

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HINDUSTAN CABLES (PRIVATE) LTD., 1956-57

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (1) of section 639 of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy of the Fifth Annual Report of the Hindustan Cables Private Limited for the year 1956-57, together with a copy of the Auditors' Report and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India thereon. [Placed in Library, See No. 591/58.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE CONTROL OF SHIPPING (CONTINUANCE) BILL, 1958

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Control of Shipping (Continuance) Bill, 1958, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th March, 1958."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

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

SHRI M. C. SHAH (Bombay): Sir, this is a Budget for the third year of the Second Five Year Plan, and therefore, Sir, we have to look at it in the perspective of what we have to do and what we have to achieve. We, in Parliament, decided to raise the national income by 25 per cent. in the Second Five Year Plan period. We wanted to double the national income by 1971. In the First Plan period we had raised the national income by

18 per cent. and the *per capita* income by 11 per cent. In order to raise the national income by 25 per cent. we must invest about Rs. 7,200 crores in order to make an income of Rs. 2,700 crores by 1961. On these assumptions, the Second Five Year Plan was based. Certain physical and financial targets were fixed. We had decided to go ahead with our Plan, whatever the sacrifices that we may have to undergo. Unfortunately during the first two years the assumptions did not tally with the actuals. We had decided to import on an average Rs. 870 crores worth of goods or so and we had to export on an average about Rs. 600 crores worth of goods. And we had calculated that the foreign exchange gap would be about Rs. 1,100 crores. Unfortunately, because of so many factors like natural calamities and the prices of foodgrains having increased and other international factors, all those assumptions did not prove to be correct. We wanted to import in the first two years about Rs. 1,750 crores worth of goods. Instead of that, what we find is that Rs. 1,070 crores were spent on imports in the first year and Rs. 622 crores in the first half of the second year, and we do not know what would be the actual figure at the end of the year. It may be assumed that it may come to about Rs. 1,000 crores or so. So there is that difficulty.

Further, Sir, about the food production also we could not achieve the targets laid down. Though in 1956-57 there was an increase of 5 to 6 per cent., the present year is a very bad year, and we have been obliged to import foodgrains to the extent of 35 lakh tons in the year 1956-57 and to the extent of about 36 lakh tons in 1957-58. We have already spent about Rs. 101 crores in 1956-57 for importing foodgrains and for the half year we have spent about Rs. 88 crores. All told, for the whole year it comes to about Rs. 130 crores or more, and as a matter of fact, according to the assumptions that we had made, we

had to import foodgrains to the extent of Rs. 240 crores for the whole Plan period which means about Rs. 46 crores a year. Instead of that, we will be spending about Rs. 230 crores or so, that means almost the entire sum that was provided in the Plan. And therefore in the first two years we found ourselves in difficulties. But, Sir, those were the difficulties which were not foreseen. Therefore we cannot find fault with the Government on that account. Unfortunately we had to import such a big quantity of foodgrains, and over and above that, we have had to provide about Rs. 30 crores either as a subsidy or as a loss which will have to be recouped from the revenue account for the next ten years. We had first provided for a subsidy of Rs. 25 crores, but unfortunately because of the recommendations of the Finance Commission, we had to give about Rs. 34.5 crores to the States and there is now a very small surplus. Therefore Rs. 30 crores will have to be taken over under suspense account or whatever it might be and every year we will have to write down Rs. 3 crores from revenues. So, Sir, there have been strains and stresses in the economy of the country, and I do not agree with my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, who said . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** (West Bengal): Not even now?

**SHRI M. C. SHAH:** He said that when he went through the Economic Survey and the detailed proposals, he felt that the hands were shaking and the hearts were failing. I am afraid my learned friend has not studied the Economic Survey very very carefully or with an open mind. If he had read the Economic Survey for the year 1957 and if he had done so with an open mind, he would have certainly admitted that it is a very lucid, clear and almost correct appraisal of the economic trends of the last two years.

**SHRI H. N. KUNZRU** (Uttar Pradesh): Why 'almost'?

**SHRI M. C. SHAH:** There might be something here or there. Anyway, it is a correct appraisal of the economic trends of these years. They have not hesitated to say what are the difficulties and what are the strains and stresses in our economy, and they have also said something about the policies and the corrective measures that have been taken. They have not hesitated to say that there is always a pull towards the inflationary pressure and therefore we have suggested certain ways also. Therefore, Sir, we can very well say that the Economic Survey and the budget proposals had rather steadier hands and stouter hearts. We have obtained independence, and we have now to obtain economic independence. We cannot halt and we cannot stagnate, but we will go forward in spite of difficulties and problems here or there because we will have to make sacrifices and we will make sacrifices. The country is prepared to go ahead under the leadership of our Prime Minister.

Then, he said that the Government's attitude is not realistic with regard to the food situation. He said that there was no mention about it. It has already been stated that the Government are very conscious of the food difficulties. All possible steps are being taken, and the States have been activated in taking all possible actions. If there are difficulties on account of natural calamities, we cannot help it. Therefore, though we have gone through some bad years, the situation during the last three or four months is rather improving, and we can hope for better times next year. The third year is going to be an year of difficulties, there is no doubt about it. Probably the foreign exchange difficulties may have to continue for the next five to ten years, because the difficulty is that we have to curtail imports but at the same time we have to increase our exports, and there are a great many difficulties about increase in our exports. The other day the Deputy Finance Minister said that today there are recessionist or depression tendencies in the U.S.A. and the

[Shri M. C. Shah.]

European countries, and that may effect us, who are producers of raw materials. Therefore, there will be a difficult situation, but it is not beyond control. There has been very good improvement in the economic situation, during the last three months or so and the money market is rather improving.

About the balance of payments also, the position has changed. From a deficit of Rs. 9 crores a week, it has come down to Rs. 3 crores a week, and I have seen in the reports that last week or the week before there was rather a surplus of Rs. 2 crores in the balance held in foreign countries by the Government of India. But there is no gainsaying the fact that we have to exert ourselves to the utmost in so far as production is concerned. Agricultural production has fallen and we will have to activate that sector and meet the needs of our people. So far as industrial production is concerned, there has been good improvement. The index rose from 113 in 1954 to 122 in 1955 and further to 133 in 1956. This year, in 1957 also it is estimated that the increase would be about 4 per cent. Though during the last few months production has stepped down, I am sure that production will go up. Therefore, there will be difficulties, and we will have to be very careful about production, and at the same time we will have to be very careful about any increase in unplanned consumption. We will have to save. We have been able to save in the year 1956-57 about 7 per cent. of the national income, but we will have to save about 11 per cent. of the national income in order to achieve the targets in the Second Five Year Plan. When the Plan was evolved, we had estimated that its **cost would be about Rs. 4,800 crores**, but on account of so many factors it has gone up. The cost must have gone up by nearly Rs. 800 to Rs. 900 crores, but the Government has decided to stick to the financial target of Rs. 4,800 crores. Naturally, there

will be some reduction in the physical targets. Possibly very soon we will be given an idea by the Planning Commission as to how we propose to maintain the developmental tempo, maintain production and also maintain the expected rise in national income and provision of employment to 8 million people. These are very difficult times; there is no doubt about that, but as the Prime Minister said and correctly said, the crisis through which we pass is a crisis of development, a crisis of resources. My learned friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, said that it was a crisis of policies. What policies? I do not understand him. It may be that there is a difference in approach. We want to achieve our goal of a socialistic pattern of society by democratic and peaceful means. We do not want to be authoritarian; we do not want to adopt those methods. Otherwise, it is possible with those methods to achieve spectacular results for the time being, but we want to have a solid foundation on which we can construct a beautiful edifice in our country. Therefore, I say that we will have to be very careful so far as production, particularly agricultural production, is concerned. So far as production in the industrial sector is concerned. I am sure that it will be maintained; there is no doubt about it. **So far as the private sector is concerned**, they had to spend about Rs. 700 crores in modernising and in new plants. Already they have got these Rs. 700 crores.

Unfortunately, there was a very liberal import licensing policy in the year 1956, and this is one of the main reasons why we experience difficulties so far as foreign exchange is concerned. Now, the Government have already taken steps to see that this liberal import licensing policy is not followed. As a matter of fact, Government will have to be very careful about their licensing policy. Licences will have to be confined only to those capital goods in industries which are either foreign exchange earners or foreign exchange savers and

as far as possible on deferred payment basis, instalments to start only when the industry goes into production, saving foreign exchange or earning foreign exchange. As far as participation by foreign capital is concerned, it should be in consonance with the policy laid down by the Government to the extent of the foreign exchange content only. We will have to strictly follow these things. If we do not, then there is a possibility of our facing difficulties. With regard to the import of consumer goods, they will have to be kept to the minimum, to what is absolutely necessary. Otherwise, there will be difficulties. We have turned the corner so far as foreign exchange is concerned, because we are getting foreign assistance in time. Still, if we do not follow these principles, we will again face difficulties.

Now, a few words about taxation. The Prime Minister said in his speech:

"I believed then, and I believe now, that this was right direction us to travel and that we should continue to pursue this path. With experience we may no doubt make changes here and there and advance further in that direction, but I think that the major steps that we had taken last year have to continue."

Sir, I wholeheartedly endorse what the Prime Minister has said, but from experience it appears that, without affecting the revenues, we might give some relief to the people who are in need of some relief. For example there is this excise duty on cotton cloth. This was aimed at two objectives, when this additional excise duty was levied in September, 1956. The first was to mop up the extra profits and the second was to inhibit the consumption of cloth so as to allow more export of cloth. These two objectives have been achieved and that is well and good. But the industry came to difficulties and then there was a great deal of agitation from the textile industry. So the Government were pleased to remit this additional excise duty of 6 pies

per yard on mediums and at that time it was announced that that relief will remain in force only up to 31st March, 1958. But I think there ought to be a clear declaration that that policy will continue for at least one year, that is to say, for the financial year. In the Explanatory Memorandum also it is already stated that the estimates take into account the whole year's effect, for it is stated here:

"The estimates take into account whole year's effect of the increases in duty imposed in May 1957 on sugar, tobacco, matches, motor spirit, cement, steel ingots, diesel oil, vegetable oils, paper, etc. partly counter-balanced by the full year's effect of the relief given this year in duties on medium cloth."

So they have taken into account the reduced income from this duty on medium cloth. But they have not made any announcement. I think if they make an announcement, that will be better. The intention is already there, because they have provided for this half an anna relief in the Budget Estimate. If they make such an announcement also, then there will be a stabilising effect and the relief given will be more appreciated.

There is then another thing to which I would like to refer and that is about this compulsory deposit scheme. When this was introduced last year, it was thought that they will get through it a sum of Rs. 30 crores. The Explanatory Memorandum says under the head Deposits under Income-Tax Act:

"The gross deposits from companies under sub-section (2B) of section 10 of Income-Tax Act, 1922 are now estimated at Rs. 4 crores as compared with Rs. 30 crores in the original Budget. Next year's estimates include Rs. 10 crores as deposits and Rs. 3 crores as withdrawals."

This scheme, really speaking, has been very much modified and they are now taking the compulsory deposits from the current profits. When

[Shri M. C. Shah.]

they got only a sum of Rs. 4 crores, why keep that irritant? There has been a good deal of agitation. As a matter of fact, this is not part of the revenues. The only idea or motive was that this surplus money with the companies may not be ploughed into undesirable channels or into channels which were not within the Second Year Plan. But when only Rs. 4 crores is the income, I believe the time has come when we should consider whether this compulsory deposit should not be withdrawn. After all, by that we are not going to lose a single farthing of revenue. Therefore, I would request the Government to consider this aspect. There will be no adverse effect on the revenue. When you budgeted for a deposit of Rs. 30 crores, you could hardly get Rs. 4 crores. This year Rs. 10 crores are expected, but I am afraid they will get only Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 crores.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Third point?

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Only one point more, Sir, and that is about the bonus shares. The tax levied was 12½ per cent. The Taxation Enquiry Commission did not recommend any tax. We thought when they are just capitalising, then naturally when we are going to levy a super-tax on dividends, this capitalisation might got some benefit. Therefore, it was thought proper then to have it at 12½ per cent. that is to say, 2 annas in the rupee and that was thought sufficient. Last year it was raised to 30 per cent. I do not know the figures, because in the explanatory Memorandum they have not given any figures, perhaps they have not yet been worked out, because the tax was levied only in May last. Therefore, I am sure that there also the income would not be much, perhaps only a few lakhs. I don't know and I would stand corrected, if in reply I am told that this brings in a few crores, and in that case I will never say that it ought to be removed. But nobody can give 30 per cent. in order to give

bonus shares and that fact can be verified from the Company Law Administration to see whether there are applications made. So if there is only negligible effect on the revenue, I think it may be kept at the original rate of 12½ per cent. or 2 annas in the rupee.

Sir, these are the few suggestions that I am emboldened to make in all humility, because the Prime Minister said that from experience we can make some changes here and there. These suggestions only mean changes which would not involve revenue to any extent. With regard to the excise duty on medium cloth, that declaration should be there. Secondly about compulsory deposits, since no revenue is involved, my suggestion may be accepted. Therefore, I appeal to Government to consider all these suggestions on their merit and if they find that they are suggestions worth accepting, I hope then they will be accepted.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, my first reaction after seeing the Budget was one of great disappointment. We had the previous Budget in which the Government had levied a large number of taxes, direct and indirect ones, through which they got more than Rs. 150 crores from the public. On the top of that, in this Budget, instead of giving relief which the public was anticipating in different ways, they have brought forward additional taxes, partly direct and partly indirect ones. The direct taxation you have in the form of the Gift Tax which we are told is meant to plug certain loopholes in the taxation structure which the ex-Finance Minister had introduced in his taxation system. I do not know whether this is going to stop all the loopholes, because, I feel whenever you put a new sort of a restriction on an unwilling mind, you give a chance to that unwilling mind to work devil and create new loopholes. The taxation system, unfortunately, has become so heavy

on the public purse that everybody is trying to evade taxes. Of course, one class accuses another class of evasion of taxes. But if you really go and investigate the thing, you find that almost every class in our community is trying to evade taxation

AN HON. MEMBER: The capitalists.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Some people say that the capitalist class evades it. Of course, that one class is the biggest target and it has been the biggest target. But I know that the professionals and for the matter of that, even politicians have been evading taxes. The only difference is that they are more vocal or perhaps they have hidden themselves from the public eye.

But the fact is there that every section of the community under this heavy taxation system has been trying to evade taxes.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Not indirect taxes.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Politicians have no money at all; it is only the capitalists who have money.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: The capitalists' money is seen whereas the politicians' money and the professionals' money is not seen and that is the only difference. He has whatever income he has and he is trying to avoid payment on that. Sir, what is the cause? The cause is that in different ways, in the form of direct taxation as well as in the form of indirect taxation, the community has been made to bear a heavy burden of taxation as well as in the form of indirect taxation, the community has money, we are told, is to carry out the Plan. A very noble objective. The Plan is for increasing production and for creating more and more of employment so that the standard of living of the people may go up. A very good objective but unfortunately the incentive for saving which is the basis of production is being

retarded under this heavy taxation. We find this reflected in the capital flowing to industry on the one hand and capital flowing to Government in the form of small savings on the other. Why is it? There is a certain amount which the public can save out of the total income and you can get it either in the form of small savings or in the form of taxation which is, to some extent, a form of compulsory saving and it is not surprising that when you are getting money in this form of heavy taxation the savings should go down and that is being reflected in people contributing less and less in the form of savings. The industry is also getting less money for capital, Sir.

What is the need for this particularly heavy taxation? We find that the Indian public have to pay as much as 77 per cent. of its income in the higher brackets. If it is unearned income, it is still more. How does it compare with the foreign countries? I was surprised to read some comparative figures. Comparatively, India stands at the highest level so far as direct taxation is concerned. Let me read some of those figures. In income groups of a little over Rs. 60,000 India pays 40.8 per cent. of its earned income while in U.K. which is considered to be one of the heavily taxed countries, it is 38 per cent., Australia 35.9 per cent., West Germany 35.6 per cent., Canada 28.9 per cent., U.S.A 25.1 per cent., and South Africa still less. There are only two countries which are paying higher taxes in this category. For £7,000 or Rs. 90,000, India is at the top, paying 49.9 per cent. of the income and, as the income goes still higher, the position becomes still worse. In the case of persons whose income is a lakh of rupees, he pays 53 per cent. as against 51.9 per cent. in the Netherlands, 49.6 per cent. in Sweden, a socialist country, 49.1 per cent. in U.K. Every country worth the name is paying much less, France coming to 24.6 per cent. This is the position of direct taxes.

In the same way, Sir, various excise duties on commodities have resulted

[Shri Lal Chand Hirachand Doshi.]  
in heavy taxation on the people and the consequent result is that the capacity for saving has steadily gone down. If one observes the recent trend in taxation, one finds that there is a growing trend in Western countries to keep direct taxation lower because there are two aspects of this problem, one is that it reduces the incentive for saving and, secondly, it creates a sort of feeling in the mind of the taxpayer to evade taxation. Every person does realise that tax has to be paid but when such incidence of taxation becomes heavy, he unwittingly tries to avoid payment of taxes. To avoid this feeling, the Governments in Western countries are trying to reduce direct taxation. You find the same thing in Eastern European countries, particularly in Soviet Russia. What is the condition there? They have kept direct taxation at the lowest level. The highest taxation is not more than 12 or 13 per cent.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh): What is the level of taxation in the U.S.S.R?

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: I am glad I have roused interest in the opposite side.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, you have.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: You always rouse it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the trouble is that in the Soviet Union there is no Mr. Doshi.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Yes, but there are people who earn more income than what Mr. Doshi does. Probably this is a fact which my friend has forgotten.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know what he earns.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Mr. Doshi does not earn anything like Rs. 40,000 a month but there are people there who earn that much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How much does he exactly earn?

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: My hon. friends opposite will not deny the fact that there are people in the Soviet Union who earn more than Rs. 40,000 per month and pay as little as 11 or 12 per cent. in direct taxes. It makes little difference whether you run an industry in the private sector or whether you run the industry in the public sector as long as you are able to make as much and as handsome profits as Rs. 40,000 and more in a country like that. What is the objective, what is the lesson that the people, the Communists, learnt from Karl Marx? They wanted equality and have they achieved that equality in this paradise of Karl Marx?

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI (Uttar Pradesh): No, they have not.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Certainly they have not.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): There is equality among the "have-nots".

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: The inequalities that you can come across in this so called paradise of Karl Marx are so great that before them the inequalities in this country become very small. But why? Having started with Communism in Russia why have they come to this realisation that direct taxes . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: In Russia there is no Communism; still there is only socialism.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: I am surprised that my hon. friend over there is feeling shy of the word Communism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the result of capitalist expansion.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: (Andhra Pradesh): He is influenced by you.

**SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI:** It is not for the sake of fun that they have now adopted these inequalities. They have realised by hard lessons that good incentives have to be given to the people who are working. Human nature being what it is, they have studied human nature and found that unless there are sufficient incentives for a man to work you don't get the good results which you expect of him. I mean, this is the lesson which they learnt after their revolution, and they have reconciled themselves to the fact of having to give very high wages and salaries and scope for more income.

