

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

Rules of Procedure to deal with a new situation. This is what the situation demands here today.

SHRI ABID ALI (Maharashtra): Of course I support what my friend has just said. My request to you is this. We have submitted a motion for discussing the matter of criticism by the All India Radio of the Home Ministry of the Government of India.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
What are you suggesting?

SHRI ABID ALI: Some time should have been suggested by the Business Advisory Committee for discussing that item of mine. Kindly reconsider this matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Now I do not know whether it will meet with the approval of the House but the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has suggested that this House will have to sit up to Monday, the 19th May, 1969. Every Session we sort of add one, two or three days to the Session. I think there should be some finality from now on, and next time I think we should adjust our business according to the Calendar that is published before we begin a Session. I would seek your co-operation on that. Number two; many suggestions have been made that many things have not been discussed, but it is open to the House to realise. Where is the time? And I seek your co-operation when I say this that time can be found if we co-operate and go through the agenda in the most expeditious way. But, if we bring in extraneous matters every day, whichever side, if you bring in a matter every day, a matter which has not been thought of but brought suddenly on the floor of the House, I do not think we can adhere to all that you want to discuss—and you want to discuss this report and that report. Even the Chair is anxious that everything should come on the floor for discussion, but it is up to you to co-operate with the Chair and see that the daily business is finished according to the

time limit laid down by the Business Advisory Committee, in which all of you are present to give your suggestions. As to the House sitting on the 19th, I want to tell the Parliamentary Affairs Minister that, if need be, we shall sit on Monday, the 19th May, 1969 but from the next Session...

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: No, we shall not sit on the 19th. We have fixed our programmes already and it is inconvenient for us if you go on extending the duration of the Session like this.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh): But we will not sit on the 20th of May in any case.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Whatever happens now, from the next Session we must adhere to the Calendar of Sittings that is published beforehand and circulated to the Members, and not a single day more. Now we pass on to the next item of business.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: What about my request for a discussion on industrial licensing?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Nothing more is going to be considered. Next item. The Deputy Prime Minister.

THE FINANCE BILL, 1969

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND
MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI
R. DESAI): Madam, I move:

"That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1969-70, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Bill has been before this House and the country for a little over two months. During this time

its provisions have come under extensive scrutiny in both Houses of Parliament and also outside. I am very grateful to hon. Members of this House and also members of the public who have devoted their time and attention to my proposals in the Bill and have given their valuable comments and suggestions on its provisions.

Madam, the important features of my proposals in the Bill have been explained by me in my Budget speech and the details of its specific provisions have been brought out fully in the Explanatory Memorandum circulated to hon. Members with the Budget papers. I would not, therefore, take the time of this House in going over this ground again and shall confine my remarks to explaining the main changes made in the provisions of the Bill during its consideration in the Lok Sabha.

In the sphere of direct taxes, the Bill proposes to make certain changes in the present scheme of payment of advance tax in order to rationalise it and to relieve persons with comparatively smaller incomes from the burden of paying such tax. Under the revised scheme, persons who close the accounts of their business or profession on December 31 or any earlier date will be required to pay advance tax in three instalments on June 15, September 15 and December 15 of the financial year. It has been brought to the notice of Government that the requirement of payment of the last instalment of advance tax on December 15 may cause hardship to certain categories of tax payers closing the accounts of their business on December 31, such as tea companies in Northern India, which receive the bulk of their sale proceeds some time after December. Such tax payers may not also be in a position to comply with the requirement, under the revised scheme, of estimating their current income and paying advance tax thereon where such tax exceeds the advance tax demanded by more than one-third of the latter. Power is,

therefore, being taken for the Central Board of Direct Taxes to authorise the payment of the last instalment of advance tax on March 15, instead of December 15, by classes of tax payers to be notified in the Official Gazette.

As hon. Members are aware, the Bill proposes to extend the levy of wealth-tax under the Wealth-tax Act to the value of agricultural property owned by individuals and Hindu undivided families with effect from the assessment year 1970-71. As announced by me in the Budget speech, the net proceeds of this levy are to be passed on to the States as grants-in-aid. I need not say anything about the competence of Parliament under the Constitution to legislate for such a levy as the position in the matter has already been explained in the other House by the Attorney General and copies of the relevant papers have been circulated to the hon. Members of this House.

In my Budget speech, I had mentioned that Government would consider as to how genuine agriculturists could be exempted from the scope of this levy. The common concept of a genuine agriculturist is that of a former of moderate means whose main occupation is agriculture. In order to exclude such agriculturists from the scope of the proposed levy, a specific exemption is being provided in respect of agricultural lands upto Rs. 1,50,000 in value. This exemption is in addition to the existing general exemption of the first Rs. 1 lakh of the net wealth in the case of individuals and Rs. 2 lakhs in the case of Hindu undivided families. Under the present provisions of the Wealth-tax Act, the value of an urban residential house situated in a place with a population exceeding 10,000 persons is exempt from wealth tax upto Rs. 1 lakh. In such cases, the separate exemption upto Rs. 1,50,000 in respect of agricultural land will be reduced to the extent of the exemption availed for the urban residential house. Thus, where a tax payer has an urban residential house worth

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]

Rs. 40,000, the separate exemption for agricultural land in his case will be available to the extent of Rs. 1,50,000 less Rs. 40,000, that is to say Rs. 1,10,000.

Under the changes proposed by me an individual agriculturist having no urban residential house will be liable to pay wealth-tax only if his net wealth exceeds Rs. 2,50,000. I may mention that on the excess of net wealth over this amount, he will be liable to pay wealth-tax, at one-half per cent. Only on the first Rs. 4 lakhs of such excess. Thus, in the case of an individual having agricultural land worth Rs. 5 lakhs and no urban residential house, the wealth-tax payable after these exemptions will be Rs. 1,250 only, which is one-fourth per cent, of the gross wealth.

In order to provide an effective deterrent to defaults in furnishing the returns of wealth, the Bill seeks to step up the penalty for such defaults by linking it to the assessed wealth instead of to the wealth-tax payable. The revised scale of penalty is one-half per cent, of the assessed wealth for every month of the default, subject to a maximum in the aggregate, of an amount equal to the assessed wealth. This provision has been modified to avoid hardship in cases where the assessed wealth is marginally in excess of the initial exemption from wealth-tax of Rs. 1 lakh in the case of individuals and Rs. 2 lakhs in the case of Hindu undivided families. Under the provision as modified by the Lok Sabha, the base for calculating the penalty for default in furnishing the return of wealth will be the assessed wealth as reduced by the amount of the initial exemption.

Coming to the Union Excise Duties the criticisms have been mainly against the proposed levy on fertilisers and power driven pumps. There has also been some criticism of the proposed levy on prepared and preserved foods and of the enhancement in the rates of duty on some other commodities. Government have very

carefully considered the views expressed by the various hon. Members as well as the numerous representations received from the industry. After due consideration, the conclusion has been reached that the levy on power driven pumps should be withdrawn. Accordingly all power driven pumps have been completely exempted from this levy by a notification and the exemption has been given effect to from 1st March 1969 in those cases where the manufacturers have either not charged the duty from the buyers of pumps or it is proved to the satisfaction of the Central Excise authorities that the benefit of the refund of the duty where already paid passes to the buyers. The estimated revenue of Rs. 2 crores from this item will thus be foregone.

Government are, however, of the view that there should be no cause for apprehension that the proposed levy on fertilizers will in any way discourage the use of fertilisers. There has been a rapid increase in the consumption of fertilisers in recent years and the prices of agricultural products are also quite remunerative. Looking to the additional return which a farmer gets by using fertilisers, there should be no reason to fear that a duty of 10 per cent, will have any material effect on its consumption. No change is therefore proposed in this levy.

I have also announced in the Lok Sabha certain concessions in respect of the levies on prepared and preserved foods, cotton textiles and rayon yarn. These concessions have already been given effect to by notification with effect from the 29th April, 1969. All nuts, most of the vegetable products and a number of food products have been excluded from the purview of levy on prepared or preserved foods. In addition, all dutiable fruit and vegetable products cleared by any manufacturer upto the value of Rs. 50,000 in a year have been exempted from duty. Products like pickles, chutneys and murabbas have also been kept out of the excise levy.

In the field of cotton textiles, the ad valorem duty leviable on certain specified varieties of cotton fabrics has been, reduced to half if the value of the fabric does not exceed Rs. 2.50 per square metre. In the case of cotton blankets the concession has been extended to all blankets of the value not exceeding Rs. 4 per square metre. In the case of fabrics falling under sub-item 1(1) of Item No. 19 of the Central Excise Tariff when manufactured in the powerloom sector, the duty has been reduced to two-third of the rate applicable to similar fabrics manufactured by the mill sector. The duty on cotton yarn in count groups 22-29 N.F., 14-22 N.F. and less than 14 N.F. has also been reduced by 8 paise, 5 paise and 3 paise per kg. respectively. In the case of filament yarn, the preference available to the small manufacturers which was reduced to 50 per cent, in the Budget proposals has now been restored to approximately three-fourth of the concession which they enjoyed over the big manufacturers before the Budget.

In addition to the reliefs which I have mentioned, a reduction has also been made in the rates of duty on cement so that the cumulative incidence of basic and special duty will now be 23.76 per cent, as against the Budget proposals of 25.2 per cent. This reduction had to be given as the rate proposed in the Finance Bill was somewhat higher than what was originally intended.

The reduction in revenue as a result of the various changes that I have proposed with regard to excise duties will be Rs. 5.09 crores.

Two changes are proposed to be made in respect of postal tariff. The postage rate for a single copy of a registered newspaper weighing up to 60 grams is proposed to be reduced from 5 paise to the rate of 2 paise in force before 15th May, 1968. This reduction will cost Rs. 32.81 lakhs in a full year.

In order to help balance the Budget of the P&T, the fee for registration

of postal articles is proposed to be raised from the present level of 70 paise to 75 paise. These changes will be introduced by a notification.

Madam, 1 move.

The question was proposed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam, I have heard the speech of the hon. Finance Minister with attention. I think he has given a little chutney...

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (An-dhra Pradesh): Murabba.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:*

... to make the Bill, the taxation proposals a little more palatable. Murabba, if you please, if that makes it a little more palatable to you, but on the whole I am afraid the Bill is not going to serve the objectives with which the taxation proposals were introduced. It is going to be inflationary. There is no doubt about it. The Government suffers from two misconceptions. One is the little improvement in agriculture that has been noticed in the last few years. They have taken it as if agriculture in the whole country has improved immediately. We hear the talk of a green revolution. A large number of pamphlets have been issued by the Government talking about the green revolution. I see only a red revolution that is overtaking the country. Events in Calcutta are very clearly indicative of it, but Government seems to be absolutely complacent about it. Where is the green revolution? What percentage of the farmers is able to use the new techniques, the new type of seeds, the fertiliser, which is so necessary if the new seed is used, and water for irrigation? Many places in this country are without water still. How is the agriculturist going to use the new seed, the new technique and fertiliser for this purpose? The Government's idea of what is going to come out of the larger output from agriculture, the notion that the Government has,

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Paid.]

I think, is a little exaggerated. Even this year North India, Punjab, was expecting a bumper wheat harvest. I hope it does, because the agriculturist needs relief, but in the last few weeks we have seen such an unusual weather, rains and hailstorm. Will the agriculturist be able to gather all his crops? Is his hope of getting so much extra income out of that going to be realised? How much of the crop, which looked so promising, has been destroyed by the rains and hailstorm that occurred recently? So, I think, this emphasis on what has happened to our agriculture and of trying to tax agriculture and agricultural land is a little too much in haste, perhaps like »putting the cart before the horse.

I need not say very much about the agricultural wealth-tax, but I feel that in that also there has been undue haste. Agriculture may have improved and it may have been better possibly for a few large landowners, but the wherewithal necessary is not available in this country. Where it is available, Government interference at every stage makes things more and more difficult. We are supposed to be manufacturing tractors. I wish the Minister would talk to some of the people who try to manufacture tractors and they would know what their difficulties are. At every stage there is difficulty. Of course, for those who import parts and assemble them and pass them on as tractors manufactured in India, it does not matter, but those who try to manufacture things in this country suffer from difficulties at every stage. What does Government do about it? That is not the case only with the manufacture of tractors. Everyone who tries to manufacture anything in this country finds difficulty at every stage, because of the changing policies of the Government, because of the uncertainty of the policy which is changing every time. Government realised perhaps the mistakes they were making in their policy with regard to textile mills and the burden of the sick mills was becoming more and more a mill-stone round their neck. They realised that they could |

not bear the burden of it. So, they have given a little sop to the textile industry. Some of the textile people seem to be very happy about it, but I do not know whether they have real reasons to be happy about it. I do not think this little relief is going to make any serious difference to the textile industry. It has given them breathing time. More mills would have closed down as sick mills and the Government would have had to face the situation of labour clamouring about it and the burden of having to take over the mills. So, the Government has done a wise thing in giving them relief, but the relief should not have been tardy. It should have been in a little more measure, in a liberal measure, so that the textile industry could rehabilitate itself. I do not see that possible under the relief that has been given.

We have lost a large export market for textiles that we had because of this policy of Government vacillating, not deciding and changing every year. So, I am doubtful whether the policy in the matter of the textile industry is going to produce the results that are expected. I certainly welcome the little relief, but I had expected it in a more generous measure, so that the industry could do better, the industry could revive and it could help everyone else in this country.

The same is the case with other industries. What can we do when Government cannot make up its mind? The real difficulty is the vacillating policy of the Government and Government's inability to take decisions. The Tata fertiliser factory is an example of how delay is costing the country so much and Government does not seem to bother about it. It is not a matter of economy or anything in a matter in which this country is losing about a lakh of rupees every hour with the delay on this question. Every hour of every day and every day of every year this country is losing a lakh of rupees because of the Government's indecision. The Government would not say: "No, we are not going to have it." Then, of course, the matter would be closed. But if the

Government is going to have it, will it make up its mind about it? This is the situation that everybody in industry is faced with. Because Tata is a known name, because the question of this fertiliser industry is known, because people have come to know about it, I mentioned it. Talk to people in industry and they will tell you the same thing. At every stage there is delay, indecision and that costs loss of so many man-hours, so many working hours. The moneys that have been spent on investigation and preparing projects, all that is hanging about and the country is losing interest and all that. Of course, unemployment is there. Are we going to solve this unemployment problem by this method of indecision? Is the Government going to collect more taxes by this method of indecision? If Government were to take quick decisions all these projects would come into operation, Government would get taxes, people would get employment and Government would get taxes from the people who were employed. It is this policy of the Government that is resulting in loss of revenue to the Government.

The Finance Minister, before he sat down, referred again to the question of postal rates. I do not agree with the Finance Minister. I believe the postal rates, the telegraph rates and the telephone rates are the highest in this country for such a poor service. We had a postcard which used to go to any corner of the country at the cost of the original quarter of an anna, which is perhaps two paise now. From that where have we gone? We have now got the ten paise postcard. Have we got improved service for that? We have not. The same is the case with telephones. In the case of the telephone I must repeat the charge of the greed of the Government that I have made before. Government make a very heavy profit on the telephones and the trunk telephones. They make something like two hundred per cent profit. Yet they stick to the monopoly instead of allowing other people who know, who are willing, who would even put up the money if

Government allowed them. If Government would share the responsibility, we would get a quicker expansion of the service and Government would get more money. It is this policy of the Government that is dodging us and preventing the progress of the country. Perhaps the Finance Minister himself cannot take decisions on matters pertaining to other Ministries, but today the Finance Minister is in the position of Deputy Prime Minister also which gives him a little more authority than he would have only as Finance Minister, and surely he can bring the Ministers together and take decisions of this type which would help the country to get more revenue which would prevent loss of time, loss of revenue and therefore prevent the inflation that is coming in every year. Every year we have a fresh dose of deficit financing, and this deficit financing brings in its wake inflation. Therefore, when we have inflation, the cost of living goes up, and then we have demands for more allowances for labour, very naturally, and from Government servants, employees elsewhere, everywhere, because everybody is today is feeling the pinch of high prices, and I fail to see anything in the Budget that is 'striking at the root of this great disease that has overtaken the Government and seems to be overtaking it more and more. Therefore, I consider the Budget and the Finance Bill disappointing. I would have expected the finance Minister, who had listened to the criticisms in this House and the other House, to have shown some concessions to the smaller people. No concessions have been shown particularly to the middle class which has the difficulty of getting neither dear-ness allowance nor subsidies nor any fair price shop advantages which Government servants or those in organised industry do get. I would have expected him to give some relief to the ordinary income-tax payer, the man who is a small shopkeeper, the small salary earner who has an income under Rs. 10,000 per annum. In these days of high cost what is Rs. 10,000? If a man has three or four children, how could he maintain them

(Shri Dahyabhai V. Pate).]

if he has to give them a decent education? Everything has gone up in terms of these increasing costs. We must also look at it from that point of view. I am afraid I cannot characterise the attitude of the Finance Minister in this matter as sympathetic to the smaller man. Government servants are protected. Labour unions protect labour by trying to get them dearness allowance. It is their right. I have no quarrel with that. That is why labour unions are formed, and labour unions carried on in right lines should function that way and plead for an adequate living wage to labour. But in spite of that I feel even if they do there is a large class of people in this country who cannot form a labour union, the ordinary agriculturist, the poor agriculturist. He is so staggered far and wide all over the country that he cannot form a union and say, "I will not cultivate tomorrow". He has to cultivate. He has to look at the sky and hope that rain will come, because while we have promised large irrigation schemes and adequate water, how many places are there where they have not yet reached? How many of our schemes are half way through? So the poor agriculturist and the poor middle class man are very worse off after this Budget. The Finance Bill gives them no relief, the relief that most of us in this House pleaded for and in the other House also pleaded for.

I will say one word about the proposed agricultural wealth tax. The Attorney General was called in the other House. I do not propose to suggest that he should be called in this House also, but after that the Attorney General's opinion leaves us in doubt. He said it may be this way or it may be that way. I do not know how we are better off. But certainly the House and the country are worse off by this that Government have found a new source of revenue, and i use of large pressure perhaps Government is going to make a small charge this year, and other Finance Ministers, perhaps the same Finance Minister, will again push it up further

when the Government needs it. What are Government's needs? Government's needs are to balance the Budget, nothing else. There are other ways of balancing the budget. That the Finance Minister also very well knows. Why don't you put your public sector projects in good shape? You are punishing the poor taxpayer, the poor agriculturist, the poor middle class man, whether he pays taxes v directly or indirectly, because of the failure of the management of your public sector projects which run into huge losses. The talk of service that they give does not appeal, does not convince me, and that is also the modern thinking of some of the socialist countries like Yugoslavia and others. Therefore, it is time that Government took a lesson from this. After all people are not going to pay on indefinitely like this, and people are not going to suffer inflation of this type year after year. I am afraid the Finance Minister's arguments in this matter are not convincing, and I am sorry we do not feel at all happy about the proposals made by the Finance Minister.

SHRT R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Finance Bill, 1969, and in doing so I would like to deal with a provision or two that remain imbedded in the Bill as well as the general economic base on which our country's prosperity lies.

I was sorry to hear the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Dahyabhai Patel say that he feels disappointed at the Budget and the Finance Bill as formulated by the Deputy Prime Minister. I would on the other hand pay a compliment to the Deputy Prime Minister for having brought in a measure like this which may well be described as a booster to our economy. He, has braved the economic storm and taken the wheel himself to steer the ship in a safe but sure course in spite of the opposition from within and from without. The Finance Minister's objective has been clearly underlined as one of faith in mixed economy with the ultimate goal being

the socialist fabric, and he has rightly chosen to adopt the method of orderly and balanced transformation. But his proposals have not only made the rich share a heavier tax burden, but he has also called upon a large section of the rural populace to make a small contribution to the national exchequer. Whereas he has signalled to the rich agricultural sections to pay a good dividend to the Government, he has very unfortunately continued to inject the drug calling upon the ever suffering middle classes to sacrifice, sacrifice and sacrifice. What is it that has made the opposition and others to indulge in a concerted and concentrated attack on the Finance Minister's taxation proposals? It is particularly the one that leads to the levy of excise duty on fertilizers and the levy of wealth tax on agricultural holdings.

Madam Deputy Chairman, it cannot be controverted today that the urban sector, relative to its income, pays the highest tax in India, whereas the rural sector fortunately has escaped this burden for a very long time. The Government of India, having invested crores and crores of rupees on the development of agriculture, what is it that it gets in return from those that get the benefit from it? Avowedly, the small farmer is not affected; on the other hand the small farmer is exempted by the Finance Minister from the operation of the agricultural wealth tax. But if the large land-holders, the richmen, do not want to pay may I ask who else can pay and who else will pay? Government has to find the revenue. And the Finance Minister justifiably did the right thing in imposing a wealth tax on large agricultural holdings, which would ultimately equate them with the property holders in the urban sector as well. He has proposed a levy only where the individual land-holder has Rs. 2½ lakhs of wealth and where a joint family possesses Rs. 3½ lakhs of wealth. Certainly, it does not affect the common man or the poor agriculturist. If you take the general average, only 1 per cent of the total agricultural population of our country comes under 3—10RSS/ND/69

the purview of the agricultural wealth tax.

Let us pause for a while here. What is it that motivated the Government to impose a levy of agricultural wealth tax. Today there are about Rs. 2,000 crores of additional surplus of agricultural income in the hands of the public and that has not been properly channelised or harnessed. If this additional amount of Rs. 2,000 crores is not channelised or is not properly harnessed, then it will, in the immediate future, have an adverse effect on our general economic condition. It should also be remembered that less than 20 per cent of the agriculturists have a share of more than 60 per cent of Rs. 2,000 crores of profit, and when they can well afford to pay, why should they not be taxed is a question for the critics to answer.

The criticism of the levy of an excise duty on fertilisers has rent the air and the most vociferous has been not only from this side of the House but also from the other side of the House. I for one do not subscribe to their view. After all, as the Deputy Prime Minister very rightly stated on an earlier occasion, what is demanded of the small farmer is only Rs. 4 out of every Rs. 134 that he expends on his own agricultural holding with reference to fertiliser. And when the fertiliser by itself as an input has contributed in a treble or quadruple form to the increased yield in his farm, what is wrong in the Government asking even the small agriculturist to pay 2 to 3 per cent of his total expenditure by way of a levy that the Finance Minister proposes to collect from him for fertiliser? I feel that even the small farmer when he gets so much of benefit from the fertiliser is bound to contribute in a small way to the growth of our nation and the economic well-fare of our nation.

Madam, the criticism that has been levelled against this levy is not based on economics but I would say that it is politically motivated by most of those who argue against this levy on fertilisers.

[Shri R. T. Parthasarathy.]

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have been appealing to the Deputy Prime Minister on behalf of the middle classes persistently and consistently and also insistently, and the Deputy Prime Minister never gets tired of rejecting my appeals equally persistently and consistently. May I once again repeat my appeal to him and find out if there is a soft spot in his heart so that that soft spot may bring benefit to the large section of the middle class people, the Government officers and the low-income group? May I request him to consider that he should accept the Bhoothalingam Committee's Report by raising the income-tax limit to Rs. 7,500? If he finds any difficulty in that, may I ask him to raise that limit from Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 6,000 at least. This will, in a large measure, receive national acclamation and at the same time will annul the prohibitive cost of collection which bears no net income to the Government ultimately. It would also streamline the administration. I do hope, when the Finance Minister replies to the debate, he will consider my request, and not reject it totally.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the Finance Bill aims at our country's economic recovery and industrial growth. The Bill has given a thrust forward to our developmental programmes and an incentive to augment production as well as exports. It aims at realising a production-oriented economy which is the right way of approaching this complex problem. Our attention should be focussed, and rightly so, on the economic issues, and therein lies the future welfare of our nation.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact of our national income which at current prices has doubled, having 1961 as the base year. But at constant prices, the national income increased by 25 per cent only. What is necessary is that we should try to minimise the gap between the two, and only when there is no gap or when there is little gap, that will be a signal for the prosperity of our country. To achieve this, it occurs to me that there is only one way, and that is to concentrate on development

investment whereby we shall be able to get quick production results within a period of three or four years. Only then will our economy be stabilised and it would get, what I call, a forward thrust. This is the crux of the situation and in order to rejuvenate our economy our economic standard and order, we should make our economy production-oriented and quick-yielding developmental programmes should be instituted forthwith. The Finance Minister's measures go a long way in achieving this end, and hence they deserve our support.

Critics are hard on the Finance Minister for levying both direct and indirect taxes. Whereas the State Governments vie with each other in de-ing an increased share of income from the Central revenues they at the same time do not want to impose any tax whatsoever. And I attribute that the reasons are only political and nothing else. When the resources of the States are said to be rather poor and they do not want the Centre also to increase taxation through the proposals as initiated by the Finance Minister, how else are we going to find finances for our Plan and programmes? I would only request that the States, instead of criticising, should appreciate the position of the Finance Minister, and they should not take the position of the younger boys leaving the elder brother to get all the odium and themselves getting all the praise and if that is the attitude of the States it is nothing but what I would call a child's play. Today we do not find men to speak for the country as a whole; we find opinion reflected on the floor of the House and outside advocating the cause of the States. But I would tell the hon. Members that it is the Parliament of India that is the right forum from where we should project the nation's image and only by that can we build up the progress of the whole nation, towards the realisation of which the Deputy Prime Minister's Budget proposals and the Finance Bill have come not too late.

