

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ जो श्री भूपेश गुप्त के कथन से उठता है। मेरा कहना यह है कि पश्चिमी बंगाल की जो दयनीय स्थिति है और सभी कारणों का जो फल हुआ है प्रेसिडेंट रूल, उन तमाम बातों पर मद्दे नज़र रखते हुए जिन कारणों से कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी बनाई गई— लोकसभा के नाम तो आ चुके हैं और राज्यसभा के नाम आज नहीं तो कल, परसों आ जायेंगे, सी० पी० आई० एम० की ओर से कहा गया है कि वह उसमें भाग नहीं लेगा चाहे आप बनाये या न बनाये, मगर यह कमेटी बनेगी और अपना काम करेगी, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी जो बनी है, उस कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी के किस अधिकार का अतिक्रमण कर रहे हैं होम सेक्रेटरी यदि तमाम घटनाओं की जानकारी करने के लिए वे पश्चिमी बंगाल जाते हैं। यह हमारा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मैं समझ नहीं पाया हूँ श्री भूपेश गुप्त कि वे क्या चाहते हैं। पश्चिमी बंगाल में आज नरसंहार हो रहा है और पार्टियाँ आपस में आंख मिचौती कर रही हैं। जब वहाँ पर प्रेसिडेंट रूल लागू हो गया है तो यह केन्द्र की जिम्मेदारी हो जाती है, अगर वहाँ पर कोई गड़बड़ी होती है तो यह केन्द्र का प्रश्न है कि वहाँ की हालत को ठीक करे। इसलिए चाहे केन्द्र की ओर से एल० पी० जायं या सी० पी० जायं।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Sir, as far as I know, no statements or public utterances were made by the Home Secretary and whatever has appeared in the Press is all conjecture. The Home Minister has stated the position of the Government of India that whatever proposals are received from the West Bengal Administration about the Preventive Detention Act or any related matter, they will first be placed before the Consultative Committee and after that whatever advice we receive

from the Consultative Committee, decisions will be taken by the Government after ascertaining the views of the Members of the Consultative Committee. Regarding the composition of the Committee, after taking the consensus we have taken certain decisions and you have to make the nominations based on those views. As far as the question of statements and public utterances is concerned, no such statements have been made and he has had no talks with the pressmen about that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House Stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty-seven minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

#### THE FINANCE BILL, 1970

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI) : Sir, I beg to move :—

“That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1970-71, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : I rise on a point of order. It appears to me, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that this Bill is a mixed bag, and it curtails the rights of this hon'ble House. In regard to the Finance Bill, we have got certain limitations, that is, this House has got certain limitations. If the Bill contains extraneous matters, to that extent, the Bill curtails the right of the House to consider those extraneous matters, because they are all brought together under one blanket name—Money Bill. My submission is that this is not a Money Bill. If you take into account all the offending clauses of the Bill, there are certain clauses of this Bill which offend Article 110 of the Constitution. That is the relevant Article to be considered in this context, even if we give due consideration to sub-clause (g). Article 110 of the Constitution says—Definition of “Money Bills”—“For the purposes of this Chapter, a Bill shall be deemed to be a Money

Bill if it contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters, namely the imposition, abolition, remission, alteration or regulation of any tax." The scope of the Bill is enlarged by sub-clause (g) "(g) any matter incidental to any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f)." I agree with the definition of this Bill; even the meaning and the spirit of Article 110 of the Constitution along with its sub-clause (g). My submission is that there are many matters introduced in this Bill which offend Article 110.

I have emphasised the word 'only'. There are constitutional commentators who say that the word 'only' has been introduced for the sake of this hon'ble House. I have got the authority of some political commentators who say that it is only for this hon'ble House that the word 'only' has been introduced there. Otherwise, this House would not have got a fair deal, if the word 'only' were not there. That is a very significant and key word to be considered.

**SHRI MAHA VIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh):** How does it relate to this House alone?

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA:** Because of the power for consideration of the Money Bill in this House, and our limitations so far as this House is concerned. And if you limit the powers of this House, then you have to be very strict about the definition.

Now, I would like to mention by way of illustration some of the clauses which offend Article 110 of the Constitution. I will not go into detail. Before I do so, I would like to say that I am not objecting to them on the basis of the merits of the proposals contained in them. The merits of the proposals are not in question just now. It is only the constitutional aspect of the matter that is under consideration. Let me take first sub-clause (a) of clause 3 of the Finance Bill. This, to my mind, seeks to amend the definition of "capital asset" as contained in the Income-tax Act. Similarly, sub-clause (b) seeks to amend the definition of "Commissioner", as contained in the Income-tax Act. Here, the two definitions have been sought to be amended. They pertain to the Income-tax Act. If these had come by way of substantive amendments to the Income-tax Act, then this House would have an opportunity of discussing them, and making amendments also.

**AN HONOURABLE MEMBER:** Even now we can do.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA:** No, Sir. If it is certified to be a Money Bill, then we work under certain limitations. That would be only in the nature of recommendations. I can give you some illustrations Clauses 4, 8, 26, 27, 39 and so on. I do not want to multiply these examples. This Bill offends against Article 110 of the Constitution. The material that is given for our consideration is certified to be a Money Bill by the Speaker. And again, according to the Constitution the certificate of the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha is final. That is, his certificate cannot be questioned anywhere. I do concede that point. But may I submit to you that if there is a Bill for the legislation of abortion, and that is also sought to be certified as a Money Bill, would it stand to reason and would it be tenable? That must conform to certain practice. In the UK, sometimes some Bills have not been certified as Money Bills which are obviously Financial Bills. Similarly, sometimes, some Bills, which are not Financial Bills on the face of them, are certified to be Money Bills. That has happened. But we have certain examples on the basis of the practice in the world, particularly in the kind of constitutional framework in which we are functioning. Now, we should have made some reference to that and then come to certain decisions about it. Then, another thing to be considered in this context is the ruling given by the hon. Speaker in that House in the year 1956.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** Is it a point of order, Mr. Mishra?

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA:** Yes. You have to consider it. I am going to refer to one rule. It relates to the rights of this House; and what I want to bring out is the way in which the rights of this House are sought to be curtailed. That is a very important point for your consideration. I was submitting that the Speaker in that House in 1956 had gone into this matter and he had also passed some remarks for the consideration of the Government. Whenever there are doubts expressed in relation to any Bill, then the Government has to be extra careful about that. Useful reference can be made to what the hon. the Finance Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister did last year. Last year objections were

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

raised in that hon. House as to whether certain clauses of the Bill conformed to article 110 of the Constitution or not. Then, the hon. Finance Minister conceded their point of view and he gave an assurance. Later on he brought forward an amending Bill to the Income-tax Act which is now under the consideration of a Select Committee. There he separated those clauses. That is my impression. The hon. Finance Minister, on objection having been raised last year, separated those parts of the Bill which did not conform strictly to article 110 of the Constitution. This year also I must say that this House has to be grateful to the hon. Members of that House who raised this point, because they particularly brought in the rights of the Rajya Sabha. It is, indeed, a very happy thing for us because it indicates that both Houses want to work in perfect harmony and one is quite considerate about the rights of the other.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Not last year?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No. This year. This year when this matter was taken up by the other House this point was raised by some hon. Members in that House. Now, last year on their objection the hon. Finance Minister did separate certain clauses. That is my information. The hon. Finance Minister did separate those clauses and brought them forward by way of amendments to the Income-tax Act, which is under the consideration of the Select Committee just now. The proper course even this year should have been this. The offending clauses in this Bill should have been withdrawn from the Finance Bill and then by way of amendments to the Income-tax Act or the Wealth-tax, whatever is appropriate and relevant, it should have been done.

Now, what are the courses open after the certificate has been given by the Speaker? I would like to refer to rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure of Rajya Sabha. I shall read :—

“(7) On a Bill being introduced in the Council or at any subsequent stage, if an objection is taken that a Bill is a money Bill within the meaning of article 110 and should not be proceeded with in the Council, the Chairman shall, if he holds

the objection valid, direct that further proceedings in connection with the Bill be terminated.”

Now, it is within your power to direct that further consideration of the Bill be terminated if you think that the objection is valid.

Again, I am only reminding you of your powers, of what you can do in the matter. You can terminate proceedings in connection with the Bill. I must be squarely held that the House, through you, has got the power to terminate the proceedings in connection with the Bill, if, in your opinion, the objection is valid. Now, I come to rule 186(8). It says :—

“If the Chairman has any doubt in regard to the validity of the objection, he shall refer the matter to the Speaker whose decision on the question shall be final in accordance with clause (3) of article 110 of the Constitution.”

Now, if the points raised here convince you that there is scope for doubt...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The provision is just the other way about, Mr. Mishra. You are arguing that there are certain things which ought not to be here. The provisions that you have kindly read out just now relate to the fact that if there is a Bill which is a money Bill and has been wrongly brought here, then, under this provision I have got a right either to terminate the proceedings or to send it for the opinion of the Speaker. Here the provision is slightly different. I think you will appreciate it. You are not arguing that it is a money Bill and by mistake it has come here, but you are drawing my attention to the fact that there are certain provisions which ought not to have been in the money Bill and ought to have been in another enactment. These have been introduced and as such the rights of the Rajya Sabha have been affected.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Quite right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : How is it materially different ?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I began by saying that this is not a money Bill strictly because it brings in many extraneous things which do not conform to

the requirements of article 110 of the Constitution. Therefore, although the certificate of the hon. Speaker is binding and final as I have submitted, according to the rules that we have framed for the conduct of business in this House, we have a right to bring it to your notice that this particular Bill does not conform to the requirements of a money Bill. If you hold our objection to be valid that it does not conform to the requirements of a money Bill, according to article 110 of the Constitution, then you can terminate the proceedings and you can make a reference to the other House, to the Speaker of the other House. So...

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** (Orissa) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir...

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : Let him complete it.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** : I will say a few words only to help him and you to arrive at a conclusion. Because this question has been raised...

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : Mr. Banka Behary Das, let him finish it.

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY** (Mysore) : He has yielded.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : Much more time will be taken than need be.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** : At this point I want to ask. I will come to the other aspects afterwards when you give me a chance. I am helping him in this matter. Article 110(4) says :—

“There shall be endorsed on every Money Bill when it is transmitted to the Council of States under article 109, and when it is presented to the President for assent under article 111, the certificate of the Speaker of the House of the People signed by him that it is a ‘Money Bill.’”

According to his submission you can refer the matter to the Speaker, but when we are going to consider this Finance Bill you can see that nowhere in the Bill it has been mentioned that the Speaker has certified that it is a money Bill.

**SHRI OM MEHTA** (Jammu and Kashmir) : In the message.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** : That is immaterial. In the message the Speaker might have certified it to be a Money Bill.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : You have made a point other than what Mr. Mishra was saying.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** : I am going to say you can refer. But I am saying there is no question of reference. You know the other question. When the President certifies also, when the Bill is introduced, then the Bill itself contains that the President has recommended that it can be taken up. Just like that when Speaker certifies—because it is a constitutional provision, it is not a provision according to the rules...

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : What is your point?

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** : It would have been proper for the office or the Minister also to see that this certificate is appended to the Finance Bill as is done in the case of the President. It is not done. So I am just...

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI** : If it is on the record, is it enough?

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS** : It is not enough. You know it very well. It is not enough unless it is circulated along with the Bill. That has been the procedure throughout. I want to say that in the case of the Finance Bill the same procedure should be adopted so that at least there will be no doubt in anybody's mind that the Speaker has certified. That should be the procedure. I will go into another aspect afterwards, but I am pleading along with him in this matter that the Speaker may again be referred or you can append the certificate of the Speaker so that we may know whether it has been properly certified or not. In the case of the President it is always done.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI** : Without the certificate it is incomplete. If a certificate is there, the hon. Minister might bring it.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS** (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, you have raised a very pertinent and relevant question. The question is, as you have said, the rule quoted by Mr. Mishra, 186(7) says that when objection is raised that it is a money Bill within the meaning of article 110, it is only in that case that the discussion can be terminated, whereas the objection raised by Mr. Mishra is that it is not a money Bill. Your difficulty was that if objection had been raised that it is a money Bill, then it could be terminated, not when the objection is that it is not a money Bill. My submission in this case is that this provision, which affirmatively says when objection is taken that it is a money Bill, also includes when objection is taken that it is not a money Bill. Even in courts the issues are always framed in the affirmative but they also include the negative. This also includes both by implication. That is what Mr. Mishra means.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI** : The distinction between a money Bill and any clause which is not directly connected with a money Bill is made for the simple reason that this House has no right to amend a money Bill. With regard to every other thing except a money Bill it is our privilege to make any recommendations, to make changes to amend. Now if a matter which is relevant to non-money Bills had been just smuggled into it, then it deprives the House of its right to make amendments. Therefore, this is most relevant. With a view to safeguarding the rights and privileges of this House I would request you to please find out what is the matter. One way may be that all those clauses which are not relevant to the money Bill, which are outside the purview of the money Bill, might be deemed to be deleted, and on the rest we can discuss and make recommendations.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA** : I have to finish. I was just on the point of concluding. So, my submission would be that since an objection has been raised—and this objection has not been raised only in this hon. House but it was raised in the other House for our sake; please underline it; for our sake also one Member mentioned it that “you would be curtailing the rights of the other House” . . .

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI** : Did the Speaker give a ruling?

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA** : When my hon. friend, Mr. Tyagi wants to know it, I would say that there is another objection to be raised in that context; he has reminded me of a very good point. The hon. Deputy Speaker who happened to be in the chair at that time said that ultimately “I leave it to the wisdom of the House”. These are his words. I am coming to this. Even if he certifies on the basis of the wisdom expressed by the House through a majority, I should say that it is not discretion exercised by the Speaker. It is not his discretion—that discretion relates to the Speaker. The Speaker has to exercise his discretion whether a particular Bill is a money Bill or not. That cannot be decided on the basis of a majority of the House expressing itself in favour of a particular point of view. That cannot be done. But here I shall read it for you and later on I do not know what transpired—what the Deputy Speaker said : “If I have followed Mr. Dandekar correctly, the crux of his submission was that certain provisions that are sought to be put into the Finance Bill would affect fundamental structural changes of certain Acts and also the changes in the Taxation Law Bill that is being the Select Committee”—there is some mistake here. “The Government thinks that these are not fundamental structural changes and that they are incidental. So I leave that to the wisdom of the House”. That is what the hon. Deputy Speaker was pleased to remark.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : The House decided anything?

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA** : I do not have the full record but since the hon. Deputy Speaker referred it to the House, probably the House . . .

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS** : Passed the Bill as it was.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA** : So, it is a very serious matter. That discretion rests with the Speaker and not with the House. The Speaker has to exercise his discretion in this matter. My humble submission is that the discretion has not been exercised by the hon. Speaker of that House and therefore this certification is not a valid certification if it is based on the expression of opinion by the House.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI** : May be the Speaker might have given some ruling.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** But I should not be very particular about that. Let them bring forward if the hon. Speaker gave any ruling. Whatever they have to do they will do it in reply to this. This is another point which arises apart from the fact that this is a mixed bag and this contains many extraneous things. Therefore, I would submit to you that according to the Rules of Procedure that we have framed, my interpretation is that the Rules of Procedure give you the right to terminate the proceedings just now and the Rules of Procedure give you the right to refer it back to the Speaker. I submit to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, on the basis of what Mr. Basu, a political commentator has written about it. He says that the Rules of Procedure indicate that this can be referred to the Speaker for his decision. His decision would be ultimately final. Even so the rules clearly indicate that the House can go into this matter and refer to the hon. Speaker with such submissions as the hon. Members might have made in this connection, so that the hon. Speaker comes to certain decisions about this in the light of the submissions made in this House. Therefore, I would request you, in the first instance, to terminate the proceedings. Probably no meaningful discussion can take place unless you terminate the proceedings. The proceedings can easily be terminated till the decision comes back from the hon. Speaker of that House. (*Interruption*) That would be according to the Constitution. That would be binding. About that I have absolutely no doubt. The Speaker's word is the final word in this matter.

3 P. M.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS :** Before I go to the . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** Are you also of the same view?

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS :** I am of the same view and I am to add to and emphasise the very facts. I want to draw your attention to what is the practice up till now in this House and in the other House and then I will go to articles 110 and 117. Article 117 says—

“(1) A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub clauses (a) to (f) clause (1) of article 110 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the President and

a Bill making such provision shall not be introduced in the Council of States :”

So, whenever a Finance Bill comes, always the President's recommendation is obtained first and after that it comes. Because of the objection in earlier days, you know, the recommendation was always appended to the Finance Bill and you see all those Bills. It has not been appended here. But you will find that earlier in all the taxation measures, the President's recommendation is mentioned on one page so that the House knows that the President has recommended that it is a Finance Bill which the Parliament can take into consideration. When that certificate was not appended, there was objection. So, the procedure was evolved that to complete the formality of article 117, the recommendation of the President should be appended to the Bill and that procedure is continued up till now in this House. Similarly, in the case of article 110, if the Speaker certifies that it is a Money Bill, it is not enough that only a communication comes to the Secretariat of the Rajya Sabha. It ought to be appended to the very Bill for which the consideration motion is moved by the Minister concerned. I say, it is a lacuna which ought to be set right and you should direct that in conformity with article 110 of the Constitution, this certificate of the Speaker that it is a Money Bill should be appended always so that there is no doubt in the mind of anybody that the certificate has not been obtained.

Secondly, I would come to the point of Mr. Mishra ; I am in complete agreement with him so far as this matter is concerned that we have some limited powers and taking umbrage under these limited powers, Government should not bring in extraneous matters in such a Bill which is termed as a Finance Bill according to the Constitution. I want to emphasise this fact. Article 110(1) says—

“For the purposes of this Chapter, a Bill shall be deemed to be a Money Bill if it contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters, namely :—

(a) the imposition, abolition, remission, alteration or regulation of any tax ;”

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

That means, beyond that nothing should be mentioned in the Finance Bill. This is the clear directive of the Constitution. It is not a question of the Speaker's directive. The Speaker may certify and the Speaker may err also, and for that, if he commits a mistake, there is a provision. Otherwise, there would be no necessity in the Rules of the Rajya Sabha for this provision, because always Money Bills come after they have been passed by the Lok Sabha. This provision is there; there is a necessity for this only because if this House thinks—and you, Sir, also think in your good sense and agree with the spirit—that some extraneous matters have been brought into the Bill, you can send it. Otherwise, the Speaker sends it with the certificate, and there would be no occasion for such a rule being mentioned in the Procedure of the Rajya Sabha. Here it is specifically mentioned that only such things should be mentioned. I do not want to quote many instances but I will give only one instance and read it out so that you can understand how the Government has tried to bring in extraneous matters in the shape of this Finance Bill. In Chapter III, in clause 3(b), see the definition of "Commissioner".

