

## RAJYA SABHA

Saturday, the 25th April, 1964/thu 5th  
Vaisakha, 1886 (Sa/ca)

The House met at eleven of the  
clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

(i) THE DELHI MOTOR , VEHICLE;?  
(TENTH AMENDMENT) RULES, 1962

(ii) THE INTER-STATE TRANSPORT COM-  
MISSION (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1964

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT (< ;iti  
RAJ BAHADUR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table,  
under sub-section (3) 'of section 133 of the  
Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, a copy each of the  
following Notifications: —

(i) Notification No. F. 12/64/62-PR(T),  
dated the 11th October, 1963,  
publishing the Delhi Motor  
Vehicles (Tenth Amendment)  
Rules, 1962, issued by the Delhi  
Adminif-tration.

(ii) Ministry of Transport (Transport  
Wing) Notification N). 41-  
TAG(2)/63, dated the 6th March,  
1964, publishing the Inter-State  
Transport Commission  
(Amendment) Rules, 1964.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-  
2785/64 for (i) and (ii).]

### MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE COMPANIES (PROFITS) SURTAX  
BILL, 1964

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the  
House the following message

received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the  
Secretary of the Lok Sabha: —

"In accordance with the provisions of  
Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and  
Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am  
directed to enclose herewith a copy of the  
Companies (Profits) Surtax Bill, 1964, as  
passed by Lok Sabha, at its sitting held 'on  
the 22nd April, 1964.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is  
a Money Bill within the meaning of article  
110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

### THE FINANCE BILL, 1964—con- tinued

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sur had not  
finished his speech yesterday. He may do so  
now.

SHRI M. M. SUR (West Bengal): Mr.  
Chairman, Sir, in my opening remarks  
yesterday I mentioned how by following a  
different policy or the different rates of  
customs duty we are impeding the progress of  
industry. I have mentioned that petrol in India  
costs four times as much as it costs in the  
United States. So also diesel oil, heavy  
chemicals and other raw materials that we  
import for industrial use.

An'other important thing is furnace oil.  
Landed in Bombay it costs Rs. 78 and after  
levying 100 per cent, duty it costs Rs. 143 in  
Bombay and Rs. 106 in Calcutta. Furnace oil  
is a modern fuel. It is only with furnace oil  
that we can control the temperature t > a  
correct extent, making the desired variations  
in temperature. That is not possible with coal.  
It is by using furnace oil that you can get  
better products than you can get by using  
coal. With coal there is another difficulty—  
the disposal of ash in industrial areas. It  
becomes very difficult to dispose of ash when  
we use coal.

[Shri M. M. Sur.]

Therefore, Sir, we should think over the matter and follow the policies that are being followed by the countries which have industrialised themselves by keeping the prices of basic materials low, by not taxing motor spirit, diesel oil, furnace oil, heavy chemicals, etc., so that the cost of production remains low. In making industrial production, there is a certain amount of wastage. So, if your cost of material is high, you lose some more money by producing second-quality articles, slightly below the standard articles. That also prevents us from competing in the foreign market, in the export market. It is for that that a new incentive has been given that if we export then the foreign exchange earned can be utilised for importing things of our choice, and by selling or disposing them of we can make good the loss suffered in exporting the manufactured articles. Previously those manufacturers, who were unable to export, were paying a certain amount toward export promotion as their share. Now because of this advantage we find that there have cropped up middlemen who are coming forward for making exports so that they may utilise the foreign exchange earned for investing in something which they can sell at profit.

Small manufacturers, Sir, are usually simple folks. If you go into the history of the growth of small industries in any nation, you will find they always make a very small beginning. In Japan, some years ago—this is what we have noticed—70 per cent. of their industries had a capital below Rs. 5,000. So these small manufacturers, technicians, craftsmen, mechanics, who have the ability and enterprise, make a small beginning and then they make progress. They know how to work with their tools. They are not very clever in buying materials that may be sold at three times the cost price and making profits. When the raw materials cost more, when the cost of transport is high

and the price of furnace oil and other basic materials is high, they are unable to export because they find that the loss suffered by exporting the goods is so much that it would be difficult to cover that up by manufacturing more goods in the country, even if they import raw materials for manufacturing more goods. This is a very unhappy situation. Therefore, I wish the Finance Minister to consider whether they would change the policy of assessing duties and not follow what the Britishers had done for their benefit, by discouraging the growth of industries in this country, but follow what the other industrialised countries like Japan and West Germany have done. By following their approach, by following the way they developed their industries, we can encourage our small industries to grow.

Sir, a few days ago I read in the papers something. It was a survey of rural indebtedness, made by the Reserve Bank of India. In that it was shown that indebtedness was to the tune of Rs. 3,000 crores. For 74 thousand families, the average indebtedness was of the order of Rs. 406 which in 1961-62 rose by another Rs. 108. So, the possibility of starting new industries by finding capital in the villages is very remote. We will not be able to make any progress if we discourage the small entrepreneurs who are already in the field, or prevent other smaller people who want to come forward with small money. There are trained mechanics, good craftsmen and they want to labour hard. The question that is before us is how we are going to industrialise our country. In the villages they have no technical know-how; they have no capital. It is available only in big cities where we get trained mechanics and craftsmen. I therefore request the Finance Minister to follow the policy which the other industrialised nations have followed.

In the initial stages if we reduce the cost of raw materials, electricity, transport and so on, the cost of pro-

duction will be low. At the final stage, of course, the Finance Ministry can take over the entire product of the small industries, market it locally and make arrangements for export. They have started distribution of foodgrains. So some machinery is already there—Government purchase sections and all that. Also they have experienced men who know how to make purchases. They understand the quality of different products. It is only just an enlargement of that machinery so that the goods may be purchased from the manufacturers wholesale and then distributed to the shopkeepers. Just as you are trying to do for foodgrains, you may do it so that the manufacturers would be relieved of much of the trouble. They usually get into the clutches of the shopkeepers. They advance them a little money and then buy it at a very reduced price. So, they will be out of their clutches and we should see that the small entrepreneurs, the technicians, the small mechanics will get encouragement to manufacture these things which will be acceptable and which will find a ready market.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I may make use of the interval to say that you have already spoken for nearly twenty minutes.

SHRI M. M. SUR: I do not want to speak very much. I want to say that instead of raising the cost of materials in three or four stages, namely, customs duties, protective duties and Central excise, you do it in one stage, in the final stage of manufacture, so that when the goods are manufactured there will be better chance for the growth of industries in this country. Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, the Finance Bill which the House is considering

has come as a great disappointment to many of us here and to a large number of people in the country. I quite realise that the Finance Minister bears a very heavy burden. He has to find resources to meet our commitments in respect of increased defence expenditure. While he has control over the fiscal policies of the Union Government, he does not have the same measure of control over the fiscal policies of the State Governments. The State Governments are not able to raise resources adequate enough for the implementation of the Plan and as years pass, the burden of implementing the Plan, the Third Plan and probably the Fourth Plan when it is framed, will fall heavily on the Union Government.

The Finance Minister, in the course of his observations, stated that the present taxation structure has been simplified so as to enable the lower income groups to get a large pay packet. The initial tax-free slab of income for the income range up to Rs. 20,000 has been suitably raised to provide further relief to these income groups. I am sorry that this claim of the Finance Minister is not accepted by those who have to pay income-tax. I raised the point, when the Budget was being discussed, that with the abolition of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme and the merging of the surcharge, the tax-payer in the small income group has got to pay more tax than he did in the past. The Compulsory Deposit was not a taxation measure. It was a saving measure. It was free from income-tax. The figures I mentioned on that occasion have, so far, not been repudiated. I do not know how far these figures are correct, but these figures are supplied by the Delhi Shareholders' Association of which Mr. R. N. Banerjee, an old friend of mine and a former Chairman of the U.P.S.C. is the President. According to this Association, these figures have the approval of Mr. R. N. Banerjee, one of the old civil servants of the country.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

The rate of income-tax applicable to individuals will be as follows. On the first Rs. 1,000 slab, there will be no income-tax. I am mentioning this point because the Finance Minister said that the lower income group will carry a bigger pay packet. This has been challenged by the Association. On the next Rs. 4,000 group, the taxation in 1961 was 3 per cent. In 1963, it was again 3 per cent, and in 1964 it is 6 per cent. I do not know how far these figures are correct, but I am mentioning them so that if the Finance Minister seeks to examine these figures, he will have a reply ready when he winds up the debate on this Bill. On the next Rs. 2,500 of income-tax slab, the taxation in 1961 was six per cent., in 1963 seven per cent, and in 1964 six per cent. There has been certainly a reduction in income-tax applicable to this category. In the third category of Rs. 2,500—that is to say Rs. 8,000—it was 9 per cent, in 1961, 10 per cent, in 1963 and 10 per cent, in 1964. There is no change. On the next Rs. 2,500 it was 11 per cent, in 1961, 12 per cent, in 1963 and 15 per cent. in 1964. These are categories which are capable of finding investment in the corporate sector. These are categories which are in a position to make savings.

Then, I go on to the next Rs. 2,500 slab. In 1961, it was 14 per cent, in 1963, 15 per cent, and in 1964 it is 15 per cent. On the next Rs. 2,500 slab it was 18 per cent, in 1961, 20 per cent, in 1963 and 20 per cent in 1964. There is no change. It is in the category beyond Rs. 25,000 that the taxation has been stabilised, viz., 1961—25 per cent., 1963—25 per cent, and 1964—25 per cent.

Now, I have given these figures to show that the claim of the Finance Minister is not correct. I have given these figures which have been analysed by Mr. Banerjee and others and submitted to the public.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh): These figures may also be wrong.

SHRI A. D. MANI: This is not a matter of politics or polemics. If these figures are wrong, the Minister can say so. I have already said in my remarks on the general Budget that it is not correct for the Finance Minister to say that he has lessened the burden of taxation on the lower income groups. The burden of taxation on certain categories of low income groups has increased, and how does he expect savings to flow from these categories into the public exchequer in the form of investment in Defence Certificates or in the corporate sector?

I would like to go on to another point made by the Finance Minister in his speech on the Finance Bill in this House as well as in the other House. I know his sincerity in trying to create an atmosphere and climate for more investment in the country. Whatever might be his views on the question of socialism, he, being a former and a very experienced businessman, knows that investment is necessary if the Plans are to be executed properly, and he has tried to see that some incentives are given to foreign investors, notwithstanding the barrage of criticism which has come from certain political groups in the country. I am one with the Finance Minister in the incentives which he has offered to foreign investors.

But the stock market is the barometer of the capital market. The stock market has reacted very badly to the Finance Minister's taxation proposals. The Finance Minister has said that he does not accept the stock market as the barometer. If he does not accept the stock market as the barometer, what is the barometer that he has in view? Has he in view the Finance Ministry or the Central Board of Revenue? It is the stock market which is an unfailing indication of the reaction of the investors to the taxation proposals of Government. The stock market has reacted very badly and I am afraid that some of the taxation proposals, which the

Finance Minister has placed before Parliament, are of such a character as to act as an acute disincentive; to more investment.

Before I go on to structure of taxation in the corporate sector, I would like to say that I have been one of those who have been of the view that the Compulsory Deposit Scheme should have been retained. I was not in favour of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme at the time in its entirety, but since the C.D.S. was introduced, some saving was given to the low income groups in respect of moneys that they deposited under the Compulsory Deposit Scheme. It had the value that it was free from taxation. The Finance Minister's proposal of an annuity scheme is not free from taxation 'because when the money is being paid in instalments, it will be added to the income of the person concerned who is assessed. The C.D.S. might have succeeded if Government had persisted with it, and if it is a question of choice between the present structure of taxation and the Compulsory Deposit Scheme. I would retain last year's compulsory deposit and not the present scheme.