*(Time bell rings.)*

It is only ten minutes, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Fifteen minutes are over.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** He is retiring, Sir; he may be given more time.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** So you take a little more time.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** He represents one point of view.

**SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI:** What I am trying to state and convince my friends on the opposite side who have been making a fetish of heavy direct taxation is that I am quoting from their own bible and from facts pertaining to countries for which they have such enormous love, and saying that there also experience has taught them that too much direct taxation is the negation of incentives and negation of effort to work. For that reason, Sir, if we have to learn a lesson from history and from common practice, let us learn it before we do the damage of destroying the incentive which is so very important in our country which is yet an underdeveloped country and is still backward, and therefore we need much more incentive for our people who have had no opportunity of working, whether he is a small man or whether he is a big man, economically.

Sir, the cost of living in this country has gone up in the last twelve or eighteen months. We have been told that the level of wholesale prices has shown a tendency to go down since August last. But it is not reflected in the cost of living. When it will be reflected in the cost of living it is difficult to know. But since the cost of living has not gone down and since the people have to pay heavy taxes, living has become more difficult, and therefore I would appeal to the Government to look into this question. Not only that, due to the lower purchasing power the purchases are going down, and consequently production is also going down. The case of the textile industry is obvious. We are told that some of the mills have closed down and the reason is mentioned that they are inefficient units. Well, they have managed . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Some of them are guilty of swindling.

**SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI:** Some of them are inefficient and some of them are in the hands of . . . What did you say?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I said some of them are in the hands of swindlers.

**SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI:** Exactly. Some of them are inefficient and some of them, according to my friend opposite, are in the hands of swindlers. I do not deny that, there may be some people who are swindlers. But the fact is that these units have been working for the last fifty years, and it is only now that they have had to close down, and you have got to find out whether these people who have been running these units for the last so many years have become swindlers in a minute. Well, there is a clear case of a textile mill and one very notable in history. The Government took over its management, and what happened? Did the working of that mill improve under Government management? No. It has gone back to the same person again, and with



[ Shri Lal Chand Hirachand Doshi,] Government's blessings perhaps. But the fact has to be borne in mind that these units which have been working for the last thirty, forty or fifty years are closing down with the consequent result that employment, for which we have got this Plan, is going down. And that is not peculiar to the textile industry. We find the same result or the same tendency creeping in other industries too, and if we are not watchful enough, we will find that many industrial units will be closing down with the consequent result that there will be increasing unemployment. *(Time bell rings.)* You may be able to abuse the industrialists, but that won't help you in creating more employment, and if you want more employment, you have to find, you have to create conditions whereunder there is more industrialisation, there is more employment and there is more care taken of the industry and of those who run the industry.

*(Time bell rings.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: All right, Sir. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope it will be an enlightening intervention.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): I will try to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there are only three points that I wish to enlighten on. One was raised by my distinguished colleague from Rajasthan when he expressed his inability to understand what we meant by non-alignment. It is rather surprising, Sir, that after listening to so many debates in this House on India's foreign policy and so many replies by our Prime Minister clarifying India's stand and the policy of non-alignment, a Member

of the House still finds it difficult to understand what is meant by non-alignment. From what he has said, according to him a policy of non-alignment means that if a country does not wholeheartedly support India's stand in international affairs, then our policy has failed. It is a kind of ethics which must be peculiar to the martial race in India, Sir, which divides the world into sheep and goats and accepts the principle that if a country or a person is not with us, that person or country must really be against us. Therefore, Sir, with your leave I will try to tell him that the policy of non-alignment that India pursues in her foreign policy is not the same kind that Rajasthan has in view. All that we say is that it is our policy to be friendly. I am trying to make it clear to the martial representative from Rajasthan. All that we mean is that we pursue a policy of friendliness and friendship towards all the other countries whether they support our policies or not. Our policies are meant not to secure support for individual issues or generally for our foreign policy, but we believe that it is a correct thing for us to be friendly with all the other countries in the world and not pick up quarrels or engage in private vendetta.

The second thing and a more serious point is the problem raised by our friend, Mr. Prasad Rao. Now, the Communists have their own idea as to foreign affairs and . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So have you.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: So have I? Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nothing wrong in it.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: They think that anything that is foreign should be discussed in the House. They have been very bold and categorical as they always are and they want the Government also to be categorical. Every speech is a challenge

to the Government: "Why does not Government of India come forward with a categorical statement? Why does it not interfere in the internal affairs of Indonesia according to what is known as the Bandung spirit? Sir, being a party which professes to be very well informed on international affairs, I would expect that the spokesman of that Party would, at least, know what is meant by the Bandung spirit. It does not mean that we should interfere in the internal affairs of other countries; nor does it mean that Members should rely on newspaper reports for what they regard as authentic information.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Members spoke relying on Dr. Soekarno, President of the Indonesian Republic.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, Order.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Because a short notice question was disallowed, they thought that it was proper to raise it again in the House in the form of a speech on the Budget. Sir, we have also seen that newspaper report and I want to say categorically that the Indonesian Government . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would like, with your permission, to draw . . .

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I think the hon. Member should listen to me. I have listened for hours and hours to his speech without interrupting and now it is his duty to listen to me for at least five minutes.

Sir, we have also seen Press reports that the Indonesian Government was approaching us for intervention with the Western Powers to prevent their interference in the present domestic crisis in Indonesia caused by the Sumatran revolt; but in fact no such approach has been made to us and it is not the policy of our Government to rush to the Press with statements either supporting or opposing or making any kind of comments about what happens in Indonesia or in any other country. Sir, a recent report has

appeared in the 'Times of India' on the 3rd March and it talks about an appeal made by the Foreign Minister, Subandrio at a Press Conference. I must enlighten the Opposition by saying that we have not received any official approach from the Indonesian Government and therefore the question does not arise at all.

The second thing that he said was that the rebel leader has been invited by the Western Powers to attend the SEATO Conference and that we should also come out with a statement or we must interfere or do something . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where is the question of interference?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: . . . to say that he should not be invited . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We can protest against it.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: All right, protest. Now, we do not protest on the basis of mere newspaper reports. I think the Leader of the Opposition thinks very poorly of a Government if he expects it to act on newspaper reports or to lodge protests on international affairs on . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we . . .

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Wait till I finish. Now, I want to come to the last point and that is about the question of Indians in Burma. It is rather unfortunate that the hon. Member from Rajasthan should use adjectives which are not really proper when criticising the policies of a Government. He said that our Government was without guts, without spine and therefore . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): That was not for Burma; not in connection with Burma.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Does not matter; you used them in connection with our policies.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That of course I maintain.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: He has said that before also and the Prime Minister has said that such things should not be used. I am only repeating that warning.

Now, the problem of Indian citizens either in Burma or in Ceylon or anywhere in the world is very much complicated by the fact that these people, although they have lived for generations in those countries, do not identify themselves with the people there nor do they seek their citizenship but they expect that they will be regarded as Indian nationals. When they are compelled to register themselves as citizens of those countries, they will not do that. They do not visit India nor have they any contacts with India. They always state some distant relations or some reason to come to India and then they claim Indian citizenship. Our citizenship laws are clearly defined; so are the citizenship laws of Burma clearly defined. When the time for registration of citizens came and our embassies made special appeal to the people there to register themselves as citizens they either did not want to do that or they wanted to bide their own time and the result was large numbers of people do not know what to do now. They have not got themselves registered but they have obtained what is called foreigners' registration certificates and having secured the foreigners' registration certificates, they come to us for registration as Indian citizens. Naturally certain enquiries will have to be made to find out whether they are really Indian citizens according to our Indian Citizenship laws and this naturally takes time. So the picture is not as Mr. Jaswant Singh has painted. They get themselves registered under the Burmese Foreigners Registration Act and then they come to us and we tell them, 'you cannot be regarded as Indian citizens because you are already registered under the Foreigners Registration Act.' It is not like that. We must try to investigate and find out in

each case whether they are eligible for our citizenship and I am sure the hon. Member who has contributed so much to the Indian citizenship law in this country will know that people are not admitted as citizens just because they apply for it.

He also referred to certain difficulties about registration of Indians in Burma. Sir, according to the latest information available the total number of Indians granted Burmese citizenship till the 31st March is 6,246. The number of applications for naturalisation by our nationals in Burma total up to only 335 up to the end of June 1956 of whom 42 persons have been granted naturalisation. No rejection has come to the notice of our Embassy in Burma. Of course, there are certain delays. They are administrative delays and I think we cannot complain about administrative delays in other countries when such delays are common to all the Governments all over the world. Sir, the Government of Burma have gone even farther than other Governments with a view to expediting matters. For instance, a new Ministry to deal with the issue of citizenship certificates was created by the Government of Burma in the middle of 1957 and now the present rate of disposal is about 300 to 400 a month.

Then he referred to the high rates of fees charged by Burma for registration. But this is not only for Indian citizens or Indian nationals who want to be registered as Burmese citizens but it is for all foreigners who want to get themselves registered. It is true that the rate of the fee has been raised from Rs. 20 to Rs. 100 per annum and the fee for renewal of the foreigners registration certificate has also been raised from Rs. 25 to Rs. 50. I quite agree that this means a great hardship for our people in Burma but these fees are decided by the need for finance by the Burmese Government and there is little that we can do except to accept them.

He also said something about remittance facilities. The Burmese Gov-

ernment have been very friendly towards us and therefore they should treat us in a better way or we should claim better rights for our nationals; that was the argument. I think it is not fair that we should exploit their friendship by making unnecessary demands on that Government. Every time a case of hardship is brought to the notice of our Government, whether it is the case of groups or of individuals, every attempt is made by our Mission there as well as at the Ministerial level to find out whether, by persuasion and by bringing about better understanding between the two Governments, the hardship can be mitigated. And this is being done and

there is no reason why any  
1 P.M. Member of this House whether on this side or on the Opposition should find fault with the Government of India or with the Government of Burma for the changes in their rules which are meant for their own advantage. Just as we have got very strict laws against the foreigners, so are the Government of Burma entitled to have their own laws against foreigners. These are some of the things that I wanted to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Sharda Bhargava.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would like to make . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No second speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No . . .

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) :  
उपसभापति महोदय,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot make another speech. Pass on the information to Mr. Narayanan Nair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Sharda Bhargava. Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have deliberately misunderstood. Here is the bulletin from the Indonesian . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with any bulletins. Order, order. Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a personal clarification. The rules of procedure say that a Member can offer personal explanation . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Shrimati Sharda Bhargava, please go on. Please sit down, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. She is speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I ask on a point of order. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No point of order . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under which rule you are not allowing . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. I have called on the next speaker. Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under the rules have I or have I not got the right?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. There cannot be a particular . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I request, it be recorded that I raised a point of order which was not allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have not heard. I protest against it. The point of order you did not allow. I give notice that the matter should be raised before the Privileges Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have not raised the point of order. You did not raise it.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): He was asked for it; he does not give it.

**श्रीमती शरदा भागवत :** उपसभापति महोदय, हमारे वित्त मंत्री तथा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो हमारे सामने बजट रखा है और उसके ऊपर जो भाषण दिया है, उसमें मुख्य बात जो उन्होंने कही है, वह यह है कि देश में उत्पादन बढ़ाया जाये और खर्च में कमी की जाये। इसमें कोई भी दो रायें नहीं होंगी कि देश का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये और प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को अपने हिस्से के अनुसार खर्चा करना चाहिये और इसी से देश की बढ़ोतरी हो सकती है और देश उन्नति पर जा सकता है ; परन्तु जब मैं सरकार के प्रशासनिक खर्चों को देखती हूँ, तो मुझे यह मालूम होता है कि उसमें ये दोनों सिद्धांत बहुत कम काम में लाये जाते हैं। पहले देश के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने की बात है। सरकार भी चाहती है कि उत्पादन बढ़े। मुझे मालूम है कि अभी जो बजट हमारे सामने आया है, उसमें कोई भी ऐसा नहीं कर लगाया गया है जिसका कि सामान्य जनता पर बोझ पड़े। यद्यपि उसका कारण यह है कि पिछले वर्ष के बजट में जनता के ऊपर कर-भार इतना अधिक हो गया था कि अब उसमें गुंजाइश ही नहीं है कि उस पर अधिक कर लगाया जा सके ; परन्तु मेरी राय यह है कि जिस प्रकार के कर लगाये गये हैं, उसमें यदि कर-भार जन-उपयोगी वस्तुओं पर न हो कर विदेशी शराब या विलायती सामग्री आदि के आयात पर कठोरतम होता, तो वह भारतवर्ष के लिये और यहाँ की जनता के लिये अधिक उपयोगी हो सकता था। देश के छोटे उद्योगों को बढ़ावा तभी मिल सकता है, जब कि इन उद्योगों द्वारा पैदा की हुई चीजों पर कर का भार कम हो। जब हम देखते हैं कि हमारे यहाँ विदेशी आयात पर कर इतना कम लगा हुआ है, तो हमें दुःख होता है कि हमारे यहाँ जो विलायती

वस्तुयें आती हैं उनको हम प्रोत्साहन देते हैं।

यही नहीं बल्कि मैं सरकार के एकाध उदाहरण भी यहाँ उद्धृत कर सकती हूँ। जब भी कोई सरकारी जल्सा होता है या किसी प्रकार का राष्ट्रपति-भवन में या सरकार के किसी भी विभाग में कोई जल्सा होता है, तो जो मेरे पास कार्ड आता है उसको देख कर मैं आश्चर्यचकित रहती हूँ। हमारे नेताओं ने और हमारे देश ने स्वदेशी के द्वारा, स्वदेशी का नारा लगा कर, स्वतंत्रता ली है। देशी कपड़ों और देशी वस्तुओं के उपयोग की रोज बात करते हैं, परन्तु हमारी सरकार की तरफ से जो निमंत्रण कार्ड आते हैं उसमें हमारे गौरांग प्रभुओं की नकल के सिवाय कोई चेंज नहीं हुआ है। इतने बढ़िया बढ़िया विलायती कार्ड, इतने बढ़िया बढ़िया विलायती लिफाफे हमारे यहाँ उपयोग में लाये जाते हैं कि जिनको देख करके थोड़ी शर्म भी मालूम होती है। क्या हम उन कार्डों का बहिष्कार नहीं कर सकते, क्या हम उस स्तर को नहीं भूल सकते जो कि अंग्रेजों का था ? इसमें दो बड़े अपराध हम करते हैं। एक तो यह कि हम इधर बचत बचत करते हैं और उधर वही चार, चार और आठ, आठ आने के कार्ड और चार, चार या दो दो आने के लिफाफे भेजते हैं। तो एक तो यह है कि बचत का नाम ले कर खूब खर्च करते हैं और दूसरे यह कि देशी उद्योगों के पनपने की बात कहते हुये भी विलायती चीजों का खुले आम सरकार में उपयोग करते हैं। तो मैं वित्त मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहती हूँ कि क्या सरकार सचमुच जो कहती है, उस पर आप अमल क्यों नहीं करना चाहती है ? यही नहीं, बल्कि यदि एक उत्सव हो और उसका तीन दिन तक फंक्शन हो, तो एक-एक आदमी के पास तीन-तीन कार्ड और तीन-तीन लिफाफे पहुंचते हैं। क्या तीन कार्डों का मजमून एक कार्ड में छाप कर लोगों को एक ही

लिफाफे में वितरित नहीं किया जा सकता है ? तो मैं यह नहीं मान सकती हूँ कि हमारी सरकार जो कहती है, उस पर स्वयं भी अमल करना चाहती है । मैं यह भी जानती हूँ कि सरकार में हमारे जो व्यक्ति हैं, वे हमारे देश के नेता हैं और जो जनता है वह हमेशा नेताओं से प्रोत्साहन लेती है और उनकी नकल करती है । तो जब तक हमारे जो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स हैं वे अगर इस कार्य को करना नहीं छोड़ेंगे, तब तक हम या हमारी सरकार जनता से यह आशा करे कि हमारा देशी उद्योग बढ़े और हमारे देश की चीजें ज्यादा पनपें, तो यह आशा करना बेकार है । मुझे याद है कि पिछली दफ़ा जयपुर में मैंने मारल एंड सोशल हाइजीन कांफ्रेंस बुलाई थी और उसके लिये मैंने देशी कागज के कार्ड में निमंत्रण छपवाया था, तो लोगों ने कहा कि अरे, आप ऐसा कार्ड काम में लाती हैं ? आपके पास दिल्ली में भी रोज़ इतने बढ़िया कार्ड आते होंगे लेकिन आपने उन पर ध्यान भी नहीं दिया । कम से कम कार्डों को देख तो लेती कि कैसे कैसे बढ़िया कार्ड आते हैं और उनमें से कोई नमूना निकाल लेतीं और उसी में छपातीं । खैर, उसका जवाब तो मैंने दे दिया था, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि अगर हम छोटे आदमी ऐसी चीजों को काम में लेने लगेंगे तो हमको रोज़ क्रिटिसिज्म मिलेगा और हमको लोग कहेंगे कि क्या जानती नहीं हैं कि कितनी बढ़िया बढ़िया चीजें होती हैं । तो मैं सरकार से यही निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि जिस पालिसी और जिस सिद्धांत का हम आज प्रचार करना चाहते हैं और जिसको हम समझते हैं कि देश के लिये उपयोगी है उसको सब से पहले हमारे नेता अग्रग्राह्य कर काम में लायें, तभी हमारा देश उसकी नकल कर सकेगा ।

अब जहां तक बचत के काम का सवाल है उसके लिये भी मैं दर्जनों उदाहरण दे सकती हूँ, लेकिन समय बहुत नहीं है इसलिये बहुत सारे, दर्जनों उदाहरण न दे कर केवल एक

चीज के बारे में अर्थात् सरकारी गजट के बारे में कहना चाहती हूँ । हमारे यहां जितने मंसूब के बिल पास होते हैं, उनकी एकट के रूप में हमको एक कापी मिलती है, दूसरी कापी हमको गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया गजेट से मिलती है और तीसरी कापी हमको स्टेट गवर्नमेंट गजट से मिलती है । हमको एक बिल या एक एकट की तीन तीन कापियां मिलती हैं और हम एक रख लेते हैं और बाकियों को हम रद्दी में डाल देते हैं या हम उनको फेंक देते हैं, क्योंकि हमको तीन तीन कापियों की जरूरत ही नहीं है । एक ही हमारी फाइल के लिये पर्याप्त होती है । होता यह है कि एक चीज को गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया आज छापती है तो फिर उसी बिल की सारी कापी उसी लैम्बेज में—इंग्लिश में—सारे स्टेट्स में छपती है । अब बताइये कि यह क्या है । कागज तो उतना ही लगेगा मगर प्रिंटिंग का जो खर्चा है और समय की जो बर्बादी है उसमें किसका नुकसान हुआ ? पहले जो गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया का प्रेस है उसमें उसकी कम्पोजिंग होगी, कम्पोज हो कर छपछपा जायेगा और फिर उसके बाद छपा में जो गवर्नमेंट प्रेस हैं उनमें कम्पोज होगा । कुछ लोग कह सकते हैं : “क्या है, रोज़गार ही तो मिलता है । गरीब आदमियों को”, एक पुरानी मसल है :—