"for clause (1), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

'(16) "Commissioner" means a person appointed to be a Commissioner of Income-tax under subsection (1) of section 117..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Is it not incidental ?

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : ". . . and includes a person. . ."

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : It does not reflect the rate of taxes.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : I am emphasising on this word only. If they have said that it contains provisions 'dealing with all or any of the provisions', I can say that you can bring it and stretch your imagination to such an extent that the definition of 'Commissioner' may be brought in because the article is a little bit vague. But here the article is very specific. It cannot bring in any extraneous matters because the word has been specifically mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, here Mr. Mishra also referred to the question of the ruling of the Speaker in 1956. The ruling of the Speaker in 1956 clearly mentions that if it is not illegal, it is improper and it is virtually commitment of impropriety on the part of the Government if they bring in extraneous matters. That is the Speaker's ruling also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : That is what he has said.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : He has not said that.

The Speaker has said that categorically in 1956, not this because in this session he left it to the House without coming to any conclusion—he ought to have come to a conclusion—after hearing both the parties. But there he said that it is improper, it is commitment of impropriety on the part of the Government if they bring in extraneous matters. Here I gave you an instance. And if you now reject this point of order, you will have to give your opinion as to why these are not extraneous matters, that these are matters directly concerning the Finance Bill. I think you will have to come to that conclusion. If you give that ruling, then you will have to consider whether this definition of 'Commissioner' can be brought in. If a Vice-Chairman of this House in his good sense gives a ruling that these are not extraneous matters—it will have a very vital bearing concerning article 110—if you do this, then I think you will be doing a great mistake. And if you concede the position as Mr. Mishra and I have stated, you have only one option left—you have no other option according to the rules. The Rules say that even if the certificate has been obtained from the Speaker but this House is of opinion that extraneous matters have been there and if you agree with it, you may not say that this is out of order and so I do not allow this discussion but at least you will have to say that I am again referring the matter to the Speaker for his opinion. If after that the Speaker gives an opinion that I am satisfied that it is a Money Bill, of course, we cannot do anything; nor have you any right to say anything.

Now, the question is whether, according to you, on this point of order, these matters are extraneous or not. If they are extraneous, then you should be guided by the Rules of Procedure

of the Rajya Sabha which means that you will have to refer the question back to the Speaker. If you say that these are not extraneous matters, then you will have to see, as a member of this House, what will be the consequences—the power of the Rajya Sabha will be curtailed and the Constitution will be violated with the consent of a Vice-Chairman who is also a Member of this House. So, I want to emphasise here that in the interests of the protection of the rights of the Rajya Sabha, because we have limited rights as regards the Finance Bill and other Money Bills are concerned, you will give an opinion and again seek the advice of the Speaker so that you will have to say whether it is a Money Bill or not. And in that connection you can give all those instances which have been referred to by Mr. Mishra and by me or by some other Members so that on that basis, the Speaker can take it up and give an opinion. So, I will not say more about it.

My first submission therefore is that the certificate of the Speaker should be appended to the Finance Bill whenever it comes before us. Secondly, because extraneous matters have been inducted into the Finance Bill just to avert a discussion, just not to give any scope to the Rajya Sabha to discuss those things and come to a decision, you will, as protector of the rights of the Rajya Sabha, will give your opinion that these are extraneous matters and that these matters should be referred to the Speaker for a final decision.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE** (West Bengal) : Sir, I think I cannot agree with the point of order raised by Mr. Mishra. Of course, the question of curtailing or extending the powers of the Rajya Sabha is quite irrelevant though, of course, I must say with all respect to the hon'ble Members who have spoken before me that as far as the question of a Money Bill is concerned or the question of the Finance Bill is concerned, I think the right is always with the representatives of the people, and even if there is a shadow of a doubt that the matter is a Money Bill, I think even as a Member of the Rajya Sabha I shall say that the matter should be decided by the representatives directly chosen by the people and not by the people sitting in the Rajya Sabha. It is not a question of paro-

chialism; it is a question of the fundamental principles of democracy. Apart from that, what I say is this.

Apart from the question raised by Mr. Tyagi, as far as sub-rule (7) of Rule 186 is concerned—I am coming to Rule 110 also—of course, he raised it ingeniously, if I may say so with respect, suppose for a moment that he is correct in his interpretation. . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** : Mr. Pitamber Das said that.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS** : Mr. Das only said that. But Mr. Das did not believe in it. I will explain my position later on.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE** : Supposing for a moment that Mr. Tyagi is correct I think he is not—the difficulty that will arise with regard to sub-rule (7) of Rule 186 is this. Sub-clause (7) says :—

“On a Bill being introduced in the Council or at any subsequent stage, if an objection is taken that a Bill is a money Bill within the meaning of article 110.

The objection can be raised only if a Bill is introduced in the Council or at a stage subsequent to the introduction of the Bill in the Council. The point is that the Bill has already been introduced in the Lok Sabha. It has come here after being introduced and after being passed there. If it comes after being passed there, then it cannot be the stage subsequent to the introduction stage, because as a matter of fact the stage subsequent to the introduction can only mean a stage subsequent to the introduction in the House itself; otherwise it has no meaning. Therefore, it is now a Bill which has been introduced in the Lok Sabha and passed and has been sent to us for consideration. Therefore, the question whether the Bill is a Money Bill or not, that objection cannot be taken at all in this House because it is not a stage subsequent to the introduction in this House.

Further, Sir, sub-section (8) has no relevance here because sub-section (8) certainly refers to sub-section (7) only. If a Money Bill is introduced and the Chairman feels that it is a Money Bill, the Chairman shall say that it cannot be taken up in the House. If there is a doubt on that question being raised,



[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

then the Chairman shall refer it to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha. This situation is not there.

As far as article 110 is concerned, it is very clear. What is a Money Bill? A Money Bill contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters, namely, (a) to (g). And what does (g) say? It says:—

“any matter incidental to any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f).”

Mr. Banka Behary Das says that the definition of “Commissioner” is not within the clauses. What I am submitting to you is this. If a person is to decide as to the quantity of tax, incidence of tax, that person, naturally, has to be defined, has to be delegated the powers in the Bill itself. You cannot certainly contend that to raise taxes in a particular Bill you have to bring in another Bill. Therefore, it is an incidental provision. Therefore, the question of definition of Commissioner also is a matter incidental to any of the matters specified in the sub-clause. What I am submitting is this. The point of order of Mr. Misra cannot be raised by virtue of section 110 read with Rule 186. As far as I am concerned, much as I would like the powers of the Rajya Sabha extended, I would not be a party at least to this that the Rajya Sabha's power should extend to the question of voting down a Money Bill because that would be completely undemocratic. The power vests in the representatives chosen directly by the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Nobody questions that.

**THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE** (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : I want to intervene at this stage.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I hope his would not be the final say. It would be only intervening in the debate.

SHRI K. K. SHAH. I want to speak at this stage.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN** (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : After him, I want the Government to give a reply so that I may finally give my ruling.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I wanted to know who in the end will reply on behalf of the Government, Mr. Shah or Mr. Sethi?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN** (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Both may reply.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : If Mr. Sethi replies then I will take Mr. Shah's contention only as an intervention. Let him speak.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN** (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : After that I want to give my ruling.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : So you propose to give your ruling only after Mr. Shah has spoken, without hearing Mr. Sethi.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN** (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : If Mr. Sethi wants to speak, he will also be given the opportunity.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : If Mr. Sethi will be the last to speak, then let Mr. Shah speak before me.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : You have to speak earlier because you are my senior colleague. So have precedence over me.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Why do you deny him the opportunity to clear the confusion that you are likely to create?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Since this is a matter of procedure, I hope my friend, Mr. Misra, will excuse me if I do not agree with him.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Why be so apologetic?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I belong to Lucknow. I know some manners. At that time, I only meant to say how Mr. Misra was justifying the application of that rule without expressing any opinion from my side. I personally agree with what Mr. Chatterjee has said because it applies to a Bill which is introduced in the Council. Now, this is a Bill which has not been originally introduced here, but has only been “transmitted” to it, to use the word that has been used in the rules. The word “transmitted” has been used in the rules.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU (Andhra Pradesh) : That interpretation has to be given; otherwise the rule becomes meaningless. There is no question of introduction here.

**SHRIMAT YASHODA REDDY** (Andhra Pradesh): His objection is that no Money Bill can be introduced. If that is so, what was the necessity of such a rule if this contingency was not there?

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE**: The Ministry may commit a mistake if they introduce a Money Bill here.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS**: Just as by mistake the Government has included many provisions in this Bill which should not have been included, similarly, by mistake it can introduce a Bill here which, in fact, should not be introduced here. Therefore, Rule 186(7) is here. If objection is taken that the Bill cannot be introduced here because it is a Money Bill, then Rule 186(7) would apply, but not in this case because in this case the Bill has been transmitted.

Apart from this procedural question now with regard to this Bill being a Money Bill and the right of the Rajya Sabha to question the validity of the certificate issued by the Speaker, I have got an entirely different approach. My approach is that we should not question the speaker's certificate regarding this Bill. I do not want to enter into a discussion whether we can question it or we cannot question it. But I do not like to question it. Assuming that it is a Money Bill, I should be anxious to see that the Bill remains purely a Money Bill. For instance, supposing my friend, Mr. Shah, gets up and tells me that here is a heap of rice. I do not want to question what he says although apparently there appear to be particles of stone and other grains in that rice; it is not pure rice. But I do not want to question what he says. I have accepted it as a heap of rice. Then it would be my duty to pick and choose those articles which, in fact, are not rice, which are pieces of stones, which are particles of dust, which may be particles of some other foodgrains and thus make that rice perfectly pure so that it is really claimed to be pure rice and not adulterated rice. So I look at this Bill from that point of view. The Speaker says that this is a Money Bill. I take it to be a Money Bill. But I am anxious to see that it remains a Money Bill. Article 110 provides the rod of measurement as to what a Money Bill should contain. Therefore, my duty would be to see

that if it is made to contain anything, other than what article 110 mentions, then I should try to take it out, in order that the Bill does not remain an adulterated Bill.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI**: It is Mr. Shah who has committed adultery.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE**: On a point of order, Sir. He says Mr. Shah has committed adultery. It is a very serious allegation.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN**: (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He meant adulteration, not adultery. It was a slip of the tongue.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE**: Oh, I see.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI**: I am sorry for my wrong use of the word.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN**: (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think Mr. Tyagi is better when speaking in Hindustani.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH**: You can understand what Tyagi means by a particular word. He has got a different dictionary. Why do you want to quarrel with his dictionary?

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS**: Over the question of adultery between Mr. Tyagi and Mr. Shah, I would not like to be a party.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH**: I know Tyagiji for 40 years.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS**: What I have tried to do, in regard to certain provisions that apparently cannot be covered under article 110 of the Constitution, is that I have given amendments to those provisions so that this House may consider them and accept those amendments. It would avoid quarrelling with the Speaker that it is not a money Bill. That is number one. Then it would also be safeguarding the rights of this House to make amendments with regard to the matters which cannot be covered in a Money Bill under article 110 of the Constitution. When the time of my amendments comes, of course, I will have my say in detail.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** Sir, for the spirit in which the debate has taken place, I think this House deserves congratulations because it has argued absolutely on the merits. But may I point out that article 110 has defined a Money Bill not only positively but also negatively. Article 110(2) says :

“A Bill shall not be deemed to be a Money Bill by reason only that it provides for the imposition of fines or other pecuniary penalties, or for the demand or payment of fees for licences or fees for services rendered, or by reason that it provides for the imposition, abolition, remission, alteration or regulation of any tax by any local authority or body for local purposes.”

Now, have any of these things been included in the Bill?

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** Yes, they are.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** No, they have not been included in the Bill. That shows that when you discuss the question whether a particular Bill is a Money Bill or not. . .

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS :** This is absolutely wrong.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** It may be wrong from your point of view. (*Interruptions*) At least as a lawyer, I know how to argue. Please leave it there.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :** That is why I said that after he confuses the issue, let Mr. Pitamber Das clear it.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** Dahyabhaiji is always confused when I speak. I cannot help it. Article 110 defines what a Money Bill will be. It also defines when it will not be a Money Bill. It defines two things, not one thing only. Now the question that was raised by my hon. friend was that the definition of Commissioner has been included in the Bill and the definition of capital gains tax has been included in the Bill. Now we will see whether article 110(I)(g) covers those two instances which have been pointed out. Are they incidental to any of the things specified in sub-clauses (a) to (g)? Sub-clause (b) says : “the regulation of the borrowing of money or the giving of any guarantee by the Government of India, or the

amendment of the law with respect to any financial obligations undertaken. . .” Now when you give a guarantee, has the authority which gives the guarantee to be defined or not? Under whose signature will the guarantee be given?

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** The definition of Commissioner is not involved in it.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** It is not incidental.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** They are incidental. “Incidental” in law has always been defined as something which is necessary to carry out the objects of the Bill; everything that is necessary to carry out or implement is incidental to the Bill. This has been accepted universally everywhere. Unless they point out something that it is not a natural concomitant, it is not incidental to the carrying out of the objects of the Bill, it cannot be taken out. Thirdly, Sir, I was amazed when my hon. friend Mishra, argued saying that at any stage it could be pointed out that this is a Money Bill and then the proceedings will be terminated. And what happens then? If there is any doubt in the mind of the presiding authority, it goes back to the Speaker, and the Speaker certifies that it is a Money Bill. But when he has certified that it is a Money Bill, then what happens? It has already been certified that this is a Money Bill.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** Where is the certificate?

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** The certificate is here. It has been certified to be a Money Bill. Then for Mr. Pitamber Das, a veteran lawyer of his stature, having once accepted that it is a Money Bill, to say that part of it is not Money Bill. . .

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS :** I did not say that.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** Yes, you said that and you gave an example.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** I have said it is a mixed bag.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS :** I only said that this is a Money Bill but if there appears to be any adulteration and there are things which should not have been included in a Money Bill, then

they have to be taken out. It should not be very difficult to understand what I said, particularly for Mr. Shah.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI:** Mr. Shah, you said with great emphasis and authority that the definition is consequential and, therefore, it is a Money Bill. Supposing in the definition you have got to say that the clerk of the Income-tax Officer will also have the same power, then we cannot move any amendment, we cannot object to it. The procedure etc., will be badly affected. So, you cannot try to argue that way. Now it is only Additional Commissioner. Suppose you had said that a peon also will do the needful.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH:** Tyagiji, you have dealt with this matter. When a tax is to be levied, the authority to levy the tax has to be mentioned. Otherwise no tax can be levied.

Then, Mr. Pritam Das says it is adulterated rice; he accepts it is rice but wants to pick out the stones. Now it has been certified by the Speaker, and when the Speaker certifies, he certifies every clause. He does not certify only the general temper of the Bill. Therefore when everything has been certified, what will you take out?

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI:** Is it orally certified or certified in writing?

**SHRI K. K. SHAH:** In writing. Under these circumstances, therefore, there is no question of raising any objection at this stage.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** Mr. Sethi, would you like to add anything?

**SHRI P. C. SETHI:** I would not take much time of the House because the Leader of the House has clarified the position to a very great extent. And I am thankful to the hon. Members, Mr. Chatterjee and Mr. Das for having accepted it as a Money Bill. First of all, I would like to point out that that the honourable Shri Mishra pointed out what happened in between when the debate was going on in the House. In between the honourable Deputy Speaker did say, "I leave it to the wisdom of the House". But, Sir, when the matter was thrashed out ultimately, what the Deputy Speaker was pleased to observe was this—

"In the first place I do not agree with Shri Dandekar that the time

of the House will be wasted if you want my ruling now on this issue. The very fact that I allowed the Bill to be introduced and that I allowed the consideration of the Bill and Mr. Shantilal Shah was half way through with his speech, is itself an indication that I considered it as a Money Bill."

Sir, he also further observed that—

"Whatever changes, whatever proposals, are made in the Finance Bill are consequential and incidental."

Therefore, as far as the ruling of the Speaker is concerned, it is final.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** That is the Speaker's.

**SHRI P. C. SETHI:** Yes, Sir. That is the ruling of the Presiding Officer of the other House.

Then a point has been raised with regard to the recommendation of the President. I would like to point out for the pleasure of the House that the recommendation of the President under Article 173 has been communicated to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat as far as this Bill is concerned.

Then, Sir, a question has been raised as to who would decide whether this is a Money Bill or not. From this point of view I would like to draw the attention of the House to Article 110(3) which says—in fact, there is an endorsement of the Speaker that the Bill is a Money Bill—

"If any question arises whether a Bill is a Money Bill or not, the decision of the Speaker of the House of the People thereon shall be final."

Therefore, having obtained the ruling of the Speaker that it is a Money Bill, now it does not lie for a discussion here whether you consider a part of the Bill as Money Bill or not. Therefore, I do not agree with what Mr. Das has said—that although the Speaker has given his ruling that this is a Money Bill, we will have to find out how much of it is adulterated and how much of it is not. The Speaker has given his ruling on the totality of the Bill and therefore, that question does not arise. Sir, I would also like to point out that this is not a new thing that it has come to this House or that it has come to the other House. . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What did Mr. Morarji Desai do when he was the Finance Minister?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : This is not the first time that such type of introductions have come in the Finance Bill or through the Budget Proposals. We have been doing this sort of a thing and I have got a long list of things which were done from time to time as, for example, merger of income-tax and super-tax, elimination of calculation on rebates, rounding up of income-tax, diversification of developmental rebate, grant of export market, grant of agricultural development allowance, so on and so forth. There are innumerable instances where this has been done. . .

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : But could you tell us what the Speaker said when such points were raised in the past?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I have told you just now. He said, "Whatever changes, whatever proposals, are made in the Finance Bill are, consequential and incidental".

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : No, no. Not about this. You said that such objections had also been raised even in the past in the House of the People. I would like to know if you could tell us as to what the Speaker said on the previous occasions when such points had been raised. For instance, it was raised in 1956.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : When this was raised, the honourable Speaker observed—

"Discretion will be exercised by the honourable Finance Minister or his Ministry in bringing them separately unless they are so interconnected with the other provisions of the Bill that the finances for any particular year depend upon those provisions. In such cases they can be added on here. It is not so much a question of legality as a question of propriety."

Therefore, even at that time the Speaker had observed that "it is not a matter of legality, but it is a matter of propriety". . .

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : You will excuse me. The observation of the Speaker was very much different. With your permission, Sir, would like to read

it and I would like to know whether the observations of the Speaker categorically were these or not. The Speaker observed—

"I would normally urge upon the Finance Minister, not only he but also all his successors. . ."

including yourself, Mr. Sethi,

"... to see to it that only these provisions which relate to the raising of taxation should be included in the Bill. The procedure should be followed and no other provision should be given attention to unless they are absolutely consequential."

