

[Shri Satya Narain Sinha.]

(ii) Statement No. VII—Eighteenth Session, 1957.

(iii) Statement No. IX—Seventeenth Session, 1957.

(iv) Statement No. XIV—Eleventh Session, 1955.

[See Appendix XX, Annexure Nos. 25 to 28 for (i) to (iv).]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Budget discussion to be resumed. Mr. Shiva Rao.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1958-59 —GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

SHRI B. SHIVA RAO (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, the budget speech of the hon. Prime Minister in his capacity as the custodian of the finances of the country for the time being and the economic survey prepared by the Ministry of Finance and circulated with the other papers, between them, they give a fairly clear and comprehensive picture of the economic conditions in the country.

The Economic Survey is a brief and business-like document which contains a realistic assessment of the forces that are at work. I would invite the attention of the House to one conclusion which has been drawn in this survey and it is that despite the slight improvement in the situation in recent months, "the economic situation is basically one in which there is a continuous pull, on balance, in the direction of inflation." Then this document goes on to refer to the adjustments which would become inevitable in the Second Five Year Plan. It frankly admits that the "costs estimates for some of the projects in the Plan have gone up; in a few cases the initial financial provisions in the Plan were admittedly on the low side." And it goes on to add:

"The experience of the last two years has shown that the impact of the Plan on the balance of payment was under-assessed when the Plan was formulated."

Later, in the course of this pamphlet, a reference is made to the memorandum which is believed to be under preparation by the Planning Commission with regard to the manner in which those adjustments should take place. I hope, Sir, that that memorandum when it is completed, will be supplied to Members of Parliament so that we may have both time and opportunity to discuss the proposals made by the Planning Commission before final decisions are taken by the Government.

Taking this economic survey as a whole, I am bound to say this, that this document does not give us any rosy picture of Government's effort to secure public loans and to stimulate small savings in the last two years. The figures are interesting. Against Rs. 280 crores which were expected in these two years as loans, only Rs. 213 crores were realised. And so far as small savings are concerned, they brought only Rs. 120 crores in the same period which is a drop of Rs. 80 crores from the target for the two years in the Plan. One cannot read with any satisfaction the suggestion that some items in the field of social services may have to suffer from lack of funds during the plan period. More resources are wanted both internally and externally and this is described as the crucial task for the coming year, and indeed for the rest of the plan period.

Now, turning to the Budget, it makes an appeal to the country "to produce more, to export more and to save more." May I in all earnestness add that the Government should itself make a serious effort to spend less, because the situation today, on the Government's own showing—I think it comes out more clearly in the Economic Survey than in the Budget—is such that it calls for the utmost care and vigilance in regard to expenditure.

There is no new tax suggested apart from the gifts-tax. The obvious inference is that new taxes are

beyond the capacity of the country to bear at present. We have resorted to some extent, to deficit financing even in this year. There is an uncovered deficit of Rs. 27 crores which is not a good thing in view of the warnings held out by the Economic Survey to which I have already made a reference. And this uncovered deficit will be an additional pull in the direction of inflation. But as one reads the Budget and the estimates for the coming year, I for one have a certain amount of uneasiness as to whether the uncovered deficit would remain at Rs. 27 crores twelve months hence. Let me refer only to one item of expenditure, because it is the biggest, namely Defence. The defence expenditure was estimated at Rs. 252 crores in the Budget for this year. But in the actuals there has been an excess expenditure of Rs. 14 crores. From Rs. 252 crores it has gone on to Rs. 266 crores. The estimate for the coming financial year is Rs. 278 crores. Sir, I will be agreeably surprised if at this time next year, the Finance Minister at that time is in a position to say that he has not exceeded the estimates for the coming year. Maintenance and repairs are a very heavy item of expenditure and I have a fear that we shall go well beyond the sum of Rs. 278 crores in the next twelve months. I do ask the Government in view of the danger of inflation which is accepted by the Government itself and in view also of the implied threat to social services about which there is a clear warning in the Economic Survey, whether it would not be possible even at this state for the Government to revise its defence estimates and so re-phase its programme of purchases of equipment from abroad as to effect substantial savings. Sir, if we only reduce our arms, it would make a much better impression on the Powers to whom we address appeals for disarmament. Apart from this, there is an urgent need according to the budget statement, for "plugging the loop-holes in taxation." How much

we lose through evasion of income-tax is anybody's guess.

12 Noon.

Estimates of evasion have ranged from 15 to 20 crores on the low side, to over a hundred crores a year. But, whatever be the amounts that we lose, there is no doubt that we lose a very great deal. It seems to me that all our efforts should be concentrated on plugging these loop-holes as the Budget describes them. In this connection, Sir, I would like to make a few suggestions for the consideration of the Finance Ministry. The time has come, it seems to me, for a thorough re-examination of the present structure, the procedure adopted and the division of functions amongst the Members of the Central Board of Revenue. We have, in the last few years, heaped upon the Central Board of Revenue, almost an overwhelming burden in the form of the collection of new taxes—not only the Customs, the Income Tax and Excises—but also the new taxes, the Wealth Tax, the Expenditure Tax and now the Gifts Tax. But the organisation continues to be more or less run on the same lines as it used to be in British times. In the Explanatory Memorandum which has been supplied to us, there is very sketchy information as to the activities of the Central Board of Revenue; and my first suggestion to the Ministry is that from the next Budget, papers should be circulated to include a volume giving us comprehensive an account as possible of the activities of the Central Board of Revenue, the collections made, the problems that are encountered in regard to the collections and other relevant factors that can be included in it. Without much information as to the working of the Central Board of Revenue at present, I can only make certain tentative suggestions. I have wondered whether the Central Board of Revenue, with all the functions assigned to it at the moment and with the enormous task thrown upon it of collecting, I think, over Rs. 660 crores

[Shri B. Shiva Rao.]

a year, is adequately staffed with only five Members on it. I offer no answer; but it certainly is a question which I think deserves examination. Secondly, with all these new taxes introduced in these twelve months, I would like to know, when someone replies on behalf of the Finance Minister or the Finance Minister himself, what training is given to the rank and file to equip them properly for the collection of these taxes. Now, we have borrowed from Sweden the Wealth Tax. Curiosity led me last year, after the introduction of the Budget, to see how this tax is collected in Sweden. So, I paid a visit to the office of the Swedish Legation in Delhi and asked for the Year Book. I found that in Sweden they have by means of a simple but very effective device been very successful in the collection of both the Income Tax and the Wealth Tax. That device is that in Sweden, the Municipal Corporations publish the names of all the assesseees and that, I was told, has a very salutary effect. Attempts at evasion are few and the Swedish Government succeeds in collecting a great deal of the Income Tax and the Wealth Tax. It may seem at first sight a revolutionary proposal to make, but I do seriously suggest that our Finance Ministry should consider whether it would not be possible to make such a list of all assesseees. As a beginning, a start might be made with assesseees with income of Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 12,000 a year and more. Those names may be published with the income-tax slabs in which those names appear. I think publication will have a very wholesome effect, because it would rouse public opinion and people would begin to wonder why a wealthy businessman here or there pays so little or why his name does not appear at all in the list of Income-tax assesseees.

I would like to make another suggestion in regard to the structure of the Central Board of Revenue. I have had a good deal to do with pro-

blems of people working in the Customs side and sometimes on the Income Tax side. I regret to say that in the Central Board of Revenue, these staff problems do not receive a sympathetic and fair consideration, not in many cases at any rate, and I would suggest that the Central Board of Revenue should follow the example of the Railway Board. The Central Board of Revenue, should have a whole-time separate Member for staff problems only, with no other duties assigned to him. His main qualification need not be a profound knowledge of finance; his essential qualification should be a warm and human understanding, easy accessibility and a sense of fairness. He should have no routine duties assigned to him, so that he may travel all over the country, visit the main centres and ascertain for himself the needs and the problems of the staff. I would also suggest that periodically, once or even twice a year, as the Railway Board does, the Central Board of Revenue should also have a conference with representatives of different branches, the Customs, the Income Tax and the Excise, and, as the Railway Minister presides over such a conference, I would suggest the Finance Minister hereafter should do the same and have a direct knowledge of the problems of the staff and also make direct contacts.

Now, Sir, I would like to pass on to a wider issue on the same lines. Last year, when the Appropriation Bill was under discussion in this House, I ventured to suggest that the formation of Staff Committees in the Secretariat and the appointment of Welfare Officers would go a great way towards solving many of the problems with which Secretariat workers are faced at the present moment. Later I was informed that such Staff Committees had been constituted, may be in some Ministries may be in all, and also that Welfare Officers have been appointed. But I am sorry that very little has been said on this subject on the floor of the House. I have seen no report,

not even a press report on the subject; and the whole thing has been done in such a routine and unimaginative fashion that the appointment of these Staff Committees and of these Welfare Officers seems to have made very little difference to those who are working in the Government of India offices. Sir, from time to time we discuss labour-management problems in this House. Only yesterday there was a question on that subject. We want to foster a spirit of partnership in workers in industry in the private sector. If that is good enough for the private sector, I suggest that the same spirit may be fostered in the Government of India secretariat, and I think nothing would inspire the workers in the secretariat here, nothing would encourage the staff committees and the welfare officers to put more vigour into the tasks that have been allotted to them than if either the Prime Minister himself or, if he cannot find the time, the Home Minister would call them all together for an inaugural meeting. The welfare officers are, I believe, intended to deal mainly with the problems of Class IV employees in the secretariat. Their main problems, as far as I can understand, are housing, medical relief, education of their children and indebtedness . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): And service rules.

SHRI B. SHIVA RAO: . . . and I wish definite directives could be given to the welfare officers so that they could proceed to deal with the different problems that come to their notice. I would also suggest, if these steps have been taken with any seriousness, that the Ministry in general overall charge of the staff committees and the welfare officers should ask for periodical reports from the various committees and the welfare officers to see what progress has been achieved, what problems are being tackled.

Sir, now I would like to deal with another subject in which I have taken some interest in the House at Question time. We have had discussions from time to time on the material

resources required for our major projects under the Five Year Plan. But insufficient attention has been paid in the House to the equally important problem of manpower resources. To take the biggest example, we have now three steel plants in various stages of construction at Bhilai, Durgapur and Rourkela. I have ascertained approximately what would be the manpower requirements of the three steel projects taken together. And according to my information these steel projects will require at least 120 experienced engineers for higher technical direction. They will need 1200 qualified engineers to constitute a kind of second line. But even more, they will need at least 10,000 skilled workers of different categories in the lower grades, by which I mean foremen, assistant foremen, and the like, and in addition to these 10,000 skilled workers they will need another 7,000 semi-skilled workers.

Sir, I believe there was a technical personnel committee which was appointed about two years ago to deal with this general problem of manpower for the various industries, and I would like to have some information as to the progress made by this committee in regard to the provision of training facilities for the very large numbers. So far as the top grades are concerned, for the top engineers and the engineers in the second grade I believe something is being done at the moment through the good offices of the Ford Foundation. I am told a programme of training has been drawn up for about a thousand engineers for the Rourkela and Durgapur steel projects in the United States, and I believe that at the moment already something like 200 young men are receiving training in that country. But I hope the House will be informed of what is being done in regard to the balance of over a thousand engineers that will be required for these projects. So far as Durgapur is concerned, I am told that under the Colombo Plan the British Government will provide train-

[Shri B. Shiva Rao.]

ing facilities for about 300 engineers. On this too more detailed information will be welcome to the House. Something is also being attempted on the same lines by Canada, Australia and Germany, and the Soviet Government. That, Sir, is as satisfactory as it can be at the moment, but what I have particularly in mind is the question of what is being done to train the very large number of skilled and semi-skilled workers for these steel plants. About 17,000 of them will be required in the next few years. Sir, this is a matter which needs much foresight and a great deal of careful organisation. I am raising this point because, a few years ago when I had the privilege of being the chairman of the employment exchanges committee, a very attractive and generous offer was made by British witnesses on behalf of the engineering firms and the industrial concerns of Calcutta; they were quite prepared to train in their workshops a large number of apprentices so that they could help in the construction of various hydro-electric schemes. I drew the attention of the Labour Ministry and of the Government to this particular offer and I repeated it again when we submitted the report of the committee. But the response of the Government, I am afraid, was extremely disappointing. For that reason I would like to know how the requirements of the steel projects are going to be met in terms of trained personnel. Capital goods we may be able to acquire from abroad, but trained personnel is a matter to which we should devote the utmost attention from now. In this connection I would like to know, in regard to these training facilities which particular Ministry deals with them; because, in the past, I think there has been a good deal of confusion and misunderstanding. I do not quite know whether it is the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Planning or all three of them put together, that deal with this general problem of manpower training.

Finally, Sir, I would like to refer to a topic which is seldom mentioned in the House but one which, I think, is a very deserving case, and that is the claims of Government pensioners to some relief in these hard times. Not all pensioners stand in the same category. I have had a good deal of correspondence with one or two associations of retired officials in different parts of the country. I do not propose to take the time of the House to deal with this matter in any detail, but I would suggest to the Finance Ministry that it should consider the claims of retired officials for a dearness allowance or some addition to their meagre incomes with sympathy. During the last ten years the British House of Commons has had not less than six pension Acts; the last one was in 1956. And each has been an advance on its predecessor. I do not think the additional burden on our exchequer will be considerable. The Finance Minister will earn the gratitude of a very large number of deserving people, if the principle of assistance to pensioners is accepted, and leave the details and the quantum of assistance to be given to the different categories of pensioners to be settled after discussion with the representative organisations of the pensioners themselves.

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, this year's budget has been described as a pedestrian budget by the Finance Minister, but I think it is rather modest because it is a continuation and confirmation of last year's flighty and even rocketing budget. In one year we had made large additions to our taxation especially direct taxation, and as the Prime Minister himself says this was of a magnitude rarely equalled in peace-time. That is to say, we have brought together several taxes—wealth tax, expenditure tax—which are imposed only in countries which are more advanced economically, where population is much smaller and more compact than in our country. And further, Mr. Kaldor's—who is the author of these ideas—idea was to reduce the burden

of the income-tax along with adding wealth and expenditure taxes, that is to say, bring down the maximum rate of income-tax to 45 per cent. This has not been done. So, the burden on the industry and business has been rather heavy and naturally there have been various difficulties. We have seen the fall of the stock market prices. In fact, the fall has been about 25 per cent since 1956, and also there was in regard to gilt-edged securities some percentage fall. Thus we find that there has been some economic disturbance in the country on account of this heavy taxation.

But I am not saying that we should not have this taxation. We are in need of funds in this country. We are engaged in a very important Five Year Plan and the resources are needed not only for external finance but also internal finance and, therefore, we have to raise taxes. In fact, if it is merely a matter of raising revenues we have various other ways, less difficult, less disturbing. Unfortunately, ideology stands against our doing it. Last year we heard from a very experienced Member of our House about this. But, of course, ideology still remains very strong. So, we have to raise more unpopular taxes. But the question is how inquisitorial it is going to be? As Mr. Rama Rao, the retired Governor of the Reserve Bank, the other day wrote in the 'Times of India', the real difficulty about these direct taxes—the wealth and expenditure taxes and now the gift tax—is that they make highly inquisitorial inroads into private affairs which most people do not like; it may even cause corruption, and in any case, annoyance. That somehow must be reduced considerably, in my opinion, and steps must be taken for that.

Now, in this year's budget the main addition to our taxes is the gift tax. As a complement to the expenditure and wealth taxes we have to support this measure. That is to say, this is meant to plug the loopholes which are bound to be in the income-tax and other taxes. But the difficulty is that plugging the loopholes is difficult

in a country like India. Evasion is a fine art in this country. There are here people who are much more competent in evading taxes than anywhere in the world probably, and certainly more than in Western Europe. Therefore, even the inclusion of this gift tax may not be able to plug the loopholes sufficiently and there will be a lot of evasion left. After all it is only when people feel that they have a duty, as citizens of the country, to support the State, it is only then that people will be willingly paying their taxes. In fact, we know particularly in England and in the Scandinavian countries people smilingly pay taxes and even if something is left out they afterwards give information to the authorities. That is because they are people with a public spirit which is goading them. Unless that change comes in this country also, large evasion is bound to continue.

The next item is the amendment of the Estate Duty Act, reducing the exemption limit from Rs. 1 lakh to Rs. 50,000. There are reasons which justify this. But in my opinion this will certainly weaken the middle-class further. After all in this country we are not thinking of bringing down everybody to a low level. We want to build up our middle class, somewhat to the level of the middle classes of other democratic countries. We find a very large and growing middle class in England, France, Germany, all over. The biggest body of the people are the middle class, say on our standards, having an income of about Rs. 500 per month to Rs. 1000 and so on; in England, it is between one thousand pounds to fifty-thousand pounds a year . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: £ 50,000?

DR. P. J. THOMAS: I beg your pardon. I mean £5,000. Our aim is more modest, but such people we want more and more. In this country unfortunately we are trying to weaken the basis of this middle class formation. I would even say a lower middle class we must aim at. But even that will be weakened by these modifica-

[Shri P. J. Thomas.]

tions. The same will be the result of the changes in our Estate Duty. In the Act as it was, two years was the period during which a person would make gifts untaxed. That is, if gifts were made within two years of death they were not taxed. Now, it has become five year. A great burden is thus imposed on those who receive gifts. It is true that the Taxation Enquiry Commission has recommended it. But I think it is rather unfair to plug the loophole in that way, because it will certainly affect many people, young and old. There is one point which makes me support it, and that is, the whole of the revenue goes to the States and the States do want more revenue. In my opinion, in this country the States need far more revenue and a larger part of the revenue must go to the States in future. Decentralisation is required, the real federal principle. I certainly would encourage it. But how much are the States going to get? Only about Rs. 50 lakhs. It is a very small amount. We can easily raise this amount, even more by taxes, which are less troublesome and less burdensome.

Now, I come to a very difficult topic, the defence budget. We have increased our defence expenditure very much recently. It was only Rs. 170 crores in 1951. This coming year it is Rs. 278 crores; it was Rs. 266 crores during the current year. Now, this is a matter touching the security of the country. Important questions are involved in that, foreign policy questions. I am not competent to deal with those questions. That is not my field at all. But as an economist I think that such large increases in the defence budget are harmful to us just now because, firstly, we have a very important economic task, to carry out the Five Year Plan which requires not only internal finance but also external finance. Secondly, we have been purchasing stores from outside, and that means impinging on our scarce external resources. Thirdly, this increase in the defence budget

does not very much help our industry or employment. In England and in most countries in Europe, nay in the world, most of the stores are gathered from local production and therefore employment increases. In fact, in America particularly and in many other countries, one of the major factors of employment is the vast expenditure on armaments which means more industries and more employment. But in this country, so far as we have been able to do, most of our defence equipment has been purchased from abroad and, therefore, there is no increase in our employment in this country on account of our expansion of our defence budget. There is indeed some amount of money spent in this country mostly on the frontiers e.g., the North-West and the North-East, and also probably in Bangalore, Poona and a few other centres. Now, this money does not go into the pockets of the poorer people even in smaller towns, not to speak of the rural areas. In my opinion the part of the Defence Budget spent in this country has been very badly distributed, and that also is a very serious factor to be considered. After all, when Government is spending any money, it means that that money will go into some people's pockets. In this case the money goes into the pockets of a very small number of our people in the country.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, considering our present situation, I am wondering how our expectations in the present Budget can be fulfilled. We have got for instance the expectation that we can collect from market borrowings a sum of Rs. 145 crores. That is, of course, gross. And there is also the expectation to collect Rs. 100 crores from the small savings. Now, Sir, in the last year we were able to get only Rs. 68 crores from market borrowings—a very small figure—and hardly Rs. 60 crores may be reached out of the budgeted Rs. 80 crores under small savings. Now how do you then expect such a large increase under market borrowings and under small savings?

Of course, we all say that more and more money should be raised from the market and from small savings, but unfortunately there are various factors working against that. Of course we find that things are improving now and there is more money in some of the joint stock banks, but in spite of our best efforts, there is this difficulty to attain this higher limit. Sir, the indirect taxation, for example, the excise duties have certainly affected the purses of our poorer people. Therefore for them to save more has become rather difficult, particularly due to the higher prices of the goods that they buy. So, Sir, our expectation regarding both the revenue budget and the capital budget, to my mind, is rather difficult to be fulfilled, and a larger amount will have to be raised by deficit financing.

Now, Sir, much has been said against deficit financing; most of the Members who spoke here today and yesterday had been opposing deficit financing. Personally I do not agree with most of them because in my opinion an under-developed country like India cannot develop rapidly unless some resort is had to deficit financing. But, there are certain very essential conditions to be fulfilled to make it a success.

First of all there should be a sufficient quantity of cloth and foodgrains made available in this country, and secondly money must be used for productive purposes. Thirdly people must save. If you spend for the Five Year Plan, it is all right. And we can certainly resort to deficit financing to a large extent, and even to the extent which we had originally planned, provided we have a sufficient supply of consumer goods like cloth and foodgrains. Unfortunately we had not made sufficient preparation for supplying foodgrains, also our people are rather avaricious because they want to fill their stomachs with rice or wheat which are foodgrains difficult to raise or multiply. That of course is the chief reason for this difference between the supply and the demand.

I am not saying that it is possible to resort to deficit financing to any extent, but that it can be made very safe, provided we are particular in carrying out two things I just mentioned. In my opinion, the first and the foremost of them is the supply of sufficient quantities of foodgrains, and there should also be a reduction in the demand for such foodgrains as are difficult to grow. We can devise some kind of a diversified diet as in parts like Maharashtra and Gujarat, and introduce it throughout the country. By doing that we may be able to make the use of deficit financing much easier.

Equally important is the third requirement that our people must save more and more. In what way can they do it? People can certainly save more provided their needs can be reduced. Partly it can be done by lowering the prices of foodgrains, and partly some incentive must also be given to them to save more and more. But we see that the prices have gone up on account of higher levies of excise duties. Now my suggestion is that whenever there is an increase in their wages and salaries, a certain part of that increase must compulsorily be put into the small savings. I think some provision has already been made by the amendment of the Payment of Wages Act. That certainly ought to enable us to take a certain portion of the increased wages, maybe, bonus etc. into the small savings drive so that their children may be benefited by that saving. After ten years or so they would get that money back, and that would greatly help their families and their children. So from the point of view of carrying out our Five Year Plan and also from the point of view of looking after the families of the employees we have got to encourage this savings drive by even making some provision in our laws. I don't think this is too difficult a task; it is possible, provided we have got the will to do it. Certainly the families of the people themselves will be agreeable to such a proposal!

