

**An hon. Member:** What about the debate?

12.35 hrs.

**Mr. Chairman:** It will be continued after this

**THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL\***

(Amendment of article 120)

**Shri R. Barua (Jorhat).** On a point of order This item is not on the Order Paper.

**Shri Seshiyan (Kumbakonam):** Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India

**Mr. Chairman:** It is there

14 32 hrs

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

**CATTLE SLAUGHTER PROHIBITION BILL\***

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India"

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड)  
सभापति महोदय, मैं डोर वध के निषेध के लिए उपबन्ध करने वाले विधेयक को प्रस्तुत करने की प्रार्थना करता हूँ।

*The motion was adopted*

**Shri Seshiyan:** Sir, I introduce the Bill

**Mr. Chairman** The question is

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for prohibition of slaughter of cattle"

*The motion was adopted*

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री: मैं विधेयक को प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

12 35½ hrs.

**GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd**

**Mr. Chairman:** Now Shri Kundu may resume his speech

14 32½ hrs.

**CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL\***

(Amendment of articles 15 and 16)

**Shri Seshiyan (Kumbakonam)** Sir I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India"

*The motion was adopted*

**Shri Seshiyan:** Sir, I introduce the Bill.

**Shri S Kundu.** Sir, I was on the point that after 20 years of Congress rule if we do not draw a line between the past and do not chalk out a programme for the future, I am sure—and I will be extremely sorry—that this democracy will be a shortlived one. Therefore, the compelling circumstances of today should drive the people who prepare the Budget to prepare it so as to reflect a positive attitude of the teeming millions of this country. I must, therefore, confess that when I glance through this Budget I do not find that this Budget expresses or reflects a positive attitude a definite purpose, which the people of this country want or which the Government wishes to achieve during their tenure of the coming five years

It would be a mistake, a gross mistake if I may say so, to draw up a Budget in a mechanical way, leaving it to the officers to prepare it in a line as has been the trend for the last few years. The Budget must express the hopes and the aspirations of the people of the country. Large number of the people of this country have no food to eat, no house to stay in, no clothes to wear; most of them are denied education and the basic necessities of life; when they are sick, no medicine or treatment is available.

Look at this Budget. If this Budget is examined in detail, it will show that it has added to the burden of the poor man. While I say this, I have look at the different taxes which the Government has imposed or propose to impose in the coming years and find that indirect taxes are—I should say, about 70 per cent more than the direct taxes imposed in this Budget.

This Budget cannot stop inflation. A promise has been made in this House that while drawing up the Budget for the coming five years, all care would be taken to check inflation. But, Sir, to check inflation, is a question of attitude and policy; it cannot be done with mere pious wishes.

It has been said that the utmost economy is to be practised, but it is a contradiction in terms when we see that in this interim Budget a sum of Rs. 10 crores extra is going to be spent for the huge administration. The bureaucracy, which has grown bigger and bigger in size from day to day, and this huge bureaucracy which blocks the aspirations of and all avenues of advantage to the common man, the poor man, is being fed with more and more money. This trend is not checked. Unless this bureaucracy is crushed and utmost economy in actual terms is practised, there is no hope for the future of democracy in this country. No positive step has been indicated how less expenditure will be incurred on this administration. I know the amenities which are provided to big

officers. I know their callous attitude towards the poor man. I know the training which they get. A friend of mine told me that in the I.A.S. and the I.F.S. training schools, when they are sent there, they learn how to open a soda bottle without a bottle opener. And are there the officers who are meant to serve the poor people as Block Development Officers? According to the political situation, the economic situation, of our country, unless we completely reorient the training aspect of our bureaucracy, unless we know what sort of officers will rid the people from the age-long slumber, age-long poverty and age-long illiteracy and all that, then, I am sure, the most part of the tax-payers' money which comes to the Exchequer of the Central Government in crores of rupees, will not reach back the common and the poor man. Therefore, I would have been glad if some positive steps had been taken to control the economy and some sign of that must have been shown in the Budget

I will go to the extent to say that if we can reduce about one-fourth of this huge bureaucratic machinery, if we can make some sort of a revolutionary attempt to have only three or four cadres, we will be able to reduce the burden on the poor, the common man. We should not only preach but we must also practise economy. To start with the galaxy of Ministers who are here, 52 in number and down to the officers is quite a big burden on the poor man. If they live an austere life, we can save a lot of money. But, on the contrary, there has been a disappointing feature in this Budget which increases expenditure in administration and the Budget is merely a routine work.

In the last 20 years, in the name of development, in the name of reconstruction, when the Government wanted money, we have run to the Nasik Press to print notes. During the Third Plan period, we have printed notes worth about Rs. 1150 crores. There has been a promise given that

[Shri S. Kundu]

no more inflationary budget will be presented in May, 1967. At the same time, in para 27 of his written speech this is what has been said by the Hon'ble Finance Minister:

“Government expects to review the position shortly and bring forward such proposals for incurring additional expenditure and raising resources for the purpose as may be necessary and feasible in the present circumstances.”

I look at this observation with great disappointment. If we do not fix the limit, the expenditure will go up. The demands of the bureaucracy and of the Ministers will increase and the Government will increase the budget and our objective will be lost. Therefore, Sir, unless we put a stop to this additional expenditure, to this vague expenditure, and if the Finance Minister does not find other ways of finding money, they will run to the Nasik Press to print notes.

I would like to give some caution, a little warning, here. We have seen the horrible picture of inflationary trends in Indonesia, in China before the Communists came, and in Germany after the Second World War. If we are to save democracy and if we are to establish socialism here, I must say that the first attempt we should make is to stop these inflationary trends and this sort of Budgeting. This cannot be done only with pious promises. Definite attempts should be made. As I said in the beginning, and I repeat, in this Budget or the one which is going to be presented, there is no such indication that Government are taking a positive step. A deficit budget of Rs. 350 crores has been presented. Nowhere it has been indicated how the Government is going to bridge this gap. It has been left in vacuum. Well, there are various ways to bridge the gap, the deficit. There is hoarded wealth worth crores of rupees. There is black money in the country. There

are hoarders and profiteers. There are ornaments, jewels and jewellery in the country. No indication has been given that this deficit or the future finances of the country will be raised from such sources. It has been said that black money worth Rs. 3000 crores is circulating in this country. I would be very happy if the Hon'ble Finance Minister makes a promise in this House that he will, to start with, catch about Rs. 500 crores of black money. But there is no such hope. I would have been very glad if the Finance Minister had said that the hoarded wealth which lies with kings and queens, with *rajās* and *ranis*, with capitalists like Tatas, Birlas and Dalmias, would be unearthed and accounted for in the budget. I would have been happy to see that at least after 20 years there is a break-through and that we are in for brighter days.

As I said in the beginning, unless we take a positive and progressive attitude, at least after these 20 years, we will not be able to maintain democracy. If we do not shape our economy on equality basis, I am sure, we are not going to maintain democracy. Democracy is vitally connected with economic conditions of our country. It is unthinkable today, after 20 years of *swaraj*, to find that 10 per cent of the rural population in the country have only 0.7 per cent of the total income of the country and 10 per cent of the top people enjoy an income of 55 per cent of the total income in the country. We have to do something about it. This time, in the General Elections, the people have shown their strength. Through democratic and peaceful movement, they can put pressure on the Government to force it to draw a realistic budget, to have a realistic programme, based on equality and will not rest content merely on platitudes.

The picture today is very disappointing. It is a picture of frustration and gloom. I am glad that the Finance Minister has admitted that

there is a stagnant economy. But he has not given the reasons why after 20 years of the Congress *raj* this picture of stagnant economy has been given on a plate to us. Who is responsible for this stagnant economy? Who is responsible in this country for allowing 75 big business houses to which the Monopolies Commission has referred to have the monopoly? Who is responsible for allowing *raj*as and *maharaj*as to have large amounts of wealth? This picture is of your creation. Unless you change your vision and unless the people here in Delhi, in such cosy and nice surroundings, who make laws and discuss and debate for hours and hours, take into consideration what is happening in small villages in the rural areas of our country, the future of democracy will be at peril. Therefore, something vigorous, something dynamic, some progressive stand should have been taken in this budget, but I do not find it here. Therefore, I am indeed disappointed. The poor man, for the last twenty years, has been giving his money to the Central exchequer, but in return, what has he got? He has not got anything substantial. Day by day his indebtedness has grown. If you calculate, at the end of the budget for 1967-68,—the figures are given—you will find that every baby born today will be left with a loan of Rs. 243 per year. During the last twenty years, this Government has done only this good to the country; it has put on the head of every newborn baby a loan of Rs. 243 per year. This is really a shocking and staggering picture. This has to be changed completely.

We have increased our expenditure on Defence. I know that Chinese and Pakistanis are there at the border, but sometimes I fail to understand why, after the last year's budget and during the few months of presentation of the interim budget, there should have been an increase of about Rs. 128 crores in Defence expenditure. We do not get a picture that utmost economy was practised in Defence, cor-

ruptions were checked and useless expenditure was stopped in Defence. I know and my Party realises—that we have to defend our country, we have to safeguard our interest, because foreign enemies are there on our border. But at the same time we must also know that every pie that is paid—every tax-payer pays one-third of his money for Defence—is spent properly. We go on raising the provision for Defence, but we do not get a picture that utmost economy was practised, and corruptions at various levels which have been alleged from time to time have been checked.

Members have spoken about banks. I would not like to repeat it, but one good thing could have been done; while presenting the budget, at least a hope could have been indicated that in future this Government is going to nationalise all the banks in India which are in private hands and which are controlling the major part of the economy of the country and this would have provided some solace to us. About Rs. 1,600 crores are in their hands; they start spurious trusts; they start companies and they favour certain groups of business houses by giving them a lot of money as loan; they are controlling, to a large extent, the political power in this country. There has been a demand all along in the country that these banks should be nationalised and the money in them should be put into our Central budget, the shortfall must be met from it, but I am sorry to say that we do not find in this budget also a picture of assurance or some sort of a hope that this will be done in due course.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Bibhuti Mishra.

**Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk):** I am sorry, Sir, I was absent when my name was called. Today is a day for Private Members' business, but since only introduction of bills was there,



[Shri S. C. Samanta]

the Government business has been taken up. So far as I remember, on days meant for Private Members' business the Bills that were not introduced before were allowed to be introduced later in between the business. So, you have the power and I request that I may be allowed to introduce the Bill now.

**Mr. Chairman:** I am sorry, the rules do not permit this. The hon. Member has to wait for the next day when Private Members' Bills will be taken up.

Mr Bibhuti Mishra. He is not here

Mr. Chintamani Panigrahi,

**Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Bhubaneswar):** The Finance Minister, in his speech, has placed before the country the difficult situations that the country is facing today in the economic sphere. They are the deterioration in exports, the rising debt service payments, slow rate of industrial output, less agricultural production, less railway earnings and price rise. But in a developing economy, there will be temporary setbacks to economic developments. The setbacks which have been narrated in the budget speech are no doubt quite disquieting, but every cloud has a silver lining. There is nothing to be despaired. It was pointed out that India has gone bankrupt, but I beg to differ from that. During the last twenty years, the path that we have taken is towards the socialist transformation of this country and in the long twenty years, if we look to the economic growth, we will find that in this process of socialist transformation of the country within the framework of democracy, we have created a strong industrial base, a strong industrial base in an economy which was primarily agricultural; huge industrial plants to our assets have been built up in this country; the great rivers have been

tamed and they are the assets of this country; nearly 60 new universities have been opened and nearly 80 million boys and girls have been sent to schools; more than 50,000 villages have been brought under electrification; more than 12 million acres of land have been provided to the landless. The Finance Minister has been bold enough to place before us whatever temporary setbacks we are facing today, though it is to the disadvantage of the Government. He has put before us whatever difficulties the country is facing today because the setbacks are challenging and he has put before the people, this country and the House so that we squarely face the challenge.

