

[Mr. Chairman.]

stop you. If I want to permit him, I will do so and if I want to permit you, I will permit you also.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: But I take very serious objection to the remark of Mr. Gupta that he can teach me and on that I want a ruling from you, Sir. I will not take any teaching from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the Leader of the Communist Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will not teach you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He says he will not teach you.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Those remarks of the hon. Member should be expunged from the proceedings. I take very serious exception to those remarks of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. \* \* \*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: \* \* \*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Gupta, Please sit down.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: \* \* \*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: \* \* \*

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: \* \* \*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, I hope you will please remember that you are a Member of the House and you should use Parliamentary language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: \* \* \*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I would request you not to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: \* \* \*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: \* \* \*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot say that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: \* \* \*

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. These should be expunged. This is against Parliamentary decorum. This is expunged from the proceedings. Please sit down.

# THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1963-64—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now have the General Discussion on the Budget. The Finance Minister will reply at 3.45 P. M.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise with a heavy heart—for who can carry a light heart in our country today—to make a few comments on the Budget proposals.

The country had been prepared by those in authority for some months past to expect additional burdens and now we are being asked to bear them cheerfully. But I do not think that even the most pessimistic amongst us was prepared for the cruel and crushing nature of the taxes sought to be imposed on the people from the wealthiest down to the poorest.

Mr. Chairman, at all times of crises, whether in the life of an individual, a community or a nation, it is absolutely essential to turn the searchlight inwards and see where we ourselves have gone wrong. At any rate this is what I as a very humble person in the rank and file learnt from Gandhiji under his incomparable leadership. I wonder whether those in authority today ever do so. Day in and day out we are told that there is a state of emergency caused by the unabashed aggression of China. But all talk of turning the aggressor out has ceased and while there was

an amazing upsurge of patriotic fervour when the fighting was actually taking place, it has died down now and sometimes I wonder whether we still feel that the emergency continues. In any event who else is responsible for our total unpreparedness and our inefficiency in not being able to defend our borders except the Government? And yet it is the people of the country who are being asked to pay a very heavy price for the mistakes of those in authority.

However, the heart of the people is sound. They rose as one man and gave their all for the defence of the country's honour but having done so and being at all times in the future also willing to do so, I am sure that the Government must also realise the limits beyond which the people cannot go.

The size of our defence expenditure is just colossal. I wonder if we will be able to spend all these monies. I do not myself understand why we cannot greatly lessen it by accepting protection, in whatever way they can give it, from those who have proved themselves in our hour of trial to be our true friends. Any *shamiana* given by them to protect us from the rays of the burning and blasting sun of China's hate should be willingly accepted until such time as we gradually become able to look after our own safety with efficiency. Our friends demand nothing from us. So, why are we afraid? Italy has gone ahead with her economic development by leaps and bounds without spending vast sums on armaments and has not lost her sovereignty thereby and she is but one example. However much we may talk in glib terms of standing on our own, we must, if we are practical, remember that no country today can fight a war by itself. And taking such help as we need in an emergency does not by any manner or means connote the abandonment of our policy of non-alignment, that is to say, not joining up with military blocs.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget proposals, if accepted, are going to bring untold hardship on the people and in particular on the middle classes or the intelligentsia with static incomes and since these are the backbone of any country, it is surely unwise to alienate them. Life is going to be much costlier, however much the Government may boast about holding the price-line. They have not been able to do so all these years and they have not the capacity to do so in future either.

Instead of taxing such absolute necessities of life as soap, tea, coffee, kerosene, cigarettes and the post card, why do not the Government of the day think in terms of tightening their own belt instead of always laying the axe on the people?

There is any amount of wasteful expenditure in Government. Unnecessary jobs, unnecessary travelling waste in stationery and postage, waste on committees whose recommendations generally go to adorn our archives, on seminars that consist of indulging in slogans and platitudes, to mention only a few items. Endless noting on files still goes on and yet officers keep on multiplying and efficiency must perforce get less and less as the plethora of administrators and office clerks increases. The Punjab Chief Minister set an excellent example by cutting down his Cabinet which lead in reality the Centre should have given but failed to give. At any rate they must now follow suit and then other States will also come into line. Should not the very large number of Ministers of all kinds and Parliamentary Secretaries be lessened considerably, if we are really catering for an emergency? The increase in the service cost of the Ministries is said to have been from 100 to 140 per cent. during the last six or seven years and certainly the extent of work or output has not kept pace with it.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Urgent and determined efforts are needed to bring administrative ex-

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.]  
penditure down. Even the United States of America, if I remember correctly, has not more than ten Cabinet Ministers including the President and the Attorney-General. Indeed in a Federal Government where the States are autonomous a top-heavy central administration is wholly unnecessary. And here we have in addition to a large number of Ministers an expensive superstructure of the Planning Commission too.

Vast sums are spent on uneconomic projects. The evil of drink is increasing due to prohibition by law. Corruption and illicit distillation are ruining us both morally and materially and yet we refuse to see daylight and lose crores of good money in revenue as also foreign exchange from tourism. Does not experience tell us to reverse our policy? What percentage of monies spent on Community Development, on Family Planning and other projects goes down the drain should be assessed and after such assessment we have to be honest with ourselves. Large sums of money are given to the States but do we care to know how they are being spent?

We have taken away from our womenfolk the one security that they cherished. Gold ornaments are no more to be allowed to them and now you are going to tax their *stridhan*. I beg of the Government not to alienate the women of this country. They are something of which India should be proud as custodians of the religion, the morals and the culture of our past—all the things that once made us great. Leave their *stridhan* to them. An exemption of Rs. 25,000 for jewellery is not much indulgence for them.

I am not opposed to compulsory savings in principle but I wonder with what sense of reality the Government can ask a man or woman who earns Rs. 1,500 a year to be able to save a single penny. A family man cannot possibly make two ends meet from Rs. 125 a month if he has even two children to educate.

There is far too much emphasis laid on nationalising everything and thereby far too little latitude given to the incentive to produce. Private enterprise should be allowed much more play and investments from outside must be attracted to come to our aid. Our only salvation lies in production and ever-increasing production and thereby an increase in exports but nowhere is production up to the mark. Should not the Government pause to ask itself why this is so? Agriculture should have top priority. Failure to produce is not due to the farmers so much as to our land policies. The sentimental but uneconomic ban on cattle slaughter should go. Why are we averse to making over production to persons who have the know-how of business in their bones rather than losing money or at any rate not making enough profits in the public sector? Far too many burdens are being thrown on the consumer and on industries and often and often we follow obscurantist policies. Diesel and petrol, motor parts and accessories have all gone up in price. How can the cost of transport for the poor man not go up and there too we are hitting the middle class, who try to earn a living by running a bus, by nationalising even road transport. Just as we hate criticism so also we hate healthy competition whereas both should be welcomed in a developing economy. Indeed they are of the essence in a true democracy. In his recent budget proposals President Kennedy has proposed a permanent reduction in tax rates with a view to encourage the initiative and risk taking on which, as he says, "our free enterprise system depends". "This reduction in tax liabilities of 10 billion dollars will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises in every tax bracket with the greatest increase going to our low-income consumers". But we follow a reverse policy. We reduce the purchasing power of our citizens, we crush initiative and incentives to produce and cause inflation which in its turn means a higher cost

of living. Moreover with what face can we call ourselves a welfare state when we cannot give schools to our children, to say nothing of free primary education, when we have no health insurance, no old age pensions and no unemployment doles while we ask our citizens to give until it hurts or rather kills?

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have no doubt in my mind that neither the poor nor the rich who should be the natural custodians of production need be taxed and super and super-super taxed, as they are going to be if we were to effect real economies where they can and should be effected and if we were to seek avenues other than legislation for curbing the evils of society. The incidence of taxation, Union, State, municipal, etc., on people in the highest income bracket amounts to about 125 per cent. of their gross income. This means that they are living on their capital. And the proposed super-profits tax is going permanently to bury their incentive to increase production. Is it a wise policy? Even our foreign friends will fight shy of investing their monies here if there is no encouragement from Government. Instead, cannot Government appeal to the people not to have any marriages for five years as their contribution in this emergency? This would mean a lot of saving all round and make a big dent on the growth of population. I would like to have the age of marriage of our girls and boys in any case raised to 21 and 26 respectively. Further, a medical examination of the prospective parties and a marriage licence should be compulsory. No one who is suffering from active T.B., active leprosy or active venereal disease should be allowed to marry, nor should the mentally defective. Even a small sum on marriage licences would bring in an appreciable revenue and would not be felt at a time when spending is a necessity. May we not also appeal for hard and honest work from everyone and no remuneration for overtime while the emergency lasts? It seems to me that such contributions from

us all would make for contented co-operation from the people instead of unwilling submission to dictation.

The Government should also refrain from bringing in any legislation unless it is an absolute necessity for national welfare. We have had far too much of it since we became independent and Parliament, apart from the Budget Session, need only meet during the emergency for two very short monsoon and autumn sessions, just to review the position. A great deal of money can be saved in this way.

We talk of integration, Madam Deputy Chairman, and yet deliberately we break up the unity of the Punjab. Himachal in my opinion, is a ludicrous anomaly. Kasauli and Subathu are in the Punjab, but Solan a few miles away, is in Himachal and so on throughout. The hill areas of the Punjab belong to the Punjab and Punjab alone and their representatives should find a place in the Punjab legislatures and not be separated from them. It is all so unnatural and a positive crime to incur such wasteful administrative expenditure at this time of financial crisis. And this should apply to all the Union territories.

May we not also stop expenditure on things like the zoo in Delhi—a truly white elephant for us? Every country is discarding zoos for national parks because zoos are really cruel to animals in the long run. In any case Delhi has a very unsuitable climate for most animals and would not lakhs spent on the zoo be better spent on housing for the low income groups for whom we have not fulfilled our obligations in this regard?

Can we not also eliminate the giving of costly presents to VIPs so long as we have a financial crisis?

My humble submission therefore is that the present tax proposals should be seriously reconsidered and other ways and means found on the lines

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.] indicated by me or by anybody else which will lessen the inordinately heavy burden sought to be imposed on the general body of citizens and yet give the exchequer the necessary means for fulfilling only our worthwhile Plan targets and defending our honour and integrity against the designs of our expansionist neighbour.

Madam, it hurts me to criticise the Government at any time but there are occasions when what one feels to be the truth has to be expressed in the larger interests of the country which must always also be the primary concern of those in authority.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL, (Gujarat): At least somebody can speak the truth from the other side.

SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): At least one brave person from that side—and she a woman.

SHRI D P KARMARKAR (Mysore). Madam Deputy Chairman, it was with very great interest that I have been listening to this debate these three days until I came to the distinguished speaker who just now preceded me. Having closed my eyes for a moment I wondered for a while whether it was a Member who belonged to the Congress, who has had the supreme privilege of spending almost a whole lifetime in the blessed company of a great man like Gandhiji....

SOME HON MEMBERS: There are many others there who would be feeling like that.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I have only ten minutes and I would request you to interrupt me at the end of my speech, not at the beginning.

As I was listening point by point I wonder, if the Opposition leaders had mustered up all correct and incorrect things that could be said about the Finance Minister's Budget, whether this speech had not excelled the worst that could have been said. My dis-

tinguished predecessor has not only covered the Budget but has ventured to attack the very fundamentals on which the Government has based its policies, a Government to which she lent her distinguished support for more than ten years, and then we did not hear a single word or even a shade of the words that she has told us today. In fact, Madam, had I not known the nature of our distinguished Finance Minister and of Rajkumariji I would have thought that both of them between themselves were playing the part of old preachers who would put forward someone to put up a strong *poorvapaksha* so that the *uttarapaksha* or the later reply when it came was a demolishing reply. But knowing their nature I can quite realise that there could have been no private talk between them on this particular subject before the speech was made.

The first point I would like to touch upon is this. My hon. friend began by saying that the people are made to suffer for the Government's faults. Well, whatever Government's faults were there and the unpreparedness have been acknowledged by our distinguished Prime Minister by one single phrase, by one single sentence when he said that we have descended from the land of dreams into a land of realism. After having said that the Government of India have done their best and the people of India have done their best in trying to meet the situation.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): But that does not absolve them of their responsibility.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Well, I have decided completely not to hear any interruption.

The second point that she made was that there should be economy on which we are all one. There is a top-heavy administration. Then she attacked seminars, meetings and everything. Now, I had a little research made into the Health Ministry when I was a Minister and certainly I could see

nothing that could beat the number of seminars and meetings that were held prior to my arrival there. All of them were necessary; I do not condemn them. All of them were necessary and I must congratulate my hon. friend on the number of seminars that had been held because it was those seminars which contributed a great deal to the Health Ministry's work.

With regard to the gold business. I will not take longer than two minutes on that point. Madam, it is something very unusual to hear a speaker like my hon. friend waxing eloquent on the wisdom of ornaments to women. Till now I thought that she was a protagonist of all simplicity and that if she had the power she would not only do what the Finance Minister has done but would take one more step forward and say that we should have a law, if it was possible and practicable, that any woman wearing any ornament except those made of iron and steel should go to jail. I am quite sure of that; she is so simple herself. She has led the whole country's womenfolk by her example and having led the country for about 70 years by her example it takes my breath away to listen to her eloquent testimony in favour of ornaments. Well, then again I entirely agree with her that the womenfolk of India have been the custodians of the morals, wisdom and the culture of the country. My only humble plea is that menfolk have tried their best to co-operate with them in seeing that they are the custodians of all these precious virtues.

Then, again, agriculture is not progressing, industry is not progressing. I wish she had not forgotten something of what had happened in the past but had studied a few reports. If she cannot believe us, let her believe some objective critics from the Western countries, people who are not emotionally attached to India or Indian culture, people who know how to deal with money and who have

advanced us money. People of the United States and other countries are not fools. They know that their money is safe, that their investment is safe. They have co-operated with the Government of India in this particular matter. Agriculture, as she well knows, in our country is precarious. It depends upon rainfall. But, nevertheless, we know the immense progress that has been made in that field. No doubt there have been drawbacks and the Planning Commission itself has pointed them out. It is not as if we can change the present pattern of agriculture overnight. It is not as if we can persuade overnight our agriculturist to take to modern implements and things like that. It will take a long time. But one who has got eyes to see and ears to hear and then literature to read can easily see that during the last fifteen years not only has industry been buoyant but agriculture also has shown progress, which if not marvellous, has been really very creditable.

Since I have no time, I shall take some other opportunity, if at all, to deal with her observations with regard to the public sector. The other research I would like to make is at what point of time my hon. friend began to detest the public sector. The public sector, of course, at the beginning is not paying. At the beginning probably it is inefficient. The private man, the private entrepreneur, works from day to day, hour to hour, all the twentyfour hours of the day and our public sector works within the stipulated hours. That is the handicap. We cannot drive our officers like sheep, while we have to pay them well. But by and large we have yet to hear a considered castigation of what is in the public sector. The public sector is one of the key points in our economy, which has to develop into a socialist economy. We have to build on two pillars. One is, we have to expand the public sector and the other is, we have to build up co-operative societies. And between these two we have to achieve progress in

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]  
time, whereby the production and distribution of national wealth has to go on on an equitable basis.

Then, of course, she said something about competition, democracy, President Kennedy and the rest. All of us know that there is free enterprise in the United States. We knew that when we framed our Constitution, when we framed our Fundamental Rights, when we framed our Directive Principles. We knew that when we framed our economic policy and drew up the Industrial Policy Resolution in 1948 and thereafter. We were all conscious of it. We were not asleep. We are not asleep now. Now, after having considered the whole matter very carefully, we came to the conclusion that the key sector of our industrial economy has to be the public sector if there is to be equitable production and distribution. As an illustration I may point out something of which I hope she is still proud, namely, the Pimpri Penicillin Factory. As you know, the Pimpri Factory, which is a public sector enterprise, came on the scene and brought down the price of penicillin like anything. Equitable distribution at an equitable price is only possible in the public sector. I will not wax eloquent on this because the point is so obvious. I am quite sure that if my hon. friend recovers from her present mood of attack, she will surely agree that the public sector has done very well.

Then again, there is education, health and all that. I will not touch on them. There is the incidence of taxation and the Finance Minister has to be congratulated. That is the last but one point I am trying to make. If there is any one point on which the Finance Minister has to be congratulated, it is this, his reply to the last three questions that he put in his speech. Can we afford to ignore the Chinese threat? If we cannot ignore it, then can we do it at the sacrifice of development? And if we are to meet both the Chinese threat and the threat of increasing poverty, there is

a third easy way for any Finance Minister, that is, inflation caused by having more efficient printing presses in Nasik and other printing presses—by deficit financing. He has been conscious of the problem. I really feel that just as it is a blessing at the present moment of emergency to have the Prime Minister that we have, I think the next best thing that Providence has given us is to have the Finance Minister that we have just now. I will be charged with flattery, but there is much to say about him. I have had the privilege of knowing him not only now but for the last 25 years. I knew him as an ordinary Minister in the Bombay Government and then as the Chief Minister of Bombay Government and I know it as a matter of fact that whenever it came to having an unpopular policy but a true policy, all his colleagues passed on the burden to him and he bore it very willingly. I really not only congratulate him, but I should express our gratitude.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Has Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha passed on the burden?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I have not heard what you have said. Now, I should really express gratitude on behalf of all our countrymen in the sense that as humble citizens of this country we have someone who is not only seized of the problem, as he is whether it is politics, economics, or anything else, and having been seized of the problem he has the courage to grapple with it. He has always held it as his view that social reform is always unpopular. Yesterday, he allowed himself to say in the Lok Sabha that maybe people threatened him with unpopularity. We are a non-violent nation, having threatened him with nothing worse. But there is no other Minister who has got the guts to act in the whole country without fear or favour. He could have been popular by announcing a reduction or complete elimination of duties on kerosene as some previous Finance Ministers used to do. They

used to sandwich one or two very unpopular measures so that the rest may pass muster. At the end of the debate they said: "Out of deference to the wishes of the House I now announce a reduction in duty on matches, kerosene", or something like that. But then he is not going to do that.

(Interruptions.)

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** How do you know that?

**SHRI D. P. KARMAKAR:** My esteem for him would get less—not that he cares for my esteem—if he were to reduce by one single nP. the taxation on these things. (Interruptions). I was listening with very great respect to Members for whom otherwise I have respect, apart from the observations that they made—my friends, Mr. Govinda Reddy and Shri Sri Rama Reddy, apart from the Members of Opposition who did not contribute so badly to this aspect of the thing. The burden has to fall on someone. The sum of Rs. 268 crores has to be raised. It has fallen on the richer sector. It has fallen on the middle sector. It has fallen on manufacturers. It has fallen on imports. It has fallen on the poor man. If at all, I shall be very happy if the poor man asks why is kerosene taxed and the other man tells him, because the Chinese are attacking us. It should easily lighten the burden of the Information Ministry because every poor man of the country will know now why kerosene is taxed, that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's Government is taxing these because it must tax. Not only that. As I was listening to the debate and suggestions, for once I felt that sitting in this air-conditioned Chamber we really sometimes, without our fault, forget what is happening there. Maybe the fight may flare up again in April. Maybe not. Whatever may happen, we can never rely on the Chinese. And then if it flares up, will it be good for the Finance Minister to come then and say: "It has flared up and, therefore, I tax

you"? Just as at the beginning of the Plan he provided for 85 per cent. of the Plan in the first two years, in the same manner I must congratulate him on his taxation measures. He has not only provided for this year, but for all the time the emergency may be there.

Madam, I have finished. One little request I have to make and it is this. He has introduced this compulsory savings scheme. Well, people who are either not habituated to save or who have not much use for saving or who have nothing to save, perhaps may be opposed to this scheme. But people who have a stake, who have a family to provide for—I am quite sure in my mind—will not only appreciate it but will be grateful to the Finance Minister for having compelled them to save something in spite of their otherwise spendthriftiness. Instead of trying to be kind towards the critics of these savings, I would like him to think in terms of larger savings. I would not repent if he were to propose a flat ten per cent, saving on all salaries. I am quite sure the head of the household would not only have money with him but would be very happy to have all his cares taken away about the education of his children, marriage of his daughters and things like that because our people are not used to save. If a man has a scooter, he goes in for a car. If he has a FIAT car he goes in for a Chevrolet car or something else. If he can afford one ornament, he goes in for two. Well, ornament at times is some investment at home. Our habit should be just like the Swiss people. The Swiss people are the richest in the whole world. Their standard of living is the highest. But as I was watching these Swiss people, there are no more frugal people than the Swiss people, and every year their deposits with the banks are increasing. I wish we go on that line, and my request to the Finance Minister will be not to mind any criticisms that may be made—he does not need my advice, he has got sufficient strength with him to do that—but to go one



[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

step forward and, instead of the 3 per cent, that he proposes to make it 5 per cent, at least in the first instance and then 10 per cent., and the country will bless him for that.

I would not like to take much time of the House, but if at all I must thank the hon. friend who preceded me because in a sense, she concentrated all that could be said against the Budget, and there was not one point in which, unhappily for me, I found her to be right.

I thank you, Madam, and the House for the indulgence which it has shown me.

SHRI SUNDARMANI PATEL (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to speak in favour of my brethren who are most exploited from the very beginning, most harassed and most poorly paid. My reference is to the agricultural labour.

Agriculture, Madam, is the mainstay of 82 per cent. of the population in our country. We have already seen through the two Plans and are half way in our Third Plan. The Government undoubtedly has spent a good deal of money for the development of the country's agriculture, but what has been the result? Further, I have to say that I have my doubts if this planned economy has taken us anywhere. Have we been in a position to achieve self-sufficient in food? In what way has the lot of the rural population been bettered?

Agricultural labour, Madam, is the most exploited section of the people. They have hardly been benefited during the sixteen years of our independence. Previously, colonialism was regarded as a handicap in their development. But, Madam, it should be interesting to know that despite our three Plans the lot of these people has rather been worsened instead of any improvement. His *per capita* income which was Rs. 105 in the beginning of the First Plan has come down

to Rs. 95 at the end of the Second Plan. This Madam, is the result of our planned economy. Even in the Report of the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee it was emphasized that there was hardly any improvement in the economic conditions of this category of people. As is stated in the Report, at the all-India level even the average wage-paid employment of agricultural labour registered a decline from 200 days in 1950-51 to 197 days in 1956-57 and it stood at 195 in 1960-61.

Madam, some time back the Planning Commission had asked the Ministry of Labour to find out the comparative position of employment, wages and earnings and standard of living of agricultural labourers in the Community Project areas *vis-a-vis* other areas, and what was its finding? It was conceded that there was hardly any improvement in employment even in the Community Project areas. There could not have been. My party has been, since the very beginning, emphasizing that the policy of co-operative agriculture in any form will not in any way be in the interest of the country's economy and certainly not in the interest of our weaker and illiterate section of the rural population.

It is high time, Madam, that we should seriously think of doing something in this regard. Undoubtedly, as has also been conceded by the Planning Commission in the Third Five Year Plan and as the two enquiries on the subject have brought out, the enormous size of the problem, the widespread underemployment that exists and the fact that increase in population has borne harshly on this section of the population, are there. These general conclusions are also reflected in the results of benchmark surveys undertaken by the Programme Evaluation Organisation. The problem of agricultural labourers is part of the wider problem of unemployment and underemployment in rural areas. To repeat what I

have stated in the beginning, Madam, I quote in my support from page 375 of the Third Plan:

"Even though, with the development of agriculture and irrigation, there has been increase in production and in the total volume of work, this is shared among much larger numbers. Those sections of the rural population who are landless and are not actual cultivators have benefited much less than others; in some areas their conditions may have actually worsened."

So, in view of these facts and experience of the working of our agricultural economy during the last fifteen years what lesson have our leaders learnt? Nothing whatsoever it seems, Madam, I come from the rural area. I have been from the beginning intimately connected with such problems. Speaking from practical experience, though I do not have much theoretical background, I should say that there are a number of ways by which this problem can be successfully tackled. Before I put forward my suggestions I must make it clear that I strongly believe in the economy of self-employment. Firstly, there is a good deal of waste land, statistics about which are available to us from different government documents, and they must be reclaimed. I do not deny that we should concentrate both on extensive and intensive agriculture but unless we reclaim the cultivable waste land we may not succeed in doing much for our labourers in agriculture. The land thus reclaimed can easily be distributed to these people in the same manner as we have done in the case of refugees in Dandakaranya. The refugees' problem came before the country only after the partition and something has been done in this regard, but the problem of agriculture labour has been before us for hundreds and hundreds of years and with no improvement. Madam, I find from the

statistics given on page 378 of the Third Plan that the Government proposes to reclaim under the agriculture programme land to the tune of about 4 million acres and as a result visualises to settle about 700,000 families of landless labourers. But our Third Plan is half way through already, and what has been the achievement so far in this regard? Madam, the least we can do is to grant unoccupied cultivable land to these people. In this way we shall give them the opportunity of finding employment for themselves. I am fully convinced, Madam, that they will be happy even if they are employed for only 100 days in a year in their own land. They would not like to be members of the co-operative farm where they are simply the wage-earners. Go anywhere, Madam, in the country and enquire from this class of people whether they would like land worth 10 cents or they would like an employment on the farm. The answer would be: "But who would give the land to me? I would be grateful if it happens."

