

proceed to elect in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among the members of this House to be a member of the All India Council for Technical Education to be reconstituted with effect from the 30th April, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the Members that the following dates have been fixed for receiving nominations and for holding election, if necessary, to the All India Council for Technical Education:

1. Number of members to be elected—One.
2. Last date and time for receiving nominations—14th March, 1961 (Up to 3 P.M.).
3. Last date and time for withdrawal of candidature—15th March, 1961 (Up to 3 P.M.).
4. Date and time of election—17th March, 1961 (3P.M. to 5 P.M.).
5. Place of election—Room No. 63, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.
6. Method of election—Proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL) 1961-62,
GENERAL DISCUSSION—continued.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA (Manhya Pradesh): MR. Chairman, Sir, on the last day I was dealing with the position in the coal mining industry . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have ten minutes today.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: . . . with which the
1089 R.S.—3.

Ministries of Railways, and of Steel, Mines and Oil are concerned. I have read the reply of the hon. the Railway Minister in which he has observed that the production of coal in place of 60 million tons was reduced to 56 million tons. Ten per cent. of the output was to be transported by road, and instead of 51 million tons they have been able to move 52 million tons of coal through out the country. Therefore, so far as the movement of coal is concerned, the railways have played their part which they ought to have done.

Sir, it is also suggested that due to the demand of coal from western India, especially Ahmadabad and Saurashtra side on the Jharia colliery, the difficulty in its movement is coming. It is suggested that more coal should be produced in Madhya Pradesh and moved from that area. Sir, the question has been partly replied to by the hon. Minister. It is suggested that there is some deficiency in the wagon supply and difficulty in regard to the production of wagons too. But the present crisis does not arise out of this. The crisis has arisen due to the fact that the existing wagon supply, which has been there to the collieries so far, has been reduced. The railways have got to examine this question very deeply. They should supply wagons to the collieries at the rate at least at which they were doing so far.

I know, Sir, that the National Coal Development Corporation has a stock of about 2 million tons. I stand corrected. It is nearly 2 million tons; it is less only by a few lakh tons. The stock in Madhya Pradesh, from where the coal is supplied to Saurashtra, is more than 1,50,000 tons. Now, new collieries are being opened and they are going to create fresh problems of transport. I hope the Government will take into consideration all these factors and will improve the wagons supply and would also increase the number of wagons for the future.

[Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal Malviya.]

Sir, so far as the present crisis is concerned, the railways have got to look into the fact that the supply, which they have maintained till December or a month or two earlier, should be maintained, and the wagons should be supplied on the basis of production and not on the basis of the indent submitted by the collieries. Sir, as the time is very short, I cannot deal at great length on this point. I will deal with some more points very briefly.

Arising out of coal production, I make one suggestion. I request the Government, especially the Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel, to see that as a result of the report, which had been submitted many years ago, recommending the amalgamation of smaller collieries, steps should be taken to complete this amalgamation as early as possible.

Another suggestion is in regard to private collieries. They are purposely and intentionally suppressing production and not fulfilling the target due to increased rate of income-tax which they are required to pay on increased production. I am glad that the Government have decided to open their own coal mines in future and not to allow mineral concessions to any private party. I will submit that the time has come when, if not all, such of the collieries which fail to fulfil the target should be nationalised. The Government should take steps to nationalise these mines.

Sir, I would like to make one more suggestion; that is, with regard to the use of heavy machinery like drag lines for moving earth by the National Coal Development Corporation. This has very greatly affected the employment of labour. Machines like drag lines, which are supposed to be the biggest and the only earth moving machines, are moving earth. Sir, earth moving could be done by smaller machines and through manual labour. I would request the Government to see that no more of such

machines are employed for this purpose. The employment potential should be taken into consideration before these machines are put into operation.

Now, Sir, one or two points with regard to the Ministry of Labour. There has been a cry by labour and the organisation which I represent that since the Labour Appellate Tribunal has been abolished, a branch of the Supreme Court should be created for hearing labour appeals expeditiously. No doubt, the Supreme Court has made arrangements for expeditious hearing of labour cases, still it takes about two years for an appeal to come up for hearing. Lesser time should be taken in hearing labour appeals. My special request is that the question of court fee, the question of security, the question of printing of paper book, should also be done away with so that labour may be in a position to file appeals without much expense.

Then, Sir, I would make a suggestion to the hon. Minister of Labour to create a Welfare Fund for minerals other than coal and manganese for which Welfare Funds already exist. That should be created without further delay. I would also request the Government to appoint Wage Board for coal for which resolutions have been passed and a specific request has been made to the Government in this regard.

Sir, with regard to the Budget proposals I have to make only a few suggestions. Tax has been levied on betelnuts and kerosene. I mention these two items from the Budget because these are the ones which are consumed by very poor people and they have been very hard hit by the taxation. On the day when the Budget was presented in Parliament, I was at home. The next morning after the Budget was presented, the rate of supari—betelnut—went up by more than one rupee per seer. The rate of kerosene went up by Rs. 2/- per tin. The duty levied is not so

much as has been the increase in the price of kerosene. These were the two articles that were talked of most by the people, especially the poor people, at that time. My request to the hon. Minister is, as has been suggested by other hon. friends in their speeches, to revise these taxes since there is scope in the Budget to do so. The hon. Minister should kindly see to it that kerosene and betelnut are exempted from tax. This will be in accord with the feelings of the very poor people and they will thank the Government for this.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, the Budget for the current year has been generally welcomed throughout the country, though of course, not without some criticism or the other from every quarter. I also join these persons in welcoming the Budget and in complimenting the Finance Minister on his endeavour.

The Budget, Sir, has been considered, on the whole, a very realistic Budget and especially so in the light of the effort we have to put in for the achievement of our Third Five Year Plan—a Plan—Sir, which is of much larger dimensions and monetary value than either of our previous Plans. The Third Five Year Plan, Sir, as you are aware, is almost the size of our First and Second Plans put together inasmuch as the proposed investment in the Plan is of the order of over Rs. 10,000 crores and our aim in it is to attain complete self-sufficiency in food within the next five years and to advance our industrial economy to a “take off” stage of a self-developing economy, as our honoured President so aptly put it in his Address to us a year ago.

With such an objective before us, for our next Plan, is it at all surprising that the hon. Finance Minister has brought to bear a greater burden of taxation on the people? I would say, Sir, that such a thing could not

but be visualised, for if this was not done by him, the fulfilment of the Plan could not be assured since its achievement on external aid alone is an impossibility.

In the matter of external aid, Sir, we cannot be and we should not be, unmindful of the fact that no country, however friendly, will be inclined to aid and help another unless it is satisfied that the people of that other country are putting forth their best effort to create more and more wealth by their own toil and labour for raising the standard of living of its people by the removal of poverty, ignorance and want. Of this sacrifice and supreme effort, I submit, Sir, our people have given ample proof in the course of the fulfilment of our last two Plans and it is because of this that all friendly nations which have the resources and the technical know-how, are not only eager, but anxious to help us to remove poverty and to raise the standard of living of our people.

Therefore, Sir, with a big Plan of the order, and dimension of our Third Five Year Plan, the Finance Minister, I would venture to say, had no alternative but to ask the people to bear the further burden of taxation with a view to improving the ultimate lot of the common man of this country. We have, however, to see whether the particular taxes imposed have been well chosen and lightly distributed so as not to cause any very great hardship on any particular class of people or trade.

However, before dealing with this matter, I would like to say a few words about our Defence budget which, to my mind, has not been given the due weight which it deserved. Our Defence budget, for the ensuing year is up by Rs. 16.2 crores, of which, the Finance Minister tells us, that Rs. 9.2 crores is the excess budgeted expenditure for the Army and Rs. 3.54 crores for the Navy, Air Force together and the rest is for the non-effective charges.

[Pandit S. S. N. Tankha.]

While this increase of Rs. 9.2 crores on the expenditure of the Army is greatly welcomed by me, I am afraid, it is highly insufficient for building up our defences adequately to meet the threat of the situation created on our northern borders. It is true we should not be unnecessarily alarmed and panicky at the impending threat and should be prepared to face it boldly if and when, it comes, but at the same time, Sir, we should not be too complacent about it either. As such, it is our duty to build up our defence strength even at the cost of many of our other needs. In this connection, I would like to assure the hon. Finance Minister that the people of this country, of all parties and shades of opinion, feel the need for such a step and are prepared to undergo any sacrifices needed of them to help him in increasing the might of our Defence Services.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to note that we have recently added an aircraft carrier to our naval fleet to protect our shores, but as the present threat is from the side of our land frontiers, the need of the moment seems to be to concentrate more thoroughly in the building up of our land and air forces and particularly the latter, so as to smash up easily any attack on us from those directions and I trust that both the Finance Minister and the Defence Minister will not be unmindful of the threat and will not grudge the expense needed to ward off the danger.

Coming now to the other aspects of the Budget, we find that of the total additional revenue of Rs. 60.87 crores which is to accrue to the Centre under the present Budget proposals, only Rs. 3 crores additional revenue is to be derived from adjustments made in income-tax and corporation tax changes while the rest, namely, about Rs. 57 crores, are to accrue from custom and excise duties. In so framing his Budget proposals, you will see Sir, that the Finance Minister has relied almost wholly upon the indirect method of taxation rather than on the

direct one which hits only the more affluent and the well-to-do who have the capacity to bear the burden, and he has thus laid himself open to the charge of being partial to the rich and the wealthy classes at the cost of the middle and poorer classes of our people who will be crushed further under the weight of his wide net of new additional taxation proposals. But, Sir, such a charge will not be wholly justified, since the real aim of the Finance Minister seems to me to be to touch all pockets lightly while avoiding any real great hardship on any particular class of people or trade.

It has, however, to be admitted that except for raising the rate of surcharge above one lakh income from 5 per cent. to 10 per cent., which is indeed a step in the right direction of bringing nearer the goal of a socialist pattern of society very little change is made in the structure of direct taxation, perhaps under the belief that under this head that limit of taxation has been reached beyond which it is not possible to tax further, since it is maintained by the higher income groups that with that payment of income-tax, super-tax, wealth-tax and expenditure-tax, etc, no part of their current earned income remains with them and hence any further taxation would act as the highest disincentive to work and thus affect the production of greater wealth. Whatever the merits of the argument may be, which I do not for a moment appreciate, I would like to know from the Finance Minister as to how many persons of the higher income group there are in the country who in fact pay by way of taxes all, or nearly all, that they earn during the year. Under such circumstances, further taxation on them would not only have been not unjustified but I would rather say was called for. Such a step seems to me to have been all the more necessary because of the fact that it is this class of persons who have benefited most from the last two Plans as compared to any other and as such I note with regret that no drastic steps have been taken to mop

up the ill-gotten gains of this class of persons. Coming now to the indirect taxes which have been levied, it will be noticed that out of the Rs. 57 crores of additional duty to be derived under this head, almost as much as Rs. 21 crores, or in other words a little over one-third of it, is duty on commodities consumed by the poor and middle classes. While it may be conceded that in levying this class of taxation, the Finance Minister has taken pains to see that so far as possible only such commodities in the common man's use may be taxed as are of a non-essential character such as tea, coffee, betelnut, tobacco, cigarette, cigars; etc., but the duty which has been levied on vegetable oil, mill-made cotton and woollen yarn, medium grey cloth and higher grade kerosene oil cannot be considered to be of non-essential character. These particular duties are bound to hit the middle and the lower income groups of people who because of the prevailing high prices find it difficult to make their two ends meet, and I would urge upon the Finance Minister to spare the people from these additional taxes.

The raising of duty on certain non-essential articles of one's daily use such as cosmetics, toilet preparations, glass and glassware, China porcelainware including crockery, cannot be objected to, but, Sir, I fail to see why patent and proprietary medicines have been chosen for inclusion in this category of goods. And I would urge upon the Finance Minister to exclude medicines from enhancement of duty.

Articles of real luxury such as air-conditioning machinery, refrigerators, electric instruments and appliances, wireless receiving sets and mill-made silk fabrics which are used by the higher middle class and the richer class of people have been rightly chosen for imposition of extra duties on them. The steps taken by Finance Minister to encourage export of tea is warmly welcomed.

Mention has also to be made of the tax concessions which have been

granted by the Finance Minister to attract greater foreign capital and technical know-how. These concessions, I have no doubt, will enable further foreign participation in our country's industrialisation programme and I welcome these two proposals. But in this context, care must be taken to see that no industrial units which are not essential for the country's economy are allowed to be developed.

There are two other matters which call for attention when considering the question of the imposition of new taxes. While it is gratifying to find that as much as 40 per cent. of the total revenues required for fulfilment of the Third Plan would be raised by the proposals put forward by the Finance Minister, yet it is my fear that the imposition of so many and so varied indirect taxes would lead to a further rise in prices with its concomitant evils, and even though the Finance Minister has tried to guard against this by not resorting to deficit financing on any large scale, yet this aspect of the matter needs a close watch and constant attention and I would respectfully draw his special attention to it. It must be remembered, Sir, that prices during the last five years have risen almost by 25 per cent. while the *per capita* national income has lagged behind with the result that in spite of greater funds being in the hands of the people because of the last two Plan investments, the purchasing power of the rupee has gone down to a greater extent and hence the growing discontent of the people and their lack of enthusiasm for the Plans.

Another equally important matter connected with the taxation proposals is with regard to the cost of collection of all these taxes. Imposition of taxation on larger numbers of commodities will mean greater administrative and collecting machinery for them necessitating a rise in the cost of their collection to consumers. The Finance Minister has, therefore, to see that the extra administrative and

[Pandit S. S. N. Tankha.]
collection costs do not take away the anticipated benefit to the exchequer by the various items of taxation.

With these words, Sir, I lend my support to the taxation proposals before the House.

DR. TARA CHAND (Nominated):
Mr. Chairman, I must apologise to you, and through you to the House, for taking the time of the House, valuable time as it is, in speaking on a point of personal explanation.

I understand, Sir, that an hon. Member of this House the other day made a speech in this House in which he had some very ungenerous remarks to make in regard to me personally and in regard to this book which I have had the honour to prepare for the Government. I do not propose to deal with the remarks which have been aimed at me personally but I should certainly like the House to know that the remarks made in regard to the book cannot stand any scrutiny. I am sorry that I have to speak here on matters relating to history, economics, politics, etc., which are subjects very far from the ordinary interests of this House but as these remarks relate to questions of politics, history and economics stated in this book, I am obliged to refer to these academic matters.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh):
If the House is not concerned with history, economics and politics, what subjects are there left for it?

DR. TARA CHAND: The hon. Member, in his speech, made nine points in regard to this book, and I propose to deal with these points *seriatim*. His first point is, "the national movement in India was an expression of the conflict between the middle classes of the two countries, one aspiring for wealth and influence and the other already in possession of it." He has taken very strong objection to this statement which I have

made in this book. Very likely, he has not understood why this statement has been made. It is a matter of very common knowledge, and every historian bears this out, that from the 16th Century onwards English politics and its economies were being influenced more and more, by the middle class and that this middle class was excluding the influence of the feudal classes which were then in power in England and itself coming into power. Now, this is a matter which I felt was very well known to every student of history that no one, I thought, would take any objection or raise any difficulty in regard to this statement. Now, if I may, I will refer to a statement made by a historian and economist, that is, Schumpeter on this subject. He says:

"Capitalist entrepreneurs fought the former ruling circles for a share in State control, for leadership in the State. The very fact of their success, their position, their resources, their power, raised them in the political and social scale. Their mode of life, their cast of mind became increasingly important elements on the social scene. Their actions, desires, needs and beliefs emerged more and more sharply within the total picture of the social community. In an historical sense this applied primarily to the industrial and financial leaders of the movement—the bourgeoisie."

Nobody, I hope, will have any doubt in his mind that when the British came to India in the 18th century they were motivated by these ideas . . .

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Let him speak through the mike, Sir. He is not audible

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants you to speak through the mike so that all Members of the House may have the benefit.

DR. TARA CHAND: All right, Sir,

MR. CHAIRMAN: At 4 o'clock the Finance Minister will answer.

DR. TARA CHAND: I hope that this House will agree with me that so far as England is concerned the statement that England was controlled by the middle classes at that time can stand. So far as India is concerned, all those who have written about the history of India, especially those who have treated the history of India from the sociological and economic point of view will bear me out that there was a tussle or struggle between India and England and that was a struggle between the middle class of England and the middle class of India. I will read out only one passage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Tara Chand, you have nine points.

DR. TARA CHAND: The other ones are very minor. This passage is from a book by Mr. Palme Dutt. The book is *India Today*. He says.

"The historical development of Indian nationalism is marked by three great waves of struggle, each at a successively higher level, and each leaving its permanent marks on the movement and opening the way to a new phase. In its earliest phase Indian nationalism, as we have seen, reflected only the big bourgeoisie—the progressive elements among the landowners, the new industrial bourgeoisie and the well-to-do intellectual elements. The first great wave of unrest which disturbed these placid waters, in the period preceding 1914, reflected the discontent of the urban petty bourgeoisie, but did not yet reach the masses. The role of the masses in the national movement, alike of the peasantry and of the new force of the industrial working class, emerged only after the war of 1914–18."

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): That is the Communist interpretation, because . . .

DR. TARA CHAND: That interpretation, you will find, is supported by all historians.

SHRI SUDHIR CHOSH: . . . Mr. Palme Dutt is a leading member of the Communist Party there.

DR. TARA CHAND: Quite right. Therefore, it should be a better evidence of how things were than any statement made by non-Communists.

The second point which this gentleman has made is this. On page 214 of this book it is said:

"The preliminary course in all subjects consisted in the learning of sanskrit. In the case of the general reader the greatest stress was laid upon grammar, rhetoric and lexicology in Panini's *Kaumudi* and *Amarakosha*."

Here the word '*Ashtadhyayi*' had been left out. When the proof was read after the book had been prepared we found that '*Ashtadhyayi*' had been left out. So an erratum was issued and it was stated that the word '*Ashtadhyayi*' should be added here and now it reads, '*Panini's Ashtadhyayi, Kaumudi and Amarakosha*.' I fail to understand what difficulty the hon. Member had about this matter. He seems to have read this to mean that Panini was the author of *Ashtadhyayi*, Panini was the author of *Kaumudi* and Panini was the author of *Amarakosha*. Anybody who is familiar with sanskrit knows that *Amarakosha* was written by Amar Singh, that it could not have been written by Panini. Everybody knows that *Kaumudi* is a commentary on *Ashtadhyayi*. It could not have been written by Panini. Therefore it is quite clear that Panini's *Ashtadhyayi*, *Kaumudi* its exposition and *Amarakosha* written by Amar Singh are the three books which are meant; not all the three written by Panini but as written by three different persons.

His next point again has reference to page 214 where it is said: "In Bengal, the treatises *Raghuṇandan* and *Jimutavahana* were studied." His criticism is that *Jimutavahana* and *Raghuṇandan* are names of persons and not of books. But if he had referred to page 209 he would have seen that it has been stated there that they

[Dr. Tara Chand.]
were human beings. It has been stated there:

"After the days of Vachaspati Misra (16th century), Jimutavahana, Raghunandan, Kamalakara, and Mitra Misra, no commentary of importance was produced."

Therefore, he should have seen that the author is not unaware of the fact that these two are persons and not books.

His fourth criticism is "that the author may be told that 'Riti' does not mean erotics." Now, I am afraid the hon. Member is not aware of the history of Hindi literature. If he had read any of the books beginning with Ramachandra Shukla's 'History of Hindi Literature' or Dharendra Verma's 'History of Hindi Literature', he would have known that Riti is the style where *sringar* is the subject-matter. And what is *sringar*? It is not necessary for me to tell you but here is a definition of *sringar* according to Sahitya Darpan:

पुंसः स्त्रियां स्त्रियाः पुंसि संभोगं प्रति या
स्पृहा
स शृंगार इति ख्यातः क्रीडा इत्यादि
कारकाः ॥

I do not propose to translate that but I will state what Apte's Sanskrit Dictionary says about *sringar*. It says: "sentiment of love or sexual passion, the erotic sentiment." So if for Riti I have put erotic sentiment, I hope I am supported by Apte's Dictionary and Sahitya Darpan.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): Probably the learned author is mistaking between Riti and Rati.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. You come to Point No. 5, Dr. Tara Chand.

DR. TARA CHAND: Riti and Rati are quite different. Riti is the style; *sringar* is the subject-matter of Riti.

The fifth point is about the statement made in the book that in the

18th century India passed under the sway of Britain. I do not see how any objection can be taken to that statement. In 1757 the Battle of Plassey was fought and the three provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa came under the sway of Britain. In 1761 the French and the British fought in the South and the influence which the French exercised over Karnatak and the Nizam's Dominion passed into the hands of the British. In 1765 the Shahzada who was staying at that time at Allahabad signed a document by which we know Bengal, Bihar and Orissa were transferred to the British. But it did not stop there. It made Oudh a dependency of the British and it made the Shahzada a pensioner of the British. In 1782 a war was fought between the British and the Marathas and the British obtained primacy in Indian politics. In 1799 the Mysore War had been fought and Mysore had been annexed by the British. From 1803 to 1805 another war took place between the British and the Marathas and the result was that the British sway extended up to the Sutlej River. The only part of India that remained outside the British sway was Punjab and Sind.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: You say also that in that century the whole of India was under the Mahratha sway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He does not say that.

DR. TARA CHAND: That point has not been made. The point that this gentleman made was this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed under the sway of the British. Next point.

DR. TARA CHAND: The next point is that regarding British tutelage. Some objection has been taken to the word 'tutelage'. The book says "as a result of British intervention in the 18th century, India lost independence, but under British tutelage which lasted for nearly two centuries it gained freedom." In the first place, may I say that I have made, rightly or wrongly, a distinction between independence and freedom. Independence

I take to be a negative term, which means absence of foreign domination. 'Freedom' I take to be a positive term, which implies not merely the absence of foreign domination, but self-rule, rule of the people over their own country. What I have stated is that in the 18th century the British took away our independence. We became dependent upon the British. India became a dependency of the British. But events happened, things developed, the evolution of society took place and the result was that India gained freedom. Now, some sort of a misunderstanding is in the mind of the gentleman in regard to this word 'tutelage' and he thinks that India perhaps does not owe anything to the British or perhaps India has not been under the protection of the British. I do not know what he means. I have in my hand quotations starting from Raja Ram Mohan Roy to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, which bear on this point. May I read just one sentence from what Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said when he was speaking in the Constituent Assembly:—

"Here I am the patent example of these contacts, speaking in the House in the English language. The fact remains that we are functioning here under certain rules and regulations for which the model has been the British Constitution."

I would not press this further.

Then, there is point number seven. He thinks that I have quoted Adam Smith in support of mercantilism. May I humbly suggest that if he reads this page, he will find out that there is nothing of that kind there? All that I have done is to quote Adam Smith to show what mercantilism means.

So far as point number eight is concerned, there is a statement in the book that women were sold in England in the 18th century. This gentleman has appealed to the Members of this House to find a reference and authority for this statement. If he had looked into that page, he would have found it in the

footnote. The authority given is R.A. Philip, 'Georgian Scrap Book'.

Point number nine does not refer to me. It refers to my friend, Shri Humayun Kabir, who had signed the Foreword on the 26th of January, 1961. In that Foreword, he has made the statement that this book is being published two hundred years after the anniversary of the Battle of Panipat. Now, of course, everybody knows that the Battle of Panipat took place on the 14th January 1761 and if the Foreword states that the book is being issued two hundred years after the battle of Panipat, I do not know how anybody can take exception to the statement.

Now, I have nothing more to add, except that if there is any Member here in this House or in the other House, who has any difficulties about this book or who has any criticism to make, and if he speaks to me or writes to me, I will be happy to answer.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I rise to welcome the Budget and give my support to it.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Permit me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to quote from some comments of "The Economic Review", which says:—

"A budget which would please all sections in a country can seldom be there. There is a general dislike of parting with a person's income, more or so when such parting would bring no direct reward as is the case with regard to taxes. And hence no budget proposal can be called successful from this angle. It is also not possible to have a fixed taxation for all time. With the passing of every year, the needs of the State exchequer also grow. There is also a growing consciousness among modern States to provide more and

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

more amenities and welfare measures to the people. These, in turn, would call for a growing tax structure, in rates as well as composition."

I have been listening to the debate in this House and I am happy to note that all sections of this House do want that the Third Five Year Plan should go through and that resources should be found for the Plan. The difference of opinion comes only as to from where the resources have to be found. The Finance Minister in his speech, para 11, has clearly stated what is in store. He says:—

"Developmental activities of this magnitude . . ."

referring to the Third Plan,

"... with all the limitations which we face, are not an easy task. They call for sacrifices. They necessitate a willingness to go without many things. They involve a restraint on consumption in order that more resources are available for investment. The degree of hardship which this development entails can be alleviated to some extent by external aid. Such aid has been available to us from friendly countries in the Second Plan period and has enabled us to make substantial progress with our 'core' projects, in spite of the acute position in regard to foreign exchange with which we were faced in the middle of the Plan. I am grateful to all those who have helped us. But ultimately it is through our own efforts . . ."

This has to be emphasised,

"But ultimately it is through our own efforts and our own sacrifices that we can build our future."

Well, the Budget has been described in various ways in this House and in the other House. People having various interests have pleaded for one tax or the other. Our friend,

the leader of the Communist Party, has a peculiar way of doing things. Last year he called the Finance Minister's Budget a pickpocket's Budget and this year he has been pleased to say that it is a highwayman's Budget. I do not know what he means by all these adjectives to the Budget proposals.

One thing is certain that he presupposes when he says that it is a pickpocket's Budget or a highwayman's Budget, because nobody picks anybody's pocket unless he is sure that he is to get something from there, nor a highway robbery is done. The tax which is being collected is being collected from the correct sources. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is left to himself, he will probably present a murderous Budget where he will liquidate all those whom he does not like. He will do away with that society for which he does not stand. Well, those are the ways of the Party to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has the honour to belong. All those are the ways of the countries to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta owes allegiance.

Sir, I have great respect for the Professor Member from the Praja-Socialist Party—unfortunately he is not here at the moment. I will quote from his speech delivered on the 8th March:—

"More than that, Sir, the Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, makes no reference to socialism or socialist society. This omission is a very significant omission. Does it mean that the Government is divided on the issue even when the President of India wishes us to advance towards a socialist society, I think with the fullest consent and at the initiative of the Prime Minister but that his Finance Minister is not prepared to reorientate his fiscal policy on social lines?"

I have always been thinking that professors are very studious people. They do justice to all that is presented to them, but I am surprised how in this case something has

escaped the attention of my hon. professor friend. I would like to invite his attention to the last paragraph of the Finance Minister's speech in Part B, where he says:

"We have chosen for ourselves certain social and economic goals."

There is no ambiguity about it. He has said "social and economic goals". What are the social and economic goals? They are well known to the friends on this side and to the friends opposite. They are the goals which are incorporated in the Congress objectives which are well known, a socialist pattern of society. Will mere mentioning of the word "socialist" satisfy him or is it the action which will satisfy him? Even when he says that it has not been mentioned, I have just pointed out that it has been mentioned. It has been very clearly stated that we have chosen for ourselves certain social and economic goals. He goes on to say:

"We must do our utmost to achieve them".

There should be no ambiguity about it. Here is a categorical statement by the Finance Minister saying that we must do our utmost to achieve the goals set before us by the Congress—

"This will mean hard work and sacrifices for some time to come. But there is promise of a rich reward in the shape of higher standards of living, more employment opportunities and a better socio-economic system. The task that we have undertaken are of great moment for the future of country."

Finally he gives the warning:

"We dare not falter at this crucial stage."

