

- (ii) Statement No. XIII—Fortieth Session, 1962.
- (iii) Statement No. XI—Forty-first Session, 1962.
- (iv) Statement No. VIII—Forty-second Session, 1963.
- (v) Statement No. V—Forty-fourth Session, 1963.
- (vi) Statement No. III—Forty-fifth Session, 1963. [See Appendix XLVI, Annexure Nos. 34 to 39 for (i) to (vi) respectively.]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS ACT, 1952

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: I also beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section(2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Labour and Employment:

- (i) Notification G.S.R. No. 206, dated the 30th January, 1964, publishing the Employees' Provident Funds (Fifth Amendment) Scheme, 1964.
- (ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 207, dated the 31st January, 1964, publishing the Employees' Provident Funds (Sixth Amendment) Scheme, 1964. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2508/64.]

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1964-65.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall now commence the general discussion on the Budget. Shri Dahyabhai Patel will initiate it.

We shall sit up to 1.30 P.M.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Sir, as I rise to speak on the Budget of the Government of India

for the year 1964-65, my mind goes back to the similar occasion last year when I had characterised the Government's and the Prime Minister's attitude to different Finance Minister and I had compared it to that of a Bluebeard who could not stand a wife very long.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pardon?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I had compared his attitude to that of a Bluebeard. Like Bluebeard the Prime Minister could not stand a Finance Minister very long. And that remark roused very angry protests from the then Finance Minister. However, subsequent events have shown that my remarks were not unjustified.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Quite irrelevant.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: In his Budget speech, the Finance Minister has enunciated principles which are basic to the needs of a developing economy. While stressing the importance of making the most efficient use of investments already completed and at the same time stepping up further the tempo of investments, he has rightly pointed out that the prime objectives of our economic and fiscal policy must be to generate savings, both in the hands of the individuals and in the corporate bodies.

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): Is the hon. Member reading out a statement?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He considers it of the utmost importance for the economy that the enterprises in the public sector should not only make profits, but should make good profits. He feels that it is equally important for our development that the private sector has the resources to expand in the fields assigned to it in our planning, and that in the corporate sector the primary need of the hour is to in-

fuse some confidence. In order to make full use of private capital sources in the world outside, to augment the external aid we receive, he thinks we should specially welcome foreign investment in the shape of equity capital. According to him, the taxation policy, apart from producing revenue, has also to be geared to the paramount task of promoting growth. If these concepts are put into the framework of an integrated policy, the three inter-related problems of prices, growth and balance of payments would find a speedier solution and bring the goal of attaining an economy of abundance and assuring to the individual a national minimum standard much easier.

The question now is whether this has been done. Many of us feel disappointed at this and feel that he has not been able to carry out his intentions. While he appears to give relief in a certain measure, in effect, the relief is not there, or it is counter-balanced by certain other imposts which make the person concerned pay higher. In the case of the middle-class tax-payer who, I feel, is the hardest hit, this is particularly true, more so with the rising prices all over.

The Budget proposals which he later announced do not, however, measure up to the criteria laid down by him in the earlier part of his speech. The overall effect of his proposals, whether in the field of investment or savings, would be depressing. What he has granted by one hand he has, more or less, taken away by the other, with the result that the tax burden on the individuals, barring perhaps persons in the lower income groups, and the corporations has, by and large, continued to be heavy. Even in the case of assesseees with incomes below Rs. 15,000, though there will be benefit as a result of the withdrawal of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, the net burden of direct taxes will be much higher than that of 1962-63. It is indeed a paradox that in a developing economy like that of India where the need for an incentive taxation is being increasingly felt, the

rates continue to be unduly high, while in advanced countries like the United States of America where the economy is booming, the income-tax rates are being slashed. In the United States, in the case of individuals the present range of 20% to 91% will be slashed to 16% to 77% this year, and 14% to 70% in the year 1965. For large corporations, the present rate of 52% will be cut to 50% with retrospective effect from January 1 of this year and to 48% by January 1, 1965. In the case of our country the need for bringing down the burden of taxation is all the greater. Higher investments in our country will be possible only when the corporations and individuals both have more savings.

It should not have been difficult for the Finance Minister to lighten the burden as the revenue from the direct taxes has shown a considerable amount of buoyancy. Corporation and income taxes together during 1963-64 are likely to exceed the original expectations by Rs. 70 crores, i.e. Rs. 53 crores of Corporation Tax and Rs. 17 crores of income tax. This is indeed a feature of our budgeting where revenues have been under-estimated and the expenditure over-estimated year after year. Sir, when I spoke last time I had quoted figures of the last preceding five years, showing how this had become a feature from year to year, and I was quoting from the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee which are published and are available to Members of Parliament and to the public. The same feature continues this year also. In 1964-65 the same feature is likely to be repeated despite the assertion of the Finance Minister that this year he has done tight budgeting. As a result of the Budget proposals, there will be a net gain to Revenue of Rs. 40 crores and to Capital of Rs. 50 crores during 1964-65. And this is in addition to the heavy burden already imposed. As against the original target of Rs. 1,100 crores of additional taxation during the whole of the Third Plan at the Centre, the taxation measures introduced till the last year's Budget alone

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]
would give a sum of little over Rs. 1,900 crores of additional taxation to the Centre, that is to say, an excess of Rs. 800 crores during the Plan period. This year's Budget proposals would substantially increase this amount. How such heavy taxation will leave enough savings at the hands of the individuals and of the corporate sector and induce investment in productive enterprises and to what extent it will attract foreign equity capital for which the Finance Minister is so keen, time alone will show. But the indications do not seem to be very favourable. Foreign equity capital, particularly, is in great demand in a capital-hungry world, and it naturally flows to places where it finds the terms and the climate more favourable. If, therefore, we want to attract this foreign equity capital, our taxation rates will have to be competitive.

Another point which needs consideration is that the sum total of all the taxes imposed in India exceeds the total income of an assessee after a certain level of income, when erosion of capital starts. In the Kaldorian scheme of taxation which the Finance Minister accepted, the ceiling on income-tax rates was put at 45 per cent. But in our present scheme of taxation, all the unfavourable features are introduced without the redeeming ones. For instance, the various allowances which are granted to an assessee in advanced countries are denied to us. The incidence of tax in India as percentage of earned income, salaried income, is much higher than in advanced countries with the result that the net income in the hands of an assessee in India is considerably lower. Perhaps the burden of taxation on assesseees could have been less if the public sector enterprises had made the expected contribution to the exchequer. Against the anticipated surplus of three hundred crores of rupees at the Centre during the Plan period, the public sector enterprises have paid a dividend of Rs. 1.36 crores in 1962-63 which is expected to go up to 2.16 crores in 1963-64 and 2.32 crores in

1964-65. This has been paid on an investment of Rs. 806.47 crores in share capital and the return works out to 0.25 per cent. In effect, the people are being whipped for the failure of planning and for the failure of management of these plans and for the failure of Government. The Finance Minister admits that the Super Profits Tax produces psychological resistance and affects industrial growth to some extent. The Super Profits Tax goes but it is substituted by a Surtax on profits of companies. Even with a higher standard of deduction, and the inclusion of some loans in the capital base and the grant of some rebate of Corporation Tax in respect of a few scheduled industries, the burden of the new Surtax on companies will by no means be small. The Surtax has no provision for setting off deficiencies. Since this Tax is in the nature of Excess Profits Tax, it should have, in fairness to the assesseees, provided for fluctuation in the fortunes of the company. In fact, the Excess Profits Tax had even a provision for the carry back of deficiencies. The Surtax also does not contain provision of allowances of ten per cent. of the amount when carried to the reserves. Besides, some essential industries like automobiles which have a higher priority or account of their strategic importance on our capital incentives have not been allowed the rebate. It is argued that the incidence of Surtax on industries will not be heavy. If that be the case, the collections from this source could not be so large that the Government could not give up the revenue and allow to the industrial sector the much needed incentive for its growth. The proposal to levy a Dividend Tax on equity capital runs counter to the policies of Government to boost up investment. On the contrary, it is bound to dampen the investment climate and is, therefore, a retrograde step. The imposition of the Capital Gains Tax on bonus shares will be another inhibiting factor to the investor. It will be in the nature of double taxation or perhaps treble taxation because the bonus shares are given from resources built up after

payment of tax. Further, bonus issues are subject to Super Tax of twelve per cent. A tax then for capital gains is, therefore, inequitous. The removal of the ceiling for Capital Gains Tax is another undesirable feature of this Budget. The increase in the rate of Super Tax from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent. in the case of companies in which the public has no substantial interest or which are subsidiaries of public companies is not a wholesome feature of the Budget as this will tend to retard the rate of industrial growth. These companies are performing a very useful role and, therefore, do not deserve to be discriminated against. The Finance Minister has given a warning that the continuance of the Development Rebate in its present form from the 1st April, 1966, should not be assumed. This is rather odd that in the face of the present need for accelerating the rate of capital formation this warning should have been issued when far more advanced countries like the United Kingdom only last year announced liberal allowances to promote capital formation. The total allowance in the first year amounts to a minimum of fifty-five per cent. in the case of plant and machinery, twenty-four per cent. in the case of industrial buildings. The allowances in respect of capital expenditure on scientific research amounts to one hundred and thirty per cent. of the expenditure, comprising of one hundred per cent. annual allowance and thirty per cent. investment allowance in respect thereof. The reimposition of the Expenditure Tax and steepening of the rate of Estate Duty and the Gifts Tax, to put it mildly, are harsh steps, hardly justified. The rate of higher levels in the case of Estate Duty and Gifts Tax are confiscatory and punitive and will react sharply on the propensity to save and as a result affect the investment and capital formation will be just the reverse of what the Finance Minister expects. The decision to reimpose the Expenditure Tax will tend to undermine the confidence of the public in regard to long-term policies of Government

Such frequent changes in Government policies cannot but have an upsetting effect on the public. Moreover, past experience has shown that the collection of this Tax is not commensurate with the time spent, the expenditure incurred and the energy that is to be spent both by the Government and the assessee. Inequitous distinction between earned income and unearned income has not been a happy feature of our tax system. A higher incidence of taxation on unearned income is not compatible with the ideology of inducing the people to invest their savings in productive enterprises. The discontinuance of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme is to be welcomed but the introduction of the Annuity Benefit Scheme in place of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme at income levels above fifteen thousand rupees per annum on a graduated scale has taken away the grace of the relief granted. Under the Annuity Scheme the net increase in the hands of an assessee will be lower than it has been heretofore. Certain ranges of income will be put to avoidable hardships apart from the time consuming formalities that will have to enter in it. It descends heavily on a class of people who have marginal capacity to save and invest. All these schemes could have been put on a voluntary basis; if necessary, the term could have been a little more attractive or else provision should have been made for the purchase of Treasury Saving Deposit Certificates or negotiable bearer bonds on a compulsory basis. The provision to tax the Annuity payments in the hands of the taxpayers is the most undesirable feature of the scheme because at higher levels of income quite a good percentage of this repayment will be taken away in the form of taxation. The provision for deposit of Income Tax due within one month of the submission of the returns and a levy of a penalty of fifty per cent. of the amount of tax payable in case of failure to pay the tax is very severe. The time limit should be suitably extended. It is proposed to allow to resident assessee who are not citizens

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]
of India a rebate in Income Tax and Super Tax on a sum of two thousand rupees per child up to two children under twenty-one years of age receiving education outside. In India too, the education of children has become a very costly item and puts a severe strain on the finances of the middle classes particularly with the rising price line all round. There is no reason why a similar rebate should not be granted to Indian citizens as well. Further, in a number of countries rebates are granted for medical expenditure incurred. In the United Kingdom, the State provides for medical relief. Here too some sort of relief for medical expenditure should be granted to Income Tax 12 Noon payees. Grant of exemption to all intercorporate dividends from Super-tax and removal of the provision in the income-tax law respecting disallowance of expenditure incurred by companies on the remuneration of their Indian employees above Rs. 60,000 per annum for each employee are welcome features of the Budget. But in the latter case, the provision regarding perquisites nullifies the concessions granted to a great extent. The exemption of section 23-A companies engaged in the manufacture or processing of goods or mining or generation and distribution of power from the existing requirements of compulsory distribution of dividends has removed a long-felt grievance of the industry. Tax exemption to foreign technicians for three years provided Government approval is obtained within one year on their arrival in India has removed the difficulty which was hitherto felt in this respect.

The Finance Minister should give second thought to his proposals for doing away with the secrecy provisions in the Income-tax Act and other similar enactments and for having powers to make rules to stop abuses in certain types of business expenditure, as also with regard to powers of search and seizure. Such large dis-

cretionary powers in the hands of the executive are likely to cause greater harassment to law abiding citizens than to the unsocial elements. This will, at the same time, open more opportunities for corruption.

I have criticised corruption in this House so often. I am not against Government coming down with a heavy hand on people who are engaged in corruption. I would like to see come true the Home Minister's assurance that he will put down corruption within a short period. But the drastic powers that are proposed to be given, to my mind, are likely to lead to further corruption than eradicate it and past experience has also shown that my fears are not unjustifiable. Therefore, I would request the Finance Minister to reconsider some of the aspects of his Budget and be true to the assurances that he has given to the country. He began by giving an assurance that he was going to give relief. Unfortunately, it has proved to be completely illusory. The tax-payer is going to pay more, particularly the middle-class tax-payer, who has suffered all these years. I would like the Finance Minister to give serious thought to this.

Thank you.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras):
Mr. Chairman, I rise to accord my warm support to the Budget proposals as presented by the Finance Minister. In his Budget Speech, the Finance Minister has given us a lucid and impressive exposition of fiscal policies which he intends to pursue. I am in whole-hearted agreement with all those policies. In my view, the most important of them are: Firstly, our economic development should be so geared as to yield an increasing rate of production, especially in regard to essential commodities. Secondly, our investment should be made so as to be productive and as far as possible unproductive investments should be avoided. Thirdly, our administration should be made more efficient

and strict economy should be enforced. Fourthly, he has said that the range of inequalities in income as well as in wealth should be reduced. gradually but steadily and he has stressed the need for expanding the Government's activities on social welfare and social security. I am very particular about the last item, social security, which has not found much place in the Budget. In some States, feeble attempts are being made to provide old age pension or destitute relief. I think piecemeal attempts like this will only create more and more discontent among the people. The time has come when the Government of India should formulate a real national policy on social security, starting with old age pension. I do not mind where they start from. They may start with people of 65 and above. The provision may be merely Rs. 10 or Rs. 15 per month, but it should be started on a national scale and cover all classes of people. The Finance Minister has provided family pension for Government servants. I welcome the proposal, but Government servants are a small fraction of the population and they are not the poorest section of the population. In the villages, I have come face to face with people who are utterly destitute, who do not know how to live and for whom no provision has been made. I think that it is not right that free India, after sixteen years of freedom, should say: We are not yet ready to give you any kind of relief. Therefore, I suggest that the Finance Minister should take early steps to evolve a national system of social security for all the people of this country.

Now, Sir, I am glad to find that the Finance Minister has resisted the claims of fanatics from both the right and the left. It will be very regrettable and harmful to the country if he yields to the clamour of many people who want the Government to manufacture cigarettes, to trade in rice and grains and possibly in vegetables and fruits. I think all this is crazy. The

Government should concentrate on those things which other people cannot do. In fact, it has got tremendous work to do in developing power, in developing our basic industries and transport and communications. Yesterday a responsible person told me that if we are to achieve even the level of Japan, the per capita income of which is only five times that of India, then our power production must be of the order of over 100 million kilowatts, while it is only about ten million kilowatts now. That is the range of development that is needed. Therefore, it is right and necessary that the Government should concentrate only on those things which cannot be done by others and concentrate on them with more effect.

I am also in general agreement with the taxation proposals. The proposals are based on some general principles. First is that the present taxation is very complicated and it should be simplified and rationalised. In the case of excise duties and also direct taxes he has taken some steps to simplify and rationalise the structure. I warmly welcome those proposals.

Then, a second set of proposals are intended to reduce the range of inequalities, especially the Estate Duty and Gift-Tax. He has raised them very steeply. In principle they are justifiable, but I am very doubtful about the ability of the present Government to enforce them. They are likely to be evaded in a large measure. I suggest that if he is anxious to enforce these taxes, he must immediately set up a National Valuation Commission, with branches in every State, which will value all buildings and lands, all immovable property. All kinds of taxation—income-tax, wealth-tax and also stamp duty—also, the local property tax, the municipal tax should be based on the Valuation Commission's report. Now, recently I went to Calcutta and Bombay to find out about the evasion of tax and of corruption. We were told by responsible

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

officers that properties worth Rs. 50 lakhs are registered for Rs. 15 lakhs and 20 lakhs. Thereby, the stamp duty, the local property tax, income-tax and wealth-tax are all evaded. Large-scale evasion is going on. Unless we take steps to prevent evasion simply raising the rate of taxation is not going to do any good. I understand that in Great Britain there is a National Valuation Commission which values all kinds of property and whenever there is any dispute the estimate or rather the finding of that Commission is binding upon all the parties. If a similar thing is done, not only the Central taxes will be collected properly but also all our municipalities, corporations and State Governments will gain immensely. I am afraid that the expenditure tax will only give rise to all kinds of false statements as in the case of election expenditure. No one is likely to give a true statement of his expenditure. He will distribute his income among his relations, among his sons, daughters, etc. Each will be spending, and therefore, unless all the members of a family and their relations are asked to submit separate expenditure statements, there will not be any proper basis for enforcing this tax. Therefore, I do not expect that it will be a good tax. One may not object to the principle of the tax, but it is not a tax which can be enforced, and a tax which is not enforced is a breeding ground for all kinds of evasion and corruption. It is one of the great evils of our present policies that we have got too many measures which we are not able to enforce. Therefore, all kinds of touts, contactmen and others who become skilled in evasion of these taxes begin to flourish. We have got almost a professional class which helps all businessmen and other people to evade these taxes. It is almost like the lawyer class or the auditor class. It has become one of the most important classes in Delhi. Its number is legion. There must be thousands of such people whose sole business is to see that as much tax is evaded as

possible. Therefore, it is not right to give more scope for such people.

I welcome the abolition of the secrecy clause regarding income-tax, estate duty and wealth tax. When the Income-tax Bill was before this House, I actually put forward an amendment and pleaded that all assessments, especially assessments of, say, over Rs. 10,000, should be published. Today what is happening? The lawyers give in their statements only part of their income. The doctors take half of their fees in cheque and half of their fees in cash. All the actresses, if they get Rs. 1 lakh, show in account only Rs. 10,000, and Rs. 90,000 go in the form of cash or jewellery or other kinds of things. If the Government systematically publishes the names of all these people, their prestige within their own class will be affected. If a leading lawyer practising in a High Court is taxed only for Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 20,000 a year, then his prestige will fall suddenly. Therefore, we must mobilise public opinion against this evasion of tax. One of the best means of such mobilisation is to publish them. I am not satisfied with the present provision which only says that secrecy will be lifted. The Government must take the positive step of publishing the various categories of assesseees and the assessments and whether they have paid their assessments or not. Therefore, it will become a matter of prestige for them to give a proper statement of income and to pay the income-tax. It is only in that way that public co-operation for this purpose can be mobilised.

Now I come to the question of economy. Of course the Finance Minister has mentioned it, but there is no indication that any serious steps to enforce economy in the Government have been taken. The need for economy is obvious from the fact that the increase in Government expenditure is greater than the increase in national income. In 1962-63 the total increase in national income was Rs. 230 crores. The increase in Central Government

expenditure under revenue account alone was Rs. 272 crores. If we add to this the increased revenue expenditure of all the States, it will be evident that the Government is spending every year twice or thrice the total increase in national income. And what is the result? Of course the Government services may get a better deal, but with regard to the non-official population who are the vast majority, their standard of life is bound to fall. Therefore, strict economy must be enforced. I think it can be enforced. I would suggest to the Finance Minister that he must take a decision to retrench 25 per cent of the Class IV staff and at least 10 per cent of the Class III staff. I do not want any single Government servant to be dismissed or to be discharged. But if in future recruitments for the next 10 or 15 years it is decided that recruitment will be made only for 75 per cent of the Class IV retirements and only for 85 per cent of the Class III retirements, then there will be a steady economy throughout the administration. I am sure that this economy will increase efficiency. Everywhere there are too many of these people, clerks, peons and others, going about, who have no work whatsoever in most of the offices. Therefore, if you give them more work, there will be more efficiency and therefore this is a thing which the Finance Minister ought to give his attention to.

Now I come to the Defence Ministry. Of course our country being in a state of emergency, it is considered to be rather unpatriotic to say anything about the Defence Ministry. But I do think that the Defence Ministry deserves very close attention, and if the Finance Minister is strong enough, he can effect an economy of at least Rs. 100 crores in the Defence budget. We propose to spend for 1964-65 Rs. 717.8 crores in revenue expenditure and Rs. 136 crores in capital expenditure for purposes of defence. This is Rs. 50 crores more than that for the year 1963-64 though this year as well as

last year there have been no actual military operations. Members may think that the bulk of this expenditure goes in the form of salaries to officers and soldiers. Only one-third of this Defence expenditure is spent as salaries and allowances. The other two-thirds are for various purposes. The pay and allowances account for only Rs. 216 crores out of Rs. 728 crores; transport Rs. 42.1 crores; manufacturing and research Rs. 154 crores. I think here this is a big leaky budget. So far as manufacturing is concerned I do not see why the Army should take to manufacturing things which are manufactured by other people. Our Army is in many respects a medieval army. We are spending over Rs. 10 crores on animals and their maintenance. These are days in which the animals have no place in any kind of fighting.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): They are useful in the hilly areas.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: In the hilly areas only the small tanks are required. Please find out whether your cavalry fought in the NEFA region. They could not go there at all.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: For transporting goods.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Some mules may be useful, but they are only a small part. The bulk of the expenditure is for the sake of show and prestige. Horses are good for processions but they are not good for the Army. These military farms on which we are spending nearly Rs. 6 crores are giving a return of only Rs. 1 crore. So, why should it not be transferred to the Food Ministry. They should manage them as economic farms and give the produce . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): If the profit is Rs. 1 crore out of Rs. 6 crores, it is good return. Is it Rs. 1 crore out of Rs. 6 crores?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: No, the amount of Rs. 1 crore is the gross return on an expenditure of Rs. 6 crores and so, there is a net deficit of Rs. 5 crores a year. Therefore, the military farms are not economical.

So far as fundamental research is concerned, it does not belong to the Defence Ministry. We have got extensive laboratories all over the country but why should there be duplication in the Defence Ministry? In fact, for the last ten years an attempt has been made in the Defence Ministry to build up a separate empire altogether to duplicate every thing. They manufactured on the civil side and all kinds of things have crept in. It requires a thorough cleansing and this will result in a great deal of saving. Will you, Sir, believe me when I say that the Army spends Rs. 4 crores on mere stationery and printing and this is more than what is spent by the Railways or more than what is spent by all the other civil departments put together?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: They write protest notes.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I do not know. I am only saying that all sorts of things are done in the Army.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Does it pertain only to the Army or to the Armed Forces, the Navy and the Air Force, all taken together?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: All of them taken together. I will give you the details. For the Army, the printing and stationery expenditure is Rs. 322 lakhs, for the Navy it is Rs. 7.4 lakhs and for the Air Force it is Rs. 36.4 lakhs.

And then comes the stores purchase. I think greater leakage occurs in the Military Stores Department than in the Civil Supplies Department and I know that in the Civil Supplies Department generally the Government

pays at least 10 to 15 per cent. more than the value. Therefore, you can imagine how much more they should be paying for the military stores. In the Air Force, the stores take up more than half of the budgeted amount Rupees sixty-seven crores out of Rs. 125 crores go for aviation stores. I am not saying that much of it may not be justified. But we require a regular scrutiny squad attached to the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, which will continually audit and scrutinise the expenditure and see if economies cannot be effected. I have no doubt that as much as probably Rs. 100 crores can be saved in our military expenditure and that burden on the people can be reduced.

Well, again, the Finance Minister has mentioned in his Budget Speech the need to rationalise the financial relations between the States and the Centre. They are becoming more and more chaotic.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair] Now, approximately, one-third of the total amounts given as subventions, grants and loans have to be returned to the Centre in the form of interest and repayment of loans. And what is happening is that the Government of India is giving loans for unproductive purposes. The State Governments take loans from the Centre and build medical colleges, engineering colleges, elementary school buildings and other things. How can we expect any State to repay these loans with interest except through taxation? To give loans to the States, which can be returned only through taxation, I think, is a wrong policy. But the States do not mind, because the States say, "If you have to pay, then we will ask for more. If you have to pay Rs. 100 crores this year, we will ask for Rs. 200 crores, spend Rs. 100 crores and repay the other Rs. 100 crores." This is the financial relation that is going on between the Centre and the States. There is no sense of responsibility on the part of the States, and the Centre is not in a position to say to any State,

"You are investing your assets very badly, you are incurring unnecessary expenditure. Cut down your expenditure. See that your assets yield profits." It is not in a position to say that because the States will say, "We will strike", and there will be political repercussions.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): It is the same party.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Whether it is the same party or other parties, the thing is that when the State is against the Centre, all the parties in the State combine together against all the other parties at the Centre. Where regional considerations come in, these party feelings disappear, I may say. Everybody wants railway lines in his own State; the Swatantra Party people and the Communists all join together. Therefore, my feeling is that the Centre should create an independent body for financing the States, a body which will look at things more from the point of view of business principles, so that no political influences will be possible. The Planning Commission may scrutinise the projects and the financing body—it may be a branch of the Reserve Bank or some organisation of that type—will scrutinise, and it will issue only such amounts as are invested properly. The Central Government should not take the responsibility for the proper implementation of the State Plans. It should be done by this body; it will have the power to say, "You have not spent last year's allotment properly. Therefore, we are not going to give you this year's allotment." It should be a body which will be guided only by business principles and not by political considerations. Therefore, the financial relations between the Centre and the States should be put on a proper basis, grants under article 282 should be stopped. The grants should be determined by the Finance Commission once for five years, and there should be no change. So far as loans are concerned, they should be given only by a special branch of the Reserve Bank or a new

organisation to be set up for the purpose. On the lines of the Planning Commission, you may have a Central Finance Commission permanently which will deal with loans, collections, instalments, interest and everything.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Cannot the Finance Commission which is to be appointed deal with this matter?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: The Finance Commission is a temporary body; if it is made into a permanent Commission, then it may be able to do that.

