

have been levelled with the object of buttressing the claims of superiority of the political and economic creed of their admiration. And the remedies suggested reveal a manifestation of their faith in efficacy of policies which conform to, and support, their own political and economic ideals.

13 hrs.

I beg to point out to my hon. friends in the Communist Party and their friends that we are a nation where the rates of taxation are not only the highest at the highest point but they continue to be the highest at each point of each slab. I have compared these rates with those in various countries—countries which desire an egalitarian or socialist pattern of society, whose objective is to establish a society based on the socialist or egalitarian pattern. I have compared the rates with those countries which are developing countries. I have also compared them with those countries which could be considered as advanced, economically.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue after Lunch. Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again at 2 p.m.

13.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

(The Lok Sabha reassembled after lunch at Fourteen of the Clock)

[**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** in the Chair]

STATEMENT RE. GIFT PRESENTED TO P.M.

डा० राजू जगदीश लोहिया (कन्नौज) :
माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अध्यक्ष के

आवेश नियम 115 के अन्तर्गत मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री के प्रसन्न को सुधारना चाहता हूँ।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने लोक सभा में 18 मार्च 1967 को कहा, “यह सही है कि सऊदी अरेबिया के राजा ने मुझे एक हीरो का हार भेंट किया, लेकिन ऐसे उपहारों के बारे में सरकार के नियम बहुत ही सख्त और सख्त हैं। हम लोगों को ऐसी भेंट रखने की इजाजत नहीं। वे तत्काल खजाने (तोशे-खजाने) भेज दिये जाते हैं। क्योंकि यह बहु-मूल्य चीज थी यह रिजर्व बैंक को दे दी गई।” आधी एक मिनट के अन्दर उन्होंने फिर कहा, “मुझे तारीख का पता नहीं। वह मेरे कब्जे में नहीं था और इस लिये मैं नहीं जानती कि किसने और कब बैंक को दिया।”

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दो परस्पर विरोधी बातें कहीं, जिनमें से एक जरूर झूठ है इन दो बातों के कहने के बीच मेरा सवाल जरूर हुआ था, “कितने दिन बाद में?” शायद इसी सवाल ने उन्हें इतना घबड़ा दिया कि वह सब पूरा छिपा नहीं पाई। एक तरफ वह कहती हैं कि बहुमूल्य भेंट तत्काल तोशेखाने भेज दी जाती है और यह भेंट अधिक बहुमूल्य होने के कारण रिजर्व बैंक भेज दी गई। दूसरी तरफ वह कहती हैं कि हार उन के कब्जे में नहीं था और वह नहीं जानती कि कब और किसने और किस तारीख को बैंक को दिया। दोनों बार वह सत्य नहीं बोल रही हैं और कहीं कोई चीज उन्हें छिपाने की जरूरत पड़ रही है।

जिस तरह उन्होंने लोक सभा में “तत्काल” शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया, उसी तरह 3 दिसम्बर 1966 को दूसरे सदन में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था, “किंग आफ सऊदी अरेबिया से एक हीरो का हार मुझे दिया था और वह उसी समय रिजर्व बैंक

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

को दे दिया गया।" "तत्काल", "उसी समय" ऐसे शब्द हैं, जिन में एक क्षण की देरी की गुंजाइश नहीं रहती।

दूसरे सदन में उसी 3 दिसम्बर को बेगम श्रीमती किरवई ने कहा था "सोने का हार हो या हीरों का हार होया जवाहरात हों, वह पंडित जी के घर पर जा कर पहले एक हफ्ते तक हर धातमी देख सकता था—एक हफ्ते के बाद जो इन को प्रेजेंट वगैरह होता था, वह खजाने में दाखिल हो जाता था।"