“क्या करे ये खाली बैठ कर  
पैजामा उधेड़ कर सिया कर ।”

हम समझते हैं कि रोज़गार इसी तरह से देना है । रोज़ हम बिल्डिंगें बनायें, बना कर तोड़ा करें और फिर बनायें जिससे लोगों को रोज़गार मिल जाये । तो इसमें इकानामी कहां हुई, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया । स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को जितनी प्रतियां गजट की या बिल की चाहिये, उतने ही बिल वगैरह एक ही जगह छपवा कर प्रत्येक स्टेट में पहुंचाई जा सकती हैं और वहां से उनका डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन हो सकता है । या दूसरा उपाय यह भी हो सकता है कि स्टेट जिस जिस को

[[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]]

भेजती है उस उस के एडरेसेज भी आपके पास केन्द्र में आ जायें और वह सेंट्रल गजट डिपार्टमेंट से इश्यू हो जाया करें। इसको बहुत ज्यादा डिटेल् में मैंने स्टडी नहीं किया है, मगर मैं यह जरूर जानती हूँ कि कोई न कोई ऐसा उपाय निकाला जा सकता है। जिससे डुप्लीकेशन और ट्रिप्लिकेशन बच सकता है। सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि टाइम पर चीज नहीं मिलती है। गजट की प्रतियाँ, मैंने देखा है, उस टाइम पर मिलती हैं जब किसी चीज की अवधि निकल गई है। यह हमारी एंफ्रीशियेंसी है। तीन, तीन जगह छपता है फिर भी एंफ्रीशियेंसी नहीं आती है और अगर एक डिपार्टमेंट पूरा इसके लिये जिम्मेदार हो कर रहे, तो हम कह सकते हैं कि वह अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभाये। अगर हम लोग सचमुच बचत करना चाहते हैं, तो इस प्रकार आपको जरूर कही न कहीं कमी करनी पड़ेगी।

फिर मैं आपको बताऊँ कि जो गजट है, उस पर जो रैपर्स लगाये जाते हैं वे भी बहुत बढ़िया कागज के होते हैं। हजारों मन रहें। गवर्नमेंट प्रेस से निकलती है जिसमें एक तरफ लिखा रहता है। क्या वह रैपर के लायक भी नहीं रहती? मैं यह सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ कि गजट के ऊपर रैपर्स की जरूरत ही नहीं है। गजट के ऊपर थोड़ी सी जगह आप पते के लिये छोड़ दें तो वहाँ प्रिंटिंग मशीन से प्रिंट करके बिना रैपर के वे चले जाया करें। उसमें कागज की जो बचत होगी सो होगी, लेबर की भी बचत होगी।

एक बात और भी है। हर एक गजट पर रैपर लगाने के बाद उस पर टिकट लगाये जाते हैं। अब यह बताइये कि टिकट जो लगते हैं, सिवाय इसके कि डिपार्टमेंटली पोस्ट एंड टेलीग्राफ्स डिपार्टमेंट में इसका हिसाब हो जाता है कि इस इस डिपार्टमेंट के स्टाम्प लगे, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता उसका और

क्या उपयोग है। बाकी अगर हम सचमुच बचत करना चाहते हैं पोस्ट एंड टेलीग्राफ्स डिपार्टमेंट के साथ हिसाब करने में, तब या तो आप गिन कर गजट दे दीजिये या उस पर इम्बास हो सकता है। उसमें आपका लेबर भी बचेगा, स्टैम्प्स भी बचेंगे। अगर सचमुच मैं हम इकानामी करना चाहते हैं, तो सरकार को यह देखना पड़ेगा कि हमारे यहां किस प्रकार फिजूलखर्चियाँ हो रही हैं और उनको हम किस प्रकार से दूर कर सकते हैं।

तीसरी बात जो सबसे बड़ी मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि हमारे यहां जो बजट बनाने का तरीका है वह भी मैं समझती हूँ कि बहुत पुराना हो चुका है। वह पुराना यूँ हो चुका है कि वह हमारे गौरांग महाप्रभु की देन थी। चाहे वे बहुत ही बुद्धिमान रहे हों—हां, बुद्धिमान तो वे थे ही, जिन्होंने इतने बड़े देश को जीत लिया—लेकिन यह मैं नहीं मानती कि उनके हर तरीके को हम अपनायें। आखिर हमारा देश हमारी स्थिति के अनुसार आगे बढ़ेगा। हमारे यहां बजट मार्च में बनता है, मार्च में ही वह स्वीकार हो जाता है, सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट या स्टेट गवर्नमेंट से। उसके बाद डिपार्टमेंट्स को रुपया सैंशन होने का जो तरीका है, फाइनेंस डिपार्टमेंट में कई डिपार्टमेंट में सैंकशन लेने का जो तरीका है, वह मुझे अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि इस स्वीकृति में सारा साल करीब करीब दिसम्बर तक उसमें चला जाता है फिर यह होता है कि तीन ही महीने रह जाते हैं और खर्च इतना करना होता है। आपको हर एक को यह बात मालूम होगी कि फरवरी-मार्च में सरकारी खरीददारी इतनी होती है कि चीजें एकदम महंगी हो जाती हैं। मुझे मालूम है, बहुत से आफिसर्स जो यह नहीं पसंद करते हैं कि हम सरकार के रुपये से महंगी चीजें लें, उनको भी वे महंगी चीजें मार्च में खरीदनी पड़ती हैं और मुझे मालूम है कि पांच,

पांच रुपये की कुर्सी पन्द्रह रुपये में बिकती है। कभी कभी ऐसा होता है कि इतना टाइम नहीं होता है कि टेंडर लिये जायें, तो बिना टेंडर के आफ़िसर्स सामान खरीद लेते हैं। वे ऐसा अपनी इच्छा से नहीं करते हैं, बल्कि उनको खरीदना ही पड़ता है, क्योंकि नहीं तो रुपया लैप्स हो जाता है। मार्च में और फ़रवरी में ख़ूब बित्री होती है। उस समय जो लोग हिम्मत कर के जल्दी जल्दी खरीद लेते हैं, वे खरीद लेते हैं और कुछ लोग जो समझते हैं कि वाकायदा टेंडर लें, यह लें वह लें, उनका सैक्शन लैप्स हो जाता है। बहरहाल हमारे बजट का तरीका यह है कि साल के अन्त में हर एक जो डिमांड होती है, वह लैप्स हो जाने का डर होता है इसलिये यह देखा जाता है कि वे जल्दी जल्दी महंगी सस्ती चीज़ें खरीद लेते हैं। इसमें यह भी होता है कि बाद में वे एस्टीमेट करते हैं अपने एचीवमेंट्स का कि हमने इतना रुपया खर्च किया। इस प्रकार हमें संतोष होता है कि एक लाख का बजट बनाया और उसमें से कम से कम नब्बे हजार खर्च किया। मगर क्यों न हम नब्बे हजार के बदले में जो आया उसको तो नापें तोलें कि वह तौल में कितना है? अतः यथार्थ में तो डिपार्टमेंट में जो सामान आया, इनसे हमारे एचीवमेंट्स मालूम होने चाहियें। मार्च के बाद अप्रैल में उस सामान की कीमत कम हो जाती है क्योंकि सरकारी डिमांड नहीं रहती है अतः उस वक्त मेरे खयाल में शायद आधे दाम रह जाते हैं। अतः यदि अप्रैल में उन चीज़ों की कीमत लगाई जाय तो हमें मालूम होगा कि रुपये के खर्च के अनुपात से हमने बहुत कम मूल्य की वस्तुयें खरीदी हैं।

(Time bell rings.)

इतनी जल्दी टाइम हो गया मेरा ?

श्री उप-सभापति : १५ मिनट हो गये।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : मुझे पांच मिनट और दे दीजियेगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : I am speaking for the first time in this session.

तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि लैप्स करने के बजाय यह चीज़ हो कि जिस दिन से सैक्शन हो उस दिन से साल भर का टाइम दिया जाय। मैं इतनी एक्सपर्ट नहीं हूँ बजट में, लेकिन मैं सोचती हूँ और भी तरीके निकाले जा सकते हैं ताकि गवर्नमेंट के रुपये का वेस्ट न हो और साथ ही साथ उसमें एचीवमेंट्स रुपये के खर्च के स्थान पर खरीदी हुई वस्तु के मूल्य और उपयोगिता से जानी जानी चाहिये। यह चीज़ बहुत ध्यान में रखने की है।

वेतन-वृद्धि के लिये भी हम लोग बहुत पुकारते हैं और मैं भी सहमत हूँ कि कुछ कर्मचारियों को इतना कम वेतन मिलता है कि वे अपने कुटुम्ब का भार नहीं सहन कर सकते और मैं सब के साथ यह आवाज़ उठाना चाहती हूँ कि उनका वेतन बढ़ाया जाय और अगर इस बजट में भी बढ़ाया जाता तो मैं खुश होती, पर साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूँ कि हम वेतन-वृद्धि तो पुकारते हैं, परन्तु हमने यह नहीं कहा कि उसके बजाय कर्मचारी कितना देते हैं। मतलब यह है कि "सिक्क्यूरिटी आफ़ सर्विसेज" होनी चाहिये लेकिन यह नहीं हो कि जो काम करते हैं और जो काम नहीं करते हैं उनको एक ही लेबल पर रख दें। हमारे कुछ सरकारी अफ़सर जो बहुत कांशेंशस होते हैं, जो समझते हैं कि उनको काम करना चाहिये और रात दिन काम करते हैं, उनको खास कोई इनाम नहीं मिलता है। मगर कुछ लोग जो लापरवाह होते हैं, जो काम



[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

की विशेष परवाह नहीं करते हैं उनको भी उसी प्रकार प्रमोशन मिलता चला जाता है। इसलिये हमको कोई न कोई तरीका इस प्रकार का निकालना चाहिये कि जो कांशेंस वर्क्स हैं उनको ज्यादा प्रमोशन मिले, जो काम नहीं करते हैं उनको प्रमोशन न मिला करे और उनसे काम लेने का कोई तरीका निकाला जाये।

उपसभापति महोदय, वैसे मैंने बहुत सारे पाइंट्स इकट्ठे किये थे जिनको मैं कहना चाहती थी, पर मेरा समय हो गया है और जो मैं कहना चाहती हूं वह कह भी नहीं सकती हूं। इसलिये सिवाये धन्यवाद देने के और कर ही क्या सकती हूं।

SHRI J. H. JOSHI (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I welcome the proposals of the Budget placed before this House by the hon. Finance Minister. It has been stated, and rightly so, that this is a pedestrian Budget in the sense that it makes no great changes in the previous one. Now, Sir, because I have only a short time before me I shall offer a few remarks on Defence.

The expenditure on defence in the year 1956-57 was Rs. 212 crores, in 1957-58 it was Rs. 282 crores, and the Budget estimate for defence before us for 1958-59 is Rs. 291 crores. The capital outlay for 1956-57 was Rs. 19 crores and for 1957-58 it was Rs. 25 crores. In the present Budget before us it stands at Rs. 27 crores. Now, Sir, we can see from these figures that there was a steep rise in the year 1957-58. The reasons given for that are that there was so much military aid given by the U.S.A. to Pakistan and also there was a sudden increase on account of the replacement in the Air Force and in the Army in particular. Now we know that in our democratic States this sort of replacement is very essential because of the changes in the military thinking as

well as the advance in scientific and technical matter. Sir, we know that we have to import a large number of articles for arms and ammunition, and after a certain period some of them become useless or obsolete. In countries which are manufacturing these types of arms and ammunition they can make use of those articles which go obsolete or useless, but in our country, where we have to import all these materials, these articles now lie as if they were in a museum. We have to keep space for them and maintain a large army of persons to keep a watch over them. We have some Sherman tanks, then there are some bombers like the Liberator bombers, some Spitfires or Vampire Fighters. When all these go obsolete, we have to keep them away without any use. Now, Sir, this is a matter in which our condition is like a candle burning at both ends. We cannot manufacture them so that we can give employment to the labour, nor can we be self-sufficient in the manufacture of these arms and ammunition. So that is a situation which is a rather embarrassing. But circumstanced as we are, and since it is a matter of self-existence also, we have to do all these things and incur all this expenditure. But, Sir, there is a limit to the capacity of the people to pay towards this expenditure or pay their taxes. Anyway, Sir, the Defence Department is a privileged department of our State and whatever demands are made, the general practice is that they are sanctioned by Parliament or by the State. But, Sir, there must be some ways and we should find out those ways as to how best to meet with this financial situation. The first thing is that we should increase the pace of our production in the defence factories, and the second thing is that as far as possible, we should effect economy. Now, Sir, so far as the defence factories are concerned, I feel that they are not working on business lines. They are just like concerns the object of which is to give out doles to the needy people. I think we should make improvements in the

running of these factories. Then, Sir, so far as the labour is concerned, it is essential that we should inculcate in them a spirit and a sense that they also are the various components of the strong arm of this country. Now I have come to know that in these defence factories also there have been strikes. In 1953-54 there were 25 strikes, in 1954-55 there were 10 strikes, and in 1955-56 there were 32 strikes, and the man hours lost were 7,65,564 in 1953 and 45,579 in 1956. Now, Sir, the strikes or the loss of man hours may do in any other factories, but certainly not in the defence factories. It is a serious thing and the department should see that no such thing happens.

Now, Sir, with regard to the question of economy, there may be a hundred things in which economy may be effected. But what has come to my notice is that hundreds and thousands of vehicles, big and small, are lying in the open, without any cover, exposed to the excessive heat, rainfall and dust or dust-storms. The tyres, the tubes and the machinery are all rusted and we know that these articles have not as yet been able to be manufactured in our country, and all those vehicles become useless in a short time. Sir, notwithstanding the Rs. 300 crores which we spend for our defence budget, it is rather pitiable that we are not able to provide sheds or any cover for such valuable vehicles, and every year we have to import these vehicles from abroad. Now this is one instance in which, as I stated, with an expenditure of a few lakhs of rupees we can salvage all this great loss that is being done.

Now, Sir, next I come to education. It is in direct contrast to Defence about which I made some mention. It is a State subject and the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have just two minutes, Mr. Joshi.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: I shall thank you if you add just three minutes and give me five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then I am adjourning the House. You can continue afterwards. We will meet again at 2 O'clock. The House now stands adjourned till 2 O'clock.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI J. H. JOSHI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I was saying that Education is a State subject. The Budget estimates for the year 1958-59 have placed it at Rs. 29,63,20,000, while last year it was Rs. 24,14,00,000. Much of this amount is spent on scholarships and also for maintaining the universities under the Central Government. There is a general feeling that there is a great decline in the standard of university education. We have been told, and it is quite true, that the country requires unity—emotional unity, political unity and social unity—but these colleges and universities come under the State Governments, and State control. So long as this is so, I am of the opinion that this unity cannot be achieved in a short time. The colleges run by the State Governments are overcrowded. There is no ratio between the teacher or the lecturer and the number of students, and the standard of teaching and examination is declining. Here are students full of energy. We have here the Ministry of Irrigation and Power and we are controlling floods; we are harnessing the big rivers and are irrigating thousands and lakhs of acres of land. But the energy that we find in the students unless it is properly directed, will turn out to be more violent and more devastating than the floods of the Kosi or the Brahmaputra. But if well-canalsed, it will irrigate the soil of the culture of this land and the prosperity of this country. I feel, therefore, that university education should fall under the Central Government, or in the alterna-

[Shri J. H. Joshi.]

tive a Board should be set up representing all these universities, of a federal nature, to keep uniformity in matters of education, examinations and books.

**SHRI R. P. TAMTA (Uttar Pradesh):** Sir, I welcome this Budget because this is a Budget after many years wherein there is no proposal for fresh taxation, which would affect the common man. The common man these days is facing hardship and is leading a miserable life because the cost of living has gone up very high, and moreover there are so many taxes, direct and indirect, which he is finding it hard to pay. Sir, when we look at the general economic condition of our country, we find it far from satisfactory. We see that our foreign exchange resources and reserves have dwindled down. Last year our Finance Minister had to go virtually with a begging bowl round the world. It is true that mainly due to his efforts foreign aid to the tune of Rs. 325 crores we are hoping to get in the near future. But my feeling is that to beg and borrow is not a desirable thing especially for a country which has got self-respect, and for a self-respecting nation like that of ours, I think, we should try to avoid borrowing from other countries. It is true and it might be said that the aid that we are getting is without any strings attached to it, but when the time comes for the repayment, if you are not able to repay the amount that you are borrowing in time, it would place the country in an awkward position. So, I hope that the money which the Government is going to receive from other countries would be spent on such projects from which returns might be sure and we might be able to repay back the loans, within stipulated time, that we are getting now from other countries. In this connection, I would like to place one suggestion before the Government, and that is this, the Government should consider the question of nationalising all the gold in the country. My feeling is that there is enormous gold

in the country, but the people are shy and not willing to give it to the Government, because they fear that Government might confiscate it.

**SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar):** What about ornaments?

**SHRI R. P. TAMTA:** Government should fix a limit of say 100 tolas or 50 tolas for ornaments that may be left with the individual, and above that limit all people should be asked to deposit their gold with the Government, and the Government should in lieu thereof issue redeemable bonds, interest-bearing bonds, income-tax and wealth-tax free, so that those who have gold and jewellery with them might invest it with the Government and in return they may also be able to get a regular income by way of interest. In this way, if the Government nationalises all the gold in the country, they might be able to get sufficient gold and it may not be necessary for them to borrow from other countries.

Sir, in the Budget speech of the Finance Minister towards the end I find a sentence in which he calls for unity and co-operation from all. This is what he says:

"How can we and others raise ourselves above fear and hatred and the petty conflicts that are so out of place in the new world that is taking shape? 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. We can only serve our own people or the world if we hold to our ideals and live up to them.

This budget statement is a minor event in our march forward. We have to look at it in the perspective of what we have to do and what we have to achieve. Above all, we have to realise that our success depends on ourselves and not on others, on our own strength and wisdom, on

our unity and co-operation and on the spirit of our people whom we are privileged to serve."

These, Sir, are golden words contained in the Budget Speech. The Prime Minister has rightly called for unity in the country and for the co-operation of all the people. My feeling is that it is rather unfortunate that in our country—if you look at our past history—we find that the people of this country have not been able to stand united together and work together. We also find that even before a common foe, our Hindu rulers of the past were not able to unite together and repel aggression and as a result of that, our country was subjugated and it came under the bondage of foreign rulers, and that lasted for centuries. Today, after attainment of our independence, we find that disruptive forces are again raising their heads. In some places we find agitation for language, in some other places we find the feeling of casteism, of provincialism and of communalism. This is a great obstacle in the way of the unity of our country. My feeling is that as long as the caste system remains in this country, it will be very difficult for the people of this country to unite together as one man. So the greatest need of the country is the consolidation of the people so that all of us may realise that we are one nation, one people and that we have to work together. For this I would suggest that the Government should take all such steps as would make it possible to do away with casteism, provincialism and communalism. For this my suggestion to the Government would be to ask all Government servants in the various services to make a solemn affirmation on oath that they will not observe casteism, provincialism or communalism in the discharge of their duties. Those found guilty of this should be dealt with rather severely.