If we look to the production of steel in this country, in 1951-52 it was 25 million tones and in 1964-65, it was 108 million tonnes. In the case of cement, it has gone up from 273 million tonnes to 10.8 million tonnes, and in the case of petroleum it has gone up from 0.2 million tonnes to 9.4 million tonnes. Oil production is making good progress in this country. When we are facing difficulties so far as foreign exchange is concerned, all efforts must be made so that we can reach our target of 20 million tonnes by 1970-71 and make the country self-sufficient in respect of petroleum products.

15 hrs.

So far as foodgrains are concerned, we have been importing about 6 million tonnes of foodgrains every year. We are importing nearly Rs. 60 crores worth of cotton for superfine and fine fabrics. Machinery and components worth about Rs. 300 crores are being imported still. Nitrogenous fertilisers are being imported to the extent of about Rs. 30 crores. We are even importing sulphur whereas we can substitute it

with pyrites. The import of sulphur is of the order of about Rs. 18 crores. In view of the difficulties that we are facing we should go in for import-substitution more and more so that we could save all this expenditure by way of foreign exchange.

When I was listening to the speech of the spokesman of the Swatantra Party I was reminded of a story. He was saying that there should be a moratorium on political strife between the political parties in the Opposition. The second point that he made was that they should enter into a democratic dialogue with the Congress so that they could convert Congress to their points of view. I hope that both these hopes would be belied. When I was listening to his speech, a story came to my mind. Two birds were sitting on a tree and the gunman was aiming at the birds. One bird said to the other, 'See, the gunman is weeping'. The other bird, however, replied, 'Do not look at his eyes, but look at his hands'. So, we could see the way the Swatantra and Jan Sangh parties are driving. This has become more explicit in the words of great Messiah of the Swatantra Party, namely Shri Rajagopalachari. He has said that with the selfless workers of the Jan Sangh and with the economic understanding of the Swatantra Party they will form a united front and they will mount pressure on Government so that government gives up its policies one by one. But I am sure Government have heard voices from this side that we want a bigger plan, because the plan is an instrument of social reconstruction. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the great leaders like Shri Morarji Desai or Shri Y. B. Chavan Shrimati Indira Gandhi and our late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri all have thought of this plan in the same way. Planning was not something mechanical for them but it was meant to drag this country out of the morass of two hundred years of British rule, so that we could

change the countryside, so that we could give food to the people, give schools to the students, provide doctors in this country side and undertake all types of welfare measures in the villages which have been lying neglected during all these years. Therefore, planning is an act of faith. I feel that under no pressure should this faith in planning and this faith in socialist transformation of this country be undermined.

Some hon. Members have repeated in their arguments that the people have voted against the policies of the Congress during the last elections. I have also made an analysis of the election results. May I in all humility bring to your kind notice the fact that 90 per cent of the voters of India have voted for planned development in the country, for peace, for socialism, and for social transformation of the country and not for free enterprise? I hope this is also an analysis of the election results of this country. Therefore, when a case is made out by the Swatantra and Jan Sangh spokesmen that the people have voted against the policies of the Congress and against the policy of socialist reconstruction and transformation, they are wrong. The people have voted against the Congress because of the anti-Congress feeling, because the Congress could not keep up to the promises and the Congress was not able to implement all the declarations of the policy that they had made. It is because of these reasons that the people have in many places voted against the Congress, but they have not voted against the progressive policies of the Congress. Therefore, if my hon. friends opposite want the Members on this side of the House to learn the lessons of history or the lessons of the elections, I hope they will also try to learn the lessons which I have pointed out. The people are watching them also. You will be surprised to know, and the House as a whole will be surprised to know that the first shot by the Swatantra Ministry

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

in Orissa has been fired at the peaceful workers of the Rajgangpur cement factory. Therefore, the people will judge them not by their professions but by their actions, and their first shot has been fired at the cement factory workers at Rajgangpur. The people will surely judge them.

Now, the time has come when the blind anti-Congress hysteria may be analysed a little more by the Opposition Parties. I am quite happy that *The New Age* has made an analysis in its issue of February 26 and you know to whom this magazine or journal belongs. *The New Age* says:

“There is a yawning gap between the anti-Congress popular upsurge of the organised Left and democratic movement. This chasm, in fact, has enabled the forces of Right and communal reaction like the Jan Sangh and Swatantra to ride on the crest of people's just anger against the Congress. The pressure of Right reaction will now immensely mount”.

I hope the Opposition Parties will now think between themselves whether they would break their pre-election honeymooning now and come to grips with the realities of the post-election period.

I would bring to the notice of the Finance Minister the slow rate of economic growth in our country. I was studying the figures in this regard during the period 1960-63 in respect of several countries, namely Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Mainland China and so on. In the case of Burma, the rate of economic growth was 4.00, in Ceylon it was 3.9, in India it was 3.1, and in Pakistan it was 5.2. Similarly we find that in the case of Mainland China, the rate of economic growth was 15.4. Therefore, we must take steps to see that the rate of economic growth is speeded up in our country.

Attempts are now being made to curtail the Plan. The resources position has also got to be looked into. There is no doubt about it. But the Finance Minister has made it very clear that the aspirations of the people for accelerated development should also be kept in view. I would submit that there should not be any 'ifs' and 'buts'. If there is any suggestion that the size of the Plan should be reduced to Rs. 10,000 crores or Rs. 12,000 crores, then I would submit that we shall not be able to fulfil the rising expectations of the young men and women of this country by doing so. The Plan will fail and we will not be able to fulfil the demands of the new generation.

Therefore, as planning is an instrument for social change, whenever pressure is brought to revise the plan, we must consider whether we are going against the aspirations of the people of India. There are many programmes before us. If we do not fulfil them now, if we do not fight on the principles, we will go down and we cannot recover ourselves.

Therefore, I submit that all efforts should be made to mobilise the resources, all efforts should be made to stop wasteful expenditure, all efforts should be made at economy. When every State is laying its claim on food from the Centre in more and more quantities, the question arises from where will the Centre give it. Therefore, there should be conferences between the Chief Ministers—one is going to be held soon—to thrash out the relations between the Centre and the States. The problems that the Finance Minister has posed must be squarely met. There is nothing to despair. We can go ahead with new hopes so that we can build the India of our dreams, fulfil the aspirations of our people and forge along the path that has been charted for us by one of the greatest modern socialist thinkers, Pandit

Jawaharlal Nehru, I mean the path of socialist transformation. There is no going back. As Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had said, there is no going back from the socialist path of reconstruction to which the country and its people are pledged.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham** (Visakhapatnam): Mr Chairman, my hon. friend opposite who preceded me was talking about the socialistic pattern and the way which the Government have been following. I shall tell you one thing about the socialistic pattern followed by this Government. There was a gentleman who at the time of income-tax investigation made an admission under the voluntary disclosure scheme that he had evaded Rs 35 or Rs 50 lakhs tax. It was compounded to Rs. 5 lakhs. A few years later, I found his name in the list of Padma Vibhushans in this country!

It is easy to talk of socialism and praise it, but it is very difficult to practise it. When Gandhiji blew the horn inviting everybody to join the movement for independence, we had certain dreams of our own. The first time I came into contact with him was in 1916. Actually it was in 1918 when the passive resistance movement was started that I as a student then began to follow him. All of us who talk about Gandhiji must realise what dreams he had, whether we knew it or not, he knew his mind. All through he had one ideal. But at the end of 1947, he said: 'I am sure of one thing, that the Congress of today cannot build the India of my dreams'. It is recorded in his biography.

Now why did we join in the swaraj movement? The fight for freedom was not merely to change the white ruler and instal a brown one, as he used to say. We had hopes that after freedom, food will be available to all, shelter would be provided to all and that the inequalities which we saw in

those days would be removed. But the inequalities of those days were practically nothing compared to the inequalities that have developed at present as a result of the economic administration by this Government during the last three plan periods.

Gandhiji was always saying that there must be a society where one section does not impose its own weight upon the other sections. He said, 'If you drop a small piece of stone on a placid pool, there will be several circles formed; one circle does not press its weight on the other'. Indian society must develop in that fashion, not in the present pattern where every section presses its weight upon the section below. As our friends have pointed out, there are the topmost people, about 75 houses who enjoy, but people below, your voters and my voters, live in slums, in tattered houses, on the sides of gutters. The weight of every section of society is upon them. Perhaps you know that 60 per cent of the people live practically in slums. I know in my part of the country that is so. I believe it is so in almost every part of the country excepting in some portions of these newly-built cities.

Gandhiji always thought, and we also thought, that after swaraj, we would all lead a simple life. Only the reverse of it is observable wherever we go, whether it is Delhi, Hyderabad or any other capital city or metropolis of any other State in the country. In fact, who have been carefully and studiously moving farther and farther away from Gandhiji. There would have been nothing very much wrong if we moved farther and farther away from Gandhiji provided we had stuck upon some other plan whereby we could become prosperous and spread prosperity among all those who live in this country. We did not do that either.

In my election campaign—I do not know about other parts of the coun-

[Shri Tanneti Viswanatham]

try—I found the name of the Congress candidate on the one side and at one corner there was a huge portrait of Gandhiji printed. Canvassing was done on that basis. I thought whatever might have happened in these three plan periods, these gentlemen who canvassed votes with the help of Gandhiji's portrait, might turn a new leaf. May I expect it? I hope that this new Government will have some thought about it. I thought some indication of it would be given in the Finance Minister's speech. But it followed the same tenor as that of his predecessors, and I see no indication whatsoever that we are going that way.

We may say that this is perfectly logical and so on. But what has been the result? During question hour today, a Member from this side asked, 'Are you watching whether your plans are being implemented?'. The Planning Minister categorically said, 'My duty is only to plan. I have nothing to do with implementation'. This Government is divided. Planning has no concern with implementation. Planning is made in the cool chambers of the newly-built building of the Planning Commission. It has nothing to do with implementation. What is the use of talking in high flown language when implementation is divorced totally from planning? If the results of implementation are not to guide your planning, what is all that for?

This morning, again, there was a difference of opinion. I am not here now to expatiate on the differences of opinion between Minister and Minister, but there was certainly a marked difference of opinion between the outlook of the Finance Minister and the outlook of the Planning Minister, the two Ministers who really matter to this country at present, barring the Defence Minister. I think this country has got to deal with only the Finance Minister and the Planning

Minister, and they differed from each other. I do hope that by the time this session ends the differences will be composed.

Shri Morarji Desai: In what respect, I do not know.

Shri A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): There is no difference.

Shri Tanneti Viswanatham: I am very sorry I have been misunderstood. If our friends had been here this morning, they would have understood. From the language spoken by the Planning Minister and the Finance Minister when answering questions about devaluation, everybody understood it, and even the question was raised whether there was any difference of opinion, whether there was a clash of opinion. It was there. What is the use of my friends denying it? As the Government is the ruling party, as we want some stability in this country, we want the Ministers to have one mind as long as they are on one side. If they want to change to this side, it is another matter, but when they are there, they must have one opinion. We want to know to whom to speak. Shall I speak to the Finance Minister, or shall I speak to the Planning Minister? Let not my friends be upset so soon. I am not thinking of any internecine warfare between Minister and Minister at a personal level. I did not mean that.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I know where he finds internecine warfare? I do not find any.

Shri Tanneti Viswanatham: I also did not say so, I only said there was difference of opinion between the Planning Minister and the Finance Minister.

Shri Morarji Desai: There is no difference of opinion. Where is the difference of opinion, I want to know.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** Now at present there does not seem to be, but during the Question Hour there was certainly difference of opinion.

