

13.04 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till  
Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch  
at five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

RE: STRIKE IN PATNA UNIVERSITY

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Shri Maharaj Sing Bharati.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : मेरा एक निवेदन है। पटना यूनिवर्सिटी बन्द कर दी गई है। वहाँ के कर्मचारी पिछली पांच तारीख से हड़ताल पर हैं। बिहार गवर्नमेंट ने कांशिश की है कि उसका कोई रास्ता निकले लेकिन कोई रास्ता अभी तक नहीं निकल सका। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्री महाशय इस सिलसिले में एक बयान दें और कांशिश करके, हस्तक्षेप करके मामले को तय करें। अगर उन्होंने ऐसा किया तो उनकी मांगों पर विचार हो सकता है और कोई रास्ता निकल सकता है। विद्यार्थियों की पढ़ाई वहाँ बन्द हो गई है, परीक्षाएँ बन्द हो गई हैं अगर इस ओर ध्यान न दिया गया तो स्थिति और ज्यादा खराब हो जाएगी, ऐसा खतरा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्री जी इस बारे में एक स्टेटमेंट सदन में दें।

14.06 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET 1970-71—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Maharaj Sing Bharati may now continue his speech.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ) : विरोधियों की तरफ से जो दो मज्जान कांग्रेस विरोधी और स्वतंत्र पार्टी की तरफ से बोले हैं उन्होंने कहा है कि इस सरकार ने राजस्व को ज्यादा आँका है। मैं नहीं जानता कि किस खयाल से उन्होंने ऐसा कहा है। हो सकता है कि राजस्व कम आँका जाता तो ज्यादा टेक्स लगते। लेकिन

मेरा इलजाम तो ठीक इसके विपरीत है। जब डायरेक्ट और इंडायरेक्ट दोनों प्रकार के टेक्सों की चारों रोकने की बात सरकार करती है और साथ ही साथ बैंकलाग को भ्रच्छी तरह से वसूल करने की बात सरकार करती है तो मेरे खयाल से जितना राजस्व आँका गया है, वह कम है, इससे ज्यादा राजस्व आएगा और इस तरह से जो कुछ जरूरी चीजों पर टेक्स लगे हैं वे घटाये जा सकते थे।

सरकार विरोधी कांग्रेस के नेता ने जो बजट की नुकताचीनी की है उस में उन्होंने कहा है कि उन्हें पुराने बजटों में और इस नए बजट में कोई मौलिक अन्तर नजर नहीं आता। अगर सचमुच दोनों कांग्रेसों को कोई अन्तर नजर नहीं आता तो फिर कुर्सी के झगड़े में वह विरोध में क्यों आ कर बैठ गए हैं ? आराम के साथ उनको उधर चले जाना चाहिये। ऐसा करके कम से कम हमारे हिस्से का जो समय वे ले जाते हैं, वह तो बच सकता है। प्रधान मंत्री से भी मैं कहूँगा कि कोई मौलिक अन्तर नहीं है तो पुचकार कर उनको वह वापिस बुला ले, इस में कोई बुरी बात नहीं है।

स्वतंत्र पार्टी के नेता श्री मसानी ने इस बजट के सिलसिले में कई तरह कि बातें कही। लेकिन आखिर में यह कहा कि यह बजट स्टेट कैपिटलिज्म का बजट है। अगर यह मामूली छोटा बजट कम्युनिज्म का बजट हो गया तो कल को अगर कोई सचमुच समाजवादी बजट आ गया तो मसानी साहाब क्या करेंगे। मैं आशा नहीं करता था मसानी साहाब जैसे आदमी से कि इतने छोटे से बजट को देख कर वह दुनिया के एक महान लैनिन जैम आदमी को नीचे स्तर पर उतर कर गाली देंगे। अगर कल को कोई समाजवादी बजट आ गया तो फिर वह क्या करेंगे ? क्या अपने कपड़े फाड़ेंगे, आगरे जायेंगे, क्या करेंगे ? यह आशा उनसे नहीं की जा सकती थी। जब कोई योगी भ्रष्ट होता है तो वह गृहस्थियों से बहुत घटिया साबिन होता है। इसी तरह में जब कोई समाजवादी भ्रष्ट

[ श्री महाराज सिंह भारती ]

होता है तो वह घटिया से घटिया पूंजीवादी से भी नीचे जाने की कोशिश करता है।

एक बात मसानी साहाब ने और कही। उसका एक इलाज, एक समझौते का मार्ग मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि पूंजीवाद में एक रूपया लगता है, तो सात पैसे की वापसी आती है और जब सरकारी सेक्टर में एक रूपया लगता है तो दो पैसे की वापसी आती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि काम बहुत आसान हो गया। मैं नहीं जानता सरकारी पक्ष मेरी बात को मानेगा या नहीं और मसानी साहाब भी मानेंगे या नहीं। ऐसा कर लें अगर आपको मंजूर हो। सरकारी पक्ष में भी एच एम टी में घड़िया बनाने का काम होता है। इस्ट्रुमेंट्स फैक्ट्री भी है। उनमें सात पैसे से भी ज्यादा मुनाफा होता है। इस तरह में यह साबित होता है कि कंज्यूमर गूड्स जो है, उनमें मुनाफा कमाने की योग्यता तो सरकार में भी है। अब ऐसा करें कि जितनी कंज्यूमर गूड्स की इंडस्ट्री है वह सब तो दो दो सरकार को क्योंकि वह इनका चला लेती है आराम से और कम्पेंसेशन की शकल में दो चार सौ करोड़ रुपये का फोलाद का कारखाना प्राइवेट सेक्टर को थमा दिया जाय, जिसको वह बढ़िया चला सकता है। या फिर उस को एक दो बांधों या नहरों का काम दे दिया जाय, पटना में जो तीस करोड़ रुपये का पुल बनने वाला है, वह उस को दे दिया जाय।

कुछ जरूरी कामों के लिए बजट में व्यवस्था की जाती है, लेकिन जब सरकार वे काम न करे: उन के लिए निर्धारित रकम को लौटा देती है, तो हमें बहुत शिकायत होती है। उदाहरण के लिए पिछले बजट में कृषि तथा वैज्ञानिक विभाग में 6 करोड़ रूपया सड़के कम बनाने में 17 करोड़ रूपया और कल्पक्कम बिजली घर के सम्बन्ध में 5 करोड़ रूपया बचाया गया। हम लोग इस सदन में भावण दे सरकार का बजट मंजूर हो, जिस में बढ़िया कामों के लिए रूपया दिया गया हो लेकिन सरकार उन कामों

पर वह रूपया खर्च न करे दूसरे कामों पर खर्च करे सदन इस बात को माफ नहीं कर सकता है।

सरकार की ओर से कहा गया है कि देश में बेरोजगारी को दूर करने के लिए कुछ कदम उठाए जा रहे हैं। बिरोधी दल के सदस्य भी यही चाहते हैं। मैं एक मौलिक बात की ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम बेरोजगारी दूर करने की बात करते हैं, तो आखिर रोजगार देने में हमारा मतलब क्या है। रोजगार देने का मतलब यह हरगिज नहीं है कि आज के वैज्ञानिक युग में किसी को बान बांटने की मशीन दे दी जाये। बुनियादी उद्योग धंधों में उन्नत जापान जैसे देश में औद्योगिक उत्पादन का पचास सेकड़ा कुटीर उद्योगों से आता है और उस के निर्यात का साठ सेकड़ा भी कुटीर उद्योगों में आता है। हमारे मंत्री जापान गये हैं और वहाँ के हालात को देख कर आये हैं। कुटीर उद्योग का जो मतलब जापान ने लगाया है, अगर वही मतलब हिन्दुस्तान में भी लगाया जाये, तो यहाँ सचमुच समाजवाद आ जायेगा और उस से देश का भला होगा।

जो चीज अमरीका और अन्य देशों में करोड़ों रूपयों की पूंजी लगा कर बड़े पैमाने पर बनाई जाती है, उस के एक एक पुर्जे को अलग अलग कर के, उन पुर्जों का स्टैंडर्डइजेशन कर के, उसके कच्चे माल का स्टैंडर्डइजेशन कर के, लोगों को उन के घरों में मशीनें दे कर, उन पुर्जों को बनाने का प्रशिक्षण दे कर, कुटीर उद्योग के रूप में अलग अलग लोगों से बनवा कर, और उन को जोड़ कर, उतनी ही बढ़िया चीज जापान में तैयार की जाती है। उस काम को पढ़ने वाला विद्यार्थी भी करता है। लोगों को उन के घर में ही रोजगार दिया जाता है और इस प्रकार ऐसा बढ़िया माल तैयार किया जाता है, जो आधुनिक युग में दुनिया के अन्य देशों के उत्पादन से कम्पीट कर सकता है, जो सस्ता होता है और जिस के उत्पादन पर पूंजी भी कम लगती है। सरकार उस नीति पर चल

कर लोगों को उन के घरों में ही रोजगार दे । रोजगार देने के लिए सब दुनिया को दिल्ली में लाने की जरूरत नहीं है । देश के गांवों, कस्बों और शहरों में रहते हुए ही रोजगार उपलब्ध किया जा सकता है ।

यह काम बड़ा है, लेकिन जब यह सरकार समाजवादी होने का दावा करती है, तो उस को कम से कम इस दिशा में शुरूआत तो करनी चाहिए थी । उसके नतीजे आठ दस माल से पहले नहीं निकलेंगे । लेकिन इस बजट में इस तरह की कोई चीज दिखाई नहीं देती है ।

पहले जब अमरीका से आमान शर्तों पर गेहूं उधार मिला, तो उसकी वजह से हमारी खेती चौपट हो गई । जब 1954 में देश में बम्पर क्राप हुई थी, तब इस सरकार की प्राइम पालिसी तो रुपये मन गेहूं खरीदने की थी, क्योंकि अमरीका से सस्ते भाव पर अनाज लाकर उसका नगद बेच कर अपना काम चला लिया जाता था । जब अमरीका की शर्तें कठिन हो गईं, जब वह पाटेंट पैमेंट डालर्स में मांगने लगा तो देश में हरी क्रान्ति दिखाई देने लगी ।

जहां तक दुध का सम्बन्ध है, अब तक उस का उत्पादन उपेक्षित रहा है । मुझे लगता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार जो नीति अपनाते जा रही है, वह पी० एल०-480 की नीति है जिससे दुध बिल्कुल चौपट होने जा रहा है । आस्ट्रेलिया, न्यूजीलैंड, अमरीका और कुछ यूरो-पियन देशों से बचा हुआ फालतु धी और दुध-चूर्ण हमारी सरकार को डोनेट होने जा रहा है, जिसके आधार पर बड़ी योजनाएँ बनाई जा रही हैं । उसका नतीजा क्या निकलने वाला है ? इस देश में 1,20 हजार टन दुध-चूर्ण और 42 हजार टन धी आयेगा, जिस की कीमत उन देशों के हिसाब से 42 करोड़ रुपये होगी, जबकि सरकार उसको यहाँ के उपभोक्ताओं को बेच कर 95.40 करोड़ रुपये बमूल करेगी ।

सरकार का कहना है कि इस समय देश के चार बड़े शहरों को, जिनमें दिल्ली भी है

10 लाख लिटर दुध दिया जा रहा है, लेकिन बाहर से आने वाले दुध-चूर्ण की सहायता से वह इन शहरों को 27½ लाख लिटर दुध सप्लाई कर सकेगी । मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे इन शहरों के लोगों को तात्कालिक राहत और लाभ तो मिलेगा, लेकिन जिस दिन यह पोल का माल खत्म हो जायेगा, उस के बाद अगर सरकार कहेगी कि दो रुपये लिटर के हिसाब से दुध दे दो, तो किमान कहेगा कि दुध परनाले में पैदा नहीं होता है, मैंने भंडा रखना बन्द कर दिया है, दुध कहाँ से दूँ । सरकार को एक ऐसी दीर्घ-कालिन योजना बनानी चाहिए जिस के अन्तर्गत अपने देश में ही दुध का उत्पादन बढ़े । आश्विन दिल्ली के चारों तरफ दुध का उत्पादन क्यों नहीं बढ़ता है ? बम्बई वालों को भंडा मिलती है मेहमाने से और उत्तर प्रदेश वालों मिलती है हरियाणा से । दोनों को एक भाव पर भंडा मिलती है । लेकिन इन दोनों स्थानों पर दुध का भाव क्या है ! कांग्रेस के बैचिज पर बैठने वाले एक मज्जन किसान हैं, जो अपना दुध बेचते हैं । वह 1 रुपया 30 पैसे लिटर के हिसाब से बम्बई की दुध स्कीम को दुध बेचते हैं और 1 रुपया 60 पैसे लिटर के हिसाब से बेचते हैं बम्बई की को-ऑपरेटिव यूनियन को, जो उस दुध को 1 रुपया 70 पैसे लिटर के हिसाब से बेचती है ।

बम्बई के लोगों को मूंगफली और बिनौले की खली सस्ती मिलती है । लेकिन वह यहाँ मिलती नहीं है और अगर मिलती भी है, तो बहुत तेज भाव पर । उत्तर प्रदेश के गांवों में जिस भाव पर खली बिक रही है, उसी भाव पर दुध बिक रहा है । जो सरसों की खली मिलती है, उसमें प्रांटीन नहीं होता है । वह शक्तिदायक नहीं है, बल्कि बेवज्र खाना पचाने के चुर्ण का काम करती है । दोनों जगह भंडा का भाव एक ही है लेकिन बम्बई के किमानों को दुध का दूना दाम मिलता है । फिर शिकायत की जाती है कि दिल्ली के ग्राम-ग्राम दुध की पैदावार नहीं हो रही है या तो बम्बई में भी उसी भाव पर दुध बिकवाया जाय, जिस भाव