Secondly, once we have provided them with land we should help them by way of giving credit in terms of money, good quality of seeds, etc., and help them with the technical "know-how". This is the minimum programme, Madam, to which we must attend to start with if our leaders are sincere about doing something for these most exploited people of our community.

With these words I thank you, Madam, and resume my seat.

श्री मैथलीशरण गुप्त (नाम निर्देशित)  
श्रीमती जी, ऐसे अवसर पर मैं सदन में कुछ पद्य सुनाता रहा हूँ। आज भी मुझे आपने इसका अवसर दिया है इसके लिये मैं हृदय से कृतज्ञ हूँ। मैं अस्वस्थ हूँ, फिर भी मैंने कुछ पंक्तियाँ लिखी हैं। वे इस प्रकार हैं :—

[श्री मैथलीशरण गुप्त]

करते थे कुछ मित्र बजट की बातें ऐसे,  
देख रहे हों एक भयानक सपना जैसे ।  
मुझको सीमा प्रान्त दीख पड़ता था अपना,  
अरे व्यर्थ है, आज विलपना और कलपना ।  
है इसका दायित्व अन्त में उस संकट पर,  
जिसका प्रकट प्रभाव पड़ा इस विकट बजट पर ।  
पहले उसका अन्त करो तन-मन-धन देकर,  
रक्खो अपना मान विजय का बेड़ा खे कर ।  
बाधा जो आ पड़ी हमों को सहना है,  
रहे हमारी भूमि हमें जिस पर रहना है ।  
समझे शासक कों उसी की है सब बारी,  
पाई-पाई गिने रक्त की बूंद हमारी ।  
हुआ न वह सम-भक्त हमारा सच्चा साथी,  
तो निश्चय ही बैठ जायगा उसका हाथी ।  
हम सब को इस अनाहत भय से बचना है,  
तो उसको भी आप अपव्यय से बचना है ।  
मिला ताम्र से स्वर्ण, दूध जैसे पानी से,  
घी बन बैठा तेल बनस्पति की घानी से ।  
किन्तु भिन्न दो भाव खिन्नता सी उपजाते,  
दो प्रवाह मिल सदा तीर्थ ही नहीं बनाते ।  
कर बांधो, पर सावधान ! न हके उत्पादन,  
एक साध्य के अर्थ अपेक्षित सौ-सौ साधन ।  
विजय-यज्ञ में कौन न आहुति-दान करेगा,  
ग्रास-त्याग कर भी न देश का त्रास हरेगा ?  
हों कितनी ही बड़ी क्यों न अंकों की लड़ियां,  
जुड़ें हमारी पुण्यभूमि की टूटी कड़ियां ।  
निज निसर्ग है सत्य-अहिंसा ही आचरता,  
हिंसा से भी किन्तु अधिक कुत्सित कायरता ।

धन्यवाद ।

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI (Gujarat):  
Madam, I must congratulate the hon. Finance Minister for the bold, imaginative and well-balanced Budget which he has presented. The Budget very equitably spreads out the burden on all sections of the society. There is also a social and economic purpose behind the Budget. Firstly, apart from satisfying the defence needs of the country, the Budget strengthens the economic base, the industrial base, of the country, the

necessity for strengthening which has been recognised not only by our esteemed Prime Minister but by all sections of the people. After all, adequate defence of the country cannot be secured unless we strengthen the industrial base of the country also. The second purpose behind the Budget is to save valuable foreign exchange. Our foreign exchange position has deteriorated in recent months, and on the 15th February of this year, as the hon. Finance Minister said in his speech, it came down to Rs. 105 crores, which is a very dangerous limit, a limit just above the legal minimum. Most of the levies, customs duties, surcharge, etc., try to save as much foreign exchange as possible. The third purpose of the Budget—the social and economic purpose—is to mop up the extra purchasing power with the people so that inflationary pressure may be reduced. Fourthly, the purpose of the Budget is to mop up the extra profits which certain sections of the society like importers have been making. These are the economic and social purposes behind the Budget and I regret to note that many of the Members who criticised the Budget failed to notice the social and economic purposes which are behind the Budget.

The Budget has been very skillfully framed also. In the current year, the revenue increased by about Rs. 119 crores. But the expenditure also increased by Rs. 140 crores, out of which Rs. 108 crores were for defence purposes. There was actually a deficit of about Rs. 22 crores. In the next year also, that is in the year 1963-64, the expenses will go up to Rs. 1,852 crores while the receipts on the present basis will be Rs. 1,586 crores. So, there will be a deficit of Rs. 266 crores. Now, the Finance Minister has just tried to make up this deficit on the revenue account by additional taxation which is practically equal to that amount. Taxation of Rs. 275 crores is imposed by way of new levies out of which Rs. 9 crores will go to the

various States by distribution. So, about Rs. 266 crores will be available to the Centre and the deficit on the revenue account is just Rs. 266 crores. This Budget has been very skilfully framed because on the capital account, the Finance Minister is not levying any additional duty to meet any capital expenditure. On the capital expenditure side also, there is a deficit of Rs. 187 crores. Out of this sum, a sum of Rs. 37 crores will be made up by Rs. 40 crores due to compulsory savings and out of that we will have to deduct Rs. 3 crores for Emergency Risk Insurance. So, Rs. 37 crores will be deducted from Rs. 187 crores of capital expenditure and the overall deficit will be Rs. 150 crores which he has left uncovered.

This Budget, as I said, has been very skilfully framed, skilful in this way that no additional burden on capital account is levied on the people. The hon. Finance Minister has imposed taxation just to meet the deficit on the revenue account and most of that is for defence purposes. As everybody knows, the Defence Budget for the current year is only Rs. 376 crores. The revised estimates come to Rs. 505 crores because of the emergency and the hon. Finance Minister provides for the next year Rs. 867 crores, a huge amount, which is quite necessary for adequate defence purposes. At the same time he has budgeted for Rs. 1,226 crores for the Plan outlay, that is, Rs. 119 crores more than what was provided for the current year. This is very necessary because, while providing for the Defence Budget, we have not to ignore the need for the economic development of the country. And even at such time of the emergency, the Finance Minister has been able to give Rs. 119 crores more for development purposes, for Plan purposes, which is highly creditable.

The additional outlay on defence and the additional outlay on planning together come to Rs. 610 crores

which is a huge amount. To have Rs. 610 crores which is absolutely necessary both for the development of the country and for the defence, he has imposed additional taxation of only Rs. 275 crores. Out of Rs. 275 crores, Rs. 9 crores will go to the States and only Rs. 266 crores will come to the Centre. The whole amount for capital expenditure will be left uncovered except for Rs. 40 crores minus Rs. 3 crores, that is Rs. 37 crores, which will accrue by way of compulsory savings. And that is why I say that the Budget has been very skilfully and ably framed.

There has been some criticism about the need to economise the expenditure of the Government. No doubt, the Prime Minister also has time and again emphasised the need for economy and everybody realises the need for economy. But some of the criticism has been very much misdirected. Those Members said that about Rs. 74 crores of additional expenditure will be incurred in the next year. If those Members who criticised had just tried to go through the items of expenditure carefully, they would have found that an additional expenditure of Rs. 34 crores is provided for meeting the debt services. After all, our borrowings have been increasing—foreign borrowings and internal borrowings and naturally, we have got to provide more for debt services. A sum of Rs. 34 crores out of Rs. 74 crores of additional expenditure will go to meet the debt services. Then, only a sum of Rs. 12 crores is provided for administrative services. Here, the Explanatory Memorandum is very clear on the point. It says:

“Revision of the rates of dearness allowance of employees drawing pay up to Rs. 400 per month, grant of childrens’ education allowance and purchase of additional equipment, vehicles etc. for the Intelligence Bureau explain the increase in the Revised Estimates”.

[Shri Suresh J. Desai.]

1 P.M.

"Budget provides for normal growth as well as for further expansion of Intelligence Bureau and re-organisation of the administrative machinery of North-East Frontier Agency and Naga Hills and Tuensang Area."

This is absolutely necessary. There is no extravagance in this increase in the administrative expenses. Thirdly, the large item of increase is in the Extraordinary item, and that is Rs. 22 crores. Now, regarding this Extraordinary item in which the expenditure has gone up by Rs. 22 crores it is very clearly stated, Madam, that this is a new composite head to accommodate additional items of expenditure arising out of the present emergency, such as civil defence, training of wireless operators, mobile civil emergency force, national labour corps, etc., and that provision has been included for the transfer of Rs. 9 crores in the current year and Rs. 36 crores next year of the receipts to be realised under the Emergency Risk (Goods) and Emergency Risk (Factories) Insurance Acts to the Emergency Risk Insurance Funds. What is wrong in this? This is an absolutely necessary expenditure. There is no extravagance in Rs. 74 crores additional expenditure which will be incurred next year. After all, the emergency requires this expenditure and this expenditure has got to be incurred by the Government. At the same time everybody recognises the need for economising and certainly the Finance Minister is the most concerned to see that economy is effected in the administrative expenses.

The next point, Madam, is about the Excise Duties. I was a little surprised to read the speech of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in which he has said that Excise Duties are a form of exploitation of the poor. After all, the total income in the Communist countries is from indirect taxes, and

Excise Duties are a recognised form of indirect taxes, and in the Communist country of Soviet Russia, last year they increased the price of bread and butter by 20 per cent. and 30 per cent. respectively, a 20 per cent. increase in the price of bread and a 30 per cent. increase in the price of butter just by an order, while here these Excise Duties are well regulated. They go on increasing according to certain principles. Out of the 67 items on which Excise Duty or cess is being levied during the current year, hardly ten items are there which affect the poor man or the middle-class man. Electric motors or refrigerators or air-conditioners or internal combustion engines, they do not affect the poor man; they do not go into the budget of the middle-class man even. All of them, at least most of them are paid by the industry, or paid by people who can afford. Only about 10 items would come into the budget of the poor man. After all, the burden has to be spread out evenly between the poor man, the rich man, the middle class, the lower middle class and so on, and the hon. Finance Minister has left out completely the poor class who are getting an income below Rs. 1500. He has completely left them out, they do not figure at all, but those people who can afford have to contribute something to meet the defence needs of the country. After all, defence needs of the country cannot be met by any one section of the people of the country. All sections of the people have to contribute, according to their ability, to meet the defence needs of the country.

Then, Madam, I come to the duty on kerosene. Certainly the hon. Finance Minister has said in his own speech that it will affect the poor, that one bottle of superior kerosene will be costlier by 10 nP and one bottle of inferior kerosene costlier by 7 nP; he has himself recognised that it will affect the poor people. The imports of kerosene have been increasing so much during the current year; we have collected in the current year an

additional duty alone of three crores and twenty lakhs of rupees on the import of kerosene and the imports of kerosene are going up further and further. In this difficult position of foreign exchange resources we have got to see that the imports of kerosene are curtailed. And what is the other way of curtailing it except to increase the price of kerosene? Then only people will reduce consumption of kerosene; then only imports of kerosene can be curtailed. There is no other way to curtail this drain of our valuable foreign exchange except by increasing the import duty on kerosene.

Then another provision has been made about the surcharge on Income-tax. Here, I would like to suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that the lower income group, those who are getting below Rs. 5,000 will be a little hurt and he can change it so that whatever tax they pay can be totally taken as compulsory deposit. For instance, a man with a salary income of Rs. 3600 per annum will have to part, under this Budget, with a sum of Rs. 241 by way of additional tax and compulsory deposit. While he is paying only Rs. 42 now by way of tax, he will be paying hereafter Rs. 199 more out of which Rs. 150 will be compulsory savings and the rest will be tax. I would suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that if he can make the whole of Rs. 199 to be compulsory savings, then the lower income man will have something to fall back upon. I would commend this suggestion for the consideration of the hon. the Finance Minister.

There is one more thing which I would like to touch. If we want to strengthen the industrial base of the country, then we have got to allow certain resources for the other sectors of the economy also. Defence needs are met, needs of planning are met—something more is being provided for planning also—but what about the other sectors of the economy? After all, the Finance Minister himself in

his speech has placed a heavy responsibility on the private sector also. So, resources for the private sector should also be left so that the private sector can play an important part in meeting the defence needs of the country. I am not at all for abolition of the burden which has been laid. The Rs. 25 crores which are expected from the Super Profits-tax should be collected. But this Rs. 25 crores can be collected in a way which will also equally promote industrial development. I would suggest for the consideration of the hon. Finance Minister that if the Corporation-tax can be increased by 6 per cent. he can easily get Rs. 25-30 crores. Industrial profits are something like Rs. 400 crores out of which we get Rs. 196 crores by way of Corporation-tax. On the present basis of 50 per cent. Corporation-tax, we will be getting Rs. 196 crores next year, that is, in 1963-64. So, a 6 per cent. increase in the Corporation-tax will easily bring about Rs. 25-30 crores, and this will avoid a great burden on industry so that industries can equally develop and they will have some resources left for development. I am not at all suggesting that this burden should be removed from the industry. This burden must be there. After all, they have got to bear the burden for meeting the defence needs of the country, but if it can be changed in a way in which industrial development can also proceed along with the requirements of Government being met, I think that would be better.

Then, in this connection, there is another provision also, about the limit of Rs. 5,000 on perquisites. As far as Indian personnel are concerned, there is absolutely no difficulty and they can be subjected to that provision. But about foreign personnel perhaps there may be some difficulty, and I think the foreign technicians who are here in this country would not perhaps like to work under this limit of Rs. 5,000 because out of the Rs. 5,000, Rs. 500 will go for housing

[Shri Suresh J. Desai.]

and about Rs. 300/400 for car allowance, and the balance of Rs. 4,000 will be perhaps a very low level of remuneration for foreign technicians. In the United States, the average wage of a worker per week is 94 dollars. That comes to something like Rs. 2,000 income per month. That is the average wage of a worker, and a steel worker gets even more than that and many other workers get even more than that. Now, to ask a well trained foreign technician to come and work in our country for only Rs. 4,000 will be difficult. That is why some exemption should be made in the case of foreign personnel.

Then, my last point is about the public sector. Certainly we all wish that the public sector must expand. As my hon. friend Mr. Karmarkar said, the public sector is the very basis of our socialist economy, and we certainly wish that the public sector should expand. I am not going to take the time of the House by reading out the figures which are given in Annexure XV, but these figures are not encouraging. The hon. Finance Minister should see that the performance of the public sector is such that it is strengthened, that it ploughs back more and more profits; that it expands and is strengthened and becomes the backbone of our economy. That is exactly what we wish that the public sector should be. It should strengthen the whole economy of the country. At the same time, Madam, the present performance of the public sector is not very encouraging. I can appreciate that most of the industries in the public sector are basic industries; they are not consumer industries that can make easy profits. They are basic industries in which profits are difficult to get. I also appreciate that quite a number of industries in the public sector are not yet completed. They are in the process of being completed, only some have been completed and have been running for some time. There are a number

of industries which are of a promotional character, of a developmental character, not of a profit-making character. Certainly, I do appreciate that. But at the same time, as the hon. Finance Minister in his speech has said, the emphasis is on performance. In the national emergency the emphasis is on performance, as he himself said. We would wish that the public sector should also fair better so that it can become the backbone of the country's economy. It should strengthen itself, should plough back more profits and expand further.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMACHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister for presenting a very bold Budget for the year 1963-64. We have to fulfil the twin national task of defence and of development. We must bear in mind that an obvious and an essential priority on the country's financial and economic resources is to fulfil the defence requirements which are immediately to be dealt with, and also there are some long-term requirements as well.

We have no right to grumble against the heavy taxation, especially those who used to criticise the Government and used to ask why the Government did not prepare itself to defend the country against any aggression. Now, here comes the emergency Budget. Let us face it bravely.

Madam, the defence expenditure in India in peace time was 5 per cent. of the gross national income while the corresponding figure in peace time in other countries is: in the U.S.A. 11 to 12 per cent., in West Germany 7 per cent., in the U.K. 7 per cent., in France 7 per cent. Taking into consideration the size and the population of our country, our expenditure on defence is very low. Now, we have to prepare ourselves

for the present situation. China is knocking at our doors.

Madam, let us think what are the tests to be applied for a good budget? Firstly, how to meet the expenditure, and secondly, whether the taxes levied are equitable or not? Yes, this Budget stands these two tests. Now, let us think how to meet the expenditure. It should be either met by inflation or by taxation. We have to choose between the two evils. Shall we welcome inflation or shall we want planned economy? We know that deficit financing will lead to chaos, and inflation causes prices to rise. Then we have to again take shelter behind inflation and again there will be rise in prices. This will be a sort of a vicious circle.

The hon. Minister has put a very equitable Budget, that is, he has taxed all people from all strata of society—the rich and the poor, the middle class and the coolie, the wage earner and the industrialist too. That means he demands equal sacrifice from all. Now, it is the duty of all of us to adjust our living according to the demands of the nation. We should plan our Budget. Especially, I appeal to the middle class, the so-called intellectual class, who are responsible to create a public opinion, to adjust themselves to the new mode of life. This vocal class should develop—I appeal to them—the habit of plan-consciousness. They should think thrice when they incur expenses for unproductive purposes such as marriages, parties, etc.

Madam, I do not agree with the hon. Member who said that for five years marriages should not take place. They must take place but I say that unproductive expenses should be avoided.

Now, coming to the criticism about kerosene, kerosene is the most important factor which is widely criticised. There are no two opinions, Madam, that the import should be restricted.

Let us see how far kerosene is an essential commodity. In urban areas, wherever there is electricity, in those areas kerosene, I can say, is a comfort. I say comfort because it is mainly used for stoves, for cooking purposes, and we can find some substitute for kerosene. We can use saw-dust for *chulha* and thus save kerosene. Saw-dust is available at a very cheap rate. A very small quantity is used for press wood. Thus, it is available in abundance. It can be introduced through the consumer co-operative stores which the Government has either already opened or is going to open more and more.

Madam, we cannot ignore the rural population. They require kerosene to light their cottages with a small smoky chimney. There it is not a comfort but a necessity. So, there should be some special arrangement made for the rural areas only.

Secondly, we should increase the supply of non-edible oils which will in the long run be a substitute for kerosene for lighting purposes, at least to some extent. The non-edible oil should be available at a moderate rate. Apart from kerosene, salt, chilly, foodstuffs, sugar, coarse cloth, are not at all taxed. In that way the poor will not have to suffer much. Even then I appeal to the hon. Finance Minister to reduce some tax at least from the inferior quality of the kerosene.

Madam, I wish the people of India, we patriots, demonstrate a fine sense of duty and pay taxes readily and willingly. I quote Sir John Simon when he submitted his War Budget:

“People will accept its burden readily without complaint provided that they are satisfied that every effort is really being made to reduce waste and therefore to secure the feeling that we pay no more than we need pay.”

So, Madam, the people demand something from the Government. Every



[Shrimati Tara Ramachandra Sathar] serious person in the country raises the question of economy in public spending. The people are always alert to watch the expenses incurred by the Ministers and officials for their tours and the functions they attend. Just now Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, the honourable Member, confessed waste in Government to some extent. So the Government should undertake all measures to economise and should convince the people that every pie is being spent in a proper manner. Orders must be issued for reduction in unnecessary expenses, for the purchase of furniture, for the purchase of stationery. Especially, I should like to put stress on economy in the use of vehicles. Money, man power and material must be used only where it is essential.

Madam, another important point that I want to mention is that steps should be taken to collect the dues, which is a very alarming sum of Rs. 253 crores. In the U.K. the sense of duty prompts every individual, at all levels of the society, to pay his taxes punctually and honestly. On the contrary, it pained me, Madam, when I saw the Report of the Taxes Enquiry Committee where they say that in India tax-evasion is the highest. If the taxes are paid honestly and punctually, it will be possible for our hon. Finance Minister to reduce some other taxes. So, I appeal to them to take stern steps and they should tighten the machinery for collecting revenues and other Government dues.

Madam, at this juncture only essential goods should be imported. I request the Government to prohibit imports of all cosmetics. I have to suggest something more. The licensing system should be improved. The actual user should get a licence for raw materials. I am sorry to say that persons who need it do not get it in sufficient quantity and persons who have not got a factory even get such licences. A sort of a different type

of blackmarket is caused hereby. If I can use this word, such types of blackmarket are taking place. This should be checked up properly and everywhere we should stick to our policy of avoiding the middle man.

About the surcharge which is levied on the companies, many industries have protection for more than 25 years. They have got a sort of sheltered and protected market as there is no foreign competition and they are having a sort of assured, or I can say, monopoly profits. These companies are paying 12 per cent. dividend to the shareholders and bonus to employees but they never thought of the consumers and they had never reduced the prices. Now, I appreciate the hon. Finance Minister's policy of taking away their extra profits from them at the time of the emergency. I request the industrialists that they must pay the extra profits most readily and most honestly.

Many people grumble about taxation and say: 'Why should we not ask for foreign aid instead of taxing our people in India?' But they simply forget that when the other countries are helping us, the citizens in the respective countries are taxed for us and when we ask for foreign aid, we should not grumble when we are heavily taxed.

One of the hon. Members referred to the gold policy yesterday and said: "Women like ornaments.". He called it an instinct and then he criticised the gold policy. I can tell the hon Member that women have fought for the country even in battle fields. So they will never grumble to abandon wearing ornaments. If at all some women do want to wear, they can wear 9-carat and 14-carat gold ornaments or any kind of ornaments. There are so many ornaments available in the market of different kinds of stones, etc. They can wear them. Even in history, we find such cases where gold was used

by the Government for buying materials at the time of war and emergency. In 1761, after the third battle of Panipat, Thotle Madhavrao Peshwa had sent a letter to Poona from Panipat to send all the silver and gold ornaments and vessels to the Mint. He writes to Tulshibahwale and he says: "We have decided to fight with the Moguls and we need the gold and jewels". We women, let me emphasise again, we women fully support and appreciate the gold policy laid down by the hon. Finance Minister.

An hon. Member criticised the prohibition policy of the Government and said prohibition should be scrapped. Really I wonder. Let me tell the hon. Member that we women want prohibition. The money earned by excise on liquor is, if I can say so, black money or red money. It is collected at the cost of the ruin of our agriculturists and labourers.

The hon. Member asked us to go with him to Bombay where he will show us what prohibition is. I will request the hon. Member to come to the villages and I will show him hundreds of families who are enjoying happy lives because the head of the family is now free from drinking. They support and especially the housewives give their blessings and support to the Government of Maharashtra for their prohibition policy. So, I request the hon. Member to suggest some other means to make prohibition a success instead of asking to scrap it.

I refer to the compulsory savings. When the nation demands sacrifice, let us at least cultivate the habit of saving. This saving is to be repaid after 5 years with interest.

Stable economy is the result of several forces. Government measures like monetary policy may contribute to stability but equal response must come from the private sector which is responsible for regulated supply of goods and services. The stability of

our economy is a result of joint efforts and mutual cooperation between the Government and the business and the consumer has also to adjust himself and plan his expenditure in a rational and productive manner.

Lastly, we appreciate the honest approach of the hon. Finance Minister in saving the nation from the chaos, which might have resulted from a policy of deficit financing, for sustaining the defence expenditure. Thank you.