**Shri Umanatha (Pudukkottai):** Difference on post-devaluation consequences.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** There was some difference of opinion, it was quite clear to us. If now both have agreed or the same thing, it is so good of you. I will certainly accept whatever the Finance Minister says.

**Shri S. Kandappan (Mettur):** They do not realise their own differences. That is unfortunate for the country.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I was only talking of this matter, that there can be difference of opinion between two men of intelligence, there will be, but the question is whether there is any difference in action or in the decision taken, that is all that should be seen.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** There will be time for us to go in more detail into all those things, but at present ..

**Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool):** This morning the Planning Minister stated that he had nothing to do with implementation, he is concerned only with planning. That is the point of Mr. Viswanatham

**Mr. Chairman:** The Minister has clarified the point

**Shri Morarji Desai:** The Planning Minister referred to the Planning Commission's job. He did not say he was not concerned with it.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** Then we stand corrected, only I suppose the answer also in the record would be corrected.

I come from a State which is backward, I come from Andhra Pradesh.

**Shri K. N. Tiwari:** How is it backward?

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** Industrially and economically it is a backward State.

**Shri Randhir Singh:** If you want to see a backward State, kindly see Haryana.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** I will see every State if you have got patience, you see my State in the first instance.

The per capita income in Andhra Pradesh is lower than the all-India average. Is it not a sufficient indicator that we are backward?

Out of the 24 or 25 hundred crores of rupees spent during the last three plan periods, only about Rs. 48 crores was invested in the Central sector projects in that part of the country. Is that not a sufficient indicator?

If you take the availability of electricity, you will find that the neighbouring State of Madras, which is much smaller than Andhra Pradesh has four times larger supply than Andhra Pradesh. Is this not a sufficient indicator that we are backward?

Then you say that we produce a lot of grains. On what basis are we not producing the surplus? During the freedom fight when we were in jails, we were getting 20 oz. of rice per head. Now we are given 6 oz. in Visakhapatnam and Hyderabad, and I believe in Kerala it will be 8 oz. or even less. This is the progress which we have made. Therefore, the point that we are backward is absolutely clear from these facts.



[Shri Tenneti Vishwanatham]

The Third Plan said that it would be one of the aims of the plan to remove regional imbalances, but what has the Government done? What are the proposals of this Government to remove regional imbalances?

A steel plant was promised for us in 1963. It was said that on the advice of foreign experts, and in accordance with modern trends, the Government had decided to locate the fifth steel plant at Visakhapatnam. That was the statement made by the Minister in those days. Then there was some difference of opinion, and a consortium was appointed as an expert body, and that body again said that Visakhapatnam was the best place for the fifth steel plant. Neither the Minister who in 1963 said that the steel plant would be at Visakhapatnam, nor the consortium had any linguistic bias, nor any State bias; they only looked at it from the larger point of view then they said that in accordance with foreign expert opinion and modern trends in the steel industry, Visakhapatnam was the proper place. Then it even went to the Cabinet about September, 1965, and the Cabinet generally accepted it. Then Pakistan's invasion intervened, and then, all of a sudden, the whole thing evaporated. They said 'no plant' 'no money', and the promise was broken.

Not only that a false piece of news, I do not know who supplied it, appeared in all the newspapers when the agitation was very strong for the steel plant, when the tide was at the highest; the report said that the Government of India had agreed that the fifth steel plant would be located at Visakhapatnam, whereupon the agitation subsided. The next day or the day after that the Prime Minister made a statement that there was no such thing as a steel plant at all, there was no money at all, that when there was money and when they thought of an extra steel plant,

they would think about Visakhapatnam along with other names that might come up then. This is how that part of the country, which is known as Andhra Pradesh, is treated.

Then they said that steel was not so important, agriculture was important, irrigation was important. What is the treatment given to us in respect of irrigation? In 1951 in an inter-State conference on the division of the waters of the Krishna and the Godavari were allocated in a particular way. The Ministers were present, the engineers of all the States were present. It was not the Ministers at the political level who made the allocation, but it was the various engineers who were asked by the conference to sit together and make a proper allocation. They made the allocation, they prepared a memorandum, and that memorandum was read sentence by sentence at the joint inter-State conference and it was accepted by everybody. The Planning Commission wrote letters to all concerned Government that this award might be also ratified by them. Every Government ratified it, although later the Mysore Government said it did not. As a matter of fact, if you refer to the Planning Commission's records, you will find that the Mysore Government also accepted the allocation categorically not once, but twice or thrice. There were letters from the Mysore Government on this question and I pointed this out in a memorandum to the Minister of Irrigation last year when he came to Hyderabad. But what happened in 1960? They said: no. In 1951, under the aegis of the Planning Commission water is allocated; in 1960, they say: no. That is the treatment given to irrigation and to an agricultural State. If only water had been allowed to come in, if only money was given to the Nagarjuna-sagar project adequately and in time

we would have made up by now the entire rice deficit in the country. Again, they allowed the Government to spend 2 crores on Pochampad project and now they say stop it. Is this financial discipline? The Finance Minister said that we must have financial discipline. Is this the way in which the rice deficit in the country could be covered? Similarly, 50 lakhs was provided for a dry dock at Vizag and 15 lakhs were actually spent, officers were appointed and certain buildings were put up. But immediately before the elections they were told to stop it. The Finance Minister must know what is happening asking people to spend a sizable amount and then asking them to stop further work for political reasons! Where did the balance of 35 lakhs go? Ha dia was important to some minister and it went away there. I do not know how it is done in respect of other States but this is the way things are done in the case of Andhra Pradesh. I am not saying these things merely for picking up quarrels but to make the Finance Minister know that projects are stopped midway like this. The lower Sileru project was sanctioned because Andhra Pradesh was lagging much behind in electricity generation, suddenly you ask that to be stopped. Similarly, Srisailem project is stopped after some crores are spent on it. Is this the way of dealing with backward States like Andhra Pradesh and of removing regional imbalances? I should not be mistaken to be speaking only from the narrow point of view of my State. If a Member is not able to put up the case of his own State, how can he put up the case of India? India lives in States. If I cannot love the State in which I am born it is idle to say that I love India just as Jesus Christ said if you cannot love your neighbour whom you can see how can you love God whom you cannot see? So let not the Ministers be mistaken in speaking for a State, I am speaking for the whole country.

When we got independence, over-

night, we became a deficit country. The First Plan itself should have taken care to see that we became self-sufficient. I remember that Pandit Nehru replying to questions in a television interview in 1953 whether India could become self-sufficient, said yes, we would become self-sufficient not today but in a year or two. Are we self-sufficient today? We are in 1967. I was getting 20 ounces per day before independence, today I am getting only six ounces. This is the kind of self-sufficiency which we have attained.

**Shri K. N. Tiwary.** What was the population then and what is it now?

**Shri Tenneti Vishwanatham.** It has increased by 18 per cent. Our statistics—I am speaking from the production statistics given by the Government show that we have increased production by 40 per cent.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Sixty per cent.

**Shri Tenneti Vishwanatham.** Surely population has not grown by sixty per cent. What is the mistake? My complaint is that we are not allowed to produce sufficiently and cut off imports. I understand that we pay about a thousand rupees per ton of rice imported from America and we pay about twenty per cent more as freight to foreign steamers whereas the best rice produced in India would not cost more than Rs 700 or Rs 750 per ton. Our first priority after independence should have been given to food production. Unless there is adequate food production, the industry suffers. Foodgrains should be produced extensively and cheaply and made available freely without difficulty. Otherwise the cost of projects, wages and everything else would increase. We will have to borrow more and tax more and pay more interest.

I would now refer to the Nagarjunasagar project and I would re-

[Shri Tenneti Viswanatham]

quest the Finance Minister to correct me if I am wrong. It is a multi-purpose project and was scheduled to be completed in ten years. The foundation-stone was laid in 1955. We were told that thirty lakh acres would come under irrigation by 1965. But in 1960, ten lakh acres were cut off and only 20 lakhs were retained. But even with this reduced acreage, the project was not completed by 1965 because the planners had been allotting Rs. 10 crores a year, not realising that as the work progressed the tempo of work would increase needing more funds. Every year about December the available funds are exhausted because of the increased tempo and the staff remain idle; that means the overheads are increasing. The officials and Ministers from Andhra Pradesh come here asking for some more money to be allotted; sometimes they do not get the money asked for. Last year and this year, the working group recommended an allotment of Rs. 16 crores but only Rs. 10 crores had been provided. It is a pity that the Planing Commission does not realise that with the tempo increasing, more money should be allotted. But right from 1955 till now, every year Rs. 10 crores are given. On top of all this, they say that Nagarjunasagar is costing more when Andhra Pradesh asks for more money in a year because the funds had been spent completely and overhead charges are increasing.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** May I tell the hon. Member that Nagarjunasagar was conceived over a long number of years? After taking it up like that, they are pressing for more money.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** It was a Rs. 90 crores scheme started in 1955. It was given 10 crores a year. It would not take us beyond 1965; it was not conceived to be longer; any scheme which is conceived to take more than ten years will be of no use because it will add to the cost. That is not the

way in which planning should be made. Even ten years is too long a period of a Rs. 90 crores scheme. Even this year the budget provides only for Rs. 10 crores while the working group has asked for Rs. 16 crores. Where is imagination or foresight? After some-time again, when these funds are spent and when Andhra Pradesh asks for more funds, you will say, Andhra Pradesh always comes begging. That is not the way in which you should treat one of your own States. He said that some states were having large amounts of overdrafts. Are they Indian States or foreigners?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Andhra has the largest.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** Andhra will be larger than the largest if this is the kind of treatment meted out to it. Does India live without the States? From whom are you taking excise duties? Are not the people of the States giving these duties? Are not they the citizens of the country? Why differentiate as if the Central Government is the money lender and the States are mere debtors? This is not the way in which it should be done.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Nobody has such an attitude.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** You should not treat these States as mere debtors and beggars.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I agree entirely.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** I thank you very much. But it must be implemented; your officers must implement it. There was a Finance Minister; who when the Public Works Minister came here in order to request him some more money because the overheads were increasing and there was no work and the allotment had already been finished by November or so of that year, the Finance Minister refused to see the Public Works Minis-

ter on the ground that he could not see anybody less than the Chief Minister of the State. That is not the way in which the Centre should treat the States. This attitude must change. I hope that the present Finance Minister, a true follower of Gandhiji, will hereafter see that such an attitude is not shown. The Finance Minister must change this kind of attitude.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I never have shown this kind of attitude. I have seen everybody very readily; whoever wants to see me, even the man-in-the-street.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** He did not follow what I said. I said, a previous Finance Minister. Therefore, this treatment must go. Not only must that go, but this approach that the State is a debtor which is asking for doles from the Centre must entirely be wiped out. There is no use saying "We cannot give overdrafts." The States are India and India is made up of the States. The Centre also is responsible.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** With that appeal to you, I want you to change your approach to the States. By helping Andhra Pradesh you will be helping India. If you help Andhra Pradesh, you will be helping an important limb of the country. You will be helping to wipe out country's deficit in rice. There, we have water, there we have the men; there, we have got everything ready. Why don't you allow us to grow more and wipe out the deficit? That is my appeal to you.

**Mr. Chairman:** There is an announcement to be made. The hon. Minister of Labour will make a statement at 4.50 p.m. regarding the strike in the *Times of India* and allied publications, and at 5 p.m. some of the private Members who could not

introduce their Bills may introduce the Bills then, at 5 p.m.

**Shri Umanath:** I had submitted a Short Notice Question on the *Times of India* strike some days back. No decision has been given. While that Short Notice Question is pending, what is the idea of the Minister coming here and making a statement? What happens to the Short Question?