## [ श्री महाराज सिंह भारती ]

पर हमारे यहां विकता है, या फिर हमारे भाव को तेज किया जाये। अगर लोगों को ज्यादा दूध देना है, तो दूध की पैदावार बढ़ानी पड़ेगी। मैं श्री मधोक का कहना चाहता हूं कि मुफत का दूध-चूर्ण मंगा कर दिल्ली वालों को चार दिन तक तो खुश कर सकते हैं, लेकिन बाद में चाय बे: लिए भी, दो रुपये किलो पर भी, दूध नहीं मिल पायेगा।

**श्री बलराज मधोक (दक्षिण) :** मैं माननीय सदस्य से पूरी तरह सहमत हूं।

**श्री महाराज सिंह भारती :** दुध का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं। ये बातें छोटी हैं, लेकिन उनसे नतीजे बड़े हैं। जहां तक कृत्रिम गर्भाधान का सम्बंध है, वह उड़ीसा में पूरी तरह कामयाब हुआ है, वहीं पर वह आधा कामयाब हुआ है, लेकिन भेरे मुबे में वह मुकम्मल तौर पर फेल हुआ है। इसका कारण यह है कि वह अन-क्वालिफाइड आदमी, स्टाकमेन, जिसको गांव वाले डाक्टर कहते हैं, यह ध्यान तो रखता है कि कितनी भैंसें गाभन की गईं, लेकिन उसके रजिस्टर में यह हिसाब नहीं है कि उनमें से कितनी ब्याही गईं। खराब, पतला, घटिया वीर्य के इस्तेमाल और लगाने की प्रणाली में दोष होने का नतीजा यह है कि कृत्रिम गर्भाधान करने के आठ महीने बाद पता चलता है कि भैंस ब्याहने वाली नहीं है। इस तरह 1500 रुपये की भैंस सिर्फ 200 रुपये की रह जाती है आज स्थिति यह है कि किसानों कृत्रिम गर्भाधान कि योजना पर विश्वास नहीं रह गया है और वे दो रुपये दे कर अपनी भैंस को किसी कूड़ा ढोने वाले भैंसे से नया करवा लेते हैं, लेकिन कृत्रिम गर्भाधान के जरिये बढ़िया वीर्य से फायदा उठाने के लिये तैयार नहीं होते हैं। परिणाम यह है कि गाय-भैंस की बढ़िया नस्ल घटिया बनती जा रही है।

जब दो कांग्रेसें हो गई हैं, जिनमें से एक समाजवादी कांग्रेस है, तो उस को उन बुनि-

यादी नीतियों को भी बदलना पड़ेगा, जिन के कारण चीनी चौपट हो गई है। अब तक यह स्थिति रही है कि एक साल चीनी का ओवर-प्राइक्शन होता है, अगले साल ठीक प्राइक्शन होता है, उससे अगले साल कम प्राइक्शन और उससे अगले साल क्राइसिस। आजादी के बाद से अब तक यह पांच साल का चक्र चलता रहा है। जब गन्ने के दाम बढ़ जाते हैं, तो किसान लोग ज्यादा गन्ना बोने लगते हैं और गन्ने का प्राइक्शन बढ़ जाता है, लेकिन जब सरकार द्वारा उनकी पिटाई हो जाती है, तो वे प्राइक्शन को कम कर देते हैं। इस साल 42 लाख टन चीनी पैदा होगी, अगले साल 30 लाख टन से ज्यादा नहीं होगी, उससे अगले साल 22 लाख टन से ज्यादा नहीं होगी और फिर सरकार को गन्ने का भाव 18 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल देना पड़ेगा। इस वक्त वह 10 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल नहीं दे सकती है लेकिन उम वक्त 18 रुपये प्रति-क्विंटल दे सकती है।

दस मन गन्ने से एक मन चीनी बनती है। इस तरह एक किलो चीनी पर एक रुपया लागत आनी चाहिए। उसमें पच्चीस पैसे बनाने की लागत और पच्चीस पैसे सरकार का टैक्स जोड़ कर उपभोक्ताओं को डेढ़ रुपये प्रति-किलो के हिसाब से देनी चाहिए। सरकार उस को सब-सिद्धाज कर के एक रुपये किलो के हिसाब से चीनी बाहर भी भेज सकती है। इस समय तो चीनी उद्योग भिल-मालिकों का उद्योग है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं चीनी उद्योग के सिलसिले में, आज तो उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार और बिहार की सरकार ने बड़े आराम से कह दिया है कि इनका राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए। मैं भी सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं होना है तो क्या होना है? आज के जमाने में चीनी के कारखाने दुनिया में कोई नहीं लगाता। चीनी के काम्प्लेक्स लगाए जाते हैं। काम्प्लेक्स और कारखाने में फर्क है। आप सिर्फ चीनी का कारखाना लगाएँ तो वह ठीक नहीं होगा।

जैसे पेट्रोलियम की रिफाइनरी कोई कामयाब नहीं हो सकती, उसके बदले पेट्रोलियम का काम्प्लेक्स भ्रगर आप लगाते हैं तो उस की प्रसली कीमत दूसरे वाई-प्रॉडक्ट्स के रूप में आपको मिल जाती है और पेट्रोलियम आप अलग से मिल जाता है। ठीक इसी तरह से आज के जमाने में चीनी वाई-प्रॉडक्ट्स ही जाती है और उसके जो दूसरे प्रॉडक्ट्स हैं उससे मोम निकालते हैं, उससे रंग निकालते हैं, उस की खोई से न्युज प्रिन्ट बनाते हैं, बॉर्ड बनाते हैं और उसके शीरे से तरह तरह की चिजें बनाते हैं स्परिट से लेकर पावर अलकोहल तक बनाते हैं उनकी तरफ अगर ध्यान न रखा जाय और खाली आप चीनी की मिल चलाना चाहें तो कभी भी यह उद्योग बढ़िया नहीं सकता। यह काम कब होगा ? इस के लिये अरबों रुपये की जरूरत है। यह टूट-गुजिए पूंजीपति जिन्होंने 18 लाख में मिल खड़ी की और डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया मुनाफा का कमा लिया मशीन टूटी पड़ी है, उसको भी ठीक नहीं कराते, यह अरबी रुपया कहां से लगाएंगे। और इस मुल्क में चीनी की इंडस्ट्री तभी पनप सकती है जब अरबों रुपये उसमें लगें। अरबों रुपये तब लग सकते हैं और काम्प्लेक्स तब बन सकते हैं जब सरकार इनका नेशनलाइज करे। एक बात और ध्यान में रखनी पड़ेगी आज तक जो मिलें चलती हैं यह किसान के लिए नहीं चलती हैं। यह मिल मालिकों के लिए चलती हैं या सरकार के टैक्स के लिए चलती हैं। अगर किसान के लिए चलाई जाती तो फिर अक्तूबर के महीने से उत्तर भारत में मिलें चलतीं और सरकार कहती कि अक्तूबर में बनी चीनी पर कोई पैसा नहीं लिया जायेगा। इसके बाद नवम्बर से आधा लिया जायगा और दिसम्बर से पूरा लिया जायगा। क्यों कि अक्तूबर नवम्बर दिसम्बर में जो मेरा खेत खाली होगा उसमें गेहूं पैदा हो सकेगा। लेकिन आप मुझे भ्रज-बूर करते हैं कि जनवरी में मैं अपना खेत खाली करूँ शूक करूँ और फिर मजबूर करते हैं कि मैं जून तक अपना खेत ऐसे ही रखूँ। इसलिए किसान के हित में यह पालिसी नहीं

है। इस पालिसी को इस समाजवादी सरकार को तो कमसे कम बदल ही देना चाहिए। किसानों के हिसाब से मिल चलनी चाहिए। आखिर में मैं यह कहूंगा कि मिल गन्ने पर ही नहीं चलनी चाहिए। बल्कि चलनी चाहिए चुकन्दर पर और चुकन्दर के मिनिमम भाव आप को तय कर देने चाहिए क्यों कि भ्रगर चुकन्दर के मिनिमम भाव तय नहीं करेंगे तो कोई चुकन्दर बाने वाला नहीं है।

ठीक इसी तरह से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि खांडसारी और चीनी इन दोनों का जरा मुकाबिला फरमाइए। चीनी निकलती है दस सैकड़ा और खांडसारी निकलती है 5 सैकड़ा। चीनी का दाम जितना है उससे 60 सैकड़ा खांडसारी का दाम है। यानी जितने गन्ने में 30 रुपये की चीनी निकलती है उतने गन्ने में 30 रुपये की खांडसारी निकलती है और उस पर भी जब 30 रुपये की खांडसारी निकलती है आप टैक्स थोप देते हैं। तो आप कहना क्या चाहते हैं ? या तो इस समाजवादी सरकार में इतना दम हो कि खांडसारी के लोग जो गन्ना खरीदते हैं वह वही दाम दें किसानों को 7 रुपये .37 पैसे बिबंटल और अगर वह नहीं देना चाहते तो आप जितना पैसा खांडसारी से लेते हैं, जितना टैक्स लेते हैं वह खांडसारी वाले नहीं देते हैं, वह मैं दे रहा हूँ। चार रुपये बिबंटल गन्ना बिक रहा है। तो वह टैक्स मैं दे रहा हूँ। बजाय उस सन्सिडी देने के आप टैक्स लगाते हैं तो वह अच्छा नहीं दिखाई देता।

इसी तरह से श्रीमन घोरा सा फौलाद के सिलसिले मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। अपने यहां के फौलाद की दुनिया में बहुत मांग है और हम से अच्छी फौलाद का आयरन किसी और के पास नहीं है। लेकिन क्या वजह है हमारा कास्ट आफ प्रॉडक्शन ज्यादा है सिर्फ एक ही वजह है कि जो कोयला हम इस्तेमाल करते हैं वह बहुत घटिया है। 22 सैकड़ा ऐश कन्टेन्ट का कोयला हम इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं। घाने के

[श्री महाराज सिंह भारती]

बाद भी 17 परसेंट से नीचे ऐश कंटेन्ट नहीं आता है। और फिर जो डोलोमाइट और चूना लगाना पड़ता है वह अलग। मेरे एक सवाल के जवाब में उन्होंने कहा है कि अगर एक परसेंट ऐश कंटेन्ट बढ़ जाय तो तीन परसेंट एफिशियेंसी घट जाती है। जापान वाले 8 परसेंट ऐश कंटेन्ट का कोयला इस्तेमाल करते हैं। आस्ट्रेलिया से मंगा कर और हमारा घोने के बाद भी 17 परसेंट आता है। 9 परसेंट ऐश कंटेन्ट फालतू होने से 27 परसेंट हमारी क्षमता घट जाती है और हमारी भट्टी 27 परसेंट फौलाद कम बनाएगी, तो निश्चित रूप से दाम ज्यादा आएंगे और हम कम्पीट नहीं कर सकेंगे। इस मुल्क में राजनैतिक आन्दोलन होते हैं कि फौलाद का कारखाना यहां लगाओ वहां लगाओ। मैं कहता हूँ हमारी फौलाद की मिलें समुद्र के किनारे होनी चाहिए और सारा कोयला बाहर से आना चाहिए। हमारे जो इस के एक्सपर्ट्स हैं उन्होंने कहा था कि आप हम को कोयला बाहर से मंगा कर दीजिए, जितना कोयला आप बाहर से मंगाएंगे, उसमें जितना फोरेन एक्सचेंज खर्च होगा हम उतना ज्यादा स्टील बना कर देंगे और उस को एक्सपोर्ट कर के वह भी फोरेन एक्सचेंज दे देंगे और, और भी विदेशी मुद्रा आप को देंगे। लेकिन पता नहीं किन कारणों से आज ऐसा किधा जा रहा है। कम से कम भविष्य के लिये इस का ध्यान रखा जाय। साथ में एक बात और बताना चाहता हूँ। क्या वजह है कि टाटा साहाब को कोयला 14 परसेन्ट ऐश कंटेन्ट का मिलता है और आप को 22 परसेन्ट का मिलता है? इसी मुल्क से दोनों के कोयले आते हैं। इसी लिए कि शुरू में जो कोयले के खदान लगे हैं प्राइवेट खदान वह बढ़िया कोयले के खदान शुरू में लगे और सरकारी पब्लिक सेक्टर तब आया है जब घटिया कोयला रह गया। इसलिए उनको 14 परसेन्ट ऐश कंटेन्ट वाला मिल जाता है और पब्लिक सेक्टर को नहीं मिल पाता है। इसलिए उन का राष्ट्रीयकरण अगर आप नहीं करोगे कोयले की खदानों का तो स्वाम-