Before I conclude, I would respectfully invite your attention to the taxation proposals of last year when I

had the honour of speaking on them. I compared the Deputy Prime Minister to an artful bowler, and this Budget and the Finance Bill have revealed to the world that Mr. Morarji Desai is not only an artful bowler but he is a complete all-rounder who can bowl any one and who will not allow himself to be bowled by any one because he always plays with a straight bat. In spite of insurmountable attacks by the Opposition upon him he continues to remain not out and hence I support the Bill. Thank You.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : उपसभापति महोदया, मैं इस फाइनेंस बिलका, जिस रूप में वह इस सदन में प्रस्तुत किया गया है, विरोध करता हूँ। इसलिए विरोध करता हूँ कि इसमें जो प्रस्ताव रखे गए हैं टैक्स लगाने के या एक-आध जगह पर टैक्स कम करने के, उनसे देश के खर्च को हम ठीक प्रकार से सही रास्ते पर नहीं ला सकते। यह तर्क दिया गया है कि जो टैक्स-पेयर्स का ऊपर का वर्ग है उससे टैक्स वसूल करते करते हम एक सेच्योरेशन पाइन्ट पर पहुँच गए हैं, 115 परसेंट तक टैक्स कुछ लोगों पर, कुछ कैटेगरीज पर लगाया है उनकी वेल्थ में से कुछ चीजें निकालने के लिए। अब हमें इस बजट को बराबर करने के लिए मजबूरन तौर पर छोटे लोगों तक, किसानों तक भी जाने की आवश्यकता पड़ती है। मैं इस मजबूरी को तो समझ सकता हूँ कि अब देश के अन्दर लगे हुए टैक्स एक सीमा तक पहुँच गए हैं और एक ऐसी सीमा तक पहुँच गए हैं कि उनके माध्यम से जितनी वसूली होनी चाहिए थी अनुपाततः वह कम होने लगी है। यह एक ऐसे खतरे की चीज है कि जिसकी तरफ हमको ध्यान देना चाहिए।

कृषकों पर टैक्स लगाने की इस बार बात आई और उसके लिए तर्क

दिया गया कि जब हम सारा खर्चा उनके लिए कर रहे हैं, आधा खर्च सिर्फ कृषकों पर, कृषकों के लाभ के लिए कर रहे हैं, फिर यह कैसे हो सकता है कि हम उनको छोड़ दें, केवल गैर-कृषकों पर टैक्स लगाएं और कृषकों पर हम टैक्स न लगाएं। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि आंकड़ों से यह बात सच है लेकिन इसको भी हमें स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि आधा खर्चा कृषकों पर होता है तो कृषकों की जनसंख्या भी आधे से ज्यादा है, 70 प्रतिशत है और इस कारण से केवल इतने तर्क मात्र से तो काम नहीं चलेगा। यह जो कृषि के क्षेत्र में खर्चा किया गया है इसका हिसाब हमने कहाँ लगाया कि वास्तविक रूप में उसका लाभ किसान को कहाँ तक पहुँचा। जो कुछ खर्चा उनके लिए किया गया है उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं उदाहरण के तौर पर पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने जो सूरतगढ़ फार्म के सम्बन्ध में अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है उसे उद्धृत करना चाहूँगा। उसमें कहा गया है कि 13 साल के बाद भी—

“The Farm has still not been able to work out a proper crop pattern.”

यह इसका पहला कमेन्ट है। दूसरा है—

“It also raises the basic question as to whether the site for the farm was correctly chosen.”

इसका जो तीसरा कमेन्ट है, वह यह है कि बाढ़ के सीमा क्षेत्र में होने के बाद भी—

“A comprehensive flood protection scheme has yet to be worked out thirteen years after the farm has come into existence.”

जो कुछ भी इसका उत्पादन बिका है, उसके बारे में है—

“The arrears represent nearly 66% of the farm's annual income

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

during the five years ending 1967-68."

फिर केवल इसी फार्म के बारे में यह बात होती तो इतनी चिन्ता नहीं थी। इसके बारे में बताया गया है कि महज इस बजह से कि कुछ मशीनरी हमको गिफ्ट में मिलने की तैयारी हो गई (इस फार्म के लिए एक करोड़ रुपए की रूसी मशीनरी हमको प्राप्त हुई) इसलिए हमने बिना इस बात की चिन्ता किए हुए कि इसका यहां पर लगाना ठीक है या नहीं इस गिफ्ट में मिली मशीनरी का उपयोग करने के लिए इस स्कीम को चला दिया। इसी तरह के दूसरी जगहों पर स्टेट फार्म्स बने हैं, जैसे हिसार में बना है। इसके बारे में उनका कहना है कि उसका कनाल सिस्टम जो 75 लाख रुपए लगने के बाद तैयार होगा उस पर उस फार्म का सारा भविष्य निर्भर करता है। हीराकुड फार्म के बारे में 21 परसेंट हम इन्टीसिपेट कर रहे हैं जब उसका रिटर्न केवल 3.60 लाख है 29.21 लाख की तुलना में और सिन्धु-नूर के फार्म पर हम 38 परसेंट जो एन्टीसिपेट कर रहे हैं वहां "prolonged droughts are of frequent occurrence." मैंने उदाहरण के तौर पर सूरतगढ़ की बात इसलिए कोट की कि उस सारे फार्म को इतने वर्षों तक चलाने के बाद अब बन्द करने का सुझाव दिया गया है। कृषि के क्षेत्र में हमने खर्च किए लेकिन इस प्रकार के खर्चों के लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है। मैं समझता हूं कृषक तो नहीं हैं। आज उनके ऊपर किए गए खर्चों के सम्बन्ध में केवल आंकड़ा प्रस्तुत कर हम उनके उपर टैक्स लगाने की बात करें तो वह उचित नहीं प्रतीत होती।

1968-69 की जो एक साला योजना समाप्त हुई उसमें यह बात साफ

है कि जितना प्रोडक्शन हम कृषि के क्षेत्र से चाहते थे उतना नहीं हुआ। यह केवल कृषि के क्षेत्र में ही नहीं है, फर्टिलाइजर के क्षेत्र में भी जितना उत्पादन हम करना चाहते थे उतना नहीं हुआ। कन्जम्प्शन भी जितना हम चाहते थे उतना नहीं हुआ, पावर केपेसिटी का भी जितना लक्ष्य रखा था वह पूरा नहीं हुआ। यह इस बात का संकेत है कि एक-साला योजना के लिए भी हमने जो लक्ष्य निश्चित किए वे हम पूरे नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। इकोनॉमिक ग्रोथ जो दो साल पहले 8 प्रतिशत थी, पिछले साल वह 7 प्रतिशत रह गई और इस वर्ष 68-69 के अन्दर वह 5 प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं होने वाली है। यह इस बात का संकेत है कि हमें इन सारी बातों पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करना पड़ेगा। मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि अगर कृषकों ने थोड़ा बहुत फर्टिलाइजर की मदद से अपनी आमदनी बढ़ा ली तब भी मैं समझता हूं कि ओवरऑल नेशनल एक्टिविटी को ध्यान में रख कर कृषकों पर हम टैक्स लगाए या टैक्स न लगाएं, इसके बारे में विवेक का उपयोग करना चाहिए। हमारे खर्च भी कुछ प्रोडक्टिव है, कुछ अनप्रोडक्टिव है। प्रोडक्टिव आइटम्स पर खर्चा करते समय संकोच नहीं होता लेकिन अनप्रोडक्टिव आइटम्स पर खर्चा करते समय जरूर बहुत सोचना पड़ेगा। आज किसान अपने देश का सबसे बड़ा कन्ज्यूमर है और सबसे बड़ा परचेजर है। आज अगर कृषि के क्षेत्र में किए गए किसी भी प्रकार के विकास से किसान के पास पांच पैसा बचता है तो वह उसका बचा हुआ पांच पैसा परचेज में एक अच्छे कन्ज्यूमर के रूप में उसके हस्त में आएगा और सारे देश के अन्दर जो इनएक्टिविटी का वातावरण चला है, जो आज माल विक नहीं रहा है ऐसी कई क्षेत्रों में परिस्थिति पैदा

हुई है, किसान के हाथ में आया हुआ पैसा उस सारी इकानोमी को चलाने में मदद देगा और इस प्रकार के सारे कामों की गति बढ़ाएगा। उसके कारण सर्विसेज में और अन्य चीजों में नए जीवन का संचार होगा। किसान के हाथ में आया हुआ पैसा ओवरऑल नेशनल एक्टिविटी में वृद्धि करने वाला है।

वित्त मंत्री महोदय किसान के हाथ में आए हुए पैसे को निचोड़ कर उसका उपयोग करना चाहते हैं। किसान अपने पास आए हुए पैसे का भिन्न प्रकार से उपयोग करके नेशनल एक्टिविटी में कन्ट्रीब्यूट कर सकता है। उसको ऐसा करने का मौका दीजिए। इस देश के सारे डेवलपमेंट में वह एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सेदार बनेगा। ऐसा मालूम होता है इस बजट और फाइनेंस बिल से कि उनसे सब सूत कर सरकारी खजाने में जमा करने की होड़ लगी है। हम अभी भी घाटे में हैं, डेफिसिट चल रहा है। केवल सरकारी खजाने और सरकारी टैक्स के आधार पर हम आज की आवश्यकताएं पूरी नहीं कर सकते। लोगों को देश के अन्दर अपने पैसा का उपयोग करने देकर, लगाने देकर हम एक एक्टिविटी का काम प्रारम्भ कर सकते हैं। जब तक सरकार इस प्रकार के तबके को छूट और अवसर प्रदान नहीं करेगी तब तक इस देश की सारी अर्थ रचना को हम किसी सुद्ध आधार पर खड़ा नहीं कर सकेंगे, यह मेरा उनसे निवेदन है और इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि वे फिर से इस सम्बन्ध में विचार करें।

सन् 1964, 1965 और 1968 के साल में कुछ फसल अच्छी हुई, लेकिन 1966-67 में 19 परसेंट फसल कम भी हो गयी। तो जो वेगरीज आफ मानसून है वे बहुत बड़ा फैक्टर प्ले

करती हैं। सब प्रकार के हमारे दावों के बाद भी उन का असर काफी पड़ता है और इस कारण से केवल इस साल फसल अच्छी हो गयी इस लिये उसी में से इन्हें यह सारे टैक्स लगाने के लिये तैयार होने का जो साहस हुआ है, मैं समझता हूं कि यह उचित नहीं है। यह इस समय के लिये युक्तिसंगत नहीं है और इन्हें फिर से इस संबंध में दुबारा विचार करना चाहिये।

जहां पर एग्रीकल्चर क यह सारा विचार किया है, वहां मैं सरकार के सामने यह बात भी रखना चाहता हूं कि कृषि के क्षेत्र में लगने वाला पैसा भी इन दि लांग रन किस प्रकार से अनप्रोडक्टिव बन रहा है। स संबंध में मैं कुछ संकेत देना चाहूंगा। और इस संबंध में मैं राजस्थान नहर को फिर वित्त मंत्री महोदय के सामने रखूंगा। 58 करोड़ रुपया हम ने इस पर खर्च किया है, लेकिन 125 करोड़ रुपया अभी इस पर खर्च होना बाकी है। हम 5 करोड़ प्रति वर्ष के हिसाब से चल रहे हैं। 25, 30 वर्ष का समय इस योजना को पूरा होने में लगेगा और स्वाभाविक है कि आज की एग्रीकल्चर या अन्न की कमी की दृष्टि से हम ने जो इस योजना को शुरू किया है वह 20, 25 या 30 वर्ष में व्याज की रकम मिलते मिलते कब पूरी हो पायेगी इस का सही अनुमान लगाना मुश्किल है। कम से कम इस पीढ़ी को तो इस की आशा नहीं करनी चाहिये। यह किस तरह से प्रोडक्टिव इन्वेस्टमेंट माना जायगा। हम किस तरह से इस को प्रोडक्टिव बना सकते हैं इस दृष्टि से इस संबंध में विचार होना चाहिये। और यह सवाल इसलिये भी आवश्यक बन गया है क्योंकि यह सवाल जुड़ गया है पोंग बांध के कंस्ट्रक्शन के साथ। पोंग बांध करीब करीब कंप्लीट

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

हो गया है। राजस्थान नहर 25, 30 वर्ष बाद पूरी होगी और पोंग बांध के निर्माण में राजस्थान सहयोग दे रहा है, लेकिन जब तक राजस्थान नहर का इरिगेशन चैनल कॉम्प्लेक्स पूरा नहीं होता तब तक वह उस को यूज नहीं कर सकता। वहां के जो विस्थापित उखड़ेंगे उन के लिये साढ़े तीन लाख एकड़ जमीन चाहिये। अभी तक की सारी व्यवस्था को देखते हुए ढाई लाख एकड़ केवल राजस्थान कैनल से हम इरिगेट कर पा रहे हैं। किस प्रकार का प्रपोज़न हम बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, हम किस तरह से एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट की इस में मदद करना चाहते हैं। बड़ी बड़ी हम ने घोषणायें की थीं कि हम हरिजनों को, भूमिहीन कृषिکارों को और सेना के जवानों को इस इलाके में बसायेंगे, अभी समस्या खड़ी हो रही है कि पोंग बांध के विस्थापितों को हम कहां बसायेंगे। बाकी अन्य उच्च घोषणाओं का तो सबाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि इन प्रश्नों पर विचार करते समय हम केवल प्लान के आंकड़ों के आधार पर ग्रीन रेवोल्यूशन के कारण टैक्स के जस्टीफिकेशन के रास्ते पर जायेंगे तो वास्तविकता के ऊपर वह आधारित नहीं होगा। हमें इस पर नये ढंग से विचार करना चाहिये।

पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी की 55 वीं रिपोर्ट में टैक्स वैरियेशन के जो आंकड़े हमारे हैं उस की तरफ भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया गया है। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इन बातोंको अपने सामने रख कर अपनी मशीनरी को इस संबंध में टाइट करे। इस के संबंध में उन का यह कहना है कि :

“There is a wide variation between the estimates and actuals under some of the Principal Heads of Tax Revenues.”

यह उन्होंने स्वीकार किया है।

“There is scope for improvement in the technique of estimation by the Tax Planning Cells in the Boards of Direct Taxes and Indirect Taxes.”

अभी भी यह रिस्क है और मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार का बजट इन वास्तविकताओं को ध्यान में रख कर बने। यह आंकड़े सही नहीं हैं। पिछले साल भी 186.97 करोड़ रुपया हमारे टैक्स कलेक्शन में शॉर्ट फाल हुआ। यह छोटी राशि नहीं है। कारपोरेशन टैक्स, में ही करीब 40 करोड़ रुपया कम वसूली हुआ। तो इतना बड़ा वैरियेशन हमारा क्यों इस हिसाब में होता है इस पर हमें गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिये।

हमारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव एक्सपेंडिचर को घटाने के बारे में कई चीजें बार बार आ रही हैं। एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमीशन का कहना है कि पिछले 5, 7 सालों में फर्स्ट ग्रेड के आफिसर्स की संख्या एक दम से बढ़ी। आई० ए० एस० आफिसर्स की संख्या देते हुए उन्होंने कहा है कि जहां 1948 में केवल 803 थी वहां 1966 में 2575 आई० ए० एस० आफिसर्स हो गये। तो जितनी तेजी से हम इस ओर बढ़ रहे हैं। इस संबंध में हम को विचार करना चाहिये क्योंकि कैबिनेट के अंदर कितने मंत्री रहने चाहिये वह तो पोलिटीकल कंसीडरेशन्स आप के डिटरमिन करेंगे, वह तो बर्क के बरडन लोड के आधार पर तय नहीं होता और इस में अगर मैं जाऊं तो वह एक अन्य विषय होगा, लेकिन कम से कम अफसरों की नियुक्ति और फर्स्ट क्लास अफसरों की नियुक्ति के बारे में हमें निश्चित रूप से विचार करना चाहिये। केवल डबलपिंग इकानामि की बात कह कर हम सारी स्थिति को छिपा नहीं सकते कि तीन

गुने अफसर हो गये हैं इन पिछले 16 सालों में। फर्स्ट क्लास के अफसरों की संख्या बढ़ना यह एक ऐसी चीज है कि जिस के बारे में हम को गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिये।

सरकारी जो सारे उद्योग चल रहे हैं आज उन के संबंध में हम को यह विचार करना चाहिये कि उन का काम कैसा हो रहा है। मैं यहां पर उदाहरण के तौर पर बतलाना चाहूंगा कि जैसे नंगल में फर्टिलाइजर कारपोरेशन उस ने कई कर्मचारियों को एक्स-ग्रैशिया पेमेंट आफ् बोनस देने के बारे में फैसला किया गया। कैबिनेट का फैसला हुआ। अब वहां का मैनेजमेंट कहता है कि हम कैबिनेट के फैसले को मानने के लिये बाउन्ड नहीं। पर सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने भी इस बात को अपहोल्ड नहीं किया। तो जितने भी इस तरह के कारपोरेशन्स हैं क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार केवल बजट में उन को कुछ पैसा देने की जिम्मेदार है। उस में कुछ दखल नहीं दे सकती। इन के डिस्जिन्स को कारपोरेशन्स मानें या न मानें इस के बारे में क्या वे स्वतंत्र हैं, या हम इन कारपोरेशन्स को बना कर पब्लिक स्कूटनी से और पालिथामेंट की स्कूटनी से कम से कम गवर्नमेंट को जो रिस्पॉसिबिलिटी उस के लिये होल्ड करनी चाहिये उस से सरकार स्वयं सुबुकदोष होना चाहती है इस प्रश्न पर हम को सोचना पड़ेगा।

इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन का विचार करते समय इस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने केवल फाइनेंसिंग के हिसाब से एक चीज का उल्लेख किया है। इस के पेज 100 पर 86 वीं रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि :

“The Committee are surprised that an organisation of this nature and experience of the Indian Oil Corporation which has to make large purchases found itself helpless

to secure compliance with the terms of the Purchase Order and recover adequate compensation from their regular suppliers for breach of contract.”

ऐसी कौन सी मजबूरियां हैं कि जिन की वजह से इन कारपोरेशन्स के कामों में बाधाएँ उपस्थित हो रही हैं और सरकार इन के कामों के ऊपर नियंत्रण नहीं रख पा रही है। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इस का विचार करे।

मैं इस के साथ साथ फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री का ध्यान इस बात की तरफ भी आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा—राजस्थान के अकाल के क्षेत्र के प्रति। उन की एक टीम यहां से गयी थी वहां का सारा हिसाब किताब देखने के लिए। कुछ पैसा उन को दिया गया है और दिया जाने वाला है। लेकिन वहां की परिस्थितियां खराब हैं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर महोदय वहां पर गयीं। एक दुखद घटना के कारण उन को वापस आना पड़ा। मैं इस बात को समझ सकता हूं लेकिन जो एक्सपर्ट्स की टीम गयी वह उदयपुर, डूंगरपुर और बांसवाड़ा के इलाकों को देख कर आयी जब कि वहां आज लोग मर रहे हैं राजस्थान के पश्चिमी जिलों में। हजारों लोगों के मरने की बात स्वीकार की गयी। अब यह स्वीकार किया गया है कि वे गैस्ट्री इंट्राइटिस से मरे हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी ने पिछली बार दावा किया था कि वहां एक आदमी भी भूख से नहीं मरा। मैं नहीं जानता कि यह परिभाषा राजस्थान के मुख्य मंत्री ने की थी। 1947 के पहले जब बीकानेर के राज्य में अकाल पड़ा था तो 5 लाख आदमी भूख से मर गये थे। उस समय मेडिकल डिपार्टमेंट में किसी को शायद गैस्ट्री इंट्राइटिस के नाम का पता नहीं था। हेजे के नाम से परिचित नहीं थे या कोई ऐसी नई

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

बीमारियां डेबलप नहीं हुई थीं और बीकानेर रियासत जब तक थी तब तक भूख से मरे यह गिना जाता था और राजस्थान के कांग्रेसी मुख्य मंत्री ने माना कि वह भूख से मरे और अब अकाल के समय में जब भूख से मरे तो कहते हैं कि भूख से नहीं मरे, अब गैस्ट्रो इंटराइटिस से मरे, पेचिश से मरे, हैजे से मरे, जूड़ी-ताप से मरे, भूख से नहीं मरे। इसमें तो सरकार को कंविस करना मेरी शक्ति के बाहर है।

मैं केवल शब्दावली में जाना नहीं चाहता लेकिन जो वहां की मेडीकल टीम उस इलाके का दौरा करने को गई है उसने कहा है कि जहां मार्च तक एक जिले में 800 लोग साल भर में मरे वहां अप्रैल के महीने में उसी जिले में 440 लोग मरे। उन्होंने बताया पापुलेशन के परसेंटेज से कि पहले भी डेथ रेट 16 थी और अब भी 16 है। आंकड़ा मिला कर बता दिया, मैं उन अकाल के अंधों को केवल यही कहना चाहूंगा कि आज वहां पर पापुलेशन केवल उसकी 40 परसेंट रह गई है, 60 परसेंट माइग्रेट कर गई है, उनके आंकड़े के हिसाब से भी अगर डेथ रेट सेंसस की फिगर्स के अनुसार 16 प्रति हजार आती है तो वर्तमान आबादी में आज मरने वालों की संख्या 16 प्रति हजार नहीं रही बल्कि वह करीब 50 प्रति हजार पहुंच गई। इसका हमको विचार करना चाहिये। आप इसको तरफ मानवीय दृष्टि से देखिये। 1969-70 ई० में कोई रकम राजस्थान को इस काम के लिये दी नहीं गई है, आप उसको दीजिये। 20 करोड़ रुपये की मांग उनकी है और इस काम को पूरे जोर से, तेजी से, जल्दी से, व्यावहारिकता के आवार पर पूरा करना पड़ेगा। उस इलाके में दवाइयों की व्यवस्था नहीं है। बच्चे मां की

गोद में तड़प तड़प कर मर रहे हैं। वहां पर खारी पानी लोगों को पीना पड़ता है जिससे ये बीमारियां हो रही हैं। यहां से सड़ा हुआ ज्वार वहां पर आपने भेजा है। उस इलाके की हालत को देख कर आप बाजरे की व्यवस्था करिये और बाजरे के साथ अगर आप गेहूं भी भेज सकें तो आप निश्चित रूप से इस मारटैलिटी रेट को रोक सकते हैं। जो तूड़ी आप भेज रहे हैं मवेशियों के लिये वह ऐसी है कि उसको खाते खाते मवेशियों के मुंह में गांठें बन जाती हैं, उसको वह चबा नहीं सकते और उसके कारण वह कमजोरी से तड़प तड़प कर मरते हैं। आप यह कह सकते हैं कि हम उनको माइलो दे रहे हैं और उनको तूड़ी दे रहे हैं। औस गिन कर आपने दे दिया और रेट बढ़ा दिया। रेट के हिसाब से आप क्वांटिटी की बात कर रहे हैं। मैं तो स्वीकार करता हूं, क्यों आपने नहीं कहा कि हमने मिट्टी खाने को दे दी तब तो बात कुछ समझ में आ सकती थी। लेकिन जो उसका परिणाम आज उनके शरीर पर हो रहा है वह मिट्टी से दूसरा नहीं हो रहा है। हम 12 औंस दे रहे हैं, केवल इतना कहने मात्र से कोई रिसर्पांसिविलिटी समाप्त नहीं होती। तो अगर आप कोई कदम उठा सकें इस मानव-जीवन की रक्षा करने का, इस पशु-धन की रक्षा करने का, तो आप उसको उठाने का अवश्य प्रयत्न करिये, यही मुझे आपसे निवेदन करना है।

इसके सम्बन्ध में केवल एक चीज और आपके सामने मैं रखना चाहूंगा कि इस सारे औद्योगीकरण के पैटर्न में जब तक हम नये सिरे से नहीं चलते तब तक समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। मुझे दुख है कि फोर्थ फाइव ईयर प्लान के कंसीडरेंस में भी इन

बातों की तरफ जितनी तबज्जह देनी चाहिये थी वह नहीं दी गई। सरकार के सामने वांचू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है। वांचू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट ने कुछ बातों की तरफ बड़े स्पष्ट रूप से सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है और उसमें उन्होंने कहा है :

“... a series of new tax concessions and any other incentives to promote the location of small and medium industries in backward areas.”