So also, a Calling Attention Notice has been given. When both the Calling Attention Notice and the Short Notice Question are there the Minister must make a statement either in reply to the Short Notice Question or the Calling Attention Notice. But he is just by-passing both these things. What is the procedure, Sir? He is by-passing both these two things; the Calling Attention notice and the Short Notice Question. The Minister must make a statement on them, and now we are deprived of an opportunity of putting questions on them.

**Mr. Chairman:** This is an opportunity given, to ask questions.

**Shri Umanath:** On the point raised I want a decision. What happens to the Calling Attention Notice?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** I have a submission to make, before you give your ruling. We have been informed today that the Calling Attention Notice.

**Mr. Chairman:** He may take this opportunity of asking questions.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** That is kind of you, Sir. Now, the Minister wants to make a statement. But then, I have come to know that the hon. Minister has made a statement already in the other House at 12 or 12.30. I do not know. Why this House is treated with contempt. After all, this House is not a House of post-mortem. We have elected represen-

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

tatives here, and the Minister should have enough courtesy to make his statement here first. We gave a Calling Attention Notice right in the beginning. The Minister should be pulled up and asked not to repeat such a thing in future.

**Mr. Chairman:** The Minister will make a statement; you can put questions.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee.** Why ignore this House?

**Shri Umanath:** We want to know from the Secretariat also about the Calling Attention Notice. What has happened to the Calling Attention Notice and the Short Notice Question?

**Mr. Chairman:** They were referred to the Minister.

**Shri Umanath:** Well, then, it is all the more wrong on the part of the Minister. when the matter has been referred to the Minister, not to reply to it. Just ignoring the Calling Attention Notice and the Short Notice Question, and coming here to make a statement is all the more wrong, when the matter has been referred to him already.

**An hon. Member:** He may ask a supplementary.

**Shri Umanath:** That is another matter I am now asking about the procedure.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh):** As the House knows, we answered only one Calling Attention Notice the other day and today there was a Calling Attention Notice by about half a dozen Members headed by Shri S. M. Banerjee, and therefore, the Minister will be making a statement.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** This is again wrong. Being the Minister of Parlia-

mentary Affairs, he should know the rules. We have followed a procedure in the past; when Sardar Hukam Singh was the Speaker, this question came up before the House; we have on behalf of all the parties readily agreed that if the question of Adjournment Motion does not come every day, at least there should be some forum for us to put the questions. He agreed that if Calling Attention Notices were very important, then one will be put up on the Order Paper for the day in the morning and if another one is very important, it can be replied to at 5 p.m. Let not the hon. Minister say that because a Calling Attention Notice has been answered in the morning another cannot be put up in the evening. We have followed a procedure; let him go and look into the records. There is a Calling Attention Notice to which we are all signatories.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** A new procedure has been introduced; perhaps the hon. Member was not here when the Speaker said that only one Calling Attention would be taken up every day. Therefore, the procedure mentioned by the hon. Member is no more in existence; that was the old practice, not the new one (*Interruption*).

**Shri Liladhar Kotoki (Nowgong):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the budget presented before the House by the hon. Finance Minister. We all know that this is an interim budget, and the Finance Minister has promised before the House that he would be coming with the final budget with new proposals and a reorientation of the entire economic policy. Therefore, I do not propose to take much time of the House in dealing with the interim budget itself, but, on the other hand, I would venture to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Members of the House to some of the distressing features of our economy today, and request the hon. Finance Minister to

take these suggestions into consideration when he takes up the finalisation of the budget.

The President, in his Address to the joint session of Parliament, referred to some of these features and he also assured Parliament that the Government would be taking adequate measures to eradicate those problems. The main problem before the country today is the failure of the agricultural sector. Since the beginning of Planning we have seen that the programmes in the agricultural production sector have not kept up with the target, and that has been the main reason, at the root, for the stage of economy in which we are today. It has gone so far as to devalue our rupee; we have been still dependent on foreign imports of foodgrains and today the situation has become acute in this matter. I am glad that the President has indicated that the Government have decided to take up the question of food on an emergency basis. This is exactly what we have been telling in this House all along—that the Government should take up the question of making the country self-sufficient in food within a specified period. We have gone through the first Plan, the second Plan and the third Plan, and we are now in the second year of the fourth Plan, and yet we have not been able to tackle this one single problem. Therefore, we want the Government to spell out as to what they mean by taking the food problem as an emergency and how they propose to implement the programmes.

I am sorry that it has not been possible for Government to finalise the fourth Plan as yet for the first two years of the fourth Plan, we have had annual plans. I am only hoping that Government will give a final shape to the fourth plan soon so that Parliament can approve of it.

The budget cannot be taken in an isolated manner. It is not that we consider the budget for the year only. It has the legacy of the past year and the perspective of the next year and subsequent years. The major part of

the budget is linked with the Plan. So, unless the Plan is finalised, it is very difficult for us to consider the annual budget.

In the matter of self-sufficiency of foodgrains, various suggestions have been made and various steps have been taken regarding fertilisers, improved seeds, etc. On basic factor that is needed to put our agriculture in proper shape is this two-fold proposition: to prevent damage to crops by floods and to provide sufficient irrigation facilities, so that more than one crop be raised. We have not been able to tackle this factor during the last three Plans. I am not quite sure whether fourth Plan as drafted and as is going to be finalised will take adequate steps to provide irrigation to all the fields in this country. During the discussion on the President's Address, this same point was emphasised by various sections of the House. We should mobilise all our available resources of men and material so that we can provide irrigation facilities to the cultivators and take up other inputs that are necessary to increase our agricultural production more and more. We have to go on increasing our agricultural production more and more, because despite family planning, we are not going to have a static population figure in this country. The renowned population expert in this country, who is now in the Cabinet, has told us that population is going to increase in spite of whatever measures we take for family planning. So, the only solution is that we must concentrate on agricultural production and give priority to necessary inputs. Irrigation is obvious the most fundamental input for agricultural production.

The President has indicated and the hon. Finance Minister has also admitted that while our plans and programmes are more or less in the right direction to achieve the objective of a socialist society, the implementation of these programmes has not kept pace with the needs of the country. This aspect has to be given due attention. I



[Shri \_\_\_\_\_dhar Kotaki]

am glad Government did realise the urgent need of reforming our administration to cope with the needs of the country and the Administrative Reforms Commission has submitted an interim report. I would have wished that the final report also should have come by now, so that the main part of the administrative reforms would have been taken up in right earnest. I am, however, glad that the Chairman of the Administrative Reforms Commission is now at the helm of the financial affairs of the country and another senior member of this House is the Chairman now. I hope that the recommendations that would be made in the final report would be given due importance and implemented with earnestness.

It is very distressing that the good results that we anticipated at the time of devaluation about which Government also assured this House have not materialised during the intervening period. Therefore, I would request the Government to take proper steps to examine this question in all its aspects and take earnest steps to examine this question in all its aspects and take earnest steps to remedy the shortcomings, so that our economy does not suffer a further setback and we may not have to take recourse to further devaluation. This involves further examination of our import policy and also taking various steps that are necessary to augment our exports.

In all these aspects, I entertain the hope that the Finance Minister in his final budget will bring forth such financial measures as would remedy these shortcomings and will put our economy on a sound basis, so that we may not have to suffer from distresses in the internal economy and may be safe from dependence on foreign countries for our basic needs of foodgrains and foreign aid.

With these observations, I support the budget.

Shri S. Kandappan: Mr. Chairman, Sir, before I make my observations on the interim budget presented by our Finance Minister *cum* Deputy

Prime Minister or by our Deputy Prime Minister in his capacity as Finance Minister—I do not know which is correct—

Some hon. Members: Both are correct.—

Shri S. Kandappan: I would like to make a few observations on the serious consideration of this House. Only this morning, soon after the Question House, while referring to a particular clause in the Constitution, Dr. Lohia expressed a sense of shame that he has got to refer to the English Edition of the Constitution, as there is no original edition in Hindi. Fortunately for him, he was permitted to make a translation on the spur of the moment and he was happy over it. I do not know how far the Hindi people appreciate the feeling that we have over this issue in this House. It is not that we love English and so we are making our speeches in that language here. In fact, an hon. member from the PSP who preceded me was apologetic that he was making his speech in English. I am not going to be apologetic, but I charge this Government that it is this Government which forces us to speak in English. The House would have taken note of the fact that all the members from Tamil Nad, to whichever party they belong, barring two members, took their seats in the House after taking oath or affirmation in Tamil which is our mother tongue. It is not that we lack in our love for our mother tongue, but it is the inevitable necessity of circumstances that compel us to use a foreign language. I would like to plead with the Government and the opposition that they should make an early and earnest attempt to change this procedure and members from Tamil Nad must be allowed to make their speeches in Tamil. If there is provision in this House for simultaneous translation of Tamil speeches, I will be the first person to stop speaking here in English and to speak in Tamil.

There is a fantastic argument advanced by the protagonists of Hindi that it is a prestige question, that when we go to foreign countries we have to pose ourselves saying that it is our national language. I do not consider it a virtue to hide the fact that India is multi-lingual and tell to the outside world that we are unilingual. I fail to appreciate that point. It is a hard fact, whether we like it or not, that we are multi-lingual and it is good to say so. The Government should give the fullest scope and opportunity for all language groups to make their contribution effectively in this House. I hope the Government will consider this point and make necessary arrangements here for having dialogues in all the languages, at least the major languages.

Sir, with regard to this Budget, excepting one or two Members from the Congress side, almost all the hon. Members who spoke or took part in the discussion have prophesied a dismal future for the economy of our country. I think even the Finance Minister is very pessimistic over the financial affairs of our country

16 hrs.

An hon. Member: Realistic.

Shri S. Kandappan: He is very pessimistic, that is what appeared to me from the speech that he has made. But I am going to confine myself to the State-Centre relations only. Before I take up that point, I would like to make a few general observations. Some Members from the Congress side were very eloquent about the achievements of their party in solving the problems of this country. But even they were not able, on the face of hard facts, through they made tall claims, to

say that all is well with this country. So they did agree that the country's affairs are not being run smoothly and the country is really in a fix. But some of them put the blame on the administrative machinery and not on the Government. I do not know how they can make this division between the administrative machinery of a country and the Government of that country. We, on this side, can, for the sake of convenience, say something about the executive, the government or the administration. But I think the Government is virtually the head of the administration. Therefore, for a party which has been in power persistently for the last twenty years after the British left this country, to come and say in this House that it is the administration that has failed and not the Government is rather not tenable. It is the business of the Government to see that the administration is run on proper lines. If it is outmoded, if the bureaucratic administrative set-up of the British is not viable, is not flexible enough for the implementation of the socialist ideals that the Congress Government professes to have, I fail to appreciate why they have not thought it fit to change the administration in the early days and only now, after twenty years, wisdom dawns upon them and they come to the House saying that they are setting up an Administrative Reforms Committee and everything will be well after receipt of the report of that Committee. To accept or to confess that their administration has failed is tantamount to saying that they are not fit to rule this country and, therefore, they ought to leave. Unfortunately, they are clinging to power and they say that all will be well within a shortwhile.

Also, they have said and it is almost universally accepted now, that the people have not supported the Congress because they have failed to implement the policies, that nothing is wrong with the policies or ideals of

[Shri S. Kandappan]

the Congress but they have failed to implement their policy. It is not good for them to make this comment. I am sorry, I am constrained to say that policy or plans could be made today, I think, even by electronic computers. The success of the planning or the achievement or claim that a Government can make, depends on the performance that they will be able to show in the country. It is not only a question of mere planning on paper. That anybody can make. In the absence of another alternative planning in this country, there is no wonder that the Congress claim that their Plan is the right one, that their Plan is superb and God-given. Sir, in a kingdom where all are blind the one-eyed will be the king. So, when there are only these Congress bosses with spokesmen like Shri Kamaraj, who were the exponents of democratic socialism unfortunately in this country, when they are the men who are to preside over the destinies of this country, there is no wonder that the Congressmen think that their planning is superb and the fault lies in the failure of implementing the Plan. This kind of excuses leads us nowhere. There should be a realistic thinking and the Government should not hesitate to re-draft the Plan if it is not realistic and come forward in this House with an agreeable Plan so that the country may move forward. Actually, as far as we are concerned we do not quarrel with the concept of planning and, for that matter, I do not think any party here is not agreeable to the concept of planning. It is a question of how you plan, how you formulate your plan and how you implement it.