The procedure should be followed and no other provision should be given attention to unless they are absolutely consequential.

"If we have to provide by way of an amendment to the Income-tax Act or by way of an amendment to a substantial Act, the Government must come forward with an independent measure separately and the House will have ample opportunity to consider it."

This was the observation which was made by the Speaker in 1956. I want to know categorically whether this is correct or not.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : We entirely agree with the Speaker's ruling.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : Whatever is part of the proceedings, I would not say that it is not correct. But the main question is that it has to be decided whether what has come is consequential or incidental or not. And even in the light of the observations which have been raised by the honourable Member here, I would like to say that the honourable Speaker of the other House did consider this matter at great length and this was discussed and ultimately it was ruled by the Speaker that this is a Money Bill because all the matters raised here are relevant and consequential. The Leader of the House rightly pointed out why the definition of "Commissioner" was changed here. Now, it is known to the honourable House that we have introduced wealth-tax on agriculture which is going to be enforced from this year. Therefore, certain commissioners had to be appointed for that purpose. The old definition of "Commissioner" who

was to take up this work was not applicable. Therefore, it was necessary to change the definition of "Commissioner". . .

SHRI MAHA VIR TYAGI : You can appoint a Tehsildar also as a commissioner.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I would ask Mr. Tyagi if he could do it as the Finance Minister. If he could do it, I can certainly do it too. Why bring in Tehsildars here? Mr. Tyagi knows the whole practice very well.

Therefore, Sir, this is definitely a Money Bill.

With regard to the other point about what the honourable Shri Morarji Desai is said to have observed during the discussion, I would like to point out that the Income-tax Act is before the Select Committee for its consideration and when this matter was referred to the Speaker, it was pointed out that any change in the Income-tax Amendment is a Money Bill. Therefore, from that point of view, as far as that Select Committee is concerned, only Members of the Lok Sabha are there on that Committee and Members of the Rajya Sabha are not there although discussions and arguments went on. As far as the Income-Tax Amendment Bill is concerned, I would like to point out that that is on account of the Administrative Reforms Commission's recommendation as well as on account of the recommendation of the Bhoothlingam Committee, and therefore, that is a separate consideration altogether. And all such measures which have to be brought during the Budget Proposals have to come through the Finance Bill and if the Finance Bill is made a static thing where only changes in the revenue receipts are to be made, then, through the Budget Proposals we would not be able to do much that we desire to do. Therefore, I would request the honourable House to proceed with this Bill. We have had an intelligent discussion about the whole subject. I am thankful to Shri Mishra and Shri Banka Behary Das for having raised this intelligent discussion. And now I would request them to settle the issue and proceed with the Bill.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I have a small submission to make.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please be brief.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I am always so. And this has been to my eternal chagrin that the Chair has been allowing all kinds of things to be said in this House. We are going to make an issue of it, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the valuable time of the House is consumed by so many persons in raising. . .

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I was only requesting you to be brief.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I must say that this is not fair. I have raised this point and I am coming to that. Whenever I made a point, I think I have tried to make a substantial point. I say so with great humility and I hope to make a few submissions in the briefest words possible.

Now, under Rule 186(7) to which I made a reference the point that is being made is that "if any Bill is introduced by mistake. . ." That is the point that is being made now. May I say that Article 109 of the Constitution categorically states that a Money Bill shall not be introduced in the Council of States? And yet a plea is being made that there might be a mistake committed in introducing a Bill which is really a Money Bill in the Council of States. A mistake can be attributed to this House, but a mistake cannot be attributed to that House that a certification is being made of a Bill which is not essentially in its entirety a Money Bill. Here a mistake is being attributed although I do not go on the basis of a mistake; I would say that there can be no mistake committed because the mandate of Article 109 is clear and categorical. It was urged that there cannot be any introduction of a Bill which is a Money Bill in its nature in this House. I had begun by saying that that was mixed bag. I do not say that it does not have any financial implications and so on or that many aspects of the Bill cannot be interpreted to be of such a nature as to justify inclusion in a Money Bill. That was not my submission; my submission was that many things have been brought in which completely changed in many ways the nature of the Bill. That was my submission. Earlier also I had said that if a Bill for the legalisation of abortion, I take the extreme example

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

only to illustrate, is certified to be a Money Bill, what is the remedy open to this House?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : It casts aspersions on the wisdom of the Speaker.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No aspersion.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Of all the subjects, why does he lay great emphasis on legalisation of abortion?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : My submission is, this House can of course not do much in this matter. But I would not like to indulge in self-flagellation or self-exultation so far as the powers of the House is concerned. No doubt we have some powers which are not possessed by that House but in this matter that House has got powers which we do not possess. That point is conceded. Your point is also conceded that the certification of the hon. Speaker is final. My only submission is, if in certain absurd cases and I have brought in the example this House is able to make certain submissions for reconsideration of the Speaker, then this House should be in a position to do so; that was my interpretation of Rule 186, (7) and (8), I can base it on the assumptions regarding that a mistake could be committed because I would not say that a mistake cannot be committed by that House and I would not make that House infallible. Although the Speaker there might not be infallible, yet, we have to consider him infallible in the matter of certification of Bills for this purpose. I concede that but if you interpret Rule 186(7) and (8), then it can be interpreted in terms of submission for reconsideration by the Speaker because a mistake might be committed even by the Speaker. That is my interpretation.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Ruling and certification are different. Has he given a certificate?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : In accordance with the procedure of this House, when the Secretary lays the Message of the Lok Sabha, he also specifically mentions that the Speaker has certified it as a Money Bill and I have the proceedings here of 7.5.70. When the Secretary of this House placed the Message he said: "The Speaker has certified that this Bill

is a Money Bill within the meaning of Article 110 of the Constitution". According to my lights, I will give you. . .

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : The certificate must be laid on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It has been laid on the Table. In fact he says: "Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table".

He had read this thing also.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : It is not here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Now attention has been drawn to article 110 of the Constitution. I think it has been laid very clearly what the provisions of the Money Bill and the other things concerned. At the same time it has also been laid down in article 110(3) that the certification of the Speaker is final. So, in view of that, as there has been a clear and unequivocal certification of the Speaker, I hold that this is a Money Bill.

Regarding the other matters that Mr. Mishra and others raised that there are extraneous matters regarding those instances that have been brought to my notice they are incidental and they are also covered by (g), which reads :

"any matter incidental to any of the matters specified in this clause are also to be included."

As regards Rule 186(7) and (8), I have further considered it but I feel we are bound by the very clear wording of this rule and when the rule says 'introduction of the Bill', the meaning of introduction is obviously clear.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What about introduction in subsequent stages?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Regarding that, I lay down that this rule does not apply to the case under discussion and so it stands that it is a Money Bill and the Minister will proceed with the Bill.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I request you to read over to the House the actual wording of the certificate. It is not enough that he has done it. Let it be read.

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** I have given the decision but for the satisfaction of yourself and other Members, I will read. The Speaker says :

"I hereby certify that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

In such circumstances we cannot go beyond the ruling of the Speaker.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS :** Sir, I want to know one thing with regard to your ruling. You just now said that certain examples that have been given here were incidental to Article 110(a). I would like to know whether this ruling will debar me from moving my amendments with regard to those provisions. I hope not.

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** My ruling is to the point raised. According to the procedure you will be able to move and it will be discussed.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** There will be one difficulty. Was it necessary for you to pronounce your opinion with regard to certain extraneous matters that we referred to here? Was it at all necessary for the Chair to pronounce on that? Whatever the case might be, I am urging upon you for reconsideration. It is entirely within the powers of the Speaker to certify anything to be in the nature of a Money Bill, then was it necessary for you that all to pronounce your opinion on that?

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** Because you had raised that.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** My raising the point was subject to the final word by the Speaker. If that is so, your ruling only restricts us in some ways. They were only illustrations regarding certain things.

**SHRI P. C. SETHI :** The Budget proposals have now been before the country for a period of nearly 10 weeks. Hon. Members have had an opportunity to discuss the major features of the Budget and the Finance Bill in the course of the general discussion and also following the presentation of the Appropriations Bill. My task on the present occasion is therefore fairly simple. With the indulgence of the hon. Members, I will merely use this opportunity to explain once

more the rationale behind the proposals in the Bill. I will also explain the changes and amendments in the Bill originally proposed we have felt necessary to introduce in response to the valuable suggestions made on the floor of this House and outside.

Sir, any set of Budget proposals is unlikely to satisfy all members of the community to an equal degree. There are two sides to the Budget, one which sets out the processes by which certain resources are transferred from the citizens to the Government, and the other which delineates the pattern of expenditure from out of these resources. By virtue of these two operations, the Government affects the disposable income of individual citizens and groups. It is not—and it cannot be—the function of a Budget to leave things as they were before it was presented. It is inevitable that, as a result of the Budget proposals, certain sections of the community would be better off while certain others would be slightly worse off than what they were before the proposals were made. In the olden days a Budget could confine itself to raising revenue solely for purposes of maintenance of law and order and defence; it was thus natural that the resources that were tapped from the community constituted a relatively small proportion of national income. The context is now completely altered. We as a struggling nation aspiring for rapid economic growth and simultaneously aspiring for the reduction of socio-economic inequalities could not possibly keep the budgetary exercise limited to such a narrow confine. I will here refer to the relatively slow rate of growth which has afflicted the economy in recent years, and which has aggravated the problems of unemployment and social tension. Public outlays have tended to stagnate; no perceptible improvement in the level of private investment has been discerned either. In fact, one of the most remarkable lessons emerging out of the experience of the last few years is that, where there is a lag in investments in the public sector, the private sector too lags behind. It is in this context that the need was felt for a considerable augmentation of investments and developmental outlays in the public sector; the proposals in the Budget are a reflection of this need, for public outlays can be expanded only if there is a sizeable expansion in public revenues.

[**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair]



[Shri P. C. Sethi]

Raising revenues does of course mean that certain relatively affluent sections experience a diminution of their wealth and incomes. This is however inevitable if the urges of development are going to be satisfied in the over-all. Let me also add that we often tend to take a one-sided view of these fiscal operations involving a transfer of resources to the Government; the other side of the picture, namely, a retransfer of these resources, which stimulates economic growth and reduces income inequalities, is not sufficiently emphasised.

We owe it to the nation to accept the imperative need for widening and deepening the revenue base. In this year's Budget, we have however tried to ensure that whatever additional revenues are raised are deployed in a manner as would raise the potential of growth in the system. We have also tried to ensure that in the overall scheme of raising revenues, a proper balance is maintained between direct and indirect taxes. The principal desideratum here has been the importance of minimising the burden of imposts on the poorer sections of the community. This has been the reason for being especially selective in the choice of items on which excise levies have been increased. In the field of direct taxes, an attempt has been made to combine, optimally, the goal of raising revenues with that of furthering the cause of distributive justice. We are passing through a period of growing consciousness amongst the common people. Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that in the two decades following independence, certain forces were unleashed which went to accentuate the inequalities in the distribution of income and wealth in our society. If we want to ensure the harmony of our system and institutions, it is necessary that incomes at the very high ranges are taxed at increasingly stiffer rates and that assets accumulated at the very top of the social scale are scaled down through fiscal devices. At the same time, it is equally desirable that taxes are not deliberately avoided or evaded by stratagems which barely manage to keep on this side of the law.

Where a tightening of the rigours of direct taxation has been considered necessary both for a social reasons and for fiscal purposes, the Budget, I dare say, has suggested the appropriate mea-

asures. At the same time, by no stretch of imagination can the proposals in the Bill be said to be against the healthy and smooth growth of the private sector. The Budget proposals have been purposively framed to encourage private savings. For example, as hon. Members are aware, the Bill has made a provision to exempt from taxation income up to Rs. 3,000/ a year which is derived from investments in certain specified categories of financial assets and also to exempt investments up to Rs. 1.5 lakhs in such assets from the purview of the Wealth Tax. By an amendment made to the Bill during its consideration in the Lok Sabha, deposits with State Financial Corporation as well as with other approved long-term financial institutions would be included in this tax-exempt category. To promote savings in the economy, the Government has also proposed a further amendment to the original Bill. In the context of the need to extend the coverage of banking to rural areas to tap savings there, we have proposed to amend the relevant provision in the Income Tax Act so as to exempt from deduction of tax at source the interest earned from deposits with banking companies including the cooperative banks.

I might also mention at this stage our acceptance of a proposal made on the floor of the Lok Sabha to further lighten the fiscal burden on the middle class population. The minimum deduction in lieu of the cost of travel to work for salaried assesses has now been raised from Rs. 20 per month, as originally proposed, to Rs. 35; for these travelling by scooters or motor-cycles, the deduction will be Rs. 60/ per month instead of Rs. 50/ proposed earlier.

The Finance Bill introduces certain changes in the existing law with a view to preventing abuses in the running of charitable and religious trusts and reducing the scope for the use of trust funds for acquiring control of industry and business in which the author of the trust or his relatives may have a substantial interest. While this proposal will stamp out a rampant social evil, it has always been our intention to try to remove any genuine difficulties which parties may face in complying with some of the conditions in the Bill. Hon. Members will recall that a provision exists in the existing law whereby a trust of this nature is allowed to accu-

accumulate its current income without attracting tax liability for a maximum period of ten years, for purposes authorised under the terms of the trust, provided the funds thus accumulated are invested in Government securities. With a view to lightening the rigours of this provision, we have now amended the relevant provision in the Bill so as to allow investments of the accumulated income also in the form of deposits with post office savings banks, banking companies, and approved long-term financial institutions.

The Bill had originally proposed that a trust or an institution which engages in any transactions which provide direct or indirect benefits to its author or his relatives during the previous year relevant to the assessment year 1971-72 would forfeit the exemption from tax on its income for that year. Since, under the law, the previous year relevant to the assessment year 1971-72 could, at the option of the trust, be the financial year 1970-71 or the calendar year 1970 or the year ending on Diwali in October 1970 or even the year ending on the 30th June 1970, trusts which may already have engaged in these transactions before the announcement of the Budget proposals would normally have forfeited the exemption from tax on their current income. Since this particular provision of the Bill could not have been anticipated by trusts who were not subjected to the disability before, it has now been proposed that any use of the trust's income or property to provide benefits to the author or his relatives in relation to any period up to 31st May 1970 would not lead to forfeiture of the exemption from tax on their current income.

If trust funds are invested in any concern in which the author of the trust or any of his relatives has a substantial interest and the amount of such investments is in excess of 5 per cent of the capital of that concern, that too would, according to the condition specified in the Bill, lead to a total forfeiture of the tax exemption. Since a certain minimum time should be allowed to the trusts to enable them to change their investments, we have proposed to allow the trusts and institutions time up to 31st December 1970 to alter their investment portfolio.

A related minor amendment makes it explicit that persons making donations to a trust will continue to be eligible

for tax relief so long as the volume of investment on the part of the trust in any of the prohibited concerns does not exceed 5 per cent of the capital of such concerns.

Under the original provisions of the Bill, capital gains which arise from the transfer of agricultural land situated within the limits of any Municipality or Cantonment Board having a population of not less than 10,000 persons will from now on be subjected to income tax. It is now proposed that where the holder of such land disposes it but acquires other land elsewhere to continue agricultural operations, the capital gains arising out of such a transaction would be exempted from taxation.

While the Bill tended that discretionary trusts should generally be taxed at a flat rate of 65 per cent on their incomes and at 1.5 per cent on their wealth or at the rate applicable to individuals which is higher, certain categories of existing discretionary trusts, which have been created by employers for the benefit of their employees, such as provident funds, superannuation funds, gratuity funds, pensions funds, etc. are to be exempted from charge of tax at the flat rates. The amendment necessary for this purpose has been approved in the Lok Sabha.

As hon. Members are aware, agricultural wealth comes under the purview of taxation with effect from this year. The utmost care will be taken at the time of the collection of Agricultural Wealth Tax to ensure that small farmers are not harassed, assessment is made only with respect to fairly large-sized holdings, and the genuine agriculturists are not put to any inconvenience. It will be recalled that in the case of ordinary wealth tax, apart from the general exemption of Rs. 1 lakh, a residential house up to a value of Rs. 1 lakh is also exempt from tax. In the case of agricultural wealth tax, in addition to the general exemption of Rs. 1 lakh, there is a further exemption of Rs. 1.5 lakh. But, to ensure that genuine agriculturists are not harassed, we have now also decided to exempt a farm house, whatever its value, from the ambit of the tax. These various exemptions will be over and above the exemptions for farm implements, tractors, wells, and so on.

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

In the present circumstances, it is simply not possible to give up our 4 P. M. reliance on indirect taxes for revenue-raising. But, as I said earlier, in the present Budget we have taken great care to limit the new indirect imports by and large only to such commodities as enter the consumption of the upper sections of the community; wherever it has not been possible to avoid some taxation of goods which are consumed by the poorer people, the rates of duty have been purposely kept at low levels. We have also considered the views expressed by the Honourable Members in this House and outside on the original proposals. Up to a point, some of the sentiments expressed have already been taken into account in the amendments moved in the Lok Sabha; certain other changes are being carried out by separate notifications. Among these changes, I might mention the steps proposed to obviate the difficulties of the decentralised sector of the art silk industry in the matter of declaration of values for purposes of assessment. As a result of the changes now proposed, tariff values have been fixed for the assessment of the major varieties of art silk fabrics which would considerably simplify the assessment procedure. At the same time, the slab up to which the rate of duty is 3 per cent is being raised from Rs. 2.50 to 3.00 per sq. metre. It is also proposed to lower by 5 per cent the duty to be charged on fabrics turned out by "independent processors" in case the grey cloth brought to such processing houses is delivered to the owner, after processing, in an uncut condition.

Subsequent to the presentation of the Bill, a number of measures have been proposed to accord relief to small producers and manufacturers in various fields. The principal concession, reducing the revenue yield by as much as Rs. 90 lakhs is with respect to tea; the small tea gardens in Nilgiris, Assam and Darjeeling will be the major beneficiaries as a result. The production of metal containers, safes and strong boxes by units which do not use power will be wholly exempt from payment of excise duty; even in the power-operated sector, units manufacturing these commodities will enjoy a limited exemption provided the scale of production is small. An exemption of a similar nature will also extend to units manufacturing biscuits. Mathematical box-

es, geometry boxes and colouring boxes used by students and children will not be liable to payment of excise duty either.

Apart from lowering the proposed duty on television sets from 20 per cent to 10 per cent, a series of other measures we have now proposed which will provide relief in diverse directions. Pasteurized butter, used within the same plant either for making ghee or for re-constituting into milk will be exempt from duty. Room-and-package-type air-conditioners, in case installed in hospitals, will not be subject to enhanced rates of duty; fish-freezing plants will enjoy a concessional rate of duty; the levy on arrated waters will be confined to products manufactured with the aid of power and marketed with a registered brand name or trade mark. The provision of total exemption to hank yarn in plain straight reels used in the cotton handloom industry is being extended to all counts less than 31 N. F.

