

[Shri Amar Roy Pradhan]

one lakh seventy seven thousand bales are still in stock in different godowns of JCI in North Bengal. The most important is that the Jute growers are now at the mercy of the private traders, that is, middlemen who are purchasing raw jute at the rate of Rs. 120/- to Rs. 130/- per quintal. Under these circumstances, I would like to request hon. Commerce Minister to make immediate necessary arrangements for godowns, railway wagons for early despatch of jute and necessary legislation so that the mill owners be forced to purchase raw jute from JCI and cooperatives just to save the poor jute growers who are helping to earn huge foreign money.

(v) CONDITIONS OF BEEDI WORKERS IN THE STATE OF KERALA

\*SHRI V. S. VIJAYARAGHAVAN (Palghat): Beedi industry in Kerala is facing a crisis due to irrational taxation. As a result of this lakhs of beedi workers and their family members are finding it hard to make both ends meet.

During the Janata rule, instead of imposing the cess on beedi tobacco, the Government levied cess on branded beedi. The companies which manufactured less than 60 lakhs of beedies in a year were exempted from this duty. This led to surreptitious manufacturing of beedies and it has deprived the workers, working in authorised companies of regular work.

Exemption given to unbranded beedies has only led to the beedi manufacturers increasingly resort to corrupt methods. Since there is no control either on the storage or distribution of tobacco, the exemption from excise duty has led to greater tax evasion. To avoid this, less

should be levied on tobacco after it has been purchased by the traders.

Since the wages paid to workers vary from State to State, the beedi manufacturers shift their factory into those State where wages are very low. This results in loss of work to the workers. To put an end to this exploitation, national minimum wages should be enforced.

No State except Kerala and Karnataka has implemented the Central Act, namely, "Beedi and Cigar Workers (Conditions of Employment) Act 1966". Therefore, the traders are shifting their industries to other States which has resulted in the workers losing their jobs. Therefore, necessary steps should be taken to see that this law is implemented in all the States.

Apart from saving the industry from ruin and saving lakhs of families who are wholly dependent on this industry, it is requested that Government should also take steps to raise the housing grant from Rs. 1500/- to Rs 5000/-, provide scholarship to their children and set up the welfare fund advisory committee, as quickly as possibly.

14.55 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET, 1980-81—  
GENERAL DISCUSSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up General Discussion on the Budget (General) for 1980-81.

श्री चरण सिंह (बागपत): चेरमन महोदय, वैसे तो हमारे कांग्रेस के जितने भी वजीर हैं सभी अच्छे और भले आदमी हैं लेकिन हम ने जिस वक्त मंत्रिमंडल की नियुक्ति हुई तो श्री वेक्टरमन के सम्बन्ध में तरह-तरह की अच्छी बातें सुनी थी कि बड़े स्ट्रॉट फार्वर्ड हैं, बड़े स्कूपलस हैं। लेकिन बजट को जिस तरीके से उन्होंने पेश किया उससे मालूम होता है कि हमारा पहला अनुमान बिल्कुल निराधार था। मैं यह इसलिए कहता हूँ कि उन्होंने इससे मुद्रा

स्फीति या इनफ्लेशनरी प्रेशर जो हमारी इकोनॉमी पर डिवेलप होंगे उनको छिपाने की कोशिश की है। सेशन जब शुरू हुआ उसके ठीक दो दिन पहले उन्होंने तेल और पेट्रोलियम प्रोडक्ट्स की कीमतें बढ़ा दीं और इससे उनको 2100 करोड़ प्राप्त होने की आशा है। फर्टिलाइजर्स पर साढ़े पांच सौ रुपये की टन बढ़ाया। पिछले साल 1 जितना फर्टिलाइजर्स खर्च हुआ यदि उतना ही हांता है तो 665 करोड़ रुपया यह हुआ। ये दोनों मिला कर के करीब 2750 करोड़ हो जाता है। हमारी इकोनॉमी के बारे में कहा जाता है कि इसकी कमांडिंग हाइट्स गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में है। प्राइस का बढ़ना, प्राइस का एसकेलेशन और टक्सेशन इन कनवर्टिबल टर्म्स इंटरचेंजबल है। साढ़े 27 सौ करोड़ के टैक्स या इसको आप कुछ भी कह लें, ये सीधे इनफ्लेशन को बनाएंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने हमें यह समझाने की कोशिश की है कि केवल 1400 करोड़ का ही डिफिसिट है। अब 2750 करोड़ और 1400 करोड़ साढ़े 41 सौ करोड़ यही हो जाता है। इसके अलावा जो रेलवे पैसेजर्ज के लिए इन्क्रीज एनाउंस किया है, रेल मंत्री जी ने किया है वह 250 करोड़ है जो पहले 200 करोड़ था। 250 करोड़ यह और 44-45 सौ करोड़ वह, यह सब डिफिसिट हुआ। आप इंटरनेशनल मानेटररी फंड से भी लोन ले रहे हैं। वह आमदनी तो है नहीं, एक लोन ही है। उसमें भी मुद्रा स्फीति बढ़ेगी, उससे भी इनफ्लेशनरी प्रेशर डिवेलप होंगे। लेकिन उसको आप निकाल भी दें, आई एम एफ से जो आप लोन ले रहे हैं, करीब पांच सौ करोड़, उसको आप निकाल भी दें तो भी पांच हजार करोड़ के करीब का जो डिफिसिट है, आज तक भी अपने मूलक में इतने बड़े डिफिसिट वाला बजट पेश नहीं हुआ है। यह बात उन को साफ तरीके से स्वीकार करनी चाहिये थी और कहना चाहिये था कि इस तरह की स्थिति है और हमें यह करने के लिए बाध्य होना पड़ रहा है।

एक बात और है। 9 तारीख को बजट दिया। क्यों बजट आप पेश करने वाले थे। दिन पहले यह सब एनाउंसमेंट उन्होंने कर दिया। क्यों बजट आप पेश करने वाले थे।

बजट में आप ने इसको क्यों नहीं रखा? इस प्रकार से मैं समझता हूँ कि इस हाउस का और इस सदन का यह एक प्रकार से अपमान है, कन्टेम्प्ट है। जनता को मिसलीड करने की कोशिश तो है ही, इस सदन का भी अपमान है।

मैं वेंकटरामन साहब के बारे में बहुत अच्छी राय रखता हूँ और जल्दी से मैं अपनी उस राय को छोड़ने वाला नहीं हूँ और न ही इसके लिये तैयार हूँ। मैं मान लेता हूँ कि उनकी शायद यह गलती नहीं थी। उनके जो फाइनेंशियल एडवाइजर्स हैं उन्होंने ऐसा कर दिया है। लेकिन हार्ड फैक्ट यह है, ठीक तथ्य यह है कि मुद्रा स्फीति जो बड़ी से बड़ी होने वाली है आप उसको जानते थे और आप यह भी जानते थे कि आप एक पाप इस हाउस के साथ कर रहे हैं और दूसरे आपके मन में यह था कि आप मुद्रा स्फीति को कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकेंगे, इस इकोनॉमी का कोई क्यों आपके हाथ में नहीं है तो आपको इसके लिए स्वीकार करना चाहिए था। लेकिन नहीं। दिल में जो बात थी, इसके आप इनफीरियोरिटी कम्प्लेक्स कहिये या कुछ भी कहिये, दबाने की कोशिश आप कर रहे थे पानी पी पी कर। 1 घंटा 40 मिनट में, दो दो गिलास पानी पिया जा रहा था। चार चार घंटे लोग बोले हैं लेकिन एक बूंद नहीं पिया इससे जाहिर होता है कि साइकोलोजिकली आप, कोई एस्केप ढूँढ़ रहे थे और वह आपको पानी पी कर मिला।

दरअसल यह कि बिलावजह, जैसा कि मैं अभी साबित करूंगा, और तथ्यों के विरुद्ध उन्होंने मुझे मिस-रिप्रेजेंट और बदनाम करने की कोशिश की है, जोकि मैं उनसे उम्मीद नहीं करता था। मकवाना साहब बैठे हैं, तो वह माफ करें, अगर वह होते तो बात समझ में आ सकती थी, अब आप तो सीनियर मिनिस्टर हैं और बाल भी आपके करीब करीब मोरे बराबर सफेद हैं।

15.00 hrs.

आपने यह कहा है कि पिछले साल खेत की पैदावार में 10 फीसदी की कमी हुई और राष्ट्रीय आय 3 फीसदी तक हुई। बेशक



[श्री चरण सिंह]

हुई, लेकिन क्यों हुई? आपने स्वयं तीन जगह अलग-अलग पैराग्राफ्स में इस बात को तस्तीम किया है। उसके 3 कारण यह थे। एक तो यह कि एक्सप्लानल ड्राउट, मामूली ड्राउट नहीं कि महीने, डेढ महीने बारिश नहीं हुई। 1899 में सबसे बड़ी अनावृष्टि हुई तथा यह 1979 में हुई। तो एक तो यह वजह आपने खुद तस्तीम की है। आप कहते हैं पैरा 3 में अपनी स्पीच में-- that it was severe drought that was partly responsible, and in paragraph 8 that increases in prices of crude oil and oil products also contributed to inflationary pressures.

मैं आपको इस बात की स्वीकारोक्ति के लिये धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Further, in paragraph 19, he admitted that the problem was compounded by almost total cessation of supplies from January onwards from the four refineries dependent on the Assam crude.

4 महीने जनवरी से लेकर मई तक तेल आसाम से नहीं आया, उसके लिये तो आप सीधे जिम्मेदार हैं। तीन बातें आपने कही हैं कि इसकी वजह यह है। अगर यह बात आपको तस्तीम है, और आपको तस्लीम है, तो फिर आगे चलकर आप यह कहते हैं कि इस गवर्नमेंट को विरासत में डिस्मल इकनामिक सिचुएशन मिली है, आर्थिक स्थिति ऐसी मिली है जो बहुत दख-दायक है, तो उसके लिये कौन जिम्मेदार है? यह इस गवर्नमेंट को प्रीवियस गवर्नमेंट से विरासत में मिली, यह तीन कारण आपने स्वयं तस्लीम किये हैं, इनके अलावा मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि मनी सप्लाई में इतनी इन्फ्लेज हुई है, रुपये लोगों की जेब में इतना हो गया है, कि क्रय शक्ति आज तक इतनी कभी नहीं हुई।

सन 1976-77 में जो कांग्रेस रुल था, तब मनी सप्लाई आपकी बढी है 20.3 परसेंट उससे पहले कभी इतनी नहीं बढी थी। यह आपका आखिरी साल था। अगले साल जनता गवर्नमेंट के जमाने में 14.7 परसेंट 77-78 में 19.8 परसेंट तो 3 साल तक इतनी बढी, अगर आप इसको घटाये 75-76 की फिगर्स पर

तो 80 परसेंट, अगर 100 रुपये मनी सप्लाई थी पब्लिक के पास तो 79 में वह 180 रुपये हो गई। यानी लोगों की क्रय शक्ति दुगुनी हो गई, पच्चीसिंग पावर बढ़ गई। तो यह फैक्ट आपकी नजर से ओझल नहीं होना चाहिये था, आपको इसे तस्तीम करना चाहिये था। अब बेशक जनता गवर्नमेंट के सामने बढी थी, आप सबसे ज्यादा कर चुके थे।

इसके अलावा यह भी बात ध्यान में रखने की है कि जो ड्राउट हुआ तो उसमें पैदावार वैसे ही कम हुई, लेकिन हमारे यहां के ट्रेडर्स नाजायज फायदा उठाने की कोशिश करते हैं यह भी मिजरी है। अनावृष्टि हो जाये, अतिवृष्टि हो जाये, लोकस्ट की भार हो जाये तो हमारे यहां टैंडरी यह है कि मनी-लैंडर्स ट्रेडर्स, होलसेलर्स हर आदमी मौसम को एक्सप्लायट करता है और उसका ज्यादा फायदा उठाना चाहता है।

परमात्मा न करे, अगर हमारे यहां लड़ाई शुरू हो जाये और किसी शहर में बिम्बंग हो जाये तो हमारे यहां 24 घंटे में आप देखेंगे कि ट्रेडर्स 50 फीसदी प्राइसेस बढ़ा देंगे और सेंकिंड वर्ल्ड वार में 39 से लेकर 45 तक बराबर लन्दन में बिम्बंग होती रही लेकिन केवल 10 परसेंट प्राइसेस वहां बढ़े। लेकिन यहां यह देख कर कि सूखा पड़ा है, ट्रेडर्स और होलसेलर्स ने गुड़ज होते हुए दाम बढ़ाने की कोशिश की। इसका कोई लिहाज नहीं कि गुड़ज की एवेलीविटटी है या नहीं। उन्होंने सोचा कि चूँकि सूखा पड़ा है, किसान और जनता परेशान हैं, शहरों के कनज्यूमर परेशान हैं, इस लिए दाम बढ़ाओ।

प्राइसिज को एरेस्ट करने, राकने, के लिए हम एक आर्डिनंस लाये। मदनराय इन्दिराजी नहीं हैं, लेकिन मुझे उनकी स्पीच याद है, जो उन्होंने पार्लियामेंट के इलैक्शन से पहले दी थी, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि यह आर्डिनंस मुझे गिरफ्तार करने के लिए लाया गया है। कहां जा कर बात लगी? एसेंशल कामोडिटीज की सप्लाई को बनाये रखने के लिए यह आर्डिनंस लाया गया था—हमारा तो केवल आर्डिनंस था, आपने उसको एक्ट बनाया—, लेकिन उसके बारे में आपकी लीडर कहती थीं कि दर-असल ये मुझे गिरफ्तार करना चाहते हैं।

बजाये लोकदल की गवर्नमेंट को सपोर्ट करने के आपने उसका पोलिटिकल एडवांटेज उठाने की कोशिश की। अगर कोई श्रमिक को स्टोर करेगा या प्राफिटियरिंग करेगा, तो उसे गिरफ्तार किया जायेगा, लेकिन महज प्रापेगेंडा के लिए ऐसी बातें कही गईं। अफसोस की बात यह है कि आपने स्वयं उस आर्डिनैस को एक्ट बनाया। जब आप नवम्बर-दिसम्बर में उसको कनडैम कर रहे थे, तो आपने एक्ट क्यों बनाया? इन फैक्ट्स की वजह से भी प्राइसिज बढ़े।

1965-66 में मामूली सा सूखा पड़ा—यह नहीं कि तीन चार महीने बराबर सूखा पड़ा, लेकिन कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट उसको कंट्रोल नहीं कर पाई। नतीजा यह हुआ कि 1965-66 में एग्रीकल्चरल प्राडक्शन 16.6 परसेंट और 1966-67 में 16.7 परसेंट घट गया। 1979 में वह केवल 10 परसेंट घटा। ये इकानॉमिक रीव्यू की फिगरज हैं। मैं फिर कहता हूँ कि डाउट नहीं था, सिवियर डाउट तो दरकिनार, मामूली डाई स्पेल से एग्रीकल्चरल प्राडक्शन दो साल तक 16.6 परसेंट घटता रहा।

आपने एनेलेसिस में इन्फ्रा-स्ट्रक्चर को ठीक वर्क न करने की बात कही है। मैं उसको तस्लीम करता हूँ, लेकिन उसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है? आपके जरिये मैं अपने माननीय मित्र से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कोई जिम्मेदार है, तो आप, आपके प्रेडिसेसर और आपकी पोलिटिकल पार्टी। इनफ्रा-स्ट्रक्चर में बातें तो बहुत सी हैं कहने का, लेकिन आज समय नहीं है, मौका भी नहीं है। मैं तीन बातों का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ—कॉल, पावर और ट्रांसपोर्ट। इनमें विलेन आफ दि पीस है कॉल। कॉल को किसने नेशनलाइज किया? नेशनलाइजेशन के बाद कॉल की कीमत बढ़ती चली गई, स्ट्राइक्स होती रहीं और 45,000 ब्रायन वर्कर्स नाम कागजात में दर्ज हैं, जिसकी वजह से 32 करोड़ रुपये सालाना गवर्नमेंट को पेमेंट करना पड़ता है। मैं इसके लिए जनता गवर्नमेंट को भी दोषी मानता हूँ—लोकदल गवर्नमेंट को मौका नहीं मिला—और उस गलती के लिए मैं अपने आप को जिम्मेदार मानता हूँ। लेकिन कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट इस साल तक बराबर पोजीशन को