This is what he says: "We dare not falter at this crucial stage". He means that we must go ahead with what the Congress wants us to achieve—giving equality of oppor-

tunity, more and more employment to people, taking the society towards the socialist pattern, etc. I do not think that my hon. Professor friend from the P.S.P. will have any doubt that Shri Morarji Desai has not mentioned the socialist pattern in his speech.

Sir various Members have been speaking in this House on various lines as it suits them, while my friend from Bhopal pleads for the removal of tax on newsprint. My friend from Bombay, Shri Chinai, wants more and more concessions for the industrialists, and my sister sitting to my right wants exemption of tax on glass bangles. I wholeheartedly support the last suggestion. Glass bangles are a sign of Hindu married women and they have compulsorily to wear them, and I would not like women in the villages and women in the cities to be inconvenienced by a rise in the prices of bangles.

Various suggestions have been made for consideration by the Finance Minister in his future Budget proposals. My friend, Shri Khandubhai Desai, has made out a very clear and distinct case for the imposition of excess-profits tax and capital-gains tax. I do hope that the Finance Minister will keep that in mind in his later Budgets.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur has thrown a novel suggestion, and that is the imposition of a marriage tax on all those marriages to be registered in future and even those marriages which have been performed but have not been registered. I can understand the former part of her suggestion, that is registration of marriages to come, but I fail to agree with her suggestion in the latter part.

Then my friend, Mr. Yajee, threw a suggestion for the imposition of a children's tax.

Coming to the Budget, as I have said, it has been described in various ways. I will also describe it in my

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]
own way, and I will call it a fearless Budget, characteristic of the man who has presented it, the Finance Minister, a bold, fearless Budget, which shows clearly what we have to undergo if we have to go through and complete the Third Plan.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): If I may be permitted to interrupt my friend, Mr. Bhargava, it may be a highwayman's Budget or it may be a pickpocket's Budget. I am not concerned with that. That is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's language. But then so far as I am concerned, I want to know if it is a common man's Budget.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I am coming to that if he will have patience and bear with me, when I come to the tax proposals. I will show Mr. Saksena how in the imposition of every tax the Finance Minister has kept the common man's interest in mind. I will prove it by facts if I have the time. ---

1 P.M.

I had quoted earlier from "The Economic Review" and I will quote another paragraph from it:—

"The taxation proposals are definitely of a bold nature. The Finance Minister went even to the extent of risking the election prospects in order to assure to the country at large of the government's sincerity in investments both private and public for a rapid economic development. In one way it is a challenge to the private sector, who we may anticipate will take up the challenge, rise to the occasion and make larger investments for bringing about rapid economic development in the country. They should not instead build up artificial scarcity and boost up the price which may ultimately paralyse all our developmental efforts. The lower income group

people ought to have one consolation—a genuine one—in that the Finance Minister's proposals to keep deficit financing to such low level as Rs. 64 crores in the wake of large possibilities of employment and commodity creation, will keep the prices well under check and would be a sufficient compensation to the small additional taxes that they may have to pay."

Now, we are living in an era of productivity all round. My hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, has given figures of agricultural production and of industrial production and I need not go into them. But while we welcome productivity on all directions, there is one thing which has always been giving me anxious moments and that is productivity in one sphere which will mar all our progress and which will not keep pace with any of our efforts at increased agricultural and industrial production—any progress whatsoever—if we do not put any check upon that, and that is human productivity which is going up at a very fast rate. Something has to be done and should be done quickly to see that that kind of productivity stops as early as possible. Some people have thrown hints here about sterilization and other things. I need not go into them now but it is a problem which should receive the attention not only of the Finance Ministry but of the Planning Commission and that too seriously.

SHRI GURUDEV (Madhya Pradesh): What is your suggestion?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I will give that suggestion on some other day. To an alarming extent the population is rising; it is a disconcerting feature. The Finance Minister was pleased to say last year that measures were being taken and a special unit was formed. And I find from the Report of the Finance Ministry that its report is being awaited. I hope, Sir, very soon those figures will be placed before us.

While I plead for economy in all spheres, I for one have one request 'o make to the Finance Minister and that is about strengthening the Company Law Administration. As he knows, the Company Law was amended last year, several amendments were carried out and a special audit provision was included. Unless the Company Law Administration is allowed to be strengthened and some more staff is given to it, it will be difficult for them to enforce any of the provisions which were accepted by this House. I do hope that the Finance Minister will look into this matter and give the Company Law Administration what they want.

Thank you.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति जी, यह बजट जो हमारे सामने आया है, इसका स्वागत तो मैं करता ही हूँ लेकिन मेरा यह नम्र निवेदन है कि बजट हमारे देश के लिए एक बहुत आवश्यक वस्तु है और इस पर किसी तरह का कटिंसिज्म होना कोई उपयुक्त बात नहीं है। प्रजातंत्र में या डेमोक्रेसी में जो मेजारिटी पार्टी होती है, उसके बारे में किसी भी पार्टी का चाहे कुछ भी ख्याल हो, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका यह कर्तव्य अवश्य होना चाहिये कि वे इस प्रकार का लाइन आफ डिमाकेशन रखें जिससे वे इस नतीजे पर पहुँचें कि कन वस्तुओं पर उनको किस प्रकार का कटिंसिज्म करना चाहिये। बजट एक ऐसी चीज है कि जबतक हम जनता में विश्वास उत्पन्न नहीं करेंगे तब तक वह कामयाब नहीं बन सकता है। लेकिन यह विश्वास हम किस प्रकार उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं? हम देखते हैं कि छोटी-मोटी बातों को लेकर बात का बतंगड़ बनाया जाता है और सारे अच्छे कार्यों को नुकसान पहुँचाया जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन लोगों के पास न इस प्रकार के साधन हैं कि वे बजट के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट कर

सकें न आंकड़ों द्वारा वे किसी चीज के बारे में बतला सकते हैं। फिर भी वे कुछ न कुछ बात अपनी कहते ही रहते हैं।

इसमें कोई सुबहा नहीं कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब एक कर्मठ और अनुभवी आदमी हैं। उनके डिपार्टमेंट में काम करने वाले भी बहुत ही अनुभवी लोग हैं जो उन्हें हर बात में मदद देते हैं और उन सब एडवाइजर्स की ही मदद से आज हमारे सामने इस प्रकार का बजट पेश किया गया है। जब इस प्रकार बहुत सोच समझ कर हमारे सामने बजट पेश किया जाता है तो फिर उस पर कटिंसिज्म करना शोभा नहीं देता है। मैं अपने विरोधी दल के नेताओं से नम्र निवेदन करूँगा कि वे इस बारे में कोई खास पालिसी निश्चित कर लें क्योंकि जब हम देश में किसी संस्था को भड़काना चाहते हैं चाहे वह सर्विसेज की संस्था हो या डिफेन्स की संस्था हो या विद्यार्थी हों—उसके देश के लिए घातक परिणाम हो सकते हैं। इस तरह की बात किसी भी पार्टी के लिए हितकर नहीं चाहे, वह शासक पार्टी हो या विरोधी पार्टी। इस तरह की बातों से कोई भी पार्टी बच नहीं सकती है। इसलिए मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि जब भी हम किसी बात का विरोध करते हैं तो यह अवश्य देखना चाहिये कि वह बात हमारे देश के लिए हितकर है या नहीं।

मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी डिफेन्स डिपार्टमेंट के बारे में बहुत सी बातें कही गईं। यहां पर हर प्रकार की बातें कहने की हर सदस्य को पूर्ण स्वतंत्रता है और किसी प्रकार की कोई रोक-टोक नहीं है। लेकिन मैं आपसे नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार का ऐतराज अभी सदन में उठाया गया था उसी प्रकार का ऐतराज पिछले साल भी लोक-सभा में उठाया गया था और मैं उस वक्त वहां पर मौजूद था। उस समय

[श्री राम सहाय]

जब यह बात उठाई गई थी तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल जी ने कहा था कि मैं चैलेंज करता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य बतलाएँ कि इस चीज में कहां पर अनियमितता हुई है क्योंकि मेरे पास फाइल्स मौजूद हैं। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हर एक आदमी को यह सोच और समझ लेना चाहिये कि वह जिस तरह की बात कह रहा है उसके बारे में दूसरे लोगों के दूसरे विचार हो सकते हैं। किसी भी बात पर लोगों के विचार अलग-अलग हो सकते हैं लेकिन हमें अच्छी तरह से सोचकर किसी बात का विरोध करना चाहिये। मैं आपके सामने एक बात की मिसाल देता हूँ। हमारे हाउस में बहुत से मेम्बर ऐसे हैं जिन्हें भिन्न भिन्न कमेटियों में नियुक्त किया गया है। इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी देखता हूँ कि हमारे बहुत से सदस्यों को अपने विचार प्रकट करने के लिए समय-समय पर अवसर दिया जाता है और बहुत से मेम्बर ऐसे हैं जिन्हें कम अवसर मिलता है। मैं यह बात किसी क्रिटिसिज्म की दृष्टि से नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि जिन लोगों को इस तरह के अवसर दिये जाते हैं उनमें कुछ न कुछ गुण अवश्य होंगे जिसकी वजह से उनको इस प्रकार की सुविधा दी जाती है। तो इस तरह के क्रिटिसिज्म से कोई नहीं बच सकता है। इसी प्रकार डिफेंस के बारे में यह कहना कि भेदभाव की नीति बरती गई है बिल्कुल गलत चीज है। इतना ही नहीं, मैं तो यह निवेदन करूंगा कि वहां एक कमेटी नियुक्त है जो ऊपर के अधिकारियों को चुनती है। उसमें स्वयं प्राइम मिनिस्टर, होम मिनिस्टर और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर बैठते हैं और ये सब बैठ करके विचार करते हैं और विचार करके किसी नतीजे पर पहुंचते हैं। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जब हम कोई क्रिटिसिज्म करें तो हमें सब हालात से वाकिफ होना चाहिये।

हैल्दी क्रिटिसिज्म हमेशा अच्छा होता है। जो क्रिटिसिज्म हमारे फायदे के लिए हो और हमारे लिए आसानी पैदा करने वाला हो, उसका हमेशा स्वागत है, लेकिन निरर्थक और बेकार की बातें कहने से हम किसी नतीजे पर नहीं पहुंच सकते। इससे संभव है कि किसी खास व्यक्ति को हम खुश कर लें, लेकिन इससे कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है। जब हमारे यहां डिफेंस का मसला बहुत गंभीर मसला हो रहा है, हमारे बार्डर पर तनाव की हालत है, फिर भी यदि हम इस हाउस में ऐसी बातें कहें जिनका प्रचार हो और जिनसे मिलिटरी के आदमियों में, डिफेंस के आदमियों में किसी प्रकार का असंतोष फैले, तो यह हमारे लिए शोभनीय नहीं है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस बारे में हमें खास ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों का कार्य-क्षेत्र बहुत अच्छा है और इसमें सन्देह नहीं है कि उनमें कार्य करने की कुशलता है। लेकिन मैं यह देखता रहा हूँ कि आजादी के पहले भी और आजादी के बाद भी उनकी बुद्धि कुछ पिछड़ी हुई सी रही है। जब सारे वाक्यात उनके सामने आ जाते हैं और जब सारा काम खत्म हो जाता है, तब बात उनकी समझ में आती है। ऐसी कई मिसालें हैं। अगर मैं उन्हें गिनाऊं तो बहुत सी होंगी। चीन की ही मिसाल हम ले लें, तो यह सब को मालूम है कि पहले उन्होंने किस तरह से प्रचार किया, लेकिन अंत में वह बातें जो कि मुनासिब थीं और जो कि उन्हें कहनी चाहियें थीं, वे कहनी पड़ीं। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इन बातों पर खास ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

हमने बजट को देखा, हमने देश की हालत को देखा और हमारा यह विश्वास है कि बजट निहायत ही अच्छा है। इतना ही नहीं, दस साल के अन्दर जो

इंडस्ट्रीज का उत्पादन बढ़ा है वह ६६ परसेंट बढ़ा है। मैं नहीं समझता कि इससे ज्यादा और बढ़ने का कुछ इमकान हो सकता था। ऐग्रीकल्चर का प्रोडक्शन भी ३३ परसेंट बढ़ा है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत काफी है। जितने हमारे रिसोर्सेज हैं, उनको देखते हुये यह किसी प्रकार कम नहीं कहा जा सकता।

इसके अतिरिक्त जो मौजूदा बजट हमारे सामने चल रहा है, उसके बारे में हम अगर देखें तो फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी स्पीच में जो बातें हमारे सामने रखी हैं, उनसे हमें यह बात प्रत्यक्ष मालूम हो रही है कि खर्च में २५ करोड़ रुपये की कमी हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वैसे तो ३३ करोड़ रुपये की कमी हुई है, लेकिन जो सिविल एक्सपेंडीचर है उसमें २५ करोड़ रुपये की कमी हुई है। तो इस बारे में हमें काफी गौर करने की जरूरत है।

फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो एक सुझाव रखा है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह भी बहुत अच्छा है; उसमें उन्होंने सिविल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विसेज और सोशल डेवलपमेंट के जो कार्य हैं, उनके विभाजन करने की बात कही है। वह बहुत ही उपयुक्त और मुनासिब बात है। उससे बहुत सी बातें हम लोगों के दिमाग में साफ हो जायंगी और हम सही नतीजे पर पहुँच सकेंगे कि कहां पर खर्चा ज्यादा हो रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जिस प्रकार की उन्नति हो रही है वह किसी प्रकार से कम नहीं है। उत्पादन की बात मैंने आपसे कही। मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि हम किसी चीज को ले लें, बिजली को ही ले लें, तो हम देखेंगे कि हम कई सौ गुना तरक्की कर चुके हैं। जहां तक आबपाशी के साधनों को बढ़ाने का प्रश्न है, यदि हम देखें तो हमें मालूम होगा कि

इस सम्बन्ध में भी हमने बहुत तरक्की की है। इसके साथ-साथ हम बहुत सी चीजों को अपने यहां बनाने लगे हैं और वे हमारे यहां बन रही हैं। हम किसी भी वाक आठ लाइफ में जायें, किसी भी विषय को ले लें कोई भी विषय हमें ऐसा नहीं मिलेगा, जिसमें हमने उन्नति न की हो। वैज्ञानिक रिसर्च को देखें मेडिसिन इत्यादि के बारे में देखें, तो उसमें भी एलोपैथिक और आयुर्वेदिक, दोनों सिस्टम्स में हमने काफी तरक्की की है। इसी प्रकार हम शिक्षा को लें, तो शिक्षा में हमने इतनी अच्छी उन्नति की है जो इतने थोड़े से समय में होना बहुत मुश्किल है। टेक्निकल एजुकेशन के बारे में जिस तरह से हमारे यहां कालेजेज खोले गये हैं और सिविल मेकेनिकल और इलेक्ट्रिकल इंजीनियर्स के लिए जो सुविधाएं शासन की ओर से वहम पहुंचाई गई हैं, वे इतनी अधिक हैं कि इतने कम समय में उनका वहम पहुंचाना बहुत मुश्किल था। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि हम इस प्रकार किसी चीज को लें, उसमें हमें कोई कमी नजर नहीं आती। लोहे के बारे में तो हमारे सामने प्रत्यक्ष मिसाल मौजूद है कि हमारे यहां कितने कारखाने खुले हैं और अभी कुछ और कारखाने खोलने की बातचीत चल रही है। हवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स के बारे में जैसा भोपाल में कारखाना खोला गया है, वह बहुत बड़ा है। उसके बाद और भी कारखाने खोले जाने की बात की जा रही है। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस बारे में यदि हम पूर्ण सावधानी के साथ अपनी बात रखें तो बहुत ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

अब टैक्सेशन के बारे में थोड़ी सी बातें मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। टैक्सेशन जो थोड़ा सा बढ़ा है मुझे विश्वास है कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने उस पर पूर्णतया गौर करके सब कुछ किया है। लेकिन मेरा इतना निवेदन है कि वे ऐसी चीजों के बारे में सोचें जिनसे

[श्री राम सहाय]

कोई विशेष आमदनी न होती हो और जिनसे जनता पर और हाथ से काम करने वालों पर विशेष प्रभाव पड़ता हो। इस सम्बन्ध में प्लास्टिक की एक मिसाल मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। मुझे मालूम है कि कलकत्ता में बहुत से छोटे-छोटे लोग प्लास्टिक के कारखाने चला रहे हैं। तो ऐसे लोगों की तरफ यदि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब विचार कर सकें और उनको कुछ सहूलियत मिल सके, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत अच्छा होगा।

टैक्सेशन के बारे में हमारे सामने एक बात और आती है कि टैक्स बढ़ता है, एक रुपया, दो रुपया, चार रुपया, दस रुपया, लेकिन व्यापारी लोग चीजों के दाम उताना न बढ़ा करके, उससे कहीं ज्यादा बढ़ा देते हैं और इस प्रकार वे अपना लाभ तो उठाते ही हैं, टैक्सेशन जो होता है उससे भी लाभ उठाते हैं। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि गवर्नमेंट को इस बारे में विशेष विचार करना चाहिये और ऐसा कोई कायदा हमारे सामने अवश्य आना चाहिये जिससे ऐसा नियंत्रण हो सके कि जितना किसी चीज पर टैक्स बढ़े, उसी के अनुसार उस चीज की कीमत बढ़े और उससे अधिक न बढ़ने पाये। इससे जनता को जो एक बोझ सा मालूम होता है वह बहुत हलका हो जायगा। मैंने यह देखा है कि यदि किसी चीज पर एक पैसा टैक्स बढ़ता है तो उसकी कीमत एक आना, आध आना बढ़ा दी जाती है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इन सब बातों पर हमें भलीभाँति विचार करना चाहिये।

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, within the very short time at my disposal I would like to draw the attention of the House as well as of the hon. Finance Minister to certain basic questions that have come up during

the course of the discussion on the Budget. The Finance Minister has been showered a lot of congratulations by Members of his own party. It was naturally to be expected. But I wonder whether the Finance Minister would feel happy and glad over these encomiums and congratulations if he goes through the actual text of the speeches delivered by hon. Members of his own party. The fact is that out of about 36 people, who have taken part in the discussions during the last three days, about 22 are members of the Congress Party. I made an analysis of the speeches; I went through the speeches of all these people last night, and I found that despite the various encomiums that they have attempted to pay to the Finance Minister in the beginning of their speeches, almost all of them, barring about half a dozen, have criticised the actual proposals of the Budget. I would just make a present of one sentence from the speech of one of their members, Shrimati Krishna Kumari. After reading the Budget, what her feeling is is this. This is what she says:—

“जब हम भारतवर्ष की जनता को देखते हैं और दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ते हुए दामों की तरफ देखते हैं तो हमारे चारों तरफ अंधेरा ही अंधेरा छा जाता है।”

This is not a speech by a Communist Member. Why do you blame Comrade Bhupesh Gupta? This is one of the speeches by one of the Members of the Congress Party. What does she say:

“When I read this Budget, when I see these proposals and then when I look at my people and also at the prices that are rising day after day, nothing but darkness envelopes on all sides.”

So, one of the Members of the Congress Party is enveloped with darkness all around, and you expect

that this Budget will be able to inspire confidence in the entire country. A very strange thing. Every Member of the Congress Party today, almost about 12 or 13 Members of the Congress Party—I have counted them—have talked about it. Everyone feels that as a result of some of these proposals at any rate the prices are going to rise. And the best tribute to the capacity of our Finance Minister to be able to control the prices was paid by one of the Members of his own Party, Shrimati Savitri Devi Nigam, who said:

“I know with the best of his intentions, the Finance Minister will not be able to control the prices.”

You are having a Plan and the best tribute to your capacity to plan for the country, to bring every aspect of life under your control, has been paid by one of your own Members who says that you will not be able to control the prices. Therefore, Sir, I do not want to dwell much upon these various proposals. But why is it so?

I know that many Members of the Congress Party as a matter of fact do not like this state of affairs, and it is just because they do not like this state of affairs that they have given expression to their feelings. Their conscience dictates to them and they come here and criticise these proposals. I know that when the question of voting comes, they are bound by the ties of their party and they will certainly support this proposal. That is a different question. But here is the real reaction to the Budget proposals of the Members of the Congress Party itself. Why is it so? Does it not mean that there is something wrong with our understanding, that there is something wrong with our basic approach to the entire problem, to the entire problem of finance, to the entire problem of economic development? Is it now not necessary for the Government and the Finance Minister to think as to why it is that his proposals should lead to

this kind of criticism by members of his own party? Is there any other way by means of which this thing could be avoided? Is that not the way by which the whole problem has got to be looked at? It is so because there is a contradiction between your professions and your practice. There is contradiction between your aims and the methods that you adopt in order to achieve those aims. It is that contradiction that comes and stares you in your face. Because of these contradictions these reactions are there. The common people cannot get enthused. What is the use of blaming Comrade Bhupesh Gupta? The speaker who just preceded me said that the people cannot be enthused if these things continue. That is the voice of the common people coming through your own Members. That is the actual position. Let us just see what is that contradiction.

Now, Sir, we have built up industries. True, 66 per cent. industrial development has taken place; 33 per cent. development in agriculture has taken place. All that is good. You hope that the common man will feel that. We are building for a future. We are building a socialist pattern of society. What is that socialist pattern of society? As far as the common man is concerned, he does not understand what that socialist pattern of society is. I do not know whether the Congressmen themselves understand what that socialist pattern of society is. Probably it is like the *Parabrahma* which is undefinable.

Anyway, what is it that we have been building all these years? That is the major question. All these ten years, certainly, private industry has grown. No doubt about that. Industrial development has taken place. But what does it mean when prices have risen during the last ten years by about 25 per cent.? What is the meaning of that? The meaning of that is that the wealth of the country has been taken away from certain people and given into the hands of certain other people. Even on the

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

basis of your own capitalist norms—I am not talking of socialist norms in a socialist society we would certainly say nobody has got the right to get profit when today prices are rising—what does it mean when people say that people are profiteering as a result of the rising prices? What does it mean? It means that even what is legitimately due to the common people under the ordinary norms of a capitalist society has been taken away from the common people and given into the hands of somebody else. Therefore, if development in the private sector has taken place during the last ten years, it has primarily been taken away from the common people. Their share of the wealth of the country year after year has been allowed to be accumulated in the hands of certain other people.

You tried to start industrial development on capitalist lines after independence. Then what has happened? What England and America did, you certainly cannot do today for the simple reason that England and America had their overseas empire. They had their entire colonial world at their disposal, and they were able to invest their colonial loot. Such a path is not open to you. We can very well understand it. What is the method that we are adopting under these conditions? The Government is using the entire resources of the country, using the entire economic policy as an instrument in order to see that the wealth created by the common people by their work is transferred from their hands into the hands of certain other class in the name of capital formation. I can understand, for example, money being taken away from the common people and put into the hands of the State so that the industries become the property of the entire people. I can understand that. But that has not taken place. That is the reality that stares us in the face.

Take an example. Last year it was admitted by the hon. Minister of Com-

merce and Industry that the textile mill owners raised the price of cloth by nearly 50 per cent. According to him a rise of 15 per cent. alone was justifiable on the basis of the rise in the prices of cotton. That would mean that certainly 35 per cent. more was charged by the mill-owners. Let us assume that only 25 per cent. is unconscionable profit. Year after year we produce about Rs. 600 crores worth of cloth. An unconscionable profit of 25 per cent. on that would amount to about Rs. 125 crores. Even according to the capitalist norms of profit, Rs. 125 crores goes from the hands of the people into the hands of the mill-owners and a hierarchy of people between the consumer and the mill-owner. This is the simple meaning. It is this way that capital formation in the hands of the private industry has been facilitated and the Government is using its economic policy as an instrument for this very purpose. Naturally, we are today not in a position to control prices because these interests are sought to be protected.

How can we control the prices of foodgrains? I know that many of the Congress Members would like to see that the prices are stabilised. But why is it today that we are not able to stabilise the prices? That is the simple question. Why is it that we are not able to do it? The answer is very clear. Who is putting up the prices? Is it the small land-holder having about 2 acres, 3 acres or 4 acres of land that is putting up the price or the ordinary peasant that is putting up the price? Is he putting up the price of paddy? Is he putting up the price of wheat? Obviously not. He has not got the wherewithal to stand for six months. Immediately after the harvest, because of his heavy indebtedness, he has to sell his produce. It is, on the other hand, the people who have the wherewithal to stand for about six months, who do not have the need to sell immediately, who have enough credit facilities for hoarding grain for about five, six or

seven months, it is they who can sell it for higher rates later. You cannot control them. Many of them are Congressmen. You cannot control them. Why? For the simple reason that for them the interest of the country is not very important. Their own private profiteering is supreme. Therefore, you are not able to control them. They are able to profiteer for the simple reason that they have the capacity to hoard and that capacity they get primarily because they are the owners of vast pieces of our land. That is what happens in the country. It is these people who do not sell immediately after harvest that put up prices. You allow them to hold in their hands this capacity to hold society to ransom. They have the resource to do that and this they get as a result of the concentration of land in their hands. Obviously, you are not in a position to control prices. Prices are going up. They are increasing. Here comes the question of basic policy. In the name of building up a socialist society, what is being done here? Our private capitalists would not be able to find resources for investing so much in the private sector but for the tremendous assistance given to them by the Government. They are using not only the Budget and the economic policy as an instrument to build up their resources, but there are other ways also. for the entire banking system is working to their advantage. Whom does it help? These institutions, the Life Insurance Corporation and other institutions, whom do they serve? The savings got from the common people and invested in the L.I.C. or in these banks, whom do they serve? A handful of persons are able to get hold of all the resources and they are in a position to invest. That is what we see when we look at the investments. The bulk of these shares and these new capital issues are taken either by the banks or the L.I.C. or other credit institutions created by the Government themselves. This is their wonderful record. We are assisting these people and obviously therefore,

it is difficult for Government to attack them.

The other day Shri Khandubhai Desai made a very straightforward and simple proposal. That proposal was this. Why don't you today impose an excess-profits tax? That is a very simple proposition. But behind that there is a policy. What does it mean? The very term excess-profits tax means that these people are earning profits in excess of what they should normally earn even according to the norms of capitalist society. Therefore, the hon. Members asks, "Why not the Government take at least a share of it?" This is what he says; but here is our Government which says, "No. In the name of capital formation, we will not do it." But your own policy enables these people to earn profits out of the sweat and toil of the people, profits in excess of what is normally expected to be earned. But the Government is not prepared to mop up that excess earning or even get a share of it. That is where the question of your economic policy comes up. Obviously, if they do not earn excess profits, there is no question of any excess-profits tax. If only normal profits were earned then if you levy an excess-profits tax, there will be no question of any collection of that tax, no excess-profits tax, because they do not earn anything more, no excess profits.

Therefore, the question that we are faced with today is this. The Government's economic policy is used as an instrument to create conditions so that our industrialists may get more money, because they have come late in the field and they will not be able to find the resources for building up industries in the private sector. Therefore, you make them the owners of the wealth created by the common people. And today we are told that that is a socialist state of society! Because of this policy, we find there is a big contradiction between Government's declared objectives and the methods that they are using for their attainment. Therefore, all this attack in-

[Shri P. Ramamurti.] side the House. Your own party people come and say that prices are going up. Complete darkness envelops them and there is no hope. That is what we find in the speeches made by even Congressmen. Therefore, I say, there should be a serious rethinking over this question.