इसकी तरफ आप ध्यान दीजिये।

आपने लूमस पर से ड्यूटी हटाई है लेकिन मुझे दुख है कि जो निम्न क्वालिटी और टेक्सचर को इस्तेमाल करने वाली पावरलूमस हैं उनको इसका लाभ नहीं मिला क्योंकि आपने कम्पाउंडेड लेवी आन पावरलूमस के सम्बन्ध में यह किया है कि 30 एन० एफ० के काउंट्स का इस्तेमाल जो करते हैं उनको छूट मिली है पर 29 एन० एफ० और उसके नीचे के काउंट्स पर काम करने वाली पावरलूमस को राहत नहीं मिली जब कि वास्तव में उनको राहत देने की आवश्यकता है। लूमस थ्रैडकी इसीलिये ज्यादा मांग थी कि वह मिल के थ्रेड से सस्ता पड़ता था लेकिन आपने यहाँ पर मिल फैब्रिक में रिडक्शन किया है एक्साइज में मिल फैब्रिक में रिडक्शन करने के कारण पावरलूम के फैब्रिक को जो एक सहूलियत थी वह समाप्त हो गई। आपको इस पर दुबारा विचार करना चाहिये। (Time bell rings)

वांचू कमेटी ने इसी प्रकार से बैकवर्ड एरियाज के लिये सुझाव दिया है। उन्होंने सुझाव दिया है कि अब बम्बई, कलकत्ता, दिल्ली और मद्रास, इन जगहों पर कोई भी नया लाइसेंस आप मत दीजिये और दूसरी जगहों पर कारखानों को खड़ा होने के लिये मौका

दीजिये और ऐसी जगहों पर जो लोग कारखाना खड़ा करना चाहते हैं उनको विशेष सुविधायें प्रदान कीजिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम इन सुझावों पर विचार करें तो ये ऐसे सुझाव हैं कि सारा प्रोडक्शन पैटर्न बदल सकता है और जनसाधारण के पास जो बचा हुआ पैसा है वह देश की ओवरऑल एकानामिक एक्टिविटी में योगदान दे सकता है और इससे हो सकता है कि वित्त मंत्री भी जो सरकार के ऊपर आये हुये बढ़ते हुये खर्चों को बराबर करने के लिये आज सभी क्षेत्रों को अपने टैक्स के वजन से बोझिल बनाना चाहते हैं वैसा न कर के कुछ सिद्धांतों का पालन कर सकेंगे।

हमने टैक्स के मामले में सब बातें छोड़ दीं। एक अवसर था कि गांधी जी के समय में लोग यह मान कर चलते थे कि नमक पर टैक्स नहीं लगेगा, जनोपयोगी वस्तुओं पर टैक्स नहीं लगेगा लेकिन वह सब बातें छोड़ दीं आज मुझे ऐसा लगता है जैसा कि डाह्या भाई ने भी बताया। (Time bell rings) केवल कुछ पर 4 रुपया लगाया लेकिन यह हिसाब की बात नहीं है। एक बार आपका संयम टूटा और उस क्षण में टैक्स के लिये गये तो बजट को बैलेंस करने की बात आपके सामने आ जायगी। इसलिये आप ऊपर से लौट कर नीचे आये हैं कि आप सैचुरेशन प्वाइंट पर पहुँच गये हैं। अनप्रोडक्टिव सिस्टम आफ टैक्सेशन जब आपका ऊपर के लेबिल पर आ गया तो रिप्लिसव आपका कदम हुआ, आप नीचे पर आये हैं और यह हो सकता है कि आप नीचे भी इसी प्रकार से अनप्रोडक्टिव सिस्टम को इस्तेमाल कर के तब तक लोगों से टैक्सों को सूतने की नीति अपनाने रहें जब तक कि जिन्दा रह कर उनकी टैक्स देने की

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

स्थिति है। यह तो केवल ऐसा है कि हम बजट के खर्चों को किसी तरह से मल्टीप्लाय करके चले जायें और फिर अपने टैक्स प्रोपोजल्स को किसी तरह से इक्वेट करने की कोशिश करें। तो एक नये सिरे से, एक नये आधार पर, डी नोवो, इन सब चीजों पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

अगर आज किसान के पास, गरीब तबके के पास पांच पैसे बचने लगे हैं तो वह तो हमारे सारे समाज के एक लोएस्ट रंग पर खड़ा है, वह प्रोड्यूसर है, वह सब से बड़ा हर एक्टिविटी के लिये चालना देने वाला व्यक्ति है, उसकी जेब में रहने वाला पांच पैसा सब प्रकार के मार्केट ओपेन करेगा, सारी एक्टिविटी को बढ़ाने की चीज उसमें से पैदा होगी, उसमें से देश की नेशनल एकानामी को, नेशनल प्लानिंग को, नेशनल प्रोडक्टिविटी को बढ़ाने में मदद मिलेगी। जब तक इन लाइन्स पर विचार नहीं करेंगे तब तक बढ़ता हुआ खर्चा और बढ़ता हुआ टैक्स एक ऐसा विशेष सकिल बन कर खड़ा हो जायगा कि जिसमें से हमें मुक्ति नहीं मिल सकेगी। (*Time bell rings*) मुझे अफसोस है कि इन आधारों पर चूंकि फाइनेंस बिल में प्रोपोजल्स पर विचार नहीं किया है इसलिए मैं इसका विरोध करता हूं।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, when several serious problems like poverty, unemployment, education, housing, water scarcity and several minimum needs required for human beings, are confronting this country, I fail to understand how it will be possible for our Government to meet these challenges with the present economic policy which is nothing but a status quo policy. Until and unless we accept the path of a dynamic change in our economic policy, I

am afraid, it will not be possible not only to solve these problems but even to save the democratic institutions and the democratic path that we accepted in our country. Madam, I have decided today only to confine myself to the taxes that are levied on fertilisers. When in this country we have been saying that soon there will be a green revolution, that this country has already started in that direction, I feel that this Duty on Fertilisers is a red signal and a red light when we should take this country towards a green revolution. I feel that the Government, as it has sympathetically considered in the case of the duties that were levied on power pumps, should also have sympathetically considered the duties that are levied on fertilisers. So far as the wealth tax on agriculture is concerned, I would make myself very clear that I welcome the move of the Finance Minister of levying a Duty on Agricultural Wealth. Wherever wealth is accumulated, whether in the rural sector or in the urban sector, whether by the industrialist or by big farmers, having regard to the various problems of this country, if they are to be solved, the Wealth Tax shall have to be accepted. Therefore I welcome the move of the Finance Minister of having a tax on agricultural wealth but at the same time I am here to record my protest and my opposition towards the continuance of these Duties on Fertilisers. It is being argued that if some other sources are made available, we are prepared to reconsider this decision. Here I feel that the Government have failed in understanding the economic problems and the economic solutions that are at the disposal of the Government under even the democratic constitution that we have and from that point of view I feel that the Government should have reconsidered these duties of fertilisers. Fertilisers are not only being used by rich farmers but they are being used by the poor farmers also. I know the Konkan area very well. The Finance Minister knows every taluka and even every village. In all those areas there is no irrigation. Land ceilings have been properly implemented in the Konkan area. There

are no rich farmers but almost all the farmers have taken to fertilisers. That is my personal knowledge and they are all depending on the rainfall. If the rainfall does not properly fall in time, many times the whole crops are burnt because they have gone for high-yielding varieties and they have been using these fertilisers and they are the worst sufferers if rainfall is not there for the crops. Under these circumstances to say that it is only the rich farmers who will be the sufferers if these duties are levied is not correct. Besides, if we look at the various disposals and purchases of fertilisers, it will be seen that in Maharashtra, Mysore, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh where the irrigation is hardly 12 per cent, or below, they are the best possible buyers of fertilisers. So it is used not only in such areas having irrigation and it has gone to all the corners of the country and we should be proud of it. With the new science and technology...

श्री नेकी राम (हरियाणा) : धरिया,
जी, क्या आप भी कृषक हैं ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I come from a poor family. My brother himself is an agriculturist. I am an advocate.

श्री नेकी राम : उप सभापति महोदया,
मैंने इस खयाल से पूछा कि आप कृषक
हैं क्या, क्योंकि कइयों बातें जो कही
हैं वह हमारी समझ में नहीं आयी हैं।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: May I tell my friend that I am an advocate but my brother himself is an agriculturist. I am concerned with agriculture. Because I am an advocate I cannot go for agriculture but my house, my family is concerned with agriculture. So I know the problems of the agriculturist. I am proud that I am from a family of agriculturists. My point is, it is not only the irrigated lands but unirrigated lands are also using fertilisers and the new science and technology are being accepted by the villages. So far as the prices of fertilisers are concerned, you kindly have a look at the tremend-

ous rise in the prices of fertilisers. In 1965-66 ammonium sulphate was Rs. 1,800 per tonne in 1968-69 it is Rs. 2,400 per tonne. Urea has gone up from Rs. 1,396 to 1,870 Potash has gone up from Rs. 505 to Rs. 808. Superphosphate—of course they are in pounds—has gone up from 1,321 to 2,077. So if we look at the steep rise, the prices have gone up from 100 to 150 or 160 per cent, and that way, in some cases they have gone to nearly 200 per cent. So, in this light, when the prices have gone up and particularly when we have to compete in the world, this House may be surprised to know that our prices of nitrogen fertilisers and phosphate fertilisers are the highest in the world. If we compare ourselves with the USA, Germany, France and even with Pakistan, the House will be surprised to know that in India, in American cents, the prices of nitrogen fertilisers are 36 cents, per kilo and in Pakistan it is 15 cents per kilo. So far as phosphate fertilisers are concerned, the prices are 34 cents—American cents—per kilo and in Pakistan they are 18 cents. Potassium fertilisers are 10 cents here while in Pakistan they are 6 cents. So it is for these reasons, namely, that the prices have gone up, that the farmers have recently started using fertilisers, that these Duties are bound to discourage particularly such farmers who are having their farming not on irrigation but on rainfall. So from this point of view I oppose these duties on fertilisers.

Besides when the Government argues that there are no other resources available to the Government, I fail to understand whether the Government has taken any care to look at the other resources that could be available. Take the Wealth Tax. The corporate sector in this country was brought under the Wealth Tax but that was afterwards removed. I make a demand today that the corporate sector should be again brought under the Wealth Tax and right from 1 to 3 per cent, if they are properly taxed on a slab basis, an amount of Rs. 50 crores—that amount which would be

pnn M. M. Dharia. J available from the duty on fertilizers —would be available to the Government. I would draw the attention of the House to the Death Duty. Has not the time come in the country to decide and to prescribe what should be the maximum Wealth that a person should inherit? Today if I am born in a rich family, I inherit all the property except that amount of taxes which are not much. I make a plea to the Government that Death Duties should be such as would not allow anybody to inherit more than the prescribed ceiling on property. There should be a ceiling in the urban areas, in the rural areas and there should be a ceiling for agricultural properties and there should be one for the urban properties and no individual in the country should be entitled to inherit property which he inherits today, to the tune of crores and crores of rupees. Why is it being allowed? In the democratic set-up of ours, if one is to get all possible opportunities because he is born in a rich house, how can we say that it is democracy or socialism. So, from this point of view why these sources are not being tapped?

Then, Madam, coming to black money, I have been insisting on the hon. Finance Minister—and here I would like to clarify to this House that when I say "hon. Finance Minister" I mean the Government; it is not an individual, and whatever I have to say, it is against the Government and not against any individual—I have been insisting on Government since long that black money is invested in huge properties. If the Government takes into consideration the property deals of the last fifteen years involving amounts of, say, five or ten lakhs of rupees, and have investigations into those property deals—all property deals are registered because they are by way of deeds and therefore the prices are noted—matters will come to true light, and I know of several transactions where the real amounts—the properties are worth lakhs of rupees—where the real amounts have not been shown in those property deals. A property worth two crores of rupees is only shown as forty lakhs of rupees. And here the Government can come in. Government can catch hold

of those properties and Government can have a proper assessment of them. Even under our present Constitution Government can say, "Yes, these are properties of which you have not shown the proper price." Either their proper price should be shown and that large amount should be properly taxed, or Government should take over such properties at the registered prices and Government should auction such properties. That way, crores of rupees will become available at the disposal of Government. Instead of taking such rigorous measures I fail to understand why the Government should come in the way of the poor agriculturist, who is just turning a new leaf and is just enjoying a better life—the green revolution for him has just started—with this levy on the fertilisers that he uses in agriculture. If this fertiliser is made available to him tax-free at this stage when the green revolution has just started, I have no doubt that the agriculturists would be able to give a new turn to the whole Indian economy, and at the same time it will be possible for the Government to unearth the black money which is that way hidden in those property deals.

Then, Madam, coming to other aspects, may I quote some instances? Take for example the molasses in the sugar factories. It is a controlled article, and its price is seven rupees per tonne. The hon. Government may rectify me if I am wrong in my information that it is seven rupee per tonne. Now, if molasses is decontrolled, several by-products are possible to be manufactured by the sugar factories, and then the price of sugar also can come down. Then the Government can also have the additional cess derived from them.

May I speak afterwards, Madam?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can finish it now if you can do it in another five minutes.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I shall speak afterwards.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You won't have more than five minutes now.

SHRI M.M. DHARIA: If you want I will finish just now and in only five minutes.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): Madam, let him speak after the lunch break. It is time for lunch adjournment. Let him speak even for ten minutes after the lunch break.

SHRIMATI LALITHA RAJA-GOPALAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, we are feeling hungry.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, you may speak after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I was pointing out to this House that various avenues of resources were open to the Government and if proper efforts are made in the proper direction it would not at all have been necessary to tax fertilisers as they are proposed to be taxed now. I was also referring to the decontrol of molasses. I was really surprised to see the other day that the Governors of our country were allowed to import wines from foreign countries, that too tax-free. When this country can produce such wines I fail to understand why such wines are being allowed to be imported from foreign countries.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Wines by Governors?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Yes, I read in the papers the other day. It was in reply to a question in the other House it had been stated that wines and liquors worth hundreds of thousands of rupees were allowed to be imported by Governors tax-free.

So far as prohibition is concerned, this is not the forum to discuss that. I can understand the policy of the Government about that but in this case when we are manufacturing such things here why should we allow such wines and liquors to be imported? If the molasses are decontrolled and the sugar factories are allowed to produce by-products, that will bring down the price of sugar and it is possible for the Government to have additional revenue from the sugar factories in the country. I should like to say here that the time has come when we should pay more attention to rural development. We can have a special cess on the electricity that we consume in this country. We can have a special cess of 1 per cent, and earmark the proceeds from this cess for rural development and I say it will be possible for the Government to get nearly Rs. 50 crores which can be spent for rural development purposes.

So far as the financial institutions are concerned, may I make it very clear to the House that our quarrel is not with the expression we use? Whether it should be nationalisation of banks or it should be social control of banks, is not the quarrel. What we want is additional resources for the achievement of our social objectives and from that point of view I would like to urge on the Government to again examine how these banks and their credit facilities are working in this country. When we see in cities like Delhi we can afford to give Rs. 50 lakhs from the LIC funds for the construction of a building for the Hindustan Times and such other things, is it not possible for us to divert these amounts for more productive purposes in this country? Can't you have a proper vetting of such schemes? That is the whole issue. So my submission to the Government is that we want these financial institutions to function for the achievement of our social objectives. Morarjibhai was described as an all-round cricketer. I know he is a good all-round cricketer. But today in this country I find that the Government Ministers are functioning like fielders and the

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

batsmen are the monopolists of this country. They have their bats of monopoly in their hands and whether the balls are googly balls or otherwise, they have been batting so well that they have been adding to their monopolistic empires and getting away with runs like anything. That is the main point. If Morarjibhai was an all-round cricketer he should also be a good bowler and I would like him to send such balls against these monopolists whereby their monopolies would be curbed.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: There will also be Bradmans against the best of bowlers.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: My difficulty is there should be some good bowlers who can properly hit against these batsmen and take their wickets. That is the whole tragedy of this country. So far as the financial institutions are concerned—whether they are nationalised or brought under social control, whatever may be the word used—the point is whether we can make their funds available for the achievement of our social objectives and my point is that it has not been possible for the Government to do that and I would like to urge on the Government that they should see that these funds become available for this purpose.

Several other suggestions have been made in regard to finding of resources. We have the import and export trade. Here again if we use the word 'nationalisation' it will be said that we are dogmatic but that is not the point here. We are all aware that nearly Rs. 400 crores are being gained by these permanent houses of import and export. I can understand the industrial houses themselves making their own efforts in foreign countries to create and improve the markets for their products but these established import and export houses and the stevedore companies without doing anything—because they are the original houses—carry away all the profits and it is there the under-invoicing, over-invoicing and all these problems'

arise. If this country needs more resources, instead of tapping such sources why is the poor farmer being taxed and why is he burdened with this levy of tax on fertilisers? I say the farmers should be given more and more amenities; they should be given more and more facilities. I do not want to take more time of the House. There should be proper direction in such matters so that we can have our social objectives fulfilled and this politics of commitment very rightly put in the AICC Resolution is the need of the hour. Are we prepared for that? When we say all these things we are branded as extremists, communists and all that. It is not so. What we are urging is the fulfilment of our own accepted programmes and policies and if for urging for the implementation of such programmes and policies I am to be branded as communist or as anything else I am prepared to get branded by any name the people may like to have. I would have no objection to it whatever. Therefore my submission to this House is that it is not a question of branding somebody; it is not a question of using some words but the main problem is having regard to the various problems of this country should we not be alive to those problems, responsive to those problems and should we not be responsible in our task? Madam Deputy Chairman, I have got a feeling that the coming generation is going to be absolutely frustrated. They are youngsters who are just being thrown into the valley of frustration. This year more than 24 lakhs of students have already appeared for the SSC and Higher Secondary examinations and out of these 24 lakhs of students about 4 lakhs will go to the colleges and 2 lakhs will enter the professions of their parents and the rest of 18 lakhs of students of the age of 15 to 17 years will be thrown into the valley of frustration. They are educated up to matriculation and in the next five years to come nearly a crore of such youngsters will be loitering in the streets of our country. What will they do? Why should they have any respect for democracy? We function in a democratic set-up and

to implement these programmes is a very difficult task in a democratic set-up. We cannot function like dictators. Under these circumstances I feel that as representatives of the people our task, our responsibility is much greater than in other countries where dictatorship prevails. Therefore my submission to the Government is this. Time is running short and our younger generation is absolutely dissatisfied and frustrated. There are several problems to be solved and if vigorous methods are not adopted, and if dynamic economic policies suitable for the formation of democratic socialism in this country is not immediately implemented, the country is not going to wait, the people are not going to wait and the whole democratic set-up that we have in this country will be in danger. Therefore I would have to urge on the Government that this status quo policy as we see it reflected in the Finance Bill is not going to solve our problems. This Finance Bill, this Budget forms part of the Fourth Five Year Plan. This is the first year of the Fourth Five Year Plan. The other day in reply to a question of mine it was stated that to solve the problem of housing in this country Rs. 33,000 crores will be required. This is the reply given by the Minister of Housing to my question. Now, if Rs. 33,000 crores are required for solving the problem of housing alone, several such crores of rupees will be required for solving so many other problems and from that point of view can we afford to go in this status quo manner? That is the whole problem today which is being faced by us and that we have to solve. It is in that spirit that I would urge and insist again in this House that by this method it will not be possible for us to solve the problem. Again, I would insist and request the hon. Finance Minister and the Government to reconsider the tax on fertilisers. I would like him to come with a revised Budget, after considering several proposals which I have made and which he is also aware of. Let there be taxes where they should be taxed, but let the farmers, who have accepted the green revolution and who have

been accepting new science and technology, have more and more advantages. Let them have more and more freedom, so that their fear in the mind is not retained as it is being retained today. That is my submission. I am sure the Government will reconsider the whole situation and that the red light will be put out and there will be a green light and a green revolution. Thank you.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI

(Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the Finance Minister for having given a number of tax incentives by way of extension for another five years of the tax holiday for new industries established during that period, continuance of the development rebate for another five years, raising the amount of tax-exempt dividend from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000 and exemption of 40 per cent income of companies for the supply of technical knowhow to Indian business. However I am afraid that these marginal benefits will not give the economy the kind of boost that it needs. Even the incentives, if they are to be meaningful, should be significant enough to influence business decisions. I do not understand the reason for limiting the concession on income for supply of technical know-how to companies alone. Certain tax concession is given to income derived by Indian companies for supply of know-how abroad. Even here the concession should be available to both the corporate and non-corporate assesseees. Similarly, the concession given to authors, playwrights, artists, etc., in respect of their foreign income brought into India should apply to all professions. The basic idea, after all, is to encourage the earning of foreign exchange whosoever does it should get the incentive.

The incidence of tax on income between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 20,000 has been raised. Tax on registered firms has been introduced on income between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 25,000. These impositions are very burdensome. Government should, in fact,

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.] have provided some relief to middle-class tax-payers, in view of rising prices. So far as the tax on registered firms is concerned, it should be done away with, as recommended by Shri Bhoothalingam and also earlier by the Law Commission because it is an unwarranted levy. In any case the professional firms should not be taxed as those in professions are debarred from forming companies. For the last two years the Finance Minister has been placing a lot of emphasis on making penalty provisions more and more stringent. I am one with him so far as the objective of checking tax evasion and ensuring compliance with tax laws is concerned. Even if the law is unreasonable, I would expect the citizens to obey it and the authorities to enforce it. At the same time I would expect that the law is not unreasonable either. Penalties for tax evasion should no doubt be stringent. But at the same time, they should be commensurate with the offence. This year maximum penalty, equal to 100 per cent of wealth, has been prescribed for failure to file returns in time. Is it justifiable? Will it not bring many honest assesseees to ruin? We are...

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:
How will an honest assessee come to ruin?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:
Suppose a person has a wealth of Rs. 1 lakh and Rs. 10,000 is the tax or Rs. 5,000 is the tax. Hundred per cent will be the penalty on it.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Minus the exemption. One lakh is exempted in wealth.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:
We are living in a democracy. The penalties for defaults must be reasonable, equitable, justifiable and commensurate with default. The penalty should be based on tax evaded and not the amount of net wealth assessed. I can foresee a time when the statutory minimum penalties will be so much out of proportion that the De-

partment will find them unmanageable. Moreover, since certain discretions are involved, increasing temptation for corruption cannot be ruled out. The other changes in the direct taxes are procedural. But I do not think they are deserved or desirable. For instance, changes in the advance tax procedure. Nobody ever complained about the existing procedure. Government could have no grudge either since there was no leakage of revenue. Where was the provocation then to introduce all kinds of changes in the advance tax system? There is neither simplification, nor rationalisation. Such changes must be avoided. And then why introduce them in the Finance Bill? After all, the amendment Bill is shortly to follow. These provisions could be there, so that they should be considered in detail. I am avoiding the technical details because in this matter I am opposed to the basic approach and attitude. Such changes act as pin-pricks, which do good to none.

Indirect taxes on sugar and petrol have been increased. These taxes add to the heavy burden on the middle-class. Besides, taxes on cigarettes, electric fans, domestic electrical appliances have squeezed the family budget and hurt the middle-class. The incidence of ad valorem taxation on free sugar is of the order of Rs. 40 per quintal. So long as this impost continues, sugar will be expensive to the people. No doubt, as regards cement the Finance Minister has announced certain relief, but it is not enough. Due to conversion from specific to ad valorem the increase was Rs. 3.30 per tonne, but the relief announced is only Rs. 1.86. There is still a gap of Rs. 1.45.

Then, again, the relief announced in the Budget proposals in respect of jute goods and tea is inadequate. Both in respect of jute and tea India is gradually but steadily losing the export market in favour of Pakistan and Ceylon, respectively. The situation can be remedied by a further relief in respect of commodities. Our export policies should be directed to-

wards the promotion and growth of trade than towards revenue collection.

Then, there is the controversy regarding wealth-tax on agricultural property. When the Finance Minister announced this levy I was very happy about it. I do not understand why he has modified his proposal. Unfortunately it seems he has succumbed to pressures. I am not sure how far the relaxation will help real agriculturists. To my mind, it is the most undeserved concession to industrialists-turned-farmers, Ministers and politicians, who have played the game of tax avoidance in the garb of agriculture. If you want, I can name them also. As regards the levy on fertilisers there is a good lot of criticism. I am personally of the view that there is no ground for the apprehension that the tax would inhibit the use of fertilisers. If agricultural production is to expand and the benefits of agricultural production are to be realised even by producers themselves, a great amount of development of the infra-structure is necessary. In this context those who are benefiting today have the responsibility to share a part with the Centre so that the green revolution spreads throughout rural India.

As regards textile industry, I am glad the Finance Minister has given some relief in excise duties on cloth and yarn, but he has not gone far enough. What is more, the introduction of ad valorem system of excise duty on certain varieties of cloth will cause complications and lead to a distortion of production pattern, especially as the incidence of duty jumps up from 1\ to 15 per cent on cloth valued above Rs. 2.50 per sq. metre. It would have been better and more practical had he introduced this system on a slab basis as in the case of income-tax, so that the higher the value of cloth the greater will be the incidence, and the progression from one slab to the next will be gradual. I am happy that the industry has been included in the list of priority industries for higher development rebate. But the development rebate at the

5—10RSS/ND/69

higher rate of 35 per cent should last at least for a term of five years so that the industry has time enough to modernise. Moreover resources have to be found for the same. The textile industry has been passing through difficult times. It would be desirable if the industry is included in the list of priority industries for the purpose of 8 per cent deduction in the income assessable to tax.

Although I would be digressing a little from the provisions of this year's Finance Bill, I must draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the difficulties created by Section 40A(3) of the Income-tax Act introduced last year but which has come into effect this year from 1st April. This is regarding payment by cheque in respect of expenditure over Rs. 2,500. This is unworkable if it is applied to transactions in commodity markets like grain and cotton. How can you expect small illiterate traders to always deal through cheques? Where do you have the facilities? Where is the training and education? There is panic all round in the trade and it is genuine. After all why should expenditure be not allowed deduction if the assessee proves it as genuine—just because payment has not been made by cheque? Cheque transactions can take place only amongst parties of long standing and known to each other—not amongst strangers. I can understand applying this provision to general expenditure but not to purchase and sale of goods in the ordinary course of business. For the time being my suggestion is that application of this provision should be deferred. The officers concerned with the drafting of the Rules should discuss the problems with the representatives of trade with an open mind and should make on-the-spot study of the market mechanism before making their recommendations. Our object is to ensure due collection of taxes. To my mind the effect of this provision would be just the reverse. Small as-sessees will be driven away from honest and accounted business on account of the complications involved in the same. It is very essential that

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.] in such matters we take into account commercial expediency, available banking facilities etc. This was what the Finance Minister promised when he introduced the provision last year. Government must give a fresh look to this provision and the Rules, and take care of avoidable hardships.

I do not understand why the Finance Minister should have abruptly announced the proposal of ceiling on urban property during the discussion on the Finance Bill. I wonder if it was the proper time. The question of ceiling on urban property is not as simple as that. Ceiling on agricultural land has a long history, as ancient as the hunger for land. Perhaps, it may be argued, though I do not agree with the argument, that agricultural land is limited and therefore it must be fairly allocated. Such is not the case with urban property because vertical expansion is possible. The availability aspect is not there. This is one of the several issues connected with this proposal. I would insist that the proposal, if any, be thoroughly thrashed out before taking any final decision.

I would just sum up by saying that the Finance Bill contains well-intentioned provisions but there is scope for improvement and change for the better and the opportunity for the same should be fully utilised in the light of the suggestions that have come up. Thank you.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN

(Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairman I rise to oppose this Bill, and my first submission, Madam, is that we should really try in the coming years to have a holiday so far as fresh taxation is concerned. Madam, I would also suggest that it is time that we think of a holiday in regard to fresh legislation also because so far as legislations which have already been enacted are concerned, so far as taxes which are already covered by the Statute Book are concerned, we find. Madam, that there is non-implementation of legislations, there is non-collection of taxes. Income-tax is in arrears to the extent of Rs. 84 crores. The total taxes in arrears come to '

about Rs. 300 odd crores. In this state of affairs there is no moral right on the part of the Government to come in for fresh taxation and increased taxation. This House should know from the hon. Deputy Prime Minister how much of the taxes in arrears, income-tax and other taxes, are proposed to be really collected during the current year. The hon. Deputy Prime Minister was stating that machinery has been thought upon for the purpose of expediting the collection of these tax arrears. To what extent that machinery is going to cost the taxpayer this House must know.

We find, Madam, that in the registers of the unemployed kept officially by Government the present number of unemployed as registered in the country comes to 20 million. It is a very huge figure. The apportionment and the appropriation of the taxes that are collected have not contributed in any measure to a decrease in unemployment. We find that as the population grows the figures relating to unemployment also grow.