Another suggestion is that in all institutions, government records, educational institutions, colleges and so on, the Government should prohibit

the use of the 'caste' name before the name of the person. They should also ban all institutions of a communal nature. Also I feel the Government should give preference in government services to those who go in for inter-caste marriages. Recently I read an article written by a well known social reformer Shri Sant Ram the founder of the Jat Pat Todak Mandal in the weekly "Samata" published from Almora, where he says:—

"आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जिस प्रकार आज से कुछ वर्ष पहले तक जात पात तोड़न विवाह अवैध या नाजायज़ थे, वैसे अब जाति के भीतर होने वाले विवाह अवैध ठहरा दिये जायें। इस क्रांति के बिना काम न चलेगा। कुछ लोग कह सकते हैं कि यह तो व्यक्ति की स्वतन्त्रता पर प्रतिबन्ध होगा, यह तो एक प्रकार का फ़ासिज्म और तानाशाही होगी। प्रेम किसी विशेष क्षेत्र में सीमित नहीं किया जा सकता। जहाँ जिसका प्रेम हो उसे वहीं विवाह करना चाहिये चाहे वह स्वजाति के भीतर हो और चाहे उससे बाहर। इस आपत्ति का उत्तर यह है कि . . . . . उपर्युक्त नवीन अधिनियम से उसके विवाह के लिये केवल एक उसकी अपनी जाति ही निषिद्ध होगी। शेष सभी बहुसंख्यक जातियाँ उसके लिये खुली होंगी क्या यह पहले से अधिक स्वतन्त्रता नहीं। इस क्रांति को लाने के लिये कुछ लोगों को भीषण कष्ट भी सहन करने पड़ें तो उसे मानवता की निष्ठा के लिये बलिदान समझ कर सहर्ष सहन करने के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये।"

So this is a further step that has been suggested. So my submission is that everything possible should be done to consolidate the people of this country and as far as possible we should take steps to put an end to all these disruptive forces that are raising their heads in the country.

[Shri R. P. Tamta.]

Above all, I would submit two things. The first is about the backward people of this country, I mean the Scheduled Castes who constitute five and a half crores of the population of this country. Their condition is still far from satisfactory. It is true that untouchability has been abolished by the Constitution, but if you read through the Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, you will find that he gives many instances to show that though untouchability has been abolished by the Constitution, this practice is found still in some parts of the land in some form or other. Some days back there was a Resolution discussed in this House to the effect that the period of reservation of ten years which is there should be extended to 20 years so that the members of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes might be able to enter the legislatures in their proper numbers. But my own feeling is that this reservation is actually an obstacle in the way of the Members of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes being able to stand on their own legs. This reservation actually prevents them from doing so. They have to depend on the mercy of others. My suggestion in this connection is that we should give these people the opportunity to contest the general elections and if as a result of that general election they are not returned in sufficient numbers then we should amend the Constitution in articles 331 and 333 in some suitable manner so that we may have a provision to the effect that in case the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes members are not returned to the legislatures in sufficient numbers, then the President will have the power to nominate such numbers of them as he thinks fit so that they get proper representation in Legislature.

(Time bell rings.)

This is one of my suggestions. My submission is that the economic condition of these Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes should be improved and everything possible should

be done to better their economic condition. Unless their economic condition is bettered, they will not be able to compete with others and be able to march forward side by side with others, and untouchability also will not go.

May I have another three or four minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI R. P. TAMTA: I am sorry, Sir, I was not given an opportunity to speak last time and this time also I am told my time is up. This is strange.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI R. P. TAMTA: Then I will only say just one word more. I feel, Sir, that at least there should be free education for the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes for a period of ten years in all stages throughout the country.

Lastly, Sir, I have one suggestion with regard to the hill districts of Kumaon. There are good many mineral resources; there is copper, lead, graphite, etc. These are found there but nothing has been done to tap these resources. Something should be done to tap these mineral resources which are there. Lack of communication is one obstacle but we may have ropeways there. For the betterment of the people there, I think, something should be done to encourage the tourist traffic also.

SHRI S. C. DEB (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman. I rise to support the Budget proposals. It is under changed circumstances that our Prime Minister presented the Budget this year. In his statement, he very ably presented the state of affairs in the country. It is a great concern for all of us as to how we will meet the economic situation in the country and how we will fulfil the responsibilities

so far as the Second Five Year Plan Programme is concerned. Because, on that hinges the economic situation of the country. Though Government has been trying to tide over the difficulties it has not still been able to ease the situation even when we have got aid from friendly foreign countries. A crisis has been persisting during the year 1956-57 when the balance of payments position took a reverse turn and till the quarter, July-September, 1957, the position had not improved. There is clear admission that in that period there was a substantial increase in imports. Of course, after that period, the import policy has been tightened so far as consumer goods are concerned but there is the danger of deficit financing and economists are offering continuous warning against this deficit financing and they assert that our Second Five Year Plan programme is too ambitious and howsoever the Government could guard against this deficit financing, inflation is bound to come. As for myself, I do not subscribe to this view and we must face facts boldly and without basically minimising the development programme we should go ahead with determination and courage. In any case, we may accept the criticism in its true light and take all precautionary measures against deficit financing. We appreciate the offer of financial aid from all the friendly countries for our development programme and I am one with the policy that we shall entertain all such offers from whatever quarter they come having no string in such offers. However, Sir, it is a good sign that in recent times the economic situation is getting eased and the price index has been round about 105 which is a reflection of the improved supply position. Though industrial production has continued to expand, the rate of expansion is not encouraging; when we had tightened the import policy regarding consumer goods, industrial production must reach up to a certain level and we should take more positive steps so that our export market would expand and we could achieve a surplus balance of payments.

For the economic stabilisation of the country, I would like to suggest that we must take concrete measures so that small-scale industries could be developed throughout the length and breadth of the country, more so in the undeveloped parts of the country. Though Government has taken some positive measures for the encouragement of small industries, they are not enough; further drive has to be given and further steps are to be organised to create initiative in the minds of the people. Public opinion should be roused and mobilised in that behalf and a favourable atmosphere has to be created to enthuse people in that direction.

Now, Sir, I would like to come to some of the problems, for example, the refugee problem in Assam, particularly in the district of Cachar from where I come. The problem there cannot be solved within the period of the Second Five Year Plan unless Governments, both in the Centres and in the State, are serious about solving that problem. I am going to give an illustration in that behalf. I had been to my place in connection with a by-election. I had been to the Salebari refugee colony and the Panchgram refugee colony. I must say that this is the first time I have come across the actual position in the Salebari refugee colony. During the six years that I have been in Parliament, nobody, not even any member of that colony, had drawn my attention to the actual conditions there, the conditions under which the refugees there are living. The place is situated just by the side of the Badarpur Railway Colony and unless one visits the place, it is impossible to imagine the pitiable conditions under which these refugees live there. The whole area is a slum area; the whole thing is so unhygienic and unplanned that it may safely be called hell. Water supply is lacking; the sites of the latrines are horrible. Almost the same is the case with the Panchgram refugee colony which is situated on a hillock. There is no proper water

[Shri S. C. Deb.]

supply. So, my suggestion is that unless Government improves the condition of the refugees who are spread over in different parts there, the situation would not improve. Sir, our Chief Minister, Shri B. P. Chaliha, who was not a Member when he was elected as Chief Minister, sought election from that area and when the result of the election was out he made a categorical statement that the condition of the refugees there has yet to be improved and that unless the problem was properly solved, conditions will deteriorate.

Now, Sir, I come to another part of that question. When we ask question in this House or in the other House, the Minister in charge always says that money is given to the States according to the Plan, according to the Schemes, but I cannot understand the position. Unless our Rehabilitation Ministry takes full responsibility about what is being done there, the situation cannot be improved. So it is a serious point and a serious view of the matter has to be taken and that has to be taken with a breadth of vision and with a plan so that the refugee problem, wherever it is, should be solved properly and within the Second Five Year Plan period.

Now I come to another question, of transport facilities to be offered for movement of goods and even of daily necessities from and to the Union Territory of Tripura. In the first week of January, Sir, I had been to Agartala. There the economic situation is deteriorating and the trading community there who deals in daily necessities finds it very difficult to maintain the business connection *via* East Pakistan. The merchants there are helpless in the hands of the railway administration in East Pakistan. No effort on the part of the Central Government can improve the transport facility *via* East Pakistan, and the administrative set up there in Tripura also is not to people's liking. So it is very necessary first to devise ways and means of having

transport facilities both by rail and road to Agartala *via* Assam. First-class road transport system and railway connection up to Agartala are to be created soon to combat the transport difficulty of Tripura. Such is also the case with Manipur. Both these areas require an effective communication system to be provided to improve the condition in those places.

Now I come to the question of inland water transport. There is a great demand to develop inland water transport all over the country. That way I am much concerned about the development of water transport between the Ganga and the Brahmaputra. I like to know whether any survey has been undertaken by our Government in order to create such connection and if so, may I know what is the result of that investigation? To ease the transport bottleneck in the eastern parts of the country such a programme of development is absolutely necessary. Unless special steps are taken in that direction, that is, to develop railway, road and water transport facilities in the eastern parts of the country, the transport difficulty will be there and the situation will not be improved.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I acknowledge that Government has created a separate Railway zone in the eastern part of the country but unless some plan is devised to improve the transport facility in that corner of the country, the situation will go from bad to worse, and I like to draw the special attention of the Government to see that the transport bottleneck in Assam is removed as soon as possible because we are also faced with some border and other difficulties, and that also requires proper attention on the part of the Government to improve the transport facilities in that part of the country.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I just want to touch on one point

which, I feel, has an important bearing on development of democracy in this country. I refer to the relationship which exists or ought to exist between the Centre and the States and as between the States. Now, Sir, this is a broad issue and most obviously I cannot go into in detail over the various aspects of this issue and I shall not do so. I want to make it clear that it is not my case that there is any general embitterment of relations between the States and the Centre or between the States. It is not so; it does not exist over any wide sphere; I grant that. But there are unmistakable trends in evidence which we in this House would do well to take note of. To illustrate my point, Sir, I would just refer to the feelings that have been aroused in wide sections of the people in Kerala over the attitude of the Central Government to the Education Bill sponsored by that State. Now, Sir, I am not going into the constitutional aspects of the issue. We are told that the Government have decided or are about to decide to advise the President to refer the Bill to the Supreme Court. As I said, just at the moment I am not going into the constitutional aspects of it. But our Prime Minister had occasion to make a statement in respect of this Bill, a public statement which, I must say, vast sections of the people in Kerala have not found satisfying, or even correct for that matter. Now the Prime Minister said, Sir, that the Government of India are advising the President to refer this Bill to the Supreme Court so that unnecessary litigation may be avoided in future. Now that is a very desirable objective. But I ask, "Is it possible that that desirable objective can be reached through this procedure?" For aught I know the advisory opinion which the Supreme Court may give can have no binding or mandatory effect. For aught I know the advisory opinion which the Supreme Court may give will not have the force of a judgment, and that may not act as a bar for any citizen of India to again approach the Court and get a judgment on that issue?

Now, Sir, over three thousand Bills have been passed by the various State Legislatures and Parliament, and in respect of no such Bill the Government of India thought it necessary to advise the President to have recourse to this thing. Now when the Prime Minister says that the desirable objective of avoiding future litigation can be achieved through this procedure, the people in Kerala are at a loss to understand that, and I would entreat the Prime Minister to throw some more light on that aspect of the matter. And again, Sir, the people of Kerala find that under the Directive Principles of the Constitution which throw the responsibility on States for universal free primary education, under those Directive Principles, in two districts in Andhra Pradesh, the schools including private schools have been taken over by the Government. Necessary legislation has been enacted and the President has given his assent to that. Again, Sir, in Assam also, to be more exact, in the Naga areas, there also, so far as my information goes, private schools have been taken over by the State Government. And again the necessary legislation was assented to. Now there is naturally a feeling in Kerala whether this is some politically discriminatory attitude which is being shown to this particular piece of its legislation. As I made it quite clear in the very beginning I am not suggesting that there is this discriminatory attitude in all cases and over a vast sphere. In regard to this because they find that in Andhra and in other States the State Governments are enabled to take over private institutions and the constitutional and legal issues are not raised, they feel that there is some sort of a political discrimination against them.

Again there is one material point. The provisions in this Kerala Bill enable the Government to make direct payment to the teachers; that is one change which is being sought to be made through the provisions of this Bill. Again I find in Madras, for example, this direct payment to the teachers through the Headmaster and



[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.]

not through the Manager has been accomplished by an executive order and in their case no constitutional or legal issues were raised. So the people in Kerala are at a loss to know why this sort of attitude is being adopted towards them. Sir, it is quite necessary that in regard to these issues there should be proper relationship existing between the Centre and the States and if my information is correct this Bill in the draft form was referred to the Government of India in the various departments and my information is that all the various suggestions which they gave were accepted and embodied in the Bill. Not that the State Government was under any obligation to consult the Centre except on the question of compensation on which under the Constitution they are bound to consult the Union Government; but they did consult the Union Government so that the passing of this legislation might be smooth. They took the precaution; they took this wise recourse of approaching the Union Government, and the State Government having embodied all the suggestions that were put forward I do not see any reason why this particular attitude should be shown. Sir, on these points feelings have been aroused in Kerala and if such feelings continue to spread not only in this but in other fields also, then the question of the autonomy of the States and the proper relationship between the States and the Centre are all involved and that is the reason why I take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Government to this feeling which is there in Kerala.

In regard to this question of inter-State relationship, again certain other things are in evidence. Of course, I do not want to go into this food problem which is a pivotal thing in the scheme of our Budget and in the scheme of our Plan. All the various aspects have been gone into in the course of the debate here. Now, there is this zonal arrangement for distribution of rice. It is a difficult thing to go into this problem which has a bear-

ing on inter-State relationships but the fact is that of the four State Governments which are parties to the South Zone agreement, three Governments have adopted a certain attitude. They may be right; I am not questioning their authority. Now when the Government of India accepts a policy, when Parliament accepts a policy and when certain administrative arrangements are made, it is necessary that the scheme is given a free trial. Again I am just drawing your attention to this aspect of the question so that unnecessary developments and acerbities in relation to the question of inter-State relationships may be avoided. After all, at party level also it can be taken up and tackled. More than that I do not want to go into this at present but there is another aspect of this question so far as it affects Kerala. As the House is aware Kerala is acting as a drag on all India and all active steps to tide over the food deficit in that State must be taken looking at the question from the all-India point of view. Now, whatever may be reasons—within the limited time at my disposal I cannot go into all the details—under the second Five Year Plan there are certain irrigation schemes and schemes for improvement of agriculture and our Government are going full steam ahead with the efforts to increase food production. The deficit in that small State comes to over seven lakh tons and the zonal arrangements and other things being what they are, naturally it is up to the State Government to augment food production. My information is that for the next two or three years the State Government has worked out irrigation schemes—not large scale irrigation schemes but medium and minor irrigation schemes—which would irrigate over four lakh acres of land, which means the production from these four lakh acres, especially in the present conditions, is a material thing. And those various schemes have been brought to the notice of the Government. That is my information. There is the Periyar Valley Scheme, the Thanneermukham Scheme and the Valiapattanam scheme. Sir, if some

additional allotment is made in this connection to solve the food problem of the deficit State of Kerala, it will go a long way in easing the tension in other spheres. It is from that national point of view that we have to look at this problem and I would urge the Government to do something for them. The Periyar Valley Scheme, the Thanneermukham Scheme and the irrigation part of Barapole scheme do not require foreign exchange; they require only additional allotment. Even though for the development of scarcity areas over Rs. 40 crores have been allotted under the second Five Year Plan, because of so many factors, primarily because the Governments which were there in Kerala never thought about bringing these schemes to the notice of the Government, not a single rupee has been allotted to Kerala. I am not making any grievance of it but the fact is there and taking all these facts into consideration I would request the hon. Minister, I would request the various departments of the Government of India to pay some particular attention to this aspect of the question.

I have only one small point more, Mr. Deputy Chairman, and that is the position of the Law Officers of the Government of India *vis-a-vis* the States. Now, I am not raising any question of professional etiquette; nothing like that. In the present conditions the Law Officers of the Government can accept private briefs and there have been instances of their accepting private briefs against the State Governments. There is nothing to bar them but what I ask is, is it proper? Can we not think of having a healthy convention that the Law Officers, that the services of the great legal officers of the Government of India are not placed at the disposal of private parties against the States? I am not suggesting that they must be debarred from accepting private briefs.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, so far as I know, they do not appear against the States—the Advocate General or the Attorney-General.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: There have been instances of the Attorney-General . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is correct.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: . . . having accepted such briefs. Only recently—last year in fact—there was a case in which the Madras Government was involved. The Attorney-General was briefed by a party. Here, in respect of a Kerala Bill also in regard to the extension of the basic tax to provide lands in Malabar, the services of the law officers have been secured by the private parties. My point is, in such cases if a proper machinery can be organised with the State Governments concerned, they are consulted or are informed sufficiently early, so that they get the first chance to avail themselves of the services of the law officers, that will be quite proper. And I think at the Law Ministers' Conference last time this point was taken up. And I think that the point was taken up with sympathy by the Law Minister that he would look into it and a more proper and a more healthy convention would be established in respect of this thing. But that has not been done. I want to draw the attention of the Government to this particular thing also.

Again, Sir, before I close . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Only one point and that is in regard to the situation in Indonesia. The points made from this side of the House were not made just on press reports. Now, the news from Indonesia, an official bulletin which is made available to Members of Parliament, also to Government there. . .

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): How is Indonesia relevant to the Budget discussion?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Failure of the Government of India.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: They are No. 43, verbatim report of President Seokarno's speech. There he makes a categorical, unequivocal mention of the interference of other powers in the internal affairs of Indonesia. So, that is there, an official statement which was . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That may be, but do you expect . . .

(Interruptions.)

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: That is another thing. Our information was not based on just press reports.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What she said was that they have not received any communication from the Government of Indonesia.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: It is not our suggestion that Indian Government should intervene.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Of course, it is.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: It was not our intention. We just mentioned that cognizance be taken of the fact and attention has been drawn to it by no less a person than the President of Indonesia himself. That is the point which I wanted to make out.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS): Mr. Deputy Chairman, a complaint has been made against the Government of India that in advising the President to accord assent to Bills sent by the State Governments, in which his assent is necessary under the Constitution, the Government of India discriminate between one State and another and it is said that so far as Kerala Government is concerned they have some ground for complaint that we have applied different standards to their Education Bill. Now, it is possible that the case may soon go before the Supreme Court.