In this connection, Sir, I would like to make one or two things clear with regard to the role of foreign assistance in our country. There are Members in this House who say that because we are Communists, we owe allegiance to the Soviet Union, and therefore we do not want help from the West; we want help only from the Soviet Union, from the Soviet bloc, the socialist bloc and so on. That kind of thing is being said. But may I point out that we have never stated that we do not want any help from any particular country? The question really boils down to this. What are the terms and conditions under which we are going to get this aid or help? Here is aid from the Soviet Union. Here is help from the U.S.A. Is there no difference or distinction between the two kinds of help? Does the Soviet Union say, "We want to invest our capital in your country and get profit out of that investment?" Is there not a fundamental difference between Western aid and the Soviet aid? You give me a single instance, let the Government cite a single instance where a socialist country has said, "We will invest in the private sector or any sector, but we will get a permanent lien or charge on the profits because of that investment". On the other hand, the kind of help that you are trying to get from other countries does exactly the opposite. What are we to do? Certainly, get help from other countries but without a permanent charge on our wealth. But what is the position today? What we see is a terrific onslaught of foreign private capital, particularly in the form of equity capital. After all, the national movement in the early days thought it unwise for foreign private capital to come into this country in the form

of private capital. There was reason for it. In the thirties a terrific swadeshi movement took place and it laid down norms as to what exactly was meant by swadeshi. In Madras we did not accept the Buckingham Carnatic Mills as swadeshi, just because it existed inside the country. We laid down norms and for good reasons, for the simple reason that if private capital, if it came to have a lien on the resources and wealth of the country, would become a permanent drain on our development and would block our development. Our resources would be taken away.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: More than three thousand million dollars worth of resources are given by the United States of America. What is the return that they expect from it?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I will come to that. I will deal with that also. It is the investment of this foreign private capital that we object to.

Today, I found in yesterday's paper that our Minister of Industry, Shri Manubhai Shah, at Bombay had stated that our Government had an open door, that foreign capital could come in any form, in the form of financial participation, in the form of technical participation and so on. That is the kind of thing that is stated. But today, when somebody wants foreign participation, foreign partnership, can the ordinary man having only, say, a lakh or two lakhs, get this foreign participation? Is the ordinary capitalist tide up in partnership with the ordinary capitalists in foreign countries? No, only the big business people and the monopolist people in the other country, they alone will be prepared to come in. And with whom will they be prepared to take as partners in this country and come to such arrangements? I dare say, only with those people with a tremendous amount of capital resources, with the Tatas, the Birlas, the Jains, the Dalmias, the Seshasayees. With these big people alone will they come to an understanding. With these people

alone will they have partnership. But these are the very people who . . .

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: Why not suggest an alternative?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I will do it, if I have the time. Please wait. Within the short time at my disposal, I have to point out what is wrong. If I have a little more time, I shall certainly argue out the other things also. Exactly these are the people, the big business people who can enter into partnership with the big people in other countries. Obviously, this way you are bolstering up the position of these big people. What does it mean? It obviously means the creation of monopolistic interests which is exactly what we are out to avoid. Of course, that is your profession too, but the fact is that it leads to concentration of capital in the hands of a few. This kind of capital formation leads not only to concentration of wealth in the hands of big business, but they are also tied up with foreign monopolist interests. Where will it lead to? It will certainly have serious political implications later on. After all, we know that if we strengthen the hands of these people, it does have certain serious political implications. For, along with economic power comes political power. It has been stated in the Second Five Year Plan itself that we should avoid the concentration of economic wealth in the hands of a few people. Once this thing is allowed to take place all your solicitude for seeing that the political development of the country takes place on proper lines will go away. All that will be smashed. Even today, despite your desire to prevent any rise in the cost of living, despite your desire to prevent rise in prices of the commodities, you are unable to do anything because people who have got the power to put up prices are others. You may have the political power, the Congress Party may have the political power, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru may be the Prime

Minister, but the people who can determine prices today are not Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Morarji Desai. They are some others, people who have got the economic power in their hands. This is exactly what will happen.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: They are at the mercy of the Government.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I do not know whether they are at the mercy of the Government or whether the Government is at their mercy. If they are at the mercy of the Government, then, one cannot but come to the conclusion that it is the policy of the Government to put up the prices. Is that the policy of the Government?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: No, definitely not.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If that is not the policy, if that is not the plan, then obviously it is very clear that the Government is at the mercy of somebody else. They are not able to prevent any rise in the prices. This is a very simple proposition. It is exactly the reason why we say that these are very dangerous things.

Somebody asked, did not the Soviet Union also get foreign aid? Certainly it got foreign aid. Who objects to that? Foreign aid is one thing and getting foreign private capital is another. We do not object to your getting technical aid. Get foreign technicians and pay them heavily. We do not object to that but what we object to is the invitation issued to foreign capitalists to come and invest their capital and get a return on that capital. The Soviet Union never got any capitalists to come and invest. That is why we object. We are also committed to a position where we say that exploitation should cease. It is from that point of view, Sir, that we have been seriously objecting to this kind of thing, and we do so because it has got other implications. The Congress leaders answer us by saying that we are committed to a democratic process. I do not understand this. Why I say

[Shri P. Ramamurti.] that I do not understand this, Congress Members would say that just because I am a Communist I do not understand democracy. I really do not understand the kind of democracy that you talk of. Today, we are talking of rising prices. Are we to understand that prices are rising because the majority of the people of this country democratically want that the prices should rise or is it the case that despite the will of the people, despite the will of the people not to have any rise in prices, prices do rise. In spite of the fact that people have chosen a particular party as their representative, in spite of their will expressed in a democratic manner, the economic trends in the country and the economic policies in the country are decided despite their will and against their will by certain other people who have got wealth concentrated in their hands. This is the simple proposition. Just because of this we say that concentration of wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer people is going to be extremely dangerous for our country. And it is from this point of view that we ask the Finance Minister to think very deeply. I am not now bothered about the number of abuses from the Members of the Congress Party. We are not bothered about the abuse which is being showered upon us by the Congress Party. We have outlived these abuses and will outlive them. That is not the point. Is there nothing in common . . .

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI): Nobody can beat you at that game.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If the Finance Minister comes to my place, and hears the speeches there, speeches from Members of his Party, he will understand as to who can beat whom. I can make a present of many of these speeches to him. I will send them to him. Let us not now bother about it. The point under discussion is not who can abuse more or less, but the point under discussion today is the policy

behind the Budget. I am asking, therefore, the Finance Minister to leave alone these abuses and think of the reality that stares us in the face, stares Congressmen, stares other people, Independents, Communists, everybody in the face. Is it not necessary for him to think very deeply and realise that there is something wrong? He should think over what is wrong with the situation today and, on that basis, sit together and try to have a rethinking of the basic policy and see whether the policies are such as are calculated to see that there is no contradiction between the objectives and the methods. This is the simple proposition which we Members of the Communist Party would like to urge upon you and we hope that you will consider them. It is not necessary for you to reply to us immediately. If we succeed in stimulating a new process of thought, if we succeed in making you feel that there is something wrong which must be considered very seriously, then we feel that the Members of the Communist Party in Parliament would have done their duty by the people and by the entire country.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar): Sir, I do not wish to discuss the General Budget which has already been discussed. I would like to mention one or two aspects about health.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, as far as I am aware, there are two kinds of indigenous systems of medicine in this country, the Ayurveda and the Unani and both these are purely Indian. I submit, Sir, that our system of treatment and medicine is as effective as any foreign system of medicine. Besides that, the Ayurvedic and the Unani systems suit us and suit our climate. They were invented for the people of India and so they suit us very well indeed. Besides, there is another point; they are much cheaper, in fact, the cheapest. As our people are very poor, these systems are more useful to us than any other system. The

medicines are made by our own people, the *vaid*s and the *hakim*s who, as we all know, are all very poor and hence cannot produce these medicines in large quantities. My point now is that we are not paying as much attention to our systems as we should. Take the case of Ceylon, a country much smaller than ours. They are developing the Ayurvedic system on a very very large scale. They have employed an Indian to develop that system and they have got a research institute established there. I read in the papers the other day that they had initially spent five lakhs of rupees and are ultimately going to spend a crore of rupees. They have already acquired land for planting herbs and they are also going to appoint an Indian as director. In Ceylon, there are at present 8,000 Ayurvedic hospitals and dispensaries whereas there are only 2,000 hospitals under the allopathic system. I see no reason why, when Ceylon can develop our system, we cannot develop it in a better way. My point is that Government should pay more attention to the indigenous systems and develop them to the utmost. I see from the Budget papers that a sum of Rs. 20,000 is to be allotted for the year 1961-62 for the development of the indigenous systems which consist of Ayurvedas, Unani, homoeopathy and nature cure. For this nature cure there is no medicine attached to it and homoeopathy has nothing to do with India. It is a foreign system. My submission is that more facilities should be given to our *vaid*s and *hakim*s and the Government should have its own land for herbs. We have got only one indoor hospital in Bangalore; in the whole of India there is only one indoor hospital. This is not sufficient; practically in every State we should have more than one hospital. In Dehra Dun there is a research institute for the allopathic system; there is no such thing for our Indian systems. In Ranikhet there is a farm for allopathy but no farm for us. And I find that in the Jamnagar Institute only 25 students are there. I think the Government should grant

loans to suitable *vaid*s and *hakim*s to build up their own systems.

Now, we have the Contributory Health Scheme in this country but there only allopathic doctors are employed. I live in North Avenue and there is a unit of the Contributory Health Scheme which is doing very good work indeed. There is an allopathic doctor there. I suggest that side by side there should be *vaid*s and *hakim*s also so that poor people can go to them and thereby we shall be encouraging our own systems.

There are certain things which are absolutely essential for Ayurvedic system but which are not available in India. They have to be imported from outside. They are *munakka*, *javitry*, *jaiphal*, *laung* and *sendha* salt. For these licences have to be obtained. The Government have classed them as *masala*. I submit that for use in Ayurvedic system they should be allowed freely. For private use they can have this licensing system but where they are required for purposes of Indian medicine they should be allowed freely.

In conclusion, I would like to make one more suggestion. As I have already said, our systems are very useful for us. As the country is poor, there should be no sales-tax on indigenous medicines at all. If we do not have that, we will be encouraging our systems. There is the Indian Medical Council for allopaths and such Indian Councils should be there for the indigenous systems also.

We also find that in the Unani Colleges or Ayurvedic Colleges where only Unani or Ayurveda systems are taught, the principal appointed is not necessarily a *vaid* or a *hakim* but an allopath doctor. This should not be. Where there is a Unani College the principal and professors should be *hakim*s and so on.

One more point. The allopathic doctors are allowed to give certificates when a person in service is ill while

[Shri Tajamul Husain.]
the *vaids* who are doing very good service are not allowed to issue such certificates.

With these remarks I would request the Government to pay more attention to our systems of medicine. After all, we are doing away with many of the foreign things. For instance, take the case of blades. We are now making our own blades. Even in the case of languages we are having our own. We want to adopt Hindi all over India. As far as possible we want to do away with foreign things. I do not say that we should entirely do away with the allopathic system but we must develop our system so that it may become as good, as important and as useful as the foreign system.

श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बजट के निर्माण में वित्त मंत्री का उद्देश्य यह रहा है कि हमारी तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के लक्ष्य पूरे हों और हमारा देश समृद्धि और उन्नति के मार्ग पर अग्रसर हो।

श्रीमन्, इस समय मैं वित्त मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान अपने लोगों की कुछ उन दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण प्रवृत्तियों की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहती हूँ जो हमारी इस सम्पन्नता और समृद्धि के अभियांत्रिकी में ही बाधक बन कर खड़ी हुई हैं। मुझे भय है कि यदि उनका अभी से प्रतिकार न किया गया तो वे हमारी स्वतंत्रता के लिए ही खतरा सिद्ध हो सकती हैं। अपने देश में एक बड़ी विलक्षण बात है। दूसरे देश आपस में लड़ते हैं। अपने देश की विलक्षण बात यह है कि हम अपने देश के अन्दर ही आपस में लड़ने जगड़ते हैं। दूसरे देशों से तो हमारा रख पंचशीलता का रहता है। चाहे वे हमारे सिर पर ही आ कर बैठ जाय, तब भी हमारा व्यवहार उनके साथ शिष्टता का रहता है। किन्तु अपने लोगों के साथ हमारा व्यवहार दुश्शीलता का रहता है। इसका कारण यह कि

हम कभी तो अपनी भाषा को लेकर, कभी प्रदेश की सीमा को लेकर, कभी छोटी छोटी बातों को लेकर आपस में लड़ने जगड़ते रहते हैं। कहा जाता है कि दूसरे देशों में भाषा, सामप्रदाय आदि की भिन्नताये नहीं हैं। ऐसा नहीं है, भिन्नताये वहाँ पर भी हैं। लेकिन वहाँ पर राष्ट्रियता की कड़ी इतनी मजबूत है कि वह सब लोगों को समेटे रहती है। अपने देश का दुर्भाग्य यह है कि अपना देश राष्ट्र तो बन गया है, लेकिन अपने वहाँ राष्ट्रियता अभी तक पतनी नहीं है। हमारी राष्ट्रियता तो उस बुदबुदे के समान है जो जरा से झोके में समाप्त हो जाता है। कभी हम भाषा के नाम पर, कभी हम प्रदेश की सीमाओं के नाम पर, कभी हम अपने ही स्वार्थों को लेकर आपस में लड़ते जगड़ते रहते हैं। श्रीमन्, एक और भी बात है कि अपने वहाँ जो एकता को लाने वाले सूत्र थे, एकता को मजबूत करने वाली जो कड़ियाँ थीं, वे धीरे धीरे गिथिल होती जा रही हैं। आज अपने अन्दर की जो समानताये, हैं उनपर हमारी दृष्टि नहीं जा रही है। अपने

2 P.M. जो भेदभाव हैं उन्हीं पर हमारी दृष्टि जाती है, जो हमारी भिन्नताये हैं उन पर हम विशेष बल दे कर उनको ही विकसित करने में गौरव का अनुभव करते हैं और अपनी एकताओं को आँखों से ओझल करने चले जाते हैं। आज हालत यह है कि यदि अपने देश को किसी से खतरा है तो वह चीन और पाकिस्तान से नहीं है बल्कि अपने ही से है, अपनी आन्तरिक कमजोरियों से और इन प्रवृत्तियों से ही है।

श्रीमन् इस लिये मैं ने आज यह सोचा कि मैं इस सदन का और वित्त मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस बात की ओर आकर्षित करूँ कि हमारा सब से पहला, मुख्य कर्तव्य यह है कि देश के अन्दर जो राष्ट्रियता और एकता की प्रवृत्तियाँ हैं, जो एकता में बांधने वाले सूत्र हैं—जो कि आज बिल्कुल ढीले पड़ते चले जा रहे हैं—उनको किस प्रकार से मजबूत

बनायें और उन्हें किस प्रकार से संगठित किया जाय इस ओर ध्यान दें ।

सब से बड़ा सूत्र जो कि हमारी राष्ट्रीयता को मजबूत करता है और हमें एकता के बंधन में गठित करता है वह है हमारी संस्कृति । आज हम समझते हैं कि संस्कृति के माने केवल नृत्य, संगीत और अभिनय, इत्यादि हैं—ये भी हमारे संस्कृति के अंग हैं किन्तु हमारी संस्कृति जो है वह तो इन सब से गहरी चीज है । हमारी संस्कृति के आधार आध्यात्मिक और नैतिक हैं । इस संस्कृति से ही मरियों से हमारे देशवासी बड़ी विपरीत परिस्थितियों में भी जब कि यातायात के साधन भी नहीं थे तब भी बन्ध कर रहे हैं और आज भी भिन्न भिन्न भाषाओं को बोलने वाले जो प्रदेश हैं, और जो देशवासी हैं वे इसी संस्कृति के भरोसे पर, इसी संस्कृति के बल पर ही, इस संस्कृति से अनुप्राणित हो कर ही अपने को एक ही पूर्वजों की संतान मानते हैं और एक ही राम, सीता और राधा कृष्ण के गीत अलापते हैं । आज इसी संस्कृति से प्रेरणा लेकर हमारे देशवासी भिन्न भिन्न भूभागों में रहते हुए भी एक ही तीर्थस्थानों की यात्रा करते हैं और एक ही देवी देवताओं को आराधना करते हैं । यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि आज हमारी एकता को मजबूत करने वाले जो बंधन हैं वे ढीले पड़ रहे हैं और अराष्ट्रीयता तत्व सिर उठा रहे हैं । ऐसी अवस्था में आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम इनको मजबूत करें । वह कैसे हो सकता है ?

श्रीमन्, पहले एक जमाना था जब कि अपना देश संस्कृति की दृष्टि से बहुत ऊंचा माना जाता था और तमाम दूसरे देशों में संस्कृति का प्रचार करने के लिये यहां से लोगों को, शिष्ट मंडलों को भेजा जाता था और आज भी हम शिष्ट मंडलों को भेजते हैं लेकिन आज दूसरे देशों को प्रभावित करने के लिये नहीं, उनको सिखाने के लिये नहीं बल्कि उनसे कुछ सीखने के लिये भेजते हैं

तो आज जब कि अपने ही देश के अन्दर हम अपनी संस्कृति को भूल चुके हैं मैं इस बात की आवश्यकता समझती हूं कि अपने देश में ही भिन्न भिन्न प्रदेशों में हम सांस्कृतिक मंडल भेजें और अपने यहां इस प्रकार के प्रचारक, इस प्रकार के उपदेशक तैयार करें जो कि इस देश के कोने कोने में अपनी प्राचीन संस्कृति की धारा बहा दे और जो “वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्”, “एको-ही आत्मा बहुधा प्रविष्टः” —एक ही आत्मा भिन्न भिन्न रूप में प्रवेश करती है, एक ही आत्मा के भिन्न भिन्न रूप हैं, एक ही अखंड-धारा सब के अन्दर प्रवाहित हो रही है—के सिद्धान्त हैं और “सर्वे भवन्तु सुखिनः सर्वे सन्तु निरामया”—यह जो सर्व-मंगल-कामना और सर्वोदयी भावना है उससे देश के कोने कोने को भर दे । आज इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि ऐसे प्रचारक तैयार करने के लिये अपने देश के अन्दर सांस्कृतिक केन्द्रों की स्थापना की जाये । संस्कृति मंत्रालय का यह मुख्य कर्तव्य होना चाहिये कि देश के अन्दर सांस्कृतिक एकता पैदा करने वाले जो सूत्र हैं उनको वह मजबूत बनाये ।

श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रीयता को मजबूत करने का जो दूसरा साधन होता है वह राष्ट्रभाषा है । आज यद्यपि यह मान लिया गया है कि हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा एक भारतीय भाषा ही होगी, किन्तु क्या यह सच नहीं है कि स्वतंत्रता के बाद इन १२, १३ सालों के अन्दर अपनी एक भारतीय भाषा को राष्ट्रभाषा का वह पद देने में हम काफी असफल हुए हैं और हमने इस दिशा में बहुत कम प्रयत्न किया है ? क्या यह भी सच नहीं है कि जो अंग्रेजी भाषा है वह अभी तक राष्ट्रभाषा के पद पर क्रियात्मक रूप से आसीन है ? हमें यह देख कर काफी दुख होता है कि इस दिशा में शिक्षा मंत्रालय की ओर से और प्रशासन की ओर से जो प्रयत्न हो रहा है

•[श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल]

वह कुछ संतोषजनक नहीं है। हमें यह देख कर और भी ज्यादा दुःख होता है कि देश के अन्दर जब राष्ट्रभाषा के विकास का प्रश्न उठता है तो अपने ही देजवामियों के द्वारा क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के नाम पर राष्ट्रभाषा का, हिन्दी का, विरोध किया जाता है, हिन्दी और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के अन्दर कोई मौलिक विरोध है यह एक ऐसी भ्रान्तिपूर्ण भावना है कि इससे अधिक भ्रान्तिपूर्ण और इस से अधिक धातक भावना और कोई दूसरी नहीं हो सकती है। इसमें जरा भी सन्देह नहीं है कि हिन्दी और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं में कोई मौलिक विरोध नहीं है बल्कि दोनों का भविष्य एक साथ गठा हुआ है, अगर हिन्दी गिरती है तो क्षेत्रीय भाषायें भी गिरती हैं और अगर हिन्दी उठती है तो क्षेत्रीय भाषायें भी उठती हैं। हां, अगर हिन्दी और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं इन दोनों को किसी से खतरा है तो वह अंग्रेजी से है। आज हमारी चिन्ता यह है कि स्वतंत्रता के बाद से अंग्रेजीवाद हमारे राष्ट्रीय जीवन के हर एक पहलू पर बड़ी गहराई के साथ छाता चला जा रहा है। अंग्रेजी से हमें कोई दुश्मनी नहीं है। अंग्रेजी एक दूसरी भाषा के रूप में रहे लेकिन हमें यह देख कर दुःख होता है कि अंग्रेजी को राष्ट्रभाषा के पद पर प्रतिष्ठित करने के लिये देश के अन्दर तरह तरह की दलबन्धियां हो रही हैं, इस प्रकार की एक कांस्प्रेसी चल रही है, इस प्रकार की एक विचारधारा पनप रही है और इस प्रकार की विचारधारा से देश के अन्दर हिन्दी और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के विरुद्ध आज एक जबरदस्त वातावरण तैयार हो रहा है, इस प्रकार का वातावरण तैयार हो रहा है कि जिसमें हिन्दी और क्षेत्रीय भाषायें पनप ही नहीं सकती हैं। विश्वविद्यालयों के अन्दर जहां क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को और हिन्दी को शिक्षा का माध्यम बनाने का प्रश्न था वह सारी नीति ही आज पलटी जा रही है। विश्वविद्यालयों की क्या बात कहूं, स्कूल और कालेजों में भी हिन्दी

और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के घंटे कम कर के अंग्रेजी को ज्यादा घंटे देने चले जा रहे हैं। हमें इस बात का भी बहुत अफसोस है कि हमारे दैनिक जीवन के जो कार्यकलाप हैं उनके अन्दर अंग्रेजी की छात्रछाया, अंग्रेजी का मोह इस कदर बढ़ता चला जा रहा है कि आज हमारे बच्चों के बोलचाल में, हमारे बच्चों की विचारधारा में, उनके सोचने के तरीके में, उनके उच्चारण तक में अंग्रेजी भाषा का प्रभाव दिनों दिन बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। आज हम हिन्दी के शब्दों का उच्चारण भी अंग्रेजी भाषा के आधार पर करते हैं, कृष्ण को कहते हैं “कृष्णा” अशोक को कहते हैं “असोका”। मैं अभी बम्बई में थी, मुझे यह देख कर बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ कि हर एक “श्री प्रकाश” का नाम “प्रकाशा” कह कर ले रहा है। पहले मैं समझी भी नहीं कि “प्रकाशा” कौन है। बाद में समझ में आया कि श्री प्रकाश जी का नाम “प्रकाश” है कितनी चिन्ता और लज्जा की बात है कि हमारी समस्त जीवनशैली में, हमारे विचारों में, हमारे उच्चारण तक में अंग्रेजीवाद इतना छा गया है। मुझे इतना ही इस बारे में कहना है कि आज हमें जितनी चिन्ता अंग्रेजी के स्तर को ऊंचा करने की है उससे आधी चिन्ता भी हमें राष्ट्रीय और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को विकसित करने की होती तो आज हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा की इतनी दुर्दशा नहीं होती। मेरा आज वित्त मंत्री महोदय से इन बातों को कहने का मतलब यह है कि वह इन सब चीजों पर ध्यान दें और इसके लिये जो कुछ भी आर्थिक दृष्टि से समुचित व्यवस्था हो सके उसको करने की कृपा करें।

एक शब्द इस बारे में और कहना है और वह यह है कि राष्ट्रीयता को मजबूत बनाने के लिये राष्ट्र का चरित्र एक सब से मजबूत स्तम्भ माना जाता है और मुझे यह खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि स्वतंत्रता के बाद

अपने देश का चरित्र बनने के बजाय गिरा है। हमारी नैतिकता आज इतनी नीचे स्तर पर है कि वह ऐसी पहले कभी नहीं थी। हमारी शिक्षा का जो मुख्य कार्य है वह चरित्र निर्माण का है। श्रीमन्, मुझे यह कहते हुए दुख होता है कि आज की हमारी शिक्षा प्रणाली हमारे नवयुवक और नवयुवतियों के चरित्र को बनाने में पूरी तरह असफल रही है। हम अपने नवयुवकों और नवयुवतियों को उन ऊँचे आदर्शों की तरफ प्रेरित नहीं कर सके हैं, उनको उन उच्च प्रेरणाओं से अनुप्राणित और प्रभावित नहीं कर सके हैं, जिनके आधार पर नवयुवक और नवयुवतियाँ राष्ट्र के लिये एक एसेट, एक संपत्ति बन जाया करते हैं।

(Time bell rings.)

श्रीमन्, मैं एक मिनट और लूंगी। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज जब कि हमारा विद्यार्थी समाज लक्ष्यहीन होकर, बिल्कुल निकम्मा, अकर्मण्य होकर विलासिता की ओर और अनुशासनहीनता की ओर जा रहा है, जब कि वह समाज के लिये समस्या बन गया है, तब हमारा ध्यान अब इस ओर जा रहा है और कुछ कमेटियाँ शिक्षा मंत्रालय की ओर से बनायी जा रही हैं चरित्र निर्माण की दिशा में। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि कमेटियाँ बनाने के मानी हमेशा समस्या को टाल देना होता है। आज तो हमें शिक्षा के अन्दर बुनियादी परिवर्तन करना है। किसी भी प्रकार के बुनियादी परिवर्तन करने के लिये आज हम तैयार नहीं हैं, यह तो इसी बात से स्पष्ट है कि बुनियादी शिक्षा हमारे देश में महात्मा गांधी के समय से चली और आज हम देखते हैं कि अपने देश के अन्दर बुनियादी शिक्षा की जो दुर्दशा है वह इस बात का स्पष्ट प्रमाण है कि हम शिक्षा के अन्दर कोई आधारभूत परिवर्तन, मौलिक परिवर्तन—ऐसा परिवर्तन जिसके द्वारा देश की काया पलट हो सके,

जिसके द्वारा हम देश के अन्दर एक नयी हवा बहा दें और राष्ट्रीयता को पनपा सके—ऐसा परिवर्तन करने को हम तैयार नहीं हैं। इस दिशा में आज अपने देश के अन्दर एक ऐसा परीक्षण हो रहा है, गुरुकुलों के द्वारा। गुरुकुल शिक्षा प्रणाली का उद्देश्य है—अपने प्राचीन आदर्शों के आधार पर नवयुवक और नवयुवतियों को तैयार करना, सदाचार, समानता, सादगी, संयम, इनके आधार पर शिक्षा को ढालना। गुरुकुल शिक्षा प्रणाली के जो तत्व हैं उनसे हम बहुत कुछ ले सकते हैं और सीख सकते हैं। हमें आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि शिक्षा के जितने भी अंग हैं—शिक्षक, पाठ्यक्रम, छात्रावास, पुस्तकालय—इन सब अंगों को इस प्रकार से और इस उद्देश्य से ढालना होगा जिससे हम अपने विद्यार्थियों के अन्दर उन उच्च चरित्र वाले आदर्शों, जैसे सादगी है, संयम है, सदाचार है, इनका समावेश कर सके। और, श्रीमन्, हम उन संस्थाओं से भी सीखने में, जो कि आज देश के अन्दर गुरुकुल जैसी संस्थाएँ हैं, कोई संकोच नहीं करना चाहिये। उनसे हमें सीखना चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, आज मैंने ये थोड़े से शब्द वित्त मंत्री जी के सामने इस लिये रखे हैं कि मैं उन का ध्यान आर्कषित करूँ कि समचित्त आर्थिक व्यवस्था के लिये शिक्षा मंत्रालय, संस्कृति मंत्रालय और अपनी राष्ट्र भाषा की उन्नति करने के लिये जो समुचित व्यवस्था हो सकती है, आर्थिक दृष्टि से और दूसरी दृष्टियों से, उसको करने में संकोच न करेंगे।

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I wish to say straightway that I have no complaint against the taxation proposals of the Finance Minister. To produce wealth a community must invest, and to invest it must save. For rapid development of a community it must be prepared to sacrifice present satisfaction for the

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.]

sake of its future. I think the Finance Minister ought to make it plain to Parliament and to the country that the rate of sacrifices will be higher, if anything, in the second, third, fourth and fifth years of the Plan than it is going to be in the first year of the Plan. On the whole I think he has spread the Rs. 63 crores of additional tax burden evenly over the different sections of our community, and I for one congratulate him on the straightforwardness that he has shown in this matter. I also congratulate his very able Finance Secretary who has shown ability of a very high order. I only wish that the Railway Minister of our Government and the Finance Ministers of the State Governments had shown some of the courage of the Central Finance Minister; because we notice that the States have not provided for even 5 per cent. of the total that they have undertaken to raise in the five years of the Third Plan. I suppose they have to make some concessions in view of the general elections coming early next year.