Then, about hoarding and other things certain general observations were made. Some hon. Members made some remarks about non-Congress Governments in Madras and other States. I do not know what is troubling them about the de-hoarding efforts made in Madras and other

States. One hon. Member said that the coming of D.M.K. into power in Madras is not the real cause for the prices coming down, there were some other economic causes. Whatever the economic causes, the fact remains that the prices have been brought down.

An Hon. Member: They have gone up again.

Shri S. Kandappan: For the good of the country we will bring them down again (*Interruption*). You cannot absolve the Government of their failure, that they have not produced enough in this country. If we want to tighten the procurement, there must be foodgrains enough to procure. Therefore, they cannot absolve themselves of their faults and failure. At least now we hope, after the results of the elections, they will wake up to the situation and make amends for their past mistakes and steer the country in the right direction.

On page 7 of the Finance Minister's speech there is a sentence about the overdraft by States. He says.

"The assistance of Rs. 113 crores to some of the States because of their overdraft from the Reserve Bank has merely had the effect of increasing the deficit at the Centre."

Among the so many excuses for this deficit Budget, this is one, that since the Government has got to meet the overdraft of some of the States the deficit has increased. The remedy suggested for this is, that they are going to put a ban and going to issue directive from the Reserve Bank that after a certain time they would not allow the States to avail of this facility any more. I do not think that would solve the problem. Actually, as Shri Tenneti Vishwanatham has very rightly pointed out, India lives in

the States. This posture that it is only the fault of the States has brought down the economy of this country to ruin is not at all correct. It is a very wrong picture. It is the inept handling of the finances at the Centre over the past 20 years, constitutionally and even by-passing the Constitution or by perverse attempts at misreading of certain articles of the Constitution that has brought about this situation. In 1964-65 when Shri T. T. Krishnamachari was the Finance Minister, while presenting the budget he made the following observation:

"The total amount due to the Centre by the States at the end of the current financial year will be of the order of Rs. 3,000 crores. In addition, the States' liability on account of market loans at present amounts to Rs. 656 crores. Both in terms of loans from the Centre and market borrowings the States have been receiving more than what was originally contemplated in the Plan. Their share of Central taxes and duties has also been increasing. Yet most of them are constantly facing ways and means difficulties of a disturbing nature. The whole position will require careful review in the context of the Fourth Five Year Plan."

But the draft Fourth Five Year Plan does not have the impact of this review and the person who promised this review is also not here. Perhaps that explains the absence of any impact of this kind of thinking in the Draft Plan.

We should remember one thing. Nation-building activities and social welfare work are placed mainly on the shoulders of the States and not of the Centre. But the finances that have been earmarked for the States in the Constitution are neither adequate nor flexible unlike the finances of the Centre. Even the Finance Commissions that were appointed periodically were of the view that a bigger share should have been given

to the States, and that too on an automatic basis and not *ad hoc* grants so that the States can go ahead with their plans. Yet, in actual practice, not enough funds are provided by the Centre for the plans of the States. Even in today's paper there is a news item that the Chief Minister of Madras has stated that the deficit of Rs. 7.60 crores in Madras could have been wiped out if the Centre had not reduced the State's share of income-tax and excise duties. I do not think this is the view of only one Chief Minister. I am sure that other States are also of the same view clamouring for more and more funds from the Centre.

Here I would like to give some figures from the reports of the Finance Commissions. The first Finance Commission increased the share of income-tax due to States from 50 to 55 per cent and recommended sharing excise duties to the tune of 40 per cent on three commodities alone. The second Finance Commission increased the share of income-tax of the States from 55 to 60 per cent. In the case of excise duties it added 8 more items to the pool of divisible excise duties but reduced the share falling on the States from 40 to 25. The Third Finance Commission recommended two-thirds of the income-tax as divisible to the States. With regard to excise duties it recommended duties on all commodities barring tax on motor spirit divisible to the States but reduced the quantum to 20 per cent. So, the Finance Commissions have gradually increased the share of the States. They have been of the unanimous view that more funds should be placed at the disposal of the State Governments.

As hon. Members are aware, the Constituent Assembly while framing the Constitution set up an experts committee on finance to go into the financial relations between the Centre and the States. That Committee has stated:

"The Committee affirmed that it would be impossible to avoid divi-

[Shri S. Kandappan]

ded heads of revenue and that the aim should be to have a few divided heads well-balanced and high-yielding and to arrange that the shares of the Centre and the Provinces in these heads are adjusted automatically, without friction or mutual interference."

Yet, we do not find enough funds provided to the States with the result that they are clamouring for more and more funds. It looks as if they are begging for funds and the Centre, which is the boss, is not willing to allocate enough funds to an erring State. This kind of psychology should go and the States should be treated as on par with the Centre. It is not as if the Union alone has superwisdom and it can rule the States or dictate to them. The States can well look after their own finances. In the Constitution there are built-in checks to ensure that the States manage their finances well. They cannot afford to be extravagant, mismanage or commit mistakes. There are enough of checks provided in the Constitution itself like audit. So, the Centre has got to take the State Chief Ministers and State Governments into confidence and allocate more money to them so that they can take the initiative in preparing their plans. Now, they are politically almost the agencies of the Centre and economically they have lost their initiative and become more and more dependent on the Centre. This attitude and set up should be radically changed.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention two points. Firstly, more allocation of funds should be made to the States and secondly that should be on an automatic basis; not *ad hoc* grants as they are making just now. Under the provisions of article 275, the Central Government should make grants to the State Governments as per the recommendation of the Finance Commission. But, instead of doing that, the Central Government is taking protection under article 282 and making more of *ad hoc* grants and

discretionary grants which give rise to grumbling on the part of the States and the charge of favouritism on the part of the Centre. In fact, the assistance given under article 282 comes to 48.7 per cent of the total assistance in 1952-53. Later, in 1961-62 budget it was of the order of 80.2 per cent. Such a large portion of the grants are allocated as discretionary grants to the States. In the context of non-Congress Governments in power in so many States I think it is time that there is re-thinking so far as allocation of funds to the States under the discretionary powers are concerned. Before proceeding with the plans, the Central Government should take into confidence the Chief Ministers, particularly those of non-Congress States. Then alone can the country move forward smoothly and then alone will we be in a position to set our house in order.

Finally, I would like to make one specific request with regard to the steel plant, because the hon. Member from Andhra was saying something about Visakhapatnam. We do not have any quarrel over the claims of Andhra in this matter. But I would like to submit, as we have submitted already in this House and outside, that instead of going in for the installation of mammoth unviable and unprofitable units, we can better go in for smaller units, as recommended by the Prime Minister herself some time back. We could as well start steel plants of medium or small size in Salem, Visakhapatnam and Hospet also. I would ask the Government to consider this and give satisfaction to the just claims of all sections in the various States. It will immensely help in improving our finances in the States.

With these words I conclude

श्री विजयि सिन्ध (मोतिहारी)  
चेदरमैन साहब, यह इन्टीरिम बजट की मोटाखी जाई वे पेश किया है, इसको सिन्धे मैं

मोरारजी भाई को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि भ्रगले सेशन में वे इसे बृहद रूप में हमारे सामने लायेंगे। इस बजट को पेश कर के उन्होंने हम लोगों को भ्रगले के लिये हितदायक किया है कि हम लोगों सोचें कि इस देश में भ्रगले काम कैसे चलेगा। इस बजट के आखिर में उन्होंने हम लोगों से समालोचना करने को भी कहा है। यह पहलो वक्रा है कि जब हमारी तादाद 376 से 280 पर आई तो हमारी सरकार को मुबुद्धि हुई कि हम लोगों से सरकार पूछ रही है कि भाई, आपको क्या कहना है। इस लिये मैं मोरारजी भाई को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने भाषण के 13 वें पृष्ठ पर हम लोगों से पूछा है कि हम को क्या कहना है।

हम को यह कहना है कि हमारा फेल्योर क्यों होता है? इसका कारण यह है कि हमारा जो प्लान है वह धन-प्रेक्टिकल है। क्यों है? प्लानिंग कमीशन के जो मेम्बर हैं उन से पूछता हूँ, यहा पर प्लानिंग कमीशन के मंत्री भी बैठे हुए हैं, उन से पूछता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो सिचाईवाली जमीन है, उस में क्लास 1, 2, 3, तथा 4 में फी एकड कितनी पैदावार है, इन के पास इस का कोई आकड़ा नहीं है। उमी तरह से नान इरिगेटेड लेण्ड में क्लास 1, 2, 3 तथा 4 में कौन सी जमीन कितनी आपके देश में है और फी एकड कितनी पैदावार है, आप बताइये, इन के पास कोई फिगर नहीं है। मिक्र यही फिगर है कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में 32 करोड़ एकड जमीन है जो जोत की जमीन है, इस में से बना देते हैं कि कि किसी साल 99 मिलियन टन हुआ, इस साल मोरारजी भाई का कहना है कि 76 मिलियन टन होगा। लेकिन यह पता नहीं है कि हमको किम जमीन से कितनी पैदावार हुई।

वेयरमैन साहब, आप भी खेतों करते होंगे, आप भी देखते होंगे कि हम को कौनसी जमीन से पिछले साल कितना पैदा हुआ और

इस साल कौन सी जमीन से कितनी पैदावार हुई, लेकिन इस प्लानिंग कमीशन के पास कोई जानकारी नहीं है, सिवाय इस के कि प्लानिंग कमीशन का एक भव्य भवन बना हुआ है, उस में कुशन के गद्दे बने हुए हैं, मिनिस्टर लोग उन में रहते हैं, जिनको दुनिया में कोई काम नहीं है। इसी वजह से हमारा प्लान फेल्योर हुआ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारा कोई असली प्लान नहीं है, जिसे कि वह बनाना चाहते हैं। इन्होंने कहा कि हम ने प्लान बना दिया, प्लान इन्होंने बना दिया, लेकिन उस का पालन-पोषण कोई दूसरा करे। बच्चा हम पैदा करे और हमारे बच्चे का पालन-पोषण कोई दूसरा आदमी करे, क्या दुनिया में कहीं ऐसा होता है। हम बच्चा पैदा करे तो उसकी परवरिश का इन्तजाम भी हम को ही करना चाहिये, रम लिये जो हमारा प्लान है वह डिफेक्टिव प्लान है। मैं आप को एक बात बतलाता हूँ— गण्डक योजना पर 125 करोड़ रुपया खर्च करने जा रहे हैं, 125 करोड़ रुपया कितने दिनों में खर्च होगा, गण्डक की नहर कब तक चलेगी, कब तक पैदावार होगी, एक स्कीम को लिया नहीं, कितनी ही स्कीमों को ले लिया और कोई पूरी होती नहीं है, इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग दुग्न्त होना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात, हमारे अपोजीशन के नेता कहते हैं कि टेलिन्टेड आदमी आने चाहिये। गांधी जी ने अच्छी धंधेजी लिखने वाले बहुत से टेलिन्टेड आदमी हिन्दुस्तान में थे, लेकिन किसी ने धंधेजों से लोहा नहीं लिया बहुत से भाई 0 सी 0 एस 0 थे, लेकिन कोई भी सत्याग्रह की लड़ाई में नहीं गये। गांधी जी उन के मुकाबले कम टेलिन्टेड थे, लेकिन कर्मशील आदमी थे, उन्होंने दिखला दिया कि धंधेजी को हम हिन्दुस्तान से हटा सकते हैं। इस लिये अरुण इस बात की है कि जो हमारे यहां ब्यावहारिक आदमी हों, काम