Therefore, this is neither the occasion nor the forum where the contention on behalf of the Kerala Government that it is *intra vires* of the Constitution, and the objections raised by us against certain provisions of the Bill, should be debated. The appropriate tribunal would, of course, be the Supreme Court. But I deny, and I deny with all the earnestness at my command that the Government of India do not treat the proposal for legislation by the Kerala Government exactly on the same basis as they treat the legislation of other States. I might inform the hon. Member that proposals for assent by the President come to us from all the States and in each case it is subjected to scrutiny. And there are certain well established principles on the basis of which this assent is either given or withheld. What happens in other cases is that wherever there is a refusal that refusal is understood in the spirit in which it is made and no complaint is received.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether any other cases have been referred to the Supreme Court?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: All that I can tell the hon. Member today is that the assent has been withheld in many cases. And if I remember aright, probably there was one piece of legislation by the Kerala Government in which we pointed out to them certain defects and it appears to me that the Kerala Government have accepted our advice. If they had agreed with our advice they would have withdrawn the proposed Bill.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: They have already accepted the suggestions made to the Government.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: No, not in respect of others to which we raised the objection. They are still a matter of controversy between us and the State Government. And then after all we did not decide the matter. We have asked the final arbiter, the Supreme Court, to decide the dispute. So, where is the question of grievance?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In which other cases you have asked?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I do not believe that the Kerala Government are represented here in this House.

(Interruption.)

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: I never raised . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with Kerala Government. Please go on. Order, order.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Certain political . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is standing on his legs. You should not disturb.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Then, it was contended that this probably was the first time that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was invoked. That is not correct. As soon as the federation was established, it was necessary to have a court to decide the limits of the legislative power between the States and the Centre and there was the Federal Court. The first case that went to the Federal Court was in connection with the C. P. and Berar Sales of Motor Spirits and Lubricants Taxation Act. This was referred by the Government of India for their advisory opinion to the Federal Court and as far as I know that opinion still stands. It is quite true, theoretically it is quite correct to say, that an opinion delivered by the Federal Court in its advisory jurisdiction is not binding upon private parties. But as far as I am aware there is not a single case where an advisory opinion which has once been given by the Federal Court has been dissented

from. That is to say, the decision given is given after due deliberation and though there is a theoretical possibility that that opinion may be subsequently changed, yet parties have had the advantage of the final opinion of the Federal Court.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: The Minister is anticipating many things.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: After that, after opinion was given on the C.P. and Berar Sales of Motor Spirit and Lubricants Taxation Act, there were two further references, one on the Hindu Women's Right to Property Act and the third on the right of the Centre in respect of the Estate Duty. And as far as I am aware—I may be wrong—in no case has an advisory opinion once given been dissented from in any subsequent case, though the Supreme Court has to a certain extent dissented from the position, from the law that it had declared in cases between private parties. So it is not correct when the hon. Member says that the advisory opinion given will not be of any use. As a matter of fact, there is a considerable body and a responsible body of constitutional lawyers who say that the provisions relating to the advisory jurisdiction of the Supreme Court may be resorted to more often than it is now, and that it should not be left to the chance or vicissitude of a private individual, that these controversial questions should finally be decided. Therefore, I suggest that where a serious question arises and it has to be decided, I do not think that any responsible person can make a grievance of the fact that the highest tribunal in this land has been invited to express an opinion.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: It is not so simple as all that. Nor is it . . .

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Well, a straight course is always probably the simplest. That is what I thought.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why don't you assent to that Bill and then consult the Supreme Court and make amendments, if necessary?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Now, therefore, I thank you for giving me an opportunity for explaining the point of view of the Government. There, I think, the matter should be allowed to rest.

श्रीमता मायादेवी छेत्रा (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उपसभापति महोदय, आपने इस बजट के ऊपर दो चार शब्द कहने का मुझे जो समय दिया है उसके लिये आपको धन्यवाद है।

उपसभापति महोदय, देश के स्वाधीन होने के बाद देश में तरह तरह की उन्नति हो रही है और आगे भी होने वाली है। इसके अलावा हमारे देश में जो भयानक रोग—जैसे कि मलेरिया, फाइलेरिया, कालरा, हैजा आदि होते थे और जिन्होंने हजारों लोगों को तबाह कर दिया था, उन रोगों पर भी बहुत कुछ कंट्रोल हो चुका है।

3 P.M.

मैं विशेषकर सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाना चाहती हूँ कि इन रोगों से भी भयानक एक दूसरा रोग है ट्यूबर-क्लोसिस, टी० बी० की बीमारी। टी० बी० की बीमारी के ऊपर अभी तक सरकार ने जितना ध्यान देना आवश्यक था, उतना ध्यान नहीं दिया है। इसीलिये हम सरकार से अनुरोध करते हैं कि हर एक स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को हेल्थ स्कीम के अंतर्गत ज्यादा ग्रांट दे दे ताकि वे लोग हासपिटल और सेनीटोरियम टी० बी० केसेज के लिये बना सकें। जहाँ पर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट सेनीटोरियम नहीं बना सके वहाँ पर कम से कम सेपरेट

वार्ड बना सके ताकि यह भयानक रोग निर्मूल हो सके। यह रोग एक खानदानी बीमारी है, यह आपको मालूम है। यह रोग दो चार दिन रेस्ट करके, या दो चार सप्ताह खर्च करके आराम होने वाला नहीं है। अगर इस रोग ने एक व्यक्ति को पकड़ लिया तो वह तमाम परिवार को ही समाप्त करके छोड़ने वाली बीमारी है। इसलिये इस बीमारी के ऊपर, इस रोग के ऊपर सरकार को विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये।

हमारे देश में अभी भी, दस वर्ष के बाद भी, बहुत सारे प्राबलम्स हमारे सामने हैं। अभी इतना सहज यहाँ नहीं पैदा हुआ कि हम सदस्य लोग यहाँ पर जो कुछ बोलें सरकार उसको कर दे। पर हमने दूसरे देशों में देखा कि वहाँ हेल्थ के लिये वे विशेष ध्यान देते हैं, प्रत्येक रोगी व्यक्ति के ऊपर विशेष ध्यान देते हैं। बड़े लोगों की बात तो अलग है, हमने देखा कि छोटे छोटे बच्चों के लिये भी वे लोग कितने ध्यान से देखते हैं। हमने पेरिस में क्रिपिलस चिल्ड्रेन का हासपिटल विजिट किया और वहाँ जाकर पहले पहल जब उस हासपिटल का दर्शन किया तो मालूम हुआ यह हासपिटल ही नहीं है बल्कि उसमें चिल्ड्रेन के लिये खेलने का घर है, और उस खेलने के घर के भीतर उन्होंने पेंटिंग हाउस बनाया है और उसमें बच्चों ने ड्राइंग करके रंगीन पिकचर्स लगाये हैं। वहाँ हासपिटल के अन्दर सिनेमा हॉल्स भी एटेच हैं; बच्चों को स्वास्थ्य के विषय में तरह तरह की शिक्षा सिनेमा द्वारा दी जाती है। इतना ही नहीं, वहाँ पर क्लासेज भी लगते हैं, जिससे कि जो रोगी बच्चे होते हैं उनकी शिक्षा में कोई नुकसान न हो। हमने देखा है कि रोज उन लोगों के क्लासेज होते हैं और इस तरह उनकी शिक्षा पर ध्यान दिया जाता है। हमने दूसरा चिल्ड्रेन हासपिटल लंदन में भी देखा। वहाँ पर छोटे छोटे बच्चों का जो

हासपिटल था उसमें ३०० चिल्ड्रेन की अकमोडेशन थी। वहाँ एक महीने दो महीने के बच्चे से लेकर बारह वर्ष तक के बच्चे हासपिटल में रहते हैं। हमने देखा इतने छोटे छोटे शिशुओं को छोड़कर मातायें चली जाती हैं और कोई भय नहीं रखती हैं कि हमारे बच्चे इतने छोटे हैं, कैसे हासपिटल में रहेंगे। हर एक नर्स बच्चों की सेवा के लिये हमेशा तत्पर रहती है। बच्चे को कभी खिलायेंगे, कभी पिलायेंगे, कभी सुलायेंगे। इस तरह से बिना मां के भी बच्चे उतने ही खुश रहते हैं जितने मां के लाल।

हमारे देश में छोटे बच्चों का ही सवाल नहीं, बड़े लोग भी अभी तक गांव या बस्ती में जो हासपिटल है वहाँ जाने के लिये भय करते हैं। क्यों भय करते हैं? क्योंकि अभी तक उन लोगों को डाक्टरों के ऊपर नर्सों के ऊपर विश्वास नहीं, भरोसा नहीं कि हमें वे ठीक तरह से, जतन से देखेंगे। तो जहाँ हम बड़ी उम्र के लोगों के लिये ही हासपिटल नहीं कर सकते हैं वहाँ बच्चों के लिये हासपिटल करना मुश्किल है। अभी हम स्वप्न की बात नहीं कह सकते हैं पर समय आने पर यह भी जरूर हो सकता है।

हमारे कहने का उद्देश्य यह है कि हमारे वैस्ट बंगाल में दो सेनीटोरियम हैं, एक जादवपुर सेनीटोरियम और दूसरा कुरसिआंग सेनीटोरियम। इन दोनों सेनीटोरियम में बहुत से पेशेंट्स वेंटिंग लिस्ट में रहते हैं। छः महीने या वर्ष भर उनको वेंटिंग लिस्ट में रहना पड़ता है तब जाकर उन लोगों को सीट मिल सकती है और तब तक पेशेंट ही खत्म हो जाता है। तो इतने दिनों तक वेंटिंग लिस्ट में उनको रहना पड़ता है। आज जब हिन्दुस्तान स्वाधीन हो गया है तब भी लोग रोगी और बीमार होकर रहते हैं और डाक्टर के लिये, दवाई

के लिये खर्च नहीं कर सकते हैं। सेनीटोरियम में सीट नहीं मिलती है, और मिलती भी है तो पेइंग बैड्स जिसके लिये एक बैड का करीब दो सौ, तीन सौ रु० महीना खर्च होता है। मामूली गरीब आदमी इतना रुपया कहाँ से लायेगा? इसलिये हासपिटल्स में बहुत से बैड्स फ्री होने चाहियें ताकि हम गरीब रोगियों के लिये उनमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा सीट दे सकें। हमारा हेल्थ मिनिस्ट्री से यह अनुरोध है कि हर एक स्टेट में एक एटेच्ड चैस्ट क्लीनिक हो जहाँ कि, अगर रोगी को हासपिटल में सीट न मिले, तब भी आउटडोर पेशेंट की हैसियत से ट्रीटमेंट मिले और वहाँ जाकर वह अपने चैस्ट को दिखला सकता हो और जब तक बेड न मिले तब तक वह अपने स्वास्थ्य के लिये कुछ इलाज कर सकता हो।

दूसरी बात है, हमारे देश में हम लोगों पर टैक्स इतने लगे हैं कि यह जरूर कहना पड़ता है कि ये टैक्स दिन पर दिन आदमी के ऊपर बहुत बोझा हो रहे हैं। दूसरी तरफ देखें तो इतने टैक्स भी न लें तो देश की उन्नति कहाँ से होती है।

अब मैं डिफेंस के ऊपर दो चार शब्द कहना चाहती हूँ। डिफेंस के लिये २७८ करोड़ रु० बजट में रखा है। हम नहीं कह सकते हैं कि सारे डिफेंस के लिये इतना बजट बहुत अधिक है पर इस विषय को छोड़कर हम केवल एक्स-सर्विसमेन की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहते हैं। एक्स-सर्विसमेन बेचारे जब आर्मी में काम करते हैं तब अपना खून अपना सारा जीवन देकर देश रक्षा के लिये सब कुछ बलिदान करने के लिये सदा तत्पर होकर रहते हैं। जब हम लोग १९५३ में काश्मीर गये थे तब जम्मू में मिलिटरी गेस्ट होकर रहे और हमने मिलिटरी में उनकी यह हालत देखी कि जंगलों में, ज़मीन पर नीचे,

[श्री.मती माया देवी छेत्री]

पेड़ के ऊपर, वर्षा, गर्मी, सर्दी उन लोगों के लिये समान है। रात दिन वे इस तरह से काम करते हैं। किस लिये? केवल अपने देश की रक्षा के लिये, जब तक इनमें अपना बल होता है, ताकत होती है, जब तक जवानी रहती है तब तक देश की रक्षा के लिये वे लोग कभी कुछ न कह कर, जहां पर हो जिस तरह से हो, अपनी जान देने के लिये तत्पर रहते हैं, पर जब रिटायर हो जाते हैं तब इन लोगों के लिये रिसेटलमेंट के लिये या ट्रेनिंग के लिये सरकार ने अभी तक सुचारु रूप से कोई बन्दोबस्त नहीं किया है। मैं नहीं कहती हूं कि सरकार ने अभी तक एक्स-सर्विसमेन के ऊपर ध्यान ही नहीं दिया है। यह हम नहीं कहना चाहते हैं। पर जो ध्यान देना चाहिये था वह अभी तक पूरी तरह से नहीं दिया गया है।

जर्मनी में जब "वर्ल्ड फेडरेशन कांफरेंस" हुई थी तब वहां ३६, ३७ कंट्रीज़ के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स आये थे। वहां उन्होंने बताया कि उनके अपने अपने देश में एक्स-सर्विसमेन के लिये क्या क्या हो रहा है या वे क्या क्या करने वाले हैं। तो हमने भी उस कांफरेंस में यही बताया कि हमारा देश अभी अभी स्वाधीन हुआ है और उसके सामने बहुत से प्रॉब्लम्स हैं जिनको फेंस करना पड़ रहा है, इसलिये एक्स-सर्विसमेन की तरफ हमारी सरकार का ध्यान कम ही गया है। जान-बूझ कर उससे ऐसा नहीं किया बल्कि जो जल्दी वाले प्रॉब्लम थे उन्हें साल्व करने के कारण ही एक्स-सर्विसमेन की तरफ इतना ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। फिर अभी हमारे देश में कुछ पाइलट प्रोजेक्ट बन रहे हैं जिनके द्वारा उन लोगों का रिसेटलमेंट होगा। इस तरह से हमने उन लोगों को सान्त्वना दी थी।

जो युवक जवान उम्र में ही रिटायर्ड और बेकार हो जाते हैं उनके रहने के लिये

और उनके इम्प्लायमेंट के लिये सरकार की ओर से कोई न कोई बन्दोबस्त अवश्य किया जाना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं डिफेंस मिनिस्टर और डिफेंस डिपार्टमेंट से यह कहना चाहती हूं कि इन लोगों के रिसेटलमेंट के लिये सब स्टेप्स में कुछ न कुछ बन्दोबस्त अवश्य किया जाना चाहिये। जहां पर ज्यादा एक्स-सर्विसमेन हों वहां पर तो अवश्य ही इस बात का प्रबन्ध किया जाना चाहिये और जहां कम भी हों वहां भी कोई न कोई प्रबन्ध इसी तरह का होना चाहिये। हर स्टेट में इन लोगों के लिये प्रोफेशनल, वोकेशनल और टेक्निकल ट्रेनिंग की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये ताकि वे लोग रिटायर्ड हो कर काम में लग जायें और उनके दिल में यह भावना न हो कि इतनी सी छोटों उम्र में हम लोग बेकार हो गये हैं जब कि हमने अपना इतना जीवन देश की रक्षा के लिये लगाया है। उन लोगों के मन में यह भावना नहीं आनी चाहिये कि सरकार उनकी ओर ध्यान नहीं दे रही है और उनके ऊपर कोई रक्षण नहीं है। सरकार को इस असंतोष की भावना को दूर करने के लिये उन लोगों को किसी न किसी काम में लगाने का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये। जब उन लोगों को इस तरह का ज्ञान हो जायेगा कि सरकार की ओर से उन लोगों के परिवार वालों के लिये हर तरह का प्रबन्ध किया गया है तो वे लोग अपनी जान देने तक के लिये हमेशा तैयार रहेंगे। इसलिये सरकार को चाहिये कि उन लोगों के लिये विडोज़ होम्स और चिल्ड्रेन होम्स हर स्टेट में अवश्य बनाये। विडोज़ के लिये काटेज और स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्री की शिक्षा का अवश्य प्रबन्ध किया जाना चाहिये ताकि वे लोग अपना जीवन खुशी से और आराम से बिता सकें।

अब मैं दो चार शब्द रेलवे के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहती हूं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not the Railway Budget.

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTY:

I just wanted to point out a few difficulties about our Assam rail link.

मुझे आसाम रेल लिंक के सम्बन्ध में दो चार बातें कहनी हैं। इस रेल लिंक के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि जब देश का विभाजन हुआ तब यह रेल लिंक लाइन बनाई गई। पहले जो डाइरेक्ट लाइन थी वह दार्जिलिंग और कलकत्ता का सीधा सम्बन्ध था और वही आसाम जाती थी लेकिन वह डाइरेक्ट लाइन पाकिस्तान में चली गई है। यह जो नई रेलवे लाइन बनाई गई है वह बहुत जल्दी बनाई गई और उसमें बहुत कमी रह गई है। न इस रेलवे लाइन की गाड़ियों में डाइनिंग कार का बन्दोबस्त रहता है, न पंखे ही ठीक तरह से लगे हुये हैं और न पीने के पानी का ही बन्दोबस्त है। पहले जब कलकत्ते से दार्जिलिंग जाने के लिये डाइरेक्ट रूट था तो बहुत से लोग दार्जिलिंग जाते थे और हर प्रकार की सुविधा थी लेकिन आसाम रेल लिंक बनने से कई कठिनाइयां पैदा हो गई हैं इसलिये बहुत कम लोग दार्जिलिंग जाते हैं। पहले से इस समय आधे लोग प्लेन्स से जाते हैं। इस समय कलकत्ते से सार्गीकली घाट और मनिहारी घाट हो कर लोगों को जाना पड़ता है जिससे बहुत डिफिकल्टी होती है। मैंने पहले भी फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर महोदय से अनुरोध किया था कि गंगा नदी के ऊपर एक ब्रिज होना चाहिये जिससे कि कलकत्ते और दार्जिलिंग के लिये डाइरेक्ट रूट हो सके, और आसाम तक गाड़ी जा सके। दार्जिलिंग एक छोटी सी जगह है लेकिन छोटी जगह होते हुये भी हिन्दुस्तान के लिये बहुत इम्पार्टेंट है क्योंकि दार्जिलिंग के तीन ओर तीन विदेशी राज्य पाकिस्तान तिब्बत, भूटान, नेपाल हैं। इन तीनों देशों से दार्जिलिंग का बोर्डर मिलता है। अगर इस इम्पार्टेंट एरिया पर किसी

तरह की विपत्ति आती है तो वह सारे देश के लिये विपत्ति है। इसलिये मैं फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर महोदय से अनुरोध करती हूँ कि गंगा के ऊपर एक ब्रिज बनाने के लिये एक अलग से एलाटमेंट किया जाना चाहिये ताकि वहां पर जल्द से जल्द ब्रिज बन

(Time bell rings.)