In regard to annuities, the point I would like to make is that the Government had an excellent opportunity of trying to make the annuity scheme a social security scheme. The life insurance companies, particularly companies which are operating in foreign countries, have regular annuity schemes for which certain premia are paid every year, and at the end of 20 years or 25 years the person concerned receives a stable monthly income till the time of his death, and I know that there are certain insurance companies abroad which even provide for his funeral expenses. All of them are included in the annuity scheme. If the Finance Minister had framed an annuity scheme which would have been a social security measure, that would have been very widely welcomed in the country.

Sir, I would like to say further that with the introduction of the annuity scheme in slabs above Rs. 15,000 what the Finance Minister has done the effect is to see that persons below the Rs. 20,000 income group do not have the resources to invest money in the corporate sector or in the Defence Savings Certificates. We are all told that the country is marching towards a socialist form of society. I have been one of those who believe that it is inevitable that at some stage or other in the country's history, we have to accept socialism as the basis of the structure of our society. There are differences of opinion on the question of the pace and the approach. Barring these differences, a large number of persons agree with what is called the socialist ideal which the Government and the Congress organisation have placed before the country. But, Sir, if there is to be socialism in the country, investment has to come only from those categories of people who draw incomes of less than Rs. 20,000 a year. It will be seen that in the corporate sector of the United Kingdom, the bulk of the investment comes from people of the low income group. What the Finance Minister has done is: By imposing the annuity scheme and by imposing a taxation structure on the individual income of people he has prevented those categories of people from investing money. The only category which can invest money today is the rich sections of the people. The rich sections of the people are also going to be taxed by the punitive and confiscatory estate duty and by the punitive and confiscatory application of the gift tax with retrospective effect. So, how is he going to find the money for investment?

I would like to go on to the question of taxation of the corporate sector. I must confess that all of us do not have readily available to us all the necessary figures in respect of private companies. But according to the figures that I have, the companies which are covered by section 104 are as many as 19,500 in the country.

[Shri A. D. Mani.] and this group has a total capital command of Rs. 400 crores. It has been again alleged—and these figures again have got to be examined—that the taxation on this group of companies has been increased from 50 to 60 per cent. When all the surcharges and the deduction for income-tax at the source, all these are taken into consideration, there has been an increase in the taxation of this group of companies. I am not enamoured of the companies which come under the category of section 104 companies. They are companies controlled by small groups. But today, the fact remains that the bulk of the corporate sector activity is largely run by these people. It is unfortunate that persons who have got such extensive command over financial resources, who are a small group in the country, should continue to direct the economic activity of the country in the corporate sector.

I am in favour of the steps taken, by the Finance Minister to appoint a Monopolies Commission, but when capital formation is inadequate and when capital formation has been frightened by the taxation proposals, who is going to invest money? Are these the people who are going to invest money or the people who are earning Rs. 20,000 who are going to invest money? I have already said that the groups below Rs. 20,000 income per annum are not in a position to make a contribution towards the corporate sector. I feel that in regard to these matters, the time has come for us to have a *de novo* enquiry into the question of taxation of incomes and the corporate sector judged in the light of the results of the Third Plan and the requirements of the Plans to come in the future. It is necessary that such an enquiry should be conducted because the Government of India does not have before it adequate material to form a statistical appraisal of the financial requirements of a family and the financial requirements of the private sector.

I am not suggesting that such an enquiry should be conducted in order to avoid further taxation, but it is necessary that we should know what exactly are the limits to which Government's fiscal policies can go in making readjustments in our taxation system. I would like the Finance Minister, for example, to conduct an enquiry into the question of income of small families in the country. I have come to the conclusion that a family of a husband and wife and two children require as much as Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 a month for just existence, let alone the question of comfort. Even workers are getting Rs. 100 as the pay packet from the textile mills, which includes dearness allowance which is sanctioned by the mills. I think it is necessary that such an enquiry into the taxation of personal incomes and the corporate sector should be conducted so that the Finance Minister may know what exactly we should have as an incentive or disincentive to capital formation.

I would like to go on to the question of tax on bonus issues as well as the capital gains tax on bonus issues which have been condemned all over the country. Capital gains tax on bonus issues is not a satisfactory way of raising financial resources because the capital gain, do not accrue as the bonus shares form a part of the investment of the company. Capital gains, naturally, accrue only when there is a transfer. Here there is no transfer, and this again has caused disincentive to capital formation.

I would like to go into the question of certain changes that he has made in respect of the incomes of persons employed by companies. I welcome the Finance Minister's decision to impose on companies the obligation of seeing that perquisites of employees in the company do not exceed 20 per cent, of their salary. But, in this matter, I am not trying to raise what may be called a cheap,

popular point of view. Example is better than precept. I wish he would apply it also to the Ministers of Government whose perquisites are much more than 20 per cent. Will the Finance Minister say that the perquisites are not more than 20 per cent, of the salaries which the Ministers draw at the present time? The Finance Minister said the other day in the other House—I am only paraphrasing roughly what he said—that the House in which he stayed was a pig-sty. A large number of persons, let alone pigs, would like to go and stay in the house which he occupies. I was very sorry that such a remark should have been made, because the cost of ministerial maintenance is very heavy in the country. I know that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari has a palatial residence in Madras and that perhaps, if he had been left to himself, he would not have chosen the house in which he resides, but these remarks come ill at a time when the expenditure tax is sought to be re-imposed. We should have a little more austerity living and I hope he will apply the rule regarding the perquisites of companies to the Ministers—that the perquisites of Ministers are not more than 20 per cent of their salary.

I would like to go on to the question of the imposition of the confiscatory and punitive levy of the estate duty. Sir, under the taxation structure as it stood before the Finance Bill, 40 per cent, was taken away as estate duty at a level of Rs. 50 lakhs but under the new structure, 40 per cent, will be levied on an estate of Rs. 10 lakhs and 50 per cent, on the next slab of Rs. 5 lakhs. That is, on Rs. 15 lakhs of estate value the taxation will be 50 per cent., and 85 per cent. will be the taxation on Rs. 20 lakh. I am not an admirer of the rich people. I do not want grave inequalities of income and wealth to exist in this country. But then, when the capital formation has been so poor and when the taxation proposals are

coming as an oppressive burden on the community, who is going to invest the money? As he said, the Finance Minister has made it possible only for the rich men to invest money, not for the poor men, and the rich man is also sought to be killed. I would like the estate duty to be put on the lines of the Act in England where a count is taken for the necessity of maintaining some incentives to savings.

Sir, I have been to the Soviet Union also. I have also seen how the Communist society functions. Even in a Communist society where the persons are asked to work on collective farms, a small plot of land is given by the State in order that the person concerned may cultivate a vegetable garden. Thus, the Soviet Union also recognises the need for a personal incentive.

SRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated)  
: Not more than three fourths of an acre.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Whatever it is. It is a separate garden. I mean, they measure the (incentive in terms of three-fourths of an acre. There is necessity for an incentive for savings so that the person concerned may have some savings of his own which he can pass on to his family. I would like the estate duty to be rationalised and I feel that the burden of 85 per cent, tax on Rs. 20 lakhs will only frighten away people and will prevent them from effecting the necessary savings when are called for at the present juncture.

There is one more point. Under Mr. Krishnamachari's proposals, after three generations there will be no rich people left in this country. I can assure you (Interruptions) that three generations later, there will be a larger number of people who have got undisclosed income as a result

[Shri A. D. Mani] of blackmarketing and evasion of the taxation laws and the numerous procedural laws which have been inflicted upon the country from day to day.

I would like, finally, to conclude by referring to the provision regarding the disclosure of income under the income-tax law. I welcome the amendment which the Finance Minister accepted in the Lok Sabha to the Finance Bill under which the Commissioner of Income-Tax is under an obligation to disclose the income of an assessee on receipt of a representation or an application only on grounds of public interest. I am very happy that this provision has been introduced but I would like the Finance Minister to consider this question that before he issues the procedural instructions under this Act, he should make it clear to the Commissioner that when a letter is received by him asking for the disclosure of information of the income-tax of an assessee, he should write to the person concerned, he should give an opportunity to the assessee concerned to state his case. Suppose a person feels that this information is called for for blackmailing purposes, he can come forward and tell the Commissioner of Income-Tax that you should not give this information to this person, this person is personally prejudiced against me. This can be done by the procedural instructions that the Central Board of Revenue may issue from time to time. I do hope that this step will be taken and that all attempts will be made to see that this information is not misused for personal purposes.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Chandra-sekhar. He is making his maiden speech.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR (Madras) : Sir, I rise to support the Finance Bill and congratulate the hon. Finance Minister on his masterly, excellent and, if I may use the word,

ingenious manner of making provisions in it to satisfy the demands of the country today. One section of the House has complained that he has not gone far enough to implement the Bhubaneswar Resolution on Democratic Socialism and that he has been giving a leeway and a little fillip, perhaps to foster economic growth at a high level, to the large industries. On the other hand, people in other sections of the House complain, bitterly that he has gone too far with numerous taxations, imposts, levies, measures, resulting in a crushing burden on the average Indian taxpayer today. The very fact that the Finance Bill has evoked such opposite, extreme and diverse views means to some extent that he has struck the golden path of a middle way, which, in the present circumstances of the country's demands, is the only way that we can go.

We must sympathise with the Finance Minister's task which is threefold and which is before him, firstly of raising the level of living of the country's long-suffering masses by providing them not only the basic irreducible minimum requirements of decent human existence in terms of food, clothing, housing, education, public health, recreation and leisure but also providing certain amenities — I may even go to the extent of saying, luxuries—and raising their level so that it may not be said that the country is in incredible, unashamed poverty. Secondly, he has the task of providing adequate defences to defend and guard our political freedom against both Pakistan and China. And thirdly, he has something new in his hands, that of rehabilitating and resettling the refugees from East Pakistan, which is causing such a headache to the Government. If we think of all the problems of the country, which the Government are facing, it is right that he is asking everybody to dig deep into their pockets and pay the money.



I think the Opposition is grossly misled on the one hand when it says that the country is so poor and the Government during the last sixteen years has done nothing about it and at the same time when it attacks the Finance Minister and says that the Finance Bill has gone too far. I wish they would make up their minds and see the good side of it. It is forgotten why all these imposts, all these taxations are there. Is it a big *tamasha*? Government has a task of providing the people all the basic necessities. We want to provide them. We do not want political freedom alone. Unless you guarantee economic freedom, social advancement and educational growth, political freedom will be a mockery. You should guarantee these basic requisites of, shall I say, civilised human existence.