Another very disquieting state of affairs is projected, Madam, in the figures relating to capital formation in the country. The rate of growth of capital formation has never kept pace with the rate of growth of population and after the Third Five Year Plan when we were having only these Annual Plans, the figures indicate that there has been in some measure a stage of stagnation so far as capital formation in the country is concerned.

The most controversial provision contained in the Finance Bill is the proposed levy of tax on the capital value of agricultural land. I have no doubt to submit initially itself that from the economic and social point of view, from the point of view of a welfare State, from a socialistic point of view, a tax of this nature should be imposed either by the Central Government or State Governments concerned. My only doubt, Madam, is whether in the existing state of affairs as seen by the entries in the Union and State Lists in the Seventh Schedule to the

Constitution, this tax could be levied by the Central Government. The Note that has been given to us contains no doubt the valued opinions of the previous Attorney-General and of the present Attorney-General. I am aware of the fact that both have agreed that in view of article 248 of the Constitution read with Entry 97 in List I of the Seventh Schedule, the residuary power is vested in the Central Government and therefore this could be levied. But I submit that in view of Entry 86 and the wording of Entry 86, the residuary power that is contained in Entry 97 and article 248 of the Constitution may not be available, because Entry 86 specifically states that taxes on the capital value of the assets, exclusive of agricultural land, of individuals and companies, are alone to be levied by the Central Government. And Entry 82 relates to taxes other than agricultural income. In the State List, Entry 46 relates to taxes on agricultural income. And Entry 49 deals with taxes on lands and buildings. This Note that has been given to us proceeds on the assumption that although from Entry 86 agricultural land is excluded, there being no corresponding entry in relation to tax on the capital value of agricultural land in any of the items contained in the State List, it can be taken that in view of Entry 97 in list I and article 248, there is the residuary power in the Central Government. My submission, Madam, is that this is not at all correct. It is not as it that tax on the capital value of agricultural land is excluded from the purview of the State List. We have got under Entry 46 taxes on agricultural income, and we have got under Entry 49 taxes on lands and buildings. About the tax on lands under Entry 49, it has been held by a decision of the Madras High Court last year and then again by a recent decision of the Supreme Court that that tax can be levied based on the capital value of the land, so that it seems that tax on the capital value of agricultural land and tax on agricultural land computed or based on the capital value of such agricultural land loses all its distinction, and by virtue

of losing all that distinction, if tax on agricultural land computed or based on the capital value of such agricultural land is clearly brought within the ambit of Entry 49, my respectful submission before this House is that the Central Government has no power to levy a tax on the capital value of agricultural land, because under Entry 49, the States have got the power to levy taxes on agricultural land computed or based on the capital value of such agricultural land.

Madam, I may bring to your notice that recently the Government of the State of Kerala had appointed a Taxation Inquiry Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. Thavaraj, and the Thavaraj Committee has gone into this aspect and has recommended to the State Government that tax on agricultural land in the State based or computed on the basis of the capital value of such agricultural land could be included within the scope of fresh taxation thought of or to be thought of by the State Government.

Then, Madam, I am not sure...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Your time is almost over. Your party has got only 15 minutes.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN: I know that. I will take five minutes more.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes take it.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN: Then, Madam, I do not know what effect this tax might have adversely on the agricultural income-taxes collected by the State Governments. Many of the State Governments are having a law relating to agricultural income-tax. This particular tax and this enactment may lead to a large-scale fragmentation of agricultural lands with a view to escaping from the effects of this taxation and that, in turn, may adversely affect the agricultural income-tax collected by the State Governments also, so that it

[Shri K. Chandrasekharan.] would have been better on the part of the Centre to suggest the collection of this tax even, if it is feasible under the law by the various State Governments concerned.

It has been stated, Madam, that the plantations would be hit by virtue of the fact that labourers' quarters, hospitals intended for the labourers and creches for labourers' children are not brought within the exemption of clause 24. I would only state that it is a matter which may require examination.

Then, one more thing I may say with regard to this tax and that is that I have got an apprehension about the fairly-knit and the fairly well-functioning Income-tax Department —by and large we are proud of the fact that the Income-tax Department is a department wherein to corruption has not eroded—and that is whether the levy of this tax and the entrustment of the realisation of this tax to the Income-tax Department—which would in turn mean a very enlargement of the staff of the Department —would not contribute to great delays in the computation of the capital value of agricultural lands and, in turn, to corruption. Whether the State Government realises this tax or the Central Government realises it, the possibility of corruption is there. I am more afraid of the fact that this corruption will affect the officers of the Income-tax Department and that will in turn affect the realisation of the tax under the Income-tax Act as it stands at present, which means that there will be difficulty caused on account of that in the entire Department.

Madam, the hon. Deputy Prime Minister stated with reference to the provisions regarding advance income-tax that a Notification is proposed to be issued with regard to certain tea companies, etc. But my objection is to the reduction of four instalments to three in respect of all income-tax payers whose income-tax returns end with 31st December. I would submit, Madam, that this is a clear case of

discrimination which is likely to be hit even by the provisions of article 14 of the Constitution because there is absolutely no reasonable classification at all. Take the case of two persons who are entitled to submit their return for the income-tax year ending 31st December and 31st March respectively. There should not be a discrimination in favour of one. While one is being given the advantage of four instalments, the other is being given the advantage of three instalments only. My submission, Madam, is that this is certainly unfair so far as the particular classes are concerned.

Then, Madam, reference was made in the course of this debate to two matters. One is regarding fertiliser factories. I have absolutely no doubt to command to the hon'ble Deputy Prime Minister the need for the establishment of fertilizer factories only in the public sector. I am not happy Madam, over the way in which some of our fertiliser factories are functioning. I do not want to name them because there is absolutely no time. But entrusting such a great public requirement in the country, such a great premier ingredient of the 'Green Revolution' as it is known today, should never be in the hands of a private agency, and I submit, Madam, that the proposed fertiliser factories should be established in the public sector.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now wind up.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN: One more thing that was referred to in the course of the debate was that there was absolutely no need for a ceiling on urban property because there is possibility of vertical expansion. It is a rather intelligent type of argument, no doubt, but more than the need for a ceiling on agricultural property, today the need is for imposition of a ceiling on urban property. Everywhere, so far as property holders are concerned, property owners are concerned, property possessors are concerned, there is congestion in

almost all the cities of this country, and therefore a ceiling on urban property should be introduced.

I shall just submit one more point and I have finished, Madam. It is a reference in newspaper reports with regard to the position of the Madras Surgical Instruments factory. It was amazing, Madam, to read that this very important factory in the public sector has been producing to its optimum capacity during the last three years, but not even 2 per cent, of the surgical instruments produced in that factory have been sold so far. It is a most disquieting state of affairs which requires an immediate probe. We are not importing so much of surgical instruments but where is it that the surgical instruments that are required by our hospitals are coming from? The press report also states that what is produced in the Madras Surgical Instruments factory is quite up to the mark, and yet only 2 per cent, of three years' production have been sold out. This is the state of affairs with regard to most of our public sector industries. The way they are run, the way they are managed, makes a most disquieting state of affairs so that even a convinced socialist may think in terms of the private sector. I do not know whether the Government's intention is that.

SHRI U. N. MAHIDA (Gujarat): Madam, in referring to the Finance Bill I have only a few observations to make, and that is regarding the new agricultural wealth tax. I do not see why an uncertain measure has immediately come up in view of the earlier exemptions deliberately given. Not that I object to agriculture being taxed, but the manner in which it is being done and the generalisations made regarding that might lead to serious complications in the future.

Madam, as welfare States have to raise revenues, all taxation measures have to be willingly or unwillingly welcomed. But here there is a great disparity. Yesterday I heard the Deputy Finance Minister saying that revenues are being raised and wealth

tax on agricultural land is being levied because agricultural lands have greatly benefited by huge expenditure on irrigation works. Now therein lies my difficulty. Twenty or thirty per cent, of agricultural lands in India have benefited by an expenditure of the order of Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 3,000 crores during the Plan periods. There is a definite policy. There are requisite laws and there is the blessing of the Planning Commission that a betterment levy must be recovered from lands that have benefited, that have earned unearned increments in their values because of large expenditure on irrigation works. Why is that betterment levy not being recovered at all? Even if a small levy is made on the 50 million acres of irrigated land, even on a modest rate the Government will be able to raise Rs. 500 crores. That which is authoritative, on which probably all States have passed laws, that alternative is being given up. I do not know whether it is being finally given up. But unless that matter is settled once and for all, there will be serious inconsistencies in the methods of valuation and in the various methods of raising those agricultural taxes. Apart from the legal nicety, on which I am not competent to remark, the greater emphasis and the justification for this levy at the present day have been stated in the Deputy Prime Minister's speech on the Budget. He has said: "There is no case in equity for taxing other productive wealth but exempting the wealth in the form of agricultural land." If that is the basis of this agricultural tax, it follows that this wealth or wealth in agricultural land in India and other types of wealth are put on absolute par. Is that a fact? In a predominantly agricultural country, sentimental satisfaction in the possession of wealth in the form of agricultural land may be very substantial. But the concept of wealth in agricultural land is very ephemeral. I will try to demonstrate how.

Take any other form of wealth— bank deposits, bank balances, fixed deposits, investment in non-speculative shares and buildings. They are

[Shri U. N. Mahida.] not very fluctuating, almost constant and almost spontaneous. Is that the case in agricultural land? No. Return or income from the agricultural land depends upon the vagaries of nature. Scarcity, famine and drought are well known in this country. Fifty per cent, of the lands are affected by these conditions. What is the permanence of the income? All this is devmatrika (devmatrika) depending upon rainfall and depending upon dciiv (far). That is one aspect. Even when the rainfall is satisfactory, there is pestilence, frost, calamities like locust. And what does the agriculturalist get? Practically nothing. In these circumstances return from wealth, which is now regarded as capital, is very precarious and the lands which are now to be regarded as property, as capital, in many circumstances become a liability. There have been instances when landholders have been compelled to part with their holdings because of landed indebtedness. That is one part of the thing. I only want to plead that, apart from exemptions if your very approach is not to separate the agricultural property as far as taxation is concerned and if you lump it with others, many more complications will arise. I will try to explain my view a little further.

Taxation is imposed after valuation. How are lands to be valued? That is the biggest question. Now I earlier referred to the question of betterment. In this aspect of valuation the question of betterment will also come up. Let there be two parcels of land of which the valuation is Rs. 1.75 lakhs both liable to taxation, one irrigated and the other non-irrigated. The unirrigated lands have received nothing from the Government, from the Plan expenditure. In the other case, as a result of the several projects, land worth Rs. 200 is now worth Rs. 1,000. The increase is of the order of Rs. 800. Under the betterment rules Rs. 400 is liable to be recovered by the Government. That is not recovered. And yet the valuation of both these properties is Rs. 1.75 lakhs, and in the very scheme of

valuation both are treated as identical and taxed accordingly. Is the taxation, therefore, justified and should it be on identical lines? That is one way of looking at it. Then there are various other aspects. Another reason why the two classes of wealth must be regarded differently is that there is what we call ceiling. And the agriculturists' activities are restricted. I am not talking of the degree or rate of taxation, but I am objecting to the classification in which both the items are lumped together.

Coming to the question of valuation, when lands were made over to the cultivators from zamindars, one line of valuation was adopted; a certain multiple of rentals or assessment would be given to the zamindars. Take the recent case of ceilings when lands in excess of the ceiling were taken over by the Government to be distributed to the landless. What have the old owners been paid? A certain multiple based upon rentals or assessment. Will this be the same line of approach in valuation? Usually the wealth tax prescribes market value. Now in the case of agricultural lands, there is nothing like market value. Agricultural lands are not readily marketable. The sale prices are not also a guide. The sales that are made are on entirely different considerations not like commercial transactions. Sales are made for convenience. Sales are made because of the rights of the neighbour. Sales are made because of indebtedness. Sales are made at fictitious value to hide black wealth. Sales are made even at inflated values to see that the right of the neighbour is ousted. Therefore, sale values are not a guide for valuation. These questions will, therefore, have to be considered. The right approach would be the old system of revenue administration which recognises land settlement as one of the most thorough and scientific methods of taxing land. Will valuation of land be related to assessment? This is a fit case for doing so, I because after all what is wealth? It produces income and assessment is based on income.

Then there is the question of the years for which the valuation will be

valid. Because of the fluctuating nature of income from land, a very long period of valuation will have to be adopted. Why should we have a long period of fixation of assessment? It is because the fluctuations are so violent so varied and so numerous that it is almost impossible to have annual, biennial, triennial valuations. The valuations should, therefore, be for a long period and should be related to assessment. Government cannot come out and say that when it comes to acquiring land, taking away from the present owners to give to the landless for the sake of ceiling enforcement, (hey would follow a different way. You should have a consistent way of valuation.

Then lastly I come to the question of exemption. The hon. Minister said that genuine agriculturists will be exempted and we find that Rs. 1.5 lakhs is given by way of exemption. Is a monetary value of Rs. 1.5 lakhs the correct way of protecting the genuine agriculturists? We started wealth tax with Rs. 2 lakhs and then it became Rs. 1 lakh. Similarly the present exemption limit of Rs. 1.5 lakhs may disappear or may be reduced to Rs. 0.5 lakh. In that case what we call the genuine agriculturists would not really be exempted. I submit, therefore, that rather than giving these financial exemptions, the very classification of wealth be considered on the lines I have suggested. The genuine agriculturists should be exempted defining "genuine agriculturists" as those who do nothing but practise agriculture, who have no other trade or commerce, no other activity or profession. But then the agriculturist must also save. We want them to be active and thrifty. If they merely derive incomes from their savings by way of interest or rents, that by itself should not disqualify them for purposes of this definition. The test should be whether he is practising agriculture as his sole profession, if you call agriculture a profession at all, and has no commercial activity or follows no other trade. If that is done, then the sentiment behind the protection of genuine agriculturists will be valid. Thank you.

श्रीमती बिद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (मध्य प्रदेश): माननीया उपसभापति महोदया, आज वित्त मंत्री द्वारा जो वित्त विधेयक सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूँ। माननीया, मैं इस बात के लिए अपने माननीय मंत्री महोदय को बधाई देना चाहती हूँ कि उन्होंने पम्पिंग सैदों के ऊपर से जो कर का भार हटा दिया है और प्रशासन में मितव्ययिता बरतने का जो उन्होंने साहसिक कदम उठाया है, उसके लिए भी वे बधाई पात्र हैं।

माननीया, मैं इस बात का तो विरोध नहीं करती हूँ कि वैल्यू टैक्स नहीं लिया जाना चाहिये, लेकिन इसके संबंध में इतना ही कहना चाहती हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय इस पर थोड़ा सा सहानु-भूतिपूर्वक विचार करें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। यह बात सही है कि इसका कम लोगों के ऊपर असर पड़ेगा और जिनकी 2½ लाख से कम की जायदाद होगी उनके ऊपर इसका कोई असर नहीं पड़ेगा। लेकिन इसके ऊपर जिनकी 5 लाख रुपये की जायदाद होगी उनको 1,250 रु० कर के रूप में सालाना देना होगा। इस संबंध में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि अभी हमारे किसानों की हालत इतनी सुधरी नहीं है कि हम उनके ऊपर इतने बड़े-बड़े कर एकदम लाद दें। इसलिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि इसके ऊपर माननीय मंत्री महोदय सहानु-भूतिपूर्वक विचार करें। साथ ही साथ मेरा यह भी सुझाव है कि जो सम्पत्ति का आंकलन किया जाय वह किसी पटवारी या तहसीलदार द्वारा न कराया जाय क्योंकि अगर इन लोगों ने सम्पत्ति का आंकलन किया तो ये लोग बड़ी मुसीबत में आ जायेंगे और परेशानी में आ जायेंगे। बेहतर तो यह होगा कि

[श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी]

उनके ही द्वारा उनकी सम्पत्ति के मूल्य का आंकलन कराया जाय कि उनकी सम्पत्ति कितने मूल्य की है। अगर इस तरह की व्यवस्था कर दी जायेगी तो इन लोगों को बहुत सुविधा हो जायेगी। यह मेरा सुझाव मंत्री महोदय के लिए है।

माननीया, दूसरी बात मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि हमें यह मान कर चलना है कि हमें अपने देश को अन्न के मामले में आत्म निर्भर बनाना है। अगर अन्न के मामले में हमें अपने देश को आत्म-निर्भर बनाना है तो निश्चय ही हमें किसानों को विशेष रूप से सुविधा देनी होगी। माननीया, आपको ज्ञात होगा कि हमारे देश में वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने फर्टीलाइजर के ऊपर जो टैक्स लगाया है वह और देशों के मुकाबले में बहुत ज्यादा है। हमारे देश में पहले से ही रासायनिक खाद महंगी है और उसके ऊपर जो टैक्स लगा दिया गया है, वह न्यायसंगत मालूम नहीं देता है। माननीया, मैं कई उदाहरण दूसरे देशों के न देते हुए केवल अपने पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान का उदाहरण देना चाहती हूँ जहाँ पर प्रति टन फर्टीलाइजर की कीमत 1,500 रु० है जबकि हमारे यहाँ 2,600 रु० प्रति टन है। इसी तरह से दूसरे देशों में भी हमारे यहाँ के मुकाबले में फर्टीलाइजर की कीमत कम है। हमारे यहाँ फर्टीलाइजर की कीमत सब से अधिक है। इस खाद की कीमत इतनी महंगी है कि किसानों को वह बहुत महंगी पड़ती है। दूसरी बात यह है कि अब भी जो किसान यह खाद लेते हैं, उसके उपयोग के लिए उन्हें साधन मिलने चाहियें। जैसाकि इस संबंध में बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि आज भी हमारे देश में सिंचाई के साधन पर्याप्त नहीं हैं।

3 P.M.

आज भी कई प्रदेश ऐसे हैं जिनमें नहरें नहीं हैं, दूसरी तरह की सुविधाएं नहीं हैं, देहातों में बिजली नहीं गई है जिस के द्वारा वे लिफ्ट इरिगेशन ले सकें। इसलिये मेरा यह एक सुझाव है कि इस तरह का जो फर्टीलाइजर पर उन्होंने एक टैक्स लगाया है, उसको वे सहानुभूतिपूर्वक देखें। आज यदि हमें अपने देश में अन्न के उत्पादन को बढ़ाना है तो किसानों को हमें अधिक से अधिक सुविधाएं देनी पड़ेंगी ताकि हम जल्दी आत्मनिर्भर हो जायें। आज हमारा किसान प्रकृति के पानी पर मुन-हसिर रहता है। पिछले वर्ष आपके सामने उदाहरण है जब कि कई बार हमारे यहाँ सूखा पड़ा और हमको बड़ी कठिन परिस्थितियों से गुजराना पड़ा। अभी एक आध साल से ही किसानों ने कुछ तरक्की की है और खाद लेने की तरफ कुछ रुजहान किया है। लेकिन एकदम यह टैक्स लगा देने से उनको बजाय प्रोत्साहन मिलने के वे निरुत्साहित होंगे। इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय इस तरफ ध्यान दें। अभी भी हमारे देश में दूसरे देशों की बनिस्बत बहुत कम लोग खाद इस्तेमाल करते हैं। अगर उसका औसत देखा जाय तो मालूम होगा कि जैसे बेल्जियम में ढाई एकड़ पर 474 किलोग्राम, डेनमार्क में ढाई एकड़ पर 186 किलो ग्राम, इजिप्ट में ढाई एकड़ पर 121 किलो ग्राम, इंग्लैंड में 205 किलो ग्राम, चाइना (तैवान के इलाके) में 255 किलो ग्राम औसत आता है जब कि भारत में ढाई एकड़ पर केवल 5 किलो ग्राम औसत आता है। इन सारी चीजों को मद्देनजर रखते हुये हम माननीय मंत्री जी से यह उम्मीद करेंगे कि वे इस ओर ध्यान देंगे और यह जो फर्टीलाइजर पर टैक्स लगाया गया है उस पर पुनः विचार करेंगे।

माननीया, हम माननीय मंत्री जी का इस ओर भी ध्यान दिलाना चाहते हैं कि जहां हम एक तरफ किसानों पर इस तरह के टैक्स लगा-लगा कर अपने वित्त के लिये पैसा इकट्ठा करते हैं वहां दूसरी ओर हम इस बात को मद्देनजर नहीं रखते हैं कि हमारा पैसा कई जगह फिजूलखर्ची में जा रहा है। वैसे मैं इस बात को कह दूँ कि मैं परिवार नियोजन के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। लेकिन आज परिवार नियोजन के नाम पर जो पैसा खर्च हो रहा है और जिस तरह से खर्च हो रहा है उस पर मुझे आपत्ति है। मुझे देखने को मिला है कि सधन परिवार नियोजन कार्यक्रम के अंतर्गत 15 दिन में एक-एक जिले के अन्दर एक एक लाख रुपये खर्च कर दिया जाता है। जहां पर आपने शायद एलेक्शनों में इतनी जीपें और गाड़ियां दौड़ती हुई नहीं देखी होंगी, इतने शिविर खुले हुये नहीं देखे होंगे, वहां अगर डिस्ट्रिक्ट में डाक्टर पूरे नहीं हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान के कोने-कोने से वे बुलाये जाते हैं और पेट्रोल में, इधर उधर की दौड़ा धूपी में लाखों रुपये पानी की तरह बहा दिये जाते हैं। इस तरह उस पर पैसा ज्यादा खर्च होता है और उससे फायदा कम होता है। उधर दूसरी तरफ हालत यह है कि दवाखानों में अगर आप जाइये तो गाज आप को नहीं मिलेगा, टिक्चर आप को नहीं मिलेगा, पट्टी आप को नहीं मिलेगी। तो परिवार नियोजन के नाम पर यह जो अनावश्यक खर्च हो रहा है इसको हमें देखना चाहिये और इस तरह की जो फिजूलखर्ची होती है उसको रोकना चाहिये। इसके साथ ही हम जो चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश में अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़े और हम आत्मनिर्भर हों, उसके लिए हमें किसानों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहायित्व देनी चाहिये।

माननीया, मैं थोड़ा सा जिस क्षेत्र से आई हूँ उसकी ओर माननीया मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहती हूँ। मध्य प्रदेश वैसे ही बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश है। वहां पर कई समस्याएं हैं। वहां पर आदिवासियों की समस्या है, हरिजनों की समस्या है और भी कई समस्याएं हैं। वहां पर सिंचाई के साधन बहुत कम हैं। हमारे यहां एक नर्मदा परियोजना चल रही है, लेकिन काफी दिनों से वह घपले में है। मैं चाहती हूँ कि उसको जल्दी से जल्दी कार्यान्वित किया जाय। दूसरे उसी नर्मदा के ऊपर एक बर्गी पुनाचा जल सिंधी योजना है जिसका सर्वे हो चुका है। उसका कार्य जल्दी से जल्दी शुरू किया जाय और उसके लिये हमारे माननीय मंत्री महोदय विशेष निधि दें ताकि यह कार्य पूरा किया जा सके जिस से अधिक से अधिक सिंचाई की व्यवस्था वहां हो सके और अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाया जा सके।

इसी तरह से जहां से मैं आई हूँ वहां छतरपुर जिले में एक रेनुआ डैम है जिसे कभी यू० पी० ने बांधा था। हालांकि वह नदी मध्य प्रदेश में है लेकिन वहां छोटी-छोटी रियासतें थीं और उनके पास इतने साधन न होने की वजह से उस डैम को यू० पी० ने बनाया था। वैसे आदत यह होती है कि लोग सुई की नोक के बराबर देने को तैयार नहीं होते हैं, लेकिन किसी तरह से वे उसको मध्य प्रदेश को देने को सहमत हुये हैं। वह स्कीम भी बड़े घपले में पड़ी हुई है। छतरपुर जिले में और अधिक कोई सिंचाई के साधन नहीं हैं। मैं चाहती हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री महोदय इसके लिये विशेष निधि का प्रावधान करें ताकि वहां सिंचाई के साधन हो सकें। छतरपुर के जिस इलाके से मैं आई हूँ वह बुंदेलखंड का इलाका बहुत ही पिछड़ा

[श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी]
हुआ इलाका है। माननीया, एक तरफ हमारे योजना आयोग ने कई बार इस बात की घोषणा की है कि जो पिछड़े हुये क्षेत्र हैं उनके लिये विशेष सहूलियत दी जाय, उनकी उन्नति के लिये विशेष धन दिया जाय, लेकिन जो हम प्रत्यक्ष देखते हैं वह उसके विपरीत ही होता है। आज जो क्षेत्र पिछड़े हुये हैं वे पिछड़ते चले जा रहे हैं और जो क्षेत्र आगे बढ़े हुये हैं, उन्नतशील हैं उनकी और उन्नति होती चली जा रही है। आज वहां की जनता यह देखती है कि शायद इन बीस वर्षों में कुछ भी योजना का काम वहां पर नहीं हुआ है। आवागमन का, सिंचाई का, शिक्षा का या किसी तरह का भी कोई विकास का कार्य वहां पर नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये वहां की जनता यह महसूस करती है कि आया हम इस स्वतंत्र भारत के नागरिक हैं या नहीं हैं और यह समाजवादी समाज की जो व्यवस्था हमारे देश में चल रही है उसके क्या हम हकदार हैं या नहीं हैं। बुंदेलखंड अपनी तरह का अलग एक क्षेत्र है, उसकी अपनी अलग समस्याएं हैं। वहां पर डकैती की समस्या है, गरीबी की समस्या है, बेकारी की समस्या है जो आये दिन लोगों को परेशान करती है। वहां पर शिक्षा का बहुत अभाव है। इन बीस वर्षों में चाहे राज्य सरकार रही हो, चाहे केन्द्र की सरकार रही हो, उस क्षेत्र के विकास की ओर किसी का ध्यान नहीं गया है। अतः माननीय वित्त मंत्री महोदय से मैं अनुरोध करूंगी कि उस पिछड़े हुये इलाके की ओर वे ध्यान दें। आज जो देश में तेलंगाना जैसी समस्याएं हमारे सामने आ रही हैं उसका यही एक कारण है कि जो पिछड़े हुये इलाके हैं उनकी तरफ हम कोई ध्यान नहीं देते हैं और वे लोग शायद यह महसूस करने लगते हैं कि जब तक हम सत्याग्रह न करें या लड़ने वाला कोई कदम न

उठाये तब तक हमारी बात सुनने के लिये कोई तैयार नहीं होगा। अतः मेरा माननीय मंत्री महोदय से यह निवेदन है कि वहां जो डकैती की समस्या है उसकी ओर विशेष ध्यान दिया जाय। यह बात अलग है कि दो चार डाकुओं को मार दिया जाय लेकिन उससे कोई समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है। अगर दो चार डाकुओं को खत्म कर दिया जाता है तो उनकी जगह दस तैयार हो जाते हैं। जब तक इस समस्या के मूल को न पकड़ा जाय कि यह डाकू बनते क्यों हैं तब तक इस समस्या का ठीक निदान नहीं हो सकता है। आज वहां गरीबी है, आज वहां बेकारी है, आज वहां आवागमन के साधन नहीं हैं, आज वहां शिक्षा का अभाव है, इसलिये मैं चाहती हूँ...