Finally, the V. P. P. Charges are being retained at 10 paise for all packets up to Rs. 10 in value.

Sir, in concluding, I can but repeat what the Prime Minister has said on several occasions. No Budget can satisfy all interests. Even if marginally, it is bound to hurt some, it is bound to leave some members of the community less satisfied than others. But, at the same time, I will urge that the proposals in the Bill be appraised in their totality, and that judgement on it ultimately be based on the significantly qualitative change in direction which these proposals reflect and embody.

Sir, I move.

*The question was proposed.*

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY** (Mysore) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, on a previous occasion I expressed my views about the various taxation proposals. I do not propose to deal with this aspect of the problem in detail, except to remark that the concessions that have been made by the Finance Minister this time after the introduction of the Budget are very marginal and they do not take us much far. Sir, the totality of all these concessions, as my friend will agree, will be too small; it has not changed the character or the complexion of the

original Budget proposals. Sir, I would like to deal today with the perspectives and the problem which are pressing us, the various challenges that are confronting our country.

Sir, there is a general challenge of which all of us should be aware, the challenge of growing economic distance between India and other countries. This challenge has been growing year after year. Notwithstanding the fact that claims have been made on the part of the Government and many measures have been taken by the Government to bring about the sustained economic growth towards take-off or to create pre-conditions for take-off, the fact remains that the economic distance between India and other countries is very wide and it is growing. Sir, there has been an economic study made by certain knowledgeable friends. I would like to refer to this study for the consideration of the Members of this House. What does the study say? It has been brought out, Sir, that India, in spite of its two decades of development, remains in a very vulnerable position. The study has taken the figures of 1963 for all the countries of the world including India. In 1963, Sir, India's per capita income was only 80 dollars as compared to 218 dollars of the Philippines, the second lowest among the countries under study, 298 dollars of Portugal, the lowest in Europe, 763 dollars of Italy, the lowest among the developed countries of West Europe, 1300 dollars of the U. K. and 2560 dollars of the USA. Sir, if you assume that India's per capita income is at an annual average of 1.6 per cent., that was the rate of growth in 1950s. In the sixties the growth rate was smaller than 1.6 per cent, then India will take 63 years to reach the 1963 level of the Philippines, 83 years to reach the level of Portugal, 142 years to reach the level of Italy, which is the lowest among the developed countries in the West, 172 years to reach the level of the U. K. and 218 years to reach the level of the USA.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : That is 1.6 per cent.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : Sir, 1.6 was the rate of growth in 1950s. It is less than 1.6 per cent. in the sixties. I am not criticising anybody. I am only bringing to the notice of the Members how vulnerable we are. What is

the use of claiming that we have done wonderful things for our countrymen? Let us not fool ourselves like that. I of course share the anxiety of the members of the Government and the anxiety of my colleagues on this side. I am not making any adverse comments; I am only bringing to the notice of the House the vulnerability of the Indian economy. Sir, India requires an annual rate of growth of 6.3 per cent in per capita to reach Italy's present level in 37 years.

AN HON. MEMBER : By that time America and others would have gone 400 times ahead because he is comparing from their present standards.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : That is why I referred to the level of 1963. To achieve this rate of growth of 6.3 per cent per annum in per capita income, India will have to grow at 8.4 per cent per annum. The annual rate of economic growth should be round about 8.4 per cent or 9 per cent. There are figures given by the Planning Commission, and there had been targets fixed in the past. The rate of growth for the last several years and in the period of planned economic development has been round about 3.4 per cent. The rate of growth fixed for the Fourth Plan is somewhere between 5.5 or 6 per cent. Even this, Sir, falls short of the basic requirements of reaching the minimum standards or the minimum per capita income required. I say that the growing economic distance between India and other countries is a great challenge. And I want to ask whether this challenge can be met by us and whether the rate of growth as envisaged—8.4 or 9 per cent per annum—can be realised and attained. I say that it can be attained. If we look at Japan's rate of growth, and if we can only emulate the norms, the standards, the efficiency and the progress of their various sectors, it would be possible for us to overcome this vulnerability over a period of time. But I am afraid, this Budget and the previous Budgets do not reflect this. This is my complaint. My friend, Mr. Sethi, is a progressive man, and I believe in his orientation as a progressive Member. But I do feel that there is a lack of appreciation of this reality. If I can use the word of President Kennedy, Sir, we have not been able to come into confrontation with the

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

realities. We have not been able to come in confrontation with the challenges of our times. I want to pose this first thing before the hon'ble House. In spite of this Budget, which is a part of the Fourth Plan, and in spite of the fact that many attempts have been made to take the economy further, we will not be able to reach even the target that has been fixed i.e. 5.5 per cent growth. Sir, the rate of growth achieved during the last year is 5 per cent. I do not think that this rate of growth can be increased to 6 per cent. I have got my own reasons. The biggest factor for the rise in the last two years was the growth registered in the agricultural sector. That has given a tremendous boost not only to morale but also to economic growth. But I do not think that this can be sustained for a longer time. I say this because we expected 106 million tons of food production this year. And the target fixed last year was somewhere between 100 and 103 million tons. This target has not been reached in spite of the fact that we have been saying that we are having a successful green revolution all round. In spite of this green revolution and agricultural transformation, we have achieved this year only the target of 100 million tons. And I say that this is a very limited advance over the advance we made last year. This falls short of the estimate. And the biggest factor which gave a tremendous boost to this economic growth in the last two years has been the agricultural sector. And I am afraid that we are now entering into a stalemate. The advance in the agricultural sector seems to have been frozen.

Sir, various measures have been taken on a selective basis to bring about rapid economic transformation in rural areas. I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the various specific challenges that we are facing, apart from the general challenge of economic growth and of bridging the growing disparity in the growth between India and other countries. I would like her to concentrate on specific challenges, and to tell us whether she has been taking measures to meet these challenges in the various sectors.

The biggest challenge is unemployment. My friend referred to this casually in his speech. According to me,

unemployment poses a very big challenge. It is one of the biggest problems of our time. In European countries, sometime past when socialism was very fashionable, the planners and socialists in France and elsewhere and even Lenin said that socialism means electricity. Some said that socialism means electricity plus steam engine. Some others said socialism means electricity plus water. These things have been said by the socialists of those times. To us now socialism is employment, Sir, 'I see darkness in the noon'. Why do I say that? We have recognised, and I believe the Government have recognised, the problem of the growing unemployment. Having recognised it, are we equal to the task of meeting this challenge?

Sir, take the rural areas. What is the picture there? The biggest labour force is the force living on the land. The agricultural labourers form the greatest bulk of the working population in the rural sector. I think they constitute something like 50 to 60 million. For the last many years and during every plan period we have said that employment is one of the main objectives of planning and development. And in spite of these assertions, what do you find? In spite of three Plans and development during these three Plans, the per capita income of agricultural labourers is far less than what it was before the Plan started. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected by the hon. Minister. Today, the per capita income of the rural proletariat, the agricultural labourers in particular, is far less than that it was fifty to 60 million people, who are the landless labourers and who form the bulk of the labour force in this country do not see any increase in their per capita income for the last several years. Is it socialism? If socialism means the protection of the vulnerable, the most vulnerable section, according to me, Sir, is the agricultural proletariat. What has been done to them? Mere nationalisation of 14 banks is not socialism. Perhaps, after nationalisation of these 14 banks, socialism has been confined to the safe-vaults of 14 banks. There is a stalemate today. There is no dynamism and forward thinking. If socialism has to mean anything for the ordinary people who live at the grass level, I think various specific schemes have got to be formulated.

I ask : Is it not possible to mobilise these 60 to 70 million people ? Is it not possible to give an institutional shape and expression to these people ? Is it not time to think of forming a land army ? Why not we organise these people and use this human power for the economic development of the rural areas ? Madam Prime Minister has been very gracious to repeat some of the previous projects for the village labourers. She has accepted, after a good deal of difficulty, to have in the Fourth Plan the rural works programme, but it is confined to a few drought-affected areas. It was tried in the past. What happened ? What was her experience ? The experience has not been very satisfactory. I always stood by the rural works programme on a permanent basis. Even today I maintain that the rural works programme has got to be organised on an institutional basis. It should be permanent. It should be applicable to all the blocks, to the five thousand odd blocks in the country, but what do we find ? The rural works programme has been conceived of to be applied to only a few selected blocks, that is, the drought-affected blocks. They are very few. I have no doubt that they are socialistic and piecemeal. Why not have a permanent arrangement for the agricultural labourers ? Why do you not have a land army. The functions, the powers and the constitution of the land army can be formulated by us. It can be evolved. Norms can be formulated. Training can be given, education can be given and funds can be created. If this can be done over a period of time, if it is achieved during this Plan period, I am sure there will be total involvement of the people in the various employment activities and to that extent the rural economy will change its shape and complexion.

Secondly, there are the other categories of workers. There are the young professionals in the villages. There are the Dhobies, tailors, caterers, scavengers, blacksmiths, goldsmiths and so many other people. What have you done ? We are saying that we should modernise the villages. How can you modernise these services ? Today the affluent people in the rural areas are going to the city. Have you done anything, have any schemes been formulated for this category of labourers ? Nothing has been done. I say why not

these professional men, particularly the young professionals in the rural areas get some programmes, some activities, and their services are modernised ? Can I ask the Prime Minister to consider these things deeply and start her socialism from the villages, not from the nationalisation of the banks ? Nationalisation of banks is important. I welcome it. I am for it, but should we stop there ? Let me tell you that real socialism has got to be socialism of the masses. Socialism has got to give more employment to ordinary people. The vulnerable, the low and the down-trodden people have got to be thought of. I say the provision made in the present Budget for the rural works programme is niggardly. It is **fooling us**. It is not at all socialistic. I say this is anti-socialistic. I say that it is anti-socialistic, because it will be-trool us. People will not get anything out of it. Let there be a vigorous, bold thrust in giving employment to these people in the villages. Unless the rural economy, the rural sector is transformed, unless the economy of the countryside is metamorphosed or changed rapidly, it will be difficult to bring about economic development in this country. The perspective, the target and the objective should be to transform rapidly the farm economy into a non-farm economy. Today 70 per cent of our people live on farms. This 70 per cent farmer economy should be transformed into a 20 per cent farmer economy. It is possible to do that. If you achieve a rate of growth of 8 to 9 per cent, I am sure the agricultural economy in the country, the rural sector in general will improve a lot. Unless that is done, it would be difficult to say that we have brought about socialism. How can you talk of equality of opportunity when these people are denied all opportunities ? How can we talk of justice to the people, unless they get the right to live ? Have you given the right to live to these people ? As I have said, they have been impoverished over a period of years as a result of your wonderful planning. They are today poorer than before. I say, stop this nonsense of socialism. Unless you tackle these problems, the problem of the agricultural labourers and the rural sector in particular. I am afraid socialism will be a wishful thinking. I am afraid socialism will be only on paper. It will be superficial and peripheral.

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

Take another challenge. You are facing the challenge of illiteracy. What do you find today? There is a mass illiteracy. It is estimated that between the ages of 15 and 45 we have something like 150 million people who are illiterate. This is one of the biggest ignorant democracies that we have built up in the world. One hundred and fifty million people are ignorant and illiterate. What have you done for them?

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI-MATI INDIRA GANDHI): Presumably they were all literate before and it is only in the last few months they have become illiterate.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADSWAMY : I do not know. Madam Prime Minister may look into the figures and tell me later when there is an opportunity for her to reply. I say that nearly 150 million people are ignorant or illiterate. Are you building up an illiterate democracy, an ignorant democracy? How can there socialism and the growth of socialism without social consciousness? How can they be conscious of their rights and responsibilities unless they are literate? The Soviet Union has been able to solve this problem within twenty years. They had this problem. After the revolution, within two decades the Soviet Union has been able to abolish illiteracy completely. What have you done?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Are you prepared to adopt their methods?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: They have dictatorship and here it is democracy.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADSWAMY : I do not want to enter into any argument with my friends. I only wish to emphasise the significance of this problem. Unless this class of people who are ignorant and illiterate are educated very soon, we can never bring about socialism and economic transformation. How is it possible to bring about socialism and economic transformation without the involvement and commitment of the people in the various economic activities? It is possible to achieve it only when we have people who are conscious of their responsibilities and conscious of their rights. Unless we fashion the will and the skill

of the people of this country, we cannot bring about social transformation and economic change. Let us be very clear about it. What have you done about this? People may be ignorant, but I do not think that the Government is ignorant. What have they done? Very little has been done. I wish the Education Ministry is reoriented for tackling this important challenge.

Apart from these two challenges, there are other challenges, the challenges of inflation and price instability. I referred to this important aspect when I was speaking last time on the subject. I would like to tell the House in all humility that we are going to be ruined economically because of the danger of inflation. My friend, Mr. Sethi, and Madam Prime Minister may say that inflation is not so much today, that deficit financing last year was less than what it was anticipated. That does not satisfy me at all. What is the deficit financing that we have indulged in over a period of time? Take the figures. I can give you only broad figures. In 1950-51, what was the picture, what was the scene in deficit financing. Since 1950-51, we have resorted to deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 1700 crores. There has been a 200 per cent increase in created money since 1950-51 up to 1969-70 and the gross national product has increased only by 91 per cent. What does it mean. Is it not inflationary? Is it deflationary? Between 1961-62 to 1969-70, the increase in wholesale prices has been somewhere about 75 per cent, as a result of this deficit financing, inflationary financing. Have I to take it that they have been able to take all the measures to restrain the evil effects, evil consequences, wrong consequences of the deficit financing? If that is so, why this picture? In the twelve months of previous year, the increase in the wholesale prices is something like 6 per cent or 6½ per cent. Last month it is about 2.2 per cent. Anyway, is there no increase since March, since the Budget was introduced? What is the percentage, let me know. If there is no increase, I will be happy.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : 0.6 per cent.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADSWAMY : Even 0.6 per cent is something. It is not stabilised. This 0.6 will become 6 per cent later on, over a period of time.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Forecast of gloom.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I am not a Cassandra. Cassandras are all there on your side. I am an optimist. I have started with a note of optimism. It is possible to surmount economic vulnerability provided you have the will, the determination and the purpose. That you do not have. For instance, what was the deficit financing resorted to in the Third Plan? We thought that in the Third Plan the deficit financing would be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 550 crores. What is the picture? Ultimately we had to have deficit financing of Rs. 1133 crores. What about the three Annual Plan periods? What was the deficit financing? What is the total effect of all this on the economy and the price level? I say we are in for inflation, we are already in. We have entered into a dangerous one. No measures have been taken. This inflation and the price increase will inevitably hit the wage-earners and the salaried classes. Is this your socialism? If you want to harm the poorer sections in the villages, labourers in the factories or in the fields, or the middle classes or the salaried classes by this kind of dose of indirect taxation, as somebody put it, is this your socialism? Is it your socialism of inflation and the price instability? Let us not simplify socialism with a view to hoodwink people. Let us talk about socialism in depth. If this trend continues in the economy, I am afraid we are in for trouble. This is the third challenge.

What are the other challenges? I do not want to refer to inequality or various other problems. But I am afraid I must refer to one or two problems connected with technological under-development. This also is related to national security. How are we placed so far as technology is concerned? In all the countries of world where economic development was undertaken two approaches were made: to give mass technology, that is to give technology for the masses; and to give class technology, that elite technology. What have you done in this? Today you go to any village, any small town. The traditional craftsmen suffer. Nothing is being done. I have already referred to the case of professionals in the villages. They have not been trained. Their trade or craft has not been modernised. Training has not

been improved. They have not been educated, and the goods and services they are producing are not linked to marketing because there is no infrastructure. They are not sure whether they will be able to sell their goods and services because of the fact that we have not been able to have the type of technology that is required for the masses. Where are the improvements and innovations? Where is the technology for these villages? You do not have a policy on science and technology. On the contrary you select some technology and ask the people to adopt it. The net result is that traditional technology is gone, and new technology is not coming. There is a vacuum in technology. People get frustrated. The goods and services are not marketed. There is no infrastructure. You are talking of bank loans to the engineers. They do not want it because of the fact that what they produce in their workshops cannot be sold. This is a simple fact. How do you create employment for these technicians, let alone the poor people? I say we do not have any policy on science and technology. We should adopt two approaches. One approach is to give technology for the masses—improve the techniques available already; innovate them; change them to suit modern conditions; and that is how modernisation process starts. Without modernisation process socialism is dead. Nationalised banks cannot deliver the goods, I tell you, unless you create proper conditions for utilisation of these banks for socio-economic changes. I say that you must think of proper technology for both.