### [श्री विपुल मिश्र]

करने वाले आदमी हों, जिनको सुन-बुझ हो, ऐसे आदमियों को काम देना चाहिये, वे टेलेस्टेड आदमी कोई काम नहीं करते हैं, केवल स्कीमे तैयार करते हैं। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो व्यावहारिक, कर्मशील कार्यकुशल आदमी हों, उनको हमें रखना चाहिये और वे इस काम को करें।

बिहार में इस साल बहुत सूखा है, 476 ब्लाको में से 400 ब्लाक सूखाग्रस्त डिक्लेयर किये जा चुके हैं। मैं मोरारजी भाई से कहूँगा—चुनाव के समय उन्होंने साउथ-बिहार का भ्रमण किया था, वह नाथं-बिहार की हालत भी देख लें। वहाँ क्या हालत है, पानी नहीं मिलता है, सिंचाई का प्रबन्ध नहीं है। बिजली से भी जो थोड़ा बहुत सिंचाई का प्रबन्ध है उस में भी बिजली नहीं मिलती है। कम से कम ऐसा इन्तजाम करें कि वहाँ पानी मिले, सिंचाई का इन्तजाम हो। जब तक हम सिंचाई का इन्तजाम नहीं करेंगे बिहार में, खाद मगाना बेकार है। अगर पानी का इन्तजाम हो जाय तो किसान अपनी पैदावार बढ़ा सकता है। आपकी 12 मिलियन टन की शार्टेज है, 32 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन आपकी जोत में है, अगर हर एकड़ में 1 मन अनाज ज्यादा पैदा करें, तो 32 करोड़ मन हो गया। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि वह करेगा कौन? यह प्लान बन कर ब्लाक में जायगा, लेकिन क्या किसी मिनिस्टर ने देखा कि बी० डी० प्रो० जीप गाडी लेकर क्या करते हैं? हम यहाँ बैठे रहते हैं, इसे स्टेट को दे देते हैं और स्टेट ब्लाक को भेज देते हैं, लेकिन क्या होता है यह कोई नहीं देखता है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने बेताबनी दे दी है, कुछ स्टेट्स तो हमारे हाथ से निकल गये हैं सिर्फ सेन्टर बाकी है। हमारे विरोधी लोग कहते हैं कि 25 का फर्क है, अगर 25 इधर-उधर हो जाय तो यह सरकार फेल हो जायगी, सारा प्लान बैसा ही पड़ा रह जायगा। हमारी एक विस्कत है कि जो

आज मिनिस्टर हो गये हैं, वे समझते हैं कि बहुपक्षि धीर बाधस्पर्धि हो गये हैं, सारे इन्तजाम करता हो गये हैं, लेकिन जब मिनिस्टर नहीं रहते तो हमारे-आपके जैसे पाव-प्यादे हो जाते हैं। आप को बेतना चाहिये, कांग्रेस की सरकार को, कांग्रेस-नेम को बेतना चाहिये, आज लोगो ने बोट डेकर बता दिया है कि हम किस तरह से काम करें। लोगो की आस्था अभी भी सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट में है, इसी लिये हम को उन्होंने लोक सभा में चुन कर भेजा है।

अभी 350 करोड़ का घाटा मोरारजी भाई ने बताया है। मैं मोरारजी भाई को बताना चाहता हूँ कि घाटे को पूरा करने के लिये अगले समय में आप टैक्स लगायेंगे, अभी से पूजीपति अन्दाज लगायेंगे कि मोरारजी भाई कौन-कौन सी चीज पर टैक्स लगायेंगे। मैं सजेशन देता हूँ कि यह जो धूम्रा करते हैं, सिगरेट बगैरह पर टैक्स लगाइये, षडी पर टैक्स लगाइये, मोटर कार पर टैक्स लगाइये, ऐसी ऐसी लक्जरी की जो चीजे हैं उन पर टैक्स लगाइये, न कि किसान के जीवन की उपयोगी चीजों पर टैक्स लगाइये।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारे यहाँ किसानों को उचित कीमत नहीं देते हैं। किसान को जो दुनिया की ज़रूरी चीजे हैं, उन को महंगे दामों पर खरीदना पड़ता है लेकिन किसान को हम उचित दाम नहीं देते हैं। इस लिये किसान को नुकसान होता है। एक बात मैं अपनी पार्टी वालों को बतलाता हूँ—आपको इस बार अहरो से बोट नहीं मिला है, बड़े बड़े बाजारों से बोट नहीं मिला है, किसान ने आपको बोट दिया है, उस ने कांग्रेस को जिन्दा रखा है। हम को इस बात का अनुभव है कि किसान ने ही कांग्रेस को जिन्दा रखा है, इस लिये आप किसान का क्याल रखिये किसान के हितों की रक्षा आपके द्वारा होनी चाहिये और गांधी जी भी किसानों के हितों की रक्षा करते थे।

350 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा मोरारजी भाई ने बताया है जो कि एक आदमी पर 7 २० पड़ता है। एक बच्चा जो पैदा हुआ इन के बजट पेश करने के पहले, उसको 7 २० देना पड़ेगा, जो मरने के किनारे है उसको भी सात रुपया देना पड़ेगा, हर आदमी पर सात रुपया घाटा है—तो अब वह घाटा कैसे पूरा होगा, इस के लिये हम लोगों को सुझाव देना है। इस के लिये मैं कहूंगा कि जितनी भी आराम की चीजें हैं, जैसे लेंदर बैग है और इन तरह की चीजें हैं, इन के ऊपर मोरारजी भाई टैक्स लगाइये।

अब मैं बताना चाहता हूँ—सन् 1966-1967 में इन्होंने बताया कि 76 मिलियन टन अनाज पैदा हुआ, 1964-65 में 79 मिलियन टन हुआ था, पिछले साल हुआ था 72.3 मिलियन टन, इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि खेती ही एक ऐसी चीज है जो कठिनाइयों को दूर कर सकती है। अगर खेती पर ध्यान नहीं देंगे तो हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था खराब हो जायगी। जो अविकसित देश हैं, अण्डर डेवलप कंट्रीज हैं, जब तक खेती पर ध्यान नहीं देंगे, तब तक उनको अर्थ-व्यवस्था नहीं सुधरेगी। जब तक हम खर्च कम नहीं करेंगे—हमारे आदमी जब मिनिस्टर नहीं रहते हैं, मँम्बर नहीं रहते हैं तो उनका दूसरा जीवन रहता है, जिस बन्त मिनिस्टर हो जाते हैं, मँम्बर हो जाते हैं जीवन बदल जाता है। मोरारजी भाई को मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ—अखबार में निकला है कि अपनी गाड़ी प्रयोग में लायेंगे, सरकार की गाड़ी नहीं लेंगे। लेकिन वही आदमी जब मिनिस्टर नहीं रहते हैं तो उनकी दूसरी हालत होती है। इस लिये यदि हम जन-जीवन से दूर हो जायेंगे, अगले चुनाव में जनता काट कर हम को फेंक देगी। अगले चुनाव में हमारे मंत्री और हमारी सरकार के लोग नहीं जीतेंगे यदि अपना जीवन जन-जीवन से दूर रखेंगे, 20 साल में कितनी स्टेट्स हमारे हाथ से निकल गईं, जिसमें मेरी भी स्टेट है जो हमारे हाथ से निकल गई। और सेंटर चीज़

बहुत है। अगर हम अपने जन-जीवन के मुकाबले अपने जीवन को नहीं रखेंगे तो हमारी हालत खराब हो जायगी। हमारे यहां कहते हैं, कुछ लोग शिकायत करते हैं कि श्रीरंगजेब एक खराब बाबशाह था लेकिन मैं ऐसा नहीं समझता क्योंकि वह अपनी जीविका टोपियां बना कर चलाता था। हमारे कुछ राज्यों में मिनिस्टर्स लोग अपनी तनख्वाहों में कमी कर रहे हैं। मैं यहां केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों से भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप लोग भी अपनी तनख्वाहों को घटाइये। अगर आप अपनी तनख्वाह नहीं घटायेंगे तो हमारी आप की कुशल नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता हमारा साथ नहीं देगी . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : माननीय सदस्य इधर आकर बोलें।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं इधर से ही बोलता हूँ। मैं जनता के बीच में काम करता हूँ और मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे खिलाफ वह हारे थे।

मैं एक बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारी प्लानिंग हो वह ऐक्टिव प्लानिंग हो। लेकिन हमारे यहां प्लान का पता ही नहीं है कि कितनी प्लानिंग हम कर रहे हैं, कितना पैसा लगेगा और वह पैसा कहां से आयेगा? प्लान हम ने बना दिया लेकिन कौते इसे इम्प्लीमेंट करेगा इस का पता नहीं। प्लान को सुधारने की हमें आवश्यकता है। अभी हमारे प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर ने बतलाया कि डेवलपमेंट कांसिल की मीटिंग होगी। अब दरअसल डेवलपमेंट कांसिल की सिद्धान्ततः संविधान में कोई जगह व आस्था नहीं है। अब एक पंडित जी ने बीफ़ मिनिस्टर्स को लेकर कांसिल बना दी और वह प्लान वहां से बना कर ले आते हैं और चाहते हैं कि बस पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरान यस कहें। लेकिन डेवलपमेंट कांसिल की जिम्मेदारी

### [श्री विभूति मिश्र]

नहीं है, जिम्मेवारी है लोक सभा की जोकि सर्वसत्ता सम्पन्न सदन् है इसलिये इस लोक सभा की राय लेकर इसे बनाया जाय और तब उस के बाद कोई कार्यवाही की जाय ।

अब धार्ये मुझे कहना है कि हमारे यहा जूट होता है । अब कलकत्ते मे जूट के दाम रखे जाते है 30 रुपये मन

श्री मोरारजी बेसाई 30 नही 55 रुपये मन है ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : आप उस के लिए साधार हो गये और 55 करने पड़े वैसे सरकार ने अपनी ओर से भाव 30 रुपये मन का ही रखा था । लेकिन जब आप के हाथ मे से व्यापार निकलने लगा तो 55 लाचार होकर करना पड़ा और 55 ही नही 70 रुपये तक जूट बिका है ।

श्री मोरारजी बेसाई . यह झूठ ब गलत बात है ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : 50-55 मिलता है लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि चीखो की कीमत ठीक ढंग मे फिक्स होनी चाहिए ।

श्री मोरारजी भाई ने कहा है कि देश मे फेमिली प्लानिंग होनी चाहिए । यह फेमिली प्लानिंग ठीक है लेकिन यह फेमिली प्लानिंग करने वाले कड़ा तक पहुच पायेंगे ? कौन जानता है कि आज हम बच्चे पैदा करना बन्द कर दे लेकिन हो सकता है कि नही बन्द हो और उस मे से गांधी जी जैसा तगड़ा लड़का निकल जाय । कोई गारन्टी नही है (ब्यबसाई) जी हां लड़की भी हो सकती है, आप काहे को धबड़ाते हैं, लड़की भी आप पैदा कीजिये । दरभसल बात यह है कि यह फेमिली प्लानिंग का काम बहु लोग करना चाहते है जो चाहते है कि दुमिबा में हम ही रहे लेकिन बहु लोग

यह नही जानते कि प्रविच मे, कौन पैदा होगा, कैसा होगा इसलिए बहु जान की हत्या क्यों करते है ? इसलिए मेरा भी मोरारजी बेसाई से फेमिली प्लानिंग के ऊपर मतभेद है और मैं इस फेमिली प्लानिंग के खिलाफ हूँ यह मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ । जब तक आप समाजवादी व्यवस्था क्रमय नही करेंगे तब तक यह देश चलने वाला नही है ।