वित्त मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री पी० सी० सेठी) : वह तो डाकुओं का इलाका है।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : इसी लिये मैं कह रही हूँ कि लोग डाकू क्यों बनते हैं, इसकी तरफ आप ने ध्यान नहीं दिया। वहां गरीबी है, बेकारी है, वहां के लोग भूखे हैं, वहां आवागमन के कोई साधन नहीं हैं और जब आवागमन के कोई साधन नहीं हैं तब वहां कोई उद्योग लगाने के लिये तैयार नहीं होता है। इस से लोगों को कोई कार्य नहीं मिलता है...

श्री मोरारजी आर० देसाई : देश में कई इलाके हैं जो ऐसे ही हैं, लेकिन वहां डाकू क्यों नहीं होते हैं।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : आपने जो यह प्रश्न उठाया है तो मैं बता भी दूँ कि क्या कारण है। मैं नहीं चाहती थी कि मैं ज्यादा डिटेल् में जाऊँ, लेकिन

अब मैं यह बताना चाहती हूँ कि वहाँ छोटी-छोटी रियासतें थीं, वहाँ छोटी छोटी जागीरदारियां थीं और जब वे रियासतें और जागीरदारियां खत्म हो गयीं तो उनके पास कोई काम नहीं रहा। वे ठाकुर हैं, थोड़ी सी शान और अकड़ उनमें रहती है जो स्वाभाविक है। जब उन की मान और प्रतिष्ठा को कहीं धक्का लगता है तो वे ऐसा काम करने को विवश हो जाते हैं। उनको कोई काम नहीं दिया गया। आज मिलिटरी में दूसरी जगहों के लोग ले लिये जाते हैं, लेकिन वहाँ के बहादुर लोगों को नहीं लिया जाता है। उनसे कह दिया जाता है तुम्हारा चेस्ट ठीक नहीं है या तुम्हारी हाइट कम है। जब उनको खाने के लिये भरपेट रोटी न मिले और जब उनको वर्ष में चार महीने महुआ और बेर पर गुजर करना पड़े तो आप कैसे उम्मीद कर सकते हैं कि वे अपनी हेल्थ बनाये रख सकते हैं और जो आप ने नियम बनाये हैं, जो आप ने मिलिटरी की परंपरायें बनायी हैं, उनमें इन परिस्थितियों में वे कैसे ठीक बैठ सकते हैं।

श्री मोरारजी आर० देसाई : माननीया, क्या आप यह चाहती हैं कि ऐसे दुर्बल लोगों को फौज में लिया जाय ?

श्रीमती बिद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : मैं यह नहीं चाहती। लेकिन मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि आप उनको ऐसे साधन दें ताकि वे बलवान बनें और फौज में भर्ती हो कर देश की सेवा कर सकें।

आज वहाँ गरीबी है, लोग महुए खा कर, बेर खा कर गुजर करते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जो उस तरफ विशेष ध्यान दें।

हर इलाके में कुछ न कुछ हुआ है लेकिन बीस वर्ष में बुन्देलखंड में एक भी विकास का कार्य नहीं हुआ है, एक रेल की लाइन नहीं पहुँची, एक यूनिवर्सिटी नहीं खुली, कोई मेडिकल कालेज नहीं दिया, कोई इंजीनियरिंग कालेज नहीं दिया। आज वहाँ का क्षेत्र इसीलिए पिछड़ा हुआ है। मैं खास तौर से इस बात की ओर ध्यान दिलाऊंगी कि जिस तरह से आज तेलंगाना में परिस्थिति है उसी तरह से बुन्देलखंड के लोगों ने एक मीटिंग की और वे अलग बुन्देलखंड की मांग करने वाले हैं। इसलिए मैं आगाह करना चाहती हूँ कि आपको इस तरफ ध्यान देना पड़ेगा।

दूसरा मेरा एक अनुरोध और था। बुन्देलखंड की ऐतिहासिक परम्परा रही है, वहाँ का साहित्य, वहाँ का वीरता का इतिहास गौरवशाली है। वहाँ पर छतरपुर में रेडियो स्टेशन के लिए एक स्कीम चल रही है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगी कि उसकी तरफ ध्यान दें और उसके लिए अपने बजट में निधि का प्रावधान करें।

मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय के प्रति आभार प्रदर्शित करती हूँ कि उन्होंने बीच में टोक कर, मैं जो नहीं कहना चाहती थी वह भी कहने का मौका दिया। मैं पुनः इस विधेयक का समर्थन करते हुए माननीय मंत्री जी से यह अनुरोध करूंगी कि वे इन पिछड़े इलाकों की ओर, जो भी पिछड़े इलाके हैं उनकी ओर—मैं इन्हीं का नहीं कह रही हूँ—ध्यान दें क्योंकि हमने समाजवादी समाज की व्यवस्था बनाई है, उसमें एक आदमी भूख से मरे और एक अजीर्ण से मरे, यह उचित नहीं है। इसलिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि वे इस पर विशेष ध्यान दें। धन्यवाद।

SHRI M. D. NARAYAN (Mysore): Madam, I regret that no amount of arguments, persuasion and representations have been able to bring round or convince the Finance Minister to reconsider the levy on fertilisers and the Tax on Agricultural Wealth. The Finance Minister has been equally inconsiderate regarding the direct and indirect taxes. That is against the very object of socialism. Their Five Year Plans, their related policies, their taxation proposals are also likely to bring about an economic stagnation. In support, I would deal point by point their taxation proposals.

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

Take the case of the Wealth Tax on agricultural land. Firstly I entirely disagree with the Government that they have the legal and constitutional right to levy any such tax. Even if it may be taken that the Central Government can levy such taxes, they should do it with a certain amount of planning and understanding. The other day the Finance Minister seems to have clarified that the facilities like residential houses etc., provided for the labour in the rural areas by the agriculturist would come under the purview. He does not seem to have understood the implications. Does he mean to deprive the landless labourer of such like amenities? Why would an agriculturist build houses on which he would have to pay Wealth Tax and for which he charges no rent from the labour? The coffee and tea planters have been the target of direct and indirect taxes for the last so many years without attending to their problems. This class has not been able to get the benefit of big irrigation projects brought about by the Five Year Plans because their estates are situated on hilly slopes. In addition they had to arrange their own irrigation schemes. They have to leave the cosy atmosphere and conveniences of cities and live in jungles, spend a major portion of their earning on the education of their children, medical aid and on facilities to the labourers compared to the people living in cities.

In return tea and coffee were being taxed more and more every year in one way or the other. Because of competition from Ceylon, the Government have started realising the difficulties of the industry and have started giving them some concessions. Coffee industry is still being neglected. I may warn the Government that these foreign exchange earners are now thinking of changing their trade. The Wealth tax on agricultural land and holdings now proposed to be levied will hasten things. The coffee estates would disintegrate into fragmentations if proper attention is not given to redress their grievances and problems. The planters have been denied each and every facility. They have to purchase tractors on very high prices; the Government being negligent through all these years to make the country self-sufficient in this basic agricultural implement. Even the sprayers, pesticides, etc. are in short supply and if available, on prohibitive prices. Again "the Finance Minister proposes to levy Tax on Fertilisers adding fuel to the fire. The Government has been spending crores worth of foreign exchange on import of fertilisers leaving untouched the techniques and other resources of the country to make' itself sufficient in fertilisers. This is what I see today the beautiful results brought about by planning Five Year Plans.

I know the, Finance Minister has a comfortable majority to get his proposals through but his successors, the future generation, the future Government will face a tough time in setting right the follies of the present Government. In this context I would appeal to the Finance Minister to be fair to the agriculturist, the coffee and tea planters, the landless labour and postpone the levy of Wealth Tax on farm land and Excise Duty on fertilisers till he is able to provide the same basic facilities which are available in urban areas in the shape of hospitals, schools and colleges, entertainment etc.

In one thing I am happy that the Finance Minister is increasing penalties leviable for defaults in furnishing returns and production of accounts,

documents, etc. But he should apply this rule uniformly to the big and the small. He should also make earnest efforts to recover the outstanding arrears of 84 crores of rupees. Many a time this matter has been raised on the floor of this House in one way or the other but without results. Year in and year out the arrears of unpaid taxes remain unrecovered to the detriment of the common man who is required to pay enhanced taxes to fill the gap in March every year. I consider it an act of unkindness when I see that additional tax is proposed to be imposed on petrol, sugar and Income-tax is proposed to be enhanced on the middle class people earning between Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 20,000 per annum. This requires reconsideration. The concept of the Government that the public undertakings needed a long period of gestation will ruin the economy of the country. The concept requires revision and we should go for quick results.

Again the Fourth Plan is inflationary in nature. Imposition of taxes on the common man to boost resources for such plans should be considered as criminal.

In conclusion I would bring to the notice of the Finance Minister the consequences of fragmentation. The "State Governments will be losing because of reduction of Agricultural Income-tax. The Central Government will be losing on Excise Duties. Great scope for blackmarketing and difficult to control and supervise if the producing units are small. According to the Coffee Board report smuggling from the small units is about 5,000 to 10,000 tonnes. Labour amenities, wages and bonus will be decreased if the units are small and they do not come under Plantation Labour Act. Disincentive for the development of rural housing. Ultimately the Central Government will not be getting the Wealth Tax they are contemplating because of the threat of Wealth Tax the divisions are already taking place. Increase in cost of production because the economies of large-scale farming cannot be applied. Exports will be

reduced. Major portion of the plantation crops are exported. It will be difficult to compete in the international markets if cost of production is high. Thank you.

SHRI M. ANANDAM (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Finance Bill. At the outset let me make one or two observations on the Bill. Normally, a Finance Bill is supposed to bring in legislation to implement the fiscal policy or the taxation policy enunciated in the Budget speech by the Finance Minister. But what we have been seeing for the last six or seven years is that in addition to the implementation of legislation for this purpose a number of amendments have been brought forward to amend the Income-tax Act and the Wealth Tax Act. These amendments have been so complex and complicated that I have begun to feel that it is not only the tax-payer, even an Income-tax Officer who is asked to administer this law has not been able to keep pace with these amendments, and he is not in a position to say which amendment really related to which year. In these circumstances I really wonder how a handicapped tax-payer would be able to understand these amendments and comply with the provisions of the law. I may also say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that this complicated fiscal law is in a language which is alien to this country. Though many of the educated people of this generation may know this language, I am afraid the taxpayer, who is the real person who has to pay the tax, is not in a position to understand the language. And yet he has been asked to comply with it. And if he does not comply, he is asked to pay a penalty for it. Further, these amendments are brought in the Finance Bill this year I might say in this connection that the Finance Minister himself had earlier brought it to the notice of this House and the other House that, in conformity with the recommendations made by the Bhooihalingam Committee, he is going to come forward with a very comprehensive Bill to amend the entire income-

[Shri M. Anandam.] tax law. Now, if that is coming, I do not feel any urgency for the Finance Minister to come out now with certain amendments which are not really very urgent at the present juncture.

Now coming to the provisions of the Finance Bill, I must say that I welcome the proposal to tax fertilizers. I know that when I make this announcement before this House, there are a number of people who are sympathisers of the farmers and who would not welcome my saying that. But we must consider that during the last fifteen years in the three Five Year Plans, we have spent a lot of money on the promotion of agriculture by providing irrigation projects and providing fertilizers and improved seeds at subsidised rates and we are only now asking the rural sector to contribute a mite in the shape of a tax on fertilizers. I need not stress here, Mr. Vice-Chairman—you also come from Andhra Pradesh which is very affluent so far as agriculture is concerned—that during the last fifteen years real economic progress has been made in the rural sector in our State.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY
(Mysore): Including Rayalaseema and
Telengana?

SHRI M. ANANDAM : This is not a tax on Rayalaseema or Telengana anyway. This is a tax at a place where the rural sector has really made some money; I mean, Rayalaseema does not buy fertilizers to any appreciable extent, and even if they buy any fertilizers, the return is not really very encouraging. I might also say that, as in Andhra Pradesh, the return from agriculture is equally good in some other States. In Punjab, and to some extent in Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal, agriculture has been really very affluent, and there is so much of money in the rural sector nowadays—this I wish to say—that it has not been possible for the rural sector to decide how they should spend it. As a matter of fact, I have seen a lot of extravagant expenditure on the part of the farmers. Also, I read very recently a very inte-

resting report in one of the journals v in the 'Commerce', which is a very responsible journal that in Punjab there is so much of rural affluence that the farmers have taken to various types of expenditure, which was not warranted and which they had not known earlier. The editor of that magazine has given this information, in that edition of the magazine which I read recently, that in the village Sidwa in the Ludhiana district of Punjab there is a liquor shop, which previously was making a turnover of about ten to fifteen thousand rupees and which now has been making a turnover of about two lakhs of rupees. Now that shows the rural affluence of late and so it is not unjust if we ask the affluent agriculturists to pay a few rupees towards tax on fertilizers, because the fertilizers are responsible for contribution to the rural affluence.

There is another thing, which is a very subtle thing. I would like to mention here. Mr. Mohan Dharia mentioned in the morning that the price of fertilizers has gone up by at least 150 per cent. He said that whereas ammonium sulphate was selling at about Rs. 1,500 some ten years ago, it is selling at about Rs. 2,400 now. I just wanted to know this. When the manufacturer has been increasing the prices by another hundred or two hundred rupees, off and on, all these years, the farmers have been paying the enhanced prices without any demur and without anybody protesting against it on behalf of the farmers. Now, it is because the tax on fertilizers is perceptible and it has come on the floor of this House for approval that we are all protesting against it. But when the manufacturer himself has raised the price by another hundred or two hundred rupees, the farmer has silently been paying it, and nobody has been realising the gravity of the increase. I must say that the tax that the Government is collecting is being utilised for the promotion of agriculture as the Finance Minister himself has promised that this money will be made over to the States for development of agriculture. When such is the case. I am sure

Members will take cognizance of this fact before they oppose this levy on fertilizers.

Now coming to the other factor concerning the rural sector, as I have already pointed out to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is a lot of funds which have accrued in the rural sector of late. There is need for us to mobilise those resources. I know, as one sitting at the Centre, it is not possible for us to touch anything concerning the rural sector. But my feeling is that, unless we try to mobilise those resources, all those resources will be dissipated in all types of extravagant expenditure and I am sure that this money would be wasted. Therefore it is necessary for us to consider ways and means of diverting this money to more* useful purposes. I therefore suggest that more and more banks must be able to move to the rural sector so that the resources available in the rural sector could be mobilised and utilised for the development of the country. There must be a sufficient number of banks to cater to the needs of the rural sector. We find that there are only about 7,000 banks in this country catering to the needs of as large a number as forty-two crores of people: on an average it works out to one bank for every 493 square kilometres or for every 70,000 population. Now, with this meagre provision of banks, is it possible for us to say that these banks will be able to serve the rural sector? I am strongly of the view that in this matter the Government of India has got to take a very positive decision to see that the State Bank of India opens at least mobile banks in all these rural places. Unless the mobile banks are constituted and are asked to cater to the needs of the rural sector, it may not be possible for us to mobilise the resources in the rural sector. May I also say, Sir, that it is necessary for us to consider the proposal for raising rural debentures at a fairly handsome rate of interest? We know that the usurious money-lender in the rural sector has been charging a very heavy interest, and he is not inclined to deposit his money with the commercial

banks at the prevailing rates of interest. Now, in order to see that he diverts his resources from private money-lending to the banks, it is necessary that the Government of India floats rural debentures at handsome rates of interest.

Coming to the question of savings in (the urban sector, I may say one or two things. I know, Sir, with the present tax structure of Income-tax and Wealth Tax there is very little that is left with the tax-payer to make a saving, and, our slogan that the individuals must invest a lot of money in the private sector is almost going without proper response, because there is very little left in the urban sector for investment in the private sector. I would like to make a suggestion here. I know with the present expenditure of the Government it will not be possible either to reduce the income-tax rates or the wealth-tax rates, because you need all this money for the country. But if we want that there must be proper investment in the private sector we must see that individuals who own other types of property divert them towards investment in industrial undertakings. There is lot of money in the form of gold, immovable property and in the form various other types of unproductive things that it is not possible for the people to divert them to the industrial sector. And one reason is the very heavy capital gains tax. If any person wants to sell his immovable property to invest the proceeds in an industrial undertaking out of whatever gain he makes out of the sale of the property he has to shell out a large portion of the capital gain towards tax. This is one of the disincentives for the ordinary individual to sell his property and invest the proceeds in the industrial sector. Therefore, I would make a suggestion that if a person wants to sell away his property for the purpose of investment in industrial sector, the capital gains tax should not be there because this is only a conversion of the property of the same person from one type to another type and there should not be any tax on that. This will definitely

[Shri M. Anandam.] act as an incentive to people to invest in industrial undertakings.

Coming to agricultural wealth-tax, I welcome it and it is because of various reasons. One is that the Finance Minister himself announced very liberal exemptions in respect of this. Secondly, we will have to take into account the imbalances between the urban sector and the rural sector. A person in the urban sector is made to pay a number of taxes whereas a person in the rural sector has not been paying any tax excepting land revenue. If we want to correct this imbalance between the urban and the rural sectors it is necessary that even agricultural wealth should be subjected to some tax or other and it is for this reason that I support the move of the Finance Minister to levy this tax on agricultural wealth. But I may say that he has been very liberal with regard to the exemptions. Probably he did not want to go very fast in taxing the agricultural sector so that it may not meet with a lot of opposition but I am sure in the years to come he will see that the tax on agricultural wealth will be equal to the tax on urban wealth.

I might say in this connection that there is need for us to think in terms of integrating the tax on agricultural and non-agricultural income. As I have already said, there has been a lot of imbalance between the urban sector and the rural sector. A person making an income of about Rs. 50,000 in the rural sector does not pay any tax and he is scot-free, whereas a person with the same income in the urban sector pays nearly Rs. 30,000 towards taxes.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore): But you must know that there is agricultural income-tax in many of the States.

SHRI M. ANANDAM: That is a matter of detail.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA : You said just now that a man with an income of Rs. 50,000 in the rural sector does not pay any tax.

SHRI M. ANANDAM: There are a number of States where you do not have agricultural income-tax. If my proposal is to be considered I think it might be necessary for those States which have the agricultural income-tax, to get it integrated with the Central tax and later on ask for contribution or grant-in-aid from the Centre. That is the only way to have uniformity in the matter of this tax in all the States. (Time bell rings) There are various other matters which I would like to suggest and I would request the Vice-Chairman to give me a few more minutes. And this is my first speech which I make here as a Member of the Rajya Sabha and I hope my contribution will be fairly useful to the Finance Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You will have five minutes more.

SHRI M. ANANDAM: There has been a lot of talk about alternate resources to be found. I do not know how long we will allow OIT sentiments to play. I ask: what about taxing salt?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Taxing what?

SHRI M. ANANDAM: Taxing salt.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: There are two more things that you can tax. You can tax water; you can tax air.

SHRI M. ANANDAM: I say this. Salt is no more used only for human consumption. Nearly 50 to 60 per cent of salt is used in the industrial sector for industrial purposes. Nobody seems to be realising that aspect of it. Of course, any tax on salt may affect and touch the pockets of the poor people but when nearly 60 per cent of the salt is used for industrial purposes why should we keep this salt free from taxation?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: Now we understand why you hoped your contribution will be useful to the Finance Minister.

SHRI M. AN AND AM: If the salt manufacturers increase the price of salt per bag from Rs. 6 to Rs. 7 or from Rs. 7 to Rs. 8 or from Rs. 8 to Rs. 9, people will happily pay it and buy. After all in the budget of the family the expenditure on salt is absolutely small and my calculation is if we tax Rs. 2 per bag of salt, the consumption of the entire family for one year will not be even half a bag and the tax that the family may have to bear for one year would be only fifty paise.

SHRI K. SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): May I remind the hon. Member that this is Gandhi Centenary year?

SHRI M. ANANDAM: Gandhiji's opposition to this was purely a token of protest against the levy of taxes in the days of the British Government. It does not mean that salt should not be taxed for all ages. And if sentiments have to have their play I would suggest that after the Gandhi Centenary year is over, probably next year, the Finance Minister may consider taxing salt.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: By that time you may be the Deputy to the Finance Minister.

SHRI M. ANANDAM: I will now deal with one final point and close. There has been a lot of agitation by the State Governments that they want more resources and it has not been possible for the States themselves to raise revenues because of the limited scope they have in this regard. There have been a number of suggestions made by the States in the various conferences like the National Development Council, Chief Ministers' Conference, etc. They have said that there is a lot of duplication of expenditure 7—10 RSS/ND/69

by the Centre and the States especially in matters connected with agriculture, health and education which are State subjects. Both the Centre and the States have been spending money on them. Maybe whatever the Centre wants to spend on these matters may be channelled through the various State Governments. Now when I say that the State Governments have very limited sources for taxation you may remember. Mr. Vice-Chairman, that in the year 1957 the State Governments surrendered their right to levy sales tax on three commodities, namely, textiles, tobacco and sugar, and they said that the Central Government may levy additional excise duties on these three commodities and make over whatever proceeds they get to the State Governments. In 1957 when this was done, so far as Andhra Pradesh was concerned the tax on these three commodities amounted to Rs. 2.43 crores as against about Rs. 9 crores of revenue of the entire State from sales tax. That means the sales tax on these three commodities alone came to about 42 per cent. Again, in 1965-66 the tax that is given to the State from these three commodities is Rs. 3.36 crores, when the total sales tax revenue in Andhra Pradesh is Rs. 74.7 crores. Whereas previously it worked to about 42 per cent, now this sum of Rs. 3.36 crores works to only about 12½ per cent. If the power to levy sales tax on these three commodities is given back to the States, I am sure they will be able to get 42 per cent. Our own State will be able to get nearly Rs. 10 to Rs. 11 crores. When the State Governments do not have enough resources, enough avenues of taxation, is it not necessary for us to see that we abolish the additional excise duty on these commodities and allow the States to collect the tax on these commodities?

Finally, as a Member of Parliament from the Telengana region, I have to say something about the Telengana agitation, restricting myself to the economic aspect of it. It is my view that the entire agitation originated from the fact that the Telengana region has been

[Shri M. Anandam.] neglected in regard to economic development and it is the fear of unemployment of the educated that has been the cause of the present agitation in Telengana. I am one of those who believe that we should have an integrated Andhra Pradesh, with both Telengana and Andhra regions. It is true that Telengana did not register any type of economic development, but the main difficulty is that the Andhra Pradesh Government itself could not do anything in this regard. Time and again, at various conferences, both in the National Development Council and Planning Commission meetings, our Chief Minister, Shri Brahmananda Reddy, had pleaded for correcting regional imbalances. This is a task which the State Government by itself cannot undertake. The Centre has to come forward in a very big way and take it up very seriously. Even at the latest conference of the NDC, the Prime Minister emphasised the need to correct regional imbalances, but I would like to ask what concrete measures have been taken in this regard. In retrospect, I would like to say without any hesitation, if only this aspect of the problem had received the attention it deserved from the Central Government, probably this ill-conceived Telengana agitation would not have been there. It is in this context that I plead for enlarging the financial powers of the State and an important method by which the regional imbalance could be corrected is to locate some of the major public sector undertakings in the heart of the Telengana region itself. To avoid any political upsets, it is necessary that this matter should be gone into by the Deputy Prime Minister with all the seriousness it deserves. It is also not wise to ignore the fact that economics and politics are inter-connected and closely interlinked with one another. You can put off economic development only at political peril. This is the lesson that the Telengana agitation has for us.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I agree with my friend, Mr. Parthasarathy, when he paid compliments to our Finance

Minister and he described him as a batsman not out. Certainly I agree with him and I want to pay that compliment to our Finance Minister, because he is a very steadfast and fearless Finance Minister. I do believe that it is only steadfast and fearless leaders like him who can deliver the goods. In this connection, I would respectfully bring to the notice of the Finance Minister and this House, through you, certain facts, not that he does not know them, but all the same, by way of recapitulation, I would draw his attention to the state of the economy of this country over which he presides. When I say it I say it with all goodwill and with no ill-will to anybody. They are bare facts and they have got to be taken note of, before we criticise the financial proposals of the Finance Minister. Firstly, we have a situation where the States are vying with each other in producing deficit Budgets. I think all the States, put together, this year have produced a deficit to the extent of Rs. 308 crores and if the concealed deficit of Andhra Pradesh is also taken into consideration, it comes to Rs. 361 crores. That is the deficit Budget the States have produced for the Finance Minister to solve. I certainly sympathise with him. The situation is so bad as it is. That is one problem. Now, take the public undertakings. The other day he answered in this House that the total investment is Rs. 3,333 crores and in his own words in respect of the year 1966-67, all the public enterprises, other than the Hindustan Steel, showed a net profit of Rs. 3 crores. The Hindustan Steel has suffered a loss of Rs. 38 crores. The net result of an investment of Rs. 3,333 crores is a net loss of Rs. 35 crores. This is the result of the functioning of our economy in the public sector. I do realise that our economy has had to face rough weather especially on account of two famines, two successive famines at that. In my part of the country three or four successive famines have occurred. In Mysore State, from where I come, 17 districts out of 20 districts are even today affected by famine, as admitted by the Government of India themselves. Therefore, it is a very difficult

task. Our economy could not keep pace with the requirements of the country. I do understand it. On top of it, on account of defence, the other day we passed in the Appropriation Bill a defence expenditure of Rs. 1,051 crores. Therefore, the problem has become all the more difficult. On account of these factors the problem of maintaining the health, vigour and vitality of the economy has become really difficult and our Finance Minister is operating under conditions which are most difficult and most critical. Not only that. Even in our revenue Budget, the expenditure has increased enormously with the result that this year it has shown a deficit. He has taken recourse to a deficit financing of Rs. 250 crores. Non-developmental expenditure in the States and Centre put together has increased by 30 per cent this year. The Railways, where we have invested Rs. 4,000 crores, have drawn from their Reserve Fund Rs. 49 crores to keep going. The Posts and Telegraphs, which were generally giving us a profit, incurred a loss of Rs. 14 crores. Major irrigation projects have suffered a loss of Rs. 48 crores. This is how our economy has been functioning. Huge amounts have been invested in various sectors and everywhere there is loss and loss. What else is the Finance Minister to do except take recourse to taxation? I really sympathise with him. He has no other way of doing it. God willing, during the present year if our agriculture fares well and if our industries fare well, as I hope they will, we may expect from the Finance Minister not the imposition of more taxes or the salt tax as my respected friend, Mr. Anandam, suggested, but less of taxation, because this country is suffering from an overdose of taxation.