Now I will take only a few minutes and it is to speak about the Fourth Plan. It is obvious that because we had all accepted the Third Plan, we had to accept all the consequences. Therefore we have to learn from the lessons of the past and draw up the Fourth Plan accordingly. The previous Plans were made like this; first you estimated the expenditure and then tried to see if you cannot have some resources, whether real or on paper, to meet the expenditure of the Plans. I think the process should be reversed. This year the Finance Ministry should tell the Planning Commission that these are the possible resources for the next five years—of taxation, of loans, of savings of foreign assistance—and you plan accordingly. You should not call for expenditure from all the States. Last time they gave three times the possible resources. You must tell Madras: "We are going to give you Rs. 200 crores; give a plan for Rs. 200 crores", and they should distribute it between the districts, the taluks etc. Then we will get a realistic plan. Instead of that we get all kinds of plans and then, at the Centre, you ask the States to reduce their plans to one-third, and the States cut down all the district plans and all the village plans leaving only the provincial plans. All that procedure must go, and they should concentrate on what the Finance Minister has called 'productive investments'. There are many investments

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

which have been made during the last three Plans, which have been wholly unproductive. I do say that no more capital should be sunk in these items. There are many items—I do not want to single them out—in which we have invested enough, crores and crores of rupees. We must tell them: "Convert the capital already sunk into a revolving fund." We must tell them: "Whatever you can recover from the loans, you reinvest. We have no objection, but don't ask for more. We have already given enough for this purpose." Hundreds of crores of rupees have been given for handloom, for khadi, for cottage industries and some of the agricultural plans also. For instance, even for minor irrigation; if you take the net result, you will find that the minor irrigation area has not increased. While new irrigation has been developed and old irrigation has gone out of use and the net result is nil, while the capital investment has been of the order of many hundreds of crores of rupees. Therefore we should tighten all these investment policies and see at least that every crore invested during the Fourth Plan, either by the Centre or the States, brings at least 7 per cent, 8 per cent, 10 per cent return. If it does not do so, we must say that the Government has failed in its duty, and it should take full responsibility.

Only one word more. The Government of India have brought into existence panchayat raj institutions all over the country; practically every village is covered with a panchayat, and then a group of village, 60 or 70 villages have been grouped under panchayat samitis, and then there are the zila parishads and many of them are doing very good work; they have all come into existence, but they have no resources. In France such institutions get an income of Rs. 50 *per capita*. But in U.P., in Punjab the panchayats do not get 4 annas *per capita*. I had the privilege of being the chairman of a committee to investigate these panchayat finances. We

have recommended that every panchayat in this country should be assured a minimum grant from the Centre and the States of one rupee *per capita* and they should raise another rupee at least, and with two rupees *per capita* they can provide the minimum civic amenities to the villages. Similarly the panchayat samiti should have one rupee *per capita* as grant and it should have its own taxation, and we have also suggested that special finance corporations should be set up in each State to give loans to these panchayats to build up remunerative assets. There are many places, vacant plots on which if they build a market, they may get a minimum return of 15 per cent, or 20 per cent. But they have no capital, and therefore, to provide the capital needs of these panchayat institutions the committee has suggested the setting up of panchayat finance corporations. I do suggest to the Finance Minister that he should not brush aside the claims of these panchayatraj institutions saying that they are the responsibility of the States. No doubt they are the responsibility of the States, but the States can say that if they had been left alone, they would have developed the panchayatraj institutions slowly, as and when their resources developed. It is due to the pressure from the Centre that these institutions have had to be set up on a universal basis all over the country. Therefore the Centre cannot escape responsibility. The Centre should share the responsibility with the States and provide the panchayatraj institutions with the minimum funds which will enable them to live, and if they function well, then a great deal of the burden will be taken away from the State Governments and the Centre. Otherwise these institutions will become centres of discontent and unrest, and it will be a headache to both the States and the Centre.

With these few remarks, I wholeheartedly welcome the Budget proposals and congratulate the Finance Minister on his excellent performance. Thank you.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, while according general support to the Budget proposals I have got a few observations to make. The Budget, if I can describe it, is just like the curate's egg, good in parts and bad in many parts, but it is presented with an acumen and ingenuity of a businessman; an intelligent and experienced administrator as he is, he has tried to present the Budget in such a manner that it becomes rather an essay in ingenuity and it is difficult to understand the exact implications of this Budget. The other aspect which I can say about the Budget is that the Budget has tried to do some good to the industrialist and businessman, but it has neglected the farmer altogether; no fair deal is given to the farmer who is supposed to be the key man in agricultural production, and if at all he is mentioned, he is mentioned very cursorily and no positive help has been given to that man.

Madam, one of the most important factors in the country's Budget is the period for which the Budget is presented. Several State Governments have made recommendations to the effect that the present period from 1st of April of a year to 31st of March of the following year is not suited to Indian conditions, that maximum use of the money is not made and much of the money spent is not gainfully employed so there should be a change in the period, it should be from the 1st of August, or even it can be a little farther, I mean from the 1st of September to 30th of August, so that the country can spend the money gainfully and also get more work out of the money which is provided. I made this suggestion, when I came first to Parliament and I made it to the then Finance Minister—Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari—in 1957. And the reply given to me was that considering the pros and cons of the suggested change, the balance of convenience was in favour of retaining the present period. With due respect to his bril-

liance and intelligent working I still feel that he has not abandoned his orthodox thinking for which he is little known but he is known for his unorthodox thinking and think this is one of the orthodox things which is still in the thinking of the Finance Minister.

Secondly, he has presented a Budget which leaves some surplus, a surplus of Rs. 54 crores. But the attempt to rationalise the tax structure does not bring about any radical change in the Government policies. As the Finance Minister of the country he will have to rethink and come out with bold ideas, with new ideas as to how to gear up the economy of the country. Madam, we have seen from the President's Address that the economy is being geared up is self-generating and self-sustaining. Do we see any signs of such an economy? I am very doubtful whether the economy is so. Our economy is sustained by foreign aid; we get a lot of foreign aid, but much of the foreign aid, a substantial portion of it is eaten up in consumption, and it has been commented on by one of the observers looking at our Plan that nearly 75 per cent of the foreign aid is being consumed in the country and very little is left for Plan expenditure. To quote Vinobaji, he says that India hardly gets one anna per day per man for development. Can this poor country go on with such a meagre fund and think of its development? There is a claim that this Budget is a Budget for growth. Are there any indications that the growth is towards a socialist economy? Are there any indications to show that the Bhubaneshwar spirit is reflected? No doubt there are some brighter aspects, but those aspects are concealed in such a manner that we can neither have any inkling into socialism nor can we see any radical change in the taxation policy. Madam, in a poor country, in a developing country like India, the tax structure or the taxation policy should be so attuned that

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil] it reflects the common man's mind, it reflects the common man's needs and it caters to the common man's needs. And for that purpose the country's taxation policy should be broad-based. It is not broad-based, it has tried to cull out incomes or revenues from a few pockets. And that is going to help in the country's requirement of capital formation. And that capital formation can only come very substantially from agricultural production, which provides both the raw materials for the industry and also provides employment, substantially to a very large section of the masses. So while discussing the taxation proposals or even formulating the taxation proposals, the Finance Minister has to think whether he can collect adequate revenue from all those pockets which are able to pay the tax. If that is not then I think the country's economy will not stand on its own. It cannot be self-sufficient and independent of other sources. Whatever foreign aids we get by way of P.L. 480 acts as the greatest restraint on our production which, if I may say so, is the greatest single enemy of agricultural production. It might look as a very strange proposition from one belonging to the Government Benches but I am saying what I feel. My seven years' experience in Parliament has not dislodged me from that thinking, namely, that the P.L. 480 is destroying the agricultural economy of this country. I have written times without number and also spoken to important national leaders that this P.L. 480 Mission is a suicidal Mission to this country's agricultural production. Now today our esteemed Food Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, who is a practical man, is going abroad for demanding more food. So that brings in a psychology when we are not able to react sharply, independently, to any proposal of national importance. And these are the consequences of this P.L. 480. Even if I have to take food with a friend, I feel that I am indebted to him. Now we are getting crores and crores worth of wheat,

cotton and jute from America. And the cotton that is imported is not so much to serve the common man but the mills derive the highest benefits. They make immense profit. That has been said in the Budget Speech itself. They have to be checked. So if these imports are meant just to swell the pockets of the profiteers, is it going to be a socialist economy or taking a step towards it? So the Finance Minister's Budget reflects the mentality of a man who belongs to an elite society and is not a man from the masses. India needs a Finance Minister who can look to the needs and the welfare of the common man.

Then there is a certain bright aspect also of the Budget in so far as it replaces the CDS by Annuity Deposits. But it is just an intellectual game. It is not something which can give us some confidence that the Annuity scheme is something better than the CDS. Whatever may be the opinion of the Members of Parliament and the people outside, I still feel—here I am not defending anybody—that the CDS would have given more savings than the Annuity scheme. There is no doubt that there is an attempt to rationalise the tax structure so that the revenues can be swelled. But this rationalisation has not brought enough revenues to the national exchequer. If it had brought more of revenues it would have been certainly welcomed because we could have utilised them for productive activity and the defence of this country.

Mr Santhanam has rightly hit on the point that we are providing a very heavy budget for the Defence. But what was the performance of the Defence Ministry last year? We provided Rs 863 crores. And now there is a shortfall of Rs 175 crores which they have not utilised. I do not lay the blame at the door of the Defence Minister as such but the blame is attributed to the fact that you are not ready with your schemes, with your production targets. Why

do you want so much money? You are taxing the people to a point where they are not able to pay. It results in rising prices. And I am afraid no Finance Minister upto this time could tackle the problem of rising prices. That is one of our headaches. And in its turn it brings in a number of problems, rising prices, increased dearness allowance upgradation of cities and again giving more and more allowance to employees so that the production can be geared up. But this again results in the concentration of wealth in a few hands or meeting the demands of those persons who are marticulate at the cost of millions and crores of people who are almost leaderless. Look at the condition of agricultural labour. They are not organised. Nothing is done to ameliorate their condition. They are looking helplessly to the national leadership. But the national leadership, if I may say so, to the great misfortune of this country, is still not coming out of the steel frame of bureaucracy. The bureaucracy still holds the balance. They conduct the democracy in this country. So what we need is national leaders who can curb the bureaucracy in an effective manner, control it in such a manner that they will be able to guide the destinies of the country and deliver the goods.

I have read the article written by the ex-Governor of the Reserve Bank. In the beginning there was some zeal and earnestness on the part of political leaders. That zeal has now vanished. I do not know why. They have to pamper the bureaucracy because the bureaucracy is one of the sheet anchors of political power. For any performance of any Ministry they praise the bureaucracy. Of course, I do agree that those who turn out good work must be praised; they must be complimented. All the same, their energy must be orientated in such a way that they look to the common man. Here I doubt whether we are really looking to the common man.

Madam, the question of rising pri-

ces, the question of State finances are the two most disturbing factors which have been touched by the Finance Minister and I congratulate him for that because the States, in their own way, depend more on the spoon-feeding process of getting foodgrains and other aids from the Centre. They do not exert themselves much. Look at their state of affairs. As far as the betterment levy collection is concerned, or the irrigation cess is concerned, are there any States which have really given a return from the projects for which they have spent money? This reflects the general condition. I may just quote how the whole thing goes on. There is a lack of adequate planning and co-ordination. There is a gap between the potential created and the irrigation and power utilisation thereof by some of the States. Gujarat, Mysore, West Bengal yield very poor revenue; there is under-utilisation of the whole thing. The States are now getting into more and more debts whereas their capacity to pay the debts is very doubtful. Therefore, the time has come when there must be some rethinking on the State finances. Whatever autonomy we might have given to the States, the Centre cannot afford to be weak towards the States. Now a stage is coming when the Centre can be accused of conniving, or whatever reasons, known or unknown, at the State finances of trying to continue the process of spoon-feeding. So this is a very alarming sign. Some of the States cannot even meet their overdrafts. And this is a very alarming sign. They have to overdraw on the banks thereby creating a situation from where they cannot come out. So what we need is utmost economy in public funds and proper utilisation thereof. So the State finances will have to be examined very carefully. They will have to be told definitely that they cannot avoid the responsibility of repaying the debt and they will have to give proper return on the investment that they make either in the major projects or any other projects.

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil]

As far as agricultural production is concerned, the argument is advanced that it is the direct responsibility of the States to produce more. But the Centre has never fixed the responsibility of any State, it has not advised the States to entrust the Agriculture portfolio to people who are really motivated by a sense of earnestness of purpose, urgency of purpose, that the agricultural target must be kept at a level at which they are expected to keep. And if the States are not definitely told that they are to produce to such and such a target, I think the Government's attitude of supplying food from the Central stores to the States is creating a psychology of dependence, a psychology of spoon-feeding.

Therefore they do not really devote more attention to agricultural production. We thought that the Finance Minister should have at least thought of some radical change in the banking policy. I do not say that nationalisation is the remedy but I do feel that the policy followed by the Reserve Bank and the commercial banks in our country certainly required some revision. More and more adequate finances are to be provided to the needy agriculturists who alone will utilise them for production purposes but the banking policy in the country is not farmer-oriented and the farmer still lacks adequate help by way of adequate finance. Naturally, what I thought was that the Finance Minister will have a new approach and will lay down certain conditions on the Reserve Bank that at least 50 or 60 per cent of their assets or working capital will be utilized to provide agricultural credit and he should enjoin on the commercial banks to follow suit for this; but if we take into consideration the industrial production, unfortunately even the enlightened industrialists in this country are not alive to this urgency that unless they protected the farm economy of this country, they would not be able to make profits or even

gear up the industrial production. This is going to happen because what is the state of affairs in the small-scale industries? They suffer from lack of raw material. That is their cry. So the industrialists will also have to think more and more on these lines.

Then I come to another bright aspect of the Finance Minister's speech where he laid emphasis on the role of public sector undertakings. As a Member of the P.A.C. I had an opportunity to study their finances at very close quarters and I am of this opinion that what he stated is truism and I must congratulate the Finance Minister for stating the facts. Even Mr. Asoka Mehta, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has hit on this point. Their returns are very poor. We have employed nearly Rs. 1100 crores in the public sector undertakings and the return is not more than half per cent. Only the HMT at Bangalore is giving us an adequate return but the rest of the public sector undertakings are not giving adequate returns. So unless the public sector undertakings in this country give some profits, we will not be able to gear up the economy to the extent to which we require. In this regard there are a few suggestions which I wish to make in brief. The role of public sector undertakings should be that they should be financially successful, administratively and technically efficient and should be giving reasonably adequate satisfaction to the consumers' demands. If these tests are satisfied, then I feel that the role of public undertakings, which is going to help our socialistic pattern or even the socialist society will be realised. No doubt there is a move afoot that a Parliamentary Committee should be appointed for this purpose because up to this time the undertakings responsibility and Parliament's role were not defined. The Committee will go a long way to help but the Committee will have to apply this test because certain people

grudge that the role of the public sector is not properly presented by the Finance Minister. I disagree with them. He has placed the facts before the Parliament because it is one of our planks and unless we earn more and more and also meet the legitimate demands of the labour there, earn more on account of the public sector undertakings and get adequate return as per our estimates, we will not be able to inject sufficient money or funds in our economy which is going to have a capital base. Our role up to this time—the role of the Members of Parliament—was just like that of a spectator at a tennis match. We cannot disturb their internal working except where we happen to casually discuss some annual reports but that does not give clearly the picture. Even the annual reports presented to the Parliament or the P.A.C. are so cleverly and intelligently put or drafted that you cannot get a proper inkling into the matter. So the role of the public sector undertaking needs to be completely revised and it should be made a sort of a mechanism by which we can realise adequate profits.

Coming to the third aspect, I must congratulate the Finance Minister for removing the secrecy clause in the Income-tax Act. My friend Mr. Dahyabhai Patel raised his voice of protest that this will open the flood-gates for those who are revengeful and vindictive and that people will earn money on account of this but there is a very bright aspect of this question that people will not be able to conceal their income and the unaccounted money also. That is a good feature and a very great achievement so that the tax evasion and other maladies can be removed. So this is also a matter for satisfaction.

Coming to the other aspects, I say that the country's taxation policy should be broad-based. Of course my line of thinking may not be palatable to a number of Members here but I

still feel that the income-tax base must be lowered down so that more and more people we can have in its sweep, who can legitimately contribute to the national exchequer. The limit can be lowered down as in Japan where the levels of income also are very much higher than ours but the lowest limit in Japan is 1500. There is another aspect that in a socialist economy, when we are marching towards building up a socialist society, we have to think about the proportion of direct tax to indirect tax. This country is now levying only 29 per cent. as direct tax and 71 per cent as indirect tax. This indirect tax only means a rise in the prices. What we really feel is, we are taxed less but we are taxed indirectly to such an extent that we cannot bear the burden. This is a sort of camouflage. In a developing economy, even in an undeveloped country we must switch on, though the switch or shift may be gradual but we must make a beginning towards that that our indirect taxes are brought down and the direct taxes are increased. Otherwise, we will not be able to contribute much to the economy.

Another factor is, there must be some built-in safeguards for economy. Of course I am happy that there is indication in the Budget papers that security measures are going to be there. I think for the first time after 16 years the Finance Minister is going to look after the weaker sections of the society which is a constitutional responsibility on us but how far they are going to be brought into practice is a matter to be seen and observed but I still feel that the indication in the Budget is so slight that it may be lost in oblivion. Perhaps it may not be remembered because the weaker section needs the greatest protection and if we look to the level of income on a national basis, the majority of the persons living in this country have not come out of poverty and helplessness. Of course there is some change and the change is also welcome that

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.]

people will have a little better life, they use a little good cloth, they have some facilities but they are so inadequate, looking to the stupendous problem of poverty, illiteracy and ignorance that whatever is done, is not at all left and I am afraid that there is going to be a revolution by the rising expectations, because we have raised the expectation in our pre-Independence days and even afterwards from election to election in our propaganda that people will get this and that. This expectation is rising every time. It is rather a difficult problem to counteract this expectation. So this problem the country is going to face. So if we are not going to deliver the goods at the proper time, I am afraid that people will begin to disbelieve and even they will distrust the national leaders, to whatever party they may belong. So the time has come where we have to look to that side of the question.

I have said that built-in safeguards are the prime necessities and this should have been adequately thought of much earlier but even now it is not too late to mend. The positive aspect of this social security measure is, that those persons who are not able-bodied, who are disabled for one reason or other—and the standard for deciding the social security measures should be on grounds of poverty—should be given some doles or some work which they can carry out effectively in spite of their disability, just like there are some hotels run by Parsee Trusts and those who are deaf, dumb or disabled, only they are running the hotels and are getting the profits out of them. So
1 P.M. these people should be made to work in some way or the other and wherever possible. And those who are not able to work should be given some sort of aid. We cannot call it pension, but some sort of help should be given to them when they are neglected either by their

family members or due to circumstances. Such people should be protected and they should be given this kind of help and protection immediately. The matter does not brook any delay. Therefore, that aspect of the Budget, namely the aspect of giving some relief to people of this type, giving them some social security, should really be expanded and some more funds should be brought in for this purpose.

Thirdly, I would like to say that there is scope for cutting down the *expenditure on the Administration in general*. As Shri Santhanam rightly pointed out, there is need for this. Our administrative expenditure is going up every year and every time we feel that unless we give adequate relief to the workers, to the government employees, the officers and their staff, we will not be able to carry on the administration efficiently, and in the interest of the people. This aspect of the matter, however important and legitimate it may be, has also to be considered in the context of the all-India picture of the position of the people living in the country in general. If we create a very major gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" in the sense of those who are in government service and those who are not so employed, or for whom employment is not possible, then the disparity between the incomes would be so great that it would jeopardise our national economy itself. Now the labour legislations are in full swing—and I have to say this with due deference to Shri Nandaji and his colleagues—and the labour policy and the general trend of it, I still hold, do not benefit more than a crore of people. But we have also to care for the rest of our people. What is the remedy for them? I have been on the Central Committee for Employment during the last five years. That Committee has not been able to find out even a single job or think of any other alternative

method by which the unemployed could be employed. So the prospects in India are that for many years to come, agriculture alone will give the necessary employment to our people. Therefore, the trend of our labour legislation should be such that it does not disturb the overall economy and does not disturb the persons who are there. We cannot widen the gap of disparity between the income levels

I next come to other aspects of the question. The needs of defence have to be borne in mind. Those of general economy in public expenditure should also not be lost sight of. As a matter of fact, the performance of the Defence Ministry in many respects discloses that this Ministry is not very alive to the necessity of bringing about economy in matters of defence projects. A number of contracts are given without properly scrutinising them and also at rates very much higher, and thereby these defence projects have become the paradise of these contractors. Look at the contracts given to the contractors

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI D. R. CHAVAN): Give an example.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: I can give a number of examples. The hon. Deputy Minister in the Defence Ministry will be enlightened by the Audit Report for the year 1963. I think he will find there a number of instances. I need not take up the time of the House now. He should not be touchy over such points. Facts are facts. As a matter of fact, these contractors get a lot of benefits out of the Defence Ministry and there is need for economy in the Defence Ministry. Howsoever vital such defence projects may be, there is also the vital responsibility on us to see that the money of the taxpayer is utilised gainfully and properly. The hon. Deputy Minister of Defence will do well to probe into the matter and

see how things are happening in the Defence Ministry, how the timber contracts are carried out, what are the things done in the Andamans and how several projects are carried out.

Moreover, whenever we launch upon any project, unless and until the cost-benefit ratio is borne in mind, unless the consciousness of this cost-benefit ratio is there, we will not be able to deliver the goods and we will not be able to carry out our projects efficiently and with adequate returns. We have to bear this in mind particularly in the case of irrigation facilities. We have created a lot of potential in the matter of irrigation. But the utilisation there is poor. Take the concrete case of the D.V.C.—the Damodar Valley Corporation. As far as I remember, a sum of Rs. 2 crores is in arrears, yet to be taken from the Government of West Bengal and the matter is in dispute. Whatever may be the reason for that dispute, whether it is due to the State Government or to the Centre, that may be decided between those two Governments, but the main question now is whether there is adequate return on the amount invested. There is not. Unless there is this cost-benefit ratio consciousness and unless this ratio is really adhered to, we will not be able to carry out the development that we need most. Defence and development are both vital things for our country. But we should not get lost in this process of development. There is no real development reaching those who should be benefited and the benefits are taken advantage of by contractors and businessmen and very little goes to development as such. This is a matter which also requires a deep probe. Every pie that we spend from the tax payer's money must be properly utilized. The greatest single factor which really must weigh with us is that whatever irrigation facility we have created, we are not utilising to the fullest extent and when we are not utilising that irrigation facility

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.]

we are throwing the economy of the agriculturist back into the region of gamble, in the hands of nature. There is a serious disclosure in the mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan, that agricultural production is going down. To save agriculture irrigation is one of the most vital things. It is a sort of life-line of agriculture. And if that is not used properly and if adequate revenues are not derived from the potential that was created, then it has got to be looked into. More and more use should be made of irrigation to produce more per acre. Otherwise PL. 480 unfortunately is not going to help us.

Lastly I have to touch on the subject of rising prices. It may appear strange coming from my mouth, but I believed and still continue to believe that whatever the theoretical or practical objective of State-trading in food-grains may be, in this country we will not be able to lower the prices and hold the price line unless the country resorts to State-trading in food. At least let us proceed by stages. At least adopt such a policy in certain States where you can get surplus food and also in those States where there is the possibility of increasing production of foodgrains because of irrigation facilities.

We always lay the blame on land reforms and say that because they are not radical, things are not improving. Having had some experience on this line and even as a practical farmer, I would say that there is a lacuna in the matter of our land reforms. In our land reforms we may put ceilings on holdings, we may keep so many acres as standard area, we may give further benefits to the tenants and do so many other things. But there is one aspect of the land reform question that is very important. Either in respect of the personal cultivator or in respect of the tenants, we have not laid down any clause by which we can enjoin upon the person, the producer, that he must give so

much minimum yield per acre. I feel that unless such a clause is there, the producer in our country will not be producing more. After all, we are living in an age where the rule of law prevails. The *sine qua non* of democracy is that the rule of law must prevail. Here we must not forget that people must not be compelled but it is a question of realisation of our national needs. Unless we put in a clause saying that unless a minimum yield per acre is shown, we will not be able to carry the spirit of land legislation, merely making them more and more radical is not going to help as all our speeches will not help in producing a single blade of grass. Likewise, whatever provision we may make radically in the land reform measures, we will not be able to achieve the results unless we put the responsibility on the grower.