And then, Sir, when all this is meant for the people, I do permit myself to remark that while the national income and the total wealth of the country have perceptibly increased in the last sixteen years, the available statistics provided by both the Government and private organisations reveal that the *per capita* income, the individual family's prosperity and the average family's share of the total wealth of the country have not perceptibly or proportionately increased; and therefore there is the legitimate criticism that while the nation has advanced remarkably, the man in the far-flung remote villages of the country has not benefited as he ought to have. Here comes the problem of what we are to do with the growing numbers. We are increasing the wealth, we are increasing the goods, commodities and the services, as any economist can bear witness to the fact. Government has done much. It has brought new land under cultivation, increased the *per capita* yield, the per acre's yield; they have started new industries; more goods and services are flowing out of these factories, and yet the lot of the com-

mon man is not as it ought to be. We plead guilty to that fact and the reason is not the Government's fault because the population is multiplying at an enormously rapid rate. Sometimes, almost a critic might say that the national emblem ought to be the rabbit. How are you going to control this population growth? The population has been increasing at an alarming rate irrespective of the Government's present measures. Today our population has exceeded 460 millions. This is extraordinary. And at the rate of nine millions as the net annual addition to the existing population, according to my projection, by 1971 when the next Census is due, we shall have more than 526 millions. And with the existing fertility, morality, migration and marriage rates, by 1981 we shall exceed 650 millions. These numbers are so formidable that we might say, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Sir, something must be done about this population growth. I am very serious about this. We have been talking about it. I do realise that the Government of India has taken a very courageous and progressive stand on the question of family planning and birth control. In the last fifteen years, we have conducted several attitude surveys of all castes, of all religious groups, of various income levels in the rural and urban areas among married couples—fathers and mothers—who have at least one child, and they have expressed themselves categorically in favour of family planning. And some 67 per cent, of the fathers are in favour of family limitation and about 75 per cent, of the mothers have said that they do want to limit the size of their families for health or economic reasons.

The Government has provided some help. I do not deny it. But I want something more to be done than mere lip service and relegation of it simply to official levels. We want to import a missionary zeal in going to the root of the problem in

[Dr. S. Chandrasekhar.] the forgotten and remote villages of India so that every man who is married or every mother who is desperately in need of it is provided with the service on the spot not in an officious manner but in a dedicated, missionary manner. If we do that, I am sure we will succeed.

Here I may plead very frankly, Sir, that sterilisation is the only answer to the population problem of our country. I have been in this field during the last 25 years. I have travelled in some 76 countries studying this question during the last twenty years, not as a tourist, Sir, but studying, meeting people and working as a research demographer, and <sup>am</sup> convinced that the kind of remedies that we have been recommending and suggesting to the people at large are not delivering the goods today. And, therefore, the only solution in the present context of economic development and social progress is a kind of permanent conception control, namely vasectomy for the father, or salpingectomy for the mother provided it is voluntary; and I know the people are willing to receive surgical sterilisation.

Here I may, in passing, say that the Finance Minister must also consider giving a bonus of Rs. 100 for every parent—father or mother who is willing to undergo voluntary sterilisation. I know health is a Concurrent subject and I know that the States have taken a lead in it but their resources are not adequate. I would like to congratulate the States of Madras, Maharashtra and Kerala which have taken steps in the right direction in this matter. But the steps they have taken have not gone far enough. I have calculated—I shall not disturb the House with detailed statistics as to how many operations we should have in the next ten years to effectively reduce the birth rate. We must be able to reduce the birth rate from 40 to 20 by

various methods. Therefore, I hope that the Finance Minister will seriously consider the question of making available to the State Governments a Central fund for this specific purpose of a bonus. If he thinks that it will mean a lot of expenditure, here is a suggestion to augment our resources. He can recover this bonus expenditure by a marriage tax, a kind of levy on every marriage. Well, I would not perhaps, call it a marriage tax but a fee. Let there be a marriage licence as they have in some of the advanced countries. That is, the Government can charge a small fee for a licence for the couple to get married. We do not have statistics for marriages. I looked into the Census report but there are no figures for the total number of marriages performed in our country because they are not registered. The Hindu priest, whether he is a Brahmin or a non-Brahmin, does not have a legal status comparable to the priests in other religions. Apart from convention, he should have some legal status in order to enable him to register every wedding or marriage, which will provide all the statistics required by the Government for demographic purposes.

Sir, as our society is becoming more complex, urbanised and industrialised and as women's freedom increases, separations and divorces may take place, and it is necessary to have detailed data for demographic, legal, health and revenue purposes. I believe, Sir, that a marriage in even the poorest family costs about Rs. 1,000. A levy or a tax or a fee of Rs. 25 per marriage would give the Finance Minister enough money to spend on services required for vasectomy or sterilisation or family planning. I hope the Finance Minister will seriously consider this suggestion when an occasion arises to see, as it obtains in some advanced countries, that a fee is taken and in return a certain service is given or a provision is made for the medical examination of the prospective couple before getting

married. This would enable the Government to give them during their married life all help towards birth control and other health services.

Sir, the next point that I want to make in this connection is that the population problem is at the bottom of all our problems. You will forgive me for saying that. The more I examine this question, the more we see our tax proposals, and the more we see our nearly vain efforts, it seems to boil down, whether we like it or not, to the demographic factor and nothing more. What is all this trouble about? Despite the statistics and a series of Census reports from 1871, 1891, 1901 up to 1961, we have hundreds of questions going unanswered because we just do not have enough studies and statistics about the population question. Therefore, the point that I would like to make is on the pressing need for a national population commission composed of non-official demographers, economists, sociologists, medical men, anthropologists and statisticians and Government members concerned with demographic problems. If such a commission with wide terms of reference can explore into numerous aspects of our national population...

SHRI A. D. MANI: Members of the Opposition also.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR: Yes, Members of the Opposition also. They can produce a report in a year or 30, as Great Britain, Sweden and France have done, so that we may have a body of facts and figures, a body of irreproachable data on which the Government can base national, economic and social policies for the rehabilitation of this country.

And last, I would like to mention the present refugee problem. Though people are importing into it political bias and ideologies, here I speak purely as a demographer and a social scientist. We are getting a tremen-

dous number of refugees from East Pakistan into West Bengal. Unfortunately, till now this has been looked upon as a West Bengal problem. I am one of those people who believe that it is not a West Bengal problem. It is a tragedy for West Bengal. We are very sorry for West Bengal. But West Bengal is saturated with so many people that she cannot accommodate any more people. Therefore, it must be treated as a national problem.

In this respect, Sir, some people have mentioned that we should have an exchange of minorities. Let me tell you, Sir, that I am against such an exchange because India is wedded to the secular ideal and it has been trying to practise it as far as possible and, I think, we have remarkably succeeded as per the testimony given by the Muslims and members of minority communities in our country. But, unfortunately, from whatever we have read and from my own visit to Pakistan, I am persuaded to believe that Pakistan, both in theory and in practice, is a theocratic country and they apparently want to eliminate their minorities in the long run. Therefore, we as a secular republic have to take into our bosom all the unwanted minorities in East Pakistan.

Sir, I looked into the Pakistan Census report the other day. The figures show that we have in East Pakistan a little less than one crore of Hindus, Buddhists and Christians. Since this problem is a perennial and a perpetual one, may I submit very seriously to the Government of India that they should make a long-phased programme, by either diplomatic means or otherwise, to take all these minorities out of Pakistan and not put them in West Bengal alone but distribute them all over India, preferably South India where—I want to pat myself on the back—we have no communal problems whatsoever, and rehabilitate them and resettle them so that

[Dr. S. Chandrasekhar.] we will never have the problem of Pakistan exploiting, ill-treating or even resorting to a kind of genocide as far as their minorities are concerned. I say this because I know that we are wedded to the ideal of secularism in this country. But since Pakistan is a theocratic State, the problem of refugees has to be a one-way traffic.

We are trying to protect our minorities as best as we can, despite deviations here and there. I am sure once we bring these minorities into our country, we shall be doing very well indeed. I have no doubt about it. Therefore, if these problems are tackled—as I believe they ought to be with some energy and zeal—as a country we will be able to give a better deal and a better way of life to our people. We want not only political stability and economic progress but also lasting peaceful relations with our neighbours. In fact, peace is our cherished goal. And we can provide and achieve peace better if we can solve our demographic problem.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Mr. Chairman, coming immediately after Dr. Chandrasekhar, may I congratulate the Congress Party on a very welcome acquisition to its debating strength which very badly needed it. If this were a debate on the question of population, I could have gone into detail in dealing with some of the arguments of Dr. Chandrasekhar, but the world has discovered many better methods of controlling population than the drastic method of sterilisation which he recommended to this country.

Girls' education, which under the Congress regime has been deplorably low, the raising of the marriage age, these are devices which have been followed by other countries to control population. Against the demographer, may I quote the opinion of Barbara Ward, the Economist, who

from historical and economic experience, has shown that population diminishes as economic growth advances. Most of the industrially advanced countries have been able to control their population and I think it is in that direction that not only the economic prosperity of the country but the control of its population can be effected, not by the suicidal methods which Dr. Chandrasekhar, being a demographic expert, has recommended to the country. May I leave the solution of this problem to the demographic expert on the one hand and the financial expert on the other hand, both on the Congress side?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: May I ask a question? You said that there are countries which have controlled the growth of population without recourse to what is being characterised here as artificial birth control process. Can you tell us which country has controlled the problem of the growth of population merely by raising the age level for marriage and through economic prosperity?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY:

All the Western countries have done it. They did not have recourse to birth control at all till recent times.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): He is only objecting to sterilisation ....

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Coming to the subject of the debate, the more relevant subject of this debate, the Finance Bill deals with taxes whereas the Appropriation Bill dealt with expenditure, and although you have ruled that there is no objection to the Finance Bill coming before the Appropriation Bill had been dealt with, I think it was improper for the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to have arranged for a debate on the Finance Bill before the Appropriation Bill had been taken out of the way. I think, as contrasted with the

domestic budget, a State Budget deals first with the expenditure and then they find the money, the income that is required to meet the necessary expenditure.

The Finance Bill, as the whole Budget as I said, reveals a struggle in the mind of the Finance Minister between his duty as a financier interested in the economic growth of the country and as a socialist which he has become in recent years. You find this struggle between the two personalities running through the whole of his taxation system. For instance, in the Income-tax he has given relief to the middle-income groups by way of exemption. On the dividends tax—and he has continued the dividends tax in a country where capital is proverbially shy—the exemption to new companies is illusory because it may not last. One Finance Minister took away that exemption and another has restored the exemption.

With regard to companies and corporations again reliefs and rebates have been given to manufacturing and processing as well as other industries. These reliefs and rebates would be welcome if they stood alone, but then there are other measures which take away with one hand what he has given with the other. The development rebate that he has announced, is not to continue after April 1966. This may have a depressing effect on foreign investing companies. It is another instance of giving with one hand a concession and taking away with the other hand another relief. The tax on Annuity deposits when returned is rather unfair because the very Compulsory Deposit is a temporary taxation. You take away so much money out of the hands of the depositor and when the money that you have taken is returned, you impose income-tax on it. The tax on capital gains is divided into two classes—the tax on gains on houses and landed property where the rate of tax is 75 per cent, of the rate appropriate to the assessee, and the tax on

other capital gains on other movable assets is 50 per cent. This discrimination against landed property is in keeping with the social philosophy of the Congress Party.

As for the wealth tax, estates worth a small sum of Rs. 1 lakh, which is small in our country, is brought within its ambit, and as for the estate duty, more than one Member has pointed out the extreme hardship of the imposition of the duty of 85 per cent, on estates worth more than Rs. 20 lakhs. These people affected by the wealth tax and the estate duty and the expenditure tax, are the people who furnish the capital of the country.