### श्री विमल कुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया

( मध्य प्रदेश ) : उपसभापति महोदया, जो बजट प्रस्तुत किया है और उस में जिन बातों की चर्चा की है उनको देख कर के ऐसा कुछ लगा कि हमारी सरकार बिल्कुल इस बात पर तुली हुई है कि जितना अधिक से अधिक पैसा इकट्ठा किया जा सके किया जाना चाहिये। जहां तक चीन के आक्रमण का सवाल है कोई भी भारतवासी ऐसा नहीं जो यह नहीं चाहता हो कि सर्वस्व अर्पण करने के पश्चात् भी हम इसका मुकाबला कर सकें तो बहुत अच्छी बात हो किन्तु जो प्रशासन कर रहे हैं उनका यह कर्तव्य है कि ऐसी स्थिति का निर्माण करे जिस से कि सांप भी मर जाय और लाठी भी नहीं टूटे, किन्तु हमारे यहां स्थिति ऐसी हो रही है कि आशंका है कि सांप मारने के प्रयास में हम वहीं लाठी को न तोड़ दें और उस से हमारे यहां अव्यवस्था न फैल जाय। जहां तक मुकाबले के लिये पैसा एकत्र करने का सवाल है उस के कई रास्ते हैं—हम अपने खर्चों में कमी भी कर सकते हैं, हमारी जो पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उन से विशेष आमदनी प्राप्त करने का प्रयास कर सकते हैं और इन के अलावा टैक्स के साधन हैं ही, कर्ज के साधन हैं ही।

जहां तक खर्च की कमी का सवाल है, यह मेरी अपेक्षा थी कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी अपने भाषण में, अपने बजट में इस बात का इशारा करेंगे—देश का नेतृत्व सम्हालने के नाते, देश को मार्ग दर्शन देने के नाते,

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया]

देश को ठीक रास्ते पर चलाने के नाते—कि हमने अपनी मिनिस्ट्री के खर्च में इतनी कमी कर दी है, हमने अपने वेतन में इतनी कमी कर दी है, हमारे जो कांतिनर्जनीज के खर्चे हैं, बिजली के खर्चे हैं उन में इतनी कमी कर दी है, उद्घाटन और समारोहों के खर्चों का बिल्कुल मनाही कर दी है। इस तरह से हमारा मार्ग दर्शन हमारे मंत्री महोदय करते तो सम्भवतः सेक्रेटरीज को उस से प्रेरणा मिलती, संसद् सदस्यों को इससे प्रेरणा मिलती और देश के अन्य लोगों को प्रेरणा मिलती। यह बात हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी और माननीय सदस्य भी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि जब नमक का सत्याग्रह प्रारम्भ हुआ था तब गांधी जी ने केवल दो मुठ्ठी नमक बनाया था मगर उसी से हजारों मन नमक तैयार हो गया था, वैसे ही अगर मंत्रिमंडल भी कुछ त्याग की भावना ले कर स्वयमेव त्याग करते और त्याग का मार्ग दिखाते तो संभवतः देशवासी भी उस दिशा में बहते और समझते कि जब हमारे मार्गदर्शक, हमारे चोटी के नेता त्याग करने को तैयार हैं तो हमें पीछे नहीं रहना चाहिये लेकिन उसके विपरीत मैं कुछ और ही दूसरी बात देखता हूँ। एक तरफ तो कमी करते जाय और दूसरी तरफ कुछ करें नहीं तो यह उचित नहीं लगता है। अगर हम देश को त्याग के लिये तैयार करना चाहते हैं, देश को त्याग का पाठ पढ़ाते हैं तो हम स्वयं त्याग कर के बतायें कि हमने इन बातों का त्याग कर दिया है और इन बातों का त्याग करना चाहते हैं और तब कहे कि देश हम को सहयोग दे। अगर वैसा होता तो सम्भव था कि उसका ज्यादा असर पड़ता लेकिन अपनी मुख-सुविधाओं को, अपने बिजली के खर्चों को छोड़े नहीं, अपने साधन-प्रसाधनों को छोड़े नहीं और जनता से अपेक्षा करे कि वह त्याग करे, हम अपने आप तो काज खावे और जनता से कहे कि आप मूंगफली से काम चलाओ, मूंगफली बड़ी लाभदायक है—तो ऐसा कहते रहने से कोई काम चलने वाला नहीं है। तो इस दिशा में जो अपेक्षा थी

वह हमें इस बजट से मालूम नहीं पड़ती है। इसी प्रकार अन्य प्रशासनीय खर्चों में काफी कटौती की जानी चाहिये थी किन्तु वह खर्चा कम नहीं किया।

दूसरे, पब्लिक सेक्टर का जहाँ तक सवाल है, पूर्व वक्ताओं ने उसके बारे में अच्छी तरह से प्रकाश डाला है। हमारी ८०० करोड़ के लगभग पूँजी उस में लगी हुई है और आमदनी हो पायी करीब ६.४५ करोड़ के, वह भी ऐसी स्थिति में जब कि हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर में चलने वाले जितने कारखाने हैं उनको फारेन एक्सचेंज की उतनी तकलीफ नहीं जितनी प्राइवेट सेक्टर वालों को है और हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर में चलने वाले कारखाने में आने वाली सामग्री मुख्यतः लोहा, सीमेन्ट मिलने में उनको उतनी तकलीफ नहीं जितनी प्राइवेट सेक्टर वालों को होती है। इसके अलावा पब्लिक सेक्टर वालों को जमीन प्राप्त करने में कोई तकलीफ नहीं होती, पैमों की तकलीफ नहीं होती, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सहायता अलग मिलती है। रिजर्व्स वगैरह के लिये जितनी पाबन्दियाँ दूसरे लोगों को होती हैं उतनी उनको नहीं होती। कई उद्योग इन्टररेस्ट हालीडे का लाभ ले रहे हैं। इस के बावजूद भी हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर में कम आमदनी है, हम उस में कम प्राफिट कमाते हैं। इसका कारण यह है कि कहीं न कहीं गड़बड़ियाँ होती हैं, गलतियाँ होती हैं जिसकी वजह से यह सारा हो रहा है। लेकिन मेरे कहने का मतलब यह नहीं निकालना चाहिये कि पब्लिक सेक्टर के सब काम बंद कर दिये जाने चाहिये। पब्लिक सेक्टर में कुछ काम नुक्सान उठाकर भी चलाये जाना आवश्यक है, जहाँ तक कि डिफेन्स इन्डस्ट्रीज का और सिविल इन्डस्ट्रीज का मवाल है जो कि प्राइवेट इन्डस्ट्रीज के बस की बात नहीं। लेकिन जितने क्षेत्र में प्राइवेट सेक्टर अच्छी तरह से कार्य कर सकता है, अच्छी तरह से नियंत्रण और संचालन कर सकता है, उस में हम क्यों नहीं प्राइवेट सेक्टर का ही क्षेत्र निर्धारित करें? उन क्षेत्रों को बिल्कुल प्राइवेट सेक्टर के

लिये छोड़िये और जो जिम्मेदारी के काम है, विशेषतः जिनका संबंध देश की सुरक्षा से है, उनकी इन्डस्ट्रीज को आप पब्लिक सेक्टर में रखिये और उन पर अपना खर्च कीजिए और सारे ससार को आप बता सकें कि हम भी अपनी रक्षा में मग्न हैं, तब तो हमें कुछ अच्छा भी लगेगा। परन्तु हम समाजवादी नारे के पीछे और कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के रातदिन के प्रचार को वजह से भी पब्लिक सेक्टर को बढ़ाये जा रहे हैं और सब के सब कारखाने पब्लिक सेक्टर में रखना चाहते हैं और उन्हें घाटे में चलाना चाहते हैं तो यह कुछ ठीक लगता नहीं। हमें यथार्थवादी होना चाहिये, हम केवल प्राइवेट सेक्टर के भरोसे ही न हो जायें और न पब्लिक सेक्टर के भरोसे ही न हो जायें। हमें तो योग्यता के आधार पर, यथार्थवादिता के आधार पर जो कुछ भी देश की हित की दृष्टि से उचित है, देश की रक्षा के हित में उचित है, वह करना चाहिये, यह नहीं कि हवा में बहकर हम को सारे का सारा पब्लिक सेक्टर ही में करना चाहिये, चहें कितना ही घाटा क्यों उठाना पड़े। इसलिये मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जो भी हमारा पब्लिक सेक्टर में कारखाने चल रहे हैं उन पर अच्छी तरह से निगरान करे और निरीक्षण करे। उनका जो घाटा बढ़ रहा है, वास्तव में स्ट्रक्चर बढ़ रहा है, उस में भी बचत करने की अत्यंत आवश्यकता है।

उसी तरह से पोस्ट एन्ड टेलीग्राफ्स के बारे में बताया गया है कि यह भी घाटे में चल रहा है। एक जमाना था जब कि मैं छोटा था, तब एक पैसे का पोस्टकार्ड चलता था, दो पैसे का लिफाफा चलता था फिर भी उनका काम ठीक ठाक चलता था। और आज पुराने एक पैसे का जगह नए ५ पैसे का जो पोस्टकार्ड आता है उस को भी ६ नये पैसे का करने जा रहे हैं। आज ५ नये पैसे का एक पोस्टकार्ड और १५ नये पैसे का एक लिफाफा आता है फिर भी आपका दिवाला निम्न रहा है। ताजे वज्र हनुही मण्डल

और सिन्सियरली हम को देखनी पड़ेगी कि कहाँ पर डिफेक्ट है जिसकी वजह से हमारी आय और साधन इतने बढ़ने के बाद भी हमको नुकसान होता जा रहा है। उनकी बिल्कुल अच्छी तरह से जांच करे और उनकी रोक करे तब कहीं काम चलेगा। लेकिन आप जितना ही टैक्स लगाएंगे, एक स्थिति ऐसी भी आ सकती है कि अराजकता हो जाय जो कि आप और हम पसंद नहीं करते, जो कि प्रज तन्त्र के देश में ज़रा भी उचित नहीं कही जा सकती।

जहां तक टैक्सों का सवाल है, टैक्स आमदनी के लिये बढ़ाये गये हैं। आमदनी बढ़ाने के दो रास्ते हो सकते हैं। या तो हमारे मोरारजी भाई रिजर्व बैंक से नोट छापते जाय, लेकिन उससे हमारा काम चलने वाला नहीं है क्योंकि उससे इन्फ्लेशन हो जायेगा और जिस अराजकता की मैं अपेक्षा नहीं करता वह बहुत जल्द आ जायेगा। उससे हमें हमेशा बचना चाहिये। इसके लिये मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने कम से कम इस बात का ध्यान रखा कि नोटों के छापने की बात उन्होंने नहीं की। उसकी तरफ उन्होंने विशेष ध्यान नहीं दिया। खाला दूसरे साधनों से आमदनी बढ़ाने का प्रयास किया। वैसे अपने भाषण में उन्होंने कहा 'टैक्स का लक्ष्य—Imbalances between different sections मिटाना तथा आगे कहा'

"It has been my endeavour to ensure that the additional burden is distributed as equitably as possible among the different sections of the community"

परन्तु जो टैक्सेज की व्यवस्था की गई है उससे कुछ दूसरी स्थिति लगती है और मैं चाहता था कि मंत्री महोदय उसके

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]  
 बारे में कुछ और विचार करके उनमें सुधार करते तो और ज्यादा अच्छा होता। इनकम-टैक्स का जो चार्ट है उसके आधार पर जिनका ५,००० का आमदना था उनका टैक्स तो बढ़ गया ५ ६ गुना और जिनका आमदना २ लाख था उनका टैक्स बढ़ा केवल १.०२ गुना यह जरूर है कि पहले से कुछ ज्यादा टैक्स हैं उन पर, लेकिन यह जो फर्क है यह इतना अधिक है कि इन्विटेशन डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का परिभाषा में नहीं आ सकता। उनसे कुछ और अधिक प्राप्त करने का संभावना हो सकता था और ५,००० आमदनी वालों पर टैक्स कम किया जाता तो बहुत अच्छा होता।

ठीक उसी तरह से विदेश से आने वाले काटन पर मंत्रा महोदय ने टैक्स लगाया पर वह टैक्स का हिसाब इतना नेगलिजिबल है कि उसका असर विशेष नहीं पड़ेगा। यह फारेन से आने वाला जितना काटन है वह बेचारे एक आदिनरा आदमी के पहिने का काटन नहीं है। वह सुपरफाइन काटन बड़े बड़े पूजापतियों के लिये, बड़े बड़े मिल मालिकों, बड़ी बड़ी आय वालों के पहिने के लिये है। जो विदेश से काटन यार्न इम्पोर्ट करके अपने यहाँ कपड़ा मैन्युफैक्चर करते हैं अगर उनके प्राफिट्स को देखा जाय तो यह लगता है कि उनके ऊपर और टैक्स लगाने का गुंजायश है और इसको किया जाना चाहिये था, मगर हमारे मंत्रा महोदय ने एक नाममात्र का थोड़ा सा टैक्स लगा दिया, १४०० रु० के करोंब की एक गांठ आता है उस पर ३५ रुपये के बरोब टैक्स लगा दिया है, जो कि उचित नहीं है। मंत्रा महोदय को चाहिये था कि उस पर कुछ और टैक्स लगाते और इस प्रकार इस स्रोत से जो अधिक आमदना प्राप्त हो सकती था उसको गराब आदमी का भलाई के लिये लगाते और उनको कोर्स

और मिडियम कपड़े को टैक्स से कुछ मुक्त करते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता।

काटन यार्न पर जो टैक्स लगाया है उसके बारे में मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जहाँ तक इस यार्न का सवाल है, इसको मिल वाले भी उपयोग में लाते हैं और पावरलूम वाले भी उपयोग में लाते हैं और हैंडलूम वाले भी उपयोग में लाते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में अगर हमारे मिलों तक हाँ इसका दायरा होता तो मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं थी किन्तु इसका असर हैंडलूम और पावरलूम वॉवर्स पर भी पड़ने वाला है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में अगर मंत्रा महोदय सीधे का सीधा टैक्स कपड़े पर लगा देते और काटन यार्न को उससे मुक्त रखते तो अच्छा होता क्योंकि इससे मिल वालों पर टैक्स का असर पड़ता और जो हमारा नाति है कि हम इम्पोर्ट को बंद करना चाहते हैं, एक्सपोर्ट को इन्सेन्टिव देना चाहते हैं, तो हमारे लघु उद्योगों को, ग्रामोद्योगों को इस योजना से इन्सेन्टिव मिलता, उनको काटन यार्न सस्ता मिल सकता था और मिल मालिकों के मुकाबले में वे कुछ स्टैंड भी कर सकते थे। इसलिये मैं माननाय मंत्रा जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे अगर पुनर्विचार करने वाले हैं तो काटन यार्न को बचाय मिल में तैयार किये गये क्लाय पर टैक्स लगाएं तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

कामतों के बारे में हमारे मंत्रा महोदय ने एक बड़ी अच्छी होप बतायी है:

"The surcharge on cotton yarn and the import duty on raw cotton will mean increase only of a fraction over a naya paisa per square metre in the cost of cotton fabrics and should not call for an increase in their prices also."

हमारे मंत्रा महोदय इस मामले में बहुत ढग से काम लेते हैं कि ऐसा छोटा छोटा हिसाब भी बता देते हैं जिससे लोगों को

कुछ मालूम नहीं पड़े—वन टेन्थ पैसा एक तोला पर जिस हिसाब से यह बताते हैं उसी अपेक्षा से यह बताते हैं कि कोई भाव बढ़ने वाला नहीं है, सिर्फ एक नया पैसा बढ़ने वाला है। हमारे व्यापारों इतने बेवकूफ नहीं हैं, कि वे सवा पैसा को जगह सवा पैसा ही बढ़ाएंगे वे सवा पैसे के स्थान पर दो पैसे बढ़ाएंगे। मंत्री महोदय ने गये साल अपने भाषण में कह दिया था कि माचिस के भाव नहीं बढ़ेंगे लेकिन उनको अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि माचिस का भाव बढ़ गया है माचिस के ऊपर दाम लिखा रहता है छः पैसा लेकिन ७ पैसे में बिकती है। साथ ही काटियां माचिस की कम भी हो गई तो ऐसी स्थिति में ये जो अच्छी घोषणाएं हैं, अच्छी होएस हैं, उम्मीदें हैं। केवल उम्मीदों से काम चल सकता है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। उसके साथ ही साथ हमको प्रयास करना चाहिये कि हमारी उम्मीदें सच हो सकें, वे केवल कारात्मक न रह जायं।

घासलेट पर दस नये पैसे बढ़ाये गये हैं। बहुत से भाइयों ने कहा है कि शहरों में बिजली आ गई है अतएव इसका मुख्यतः असर ग्रामों पर पड़ने वाला है जहां कि धीरे-धीरे तेल के दीये के बजाय घासलेट के दीपक जलने लग गये हैं। मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि हमारे मंत्री जो इस पर पुनर्विचार करें क्योंकि इसका मुख्यतः असर देहातों में पड़ता है। मेरी पूर्ववक्ता बहिन ने कहा कि स्टोव्ह जलाने के काम में इसका इस्तेमाल होता है। लेकिन अक्सर बड़े बड़े लोगों के यहां बिजली के पावर प्लग्स लगे रहते हैं और बिजली से ही खाने पकाने का काम वे लेते हैं। आजकल जब से स्टोव्ह्स की दुर्घटनाओं के केसेज होने लगे हैं और कई महिलाओं की उनसे मृत्यु हो गई है तब से (interruptions) इसका उपयोग धीरे

धीरे कम होता चला जा रहा है। ऐसी दशा में मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि घासलेट पर जो टैक्स बढ़ाया है उसको कम किया जाना अत्यंत आवश्यक है।

अब जहां तक हमारी आमदनी के स्रोत का सवाल है यह अच्छी बात है कि लोग अधिक से अधिक बचत करें, स्माल सेविंग्स द्वारा बचत करें, लेकिन मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि ऐसे लोगों से बचत की क्या अपेक्षा की जा सकती है जो कर्ज के भार से दबे हुए हैं और यह न्यायोचित नहीं कहा जा सकता है। ऐसे लोग जबतक अपने कर्ज के भार से मुक्त नहीं हो जाते तबतक उनको बचत के लिए मजबूर करना उचित मालूम नहीं होता है।

अंत में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आप इन सब व्यवस्थाओं से इतना टैक्स वसूल करते जा रहे हैं सब कुछ कर रहे हैं, लेकिन जनता आप से यह अपेक्षा करती है कि उसके साथ न्याय हो। आपके विभागों में जो भ्रष्टाचार इतने व्यापक रूप में फैल रहा है उससे जनता को मुक्ति मिलनी चाहिये। मैं माननीय मंत्री से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे इस दिशा में विशेष रूप से ध्यान देंगे। अभी हाल ही की बात है कि शिवपुरी में बीच बाजार में दिन दहाड़े एक व्यापारी को डाकू उठा ले गये, मार डाला और केवल उसकी लाश ही ली। आज दिन दहाड़े इस तरह के काम होते हैं और आपसे ला एन्ड आर्डर मेन्टन नहीं हो पाता है जिससे जनता में दिन प्रति दिन असंतोष की भावना फैल रही है। आज आप किसी दफ्तर में चले जाइये वहां पर वगैर रिश्तत दिये कोई काम नहीं चल सकता है। आप जनता से इतना टैक्स देने के लिए कह रहे हैं, इसलिए जनता भी आप से अपेक्षा रखती है कि

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया]

आप अपने एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को टाइट करें और इस तरह की जितनी खराबियां हैं उन्हें दूर करने का प्रयास करें। मैं जनता से टैक्स न देने के बारे में नहीं कहता, आप कई तरह के टैक्स जनता से वसूल कर रहे हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ आप उनकी सुविधा के लिए कोई व्यवस्था नहीं कर रहे हैं जिसकी वजह से उनमें असंतोष फैलता है। जिस बुद्धिमत्ता से आपने टैक्स प्रोजेक्ट बनाये है उसी बुद्धिमत्ता से आप अपने एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में सुधार करने का प्रयास करें। अगर आप सख्ती से और बुद्धिमत्ता से सुधार करने का प्रयास करेंगे तो जनता आपकी आलोचना, प्रत्यालोचना करना कम कर देगी और संतोष की सांस लेगी वरना इन टैक्स प्रोजेक्ट्स को देखकर उसकी कमर ही टूटो जा रही है।

SHRIMATI DEVAKI GOPIDAS (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chhirmen, I rise to support the Budget wholeheartedly. At the outset, let me congratulate our Finance Minister for his headstrong and brave step in framing and presenting this present Budget. Of course, the nation is prepared to undergo any trial and hardship to meet the Chinese aggression and also this heavy burden of taxation.

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

I may be permitted to say that as far as the lower income group, especially the middle class, is concerned, life has become quite unbearable. To them, life is sacrifices only. Calculating on the First and the Second Five Year Plans, we were expecting a better life but unfortunately now, we have got to face this ruthless Chinese aggression and consequently we have to meet expenditure on account of the development schemes as well as defence production. We cannot help but sympathise with the

lot of the mothers in the lower income group who are already half-starving any may have to face a situation of full starvation. Our women have already shown their patriotism and sacrifice for the sake of preservation of the freedom of their motherland by donating blood, ornaments, wealth and their children to the war effort. Let me place on record my deep appreciation of the timely rising up of our womenfolk. Therefore, I am sure that these burdens will also be borne by them with a smiling face even though under the burden of direct and indirect taxation their vitality may be drained drop by drop. Enough means have to be found to meet both Plan and defence programmes. The question before us is not defence versus development but defence vigorously backed up by production so that the sinews of economic progress could be strengthened. Taking all these factors into consideration, the Finance Minister has had an exceedingly difficult task to perform and he has performed it fairly well. I am sure the whole country is behind him in this respect. A final touch here and there seems extremely essential to reach the goal we are aspiring for. If we want to mould up a socialistic pattern of society, as is our avowed programme, then the poorer sections of the society must be permitted to have a better standard of living. Assessing on this line makes us feel that the various taxation proposals, both direct and indirect, hit very hard the already overburdened lower income group. They have ungrudgingly contributed to the Defence Fund more than their mite and to burden them with more and more of direct and indirect taxation seems to be quite uncharitable. I know of people who contributed, who had the audacity to contribute fifty rupees when I know they can contribute more than fifty thousand rupees to the Defence Fund. I have a suggestion here and that is, instead of putting more and more burden on the common man, the well-to-do must be asked to contribute according to their income-tax returns.

If necessary, legislation to that effect must be passed. That is sure to fetch more votes to the ruling party. At this juncture, may I request you to stop Defence Fund collections through schools? This is causing a lot of difficulty to the poor parents. I know of one instance where four children, just because they could not take forty nP. to the school, did not attend school. The children are so sentimental and they are so proud and they feel it too much.

The increase in prices of essential commodities like kerosene, washing soap, cotton clothes, ought to be safely avoided as it affects the life of the poor people. In the rural areas, kerosene is mainly used for lighting lamps and in the urban areas the poorer sections, especially the working classes, use it as fuel. Hence, it is quite unavoidable. Some alternative fuel should have been suggested. The fact that saw dust is used as fuel in the rural areas is quite correct but in the urban areas, especially in towns like Delhi and its suburbs, saw dust cannot be got and cannot be used as fuel. Enhancement of price by 10 nP. per bottle is quite unthinkable and inhuman. The argument that it is meant to restrict consumption of kerosene as fuel and preserving foreign exchange is no going to work. The enhancement may deprive them of better light and the education of the children will also be adversely affected. What is the alternative arrangement that has been suggested to be used as fuel in place of kerosene to the poorer working class people? Electricity is not enough and is above the poor man's means. The reduction of duty or price of ordinary edible oil and non-processed oil does not help in this matter firstly because even after this reduction, the price is high for the common man and secondly, this oil cannot be used as fuel or for lighting lamps so efficiently. The fact that the rise in price of kerosene oil affects the poor and not the rich has to be borne in mind. They should not at least be denied such small amenities.

Similarly enhancement of duty on writing paper should not have been thought of. Even now, the price of books and paper to the school children is a great burden to the ordinary citizen. Added to this is the enhancement of school fees by the States. If we want to go ahead with education, facilities for promoting it should be given at any cost.

The price of cloth is sure to rise in spite of the Finance Minister's assurance to the contrary. Surely, a 33½ per cent. duty on cotton yarn of 35 counts or more and a surcharge of 20 per cent. on cotton yarn of less than 35 counts and import duty on raw cotton will mean that price of all varieties of cloth will increase. Cotton cloth and washing soaps and kerosene oil should be spared. Such essential articles of common use should not be taxed. After all, the income from these items of assessment is not very much. The compulsory savings scheme is to be applauded as a very sensible and clever proposal as it affords compulsory opportunities to all to save and contribute their mite to the defence efforts. But it will prove to be a great burden on the poor agriculturist, N.G.Os and such other lower income group. For example, a person getting a salary of Rs. 126 per mensem is compelled to save 3 per cent. when he is already in debts due to the rise in the cost of living and expenditure on the education of the children, etc. Consequently, the net result will be that this savings also will be in debts. As Mr. Govinda Reddy and some others have said, a bit higher income limit could have been safely fixed and incomes above Rs. 1,000 per mensem could advantageously be freed for the Defence Fund. It would look only fair if during the continuance of the emergency no officer is paid more than Rs. 1500 per mensem and it also fits in with the socialistic pattern of society. It has to be remembered that direct and indirect taxes ultimately affect the living condition of the common men. They hit them so hard that



[Shrimati Devaki Gopidas.]  
they may be crushed and the net result will be discontentment and more and more suicides from among the middle class who find it impossible to have a decent living and keep up their status. This class of people who form the backbone of the society must get the primary consideration in a welfare State. But here it appears that they are being ruined and eliminated from the society. Now, due to the feeling of emergency people may mutely suffer and tighten their belts more and more but how long can this continue without bursting? We have to pause and think and find out remedies. This common man must be allowed to live. At least allow him a square meal a day; otherwise dire consequences are sure to follow.

The proposal about Super Profits-tax is quite an unexpected and novel one but it is a welcome innovation and I hope that it will yield more results than estimated.