I have another suggestion to make. The policy of the country in regard to forests is implemented by the States, and the forests are being destroyed under one pretext or the other. Some States want to have cheap popularity by giving lands to the landless people. The idea may be very good but we are destroying national property by which we are making our agriculture more and more a gamble in the hands of nature. Where the country's requirement is that at least thirtythree per cent. of the area must be under forest—in Japan it is about forty-six per cent. and even an individual Japanese farmer keeps one-third of the cultivable land under forests. Here the average is going down and in certain States it has come to the ridiculous figure of thirteen to seventeen per cent. This is the horrible state of affairs and unless there is an all-India realisation of the forest policy of the country, the production of food will not be more. I would also like to mention about the judicious cattle policy and what America calls the Billion dollar industry, namely, the poultry industry. In America it is called the million dollar industry. Alongside improvements in agriculture, we must, to keep down the

prices, give more and more attention to small-scale industries, poultry farming and so on. Unfortunately, even the Central scheme is not functioning properly. As a Member of the Public Accounts Committee I had the good fortune to visit the Delhi Milk Scheme and I asked them whether they were producing their own milk but I was told that they collected the milk from the villages by paying better prices and then distributed it on a 'no profit no loss' basis. There is a lot of difference between the rural and the urban outlook and this must be seen in the Budget proposals too. Unfortunately, I do not see this reflected in the Budget. I only see the personality of the Finance Minister reflected, a city man, a businessman and an ingenious man.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have gone through the various speeches made on the Budget in the Lok Sabha and here in this House as also the clarifications given by the Treasury Benches in and outside Parliament. I have also gone through the deliberations in the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of Finance where the Budget proposals were discussed. Before expressing my views on the various Budget proposals I would like to congratulate the Finance Minister for his forthright approach to the economic problems. He has confidence in the future of Indian economy and he has also infused confidence in us though it is not to say that the taxpayers are happy with all the tax proposals. I am very much impressed by the announcement of the Finance Minister that the form of the tax structure should be such as to meet the needs of the growth, the revival of the capital market, inflow of private foreign capital and provide sufficient cushion for both corporate as well as individual savings. I fully share his opinion that in the ultimate analysis the problem of prices and growth in balance of payments are interlinked and it is only to the extent that all these problems are tackled within the framework of an integrated policy in

regard to income and investment. It would be possible to ensure the necessary climate for a rapid take off. There are critics who say that the Finance Minister has not implemented the Bhubaneswar Resolution. Yes, he has not once used the word 'socialism' in his Budget speech but every tax proposal that he has put forward raises the spirit of socialism. In my own view he has gone much farther than Bhubaneswar. Sir, the Budget proposals disclose a disquieting trend *apropos* the economic. In fact, they do not indicate the broad approach hinted at by the Finance Minister that the financial and economic policies have to serve first and foremost the requirements of the economic growth. The impression created that it would revive the capital market, encourage greater flow of private foreign capital has been belied. Some of the proposals which appear as concessions are more than counterbalanced by some other new levies. This is very definitely so if the tax proposals relating to the corporate sector and to individuals are taken together. After all, the individuals constitute the prime source for investment in the corporate sector. Even the low income group assessee are not better off as would seem to be the case because their 'take-home' pay packet will not be in any way more than under the present scheme. Even according to the clarifications given by the Finance Ministry, the incidence of the tax for 1964-65 on earned income will be higher at Rs. 6,000, Rs. 9,000, Rs. 10,000, Rs. 11,000, Rs. 14,000 and Rs. 15,000. Generally speaking, with the Annuity Scheme the net 'take-home' income of all assessee with incomes above Rs. 15,000 will be below the level under the present scheme. It is also not clear whether the Finance Minister regards the Annuity Scheme as a permanent feature of the Income Tax. Again, taken together, the incidence of personal and corporate tax, I wonder whether it would be possible to stem, if not reduce, the spiral of rising cost of living and control the prices of consumer goods. In the

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.]

Budget speech, the Finance Minister has expressed his apprehensions about the upward tendency of prices and has hinted at the urgency of taking the situation considerably under control. In the Consultative Committee he is reported to have stated that Excise Duty on goods such as cloth, sugar and kerosene will be meaningless without proper control. This is really ununderstandable for the simple reason that it is not always right that the burden of taxation is passed on to the consumers. In fact at various levels, consumer resistance has always developed and the incidence of tax is being absorbed by the manufacturer or the manufacturer-cum-trader. I might, in this connection, refer to the incidence of Excise Duty on cotton yarn and rayon yarn as also to the increase in the Customs Duty on copra and Caustic Soda. There is no doubt that the steep increase in the rate of duty would be undesirable in the case of cotton yarn. The effect of increase on artsilk yarn would be to increase the burden on rayon yarn industry to the extent of Rs. 8.68 crores and in terms of percentage, the burden would come to sixty on rayon. I may point out that hardly 3 to 4 annas is being absorbed by the consumers and the rest is being borne by the manufacturer-cum-trader. It is claimed that rayon is a luxury good and, therefore, it can afford to bear the increased duty. I do not understand how this can be considered a luxury, especially when rayon fabrics are cheaper than cotton fabrics. Even if it is a luxury, it is a luxury to the poor and not to the rich. I, therefore, think that the increase in duty on rayon should be

withdrawn and the poor man not deprived of the benefit of this small luxury.

A perusal of the budgetary policy over the past few years discloses frequent changes in the fundamentals of fiscal policy. I do realise that fiscal and monetary policy should change according to circumstances. However, there should be some stability in policy and consistency in application and the ultimate objective should be to serve the requirements of rapid growth. A review of the Budget proposals discloses that the Finance Minister's approach to the overall deficit, taking the revenue and the capital Budgets together, has been one of placing undue reliance on taxation alone. With the existing levels of taxation, there will be a surplus of Rs. 50 crores in the Revenue Budget. Yet, additional taxation to the extent of Rs. 40 crores, even after the unprecedented burden which the last Budget placed on the taxpayers when the emergency was real and active, has been imposed.

The present level of additional taxation has to be considered in the perspective of the Third Plan. It was indicated that the requirements of additional taxation for financing investment in the public sector would have to be of the order of Rs. 1,710 crores in the five-year period. However, actual taxation imposed over the first three years of the Plan would yield a total revenue of Rs. 2,400 crores. Inclusive of the taxation imposed in the Budget for 1964-65, the total yield would appear to be in excess of the Plan target by over Rs. 800

crores, excluding the income-tax annuity deposits. The additional taxation would not, however, be wholly available for investment in the Plan. In fact, a major part of the additional taxation would be absorbed in non-Plan uses.

Coming to the specific Budget proposals, I would like to deal, at the outset, with those which affect directly the capital market and the investment climate. First of all, there is the tax on dividends distributed by companies. The dividends are proposed to be taxed at 7.5 per cent and this is apart from income-tax and super-tax payable by companies. It has been stated that the main objective is to discourage dissipation of resources by companies in paying higher dividends and induce the companies to build reserves for meeting development needs.

It should not, however, be forgotten that a minimum distribution of dividends is a 'must', however necessary the requirement for ploughing back of profits. Unless the shareholders are assured of a minimum, he cannot come forward to invest in the risk-bearing capital of the company. Again, tax on distribution of dividend is to tax the same income a third time. For instance, the amount out of which the dividends arise is already taxed in the hands of the company. Secondly, it is taxed in the hands of the shareholders. As such, a further tax on distribution of dividends is to tax for the third time. Also, tax on distribution of dividends on equity capital is to discriminate against equity capital in preference to preference capital. This levy would cause a psychological resistance for investment in equity capital.

Then, there is the tax on bonus shares. While on the one hand the distribution of dividends is penalised on the plea that the companies should be induced to create reserves, the

creation of reserves is penalised by a tax on bonus shares received by the shareholders. The bonus are issued by the companies in the process of capitalising the reserves, which is the only way for stimulating development. On receiving bonus shares, a shareholder is no better off than before. When bonus shares are received, the market value of the original share correspondingly drops, because the original market value gets spread on the original holding and the bonus shares. But clause 12 of the Finance Bill proposes to tax bonus shares when they are received, on the presumption that the shares are transferred by the shareholder at the fair market value on the 31st day of receiving them. This levy will have a serious effect on the capital market, because a shareholder subscribes to the shares of a company primarily to take advantage of the capital appreciation in the value of shares. Moreover, while the issue of bonus shares provides a psychological satisfaction to the shareholder, it enables the company to plough back the profits for further development. The bonus issue is at present taxed at the point of issue in the hands of the company at 12½ per cent. The profits out of which the bonus shares arise are already taxed as the income of the company. The proposed levy of tax on the shareholders on receipt of bonus shares is to tax the same income further.

Then, there is the warning given by the Finance Minister regarding the withdrawal of the development rebate. He has stated that the availability of the development rebate might be discontinued and has indicated his intention to give it effect from 1st April 1966. This is certainly a very retrograde measure. Firstly, the development rebate has been responsible for giving a great fillip to the development of industries. Secondly, the announcement has created a stir and introduced an element of uncertainty in the industry, particularly on account of the fact that the exact implications of this announcement have not been made known.

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.]

Then, there is the replacement of the Super Profits Tax by the Surtax. Here again, there are certain objectionable features. At the outset, all the objections against the Super Profits Tax are equally applicable to the Surtax. No doubt, the statutory reduction for purposes of Surtax has been increased from 6 per cent of capital to 10 per cent, and from the minimum of Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 2 lakhs and the capital base enlarged. But the scope of loans and borrowings, which could be included in the capital base, has been very much restricted. Again, there is a serious omission as regards the relief on occurrence of a 'deficiency'. Further, the provision regarding exclusion of 10 per cent. of the total income, subject to the amount being spent for specified purposes, does not find a place in the computation of chargeable profits for Surtax.

I would also like to refer, in this connection, to the steep rise in the rates of Gift Tax and Estate Duty. Taken together, these two duties make a heavy dent on the investible resources. The exemption limit in the case of Gift Tax has been reduced from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 5,000 and the rates have been raised so steeply as to make the rate of 40 per cent applicable to gifts between Rs. 1,45,000 to Rs. 3,45,000 and the highest rate of 50 per cent applicable to gifts over Rs. 3,45,000. It is needless for me to point out that the maximum rate of 40 per cent hitherto was for a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs. Also, there is a steep rise in the case of Estate Duty and the rate of 85 per cent. applies to estate above Rs. 20,00,000. In fact, as the proceeds of Estate Duty are dependent on factors such as mortality among the rich, the fiscal value of the tax is small in a Budget of Rs. 2,135 crores.

Then, there is the proposal to vest Government with powers to give a go-by to the secrecy provisions prohibiting the disclosure of information in the case of assessments of income-tax, wealth-tax, Estate Duty and Gift Tax. The removal of the secrecy

provisions is bound to jeopardise the carrying on of business by the assesses. It would surely not serve the interests of revenue if the reputation of individuals and business houses is tarnished because some irresponsible persons obtain information and misuse the same for mischievous ends. This proposal will encourage malpractices and corruption and give strength to anti-social elements which are already causing grave anxiety to all, including the authorities.

Finally, there is the proposal to give powers to Government and, in effect, to individual officers to take a view as to whether expenditure amounts spent wholly and exclusively for the purpose of business are really so by reference to norms that might be laid down in the Rules. I have no doubt that such discretionary powers will lead to harassment. Already the computation of business income under the Income-tax Act does not conform to commercial accounting principles. Under the new arrangement, it will further distort the position. I do hope that Government will give careful consideration to these views, while finalising the Budget proposals.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

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

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is now six months since Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari became the Finance Minister, and we all know that he became the Finance

Minister as a result of what was tom-tommed as the Kamraj Plan. At that time very many great attributes were talked of about this Kamraj Plan. Now that the Budget has been presented, we are able to see the real face of what that Kamaraj Plan is.

During the six months, Sir, many things have happened to rouse a lot of hopes among the common people of our country. For example, there has been the great, what they deem as the historic, session of the Congress at Bhubaneswar, though I do not call it a historic session. It was a dull and drab session just to talk about the same old things that they had been talking about all these years. Nonetheless it was stated that after that Bhubaneswar Congress session there was going to be a great change. There are also Members of this House, and Members of the Congress Party at that, who think that the budget presented by Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari does not reflect the spirit of that Bhubaneswar session. Frankly I should think that the budget does reflect the spirit of Bhubaneswar. It is all a question of understanding of that Bhubaneswar session. Unfortunately I think those Members who think that this budget does not reflect the spirit of Bhubaneswar have misunderstood what that Bhubaneswar session of the Congress really meant. Therefore, the Finance Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, is certainly well within his rights when he claims, within the Congress Party, of course, that the budget carries out both in letter and in spirit what was intended at the Bhubaneswar session of the Congress.

Now, Sir, we know that there has been no need for any additional taxation. I am not giving any credit to Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari for not imposing any additional taxation for the simple reason that last year the total amount of money for had been collected by way of revenues had exceeded the expectations by nearly

29RSD—4.

Rs. 100 crores. Therefore, if no additional levies have been imposed, it is not out of any virtue but it is because there has been no need for them. After all so much money has already been collected. To tell the truth, the Third Plan envisaged a collection of Rs. 1100 crores by the Central Government. Already under the taxation proposals made the total amount of money that is expected to be collected at the end of five years is going to be of the order of Rs. 1900 crores, that is, about Rs. 800 crores more. Whatever might be said with regard to this Plan, whatever might be the facts with regard to the fulfilment of the targets of the Plan in respect of other sections of the Plan, as far as the collection of revenues by way of additional taxation from the people is concerned the target has not only been fulfilled but it is going to be over-fulfilled. That is the only item about which we can be sure, that is, that the targets will be over-fulfilled. That is the only credit the Government can take. Therefore, the task of our Finance Minister has not been to find additional resources. His task has been to readjust the existing structure of taxation making some little concessions here and some little concessions there, and to make it appear that he is doing something wonderful for the common people. It is there that we find that the philosophy underlying the whole thing is what the Bhubaneswar Congress itself had stated. For example, our friend, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, had been stating—I have here a newspaper cutting—in the month of October last:

“We are in a stage of rethinking in every direction, and the Planning Commission is in the process of shedding its skin. After shedding its skin, which is usually a painful process, it might look silly and dull.”

That is what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari stated in Madras in an informal chat with the pressmen on the 22nd of October, 1963. All these six months

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

they have been rethinking, and the budget is a result of that rethinking. What does that rethinking actually reveal? It reveals only one or two things. Firstly, as far as the basic problems facing our country are concerned, there has been absolutely no rethinking whatsoever but trying to put the same thing in a new language, trying to find a new philosophy for the policies that the Congress Government has been pursuing all these seventeen years since it came into existence. There has been absolutely no rethinking whatsoever, but an attempt has been made to put the same ideas in a new language. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari being a clever man, he tries to put the same thing in a new language, and what is it that we find? We find that first of all as far as the economic growth is concerned Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari is very clear on that question. He says that these three problems are inter-related:

"In the ultimate analysis, the three problems of prices, growth and balance of payments on which I have focussed my remarks so far are inter-related and we cannot solve any one of them without the fullest attention to the other two."

I agree with this bald statement that in the ultimate analysis the three problems of prices, growth and balance of payments are inter-related, and you cannot solve one of them in isolation from the other two. They are inter-related problems. But what is the approach to these inter-related problems? That is the real crux of the whole question before us. As far as our economic conditions are concerned, how are you to integrate all these three aspects of our economy, namely, the problem of prices, the problem of growth and the problem of balance of payments? It is quite true that unless you increase your agricultural production and you also diversify your industrial production, it will not be possible for you to have sufficient exports, and therefore the balance of payments position will remain as it is.

I quite agree with that. Similarly growth also depends to a considerable extent on the problem of prices. Therefore, all these three problems have got to be tackled in an integrated manner. I quite agree. But how does Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari propose to address himself to these problems together? That is the crux of the whole question. It is there that I find there has been absolutely no change despite all the tom-tomming about rethinking that has been going on during the last six months.

Take the question of prices. When you take the question of prices, of course prices are inter-related with the problem of growth. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari says:

"Treating the problem of growth as an isolated factor and promoting growth by stepping up investment from the sources available within and without the country, without a corresponding policy for the incomes generated in the process, would only stimulate inflation. Similarly a price policy which disregards the dynamics of growth, or the impact on investment decisions, cannot but be self-defeating in the same way as a price policy which is not co-ordinated with a corresponding policy in regard to wages."

Therefore, the question boils down to this. Unless prices are kept at a sufficiently high level in order to be able to generate a sufficiently large amount of profits for the private sector, according to Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari the problems of growth cannot be properly tackled in our country. Therefore, the entire reliance for the growth of our economy is placed essentially and primarily on the question of the private sector in our country being enabled to get more and more profits, and it is expected that the more the profits they make, the more they will be able to plough back the profits into new ventures and thereby ensure also industrial development. This is the entire philosophy

that is underlying the approach of the Finance Minister and, I dare say, of the Government of India also, because I do not think that the Budget that has been presented is his own Budget. It is certainly the integrated thinking of the Government of India, and the Government of India today places its entire reliance for our economic growth on the private sector, on its ability to plough back as much profit as possible and therefore on its ability to make more and more profits. That is their entire approach to the whole problem, and they can obviously make more profits only at the expense of the worker. Therefore, the workers should not ask for higher wages and that is how the problem of wages also has been brought down. They can make profits only at the expense of the consumer. How can they make profits at the expense of the consumer without keeping the prices high? Therefore, the prices will also rise, and as a result of the rise in prices, when the prices rise, if the workers or the employees ask for compensation for the rise in prices, you say that you cannot ask for compensation because if you ask for compensation, in that case, profits will not be there and therefore, growth will not be there. This is the entire logic. That is why you find him saying in the next sentence—

"It is now generally agreed, for example, that trying to keep agricultural prices too low for producers may defeat the objective of raising agricultural production. But if this is the case, one cannot, at the same time, try to keep agricultural prices low for all consumers, or adopt a wage policy in which most wage-earners are compensated for the increase in agricultural prices."

Therefore, agricultural prices will rise but the workers and most of the wage-earners cannot be compensated for the rise in agricultural prices. Why? Because they must earn profits and the profits can be earned only by increasing the prices. And when the prices rise, if the workers and the

wage-earners ask for an increase in their wages to compensate for the increase in the cost of living, you cannot do it because, you feel, thereby growth cannot take place in this country. This is the entire philosophy, this is the logic, of the whole Budget that has been presented to us. When we take up this question, it is no wonder that everybody in this country has been shouting about the increase in prices, and we know that our friend, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, was also shouting very much, when he was not a Minister, about the increase in prices. But today what is it that he talks about? What is the remedy that he suggests? A very simple one. In the ultimate analysis, he says:

"Essentially, the rising trend in prices is explained by the inadequate rate of growth in agriculture."

Therefore, the entire blame is put on the inadequate rate of growth in agriculture. But the fact is that our agricultural production has not increased sufficiently. But as to why it has not increased sufficiently, I do not want to go into it just now, but the fact remains that the Finance Minister puts the entire blame for the rise in the prices on the inadequacy of our agricultural growth.

Now, Sir, the same Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari about a year ago, when he was not the Finance Minister, was shouting hoarse in Madras that it was primarily and fundamentally due to the fact that the middle men were cornering huge profits and that unless these middle hands were completely broken, it would not be possible for us to bring down the prices. And I know that Mr. Krishnamachari was also heading the Committee that was appointed by the Tamil Nad Congress Committee in Tiruchirapalli to make a report to the Congress Committee at Madras for bringing down the prices. I would ask him to look into that Report. Unfortunately, the Tamil Nad Congress Committee did

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

not dare to publish that Report. But I would ask Mr. Krishnamachari to place that Report openly before this House and tell us whether he stands by that Report. Today he will not stand by that. (Interruptions) When he is not a Minister, he will talk of the middlemen but today no such thing is there. Today the entire thing is due to the fact that agricultural production has not kept pace, as if two years before agricultural production had been tremendously high and the blame was not on agricultural production but on something else. This is the wonderful way in which we are today doled out these things.

The other day, Sardar Swaran Singh—I read it in the newspaper—made a statement that there was no justification for the increase in prices. Well, did anybody ask Sardar Swaran Singh whether there is any justification or non-justification for the increase in prices? The fact is that the prices have increased, and even according to him, there is no justification for the increase in prices. But according to our friend Mr. Krishnamachari, the Finance Minister, there is every justification for it because it is essentially due to the fact that agricultural production has not kept pace with our requirements; therefore, there is every justification for this, as far as the Finance Minister is concerned. But according to the Food Minister's letter that he is reported to have written to a friend in Punjab, there is absolutely no justification for the increase in prices. But nonetheless, the prices have increased. How are you going to solve the problem? This is the fundamental question that is facing us.

Now, Sir, people today say that in order to increase agricultural production, it is necessary to give incentives to the producer. Very well. Give incentives. But how are they to be given? We are told that the procurement price has got to be increased. But

what I do not understand is whether the Government really understands the difference between the procurement price, the price of procurement by the Government of the 10 per cent of the produce that comes into the hands of these merchants, and the actual price that the actual tiller of the soil is getting today. Your procurement price does not mean that the peasant today gets that price. Is it because that the procurement price is today very low that we are unable to have actual agricultural growth? How is it that today agricultural growth is sagging? This is the primary question that is facing us today, and unless we are able to solve that problem, I do not think any amount of these adjustments in the Budget are going to really solve our economic ills.

The other day I was at Nagapattinam, a district which is in the Thanjavur District which is supposed to be the granary of Tamil Nad. When I asked what the price of paddy was, they told me that it was about Rs. 19 per bag of 48 Madras measures. I do not know about the maunds but the price was Rs. 19 for 48 Madras measures. When paddy was selling at Rs. 19—two bags of paddy would give you one bag of rice of 48 Madras measures—rice was selling at Nagapattinam at the rate of Rs. 1-5-0 per Madras measure or at about Rs. 59-6-0 per bag. Two bags of paddy, each of 48 Madras measures, would give you one bag of rice, which would mean about Rs. 38 as the purchase price of the middlemen who purchase that paddy from the peasant but actually they are able to market it at the rate of Rs. 55 to Rs. 58. The difference therefore amounts to something like Rs. 16 or Rs. 17. This was the position one month ago just when the bumper harvest was coming out. This is the big difference that is there between the price of rice when it is marketed to the consumer and the price that is paid actually to the tiller of the soil. I do not say that this is the price that all the tillers of the

soil are getting. I do not say, for example, that the big landholders, people who are in a position to withhold their stocks for a period of six or eight months, are getting the same price. Absolutely not. But as far as the common peasants are concerned, as far as the tillers of the soil who have got one or two or three or five or ten acres of land are concerned, they do not get that price. They have to sell their paddy immediately after harvesting at distress prices because of their heavy indebtedness and all other types of things. Therefore, it is these people who have to sell their produce at distress prices. They do not get this price. On the other hand, what does the Government do? The Government fixes the procurement price. They compulsorily procure about 10 per cent. of the rice that has been already taken by the millers and by the wholesale merchants, and the procurement price is fixed only for that. There is a levy of 10 per cent. After selling that at that price, these people are allowed to sell the rest at whatever price they can get for it. Therefore, what happens today is that this procurement price that you are fixing has no relation whatsoever to the price that the actual tiller of the soil is getting. So, this is the actual position that is facing the entire peasantry of this country. How are you going to solve this problem? That is the simple problem.

Now, in order to be able to assure a proper price to the peasant, will the Government assure that price? You will have to assure that. What is the machinery it has got to do that? Fixing a minimum price for paddy or for agricultural products does not mean that the peasant is going to get that price. Therefore, the question is, what is the way by means of which you will enable the peasant to get that minimum price that you want him to get, not the procurement price but the actual price that you think is reasonable?

This is the fundamental question that is raised. Now therefore, Sir, you cannot avoid this question. whatever might be the measures that might be taken, whatever the amount of regulation. We are told that the Government today are asking the State Governments to tighten their regulations over the wholesalers. But we know, whatever might be the regulations and however much you may tighten these regulations, these wholesale dealers have a way of escaping all these regulations. Mr. Bhaktavatsalam, the Chief Minister of Madras, had admitted some time back, two years back, that the regulations were tightened and that in spite of their tightening the regulations they were not in a position to actually control these wholesale merchants. Any number of accounts can be cooked up by them. They have got their experts who are in a position to cook up accounts, and therefore it is absolutely impossible to really enforce any regulations. This was the position some time back. And today, if you tell us that the Government is going to tighten the regulations and that these wholesale merchants will not be able to escape, I do not believe a word of it, because this is not practicable. Therefore, Sir, what is the way out? The simple thing that comes handy is this. We have tried to depend upon these wholesale dealers for any number of years. The other day I think Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda stated in Parliament, in the other House, that they had depended upon the wholesale dealers but unfortunately these wholesale dealers had let them down very badly. And I can tell you, the more you rely upon them, the more you will be let down badly. Therefore there is no other way left than taking over this wholesale trade; I am not asking for taking over of the other trade; take over this wholesale trade. There is no other way. I know Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari himself had advocated it some time back. I do not know why Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, after he becomes the

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

Finance Minister, suddenly gives up the very slogan that he had advocated some time back, that was given two years back. Is it not good today when prices have increased much more than what they were two years ago, when today you find that these wholesalers have become much more unreal than they were some two years ago, when the resources in their hands are today far greater than what they were about two years ago? Well, in spite of these things, if you still think that you cannot take over these things, then the reasons must be something else. Of course I know that Mr. Krishnamachari stated the other day in his party—I read it in the newspapers—that provided the State Governments are willing to co-operate and the State Governments and the Central Government are willing to impose strategic controls—I do not know what strategic control means—provided the State Governments and the Central Government are willing to impose strategic controls . . .

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): Is there anything that the hon. Member does not know?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Many things; I do not follow many, much of your language now.

So, if the State Governments and the Central Government are willing to have strategic controls and they are willing to enforce them, the prices can be brought down appreciably. Now my question is: What is it that stands in the way? The State Governments are all governments of the Congress Party; the Central Government is also of the Congress Party, and when this is the case, what is the question, what is the point in saying "if the State Governments are willing to co-operate and if the State Governments and the Central Government are willing, together, to enforce these strategic controls". Then where is the rub? Where is the difficulty? In

spite of this formulation of statements the difficulty arises from the fact that there are vested interests both in the Central Government as well as in the State Governments, which do not want this kind of effective controls, which do not want the profiteer to be taken away. Therefore you are interested in continuing the present state of affairs. This is my straight question, Sir.