[Shri P. J. Thomas.]

Then, Sir, I also disagree with some of the remarks made by some Members regarding the present state of inflation. Compared to other countries like America or England, the price rise in the last few years in India has been very small. And this rise was largely due to the high price of rice and the scarcity of rice in the country. The price index with regard to cereals is 98 now and when the prices are thus falling, we cannot speak of inflation in the country. Of course, if you go on spending more and more money, there will be inflation. But every month and every year we have got to make provision for money being withdrawn and goods being provided. If we can do that, we can boldly go ahead with our programme and we can even . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Is it not true that part of this lowering of the index of food prices is due to the subsidy of the Government which purchases from foreign countries at higher rates and sells at lower rates?

DR. P. J. THOMAS: I agree with the hon. Member. That is so. But our object now must be to reduce that subsidy and to reduce the need for it by first of all growing more food in the country and also by reducing the intake of foodgrains by giving people more and more of other foodstuffs like millets which are very nutritious and which have been our main diet formerly, and also by giving people more and more vegetables etc. In that way we can reduce the necessity of our people . . .

SHR. J. S. BISHT: That will require rationing on a vast scale.

DR. P. J. THOMAS: Each family must ration, each municipality must ration and each panchayat must ration. In my opinion, the Government of India must tell each State "Look here, food is primarily your duty. We will supply you so much, and year after year you should go on reducing the quota by raising more food grains, raising something else in their place". In that way the whole burden must

be put on the States rather than the Government of India wasting resources like this.' I have only one more point. Considerable economy has to be practised in the country. Extravagance is going on everywhere. As a matter of fact, I have repeatedly said this and so many other people have talked about it, and I do hope that something will be done to check the expenditure of the Ministries of the Government of India themselves, because there has been an increase in staff in all directions, most unnecessarily in some cases. A very strong hand must be used in curtailing this extravagance and reducing the expenditure on general administration. It is possible only if we have decided to do that. With a bold determination, certainly it is possible.

There is only one other point which I would like to put before you. This Budget happens to be 99th Budget of the Government of India. Next year's is going to be the hundredth Budget. In 1960, the then Government of India invited James Wilson from the British Treasury to become the Finance Member, and he drew up the first budget. So, next year is going to be the one hundredth anniversary of this event, and I do hope that the Government and the public and Parliament also will think over the need for some kind of centenary celebration.

SHRI ABHIMANYU RATH (Orissa): Would it not mean some expenditure?

DR. P. J. THOMAS: It need not be by the Government alone. There are other ways of meeting the expenditure. It need not be in the manner of the Republic Day celebrations; it can be done in a much humbler manner. In my opinion, it will be a good thing for the Government. Although our present set-up is different, still our Budgets are only a continuation of those of that Government. We really feel—those who have seen so many Budgets in the past—that an opportunity may be given to us to show what has been done in the past and thus give an incentive for further improvement to the coming generations. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I make a submission? It seems that the protagonist of the pedestrian budget has preferred to perform his duty by proxy. Would it not be possible to get him here to listen to the debate?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is the Deputy Minister for Finance.

There are 35 Members who have given their names, and obviously everybody cannot go on speaking for half an hour or 40 minutes.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Yesterday, you allowed one hour each.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Therefore, I am restricting the time. Congress Members will have 15 to 20 minutes.

SHRI AHMED SAID KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I congratulate our Prime Minister upon presenting this Budget. The economic survey is very lucid and very realistic. I also sympathise with him for having shouldered this burden at a very short notice under circumstances which were rather difficult. He had lost a colleague of his, one of the greatest leaders of India, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. The Maulana was not only a respected colleague of our Prime Minister but he was a far-sighted and clear-headed statesman, a loyal and staunch friend and a very courageous colleague and in spite of this circumstance, the Prime Minister has shouldered this burden and presented this Budget to us.

I would like to focus the attention of the Government on a few points by making certain observations. The first thing that I wish to put before the House is that during these years we are having constantly adverse trade balances. In the Budget speech the Prime Minister has himself deplored this, but the explanation of the Government is that we are importing capital goods and therefore there is this adverse trade balance. In the statement given by the Prime Minister, for 1956-57 the adverse trade balance will be Rs. 292 crores. I would like to place a few more figures before the

House. In 1954-55, our imports amounted to Rs. 311·6 crores; our exports were for Rs. 257·54 crores, and the adverse balance was Rs. 53·86 crores. In 1955-56, our imports were for Rs. 427·50 crores, our exports were Rs. 251·46 crores and the adverse balance was Rs. 176 crores. This year the adverse balance has risen further to Rs. 292 crores. This shows that there is a progressive deterioration in our exports and increase in our imports and an increase in our adverse balance. The Government's explanation is quite satisfactory as far as the capital goods are concerned. But I would like to request them to have a statement of the imports for the last three or four years and to divide it between two sections, imports of capital goods and imports of consumer goods, and then to see whether our policy in the past was very wise in issuing so many licences for the import of consumer goods. I heartily support the present policy of the Government of controlling imports, and I am certain that our people will be willing to tighten their belts for the sake of the next Five Year Plan. In this connection, what is more alarming is the progressive reduction in our exports. What is the cause of it? Is it due to the fact that our products are costly and cannot compete with foreign products in foreign markets? I can understand this only as the reason. I cannot imagine any other reason for it. In the same manner, we are finding very few buyers in our own country. Here in this House in reply to a question, the Government said that there is a lot of cloth lying in the godowns of the textile mills, and that there is no demand for it either internally or in foreign markets. What is the cause of this? Is it due to the fact that by our excise duty and our fiscal policy we have raised the price of this cloth so much that our own people cannot buy it? I think that this question should be considered by the Government. Otherwise, if this thing persists, then there can be no hope of earning foreign exchange, because this is the only way.

[Shri Ahmed Said Khan.]

If we are not able to export more, then naturally our foreign exchange resources will dwindle. I am glad that friendly nations have helped us and I associate myself with our Prime Minister in thanking them wholeheartedly, particularly the U.S.A. whose share of help is larger than that of others.

Coming to the Budget, we find that there is an increase of Rs. 64.34 crores in the Revenue Budget on expenditure side this year. This increase is explained in the Budget statement in the first instance on account of the defence expenditure. I know that defence expenditure cannot be cut down. I think it is as important, if not more important, than the Five Year Plans. The other item given is that Government had to pay a very large amount, on account of the recommendations of the Finance Commission Award, to the States. In this connection, I would like to say a few words. The Central Government has been helping the States for the Five Year Plans and they are distributing various excise duties between the States. In U.P. there is a little complaint that they are not getting their due share from the Centre. They don't know what is the criterion of the Government of India for distributing this help to the various States. We in U.P. think that the best and just criterion and principle should be the population basis because the larger the population the larger is the necessity for help that is received from the Centre and if we examine this question from this angle, we find that U.P. has not been treated fairly and I do hope that the Finance Minister . . .

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): 90 per cent. is on population basis and only 10 per cent. on collection basis. So it is already fulfilled.

SHRI AHMED SAID KHAN: I hope that it is so and I do hope that the Finance Ministry will explain that they are helping the States on the population basis. This is what we

think and what it should be but when they see the figures, they will find that it is not so.

Coming to loans and small savings, the Finance Ministry was warned last year that perhaps they were over-budgeting. That warning has proved correct. We have been able to raise only Rs. 68 crores as loan. Of course Rs. 45 crores was conversion but as far as the cash payment is concerned, we had raised only Rs. 68 crores although we estimated Rs. 140 crores in the last budget. In the same manner, we estimated Rs. 80 crores of the small saving but we have been able to get only 37.6 crores upto the end of January. I don't know but in these two months there might have been a few more crores. Again this year we are estimating Rs. 145 crores as loan and Rs. 100 crores as small savings. I will respectfully submit that we are again over-budgeting. The mistake that we made last year we are repeating. We would not be able to get all this money out of small savings and perhaps out of loan also. We are often hearing in this House as well as elsewhere that there is a lot of evasion of income-tax. It is being evaded and it can be remedied by strengthening the Central Board of Revenue. If they strength it, and if, as suggested by my friend Shri Shiva Rao, they publish a list of the assessee before-hand I think the evasion could be controlled to a very great extent. Instead of devising new taxations which are so irritating to the people if they could strengthen the C.B.R. they will be able to get more money than what they are getting at present.

Then I would like to say a few words about the food situation. We have always been importing a little food even before partition—in the neighbourhood of 16 lakh tons. In the beginning of the First Five Year Plan approximately our production was about 50 million tons. It went up to 64.9 lakh tons—an increase of 29 per cent. This is very creditable. We all know that food depends on the

vagaries of monsoons. If there is a good monsoon there is better harvest and if otherwise we are in difficulties but in spite of the fact that we had droughts in considerable parts of our country last year the Food Department was able to control the prices of foodgrains and it is creditable to them. They had to import food, it is true, but they also were able to control the rising prices in the market. There can be a pertinent question that if we are producing more food, why are the prices going up, and why are we importing more and more every year? The reason is that we have injected too much purchasing power into our economy which is not matched by the goods in the market. It is forming inflationary conditions and that is one of the causes for the rise in prices. The other reason is that our people were never fully fed in the past. They never used to get two square meals a day. Now with a few rupees more in their pockets, they are consuming more. They are producing more but the production is counter-balanced by the increase in consumption also. So far as it goes, it is good but the result is that in spite of the increase in production, we are nearly where we were before and I would like to warn the Government that this will continue in the future also because our people are not fully fed even now.

The Food Minister the other day in this House, when the discussion took place on food situation, said in two words 'Produce or perish'. I agree with him there. This is the position. Whenever we talk of the food situation, I generally hear two suggestions—family planning and land reforms. Well, Sir, family planning may be of some use as a long target but I cannot understand how it can possibly relieve the country immediately. Moreover, even as a long range policy, I am doubtful whether it will succeed and the reason is that unless our people are so educated that they may be able to understand the advantages of family planning and unless their standard of living is so high that they will be afraid of reduc-

ing it on account of too many children, family planning will not succeed. As to land reforms, I think in most of the States the intermediaries have been abolished and land reform has been done but land reform in itself will not be able to produce anything more per acre. I think it is the fertiliser, the irrigation, the good seed and many other kinds of help which the Government is giving that can raise the produce and not only land reforms. I would like to make a suggestion to Government that there are two kinds of crops—cash crops and food crops. A tenant can get more per acre by showing cash crops than by foodgrains. Unless the Government follows a policy which enables him to get almost the same amount of profit out of foodgrains as he gets out of cash crops, I don't think the tenant will be inclined to cultivate more foodgrains.

1 P.M.

There is one other suggestion which I should like to make, but with a good deal of diffidence. We are a very compassionate people and we are a very kind-hearted people and these are very lovable and noble sentiments. This has to be admitted. But the urgency of the situation is such that we are advocating family planning. What is family planning in the phraseology of the man in the street? It means the production of less number of children, children who are and shall always be, the light of our eyes and the joy of our hearts. But we have been forced and the circumstances are such that they force us to reduce the number of children, to produce fewer children. Well, Sir, if that is the situation, then I will suggest that we should do something to reduce the number of such birds and animals that are damaging our harvests and fruits.

Next I would like to say a few words about the services. During the discussion on the Chagla Commission's Report and at other times also, I have seen some of our friends here attacking the members of the services. In the first instance it is not correct, for

[Shri Ahmed Said Khan.]

this reason that they have not got any representative here to defend them and to attack a person behind his back when he cannot defend himself is not correct.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): The Ministers are there.

SHRI AHMED SAID KHAN: Well, I am sorry the hon. Member is mistaken. Ministers represent you. They are not the representatives of the services and they cannot be their representatives.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): The members of the services carry on the Government in their name.

SHRI AHMED SAID KHAN: I may say, "yes", but you can ask the Minister to resign.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: For the sins of others?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, let him continue.

SHRI AHMED SAID KHAN: I think it is very wrong to malign them in season and out of season. There may be lapses and they happen in all fields of activity. There may be black sheep. But I can say those in the services are doing very useful work and they are carrying the burden of the administration. I had some association with the members of the services in my life and I know what a useful work they are doing.

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) in the Chair.]

I would also like to associate myself with my hon. friend Shri B. Shiva Rao in the remarks he made about the condition of pensioners. Their condition is very pitiable. The rise in prices is nearly 400 per cent but the pensions of these old people are stationary. I think the pensions of those people who have pensions below Rs. 200 or Rs. 300—the amount can be fixed properly—should be revised and some scarcity or other allowance given to them so as to lessen their difficulties.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT (West Bengal): Sir, this is the first time in many years that we have a Budget which maintains the *status quo* and does not provide a fresh imposition of direct or indirect tax, except for stopping the loopholes of the previous taxes, I mean the gift tax and an increase in the excise duty on powerloom factories. There was an expectation that some relief would be given to companies in regard to compulsory deposit and the dividend tax, which are acting harshly on the limited companies. The slight relief given to section 23A companies in regard to the dividend tax is welcome and I hope the system of compulsory deposit will be taken into consideration and if possible, it will be discontinued in future.

The previous speakers have already dealt with the general aspects of the economic condition of the country and I need not repeat them and thereby take up the valuable time of the House. I shall confine my remarks to one or two points which, I feel should attract the attention of the Government.

The first point relates to the problem of foreign exchange. It reflects great credit on the Government for its efforts to obtain aid or deferred payment arrangements from foreign countries and the willingness of the foreign governments to see to the fulfilment of our programme in the Second Five Year Plan. It is reassuring from the reply given yesterday by the Deputy Minister to a question in the Lok Sabha, that the Government is quite hopeful about meeting the foreign exchange needs of our Plan. But what I am not happy about is that the efforts of the Government to boost exports are not adequate. There is in fact, no export drive of the Government. The Government has, no doubt, appointed Export Promotion Council, provided Export Risk Insurance and made a study of market possibilities and they have even opened exhibitions of Indian products in foreign countries. But the results have not been

commensurate to their efforts. The framers of the Second Five Year Plan strangely enough, have pegged their earnings through exports in 1960-61 to the 1954-55 figures. It shows that our Government is not confident enough that there will be an increase in export-earnings. It seems that instead of spending money on exhibitions and delegations for increasing foreign trade, the Government should lose some revenue by reducing the export duty and the restrictions on commodities which are in good demand in foreign countries. This may cause some hardship to our people, but I think that would be better than an increase in prices of bare necessities of life.

Besides a reduction in export duty, I feel that a portion of the excise duty should be diverted to subsidies in the shape of railway or steamer freight rebates to exportable manufactured goods or raw materials or some credit facilities or subsidies in any other suitable form.

As far as the export of cotton textiles is concerned, I may say that the policy of the Government to impose heavy duty to retard consumption in the expectation of greater export quantum has not proved a success. Cloth is not a commodity in inelastic demand and so the disequilibrium taxes have not produced the desired effect. It has no doubt, mopped up the extra profits of the mill-owners and reduced consumption; but in spite of the cloth-stock piling up, there is no increase in exports. On the other hand, the stalemate in the cloth market has locked the capital of the industry and thereby increased the cost of production. Our main difficulty in exporting cloth is the price factor which is not competitive with the foreign products, like those of Japan and not even of Pakistan which has started exporting cloth.

I hope the Government will take the matter into consideration and devise some means by which the

quantum of exports of textile fabrics is increased and export earnings also grow thereby. I would like to say now a few words about the excise duty on cloth. The textile industry as a whole has never been in a very happy position as far as profit earning is concerned. There may be a very few efficient and well-organised mills in Bombay and Ahmedabad which have earned good profits but, generally speaking, the mills in the up country do not earn much, especially those which are producing coarse and medium cloth on grey. Our former Finance Minister realised this fact and reduced the duty on medium cloth by two pice per square yard and that was up to the 31st March 1958, with the expectation that it would help clear the stocks but the imposition of the additional excise duty in lieu of sales tax neutralised the concession made, because the additional duty was double of the sales tax that was being charged by the States. The cloth stocks have been piling up and it is, therefore, time now to reconsider the question of the reduction of excise duty. There should be an adequate reduction both in medium and fine, if not in coarse. As far as my knowledge goes, many mills are in a precarious financial position and are trying to reduce their production by closing one or two shifts. Most of the mills have not been able to transfer the whole of the excise duty including the additional one to the consumers and this inability has increased their cost. This is also one of the reasons why Indian mills are unable to compete in the foreign market on account of the price factor. But, Sir, the additional excise duty in lieu of sales tax has affected the mills in another manner. Before these alterations, the mills were not required to pay sales tax on raw materials or machine part or stores but, after this, they have become liable to pay these Central and State sales taxes and this has increased the price further, not to speak of the increase in labour charges on account of the rise in the price of foodstuffs

[Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt.]

or other items of the cost of living index. I hope the reduction of the excise duty may be made up by more internal consumption and exports. Government should also bear in mind that the law of diminishing returns operates. Any improvement in revenues by way of excise duties will be neutralised by the decline in the tax realised on profits. The industry as a whole is not prosperous and may incur loss in 1957 and also in future. In view of these facts, I trust the Government will reduce the excise duty on fine counts and continue the reduction on medium beyond the 31st March 1958.

The next point that I want to deal with is unemployment. The fiscal policy should be linked up with employment but there is no reference to it in the Budget speech. It is disheartening to see the figure of registration in the Employment Exchanges going up. It has gone up today to 8½ lakhs which means, according to the calculations made by the framers of the second Five Year Plan, 34 lakhs of urban unemployment. To this has to be added the annual addition of 20 lakhs of fresh labour force. I admit that some outlet has been found in the khadi and handloom industries and other cottage and small scale industries but what is needed is more and more industries with labour intensive technique. The heavy industries will open up new avenues after they are in production but now we should make out a plan and make a man-power budget as to how to utilise this unemployed labour and also the educated unemployed. Employment is the only cure for frustration or indiscipline amongst our young folks. It is not necessary to pass resolutions about indiscipline. The real and basic cause of this unrest in our country of these hunger strikes of these teachers and the students, is unemployment or

under-employment of the educated unemployed. I hope that some sort of allowance will be given to this class of unemployed people.

The third point I would like to deal with is the effect of the Finance Commission's Report on the West Bengal Budget. The second Finance Commission has followed the footsteps of the first Finance Commission and has distributed the Central assets on the basis of population. The only difference it has made is that in the case of Income Tax, it has raised in a general way, the percentage from 55 to 60 and the basis of distribution has been changed to 90 per cent. on population and 10 per cent. on collection. This has helped West Bengal to get an increased share to the tune of Rs. 40 lakhs and in railway fares to the tune of Rs. 29 lakhs but they have not taken into account the present census. They have, instead taken the figures of the 1951 census. To this, the Finance Commission should have added the number of refugees that have come into our State. It is a small area but with great density and there is an influx of refugees still going on. Hence, it is not fair for West Bengal to have a smaller grant just on the basis of the population of 1951. According to the latest distribution of Union Duties, a number of commodities have been added and thereby the quantum of the assets has also been increased but the percentage has been reduced from 40 to 25, and that also is being distributed on the basis of population, 90 per cent. on population and 10 per cent. on other grounds. The distribution should be on the basis of consumption. The previous Commission also pointed out that the division of Union Duties should be on the basis of consumption but that data has not been prepared. For the Government not having prepared that data, the West Bengal Government suffers. Though there is more consumption in West

Bengal, we have got only 10 per cent. for other considerations. Now, Calcutta happens to be the railhead of two big railways and it is also the market place for the adjoining big States like Bihar, Orissa and Assam. There is a large incoming and outgoing population and no consideration has been shown in the Finance Commission's Report to this fact that we have to maintain a very much larger population than what the 1951 census shows. The rate of sales tax in West Bengal was much lower and it has now been doubled in the additional excise duty but no concession has been shown to the West Bengal Government for this doubling of the earnings through additional excise duties. The basis of route mileage for distribution of Railway Fares Tax has not been very fair to West Bengal. Our Chief Minister, Dr. Roy, has remarked that the Commission's treatment of the sharing of the net proceeds of taxes is the most unsatisfactory part of the Report and the distribution of the net proceeds of the tax on railway fares has been the unkindest of all. The route mileage has no conceivable connection with either the collection or the incidence of the tax. These are the remarks of our Chief Minister to which I should like to draw the attention of the Government to see whether they can increase their grant-in-aid which they could do even now and remedy the defects of the recommendations of the Finance Commission. There is very great unemployment in our State, especially of the educated and for this reason there is frustration and indiscipline amongst the students, for this reason there is constant hunger strike on the part of the students and the teachers. We need some more funds for providing these educated unemployed with jobs. I appeal to the Government for rendering some aid in this regard and also to make some better provision for the refugees that have come to our State. With these words, Sir, I close my speech.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Budget has been called a pedestrian Budget, I do not understand what is meant by a pedestrian Budget. If it means that it is a common man's Budget, then I beg to submit, Sir, that certainly it does not justify that name. To me it is a very disappointing Budget and, in the short time that is at my disposal, I will try to prove that this is a disappointing Budget. I would much rather call it a stop-gap Budget by a care-taker Finance Minister and a stop-gap Budget naturally means just a continuation of what existed in the previous year with slight adjustments. The slight difference that has been introduced by the addition of the Gifts Tax is not a special thing. I am very glad, Sir, that most of the Congress Members who have spoken so far have been very critical of this Budget. Though they have at the conclusion of their speeches, given support to this Budget, the main tenor of their speeches has been a wholesome criticism of the Budget.