As regards the details of the taxation proposals, I do not think that any reasonable man is going to shed tears over the higher duty on radios, air-conditioners, liquor, tobacco, coffee, china, textiles, rayons, and the whole long list that he has submitted to the House which yields a total additional Rs. 60 crores which he is collecting. I will also not shed tears over the higher import duty on betelnuts because anyhow the price of indigenous betelnuts is about five times higher than the price of imported betelnuts. In any case it would not be a bad thing if we as a nation chewed less *pan* and did not decorate our street pavements and the Secretariat walls with the awful red juice coming out of the mouth of our people. If our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, introduced a Bill banning the chewing of *pan* in this country, I for one would be willing to support him even if he is a Communist.

I do not lament even the higher import duty on machinery and machi-

nery components. Even after the Finance Minister has collected Rs. 7.76 crores on that account, we shall find that imported machinery will still be cheaper than the machinery made in our country, and I do not see any reason at all why a man who is clever enough or lucky enough to procure an import licence—which he sometimes sells at a profit in the black market—should be at an advantage over the other fellow who is required to purchase his machinery inside the country. But in this matter of higher duty on imported machinery I would like the Finance Minister to clear up one little puzzle which I have in my mind. He himself says in his Budget speech that there are certain items of machinery which we import into this country, which are bound by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT as it is called, items which we are not free to touch; and he will collect this Rs. 7.76 crores out of the other items which are not covered by this international agreement. I would be interested to know from him how he proposes to deal with this discrimination between one lot of imported machinery and another lot of imported machinery and how he proposes to redress this imbalance in his tariff schedule. There may be an answer to this question, and his very able Secretary who is Chairman of GATT may know the answer to the question, which I do not know.

I welcome the concessions made by the Finance Minister in favour of investors. We need more and more investment in this country, both Indian investment and foreign investment in spite of all that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta says, and I appreciate the very bold and frank statement made by the Finance Minister in this matter without mincing words. He is very wise in removing one item of unintelligent discrimination, and that is, by making a flat rate of 20 per cent. corporate tax on dividends received by companies which will be registered after the 1st of April 1961 in place of the old

arrangement of 30 per cent. tax on majority owners and 53 per cent. tax on minority owners. All that discrimination he has removed, and I welcome it. He is also very clever in reducing one item of incentive which had been given to private enterprises because he can afford to reduce it now. And that is the reduction in the investment rebate from 25 per cent. to 20 per cent. He is not going to lose anything by reducing it because there is sufficient profit incentive in a buoyant economy and we can afford to reduce it at this stage.

There is, however, one observation which I would like to make. I make it because I believe the Finance Minister to be a realist and that is about the question of rise in prices. The Finance Minister himself admits that in a growing dynamic economy you cannot escape rise in prices. And if this is so, I do not understand why he, as a realist, does not make a provision for this rise in prices in this Rs. 8,000-crore Plan before him for which he will have to find the resources. He has got before him a Plan of Rs. 8,000 crore worth of work at the current rate of prices. The rate of rise is, of course, difficult to calculate but I suppose it will be reasonable to say that perhaps over this five-year period, there will be something like 10 to 15 per cent. rise in prices. In other words, his Rs. 8,000 crores will be able to do the work of something like Rs 7,000 crores. As a realist, he may like to throw some light on this difference between the size of the Plan in reality and the size of the Plan in theory.

Incidentally, I do not agree with one point referred to by our much respected senior Member, Dr. Kunzru, who linked the huge accumulation of P.L. 480 funds in the American Bank account with the problem of inflation in this country. This is a fallacious notion which has been rather assiduously spread by the Indian economist, Mr. Shenoy. If you take into the Indian economy goods, say, seventeen million tons of foodgrains and in order to pay for those seventeen million tons

of foodgrains if you take out of the existing money circulation in the country the necessary volume of rupees and reduce the money circulation to that extent, well, you are in fact creating a deflationary effect instead of an inflationary effect and I notice on page 19 of the Budget of the Finance Minister that he has, in fact, taken this huge amount directly into capital receipts. And in fact, he has frozen the whole amount. Therefore, there is no occasion for any inflationary effect to be produced by this money.

There is, however, one observation of Dr. Kunzru which I would like to support very strongly, and that is the Government's organisational capacity to use resources with us to extract the best possible value out of the limited resources in a poor country. Resources alone are not going to save us. If we are going to survive as a free society, we have got to find an answer to this problem of organisation—organization to extract the maximum value out of limited resources. It is not enough to raise resources either by persuasion or by coercion from a people the bulk of whom still live in a state of real poverty or by collecting resources from other friendly countries, whether Communist or non-Communist, who are willing to help us and see India succeed. We have got to understand what we are doing with our resources. A *bania* gets sixteen annas worth of work out of a rupee, sometimes he tries to get even seventeen annas worth. But a government is very lucky if it gets nine or ten annas worth of work out of a rupee

If we briefly look into one or two items of use of large funds by the Government, the meaning of what I am saying becomes clear. For instance, you look at one field of economic activity of the Government, that is the large industrial enterprises in the public sector where you have invested vast sums of capital. And you look at another field of agricultural wealth production in the so-called Community Projects. And there you

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.]

will find that there are danger signals and it is necessary for us to warn the Government about it. You invest two hundred crores on the so-called Community Projects. Well, I think the unpleasant truth has become obvious now that by and large we have very little to show for the two hundred crores of rupees that we have spent. Does the Finance Minister look upon this as an investment or as an expenditure on social education of our community? What is it? We should have a very clear idea about it. And the loss of two hundred crores of rupees itself is not so serious. We can survive as a great country and will survive the waste of two hundred crores. But what is far more serious is the fact that the people living in half a million Indian villages are steadily losing their faith in the Government's capacity to help them build for themselves a better life, a better standard of living. You take a group of one hundred villages in any part of India—south, north, east or west—and you will find that there are, say, one hundred thousand acres of land and a volume of human labour and very little else. If you introduce into that community a certain volume of capital and a certain amount of leadership, if you use that capital to give them water for their land which is very scarce in most areas in order that they get two or three crops out of the land instead of one which is true in most cases, if in addition capital is invested on other wealth-producing activities,—that is better seeds, better cattle and fertiliser—and if as a result of that that community produces a larger volume of agricultural wealth, it can pay back to you whatever capital you have introduced into that community over a period of years perhaps with little or no interest, and you can use that capital and reinvest it again and again in the countryside for the same purpose of producing more wealth. Well, if you do that, then you are investing your capital for a social purpose and an economic purpose. On the other hand, you spend your money

in building up a vast Ministry which has spread its bureaucracy from Delhi right down to the village level and producing a large quantity of papers, circulars, jeeps and station-wagons wasting its time in a process of what we call educating the backward Indian villager and peasant out of his old-fashioned ways. When the villager says, "Give me water, give me fertilizer, give me better seed, give me better cattle," we give him lectures about the desirability of adding water, fertilizer, seed and cattle to the existing resources that he has got. So we do not look upon this as an economic investment for a social purpose, it has become some kind of an anthropological study of the 'felt-needs' of the village people for raising their desire to have a better living or a better life but not to give them the credit and the supplies and the leadership in order that they can invest resources to produce more wealth for a better life for themselves. This is a very dangerous thing. If you waste two hundred crores of rupees on this, I do not think you have any right to spend another two hundred crores during the Third Five Year Plan in the same sort of way.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): You are very much mistaken. Have you ever visited any Community Project area?

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I am surprised. I happen to be one of the originators of the so-called Community Project and I know a great deal about it.

The other field of economic activity of the Government to which I wish to make a reference is the large-scale industrial enterprises in the public sector. Take, for instance, the steel plants of the Government. You set up three huge steel plants which are basic industries which we must have. It should not have normally cost any government or competent industrialist more than Rs. 150 crores into 3 that is Rs. 450 crores plus Rs. 50 crores for the special expensive equipment and

machinery for one of the three plants at Rourkela where we are having a hot strip mill and a cold reduction mill. Altogether, it is a job that should have cost us five hundred crores of rupees. By the time we complete the job, the Finance Ministry finds that the sum of Rs. 500 crores has become Rs. 700 crores and the sum of Rs. 200 crores represents the incompetence of the Government machinery through which we use our precious scarce resources. Now, I would like to ask him this question. If you need Rs. 200 crores to pay for your incompetence, what right have you to ask the Indian people to pay the Rs. 200 crores . . .

(Time bell rings)

Sir, I have been given fifteen minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): All right.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: It is not only this initial loss of Rs. 200 crores due to the inadequacy of our Government machinery. There are other losses on account of this wastage and it is going to affect our economy very dangerously. I think it was Mr. Santhanam who tried to draw the attention of the House to the delay in receiving a return from the huge industrial investments that we are making. In the winter session of this House, I asked the Steel Minister a very innocent question. I asked him what the cost of producing a ton of steel was in these three steel plants. He cheerfully read out some reply, obviously written by some civil servant, and said, "Well, of course, it is impossible for anybody to calculate what the cost of producing a ton of steel is because we have not completed the steel plants yet". So I asked him a further question, "Well, you have offered to pay to the Finance Minister two-thirds of Rs. 440 crores. It is a part of the surplus to be contributed by the public enterprise to the financing of the Third Five Year Plan. Two-thirds of Rs. 440 crores are to be contributed by these big steel plants, roughly Rs. 250 crores in five years'

time. If a man does not know what the cost of producing one ton of steel is, it is very difficult to know how he calculates the huge profits that the plants are going to make out of which he proposes to make a provision of Rs. 250 crores." Well, he said, "After all, this is only an estimate." It seems that he did not expect us to take the estimate seriously. As far as I can find out, last year these big steel plants made a loss of Rs. 2½ crores, and in the next five years it is extremely doubtful whether they will produce even one rupee worth of profit, and if these big investments—Rs. 700 crores—fail to produce any profit at all, I do not understand how the Finance Minister is going to get from his colleague the Steel Minister his contribution, which is Rs. 250 crores. In any case we have to ask him to find out from the Steel Minister how much of this contribution is going to be real and how much of it fictitious. It applies to the whole of the Rs. 440 crores, surplus from the public sector enterprises, and I very much hope, when the Finance Minister replies to the debate, that he will tell us something about what is the actual amount of profit they will be able to make, and how much of this contribution is real and how much of it is fictitious.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have already taken eighteen minutes, Mr. Ghosh.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: Well, I am concluding in a minute or so, Sir. Now, Sir, behind it all, of course, is the problem of organisation, and many of us in many different ways have tried to persuade the Government to face up to this problem, but it does not seem to produce any result. Some time ago—I have not got the time, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to go into the question of the details of this problem of organisation—a committee was appointed under the chairmanship of the Defence Minister to look into the question of the management of the public enterprises. I do not know why the Defence Minister had to preside over

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.]

it because, as far as I know, his knowledge of industries is not very wide, and the only industry with which he has so far been associated intimately is the jeep industry, and not very successfully either.

Now, only one last remark, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Our very respected senior Member, Dr. Kunzru, while making a reference to the Budget of the Defence Ministry, drew attention of the House and the country to some very serious things, namely, the demoralisation that is taking place in the Indian armed forces under the auspices of our present Defence Minister. To what Dr. Kunzru said I would like to add this one word, and that is that I have heard from an authority whose integrity is unquestioned that the Defence Minister had, some months ago, entered into an agreement with the U.S.S.R. Government about supplying a number of transport planes, which are now in this country, and are operating in the frontier areas of India, where the Chinese are sitting opposite us. A part of the agreement is that these transport planes are supposed to be of such a special nature that only Russian pilots can fly them. Indian pilots cannot fly them and, therefore, we have to allow the pilots from the U.S.S.R. to operate these planes in the areas where not even you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, or I, will be permitted to go for security reasons. I am told that in these frontier areas no Indian citizen, not even Members of Parliament, are allowed to go. I do not understand, therefore, how the Government can enter into such an agreement with another foreign Government. I do not doubt the friendliness or sincerity of the U.S.S.R. Government at all. I am not suggesting for one moment that the Russian Government has not been friendly to us, particularly in the matter of our difficulties with the Chinese Government. But that is another matter. No independent sovereign Government permits this

sort of thing, that planes are allowed to be flown by foreign nationals in that kind of a sensitive frontier spot, and where the nationals of the country are not permitted to go, on the ground that these planes could be flown only by Russian pilots. If it is true that Indian pilots have not yet learnt how to fly these planes, surely it could be arranged with the Russians to train our pilots in some other part of India. They could fly from Madras to Bangalore and Bombay and so on, and our pilots could learn how to fly these planes, instead of entering into this kind of arrangement with a foreign Government in such a sensitive area. I think the House has a right to demand that the Defence Minister should place on the Table of this House a very frank statement about the actual details of the agreement, because we do not know the facts. All that I wish to add is that we would like to know what is the nature of this agreement, and whether what I have said, namely, that the Russian pilots are flying the planes in the frontier area, is true or not. We want a frank statement from the Government.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, before I take up a few points, I would like just to say a word about one remark which fell from my hon. friend opposite, Mr. Ramamurti, and another from the last speaker. Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Ramamurti, made very much about foreign investments—not that we in this part of the House are not aware of the dangers of allowing too much foreign investment in this country. But we have to choose between two things. One is we want rapid industrialisation and development of this country. We cannot wait for it indefinitely, and the next five or ten years are crucial to the development of this country. Shall we wait eternally till we mint our own money, or take the help of other people in making this development? That is the point before us, and we have decided to take help from whatever

source it comes so that the development of this country shall be as quick as possible and so that it can be completed as quickly as possible. So there is not much in this argument that we are taking help from foreign sources. We are, we are out for it.

Referring to the last speaker I would like to refer to only two of the points that he made, with one of which I agree and with the other I disagree. I am very sorry that I cannot agree with what he said about Community Development—maybe there is much scope for improvement; we have much to improve in almost everything that we do, but to say that all the Rs. 200 crores is wasted is unthinkable by me. Going round the countryside and living there I think that is the only department today which is in touch with the people. All others are far away—may be there is very much to improve in its activity.

Secondly, with regard to Government undertakings, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think it is a matter which we should deeply go into. We find that some Government undertakings, Sindri for example, are working at a loss. The imported fertiliser of the same variety as produced at Sindri costs less than the Sindri fertiliser at Bombay where it is imported. That is the information that I have been given. Why should the cost be high here, especially when the labour in this country is not so costly as in foreign countries?

Another question I would like to put, about which I do not know very much but I have heard. Is the pig iron, which is being produced at Rourkela, more costly than that produced by the Indian Iron & Steel? Is that true? I understand it is true. If so, how is it that a factory, which is a Government undertaking, is producing it at a greater cost than that at which an Indian private undertaking is producing it? I am also told, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that Rourkela iron is more costly than imported iron—I am speaking subject to correction. If in foreign countries such undertakings cost more, there is

some reason for it, but the contrary is the case with our Government undertakings here, which are situated at places where the raw materials are available nearby and where the wages paid are certainly much below the wages paid in foreign countries, and many of them, I believe, are over-capitalised. We are not getting our money's worth.

(Interruption)

The Deputy Finance Minister will keep quiet if he does not understand.

What I am asking is this. Have we gone into the method of the cost structure of what we are producing, and with the investments that we have made, can the cost incurred at every stage be justified? A parliamentary committee went there and examined these matters and they came back with a report saying that money was being wasted. I say, Sir, it is not too soon that we are going to appoint a parliamentary committee to go into this state of affairs.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are told, and I believe there is truth in it, that we have increased our national wealth by 40 per cent. and we are also told that the *per capita* income has risen by 20 per cent. It was suggested that a committee should go into the matter to find out as to where that money is. The Finance Minister's taxation proposals affect the people in general, and he should find out as to where the 40 per cent. increase in national wealth has gone. The taxes must come from out of the people who made the profit. To me it is very clear—living in an industrial city—as to where the profits lie. In a developing economy the profits go to the people who produce them, and especially where private industries are situated, they go to the industrialists. To my mind it is very clear that a large portion of this profit has gone to those people who are responsible for production of wealth. Now, the question is what portion of the tax pro-

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingan Chettiar.] posals falls upon the people who have really earned in these First and Second Five Year Plans? I have been told—I have not myself calculated—that a very small portion of the burden of these levies of Rs. 62-63 crores falls upon that strata of economy which has profited by this Budget raise. You have reduced this 25 per cent. development rebate to 20 per cent; that is about the only thing that affects them.

About the other taxes I do not know since I do not have the figures to calculate, what percentage of profit arising out of these taxes has gone to them. We know that today if we float a mill, we would require about a crore of rupees or even more sometimes. We know that money will be forthcoming for that because there is capital formed. We want industries to be encouraged. But we also want at the same time that those people, who have all that money, should be taxed, and not those who cannot bear the burden. I do not mind tax on radios. But if you tax kerosene, it hits the poor people. Similarly, there are other items of tax which will hit the poorest people. I can say that most of the benefit of the 40 per cent. increase in income has gone to the higher income groups, and all our attempts at taxation must be on those people who have had a great share of these higher incomes. I hope that before the next Budget the report enquiring into the distribution of this rise in income will come before Parliament.

Now, Sir, I would come to undertakings by private industrialists. Here is a fact. We are producing sugar. To us, in India where the wages are low, our cost per ton is Rs. 700 but the imported sugar costs Rs. 400 per ton. May I know, Sir, if we have ever gone into this question? Has the Finance Minister ever gone into this question as to why in our country sugar costs so much.

Then, something more happens. We are exporting sugar and selling it at

Rs. 400 per ton, making the consumer pay for this loss. I am not saying something which happened far back, I am saying something which is happening even today. The question was answered just two days back. This is true that the consumer pays for the export of sugar. We get foreign exchange but the consumer of sugar pays the money. Why should it cost so much?

I come to another question, that is, about motor cars. Sir, if there is anything over which the consumer pays the greatest subsidy, it is on motor car. Even today, what is the price of an imported motor car? We have banned the import of motor cars so that our cars are able to sell. But what about the efficiency of these cars? Previously, we used to think that at least for the first three years it would not require repairs, but within six months of its purchase India made cars go for repairs. It is almost the daily experience of those who have motor cars. With great difficulty one gets oneself registered two years in advance to get a car. Now, the consumer pays one of the biggest subsidies to motor cars. Why should it be necessary to pay so much? What is the reason for that car to be manufactured at so high a cost?

Let me come to another question. The Parliament is always faced with such things. There are rumours—if the rumours are true—that there is a proposal to have a State undertaking for the manufacture of small cars. I do not know, Sir, who makes these plans and who takes these decisions, but I should think that more than the mere fad of it, the economics of these things should be studied. I am not sure, Mr. Deputy Chairman, whether in this country, when we are in need of every rupee, we want such an undertaking. We want that all the money that we receive should be properly spent.

I do not like to mention names. We ask everybody else to tighten their belts. We ask them to make sacrifices

for the future of the country, but certain questions have been put and certain discussions have taken place in the other House, which I do not want to repeat, that extraordinary amounts of money are being spent for the convenience of certain officers. Is this true? If it is true, we are not justified in levying these taxes at all at this time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): That is the cost of the belt.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Sir, we who have to go to the common people to justify all these taxes that we are levying upon them, it is for us to answer these very questions that are being put by us.

It is not my purpose to take very much of your time, but this much is true that in a developmental economy prices always go up. It is something inevitable. It is inevitable that the prices of certain articles should go up. But rise in prices is not governed always by one reason. It may be due to shortage, it may be due to inflation, it may be due to many other reasons. But it should be our purpose to see that the rise of prices in any economy should be on such articles which are not used by everybody in the country. If food prices go high, then everybody is affected. But if the prices of motor cars go high, everybody is not affected. If the price of radios goes high, everybody is not affected. I do not mind if there are fewer radios. The less noise they make the better it is, and I will welcome it. So, Sir, in our economy, in our taxation measures it is up to us to see that only there is that rise which is inevitable. If the circumstances make such a rise inevitable, it should be only to an extent to which it is inevitable and the articles which are essential for everybody should register as little a rise in price as possible. Of course, I do not mind larger taxation on luxury articles, any amount of taxation.

Sir, before the next Budget Session, I would like to get report of the expert committee showing as to how this rise

in income has been distributed. There should also be an economic survey which will help us to understand the incidence on various kinds of taxation which fall upon the lowest people and which fall upon the people who can bear that taxation. Then we would know whom to tax, which taxes warrant an increase and which warrant a decrease.

Looking back to the last two Five Year Plans, I think, Sir, we have done well. I am not a pessimist. I am not one of those who think that whatever we have done is wrong. I am proud of the effort that this country has made during the First and the Second Five Year Plans. We have achieved much. We would not have achieved it had it not been for these concerted efforts. Things which we could never think of manufacturing in previous years we are manufacturing now. The skill has gone up. Confidence has gone high and all sections of the Indian people today feel confident that they can do a great job which, in my opinion, is perhaps the greatest benefit which these Five Year Plans have given to us.

At the same time, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are certain things which we should learn from these two Five Year Plans. Wastage has been there and we have not been able to devise ways and means to avoid this wastage. Our number of officers has gone very much high, and it is time for us to appoint a yardstick committee which will go into this question. No officer, who gets under him an Under Secretary or a Deputy Secretary, is prepared to give him up. I say, Sir, we must be able to go into these matters and that is the job of the Finance Ministry. On the one side, he should be able to boldly get the proper money required, and on the other side he must keep a watchful eye in all directions to see that the least is spent and the most is got out of every rupee that we invest.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Budget speech of the hon. Minister is supposed to be based on the economic survey

[Shri Harihar Patel.]

and I will therefore, before speaking anything about the hon. Finance Minister's speech, say a few words about the economic survey. I wish to express my appreciation of the survey report for the year 1960-61 which appears to me to be a frank and realistic survey. If one goes through this report and the statistics given there, one will learn how our Plans have been ineffective in their consequences. They have not produced the effect that they should have. You will find there has been no steady or continuous rise in the national income in terms of the 1948-49 prices. You will find that in 1956-57 our national income was Rs. 11,000 crores. In the following year, 1957-58 it came down to Rs. 10,890 crores. Taking into account the *per capita* income, you will find that in 1956-57 it was Rs. 283·5 and in the following year it came down to Rs. 277·1. Again, in the year 1958-59 the *per capita* income was Rs. 293·6 and in 1959-60 it came down to Rs. 291·3. Next, let us take the figures of food production. You will find that in 1956-57 our food production was 68·75 million tons and in the next year it came down to 62·51 million tons. In 1958-59 the food production was 75·50 million tons and in the next year, 1959-60, it was 71·75 million tons. The same is the case with the production of non-foodgrains also, except in the matter of sugarcane. In this matter of food production, I would like to invite the attention of the House to one fact. In the year 1954-55 the food production was 66·96 million tons and this was regarded as excessive of demand and so some exports were made that year and the import of foodgrains also came down to half a million tons. The price index in that year was 86·6. In the year 1958-59, as I have already stated, the production was 75·5 million tons and in the next year, 1959-60, it was about 72 million tons. But the price index number for October 1960 was 127. What is the explanation for this discrepancy? With less quantity of production there was a lower price index and with increased food production there was a higher

price index. I have not been able to understand this thing and I think either the figures are incorrect or in the year 1959-60 the increased production was not available to the consumers. I would request the hon. Finance Minister to explain this.

The wholesale prices of food articles have been continuously rising. In 1956 the figure was 99·0 and in 1960 it has risen to 120·3. Similarly, prices have also increased with respect to industrial raw materials. In the case of manufactured articles also, we are told there has been a rise of 10 per cent. Thus we find there is rise of price in everything.

Sir, the very purpose of planning is to secure smooth and ordered progress. What do we find? Is their ordered progress that we wanted to see? In some years the prices are going up. In some others they are coming down.

Regarding employment position also it is clearly stated and admitted in the survey report that the creation of new employment opportunities during the Second Plan period has, on the whole, lagged behind the increase in the labour force. The number of applicants on the live registers at the end of December 1960 is 6,06,242. We are told repeatedly that all efforts are being made during the Plan periods, to fulfil the Directive Principles laid down in our Constitution. But are they being actually fulfilled? If we really make a survey of the effects of the Plans, we find there has been signal failure. We have invested money, but the results have not followed.

With this background in my mind, I am really shocked to find unwarranted complacency in the hon. Finance Minister's speech, where he says that the last ten years has been a period of striking development. He also says that we have succeeded in creating a new dynamism. He feels that our First Plan has been fulfilled satisfactorily. I do not feel so. Instead, there is much to show that contrary is the

case. There has been lack of administrative efficiency. There has been wastage and it seems our investments in many cases have been infructuous. The hon. Minister made reference to our public enterprises and he hoped that these industrial undertakings would contribute to our revenues to a great extent. But what is the real picture that we find? You find that up to the year 1950-51 our investments in industrial undertakings came to Rs. 334 lakhs. During the First Five Year Plan our investments were Rs. 4,840 lakhs and by the end of 1957-58 our investments in industrial undertakings totalled to Rs. 24,223 lakhs and we earned a profit of only Rs. 103 lakhs on this amount. Up to the end of 1959-60 our investments equalled Rs. 5,055 lakhs and on this we earned a profit of only Rs. 101 lakhs. This means that the profit was less than that of the previous year.

In the case of departmental undertakings also we find that in the year 1957-58 we earned a net profit of Rs. 36 crores and in 1958-59 also we earned a net profit of Rs. 36 crores, though the Revised Estimate was for Rs. 39 crores. In 1959-60 we earned a net profit of Rs. 48 crores and in 1960-61 the Revised Estimate was Rs. 42 crores. That has been reduced. In the year 1961-62 it fell to Rs. 47 crores. We earned more in 1959-60 and in the following years we have got reduced incomes. This is the state of affairs of our industrial undertakings and departmental undertakings.

Looking to the statistics given 3 P.M. in respect of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department, I find, Sir the expenditure has been rising beyond proportion. In the year 1956-57, revenue for Indian Posts was Rs. 32,74,59,000 and the expenditure was Rs. 31,41,97,000. In the year 1957-58 revenue increased to Rs. 34,87,88,000 and expenditure rose up to Rs. 36,87,36,000. In the year 1959-60, revenue was Rs. 39,22,06,000 and expenditure was Rs. 38,42,83,000. The increase in expenditure has been beyond propor-

tion. There has been loss on other heads also. Now, we are being repeatedly told by the hon. Finance Minister that we have to sacrifice, that we must have restraint on consumption and that we must have the willingness to go without many things for the future. Is it not the purpose of planning to secure the maximum utilisation of our investment and reduce such sacrifice to the minimum? What is being done in that respect? We do not grudge paying more and we do not grudge a few more investments but if those investments do not result in raising the standard of life which is one of the directives given in our Constitution, then is the purpose of planning fulfilled? We had been saying repeatedly in the House that there has not been the desirable progress in our agricultural sector. Industrial development and agricultural development should, as a matter of fact, have gone hand in hand together but if we review our past, we would find that there has been some progress in the industrial sector; we have some big undertakings but in the agricultural sector, the picture there is very dark and we have not got any glimpse of the nature of the efforts made by the Government to increase our food production. Unless the two sectors, agricultural and industrial, are developed side by side, the development will be lopsided and we will be faced with a lot of complicated problems.