Now the other question is with regard to the state of our economy in other respects. Now, as I said, we are going to depend entirely upon the profit motive and private capital for the purpose of ensuring economic growth. Our Finance Minister is not content with the fact that already the private capital is allowed to have enough profits. Today also he is giving an open invitation to foreign capital to further penetrate our economy. And what is the reason for it? Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari himself admitted in Madras—I am reading from newspaper reports—now he admitted, in an informal chat with pressmen, that foreign collaboration had to be welcomed because our technique and technological know-how were still poor, even though he would not deny—I am underlining this—even though he would not deny that foreign collaboration in a way meant foreign domination. So it is admitted that foreign collaboration would mean foreign domination.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Is it correctly reported? Did you ask him?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: There has been no denial so far.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: There is no use interrupting the hon. Member; he is so resourceful.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Anyway it has not so far been contradicted and it has been reported by a respectable paper, the 'Economic Times.'

SHRI A. D. MANI: How respectable?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It is very respectable from their point of view, representing big business interests, and therefore . . .

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I do not know what it represents.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Well, you know what it represents. Is there anything that you do not know? I am putting the question. You know which paper represents what. If you do not know what interests a particular paper represents, then obviously you cannot be the Finance Minister of this country. You know that and therefore they point out that the Finance Minister admitted that in a way foreign collaboration might lead to foreign domination, continuation of foreign domination. Then what is the reason for this? He says we must have technical know-how, that we do not have technical know-how. Then he also says that, unfortunately, we have to get along by getting loans for the public sector, Government-to-Government loans, the types of assistance that we are now getting, that the problem of repayment is going to arise and that therefore, in order to obviate the problem of repayment, it is better to have equity capital coming. Therefore, on that basis we will be able to solve our problem. Now in this connection I would just like to point out certain things. Yes, loans we have got to repay; the problem of repayment is there; no doubt about it and the interest charge will be about 5 per cent. But what is the rate of return for the foreign capital that is being invested in our country? What is the rate of return? Now here are the figures, not my figures; they are in a report of the United States Commerce Department. It stated in a recent report, the United States Government itself stated that the return, after taxes—mind you, after deducting sales—that the return on American investments was of the highest in the world, and it stated that the return in 1962 amounted to 20.6 per cent; that is after deduction for taxes the return in 1962 amount-

ed to 20.6 per cent, as against 19.2 per cent in the year 1961. Of course the figures are varying, our Government has computed them differently; I know that our Government had stated that figure to be 13.2 per cent in 1962 as far as the American investments are concerned. I do not know how to reconcile these two figures. Our Government says that it is 13.2 per cent and the American Government says it is 20.6 per cent, and I dare say the Americans will not be far wrong, because I believe the American Government takes not only the actual . . .

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): That includes private sector probably.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It is in the private sector; 'private investments' I said; return on private American investments in India; not the public sector. In the case of the public sector you have got to pay only interest, and where is the question of return. It does not arise from that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Do you rely more on American figures?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am concerned with reconciling these two figures; how are these to be reconciled? And reconciliation comes this way. We know, as far as the foreign collaboration agreements that have been entered into are concerned, it is not only a question of profits, but you have also got the question of royalties. I am reading from the 'Economic Times' of February 10, 1964 and it says that there are about 101 collaboration agreements in our country. Now what do these agreements provide for? They provide not only for the return of profits on the actual number of shares that have been taken, but they also provide for, what are called, royalties for the manufacture of particular goods in this country. I will just read out to you, I will give you samples; it is not possible for me to read the entire list; I will just read some of the samples.

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

3 P.M.

"Precision Bearings—2 per cent on sale of products free of taxes for sales within the country and 3 per cent, on export revenue."

That is, for every item that is sold you have got to pay 2 per cent. as royalty to the particular company. Similarly:

"Prestolite—4 per cent, on the net annual ex-factory cost of products manufactured less the value of imported components.

Paper Products—3/4 per cent of its total net turnover to the maximum of U.S. \$ 90,000.

Wellman Incandescent—3 per cent. on the net sales excluding the value of imported parts."

Therefore, if you take into account all these things, the royalty is paid not on the basis of profits because we know that the profit is calculated on the basis of total invested capital, but on the basis of the turnover. Royalties are paid on the basis of turnover. So if you take into account the return, it will explain the discrepancy between the Government's calculation of 13.2 per cent. return on the United States capital invested in this country and the American Government's calculation of 20.2 per cent. This would explain the royalty that is paid today by our collaborating companies. That would explain the actual difference that you find between our Government's calculation and the calculation by the United States Government. Therefore, Sir, nearly about 20 per cent. is the annual return that the American private investor in our country is today getting.

Now, this is going to be a perpetual thing. Whereas if you take a loan and pay 5% interests and the balance of 15 per cent. if you pay for about three years, in that case the entire loan gets liquidated. On the other hand, inviting this private capital, this equity capital, would only mean that permanently, year after year you

would be sending out 20 per cent. or 30 per cent. as profits on their investments and this will be a permanent drain on our country. Therefore, Sir, I take the statement of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari to be correct.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: No, it is not.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: All the papers have published it. You should have corrected it long ago.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I did not use the words "foreign domination".

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Even if Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari did not use the words "foreign domination", the fact remains that it is foreign domination. About 20 per cent. is a permanent drain on our country. Is that what we are bargaining over?

SHRI A. D. MANI: You have not explained why you rely more on the American statistics than on our Government statistics.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: The deference is that royalty is not taken into account. Once you take royalty into account the discrepancy is explained.

Now, Sir, you take the other question. We are now told about the question of our technical know-how. We had a number of technical agreements. We are now becoming the wiser for it. The other day, for example, Mr. G. L. Mehta, Chairman of the Indian Investment Centre, in a speech in Bombay said—I am quoting:

"We have come across cases where attempts have been made by collaborators to sell obsolete processes or outdated machinery, including items of unnecessary equipment in the essential machinery list and make exaggerated claims regarding the potentialities of the Plan."

He further criticised agreements both in private and public sectors

which did not provide for Association of Indian technologists with the designing of plants. He added:

"This is a distinct loss to the national economy. Our industrialists and even the Government in respect of public sector projects have been content with receiving ready-made designs and plants from foreign collaborators."

So this is the statement made on the highest authority. We know what happened with regard to the turbine that has broken down in Delhi. The Japanese turbine has broken down and Mr. K. L. Rao himself found fault with our Indian engineers—that is what the newspapers report—that they are not in a position to repair it and he found fault with them. What is the use of finding fault with them when we are making technological agreements on collaboration with these foreign companies without associating our Indian technologists in the very designing of these plants? How can we expect our engineers to be able to master these technicalities? That is why, in spite of innumerable agreements that have been entered into by way of collaboration, both in the private sector as well as in the public sector, we find, even after the completion of two Five Year Plans and after nearly three years of the Third Plan, that the technical know-how is absolutely absent in our country.

People will say, "What is the way out?" May I just put a question? The Soviet Union in 1927 was in the same position as we were in 1952. How did they master the technique? They did not find it necessary to go on asking for foreign collaboration in order to be able to develop the Soviet industry. And today even the Finance Minister will admit that the Soviet industry is one of the best in the world.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: May I tell the hon. Member—because he is not so much interested in the Soviet Union—that probably we are

more interested in the Soviet Union than he is? Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has given a contract to the I. C. I. in a chemical plant. The turbine is being built entirely by their technicians. That the Soviet Government has got a different view with regard to our technical competence is wrong.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: That is the Chinese view.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: The Soviet Union might certainly give order for the designing of a particular plant to the I. C. I. or to any other foreign company. That is not the problem. The problem is whether the Soviet Union is today dependent as we are after two Five Year Plans are over and part of the Third Five Year Plan? Has it been dependent as we are dependent on foreign collaboration? This is the simple and straightforward question. It has never been so dependent.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: They paid in gold when they called these people. I have no gold to pay. I have only got Communist friends, not gold.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Therefore, unfortunately the position is that we do not find money to increase our production.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): How long did it take Russia to be independent of foreign aid?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: In 1927 they had their first plan. In the second plan itself they did not depend on foreign collaboration. We can also do it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: May I remind my hon. friend that the Revolution took place in 1917 and they had their first plan in 1927?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I quite agree. But the ten years that the Soviet Union had to pass through immediately after the World War was a trying period for them. There was

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

the internal revolution that was taking place and afterwards they had to rehabilitate. We achieved independence in 1947 and within five years we were able to solve the problem of recovery. We started our Plans in 1952. Now the two Plans have been completed. The Third Five Year Plan is about to be completed. And even at the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan I do not think we are going to be self-sufficient as far as technical know-how is concerned. That is the Unfortunate position.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You know technically Russia in its previous stage also had very much developed.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Not much. India and the Soviet Union is the same thing. Therefore, the problem is that the very agreements that we are today entering into with regard to foreign collaboration are such that they will never make our technicians understand the know-how of modern technology. This is the only position. And also it is admitted that many of the agreements on technical know-how that we are getting are antediluvian, of the year 1940 or earlier. We do not get the most modern and up-to-date techniques. This is the unfortunate position. They are interested in seeing that the most up-to-date modern techniques are not given to us. This is the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves today. Therefore, to say that this foreign collaboration is absolutely essential in order to develop our growth, to ensure our growth is something which I cannot understand.

Sir, there is another question on which I would like to say a few words. There is the question of monopoly Commission that has been promised. I do not know why it has become necessary to appoint another commission. We know, for example, Prof. Hazari Report. That project was financed by the Planning Commis-

sion itself. Is that report not sufficient? And is it also not a fact that as far as the banking industry is concerned, during the last ten years, from the year 1952 to 1962, the total deposits in the Scheduled banks increased from Rs. 900 crores to Rs. 2,260 odd crores in which the State sector also is included. None the less a tremendous growth has been there in banking. How did this growth come about? It grew partly as a result of inflation that is generated in the economy of the country. It grew as a result of that. But we also know that as far as these banks are concerned—at least as far as five top banks are concerned—the Punjab National Bank with which my friend, Mr. Goenka is connected, the Central Bank of India, the Bank of India, the Bank of Baroda and the United Commercial Bank, these are controlled by certain big business houses.

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari today says that he does not know whether there is any real growth of monopoly. It is only a question of controlling of interests. What exactly is monopoly is something about which he is not very clear. The ownership is to-day dispersed but unfortunately there is some amount of concentration and bad management is also there. He does not want to interfere with management. How he will not be interfering with management and still prevent control, how the control and management can be diversified is a thing I cannot understand. At any rate, how he is going to solve I do not know. None the less, the problem is there. Is it not a fact that there is a linking up of banking finances? The industrial houses are also controlling these banks and what else is required to prove that there is growth of monopoly interests in our country? When once inside our country banking capital is to-day concentrated, bank deposits are controlled by a few big or top houses in this country and therefore they are enabled to utilise these bank deposits in furthering the growth of their own interests, industries in which they are interested, then obviously he will not be able

to prevent a further concentration of economic power in the hands of these few people so long as you allow these banks to continue in their hands. This is the simple proposition that stares everyone in the face but my friend says that he will be able to control the banks not by taking over the banks but by the new Banking Act he has passed, he will be in a position to prevent all these. I dare say that any amount of inspection that might be ordered by the Finance Minister will not be able to prevent the utilisation of the funds concentrated in the hands of these big bankers who are also the biggest industrialists in our country in their own interests for the development of their own particular industries that they want to sponsor in this country.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Do you mean to say that the Reserve Bank is not discharging its functions?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: The Reserve Bank will not be able to. If the Reserve Bank has been able to discharge its duties, why is it that the concentration has grown?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: These banks control the Congress.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: That is true. They will be able to control not only the Congress but they will be able to control the Finance Minister also; in spite of all, that is going to happen.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: They take the Congress as an industry.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I do not think that the Congress is an industry.

Therefore when that has been the position, as far as the Banks are concerned, our Finance Minister tells us that he is going to appoint a new Commission as if all the reports that have been made available to the Government all along by its own officers are not sufficient. For example, there is the report of the Company Law Administration. A number of studies have been conducted by the Company Law Administration, a number of studies with regard to inter-locking of directorships are

there. When all these facts are there what is the fun of saying that we are now going to appoint another Commission to go and find out whether there has been really any concentration of economic power, whether there has been any growth of monopolies in this country and how we are going to stop this monopoly? This is what we are being told. Now the result is going to be that for the next five years, further concentration of wealth and further concentration of economic power—and with economic power also goes political power—is going to take place in the hands of these few houses and we do not know where we are going after that.

The last question that I wish to deal with is this. Our friend talked about the fact that much of the profits that are made are to-day invested not in productive avenues but for speculative purposes. It is quite true. How are we going to stop that? The best way to stop that, according to Mr. Krishnamachari, is to adopt some fiscal measures. I dare say that all these fiscal measures will be defeated by those people. For example take urban housing and the Capital Gains Tax. You are putting about 75 per cent. Put 100 per cent. Capital Gains Tax. I dare say that methods will be found to evade the Tax, because it will be very simple. After all the thing has to be registered. I know of instances. I myself wanted to sell some property. I may now tell the facts. When the Kerala Government was there, they asked me to find out some purchaser for their house near Kotagiri. I went and asked some people to buy that. The Kerala Government was willing to sell it for about Rs. 6 or Rs. 8 lakhs. The people said "We will give you Rs. 6 lakhs but you must be prepared to register it for Rs. 2 lakhs". This is the position. I tried my best. I said: "Who is going to take the rest of Rs. 4 lakhs? Am I going to take or is Mr. Nambudripad going to take?"

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Is it the same property which Mr. Easwara Iyer

sold to the Communist Government for an abnormally high price?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: No, it is still there. Ultimately I said: "Unless you are prepared to register the deed for Rs. 6 lakhs I am not going to sell." We cannot. . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): For your information, Mr. Easwara Iyer did not purchase, he sold the land.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): For transport purposes.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Let us not digress. Whatever might be the Capital Gains Tax that you might impose, even if 100 per cent, is imposed I dare say that this speculation will continue and the registration deed will not show any capital gain, on the other hand it is quite possible that the registration deed might show even capital loss. Therefore it is not by means of fiscal measures that we will be able to to-day stop this speculation that is taking place not only in urban houses but even with regard to sites. For instance, in regard to lands laying round about Coimbatore or Tiruchy, just because there is a Heavy Electrical Engineering Factory that is coming up, immediately the land is grabbed and within two years land is being sold and a land which was bought for Rs. 30 a cent is sold for Rs. 300 a cent. That is taking place everywhere. Therefore how is it that we are going to stop this? To-day we want capital formation. We are talking about capital formation. How are we going to get this capital formation? We know that the biggest source of this speculative activity is the commodity market. It is there. Unless we are in a position to stop the commodity market, unless we are in a position to totally take over that and prevent that, and tackle it at the source of it, any amount of these fiscal measures is not going to prevent the tremendous amount of speculation that is taking place to-day in the commodity market, in the share market, in the bullion market and in every place that is imaginable. Therefore, not be-

ing in a position to stop this tremendous speculation that is taking place everywhere, the poor people are being sought to be penalised for that.

Take the other question. Agricultural production has to be increased. Where is the capital to be invested in agriculture? We know that the last Reserve Bank Survey of 1964, January also pinpointed that the indebtedness of the peasantry to-day has increased. It is true that the indebtedness of the big land-owning class is not there. They have to-day actually profited as a result of the increase in the prices but the common people, the poor peasants have to-day become extremely dependent on usurious loans. The village money-lender is the biggest shark and because of this heavy indebtedness, the farmer is forced to sell his produce at the lowest price available immediately after the harvest. So either way he is to-day mulcted. He is to-day mulcted, he is to-day the victim both of the speculator as well as the village money-lender. Now a part of the big money that is being created in this country, the big money that is being made in this country, that money is being utilised both for usurious money-lending in the villages as well as for speculative trade. Now what is the total amount? Is there any account of it? Is there any estimate that is made of the amount of money that is invested in this country for speculation as well as for usurious money-lending in the villages? Now unless both these sources are to-day completely cut off and you ensure the peasant a proper price so that he is enabled to invest a certain amount of money in agriculture, how are you going to-day to increase the agricultural production? Therefore it is from this point of view, it is from this aspect that I said that I agree with Mr. Krishnamachari when he said that all these three are integrated problems—the problem of prices, the problem of production and problem of export; all these are integrated problems but the way to tackle them is not just to go on as it is but

the way to tackle them is to prevent the sources where the accumulation takes place for the purpose of speculation, ensure that the peasant gets a proper price, see that to-day he is totally freed from the clutches of usurious money-lenders. If necessary we can even make a law saying that all the indebtedness of the agricultural peasants is today totally wiped out and the State itself should provide the needed agricultural credit for the peasants. These are the fundamental and immediately necessary measures without which it is not going to be possible to solve the problem of our agricultural production and so long as we are not in a position to solve the problem of agricultural production, we cannot have surplus for export. Therefore we go on depending more and more on foreign capital and if we go on depending more and more on foreign capital, I do not know where our country will go. We will continue to be poor. Therefore, it is from this point of view that I want to point out that as far as this Budget is concerned, there has been no re-thinking whatsoever. In spite of all this tom-tomming, there has been no real re-thinking. On the other hand, the clock has been put back. More and more concessions have been shown to the private sector. More and more opportunities have been given to them for making profits and as far as the common people are concerned, nothing has been done to them. The prices will continue to rise and nothing has been done though they had promised that they would hold the price line. The prices continue to rise and the people will continue to suffer and it is on that basis that capital formation is being built up in our country. I can understand their saying there is no capital formation in our country. Capitalists in our country cannot find capital because they do not have an empire just as the British had an empire and the French had an empire when they built up their capitalism. Our capitalists do not have an empire on the basis of which the British could build their capitalism. Unfor-

tunately our capitalists do not have any empire. They have only the Indian people to loot. And how do they loot the Indian people? The only way that these capitalists can do that is by increasing the prices. That is the main reason why in spite of what the Finance Minister was saying—and very rightly too—when he was not the Finance Minister, that they should take over the foodgrain trade, that the difficulties were mostly due to the middlemen, that the middlemen should be totally eliminated, today, when he has become the Finance Minister, he has totally changed his tone. He does not even talk of the middleman. In the entire Budget speech he has not talked of the middleman. No wonder that the big man-eaters he was talking about they are now extremely happy about it. Every pronouncement by him was followed by a spurt in the stock exchange prices. On the 29th August, 1963, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari became the Finance Minister and immediately in the stock exchange in Bombay the Tata shares increased by Rs. 5.50 nP per share.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a great tribute.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: The Tata shares increased by Rs 5.50. I don't know whether that is relevant or not, but that is the fact. On the 29th August he took office and on the 30th September, Tata shares increased by Rs. 5.50 per share. Similarly the Century Mills shares went up by Rs. 14 per share. Instance after instance can be given to illustrate how the Bombay Share Market showed a big buoyancy immediately Shri T. T. Krishnamachari was appointed Finance Minister. I may read out a small quotation from 'The Capital' of December, 1963 where it is written:

"There has been a spectacular rise in share prices since the return of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari as the Central Finance Minister. Whatever one may say about the Kamaraj Plan, the stock market has been greatly benefited since the Cabinet

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

reorganisation following the implementation of the Plan has installed Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari as the Finance Minister."

Great tribute from the proper quarters. That is the proper quarter from which tribute should be paid and it has been paid to Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. Even today I know there are members of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry who are shouting against the fiscal policy of the Government. But I can see that really in their minds, they are extremely satisfied with the measures that have been taken. What more can they possibly want? The Excess Profits Tax has been taken away. The Super-profits Tax has been taken away and it has been substituted by the "Surtax", where the capital basis has been so widened that it now includes not only the actual share capital invested but also the borrowed money. They are all taken together and also so many others—I forget which,—and the capital basis has been widened and on that there is to be this surtax. Actually the industrialists must be happy about it. And these industrialists have been clamouring for collaboration of foreign capitalists, that some of the existing restrictions should be withdrawn and so on. And Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari has given them these concessions now. What more do they want? As a matter of fact, the philosophy underlying this Budget is actually the philosophy of the Swatantra Party and I do not see any socialism in it. If then people still shout against it, it is because they want him to go more in the same direction. They should be actually grateful to him for what he has done. But they want some more concessions and it is only for that that the Federation of Commerce and Industry are shouting. We can understand that. I dare say Shri T. T. Krishnamachari thinks it is within the ambit of and in the spirit of the Bhubaneswar Resolution. I think this is not the real spirit of the Bhubanes-

war Resolution, this is not socialism. He has tried to put it in socialist language, but actually the thing is something different. Actually it is nothing but bolstering up of big private monopolists in this country and big concessions have been made in order to get further growth of capital formation. Unfortunately this is going to distort the growth of capital in our country. Our capitalists are not in the same state as those successful capitalists of England and France in the nineteenth century. We know how those capitalists went through a competitive stage. We know the English proverb: "Honesty is the best policy." They don't say it is a virtue. They say it is the best policy, because in that period of competitive capitalism, honesty paid. The more honest you were the more customers you had. That was the period of competitive capitalism. Unfortunately, in our country we are trying to build up capitalism when it is not possible to have such a competitive stage at all. Today our industries are protected in every way. Capital formation is in the hands of the Government. All sorts of incentives have to be given to these men. Banks are kept at their disposal. It is the policy of the State to see that capital formation takes place. The State helps them in every way. The State helps them to find foreign collaboration. Everything is done for them. Similarly, the market is protected. It is all a protected market. There is no competition. Therefore, unfortunately, capitalism cannot develop here as it did in other lands. Everything is found for it, and therefore, it is not a stage when that proverb "honesty is the best policy" holds good. On the other hand, they find that dishonesty today is the best policy. That is why today we find values have been totally shattered and corruption takes place not only in the Government but also in the highest business quarters. Our business standards are so very bad. Therefore, when that is the standard set by those in the highest levels, what can be the social values at the lower

levels? That is why today in society we find values being shattered.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): What is your remedy?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Well, about that we can talk later. Unfortunately I have not the necessary time now. But this unfortunately is the position now and there is no dispute about that. Today, after seventeen years of our attaining independence, the best values we had during our national struggle, they are totally shattered. And so long as this policy of the Government continues, these values will go on suffering and they will get shattered and we do not know what the fabric of our society will be, what the moral fabric of our society is going to be at the end of it all.

Though Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has been talking of re-thinking, I find very little of real re-thinking in this Budget. We can only request the Government to have some real re-thinking. If there is real re-thinking, then it must be seen in their policy. I do not want any socialism. I am not asking for any socialism now. I only want some immediate measures to be taken. About socialism we can dispute later on. We can then think of what sort of definition socialism should have and so on. Pandits can quarrel about that. You can quarrel. I can quarrel. We can talk about it. But that we can do later on. Now, all I want is some immediate measures which will put our economy on a proper basis and which will prevent the tremendous amount of growth of speculation that is taking place, with so much money being invested in speculations. All that money should be invested on the land and for forming real capital for production purposes. You should take some immediate measures which will put an end to the price spiral that is going on today. If the Government is pleased to take some of these measures I will be satisfied.

Therefore, there is nothing to commend this Budget. On the other

hand, I find the same policy that has been there all these seventeen years, still being continued, despite all this loud talk about re-thinking. I only request the Government to do some real re-thinking.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the hon. Member who has resumed his seat just now criticised the Budget as one which has nothing new in it but containing old things with slight adjustments here and there but towards the end of his speech he said that there was no rethinking. Of course, there would always be rethinking upon anything. That is a thing which cannot be disputed. In my opinion there is a good deal that is new in it and the approach of the Finance Minister in making the Budget proposals has been imaginative, realistic and responsive to public opinion. Sir, a Finance Minister, in my humble opinion, is not a mere tax-gathering machine. He has to have his eyes on the pockets of people as well as on their sufferings. That is why I said that the Finance Minister has to be responsive and I am glad that the Finance Minister has proved to be very responsive. As an instance of a responsive act, I would just mention that he immediately on assuming office relaxed the Gold Control Rules. Sir, whatever may have been the good object of the Gold Control Rules, it cannot be denied that it was not an imaginative step. I agree entirely that we should do away with the rule and lure of gold but there is a method and there is a time for it. What happened, Sir, after the Gold Control Rules were promulgated, there was a gold rush and people—if people with means lose money it does not matter—belonging to the poorer sections had to buy, out of necessity, gold in the blackmarket and those of us who move with the people, with the masses, know what a tremendous amount of gold rush there was and what an amount of money flowed into the hands of the blackmarketeers. Crores and crores of rupees went into the hands of the very people whose hands were to be

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] tied by the Gold Control Rules. I will mention one personal instance. I had to marry off a niece of mine, two or three months after the Gold Control Rules came into effect, and according to the custom of my community in that part of the country, at least a ring has to be exchanged and a *thali* has to be put round the neck of the bride. I was asked by my people to get a ring and some gold for the *thali*. I brought to their notice the existence of the Gold Control Rules and told them that it was impossible to get gold; I could, at the most get 14 ct. gold but then they said that 14 ct. gold was no gold at all. They wanted real gold. I wrote to the bridegroom—he is a graduate—explaining the position and telling him that I could not go and buy in the blackmarket and asked him whether he could do without it. He was prepared to do it but his people would not allow him. They said, marriage with this or no marriage. I persisted in not buying gold from the blackmarket and my people wrote a strong letter saying “Your stupidity is incorrigible. The girl will be left in our hands. Who will marry her then?” Now, this was the position not only in my community but in almost all communities. There was a stage for doing these things but unfortunately lack of imagination defeated the very purpose of the Gold Control Rules and the very temptation for gold was increased by a thousand-fold, making the blackmarketeers and the jewellers to profit while the poor people suffered. I am very happy to say, and when I say this, the House will agree with me, that the Finance Minister relaxed this decision and although he was not the less firm in insisting upon the implementation of the Gold Control Rules, he was responsive to public suffering not only of the goldsmiths who were driven out of occupation, who were starving and some of whom even had to sacrifice their lives but also of the people and he relaxed the Rules. I wish he applies his mind to this question and relaxes the Rules to the

extent of necessity. One can ask, who asked these people to indulge in this sort of custom? That is true, nobody asked them to indulge in such customs but the customs are there. You cannot do away with them. Why have the Government not brought forth a common civil code for India as directed in the Constitution, article 44? It is simply because that such a code would now wound the susceptibilities of some communities, wound the people who believe in certain customs; and you cannot do away with them overnight. If that is so, what is the good of making people rush into the hands of blackmarketeers like this? This is one instance of the responsiveness of the Finance Minister that I wanted to bring to your notice.