It is not a matter of slogans and saying that ours is a socialistic State, that the rich should be exterminated and the poor should get all the benefits, which is going to solve our problem. Our main problem, Sir, is the fulfilment of the second Five Year Plan, and the object behind the second Five Year Plan is raising the standard of living of the common man. We have to consider this Budget from this point of view, whether it is helping in the attainment of the second Five Year Plan, whether it is creating enthusiasm or not. The second Five Year Plan first of all requires the enthusiasm of the people. In the last year's Budget by the introduction of excise duties on many additional articles, by lowering the minimum limit of income-tax from Rs. 4200 to Rs. 3000 with the exception that if there were one or two children to an assessee the minimum limit in his case was fixed at Rs. 3600, the sympathy of a large number of middle-class men whose family

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

budget was a tight family budget has been, alienated and with the additional imposition of the income-tax and the excise duties their domestic budgets have become unbalanced. They were on the marginal limits. I would have liked to know from the hon. Finance Minister who is also the Prime Minister, what income has been derived from these three lakh assesseees who have been brought in by the lowering of the income-tax level. If it is a few lakhs of rupees, less than a crore of rupees—my estimate of the total income derived by the lowering of the income-tax level is about fifty lakh rupees—how much of this fifty lakhs has been spent in collection, in assessment. How much harassment it has caused to the common man whose income was Rs. 350 a month and who was formerly exempt from the income-tax and who now has been brought in the limit? How much attention of the income-tax officers has been diverted from the big assesseees to the small assesseees because, after all, the time of the income-tax officer is limited, and if he has got to devote some time, let it be only a few hours a day; after all his attention to that extent will be diverted from the big assesseees. Even to-day, Sir, an hon. Member said that there is big scale evasion. It is a common thing. You just make a statement that there is big evasion, Professor Kaldor estimated it was 200 crores of rupees per year, but many others have estimated that it was only about 10 or 15 crores. Anyhow, Sir, by giving a bad name to a class we are thinking of or rather devising novel ways of avoiding this tax evasion. I was rather surprised to hear the suggestion of Mr. Shiva Rao when he gave the example of Sweden. He did not realise that the conditions in our country are quite different from those of Sweden. In Sweden nearly 40 per cent of the people are assesseees. There if you put up a list in the municipal corporations of that country, certainly it will attract attention. In our country before this lowering

of the limit from Rs. 4200 to Rs. 3600, the total number of assesseees was six lakhs. Probably if you leave aside the city of Bombay and the city of Calcutta, Kanpur, and some other big cities of India, in the rural areas there is hardly any assessee and in the small towns there will be one or two assesseees—everybody knows their names, and whether you publish them or you do not publish them, it is not going to bring any benefit. I maintain, Sir, that any taxation policy, or rather our taxation policy should be a flexible policy. We imposed certain new taxes last year. We imposed the wealth tax; we imposed the expenditure tax last year. I welcome this; I welcome it to-day. I think theoretically and scientifically it is a better structure of taxation—we must have a wealth tax; we must have an expenditure tax; we must have income-tax and super-tax. But there should be checks and counter-checks. It is an integrated whole, and if you want to impose the wealth tax and the expenditure tax, you have got to reduce the income-tax and the super-tax. I think the hon. the ex-Finance Minister reached a very healthy compromise when he fixed the total level of the income tax and the super-tax at 70 per cent. but I am not happy at the surcharges that he has imposed. There was a general surcharge on all income of 5 per cent; then there was an additional surcharge of 5 per cent on earned income and a surcharge of 15 per cent on unearned income. Well, he should have been consistent; he should not have imposed these surcharges. If those surcharges were not imposed I think the ordinary income-tax and super-tax, the wealth tax and the expenditure tax would have made a complete whole against which there would have been no objection. My only request is that the additional surcharge of 5 per cent on earned income and 15 per cent on unearned income should be removed. The distinction between earned income and unearned income at high levels is non-existent, and it is unfair because, after all, the man

who is getting unearned income has also to put in very hard labour to get the income. Supposing it is a property, the man has got to collect the rent; the man has to keep it in proper condition, and the full rebate of the property tax paid by him is not allowed; only half the rebate is given.

So what I was saying is this. Professor Kaldor made certain recommendations. He is an economist, a very good economist; of course he is not recognised either in his original country or in his adopted country. I welcome that he did make some good suggestions and our ex-Finance Minister adopted them, but wherever our ex-Finance Minister departed from Professor Kaldor's report, where he tried to remove the checks and counter-checks suggested by Professor Kaldor, the net result was that the burden became very heavy both on industry and on the individual. I make the appeal for the removal of these surcharges from the income-tax and super-tax payable by individuals.

Now I come to wealth tax. Wealth tax is very good for individuals, but if you impose wealth tax on the companies also, first of all you will have to make an exception in the case of companies which are not making any profits, and that exception has been made. But in the matter of income-tax when the dividend is given, when the dividend reaches as individual he gets a rebate. It is stated that because on the dividend amount income-tax has already been paid, in the matter of calculation of income-tax of the individual that income-tax paid at the source, that is paid by the company, is taken into account, and he is given a rebate. But in the matter of wealth tax I will give a concrete case. Supposing a man holds one-tenth share capital of a company and the company pays a wealth tax of Rs. 10,000. Now normally if the procedure of income-tax had been followed, here also he would have received the rebate of

that one thousand rupees paid by the company as wealth tax on behalf of this individual. But this is not done. He is assessed again for the wealth tax as an individual, and no rebate is given for the wealth tax paid by the company on the shares held by him; it amounts to double taxation.

I think there was some slip made by him because originally when he introduced the wealth tax the hon. Finance Minister gave us an assurance that this double taxation would not be imposed. But when the Bill came here all that was omitted and a shareholder of a company has not only to pay individual wealth tax but on the same shares the wealth tax is paid by the company. It is a double taxation and I do hope that the present Finance Minister will carefully examine whether it does not lead to extra hardship.

Then, Sir, Prof. Kaldor never suggested that the companies should be asked to make compulsory deposit. It is not at all mentioned. Compulsory deposit by the companies is not Government income. It is not a tax. It is just a deposit. The Government pays interest on it. It is returnable and it has to be returned in any case. I do not understand why this compulsory deposit scheme was introduced. What is the advantage? If a company has got spare money, the company can take Government loans. They normally take Government loans. Why impose an unnecessary condition? Some years ago when the company law was defective, the directors of companies used to take advantage of this reserve fund and utilise that reserve fund for their personal gains. But now after the amendment of the Companies Act, no director can take a loan from a company or can give loan to any of his relations or friends or anybody without the express permission from the Company Law Administration. You know, Sir, every company before the 31st March has to deposit fifty per cent of the depreciation fund that they claim during the preceding year and for the accu-

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

mulated depreciation they have to deposit 25 per cent. Now, many companies cannot find cash money. Some companies may be flourishing, but in the majority of cases there is depression and if they are asked to pay this deposit and then subsequently go on applying whenever they want money for the expansion, there is unnecessary delay and it is causing great hardship. I should like to know when the ex-Finance Minister had made a definite promise that this compulsory deposit will be removed, why it has not been removed? It is not a tax. It is not an income to the Government. It is just unnecessary harassment to the industries, to make them deposit money, so that subsequently they have to apply for the reimbursement of their deposits.

Then, I come to dividend tax. It is a very good tax. We must have a dividend tax if the dividend is paid in excess of a certain amount. But the rates of interest have changed. Now, the bank rate in the United Kingdom is 7 per cent; the bank rate in our country has been raised to four per cent. Therefore, the expectation of dividend has also gone up. To expect that the companies, if they want to pay more than six per cent, will have to pay an extra dividend tax is not fair. I would request the hon. Finance Minister to raise the limit from six per cent to eight per cent. That means, additional dividend tax will be levied if any dividend is given in excess of eight per cent. Two slabs have been fixed now. There is a dividend tax of ten per cent if the dividend given is more than six per cent; and there is a dividend tax of twenty per cent if the dividend is in excess of ten per cent. My suggestion is that the limit of six per cent and ten per cent be raised to eight per cent and fifteen per cent respectively. Why do I say this? Is it going to lead to any loss to Government? My contention is that it will not. Because if the company does not

pay that ten per cent and twenty per cent dividend tax, that company will declare a higher rate of dividend. When that higher rate of dividend reaches the shareholder, he will be assessed to that additional income and he will pay a higher tax than what is being recovered from this dividend tax. I think personally that it has been a wrong policy. We are going to earn less from this dividend tax, by keeping down the rate of dividend than we would have earned if we had allowed a higher rate of dividend to be given to the individual shareholder and then recovered from the individual shareholder in the shape of incometax a higher amount. Here also my contention is that the Government has adopted a wrong policy.

There has been a distinction between 23 A companies and other companies. I think this should be uniformly followed for all companies, that the dividend tax at 10 per cent should be levied only when the dividend is in excess of eight per cent and at a higher rate when it is in excess of fifteen per cent.

Well, it may be said what is the justification to conclude that the poor man, the common man is very hard hit? My contention is that for the capital budget we must get savings, and so far the capital budget has been maintained only either by deficit financing, borrowing internally or borrowing externally. This economic survey is a big eye-opener and if you read that, you will find that small saving is going down very rapidly. What does it show? It shows that the common man is not able to balance his budget, that his savings are going down, that it is very difficult for him to maintain his living at the present standard and there is no saving. That is one side. The subscription to the loans is going down because the rich people, the rich companies which invested money, do not have any balances.

The result is that we are led to deficit financing. Deficit financing is good. Mr. Bisht spoke yesterday that deficit financing is only workable in countries which are highly industrialised. My contention is that deficit finance to a certain extent can work in our country also, though our country is not highly industrialised, because in a highly industrialised country they go in for large-scale industry which has a big time-lag between the investment of money and its production. If you have a big time-lag of three years for instance, you go on investing money for three years. That means you are pumping money into the market, but you are not producing for three years. The result will be that there may be a danger of inflation. But supposing you go in for small scale industries or cottage industries where capital expenditure is small. Now, you see there is fine distinction between the two cases. Where capital expenditure is small and they start producing within six months or within a maximum period of one year, in such a country deficit financing on a fair scale is possible.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: May I just give an explanation? You have quoted me, but you forget that I did not say that the English people or the Americans in the 30's were investing any large capital. The machinery was there; the factories were there, but they were idle. The labourers were there. They were idle. It was only to bring them together that this particular device was invented by Keynes. There is no question of any capital expenditure.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I beg to disagree, because if the machinery was there, if everything was there, what was the need of capital? Why did they want deficit financing? Did the factories ask for money from them? No, Sir. Whenever there is depression there are other methods adopted. There has been depression in foreign countries. Now, in the U.S.A. whenever there is depression they

divert a large amount of their money either to defence department, that means defence industries. Large orders are placed with defence industries. Naturally the defence industries employ more people who have got to be paid. Or they go in for a road building programme. Just now in the U. S. A. suggestions are being made that because there is an impending depression, big scale housing programme and road building programme should be taken up, because in this way you can give employment. Just now in America the unemployment figure is four and a half million. It is the largest figure they have had for several years. To employ these people they adopt those methods. There is also immediate return. The road is immediately ready. The man finds employment. Because the man has got money, he will purchase more goods and because he purchases more goods the industries will flourish. In our country it is quite different. In our country, for instance, you start road building. The man will get money. The road will be ready. If the man gets money, a large part of it he will spend on food (*Time bell rings*), the next part on clothing and on housing which are not available. The result will be that prices will go up. So, I come back to my conclusion that in our country deficit financing can work, but to a certain extent. We have nearly reached the maximum. If you see the treasury bills, we have now Rs. 1450 crores of treasury bills and I think the limit has been reached. We cannot go in for more treasury bills. That is the indirect way of deficit finance. On paper you cannot find anywhere how the deficit finance is being managed. It is by increasing the treasury bills which are sold by the Government of India in favour of the Reserve Bank. The result of inflation will be that we will not be able to attain the physical targets of the Second Five Year Plan. We are interested in the physical targets of the Plan. I will not be satisfied if the Government of India spends Rs. 4,800

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

crores and gets only 50 per cent. of the physical targets. The prices have gone up. You know, Sir, that almost in every dam and in every project the cost of construction has gone up by over 50 per cent. or even 100 per cent. The result is that we are not able to attain the physical targets.

So far, Sir, I have only talked about the taxation policy. Now, I should like to say something about the expenditure side. Several Members have pointed out that we are spending Rs. 278 crores on our defence. I submit that we are as a nation asking other nations to go in for disarmament. (*Time bell rings*). Will it not be right that we set an example to others. It has been stated that we have a powerful neighbour, Pakistan, who is getting military aid from the U.S.A. and therefore we must defend ourselves. I think, Sir, the happiness of our people and a better standard of living of our people is a greater security against any aggression by a foreign country than these additional amounts of money that we are spending. An hon. Member has pointed out that if these industries had been working in our country, the additional expenditure on the armaments industry would have led to greater employment, but now we are only importing all these armaments from foreign countries and all this money is going away in foreign exchange.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of prohibition. (*Time bell rings*). An hon. Member tried to show that he would welcome it if prohibition is removed. Well, I do not agree with him. I maintain, Sir, that prohibition is very essential for our country and we must continue our policy of prohibition. If you read the social statistics of Europe, you will find that they are realising that the biggest curse of their country is drink and that it is affecting the morality of the European countries. Sir, I am very glad that our Government is

insisting upon prohibition and maintaining prohibition. We do not want any tainted money. We do not want any money from excise on liquor. It is a tainted money and that money is being taken after depriving— (*Time bell rings*). Sir, I will say one word more before I finish.

In this Budget, Sir, there is mention of nearly 70 or 80 corporations and private limited concerns owned by the Government of India. It is not possible to discuss them here. May I suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that all commercial undertakings of the Central Government should be presented in a separate budget and different days should be allotted so that Parliament can carefully examine all the companies? You know, Sir, that Parliament could not keep full control over the Life Insurance Corporation and the result is that there has been some mismanagement. All these Corporations, Sir, are just lumped together in the Budget. Every one or two minutes you are ringing the bell now. But I would like to spend at least half an hour over such things—considering the Budget and the policy with regard to the expenditure that is being followed by the Government of India in the commercial undertakings. Therefore, Sir, I will end by once more saying that this is a very disappointing Budget.

श्री रामधारी सिंह दिनकर: (बिहार)

श्रीमान् उप सभाध्यक्ष जी, बजट पर लेने वाली सामान्य बहस के सिलसिले में मुझे दो, एक ज़रूरी बातें कहनी हैं, यद्यपि, इन बातों का सम्बन्ध सरकार की हिन्दी नीति से है। जहाँ तक हिन्दी के विरोध का सवाल है, आज मैं उस सवाल को छूना भी नहीं चाहता। उसका मौका, शायद, इसी सत्र में आगे आयेगा, या वह दूसरे सत्र में आये। आज तो मैं सरकार और देश का ध्यान इस बात पर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी के राजभाषा हो जाने से किसको क्या कठिनाइयाँ हो रही हैं और उनका समाधान क्या है।

ऐसी एक कठिनाई मने अपने प्रान्त में देखी है जहां एक खास गिरोह के अहिन्दी भाषी लोग नौकरियां पाने में कुछ कठिनाई का अनुभव कर रहे हैं। बात यह है कि ये अहिन्दी भाषी उम्मीदवार सरकारी नौकरियों के लिये जो परीक्षाएं होती हैं उनमें बहुत अच्छा नहीं कर रहे हैं। और विषयों में वे क्वालिफाइंग मार्क्स ले आते हैं, लेकिन, हिन्दी, जो अनिवार्य पत्र है, उसमें क्वालिफाइंग मार्क्स कुछ कम लोगों को मिलते हैं। बिहार में क्वालिफाइंग मार्क्स शायद ४० और पास मार्क्स ३० हैं और मेरा खयाल है कि और हिन्दी राज्यों में भी स्थिति ऐसी ही होगी और इस तरह की कठिनाई अहिन्दी भाषियों को वहां भी आती होगी। इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि भारत सरकार का गृह मंत्रालय ऐसे सभी राज्यों की सरकारों से अनुरोध करे कि अगले दस वर्ष के लिये इन अहिन्दी भाषी उम्मीदवारों को यह रियायत दे दी जाय कि परीक्षाओं में उनका पास मार्क ही क्वालिफाइंग मार्क समझा जायेगा। बिहार में शिड्यूल्ड जातियों के उम्मीदवारों को इस तरह की रियायत पहले से ही हासिल है और मेरा खयाल है कि अहिन्दी भाषी लोगों को भी यह रियायत दे दी जाये तो उनकी सारी दिक्कतें दूर हो जायेंगी और वे किसी तरह के घाटे में नहीं रहेंगे।

हिन्दी प्रान्तों में जो अहिन्दी भाषी लोग डोमीसाइल्ड हैं, अगर उन्हें भी कठिनाई हो रही हो तो यह रियायत उन्हें भी दी जानी चाहिये। इससे एक तीसरी बात निकलती है कि बंगाल में हिन्दी भाषियों का या तामिलनाडु में बंगालियों का क्या होगा? मगर यह एक ऐसा सवाल है जिस पर सुझाव इन्हीं राज्यों से आना चाहिये अथवा भारत सरकार भी इस पर अपनी कोई राय कायम कर सकती है।

जिस दूसरी कठिनाई की ओर मैं देश और सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि देश में हिन्दी का विरोध तो

हो रहा है, लेकिन, हिन्दी के काम भी बहुत आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। लेकिन, इन प्रयोगों से एक बात जाहिर हुई है कि जिसे हम दफ्तरी हिन्दी—राजभाषा—कहते हैं, वह जरूरत से ज्यादा कठिन होती जा रही है। और यह शिकायत सिर्फ उन्हीं की नहीं है जिनकी मातृभाषा हिन्दी नहीं है, बल्कि, उनकी भी है जो हिन्दी को अपनी मातृभाषा समझते हैं। मगर, उसकी जिम्मेदारी किस पर है? सारा देश इस भ्रम में पड़ गया है कि इस कठिन हिन्दी के पिता का नाम डा० रघुबीर है। लेकिन सारी जिम्मेदारी में डा० रघुबीर पर नहीं डालता हूं। भारत सरकार के शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने क्या किया है? शिक्षा मंत्रालय और रघुबीर, ये कभी आपस में एक नहीं रहे हैं। उदाहरण के लिये शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने वैज्ञानिक पारिभाषिक शब्दों के निर्माण के लिये जो कमेटियां बनाईं, मैंने डा० रघुबीर का नाम उनमें कभी नहीं देखा है। किन्तु, रघुबीर का विरोध करते हुये शिक्षा मंत्रालय भी लगभग उतने ही कठिन शब्द बना रहा है जितने कठिन शब्द रघुबीर बनाते हैं अथवा उनसे प्रेरणा लेकर देश के अन्य विद्वान सारे देश में बना रहे हैं। उससे भी पहले जब विधान निर्मात्री परिषद् न देश की चौदह भाषाओं के विद्वानों की गोष्ठी बुलाई थी तब उस गोष्ठी ने भी यही सिफारिश की कि राजभाषा हिन्दी का रूप संस्कृतनिष्ठ होना चाहिये क्योंकि इस देश की सभी भाषाओं के बीच एकता संस्कृत को लेकर है संस्कृतनिष्ठ हिन्दी सभी लोग समझें।

मैं समझता हूं, यह निर्णय करीब करीब ठीक है। ध्यान, सरकार को और हिन्दी का काम करने वालों को यह रखना चाहिये कि विधान में जो ३५१वीं धारा है उस धारा के अनुसार इस निर्णय को काम में लाया जाय। संस्कृतनिष्ठ हिन्दी भी दो प्रकार की हो सकती है एक कठिन दूसरी सरल। सरल संस्कृतनिष्ठ हिन्दी वह है जिसमें हम किताबें लिखते हैं जिसमें देश के अखबार निकलते हैं बल्कि जिसमें हिन्दी वालों के ही लेख

[श्री रामवारी सिंह दिनकर]

नहीं काका सहिब के लेख मगन भाई के लेख मोरारजी भाई के भाषण और सत्यनारायण जी के भी लेख और भाषण होते हैं। इन भाषणों और लेखों में भी संस्कृतनिष्ठ हिन्दी के ही नमूने मिलते हैं।

तकलीफ की बात यह है कि लोग समझने लगे हैं कि संस्कृतनिष्ठ हिन्दी वही होगी जो शत प्रतिशत संस्कृत हो अर्थात्, जिसमें “अगर” को काट कर “यदि” बना दिया जाय और “खतरे” को काट कर “त्रास” कर दिया जाय। मेरा खयाल है, इतनी दूर तक जाने में बात बिगड़ती है। मेरा खयाल है कि विधान में ३५१वीं धारा बहुत सोच समझ कर रखी गई थी। यह बड़ी ही अकलमंदी का निर्णय था। इस देश में दो तरह के लोग हैं। काश्मीर, पंजाब और हिन्दी प्रान्तों के बहुत से उर्दूवां लोग संस्कृत की धारा से दूर हैं। उनको मामूली संस्कृत-निष्ठ हिन्दी भी कठिन मालूम होती है। तब बंगाल, आसाम उड़ीसा, महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात और दक्षिण भारत की जनता है जो संस्कृत की धारा के करीब है, उसे संस्कृत-निष्ठ हिन्दी ही आसान मालूम होती है। इसलिये दफ्तरों में हिन्दी चलाने के लिये देश की दोनों तरह की जरूरतों को खयाल में रखना होगा।

जो लोग संस्कृत की धारा से दूर हैं उनको हिन्दी के विकास की दृष्टि से इतना कष्ट जरूर स्वीकार करना चाहिये कि वे अधिक से अधिक संस्कृत के शब्द सीख लें। लेकिन, जो लोग संस्कृत की धारा के समीप हैं उनको भी इसके लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये कि हिन्दी में जो विदेशी शब्द प्रचलित हैं, विदेशी मुहावरे चालू हैं और जिनसे हिन्दी की ताकत बढ़ती है, उनको वे सीख लें क्योंकि इतना कर लेने से जो देश के दूसरे लोगों को आसानी होगी। हिन्दी में अरबी, फ़ारसी, पुर्तगाली, फ्रांसीसी और अंग्रेजी इन सभी भाषाओं के कई हजार

शब्द अभी धड़ल्ले से चल रहे हैं और मेरा खयाल है, अगर इन शब्दों को हम हिन्दी से हटा दें तो हिन्दी एसी लढ़कू हो जायेगी कि घर से बाहर क्या, वह घर में ही नहीं चल सकेगी।

हिन्दी का रेशनल रूप क्या है, यह स्थिति बहुत साफ़ है और दफ्तरों में काम करने वाले हमारे इन्टलेक्चुअल अगर इस नक्शे को अपने सामने रखें तो हिन्दी का रेशनल रूप बहुत आसानी से निखर सकता है।