In paragraph 28, the hon. Finance Minister has said a lot of things about prices and he has also said that all efforts will be made to keep prices under control but this is only a proposition which is being more often repeated. No positive steps are being taken in this respect; at least, we are not told of any such steps.

Regarding the tax proposals, it is said that the proposals have been made with a view to securing the economic objectives. Higher revenue and increase in the per capita income are only paper figures; in actual fact we do not find anything like that

[Shri Harihar Patel.]

barring the mathematical calculations. We do not have any glimpse of any such benefit and it is widely felt that the social purpose is completely forgotten. The tax proposals will admittedly affect the poor people in various ways. The levy on betelnut, tobacco, etc., will certainly affect the standard of living. The hon. Finance Minister himself may have no liking for tobacco or betelnut but the fact remains that people have been consuming those and to teach the people ethics or morality, such taxes should not be imposed on goods which have entered into their necessities.

There is also levied an import duty on machinery and components. Components are imported from outside to produce machinery here which in turn will help greater production of things and a levy on such components and machinery should have been considered inadvisable. The levy on spirits and wines could have been more instead of the tax on betelnut and tobacco. I think a little higher rate could have been levied on wines and spirits.

Regarding the duty on tea, it has been explained that we have been facing difficulties in the export market to remove which the export duty has been reduced but simultaneously the excise duty has been enhanced on loose tea and the reason advanced is that we should have some restraint on consumption. A few days back I read in a newspaper that in India production of tea could be divided into four divisions and that export of tea is made by two divisions while internal consumption is met by two divisions. In the face of that fact, how does this restriction of consumption of tea or the levy of an excise duty on tea help export in any way? This is simply taxing the consumers and has absolutely no relation to export promotion at all. Similar is the case so far as kerosene oil is concerned. It is said that we have a lot of improvement in the standards of living, that the

consumption of kerosene oil has increased in the country and that as the internal production is unable to meet the demand, a duty must be put on kerosene to deter import from outside. I do not think, Sir, we have as yet reached a standard of living, what to talk of improvements in the standard of living. We may be importing or producing internally, but a thing which affects our standard of living and is a very important item in our standard of living should not be so light-heartedly taxed as to hit hard or reduce the standard of living. In the Constitution also, it has been laid down as a duty of the Government that it should secure a decent standard of living for the people. Such being the case, when certain standards are being attained, there should be reluctance on the part of the Government always to affect that standard attained in any manner but the hon. Finance Minister here says that he grudges any improvement in the standard of living and tax proposals are being made to that effect. The duty on diesel oil will affect transportation costs and prices will rise still higher.

Then, Sir, I would like to say something regarding the concluding paragraph of the hon. Finance Minister's speech. An hon. Member of this House has read very high hopes in it and he has really praised this concluding paragraph but I do not find anything there to agree with him. This last paragraph is in fact, to me, indicative of a spirit of diffidence. That last sentence, 'We dare not falter at this crucial stage' and the other things contained in that paragraph rather go to show that we have no grip over the Plan; we are merely groping about. We raise our revenues and we raise our allocations as a routine matter of mathematics and then say that unless we do so there may be some danger. It amply goes to justify the criticism that the Swantantra Party leaders have often been making that we are caught up in the Plan. If our Plans are based on sound principles, one Plan should

lead to the other and there should not be any difficulty in raising revenue as well as the allotments. But because it is not so we have always to feel like this. In fact, in the economic survey it has been pointed out that the real task at the present moment is that the investments undertaken have to be completed economically and as early as possible and brought into productive use but the hon. Finance Ministry has not dealt with this question in his speech at all. He has not referred to Government's failure as far as the implementation part is concerned. We would have been glad to be told of the steps that are being taken by the Government to increase efficiency and reduce unnecessary expenditure and that would have helped us as well as the people to be hopeful about the future. We see that the expenditure on administrative services has been rising inordinately and expenditure on police has been rising beyond proportion. Looking to the statistics about the cost of collection of taxes you will find that the cost of collection is beyond proportion; it does not have any bearing on the increased revenue from taxes. These are the things on which the hon. Finance Minister should have concentrated and he should have informed the House of the definite steps being taken to reduce the increase in wasteful expenditure and assured the House that necessary attention will be paid to implementation. We find nothing to that effect and I am not inclined to congratulate the hon. Finance Minister as others have done, saying that he is either courageous or frank.

سید مظہر امام (بہار) : دیتی

چورسین صاحب - میں اس بجٹ پر کچھ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں - قبل اس کے کہ میں کچھ عرض کروں میں فائننس منسٹر صاحب کو ضرور مبارکباد دور گا -

انہوں نے جو بجٹ پیش کیا ہے اس میں شک نہیں کہ بعض اخباروں

میں پبلک میں اور اس ہاؤس میں بھی اس بات کی چرچا ہوتی ہے کہ جو ٹیکسیز لگائے گئے ہیں وہ مناسب نہیں ہیں - مگر مہرا یہ خیال ہے اور میں ہمیشہ اس خیال کی آدھی رہا ہوں کہ جب ہم ملک کے اندر اتنے بڑے بڑے پلان بنانے جا رہے ہیں اور اپنی گورنمنٹ سے یہ کہتے ہیں کہ تم اتنے بڑے بڑے پلان ملک کے اندر چلاؤ تو اس وقت ہمیں یہ سوچ لینا چاہئے اور سمجھ لینا چاہئے کہ ہمیں اور ٹیکس دینا ہوگا - گورنمنٹ سے صرف یہ کہنا کہ تم باہر سے قرض لیکر ہماری اتنی بڑی بڑی پوجائیں چلاؤ اور ملک کے اندر ٹیکس نہ لگاؤ یہ مہرے خیال میں مناسب بات نہیں ہوگی - اس لحاظ سے ٹیکسیز جو لگے ہیں ان کی میں مخالفت نہیں کرتا - مگر مجھے اپنی حکومت سے جو کچھ کہنا ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ ہماری حکومت ایک طرف تو ٹیکس لگاتی ہے لیکن دوسری طرف یہ نہیں دیکھتی کہ ٹیکس لگانے سے مارکیٹ کے اندر قیمتیں کتنی بڑھ جائیں گی - گورنمنٹ نے ٹیکس لگا دیا اور ہم نے یہ سمجھا کہ گورنمنٹ نے روپیہ پر ایک پیسہ ٹیکس لگایا ہے یا گورنمنٹ ہم سے روپیہ پر ایک پیسہ لیتی ہے مگر ہمارے سرمایہ دار اور بڑے بڑے تاجر ہم سے روپیہ پر ایک آنہ اور دو آنہ وصولیے ہیں - حکومت کوئی اس طرف چونہ نہیں دیتی ہے - میں ٹیکس

[سید مظہر امام]

سے نہیں گھبراتا - میں گھبراتا ہوں ان سرمایہ داروں سے جو چیزوں کی قیمتیں بڑھا دیتے ہیں - اب آپ دیکھئے کہ ٹیکس لگے گا پہلی اپریل سے لیکن قیمتیں پہلے سے ہی بڑھ گئی ہیں - مجھے افسوس کے ساتھ کہنا پڑتا ہے کہ حکومت کے پاس کوئی ایسی صورت نہیں ہے جس سے اس کو روکا جاسکے - دو سال ہوئے ہیں نے اسی ہا میں میں یہ عرض کیا تھا کہ ہمیں پرائسز پر کنٹرول کرنا ہوگا اور یہ دیکھنا ہوگا کہ مارکیٹ میں چیزوں کے دام زیادہ نہ بڑھنے پائیں - آج حالت یہ ہے کہ ٹیکس بڑھا ایک پیسہ اور قیمت بڑی آدھہ آنہ - اگر حکومت ہم سے ٹیکس لیتی ہے تو ہم ٹیکس دینے کو لیتے تھے ہیں مگر دوسری طرف حکومت کا یہ بھی فرض ہے کہ وہ قیمتوں کے نہ بڑھنے میں ہماری مدد کرے - گورنمنٹ سرمایہ داروں کو روکے تاکہ وہ من مانے طوفا سے قیمتیں نہ بڑھا سکیں -

دوسری چیز میں یہ عرض کروں گا کہ ٹیکس تو بڑھایا جاتا ہے - معمولی معمولی چیزوں پر اور پھر ٹیکس بڑھانے کے بعد پبلک میں خلفشار ہوتا ہے - میں خاص کر فائلنس منسٹر صاحب سے کہوں گا کہ آپ اپنے انکم ٹیکس دیہارملت کو دی آرگنائز کرنے کی کوشش کریں اور

یہ دیکھیں کہ ملک کے اندر انکم ٹیکس صحیح طریقہ سے وصول ہو رہا ہے یا نہیں - آج میں یہ دیکھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک کے اندر قریب ۹ لاکھ انکم ٹیکس سپر ہیں - ۴۰ کروڑ کی جہاں پاپولیشن ہو وہاں اتنے کم انکم ٹیکس دینے والے ہوں تو اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ صحیح طریقہ پر انکم ٹیکس وصول نہیں کیا جا رہا ہے -

اس کے علاوہ آپ یہ دیکھیں کہ جو کروڑپتی ہیں بڑے بڑے سرمایہ دار ہیں وہ پہلے کتنا ٹیکس دے رہے تھے اور اب کتنا دے رہے ہیں - اگر اس میں آپ کبھی دیکھیں تو آپ یہ سمجھیں کہ وہ صحیح طریقہ پر ٹیکس نہیں دے رہے ہیں - جب روپیہ میں تھوڑے آنے کے قریب ان کو ٹیکس دینا پڑتا ہے تو پھر وہ دوسرے کاروبار کہاں سے کرتے ہیں اور ان کے لئے کہاں سے روپیہ لاتے ہیں -

دوسری بات میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس دن مسٹر بھوپیشہ پرائیویٹ بزنس میں جو اپنے ملازمین کو سہاری دیتے ہیں اس پر سولنگ لگانے کے لئے بل لائے تھے لیکن میں اس وقت اس پر بول نہیں سکا تھا - اب میں یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ کی فیکٹریز میں ملازمین کو جو سہاری ملتی ہے اس سے زیادہ

سہاری بڑے بڑے بزنس مین اپنے ملازمین کو کہاں سے دیتے ہیں - وہ اپنے ملازمین کو پانچ چھ سو روپیہ کا استعارت دیتے ہیں اور اس کے ساتھ موٹر دیتے ہیں بلکہ دیتے ہیں جو آپ اپنے آئی-سی-ایس-اور آئی - اے- ایس-افسروں کو بھی نہیں دیتے ہیں - اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ وہ زیادہ سے زیادہ پرافٹ لیکر اپنے ملازمین کو تنخواہیں دیتے ہیں - ہماری حکومت اس طرف توجہ نہیں دیتی ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ کو اس بات کا کنٹرول کرنا پڑے گا کہ وہ لوگ زیادہ سے زیادہ پرافٹ نہ لے سکیں - سرمایہ دار یہ کہہ دیتے ہیں کہ ہم نے اتنے ہزار روپیہ سہیلہ پر منہجر رکھا ہے اور ہمارا اتنا خرچ ہوا ہے اور گورنمنٹ اتنا روپیہ چھوڑ دے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ حکومت کو ان سے کہنا چاہئے کہ تم اس تنخواہ پر منہجر نہیں رکھ سکتے کیونکہ اگر تم اتنی تنخواہ پر رکھتے ہو تو اس سے پرائسز بڑھ جائیں گی اور جب پرائسز بڑھ جائیں گی تو پبلک کو تکلیف ہوگی - تو میں فائننس منسٹر صاحب کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ ایک طرف ہم سے ٹیکس لیں مگر دوسری طرف آپ زیادہ سے زیادہ منافع کرنے والے ان سرمایہ داروں کو بھی روکیں -

اس سلسلہ میں یہ بھی عرض کروں گا کہ آپ انکم ٹیکس ڈیپارٹمنٹ

کی پوری جانچ کریں - انکم ٹیکس ڈیپارٹمنٹ والے کتنے روپے کا نوٹس ایشو کرتے ہیں اور فائل ان کا کتنا روپیہ آتا ہے - یہ دونوں لسٹس اگر آپ فائننس منسٹری میں منگوائیں تو آپ کو پتہ چل جائے گا کہ اگر وہ ۱۰۰ روپیہ کا نوٹس ایشو کرتے ہیں تو ۴۰ - ۵۰ روپیہ کا فائل کرتے ہیں - اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ ان کا اندازہ ٹھیک نہیں ہوتا اس کو بھی حکومت کو دیکھنا ہے - اس سے حکومت کو پتہ چل جائیگا کہ کیا لوپ ہول اس ڈیپارٹمنٹ میں چل رہا ہے - اسی لئے دو سال پہلے میں نے یہ عرض کیا تھا کہ تمام دوکانوں اور فیکٹریوں کے لئے گورنمنٹ کی طرف سے کبھی مہمو ایشو ہونے چاہئیں - ان پر گورنمنٹ کی مہر اور نمبر ہونا چاہئے - اس کے ساتھ ساتھ تمام دوکانداروں اور فیکٹری والوں کو یہ ہدایت ہونی چاہئے کہ گورنمنٹ کی طرف سے دیئے ہوئے کبھی مہمو ہی ای گے جائیں - اس سے سٹس ٹیکس کے وصول کرنے میں آسانی ہوگی اور انکم کا بھی ٹھیک پتہ چل جائے گا - اور انکم ٹیکس ڈیپارٹمنٹ کی جو حالت ہے وہ بھی چھٹی نہ رہے گی اس لئے حکومت کے سامنے میرا یہ سنجیدگی ہے کہ کبھی مہمو حکومت کی طرف سے جاری کئے جائیں تاکہ صحیح معنوں میں سب بنانوں کی جانچ ہو سکے -

[سید مظہر اسام]

اس کے بعد میں ایک چیز کا اور ذکر کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ ابھی بحث کے درمیان سدھیرگوش صاحب نے ٹیفنس کا ایک معاملہ ہمارے سامنے پیش کیا۔ اسے سن کر مجھے بڑی حیرت ہوئی۔ انہوں نے بتایا کہ رشمن پائلیٹس ہمارے ہوائی جہازوں کو چلا رہے ہیں۔ مہری سمجھ میں نہیں آیا کہ یہ کیسے ہو سکتا ہے کہ دوسری جگہ کے پائلیٹس بلا کر ہم ان سے کام لیں۔ اس کے معنی تو یہ ہوئے کہ ہمارے آدمی اس قابل نہیں ہیں ورنہ اگر اس قابل ہیں تو وہ خود کیوں نہیں چلاتے ہیں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے دوست کی یہ خبر غلط ہے۔

श्री० मुकुट बिहारी लाल : अगर यह सही होगी तो आप क्या समझेंगे ?

سید مظہر اسام : میرا یہ خیال ہے

کہ کوئی ایسا نہیں کر سکتا یا یہ تب ہی ممکن ہے کہ جب ہمیں ایسی کوئی ضرورت ہو۔

دوسری چیز میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پرموشن کے متعلق یہاں کہا گیا۔ میں یہ کہوں گا کہ ملٹری کے معاملات کو ہمیں زیادہ تسکس نہیں کرنا چاہئے۔ ملٹری میں تسکس کی بڑی ضرورت ہے اور ہمیں اس کو قائم رکھنا ہے۔ بہت سی چیزیں جو کہ ہمارے سول آفسیسز کے ساتھ چلتی ہیں وہ ملٹری میں نہیں

چل سکتی ہیں۔ ملٹری کے تمام معاملات کو ہم یہاں لانے لگیں گے اور ان کو اوپن کرنے لگیں گے تو میرے خیال میں یہ ہمارے ملٹری کے لئے مناسب نہیں ہوگا۔ وہاں پرموشن اور ایوانٹمنٹ کے لئے ایک کمیٹی ہے جس کو کہ کمیٹت کمیٹی کہتے ہیں اور اس کے اندر ہمارے پرائم منسٹر ہیں اور ہوم منسٹر پنٹ جی جن کا کہ ابھی انتقال ہوا ہے وہ بھی اس کے اندر تھے تو ان دو بڑی شخصیتوں کے ساتھ ٹیفنس منسٹر صاحب کام کرتے ہیں اور سب کی صلاح سے ہی سب پرموشن وفیرہ ہوتے ہیں۔ تو جب تک ہم پنڈت جواہر لال جی کو اپنا لیڈر مانتے ہیں اور جب کہ پنڈت پنٹ جی ایسے بڑے آدمی اس کمیٹی میں تھے تو ہم یہ مرکز سمجھنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں کہ کہیں بھی کوئی انجسٹس ہوتی ہوگی اور کسی کے دیکھنے میں اگر کہیں کوئی انجسٹس معلوم بھی ہوتی ہے تو میرے خیال میں ہمیں یہ سمجھنا چاہئے کہ ملک کے لئے یہی مفید ہوگا جو کہ ان لوگوں نے کیا ہے۔ پرموشن صرف سہارٹی پر ہی نہیں ہوتا ہے۔ ہمارے ملک کے جو لیڈر ہیں اور جو گورنمنٹ کے لیڈر ہیں وہ بھی اچھی طرح سے سمجھ سکتے ہیں کہ کون آدمی بہتر ہے اور کس کو ترقی دیں اور کس کو ترقی نہ دیں۔ یہ ملک کی قسمت کا سوال

ہے، ڈیفینس کا سوال ہے اور یہ بڑا نازک مسئلہ ہے۔ تو پرائم منسٹر اور ہوم منسٹر جس کمیٹی کے ممبر ہوں اس کمیٹی کے بارے میں کوئی شبہ ظاہر کرنا سیرے خیال میں مناسب نہیں ہے۔

آخر میں میں آپ سے ایڈمنسٹریشن کے متعلق کچھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ ملک میں ایڈمنسٹریشن کی جو حالت ہو رہی ہے وہ بہت بہتر نہیں ہے۔ ہمارے فائلنس منسٹر صاحب جو کہ اس وقت یہاں وجود نہیں ہیں بلکہ فائلنس منسٹر ہی نہیں ہیں بلکہ ملک کے ایک بہت بڑے لیڈر بھی ہیں، اس لئے میں ان کی توجہ اس طرف دلاتا ہوں کہ ایڈمنسٹریشن کی جو حالت ہے اس کے اوپر وہ غور کریں۔ جب وہ بمبئی میں ہوم منسٹر تھے تب انہوں نے وہاں بہت کچھ کیا تھا اور یہ قابل فخر بات تھی کہ وہاں جو مائنداریتیں تھیں اور جو دوسرے لوگ تھے وہ سب خوش تھے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ اس معاملہ میں بھی اپنی رائے دیکر ملک میں جو دوسرے صوبوں میں اپنی بات چلا دیں گے۔ اس وقت جمپور کے واقعات کے بارے میں زیادہ کچھ کہنا نہیں چاہتا ہوں۔ جمپور کے واقعات کی تفصیل میں نہیں جاؤں گا کیونکہ جج مقرر ہوئے ہیں اور پارلیمنٹ کی ایک کمیٹی بھی وہاں گئی ہے۔

دیکھیں گے کہ کیا بات تھی۔ میں خود وہاں گیا ہوں اور میں نے دیکھا ہے۔ میں اس وجہ سے اس کو نہیں کہتا ہوں کہ میں مسلمان ہوں بلکہ ایک ہندوستانی کی حیثیت سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہاں جو کچھ ہوا وہ بڑی شرم اور افسوس کی بات ہوئی۔ یہ کیا حالت ہے کہ آج کہیں پر لنگوسٹک بلنا پر فساد ہوتا ہے تو کہیں پر ریلوے بلنا پر فساد ہوتا ہے۔ اگر ایسا ہوتا رہا تو پھر ملک کی حالت کیسے بہتر ہوگی اور کیسے کوئی فائیو ایر پلان چلے گا۔ جب لوگ پریشان ہوں گے اور لوگ دوسرے کاموں میں لگے رہیں گے تو پھر ترقی کا کام کیسے ہوگا۔ جب لوگ ان کے ریہیلٹیشن میں ہی لگ جاتے ہیں اور تمام مقدمات کے کاموں میں لگ جاتے ہیں تو پھر اور کام کیسے ہوگا۔ اس لئے ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ اسٹرانگ طریقہ سے سنٹرل گورنمنٹ اس چیز کو ختم کرے۔ صرف اسٹیت گورنمنٹ پر ہی اس کیلئے بھروسہ نہیں کرنا چاہئے۔ خود سنٹرل گورنمنٹ کو اسٹیت گورنمنٹس پر کڑی نظر رکھنی چاہئے اور ہمارے جو بڑے بڑے منسٹر ہیں، فائلنس منسٹر ہیں ان کو خود جا کر دیکھنا چاہئے نہ اگر اسٹیت اپنی ذمہ داری میں کہیں فیل ہو رہی ہے تو اسٹرانگ ہینڈ سے وہاں ان پر ایکشن لینا چاہئے۔ صرف یہ سوچ کر کہ لا ایڈ آرڈر اسٹیت سمجھکتا ہے اس لئے اس کو اسٹیت گورنمنٹ پر ہتھ دینے میں خیال میں تھیک

[سید مظہر امام]

نہیں ہے۔ اب وقت آ گیا ہے کہ اس چھڑ کو آپ اپنے ہاتھ میں لیں اور اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹس کے اوپر نہ چھوڑیں اور ان پر کڑی نظر رکھیں۔ اس کے لئے اگر قانون میں تبدیلی کی ضرورت ہو تو قانون میں تبدیلی بھی کر سکتے ہیں اور اس کے لئے ملک آپ کا ساتھ دے گا کیونکہ ملک کی بھائی کے لئے ملک کی ترقی کے لئے سب سے پی پی چھڑ ہے۔ من روٹی دہلے سے پہلے یہ ضروری ہے کہ آپ لوگوں کو امن دیں۔ ہر ایک انسان امن چاہتا ہے۔ اس کو پہلے آپ امن دیجئے پھر اس کے بعد اس کی روٹی، نوکری اور سروس کا خیال کھجئے۔ اس کے لئے میں ایک سبجشن رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔ اس پر فائنل منسٹری کو، تمام منسٹریز کو اور ہاؤس کے جو ممبران ہیں ان کو غور کرنا چاہئے۔ وہ یہ ہے کہ ہر گاؤں میں اور ہر محلہ میں اور ہر شہر میں اس کے لئے ایک ایک یونٹ بنائیں۔ جس طرح سے جگہ جگہ چلتے ہیں اسی طرح سے گاؤں، محلے اور شہر کے یونٹ ہوں اور جو لیگوسٹک مائٹاریٹی ہے یا ریلیجس مائٹاریٹی ہے اس کی حفاظت کی ذمہ داری اس یونٹ کی تجارتی کمپنی پر ڈال دیں۔ میجرٹی پر یہ اسپانسیلٹی قالی جائے کہ اس کے یہاں جو ریلیجس مائٹاریٹی ہے اس کی حفاظت تم کو کرنی ہوگی اور تمہارے پروٹیکشن میں ہیں ہی ہم ان کو دیتے ہیں۔ اگر کوئی ممکن جلایا گیا اگر ان کے گھروں کو

لوٹا گیا یا ان کو مارا گیا تو اس کے لئے تم اسپانسیل ہو گے۔ خواہ وہاں ہندو ہوں، مسلمان ہوں، سکھ ہوں، کرشچھن ہوں، گولی بھی ہوں، جس جگہ جس گاؤں میں، جس یونٹ میں جو میجرٹی ہو اس کے اوپر یہ ذمہ داری ہو۔ آپ اس کے لئے ایک قانون بنا دیں اور ان کو اسپانسیل قرار دیں کہ وہ اپنے سے کمزور کو اپنی ستائیں گے اور نہ انہیں کسی دوسرے دستانے دیں گے۔ آپ کی ملٹری اور پولیس تو ہے لیکن وہ بعد کی چھڑ ہے۔ اگر یہ صوت کی جائے تو مہرا خیال ہے کہ ملک کے اندر امن قائم ہو جائے گا اور ایسا بھائی چارہ قائم ہو جائے گا کہ پھر اس طرح کے رائٹس کہیں نہیں ہو سکیں گے اور ہم تمام دنیا کے لئے ایک مثال ہوں گے کیونکہ اور ملکوں میں بہت سی جگہ مائٹاریٹی کے پرابلم ہیں اور ان ملکوں میں وہ سالو نہیں ہو پائے ہوں۔ میں نے اس کو بہت مختصر طور سے کہا ہے۔ اگر ہمارے فائنل منسٹر صاحب چاہیں گے تو ان کو بتاؤں گا کہ کس صورت سے اس کو ورک آؤٹ کیا جا سکتا ہے۔ اگر یہ صورت اختیار کی گئی تو ملک کے اندر امن قائم ہو جائیگا۔ ورنہ آج حالت یہ ہے کہ آج یہاں ہے تو کل وہاں اور پرسوں وہاں ہے اور اس طرح ملک کی اتنی زیادہ پریشانی ہے کہ جس کی

کوئی انہیں نہیں ہے - اس سے زیادہ میں اس وقت بولنا نہیں چاہتا ہوں اور ان الفاظ کے ساتھ آپ کے بحث کو سپورٹ کرتا ہوں -

†[सैयद मजहर इमाम (बिहार) : डिप्टी चैंयरमैन साहब, मैं इस बजट पर कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। कब्ल इसके कि मैं कुछ अर्ज करूं, मैं फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब को जरूर मुबारकबाद दूंगा।

उन्होंने जो बजट पेश किया है, उसमें शक नहीं कि बाज़ अखबारों में, पब्लिक में और इस हाउस में भी इस बात की चर्चा हुई है कि जो टैक्सेज लगाये गये हैं वह मुनासिब नहीं हैं। मगर मेरा यह खयाल है और मैं हमेशा इस खयाल का आदमी रहा हूं कि जब हम मुल्क के अन्दर इतने बड़े बड़े प्लान बनाने जा रहे हैं और अपनी गवर्नमेंट से यह कहते हैं कि तुम इतने बड़े बड़े प्लान अपने मुल्क के अन्दर चलाओ, तो उसी वक्त हमें यह सोच लेना चाहिये और समझ लेना चाहिये कि हमें और टैक्स देना होगा। गवर्नमेंट से सिर्फ यह कहना कि तुम बाहर से कर्ज लेकर हमारी इतनी बड़ी बड़ी योजनाएं चलाओ और मुल्क के अन्दर टैक्स न लगाओ, यह मेरे खयाल में मुनासिब बात नहीं होगी। इस लिहाज से टैक्स जो लगे हैं उनकी मैं मुखालिफत नहीं करता। मगर मुझे अपनी हुकूमत से जो कुछ कहना है वह यह है कि हमारी हुकूमत एक तरफ तो टैक्स लगाती है, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ यह नहीं देखती कि टैक्स लगाने से मार्केट के अन्दर कीमत कितनी बढ़ जाती है। गवर्नमेंट ने टैक्स लगा दिया और हमने यह समझा कि गवर्नमेंट ने रुपये पर एक पैसा टैक्स लगाया है या गवर्नमेंट हमसे रुपये पर एक पैसा लेती है। मगर हमारा सरमायादार और बड़े बड़े ताज़र हमसे रुपये पर एक आना और दो आना वसूलते हैं। हुकूमत कोई