हमारे जनसंघ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी के भाई समझते है कि दो, एक चुनावों तक वे वोटर्स को भुलावे में रख कर उनसे मत प्राप्त कर के विजयी हो जायेंगे । हमारी अपनी पार्टी मे भी वैसे लोग है जोकि 1, 2 चुनाव में वोटर्स को भुलावे में रख कर चुन कर घाने की आशा रखते है लेकिन सब को याद रखना चाहिए कि देश मे जब तक समाजवादी व्यवस्था नही कायम होगी तब तक जनता हमारा साथ नही देगी । इन चुनाव मे हम लोगों ने इस चीख का सामना किया है और देखा है कि गरीबो की क्या हालत है ? गरीब पूछते है कि आप ने हमारे लिए क्या किया ? दरभसल हकीकत यह रही कि जितने भी प्लान हुए उन का लाभ गरीबो के स्तर तक नही पहुंचा और बहु प्लान ऊपर ही रह गये । आप खरा इस बात की जांच कर के देखिये कि इस अर्थ-व्यवस्था से स्वराज्य के दरमियान मे धाम लोगो की आर्थिक व्यवस्था कैसी बनी है । अब जहा तक टैक्स लगाने का सवाल है हम उन पर टैक्स नही लगाना चाहेंगे क्योंकि गरीब चाहेगा नही । वित्त मंत्री कहते है कि टैक्सों का भार सभी को वहन करना चाहिए लेकिन आज मैन आन दी स्ट्रीट्स की हालत बड़ी नाजुक है । गांधी की गरीब जनता को अभी तक कोई भी लाभ नही पहुंच पाया है इसलिए उन पर टैक्सों का भार न लादा जाय । मैं समझता हूँ कि आप की, कांग्रेस पार्टी और सब की भलाई इसी में है कि आप टैक्स लगाइये धनिकों पर जोकि वोटर्स पर चलते है । जब तक आप धनिकों

के ऊपर टैक्स नहीं लगाने में यह ऐडवैट कीर्तिपत्र जो हमारे प्रजातंत्र में चलती है हमें कोई उम्मीद नहीं है कि भागे हमें कोई बोट देगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो टैक्स लगे वह गरीबों पर न लगे अपितु धनिकों पर लगे और देश में समाजवादी व्यवस्था कायम हो।

लोग कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस में भी कुछ लोग स्वतंत्र पार्टी के और जनसंघ मिजाज के हैं। विरोधी पक्ष में तो है ही। मैं इसे मानता हूँ कि हमारी पार्टी में भी उस तरीके के लोग हैं लेकिन चाहे उधर के लोग हो या फिर इधर के ही लोग क्यों न हो, थोड़े दिनों तक ही इकट्ठा हो कर राज्य चला सकते हैं लेकिन यह बहुत दिनों तक चलने वाला नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान में अगर राज्य होगा तो केवल गरीबों का ही होगा और वही यहाँ पर टिकेगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि अभी भी हम लोग चेत जायें और गरीबों के लिए कुछ करें।

प्रशासन में आमूल चूल सुधार होना प्रति आवश्यक है। श्री मुरारजी देसाई ने तो प्रशासन सुधार आयोग से भव इस्तीफा दे दिया है और श्री हनुमन्तया भव उस कमीशन के सभापति हो गये हैं। नौकरशाही का ढाँचा काफी पुराना और जर्जर हो चला है और वही घूसखोरी, डिब्बाई, डोलापन का पुराना सिलसिला पिछले 20 सालों से चला आ रहा है। सरकारी नौकरो की घूसखोरी, डिब्बाई आदि के कारण देश की आम जनता के दिल पर बड़ी चोट लगी है और यह बहुत आवश्यक हो गया है कि उनके प्रशासन में सुधार लाने का काम केन्द्रीय सरकार अविलम्ब प्रारम्भ कर दे वरना हम लोगों का खात्मा हो जाने वाला है।

सैंटर में और राज्यों में सैक्रेड चैम्बर का रहना जरूरी नहीं है क्योंकि बीस साल का अनुभव बतला रहा है कि यह वास्तव में बेकार है और देश के ऊपर एक बहुत बड़ा

भारस्वरूप है और काफी पैसा इन पर व्यर्थ जाता है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जनता के पैसे से जो यह राज्यों में और सैंटर में सैक्रेड हाउस रखा है उसको ऐबालिश करना चाहिए। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार नहीं चाहती है कि सैक्रेड हाउस ऐबालिश हो क्योंकि हम अपने लोगों को इस तरह से बैंकडोर से अन्दर लेने के बादी हो गये हैं। लेकिन यह बैंकडोर से बादमी लेने से काम नहीं चलने वाला है। यह चुनाव मेरे जीवन का अन्तिम चुनाव है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह बैंकडोर से लेने वाला काम न किया जाय। अगर बैंकडोर से लेने वाला यह सिलसिला हमारे द्वारा जारी रखा गया तो इस देश में शीघ्र कान्ति आने वाली है और उम को प्रायः रोक नहीं सकते हैं। बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

श्री योगेश्वर शर्मा (बेगूसराय) सभापति महोदय, कबल इसके कि मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री द्वारा पेश किये गये बजट पर अपने विचार प्रकट करूँ अभी अभी हमारे डी० एम० के० के दोस्त और उसके पहले पी० एम० पी० के दोस्त ने अंग्रेजी भाषा में बोलने की जो विवशता प्रकट की है उम विवशता से हमें आशा है कि हम सभी बहुत दुःखी होंगे।

17 साल के भारतीय जनतांत्रिक विकास की इस ससद् में हमारे सदस्या को ऐसी भाषा में बोलने के लिए विवश होना पड़ता है जो इस देशवासियों की भाषा नहीं है। यह हमारे लिए दुःख और शर्म की बात है। इसलिए इस सवाल पर अपनी पार्टी की निश्चिन्त, भारतीय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की निश्चिन्त राय जाहिर करना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन में हिन्दी भाषा भाषियों को जो सुविधायें प्राप्त हैं वही सुविधायें तामिल भाषा भाषियों को, बंगला भाषा भाषियों को तेलगू भाषा भाषियों को और भारत के अन्य भाषा भाषियों को प्राप्त हो। वह भारत के जनतांत्रिक विकास में व भारत की एकता में

## [श्री योगेश्वर शर्मा]

बहुत बड़ा साधन है और हम समझते हैं कि यही तरीका है जिसके जरिये से हम अंग्रेजी को इस देश से निकाल सकते हैं। जिस तरीके से बहु भाषा भाषियों ने मिल कर अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ़ इस देश में लोहा लिया था और अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद को इस देश से निकाला था उसी तरीके से आज भारत के तमाम भाषा भाषियों की एकता की आवश्यकता है। समुक्त मोर्चे की आवश्यकता है। जिसके कि द्वारा भारतीय संस्कृति के विकास का रास्ता रोकने वाली, भारतीय जनतन्त्र का रास्ता रोकने वाली अंग्रेजी भाषा को हम अपने सांस्कृतिक और राजकीय जीवन से निकाल सकें।

महोदय जहाँ तक बजट का सवाल है वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि यह बजट अन्तरिम बजट है और उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया है कि कुछ दिनों के बाद जो वह वित्तीय नीति रक्खे उसे सिलसिले में उन्होंने हम से रचनात्मक सुझावों की आशा की है। हमारे बुजुर्ग मिश्र जी अभी कह रहे थे कि यह पहला मौका है कि रचनात्मक सुझावों की आशा की जाती है। उन्होंने बहुत ही सही चीज पर उगली रखी। ऐसा इसलिए हुआ है कि अब सदन में शक्तियों का समन्वय बदल गया है। हम मिश्र जी को कहेंगे कि जिस दिन विरोधी दल का बहुमत इस सदन में हो जायेगा उस दिन उनकी ज्यादा पूछ होगी और हम उनसे ज्यादा रचनात्मक सुझाव चाहेंगे। उस दिन को लाने की कोशिश करते-ब फ़िर उनकी उपेक्षा नहीं होगी, कांग्रेस बेंचों पर पीछे बैठने वाले सदस्यों की उपेक्षा नहीं होगी, उस दिन उन की पूछ होगी और उन के सुझावों का आदर होगा।

इस अन्तरिम बजट में हमारे देश की आर्थिक परिस्थिति का जो चित्र उपस्थित करने की कोशिश की गई है, हम समझते हैं कि वह चित्र भ्रष्टा है। हम समझते हैं कि आर्थिक परिस्थितियों की जो गम्भीरता है

हमारे देश में बढ़ते हुए आर्थिक संकट की जो यथार्थता है उसको बहुत ही कम कर के दिखाया गया है। इसीलिये बाबजूद इसके कि वित्त मंत्री ने एक बहुत ही यथार्थवादी विश्लेषण की बात की है लेकिन अभी भी वह अपने वित्तीय भाषण में देश की आर्थिक परिस्थिति की वास्तविकता से बहुत दूर है।

शायद उनको इस बात का ज्ञान हो कि इस रेशमी नगर दिल्ली में वे उस के दो चित्र देख सकते हैं। मैंने सुना है कि इस रेशमी नगर दिल्ली में एक सेवानगर है और दूसरा सुन्दर नगर है। वे दोनों इस रेशमी नगर दिल्ली की दो दुनियायें दो मानव समुदायों के चित्र हमारे सामने पेश करती हैं। नाम बड़ा अच्छा है : सेवानगर मगर उस सेवानगर में कौन लोग हैं ? चौथी ग्रेड के एम्प्लॉयीज। उनके लिये सेवानगर है और सुन्दरनगर देश के पूज्यपतियों का भ्रष्टा है। यह हमारे देश की राजधानी रेशमी नगर दिल्ली का एक विषम चित्र है। सेवानगर एक तरफ़ और सुन्दरनगर दूसरी तरफ़। उस सेवानगर में क्या हो रहा है ?