कहीं कोई चीज बहुत गड़बड़ है। उल्टा मुझे बदनाम किया जाता है। जिन लोगों का पैसे श्री सम्पत्ति के मामले में रत्ती भर चरित्र नहीं बचा है, वे मुझे सदन में और बाहर बार-बार चरित्रहन्ता कहते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी उम दिन कहा कि मैं भ्रष्टाधुंध और आधारहीन आरोप लगा रहा हूँ। इस हीरे के हार के सम्बन्ध में मैंने कोई आरोप नहीं लगाया। जो आरोप है, वे प्रधान मंत्री जी और उनके दोस्तों के लगाये हुये हैं। उन से मैंने कुछ तर्क और नतीजे अवश्य निकाले। तथ्य प्रधानमंत्री जी के अपने दिये हुए हैं, तर्क और नतीजे मैंने निकाले हैं।

यह सवाल तो मैं अभी तक उठा ही नहीं पाया हूँ कि एक औरत को किसी भी सम्पत्ता और मर्यादा के अनुसार परदेसियों से बहुमूल्य भेंटें लेनी चाहिए या नहीं। दूसरा सवाल यह भी है कि राजा-रानियों के भलाबा —और उनके लिये भी नियम सख्त हैं—किसी सम्पत्ति देश के प्रधान मंत्री अथवा उनके रिश्तेदार केवल यादगारी भेंटें लिया करते हैं, बहुमूल्य भेंटें कभी नहीं।

पिछले बीस बरों में सालब, भोग और संचय का युग रहा है बड़े लोगों के लिए,

और रोग तथा लाइला सरीसों के लिये। इस युग की समाप्ति किये बिना बेती-कारखाने का सुधार असम्भव है।

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have carefully looked into my statements to which Dr. Lohia has drawn attention. My statement in the Rajya Sabha was made in response to an allegation which Shri Raj Narain made in that House, without prior notice. I pointed out that it was many years since I had received this particular gift, that I did not remember the exact date and that the gift was sent at that time to the Reserve Bank.

When Dr. Lohia asked me in this House on March 18 about the date on which the present had been sent to the Reserve Bank, I said; 'I do not know the date. It was not in my custody, and, therefore, I do not know who handed it over and at what time.'

It will be seen that on both occasions I said that I was not sure about the date as the event related to a period more than ten years ago. The present was made to me by the King of Saudi Arabia during his visit in November/December, 1955. As soon as the present was made, my father and I decided that it should not be retained, and, thereafter I had nothing more to do with it.

You will observe that my statements in the House were neither contradictory nor misleading.

However, I should like to take this opportunity to say that from records which I have since consulted, it appears that there were some consultations between the then Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari and Prime Minister Nehru about the most appropriate disposal of the presents received by my father and me from

the King of Saudi Arabia, and a certain view was taken about the disposal of the articles. Meanwhile, Shri Morarji Desai took over as Finance Minister. Records show that the Prime Minister wrote to him on the subject on 2nd April, 1958, referring to his discussions with Shri T. T. Krishnamachari about the disposal of the articles and the articles were sent to the Finance Ministry the following day by the Prime Minister's Secretariat. After further consultations with the Finance Ministry, the articles were finally disposed of through the Reserve Bank and the State Bank of India. I have already indicated to the Speaker and have also mentioned in my speech in the House in the debate on the President's Address why it will not be desirable to go into the manner of the disposal, price etc. If such details of presents received from foreign dignitaries are publicised, there may be unfortunate comparisons which may cause embarrassment to the foreign dignitaries, their governments and to our country.

There is one point which Dr. Lohia has raised. It is about Begum Anis Kidwai's statement. I do not think I am called upon to give an answer to a statement made by another Member. The statement was not made by me and I do not wish to say anything about it.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब आप नियम 15 देखिये... (व्यवस्था) मैं मवाल नहीं पूछ रहा हूँ। व्यवस्था के ऊपर नियम 15 की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान खींच रहा हूँ। अब आप मेहरबानी करके नियम सुनिये... (व्यवस्था)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No questions.

श्री मधु लिम्बे (मुंगेर) : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न तो सुनिये। मेरी प्रार्थना है आप हुनिए फिर निर्णय दीजिये।

183 (A) LS-3

Shri M. B. Krishna (Peddapalli): Why is he so particular about the date?