इस तरफ तवज्जह नहीं देती है। मैं टैक्स से नहीं घबराता। मैं घबराता हूं उन सरमायादारों से, जो चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ा देते हैं। अब आप देखिये कि टैक्स लगेगा पहली अप्रैल से, लेकिन कीमतें पहले से ही बढ़ गई हैं। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हुकूमत के पास कोई ऐसी सूरत नहीं है, जिससे इसको रोका जा सके। दो साल हुए मैंने इसी हाउस में यह अर्ज किया था। कि हमें प्राइसेज पर कन्ट्रोल करना होगा और यह देखना होगा कि मार्केट में चीजों के दाम ज्यादा न बढ़ने पावें। आज हालत यह है कि टैक्स बढ़ा एक पैसा और कीमत बढ़ी आधा आना। अगर हुकूमत हमसे टैक्स लेती है, तो हमें टैक्स देने के लिये तैयार हैं मगर दूसरी तरफ हुकूमत का यह भी फर्ज है कि वह कीमतों को न बढ़ने में हमारी मदद करे। गवर्नमेंट सरमायादारों को रोके, ताकि वह मनमाने तरीके से कीमतें न बढ़ा सकें।

दूसरी चीज़ में यह अर्ज करूंगा कि टैक्स तो बढ़ाया जाता है मामूली मामूली चीजों पर और फिर टैक्स बढ़ने के बाद पब्लिक में खलफ़शार होता है। मैं खासकर फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब से कहूंगा कि आप अपने इन्कम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट को रिआर्गनाइज करने की कोशिश करें और यह देखें कि मुल्क के अन्दर इन्कम टैक्स सही तरीके से वसूल हो रहा है या नहीं। आज मैं यह देखता हूं कि हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर करीब नौ लाख इन्कम टैक्स पेयर हैं। ४० करोड़ की जहां पोपुलेशन हो वहां इतने कम इन्कम टैक्स देने वाले हों तो इसके माइने यह हैं कि मही तरीके पर इन्कम टैक्स वसूल नहीं किया जा रहा है।

इसके अलावा आप यह देखेंगे कि जो करोड़पति हैं बड़े बड़े सरमायादार हैं वह पहले कितना टैक्स दे रहे थे और अब कितना दे रहे हैं। अगर इसमें आप कभी देखें तो आप

[संयद मजहः इमाम]

यह समझे कि वह सही तरीके पर टैक्स नहीं दे रहे हैं। जब पये में तेरह आने के करीब उनको टैक्स देना पड़ता है, तो फिर वह दूसरे कारोबार कहां से धरते हैं और उनके लिए कहां से रुपया लाते हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि उस दिन मिस्टर भूपेश प्राइवेट, बिजनेसमैन जो अपने मुलाजमीन को सेलरी देते हैं, उस पर सीलिंग लगाने के लिये बिल लाये थे, किन में उस वक्त इस पर बोल नहीं सका था। अब मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट की फैक्ट्रीज में मुलाजमीन को जो सेलरी मिलती है, उससे ज्यादा सैलरी बड़े बड़े बिजनेसमैन अपने मुलाजमीन को कहां से देते हैं। वह अपने मुलाजमीन को पांच छः सौ रुपये का स्टार्ट देते हैं और उसके साथ मोटर देते हैं, बंगला देते हैं जो आप अपने आई० सी० एस० और आई० ए० एस० अफसरों को भी नहीं देते हैं। इसके माइने यह है कि वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रोफिट ले कर अपने मुलाजिमों को तनखाहें देते हैं। हमारी हुकूमत इस तरफ तवज्जह नहीं देती है। मैं समझता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट को इस बात का कन्ट्रोल करना पड़ेगा कि वह लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रोफिट न ले सकें। सरमायेदार यह कहते हैं कि हमने इतने इज्जार महीना पर मैनेजर रखा है और हमारा इतना खर्च हुआ है और गवर्नमेंट इतना रुपया छोड़ दे। मैं समझता हूं कि हुकूमत को उनसे कहना चाहिये कि तुम इस तनखाह पर मैनेजर नहीं रख सकते। क्योंकि अगर तुम इतनी तनखाह पर रखते हो, तो इससे प्राइसेज बढ़ जायेंगी और जब प्राइसेज बढ़ जायेंगी, तो पब्लिक को बकलीफ होगी। तो मैं फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब की तवज्जह इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूं कि आप एक तरफ हमसे टैक्स लें, मगर दूसरी तरफ आप ज्यादा से ज्यादा मुनाफा करने वाले इन सरमायेदारों को भी रोकें।

इस सिलसिले में यह भी मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि आप इन्कमटैक्स डिपार्टमेंट की पूरी जांच करें। इन्कमटैक्स डिपार्टमेंट वाले कितने रुपये का नोटिस इश्यू करते हैं और फाइनल उनका कितना रुपया आता है। ये दोनों लिस्ट्स अगर आप फाइनल मिनिस्ट्री में मंगवायें, तो आपको पता चल जायेगा कि अगर वह १०० रुपये का नोटिस इश्यू करते हैं, तो चालीस पचास रुपये का फाइनल करते हैं। इसके माइने यह है कि उनका अन्दाजा ठीक नहीं होता। इसको भी हुकूमत को देखना है। इससे हुकूमत को पता चल जायेगा कि क्या लूपहोल इस डिपार्टमेंट में चल रहा है। इसीलिये दो साल पहले मैंने यह अर्ज किया था कि तमाम दुकानों और फैक्ट्रियों के लिये गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से केश-मिमों इश्यू होने चाहियें। इन पर गवर्नमेंट की मोहर और नम्बर होना चाहिये। इसके साथ साथ तमाम दूकानदारों और फैक्ट्री वालों को यह हिदायत होनी चाहिये कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से दिये हुए केश-मिमों ही इश्यू किये जायें। इससे सेल्फ टैक्स के वसूल करने में आसानी होगी और इन्कम का भी ठीक पता चल जायेगा। और इन्कमटैक्स डिपार्टमेंट की जो हालत है वह भी छुपी न रहेगी। इसलिये हुकूमत के सामने मेरा यह सजेशन है कि केश-मिमो हुकूमत की तरफ से जारी किये जायें, ताकि सही माइनों में सब बातों की जांच हो सके।

इसके बाद मैं एक चीज का और जिक्र करना चाहता हूं। अभी बहस के दरमियान सुधीर घोष साहब ने डिफेंस का एक मामला हमारे सामने पेश किया। इसे सुन कर मुझे बड़ी हैरत हुई। उन्होंने बताया कि रशियन पाइलट हमारे हवाई जहाजों को चला रहे हैं। मेरी गमझ में नहीं आया कि यह कैसे हो सकता है कि दूसरी जगह के पाइलट्स बुला कर उनसे हम काम लें। इसके

माइने तो यह हुये कि हमारे आदमी इस काबिल नहीं है, वरना अगर इस काबिल है, तो वे खुद क्यों नहीं चलाते है ? मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे दोस्त की यह खबर गलत है ।

प्रो० मुकुट बिहारी लाल : अगर यह सही होगी, तो आप क्या समझेंगे ?

सैयद मजहर इमाम : मेरा यह खयाल है कि कोई ऐसा नहीं कर सकता या यह तब ही मुमकिन है, जब हमें ऐसी कोई जरूरत हो ।

दूसरी चीज मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रमोशन के मुतल्लिक यहां कहा गया । मैं यह कहूंगा कि मिलिटरी के मामलान को हमें ज्यादा डिस्कस नहीं करना चाहिये । मिलिटरी में डिभिप्लिन की बड़ी जरूरत है और हमें इसको कायम रखना है । बहुत सी चीजें, जो हमारे सिविल आफिसर्स के साथ चलती हैं वह मिलिटरी में नहीं चल सकती है । मिलिटरी के तमाम मुआमलात को यहां लाने लगेंगे और उनको ओपिन करने लगेंगे, तो मेरे खयाल में यह हमारे कण्ट्री के लिये मुनासिब नहीं होगा । वहां प्रमोशन और एपाइंटमेंट के लिये एक कमेटी है, जिसको कि कैबिनेट कमेटी कहते हैं और उसके अन्दर हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर है और होम मिनिस्टर है । होम मिनिस्टर पन्त जी, जिनका कि अभी इन्तकाल हुआ है वह भी इसके अन्दर थे और इन दो बड़ी शक्तियों के साथ डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब काम करते हैं और सबकी सलाह से ही सब प्रमोशन वगैरा होते हैं । तो जब तक हम पं० जवाहरलाल जी को अपना लीडर मानते हैं और जब कि पं० पन्त जी ऐसे बड़े आदमी इस कमेटी में थे, तो हम यह इरगिज समझने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि कहीं भी कोई इनजस्टिस हुई होगी और किसी के देखने में अगर कहीं कोई इनजस्टिस मान्य भी होती है, तो मेरे खयाल में हमें

यह समझना चाहिये कि मुल्क के लिये यही मुफीद होगा कि जो कि इन लोगों ने किया है । प्रमोशन सिर्फ सीनियोरिटी पर ही नहीं होता है । हमारे मुल्क के जो लीडर है और गवर्नमेंट के लीडर है, वह भी अच्छी तरह से समझ सकते हैं कि कौन आदमी बेहतर है और किसको तरक्की दें और किसको तरक्की न दें । यह मुल्क की किस्मत का सवाल है, डिफेंस का सवाल है और यह बड़ा नाजुक मसला है । तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर और होम मिनिस्टर जिस कमेटी के मेम्बर हों, उस कमेटी के बारे में कोई शुबहा आहिर करना मेरे खयाल में मुनासिब नहीं है ।

आखिर में मैं आपसे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के मुतल्लिक कुछ कहना चाहता हूं । मुल्क में एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की जो हालत हो रही है, वह बहुत बेहतर नहीं है । हमारे फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब जो कि इस वक्त यहां मौजूद हैं, वह सिर्फ फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ही नहीं हैं, बल्कि मुल्क के एक बहुत बड़े लीडर भी हैं इसलिये मैं उनकी तबज्जह इस तरफ दिलाता हूं कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की जो हालत है, उसके ऊपर वह गौर करें । जब वह बम्बई में होम मिनिस्टर थे, तब उन्होंने वहां बहुत कुछ किया था और यह काबिले फख्र बात थी कि वहां जो माइनोरिटीज थी और जो दूसरे लोग थे वह सब खुश थे । मैं समझता हूं कि वह इस मामला में भी अपनी राय दे-कर मुल्क में और दूसरों सबों में अपनी बात चलायेंगे । इस वक्त जबलपुर के वाकयात के बारे में मैं ज्यादा कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता हूं । जबलपुर के वाकयात की तफसील में मैं नहीं जाऊंगा; क्योंकि जज मुकर्रर हुए हैं और पार्लियामेंट की एक कमेटी भी वहां गई है और वह देखेंगे कि क्या बात थी । मैं खुद वहां गया हूं और मैंने देखा है । मैं इस वजह से इसको नहीं कहता हूं कि मैं मुसलमान हूं बल्कि एक

[संयद मजहर इमाम]

हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत से कहता हूँ कि वहाँ जो कुछ हुआ है, वह बड़ी शर्म और अपमान की बात हुई। यह क्या हालत है कि आज कहीं पर लिग्विस्टिक बिना पर फिसाद होता है, तो कहीं पर रिलीजस बिना पर फिसाद होता है। अगर ऐसा होता रहा, तो फिर मुल्क की हालत कैसे बेहतर होगी और कैसे कोई फाइव ईयर प्लान चलेगा? जब लोग परेशान होंगे और लोग दूसरे कामों में लगे रहेंगे, तो फिर तरक्की का काम कैसे होगा? जब लोग इसके रिहैबिलिटेशन में ही लग जाते हैं और तमाम मुकदमात के काम में लग जाते हैं, तो फिर और काम कैसे होगा। इसलिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि स्ट्रॉंग तरीके से सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट इस चीज को खत्म करे। सिर्फ स्टेट गवर्नमेंट पर ही इसके लिये भरोसा नहीं करना चाहिये। खुद सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स पर कड़ी नज़र रखनी चाहिये और हमारे जो बड़े बड़े मिनिस्टर हैं, फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर हैं, उनको खुद जा कर देखना चाहिये कि अगर स्टेट अपनी जिम्मेदारी में कहीं फेल हो रही है तो, स्ट्रॉंग हैंड से वहाँ उन पर एक्शन लेना चाहिये। सिर्फ यह सोच कर कि ला एंड आउट स्टेट सबजेक्ट है, इसलिये इसको स्टेट गवर्नमेंट पर छोड़ दें, मेरे ख्याल में ठीक नहीं है। अब वक्त आ गया है कि इस चीज को आप अपने हाथ में लें और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स के ऊपर न छोड़ें और उन पर कड़ी नज़र रखें। इसके लिये अगर कानून में तबदीली की जरूरत हो, तो कानून में तबदीली भी कर सकते हैं और उसके लिये मुल्क आपका साथ देगा; क्योंकि मुल्क की भलाई के लिये मुल्क की तरक्की के लिये सबसे पहली चीज है अमन। रोटी देने से पहले यह जरूरी है कि आप लोगों को अमन दें। हरेक इन्सान अमन चाहता है। उसको पहले आप अमन बीजिए फिर उसके बाद उसकी रोटी, नौकरी और सविस का खयाल कीजिए। इसके

लिये मैं एक सजेशन रखना चाहता हूँ, उस पर फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री को और तमाम मिनिस्ट्रीज को और हाउस के तमाम मेम्बरान हैं, उनको गौर करना चाहिये। वह यह है कि हर गांव में और हर मुहल्ले में और हर शहर में इसके लिये एक एक यूनिट बनायें। जिस तरह से जगह जगह थाने हैं, उसी तरह से गांव, मुहल्ले और शहर के यूनिट हों और जो लिग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटी है और रिलीजस माइनोरिटी है, उसकी हिफाज़त की जिम्मेदारी इस यूनिट की मेजोरिटी कम्युनिटी पर डाल दें। मेजोरिटी पर यह रिसपांन्सीबिलिटी डाली जाये कि उसके वहाँ जो रिलीजस माइनोरिटी है, उसकी हिफाज़त तुम को करनी होगी और तुम्हारे प्रोटेक्सन में ही हम उनको देते हैं। और कोई मकान जलाया गया, उनके अगर घरों को लूटा गया या उनको मारा गया, तो उसके लिये तुम रिसपांन्सीबिल होगे। स्वाह वहाँ हिन्दू हों, मुसलमान हों, सिक्ख हों, क्रिश्चियन हों कोई भी हों, जिस जगह, जिस गांव में, जिस यूनिट में जो मेजोरिटी हो उसके ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी हो। आप उसके लिए एक कानून बना दें और उनका रिसपांन्सीबिल करार दें कि वह अपने से कमजोर को नहीं सतायेंगे और न किसी दूसरे को सताने देंगे। आपकी मिलिटरी और पुलिस तो है, लेकिन वह बाद की चीज है। अगर यह सूरत की जाये, तो मेरा खयाल है कि मुल्क का अन्दर अमन कायम हो जायेगा। और ऐसा भाई-चारा कायम हो जायेगा, फिर इस तरह से रायदस रुहीं नहीं हो सकेंगे और हम तमाम दुनिया के लिये एक मिसाल होंगे; क्योंकि और मुल्कों में बहुत सी जगह माइनोरिटी के प्रोबलम हैं और उन मुल्कों में वे सोल्व नहीं हो पाये हैं। मैंने इसको बहुत मुस्तसिर तौर से कहा है। अगर हमारे फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब चाहेंगे, तो मैं उनको बताऊंगा कि किस सूरत से इसको वर्कआऊट किया जा सकता है। अगर यह सूरत अस्तित्थार की

गई, तो मुल्क के अन्दर अमन कायम हो जायेगा वरना आज हालत यह है कि आज यहाँ है, तो कल वहाँ है और परसों वहाँ है। और इस तरह मुल्क को इतनी ज्यादा परेशानी है कि जिसकी कोई इन्तहा नहीं है। इससे ज्यादा मैं इस वक्त बोलना नहीं चाहता हूँ और इन अलफ़ाज के साथ आपके बजट को सपोट करता हूँ।]

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति जी, मेरी बोलने की जो पहले स्वाहिश थी, वह अब जाती रही। सुबह ११ बजे से मैं यहाँ पर अपनी सीट पर बैठा रहा हूँ और इन्तज़ार करता रहा हूँ कि मुझे अब मौका मिलता है, अब मौका मिलता है। मैं लंच के लिये भी नहीं गया और मैंने एक गिलास पानी भी नहीं पिया। अब मैं क्या बोलूँ ? बे जोशलिस्ट पार्टी की नुमाइंदगी करता हूँ और मैं यहाँ उसका अकेला मेम्बर हूँ। मेरी पार्टी के साथ और मेरे साथ अगर ऐसा चलूक होगा, तो मैं भी जानता हूँ कि मैं किस तरह से इस सदन में मुसीबत पैदा कर सकता हूँ। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि मुझे समय पर बोलने का मौका दिया जाये, और हर मसले पर बोलने दिया जाये। पिछली बफा मैं रेलवे बजट पर बोलना चाहता था। तीन दिन तक लगातार बैठे रह कर आखीर में मुझे मजबूर हो कर जाना पड़ा। मैं कई दिनों से हाउस में बैठा रहा हूँ लेकिन मुझे बोलने का मौका नहीं दिया गया है। अब जब कि मैं मायूस और बेज़ार हो चुका हूँ तो मुझे बोलने के लिये कहा गया है। आइंदा के लिये, उपसभापति जी, इस बात का खयाल रखा जाये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is the only Member of his party.

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' : जो बजट तज़ावीज़ इस सदन के सामने रखी गयी हैं, उनको देखते हुए मुझे तो यह सोचना

पड़ता है कि आया यह एक जम्हूरी बजट है या किसी इम्पीरियलिस्ट हुकूमत का बजट है ? अगर इस बजट पर इस बजट के तज़ाबीज़ पर गौर करें और अच्छी तरह से गौर करें, तो मालूम होगा कि जिस तरह का अंग्रेजी हुकूमत में हमारा इक्तसादी निज़ाम था, बिल्कुल उसी तरह का आजकल भी इक्तसादी निज़ाम है। हमारे इक्तसादी निज़ाम में किसी तरह की भी कोई बुनियादी तब्दीली नहीं आई है। जिस तरह से अंग्रेजी हुकूमत में बजट पेश होते थे, उसी तरह से आज एक आज़ाद हुकूमत में भी हमारे सामने उसी किस्म का बजट पेश किया जा रहा है। आज़ादी से पहले इस देश के अन्दर गरीबी थी, आज़ादी से पहले लोगों के तन-बदन पर कपड़ा नहीं था, आज़ादी से पहले बेकारी थी, और आज भी, आज़ादी के मिलने के बाद भी, हमारी जनता के अन्दर वही गरीबी है, वही बेकारी है और वही तन-बदन ढाँकने को कपड़ा नहीं है। मैं अपने मिनिस्ट्रो से और इस सदन के दूसरी तरफ के जो हमारे मेम्बर हैं, उनसे कहूँगा कि वे स्लम एरियाज़ में जायें, गरीबों की बस्तियों में जायें और देखें कि हमारी माताएं और बहनें किस तरह से अपने बच्चों का पेट पालती हैं, किस तरह से मिडिल क्लास के लोग, निचले मिडिल क्लास के लोग गुज़र-बसर करते हैं, किस तरह से तन-बदन ढाँकने के लिये कपड़ा मुहय्या करते हैं, किस तरह से उनके पेट में रोटी जाती है। अगर गरीबों की बस्तियों में जायें, तो आपको एहसास होगा कि हमारी मायें, हमारी बहनें अपनी अस्मत्, अपनी इज़्जत बेचने पर मजबूर हैं। आप जाइते हैं कि कितने ऐसे सदस्य यहाँ हैं और मुझे तो उम्मीद है कि सदन के अक्सर मेम्बर इस हकीकत को जानते हैं। आज हमारे इस कंपिटल सिटी को ही ले लीजिये, हमारे इस कास्मोपोलिटन सिटी को ले लीजिये, यहाँ क्या हो रहा है ? गरीबों की इज़्जत के साथ खेला जा रहा है और इसमें हमारा अमीर तबका संबिस्टिक

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरीन 'तालिब']

बिलाइत ले रहा है, उनकी इज्जत के साथ खेलते हुए। आज क्या आप इस बात को नहीं जानते हैं? हमारे सदन के सभी लोग जानते हैं। हम भी जानते हैं कि क्या हो रहा है? आपने देश के आर्थिक ढांचे में कौन सी बुनियादी तब्दीली की है, क्या आज जनता के अन्दर गरीबी नहीं है? क्या आज जनता के अन्दर बेकारी नहीं है? क्या आज जनता को तन-बदन ढकने के लिये कपड़ा सस्ता मुहय्या होता है? चीजों के दाम दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ते जा रहे हैं, गिरानी बढ़ती जा रही है। हमारे क्लर्क लोगों को देखिये। किस तरह से गुजर करते हैं। अगर आप देखेंगे और गौर करेंगे, तो आपको इस बात का एहसास होगा कि आजादी मिलने के बाद भी हमारे इक्कतसादी निज़ाम में किसी किस्म की कोई तबदीली नहीं हुई है। हमारे आर्थिक ढांचे में किसी किस्म की कोई तब्दीली नहीं हुई है। जैसा कि आजादी से पहले इक्कतसादी ढांचा था, आर्थिक ढांचा था, वैसे ही बिल्कुल अब भी मौजूद है। आपको ताज्जुब होगा कि हमारे देश की दौलत, हमारे देश का सरमाया, ६५ फी-सदी सरमाया, हमारे मुल्क के केवल पांच फी-सदी लोगों के हाथ में है—पांच फी-सदी लोग, जिनको गमीर कहा जा सकता है। उनके हाथ में ६५ फी-सदी सरमाया देश की दौलत, इकट्ठा है। और हमारे ६५ फी-सदी लोग, गरीब लोग, मूखे लोग, उनके हाथ में मुल्क के सरमाये का सिर्फ ५ फी-सदी है। अभी भी, आजादी मिलने के बाद पांच फी-सदी सरमाया उनके हाथ में है, जब कि उनकी आबादी ६५ फी-सदी है। आप देखें और सोचें कि क्या बुनियादी आर्थिक तब्दीली हुई है देश में, आजादी मिलने के बाद? कौन-सी बुनियादी तब्दीलियां हो गयी हैं? बजट के वारे में तरह-तरह की बातें यहाँ कही गयी हैं। किसी ने कहा मर्डरस बजट है, किसी ने कहा पिकपाकेट बजट है, बहुत से लोगों ने कहा काला बजट है। मैं

तो कहूंगा यह खटमली बजट है। जैसे खटमल गरीब आदमियों का खून चूसता है, खटमल हमेशा गरीब लोगों के अंधेरे और तंग घरों में पाया जाता है, जैसे कि खटमल गरीबों का खून चूसता है, वैसे ही यह खटमली बजट आज हमारे सामने पेश किया गया है, जो कि सिर्फ गरीबों का खून चूसेगा और गरीबों पर हमारे इस बजट के खसारे का सारा बोझ पड़ेगा। सोचने की बात है, आप ज़रा गौर से सोचिए, कि वे लोग, पांच फी-सदी लोग, जिनके पास मुल्क का ६५ फी-सदी सरमाया है, उनके ऊपर सिर्फ तीन करोड़ के टैक्स लगाये गये हैं और वे ६५ फी-सदी लोग, जिनके पास सिर्फ पांच फी-सदी सरमाया है, उन पर ६८ करोड़ ६० टैक्स लगे हैं। गौर कीजिये, खूब सोचिये, सीने पर हाथ रखिये, क्या आपने जनता के साथ इन्साफ किया है? जिनके पास ६५ फी-सदी मुल्क की दौलत है, उनके ऊपर सिर्फ तीन करोड़ का टैक्स लगाया है और जिनके पास ५ फी-सदी सरमाया है, उनके ऊपर ६८ करोड़ के लगभग टैक्स लगाया है। कुछ तो इन्साफ कीजिये। हम तो चाहते हैं कि आजाद हुकूमत है, देश आजाद हो गया है, कुछ तो हमारे देश में बुनियादी तब्दीली आनी चाहिये, हमारे विचारों के अंदर तब्दीली आनी चाहिये, हमारे कार्यक्रम और ऐक्शन में तब्दीली आनी चाहिये। अभी भी एक गरीब आदमी, जब कभी इम्पोर्ट-एक्सपोर्ट लाइसेन्स के लिये अर्प्लाई करता है, तब कहते हैं कि वह इस्टेब्लिश्ड एक्सपोर्टर, इम्पोर्टर नहीं है, अगर वह कोई दूसरा काम करना चाहता है, तो उससे कहा जाता है कि तुम्हारे पास बैंक बैलन्स नहीं है। बुनियादी तब्दीली पैदा कीजिये अपने विचारों में और कुछ ऐसा काम कीजिये जिससे गरीब और अमीर में फर्क मिट जाये। एक छोटे अपसर और बड़े अपसर, छोटे मुलाजिम और बड़े मुलाजिम में जो फर्क है, वह किसी तरह से कम हो जाये, ताकि हमारा अवांम भी जैन की मांस ले सके। अभी देश में

कोई बुनियादी तब्दीली नहीं आयी है, अभी कोई सोशलिज्म जैसी चीज़ दिखायी नहीं दी है, अभी कोई सोशल इक्वेलिटी, सामाजिक तथा आर्थिक समानता नहीं आई है। हम किसी भी हालत में इसको जमहूरी बजट या समाजवादी बजट नहीं कह सकते।

इसके बाद मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जमहूरी निज़ाम में जो आर्थिक ढांचा है, उसमें कोई तब्दीली नहीं आयी, मैं यह कहे देता हूँ कि अगर यही हाल रहा तो इस देश में इन्किलाब होगा, एक जबर्दस्त इन्किलाब होगा और उसमें जितने अमीर आदमी हैं और अप्सर लोग, जो इस किस्म का बजट पेश करते हैं और गरीब लोगों के गजों पर छुरी चलाते हैं, वे उस इन्किलाब की लौ में हमेशा के लिए तहस-तहस हो जायेंगे। आपने चाय पर टैक्स लगाया, जो गरीब आदमी के लिये सबसे सस्ता ड्रिंक है। अमीर आदमी के पास तो अच्छे अच्छे ड्रिंक्स के साधन हैं। आप देहात में चले जाइये, गरीब से गरीब आदमी भी आजकल चाय पीता है। चार पर जितना टैक्स बढ़ा है, काफी पर जितना टैक्स बढ़ा है, उसका बोझ ज्यादातर नीचे के तबके के लोगों पर पड़ेगा, मिडल क्लास पर पड़ेगा। सबसे ज्यादा गरीब और लोअर मिडल क्लास के लोगों पर पड़ेगा। इसी तरह से सुपारी है, उसको भी ज्यादातर मिडल क्लास के लोग इस्तेमाल करते हैं। अमीर आदमी के पास खाने पीने की और भी बहुत सी चीज़ें हैं। सुपारी पर आपने टैक्स लगाया, चाय और काफी पर आपने टैक्स लगाया है, जो कि गरीब आदमी की यकान दूर करने और उसको थोड़ी बहुत तफ़रीह देने की चीज़ें हैं। बड़े बड़े आदमियों के पास तो भाला और कीमती ड्रिंक्स पीने के लिये हैं, आम लोगों के पास तो ये ही चीज़ें हैं और आपने इन पर टैक्स लगा कर मरीबो का खून चूसा है।

इसी तरह तम्बाकू का धवास आता है। जो लोग बीड़ी इस्तेमाल करते हैं वे भी गरीब

वर्ग के आदमी ही होते हैं। सिगरेट तो मालदार आदमियों के पीने की चीज़ है। तो गरीब लोग ज्यादातर बीड़ी का इस्तेमाल करते हैं। बीड़ी पर टैक्स लगने से गरीब लोगों पर ही असर पड़ेगा। मिट्टी का तेल से लीजिये। मिट्टी का तेल ज्यादातर देहात में इस्तेमाल होता है और इस पर टैक्स लगाने का सबसे ज्यादा असर गरीब तबके पर पड़ता है। रात को घर में जलाने के लिए घर घर में इसका इस्तेमाल होता है। मिडल क्लास के लोग स्टोव में और जहाँ बिजली नहीं होती है, वहाँ अपने घरों में मिट्टी के तेल से ही काम लेते हैं। आपने देखा होगा मिडल क्लास के लोग जब पिकनिक के लिये या कहीं बाहर जाते हैं, तो मिट्टी के तेल से स्टोव में खाना बनाते हैं। अमीरों की बात छोड़ दीजिये, उनका तो हर काम बिजली से चलता है, खाना भी बिजली से ही बनाते हैं। इसी तरह आपने दियासलाई पर टैक्स लगाया है, लेकिन वे लोग मशीन से, लाइटर से, प्राग मुलगाते हैं, जो कि हर वक्त उनकी जेब में रखा रहता है। तो दियासलाई के ऊपर टैक्स का पैसा भी गरीब आदमी पर पड़ेगा। इसी तरह आपने वनस्पति पर टैक्स लगा दिया है। अमीर आदमी तो मक्खन खाते हैं और बढ़िया देसी घी भी देहातों से मंगा लेते हैं, दो छटांक, एक छटांक रुपये का मिलेगा, तो भी वे खा सकते हैं। गरीब आदमी सरसो का तेल और वनस्पति इस्तेमाल करते हैं। अभी बजट प्रपोज़ल्स से पहले जो छोटा डालड़ा का डिब्बा आता था, वह ३ रु० ८१ पैसे में आता था, अभी देखते देखते ही उसके दाम ३ रु० ९४ पैसे हो गये और यहाँ ४ रु० में बाज़ार में बिक रहा है। सरसों का तेल ३ रुपये सेर बिक रहा है। क्या यह कोई इन्साफ़ है? बिजली के सामान की भी से लीजिए। शहरों में सभी लोग बिजली का सामान इस्तेमाल करते हैं। इधर तो आप लोग कहते हैं देहात में भी हम हर जगह बिजली लायेंगे, घर घर में बिजली होगी

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरी : 'तालिब']

और दूसरी तरफ आप बिजली के सामान पर टैक्स लगाने हैं। एक तरफ आप इण्डस्ट्रियल एक्सपेंशन की बात कहते हैं, छोटी छोटी फॅक्ट्रियों और उद्योग धंधों को चलाने के बारे में कहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ री-सेटीरियल पर टैक्स लगाते हैं, बाहर से जो मशीनें आती हैं, उन पर टैक्स लगाते हैं। पानी, एक तरफ जो काम करते हैं दूसरी तरफ उसके खिलाफ काम करते हैं। आपके कहने और करने के ढंग में कोई रैशनलिज्म नहीं है। अभी बजट प्रपोजल आये देर नहीं और बाजार में चले जाइए, पन्द्रह, बीस फी-मदी कपड़े के दाम में इजाफा हो गया है। दही ले लीजिए। दही सब लोग रोज खाते हैं। बारह आने सेर मिलता था, इस वक्त एक रुपये सेर मिल रहा है। दूध ले लीजिये, दूध में कितना फर्क पड़ गया, बारह आने सेर दूध मिल रहा है। को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी आपके बगल में है, यह पालियामेंट की को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी कही जाती है। पहले का जो माल मौजूद है, उसी पर वे लोग प्राफिटियरिंग कर रहे हैं, खूब मुनाफा पैदा कर रहे हैं। यह सब क्या है ?