खराब कर चुकी थी। जब कभी कॉल वर्कर्स ने ब्लैकमेल करना चाहा, तभी गवर्नमेंट ने हमेशा उनके सामने घुटने टेक दिये। इस का इफेक्ट पावर और ट्रांसपोर्ट पर होना ही था।

कॉल ही नहीं, और भी बहुत सी चीजें हैं। अगर इन समस्याओं को हल करना है, तो हार्ड डिसिजनज लेने पड़ेंगे, और अगर जरूरी हों, तो सब पोलिटिकल पार्टीज को मिल कर लेने होंगे। कौन नहीं चाहता कि वर्कर्स और गरीब लोगों को सहूलियत मिले? लेकिन सिर्फ आर्गनाइज्ड वर्कर्स ही गरीब नहीं हैं, जो ब्लैकमेल कर सकते हैं।

अनआर्गनाइज्ड वर्कर्स जिन का कोई जिक्र न असेम्बली में होता है न इस सदन में होता है, उस से दस गुना, पन्द्रह गुना ज्यादा है जिनकी कोई फिक्र नहीं है। जो स्ट्राइक कर सकते हैं उन के लिए तो सारी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज मदद करने को तैयार हैं। अब इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर खराब है तो उस के लिए प्रीवियस गवर्नमेंट, जनता या लोक दल गवर्नमेंट तो जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं। उस के लिए अगर कोई गवर्नमेंट या पोलिटिकल पार्टी जिम्मेदार है तो जनाब की पोलिटिकल पार्टी है।

आप आगे कहते हैं कि सूखा से रिलीफ के लिए बहुत बड़ा इंतजाम कर रहे हैं। कौन सा नया इंतजाम कर रहे हैं जो लोक दल गवर्नमेंट ने नहीं किया? उल्टे आप ने बिगाड़ा है। मैं बतलाता हूँ कि कैसे बिगाड़ा। हम ने रिग्ग्स का इंतजाम किया। रिग्ग्स की जरूरत राख प्रदेश में जहां पर कि बहुत पथरीली जमीन है जहां आसानी से पानी नहीं निकाला जा सकता, सब से ज्यादा है। इस के लिए एक जो उन का सर्वे है उन से हम ने पूछा कि क्या उनके यहां रिग्ग्स अवैलेबल हैं। और कोई एजेंसी या इन्स्टी-च्यूशन इस के लिए है उन से पूछा। नहीं थे। लिहाजा मारे एम्बैसेडर्स को बतलाया कि फॉरेन गवर्नमेंट्स जितनी रिग्ग्स दे सकती हैं उन को वह फौरन खरीद लें। दूसरे देशों के जितने एम्बैसेडर्स अपने मूलक में हैं, अपनी एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री से उन को कान्टैक्ट किया और सैकड़ों रिग्ग्स

[श्री चरण सिंह]

मंगाने का इंतजाम किया। उस को एयर-लिफ्ट करने का इंतजाम किया। मैं सब-जेक्ट टू करेक्शन बोल रहा हूँ, मैंने सुना है कि जब जनाब की गवर्नमेंट ने चार्ज लिया तो उस में ठील आई। बाद में शायद रिग्स मंगाए या नहीं, मुझे नहीं मालूम।

आप ने कहा कि आप ने कमेट्री बना दी, यह कर दिया, फूड फार बर्क प्रोग्राम लागू कर दिया। यह कोई नई चीज आप ने नहीं की है। तो क्यों आप उस के लिए क्रेडिट लेते हैं, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

एक बात आगे कहते हैं कि कोई बिल ला रहे हैं होटल की ग्रास रिसीट्स पर टैक्स लगाने के लिए और आप उस का क्रेडिट ले रहे हैं मानो यह आप की बूने-बेव है। यह भी गलत है। इस बिल के लिए तो मैं खूब ही कह गया था और मैं आप को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ। आप को यह कहना चाहिए था कि चरण सिंह पिछली बार जो कह गए हैं उसके अनुसार गवर्नमेंट बिल ला रही है। यह आप ने क्यों नहीं कहा आप को कहना चाहिए था। गाली तो आप को सब याद रहती है। खैर, वह इस में दो रखा है, इस समय मिल नहीं रहा है। इस में मौजूद है पहले से कि जो अलग अलग आइटम्स हैं उन पर सेल्व टैक्स स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को लगाने का अधिकार है, लेकिन ग्रास रिसीट्स पर गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया लगाना चाहती है तो उसमें क्या कठिनाई है? अगर कोई है तो उस के लिए यह भी मेरी स्पीच के अंदर दिया हुआ है कि हम एक आफिसर एक्वाइट कर रहे हैं और एक बिल लाएंगे। आप को कहना था कि प्रीवियस जन्ता गवर्नमेंट जो यह दावदा कर गई थी उस पर हम अमल कर रहे हैं। लेकिन आप ने नहीं कहा।

फिर आप का कहना है, जनरल बात है, कि कामन मैन के लिए आप कर रहे हैं। कामन मैन की जनाब की क्या डीफिनीशन है? कामन मैन यहां नहीं रहता है। दिल्ली में जो रहते हैं उस में 26 परसेंट कामन मैन है, सब से कम। जो बिल पावर्टी लाइन लोग हैं, जो पेंशन पर रह

रहे हैं, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ उस के लिए इस बिल में कोई प्राविजन है? जो टैक्स देने वाले हैं उस के लिए रिलीफ है। लेकिन टैक्स देने वाले कितने लोग हैं? वह कामन मैन तो नहीं है। कामन मैन को जनाब की डीफिनीशन क्या है? आप की कामन मैन को डीफिनीशन है—इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट, उन के मैनेजर्स, उन के इंजीनियर्स, उन के टेक्नीशियंस, उन के कॉमिस्ट्स, होलसेलर्स, एक्सपोर्ट इम्पोर्ट करने वाले, बड़े बड़े ट्रेडर्स और कमीशनि एजेंट्स, ट्रान्सपोर्टर्स वगैरह वगैरह और पालिटिशियंस, जर्नलिस्ट्स, डाक्टरों, बड़े बड़े लाइयर्स, यूनिवर्सिटी के प्रोफेसर्स—यहां आप के कामन मैन की लिस्ट एग्जास्ट हो जाती है। लेकिन यह कामन मैन नहीं है।

आपके सारे प्रपोजल्स क्या कामन-मैन के लिए हैं—यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। कामन मैन कौन है? आज 55 फीसदी लोग बिलों पावर्टी लाइन हैं, बिलों द सर्क्सस्टेंस लॉबल रह रहे हैं। 1976-77 के रेट्स के हिसाब से साढ़े 47 फीसदी लोग थे और आज प्राइसेज बढ़ गई हैं इसलिए शायद 60 फीसदी भी हों। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ इन लोगों के लिए आपने इसमें क्या रखा है? क्या हम लोग कामन मैन हैं? यहां दिल्ली में जो सड़कों पर दिखाई देते हैं, महलों में रहते हैं, मोटरों पर आते-जाते हैं—क्या वे कामन मैन हैं? फिर गरीब आदमी के लिए, विलेजर के लिए आपने क्या किया है और उन गरीबों के लिए आपने क्या किया है जिनके घर में कोई सामान नहीं है?

आपने जो रिलीफ दी है, उसको एक मिनट के लिए देखें कि कामन-मैन उससे कहां तक अफेक्टेड है? आपने इनकाम-टैक्स में एग्जेंशन लिमिट 10 हजार से बढ़ाकर 12 हजार कर दी है, बहुत अच्छा है, 1 हजार रुपए की महीने हो गया। इससे जो लोग रिलीफ पायेंगे उनको बहुत अच्छा लगेगा। मेरे स्थान में 20 हजार कर देते तो और अच्छा लगता लेकिन इसमें आप कामन-मैन की बात मत कहिए। आप सीधी सीधी बात कहिए कि जो हमारे मिलने-जुलने वाले हैं, हमारी सोसाइटी में रहने वाले जिन्होंने मार्डन स्टाईल ऑफ लिविंग अख्तियार कर ली है, वही हमारे कामन मैन हैं।

वही क्लब में मिलते हैं, वही टहलते हुए मिलते हैं, वही एरोप्लेन में मिलते हैं, वही हमारे दोस्त हैं और वही कामन मैन हैं।

इसी तरह से इनकम टैक्स में ऊपर मैक्सिमम लिमिट को भी आपने 72 से घटाकर 66 परसेंट कर दिया, वह भी उनको अच्छा लगा होगा। अगर किसी इण्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट से आप पूछते तो शायद यही कहता कि 50 परसेंट और भी अच्छा रहेगा क्योंकि उसमें उनको रिलीफ पहुंचती है। यही नहीं, वोचो कि जो स्लैज है उनके रेंट्स भी आपने गिराए हैं। इसके अलावा वेलथ टैक्स की एग्जम्पशन लिमिट भी आपने 1 लाख से डेढ़ लाख बढ़ा दी। क्यों? इसको एक लाख क्यों नहीं रहने दिया? अगर प्राइसेज बढ़ रही हैं तो उससे सारा देश अफेक्टेड होगा। फिर वेलथ किसको कहते हैं? यह कम्पैरेटिव टर्म है। बहुत से लोगों के लिए तो डेढ़ लाख भी कोई वेलथ नहीं है, उनके लिए तो 10 लाख चाहिए लेकिन आम आदमी के लिए 1 लाख बहुत बड़ी चीज है।

फिर आपने किसानों के लिए एक बहुत बड़ी स्नेहबानी कर दी है कि उनको वेलथ टैक्स से एग्जम्प कर दिया लेकिन इससे कितने किसान अफेक्टेड हैं? इसमें सरकार को 1 करोड़ से कम आमदनी थी और इसमें बहुत करप्शन था। आपने करप्शन की बात मानी है और कहा कि उसका असेसमेंट करना है कि कितना टैक्स है, कितनी वेलथ है—यह ठीक है लेकिन यहां पर यह इम्प्रेसन पैदा करना और जिसपर अपने दोस्तों से यहां पर ताली पिटवाई, कि किसानों को वेलथ टैक्स से माफ कर दिया मानो करोड़ों किसान इसमें अफेक्टेड हों। अगर सुझा ठीक से था है तो शायद 16 हजार आदमी थे जो वेलथ टैक्स गांव में देते थे जिनमें नान-एग्री-कल्चरिस्ट भी थे जबकि वहां केवल दिल्ली में 10 हजार ऐसे लोग हैं जो वेलथ टैक्स देते हैं। तो इससे कितने किसान अफेक्टेड हुए? तो यह आपकी वेलथ टैक्स की बात रही। अगर इस क्षेत्र में मैंने कुछ कर दिया होता तो मैं कलक हो जाता... (बदधाल) मैं यहां पर लैण्ड रिकॉर्म्स की बात नहीं करना चाहता बरना बतलाता कि कलक कौन है। अभी मैं एक किताब लिख रहा हूँ जिसका एक चैप्टर इसी सब्जेक्ट पर है “हूँ आर द

कुलक्स” वह मैं आपके पास भेज दूंगा जिसमें आप पायेंगे कि वे सभी उस तरफ बैठे हैं।

आप कहते हैं कि एडवर्टाइजमेंट पर, पब्लिसिटी पर, सेल्स प्रमोशन पर जितने टैक्स हैं, वह सब आपने हटा लिए क्योंकि इण्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट, मनीलेण्डर और रिचमैन जो हैं, आपका ध्यान रह रह कर उन्हीं पर जाता है कि उनको कोई तकलीफ नहीं होनी चाहिए। एक्सपोर्ट प्रमोशन की बात आप करते हैं जिसके लिए 3 सौ करोड़ रुपये, पता नहीं और कितना हाँ लेकिन 3 सौ करोड़ से कम नहीं है जबकि हमारी इन्टर्नल प्राइसेज से एक्सटर्नल प्राइसेज हायर है, वहां पर इंफ्लेशन का रेट बहुत जबरदस्त है फिर एक्सपोर्ट प्रमोशन के लिए सब्सिडाइज करने की क्या जरूरत है? कम्पीट करने की एबिलिटी तो उनमें वैसे ही होनी चाहिए। आज इंटरनेशनल मार्केट में प्राइसेज बहुत हैं फिर भी 3 सौ करोड़ रुपये गरीब आदमियों से लेकर मालदार आदमियों को देकर आप उनको और मालदार बना रहे हैं। यह सब्सीडी उनको मिलती है जोकि उसके एंटाइटिल्ड नहीं है। इसमें इतनी खराबी है, मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि आप इसके करप्शन की डिटेल्स में जाइये। इसके अलावा मैं एक बात अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, इन्डस्ट्रीयल नीड्स में, ठीक है कुछ ऐसी चीजें हैं जिनमें आप कम्पीट कर सकते हैं, लेकिन जनरल इंडिया और पॉलिटिकल लीडर यह समझते हैं कि दूसरे देशों को मशीन वगैरह भेजकर कम्पीट कर सकते हैं, मैं कहता हूँ कि कभी नहीं कर सकते हैं। एक ही चीज में कम्पीट कर सकते हैं और जिसकी जरूरत है, वह है, — फूड प्रोडक्शन और एक्सपोर्ट। आप फूड प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने की तरफ ध्यान दीजिए और अभी वर्ल्ड फूड काउन्सिल की हालत क्या है, वो और इन्स्टीचुशन्स की हालत क्या है? बहुत सी कन्टीज है, जहां फूड शार्टेज होने वाला है। इस चीज को देखते हुए हमको यह फायदा उठाना चाहिए कि फूड की तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान जाए और उसमें आप कम्पीट कर सकते हैं, इसमें आप इतना फारगेट-एक्सचेंज क्या सकते हैं कि हमारी फारगेट-एक्सचेंज की जितनी भी रिक्वायरमेंट है, वह आसानी से पूरी हो सकती है



[श्री चरण सिंह]

और उसका इफैक्ट जो हमारी इकानामी पर पड़ेगा, वह है इनवैल्यूबल। आज हम 125 करोड़ टन पैदा कर रहे हैं। क्यों नहीं 250 कर सकते हैं? कुछ ऐसी कन्टीज भी है जो 5-6-7-8 गुना "फी" एकड़ पैदा करती है, हम भी ऐसा क्यों नहीं कर सकते हैं? लेकिन इसकी तरफ किसी का ध्यान नहीं जाता है। किसान तो गंदार आदमी है, वह दो एकड़ का भी कूलक है, वे तो गाली देंगे ही।

अगर देश की इकानामी को रिडीम करने वाले पांच-छः स्टैप्स हैं, तो एक स्टैप यह है कि

more attention to food production; we should be able to produce so much that we are able to export millions and millions of tonnes of foodgrains.

तब देखिए कितना फायदा होता है।

ये चन्द लोग हैं, आप जरा ऐसा कीजिए कि अपने सी.बी.आई. या आई.बी. से पूछिए कि फूड एक्सपोर्ट प्रमोशन से कितने लोगों को बम्बई में फायदा हो रहा है, कितने लोग बेईमानी से अफसरों से मिलकर और सब्सीडी के नाम पर रुपया कमाते हैं।

आप कहते हैं कि कस्टम ड्यूटी हमने हटाई है मशीनरी और इन्स्ट्रुमेंट्स पर क्रिसके लिए—इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स के लिए। इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स का न सी बड़ी भारी चीज है। इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स ठीक है, हमारे एयरप्लेन बगैरह के लिए, कुछ स्पेशल डिपार्टमेंट्स हैं, उनके लिए हैं। लेकिन जो आपने पैरा 103 और 104 में इम्पार्टेंस दी है कि इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स कम्प्यूटर इन्डस्ट्रीज बढ़ने से एम्पलायमेंट बढ़ेगा मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने जानने की कोशिश की है कि कितने लोग एम्पलायड हैं और कैसे इससे एम्पलायमेंट बढ़ेगा।

आज अन-एम्पलायमेंट की क्या हालत है और क्यों हर साल बढ़ता जा रहा है, क्या उसके लिए किसी ने सोचा है? नहीं। क्यों—कि अन-एम्पलायड आदमी अपनी मूसीबत को बताने के लिए यहां नहीं है। जो अखबार

निकलता है वह भी जो फुल्ली एम्पलायड है, उनके लिए निकलता है। आप कहते हैं कि इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स की जो इन्डस्ट्रीज हैं, उनसे एम्पलायमेंट बढ़ेगा, मुझे बहुत ताज्जुब हुआ और आप पर मुझे दया आती है।

आप कहते हैं कि एक्साइज ड्यूटी चीपर टेलीविजन सेट्स पर कम की है, क्यों? क्या ये टेलीविजन सेट्स कामन मैन को चाहिए? मैं गिनाऊंगा उन चीजों को भी जो चरण सिंह ने की हैं और आपने माफ कर दिया है। जब 55 परसेंट आदमियों को फूड नहीं मिल रहा है, तो आप फूड प्रोडक्शन पर रुपया लगायेंगे या आप को फिक्र पड़ी है घर-घर में टेलीविजन सेट्स पहुंचाने की? क्या हम लोगों का यह नजरिया हो गया है कि हर घर में टेलीविजन सेट होना चाहिए? टेलीविजन सेट वाले लोग आप से मिलते जुलते हैं, इस लिये आप को उनकी फिक्र पड़ी है—क्या ये कामन मैन है?