खाह पब्लिक सेक्टर में हमें घाटा रहेगा और मसानी साहाब बोलेंगे कि हम को पब्लिक सेक्टर चलाना नहीं आता। इस बात पर नहीं बोलेंगे कि टाटा मार देता है बढ़िया कोयला। मैं थोड़ा सा ट्रेक्टर्स के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। दुर्गापुर में जो हमारा रिसर्च और डेवलपमेंट सेक्शन है उसने एक टेक्टर डेवलप किया है और मुझे उस पर नाज है। दुनिया में उस तरह का कोई ट्रेक्टर नहीं है। क्यों नहीं है क्यों कि फर्ग्यूसन की हाइड्रोलिक सबसे बढ़िया मानी जाती है। बड़े पेटेंट है। कोई नकल नहीं कर सकता। लेकिन उसमें एक ऐब था। उसमें दो लिबर थे। किसान दोनों से काम नहीं ले सकता था। दुर्गापुर वालों ने दो के वजाय एक लिबर बना दिया है। एक लिबर से कंट्रोल करना सिखा दिया है। इस लिए काम करने में आसानी होगी। यह उससे भी अच्छा है। उस का पेटेंट करा लिया है, बड़े पेटेंट, सब से बढ़िया। पर मुझे डर है उसका कोई इस्तेमाल नहीं होने जा रहा है। जितर ट्रेक्टर आना चाहिए, लगना चाहिए, बनना चाहिए, उसको लेकर झगडा डाल दिया गया है। शुरू में उन्होंने प्रोटो-टाइप बना कर दे दिया और उन्होंने कहा कि यह सर्वोत्तम है। लेकिन हमारे अफसरों ने कहा कि हम नहीं मानते। फिर बुदनी के ट्रेक्टर टेस्टिंग स्टेशन की रिपोर्ट आई कि यही सर्वोत्तम है। तब कहते हैं कि भानना तो पड़ेगा पर ऐसा करो कि दस हजार जितर बना लो और दस हजार यह बना लो दुर्गापुर वाला। मैं स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे ही सवाल के जवाब में फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहाब ने कहा था जब मैंने कहा कि 50 हजार से कम नहीं बनने चाहिए क्यों कि मांग सेवा और डेढ़ लाख ट्रेक्टर्स की हो गई है। तब उन्होंने कहा था कि तुम 50 हजार की मांग करते हो हम 70-80 हजार बनाएंगे और आज दस की बात हो रही है। आज इस की वजह क्या है? क्यों ऐसा हो रहा है? किस लिए हो रहा है जितने ट्रेक्टर आप मंगाने जा रहे हैं

इस साल 32 हजार उस पर कितनी विदेशी मुद्रा आप खर्च करेंगे ? 35 करोड़ । 32 हजार ट्रैक्टरों के इम्पोर्ट करने पर 35 हजार विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च करेंगे और अगर 1 लाख सालाना क्षमता के दो कारखाने लगाएँ तो उन पर भी 35 करोड़ ही खर्चा आता है । फाइनेंस विभाग कहता है प्रधान मंत्री जी, कि हमारा विभाग इतने रुपये नहीं दे सकता इतना बड़ा कारखाना लगाने के लिए । आप शुद्ध 35 करोड़ की विदेशी मुद्रा इम्पोर्ट पर दे सकते हो और स्वदेशी और विदेशी मिलाकर 35 करोड़ नहीं सकते । 32 हजार एक दफा मंगाने के ऊपर 35 करोड़ रुपये दे सकते हैं लेकिन 1 लाख की क्षमता के कारखाने नहीं बना सकते । यह कौनसी नीति है और कि घर का समाजवाद है । मैं उम्मीद करूँगा कि जो बड़ी आशाएँ लोगों ने लगाई हैं इन आशाओं को इतनी जल्दी आप नहीं तोड़ेंगे और इस दिशा में सुधार करेंगे ? मैं आप का धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस पर इतना समय दिया ।

**SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA**  
(Kaliabor) : Sir, it is unfortunate that neither Mr. Asoka Mehta nor Mr. Masani is here today. Yesterday when Mr. Mehta was giving vent to the now well-known frustration of his group in Parliament, he said things which were rather contradictory. I would rather compliment him for not joining the annual chorus for concessions but trying to raise the debate to the level of resources mobilisation. He said that the budget must have a tight and not a loose texture, as otherwise the expectations cannot be fulfilled. That is why he took the opportunity of his speech to say that an allocation of merely Rs. 2 crores is not enough to develop the new technique of dry fanning and a small amount for school feeding does not solve the problem of school children's health nor of the coming generation of children, for whose mental and physical development we need to provide larger amounts. He also said the rural water-supply programme is long over-due in fact, it was long over-due even when the friends on the other side were on this side. He said that the

allotment is not sufficient and that a massive rural works programme costing not Rs. 25 crores or Rs. 100 or even 200 crores, but Rs. 600 crores should be allotted to create a dynamic onward march among the really down-trodden people in the agricultural sector. We can have no quarrel with that. But when he said that we must have a development rate of six to seven per cent and without that growth social justice cannot be achieved, one can agree with him. He also concluded, without elaborating, that only reactionary people could expect that social justice could be achieved without growth.

A logical corollary of increased development or growth rate would be increased expenditure which means increased mobilisation of resources. It is here that we suffer from hypocrisy. We say that so much of resources have to be spent. But the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister cannot spend the resources unless they are first raised. Resources could be raised only by taxation of those sectors which have not been taxed. Therefore, any attempt to say, as Shri Masani alone can afford to say, that there should be no taxes, or taxes should be reduced by 30 or 50 per cent and things will go on merrily and no money will be there in the sterile pockets of the government is not right. That type of argument does not lead us anywhere.

But I did not expect such a criticism from Shri Asoka Mehta who has written books on economics. When one criticises the budget one has, at the same time, to suggest measures to raise resources and how they are to be used. Any duty or tax is bound to hit somebody or other. I do not know of a tax which can be imposed without hitting somebody. If it is an indirect tax, it hits the common man; some other tax hits the industry; yet some other tax affects some other people, either poor, middle class or rich. I wish the opposition could suggest a magic of imposing tax without hitting anybody so that we can have a rural works programme costing Rs. 600 crores.

Coming to Shri Masani, he made a reference to Ghana and said that socialism

[ Shri Bedabrata Barua ]

is a hated word there which has even been vulgarised. It is becoming a fashion to take the populist line, a line that makes one popular no customs, no excise, no additional taxation and yet crores of rupees for government spending. This is the populist line everywhere. If India is to progress, if socialist base has to be founded, if rural development programme has to be taken up, India has to fight this type of populist line from top to bottom because that makes no sense.

Interestingly, Shri Masani described the Prime Minister as takings to Marxism of the thirties. I do not know why Shri Masani avoided reference to Communism and has taken to Marxism. I do not know what he means by Marxism of the thirties as if he has some knowledge of the Marxism of the seventies. I do not claim to be a Marxist but I know that there is much difference between the Marxism of the 30s and the Marxism of the seventies. The Marxism of the 30s was blindly for a conflict of the classes.

Even Laski, who was more or less a Fabian, believed in class conflict. And Shri Masani knows that Marxism means an attack on the propertied class.

Here is a Budget which believes in the development of the private sector as well as of the public sector. The private sector has also been allowed scope for development because the development of the private sector is also national development. It is a Budget in which relief has been given and welfare measures have been proposed. And he has called it Marxism of the 1930s, immediately contradicting himself by saying that this is a Budget that has declared a war on the common man. I cannot think of a bigger contradiction than this, namely, saying that Marxism of the 1930s had declared a war on the common man. If it was a war at all it was declared to be a war it was war by the proletariat against the propertied class. As Marx said, the proletariat had nothing to lose but their chains.

Shri Masani himself, however, does not go even up to the 1930s. It is interesting to take quotations from Shri Masani and to compare them with those of Herbert Spencer of the 19th Century. Word for word one can find an equivalent in Herbert Spencer, that prophet of free enterprise or *Laissez Faire* who tried to make a religion of free enterprise and said that an economy with free enterprise will deliver the goods. Though there was exploitation, it did deliver the goods.

But here is something which is forgotten. We face a situation where, whether one is a socialist or not, one has to face certain facts. Industry is not getting developed; they are not competitive; they are not able to export; we are not able to import everything to compete with them job they are allowed to raise prices in a sheltered market, nor are they interested in the export of our commodities. It is really a difficult situation in which not even free application of Marx will do.

It is very interesting that this is called an inflationary Budget. Lord Keynes, who civilised the 20th Century capitalism, said that there was no such word as inflationary. There can be no application of the modern economic theory, the theory of free competition, to our economy. Keynes said, let Government dig holes and fill them up. It was the civilised face of 20th Century capitalism. If Government digs holes and fills them up, even then it will develop the economy because it will strengthen productive forces all along the line and create demand. Here, demands are created, prices rise and industry is not developed. It is quite a challenge which we face for which putting no stigma, one word or another, will do.

Another argument is that this is a State Capitalist Budget without explaining what State capitalism is. Shri Patil also adopted a similar type of logic in a previous speech. Referring to the Budget he said that Government's whole system is State capitalist and that it is a

continuation of TTK, Morarji Budgets. Even Shri Morarji Desai says that he would have made the same type of Budget. Shri Asoka Mehta also says that, I do not know whether all their Members would agree to that. But even Shri Morarji Desai says that he would have made the same type of Budget because this Budget was no departure from his policy. I do not think that it is not departure.

Coming back to Shri Masani, he says that one has to produce Rs. 15 to earn Re. 1. He is speaking of the multi-millionaire who is capable of earning Rs. 1 by a gross earning of Rs. 15. He is also sorry that people in the income bracket of Rs. 40,000 and above are being taxed more but he says that they are the tax-evaders who would be very happy in spite of they being taxed more.

Then he refers to the German Social Democratic Party, the Swedish Social Democratic Party and then comes to, Ghana and says that socialism itself has been vulgarised. However, when he refers to those parties he forgets that they have no challenge of capital formation to face.

He has referred to Shri B. K. Nehru. He has said that State capital is a robbery. There can be no robbery when wealth is accumulated but when wealth begins to be raised not by increasing production but by trying to raise prices by a restrictive economy, it can be robbery.

He ended up with a reference to Lenin and Gandhi and referred to Milovan Djilas, that great Yugoslav theoretician, and his book, *The Unperfect Society*. I fail to understand how Shri Masani has come to use Gandhiji for profit. Gandhiji or Marx or Lenin had one thing in common; they were against exploitation. Gandhiji did not want capitalists to make money by tax-evading-black money-and keeping all the money for themselves and support Shri Masani to say that this is a way to welfare.

I do not know how Gandhiji comes into the picture. If he mentions Milovan Djilas and other intellectuals, I can understand. Gandhiji is great man. I have no

doubt that Gandhiji would have asked them to share their profits with the poor. If taxes are voluntarily paid, it is sharing. What about tax evasion? Is it Gandhian to support the profits for the development of the top income brackets? Mr. Masani said that the only good point in the Budget is the raising of the exemption limit to Rs. 5000. One significant point Mr. Masani is for getting is that this Budget has made provisions which are more for the common man. It is not the only good point that exemption limit has been raised. There are many other good features in the Budget which he has not mentioned. The Employee's Provident Fund has been subsidised by the Government. Pension for industrial workers has been laid down. Drinking water supply provision has been proposed, An Urban Development Corporation has been proposed. Higher rate of interest for rural savings has been proposed. These are concessions. These are attempts to genuinely help the common man. Mr. Masani, in his anxiety to speak about the benefit to the common man, can see no other good point than the Rs. 5000 exemption limit. Even that he is trying to criticise. Of course, Mr Masani does not believe in mobilising the resources while we, on this side and many others in which I include Mr. Asoka Mehta also, would have to believe in resource mobilisation. Assuming that mobilisation of resource is demobilisation of resources the hard facts have to be answered.

Sir, the per capita income in India is very low. It has gone up by 20% in the last three Plans. From 1948-49 to 1963-64, while the per capita income has gone up by 20% the per capita availability of a whole range of nonessentials like air-conditioners, scooters, etc. has gone up by 214% which means that availability of luxury items to a very small proportion of the population has gone enormously. So, there is something wrong which has to be corrected. Drastic measures have to be taken to rectify this position where luxury items increase, and the common people are for gotten.

One suggestion I would like to make before I conclude. Possibly we have to think of mobilising our resources by impo-

[ Shri Bedabrata Barua ]

sing more taxes. We must find out the areas which can bear heavier taxation. It is not simply good to say that we must have consumption oriented budget. We must be able to mobilise resources in spite of the very strident demands of the middle class, and the demands of the upper middle class for concessions. We must meet the demands of people who cannot even demand, for the demands of the lowest category of the community whose average income is Rs. 500 per annum, the lowest. 20% of citizens whose consumption is not even Rs. 500 per annum for they only consume 8% of the total wealth of the country. So unless there is a genuine development expenditure in the country and unless development is expedited he has no hope. Concessions do not affect him. Sugar may not even affect him. He has to be helped only by great national efforts ranging across the entire economy.

One suggestion I would like to make about the national expenditure. Regarding capital formation, the total capital expenditure was 49.5% in the Second Plan. It was 46.96% in the Third Plan—it was coming down—and it was only 39.3% in the annual plan during 1966 to 1969. When this capital formation has come down, it shows that unproductive expenditure is increasing. While it is said that the national income has gone up by two times during the last 15 years, expenditure on non essential items has gone up by 5 times. These are dangerous trends which we should try to check. Those people who speak in terms of austerities, those people who speak in terms of savings, those people who speak in terms of Minister's bungalows, those people who speak in terms of Minister's emoluments and salaries should realise that austerity in respect of Minister's bungalows alone would lead the country nowhere. Austerity must be imposed all along the line. For all sectors, for the industrial sector, for the top income bracket people, in agricultural sector and in every sphere of economy. The previous speaker said that it should be possible to save a lot of money on overheads and other expenses.

So, Sir, the public expenditure has to be checked and unless we take some concrete measures it is difficult to face the problem. It is no use just to make catchy slogans. We should make sincere and concerted efforts to solve the problem of the people at large.