The other thing that I want to mention and for which I would like to offer him my congratulations relates to the abrogation of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme. As far as the financial side is concerned, nobody can dispute with the arithmetics of it. That is true but then it results in terrible pressure, inconvenience to people, hardship to people, particularly in the rural areas. This should have been realised then. This was again another instance of a less imaginative act, if I may be pardoned for saying so. No doubt the State would have mopped up a huge sum of money by this Compulsory Deposit Scheme but the hardship and inconvenience that would have resulted to the lower income groups would have been tremendous and I am glad that he has realised this and has abrogated this Scheme. The third thing for which I want to congratulate him is the reimposition of the Expenditure Tax. I know that this measure has been criticised by many as a very unproductive measure involving hardship. I do not know whether it is productive or unproductive but there is one distinct gain which I want to place before this House and that is the psychological gain. People belonging to the business community and well-to-do people are indulging in a spree of spend-

ing. Go to the most luxurious hotel; examine the passenger list of the air line companies; go to the race course or any place of pleasure and entertainment and spending. You have the sons and daughters of rich people indulging in wasteful expenditure. Unfortunately in this country, Sir, money can buy anything. Money can buy the honour of people. Money can bring people to dishonour. Money can make slaves of people and money can buy anything.

SHRI BAIRAGI DWIBEDY (Orissa): Money can break the Ministry even.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, money can do anything. If that is so, for a Government which has the object of establishing a socialist pattern of society, I would ask whether it is advisable to allow money to have this free play, free play not only in respect of wasteful expenditure but free play for exploitation of the weaker sections of the community also. Sir, this exploitation results in untold social evils. If we are going to give this free play to money, when are we going to bring a socialist society in this land? I would like to know this and anybody can enlighten me on this. We can never have a socialist society without the spending spree being curbed. Therefore, this Expenditure Tax, apart from stopping the waste and preventing youngmen and women wasting their substance and apart from stopping the wastage of national wealth in a sense, will stop the ushering in of so many social evils which are harmful. I am glad that a tax on expenditure has been imposed. There is no doubt that there will be hardships, on account of accounting and some harassment too. I want to know one taxation measure in which is not to be found some element of harassment or hardship. This cannot be avoided. Similar is the case with this measure. Therefore, the harassment that might result in some cases should not have been a justification for having removed this measure and I am glad that the Finance Minister has reimposed it. Psychologi-

call it is toning up the wealthy classes and it is also an encouragement to those who are economically poor. Now, Sir, a fiscal measure has two sides to it. One is the monetary side and the other is the human side. Now, any Finance Minister, first of all, looks to the monetary side. That is true. But we have to look to the human side as well. Now, I am taking up a point in relation to the objective we have, namely, a socialist society, whether this objective does not call for a re-orientation of our fiscal policies. The measures which have been adopted till now are mostly orthodox measures, traditional measures. I want the Finance Minister to think on original lines. I appeal to him, because I believe he has originality. I do not know and I cannot say that he is a socialist. He will excuse me for saying that, but I know this that if he minds he can introduce a cent per cent socialist Budget. He has imagination to devise ways and means. For that I do give him credit and, therefore, I appeal to him.

Now, Sir, I want to draw his attention and the attention of the House to a fact which is very disturbing and that is the fate of the middle classes. The middle classes are not high earning groups or high income groups. At the same time, they have to keep up a hundred appearances of decency in society. Each earning member will have four or five persons dependent on him, which is not the case in respect of the working class. Now, what is their position in this rising spiral of prices and decreasing income? These people find it hard to live. If I say that life for at least the lower middle class is becoming impossible, I do not think it is an exaggeration. Those who move with them know it. Maybe Ministers will have no occasion to move with such people and they do not know their sufferings. I know to what moral degradation people have come down, particularly in cities, people who have a very limited income but who have large families. This is a thing which has destroyed

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy]

our social fabric This is a thing which cuts at the root of our ethical standards I think, it deserves the attention of the Finance Minister A way must be found to come to their relief Relief should be found Of course, I am only suggesting it I do not say that the way is very smooth or very easy I realise the difficulty of devising an equitable method of making up for these middle classes One way is this There are these indirect taxes Now, a rich man earning Rs 10 000 a month will pay the same tax on the commodities which he consumes as another man belonging to the middle class getting only Rs. 100 or Rs 120 a month Now, Sir, can we not devise a means by which at least articles of consumption, of daily necessity and certain other necessities like shelter, clothing and other things, are given to him without the disadvantage of his having to pay the rising prices? A method could be devised, I think I do not know I cannot say that I can now give a particular method But if the Finance Minister's mind works on those lines I am sure he will be successful in devising ways and means This has to be done With all the emphasis at my command I wish to urge him to devote his attention to this question, because the fate of the middle classes is terrible Now, they want to educate the boy or girl Imagine the cost of text-books Should excise duty on paper be levied for these things? Take, again kerosene matches and such things The excise duty realised may be considerable I think an alternative could be found I suppose we should exempt at least several stages of these articles or several stages of levels of consumption of these articles and see that an increasing burden is not imposed on those whose purse is already limited This should be made possible Otherwise let us give up this business of having a socialist pattern of society Let us give it up Nobody believes in us now I honestly say—people will excuse me for saying it—nobody be-

lieves in us All these years we have not taken any socialist step and, therefore, nobody believes that we are very earnest about having a socialist society If we do stick to that objective we must think on these lines, of making up for those by other means than the traditional means which we have used We must pull up people whose levels of income are low and who are suffering a lot of hardship This has to be done Education must be made cheaper Medical facilities may be given free by some method A hundred ways can be devised of making up for these people

The next question I would like to deal with is the nationalisation of banks I know the Finance Minister's views on that I know that many people are against the nationalisation of banks When I say that and when I give him my views it is not that I do not appreciate the difficulties in the nationalisation of banks I know that it gives a sudden shock to the capital market and it may disturb for a time our economy But there is another side to it and to which I would invite the attention of the House and that is this As I said, money has got a very great power in this country If I have Rs 10 lakhs and if I know I can get access to banks and loans as I desire, I can compete with anybody else who is less favourably situated than me in regard to financial resources either in accepting contracts for buildings or supplying or purchasing in the market or in respect of any economic activity That is why economic activities are controlled by a few houses in this country In spite of the measures that we have taken so far, we have not been able to take away from them this economic power Now, the man is privileged in getting loans from banks As it is now, his relation is a director He has somebody who has a friend as a director Therefore, he can easily get access to a loan He can get it on favourable terms, whereas the other man who does not know anybody can-

not get it on such terms or so easily. Therefore, in the matter of economic competition, where will this man stand, when he has no help, no access to a bank in the ordinary way . . .

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): No relation.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: . . . no relation, no friend or no influence or any such thing? Where does he stand in economic competition? He must stand alone. And that is why in spite of our earnest attempts to find out how far the gulf between the income groups is lessened, in spite of the Mahalanobis Committee's attempt to find out, they have not been able to say exactly how and where the huge money that we have invested in these Plans has gone, whether the gulf between the rich and the poor has been bridged to any extent at all. I think the Finance Minister has promised to go into it and take further steps to examine this question. What I am submitting is that it is true that the access to money for a man who is situated favourably places him in a better position than the other man in regard to economic competition. Therefore, you can never have a socialist society. That man will always be free to exploit and he has exploited. The other argument that you give is: Let him earn, but I am here to take away the money, to take away his earnings. That is true. But what is the good of that? If I earn Rs. 10 lakhs I can give away to the Finance Minister Rs. 9 lakhs. But the trouble is, what about the man who cannot earn even Rs. 10 because I am having the power to earn Rs. 10 lakhs? That is the thing. Our ability to mop up is no remedy for ending exploitation. It is no justification at all. Therefore, this side has to be considered, whether the economic life of the community is not now at a disadvantage as far as the poorer sections are concerned, when contrasted or compared with the richer section of the community, and whether we should not remove the unfavourable advantage that the

stronger people enjoy. Nationalisation of banks, in my opinion—I have an honest belief—will go a long way towards solving this question.

I am glad, Sir, that the Finance Minister has provided some concessions for the private sector. It is true that as long as we have a mixed economy in this country, as long as we cannot do without the private sector, we should take care to see that unnecessary hardship is not imposed on them. Simply because I am a socialist I do not for a moment say that we should not give them due facilities. The Finance Minister has made a very intelligent distinction, if I may say so, in categorising industries and giving relief to those industries whose profitability is less and at the same time whose utility to the nation is more like the electricity undertakings, etc. They richly deserve that support, and I do not find fault with the several measures which he has taken to give them relief. I do not know, and I cannot say whether the surtax that he has proposed will bring in the same amount as the super profits tax. It is only for experts and for those who know the business affairs to come to a decision in this regard.

Only one more point I would like to mention, and that is with regard to the public sector undertakings. The public sector undertakings have come under criticism, some of it harsh at many hands. I think the Finance Minister also has been very firm in saying that the public sector undertakings should pay an adequate return. Of course nobody can dispute with that point that the public sector undertakings should pay an adequate return. But, Sir, the public sector undertakings are on a different footing from the undertakings of the private sector. They have got a social objective. Their way of running is different. The amenities and other things that are provided in the public sector undertakings are far better than those provided in the private sector undertakings. But above all, a

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]
public sector undertaking by its very nature can never give the same return as an undertaking of private individuals. So, to insist on a public sector undertaking giving a return all at once is . . .

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:
Nobody said that.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I do not say that you insist, but several people do say that. There was criticism. I do not say that you did it. So, it is not quite right to say that. In fact I know of several cases and I think the Finance Minister also knows of several cases in the private sector where for years together they have not been able to pay any return at all. It is quite possible. By that I do not mean to say that they should not be run on efficient lines. They should be run on efficient lines because they are public undertakings which have the public money on trust with them.

[DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

It takes some time for them to yield adequate returns. One must view them with sympathy because it is for no private profit that these public sector undertakings are being run. One has to view them with sympathy, one has to wait and watch. I do not agree with Mr. Santhanam and others when they said that the State should not indulge in these things. In fact more and more undertakings which are of a productive nature and which cater to the common masses as such must be handled in the public sector. I have no doubt that with good management they will be run successfully.

Madam, on the whole I welcome the proposals of the Finance Minister.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Madam Deputy Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to speak on the budget proposals. It is not necessary for me to go into the details of taxation, but at the outset I would like to say that the Finance Minister's task at all times is a very

difficult one in any country, and here particularly in a way it has been a difficult one and also in a way it has been an easy one. It has been an easy one because last year's taxation itself has given him at least some relief as far as providing money for defence is concerned, which is quite out of proportion to what we have ever done before. It has been a difficult one because people were expecting, specially those who wanted to make out that the emergency was over, that there would be very great relief because the common man was suffering under the burden of taxation very severely. That has not been possible with regard to relief from taxation on commodities the prices of which had gone up last time all of a sudden. But before I go into that, I would just mention that though we feel that there is no fresh taxation on ordinary commodities like soap and other things, the States which are very short of money—and I have here papers relating to a certain State—have this time levied taxes on practically all items of everyday use. However, I cannot go into that here. But if every State does that, whatever relief one feels has been afforded by the Centre in not taxing the ordinary items of daily consumption will be taken away by the States by doing so.

The budget has provided this time for a little surplus. There are differences of opinion with regard to a surplus budget. Some hold that it is not very good economy—and it has been held to be so for the last six or seven years—to have a surplus budget, that it should be just a balanced budget. But a deficit budget was always considered to be a better budget because it gave an incentive to work hard. But I do not think that it has resulted in that.

The Finance Minister is really in a difficult position, as I was saying just now, because the emergency is not yet over. But on the other hand it has increased. If he does not provide for

defence on the same scale—and he has provided some Rs. 34 crores more—people will blame him for having gone to sleep. But there, Madam, we have the consolation that foreign countries like the U.K. and the U.S.A. who promptly came to our help will continue to do so by our being grateful to them for coming forward to help us generously. I would like to put it to the House that no foreign country which helps another country of the size of India in trouble really does it entirely on humanitarian grounds. It is also equally for its own protection. I think it is a wise policy for the United States and Britain to have come forward to help India to fight an enemy like China, if it came to that, because it is better to fight the battle on another person's soil than bring the danger nearer oneself. From that point of view even though the danger is not quite imminent yet—because we all expected last summer a renewal of the attack that has been held back—we should not be complacent because it is the peculiar method of the Chinese to blow hot and cold and they would suddenly strike the person unawares. There is also another purpose in making a country like India, whom they consider as their rival, spend on defence, because in that way she will not be able to divert all her resources in a peaceful way to her progress. Countries like Pakistan may well criticise India that India should not spend so much on defence. But that is neither here nor there. They are talking about things which China would like them to say and they are following that policy.

4 P.M.

Now, I would refer to some of the remarks made by the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech. Part A of his speech shows that he is appreciative of the problems and difficulties and also that he is prepared to do certain things for meeting the present situation about development and about the shortage of capital. He is prepared to welcome and invite foreign capital. I refer to paragraph 24 where he says:—

"Quite apart from the credits which we receive from Governments, we could raise funds from the banking system and capital markets of the world."

I need not read out the next sentence. But further on, he says:

"... we should specially welcome foreign investment in the shape of equity capital which not only brings with it technical know-how and managerial skills, but has the special advantage of not adding to the heavy and growing burden of debt repayment."

Well, it sounds very nice but there are inherent dangers in this policy. I do not know what way could be shown perhaps to get out of this in the immediate future but I feel that it is necessary that on the floor of the House, in an outspoken manner, a hint should be given of the dangers in this. Later on, he goes on to say about the managerial personnel, etc.

Well, first of all, I would point out the dangers involved in accepting foreign capital in an unbridled manner and without any limit. There is the risk of foreigners getting the upper hand in our economy. It is usually said that the man who pays the piper calls the tune, and we do not know whether we have laid down a limit to the total capital that we would accept. As such, I would not have liked this sentence about equity capital. At least the words '51 per cent. and 49 per cent' should have been there; the foreigners' share should have been 49 per cent and ours 51 per cent.

Then, he goes on to say, in another paragraph, that there are two or three things about running the business successfully and he says, "The question is of management, not of control." In one place he says that control is of secondary importance but managerial skill with technical know-how is important. Now, we are going to invite so much of foreign capital. I know for a fact what is happening, in certain concerns, and we are bound

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

to invite more and more foreigners to manage their business. When we get the foreigners into business in this country, our people, though they are competent, have to play a second fiddle. They get disappointed; there is a vast difference in their salaries. That is why I said that the man who pays the piper calls the tune. No rules are laid down about the salaries that could be paid to the managerial staff that is coming from abroad and to our men holding similar positions. Why should that not be done? I would refer here to the way in which certain other countries, like Egypt in Africa, manage their business. After inviting foreign capital, as far as possible, they keep the entire control of the industry in their hands—I am open to correction—and have all the managerial personnel from their own countries. It was said by the Chinese themselves—whether it was actually a fact or not, I do not know—that in China, in spite of the technical know-how that the USSR was providing it, at least by the visitor who was going there, there was not a single Soviet citizen to be seen anywhere about in such an important plant like the Anshan Steel Works even as long ago as 1954 when the Chinese perhaps had not made so much of advance. So, I have to say that apart from the fact that when persons are drawn from abroad, so many of our own technicians who have got their training get frustrated that they are not given a chance in the running of the industries and that there is so much of difference in the salaries paid to the foreign personnel in a concern and the Indian personnel, I feel that the future development of the industry in this respect will meet with certain hazards. I think this question should be carefully examined and certain conditions should be laid down in these matters as to what percentage of foreign personnel should be there, what percentage of their salary burden should fall on the industry, where they can be employed, what positions they should occupy and for what period they should remain. I

can understand if they are to come for starting a new industry and remain for two or three years and be sent back, but facts are otherwise.

I would also like to ask here why we do not take any steps to see that the money invested by our own businessmen from India in foreign countries is brought back to this country, at least to some extent. There are very many big business people—I do not want to mention their names—who are doing business in Addis Ababa and other places and also in Egypt, who keep their money for the expansion of their business there. Instead of inviting foreign capital, some of this capital, by compulsion, ought to be ploughed back into our country.

Incidentally, I would also like to ask what measures Government are going to take to check the bank accounts and search the lockers, etc. for hidden gold of the business people. Are they taking any steps to look into the accounts of the Princes and other rich people who have opened accounts in Switzerland, accounts which are not in any name? I understand that they are allotted a number and nobody, not even the bank's agent, knows what name or whose account, No. 67 or No. 55, as the case may be, represents. So, these Princes and others who have hidden accounts in foreign countries should be asked, should be made rather—because they are not going to listen by being asked only—to plough back their capital or their investments in foreign countries into this country, before we ask other foreigners to come and invest here.

Well, Madam, after this I would like to turn to a few other matters before I come to education. The speaker who preceded me was saying something about the cost of living. I would like to say that while the statistics given indicate usually the cost of living index having gone up 9 per cent. or 8 per cent. or 10 per cent, actually the prices of commo-

dities which the poorer classes, the wage-earners and even the lower middle classes have to pay are about 40 per cent or more sometimes. I am referring to wheat and other grains that matter to them a great deal. The poor man is very rarely able to afford any other articles of daily consumption, in whose cases the index could be shown as 9 per cent. or so. I mean meat and other things like eggs. In England during war time people used to get one egg, or rarely two perhaps, per head per week. I was reading that the milk that is consumed in India can be counted in spoons per head, not even a quarter of a seer. So, the cost of living index figure of 9 per cent is just a figure to be laughed at when actually the cost of living in the different States has risen from 25 to even 40 per cent. Therefore, instead of being told that by running co-operatives they will get relief, they should be given certain facilities by whatever method it is possible to do so. Rationing has failed because of the all-pervading vice of corruption. They should be given certain relief by giving them essential commodities at a certain fixed price. Otherwise this tax relief and other relief will remain a topic for discussion for a little while amongst businessmen, and a few people at the top will prosper while the others are left to suffer throughout the year as a result of this.

Similarly the Government should take care that the prices of commodities are not raised just a month or two before the Budget, or a month or two even after the Budget, of stocks which were purchased perhaps three or four months ago. This will mean a very careful inspection; a random inspection certainly will enable them to catch a few people, and if they are drastically punished under the Defence of India Act, under the powers which the Government still possesses, I feel this disease of fleecing the ordinary consumer will go. I would refer incidentally in one sentence to the amount of pensions that the old pen-

sioners draw, the pensions that they get on a salary of below Rs. 300, the money value now being perhaps four annas or three annas to the rupee. Now one has to imagine the plight of some of these pensioners who have old dependants to support and who draw pensions of Rs. 100 or Rs. 125 per month. So something should be done by Government, not increase their pensions, but give them relief in a certain form, i.e. as medical treatment, or perhaps clothes at a cheaper price. Now all these remedies were suggested for several years, during the last few years, but the State Governments, who can really move in the matter, seem to be incapable of handling the problem. I would suggest one more interesting way to the Finance Minister for increasing taxation, and at the same time for solving a big problem of unwieldy increase of population.

We all know that our food production falls short of all the targets that we may be achieving leaving aside the vagaries of climate, like frost, like heavy rain, like drought, etc. because our population is increasing at a very high rate. It has been suggested very often, that a tax on people having more than three children should be considered—a tax per extra child; not with retrospective effect; that would not be fair—at least now, here. Somebody should suggest an amendment, somebody should bring forward this amendment; if the colossal amounts spent on family planning—crores of rupees now, several crores—are to be of any use and are not to be an infructuous expenditure it is very essential that this tax measure should be considered, and there is nothing novel about it because, already, an extra tax on bachelors is in existence. So this will be following the same ideology.

Similarly there should be a tax on marriage expenditure. The General Expenditure Tax has been suggested, but I personally think it will be more

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

a tax on paper, because of evasion and the cooking up of accounts than something which will actually help the Government. Now marriage expenditure can be easily assessed if people are put on the spot to watch the expenditure; at least so much expenditure on lavish entertainments and show and pomp, that will be saved.

I am glad the Compulsory Deposit Scheme has been scrapped and the Annuity Scheme has been put there. But I would make a suggestion that the lower income group people should be allowed to pay their insurance premium from this Annuity. Otherwise it would be a double burden on the tax-payer and it would also perhaps reduce the life insurance receipts. This question should be examined in three months' time; Government could take up this issue and see that permission is given to people drawing up to Rs. 1,000 and below to pay their life insurance premium from the Annuity that they would have to pay.

Now I take up Wage Boards. Wage Boards are appointed. I do not know how Wage Boards after Wage Boards, which have come and which are going to come for different industries, which have given and will give their Awards, how they are going to meet the situation unless there is a composite Wage Board to examine the proposals of these Wage Boards. But all the workers' representatives will object, because it means a time-consuming factor, and Government studying the proposals of any Wage Board itself is being objected to by workers, because that delays the giving of increase in wages. I feel therefore, what is necessary at least for the time being is to scrap the Wage Board machinery and decide on a certain minimum wage for all industries, then add a certain agreed percentage—that will be for all time—and then add a certain percentage agreed upon by the workers and the employers and the Government representatives—not a Wage Board; Wage Board

wastes a lot of time going round, touring all over the country where the industries are spread over different places—and add to that a sliding dearness allowance and that sliding dearness allowance itself will meet the needs according to the prices of commodities, which differ in different States as a result of the vagaries of climate. Otherwise, there will be a constant agitation for raising wages, because of the local rise in prices due to various circumstances, more cunning businessmen trying to exploit the market, and the constant agitation is bound to affect the production level, and one reason why I feel the country has not been able to make rapid progress in raising the income of the common man, or even raising our small savings, is that we as workers, ordinary workers, even office workers, are not taught to give our best to the country by working in a conscientious and honest manner. This type of agitation always takes away the desire to work in a steady manner.

Now I turn to education, Madam. I do not know whether this is the appropriate time, but I would like to refer to the fact that the number of officers in the Secretariat of the Education Ministry has increased from last year, from 115 to 229, and their salaries and wages have gone up from Rs. 12 lakhs to Rs. 26 lakhs. Well, I hope this means more efficiency. I do not object to the cost of the civil expenditure or of the officers' salaries going up provided the output is commensurate, and especially on education I will never deny any expenditure provided the problem is tackled with vision and quickness. Now as to what type of education should be given, there has always been a discussion continuously going on, through seminars, conferences, etc. and I feel that if we were to appoint a research officer or a research student to study, in any State, all over the country, since the days of the Radhakrishnan Commission up to date, whether there has been un-

animity even about the degree courses, about the standard of our institutions, the findings would be something very interesting and also educative. Therefore I feel that something immediately should be done. I cannot go into the details, in what way it should be done but I am glad to find that social welfare has been given a little more money, not as much as it should have been. I am referring to the Social Welfare Board. After all, it is the States not the Centre that implement the scheme. That also applies to some other schemes like the education of handicapped children. The State Boards are the implementing machinery. Unless, therefore, the State Boards—whether it is for social welfare, whether it is for education of women—are run in the way the various regional plans are run, it is not likely to produce the result which it should. I would refer here to the need for appointing different persons in the States as chairmen of Social Welfare Board and of National Council for Women's Education. Now the point is that in the States unless the people working there feel that there is some scope for them to work for the country in these organised schemes, there is stagnation. And as a result it is no wonder that the people do not believe in the schemes which the Government takes up as they did when the committee was appointed.

I would now refer to the loan of 2,000 tons of paper which Australia is going to give to the Education Ministry for the printing of text books. The text books are supposed to be printed with that loan by the State Governments and given free to poor children. I would here like to draw the attention of the Education Minister, which perhaps they would do with greater force in the Lok Sabha when the Demands for Grants come, that the text books are never published in time, not to talk of giving them free to the poor. The text books are not available in the market even six months after the

courses have begun. Where is the question of giving them free? Unless, therefore, the machinery is properly strengthened, it is no use handing over this paper to the State Governments. I do not know where it will go.

The Education Ministry has started taking steps by setting up a Commission, as I said, the other day, composed of Members of Parliament under the chairmanship of Dr. Sapru to see what can be done to decide the pattern of university education, what can be done to see whether education should be a Centrally-administered subject in certain aspects. The Commission will go deep into the problem. I would like to point out here that it is not necessary to appoint another commission for the purpose because that will again be a frustrating and time-consuming measure. It will be better to take decisions, send them to the States and ask the States to send back their reply very soon.

Lastly, Madam, I would like to say that the Chamber of Commerce has sent its criticism on the Budget to the Members of Parliament. It was rather amazing to see the Chamber criticise all measures that would affect the capitalists. There is very little from the consumers' point of view that they have to say. I wish they had themselves submitted an exemplary budget or an alternative budget. In other words, it would have been better if they had said what they would have done if they were to run the Government. They do not realise that it is very difficult to find money for the Defence in our present condition and also to put the country properly on the path of industrial development so that we do not have, sooner rather than later, to depend on foreign countries. But there is only one danger, namely, that of the foreigners getting the upper hand in the running of our industry and, therefore, getting the economic hold of the country as the Western countries did in China when they took over the control of

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

all its sea ports leaving the interior without any communications to be used for itself.

