वे परिस्थिति से बचना चाहते थे लेकिन गत वर्ष के बजट से मंहगाई जरूर बढ़ी।

दूसरी चीज जो उनको कहनी चाहिए थी वह यह कि वेकारी उन्मूलन की दृष्टि से, रोजगार देने की दृष्टि से जो प्रावधान उन्होंने रखे थे उन प्रावधानों का उपयोग हम कर पाए या नहीं कर पाए। स्थिति साफ है कि जितना उनको करना चाहिए था जितना वार्षिक योजना में रखा था उसका उपयोग हम नहीं कर पाए और इस नाते से आज देश के अन्दर यह स्थिति है।

इस बात का दावा कांग्रेस के लोग करते हैं कि हमने चुनाव जीते हैं। चुनाव उन्होंने जीते, इसमें कोई दो रायें नहीं हो सकती लेकिन चुनाव अपनी आर्थिक नीतियों के कारण नहीं जीते हैं। बंगला देश के कारण से जो भी स्थिति देश में पैदा हुई और जिसका क्रेडिट कांग्रेस को बड़ी मात्रा में गया, सरकार को भी गया उसकी हवा में वे जीते या वैसा हो सकता है जो कल डा० महावीर कह रहे थे—जिस पर हमारे मंत्री जी नाराज भी हुए—और गोरे साहब भी कह रहे थे कि ब्लेक मनी कांग्रेस के लिए वरदान सिद्ध हो रहा है। वही सबसे बड़ा कारण है। चुनाव में जीतने का। एक-एक चुनाव क्षेत्र में—चाहे वह विधान सभा का हो या कहीं का हो—दो-दो, चार-चार लाख रुपया खर्च किया गया। जब कम्पनीज के द्वारा चन्दा देने की व्यवस्था नहीं है, तो यह रुपया कहां से आता है। ब्लेक मनी के आधार पर समझौता चाहे वित्त मंत्री जी के माध्यम से हो, चाहे विदेश व्यापार मंत्री जी के माध्यम से, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को लूटने के लिए बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपतियों से इन्होंने सांठगांठ की है। उसी का परिणाम आज इतनी बड़ी मात्रा में सारे देश में आया। वे लोग रुपया कम्पनी के खाते में से या घर के खाते में से देने वाले नहीं हैं। सारा ब्लेक मनी कांग्रेस के चन्दे के अन्दर आया और उसी का

परिणाम है कि चुनाव के सारे नियमों को तोड़ कर दो-दो, तीन-तीन लाख रुपया चुनाव में खर्च होता है। जो हमारे यहां हुआ है यह रुपए की जीत है, ब्लेक मनी की जीत है, कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्तों की जीत नहीं है। इसलिए अगर गवं करें कि हमने बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में चुनाव जीता है, तो जीता जरूर है लेकिन पिछले वर्ष के बजट में जो नीतियां रखी थीं कि रोजगार मिलेगा, गरीबी हटेगी समाज के अन्दर नई चेतना आएगी इसके कारण प्रसन्न होकर लोगों ने वोट दिया है, यह बात नहीं हो सकती। एक फंक्टर बंगला देश का था, यह मैं मान सकता हूँ, उसके कारण उनकी प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ी है, लेकिन उसके बावजूद अगर इस मात्रा में कांग्रेस रुपया खर्च न करती, तो वह परिणाम न आता जो आया। बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों से कारखानेदारों से उनकी साठगांठ है और उसके परिणामस्वरूप रुपया उनको मिला है और उस रुपए का उपयोग चुनावों में हुआ है और उसके कारण यह स्थिति हमारे सामने आई है।

जैसा कि इस वर्ष के बजट के बारे में गोरे साहब प्रतिक्रिया प्रगट कर रहे थे, कुछ थोड़ा बहुत आंकड़ों के हेरफेर के अलावा हम कोई नई चीज देख सकें, ऐसा लगता नहीं। विशेष रूप से जहां बेकारी उन्मूलन या गरीबी हटाओ की बात कही जाती है, देश में लोगों को रोजगार मिले, इसके लिए साधनों की व्यवस्था नए बजट में रखनी थी। इस नाते से मुख्य रूप से मैं वित्त मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट करूंगा कि देहातों में—शहरों में बेकारी होगी—गांवों में जो नई बेकारी फैलती जा रही है उसको मिटाने की दृष्टि से लघु सिंचाई योजनाओं के ऊपर सरकार को विशेष रूप से ध्यान देना चाहिए। इस वर्ष के योजनागत व्यय के

अन्दर उसके सम्बन्ध में बहुत कम प्रावधान है। आप नारा तक लगा सकते हैं जब आप हर खेत में पानी दें। पानी की व्यवस्था करने के सम्बन्ध में आज आपकी योजनाएं कार्यान्वित हो रही हैं। लेकिन आज सिंचाई के लिए ही पानी की व्यवस्था का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि आज हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ऐसी स्थिति है कि पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था भी हर गांव में अभी तक नहीं हो पाई है। आज आप बड़े-बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स लागू करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स के लिये जितना प्रावधान करना चाहिये उतना प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है। यह एक बहुत बड़ी आवश्यकता है जिसके आधार पर हम कह सकते हैं कि उसके पूरा होने पर हम सफलता प्राप्त कर सकेंगे। पिछले दो तीन वर्षों से हरी क्रान्ति की बहुत चर्चा की जाती है, उसमें मुख्यतः जो खाद्यान्न है उनमें हम कहते हैं कि हम लोगों ने आत्म निर्भरता प्राप्त कर ली है। लेकिन आज भी हमको जो हमारी कामशियल क्रॉप्स हैं, खासकर रुई उसके लिये दुनिया के दूसरे देशों पर निर्भर रहना पड़ता है और उसका हमको आयात करना पड़ता है। आज हम सौ करोड़ रुपया इस रुई का आयात करने के लिए खर्च करते हैं। क्या इस रुपये को हम अपने देश में खर्च करके यहाँ ही रुई पैदा करने की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकते थे? इस नाते मैं अपने प्रांत की बात आप से कहना चाहूंगा। अगर हमारी सरकार इस ओर ध्यान दे, तो रेगिस्तान का बहुत बड़ा क्षेत्र राजस्थान में है और एक्सपर्ट्स की राय है कि वहां बहुत अच्छी रुई और कपास पैदा की जा सकती है। मिश्र की तरह की रुई भी वहां पैदा की जा सकती है, तो उसको पैदा करने की दृष्टि से कोई बड़ा प्रोजेक्ट हमारी सरकार बनाये। लघु सिंचाई योजनाओं से वहां का काम नहीं चल सकता और जहां तक प्रान्त

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

की सरकार का सवाल है वह राजस्थान नहर को पूरा नहीं कर सकती। वह उसके अपने सामर्थ्य के बाहर की बात है। जितना आप उसको प्रति वर्ष देते हैं उस सारे का भी यदि वह उपयोग करे, तो भी कई वर्षों में जाकर भी वह राजस्थान नहर को पूरा नहीं कर सकती। तो अगर इसको हम एक नया प्रोजेक्ट मानकर पूरा करावें, तो हमारी इकोनामी पर, हमारा जो इंपोर्ट है उस पर, हमारे खाद्यान्नों पर और हमारी दूसरी कामशियल क्राप्स पर इसका बहुत बड़ा और अच्छा असर पड़ सकता है। वह इतना बड़ा प्रोजेक्ट है और वहाँ उसके लिए जमीन इतनी ज्यादा मात्रा में है कि उसका उपयोग करके हम बहुत से क्षेत्रों में आत्म निर्भर हो सकते हैं। वहाँ पानी बहुत काफी मात्रा में है, लेकिन अगर उसमें कोई बावक है, तो वह है केन्द्रीय सरकार और केन्द्रीय सरकार उसको करना नहीं चाहती। लेकिन अगर केन्द्रीय सरकार इस प्रोजेक्ट को अपने हाथ में लेकर उसको पूरा करती है, तो सारे देश की योजनाओं पर इसका असर पड़ेगा, और सारे देश में अनाज की दृष्टि से हम आत्मनिर्भर बनेंगे, कामशियल क्राप्स की दृष्टि से भी हम आत्मनिर्भर बन सकेंगे और तेल पैदा करने के क्षेत्र में भी हम तमाम चीजों का उत्पादन कर सकेंगे वशतें कि सरकार इस ओर ध्यान दे। हमारी स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, वे गांव के आदमी को रोजगार देने का साधन हैं। मैंने कहा कि सरकार को जहाँ से पैसा मिलता है, कांग्रेस को जहाँ से पैसा मिलता है, वहाँ ही उनका विस्तार होगा। दो दिन पहले यहाँ बहुत से उद्योगपति इकट्ठे हुए थे, प्रधान मंत्री ने उनसे भी इसकी चर्चा की होगी। स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज का जो सेक्टर है वही कांग्रेस का आधार है। महात्मा गांधी ने इसी को आधार बनाकर

अपनी सारी आर्थिक नीति की रचना की थी और सारे देश की आजादी का आन्दोलन उसी पर निर्भर करता था, लेकिन आपके टैक्स के कारण, वह सब बेमानी हो गया है। रसायनिक खाद पर आपने जो टैक्स लगाया है उसका प्रभाव सभी पर पड़ता है। जहाँ भी पानी जाता है उस पर टैक्स है। छोटा किसान भी उसका उपयोग करता है। स्टील पर और दूसरी चीजों पर आपने टैक्स लगाया और उसका परिणाम यह है कि जो लघु उद्योग वाले हैं उन पर इसका असर पड़ेगा।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज देश में इस प्रकार का वातावरण है और विशेषतौर पर पाकिस्तान की लड़ाई के बाद, उसमें जिस प्रकार हमारी विजय हुई है उसके परिणामस्वरूप स्वाभाविक रूप से लोगों में एक राष्ट्रीय चेतना आयी है और उसके आधार पर सेल्फ रिलायंस का, आत्मनिर्भरता का नारा सरकार की ओर से दिया जा रहा है। लेकिन इस नाते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमको दुनिया के दूसरे देशों से पूंजी लेनी पड़ती है, टेक्निक लेनी पड़ती है। हमने इस बारे में पहले एक सुझाव दिया था कि अगर हमको आवश्यकता है, तो हम लें, दुनिया के दूसरे देशों से मदद लें, लेकिन आज चीन जो साम्यवादी है वह भी दूसरे देशों से उधार लेता है, लेकिन वह वर्ल्ड के मार्केट में जाता है और कामशियल आधार पर टेंडर इन्वाइट करके अपना काम करता है। उसके यहाँ स्टील प्लांट वेस्ट जर्मनी बैठा रहा है जो उसको टेंडर के आधार पर दिया गया है। हम दुनिया के देशों से जहाँ फंस गये वहाँ फंस गये, स्टील के मामले में, खाद के मामले में, चाहे हम अमरीका से फंसे या रूस से, किसी भी दुनिया के देश से किसी प्रोजेक्ट के आधार पर, लेकिन जब

हम किसी दूसरे देश से पूंजी के आघार पर या टेक्निक के आघार पर सहायता लेते हैं तो उसमें हमारा आत्मनिर्भरता का सवाल अचूरा रह जाता है। ऐसा करके हम आत्मनिर्भर नहीं हो सकते। तो इस नाते हमने सरकार से कहा है कि आप लें जरूर, टेक्निक की दृष्टि से भी हम लें और पूंजी की दृष्टि से भी हम लें, लेकिन उसके लिए अगर हम ओपन मार्केट में जाते हैं और वहां पर देख कर लेते हैं तो वह अच्छा होगा। दुनिया के किसी देश से हम बंधे नहीं।

हमने काले धन को समाप्त करने के लिए भी एक बात कही थी कि आप जो लाइसेंस देते हैं विदेशों से माल लाने के लिए जो परमिट आप देते हैं, वह आप कुछ लोगों को ही देते हैं। उसके लिए आप क्यों नहीं ओपन मार्केट में उनको बेचते। लोग उसके लिए बोली लगायेंगे और आपको उनका ज्यादा दाम मिलेगा और जो कुछ लोग ब्लैकमार्केटिंग करते हैं उनको लेकर, जो एक्चुअल कन्ज्यूमर नहीं हैं उसको वह चीजें पहुंच नहीं पाती हैं, वह रुकेगा। फारेन एक्सचेंज के माध्यम से जो लोग इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस लेते हैं वे लोग उसको बेच कर बीच में मुनाफा कमाते हैं। क्या आप इसको कम नहीं कर सकते? यह मुनाफाखोरी कम हो सकती है, लेकिन सवाल है कि तब कांप्रेस के पास पैसा कहां से आयेगा। ऐसा करने से ब्लैक मनी पर भी रोक लगेगी और माल एक्चुअल कन्ज्यूमर्स तक पहुंच सकेगा। आप के पास अपनी आय के श्रोत बढ़ाने का यह एक साधन है और आप अपनी आय इससे बढ़ा सकते हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी ने पिछली बार भी कहा था कि हम इस बारे में विचार करेंगे कि क्या जो इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस हम देते हैं किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को, वह उसको न दिया जाकर क्या बेचा जा सकता है और

देखेंगे कि उससे सरकार को ज्यादा प्राप्ति हो सकती है या नहीं। लेकिन इसके बारे में उन्होंने इस बार भी कोई योजना नहीं रखी। मैं वित्त मंत्रों जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस दृष्टि से विचार करें। इससे सरकार के साधन बढ़ेंगे और जिन लोगों को जिस चीज की आवश्यकता है उनको वह चीज मिल सकेगी। इतना ही मैं कहना चाहूंगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA): Yes, Mr Schamnad.

SHRI HA MID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy to see that the Finance Minister, while placing the Budget, has not made any taxation proposals which would directly affect the command man. Sir, I am extremely happy to note that.

Sir, our country had to pass through critical days and we did face all these critical days very bravely and with dignity. By November, 1971, millions of people sought shelter on our soil and our Government looked after those helpless and bold people in a very dignified way.