आप कहते हैं—इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स कम्प्यूटर्स पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी कम करने से एम्पलायमेंट बढ़ेगा। वैंकटरमन जी, आप बुरा न मानें। अभी 1978-79 में आस्ट्रेलिया के प्राइम मिनिस्टर यहां आये थे, आप की गवर्नमेंट से मिलने के लिये। उस में कुछ नोट्स तैयार हुए, कुछ उन की इकानामी की बाबत, कुछ हमारी इकानामी की बाबत तथा कुछ बातें इकानामिक मॅटर्स पर भी हुईं। आप को ताज्जुब होगा यह जान कर कि कम्प्यूटर, इलैक्ट्रो-प्रोसेसिंग बगैरह से यह नतीजा हुआ कि आस्ट्रेलिया जैसे देश में जिन के पास ढाई गुना जमीन है, जिनकी कूल आबादी इतनी है जितनी कि यहां एक साल में बढ़ जाती है, लेकिन फिर भी वे लोग आज अन-एम्पलायमेंट से सफर कर रहे हैं। हर साल डेढ़ करोड़ आबादी बढ़ जाती है और 50 लाख लड़के 16 साल की उम्र के हो जाते हैं, वर्किंग फोर्स में शामिल हो जाते हैं और आप कहते हैं कि इलैक्ट्रॉनिक कम्प्यूटर्स से उन को एम्पलायमेंट मिलेगी। लेकिन जिस मुल्क की कूल आबादी डेढ़ करोड़ है और जहां पर इतने नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज और मॅटीरियल रिसोर्सेज अवैलेबिल हैं—वह मुल्क अन-एम्पलायमेंट से सफर कर

रहा है। हमारे नोट्स में यह बात थी, आप चाहेंगे तो मैं भेज दूंगा।

मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है—हम लोग जमीन से अलग हो कर हवाई वातों में, अखबारों को पढ़ कर, अमरीका या इंग्लैंड जा कर क्या सीख कर आते हैं? गलत आइडियाज को लेकर आते हैं, बजाय इसके कि हम अपनी ही बातों पर अमल करें। मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है—इलैक्ट्रिक कम्प्यूटर्स पर क्यों इतना जोर दिया गया है? क्या इस तरह से गरीबों के मसलों को हल करेंगे?

सभापति महोदय, हाई प्रेशर गैस सिलेंडर्स के लिये स्टील ट्यूब्स इम्पोर्ट करने पर टैक्स की छूट दी गई है। ठीक है, ये गैस सिलेण्डर्स हमारे यहां इस्तेमाल होते हैं, लेकिन कितने घरों में? गांव में चूल्हा कैसा बनना चाहिये, उस के लिये कैसा फ्यूअल चाहिये, उस फ्यूअल की कितनी कमी गांवों में हो गई है—इस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं है। बल्कि हाई प्रेशर सिलेण्डर्स स्टील ट्यूब्स के इम्पोर्ट पर टैक्स को घटा दिया—

Shame on all of us, not only on you, but all of us.

टैक्स-हालिडो को लीजिये। टैक्स हालिडो हम ने भी किया था, लेकिन प्रायोरिटी सेक्टर के लिये क्या था। लेकिन आप ने 11 वें शेड्यूल में जो चीजें गिनाई हैं, उन में नान-प्रायोरिटी सेक्टर की चीजें भी शामिल कर ली हैं। आप दोनों को क्यों दे रहे हैं? जो चीजें प्रायोरिटी सेक्टर में नहीं आती हैं, हमारे लिये गैरजरूरी हैं उन को टैक्स हालिडो में शामिल करने के क्या मायने हैं? हम ने भी पिछले बजट में दिया था, लेकिन प्रायोरिटी सेक्टर को दिया था, आप ने दोनों को क्यों दिया? मालूम होता है—कुछ दोस्तों को इलैक्शन के वक्त सब इण्डस्ट्रीयलिस्ट्स आ कर मिल गये हैं।

डेप्रीसियेशन पहले जितना था, उस से 50 परसेन्ट और ज्यादा कर रहे हैं। डेप्रीसियेशन की बात समझ में आ रही है, इम्पोर्ट ड्यूटी की बात समझ में आ रही है—लेकिन मैं आप से पूछता हूँ यह सब किस के लिये हो रहा है? यह सोसायटी के सिर्फ

10-15 परसेन्ट लोगों के लिये हो रहा है, गरीब के लिये कुछ नहीं हो रहा है। आप के इस एटीचूड का नतीजा क्या हो रहा है? इस का नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि आज जितनी इन्वेस्टमेंट हो रही है—सब लक्जरी आइटम्स में हो रही है। रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया की तरफ से जनवरी, 1980 में एक स्टडी पब्लिश हुई है, जिस में उन्होंने साढ़े आठ साल के इन्वेस्टमेंट का हिसाब लगाया है, जून, 1979 तक का हिसाब लगाया है, मैं उस का एक पैरा आप को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ—

“The study relates to a period of 8.5 years upto the first half of 1979.

While the annual combined rate of growth for consumer goods was less than 3.9 per cent....”

वनस्पति, शूगर, जूते या जो भी कन्ज्यूमर गुड्स हैं उन का कम्बाइंड रेट आफ ग्रोथ 3.9 परसेन्ट था। लेकिन दूसरी चीजों की क्या हालत है—शराब का 287 परसेन्ट था। शराब कौन पीता है? शराब बड़े आदमी पीते हैं और टैक्सों को कम कर के आप के शराब पिलाने का इन्तजाम कर दिया, उस में कोई कमी नहीं हो रही है। परफ्यूम्स का 435.3 परसेन्ट हो गया, एअर कण्डीशनिंग और रेफ्रिजरेटर्स का 249.7 परसेन्ट है वाचेंज एण्ड क्लॉक्स का 290.5, कार्माशियल हाउस होल्ड इक्विपमेंट्स का 215.7 परसेन्ट, इलैक्ट्रिक फर्निचर का 232.1 परसेन्ट, इलैक्ट्रिक लैम्प्स 189.7 परसेन्ट। शायद आप को इस से तसल्ली होगी कि देश का एक बड़ा भारी डेवलपमेंट ऐसा करने से होगा लेकिन वास्तु मासोज के लिए केवल 3.79 परसेन्ट है जबकि वह 85 परसेन्ट है। अगर आप एकोनामी को पुराने रास्ते पर ही ले जाना चाहते हैं, तो Country is doomed इसलिए कुछ हाई थिंकिंग आप को करनी चाहिए। उसी तरह से चलते रहे जैसे 25, 30 साल तक आप चले हैं, तो उस से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। उस को चेंज करना चाहिए।

सन् 1917 में महात्मा गांधी जी चम्पारण गये थे जबकि ब्रिटिश इन्डिया प्लान्टर्स, इन्डियन पीजेन्ट्स को तंग कर रहे थे। जब वे सड़क से गुजर रहे थे, सड़कें जो गांवों से हो कर, गांवों के बराबर हो कर या गांवों

[श्री चरण सिंह]

के बीच में से हो कर जाती है, —तो गांवों के लोगों ने सुन रखा था कि कोई बड़ा आदमी आ रहा है हमारी मुसीबतों को स्टडी करने के लिए। उस समय महात्मा जी ने यह देखा कि जितने लोग आए थे, खास तौर पर उन का ध्यान औरतों की तरफ गया और उन्होंने देखा कि वे सब मूले कपड़े, निहायत मूले कपड़े पहने हुए थीं। तो थोड़ी दूर चल कर उन्होंने माता कस्तूरबा को भेजा उन से पूछने के लिए कि माना कि गरीबी है, फिर भी वे कपड़े क्यों नहीं धो सकती। जो धोती पहन रखी थी, उनको वे धो सकती थीं। जालूम है क्या जवाब दिया उन्होंने? यह जवाब दिया कि हमारे पास केवल एक ही धोती है, कैसे चेन्ज करें, कैसे नहायें, कैसे धोयें। मैं बेंकटरामन साहब से गुजरािश करूंगा हाथ जोड़ कर और मैं यह चाहूंगा कि आप दिल्ली की हवा छोड़ कर बिहार के एक, दो दोस्तों के साथ चम्पारण के गांवों में आज भी चले जाएं, तो आप पाएंगे।

Exactly the same condition exists today.

उन के पास आज भी कपड़ा नहीं है। उन के घर जाइए और देखिये कि क्या चीज है? उस तरफ कभी आप का ध्यान नहीं गया है। बहुत से ऐसे घर हैं जहां पर दो महिलाएं हैं और तीन धोतियां हैं। बारी बारी से आ कर वे नहाती हैं और ऐसे कराड़ों घर हैं, जहां पर एक ही थाली है। एक आदमी खाना खा लेता है, फिर वह मंजती है तब दूसरे का नम्र आता है।

फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि आपने

Sweeping taxation on articles of common consumption.

लगा दिया। आप ने यह सूक्ष्म पर चार्ज लगाया, लेकिन आप ने क्या एग्जम्प-यन्स दिये हैं, वे सुनिये। आप कहते हैं कि

Cycles and sewing machines

इसमें आप का कहना यह है कि मैंने इन पर टैक्स लगाया था . . . (व्यवधान) . . . आप का यह कहना है लेकिन मैंने टैक्स लगाया ही नहीं। पहली बात तो यह है। आप पैरा 119 आफ माई स्पीच देखिए।

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने टैक्स लगाया नहीं साइकिल्स पर बल्कि जो मापेड होती है, जो एक तरह की साइकिल होती है, उस पर टैक्स कम किया था। साइकिल्स पर टैक्स लगाया नहीं, Nothing of the kind. सुइंग मशीन्स पर भी नहीं लगाया।

फिर आप ने जिक्र किया है लाइफ सैविंग ड्रग्स का। आप कहते हैं कि इन पर हम टैक्स माफ कर रहे हैं। मैंने लाइफ सैविंग ड्रग्स पर टैक्स नहीं लगाया था। आप मेरी स्पीच का पैरा 108, 109 देखिए। मेरे पास वह है, मैं पढ़ कर सुना सकता हूँ। हम ने उन पर टैक्स माफ किया था, आप ने ज्यादा माफ किया, यह आप कह सकते हैं लेकिन मैंने उन पर टैक्स नहीं लगाया था। मैं पैरा 109 पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ।

"I would also refer to the relief in the field of drugs and medicines. I propose to fully exempt from customs duties 27 specified bulk drugs required for the formulation of life-saving drugs and to reduce the customs duty on 17 specified bulk drug intermediates from a total of 75 per cent ad valorem to 25 per cent ad valorem."

मैंने तो घटाया है। आपके लफजों से ऐसा लगता है कि मैंने बढ़ाया है। यह बहुत अन्याय है मेरे साथ। फिर आप कहते हैं कि प्रेशर कुकर पर मैंने टैक्स लगाया है। प्रेशर कुकर एक डायरेक्ट आइटम है, यह बीस सालों तक चलती है, इसलिए उस पर लगाया था। इसमें आपने छोड़ दिया है तो कोई गरीब आदमी को बड़ा भारी रिलीफ दे दिया है? अगर नहीं तो इसको मॉशन करने की जरूरत नहीं थी। आप बेशक कम कर दें लेकिन यह मॉशन करके आप इम्प्रेशन क्या देना चाहते हैं?

अब चीफर मोंरायटी आप टाथ पेस्ट और टूथ ब्रश की बात है। उनके बारे में जो मैंने कहा था वह यह है—

"I have also selected some consumer items like soap, toothpaste, tooth-brush and detergents for increase in duties, taking care, at the

same time, to see that the goods produced by the small units in the decentralised sector are not adversely affected by this increase. Excise duties will go up on household and laundry soap.....etc. etc."

आपके ये टूथ ब्रश और टूथ पेस्ट्स कौन बना रहे हैं? ये मल्टी नेशनल बना रहे हैं। जो बड़े हाउसिंग इन्हें बना रहे हैं, चाहे वे अपने यहां के हों या दूसरे देश के हों उनको पढ़े लिखे लोग इस्तेमाल करते हैं। बहुत-सी चीजें जो पढ़े-लिखे लोग इस्तेमाल करते हैं वे सब मल्टी नेशनल कम्पनीज पैदा करती हैं। लेकिन मैंने केवल टूथ ब्रश और टूथ पेस्ट्स बढ़ाया है वह भी उन पर नहीं बढ़ाया है जो स्माल इन्डस्ट्रीज में बनती हैं, उन पर तो बिल्क घटाया है।

It is just to get cheers from our friends here.

फिर आप बेक्यूम गंस फिल्ड बल्ब्स की बात करते हैं। इन पर भी हमने टैक्स माफ किया है। दो किस्म के बल्ब होते हैं। उनके बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने बल्ब पर काम किया है।

"In restructuring the duty rates on consumer products I have reduced the incidence on a number of items by exempting them from special excise duty I would like to make particular mention of the duty reduction from 42 per cent to 30 per cent in fluorescent lighting tubes which are widely used for street lighting and which help in reducing the consumption of electricity. I also propose to extend the scope of the present excise exemption for low price footwear valued up to Rs. 5 per pair to footwear valued up to Rs. 15 per pair."

तीस रुपये तक के जूते पर एग्जेंसट दिया है। उससे अधिक के जूते पर जो पहले बस रुपये था, शायद उस पर बीज कर दिया था। लेकिन फ्लोरोसेंट लैम्प जिस पर पिछली कर छूट होती थी उस पर हमने 42 परसेंट के बजाय 30 परसेंट टैक्स किया था। मान लें कि इन पर हमने बहुत लगा दिया तो आपने

उन पर माफ क्यों नहीं कर दिया? आप इन पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी माफ कर सकते थे। मेरे जमाने की बजट स्पीच में दिया हुआ है कि पहले साल को 5 हजार 2 सौ करोड़ रुपये की एक्साइज ड्यूटी मेरे जमाने में जो थी वह आपकी हो गई 6 हजार 205 करोड़। आपने एक्साइज ड्यूटी बढ़ाई है। बहुत सी चीजों पर आपने माफ की है। 691 करोड़ में से 35 करोड़ की आपने माफ कर दी है। जो पहले थी वह तो रह गयी है। मैं फिर दांहराता हूँ कि स्टेट्स का शेयर शामिल करके मेरे जमाने में 641 करोड़ थी। उसमें से आपने 35 करोड़ कम कर दिया लेकिन 440 करोड़ उस में और बढ़ा दिया। इस तरह से आप 606 करोड़ और 440 करोड़ मिला दांजिए। यह 1,046 करोड़ हो जाता है।

These are the hard facts.