When we turn to the indirect taxes, we see that very little relief has been given to the common people, to the masses. No doubt, some relief is given to the users of gramophone records, aerated waters and soap manufactured in the villages. What proportion of the masses of people can benefit from these reliefs? There is abolition of suicharge on iron and steel but increase in the excise duty on pig iron and other kinds of steel and steel products. The transfer of excise duty from fibres to iron and processed cloth will not help the spinning and weaving industry of the country. Duty on imported cars has been reduced from 150 per cent, to 60 per cent. We all thought that it was a good measure of liberalisation of our import policy but the ban on the import of cars has not been removed. So, what is the number of cars that will benefit from this concession? A few cars used by tourists in the foreign countries or by diplomats and officials serving in the foreign countries who return to our country,—forming a small class of people—that could benefit by this relief. The net result of this Budget is that there is an addition of Rs. 40 crores to the revenue. Rs. 15 crores from direct taxes and Rs. 25 crores from indirect taxes. No relief therefore, has been given to the indirect taxpayer which is worth considering.

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

A curious argument was advanced by the Finance Minister that whatever relief you give in connection with the indirect taxes to the consumer, it will not benefit the consumer but will benefit the middleman. Are the financial resources of the Government so weak that they cannot get at the middle-man, that they cannot prevent the middle-man from absorbing all the benefit that accrues from relief given to the indirect tax-payer?

12 NOON

And then, there is another source of revenue which the Finance Minister and the Finance Ministry seem to have neglected. No doubt, evasion of income-tax is to be met by more measures which are of a penal character, but then this only means that the war between the Income-tax Department and the income-tax assessee is to continue and to continue fiercely. It will lead to greater evasion because, for every rule of the Department, there is a dodge invented by the assessee. It is due to the high and complicated system of income-tax that all this evasion has been made possible. Just as high customs duties lead to smuggling, so also a high and complicated system of income-tax leads to its evasion. Adam Smith, himself an excise official, recommended that low rate of duty would lead not only to honesty but also to productiveness.

Not enough measures have been taken against smuggling. I learn that the whole of the customs department has about six to eight launches in order to prevent smuggling. What is six to eight launches for a sea coast which is 3,000 miles long? I have written and I have spoken recommending the organisation of an efficient coast guard. Every country which has an extensive coast-line has organised a coast guard which prevents smuggling; it has a fleet of boats cruising all over the country in order to prevent smuggling of any kind. I learn that these launches are not able to go very near the coast. But it is near the coast that all the smuggling

is organised. A regular stream of smuggling boats comes from the Persian Gulf to our coasts and indulge in smuggling of gold and other articles. It is the small boats which can hug the coast that will be able to prevent the smuggling. I hope the Finance Minister, if he is interested in the collection of this lost revenue due to smuggling, will give his mind to the question of organising an efficient coast guard for India.

Low taxation and economic prosperity have been linked together from the beginning of economic and financial history. From Gladstone to Kennedy, financial statesmen have recommended the reduction of taxes in order to increase economic prosperity. Even the Finance Minister, left to himself, would have reduced the number of taxes and the rates of taxation. But in addition to being Finance Minister, as I said, he is a socialist, and so he has to satisfy the calls of socialism and, at the same time, he has to meet the financial and economic needs of the country. It is therefore a socialist budget that we are dealing with, and a socialist budget thinks not of how much money remains in the hands of the citizen, but how much money can be taken into the hands of the State. And as long as we have this kind of social philosophy, we shall be suffering from financial stringency. It is a great French financial statesman who said: "Give me good politics and I will give you good finance." And as long as the politics is the bad politics of socialism, we shall suffer from financial difficulties in this country.

SHRI S. C. DEB (Assam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Finance Bill generally, but I have some few observations to make that may not fall strictly within the ambit of the Finance Bill, and if I go out of my way, I beg to be excused by the House.

Sir, as far as the taxation policy is concerned, the burden of indirect

taxation hits hard the consumers, and 80 to 90 per cent of them are common men. And what is the condition of the common men, the majority of whom cannot bear this tax burden? They cannot have enough food to eat. They have not enough clothing to wear. Poor men cannot resist when attacked with diseases, have not the capacity of having a good house to live in and cannot enjoy other amenities of life unless their standard of living is raised; and a national Government cannot reasonably extract money from them by imposing indirect taxation. It is agreed on all hands that our economic condition is not good although we are making all kinds of efforts to build up our country economically and also otherwise. But unless you have economic stability in the country, if the poor people continue to live as they are living—which is admitted on all hands—how can you expect money from them? When you cannot afford him a good house, cannot afford him to have his education, cannot afford him to have enough clothing, how can you exact money from him by this indirect taxation? And this indirect taxation is not a good policy, and a national Government cannot depend upon indirect taxation for continuing its work of administration.

Sir what is the condition of our income? The *per capita* income has gone down by 2½ per cent, in spite of the 5 per cent envisaged in the Third Plan, and the Planning Commission is admitting this shortfall. Now, if you admit that this is the condition, what is your programme whereby you lift the poor people, their economic condition? What is your programme for that? Have you any small-scale industry on a large scale all over the country? Have you any programme of generating power which will enable the poor people and the village people to set up an industry? It is admitted on all hands that agriculture alone cannot give employ-

ment to all agriculturists. On agriculture alone, he cannot depend. He must have some other occupation to keep him going. And what is the occupation available to him? No village industry, no power, and how can you develop your village industries and your small-scale industries? An hon. Member was telling that you are taxing all the small entrepreneurs by your tax on diesel oil and your other kinds of taxation. That is the position. You may require money, but you must have a good programme for the economic development of the country, and that programme should be fulfilled. But you admit that you cannot fulfil your programme. You give money to the States but the States cannot fulfil their programmes; they spend the money on items for which it is not meant. This is the condition of the States, and the States borrowing money from the Centre cannot repay it. If this is the condition, how can it be called a good Government? This is the thing.

And the Government should know how the money is spent. When they give money to the States, they must have the capacity to realise it and also to fulfil the programme? There. Under some of the Heads, the programmes are not fulfilled and the money is returned. When the States borrow money from the Centre, they are not able to repay it. If this is the state of affairs, if agricultural output is going down, if you cannot feed the people, if you have to borrow food from other countries, then what is your programme for national development?

You have also to face other difficulties. The refugees are coming from East Pakistan and you are also having talks for settling the affairs there. But there is no result coming out of all this. We understand that we have to live with Pakistan in harmony and in peace. Whether they understand it? But what is their attitude? The minorities are being squeezed out. These minorities cannot remain there. The condition of women is miserable there.

[Shri S. C. Deb]

We ask Government to see that at least the womenfolk are not molested, wherever they are. In no country should the womenfolk be molested in this way. But are you coming out with good results from your negotiations with Pakistan? If you do succeed, it is most welcome. But you do not succeed. What is your position? What is your policy about China? What is your policy about Pakistan? You cannot deal with either. They are hostile. Now the country is facing difficulties due to this. You may also have to rehabilitate some 2 millions coming in. Some two lakhs have already come. That is a great problem. For that I ask our Government, if the minorities are squeezed out of Pakistan, you should demand land from them. You should demand compensation. When you have to face this problem, when you have to rehabilitate these minorities who are squeezed out, why don't you ask for land from them?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Supposing they do not give you the land, what would you do?

SHRI S. C. DEB: Pardon?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: You may make the demand, but supposing they do not yield to your demand, what will you do?

SHRI S. C. DEB: We must create world opinion for that. If Pakistan is able to create world opinion, why can't we do it? You say world opinion is in their favour although they are doing all this mischief. We are doing good things and yet we cannot create world opinion in our favour? We must say that land should be given to us in proportion to the people who are being squeezed out.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I agree with you that you can make your demand, but what is your sanction behind\* the demand?

SHRI S. C. DEB: Our stand would be to get world opinion for it, and to put Pakistan in the wrong. We must have

the necessary machinery. we must create that machinery. Otherwise, can we dare to live? When you are doing good things, you should get world opinion. That should be done. You should have sufficient machinery evolved for that. India may be left alone, but we must exert and we must live among the nations as a good and free nation. For that we must exert ourselves to our utmost. There is no point in your saying that other nations are supporting Pakistan. You should mould the necessary machinery, change the machinery if necessary, so that the world may hear you. The world hears Pakistan and China even when they are doing mischievous things and when they are doing harm to India. Can't you do it when you are doing harm to nobody? We are here trying to live as a good nation, a very good nation. For that and in that behalf, we have a name in the world. If we are to continue that name, we have to create the necessary conditions and we should have an efficient machinery. Even a small nation can work if it has a suitable machinery and it can work with great effect and force. You should have great moral force, for moral force can work in this world. We boast of moral force and we always boast of peace. But that peace and that moral force should be so visualised and so augmented that the whole world can hear you. The whole nation is behind the Government and so you can form world opinion in your favour. You need not cry like this that other nations are heard and we are not being heard. That should not be our cry or policy. We must have a positive policy and not a negative policy or an appeasing policy. Many people complain that we are having an appeasing policy. We must have a definite and concrete policy so that India can be heard throughout the world. We have that moral force and courage to meet the world at every corner and at every time with courage and determination and with moral force.

You will please excuse me, Sir, if I go into these matters.

About agriculture, I have to say that this is the most important and



vital thing in our national development, but we are failing there. We cannot force the States to take up the subject of agriculture in right earnest. We give money to the States. We are asking the Chief Ministers of the States to take over that particular portfolio of Agriculture, but we cannot force them to do so. We all agree that agriculture is the most important thing and we are doing certain things. But the desired results are not being created. That is the present position. How can the desired results be achieved? The matter must be taken up from a perspective point of view and effective steps should be taken so that agricultural output is able to meet the demands of the nation. We should not borrow like this. When 80 per cent. of the population of the country is engaged in agriculture, it is not a good thing for such a nation or country to be in that condition. So, we must have the determination to force the hands of the States. Otherwise, if you cannot force the hands of the State Governments to do what is necessary, things cannot improve. You say that Agriculture is a State subject. But then you have taken on the responsibility in the matter. Otherwise, why do you have the Ministry of Food and Agriculture here? You cannot give all the things to the States and leave them to do whatever they like. If you have taken on the responsibility for improving things, you have to force the hands of the States to go forward with agriculture and augment our food production.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Deb, I just want to tell you that you have already spoken for fifteen minutes.

SHM S. C. DEB: I am just finishing Sir.

Now, conditions in the agricultural sector are not good. The Government is realising this and has admitted this also but what is the concrete step that is being taken to meet the situation? The situation should be effectively met; otherwise the whole thing becomes a cry in the wilderness.

I am in favour of small industries, village industries and I would urge

190 RSD—2.

upon the Government to increase the scope for power generation. This would help not only the agriculturists but also the people in the villages to go in for some craft or the other. These are the most important things. You must have improved and modern methods for improving agriculture and modern equipments, in turn, would mean more of power generation. If you are to give employment to the unemployed, here also you would require more of power. The village industries can employ many people who are now unemployed. I would request our Government humbly to look into these things themselves and create conditions so that our Plans and programmes, what we decide upon, can be carried out effectively and successfully. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, I am highly grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to take part in the discussion on the Finance Bill. I welcome, Sir, certain measures in the Finance Bill which provide relief for the low income groups and certain incentives for the growth of savings in our country. I also welcome the pronouncements of the Government of India that funds will be provided for relief and rehabilitation of the refugees coming from East Pakistan. But I feel sorry that there are no indications that the mounting prices of foodstuff and other necessities of life, which are causing a serious hardship to the common man, have been checked. I demanded once again that Government should tackle this most menacing problem in a blitzkrieg fashion and ensure that there is no further inflation in the prices.