Sir, the events of the past days will cast their shadows in the coming months and I hope, Sir, the Government will bear them with grace. Sir, many Members of this House were proposing to the Government to bring rural wealth under the purview of the Income-Tax Act. I may submit, Sir, that it would definitely hamper the growth of rural wealth, firstly because rural wealth has come under agricultural income-tax and many of the States in the South, especially States like Kerala, have taxed agricultural wealth. A cultivator who has got an income of more than Rs. 5,000 per year has to pay agricultural income-tax and as the income increases the income-tax also increases and at certain levels Sir, he has to pay super-tax on the agricultural income. So also a cultivator has to pay, apart from agricultural income-

[Shri Hamid Ali Scbamnad]

tax, plantation tax and also he has to pay basic tax. So it will be a great burden if agricultural property also is brought under income-tax. This source of income should be left to the States so that States may tax agricultural properties.

Sir, another point I should like to stress is about wealth-tax. Now, property worth Rs. 1 lakh has been exempted from the purview of wealth-tax. But when a man has got property worth Rs. 2 lakhs, he has to pay wealth-tax on the entire Rs. 2 lakhs. In many cases it has been brought to our notice that a man has to pay more wealth tax than income-tax. That would definitely hamper at least the middle class people. So what I would submit is that at least a man should be exempted from paying wealth-tax completely on the first lakh, to the extent of Rs. 5 lakhs. Thereafter the entire property could be considered for wealth-tax.

May I take this opportunity to bring to the notice of the Government how far Kerala has been neglected in all spheres of developments. Kerala has been neglected. I do not say that Kerala State should be given more powers as it is being demanded by other States. But I definitely say that Kerala should be given more financial help, more financial assistance and more money for its development. This is absolutely necessary for her development.

Fisheries is one of the most important economics of Kerala. Kerala has got a lengthy coastal area and the Government of Kerala has prepared a master plan by which they could increase the catches and also provide colonies for the poor fishermen and a/so provide educational facilities for the children of fishermen. A master plan has been prepared and sent to the Government of India for their consent and for their financial aid. So far there has been no response from the Centre. This is one important example by which I draw the attention of the Government to show how far Kerala is being neglected.

Again, Sir, recently the Kerala Government has prepared a housing scheme. As we all know, Kerala has been a thickly populated area. They have dearth of houses. So a scheme has been prepared by the Government of Kerala for the landless poor people. The project has been submitted to the Government of India for their approval and for their financial aid. Green signal has not been given by the Government. This also may be considered and a favourable reaction may be given to the Government of Kerala.

Another thing, Sir, is with regard to the aerodrome at Calicut. Calicut is a very important city, an ancient city, and a historical city. Once upon a time Calicut used to have trade with Arab and other foreign countries. Now Calicut has been cut away from the rest of the cities of India and such an important city as Calicut, which is a commercial city, which is a city with historical background, which had trade with foreign countries before the British came to this land, even such a city is being neglected *in toto*. It was a long desire of the people of Malabar and Kerala to have an aerodrome at Calicut. Repeated requests have been made to the Government of India. But somehow because of the financial difficulty or technical difficulties, matters have been brushed aside. I appeal to the Government to see that an aerodrome at Calicut is provided immediately so that Calicut is also connected with the rest of the cities of India.

Another important matter, which the Government should consider, is a minor port at Kasargode. Kasargode is the border of Mysore and Kerala State. A good number of vessels come to Kasargode and go from there and because of lack of port at Kasargode the vessels now go to Mangalore Port. So the vessels and small ships are not able to come to Kasargode. There was a proposal by the Government of Kerala which had been sent to the Government of India to convert Kasargode as a minor port. That is pending with the Government. I I appeal to the Government to consider it

and see that the Kasargode port is developed as a minor port.

There is a proposal in the Budget to give loans to small people at low rates of interest. I really welcome that move. Everybody would welcome it because the common man or a poor man may have a lot of enthusiasm and he may be enterprising but he may not have money. Now he can go to a bank and get loans at low rates of interest and invest that money in any of the enterprises he likes. But all these good schemes are made use of by the rich people. Now in the villages, in the Blocks and Panchayats many schemes are there to help the poor but all these are made use of by the rich people, the rich farmer. For example, he may be an influential man and if he wants money what he does is to give his property in the name of his wife or children and then he may go to the Bank and ask for money under this provision saying that he has no property and he must be given money. In such a way he may influence the bank and get the money in his name; otherwise the money may be given in the name of his wife or children. This misuse should not be there and the Government should see that it should be given strictly only to deserving men who would make use of that money by investing it in such a way as to improve the wealth of the country. With these words, I conclude.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi):
Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am grateful to have this opportunity to address the House just before I have the privilege to retire from here. With the privilege of belonging to the House I did whatever service I could render as one of the Members and mostly as a Congress woman whatever service I could render I was very much privileged to do that. These have been interesting and fruitful years and perhaps years of some service that I could render.

I would like to say a few words and as usual they will be frank. Particularly I would like to say a few words about Delhi

because it is where I come from, I have some obligations to the people of Delhi, and the Union Territory of Delhi. The Prime Minister had promised that powers would be given to the Metropolitan Council about 5 or 6 years back and a good deal of time has lapsed since then and now that her party is in power—of course whether her Party will be asking for powers or not I do not know—I think it will be in the Interest of democratic process in Delhi as well as for rendering service to the people of Delhi that as far as possible more powers should be given to the Metropolitan Council so that they can render service to the people of Delhi. Of course they have a setup only to recommend or only have a debating society. They have the power to discuss and to recommend. These are only the powers that the Metropolitan Council of Delhi can enjoy and you would appreciate, and so would other Members, that when you have only the powers to discuss and recommend, of course not much can be done. The Prime Minister and her Party have a massive mandate and they have the obligation to really deliver the goods and they have all the opportunity also and I think it is very necessary and high time that this particular opportunity is used by the Congress to deliver the goods as quickly as possible and further delays will be very harmful, particularly to the people and the Ruling Party. I hope at least they realise this situation. If the Congress lost hold in Delhi some years back, I think some of the Ministers in the Government of India are responsible because they were unfortunately if I may say so, in league with the Jana Sangh. They were surreptitiously and quietly helping and collaborating with the Congress in Delhi was demolished by some of the high-ups in the Governments, by those in high authority and by the Big Business as well. Gradually the Congress hold over Delhi was being eroded. We saw it, we complained about it, we talked about it all the time but nothing was done. Ironically some Ministers who were representing Delhi at that time were themselves the tools

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

and instruments through which the decline and fall of the Congress in Delhi came about. I am glad that ultimately Shrimati Indira Gandhi has been able to rescue Delhi from the Jana Sangh. I think there should be secular forces; they should operate. I think that the democratic process should also operate whether it is Delhi or the whole of India. To that extent I am very happy that the ruling Congress has come back into power. There has to be equal opportunity for everybody; there has to be equality of all human beings and all religions and all sections of people have to be treated alike. Therefore this coming back of the Congress and the exit of the Jana Sangh is a great advantage. The hand that some of the Central Government Ministers had their, functioning was such that the Jana Sangh was able to have more and more hold in Delhi at the cost of the Delhi Congress and it became a job for the Delhi Congress later to rescue Delhi from Jana Sangh. And by the stroke of luck or hard work or whatever it may be, and as a result of a large number of promises to the people of Delhi and to the people of India generally the Congress has come back to power and to that extent it is very good. The point here is that more power should be given to Delhi; they should not have any inhibitions even to go in for a State Assembly responsible to the people who are their electorates and with powers to administer the territory.

I may say a few words about the business houses who also control or who have vested interests in the country. They make or mar you and your political career no matter which party you happen to be in; whether you are in the Indicate or Syndicate or you are socialist or a CPI or CPM, it is the shadow of the long arm of the Big Business that controls the affairs of the people in the country. I hope that Shrimati Indira Gandhi will break some of these strangleholds and their unholy control over politics, over bureaucracy, in fact over life in India.

I hope she will take a few stern steps to liberate this country from this stranglehold of the Big Business. It is very necessary. She must be aware that this is the very vested interest which at one time was working day and night against Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru; it is the same vested interest again which was off and on working against Indira Gandhi also; it is the same vested interest which has worked against many people who have been persecuted, harassed and bothered. This vested interest is already spread out everywhere; it is there in the bureaucracy, it is there in the secretariat of the Government of India; it is there among the Ministers, it is there among the high ups; it is here here, there everywhere. It is very unfortunate for the country, unfortunate for the people of this land and it must be done away with and the sooner the better. I have seen how this works. Some years back suddenly some name came up recommended by some Birla Minister in the Central Government for chairmanship of the Municipal Committee and he happened to be a Birla man.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

The Birla Minister in the Central Government wanted to foist a Birla man as Chairman of the Delhi Municipal Committee and that was how this man came to be the Chairman of the Delhi Municipal Committee at the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He did not have any majority; he did not have any backing but because of machinations like these such J P.M. people could come into power. So also you bring into power many people. They are only the representatives of vested interests. They are the representatives and creatures and creations of the big business houses. They are produced by them. Their images are built up by the press because the press also is under the control of those very big business houses. Their path is cleared of all obstacles. If they are bad people, they are

made out to be very good people and the very good and nice people, the other contestants in the field, they are all blacked out or some other treatment is meted out by the press and the vested interest to the others. This is a vicious circle and this vicious circle must be finished in this land. Thing must come to an end. All this vicious atmosphere must be stopped, and only the Ruling Congress can do it. Correctly and slowly but they must do it some time or other. But this is a very unhealthy trend that those people are going to have a lot of say or come to power or be there because they are backed or sponsored by business houses. That is not a healthy sign for democracy and that is not a very healthy sign for them. At one time when the Prime Minister's name came up as a candidate for Prime Ministership, it was these very newspapers which were running her down and which were belittling her. When these very vested interests were working against Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and when some of these matters were brought to the notice of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, her own personal staff, her own personal secretariat leaked out the news to the vested interests and their representatives. I do not think Shrimati Indira Gandhi knows what her own personal staff did at that time. Instead of helping Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru during the time of crisis, when he was facing a life and death issue in 1962, it is her own personal staff who leaked out the news from her own office about some of the matters which sent to her, which were informed to her. This is only by the way and I think this is an unhealthy trend which should be done away with. And this should be done away with through democracy.

Then I would like to say one or two more words about the Budget on the other sense. I refer to some of the taxes which have been levied on steel, on fertilizers, in kerosene, etc, and I hope the Finance Minister will be good enough to remove them and particularly the tax on kerosene. It is the superior quality of kerosene that

has been taxed, but it does hit the people because the prices of all articles will be raised in the market and the prices have not been controlled by the Government, and the Government is not making any efforts and in spite of our repeatedly saying it for the last ten years in every Budget speech that the prices should be controlled, the Government has not been able to control the prices so far at all, and they don't seem to be serious about it either. When the Prime Minister herself was the Finance Minister, the result was the same. When Morarji Bhai was here, the result was the same. Now Mr. Chavan is the Finance Minister and I hope he will do something. If they can tackle this problem, a very great service would be rendered to the whole country. If the prices can be controlled, the people can get a bit of relief. The basic minimum facilities must be ensured to all the people in the country, and then only other sections of the people should be served. The other good services may percolate to other sections of the community, but a certain basic minimum must be ensured to everybody in this country before other things percolate to the other better sections. But our capitalist system is such that all the goods and services really go first to the top hierarchy, then to the second crust, then to the third one and last of all they percolate to the lowest income group in this country. But this system should somewhat be changed and I would like to repeat that this needs the urgent attention of the Government. I now take the levy on steel. Government itself is one of the big users of steel and I think Government may have to pay a lot of duty on steel because they consume a lot of it for their buildings, for their factories, and for their public sector plants and so many things. So also fertilizer is one thing which is being used today even by the very small farmers, at least in North India as far as I know, and I think taxing the fertilizer today, the fertilizer which is now used even by the small farmers, in North India definitely, this is going to discourage, or not give

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

the impetus that is necessary for the green revolution. The green' revolution is 'still not a very- very stable factor. Because you have had one or two bumper crops, you should not think that everything [is now fine and everything is rosy. It is not rosy. Government makes mistakes repeatedly and they made *the* mistake when they decontrolled sugar some years back. I do not know whether they wanted money, or what they wanted and why they decontrolled sugar. And the prices shot up and shot up and shot up. Now they ate again going to have fair* price shops for this thing and they are going to bring down the prices somehow. Then why was this experiment done? I am sure they know better than that. They knew that the prices would go up. The sugar industry wanted some more concessions, some more advantages and some more promises from them. Whatever it may be, the Government knowingly, willingly, deliberately and calculatedly gave those advantages to the sugar industry with the result that they have made hay. The prices have gone up again. The common people are again saying that the prices are too high, what to do. Prices should not be so high. After all it is not only the people who take sweets who want sugar. Sugar is needed by the ordinary poor man. The working man requires sugar for a cup of tea in the morning and in the evening. Milk* cannot afford. It is the ordinary man who wants a cup of tea in the morning or in the evening and this you are denying him. You are taxing that cup of tea. I think it is not only a very inequitable and unfair taxation, but it is rather a very unfair concession that is given to the sugar industry. It is really they who are "benefited. This again is blackmailing the Indian community and the Indian people by raising the price of sugar. The Government do not understand this problem. They do not know anything about it. They do not bother it. The Government should not give in to important sections like this and do something at

the cost of the ordinary people. I feel that the Government should not have shown so much weakness. They should not go in for a sort of arrangement or agreement or bargain with them in such matters. Wherever some items are controlled by the Government, these controls are invariably found to be very helpful. I am very glad and I am very proud to say that the functioning of the Government units, the availability of those articles which are controlled by the Government and the price structure of these things is very satisfactory. It is very good and it works much better compared to the private sector functioning in the same field. I think the Government should be proud of the fact that in respect of whatever commodities it produces, whatever the public sector units are making it is doing well. Their availability is reasonably good and the prices are reasonable. When people buy them they feel secure, happy and comfortable. They feel that the items which they are buying from the Government are really of good quality and that the prices are reasonable. The controls have been fairly helpful to the ordinary people and the Government has done very good to that extent. They should not have yielded to the pressures of vested interests and decontrolled some of the items. Controls have worked satisfactorily. Decontrols are not doing well. Wherever they have decontrolled, the prices have shot up. Where there is control, the availability is good, the quality is good and the price is reasonable. Invariably the Government products are very satisfactory to the consumer. The Government should go ahead with such ideas and plans so that they can get more and more goods available to the ordinary people of better quality and at a reasonable price.