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने घटाया नहीं है आपने बढ़ाया है। अगर आप करना चाहते थे तो क्यों नहीं आपने इन एक्साइज ड्यूटीज को एक कलम से खत्म कर दिया? मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जब आप जवाब देंगे तो इसका जवाब देने की भी आप कॉन्सिडर करेंगे।

अब जो गरीब आदमी पर आता है। ये जो 50-55 परसेंट है इसका कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं है। बिलों पावर्टी लाइन वालों का कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं है। नाट ए वर्ड इज बेयर। क्यों इनका जिक्र नहीं किया गया है? पावर्टी को किस तरीके से आप खत्म करना चाहते हैं? कोई उसके बारे में तजवीज नहीं रखी गयी है। पढ़े-लिखे लोग, अंग्रेजी जानने वाले लोग, साइड स्ट्राइल आदि लिबिंग में जो विश्वास करते हैं, फोरैन वॉट्रीज की जो तकल करते हैं, जो दुहरों में रहते हैं, वही हमारे सामने आते हैं, वही हमारी सारी दुनिया है, हमारे मॉडल होराइजन पर वही छाए हुए हैं। अधिकतर पॉलीटिक्स लीटर्ज इनके बारे में ही खोजते हैं और उनका मॉडल होराइजन एक कन्सट्रिंड टू दिस काया आती है। गरीब जो दुहात में रहता है उसकी तरफ ध्यान ही नहीं है। शायद आप यह समझते हैं कि गरीब दुहात में ही ही वही उसका कोई जिक्र नहीं है। उसके बारे में



[श्री चरण सिंह]

आपके दिल में कोई दर्द नहीं है (इंटरफ़ॉज) डिस्ट्रिब्यूटिड भाव से आप इस पर विचार करें। इलैक्शन जीतने की बात नहीं है। पचास सौ गलत बातें कह कर इलैक्शन जीत कर आप आ सकते हैं।

आपने शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और ट्राइब्स की कंडिशन को इस्लूव करने की बात कही है जो बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन कोई डिफिनिट चीज भी उसमें नहीं है। केवल यही आपने कहा है कि जो स्कीम्स हैं उन में हम कांशिश करेंगे कि उनके लिए अलग से एलोकेशन हां जाए। कोई नई चीज नहीं है और नई चीज शायद हां भी नहीं सकती थी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे भाई हैं ये करीब साढ़े 22 परसेंट हैं उन में से 17-18 परसेंट बिलों पावटी लाइन रहते हैं। इनके अलावा और भी 35-40 परसेंट हैं। उन सब के लिए भी आप का सोचना चाहिए। एक बार न्यूज आई थी कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया सोच रही है शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और ट्राइब्स के लिए अलग इंतजाम करने की। वह आप करें। लेकिन सवाल बिलों पावटी लाइन वालों का है चाहे वे इन जातियों से सम्बन्ध रखते हों या दूसरी जातियों से, शहरों में रहते हों या देहातों में और मैं समझता हूँ कि उन सभी के लिए एक ही प्रोग्राम होना चाहिए और बहुत सोच-विचार करके उसको बनाया जाना चाहिए। मैं बाद में बताऊंगा कि नया इकोनॉमिक प्रोग्राम हो सकता है। इन सब को वह प्रोग्राम एम्बूसे क्यों न करें। कोई कनक्रीट प्रोपोजल आपने पेश नहीं की है। अगर आप ईमानदारी से उनके लिए कुछ करना चाहते हैं और आपका इरादा है तो फिर 17-18 परसेंट जो ये हैं और 35-40 परसेंट दूसरे हैं इनके अलावा तो उनके लिए क्यों आप कुछ नहीं करते हैं।

गांवों का इस में कोई जिक्र नहीं है। स्पीच के भाग बी के पैराज 37 और 39 ही गांवों से ताल्लुक रखते हैं। अस्सी परसेंट आदमी वहीं रहते हैं, मास आफ दी पीपल वहीं है और मास आफ पावटी भी वहीं पर है। उनके लिए केवल दो पैराज हैं। उनके वास्ते स्कीम्स आपने क्या बनाई हैं। एग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने के लिए जो स्कीम्स थी उनके वास्ते आप ने इस वजत में फाइन-शियल एलोकेशन और भी कम कर दिया है।

मार्जिनल फार्मर्ज डिवेलपमेंट स्कीम के वास्ते मेरे जमाने में 136 करोड़ रखा गया था जबके आपने 56 करोड़ कर दिया है। ड्रूट प्रांन एरियाज प्रोग्राम के वास्ते 59 करोड़ हुआ करता था जिस को आपने 49 करोड़ कर दिया है। कमांग एरिया डिवेलपमेंट बलाक्स के वास्ते 44 करोड़ था उसको आपने 15 करोड़ कर दिया है। एरिया प्लानिंग फार फूल एम्प्लायमेंट तो शायद उस में नहीं आता है, उस में तीन स्कीम्स थी मार्जिनल और सब मार्जिनल; किसानों के लिए। उसका एलोकेशन बचाय बढ़ाने के आपने घटाया। फिर जितने इसमें एग्रीकल्चरल बगैरा दूसरे इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स और इलैक्ट्रिक कम्प्यूटर्स और हजार नाम जो आपने एम्प्लॉय किये हैं, ऐसी किसानों की हजारों समस्याएं हैं। मसलन आज मुझे गैलरी में एक फ्रैंड मिले, आपको पाटी के हिमाचल प्रदेश के हैं उन्होंने मुझे बताया मैं पिछले साल हिमाचल गया था वहां के मिनिस्टर और दूसरे लोगों ने भी बताया कि वहां पर सब का दाम 1 रुपये किलो का है और दिल्ली में 5 रुपये के भाव पर कज्यूमर को मिलता है। तो वह 4 रुपये कौन खाता है। गरीब को, एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूसर को कुछ नहीं मिलता है। क्या उसकी कोई स्कीम आपके पास है? नहीं है। उसकी फिक्र किसी को नहीं है।

जमीन का जो इरॉजन हो रहा है आपके जरिये, जो दोस्त मुझ कहते हैं, तो मैं तो निकम्मा हूँ ही, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप कुछ करके दिखाइयें। इससे कुछ तसल्ली नहीं होनी चाहिए आपको कि मैंने यह नहीं किया। मैं जो प्राबलम बता रहा हूँ वह यह है कि सायल कंजर्वेशन की बात है, जमीन इतनी खराब होती जा रही है कि आगे आने वाली जनरेशन हमें कर्स करेगी। 4, 5 प्लान में कितना रुपया सायल कंजर्वेशन के लिए लिया गया है? मेरे पास इस वक्त फिगर्स नहीं हैं, आप कहेंगे तो भेज दूंगा। जमीन पर तो सारा कुछ निर्भर करता है। एग्रीकल्चरल मायने

utilisation of the existing soil resources लेकिन the conservation of the soil resources for the future generation क्या उसके लिए एक लफ्ज है? नहीं है। राजस्थान का डैजर्ट नजफगढ़ एरिया में दिन रात बढ़ता जा रहा है, डैजर्ट बढ़ता जा रहा

Is there any word about it? Have you given any thought about that, I do not know?

उसकी वजह यह है कि हमारी दुनिया तो दिल्ली तक ही है। यह पता नहीं कि आप कोल से जिले के रहने वाले हैं, अगर है तो वहां तक है।

एक बात मैं और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ दोस्तों से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि गरीबी से बचने का जो रास्ता है वह शहर और इंडस्ट्रियल सेक्टर के जरिये नहीं है। मेरे दोस्तों, वह गांव और खेत के जरिये है। पावर्टी से बचने का जो एस्केप रूट है वह इंडस्ट्रियल सेक्टर में से निकल कर नहीं जायेगा कि पहले उसको बढ़ाये और बाद में देखा जायेगा। नहीं, पहले उस पर ध्यान दीजिए। जितना एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन प्रति एकड़ बढ़ेगा कम आदमी जितने होते जायेंगे, with fewer and still fewer men on the soil.

पैदावार फी एकड़ बढ़ती जायेगी। और जो रिलीज वर्कर है, एग्रीकल्चरल है वह इंडस्ट्री में शिफ्ट करेंगे तब जाकर यह होगा। यह जो करने जा रहे हैं कि एक्सपोर्ट प्रमोशन से इंडस्ट्री बढ़ जायेगी, यह नहीं बढ़ेगी

सन् 51 की सैन्सस में 10 परसेंट आदमी इंडस्ट्री में थे, 9 इंडस्ट्री में थे और एक माइनिंग में। सन् 1961 में 10 परसेंट, एग्जैक्टली दी सेम रीशियो और 72 परसेंट एग्रीकल्चर में और 71 में ठीक वही रीशियो। मूलक वही तरक्की किये माने जाते हैं जहां एग्रीकल्चरल पॉपुलेशन का परसेन्टेज घटता जाता है और नॉन-एग्रीकल्चरल पॉपुलेशन का परसेन्टेज बढ़ता जाता है।

जब अंग्रेज आये थे, तो एक इकनामिस्ट के हिसाब से 85 परसेंट आदमी खेती में लगा हुआ था और आज 72 परसेंट लगा हुआ है। उस समय 25, 30 परसेंट डोमेस्टिक इंडस्ट्री में लगे थे, सब बर्बाद हो गई इंडस्ट्री अंग्रेज अपने कारखानों के हक में थे, कारखानों के भाल से काटते प्रोडक्ट कंपीट नहीं कर सके वह सब खत्म हो गये बेरोजगार हो गये। 50 से 72 हुआ, मूलक गरीब हुआ और अंग्रेज के जाने के बाद भी लीवर पूल या लंकाशायर के इंडस्ट्रियलिसट्स की वजह से हमारी काटते वीवर्स

और आर्टिजन बेरोजगार हो गये। आज बिड़ला, टाटा और इंडस्ट्री हाउसेस, बम्बई, कलकत्ता और अहमदाबाद में वही हमारे सामने प्राब्लम है। क्या फर्क पड़ा स्वराज्य का? आपका इंडस्ट्रियल एम्प्लायमेंट कहां बढ़ा है?

शहर का यह हाल है कि एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में आज 1 करोड़ 50 लाख आदमी के नाम दर्ज हैं। अब से 3 साल पहले यह 1 करोड़ 2 लाख थे। वह जनता पार्टी के जमाने में बढ़ते गये क्योंकि जो हमारे मैटल यूथ बन गये उनका छोड़ना आसान नहीं। हमारे दोस्तों का भी वही हाल था। माफ़ करें, पास तो कर लिया कि आगे नई इंडस्ट्री लगायेंगे उस काम को करने के लिये और उस चीज को पैदा करने के लिये जो कि छोटे पैमाने पर हो सकती है। But no thought was given to its implementation.

वही मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने आंखें मीच रखी हैं। शूतर्मुंग को तरह unemployment can be washed away. मैं डीटेलज को छोड़ देता हूँ। उसका एक हो इलाज है। कोई नहीं कहता है कि बड़ी फैक्टरीज न हों। उनके बिना देश का काम नहीं चल सकता है। लेकिन जो फैक्टरीज या इंडस्ट्रियल अंडरटेकिंग वह सामान पैदा करें, जो अपने मूलक में छोटे पैमाने पर पैदा होता रहा था और आज हो सकता है, उन को आगे के लिए न लगने दीजिए। और जो आज लगी हुई है, मसलन अहमदाबाद की काटन मिलज, उनमें दस लाख आदमी लगे हुए हैं वीविंग और स्पिनिंग में। वीविंग में सात लाख आदमी लगे हुए हैं। अगर हम कहें कि वीविंग मिलों का कपड़ा हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं बिकेगा, वह एक्सपोर्ट किया जाये और अगर एक्सपोर्ट नहीं कर सकते, तो वे वन्द हो जायें, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में अब हंडलूम प्राइवट बिकेगा, तो इससे 84 लाख लड़कों को काम मिलता है। 12 आदमी हंडलूम पर उतना ही कपड़ा पैदा कर सकते हैं, जितना कि यह टेक्स्टाइल वर्कर करता है। ऐसा करने में क्या मुसीबत है? इससे दो साल में सब मामले हल हो जायेंगे।

[न. च. ण सिंह]

अगर मेरे दोस्त बुरा न मानें, तो मैं उन्हें मशवरा दूंगा कि वे अपने अपने जिलों में 1880 के आस-पास के डिस्ट्रिक्ट गेजेटियर पढ़ें, जो डिस्ट्रिक्ट कलेक्टरों की लाइब्रेरी में मिल सकते हैं। उसमें मिलेगा कि आपके जिले में फलों के क्षेत्रों में फलों काटने इंडस्ट्री हुआ करती थी। आज वे नहीं हैं। कहाँ गये वे लोग? 1931 की सेंसस रिपोर्ट उठा कर पढ़ें। उनमें से दो-तिहाई टुकटुक प्लॉट्स खेती करने लगे। अंग्रेजों की फैक्ट्रियों के काम्पीटीशन में वे खत्म हो गये। जो कुछ बचे होंगे, वे 1947 के बाद हमारे अपने इंडस्ट्रियल हाउसिंग के काम्पीटीशन की वजह से खत्म हो गये। अगर उन्हें प्रोटेक्शन दिया जायगा, तो एम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ेगा।

इन्दिरा जा यहाँ पर नहीं हैं। जाकिया ऐसा हो गया है। इस इलेक्शन में मैंने अखबार में उनकी स्पीच पढ़ी कि वह अन-एम्प्लायमेंट मिटाने के लिए हर एक परिवार को एक नौकरी देंगे। लेकिन नौकरी देने से अन-एम्प्लायमेंट नहीं मिटेगी। 1972 में पटना एन. आई. सी. सी. में एक रजो-ल्यूशन पास हुआ, जिसमें एग्लेक्टली यही कहा गया था कि हम पाँच साल तक हर घर में एक लड़के को नौकरी देंगे, जिसे सौ रुपये मिलेंगे। यह न हो सका और न हो सकेगा।

अगर अन-एम्प्लायमेंट मिटानी है, तो प्राइवेट एम्प्लायमेंट देनी होगी, ताकि व्यक्ति को कुछ इनकम भी हो और वह देश को प्राइवेट में इजाजत करे। उसकी पर-चीजिंग पावर हो। अगर हम अपनी एग्री-कल्चरल प्राइवेट बढ़ाएँ, मगर मासिज के पास परचीजिंग पावर न हो, तो वे सामान खरीद नहीं सकेंगे। यह समस्या हल होगी प्राइवेट एम्प्लायमेंट से। गांधीजी काटने इंडस्ट्री पर जोर देते थे। उसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि बूढ़ा आदमी हो गया है, दकियानूसी बात करता है, हमने आहर का लिटरेचर पढ़ा है, उसमें काटने इंडस्ट्री का जिक्र नहीं है। लेकिन इसके अलावा कोई हल नहीं है। अगर कोई हल हो, और कोई नौजवान कोई नया आईडिया दे सके—मेरी एज के बराबर तो शायद ही कोई

हो—, तो मैं उसके घर जा कर बहस करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। इसके अलावा इस समस्या का कोई इलाज नहीं है।

काटने इंडस्ट्री अभी बढ़ेगी, जब बड़ी इंडस्ट्री पर लगाम लगे, क्योंकि काटने इंडस्ट्री फिनांशली मैकेगाइज्ड इंडस्ट्री से काम-पीट नहीं कर सकेगी। लेकिन यह काम करेगा? सब सेठ नाराज हो जायेंगे। मैं श्री वेंकटरामन की प्रबलता को जानता हूँ। हिज पार्टी डिपेंडेंस आन वॉज इंडिस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स फॉर इंस पोलीटिकल सरवाइवल। अब आप यह इरादा कर लें कि अब तक तो हर इलेक्शन में आपने कराँड़ों कराँड़ रुपये लिये हैं, लेकिन आगे नहीं लेंगे। अभी आप एक्शन ले सकेंगे, वना आप एक्शन नहीं ले सकेंगे। (व्यवधान)

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने कथन को समाप्त करता हूँ। अगर मुझे से कोई ऐसी बात कही गई हो, जिससे श्री वेंकटरामन को तकलीफ अगर्चे मैंने साफ करने की कोशिश की है, तो वह मुझे साफ करे।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (Latur): I am conscious of the fact that I have to speak after the present Finance Minister had spoken on the budget and after the ex-Finance Minister had given his comment on it. First, I should like to deal with the salient features of the budget. And then I would endeavour to meet some of the criticism that is levelled against the budget by the hon. Member, Shri Charan Singh.

Sir, in order to assess the true value of the present budget, it is necessary for us to bear in mind the economic condition that is existing in the world and that is existing in this country and the causes because of which the present economic condition is existing. The gross national income has gone down by 3 per cent. The prices had shot up by 20 per cent. The price of oil has gone up. The last budget showed in a

deficit of Rs. 2,700 crores. The economy pushed in a completely chaotic condition. In this situation, the present budget is presented to this House, and through this House, to the people at large.

Sir, one of the most important features of this budget is that it does not impose heavy taxes. It reduces the taxes which are already imposed. The hon. Member Shri Charan Singh Ji said that you have given exemption in the income-tax limit. You have raised the limit from Rs. 8,000 to 12,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is from Rs. 10,000 to 12,000.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: He has raised it from Rs. 10,000 to 12,000. This does not mean any relief to the poor man. I do agree that the relief must be given to the poor man. It is a relief given to the man who comes from the middle class. If an artisan is working in a factory and if he gets Rs. 12,000 per annum, he would be required to pay income-tax. Relief is given to such a man and that relief is also a valuable relief.

I believe 6 lakhs of income-tax payers would benefit out of this relief. It is not a small thing; this has to be borne in mind. It is not only the poor man who is suffering but it is the middle-class man also who is suffering. It is the intention of the present Government to give relief first to the poor man. The Government wants to give relief to the middle class man also, and hence this relief.