I have got figures. No less a person that the retired Chairman of the Central Board of Revenue has written an article in the Economic Times where he has shown that the taxation is almost the highest. I need not try to teach the respected Finance Minister about these things, but here is the article where he has shown it. These figures he knows, I do not want to waste my time.

Now I come to the brasstacks of the problem. The question of fertilizer tax and wealth tax has become the proverbial tale of four blind men and the elephant in this House also. There are those who very fervently plead for more and more taxation in the agricultural sector, and there are those like me who are absolutely against touching the agricultural sector. It is just now opening its eyes and even before it has opened its eyes, the Press in this country has played havoc. Every paper —of course I read almost every paper, if it is not taken as egotism—the Financial Express, Economic Express, Hindustan Times, Statesman, every paper has been carrying on incessantly a propaganda that the rural rich have been simply rolling in wealth in the streets of the villages, as even my friend there has said. It is an astonishment for me to hear that. If that was the case, where was the poverty of this country? We would not have been this bad. We would have been wonderfully good. Our economy would have been simply buoyant. It would have been full of vitality.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: Full of milk and honey.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: There is no question of it. If the rural sector was that prosperous, the hon. Finance Minister would not have had any problem at all. I beg to submit that the position is misrepresented by the Press very badly. All those that are depending on the Press for their information, for their knowledge, for their teaching of the rural economy in this country, are thoroughly misled. Maybe in a few places, in a few pockets where there is irrigation facility, assured supply of irrigation, certain prosperity could be seen. What is the area in which this irrigation facility is there? In all it is about 70 million acres out of 350 million acres of cultivated land in this country. It is not even one-fifth of the total. The part is represented as the whole as if prosperity is everywhere. If that was the case, there would have been no problem. All the economic problems

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] would have been solved of their own. So this is a myth. That there is enormous prosperity in the villages is a myth. That there is a green revolution is also a myth because the revolution is only in spots, in pockets here and there, not ail over the country. I can prove it by facts and figures. That is also not the case because we are still importing food; probably 5.5 million tonnes of PL 480 wheat are being imported. Still you call it green revolution. Is it fair to call it green revolution? Green revolution comes on that day when this country produces enough of food required for all the people of this country and when all the raw material required for agn cultural purposes is produced and also when we start exporting and earning at least Rs. 1000 crores through that source. Then only green revolution can be said to have come about. Let us not have the complacency that green revolution has come about and we are safe.

Now I come to the wealth tax. What justification is there for that tax? I am sure of course that our Finance Minister would not have been taught by the Press, but he is also under the same impression. You have imposed what is called land ceilings all over the country. You have fixed 27 standard acres to be the order of the day everywhere, and then on the top of the ceiling comes this wealth tax. Does it go well? Is it fair? After all in any measure politics is also involved. I would bring to the kind notice of the Finance Minister this: Do you know with this wealth tax things will go awfully bad to the Congress Party of which I and he are members, of course he as leader and I as follower? This will go terribly against our party. That is what I would like to submit. So, you must have been satisfied of one thing. All the aspects of the village economy were taken into consideration and ceilings have been imposed. It is a different matter if the law of ceilings has not been worked or implemented properly. Non-implementation or default in the implementation of land reforms should not be the cause for

imposing an additional tax on wealth. Not even animals are excluded, not even sheep, goat, poultry. They are all included in the wealth tax.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:
Where?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:
You have included. It is number three . . .

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: If it is over Rs. 250,000. If the whole thing is worth more than Rs. 250,000.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:
Individually Rs. 150,000.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Rs. 250,000.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I would like to bring to your kind notice . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It touches only the rich farmer.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Ask him what he was in 1946 and what he is now.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I experimented. I have done my own experiments without costing a pie to the Government. I started cross-breeding cows. Cows which were producing one pound of milk, those very cows today produce 30 or 40 or 50 pounds, and they have beaten all-India record in the recent Cattle Show.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Who has enabled you to make this all-India record? The Government is spending money on it.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: No, no. I have not asked for a single pie. There are 50,000 cows whose cross-breeding has been introduced in Bangalore in the year 1933. Within the course of these 36 years without asking a single pie from the Government, either of the Centre or of the

State, we have been able to produce 50,000 cows whose average yield is 20 pounds of milk a day. This is what has been achieved. I put it before you, and I am prepared to invite you for the next Cattle Show to see what we have done. That is with regard to wealth tax.

With regard to fertilizer tax, I want to say one thing. I want to bring to the notice of the Finance Minister that this fertilizer tax is an impost uncalled for, unnecessary, it is going to be very very harmful, according to my humble understanding. I have been a farmer for the last 33 years, and I would put before the Finance Minister this: You are far too early, a decade too early, in the introduction of this. Our fertilizers are the costliest in the world.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: No, no.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: It has been admitted . . .

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: See the figures.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I want to give a little economics of my own. For one acre of jawar . . .

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): He is the leading agriculturist, he is an American agriculturist . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You finish.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Suppose a man has only one acre. In this country you know that 40 per cent of the farmers have below one acre. Even for one acre the man has got to use under the latest science and technology, according to the Government formula, seeds, fertilizer and all the input worth Rs. 300, if he has to reap the full benefit. Granting that he does it, he spends Rs. 300 worth for one acre, is it fair to tax him 10 per cent? In this country there are only 10 per cent of them who produce for the

market. It is his own figure, his Economic Survey says it. Forty per cent have got to depend upon others. 4 P.M. Another 50 per cent have just enough for their stomach and another 10 per cent of the people produce for the market purpose. For the sake of this 10 per cent are you going to tax even the humblest man, the one-acre man, the half-acre man, the one-quarter acre man? I would request him to reconsider this. Of course, it may be too late but all the same I do so because I should not give up hope. Our respected Finance Minister has got the greatest affection and sympathy for the welfare and prosperity of our country and for the poor man—I plead with him: if he does away with this fertiliser levy even at this late stage, I would call him the greatest steadfast man in the world. I call him the most fearless man in the world today. Therefore, let him take courage on both hands and do away with the fertiliser levy and the wealth tax on agriculture and not levy them for another 10 years. Thereafter, certainly he can do it.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He does not fear you also.

Mr. Suraj Prasad.

श्री सूरज प्रसाद (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभापति जी, जो वित्त विधेयक पेश किया गया है इस वित्त विधेयक में कोई नई चीज या कोई नई नीति का प्रतिपादन नहीं मिलता है। भारत सरकार की हमेशा से यह नीति रही है कि वह गरीबों पर अधिक टैक्स लगाये, अमीरों पर कम टैक्स लगाये और जो टैक्स जमा हो वह टैक्स अमीरों की झोली में डालती जाय ताकि अमीर और अधिक अमीर होते जाये। सरकार ने और हमारे वित्त मंत्री ने अपनी उसी पुरानी नीति पर इस वित्त विधेयक में भी चलने का

[श्री सूरज प्रसाद]

प्रयास किया है। इस से यही जान पड़ता है कि बीस वर्ष तक हिन्दुस्तान में जो तस्वीर रही, जो नये अनुभव हुए, जो नई बातें पैदा हुईं उनसे कुछ सीखने का प्रयास हमारे वित्त विभाग की ओर से नहीं किया जा रहा है।

माननीय उपसभापति जी, अभी सरकार ने जो नये टैक्स लगाये हैं उनमें कुछ नवीनता तो जरूर है लेकिन वह टैक्स बढ़ाने वाली पुरानी श्रृंखला में एक नई कड़ी है। इस साल वित्त मंत्री ने खाद पर नये रूप में टैक्स लगाने का, उत्पादन कर लगाने का प्रयास किया है। उसके पीछे तर्क क्या है। तर्क यह है कि देहाती जिन्दगी में बहुत ही अधिक संपन्नता चली आ रही है, लोग धनी हो गये हैं और इसलिये उनसे कुछ साधन मुहैया करना हमारा कर्तव्य है और इस उद्देश्य से यह टैक्स लगाया गया है।

खाद के बारे में यह कहा जा रहा है कि कृषि पर जो खर्चा होता है, उस खर्च का बहुत ही कम हिस्सा खाद का होता है। यह बात बिल्कुल सही है, लेकिन खाद ही कृषि के खर्च का सब कुछ नहीं है। किसानों को कृषि में तरह तरह के खर्च करने पड़ते हैं। अगर गत दस वर्षों का इतिहास देखा जाय तो हम लोगों को यह मालूम होता है कि गत दस वर्षों के अन्दर खाद की कीमत स्थिर नहीं रही है, स्टैटिक नहीं रही है और क्रमशः उसका विकास होता गया है। 1962 में अमोनियम सल्फेट की कीमत 35 रु० बैग थी और 1969 में अमोनियम सल्फेट की कीमत बढ़ कर के 54 रु० बैग हो गई है। सिंगिल सुपर फास्फेट की कीमत अगर 1966 में 22 रु० बैग थी तो सिंगिल सुपर फास्फेट की कीमत इस साल बढ़ कर के 66 रु० हो गई है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने एक

सवाल पूछा था खाद्य मंत्री से तो उन्होंने कहा था कि सिंगिल सुपर फास्फेट की कीमत में विकास तो जरूर हुआ है, लेकिन तीन गुना विकास नहीं हुआ है। अगर सही जानकारी प्राप्त की जाय तो मालूम होता है कि सिंगिल सुपर फास्फेट की कीमत में तीन गुना और अमोनियम सल्फेट की कीमत में डेढ़ गुना गत पांच छह वर्षों के दौरान में वृद्धि हुई है। आखिर यह बोझ किस पर पड़ेगा। यह बोझ जो किसानों के दुर्बल कंधों है उन्हीं पर पड़ेगा।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने बोलते हुये यह भी कहने की कोशिश की कि गत वर्षों में शहरी जिंदगी में शहर के रहने वालों पर तो टैक्स जरूर बढ़ा है, लेकिन देहाती जिंदगी में देहात के रहने वाले किसानों पर कोई टैक्स नहीं बढ़ा है। मुझे तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि शायद वित्त विभाग और सरकार का खाद्य विभाग भी कृषि जिंदगी से कोई सीधा सम्बन्ध नहीं रखता है। अफसोस की बात है कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर कृषि नीति का निर्धारण उन लोगों को सुपुर्द किया जाता है जो कृषि के बारे में क, ख, घ भी नहीं जानते हैं। उनसे अगर यह पूछा जाय कि एक एकड़ जमीन में कितने धान के बीज की जरूरत होती है तो शायद कृषि विभाग और फाइनेंस विभाग का एक आदमी भी नहीं बता पायेगा और उनके हाथों में ही कृषि नीति के निर्धारण करने की बात होती है और वही हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों के भाग्य विधाता हैं। जिन लोगों के कहा कि कोई टैक्स नहीं बढ़ा है, किसानों को क्या टैक्स देना पड़ता है, मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूं कि देहाती जिंदगी में अगर आप प्रवेश करें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि किसानों को लैंड टैक्स देना पड़ता है और यह लैंड टैक्स स्थिर नहीं

है। मैं बिहार के सम्बन्ध में बता सकता हूँ कि वहाँ लैंड टैक्स में रेशनलाइजेशन हुआ है। आज से पांच छह वर्ष पहले अगर लैंड टैक्स से बिहार सरकार की आमदनी नौ सौ रुपया थी तो इस साल लैंड टैक्स के रेशनलाइजेशन से बिहार सरकार की आमदनी 1200 रु० हो गई है। किस पर यह बोझ बढ़ा। किसानों पर बढ़ा। वहाँ सिंचाई के रेट में वृद्धि हुई है। 1955 में बिहार में सिंचाई का रेट तीन रुपया एकड़ था, लेकिन उसी साल सिंचाई का रेट बढ़ा कर के 6 रु० कर दिया गया। उसके चार पांच वर्ष के बाद सिंचाई का रेट बढ़ा कर के 9 रु० कर दिया गया। 1967 में सिंचाई का रेट बढ़ा कर के 16 रु० एकड़ किया गया। इस साल मैं यह सुन रहा हूँ कि बिहार की हुकूमत सिंचाई के रेट को 24 रु० एकड़ करना चाहती है। एक दिन यहीं पर भारत सरकार के सिंचाई मंत्री बोल रहे थे कि दिल्ली की हुकूमत किसानों से पूरे उत्पादन का साढ़े 12 प्रति शत सिंचाई के रूप में लेना चाहती है। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि निजलिगप्पा कमिशन ने सिंचाई के रेट के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा है कि सिंचाई के साधन मुहैया करने से उत्पादन जितना होता है उसका अगर 50 प्रति शत ले लिया जाय तो कोई नाजायज बात नहीं होगी। तो यह सिंचाई का रेट क्रमशः बढ़ता गया है। इतना ही नहीं है। मैं यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि किसानों को लैंड सेस देना पड़ता है, किसानों को शिक्षा सेस देना पड़ता है। बिहार के अन्दर एक डेवलपमेंट टैक्स भी लगाया गया है जो 105 रु० एकड़ 15 वर्षों में किसानों को देना पड़ेगा। इसके अलावा बिजली का रेट है। वह किस को देना पड़ता है। आज से दो वर्ष पहले बिजली का मिनिमम चार्ज 180 रु० था। 1968 में बिहार के अन्दर बिजली का मिनिमम

चार्ज बढ़ा कर के 180 के स्थान पर 600 रु० कर दिया गया है। फिर भी आप कहते हैं कि किसानों पर कोई टैक्स नहीं है। इतना ही नहीं है। मैं आप को बता दूँ कि बिहार के अन्दर 1948 में सेल्स टैक्स से बिहार सरकार की आमदनी 75 लाख रु० थी और 1969 में सेल्स टैक्स से बिहार सरकार की आमदनी 42 करोड़ रु० हो गई है। अब उत्पादन कर का प्रश्न ले लीजिये। 1951 में उत्पादन कर से हिन्दुस्तान सरकार की आमदनी अगर मुझे ठीक ठाक याद है तो 68 करोड़ रु० थी और इस साल उत्पादन कर से हिन्दुस्तान सरकार की आमदनी 1300 करोड़ रु० हो गई है। कौन देता है इस टैक्स को? शहर में रहने वाले कुछ मुट्ठीभर पूंजीपति, शहरों में रहने वाले कुछ अमीर लोग? इस टैक्स का अधिकतर बोझ देहात में रहने वाले किसानों को देना पड़ता है। इसका बोझ किसान को बर्दाश्त करना पड़ता है। फिर यह बात कही जाय कि किसान पर कोई टैक्स नहीं, यह तो एक नया, नावेल मेथड है। हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय को बहुत बधाई मिल रही है, कुछ दोस्तों का भाषण सुना तो लगा कि जैसे वित्त मंत्री महोदय का स्तुति-गान हो रहा है, जैसे कोई नवीन तरीका हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की तरक्की का उन्होंने खोज निकाला है। यह हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के लिए कोई नई चीज नहीं। वित्त मंत्री के तरकश में बहुत से ऐसे तीर हैं हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों और मजदूरों को चुभाने के लिए। उनका यह नया तीर हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों को छलनी कर देगा और उनके पास कोई साधन नहीं रहेगा जिससे कृषि का विकास हो सके। कृषि के विकास के लिए पैसों की जरूरत है। अगर तमाम पैसा किसानों के हाथों से टैक्स के रूप में ले

[श्री सूरज प्रसाद]

लिया जाय तो किसान बीज कहां से खरीदेगा, किसान ट्रैक्टर कहां से खरीदेगा, किसान और रुपया कैसे इन्वेस्ट करेगा।

आज प्राइस नीति क्या है? आप किसानों से टैक्स लेना चाहते हैं (Interruptions), आप किसानों को कुछ देना भी चाहते हैं। आज किसानों की चीजों की कीमतें गिर रही हैं। जो आज पैदा करने वाले किसान है उनका दिवाला निकल गया, जिन्होंने गुड़ बनाया उनका दिवाला निकल गया। जो मिल्नों में चीजें बनती हैं उनकी कीमत क्या है? डालडा का टीन 6 महीने पहले 70 रुपए का बिक रहा था, आज डालडा 75 रुपया टीन बिक रहा है। डालडा की कीमत बढ़ी, सीमेंट की कीमत बढ़ी, लोहे की कीमत बढ़ी तमाम चीजों की कीमतें आप बढ़ाते चले जा रहें हैं जबकि किसान द्वारा पैदा की जाने वाली चीजें गेहूं, चावल आदि की कीमत को घटाने की बात कही जाती है, कहा जाता है कि इनके दाम बढ़ गए हैं, उन्हें घटाने की जरूरत है। तो उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे कह रहा था कि किसान के ऊपर यह एक बहुत बड़ा बोझ है जो खाद की कीमत बढ़ाई जा रही है। अभी मैंने सुना कि इससे 4 रुपए बैंग खाद की कीमत बढ़ गई है। जब मैं देहात में गया था तो मैंने पता किया था कि इसका क्या असर पड़ने जा रहा है। उन्होंने कहा कि 4 रुपए बैंग इसका असर पड़ने जा रहा है। इससे किसान का उत्साह कम हो जायगा। देश के अन्दर खाद्य में आत्मनिर्भर होने की बात चल रही है। हरी क्रान्ति की बात हो रही है। हरी क्रान्ति जो पल्लवित हुई है, इसको पुष्पित और फलित होना बाकी है, इसमें फूल और फल लगने बाकी हैं। ऐसे अवसर पर हिन्दुस्तान के वित्त मंत्री ने किसानों पर बमबर्षा कर दी, जिससे

तमाम हरी क्रान्ति, हरी जिन्दगी जो देहातों में है उसके वीरान हो जाने की सम्भावना पैदा हो गई है। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस टैक्स से जघन्य टैक्स किसानों के लिए कोई नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं कहूंगा कि इस टैक्स को न बढ़ाया जाय। क्यों? आज हिन्दुस्तान को अन्न के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर होने की जरूरत है। हमारे खाद्य मंत्री जगजीवन राम जी कहते हैं कि 1972-73 तक हिन्दुस्तान अन्न के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हो जायगा। कैसे होगा? हिन्दुस्तान में अभी अन्न उत्पादन करने की जरूरत है। 1966 में हमने एक करोड़ टन अनाज मंगाया, 1968 में 70 लाख टन मंगाया और शायद इस साल 50-60 लाख टन मंगाने की योजना है। अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की निर्भरता अमरीका पर कम हो, हिन्दुस्तान अन्न कम मंगाए तो किसानों को अधिक प्रोत्साहित करने की जरूरत है, उनको और अधिक उत्साह देने की जरूरत है, उन्हें और अधिक इनसेन्टिव देने की जरूरत है, यह नहीं कि उनकी अधिक उत्पादन की जो क्षमता है उसको आप कुण्ठित कर, यह उद्देश्य नहीं होना चाहिए। जो उत्पादन कर खाद पर बढ़ाया गया है उससे यही नतीजा होने जा रहा है। जगजीवन राम का सपना हिन्दुस्तान में खाद्य के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर होने का कभी सच नहीं हो सकता है अगर वित्त मंत्री महोदय का यही कदम रहा। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि फिर से इस पर सोचने की जरूरत है। इस तरह से टैक्स लगाने से किसानों की जिन्दगी बिल्कल वीरान बन जा सकती है। (Time bell rings) 7 मिनट हमारे हैं, हम नहीं बोलेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान):
भूपेश ने कहा था कि वे कहेंगे।

You can take your party's time. But he has given his name.

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि हम टैक्स इसलिए लगा रहे हैं कि अब किसी और क्षेत्र में टैक्स बढ़ाने की सम्भावना नहीं है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में तुलसीदास की एक लाइन उद्धृत करता हूँ—

“जाके मतिभ्रम भयउ खगेसा सो कह पश्चिम उगयु दिनेसा ”

जिसका दिमाग खराब हो जाता है वह आदमी यह कहता है कि सूरज पूर्व में नहीं पश्चिम में उगता है। माननीय वित्त मंत्री का दिमाग भी खराब हो गया है, बुद्धि में भ्रम पड़ गया है, हिन्दुस्तान के साधन को समझने की क्षमता ही नहीं रही, तमाम उन्होंने अपनी बुद्धि खो दी है। मैं कहूँगा कि अगर दूसरी जगह दिमाग ठीक करने की जगह नहीं है तो बिहार में हमने कांके में एक जगह बना रखी है जहाँ लोगों का दिमाग ठीक किया जाता है।

वित्त मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री जगन्नाथ पहाड़िया) : आप ठीक करा आए हैं ?

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : हमारा तो ठीक हो चुका है, हमको अनुभव है, इसलिए हमने कहा कि आप ठीक कराएँ।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : कितने दिन रहे ?

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : इसलिए मैं कह रहा था कि इस तरह की ऊलजलूल बातें कही जाती हैं। एक बात मैं वैल्य टैक्स के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। वैल्य टैक्स का मैं सिद्धान्ततः विरोधी नहीं हूँ। देहाती जनता में जो अमीर हैं, जो

जमींदार हैं, जो धनी किसान हैं उनसे साधन लिया जा सकता है, योजना के लिए खर्च लिया जा सकता है। लेकिन प्रश्न यह उठता है कि कृषि पर टैक्स कौन लगाएगा दिल्ली की हुकूमत या राज्य की सरकार ? गत बीस वर्षों के दौरान केन्द्र की ओर से हमेशा इस बात का प्रयास हुआ है कि राज्यों के जो स्वायत्त अधिकार हैं उनको छीन लिया जाय, उनका अपहरण कर लिया जाय, राज्य, राज्य न रहें बल्कि डिपेंडेंसी बन जायें, एजन्सी बन जायें केन्द्र की सरकार की और एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव यूनिट्स बन जायें। राज्यों के जो स्वायत्त अधिकार हैं उनको छीनने का कुप्रयास, जघन्य काम, धिनौना कदम केन्द्र ने उठाया है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि राज्यों का यह अधिकार यह जिम्मेदारी वापस दे दीजिए। खुदा के वास्ते जो राज्यों को अधिकार मिले हैं उन्हें छीनने की कोशिश मत कीजिए। उन्हें बढ़ाइए, छीनने का तो प्रश्न नहीं है। जब वित्त मंत्री ने देखा कि सीधे रास्ते से प्रवेश नहीं हो सकता तो चोर दरवाजे से घुसने का प्रयास किया, कहा कि रेजीडुअल पावर्स हैं, सीधे दरवाजे से हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी तो कहा कि चोर दरवाजे से घुस चलो, राज्यों का जो हक है उसको छीन लो। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस काम को मत कीजिए, राज्यों के ऊपर छोड़ दीजिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): But it is being paid to the States.

SHRI SURAJ PRASAD: I am coming to it.