Sir, I would say that enough attention has not been given to the densely populated and economically backward areas, particularly in the South and more so in Kerala, to eradicate unemployment by providing industrial employment and encouraging cottage industries. I am glad that certain steps have been taken in this direction in Kerala by the establishment of the

[Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait.] oil refinery there, and I hope that the shipbuilding yard also will soon come into existence at Cochin and the Government of India, will soon try to come to a final agreement with the Japanese experts with whom, I understand, the collaboration agreement is under discussion.

Sir, it will not be out of place if I were to mention here that we are entering upon a very momentous week when there will be talks between our Prime Minister and the great leader of Kashmiris, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah. Our prayers are that these talks should succeed and bring in a new era of love and goodwill between the different communities, particularly the Hindus and the Muslims living in this great country. Therefore, I would plead, Sir, that nothing should be said or done at this juncture which might complicate matters. Let us pave the way for the cordial meeting of these old friends, Panditji and Sheikh Saheb. In this connection, I have only to say one thing and that is, as a community, the Muslim, of India earnestly desire that Kashmir should remain part of India. The President and the Working Committee of the Indian Union Muslim League, the only representative organisation of the Muslims of India, which I have the honour to represent in this august House, have several times toy statements and resolutions reiterated that Kashmir is and should remain a part of India. I feel, Sir, and I feel very strongly that in view of the circumstances and because of the dispute being with the Security Council, we must make sincere efforts to win over Sheikh Abdullah by guaranteeing to him an honourable compromise as a gesture of goodwill, and the special status under article 370, which the founding fathers of the Constitution had originally guaranteed, should be retained. I am hopeful, Sir, that in the warmth of friendship and hospitality, the talks between our Prime Minister and Sheikh Abdullah will prove successful thus opening a glorious chapter in the history of our

country. "Whatever be the result, the four hundred and eighty millions of people will stand with our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Yesterday, my learned friend, Prof. Mukut Bihari Lai, asked, "who is the leader of the Muslims of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or Sheikh Mohammed Abudllah?"

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): I am sorry, I only asked, "who is the leader of the Congress Muslims in India?"

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: The Congress, Muslims or the entire Muslim community or, for the matter of that, all the Indians, the four hundred and eighty millions of them. It makes no difference in this context. Let me emphatically declare here and now that the Muslims belong to India. We are citizens of this country. We have to live here and die here and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who is the Prime Minister, carries with him our confidence and our trust. There cannot be any doubt about this.

Sir, coming to the problem of the refugees, I have to say that my heart goes out in full sympathy to the refugees who are coming to India from Pakistan. Here, I cannot but condemn the Pakistan Government for this letting down of the highest principles of Islam which enjoin protection of the minorities as a religious obligation. But kindly permit me, Sir, to bring to the notice of this House and the Government of this country the terrible atrocities that have been committed against the Muslim minority in our secular country. I feel relieved that our Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has condemned these atrocities which had taken place in Calcutta, Jamshed-pur and Rourkela. I also have deep appreciation for our Home Minister, Nandaji, who took effective steps to control the situation at places where communal riots had taken place. But I am sorry to say that very few Members of our Parliament, very few leaders of public opinion, have taken a grave and anxious view of these happenings in India and very few have condemned these atrocities and have

uttered a word of comfort for the plight of the Muslim minority victimised by the mob violence in these centres where communal riots broke out, that is, at Calcutta, Jamshedpur and Rourkela, Sir, my heart bleeds when I think of what I have seen recently in Calcutta which I visited together with my leader, Qaidemillit Janab Ismail Saheb, and my colleague, Janab Mohamed Koya Saheb of the Lok Sabha.

I cannot better describe the tragic situation than quote what a leader of the eminence of Shri Jai Prakash Narain has said in his letter to you, Sir, and to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha which has been published recently in "The Hindustan Times". I would only request your permission to quote a para or two from this letter.

Jai Prakashji says:

"I am not writing this in order to make a report to you on the situation, in these areas, of Bihar and Orissa and the vital steel cities. But I do most earnestly wish to say that India and Indians have no cause to feel smug and complacent or superior and holy.

Terrible things have happened and on a scale that has not been realised by Delhi or the country at large. The tale of provocation caused by refugee trains is only a small part of the full story. There is no doubt in my mind that there was an organisation behind these dastardly activities which operated from a common centre, manufactured and spread rumours, planned and financed specific actions, provided the whole operation with a political and philosophical justification."

Again Jai Prakash Narainji goes on to say:

"It was further proved how inadequate and insufficient was the civil Administration and how the forces of law and order were themselves infected considerably with the virus of communalism.

As for the nature of atrocities committed, I do not think there were any holds barred. Every revolting kind of deed was done. The tragedy seen in the mass was terrible enough but some of the individual cases were fathomless, indeed, in their cruelty and degradation."

Finally he says. I am cutting it short:

"If the people are kept in the dark about what is happening in the country, they may not be mentally prepared to accept the radical remedies that might become necessary."

Sir, I am quoting all this not to speak ill of anyone or to cause uneasiness in the minds of my friends here by mentioning the unhappy incidents in this country. But I feel that I will be failing in my duty if I do not bring these facts to your notice and to the notice of hon. Members of this august House and the Government of this country the situation that is prevailing and plead for the protection of the life and property of the minorities of this country, particularly the fifty million Mussalmans of India.

Sir, I am glad that a Ministry for refugee rehabilitation has been created and the Centre has assumed full responsibility for the relief and rehabilitation of the refugees. This, Sir, is a right step in the right direction as it is our sacred duty to go all out to help the refugees who come to us here in search of peace and protection. But together with this in the interest of secularism, in the interest of democracy, in the interest of national solidarity and finally in the interest of restoring confidence among the minorities of this country, particularly **ifain** the fifty million Mussalmans of India, I demand that the Centre should assume also the fullest responsibility for the protection of the person and property of the minorities and for providing relief and rehabilitation to the minorities that have suffered here in our

[Shri Eforahim Sulaiman Sait] country in the recent riots. Several thousand Muslim lives have been lost and several crores worth of properties have been destroyed. All this, Sir, I feel, is a great national loss. Nothing tangible, I feel, has been done for providing relief and for improving the lot of the Muslim minority which has lost its hearths and homes during the communal disturbances. I therefore demand that a Central Ministry for minority affairs be constituted to go deep and to go all out into this question, rehabilitate all the members of the Muslim minority, who have been uprooted and restore confidence among the minorities in this country. I hope, Sir, that our Prime Minister will give careful consideration to this very vital problem and gain the gratitude of the millions and millions of Mussalmans of this country who are the loyal citizens of their motherland.

Sir, I have finished.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the taxation proposals.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I also compliment the Finance Minister for all the labours and pains he has taken and for having brought all his ingenuity, experience and abilities to bear upon the tackling of the problem of taxation proposals. He has done it in such a nice manner that whatever encumbrances were there, he has removed them and the procedure has been simplified. He has secured money from quarters from which alone money could be procured. He has taken the low and middle Income groups outside the purview of his taxation proposals and still has been able to meet the demands of the society which we want to reconstruct. Despite all the pressures, stresses and strains, he has done so well. I remember—when Mr. Krishnamachari was appointed Finance Minister I was in Bombay—the reputation that he had, that he would fall flat on the private sector. But they themselves have appreciated

and said, 'here is the man of whom we were much afraid'. Even the 'Times of India' leader came out complimenting him. He is always of the private sector; not today, sixteen years previously he was the first person in the name of poor people to protest against taxation proposals. Here also, the leader of the Opposition briefly said something because there is nothing much to be said.

Now, an hon. Member—I think it was Prof. Wadia—referred to some lawyers and doctors and he said that they were not taking up cases just because they will have to pay taxes. I do not think the lawyers and others who earn are so unpatriotic. In fact, our Finance Minister knew the methods of evasion, both by the big professional people and the private sector people, and that is why he has empowered the authority with sufficient authority so that all those who are interested in evasion of taxes could be brought within his clutches. I compliment the Finance Minister for his remarkable performance in this matter.

Madam, having done that I am in duty bound to refer to an unfortunate remark made by a Congress Member, Shri Anwar, who said that most of us were show-boys here. It is most unfair; it is most untrue and it could not be allowed to go unchallenged. I repudiate this and I would point out that when India was made independent, there was so much communal orgy that the Father of the Nation did not come to the Rashtrapati Bhavan for the celebrations but went to the jungles of Noakhali, and the hell of communal fire was quenched by his sacred blood. From that day all the Muslims here, who were previously under the influence of the Muslim organisation named the all-India Muslim League, were impressed much by the sacrifice and by the speeches of our beloved Prime Minister who recognised the mental agony from which the Indian Muslims were suffering and their anxiety for the future. We, who then were the representatives of the Muslims in the State legislatures and in Parliament, were taken into confidence and it be-

came clear to us that the best interest of the Muslims was to eschew communalism and to hold fast to the principle of secularism. We have not hidden this from any of our Muslim brethren. We have impressed it upon them and convinced them that this way lies the interest of the Indian Muslims, this way lies the interest of India, this way lies the proper answer to Pakistan which says, it is an Islamic country but forgets the Islamic principle that minorities are their *amanat*, and *Khayanat* is *bemani*. It has done so; we do not warn to retaliate because we hold fast to the secular principles. Here the Indian Muslims play an important role. We not only owe allegiance to secular principles; we live for that ideal and we shall die for that ideal. We shall uphold the honour of our motherland and teach a lesson to the Muslim of Pakistan that if there are true Muslims, they reside in the land of India and not in Pakistan. So, how can our friend who is a Congress Member, here say that we are all show-boys? He may have been provoked as Muslims are usually provoked because of their temperament into making such statement. That is understandable.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): Don't play into enemy's hands.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: May I say that the whole of his speech was exactly like yours? Only occasionally he was lead away by his emotion,

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: All right; I am prepared to pardon him.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): May I say that there is not a single Muslim in this country who does not pledge his loyalty to this country? And I said by way of an example that even the Indian Union Muslim League which claims to interpret the mind and the spirit of the Muslim community has pledged, time and again, through the Resolutions of its Working Committee that Kashmir is

part of India and that we axe all citizens of the secular State of India.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I hope the quarrel has now been made up completely.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is a maiden speech. Don't interrupt him.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: My point is that Congress Muslims who tell them publicly to be flash-lighted in papers, to be made use of by agents *provocateur* here and outside—that is a sense of responsibility any hon. Member at this critical period should show, and my regret is that that was not done. Personally I can understand his having said it, as I said in the heat of the moment, but it must not be allowed to go unchallenged. I have done that part of the thing.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you have explained yourself.

(Interruptions')

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: It is a maiden speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you should not interrupt when a Member is delivering his maiden speech.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: I believe it is an article of faith, as a Mussalman following the injunctions of the Quoran. The law of the motherland is part also of the Quoranic injunction. I am bound by that. I have made a choice to be in the Congress Party or in the Socialist Party or in the Communist Party. I have not made a choice to be in the Muslim League Party. I am glad that the Muslim League of India stands by saying that Kashmir is an integral part of India and shall remain so. Since it is only a Muslim Party, I shall say from the place where I have come, that is, Gujarat, that there is no such thing even in existence as the Muslim League, nor is the Mus-

[Shri G. H. Valimohmed Momin.] I am League functioning in most parts of the country. It may or may not stand because of the local conditions prevailing. Where it continues, it may function or may not function. But I am very clear in my mind that directly or indirectly the spectre of communalism, the illusion of communalism shall not cross this land once again. It may be in one form of glorification of Sheikh Abdullah. It may be in the other form of sentimentality in denunciation of Sheikh Abdullah. I am not concerned with one or the other. I am concerned with this. Be they the utterances of Sheikh Abdullah, be they the utterances of Muslim countries like Pakistan, be they the utterances of conspirators, the Western powers, nobody shall dismember Kashmir from the Indian Union. Nobody shall question its validity and its accession to India. Therefore, it is not a question of loyalty. It has to be very clear in the minds of all the members of the minority community.