Then I enter a very crucial and very significant sector, that is about technology and national security. We are all aware that we are insecure. China is growing. Pakistan is strong. Not that I want to castigate my country. Our people are strong and we can stand up to any force outside. At the same time I have to say that the strength particularly of China is growing enormously. Now China has invented a satellite and sent it into orbit round the earth. This time again a debate has been started about atom bomb, about what to do and what not to do of the old debate. It has risen again like the Phoenix's head from the ashes. When an atom bomb was exploded for the first time by China, there was a big debate on atom bomb in this country. The same debate has



[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

raised its head today because now it was a satellite fabricated and put into orbit by China. What is the picture? I do not think Government have been able to understand the strategic implications of these things, and they have been coming, to my astonishment, with the same old stories, same old replies. My friend, the Defence Minister, seems to have gone on record in the other House as saying "we can stand up to any challenge by both China and Pakistan". I would be very happy if we can do that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 35 minutes.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY. Without losing much time I want to formulate only a few things. China has got the atom bomb, has got the satellite. In this context what are we to do? May I ask the Prime Minister, she is in charge of the Atomic Energy Department, whether she has cared to find out what are the problems of the Atomic Energy Department? I find there has been considerable inertia in the Atomic Energy Department. There is a lack of fervour, lack of effort, and that has been the case for some time past. Has she decided what areas should be developed in the atomic energy sector, what areas should be properly concentrated upon in the beginning? Why has there been a delay in the execution of the projects? Take Tarapur. What has happened to Tarapur? Why is there considerable delay? This project was given to Americans on a turn-key basis. There was accident, and there was delay. What about Rajasthan's two projects? There is delay. The schedule has been changed from time to time. May I ask, is it possible to say today that we are in a position to undertake any responsibility. I do not want to give my own comments on this. I want to know whether the Prime Minister is in a position to say today that we have got the wherewithal to take up any responsibility in the atomic field. Have we achieved the potential credibility which is so necessary for us? What about the equipment? It should be our own. She is smiling. She knows it. I am very glad if she says so. I will be very very happy if she will give more smiles to me. I will be very happy,

Sir, to hear from the Prime Minister that we are going through the Kalapakkam programme according to the schedule which is not, according to my information. I ask what are the areas selected by the Prime Minister as Minister in charge of Atomic Energy to train people to utilise the existing people and to develop expertise and to develop certain areas? What are the tasks that you have chosen for this purpose? If it is for peaceful purposes, certain areas have got to be fully developed. Has there been any evaluation made about the work of the Atomic Energy Department, to find out the critical gaps, whether crucial defects, deficiencies, are identified? Sir, I do not want to say things which may not be good for our country. I say, when India was developing atomic research, China was not doing it. She was lagging behind. I do not know what is the comparative assessment of our strength and their strength. If we are told that the development of our present strength is much bigger than China's I will be too happy to know about it. I want to know whether there is any comparative assessment and evaluation made about the development of atomic energy in this country vis-a-vis China. Why do I mention China? Why do I not say about other countries. It is because till today one fact emerges and that is, no nuclear power enters into a major battle against the other nuclear power. That is one fact. And when a non-nuclear power enters into a battle against a nuclear power, it will be very difficult for a non-nuclear power to take back all the territories occupied by the latter. I put this question to the Prime Minister. Our borders are freezed; China is in occupation of them. China is a nuclear country. She has got the atom bomb and missiles. Is it possible to take back those territories? I hope it is possible. But let us consider whether we are in a position to wage a battle, if negotiations fail, to take back those territories when China is nuclear. So long as China is nuclear, will we not be deterred? Will we not develop a psychosis not to go into a battle with China? Is there any instance in the past where in a battle between a nuclear and non-nuclear power, the non-nuclear power has emerged victorious? Or is there any case where nuclear powers have battled among themselves and entered into a war? Let us have the answers:

We can develop conventional weapons; we should develop them. But it is no use saying that we can meet any challenge. That was the assertion made by Jawaharlal Nehru before China attacked us. We want to be assured of our capability, that our atomic capability is strong and viable.

What about the satellite? I would like the Prime Minister to give attention to that satellite programme. What are we doing in this field? We are flying only toy satellites in Thumba. Only toy satellites are shot there. Can we not have improved and sophisticated technology, the technology which is available? Why not we have investment of a sort which can give us sophisticated rockets? Why do we depend upon other countries for a long long time to come? It is said that it will take about eight years to reach the stage of the present-day China. If that is so, that doubt has got to be cleared. I do not know why the Atomic Energy Commission has been given such freedom only to feel us. If they are not fooling us, very good. I say that the whole Commission has got to be overhauled. I know the young scientists there; personally I know them. They are a wonderful people. We have been able to create a pool of scientists who can be utilised very well and that talent can be compared to any talent in the world. . .

(Interruptions) I have no time to hear you. Let me finish my speech. That talent is available. There is no coordination among them because there is no direction from the top. It is no use saying that the scientists are like artists, they should not be touched. They ought to be touched. They should be told to produce results, I say. And I say that there should be guidance; norms should be formulated. Leadership has got to be given. Coordination has not to be brought about not only among the young scientists in Tromby, but also there has got to be coordination between the scientists working in Tromby and the electronics, industries, Defence establishments and others. Again I ask what are the special areas that you have selected. I do not know whether it has been done. Let there be orientation of policies with regard to this without which I am afraid we will not be able to have viability in the satellite programme. More investment, more training, more coordination, more guidance, and more pur-

posefulness of these activities, these will take us further.

I say, Sir, that though we do not use nuclear weapons, we believe like Mao Tse-tung that men are superior to weapons. While saying that men are superior to weapons, Mao Tse-tung has produced nuclear weapons. So let us have credibility, let us build up the potential. Let us very soon see to it that our country is potentially capable of delivering the goods if the need arises.

With these words, I say that this Budget does not offer any perspective, neither social perspective nor technological perspective nor financial perspective. It is a very humdrum Budget, a Budget which is very conservative. There may be frills, as I said, very negligible frills. But they are only frills. In substance, the way of this Budget is the way of all the other Budgets. There is no difference. And this Budget will not usher in social justice and I do not see any jump in it to bring about distributive justice in the economy today or tomorrow. I say, it calls for a radical change in the outlook, aptitude, approach, perspective on the part of Government. The socialism of the Prime Minister has been confined only to the vaults of the fourteen banks and nothing more.

श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र (बिहार) : आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हमारे लिए यह बहुत ही सौभाग्य का विषय है कि मुझे आज देश की सर्वोच्च सभा में इस फाइनेंस बिल पर, जो कि वित्तों का मेरुदंड होता है, अपने विचार प्रकट करने का आप ने अवसर प्रदान किया है। इस के कांस्टीट्यूशनल एस्पेक्ट पर बहुत सी बातें हो चुकी हैं और इस लिए मैं उन में जाना नहीं चाहता, परन्तु भारत की आजाद हुए आज 24 वर्ष हो चुके हैं। 1950 में हमारा संविधान लागू हुआ था और तब से आज तक हर वर्ष कितने ही कानून बनाये गये, हर वर्ष फाइनेंस बिल पास हुआ, टैक्स वसूला गया, किन्तु हमें यह भी विचार करना है कि यह दोनों सभायें, लोक सभा और राज्य सभा अगर फाइनेंस बिल पास कर देती हैं तो वह सरकार के हाथ में एक हथियार के रूप में होता है जिस

[श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र]

के आधार पर वह देश की जनता से पैसा वसूलती है।

परन्तु अपने को यह भी देखना है कि आखिर जनता के पैसे का हुआ क्या? आखिर जनता पर टैक्स लगाया गया, बहुत से फाइनेंस बिल आये और बहुत सा टैक्स लगाया गया, परन्तु जो हम आज तक जनता से दिलाते रहे, उसका प्रतिफल जनता को क्या मिला, उसका भी हमें सोचना है। अगर्चे हम सारी चीजों को देखें तो हम पायेंगे कि अगर्चे यह कसूर है, यह दोष है, यह पाप है तो ये सारी परिस्थितियों के कारण जो हैं उसमें हम भी भागी हैं। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इतने दिनों की आजादी के बाद कौन सी कमी हुई? बेकारी की कमी हुई? गरीबी की कमी हुई? कौन सी चीज की कमी भारत को हुई। आपने करोड़ों पैसा खर्च किया, जनता पर बड़े-बड़े टैक्स लगावाये, टैक्सों के नाम पर बहुत से बिल लाये, परन्तु आखिर पैसे का हुआ क्या? क्या जनता के फायदे के लिए खर्च हुआ?

अब मैं बेकारी को लेता हूँ। पहले से बेकारी कितनी गुनी बढ़ी है। उस बेकारी के बढ़ने में आपकी नीति भी बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा लेती है। आपने बेकारी बढ़ाई है। लोक सभा और राज्य सभा ने कानून बनाया और बेकारी को बढ़ाया। मैं इस सिलमिले में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि बेकारी आपने कैसे बढ़ाई। आजादी के पहले यह कानून था, यह व्यवस्था थी कि मैट्रिक पास करने के बाद लोग कानून का पेशा अख्तियार कर सकते हैं, अपनी आजीविका चला सकते हैं, वह लॉ पास कर सकते हैं। मैट्रिक के बाद वह डाक्टरी पेशा कर सकते हैं, एल० एम० एफ० में हो सकते हैं। एल० एम० एफ० होने के बाद वह डाक्टरी करके, पब्लिक की सेवा करके अपनी आजीविका चला सकते हैं। आपने कानून बनाया कि

मैट्रिक के बाद वह लॉ नहीं पढ़ सकता। आपने कानून बनाया कि एल० एम० एफ० की पढ़ाई नहीं होगी। एल० एम० एफ० की बहाली नहीं होगी। नतीजा यह हुआ कि मैट्रिक पास जो जोविका पाते थे, उस आजीविका को आपने छीना और उसे बेकारी में बदला। और शिक्षा कैसी बनाई आपने? बेकारी को बढ़ाने वाली।

आजादी के पहले 12 वर्ष तक जो पढ़ता था, 10 वी क्लास जो पास करता था, वह अपनी आजीविका चला सकता था। कानून में उसको नौकरी मिल सकती थी। अभी भी करोड़ों लोग रेलवे और पोस्टल डिपार्टमेंट्स में हैं, सभी पुराने मैट्रिक थे। आज आपने स्टैंडर्ड बढ़ाने के नाम पर कहा कि बी० ए० पास ही उसका ऐलिजबल होगा—मैट्रिक पास भी कुछ रखे हुए हैं, परन्तु मैट्रिक की शिक्षा आपने 11 वी तक कर दी कानून के माध्यम से जो कानून आपका बनाया हुआ है। आज मैट्रिक क्या, बी० ए० पास किया हुआ लड़का निकलता है। अगर कोई प्राइवेट टीचर भी रखता है अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाने के लिए तो वह कहता है—मास्टर साहब, यह पास किया है, आप हिसाब तो जानते होंगे? वह कहता है हि साब तो नहीं जानता हूँ। अगर्चे किसी का लड़का इतिहास पढ़ता है और कहा जाए कि आप हिसाब जानते हैं तो वह कहता है नहीं, दूसरा कहता है कि हिसाब तो नहीं पढ़ा। आज उसका हिसाब दूसरी जगह होता है। इतिहास की बात पूछी जाए कि बाबर हुमायूँ का लड़का था या हुमायूँ बाबर का लड़का तो कहेगा, नहीं जानता। अगर कहा जाए दिल्ली आने पर कि यह लालकिला मुगलों के समय का बना हुआ था? तो वह कहेगा मुझे पता नहीं किसने बनाया। अगर एक लड़का आज निकलता है बी० ए० पास करके और उससे पूछा जाय कि इंग्लैंड कहां है, भारत कहां है, तो कहेगा हम लोगों ने जाग्रती नहीं पढ़ी। कैसी शिक्षा दी आपने। यह कानून

आपने बनाया। शिक्षा मंत्री भी हैं, शिक्षा मंत्रालय भी है, बेकारी की हवा भी बीच में है। बेकारी मिटाई कहाँ आपने? बेकारी को बढ़ाया और ये सारे कानून बनाये और जो चले आये, जिनकी वजह से शिक्षा विभाग चल रहा है, उसको तनख्वाह मिल रही है टी० ए० मिल रहा है, वह पैसा कहाँ से लिया? जनता से आपने लिया। पास किससे करवाया? हाउस से पास करवाया। बेकारी बढ़ाई आपकी सरकार और आपकी नीति ने।

मैं दो मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। आप यह कानून बनाते रहे। लेकिन कानून किस लिए बनाया? क्या समाज के उपयोग के लिए बनाये? क्या देश के फायदे के लिए बनाये? नहीं। आपने समाज के विघटन के लिए बनाये, देश की परवाही के लिए कानून बनाये।

मैंने शिक्षा की बात कही। आपने कानून बनाये, आपने हिन्दू मैरिज ऐक्ट लोगों के विवाह की आगु के लिए बनाया। आपकी धर्म निरपेक्ष सरकार, जिसने कहा कि हम धर्म निरपेक्ष हैं, ने उस कानून को बनाया मजहब को मद्देनजर रखते हुए। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लक्ष्मी देवी पर आपने दया की, आपने उसके दर्द को समझा। मैं मानता हूँ कि यह ठीक किया है, यह मानते हुए कि एक स्त्री का जैसे एक पति है वैसे ही उस पति की दूसरी स्त्री नहीं होनी चाहिए, जब तक वह जिन्दा है। उसकी सौत होगी तो उसे तकलीफ़ दिया जाएगा, उसको दुतकारा जाएगा। लक्ष्मी पर तो आपने कृपा की है, लेकिन मुसलमान बहनों पर आपने यह लागू नहीं किया। क्या वह भारत की पुत्री नहीं है? क्या कोई मुसलमान औरत आपसे आकर कहती कि हमें सौत पसन्द है, हमें चार सौत रहने दो? क्या हिन्दू की किसी औरत ने आपका कहा था कि हमें सौत पसन्द नहीं है? आने इसमें दोनों मजहबों को क्यों अलग रखा, जब आपने कहा कि हिन्दू-

मुसलमान भाई-भाई हैं। परन्तु यह कैसा भाई कि तुम्हारे लिए अलग नीति और मेरे लिए अलग नीति।

**श्री महावीर त्यागी :** मुसलमानों ने कानून बनवाना पसन्द नहीं किया।

**श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र :** मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि मुसलमान औरतों से कब वोट लिये गये थे और हिन्दुओं से कब वोट लिये गये थे, इसके बारे में कि हम इस कानून को पसन्द करते हैं। (*Interruption*) आप नहीं चाहेंगे कि नये सदस्य जो आपके यहाँ आये हैं वह कुछ बोलें। मैं पहली बार इस सभा में आया हूँ। वह कुछ ऐसी प्रक्रिया सीखें कि दूसरे के भाषण में इंटरप्ट न करें। यह एक राज्य सभा है, बड़ी आशा है। मैंने 1942 की क्रान्ति में भाग लिया, सक्रिय भाग लिया। आप समझ सकते हैं कि मेरे दिल में कितनी जलन इस आजादी और स्वतंत्रता के लिए थी। छः वर्ष तक हमने अज्ञातवास किया। ब्रिटिश सरकार की गोली मेरे पीछे चलती थी और एक दस्ता सैनिक खोज पर चलते थे, जंगलों में और पहाड़ों में। यह ऐलान था कि उस आदमी का सिर लाओ, वह जिन्दा हो या मरा हुआ। कितनी तड़पन थी आजादी के लिए। आप यहाँ पर इतने दिनों तक क्या देखते रहे। आप मेरी भावना का विचार कीजिए।

पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में आपने क्या किया? आपने कानून तो बनाये, लेकिन कानून कैसे बनाये? आपने 20 वर्ष के अंदर ऐसा कानून क्यों नहीं बनाया कि भिखमंगे भीख नहीं मांग सकते। प्राइविशेशन ऐक्ट क्यों नहीं बनाया। मैं पूछता चाहता हूँ—प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा चली गई हैं—इलाहाबाद में शायद जाती होंगी हवाई जहाज से, इसलिए उन्होंने देखा नहीं होगा। लेकिन बहुत से अपने सदस्य इलाहाबाद ट्रेन से गये होंगे और इलाहाबाद ही नहीं उससे

[श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र]

आगे जाना पड़ा होगा। गाड़ी में हम क्या देखते हैं। जब खाने का वक्त होता है और बैरा खाना दे जाता है, तो इधर-उधर से भिखारी लोग कहते हैं—बाबू हमें दो—एक टुकड़ा दो। जरा सोचें प्रधान मंत्री जी जिस शहर से आती हैं और जिस कांस्टीट्यूंसी ने बार-बार देश को प्रधान मंत्री दिया, बीस वर्ष से दे रहा है, वहां से पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू हुये, श्रीमान शास्त्री हुये और उसके बाद से श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी हैं, वहां के स्टेशन की क्या हालत है, वह क्या बोल रहा है। वहां आज भी लोग भीख मांगते हैं और लोगों को ट्रेन में खाना नहीं खाने देते। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि सरकार ने क्या प्राहिबिशन आफ दि बेगर्स ऐक्ट बनाया? क्यों नहीं बनाया? आपने कौन सा कानून बनाया? आपने बनाया एक दूसरे को अलग करने का कानून। और आपने एक कानून बनाया यह कि सी० आर० पी० सी० में अमेंडमेंट किया। जरा सोचिये कि देहात का एक अपढ़ क्या कहता है? यहां तो बातें होती हैं कि शिक्षित कितने हैं और अशिक्षित कितने हैं लेकिन जरा इसको सोचें कि गांव में बैठा हुआ अशिक्षित आपके बारे में क्या सोच रहा है। वह सोचता है, मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूं, विद ड्यू रेस्पेक्ट टु आल दि मेम्बर्स आफ दि हाउस मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि वह लोग वहां बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि पार्लियामेंट विधान सभा मूर्खों की सभा है। वह यह बोलते हैं। जो अशिक्षित हैं वह यह बोलते हैं, क्योंकि आपने 20 वर्षों में क्या किया। खाली बच्चों का घरोंदा सा कानून बनाया।

मैं इसको साबित कर रहा हूं। मैंने आपको बताया कि आपने कौन से कानून बनाये हैं। आपने सी० आर० पी० सी० का अमेंडमेंट किया, जरा सुनिये आपने दफा 145 का अमेंडमेंट किया। जहां क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड में

डिक्लेयरेशन की प्रोसीजर दी हुई है, वहां उसके प्रोसीजर में आपने चेंज किया और आपने कहा कि सिर्फ एफिडेविट दे देना है। पहले एविडेंस लिया जाता था, लेकिन उसके लिये आपने कहा कि नहीं, सिर्फ एफिडेविट देना पड़ेगा, नो एविडेंस इज रिक्वायर्ड। तो रिटर्न स्टेटमेंट एंड एफिडेविट होने लगा, लेकिन अब जो उसके लिये आपने कमेटी 1970 में बिठाई, जो 1970 में यह कमेटी हुई उस कमेटी की यह रिपोर्ट है कि वह गलत हो गया और पहले के मुताबिक ही फिर से एविडेंस लिया जाय, जो पहले था वही किया जाय। तो यह बच्चों का घरोंदा नहीं है तो क्या है। इस पर गांव में बैठे हुये लोग और क्या कहेंगे। कानून को बनाते समय कुछ नहीं सोचा गया और कितनों का घर तबाह कर दिया गया, जहां एविडेंस नहीं ली गई वहां उसका केस हार गया, उसकी ज़मीन छिन गई और वह गरीब बर्बाद हो गया। गरीब के पास तो कोर्ट फीस के लिये भी पैसा नहीं था क्योंकि कोर्ट फीस ज्यादा थी, वह कोर्ट फीस का पैसा नहीं जुटा सका और वह गरीब बेज़मीन का पड़ा हुआ है। जो धनिक वर्ग हैं, उसकी तो ज़मीन नहीं जायगी; वह तो कोर्ट फीस देगा और अदालत में जायगा, लेकिन गरीबों को आपने कानून के पचड़े में डाल कर के दिखलाया कि हम इनसेन हैं, हमने जो कानून बनाये हैं वह वाकई में गलत हैं। तो यह क्या हो रहा है!