Another serious problem is regarding family planning. I do not know how the problem is to be faced. The population is expected to rise to 700 millions in no time. No amount of planning no amount of resources mobilisation can catch up with that enormous increase in population unless we make concerted effort and take adequate measures well in time. I do not know how we can solve it, whether we can get the help of world health experts in solving this problem. But I wish to say this, that unless we are able to control the growth of the population all our efforts will come to nothing. Thank you.

SHRIBAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): I have listened with great attention to the peroration made by Shri Bedabrata Barua criticising Mr. Masani and Mr. Asoka Mehta. The suggestion he had to make was this, that Government must live an austere life and that, austerity should not come only from the Ministers everybody should practise it. I agree there. But Sir, यथा राजा, तथा प्रजा is the old adage. If the Raja continues to live in great luxury like the great Moghuls, to expect other people to live in austerity is something which cannot happen. And therefore a beginning has to be made by the people who run the Government, the ministers and others who are in the ruling party. They only give slogans; they don't set the example.

I read great attention the budget speech and other explanatory materials supplied to us. After reading all that, in the background of the slogans raised about the poor man and common man and the tasks ahead, I am reminded of an Urdu couplet :

बहुत शोर सुनते थे पहलू में दिल का,  
जो काटा तो एक कतर-ए खू निकला

Here is something about which so much noise had been made, saying, we stand for the common man, for the poor man, we are going to improve his lot, etc. But actually what has come out of this budget.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU:** (Chittoor) When Budget discussion is going on there should be at least a Cabinet Minister. No Cabinet Minister is here to listen to the discussion. What is this, Sir?

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH):** The Prime Minister is coming back in a few minutes. Please sit down.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU:** The House cannot be treated like this.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh):** The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs asked him to sit down. He has raised a very valid point. There should be a Cabinet Minister (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH:** I am just asking him as he is a friend of mine.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** The Prime Minister may be coming; but that is no excuse. There should be a Cabinet Minister and my hon. friend has raised a very valid point. (*Interruption*)

**SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH:** The Prime Minister will be coming back in a few minutes.

**SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA:** One Cabinet Minister should be here.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** He says, she has gone and she is coming.

**SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU:** Sir, you yourself said that a Cabinet Minister must be here. (*Interruptions*)

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would request the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to convey the wishes of Members to the Cabinet.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** This Budget which has been presented in the name

of the poor, to improve the lot of the common people, is the worst example of the exploitation of the poor people in the name of socialism. It is an example of window-dressing and the make-up men who prepared the speech for the Prime Minister no doubt did a good job of window-dressing, but the make-up, as we know and the lady knows better can last only for a day at the most. It cannot last for long; it cannot last for ever. This kind of deceiving the people is not going to last for long, Sir.

This budget is primarily a political budget. Just as bank nationalisation was done with a political motive, this budget has also been framed with a political motive. It is not framed from the point of view of making the economy of the country improve or for ameliorating the lot of the common man in this country. That is why it is being justified by people who otherwise would have condemned it. If the same Budget had come from Morarjibhai—and Morarjibhai would not have brought a worse or better budget then these very communists who are trumpeting now in support of this budget would have condemned it as a most reactionary budget. Therefore, I say this budget is a political budget and the support it is getting is political support, whereas in considering a budget its real economic content has to be considered primarily.

This budget is being justified and eulogised as a socialist budget, which is going to further the cause of socialism. First of all I want to know what these supporters of the budget mean by socialism. There are hundreds of brands of socialism. But two main brands are known to the world. One is the brand of socialism that we have in communist countries, in the Soviet Union, China and other communist countries. The basic concept of that Marxist socialism is that all the means of production and distribution should be owned and controlled by the State. Once that is accomplished those persons or authorities or party which control the State apparatus can force their views on every body else, finish off all opposition and establish a one-party totalitarian regime. That is why that socialism has become synonymous with totali-

[ Shri Balraj Madhok ]

tarianism and that socialism is incompatible with democracy. If you mean socialism is that thing, what we have in Russia, then democratic socialism is a contradiction in terms. There can be no such socialism and democracy; they cannot co-exist. Unfortunately, in this country by 'socialism' we mean this brand of it because the trumpet bearers of this are the communists. The Prime Minister has joined their ranks. She protests very much and says she is not a communist. She knows very well that a man or a woman is judged by the company he or she keeps. Hence in this case the company she keeps determines what she is. Therefore, when the commies do the trumpeting for her and she follows their socialism, the world looks upon her as a communist or fellow traveller, and it is not wrong in doing so. She must improve herself; she must dissociate herself from these commies if she wants to remove this impression.

This is one brand of socialism, the Russian or Marxist brand. I do not think any democrat can ever consider himself a votary of that brand on can ever propagate that kind of socialism (*Interruptions*).

It is against constitutionalism (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): He should speak on the Budget.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: We cannot tolerate this kind of interruption by the communists. We have not come here by their courtesy. We are here by our own right. The hon. member should be heard patiently. If they are going to hold the House to ransom, it cannot be tolerated (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: Who is she to say like this?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: This House will not tolerate it if he is interrupted like this. If this interruption continues, we will not allow them to speak (*Interruption*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This cannot go on in this way.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा: उन के घर का समाजवाद नहीं होगा। वह कौन होते हैं बोलने वाले? (व्यवधान)

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: आप से कौन कह रहा था?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: We are all Members of Parliament, we have every right to speak. How can they interrupt or intimidate anybody when he is speaking? We will not allow this parliament to function if they hold parliament to ransom. This kind of thing will not be tolerated.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: खबरदार (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा: "खबरदार"। उनसे रुकने के लिये आप कहिये। (व्यवधान)

This is the kind of language they are using. I would like to know whether ten Members of the Communist Party can be allowed to hold this House to ransom. It will not be allowed. It will never be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would request all the hon. Members to treat the House with respect, to treat each other with respect, and to give every Member a hearing. You may agree or may not agree with his view, but we must all hear every body. I would request Shastriji to kindly co-operate.

SHRI HARDAYAL DEVGUN (East Delhi): This is very important, we are not here at his sufferance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would earnestly request Members on both sides of the House to give every body a patient respectful hearing.

SHRI BISHWANATH ROY (Deoria): On a point of order. Hon. member Mr. Madhok just now said that a person is

known by the company he keeps, I would like to know whether it applies to the Ex-Congress Members sitting by his side also

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is no point of order.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I was submitting that socialism of the Marxist or Russian or Chinese brand is incompatible with democracy, and no real democrat can be a socialist of that type, but unfortunately in this country because socialism has got identified with them, when they talk of socialism, they talk only of communism. This word socialism has become vulgarised, and therefore this kind of socialism must be discarded once for all.

There is the other socialism which is prevalent in some western European countries in Sweden, west Germany, Israel etc., which means welfare, the needs of the common people being met. No decent man can disagree with that kind of socialism. In fact, from that point of view, I am a socialist, everybody can be a socialist. So, I suggest that this word, because of the connotation that it has got in this country, must be discarded. I would appeal to this House and particularly to my socialist friends to use the word *Jan kalyan*, and not to use the word socialism. (Interruptions). You may accept, you may not accept.

15 hrs.

Therefore I submit that if we want to have democratic socialism, then that socialism has to be of a different type, different from the socialism that my communist friends advocate. Therefore, we should try to have some kind of *Jan kalyan vad* or *manav vad*, and we have to judge this Budget from that angle. If we look at it from the *Jan kalyan* point of view, from the people's point of view, from the point of view of improving their lot, what do we need? what is the basic problem. The basic problem is that we do not have enough goods. We want the common man's standard to be raised. We want his immediate

needs to be fulfilled. But those minimum need can be fulfilled only if we have enough goods to go round. You cannot ask poverty to quit when you have nothing to distribute except poverty. So, the first thing is how we can increase our production.

Therefore, the first requirement of a really *Jan kalyan vadi* budget is to see that it is production oriented. I want to ask whether the budget that has been presented is production-oriented. It is not, though the Prime Minister has said in her speech that we want to have social justice with growth? But there is the growth? Growth needs capital formation. But the measures that have been suggested, the deficit financing that have been brought in, the rise in prices that is going to come in— I shall deal with this separately— ultimately in the long run is not going to increase production.

Production is to come primarily from the fields. But we find that agriculture is neglected. You may have some projects for agriculture. They are just an eyewash. But the real thing is that for the past 22 years we have neglected agriculture. Our entire economy had an urban bias and villages were neglected. Even to day, we can find hundreds of crores of rupees for Bokaro, but we have no money for the Rajasthan canal and no money for the Pong dam and no money for them dam though you have provided 25 crores for drought relief. How much money have we spent on the Rajasthan canal, and how much money have we spent this year on drought relief in Rajasthan and elsewhere? After 22 years of freedom, why should there be drought, famine in this country? If we had given proper priority and attention to irrigation works, there would have been no drought at all. And we know how the money for drought relief is spent, and how this money too is going to be used for political purposes and not for the people who are really drought affected as has been the case in Rajasthan. Therefore, what we need is a production-oriented economy.

SHRI SONAVANE (Pandharpur) : He is not able to prevent the pollution of water in Delhi. What is he talking about?

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK :** What we need is a production-oriented budget, which the present budget is not. What we need is a rural bias given to our economic planning, which is also not there. No doubt, a small beginning has been made, and I welcome it. But that is just touching the fringe of the problem, and it is not going to take the kisan very far.

Then, the other basic problem is unemployment. How are we going to remove it? Actually, Government have no figures. Once a question was put in this House and we were told that figures had not been collected. The Planning Commission said we might have 28 million unemployed after the Fourth Plan, but the actual number will be much more. How are we going to have this unemployment removed by having these kinds of public sector undertakings and by these kinds of heavy industries? For that purpose, you have to adopt Gandhian economics. Here, I would like to quote what Shri V. V. Giri, our President, has written in an article in *The Indian Express* of today, entitled 'Jobs for Millions' and this is what he says.

"Modern technology as applied to highly industrialised nations of the west with capital-intensive production cannot become the basis for planning in India. Gandhiji's concept of village self-sufficiency was essentially based on the need for separate labour-intensive technology. For Indian conditions, there can be employment oriented industrial projects that fully absorb local skills and raw materials, and also cater to local markets. The notable example of Japan in its adaptation of modern technology to suit its own conditions has much to commend itself."

This is what our President has got to say. But our Prime Minister, for herself, exploits the name of Gandhiji all right, but for other things, Gandhiji to her was a reactionary, and if we follow Gandhi's economics, and if we follow Gandian methods, then we will go back to the 18th century or the 17th century. If you want to remove unemployment in this country, you will have to follow labour intensive, economic planning. You will have to have

those industries which employ more hands. You will have to pay more attention towards Gandhiji's concept about this matter. But I am sorry to say that in the budget speech, we do not find anything being said or done excepting that there will be some public works which may employ a couple of lakhs of people. Otherwise, nothing has been said to meet this massive problem of unemployment which is the basic problem of our economic life today.

Then, if we have to provide the minimum needs of the common people, what have we to do? what are the minimum needs. They are: food, clothing, shelter, education and medicine. Now, as to food, what is the condition regarding food? Even though lord Indra has been merciful and we have had good crops, we do not know for how long he will remain merciful. Yesterday only we had the hailstorm, and that might have cost half a million tonnes of grains to this country. What steps have we taken to improve production and to make our agriculture independent of the vagaries of nature? That could have been done. We have the case of Punjab. Punjab has increased production. Punjab has given a surplus of a million tonnes last year. It may give more this year even though it has an area of only 16,000 sq. miles. How did it achieve it? It achieved it with the help of the small cultivator who owns five-acre, or ten-acre or twenty acre farms, with incentive. He produces more and earns more and eats more. But what are we doing? What are the State farms doing? The self-employed Punjab farmer produces more. But what has been the record of the State farms? The record of the State farms has been dismal. If we have to increase production, we have to follow the pattern of Punjab, and you have to give up your fad for State farms and co-operative farms, because they have not increased production anywhere. Furthermore, you have done something to provide chemical fertilisers. But chemical fertilisers without proper soil-testing and without proper and adequate supply of irrigation water is going to destroy the land. That is the experience of the USA. That has been the case in Punjab also. No need to pay proper attention to soil-testing and we need to pay proper atten-

tion to green manure which must be used along with chemical manure, and we need to pay proper attention also to irrigation. We had the Indus waters Treaty with Pakistan. That Training period is now over. Now we are entitled to use the every single drop of water of the rivers, Ravi, Beas and Sutlej. In spite of that, the whole waters of the Ravi are flowing into Pakistan, because we have not been able to start even a single dam on that river. We started the Pong dam along with the Mangla dam in Pakistan, but whereas the Mangla dam has been completed and is irrigating lands in Pakistan, the Pong dam is not even half-finished. Therefore, to say that we have the good of the common man at heart and that we have the good of the peasant at heart is just empty slogan. If you had the good of the common man at heart, if you had the good of the peasant at heart, you will not have neglected 80 per cent of our people who live in the villages and you would not have neglected the Pong dam, the Thiem dam and the Rajasthan canal as you have done so far.

Then there is the question of clothing. It is true that in this budget, no further imposts have been put on cotton cloth. But you have put some imposts on terylene and such other cloth. You may say that only the rich people wear terylene and, therefore, this burden is not going to affect the common man, and this burden is going to be borne by the rich people only. Actually, it is not so. Ask any white-collar worker why he is wearing a terylene pant, and he will tell you that in the long run it is cheaper. Many fixed income people who do not have enough, use this cloth because they find this more economical from the point of view, washing, pressing and durability. Therefore, the burden that you have put on terylene etc. is ultimately going to hit the common man.