One point I wish to stress upon is that here in India, with so much of man-power resources our main problem is unemployment. To solve that problem industrialisation and more and more investment in that direction is the only remedy. Therefore, we have to be careful not to scare away private enterprises and investment in new avenues of industry in the country especially from foreign resources.

Now that we are sure the living budget of the average citizen will go up and his income diminishes, the measures that the Government proposes to take to check profiteering must be swift and sure so that they hold the price line in respect of essential commodities.

As regards Defence Budget, it is heartening to note that enough attention is being paid to defence production. As our Prime Minister said, we have to equip ourselves to stand on our own legs. Defence production and

army personnel are going to be expanded. An amount of Rs. 867 crores is provided for the next year in this line. But I regret to point out, in this connection, that in the distribution of defence industries the already backward and neglected areas like Kerala State which stands foremost in literacy and unemployment are completely neglected. When our neighbouring State of Madras has four factories for defence production, may I ask what has been given to Kerala which is also a part and parcel of this great country? I am proud to say that there are ever so many brave and valiant jawans in all status from Kerala State in the war front here and abroad. We know that the Army is going to be expanded. Then why not have a cantonment and a training centre in Kerala too? From the strategic point of view also it is quite essential. It is reported by Shri R. Prasad, I.C.S., that for imparting technical training for defence, Kerala State has responded immediately and to the maximum.

It is regrettable to note that up to this time the Centre is always adopting a lukewarm attitude towards that State. When in the Central sector a sum of Rs. 1,000 crores is spent, the investment made in Kerala is only Rs. 79 lakhs; nothing else. We were promised a heavy electricals factory and then what happened to it, everybody knows. Now we are promised the second shipyard and I hope it will materialise. Now, what about the oil refinery? May I ask whether it is going to be located in Cochin or is it going to be snatched away by Madras by means of their bargaining strength in the form of number of Ministers and members. If that be the criteria for allotment of due share of developmental projects, there is no hope for the small States and minorities. I am constrained to say so because regarding the location of the fourth oil refinery there is already a Report by an experts committee and it emphasises the convenience of having it at Cochin, a natural port in Kerala.

In spite of all that another sub-committee of three members has recently been formed, I understand, to fix the location of which two are Ministers from Madras and the third is the concerned Minister. Is it a fair step, may I ask? The other day while answering questions here in this House on the location of this oil refinery it pained us to hear from the hon. Minister that Kerala was listed last even in the face of the Report which has said that Kerala is the most ideal place for this. Why is there this sort of vacillation to do mere justice as it intimidated by power and influence? We cannot call this a fair and just deal. Of one thing I am sure and it is that the people of Kerala will not take it lying down if this fourth oil refinery is not located in Cochin in the face of such a flagrant neglect to this State in the First and Second Plan periods.

In this connection, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a recent report on the Techno-Economic Survey of Kerala by the National Council of Applied Economic Research and the recommendations made by them. I do not propose to deal with them at length because I have not got the time to do so.

Another point which I wish to stress is about women's education. Here I wish to say that it is only the mothers who are educated who can mould the future of India and so women's education has to be given its due importance. And no amount spent on it can be too big because it is on the educated mothers that the future of the country depends. I would also like to say a few words about children's education and child welfare. If you will permit me to say so, I think we are not giving attention to this at all. We hear so much of talk about switching over to Hindi and discarding English but are there books for the infants? We have not turned our attention to that side at all; we have not thought about it up to this time even after 15 years of independence. The beginners

are taught "Cot, Pot, Tot" like that from English books even now. Is it not a shame? We have not got even a single book so to say for beginners. I find so many publications printed on very nice paper and wasted and I wonder whether we could not utilise some of these nice papers for producing books for infants. Why can't we teach them from infant standard onwards in the regional language and be patriotic rather than go in for books from England? This is shameful so to say to a nation which calls itself a free nation. We have to bestow our attention and thought to this matter and we must set apart a good sum of money for women's education, children's education and child welfare.

Thank you.

2 P M

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय वाइसचेयरमैन साहब, जो बजट हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने पेश किया है, प्रस्तुत किया है, मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। वह बड़े साहस का बजट है, उसके पीछे माननीय वित्त मंत्री का और हमारी गवर्नमेंट का दृढ़ संकल्प है कि हम चीन का मुकाबला फौजी मैदान में और अपनी मजबूत अर्थव्यवस्था के मैदान में, दोनों में, मजबूती के साथ करेंगे। जब चीन की/फौज हमारे बार्डर पर, हमारी सीमा पर, खड़ी है तब उस वक्त हमको दायें-बायें नहीं देखना है, हमको तो हर तरह से उसका मुकाबला करना है और उसका मुकाबला करने के लिये जो साधन आवश्यक हैं वह हमको जुटाना है, उसके जुटाये बिना हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता—जब चीनियों का आक्रमण हुआ था तब चारों तरफ से इस सदन में इस किस्म की आवाज उठी और इस सदन में ही नहीं बल्कि बाहर भी जनता ने चारों तरफ यह आवाज थी कि जनता को दृढ़ संकल्प होना चाहिये, अपनी डिफेंस को, अपनी फौजी ताकत को मजबूत बनाना चाहिये और उसके पीछे जो अर्थ-व्यवस्था एक जरूरी चीज है

[श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र]

उसको सुदृढ़ करना चाहिये। यह दोनों चीजें बिना रुपये के सम्भव नहीं है, बिना टैक्स के भी सम्भव नहीं है। तो अगर दोनों चीजों को करना है तो हमको टैक्स लगाना पड़ेगा और अपनी कमर को कसना पड़ेगा। हर एक भारतवासी का आज यह कर्तव्य है कि चीन के हमले का मुकाबला करने के लिये जो कुछ भी त्याग उससे हो सकता है वह उसको करे—अपने खर्चे में कमी करे और चीनी हमले का मुकाबला करने के लिये फौजी ताकत को बल दे। फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने उसी का इतजाम किया है। यह कोई नहीं कहता है कि इतने रुपये की जरूरत नहीं है, यह सब मानते हैं कि हमको अपनी फौजी ताकत को मजबूत करना है लेकिन फिर हमारे यहाँ यह आवाज आती है कि यह टैक्स गलत लगा, वह टैक्स गलत लगा, यह चीज नहीं करनी चाहिये वह चीज नहीं करनी चाहिये। विरोधी दलों की तरफ से—जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है उसकी तरफ से श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने इधर एक्साइज ड्यूटी के ऊपर आलोचना की कि एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगाना एक तरह से गरीबों का शोषण करना है और उधर हमारे जन संघ के जा नेता हैं श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी उन्होंने कहा कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने टैक्स का एक जाल बिछाया है और उस जाल के अन्दर छोटे बड़े सब को फाँस लिया है तो फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के उस बजट के लिये इस तरह की भाषा इस्तेमाल करना उचित नहीं है जो कि इस दृष्टिकोण से बनाया गया है कि इस देश की ताकत को मजबूत बनाये, इस देश की अर्थव्यवस्था को दृढ़ करे ताकि चीनी हमले का हम डट कर मुकाबला कर सके ठीक नहीं है। इसके लिये मैं यही कहूँगा कि बाहर से हम/ यह दिखाते हैं कि हम सब एक हैं, गवर्नमेंट के पीछे हैं, गवर्नमेंट की ताकत को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं और हम सब चीन का

मुकाबला करने के लिये देश को तैयार करना चाहते हैं लेकिन उसके लिये जो जरूरी चीजें हैं उनको हम अन्दर से सपोर्ट नहीं देते हैं।

माननीय वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, आज जब कि लडाई का मैदान सामने है, जब कि हमें एक बड़े भीषण हमले का मुकाबला करना है तब किसी भी पालियामेंट में चारों तरफ से यही आवाज आनी चाहिये थी कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने जो टैक्स लगाया है, इसमें जिम साहस का परिचय दिया है, उन्होंने २७५ करोड़ रुपये के नये टैक्स लगा कर जो साधन जुटाया है, वह ठीक है और वह हमले का मजबूती के साथ मुकाबला करने के लिये है, उसकी चारों तरफ से तागीफ होनी चाहिये थी लेकिन हमारे यहाँ आज इस बात की कमी है।

फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने दो, तीन स्कीम्स चालू की हैं उनके, संबंध में अब मैं अर्ज करना चाहूँगा। एक तो गोल्ड कंट्रोल स्कीम है। गोल्ड कंट्रोल स्कीम की काफी चर्चा है, उसकी चारों तरफ आलोचना भी हुई है और यह भी कहते हैं कि जो गोल्ड स्मगल हो रहा है उस पर कंट्रोल होना चाहिये। तमाम दुनिया में गोल्ड के ऊपर नियंत्रण है, तमाम बड़े बड़े देशों में जो कि हमसे ज्यादा धनाढ्य देश हैं उनमें भी गोल्ड के ऊपर नियंत्रण है, वहाँ इस बात के लिये छूट नहीं है कि जितना चाहे उतना जेवर बनवा कर पहिनें। लेकिन इस देश के अन्दर कहा जाता है कि यह स्त्रियों का सौभाग्यचिह्न है। आज हमारी माननीय सदस्या राजकुमारी अमृत कौर ने कहा कि यह तो स्त्रियों का सौभाग्यचिह्न है और स्त्रियों के ऊपर बड़ा कुठाराघात किया गया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश

में एक जमाना था जब कि सोने के जेवरों का रिवाज सिर्फ बहुत बड़े बड़े घरों में ही था और छोटे घरों में ज्यादातर चांदी के ही जेवर पहिने जाते थे लेकिन आज सोने के जेवरों का रिवाज बहुत ज्यादा हो गया है, सोने की चूड़ियां पहनने का रिवाज है यह तो बहुत ही रीसेट चीज है, यह रिवाज अभी हाल ही में हुआ है नहीं तो सोने की चूड़ियों का पहिनना कुछ लोगों में वैधव्य का चिह्न समझा जाता था। कुछ लोगों के यहां विधवा ही सोने की चूड़िया पहिनती थी नहीं तो और सब कांच की चूड़ियां पहिनती थी। सोने की चूड़ियों को पहिनने का रिवाज धीरे धीरे तेजी से बढ़ता गया। जैसा कि फाइनेस मिनिस्टर ने कहा है कि जो स्वर्णकार हैं वे ज्यादातर स्वर्ण का काम नहीं करते हैं बल्कि चांदी का काम करते हैं जिस पर कोई नियंत्रण नहीं है।

फिर वास्चेयरमन साहब, दूसरी बात यह है कि जो चांज देश के लिये बुरी है, जिसमें देश की शक्ति जाया हो रही है जिससे हमारे साधन नष्ट हो रहे हैं—आज हमें फारेन एक्सचेंज की दिक्कत है। फारेन-एक्सचेंज के बारे में हमें मुत्किलात पड़ रही है और सोना हमारे घरों में दबा पड़ा है जेवरों की शक्ल में—उसके लिये हमारा यह फर्ज है, हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर का यह कर्तव्य है कि उसके लिये कोई प्रबन्ध करें, उसके लिये वह कोई तरकीब करें जिससे कि सोने को निकाल कर बाहर ले आयें और आगे के लिये सोने का ऐसा दुरुपयोग न हो सके ऐसा बन्दोबस्त करें। यही बन्दोबस्त उन्होंने किया है कहा जाता है कि इसकी वजह से सारे गोल्डस्मिथ बेकार हो जायेंगे। मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि दुनिया के अन्दर जो भी सुधार किये गये हैं चाहे कितने ही कल्याणकारी सुधार हों, जितने ही प्रगतिशील सुधार हों उनकी हमेशा मुखालिफत को गई है।

मैं एक मिसाल दूंगा। अमेरिका के अन्दर एब्राहम लिन्कन ने गुलामों को आजाद किया था लेकिन उसको भी मुखालिफत गुलामों की ओर से को गई, का गधा कि इतने जो गुलाम हैं उनको आज खाना मिल रहा है, उनको खाने की कोई तकलीफ नहीं है, उनको रहने की जगह है और उनके लिये सारे साधन हैं लेकिन कल वे बेचारे क्या करेंगे। जब कोई बुराई दूर की जाती है तो उसके रास्ते में रुकावट आती है लेकिन जो समझदार लोग हैं, जो समझते हैं कि यह बुराई है वह उसे दूर करते हैं और उनके सामने जो दिक्कतें इसमें आती हैं उनका उन्हें मुकाबला करना पड़ता है। फाइनेस मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी यही किया है और इस वास्ते मेरा निवेदन है कि जो उनकी गोल्ड कंट्रोल स्कीम है वह बहुत अच्छी स्कीम है और इसके लिये उनका नाम भारतवर्ष के इतिहास में चिरस्मरणीय रहेगा कि जो हम यह आवाज लगाते थे कि सोने का इस्तेमाल इस देश में कम करे, सोने के जेवर को कम करे उनकी तरफ हमारे मोरारजी देसाई ने कदम उठाया। मैं सिर्फ इतना अर्ज करूंगा कि जो गोल्ड कंट्रोल स्कीम लागू की गई है उसके अन्तर्गत जो निधम बनाये गये हैं उन निधमों के पालन करने के बारे में, उनको कार्य रूप में लाने के बारे में सख्त हिदायतें जरूर जारी की जायें कि जो अफसरान हैं वे लोगों को परेशान न कर सकें। १४ कैरेट गोल्ड के जेवर बनने की जो योजना है वह बहुत अच्छी है—१४ कैरेट गोल्ड की बहुत सी चीजें बनती हैं और वे बड़ी मन्दर लगती हैं—लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जो अधिकारी हैं वे हर एक स्त्री को बाजार में चलते हुए कहें या उनके घर में जाकर कहे कि उनके पास २० कैरेट गोल्ड का जेवर है और उसको वह कहें कि चलो पुलिस थाने में, चलो वहां इसको रखा जायेगा और इसकी तहकीकात होगी, जांच होगी। इससे बड़ा हैरेसमेंट होगा, लोगों को परेशानी होगी। ऐसी हिदायतें जरूर

[श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र]

जारी की जायें कि आभ तौर पर जो जेवर पहनने वाली औरतें हैं उनके ऊपर कोई किस्म की निगरानी, कोई किस्म की निगाह नहीं रखी जाय कि उन्होंने १४ कैरेट गोल्ड का जेवर पहना है। सिर्फ कड़ी निगरानी बहा रखी जाय जो रिफाइनरीज हैं, जहां सोना बनता है, वहां १४ कैरेट से ज्यादा सोना बनकर बाहर बेचा न जाय, दूसरे जो सोने के जेवरात बनाते हैं उन पर कड़ी नजर डाली जाय और उनके जरिये भी सोने के जेवर १४ कैरेट से ज्यादा के न बनने पाएं। लेकिन जो जेवर पहनने वाली स्त्रियां हैं, जिनके घरों में सोने के जेवर हैं उनके जेवरों पर लोग हाथ न लगाएं, उनको परेशान न करें, उनकी तलाशी न करें, ऐसी हिदायतें इस संबंध में जारी की जायें।

दूसरे, हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक नयी योजना चालू की है जिसका ख्याल पहले से किया जाता था और उसके संबंध में पिछले बजट के भाषणों में यह तजवीज पहले भी आई थी कि हमको अनिवार्य बचत योजना चालू करनी चाहिये। अनिवार्य बचत योजना उन्होंने चालू की है, जो कि एक बहुत सुन्दर योजना है। उन्होंने सबको मजबूर किया है कि इस लड़ाई के जमाने में वे कुछ बचत करें ताकि उनकी बचत इस वक्त देश पर जो हमला है उसका मुकाबला करने के काम में आए और बाद में जब उस हमले का मुकाबला सफलता के साथ हो जाये तो उनकी बचत का रुपया मय सूद के उनको वापस मिल जाये। तो यह जो सुन्दर योजना है इसके संबंध में मुझे इतना ही अर्ज करना है कि इसका मैं स्वागत करता हूं और इसमें जो कई कटेगरी आपने रखी हैं कि इस कैटेगरी पर इतना, इस कटेगरी पर इतना, उनके ऊपर फिर से नजर डाली जाय, उनको

फिर एक दफा दोहरा लिया जाय और यह देख लिया जाय कि किसी तबके के ऊपर, किसी कैटेगरी के ऊपर, जरूरत से ज्यादा ज्यादाती न होने पाय। मैं देखता हूं कि जो हमारा किसान है, भूमिधर है उसके इपर इसमें बहुत ज्यादाती हुई है। जो ३ रुपया लगान देता है या २० रुपया लगान देता है उसके ऊपर भी यह रखा गया है उसका आधा रुपया वह अनिवार्य रूप से जमा करे। अर्थात् २० रुपया वह भूमिधरी का दे और १० रुपया अनिवार्य रूप से जमा करे। २० रुपया जिसके पास कुल भूमिधरी है उसको १० रुपया जमा करने को मजबूर करना और दूसरी तरफ जो लोग तनख्वाहदार हैं उनको ३ प्रतिशत देने को कहना, यह मेरे ख्याल में भूमिधर के साथ ज्यादाती है। हमारे बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा, उसको वसूल करने में दिक्कत होगी, वसूल करने में खर्च बढ़ जायेगा लेकिन मैं समझता हूं यह बात सही नहीं है क्योंकि जहां उसकी भूमिधरी वसूल होती है उसी के साथ साथ वह भी वसूल हो जायेगा। वसूल करने में कोई खर्च नहीं लगेगा और न कोई दिक्कत होगी लेकिन उससे उनके साथ बड़ी ज्यादाती होगी। इस वास्ते उनके बारे में जरूर ख्याल करना चाहिये।

दूसरी इसमें कैटेगरी हैं : जिनकी आमदनी १५०० रुपया है उसके ऊपर भी कुछ ज्यादा लगा दिया गया है। उस पर भी तीन, चार परसेंट से अधिक बचत योजना के अन्तर्गत नहीं लगना चाहिये, तभी यह स्कीम लोगों को बुरी नहीं मालूम होगी।

अंत में मैं इस बात पर आता हूं कि जैसा कि और माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा है, हमको किरायेदार भी करनी चाहिये, अपने खर्च में भी कमी करनी चाहिये। आज देश से हम इस बात की तबको रखते हैं कि वे संकट का मुकाबला करने के लिये धन दें आज हम

गरीब से गरीब आदमी से भी इस बात की आशा करते हैं और इसके लिये हमने गरीबों पर टैक्स लगाया है, अमीरों पर टैक्स लगाया है। जिन लोगों पर हमने टैक्स लगाया है वे भी हम से तबक्को रखते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट अपने घर में सुधार करे और अच्छी तरह से सुधार करे। इस बात की अच्छी तरह से सुव्यवस्था करे कड़ी नजर रखे और एक पैसा भी उनका बरबाद न होने पाए। यह बात सही है कि इसको अमल में लाना बड़ी मुश्किल है। इतना खर्च गवर्नमेंट का चारों तरफ चल रहा है। मैंने सुना है कि कहीं डिफेंस के काम के लिये खाट खरादी गई, पलंग खरीदी गए जो कि बाजार भाव में १०, १५ रु० के मिल रहे थे वे तीस तीस रुपये में खरीदी गए। इस तरफ हमारी कड़ी निगाह होनी चाहिये। जो चीज हम खरीदें उस में एक पाई भी ज्यादा खर्च हम न करें। बहुत मुमकिन है कि इसको कार्य रूप में लाने में दिक्कत हो लेकिन गांधी जी की मिसाल हमारे सामने हैं। गांधी जी जिस काम को करते थे उस में एक वह मिसाल पेश करते थे, अपना उदाहरण पेश करते थे। उन्होंने देखा इस देश में गरीबी है, इस देश में कपड़े की कमी है, एक स्त्री उनके सामने आई, वह मैले कपड़े पहनी थी, उस से वे बात करने लगे। उन्होंने कहा, बहिन तू गरीब तो जरूर है लेकिन तू अपने कपड़ों को तो धो सकती है, मैला कपड़ा उतार कर उज्ज्वल कपड़े क्यों नहीं पहनती? उस औरत ने कहा, महात्मा जी, बात तो आप सही करते हैं लेकिन मेरे पास एक कपड़ा है, कैसे इसको उतारूं, कैसे इसको धोऊं? महात्मा जी ने उसी रोज से यह तय कर लिया कि आइन्दा से, जब देश के अंदर कपड़े की इतनी कमी है, इतनी गरीबी है कि लोग अपना तन ढकने को कपड़ा नहीं ले सकते हैं तो मैं भी कपड़ा नहीं पहनूंगा और उन्होंने और कपड़ा पहनना छोड़ दिया और सिर्फ लंगोटी पहनना शुरू कर दिया। ऐसी मिसालों से हम शिक्षा ले सकते हैं और अपना खर्च घटा सकते हैं।

महात्मा गांधी "हरिजन" पत्र का संचालन करते थे और उसके लिये लेख लिखा करते थे। वे छोटे छोटे कागजों के अखबार के टुकड़ों के खाली हिस्से फाड़ फाड़ कर उनके ऊपर लिखते थे। चाहे उस से कितनी उतनी न हो लेकिन उस से दूसरों पर बड़ा असर पड़ता था। इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्रियों से आशा करूंगा कि वे इस किस्म की मिसाल देश के सामने पेश करें कि वे खुद कुर्बानी करने को तैयार हों, खुद अपना खर्च कम करने के लिये तैयार हों। आज जो सहूलियतें उनको मौजूद हैं चाहे कम हों या ज्यादा हों, उनमें भी वे थोड़ी बहुत कमी करके दिखाएं ताकि लोगों को पता चले कि वे कमी करने को आमादा हैं।

यह तो महात्मा जी की मिसाल थी। मैं अंग्रेजों की मिसाल देता हूं। मैं दो मिनट में खत्म करता हूं। जब पिछली लड़ाई हुई थी तब अंग्रेजी हुकूमत थी, उस समय उनकी भी अवस्था, आर्थिक अवस्था अच्छी नहीं थी, फौजी अवस्था भी अच्छी नहीं थी फिर भी उन्होंने मुकाबला करने के लिए अपने सारे साधन जुटाए थे और अपने खर्च में भी कमी की और खूब अपने ऊपर टैक्स लगाए। उसका असर हमारे देश में भी चला। उस जमाने में मैंने देखा—जोकि उस वक्त हम अंग्रेजों के साथ देश की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे—तब बड़े से बड़ा अंग्रेज आफिसर—कमिशनर और कलक्टर तक—१०, १०, १५, १५ मील साइकिल पर चलता था क्योंकि पेट्रोल की तंगी हो गई थी और उस पर कितनी तशारी बरती जा रही थी। यह मैंने अपनी आंखों से देखा है। इन चीजों का असर पड़ता है। मैं अपने वित्त मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जब वे जनता से तबक्की करते हैं कि कौड़ी कौड़ी निकाल कर दें तो साथ ही साथ उनके सामने भी उन्हें मिसाल पेश करनी चाहिये ताकि लोगों को पता चल जाये और यह मालूम हो जाये कि आज सारा देश, मंत्री जी से लेकर नीचे का तबक्का गरीब और मजदूर सभी त्याग करने को तैयार हैं।

[ श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र ]

सुपर प्राफिट टैक्स आपने लगाया आज तक कहा जाता था कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेज नहीं लगाते ह डाइरेक्ट टैक्स जो आज उन्होंने लगाया है वह बड़ा सुन्दर लगाया है। सुपर प्राफिट टैक्स की मुखालिफत हो रही है। इधर गरीबों का नाम लेकर टैक्स की मुखालिफत हो रही है और उधर जो हमारे पंजीपति हैं, इन्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट हैं, वे सुपर प्राफिट टैक्स की मुखालिफत कर रहे हैं। जिसके ऊपर टैक्स लगेगा वही मुखालिफत करेगा। लेकिन हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने बहुत सोच समझकर ऐसी कर निर्धारण व्यवस्था की है ताकि सब लोगों पर देश का भार उठाने की, बोझा उठाने की जिम्मेदारी आ जाये, वह जिम्मेदारी सब लोगों में बंट जाय और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि यह जो ५ परसेंट सुपर प्राफिट टैक्स है उसमें कोई तब्दीली माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी नहीं करेंगे।

**SHRI SANTOKH SINGH (Delhi):**  
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to welcome this emergency Budget. This emergency is a blessing in disguise. Our sacred motherland was invaded very ruthlessly by the Chinese in the form of a massive attack. Our people rose as one nation against it. They came in large numbers and men of all ranks have added to the National Defence Fund in the form of money and gold. Young men in large numbers are joining the Army. And it is imperative that this Defence Budget to the tune of Rs. 867 crores should be before us. Certainly, it is in the fitness of things that we should have such a big Budget for a big purpose. The hon. Finance Minister is providing a Budget of nearly Rs. 900 crores which is three times bigger than the last year's Budget. In my humble view, the Finance Minister has taken the most appropriate step and I appreciate his boldness, and he has risen to the occasion.