I do regret that what has happened in Pakistan is a disgrace to the fair name of Islam. Muslims should be ashamed of it. I am ashamed of it as a Mussalman. What has happened in India by way of a retaliatory measure is also obnoxious. It has also blackened our fair name. It is a disgrace to the great sacrifices that the Father of the Nation had made and to the fair name of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru too. But we must not dwell at length on that. We must also see that the Government of India, our Home Minister, Nandaji, has effectively dealt with communal violence in this country. All those devilish acts in the name of one or the other do stand condemned before me as an Indian, as a Mussalman and as a human being.

I was referring to the fact that on an important matter like this, the Swatantra Party leader here should say: "We have not made up our minds." Kashmir is a national question. If Rajaji says one thing, if Shri Jayaprakash Narayan lends his

support even indirectly by saying that self-determination is the right of Kashmiris, the question at this moment is: Whom are we supporting, whom are we weakening? We say that we are all united against all the evil forces that are gathering around us. Then, it becomes part of the duty of every Member sitting in this august House—be he on the Treasury Benches, be he on the Opposition Benches<sup>1</sup>—to strengthen the hands of our beloved Prime Minister at this stage. Weakening him is to strengthen the cause of Pakistan. Weakening him is to make us more and more weak to create public opinion. One hon. Member asked: Why are we not able to create public opinion? Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has created enough public opinion.

Let me tell you Nasser belongs to a Muslim country. He is a member of the UNO. No Muslim country has come forward officially even to go against Nehru on the Kashmir issue in the UN debate. Had support not been lent by the Western powers, whatever may be their motive, today the Kashmir question would not have assumed its present form. Kashmiris are our brethren. Everybody is a brother. Our message is that of peace. Our message is that of goodwill. Even today we harbour no ill-will towards Pakistan or its people. As Indians we are wedded to democracy. As Muslims we are wedded to Islamic democracy. We assume that there is no democracy existing in our brother country of Pakistan. Today Pakistan can woo Sheikh Abdullah, saying self-determination. You know that Pakhtoonistan has been asking for self-determination. Our great leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, was incarcerated all these years.

We must have no illusion about the periods through which we have passed. We can hope for the best. Let the things come out. But we should have no illusions. We must be prepared for the worst. If it comes we shall take up this challenge and show that India is one.

however mighty the powers be against us because we stand for right. We stand for truth, "Satyameva Jayate". Truth is bound to prevail.

Therefore, let us strengthen the hands of our beloved Prime Minister. Let us not distrust him, nor say that he is getting weaker. He knows what to do and when. I know when Sheikh Abdullah was under arrest even Opposition leaders had sent telegrams for his release. At that time when our Government arrested him, they said, release him. When they release him, then they say, rearrest him. When the Government re-arrest him, they say, release him. Can those, who have the task of shouldering the great responsibility, play will-o-the-wisp? It is the Government which is before the bar of public opinion and it has to be have with responsibility. This Government is wide awake. Every citizen is wide awake. We want to have no illusion.

Things may come out very good. If it does not come out good then we are prepared to take up the challenge and we shall see. The clouds will disperse. This anguish and the darkness of night will be over. The sun of hope, the dawn is being seen. It shall rise. There shall be sunshine. There shall be peace. There shall be goodwill. There shall be Hindu-Muslim cordiality in this land of ours, in this motherland of ours where our forefathers are lying buried, whether they belonged to this religion or that religion, where mosques stand, where 'mandirs' stand, where 'Gurdwaras' stand, where Parsi temples stand.

This land of ours once again shall breathe the message of peace, goodwill and brotherliness.

I have done.

شری مودالنی (پنجاب) : مقدم

قہمی چہر میں - جہاں تک ٹیکسوں کا تعلق ہے میں نے پہلے ہی دارس

میں کہا ہے اور آج بھی کہتا ہوں کہ کسی ملک کو چلانے کے لئے ٹیکسز لگانے ہوتے ہیں لگانے ہی پڑتے ہیں یہ بات الگ ہے کہ ابھی تک مجھے اس بات کا اطمینان نہیں ہے کہ جن لوگوں پر زیادہ سے زیادہ ٹیکس لگانا چاہئے ان پر وہ لگا پائے ہیں - مہر مراد ان سے ہے جن کو نہرو سرکار کی برکت سے قلم کی ایک نوک سے اسٹیمپنگی سرٹیفیکیٹ دے کر پرمٹ دے کر ٹیکس دے کر کروڑ پتی بنا دیا گیا ہے اور جن کی گردن پکڑنے کے لئے اس سرکار نے کوئی صحت قدم نہیں اٹھایا ہے - بہر حال ٹیکسز لگتے ہیں اور ٹیکسز کا استعمال کہے کہا جائے یہ دیکھنے والی بات ہے کہ آیا نہرو سرکار اس بات کا احساس کرتی ہے کہ آج دیہی میں جو سب سے زیادہ بڑی ہوائی ہے اس کو کس طرح سے قابو کیا جائے - نلدا صاحب کے بہت اسٹیمپلس آتے ہیں اور آئے دن وہ کرپشن کے خلاف چرچا کرتے ہیں لیکن جیسا کہ نران مسجد میں آتا ہے کہ لمبا تقولوں والا تھیلون - جو کچھ کونا نہیں ہے وہ کہتے کہیں ہیں - کرپشن کے خلاف آپ چرچا کرتے ہیں کہ کرپشن کو ختم کیا جائے گا لیکن وہ کہتے ختم کیا جا سکتا ہے - دوسرے ورڈ کے بعد وارن سسٹم کے بعد یہ پہلا امپروومنٹ ہے جو کہ آج ہڈ آف دی اسٹیمٹ آف پنجاب کا ہو رہا ہے - جب بھی کوئی انکوائری ہوتی

[شری عبدالغلی]

ہے کوئی انکوائری کنکشن بتایا گیا ہے تب ان کے اتارنی جدول ان کے سولیکر جدول اور ان کی تمام مشملوں اس بات پر لگی کہ اگر کوئی کرپشن ہے اگر کوئی برائی ہے تو اس کی ہکڑ کی جائے۔ لیکن اب ان کو جیسے صائب سونگہ لیا ہے کہ کہتے تو ہوں کرپشن کو ضرور ختم کرنا ہے مگر ایک دن کے لئے بھی اس طرف کوئی توجہ دی نہیں۔

دوسری بات میں یہ کہا چاہتا ہوں کہ ابھی ایک خاص چوز یہ چل گئی ہے کہ شیخ عبداللہ کیا ہیں۔ ہندوستان کا مسلمان کہا ہے اسی کو کس طرح سے اس سرکار کے نیچے رکھنا ہے۔ کس طرح سے اپنی وفاداری کا یقین دلانا ہے۔ میں کہا چاہتا ہوں کہ ۱۹۱۷ء میں میں جنگ آزادی میں شامل ہوا اور آج ۱۹۶۳ء میں ۴۵ سال ہنس برس گذر گئے ہیں۔ سولہ برس تک مسلم لیگ نے مجھے مہاشہ عبدالغلی کہا جو بھی گالی دے سکے تھے وہ گالی مجھے دہلے کی کوشش کی اور میں ملک کے ساتھ رہا۔ لیکن میں ان سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں جو مسلم ممبر صاحبان فرماتے ہیں ان سے اور خاص طور سے نندا صاحب سے کہ اپنی تو سیکرٹری اسٹوف ہے اس میں کہا ہوتا ہے۔ پاکستان میں نے نہیں بتایا یہ یاد رکھنا چاہئے تمام آئینہ ممبروں

کو کہ پاکستان کو ملت نہرو نے مانا میں نے نہیں مانا۔ میں نے اس کو نہیں بلایا۔

آئی رمنشندھ شکرراو خاڈیکر (مध्य प्रदेश) : کانپس نے بنایا۔

सरदार रघुवीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंजाब) : आप भी असेम्बली के मेम्बर थे और आप ने रेजोल्यूशन पास किया था इस सिलसिले में।

شری عبدالغلی : کہا پاس کیا

تھا۔ ذرا سلیے کی طاقت اپنے اندر پیدا کیجئے۔ میں یہ کہہ رہا تھا کہ پاکستان میں نے نہیں بلایا پاکستان بلایا انہوں نے جو گندی کے خواہش مند تھے جو جلدی گندی پر بیٹھنا چاہتے تھے۔ دس برس اور صبر کر لیتے۔ صبر بھائی شہد ہوا تھا۔ صبری بہنوں شہد ہوئی تھی، بہنیں شہد ہوئی تھی۔ میں یہی سوچتا تھا۔ کہا دس برس اور صبر کیا۔ انہوں نے ملک کے ٹکڑے کئے اور اب بڑے زور سے چلاتے ہیں کہ دیہی کو یہ دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں وہ دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں وہ فلاں دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں۔ میں کہا چاہتا ہوں یہ کہوں ہوا؟ ہمارے جواہر لال نہرو نے کہا۔ ہندوستان میں پاکستان میں ہندو بھائیوں کے اوپر مسلمان بھائیوں کے اوپر مصیبتیں آئیں۔ کہا اس بات سے انکار کر سکتے ہیں۔ جب لال بہادر شاستری وہاں تصفیقات کرنے کے لئے گئے تو انہوں نے کہیں نہیں کہا کہ موٹے مبارک کی چوری میں کسی گھر مسلم



بھائی کا ہاتھ نہیں ہے - وہ حسوس رہے - کہا ان کو پتہ نہیں تھا کہ کون چوری کرنے والا تھا - مگر انہوں نے بولے اور پاکستان میں ظلم ہوا - میں اپنی سرکار سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان میں جب یہ بھائی بھینس اُنہیں تو ان کی فلم لی گئی گاؤں وہل جو ہندوستان بھر کے مسلمانوں میں کئی دن تک دکھائی گئیں ان میں ان کی مصیبتیں دکھائی گئیں لیکن سیکولر اسٹیٹ کے مالکوں سے یہ نہیں ہو پایا کہ جو کلکتہ میں روز کھلا میں جھینڈ پور میں مسلمان برباد ہو گئے قتل ہو گئے جو وہاں بستیاں برباد ہو گئیں اس کو بھی دکھاتے اور بتاتے کہ کمیونزم کا فرقہ پرستی کا بھوت جو ہے وہ اس طرح سے ہندوؤں اور مسلمانوں کو تباہ کر رہا ہے - دونوں کی مظلومیت کی پکچر دکھائیے - نلدا صاحب کو کہا ہو گیا - سرکار کو کہا ہو گیا ہے کہوں نہیں دونوں طرح کی تصویر دکھائی جس سے معلوم ہوتا کہ کیا ہے - فرقہ پرستی کا کیا بھوت ہے -

میں آپ کے سیکولرزم کی تعریف کرتا ہوں میں اس کی عزت کرتا ہوں - میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس پر بھی یہ نہیں ہوا اور حال ہی میں ہے کہ مسلم مسلمان جو وہیں رہے ہیں وہیں ہیں کہ ہم شو ہوائے نہیں ہوں ہم یہ نہیں ہوں ہم وہ