Now, I come to the entire system of distribution. The distribution system is very defective. If I may reveal something, goods and services are used and wasted by people who have a lot and who can spare. It is not available to those who are poor and those who cannot afford to buy it at

higher price. So, the distribution system in the whole country in principle and as a policy should be streamlined, overhauled and completely changed. It needs total overhauling. If it is free trade and a free market and freedom to buy whatever you want and whoever has money, that policy is not going to help the Government very much. You cannot leave the people of the country and everything else at the mercy of those who have. You must give things also to those who do not have. You have to bring about some sort of equality between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'. Therefore if you are going to build up a free economic society or a capitalistic structure altogether, it is not going to help the country. It is not going to help the Government either. Whether it helps the Government or not I do not care, but it should help the people of the country definitely. Therefore, your distribution machinery should be streamlined. You may produce and produce, but still people are not able to buy because they do not have the money to buy or they do not have the capacity to buy. You may have all the goods in the store. You may make them available, but still the poor people cannot buy them. If there is no way for them to buy, then the production itself becomes useless. Production is meant for every single person in the country. It is not only for some class of people who have the money. Therefore, the economy should be geared to meet the requirement of the 'have-nots' and not only of the 'haves'. About distribution of foodgrains or coal or steel, whatever it may be, the basic necessities of life must be available to everybody as far as possible, So also the prices must be controlled by the Government.

I would like to say a few words about our troops who have done extremely well in Bangla Desh. I have not been a very enthusiastic person at all about this matter. I was neither enthusiastic then nor am enthusiastic now. Bangla Desh to me was still an internal matter, for which I could care less. Of course, I have been

distressed at Pakistani troops' behaviour, at their misbehaviour, towards women, at their injustice and at their atrocities. Wherever it is done, it is all wrong; that is deplorable, that is depraved, that is condemnable, it is far away from the gentlemanly way. I had expected that the Pakistani people would not behave in such a depraved manner as they have done in Bangla Desh. It is a bad thing. I totally condemn it. But there are also many things to which I would not be a party or about which I do not feel happy. But as far as our soldiers and the people who are at the command of the Government here are concerned, their behaviour was extremely good. The soldiers have sacrificed every thing in the war and they have suffered a lot. Nearly 20,000 people have given their lives; they have been incapacitated or they have been killed or they have been seriously wounded or they are missing or they are lost, and at their cost has come up a feather in the cap of the Prime Minister, glory to India, some freedom to Bangla Desh and some allies to Bangla Desh and some allies to Russia, if I may say so, and also some market to the business community. But who sacrificed? It is the people who took part in the fighting who sacrificed, it is the 20,000 people who have given their lives and who have given so much that they have brought glory to India, brought markets to the business community of India and brought glory to those who built up this Bangla Desh movement. And it was not such an altruistic affair to go to Bangla Desh and help them. Whatever it may be, I am not going into it. But the fact is that the Government should do everything possible in their power to help our service people who have suffered and sacrificed but whose life is treated as if it is nothing at all, just like a ten naye paise coin. I do not mean so but what I am saying is that it should be valued as something precious in the life of the nation, something valueless, something great, something honourable, something noble. This is what our fighting people are there

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

for, and they should be given their recognition and due as people who have always upheld the honour of this country. We are no more under any foreign rule. Our Army is our Army. Whenever they fight, they fight for the honour and glory of this country, and they have brought honour to the Prime Minister, honour to the Defence Minister, honour to the country and nation. And after utilising their services, all our business community, before even the ceasefire had taken place, had gone to Dacca. And when I went to the market, I found people saying that he has come from Dacca, he has come from Dacca and so on. They had gone to Dacca only to exploit the market there. And therefore it is only natural that the Bangla Desh people should say, "please select the business people you are sending here so that we are able to know with whom we are dealing and with type of people we are dealing." Wherever they have gone, to Burma or Malaysia or Singapore or to the various African countries, some times they have gone to make money. And we do not always show our best light and we bring sometimes a bad name to our country also. But the Government should ensure that when they are sending people to such places there should be some control so that they are not let loose completely to exploit the economy of those countries; they should have some control over them. So this boosting of the fighting forces by these people, saying 'Bravo to everybody who is fighting,' all this, is only so that their market is available. This is not an entirely happy thing as far as I can see. But those people who have done so much and who are pledged to serve the country and who fight for the country, they should always be given the maximum care and attention by the Government.

I have seen people do not give them accommodation when they go to purchase rations etc. But when they are in trouble they want protection of the military, whether it be floods, famine or law and I

order situation. If there is law and order situation the army will be mobilised to look after the situation. If the Central Government employees go on strike, the army and the police are called to take care of the situation. But these very people are neglected later on and dropped like hot potato. This attitude should be changed. I think the Government should go a long way in helping them as much as they can.

I will not go too much into these things. I think more spirit, flesh and blood should be given to the skeleton of democracy. Democracy needs more and more vital spirit. We want to maintain democratic traditions. We are proud of democracy in this country and we have some convictions about democracy and so on. But I think democracy should be given more and more meaning. It will be a good day for the country when there is more and more equitable distribution of wealth, more and more facilities to the ordinary people. I think the Prime Minister has gone a long way in improving many things though she has not improved many other things. However, she has improved some things. My suggestion is that she has to go still a very long way. I want that she should be able to improve many things, she should be able to change many things and really get rid of quite a lot of dirt that has accumulated in our society, in our politics and everywhere else. I hope this will be done. Well, I wish the Government success in their work to improve the situation. If they bring about any deterioration I shall not be sorry to condemn them. I shall not be sorry to criticise them and I shall not be sorry to blame them for it. But I hope and wish that they will do well in improving things, in really implementing all their promises, in implementing all their slogans not only by word of mouth, because word of mouth has no meaning in the modern world, but in spirit and action. Let them translate democracy into economic freedom, social justice and economic equality. These are very important things in our life. I think the

Government should do everything it can, with all the support it has and the goodwill it has with its own people and the Opposition—half of which is in league with the Government. I am not one of those who are in league with the Government. But I will say that they should do everything in their power to bring about social justice and give real meaning to democracy.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, no Finance Minister can get hundred per cent, encomiums. He mostly gets brickbats or something of that type. I am sure this time he was able to make the best of his ability in presenting a Budget to some extent which satisfies to a larger extent though it does not satisfy the common man.

Sir, the method of preparing the Budget is almost of a conventional type. They take the same type of categories in increasing the taxation or decreasing the taxation. They do not go in for fresh thinking. They always think of the old things like cigarettes, tobacco, wine, spirit, petrol and the like. They do not have a fresh approach. They cannot think of taxation on fresh items. The man in a corner village too must feel the thrill of the Budget. He must feel the change. He feels the pinch every time kerosene is taxed. Now he has been kind enough to reduce it by a few paise per litre. It is not much. He could have altogether eliminated it. After all, it is the poor man who is the basis of all our actions in India. Therefore, instead of eliminating it completely, if you only reduce it by 6 paise or 4 paise or 3 paise, it will not work. Therefore, he must eliminate it altogether. He may stand on prestige. He may think, "Having levied it, I can only show some concession. I cannot eliminate it altogether." This may be his view. But standing on prestige will not help us. Yielding to the pressure of public opinion in favour of the common man so far as kerosene is concerned, will be appreciated.

After all, electricity and other things are used only by people in the higher scale in social life. People living in villages depend only on kerosene. And they do not also go in for pure kerosene. They go in for black or yellow kerosene. And everywhere the poor man feels the pinch. Sir in his Budget speech, the Finance Minister has laid stress on development and social welfare. He has said:

"Despite this massive influx and the cost of a war, which was not of our seeking, we decided not to delay or postpone in any way the equally urgent task of development and social welfare."

So, these are the two pillars—development and social welfare—on which he wants to construct the entire edifice. We shall have to see that these two pillars are really pucca pillars and not kutchha pillars. In this connection, I would like to refer to some figures in "The Budget At a Glance", a brochure supplied to us by him. On page 4, you will see that under "Social and Development Services", the Budget estimates for 1971-72 are shown as Rs. 376.40 crores. The revised estimates for the same year are Rs. 351.94 crores. From this, you see that there has actually been a reduction, though he has said that he wants to accelerate the programme. In what way can you accelerate the programme by reducing the Budget estimates? Public Works also comes under the same heading. It has also come down from Rs. 42.71 crores to Rs. 41.56 crores. So, in what way is he justified in saying that there is emphasis on these two aspects? The figures that are given here belie the platitude that he has given to us in his speech.

Now, apart from these two aspects, the main object is supposed to be to declare a war on poverty—*Garibi Hatao*. But you see something different in the day-to-day life. For the last two years, I have been seeing that the sugar prices are rising, even the vegetable prices are

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

rising and the ordinary things which we used to get for one rupee are costing now two rupees. It looks as though, instead of *Garibi Hatao*, it is *Garibi Badao*. Everyday you see that the prices are increasing by leaps and bounds. Therefore, what they say is one thing, and what is actually taking place is another thing. Therefore, I would say that these platitudes with which he has composed his entire speech, are not to be taken at their face value.

There is another craze with the Government, that of taking over undertakings of the private sector and bringing them into the public sector. If due to mismanagement and running in loss, private undertakings are taken under the control of the Government, under the public sector, if they can manage it well, I can understand it. We have seen what the public sector is doing so far as the Indian Airlines is concerned or other undertakings are concerned. There was a hue and cry in the House that it is not being managed well. At one stage you take it and then allow it to suffer. I will give you an illustration. The Hindustan Copper Limited is a private concern. Everybody knows that the Hindustan Copper Limited is working on profit. It is being taken over by the Indian Copper Limited, which is a public sector undertaking and which is running at a loss. What is the use of taking over a profit-earning concern and handing it over to another concern which is running at a loss due to mismanagement or whatever it is? There is no use, there is no sense in handing over a profitable concern to another concern which is running at a loss. I think they will bring it to a level, whatever profit or loss that is there, they will mix up everything and then say it is running on a no-profit-no-loss basis. There is another thing. The IISCO and the TISCO are also to be taken over and handed to the Hindustan Steel Limited. We all know, we read in the newspapers,

there is cumulative loss of about Rs. 200 crores every year in the HSL. When the HSL itself is running at a loss of about Rs. 200 crores every year, what is the fun of disturbing the IISCO and the TISCO from the private sector and putting them under the HSL when the IISCO and the TISCO are making profits in the private sector? What is the sense in this proposition? I do not understand this craze of taking away a profit-making concern from the private sector and tagging it to a losing concern in the public sector. The scheme is absolutely meaningless. I only appeal to the Government that such profit-making concerns should not be disturbed and they should not be brought into concerns which are already running at a loss in the public sector. First you show your performance in the public sector, in the Government undertakings, managed by our bureaucrats, your experienced people. You have not shown a profit anywhere. You are running at a loss yourself. Everybody knows it and it is said openly that you are running at a loss, the Government is running them at a loss. What is Government after all? It is by the people. So you have to see that the people are satisfied; otherwise, I do not know what is going to happen in the long-run. Please take care and see that your undertakings run on a competitive basis and not make cumulative losses. Government can do and undo things. They can, if they want, run a concern at a profit or at a loss. Who is to question them? In one of the meetings that we had and where Mr. Chavan also was present, some speeches were made as to how we could increase our revenue. Of course, they are trying their best to recover arrears of income-tax and other taxes and I think to some extent they have succeeded and the level of arrears of income-tax has come down now from Rs. 700 crores or so. I have suggested a few things in the way of getting more revenue, in the way of new openings, new avenues, for taxation. I suggest a tax on supari as well as pan. I know pan

and supari are munched or chewed by the lower classes or middle class people "and even in villages. It has become a regular habit, a regular feature of civilisation. Almost everyone takes pan and supari. You go to Connaught Place and you will find any number of people buying pan and supari. Each pan costs 4 annas, *i. e.* 25 paise. There are many varieties. There is a variety of pan costing even 50 paise. And people who purchase pan at such a cost do not obviously seem to feel the pinch of it, they do not seem to feel that they are paying a heavy price. But you have not thought of taxing it. You have ignored it. Instead of thinking of such things, you have gone to tax kerosene oil. There are very many varieties of pan available at higher and higher prices. And the buyers do not seem to feel the pinch. So why cannot you tax it? Then, Sir, I come to another thing. Instead of Rs. 5,000, why not increase the exemption limit for income-tax upto Rs. 6,000? You can keep the minimum at Rs. 6,000. Over and above this ceiling, you can certainly tax people. Thereafter, instead of flat 10 per cent or above you can introduce a slab rate; otherwise, there is no incentive for anybody to save money and invest. Instead of taxing to the extent of 97.5 per cent or 96 per cent, we can even reduce the level and thus provide an incentive for saving* and investment in any fashion which will be useful to the country. So why not reduce the level to, say, 95 per cent or so? I am told in the whole world only in India we are paying income-tax up to a level of 97 per cent. This has to be avoided and you have to see that it is reduced. The budget is not prepared by Shri Chavan. It has been prepared after a great deal of thinking and after so many Cabinet meetings. Still Shri Chavan has his own individuality and that should be reflected in the budget. So far as the corporate sector is concerned... Sir, are you in a hurry to ring the bell?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No.

SHRI N.R. MUNISWAMY : I thought you were going to ring the bell from your movement. I will close myself.