लेकिन, जो कुछ मैं देश में देख रहा हूँ, उससे मुझे घबराहट होती है। हालत यह है कि अंग्रेजी के पारिभाषिक शब्दों के अनुवाद के बहाने बहुत से ऐसे अंग्रेजी शब्दों के भी कठिन अनुवाद प्रस्तुत किये जा रहे हैं जो पारिभाषिक नहीं हैं, जो भाषा के अंग मात्र हैं और जिनका अर्थ केवल पारिभाषिक नहीं है, उनसे बहुत से अन्य अर्थ भी निकलते हैं। उस पर तुरा यह है कि दिल्ली का शिक्षा मंत्रालय पांच, पांच हजार शब्दों की सूची बना कर मंत्रिमंडल के सामने रख देता है और कहता है कि इस पर अपनी मंजूरी की मुहर लगा दो जिससे ये शब्द देश भर में चल जायें, और सुना जाता है कि मंत्रिमंडल इन शब्दों पर अपनी स्वीकृति की मुहरें लगाता भी है। मैं यह नहीं पूछता हूँ कि मंत्रिमंडल में भाषा के विशेषज्ञ हैं या नहीं। लेकिन मेरा सवाल है कि मंत्रिमंडल को इस झमेले में घसीटने से क्या लाभ है? मंत्रिमंडल को इन बातों में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये क्योंकि भाषा पर मंजूरी की मुहरे सरकारें नहीं लगा सकती हैं। और बड़े बड़े विद्वान भी यह आप्रह्न नहीं कर सकते कि जो शब्द हमको पसन्द हैं, सारे देश को उन्हीं शब्दों को मानना होगा। कोष के शब्द निर्जीव होते हैं। उन शब्दों में जीवन का कम्पन अथवा जिन्दगी की थरथराहट तब आती है जब वे लेखकों और वक्ताओं की कल्पना की गर्मी के नीचे आते हैं और जब उनका वास्तविक रूप से प्रयोग किया जाता है। इसलिये, मैं मंत्रिमंडल को सलाह दूंगा

कि शब्द चाहे किसी भी मंत्रालय में बनते हों उन्हें मंत्रिमंडल अन्तिम रूप से स्वीकार न करे। स्वीकृति इन शब्दों को सरकार से नहीं लेनी है। स्वीकृति लेखक देंगे, विद्यार्थी देंगे, वकील देंगे, अध्यापक देंगे, अखबार वाले देंगे, संसद और विधान सभाओं के सदस्य देंगे और सरकारी दफ्तरों में काम करने वाले हमारे कर्मचारी और अफसर देंगे। जब य शब्द उन सभी लोगों द्वारा मंजूर हो जायें, तब उनका प्रचलन होगा।

इसीलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि जो शब्द अभी बन रहे हैं वे आखिरी सिक्के नहीं हैं, उनको कच्चा धातु कहना चाहिये क्योंकि उनकी परीक्षा अभी बाकी है। जैसे कच्चे आइरन-ओर से पक्का इस्पात निकलता है, वैसे ही इन शब्दों के ढेर में से पक्के शब्द निकलेंगे। आइरन-ओर, इस्पात नहीं है। जो सामग्रियां देश के विद्वान दे रहे हैं वे आइरन-ओर हैं और उनमें से इस्पात काफ़ी आगे चलकर निकलेगा। ऐसा होगा कि विद्वानों के बनाये हुये बहुत से शब्द चल जायेंगे, और वे चल भी गये हैं। ऐसा भी होगा कि बहुत से शब्दों के बदले हमें दूसरे शब्द बनाने पड़ेंगे। और यह भी होगा कि बहुत से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अथवा अंग्रेजी के शब्द इसलिये हिन्दी में जमे रह जायेंगे कि उनके जोड़ के प्रतिशब्द हम भारतीय भाषा में नहीं बना सकते।

इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रख कर हिन्दी को आगे बढ़ने देना चाहिये। मेरा निजी मत है कि हिन्दी को अगर आज अभी से शुरू कर दिया जाय तो भी देश का कुछ नुक़सान होने वाला नहीं है, क्योंकि, अंग्रेजी की सहायता हमारे साथ है। हिन्दी के प्रति बहुत उत्साह दिखाने में हम लोग इस बात को भूल रहे हैं कि अंग्रेजी से निकलने के लिये भी अंग्रेजी की मदद जरूरी है। इसी सभा में हम देखते हैं कि लोग हिन्दी के साथ अंग्रेजी फ़ैटकर बोलते हैं। मैं खुद

भी चाहूँ तो केवल मैं हिन्दी में बोल सकता हूँ। मगर अंग्रेजी के शब्द में भी फ़ैटता हूँ क्योंकि इन शब्दों के हिन्दी प्रतिशब्द अभी कम लोग समझते हैं और अंग्रेजी शब्द संसद में ज्यादा लोगों को मालूम है। अभी हम एक ऐसे दौर से गुजर रहे हैं जब बीच बीच में अंग्रेजी के शब्द फ़ैट फ़ैट कर बोलना कोई पाप नहीं है। इसी तरह से अगर कोई अफसर अंग्रेजी शब्द फ़ैट कर हिन्दी में लिखे तो वह भी कोई पाप नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यही एक मात्र मार्ग है जिससे हिन्दी अभी तुरन्त चलायी जा सकती है।

प्रान्तों में मैंने देखा है कि वहां भी हिन्दी का सारा काम अनुवादकों के अधीन है। हमारे बहुत से इंटेलेक्चुअल जो अफसरी के ओहदों पर हैं, वे इस इंतज़ारी में बैठे हुये हैं कि अनुवाद विभाग से सिक्के डल कर आ जायें तब हम अपना काम हिन्दी में शुरू करेंगे। इसे मैं भयावह स्थिति मानता हूँ। सबल और समर्थ हिन्दी को निर्बल और बदनाम करने का इससे अच्छा तरीका और नहीं हो सकता है। मैं इस मूर्खता-पूर्ण परिपाटी का घोर विरोध करता हूँ। मैं प्रान्तीय और केन्द्रीय सरकारों को यह सलाह देता हूँ कि हिन्दी का नेतृत्व अनुवादकों से छीन कर उनको दिया जाय जिनको सचमुच लिखना है, जिनको सचमुच सोचना और बोलना तथा काम करना है, और इस दृष्टि से अगर आज भी हिन्दी का काम शुरू कर दिया जाता है तो कहीं कोई काम रुकने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन कहीं सरकार ने यह नीति बरती कि पहले हम कोष बना लेंगे फिर हर अफसर को लाचार करेंगे कि पहले तुम कोष रटो तब हिन्दी में काम आरम्भ करो, तो मैं कहूंगा कि यह टार्चर होगा, यह अत्याचार होगा। ऐसा टार्चर कोई भी नहीं सहेंगा और मैं ही नहीं, मैं समझता हूँ, सारा देश इसका विरोध करेगा।

[श्री. रामधारी सिंह दिनकर]

हिन्दी को देश के स्वभाव में पचाने में बहुत समय लगेगा। ऐसा नहीं है कि किसी को लाचार करके हम उस काम को आसान कर दें और इसमें घबड़ाने की बात भी नहीं है क्योंकि हम एक ऐसे महादेश में एक भाषा को सर्वव्यापी बनाना चाहते हैं, जिस में बहुत सी भाषायें और बोलियाँ हैं, जिनमें से कितनी तो बहुत ही विकसित और समृद्ध है। इसलिये हिन्दी का सही मार्ग वही हो सकता है जो लीस्ट रेजिस्टेंस का मार्ग है, जिसमें रुकावटें सब से कम हैं।

राजा जी हिन्दी के प्रति गुस्से में हैं, इससे चिंता होती है। लेकिन उससे बड़ी चिन्ता मुझे इस बात से होती है कि सरकारों ने यह समझ लिया है मानों हिन्दी नाम की कोई भाषा है नहीं, उन पर एक सर्वथा नयी भाषा गढ़ने का काम आ पड़ा है। मेरा मत इसके ठीक विपरीत है। हिन्दी की आयोग्यता के बारे में देश में बहुत सी बातें कही गई हैं और मैं उन्हें चुपचाप सुनता रहा हूँ। लेकिन, तब भी मेरा खयाल है कि हिन्दी पूर्ण रूप से समृद्ध भाषा है, बहुत ही विकसित भाषा है, उसकी अभिव्यक्ति उतनी ही प्रबल है जितनी संसार की किसी और भाषा की हो सकती है।

2 P.M.

हिन्दी में रामचन्द्र शुक्ल और वासुदेव शरण के निबन्ध पढ़िये। हमारा मत है कि उनकी भाषा उतनी ही समर्थ है जितनी समर्थ रिचार्ड्स और बरड्रेंड रसल की अंग्रेजी मानी जा सकती है। और बुजुर्गों की बात जाने दीजिये मैंने स्वयं संस्कृति पर एक किताब लिखी है जिसमें मैंने अरबिन्दो के विचारों की व्याख्या में कोई २० पेज लिखे हैं और राधाकृष्णन् के विचारों की व्याख्या में कोई ३० पेज। मुझे ऐसा लगा कि इस काम में हिन्दी ने मेरा उतना ही साथ

दिया है जितना अंग्रेजी ने मूलचिंतकों का साथ दिया होगा।

नयी हिन्दी गढ़ने का काम बिल्कुल हास्यस्पद काम है। अनुवादकों और शब्द गढ़ने वाले पंडितों को अनुचित महत्व दे कर सरकार हिन्दी का अकल्याण कर रही है।

राजा जी ने एक मज़ाक किया है जो मुझे याद आता है।

"We have no bird in the hand. We are trying to stuff a new bird with new feathers."

The fact is that we have already a fully grown up, live and a healthy bird in our hands and it will be preposterous to try to create a new bird and stuff it with all kinds of horrible feathers.

राजा जी का मज़ाक एक बड़ा प्यारा मज़ाक था। उसमें साहित्यिक विदग्धता थी इसलिये वह मुझे पसन्द आया।

I find it a little inappropriate but surely if the Government take note of this witty remark by Rajaji, they shall be doing better.

आप घड़ी की तरफ देखते हैं इसलिये मैं घबराता हूँ। दो मिनट में मुझे एक दूसरी बात कहनी है। वह बात उत्तर बिहार के सिलसिले में है। उत्तर बिहार में जहाँ गंगा पुल बन रहा है वहाँ पर सरकार ने थर्मल पावर स्टेशन हाउस बनाने की स्कीम रखी थी। लेकिन, मुना है कि अब वह स्कीम बन्द कर दी गई है या ठप्प कर दी गई है, कारण यह है कि उसके लिये फारेन एक्सचेंज नहीं मिल रहा है। आज ही मैंने टाइम्स आफ इंडिया में एक लम्बी सूची पढ़ी है जो अर्थ उपमंत्री ने निकाली है उसमें यह बताया गया है कि किन किन योजनाओं को प्रायोरिटी दी जायगी। उसको देख कर मुझे हैरत

हुई कि उत्तर बिहार के थर्मल पावर स्टेशन का नाम उसमें नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस योजना के लिये फारेन एक्सचेंज रिलीज क्यों किया नहीं जाता है। मैं आपको थोड़े में इस स्कीम की आवश्यकता बताता हूं। उत्तर बिहार का रकबा २१ हजार वर्ग मील है और उसकी आबादी एक करोड़ ८२ लाख है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह आबादी आसाम की आबादी से अधिक है, उड़ीसा से अधिक है, केरल से अधिक है, मीलों से अधिक है। लेकिन इतने लोगों के लिये पूरे उत्तर बिहार में जो बिजली का कुल इंस्टालेशन है वह सिर्फ ८,००० किलोवाट है और उसमें भी ५,००० किलोवाट डिजल तेल से पैदा किया जाता है। आशा की गयी थी कि यह थर्मल पावर स्टेशन बन जायेगा तब उसी से पहले के इंस्टालेशन को भी शक्ति दी जायेगी लेकिन इसके ठप्प हो जाने से भारी विपत्ति खड़ी हो गयी।

दक्षिण बिहार में भी उतने ही लोग हैं जितने लोग कि उत्तर बिहार में बसते हैं। लेकिन, जब कि उत्तर बिहार में पूरा इंस्टालेशन केवल ८ हजार किलोवाट है तब दक्षिण बिहार में ६ लाख किलोवाट है। यही नहीं, बोकारो में ७५ हजार किलोवाट बिजली का अतिरिक्त प्रबंध होने वाला है और उसके लिये फारेन एक्सचेंज रिलीज किया जा चुका है। इसी प्रकार, दुर्गापुर के लिये भी २ लाख ३० हजार किलोवाट की मंजूरी दी जा चुकी है और उसके लिये भी फारेन एक्सचेंज रिलीज किया जा चुका है। कोसी योजना से हम १५ हजार किलोवाट की उम्मीद लगाये हुये थे लेकिन वह चीज भी अब ठप्प कर दी गई है। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि उत्तर बिहार की इस आवश्यकता को देश की प्रायरीटी नम्बर १ में रखना चाहिये। यदि फारेन एक्सचेंज की कठिनाई हो तो मैं यह भी कहता हूं कि बिहार की दूसरी योजनाओं को स्कैप कर दीजिये, उनको

रोक रखिये, लेकिन बरौनी के थर्मल पावर हाउस को जल्दी बनना चाहिये और उसके लिये फारेन एक्सचेंज तुरन्त रिलीज होना चाहिये।

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Sir, I thank you very much for having been able to find time to call me. Sir, it is a peculiar circumstance in which we are called upon to discuss the budget. The budget is distributed on the 28th, with a massive volume of books containing a lot of figures and facts and we have to discuss it on the 3rd and 4th. Sir, this is rather difficult. . . (Interruption.)

Two days have been allotted to discuss the Budget of India. I am therefore thankful to you, to the Chair, for two things, namely, for the decision to allow 20 minutes only and also to be anxious to see that the Bell is rung. That is a great help to the man who begins to speak.

With this preliminary, let me congratulate the hon. Prime Minister upon having taken upon himself the task of presenting the budget, so difficult and so sudden that has fallen to his lot. This is the first Budget in free India to be presented by the Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Prepared by whom?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I am coming to it. I have a reply for your observations. Looking into the precedents, you don't find very many even in the British Parliament. It is only on rare and urgent occasions that the Prime Minister has presented his budget—probably once.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In West Bengal the Chief Minister is also the Finance Minister. He is always there.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Greater must be the strain on the Prime Minister who has to attend not only to his foreign relations work, which is

[Shri Biswanath Das.] very complicated at this juncture, along with various other activities but added to these he has got the finance. The Budget, according to me is an account of the stewardship of the great Indian household. This account could be divided under two heads, namely, the achievements of the current year and the requirements of the coming year. Therefore the time is certainly auspicious and I will implore the Government to see that all possible chances are given to Members for full expression on the consideration of these two important aspects.

I was surprised to hear one hon. Member from the Opposition discussing about the losses to India accruing out of the policy of non-alignment, a speech which would have been very welcome on an occasion like the General Elections. My hon. friends in the Opposition should have realised that this policy of non-alignment, whether good, bad or indifferent for India, has been placed before the country, the electorate, and the country has accepted it time and anon. Therefore it is late in the day and a waste of time for them and also for us to discuss an issue which has been accepted by the electorate, the masters of the Opposition and of the party in power.

Then I come to another observation made by another hon. friend from the Opposition. The observation was that the Budget is nothing but Krishnamachari wine in Nehru's bottle. I don't understand what it is. I am alive to one fact, namely, that my hon. friends are sitting in Delhi, in Parliament, and are thinking of in terms something else, of principles and of propositions and the ways and means of countries different from that in which they are. That explains why my hon. friends has given vent to such ideas. Sir, the Cabinet is a united one and this Budget reflects the policy of the Cabinet, the programmes it follows, the programmes

of the party in power, as approved and accepted by the country and by the House. Therefore, it is unfair to say that it is Krishnamachari wine in Nehru's bottle. I do not understand what it means.

I do not propose to go into details of this Budget because we realise how difficult it is even for a Prime Minister to prepare a Budget and present it in the way he has done it in such a short time. I must frankly confess that the Budget that has been presented does contain certain new features and new aspects in the sense that it places all the cards on the table. It has certain facts which were not given hitherto in the course of a Budget.

Having stated this much, I come to certain aspects which I propose to place before the House. They are very urgent matters, I mean certain important social matters. We have, by our policy of social legislation and also by our policy of taxation removed certain aspects of protection which the poor were having in their old age. Philanthropy has become a thing of difficulty. The joint Hindu family is dying away. What then is the protection for the disabled, for the old and the helpless people in our society? Going through the Budget I find little provision has been made and no thought has been given to this aspect of the question. Sir, I plead with the Ministry, I plead with the Minister and I plead with the hon. Prime Minister to think about this serious question. It has not been done but it has to be done.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are a young nation.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Sir, we may be a young nation, but still we have to make certain provisions. Having taken a certain course of action, we must be prepared to face the consequences. Otherwise we will be failing in our duty. I am aware of the fact that certain States have

taken certain definite steps in this regard, I mean the State of Uttar Pradesh and I believe the State of Bombay also. But the States have got very slender financial resources and this is a huge problem which needs the coordination and cooperation and practical and actual help of the Union Government. Under these circumstances, I plead with the Government that they should give their thought to this important question.

Sir, I next come to another important social aspect of a very urgent nature. We have reformed Hindu Law and it is our desire to reconstitute Hindu society in a different way, different from the one which was in vogue. That is good. That may be welcomed. That may be desirable or it may not be desirable. But I am not here to consider these. But certain things flowing out of the steps that we have taken, have to be faced. What are those? Sir, we have created a certain way of life in which women have to eke out an independent existence. The Constitution of India gives them equal rights and freedom. The Hindu Code has been re-modelled and reconstituted keeping in view this important aspect. Joint families are no more in existence, or they are practically fading away. Then again, marriage laws have also been changed. All these things bring in their actions and reactions on the social life of man and woman and the consequences have to be faced. Therefore, it is necessary that Government should take on themselves the responsibility of starting women's homes in every district and every subdivision. That is an aspect which cannot be left to itself. I do not think, on this aspect, even the States have bestowed very serious thought and sought a solution. Under these circumstances, I plead that this House and also the Government should give thought to this important question.

Sir, the question of crop failure is known to everyone. It is a terrible thing that has come upon four States,

namely, Orissa, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and parts of Madhya Pradesh.

SHRI PURNA CHANDRA SHARMA (Assam): And Assam also

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Yes, Assam also. That being the position, I should have been very glad to know what the Government has done in this regard. Speaking for my State, I have to point out that severe water scarcity has to be faced in these summer months, unless relief steps are taken. The position will be extremely difficult. I will not now speak of other economic difficulties and I expect the Government to make a statement on this important issue on which hon. Members of this House are worried.

The point that has always been made is want of finance. I know the difficulties, both internal and external. But looking into certain aspects of finance, I have no hesitation in saying that much of this is man-made. In a note that I have written about defective planning I have clearly discussed this issue.

While discussing this issue, I do not see why certain aspects which would have yielded immediate results have not been taken into account. Sir, looking at the Report of the working of Mines and Minerals, barring coal, you find that we have minerals, the pithead cost of which comes to Rs. 125 crores. The international price, the export price, may be about three times the same, including the transit charges, the railway freight, profits, this and that. (*Time bell rings*). I should like to know why the State Trading Corporation has not taken upon itself the sole responsibility of exporting iron, managanese, chromite ores, etc., which are important items which not only earn good profits but also earn a good amount of foreign exchange. Sir, looking at the Report of the State Trading Corporation, I see at paragraph 8 that out of Rs. 35 lakhs of gross profits earned, the profits out of iron ore, managanese and chromite

[Shri Biswanath Das.]

alone come to nearly Rs. 33 lakhs. It has to be realised that iron ore is exported solely by the State Trading Corporation. In regard to manganese, 60 per cent. is sent out by private exporters and 40 per cent. only is exported by the State Trading Corporation. I do not know why. While the f.o.b. price of iron ore is about Rs. 70, the f.o.b. price of manganese is about Rs. 200 while that of chromite, even of the ordinary grade not to talk of the high grade one, is about Rs. 300. These are industries which could easily be organised without any difficulty. The raising may be left to

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

private firms but all export should be handled only by the State Trading Corporation so that the benefits accruing out of this increased quantum of exports will help the Five Year Plan as also the other developmental schemes that are under contemplation. Sir, in this respect, I would request the Government and also the State Trading Corporation to pay serious thought to this aspect.