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि आपने रेलवे में क्या किया? आपने वहां बच्चे के घरोंदे की बात नहीं दिखलाई तो और क्या दिखलाया।

(Tune bell rings)

महोदय, मेरे पास प्वाइंट्स बहुत हैं, इसलिये मुझे थोड़ा सा और समय दे दे। आपकी घंटी ने मुझे घबड़ा दिया, इसलिये कि यह अध्यक्ष महोदय की घंटी है न। कुछ दिन के बाद नहीं घबड़ाऊंगा। कुछ दिन के बाद उपाध्यक्ष कहेंगे

बैठने के लिये तो कहूंगा कि मैं नहीं बैठूंगा क्यों बैठूं। तो मैं कह रहा था कि आपने रेलवे में क्या किया, आपने रेलवे में क्या कानून बनाया, क्या रूल बनया। आपने कहा कि रेलवे में जो फर्स्ट क्लास, सेकेंड क्लास और थर्ड क्लास पहले था वह नहीं रहेगा, सिर्फ रहेगा फर्स्ट क्लास और थर्ड क्लास। गाड़ियों में बहुत लीपा-पोती हुई सेकेंड को मिटाया गया और उसको थर्ड किया गया, उस पर कितना पैसा खर्च हुआ और फिर कुछ दिन के बाद कहा कि नहीं गलती हो गई, फर्स्ट भी रहेगा, सेकेंड भी रहेगा, थर्ड भी रहेगा। अब फिर सब कुछ मिटाया गया। क्यों साहब, इस तरह से कहीं वर्ग मिटता है। फिर पैसे वालों के लिये एक और क्लास बना दिया और आपने एक एयर कंडीशंड क्लास कर दिया। तो चले थे वर्ग मिटाने और आज क्या कर दिया है। आज आप कहते हैं कि नहीं मेन लाइन में तो फर्स्ट, सेकंड और थर्ड क्लास रहेगा लेकिन ब्रांच लाइन में सेकेंड क्लास नहीं रहेगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि ब्रांच लाइन में रहने वाले जो भारतीय हैं, वे भारतीय नहीं हैं क्या? क्या यही आपकी समानता है? क्या यही आपका समाजवाद है? यही समान अधिकार आप दे रहे हैं। अगर ब्रांच लाइन में मेरा घर है, जहां कि आपकी ब्रांच लाइन जती है, तो इसमें मेरा क्या कसूर है कि हम सेकेंड क्लास अवेले नहीं कर सकते, हमें सेकेंड क्लास में नहीं बल्कि थर्ड क्लास में ही जाना पड़ेगा।

**श्री महावीर त्यागी :** छोटे आदमी छोटी लाइन।

**श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र :** ब्रांच लाइन में छोटे आदमी रहते हैं और मेन लाइन में बड़े लोग रहते हैं। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि वह गांव में बैठा हुआ क्यों नहीं मूर्ख कहेगा। यह बच्चों का बरंदा दिखलाया जा रहा है।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि यह पैसा किसलिये? भ्रष्टाचार मिटाइये जो कि यहां की समस्या है। आज भ्रष्टाचार इतना अधिक हो गया है। जरा इसको सोचें और ध्यान से सोचें मंत्री महोदय और सभासद कि आज भ्रष्टाचार की बीमारी किस कदर हो गई है। इतने दिनों तक तो अफसर ही भ्रष्ट थे, लेकिन आज कौन नहीं है भ्रष्ट। आज यहां की राजनीति भ्रष्ट है। राजनीति भ्रष्ट हो गई है और जरा सोचें कि जिस देश की राजनीति भ्रष्ट हो जाती है, उस देश का भविष्य क्या होता है। अखिर हम गुलाम क्यों हुये? कोई देश पराजित क्यों होता है? आखिर जयचन्द का क्या था? उसको लोभ खा गया कि भारतवर्ष का मालिक मैं बनूंगा। वही आज आप कर रहे हैं। सरकारी पैमाने पर ही भ्रष्टाचार नहीं है, आज तो इस दल से एम० एल० ए० आते हैं और उस दल में चले जाते हैं। इतनी दूर तक भ्रष्टाचार चला गया है। तो क्या आपने भ्रष्टाचार मिटाया। श्री गुलजारी नन्दा बीते समय में आये थे, उन्होंने कहा था कि डेढ़ वर्ष के अन्दर अगर भ्रष्टाचार नहीं मिटाया...

**श्री पी० सी० सेठी :** गुलजारी लाल नन्दा कहिये, गुलजारी नन्दा नहीं।

**श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र :** जी हां, उन्होंने कहा कि डेढ़ साल के अन्दर-अन्दर भ्रष्टाचार मिटा-येंगे, किन्तु आपने देखा कि डेढ़ साल के अन्दर भ्रष्टाचार नहीं मिटा, किन्तु भ्रष्टाचार ने उनको मिटा दिया। इस दफा फिर मंत्री बन कर आये हैं, इस दफा वह सदाचार की बात नहीं करते हैं। अब शायद सदापांच कह देंगे। पहले सदाचार बोलते थे, तो जहां दो रुपये में काम होता था, वहां सदाचार में हर काम में चार रुपये लगने लगे और अब शायद सदापांच या सदाछः बोलेंगे। आप कान लगा कर सुन लें मैं यह सोच रहा था कि अब वह क्या कहेंगे, सदातीन कहते हैं या सदापांच कहते हैं, किन्तु

[श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र]

उन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा। अब क्या कहेंगे। तो जरा सोचिये कि भ्रष्टाचार की आज क्या हालत है! आज भ्रष्टाचार से कोई झूझना नहीं चाहता। आपके कानून ने क्या किया? यह आपने सोचा। यह पैसा ले कर के क्या किया आपने? आपने बढ़ाया भ्रष्टाचार को, भ्रष्टाचार में और भ्रष्टाचार को आपने जोड़ दिया।

जातिवाद की बात करते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस दफा प्रधान मंत्री तक ने क्या जातिवाद नहीं किया? यह सोचें। कोई ब्राह्मण है, मंत्री है, उसके पास गई तो कहा मैं तो ब्राह्मण हूँ, पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू की लड़की हूँ। इसलिये जितने मिनिस्टर थे, शुकुल, तिवारी वगैरह सब आ गए। चूँकि हम जनसंघ के हैं हम छूटे हुए हैं जैसा कि ये मिश्र जी छूटे हुए हैं। क्या बात थी कि आप वहाँ बिहार में गये। क्या बात थी कि ए० पी० शर्मा भी उनके गुट में आए, एल० एन० झा भी आए, एल० के० झा भी आए, उसके बाद विनोदानन्द जी से मुलाकात की। विनोदानन्द जी भी उनके गीत गाने लगे हैं जो कांग्रेस में नहीं हैं। एक नेता हैं तिवारी उत्तर प्रदेश के, वे चले आए। शुक्ला जी चले आये। मिनिस्टर सब चले आते हैं। यह जातिवाद नहीं है तो क्या है?

श्री उपसभापति : अच्छा, समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र : जातिवाद को आपने बढ़ाया। इसके बाद मैं और भी सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ। क्या आपने गरीबी मिटाई? क्या आपने भारतीयों को सुरक्षा दी? आज सवाल उठता है नक्सलवाड़ी का। क्या आज सब नक्सलवाड़ी हो गए हैं। आज कौन ऐसी बस है, कौन ऐसी ट्रेन है जो दिन दहाड़े लूटी नहीं जाती है। ट्रेन में सिक्योरिटी नहीं है। आप जो पैसा लेते हैं, वह किस काम के लिये।

आज चलती गाड़ी में लोग लूट जाते हैं। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ और श्रीमान का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, आपके माध्यम से फिर सरकार को कहना चाहता हूँ, किसके लिये आप यह पैसा ले रहे हैं। एक नयी दृष्टि लीजिए, इस काम के लिये हम खर्च करेंगे, गरीब आदमियों के लिये खर्च करेंगे। आज चीजों के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं। आपने जो टैक्स बढ़ाया है, क्या कभी इसके बारे में सोचा है...

श्री उपसभापति : अब समाप्त कीजिए काफी समय हो गया है।

श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र : मैं आपके फाइनेन्स बिल के विरोध में अपने विचार प्रगट करते हुए आपसे आग्रह करता हूँ कि अगर हम किसी बिल को स्वीकृति देते हैं, तो हम भी उसमें हिस्सेदार हो जाते हैं और अगर टैक्सेज को बढ़ाने का प्रस्ताव करते हैं तो वह पैसा किस रूप में खर्च होता है, यह भी देखने का अधिकार है।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : इसका फाइनेन्स बिल से क्या संबंध है।

श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र : यह कोई इरिलेवेन्ट नहीं है। मैं श्रीमान से, सिर्फ 3 मिनट और चाहता हूँ। आप योजनाओं के नाम पर पैसा खर्च करते हैं। कोसी योजना बनाई, दामोदर घाटी योजना बनाई। क्या आपने सोचा कौन एरिया में कितना खर्च हो रहा है, प्रोडक्टिविटी में कितना खर्च हो रहा है, अन्प्रोडक्टिव एरिया में कितना खर्च हो रहा है। उससे ज्यादा आपने क्वार्टर्स, गार्डन, फुलवाड़ी में खर्च किया। सारा पैसा किसान के लिये लगा नहीं। प्रोडक्टिव काम में क्या आप कभी खर्च करते हैं। अन्प्रोडक्टिव एरिया आफ द प्लान में ज्यादा खर्च करते हैं। आपने कोसी बांध, कोसी का बैराज बनाया है, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ इतना खर्च किया, लेकिन नेपाल में क्यों किया। उसकी

क्या सुरक्षा है आपका वह जो बेराज है वह सिर्फ 100 ज़ा अगर डाउन चला जाये तो उसकी सुरक्षा क्या है। न कोई आपकी पुलिस वहां रह सकती है न कोई और रह सकता है। जो आपके हिन्दुस्तान के आफिसर हैं वे वहां कुत्तों की पीठ मरते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : आपके 3 मिनट खत्म हो गये।

श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र : 3 मिनट भी हो गये। अच्छा इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने विचारों को रिजर्व रखता हूं और अगर कोई मौका मिला तो कहूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति : जरूर मिलेगा।

श्री श्रीकान्त मिश्र : मैं आपको एक दफा फिर धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आपने मुझे कहने का मौका दिया और मेरे विचारों को सुना भले ही वह अष्ट रह गये हों।

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the financial proposals of the Government of India for the ensuing year have already been discussed threadbare in this House and the other House during the last six or seven weeks. In fact, we are now almost at the end of the process and probably only some formalities have to be gone through. Further, since the two Houses, I think it can be very correctly said, are a kind of spectrum of all the political views and of the economic and other interests in our country, it can be said that almost everything that can be said and all the views that can be expressed and the various analyses that can be made, have already been made. I have no intention, therefore, either to cover the ground which has already been covered or to go into matters which have been, as I said, already discussed threadbare. So, so far as the question of the income and expenditure of the Government is concerned, I want to limit myself only to one remark and a very general remark that quite an amount of enthusiasm was generated in the country when the Budget proposals were first placed before the country in the middle of February, and that enthusiasm has obviously died down. This fact was expressed

and reflected here in the speeches of the Members of the ruling party itself. So I do not want to go into it though I should add that with all the loss of enthusiasm of the people for which the Government itself is obviously responsible, the criticism of the Budget proposals from the angle of the Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and of certain political elements and parties which more or less reflect the views of the Federation, is not correct. But meanwhile the fact remains that, by and large, the kind of hope which was generated in the early period has more or less vanished. But, as I said, that is not the question into which I want to go in detail just now.

Before I came to this House I used to read the proceedings of this House as well as the proceedings of the Lok Sabha in the papers and I had an impression, and even after coming here now I do have an impression, that a very vital aspect of our national policy on which the income and expenditure of the Government of India have very much of a bearing—in fact, the entire policy of the Government has a bearing on that question—has been rather inadequately dealt with in all the discussions and proceedings of the two Houses and proper attention has not been given to it. I have in mind certain immediate burning and vital aspects of the question of national integration.

Sir, the other day in this House, and quite often outside, the Home Minister has been saying that we see so much violence in this country but basically that problem cannot be tackled as a law and order problem and that it has to be tackled as a socio-economic problem, as a political problem and also as a cultural problem, I might say. That is undoubtedly true.

Only the other day, in the Lok Sabha, a statement was made by a Member of the ruling party which was subsequently appreciated by the Prime Minister herself, namely, that the Budget proposals express the political will of the ruling party. Well and good, but surely it is not only the Budget proposals and not only the astronomical monetary figures which express the political will of the Government. It is the actual implication, the entire implication of the declared policies which express their will such as it is or to the extent that it exists.



[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

In his connection I want to take up the question of what is being done for national integration and particularly one or two questions. Members will remember that probably 2 or 2½ years back, the Government convened a National Integration Conference at Srinagar. Committees were appointed and certain work has been actually done. Lot of money is being spent on it and I think there are other Departments of the Government also, Education and others, whose policies are expected to strengthen national integration. What is being done? Above all, there are two aspects of the question to which I wish to draw very strong attention to-day, which have become extraordinarily urgent because they are reaching a point where the fundamental unity of the country itself is coming to a stage in which I think it cannot brook any delay from the point of view of proper tackling. I have in mind the problems of communalism and linguistic chauvinism or fanaticism.

In this connection if I refer mainly to what I know from my own State of Maharashtra, it is not because I am not equally concerned with similar happenings in other States. Surely I am. If I refer to Maharashtra, it is more because I have direct experience of what is happening there, direct knowledge of what is happening there. I have to intervene constantly in all these kinds of problems in my State and besides, I may say in passing—that is also not unimportant—I think the Home Minister of the Government of India does bear a certain personal and moral responsibility for what happens in the State apart from his general responsibility as the Home Minister of the whole country.

Take the Shiv Sena. In the last 3 or 4 years there is not a corner in the country from where the strongest protest or deep alarm has not been expressed as to what is this organisation, what is this movement, what is it going to do, what is the future for this movement and for us.

If we want to understand this problem, let us be perfectly clear that if ever in our history any movement or any organisation in the country came as near to fascism as any can, it is the Shiv Sena movement. I say this with all the sense of responsibility and I do

not say it just because I want to bandy a few words or use a bad name. Let me say briefly what I have in mind. What is the entire technique? What is the entire manner in which this movement and this organisation have grown? The first and foremost is, let us not forget that these fascist movement and organisations do pick upon certain genuine popular demands and grievances. They take them up. It will be a wrong thing to ignore that they do take up popular questions such as, for instance, unemployment or urban housing condition in the City of Bombay for the Maharashtrians. So on the one hand we find that they take up these issues but then what do they do? They poison, they pervert the entire struggle of the people for a just settlement of these demands, for the redressal of these grievances. Day in and day out what do you find the leader of this organisation and his weekly called 'Marmik' saying? Day in and day out what do they tell the Marathi people in Bombay? Do they tell them that the South Indians are their brothers? They do not call them South Indians, they call them lungiwallas. And do they tell them that in the struggle for good housing, in the struggle for employment in Bombay, the Marathi workers, the Tamils, the Telugus, the Kannadigas and the Malayalies are brothers? Do they tell that? No. They tell them: "It is these workers who have come to Bombay because they have no employment in their own States. These are your enemies." Only the big capitalists, they preach day in and day out, are the 'Annadatas'. So they preach servility to those who are the exploiters and oppressors of the people and they preach enmity to their own brothers. This is the essence of their propaganda. No wonder the industrial tycoons of Bombay completely support the Shiv Sena. If I am asked what is the basic crime, what is the basic wrong thing in the Shiv Sena movement, I will say that it calls the brother the enemy, and the enemy the friend. This is the fundamentally wrong position.

I want to go further. Do you know what is the amount of militant demagoguery that the Shiv Sena indulges in? Normally in a movement of this character one would feel that they do not take a posture of militancy. That is not so. Tremendous militancy, a sort of artificial or fraudulent militancy and

demagogy are indulged in and why? It is because there is the youth which they know is militant and will not be won over except by calling out to them: 'We are fighting this enemy or that enemy' but there again the perversion is there. There again distortion comes in. Let us not forget this. What did Hitler do? Hitler ranted against the rich and said 'All the rich and all the Jews are the same' and here the leader of the Shiv Sena comes forwards and says: 'All capitalists and all lungiwallas are the same' because some Udipi people and Kannadigas have started some hotels in Bombay. So the capitalists and the lungiwallas are the same. This is the kind of diversion or poison which is spread.

Then there is not a single minority against which the Shiv Sena does not create hatred. There is hatred against the Muslims and there is contempt for untouchables. Day in and day out see what they write about the Scheduled Castes. There is hatred for the Muslims. These are the kind of things which are constantly being preached and this goes on months and months, year after year and day after day in the press, on the platform and everywhere. Then one fine morning you get this orgies. Orgies do not fall from the clouds. The orgies do not start one fine morning. Behind that there is constant propaganda and agitation and as I said, the thing which alarms me most and pains me most is that tens of thousands of the younger generation of our Marathi youth is being lost in this kind of thing—perversion and diversion—because of the poison which is being put in their minds.

Then what is the Shiv Sena attitude towards the Police and the Government? It is very interesting. That again brings to my mind what Hitler used to follow. On the one hand, it is amazing, they will blackmail and bully even the Government. They blackmail and at the same time they go on cajoling them and saying: 'This Minister is good and that Minister is bad or this Police officer is good and that Officer is bad'. It is a kind of mixture in which threat, blackmail, cajoling, etc. are used to which it is a fact—whatever friends from the other side may say—the Government is succumbing in Maharashtra.

The Shiv Sena of course says: 'The Communists are enemy No. 1'. It is a fact. I am not stressing that point here to-day. Why? First and foremost, it is my firm opinion that something for deeper is involved than just a question of Communism and that is the question of the unity of our entire country. The unity of the people of all religions, the unity of all the people speaking all the languages, all that is involved. Secondly, so far as we are concerned, I want to make it clear that we want no mercy and no protection from the Police in Bombay. If we are true communists, we will defend ourselves. We have defended ourselves. We do not want to go to the Government for protection but we say: 'Save the people, save the common man and save them from this poison'.

What does the Government do? I am not interested in denouncing anybody, but I will just state certain facts. When this kind of agitation goes on, a terror campaign goes on and when an atmosphere of fear is created among the minorities, all that time, nothing is done. Then naturally, as happened last year or this year or recently, a burst-up takes place. Then arson, lootings, etc. take place but what does the Government do? Only the other day the Home Minister issued a statement from Jalgaon saying: 'This is a tragedy and a shame for all of us'. My simple question is, behind that tragedy is a crime and why don't you speak on the crime? Why do you speak only of the tragedy? Of course it is a tragedy but behind that there are years and years of crime against which you do not speak.

As for shame I want to understand this. Those who have resisted the Shiv Sena, why should they be ashamed? The victims of the Shiv Sena why should they be ashamed? It is those who perpetrate the crime who should feel ashamed. But we hear the Government saying that it is a matter of shame, it is a matter of shame.

Now one most important thing I want to say at the end. This issue is so important that all of us should act together. From all sides we want something to be done. Congress Ministers are sitting here and I see many Members from Maharashtra also. I want to pose a direct and straight question to them. Let us not depend on the Government; keep the Government out.