During the last decade and a half, we very rightly laid stress on the economic growth of the country and as a result of that, our agricultural and industrial foundation has been firmly laid. While reinforcing and expanding this foundation, we must now build up the necessary military potential. Obviously, the necessary funds have to be raised through increased taxation. There can be no two opinions about it. One can say that a particular levy should have been imposed on such and such items and that such and such items should not have been taken care of. But it is a fact that increased taxation has to be imposed to meet the situation. I am not at the moment going into details regarding this. I, however, give my full support to the Finance Minister in regard to the broad proposals of the Budget.

Sir, I would like to make a few observations regarding the industrial growth in the country. My honourable colleague, Shri V. T. Krishnamachari, in his illuminating speech the other day in this very August House dwelt at length on the contribution of the agricultural sector to the National income, which is to the extent of 48 per cent., and to the necessity of expanding it further. As regards the agricultural sector, I want to observe that at this rate of 48 per cent. it is giving to the national income about Rs. 7,000 crores. There is a limit to the contribution that we could get from this side. As he pointed out, soil conservation, up-to-date manuring and other things can increase production to the limit that we are importing foodgrains. On this score, we cannot go on increasing production because some factors also come in. If there is too much of production of foodgrains, the prices come down. But about the industrial sector which gives 52 per cent., to the national income, including other incomes, we can do a lot. I would therefore, like to make some observations about the industrial side.

Turning to the industrial side, I notice that the Government have already carried out a careful review of the current year's programme of the Third Five Year Plan. All the vital items of the Plan have been kept intact. This is necessary for providing a suitable industrial base for our growing military potential. In this context, I would like to offer a few suggestions for the consideration of the Government. Today, our honourable colleague, Shri Karmarkar, referred to the public sector. I am a person who values the efforts of the public sector and I am all for this. But being myself in the thick of fight in the private sector, I would like to welcome both the sectors the private sector, and the public sector. They are supposed to grow very well in our country and that is the policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: For how many years more?

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH: For any number of years. If we are to grow industrially and if we are to increase the per capita income, as has been said by our hon. colleague, Shri V. T. Krishnamachari, to Rs. 550, both the public and the private sectors should go together, side by side; only then can we progress, otherwise we cannot. As a matter of fact, both the public sector and the private sector are, so to say, the limbs of the same body. They are the two branches of the same tree. Both of them have got to come up together so as to contribute to the national wealth. There are some industries involving crores and crores of rupees, Rs. 5 crores, Rs. 10 crores, Rs. 26 crores where the private sector cannot come in. It is only the public sector that can build the Bhakra Dam investing Rs. 200 crores; it is only the public sector which can spend Rs. 100 crores each on the three iron and steel plants. In items such as these, the public sector is welcome and they would create the necessary industrial base of the country. Side by side, in

the private sector, all the ancillary industries, small-scale industries, medium-scale industries, cottage industries and rural industries are supposed to thrive. There should be no rigidity. As a matter of fact, any factory could be in the public sector or in the private sector. . . (Time bell rings.)

Give me five more minutes, please,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please take two minutes.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH: Sir, all my time has been taken away by my hon. colleague.

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

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH: My second suggestion is regarding the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. This Act was brought into force in 1952. Under this Act, not only are new establishments developed but the existing units are controlled.

On this score I want to say Sir, that under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act huge numbers of licences have been granted to the various influential houses and so much capacities have been given, up to the targeted capacities of the Third Five Year Plan and in some cases even the contemplated capacity of the Fourth Five Year Plan has also been touched. I had an occasion to look into the licences, and it pains me to find that the capacity granted to them has not been utilised; all those licences are lying as such and the country's growth is being checked, is being held, which should not be the case. They can revoke these licences if these have not been used properly, and if the revoking of the licences cannot be brought about by that Regulation Act, then the Defence of India Act should be used, because the country's progress cannot be held up.



[Shri Santosh Singh.]

One more point I am taking and that is exports. We are trying to make good exports but our country on the whole has not been export-minded. We had a huge internal market in our country and the industries were used to making huge profits in their own country and exports were not progressing. It is only in the last few years we have felt the need for making exports. But there is a big gap of Rs. 500 crores. In this context, Sir, I want to observe that if proper care is taken and all those industries are made to export, the gap of Rs. 500 crores could be bridged.

Finally, since my time is up, I want to make an observation on the gold policy. I must congratulate our hon. Finance Minister for the brave step that he has taken in introducing the long-felt and the much-needed social reform in our country, and I call upon every citizen to help in this policy and welcome this policy.

In the end, I welcome and give my full support to the Budget proposals. Thank you very much.

**SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO** (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, half measures haltingly taken, that, I believe, is not a too severe description of our Budgets so far. For once a departure from this practice is now made by our Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, and I offer him my hearty congratulations. It is however a pity that this correct step had to wait until our perfidious neighbour committed naked and unashamed aggression on our motherland.

In framing our very Constitution we set for ourselves the mighty task of achieving a socio-economic revolution within one generation. I may abhor most of the things that Mao says, but he is, I think, largely correct when he asserts that "revolution is not an invitation to a dinner party." When we launched a big revolution—the biggest in our long history—a revolution aiming at fundamental changes in the structure of our society—we should have prepared our-

selves to pay the heavy, exactly price which it demands. This we have not done up till now, either fully or willingly. Of course, it is far from my intention to say that we should have adopted the ruthless measures which totalitarian regimes invariably enforce to push up the pace of the development of their countries through planned economics. That would have been the negation of our Constitution. That would have been the death of our political democracy and individual freedom. That would, again, have been doing great violence to our national spirit. Without adopting any of the ruthless, almost inhuman measures, we could still have been, I submit, more consistent and comprehensive in our fiscal policies to have already made a much bigger success of our socio-economic revolution.

My complaint is not against the soundness of our fiscal policies. They are basically correct; they are wholesome. To make myself more clear, I may be permitted to dilate a little on this point. Enhanced duties on non-essential goods proposed in this Budget should have been imposed at the present rates—if not at higher rates—years ago. This mechanism of the same excise duties should have been applied much earlier to limit consumption. Compulsory savings should have synchronised with the launching of our First Five Year Plan. Import restrictions should have been clamped down long before our sterling reserves and other resources of foreign currency were partly frittered away by the purchase of such luxury items as radiograms, tape-recorders, fridges, air-conditioners, etc. Gold Control Order should have come into operation a decade earlier. Super Profits-tax, limitation of the remuneration and perquisites of company executives and other such measures contemplated by this Budget are also very much delayed. Had all these steps been taken in proper time, we should have been today surely in a much stronger position economically as well as militarily, to meet armed aggression from any quarter.

Now, Sir, I also venture to suggest that considerable deficit financing to which we have resorted in earlier years was not on the whole a happy thing. It has led to inflation and to the rising of prices. Taxation on a larger scale, in spite of its apparent hardship, would have been a more sound and equitable policy. As President Hoosevelt has rightly remarked, "Inflation is itself a most inequitable type of taxation. It grants no exemptions and recognises no hardships—though a well-drafted tax bill can do both." It is only because of this inequitable nature of inflation much of the benefit of our developmental activities has not, I believe, reached the poorer sections of our population. While saying this I hasten to add that our present Finance Minister, Shri Morarji, has always been averse to large-scale deficit financing.

Well, Sir, whatever might have happened earlier, a time has come when we should prepare ourselves for greater sacrifices to meet the challenge of the menacing enemy on our borders, and also to carry on uninterrupted the socio-economic revolution on which we have set our heart. And the Budget which is before us is, if I may say so, a clarion call to our duty. After it was presented to us I have re-read a couple of books on war finance and this has confirmed my first impression that Shri Morarji has prepared his Budget on the latest and widely accepted principle of war finance. Whether it is war finance or defence finance, its function is—according to an American authority on the subject—"to distribute the national income in such a way as to provide for the requisite military effort, to distribute equitably the pecuniary sacrifices required for that effort, and to forestall the development of vested interests in the indefinite perpetuation of the war society." The three aspects of this main function of defence finance can be clearly seen in Shri Morarji's present Budget.

"The mechanism of war finance", to quote the same American expert

again, "are three—taxation, borrowings and inflation". Shri Morarji has made use of all these three mechanisms in their proper proportions. He is seeking to collect Rs. 275.5 crores by additional taxation, Rs. 967 crores by internal and external borrowing and Rs. 151 crores by expansion of treasury bills, that is, by inflation. As he has budgeted for a total sum of Rs. 2,041 crores, deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 151 crores could not by itself lead to any inflationary pressure or to any steep rise in prices. But any large outlay on defence has a definite tendency to force up the price index. It is, therefore, very essential that an ever-vigilant type is kept on prices and every step should be taken to put down profiteering. Otherwise, the poor and middle classes would be hit badly, grievously. A call for sacrifices, when it is inequitable, produces no correct response. Equitable sacrifice strengthens a nation by steeling its will, by uplifting its heart, by ennobling its spirit and brings about unity and a sense of purpose. Inequitable sacrifice, on the other hand, makes a people corrupt, weak, vacillating. Unchecked prices would, in effect, mean inequitable sacrifice because they lead to widespread distress and discontent and diminution of defence effort.

Though it is a sad thing, a shameful thing, it should at the same time be admitted. Sir, that there are in our country certain people who are out to profiteer out of every conceivable and even inconceivable situation. They may be truly called the merchants of distress and death. The big sharks among them are masters of the company law, the labour law and the income-tax law. They are experts in amassing large fortunes, in building up vast commercial and industrial empires through fraudulent means and yet be within the four corners of the law. It is high time that this greedy crowd is crushed and eliminated. Any further delay or hesitation in this matter would come in the way of creating

[Shri N. Venkateswara Rao.]

full confidence and enthusiasm in the common man in the great future which he is being called upon to defend.

Now, Sir, in the interests of the common man, I would like to submit to our Finance Minister that he should give serious thought to see whether he could not give a few minor reliefs. Of these, I may mention—for want of time—just three; omitting agriculturists of lesser holdings than five acres from compulsory savings; omitting also employees who earn less than Rs. 2,500/- per annum, as well as those urban property owners who collect by way of rent less than Rs. 1,800/- per annum from the compulsory savings scheme, and exempting at least inferior kerosene from the proposed enhancement of excise duty.

Finally, Sir, I would only like to add that in preparing this Budget, Shri Morarji has shown himself to be a man of courage and vision. Because of its radical departure from what has gone before it, a day may come when this would stand out in our history as big a landmark as did the budgets of Lloyd George which helped British Liberalism to touch the highest and noblest point in its reforms, and also the budgets of Hugh Dalton which greatly furthered the cause of socialist legislation. Mention of Dalton reminds me of a slogan which he coined when Britain was facing a very adverse balance of trade. He then said "Export or Expire". The slogan for us today, when we are facing a big bully on our borders, should be "Pay or Perish".

**श्री कुम्भाराम (राजस्थान) :** उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज से पहले जो बजट बन कर आया करते थे वे खास तौर से योजनाओं को सफल बनाने के लिये बन कर आया करते थे पर इस बजट के अन्दर अब की बार यह बात और बढ़ गई है कि हम अपनी सुरक्षा के लिये भी आर्थिक

व्यवस्था करे। हमें इस बात का ध्यान रखना है कि हमारी योजनायें भी कामयाब हों और हमारी सुरक्षा जो है उसमें भी हमको कामयाबी मिले। इन दोनों बातों को जब हम देखते हैं तो पाते हैं कि इनका आधार केवल पैसा नहीं है, अगर केवल पैसे से काम चल जाता तो हमारा बजट अपने आप में पूर्ण था और हम अपने माननीय मंत्री महोदय को इसके लिये बहुत बहुत आभार के साथ धन्यवाद देते लेकिन इसके साथ एक दूसरा दृष्टि भी है। जहाँ तक सैद्धांतिक दृष्टि से इसको देखने का प्रश्न है वहाँ तक हमारा बजट अपने आप में पूर्ण है लेकिन जब हम उसका व्यावहारिक पहलू देखते हैं तो हमको कुछ गंकाएँ पैदा होती हैं और वह यह होती है कि हम पैसे के आधार पर परिणाम नहीं ला सकते। पैसा एक बहुत बड़ा कारण है लेकिन उसके आधार पर ही हम परिणाम नहीं ला सकते हैं, परिणाम लाने के लिये जो हमारी सेवायें हैं उनके ऊपर भी हमें ध्यान देना होगा। अगर हमारी सेवायें कुशल नहीं हैं तो हम उससे वह परिणाम पैदा नहीं कर सकेंगे। सेवाओं के बारे में जो आम धारणा पैदा हो गई है, बन गई है, जो लोगों की ज़बान पर बात आ गई है, वह यह है कि उसमें बड़ा लचीलापन आ गया है, बड़ा ढीलापन आ गया है, और कोई काम किसी का नहीं होता है, किसी की सुनवाई नहीं होती है। इसलिये अगर इस पक्ष को भी हम देख कर नहीं चलेंगे तो हमारा काम नहीं चलेगा।

इसके साथ सुरक्षा की बात है। सुरक्षा में हम कामयाबी तो चाहते हैं लेकिन उस कामयाबी का आधार क्या है? उस कामयाबी का आधार सब से पहले जनता है और उसके बाद खेत-खलिहान और कारखानों में काम करने वाले किसान और मजदूर हैं और फिर उसके बाद फ्रंट पर लड़ने वाले हमारे सिपाही हैं। अगर इन तीनों आदमियों

का उत्साह बढ़ायें तब तो हमारी सुरक्षा के अन्दर कामयाबी है लेकिन अगर इस बजट से ये तीनों नाराज हों, उनका उत्साह नीचे गया तो हम परिणाम प्राप्त नहीं कर सकेंगे। हाँ, पैसा जरूर खींच कर निकाल लेंगे। पैसा तो आज भी निकाला जा रहा है, कोई इसे जनता के पास छोड़ नहीं रहा है। जनता में जाकर देखेंगे तो पता चलेगा कि जब हम एक डिपार्टमेंट की सेवा लेते हैं तो टैक्स के रूप में पैसा लिया जाता है और जब अधिकारियों की ओर देखते हैं तो रिश्वत की तरह से पैसा लिया जाता है और जब राज्य चलाने वालों की ओर देखते हैं तो चन्दे के रूप में पैसा लिया जाता है। जो बड़े हैं उनके पास चले जाइये तो चन्दे के रूप में निकाल लें, नौकर के पास गये तो रिश्वत के रूप में निकाल लिया और जहाँ सरकार का वास्ता हो तो वहाँ टैक्स के रूप में निकलेगा, जहाँ तक जब से पैसा निकालने का सवाल है उसमें कमी नहीं पड़ती है चाहे टैक्स के रूप में ले लिया जाय, चाहे रिश्वत के रूप में ले लिया जाय या चाहे चन्दे के रूप में ले लिया जाय। इस तरह से हम टैक्स के जरिये से देश को ऊँचा उठावेंगे तो कहीं इतना ऊँचा न उठ जाय कि इसके पैर भी जमीन पर नहीं रहें—केवल पैसे वाली बात कल्पना की तो हो सकती है, व्यवहार की नहीं है और जनता इसको बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकती। इस लिये हमको यह निश्चय करना पड़ेगा कि हम पैसा तो ज्यादा से ज्यादा बसूल करें लेकिन हमारी सेवायें कुशल होनी चाहियें। आज सेवाओं का क्या हाल है? जिस पालिटिशियन को फील्ड में शिकस्त मिल जाती है वह हाईकोर्ट का जज बन जाता है। यह तो आज कल न्याय का हाल बना रखा है। अगर इस तरह के न्यायाधीश बन जायेंगे फिर वे पवित्र रह जायेंगे यह उनके चरित्र की बात है लेकिन हमारी देखरेख क्या होनी चाहिये थी और हम हैं क्या जिम्मेदारी अदा की आज इसका कोई ख्याल नहीं है—

कौन आदमी किस पोलिटिकल पार्टी में कितना एक्टिव काम करता है — वह कहीं भी चला जायेगा, न्याय विभाग में सब जगह चला जायेगा और शासन व्यवस्था में सब जगह चला जायेगा और इस तरह के दृष्टिकोण के आदमी जब जा कर जिम्मेदारी की कुर्सियों पर बैठेंगे तब उनका एक मिनट में आचरण बदल जायेगा यह असम्भव बात है और जब एक मिनट में उनका आचरण नहीं बदलता है तब वह फिर सरकार की वफादारी करेंगे या अपने मन की बात पूरी करेंगे।

जब तक इस बात का हम कोई फैसला नहीं कर लेते, इसकी कोई व्यवस्था नहीं कर देंगे कि हम इस तरह के लोगों को इस तरह सेवाओं में नहीं आने देंगे और न्याय के अन्दर प्रवेश नहीं करने देंगे तब तक इस देश की सरकार के प्रति जनता की सद्भावना पैदा नहीं हो सकेगी और जनता की सद्भावना के बिना हम इस बजट के जोर पर इस देश को ऊँचा उठाना चाहते हैं यह असम्भव बात है, कभी ऊँचा नहीं उठ सकता और यही वजह है कि जनता ज्यादा से ज्यादा सरकार से नाराज है। आज देश के अन्दर लोगों की यह हालत है कि दिमाग तो उनका हमारे खिलाफ है और दिल सरकार के साथ है इसलिये रोते जाते हैं और हमारे पीछे घसीटते आ रहे हैं। हमको यह फैसला करना पड़ेगा कि उनका दिल व दिमाग दोनों हमारे साथ रहना चाहिये और दोनों तभी हमारे साथ रहेंगे जब हमारी कुशल सेवाएं होंगी और न्याय उनको सही मिलेगा। आज सही न्याय नहीं मिलता है। पोलिटिशियन्स लोग अदालतों में जा कर और जज बन कर बैठ जाते हैं। उन आदमियों से यह उम्मीद करना कि वे लोग हमको न्याय देंग यह वाजिब है, लेकिन सरकार को यह सोचना चाहिये कि इस तरह की छट दे दी जाय तो यह सब लोगों के लिये वाजिब नहीं है।

[श्री कुम्भाराम]

इसके लिये एक बात मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि अगर बजट को कामयाब बनाना है तो इसके ऊपर ध्यान देना होगा कि जिस किसान से हम यह उम्मीद करते हैं कि वह खेत खलिहान में रह कर उत्पादन बढ़ाए, दूसरी तरफ हम यह कहते हैं कि वह मिल में जा कर हमारे उत्पादन को बढ़ाए और उसका बचा खुचा कुटुम्ब सिपाही बन कर और सीमा पर जा कर देश की रक्षा करे और फिर उसके ऊपर जब हम दुहरा टैक्स लगाते हैं। एक टैक्स तो यहां से हमारा लगता है, उतने से उसकी जान नहीं छट जाती है, दूसरा टैक्स उसका स्टेट लगाता है। दो दो टैक्स वह बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकेगा। एक तरफ हम कह रहे हैं फौजियों के लिये रियायत देंगे, फौजियों के लिये हम व्यवस्था करेंगे और दूसरी तरफ हमने एक टैक्स लगा दिया यहां पर और एक टैक्स लगा दिया स्टेट में और इस तरह टैक्स बढ़ते जाने से भार इतना बढ़ जायेगा कि वह अदा नहीं कर सकेगा।

मैं एक एकड़ जमीन वाले किसान का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। जिस किसान के पास एक एकड़ जमीन है और जिस पर ५ रु० लगान लगता है उस किसान को इस बजट का और स्टेट के बजट का, दोनों का, बोझा पड़ने वाला है। वह बोझा दुगुने से भी ज्यादा हो जायेगा। जिस आदमी के ऊपर सौ फी सदी से ज्यादा टैक्स पड़ जायेगा उसको हम कैसे कह देंगे कि यह समाजवाद की परिभाषा का हमारा बजट है। हम लड़ना तो चाहते हैं चीन से—मुझे बहुत खुशी हुई वित्त मंत्री महोदय के भाषण का एक शब्द पढ़ कर, कि हमको चुनौती देनी है चाइना को, उस चुनौती के लिये हमको यह बजट बनाना पड़ा है—लेकिन चुनौती के लिये हमको आर्थिक न्याय देना होगा, आर्थिक न्याय के साथ जब हम समाजवाद की घोषणा करके चल रहे हैं

तो हमको गरीब के लिये ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा कि उसके ऊपर कम से कम टैक्स लगे और जिसके पास जितना ज्यादा पैसा है उसके ऊपर उतना ज्यादा टैक्स लगे। हमारी हालत यह हो रही है कि एक किसान के ऊपर इस बजट और स्टेटों के बजट का बोझा १२५ फी सदी के आसपास पड़ने है। क्या फिर उस किसान से यह आशा करें कि उसका जन्मा हुआ फौज में हमारे लिये खून देगा और उसकी गोद से निकला हुआ मजदूर कारखाने में हमारी मदद करेगा? यह तो असम्भव बात है। यह दिमाग में तो आ जायेगी लेकिन इस बात को व्यवहार में उतरना बड़ा कठिन हो जायेगा। इसलिये जरूरी है कि उन पर कम से कम टैक्स लगना चाहिये।

**वित्त मंत्री (श्री मोरारजी देसाई) :**

मैं माननीय सभासद से कह सकता हूँ कि आरमी में सिर्फ किसान के लड़के ही नहीं जा रहे हैं, औरों के लड़के भी जा रहे हैं, सब लोग जा रहे हैं और धन भी दे रहे हैं। इसके साथ उसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

**श्री कुम्भाराम :** मैं अदब के साथ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ६५ फी सदी लोग वे हैं जो खेती और मजदूरी का काम करते हैं और फौज के अन्दर हैं। दूसरे जो जाते हैं वे बड़े बड़े लोगों के लड़के जाते हैं। उसका नतीजा हमने अबकी बार देख लिया सबसे पहले वे ही भागे, सिपाही कोई नहीं भागा ( *Interruptions* ) इसलिये मैं अदब के साथ यह कहना चाहता हूँ ५ फीसदी वालों के भरोसे पर देश की रक्षा हम नहीं कर सकेगे।

**DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated):**  
This is not true.

**श्री कुम्भाराम :** दूसरी बात मैं तेल के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। तेल के बारे में मेरा निवेदन है कि तेल के ऊपर जो टैक्स पड़ रहा है वह हर आम आदमी के ऊपर टैक्स पड़ रहा है।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : कौन से तेल पर ?