I now come to planning. Just like the Budget discussion, planning also had a similar deal in this House. We were not given proper opportunity and proper time, the time necessary, to discuss such an important aspect. I consider that planning has been going on in unmethodical and contradictory directions. (*Time bell rings*). I have no time. I would very much like to discuss this aspect but I will illustrate one point as to how contradictions appear in planning. Sir, let me illustrate one, namely, the Dhinki (hand pounded) rice. A Dhinki organisation has been set up in all districts in the name of promotion of cottage industries, the Dhinki hand-pounded rice. Now, you have got this organisation and, along with this organisation, licences are freely issued for milling of rice. As if that is not enough, hullers are licensed in very many villages with the result that you have got a huller in every panchayat. In result, handpounded rice is available only with the subsidised

Dhunkies. You have thrown out of employment millions of people in the name of protection. This sort of planning will do little good to anybody. It may be applauded by the Westerners and it may be useful so far as industries are concerned but for cottage industries, this sort of planning is going to do nothing. What I have said about handpounded rice applies to so many other things. I should have itemised this provided I had been given time but I do not want to worry you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Therefore, with these words and in the hope that the note that I have submitted about defective planning will receive due consideration of the Planning Commission and the concerned Ministries of the Government, I take my seat.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उप सभापति महोदय, बजट पर बोलने के लिये आपने जो समय मुझे दिया है उसके लिये मैं आपको हार्दिक धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने, जो हमारे देश के नेता हैं—एक माने में तो वे सारे एशिया के ही नेता वरन् सारी दुनिया के नेता कहे जा सकते हैं, उन्होंने सदन के सामने जो बजट प्रस्तुत किया है, उसके बारे में किसी तरह की समालोचना करना मेरे ख्याल में उपयुक्त नहीं है। मेरी आदत हमेशा से यह रही है कि शासन की ओर से जो कार्य होते हैं, उनको मैं बहुत कम क्कटिसाइज करता हूँ।

इस बजट के संबंध में मुझे एक दो बातें ही आपके सामने निवेदन करनी हैं। पहली बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह फूड विभाग के सम्बन्ध में है। फूड के सम्बन्ध में गवर्न-मेंट ने जो यह पालिसी रखी है कि व्यापारियों को बैंक किसी प्रकार से फ़ाइनन्स न करें, उसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे कुछ निवेदन करना है। सरकार की यह पालिसी सारे देश की दृष्टि से फूड समस्या को ध्यान में रखते हुए एक प्रकार से तो ठीक है, लेकिन इस बात से किसानों को बहुत नुकसान पहुंचा रहा है, इस ओर भी सरकार को ध्यान

देना चाहिये । हमारे जिले भिलिसा, बासादा और पछार में बहुत सी छोटी छोटी मंडियां हैं, मगर वहां हजारों गाड़ियां गल्ले की रोजाना आती हैं । एक एक दिन में गल्ला खरीदने के लिये व्यापारियों को तीन चार लाख रुपये की जरूरत होती है । इस तरह से जो छोटे व्यापारी होते हैं वे रुपये की कमी की वजह से काश्तकारों का गल्ला नहीं खरीद सकते हैं । इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि व्यापारी लोग ज्यादा सूद पर रुपया कर्ज लेते हैं और कम कीमत पर किसानों से गल्ला खरीदते हैं । इस तरह किसानों को बहुत हानि होती है । इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा आपसे यह निवेदन है कि आप जो काश्तकारों का गल्ला इकट्ठा करके वेयर हाउसेज में रखना चाहते हैं और कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटी बना कर उसकी बिक्री का इंतजाम करना चाहते हैं, यह तो बहुत ही अच्छी बात है, लेकिन मेरा आप से केवल यह निवेदन है कि जब तक आप इस चीज को कार्यान्वित नहीं करते तब तक आपने व्यापारियों को फाइनस करने पर जो पाबन्दी लगा रखी है उसको कुछ नरम कर दें तो बहुत ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे निवेदन करनी है वह गल्ले के मेंबमट के बारे में है । इस सम्बन्ध में जो जोन्स मुकर्रर किये गये हैं, उसमें भिलिसा, जहां का मैं रहने वाला हूं, उसका डाइरेक्टली सम्बन्ध है । भिलिसा से बहुत सा अनाज बम्बई को जाता रहा है । बम्बई की मार्केट में आज भी इस गल्ले की मांग रहती है क्योंकि हमारे यहां बहुत अच्छा गल्ला विशेष कर गेहूं पैदा होता है । इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि करप्शन द्वारा या किसी न किसी प्रकार यह गल्ला बम्बई पहुंचाया जाता है । इस तरह से जो गल्ला वहां पर जाता है, उससे न व्यापारियों को ही लाभ होता है और न काश्तकारों को

ही लाभ होता है । इसलिये मेरी आप से यह अर्ज है कि भिलिसा और उसके आपसपास की मंडियों को यह सुविधा मिल जाय कि वे बम्बई को गल्ला विशेष कर गेहूं भेज सकें । यह तब हो सकता है जब बम्बई को इस जोन में शामिल कर दिया जाय ताकि आसानी के साथ यहां के लोग बम्बई को गल्ला भेज सकें । अगर सरकार को और से इस तरह का प्रबन्ध कर दिया गया तो यहां के लोगों को बहुत फायदा होगा ।

पोस्ट एंड टेलीग्राफ डिपार्टमेंट ने काफ़ी उन्नति की है, इसमें किसी को कोई शुबहा नहीं हो सकता है । हमारे कम्युनिकेशन मिनिस्टर महोदय इस समय यहां पर उपस्थित हैं, मैं उनसे यह निवेदन करूंगा कि उन्होंने मध्य प्रदेश को दो सर्किलों में डिवाइड कर दिया है । पहले तो मध्य भारत, भोपाल और मध्य प्रदेश अलग अलग ईकाइयों के रूप में थी, तब यह बात उपयुक्त थी, लेकिन जब मध्य प्रदेश को एक बहुत ही बड़ा प्रदेश बना दिया गया है तब यह बात उपयुक्त मालूम नहीं देती है । इसलिये मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इस क्षेत्र को दो सर्किलों के बजाय एक ही में तबदील कर दिया जाय तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

अशोकनगर पछार में गल्ले की एक बहुत बड़ी मंडी है लेकिन वहां के व्यापारियों को टेलिफोन की सहूलियत नहीं है । काफ़ी लम्बे अरसे से उन लोगों ने यह प्रार्थना की थी कि वहां पर टेलिफोन की लाइन आ जाय । इस सम्बन्ध में शायद कुछ काम भी शुरू हो चुका है लेकिन मुझे इत्तिला मिली है कि कुछ सामान की कमी की वजह से यह कार्य महीनों से रुका पड़ा है । इसलिये मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस कार्य को जल्दी में जल्दी पूरा करने के लिये मिनिस्टर महोदय ध्यान दे, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा ।

[श्री राम सहाय]

तीसरी बात जो मुझे निवेदन करनी है वह यह है कि काश्तकारों की जमीन की मीलिंग अभी तक नहीं हो पा रही है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा यह फ़र्ज तो अवश्य ही है कि हम हर एक व्यक्ति के लिये कम से कम एक फ़ैमली के लिये एक ऐसे मकान की व्यवस्था करें जिसमें वह रह सके। इस सम्बन्ध में स्टेटों में भी कोई कार्य ठीक तरीके पर नहीं चल रहा है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस बारे में कोई ऐसा डाइरेक्टिव होना चाहिये जिससे गांव के मजदूरों और किसानों को मकान मिल सके और उसके बारे में कुछ ऐसा नियम बनाना चाहिये जिससे वहाँ इस प्रकार मकान बनाने के लिये जमीन को हामिल करने में सुविधा हो।

दिल्ली के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि मकान बनाने के लिये बहुत से आदमियों लाखों रुपया जमीन खरीदने में खर्च कर दिया है लेकिन उन्हें मकान बनाने की इजाजत नहीं मिल रही है। किसी और प्रकार की दिक्कत की बात समझ में आ सकती है मगर महज यह कि उनको मकान बनाने की इजाजत आथरिटीज की ओर से नहीं मिल रही है, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है कि ऐसा क्यों है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार खास तौर पर इस बात की ओर ध्यान दे तो ज्यादा उपयुक्त होगा।

अभी सदन में प्लानिंग के सम्बन्ध में कई बातें कही गईं और सरकार पर वेस्टेज और निरर्थक खर्च करने की शिकायत की गई है, मुझे भी इस बारे में कुछ शिकायत है। लेकिन मैं यह विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम किसी नये काम को शुरू करते हैं तब उस काम को जमाने के लिये जो लोग उस में काम करते हैं उनमें योग्यता पैदा करने के लिये कुछ न कुछ वेस्टेज तो होगा ही।

यह हमारा एक्सपैरीमेन्टल स्टेज है। अगर हम इस समय वेस्टेज और दूसरी बातों में घबरा कर इन स्कीमों को छोड़ दें या उनको संकुचित कर दें तो मेरे ह्याल में यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं होगी।

अब मैं आपके सामने अपने भाषण की मुख्य बात उपस्थित करना चाहता हूँ। वह कास्टीट्यूशनल प्वाइन्ट है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं जो कुछ भी कहूँगा वह किमी जजमेंट के विरुद्ध, किसी कारपोरेशन के विरुद्ध या किसी व्यक्ति को क्रिटिसाइज करने की दृष्टि में कोई बात नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि विधान में पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों और मिनिस्टर्स के अधिकारों को सुरक्षित रखने के लिये जो अधिकार दिये गये हैं, उसमें किसी जज इत्यादि या किसी दूसरे व्यक्ति द्वारा इंकोचमेंट न किया जा सके, यह बात मैं उपसभापति महोदय, आपके सामने उपस्थित करना चाहता हूँ। हमारे कास्टीट्यूशन में प्रेसिडेंट का इम्पीच करने की बात कही गई है। उसके बारे में अनुच्छेद ६१ है लेकिन विधान के ७५वें अनुच्छेद में मिनिस्टर को मुक़रर करने की बात कही गई है। उसमें कहा गया है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर की सिफारिश पर मिनिस्टर प्रेसिडेंट मुक़रर करेगा और वह प्रेसिडेंट के प्लेज़र तक अपने पद पर रहेगा। मिनिस्टरों के सम्बन्ध में इम्पीचमेंट के केस पुराने जमाने में ब्रिटेन में देखे गये थे। लेकिन जब से ज्वाइन्ट रिस्पानसिबिलिटी की बात आई, कैबिनेट की कलेक्टिव रिस्पानसिबिलिटी की बात आई, उस वक्त से वहाँ यह चीज़ खत्म हो गई और मैं समझता हूँ कि इन्हीं कारणों से, ज्वाइन्ट अथवा कलेक्टिव रिस्पानसिबिलिटी की वजह से हमारे कास्टीट्यूशन में भी वह बात मिनिस्टर को इम्पीच करने की नहीं रखी गई है। हमारे यहाँ जो कमीशन आफ़ इन्क्वैरी एक्ट १९५२ बना है, उस एक्ट को भी सीमित ही किया गया है उसमें जो

एप्रोप्रीयेट गवर्नमेंट की डेफिनिशन की गई है— उसमें बताया गया है कि किन विषयों के बारे में इन्कुआरी हो सकेगी और उसमें केन्द्रीय लिस्ट है, या स्टेट लिस्ट है या कनकरेंट लिस्ट है, मेरे विचार में उसके सम्बन्ध में ही इन्क्वारी की जा सकती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मिनिस्ट्रीअल रिस्पानसिबिलिटी की इन्कुआरी के बारे में इस एक्ट में कुछ नहीं है जिसके आधार पर किसी जज को कोई ऐसा काम सिपुर्द किया जा सके। मैं समझता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर की रिस्पानसिबिलिटी के बारे में या सदस्यों की रिस्पानसिबिलिटी के बारे में अगर किसी को कोई अधिकार है तो पार्लियामेंट को ही है और वही इस बारे में विचार कर सकती है अगर हम इस बारे में अच्छी तरह से देखें तो हमको पता चलेगा कि गवर्नमेंट ने जो इन्क्वारी इस वक़्त मुकर्रर की थी, उसमें कुछ लूप होल रह गये हैं जिनकी वजह से यह सारी चीज़ हमारे सामने आई है। ब्रिटन में इन्क्वायरी कमिशन के सम्बन्ध में जो एक्ट है, उसे मैंने देखा है, उसे देखने के बाद मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ कि वहां पार्लियामेंट के दोनों हाउसेज को कोई रिजोल्यूशन इन्कुआरी के बारे में लाना होता है तब इस तरह की इन्क्वायरी सेंट अप होती है। लेकिन हमारे एक्ट में वह अधिकार गवर्नमेंट ने अपनी तरफ ही रखा है। मुनासिब है। मुझे इसमें भी कोई आपत्ति नहीं है कि इस एक्ट में हाउस आफ दी पीपुल में ही इस तरह के रिजोल्यूशन की बात रखी गई और राज्य सभा को शामिल नहीं किया गया लेकिन मुझे आपत्ति इस बात में है कि इन्क्वारी सेंट अप करने के समय उसमें टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस के बारे में दोनों बातें नहीं कही गई हैं कि किस चीज़ की इन्क्वारी की जाय और किस की न की जाय जैसा कि क्रिशलडाउन केस के टर्म्स आफ रिफ़रेन्स के समय वहां रखा गया इसका ख्याल हम

मामले में नहीं रखा गया। अगर यह बात ध्यान में रखी जाती तो हमारे मिनिस्टर जो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर भी हैं, उनके तमाम एक्ट्स पर, उनके अमल पर, उनके व्यक्तित्व पर इस प्रकार क्विटसिज्म करने का उन पर डेसपेशन डालने का अवसर नहीं आता। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ इन्क्वारी करने का या उसके खिलाफ इम्पीचमेंट करने का सवाल ही नहीं हो सकता है। गवर्नमेंट का इन्क्वायरी सेंट अप करने का यह मकसद अभी नहीं हो सकता है कि वह इस प्रकार की इन्क्वारी करने के लिये आदेश देती, जिसमें मिनिस्टर के ऊपर कोई बात कही जा सकती है। क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री इस बात को खूब अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं और जानते हैं कि मिनिस्टरों की रिस्पानसिबिलिटी क्या है, उसका तमबिया किसी आदालत में नहीं किया जा सकता है और न होना ही चाहिये। लेकिन इसमें चूकि टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस में केवल एक बात आई है दूसरे नेगेटिव फार्म में दूसरी बात नहीं आई, इस वजह से यह सारी चीज़ें आई हैं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस गलत नियत किये गये वह इस मानी में स्पष्ट नहीं कि उनमें दूसरी बात नहीं कही गई मगर इसका यह भी मकसद नहीं है कि इस तरह से सरकार ने यह जांच का काम जज को देकर अपने अधिकारों को या पार्लियामेंट के अधिकारों को समाप्त कर दिया और जज को अधिकार दे दिया। जजों की अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र बढ़ाने की मनोवृत्ति रहती है। इस तरह की मिसाल भारत में ही देखने में आई है ऐसी बात नहीं है इस तरह अधिकार क्षेत्र बढ़ाने की बात ब्रिटेन में भी देखी गई है जहां स्पीकर तथा पार्लियामेंट के अधिकारों के बारे में भी झगडा रहा है हमारे सामने यह जजमेंट लाइफ इन्वॉरेंट कारपोरेशन के डीलिग़्ज़ के सम्बन्ध

[श्री राम सहाय]

में आया है। उस जजमेंट में मैं यह देखता हूँ कि उसमें न हमारे संविधान की परवाह की गई है और न इस एक्ट की जिस एक्ट से उसको अधिकार दिया गया न टर्म्स आफ रेफ़ेंस की। इस मामले में मतचाहे ढंग से तजवीज़ की गई इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपके सामने थोड़ा सी बात और रखना चाहता हूँ। इसमें टर्म्स आफ रेफ़ेंस ये थे :

1. Whether the purchases were in accordance with normal business principles or practice;
2. The propriety of the purchases;
3. the person or persons responsible for the purchases; and
4. any other circumstance which to the Commission may appear to be relevant.

मैं इसकी चौथी शर्त की तरफ आपको तवज्जुह दिलाना चाहता हूँ। यह एक साधारण सा कानूनी सिद्धान्त है कि जब हम किसी को कोई अधिकार दें तो उन अधिकारों से सम्बन्धित और जो बातें हो सकती हों, उनके बारे में भी हम कुछ थोड़ी सी बात कह दें जिससे उसको कोई दिक्कत उसमें तहकीकात व तजवीज़ की न आये। लेकिन इस चौथी शर्त के सम्बन्ध में जज महोदय ने किस प्रकार से अपने खयाल के मुताबिक कहा है, वह आप मुलाहिजा फरमायें।

"I have also to take into consideration all the circumstances which have any bearing on these transactions."

अब आप यह मुलाहिजा कीजिये कि "all the circumstances or any bearing" ये शब्द किस तरह से इसमें प्रयुक्त किये गये हैं। इतना ही नहीं, उनके सारे

जजमेंट को देखें तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि वे इस बात के उत्सुक थे कि मिनिस्टीरियल रेस्पांसिबिलिटी के बारे में वे ज़बरदस्ती कुछ न कुछ फैसला करें क्योंकि उन्होंने शुरू में यह कहा है :

"The third question is a question of constitutional importance, and that is the extent and nature of ministerial responsibility in our country. What I will have to consider is to what extent is the Minister in charge of a department responsible for the acts of civil servants under him".

मैं समझता हूँ कि जज महोदय का यह फंक्शन नहीं था, गवर्नमेंट का यह मक़सद नहीं था, इक्वारी कमीशन जो मुक़रर किया गया उसका यह मक़सद नहीं था, इस सम्बन्ध में जो एक्ट हमारे यहां है उसका यह मक़सद नहीं है, हमारे संविधान का भी यह मक़सद नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी इसके बारे में बहस की गई। जहां तक वकीलों का सम्बन्ध है वे बहस तो करते ही हैं। मैं भी तीस साल प्रैक्टिस करने के बाद अब पंद्रह साल से छोड़े बैठा हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि वकील लोग अपर्न; फ़ीस के लिये किस प्रकार ऐसी बहस इत्यादि करते हैं। इस केस में भी वकील द्वारा मिनिस्टीरियल रेस्पांसिबिलिटी के ऊपर बहस की गई और उसके सहारे ये सारी बातें इसमें आयी। मैं समझता हूँ कि जज महोदय का यह कर्तव्य नहीं था कि वे इस प्रकार इस मामले में जाते। यह बिलकुल निश्चित है जैसा कि ब्रिटेन का जो "THE CRICHEL DOWN CASE" है उसमें भी वहा के प्राइम मिनिस्टर से जब यह बात पूछी गई तो उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा वह मैं आपके सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ :

"On the 6th July, 1954 a member of the House of Commons asked the Prime Minister if in view of the facts disclosed in the Crichton Down Report and of the amount of detailed work that had to be undertaken by Government Departments, he

would set up a Committee to examine and make recommendations regarding the responsibilities of Ministers and their relations with their Civil Service Advisers. The Chancellor of the Exchequer replied in the negative and hoped that the question of Ministerial responsibilities and relations between the Minister and the Civil Servants would be referred to in the forthcoming debate on the Crichton Down Report."

(Time bell rings.)

तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जब ऐसी बात मौजूद थी, ऐसा प्रिंसिपल मौजूद था, तो हमारे जज महोदय को उसकी तरफ ध्यान दे कर, जो गवर्नमेंट का मकसद था और उस मकसद को पूरा करने के लिये जितना आवश्यक था वही करना चाहिये था। मैं समझता हूँ कि इंसाफन भी और जो ला के सिद्धांत हैं उनमें भी यह बात नहीं आती कि जिस व्यक्ति को अपनी स्थिति स्पष्ट करने का पूरा मौका न मिला हो उसके खिलाफ इस तरह का निर्णय दिया जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि यहां हाउस में उनके बारे में कोई सव्स्टैंटिव मोशन आ सकता था। यदि ऐसा मोशन यहां आता तो उसपर बहस होती और उसमें उनको हाउस के सामने सारे वाक्यात पेश करने का मौका मिल जाता। लेकिन यह बात इक्वायरी में नहीं हुई और सब बातों की सफाई नहीं हो सकी। जहां तक हमारे मिनिस्टर्स का सवाल है, वे हमेशा अपनी पूरी रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी को गंभीरता से करते हैं। कृष्णमाचारी जी ने जजमेंट से बहुत पहले इस्तीफा दे दिया था। हमने यह देखा कि लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने एक बहुत छोटी सी बात के कारण इस्तीफा दे दिया। हम यह भी देखते हैं कि उसके बाद एंडि-मिनिस्ट्रेशन में बहुत से इस प्रकार के वाक्यात आये और आते रहते हैं, लेकिन इसके माने यह नहीं है कि मिनिस्टर रोज रिजाइन

करते रहें। इसी प्रकार से यह बात भी नहीं होनी चाहिये थी।

एक बात मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि स्टैंचुटरी अथॉरिटीज के अधिकारों की जो चीज है उसके लिये कोई मिनिस्टर रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी नहीं है और मैं समझता हूँ कि लाइफ इश्योरेंस कॉर्पोरेशन एक ऐसी ही अथॉरिटी है और उसको अपने फंड्स को खर्च करने का पूरा अधिकार था इस लिये इस बारे में अगर कोई बात हुई तो मेरे खयाल में मिनिस्ट्रीयल रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी का सवाल पैदा नहीं होना चाहिये, लेकिन इस बात का कतई ध्यान नहीं रखा गया।

(Time bell rings.)

दो मिनट में एक बात और अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ। सविल सर्वेण्ट्स के बारे में मेरा खयाल है कि वे बहुत अच्छा कार्य कर रहे हैं। मैं भी उनके बारे में कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कहना चाहता जिसमें उनके खिलाफ ऐसपार्शन डालने का कोई मतलब हो। लेकिन एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जज महोदय ने जो फ़ैसला लिखा है उसमें उन्होंने सेक्रेटरीज के कर्तव्य के बारे में ध्यान नहीं दिया है। इस सम्बन्ध में श्री ऐटली ने जो कुछ कहा है वह मैं थोड़े में आपके सामने रख देना चाहता हूँ :

"The secretary must study the idiosyncrasies of his master and learn how tactfully to prevent him making a blunder."

जब मिनिस्टर ने यह बात सेक्रेटरी से कही थी कि जो ट्रांजेक्शन वे करने जा रहे हैं, वह ठीक नहीं है, सन्देहजनक है, तो बजाय, इसके कि सेक्रेटरी उनको गाइड करता, उनको ठीक मशवरा देता, उसने उनकी इस प्रकार की बात को स्वीकृति समझकर अपने आपको बचाने का प्रयत्न किया, यह मैं समझता हूँ कि अच्छी चीज नहीं

[श्री राम सहाय]

और जज महोदय इस बारे में खामोश है यह खास बात है मैं इस विषय में बहुत सी बातें सदन के सामने रखना चाहता था, लेकिन समय न होने के कारण मैं अब अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, within the short time at my disposal it is obviously difficult to deal with the various aspects of this budget, but I will begin by touching on some important points. The first point to note is that this budget is really a continuation of last year's budget. So far as the taxation policy is concerned, it is perfectly clear that there were certain leakages, certain loopholes in the last year's budget and the taxation policy generally. Those leakages have been plugged in this budget and so far as that is concerned, the Finance Minister certainly deserves our congratulations. The second point and which is perhaps more important than the first is that in spite of very great odds, very great financial difficulties which this country has been facing recently, the Finance Minister has not materially reduced the outlay on the Second Five Year Plan as it fell within this year. The hard core of the Plan has been maintained, and when you consider the various difficulties that this country has had to face, I feel that this is a very great achievement.

Well, Sir, I shall now go on to deal with certain aspects of this Budget which interest me. I would in this connection refer to paragraphs 49 and 50 of the Finance Minister's speech. In paragraph 49 it has been stated as follows:

"... For small savings although the net receipts of this year have been disappointing, it may be hoped that, with the more intensive development of the movement with the co-operation of the States, the net collections next year will show a substantial improvement."

And paragraph 50 says that about Rs. 100 crores are expected through small savings. Now, Sir, this question of small savings is of very great interest to me because I feel that that really indicates whether we are proceeding. Sir, after all, in a truly socialistic pattern of society it is the common man ultimately on whose energies and income we have to draw both for the purposes of the State and for the prosperity of the people generally, and when we find that there is any dwindling in these savings, we can come to the conclusion that all is not well with us. Sir, as a developing country we should expect not only a growth of the income of the common man, but also a growth in his savings generally, because it is ultimately on these savings that we draw for any development programme. Some of these savings are absorbed by taxation and the remainder leads to the growth of the private sector and the prosperity of the country generally. Sir, the private sector, it seems to me, is a very important sector which needs to be developed in a democracy. I am not now worried about these ordinary concepts of capitalism, socialism and all that, but I would illustrate my meaning by taking one particular instance. In this country as in any democratic country it is of the utmost importance that we shall preserve the liberty of the individual citizen, that that we shall not enslave his intellect, and if we start with this premise, then it is quite clear that we cannot, in a democratic society, envisage a condition in which all the citizen, at any rate important citizens, in the country depend for their livelihood on the State. I submit with great respect, Sir, that if democracy is to function properly, then we must have in the country a set of people who are intellectually as great as any civil servants and who do not depend upon their living on the State or Government services of any kind. Now if this is to happen, it is very important that we should organise the private sector on sound lines, and if we want to organise the private sector properly, how shall we do it? Where

is the money to come from? Where are the resources to come from? Now I suggest, Sir, that these resources come primarily from these small savings of the ordinary men in this country. So far as the State is concerned, normally it will not invest in the private sector. But after the deductions from these small savings the State takes away in the shape of taxes, after all these deductions, it is from whatever remains that this private sector is nursed and nourished. When therefore it is said that there is a dwindling so far as these national savings are concerned, it seems to me, Sir, I say this with all respect, that that is a sign of deterioration and not of progress. Sir, I am not worried about this taxation at all. I feel that the rich, in a democratic country like ours, ought to be taxed as much as possible consistently of course with other important considerations. But what I wish to say in this connection is that as our country is placed today, and if what I have been saying is correct, namely that we have to nurse and nourish the private sector, can we afford to have the wealth tax? I certainly do think that the expenditure tax is a very welcome tax. But can we say the same thing about the wealth tax?