Then, there is the question of housing. Now, we are told that a housing corporation is going to be set up. I welcome it. We had been demanding this for the last fifteen years, because we had the experience of Delhi in this regard. In the light of the experience in Delhi, Government thought that they could do this on some bigger scale. But what is this corporation going to do? In reply to one of the ques-

tions here in this House, we were told that there was a backlog of 7 crores units of houses in the rural areas and 1.2 crores of housing units in the urban areas. In reply to another question, the Housing Minister had said that what we had provided in this budget for housing was just like a drop in the ocean. So, what you are doing in this matter is too little, and much more can be done, if you had taken this matter more seriously. There are so many other things from which money could have been cut. For instance, Bokaro could have been waited. But Bokaro could not wait, because the Russian pressure is there, whereas housing can wait, food can wait, clothing can wait, medicine can wait, Bokaro cannot wait. That is the position, and that is how we are living under the thumb of a foreign country, and they dictate as to what policies and projects we should take up first.

Then, there is education. Education is one of the most important nation-building activities, and it is something which is a basic need. What have you done for education?

There is some increase in the grant for the UGC; I welcome it. The UGC deals with university education. What have you done for the primary and secondary education? You can say: well these are State subjects. But then there are so many other State subjects, agriculture, irrigation, etc. where you are doing something. Why cannot you do the same thing for education? So many times, demands were made in this House that the lot of the primary teacher should be improved, that a central grants commission on the model of U.G.C. for the higher secondary and primary education should be set up. Nothing had been done so far. We do not find anything in this budget for them. Because of the policies that are being pursued the prices of medicines are also going up. Therefore, the basic needs like food, clothing, shelter, medicine and education are becoming costlier and the small reliefs that you have given are more than offset by the price-rise. The wholesale price-index has risen by 73 points since 1960 and during the last 2½ months prices have increased steeply. With the new imposts prices are going to go up still higher.

[ Shri Bal Raj Madhok ]

While you have given small relief to the tune of Rs. 4 crores worth of milk for children and increased the income-tax exemption limit by Rs. 200, you have increased tax burden much more. If you had given two paise relief by one hand, you have taken ten paise by the other hand. Thus the common man will be the hardest hit; only the upper strata will gain. The middle-class people and the common man they are going to be the hardest hit by this budget and we do not find any provision for any relief for them. There is not even mention of any interim relief for govt. employees. The Prime Minister knows very well that the Government is the biggest employer. I welcome what has been done for the family pension. But more than three million persons are serving under the Government. What is their lot? With this budget the prices have already gone up by about ten per cent. Directly and indirectly it has affected the common man. What has been done for him? You announced that a pay commission will be appointed three months ago; but neither the personnel nor the terms of reference have been announced so far. Nobody knows when it will be appointed and when it will give its report. Therefore, there was demand for interim relief. Almost the entire Parliament, in fact your own supporters also, were agreed on it; yet there is no mention of it.

The Budget might have kept silent on certain matters but they are brought in for political reasons. For example, there is provision for Rs. 175 crores to be given to the States. We had a Finance Commission which allocated Central funds to the States. Over and above that why at all should there be this allocation in this budget? Who is going to distribute it? Is the Government going to decide the quantum, the way it did it last time in the case of DMK Government in Madras? It is a wrong way. If you have to give money to any State it should be done through the Finance Commission; it should be done through some kind of quasi judicial organisation which might see whether the State really needs Central help or not. If you do it on the political basis, you are going to create more political problems.

There are certain pet States. My friend Mr. Ambazhagan may not agree; Madras is one of them. Jammu and Kashmir is another and Nagaland is the third. I do not know the reasons; may be some communal reasons come in. You give so much money to Jammu and Kashmir; why do you not give money to H.P. It has the same population and big area. When you give to Nagaland, why not to Manipur? Manipur has three times the population of Nagaland and a bigger area than Nagaland. Do you want the same conditions to prevail as in Nagaland and only then will you pay attention? I went to Manipur a few months back and I found that the people there are seeing things with discontent. The situation there is really serious. This kind of discrimination between State and State must go. There is a volcanic situation in Jammu and Kashmir State. You are giving them a lot of funds, which are used only for the Kashmir Valley which is a very small part of Jammu & Kashmir. It consists of only about 2,000 sq. miles; Jammu is much bigger, about 12,000 sq. miles and Ladakh 28,000 sq. miles. The Government there is discriminating against Jammu and Ladakh. The result is discontent. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are patriotic. They have been co-operating all these years. But how long do you think they would remain patient. Do you want a serious condition like Telengana to be created there, and only then you will do justice to them?

Whenever any grant is given to the Jammu and Kashmir State, it is taken as just one unit. But it consists of three distinct units, much more distinct than even West Bengal or Bihar or Maharashtra or Gujarat. Jammu is distinct; Kashmir is distinct and Ladakh is distinct. In every way they are distinct. In fact, they are three States made into one. Whenever you give any grant, that grant should be earmarked for Jammu; earmarked for the Kashmir valley and earmarked for Ladakh, so that that money is spent for that area. Even the Gajendragadkar Commission suggested that there should be separate Development Boards for all these distinct areas, but even that recommendation has not been fully

implemented so far. The result is that discontent is growing in Jammu and a difficult situation could arise. I would appeal to the Prime Minister: Jammu and Kashmir is a border area; it is also a strategic area. I do not want any trouble to erupt there, but then the policies that you follow in respect of it are wrong policies.

Similarly in Manipur also, we must be more considerate. The situation there is serious. It is also a border State, and the people feel that "unless we take to methods which the people in Nagaland and other turbulent areas take, justice will not be done." Therefore, in the matter of States, I would appeal to the Prime Minister that the Government should be more careful and see that the feeling that some States are being discriminated in favour or against is removed.

Then the question arises, how are the funds to be raised? For that purpose, many suggestions have been made. West-of expenditure needs to be cut. Austerity has to be shown by the men who are at the top, and then if you could do something, in the field of the public sector. This problem can be solved. I am not against the public sector. I am not against the State coming into the economic field. In modern times elsewhere also, even in America, the State has to come in this sector in a big way. But the question is, should the public sector come to the aid of the people or should it rob the people? I am also a Member of the Public Undertakings Committee. I know something about it. I know how the public sector undertakings are being worked. I know many of these are simply drains on the public fund. Some of them have already lost Rs. 30 crores during the last ten years and they may not come to the break-even point after two or three years, and by that time, they may have lost another Rs. 10 crores to Rs. 20 crores. Why should this kind of thing continue? Why should they not be closed? Why should this burden be put on the tax-payer? And nobody bothers about the public sector and its problems. Parliament is supreme; it is sovereign; it is the controlling body, but Parliament has no time even to discuss a single report of the

Public Undertakings Committee. When we take evidence in the Public Undertakings Committee, it is not open to the press. It is not open to the public. The result is that the public sector people take it lightly.

I would suggest that if you want that the public sector should improve, that the public sector should not remain a parasitic sector and it should become really a public welfare sector, you will have to take a basic decision to improve it. First, you must improve the working of the Public Undertakings Committee by opening its discussions—its evidence to the press, to the public, so that the public should know, the press could know the state of things; it should be reported, and it will be a healthy check on those who run the public sector undertakings and also on the Members of the Committee so that they can all do something to improve it. This has been done in Britain. It has had a salutary effect on the working of the public sector there.

The Minister should also be brought before the Public Undertakings Committee. Whenever we ask a question, the officials say that it is passed on to the Minister. Therefore the Committee is not able to arrive at real conclusions. I think the Minister should be asked to attend the meetings; the rules should be changed and the Ministers should also come before the Committee, so that they can explain the policy, and if there are real difficulties or defects, those can be discussed in a smaller committee much better, and the difficulties can also be pointed out, so that the whole working can be improved.

Thirdly, we should try to associate more and more people from the private sector or non-official people with these public sector companies. As things are, most of these Boards of Directors consist of officials; they have no time, and the result is that the Boards delegate their functions to the Managing Directors, and in most public sector concerns, the Managing Director becomes a super-Birla or a super-Tata, but without the interest in his concern, without a stake in his concern. The result is that investment being public money, it is nobody's money, and that is why even though we have invested almost Rs. 4,000 crores in the public

[ Shri Bal Raj Madhok ]

sector so far, instead of having any profit out of it, any addition to the public exchequer, they are still running at a loss. Even this year there is a loss of about Rs. 40 crores. This situation must change. Even if the money is put in the bank, it would have fetched Rs. 200 crores a year. Mr. Bhurathi said that because there are heavy plants in the public sector, they run at a loss, but if consumer goods plants are taken over by the public sector, they will make gains. I beg to differ. Whatever you give to the public sector, it will deteriorate: जहाँ जहाँ चरण पड़े संतन के वही

बंटाधार । Even in heavy industries, compare your Rourkela or Durgapur plant with the plant of the Tatas. Even though the Tata plant is obsolete, it is doing better than the public sector plant. Why? You must go deep into the causes. We do not want to run down the public sector, but the fact is it is becoming a parasite sector. It should not be tolerated. It is very important that Government must take a new look and see that effective control is adopted.

Of course, in the public sector also there are good examples like Air India, which is doing very well. That is because it has to meet very stiff competition from other international airlines. Competition is the soul of progress. But wherever public sector comes in, it wants to avoid competition because it cannot stand competition. In fact, the private sector is very happy if the State comes in, because they know that because the cost of production in the public sector unit will be higher, the price fixed by the State will be higher and thus the private sector units will be able to make huge profits. Whether it is a fertiliser factory, steel factory or any other factory, this is true. Therefore, unless the public sector can compete with the private sector, there is no justification for it to exist. That can be possible only if the management is improved and the element of competition is brought in. We are all against monopolies. Private monopoly of Birlas or Tatas is bad, but State monopoly is worse. You can fight the monopoly of Birlas or Tatas, but you cannot fight State monopoly. It is the biggest danger to the progress of the common man and the

economy of the country. Therefore, we must take effective steps to see that State monopoly also is ended and whenever it enters any field, it enters as a competitor. It should enter a field only when it must, not for political considerations, but for reasons which are in the best interests of the people. Who should decide whether taking over a particular project is in the interests of the people or not? Not the Government. There should be some independent tribunal to evaluate it. We cannot leave this decision to the Government, as in the case of bank nationalisation. If only you can run your public sector effectively and efficiently you will not need much of the taxation you have levied in this budget, which is a burden on the common man.

What India needs today is not socialism, capitalism or communism, but Indianism. We need *Swadeshi*. Actually, our Prime Minister is very allergic to Indianisation. If she were really an Indian she would not be allergic to it. All our policies should be so made that they keep the interests of the country uppermost. It does not matter whether a particular policy is in keeping with capitalism, socialism or communism. The criterion should be whether it is in keeping with the best interests of the people of this country. If something is good in socialism, I do not mind your adopting it. But the ultimate test is the interest of the people and not any particular ideology, whether it is socialism, communism or capitalism.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani): The hon. member should plead at least for the poor people of the country.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: I am one of them and I speak for them. The Prime Minister cannot speak for them. She is an urbanite and she has lived in Palaces. She cannot understand them. जो तन लागे सो तन जाने और क्या जाने पीर पराई । She cannot know what the poor people feel. I know it because I am one of them.

Therefore, what I am submitting is this. Our country is like a rich man who has money and wants to build a House. He has cement, bricks and other things but he has no architect and no plan. The result is that instead of building a house he makes almost a mound. That is what is happening in our country. We have very fine manpower, we have very good land, we have iron and steel, in fact everything that can make this country a super-power is avoidable. But, unfortunately, we have had leadership and bad policies. Unless and until we can change the leadership, change the policies, whatever we may do whatever the people may do, this country is going to suffer. Therefore, the most important thing that every democrat, every *Jan Kalyanvadi* everyone who has welfare of the common man and not of the upper classes only at heart, has to do is to work for the change of the leadership. Unless that is done, it is no use talking in this House, because it will fall only on deaf years and is not going to have any effect.

But still I have faith in the destiny of India. I know that India is going to become a great country one day and, therefore, in that hope we must continue to work. I will continue to work with that object in view, my party will continue to work and we hope that some day some better counsel will prevail and we will have a better leadership.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI (Sholapur) : Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I want to offer my congratulations to the hon. Prime Minister for her farsightedness in her budget proposals.

SHRI HARDAYAL DEVGUN : For her pro-capitalist budget.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI: According to me, the budget proposals are production-oriented. They encourage saving and, at the same time, mobilise the surplus funds of the people. As such, I welcome the proposals....

Yesterday I listened very carefully to the speeches of my hon. friends, Shri Asoka Mehta and Shri M. R. Masani,

both of whom are economists. Both of them were saying that they could not find any change in the pattern of the budget proposals. If they have some pre-conceived ideas and they look at the budget with jaundiced eyes then they cannot find any difference. But if they have an open mind they could very easily see how this budget is different from the earlier Budgets.

I was very much pained to hear Shri Masani say that the appreciation in the prices of shares was manipulated by certain big operators. I fail to understand the logic of this argument. Under the budget proposals the rate of income-tax and wealth tax has been raised. If they manipulate the price of shares they will have to pay more of income-tax and wealth tax.

In my view the reason for the rise in price of shares is different. The exemption limit for income from shares has been raised to Rs. 3,000. Because of this many middle class people, people with meagre income, have been encouraged to make investments in shares in order to get the benefit of this exemption. That is why the prices of shares have gone up. This has nothing to do with manipulation by big operators. If you look at any newspaper which has appeared after the budget this will be evident. I will be glad if Shri Masani can produce any paper or economic journal from where he can prove that this was manipulated by some big operators.