[Shri S. G. Sardesai]

You claim to be a people's party, Gandhiji's party, Nehruji's party. How did Gandhiji change India? Gandhiji did not depend upon the use of the administration and the police. Even after independence he did not have any use for the administration. He believed in evoking mass consciousness, mass campaigning, mass education, mass organisation, mass action. That was the instrument with which Gandhiji changed India. Are you ready even today? Come on, let us join together on this. I appeal to all democrats, to all parties who believe in democracy, to all parties who believe in secularism; I appeal to you not as rulers, not as the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, but to you as a party which has grown from the people, not because you have your police and the administration in your hands. During the British days you grew; how? You had the people with you; you were not the rulers then. But you started declining after independence when you became the rulers. Come on; let us all go to the people with some three or four simple, common slogans. How do you solve the problem of unemployment, how do you solve the problem of housing in Bombay? Without tackling the problem of unemployment and housing you cannot fight the Shiv Sena. You should come out against linguistic chauvinism, come out against communalism, come out against the last vestiges of untouchability and the oppression against the untouchables. There are so many parties who agree on these things. Let us keep the other things aside for the moment; we can deal with those things on our independent platforms where we can criticise the Congress and the Government and you can criticise us, the Opposition parties but on these four or five issues let us all come together and let us stand on a common platform and let us go to the masses. Let us in spite of our political differences, join together for this work; let us try to educate the people in the country so that we can take the country forward and then only this country will grow. After that whether you get more votes or we get more votes, I just do not care two hoots. That does not matter; what matters is the younger generation. We have to save our younger generation.

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

If we are not able to save this younger generation today, let me tell you what will happen. What will happen is this Frankenstein which has been raised in Bombay will devour the country, will devour the rulers themselves. And if it occurs. What is going to happen to the country? There are so many people talking of socialism in the country. But what I am worried about is about the very unity of the country. If this unity is not preserved, if the patriotic unity is not preserved, if we do not march forward together towards the goal of socialism, everything is going to be dark in the country, medieval kind of fragmentation and disruption. At least for the sake of preventing such a thing let us come together; that is my appeal today. As one who has worked in Maharashtra for over forty-years, I say in the name of all that is to be preserved let us stand together. There are so many Congress men; we have all worked together; we were in jail together. What we have to do today is to save the country. Let us keep back our differences. Let us come together on those three or four important issues. I cannot believe that other parties will not agree on this. I have every confidence that parties like the PSP, SSP and the party of the Deputy Chairman, the Republican Party will all be ready to come and stand together to remove unemployment, to give housing, for Hindu-Muslim unity, for Marathi-non-Marathi unity and for the removal of untouchability. All those who are opposed to this will get themselves isolated. That is the way to grow; that is the way to gain strength. This is my humble suggestion. For the whole of my life I have not been a legislator and so I do not know whether according to your protocol I have said the right thing or the wrong thing but this is my earnest plea and thus alone we can march forward. Otherwise no amount of discussion in the Rajya Sabha is going to take us anywhere or help us to deliver the goods.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while generally supporting the Finance Bill, let me at the outset draw the attention of this House and let me express my feelings, the feelings of my community, the feelings of my party, about the notorious happenings in Maharashtra for the last two or three days. It is most unfortunate. This is not the first time that things are happening in India like this; this is one of such happenings in

India today. We have experience of what happened in Ahmedabad. The tears have not dried up there; even before the tears get dried up we again find that such a thing has repeated itself in a different manner in Maharashtra, in Bombay. Bombay is the commercial seat of India, the cosmopolitan city of India, I can even say, the darling city of India. In such a city such notorious things are happening and I blame this Government for this. The Indira Government has not taken precautions to prevent such happenings. If they had been careful, if there had been proper machinery for the purpose, there would not have been such things happening. The President of India in his Address to the nation had made a reference to the Ahmedabad riots. He felt tears flowing from his eyes but what has Mr. Giri's Government done to prevent such happenings? There is not doubt a feeling in the minds of the people today that the Indira Government is sympathetic to the minorities; it is true and it because of that feeling that the Indira Congress was able to win three seats in Bangalore. That is a fact because they felt that this Government will save them. That is why the Bangalore Muslims voted for the Indira Congress. But what is happening today? I appeal to this Government to be serious, to be sincere and to be above everything to see that something is done so that such things do not recur again. Prevention is better than cure. After things have happened there is no question of giving relief and there is no question of expressing sympathies. I am only expressing the feelings of my party, the feelings of my community and my own personal feelings when I say let us all join together as my friend who has come from Maharashtra has said. He made an emphatic statement in the House that all should stand united as one man, as children of one family, so that we shall do away with caste, colour, creed, breed, so that as one man we can put our country in the top in the world map. Being a human subject I cannot shut my eyes to this aspect of our life.

Now coming to the economic subject, this Finance Bill contemplates to tax the people especially the rural agricultural people. Wealth tax has been proposed on agricultural properties. This will definitely affect the rural economy.

Now when you assess agricultural wealth, there is productive wealth as well as non-productive wealth.

It will have some market value, e.g. you may have a few acres of land on which you grow coconut or coffee or rubber plantations. But that will take some ten years or so to start yielding the fruits. For ten years you will have to feed the coconut trees or the rubber or coffee trees. In the initial stages it will have a market value but wealth tax should not be levied on it because it is unproductive wealth—growing plants in the farms which have not yet fully improved. They will take time to yield fruits. Till then you will have to invest your money. In business if you invest, you will get immediate returns but that is not so in the case of agriculture, which may take a number of years to give fruits. So that is unproductive wealth and does not justify the levy of wealth tax, they are unproductive farms. When they begin to yield fruits, then I have no objection. Today the poor people are becoming poorer and the rich people are becoming richer and the middle class is being wiped out from our society. This is definitely a bad signal for any progressive country, for any welfare State. In the villages what do you find? Not only the people do not have food and clothing but they do not even have water to drink, water everywhere but not a drop to drink. That is the position in many of our villages in India today. Even in the State of Kerala and some parts of Mysore some of the people are forced to drink salt water because the supply of good drinking water is not made. Even in the urban areas and cities there is no drinking water. Some gentleman was telling me that they were forced to drink non-vegetarian water flowing in the gutter. So that is the position in the cities. Just a few days back I had the privilege of going to the city of Agra. We had to pay ten paise or twenty paise for a glass of water to drink. That is the position even in the town of Agra where we invite foreigners to see our historical places. So I request the Government to prepare a plan or a scheme for supplying pure drinking water to the villagers. Many of the States have already formed Water Supply Boards and several schemes have been formulated. I appeal to the Government to have a water supply scheme whereby they can finance

[Shri Hamind Ali Schamnad]

the different States for arranging drinking water for the people. As you know, Sir, water is the minimum necessity for any man. Therefore it is the bounden duty of the Government to supply drinking water to the people.

Then, Sir, it is the policy of the Government to help the backward areas and the backward people and they have formulated certain policies. But what do we find? The backward people continue to remain backward and the backward areas continue to remain backward. The per capita income of Kerala is very low as compared to the average per capita income of India. So it is the bounden duty of this Government to help Kerala so that it may come up to the level of the other States. For this purpose they should encourage the Government of Kerala to set up more and more industries in the different regions there, especially in the Malabar region where the people are very backward, illiterate and ignorant. Such people should be uplifted so that they may also come up to the level of others. In Kerala, Sir, fisheries could be developed because we have got a very big coastal area. A Master Plan was prepared by the Government of Kerala and submitted to the Central Government for their approval and financial help but I am given to understand that so far the Government of India has not responded to the proposals sent by the Government of Kerala. I do not know the reasons for this kind of treatment to Kerala and its people. I suggest that financial assistance should be given to the different States of India according to their needs and not according to any other criteria, political or otherwise. But unfortunately the financial help is given according to political prejudices and the result is that some States are completely ignored and other States get encouragement at the cost of others. So whichever State needs more, it should be given more and whichever State needs less, it should be given less. That should be the criterion.

*(Time bells rings.)*

Sir, I do not want to say anything further except with regard to compulsory education. That is one of the

Directive Principles of our Constitution. I therefore suggest that that Directive Principle of our Constitution should be fulfilled by implementing compulsory education. With these few words, Sir, I conclude my speech. Thank you.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, it has been stated in this House and the other House that the true test of the Budget is whether it is a socialist Budget or not. Now, so far as I am concerned—and I give my reasons for it—I consider that this Budget takes the country one step forward in the direction of socialism, because the Budget is an annual affair and it can do no more than that. We should remember the limits placed by our Constitution on the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister is not in total control of the economy as a whole. That is a very vital fact to remember at all times. A very large sector of the economy is in the private hands and that makes a great deal of difference. As Keynes put it, so long as the Government does not control the entire economy—by whatever name you may call it, you may call it mixed economy, capitalist economy, capitalism-cum-socialism—so long as a large sector of the industry is still in the hands of private enterprise, you cannot proceed very fast : your speed is limited by the measure of acceptance by the commercial community as a whole. As he put it in a very telling phrase, it is like a major surgical operation which you cannot perform except with the consent of the patient ; you have got to take the impulses, the motives, the incentives of the commercial community into consideration. You cannot do anything drastic by a single stroke as it were ; you have got to go slowly.

That slowness and gradualness is imposed by the fact that the Government does not control the entire economy, and secondly, we have accepted the democratic process, and we do not believe in coercion. If the Finance Minister had the power of coercion and the total control of the economy...

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal) : There is no quorum in this House. The House should stand adjourned. How can the House function ?

MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I have accepted your suggestion. I have asked them to ring the bell. Now, You continue.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : So, these are the limits which are placed on the Finance Minister. Within these limits, she has to discharge the responsibility to the best of her judgment. And she has struck a neat balance so far as the allocation of resources is concerned and so far as the question of levying taxes and duties on the people is concerned, I think a right balance has been struck. After all, the four important resources of the Government are taxes, loans, deficit financing and income from the public enterprises. I do feel that the time has come when the income from public enterprises should increase at a faster rate. Now deficit financing has been under fire in Parliament. The point of deficit financing is that it is, I think, one of the most cogent weapon of finance that had been developed. But as happens, powerful weapons carry their own risks. Deficit financing has to be used within limits. I think in the present Budget, deficit financing has been controlled. I may say that without deficit financing, all that development that has taken place in India during the last so many years would not have been possible. I think the Prime Minister has taken a bold step in saying that growth is more important, and that we must take the risks involved in deficit financing. That statement by her is important and it is a bold decision. The risks have to be taken. We can risk the rising prices, but we cannot do away without deficit financing because rapid growth would become impossible otherwise. As a student of these affairs for many years, I feel that a 5 per cent increase in prices per year can be absorbed by our economy. The burden imposed by the two wars led to very high rate of increases in prices, and that upset things. And I do feel that steps should be taken to control the rising prices. I presume the situation has been controlled.

It is worthwhile recalling that in the middle ages, in the countries of Europe, there were times when prices fell continuously over centuries, and that was the most stagnant period in European history. The phenomenal growth in Europe in the 19th century and the 20th century has been associated with rising prices. The rise in prices is not

a bad thing. And as Keynes pointed out, it should be gradual, perhaps, not more than 5 per cent per year in our country, and that should be matched by production. Deficit financing by itself is not an evil. But in its internal mechanism and its working by the Government and the Reserve Bank, certain safeguards are implicit. We are in mortal fear of rising price because they have risen very rapidly in recent times. So, what the Government has to do is to control this rise, and this rise can be controlled if the measures of deficit financing are moderate in quantity. That is implicit in our system of finance.

The second topic which I want to touch is unaccounted money, by whatever name you call it. I am satisfied in my mind that no human machinery can effectively control this. Punitive actions do not bring much revenue, but create a lot of bitterness in the community. Commissions may be appointed and they may devise various methods, but the commercial community, who want to do it, are always ahead of the Government, Government action and Government laws. I will give a simple illustration. Take the construction industry. Rates are fixed for flats. After some two or three years, flats cannot be sold, therefore, lower the prices. The Board meets and passes a resolution authorising the Managing Director to dispose of flats at lower prices, because they cannot be disposed of quickly. Now there is a loophole. So long as legal ingenuity is there and so long as the commercial community feel that under the existing level of taxation they cannot keep a larger share of their profits, they will resort to these devices. Take the cinema world. If I have time, I can give a number of examples as to how I hear that it is functioning. When the Finance Minister says that the maximum marginal rate of tax they levied was 93.5 per cent, that figure applies to disclosed money. Unaccounted money goes into the pockets of the businessmen and is not in the account book. They keep cent per cent for themselves. That is the reason why they do not feel the pinch of these high taxes because before the money has got into the formal accounts, they are able to pocket the money. There is an informal date after which the accounts are open. Before that, they are not open to internal audit. What the Government have got to do is that they

[Shri M. N. Kaul]

should see to it that their own intelligence people penetrate private enterprises and work there and engender the confidence of these businessmen. And they will know the whole truth. It should never be revealed who these people are. They will get the whole truth, and no Commission can get a truer picture.

Secondly, today people have a feeling that in spite of earning money, a fair size does not remain with them. The Government takes a large slice of it. Social conscience has to be developed. People have not to feel that the contribution made to taxes is something like a contribution to charities. Now, what is lacking today is that there is no respect for the Governmental machinery at various levels. If the people were to feel that they get a clean, good and non-corrupt administration, they respect it by paying taxes. Today you hear people saying : "Oh ! look at reports of Parliamentary Committees. Money is going to waste. What is the good of paying taxes ? Look at the level of service we get from the Government in various spheres of governmental activities. We do not get good service." So, the Government has to have a multi-purpose drive in all these spheres. Whatever the deficiencies are, they should be rectified from year to year. Until social conscience is developed and respect for law and the governmental machinery, is created it may not be possible to control this unaccounted money. Those are the true long term remedies. Of course, short-term punitive measures can always be taken to satisfy the Parliament and the general public. Possibly, they have a limited scope and I do not deprecate them. But these long-term devices, I think, are vital. Thank you.

6 P.M.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it appeared in today's papers that an astrologer has made a statement to the effect that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi will continue as Prime Minister till 1977 and our economic difficulties will be over by 1973. Since these are astrological utterances, neither economic nor political, we may safely overlook such news items, but why do I may make a mention of it? I make a mention of it because I feel there is no chance of that astrology being

correct, at least so far as the second part of it is concerned, namely, that our economic ills will be over by 1973. Now, what do we see? I am from the State of West Bengal. In my State I would highlight three crises. One is the crisis arising out of the ills of the partitioning of India. It is manifest in the fact that more than a lakh of Hindus have crossed into India from Pakistan without any passport in the last few months. It is a problem associated with our freedom and is old as 1947. We have not succeeded in making Pakistan friendly. I am not saying whether Pakistan is at fault or we are at fault, but the fact is that we have not been able to do it. We have failed to make Pakistan a friendly country where the minorities could live in peace.

The second thing is this. After twenty-three years of independence we find in West Bengal a district known as Purulia, which is possibly the worst economically so far as whole of India is concerned. There is no industry in that district. There is no irrigation arrangement there. There is not even a broad gauge line in that district. That district is in the grip of famine almost every third year. In 1967, even the Government of West Bengal had to spend about Rs. 8 crores for relief work and in 1970 in spite of the repeated representations by Mr. Arun Ghosh, General Secretary of the Lok Seva Sangh, to the Governor, Mr. Dhavan, no serious relief work has been started. There are starvation deaths reported in the press very frequently and the Governor is so uncourteous, I should say, that he has not even allowed the deputation to wait upon him on this very serious problem. A respectable man like Mr. Arun Ghosh has not met with any success and even an interview was not granted. This is something unusual and I shall come back to this Purulia problem later.

The third problem of West Bengal, nay I should say the whole of India, is the problem arising out of frustration. Call it the Naxalite problem, call it a problem of law and order or call it a socio-economic problem, but it is a problem. It is not peculiar to West Bengal. It is a problem which India will have to face today or tomorrow and it is a problem which is our own creation. I have all sympathies and even affection for these young people. Their death-defying courage has created a momen-

tum, has created a feeling in the hierarchy of the Government, now after twenty-three years of our independence, at least to think seriously about an answer for it. Living in air-conditioned rooms, giving big lectures, wasting the sterling balances we had, even keeping the country mortgaged to foreign countries, we have created a situation in which our very existence is in jeopardy. What we have done, I can tell you, Sir. The Sibpur Engineering College, Jadhapur Engineering College, Kharagpur Engineering College—these three engineering colleges—and the Presidency College, which is a very reputed college in the whole of India, these four colleges are the most trouble spots and the stronghold of the Naxalites. I raise the question and I give the answer. Engineers are the most unemployed class now in India. Only brilliant students get admission to the engineering colleges and they had high hopes and expected high prospects. Now, they see no such prospect. Not even the post of a schoolmaster or college professor is available to them. Similarly, only those who get very high marks are given admission in the Presidency College. They are facing the same frustration. So, they have chosen a very dangerous way. The students say: This society cannot answer my needs. This Government has gone bankrupt. So, this Government has no right to exist. That is their slogan. When they say the Chinese Chairman Mao is our Chairman, it is very unpalatable. I feel shocked, but why do they say it? Do you not see the significance and meaning of it? The meaning is that the Chinese way, the communist way, is the way for India. That is what follows, when they say that power cannot be seized except through the barrels of a gun. That is what they want to convey. They say, destroy the society. This society is rotten. Unless you can give them a better ideology, by means of the PD Act or the use of police force, you cannot kill the movement. This is their idea and this is their philosophy. It may be very wrong, but show them the right philosophy. Sir, in the name of Mahatma Gandhi and Ram Raiya you have brought about this state of affairs.

Then, here is a press note which gives quick estimates of the national income for 1968-69. I find in a table which presents the estimates of total and per capita national income at 1960-61 prices for the years 1960-61 to 1968-69. Taking 1960-61 as the base year, in the

year 1964-65 the per capita income was Rs. 333.6 and in 1968-69 we find the per capita income to be Rs. 319.3. You can find out whether we have retarded or advanced. The position is that in 1964-65 the per capita income was Rs. 333, whereas it is 319 in 1968-69.

I am not an admirer of Shri Dharma Vira. He was Governor of West Bengal. I am reading a passage from the book "Identification of Backward Areas" published by the Planning Commission, page 30, item 17, quoting Mr. Dharma Vira :

"Shri Dharma Vira, Governor of West Bengal, regretted that population criterion had not been given adequate weightage in the recommended distribution, West Bengal Government had earlier suggested a weightage of 85% to population but in the recommended calculation it has been placed at 55% which was lower than the figure adopted in 1966. He also stated that in the recommended distribution unduly high weightage had been given to the per capita income. He was also not sure about the accuracy of the per capita income figures."