It seems to me that this does require a little rethinking. I agree to the income-tax; I agree also to the expenditure tax; but is it necessary to have a wealth tax in our country? After all, when we tax on the one hand income and on the other expenditure also, all that remains is the saving. Why attack savings? Especially because I feel that this saving, whether it belongs to the rich men of the poor people, ultimately must go to the development of the private sector which, as I have just pointed out, is a very important matter. I am not an economist, but I do feel that so far as the imposition of this wealth tax is concerned, it does require a little rethinking. The only possible argument in favour of this wealth tax is that in this country wealth tends to go underground, that

it must be made a little mobile. I submit that that was certainly true of a certain age in this country but I doubt very much whether, with all the taxes that we now have in this country, wealth after all does go underground, at any rate, to the extent that it used to before.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyway, it is not arrested.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: It is all a matter of opinion. I am not an economist, nor an expert in these matters, but I would certainly submit this for the consideration of this House and of the Government. When we consider our Budget, especially when we are concerned with a socialistic pattern of society, the main criterion which we ought to consider and with which we should judge any step that we take, is the consideration as to whether we are approaching our aim; whether our direction is that we are fast approaching an egalitarian kind of State. I am not suggesting that there should be a mathematical equality in the incomes of the citizens of this country. Perhaps this mathematical equality is an impossibility, but I do suggest that the less we lay emphasis on wealth, the better it will be for the country, and the sooner we are in a position to achieve an egalitarian society, the better for us all. I shall give an instance. It is a very unfortunate matter and I say this with all respect, that there should be disparity between the salaries of, let us say—we will take the summit point—the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers. Why should there be this disparity?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do you propose to tackle it?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am only pointing out what is happening today. Why should there be this disparity unless you, so to speak, begin to think, at any rate unconsciously at the back of your mind, that somehow or other money has something to do with dignity? I do not see any justification whatever for this

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]
disparity of pay between the Ministers on the one hand and the Deputy Ministers on the other. I do not suppose that the Deputy Ministers have less children than the Ministers or they have to spend less for their family needs.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They will refute your argument by pointing to the salaries of I.C.S. officers as compared to their own salary.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am only pointing this out as an instance. I am not arguing now that there should be no disparity in salaries. I am only pointing out that very probably the reason for this disparity is that at the back of your mind there is the idea that somehow or other wealth is connected with dignity. Otherwise, there is no explanation for this disparity. I am pointing this out because I feel that we are in our society laying too great an emphasis, too great a stress, on wealth. Sir, when Shri C. D. Deshmukh was the Finance Minister and when discussion was going on in this House with regard to the Company Law, I had sent him a Sanskrit verse which, you will pardon me, if I repeat here.

देगे सदैव जनतंत्रणं व्यवस्थां
मंत्रिन्, यदेच्छसि समस्तसुखानुबन्धाम् ।
हेयम् तदा निगमार्थविमोह-जालम्
लोकाभिवृद्धिसरणिः सहकार्यमेव ॥

Its translation is this:

"Oh, Minister! If in this country you want to perpetuate democracy, which is the source of all happiness and welfare, then give up this lure of wealth obtainable through companies. For it is only in and through co-operation that the people will march on the path of progress and prosperity."

SHRI J. S. BISHT: In companies also the shareholders co-operate.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: The companies are a form of co-operation when we understand the word 'co-operation' in a very large sense.

DR. R. B. GOUR: (Andhra Pradesh): Co-operation at the cost of labour.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: So far as co-operation as ordinarily understood in this country is concerned, it is distinguishable from companies that we have in this country and elsewhere in this world.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Who is the author?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: It is my poor self.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What was the reply given to you?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Deshmukh said that he entirely agreed with me. This is what he said:

हे बारलिंगे ! भवता सहैव
श्रद्धास्ति मेऽस्मिन् सहकार्यजाले ।

"O' Barlingay, like you I also have faith in co-operation."

I have said this because I feel that we ought to restrict the word 'co-operation' to the narrower sense of co-operatives, and I submit that the real solution to this problem of a socialistic pattern of society lies not in having companies as a form of co-operation. As a matter of fact we have to change our entire industrial structure so that those companies ultimately approximate to co-operatives. So far as labour is concerned, it ought to be allowed to have more share in management of the companies, the labour ought to be given more prominence and they ought to have more facilities and so on. Ultimately I feel that if we want to bring the socialistic pattern of society in this country, then this whole company law will have to change, the

whole industrial structure will have to change so as to ultimately approximate to what I call or what we ordinarily understand as the term 'co-operatives'.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Company Law we have changed.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Yes, but not substantially. I now turn to certain other aspects of the matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 20 minutes.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: How long can I speak—another five minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: All this was, if I may say so, in respect of the receipt side of the Budget. But so far as the expenditure side is concerned, I have to make some observations also. Sir, I am greatly interested in the question of health and slums and to that I now come immediately.

One of the very important tests with which to judge a Budget is the criterion as to whether it has distributed all the available money with the State equally between the urban and the rural population; and if this were really so, then we should expect that the rural population would not tend to be drawn towards the cities. Now we ought to know the facts although unfortunately the Budget has given us no indication, or any statistics with regard to the fact as to whether in this country this tendency for the rural people to go to urban areas has increased or it has diminished. Now if it has increased, surely there is something wrong with the Budget, something wrong somewhere. Now I am not a statistician but I can see the world with my own eyes. I have seen Delhi and I need not go far into the country for illustrating my point. I will take Delhi itself. The hon. Prime Minister is here and fortunately he went round once upon a time. I remember, and made certain observations with regard to the slum areas in

Delhi. Everyone in this House knows that so far as railway lines are concerned, they are inhabited on both sides by people who have come from distant places—from Gujerat, Berar, Madras, Assam and other places. I myself have moved amongst those people very recently and looked at the way they live. They have hardly any amenities. As a matter of fact, their very existence is really a shame to us. They are ill-fed, ill-clad, they have no proper housing, there is no proper arrangement for water or for sanitation—nothing. Now all those people have come to Delhi from long distances. What does that indicate, I ask? It indicates that those people did not have any employment in those regions from which they have come. Delhi was more attractive to them in spite of the fact that they have to live here like cattle. What does that indicate? That is indicative of the fact that there is something wrong somewhere, that we are not distributing the State money properly in this country. There is another fact to which I wish to draw your attention. It is a very well known fact that our doctors are very reluctant to go to the villages. Now if the villages did offer all the cultured amenities of life that we are used to in Delhi and elsewhere, in towns, there would not be the slightest reason why these doctors should be so unwilling to go to villages but they are extremely unwilling to go to villages. What does that indicate? Our villages have no roads. The other day I was just worrying about village sanitation. There is, I was very glad to find, a very good article in the recent issue of 'Social Welfare' dealing with Kerala. I am greatly interested in sanitation and one of the most important problems of sanitation is the question of village latrines. That is very important even from the point of view of food production. So far as food production is concerned, as you know very well, what a drain the problem of food has been on our foreign exchange. We have been spending lot of money in getting food from outside. It is really a shame to an agricultural country like ours. Yet

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.] what is the basis of this? The basis is that you don't know how to utilize our waste properly, how to create manure out of human and other wastes. And the other point of course is that of water. But here I am concerned with sanitation. I was concerned to point out that in Kerala they have invented a village latrine which costs only Rs. 2 and nothing more. They are a very intelligent people—the Kerala people—and they have invented a latrine which could be constructed only with Rs. 2. At any rate, that is what your Social Welfare states. Now I ask the Community Projects Administration as to what they have done so far as village and environmental sanitation is concerned. The other day hon. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur was here and I asked her whether in the Community Development Blocks enough provision was made for village and sanitary latrines. She said 'No, not at all'. Now what other criticism shall I make of the management of the Community Blocks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister—the Finance Minister—has presented to us a Budget—what he calls a pedestrian budget. I don't know exactly how he would like us to be humoured by this fancied expression but I have no doubt in my mind that the gentlemen in the Finance Ministry who have produced this Budget are not pedestrians at all. They, from the Budget it looks, move about in fairly big sized cars and that is the reason as to why a Budget of this kind which has very little relevance to reality, could have been presented to the House. I would not personally accuse the Prime Minister about it because I know the circumstances in which the Budget has been prepared but I know it is the Government's policy also and I am not one of those who would like

to take this dish just because it has been served by certain agreeable hands. Hon. Members opposite got up and some of them said that this Budget should not be criticised, for after all, the Prime Minister had prepared or presented it. I do not belong, Mr. Deputy Chairman, unfortunately, to that category of people.

Now, in this budget speech where for once you come across excellence of language, you find:

"How can we in India function with courage and unity and grasp with strong hands and stout hearts at this future? It has been given to us of this generation to face mighty problems and to achieve great results."

But, reading the Budget proposals and especially the analysis of the situation, I felt that the hands were shaking and the heart was failing, when it was given to us or when it was prepared.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have been given in a separate note, an economic survey of the situation, for the year 1957-58, and I will have some remarks to make about this economic assessment that has been made in this survey. Sir, but before I start on that, I would ask the hon. Finance Minister to consider whether it is not desirable for him, in view of what I would say, to send the officials who have prepared this assessment to the villages and to the areas where the middle class people, live in order that they may live among these people, share their feelings and know their views and thus have a better grasp of the reality. The human picture is completely lost to the hon. gentlemen who have been at pains to draw up a picture of the economic situation in the country. I do not know, Sir, how we are going to tackle the problems that face us if we lack the courage to face realities that stare us in the face. This is the question that I put to the Prime Minister. If the situation is bad, let us squarely face it. Then let us put our heads together and find out and evolve a common solution, in order to climb out of the difficulties.

that beset our path. That should be the approach. But here you find a totally complacent performance in estimating what the situation is like. That is not the way to tackle the problem. And yet in his Budget speech, the Finance Minister said:

“The crisis through which we are passing is a crisis of development, the crisis of resources.”

I should say this is right, but I would not stop there and I would say, Sir, that the crisis through which we are passing is pre-eminently a crisis of policies of the Government and I think the time has come in the third year of the Second Five Year Plan to be self-critical and with open mind, with eyes wide open, to consider and examine the policies of the Government and to see whether they do not require some readjustments and changes. In our view, Sir, some of the policies have got to be changed if we are to forge ahead. There is no other way out. You can mark time with this kind of a budget. You can continue with these policies, with this kind of proposals that they have made. But the country will be driven to the darkness of crisis. I can tell you that much.

Let me come to the economic assessment that has been made here. Here, Sir, I would like to say that I tried to study and understand not only the expressions that have been used there, the statistics that have been given, but also the mind that has been behind it all, and I was completely at a loss to understand anything, because if I were to ask—to use the Prime Minister's language—a pedestrian in the street, just after office hours or before office hours, or after factory hours or before factory hours, then ten out of ten of them would say that here is an assessment of the economic situation which does not relate to the realities of life. On the contrary it fights shy of facts. This is what they will say. Now, that kind of an assessment has to be abandoned.

First of all, let us take the food situation. I suppose we are passing through a crisis in the food situation. Even if the Government would not otherwise admit it, it is admitted when you see the mounting imports of foodgrains from abroad. I think the Prime Minister said in 1949 in a radio broadcast, if I remember aright, in June, that he expected India to be self-sufficient in the matter of food by 1951. Then of course, he said he felt sorry that he had to eat his words. We do not want the Prime Minister of our country to eat his words. Neither do we want the people of our country to go without food. In one case the eating of words should stop and in another case the eating of food should continue. Here I just give you our assessment of the situation. Sir, we have tried to assess the food situation and I should like to be corrected by the hon. Members of the Government and more especially by the Prime Minister if I am wrong. Sir, according to us, in Rajasthan the crops have failed and many villagers have been affected. The official statements indicate that in the last year 3·7 million people were affected by the food scarcity. In Uttar Pradesh, especially in the eastern districts there was a serious food situation. About 50 per cent. of the crop in Uttar Pradesh failed, with a loss of five to six lakh tons of foodgrains. And the human suffering I would not relate here because it is well known. In Bihar the food Minister revealed that there was paddy failure of 50 per cent. in a number of districts, in about 14 districts, and in some districts the failure was even as much as 65 to 70 per cent. In West Bengal, Sir, the food situation is grim. There, according to the latest official statement, the deficit in production is very heavy. You can understand the seriousness of the crisis there. And then, Sir, even in Rayalaseema area the food situation is bad. In Kerala there is food deficit because of lack of production. There they produce more commercial crops. And in Orissa again the winter crop is expected to be only 17 lakh tons as against the normal yield of 20 lakh tons. Then in Maharashtra the food

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 situation is again bad. The food situation in Maharashtra is getting more and more critical and one-third of Maharashtra falls within the scarcity area. Thus if we take the fourteen States of India, in most of the States we come across mounting deficits in food production and the food crisis is lengthening its shadow over the land. That is the situation. But where do you find that here in this assessment, in this survey? None at all, you find nothing of it here. The food situation today is not merely one of some plus or minus, of some deficit or surplus in production. It means a critical situation and terrible human suffering. Millions upon millions of people stand up in over lengthening queues of starvation and hunger for a morsel of food. That is the picture today.

That is the picture today. Starvation deaths take place in U.P., Bengal and other States and people are becoming destitutes. Where we should see smiling faces in the countryside in the third year of the second Plan, we find tears. We find people lining up as destitutes; we find people thrown about in the streets trekking towards the city in quest of life. That is what is happening and I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister to tell us why that grim dismal picture of human agony is not reflected in what is supposed to be an economic survey for the year 1957-58. Then, Sir, food deficit means again heavy imports. It is maintained that in the second Five Year Plan period the imports would be about 6 million tons but today we are thinking of importing 3 million tons in one year and it is the hon. Members of the opposite Party, the leaders of the Congress, who were saying that the imports may cost us about 1,200 if not more crores of rupees. That is the position. Every year the import goes up but production is not going up and whatever has been the increase it has not been much. I am not one of those who deny some improvement that has taken place in the food production but there is nothing to write

home about. Even if you look at this report, you will find that in 1953-54, the food production was 68.72 million tons; in the next year, it was 66.60 million tons; again in the next year, 1955-56, it was 65.29 million tons and in 1956-57, it was 68.69 million tons. It has more or less been steady. There has been some decline but on the whole there has been a slight increase. There is no denying that; but then, how is it that the yield has been so negligible or so slow? One has to ponder over this problem. In this connection, I might also mention that many economists and statisticians in the country feel that this is not the actual yield at all. They say that the actual yield would be much less because the increase that is there has been only a paper increase because of better statistical coverage of actual food production. I am not going into this at this stage but, even assuming that this is the actual yield, the gain has been very very small and we note that the deficits are going up year after year. Therefore, from the point of view of production, we have to consider this thing. We are all for increased food production but there again we come up against certain policies. I shall come to that later. Here, imports cost money. Where we lose very heavily on foreign exchange, how can we rebuild our country quickly especially when the heavy load of food deficit is on our backs and we are crushed under these deficits, if hundreds and hundreds of crores of rupees were to be dissipated in importing a commodity which could be produced in our own country? I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister to answer this thing. If it goes on, then the other things will decline and there is no escape from this situation. Now, Sir, the question of food prices is an important one because the pivot of the price structure in the country is this and all other prices somewhat revolve round food prices. Food prices are ruling high. Even this morning, the hon. Deputy Food Minister, while answering certain questions, gave us some idea of the food prices, Rs. 20, Rs. 18, Rs. 21, Rs. 25 and so on. In

the first instance, these prices are too high for the common man to buy the adequate quantity which he requires for his calorific needs and, secondly, they influence the prices of other commodities in an upward direction. Therefore, here again, we are faced with a problem. From whatever angle you judge, the food problem has become an acute national food problem; the food crisis is a national crisis in a way and I think we need to wage an all-out war against this crisis in order to solve this problem. There is not even a recognition of the problem. This economic survey report contains statistics and all about that but that statistical information is full of "buts". I do not know how many "buts" are here; it becomes difficult for a man in his common sense to ignore some of the facts but there are intelligent people in this world who immediately add a "but" and get away from the responsibility that follows from a recognition of a fact. That is what we find in this. In this connection, I would like to tell the hon. Finance Minister this thing not because he is the Finance Minister but because he is the Leader of the country and also the Head of the Government. Now, Sir, I repeat that the food problem cannot be solved until and unless we tackle the question of agrarian reforms. Much has been said about agrarian reforms though not at Pragjyotishpur. For once I heard Congressmen at Pragjyotishpur telling the truth, the home truth. I liked the hon. Member from Andhra in the Congress Party who got up in Pragjyotishpur and said, "what was the land reform?" Many others said that it had taken ten years to realise that these reforms had led them practically nowhere. Now, it is a good thing when good people recognise facts. It is a good thing after all. Here again, land reforms are very important. The hon. Prime Minister has expressed his feelings against evictions but evictions do take place in the country. His words had been flouted by his own followers in the States. Now, Sir, evictions had taken place, as is well known. The hon.

Prime Minister was indignant about the voluntary surrenders and he made certain public remarks but it seems that those who are at the helm of affairs in the State of Hyderabad would not listen to him. It seems that there are Ministers in the Congress Party who would not only not listen to us but sometimes would not even listen to their own leader, namely, the hon. Prime Minister. The problem of land revenue has to be gone into. What we stress is that land should be given to the tiller of the soil. There is no escape from it; once you give land to the tillers of the soil, you would begin to reorganise your agriculture, create the labour incentive and a new life would spring in the countryside and you shall see the results. Until and unless this is done, not much will have been achieved by this kind of land reforms that we have had so far. The Prime Minister is fond of telling us about the community development projects. The community development projects have their own utilities and benefits; I do not deny but there again you will find that the increase in agricultural production in the community development project areas has been much less than the national increase taking the country as a whole. There has been increase of 10 per cent. in the case of the community development project areas as against 27 per cent. taking the country as a whole which is the national average. It does not speak well of the community development project areas. I think we should review this from this angle. The community development projects, whatever they may offer, would not offer a solution to this problem for the simple reason that there the land does not go to the tiller of the soil. Therefore, what is important is not to parade merely the statistics about the community development projects or to describe how fine they are, what a revolution is going on in the countryside and so on but to ensure that the land is distributed among the tillers of the soil. What we find today is that even the wasteland is not distributed among the tillers of the soil. In the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

country today there is a lot of wasteland which, if distributed, would make a material difference to the food situation. Now, I need not go into these figures here; here, I would like to only point out one thing. According to our calculations, 95 millions acres of cultivable wasteland are there. Why is it not distributed? It is possible to distribute all this land by vigorous measures among the peasantry, among the tillers, the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers. Why is it not being done? Fifty-five million acres of fallow land are there and this again is not being distributed. Let the Government answer. This is about the food situation. Then, Sir, reference has been made to the situation on the industrial front. There again you will find a rather disquieting admission that the tempo of development in the industrial sector is falling, whereas the tempo should be higher, continually higher. Now we have reached a stage when the rate of industrial development in the country in the middle of the second Five Year Plan, a Plan which is supposed to industrialise the country, registers a decline; everybody should be alarmed at it. Now, Sir, I doubt whether the Government realises the implications of this rate of fall in the industrial output. This is stated in their document.

Then again I shall point out here that industrial relations are very important. But industrial relations are becoming worse day by day. In very many fields nothing is being done to improve the position and you cannot have your industrial sector fulfil its function in a developing economy until and unless industrial relations are adjusted. You will find that in 1954 there were 840 disputes, in 1955—1,166, and in 1956—1,263 disputes. This is an indication that something is very fundamentally wrong in the industrial sector. I hold the capitalist stars, the monopolists especially and their friends the ruling party responsible for creating dislocation in industry and provok-

ing disputes. It is the policy of denial, the policy of lockout, the policy of intensive exploitation of the working people, the policy of all kinds of service conduct rules, these are the policies that spoil industrial relations and bring about a situation which nobody wants.

Then, Sir, unemployment is growing. Whereas we are told in the second Five Year Plan that eight million new employment opportunities would be created, according to the estimates of the employment exchanges in the country which reflect the very nature of the economy in the industrial sector, unemployment is swelling. There are many more unemployed people today than at the beginning of the second Plan. I would ask the Finance Minister not to try to evade the issue but explain as to why such a thing is happening.

In West Bengal, for example, unemployment is growing at the rate of 1·2 million per year—I am quoting the official figure. Now this is the picture. Whereas we should solve our unemployment problem, move towards it, unemployment is growing in the country, and there is not even an effort to arrest it.

Now, Sir, let me come to some other aspect, the price aspect. To show that the prices have fallen they have made a wonderful comparison. I do not know whether the gentlemen there think that we are a bunch of children in the kindergarten to be treated to such kind of statistics. Read that statistics and you will find that there has been hardly any improvement in the price situation. See how they make the comparison. They quote the wholesale price index number of August 1957 which is 112, and then they quote the January wholesale price index number, which is 103, and they tell us that improvement has taken place. They have forgotten that January is the harvesting time when prices tend to fall, and August is the lean period when the prices rise. Is that

the comparison that you have to make? Then you will find in the previous column, if you take December 1956 the price index number was 105 and for January 1958 it was 103. Where is the improvement? Now that has been mentioned; the comparison has been made; a strange comparison has been made. Well, I do not know if they make such comparisons where they will land themselves in. I can understand their difficulties, isolating Mr. Mundhra from his concern. I can understand their difficulties but this is how they proceed.

Now, Sir, the prices of the intermediate products and finished products have not shown any decline at all, and yet we are told that prices have tended to fall. This is what they say. It is an entirely wrong analysis. Even if you take the wholesale prices, if you ask the consumer, if you ask even the retailer, they will tell you that the price position is as precarious as it had been, and there is no sign of improvement whatsoever. Where is that recognition? On account of the high prices the people are suffering. I would ask the people who are working around here whether their conditions of life have improved. The working class cost of living shows no improvement. The collections from small savings are showing a decline. Still the hon. Members of the Government opposite would have us believe that the price situation has improved. Well, are they kidding with us? I would ask them: This kind of kidding with the public should stop and they should face facts.