Having said this, I feel—and it is correct that the economy of the country has improved considerably during the last year. For instance, our imports have gone down. Last year the import of the country was about Rs. 1,850 crores; this year our imports will not exceed Rs. 1,500 crores a substantial fall of Rs. 350 crores in our imports.

Similarly, our exports have increased considerably and have touched new high levels. Last year our export was Rs. 1,360 crores; this year it will be more than Rs. 1,400 crores. In spite of a big fall in the export of our traditional items, jute

[ Shri S. R. Damani ]

and tea, the export has increased. If the quantum of export of tea and jute has been maintained at the same level, our adverse trade balance would have been narrowed down much more. But even after that our export has increased and our adverse trade balance, which was Rs. 500 crores last year, would be between Rs. 100 crores to Rs. 120 crores this year. I think, it is a very heartening and encouraging performance for the country and is a big achievement.

In the Budget the Prime Minister has withdrawn export duty on tea and has also given relief in export duty on some items of jute. I hope, this will encourage our export of tea and jute in the current year. But I am told that the export duty on jute requires further consideration because still prices in foreign countries are not commensurate with our prices. Our export of jute should not suffer and Government should consider it; whatever measures are required to be taken to increase our jute export should be taken.

After so many years our industrial production has shown an improvement. Last year our industrial production has increased by  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. I think, this is very encouraging. According to the present atmosphere there will be a further increase in industrial production. All the engineering industries, which were running with idle capacity, are now fully booked. They are booked for the next six months or one year. That shows that industrial activity is widening and the production of industry is going to improve further. That time of recession is already past.

Similarly, our agricultural production, in spite of unfavourable weather in many parts, has touched the 100 million tonnes mark which is a very good feature. I think, our agricultural production will improve further.

Our foreign exchange position has also shown improvement. After paying the International Monetary Fund there is a surplus of about Rs. 40 crores in our foreign exchange. These are facts which show that our economy has improved last

year and these measures which the Prime Minister has proposed in this Budget will further accelerate our growth of industries and employment.

For long there was a consistent demand from the public to raise the exemption limit and I am happy that this exemption limit has been raised to Rs. 5,000. There are no ifs and buts; it will apply to every person. This exemption limit will be beneficial to all.

It will be beneficial to the common man and to the middle class people to a great extent and I hope that next year the hon. Prime Minister will consider further increase in this exemption limit at least upto Rs. 6000. By increasing this exemption limit the Income-Tax Department is also going to be benefited because about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs of assesees will be reduced and the Income Tax Department can then concentrate on the larger income groups and can make quick disposal of cases. This way it is going to benefit the public as well as the Government also.

I would like to make some suggestions regarding income tax. At present the private limited companies which are generally manned by small entrepreneurs have to pay income tax at the rate of 65 per cent against 55 per cent paid by public limited companies. After 65 per cent payment they have to distribute compulsory dividend to a certain extent and on the dividend there is again a tax. In this way these small entrepreneurs or private limited companies are hard hit. Previously the rate for both public and private limited companies was the same. Afterwards it was increased on this view that they have not to pay dividend tax. When dividend tax was introduced, they were exempted. Now dividend tax has been withdrawn but the rate of tax remains the same. Therefore, I would suggest that in the case of private limited companies where new entrepreneurs are interested, the rate of tax should be brought down to the same level as of public limited companies.

I would like to make one more suggestion. Some time back Government has introduced revenue audit of all income tax or direct taxes. The intention of introducing revenue audit was that the auditors can check up the assessments whether the tax collectors have demanded more or less or whether there is any mistake in calculation. That was the purpose. Now they have expanded their activities. They are even interfering in the decisions of officers, the decisions of Commissioners and the decisions of even Boards and they interpret how the laws should be implemented. This has created so many hardships and many people have to go in appeals on account of their interference. Therefore, this revenue audit should be confined only to audit and not to interfere in the interpretation of law and other things.

Some time ago a limit was fixed on income tax assessment, that within 2 years all the cases will be completed. That was very good. Since then the number of disposals has increased. But what do we find now? There is no time limit for disposals of appeals at the stage of appeals before Assistant Commissioners or Commissioners or the Tribunals. Therefore, Sir, the appeals are kept pending for a number of years, and unless some time limit is fixed, unless these things are completed in a particular time, the purpose will be defeated. All pending appeals must be disposed of within a particular time-limit. Otherwise it will be of no use. A time limit will save leakage of revenue, it will save the public and it will be of advantage to the Government if such appeal arrears are reduced considerably. I therefore would suggest this. If there is need to appoint more officers, which need may be felt by the Government, let the Government, appoint more officers. But fix a time limit at the maximum, say, one year, within which every appeal should be disposed of and finalised so that all these cases are completed in that period. An exemption limit of Rs. 3,000 is given. For those who get 3,000 by way of interest or dividend, tax is deducted at source and they go on appeal. They have to go in appeal for

the refund. That is a harassment and that takes a long time. What I suggest is this that in respect of those persons whose income from dividend, from interest, from Government securities etc. is less than 3,000 that should not be deducted at source; they should be exempted so that the work of the department will be reduced, the public will get more incentive to make investment in Government securities, dividend and other things. These are my suggestions. I have got one or two more suggestions to make.

The import duty on capital goods, machinery and plant has been increased from 27½ per cent to 35 per cent. Instead of this if the Government gives more incentive by way of allowing more depreciation and development rebate on the plant and machinery manufactured in the country that will attract buyers to purchase indigenous plant and machinery and that will also reduce imports. It does not mean that this will be applicable for all the machinery; but for those plant and machinery items which are being allowed to be imported. If they are manufactured in the country the respective depreciation and development rebates should be more. This is my suggestion. I think Government would consider these suggestions.

There is one more suggestion which I wish to offer before I conclude. This is regarding the import of cotton. We are importing cotton to the tune of Rs. 100 crores a year. We have got to take measures to produce more cotton per acre. I wish to point out in this connection that our product of cotton per acre is the lowest in the whole world. We produce 115 pounds whereas in Sudan, in Egypt, etc. it is 600 pounds.

AN HON. MEMBER : But our production of men is the highest in the world; you know about it.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI : We are suffering for that. (*Interruption*)

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (*Ratnagiri*) : Why does the hon. Member chose only the textile industry?

[ Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee ]

There are so many other industries in the country.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI : I have talked about other industries also; I have talked about income tax and our export potential and various other things. I am talking about the textile industry because the textile industry is the primary industry of the country. More than 10 million people are there in that industry. It gives employment to so many people. It is one of the oldest and primary industries in the country. I am sorry to say that Government is not providing sufficient funds for the development of cotton. They just provide an amount of Rs. 50 lakhs per year for the development of cotton under an acreage of 20 million it means 25 paise per acre for the development of cotton, per year. This is the reason why for the last ten years cotton production is not at all increasing. It has remained at the same level as in 1960. Instead of importing cotton if we can provide more funds for the development of cotton so as to get more per acre yield of cotton, I think, that would be of great benefit to the country and it will save use Rs. 100 crores worth of foreign exchange which we are now spending for the import of cotton.

Lastly, I would say a few words about excise duty. Excise duty contributes Rs. 1500 crores annually to the exchequer. It is a most important source of revenue. The collection charges are minimum. There is very little leakage. But I suggest that the present system of collection of specific duties should be converted into the advalorem system for most of the items so that cheaper quality goods will have to pay less duty and costlier qualities will pay more duty. This will ensure that ordinary people who want to purchase cheap cloth, for example, will not have to pay more excise duty. I will cite an example. On superfine mull costing Rs 2, a meter, the excise duty is 8 annas; on superfine popline costing Rs. 6 a metre, the duty is the same. This is a burden on the poor. Therefore, it should be on the advalorm basis.

Then sales tax should be merged with excise duty. This will have a number of benefits. This will create more employment

as there will be free trade. There will be no leakage in tax. In sales tax, we all know that there is leakage of tax, and large number of formalities to comply with. The problem of unemployment will get solved considerably if this is done because there will be free trade and more people will be adsorbed in the trade.

SHRIMATI NIRLEP KAUR (Sangrur) . Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am one of those members who usually listen more and speak very little. I have been listening to most of the members who spoke very attentively. Outside in the country, we hear our countrymen speaking. We find that every section in the country, whether it is agriculture or industry, whether it is the rich man or the poor man, everybody is crying for help and relief. They are all complaining that they are burdened. Big promises have been made to them, but in reality nothing is done for them.

The only secure section or group of our people are the people in power. They are the happiest. They seem to enjoy life. So the natural trend in this country is to achieve power. Everybody wants to be in power or to have something to do with it. You cannot be a good businessman or have your business run unless you have a share in power or have something, in the right way or wrong way, to do with it. I feel this is also a form of Corruptions. People in the countryside have a saying which means that everybody wants to have a hand in the government.

15-49 hrs.

[ SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair. ]

Every year I have been speaking for the agriculturist. This year I have heard a slogan called 'the green revolution'. It has come out in the papers. Ministers talk loudly about it on each platform. I am an agriculturist. Everybody in our family has practically something to do with agriculture. I am not speaking just for the sake of speaking over here. Each year I have tried to bring certain facts, as truthful as they can be, to the notice of this House. It is a pity that there is no response from the Government, I sometime do feel why we should come here and speak. Attention is

paid only if we abuse each other or shout at each other, but if you try to bring out facts, they are not, at least our facts are not taken into consideration.

This green revolution is so highly talked of, but how can there be a green revolution when the programme for take off is not there? After all, we see that when a plane takes off, the fuel has to be there, the engine is checked and everything has to be done, only then the take off takes place, but here everybody has been pleading for incentive to the farmer, to give more help to the farmer, urging the Government to realise the predicament of the farmer, but instead of realising all that, we see that the axe has gone deeper in to the throat of the farmer.

Only yesterday we saw a hailstorm here and very soon you will get the figures of the complete destruction around Delhi. What will happen? Probably all the farmers will be called and given Rs. 50 each. They will be satisfied and they will sit back. Nothing is being done to meet these hazards, but if once a farmer gets a good crop, then of course, the officers, Government and everybody begins to say that the farmer is the richest person today. How do they assess it? They assess it from the new seeds, that the treble seed can produce so much, so the farmer must be taxed more. They do not realise how much more the farmer has to pay for the seed. When you try a new seed, you are making an experiment. In the first one or two years you are bound to make mistakes. This is what has happened with the new seed also. They did not put enough fertiliser or they put too much fertiliser or there was not enough water for the new fertiliser, so the yield was not much. Probably a few farms here and there near the universities yielded more and the country is to be taxed on that basis.

The new seed is expensive. The cost of diesel oil has gone up by more than 50 per cent in the last two years and it is going up further. The price of petrol has gone up and diesel is also going up. How can you do agriculture with diesel? We say we should give up bullock farming and we should progress. If we want to progress, naturally we have to go in for machinery

and machinery itself is expensive. The tyres are expensive. It is impossible for a farmer of my status to buy a tractor and to pay for the water, to pay for the diesel. Fertilisers are getting so expensive. A bag of fertiliser has gone up in price from Rs. 17 in 1969 to Rs. 28 at the moment. The burden has become unbearable for the farmer.

Some of my friends go to Japan. They want to go to America for a holiday and for that they give the justification that they are going abroad on study tours. They come back and tell us what the Japanese are doing, what the Americans are doing. They do not realise how much assistance the farmer are given there.

So, I think that this new tax will be the last straw on the camel's back. How are they going to assess these taxes? I understand that they are going to tax any farmer who has got an income of above Rs. 5,000. The parties have already gone to the different States to assess the land. They say that if there is Rs. 5,000 in the bank it represents interest on Rs. 1½ lakhs and therefore the property is worth Rs. 1½ lakhs and that beyond that amount the farmer should be taxed. In near about Mehrauli there is an example. Some businessmen to make their black money into white have bought a few farms. That should not be the criteria to judge all the farmers whose existence solely depends upon the land; they do nothing else but agriculture; their future and their children's future, every thing depends upon that piece of land. In Mehrauli there are lands which are so expensive. Yet, if you took to agriculture, you got very poor returns. For example the DLF people go there and buy the land and make a small colony by putting some roads, electricity, etc. and the price is Rs. 19,000 per acre. It is a very small place. But all around the DLF colonies there are mostly Gujjars; they are poor people; there is no irrigation and for the many years that they had been there they did not get any proper income. But if you go to buy the land, it is nothing less than Rs. 10,000. So, the poor people will be taxed. Two or three big businessmen have gone there; one has come from Bombay and the other from Calcutta and bought two or three acres of land for conversion

[ Shrimati Nirlep Kaur ]

of his black money. Now the entire farming community has to suffer because of this. I appeal to the House in the large interest of the farmers throughout the country that they should not support this sort of thing, when something is against the interest of the country; they may have their loyalties to their own party but in such cases they must rise to the occasion and have the courage to tell their leaders that they do not agree with this sort of thing. Though they are loyal members of the party, they have to be loyal to the country also.

Coming to my own constituency, I have been asking the Home Minister year after year to help solve a problem which is getting worse every day. In Sangrur, Patiala district, in the Jajjar tract, there are heavy damages to crop and property. It has been estimated that during the monsoon in 1968-69 out of the total estimated damages of Rs. 617 lakhs in the whole of Punjab, in Sangrur area alone the damage was to the tune of Rs. 610 lakhs. Probably this new law will also go there. But the fact is that the people are becoming so poor; there is no flood control, drainage control. In Jhajjar tract they want Rs. 25 crores but only Rs. 5 crores had been given. Look at the demand and supply. The demand is for Rs. 28 crores, to relieve those people from suffering, not to assure them of any happy life or good cultivation but just to save them from water logging which is getting worse every day. Only Rs. 5.93 crores had been given. How can this meet their demand? I do not know where all these figures are hidden from their view. How can you tax the farmers who are in this predicament? Rajasthan has got one canal. They do not realise that for centuries those people had to suffer. They should give them at least twenty years to live in fertile land and then probably they can think of taxing them. But it is not done like that. On the one side you give them one thing; on the other side you tax them. How do they progress?