نہیں ہوں - کہیں زبان سے ایک بھی لفظ نکلا کہیں اپنی سرکار کو پلذت نہرو کو یہ بتایا کہ سیکولر اسٹیٹ کے مالک - یہ کیا ہو رہا ہے ؟

پاکستان والے تو ٹونشن تھوڑی کے مائلے والے ہیں ہی ان کا تو یہی کام ہے کہ نفرت پھیلاؤ اور اپنی حکومت چلاؤ - لیکن - مجھے ان کا درد ہے جو بھائی بہن یہاں آئے - کہیں آپ نے یہ بھی دیکھا کہ سیکولر اسٹیٹ میں دن کو مسلم ہستی ہستی ہے اور رات کو ختم ہوتی ہے - آپ کہتے ہیں کہتے ہیں کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا ہے - میں نے بھی بار بار اس کا ذکر کیا کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا ہے - میں نے یہ کہا کہ کہوں ان کے ساتھ الگ الگ ملک بن جائے لیکن کشمیر کبھی آجائے گا آپ کے ساتھ اگر آپ کا رویہ یہی ہے کہ دن کو مسلم ہستی ہستی ہے اور رات کو ختم ہوتی ہے -

مسلمانوں کے لئے انتہائی صاحب نے ایک بات کہی اور اس پر آپ بپھر گئے الجھ گئے روٹے گئے - اقبال نے بھی کہا ہے -

تینوں کے ساتھ میں ہم ہل کر چولن ہوئے ہیں

خلنچر حلال کا ہے قومی نشان ہمارا اس بے چارے نے کہہ دیا کہ مسلمانوں پر تلوار لٹک رہی ہے تو اس پر آپ روٹے گئے - میں مستر باجپئی سے

[شری عبدالغنی]

مسٹر نندا سے کہا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم تو اس کے حامی ہیں کہ اگر ہم میں طاقت ہو اور پاکستان نہیں سلجھے ہوں گا وہی موقع ملے تو ہم اس کو اس کے ساتھ فہصلہ کریں گے کہ ایک ہندو بھائی کو بھی نقصان نہیں ہو - جان ہونی چاہئے مگر حکومت میں جان نہیں ہے - آپ ہمیں وار مانگو کہتے ہیں جب قیمت کے معاملہ پر ہم نے آواز اٹھائی تو ہمیں ایسا کہا اور آج بھی شاید ہمیں ایسا ہی کہیں لیکن میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر پاکستان سلجھتا نہیں ہے وہ نہرو لہانت پمکت پر عمل درآمد نہیں کرتا تو اس کے ساتھ لوائی لکرنی چاہئے - ہم پوری ہمت کے ساتھ لڑیں گے - ایک دنیا میں ایک بھی انگریز کا کہیں نقصان ہو گیا تو ساری انگریز نیشن توپ گئی لیکن آج کہا ہم ایمان داری کے ساتھ یہ سمجھتے ہیں - جو ہمارے ہندو بھائی پاکستان میں رہتے پر معذور ہیں وہ ہمارے ہندوستانی بھائی ہیں - ہمارے انگ ہیں - یہاں کے مسلمان کے دماغ پر اگر موت کا خوف طاری رہے اور وہ یہ سمجھے کہ نندا کی سرکار صرف ہندوؤں کے مظالم کو ہی دیکھتی ہے کہ کس طرح سے ہندو بھائیوں پر پاکستان میں مظالم ہوتے ہیں - یہ میں ان کی بھائی میں کہتا ہوں - کچھ بھی ہو پاکستان والے بے ہودہ الزام لگاتے رہیں وہ بے ہودہ باتیں کرتے

دھیں ان کا تو انٹرسٹ اس میں ہے کہ کسی طرح سے نفرت بڑھتی رہے لیکن ہمارا انٹرسٹ اس میں نہیں ہے - انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ آسام سے جو مسلمان اجازت گئے ان میں ۹۴ پورسٹ سے زیادہ ہندوستانی تھے - میں کہتا ہوں آپ ان کی نہیں مانتوں اور ایسا چیخ مقرر کریں انہوں نے کہا کہ ایک ان کا چیخ ہو ایک ہمارا ہو ایک تیسرے کا ہو آپ ان کی نہیں مانتیں - میں کہتا ہوں کہ یہ ہمارے دیہی کی چیز ہے ہم ایسا فہصلہ اپنے آپ کہا چاہتے ہیں - آپ سپرو صاحب کو یہ کام سپرد کر دیجئے - ان کو کہئے کہ ان کیسے کو دیکھ لیں - اگر کہ بات غلط ہوئی ہے کوئی ایک ہندوستانی مسلمان کو زبردستی ادھر بھجوا گیا ہے تو اس معاملہ کو وہ دیکھیں - میں تو یہ بھی کہتا ہوں کہ پاکستان سے جو ہندو اجازت کر آئے ہیں ان کو ہم ہندوستان میں پھیل رہے ہیں تو جو مسلمان آسام بارقر پر اجازت ہیں ان کے لئے بھی ایسا کریں کہ وہ بھی نئے سرے سے ہندوستان میں آباد کئے جائیں -

تو میں یہ عرض کر رہا تھا کہ آج ہندو نہرو کو یہ یقیناً جاننا چاہئے کہ کشمیر ہندو نہرو کے ساتھ رہے گا بشرطیکہ آپ ایسا راستہ اختیار نہ کریں کہ چاہے شیعہ عبد اللہ ہو یا کوئی ہو کچھ دوسری بات کر سکے - سچی بات

کر سکے۔ سچی بات گزری ہوئی ہے۔  
 مہد اللہ کے لئے بہتر تھا کہ وہ صدر  
 کرتے لوگوں سے ملنے لگتا کہ گھارے  
 برس کے بعد آیا ہوں ابھی [میں کچھ  
 نہیں کہتا۔ میں اپنی بات بلند  
 نہیں اور دوسرے ساتھ میں ملنے کے  
 بعد کہوں گا۔ اگر وہ ایسا کرتے تو اچھا  
 ہوتا۔ لیکن کہا کارن ہے جو انہوں نے  
 ایسا نہیں کیا۔ وہ شاید ہنگول کرشن  
 جی کے فرماں پر بٹھیں رکھتے ہیں۔  
 وہاں تپے کل کے لئے۔ کل تپے  
 پر ہمت پر تپے ہت دیں گے۔  
 دیں تپے آپ ملتے،

جس میں اپنے ضمیر کو دیں پر  
 قربان کرنے کے لئے کہا گیا ہے۔ خیر  
 تین چار دن کے بعد وہ یہاں آئیں گے  
 اور پریس والوں سے بلند جی سے اور  
 دوسرے لوگوں سے ملنے کے اور تب اپنی  
 بات کہیں گے۔ لیکن میں یہ کہا  
 چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ اگر یہ کہتے ہیں کہ  
 کشمیر ہمارا نہیں ہے تو ہم شہر  
 صاحب سے بھی لڑیں گے۔ کہونکہ  
 کشمیر کے ساتھ ہمارے ملک کا دفاع  
 وابستہ ہے اس کے ساتھ اپنا تعلق ہے۔  
 وہ ہمارا ہے اور ہم اپنے دیہی کو محفوظ  
 دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اگر پاکستان والے  
 پاکستان میں آج مسلمان اور ہندو کے  
 ساتھ انصاف نہیں کر پاتے تو اس لئے  
 کہ وہاں فوجی راج ہے وہاں کسی کو  
 آزادی رائے نہیں ہے۔

کہا ہم کشمیر جملہ طور کو ان  
 کی گود میں ڈال دیں؟ ایسا برداشت

نہیں کہا جائے گا۔ میں آپ سے کہتا  
 ہوں کہ یہ آپ کی سہولتوں پر  
 منحصر ہے کہ ہم کشمیر کے بارے  
 میں کیا کرنے چاہتے ہیں۔ کہا اس  
 طرح ہے اگر ہندوستان کے مسلمان کے  
 سامنے میں یہ بات بڑھ جائے کہ آج  
 نندا صاحب کے یہاں ان کو انصاف  
 نہیں ملتا۔ تو اس کا اثر کشمیر پر  
 ضرور پڑے گا۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is one of the  
 clock. If the House so desires, we can sit till  
 1.30 P.M. I am in the hands of the House,

شری عبد الغنی : جیسا آپ کہیں

تھے۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you  
 finish in two minutes?

شری عبد الغنی : جی ہاں تم

چار منٹ اور لیا چاہتا ہوں۔

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) : मैं हम  
 डिप्टी चैयरमैन, जहां तक टैक्सों का ताल्लुक  
 है। मैंने पहले भी हाऊस में कहा है और  
 आज भी कहता हूँ कि किसी मुल्क को चलाने  
 के लिये टैक्सेज लगाने होते हैं, लगाने ही  
 पड़ते हैं। यह बात अलग है कि अभी तक  
 मुझे इस बात का इतमीनान नहीं है कि जिन  
 लोगों पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा टैक्स लगाना  
 चाहिये उन पर वह लगा पाये हैं। मेरी  
 मुराद उनसे है जिनको नेहरू सरकार की  
 बरकत से, कलम की एक नौक से एसेंसिये-  
 लिटी सर्टिफिकेट देकर, परमिट देकर,  
 लाइसेंस देकर करोड़पति बना दिया गया है  
 और जिनकी गर्दन पकड़ने के लिये इस सरकार  
 ने कोई सही कदम नहीं उठाया है। बहरहाल

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

टैक्सेज लगते हैं और टैक्सेज का इस्तेमाल कैसे किया जाये ? यह देखने वाली बात है कि आया नेहरू सरकार इस बात का एहसास करती है कि आज देश में जो सब से ज्यादा बड़ी बुराई है उसको किस तरह से काबू किया जाये । नन्दा साहब के बहुत स्टेटमेंट आते हैं और आये दिन वह करप्शन के खिलाफ चर्चा करते हैं । लेकिन जैसा कि कुरान मजीद में आता है कि "लिमा तकलूना मा ला तफ्थलूना ।" जो कुछ करना नहीं है वह कहते क्यों हैं ? करप्शन के खिलाफ आप चर्चा करते हैं कि करप्शन को खत्म किया जायेगा । लेकिन वह कैसे खत्म किया जा सकता है ? दो सौ वर्ष के बाद, वारेन हेस्टिंग्स के बाद यह पहला इम्पीचमेंट है जो कि आज हेड आफ दी स्टेट आफ पंजाब का हो रहा है । जब भी कोई इन्क्वायरी बैठी है, कोई इन्क्वायरी कमिशन बैठाया गया है तब उनके एटार्नी जनरल, उनके सैलीसिटर जनरल और उनकी तमाम मनीनरी इस बात पर लगी कि अगर कोई करप्शन है, अगर कोई बुराई है तो उसकी पकड़ की जाये । लेकिन अब उनको जैसे सांप सूँघ गया है कि कहते तो हैं कि करप्शन को जरूर खत्म करना है, मगर एक दिन के लिये भी इस तरफ कोई तवज्जो दी नहीं ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी एक खास चीज यह चल गई है कि शेख अब्दुल्ला क्या हैं । हिन्दुस्तान का मुसलमान क्या है ? उसको किस तरह से इस सरकार के नीचे रहना है ? किस तरह से अपनी वफादारी का यकीन दिलाना है ? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि १९१७ ईस्वी में मैं जंगे आजादी में शामिल हुआ और आज १९६४ है ; ४७ वर्ष गुजर गये हैं । १६ वर्ष तक मुस्लिम लीग ने मझे महाशय अब्दुल गनी कहा । जो भी गाली दे सकते थे वह गाली मुझे देने की कोशिश की और मैं मुल्क के साथ रहा । लेकिन मैं उनसे पूछना