हो सकता है कि मैं एक ऐसे राज्य से आया हूँ जहाँ पर अभी अकाल और अभाव से जाहि जाहि मची हो, मगर हम समझते हैं कि यही हालत कमोबेश पूरे देश में है और बहुत ही संगीन है। अभाव ने, महंगी ने, अष्टाचार ने देश के आर्थिक जीवन को तहस नहस कर दिया है और हम महंगी में जाहि जाहि मची है।

अभी अभी कुछ दिन पहले मैं अपने एक दोस्त एम० पी० से मिलने रजित होटल में गया। वहाँ उन लोगों को, जो कि एम० पी० और दूसरे लोगों को खाना परोमते हैं, देखा कि वह जूठा खाना खाने के लिये मजबूर हैं। रजित होटल के मजबूर जूठा खाना खाने के लिये मजबूर हो रहे हैं। और हम कहते हैं कि हमारे

देश में विकास हो रहा है, हमारे देश में जनतांत्रिक विकास हो रहा है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले मैंने अखबारों में खबर पढ़ी कि बिहार के गया शहर की गलियों में एक तीस वर्ष की उम्र की हमारी बहन मातृत्व की ममता के प्रांचल में, आँखों के आसू में, अपने दस दिन के पैदा हुए बच्चे को लपेट कर चीख चीख कर भीख माग रही थी कि कोई इस दस दिन के पैदा हुए बच्चे को खरीदे ताकि मुझे पैसे मिलें, मैं पेट की आग बुझा सकूँ और मेरे बच्चे की जिन्दगी बच सके। वह भी हमारे देश की एक लड़की है, हमारी बहन है, हमारी बेटा है। दूसरी तरफ हम देश में रानियों को भी देखते हैं, महारानियों को भी देखते हैं। वे भी इसी भारत माता की बेटियाँ हैं, वे भी भारत माता की सन्ताने हैं। एक और आज हमारे देश की आर्थिक जिन्दगी की कठोरता और जड़ता में एक देवी अपने दस दिन के बच्चे को बँचने के लिए विवश होती है, दूसरी और रानियों के महल और उनकी रंगरलियाँ हैं। यह कैसी हमारे देश की एकता है? कैसे इस बढ़ती हुई विषमता की खाई में देश की एकता खूब रही है? यह जो हमारे लिये इतना बड़ा खतरा है, अगर इसकी ओर से आप अपनी आँखें मूँदेंगे तो आप अपने देश की एकता की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते। आज देश की एकता खतरे में इसलिये है कि आपने बीम साल तक देश में जो आर्थिक नीतियाँ अपनाई हैं उन्होंने विषमता को बढ़ाया है, और आर्थिक विषमता बढ़ते बढ़ते यहाँ तक पहुँच गई है कि आज 75 घराने देश की आर्थिक जिन्दगी को अपनी मुट्ठी में बाँधे हुए हैं। दूसरी तरफ लाखों करोड़ों इन्सान भुखमरी से लड रहे हैं। यह विषमता बढ़ती गई है बावजूद इसके कि हमारी सरकार समाजवाद की बात करती है। बावजूद इसके कि हमारे कांग्रेस के नेता और दूसरे लोग समाजवाद की बात करते हैं, पिछले बरों में हमारे देश में जो चीज पैदा हुई है वह है आर्थिक विषमता। एक तरफ पूँजीवाद का फैलाव और दूसरी तरफ मेहनत-

का जनता की गरीबी। जब हम इस विकास की वास्तविकता को देखते हैं तो जो हमारे कांग्रेस के दोस्त समाजवाद की बात करते हैं वह एक पाखण्ड हमको मालूम होता है। भाफ करें, यह पाखण्ड कांग्रेस राज्य की सब से बड़ी वास्तविकता है। वह बात करते हैं समाजवाद की और रचना करते हैं पूँजीवाद की। यह पाखण्ड कैसे इस देश की जनता को निर्माण के आन्दोलन में लगा सकता है। आज हम बात बड़ी अच्छी करते हैं...

श्री कमलनयन बजाज (वर्धा) माननीय सदस्य लोक सभा में बोल रहे हैं या कि स्टैंज पर बोल रहे हैं?

श्री रणधीर सिंह: यह स्पीच है या मदारि का तमाशा?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा: आज जनता निराश है। वह निराश क्यों है? क्या हमारे देश की जनता देश की रचना नहीं करना चाहती? विकास नहीं करना चाहती? यह विकास करना चाहती है, लेकिन वह अपने सरकारी नेताओं की ओर देखती है तो निराश हो जाती है।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of order. I do not know the name of the hon. Member who was interrupting just now as the hon. Member who is on his legs was speaking.

An hon. Member: Shri Randhir Singh.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Randhir Singh or Ranbir Singh?

He said:

आप मदारि है या स्पीकर?

'Madari' means juggler.

Shri Randhir Singh: I said: Is it a speech or Madari ka Tamasha

श्री ए० ए० बनर्जी: मुझे आप हिन्दी न सिखाइये। मैं हिन्दी बहुत अच्छी तरह जानता हूँ।

I know Hindi. Kindly withdraw it.



श्री रघुवीर सिंह: मैं मे क्लब था कि यह स्पीच है या मदारी का समाप्ति।

If it is felt like that, I withdraw it

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour) It is a very sad state of affairs in this country and on top of that this sort of remark should never be made on a speech made here

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी अगर मैं मदारी होता तो आप को जम्हरा बना देता।

Shri Randhur Singh, I withdraw it

Mr. Chairman Shri Sharma may continue

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा: सभापति महोदय मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि इस वित्तीय बजट में जो हमारे देश की आर्थिक परिस्थिति का विश्लेषण किया गया है वह सारा उगा नहीं है। हमारी हालत ज्यादा सगीन और ज्यादा खतरनाक है। मच तो यह है कि हम बड़े ही गहरे और भीषण आर्थिक सकट में आ गये हैं। क्यों आ गये? क्या कारण है? हम समझते हैं कि जहा तक आर्थिक सकट की हकीकत का सवाल है, शायद ही उस से कोई इन्कार करे। उस का कम कर के आप बनला सकते है लेकिन उस के अस्तित्व में इन्कार नहीं कर सकते, और विल मवी भी नहीं कर सकते। उन को उमे स्वीकार करना पडा आर्थिक सकट का स्वीकार करना पडा। लेकिन हमे अफसाम है कि उन्होंने उस के विश्लेषण में उस का जो कारण बतलाया है वह बिल्कुल गलत है। उन्होंने कारण क्या बतलाया है? बतलाया कि सूखा पड गया और इसी लिये सारी गडबडिया हो गई। माफ करे, हम समझते है कि यह विल बहुलावे की बात है। इसमें कोई शक नही कि सूखे न हमारी हालत को और भी सगीन बना दिया है, लेकिन एक चीज को आप न ले।

आप कीमत के सवाल को ले लें। पिछले साल 20 फीसदी मूल्यो में वृद्धि

हुई, लेकिन क्या आप अपने सालाना-काज का एक साल भी ऐसा बतला सकते हैं, जब कि इस देश में मूल्यो में वृद्धि न हुई हो? दूसरी पक्षसाखा योजना के काल में 30 फीसदी वृद्धि मूल्यो में हुई, तीसरी पक्षसाखा योजना काल में 36 4 फीसदी वृद्धि हुई। जब हम मूल्यो की वृद्धि के खिलाफ आवाज उठाते थे और माग करते थे कि मूल्यो वृद्धि पर रोक लगाइये, तो आप के प्रतिनिधि, आप की बेचा पर बैठन वाले लोग कहते थे कि चुक वष में विकास हो रहा है इस में मूल्यो में वृद्धि हो रही है। विकास होगा तो मूल्यो में वृद्धि होगी। अब जब सूखा है, अकाल है, अविकास है तब भी मूल्यो में वृद्धि होती है। सूखा हो अकाल हो तो उमसे मूल्य में वृद्धि और विकास हो तो भी मूल्य में वृद्धि, हर हालत मूल्य में वृद्धि। वह इस लिये कि आप न जा व्यवस्था अपनाई है आप न जो विकास का रास्ता अपनाया है, वह है पूजीवादी रास्ता। आप इस लिये मूल्य वृद्धि को खामखवाह कारगर इधियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल करते है ताकि आप क पूजीपतिया का मुनाफा बड़े पूजीपतिया का मुनाफा बढाना ही आपका उद्देश्य रहा है। उम उद्देश्य की प्राप्ति के लिए आप साल-ब-साल कदम उठाते रहे है गार मूल्यो का आप बढ़ाने रहे है। एक भी माल आप बताये पहली योजना या दूसरी योजना का या तीसरी योजना का जिम साल आपन मूल्य न बढ़ाय हो और पूजापतियो का लाभ न पहुंचाया हो। जब हमारे देश में बड़ी अच्छी फसल हुई तब भी मूल्य बढ़। वह वृद्धि निरन्तर हाती गई है। यहा के जा इजारेदार है टाटा विडला, गायनका अदि वे आपके दोस्त है। वे चाहते है कि मूल्यो में वृद्धि हो ताकि उनका मुनाफा बढ़े और आप उनकी इस दृष्टा का पूरा करते गए हैं।

श्री शक्ति भूषण राजवैद्यो (खारगोन) चीन न जोकि दोस्त है, उसने हमला भी तो किया था। उनको आप क्यों भूल जाते हैं?

श्री बीनेन्द्र शर्मा: सभापति महोदय,  
मैं चाहता हूँ कि ये जो उत्पटांग बातें करती  
हैं, इनको आप रोकें।

मैं निवेदन यह कर रहा था कि यह जो  
अवगमनोत्पत्ति है, यह जो विप्लव है मूलत  
है कि केवल सूखे वगैरह के कारण मूल्यों में  
वृद्धि हुई है। यदि ऐसी बात होती तो उन  
वर्षों में क्यों मूल्य वृद्धि हुई जिन वर्षों में  
सूखा नहीं पड़ा था और हमारी फसल बहुत  
अच्छी हुई थी। आपने एक नीति के तौर  
पर मूल्य वृद्धि की है। बावजूद इस बात  
के कि आपने भाषणों में आप मूल्य वृद्धि को  
रोकने की बात कहते रहे हैं, किताबों में इस  
बात को लिखते रहे हैं, योजनाओं के प्रावधानों  
में कहते रहे हैं, आप जानबूझ कर मूल्य  
वृद्धि करते गए हैं। यह आप इसलिए करते  
गए हैं कि पूँजीपतियों का मुनाफा बढ़े और  
जो मेहनतकश है उनको जो मेहनताना मिलता  
है मूल्य बढ़ा कर उसका एक हिस्सा उन  
से छीन लिया जाए। जो नीति आपने अपनाई  
है उमका नतीजा यह निकला है कि आज  
चारों तरफ अन्धकार ही अन्धकार हमें नजर  
आता है और पता नहीं चलता है कि हम किधर  
जायें। कुछ कहते हैं कि अमरीका की  
ओर जाओ, अमरीका की शरण में जाओ  
तो कुछ कहते हैं कि जहाँ के नहाँ रहो।  
मैं समझना हूँ कि हम उसी हालत में देश को  
बचा सकते हैं, देश की जनता की जिन्दगी  
को बचा सकते हैं, लोगों की जिन्दगी में बहार  
ला सकते हैं, देश की आजादी को मजबूत  
कर सकते हैं, देश को विकसित और उन्नत  
कर सकते हैं यदि हमने पिछले बीस सालों में  
पूँजीपतियों का विकास का जो रास्ता अपनाया  
है उसको त्याग दें। आज की दुनिया में जितने  
भी राष्ट्र स्वतंत्र हुए हैं उन में से किसी ने भी  
इस रास्ते को अपना कर, पूँजीवादी रास्ते  
को अपना कर उन्नति नहीं की, वह भागे नहीं  
बढ़ा है, उसने देश की गरीबी दूर नहीं की है ..

- Mr. Chairman: May I interrupt the  
hon. Member? He can continue his  
speech later.

2773 (A) LSD—7.

Shri Morarji Deesai: He has taken  
more time.

Mr. Chairman: He has taken 15  
minutes.

16.52 hrs.

#### STATEMENT RE. LOCKOUT IN TIMES OF INDIA

The Minister of Labour and Rehabil-  
itation (Shri Hathi): As the House  
is aware, the Wage Boards for work-  
ing journalists and the Wage Board for  
non-journalists have given interim  
awards. The recommendations were  
notified by Government on 23-11-64  
and 9-4-65 respectively. The manage-  
ment of the Times of India did not  
implement the recommendations. On  
the issue of implementation of recom-  
mendations for journalists, the mana-  
gement has filed a petition in the High  
Court at Bombay challenging the vali-  
dity of the Government interim relief  
order for working journalists. So far  
as the recommendations for the non-  
journalists are concerned, they have  
taken various grounds for not imple-  
menting them.

The workers went on strike on  
17-2-67 on the ground that the em-  
ployer had not paid the interim re-  
lief granted by the two Wage Boards  
appointed by the Government of  
India.

The management declared lock-out  
on 27-2-67. The Maharashtra Gov-  
ernment has taken up the matter in  
conciliation in Delhi, the question has  
been taken up by the Labour Com-  
missioner of the Delhi Administration.  
The question, both for Bombay and  
Delhi, has however been taken up by  
the senior officers of the Labour Min-  
istry with the management and the  
workers. For the last few days, ne-  
gotiations are going on and I have  
appealed to both the parties that in  
the interest of cordial relations