Now, there is a reduction in the excise duty on toilet soaps and the tooth brushes. Sir, it is said that tooth-brushes and toilet soaps are produced by the multi-nationals, that is why excise duty was not reduced by the previous Government. It is not important which company produces these goods. But, what is

important is who consumes them. Is the common man consuming them or not? When it concerns him and when he consumes them, he has to pay more money. And that is important. The present budget takes into account the fact that the tooth-brushes and the toilet soaps—a bulk of them—are used by the common man and some relief has to be given to that common man and the relief is thus provided in the budget.

Have we raised the excise duty on the life saving drugs which are very important? Because of their non-availability, life itself would be in danger. We would be doing a criminal act if we raise the excise duty on things like that. The present Budget has given complete exemption from excise duty on articles of this nature.

16 hours

There is an exemption given on the controlled cotton cloth. That is an article which is used by the common man and the relief is given to him. Every now and then it is asked: what is the relief provided in the Budget for the common man? These are the reliefs which are provided to the common man. After a few minutes, I will come to the schemes which are meant specially for the poorest men in our country. But these are the reliefs which have been provided here. If we take into account all these reliefs, it may not be a big amount—it is only Rs. 30 to 34 crores—but what is important is that we have to see the articles which are used by the common man.

I was very much surprised to hear from the hon. Member, Shri Charan Singhji, that nothing has been done in this Budget to give relief to the poorest man, a man coming from the village and rural areas. Is it a fact? No. I may refer to paragraphs 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 of the Budget speech



[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

of the Finance Minister, which deal with the reliefs that are made available to persons coming from the rural areas only.

It is provided in the Budget that a massive national rural employment programme would be started. For that purpose, an amount of Rs. 340 crores is set aside. The State Government also will make available some amount for this purpose. All this amount will be utilised for giving employment to people coming from rural areas. With Rs. 340 crores about 900 million mandays employment would be generated. Is it not something which is good for the common man? How can we lose sight of this fact which is provided in the Budget itself? Not to pay attention to this kind of a provision in the Budget is to mislead this House and mislead the people outside.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: I said that Rs. 340 crores have been provided but what is the actual scheme on which we are going to spend this amount? I said that a major part of this amount will be consumed by the administration and corruption.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am very thankful to Shri Charan Singhji because he has referred to corruption in this scheme. I come from Maharashtra, a State which has been implementing this kind of scheme. There employment guarantee scheme came into existence five or six years ago. I have the good fortune of associating myself with this scheme. Maharashtra State has been spending about Rs. 50 to 60 crores on it.

The allegation which is constantly levelled against it is that it breeds corruption. Those who do not want that this kind of scheme should be implemented say that this scheme

involves corruption and so, let us not have it. Those who are really interested in it or those who are really interested in the welfare of the poorest men in the villages, do not talk of corruption in it. This charge is levelled by those people who are not interested in it. I do not mean to say that hon. Member, Shri Charan Singhji, is not interested in it. But I am saying this about those people who have been levelling allegations of corruption against this scheme. And I am very sorry to say that the hon. Member, Shri Charan Singhji, is taking that kind of cudgel to beat this scheme with. I would have been very happy if he had levelled some other kind of allegation against this scheme. But he is treading on the same path which is used by those people who are against this type of scheme.

There is a scheme in Maharashtra which has been implemented for the benefit of the rural people. Of course, I would not say that there would not be any corruption. Is there any sphere of life in our country where *corruption is not there?* Can we say that (because there would be some corruption, we should not have it?

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: I said nothing against the industry. I simply said about the employment of rural youth. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I was saying that in Maharashtra a scheme is prepared. That scheme is implemented. That scheme is scrutinised very now and then and a machinery is created for that purpose and now in Maharashtra we have a statute for that purpose and we are implementing that statute. The same thing can be utilised here also. I may be allowed to say that Mr. Page who was the Chairman of the Upper House in Maharashtra was responsible for that scheme and when the scheme

came into existence, I had the good fortune of initiating the debate in the Lower House in Maharashtra and then I had met him and asked him: "Sir, I am going to speak on that scheme. Will you please enlighten me?" He told me: "I have created it. That is my child. I would like to see that it is implemented in other States also. I would like to see that it is implemented in the entire country of ours and at the same time I would like to see that it is turned into a law and afterwards it becomes a part and parcel of the Constitution and the right to work is provided in our Constitution. And if that is done, I would die a peaceful death." That is what he said and I am very happy to say that the hon. Finance Minister has come forth with this kind of scheme. It is going to be implemented in our country and after some time we may have something more sophisticated, something more effective something more useful. A right beginning is made and it would be wrong to say that nothing is done in this respect. I would ask: What is it that you are going to do for the poor man in the village? Are you going to give him a dose? Are you going to send some money orders to his house every now and then? Are you going to send some foodgrains to his house without asking him to work? Are you not going to give him the power to produce, the right to work? There is a Chinese saying that if a hungry man goes to another man and says "Give me something to eat", don't give him a fish, but give him a net. If a net is given, he can continue to get the fish and he can feed himself.

Here is a scheme which is providing something for the poor man coming from the village, the poor man coming from the rural areas and in my humble judgment and opinion, this is one of the most important things. If anybody asks me to say which is the most important thing which is done in the budget for the poorest man in the country, I would point my

finger humbly to this provision in the budget.

It is also said that nothing is done for the poor man. I am referring to a provision which is not very explicit in the budget probably it will be explicit in the figures that are given in the detailed budget. I am referring to the legal aid. The Constitution provides that legal aid should be given to the poor man. We have been making laws and laws, but unfortunately for us the poor man and woman have not been able to make use of those laws, for whom those laws are made. It is said that all persons are equal in the eye of law, but it is also said, if equal kind of legal assistance is not available, all persons are not equal in the court of law. What we are trying to do here is, to give assistance to the poor man for whom the laws are made. We are going to enlighten him on all the rights that are made available to him. If a workman is working in the field and he meets with an accident and loses his land, he does not know that compensation is available to him. He does not know that there is a law which will give him the compensation. But if the legal aid scheme is available, he would know, he would be taught that he could get compensation, that would mean a big help to him. Outside and inside the courts the legal aid, for which we have made a beginning in the Budget, is going to help the poor. We may have set aside only a small amount, the State should take up the responsibility on their shoulders also, but what is important is that we are marching in the right direction to help the poorest.

Many of the poorest in the villages do not have a shelter over their heads. The Budget provides Rs. 50 crores for giving house sites and hutments to them. About 8 lakh families will benefit by this scheme. Is it not something for the poorest? This is not the only amount available for the scheme. The States also

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

would come forward giving some amount for the same purpose. These are the provisions in the Budget which are available not to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes alone, for whom there are other provisions. Mr. Charan Singh said that the poorest do not come from the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes alone. I agree, but I want to point out to him that there are provisions in the Budget which mean to help the poorest men coming not only from the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.

I am very happy that a reference has been made to the development of a science and technology in our country. It is very important. Let me say in my own humble way that today the world is developing not because of cottage industry, not because we are using our hands and feet alone, but because we are using our brains. The world is developing and going ahead because it has developed science and technology. We are very fortunate in having had a visionary like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to rule over this country for a pretty long time. He laid the foundations for the development of science and technology in our country, and we are very happy that we are one of the most advanced countries in the world in this respect. If we do not provide enough money for the development of science and technology, let me say very humbly, we will not be able to compete with the rest of the world. It is necessary for us to give employment to the poor coming from the rural areas, to have rural cottage, small scale and medium scale industries, but we will not be able to make our country self-sufficient, strong and capable of protecting itself if we do not develop science and technology and the big industries also. We are not losing sight of the fact that the rural and small scale sectors are necessary. In the olden days we had

the rural and cottage industries and we produced so many beautiful things in our country, but those things were important then, not today. It is a question of approach as to how to develop our country, help the poorest man and produce more. Can it be simply done by having recourse to small-scale, cottage and rural industries? Is it not necessary for us to develop science and technology? Can we get on in the world without understanding the importance of science and technology? If we think we can, let me say as a very small man and a junior Member of Parliament that we will be doomed. It is only by developing science and technology, by producing more and more and distributing justly, and at the same time paying attention to the problem of giving employment to people in this country that we will be able to solve our important problems. By thinking of some aspects only and neglecting others, we will not be able to develop our country. I am very happy that the Finance Minister has been kind enough to provide an amount of Rs. 116 crores. I would have been happier if he had provided more. When no heavy dose of taxation is given in it, the budget has provided enough for the planned development in our country. The annual plan outlay for 1980-81 is Rs. 7340 crores—14 per cent increase over last year. The total plan outlay for Centre, States, Union Territories and schemes of North Eastern Council is Rs. 14,593 crores whereas in 1979-80, it was only Rs. 12,511 crores—an increase of 16.6 per cent.

It has been said that nothing is provided for agriculture. I was born in an agriculturist family and I come from a rural place, a village and I have the same kind of concern as others have for the people living in the rural areas. But sometimes, I do not understand the speeches being made saying that nothing is done for agriculture. I think that the incentive



that is necessary for the development of agriculture is lost if this kind of speeches are made here. If a certain amount is provided for agriculture, irrigation, power, cooperative sector and for the scientific development of agricultural universities and colleges...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Veterinary also.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL:...that would be the amount available for agriculture. Here in this Budget, an outlay of Rs. 2247 crores has been provided whereas in 1979-80, the amount provided for this purpose for this was only Rs. 1,811 crores. For irrigation, this year's outlay is 1,380 crores, for minor irrigation it is Rs. 266 crores whereas last year it was Rs. 1,258 crores. For power, the outlay this year is Rs. 2,745 crores and the outlay for rural electrification programme is Rs. 235 crores, whereas last year the outlay for power was only Rs. 2,466 crores. There is an increase of 11 per cent. As far as coal is concerned, the amount provided this year is Rs. 473 crores, whereas last year it was Rs. 364 crores. About the petroleum sector, about which we had a happy news only in the afternoon, Rs. 337 crores have been provided whereas it was only Rs. 611 crores in 1979-80. For steel, this year we have provided Rs. 803 crores whereas last year it was only Rs. 600 crores. If we have a look at the outlays that have been provided for the important sector of our economy, we shall have to admit that the regular development of our economy is not neglected, in spite of the fact that there is no heavy dose of taxation imposed. Now, this is very important and here the skill lies. There are no heavy taxes imposed, but at the same time, the important sector of our economy like agriculture, irrigation, power, coal and steel are not neglected. That is a very important factor.

This year we are having a deficit of Rs. 1,417 crores. The question is how this deficit will be covered, how the difficulties created by this deficit will

be overcome. There is an indication as to how it will be done viz., by plugging the loopholes in the taxation laws. There are so many loopholes in the taxation laws. The concepts of partial division of Hindu Joint Family, public trust and private trust are to be done away with and by that, we would be getting something more. By recovering the taxes in an efficient manner, we can have some more money. By utilising the production capacity to the optimum, we can overcome this difficulty. It is very unfortunate that last year, the capacity to generate power was utilised in such a manner that we could not utilise 45 per cent of it. The hon. Member, Mr. Charan Singh said that it is because of the nationalisation of coal that that happened, and this was the devil of the play. That is what he said. I must very humbly say that there is no use criticising the nationalisation. It is not following the correct policy that created the difficulty. The hon. Finance Minister has rightly said in his Budget speech that there was no policy at all followed by the previous Government and that is why those difficulties arose. In Bombay, we were hearing at that time that coal was available at the pits, but the wagons were not available. Sometimes we hear that wagons were available, but the coal was not. Why was it so? It was all because there was no co-ordination in the then Government and they did not follow the correct policy. That is why we were not in a position to utilise the capacity that was existing then. If we want to overcome the difficulty that has arisen because of the power shortage, we shall have to have an unambiguous policy, it would be necessary for us to coordinate the different departments, to be very vigilant and particular about all small things and only then we would be in a position to overcome the difficulties that have arisen due to power shortage. If the Government is determined to do this, if the Government means business, if the Government want to be efficient, this task would not be a difficult one. Now the



[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

Government is not shifting the responsibility to the people, to the common man, the Government is not saying: 'This is the deficit, give us the money, we will cover the deficit and will produce more'. The Government is not shirking its responsibility. The Government is taking up the responsibility. The Government says that we would not impose taxes on the people, but at the same time, whatever capacity is available would be utilised to the fullest extent possible and we will tide over the difficulty. For this the Government has to be applauded and thanked. It is not shifting the responsibility, it is taking up the responsibility on itself. This is very important. This is possible for a Government formed by the Congress-I Party, which is led by a leader who is determined to deliver the goods to the country and we are very happy about that. Not only at the Centre, but in the States also, we have Governments which would be working in unison with the policy which is adopted by the Government here and that is what is mentioned in the Budget Speech. This is going to be one of the most important factors which would help the Government to tide over the difficulties that are created by deficit financing.

But what is most important is to create a right kind of psychology, bent of mind in our country. I do not know, but I am told by many people that the people in our country are very happy about this Budget. People who are sitting on the Opposition benches may pick holes here and there and criticise the Budget. But the common man in the street, the common Indian is very happy about the Budget. He feels that by not imposing the taxes, the Government is going to control the price line also. There may be certain other things which would be required for controlling the prices. I am not saying that simply by not imposing taxes, the price line will be

controlled. But a psychological feeling has been created in the common man, in the man who is working in the field or factory. He feels that an atmosphere is created where the price line would be controlled, where a situation would be created and his life would become happy. And this atmosphere is very important. It is very necessary also for producing more. I am happy to say that the hon. Finance Minister has been greatly successful in creating that kind of psychology, that kind of atmosphere in our country which is going to help us very much.

Ours is a monsoon economy. It is true, if the monsoons are good, everything is all right in our country. Sometimes the monsoons are very good; sometimes the monsoons are not good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: The monsoons, unfortunately, cannot be controlled by human beings and it would not be necessary for me to dilate too much on that point. So, I leave that point.

What is the objective which the present Budget wants to achieve? In my humble opinion, it wants to control the price line; it wants to create a psychology because of which there will be more investment; it wants to give an impetus to produce more and it wants to see that the produced goods are distributed in a just manner. The most important aspect of this Budget is to help the poorest man first and, afterwards, to achieve all these things. This Budget is trying to achieve that. The people may say, it is not a radical budget. I will not quarrel with it. Some people may say, it is a capitalistic budget. I will not agree with it. I say, it is a Budget which is the product of the Indian genius; it is a budget which suits the Indian situation; it is a budget which can be described as a realistic budget and it is a budget which will bring the chaotic economy in

order and will bring the economy on the right track. These are the ends to which this budget is trying to arrive at and, I am sure, these aims would be certainly achieved.

While speaking about the salient features of the budget, I attempted to meet some of the criticism which was levelled by elderly and honourable Shri Charan Singhji. At the beginning itself I said, I am conscious of the fact that I am speaking after Shri Charan Singhji who was the Finance Minister and who knows much more about finances than I do. But I may be allowed to differ on certain points from him. I am brought up in an atmosphere which is completely different from Shri Charan Singhji's atmosphere. I am a product of the new generation. I may respect Shri Charan Singhji but I may respectfully differ from him on certain points. I am not going to take up the small points which he raised on the floor of the House. What is the approach we should have and value? That approach is to be scrutinised and examined. I spoke about the provisions in the Budget for the small man, the common man. I am not going to touch that. But Shri Charan Singhji asked, "Why are you seeing that the TV costs less?" Here, I would beg to differ from him. TV is not an instrument of entertainment alone; radio is not an instrument of entertainment only. I know, in the villages, when the sowing season comes, the farmers tune radio and listen to the speeches delivered by the lecturers in the Agricultural universities on the subject which help them . . .