सके ताकि दार्जिलिंग के लिये एक डाइरेक्ट लाइन हो।

श्री एल० ललित माधव शर्मा (मनीपुर) : उपसभापति महोदय, भारत सरकार की ओर से रेल यातायात का प्रबन्ध और नये नये रेलवे कार्य हो रहे हैं या हो गये हैं, उनको देखते हुये मुझे प्रसन्नता होती है और इसके लिये मैं रेलवे मिनिस्टर महोदय को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। अभी सदन के सामने जो बजट है उसका भी मैं हादिक समर्थन करता हूँ। गत वर्ष रेलवे बजट के समय में, २७ मई को, मैंने मनीपुर की परिस्थिति के बारे में, वहां एक नई रेलवे लाइन खोलने के बारे में, भाषण दिया था। उसमें मैंने बताया था कि उत्तरी सीमान्त में कितनी कठिनाइयां हैं। भौगोलिक दृष्टि से मैंने वहां का नक्शा सदन के सामने रखा था। लेकिन आज मैं एक विशेष समस्या की ओर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मनीपुर और बर्मा के बीच जो ११६ मील लम्बा पहाड़ी क्षेत्र है, उसमें सोना, ताम्बा, पेट्रोल लोहा, अबरख, चूना, कोयला और कई चीजें मिलती हैं, जिनका मैं यहां पर वर्णन नहीं कर सकता हूँ। पश्चिमी पहाड़ में जो जंगल है, उनमें चन्दन की लकड़ी, खर और दूसरी कई चीजें मिलती हैं। यहां पर भी जो चीजें हैं, उनका भी वर्णन नहीं किया जा सकता है। ये सब राष्ट्र



[श्री एल० ललित माधव]

की सम्पत्ति है, जो कि वहां पर पड़ी हुई है। पिछले अधिवेशन के बाद जब मैं मनीपुर गया था तो इन चीजों के बारे में जानकारी मालूम की। मैं पूर्वी हिल्स सब डिवीजन ओखुरूल गया जो इम्फाल से ३८ मील की दूरी पर है और वहां से कुछ पत्थर चुनकर लाया। मैंने सोचा कि यह टैरीटरी होम मिनिस्टर साहब के मातहत है इसलिये मैंने इन चीजों को होम मिनिस्टर साहब को दे दिया। होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने उन्हें नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज मिनिस्ट्री को दे दिया जो इसके बारे में अन्वेषण और परीक्षण करेगी। वहां पर निकल, ताम्बा, आरसनिक और दूसरी चीजें बहुत भारी मात्रा में निकलती है।

मैंने वहां पर नई रेलवे लाइन खोलने के बारे में जो भाषण दिया था उसकी कापी प्राइम मिनिस्टर महोदय को दी और उन्होंने मुझे आश्वासन दिया कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में तो यह लाइन नहीं बन सकती है क्योंकि हमारे पास सामग्री की बहुत कमी है। लेकिन तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में मनीपुर में रेलवे लाइन खोल दी जायेगी। इस तरह का उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया।

प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के कहने के मुताबिक मैं नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज मिनिस्टर साहब के पास गया और उनसे मुलाकात की। मैंने उनको इस क्षेत्र की प्राकृतिक चीजों के बारे में जियोलोजिकल सर्वे करने के बारे में कहा। उन्होंने कहा कि एक पार्टी को सर्वे करने के लिये नवम्बर में भेजा जायेगा। लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि नवम्बर के महीने में मनीपुर में काफी पानी बरसता है और सब जगह पानी ही पानी रहता है। और घना जंगल है, उसमें जियालोजिस्ट पार्टी को जाने में कठिनाई होगी। इसलिये लास्ट दिसम्बर

से लास्ट अप्रैल तक जाने के लिये मैंने निवेदन किया। तो लास्ट दिसम्बर में जियालोजिस्ट पार्टी इंडिया गवर्नमेंट ने भेजी। मैंने अपने आदमियों के साथ वहां सर्वे शुरू किया। उसमें निकल का एक बड़ा भारी पहाड़ प्राप्त हुआ है। अभी और सर्वे कर रहे हैं। भारतवर्ष में अभी निकल प्राप्त नहीं है। भारत में सिक्के की तैयारी के लिये हमें निकल बाहर से मंगवाना पड़ता है। मैं यह सूचना इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूं कि हमारे भारतवर्ष के अन्दर निकल नहीं है। अब निकल के बड़े बड़े पहाड़ मिल रहे हैं और जमीन के अन्दर कितनी गहराई में निकल है इसका परीक्षण हो रहा है। मैंने फिर नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज मिनिस्टर को लिखा कि आप एक ऐसा जियालोजिस्ट एक्सपर्ट भेजिये जिसको हम पेट्रोल, सोना, ताम्बा और लाल पीले आदि नाना प्रकार के रत्नों का पता बतायेंगे। नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज मिनिस्टर ने जियालोजिस्ट डिपार्टमेंट के डाइरेक्टर-जनरल को लिखा। फिर डाइरेक्टर साहब ने मुझे लिखा कि आपका काम धीरे धीरे हो सकता है क्योंकि आपके यहाँ यातायात का प्रबन्ध नहीं है। नागा हिल के थू से जाना पड़ता है। इसके अतिरिक्त उन्होंने लिखा कि निकल के लिये हाइड्रो इलेक्ट्रिक दरकार है, निकल के कारखाने के लिये हाइड्रो इलेक्ट्रिक आयेगी, बड़ी बड़ी मशीनें आयेगी, इसलिये सब काम धीरे धीरे होगा। प्रथम निकल के सम्बन्ध में सर्वे हो रहा है और उसको पूरा करने के लिये मुझे एक चिट्ठी जब डाइरेक्टर जनरल, जियालोजिस्ट ने लिखी, तब मुझे आशा हुई। इस प्रकार जब मुझे भारत सरकार का मन मालूम हुआ तो मैंने अपने यहां का इतिहास जानने का प्रयत्न किया। इम्फाल से ४० मील दक्षिण में एक स्थान सुगनू है जहां हमारे इतिहास में लिखा है कि चांदी निकलती है। मैं भारत सरकार को देने के लिये वहां से एक

चांदी का छोटा सा कड़ा ले आया। अभी वहां परीक्षण नहीं किया गया है। इस लिये मैं भारत सरकार से कहूंगा कि वह परीक्षण कराये क्योंकि हमारे इतिहास में, हमारे रिकार्ड में, यह लिखा है कि सुगन् में चांदी मिलती है। मैं खुद वहां जा करके चांदी ले आया क्योंकि इसमें हमारी सरकार दिलचस्पी ले रही है। इसलिये रेलवे मिनिस्टर महोदय से मेरा एक निवेदन है। हमारे देश की ४० करोड़ जनता के लिये व्यावहारिक और बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण चीजें वहां प्राप्त हो रही हैं, किन्तु हमारे जिया-लोजिस्ट के डाइरेक्टर जनरल ने यह लिखा है कि अभी वहां यातायात का प्रबन्ध नहीं है, नागा हिल्स के थू मोटर से जाना पड़ता है, इससे बड़ी कठिनाई होती है। इसलिये मैं और भी निवेदन कर रहा हूं कि शीघ्रातिशीघ्र मनीपुर के लिये एक नया रेल का रास्ता खोला जाय और वहां जितनी हमारी राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति है उसको उपयोग में लाने के लिये कार्य शुरू किया जाय। मैं आज इस सदन में सदस्यों के सामने यही समाचार पहुंचाने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूं क्योंकि आजकल गणतंत्र है और गणतंत्र में बहुमत की आवाज चलती है। हमारी आवाज बहुत कम है। २३४ सदस्यों में सिर्फ मैं अकेला हूं।

**श्री शील उग्र यादव :** हम लोग भी आपके साथ हैं।

**श्री एल० ललित माधव शर्मा :** जितने हमारे सदस्य बड़ी बड़ी स्टेटों के हैं उनको बड़ी बड़ी आवाज है। इसलिये मैंने भी अपनी छोटी सी आवाज और जो हमारी राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति है उसका समाचार इस सदन के सदस्यों तक पहुंचा दिया है। मैं आशा करता हूं कि यह जो भारतवर्ष की राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति है इसको प्राप्त करने के लिये जितना शीघ्र कार्य शुरू किया जायगा उतनी ही शीघ्र राष्ट्र की उन्नति होगी।

हमारी भारत माना के गर्भ में सब चीजें हैं, किन्तु हर पर्वत में मानिक नहीं है और हर हाथी में मुक्ता नहीं है। मनीपुर में सब चीजों का भंडार है, किन्तु उसका किसी को पता नहीं है। उसका पता लगाना उचित है। सन् १९२६ में इलाहाबाद में जब आल इंडिया हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन हो रहा था, तो उसमें मैंने यह देखा कि रामायण काल के भूगोल में यह लिखा हुआ था कि उस वक्त मनीपुर में आदिमियों का निवास नहीं था, भूमि बोरान थी। रामायण काल में मनीपुर का नाम रत्नागर करके था। फिर मैंने महाभारत का भूगोल देखा। महाभारत काल में आदिमी बमने लगे थे और उसमें मनीपुर नाम निकला। उस हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन में जब मैंने उस पौराणिक भूगोल को देखा तब मैंने आशा की कि मनीपुर में कुछ रत्न हैं। तब मे मैंने हर जगह पहाड़ों इलाके में जा जा करके मनीपुर के इतिहास का अध्ययन किया। रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमिशन के सदस्यों को मैंने यह बताया था कि मनीपुर में सोना, चांदी और नाना प्रकार की जो चीजें मिलती हैं उनका उदाहरण यह है कि बर्मा देश के अपरिचिन्डिन डिस्ट्रिक्ट में चिन्डिन रोवर (निभी नदी) जाती है। चिन्डिनरीवर आपको भी भूगोल में मिली होंगी। वह रोवर कहां से निकलती है? मनीपुर से निकलती है। उस रोवर के किनारे बसने वाले बर्मी लोग जब नहाने जाते थे तो एक तख्ते पर एक कपड़ा फैला देते थे। फिर उस कपड़े पर बालू रखते थे और एक घड़ा पानी लेकर उस बालू पर डाल देते थे।

वह बालू चली जाती थी और सोने के छोटे छोटे कण उस कपड़े में लटक जाते थे। उसके पश्चात् कपड़े को एक पात्र में रख कर और उसमें थोड़ा पानी देकर हाथ से मलते थे। इस प्रकार एक दो रत्ती सोना निकल आता था।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हम भी वहां नहाने चलेंगे ।

श्री एल० ललित माधव शर्मा : वह सोना अब भी निकलता है और रोज निकलता है । लेकिन वह नद कहां से जाती है ? हमारे मनीपुर से जाती है । रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन में इस बात को रिकार्ड किया गया था ।

आखिर में रेलवे मिनिस्टर सहोदय से मेरा फिर यह निवेदन है कि अतिशीघ्र वहां रेलवे लाइन खोलने की चेष्टा की जाय ।

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have to make a few observations on the Budget which has been styled a pedestrian budget. The hon. friend who preceded me has very vividly put his case and he comes from the extreme East of India. I have to put up along side of it, the case of new state of Bombay. Of course, I do not want to take much time of the House by asking it to consider the question of forming the new state of Bombay but the financial problem that the new State of Bombay has created needs particular attention as far as the Central Budget is concerned. This matter has been very emphatically put by the Finance Minister of Bombay in the speech he delivered on the 25th February, 1958.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: We are not discussing the Bombay Budget.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: He has said that the solution of the national problem which emerged from Parliament in their wisdom after re-organisation of States has created a very complicated financial problem for the component parts of Bombay State and he has shown how

Bombay State has been given a discriminatory treatment as far as its share in the divisible pool of income-tax and its share in the excise duty are concerned and how Bombay State is having less and less share of these, though its responsibilities are increasing day by day. Without taking much time of the House, I will only urge on the Central Government while framing the Budget; to particularly take into consideration the various representations made by the Bombay State to the Finance Commission. I would also like to emphasise the fact that Bombay State has exhausted its target of taxation and it has almost exhausted all its capacity, for further taxation.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: That will be so as long as it is bilingual.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: But some of the States do not want to exert themselves to their full strength in the matter of taxation, because there is always the fear of the constituency weighing on the minds of the hon. Members in the State Legislatures when they have to face this problem. Kerala always wants the help of the Central Government for them to go ahead. This amounts to spoonfeeding. But there is one important thing I would like to say. So far as the taxation proposals are concerned, we have to see whether the States are fulfilling their obligations. There is always an instinctive hesitation to go in for fresh taxation proposals whether in the State or in the Central Government. But, howsoever we may dislike taxation, there is the Plan to which we are all committed and there are the responsibilities which come in the wake of the attempt to fulfil the Five Year Plan. These have to be faced boldly and squarely.

Sir, last year's Budget was criticised as a Budget soaking the poor, because it brought a formidable Bill for fresh taxation of about Rs. 93 crores. This year's Budget is only a pedestrian Budget which is wending its own way

with full determination, perseverance and courage. We have to support that Budget because this is intended for the fulfilment of the Plan. The ex-Finance Minister has made all the Members of this House and elsewhere plan-conscious. We have discussed the Plan in the past, but we were not quite alive to the responsibilities that came in the wake of that Plan. So there was criticism from some quarters. That criticism was sometimes of a friendly nature and sometimes it was also directed just to run down the policy of the Government. Some of our friends have not seen the realism of things and they only say that the policy of the Government is wrong somewhere. But that is not the question. The question is that a democratic Government has always to resort to heavy taxation, especially when it is an underdeveloped country. So if we take into consideration all the pros and cons of the matter of the taxation proposals enunciated last time, we will agree with the policy of the Government. Actually credit was given to the ex-Finance Minister for having re-oriented the whole structure of our taxation policy, and it was said that he removed the orthodoxy which was attached to the exchequer and brought a sort of a new reformed structure.

But there is one thing with which I am not impressed and that is connected with the period of the Budget. The period is from the 1st of April to the 31st of March and this is ill-suited to Indian conditions. It is now for the Finance Minister to examine that question. I in my humble way, referred this question to the Finance Ministry and I am surprised to see their reply saying that the balance of advantages is still in favour of the old system, that is to say, keeping the period from 1st April to 31st March. I have no time to elaborate this point, but I would like to urge that some of the State Governments have very strongly represented on this matter to the Centre.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: The first of April is a very auspicious day.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: I say this because the period that we have adopted is a legacy of the past which is most ill-suited to Indian conditions.

Secondly there is this question of poverty of India which we are all determined to fight through the Second Five Year Plan. But though we are now in the third year of this Plan, we are not even now out of the woods. The stresses and strains of our developing economy are creating problems for us and we have to meet these problems by raising up our resources, both internal and external.

The problem of food is the greatest problem that India is faced with. It is both a challenge and a problem and unfortunately, even after ten years of independence we have not been able to solve this problem fairly and squarely, at least to the degree to which the people expected it to be solved. Of course, honest attempts are being made, but even now the poverty of the country still remains and the most perplexing problem is that of food. It has been said that unless and until India produces more, she will perish. With all our grim determination, that question still remains and India is still required to import food from outside. India is losing more money and India is creating difficulties in her foreign exchange. The reason is mainly this food problem. But the food problem really needs a complete rethinking. In spite of the urgency of this problem we face this problem after every two or three years. And the question often put is why the agriculturist is not producing more and more food? Even the figures given by the Prime Minister in his Budget speech show that the food production has gone up by not more than 5 per cent, whereas the non-food

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.]

agricultural production is more by 13 per cent. That is because of the commercial or cash crops. That also shows that the agriculturist of this country is unwilling to produce more food. What are the reasons for that? Does it mean that there is something wrong with the agriculturist and he is not willing to adjust himself to the changed ways? Or does it mean that there is something lacking in our planning that he is not given sufficient incentive to grow more food? The second appears to be the reasonable cause for which he is not producing more food. There is not sufficient incentive for him and the question of guaranteeing prices to the agriculturist is pretty far now because the country is already facing difficulties in adapting itself to the circumstances which are created by the developing economy of the Plan. But when the whole economy of the country centres on the agricultural economy of the land, I honestly feel and I must urge with all the earnestness at my command the request that agriculture in this country must be given the status of an industry. This I have often repeated both here and elsewhere. Though it is said that at least 60 to 70 per cent. of our people depend on agriculture for their employment, agriculture is not given the status of an industry. Unless and until our agriculture is rehabilitated on these lines, unless and until there is improved agriculture, there will be no sufficient incentive for other industries too. The claims of other industries are put forward vociferously, because the people who run those industries are more intelligent, more articulate and they emphasise their point of view through papers, by organised debates and through their associations. But the cause of the agriculturist is lost sight of. Even the recommendations contained in the Report of the All-India Rural Credit Survey Committee are not fully implemented though some attempt is made at its implementation. Unless the agriculturist is given facilities, unless the agriculturist is given direct

help to produce more, is given incentives by way of guaranteed prices or crop insurance or crop planning, it is not possible to solve this problem and, after every two or three years, the country will be faced with food shortage, involving the import of food which in turn means the loss of foreign exchange. We see in India a picture of those who are not well-educated and those who are ignorant, that large mass of people, who are always doomed from their birth to hard work in order to provide for others the requisites of a refined and cultured life, are themselves prevented by their poverty from having any share or part in that life. If that state of affairs continues, then I am afraid that howsoever we might try to balance our Budget by foreign aid, by having resort to deficit financing and fresh taxation, the backbone of the economy of our country cannot be improved. This can be improved only through improved agriculture. I suggest that there must be rethinking as well as replanning in agriculture, particularly in regard to food because unless this question is solved, the other questions cannot be solved. This is a primary question and the other are subsidiary questions and even the major industries which we are now trying to build up in our country are subsidiary. The objective of self-sufficiency in every respect cannot come up if the importance of food problem is lost sight of. I most humbly suggest that this problem requires very close attention and scrutiny at several stages wherever it is handled. I feel that there should be completed co-ordination between the Food Ministry, the Finance Ministry as well as the Commerce Ministry and there should be a close eye kept on the food situation. The question of production of food in India mainly depends on the vagaries of nature; if there is a good season, then our prospects are bright but if the season is bad, then we are doomed to destruction. Immediately the cost of living rises and immediately a problem is created for us. The question of getting foreign aid, resorting to deficit

financing, etc., are all questions which are meant for the Finance Ministry but I would only urge that when we consider the Budget, we have always to take into consideration the needs of the Budget. Whether the tax proposals would bring us sufficient revenue and whether the incidence is such which does not unduly affect and which does not in any way take away the initiative and incentive for creating more and more production. Judging from this standard, I feel Sir, the new taxation which was initiated last year is an ideal taxation system which has got all the vision, imagination and the necessary vigour and also, it has brought sufficient revenue to the Exchequer. But, as I said earlier, the Indian conditions require that the period which starts from the 1st April should be changed because it is unsuited to Indian conditions, because in the lean months of summer we have ample leisure and unemployment in the villages. But the budget allotments of Centre and State reach villages late in June when the sowing season starts and three or four months of rainy season are wasted. Then the harvest starts and lasts till January. Taking into consideration this particular aspect of Indian seasons I feel that this change of Budget period should be brought in as early as possible.