شری ایم - آر - شہروانی (اتر پردیش):
دودھ دہی پر بھی کتنا ٹیکس لگا ہے ؟
صرف ٹیکس لگنے سے ہی دام نہیں
بڑھتا -

†[श्री एम० आर० शेरवानी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : दूध दही पर भी क्या टैक्स लगा है ? सिर्फ टैक्स लगने से ही दाम नहीं बढ़ते ?]

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' :
बहु तो आप खुद देख रहे हैं। ऐतराज करने से क्या ? आप गरीबों के साथ मिल कर देखिये। आप तो मोटरों में घूमते हैं, मोटरों में चलते हैं। जाइये गरीबों के घरों में, मिडल क्लास और क्लर्कों के घरों में जाइये, मजदूरों के घरों में जाइये। आप तो अपने यहां कूलर्स भी लगा

लेंगे, हीटर्स भी लगा लेंगे, रेफ्रिजरेटर भी लगा लेंगे, लेकिन उनकी हालत पर गौर कीजिये। यह तो जमहूरी और समाजवादी निजाम नहीं है। हमें तो अपने देश में असली जमहूरी निजाम लाना है, समाजवाद को लाना है। एक साहब कहते थे कि बजट में कहीं पर "सोशलिज्म" का जिक्र नहीं आया। साहब, आप जो टैक्स लगा रहे हैं, वह कौन-सी टाइप के जमहूरी समाजवादी टैक्सेज हैं, ये तो तानाशाही के टैक्सेज हैं। आपने जरा भी एसेन्शियल कमोडिटीज पर, जिनकी जरूरियात की चीजों पर टैक्स लगाया नहीं कि व्यापारियों को, दूकानदारों को मुनाफा-खोरी का मौका मिल गया। वे तो जनता का खून चूसने को हमेशा तैयार रहेंगे और वे हमेशा ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्राफिटियरिंग करेंगे। क्या बजह है कि आज सरासर गल्ले के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं। जखीरा अंदोजी करते हैं बड़े बड़े सरमायादार। इसी तरह देहातों में बड़े बड़े भूमिदारी ने बड़े बड़े फार्म ले रखे हैं, जहां एक छोटे हिस्से पर तो फार्मिंग करते हैं और बाकी सब वैसा ही पड़ा रहता है। इस तरह से संकड़ों बीघे जमीन पड़ी हुई है। जरा टिलर आफ दी साइल—किसान को मदद दीजिये और फिर देखिये कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ता है या नहीं, अभी दाम सस्ते होते हैं या नहीं। एक फंडामेंटल चीज लाइये अपने विचारों और कामों के अन्दर, अभी इस देश में जमहूरी निजाम हो सकता है, वरना इस देश के अन्दर कभी सही जमहूरी और समाजवादी निजाम नहीं आ सकता है। सरकारी महकमों में वेस्टेज कम कीजिए। एक्सटर्नल प्रोफेस मिनिस्ट्री में जो वेस्टेज होता है, बाहर एम्बेसीज हैं, पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० में जो वेस्टेज होता है, उसको कम कीजिये। वकीलों की आमदनी के जारये पर नज़र रखिये। मैं खुद वकील हूँ और मुझे इल्म है कि ये जो बड़े बड़े वकील हैं वे किस तरह से, किन किन जरूरियों से रुपया बनाते हैं। मैं मुआफी चाहूंगा अपने वकील मैम्बरान से और यह कहूंगा कि गवर्नमेंट ने कोई ऐसा तरीका नहीं

अस्तित्व दिया कि उनकी आमदनी का सही अन्दाज़ जगाया जा सके ।

आप हमारे मुल्क के डाक्टरों को ही ले लीजिये । वे आज कितना पैदा कर रहे हैं, क्या आप इस बात का अन्दाज़ा लगा सकते हैं? सनका खाता देखिये तो दवाओं की करोख्त तो दर्ज है, लेकिन सही फीस का पता नहीं, और क्या आपने उनकी सही आमदनी का अन्दाज़ा लगाने की कोशिश की है? इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि आप इस तरह के लोगों की आमदनी का पता लगाने की कोशिश कीजिये, जो छुपा कर रक्खा रखते हैं । हमारे देश में कितने ही ऐसे सरमायादार हैं जो नाजायज़ ढ़ीके से रक्खा पैदा करते हैं और सरकार को टैक्स नहीं देते हैं । क्या आपने इस तरह के लोगों की आमदनी का पता लगाने की कोशिश की? अगर आपने इस तरह सामान मुल्क में जितना छिपा हुआ रक्खा है उसका पता लगाने की कोशिश की होती, तो मुल्क की आमदनी बहुत बढ़ जाती और आपको टैक्स लगाने की ज़रूरत नहीं पड़ती । लेकिन हम यह देखते हैं कि सरकार गरीब जनता के ऊपर लगातार टैक्स लगाती जा रही है, जिसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि इस मुल्क का स्टैंडर्ड आफ़ लिविंग नीचे गिरता चला जा रहा है । इसका असर यह होगा कि लोग कंज्यूमर्स गुड्स नहीं खरीद पायेंगे । कंज्यूमर्स गुड्स पर और टैक्स लगाने से मुल्क की प्रोडक्शन में कमी होती चली जायेगी । अगर हमारे मुल्क के प्रोडक्शन में कमी होती है, तो इससे हमारे नेशनल इन्कम में कमी होगी और मुल्क की आमदनी में कमी होगी ।

इन सामान चीज़ों के साथ साथ आपने कागज़ पर भी टैक्स लगा दिया है । आप ज़रा दूसरे मुल्कों में जाइये, तो आपको पता चलेगा कि वहाँ पर तरह तरह के कितने प्रकार के और मैगज़ीन्स निकलते हैं । आज सैन्ड्स लोग अखबारों के ज़रिये सरकार तक अपनी आवाज़ पहुँचाते हैं और जो कुछ भी

उन्हें तकलीफ़ें होती; उनके खिलाफ़ आवाज़ खलबाराओं के ज़रिये उठाते हैं । जो अखबार गरीब जनता के काम आते हैं, उनके ऊपर आपने एक तरह से टैक्स लगा दिया है । आपने न्यूजप्रीट पर टैक्स लगा कर गरीब लोगों की आवाज़ को भी एक तरह से बन्द कर दिया है । अब आप खुद ही सोचिये कि क्या यही आपका समाजवाद है? आप यह कहते हैं कि हम इस मुल्क में समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं क्या इसी तरह से आप समाजवाद या सोशलिज़्म लायेंगे? जब तक आप अपने खयालातों में बुनियादी तबदीली नहीं करेंगे तब तक आप इस मुल्क में समाजवाद कायम नहीं कर सकते हैं और न इसके सिवाय कोई और चारा नज़र आता है ।

आपने ऊन पर भी टैक्स लगा दिया है, जिससे कई कारपेट इंडस्ट्रीज़ पर बुरा असर पड़ेगा । आपने जो रिबेट २५ प्रतिशत के २० प्रतिशत घटा दिया है उससे भी मुल्क को नुकसान पहुँचेगा और बहुत से उद्योग बन्दे बन्द हो जायेंगे ।

(Time bell rings.)

श्रीमान् जी, मैं बोड़ी डेर के लिए और बोलना चाहता हूँ, इसलिए मुझे इजाज़त दी जानी चाहिए । मैं सोशलिस्ट पार्टी को रिज़ेजेंट करता हूँ और मुझे अब सिफ़ फ़ारेन एंड के बारे में कहना है ।

श्री उ.स.भारति : दो मिनट ।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' : जहाँ तक फ़ारेन एंड का ताल्लुक है, हमें बजट के साथ जो इकोनॉमिक सर्वे मिलता है, उसमें एक पैराग्राफ़ है, जिसमें यह लिखा हुआ है :

"External assistance for implementing the projects in the Plan (in terms of disbursements—the authorisations will have to be larger) has been estimated at Rs. 1,900 crores. Further assistance of the order of Rs. 700 crores will be required, partly in the form of components, intermediate pro-

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरीन 'तालिब']
ducts etc., and partly by way of refinancing of the external obligations maturing during the Plan period."

यह रकम मिला कर २,६०० करोड़ रुपये होती है। तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के लिये और भी बाहरी आर्थिक सहायता ली जायेगी जो इस रकम में शामिल नहीं है। अगर हम इस रकम में १०० एल० ४८० के अन्तर्गत ६०० करोड़ की एस्टीमेटेड रिसीट्स की रकम को भी शामिल कर दें, तो यह सब रिजर्व्स कुल रकम मिला कर ३,२०० करोड़ रुपये बनती है। इस भारी रकम के खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान की रकम करीब १३० करोड़ रुपये होती है। इसके १२० करोड़ रुपये के मुकाबले में प्लान की रकम ३,२०० करोड़ रुपये बनती है। इसके अलावा आप देखेंगे कि हमारे फारन एंड आबराइजेशन का जो घमाउट है, वह करीब २,७२७.७५ करोड़ ३१ दिसम्बर, सन् १९६१ तक है। इसमें से तीसरे प्लान के लिए ६७७.१६ करोड़ मिलने वाली सहायता की रकम शामिल है। इसमें से फर्स्ट प्लान में ३६३.२२ करोड़ और दूसरे प्लान में २ करोड़ ३३३.५६ करोड़ रुपये की दी गई सहायता शामिल है। अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि इसमें से ज्यादातर २ हजार ६१.५७ करोड़ रुपया तो लोन की शकल में है और बाकी रुपया क्रेडिट की शकल में है। इसमें से बहुत सा रुपया जो सप्लायर्स क्रेडिट रोकपिलर फाउण्डेशन ग्रांट्स, टेक्निकल एसिस्टेंस फ्रॉम नैदरलैंड इत्यादि की रकमें है, वह शामिल नहीं है। इसके साथ ही साथ आप यह भी देखेंगे कि वर्ल्ड बैंक जो लोन देता है, उसके तरह सदस्य मुल्कों में से एशिया के आठ मुल्कों में सब से ज्यादा लोन हमारे मुल्क ने लिया है। इसलिए हमारा मुल्क सब से ज्यादा लोन लेने वाला मुल्क है। देश दो तरह से गुलाम बनाये जाते हैं। एक तो फिजिकली तौर पर गुलाम बनाये जाते हैं, और दूसरा मेटली लोगों को गुलाम बनाना जाता है। आज हम बाहर के

मुल्क से जो लोन ले रहे हैं उससे हम अपने आपको ही गुलाम बनाने जा रहे हैं। आप दूसरे मुल्कों से कहते हैं कि हम न्युट्रल हैं और हम जानते हैं कि इस रकम का सूर भी भुदा नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस तरह से आप घाने वाली नस्ल के लिए एक प्रॉब्लम पैदा कर रहे हैं और उनको गुलाम बना रहे हैं। आप तो समझते हैं कि इस तरह से रुपया लेकर डेवलपमेंट का काम करेंगे, लेकिन आप उनको एक तरह से गुलाम बनाने जा रहे हैं।

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I most sincerely congratulate the Finance Minister and all those who have assisted him in preparation of the Budget. It is not difficult to criticise this Budget or any Budget because there would be a few things, a few proposals which will not be liked by somebody or the other. But a Budget has to be viewed in a large perspective and taken as a whole and in the context of the conditions and circumstances existing in the country. Viewed in this light I have no hesitation in saying that this is the best that could have been done. Particularly gratifying is the fact that a large deficit of over Rs. 60 crores has been covered without putting unbearable strains on any one section of the people. The taxation proposals are indeed very well spread out. There was some criticism that the rich have not been taxed enough or that the corporate sector could give more revenue. Tax the rich—and tax them further by all means wherever possible—but the sooner we realise the better it would be for our nation that the resources required for the national Plans cannot be met by only one small section of the people. All of us in every walk of life have to contribute to our maximum capacity—whether we are rich or poor, capitalist or common man—if we really have ambitions for the prosperity of the nation and the fulfilment of our Plans. The revenue from direct taxes is a very small percentage of the total revenue of the Government. It is only Rs. 50 crores that we get as

direct taxes from all excepting the corporate sector and Rs. 140 crores we get from the corporate sector. And this is the revenue when the highest level of taxation is 84 per cent. in the case of the individuals. How much can you raise it? Make it 90 per cent.; it will bring in only a crore or two.

Sir, we cannot raise the taxes in the corporate sector by more than 5 per cent. without seriously damaging the industrial growth of the country and here again this source cannot bring more than a couple of crores. But if indirect taxation is increased even by 5 per cent. it will bring in a revenue of Rs. 35 crores.

There was some talk about the redistribution of wealth. I do not know what the definition of a rich man is but if you take everybody in this country who is earning Rs. 300 or more as a rich man, we have only ten lakhs of rich people, that is 0.25 per cent. of our population. If you strip them of their incomes and their worldly possessions and redistribute that wealth amongst the rest it will not increase the *per capita* income by more than two annas per month. This will not raise the living standard of the rest which we desire to do but it will add to the number of the poor people by an addition of another ten lakhs to their number.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): But it will give them satisfaction.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI: But it may be a satisfaction for a short while only but it will never be a permanent satisfaction unless their living conditions improve. Obviously, therefore, the real solution does not lie in the redistribution of wealth but in the production of wealth. I was saying that the solution lies in increasing industrial production of the country and perhaps curbing human production. It is also a great problem. Unfortunately, the industrial production of the country is not able to keep pace with the human production.

Coming to the tax proposals, Sir, I have a few suggestions to offer for the consideration of the Finance Minister. Perhaps the source I have in mind has already been investigated—I do not know. I have in view a duty or tax on stock exchange transactions on the sale of shares. If such a tax is imposed, on the one hand, it will curb speculative tendencies in the stock exchanges encourage retention of investments and on the other it will bring considerable revenue to the State. It will be a tax on moneyed people only. Furthermore, it will be a tax which will be more or less voluntary. If I sell my shares I pay tax, for I sell them for profit or my benefit and I have no reason to grudge a small contribution to the State. If I do not sell my shares I do not pay any tax. It might be said that such a tax would be encouraging private transactions. Well, private transactions do take place even now, and they can be stopped or checked if orders are issued to the companies not to register any shares unless a tax certificate or a stock exchange certificate is produced.

I am very glad, Sir, that the Finance Minister has curtailed entertainment expenses. This step was certainly called for. I must also admit that the limit fixed is rather liberal as far as big companies are concerned, but in my humble opinion the limit fixed for small companies making a profit of, say, Rs. 5 to 10 lakhs, is rather inadequate. I therefore suggest that the percentage that should be allowed for entertainment expenses if the profit is Rs. 5 lakhs, may be increased to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. For the next Rs. 5 lakhs $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. For the next Rs. 10 lakhs 1 per cent. For the next Rs. 20 lakhs $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. For the next Rs. 30 lakhs $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. For the next Rs. 30 lakhs $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. For the rest nil. This will, on the one hand, reduce the maximum allowance for entertainment expenses from Rs. 1 lakh to Rs. 65,000 and will bring a little bit of more revenue to the State. On the other hand it will give the companies which are making a

[Shri M. R. Shervani.]

profit of only Rs. 5 to 10 lakhs a little bit more than has been — in the Budget proposals. A small company, by percentage of profit, obviously spends more than a fully developed and well established company earning huge profits.

The third suggestion with regard to the taxation proposals which I wish to make is about the duty on zinc and copper. In my humble opinion, Sir, this is not the opportune time to impose duty on copper and zinc. We are short of these two strategic materials. Production in the country falls very much short of demand. We must encourage greater production. Further more this will have the effect of indirectly increasing the cost of brass. Brass is used to a large extent in the utensils industry, which is almost on a cottage industry basis and which is not so well established and profitable as to be able to bear this burden. I feel that it will not make much difference to the Budget particularly if my earlier proposal of taxation on shares is accepted. In fact that proposal will yield some more funds and will place them at the disposal of the Finance Minister which he can utilise either for supplementing the Plan resources, or for reducing some indirect taxes wherever he feels that there is some justification.

Sir, a study of the Economic Review that has been laid on the Table of this House has given me a bright hope in the future. I must admit that there is no denying the fact that we have made great strides and have succeeded in completing a large number of our projects and fulfilling our Plan targets. Every foreign dignitary or expert who comes to this country goes back duly impressed with and full of praise of our national efforts that we have made in the last ten years. Sir, in this respect I have a suggestion, that, if possible a statement should be attached to the Economic Review giving the capital outlay of each project the gains or the profits

earned, the profits expected and the future prospects. Of course, I know that there are some projects and there are bound to be some where you cannot measure the gains or benefits in pounds, shillings, pence. But then you can have a paragraph or two describing the indirect benefits that have accrued or will accrue to the people. Such a statement, on the one hand, will make us wiser in respect of future investments—there are bound to be some projects which, later on, are not found to be very remunerative either in terms of money or in terms of benefits. Well, they can be abandoned—on the other hand, Sir, I feel that such a statement if made known to the people, will increase the confidence of the people in public undertakings and Government investments. I do not believe that we should be afraid of any criticism that might come forward if such a statement is made public. You will always find people in any country who would criticise and criticise almost anything and criticise for the sake of criticism, but I have no doubt about it in my mind, Sir that the efforts that we have made and the results that we have achieved can be compared to achievements of any other country. In public undertakings, Sir, I believe that we have made very rapid strides. An outlay of Rs. 500 crores has been made. It would not be fair to compare the return received on the investment of Rs. 500 crores, and it is because projects involving an outlay of almost Rs. 400 crores are still under completion or on trial, and a large number of the projects completed with an outlay of balance of Rs. 100 crores are not in full swing. It might be said that ten years have passed since we started planning and it might be asked why it is so. But I can say from my personal experience that even in the private sector a small project or scheme worth Rs. 50 lakhs takes four or five years to get going, and it takes another five years before it establishes itself firmly. Therefore, Sir, when in the public sector we have projects whose capital outlay is far greater

than Rs. 50 lakhs or even Rs. 1 crore. They are bound to take longer to establish themselves and I personally am sure and am very hopeful that, if not now, at the end of the Third Five Year Plan, and the beginning of the Fourth Five Year Plan we will have very substantial contributions from public undertakings to our revenues and to our future plan efforts.

Sir there is one more point that I wish to mention, and that is that in respect of any project or scheme whose expenditure has been worked out and found to come to say Rs. 100, we can complete that work or that project in Rs. 98 if we are more vigilant and alert and austerity-conscious, and if this principle was applied to all our capital outlays and all our public spending and some sort of a vigilance committee could be appointed to check and economise on expenditure, I have no doubt that we can effect an overall economy of 2 per cent., and this overall economy of even 2 per cent. would mean a large and substantial amount of saving in view of our heavy spending.

Sir, Mr. Chettiar complained about rising prices, and he compared the price of the imported fertiliser with the Sindri fertiliser. I am surprised that this comparison could be made. Comparison is made between two equals. The people who are exporting fertilisers to this country had established their factories perhaps some fifty years ago, and it is nothing short of a miracle to expect that an Indian factory, within five years of its existence, will be able to progress and advance so much in technical know-how and in production as a company which had been established fifty years ago. Perhaps in another five years our fertilisers will be cheaper.

Then he complained about the price of sugar, and said that the price of sugar in India was far more than the price in the world. It is certainly

more because Indian sugar is contributing 35 per cent. of its price to the national exchequer. It is more also because we pay much more price to the cane-grower than is paid anywhere in the world. We do so because only at this price the cane-growers can afford to have two square meals a day. The price cannot be reduced because the yield is less and the yield is less because there is not sufficient manure and because there is not sufficient water. So it is a circle, and we have to keep all these facts in mind.

Then, Sir, another hon. Member, Mr. Sudhir Ghosh, mentioned that Russian pilots were flying on our borders and that Indian pilots were not allowed to go there. I am really surprised at the source of his information and his rather irresponsible statement. I have ascertained . . .

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I have only asked for facts. We have a right to ask for them.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI: Certainly. But I have ascertained facts and I can inform you that your information is entirely incorrect.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: I shall be glad if the statement is incorrect, but it is for the Government to state the facts.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI: We have Russian pilots, we have American pilots, we have Canadian pilots. They have come along with their planes which we required. They teach our pilots how to fly them and then they go back, and these Russian pilots are teaching our pilots the technical know-how, and they do not fly at the border but elsewhere.

4 P.M.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Sir, about 48 hon. Members have spoken on the Budget proposals, which shows the great interest the hon. Members in this House have been taking in the

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]

Budget proposals which I had the honour to present.

Sir, nobody can ever present any Budget anywhere in any Government which can never be criticised, and I doubt if any hon. Member here can suggest to me a Budget which will not be criticised by others, and I would not be surprised if he criticises himself on reflection. But that should not be a ground for not considering very earnestly the criticisms that are made on Budget proposals. As a matter of fact, it is all the more necessary that they should be given very careful consideration because there is always a danger of doing something which instead of doing good might do harm.

At the outset, Sir, I should like, or I would request my hon. friends here to consider that we are embarking on a Third Five Year Plan which is more than eleven thousand crores of rupees in cost, and everybody whom I have met and whom I have heard has always asked for a Plan of that size or even a bigger Plan. Therefore, there cannot be a criticism that the Government has taken up a Plan which is bigger than what it should be, or which is unusual and not quite real.

Now, Sir, if this Plan is to be executed—as it must be executed—efficiently and successfully, we must have the resources for executing the Plan. And the resources required have shown that besides having a substantial foreign aid or foreign resources from friendly countries, our internal resources will have to be of an adequate size and that we have to raise our tax resources or our revenue resources adequately, that is, by about Rs. 1,150 crores at the Centre and more than Rs. 600 crores in the States. I would rather deal with what one has to do here.

Now, if these Rs. 1,150 crores are to be raised, it is very obvious that they cannot be raised by direct taxes; a very small part of it can be raised by direct taxes because that is the

position in this country. People who earn taxable income for direct taxes are ten lakhs in a population of forty crores. We want to increase their number, and we want to see that this number is increased several times. That is what we are out to do.

I was told, Sir, by the last but one speaker that this Budget is on the same lines as the Britishers used to present in pre-freedom time. Well, Sir, he was so vehement in whatever he said as a proper representative of his party which is represented by himself only in this House that I could not follow much of what he said. It is impossible for me, Sir, to argue with him or reason with him, the way he was speaking here. I shall, certainly, try to read whatever he has said and profit by it wherever I can profit by it. But the Budget that has now been presented and the Budget that will be presented in future has certainly no relation to what the Budget were before we obtained freedom. This will have to be admitted by anybody who has the least objective attitude, even a little objective attitude in him.

Sir, it must have been seen, though it seems to have passed notice, that we have exceeded now a thousand crores of rupees in revenue this year. We were receiving about Rs. 370 crores in 1948-49 as revenue. Today it has gone beyond a thousand crores of rupees. And the fact that the revenues are rising and that they are being collected without any martial law or without any police methods whatsoever and with allegations of evasions on a very large scale, shows that the incomes are increasing and that the country is getting in a position to pay more and more revenue to the Government. That is a good sign, a happy sign.

There can be an argument that the taxation can be differently arranged. Sir, I have not yet had the benefit of any specific advice in these matters beyond saying that there should be

more of direct taxes and less of indirect taxes. But I should like to see or hear from any one who would advise me in this matter, not publicly out privately, because if he advises me publicly, no Budget can be presented by me; I will have to go out if I adopt that. If he does, I shall certainly pay it the greatest attention and try to profit by it.

The direct taxes also are going on increasing in their collection, and which is reflected in the collections which are there every year. That is, higher productions and the development of industries and business give more revenues and income-tax every year, and I am sure that during the course of the next five years or ten years our revenue from direct taxes is going to be far more substantial, and that is how we should advance. But even in countries which are highly advanced, there are indirect taxes. I had given the instance of indirect taxes in various countries last year and I do not want to repeat that. But those hon. friends from the Communist Party, who speak very loudly here about the wrong method adopted in levying indirect taxes, forget that in the administration of governments, which they prefer most and with which they are in great spiritual harmony—if they believe at all in spirit—there the taxation is only indirect, and when it is said here that the people receiving higher salaries escape or people with higher incomes escape, it is forgotten that in that economy there is no special tax for the people who receive fifty times the income of the lowest income. I should like to be put wise in this matter by the hon. Member who is a very learned person. But that he will not do, because he knows that the facts are against him. But for him anything is good to condemn me or to condemn the Congress Party. Fortunately for us, it is overdone so that nobody is misled. But it is necessary that this question should be studied more and more so that we are able to utilise our resources in a better and better manner.

The question, therefore, is whether the taxation which has been proposed is one which is going to harm and hit the poor classes much more than we could have avoided, or a little more than we could have avoided. That is what is required to be examined.