One more remark of the Chamber that I would like to mention is this. They have said that the expenditure of Rs. 191 crores on the civil administration is an unhealthy trend. I was rather amazed when I read about that. Without going into details how could such adept business people make such a sweeping remark? Maybe, it is an unhealthy trend, I do not want to go into that. But I would like to ask the business community what healthy trends they have shown today. My predecessor, who spoke before me, Mr. Govinda Reddy, was referring to control on expenditure and the way how to put it on healthy lines. Our businessmen have limousines. They undertake trips abroad under the excuse of promoting business. They have various other ways in which they spend money. Many more such examples could be given. First they should practise; and only then they should preach. And I would like to tell them the well known adage that example is better than precept and physician, heal thyself.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That will equally apply to the ruling party.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I do not know. Ruling party is a sweeping term. Every fold has its black sheep. That is equally applicable to the Communist Party, the Swatantra Party and others also. The hon. Member coming from the Swatantra Party was touched to the quick by my remarks. As far as the ruling party is concerned, I am not defending it. If there are some examples of corruption they are being dealt with. It is for the hon. Member who spoke just now to supply information about the corrupt people in the ruling party or about extravagant people. But, as I said, every fold has its black sheep. I am not holding any brief for anybody.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. C. D. Deshmukh could not eradicate it. How can I do it? I do not belong to your party.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: You can be super-Deshmukh. Why do you belittle yourself? Mr. C. D. Deshmukh was then finding difficulty. Now the times have changed. You should try to gather support and pursue the matter.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, I thought you would not call me today. However, I am thankful to you for calling me. We all know that our aim is to bring about a socialist form of Government. The Budget seems to have been framed with that end in view. The Government is thinking of equalising the unequal economic position of the citizen. But, Madam, here you find inequality even from the birth. Simply because a man is born in a particular community, he is considered low to another man who is born in some other community. Whatever may be his virtue, his merit, he is considered low because he is born in a particular community. So we have got social inequalities even from the birth. In a perfect socialistic form of government we should have both economic and social equality.

This social inequality has divided society into various water-tight compartments. Because of this hatred the untouchable was driven out to various countries such as Burma, Ceylon, Malaya and South Africa. I know, Madam, in Ceylon alone there are seven lakhs of people of Indian origin. They went there to escape from the social inequalities. I know something about these people because I was sometimes connected with the Ceylon Indian Congress and the Ceylon Indian Labour Union. These people left this country to eke out their livelihood.

They went out three centuries ago when Ceylon was under the Dutch rule to work in coffee plantations. When Sir Frederick North was the Governor of Madras in 1798, he was also the Governor of the maritime province of Ceylon, and he encouraged these people to settle in Ceylon and to work in the tea and rubber plantations. They have been living there from time immemorial. But the thing is that they have not been recognised as Ceylonese citizens. Now the Ceylon Government wants to send them back. But our Government is not prepared to take them back. Their position resembles that of the Trishanku Swargam. I do not know whether you understand that old saying. Trishanku was a shudra. He wanted to go to the Heaven. He approached saint Viswamitra to send him to the Heaven. Viswamitra said that he would utter some mantras. And he uttered some mantras. While he was going to the Heaven Vasishtha felt that a shudra should not go to the Heaven and he uttered some mantras which stopped him in the middle. Now Trishanku was hanging in between. So the people who went to Ceylon long ago are finding themselves in the position of Trishanku. I was reading the other day some literature belonging to the Third Tamil Sangam of Madurai. I have seen it. The author says:

Panan Parayan Tudivan Kadamban
Enru Annal Alladu Kudiyum Illai.

He says, these are the original inhabitants of this land. They are the original inhabitants and they have more right to live in this land than many other communities that are living here. I do not object to the others living here but I cannot understand other people standing in their way. The other day—you may have seen in the papers—President Ayub Khan of Pakistan, when he went to Ceylon, told the Prime Minister of Ceylon that he was prepared to take back the people belonging to Pakistan but they are few in number but the Indians are more in number. They have more

right to come. I was disappointed when I saw it. I thought Mr. Krishnamachari, who knows about the hardships of these people, would provide a larger amount in the Budget to bring them back and to resettle them, which he has not done.

The second point is that there is no parity between direct and indirect tax in the budget. The point has been made by others also and repetition is sometimes jarring but I would say that there is no parity between the two. The Finance Minister cares more for indirect tax than for direct tax. In this connection I would like to tell him what Gladstone said in Parliament. When he was asked which tax he preferred, he said that they were like two beautiful sisters and he loved both of them and he wanted to pay court to both of them. I will give his actual words. This is what he said:

Mr. Gladstone said on 10th May, 1864:

"I never can think of direct and indirect taxation except as I should think of two attractive sisters who have been introduced into the gay world of London, each with an ample fortune, both having the same parentage (necessity and invention) differing only as sisters may differ, as where one is of brighter and another of darker complexion, or where there is some agreeable variety of manner, the one being more free and open, and the other more shy, retiring and insinuating"

He wanted to make love to both equally—

"I cannot conceive any reason why there should be unfriendly rivalry between the admirers of these two damsels and I frankly own whether it be due to a lack of sense of moral obligation or not, that as Chancellor of the Exchequer if not as a Member of this House, I have always thought it not only allowable but even an act of duty to pay my addresses to them both. I am therefore as between direct and

[Shri J. S. Pillai.]

indirect taxation, perfectly impartial."

This is what he said. At that time probably the Europeans had better stamina than us. Probably the Finance Minister is a bit old and so he cannot attend to both the girls. My suggestion is that he should be rejuvenated by the injection of the direct tax serum, so that when he brings the next budget, both the taxes will be balanced.

Then another thing that I wish to say is that he has not paid much attention to agriculture. There are others who have mentioned about it but by agriculturist they meant the landlord but I mean the tiller, the landless labour. He has not paid much attention to them. In the future he should pay attention to these landless labourers.

Having said this I wish to congratulate the Minister. It will look strange having criticised that I should congratulate him. It is that his Budget is free from the irksome feature that we found in the last year Budget. For instance he has done away with the C.D.S. but he has not done away with the Gold Control Order. That is very important. The Gold Control Order was brought into existence for two purposes, namely, to prevent smuggling of gold and to lower the price of gold to that of the international rate. None of these has been achieved so far. So it is no use having the Gold Control Order. It has done much mischief. A number of people, I know, have committed suicide. I am not exaggerating when I say that some families of goldsmiths have resorted to prostitution for their livelihood. I know it, I am not exaggerating it, and it is simply because they have not anything to eat and so the females of some goldsmiths have resorted to prostitution.

I am reminded of what Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar said when he was the President of the Congress. He said that we should connect all the

rivers in our land. That is, he wanted to connect Brahmaputra and Ganges, Ganges and Godavari, Godavari and Krishna till you go to Tambarabarani. His object was that when you have rain in the Himalayas, there should be water in Thirunelveli and there should not be any famine. These are the things he should remember and I hope the Finance Minister will do all these in the next year's Budget.

سرڊار بدھ سنگھ (جموں اہلڪ)

ڪشمير : مهتم ٿيڻي چهره من -

بھت جو همارو سامڻي پيش هوا

ه اس منن ڪا ڪي سوچ بچار ه

ڪام لڳا ڪيا ه اور پهر موجوده مشڪل

حالات منن اڪسپرٽ هانئون ه به

نڪلا ه اور پڇهڻي سال ڪي بھت

ڪي اوڀر جس قدر واڌا هوا تها جو

اعتراضات هوڻ ته اور جس حد تک

پهلڪ ڪي ناراضڪي هماري سامڻي

آئي تهي اس ڪو مد نظر رکھ ڪر

نہ بہت احتياط ه به بھت تيار

ڪيا ڪيا ه - اس منن ڪجهه ڪجهه

آپ ڪا سوشلزم ڪي طرف اشارو ه -

اس ڪي متعلق منن فليڪٽس اهلڪ

فليڪٽس پر زياده بھت ڪرنا نه من

چاهتا - منن اس رياست ه آها

هون جموں اور ڪشمير جس ڪي

نیشنل کانفرنس ڪا ۱۹۴۳ من

پرهيز پذيرت تها - اس وقت لوڪون نه

ڪئي سوال ڪئي - ڪشميري تب تک

ايمان نه من لانا ڪسي ڀارتی من

نه من آتا جب تک اهو صاف طور

ه به نه بتايا جائے ڪه تمهارو لئي

ہم کہا کریں گے۔ ہم نے سہلف گورنمنٹ کے متعلق جدوجہد کی آزادی کے لئے جدوجہد کی اور اس وقت کشمیریوں نے پوچھا تم ہمارے لئے کیا کرو گے۔ اس وقت جب کہ ہم مہاراجہ اور انگریزوں کی زبردست طاقت کے نیچے دبے تھے، فلم تھ اس وقت ۱۹۴۴ میں میں نے جو صدارتی ایڈریس لکھا اس میں میں نے سوالوں کا جواب دیا۔ ہم نے ایک پلاننگ کمیٹی بنایا نہ تو کشمیر کے نام سے ایک اقتصادی منصوبہ بنایا ایک پلان بنایا۔ آپ چھلان دے جانے لگے ۱۹۴۴ کو نہ تو کشمیر کا پلان مشترک کیا گیا آپ خیال کیجئے جس وقت ہم مصیبت میں تھے۔ تب ہم نے عوام سے وعدہ کیا کہ تمام جتنے کارخانے ہوں گے وہ قومی ملکیت ہوں گے اور کسان کے لئے اچھے گھر بنادے جائیں گے۔ بجلی گھر بنائے جائیں گے۔ تیز رفتار سے گزریاں ہر جگہ لے جائیں گے۔ کھر کھر صنعتوں ہونگی۔ تجارت ہوگی۔ تمام ضروریات جنگلوں کے متعلق کسانوں کو ملے گی اور بھی طرح طرح کی سہولتیں دی جائیں گی۔ جیسے دوائیں اور علاج مفت ہوگا۔ تعلیم مفت ہوگی اور پھر کئی کمیٹیاں مقرر ہونگی۔ انسورنس کا انتظام ہو گا کوآپریٹو پروگرام ہوگا اور جب میں تمام

پلاننگ کی بحث کے وقت اسٹیج پر سن رہا تھا تو دو تین کو میں نے بڑے غو سے سنا میں شکر ادا کرتا تھا کہ یہ پروگرام اس وقت ہم کو کئی یہ کہتے تھے کہ یہ پائل میں فلم ہوں غریب ہیں پس ماندہ ہوں یہ کہا بدہ سلک دنیا کشمیر کی بابت بول رہا ہے پائل تو نہیں ہو گیا۔ تو میں نے کہا دیکھئے کمب اور کیسے پورا ہوگا آج دیکھتا ہوں کہ کس طرح سے تمام نہ تو کشمیر کے پروگرام کو پورا کرنا ہوگا۔ جس وقت ۱۹۴۷ میں پاکستانی ریڈ ہوا اس وقت مہاراجہ نے حکومت ہند کو لکھا تھا کہ ہماری مدد کرو ہم لت لگے ہیں تمہارا جو جائیں گے تو اس وقت سوال پیدا ہوا کہ اچھا انکسپشن کرو ہندوستان سے الحاق کرو۔ تو اس نے الحاق کیا لیکن وہاں چونکہ آل انڈیا اسٹیمپس پیپل کانفرنس میں ہمارا ہلتا جی کے ساتھ پرچے تھا تو انہوں نے کہا جو نیشنل کانفرنس پارٹی ہے اس سے پہلے پوچھنا چاہئے۔ اس وقت یہ سوال پیدا ہوا اور ہم نے کہا دیکھو کشمیریو۔ جموں اور کشمیر کے لوگو۔ اگر تم ہندوستان کے سیکولر سٹیٹ کے ساتھ ملو گے تبھی یہ تمہارا نہ تو کشمیر منصوبہ پورا ہو سکے گا ورنہ قومی دوسری طاقت نہیں دلتا میں جو آپ کو سیکوا

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

استھیت کے بغیر گارنٹی دے سکے
بھارت میں ہندو مسلمان اقتصاد
یقینی ہو سکتا ہے - جس کے لئے
ہم نے نیشنل کانفرنس بلایا ہے -
اس لئے یہ پہلی گارنٹی تھی جو
نیشنل کانفرنس نے عوام کو دی تھی۔
مجھے بڑی خوشی ہوئی ہے کہ آج
اس وقت کا وہ پائل پن کا الزام
دور ہو گیا جب آ انڈیا پلاننگ
میں شامل ہو گئے - میں دیکھ کر
حیران ہو جاتا ہوں اور مجھے خوشی
ہوتی ہے کہ اب ہم اس قابل ہوئے
ہیں کہ ہم اپنے عوام سے کہیں کہ
نو بابا یہ جو وعدہ ہم نے کیا تھا
پورا کیا جانے کا وقت آ گیا - ہم
کیسے غلامی میں مصیبت میں
غریب میں توبہ و ثلوار نے نیچے ڈھ
اور جس وقت ہم نے یہ پلان بلایا
تھا ایک خواب دیکھا تھا - بارہ برس
ہوئے آپ نے پلاننگ کمیشن بلایا
اور جب اس کو ہم نے دیکھا - تو
خواب نہ تھا حقیقت تھی -

تو میں آپ کو یہ بتانا چاہتا
ہوں کہ میری ساری زندگی محنت
کس لوگوں مزدوروں اور کسانوں نے
ہمیں ہی گزری ہے - میرے
پاس اتنی ہمت و وقت نہیں کہ
میں بجٹ کے تمام فیکٹس ایڈٹ
فیکٹس کی بابت سے آپ کو سب
باتیں بتاؤں - میں ایک دیہاتی

آدمی ہوں - گاؤں میں رہتا ہوں -
بہت عرصہ سے رہ رہا ہوں اور اب
بھی وہیں رہتا ہوں - ایک دفعہ
گاؤں والوں نے مجھ سے پوچھا کہ
یہ بجٹ کیا چیز ہے تو میں نے
اس سے کہا کہ ہمارا بجٹ دو ہزار
کروڑ روپیہ کا ہے تو انہوں نے کہا
اتنا روپیہ کہاں اور کس جگہ پر
خرچ ہوتا ہے اور یہ بجٹ کس
واسطہ ہوتا ہے - میں نے کہا سرکار
کے ہاں مختلف محکمے ہوتے ہیں -
ایگریکلچر کا محکمہ ہوتا ہے - ڈیفنس
کا محکمہ ہوتا ہے اور کئی طرح کے
محکمے ہوتے ہیں - تمہارا واسطہ اس
بجٹ سے کارخانے بنائے جاتے ہیں -
سملداری و ہوائی جہاز بنائے جاتے
ہیں ریلیں بنتی ہیں اور بہت
سی چیزیں بنائی جاتی ہیں - تب
اس کسان نے کہا - سردار جی دیکھتے
نہ ہیں روٹیاں سبھی گلاس گھوٹیاں ۲۲
تو انہوں نے کہا کہ آپ نے جو کچھ
تفصیل میں بیان کیا ہے کہ ترقی
ہو رہی ہے - کارخانے چل رہے ہیں
اس کا مطلب یہ ہوا کہ یہ سب
کچھ ہمارے واسطے ہو رہا ہے لیکن
جب تک ہمارے پیٹ میں روٹی
نہیں آئیگی - تب تک ہمارے لئے
یہ سب چیز بے کار ہے تو اس کے
جواب میں میں نے کہا کہ بھائی
میں بارہ برس سے پارلیمینٹ میں
ہوں اور میں نے ۲۲ تقریریں اس
عرصہ میں کیں - جن میں سے ۳۲

سرکار کو پہلے ان لوگوں کے لئے رہائش کا بندوبست کرنا چاہئے جو مزدور ہیں کسان ہوں اور محنت کش لوگ ہوں اور چلہیں باہر کولے ہوں رہنا پڑتا ہے۔ جس وقت یہاں پلاننگ کمیشن بلانگیا تھا اس وقت ہم لوگوں نے بھی نئے کشمیر کا پلان بلایا تھا اور جس میں دس بارہ برسوں کے لئے جو پلاننگ کمیشن نے چھڑیں رکھی تھیں وہ ساری اس میں آگئی تھیں۔ اس میں ہم نے تمام کارخانوں کو قومی ملکیت بلانے کے لئے کہا تھا۔ اور زمین کے بارے میں کہا تھا کہ وہ کسان کی ہوگی لیکن ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ ابھی تک یہ خاطر خواہ مکمل نہیں ہوئی۔

۱۹۴۴ میں جب میں آل انڈیا ہوں اور کشمیر کا پریذیڈنٹ تھا تو میں نے ایک ایڈریس لکھا تھا جس میں لوگوں نے جو سوالات کئے جنکے جوابات کئے۔ میرے کئی دوستوں نے کہا کہ سردار جی۔ نیشنل کانگریس کے جھنڈے کا نشان کھسا ہونا چاہئے تو میں نے کہا کہ سرخ رنگ کا ہونا چاہئے۔ اس پر انہوں نے کہا کہ اس پر چلار کے پتے یا پھول کا نشان لگانا چاہئے۔ تو میں نے کہا دیکھو کشمیریو۔ تم بھوکے مر رہے ہو ظلم و ستم سے دیے ہوئے ہو غلام ہو مصیبت زدہ ہو پس مائدہ ہو لیکن ابھی تک

تقریریں میں نے محنت کش لوگوں مزدوروں کسانوں کی بھلائی کے بارے میں کہیں لیکن یہ ہماری بدقسمتی ہے کہ یہاں جو رپورٹ ہوتی ہے اور جر انگریزی میں اپنی تقریر کرتے ہیں ان کی رپورٹ تو اخباروں میں اچھی طرح سے نکل جاتی ہے لیکن جو لوگ ہندی میں بولتے ہیں ان کی تقریر بہت کم نکلتی ہے۔ ہمارے باجپئی صاحب جی جب کہی ہندی میں بولتے ہیں وہ بہت اچھی ہندی میں بولتے ہیں لیکن ان کی بھی تقریر اخبار میں بہت کم نکلتی ہے۔ میں نے جتلی یہاں پر اسپیکر دی ہیں ان کو گورنمنٹ اچھی طرح سے پڑھتی ہے یا نہیں یہ میں نہیں جانتا۔ چونکہ اب میں جا رہا ہوں اور میری عمر قریب اسی برس کی ہو چکی ہے۔ اس لئے میں آپ کو سنانا چاہتا ہوں کہ میں نے اپنی تقریروں میں کہا کچھ کہا اور ان بارہ برسوں میں میں نے کیا کچھ دیکھا ہے۔ آپ اندازہ لگائے کہ خدا نے پہاڑ بلائے ہیں، ندی بلائی ہے۔ آسمان بلایا ہے۔ زمین بلائی ہے لیکن ہم خالی مہدانوں اور پہاڑوں یا برف میں نہیں رہ سکتے ہیں۔ جب تک باقاعدہ طور پر ہماری رہائش کے لئے مکان نہیں بنائے جائیں گے تب تک ہم اچھی طرح رہ نہیں سکتے ہیں۔ اس لئے

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

تمہارے دل و ذہن میں پھول اور چنار کے پتہ کی محبت ہے اور ہونی چاہئے۔ یاد رکھو - اس چھلنے کا نشان ایسا ہونا چاہئے جس میں کشش ہو جس میں جوش ہو عام مہم ہو۔ مہرے دوست نے پوچھا سرخ رنگ کھوں دکھوں - تو میں نے کہا کہ یہ اس مزدور کا رنگ ہے جو کارخانہ جات میں کام کرتا ہے - مصحت کرتا ہے - سہمت لاتا ہے لکڑی و پتھر لاتا ہے اور اپنی پیٹھ پر بوجھ لا کر یہ سب چیزیں مہیا کرتا ہے - ان چیزوں کو لانے میں اس کی ناک سے خون نکلتا ہے ملہ سے نکلتا ہے - اس کو تکلیف ہرتی ہے اور نہایت مصحت اٹھا کر وہ یہ سب چیزیں لاتا ہے - اس طرح سے وہ ہمارے رہنے کے لئے مکان بناتا ہے اور اس کی حالت پھر بھی ویسی کی ویسی ہی دکھی رہتی ہے - اس لئے ہمیں اس کی حالت کو سدھارنا چاہئے کہوں کہ یہ نہ صرف ہمارے لئے ہی مکان بنانا ہے بلکہ ملدر بنانا ہے گرجہ و مسجد بنانا ہے - گوردوارہ بنانا ہے - بڑی بڑی عمارتیں اور دفتر بنانا ہے - سہکریٹریٹ بنانا ہے اور بڑے بڑے ہوٹل بنانا ہے لہکن پھر بھی اس کے اپنے رہنے کے لئے مناسب جگہ نہیں ہے -

ابھی ۱۹۶۳ کے جنوری میں ایک کھیتی کے بارے میں ایک رسالہ نکلا تھا - جس میں پلڈت جی نے ایک پیغام دیا تھا - جس میں انہوں نے لکھا تھا کہ جتنے ہمارے پراجکٹ میں جتنے ہمارے کارخانے ہیں وہ تب تک نہیں چل سکتے ہیں جب تک کہ ملک میں پیداوار نہیں بڑھائی جائے گی - کسان اور مزدور اگر مصحت نہیں کریگا تو کارخانوں میں یہ چیزیں پیدا نہیں ہو سکتیں - اگر ہماری کھیتی کا کام نہیں ہوگا تو ہمارے کارخانوں میں بھی کوئی چیز پیدا نہیں ہو سکتی ہے - اس لئے سب سے ضروری کام یہ ہے کہ کھیتی بڑی کی پیداوار بڑھائی جائے اور اس پر جتنی مصحت ہو سکے اتنی ہموں کرن چاہئے - جب میں بھلائی اور روزگاری کے کارخانے دیکھنے گیا تو بھلائی میں جو سہمت انجینڈر تھے انہوں نے مجھ سے کہا کہ تمہارے کشمیر میں تو پانی کی نہریں بہتی ہیں مگر یہاں لڑھے کی نہر بہہ رہی ہے - آج ہمارے ملک میں بڑے بڑے کارخانے ہیں جہاں جہاں بڑی بڑی مشینیں بن رہی ہیں جہاں بڑے بڑے ہوائی جہاز بن رہے ہیں - ریلوں کے لئے سامان بن رہا ہے اور دوسری بہت سی چیزیں بن رہی ہیں لیکن میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں جب تک ہمارے ملک

میں کوہتی کی بھدوار نہیں ہوتی
 کی تب تک ہم ترقی نہیں کر سکتے
 یہ جو کچھ ہی رہا ہے اس کے متعلق
 کسان کہتا ہے کہ وہ سازیاں کلاتے
 ہتے ملے ۲۲ - یہ جب کے نچے ہے
 جب حل چلے گا تب اناج کی بھدوار
 ہوگی جس سے سب زندہ ہیں -
 میں نے وہاں دیکھا کہ مزدور لوگ
 سویرے سے شام تک اپنے کام پر
 لگے رہتے ہیں لیکن یہاں سیکریٹری
 کے پاس لکھا جاتا ہے کہ موٹر کی
 آواز نہیں ہونی چاہئے - کہوں کہ
 کلرک کام کرتے ہیں افسر کام کرتے ہیں
 اس میں فرق پڑتا ہے
 لیکن ان کاو خانوں میں جہاں
 ہزاروں مزدور کام کرتے ہیں جہاں اتنا
 شور ہوتا ہے - آواز ہوتی ہے تکلیف
 ہوتی ہے پھر بھی وہ مزدور لوگ
 محنت سے اپنا کام کرتے چلے جاتے
 ہیں یہ مزدور سخت کوشی اور
 سدی میں لوہا بڑاتے ہیں پتھر
 کاٹتے ہیں - میں تو ان لوگوں کے
 کام کو دیکھ کر حیران رہ گیا کہ یہ
 لوگ کس طرح سے اپنا کام کرتے ہیں - یہ
 لوگ آٹھ آٹھ اور نو نو گھنٹے کام کرتے ہیں
 لیکن پھر بھی کھانے کو ہوتا نہیں ملتا
 اور نہ دھلے کو اچھی جگہ ملتی ہے -
 وہ لوگ ہم سے پوچھتے ہیں کہ
 تمہارے بھرت کا کیا اثر ہم پر ہوا وہ
 کسی کے لئے بلتا ہے - وہ لوگ
 کہتے ہیں کہ یہ آپ کے لئے بلتا ہے

مستغروں کے لئے بلتا ہے اور گورنمنٹ
 کے لئے بلتا ہے - وہ لوگ خوب بھی
 کرتے ہیں اور سوچ کرتے ہیں - اور جو
 ہم پس ماندہ لوگ ہیں مزدور لوگ
 ہیں کسان لوگ ہیں غریب لوگ
 ہیں ان پر انتہائی ظلم ہو رہا ہے -
 غریب غریب تر ہوتے جا رہے ہیں اور
 امیر امیر تر ہوتے جا رہے ہیں - اس
 طرح سے زمین اور آسمان کا فرق غریب
 اور امیر کے بیچ میں اب بھی موجود ہے - ہم
 دیکھتے ہیں کہ لاکھوں من غلہ موجود
 ہے کپڑا ہے ہزاروں کوٹھیاں ہیں لیکن
 یہ سب چیزیں غریبوں کے کسانوں
 مزدوروں کے لئے نہیں ہیں بلکہ جو
 بڑے بڑے امیر وزیر لوگ ہیں ان کے لئے
 ہیں - آج ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ ایک
 طرف سینکڑوں مکانوں میں کمرے
 خالی رہتے ہیں لیکن مزدور اور
 کسانوں کو مسجدوں کو باہر
 رہنا پڑتا ہے - ان کے پاس نہ
 پہلے کے لئے کپڑا ہے اور نہ دھلے کے
 لئے مناسب گھر ہے - جب تک ہم
 کسان اور مزدوروں کو اور محنت کس
 لوگوں کو رہائش کے لئے اچھے مکان
 نہیں دیں گے - پہلے کے لئے کپڑا
 نہیں دیں گے - کھانے کے لئے پورا
 اناج نہیں دیں گے - تب ہم اس
 ملک میں ترقی نہیں کر سکتے -
 آج حالت یہ ہے کہ کئی غریبوں کے
 گھروں میں سرد ہر دانہ نہیں ہے -
 کہا یہ بے انصافی نہیں ہے کہ دولت