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: I have not said a word about radio; I have simply said about TV.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I will come to TV also.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: You compare food and TV. You dilate on that.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am sorry to say that TV is not available in the villages. I would have very much liked that TV was available in the villages also. What is important in this world? What is important in this world is the will and the knowledge. If the will is not there and knowledge is not there, we will not be able to do anything. We may spend lakhs and lakhs or crores and crores of rupees we may have sophisticated kind of machinery, but if the will is not there and knowledge is not there, we will not be able to do anything. What is the method of creating that will in the men living in rural areas? How are you going to create that kind of will? Those people who used to go from village to village preaching to the people and creating that kind of will in the minds of men and women in rural areas are not there these days. We do not have that kind of people moving from village to village. It is not possible for elderly persons to go to schools and colleges to acquire knowledge or to generate that kind of will in themselves. So what is the method by which we can reach every man in the village? In my humble opinion, the radio and the TV are the media which can be utilised for this purpose. If you have a radio and a TV you can impart the necessary knowledge, you can preach the philosophy necessary for creating the will. In the world, there is an explosion of knowledge and that knowledge has to reach the common man in the villages. What is the method by which we will be able to do it? The last Government provided a huge amount of money for taking knowledge to the people. I do not know for what purpose that amount would have been utilised but, with the radio and TV available in each village and with men sitting in the radio station or TV station, speaking to the people in the villages, we would certainly be able to impart the kind of knowledge which is necessary to develop agriculture, to develop small scale industries, to develop middle-scale indus-

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

tries and even big industries. You can tell him how he should conduct himself so that he can protect himself, how he can be healthy, how the children can be healthy etc. All these things can be done through the TV and the radio. My only worry is that the TV is not available in the villages. If only we can take the TV to the villages, we will do them better service.

But here is a question of approach. (*Interruptions*). If you think the TV is there only for hearing music or watch dances, well, the TV is not necessary. But is the TV meant only for that? It is a question of approach. Not to have a TV or radio is an old approach. Probably we will not be able to get over the difficulties that are existing in our country by following old methods. It would be necessary to have a new approach, and the new approach alone will help. All that is good in the old can be maintained; all that is good.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may leave the TV and the radio now; you have done full justice to both. They don't want to hear more about the TV and the radio.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Coming to electronics, I may say that electronics means so many things: it provides employment to so many people in the villages. If radios are assembled or some such things are assembled and if you start an industry of this kind of thing in the village, it is going to help. It has been done in Japan and in other countries also. It is no good opposing the electronic industry. The electronic industry also can be very important. (*Interruptions*).

I am a hundred per cent one with hon. Shri Charan Singh—who is leaving the House now—when he says that all the attempts of the Government should be directed towards

seeing that the poor man in the village benefits. I am 100 per cent one with him; but it is a question of approach as to how you are going to help the poor man in the villages and rural areas. Are you going to help him simply by having small scale industries and cottage industries or are you going to help him by having middle-scale and big industries in the rural areas also? Will you be able to help him by asking him to adopt the old method of agriculture or will you be able to help him by asking him and teaching to adopt the new, modern, scientific and technological methods to cultivate the land? That is a question of approach. If you follow the first approach, you would reach nowhere. We are not competing only with the people in this country; we are competing with the people in the countries outside also. If we have to come on par with countries outside, if we have to live a life materially as good as the one lived by people in other countries also, it would be necessary for us, while retaining the old, beneficial philosophy of life in our country, to adopt the modern methods of material development also. It is only then you will be able to achieve that. It is no use saying that these are old things. Good or bad, let us follow them forgetting that a new world is evolving. It is developing with such a rapid speed that it cannot be called an evolution only it is something more than evolution. Every day there is metamorphism and new things are developing in the world. And if we have to cope up with the world the old that is good and that is useful, we will have to retain and the new that is useful, modern, technological, scientific and the one in line with the things existing in the world, we will have to adopt. I think, the present Budget is aiming at that, and it is for this reason that the Finance Minister has to be congratulated.

I am very thankful to you, Mr. Chairman, for having shown me the

indulgence to speak for a little more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Remember it that, when I am there and you are here, you will show the same consideration to me.

Mr. K. K. Tewari.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): Sir, I rise to support the Budget proposals. My friend, Mr. Patil, who has spoken just before me, has covered a good deal of the ground; he has spoken about the salient features of the Budget, and if I concentrate on the same aspects, that will be a mere repetition. So, I would like to look at the Budget from the political angle and try to speak about the situation which necessitated this kind of a Budget.

The Budget that is before us is a Budget which is pragmatic; it is, perhaps, one of the best Budgets after independence. I have heard the carping critics of the Budget and the Finance Minister also. I was listening to the impassioned speech delivered by Mr. Charan Singh. I would not like to go into the objections raised by him because Mr. Patil has ably dealt with them.

I would first like to point out that the present Budget was preceded by certain political changes and political circumstances. It is very necessary to deal with them and point out how the whole political situation, the whole economic situation, in the country was bungled, how it was deliberately sabotaged, landing us in a situation which was desperate. It was ultimately the contribution of the people of India who took the country out of that morass and installed the Government which has presented the Budget and which holds out some ray of hope for the people of this country. The Government is trying its utmost to shore up the economy and restore it to its health. I take my hats off to the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister for

presenting this Budget, for, it reminds us of the dynamic decade under the leadership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi; that decade, we should remember, had brought our country nearer our heart's desire of economic self-reliance and attaining a kind of distinct international stature for ourselves befitting our history, befitting our size and befitting our potentiality but for a sad Janata aberration which still wrangles in our mind like a bad dream.

The House will agree with me and you will also agree with me, the Budget presented by the ruling party is the reflection of its political and social commitments. It is also a kind of reaffirmation of its political philosophy and the good that we want to do to the people. But merely dwelling upon the economic ruin that the Janata and Lok Dal combine brought to this country and the bold and imaginative measures that we are proposing to take will just be a kind of barking up the wrong tree. In my opinion the Janata Party and the Lok Dal combine when they came to power, I always call it a bedlam and I still maintain that the Janata Bedlam, when it was born, it introduced certain political and economic monstrosities in the system of India which led to many aberrations.

The cherished desire of the Janata Party was to dismantle the whole edifice whether it was economic, social or political assiduously built over the years by our leadership. Chaudhury Charan Singh was talking about the achievements of the last 30 years. I would not go into that. He was also part of that system, part of that organisation for many years. But I would like to remind my friends on the Opposition benches that when the Janata Party came to power, its main purpose and its main concentration to demolish everything that had been achieved under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi and we should not forget, in India we have a great tradition of massive national



[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

reconstruction through political and democratic means. And the purpose of Janata Party and Lok Dal combine was to demolish it and dismantle it.

Then it is necessary to remember that the Janta Party people now talk glibly of their economic attainment, their economic achievement. But we should not forget that soon after they came to power, their main concentration was first on demolishing all that had been achieved. I would like to remind them that soon after they came to power, they embarked on a perilous path of economic ruin. Secondly, they introduced communal and social tensions in the country and, thirdly they came heavily and unleashed a slander campaign and barbarous onslaught of vengeance on Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the inheritor of the great tradition I have talked about.

You will also remember that in India, especially after 1977 when Janata Party and Lok Dal combine, for I do not see any difference between these two groups, the difference is between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. This is a matter which is to be considered seriously—since they had no political philosophy, at best their political philosophy was only a rag bag philosophy, they had no coherent national vision about the development of India, since they had no coherent political ideology and economic programme, the only thing they had to do and the only thing that united them was a kind of pathological hatred, a kind of frenzy, a kind of wanton unconcern, for the common good of the people and common good of the nation and their utter engagement perhaps the only engagement with demolishing all that India had produced. But fortunately for India and unfortunately for the Janata Party, as I said and you will excuse me for saying this, the parvenues who were born as political giant, the parvenues of Janata Party or should

I call them floatsam and jetsam, soon became prisoners of their hubris and converted India and, perhaps, you will agree with me, into a vast political wasteland and the result was that all around there was demoralisation, all around there was a sense of insecurity. It appeared that India would go to pieces. Under such circumstances, the great leaders, some of them are sitting on the Opposition benches, the great leaders of this bizarre political drama some of them became purveyors of ego-centricity, a kind of self-centredness and this was the result why the Janata Party bedlam broke loose and outcame the screaming, screeching forces of anarchy and these forces of anarchy were none else but Janata Party and Lok Dal people.

16.40 hrs.

[SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL in the Chair.]

They immediately jumped on the throats of each other. That is how this scourge of the nation, the Janata Party, broke down. What have they done for the country? Chaudhury Charan Singh was talking about economic independence. What have they done? What a massive disservice they have done? For that they need to be lambasted; for that they need to be pilloried.

So far as economic measures are concerned—they are important—it is time for them to do some kind of introspection. For example, when the former Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai took over as the Prime Minister of India, even the Angels wept in heaven; Shri Morarji Desai, former Prime Minister, the great leader of the Janata Party, was known all over the world for his archaic and obsolete economic views. He forgot the economic problems of India. In the Janata Party some of our erstwhile colleagues had also screambled on the bandwagon of Shri Morarji Desai. The Janata Party people also forgot the Gandhian ideology. Shri Morarji Desai forgot all the pressing problems.

They were all talking about the mounting pressure of prices, inflationary pressures and all that. Forgetting all these things, Shri Morarji Desai devoted most of his time to delivering lectures on the spiritual and regenerative efficacies of urine therapy, more picturesquely called Urinology. The most surprising thing and perhaps, for a person like me, is this. I felt so saddened when I found many of our progressive friends among the C.P.I. and C.P.M. sitting at his feet and drinking deep at the sea of his knowledge while he was pontificating as a patriarch of the dark ages gone by. This was the kind of reign which we associated with the Janata Party regime.

Then, Sir, fortunately for India, there was a short-lived regime. The regime was led by Don Quixote and Sancho Pancho. I repeat that the Lok Dal regime was led by a Don Quixote and Sancho Pancho—I mean Chaudhury Charan Singh and his assistant or his lieutenant, Hanuman, Shri Raj Naram. Sir you know the philosophy that Lok Dal tried to practise. The House had heard Chaudhury Charan Singh speaking about his economic philosophy. On his political views we have no quarrels. But he has absolutely no business to introduce such aberrations into the bodypolitic of the country, specially, when he was talking about village upliftment. He was talking about the rural poor. Well, we all know he was using radical rhetoric about the upliftment of the rural folk, the poor people, in the villages. While he was talking about it in the name of the poor, he was all the while strengthening the base of the rural rich and the kulaks. You will excuse me for saying this. There was an attempt, diabolical attempt to drive a wedge between the rural sector and the urban sector people as if the Rural and the urban economic flourished in separate watertight compartments. This was the kind of situation that we inherited. Then, Sir, this situation was compounded with the association of some of our friends, erst-

while colleagues. Now, the extinct, obsolete, Congress then had also forgotten all about the economy of the country. They were with Lok Dal and the Janata Party. It is very amusing when we listened to Janata Party people and Lok Dal people talking about their economic attainment and talking about what we did. They have in fact levelled allegations that during the regime of Pandit Nehru and Smt. Indira Gandhi, nothing was done and, in fact, all these distortions that we are suffering in the Indian economy are the products of the previous regime. This amuses me. The Janata Party inherited all that is very clear. We are not suffering from a sense of forgetfulness. We can remember when the Janata Party came to power, they inherited an economy and the political order which was very healthy. They had inherited an economy where the foreign exchange reserves were rich. They inherited an economy where the Agricultural front was bubbling where the industrial production was really admirable. All that advantage was frittered away by the Janata Party and Lok Dal combine. And since they did not believe in economic self-sufficiency and since they did not believe in the prosperity of the country, so, one by one, bit by bit, they started dismantling all that apparatus and all the political and economic organisations built over the years. So, first, since they did not believe in Socialism, they started blaming the very concept of Socialism and its concomitant values. Since they did not believe in Planned Economy, so, the whole planning process was disrupted and the planning machinery was grounded. Since they did not believe in economic self-sufficiency they had to plan everything like this. Since they did not believe in self-sufficiency in the field of Science and Technology, therefore, all the apparatus engaged in this field were smashed. The scientific community was allowed to fend for itself. These then, Sir, were the achievements of the Janata Party and the Janata Party—Lok Dal Combine!

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

Sir, since the previous speaker had already spoken about the salient features of the Budget and about the doings in particular of the Janata Party regime, I would not like to concentrate on those issues. But I would like certainly to read out certain figures which are so very obvious. During the Janata Party regime, and especially, the Lok Dal regime, the GNP went down by three per cent, which is for everyone to see. The agricultural production—as has already been pointed out—went down by 10 per cent. In this way, the whole economy of the country was mismanaged. Since the Congress (I) Government has taken over, all efforts are being made to shore up the economy. I think, Sir, in my opinion, the budget proposals that are now put before us are widely acceptable and the opposition should welcome it with open arms. They should not take any political advantage out of this deficiency or that deficiency.

Sir, in the present political and economic situation, this Budget is the best in the circumstance. Therefore, I support the Budget proposals which have come before the honourable House.

For some kind of diversion, and as it is a very interesting piece,—and in order to reduce the tension of the House,—I may be allowed to read out a short poem of T. S. Eliot which is very relevant to the present situation. This will go a long way in providing a corrective to the national life and a lesson to the opposition leaders. Sir, these are the lines from T.S. Eliot. I quote:—

We are the hollow men  
We are the stuffed men  
Leaning together  
Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!  
Our dried voices, when  
We whisper together  
Are quiet and meaningless

As wind in dry grass

Or rats' feet over broken glass  
In our dry cellar

Shape without form, shade without colour.

Paralysed force, gesture without motion.

This is the characteristic situation and the position of the Opposition parties in India today, and, I think, they should take lessons from their experience of the past. I strongly support this Budget which is a most acceptable Budget, which is a widely acclaimed Budget in the country. With these words I conclude my speech.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Mukundapuram): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while presenting the Budget, the hon. Finance Minister claimed that his budget is:

“A modest contribution to the process of restoring the economy to the path of stability, growth and social justice...”

and he also claimed that it

“Seeks to revive and restore the health of the economy.”

One would have supported the Budget if the claim was really so. After hearing your tall speech, Mr. Chairman, I would have very much liked to support the claims you have made if the economic measures presented before us and the projections made in the Budget really substantiate the same. You will see that the said claims are without any basis and it is only a repeat performance as was hitherto done by his predecessors, which landed this country into the throes of an unprecedented economic crisis.

Let us now look into the *Economic Survey* presented to this House. It shows that the gross national product at constant prices has declined by 3 per cent; the agricultural production

declined by 10 per cent and industrial production declined by 0.8 per cent. This is the largest decline after 1950-51 with the sole exception of 1965-66. Since the GNP figures in our country is being calculated taking into account the output of the so-called "Service sector", which includes trade, government administration and defence, hence the actual decline in the commodity production sectors is not properly taken into account. The decline in absolute and in per capita terms will be much larger.

Let us take the unemployment situation in the country. Such a decline in output has sharply accentuated the magnitude of unemployment. Rural employment was, of course, drastically reduced by the decline in agricultural output. But in the organised sector too, unemployment shows a sharp increase. The number of job seekers on the live register of the Employment Exchanges rose from 13.5 million at the end of January 1979 to 14.44 million a year later. The survey also shows that there has been a sharp acceleration in the rate of price increase in the economy, that the country's trade deficit had nearly doubled from Rs. 1088 crores in 1978-79 to an estimated amount of Rs. 2232 crores in 1979-80. For the first time, in many years, foreign exchange reserves declined by Rs. 56 crores. Why is it so?

The *Economic Survey* would have us believe that this deep crisis of the economy has nothing to do with the nature of the policies being pursued by the Government, but is rather a product of extraordinary accidental circumstances like drought, etc. and the poor performance on the power-coal, Railways, etc. Does the budget provide for any treatment of this crisis? Not in the least. There is not a glimmer of any new policies. The old policies which in the first place brought the economy to this crisis continue.

Now, take the case of thermal plants. Their capacity utilisation is not more than 45 per cent. Most of these plants are based on foreign technology. The replacements, proper maintenance, etc. are not being regularly attended to. Those bureaucrats who manage them never thought it necessary to seek the cooperation of the workers and the trade unions and the technical personnel who man the same. They are only policing over the workers. They will easily explain that coal was not there. If coal was there, they will say that it was of sub-standard quality and so on and so forth. This kind of explanations were given by the bureaucrats who man them. If any suggestion is given by the workers in this regard, they are not taken. After all it is they who run these plants. About coal, the story is more or less like this. Somebody from this side was saying something against nationalisation of the coal industry. I beg to disagree with him. What is wrong with the coal industry? Those people who manage the industry have direct links with the private capitalists. They want to prove the inefficiency of the public sector. That is why this coal industry cannot come out of this situation. So, if you want to get out of the situation, the main thing to do is this: the out-moded machinery has to be changed, and better maintenance and modernization have to be attempted, not at the cost of the workers, but in a scientific manner. All these things should be looked into properly and urgently.

17 hrs.

For the last 5 years energy crisis is there throughout the world. Did we do anything, after understanding the whole situation? We were normally going on with the old attitude. We were losing some money and sitting calm not taking into consideration the developing energy crisis in the world, and the crisis developing in our country.