कुछ राज्यों ने वैल्य टैक्स के आधार पर ग्रेडेड लैंड टैक्स लगाने का प्रयास किया है। बिहार के अन्दर जब संयुक्त मोर्चे की हुकूमत थी तो उसने इस बात

[श्री मूरज प्रसाद]

का प्रयास किया था कि ग्रेडेड लैंड टैक्स लगाएं लेकिन हुकूमत नहीं कर सकी। केरल की हुकूमत ने ग्रेडेड लैंड टैक्स शायद लगा दिया है। तो राज्यों को आप छोड़ दीजिये कि उन को कितना रुपया मिलेगा। पूरे हिन्दुस्तान से 5 करोड़ रुपया एग्रीकल्चरल इन्कम टैक्स से मिलेगा। खोदा पहाड़ तो निकली चूहिया। क्या मिला! इस पांच करोड़, में से राज्यों को बंटेगा तो किसी को दस लाख मिलेगा, किसी को पांच लाख मिलेगा। क्या यह करने की जरूरत है। आप छोड़ दीजिये राज्यों को। वह स्वयं सोच लेंगे कि वह कौन से टैक्स लगायें। आप इस की फिक्र क्यों करते हैं! आप के पास जो साधन हैं उन को आप बांटने के लिये तैयार नहीं और उन के जो साधन हैं उन को आप छीनने के लिये तैयार बैठे हैं। इस लिये यह मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यह राज्य का हक है। इस पर कुठाराघात करना सही नहीं है और उन के जिम्मे यह छोड़ देना चाहिये।

अंत में आप कहेंगे और वित्त मंत्री जी कहेंगे कि आप विरोध ही करते हैं। देश का विकास करना है तो उस के लिये पैसा, कहां से आये। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर पैसे की कमी नहीं है। प्रश्न है हिम्मत का, प्रश्न है दृष्टिकोण का, प्रश्न है नजरिये का कि आप उसे किस रूप में लेना चाहते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का नजरिया क्या है—गरीबों पर अधिक टैक्स लगाओं और अमीरों को छूट दो। यह सरकार की नीति रही है और इस लाइन पर बेहिचक हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी चलते जा रहे हैं। समय के मुताबिक आप को इस नजरिये में बदलाव करना चाहिये। समय के अनुसार

आप अपने को बदलिये। जो जिन्दा रहना चाहते हैं उन को हमेशा समझौता करने के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये, संशोधन करने के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये। जरूरत इस बात की है कि उस के लिए सोचा जाय। कहां से मिलेगा पैसा! मैं देख रहा था इन का बजट। मैंने देखा कि जो वेल्थ टैक्स है, जो अरबन वेल्थ टैक्स के नाम से मशहूर है उस से मिलता है 10 करोड़ रुपया। स्टेट इयूटी से हमें मिलता है 11 करोड़ रुपया। क्या इस सीमा को आप और बढ़ा नहीं सकते हैं! इस को क्या और बढ़ाया नहीं जा सकता है! इस को बढ़ाये जाने का काफी स्कोप है। कंपनीज पर कोई वेल्थ टैक्स नहीं है। उन पर उसे बढ़ाया जा सकता है। उस को कीजिये। मैं एक बार इन्हीं का स्टेटमेंट पढ़ रहा था तो देखा कि हिन्दुस्तान में 500 करोड़ रुपया इन्कम टैक्स बाकी है। 5 अरब रुपया बाकी है। आप का हृदय इस को वसूल करने में क्यों कांपने लगता है, सांस क्यों फूलने लगती है। क्या कारण है कि अमीरों पर आप को इस तरह तरस आ जाता है। उन की तरफ जरा मुखातिब हो कर अपने तरक्स से कुछ तीर निकालिये ताकि वे उन की तरफ जा सकें। गरीबों को भेदने में क्या फायदा है। छोटी छोटी मछलियां क्यों मार रहे हैं हरेहू पड़ी हुई हैं समुद्र में, गंगा में, उन को जम कर मारिये। इस तरह अगर काम किया जाय तो मैं समझता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान को साधन मिल सकता है।

मैं आप से कहूं कि हमारा एक पब्लिक सेक्टर है। 3500 करोड़ रुपया उस में इन्वेस्टेड है। उस से एक अच्छी आमदनी हो सकती है, लेकिन इन की गलत नीति की वजह से, इन के गलत

मैनेजमेंट की वजह से इससे हम को मुनाफा नहीं हो रहा है। उस को अगर ठीक ढंग से संचालित किया जाय तो उस से हम आमदनी कर सकते हैं। हमारे यहां चाय के बागान हैं। चाय बागानों का काफी बड़ा हिस्सा आज भी अंग्रेजों के हाथ में है और उस से काफी आमदनी होती है। हिन्दुस्तान को उस से काफी आमदनी हो सकती है। तो बिग इंडस्ट्री जो हम खड़ी किये हैं उन से बहुत कम मुनाफा होता है, लेकिन ऐसे उद्योग जिन से हम को ज्यादा आमदनी हो सकती है उस को वह लेने को तैयार नहीं हैं। आप को चाहिये कि जो विदेशी चाय बागान हैं उन को अपने हाथों में ले लें, बैक्स हैं, उन को अपने हाथ में ले लें। जब यह बात कही जायगी तो उन को अच्छी नहीं लगेगी। वित्त विभाग को यह बात अच्छी नहीं लगेगी क्योंकि उन लोगों का दिमाग तो कहीं गिरबीं रख दिया गया है। यह लोग दूसरी जगह अपना दिमाग बंधक रख दिये हैं। यह बैठे हैं भारत सरकार के अंदर, लेकिन गाइड होते हैं प्राइवेट सेक्टर से। यह गाइड होते हैं टाटा और डालमिया के दिमागों से। तो क्या होगा। इस लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान वे जो हमारी नीति है उस को बदलने की जरूरत है। उसे एक नये ढांचे में ढालने की जरूरत है, उसे एक नया स्वरूप देने की जरूरत है और तभी हिन्दुस्तान की जो समस्या है वह हल होगी। हिन्दुस्तान की नीति में जो रीजनल इंबेलेसेज हैं, जो असमानता है, ऐसा करने पर ही हम उसे दूर करने में सफल हो सकते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में तो "जस जस सुरसा बदन बढ़ावा, तासि दुगुन कपि रूप दिखावा" वाली बात चरितार्थ हो रही है। जैसे जैसे योजना बढ़ती जा रही है, बेकारी भी वैसे वैसे बढ़ती जा रही है। पहली योजना में

50 लाख लोग बेकार थे, दूसरी योजना में वह संख्या 80 लाख हो गयी और अब 1 करोड़ 30 लाख लोग बेकार हो गये हैं। तो बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है और सुन रहे हैं कि चौथी योजना के अंत तक दो करोड़ लोग बेकार हो जायेंगे। तो इन समस्याओं के समाधान के लिये एक नया दृष्टिकोण एक नया दर्शन, एक नया सिद्धांत आवश्यक है उस की जरूरत है। इस लिये मैं वित्त मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि आप ने जो नया टैक्स बढ़ाया है उसे वापस कर लीजिये इसी में हिन्दुस्तान का कल्याण है।

SHRI K. SUNDARAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Finance Minister for the concessions shown to the South Indian Textile Mills and the engineering industry in withdrawing the proposed duty on power-driven pumps and the reduction in the excise duty on certain counts of yarn and certain types of cloth. I am particularly grateful to him for reducing the ad valorem duty on certain types of cloth from 15 per cent to 1\ per cent. The Finance Minister has also said that he is giving this concession by means of a notification and not by an amendment of the Act. He wants to keep it flexible so that during the rest of the year, if need be, he will be able to reconsider it. I would be really grateful if the Finance Minister would watch the performance of the industry and whenever it needs, give further help and assistance at the appropriate time. He has also stated that these concessions are only meant to help the consumption of yarn from the spinning mills and cloth from the composite mills, and that these are by no means a measure to help the mills to make profits. Therefore, it really means that these will help the mills to keep going and no further mills will be closed. I am very sorry to say that the measures that have been adopted so far do not help the re-opening of any of the mills that remain closed now. In addition to these concessions in excise duties,

[Shri K. Sundaram.] loans were given to the handloom societies for stocking more cloth, but these do not help the closed mills. For exports a sum of Rs. 5 crores was granted and those exports have assisted only in reduction of these stocks. Further expansion of the spinning industry has been stopped for the time being. Lowering of the margins of hypothecation and pledged goods by the scheduled banks is also not enough. It does not in any way help the re-opening of the closed mills. A special additional rebate for the handloom cloth has helped to clear the stocks of the handloom societies, but it does not help either the spinning or the weaving mills. It is said that a scheme has been sanctioned for the stocking of cotton yarn by the Southern Indian Mills and the Tamil Nadu Mill Owners Association. But unfortunately the terms have been so hard that not a single pie could be utilised for this purpose. The Industrial Development Bank no doubt has come forward to extend credits for 10 years and above only in suitable cases. The suitable cases are only those viable units and units that are making some reasonable profit, and this in no way helps the mills that remain closed. Then again the cotton mill industry has been added to the Fifth Schedule of the Income-Tax Act so that they will get the benefit of the development rebate. There also only those mills which can make profit will be able to provide for the additional depreciation that is allowed by these concessions and no other mills that remain closed or which cannot make any profit will be helped by these measures. Therefore, I humbly request that the Government should consider very seriously and seriously make an attempt to reopen these mills. I am aware that a number of these units have been completely rejected as worth only to be scrapped and they will not be looked into. Still more than 50 per cent of them are really workable, viable, and they can be reopened. The Government has done a surgical operation and has removed this useless limb, or this considered-to-be-useless limb, of the textile industry. But there is a possi-

bility of making it useful again if sufficient steps are taken. The mills that are viable today, that are reasonably working, most of them are on sophisticated goods or modernised machines and they are mostly on imported raw material. The others which are on indigenous raw material, they are able to function properly or profitably only with the help of the modern and sophisticated machines. Therefore, the only way to help these sick units is to provide them with some kind of raw material which will enable them to earn some profit and work with reasonable efficiency. My humble suggestion, therefore, in this case is that the Finance Minister should consider the import of synthetic fibre, namely, viscose and acetate synthetic fibre, which is already in short supply in this country so that these mills will be able to reopen and work. It may be argued that the Government has no foreign exchange to import this raw material. We are already importing enough of raw material for other industries and for the textile industry as well and we are providing sufficient foreign exchange for the import of American cotton and Egyptian cotton. A part of that foreign exchange available can be set apart for the importation of this synthetic material and specially allot it to these mills which will enable them to reopen.

Sir, it seems the policy has been to tax all industries alike. From the records and statistics of a quarterly bulletin of the "Eastern Economist" published in February, 1969 it is revealed that in the current budget excise duty on all the industries comes to a little over 50 per cent of the total tax revenue collections of the Central Government which amounts to about Rs. 1,200 crores. Now that the Government has got so much vested interest in the public sector industries, it is in its own interest also to keep a constant check on these industries. It looks to me that the Government does not want that the private sector industry should flourish at all. At any cost the moment a new industry is put up and the initial gestation period is over, when it starts making profits, immediately excise duty

is clamped on it and it is not allowed to make any profits whatsoever. There-fore, if that is the policy, I do not see there is any possibility of creating a capital market at all. There is already no capital market. During the year 1968 we have seen underwriting by the financial institutions to the tune of Rs. 48 crores, the highest ever underwriting. Hereafter at this rate we cannot expect any public subscription whatsoever and the entire financing of industrial development has got to be done only by the Government and the financial institutions. I am sorry to say that all that is mobilised in this manner has been invested in public sector undertakings and administrative expenses. We all know that if we want to reach our destination faster, we have to spend more. We can go from Delhi to Madras by train in three days, and if it is by air from Delhi to Madras we can go in three hours, but we have to spend more. Similarly, the Government has been planning for growth at a very fast rate, not 2 per cent or 3 per cent per annum, but 7 per cent or 8 per cent or 9 per cent per annum. So, when we want to reach our destination faster, naturally we have to spend more. The Government has invested so much in these public undertakings and having invested so much even when they do not get returns in time, you are going on spending much more endlessly year after year. There is already an investment of Rs. 3,200 crores. Normally after a reasonable period any industry should be able to give a minimum return of 10 per cent. Even at that rate these industries should have yielded Rs. 320 crores. If only the Government had paid proper attention and taken proper care to work these industries efficiently, they would have raised a revenue of Rs. 320 crores and there would not have been any need for additional taxation on any of the industries in India today. It may be that for political reasons and on ideological grounds they are not able to do it. Therefore, my humble suggestion is that a parliamentary committee of all parties should be appointed and it should be assisted by experts in productivity and it should go into all cases of losses or unpro-

ductivity in public sector undertakings, and suggest suitable measures. But the only important thing I am asking for is that the recommendations of that committee should be mandatory and binding on the Government. Already so many committees including the A.R.C. have, of course, been appointed and they have gone into this question. But no action has been taken so far. Therefore, some pressure must be brought on the Government to act quickly just as they have performed a surgical operation on the textile industry. It is high time that the same yardstick was applied, for public sector undertakings as well. Not only that. There is plenty of scope for economising expenditure — administrative and non-developmental expenditure. Only the other day there was an instance brought to the notice of the Ministry of External Affairs where we have a very big establishment for our Deputy High Commissioner in London. We used to import quite a lot of machinery and goods from Western countries. But now due to lack of foreign exchange we do not import so much of material. But the same establishment is maintained and it is going to expand also. In this instance for the repairs and redecoration of this house, an amount of £6,000 is going to be spent which amounts to 50 per cent of the total value of the house itself. If such a huge amount on its maintenance is to be spent, is it not a wasteful expenditure? I do not know what else it can be called. We see on the textiles very tight control on the production, distribution and on the price all the time but when it comes to the STC we do not find the same policy being adopted there. In auction No. 25 of second-hand used car, a Mercedes Benz 250 SL 1968 Model was auctioned for Rs. 1,70,550. Normally this car, when landed after paying 100 per cent duty will not cost more than Rs. 45,000. In another auction. No. 24, another Mercedes Benz 250 S, 1966 Model was auctioned. The highest bid was for Rs. 158,000 and the second bid was for Rs. 1,36,000. The first one having failed to lift the car, the second one paid Rs- 1,35,000 for this car.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Who purchased it?

SHRI K. SUNDARAM : In the first instance it was Messrs Bal Garage, Bombay. In the second instance it was Mr. I. J. John Love Mission, Bombay. No controls and this is not profiteering. When the State wants, they can do it and sell for any price whatever.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It is extra money.

SHRI K. SUNDARAM: Does not matter if it comes by way of excise duty or by some other way but it comes to the State. There is plenty of room for effecting economy by import substitution. Very little has been done and not enough has been done. Even in the Defence expenditure, quite a lot of import substitution can be done and the part given to the private sector is very very meagre and it is less than 10 per cent. Given an opportunity, the private sector could do quite a lot of saving in the big item of expenditure on Defence. It may be said that it is a matter of security and so it is not done but about the same goods we are importing from other countries from where they are Imported, there, no such security measures are taken and it is open there. When such goods come into our country and when such goods are to be replaced; why we should pay so much attention about security I fail to understand. Only this morning we saw that the Air Survey Company of Calcutta which has done very good, efficient service and within 7 days they finished the border survey of Indo-Burma and that too at a very cheap rate of Rs. 52,000 against the estimated cost of Rs. 60 by the Indian Air Force and they have done a very efficient job. So given the opportunity, the private sector will do definitely and economically as well. There seems to be some change in the policy on power looms. We have heard several times the Finance Minister mentioning that it is this sector that that is evading the tax and that is why the year before last such a heavy tax burden was levied on it but to-day I find that the Central Government itself

is encouraging a scheme in Goa territory. In Sylvasa, Nagar Haveli in Goa territory, the Central Government has assisted in putting up 92 powerlooms by a group of technicians by extending credit at Rs. 20,000 per powerloom at a ridiculously low rate of interest of 4 per cent—1\ per cent minus 3 per cent rebate. This is under the guise of developing that industry which is under the Centrally-managed territory. The looms and yarn are being fed from Bombay, the technicians go from Bombay to train the workers there. The cloth after woven is taken back to Bombay, it is processed there and is marketed there. I wonder how this is going to develop the Goanese who are probably not more than 50 or 60 who are employed in such a factory. I am grateful that at least now the Central Government has thought that this powerloom sector has to be encouraged and if this had been followed 2 years back, the textile industry would not have been in the present state.

Lastly, I wish to talk about the Wealth Tax. So many Members have already expressed their views about it. I am convinced that our Finance Minister has decided that the Wealth Tax has got to stay and he is not prepared to withdraw. My humble request is that tax will come into effect only next year but this is a warning to the farmers or landholders that they will be taxed next year but when 1970 comes these people would have forgotten about it and there is no provision that the ITOs should serve notice on them that they will have to pay Wealth Tax. Therefore I would request the Finance Minister that such a provision should be made in the Act when it is passed. When the Central Government cares so much for the farmers, the penal provisions in this Act are so severe that they amount to even appropriating the entire property. So they should be well-educated and well-informed. I would request the Agriculture Minister to take up this propaganda through the village programmes of the AIR so that the farmers will be properly educated as to the implications and

complications of this Wealth Tax Act. With these few words, I oppose this Bill in toto.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NARAYAN MIRDHA) in the Chair]

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I think it is time that we have a second look at our entire tax structure. We are required to raise Rs. 1,800 crores for the Fourth Plan through additional taxation. That is the Centre's job for the Fourth Plan and this will mean, according to me, in addition to the Rs. 120 crores more of taxation levied this year, another Rs. 100 crores as additional taxes will have to be levied every year to make up the total of Rs. 1,800 crores. This means that an additional taxation, tax burden, will have to be put on the people every year all the time. As one studies the tax structure of the last few years, specially after the Chinese war, it should be clear that we have relied more and more on indirect taxes. Indirect taxes may be easy to levy and also the pinch of it may not be felt by the taxed people easily as in the case of the direct taxes. The man who is directly taxed knows what is his burden but in the case of indirect taxes, the common man does not easily understand why and how the prices are rising. Yet prices do rise even beyond actual tax burden. We are told that there is an inflationary pressure on the economy, that deficit financing is going on and that we have to do something to stabilise the prices or control the prices. Therefore all taxation measures should subserve this purpose and not accentuate the price spiral. Now this reliance on more and more indirect taxes is going to affect the prices. The prices will continue to rise. The question is: should we deliberately go in for a policy which will keep up the pressure on the prices all the time?

I understand, I quite realise the problem which the Finance Minister has faced, has to face, and I do not envy him, rather I admire his courage and the bold spirit in which he goes I

on levying taxes every year. But then, I feel that this courage has been carried too far, and what is courageous may not always be a matter of discretion—I would say. So I would suggest that let us have a second look not only at the taxation proposed but at the entire tax structure. Now why all this happens?

There is the Planning Commission which, in assessing additional resources to be raised, calculates something like this. As we are going to have a five per cent rate of economic growth—according to the draft plan estimates, after allowing for an annual rate of population growth at two per cent or two and a half per cent, the remaining two and a half per cent of the increased additional national income becomes the disposable income and out of this, the planners say they propose to mop up only 50 per cent or one and a quarter per cent of five per cent of the additional G.N.P. to raise additional resources. Thus they assert the average consumer will yet be left with 50 per cent of the additional income for consumption purposes. And they say what objection can there be to this additional taxation? Unfortunately this specious and fallacious argument seems to convince our financiers. And they say: let us go on levying additional taxation year after year; this is the rate of growth, this is the percentage, and this is what we should levy as taxes. And we go on raising taxes every year. But then, all the time such measures put pressure on the prices and create inflationary conditions. Let me refer to direct taxes; we are told we have reached the limit. But I want to know; have we not reached the limit in indirect taxes also? If it is so, then how are you going to raise additional Rs. 1,800 crores during the Fourth Plan? I want the Finance Minister courageously to tell the Planning Commission and the country that this continuously rising level of taxation is not advisable in the present circumstances. Once that is clear, then probably we can have a taxation policy of the right kind for the next few years to come.

[Shri T. N. Singh.]

Now it is very easy to suggest enquiry committees, etc. to go into our tax structure. I am not in favour of appointing Committees—there has been a Taxation Inquiry Committee already. I think there is enough talent in the Finance Ministry itself, and the Finance Minister himself is an experienced enough person to apply his mind afresh to the whole taxation structure and also tell realistically the Planning Commission and the country, Parliament, everybody, that this measure of additional indirect taxation will mean this kind of strain on our whole economy and therefore we have to revise our policy. Once we do that, we will also have to revise this Plan. That is a separate matter and I shall deal with that question when we discuss the draft Fourth Five-Year Plan. In the present context I would urge in all humility that we should give a second thought to our whole tax structure as well as the policy to be pursued in future.

Then, let us also not forget this aspect of the question; when we talk of a five per cent rate of growth and the Gross National Product rising at a particular rate, we forget that somehow, because of the tax structure or because of administrative failures, all the time, every year, black money is accumulating. My own estimate is that black money of about Rs. 150 crores is generated almost every year. Mind you, this implies a corresponding production, actual but unaccounted production of the order of 500 to 600 crores of rupees, easily, in every year. And that is what escapes calculations of G.N.P. every time; we are unable to mop up this black money. The incentive to black money formation is there so long as there is a very high level of taxation. We have been gradually moving towards such a position with the result that in future there will be greater incentive for creating black money. And this will create further imbalances and stresses and strains on the economy. I think one of the greatest factors—despite the various measures we have been taking from time to time—which is pushing up prices

is the existence of black money and which encourages people to go on spending sprees.

Another argument is advanced that when indirect taxes are levied they cause restraint on consumption. But then, if such taxes were really to restrain consumption, then your income from indirect taxation should go down instead of going up. But it has not been going down. Every year you raise the rate of taxation, and find that, with the passing of years, your income under that particular head also grows. Now, if the object of higher indirect taxation is to restrain consumption, then I submit we have not succeeded in that effort. It is necessary—if not for others—at least for the bulk of the people living at low levels of consumption that they should have opportunities for higher consumption; I am all for it. But what really creates pressure on prices is the spending spree of the affluent classes. And I submit, the affluent classes' spending spree has not abated, has not abated all these years. It has gone on increasing; their thirst for this kind of expenditure is growing as we go on planning, also with the years. Therefore, my own view is that we have got to do something to prevent this spending spree of the affluent classes. But if you levy indirect taxes on what are called luxury goods, then, probably, you will not get the income that you want; you have therefore perforce to levy indirect taxes on things which are of common consumption with low elasticity and, therefore, they yield greater revenue. That is why you have been getting higher revenues. You are levying taxes on things which have got little elasticity, the elasticity is very low, and people have to purchase them whether they can afford it or not. Therefore realizations from indirect taxes have continued at a high level. But once you start levying indirect taxes on goods which have high elasticity, and again form a large part of the budget of the affluent class, then probably your income under this indirect tax will increase proportionately.

These are problems which any Finance Minister will have to face in

any scheme of large or growing indirect taxes. I therefore think it is necessary to examine this question at this very stage. Firstly, I think it will be foolish to adopt taxation measures, a taxation plan programme as the Planning Commission suggests. We have got to revise that.

I made that remark and hinted at this with particular reference to the 1963 taxation measures, and the Finance Minister was kind enough to repudiate that he was not guided by the Planning Commission. If this was so, I wish he now takes a bold measure and is not guided by the Planning Commission in this regard any more.

There is one small thing more. Much has been said about this Wealth Tax on the agricultural community. I think the Wealth-taxed people, people who have got sizeable property should all share the Wealth Tax burden; I have no hesitation in saying that there should be a broad base for the purpose. Let them share the burden. The country has to grow and we have to raise the resources. All right; let us do so. But my feeling is that in all taxation measures we have largely our experience of taxation on what are called the industrial classes to guide us. We do not know much about the real situation of the agricultural classes who are now acquiring some wealth. We have got to be very careful in what we do about it. There should be no discriminatory behaviour. May I point out that in regard to houses owned or built by people in the urban sectors, you have in the past given certain concessions, incentives etc. The houses they live in were exempt from Wealth taxes. In 1956, as early as that, we introduced certain reliefs in regard to the Capital Gains Tax for houses built by people in the urban areas. Then, in regard to people living in urban areas building houses five miles beyond, say, towns of 10,000 population, we again gave some concessions—I think this concession was given by our 5 P.M. present Deputy Prime Minister. So we have been giving concessions mostly in regard to houses 9-10RSSND /69

built by industrialists etc. Why? Because we wanted them to build more houses. Thus where on the one hand when an industrialist or a man in the urban area builds houses you give them tax incentives but if an agriculturist makes some money, has some capital, and wants to invest it in a house, not for renting purposes, mind you, but for his own children, for his own family people who may be coming to the city and living there or maybe some children are being educated in the city or for some such other purposes, you say it will be subject to a new kind of tax; I do not say income-tax but it will be subject to some kind of a Wealth-tax. In other words, whereas your policy has been to encourage construction of houses, when it comes to construction of houses by agriculturists they are made to bear some additional burden which they had not to bear up till now. A tax burden which he was not bearing up till now, he will have to bear now simply because he constructed a house in any urban area. This is a small thing but the agriculturist cannot help feeling that he is being discriminated against. Whereas so and so—and every time the name of Birla or Dalmia will be taken because these names have now become symbolic—will escape, we have to bear an additional burden on a residential house built in a city.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: If the man had property to this extent, he must be paying wealth tax.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: This will be a simple house worth Rs. 40,000 or 50,000.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: How can there be like that?

SHRI T. N. SINGH: There are many people like that. I am afraid the hon. Finance Minister does not know that there are many people who have got such small houses worth 40,000 to 50,000 rupees in nearby towns. And they will grudge this taxation. They are just what may be called middle

class people or virtually lower middle class people according to present day standards.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: How are they paying now?

SHRI T. N. SINGH: They will have to pay under this measure.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: If they have wealth of Rs. 50,000...

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Twenty acres under the ceiling can amount to that much of value in property because of the rise in price. Such is the value of the land today. As I said this is what he will feel. I say this only from the psychological point of view rather than from the burden point of view. I do not want the Finance Minister to argue in reply that after all this is only a small burden. What I am saying is psychologically he will feel that injustice is being done to him as compared to the corresponding class of people belonging to the urban sector or the industrial sector. This is what they will think. He is going to say if, I can vouch for it. The Finance Minister is welcome to levy that tax on the agriculturists. I belong to that class and we are also equally patriotic. We want to share the burden of the country's administration. Certainly we will not shirk our responsibility, but we do not want our class of people to feel that certain discrimination is being done against them as against those in the industrial sector or the urban sector. This is the small point that I was trying to make.

Now I am afraid I have exceeded my time but I would only want to say that before levying any tax in future years it is time that the Finance Minister found an answer to two very important problems. One is the problem of the impact of the taxes on prices. The rising trend of the prices has to be arrested. Merely expecting that agricultural production is going up and, therefore, the prices will be contained is a wrong calculation and we will

have to regret it later. That is not going to happen. The prices will continue to rise all the same. And I do not see any special measures or special steps taken in that regard.

The second thing is this. It is high time that something was done drastically to discover all the black money and collect it or if that is not possible at least to prevent further creation of black money. That is very important. This black money is distorting the entire economy. I feel, considering the administrative set-up and the manner in which taxation measures are administered, we cannot escape the blame for creation of black money. That blame will have to be laid at the door of the administration squarely. I know there are people who would do the unpatriotic act of evading taxes, but the administration has to see that they do not evade taxation. In other countries if a person gives a wrong return he has to go to the jail. Here the evasion of taxes is virtually not a crime. We have made it partly so now rather tardily I should think. Punishment is much more drastic in such cases in America which has a free market economy. Therefore I say that active steps should be taken in this regard and I am looking forward to some very positive measures by the Finance Minister in the next session or in the next two or three or four months to contain this creation of black money and also some measures which will contain the prices. The price spiral and the inflationary pressure has to be fought. Unless that is done all our planning will not work. That is my humble submission.

Thank you.