Therefore, Shri Chavan must create such an impression among the people that they are really satisfied. Whenever a budget is presented, people must realise—whether they are lower middle class or upper middle class or top-people—that there is a change.

So far as agricultural tax is concerned, I do not know how it will work out. I believe that people having ten acres of land will not be touched. In the context of ceiling on land, we all heard that 30 acres was the limit; then it was reduced to 20 acres. Now it has come to 15 acres. There were people having 2,000 acres and 5,000 acres. They have all bifurcated and have only 20 and 25 acres now. At this rate nobody will pay agricultural tax. Therefore you have to restructure your tax proposals. Huge lands have all dissipated. My suggestion is that people owning ten acres of land, irrespective of their income, need not be taxed. There, actually the whole family consisting of the father, mother and children is engaged in agriculture. You have to take into account the money value of the labour put in by each one of them. I do not think income tax on agriculture is a workable proposition. It can work certainly in the case of plantation or lands extending to 2,000 acres and so on. My view is that people owning 10 acres and less should be exempted from this tax. As a matter of fact, a person owning 10 acres of land gets about Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 10,000 depending on the crop he raises on his land. If it is commercial crop, he may get a little more. If it is paddy or bajra, he will not get much money out of it. He cultivates mainly for his own consumption and for the consumption of his family members. If something is left over, he sells it and spends that money for the daughter's marriage or son's education. I am sure that the hon. Minister will bear this in mind. While framing rules, he must see that

[Shri N.R. Muniswamy] people having 10 acres of land are not touched, irrespective of the income he gets from his land.

So far as electricity is concerned, there is already a tax from the State Sector. About electricity charges, there was hue and cry and it was one of the issues in the recent election also. Instead of giving the wholesale right to State Governments, the Centre should direct them to see that the tax is not levied in such a way as to cause hardship to the people. The necessary instructions have to go from here.

Then we have Central sales tax and local sales tax. There is also a surcharge on local sales tax. Also there is a surcharge on Central excise duty. These taxes and surcharges cause a great deal of confusion. Instead of having so many taxes and surcharges, you should have a uniform tax. The percentage must be worked out in such a way as to cover all the taxes that you are putting into practice now. So, Sir, these things have to be borne in mind.

Sir, so far as the Sales Tax is concerned, it must come under the Central Sales Tax Act so that whatever recoveries are made now come under the Central Sales Tax. Therefore, Sir, the different types of Sales Tax will not work. Suppose a man wants to purchase a car. The exact price of the car will be Rs. 11,000/- or Rs. 14,000/-—this, of course, is subject to correction and you will see that he has to pay many taxes and the price comes to Rs. 24,000/- or so. These taxes have to be paid and so they increase the bill. Therefore, Sir, instead of having all these different types of taxes, different kinds of Sales Tax, you must see that there is only one tax so that the man who pays the tax does not feel that he has to pay over and over again many taxes under different garbs, under different names; One is a Central Tax, another is a State tax, then the municipal tax and then the local tax and so on. The same man is paying too many taxes,

You are paying the Income-Tax; you are paying the professional tax you are paying taxes on commodities, So, where is the place where you don't pay any tax? You pay at every level and in every walk of your life and you are paying through your nose. Therefore, Sir, I would request the Government to see that these things are done properly. Even in the Income-Tax returns I find, Sir, so many columns and even the literate persons will not understand these columns. The people who know the job only can understand these columns. Therefore, you must see that instead of having so many taxes, a single tax is there which covers everything. There may be a hundred columns. Yet, you must make it in such a way that the percentage is worked out easily and you just say that so much is to be paid, that this particular tax is to be paid, which covers everything and from that we can distribute the proceeds to the various institutions, whether local or Central or municipal or whatever it is. So, Sir, you must see that that the people do not go with the idea that they are being fleeced at every place and at every juncture.

With these words, Sir, I commend this Budget.

श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह (पंजाब) : श्रीमान, हमारा देश ऐसे तारीखी वाक्यात से गुजरा है जिसमें मुल्क की कई प्रावलम्स या उलभनें सुलभ गई हैं लेकिन कई उलभनें अभी वंसी ही बनी हुई हैं। ऐसे हालात में जो फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने बजट पेश किया है यह ठीक है कि उन्होंने बड़ी योग्यता से इस बात का प्रयत्न किया है कि आर जनता पर नये करों का कोई असर न पड़े, ऐसा महसूस हो, फिर भी मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी बदकिस्मती है कि देश में जो ऐसे लोग हैं कि जिन पर टैक्स लगना चाहिए वे तो टैक्स श्रदा नहीं करते हैं। हमें दिल्ली से यह बात मान लेनी चाहिए कि ऐसे लोगों से टैक्स वसूल

करने में पूरी तरह से फल्योर रही है। इसके नतीजे के तौर पर आज बहुत सा काला धन मुल्क में बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। एक तरफ तो वह लोग हैं जिनकी मंहगाई की वजह से अपनी जिन्दगी की जरूरियात की चीजें हासिल करना कठिन और मुश्किल है। ऐसे लोगों पर नये टैक्सेज से मंहगाई का वेतन का बोझ बढ़ जाने से उनकी जिन्दगी और दुश्वार हो गयी है। तो मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि आश्वासन तो हर मौके पर दिये जाते हैं। इस समय गरीबी एक बहुत बड़ी लानत है। बीमारी भी है, अनपढ़ता भी है और इसी तरह से बेकारी भी है। यह चार हमारे मुल्क के बहुत बड़े दुश्मन हैं, लेकिन हर साल हम आश्वासन देते हैं कि गरीबी को खत्म किया जायगा, बीमारों का या रोगियों के इलाज का प्रबंध किया जायगा, हम अनपढ़ता को या जाहिलता को खत्म कर देंगे, ऐसे ऐलान होते हैं और ऐसे आश्वासन बराबर दिये जाते हैं, लेकिन असली तौर पर देखने में यह आया है कि उनमें से किसी को भी हम कम नहीं कर सके। वे बदस्तूर बराबर हैं। यह दुश्मन हमारे देश को तबाह करते चले जा रहे हैं। इसमें असली जो चीज है, मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार ने कभी उस मसले पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। जब तक वह बुनियादी बात, वह बुनियादी मसला हल नहीं होगा, तब तक हम तरक्की नहीं कर सकते। और वह मसला न कानून के जरिये हल हो सकता है और न पार्लियामेंट में जो यह तकरीरें दी जाती हैं, जो यहां सुभाष दिये जाते हैं, उनके जरिये ही हल हो सकता है। उनका कोई लाभ नहीं होता है। असली बात यह है कि हमारे मुल्क में दिन ब दिन करेक्टर खत्म होता चला जा रहा है। हम सारे देश की इंडस्ट्री को नेशनलाइज कर दें, लेकिन जब तक नेशनेलिटी लोगों में पैदा नहीं करते, हमारे लोगों में देश भक्ति की

भावना नहीं आती, हमारे लोगों में सेल्फ रिलायंस नहीं आता, हम अपना भरोसा नहीं करते और हम जब तक अपनी जिम्मेदारी को महसूस नहीं करते, तब तक यह सारी बातें अमल में नहीं आ सकतीं और उनका कोई लाभ भी प्राप्त नहीं हो सकता है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे हालात में सबसे पहले हमें इस तरफ अपना ध्यान देना चाहिए कि हम मुल्क में इंसान बना सकें। मुझे एक बात याद आ गयी। मौलाना रूमी एक दिन रास्ते से गुजर रहे थे। उन्होंने देखा कि साधु लिबास में एक आदमी दिन में दिया लिये हुए चला जा रहा है। वह हैरानी से उसे देखते हुए गुजर गये। लेकिन कुछ दिन बाद उन्होंने उस आदमी को फिर देखा। फिर जब उन्होंने देखा तो पूछा कि दोपहर में तुम दिया लेकर किसकी तलाश करते हो, मेरे दोस्त, तो वह खड़ा हो गया। उसने मौलाना रूमी की तरफ देखा और कहने लगा कि हां, मैं कुछ तलाश कर रहा हूँ। मौलाना ने पूछा कि मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कि आप किसकी तलाश कर रहे हैं। जवाब मिला कि मैं आदमी तलाश कर रहा हूँ। उन्होंने याद दिलाया कि मैं भी यही तलाश कर रहा हूँ, लेकिन असली इंसान मिलना बड़ी मुश्किल बात है। असली बात मुल्क में यह है कि मुल्क का करेक्टर जो है वह खत्म होता चला जा रहा है और हम इसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं देते। इसी से करेप्शन बढ़ता है। टैक्सेशन का सिस्टम जो है उसमें बड़ी कमजोरी है, बड़ी त्रुटि है। टैक्स का धन वसूलने के लिए और चोरी के धन को पकड़ने के लिए जो लोग रखे जाते हैं वह सरकार के लिए उस धन को पकड़ने की परवाह नहीं करते, बल्कि वे अपने लिए कोई रास्ता तलाश करते हैं। वे अपना पेट तो पालते हैं लेकिन उसका लाभ न सरकार को होता है और न जनता को होता है।

[श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह]

इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि सबसे बड़ी जो प्राबल्य है उसकी तरफ हम को ज्यादा ध्यान देना चाहिए।

यह ठीक है कि हमारे मुल्क में इस लड़ाई के जमाने में बंगला देश के मसले में हमारे जवानों ने बहुत बड़ी कुर्बानी की है। हमें इसका अहसास है, कुछ लोग तो कहते हैं कि हमारे जवानों ने जो कुर्बानी की है, उसके नतीजे के तौर पर ही बंगला देश बना है। इस मुल्क ने यह लड़ाई जीती है और इस बात का सेहरा उन जवानों पर ही है, लेकिन मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि ऐसी बात नहीं है। सरकार पर भी इसका सेहरा है। अगर कोई गलती हो जाय तो सरकार पर ही उसकी जिम्मेदारी आती है। तो बहादुरी का जो क्रेडिट है वह भी सरकार को जाना चाहिए। यह लाजमी है। इसमें सरकार ने जो डिस्मिशन लिये हैं आम तौर पर जो फंसले इन्दिरा जी ने लिये हैं, उनमें उन्होंने रिस्क भी ली है। जो फंसले उन्होंने लिये हैं उनका नतीजा अच्छा निकला है और इसके लिए उनकी प्रशंसा की यह लाजमी बात है।

अब मैं पंजाब की बात आप के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूँ। पंजाब में वहाँ के लोगों को बार्डर का सूखा होने की वजह से हर पांच साल बाद काफी नुकसान उठाना पड़ता है। इस वक्त जो नया बजट हमारे सासने आया है उसमें कई तरह के टैक्सेज हैं। पंजाब में 70 परसेंट आबादी किसानों की है, जमींदार लोग हैं, छोटे किसान हैं, उन पर इसका काफी बोझ और असर पड़ेगा। पहले ही ट्रैक्टरों पर जो टैक्स लगा हुआ है वह इतना ज्यादा है कि गरीब किसान तो ट्रैक्टर खरीद ही नहीं सकता। एक तो वह काफी

मंहगे हैं और दूसरे उन पर टैक्स बहुत ज्यादा है। दूसरी बात यह है कि जो इंप्लेशियल किसान हैं, जो असर वाले लोग हैं, जिनका सरकार पर कोई असर है, वह तो ट्रैक्टर हासिल कर लेते हैं, लेकिन जो दूसरे छोटे किसान हैं उन बेचारों को अपनी बारी पर ट्रैक्टर नहीं मिलता और वह चार-चार साल तक इंतजार करते रहते हैं और उनको मजबूर होकर ब्लैक में ट्रैक्टर लेना पड़ता है। एक तो पहले ही वह मंहगे हो गये हैं और दूसरे दो, चार हजार रुपये उनको और ज्यादा ब्लैक का देना पड़ता है। इस हालत में सुधार होना चाहिए।

पंजाब में पावर की हालत यह है कि काफी असें से उसका इंडस्ट्री पर बुरा असर पड़ रहा है। इसी तरह से उसका खेती-बाड़ी पर भी बुरा असर पड़ता है। जो पावर पंखों पर टैक्स लगा दिया गया है वह उन पर एक बोझ है। पहले ही उनको पानी नहीं मिलता। पंजाब में पावर की बड़ी कमी है। तो यह टैक्स उनको और ज्यादा परेशान करेगा और वह उनको काफी दिक्कत में डालेगा। तो मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ कि पंजाब के किसानों की हालत खराब होगी। इसी तरह इंडस्ट्री की बात है, वहाँ स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज हैं लेकिन बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज के बिना ज्यादा असें तक स्माल इंडस्ट्रीज अपने आपको कायम नहीं रख सकतीं, वह भी आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता खत्म होती चली जा रही हैं। स्वतन्त्रता के इतने असें के बाद, आजादी के बाद और सब जगह तो बड़ी-बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज लगी हैं लेकिन पंजाब में कोई भी बड़ी इंडस्ट्री नहीं लगाई है और जो प्राइवेट लोग हैं वह भी बार्डर का प्रांत होने की वजह से वहाँ कोई ऐसा रिस्क नहीं लेते, इंडस्ट्री नहीं लगाते और सरकार भी नहीं करती है। तो इसकी वजह से जो

स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उनके कायम रहने में मुश्किल है, जब तक बड़ी इंडस्ट्री न हो तो उन्हें कायम नहीं रखा जा सकता। तो आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता वह खत्म हो रही है और अगर पंजाब में जमींदारों को भी खत्म कर दिया जाय तो फिर मालूम नहीं कि क्या हालत होगी। जब कभी पंजाब की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान दिलाया जाता है तो कहा जाता है कि पंजाब के लोग बड़े बहादुर हैं, बड़े इंटरप्राइजिंग हैं और ऐसी-ऐसी बातें कह कर के टाल दिया जाता है, लेकिन पंजाब के साथ हमेशा डिसक्रिमिनेशन किया जाता है। जो दूसरे प्रान्त हैं, जहां भी जरूरत है, वहां इमदाद दी जाती है। लेकिन पंजाब में ऐसी बात नहीं हुई, तो मैं गुजारिश करूंगा कि पंजाब की प्रब्लम अपनी है, पंजाब की हालत बहुत बिगड़ती जा रही है और अगर सरकार वक्त पर इसे इमदाद नहीं करेगी तो फिर और भी कठिन हालत होगी। अगर आटोमिक पावर का चन्द वर्षों में इन्तजाम नहीं किया गया तो पंजाब में पावर की किल्लत ऐसी हो जायगी सारी इंडस्ट्री और खेती-बाड़ी सब बर्बाद होकर रह जायगी, इसलिए सरकार ने जो फैसला किया है, उन पर बहुत जल्दी अमल करना चाहिए और वहां जो पावर की कमी है उसका इंतजाम करके पंजाब को बदहाली से बचाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए।

मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेते हुए यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमें उम्मीद है कि यह पंजाब का जो मसला है उसको ध्यान में रखेंगे। अब, यह जो तेल के ऊपर टैक्स है यह भी गरीबों पर असर डालता है और यह जो पावर पम्प के ऊपर है, यह भी गरीबों पर असर डालेगा। मेरी यही अर्ज है कि ऐसे जो टैक्स हैं, जिनका आम जनता के ऊपर असर पड़ता है, ऐसे टैक्स अगर छोड़

दिये जायं, निकाल दिये जायं और उसकी जगह जो बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं, जिनके पास धन है, काला धन है और जिनके पास जराय है उन पर लगाये जायं। सरकार इन लोगों पर टैक्स लगा कर और ऐसे ही जरायों को निकाल कर अपना काम चला सकती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो इन्कम टैक्स है और जो दूसरे टैक्स हैं, उनको ही ठीक से वसूल किया जाय तो छोटे-छोटे और गरीब लोगों पर टैक्स लगा कर उन पर ज्यादा भार डालने और उनको मंहगाई का शिकार बनाने से बचा जा सकता है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब इस तरफ ध्यान देकर गरीब लोगों पर और बोझ नहीं डालेंगे और उनको और बोझ से बचायेंगे। थैंक यू।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me start with one of the very interesting formulations in the Budget Speech of the hon. Finance Minister, Shri Chavan. In paragraph 32—Part A, page 11—of his speech, Mr. Chavan who had earlier developed a sense of humour in his speech, has stated :—

"Important as the Central Budget is as an instrument for furthering our social and economic objectives, it has to be supplemented by basic changes in our economic institutions and policies."

I was frantically searching in his Budget Speech and proposals for some kind of an assurance that these words are seriously meant. I must confess, I have failed to find any trace of any sincerity—not individual—on the part of the Government that they do mean these words, very bravely uttered on the floor of the other House by the Finance Minister of the country.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

The Budget which is presented this time is really a blatant endorsement of *status quo*. To say that it is an instrument of change is an affront to the English language and worse. Sir, I say it is a blatant endorsement of *status quo* because it changes nothing basically whatsoever. And yet it has the potentialities if it is going to be changed, and that is a dangerous part of it. You can deal with a professional sinner in private life but it is difficult always to deal with frauds in our social life ; you do not know when they are virtuous and when they are otherwise. That is the trouble with this Budget, Mr. Chavan, by no means, should take it personally on himself, it is the policy of the Government which is criticised. Anyhow, I never call Mr. Chavan a flop.

The Budget has a tendency to flirt with ideas; why ? In facing facts of life—that is what I say.

Budget is not the only thing that we have since the elections this year. We have got the President's Address where the word 'monopolist' does not occur and yet at the time of the elections we had been treated with brave speeches where they went hammer and tongs against the monopolists—rightly so and we share those speeches—but coming to the Central Hall, amidst the trumpeteering of the President's speech we find that 'monopolists' had disappeared from the scene altogether. Then we had the Budget and now we have another interesting document in our possession, namely, the speech of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, inaugurating the 45th Session of the FICC in Delhi on the 25th of this month. These are very important documents. Let me have one or two words about the last one and then I shall proceed to the Budget.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in her fantastic speech, utterly ill-advised, economically misconceived, politically dangerous, said :

"I think that this year we start on a more cheerful note of cooperation and what I hope, is a sounder basis for a fruitful dialogue . . ."

it is her language, I do not know, she is not using "serious dialogue" anyhow—

". . . on the direction in which our economy should move. Your statement that the members of your Federation are in accord with the socio-economic objectives to which Government's policies are directed is very welcome."

Can you imagine a more absurd utterance than this ? The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, is giving certificate to the tycoons and monopolists who had assembled in New Delhi, who are responsible for black money which had been noted in the report of the Wanchoo Committee, who are hiding and evading taxes of the order of Rs. 1400 crores, who are exploiting the working classes and running a parallel economy in the form of black money ? They are acclaimed by the Prime Minister as something to be welcomed and in a cooperative spirit. We cannot understand it. Secondly she says :

"The Budget represents a considerable effort to raise the level of the public investment. This should help industrial revival over a wide field".

She is assuring the monopolists : 'We shall help you, do not worry'.

"This is why we emphasise the importance of evolving a joint sector where the managerial ability of the private sector could be harnessed with support from financial institutions."

Here again is a promise : 'Count on the financial institutions like the LIC, the State Bank, the Industrial Investment and Credit Corporation, the Unit Trust and all the rest and you will get help. Then she says :

"I hope you will participate in evolving a vigorous joint sector".

Enamoured of the glorious joint sector i It was mixed economy with unmixed evils all along the line and now it has become the joint sector. Another preposterous theory is being canvassed as joint sector. This <s how the monopolists will try to develop into a State moi opoly if they can. This is why we say that instead of trying to end monopoly, the '5 monopoly houses, which undoubtedly should come from the mandate of the people in the elections, the Prime Minister of the country, soon after the elections, offers these discredited, despicable monopolist classes a joint sector with the assurance that the financial institutions will be rendering more help to them than before. Is it what the people have voted for ? Is that what the Congress Party went for ail over the countty to seek the support of the people to strengthen Shrimati Indira Gandhi's hand ? Is the hand to be strengthened to feed the monopolist classes after the elections ?

It is unfortunate, Sir, that after the election the first utterance coming from the Prime Minister directly—in a way the Presidential utterance also—should have been addressed to the monopolists to appease, pamper, propitiate and flatter them. Again it says here :

"A dynamic industrial society needs large organisation; which cannot be built in public sector alone."

Can you imagine a more howling, theoretical and practical untruth than this ? Has not the Soviet Union built a dynamic economy ? Does a dynamic economy require the monopolist sector or the public sector ! Who says so ? Even Adam Smith, had he been alive today, would not have said such a thing; yet the Prime Minister of this country goes and tells something which is theoretically unsustainable, in practice is repudiated and which if we try to pursue in this land will make the economy already in doldrums run into

a crisis with social injustice growing all round. We find to our horror the Prime Minister could cultivate no belter sense of dynamism than this. I do not know; but on reading this speech I felt that some so-called expert must have advised her on this interesting learned utterance before the meeting of the FICCI. If I may say so as an old colleague in Parliament, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi should not take advice from such obsolete, oulmoded, conservative, reactionary economic experts. If she does not have better experts let her prepare her own speeches. Her election speeches were far Letter any day than what she has said on the advice of the so-called experts of her Ministry. I am rot blaming Mr. Chavan for it; he has got better experts there and therefore his speeches are very intelligently worded, although he would not like to tax our patience by making speeches. I hope I am not taxing his listening capacity. Me will forgive me when I say . . .

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : I will come back later.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is going away; he has not forgiven me.

I say this is an absurd utterance. Another absurd utterance of the Prime Minister which is shocking and which again is an indirect encouragement to the monopolist c'ass is this :

"At the same time such public scrutiny. . .

The reference is to the scrutiny into the operations of these monopolists.

". . . , through financial institutions should not become a witch-hunt for minor blemishes,

As if our monopol'ists are guilty of only minor blcnvshes. When the financial institutions give money they are told by the Prime Minister not to cany on witch-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

hunt. Our financial institutions are showering funds on the monopolists class recklessly to the detriment of our national interests without any scrutiny, without any examination, without taking the national interest into account.

4 P. M.

In this connection if you see one half of the LTCs commitment went to the monopoly houses like Birlas and Tatas. Birlas got 26 per cent, Tatas got 15 per cent and ACC got 8 per cent. 76 per cent of the I.I.C's investment commitments were concentrated in four States where monopolists are concentrated. The figures relating to 1970 show that 36.56 per cent of LTCs total investment in private sector went to the first ten business groups listed in the Monopolies Commission's Report. Out of that Tata's share was 12.3 per cent; Birla's share was 8.98 per cent. In this connection I recall the forgotten Mahalanobis Committee Report where it was pointed out how recklessly, how indiscreetly the monopoly houses had been built by the financial and credit institutions of the country. It is there and yet we find the Prime Minister of the country raising the bogey of a witch-hunt, and in fact indirectly telling the financial institutions and the credit institutions not to be bothered about how the monopolists conducted themselves because that according to her would be witch-hunt. Small blemishes. They are so innocent people: sometimes the same commit a little crime. Is that the way to talk to them, this talk to the Indian industrialists? I am not asking the Prime Minister to use my language. But the language she used is shocking. Then, Sir, again in another place, she has said: "We are committed to certain objectives and cannot deviate from them, but whatever is possible to simplify and rationalise the procedures, or to remove the difficulties and obstacles, we shall certainly try our best to do so." This is another assurance to the monopo-

list class. I have never known a speech from the Prime Minister which contains so many assurances, assurances galore, distributed and doled out to the monopolist class, a class who should be made to behave and whose concerns should really be taken over by the nation and turned into public sector concerns. Now, Sir, I need not go further into all these things. I have just mentioned the speech only to point out to you that it is not a lapse on the part of the President when he did not mention about 'monopolies' in his Address, nor is it a mere lapse on the part of Mr. Chavan when he allows the monopolist class go scotfree. It seems to me a systematic policy when the Prime Minister also assures them. When Government wants stability now, is it the idea that the stability would be in the service of the monopolist class? If that is so, I am not for that stability. If the stability is to stabilise the plunder, loot, oppression and tyranny of the monopolist class and other exploiting classes, then hell with that stability. If the stability is for progress, for helping the people to improve their living standards and live with human dignity, I am all for that stability. I demand that stability: let it be clear. Now Sir, I regret that particular speech of the Prime Minister. I do not think even those who assembled at that session of the FICCI expected that the Prime Minister would show them so much of solicitude by way of concessions, assurances, hopes and encouragement. They never expected that much and therefore they were very happy to have listened to the Prime Minister after the elections, particularly happy to hear that she was for going in for joint sector with the monopolist class. Sir, this thing should be taken seriously and I do hope it would be taken seriously by the people of the Congress Party. You admire your Prime Minister. Praise her as much as you like. But come down on the policies which cut across the mandate of the election, cut across her own election pledges and cut across her own election speeches. Surely, it will be less than

being just to one's moral conscience if they on the other side do not point out even to the Prime Minister, "Madam Prime Minister, on the advice of your officials you are going wrong. You are flying in the face of the sentiments of the masses. You are not paying attention to the spoken word at the time of the election, to the solemn pledges given to the people by Congressmen and Congress workers to satisfy their urges and aspirations." It is not for me to give advice as to how Congress people should run their party, but on the floor of the House it becomes my duty to tell frankly that, when the policies go in the other direction, it is the duty of those who fought the elections on the slogan of *Gharibi Hatao*, on the slogan of growth with justice, on the slogan of *Arthik Swaraj*—self reliance—that they should come and pick up courage in both hands to tell the Prime Minister, "None of this kind of speeches. We want a different kind of approach to the problems facing the nation at this crucial moment." That should be the way of telling the Prime Minister. To shower on her praise does not require anything. But at the time that has been going on here, I find, now, Sir, I always start with an interesting story.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) :
Give facts.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Facts are story. Otherwise, it becomes history. Now, Sir, there is a little incident to show how the rich people behave. I refer to the incident relating to a diamond in your State. It originated there. It relates to the jewels and other properties of Nawab Khurshid Bahadur so-called, nobleman and a relation of the late Nizam of Hyderabad. These properties were in the possession of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in Civil Suit No. C. S. 14 of 1958. They were sold. Among them was a diamond which was bought by Mr. Chandulal P. Choksi, Jeweller of J. Pitamber Das, Jewellers, Jhaveri Bazar,

Bombay. He bought that diamond for Rs. 20 lakhs.

SHRI A.D. MANI : From where do you get all these facts ?

SHRIBHUPESHGUPTA; I get them from all sources. He bought it for Rs. 20,01,500. It was the highest offer although it was said that the diamond would fetch Rs. 40 lakhs. The next offer was from Mr. Falonji which was rejected. It was for Rs. 17.5 lakhs. Where was the diamond gone ? Somebody should know. Now, according to me the diamond has been smuggled to Hong Kong and sold for Rs. 40 lakhs and the money is with some bank abroad. That firm runs a very small shop at Jhaveri Bazar. Behind the small shop it carries on business worth scores of rupees and the Government is favouring it with licences under certain diamond export control scheme and other things. All the story the Government should know. This was secretly taken out by all kinds of manipulations showing it as an artificial diamond and so on. Similarly they have been favoured with certain licences which have been sold as a result of which they have made another Rs. 10 lakhs. According to our information this Mr. Chandulal P. Choksi of J. Pitamberdas, has made under this deal Rs. 50 lakhs. Wealth tax has been evaded. Other taxes have been evaded and a valuable diamond has been sold outside the country. Foreign exchange also is lost. That money is deposited there. I should like to know what you are doing. I know the Government is aware of the facts because the sources from which I have got this information have also supplied the information to the Government. I do not know whether the other members have got it. But I should like to know what the Government has to say about this thing.