[Shri E. Balanandan]

With regard to Railways, we were having a perennial crisis of wagons. It has more or less come to stay. Every Railway Minister presents a Budget every year, stating these kinds of difficulties. Whether it is in power or coal, unless there is an awareness of what is really happening, or there is an effort to base ourselves more and more on indigenous technology, unless the bureaucratic administration is done away with, unless the legitimate demands of the workers are satisfied and their cooperation secured, there will be no change in the crisis situation in these two sectors. This is true about Railways also.

One must not forget the new evil added in the Railways. It is not now a days safe to travel by trains. On the way, anybody can attack us and take away our goods. Attacks are taking place on the trains every day. Nothing tangible has ever been done, or is proposed, to protect the goods and passengers on the Railways.

The Railway Minister asked for co-operation from all sides; but he himself said in this House that he would not recognize trade unions which are having the mass following of the workers. How then can he get workers' cooperation?

In this House and elsewhere, the 20-point programme is talked about very loudly. One of these 20 points is workers' participation in management. What is its meaning? Are the workers going to be taken as directors into the Board, and given equal rights and powers to exercise functions in management, or will they be made to take orders from the directors? Without changing the present concept, this idea of workers' participation in management will mean nothing.

The Finance Minister claimed that Government had taken a number of

measures with regard to prices. The exact situation to-day is that between the end of March 1979 and the end of March 1980, the index of wholesale prices increased as much as 19.9 per cent. The index which was 223.3 on January 5, 1980 rose to 238.6 on May 24—a 15.3 point or a little over 6.5 per cent rise, within 4 months, that too under the guidance of our present Finance Minister. Within 4 months there has been a 6.5 per cent rise in prices. What will be the position in a full year?

Mr. Charan Singh dealt at some length with prices.

It is on this price level that the increase in prices of petrol, diesel oil and fertilisers and also the hike in railway freight and fares have been imposed. What is the effect of these things?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You refrain from referring to the Railway Budget.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: The increase in the prices of petroleum products will impose a fresh burden of Rs. 2466 crores on the public. The diesel and petroleum hike has already sent up transport charges both for passengers and goods. The charges of the private motor cars are going up. Therefore, there will be a rise in annual inflation already at the 20 per cent mark and the Government's policies will only accelerate the inflation rate. What the Government has ordained for the people is all-round misery.

The budget proposes taxes of Rs. 282 crores which together with increases in prices of petroleum products and railway charges means a total burden of Rs. 2952 crores. After imposing this huge burden of nearly Rs. 3000 crores on the people, the relief announced is of Rs. 42 crores. What kind of relief is this? They have imposed a burden of Rs. 3000

crores and they have announced relief of Rs. 40 crores which is elaborated very promptly and strongly; and out of Rs. 42 crores, Rs. 15 crores go to the poor section of the society. We do not deny that. We say it is good also, but, at the same time, those sections which get this relief are being taxed; all of them are being taxed. This kind of remission given to them will not reflect in their daily life, only in books or in talks. We can have that in mind.

This is not the end of the story. The Budget has left a deficit of Rs. 1417 crores which the Finance Minister claims that it will not increase; it will not increase any inflation. But what is our experience? Last year, the then Finance Minister had some difficulty; some deficit was there. He said, it was Rs. 1355 crores but the Budget ended with Rs. 2700 crores. Our own Finance Minister Shri Venkatraman, in his interim budget had said something about this deficit. He said that there was an increase within four months. Then what is going to happen at the end of the year, nobody can presume? Then in the Budget it is also accounted the foreign loan of Rs. 530 crores which will be from IMF fund. We may get it or we may not get it; that foreign aid and help is enormously increased. If they deny that, if they do not give us money, then we will have to go in the international capitalist market. They stipulate all sorts of conditions which we cannot accept and the result will be that we will be forced to accept many conditions imposed by them which will go against our economy.

Somebody said about self-reliance. How do we attain self-reliance? Is it by taking Rs. 530 crores loan from IMF or some other foreign monopolist source by accepting the conditions they stipulate. Then self-reliance to that extent will have to be given up by our Finance Minister.

While these are the burdens thrown upon the people, this budget did not

touch the monopolists section, big capitalists of the country. They are given exemption on so many things and they are all praising the budget. So many concessions, tax holidays, increase in depreciation, slashing of customs duty, excise duty exemptions, waiving of convertibility clause, etc. had been proposed. Agricultural income tax totally abolished—not a single tax on that. Our Finance Minister says that it will help the small scale sector. But with this kind of concessions, there is no wonder that the Chamber of Commerce President K. N. Mody and industrial tycoons like K. K. Birla and others say that it is a very good budget, this is the way the government is setting out to redeem the election pledges of the Congress (I) to curb "Monopoly". I shall now invite attention to the editions of the big Press in the country. Look at the Indian Express; it says: Well done. The Statesman says: Well begun; Hindustan Times: pleasant surprise; the Times of India: Imaginative budget. No doubt the budget serves the monopolists well. However the misery of the common man will enormously increase.

I wish to say a few words about the postal rate increases. Does the Finance Minister think that cover is a luxury item? So thirty paise is raised to 35 paise. If you see the projections here in the small paper, a hundred per cent rise is there in postal parcels. Perhaps his friend the other minister, Minister of communications may say: this is being forced upon me because of bonus. But what is the agreement on bonus? Bonus is linked to production out of which financial commitment will not come; therefore the claim is wrong. Another thing is the talk of efficiency. He wants to increase efficiency in postal department. All right; good. He says that overtime increased. But he has not filled up vacancies in the department; 7 per cent vacancies are there and now he wants ten per cent vacancies not to be filled up. This is absolutely a wrong approach.

[Shri E. Balanandan]

Now, about the plan. The plan is a big plan and according to Finance Minister 14.5 per cent rise has been given but what was the economy position last year? 20 per cent price rise. If you want to keep it up to the level of last year, what should you do? Arithmetic tells us that it must be above 20 per cent as of last year.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN):** You should also have to raise taxes by 20 per cent.

**SHRI E. BALANANDAN:** I am only saying that you have cut down the size of the plan. The target has come down, physically. Do not say: I am increasing the plan outlay, etc. Plan outlays have actually been cut down.

What is the share of the public sector investment—Rs. 3184 crores i.e. 13.6 per cent increase as against 20 per cent price rise? That also has not come to the required extent as compared to last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 59 minutes have been allotted to your group. You have taken about 29 minutes. I have three names on the list now.

**SHRI E. BALANANDAN:** What is the total result of this Five Year Plan? Our Finance Minister wants us to believe that we are progressing, but it is not taking the country forward. The net result of this will be the economy will continue to remain stagnant; the people will face a new onslaught of price rise and unemployment—the stagnant economy cannot create employment—opportunities. You can take the example of 1978-79. It was a good period and only less than 4 per cent employment rose. Last year we had 3 per cent GNP less. This year the economic indicators are that it will be a year of declining total employment and total economy will be on the decline. I want to share

with you your assessment that everything will improve but the figures do not agree. I would submit, unemployment will also increase and the dual thing—stagnation and inflation both will kill the people of India. That will be the new situation created unless the present policies are reversed.

One funny thing in the Budget speech is, nothing is said about the land reforms as if you have forgotten this sector, as if land reforms are complete. You have given concessions to big landlords. But what about the land reform? Talking about the poverty stricken people, harijans, etc., without taking over the land and giving it to the tillers, who will create wealth for the country? There comes the false policy of the Government. It helps only the landlords of the country. That way our country cannot go forward.

The purchasing power of the masses will not be better without giving land to the tiller. Without doing it how can the country progress? So, the policy of planning has to be changed. Also, the planning method has to be changed. I must submit here, we are a country having different nationalities and States. You are having a Ministry at the Centre for planning. The whole thing is formulated and planned here. Even the States are not being consulted although they are not making open statement. Our party might be making some statement. All the Congress (I) States also are worried. They are not being consulted before framing the Plan. Not only that, now-a-days some kind of wrong attitude is being taken. For example, after the development in North-Eastern India, Government of India should have now some kind of re-thinking about certain things. We are having different parties ruling in different States. They have legislatures. They have certain sectors or spheres of operations. On all these sectors you are encroaching. I can tell you, Mr. Finance Minister, you have done one trick by imposing

special excise duty, you have taken it away from the divisible pool. The State Governments may lose. All the State Governments have complained. I can give you the example of Kerala, which is a small State. We are having certain policies with regard to cocoa, rubber, and cashewnut. All of a sudden the Centre orders—may be some Joint Secretary might have thought of it—immediate import of cashewnuts by private traders, immediate import of cocoa and immediate import of rubber. The Finance Minister has said that we have adverse trade balance. While these things are available in the country, why should you allow imports? About rubber, we are having last year's imported stock of 11,000 tonnes lying idle with the STC. Yet, you are importing it. Why? With regard to cocoa, the internal demand is estimated to be 2000 tonnes. Karnataka and Kerala produce 3000 tonnes. Why should you import? With regard to cashewnuts, it is a big story, which I have no time to narrate. The Government of India's past experience was that the private trade in the cashew industry has utilised the power to import raw cashewnuts for swindling foreign exchange for themselves. Therefore, the Government of India decided to not to allow private traders to import raw cashewnuts. This was done also for ensuring proper distribution of the imported raw cashewnuts. This was the step taken after long experience. But all of a sudden, like a bolt from the blue, this is again being given to private traders. This is one part of the story.

The latest in the series is, the Kerala Government has made some arrangement with the Madras Aluminium Factory to get aluminium by giving electricity to them. Now some objection comes from the Centre and they say, it should not be done.

Under the law, labour is a concurrent subject. States can legislate on it. From 1977 onwards certain labour legislations sent to the Centre have

not been assented to. The Kerala Assembly passed the Bill and the Centre suggested certain amendments which have been accepted by the Kerala Government. But still it is pending clearance. The State Governments have certain powers which are being curtailed. This is absolutely wrong. The State Governments' administrative, legislative and financial powers are being scuttled by various means by the Centre. This attitude has to go. Therefore, I want you to have a re-thinking on this.

Science and technology are very important. Mr. Chairman, you made many statements with which I agree. What is the situation in the country today? We are supposed to be third in the world in scientific and technical personnel. But we also hear the story of suicides by our scientists. Our R & D institutions are all centralised. The total science policy is wrong inasmuch as we always rely on imported technology. Always we want exports. Therefore, the present thinking is that any technology can be imported if it will help in increasing exports. Indigenous effort to develop our own R & D is not being properly encouraged. We are having agricultural research centrally. We are having industrial research centrally. We are having medical research centrally. In many sectors, we could have decentralisation. Agriculture is done in the States. Let us have R & D institutes in the States. Therefore, some kind of decentralisation in science and technology is required.

Now, I want to pose two questions which are not exactly relevant to Finance Portfolio as such.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then, why pose them?

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Nowadays some talk is going on about changing the Constitution to have a presidential form of Government.



MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not within the ambit of this discussion.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: In the general discussion on the general budget, all the Government policies can be discussed. That is my understanding. I want a statement from the Government whether they want to change the Constitution to have a presidential form of Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was a statement by one of the Ministers.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: This is my question and I want a reply from the Government. Then, nowadays papers report that there is a move of Government to have a committed judiciary and committed executive. Is there any policy like that? After this Government came into power, everybody saw that many judgments... \*\*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow this to go on record. You are treading on a dangerous ground. You are not expected to criticise the judgments given by the courts. That will not form part of the record.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: I would only say whether the Government's policy is to have a committed judiciary.

Innumerable officers of Police and others are being transferred. What is their crime? Because they happened to serve under the Janata rule and performed their duty according to rules and regulations.

I may conclude, Sir, by saying that the Finance Minister's claim that he is going to restore the health of the economy, is a claim without foundation. Therefore, I strongly oppose this Budget.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW (Jullundur): Hon. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I speak in

support of the Budget presented by the hon. Finance Minister.

The judicious and practical manner in which the Budget has been conceived, planned and presented, in my view, is highly commendable. The budgetary optimum, has all the way, been kept very well balanced. This is a very encouraging feature. The total conception has been based on proper plans, programmes and policies. It is backed by certain aims and objectives. It is also guided by the economic and social situation prevailing in the country as a whole. There is nothing *ad hoc* about it. It has been a continuous process. The working out of the plan as to how it will suit the masses at large and how our economy will be built up, will take time. But the start is there. And that I must say is the conception of the planning and the instinct of the high command in power today. Our hon. Prime Minister has been giving off and on her views in relation to how to build up the economy that satisfies the masses as a whole. That is why programmes like the 20-point programme and giving socialistic touch to all types of programmes came into being. That is what, I say, is the encouraging feature. So, the Budget as is evident, forms part of this particular game of economics i.e. how do we raise the living standard of the masses as a whole, not in a lopsided fashion but in a well-considered manner so that everybody gets his right share.

The process of evolution so far as the teeming millions are concerned, is moving in the right direction. The teeming millions are not mere dumb millions. They understand their rights, requirements and demands. So, it is not the question today as to how to just go through the ritual of certain plans or working out policies. They say, we will examine it as it progresses. No. Brasstacks have to be taken into account and it is here

this budget has made a mark. I am not going to repeat the little things and the big things that have already been said because that would be a repetition. That is not my intention. I want to present to you a few things which perhaps the Finance Minister would also accept later as being some kind of catalytic agent to the overall plan and overall budget under various heads which has been laid on the Table of this House.

Now, one word about the millions, that is, the teeming millions. Chaudhury Charan Singh Ji, the hon. Member of the House has said one or two things about how to maintain and to encourage the balance of economy amidst the population as a whole, his bias being towards the rural economy. I must say, we have to think of the overall question and we were doing remarkably well. Even now, as a country we have done remarkably well in so far as our progress during the last 30 years is concerned. We can see the progress of the country all around us. We have a rough measure of it, and in certain ways quite intimate measure, and in that context I would say that in all fields we have been doing quite well and even now we are doing quite well. It may be food self-sufficiency. I want to remind the honourable ex-Finance Minister, Chaudhury Charan Singh, that there was a time, say, about a decade over when he was the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh and I had had the privilege of being the Agriculture, Food and Supply and Revenue Minister of Punjab and we had to share our problems together at this very Centre. And we were in a bad way. We had to have PL-480. Grain shortages in Uttar Pradesh alone were to the tune of 27 lakh tonnes and more so in Bihar and so on, and with the progressive policies that came about under the aegis of our Prime Minister and some of the eminent soldiers I should say, the big type of leaders who are now in the Opposition. our progress came to be phenomenal. We

filled our granaries and on the food angle we became self-sufficient slowly with a magic wand. There is no doubt about it. PL-480 was thrown out and we started having our granaries filled up. Everybody knows it.

On the industrial side of it, we are among the first eleven so far as industrial output in various countries is concerned. In my own little town, in one basti alone, that is, Basti Shekhon—I am talking of Jullunder City—we could export things to the tune of about 4 or 5 crores of rupees, say, *nalke bund*, even some of the small hand tools and sports goods, footballs, this and that. Therefore, things have been moving well enough. There is no question about it. Even on the side of qualitative manpower, there is no shortage; on the side of defence potential it is a wonderful show. It is coming up so very beautiful, and even on the side of nuclear field, nuclear fission and fusion, we are well up; on the side of electronics we are well up compared with any country for that matter. So, the swing is coming up so very beautifully. And with my apologies, no aspersion cast, I would say that we had observed and everybody had observed that unfortunately there was a little bit of shake-up, a little bit of a set back during the Janata regime. We had that setback. It may have been on the gold reserve loss side, it may have been breakage in the developing swing of our industrial progress, messing up of our foreign exchange assets, the peasant's traumatic travail in relation to his own farm produce; like sugarcane, cotton, paddy, tobacco, potatoes. We all know it.

I come from a peasant family. I happen to be the President of the Kisan Khet Mazdoor Dal. I have been dealing with it. I was very surprised to hear Chowdhury Saheb saying that if the Budget had been worked out by the Finance Minister properly with emphasis on cottage industries, within two years all our ills can be solved. He had all the power, he could have

[Shri R. S. Sparroy]

done that within two or three years. I do not think anything worthwhile was done. Not any individual's fault. I would say they were brilliant type of people with beautiful brains, but teamwork was nil. There was so much tension in the administration and also neglect of our economic progress. Otherwise, in my view it could have been done very well.