✓ Now let me take the wider field, other aspects of their economic policies where there has been no change of policy whatsoever. There is the private sector. There is Mr. Mundhra. But Mr. Mundhra has done one good thing. He has focussed attention on the private sector when others are hiding. While he burnt his boat he blew up the Finance Minister. Well, in that scandal all blew up. We saw it. But one good thing came out. The private

sector was before the gaze of the public. Now what has happened? Such things are happening. They do not care to find out until and unless you get a Mr. Feroze Gandhi to divulge the facts or some other hon. Members here. I shall give you a small scandal from the facts and figures I am in possession of, and you will see how things are developing there.

Now, Sir, I am not a scandal-monger. Still I shall relate a scandal. Now, as you know, Sir, the Dalmias owned the Bharat Bank. It is well known, the Bharat Bank was owned by them.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): It is a scandal?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Originally. It does not exist now. Dalmias owned the Bharat Bank. This bank could not get on well and it never gave any dividends since 1943. Later on, when it was in an absolutely tight corner some of the offices and the assets of the Bharat Bank were transferred—the Punjab National Bank acquired them. That is how it was done—the Punjab National Bank acquired this thing for about ten crores of rupees. But all its property was not bought and certain things remained with the Bharat Bank. Then, in order to obviate certain difficulties Bharat Nidhi Limited was started by the Dalmias and the Bharat Nidhi Limited tackled the properties, the remaining properties of the Bharat Bank. In 1950 the investments in the Bharat Nidhi amounted to 70 lakhs of rupees and our information is—the Central Government can find it out—that this Bharat Nidhi began to finance the Dalmia concerns, the Dalmias, obviating the company law and other banking regulations through the mechanism of the Bharat Nidhi, which became an investment corporation. The idea was to circumvent the statutory regulations that apply in the case of banking institutions. Then, Sir, what happened? Then the Dalmia scandal came up. A commission was appointed

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
to enquire into the Dalmia undertakings, as you know, and the matter is being tackled elsewhere—I am not going into that.

Then what did they do? They set up an Industrial Investments Limited, investments with an authorised capital of one crore of rupees but a paid-up capital of Rs. 50,000, a company with an authorised capital of one crore of rupees and a paid-up capital of Rs. 50,000 only! The Industrial Investors Limited then purchased the shares of the Bharat Nidhi and commenced business. The Industrial Investors Limited got its commencement certificate on the 21st of October, 1954.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What has the Government to do with all this?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. Let me come to that. They will come at the fag end of this scandal; not before. First Mr. Mundhra, then Mr. Patel, then Mr. Krishnamachari . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must hold the Government responsible?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will see that; coming; wait a little. Wait a little, coming. Government is coming. Government will not be caught so redhanded as has been done in another place. We are talking about the resources for the Plan. Then, Sir, after the commencement of this thing what happened? These shares of the Bharat Industrial Investors Limited were financed by one gentleman. Now, people say that he is, in the language of the common man, Dalmia's bank. I do not know who is whose man. Mr. B. P. Bajoria financed the Industrial Investors Limited and Industrial Investors Limited at once acquired shares of the Bharat Nidhi and this is what was done. About 9,90,000 shares or so, partly paid up shares of Rs. 10/- each, were transferred. They were

selling in the market at the time between Re. 1/- and Rs. 1/7/-. They were transferred to the Industrial Investors Limited at four annas per share—four annas per share suddenly. Then, after having transferred the shares through the Bharat Industrial Investors Limited, Bharat Nidhi, for the first time declared its maiden dividend of two annas per share. That was followed in the two successive years . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we are not concerned with all this . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are concerned here with it . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned here with what private companies or private persons do. They are not here. We are not concerned here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not going to accept that position. I shall say how the resources of the country . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can fully criticise the responsibility of the Government . . .

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is my trouble always with the Chair. I want to criticise the Government, but not in vacuum.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not private persons who are not here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Mundhra was a private concern . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. So far as the Government is concerned, you can criticise. Please listen. You first show how the Government is concerned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. I demand my right. I criticise the Government for not applying the Company law . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I do not allow persons who are not here . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: According to the company law, I can criticise . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You kindly listen. I cannot allow you to criticise persons who are not here. You have mentioned names. You first fix the responsibility of the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir . . .

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You must obey the Chair. You fix the responsibility of the Government. You can criticise the Government. I will allow you, but not private persons who are not here to defend themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot understand what you are saying. Can I not criticise the private sector, I would ask the Prime Minister.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I understand from his speech that the provisions of the company law have not been complied with with regard to the floatation of the capital. He seems to say that . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He must have first fixed the responsibility of the Government. I will allow him to criticise the Government to any extent. He cannot go on giving 1950 figures, 1951 figures regarding private companies which have nothing to do with the Government.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: How the company law had not been administered . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with the company law.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am making a submission. This time should not be included. I wish you listened to me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You first show me how the Government is concerned with it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a minute. I have understood that. Don't you see that I criticise the Government? You cannot accuse me of not criticising the Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know you are an adept in it; the whole House knows it and the country knows it.

You have every right also to criticise the Government. But I do not want you to criticise the people who are not here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know whether the People's Representation Act has any provision for the private sector . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a well established Parliamentary practice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I tell you how I am doing. Please listen . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I cannot allow you to go on like this. You must adopt some parliamentary principle.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have adopted. I leave this matter to the Privileges Committee. I stop here. It is a question of privilege. It is for the Privileges Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. You raise a question. I shall see about it. You can criticise the Government, but not private persons.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am entitled, first of all . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wait.

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI (Uttar Pradesh): I take exception, strong exception to the attitude of the hon. Member towards the Chair and when the Chair wants to stop at a particular moment, or give some ruling or give some advice, the hon. Member must submit to it. Otherwise, the decorum of the House is seriously injured, I submit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am grateful to the hon. Member, but I am trying to impress upon the Chair in my own language, not in his.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): May I just submit that it may be possible for the members of the Government to reply to a charge which is made in regard to the policies pertaining to the governmental actions. It is not possible for us at all to say anything about the private affairs of a particular concern....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what I have been trying to impress upon him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What I am trying to tell, is this. Income-tax has been evaded. The Company Law Administration has been by passed and it was the duty of the Government to prevent such manipulation. The law has to be changed. This is the point. Otherwise . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you can say that the Government has not been able to find out the people who have evaded tax, but not go into the details of private persons. I am not allowing such things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, Sir . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't mention any names. Don't mention the names of persons who are not here to defend themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Bharat Nidhi, as far as I know, is not the name of any human being.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, you have mentioned so many names.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Be relevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These things cannot take place until and unless certain Government policies have loopholes and they are taking place through the evasion of certain laws.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may mention the loopholes. You may mention the failures of the Government. But do not refer to private persons who are not here to defend themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have understood. I have every right to criticise private sector and I have every right in the budget discussion to pillory, criticise, castigate private sector, monopolists . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can criticise the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will particularly criticise the Government for appeasing them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, criticise the Government, I will allow you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have I or have I not the right . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have understood you.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI J. S. BISHT: The hon. Member has got every right to criticise a matter of policy, what the Government policy should be with regard to private enterprise.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all right.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But not to bring in individual cases, there must be thousands of private companies, private companies run into lakhs. He has no right to bring in individual companies, unless they are here to defend themselves.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Leave it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am grateful again to Mr. Bisht, but if I just mention, you will call it propaganda. But if I quote from the copy of their balance sheet, you will say it that I am barred by Parliamentary procedure to criticise it. Well, Sir, I do not know where do I stand. Now, Sir, I am criticising. It seems the pull of the private sector is too great. Anyway, let me end here. Here is the thing. Moneys have been manipulated. Then in three years Government should have stopped it. Now, you will see that first of all the banking regulation has been evaded. Then, Company law has been evaded. Then, I say, why these things have been . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: How they have been evaded?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because if the rest of the properties of Dalmia, the Bharat Bank, had been run as bank, they would have come under the banking regulation. When it became the Bharat Nidhi, some of these measures of the banking regulation did not apply. Transactions took place. Then, when the Government delayed, when the Government started the investigation into the Dalmia concerns, in order to evade, this concern, the Industrial Investors Limited, was started, but the shares were sold like that. Here, I would ask the Government to enquire into this thing in order to see . . .

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): May I submit this? The hon. Member says that the Government should enquire into this thing. For these very particular things, the hon. Member knows that a Commission of Enquiry has

been set up, under the Commission of Enquiry Act, and all the Dalmia concerns are the subject matter of the enquiry. I do not know what the Government has to enquire and how does it come . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will tell you. In this Industrial Investors Limited, Dalmia does not appear at all. There is this snag.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can send all these to the investigating Commission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. Then, instead of being elected to Parliament I shall indulge in . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is telling you that they have already appointed an investigation Commission to go into the question about all these.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that. But the Industrial Investors Limited is not technically a Dalmia concern. Dalmia does not appear there. Somebody—Mr. Bajoria—the name I have given, he has financed it. According to the people he is Dalmia's man, though technically, legally, he is not so. I would ask him to take that particular concern under investigation—the Industrial Investors Limited. Shares have been transferred there, the moneys have gone now to somebody who is outside the pale of the investigation. Now, three years' dividend has been given. Now, blank transfers will take place and these shares—9,90,000 shares—will again go, because Mr. Bajoria has got what he paid. Four annas he paid and in dividend he got six and a half annas. It will go in blank transfer, when we shall be whistling. That is why I would ask him to enquire into these things and find out as to how this transaction took place. Sir, I am very sorry to say one thing. I do not like to irritate people, and least of all, you. And I am very sorry if I have done anything . . .

4 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you are relevant, you won't irritate me. I want you to be relevant, especially when you are the leader of the Opposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I am always relevant, but somehow or other we do not seem to be relevant to each other. So, Sir, this is what I say. Let them make enquiries about this matter.

Sir, here I have got a certified copy of the balance-sheet. They can get it. They have got more money, and they can examine this. Now here is the Birds Investments Limited. And what is the Government's policy. Well, I am not concerned with this thing as such. But here you will find in the Report of 1957 that the Allahabad Bank Ltd. advanced Rs. 43,62,408 against securities, the market value of which was Rs. 14,18,170 on the 30th of September. I would like to ask the Government as to how, in view of the Government regulations, the Allahabad Bank could advance to that particular concern, the Birds Investments Limited, an amount which is almost 300 per cent. of the amount of the securities. I would like to know that. We are told that the banks should keep a margin, under the Reserve Bank Regulation, of 40 per cent. or so. But here we find so much money having been advanced. Again, Sir, you will find that against the securities and shares of Rs. 17,99,600 an advance was made by the Allahabad Bank to the tune of Rs. 37,68,640. How was it possible? What happened to our banking laws? To whom was it advanced and why so much money is being advanced by a scheduled bank, and what is the Reserve Bank doing? This is all that I am putting before this House. You advise the scheduled banks not to advance against securities without keeping a margin so that in times of emergency.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: Is it a primary security or a collateral security? Sometimes, it is a collateral security. I request the hon. Member to explain that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What has been stated I have stated here. You can enquire into it. My complaint is that despite your regulations, the scheduled banks are advancing . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants to know whether it is a primary security or a collateral security.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I read the whole thing. I have already said what the market value of those shares amounted to. This is all that I find. Now whether it is collateral or not, I do not know. But this is a holding company and you know that a holding company has shares in various other concerns. Now how the money is distributed or administered, I do not know. I think this matter also calls for a little examination.

Here, Sir, I would only suggest one thing. The banking industry has to be nationalised. This is my point, because until and unless we nationalise the banking industry, we cannot find the necessary resources and cannot control the money market and the economic situation in any way. Now, Sir, the scheduled banks in our country control about Rs. 1300 crores to Rs. 1400 crores in deposits of all kinds, and these moneys are left in the hands of the private sector which is connected with the monopolistic concerns and from amongst whom the Mundhras come up, some flamboyant and others not. But Mundhras nonetheless come up. It is in their hands that so much moneys is left. Therefore, Sir, it is very important from the point of view of ensuring economic development that we nationalise the banking industry for two reasons, firstly that we can get control of the economic resources that lie with them, and secondly we will be in a strategic and commanding position to control and influence the other economic trends in the country for furthering the industrial development of the country. This is what we suggest. Nationalisation of the Imperial Bank is by no means enough, and there again you will find, Sir, that the State Bank today is patronising the monopolistic element, and investigations

will reveal that the State Bank of India has been one of the biggest backers of the Mundhra concerns. Rs.6 crores to Rs. 7 crores have been advanced by the State Bank to the Mundhras against securities and shares many of which are supposed to be undependable and spurious. This is what I say. Sir, it is therefore important that the Government should do something about it. Then, Sir, about the Jessops undertaking, we have suggested that it should be taken over and nationalised. Workers have already demanded it. Sir, the moneys are being utilised for speculation. The Jessops' resources are being utilised for speculation. We are not amongst those who separate the presiding deity from the show. We cannot leave it at that. Sir, therefore it is important that you should take control of the Jessop concerns and nationalise them. TELCO should also be nationalised and that is how we should proceed. Similarly, Sir, the coal mines also should be nationalised not only because of the disasters that are taking place, but enormous resources that lie with the coal mines and managements should come within the reach of the Government. That vital sector of our industry with so much of resources should not be left in the hands of these few monopolists who are mostly Britishers, if we really want to develop our national economy. This is my suggestion.

Then, Sir, about foreign investments, one of the contributions of the former Finance Minister has been to create the climate, as they call it, for foreign investors to come in. By foreign investors they mean the capitalists from the United States of America, West Germany and Britain. Now here, Sir, we have got the report of the Birla Mission. I would ask the hon. Minister as to who authorised this Mission to go. The report indicates that the Mission went there not so much for protecting the interests of our country and for advancing them, but for founding their connections and contact and establishing liaison and also for securing resources for their own ends. Now how much of

foreign exchange has been spent on this Mission, I would like to know. Sir, the former Finance Minister developed a policy of inviting foreign capital. I am not talking about the loan capital or assistance that we get, but foreign private investment. Here we have got the latest Reserve Bank survey and it only shows that the foreign private investment has not been of much help to our country. You know, Sir, that there have been two surveys before. In one survey the foreign private investment stood at Rs. 420 crores at the end of 1955. Then it rose to Rs. 481 crores. Since the last survey in 1953, the net increase has been of the order of Rs. 44 crores. This is what I have got in the year 1954-55. Therefore you will find that most of the money has gone into lines which do not enjoy the priority that we have in our mind. Oil has also taken a considerable part of it. Then, Sir, another dangerous development is this that there is a marked preference for direct managerial control over the enterprise in the selected fields. Now, Sir, two types of investments are there, direct investment and portfolio investment. Direct foreign investment is under the control of the foreigners. That has increased from 83 per cent. to 85 per cent. There has been an increase in that ratio, Sir. Therefore you will find that the trend is not only that the foreign funds are coming forth to be invested in channels which are of secondary importance, for exploiting the resources of our country, but also for securing greater and greater control in certain sectors of our economy. The fact that they do not fully succeed is a different matter, because public opinion is there; the political situation in the country stands in the way, but an attempt is being made. What is much more alarming is that the crisis of the Plan is being exploited by some extreme reactionary elements and friends of imperialist powers in order to entrench themselves and even change the foreign policy of the country. This is even more alarming

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

than the rest. One of the functions of the former Finance Minister has been to orientate and change the policy of the Government in that reactionary direction. Now, you will find that remittances are being made. An agreement between India and the U.S.A. was made last September guaranteeing these remittances, guaranteeing all sorts of concessions. We are suffering from death of resources here, but Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 crores are being taken out of the country every year by way of profits and dividend. The oil companies, you will find, are sending out lakhs and lakhs of rupees every year, and Government does not put a stop to it. In 1956 Burmah Shell remitted abroad Rs. 32.58 lakhs. the Assam Oil Company Rs. 55 lakhs; Standard Vacuum Oil Co. Rs. 10.74 lakhs; Caltex Rs. 10.74 lakhs; Standard Rs. 9.96 lakhs. This is how money is being sent out of the country. Can't we do something to retain this money in our own country in order to be invested for the development of the country? I would ask the Government to stop foreign remittance of this kind. Is it not possible to do so? When we are having so much economic difficulty, when we need to save every farthing, when we are asking our people to make sacrifices, are we to allow such remittances by the foreign exploiters of our land who have no right to be here inside our country? I put that question for the Government to answer.

Then, an agreement has been arrived at with the Assam Oil Company. A rupee company is to be started called Oil India Ltd. and is going to be registered. I would like to know the terms of that agreement before the registration is put through. I would demand of the Government that Parliament should be appraised of the terms of that agreement before the registration is finally made. I am opposed to that two-thirds share. Here you will find that two-thirds share would go to the Assam Oil Co. and only one-third is retained. Who

owns the land? How will the mining leases be affected? All these things are essential for us to know before the country is expected to accept this kind of agreement. I do not like these secret deals. Here an office had been started a long time ago by the Assam Oil Company solely with the object of entertaining some Ministers by having nice parties in the Ashoka Hotel in order to get favourable terms. Reports are published in the journal which comes from Digboi. I do not know whether you have come across any such journal. But I do happen to see these photographs in it of hon. Members and the gentlemen of the Assam Oil making merry in parties in the Ashoka Hotel nodding their heads against each other. No doubt we do not see the actual nodding in the photographs but that is what is happening. We want to know whether this agreement is in the national interests.

Then, I would deal with another aspect of the matter; we are spending on our defence about Rs. 278 crores. This is a very big sum. I am not one of those who would say that the country's defence should not be strong. We stand for a strong defence policy, for proper defence, although we stand for no war at all, no hostility to anyone, but at the same time our frontiers have to be guarded against all possible attacks by gentlemen of those powers who sometimes visit here, say one thing in Delhi, quite another thing in Karachi and quite another thing in Singapore. Against them we want to protect our country. We stand for effective and proper defence. Here you will find that in 1955-56 stores purchased abroad were of the order of Rs. 15.68 crores. In the Budget it will be about Rs. 7,13,15,000. Could we not make our defence industry self-sufficient? We must stand on our own legs. We do not like to rely on those countries who on the one hand give us some arms—I do not know whether they will function in a time of emergency—and on the other hand go to Karachi and say

that atomic bases should be started there. We do not like to treat with the thieves of the Baghdad Pact countries in this manner. They are the people who started the SEATO. They are the people who started the Baghdad Pact. They are the people who are trying to encircle India in order to blackmail and intimidate us by these atomic bases. These are the people who are supposed to help us in building up our defence. Sir, I would not rely on them. Therefore, I demand of the Government that our defence industry should be built up to such a level that it will meet all the requirements of our defence. That is most important. We must completely rely on ourselves for defence equipment. Our defence expenditure is going up but then we are not taking any measures to build up our defence industry. We can produce everything, we can produce Bren Guns, rifles; we can produce every requirement in our own country. Why can't we do that? Let us bend our efforts to that end, so that we can possess a vital and self-sufficient defence industry. Here again, there is the question of drain of our foreign exchange. All this money is lost to us. We should see that this drain declines. This is another point with regard to defence.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken for about an hour.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you. You have been so generous. It is my good luck.

Now, about the resources for the Plan. This is very important I think we must increase our internal resources. Foreign loans will not take us very far. Take this P.L. 480. What is P.L. 480? Does the hon. Minister know about? I am not sure. P. S. is public law. P.L. 480 is public law 480 of the U.S.A. I come across such things in the papers. I read some 123 RSD.—7.

American papers, because we must know the enemies of our country. P.L. 480 is meant to dump American stocks in foreign markets. I do not say this; it is the gentlemen of P.L.—not 420 but—480 who say this. Now, about foreign aid. This is what Mr. Dulles said:

“But I think people feel that if India were to fall under the control of international communism, that would be a major disaster.”

Mr. Dulles said:

“It would be a disaster of the same order as the Communist takeover of mainland China.”

This is what Mr. Dulles said before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to justify the Foreign Aid programme. Am I to understand that the American aid plan is from any altruistic motive or in order to serve their own political ends? Will the Deputy Minister for External Affairs by intervening in the debate . . .

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): She has nothing to do with it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . kindly enlighten ignorant people like me over this simple matter? Now this is how they do. Often it is done. In the United States you read in the papers slander against Prime Minister Nehru, slander against the Defence Minister, slander against our country and at the same time talks about the aid in order to save our country from Communism and in order to save what they call ‘democracy’. This is the position. Political motivation is there behind such aids. Therefore I warn the Government: ‘If you go along that way, you will not achieve any result.’ And what is more, you note that the aid is being utilized not for industrialisation of the country. A characteristic feature of the American aid is that it does not go into the building of steel mills

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
or heavy machinery. It goes into certain channels of investments which are not at all that way, industrial as we understand it. They may be helpful in certain respects. Again, the purpose is so to tie up the Indian economy with the American aid that it is possible for them to exert pressure on our economy and to do a little blackmailing over this country. This is another motive. Now I would warn the Government—I know the Prime Minister will say 'I don't care'. I know the Prime Minister will say that and I well understand his position because I think he can say this thing but, well, if others come into the scene, the pull of the strings will be too great for them to resist and I am not sure if some of them would not like to dance in the same way as Mr. Suhrawardy and Mr. Mohammad Ali had been dancing across the border. This is my fear. This is only my fear but I think this should be feared by the Members opposite also. American aid we should be careful about. About resources, I have said that internal resources have to be augmented. I am very glad that gift tax has been introduced.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: What about the Rs. 45 crore aid from Soviet Russia?

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO (Andhra Pradesh): Ask the Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Since some of you are allergic to Soviet Russia, I refrain from any mention of it.

(Interruptions.)

The Soviet Union does not make such statements. The Soviet Union wants to build up India.

(Time bell rings.)

I come to Gift Tax. You remember you appreciated that. You will appreciate when I say that we had been

the advocate of gift tax. We have been advocating it along with other taxes. It is good that it has come but after having taken the decision that the gift tax has to be introduced, the hon. Finance Minister began to think about, I believe, the big men; the donors who give Rs. 1 lakh as gift to their wives will be exempted. Rs. 1 lakh of gift to wives will be exempted. I don't know how many fortunate wives there are in the country who can look forward to a gift of Rs. 1 lakh from their husbands.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You have not married and you can't appreciate.

Shri BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member might possess one.