चाहता हूँ जो मुस्लिम मेम्बर साहबान फरमाते हैं उनसे और खास तौर से नन्दा साहब से कि अपनी तो सेक्यूलर स्टेट है । इसमें क्या होता है ? पाकिस्तान मैंने नहीं बनाया यह याद रखना चाहिये तमाम आनरेबुल मेम्बरान को कि पाकिस्तान को पंडित नेहरू ने माना मैंने नहीं माना । मैंने उसको नहीं बनाया ।

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर (मध्य प्रदेश) : कांग्रेस ने बनाया ।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंजाब) : आप भी असेम्बली के मेम्बर थे और आपने रेजोल्यूशन पास किया था इस सिलसिले में ।

श्री अब्दुल गनी : क्या पास किया था । ज़रा सुनने की ताकत अपने अन्दर पैदा कीजिये । मैं यह कह रहा था कि पाकिस्तान मैंने नहीं बनाया । पाकिस्तान बनाया उन्होंने जो गद्दी के ख्वाहिशमन्द थे । जो जल्दी गद्दी पर बैठना चाहते थे । दस वर्ष और सबर कर लेते । मेरा भाई शहीद हुआ था, मेरी बीवी शहीद हुई थी, भतीजी शहीद हुई थी, मैं भी मर जाता ? क्या दस वर्ष और सबर किया ? उन्होंने मुल्क के टुकड़े किये और अब बड़े जोर से चिल्लाते हैं कि देश को यह देखना चाहते हैं, वह देखना चाहते हैं, फलां देखना चाहते हैं । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह क्यों हुआ । हमारे जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने किया । हिन्दुस्तान में, पाकिस्तान में हिन्दू भाइयों के ऊपर, मुसलमान भाइयों के ऊपर मुसीबतें आई । क्या इस बात से इंकार कर सकते हैं ? जब लाल बहादुर शास्त्री वहां तहकीकात करने के लिये गये तो उन्होंने क्यों नहीं कहा कि मुए-मुबारक की चोरी में किसी गैर मुस्लिम भाई का हाथ नहीं है । वह खामोश रहे । क्या उनको पता नहीं था कि कौन चोरी करने वाला था ? मगर नहीं बोले और पाकिस्तान में जुल्म हुआ । मैं अपनी सरकार से पूछना

चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में जब वह भाई बहनें आईं तो उनकी फिल्म ली गई। सरकारी रील जो हिन्दुस्तान भर के सिनेमाघों में कई दिन तक दिखाई गई उनमें उनकी मुसीबतें दिखाई गईं। लेकिन सेक्यूलर स्टेट के मालिकों से यह नहीं होने पाया जो कलकत्ते में, राउरकेला में, जमशेदपुर में मुसलमान बरबाद हो गये, कत्ल हो गये, जो वहाँ बस्तियां बरबाद हो गईं उनको भी दिखाते और बताते कि कम्यूनलिज्म का, फिरकापरस्ती का भूत जो है वह इस तरह से हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों को तबाह कर रहा है। दोनों की मजलूमियत की पक्कर दिखाइये। नन्दा साहब को क्या हो गया? सरकार को क्या हो गया है? क्यों नहीं दोनों तरह की तस्वीर दिखाई जिससे मालूम होता कि क्या है? फिरकापरस्ती का क्या भूत है?

मैं आपके सेक्यूलरिज्म की तारीफ करता हूँ। मैं इसकी इज्जत करता हूँ। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस पर भी यह नहीं हुआ और हालत यह है कि मुस्लिम मेम्बरान जो हैं वह बड़े जोर से कहते हैं कि हम शो-ब्याय नहीं हैं, हम बह नहीं हैं, हम यह नहीं हैं। कभी जुवान से एक भी लफ्ज निकला, कभी अपनी सरकार को, पंडित नेहरू को यह बताया कि सेक्यूलर स्टेट के मालिक! यह क्या हो रहा है?

पाकिस्तान वाले तो दूनेशन थ्योरी से मानने वाले हैं ही उनका तो यही काम है कि नफरत फैलाओ और अपनी हुकूमत चलाओ। लेकिन मुझे उनका दर्द है जो भाई बहन यहां आये। कभी आपने यह भी देखा कि सेक्यूलर स्टेट में दिन को मुस्लिम बस्ती बसती है और रात को खत्म हो जाता है। आप कहते हैं कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का है मैंने भी बार बार इसका जिक्र किया कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का है। मैंने यह कहा कि क्यों उनका साथ अलग सलूक किया जाये। लेकिन

काश्मीर कैसे आ जायेगा आपके साथ अगर आपका खयाल यही है कि दिन को मुस्लिम बस्ती बसती है और रात को खत्म होती है।

मुसलमानों के लिये ऐयनी साहब ने एक बात कह दी और उस पर आप बफर गये और उलझ गये, रूठ गये। इकबाल ने भी कहा है—

तेगों के साथे में हम पलकर जवान हुए हैं,  
खंजर हलाल का है कौमी निशान हमारा।

उस बेचारे ने कह दिया कि मुसलमानों पर तलवार लटक रही है तो उस पर आप रूठ गये। मैं मिस्टर वाजपेयी से, मिस्टर नन्दा से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम तो इसके हामी हैं कि अगर हम में ताकत हो और पाकिस्तान नहीं संभले, हमें कभी भोका मिले तो हम लड़ कर उसके साथ फंसला करेंगे कि एक हिन्दू भाई को भी नुकसान न हो। जान होनी चाहिये मगर हुकूमत में जान नहीं है। आप हमें बार-बार कहते हैं। जब तिव्वत के मामले पर हमने आवाज उठाई तो हमें ऐसा कहा, और आज भी शायद हमें ऐसा ही कहें, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर पाकिस्तान संभलता नहीं है वो नेहरू-लियाकत पेंकट पर अमलदरामद नहीं करता तो उसके साथ लड़ाई करनी चाहिये। हम पूरी हिम्मत के साथ लड़ेंगे। एक दुनिया में एक भी अंग्रेज का कहीं नुकसान हो गया तो सारी अंग्रेज नेशन तड़प गई। लेकिन आज क्या हम ईमानदारी के साथ यह समझते हैं जो हमारे हिन्दू भाई पाकिस्तान में रहने पर मजबूर हैं वह हमारे हिन्दुस्तानी भाई हैं, हमारे अंग हैं? यहां के मुसलमान के दिमाग पर अगर मौत का खोफ तारी रहे और वह यह समझे कि नन्दा की सरकार सिर्फ हिन्दुओं के मुजालम को ही देखती है कि जिस तरह से हिन्दू भाइयों पर पाकिस्तान में मुजलिम दुये हैं यह मैं उनकी भलाई में कहता हूँ। कुछ भी हो, पाकिस्तान वाले बेहूदा इल्जाम लगाते रहे, वह बेहूदा बातें करते रहें उनका तो इंटरेस्ट इसमें है कि किसी तरह से नफरत

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

वहती रहे। लेकिन हमारा इन्टरेस्ट इसमें नहीं है। उन्होंने कहा है कि आसाम से जो मुसलमान उजाड़े गये उनमें ६४ परसेंट से ज्यादा हिन्दुस्तानी थे। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप उनकी नहीं मानें और अपना जज मुकर्रर करें। उन्होंने कहा कि एक उनका जज हो, एक हमारा हो, एक तीसरे का हो आप उनकी नहीं मानें। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह हमारे देश की चीज है। हम अपना फैसला अपने आप किया चाहते हैं। आप सप्रू साहब को यह काम सुपुर्द कर दीजिये। उनको कहिये कि इन केसेज को देख लें। अगर यह बात गलत हुई है कि कोई एक हिन्दुस्तानी मुसलमान को जबरदस्ती उधर भेजा गया है तो इस मामले को वह देखें। मैं तो यह भी कहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान से जो हिन्दू उजड़ कर आये हैं उनको हम हिन्दुस्तान में फैला रहे हैं। तो जो मुसलमान आसाम बोर्डर पर उजड़े हैं उनके लिये भी ऐसा कि वह भी नये सिरे से हिन्दुस्तान में आबाद किये जायें।

तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि आज पंडित नेहरू को यह यकीनन जानना चाहिये कि कश्मीर पंडित नेहरू के साथ रहेगा। बशर्त कि आप ऐसा रास्ता अखत्यार न करें कि चाहे शेख अब्दुल्ला हो या कोई हो कुछ दूसरी बात कर सके। सच्ची बात कड़वी होती है। अब्दुल्ला के लिये बेहतर था कि वह सब करते, लोगों से मिलते, फकत कहते कि ग्यारह वर्ष के बाद आया हूँ अभी मैं कुछ नहीं कहता। मैं अपनी बात पंडित नेहरू से और दूसरे साथियों से मिलने के बाद कहूँगा। अगर वह ऐसा करते तो अच्छा होता। लेकिन क्या कारण है जो उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं किया। वह शायद भगवान कृष्ण के फरमान पर यक़ीन रखते हैं :

“एक तजे कुल के लिये, कुल तजे परहेत।  
पर तजे हित देश के, देश तजे अपनेत।”  
जिसमें अपने जमीर को देश पर कुर्बान करने के लिये कहा गया है। खैर,

तीन चार दिन के बाद वह यहां आयेंगे और प्रेस वालों से, पंडित जी से और दूसरे लोगों से मिलेंगे और तब अपनी बात कहेंगे। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह अगर यह कहते हैं कि कश्मीर हमारा नहीं है तो हम शेख साहब से भी लड़ेंगे। क्योंकि काश्मीर के साथ हमारे मुल्क का दिक्का बाबस्ता है, उसके साथ अपना ताल्लुक है। वह हमारा है और हम अपने देश को महफूज देखना चाहते हैं। अगर पाकिस्तान वाले पाकिस्तान में आज मुसलमान और हिन्दू के साथ इंसाफ नहीं कर पाये तो इसलिये कि वहां फौजी राज है, वहां किसी को आजादी राय नहीं है। क्या हम कश्मीर जन्नतेनजीर को उनकी गोद में डाल दें? ऐसा बरदाश्त नहीं किया जायेगा। मैं आपसे कहता हूँ कि ये आपकी मेन्टलिटी पर मुनस्सर है कि हम कश्मीर के बारे में क्या करने जा रहे हैं। क्या इस तरह से अगर हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान के दिमाग में यह बात बैठ जाये कि आज नन्दा साहब के यहां उनको इंसाफ नहीं मिलता तो इसका असर कश्मीर पर जरूर पड़ेगा।]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is one of the clock. If the House so desires, we can sit till 1.30 P.M. I am in the hands of the House

श्री अब्दुल गनी : जैसा आप कहें।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you finish in two minutes?

श्री अब्दुल गनी : जी हां, तीन चार मिनट और लिया चाहता हूँ।]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghani, let me put it to the House whether it is its desire to sit till 1.30 P.M.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then we sit till 1.30 P.M.

Mr. Ghani, Just give way to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. He has to make a statement.