It was also said by the learned professor who spoke on behalf of the Praja-Socialist Party that there was no socialism mentioned in the Budget proposals. Sir, have I got to repeat it in every Budget, in order to prove my *bona fides*? Perhaps they are not sure of their own *bona fides* and, therefore, they have got to repeat it every moment. We believe in it and we have believed in it completely and we are working on it. Where is the question of mentioning socialism every time? And even if I mention it, there will be the question: What kind of socialism? Which socialism? Where is it and how? Therefore, there is no point in the criticism. We should not be judged by a word here or a word there. But I shall come to that later on.

At present I should first of all like to speak about the incidence of the taxation which is complained against. If one looks at all the new taxes that are levied, it will have to be admitted by the worst critic that the whole of it does not touch the common man, that all of it does not touch the common man. Not even three-fourths of it does it, if the items are looked at and examined. The items that are mentioned by hon. Members are betelnut—with that I started the Budget proposals—kerosene, tobacco, tea, coffee and matches. Sir, in the matter of matches, there seems to be very great confusion. Nothing has been increased in the matter of matches. As a matter of fact, what is done is that instead of selling matches in 40 sticks and 60 sticks, we have said that they should be sold in 50 stick boxes and if they sell them in 40 sticks and not 50-stick boxes, they will have to pay more. For the 50-stick box there is the same payment to be made. There is no extra duty put on it. There-

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]

fore, there is no question of increase there. If some shopkeepers have increased it, I am not responsible for it. Society ought to pull them up. But I am also trying now to find out ways and means whereby remedies can be provided to prevent petty shopkeepers from doing this sort of thing.

In the case of betel-nuts also, what has been done? The indigenous product has not been taxed at all. I do not see how all this cry is made about betel-nut being made very costly by my tax. The tax is only on the imported material which is a very small part of the betelnut consumed here and the profits made on the imported betelnut is 300 to 400 per cent. And if I try to take a part of that, and even that is objected to, then what is the socialism that is being preached to me by hon. Members opposite? Instead of trying to find a remedy which will teach those people not to take these profits in this unconscionable manner, I am asked not to have the tax. And as I said, I am therefore, trying to find out a method for these betelnut people. There is a method whereby one can say we will not give licence for importing betelnut. But that is not a simple matter, because the moment that takes place the cost of the indigenous material goes up. Therefore, one has to be careful and one must find out some ways and means.

Tea and coffee are materials which give us a lot of export potential, and if they go on being consumed more and more, a day might come when we would have nothing left for export. It is, therefore, necessary to see that the consumption is put down. That is in the interest of the country and therefore, we are trying to encourage exports and we are to see that consumption does not go on beyond a certain limit. And what is the increase in cost that has taken place as a result of the tax that is put? Ten cups of coffee will cost one naya paisa more and twenty cups of tea will cost

perhaps, one naya paisa more. Is this an unconscionable rise in any case? And are these great necessities for anybody? Is this a thing which is going to harm the living standards of the people? They certainly can consume less and not increase their expenses. I am not telling them that for increasing my revenue, they should go on drinking more. I am not going to tell them that. And this is not being paid by only the poor people. Other people are going to pay more. If they consume more, they will also pay. The argument seems to be that all the indirect taxes are being paid by the poor. They are paid by those who can pay and not by the poor. If we levy a tax on grain or on such other articles, then I would say that it does tax the poor more. And curiously this year, I am very fortunate that I have not heard that salt tax should be levied. Otherwise, that was a common argument. There was, I think, one hon. Member who perhaps repeated it to a little extent. That is a tax which will certainly hurt the poor far more than the rich. Yet this is being said because it does not hurt those who are speaking. Therefore, in these matters we must have a sense of proportion.

Take tobacco. What has been done? Cigarettes may here and there cost a little more. But bidis are not affected. What was happening was that the inferior tobacco which was not meant for bidis had a very low taxation compared to the tax on the tobacco which was used for bidis. Therefore, there was a lot of mixture of that inferior tobacco with the tobacco utilised for bidis and taxes were avoided. It is, therefore, that the tax on the inferior tobacco has been increased so that there is no temptation to mix it up with the other tobacco. It does not, therefore, increase the cost of bidis at all. The tax on cigarettes is not paid by the poor people. If my hon. friends here use cigarettes they cannot be in the line of the common man. They can certainly afford to pay it; if they

do not want to pay it they can certainly smoke less and make their health better. I am not here to say that all these things should be consumed more and more so that the treasury is enriched more and more. I shall be very happy if there is no tax recovered and these things are not consumed; if there is no use made of these, we will find other methods of having our revenues; but if they want to use them, then certainly, Sir, I should discourage them from doing it. I am their friend and they ought to thank me for it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Finance Minister is looking after their health also?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I am certainly looking after their health as I am supposed to but howsoever carefully a doctor may look after the health of a patient, the patient can go to the wall if he wants to do so, and, therefore, I have no quarrel about it. I will still go on sympathising with the patient and will go on taxing him a little more so that he has more sense.

The only item that remains ultimately is kerosene. It must have been seen—I have said it also—that inferior kerosene is not taxed more and it is the inferior kerosene which is used in the rural areas or should be used for lamps. Now, it is possible that, as in every other thing, everybody is using the higher quality in every material. Look at foodgrains. Nobody wants or very few people want to use millets; everybody wants to use wheat and everybody wants to use rice. Take cloth; everybody wants to go to the medium cloth and finer cloth; nobody wants coarse cloth. If he wants that, I have no objection about it; I should be very happy. It only means that he has increased his income and he can afford to wear it. If he can afford to do so, why can't he afford to pay me a tax? I do not understand it. Government

means the people. We are enabling them to have higher standards and if the Government is enabling them to have a higher standard of living, is not Government, are not the people, entitled to take from them the cost of it so that Government can take up more and more work for the other people? I do not understand the economics of those who say that only a few people should go on paying towards the improvement of other people. I have no objection to a few people paying more and more; I should certainly like to take everything from them if that serves my purpose but it is not going to serve my purpose; it will, on the contrary, be the reverse thing, it will go down. Our objective is not to distribute poverty. As the Prime Minister has so often said, our objective is to create more wealth and to distribute that so that everybody has a better standard of living. We do not want to bring down people. If there are some intelligent people and others are not so intelligent. I do not think the attempt should be to make the more intelligent people less intelligent so that the less intelligent people may be considered more intelligent. That is not the remedy that we want to have. In all these matters, let us examine these things from the proper point of view.

In the matter of foreign exchange and foreign aid or foreign resources, it is also argued similarly, and I was very much pained when an hon. Member said that our credit is going down in foreign countries. How is it going to benefit him or me? If that happens it will be a matter of sorrow. It may have gone down in his estimation, but, Sir, I am happy to say that in the foreign countries our credit is very high, higher than that of any other country in similar circumstances. I am prepared to take a challenge from anybody in this matter. Why try to hit this country only in order to hit the Congress or hit me? That is all that I would say. It is just like one wanting to cut off his nose in order to spite his neighbour. Why should

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]
that be done? It is my business to see that he does not cut off his nose as otherwise I lose a friend, and that is why I am submitting this for his benefit.

If these things are examined in this manner, it will be found that the Budget proposals that I have presented, which I had the honour of presenting, are framed with a view to seeing that we will be on the way to successfully meet the requirements of the Third Five Year Plan. Some Members said that this will give us more revenue than I have anticipated. So much the better and I shall thank them if that happens. After all, there should be more revenues than is anticipated, not less than what is anticipated. In this very connection, it has been agreed generally that we are under-estimating our revenues and over-estimating our expenditure so that at the end of the year revenues show more and expenditure shows less and we show a better result at the end of the year, and that that is what we do deliberately. Let me assure my hon. friends that we do nothing of the sort deliberately, but I must say that I have a cautious and a prudent approach in all these matters of estimates and that is what the Government should have. Is it desirable, Sir, that while presenting the Budget I over-estimate the revenue out of sheer optimism being infected by my hon. friends and under-estimate the expenditure on account of the fear that all of it is not going to be spent and the result ultimately is that I get less revenue and have more expenditure because we spend more and more every time? What would be the result then? At the end, there would be far more deficit financing which would eat us up. We had once deficit financing of Rs. 450 crores in one year. Should we come to that? Will that be preferred by hon. friends? I do not think so. Therefore, my hon. friends ought to be happy with our policy and ought to support me in this line of action and not make me take a wrong line. Of course, those

who want to see that I come to grief would certainly do so but I am not going to walk into their parlour. The hon. friends who want to see that this is strengthened at any rate ought not to look at it from this point of view.

Then, Sir, the question of civil expenditure crops up every year as it should. I do not say that it should not. Because it has not been mentioned here that we are taking steps to prune civil expenditure, all the while it is presumed that we are not doing anything in the matter. Sir, I mentioned last year what steps we had been taking and what steps we would continue to take. An organisation has been set up which constantly looks into this. We are looking into it and as I have this year changed the accounts and their method, it will be seen that we will have a better comparison in years to come. Civil expenditure includes many items that ought not to be there. Even now, the civil expenditure next year will exceed the current year's revised estimate by Rs. 49.94 crores but this increase is spread over a number of items. A sum of Rs. 9.55 crores will go in interest payments, that is on account of the increased borrowings; Rs. 32.88 crores for various schemes of developmental services such as education, public health, medical, industries and agriculture and Rs. 12.47 crores for grants to States as a result of the disappearance of the tax on railway fares. Therefore, it will be seen that there is not that kind of increase in civil expenditure about which we have to be frightened. The increase in administrative services proper is only Rs. 2.5 crores and these Rs. 2.5 crores again do not mean all increased staff. It also means the promotions which the staff has received and the amount required for that promotion and some more staff. Last year we had put an embargo on all new staff to be recruited outside the Plan and if any was required, it could be sanctioned only by the Home Minister and myself. Without that not one person would be allowed to be recruited.

That embargo we have continued this year and we propose to continue it. That has brought down the extra expenditure on increased staff very considerably and we shall go on doing it. At the same time we are also trying through our special reorganisation unit to continuously study works and methods of all offices, of all Ministries, to show to them new methods of work so that the staff can be curtailed. The present staff is not at all excessive if the existing methods of work are taken into consideration but the existing methods of work do require alteration and change. They require to be bettered and that is what we are trying to do but that requires study. Everybody cannot show that. Therefore, we have set up a unit which goes on training other people and our attempt is to see that every Ministry has a unit so that it continuously goes on doing it in future and we may not have this complaint in future. But it will take at least three years to reach all Ministries. We are trying to do that and the results are encouraging. I believe, Sir, that this way we will be able to keep an eye on expenditure very correctly and we will see that there is no extra expenditure, that is, there is no expenditure more than is justified or more than it pays its own value. But even then it will not be possible for me to claim or for anybody in Government at any time to claim that there will be nothing superfluous at any time in any Government Ministry. There will always be a little waste here and there but it must be the least possible and that is our attempt. Even in the food that we eat we are not able to avoid waste. One may eat the best of food and yet a lot of waste goes out from the body. As a matter of fact, some waste becomes necessary in the body but I do not want to apply that simile to Government expenditure. But some waste is inevitable; it is not waste. That is all that I want to say. But we must keep it to that limit. For that I am very thankful to the hon. Members for being vigilant and always pressing me about it and I hope they will go on pressing me about it. I have there-

fore no quarrel about this criticism; I am only trying to explain so that hon. Members may not think that I am unmindful of this or that I am not respecting their wishes or that I am indifferent to this item. That is why I try to explain.

Then, Sir, it is said that our exports are stagnant. The question of exports is a very important question for us and we have got to solve it progressively; that is, we have got to go on increasing our exports progressively. Two or three years ago we had gone down in our exports; we are again coming up and we believe that we will come up more and more. But the problem of exports is not a very simple one. This is an age of competition. This is again an age when more and more countries are getting free and getting more and more developed. All countries are trying to produce most of the things which they can produce as they should, as we are trying to do. That being so, the competition increases. It is good that the competition increases because it also exercises our minds and our intelligence so that we can go on changing the pattern of exports and we can go on increasing our exports. That is what we are trying to do. That is why we are trying to utilise the taxation in such a manner that we produce more here and reduce our imports. That is why machinery has been taxed. Not that immediately it is going to do wonders but as time goes on it is going to help the indigenous manufacture and it will save us the necessity of having more and more imports. In the course of the next ten years—I am quite sure at the end of it—we will come to a stage where the import bill will go down comparatively with the export earnings and that will be the correct state of affairs. It is because we are not able to earn all our requirements of imports through our exports that we require foreign resources from outside and that is why we have got to make those arrangements. Those arrangements are made through friends outside who are very friendly and who

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]
are trying to help us. Fortunately, we have friends all over the world. We have no camps in this matter. Of course, some of my friends opposite, especially the Communist Party, are very keen that we should take help only from one bloc and not from any other bloc, that it is only profitable to take help from there and not elsewhere, but there is a capacity beyond which those people cannot help. We are getting only 8 per cent. of our requirements from the U.S.S.R.; about 50 per cent. comes from the U.S.A. and we have got to take this. Where else will we go? Then, again, it is not less profitable to get it from the U.S.A. As a matter of fact, we get a lot of it which we have not to repay or which we have to pay in rupees or in 30 or 40 years. There is one advantage in one place; there is another advantage in another place. All give us an advantage. If we have to repay in 12 years to the U.S.S.R. the interest is only 2½ per cent. But we have to pay 3 or 4 per cent. if we are to repay in 30 or 40 years, or some of it is written off or some of it is utilised here naturally for our development. Therefore, I would only request my hon. friend not to bring his ideology in the question of the interests of the country and see that he does not hurt the country by creating a wrong atmosphere outside for this purpose. It profits him; it profits the country. Well, if his theory is that even when it profits the country, it does not profit him if his ideology is not satisfied, then I have nothing to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister may or may not have misconceived the Budget but he has completely misconceived our point of view. It has never been our contention that from outside the socialist camp they should not seek any help. Anyway, he can proceed.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I am very happy that my hon. friend has been forced to admit this and I hope he will remember it in future while being very denunciative of all these

things. That is all that I would request him to do. Something good always comes out of these things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some kind of an understanding is arrived at.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: It is difficult for me to understand my friend but it is very easy for him to understand me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is even more difficult at times.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: And it is good that I do not understand him because if I understand him, I do not know what I will have to do. It is therefore that we have to make these arrangements but these arrangements are not made in such a manner that they are going to hurt us. We are utilising all these foreign resources only for productive purposes. We are not utilising it for roads; we are not utilising it for expenditure which does not bring us any returns. Therefore, Sir, I would assure my hon. friends here that they should not feel that we are leaving a big load for the future generations and that we are being very unfair in doing all these things. We are providing them with means whereby not only they will repay but they will also better themselves and benefit themselves by what is there. That is what we are trying to do. In this very connection I would like to mention that when it is argued that our industrial undertakings are not giving us all that they should give us, we are criticising them too prematurely. We have invested money in several concerns; not that they are not paying us; many of them are paying us. But if you talk of steel plant and if you say that that also should immediately pay, well, it is an expectation which is not supported by any reason. The steel plants will give us full production only by the end of the next year. After that you can say, that it will give that much

return. After that you can say that the price must be so much. My hon. friend here was arguing about the price. If a steel mill which costs Rs. 150 or Rs. 200 crores and which is to produce a million tons of steel produces only a 100,000 tons in the beginning, then to say that production is very costly would not be right. It is not economics at all. Therefore, one should not be so very impatient about it. Try to wait and see, when the full production is made, whether our prices are all right or not. I believe that the steps that we are taking will see to it that our prices are economical and not uneconomical. It is true. I have hidden nothing as must have been seen from what I said and from the Economic Survey, which is there. I have hidden nothing from hon. Members, because that is not the policy which we follow. We believe that our faults should also be known, so that we improve. Now, we have certainly not succeeded in keeping to the schedule in everything. That is also possible, when one takes to such large undertakings, in a big way, in all directions, in a country where there is not that experience, when we all want to get rich quickly. That is, all people want to become better and better quickly. We have got to do all these, and when we have got to do all these, we have got to buy our experience. We must not croak when we pay for our experience. If we do not pay for our experience, we will never be experienced. The only criterion should be whether we have paid more or whether we have paid less than what we should pay. Therefore, let there be a little sympathetic understanding of these things and not only political understanding of these things. If there is an economic understanding of all these things, I am quite sure that the criticism, which is made today, will not be made.

It was said about Sindri Fertilisers that their price was much higher than the price from abroad. People abroad are producing for a number of years and producing on a large scale. They

1089 RS—7.

have many factories. Therefore, they have brought down the price on account of competition. Our prices are a bit high otherwise. Though our price is high, we will try to bring it down in due course. I have no doubt that we will be able to bring it down. Therefore, let there be equal comparison and not comparison in a wrong manner. That is all I have got to plead in this matter.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: All that has been pointed out is that the Government has assumed a surplus of say, Rs. 250 crores. The Finance Minister is banking on it.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Will you please wait and not interrupt? Otherwise, I will have to take more time. I will just tell you. Rupees one hundred and fifty crores surplus is in five years, not in one year. Therefore, wait for the five years and you will see that we will get it.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: Good.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: And if we did not get it, we will have to admit that we were not as competent as we should be. But I do not think my hon. friend, who has got out of the steel mills, can also say that he was as competent in that case.

Let me give the results of some of these factories. In 1958-59, the Sindri Fertilisers made a net profit of Rs 159 lakhs, showing a return of over 7 per cent., on its capital and reserves. The Hindustan Antibiotics, Limited made a profit of Rs. 87 lakhs in 1958-59 and Rs. 77 lakhs in 1959-60, all of which was ploughed back into its reserves. The Hindustan Machine Tools, Limited earned a profit of over 7½ per cent., in 1959-60. Similarly, the Indian Telephone Industries, Limited gave a profit of over 6 per cent., in 1958-59 and over 8 per cent., in 1959-60. Although the dividend paid to Government was only 2½ per cent., the profit of this undertaking was

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]
ploughed back for more expansion. The National Newsprint and Paper Mills, Limited earned a profit of Rs. 38 lakhs, that is, over 7½ per cent., which was transferred to its reserves. It will thus be seen that all these factories are earning and they will earn more and more. And I have no doubt that the steel factories which absorb a large amount of investment will also give us the dividends that we want.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): I think that in fairness the hon. Minister should mention a few concerns which have been existing for more than ten years and which are working in deficit.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: There is one such concern, which has been existing for 125 years, viz., the National Instruments Factory, Calcutta, which did not earn anything until two years ago. But it has been earning now, since the past two years. That is what this Government has done. There are some projects, which will not earn. You cannot say that they are earning in that sense. Take the Hindustan Aircraft, Limited. That is a matter of service and we require that. And there if you go on thinking in terms of the returns they can give, then we will be considering it in a wrong way. All the money that is spent by Government on various projects does not give immediate direct returns. Now, all that we spend on education gives no return, but can anybody say that it is an unprofitable investment? It is a very profitable investment, because if that is not investment, nothing else will be so in the world.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I was only referring to commercial undertakings, not social services.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I quite follow that my hon. friend's vigilant eye is there and I am very thankful to him. It is certainly possible that

some concerns may not do it. I do not myself know, but I have given what I know. I do not want to hide anything. If I am asked about any particular concern, I am prepared to give the figures, because that is very necessary. It will help me and the managers of the projects concerned to see that they work properly. It is necessary to do so.

Then I would come to the question which was raised by an hon. Member suggesting that we should have the excess-profits tax, as a direct tax, and the capital-gains tax. The capital-gains tax is there already. It is a part of the Income-tax Act. It has not been removed. There seems to be some want of knowledge in this matter. That is natural, because it has been merged in the income-tax. In the matter of excess-profits tax, there seems to be a notion that the excess-profits tax can be levied at any time and that it is going to benefit us very much. The excess-profits tax would mean that one takes a base year and more profits than that will be taxed at a certain rate. Now, what is the base year that we will take? Now, in the case of a war, it is very easy, the year before the war is the base year. And during the war whatever happens, you take the excess profits and tax them. That is not the case now. There are no such abnormal profits in that sense. It is possible that in some units there is far more profit and in some of the units there is less profit. Now, are we going to penalise the better units by taxing them and thereby encouraging those units also to make less profits? That is not what we want to do. We have various methods of taking their profits. We are having 45 per cent., as corporation tax. We can take more if we find that in some cases it goes beyond limits. We can certainly consider that—not that we cannot consider it. We are having wealth-tax in the case of private individuals. On the dividends which go to them, they also pay you taxes and their tax also is raised. That is at a

higher level in the case of all those who get more dividends. There is perhaps more wealth accruing in the case of companies, but not more wealth accruing to individuals now. There are some individuals, say, about 15 or 20 who are paying more than 100 per cent. They are paying about 120 per cent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What has happened to wealth-tax on companies?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: There is no wealth-tax now. My hon. friend does not want any company to exist. He may think so, that it should be there, but I do not think so. We have different lines of argument and we have different attitudes of mind to life itself. Therefore, it is not possible for me to satisfy him in the matter, by making everybody dry and making him only rich in power. It is not possible for me to do so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He imposed the wealth-tax on companies, and then he abolished it to please the company bosses.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Then, I would come to my hon. Professor friend, who said several things which are not quite in accordance with facts. He said that neither the Plans that had been completed nor the Third Plan which was just commencing had been based on the socialist ideology. I do not see what his stand is for a socialist ideology. If I had been put wiser about it, I should have been able to satisfy him better. He said that land revenue had increased by a hundred per cent. in the last ten years. From where he has got these figures, I do not know.

PROF. M. B. LAL: From the Report of the Estimates of National Incomes.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I do not know who has seen that. I should like to see that because there is no such increase in land revenue. But what has happened is that the

zamindaries having been abolished, what was paid to the zamindars comes to the Government. Therefore, there is no increase in that. The same thing is paid by those people to Government, and that might show a hundred per cent., increase, but that is not an increase. Therefore, to say that it has fallen on agriculture is not right.

Then, Sir, he is also misled by a comparison of the allocations to agriculture and industry. This is what happens in the matter of figures and statistics many a time when they are not properly looked at. He said that the increase from the Second Plan to the Third Plan was only 2 per cent; that is, 21 per cent., was the expenditure on the agriculture in the Second Plan, and in the Third Plan it will be 23 per cent; therefore we have not paid more attention to it. If you take the actual figures—because the figures of the Second Plan were smaller and the figures of the Third Plan are much higher—it will be seen that the amount that will be spent in the Third Plan will be 75 per cent., higher than the amount spent in the Second Plan. Is this a small increase? This is how it ought to be looked at, not in the manner in which it is looked at. If an average is taken of a person who is a hundred years old and a person who is one year old, it will be 51 or 50, but that would apply to neither of them.

As regards the data of the income having gone to various people and the wealth that has been produced having gone to certain classes or not having gone to certain classes, the dates are not complete. There has been a Committee appointed on this matter, and I am sure that it will make its deliberations as soon as possible and will give its conclusions also as soon as possible. But I personally doubt if that will give us absolutely a very correct estimate of what things have happened. I do not think that this can be estimated anywhere completely. But we can have a rough idea about it, and that is what we are going to have. Then we will be in a

[Shri Morarji R. Desai.]

better position to argue about. But to say that the developments of the last ten years have not benefited all people or have benefited very few people would be very wrong. There is absolutely no reason to my mind to say that the benefits of these developments in the last ten years have not gone to many people or have not gone to all sections of the people. They may not have reached all people. Nobody can claim that they will reach all people in such a short time. They may not have been evenly spread either. That also I am prepared to admit immediately. I do not think anybody will be able to achieve it. But we are trying to spread it as evenly as possible. That is all the claim that one can make. The larger fortunes of a few attract far more notice than the small additions to income over a broad front. That is what is happening. But when people say that there is no improvement in the villages or otherwise, I do not know whether their ideas have gone wrong or whether their minds are coloured entirely by their prejudice of the Government or of the party which runs the Government. Anybody who has the least honesty, if he goes to the villages, will see that in almost all villages there has been improvement everywhere. I cannot say that every village has benefited equally, but the number of roads that have been laid, the number of schools that have been built, the irrigation facilities that have been given, the number of bridges that have been constructed, the amount of cloth which is produced, the amount of sugar which is now produced and consumed, if all these are seen, it will be admitted that the benefits have extended to larger and larger numbers of people every year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cycles.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: The number of cycles of course has gone to 20 lakhs and more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do they reach all villages?

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: They cannot reach all the villages. Even in the wonderland of my hon. friend it has not reached all the villages. They have very bad roads there in the villages. Therefore, what is the use of saying this? It is no use trying to do this, and even the person for whom he has the greatest admiration, the man who is perfect according to him, has given us a certificate that the development in this country is more than anybody could have expected. That is what he has said, but my friend does not take a lesson even from his master. His dislike of us is so great. When I say master, it is not master in the real sense but master only in name.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have you read the Report of the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the population has been increasing in this country, and it is increasing perhaps a little faster than we had at first imagined. The increase is now about 2 per cent. That also takes away a part of the development that we are making. But we are making our development larger than what would be consumed by this larger population. Steps are also taken to see that the population does not increase so fast but goes down; that is, it does not decrease. It should not decrease in that sense. If it decreases, there is an end of the country. I do not think anybody wishes that. Of course, I have always said that population is a problem only so long as we are not able to give them the means of production. Population ceases to be a problem, it becomes an asset, when we give them the means of production, because they produce far more than they consume. But at this time it is necessary just to see that the population does not become a pressure. In a poor country where there are no means of production, it does become a pressure. Therefore, we have got to see to that. Also with more prosperity there is a population control

automatically. It is therefore necessary that we have got to pay more attention to it. It must have been seen that in the Third Plan more attention has been paid to this factor. We are also trying to see that the development is larger so that the benefit goes to all people. After all we all want that everybody must have a better living, better than what he has today. We want everybody in this country to have a proper living. Proper living by any standard we want him to have, but if we want him to have that, we must have resources. We must have investment. Without investment there cannot be increase in wealth. If there is to be investment and if there are to be resources, who else but all the people have to pay? Otherwise how are they going to relish the fruits of their production? They cannot do it unless they have contributed to that. Therefore, all have to pay for it. In these matters may I plead with my hon. friends that while they should, and they may, criticise the Budget proposals as much as they like, let them not create a resistance in the people, a false idea in the people that we are going down? We are going forward, there is no doubt about it. There is the evidence for any eyes which are not jaundiced. But we are going faster and faster, and we can go even more fast provided this is all looked into properly.

The question of prices is relevant, I will not say that it is not relevant. But prices will rise certainly to a limited extent, to some extent, in all developing economics. If they do not rise, the economy is stagnant. But they should not rise beyond a certain limit. We are careful about that. We have not gone beyond that stage, that is, to an inflation period in the sense in which people argue, but if we go beyond that, it will certainly

be inflation. We are, therefore, trying to do this. But even in 5 P.M. this matter my hon. friends opposite always pleaded that everybody should be paid more for his commodities and then when they come here, they say, 'You bring down the prices.' And they go there and tell them, "Have more prices." They go to the agriculturists and say that they must have more and more prices. They come here and say, "You must bring down the prices." How are these two things to be achieved? Therefore, let them have a sense of proportion, let them have a sense of reality, of wisdom and of truthfulness. That is what I have got to say. If they do that, I have no doubt that the prices will never run away and will not rise beyond a certain level. If the prices rise a little, there is immediately a demand for more and more wages, for more and more increments. Once they are there, they will raise the inflation because the buying power rises. Therefore, there is again an increase in prices and they are asking for more. Let them do so if they want to, because they want to do so for a political purpose, for a political game. Let all others who are not of that view take a warning from all this and not be caught by this sort of wrong propaganda and see that we develop properly together in a co-operative manner and I have no doubt that my friends opposite also will fall in line.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Budget discussion is over. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at one minute past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 14th March, 1961.