He has been talking about village life so much. Take his own role as Finance Minister and later as Prime Minister. In his own village and other villages in U.P., Punjab, Haryana and elsewhere no one would pick up sugarcane from the fields for Rs. 5 a quintal. Nobody would pick up potatoes in Punjab, Haryana and some parts of U.P. even if someone offered them at Rs. 5 a quintal. I myself came here and met the NAFED Chairman and Managing Director, warning them a month and a half earlier that the potato crop was coming, and asking what their plans were. I want to say on the floor of the House today that the answer was most unsatisfactory. There were no plans. Previously there were plans, we used to send our potatoes to Indonesia, U.K., Iran and countries of the Middle East. This could have been arranged. Even if the kisan got Rs. 10 a quintal, he would have been satisfied. Everything went to rot. I am very sorry to remind him about it. It is easy to criticise each other, but one has to be a little objective in so far as our progress, economic and otherwise, is concerned.

There is one particular point which is of very great importance in so far as our budgetary proposals are concerned. His thesis or analysis seems to be that if India invests all or most of the money in agriculture, we will be able to become well off economically, and the living standards of our masses would go up. I am very sorry to disagree with him. No country has done that so far. If I produce more wheat what am I going to do with it? Send it out? Where? It is

not going to be easy because all countries are now becoming self-sufficient in food. So, it is not that way you have to come up. It is the other way round. You have to industrialise yourself even in the fields. I am going to propose something fresh to the Finance Minister.

In that, I have a special proposal to make. It may be called an aide to this budget, to what has already been considered under the budget headings of various types. It is to bring up the living standard of the population at large, that is, the village population, the rural population, that is, Gandhiji's good old villages. India is still a land of villages. In my State, there are only three cities, namely, Amritsar, Jullundur and Ludhiana; the other places are all villages; small towns which do not much matter. That is how I would rate Maharashtra. Except for Bombay and one or two other places, its total population is rural. It is so all over India. What I would like to recommend is this. From the allocations made under different budgetary heads, a substantial share of finance has been earmarked for rural uplift. It is there: it has been there. Still it is to be considered to be done by way of having some schemes. This is how I visualise and it can be so done without shuffling about the budgetary heads: funds and allocations already made.

Suppose, as a policy, from now on, heavy, medium and mini industrial units, mandis, godowns, all types of big institutions, that is scientific, technological, medical, agricultural, research experimental centres, universities, colleges, campuses, spill out and mushroom across the countryside and not pushed inside the already congested and suffocating cities of India. No extra expenditure is involved. It is just a question where to disperse them, where to have them, so that everywhere a life of new type mushrooms out. I will explain that. I will give an example. Suppose a heavy or a medium industry is established at a

place in the interior of the countryside, based contiguous to a railway station, connected with a road system. This is what will happen. Labour will be available at the spot. No labour importing or their quartering arrangements will have to be made. The kisans, the farm labour or the artisans' wife, daughter, sister or unemployed son will be available for shift working in the factory that has been established there. These employees will add substantially to their own family's meagre income by hundreds of rupees a month.

Not only that. Wherever you have this type of 10,000 or 12,000 or 15,000 persons working, other type of facilities also come up, grow up, namely there is bound to be a cinema bound to be a college, bound to be school, bound to be a hospital, etc. etc., bound to be a new type of life. That means, the farmer is working in his field; his wife is earning very month or his son is earning every month in the factory near about.

This method may have been used by USSR or USA or Europe or other developed countries. But with the conditions obtaining in India, in relation to our situation and economic conditions obtaining in India, and the swing of evolution as it is called the scientific evolutions. This is the best solution for us to adopt. I have no doubt about it. Mr. Chairman, Sir, while speaking on the General Budget, a little while ago, you spelt out certain measures and you gave a little inkling of it. But I have elaborated that. I feel there is to be a new economic swing. More than 7 per cent of our people are from the villages. They live in villages. Should we not wish to see that India shines with villages being uplifted and developed like Europe and America which have become developed countries?

We have the chance. We have the qualitative manpower. Take the case of Delhi. Only about 2—1/2 decades earlier, it had a population of 6—1/2 lakhs only and now it is sporting over

50 lakhs. The sum of multiplication keeps on taking place. When 50 lakhs are converged into a place, there is always housing shortage, and another lakh of labourers have to be imported, may be from Madhya Pradesh automatically or from Rajasthan or other places, and say one lakh comes in for putting up the buildings. But that lakh attracts some more people to feed them and to bring more supplies for them. That means another ten thousand from the crowd and and so it works on and on. It is like Calcutta, which is daily becoming a hazard. Why do you want it to so happen? On the one hand you want the majority of the population, that is the rural population, to come up. The manner in which you want it to come up is through industrialisation, right down to the village small scale handicrafts and after that mini, medium or anything else you like in that time.

So this is why I wish to recommend to end up as the pattern of the wonderful work you have done in the form of forming this budget. Somehow, it is to be taken up as a policy and then adopted.

I have one more recommendation also to put up before you. Hon. Shri Charan Singh was thinking in terms which are rather, to my mind, a little out of place. You cannot stop mechanisation in the villages. I know about Punjab; I know about Uttar Pradesh and Haryana and other places. I have been in Maharashtra which has done a wonderful job from the cooperative angle of it, and have mechanised threshing there is even tractorisation and other things allied with it. And we have a majority of small farms; there should be no doubt about it. They are five acres and under. I have something to propose in this case also. For farms of five acres and under there is no reason whatsoever why, under the aegis of, say, such a Department as Agro-Industry, we should not have tractor-cum-input centres in each block, India-wide. If you position them there, what will



[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

happen? It would be the cheapest way of giving or offering tractorisation and mechanisation of harvesting and cultivation to the poor farmer. Now, what will he gain? He is going to gain in relation to two bullocks and possibly a cow for which, at the moment, he has to keep aside one or two acres of land for their fodder. That is also a drag on his income. So, these two bullocks can go. All he has to do is to call for or ask from the centre for tractorisation. Irrigation is done, and now it is the right time for tractor to come. The log book is there. The tractor-centre's people come at call and the plot of land is ploughed out and sown. Every six months, after the Rabi crop is out or the Kharif crop is out, the man pays out to the centre. It is reckoned that he does not have to pay more than one tenth of what he has been able to gain out of one acre of land, for the help he has received. On top of that he has saved two bullocks and the land set aside for their fodder. This programme was to be launched in Punjab and possibly will be, in due course of time.

Such are the type of schemes which will bring up our country in the proper type of perspective—which we are looking forward to. It cannot be that you just grow more food products and then say we will come up. No age has changed. We have become mechanised and we have modern-day type of mechanisation in every sphere, everywhere.

The purpose is that you want to bring your standards up. So, what will you have to do? You will have to produce things and then you have to earn money from outside international markets. Once you produce things and send them out, money comes back and then circulates among the masses; and that is what brings the living standards up.

So, these are my two proposals Sir, and, with your guillotine about to be imposed, I thank you very much for giving me this much time.

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA (Kutch): Mr. Chairman, one thing is certain. As far as the mixed economy is concerned, our Finance Minister, remaining totally faithful to it, to mixed economy, has given the best budget that he can give under the circumstances.

I was hearing with very great interest Mr. Charan Singh as well as yourself, Mr. Chairman, when you were on this side. When Mr. Charan Singh was speaking, the Members on the Opposition were clapping their hands and were happy: and when you were speaking: including the Finance Minister everybody was happy. These are the features of Parliamentary democracy; I can understand it; every party has its own say.

As you were saying, Sir, it is a question of approach. I have remained the whole life—I am now 64—a total believer in science and technology. I will ask you one question. Is not political economy a science? Nobody can differ; nobody can doubt it. Political economy is one of the social sciences. It has fixed laws. It is not only expert knowledge that is important, but able implementation of those laws is also very important to bring about the results. For the last three decades or more, perhaps, we were experimenting or fiddling with this mixed economy. we all take pride about it. Still, as if we have not tested, we cling to it.

I will ask only three questions of our very learned and respected Finance Minister. Has the number of people living below poverty-line decreased or increased? I am very sorry, Mr. Charan Singh went upto 55. I will not quote that figure. But definitely it is not 37; it has gone up to 44.

I will ask another question. Has the number of dwellers in the slums in cities increased or decreased? It has innumeraably increased, not only increased. Bombay has 15 lakhs of

slum dwellers. Calcuta has an equal number of such dwellers. There is not a single industrial city where the slums are not increasing day by day. Perhaps, the number of slum dwellers has gone up to more than one cores.

Last but not least, I will ask one question. Has the number of persons selling their blood and body for earning their livelihood increased or decreased? We have a woman Prime Minister the most dignified woman of the era. But see the dignity of women. It is the greatest tragedy of life: if you go to the Faras and Goalpeta areas in Bombay or such areas at so many other places, you will find that the dignity of women has lowered down to such an extent; You will never witness such things in any other country. It is high time that the dignity of women went up to a desirable level; it should not fall down to such a level, as I mentioned just now. Those Faras and Goalpeta areas should be removed. Prostitution should be abolished, if possible. If that is not possible, at least those areas should be totally abolished. We know what is the dignity of women now-a-days. Every now and then we read in papers about rape and other things.

Now, I ask you the fourth question. Mr. Charan Singh was talking about village industries and what he had done in his short time. I will ask this question: has the number of destitutes from villages increased or decreased? The rush of the destitutes from villages to cities has increased. This is the result of the mixed economy experiment for more than three decades. Is it not time for us to rethink about it? Is it only that the parliamentary democracies should try to please both the sides or should they not also deliver the goods for the country's sake? Is it not time for us to think whether this type of administrative system is fit for us or not? There are ways and ways. As a student of science, for me, everything has some reason and my intelligent friend, Mr. Chairman, was just speaking on science and technology. He knows that

nothing can be done without reason. That is the condition of India. What is that? It is exploitation. If, after knowing the reason, we are not going to stop it, who will stop it? Who is at fault who has to be punished? Mr. Charan Singh that side and we on this side, all these thirty years, have been experimenting with this mixed economy. No difference between us. The machinery is the same, the system is the same. It is only a question of better marking, more marking or less marking. Machinery is the same, system is the same.

Sir, we are responsible people. We are representatives of the people. I shall earnestly appeal from the bottom of my heart, let us rethinking about it. Is there nothing wrong with the system that we are following? As a student of science and technology, I would say our economy has to have a scientific approach. In mixed economy we want to please everybody. We want to please the exploited. We want to please also the exploiters. What is the result? A person who tries to please everybody displeases everybody. Giving relief here and there to the poor and at the same time creating opportunities for exploration does not lead us anywhere. We know what is the progress we have made. I remember in 1969 when our beloved Prime Minister differed with her own old leaders, the slogan was:;

गति बढ़ानी चाहिये हिन्दुस्तान को आगे आने के लिए ।

With that, I will only request,

गति बढ़ रही है और पीछे जा रही है।

What is the mistake? Sir, it is not that as a Congressman I have no right to express my views. Sir, certainly we are much better than what we were during the British times. We are definitely going ahead. But the speed and the way we should go is it all right? Sir, after the elections, let me tell you, the aspirations of our people are much higher than what they were ever before. They expect results immediately. I many tell you that people

[Dr. Mahipatray M. Mehta]

expeted hars taxes and heavy burden on them in this budget. Please see, comparatively—I will have to say—your budget is much better than that of Mr. Charan Singh. There can be no comparison....

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time more would you require?

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: I would require some more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please conclude.

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: To morrow I will conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then it will be a disjointed speech.

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: I have still a lot to say. I have to say something about my constituency also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But how much time more you want?

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: 20 minuts more at least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any way, if you conclude in another five minutes time, it is all right.

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: I will request you....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably I may not be here tomorrow and you may not get the time.

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: At least I will have the satisfaction of saying something to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, you are making a very good speech. Then it will be a disjointed speech. In five minutes please conclude. There is a long list of members who want to speak tomorrow.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): But, Sir, when his speech is

read in the record, it will be all right. It will not be disjointed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:: I can tell you tomorrow is going to be very difficult day. The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs will also be hard-pressed for time. So, please try to finish in another five minutes.

18.00 hrs.

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA: I can see the Members want to go away rather soon. I will have to shorten my speech.

Sir, the main wealth of India is manpower. How many man-hours are we losing daily: anybody imagine what wealth we are losing daily by not using our man-hours? The real wcaith of India is man-power.

Sir, if there is a richman's son he can enjoy he can have his friends and sit together whereas the members of a poor man's family without exception have to work day and night. I know of my district from where I come. When there is famine you will find most of the ladies working very hard in the burning sun and hot winds. Sir, if it was my sister how will I feel it? Sir, if it were my young wife working there at the mercy of a mistry over there how will I feel it. If my old mother were working there how will I feel it. We have never thought of the reason. The reason is that they are poor. Then Sir, as I told you about Bombay, if compulsory employment comes in then all the civil and social vices like smuggling etc. will disappear. The programmes will be implemented. As a medical man I will say that India's disease is very big and it will require some rigorous treatment. Some people may ask where is the money for the programme? I say gold is there. Why don't we withdraw from the public circulation all the gold. How many people will be dispeased. These steps may look

very extreme but the disease is like that. In India if we go on at this snail-speed, it will take thousands of years to reach the European level. We have to take some decision with cudgels in both hands. We have to take some bold decision. It is not only in Communist countries. All Capitalist countries including America have taken gold from the Circulation Bank whenever crisis came in their country. If you want to fight inflation, then the best means is to withdraw gold. You withdraw gold totally and not just have gold control or touching on the fringe. If there is total withdrawal of gold from circulation you will find that prices will come down next day. Nothing more is required. If I give example of Mao you may say that I am talking of Communism. Sir, it was not Mao only. Forty-two years ago America had done it. Britain had done the same thing. Britain did the same thing. Germany did the same thing; and lastly. Mao. When there was the greatest inflation of the world Chang-Kai-Shek supported the U.S. views. Nothing could prevent that. It was the manpower that was utilised. China with a much big or population than India at the same time keeping optimum interests in mind did one good thing. (*Interruptions*). Do you want to listen?

I want to say so many things. I want a development board for my constituency. People in that part of my constituency which is a most backward part of India are in a very bad position. Even Sardar Patel in 1948 after independence took place, said that if we want to see India, four hundred years back, we should go to Kutch. That is why I say that though India was split up into parts on the linguistic basis, Kutch was not taken into account. Bengali speaking Bengal was formed on this basis. Bihari-speaking Bihar was formed on this basis. Tamilnadu was also formed on this basis; Andhra was formed on this basis. Gujarat was not

formed on this basis; Kutch and Saurashtra were kept separate and Kutch was kept under centre. That was because they were very backward. Now people have started thinking fortunately that progress has started therein. They are happy now. It is not that our people are very poor; let me tell you that. We are poor because we have one-fourth of the land in the whole of Gujarat. That is in Kutch we have a population of only eight lakhs—a very scattered population with a big area. The per capita expense by Government is not much. That is because they were not allowed to come up. In a village of 4,000 population you will find that they have kept Rs. 2 crores as fixed deposits. This is a very important area which brings a huge amount of foreign exchange every year. Sir, in that area there is plenty of minerals available. The only mistake is that we are exploiting political minorities. There are only six people in the Assembly and one Parliament Member over here. In a big democracy it is the head which sometimes count.

Now I come to the clamour of the people to come up. They have got a constitutional right. For the development of that area, under Article 371(2) of our Constitution, the Development Board which was envisaged has got to be given to it. I am very happy to tell you, Sir, that our beloved Prime Minister, understood our problem and in 1976 she herself acquainted the President about this problem. As a result, the President had passed an order. It was made known to both Houses of Parliament. The Governor of the State when he was inaugurating the Assembly in 1977 said this in his speech. But, as soon as the Janata Party came, not for any other sake at least for the sake of constitutional right of the people which has been given to them, they should have implemented that order. But they did not do so. I will ask you whether one President's order before it is executed could be cancelled by the



[Dr. Mahipatray M. Mehta]

Executive? Sir, it was cancelled by the Finance Ministry. Suppose the President has ordered it. I will ask before one President's order is being executed, how can this be cancelled by the Executive? It requires not only the legal side of it to be studied as also the moral part of it. It is a constitutional right given to the people. I request this Government through you that one separate Development Board should immediately be granted. As I said earlier, there is plenty of minerals available there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.  
(Interruptions).

DR. MAHIPATRAY M. MEHTA:  
My link is now broken.

As I said in the beginning, I congratulate our hon Finance Minister. He is remaining totally faithful to the Mixed Economy. That is the policy

which we are following. It is not his fault. It is the policy that the Government is following. And that is why I congratulate him for presenting his excellent Budget. With these words I conclude my speech. Thank you.

## BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### SIXTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Sir, I beg to present the sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

18.13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till  
Eleven of the Clock on Friday,  
June 27, 1980/Asadha 6, 1902  
(Saka)