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

ملند اور فروغب کا ایک ہی نرخ آج ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ فروغب مزدور کے فروغب کسان کے بال بچے بغیر کپڑے کے نلکے نیم لقمہ دھتے ہیں اور جو لوگ پتی لوگ ہیں اور جو امیر وزیر لوگ ہیں انکے لئے تمام ضروریات کافی حد تک موجود ہیں وہ بڑی بڑی کونپھوں میں دھتے ہیں کہا بھی آپ کا سیکولزم ہے - کہا بھی جمہورت و سوشلزم ہے - کہا بھی انسانیت ہے -؟ ہمارے پریذیڈنٹ صاحب نے بھی اور ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے بھی کئی مرتبہ کہا ہے کہ ہمارے ملک میں جو ویسٹینڈ انٹرسٹ ہیں ان کو ہٹانا ہے کہوں کہ کسان کاشتکاروں کی حالت بہت خراب ہے - اس لئے میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک میں جو نوے فی صدی کاشت کار ہیں جو اس وقت بھوکے مر رہے ہیں اور ہمارے ملک میں جو ویسٹینڈ انٹرسٹ لوگ ہیں جب تک ہم ان کو نہیں ہٹاتے ہیں تب تک جو مصیبت کھیں مزدور لوگ ہیں ان کی حالت نہیں سدھر سکتی ہے - اگر اس کے لئے ایک نہیں ہزاروں انقلاب بھی ہوں تو بھی ہمیں کرنا چاہئے - مہاتما گاندھی سے جب وہ ۳۰ تاریخ ۱۹۳۸ء کو شہید ہوئے تھے اس سے دو دن پہلے ایک کسان نے پوچھا تھا کہ ہمارا کیا ہوا -؟ تو مہاتما

گاندھی نے کہا کہ کسان تم راجہ ہو - تم بادشاہ ہو اور اگر مہری چلے تو میں کسان کو پرائم منسٹر بتا دوں - نہ جانے کہا کہا کردوں - کسان جو ہے وہ غلام ہے وہ حل چلاتا ہے مصیبت کرتا ہے اور سادی طور سے اپنی زندگی بسر کرتا ہے - مہاتما گاندھی جی نے کہا کہ مجھے افسوس ہے کہ جو کسان ان دانا ہے جو ہمیں پاتا ہے ہمارے لئے مصیبت کرتا ہے ہمیں کھانا دیتا ہے لیکن ہم نے اس کو غلام بنا رکھا ہے - اب سوال یہ پیدا ہوتا ہے کہ اس کے لئے ہم کیا کر رہے ہیں - ایکریکلچر کے لئے یہ سب ٹھیک ہے کہ فائلٹس منسٹر نے یہ محسوس کیا ہے کہ یہ پریشانی - سردار سورن سنگھ قابل آدمی ہیں - وہ زمینداری جانتے ہیں وہ کسان جانتے ہیں اور وہ بھی پریشان ہیں اور دنیا بھی پریشان ہے - اس قدر مہنگائی میں نے کبھی آج تک نہیں دیکھی - میں سروس میں تھا اور یہ چالیس برس کی صرف بات ہے جب میں نے اس وقت دیکھا تھا کہ پچاس سیر روپیہ کی مکی تھی چوبیس سیر روپیہ کا چارل ہوتا تھا پچاس سیر روپیہ کا گلک کا آٹا ہوتا تھا - دو تہائی آنہ کی مرغی ہوتی تھی ایک پیسہ کا انڈا ہوتا تھا - تین پیسے کے ایک سو اخروٹ ہوتے تھے - تین سو سبب دیڑھ روپے

کے ہوتے تھے۔ کبھی تبھی سہر روپیہ کا ہوتا تھا اور تیل چھ سہر روپیہ کا ہوتا تھا۔ اس کے علاوہ سبزی اور آلو پیسے کے دو سہر ہوتے تھے۔ تو میں آج کے نرخ دیکھ کر حیران ہو گیا ہوں۔ میں دیکھتا ہوں کہ یہ ترقی ہوئی ہے۔ یہ آزادی ہوئی ہے۔ لوگ بھوکے مر رہے ہیں توپ رہے ہیں اور آپ ان کو نہیں دیکھتے ہیں۔ میں سیکرٹریٹ میں ابھی گزر رہا تھا تو میں نے دیکھا کہ وہ زمین کوٹ رہے ہیں اور ان کے چھوٹے چھوٹے بچے نیم لنگے دھوپ میں حیران پھر رہے ہیں۔ دفتری لوگ اوپر سے دیکھ رہے ہیں۔ ان اہل-کلمہ شدہ کمروں میں۔ ذرا خھال کھائے کہ یہ کہا ہو رہا ہے۔ دلی کے اندر آپ نے ہوٹل بنا دیا لیکن جس وقت وہ بنتا تھا تو میں نے دیکھا کہ کس طرح مزدوروں کا خون بہا اور کس طرح انہوں نے جنگل کٹتے پتھر کاٹے اور کلکریٹ بنائی۔ میں کہتا تھا کہ یہ کیا کر رہے ہیں۔ مجھے یہ وہم ہو گیا تھا کہ ان کے لئے بھی کھر بنیں گے مگر جب وہ ہوٹل بن گیا تو گلی پکڑ کر ان دس ہزار آدمیوں کو باہر نکال دیا گیا۔ میں ۳۷ برس سے ان کے لئے سر پھٹتا رہا اور روتا رہا۔ آپ ووت لہلے کے لئے وہاں جاتے ہو۔ ہاتھ جوڑتے ہو اور چھوٹے مسٹر می نہیں

پرالم مسٹر بھی وہاں جاتے ہیں ان کے سدھار کا وعدہ کرتے ہیں لیکن دو مہینے کے بعد پھر ختم ہو جاتا ہے۔ ہماری لگھان پختہ بنتی ہیں مگر گھاس پھوس کے جھونپڑے ہیں اور سوراخ اور کتے پھرتے ہیں ان ہمارے بھائیوں کے بچوں کے ساتھ ساتھ گلدکی میں گھومتے پھرتے ہیں۔ امریکہ اور رشیا وغیرہ کی جو ایمبسوز ہیں ان کے پاس دیکھئے کہ باہر ایک درم میں تمام کوزا کرکٹ مرغی انڈے کے پتر و چھلکے اور گلدکی پڑی رہتی ہے اور وہ مزدور جو آپ کا حال بنانے والے ہیں جو یہ آپ کا سہر بنانے والے ہیں جو آپ کی زمین بنانے والے ہیں جو آپ کی شاخ بنانے والے ہیں۔ ان کے بچے وہاں کے ان کتوں کے ساتھ دیکھتے ہیں کہ کوئی چیز کھانے کے لئے ہے یا نہیں مجھے بڑا دکھ ہوتا ہے مجھے بڑا رنج ہوتا ہے جب میں یہ دیکھتا ہوں کہ اس راج دھانی میں کہا ہوتا ہے۔ ابھی پچھلے دنوں یہ کہا گیا کہ اتنے ہزار آدمی باہر سو گئے اور سردی سے کئی مر گئے۔ کہا ان کے لئے کپڑا نہیں تھا۔ یہ کھدر بھندار کس لئے ہے۔ کہا پھونکنے کے لئے ہے۔ یہ دلی کلاتھ مہل کس لئے ہے کہا یہ جلانے کے لئے ہے۔ کہا یہ سارے مکان پھونکنے کے لئے

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

ہیں۔ لوگوں کے پندرہ پندرہ بیس
بیس کمرے خالی پڑے ہوئے ہیں
جن میں جانور پھرتے ہیں۔ لیکن
بے گھر اور دفنوجھڑ کے رھائے کے لئے
کوئی مناسب انتظام نہیں ہے۔

योजना मंत्री श्री बी० प्रार० भगत :
क?

سردار بدھ سنگھ : ہر ایک کا۔

مہرا اور آپ کا۔ آپ کی کوٹھی میں
۱۰ کمرے ہیں۔ منستروں کے مکانوں
میں خالی ایک ایک آدمی رھتا
ہے ۱۰-۵ ایک زمین میں آپ دیتے
ہیں۔ آپ کہتے ہیں کہ آپ کے لئے
کسان پھداوار زیادہ کرے۔ وہ کس
جگہ پھداوار کرے او کھڑے کرے۔
اس کا ہاتھ تھتا ہوا ہے ہل و پھل
نمزور ہے اس ۵ دل و دماغ پریشان
ہے وہ دکھی ہے وہ بھار ہے کمزور
ہے۔ اس کو کھانے کو پورا و مناسب
نہیں ملتا ہے۔ اس کی عورت بھم
برہنہ ننگی ہے بیمار ہے بچہ پیدا
ہونے والا ہے۔ لیکن ڈاکٹر نہیں ہے۔
اس کو آپ کہتے ہیں کہ اناج پیدا
کرنے میں جوٹ جائے۔ ہمارے پرائم
منسٹر بھی کہتے ہیں اور ایگریکلچر
منسٹر بھی انہیں غریبوں کو کہتے
ہیں کہ خوب صنعت کرو۔ لیکن
ہم کو ان پارلیمنٹ نے سمجھوں کو
اور منستروں کو کہوں نہیں کہتے
ہیں کہ صنعت کرو اور ایلی ایلی
کوٹھی میں آلو لگاؤ تھام لگاؤ اور
پھداوار کرو۔ گو سرور فوٹ کا ہم نے

ایک ملا ہوا تھا لیکن یہ کہا فریب
گاری ہے کہ کسانوں کو کہا جاتا ہے
کہ کلک پیدا کرو مگر کوٹھوں میں
پیدا ہوتے ہیں پھول۔ میں کہتا
ہوں کہ ان پھولوں کو کہا چاٹو گے۔
یہ پھول کہا تمہاری خوراک ہیں
یہ پھول کہا تم کو زندہ رکھ سکتے ہیں۔
ان دھڑکی بڑے مکانوں میں یا گاؤں
میں لاکر جو بھوکے ہیں ضروریات زندگی
کے لئے پریشان ہیں بیمار ہیں کمزور
ہیں ان کو بلایا دو گے تو وہ کہا کام
کریں گے۔؟ کہا یہ بڑے مکان ان کی
بھوک و دکھ دور کریں گے۔؟ یہ نہیں
ہو سکتا ہے۔ اس لئے میں کہتا چاہتا
ہوں کہ مزدور کو اتھاو۔ اس کو اونچا
کرو۔ اس کی لہونگ اونچی کرو۔ اور
اس کو ردتی کپڑے اور جھونپڑی سے
فارغ کر دو۔ اس کے بچے بھی ہمارے
بچوں کی طرح ہیں۔ اس کے اندر
بھی وہی احساس ہے دکھ اور سکھ کا
جو ہمارے اندر ہے۔ لیکن فریب طبعہ
میں دولت مندوں کے لئے اب حسد
پیدا ہو رہا ہے۔ مہاتما گاندھی نے
تالسٹائی کے بارے میں یہ کہا تھا کہ
وہ مہاتما ہیں۔ اس نے رشتا میں یہ
کہا تھا کہ دیکھو میں نہیں کہتا
کہ تشدد کرو اور یہ بڑے بڑے آدمیوں
سے کہا کہ غریبوں کی مدد کرو لیکن
پاد رکھو کہ حسد مت پیدا کرو۔ جو
تمہارے پاس فالٹو چھڑ ہے بچی ہوئی
چھڑ ہے اندر اشتاک پڑی ہوئی ہے وہ تو

دے دو تاکہ یہ تمہارے دشمن نہ بن جائیں۔ وہی صورت اب پیدا ہو رہی ہے۔ آپ کہتے ہیں کہ آہستہ آہستہ انقلاب آ رہا ہے۔ خاموش انقلاب آ رہا ہے۔ خاموش انقلاب بہت خطرناک ہوتا ہے۔ بولنے والے سے ہم خبردار ہو جاتے ہیں۔ جو خاموش ہوتا ہے وہ اندر ایک ناسور ہے اور اندر ہی اندر پھٹتا جاتا ہے۔ اس لئے یاد رکھو کہ جو بولے ہوں ننگے ہوں۔ وہ اب حد سے زیادہ پریشان ہیں۔ آج کل اتنا دکھ ہے۔ اتنی مہلکائی ہے کہ غریب کہا کوئی سنبھل پوہ ہے۔ چارہ سو نہیں سکتا۔ پورا کھانا کھا نہیں سکتا اور اس کے اندر ایک آہ چل رہی ہے۔ تم کہتے ہو کہ کمیونسٹ آتے رہے ہیں۔ وہ اس لئے آتے رہے ہیں کہ وہ مصلحت کشوں کے لئے بولتے ہیں لیکن جب وہ کسانوں مزدوروں کے لئے آواز بلند کرتے ہیں تو کئی ممبران ان پر برس پڑتے ہیں لیکن یاد رکھو کہ کمیونزم کے لئے کوئی دریا حائل نہیں ہے۔ کوئی پہاڑ حائل نہیں ہے۔ کوئی درمیان میں روک نہیں ہے۔ وہ ان ہلوں میں پرورش پاتے ہیں۔ جو غریب ہیں۔ جو غریب ہیں جو مظلوم ہیں جو دکھی ہیں جو مصیبت میں ہیں جو لہلہ لہس ہیں جن کے پاس کوئی کام نہیں ہے کوئی پلشن نہیں ہے اور کچھ بھی نہیں ہے وہ تڑپ رہے ہیں۔

وہ ۸۰ نہیں ۸۵ اور ۹۰ فی صدی ہیں۔ یہ ۹۰ فی صدی اس ملک کے ۳۵ کروڑ انسان غریب نادار بیمار اور کمزور ہیں اور پھر اس سے آپ کہیں کہ تم جگو۔ پیداوار کو ہر ف میں بارش میں بھوکے ننگے رہ کر مصلحت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ بجٹ کس نے بنایا ہے؟ یہ دوست جو بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں اور میگزینریٹ میں جو بھرے ہوئے ہیں جن کو رات میں نیند اچھی آئی ہے صحت اچھی ہے جن کا گرم گرم خون چل رہا ہے۔ جن کی آنکھیں کام کر رہی ہیں۔ دماغ کام کر رہا ہے۔ انہوں نے یہ فیگنٹس اٹھتے فیگنٹس بنائی ہیں۔ اگر رات میں بڑی ہو سونا پڑے سردی سخت ہو نمونہ ہو گیا ہو تو میں دیکھوں کہ کیسے یہ بجٹ بنتا ہے؟ ایسی حالت میں نہیں بن سکتا ہے۔ اس لئے وقت آ گیا ہے کہ اب جتنی جلدی ہو سکے اس چیز کی فکر کرو۔ ہمیں چائنا کی کوئی فکر نہیں ہے۔ ہمیں پاکستان کی بھی کوئی فکر نہیں ہے اور ہمیں فوجوں کی بھی کوئی فکر نہیں ہے جو ابی ہم سے لڑنے آئے گا ہم اس کا پورا مقابلہ کریں گے لیکن یاد رکھو کہ یہ جو خاموش بے چیلی فم و فصہ کی آگ پیدا ہو رہی ہے۔ جو آتھی لہاں پہاڑ ہو رہا ہے۔ اس میں ایک دکھی کیا دعا کریتا کیا پوروتھنا کریتا۔

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

کہ آپ کے حق میں ہولیکا اور کیا آپ کا وفادار ہوگا۔ جب وہ دیکھے گا کہ ایلے پکواں بازار بلے ہوئے ہیں اور اس نے پاس پیسے بھرنے کے لئے بھی کچھ نہیں ہے تو آپ کے حق میں کھسے کچھ بولے گا۔ آپ نے ایک آرڈر دے دیا ہے کہ وہ وفادار رہے اور اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ ایک بھوکا آپ کے آرڈرس سے چپ ہے لیکن جہاں ہر کھڑے کے تھان بھرے ہوئے ہیں۔ اس کو یہ حق نہیں ہے کہ وہ ان کو لے جا کر ایلے گھر میں اپنی بھوی کو جو نلکی ہے اس کو ساری پہلا سکے اس حد تک ان کی وفاداری ہے کہ جان پر کھیل جائیں گے اور آپ کا آرڈر مانیں گے لیکن آپ کی ذمہ داری یہ ہے کہ آپ ان کی بھی پرواہ کریں لیکن آپ ان کو کچھ بھی دینے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں۔ ایسی حالت میں یہ سوشلزم کب ہوگا کھسے ہوگا۔ کافی عرصہ ہوا جب میں اخبار پڑھتا تھا تو میں نے اس میں دیکھا کہ ایک نے یہ کہا تھا کہ بھائی دیکھو۔ غربت سے تقسیم کرو بلکہ ہر کوئی تاتا پولا بلے چاہئیں۔ فائنلس منسٹر صاحب کے ارد گرد جو رہتے ہیں۔ شاید وہی ان کو ایسا بدانا چاہتے ہیں لیکن ہتھ نہیں کہ وہ کب سوشلزم لائیں گے۔ انسانیت و اخلاق رحم و انصاف بھی کوئی چیز ہے یا نہیں؟ ہمدردی بھی کوئی چیز ہے یا نہیں؟ جس کا بچہ اگر بھوکا رہے نلکا رہے بھار رہے تو اس کے دل میں آگ

لگ جاتی ہے۔ تو پھر ہم ان کو جا کر کیوں نہیں دیکھتے ہیں۔ یہاں بڑے ہوٹلوں میں جو ہمارے باہر کے مہمان آتے ہیں وہ کہا سب ہاتھیں نہیں دیکھتے ہیں کہا ان کے پاس فوٹو نہیں ہیں۔ ان کی آنکھیں نہیں ہیں سب کچھ دیکھتے ہیں۔ یہاں کوئی چیز سیکورٹ نہیں ہے۔ تمام فوج تمام زمین تمام امونیشن تمام ملک کے دریا پہاڑ بارڈر اور راجہ ذرا کا وہ فوٹو لے گئے ہیں۔ ایک وقت تھا انگریزوں کا جب آپ دیکھتے تھے کہ کس طرح کام ہوتا تھا۔ میں بھی وار میں کام کرتا رہا ہوں اور میں چاہتا ہوں کہ کوئی شخص بھی لداخ کی طرف نہیں جا سکتا تھا اور کوئی فوٹو نہیں لے جا سکتا تھا۔ آج بھی رہا میں جا کر دیکھو کہ وہاں کیا ہوتا ہے۔ کہا ان کا امونیشن دیکھ سکتے ہو؟ اور کہا ان کی ایمپھسی میں داخل ہو سکتے ہو۔ لیکن ہمارے یہاں سب کچھ صاف ہے۔ کہتے ہیں کہ بتانا مفاد عام کے لئے ٹھیک نہیں ہے لیکن مفاد عام رہا کہاں ہے۔ دوست نسا دشمن جو ہوں غلہ دیتے ہیں سود پر قرضہ دیتے ہیں وہ پاکستان کو سلنگھیں دیتے ہیں اس کو توہیں دیتے ہیں اور تاکہ وہ ہمارے برخلاف اس کو استعمال کرے۔

ابھی کچھ اور وقت ملے گا یا بس -
 تو میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں -

उपसभापति : आप कितना वक्त चाहें हैं ? पांच मिनट है। कल पांच मिनट और मिल जायेंगे।

سرदार بدیع سلیم : اچھا دو چار
 منٹ میں ختم کر دوں گا - تو
 میں یہ عرض کر رہا تھا . . .

उपसभापति : कल मिलेंगे पांच मिनट।

†[सरदार बुध सिंह (जम्मू एण्ड काश्मीर) : मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, बजट जो हमारे सामने पेश हुआ है उसमें काफी सोच विचार से काम लिया गया है और फिर थोड़ा मुश्किल हालात में एक्सपर्ट हाथों से यह निकला है और पिछले साल के बजट के ऊपर जिस कदर वावेली हुआ था जो ऐन-राजात हुए थे और जिस हद तक पब्लिक की नाराजगी हमारे सामने आई थी उस को मद्दे-नज़र रख कर निहायत एहतियात से यह बजट तैयार किया गया है। इसमें कुछ कुछ आपका सोशलजिज्म की तरफ इशारा है। इस के मुतालिक मैं फैंक्ट्स एण्ड फिगरस पर ज्यादा बहस करना नहीं चाहता। मैं उस रियान्त से आया हूँ जम्मू और काश्मीर जिम् की नेशनल कॉन्फ्रेंस का १९४३ में मैं प्रेजिडेंट था। उस वक्त लोगों ने कई सवाल किये, काश्मीरी तब तक यकीन नहीं लाता, किसी पार्टी में नहीं आता, जब तक उसे साफ तौर से यह न बताया जाये कि तुम्हारे लिये हम क्या करेंगे। हमने सेल्फ-गवर्नमेंट के मुतलिक जद्दोजहद की। आजादी के लिए जद्दोजहद की और उस वक्त काश्मीरियों ने पूछा तुम हमारे लिए क्या करोगे ? उस वक्त जब कि हम महाराजा और अंग्रेज़ी को जबर-दस्त ताकत के नीचे दबे थे, गुलाम थे, उस वक्त सन् १९४४ में मैंने जो सशस्ती एड्रेस

लिखा उसमें मैंने सवाल-जवाब दिया। हमने एक प्लानिंग कमीशन बनाया, यू काश्मीर के नाम से एक इन्कतसादी मनसूबा बनाया, एक प्लान बनाया। आप हैरान रह जायेंगे, १९४४ का नया काश्मीर का प्लान मून्तहिन् किया गया। आप छ्याल कीजिए जिस वक्त हम मुसीबत में थे। तब हमने अबाम से वादा किया कि तमाम जितने कारखाने होंगे वो कौमी मलकीयत होंगे और किसान के लिये अच्छे घर बना दिये जायेंगे। बिजली घर बनाये जायेंगे। सड़कात व तेज़ रफ्तार से गाड़िया हर जगह ले जायेंगे। घर घर सन्नते जारी होंगी। निजार्त होंगी, तमाम जरूरीयात जगलों के मुतलिक किसानों को मिलेगी और भी तरह तरह की सहूलियतें दी जायेंगी जसे दवाये और ईलाज मुफ्त होगा तालीम मुफ्त होगी फिर कई कमीशन मुकरर होंगे। इन्शोरेन्स का इन्तजाम होगा। कोअपरेटिव प्रोग्राम होगा। और जब मैं तमाम प्लानिंग की बहस के वक्त स्पीचिज़ सुन रहा था तो दो तीन को यानी बड़े गौर से सुना। तो मैं शुक्र अदा करता हूँ कि परमात्मा उस वक्त हमको कई ये कहते थे कि ये पागल हैं, गुलाम हैं, गरीब हैं, पसमानदा हैं क्या बुध सिंह "नया काश्मीर" की वावत बोल रहा है। पागल तो नहीं हो गया ? तो मैंने कहा देखिये कब और कैसे पूरा होगा। आज देखता हूँ कि किस तरह से तमाम 'नया काश्मीर' के प्रोग्राम को पूरा करना होगा जिस वक्त १९४७ में पाकिस्तानी रेड हुआ उस वक्त महाराजा ने हुकूमने-हिन्द को लिखा था कि हमारी मदद करो, हम लुट गए, हम तबाह हो जायेंगे तो उस वक्त सवाल पैदा हुआ कि अच्छा एक्सेशन करो, हिन्दुस्तान से ईलहाक करो। तो उनसे ईलहाक किया लेकिन वहा चूकि आल इंडिया स्टेट्स पीपल कॉन्फ्रेंस में हमारा पंडित जी के साथ परिचय था तो उन्होंने कहा जो नेशनल कॉन्फ्रेंस पार्टी है उससे पहले पूछता चाहिये। उस वक्त यह सवाल पैदा हुआ और हमने कहा देखो काश्मीरियों ! जम्मू और काश्मीर के लोगों,

[सरदार बुध सिंह]

अगर तुम हिन्दुस्तान के सेक्यूलर स्टेट के साथ मिलोगे तभी यह तुम्हारा मनसूबा "नया काश्मीर" पूरा हो सकेगा वरना कोई दूसरी ताकत नहीं दुनिया में जो आपको सेक्यूलर स्टेट के बगैर गारन्टी दे सके भारत में हिन्दू मुसलमान इतना दूरी हो सकता है। जिसके लिये हमने नेशनल कान्फ्रेंस बनाया। इसलिये यह पहली गारन्टी थी जो नेशनल कान्फ्रेंस ने अवाम को दी थी। मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती है कि आज उस वक्त का वो पागलपन का इलजाम दूर हो गया। जब आल इंडिया प्लानिंग में शामिल हो गये। मैं देख कर हैरान हो जाता हूँ और मुझे खुशी होती है कि हम अब इस काबिल हुए हैं कि हम अपने अवाम से कहें कि ला बाबा, ये जो वादा हमने किया था पूरा किया जाने का वक्त आ गया। हम कैसे गुलामी में, मुसीबत में, गुरबत में, तोप व तलवार के नीचे थे और जिस वक्त हमने यह प्लान बनाया था एक ख़्वाब देखा था। बारह बरस हुए आपने प्लानिंग कमीशन बनाया और जब उसको हमने देखा तो ख़्वाब न था, हकीकत थी।

तो मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि मेरी सारी जिन्दगी मेहनतकश लोगो, मजदूरों और किसानों के बीच में ही गुज़री है। मेरे पास इतनी हिम्मत व वक्त नहीं कि मैं बजट के तमाम फ़ैक्ट्स एंड फिगरस की बाबत आपको सब बातें बताऊँ। मैं एक देहाती आदमी हूँ गाँव में रहता हूँ, बहुत असें से रह रहा हूँ और अब भी वही रहता हूँ। एक दफा गाँव वालों ने मुझ से पूछा किये बजट क्या चीज़ है तो मैंने उनसे कहा कि हमारा बजट दो हजार करोड़ रुपये का है तो उन्होंने कहा इतना रुपया कहाँ और किस जगह पर खर्च होता है और यह बजट किस वास्ते होता है। मैंने कहा सरकार के यहाँ मुख़्तलिफ़ महकमे होते हैं। एग्रीकल्चर का महकमा होता है। डिफेंस का महकमा होता है और कई तरह के महकमे होते हैं। तुम्हारे वास्ते इस बजट से कारख़ाने बनाये जाते हैं, समुद्री