16 hrs.

Another thing is I am really hurt to say this that the Prime Minister's words do not tally with her deeds. We had the struggle over Chandigarh. There is trouble all

over the country because of their indecision. There is no sincerity behind the decisions they take. It is not the problem that they want to solve. It is the motives they have in mind. There is no problem in the world that does not have a solution provided you honestly want to solve it. When the Chandigarh issue came up Sardar Darshan Singh Pheruman warned before the question was hanging fire for a long time. Sardar Darshan Singh Pheruman mentioned that was going to undertake a hunger-strike. Again, this is a system organised by the Congress party, of going on a hunger-strike: we must go on a hunger-strike; we must do something odd to get the attention which should have been routine work of the Government. Now, he went on a hunger-strike. Let me say a word about Pheruman's own personal life. The House is aware that some of the Ministers and some of the MPs and the MLAs are only in their positions because what is at their credit is only political suffering; they are political sufferers; there is not much else to add to them; only, they are political sufferers. So, they must be given all those positions and go on enjoying them, because they are political sufferers; for the *Kurbani* or the sacrifices they had made, they are compensated. They do not make any more sacrifices after that, when you have compensated for them. But anyhow, Pherumanji was second to none in the freedom struggle. He was in the army; he started his life in the army, and he revolted in the army; and the Britishers turned him out. When he came out, he brought 400 people with him. He has got 23 years of imprisonment to his credit, to his name. There are very few Congress people who can stand up and say today that for 23 years of the best part of my life we were in prison for the freedom of this country.

What were the consequences? The Prime Minister kept on saying one thing. She had nothing to say against him. She had nothing to talk about the delay, about the decision on Chandigarh. She was so adamant and all she said, and said

repeatedly, was "I will not yield to threats." "Well," I thought. Well and good; there is a strong lady. She says like that. She has set an example to be a strong lady. But what happened: inch by inch Pherumanji was dying. You can put this thing as cruelty. Nothing was done. This House has witnessed one thing: I have noticed that even some Members of the House have been shy to refer to his name because they are having a guilty conscience that is prevailing in everybody's mind. Inch by inch, Sardar Darshan Singh Pheruman left this world.

What happened next? After three months, the Prime Minister yielded to the threats of Sant Fateh Singh. Where had her previous stand gone? I am making this very important reference in this House, but this is what Mrs. Gandhi is doing in every issue. She takes a stand. Then, it settles down like a bubble of water. This is what we have seen. So, when human lives are involved, and human sacrifices are there, I think the House should take it seriously and this should not be allowed to continue.

Then, this sort of thing goes on and when utterance of it is made, she can even smile over these things. When references are made about all this killing, what happens? For example, I can assure the House that out of what happened in Ganganagar, not even 10 per cent of it has been brought to the attention of the House. What happened in Ganganagar, the way the people have been shot at, the way they have been thrown into the jails? It is true. I do not know whether the press has been directed not to say that. But I know from my own personal experience, the moment they start talking about it, everybody is advised, "Let us not go into it; there may be communal trouble or this or that." The only way to solve a problem is to face it and face it squarely. Be honest about it. When reference to the situation in Ganganagar was made, Mrs. Gandhi was smiling. What has been the course of history? History repeats itself. Nero was playing the fiddle when Rome was burning. Should one continue what has happened in past history and see that history repeats itself? Here she sits and sees and she can smile at such things.

So, I think there should be more seriousness shown in these matters. She may be here now. She may do well; but nobody has been in one's position for long; nobody can continue in one's position permanently. There will be a change, if not today, tomorrow. So, when you are in the chair, when they are in their chairs, they must realise their responsibilities, and those who enjoy leadership and all the respect and grandeur that go with it, must realise that heavy responsibilities also have to be borne along. She can smile, but not when other people's fathers and brothers are being killed. At any rate, that smile does not appeal to me; may be it appeals to somebody else.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI BHAGAVATI (Tezpur) : Sir, the Prime Minister in her capacity as Finance Minister has presented a budget which if I may say so, has been received well by the people throughout the country. As she said, the budget has to purposes in view—growth in economy and social justice. It is very important that emphasis is given on these two points. I remember a book entitled *Challenge to Man's Future* written by Harrison Brown, which was recommended to readers by Einstein himself. In that book, he has warned humanity that if some countries or some sections of people go on spending more and more and wars are not avoided in the not too distant future, this civilization may be extinct and it may not be possible to revive it again. He has said that the world has natural resources only enough for the created beings. If this natural wealth is wasted in some places, it will have repercussions in some other places. Our Upanishads also say that God creates enough for his creation. But if some people take more, the natural consequence will be, some other people somewhere else will have to suffer. Gandhiji also laid stress on this dictum. We cannot say for the world as a whole because that is not our sphere, but we have to plan on this sound principle for this country. We must see that all sections of our people, all regions, get equal opportunities and share the benefits of national wealth or national product equally.

[ Shri Bhagavati ]

At the same time, it is also important that we lay emphasis on the growth of economy. At present, our economy is really very poor. In 1969-70 the total tax revenue of the Central and State Governments put together are estimated to be Rs. 3,990 crores. With that revenue nothing much can be done for 54 crores of people living in this country, who are increasing at the rate of 2.5 per cent per annum. So, the basic point is how to increase the national wealth, the national product or income. For that we have to generate sufficient enthusiasm along with mobilisation of resources. Mobilisation of resources is important, but what is more important is the generation of creative enthusiasm amongst the people.

Shri Madhok has told us that he is of the opinion that India does not need socialism or capitalism, what India needs is Indianism. I do not understand what he means by that. Socialism is a definite terminology in political science. It has certain meaning, certain significance; it connotes something. So, if we have to enthuse the people we have to put before them certain ideology, certain programme based on an ideology known to them. If we put forward before them the word "socialism" they can understand it. I do not know what other concept can fulfil the desire of the commonman in this country.

I feel in this country we have to accept socialism as a national objective. I also feel that, generally speaking, our people have accepted socialism as the national objective. We have to work for it and we have to develop enough enthusiasm to work the socialist programmes in this country. Unless we do that, with the limited resources that we have we cannot go far enough. If we can mobilise our resources properly, utilize our resources properly and also generate public enthusiasm, then alone can we go ahead and make this country prosperous. So, I feel it is very important that we create strong public opinion in favour of implementing socialist programmes.

We have to see that the manpower which we have is properly organised for productive purposes. For that I think it is high

time that the progressive forces in the country are all united in the effort to push forward an agreed programme on the basis of socialism. Unless we can do that, I am afraid the economic situation will be very difficult to tackle in the near future.

This is the time when all the political parties should, if possible, come to a truce. We should adopt a common programme based on socialism and see that that programme is implemented. If we go on quarrelling over petty political issues, I do not see how this country can go ahead. If we do not combine, if we are not united to solve the economic problems which face us today, posterity will blame us.

We have tremendous problems. Our *per capita* land and resources availability is very small compared to some other countries. Our land is not enough for the population as a whole. The density of population in this country is 146 per kilometre whereas it is only 11 per kilometre in Russia and other countries. So, how can we solve our land problem unless we create new avenues for employment? How can we solve our employment problem, unless we increase economic activity? We have to increase economic activity hundredfold, thousandfold. Now our economic activity is very very limited.

With whatever money we have it should be possible for us to organise our manpower and make them work in factories, fields and some other projects so that more wealth is generated than what is possible strictly in terms of money alone. For that it is necessary that a proper climate is created. If political parties go on throwing mud at each other, quarrelling among themselves, nothing much can be achieved and posterity will blame us. I do not know whether democracy will be saved in this country if we go in this way.

So, after deciding upon a basic programme—a programme based on socialism which has been accepted as a national objective—we should all cease to find out holes here and there and go on wasting our time. We have to combine and see that

people co-operate and work hard for the implementation of that programme.

I would also like to say that in this country if we really want modernisation and that norm of living which has been accepted as the minimum norm throughout the world, it is necessary that a sizable percentage of agriculturists or farmers are removed from agriculture to industry. Because that shows growth of Economy at least in the modern sense. It is a historical fact that in the middle ages also, 80 per cent of the people did not live on land in this country. When in other countries more people have gone from land to industry, in India the reverse process was there; more people have become dependent on land, 80 per cent of the people cannot be fed by land. This is an axiomatic truth. Now we want 80 per cent and sometimes more of them to be fed by land. That is absurd. It is necessary to plan in a way so that a sizable percentage of the people now depending on land are removed from land to factories. For that new industries will have to be established. Mahatma Gandhi said that if a village had only farming and no industry, that village was said to be suffering from paralysis partially. That is the case in this country in many regions.

So, I think, it is necessary, if you really want to solve the land problem, that we have to give land to the tillers. That is the first condition: Land to the man who ploughs and creates wealth out of land by his own labour. Then, you have to give enough land, an economic holding, to each one of them. You can consolidate holdings by co-operative societies or in some other way. It is also necessary that landless agriculturists, which is a misnomer, should be provided with some other occupation.

It is generally said that we have to improve our agriculture. That means we have to emphasize on cereal production. We generally do not emphasize on production of non-cereal food.

But what is necessary is to increase non-cereal food. In this country people want protein-rich food and for that we have not done much. Quality food—we have not produced enough. If

we really want that our children grow and grow intelligent and should be capable of doing hard work intelligently, this protein-rich food must be supplied. We are having more and more schools and colleges but we do not supply them good protein-rich food. How can they study? How can they do research work? Mahatma Gandhi we saw to it and that is why he emphasized on cultivation and production of soyabean. Soyabean contains maximum of protein. For vegetarians, I think, that is the one source from which they can have protein. But uptill now we have not laid much stress on that. I can not tell you why. In this country, even now protein production is negligible. We have not given emphasis or stress on milk production, egg production, fish production or meat production. I think it is very important that production of these things are taken up as industries.

Coming to my State of Assam, I have to say that we are grateful to the Prime Minister for announcing a package deal for Assam. She has stated categorically that a second refinery, a petrochemical complex and a paper mill and Brahmaputra Commission will be established within the Fourth Plan period. I would only request her that these things are established as early as possible. It is necessary that early steps are taken to implement the announcement she has made some time back.

As regards excise duty, I only want to say that it has been enhanced on tea but common and medium tea in Zones 5 and 4 will suffer.

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह (अमरेली) : आसाम जाकर वहाँ से टी भेजते रहियेगा यहाँ जिस से टी सस्ती हो जाय ।

SHRI BHAGAVATI : Enhancement of excise duty will create difficulties for common and medium tea Zones 5 and 4. So I will request the Commerce Minister who is here as also the Finance Minister to examine this because some tea estates are facing difficulties even now. If this enhancement is effected, then there will

[ Shri Bhagavati ]

be more difficulties for them, at least for small tea gardens which produce common and medium tea. Of course, it is good and I am thankful to the Government that they have lifted the export duty on tea. That will encourage export of quality tea. But this enhancement of excise duty will indirectly affect the income of Assam Government also. When there is more so excise duty, Assam Government's revenue from Agriculture Income Tax will go down. So, it is necessary that some relief is given.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : Now he has to think of Assam Government also.

AN HON. MEMBER : The tea gardens should be nationalised.

SHRI BHAGAVATI : That may be considered. I don't think that is impossible. But at this stage, I cannot say what should be done. That is for the Government to examine and see what can be done.

Sir, in conclusion I will say that a new chapter in Indian history has been opened. Indian politics is at cross roads. Now it is important that we belonging to different political parties reconsider our positions. All progressive forces, all socialist forces should come together. We should know that if we miss the bus at this stage history may not forgive us. So, we should see what we can do to rejuvenate Indian economy. We have to do something drastic, some thing revolutionary. We have to see that old stereotyped ideas do not have hold on us and captive us even now. We have to do something in a dynamic way. We have to do something creative and revolutionary. I can only pray,—in the inimitable words of world Poet, Rabindranath Tagore,—

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;

Where Knowledge is free;

Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;

Where words come out from the depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;

Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habits;

Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action;  
Into that Heaven of Freedom, My Father,  
Let my country awake."

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor) : We have heard his parting speech. He has become an M.L.A. and he is going to become a Minister. We wish him well.

AN HON. MEMBER : A very good speech.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda) : For the last 9 Months and more intense propaganda is going on with a great deal of fanfare trumpet and that socialism is being ushered in. Therefore we had very high expectations. We were waiting for this big day, the Budget Day, to see the blue print of the Socialism about which so much was being talked about. We thought that there would be radical departure from the past because now the Prime Minister also the Finance Minister, unhampered by this gentleman, the former D. P. M. who was considered an arch reactionary who it was proclaimed, stood in the way of progress has drawn up this budget. Therefore, Sir, we were rather disappointed when in the Budget we did not see that radical trend. About this, certain views have already been expressed by Shri Asoka Mehta and Shri Massani. This Budget we feel more or less carries forward the trend of the previous years. There is no doubt a veneer of concern for the poor; certain welfare measures have been proposed; they are good. I don't want to minimise them. They are good as far as they go; but that is merely tinkering with the problems; they don't go to the basic root of our problems; they don't attempt anything radical that would really improve the condition of the poor people. I only repudiate the claim made by the Prime Minister and her cotery of following a

revolutionary policy a policy of great radicalism. The reason that was given for disturbing the Congress and bringing political instability. Prime Minister in her speech has said.