श्री कुम्भाराम : मिट्टी के तेल पर मैं कोई दूसरे तेल के पास नहीं जाता हूँ मिट्टी का तेल ही मुश्किल से मिलता है इसलिये मिट्टी के तेल की बात करता हूँ ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : आप तो घी ही खाते होंगे ।

श्री कुम्भाराम : नहीं, मैं घी नहीं खाता, तेल भी नहीं खाता । डाक्टरों ने दोनों के लिये मना कर रखा है । ( Interruption ) मेरा समय नहीं जाना चाहिये, दो चार बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ । मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि अगर हमको चाइनीज का मुकाबला करना है तो नान-एलाइनमेन्ट की हमारी पालिसी जो राजनीति में हमको काम देती है और उसकी वजह से हमको बहुत लाभ मिला है । इसकी भांति आर्थिक क्षेत्र में भी हम मजबूती से चलें । हमने फैसला किया है कि समाजवाद की तरफ जाना है । अगर हमको समाजवाद की तरफ जाना है तो चाइना का मुकाबला करने के लिये इससे अच्छा आधार हमारे पास कोई और नहीं बनने वाला है तो हमको इस निश्चय की घोषणा करके इसको कामयाब बनाना है । जब हम कामयाबी की बात करते हैं तो हमारा फर्स्ट फाइव इयर प्लान देख लीजिएगा, सेक्रेण्ड फाइव इयर प्लान देख लीजिएगा, उनमें पब्लिक सेक्टर तो मिलता है लेकिन कोओपरेटिव्ह सेक्टर नहीं मिलता है । थर्ड फाइव इयर प्लान में आ कर हमने कोओपरेटिव्ह सेक्टर को माना है । हम बाणी से समाजवाद को नहीं ला सकेंगे, हम एक्सन से समाजवाद ला सकेंगे । हमने दो फाइव इयर प्लान्स खत्म कर दिए और कोओपरेटिव्ह सेक्टर को रिकग्नाइज्ड अब किया इस थर्ड प्लान में । अब हम थर्ड फाइव इयर प्लान में कोओपरेटिव्ह को भी एक सेक्टर मानते हैं । लेकिन

फिर भी यहां बोलने वाले सदस्यों से जब हम यह सुनते हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर को बढ़ावा देना चाहिये, तब विचार आता है समाजवाद के अन्दर प्राइवेट सेक्टर को बढ़ाएंगे तब वह समाजवाद आगया या कोई और वाद आयेगा, मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती । बजट का हमारी आर्थिक, राजनैतिक और सामाजिक तीनों प्रतिक्रियाओं पर प्रभाव पड़ने वाला है । इसलिये मैं नम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि समाजवाद अगर लाना है, और चाइना के साथ हमको मुकाबला करना है और चाइना को हम को यह दिखलाना है, क्योंकि चाइना का पीकिंग रेडियो यह कहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार बुर्जुआ सरकार है, नाम समाजवाद का लेती है, काम पूंजीपतियों के करती है और यह बजट गरीबों पर टैक्स लगा कर उसके ऊपर सील मोहर लगा देगा । तो समाजवाद के ढंग का बजट बनाना चाहिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबरअली खान) : वे बदनाम करने के लिये कहते हैं ।

श्री कुम्भाराम : लेकिन यह बजट बदनाम नहीं करता, यह तो सील मोहर लगा देता है, यह तसदीक करता है कि गरीब के ऊपर टैक्स बढ़ रहा है, किसानों के ऊपर टैक्स बढ़ रहा है ।

इसलिये मैं नम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन किसानों की होल्डिंग आप की सीलिंग के अन्दर नहीं आती है, अर्थात् कम जमीन वाले उनके ऊपर टैक्स नहीं लगाना चाहिये । उन पर अनिवार्य बचत का भी भार नहीं पड़ना चाहिये । अनिवार्य बचत के लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब गांव के लोगों पर लगान का ५० फी सदी आपने लगाया और शहर में रहने वाले के ऊपर मकान के किराये का ३ फी सदी लगाया सही नहीं, दोनों के लिए बराबर टैक्स रख देते तो कम से कम यह तो होता कि गांव और शहर में समान टैक्स आपने लगाया

[श्री कुम्भाराम]

है। एक के ऊपर ५० फीसदी का लगा दिया, दूसरे के ऊपर ३ फीसदी का लगा दिया। किसान पहले भी टैक्स देता है, उसके बाद स्टेटें अनाज के ऊपर भी बिक्री कर लगा रही हैं, उसके बाद स्टेट्स और टैक्स लगा रही हैं, उसके बाद यह ५० फीसदी अनिवार्य बचत उसे और अदा करना होगा। इस प्रकार का हमारा बजट टैक्स के हिसाब से सही हो सकता है लेकिन व्यवहार के हिसाब से इस को यह सही नहीं लगता है। इसलिये इस बजट को व्यावहारिक बनाने के लिये अपील करता हूँ और इसके साथ सेवाएं जो हैं उनको कुशल बनाने के लिए आग्रह करता हूँ।

मैं उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में एक बात कह देना चाहता हूँ कि खेती में आज तक हमें कामयाबी क्यों नहीं मिली। उसका एक कारण है, और कई कारणों के साथ यह भी है, कि हमने कानून बहुत बना दिए और पैसे की भी बहुत व्यवस्था कर दी है लेकिन जिस किसान को पैसा मिलना चाहिये उसको सरकार से पैसे नहीं मिलता। पैसा नहीं मिलने वाला वह तरीका बंद कर दीजिए। जिससे पैसा मिलने लगे। हमने नियम यह बना दिया कि जिसके पास ३० एकड़ से कम जमीन होगी उसको ट्रैक्टर के लिए पैसा नहीं देंगे, दूसरे काम के लिये नहीं देंगे और इस देश की हालत यह है कि १० एकड़ से कम के ज्यादा से ज्यादा किसान हैं १० एकड़ से ज्यादा के किसान बहुत कम हैं। १० एकड़ से नीचे के जो किसान हैं वे तो इस राज से कोई फायदा नहीं उठा सकते। जब फायदा नहीं उठा सकते और उत्पादन का सारा बोझा उनके ऊपर निर्भर करता है तो आपका उत्पादन फेल नहीं होगा तो किसका उत्पादन फेल होगा? जब तक हम इन चीजों में व्यावहारिक तौर का रास्ता नहीं निकालते हैं तब तक यह कह देने से कि हमने ट्रैक्टर की व्यवस्था कर दी काम नहीं चलेगा, ट्रैक्टर का लोन लेने के लिये जो नियमों में अधिक जमीन ३०-५० की पाबन्दी लगी है किसान उसका

लाभ नहीं ले पाता। पचास एकड़ वाला तो जमींदार कहलाता है अथवा लैण्ड लांड कहलाता है ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष, महोदय, मैं इन शब्दों के साथ हाउस का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि सेवाओं के अन्दर कुशलता लाना जरूरी है और सेवाओं के अन्दर निष्ठा स्थापित करना बहुत जरूरी है और जिस जनता के भरोसे हम चीन से लड़ना चाहते हैं उसका विश्वास हम को प्राप्त करना जरूरी है जिससे हम को सहयोग मिले इसके बिना कामयाबी नहीं हो सकेगी। समाजवाद की बात कह कर हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर को सपोर्ट ही सपोर्ट करते जायें। इससे समाजवाद नहीं आयेगा और हम चाइना का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकेंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि वे इस बजट में इसी दृष्टि से संशोधन कर दें, टैक्स चाहे उससे दुगुने और तिगुने लगा दें, हम हर्ष से उसका स्वागत करेंगे।

3 P.M.

श्री एम० पी० शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस संकटकाल में माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा को सुदृढ़ करने के लिए, जो एक साहसपूर्ण और संतुलित बजट पेश किया है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। इस सदन के सभी मान्यवर सदस्यों ने इस बात का स्वागत किया है कि हमारा देश पर इस संकट काल में जो युद्ध के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं बल्कि आग बरसाने लगे हैं, उनका मुकाबला करने के लिए हमारे देश को एक साहसपूर्ण कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। इस समय हमारे देश की न केवल एक तत्कालिक आवश्यकता अपने सैनिक बल को बढ़ाने की है, शत्रु का मुकाबला करने की है अपितु आज की वर्तमान भूमिका में अपने देश के जन जीवन को हमेशा के लिए मोड़ देने की है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हमारा देश भूगोल में जहां वाक्या है उसके एक तरफ चीन और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान है। कोई देश अपने

आस पास अलग बलग के देश की सैनिक शक्ति की उपेक्षा करके अपनी स्वाधीनता की सुरक्षा की आशा और कल्पना नहीं कर सकता है । अभी हाल में चीन और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो दुरभि संधि हुई है उससे हमें और भी सजग होने की आवश्यकता है । एक खतरा आज हमारी सीमाओं पर है जहां कि युद्ध के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं और दूसरा खतरा हमारे लिए उन देशों से है जिनकी विचारधारा हम से नहीं मिलती है । एक तरफ तो कम्युनिस्ट साम्यवादी देश है जो अपनी विचारधारा ताकत के बल पर फैलाना चाहता है और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान है जहां डिक्टेटरशिप है और जो अपनी विस्तार की नीति को ताकत के बल पर बढ़ाना चाहता है और इस तरह से दोनों देशों की कुदृष्टि हमारे देश के ऊपर है । एक ने हमारे देश पर स्वाधीनता के एक साल के अन्दर ही छिप कर हमला किया और दूसरे ने हिमालय को पार कर के हमला किया । यदि भूगोल की कृपा से हमारे और चीन के बीच हिमालय नहीं होता तो हमारे लिए यह खतरा बहुत पहले ही उत्पन्न हो गया होता । लेकिन आज हिमालय हमारी रक्षा नहीं कर सकता है और हमें अपनी रक्षा के लिये सदा सजग रहना जरूरी है । आज हमें न केवल अपनी सैन्य शक्ति को वर्तमान संकट से हटाने के लिये बढ़ाना है बल्कि हमें हर प्रकार से अपनी सैनिक शक्ति को हमेशा के लिये बढ़ाना होगा ताकि अगल बगल से कोई भी हमारे ऊपर हमला ही न कर सके अपितु कुदृष्टि भी न डाल सके । कोई देश अपनी स्वाधीनता की रक्षा का भार किसी दूसरे देश के सहारे नहीं छोड़ सकता है और न अमरीका व ब्रिटेन तथा मित्र राष्ट्र हमारी सहायता कर सकते हैं । हमें यह भी आशा नहीं करनी चाहिये कि वहां के नौजवान हमारी स्वाधीनता की रक्षा के लिए अपने जीवन का बलिदान करेंगे और न अन्य देशों के करदाता हमारी रक्षा की शक्ति को बढ़ाने की के लिये पैसा देंगे । यह सारा काम हमें अपने जीवन से

अपने जीवन के बलिदान से, अपने तन, मन, धन को अर्पित करने से करना होगा और इस तरह से अपने देश की स्वाधीनता की रक्षा करनी होगी । यदि हमें अपने देश की स्वाधीनता की रक्षा करनी है तो हमें हर प्रकार से बलिदान करना पड़ेगा और देश में इस प्रकार की आगोहवा पैदा करनी होगी । हमें इस बात का हर्ष है कि माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने इस ओर जो कदम उठाया है उसका इस सदन में चारों ओर से स्वागत हुआ है और मैं भी हृदय से इसका स्वागत करता हूं ।

मैं इस बात को मानता हूं कि देश की सुरक्षा शक्ति को बढ़ाना चाहिये और इस लक्ष्य की प्राप्ति करने के लिए इस बजट में जो पैसा रखा गया है उसका इस देश का जन जन स्वागत करेगा । इस देश के प्रति यह कहना कि यहां की जो गरीब जनता है उसमें त्याग की भावना नहीं है, देश-भक्ति की भावना नहीं है, उनके ऊपर इन करों से बोझ बढ़ेगा, उनका उपहास करना है और मखौल उड़ाना है । मैं समझता हूं कि अगर इस बजट का कोई स्वागत नहीं कर रहा है तो वह धनी वर्ग है और इस दल के यहां पर जो मित्र हैं वे लोग नहीं कर रहे हैं । जो हमारे भाई इस सदन में गरीबों का नाम लेकर, उसकी दुहाई देकर इस बजट का स्वागत नहीं करते हैं, वे वास्तव में गरीबों का नाम नहीं लेते हैं बल्कि पोलिटिकल और राजनीतिक तौर पर सरकार के खिलाफ बात करते हैं ।

**श्री कुम्भा राम :** यह बात गलत कही जा रही है और मैं इसका विरोध करता हूं ।

**श्री एम० पी० शुक्ल :** आपके विचार गलत होंगे लेकिन मेरे विचार ठीक हैं । आप अपनी राय व्यक्त कर चुके हैं और अब मुझे अपनी राय व्यक्त करने दीजिये । तो मैं कह रहा था कि जो सदस्य गरीबों का नाम लेकर इस बजट का विरोध करते हैं वे वास्तव में



[श्री एम० पी० शुक्ल]

गरीबों के नाम पर राजनीतिक फायदा उठाना चाहते हैं। वे मह से तो यह कहते हैं कि हम देश की रक्षा के लिए सहायता और सहयोग देने के लिए तैयार हैं; कुर्बानी देने के लिये तैयार है लेकिन जहां हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के इस महायज्ञ में सारे राष्ट्र के हर वर्ग से छोटी मोटी आहुति देने के लिये आवाहन किया है वहां उस में दुर्भावना पैदा करने के लिए वे इस बजट का विरोध करते हैं। मान्यवर, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आज इस युग में यदि इस बात की आशा करें कि हम अपने देश को बिना कुर्बानी किये तैयार कर सकते हैं, बिना त्याग किये तैयार कर सकते हैं, उसके ऊपर बिना बोझ डाले तैयार कर सकते हैं, देश को आर्थिक दृष्टि से अधिक उपर उठा सकते हैं तो यह दुराशा मात्र है। इसलिए मैं नम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जहां हम यह सुझाव देते हैं कि हमारी सैनिक शक्ति बढ़नी चाहिये, जहां हम यह सुझाव देते हैं कि हमारे देश की सैनिक पोटेन्शियल बढ़नी चाहिये, जहां हम इस बात की आशा करते हैं कि सेना की तादाद बढ़े, सेना का माडर्नाइजेशन हो जाय, सेना में नये शस्त्र अस्त्र हो जाय, हमारे तमाम विग्विजालयों में सैनिक शिक्षा अनिवार्य हो जाय, हमारे देश में, सैनिक सामान बनाने के कारखाने खुल जाय; वहां हमें करों का बोझ उठाने के लिए भी तैयार रहना चाहिये। जब सदन में एमरजेंसी बिल पर बहस हो रही थी, राष्ट्रीय संकट पर बहस हो रही थी, राष्ट्रपति के सम्बोधन पर बहस हो रही थी, उस समय सदन के सभी कक्षों से मांग आई कि हमारे देश की सुरक्षा शक्ति को हर तरह से बढ़ाना चाहिये। लेकिन जब माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी उस सुरक्षा को दृढ़ करने के लिए बजट रखते हैं तब भी किसी कोने से उसका स्वागत न होकर उसकी आलोचना होती है तो यह आश्चर्य की बात है। मैं ऐसे तत्वों की देशभक्ति पर संशय करूं तो मान्यवर मैं आप से क्षमा चाहूंगा।

मान्यवर, जहां तक बजट का आर्थिक पहलू है उस पर हमारे बहुत से मित्रों ने अपनी राय प्रकट की है और मैं उस पर इस सदन का और आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूं। मैं केवल इस बात पर जोर देना चाहता हूं कि हमारे इस संकट के समय में यदि किसी तरह का बोझ हम उठाने के लिए तैयार नहीं होंगे तो हम इस संकट का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं। इतना ही नहीं मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हम को इस बात का अहसास होना चाहिये कि चीन और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच अब हिमालय की दीवार नहीं रही, चीन और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच में अब हमेशा के लिये सैन्य शक्ति की दीवार खड़ी करनी होगी तथा देश में एक दृढ़ एकता की दीवार खड़ी करनी होगी। हमें अपने देश की सैन्य शक्ति को बढ़ाना होगा जिस तरह से संसार के महान शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र बढ़ा रहे हैं। मैं कहता हूं कि अमराका और रूस जिस तरह से अपनी सैनिक शक्ति बढ़ा रहे हैं, उसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान जो इतना बड़ा देश है अपनी सैनिक शक्ति की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकता है। जनता इस पक्ष में है कि हम भूखे रह सकते हैं, नंगे रह सकते हैं, वे पड़े रह सकते हैं, बीमार रह सकते हैं लेकिन अपने देश को कंगाल रहते हुए भागुलाम देखना नहीं चाहते हैं। जनता आज हर कुर्बानी के लिये तैयार है, देश तैयार है लेकिन उसमें विश्वास पैदा करने की जरूरत है। लेकिन फिर भी देश की सुरक्षा के लिये जो कदम उठाये गये हैं उसके पाछे देश की जनता है, देश की गरिब जनता है, देश का अमीर जत्तन है जरूर कम होगा।

मान्यवर, मैं एक बात सोने के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं। सोने के नियम के संबंध में बहुत बिबाद हुआ है और उसके संबंध में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश को ६० फासदा आदमों ऐसे हैं जिनके

वहां सोना नहीं होगा, सोने वाले तो केवल १० फाँसदे हैं। सोने का हाथ तोबा तो धनीवर्ग के लोग कर रहे हैं क्योंकि वहां सोना रखने वाले हैं। जहां तक मैं समझता हूं हमारे सदन को नारा सदस्याएं इस नियम का समर्थन कर रही हैं और देश की जनता भी समर्थन कर रही है। देश की सुरक्षा के लिये सोने के कंगन आवश्यक हैं। देश में इस समय सोने की चोरी का जो आयात चल रहा है उसको रोकने के लिए माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो कदम उठाये हैं वे सराहनीय हैं और स्वागत करने योग्य हैं। ३

मान्यवर, मैं कुछ शब्द अपने देश के सूचना तथा प्रकाशन विभाग और दूसरा जो हमारा वैदेशिक विभाग है उसके संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं। मैं समझता हूं इस राष्ट्रीय संकट के समय में विदेशों में जो हमारे राजदूतावास हैं उनको जिस तरह का कार्य करना चाहिये था वैसा उन्होंने नहीं किया। हम संसार के अन्य देशों में अपने केंस को उत्तम अर्च्छा तरह से नहीं रख सके जैसा हमें रखना चाहिये था। मेरा इस संबंध में यह सुझाव है कि इस समय राजदूतावासों में सिविल सर्विस के आदमियों को रखने का जो सुझाव है वह मेरी समझ में उचित और अच्छा नहीं है। इस दिशा में सरकार को कदम बढ़ाना चाहिये और राजदूतावासों में गैरसरकारी राजनैतिक तत्वों को स्थान दिया जाना चाहिये ताकि वे अन्य देशों में अपनी देश की बात को अच्छा तरह से रख सकें। इस तरह से रख सकें जिस तरह से रखने की आवश्यकता है। इस तरह से यह भी निश्चित सिद्ध हुआ है कि हमारे सूचना और प्रकाशन विभाग ने इस राष्ट्रीय संकट के समय जिस तरह का कार्य करना चाहिये था उस तरह का कार्य नहीं किया। इसने मुकाबले में चूना नहीं कही अधिक किया और हम उसका मुकाबला नहीं कर सके। सैनिक मुकाबला

करने के लिये हम तैयार न थे, मुमकिन है प्रकाशन विभाग भी प्रचार करने के लिये तैयार न रहा हो, मुमकिन है वैदेशिक मंत्रालय भी इस प्रकार तैयार न रहा हो। लेकिन जिस प्रकार हम सैनिक बल से सीमा के प्रान्तों में मुकाबला करने के लिये तैयार कर रहे हैं, उसी प्रकार विदेशों में हमारे वैदेशिक दूतावासों द्वारा भिन्न भिन्न देशों के जनमत को अपने अनुकूल करने का प्रयास करना होगा और उसके लिये तरह तरह के प्रचार साधनों का योग करना होगा।

मान्यवर, दो शब्द में अनिवार्य बचत योजना के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं। जहां तक अनिवार्य बचत योजना का प्रश्न मैं आम तौर से उसका स्वागत करता हूं। लेकिन मैं भी यह समझता हूं जैसा कि अभी एक मित्र ने माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट कराया कि शहरी आय पर १५०० रुपये पर ३ फाँसदी बचत योजना है लगाया जा रहा है और देहाती आय पर जो चार आने का लगान देने वाले होंगे उनको दो आना देना पड़ेगा। उत्तर प्रदेश में एक कम्पलसरी लैव २५ फाँसदी की लगाई गई है। एक किसान २५ फाँसदी वहां देगा और ५० फाँसदी यहां बचत योजना में देगा जो कि उसके लिए सम्भव नहीं है और न वह इस बचत के बोझ को उठा सोंगा। मैं समझता हूं कि माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी इस पर पुनर्विचार करेंगे और मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जितनी अन-इकॉनॉमिक होल्डिंग्स हैं उन पर इस कर को मुक्त करने के प्रस्ताव पर विचार करेंगे। जहां तक कि मिट्टी के तेल, साबुन, लिखने का कागज इत्यादि पर ड्यूटी का प्रश्न है, मैं समझता हूं कि इसका बोझा गरीबों पर ज्यादा पड़ेगा और विशेषकर गांव वालों पर। गांवों में जहां बिजली नहीं है लोग मिट्टी के तेल को ईंधन जलाने के काम में नहीं लाते हैं बल्कि वे उसको रोशनी

[श्री एम० पी० शुक्ल]

के काम में लाते हैं और विशेषकर उनके बच्चे उससे पढ़ते हैं। यदि मिट्टा के तेल पर और कर लगा दिया गया तो यूँ ही शिक्षा की कमी है। . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) :  
अभी तो आप गरीबों के त्याग का बात कह रहे और अब आप इसका विरोध करने लगे।

श्री एम० पी० शुक्ल : मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि त्याग का बात के साथ ही इसका बोझा यदि कुछ कम हो जाय तो और भी अच्छा होगा। मैं इसका बिल्कुल विरोध नहीं करता हूँ लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि कुछ ग्रंथों में इस बोझ को कम करने की आवश्यकता है जिसे कहते हैं कि धारे धारे उनको ऊँचे ले जाना और इतना बोझ डालना कि वे संभाल सकें। इतना ही मेरा निवेदन है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस वित्त बजट का स्वागत करता हूँ और वित्त मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूँ।

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I offer my felicitation to the hon. Minister for the display of rare political courage and for the most ardent devotion to duty, a duty which of course is a very unpleasant one. Indeed, his task has been very much increased in the context of the present emergency. The additional revenue that he proposes to have is nearly Rs. 275 crores which is equivalent to the total tax revenue of the last six years. This has been due mainly to the increase in defence expenditure which has been stepped up from 2.5

per cent. to 6 per cent. of the national income. In this context, we have also got to bear in mind that the entire defence expenditure cannot be borne and should not be borne by the present generation. This is what an eminent economist and banker of our country has said. In fact, the present tax measures provide more resources for the public sector, and particularly, the economy of the private sector will be greatly disturbed because of this. We have already accepted mixed economy as an integral part of our fiscal policy and I venture to suggest that the success of the Plan can be there only when all the sectors of the economy are fully improved. To illustrate my point, let me say this. If we propose to have a banyan tree, we have got to see that not only the seed that is planted is sound but also the growth of the tree is encouraged in such a way and is looked after in such a way that the whole tree bears a pleasant look and may prove useful for the purpose for which it has been planted. If any part of that tree is dry, then neither the tree will look nice nor will the purpose of planting it be served. I have no intention of deriding the public sector in any way or vouchsafing the private sector but I would very humbly suggest, Sir, that a return of Rs. 1.45 crores on an investment of nearly Rs. 800 crores in the public sector is something beyond the comprehension of anybody. It has been suggested that the public sector undertakings are mainly for public utility purposes. I venture to ask, what is the function of the private sector industries? I do not say that defence industries or other such basic industries, which are most essential and need to be started by the State, should in any way be affected but what is the necessity for the State sector to enter the field of commodities which are already being safely and efficiently manufactured by the private sector? They both produce commodities and I am sure nobody will say that the quality of goods produced by one sector is in any way inferior to that of the other. The only

complaint which occasionally is heard is that in times of scarcity the products of the private sector are not sometimes available to the public at fair prices. If, therefore, production is given to that sector which has been considered to be more efficient and distribution taken care of wherever absolutely necessary, I think this will serve the purpose. After all, we cannot forget that action in time is the soul of efficiency and it can very safely be accepted that if the agencies that are to manage industries are small rather than vast, it would help. In regard to defence, a sum of Rs. 400 crores has been recommended. This is a very welcome step. In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in the last ten years a sum of nearly Rs. 3600 crores has been spent on defence and a look at the Review will show that only Rs. 600 crores have been spent on capital items while the remaining Rs. 3,000 crores have been spent on revenue account. If, out of a total of Rs. 3600 crores, only Rs. 600 crores could be spent on capital expenditure, how can there ever be a strong defence base? Well, this added sum of Rs. 400 crores might be utilised for defence and I am sure everyone joins the wishes of the Finance Minister in mobilising all the internal resources for fighting the Chinese menace or, God forbid, any other menace that we might have to face at any time. I would, however, humbly suggest that this thing has got to be looked into again, the question of having a strong industrial-defence base. Unless we have defence industries, a strong defence base cannot be created. We cannot have industries unless we have foreign exchange. We cannot import them because this provision of Rs. 400 crores is only a provision of rupee resources. Our foreign exchange position is so well-known to everyone and needs no repetition here. In the same connection, Sir, I would like to say a word about civil expenditure. From the Economic Survey that has been circulated to us, we find that there has been an

increase of nearly Rs. 270 crores in the money under circulation. I would like to submit, Sir, that our non-development expenditure or non-productive expenditure should not exceed in any year the currency in circulation in that year because unless and until we produce from the investment that we make, our self-generating economy principle which has been an accepted feature all over the world, will be defeated. I would here like to give the example of Great Britain during the Second World War. A Parliamentary Committee was set up—call it a Select Committee or by whatever name you would like to call it—to supervise the defence expenditure that was actually incurred. I have no intention of suggesting that there should be more information given to the House than what is actually necessary. In fact, I feel many a time, in and out of Parliament, very much more information is revealed than ought to be done. A certain amount of check and planning by Parliament through a committee consisting of persons whose integrity and sincerity is above board will, I think, help a lot in seeing that the expenditure, that is incurred is well regulated.

Coming to the question of tax proposals, I will say that the import duties that have been imposed are bound to help the indigenous manufacture of different commodities but here again, Sir, there are doubts in my mind as to how best it can be done, how far the Government will be able to mobilise its machinery for the quick granting of industrial licences and how far the Government will be able to provide the foreign exchange necessary for putting up all the plants so that indigenous manufacture might be speeded up. Without those prerequisites even these tax proposals and import duties are bound to fail in achieving its purpose. The indirect levies no doubt do always tend to increase inflationary tendencies because of prices rising. We cannot forget the fact that we have got a large number

of taxes, direct and indirect and the result of that will be that cost will increase and if the cost increases, Sir, it is a well-known fact that demand will decrease; it will dampen demand and if demand decreases, it is bound to affect production. Production will go down and if production goes down, it will mean that the cost of production will again increase. The ultimate result is that such a vicious circle might be created and it may be still more difficult to get out of it. And I am afraid exports also cannot get out of that vicious circles howsoever much we may wish.