With these remarks, Sir, I support the Budget.

**SHRI B. M. GUPTE (Mysore):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, as the time at my disposal is limited, I shall confine myself only to two points. First, I shall take up, the low income-group housing scheme. Now, that is a very important scheme because there is acute shortage of housing accommodation in cities and towns and, moreover, the scheme caters for the needs of a very hard-pressed class and, therefore, it is an important scheme. But, unfortunately the progress had been very poor. Last year, a sum of Rs. 5,59,00,000 was provided but only

Rs. 1,69,00,000 were utilised; that means, hardly a little more than 25 per cent. was used and four crores were left unspent. That is a very sad tale and this is occurring after three years of the introduction of the scheme. By this time, the scheme ought to have got into stride but it has not and, therefore, it is worthwhile looking into it to find out whether it requires any revision. I suggest, Sir, that the scheme must be liberalised. Today, eighty per cent. of the cost of land and building is given, not exceeding Rs. 8,000 in one case. This means that the cost of the land and buildings should not be more than Rs. 10,000 if 80 per cent. of that is to be given. So, this sum of Rs. 10,000 is too inadequate. In no town or city could even a small house be built for Rs. 10,000 and, I therefore suggest that the minimum limit of Rs. 8,000 must be raised at least to Rs. 10,000. I would prefer even Rs. 15,000 but at least Rs. 10,000 must be there as otherwise this target of building 68,000 houses in the second Five Year Plan period will not be reached at all. Then there is the question of the implementation also. I am connected with one co-operative housing society. Some of the members wanted to take advantage of the scheme but for eight or nine months the forms necessary for applying were not available and, therefore, much time was wasted and the patience of the people was also exhausted. Of course, that was only in the past but now things have improved. At the same time, however, there is a great leeway to be made; there is much delay and there is much red-tape. I would suggest that the Centre should employ additional supervising staff which should go to the States, expedite the matter and see what the bottlenecks are. Otherwise, the whole sum will remain unspent. For the next year, a sum of Rs. 6,25,00,000, is provided for but if this sum is to be spent, I think it would be worthwhile spending Rs. 25 lakhs in employing additional supervisory staff.

Then I shall take up my second point and that is with reference to

[Shri B. M. Gupte.]

clause 17 of the Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill. By this a very heavy hand is being laid upon the joint family property. I would not have minded if that provision had lapped off the top branches; if rich men only are to be fleeced, I would not mind it at all, but this will affect the small, middle-class, the lower-middle class people living in a joint family. For some years, under a mistaken notion that the joint family system is being widely misused for evasion of tax, a persistent fiscal campaign has been going on against it and perhaps this is the biggest shot. Even now, under the Income Tax Act, conditions have been created under which it is more profitable to break up the joint family rather than to continue it. And this would be accentuated by the proposed provision in the Estate Duty Bill. According to this provision, for the purpose of determining the rate applicable to a coparcener's share in a joint family property for payment of Estate Duty, not only his share will be taken into consideration but the shares of his sons also. I shall take an example. At least two persons can make a family and there may be the father and one son to comprise it. But let us take one more. Suppose there is a family of a father and two sons. The father dies, and let us take that the father's share amounts to Rs. 60,000. Now of course the share of the father will be taxed and Rs. 60,000 only is liable to be taxed. That is, Rs. 50,000 will be exempted and the remaining Rs. 10,000 will be taxed. But the rate applicable will be the rate applicable to all the three coparceners' shares put together. It is not the rate applicable to his share of Rs. 60,000 but it is the rate applicable to the amount arrived at by adding to this the shares of his two sons amounting to Rs. 1,20,000. That is to say, the rate applicable to Rs. 1,80,000 will be applicable to his Rs. 60,000. Now, if I am calculating rightly and only Rs. 10,000 of the father's share are taxed, Rs. 600 will be the death duty. But the two sons' shares also are to be included. That means, if, again, I am calculating correctly, the tax would

be amounting to Rs. 2,300, and that is nearly four times the present tax. I, therefore, suggest that this is a very heavy burden and what does it amount to? It amounts to this that the sons are required to pay the death duty even during their lifetime and that too at a very inflated rate. Otherwise, if this provision were not there each son's share would be required to pay an Estate Duty of Rs. 600 only. Now the share of every one of them will have to pay Rs. 2,300 as death duty. So I say that this is rather a very heavy burden and it is likely to force people to disrupt the joint family property. Now I may be told that a family having an estate of Rs. 1,80,000 is sufficiently rich. But I think this is a misconception because, if we take the annual income of the estate, calculating it at 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. of that amount, what will be the income? The income will be, at the most, Rs. 9,000 or Rs. 12,000. Now Rs. 12,000, for three coparceners amounts to an annual income of Rs. 4,000 for each. In the low income group housing scheme there is given the definition of low-income and there it is said that persons having Rs. 6,000 as annual income are eligible for that scheme. That means Rs. 6,000 is a low-income. And this Rs. 4,000 is lower than that. Therefore my point is this, that this is a very small income and these are lower middle-class men. Yet they will have to pay at least four times the tax they will be required to pay under the existing provision. So I say this is unfair and is a very great burden and it is likely to cause disruption of the joint family even though these people are willing to live under that system. But my objection goes deeper because my objection is this, that by penalising the joint family we are following a policy which is contradictory to the policy which we are following in another sphere. We are frantically trying to popularise co-operative farming and co-operative living in the villages. But we are at the same time attacking an institution which is the embodiment of co-operative living. Joint family system is nothing, but co-operative

living and, as I said, it is the embodiment of co-operative living. The joint family system has played a great part, has played an important role in the history of India. Like the village panchayats the joint family system has maintained the framework of society while successive hordes of invaders swept over the country. Not only that, it maintained the culture and traditions of the society. There was that old world charity, that old world tolerance and large-heartedness. A Tahsildar son may bring Rs. 200 to the common pool or a clerk son may bring only Rs. 25 per month to the common pool. But there was no difference made. The needs of all were catered to and there was no complaint at all. Therefore I said that it was that old world tradition and old world large-mindedness. I admit that even apart from the fiscal burden the joint family system is disintegrating. With the impact of the British connection a kind of individualism which often degenerates into selfishness has been rampant and we have become rather more petty-minded and calculating. That spirit of narrow-mindedness and selfishness is incompatible with the working of the joint family system. There must be large-mindedness and one should not mind if a brother's contribution is larger or smaller. Therefore petty-mindedness and a calculating nature are incompatible with the joint family working. But since that proper spirit is gone, since those traits which foster comradeship and large-mindedness are nowadays absent the joint family system may disintegrate of itself. To that I have no objection because that breaking up is natural and, therefore, welcome. But my objection is to breaking it up forcibly by our taxation laws. So what I object to is compulsion and not its breaking up according to natural circumstances and the forces of social order. I, therefore, suggest that this is a case which should be looked into, and I would, therefore, request the Finance Minister to revise the attitude, to reconsider that taxation attitude towards the joint family system, remove this heavy burden from the

middle classes and eliminate the contradiction in our policy whereby we are encouraging co-operative living in one sphere and undermining it in another.

Sir, I have done.

[श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त] (नाम-निर्देशित) :

उप सभापति महोदय, यथापूर्व इस बार भी मुझे कुछ बोलने का अवसर दिया गया है, इसके लिये मैं हृदय से कृतज्ञता प्रकट करता हूँ। इस बार रंग में भंग हो जाने से कुछ वैसा उत्साह न था, परन्तु श्री अमोलख चंद जैसे कृपालुजनों से प्रेरित होकर कुछ पद्य बन गये हैं, वे इस प्रकार हैं :

आय कठिन, व्यय सहज, मिलेगा

क्या दोनों का मेल कभी,

सहनी पड़ी हमें धन से भी बड़ी

एक जन-हानि अभी ।

क्रान्तिजयी विक्रान्त हमारे

मौलाना चिरशान्त हुये,

निर्मल जीवन-नाट्य पूर्ण

कर कीर्ति छोड़ निष्क्रान्त हुये ।

वह अकलान्त काल क्या जाने

हम ये कितने श्रान्त हुये,

चले बिना गति नहीं किन्तु दुर्गति है,

यदि दिग्भ्रान्त हुये ।

जैसे भी हो सके लक्ष्य तक

हमको जाना ही होगा,

लय संभाल स्वर ताल साधकर

सम पर आना ही होगा ।

चले गये सो मुक्त हो गये

हम स्वतन्त्र ही बने रहें,

उनकी थाती लेकर छाती देकर

जो आ पड़े सहें ।

मातायें हैं तो बैसे जन फिर

जनकर देंगी हमको



[ श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त ]

देते चलें चुनौती हम इस असम  
विषम को, उस यम को ।

हम में हैं मतभेद बहुत कुछ  
किन्तु एक मत सब इसमें,

ऐसा हो, निज-पर का—  
सबका योगाक्षेम सधे जिसमें ।

इतना ही क्या अल्प, अन्त में  
यहा एक ही सबका लक्ष,

वहां प्रमाद सहज सम्भव है,  
जहां न हो कोई पर-पक्ष ।

सच्ची निर्णायक जनता है,  
वह सब की सुन लेती है,

फिर गुनकर जब जिसे चाहती  
निज नेता चुन लेती है ।

सुनती है वह मेहनत को भी,  
अब्दुला मट्टला को भी,

अचरज है सुनने का कैसे  
उसका मन ऐसा लोभी ।

और अधिक अचरज, जो नेता हैं  
अपने माथे के मौरे,

कल जिस मुख से कुछ कहते थे,  
आज उसी मुख से कुछ और ।

‘वृद्धास्ते न विचारणीय’ यह  
कवि ने क्या ही ठीक कहा,

राष्ट्रपिता से राजाजी का  
किन्तु कहां समधीत्व रहा ।

साधन हमें जुटाना ही है  
देकर कर किवा बलिदान,

पर, धन का उपयोग उचित हो  
रहे आपका पूरा ध्यान ।

सफल योजनायें हों अपनी  
तो हम सब भर पावेंगे,

किन्तु जहा धन वहां चोर भी  
अपनी घात लगावेंगे

हम तब भी सन्तोष करेंगे,  
हमने जो कुछ प्राप्त किया,

पूरे से भी अधिक मूल्य है  
उसका पहले चुका दिया ।

अपने रवि ठाकुर का कहना  
कितना सुमाधानमय है,

पृथिवी के पी लेंने पर  
जो बचता वही जलाशय है ।

बहु प्रत्यक्ष परोक्ष करो न  
हमें घेर रक्खा है आज,

यह अपने भावी हित में है  
तो सह लेगा इसे समाज ।

किन्तु देश में फले हैं जो  
रक्तबीज से भ्रष्टाचार,

कहां रहेगी शासन सत्ता यदि  
न हुआ उनका प्रतिकार ।

4 P.M.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, It is a little difficult to follow a poet and what I have to say, I fear, is very prosaic. When I introduced this Budget in the other House I called it a pedestrian Budget and I said that in the circumstances I felt rather unfit for this task. I do not suffer from any over-much modesty, nor do I normally try to underestimate my own capacities. But I said it, looking at this mighty task of India, not merely this Budget, because though it is a matter of accounting and income and expenditure, does contain the dry bones of that drama, shall I say, the drama of India, the drama which has been so full of many things of high optimism, of setbacks of brave endeavours, some triumphs, many obstacles and at the same time of a grim determination to

go along whether we have to cross deserts or wildernesses so that we can ultimately go with all our people to the promised land. So listening to this debate, and may I say, Sir, with apologies that I was not present here most of the time but I have taken the trouble to read the speeches of hon. Members, or at any rate, the full notes about them by my colleagues, I find many points have been raised and many criticisms offered. Undoubtedly, anything that is said here is deserving of study and consideration even though one may ultimately not agree with it. Something has been said about those points and suggestions by my colleagues. I do not wish to repeat that or to enter into so many relatively minor aspects of this problem, though I would give this House this assurance that whatever has been said will be carefully considered. I would rather refer to a few matters which have been referred to here and also try to put before this House this larger theme of our planning or of our budgeting or of our taxation. After all, there is some connection between all these; they are not isolated happenings. Some people may criticise this tax, some that, or something else and their criticism may or may not be justified but the point is, are they looking at this picture in perspective, the whole of the picture or just some tiny part of it? If they only look at a small part of it and forget the rest, then their criticism is not of great value. I should like to say something about that but before I say that I might deal with some of the points raised by hon. Members.

I think it was Dr. Kunzru who referred to the looseness of the budgeting, deficit financing and some other like matters. Now, so far as looseness of the budgeting is concerned, I think the criticism is to some extent justified, but I would plead with this House and with Dr. Kunzru that one must consider this Budget as not a Budget of a static country during a static period. Here is a developing economy, producing changes, bringing about unexpected results. Here are taxes, a

new tax we have put of which we have no experience. We can only guess how much we will get ultimately out of that tax; what difficulties we may have to face. It is a mere guess we have put down; after a few years we may be more accurate. Take these imports. It is exceedingly difficult to say more or less precisely what the income from imports might be because there are so many other factors which affect them. Anyhow I am merely pointing out some difficulties in regard to judging the income of the country because of these changing factors. Then take the expenditure. That again is affected very much by this developing economy. It is also affected by the fact that many things that we want to get from abroad—and we make provision for them—we are unable to get. They cannot come within that period. Many things included in the Defence Budget have not been available to us during that period and so fairly large sums have been unspent and so in other matters too. I entirely agree with Dr. Kunzru that every attempt should be made for as careful budgeting as possible but there are so many indeterminate and uncertain factors that it is difficult to be very accurate and if so, one tends to err on the conservative side and not on the other.

Then, Dr. Kunzru referred I think to the foreign exchange situation. Now, I can give some figures about it but in thinking about it this morning it seemed to me that it would be far more satisfactory for Members of this House if I could soon, fairly soon, place a full paper on the subject instead of just a few figures which I might give now. Some four or five months ago when the impact of this situation hit us rather forcibly in the face, I asked the Planning Commission to enquire into it thoroughly why we were caught somewhat unawares or to the extent we were caught unawares. The Planning Commission then did prepare a note, a careful note about it, which they sent us and which was helpful, which gave us some picture of what had happened

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

or where we had erred, what we had not taken into our consideration, how there had been sometimes lack of co-ordination between some Ministries ordering things and another Ministry or the Planning Commission not knowing it, and what were the main reasons, at any rate. Well, I would have put that paper. Then, I thought that paper is out of date. It was prepared five months ago. So, I have asked today the Planning Commission to be good enough to revise that paper and make it up-to-date, so that I might be able to place it on the Table of the House and I hope that I shall be able to do so in about a week's time, next week, some time next week. But I might mention here that this great drain on the foreign exchange resources was primarily to be attributed to the attempt to carry out the Second Five Year Plan. Then, other things came in. First of all, the import of more foodgrains, much more than we had anticipated. This was a heavy load. Then, there were demands on Defence, which to that extent had not been provided for. Then, there were the increased requirements of raw materials, components, spares, replacements etc. for matching the higher levels of industrial production, reached in 1955-56 for which some allowance was made in the Plan estimates. But this had proved wholly inadequate. The House will observe how one gets entangled in one's own rapid progress. Because industrial production went up and we wanted it to go up, immediately we require more raw materials for it, more spares, more replacements and so more things to be brought in from abroad. Then, item four is rather higher imports of consumer goods in the years 1955-56 and 1956-57 compared with earlier years. And lastly increases in prices and in freight rates. Now, it has been thought that a great deal of this foreign exchange difficulty was due to a tremendous spurt in import of consumer goods. That is not so. That is, to that extent it is so. Partly it is one of the causes. But the real and the

principal causes have been those that I have mentioned. I shall not go further into this, as I propose as I have said, to place a detailed paper on the Table of the House, probably next week.

Hon. Members know that there has been considerable improvement in the foreign exchange situation and indeed not only has the weekly drain gradually been reduced and almost brought to zero, but I believe last week there was actually a plus quantity instead of the normal deficit. Now, I do not say that this is something which should make us complacent; but it does indicate that the steps we took during the past year have borne fruit and are bearing fruit. It does indicate that we have to continue those steps and not relax because nothing would be more dangerous than relaxation and complacency at this stage. Now it does show also certainly that we can re-appraise the entire situation in regard to import, etc. Now, in regard to imports another difficulty arises which we have to face today. We want exports, of course. Now, quite a number of our exports depend on some imports, whether it is raw material, whether it is something or some other component. And so our Ministry of Commerce and Industry has been put in great jeopardy and great difficulty of being told, no imports. And then the opposite side of the picture comes to us. Exports dwindle because of imports. So, one has to balance all these things and no doubt we shall have—we have normally from time to time—appraisals and reappraisals and we shall have them.

Then, there is the third important question raised by some hon. Members about these various loans that we are taking. What about their repayment? It is a very relevant question. One cannot go on piling up debt which may crush us later on and I can assure the House that this matter has been before us at every stage and we are going to have a fairly difficult time to repay these debts. In effect, the difficulty will be for two or possibly three

years. After that it tapers off. For the next few years, three years or so, conditions will not produce any real crisis for us. But after three years or so the time of difficulty arises involving the repayment of some loans and that lasts for two to three years. I will give some figures. The repayment this year, that is, 1958-59 is Rs. 23 crores—a little more than Rs. 23 crores. The year next it is Rs. 35 crores; the year after that Rs. 92 crores.

**SHRI H. N. KUNZRU:** Is that foreign loans?

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** I think so. Yes, what we have to pay in foreign currency. Then comes the year 1961-62, that is the peak year and a difficult year. We have to pay Rs. 123 crores. After that it begins to come down, Rs. 107 crores and then in 1963-64 there is a big drop—Rs. 37, Rs. 35, Rs. 48 crores. It goes down. So, the real difficult years are 1960 to 1963, when we have to pay from Rs. 92 crores onwards going up to Rs. 123 crores and coming down to Rs. 107 crores. Well, obviously paying over a hundred crores is a very large sum and the only slight consolation is that the bad years are only two or two and a half years. But we have to pay for the accommodation that we are getting. These bad years—I might tell the House—are not because of the normal credits and loans that we are taking, but because in those years we have to repay our drawings from the International Monetary Fund and hence this has gone up. Now, that is so and that is a heavy burden that we have to carry. And I might make it clear that these figures, that I have quoted, relate to the loans already taken. I am not for the moment saying, I am not including naturally any further ones that we might take which would probably increase. But this should not anyhow increase this sum for those years, because those heavy years are related to the International Monetary Fund. If we take other loans and we have to pay ten years later, it is a different matter. It is not a very difficult matter. Now, how are

we to pay them? Well, I cannot say immediately how; but a great deal would depend, I think, on the food situation, on how much foodgrains we import from abroad. A good deal will depend—and that is not an uncertain factor—on the position of iron and steel. How far we are producing it? I read out to the House just now some of the reasons for the foreign exchange position. Iron and steel was one of the principal things which has led to this tremendous foreign exchange gap apart from food. Now it is hoped, and with some assurance, that not only will we not import iron and steel then—and that will be a considerable saving—but that we might actually perhaps in regard to pig iron etc. be exporting some and getting some foreign exchange from it.