व हवाई-जहाज़ बनाये जाते हैं। रेलें बनती हैं और बहुत सी चीज़ें बनाई जाती हैं। तब उस किसान ने कहा, सरदार जी "पेट न पईया रोटिया सबे गला खोटीया" तो उन्होंने कहा आपने जो कुछ तफसील में बयान किया है कि तरक्की हो रही है, कारख़ाने चल रहे हैं। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि ये सब कुछ हमारे वास्ते हो रहा है लेकिन जब तक हमारे पेट में रोटी नहीं जायेगी। तब तक हमारे लिये यह सब चीज़ बेकार है तो उसके जवाब में मैंने कहा कि भाई मैं बारह बरस से पार-लियामेंट में हूँ और मैंने ४२ तकरीरें इस अर्स में कीं। जिनमें से ३२ तकरीरें मैंने मेहनतकश लोगो, मजदूरों, किसानों की भलाई के बारे में कीं। लेकिन ये हमारी बद-किस्मती है कि यहाँ जो रिपोर्ट होती है और जो अंग्रेज़ी में अपनी तकरीर करते हैं उनकी रिपोर्ट तो अखबारों में अच्छी तरह से निकल जाती है लेकिन जो लोग हिन्दी में बोलते हैं उनकी तकरीर बहुत कम निकलती है। हमारे बाजपेयी साहब जी जब कभी हिन्दी में बोलते हैं वा बहुत अच्छी हिन्दी में बोलते हैं लेकिन उनकी भी तकरीर अखबार में बहुत कम निकलती है। मैंने जितनी यहाँ पर स्पीचिज़ दी हैं उनको गवर्नमेंट अच्छी तरह से पढ़ती है या नहीं यह मैं नहीं जानता। चूँकि अब मैं जा रहा हूँ और मरी उम्र करीब अस्सी बरस की हो चुकी है, इसलिये मैं आपको सुनाना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने अपनी तकरीरों में क्या कुछ कहा और इन बारह वर्षों में मैंने क्या कुछ देखा है। आप अन्दाज़ा कीजिये कि खुदा ने पहाड़ बनाये हैं दरिया, नदी बनाई है। आसमान बनाया है ज़मीन बनाई है लेकिन हम खाली मैदानों और पहाड़ों या बर्फ में नहीं रह सकते हैं। जब तक बाकायदा तौर पर हमारी रिहाईश के लिये मकान नहीं बनाये जायेंगे तब तक हम अच्छी तरह से नहीं रह सकते हैं। इसलिए सरकार को पहले उन लोगो के लिए रिहाईश का बन्दोबस्त करना चाहिए जो मजदूर हैं किसान हैं और मेहनतकश लोग हैं और जिन्हें बाहर खूने

में रहना पड़ता है। जिस वक्त यहां प्लानिंग कमिशन बनाया गया था उस वक्त हम लोगों ने भी नये काश्मीर का प्लान बनाया था और जिसमें दस बारह वर्षों के लिये जो प्लानिंग कमिशन ने चीजें रखी थीं वो सारी उसमें आ गई थीं तब उसमें हमने तमाम कारखानों को कौमी मिलक्रियत बनाने के लिए कहा था। और जमीन के बारे में कहा था कि वो किसान की होगी लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि अभी तक ये खातिर ब्याह मुकम्मिल नहीं हुई।

१९४४ में जब मैं आल इंडिया जम्मू काश्मीर कं प्रेजीडेंट था तो मैंने एड्रेस लिखा था जिसमें लोगों ने जो सवाल-जवाब दिये गये। मेरे कई दोस्तों ने कहा कि सरदार जी नेशनल काफ्रेन्स के झण्डे का निशान कैसा होना चाहिए? तो मैंने कहा कि सुख रंग का होना चाहिए। इस पर उन्होंने कहा कि इस पर चिनार के पत्ते या फूल का निशान लगाना चाहिए। तो मैंने कहा देखो काश्मीरियों तुम भूख मर रहे हो जुल्मोसितम में दबे हुए हो गुलाम हो मुसीबतख़दा हो, पसमान्दा हो, लेकिन अभी तक तुम्हारे दिल और जहन में फूल और चिनार के पत्ते की मुहब्बत है और होनी चाहिए। याद रखो इस झण्डे का निशान ऐसा होना चाहिए जिसमें कीर्ति हो जिसमें जोश हो आम फहम हो, मेरे दोस्त ने पूछा सुख रंग क्यों रखें तो मैंने कहा कि ये उस मजदूर का रंग है जो कारखाना-जात में काम करता है मेहनत करता है सीमेंट लाता है लकड़ी व पत्थर लाता है और अपनी पीठ पर बोझ लाद कर ये सब चीजें मूहईया करता है। इन चीजों को लाने में उसकी नाक से खून निकलता है मुंह से निकलता है। उसको तकलीफ होती है और निहायत मुसीबत उठा कर यह सब चीजें लाता है। इस तरह से वो हमारे रहने के लिए मकान बनाता है और उसकी हालत फिर भी बैसी की बैसी हो दुखी रहती है।

इसलिए हमें उसकी हालत को सुधारना चाहिए क्योंकि यह न सिर्फ हमारे लिए ही मकान बनाता है बल्कि मन्दिर बनाता है गिर्जा व मस्जिद बनाता है, गुहदारा बनाता है। बड़ी-बड़ी ईमारतें और दफतर बनाता है, सेक्रेटेरिएट बनाता है और बड़े-बड़े होटल बनाता है फिर भी उसके अपने रहने के लिए मुनासिब जगह नहीं है।

अभी १९६४ के जनवरी में एक खेत के बारे में एक रिसाला निकला था जिसमें पंडित जी ने एक पैगाम दिया था जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा था कि जितने हमारे प्रोजेक्ट हैं, जितने हमारे कारखाने हैं वो तब तक नहीं चल सकते हैं जब तक कि मुल्क में पैदावार नहीं बढ़ाई जायेगी। किसान और मजदूर अगर मेहनत नहीं करेगा तो कारखानों में यह चीजें पैदा नहीं हो सकती। अगर हमारी खेती का काम नहीं होगा तो हमारे कारखानों में भी कोई चीज पैदा नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए सबसे जरूरी काम यह है कि खेती-बाड़ी की पैदावार बढ़नी चाहिए और उस पर जितनी मेहनत हो सके उतनी हमें करनी चाहिए। जब मैं भिलाई और रोड़केला के कारखाने देखने गया तो भिलाई में जो चीफ-इन्जीनियर थे उन्होंने मुझ से कहा कि तुम्हारे काश्मीर में तो पानी की नहरें बहती हैं मगर यहां लोहे की नहर बह रही है। आज हमारे मुल्क में बड़े-बड़े कारखाने हैं जहां बड़ी-बड़ी मशीनरियां बन रही हैं, जहां बड़े-बड़े हवाई जहाज बन रहे हैं। रेलों के लिए सामान बन रहा है और दूसरी बहुत सी चीजें बन रही हैं। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं जब तक हमारे मुल्क में खेती की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ेगी तब तक हम तरबकी नहीं कर सकते। यह जो कुछ बन रहा है उसके मुत्तल्लिक किसान कहता है कि 'सारियां कलां तेहेठ हलां' यह हल के नीचे है जब हल चलेगा तब अनाज की पैदावार होगी जिससे सब जिन्दा हैं। मैंने वहां देखा कि गरीब लोग सबरे से शाम तक अपने अपने काम पर

[सरदार वृष सिंह]

लगे रहते हैं लेकिन यहां सेक्रेटेरिएट के पास लिखा जाता है कि मोटर की आवाज नहीं होनी चाहिए क्योंकि क्लर्क काम करते हैं अफसर काम करते हैं उसमें फर्क पड़ता है, लेकिन उन कारखानों में जहां हजारों मजदूर काम करते हैं जहां इतना शोर होता है, आवाज होती है, तकलीफ होती है, फिर भी वो मजदूर लोग मेहनत से अपना काम करते चले जाते हैं। ये मजदूर सख्त गर्मी और सर्दी में लोहा बनाते हैं पत्थर काटते हैं। मैं तो उन लोगों को देख कर हैरान रह गया हूं कि ये लोग किस तरह से अपना काम करते हैं। ये लोग आठ आठ और नौ-नौ घंटे काम करते हैं लेकिन फिर भी खाने को पूरा नहीं मिलता और न रहने को अच्छी जगह मिलती है। वो लोग हमसे पूछते हैं कि तुम्हारे बजट का क्या असर हम पर हुआ। वो किस के लिए बनता है। वो लोग कहते हैं कि ये आपके लिए बनता है मिनिस्ट्रों के लिए बनता है और गवर्नमेंट के लिए बनता है। वो लोग खूब ऐश करते हैं मौज करते हैं और वो हम परमानन्दाह लोग हैं, मजदूर लोग हैं, किसान लोग हैं, गरीब लोग हैं, उन पर इन्ताहाई जूलम हो रहा है गरीब गरीबतर होते जा रहे हैं और अमीर अमीरतर होते जा रहे हैं और इसी तरह से जमीन और आसमान का ऊर्क गरीब और अमीर के बीच में अब भी मौजूद है। हम देखते हैं कि लाखों मन बल्ला मौजूद है कपड़ा है हजारों कोठियां हैं लेकिन यह सब चीजें गरीबों, किसानों मजदूरों के लिए नहीं हैं बल्कि जो बड़े बड़े अमीर वजीर लोग हैं उनके लिए हैं। आज हम देखते हैं कि एक तरफ सैकड़ों मकानों में कमरे खाली रहते हैं लेकिन मजदूर और किसानों को मजबूरन बाहर रहना पड़ता है। उनके पास न पहनने के लिए कपड़ा है न रहने के लिए मुनासिब घर है। जब तक हम किसान और मजदूरों और मेहनतकश लोगों को रिहाईश के लिये मकान नहीं देंगे, पहनने के लिए कपड़ा नहीं देंगे, खाने के लिए पूरा खाना नहीं देंगे, तब तक हम

इस मुल्क में शरक्की नहीं कर सकते। आज हालत यह है कि कई गरीबों के घरों में सैर भर दाना नहीं है। क्या यह बेईन्साफी नहीं है कि दौलतमन्द और गरीब का एक ही निखं है। आज हम देखते हैं कि गरीब मजदूर आदमी के गरीब किसान के बाल बच्चे बगैर कपड़े के नंगे नीम फाका रहते हैं और लखपती लोग हैं और जो अमीर वजीर लोग हैं उनके लिए तमाम जरूरीयात काफी हद तक मौजूद हैं वो बड़ी-बड़ी कोठियों में रहते हैं क्या यही आपका सैक्युलरईज्म है, क्या यही जमहूरियत व सोशलिज्म है। क्या यही इन्सानियत है? हमारे प्रेजिडेंट साहब ने भी और हमारे आइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी कई मरतबा कहा है कि हमारे मुल्क में जो वेसटिड इन्ट्रेस्ट हैं उनको हटाना है क्योंकि किसान काश्तकार की हालत बहुत खराब है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे मुल्क में जो भूखे नब्बे फीसदी काश्तकार हैं जो इस वक्त भूखे मर रहे हैं और हमारे मुल्क में जो वेसटिड इन्ट्रेस्ट हैं जब तक हम उनको नहीं हटाते हैं तब तक जो मेहनतकश मजदूर लोग हैं उनकी हालत नहीं सुधर सकती है। अगर इसके लिए एक नहीं हजारों इंकलाब भी हों तो भी हमें करना चाहिए। महात्मा गांधी से जब वो ३० तारीख सन् ४८ को शहीद हुए थे उससे दो दिन पहले एक किसान ने पूछा था कि हमारा क्या होगा तो महात्मा गांधी ने कहा कि किसान तुम राजा हो तुम बादशाह हो और अगर मेरी चले तो मैं किसान को प्राईमिनिस्टर बना दूं। न जाने क्या-क्या कर दूं। किसान जो है वो गुलाम है वो हल चलाता है मेहनत करता है और सादा तौर से अपनी जिन्दगी बसर करता है। महात्मा गांधी जी ने कहा कि मुझे अफसोस है कि जो किसान

भ्रष्टाचारा है जो हमें पालता है हमारे लिए मेहनत करता है हमें खाना देता है लेकिन हमने उसको गुलाम बना रखा है। अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि उसके लिए हम क्या कर रहे हैं। एग्रीकल्चर के लिए यह ठीक है कि फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने यह महसूस किया है कि यह परेशानी है। सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह काबिल आदमी हैं वो जमीनदारी जानते हैं। वो किसानों जानते हैं और वो भी परेशान हैं और दुनिया भी परेशान है। इस क्रम में मैंने कभी आज तक नहीं देखी। मैं सर्विस में था और यह चालीस वर्ष की सिर्फ बात है जब मैंने उस वक्त देखा था कि पच्चास सेर रुपये की मक्की थी चौबीस सेर रुपये का चावल होता था। पच्चीस सेर रुपये का कनक का आटा होता था। दो तीन आने की मुर्गी होती थी एक पैसे का भण्डा होता था। तीन पैसे के एक सौ अखरोट होते थे तीन सौ सेब डेढ़ रुपये के होते थे। घी तीन सेर रुपये का होता था। और तेल छः सेर रुपये का होता था। इसके अलावा सब्जी और आलू पैसे के दो सेर होते थे। तो मैं आज के निरख देखकर हैरान हो गया हूँ। मैं देखता हूँ कि ये तरक्की हुई है। ये आजादी हुई है। लोग भुखे मर रहे हैं तड़प रहे हैं और आप उनको नहीं देखते हैं। मैं सेक्रेटरीएट में अभी गुजर रहा था तो मैंने देखा कि वो जमीन खोद रहे हैं और उनके छोटे-छोटे बच्चे नीम नंगे धूप में हैरान फिर रहे हैं। दफ्तरी लोग ऊपर से देख रहे हैं इन एयर कन्डीशन्ड कमरों से। जरा ख्याल कीजिये कि ये क्या हो रहा है। दिल्ली के अंदर आपने होटल बना दिया लेकिन जिस वक्त वो बनता था तो मैंने देखा कि किस तरह मजदूरों का खून बहा और किस तरह उन्होंने जंगल काटे, पत्थर काटे और कंकरीट बनाई। मैं कहता था कि ये क्या कर रहे हैं। मुझे यह बहम हों गया था कि उनके लिए भी घर बनेंगे, मगर जब वो होटल बन गया तो फोन पकड़ कर इन दस हजार आदमियों को बाहर निकाल दिया गया। मैं दस बरस से

उनके लिए सर पीटता रहा और रोता रहा। आप वोट लेने के लिए वहां जाते हो। हाथ जोड़ते हो और छोटे मिनिस्टर हो नहीं प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी वहां जाते हैं उनके सुधार का वादा करते हैं लेकिन दो महीने के बाद फिर सब खत्म हो जाता है। हमारी टट्टियां पुख्ता बनती हैं मगर घास फूस के झोंपड़े में सूअर और कुत्ते फिरते हैं इन हमारे भाईयों के बच्चों के साथ-साथ गन्दगी में घूमते फिरते हैं। अमरीका और रशिया वगैरा की जो ऐम्बेसीज हैं उनके पास देखिये कि बाहर एक ड्रम में तमाम कूड़ा करकट मुर्गों भण्डे पत्ते व छिलके और गन्दगी पड़ी रहती है और वो मजदूर जो आपका हास बनाने वाले हैं जो आपका शहर बनाने वाले हैं जो आपकी जीनत बनाने वाले हैं जो आपकी शान बनाने वाले हैं। उनके बच्चे वहां के उन कुत्तों के साथ देखते हैं कि कोई चीज खाने के लिए है या नहीं। मुझे बड़ा दुख होता है मुझे बड़ा रंज होता है जब मैं यह देखता हूँ कि इस राजधानी में क्या होता है। अभी पिछे यह कहा गया कि इतने हजार आदमी बाहर सो गये और सर्दियों से कई मर गये। क्या उनके लिए कपड़ा नहीं था? यह खर्च भण्डार किस लिए है? क्या फूकने के लिए है। यह दिल्ली क्लायम भिल किस लिए है? क्या यह जलाने के लिए है? क्या यह सारे मकान फूकने के लिए हैं? लोगों के पन्द्रह पन्द्रह बीस-बीस कमरे खाली पड़े हुए हैं जिनमें जानवर फिरते हैं। लेकिन बेघर और रिफ्यूजीज के रहने के लिये कोई मुनासिब इन्तजाम नहीं है।

श्री बी० आर० भगत : कहा ?

सरदार बुध सिंह : हर एक का, मेरा और आपका। आपकी कोठी में दस कमरे हैं। मिनिस्टरों के मकानों में खाली एक-एक आदमी रहता है पांच दस एकड़ जमीन में घास रहते हैं। आप कहते हैं कि आपके लिए किसान पैदावार ज्यादा पैदा करे। वो किम जगह पैदावार करे और कैसे करे उसका

[सम्बन्धित बजट]

हल, व बेल कमजोर है टूटा हुआ है। उसका दिलो दिमाग परेशान है वो दुखी है वो बीमार है कमजोर है। उसको खाने को पूरा व मुनासिब नहीं मिलना है। उसकी औरत नीम बरहना, नंगी है, बीमार है बच्चा पैदा होने वाला है लेकिन डाक्टर नहीं है। उसको आप कहते हैं कि अनाज पैदा करने में जुट जाओ हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर यह कहते हैं कि और एग्जीक्यूटिव मिनिस्टर भी इन्हीं गरीबों को कहते हैं कि खूब मेहनत करो। लेकिन हमको इन पारलियामेंट के मੈम्बरों को और मिनिस्ट्रों को क्यों नहीं कहते हैं मेहनत करो और अपनी अपनी कोठी में आलू लगाओ। टिमाटर लगाओ और पैदावार करो। 'ग्रे मोर फूड' का हमने एक हल्ला बोला था लेकिन यह क्या फरेब कारी है कि किसानों में कहा जाता है कि कनक पैदा करो मगर कोठियों में पैदा होते हैं फूल। मैं कहता हूँ कि इन फूलों को क्या चाटोगे। यह फूल क्या तुम्हारी खुराक है यह फूल क्या तुमको ज़िन्दा रख सकते हैं? इन दफ्तरी बड़े मकानों में या कारखानों में जो भूखे हैं खरूरीयाने-जिन्दगी के लिए परेशान हैं, बीमार हैं, कमजोर हैं उनको बिठा दोगे तो वो क्या काम करेंगे? क्या बड़े मकान उनकी भूख व दुख दर्द दूर करने में मदद करेंगे? यह नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मजदूर को उठाओ उसको ऊंचा करो, उसकी लिविंग ऊंची करो। और उसको रोटी काड़े और झोंपड़ी से फारिग कर दो। उसके बच्चे भी हमारे बच्चों की तरह हैं। उसके अन्दर भी वही एहसास है—दुख और सुख का जो हमारे अन्दर है। लेकिन गरीब तबके में दौलतमन्दों के लिए अब हसद पैदा हो रहा है। महात्मा गांधी ने टोल्सटाय के बारे में यह कहा था कि वो महात्मा है उसने रशिया में यह कहा कि देखो मैं नहीं कहता कि नशुद करो और यह बड़े-बड़े आदमियों से कहा कि गरीबों की मदद करो लेकिन याद रखो कि हसद मत पैदा करो। जो तुम्हारे पास पास फालतू चीज है बची हुई चीज है

ग्रण्डर स्टॉक पड़ी हुई है वो तो दे दो। बाकी यह तुम्हारे दुश्मन न बन जायें। वही सूरत अब पैदा हो रही है। आप कहते हैं कि आहिस्ता आहिस्ता इन्क्लाब आ रहा है खामोश इन्क्लाब आ रहा है। खामोश इन्क्लाब बहुत खतरनाक होता है। बोलने वाले से हम खबरदार हो जाते हैं। जो खामोश होता है वो अन्दर एक नासूर है और अन्दर ही अन्दर पकता जाता है। इसलिए याद रखो कि जो भूखे हैं नगें हैं वह अब हद से ज्यादा परेशान हैं। आजकल इतना दुख है इतनी मेंहगाई है कि गरीब क्या कोई सफेदपोश बेचारा सो नहीं सकता। पूरा खाना खा नहीं सकता और उसके अन्दर एक आग जल रही है। तुम कहते हो कि कम्युनिस्ट उठ रहे हैं। वो इस लिये उठ रहे हैं कि था महन्तकशों के लिये बोलते हैं लेकिन जब वो किसानों मजदूरों के लिए आवाजबुलन्द करते हैं तो कई मेम्बर उन पर बरस पड़ते हैं लेकिन याद रखो कि कम्युनिस्ट के लिए कोई दरिया हाईल नहीं है। कोई पहाड़ हाईल नहीं है। कोई दरभ्यान रोक नहीं है। वो उन दिलों में परवरिश पाते हैं जो गरीब हैं जो मजलूम हैं जो दुखी हैं। जो मसीबत में हैं जो लैण्डलेस हैं जिनके पास कोई काम नहीं है कोई पेंशन नहीं है और कुछ भी नहीं है वो तड़प रहे हैं। और वो ८० नहीं ८५ नहीं और ९० फीसदी हैं। यह ९० फीसदी इस मुल्क के ३५ करोड़ इन्सान गरीब नादार बीमार और कमजोर हों और फिर उससे आप कहें कि तुम जुटो। पैदावार करो बर्फ में, बारिश में, आग में, भूखे नंगे रहते हुए सख्त मेहनत करो। यह बजट किमने बनाया है? यह दोस्त जो बैठे हुए हैं और सेक्रेटारिएट में जो भरे हुए हैं जिनको रात में नींद अच्छी आई है सेहत अच्छी है जिनका गर्म-गर्म खून चल रहा है। जिनकी आंखें काम कर रही हैं। दिमाग काम कर रहा है। उन्होंने यह फैक्ट्स और फिगर बनाई हैं। अगर रात में पटड़ी पर सोना पड़े सदी मखत हो नमूनिया हो गया हो तो मैं देखूँ कि कैसे यह बजट बनता है। ऐसी हलत में नहीं बन सकता है। इसलिए

वक्त आ गया है कि अब जितनी जल्दी हो सके हम चीज की फिक्र करो। हमें चाईना की कोई फिक्र नहीं है। हमें पाकिस्तान की भी कोई फिक्र नहीं है और हमें फौजों की भी कोई फिक्र नहीं है। जो भी हमसे लड़ने आयेगा, हम उसका पूरा मुकाबिला करेंगे, लेकिन याद रखो कि ये जो खामोशी बेचैनी गम व गुरसा की अन्दर आग पैदा हो रही है। जो आतिश फिशां पहाड़ हो रहा है उसमें एक दूखी क्या दुआ करेगा क्या प्रार्थना करेगा। क्या आपके हक में बोलेंगे और क्या आपका वफादार होगा। जब वो देखेगा कि इतने पक्वान बाजार में बने हुए हैं और उसके पास पेट भरने के लिए भी कुछ नहीं है तो आपके हक में कैसे कुछ बोलेंगे। आपने एक आडर दे दिया है कि वो वफादार रहे और इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि एक भूखा आपके आडर से चुप है लेकिन जहां पर कपड़े के थान भरे हुए हैं उसको यह हक नहीं है कि वो उनको ले जाकर अपने घर में अपने बीवी को जो नंगी है उसको साड़ी पहना सके। इस हद तक उनकी वफादारी है कि जान पर खेल जायेंगे और आपका आडर मानेंगे लेकिन आपकी जिम्मेदारी यह है कि आप उनकी भी परवाह करें लेकिन आप उनको कुछ भी देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। ऐसी हालत में यह सोशलिज्म कब होगा कैसे होगा? काफी अर्सा हुआ जब मैं अखबार पढ़ रहा था तो मैंने उसमें देखा कि एक ने यह कहा था कि भाई देखो गुरुबत मत तकसीम करो बल्कि हर कोई टाटा बिरला बनने चाहियें। फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब के इर्द-गिर्द जो रहते हैं शायद वही उनको ऐसा बनाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन पता नहीं कि वो कब सोशलिज्म लायेंगे। इन्सानियत और इस्लाक, रहम व इन्साफ भी कोई चीज है या नहीं। हमदर्दी भी कोई चीज है या नहीं। जिसका बच्चा अगर भूखा रहे, नंगा रहे बीमार रहे तो उसके दिल में आग लग जाती है। तो फिर हम उनको जाकर क्यों नहीं देखते हैं। यहां बड़े होटलों में जो हमारे बाहर के मेहमान आते हैं वो क्या सब

बातें नहीं देखते हैं, क्या उनके पास फोटो नहीं हैं। उनकी आंखें नहीं हैं सब कुछ देखते हैं। यहां कोई चीज सीक्रेट नहीं है। तमाम फौज, तमाम जमीन, तमाम एमूनेशन, तमाम मूलक के दरिया, पहाड़, बांडर और जरे जरे का वो फोटो ले गये हैं। एक वक्त था अंग्रेजों का जब आप देखते थे कि किस तरह काम होता था। मैं भी बार में काम करता रहा हूँ और मैं जानता हूँ कि कोई शक्स भी लड़ाई की तरफ नहीं जा सकता था और कोई फोटो नहीं लेजा सकता था। आज भी रशिया में जाकर देखो कि वहां क्या होता है? क्या उनका एमूनेशन देख सकते हो? और क्या उनकी एम्बेसी में दाखिल हो सकते हो? लेकिन हमारे यहां सब कुछ साफ है। कहते हैं कि बताना मुफादेआम के लिए ठीक नहीं है लेकिन मुफादेआम रहा कहाँ है। दोस्तनुमा दुश्मन जो है गल्ला देते हैं सूद पर कर्जा देते हैं वो पाकिस्तान को संगीन देते हैं। उनको तोपें देते हैं और ताकि वो हमारे बरखिलाफ उसका इस्तेमाल करे। अभी कुछ और वक्त मिलेगा या बस। तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ . . .

उपसभापति : आप कितना वक्त चाहते हैं। पांच बजा है। कल पांच मिनट और मिल जायेंगे।

सरदार बुधसिंह : अच्छा दो चार मिनट में खतम कर दूंगा। तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था . . .

उपसभापति : कल मिलेगा पांच मिनट]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1964

SECRETARY: Madam, I have to report to the House that I have received a Message 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