Coming to the Super Profits-tax a lot has been said by the previous speakers but if I read out from an editorial of the 'Economic Times', I think that will explain the whole position. It says:

"The real danger of Super Profits-tax in the form in which it has been sponsored is that may reward inefficiency and extravagance at the cost of those units which enforce rigorous austerity in overheads and are themselves able to plough back larger amounts and provide a reasonable and steady return on their capital."

The 'Economic Times' had made a study of 51 giant companies in this country and they have come to the conclusion that nearly 70 to 80 per cent. of such giant corporate units will come under the purview of this new levy. In fact, they may be affected to the extent of nearly 75 to 80 per cent. Now, not only that, but the character of the corporate sector has been equated with that of individuals for purposes of taxation. Even in the case of individuals progressive taxations have been imposed which will have a dampening effect on the minds of people and the will to work and earn might also go down. What will be the effect of that if all the individuals and the corporate sector and other parts of the industrial economy of the country suffer in this way? We cannot forget the fact that the vast majority of the shareholders are middle class people

and their number run into millions. If the corporate sector is affected, then it will be a great distress on them. The bank rate is already 9 to 10 per cent. and if this six per cent. prescription as normal profit after taxation is maintained, it will be very low and the result will be a lag in industrial production and probably the Finance Minister has visualised this to some extent as the provision for the Industrial Finance Corporation has been reduced from Rs. 6 crores to Rs. 4 crores in this particular year. I do hope that these factors will be taken into consideration by our hon. Finance Minister whose statesmanship and outlook for the future is very great. I will only end on an optimistic note, as Dr. Radhakrishnan has said in his Republic Day message, that no private or public interest should be denied a fair treatment in the national welfare.

Thank you.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (Punjab): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister for the very difficult task which he has performed. After listening to the debate all these four days in this House one is driven to the conclusion that everybody realises that this Budget was inevitable and everybody has a word of praise for the manner in which the Budget has been drafted. But after saying so every Member tries to criticise one proposal or the other without trying to give another alternate Budget which could meet the situation. Now, this Budget has been before the country for almost a week and if I may say so, no responsible economist or a responsible paper has dared to present an alternate Budget and that is by itself a proof that the Finance Minister while presenting this Budget has taken care to give a Budget which distributes the burden evenly and equally. Each one of us realises that there was no scope for any individual in the country to escape the rigours of the Budget and that is so then my submission to the House is that it is a highly even Budget. The richest

person has not escaped and obviously even the poorest could not escape from this Budget.

Now, the only two possible things which have been stated by more than one Member are the imposition of salt-tax and the scrapping of prohibition. So far as prohibition is concerned, may I submit to the House that we all know that in our country drinking liquor is socially taboo. We do not want to take liquor in our houses; we do not want to take liquor in public. Half the population, I mean the ladies, have clear abhorrence for this habit. But all the same it is suggested that this policy should be given up. My submission is that there is some confused thinking about it. There are certain matters to which we are wedded; there are certain matters over which we can take legitimate pride and our nation has always been known to be a big nation because of its moral values. Therefore, my submission to those who, in the heat of the moment, try to suggest that prohibition should be thrown out is, that they forget that it is one of the basic policies to which we are wedded.

So far as the suggestion to impose salt-tax is concerned, my submission would be that again this is a matter which would touch even the poorest person. Once you start in that direction and it begins to yield revenue, you will come and say that this tax should be taken away since it touches the poorest in the country. Therefore, my submission in this case is that opinions can differ, and when a person has to perform such a difficult task as our Finance Minister has to do there will always be scope for difference of opinion. Once the objective is clear to us and that objective is that we have to fight external aggression and we have to strengthen our economic base, well there could possibly be no other way except to look forward for all the resources which he could legitimately

think of. Now, is it not a credit to him that while presenting this Budget the deficit financing has been kept to the lowest limit? If because of fear of external aggression we resort to a greater amount of deficit financing, well, the country would not be looked upon as a solvent country by others and our credit-worthiness in the international market will go down but by this Budget we have demonstrated to the world that we want to stand on our own legs, that we want to gird up our loins and that each one of us in our own humble way would contribute for the defence of the country and for the upliftment of the people.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*]

Now, there is one matter on which I would like to make a submission and that concerns primarily the State from which I come, that is, the State of Punjab. Now, the sales-tax is a State subject and in the six adjoining States of Punjab, Rajasthan, U.P., Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir and Delhi, we do not have a uniform rate of sales-tax and the result is that the trade gets diverted from one State to another State where the incidence of taxation is less and when that happens the State that is affected feels and in its anxiety not to allow this diversion of the trade it also tries to lower its taxes although it is clear that its taxation was not on the high side. I will give only two examples. In the matter of petrol in Delhi, the sales-tax is only 2 nP per litre whereas in Punjab it is 7 nP. Now, what is happening is that petrol pumps are growing round about Delhi on the border of Punjab and this trade gets diverted. The only way by which we can meet the situation is to consider reduction of the sales-tax in Punjab. Similarly, in regard to the dry fruit trade which was thriving very much in Amritsar, there the tax was 5 per cent. and in Delhi it was only one

[Shri J. N. Kaushal]  
 per cent. The result was the entire trade was being diverted to Delhi and then Punjab had necessarily to reduce the tax. Now, this is an unhealthy competition between States and the only way in which there can be a uniform sales-tax is that the six States under a common directive from the Centre should think of having a uniform rate of taxation, as we have all over the country on luxury goods. The other matter which is connected with this is where probably an additional excise duty was imposed by the Centre a few years back in order to try the experiment to see whether they should collect excise duty and abolish sales-tax. It was done on three commodities. It was done with a view to seeing that ultimately sales-tax was taken away from the States, but the collections would be shared between the States and the Centre. May I draw the attention of the House to the fact that this experiment has succeeded? Now, can we not think of abolishing the sales-tax on other important commodities and put an additional excise duty which has three very distinct advantages? One is, it is very easy to collect. The second is, there is very little chance of evasion. And the third is, the trade feels very happy that they have only to pay the tax at the source. My submission is that we can obviate our difficulties in the sense that we will not have to vie with our neighbouring States in order to lower the incidence of taxation.

The other matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the House and about which Punjab takes legitimate pride is that our Chief Minister has tried to reduce his Cabinet to the minimum limit. My only submission is that this step has been taken, as has been recognised all over, with a view to economising. I would only say that nobody can deny that in whatever sectors we can economise we should try to economise and whenever any Chief Minister

thinks that he can carry such a big burden with a smaller Cabinet, he should reduce it. But then to say that it should be followed by everybody, all depends on each State, although we have tried to set an example which can be copied by other States also.

Now, I wish to say only a few words with regard to the gold policy and the compulsory savings scheme. My own reaction is that these are two very bold steps which have been taken by the Finance Minister. So far as the gold policy is concerned, I would say that this policy is bound to succeed, provided we have the co-operation of the people. Now, those people who criticise this policy think the policy is not going to succeed because people are not going to co-operate otherwise. Whenever bold steps are taken, the co-operation of the public is very much needed and if that co-operation is coming forth, then it will be a definite step in the direction of reducing the drain on our foreign exchange. Also, it would be a step in breaking the obnoxious custom of trying to invest in gold which is a dead investment. Probably this custom was brought into existence at a time when there were no banks and there were no other means to invest our savings in private ventures. In any case at this particular moment we can help the State and get away from the custom which is almost galling to every parent who wants to marry his daughter. He has to go in for gold. My submission to the House is that the Finance Minister deserves the heartiest congratulations of the country.

So far as the compulsory savings scheme is concerned, I would say it is not taxation at all. It is a matter where the Government of India wants the habit of saving to be inculcated and the Government wants to return the money after some time. I do not know how anybody can find fault with this part of the scheme. Then people try to say that this man will

not be in a position to save and that man will not be able to save. It is, I should say, a queer argument. You should not tax me. You should not also ask me to save compulsorily. Now, I say when we sit down as responsible legislators, we put before us a certain objective and then we go in for finding various resources. We are all agreed that it is good. But then I should say with great respect that some of the frustrated people in the name of one thing or another try to criticise one part of the proposal or other. I would with great respect say that we are trying to discharge a very onerous duty which falls on Parliament, namely, to strengthen the defences of the country as well as to augment the industrial base.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very thankful for the appreciation of the magnitude and the nature of the task that I had to perform while presenting the Budget this year, which I received from almost all the hon. Members who took part in this debate. I, however, found two or three very jarring notes, two from behind my back, which was almost stabbing the Government in the back, and one from the front. Before I go further into this matter I should like to refer to the two speeches which were made from behind my back, especially the first one from my hon. friend, Rajkumariji, whom I have always respected as an elder sister. And I do not in any way reduce my respect for her, even though she has deeply injured the Party to which she belongs. She took her stand on the necessity of giving expression to truth, however inconvenient it may be. I am one of those persons who do not want truth to be hidden at any time, whatever may be the consequences. I also, therefore, want humbly to speak the truth at the cost of being charged by her as being unkind. Truth when it gets coloured by bitterness does not

remain truth and this is what I saw. Though the voice was sweet, it was full of bitter representation of whatever has been done by Government so far. When I was hearing it, I was reminded of "Mother India". There are many truths in that book, but they gave a picture which was false. And Mahatma Gandhi adequately described the character of that book. I do not want to repeat it. But may I say in truth, if my elder sister really believes that we have failed entirely according to her and that we are dragging the country to ruin, should she not truthfully consider her position and dissociate herself from those who are responsible for these matters? Why should she continue to profit by that association? I do not know. This is the question which I would like to put to her. I would not like to say anything more than that.

Then there was another Member from Rajasthan who seemed to think that he alone understood what socialism meant. Madam, many people arrogate to themselves progressive views. He is probably one of them, but I would request him not to be arrogant about himself because of the position he has reached only because of his association with the Congress, a Congress which is not made by him but made by many others who have given the Congress the position, which has given the position to him. Yet he tries to depict a picture which seems to be cutting at the very root of the Congress by which he is benefiting. May I request him through you, Madam, to consider this matter and see if he is not being disloyal in this matter to an organisation to which he belongs and on which rest his position and also his status in life and in public life? I do not think I need go further than that into these criticisms because I do not want to imitate any bitter tone or any other method of refuting charges or delineations of pictures which have an absolutely dis-



[Shri orarji R. Desai.]  
 tortured vision. If there were some things where I could explain and could have a hope of persuading them to believe those things, I would have certainly made an attempt, but I think it would be futile for me to do that.

Before I go further, I should like to mention another matter about which I do not want to go into details because there is going to be a debate in this hon. House on that question, and that is the question of the gold control policy. It has been criticised by some hon. Members. I had spoken at length on this subject in the other House only yesterday evening, and there is going to be a debate in this hon. House on the same subject. It is better that I reserve my remarks or any justification that I want to put before the hon. Members for their consideration for that occasion.

I would certainly, Madam, revert to what I said in the beginning that I am very thankful to all the hon. Members who have been very kind in appreciating the nature and the magnitude of the task which has been facing me, not merely me, but it has been facing the whole nation, the task of defending this country at a time of great stress and peril and the task of continuing its development even more necessarily if this defence is to be more adequately met. I am very happy to find that there is almost a near unanimity in this matter. People may differ as regards the approaches to be made to the problem. On that I can have no quarrel. That is a matter of assessment and ultimately a matter of decision by Government as to what it has to do. But when all is said and done, if we are all agreed that we have got to meet this task, then I would certainly request and urge upon my hon. friends in this House not merely to satisfy themselves with an appreciation of the task but to join with me and the Government in conveying this to the people of this country so that they co-operate

fully in this task of mobilisation of resources after the controversy is finished and the Budget becomes law. It becomes the task of every patriotic citizen of this country to see that he does nothing to deflect from this duty of mobilisation of resources and that he does not leave the task only to the Finance Minister or his colleagues but that he helps in this task by carrying this message to all the people whom he can approach and whom he can reach. If this is not done, I would not be wrong in saying that we would have failed in our duty to the motherland whatever patriotism we may claim otherwise. After all what is patriotism? We all claim patriotism. But if at a time of danger to the country, when it has got to be defended to the best of our capacity, the country is not defended properly and successfully and if it is captured or if it is defeated, then nobody is going to benefit by it or survive from it, everybody becomes a slave. Defence certainly has got to be looked after by Government with all its capacity, and the strength of the Government is the strength of the people, the strength which the people give to it, and all those hon. Members who form the Government are not merely the Ministers; all the Members of both Houses who in themselves have the supreme power certainly are responsible for this task, and they have got to see that, whatever may be the differences otherwise, in this matter at any rate there is full mobilisation of the resources. Once that is decided upon, the differences should not come into play. This is the plea that I would make at this juncture. As there is no difference of opinion as regards the nature and the magnitude of the task and the responsibility for defending the honour and integrity of the nation, I need not say anything further on this matter. But then we have got to see what we have got to do as regards mobilising the resources.

I was happy to find that my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who is generally very condemnatory of what-

ever is being done by this side of the House was not so condemnatory this time of the Budget. He could not of course escape his nature and his deliberate antipathy to everybody else except his Party. He had to say some things which were unkind, and he had to criticise. That is how I took his speech. But I am happy that he also had a sense of proportion which he generally loses.

At the outset, I should like to refer to the common criticism that if we save our expenditure, we will be able to meet the demands of further resources more by the saving alone and perhaps the taxes may not be very necessary. I accept the necessity of a constant vigilance in this matter; I also accept the honesty and sincerity of every one who presses for economy in expenditure. But sincerity and honesty would be more effective if there is a sense of proportion about what is said, if note is taken of the actualities of the situation, if an appreciation is made of what is being done and if note is taken of what is inherent in human imperfections and of what cannot be avoided. If my Budget speech had been carefully read, then they would have seen that I had mentioned these things in my own speech. I had said:

"There cannot be any question that economy and efficiency in public expenditure are the very heart of the matter in mobilizing resources. We have taken a number of steps at the Centre to effect economies in several directions. But essentially, the task of achieving the utmost economy in public expenditure is not merely a question of cutting or reducing some items of expenditure or of laying down this or that rule of procedure. What we need is more performance with less expenditure of resources in every sphere of public activity; and what such economy through efficiency requires is an attitude of mind

—a spirit of vigilance and responsibility—on the part of all those who are entrusted with the expenditure of the people's money, be they engineers, army officers, contractors, workers, civil servants or indeed Ministers. Here again, the task is one which is for all of us to perform incessantly and not just that which anyone of us can lay down once and for all."

When I said this, I did not merely say it in order to make an impression. *We had already taken steps in various directions to see that we make economies.* But all those who are asking for economies, have they ever turned the light inwards? Have they ever asked themselves, when they say that this Government does not feel any emergency, that nobody thinks that there is any emergency, that nobody tries to save anything? Can I ask each one of them if they have reduced their expenditure even by one naya Paisa on any single item? If they have done so, they would have been in a better position to realise what the Government has been doing. I doubt if this has been done. And therefore I would request that that is how this question ought to be considered. What we have done, I should certainly like to put before the hon. House so that they may know and they can make further suggestions in this matter, if anything requires to be done. I would welcome and be grateful for whatever particular suggestions made in this matter. But merely a vague castigation of all the departments and Ministries of the Government in the matter of expenditure will not only not be fruitful but it will ultimately result in making these responsible for it more and more indifferent, because that is what happens. When a person is criticised in season and out of season, I do not think ordinary human nature is so construed that it takes every lashing, howsoever unjustified it may be, as if it is meant only for its improvement. And how many of those who do this have taken this up themselves? That is why I am putt-

<sup>1</sup> [Shri Morarji R. Desai.]  
ing this for their benefit. At a time of crisis when we all have to be together, when all of us talk so much of unity, is it not necessary that we 'should create an atmosphere even in this matter where all that we say to each other will be taken more as an aid to one's improvement rather than a source of criticism and castigation? And that is the spirit in which I would request my hon. friends to tell me, to find fault with me and to censure me. If that is done, I shall be very grateful to them.

At the time of framing the Budget Estimates, we issued instructions to all Ministries to readjust their activities which were not related to the Plan or to defence programmes. We also imposed certain percentage cuts in the standing budgets on items like travelling expenditure, contingencies and provision for vacant posts. Several periodical publications and reports are being discontinued. Expenditure on routine maintenance of buildings is being curtailed. New building activity is being scrutinised more closely. Where new activities have to be undertaken on account of the emergency, every attempt is made to find money for it from the existing provisions and staff. The full effect of several of these measures will be realised only in course of time but even as an immediate result, the net effect of these measures and the postponement or dropping of certain less essential activities is a reduction of about Rs. 35 crores to Rs. 40 crores in the Budget Estimates for 1963-64. I am sure, Sir, that this is not an anaemic effort in this direction. But we are not stopping there. Economy is, however, a continuous affair. Instructions have been issued for exercising vigilance in various aspects of Government expenditure, covering almost every phase of Government activity including staff, overtime allowance, paper, modes of travel, passage concessions, publications, meetings, inaugural functions and others,

and I am sure I will have the co-operation of all in this task of gearing our administration to meet the national emergency. It would be difficult at this stage to estimate the monetary effect of these measures in concrete terms. A special sub-committee is at present engaged in making a quick review of the staff requirements of the Ministries and revised staff strengths will be fixed in the course of the next few weeks. The effect of this effort will not only be watched but will be backed by such measures at Government level as may be necessary. The surplus personnel will be diverted to other activities through a pool under the Ministry of Home Affairs.

The analysis of revenue expenditure and that on administrative services given in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Budget itself shows that revenue expenditure excluding that on debt and defence services and extraordinary items which have necessarily to be kept apart in any such analysis, has increased by only Rs. 16 crores in 1963-64 as compared to the 1962-63 Budget. This is not appreciable, considering that revenue expenditure also includes development items. It has to be seen against the background of the annual increase in the previous years which was of the order of Rs. 50 crores to 4 p.m. Rs. 60 crores. Expenditure on Administrative Services has shown an increase in 1963-64 of Rs. 18 crores over the previous year's Budget, but this is almost entirely due to the increase of Rs. 14 crores under the head "Police" required for strengthening the police forces in the border areas—this is very essential—and an increase of over Rs. 2 crores in the assistance to Sikkim and Bhutan under the head "External Affairs". The increases under other heads are negligible, amounting only to Rs. 2 crores. This ought to convince my hon. friends how serious we are in making our attempts for cur-

tailoring expenditure, and substantial results have already been achieved. These efforts will be continued unslackened. May I say that I have no quarrel in this matter about all the complaints made? I shall welcome them continuously because it is necessary to do so in order that we are always vigilant in this matter. In the rush of work and pressure of work one sometimes loses sight; therefore, if we are reminded about it all the time, we shall be more vigilant and we shall be more effective. But as I said earlier may I request that this be said more kindly and with some appreciation of the difficulties and not in a castigating manner? I would also say that there are some suggestions which are made, which are only useful perhaps if fads are to be carried out but not if realities are to be seen. It is not possible for me to attend to them. One of the suggestions for curtailing the expenditure, made to me by several people, was that Community Development Projects should be scuttled so that many crores of rupees are saved. I do not know whether they have any idea of what they are suggesting. But suggestions like this will not be at all useful in curtailing expenditure, which is the common desire of all of us.

Then we have been told that the national income has not increased as it should have increased, and it is rather low. It is true that the national income has not increased as we had planned to increase it. But why is it so? That also has got to be seen. It is certainly true that the statistics that are there, they do not show that the income has increased by more than 2.2 in the first year of the Plan. But these statistics do not fully take into account the progress made in the small-scale industries, or the hand-trade or the commerce and transport activities. They take very inadequate notice of these things, because they have not yet developed the capacity and cleverness to assess these things. But when one goes round the country

and sees the progress made, the statistics do not come up to the progress made. I say this not in order to be complacent, not in order to say that we have made progress and that it cannot be improved. I have no doubts that it has to be improved, it has to be doubled, and even when it has been doubled, it has to be doubled after that. We cannot go on resting on our oars until we have banished poverty completely from this country and until we have given to every citizen of this country a square deal in the sense that he has full employment, that he has full food—and nourishing food—all clothes, full education for his children, full security for his life, and health and other amenities in abundance. All this we have got to give to them. But this cannot be done in a day or even in ten years or fifteen years.

My hon. friend, Shri Mohan Lal Saksena, who has experience also of administration, well, he seems to think that only savings on expenditure will bring in all this, and he recounted some of his experiences. I do not want to recount some of the experiences which I had with him in the Congress Committee, when he suggested a scheme, when we had to burn all the receipts that we had to print as a result of his scheme. But this all we have got to do. I do not find fault with him. He was fired with the best motives.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA: (Nominated): May I point out that I did not take any responsibility? I only made a suggestion and I was not entrusted with nor interested in any responsibility. I wanted that the collections should be made from ordinary people on the basis of one rupee tickets, but the hon. Minister and others were interested in collecting big sums from big money. And therefore I am not to blame. I was neither the secretary, nor was I in the Committee, and I had nothing to do with it

**SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:** I am only saying that even the best of intentions sometimes miscarry. But when that happens, why put the blame only on everybody else? I do not want to go further. I can prove that his responsibility was great in this matter, but I do not want to enter into an argument about it.

**SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA:** I would like him to prove; it was not mine; I was never . . .

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I think the Finance Minister should carry on.

**SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:** Well, I will carry on whatever he might say. So there is no difficulty about that. But we have got to be more careful in these matters.

In the matter of increasing our national income, we have got to look to both the sectors, agricultural production and industrial growth. Industrial production has increased, but it did not increase up to expectation. There were some reasons for it. We were in short supply in cotton in this year. We were in short supply in jute; then we were in short supply in oil-seeds. Some of these things come in. And the major industries, that is industries which are older industries, when they show a shortfall, the statistics suffer. But the other industries have come up much faster; they are going ahead and yet no notice is taken of that. And if you take an average, many times the average becomes very misleading. If an average is taken of a man of hundred years and a child of one year, then the average becomes fifty. But it does not represent either of them. Therefore, sometimes the law of averages can be very misleading. Statistics are very vital, very necessary. We are trying to perfect also the machinery of statistics in this country. But as in everything we are very young even in that.

We have some very clever people experienced in this matter; we are very fortunate in that, but even they cannot claim that they can go beyond the necessity of having more and more experience, and I hope they will be more humble as a result of these faults that we find. But many a time these are the statistics which Government itself puts forward, because it has to. Government has nothing to hide. No other agency can have the statistics and therefore Government puts up the statistics, and Government wants to be honest about it. But let there not be a wrong reading of these statistics. Let there be a sense of proportion applied to this and let there be commonsense in judging these matters, and not merely brilliance.

In the matter of agriculture it is true that we have not made as fast progress as we should have made in the last two years. But that cannot be said of the previous years. Even there we may not have made as fast a progress as everybody imagined. But we had banked on, or we had planned for a production of 80 million tons of foodgrains at the end of the Second Plan. And how much did we produce at the end of the Second Plan? We produced 79.7 million tons of foodgrains at the end of the Second Plan. Did we not reach our target? But nobody wants to remember that. Everybody wants to belittle everything. What happened after that? In the very first year of the present Plan we produced one million tons less of foodgrains.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** In the first two years.

**SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:** In the first year; in the second year we come very nearly to the other production, that is, we are not less but we are equal to that production. These variations in production are due to the vagaries of the seasons, and vagaries of the seasons are not in the hands of Ministers, not in the hands of the

Parliament also. Parliament is supreme over the Ministers but not over nature. I was blamed while in Bombay—I remember it very well—if rains did not come they said this Chief Minister is wrong. If more came, then they said the Chief Minister has failed somewhere. Now, many things like that can be said. This is what we attribute to all Ministers. Well, it shows the importance we attach to the Minister

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** But the trouble is that if the foodgrains are bumper, the Minister claims the credit.

**SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI:** The Ministers do not claim credit. Ministers only put it forward, when the bumper crops come saying that they are better than the previous years' bumper crops. It means the result is shown in the progress that is made in the matter of food production and its drive. That is all that is sought to be shown. Otherwise, nothing else is to be shown. We would certainly like to make further progress in the matter of food production, and I believe that with all the drive that is being made, there will be better production in the matter of foodgrains because it is a must. It is not a thing where we can be complacent. And yet this is a matter which cannot be achieved merely by going at the Ministers or the Agriculture Ministry of the Central Government or also the State Ministries alone. This is a matter which is not in the hands of Ministers alone. What is in their hands is to provide the facilities which are necessary, which are wanting and which the agriculturists should be given. But unless the agriculturists themselves take it up and create a larger productivity of land, there cannot be more production. Therefore, it requires the co-operation of everybody. I would like to know which hon. Member, including my hon. friend, Shri Kasliwal, who also went down on this and was very eloquent in

running down the agricultural effort, has ever gone anywhere and tried to see that in one centre he increases agricultural production. If he did it somewhere, I would then say that he would get a sense of proportion as to how difficult the task is. I have been trying to see in several areas where it could be done, and I see what the difficulties are. The difficulties are in the matter of making the people work more and harder.