So far as the food situation is concerned there are so many factors which cannot be definitely ascertained now, that I would hesitate to prophesy. I can only tell the House what my own reaction is to such reports that I have received. But we know, all of us, that we are still unhappily in the hands of blind gods who send the monsoon or do not send it, and we have to become wiser and more powerful than those blind gods to control the situation. And, speaking not about India but about the world generally, it is exceedingly probable, not immediately but in the course of the foreseeable future, 10 years, 12 years or 15 years at the most, that the weather and the rains might be brought under control to some extent by science. However, I can say nothing about the weather and the climate but I can say this that I believe that our State Governments and our Community Development Blocks and people are today very very conscious of the need to concentrate on greater food production, and there is not only an awareness of it but a feeling of urgency of this problem, and when there is this widespread feeling of urgency, I have no doubt in my mind that it will produce results. Now merely saying generally we produce more may produce a useful atmosphere but does not do much good.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

You have to come down to brass tacks, if I may say so, in order to grip the problem. That means that you have to come down to the village and you have to come down to the individual cultivator. Now our attempt is first to concentrate on the community project areas; secondly to concentrate upon irrigated areas or where there is abundant rain normally—between these two we probably reap a fairly large figure, I think a hundred million acres or something like that—and concentrating, that is to say, on areas where the danger of a drought is less, the danger of climatic changes affecting them is somewhat less, not fully gone of course, and trying to increase the yield per acre. It is a question of better fertiliser, better seed, better this, better that, co-operative effort and all that, I would not go into that. My point is that every effort is being made and I think that will increase the yield, because there can be no doubt that our future financial position, our Budgets, or Five Year Plans, in fact almost everything we hope to achieve depends on additional food production. It is so important, far more important in the final analysis than anything else. If we attach importance to industrial growth, as we do and as the House does, that industrial growth depends entirely on agricultural growth also. So we come back to that. So I do think that unless, again, the blind gods misbehave as they have done often in the past, we hope to do better in the coming years. It is going to be hard work and hard struggle, but then we have undertaken a hard and difficult job, and we cannot complain if we have to work hard for it and face some risks.

Now, one or two minor matters. There has been some criticism of the gift tax and the succession tax, that they are separate taxes and that they should be integrated. Well, they have in fact been integrated to a very large extent. If you look into them, the whole attempt is to integrate them.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh):  
Only the rates have been integrated.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Not at all. Rates, of course, have been integrated except for the fact that there is a slab of Rs. 50,000 in the one case and not in the other. Otherwise it has been largely integrated. Then again, there has been some criticism about the exemption limit for estate duty being reduced, that is Rs. 50,000. Well, if I may confess it, I was exceedingly sorry that it was not Rs. 50,000 last year. I was not for it but ultimately for reasons I do not remember, anyhow it went up to Rs. 100,000. But the main reason was that it being a new tax we were not quite sure about our apparatus, about our machinery, and we wanted to go slow so that the machinery might be tiffere. Now, as I said, I do not wish to go into a number of details which will no doubt be considered, but I want to take the larger problem of what we are aiming at and of what way we intend travelling.

One of my colleagues—I was not here but I read a report of her speech—Rajkumari Amrit Kaur complained of all these taxes *en bloc*, wealth tax, expenditure tax, income-tax, and in complaining she said that they retarded the growth of savings and capital formation. Further I believe she said that if the taxation proposals are maintained unchanged, the only result will be to divert money from useful investment to unfruitful hoarding in the form of purchase of silver and gold—which is rather a statement which does not fit in with the previous statement. If people attempted to put money in silver and gold, they require no great sympathy from us, and the heavier the taxation the better, and if necessity comes, we will find ways and means of getting at the silver and gold. But that does not follow at all. I do not think that the situation in India at the present moment is such that it does not offer enough incentive to people to invest. I recognize that we are heavily taxed. But that type of criticism which I just mentioned, the cri-

ticism about savings and capital formation coming from less taxation—and further it was said that a welfare state should not be unduly hard on the private sector and so on—is so utterly different in approach to the whole problem that we have to face, so different from our approach to this problem, so different from the Government's approach or the Congress's approach that it is a little difficult for me to deal with it unless I go into the very A, B, C of economics. What problem do we have to face? We have to face the problem of an underdeveloped country somehow crossing the barrier into a dynamic economy, self-progressive economy. Now we see that countries like the United States, like England, like Russia, that is industrialised communities, automatically grow, automatically become richer and richer. Just as they become automatically richer and richer, countries like India, unless something radical is done, grow automatically poorer and poorer. It does not matter how many odd factories you put up here or there. It has nothing to do with production, they automatically grow poorer and poorer. There is the old example, you may quote the Bible for it or something else:

“Unto him that hath shall be given more; from him that hath not shall be taken away what he hath.”

But it is a law of economics because a country or a region or a family or an individual who is poor lives in an environment which drags him down. And unless you change the whole environment, he is dragged down and he comes more and more poor, and because he becomes more and more poor, he becomes less and less fit to work, more and more unfit, more and more foolish, more and more incapable of doing anything useful, and more and more incapable of becoming a useful member of the society. Then you come and say, “Well, this fellow is unfit, what can I do? This country is unfit and incapable of making any progress.” Just as subjection to political rule makes the people unfit in

many ways, so poverty makes them unfit to become rich and to produce more. The worker, in a country like England or elsewhere, does much more work than the worker in India. Why? He is better-fed, better-housed, better-helped and better-looked after, and he can do better work. And I am quite sure that the Indian worker can do better work provided his surroundings are such. And that applies to the whole country. Now I submit that the complex of poverty dragging a poor country down more and more cannot be got over until you create a complex of circumstances which pull up these people. It is not a question of odd thinking or an odd factory being set up here or there, but the complex of things all round which gradually pull them up. And one has to judge therefore all these events not from even or odd tables or units of production as they are, but from the psychological atmosphere that is being produced by many factors, of course, not one, but hundreds of factors. Now this whole approach, which I just read out, of Rajkumari Amrit Kaur shows a total ignorance of all these factors. It is the approach of rather a petty capitalist who owns a factory and who thinks that by having more factories he can cure the poverty of India. It is a wrong idea. You can have hundreds and thousands of factories, and you will not be able to cure it, unless, of course, you proceed in a different way, because the odd thing is that, as I said, you will increase the differences by that. You may produce more in India, but what you produce will not be evenly spread and will not produce that complex which raises a nation. In the last ten or eleven years, say, since the last great war, actually the rich countries and the industrialised countries like England, America, Russia, Germany or France, have gone ahead far more than we have, in spite of all our efforts. The difference between India and any industrially advanced country is greater today than it was ten years ago, in spite of all our efforts, because they being industrialised highly have been able to make much progress and have been

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

able to carry on well. We have to break that barrier. How are we to do it? Not all the efforts of private enterprise in India, if money be showered upon it, can do that rapidly. Maybe, if you like, in 50 or 60 years they may be able to do it, or rather the events may be able to do it. But you have to face other problems also, for example social problems and democratic problems. Remember that England and countries like that became industrialised at a moment of very restricted democracy in those countries. A great leader—one of the most important leaders of the Labour Party in England—once said that he wondered, if England had been 150 years ago fully democratic, that democracy would have permitted the industrial revolution to come in, because the industrial revolution coming in meant a terrible burden on the people. And when you have adult suffrage in a democracy, well, they will say, "Why should we have more burdens on ourselves?" They will rather present their demands more and more. Let us not forget that democracy remembers demands and forgets obligations. Anyhow, they got over bravely that difficult period really by having practically no democracy. And we may do it only in theory subject to two matters, firstly, it would take a few generations, and secondly, it would involve, well, upheavals and the Government would disappear because people would not put up with those kind of things. So just merely thinking on those lines that we can repeat here what happened in England a hundred years ago, or in America a hundred years ago, or elsewhere, is logically not correct. Quite apart, of course, from your emotional approach to the problem and quite apart from how you feel it, it is not equitable and it is not logically so. It cannot be done today. Therefore another approach has to be made.

Now there are various approaches that we have seen in recent years. There is the approach in the Soviet Union. That is the only real approach that counts, for which we have got a

period of years to judge, and one can certainly say that in terms of fiscal or economic advance in the last forty years the Soviet Union has advanced remarkably. But one has to remember also the price paid by the Soviet Union and the people of the Soviet Union for that remarkable advance. And even that took 40 years. It did not come about suddenly. Even the path that they followed at the time of the great war was partly no doubt thought out, but partly due to chance, circumstance and defeat in the war and many other things, and you cannot possibly repeat the history of other countries elsewhere. So the problem that we have to face is unique and that problem cannot be solved by what are normally called the methods of free enterprise. Would free enterprise go in for three or four huge steel plants and wait for years and years for any profit to come out of them? No. One of the steel plants is a private plant, that of Tatas, a very fine plant, of course. They are doubling their production. How are they doubling it? With the help of big loans from abroad, with the help from our Government and with the help from abroad by way of loans etc. Very good. And the amount of help that we are constantly giving to private enterprise is surprising. In fact, the private enterprise, some of it at any rate, is carried on very much by public help, and the element of private enterprise becomes less and less when so much public help is coming in. And what is our attitude? Of course, we have been casually saying that we want the public sector, the private sector, as also the mixed economy. We have not casually said that we are aiming at a socialistic pattern of society. Great organisations and Parliament do not casually go into these things—some person may deliver a speech, it is a different matter—but come to this decision after years of thought, and after that for somebody without giving too much thought to all these difficult economic processes, all these difficult scientific and industrial processes and all that, just casually putting all this aside, seems to me rather illogical. Some

hon. Members here, and some Members in the other House, criticised this business of taxation, etc, but they offer no other course. I admit that there is a limit beyond which taxation becomes regressive. You cannot go on taxing; maybe the sources of taxation may dry up. There is a limit and it has to be carefully thought out, but the fact remains that there is no choice for us but to carry a heavy load of taxation, a heavy load in various ways, and to spread it out as far as one can. Some people criticise this lowering of the exemption limit of income-tax. I entirely appreciate their feelings, because it falls on the lower middle classes and all that. Yet, that is one of the fundamentally right things that was done last year. You can compare this with other countries and see whether their income-tax limits are lower than ours, although they are much richer countries and they can afford to have higher limits, but their limits are lower even now, because you have to spread this out. However much you tax the rich—those who can bear the burden should pay—you have to spread it, this burden of taxation, as widely as possible. There is no other escape from it. I would like, therefore, this House to consider this basic character of this problem. Here we are struggling to get out of this morass of poverty. How can we do it? By greater wealth production and of course, better distribution. Remember always that every year just about 5 million people are added to our population . . .

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 4.5 millions.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Nearly fifty lakhs more people to feed, to clothe and do everything to. It is an enormous number, so that, whatever you may produce, even to keep to the level we are, without any progress we have to produce enough to feed, clothe and to house these 5 million more people every year. If you produce less than that, then you go down. This is what we have been doing in the last 100 or 150 years. We talk about the increasing poverty of India. It has

been increasing, and the population has been increasing, and our wealth-producing capacity is going down. The result is gradual, slowly-creeping poverty, which came, and it continues. When we took up this matter in hand in the First Five Year Plan, we were cautious and we laid down certain targets. As a matter of fact, we fulfilled those targets, but the fact of the matter was that, having fulfilled the targets of the First Five Year Plan, we did not reach the target of the additional population that had been added during the Plan. In fact, the targets were too low; the progress was too slow, even to cope with this additional population, quite apart from progress. It was, therefore, quite wrong for us to have a Second Five Year Plan more or less like the First. That meant defeat. We had to have a bigger one; there was no help for it; how much bigger is a different matter. The Plan must first of all cover the needs of the additional population that will come, and there must be a plus factor for growth. Otherwise, you remain where you are and go down. If you examine it in this way, you are driven inevitably to the conclusion that there is a certain limit below which you cannot go, which is to be translated into a minimum of investment, because investment is supposed to lead to that production. I am not going into the figures, but suppose the limit of investment is Rs. 4000 crores in the First Plan; then to keep where you are, just to keep pace with the growing population, you had to add something to it for progress, and that depends on ourselves, on the people, on how hard we can work and produce results, because production means harder work. That is a simple equation.

Now, another thing that we have seen or we can see is that there is no other way for us to get over this poverty hurdle except through industrialisation and other things. There is no other way, that is to say, except through taking advantage of modern techniques, scientific and technological techniques. You may take advantage of that in many ways, in big industries, in small industries, in middle



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] industries, call it what you like. But without taking advantage of modern science, scientific technique, you can never progress. I should like to remind the House that one of the first things that we did some ten or eleven years ago was to realise the importance of science and technology in this context, and we put up some 13 national laboratories and institutes and many smaller ones. We even in the early stages started taking interest in atomic energy and today we are, apart from the first three or four nations, rather advanced in atomic energy, not for war purposes, but because in the modern world we cannot do without it, for production and the rest. We showed some foresight in this matter. I am quite certain, if I may say so with all respect, that, if we had left this, let us say, to private enterprise, private enterprise could have purchased machines from America, from Japan, put up factories here and no doubt produced the goods and we would have had statistics of greater production, but they would have come nowhere near even the road to a solution of the problem. That is certain. As a matter of fact, if you think in terms of industrialisation, you must be advanced in science, you must be advanced in technology, you must be advanced in machine-making, machine-building, but nobody is going to build machines in India except the State. It is too heavy a burden. Now, we are going ahead with these four steel plants and a machine-building forging foundry and other things. It is only when these things come and they start functioning, your speed would become swifter and swifter. If you rely on steel from abroad, you are helpless, as we are today. Even for using that steel there is needed one big step forward. If you rely on machines from abroad, you are helpless again. It is only when you make your machines you progress. When I say machines, I don't mean petty machines, I mean big machines, like the iron and steel plants. When you make them, then you are well on the

road to progress. It is hard work, but then it brings results.

The real difficulty of a democratic society like ours which is also terribly poor, in pulling itself out is how to balance these two factors, one, the legitimate and inevitable demand of saving for investment, whether that saving comes from taxation or from other ways of saving, as saving from consumption and so on, and the other this inevitable demand, also legitimate, of the people wanting higher standards of consumption. They both conflict. But one has to balance them as far as one can. Everybody sympathises, everybody in this House sympathises with the demand for better living conditions. After all, the whole purpose of our planning is for better living conditions, in a welfare State, a socialist State, whatever it is. Yet, in order to reach there, we have to deny so many things to ourselves and to our people. It is a terribly difficult problem. I can say with complete earnestness that all these things should be done for education in this country, for housing, for health and all that. These are absolutely necessary—higher wages, higher salaries. But with complete earnestness, on the opposite, I can say that nothing should be done so that we may at least get going, so that something could be done tomorrow. So there is this conflict and one has to balance these two, because one has to do something to raise our people. You cannot help it, more especially in a democratic set-up. At the same time you have to save also. Therefore, to some extent, the additional income or wealth that you get has to be divided up in two, one part for somewhat higher standards and the other part for investment for future progress.

There are one or two other matters that I want to say. We have received a number of loans and credits from other countries. I need not tell the House that they are, all of them, completely free from any type of conditions. It is left to ourselves how to use them, more or less, and I am very grateful to those countries for this help. Of course, it is for mutual advantage,

I have no doubt. Often sometimes we help our friends because they are our friends. Sometimes we help them because we want them to be our friends. That is a different matter. But still we should be grateful and India is grateful for the loans that have come to us at the time of difficulty.

I may just mention here how in all this business the question of population control becomes important. Just as every addition means additional investment, if you could restrict the growth of population, it would be a great relief and that much would go towards the progress of the others, and it is a matter which has become really of crucial importance to our country.

The other day there was a debate in this House and elsewhere over that Enquiry Report of the Life Insurance committee or commission.

AN. HON. MEMBER: The L.I.C. Report.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, the L. I. C. Report. Now, that Report dealt with particular incidents and came to some conclusions. But I find that those sets of incidents are now used often enough, to run down public enterprises and to praise private enterprises. Now, I am not running down private enterprise because private enterprise is an essential part of our structure today, and it would be completely wrong for us to have it as part of our structure and not help it. It is an absurd situation. If you don't want it, let us put an end to it. But if we have it we should encourage it to play its role in the domain allotted to it. But this business of running down because of some mistakes or errors or whatever it was, made in the Insurance Corporation or elsewhere, running down all public corporations and public sector, does seem to me rather odd. As a matter of fact, take the Life Insurance Corporation itself. It has done better in the last year than ever since life insurance came into India. It is making rapid progress. It is doing rather well, and I have no doubt that it will do well. We have heard previously of big private insur-

ance companies going to pieces, of all kinds of frauds in them, some cases going on in the courts and people being punished. In fact, one of the reasons for the formation of this Life Insurance Corporation was that several—not all—several insurance companies were in a very very bad way. I don't know, at least I don't remember there was this organised expression of opinion that private enterprise was bad, at that time, because any insurance company had failed. And now it is suggested by some people, "Oh, because of this we hope you will denationalise life insurance or a part of it." Still I think it would be wrong to leave any doubt about our intentions and I say that we do not propose to do so, now or hereafter. There is no going back, if I may say so. Some hon Members are constantly saying, "Nationalise everything". Some others object to nationalisation and even go to the extent of asking for denationalisation. We pursue, as India has often done, a middle path. We believe that if we believe in a socialist pattern of society, we must inevitably go that way. But our speed will depend on circumstances. However, in pursuing that path in a rather academical way, instead of getting there, you might get somewhere else or get your speed retarded. I believe that any rapid attempt to nationalise everything will be harmful to India, not in theory, but in practice. I want at the present moment the greatest production that we can have. Secondly, I want that the State should control the strategic places, to prevent what may be called private individuals having too much monopoly or position at strategic places. But I want to employ their ability, their spirit of enterprise and I want to give them full scope and to help them. And I want to look upon the private sector, private as it is, as a sort of a great national cause, also as being a national sector. That is so. But at the same time, we proceed inevitably, step by step, towards the goal of socialist pattern of society. Socialism does not come and will not come so long as India is poverty-stricken. A poor country cannot

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

5 P.M.

really be socialistic, or at any rate, I cannot envisage or work for a socialism which means just grinding poverty for everybody. There is no meaning to it. We have to lay the foundations of industrial progress on all these and then socialism comes step by step. In fact, the two go in parallel lines.

So, Sir, I have ventured to place before this House some wider considerations which underlie our thinking which indeed follow from those accepted by Parliament previously.

Thank you, Sir

## MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

### I. THE INDIAN POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958

### II. THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1958

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following two Messages received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

#### I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 120 of the Rules of

Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 10th March, 1958, agreed without any amendment to the Indian Post Office (Amendment) Bill, 1958, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th February, 1958."

#### II

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1958, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th March, 1958.

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

Sir, I lay the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1958 on the Table of the House.

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

The House then adjourned at one minute past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 12th March 1958.