I also do not agree with the per capita income. But the fact is this that on Government's own admission our per capita income has gone down.

"Elaborating his point, he mentioned that per capita income was an illusory concept. In the case of West Bengal, considerable share went to people outside the State. A part of it was taken in taxation by the Central Government. He suggested that weightage for 'tax effort' be raised to 10%. Of the remaining 20% spillover, irrigation and power projects should get a weightage of 7 to 8% and the balance of the Central assistance should be available for dealing with the special problems of individual States. In his view this 20% could be increased to 25% by reducing the weightage given to per capita State income."

You know West Bengal has a grievance against the Centre. Why has Maharashtra got for its development in this Plan more than Rs. 700 crores, whereas West Bengal was given not even Rs. 150 crores? Does Maharashtra deserve it? Does not West Bengal deserve more than what Maharashtra got? West Bengal, as you know, is a border State, has



[Shri Dwijendralal Sen Gupta]

a series of problems. It is suffering even today from the impact of the refugee problem. Today we had a talk with Mr. Sanjivayya. We suggested let there be rehabilitation of the present refugees in the whole of West Bengal. West Bengal has land for their rehabilitation. But what do they do? They send them to distant places from where they come to Howrah Station or Sealdah Station.

(Time bell rings.)

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I know my time is very short. From the same book, from page 43, item 52, I am quoting again Shri Dharma Vira :

"Shri Dharma Vira, Governor of West Bengal, stated that he totally agreed with the views expressed by the Finance Minister, Maharashtra, that while everything possible should be done for States which were underdeveloped in the so-called developed States there were large pockets which were totally underdeveloped and the policy which may be adopted should be such as not to impede the balanced development of these areas."

West Bengal might be one of those industrially developed States. But here we find that in developed States also there may be pockets which are underdeveloped, and they have got to be treated accordingly.

In this book, we found, there was a Study Group which adopted certain standards. I shall read it and resume my seat—page 4 of this book, item 3 :

"3. On the question of what should be the unit of an area, the Committee was of the view that the 'district' should be considered as a unit since data on different criteria examined by the Committee were available only up to the district level and not below.

The criteria recommended by the Committee for determining backwardness are listed below :

(1) Poverty of the people as indicated by :

(a) Low per capita income; and

(b) Low per capita consumption.

(2) High density of population in relation to development of productive resources and employment opportunities as indicated by the following factors :

(a) High ratio of population to cultivable land (50% below the national average of per capita land holding should be considered as backward).

(b) Low percentage of population engaged in output (50% or more below the national average should be considered as backward).

(c) Absence of under-exploitation of other natural resources, viz., minerals, forest and animal.

(d) Low percentage of population engaged in secondary and tertiary activities (25% below the national average should be considered as backward).

(e) Low ratio of urban to rural population (districts where the ratio was less than 50% of the national average might be considered as backward).

(f) Low percentage of factory employment (50% below the national average might be considered as backward).

(3) Poverty of communications as indicated by small lengths of railways and metalled roads per square mile (districts where the railway and road mileage fall below 50% of the national average might be considered as backward).

(4) High incidence of unemployment and of gross under-employment.

(5) Consumption of electric power."

I submit that all these factors are present in the case of Purulia. Purulia is the most under-developed district in the whole of India. There is no step taken so far. I appeal to the Government, let them in the interests of West Bengal, in the interests of finding a solution to the problems, have a fund, let them have a Plan specially meant for Purulia.

श्रीमती पुष्पाबेन जनार्दनराय मेहता (गुजरात) : माननीय उपसमाध्यक्ष जी, यह बजट जो हमारे सामने है, इसमें हमारा कर-बोझ

बढ़ गया है। आज जलता के लिये रोटी और रोजी का प्रश्न बहुत ठठिन हो गया है। व्यक्ति और समाज के जीवन पर इसका गहरा असर पड़ने वाला है। हमारी नीति लघु उद्योगों को बढ़ाने की है, मगर आज जब हम उसके लिये लोन भी दे रहे हैं। छोटी मशीनें और छोटे मोटे उद्योग पावर से चला है, तो मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि पावर को इतना उत्तेजन देने पर और छोटे उद्योगों का इतना उत्तेजन पहुंचाने के बाद भी बिस्किट पर, जो पावर से बनते हैं, 10 प्रतिशत कर क्यों बढ़ाया गया। यह हमारी नीति के खिलाफ है। जो हमेशा उपयोग की चीज है उस पर कर बढ़ाया गया है, जो मध्यम और गरीब वर्ग के खाने की चीजों हैं, बच्चों के लिये बहुत पापुलर हैं। मेरी मांग है कि उनके ऊपर से कर निकाल देना चाहिये।

जहां तक चीनी का प्रश्न है, मैं आपके द्वारा माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूंगी कि भारत में चीनी का उपयोग अन्य राष्ट्रों से बहुत कम है। आज भारत में 49 ग्राम पर डे, पर कैपिटा चीनी का उपयोग होता है, जो अन्य राष्ट्रों की तुलना में बहुत कम है। अन्य राष्ट्रों में चीनी का उपयोग बहुत ज्यादा है। दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारी खाने की चीजों में चीनी का अधिक उपयोग होता है, मिठाई वगैरह में उपयोग होता है। चीनी सिर्फ शौक की चीज नहीं है, वह पौष्टिक भी है। बच्चों के दूध में, खाने में भी उसकी जरूरत होती है। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताया कि आज दिल्ली के बाजार में 2 रु० किलो से कम में चीनी मिल जाती है, ठीक है, मगर उसके ऊपर कर का बोझ ज्यादा बढ़ाना नहीं चाहिये। आज हमारी खरीद करने की शक्ति इतनी कम हो गई है कि 10 प्रतिशत देने के लिये आज हम तैयार नहीं हो सकते, यह चिन्ताजनक प्रश्न है। खाद्य की चीजों के

दाम बढ़ाते बढ़ाते भी हम कहां तक पहुंच गये हैं, यह भी एक बड़ा प्रश्न है। मैं जानती हूं और आप भी जानते हैं कि शुद्ध घी तो आज मिलता ही नहीं है और तेल के दाम भी 6 रु० किलो हो गया है। आज क्या खायें, क्या पकाएं, क्या बच्चों को नाश्ता खिलाएं, यह भारत की गृहिणी के लिये, माता के लिये एक चिन्ताजनक प्रश्न हो गया है। चीनी, तेल, मक्खन, बिसकुट, सबका दाम बढ़ा है और उनके ऊपर कितना कर बढ़ा है। तेल की पर डे, पर कैपिटा खपत आज भारत में 10 ग्राम है। 10 ग्राम से ज्यादा तेल भी नहीं ले सकते हैं। तब मक्खन या घी की बात कैसे कर सकते हैं। आज प्रश्न यह है कि किस तरह खाद्य पदार्थों को घर में पकाना चाहिये, जिससे घर आसानी के साथ चलाया जा सके तथा बच्चों का पालन कर सकें। आज हमारे देश में चीनी, तेल और मक्खन आदि चीजों के दाम बढ़ गये हैं। हम जानते हैं कि जो प्रश्न हमारे सामने हैं, वे चिन्ताजनक हैं और अगर हम अन्य राष्ट्रों के साथ अपने देश का दूध के संबंध में मुकाबला करें कि यहां पर कितना दूध का उपयोग हो रहा है तो हम बहुत कम पायेंगे। इसलिए मैं केन्द्र और राज्यों का ध्यान केन्द्रित करना चाहती हूं कि हमारे यहां दूध का उपयोग बहुत कम हो रहा है। 1953-54 में हमारा दूध का उपयोग 133 ग्राम प्रति दिन पर कैपिटा था। 1963-64 में वह 117 ग्राम हुआ और आज 1970 में इसका उपयोग और भी कम हो गया; क्योंकि देश में दुष्काल के कारण बहुत से पशु मर गये हैं।

मैं यह आपसे निवेदन करना चाहती हूं कि हमारे यहां दूध का उपयोग बहुत कम हो गया है और जब हम आयरलैंड से इसका मुकाबला करते हैं, तो हम पाते हैं कि उनके उपयोग तक पहुंचने के लिए हमें 63 वर्ष की जरूरत पड़ेगी। इसलिए मैं आपका ध्यान इस संबंध

[श्रीमती पुष्पाबेन जनार्दनराय मेहता]

में दिलाना चाहती हूं कि जो पशुओं के संबंध में हमारी सरकार की नीति है, वह एक अनिश्चित नीति है और इस अनिश्चित नीति की वजह से हमारे पशुधन का हास हो रहा है। कभी कभी हम डेयरी बनाते हैं और एनिमल हसबैंडरी के संबंध में कुछ काम करते हैं। लेकिन पशु पालक के सामने जो कठिनाइया हैं, उनकी ओर सरकार ध्यान नहीं देती है और पशु पालन व्यवसाय के संबंध में कोई सामूहिक योजना सरकार की दिखलाई नहीं देती है। राजस्थान, पंजाब और अन्य प्रान्तों में पशुपालन का काम होता है, गुजरात के कई जिलों में अधिक पशुपालन का काम होता है, उत्तर गुजरात, सौराष्ट्र और कच्छ में भी यह काम होता है, लेकिन मैं यह जानती हूं कि हमने पशु उद्योग के संबंध में कोई चिन्ता नहीं की है। जब दुष्काल पड़ता है तो हमारे हजारों पशु मर जाते हैं और हमें उन्हें बचाने के लिए कोई चिन्ता नहीं है। जब दुष्काल पड़ता है तो पानी और घास के लिए इधर उधर घूमते हैं और इस तरह से थोड़ा रीलफ देने का एक रूटीन बन जाता है, परन्तु दुष्काल के बाद, हम यह भूल जाते हैं कि पशुओं के लिए पानी और चारे की सारी व्यवस्था करनी है।

मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहती हूं कि डेयरी, जो हम खोलते हैं वह शहर के लोगो को दूध पिलाने के लिए ही खोलते हैं। यह बात तो ठीक है और मैं इसका विरोध नहीं करती लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि हमारे पशु पालन व्यवसाय का क्या हाल है। कृषि के बाद पशु पालन का उद्देश्य होना चाहिये, पशुओं के लिए चारा, गोबर और पानी की व्यवस्था हमें करना चाहिये और इस तरह से अन्य सहायता का प्रबन्ध हमें करना चाहिये। मैंने कुछ दिन पहले प्लानिंग कमिशन को एक निवेदन पेश किया था, परन्तु वह एक्सपर्ट्स के

रट्स में कहां चला गया, वह मैं नहीं जानती हूं। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि जहां पहले हमारे देश में गोकुल हुआ करते थे, जहां 20 हजार गायें एक साथ पलती थीं, वहां आज दूध का पाउडर हम परदेशों से मंगाते हैं और अपने भूखे बच्चों को बिना फेट का दूध देते हैं, उनकी लाचारी और दीनता के फोटो परदेशों में प्रचार करने के लिए लेते हैं ताकि हमको भी इस तरह का टोन्ड मिल्क मिलने से बड़ी खुशी होती है। इसलिए मेरी मांग है कि अन्य व्यवसाय की तरह इस उद्योग के लिए भी और खासतौर पर पशु पालन उद्योग को हमें महत्व देना चाहिये तथा अग्रिम कक्ष में रख कर पशु धन को बचाना चाहिये।

हमारा ध्येय राष्ट्र के आरोग्य को बढ़ाना है और जल्दी खाद्य चीजों को घर-घर पहुंचाना है, इस ध्येय को भूल कर हम इन चीजों के ऊपर और कर का भार बढ़ा रहे हैं। अगर हम इन चीजों के ऊपर कर का भार बढ़ाते हैं, तो जनता इन चीजों का उपयोग किस तरह से कर सकेगी।

आप जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में दुष्काल पड़ने से जनता बहुत परेशान हो जाती है। राजस्थान और उत्तरी गुजरात में देखा कि जब वहां पर दुष्काल पड़ा, तो वहां की जनता बहुत परेशान हो गई और अपने-अपने पशुओं को लेकर इधर उधर जाने लगी। जब इन लोगो के पास खती करने के लिए जमीन नहीं रही और मजदूरी करने के लिए कोई काम नहीं रहा तो ये लोग बहुत ही परेशान हो जाते हैं और भूख से इनके पशु मर जाते हैं और स्वयं भी भूख से मर जाते हैं। अभी यह प्रश्न पानिया मेंट में उठा था कि भूख से कितने लोग इस तरह से मर गये हैं, लेकिन सरकार की ओर से कहा जाता है कि बहुत कम लोग भूख से मरे हैं और इस तरह का प्रचार किया जाता है जो कि एक बड़े दुःख की बात है।

में जब हम यह जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में अक्सर अकाल पड़ता रहता है, सूखा पड़ता रहता है और इसके कारण पशु मर सकते हैं और मनुष्यों को कोई काम नहीं मिलने वाला है, तो हम इस चीज के लिए पहले से ही प्रबन्ध क्यों नहीं करते हैं। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि पशुओं के लिए पानी, चारा और जो आवश्यक चीजें हैं, उनका प्रबन्ध हमें पहले से ही कर लेना चाहिये।

आज हम बड़े-बड़े बांध बनाते हैं, लेकिन छोटी-छोटी योजनाओं की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहती कि नर्मदा जल विवाद का अभी तक कोई हल नहीं किया गया है और न ही गंगा नगर नहर के प्रश्न का हल किया गया है। पीने के पानी के लिए राष्ट्र के ऊपर हर साल इतना बोझ पड़ता है और लोगों को तकलीफ उठानी पड़ती है। जिस चीज को हमें करना चाहिये उसको हम नहीं करते हैं और जिस चीज को नहीं करना चाहिये वह चीज हम करते हैं। हमारी जो छोटी-छोटी बांध की योजनाएं हैं, उन्हें हमें पहले करना चाहिये और जो बड़ी-बड़ी बांध की योजनाएं हैं, उन्हें पीछे करना चाहिये।

आज हम देखते हैं कि उद्योगों के बारे में हमको बहुत चिन्त है और हमेशा यह सोचते रहते हैं कि किस तरह से उद्योगों को लाइसेंस मिल जाय और किस तरह से हमारे पास पैसा आ जाय। लेकिन जो हमारे रूरल एरियाज हैं, जो देहात के इलाके हैं, वहां के लोगों का हम बिल्कुल भी खयाल नहीं रखते हैं। हम सोशलिज्म की बात करते हैं, हम गरीबों की बात करते हैं, लेकिन हम इन लोगों की कठिनाइयों का खयाल नहीं करते हैं। जब दुष्काल पड़ता है, तो हजारों पशु मर जाते हैं और कितने ही लोग भूख के शिकार हो जाते हैं। यह हमारे सामने एक बड़ी भारी समस्या है, लेकिन हम इसका सामना ठीक तरह से नहीं कर पाते हैं।

मुझे इस बात का ताज्जुब है कि जो कर का बोझ बढ़ाया जा रहा है, वह हमारे सोशल वेलफेयर विकास के लिए ही बढ़ाया जा रहा है, लेकिन मैं यह नहीं जानती हूं कि हमारे विकास का लक्ष्य क्या है। आज हम अमरीका और अन्य पश्चिमी देशों के पैटर्न को समाज की दृष्टि में रख कर अपने समाज की रचना कर रहे हैं और हम कभी भी भारत के लक्ष्य को सामने रख कर सोशल वेलफेयर के ढांचे की रचना नहीं करते हैं। यह हमारे सामने एक बहुत बड़ी कठिनाई है। मैं एक सोशल वर्कर हूं और मैं जानती हूं कि हम कितना मुश्किल काम कर रहे हैं और क्या क्या हमारे सामने विकर्त हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि गांव में हम जो कुछ भी कार्य कर रहे हैं, वह इस तरह से कर रहे हैं, जैसे वे काम शहर के लोगों के लिए हो रहे हों। यह ढांचा हमें बदलना चाहिये और सोशल वेलफेयर के बारे में एक नया ढांचा सोचना चाहिये। जब हम कोई काम शुरू करते हैं, तो हम अपने दिमाग को बद कर लेते हैं और जो पुराने पैटर्न की बातें होती हैं, उन्हीं को करने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। इस तरह का जो पैटर्न है, वह बहुत एक्सपेन्सिव है और इस तरह से भारत में सोशल वेलफेयर का काम करने में हमें वर्षों तक राह देखनी पड़ सकती है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि जो विदेशों से हम सहायता लेते हैं, वह काइन्ड मे अधिक लेते हैं। हमारी योजनाओं के सामने यह प्रश्न होता है कि उस सहायता का उपयोग किस काम के लिए लिया जाय। कार्य के लिए सहायता मिलती है या सहायता का उपयोग के लिए कार्य करते हैं। ग्राम कक्षा का एक का निरीक्षण करते हुए मुझे यह अनुभव हुआ कि हमें अपनी योजना के संबंध में फिर से विचार करना चाहिये और जो सोशल वेलफेयर के लिए हम गरीब लोगों के ऊपर कर का भार

[श्रीमती पुष्पाबन जनार्दनराय मेहता]

बढ़ा रहे हैं, वह सोशल वेलफेयर ठीक तरह से कम एक्सपेंसिव हो सके। आज जनता के ऊपर सरकार के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का बोझ बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है, जिससे जनता को बहुत परेशानी का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। क्या हमने इस बात की ओर देखा है कि इस कर के बोझ को किस तरह से कम किया जाय। इसलिए मैं आपके द्वारा सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूँ कि जनता को जिस चीज की जरूरत हो उसको हमें शुरू करना चाहिये और अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये।

हम योजनाएं इसलिए बनाते हैं ताकि हमारे देश की जनता की दशा जल्दी सुधर सके। मुझे मालूम है कि जो हमारे आफिसर लोग हैं, जो हमारी योजनाएं बनाने वाले हैं, वे इतने होशियार हैं कि जो साधन होते हैं, स्कूटर हैं, मोटर हैं, साइकिल हैं, उनका किस तरह से उप-

योग किया जाय, उसकी ओर तो देना रखते हैं, मगर जो जनता की जरूरत की चीजें हैं, उनकी ओर ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। अतः हमारे देश में जो योजना बन रही है, उसमें इस बात की जरूरत है कि जनता को रोटी उसके द्वार मिल सके। मगर हम यह देख रहे हैं कि इन योजनाओं से जनता के ऊपर कर का भार बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है और एक दिन ऐसा आयगा कि मंदिर तो बन जायगा, मगर वहां पर मूर्ति नहीं होगी। जनता के दिल में जो दुःख है वह यही है। बड़ी-बड़ी योजनाओं के बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं है, लेकिन सोचना यह है कि अनाज और रहने की जो सुविधा है वह किस तरह से हम जनता को दे सकते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at half-past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 12th May, 1970.