I will tell you my one experience—which I see even today. We opened a centre near Bombay in Borivili, called Kora Kendra, for research into village industries, cottage industries and agriculture. That is working for ten years. There several activities are carried on. Experiments are made. Paddy cultivation there has gone up from 2,000 lbs. to 6,000 lbs. Without fertilisers also, on natural manure and manure which is available here, they are doing it and they are finding that the results are the same. But there are neighbouring private agriculturists or individual agriculturists, who come to work in the centre who see this every day, and yet in the neighbouring land they do not do this, again, for their own purposes. Now, it is not possible to make them do it, to force them do it. But slowly, now as a result of persistent efforts during the last ten years, these people also are getting affected, and they are making better efforts. I am only illustrating this, I am only putting this to my hon. friends in order to show how difficult it is to take away inertia, to fight conservatism, and to fight scepticism that these things are going to benefit us. I do not say that peasants are more conservative than other people. It is a wrong idea for people to think that peasants are conservative. All are conservative in one thing or the other, even the greatest reformer, competing with all of us. Therefore, this is a relative term. Peasants have suffered many a time from all sorts of things shown to them by some officers who consider them-

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]  
selves experts but who do not know actually, practically, what it means. Therefore, peasants are sceptic sometimes about what is shown to them. These methods are now being improved.

Twenty years ago, when I went to an agriculture college which I was inspecting, I met the Principal and I asked him about what he was doing and what were the prospects of agriculture in this country. And pat came the reply. He told me that agriculture could never be a paying industry. When the Principal of an agriculture college tells me that it can never be a paying industry, what will his pupils teach the agriculturists?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Did you dismiss him?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Yes, he was. We retired him. And when he retired, he took to agriculture and he really lost because that is what he knew. But that was not the fate of other people

Then, I saw what was being done in the fields by students. I found that when they were working in the fields—that too only for an hour or an hour and a half—they were working with tennis shoes. We changed all that. Students now work for six or eight hours in the fields. They work hard, and the people who are in charge do not say that it is a losing concern. We tried to see that the lands cultivated in the colleges make profit and show that they are productive and not losing concerns. This is how things are improving. But we must realise from what base we are starting and where we have to go. The trek is very long and arduous. But if we run ourselves down, as it is our age-long habit, then we will not acquire the capacity to make greater effort. And that is why I am pleading that we should not indulge in the task of running ourselves down. If anybody runs himself down, he will be a better man. But when he runs

down everybody else except himself, he will be a nuisance in society and instead of improving others, he will also harm himself. Therefore, we have got also to get rid of this kind of thing. That is why I am pleading about these things. I said that I am not doubting the motives or *bona fides* of anybody which is the hardest thing to tell him. I am only saying that we are not getting out of the atmosphere which has enveloped us for centuries and for years and which was emphasised more by foreign slavery which we had. We have now to come out of it and see that instead of retarding each other we help each other and do not make each other lame. That is all that I am pleading for.

In the matter of agriculture also, therefore, whereas very much has to be done, I would not say that I am satisfied with what is done because it will be wrong to be satisfied even if there had been more progress because our requirements are great, our population is increasing, our food requirements are going to increase. With more prosperity, more food will be eaten up to a certain limit, and we have got to produce all that. And we have the capacity of producing all that. Today an acre of land in this country produces hardly one-third of what it ought to produce or what it produces in other countries. It produces many a time only one-fifth of the average productivity of other countries. Therefore, our possibility is five times increase in our agriculture. But it is easily said. It has got to be done by millions of agriculturists in this country, and they have got to be harnessed. It is, therefore, that we are also saying that we should take to co-operative venture, we should organise co-operative societies and we should make them work together. If we do that, then the people will be taking to it co-operatively and together and there will be greater effort. But when we say that, that is also decried by some hon. friends because they believe in something else.

And that is what retards the progress rather than increases the progress or makes it faster. But there too it is a matter of more and more propaganda, more and more understanding. And that is what we are trying to do because co-operation cannot come by a fiat. Co-operation cannot come merely by laws. Co-operation can come only by inculcation of a spirit of co-operation in all the people of the country, and that also can come only if all of us, people like us who are trying to go before the people and lead them—if we get a spirit of co-operation, then we will be able to transmit that spirit of co-operation, amongst other people and make them co-operate. But if we do not have a spirit of co-operation even in the face of danger and merely have a lip sympathy about unity of action in this matter, I am afraid we are not going to progress in co-operation.

Well, Madam, it will be the duty of the Government to go about this task unhampered in this matter by this kind of criticism. When I say unhampered, I do not mean untouched by the criticism. We will take note of every criticism, howsoever wrongly or in howsoever bad spirit it might have been made. We would like to take it not in the spirit in which it was made, but I would like to take it in a good spirit to improve myself because I have got to improve myself. If I have committed a wrong thing and if somebody points out to me that I have committed a wrong, I know that it is no defence for me to say that he has himself done wrong, therefore, why should he tell me? When I have done something wrong, I have done wrong, and if he points it out to me, I will be thankful to him. This is the attitude with which this Government works. But when I say that this is the attitude with which this Government works, I would not say that we are all angels.

We are also imperfect human beings. We are also liable to the same passions and prejudices as my hon. friends opposite are. I do not know

why they would want to make us only angels and they would remain where they are. We want that all of us should be angels. We are trying to see that we improve. Let us request them to help us in improving ourselves. That is all that I am requesting them.

Then it was suggested that we should have, instead of an Excise Duty on kerosene oil, an increase on it, there should be a duty on salt. I do not know what my hon. friends who said that, want. Not only hon. Member Shri Chinai said that but several other hon. Members and even the Professor said that. This is what Mahatma Gandhi said. It is not a matter of sentiment:

"There is no article like salt, outside water, by taxing which the State can reach even the starving millions, the sick, the maimed and utterly helpless. The salt constitutes, therefore, the most inhuman poll tax the ingenuity of man can devise."

"Even the salt he must use on to live is so taxed as to make the burden fall haviest on him, if only because of the heartless impartiality of its incidence. The tax shows itself more burdensome on the poor man, when it is remembered that salt is the one thing he must eat more than the rich, both individually and collectively."

"In accordance with the Irwin-Gandhi pact, of which only the salt clause remains still alive, salt should be free for the poor man, but it is not; it can now be free in Congress provinces at least."

This is what he expected when the Congress came to power in the States:

"I am reminded that salt being a Central subject, the Ministers cannot do anything. I should be painfully surprised if they cannot. The Central Government has to operate in the provincial territories. Provincial Governments are bound to



[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]

protect the people within their own jurisdiction against being dealt with unjustly even by the Centre. And the Governors are bound to back the protests of their Ministers against unjust dealings with the people of their own provinces.

"If the Ministers are on the alert, there should be no difficulty in the poor villagers helping themselves to the salt without undue interference on behalf of the Central authority. I have no fear of such undue interference."

But if this is considered as sentiment, I am quite sure that such a charge will not be levelled at the late Shri Gopal Krishna Gokhale. He was not a sentimental person. He talked about economics. He pleaded in the Central Legislative Assembly from year to year for reducing this Salt-tax and removing the duty altogether because he gave figures that the poor man uses far more salt because that is his only luxury. For the rich man there are many other things. For the rich man salt is but a small article for his convenience and forms a very infinitesimal part of his budget. For the poor man it forms a very substantial part of his budget and therefore he pleaded for this but then he did not merely plead on his own. He quoted eminent Englishmen in this matter and I hope an Englishman will not be considered a faddist like myself or a sentimentalist like Mahatma Gandhi or myself. This is what Lord Cross, then Secretary of State for India, in his despatch to the Government of India, dated April 12, 1883 wrote as follows. This is from a speech of Shri Gopal Krishna Gokhale. He said:

"I will not dwell on the great regret with which I should at any time regard the imposition of additional burdens on the poorest classes of the population, through the taxation of a necessary of life; but apart from all general considerations of

what is in such respects right and equitable, there are, as Your Excellency is well aware, in the case of the salt duty in India weighty reasons for keeping it at as low a rate as possible. The policy enunciated by Government in 1877 was to give to the people throughout India the means of obtaining an unlimited supply of salt at a very cheap rate; it being held that the interests of the people and of the public revenue were identical, and that the proper system was to levy a low duty on an unrestricted consumption."

Then Lord George Hamilton, in a speech on the Indian Budget statement in the House of Commons said:

"In view of these repeated declarations it is a matter for great surprise, no less than for intense regret and disappointment that Government have not taken the present opportunity to reduce a rate of duty, admittedly oppressive, on a prime necessary of life, which as the late Professor Fawcett justly urged, should be 'as free as the air we breathe and the water we drink.'"

Now, are these testimonies sentimental? I generally am not given to quoting because I do not believe that quoting strengthens anything by itself but it is only because this was quoted that Mahatma Gandhi said this and why, because of sentiment, one should stick to it. Mahatma Gandhi was not a man of sentiments only. His sentiments were based on truth and on his passion for improving the conditions of the poor people. He fought for freedom for this country, not in order that he looked up to the conveniences of those who had them but he fought for freedom of this country in order that the poor people are made happier and that they had a square deal and it was therefore that he based also his whole movement of Civil Disobedience on a breach of the salt laws. It was not for nothing

that he did it but even if it is merely a sentiment, is it a little sentiment of his, whom we call the Father of the Nation, if he based his whole movement on this and if he attached this importance to it, is it a small consideration? What are we? How do we deserve to call him the Father of the Nation and what are we going to get from the Salt Duty if we impose it? I do not think we can get certainly more than Rs. 20 crores and even if you get Rs. 20 crores, it will merely double the present value of salt. That is what it will mean. Who will contemplate doing this? And is that to be compared with the kerosene duty? About kerosene duty, certainly I do consider that it is certainly hard for the poor man. I do not say that it is not hard but as I said before, there are other considerations which are far more powerful which one has got to see and those considerations are considerations of very valuable foreign exchange. Foreign exchange is far more important today, also because of the needs of defence. Our defence requires a lot of foreign exchange and free foreign exchange if we are to build up our defence properly. In addition to all the help which we get gratefully from all the friendly countries which are giving us, we are in absolute necessity of having more foreign exchange and the expenditure on the import of kerosene is increasing year by year. Whereas it was Rs. 22 crores, it has become Rs. 30 crores and if it goes on like that as progressively people improve in their conditions, I do not know where we should be. How are we going to meet this situation and that is why, when my hon. friend Shri Govinda Reddy very feelingly said 'How do you deprive us of this fuel?', I have no alternative but to tell him that he is wrong. We have got to deprive him of this fuel. We cannot import fuel in this country with foreign exchange, however convenient it may be. We have got to use whatever fuel is available in this country. When we are prosperous, let them burn as much kerosene oil as they like. I am not going to stand in

the way of anybody. If we produce it here I would not stand in the way, I would supply it very freely. It is therefore that we are making redoubled efforts to produce more and more gas wherever we can get it, but these are not things which can be produced at once; but this is a thing which we have to do and it was because I was very conscious that in doing this I was taking away some part of the income of the poor man that I took away the Excise Duty on oils. That has cost us Rs. 11 crores but that is a good thing. I have supplied him an article of food at less cost than today and I have made a little more costly something to burn which he can replace also with castor oil or other oils and he can save some money, if necessary. That is why this is done. It is not done wantonly and it is not as if this is done because one has no sympathy for the poor. It is just because we have sympathy for the poor that we have got to make these efforts for development and these efforts for defence. Therefore, everyone has to feel that he has to subscribe his mite and it is because of that that I gave him the alternative oil. My hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee, who is not present here said, the Government has some ulterior motive in taking off this duty on oil. I do not know what the ulterior motive is. Those who think only of motives and who are governed by such ulterior motives ascribe such motives to others. There is no question of losing it in the Supreme Court. We have won already in the Supreme Court. There is no question of losing it, therefore, on the point which he mentioned. Let it not be said that there is any other motive in this. Certainly oil, and unrefined oil especially, is the only article of fat or sustenance to the poor which he can use. Therefore, we have reduced this. That will lessen its price. We are going to try to see that its price is reduced. It is a difficult job, but it has got to be done. That is how we

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]  
 have to set about our task. And it is because of that that I have tried not to touch any of the articles which the poor man directly uses. When referring to poor men, I am talking only of those poor men who have very low incomes. I am not talking of those poor men who inspite of higher incomes consider themselves poor, or who want to compare themselves with the very rich. I do not regard those people who earn Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 as rich or call them rich. But they consider themselves very poor because they compare themselves to those who earn Rs. 2,000 a month. And those who earn Rs. 2,000 per month compare themselves to those who earn Rs. 20,000 per month and become unhappy in the process. I should be very happy if everybody earned a lakh of rupees, but that is not possible. We have got to see that we go about it in a practical manner and that we get for the common man or the average person the minimum that is necessary for sustaining life in a healthy manner and in a useful manner. That is the task we are engaged in. And that task we can perform successfully only if we have a sense of proportion and do not go about with some theories or fads. The theories should be utilised for turning them into practical wisdom and we should not be like my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who goes on suggesting other avenues of income and says: Nationalise the banks and you will get all the money. Are we going to confiscate all the banks and pocket all that money? If banks are going to be nationalised, then we will have to pay them money. Whence am I going to get all that money? That money is very large. Will he arrange all that money?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: From the earnings.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: The earnings will come later on. But I will have to pay the interest on all that amount and all that earning will be lost in that. What is the use of saying all that? My hon. friend is

saying all this only because in his theory or philosophy he believes in taking away from others all that the others have and keeping to himself what he himself has. This is his theory. This is the Charvaka philosophy. This is not a new philosophy. We had the Charvaka philosophy in this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggested some of your own taxes.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Well, that is why he referred to the income-tax on Rs. 400. Because he gets Rs. 400 he does not want that Rs. 400 should be taxed more. But then he forgets that I have not taxed him to the extent he thinks I have taxed him. I have only made him compulsorily save. Rs. 3 out of Rs. 4 is saved and Re. 1 is taxed. Only Re. 1 out of every Rs. 4 is the tax and not more and that he can easily afford to pay. He was paying only 0.7 per cent, as income-tax on his income and now he will be paying 1.7 per cent. of his income and he will be saving 3 per cent, as saving. Of course, he is alone and he does not require it for anybody else. But he may require it for his rain day, when he may not be in the party and he may not get any money from anywhere, and in that case this money will come very handy to him. We have got to see that we allow people to save money and to invest money for themselves. After all, this country wants to be a welfare State. It does not mean that in a welfare State everything will be provided for everybody. But they will be provided with the ways and means and education in such a manner that they can save for themselves and to look after themselves and not depend only on doles and pensions. This is what we want to do and that is why the saving habit is necessary, and that is why we have introduced this new thing, what is called the compulsory saving. I do not say this is an easy process. This is quite a new thing. One will meet with many difficulties. I was told that

the agriculturists would be suffering, as if I am taking away all the money for them. If a man pays Rs 2 as land revenue, then he will pay Re. 1 as compulsory saving. If he can pay Rs 2 in a year, can he not set aside one rupee? It may be with great difficulty. He may have to deny himself something. I grant all that. But that one rupee will be returned to him at the end of five years with interest and it will be useful for him. That is why we are trying to do it. After all, everybody must feel that he is patriotic. Let him show that he is patriotic. What is the use of anybody only saying it? Other people also say it and the corporate sector also says that they will be touched, that they will be harmed and so production will go down because there will not be sufficient incentive and so on. Is patriotism only to be professed? Does it mean only going on just as one is, not being touched even to the extent of a pie? If that is the case, then I must say that we are patriotic only in spirit. Everybody will have to save from his income to some extent. Otherwise this gigantic effort cannot be made. Not only from the money point of view has everybody to do it but from the point of view of the spirit also everybody has to participate in it. And let it be said to the credit of the poor in this country that they do not hesitate to give this. And they have not hesitated to give it in the case of the National Defence Fund, where they have done it in spite of what my hon friends say when they say this is like this and that is like that. It is not so. These people are very much prepared to contribute. Why do we want to debar them from doing it? Or why do we want to discourage them from doing it? They will do so. I do not say that this is not hard for them. It will be hard for them, but it is the hard way alone which is beneficial to everybody, not the soft way. Therefore, when it is said that the income-tax on the lower incomes is much higher and on the higher incomes, it is not sufficiently high. I would say it is only jealousy which

says that and nothing else. After all it will be seen that on incomes up to Rs 6,000 4 per cent, will be the extra surcharge. Out of that 4 per cent 3 per cent will be saving which will be returned to the man with interest. We have said that above Rs 6,000 it will rise from 5 per cent, 6 per cent, 7 per cent 8 per cent and so on up to 10 per cent. And then only 2 per cent will be the saving, the rest will be tax. Already there is a very steep taxation of 70 per cent or 80 per cent or 87 per cent, and it goes up like that. Now, how much are we going to take away? Can we take away 100 per cent? That is what the hon Members say here. Take away 100 per cent they say, from a certain level. If I can take it, I would certainly take it. But then why should the man earn after that? Why should he, if he has to give away 100 per cent? Nobody will earn and if he does not earn, he will not put in effort. That means there will be no production and many of these things will disappear. It may be very easily said. Put restrictions. Do away with the salaries. Cut them down to below Rs 1,000. Cut them down below Rs 1,000 because we do not receive Rs 1,000. Those who do not receive it say this. Those who receive it do not say it. Those who do not receive it, they say that they themselves should receive it. There is a constant demand even here by hon Members that their allowances should be increased. That is what they ask for. I have no quarrel with them. I want to raise resources in order that I may do that. But if that is our desire, then what is the use of saying that in the case of other people it must be cut down completely so that we may be benefited? That is not the proper approach for building up this country and for making it strong and powerful. Madam, my hon friend, again Shri Bhupesh Gupta, said that this Budget was based solely on the patriotism of our people. I do not know what he means by that but if he means by that that I am relying on the patriotic

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]  
urge of the people, he is perfectly right. What else does he expect me to do? Does he expect me to rely on the treachery of the people? On what does he want me to rely? It is only on the patriotism of the people that I can rely . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you are punishing it.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I am not punishing patriotism. I am only calling upon everybody to show that he is patriotic and I would request my hon. friend also to prove his patriotism. If he claims it, let him prove it by not going at the resources which the Government is mobilising and many of the activities which he carries in defaming Government do not show patriotism at the present juncture. If he does not like that, well, facts have got to be put. I know that he is very sincere in his belief. I know that he is very honest in his ideology but, as I said, sincerity and honesty have got to be judged on the basis of truth, on the basis of objectivity and there is a higher truth. When it comes to the country, nothing is dearer for one. That is the only thing which makes one . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said that you could raise money from others, not from the low income people. I am prepared to pay.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Not from him, not from the four hundred rupees wallah but from the others. In the name of the poor people he wants to appear in that line and wants to save his one rupee. That is what he wants.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not want that.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: This is not a thing where I am going to oblige him.

My hon. friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel showed great concern for me. I should have been very grateful to him for that concern if that concern had not been perverted by his dislike of the Prime Minister. He made charges against my leader about which I can only say that they are not only based on perversion but constitute a flagrant travesty of truth—to say that the Prime Minister's sole business is to oppress the people and to utilise his Finance Ministers for that purpose, amounts only to that. If that so, then the Finance Ministers are useless people and the Prime Minister, well, I do not know what to call him. Madam, I cannot, therefore, appreciate his concern for me in this matter. It is not a complement but it is a defamation of myself. That is how I will say.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is a perverted interpretation.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: It is certainly a perverted interpretation of a perverted thing and so it becomes inverted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, we do not mind because we are living in the midst of perversion just at this moment.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Madam, my hon. friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, quoted from a publication of the National Council of Applied Economic Research but he forgot that this very Council has put out a latest brochure on this subject and he did not see that. I do not quote other people . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Usually he is out of date.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: . . . but when he has quoted this, I would certainly beg of him to look at the "Economic Implications of the Present Emergency" which the National Council of Applied Economic Research

has published only a month ago. If he reads that, he will find that the authors recommend substantial additional taxation in the present emergency. Will he now revise his views about everything? He considered this as something which is very important. Well, I attach great importance to these people not because they belong to Government—they are independent people—but they are people who study. It is not that I agree with everything that they say but I do say that they study everything properly. They put out their views very sincerely which is very helpful. Even if I differ from them, I do not differ from them lightly. Their attitude is also the same. They are not trying to prescribe something which is infallible. They also make suggestions, they also make proposals which require further careful consideration. My hon. friend should not have based his wrong theory on an older thing which has no application to the present emergency. He also quoted Rajtarangini which was written a thousand years ago. Now, I cannot quote any latest production of the author of Rajtarangini because I cannot live a thousand years back. What applied a thousand years ago, how does it apply today? But, even in those days, when an emergency came, everything was taken, even in the matter of gold. In the Arthashastra what is said is, "When an emergency comes, take away everything. Gold should be taken away. It should be regulated" and many other things are said to be done. Our *rishis* and *munis* were great visionaries. They sometimes, some of them like my hon. friend, said, when an emergency comes, everything can be even confiscated. That is what they said because they are people who had given up everything. Therefore, it is no use saying all these things. Charuvak was one of the forefathers of Communism. He said:

“यावज्जीवेत् सुखम जीवत्  
श्रमं कृत्वा घृतं पिबेत् ।”

What he said was, as long as you live, live very well. In those days ghee was the greatest standard of happiness, of good living. Therefore, he said, even by incurring debt drink ghee and what does it matter if you incur debt? After . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If he had been alive today, he would have said "Live like our Ministers".

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: After the body is burnt, you are not going to come back to return the debt. This is the basis of my hon. friend's philosophy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Morarji Desai is becoming humorous. It is a good thing.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I am glad the hon. Member is taking it in the proper spirit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I know that when he is in balance he is very well inclined to agree.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that when he is in good humour he is very amiable. Charuvak is over now.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Charuvak is finished. I will not pursue it further.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All the *rishis* and *munis* are now in the Treasury Benches.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: My hon. friend, usually, is very well read and is up to date in his news where he has no prejudice but where he has got some pre-conceived notion he forgets. He made a suggestion that we should increase the rate of contribution to the provident fund but he forgot that we have already passed legislation increasing it and it is now

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]

being applied to four industries, cigarette, engineering, iron and steel and paper.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But 35 lakhs more are still there.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Others are being considered. Therefore, he is in the backwoods. Let him come to the front line and read better.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the contribution? That is the point.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Varies from  $6\frac{1}{2}$  to 8 per cent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nearly 35 lakhs are still there . . .

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: It has to be raised from  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to 8 per cent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nearly 35 lakhs are still there under your scheme. Why has this not been raised in their case, apart from the gold mines?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Madam, there was the question of prices. In the matter of prices, we are fortunate that we have not done badly in the first two years of the Plan. The spiral has not risen as it rose in the Second Five Year Plan. Foodgrains have not become more costly; cloth has not become more costly but I cannot say the same thing of all other things. But, the index of wholesale prices which was at 127.5 when we started the Third Five Year Plan is at 126.1 today. Therefore it shows that we are not doing badly but I must admit that we are very much conscious that we are on slippery ground always in the matter of prices and we have to be very careful, especially because of friends like Shri Bhupesh Gupta, because the moment the prices reach stability, he will come up for proposals to increase the prices of foodgrains, to increase the

wages of people, and he wants the spiral to begin so that he has constant activity for his disruptive mind. These are matters which are very destructive to the stabilisation of prices but we are very careful about it. We are constantly watching it and if we look after the agricultural production in all its spheres and also the industrial production, I am quite sure that with God's grace we will be able to see that prices do not run away.

I hope, Madam, that my hon. friends, not only those who are absolutely one with this Budget, but also those who are critical of it, will, when the Budget is passed, carry the message to the people and have no discordant note as far as the mobilisation of resources is concerned and see that we are fully armed for a proper and successful defence and for a fruitful development of this country to its natural aspirations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, today we read in the papers that the Ministry of Finance have issued orders legalising the price rise for superior and inferior kerosene and they have said that even the wholesaler could charge at the higher rate on the ostensible ground that the middle man should not make any profit. Now, the matter is under discussion; we have not finalised the scheme and it is conceivable that he might be persuaded to reduce the impost on it. So why was this done anticipating the decision of Parliament in this manner, this raising of price even at the wholesalers' level rather than maintaining it where it was, pending discussion and finalisation of the schemes here?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Madam, the tax has come into effect from the 1st March. At any time if at all it happens—for which there is very little chance this time—then due note of it can be taken and correction can be made. When it comes into effect

from the 1st March as is the law, as is the practice and as is the convention, this is bound to happen.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You yourself said that normally you would not have increased the price at the wholesalers' level but you have said that in order to prevent the middle man making the profit you were compelled to do that. That means that the price will . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Finance Minister has explained that

The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-four minutes past four of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 8th March, 1963.