DRI R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): He is a bachelor and he is feeling jealous

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I don't know but exemptions have been made and you will find therefore that whereas Prof. Kaldor estimated that Rs. 30 crores would be available that way, they now expect only Rs. 3 crores. I can only say that too many loopholes and reservations have been made. The exemptions have been too wide in order to exempt many people. Here again a change should be made in this matter so that we get a lot of money.

Then charitable institutions are there, take charitable institutions. I know of industrial concerns in the country, monopolists who set up charities in certain Rajasthan areas and other places, make their sons and daughters beneficiaries and they get away with this kind of thing and avoid all kinds of Government laws. I can understand some kind of charities but these are fraudulent charities and the beneficiaries of these, the trustees and others, are all family arrangements and these are made in order to avoid Government laws.

Then comes gold. The gold with the rich people should be tapped. This is very important. Gold with the rich—not with the small man—but with millionaires. I don't know what gold Mr. Mundhra possesses but I think it is necessary to go after such people and the Birlas and Tatas, and get some gold from them and you can utilise that. Keep them as reserve for the country till we need them either for meeting our foreign exchange obligations or for backing up our own currency. This is another point.

Reserves of firms are not being tapped properly. Some loopholes are there and as you know, taking over deals are taking place in the country. One management retires in favour of another by paying very heavy amounts and control is being secured by them. This should be stopped and the Government should get at the reserves. The Company reserves are a big source of finance for the Plan. It is important for the Government to try to find this. It is very very essential for the Government to change the policy, modify the policy in this regard and improve upon it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Two suggestions. Regarding taxation, the common people deserve some reduction in taxation. They are groaning under heavy taxation. I don't know how you feel the burden of taxation but I am sure your chauffeur suffers from heavy taxation, your clerks suffer from heavy taxation, your stenographers suffer from heavy taxation, your other people who attend to your work at your home or office suffer from heavy taxation, the peasants and workers suffer. There should be relaxation of the heavy taxation and instead, the Union excise duty has come up from Rs. 170 crores some 3 or 4 years back to about Rs. 300 crores. It also needs the same thing.

The hon. Minister for Rehabilitation is here and that is the last point that

I wish to make. It is a human problem. I hope he will recognise that his policy in the Rehabilitation Ministry has been a Himalayan failure—a Himalayan failure at that. He is very happy. He smiles. But I don't see the smile on the faces of the emaciated refugees with sunken eyes who today are living in the Sealdah station struggling for life. I don't see the smile in that humanity—2,15,000 of them who are condemned to live their lives in a place called the camps, which should otherwise be called 'Ghettoes'. This is the position.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: He smiles at the absurdities of the exaggerated remarks that the Hon'ble Member has made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (*Pointing to the Member behind him*). He advises me to ignore you. I am very sorry.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): That is the difficulty. You are surrounded by wrong advisers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That should be your gain because I don't retort to it. Now many displaced persons, 4 millions of them are in Bengal today and half of them have not been rehabilitated in land. They are wandering in the streets and nobody is there to look after them and people in authority frown upon them. That is their lot. And now they have cooked up what they call the Dandakaranya Scheme. Sir, I do not know what Hanuman would have felt if he were alive today and heard of this Dandakaranya Scheme. I don't know. But the gambling with public funds will go on. I understand Rs. 100 crores have been sanctioned to do something there which they do not define, to rehabilitate refugee persons, whereas it is possible in Bengal to do by exploiting the resources there and by exploring the possibilities there to rehabilitate the uprooted Bengali people in their own environments. We are not on principle against going

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

outside. But before we leave our hearths, before the Bengali people leave their homes, before they go out to new environments, which are somewhat strange to them, and having regard to the mental condition of these people who have come because of the folly of the Government today, Sir, it is essential to make every effort to see that they are rehabilitated in Bengal. But the hon. Minister would not even listen to us. I suggest let there be a conference of the representatives of all the political parties and all refugee organisations in Delhi, presided over by the Prime Minister of India, in order to discuss this question *de novo*, the entire question of rehabilitation of the East Bengal refugees. I beg of this House to show sympathy to these people. I do not speak from any narrow angle, but today, Sir, you have in Bengal, East Bengal refugees numbering 14 lakhs out of a population of 2·5 crores and they deserve some sympathy from you. The whole problem should be tackled as national problem. The whole problem should be raised to that level and I think hon. Members should in honour be bound to solve this problem. It should not be faced, Mr. Deputy Chairman, as a problem of the West Bengal people. It should be viewed as a problem which we all have to face and which we have got to solve. So I would suggest this thing. You will be surprised to hear that there is a mill where out of the 640 men, as many as 411 are refugees; but that mill is now in the hands of the Receiver and it may be closed. I don't know what will happen then to the refugees. Why can't the Government take it up and run it as a co-operative concern, so that the workers, these refugees may make a livelihood? Why not divert some money from this Dandakaranya Scheme which nobody knows what it will produce, for industrial development in West Bengal, with special emphasis on refugee resettlement in order to help them? It is possible, Sir, but they do not discuss these things with us. Dogmatism is the line of the Government's

policy. Once they decide on a thing, they go ahead no matter what happens to humanity. I would, therefore, tell the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister,—without any reflection on the hon. Minister for Rehabilitation—that the time has come when we should raise this problem from the level of a State problem to the pedestal of a national problem and to seek a solution on the national level, by the combined efforts of all those who mean well and who wish to see these refugees properly settled. This is my last point that I wanted to make. I have said many things, but I hope the hon. the Prime Minister who was here present for a while would consider some of these things. I say this, but not with much hope. But I remember one thing. The former Finance Minister said that . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The former Finance Minister said that . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. Mr. Khanna will now reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The former Finance Minister said he was not going to talk to Communists, that he did not understand our language. I think the Prime Minister will at least understand our language. I wish that he would understand what I have said and make necessary changes in this discredited policy of the Government which has created this crisis.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, made certain remarks that you are not relevant. They are derogatory remarks and I submit they should be expunged.

AN HON. MEMBER: He said: "You are not relevant to me and I am not relevant to you".

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Sir, I support the observations made by the hon. Member, Shri Bisht. Mr. Gupta was

heard to say "You are not relevant." He said, "I am not relevant to you and you are not relevant to me." That is a reflection on the Chair. It is not a question of Mr. Krishnamoorthy Rao and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, but of the dignity of the Chair and decorum of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So long as I am in this Chair, he has to obey me. That is all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can the Chair be relevant to an irrelevant person?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, it is my ruling that should prevail here and not yours.

THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA): Mr. Deputy Chairman, my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta spoke for quite a long time, but towards the fag-end of his speech he also made a brief reference to the burning problem of the day, in his own words, I mean the problem of the rehabilitation of the displaced persons in West Bengal. Sir he has made certain observations for which I feel I should intervene at this stage so that there is no misunderstanding on that account.

My hon friend said that there should be a certain amount of sympathy as far as this problem is concerned on the part of the Government and the treasury benches. I do not think, Sir, there is any country in the world today which, depending upon its own resources, has done so much for the displaced persons as the Government of India has done. We have spent up till now over Rs. 300 crores on the rehabilitation of displaced persons from Pakistan. Not only that, Sir, the Budget that has been placed before the House by the hon. Finance Minister is indicative of the fact that even this year when we are faced with serious problems, with financial problems, when we are taking money

from foreign countries, as far as rehabilitation is concerned, a sum of over Rs. 30 crores has been provided in the Budget and of that over Rs. 23 crores are being allocated for the rehabilitation of displaced persons from East Pakistan. That is not a small sum of money.

As regards tackling this problem on a national basis, if Shri Gupta is not carried away by his eloquence and if the facts are not entirely distorted, I would like to refresh his memory and tell him that it was only on the 21st of January that a conference of the Chief Ministers of various States was held in Calcutta, his home town. But unfortunately, he spends most of his time here in Delhi pining for the fate of these unfortunate people in West Bengal, while I spend most of my time there. There, Sir, who presided over this conference?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Heaven alone knows what would have happened if you had spent your time here.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: That conference was presided over by the Home Minister of the Government of India. Who attended this conference? The Chief Ministers of the various States of India attended it and every one of them came forward willingly and cheerfully to take this human load. Why? Because they feel that these are unfortunate persons who had to come away from their homes simply because of a political fact, the fact of the partition of the country. In spite of the fact that every State is over-saturated, in spite of the fact that the food problem is acute and there is the agrarian problem, there is the problem of the kisans, there is the problem of the cultivation of the land, that the land is not enough even to meet local requirements, the Chief Ministers of the States have come forward and they have said, "We are prepared to take a quota of the displaced persons from West Bengal with a view to resettling them." So this problem is being dealt with not on a

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.]

purely Bengal, Assam or Tripura basis, but it is being dealt with on the national basis.

This is a problem which is being tackled not only by the Chief Minister of West Bengal, by the Chief Minister of Assam and by Tripura but by the Chief Ministers of all the States under the guidance of our Prime Minister and our Home Minister. Sir, he talked about the misery of the people in the camps. I have visited these camps and no Minister can be proud of the fact that nearly three lakhs of displaced persons are living in camps but let us face facts as they are. In 1954, the number of persons in camps was only about a lakh; in 1955-56, six lakhs of persons came to India from East Pakistan, six lakhs in two years. The average was about 25,000 persons a month. What were we to do then? Leave them on the road side, let them starve and die? No, Sir, we took over two lakhs of displaced persons into the camps and the population went up from one lakh to three lakhs. Today, Sir, we are spending practically on each displaced person at the rate of about Rs. 25 a month. Each person costs us Rs. 25 a month. Even a baby, an infant, a new-born, gets rations, about 75 per cent. of the scale and the rest get the cent per cent. Each family costs us, if you take a family to be about four to five persons, about Rs. 100 to Rs. 125 a month. We are paying to each displaced family about Rs. 100 to Rs. 125 a month. We give them food; we give them clothing; we give them shelter; we give them medical aid and we give them education. Not even that, Sir, if marriages are to be solemnised, we give them money. Unfortunately, if they go to the next world, we even pay for the cremation. Today, the Government of India is spending roughly about eight crores of rupees. My daily expenditure is about Rs. 2.25 lakhs on relief alone, on the relief of these displaced persons. Has the Government of India ever grudged a penny? No, not a penny has been grudged and this too, in spite of the difficulties, both finan-

cial and otherwise, the country is faced with. Everytime I have gone to the Prime Minister who now happens to be the Finance Minister he has helped. I must say to the credit of the former Finance Minister that he told me and he said so openly, "I may cut here and there but where the misery and the sufferings of the human beings are concerned, you can depend upon me to do my best" and he did stand by that commitment. I am very anxious that these people should be rehabilitated. I do not want them to stay in camps a day longer but what am I to do? I have got to create a vacuum and there is no vacuum in the State of West Bengal. In this truncated State of West Bengal, two-thirds of which has already gone away to East Pakistan, we have got 32 lakhs of displaced persons. Thirty-two lakhs is not a small number. The number of persons who have come from East Pakistan is 42 lakhs. Those of us who came from West Pakistan were about 50 lakhs. The number from East Pakistan cannot be equated with the exodus from West Bengal in terms of the vacuum because in this case there is no vacuum. In our case, it was a two-way traffic. There was exodus from West Punjab and there was exodus from East Punjab, there was exodus from Rajasthan also. When there was a slight exodus in the early stages from Bengal, we had the Nehru-Liaquat Pact. I am proud to say Sir, that we honoured every time of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact faithfully and loyally. We stood by the commitments of our hon. Prime Minister. We opened our gates and even those who had left Bengal and had gone away to Pakistan, came back but not a single Hindu went back from Bengal to East Pakistan. Even the few who did go, never got back their lands or houses. The result was that even the small vacuum that was created was filled up. Early in 1949-50, we advised our friends, our own nationals, to come back and we are proud of this fact, Sir, that ours is a secular State. In this State, we are proud of only one fact and that is that our minorities today can live with dignity, security

and honour. That is not the position in Pakistan. Though all the Hindus and Sikhs have come away from West Pakistan, barring a few in Sind, conditions in East Pakistan are not even quiet today. I do not say they are as bad today as they were in 1956 but who knows. The speeches that you read every day, the speeches of the former Prime Ministers, the speeches of the present Prime Minister, the speeches of those who want to get back into the *gaddi*, have got one thing only and that is this that they go on provoking the unfortunate minorities there and creating difficulties for them. What I am trying to say is this that we are not taking cognizance of these things. We were the first to abrogate the Evacuee Property Law in spite of the fact that the property that we left in Pakistan was of the value of over Rs. 500 crores and the value of the property left in India by the Muslims was only about Rs. 100 crores. In spite of this, we abrogated the evacuee property law in 1954. After the 7th of April, 1955, not a single national of India could become an evacuee though it was only lately, when practically everybody has been thrown out of Pakistan that the evacuee property law has been abrogated. Now, our approach to this problem is an entirely different one. Ours is a human approach; ours is a secular approach and ours is not an approach that is based on politics or narrow religious considerations. What I am trying to do is to request my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, to face the facts as they are. Where is the vacuum? If I want to create a vacuum in Dandakaranya, he feels agitated. Why does he feel agitated? Why? He has just said that we have more than 50 per cent. of the refugee population in West Bengal still not rehabilitated. I accept this version. Money is there; money has been round. When we can spend eight crores only on relief, won't I like that money to be diverted to rehabilitation? But, if there is no land, I cannot create the land. If there is no vacuum, I cannot create a vacuum. So, we tried to create a

vacuum in that region called the Dandakaranya, part of which belongs to Andhra, part to Madhya Pradesh, and part to Orissa. On the one hand, he accuses me that the problem is not being dealt with on a national basis but when I go to the Chief Ministers of these States, when I want their lands, when I want to spend money on the development of that area and have a sort of an integrated development, he laughs at us, he ridicules us and says that if Hanuman would have been alive today, God knows what would have been his feeling. I tell him that our approach is a human approach; we also wish that this problem is resolved. The approach of his party is only political. His theme is . . .

(Interruptions.)

Now, listen to me. His theme is that this problem should not be resolved. We have tackled this problem very successfully in the Western region. We will have more time and more resources to concentrate on the refugee problem in West Bengal, Assam and Tripura. Sir, I spoke in this very House not long ago about the political approach to the problem. This time last year they created trouble in Betiah in Bihar. (Interruption.) Do not laugh. It is all right. They created trouble for me in Betiah, things were very bad, people were starving, they were naked, they were famine-stricken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think trouble follows him like the fire in Hanuman's tail.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sit down, don't disturb him.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: Usual slogans. We have heard them enough. Elections were about to take place in Bengal and things had to be manipulated and manoeuvred. He talks of the public sector and the private sector. Let me talk of the human sector, how you play about with human feelings and sentiments and how you exploit them.

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.]

They created a situation for me in Patna when everything was being done for them. I can quote their leaders going from camp to camp, holding meetings and instigating people, "Please do not go out of Bengal. We will launch a resistance movement. We will not allow a single person to be taken out of the State of West Bengal." In Bengal there are no lands. So naturally this problem will never be resolved. So they created a situation for me in Betiah. 10,000 people marched out of Betiah and came to Bengal. I was warned by the State Government that things were getting out of control. I said, "I know it is a law and order problem; you are the people to deal with it but please see that nothing untoward happens," because it was the wish of many people that at the Patna station or in the Betiah camp there should be lathi charge, there should be tear-gassing and there should be what not." Trains were held up at the Patna station. People were dragged out, the normal passengers, so that my refugee brethren, the innocent brethren from Betiah, could board the train and go back to Calcutta. Sir, they did come. I allowed every one of them. I said, "Let them go." The elections were over in March. In the beginning of April who should come to me? All leaders of the Opposition parties. My friend was one of them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When did I go to you?

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: Please sit down and hear me. They said, "Time has passed. Things are bad. Will you do something for us in Betiah? They have been here now too long. They are starving on the streets of Howrah. They must be taken back."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say that.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: Just wait. I said, "No; Betiah is a very bad place. I would like a delegation of yours, my friends of the Opposition parties, to go to Betiah. I

will see that all arrangements are made for you. Go and see things for yourselves and come and tell me what is wrong with that camp." Sir, they came back and I must say to the credit of one of them that he sent a very nice letter thanking the Government of Bihar for the courtesy extended to them and for being taken round and shown round the place. I did not move a single brick. All the 10,000 persons did go back and they have stayed there since. After the elections were over, after the voting was over, the national problem, which was a very great human problem, or possibly a political problem, was at once resolved and everybody went back.

Now, Sir, he talks about the Sealdah station. No Minister, much less me who has to stay in Calcutta, can afford to see human misery and human suffering because, on the one hand, Sir, we are spending crores of rupees and we are grudging no relief to these unfortunate brethren; on the other I can never forget the fact that I happen to be one of them. They may have come from east. I come from west. But I know what human suffering is; I know what human misery is. I know what it is to be torn away from one's roots, fifty years of my life having been spent in Peshawar in certain surroundings amongst certain people. If you are at once torn away and taken to any other new surroundings, I know it is very difficult to adjust oneself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you are not in Dandakaranya.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: It is all right planting new saplings and all that, but re-planting big trees is very difficult; I know it. I have the feeling; I have the sentiment; so I do feel for all of them. My heart bleeds. But what is, Sir, Sealdah station? Now at Sealdah station, Sir, those persons who possibly cannot even claim that they are displaced persons, they are squatting on Sealdah station. I think their number is about 50 per cent. Some say that "we" have no

migration certificates at all. Some have deserted from within the State of West Bengal itself, and they have been squatting there for nearly a year now. They were squatting there even before, Sir. A year back, about November or December, 1956, we cleared the Sealdah station. Everyone of the families that was there was taken away. Some I took outside and some I put in camps and I started feeding them. And after the Sealdah station was cleared, within two months of it, the place has again been filled up, and if I want to arrange a procession and take them to the Writers' Buildings, whom am I to draw upon? If I want to take people to Wellington Square, just opposite the residence of the Chief Minister, where am I to go? And if as a friend of his, that I happen to be, I happen to stay as his guest in Bengal and if some demonstration has to take place outside my house, when at short notice he cannot get some friends from West Bengal, he has got to have my friends who are at the Sealdah station. Thus, Sir, they are paraded about.

Now, Sir, I would like to make him an offer and this offer I want him and his party to very seriously consider though I place very great emphasis on planned rehabilitation, because taking these two or three thousand families from the Sealdah station would mean that those whom we are arranging to remove from the camps and want them to be rehabilitated in a planned manner, their rehabilitation would be stayed behind, and we will be placing a premium more on unplanned rehabilitation than on planned rehabilitation and also on creating other problems. Actually it will be opening the door to this, that you come and sit down before my house, sit and make demonstration, create a little bit of fuss and then ask Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to brief their case in Parliament and speak in a sort of a very emotional manner so that "we" can be rehabilitated and even if "we" have got a loan before, "we" can get a second dose of loan, because those

who are in Bengal itself or some of them who have come away from other colonies, they have already received their loans; they have received full rehabilitation assistance. Now they come and squat outside Sealdah station. So my offer to him would be this. I am prepared to take up the question of the clearance of the Sealdah station with the State Government but I want him and his other friends to give an assurance that tomorrow if there is a fresh squatting they will stand by me and see that the Sealdah station is either kept clear or if there is squatting again they will come and stand in line with me and see that those are removed. I want him to consider this seriously because if by my clearing the Sealdah station I am again going to invite the same trouble tomorrow there is not much sense in my making that offer today and to me as the Rehabilitation Minister it makes very little difference if out of the three lakhs of persons whom I have got on my hands ten thousand of them are at Sealdah station and two lakhs and ninety thousand of them are in camps because, for me, to all intents and purposes, if they are eligible displaced persons they have got to be taken care of. So I would very much like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to discuss this matter with his friends. I am willing to discuss with him in Delhi. I am willing to discuss with him in Calcutta, but I want a categorical assurance from him and his party, a public assurance, that if any future squatting takes place, his party will come and join with me and the State Government and not again ask me to take charge of them after six months.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: May I know if the new squatters come from East Bengal and squat there?

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: So far as East Bengal is concerned, their exodus is hardly any these days.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it a fact that 60,000 people on the other side are stranded and have been

awaiting the issue of migration certificates?

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: It is a fact that during the first six months of the year 1957, when the rate of exodus was about one thousand with the great agitation that he and his friends had been launching about the issue of migration certificates we took the decision in Darjeeling about not giving any relief to any future migrants. That was the recommendation of the Darjeeling conference. The number has gone down to 500. Previously the number was one thousand; now the number has gone down to 500 because people in East Pakistan now know that by coming to India they are not going to get Rs. 5,000 or possibly five acres of land plus a housebuilding loan, plus a loan for bullocks, plus a loan for maintenance, and then having stayed here they cannot possibly do what they want to. Even the mental reservation is there that whenever "we" take this loan, this is more a grant, and there is no question of repayment. Sir, you will be surprised to know that out of the loan that we have advanced, the recovery is not even 5 per cent. Not even 5 per cent. I am talking of the persons who have taken contributory loans, men who are well placed in life, who want to have better types of houses, who are Government servants, who are people belonging to the middle-class. The position unfortunately is this now, "Heads we win; tails you lose. Keep the door open. Let everybody come into West Bengal." There is no vacuum in West Bengal. You cannot rehabilitate them in West Bengal, and if you cannot rehabilitate them in West Bengal, we will go on accusing the Government. Of what? Of apathy, no sympathy; no money. It is a cruel Government. It is an inhuman Government. And if I take them outside, "Oh, no. You can never be taken out of Bengal" because the moment a Bengali is taken out of West Bengal, is taken to Dandakaranya, his culture is destroyed, his

language is destroyed, he loses his footing; his future is absolutely doomed . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I make a submission to the Chair. He is not saying what I said. This is not what I said. I said, 'Explore the possibilities of West Bengal.'

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: My time is up. I will be finishing with only one thing and that is this, I have to see that the community life of my unfortunate brother who comes from East Pakistan is kept intact. For the displaced persons that I take out of West Bengal, I see that not only a Bengali social worker is provided, but I also see that a Bengali doctor is provided, I also see that a Bengali teacher is provided. I also see that they do not go in small numbers. I try and keep their community life intact. But Bengal has reached the saturation point, two-thirds of Bengal has already gone to Pakistan, thirty-two lakhs of persons have come into Bengal, the density of population is the highest, the unemployment problem is the acutest—it suits my friends. He wants to turn it to his political advantage—but I do not. His policy is political; mine is human. That is the difference. The difference lies mainly in this thing. Although he says all that, his outlook is only political. Mine is human. So, my problem being human, I can assure you, and through you, the last speaker, that my resolve is that I shall try and see that this problem is resolved before the end of the Second Plan period.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Friday.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 7th March 1958.