Now, Sir, with regard to the problems that we are facing today, there is the problem of growth. Economic growth is slow. Growth in the industrial sector is declining.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] Our agricultural growth is not what it should be. Somehow or other despite the fact that there has been a higher output in foodgrains, the other agricultural products are not showing up. Anyhow, stability is yet to be reached. If there are two bad weathers we do not know where we will stand. We shall be again in extreme difficulty. Everybody knows that the so-called green revolution is not so green, if you really take into account the fact that only 7 per cent of the irrigated area is under the green revolution. The irrigated area in our country proportionately is very small compared to the vast unirrigated area. Now, Sir, unemployment is rising. The middle-class unemployment has exceeded two millions already and the general unemployment is of the order of 20 million today. Under-employment nobody knows how much. Prices are rising and they continue to rise. In the present Budget, there is a further boost to prices by way of levies on kerosene and various other things which will certainly lead to a rise in the prices of the goods that go into daily consumption or affect the masses.

Now, Sir, as far as poverty is concerned, the National Sample Survey pointed out that a third of the Indian population lives in absolute poverty. In the villages they cannot get more than Rs. 15 per month average. And in the town it is Rs. 24 per month. It has been pointed out that out of the 355 million rural population, 194 million, 52 per cent, may be considered as absolutely poor. In the urban areas, according to them I think it is an under-estimation—8 per cent of the total urban population is poor. That is the position today. Now, therefore, we have poverty, rising prices, unemployment, and the Budget ignores all these problems. And what do we find in the Budget? We find here that there is a provision for some outlay for social welfare schemes and so on. A sum of Rs. 240 crores has been earmarked for these schemes. What will

Rs. 240 crores do? First of all, the amount itself is very small. You have seen what has happened to your fund of Rs. 75 crores earmarked for combating unemployment. But unemployment is rising. And half of the fund has been eaten up by the bureaucratic apparatus or because of other procedural reasons. We know it very well. What is needed today is not allocation of funds only; what we need today is the will to combat poverty, to mete out social justice, to uplift the common man, and there should be a structural change in the economy. Otherwise, it is like pouring water in a leaky pot. And that is what is happening. Without any structural change in the economy, if you expect commensurate results, you will not get them. That is what is happening in the country today. Therefore, if you want to mount an assault on poverty, an assault on unemployment, an assault on social injustice, what is needed first and foremost, is the reconstruction of our economic order and structural changes in our economy. But that is not exactly what is done in the Budget. And we are told eloquently by the Government spokesmen that things will be better as a result of this Budget. This is a fraud on people, I say.

In this connection, we come to the nationalisation of foreign and other monopoly concerns in the country. Why can't we do that? What is coming in the way of nationalisation? If you nationalise them, then, Sir, the industries will be run in such a manner that immediately in the very process of running the industries, there will be better justice to the working people, there will be better safeguards to them and a fair distribution of our national income because there will not be those people at the top who will garner the fruits of the labour as the monopolists are doing today in our country. As far as the monopolists are concerned, despite all their talk, Tatas and Birlas alone, these two, have increased their industrial assets from Rs. 711 crores in 1964 when the Monopolies Commission went into the matter, to Rs. 1161 crores,

an increase of Rs. 450 crores. You talk of big things here. But the monopolists are making money. They are concentrating more and more wealth and economic power in their hands. Therefore, Sir, I point out these things because there is no suggestion about these in the Budget at all.

Then they say that the internal resources from the public sector undertakings will be Rs. 275 crores. Why should it not be more? It is because, first of all, they are not properly run, democratically managed and efficiently run. Unless you nationalise some of the big monopoly concerns like the Tatas and the Birlas, you are not going to have the necessary surpluses from the public sector industrial concerns at all. And we can readily get Rs. 1200 crores or Rs. 1400 crores or even Rs. 2000 crores from these concerns if we truly nationalise some of the monopoly houses and concerns under them. Sir, you will be surprised to hear—Andrew Yule Company is trying to sell the shares held by non-residents: 49 per cent of the shares of Andrew Yule Company are held by non-residents, by those who live in England, out of which 30 per cent of the shares, again, are held by the family of Cato, whatever it is. These Andrew Yule Company shares are sought to be purchased by P. B. Poddar of Calcutta Kanoria and others, and we understand that the Birlas are behind them. Even over the head of the Chairman of the Andrew Yule & Co. Mr. B. P. Poddar conducted negotiations in London in order to buy the shares that inflated the price. They were selling until very recently at Rs. 5 or Rs. 6. Now the price has been inflated somehow or the other as a result of dealings between the Cato family on the one hand and Mr. B. P. Poddar on the other. The conspiracy was that Mr. B. P. Poddar should corner these shares and so on and behind them are the Birlas. The matter is before the Reserve Bank of India. Surely, Mr. Chavan knows it. Why we allow it? We should acquire the Andrew Yule & Co. That is how we should do it. I am not saying that the

choice is between India and the British. Even if it is a choice between India and the British, anybody would say it is better. But that is not so. Indians are trying to buy the shares at a high price, twenty thousand shares or so. We shall lose foreign exchange on this account. The Cato family will be repatriating the value of the 30 per cent. of the shares there and we shall be losing. Why can we not take over the Andrew Yule & Co. and nationalise it and run it on our own? Sir, I ask the Government not to sanction this kind of sale. On the contrary, take measures to acquire the Andrew Yule & Co. The Government itself should do it.

(Time-bell rings)

Sir, since you are ringing the bell, I wanted only to emphasise the need for structural changes in our economy. Here, Sir, plenty of things have been said in the Report of the Wanchoo Committee. I hope Mr. Chavan has gone through it or is getting it studied. It points to the dimension of the black money in the country, the unaccounted money. Parallel currency is being run and this money is the result largely of evasion of wealth tax and other operations also. And yet we find, according to the Budget proposals, that the wealth tax will not fetch even Rs. 50 crores. The Birlas are increasing their wealth but their wealth tax is declining. As I pointed to the House the other day, who would believe that in 1965 or so Mr. G. D. Birla was paying Rs. 8 as wealth tax? You, Sir, owning a store house at your place, Hyderabad, surely if you have been submitting honest returns, must be paying a great amount by way of wealth tax.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: May I ask you one question because it will be useful at the time of replying? You made a mention of the Wanchoo Committee report and their basic analysis about black money. There are many other explanations also. They say that because of the high incidence of taxation also this black

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

money is created. What do you do about it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I was expecting it. The moment you mention that part of the Wanchoo Committee report, I do not agree with you. Mr. Wanchoo is an I. C. S. officer of some such thing and you cannot expect better things from him. If he says something nonsense reject it. In the Wanchoo Committee report many absurd, coloured things are said. This is due to the class outlook, and you cannot expect from a man like Mr. Wanchoo a different report. . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Just I wanted to know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Wanchoo has pointed out banditry. Then he says that for banditry something else is responsible. He says that for banditry the house-owner is responsible because he is not locking his house properly. That is not the way to deal with banditry. Should your duty end with telling the house-owner that he should lock his door properly? According to me, catch hold of him, punish him and haul him up. We shall come to this Wanchoo business later because I have got to touch upon some of the stupid and mischievous things that the Wanchoo Committee has reported. I do not know how much tax Mr. Wanchoo pays. But his heart is bleeding for the upper income bracket taxpayer. Our heart is not bleeding for them. That is the difference. All the same they have pointed out having known this art better than perhaps many of us. That is why I said that it is very, very essential. We are increasing excise duties. You will collect from them over Rs. 2,300 crores. And what is your increase in the case of direct taxation? Very little. Marginal. You let them go; you don't ask them to pay. You have been very humorous saying "We leave you for the time being." It is not so humorous, it is a cruel joke, Mr. Chavan. Here was an occasion for you to tax them

heavily. Why should they, the monopolist class, not pay more taxes to-day when we are facing difficulties? Have they made less money because we are suffering? No. Their prosperity is unimpeded, unimpeded. It is we who have suffered. And when it comes to giving concessions by way of tax rebate, by way of tax holidays, by way of tax abatement, it is this privileged class which gets all the concession, and it is the working people who suffer. This is injustice. This is not how to band things. *(Time-bell)* Therefore, I say, that again is wrong. I am finishing. Now, your Plan outlay has been increased. Good, but where is the Plan? Where is the Plan, Mr. Chavan? Can you tell us what is the Plan? I do not know of any acceptable Plan in the country to-day. I know that from time to time a book comes here and it gets changed every six months. The Planning Commission does not even know how to write a Plan. It goes on being edited every three months or four months. Mr. Asoka Mehta used to go to America to consult as to how to dot the 'i's and dash the 't's in drafting the Plan. Perhaps you do not do such things. But then your Planning Commission is the embodiment of bankruptcy. There are eminent people there. I am not blaming them. But the Yojana Bhavan is the greatest joke going on in Delhi to-day. It may soon become a tourist centre if you do not set things right. The Yojana Bhavan is creating such a situation for itself that tourists may come and want to go and see how the Indian planning was killed in the Yojana Bhavan itself, how the Planners killed the Plan, how the Planners did not even know how to plan their existence within the building itself. *(Time-bell rings)* Therefore, you have done it without structural changes in our economy.

One or two things more and I will finish. Therefore, I say, Mr. Chavan, pay attention to this thing. Kerosene and other things have already been mentioned by other Members, and relief must be given. Now, why must we go on paying

this Rs. 70 crores as additional levies, as the Bangla Desh problem has been solved? We were told that it would be temporary. Why should we continue to pay? On the stamp you see 'Refugee Relief'. It is an invitation to discontent in the people. It is an attempt to create an ill-feeling. Why should we pay this Rs. 70 crores? Get it from the monopoly class, if you like. Why should we pay this Rs. 70 crores of special levies, supposed to be temporary but now well on the way to become permanent? Anyhow they will continue for the next financial year. Therefore, Sir, this is also wrong. I say, they should be withdrawn. If necessary, the funds should be found from elsewhere. We don't have to pay these special levies now that the problem has been solved so far as we are concerned. If we want to give money, we shall give from other sources. We shall help Bangla Desh but not by this kind of thing. This should be put an end to.

Now, only two simple points more. It was good of Mr. Chavan to have ensured that Mr. R. B. Shah of the United Commercial Bank and his accomplice were arrested as a result of disclosures made by me and by Mr. Kalyari Roy in this House about the leakage of the devaluation decision, as a result of which the Birlas made Rs. 10 lakhs; It is a good thing and I do not want to say much, but it has come to our notice that there is an attempt to sabotage the investigation. I am sure Mr. Chavan will not allow that investigation to be sabotaged. That should not be allowed. Birlas are pulling all kinds of wires to see that the investigation is delayed and, if possible, completely sabotaged. Sir, I think the Government should give all encouragement to those people, whoever (the agencies are who are investigating the matter, instead of allowing Birlas to interfere directly or indirectly to kill the investigation. That is number one. Secondly, regarding the Boards that are being formed for the nationalised banks, I understand that Mr. Chavan has submitted proposals for the membership of the Boards, to the

Prime Minister. Well, I do not wish to go into it very much, but Mr. Chavan should clarify the position. Sir, there is a provision in the Banking Act that representatives of Bank employees will be taken. They have been taken through verification and other things. I have no quarrel about that. But there is another provision, Section III (e), which provides, "three directors are to be nominated representing workers, farmers and artisans". Here it seems Mr. Chavan has permitted himself to be carried away by narrow partisan considerations. I say "seems". I will be very happy, Mr. Chavan, if you say you *are not*. According to my information, I will tell you, he has nominated out of fourteen, in the fourteen banks, he has given 9 to the INTUC, he has given 3 to the HMS, he has given 2 to the AITUC. This proportion anyhow is wrong. As you know very well, we are not quarrelling with any of the unions. Every union should get its fair representation. But surely it should not be in this manner. Well, it is open to the charge which Mr. Chavan would not like to be levelled against him that a particular party, because he happens to be associated with it, is being specially patronised in this manner. There, Mr. Chavan, I hope, will be cautious. If he has already submitted his list to the Prime Minister, he should get it altered, changed. Now this has created a little misgiving. I do not know how representatives of farmers and artisans are being chosen. You know very well, nowadays Maharajas go as farmers. All the Indian Princes, if you ask them what their profession is or what their avocation is, every one of them says, my profession is farming. I am a farmer. Indian Princes do not call themselves Princes or landlords. They call themselves farmers. I should like to know which type of farmers the Princes are or these big landlords are. Are they the real representatives of the toiling people? Is Mr. Chavan consulting the Kisan Organisation, the agricultural labour unions, agricultural workers' unions, and so on, to find out as to who really should represent irrespective of the party affiliations? In the case of artisan,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

also the same thing applies. This thing should be taken in 'o account. And I do hope unnecessary difficulty will not be created by the Government in nominating people on the board. We want the board to run well. Therefore, there should not be any wrong approach, any discriminating approach, in this matter. There should be fair representation to all those who deserve to be represented. And that should be the approach of Mr. Chavan. I am very sorry

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Now Mrs. Turabi Mukherjee. Please be brief. I give you five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Just a minute. I am very sorry Mr. Chavan could not help disappointing us by his Budget which, as I said before, is only an endorsement of the *status quo*. And now we will hear a speech from Shrimati Mukherjee. I know she mentally agrees with many of the things I have said. Her heart accepts many things, but her tongue may not express them. Put that is a different matter.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal) : Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Budget proposals that have been placed by the honourable Finance Minister. It is a right step in right direction. I do not agree with the criticism made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta against the Prime Minister about her address to the FICCI. Nobody is more patriotic than our Prime Minister or our Finance Minister. Both are in this country and they are trying their best to bring forth a whole social transformation. For some time we may need both the capitalists and also the socialists like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in our social texture. But everybody in this country knows where our leanings are, which our true goal is. The people's verdict also has gone in our favour only because the people were convinced about our objectives. Sir, as you have given me only five minutes,

as a representative of West Bengal I would like to draw the attention of the honourable Finance Minister that a new Government has been set up in West Bengal with the hopes and aspirations of the people. The Government of India has very leniently taken up our cause. They are showing great consideration for the State of West Bengal. They are ready, they are prepared, to finalise and sanction schemes that may be forwarded by the State Government. I have full confidence that we will be getting full justice at the hands of the Government of India. But in the social and educational field, just now I was told in the All-India Radio Programmes, with regard to Bengali programmes, there was a programme of Rabindra Sanpeeth which used to start at 4.30 o'clock and end at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. This high transmission radio programme is mainly meant for the external listeners and different Forces. Since the war is over, I understand that they are going to close it down. This is the only Bengali programme broadcast from the All India Radio. For the Bengali population in Delhi there is hardly any programme from the All India Radio relative to Rabindra Sanpeeth or any other things in Bengali. I would like the Finance Minister to take note of it and see that this programme continues for the benefit of not only Bengali population, but others as well who love to hear Rabindra Sanpeeth.