श्री मधु लिम्बे : तीन साल की अवधि बीच में बीत गई।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब नियम है :

"The Speaker shall determine the time when a sitting of the House shall be adjourned sine die or to a particular day, or to an hour or part of the same day."

कि अध्यक्ष महोदय, लोक सभा की बैठक को स्थगित कर सकते हैं। मेरा प्रस्ताव है कि ऐसी घटना होने के बाद जब कि सरकार ने स्वयं अपने कयन में साबित किया है कि वह इस गद्दी पर बैठने लायक नहीं है तो आप इस बैठक का स्थगन कर दीजिए... (व्यवस्था) ... मुझे यह बोलने नहीं देंगे, इस से मुझे मतलब नहीं, मैं केवल स्थान का प्रस्ताव आप के सामने ला रहा हूँ कि अब इस बैठक का स्थगन करिए।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has read the rule:

"The Speaker shall determine the time when a sitting of the House shall be adjourned sine die or to a particular day, or to an hour or part of the same day:

"Provided that the Speaker may, if he thinks fit, call a sitting of the House before the date . . ."

Here the past practice is taken into consideration.

The Speaker can exercise this right. But he has never exercised it before, to far as I know, and I am not going to exercise it.

की मनु लिखते हैं, वो भाषा राज
हस्ताक्षर करिए, यही इन की विनती है।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): On a point of order....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Salve to continue his speech.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: My point of order arises out of the statement and the practice followed. This procedure will once for all have to be straightened out. This has been used by Member after Member not for offering any personal explanation but for personal accusation. The rule under which this statement is purported to have been made is rule 357....

की मनु लिखते हैं, यह व्यवेसा
हस्ताक्षर नहीं, धाराकार्यका देखिए...

की डा. ना. सिवारी (गोवालगढ़): धारा
कीन बोलने वाले हैं? वह डिप्टी स्पीकर
साहब बतायेंगे।

की मनु लिखते हैं, यह व्यवेसा
हस्ताक्षर नहीं, धाराकार्यका देखिए...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This was not permitted under the rule he is quoting. He is mistaken: Let him please sit down.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Under which rule is it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Direction 115.

Shri R. D. Bhandare (Bombay Central): Rule 15 speaks of the inherent power of the Speaker to do what is contemplated there. Therefore, the hon. Member has no right to suggest anything of that kind.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have disallowed his point of order.

14.16 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1967—contd.

Shri N. K. P. Salve: I was pointing out in reply to the point made by hon. Members of the Communist Party who had said that the levies by way of direct taxation were not sufficiently burdensome whereas the indirect taxes were very heavy on the

poor and that a part of the indirect taxes should be loaded on to the direct taxes. I was also pointing out that the rates of taxation in our country are not merely the highest but are the highest at each point of every slab of income.

This is hardly the time nor the occasion for me to point out in detail the disparities which exist in the rate of our country and other countries, countries which seek to establish a socialistic pattern of society. It may satisfy the hon. Members of the Communist Party to know that the penalty clauses are not merely stringent, but I submit that the laws of penalty are punitive, punitive to the point of being vexatious. It may satisfy them to know that for an alleged concealment of as much as Rs. 10, as is contained in a decision of the Bombay High Court under certain conditions, our laws are capable of levying a minimum statutory penalty of lakhs and lakhs of rupees.

I also submit that the suggestion made by the hon. Members of the Swatantra Party and their friends that the Finance Minister must not seek to augment the revenues by way of direct taxes is an utterly pernicious suggestion. I hope my party shall not have any use for a Finance Minister who does not relentlessly look forward to augmenting the revenues of the Government. The whole point is how to work out a modern and dynamic fiscal policy which will streamline our tax laws and levies. I would point out that the theory of a high rate of taxation for the purposes of augmenting the revenue has been long expired into the limbo of exploded myths by the countries which have achieved marvellous economic prosperity. I wish to point out that it is necessary for us to have a very pragmatic and dynamic fiscal policy which will give the necessary stimulus to the taxpayers.

The United States of America, Germany, Japan, Belgium, Holland, Nigeria, Ireland, not to speak of Sweden, the great exemplar of so-