श्री रतन लाल जैन (पंजाब) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो
फाइनेंशियल प्रोपोजल्स हमारे सामने
रखे हैं उनमें से कुछ के साथ मेरी सहमति
नहीं हो पा रही है, इसलिये उनको
अपोज करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ।
ऐसा लगता है कि एक रुटीन टाइप का

बजट, कुछ रूटीन टाइप के जो प्रोपोजल्स हैं वही फिर एक बार सदन के सामने आये हैं। पिछले साल की तरह कुछ चीजों पर टैक्सेज बढ़ा दिये गये हैं, कन्वर्ट कर दिये गये हैं, ऐडवेलोरम कर दिये गये हैं और कुछ नई चीजों को टैक्स के परव्यु में लेने की कोशिश की गई है। इनका नतीजा क्या होगा! नतीजा तो इन सब का यही होगा कि चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ेंगी और चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ने से एक आम आदमी पर, विशेष तौर पर सोसायटी के जो पूअर सेक्शंस हैं उन पर ज्यादा बोझ पड़ेगा। कहा जाता है कि टैक्सेज सैच्युरेशन प्वाइंट पर पहुंच रहे हैं, लेकिन कीमतें भी सैच्युरेशन प्वाइंट पर पहुंच रही हैं। क्या वित्त मंत्री जी कोई ऐसी स्टेज हमारे देश में किसी समय में ला सकेंगे जबकि वे कह सकेंगे कि प्राइसेज का बढ़ना इससे ज्यादा नहीं होगा, प्राइसेज को कंट्रोल कर लिया गया है और अब प्राइसेज जो हैं वे और बढ़ने नहीं दी जायेंगी। ऐसा लगता है कि जिस प्रकार से यह बजट साल के साल आ रहे हैं उस से प्राइसेज को कंट्रोल करना संभव नहीं होगा। आज कुछ लोग इस प्रकार से अपनी डिमांड रख रहे हैं कि उससे मजबूर हो कर के वित्त मंत्री जी नये-नये प्रोपोजल्स हर साल ला रहे हैं। इससे प्राइसेज का स्ट्रक्चर, ढांचा जो है वह मेन्टेन नहीं हो पा रहा है। इससे लोगों की हार्डशिप बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ेगी। मैं चाहता हूं कि वित्त मंत्री जी इस बात की जांच ठीक प्रकार से करायें।

कुछ प्रोपोजल्स ऐसे हैं जिन पर इस सदन में काफी चर्चा हुई है। दुर्भाग्य का विषय यह है कि वित्त मंत्री जी किसी भी ऐसे आर्गुमेंट को सुनने के लिये तैयार नहीं हो रहे हैं या उनसे कन्विंस होने के लिये तैयार नहीं हो रहे हैं

कि वे प्रोपोजल्स जो हैं वे ठीक नहीं हैं। मेरा रिफेंस फर्टिलाइजर्स ड्यूटी पर और एग्रीकल्चरल वैल्थ टैक्स पर है। यह खुशी की बात है कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने परप्स पर जो ड्यूटी थी वह वापस ले ली है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि कौन सा वह आर्गुमेंट है जिसकी वजह से पम्प्स पर तो ड्यूटी वापस ली गई है, लेकिन फर्टिलाइजर्स पर ड्यूटी वापस नहीं ली जा रही है। आखिर फर्टिलाइजर्स पर जो ड्यूटी लगी है उसका असर भी किसानों पर पड़ेगा, किसानों को जो प्रोडक्शन करना है उसकी कीमतों पर उसका असर पड़ेगा। अगर फर्टिलाइजर की कीमत ज्यादा देनी पड़ती है तो किसान की कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बढ़ती है, अगर कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बढ़ती है तो किसान नेचुरली अपनी प्रोड्यूस की ज्यादा कीमत मांगेगा। अगर उसको हम ज्यादा पैसे देने के लिए तैयार नहीं होते तो नेचुरली डिस्कन्टेन्टमेंट किसान में होगा। डिस्कन्टेन्टमेंट आगे ही हमारे देश में बहुत ज्यादा है, और डिस्कन्टेन्टमेंट आने से हमारी इकानामी पर बहुत असर पड़ेगा। किसान इस इकानामी को इम्प्रूव करने के लिए अपना पार्ट प्ले कर रहा है।

ग्रीन रिवोल्यूशन की बात हम करते हैं। उसमें यह विवाद का विषय है कि वाकई ग्रीन रिवोल्यूशन हुआ है। मैं इस बात को मान कर चलता हूं कि प्रोडक्शन में बढ़ोतरी हुई है। अब भी हम विदेशों से बहुत सा माल मंगा रहे हैं, बहुत सा अनाज भी लिया। इस साल भी 175 करोड़ रुपए का अनाज मंगाने का प्रश्न हमारे सामने है। अन्न की समस्या अभी तक हम पूरी नहीं कर पा रहे हैं और हम ग्रीन रिवोल्यूशन की बात करते हैं। जब किसान इसमें अपना पार्ट प्ले करता है,

[श्री तन लाल जैन]

इस शार्टेज को मीट करने की कोशिश करता है, मेहनत करता है अपने फील्ड पर तो उसके रास्ते में हम रोड़ा अटका रहे हैं और इस तरह प्रोडक्शन को एफेक्ट करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। यह नीति अच्छी नहीं होगी। इससे किसान में डिस्कन्टेन्टमेंट पैदा होगा। मैं वित्त मंत्री जी की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि अगर फर्टिलाइजर की कीमत और भी ज्यादा बढ़ जायेगी तो भी किसान उसको इस्तेमाल करेगा, उसके पास कोई चारा नहीं है, प्रोटेस्ट करके भी करेगा, लेकिन इसका रिजल्ट यही होगा कि उसकी कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ जायेगी और कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बढ़ जाने से वह ज्यादा कीमत मांगेगा और अगर आप नहीं दे पाएंगे तो डिस्कन्टेन्टमेंट का घिनौना चक्कर चलेगा। दूसरी बात वैल्यू टैक्स के बारे में है। मैं प्रिंसिपली उसके अगेंस्ट नहीं हूँ। सवाल यह होता है कि यह मौजू मौका है वैल्यू टैक्स को लगाने का। हमारे देश में लैंड पर करीब-करीब सभी प्रान्तों ने सीलिंग लगा रखी है। सीलिंग का मतलब यह है कि किसी जगह पर किसी आदमी को जमीन जायदाद 20, 25, 30 एकड़ से ज्यादा नहीं होगी। जो लिमिट वित्त मंत्री जी प्रपोज कर रहे हैं वह डेढ़ लाख रुपए का है। सवाल पैदा होगा कि किस प्रकार से इसका वेल्युएशन किया जायगा? अगर वेल्युएशन करते हैं तो कदा वह वेल्युएशन दुरुस्त होगा या नहीं होगा। आम तौर पर यह देखा गया है कि जमीन हेरेडिटरी प्रापर्टी है जेनरेशन टु जेनरेशन। कितना भी कीमत दे लो, किसान अपनी जमान बेचने के लिए तैयार नहीं होगा, उसी सूरत में बेचेगा जब अटमोस्ट नेसेसिटी समझेगा, नहीं तो वह उसको अपना मां-बाप समझता है और बेचने के लिए तैयार

नहीं होता। पैसे के केल्व्युलेशन में वह जमीन को कभी भी नहीं लेता। किस प्रकार से जमीन की वेल्युएशन होगी यह बात समझ में नहीं आती। इससे बहुत लम्बे चौड़े कम्प्लीकेशन पैदा होंगे। इस प्रोपोजल से ईलड बहुत थोड़ी होंगे वाली है लेकिन बहुत बड़ी स्केयर पैदा होगी। नतीजा क्या होगा? नतीजा यह होगा कि इस टैक्स से बचने के लिए और ज्यादा फ्रेगमेंटेशन होगा, लोग छोटे-छोटे टुकड़े कर देंगे, छोटे-छोटे टुकड़े करके जमीन को रखने की कोशिश करेंगे। ज्यादा फ्रेगमेंटेशन से असर क्या होगा? प्रोडक्शन पर असर पड़ेगा, प्रोडक्शन कम होगा और देश को इकानामी सफर करेगी। 5 करोड़ रुपए के लिए इतना ज्यादा हम कर रहे हैं, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह देश की इकानामी के हित में भी नहीं होगा। जब वित्त मंत्री जी ने कहा कि इस 5 करोड़ को रकम को स्टेट्स को ही लौटा देना है तो यह जो मसला है इसको स्टेट्स पर ही छोड़ देते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। स्टेट्स में जहां डेवलपमेंट हुआ है जमीनों पर बेटरमेंट लेवी लगी है, पंजाब में बेटरमेंट लेवी लगी है और बेटरमेंट लेवी से वे रेवेन्यू कमा रहे हैं। इसी प्रकार से कुछ स्टेट्स ने एग्रोकल्चरल इनकम टैक्स लगाया है। जहां पर लोग ज्यादा कमा रहे हैं, जहां मंडर्न मेथड्स को एडाप्ट किया और उससे अपना प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाया है वहां स्टेट्स ने एग्रोकल्चरल इनकम टैक्स लगाया है और उसने वे पैसा निकालने हैं। मैं समझता हूँ ऐसे छोटे मोटे मेजरम स्टेट्स पर छोड़ देने चाहिए। एग्रोकल्चरल प्रापर्टी स्टेट्स के परब्यू में है और अगर स्टेट्स पर छोड़ दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता ताकि स्टेट्स वाले चाहें तो वे सेंटर को एडवाइस पर यह ले सकते और अपनी इनकम को बढ़ा सकते।

मैं समझता हूँ कि सिर्फ 5 करोड़ रुपए के लिए यह स्केयर जमींदारों में पैदा करना कभी भी लाभदायक नहीं हो सकता।

एक बात जिसकी ओर मैं वित्त मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि लो इनकम ग्रुप के लिए एक कठिनाई अभी भी है। चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ रही हैं, कास्ट आफ लिविंग बढ़ रही है लेकिन वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो मिनिमम टैक्सेबिल लिमिट है उसको बढ़ाने की कोशिश नहीं की है, कोई भी रिलीफ लो इनकम ग्रुप के लोगों को देने के लिए वे तैयार नहीं हैं। भूत-लिंगम कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में साढ़े 7 हजार रुपए तक का सुझाव दिया गया था कि मिनिमम टैक्सेबिल लिमिट साढ़े 7 हजार रुपए होनी चाहिए लेकिन पता नहीं क्यों इस ओर तवज्जा नहीं दी गई है। साढ़े 7 हजार रुपया आजकल बहुत ज्यादा इनकम नहीं है, कोई ऐसी ज्यादा चीज नहीं है जिससे एक परिवार अपना खर्च इस कास्ट आफ लिविंग में अच्छी तरह कर सके। फिर भी उसे टैक्सेशन के परब्यू में लिया जा रहा है। इसका कितना औचित्य है यह बात समझ में नहीं आती। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन दो-तीन चीजों की तरफ वित्त मंत्री जी ध्यान देंगे।

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to take up responsibility is not very easy. It may look glamorous, but it is not a bed of roses. We are all complaining about the taxation policy of the Government. How can any Government run without my taxation? People want many benefits. MPs want more salary and allowances. How can any Government run the administration and govern without my taxation? It is impossible. Economists have defined a number of canons of taxation. How far these canons of taxation have been followed by the illustrious Finance Minister is a thing

10—10RSS/ND/69

which we will have to examine. I do not like to criticise anybody for the sake of criticism. I am really very happy to find the illustrious Finance Minister running the fiscal administration of this country. Ever since I heard Mr. Desai, our Finance Minister at the last session of All-India Congress Committee held at Bangalore where he was the sole person to indefatigably defend the principles of the Congress Party by not allowing Mr. Kamaraj to continue for a second term—such a bold man he is—I thought that he was fit to be the Prime Minister of India. Naturally he deserves many more things. I am not flattering him here. I agree with many of our friends who paid glorious tributes to him. I would also like to join with all of them, provided he can adjust himself to the changing conditions of the Indian economy. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the greatest blunders that the Indian Government in all these twenty years have committed are the blunders of the division of India into linguistic States, the imposition of Hindi and various other things, the taxation policies which crippled the industrialists and curbed their undertakings besides their spirit of enterprise and enthusiasm. All these things have simply crippled and dwarfed the interests of all our economy. What is the net result? The purchasing power of money is not worth even 10 per cent now, why, even 6 or 7 per cent when compared to the purchasing power of the Indian rupee in 1939. Who is responsible for this? Is not the Government of India responsible for all this economic plight? Alas, the Britishers have left us prematurely in this plight when we were all illiterate, when we were not sufficiently educated to man the administration of this country. Because they could not bear the troubles that the Congress were giving them in those days they honourably left us all to be ruled under such precarious conditions of livelihood.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Congress Government, for some two election periods, was run by people who had sacrificed, who were worthy of emulation, and the people who followed

[Shri G. A. Appan.]

them have/ not been so worthy of the trust that has been reposed in them. How far have we followed the principles of the late Mahatmaji who was the architect of our Indian freedom, whose was the key role in our Indian freedom, who was responsible for this. How far are we following the precepts that were followed by the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or the late Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri? No. Many of them do not. I am really very proud that we have an illustrious Prime Minister who is the worthy daughter of a worthy father to run the Government now. That is why I said yesterday that we want a strong Prime Minister, an able Prime Minister, to control the administration. If there is any black sheep, if there is anybody who is detrimental to the interests of the nation, she should be able to weed out such perrons. If there is anybody to get a bad name for the Government, she has to be bold to weed him out. Of course I honestly feel, Mr. Vice-Chairman, while Mahatma Gandhi said, "Let us not get more than Rs. 500 p.m."; how many people have increased their salaries? I think the Ministers have inflated their salaries because the power was in their hands. The country has reposed its trust in them by electing them as "Members of the Legislature or of Parliament not to increase their own salaries but to safeguard the interests of the many, to serve the larger interests of the nation, to serve the larger interests of the larger people, not a few vested interests, not a handful but the majority. Now how many people are unemployed in our country? Should not the Govern-mont take the problem of unemployment first and try to solve it and give effective employment, full-time employment and useful employment to derive more national income and tax revenue.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the hon. Minister has come here with a number of taxation proposals. Should not the Centre take a lesson from the Madras Government, the D.M.K. Government of Madras, which has not levied any new taxes in these two years? As such

where is the need for all these taxations by the Centre now?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: That is only because you are taking loans from the Government of India . . .

SHRI G. A. APPAN: We have already paid it. We are not the only Government, my friend.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Do not tell that.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: We are not the only Government getting it.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN: Government of India loans have come because there are no State loans.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: They can float their own . . .

SHRI G. A. APPAN: There are small and big States. This is not a jound economic or political principle. I think the Government will have to :ome once again immediately for the reorganisation of all the States into three or four compact administrative regions.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: What have you done regarding giving rice at one rupee a measure?

SHRI G. A. APPAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, by taxation of the fertiliser Jie Minister has committed a blunder, because by this policy we have now ome, as the story goes, between the Scylla and Charybdies. We are diving .nio deep waters, troubled waters, and further it is opening the Pandora's Box. Why is there so much of criticism against the Finance Bill? I am really very happy to say that this time the hon. Finance Minister has heard the other House and made certain amendments or adjustments to meet the wishes of the House. This Government will have to satisfy and meet the wishes of the members of this House also,

because when we go to our own places where the electorate have sent us to represent their grievances, people will ask: "You have allowed the Government of India to tax us, even the poorest farmers". I agree with Mr. Reddy that a fanner will have to spend at least Rs. 340 for every acre. How many people are there with one acre? I can also join hands with Mr. Reddy to request the hon. Finance Minister to please be kind and gracious enough to protect the fair name of the Indian Government and the fair names of the illustrious Finance Minister and the Prime Minister by abolishing or foregoing the tax on fertilizer—which is not very large for the Centre.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, lest I am stopped, let me first of all go to what we would like to have for our States. For a long time we have been asking for the provision of sufficient financial assistance for the Salem steel plant. Unfortunately or fortunately our Salem steel plant has been left out even in the Five Year Plan Scheme given to us recently, and the favour has gone to Hyderabad, I am told. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is meet and proper that the Government should provide for the starting of the Salem steel plant immediately at any cost. I request that the Finance Minister will be able to use his good offices to see that the Salem Steel Project is included forthwith in the budget. Furthermore, I see that there is undue concentration of wealth and industries in the northern parts of India when compared to our southern parts. So, it is the duty of the Central Government to see that States which are far less developed should be given top priority and utmost priority in the development of industries, large and small scale, rather than trying to enrich too much the already richer States. For this scheme I would request that the Government and the Finance Minister will be pleased to make arrangements for starting a small car project in our Tamil Nadu Sector, a scooter project, a number of fertilizer projects, tractor projects, starting of big industries and water reservoir projects as we have already submitted for I

the district of Ramnad about which I have already spoken a number of times to get more tax revenue and self-sufficiency in food. And I would request this Central Government to release sufficient funds for the reopening of all the textile mills in our State which have been closed for a long time, putting a number of our people out of employment and also not to pursue the policy of cement decontrol against which our Government stood, and a number of cement manufacturers from our State have sent a representation to the Government. I also request the Central Government for sufficient aid and assistance that all the vacant lands in the districts of Tirunelveli, Ramnad, Madurai, Tiru-chi and other parts of our Tamil Nadu have to be reclaimed sooner than later. We want sufficient funds for all our projects. When the Government spends money on productive items in our State they will be yielding appropriate results unlike the public sector projects eating away thousands of crores of the national resources and wealth.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been telling this House that every public sector project should have a small committee to look into the various aspects of productivity, profit and all these things, rather than troubling the illustrious Finance Minister about the loss in public sector undertakings. If the Finance Minister could be put in charge of all the public sector undertakings, I am sure he will be able to make a mark by putting everyone of them into full productivity, capacity, economy and efficiency and make them all earn not a small amount but earn sufficient economic profit. I know how far this Finance Minister is capable of doing if he is put in charge of those undertakings; he will be more useful to the country and he will be able to save our country from this utter economic devastation if he is put in charge of constructive programmes rather than putting him as the Finance Minister who is being teased by a number of people. We are unnecessarily putting him to all the unpleasant experiences.

[Shri G. A. Appan.]

Sir, plantation labour earns so much of foreign exchange for this country by producing tea, coffee and all those things. If the planter has to spend Rs. 10 more on fertiliser per acre according to our Finance Minister, we will only be lagging far behind in the foreign trade markets. With our high cost of production we will have to lose a lot of money in foreign exchange which we now obtain by plantation projects.

The quantum of fertiliser which we use in our country is the least in the whole world, that is 34 kilograms per hectare, whereas in the other advanced countries they use 300 to 600 kilograms per hectare. We are unable to meet even this demand of 34 kilograms per hectare. We are trying to import a portion of it. Is it not the duty of the Government to see that they start any number of fertiliser projects and in our country Without undue restrictions give as much encouragement to these policies as possible?

We are facing a grave deficit now in our country in the matter of food production. Mr. V. V. Giri, our revered last Vice-President and now the acting President, had given a very good suggestion—"Let us unite and connect by canals all the rivers from the north to the south rather than spending piecemeal every now and then on drought relief, famine relief, etc." Suppose all the waste waters that go to the sea are harnessed through canals and drafted throughout the length and breadth of this country, is there any doubt that our country will not be self-sufficient in food production? We will also be able even to export foodgrains to other countries. I would request the Government of India to maximise their investment in the development of agriculture and to start as many reservoir projects, construct dams and dig river canals to get more employment potential and tap capital wealth and added tax revenue.

I would also request the Government to immediately constitute small committees, not with 30 or 40 people who come only for one day. They

sit in a committee for one or two hours only and get previous three days' daily allowance. At times they sit only for half an hour or one. I would request the hon. Finance Minister to see that he sets up a committee of both the Houses to regulate and revise the constitution of these committees in so many projects. The Central Government should try to economise on the administration not only in the States and at the Centre but they should also try to regulate the expenditure that is being incurred on Parliament, parliamentary privileges and other parliamentary programmes.

Now that the Finance Minister is here, I would like to draw his attention to the fact that he will pay his special and immediate attention to see that the Hindi version and the English version of the Budget Speeches are not printed on the same page or backside of the same page and to save the printing charges and the paper that is being dumped on us unnecessarily. I would rather like to tear the Hindi portions and leave them aside. But unfortunately, in such a ridiculous way they are being printed side by side in the same page. You know that in other countries the Governments calculate the cost of expenditure incurred every minute, on every pin and every paper. But here there is so much of colossal waste by way of avoidable administrative expenditure on staff, on stationery, printing, postage, etc.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been a Government officer in the Department of Khadi and Village Industries. Sir, there is so much of colossal waste on unnecessary staff establishment and on uneconomic units. I think the Finance Minister would do well to look into the financial aspects, commitments, supervision and inspection side of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission projects. He should immediately constitute at least a committee of five people from both the Houses to look into the financial aspect of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission to evaluate as to how much money is being wasted in the Khadi and Village

Industries sector throughout this country. Those" in charge appoint persons only from their own caste and relatives only. In most of the Khadi and Village Industries Departments in all the States, the Harijans are not at all properly represented. In the name of Gandhiji, in the name of Congress, these people in the Khadi and Village Industries Commission and Boards only try to harass and exploit and boycott the Harijans in that sector.

I would request the Finance Minister and all the other Ministers to see that they try to protect the interests of the Scheduled Castes by seeing to it that they are represented up to 20 per cent in all the top-ranking jobs also beside other categories. I have been requesting the Central Government since 1950 to constitute a commission on their employment opportunities so that those constitutional provisions about Harijans are not a mockery, that they are safeguarded and that they are not a mere lip-service. The constitutional provisions and safeguards should be implemented effectively, properly, honestly and honourably.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, having been a textile man myself—I have been a textile technologist for over 40 years—I would say that the textile industry in India is the foremost major industry which has contributed to the economic development of this country to a greater extent than any other industry big or small. Even before many of these industries came in, the textile mill and handloom industry was the foremost and pioneering industry of our country. Now, you are trying to throttle that textile industry by undue taxation and excise duties. You are not giving them sufficient scope for improvement, to modernise and to reorganise. When I was a small boy, I used to have a dhoti for six annas, i.e., thirty-seven paise. Now that dhoti costs something like Rs. 2 or Rs. 2.50 or Rs. 3.50. You have tried to tax even coarse varieties used by the poorest men. Will there be any man or woman who can go out in the streets without properly clothing

himself or herself? Therefore, let the hon'ble Finance Minister remove the tax on the coarse cloth and yarn that he has now come forward with.

Furthermore, I told this House last time that this increased postal rate was going to put the country to a heavy loss. My forecast is coming true. Am I not correct? The more you begin to raise the postal charges, since the people are also clever, they will not use your postal services. Everybody is economy-conscious and they now employ their own men for the purpose. Therefore, I request the Finance Minister to appoint another Committee to see that the postal rates are reduced to the barest minimum.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: How many Committees?

SHRI G. A. APPAN: It will be saving the country's economy. Perhaps the Finance Minister is not interested in what I am saying. Perhaps I am speaking something not useful to him. If I am sneaking something not useful, let me not waste the precious time of the House. Unless I have some point to drive into him I will not waste the precious time of this august House.

Sir, I have been trained by eminent I.C.S. officers. I have not been trained by others. Anyhow, Sir, I would rather request the Government to see that they appoint technologists who know something and not because one is a Congressman or somebody's friend. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is the House of Elders, I am really very proud to find that most of the people here are eminently qualified. Mr. Mahida gave a very, very beautiful exposition of his views. Having heard Mr. Mahida, having heard Mr. T. N. Singh and having heard a number of other eminent people here, I feel, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as in other countries, we the hon'ble Members want to serve our country in every possible way. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me also say that we are clamouring for more "wages and benefits. I feel, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in this , poor country Members of Parliament

[Shri G. A. Appan.]

and the Legislatures should work honorarily and those who cannot support themselves need not come here. I am prepared to work honorarily. I have been a social worker all these years in an honorary capacity. I have been spending out of my pocket for public cause. What is the use of trying to get more and more money? But there are also persons like Mr. Bhu-pesh Gupta who spend most of their time for legislative business. Let such people get even Rs. 2,000 per month. Services of such honest men can be canalised and capitalised for the larger interest of the community and this country. Let such people be properly moulded. We want people who can spare their time for public and national cause. We do not want people, Mr. Vice-Chairman, who want a huge amount of salary, T.A., D.A. and all these things. If somebody wants some money to support himself, let him be given some work in the State sector projects and Departments. After all, ours is only four or five hours of work a day. I used to work, not four or five hours, but for sixteen to seventeen hours a day from my early childhood. We want many people who can spend some time for public work and national work. We want people who can serve the country in an honorary capacity and not people who cry for more and more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Would you please wind up?

SHRI G. A. APPAN: Only one or two more minutes. Regarding the unemployment problem among agricultural labour, it is the only labour which is not at all organised in our country. Fortunately the Agricultural Minister, the Food Minister, the Labour Minister who is also the Leader of the House, as also the Finance Minister, are all here. I would request these people to appoint a National Commission—Council on Agricultural Labour—to find out their problems and to see that they are well organised in every block first, then in every taluka, and district, then in the State

and then at the national level. If this one thing could be achieved, this would help the Harijans very much and the purpose of my mission or calling here.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, one thing more. The late Mahatma Gandhi was for a Harijan to be elected as the President of India. Sir, "India cannot be called independent unless a Harijan becomes the President", said the late Mahatma a number of times. He should be an eminent person, seniormost, reliable and a strong man, who will not be biased. We would like a strong Harijan to be made the President of India. I would request the Congress Party to take my advice to their head. Four times before I have spoken about this. Today for the fifth time also I say this. Let us remember and not forget what Gandhiji said. This has been my mission ever since Gandhiji uttered these words. I wrote to the late Panditji and to the other Prime Minister a number of times. You will find that on record since 1948. I have got with me a copy of what I wrote to them then. Mr. Vice-Chairman, let not my voice be heard in wilderness. Anyhow, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I belong to the Libra class who will not tell anything untrue, who will not claim anything unjust, who will be only just, fair, reasonable and honest.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, there are many things on which I wanted to speak. I have a lot of things to say. Let me not take more time of the House. I would request the hon'ble Finance Minister to abandon the idea of taxing fertilisers and to send sufficient money immediately to our Tamil Nadu Government and to various other State Governments, to reopen all the closed textile mills, to support the one rupee per measure policy of the Tamil Nadu Government and to provide all financial assistance towards that end. I would request you to come and see how an average Madras is suffering. On this occasion I want to add one more thing also here now. When our revered Anna went last to foreign countries he earned a great name for this country. So in the absence of our

beloved Anna I would request the Government to extend their generous co-operation to us. They should encourage the Tamil Nadu Government as also the other State Governments.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM
NIWAS MIRDHA): The House

stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at seven minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 12th May, 1969.