The next point to which I would like to draw the attention of the Finance Minister is that there is hardly any case where a Bengali student or any student coming from the eastern region gets scholarships offered either by the Education Ministry or some foreign governments. These things are never advertised in our papers nor are they circulated to our State government. There is a suspicion that only children of officers who know about these things are able to get these scholarships. These scholarships should be kept open to every talented student of the country.

Now I come to certain political issues. The West Bengal assembly is sitting every

day without the CPM components and other opposition parties supporting them. I can very confidently tell this House that Shri Jyoti Basu is going to London to hold an international press conference to put forward their claim before the international press that the whole assembly election was a rigged one. This view is not getting enough publicity here and even if it gets, it seems that it is not cutting much ice with the people of India. So, he is now flying to London. There was also a secret meeting with high politbureau people in Calcutta. They are now sending Shri Jyoti Basu to London to hold this international press conference. I can even mention the names of journalists from India and abroad who have organised this. There he will put forward his claim that the whole election was a rigged one. Romania has been asked to bear all the expenses of Shri Jyoti Basu. They have also said that even KGP the secret organisation of Russia—also was responsible to make the election a rigged one.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Is it true, Shri Bhupesh Gupta ?

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADH-YAY : This is something very amusing. The election was held on the 11th March. On the 12th March they came out with a statement that appeared in all the papers that they will get absolute majority. On the 13th the results were out. On that day they said that they lost because the whole election was a rigged one. Though I say this humorously, this is a very serious thing. Sir, it is surprising that he is going to London to hold a Press conference there, an international Press conference, •••

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You should tell them that you have no intention of sending anyone to Paris to hold another conference like this.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADH-YAY : and is asking Rumania to bear the expenses for his visit and, Sir, they are also tagging KGB with the Government of

India and also mentioning some names of our Ministers representing West Bengal. Sir, when the Election Commissioner went and visited my State, he invited all the political parties. I represented my party in that meeting and in that meeting, the representatives of Mr. Jyoti Basu's party said that there were 18 pockets where they could not even enter; later on, it came to 36 pockets; and Sir, the next day it came to 36 constituencies; and then, on the eve of the elections it was 36 constituencies. Now, Sir when they have been defeated, they say that all the elections that were held in my State were rigged and as a protest they will not join—I know that they will not join and we also know what we have to do if they do not join. We also know the legal position.

Sir, one thing I would tell the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister and that is that they should be so lenient to the Government of West Bengal that the aspirations and the ideas and the hopes of the people of West Bengal are not belied. We must do whatever is possible to ameliorate the distress of these poor people. Sir, regarding the Bill on the ceiling on urban property which was sent by the Government of India as a model one to all the State Governments, our State Assembly will be passing it or asking Parliament to legislate. But the Government of India should put pressure on the other State Government, at least those State Governments which are controlled by, Congress, headed by Congress, saying that they must either legislate in their own Assemblies or pass a resolution empowering Parliament to enact a drastic land reform measure and also the measure regarding ceiling on urban property. Sir, land reforms have not been uniform in India. Many States lag behind so far as ceiling on land is concerned and in this respect there must be some sort of uniformity. I know, Sir, that social conditions are different; the production conditions are also different. But, this is a huge country where 99.9 per cent of the

[Sbrimati Purabi Mukhopadhyay]

population in the agricultural sector is landless labour and we must do something drastic to bring them out from this utter poverty and darkness. So, Sir, land legislation and land reforms should get the topmost priority at the hands of the Government of India.

Then, number two, Sir, is about the urban property ceiling. If the State Governments, at least four or five of them, pass this legislation, the Government of India should not wait a single moment for others to do this and they should pass this urban property ceiling legislation,

Then, Sir, the third point is about electrification. Sir, there is so much of green revolution. Of course, we are proud of it and we are producing more than what we were producing before this package programme was introduced. But every thing depends on the electrification in the rural areas. We do not want electrification for switching lights in our houses, but for digging out water from the underground areas and we have regions in our country which are very dry and electricity will help us in utilising the underground water fully that will be available. This programme should get the uppermost consideration from the Finance Minister. *[Time-bell rings]*. . . Sir, I know I am intruding on others time and I am finishing now. Thank you very much for having given me this opportunity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Yes Mr. Parthasarathy. Only five minutes.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASHARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, five minutes will be enough, will be quite sufficient, for me to place three points before the hon. finance Minister with reference to the Budget which I would hasten to describe not only as a clever Budget, but a clever Budget from a clever statesman of India.

Sir, I would also like to take this opportunity of congratulating the Finance Minister and the excellent officials of the Finance Ministry for the magnificent work that they have done in compiling a budget of this nature.

Sir, this Budget is a 'New Deal' that has come to the country, particularly after the two General Elections, wherein the Congress has come out with a thumping majority and hence, I would describe it not only as a 'New Deal', but also as a fair deal to the entire country. May I add one word about this, Sir ? The Finance Minister has played his cricket well, too well, because it has affected all sections of society and all sections of the community by and large. Hence I would only pay a compliment to him by saying that the Finance Minister Mr. Chavan has played cricket in politics, but not politics in cricket. And I would salute him on that score.

Sir, when I say this about cricket, I am surprised that the Finance Minister, in spite of the fact that he is a sportsman, has made an impoverishing provision in the budget for the development of sports . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Not only that but he has made a hat-trick for the monopolists . . .

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : Sir, my time is limited. I would only say to the Finance Minister and to the Prime Minister that unless and until there is a Ministry of Sports and Games it would be impossible for any Finance Minister in future to allocate more funds. Without any adequate allocation of funds, our sports in this country would certainly not be developed by any manner and any means. Having been a sportsman all my life and having served the cause of sports on and off the field, I feel that the provision that he has made is absolutely negligible. And I hope that next year at least a sizeable sum will be allotted to sports.

Sir, there is only one more point that I would like to make with reference to the rise in income-tax limit. Unless it is raised to the tune of Rs. 7200/-, the entire middle class of this country will continue to suffer. I hope that the Finance Minister will work out certain details in this regard.

The last point that I would like to make is this. Much criticism has been levelled against taxing the rural rich. The taxation proposal with reference to the duty on fertilizers and pump sets is absolutely justified. Farm income is to the tune of Rs. 16 thousand crores as per the estimates of the Applied Economic Research Committee. I know that the Planning Commission figures are to the tune of Rs. 2,000 crores of unearned agricultural income that goes untaxed, which raises the prices of agricultural commodities, agricultural land and so on. So it is absolutely justified that the rural population, along with other sections of the public, should be made to bear the great burden with the rest of the community, particularly when the rest of the people are subscribing to the tune of Rs. 1,400 crores in the form of Defence and Defence production.

Hence I have great pleasure in supporting this budget.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The Finance Minister.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir ... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You applaud him before hearing him ? ...

AN HON. MEMBER : In anticipation.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I must thank all the Members who participated in this very important general debate on the budget. Though I could not have the pleasure of personally listening to all the

speeches that were made—I was in the other House—I did hear some important speeches of this day.

First of all, Sir, I must make a mention of some of those Members who are retiring in a day or two, who have made their contribution ...

SHRI A. D. MANI : Four days more ...

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Some of them are holidays. This debate was started by Mr. T. Chengalvaroyan who made a very useful and a very constructive speech. To that I can at least add my hon. friends Shri R. P. Sinha, Shri Partha-sarathy who ended the debate just now, Miss Shanta Vasisht and Mr. Mani. They have also made their contributions. I am sorry I will not be able to listen to them at least for two more years. But I am glad that they have made certain useful suggestions ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do you think that they would not come in the bye elections ? Why do you say two years ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am glad. I am prepared to accept your amendment ! Well, Sir, the main points of criticism that I see are of a very general nature—general criticism about the price rise, general criticism about black money or general criticism about some sort of slippage in the growth of economy. These are the general points to which we ourselves have made reference in our own speeches. You are certainly entitled to do it. But if at all you want to judge this Budget you will have to see what the Budget exactly is meant for, under what circumstances this Budget was prepared, what situation particularly political and economic situation, we had to face in the last year and what problems we have to face this year and whether this Budget provides proper answers to the problems that exist in the country in the context of the economic and political

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

situation as well. Really speaking that should be the real test and criteria for deciding whether or not the Budget is employment-oriented or growth-oriented or need-oriented. My own claim is—I have not made any tall claim about this Budget, I am very modest about it but Shri Goray did quote from my last year's speech as to what should ultimately be the criteria for judging a Budget. But those criteria I laid down are not in relation to one Budget only but generally applicable in any assessment of the performance of Budget in the long range. I am prepared to stand by those criteria implementation, employment, growth—these are some of the things by which ultimately we will have to judge the performance of the Budget. But what exactly is the problem today? I personally feel—as I said in the other House and possibly I will be repeating some of the points which I have already made—this Budget is in the first instance, oriented to meet two very important priority national requirements. One was the question of meeting the requirements of Defence. Secondly, the problem that we had to face in 1971 which was of a stupendous nature—the question not only of Bangla Desh refugees but the question of liberation of Bangla Desh and all that it meant. It is not as Mr. Gupta said that with the departure of the refugees the problem has ended for us. This is possibly the most ignorant statement I have heard ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never said so. I said as far as these taxes of Rs. 70 crores were concerned.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You read your speech. You said that the problem for us has ended. It is not ended. In a way it has just begun for us. It is the question of our loyalty to a friendly country which has just been liberated. We have much responsibility towards that country. It is our duty to help the people, who have gone back, to get rehabilitated. Therefore these are the priority national requirements for the country, to stand by

our friends and to see that Bangla Desh stands on its firm legs politically, economically and from the security point of view This is the most important thing. Besides, at the same time you have to see that you take care of your own security problem. These are the two priority national requirements. Whether this Budget meets these challenges or not, is one specific question that we will have to ask. You cannot just think about the Budget in an abstract sense. I will come to the general philosophy of the Budget. Some Members have certainly raised some of these questions. Then there were certain requirements of the economy also. It needed certain support in many areas. I will come to that later. Now the main question raised by some Members and particularly by Mr. Gupta was about poverty and unemployment. I have no hesitation in subscribing to what he said. He said that if at all we want to make an assault on poverty, if at all we want to make an assault on concentration of wealth or if we want to make an assault on the question of unemployment, there will have to be structural changes in our economy. I subscribe to that. I would say that this is exactly what we are doing. You do not achieve the structural changes in one step. This is where the difference between Mr. Gupta's attitude and ours arises. He is an agitating socialist, we are practising socialists. That is the only difference. You still are the prisoners of your own slogans. Now we have to see how we implement it. He misquoted, I would say quoted out of context, from the Prime Minister's speech. Really speaking what the Prime Minister has said she has said in this hon. House while replying to the debate on the President's Address—is that we have neither hesitation, nor fear in nationalising an industry if it fits in with the general programme of national development. It is in this sense she said that. She has certainly tried to educate the people who are in the industrial sector, she has tried to tell them what the national priorities are and how they will have to join in the main stream of new

thinking in the country. In fact this is the main theme of that speech. Therefore I am afraid that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So, Sir, she went there as the Headmistress of the Government to educate them ?

SHRI V. B. CHAVAN : Naturally; the Prime Minister educates not only them but you and me in that sense.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, with all respect to the Prime Minister and to Mr. Chavan I would rather be an ignorant and illiterate person than be educated by the Prime Minister.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Which you are; I cannot help it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If the Prime Minister's speech is education I do concede I am an uneducated man and I think the...

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Keep some sense of humour alive, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

Sir, the main question is of assaulting poverty and this is exactly what we have said and done, We have made more provision for plan expenditure and that is certainly a major aspect of the Budget. There are really two aspects of the Budget; one is what is the type of resources we are raising and in raising those resources whether we are taking any major policy decisions for redistribution of wealth. And secondly in incurring expenditure also we have to see what expenditure are we incurring and what purpose that expenditure achieves. Here certainly I would say that this Budget has made a very brave effort by making provision for Plan growth and for the implementation of the plan. Even there you will have to see what is the priority programme that we are trying to have and what exactly we are trying to do. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will have to admit that really speaking in this fight against *garibi*, fight against poverty, we

cannot merely speak in general terms. What we have to do is to first of all single out and deal with those forms of poverty which really speaking are very inconsistent with our present socialist ideals or even democratic aspirations of the country; like people without having any drinking water, people without homestead, people living in slums, people without employment and so on. It is these sort of people we have kept in mind in giving priority to our schemes of social objectives. Therefore you will see these are real efforts to attack poverty. And if this is not structural change in economy what else is. Mention was made about monopoly and other things. I would like to tell them what we have done in the last three years. That really speaking must be the test. You should not judge what the Government is doing solely by the Budget document. To make a judgment on the performance of the Government you will have to see across the entire gamut of governmental activity, you will have to see what we have done in the last few years and you will then find that there has been definitely an effort to make structural changes. I would here like to recapitulate to the hon. , Members what we have done in the last three years.

I may mention here that Government has taken many measures during the last two years to check the growth of large houses and concentration of economic power in few hands. The nationalisation of banks in July, 1969 also has loosened the hold of house masters on the finances of banks and free diversion of such funds for the expansion of these group companies. This has also been followed by the takeover of general insurance and acquisition of ownership and management of several private undertakings. The system of management of companies by managing Agents and secretaries and Treasurers was abolished with effect from 3rd April, 1970. This mode of management linking companies together under the fold of big industrial houses has ceased to operate and to a great extent it will lead to the

[Shfi Y. B. Chavan]

depletion and reduction in the size of these houses. The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969, which seeks to reduce concentration of economic power has put lot of restrictions on the larger houses so far as industrial licensing is concerned.

The recent policy of the Government financial institutions of attaching the right of convertibility to the loans advanced by them will also gradually strengthen the equity share and influence in management of these financial institutions. This is why we emphasise the importance of evolving a joint sector where, managerial ability of private sector could be harnessed with support from financial institutions. It would thus be seen that the Government has been taking a number of significant measures which seek to provide that working of the corporate sector does not result in any further concentration of economic power to the common detriment.

Now, hon. Members will also agree that there has been a massive growth in the public sector companies. Their share in the total capital investment was only 3% in the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan, but it stood at 48% on 31st March, 1971. I would like to assure the Members of the House that the Government has accepted the socialist programme and will strive hard to see that the concentration of economic power is reduced.

I just tried to recapitulate the position with a view to put together the general series of actions that we have taken, and I would like to make an appeal to those hon. Members to ask themselves the question, if this is not structural change, what else is structural change.

Hon. Member, Shri Goray also, while making criticism about the general approach to this Budget, said that there are only two types of economy, mixed economy and totalitarian economy.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I mentioned three, free economy, totalitarian economy and mixed economy.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Three, free, mixed and totalitarian.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now joint sector economy.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No, don't go by phrases; it is not there, really speaking. These phrases are there but I think very often we have tried to make our position clear; I do not know how far people understand it. Some people are frightened by this slogan of *Gharibi hatao*. Because they think that politically it deprives them of the chance of securing votes, some people take rather a very cynical view of this slogan. They really do not believe that *Gharibi Hatao* can ever be accomplished.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Nowhere *Gharibi* has been abolished, even in the Soviet Union.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : This is a cynical approach and I would like you to cure yourself of this cynical approach. I personally think that this can be done. And this will be done. I have no doubt that this is something which is capable of being done, and that is why people believe it. Don't suppose otherwise. If you do you are trying to ridicule our own people. People have got a very canny sense of understanding what is possible and what is not possible, and they have got a very shrewd sense to Judge as who can do it and who will not do it. It is not just a wave as people like to describe it. It is not just a wave; it is shrewd judgement of the common man of this country that this will happen and that we will do it. Well, this will have to be done in a different way, naturally. The hon. Member also made a mention that we will have to have another look at the industrial policy. I entirely agree with him. Not once only, we will have to keep a constant watch on the

industrial policy. As we progress further and further, naturally we will have to look at it. Our Policy Resolutions are not fundamental. These are some of our instruments which we will have to modify or change if necessary.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: I want to say in this context that in countries like Singapore and others, who have followed free economy, their economy is growing at the rate of 10% or more. It is the case in totalitarian countries also. And in our mixed economy it has come down to 2%. This is exactly what I meant to say.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I will request the hon. Mr. Go ray, because he is a very well versed and a very senior politician, and I do not have to tell him this . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : He is not a politician; he is a real student.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Well, Sir, you can call him both, I do not mind. To me he is a politician and I do not think he will take it a miss if I say so but the point is that thinking merely in terms of the GNP is rather an incomplete assessment of the position. As I said in the other House, Sir, our idea of development of the economy is not merely in terms of a 5% growth or 10% growth of the GNP. Our main test is the human being. Whether we add something in quality to the life of the common man is going to be the ultimate test. I am prepared to accept what he himself quoted from Gandhiji and that was a very apt quotation.

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now, you are talking in metaphysical terms.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No, no Mr. Goray himself quoted it and it was a very apt quotation from Gandhiji. He said : You will have to see that, whatever step you take, whatever decision you take, ultimately it makes an effect on the last man in society. That is the test

to which Gandhiji made reference and that is our test also. That exactly is the test which we are prepared to accept.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Allow us to differ on that.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN ; All right, Certainly you are completely free to differ and you have differed, but unfortunately the people have agreed with us.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : That is another thing.

SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN: This is the position.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: At the time of the elections the people heard election speeches. They did not have your Budget Speech.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I had already presented my Budget last year and after that there was this election. It is a continuing thing. My main aim is not to score any debating point. I am trying to make a point and a very humble claim that this Budget make a very serious effort to meet the genuine requirements of the nation in its priority requirements and also meet the requirements of the economy as such. I must say one thing. Hon. Members must see the type of problems that our economy faced last year not only in the political field but also in the economic field. It was completely unprecedented. The way we met the demands of the situation is a matter of pride for us. To many people in this country and outside it was a matter of pleasant surprise to find that there is such an inherent strength in our economy, that we could withstand the difficulties so bravely. It was not merely through the bravery of our Jawans, although they certainly have done very glorious work for our country. What we did in the last twenty or twenty-five years certainly added to the inherent strength of our economy, and it is that which helped us to withstand the onslaughts and the difficulties that we

[Shri Y. B. Chavan] had to face last year. Now, we have to see in this Budget and the coming Budgets that this basic potential strength of the economy is not only maintained but further improved and further increased. This is what we have to do.

Now, some Members asked, so far as the raising of resources is concerned, as to what is the redistributive character of the exercise and whether we have tried to attack the richer classes. I would like to say that about the rural rich, of whom some Members have made a mention we have not been able to do much. I do concede that as far as the rural income is concerned, agricultural income is concerned, we have not been able to do much, But at the same time I must say that we have made an effort in the last two years to make an impact on agricultural wealth. The agricultural wealth-tax was introduced a couple of years back, but it was challenged. The Supreme Court has upheld it and now, from this Budget onwards, its implimentation has started in a serious manner. As far as agricultural income is concerned, as we all know, this is a matter which has been debated for a longtime. There is certainly some constitutional difficulty. I had assured the hon. House last year that I would call a meeting of the Chief Ministers to discuss the question. We did call a meeting of the Chief Ministers. Naturally this is a politically sensitive matter. When the question of Centre-State relationship comes up, many Members from this side and the other side stand up and say: "No. This is exclusively the field of the States. We must not make any intrusion into the exclusive field of the States."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You do not want to disturb the koluks.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It is not that. It is a question of the Centre State relationship. These are some of the question that were raised by the Chief Ministers.

We wanted to put the entire question in the proper perspective. They did agree that if there is an objective assessment of the problem, an objective study of the problem, they were prepared to consider it. So, at their suggestion we have appointed an Experts Committee. It is not just one of the Committees. Prof. Raj, a known and progressive economist of the country, is there; the members are also very eminent personalities. Mr. Dandekar whose book was quoted here by our honourable Mr. Goray, he is also a member of that committee. And we will have their report within a few months in our hands and I think that will be the basis on which we will have to make certain major policy decisions in the months to come, before the next Budget, I hope.

Sir, really speaking, in the last two or three years, we have made a massive effort to put practically a virtual ceiling on wealth in this country. As far as the taxation effort is concerned, last year we made a very major taxation effort, and even in this year we have made an effort. I have not spared the corporate sector which was taxed twice, in the last interim Budget in the month of November or December—some people called it a 'mini-Budget'—we made one effort. At that time we added 2% per cent. Again this year we have added 24 per cent. Really, 5 per cent in one year in corporate taxation is not insignificant, it is something substantial. They should hear the criticism of those people who know the implications of it. I wish they had read the scathing attack made by Mr. Palkiwala on this particular matter. Therefore, it is not right to say that we have not made any effort to tax the rich.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPRA : Mr. Palkiwala is a lawyer.

SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN : He is a lawyer I but at the same time a lawyer who knows the law and who knows the implications of it.

So, Sir, the point that I am making out is that it is not proved that we have not made any effort. Really speaking, as some Members have sa'd, we have already in the last two years made a very massive effort for raising resources and that has also made a certain contribution for helping the economy to face the difficult situation that we have had in this country.

Well, Sir, these are some of the general points that were made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : what about the non-general points ?

SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN : There are the specific points which you have made. You have mentioned about the nationalised banks. Those are matters ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about the case of Mr. Pitambar Das ?

SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN : You have made that point. I do not know the facts. Naturally, since you have mentioned about it, we will take note of what you have said and we will certainly find out what are the facts. You mentioned about it, I heard it. About the nationalised banks, their board of directors etc. these matters are under examination. Naturally, whatever we do, we will do after proper consideration. I cannot assure about what percentage would be given to the INTUC or what percentage would be given to the AITUC. We should be fair in proportion to their strength and position. I do not think there is going to be any difficulty about it. Possibly he may differ about the proportionate merits or strength of the different trade union movements. Possibly, his judgement and my judgement may differ. That is a different matter. But I can certainly assure the honourable House that we propose to be very objective in this matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : What about the employment policy implementation ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am glad, Sir, that you have reminded me about this programme of implementation. Mr. Goray also made the point that we have made a provision in the Plan for it, and unless there is implementation of those plans, merely making the provision in the Budget is a meaningless exercise. I have myself said so in my Budget speech. As hon. Members have said, we are making provision in the Budget. But the real test ultimately will be in the implementation.

Sir, I would like to take two or three specific points of programme. One is the drought-relief programme which is an employment-oriented and also an area-oriented programme because this is also confined to those areas which are poverty-stricken areas—areas which have a very poor rainfall and where constantly scarcity conditions prevail. It was first of all introduced in the Budget which the Prime Minister presented in 1970-71. In that year, naturally as the programme was new, administrative efforts had to be undertaken, certain preparations had to be made. Therefore, there was not complete full utilisation of the provision was not there. But I am glad to inform the House that in 1971-72 we have spent the entire amount provided for that programme. The crash programme, which was introduced last year, is also employment-oriented programme. There also we have provided about Rs. 50 crores. My information is that till the middle of March nearly Rs. 35 crores have been spent even though there were certain initial difficulties. We are not on our own in this matter. We have to function through the States.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : What about banks ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The banks are also not as active as they should be. But that is a separate question. It will require some more elaborate answer. I do not agree with you—You will permit me to disagree with you. It can be said that

[Shri Y. B Chavari]

they are not doing enough. But that will possibly be said for years to come. But within the scope available to them, I must say that they are certainly making progress. They appear slow because they are trying to consolidate their work. The major problem is to open branches. But it is not enough just to open branches. The more important question is about changing the attitude of the people, the officers, the staff, who work there. Unless I create confidence in them—because they are the men who deal with the subject—nothing much can be done. It is they who go and prepare the programme and ultimately it is they who deal with the people. They are the men who sit in the branch office. It is they who should have some understanding of this new agricultural credit programme, what sympathy they have to have, what risk they have to be prepared to take. Normally, the attitude in this country is not to make a mistake and therefore, not to take a decision, because that is the safest way. Those people who take decisions may commit mistakes. But those who think that they never commit mistakes, never do anything. So our major problem today is the training of the staff, proper recruitment and spread of the branches and consolidation of the working of the branches of the banks. I think you must allow some more time before you sit in judgment over this matter. I have said many times that I am not satisfied. But that does not mean that they are not doing anything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about demonetisation ? You have not said anything about that.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : We are not thinking of demonetisation. These matters are not answered. And even if it is to be done it is never to be announced like this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I agree with you that even if it is to be done it should not be announced before.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I must make it clear that the Government is not thinking in terms of demonetisation at the present moment. This is very clear.

You have raised the question of employment-oriented programme. I was saying that the banks are preparing schemes which will give scope for self employment as such. Now we have made certain provisions for educated unemployment. Many States have prepared schemes. Of course, they could not make much impact last year because as it happens every new scheme in its first year's performance is beset with initial difficulties. But I am sure this year the programme will be much more effective. Most of the States have planned very ambitious plans. I hope I will be able to meet their financial requirements. This will be my real difficulty this year. But I am sure, Sir, that we are determined to make an impact on the question of unemployment, the question of concentration of wealth, the poverty pockets of the rural areas and the drinking water supply position and provision of home sites, etc.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about enquiry into the leakage thing of the R.B. Shah case ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You have merely given some suggestion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is under your Ministry.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You said somebody is trying to sabotage it. This is your information. I have to find out whether there is sabotage or not. What answer can I give now ? But I can assure you that we will not allow any sale to take place—SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You have to find out.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Whatever other suggestions are given by hon'ble

Members we will look into them. I once again thank all the Members for participating in the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May I ask one question ? When have you last been to the Yojana Bhavan ? Have you been there at all ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Yes, yes, I was there at the Planning Commission meeting last time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : So, in the interest of the common man, I wish your Budget every success.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order. Sir, you are the Chair.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Now I am retiring. *

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are not to make such remarks. Thereby you are associating the Chair with some positions of the Government. We are critics of the Budget. Why don't you say . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN) ; I said, in the interest of the common man.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ...that he should accept my criticism ? Therefore, you should not say such things. Even when you are retiring without any tax exemption, please do not say such things.

TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN INDIA AND BANGLA DESH

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI A. C. GEORGE) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Trade Agreement between India and Bangla Desh entered into on 28-3-1972. [Placed in Library.

S*e No. LT-1762/72]

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : It is a very important document.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): This is a very important document. Sir, the Government is now developing the habit of not discussing these things. We are all in favour of this agreement; nobody is opposed to it. But such matters should be discussed in Parliament. Members can give suggestions as to how the agreement should be implemented from their point of view.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Sir, I support what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said. We welcome the agreement. It is really opening a new chapter in the history of this sub-committee. Therefore, we should be given an opportunity to express our opinion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN) ; I think, if the Members want, we will fix up some time for it.

SHRI N.G. GORAY ; Give us a couple of hours.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) ; Sir, I want to say something.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN); I am asking the Government to consider it. We all welcome the agreement which would further strengthen the friendship between the two countries. But the Members want to discuss the agreement that has been entered into. So, in consultation with the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, we can fix up some time.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, I want to make a submission. The Government has always taken the position that the treaty making power is a sovereign power of the Government. There is no question about that.