It is necessary to devise policies which "reconcile the imperatives of growth with concern for the wellbeing of the needy and the poor. That is measures have to be devised which, while providing welfare for poor would also add momentum to productive force."

This is a very good formulation; nobody can find fault with it. The propaganda machinery of the Government which is very powerful these days her admiring propaganda press, her cheer press has expressed its praise in such terms.

"It is a trend setter in the socialist seventies".

Again it Says,

"Political events since July 1960 firmly fit in with economic contours that people can understand and appreciate". The era of socialist justice, the era of socialism has thus come in in contrast to the era of capitalist exploitation which preceded immediately before she came.

I only leave it to the people to judge whether this radical change has been ushered in by this budget, whether this budget reflect such a radical shift in policy.

Let us see whether this budget will achieve these objectives. Certain economists are of the opinion—I am not an economist; I am just a lay person—that the budget is ill-calculated to achieve these objectives. It will not accelerate the speed of growth. As far the poor, the people who are already in the low income groups, they will be further hardhit because inflation is inevitable. Due to inflation, the value of the rupee will come down. This will lead to social tension. It will also lead to unstable politics. This opinion is expressed by one section of economists,

They feel that the imperative of growth is adequate flow of savings. But as a result of luxury living by a small minority living on unearned monopoly incomes, inflation incomes, this will be thwarted.

Another reason for inflation is improvident spending by States, bank overdrafts, favourite States spending more and wasteful expenditure by the Central Government. As a result of these, savings will be inadequate.

In the last decade ending in 1965-66, the savings rate was 8 per cent. It went down in 1966-67 to 6.6 per cent. There is now an upward surge, the saving is a little better. But this budget does not indicate that the saving will be on an appreciably higher scale. The past policy has led to the consumption of capital thus eroding savings, thus creating shortage of capital which holds back progress. Therefore, they—the economists feel the same policy will continue. There will not be any conspicuous change.

Now we come to the question of welfare of the poor. I do not wish to repeat the various taxes which impinge on the poor. The duties on kerosene, sugar, tea, cigarettes, coffee, petrol, increase in railway fare—all these are going to hit the ordinary consumer, the ordinary middle and the poor people for whom the Benches opposite are exceedingly sympathetic these days.

The revenue sought to be raised by this budget by way of additional direct and indirect taxes amount to Rs. 170 crores. What is the break-up of this figure? Excise duties account for Rs. 135 crores, customs duties come to Rs. 20 crores. Therefore, the bulk of it comes from indirect taxes. It has been contended that they have tried to put levies on certain items which will not impinge on the poor or on the general mass of the people. But I am afraid this will have a very bad impact on the people at large. Such invisible taxes are the harshest. People cannot place their fingers on them; they go undetected. But they have an over-all impact as they increases prices.

We are told that the raising of the exemption limit of for income-tax is a

[ Shrimati Sucheta Kriplani ]

great socialist measure. I thank her for what little she has done. But that little is not going to affect a very large number. The Bhoothalingam Committee report had proposed an exemption limit of Rs. 7,500. That should have been taken as the limit of exemption. Why has she not gone up to that ? That would have been the proper and rational thing to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too much.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI :  
Very good. But I beg to differ.

Then the tax rate on incomes of Rs. 40,000 and above has been raised. The new wealth tax at the highest slab will impose an effective ceiling of approximately Rs. 25,000 rupee incomes derived from wealth. That is also a good socialist measure. But where does the defect, the catch, lie ? It will lie in administration, in the collection of it. I would like her to tell me whether the big bosses, the leaders of big business, houses such people who figure in the Report of the Monopolies Commission Report: who represent real concentration of wealth will pay up. I know that income tax of 93.5 per cent is an almost confiscatory level. Nobody can say it should be more. It is good socialistic measure, but may I know how many assesseees will come under this category and what quantum Government expects to get out of this category ? When the Prime Minister replies I would very much like to know what she expects to get out of this sector. She is a very hard realist therefore in the Wealth Tax she has taken credit for an increase of only Rs. 4 crores, from Rs. 14 to Rs.18 crores. She knows they would collect more. The apprehension is that the premium on evasion will be high at the higher levels of income. This was said by Prof. Kaldor had said and we are afraid that the same thing is going to happen. We also apprehend that it will also lead to further accumulation of black money which is creating havoc in the Indian economy. Therefore, it is more necessary, according to me, to plug the loopholes.

The loopholes of urban property for instance, In urban property, tax has been

imposed on individual and family property but corporate property has been left out. I would like to ask how many of these big businessmen bosses own property in their own names ? In this House some months ago when this question of taking over Birla House as a national monument came up, we learnt that it does not belong to the Birla family but to their business. Therefore, this entire gamut of property will be left out of the purview of taxes. This is only a big loopholes which needs to be plugged. There are other loopholes. I cannot go into details, I can mention only a few.

The far instance method of evaluation of shares of companies, particularly private companies, leaves much to be desired. That is a major loophole. For example, an individual may transfer his personal house say worth over Rs. 10 lakhs to a company against shares. The company will not be liable to wealth tax. None will be paid on that property. The Wealth Tax leviable on shares may not reflect the real value of the property as there is no arrangement to evaluate shares. Therefore, the Wealth Tax that he pays will not reflect the real value of his wealth. There are various ways of evasion which the Government needs to look into and check.

Then, the P.M. has initiated certain new measures in order to give incentive to people to put money in the nationalised banks. Wealth tax will not be charged on deposits upto Rs. 1½ lakhs if it is kept in the bank, or invested in the shares of certain companies, and income tax will not be charged upto Rs. 3,000 of income derived out of money placed in these banks. So far so good. It is a good incentive to increase deposits in the banks because banks now belong to the Government. The depositors are certainly being helped, but at whose cost ? The depositor will be helped at the cost of the public exchequer. Is the Government justified in doing that ? That is a very simple question I ask the Government. There is the gift tax, that is considered a great socialist measure, but no credit has been taken in the revenue for this item because it never increases. This has no revenue impact. It is another of the window-dressings to which Shri Asoka Mehta referred.

I welcome the decision of the Government to tax those charitable trusts which were a cloak for evading taxes. I also welcome the decision to tax entertainment, not to leave business entertainment free any more.

It has been said that corporate tax is not being raised to create acclimate for better investment, to help for production. I take this assertion at its face value. But I have a few questions to ask. Corporation tax has been stagnating over the last few years. Production has increased, diversification has increased, but in spite of that the corporate tax has not increased, rather in real terms it has gone down. Has the Government probed into it to see what the loopholes are? Are they at all planning to plug the loopholes? We would like these simple questions to be answered.

Then, I come to the question of inflation? There is a great deal of sympathy for the poor, but the ban of Indian economy has been in the last few years mounting inflation, inflation mounting year after year. The spiral of inflation is going on, and that is hitting us the hardest. Who gets hurt by the inflation—poor middle-class and fixed income groups. An impression is sought to be created that inflation is no more a big problem. But there has been a re-emergence of inflationary trend after a brief period of price stability and this belies the claim that inflation is no longer a problem. In the last 12 months prices have risen by seven per cent. If this trend continues, there will be demand for wage rise. All our calculations of development expenditure will also go wrong. The Prime Minister has stated that deficit financing of Rs. 225 crores should not cause concern in view of better foodgrains position. Liberal foodgrains supply alone cannot provide cushion against inflation. Harvest still depend upon the vagaries of nature. Only yesterday we had a severe hail storm which might hit this year's production. Therefore, we feel that there is no justification for this optimism. Then, Sir, the gap is even bigger. I do not want to go into it in great detail because Mr. Asoka Mehta and Mr. Masani had touched earlier on this point. The

Government has over estimated their revenue yield by at least Rs. 100 crores. On top of that State after State is bringing forward deficit budget. Some State will go in for overdrafts from the Reserve Bank. All this will add to inflation. The losses in the public sector are there I shall quote only one sentence from the Economic Survey.

The financial results of 55 running concerns with a total investment of Rs. 3093 crores disclose a net loss of the order of Rs. 35 crores for 1967-68. Further, Hindustan Steel alone with a total estimated investment of Rs. 1084 crores incurred a loss of Rs. 38 crores.

If the public sector projects are run in this insolvent manner that is bound to increase inflation.

I am sorry to quote that in the budget there is no indication that the Government is at all concerned about effecting any economy, about cutting the wasteful expenditure. I am sure that if the Government wanted they could curtail non-development and non-plan expenditure to a certain extent. With the little experience I have of administration in U.P. Where we had a budget of only Rs. 300 crores, not Rs. 4000 crores, we had provided for a plan of saving Rs. 13 crores spread over 5 years. If I had continued there it would have been possible to effect that much of saving. If the Government is earnest it is possible to do these things. But not a single word had been said about cutting down wasteful expenditure. therefore, I come to the unfortunate conclusion that inflation will rise, nothing has been done to prevent it. Whatever benefits people may get out of the welfare schemes, will be set off by inflation. The worker is better off in a State where fiscal arrangement will give him a stable and honest rupee. Today the crying need of India is for an honest and stable rupee so that people know how much their rupee is worth.

We find a novel proposition in this budget. Rs. 175 crores have been retained by the Prime Minister as discretionary grant to be spent for the States as and when she thinks fit. I am surprised why this need

[ Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani ]

has arisen. The Finance Commission gave its award only last year. The Planning Commission goes meticulously every year into the needs of the States and the resources availability position and makes allocation. After the Planning Commission and the Finance Commission have gone into the matter, what more is left necessitating the Prime Minister to keep such a large amount in her hands? What is the purpose of the Finance Commission? The Finance Commission measures with a common yard stick the relative needs of the States and then makes its recommendations. The Planning Commission does the same. What will the Prime Minister do? I am afraid this amount will be used for political purposes, for partisan purposes. It is to favour one State or to topple the Government in another State. The recent trend has been to use public funds for such purposes. This is a very nefarious trend and this trend should be condemned. This may sabotage our federal and democratic structure. This will sabotage our Constitution. I make a specific demand: if the Government have got so much money to spare, let them appoint a Commission, and let the Commission go into the needs of the States and then allocate the amount. Therefore, I strongly oppose this measure of holding the sum of Rs. 175 crores under her discretion.

I now come to another very interesting subject, and that is about the bank nationalisation. I shall refer to the report in this Government document, the *Economic Survey*. The nationalisation of banks is the trump card in the Prime Minister's hand in her political game. This word has been used *ad nauseam*; we are rather sick of this propaganda. Why were the banks nationalised? They were nationalised in order to give money to the priority sectors, the sectors that were being deprived by the private banks. The object was to increase the tempo of production in the agricultural all small industrial sector, etc. What does this report say about bank nationalisation? It is rather revealing. It says:

"As a result of the various measures taken by the Reserve Bank, commercial

banks had stepped up credit to priority sectors. Thus, between end-June 1968 and end-June 1969—

Please mark the dates.

"the total outstanding credit rose from Rs. 45 crores to Rs. 188 crores in respect of agriculture, from Rs. 194 crores to Rs. 294 crores in respect of small scale industries and from Rs. 174 crores to Rs. 255 crores in respect of exports."

This has happened when? (The law came into force only in February.) This happened in the year ending June 1969; but this is the period when this "reactionary" gentleman who sits here, the friend of the capitalists, who has not the good of the poor at heart, was at the helm of the Finance Ministry. Then, in July, 1969, the dynamic personality, the "friend of the poor", the socialist, Prime Minister came to procoide over th: Finance Department: (*Interruption*) the harbinger of radicalism. We would like to know what is the record of achievement in the later period. Very cleverly, neither the *Economic Survey* nor the budget, said anything about it. We do not know what is the performance of the nationalised banks *vis-a-vis* all these priority sectors during this period, when the socialist, P.M. took up the stewardship of the Finance Ministry.

I do not say much, owing to lack of time. I would only ask a few questions on this. I want to know what is the performance of the nationalised banks during this period. Can we have a picture of the firm credit plan? What is the provision for agriculture? What is the provision for small industry that the Prime Minister has made?

With these few words, I am finishing. The budget is very cleverly drafted. If you look at it superficially, you will be certainly taken in. You will find a good facade of socialism. But if you go a little deep, if you probe into it, if you come to read the literature, carefully the hollowness of the claim is exposed. All I say is—I do not say there are no good points; there are (some good points—that the tall claim

made by the Prime Minister and her supporters is not justified.

**श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव (आजमगढ़) :** माननीय अधिष्ठाता महोदय, मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता है कि सन् 1970-71 का बजट पेश करने के बाद देश में लगभग सभी वर्गों से एक अनुकूल प्रतिक्रिया आई, महज उन लोगों को छोड़ कर जोंकि यह महसूस करते थे कि इस बजट में या तो कुछ ऐसे कर लगाए जायेंगे जिनका बोझ आम गरीब जनता पर पड़ेगा और उन्हें आलोचना करने का मौका मिलेगा या वे समझते थे कि प्रधान मंत्री अपने जांश व खरोश में जिन प्रगतिशील और समाजवादी नीतियों की आज-कल वे बातें करती हैं उसमें कुछ ऐंम बड़े टैक्स लगायेंगे जिससे हमारे देश की जो औद्योगिक व्यवस्था है उसमें अराजकता फैल जायेगी और विकास की जो गति है उसमें र्कावटें पैदा हों जायेंगी और इसलिए उन्हें आलोचना करने का मौका मिलेगा। और इस आशा में इस बजट की तरफ देख रहे थे कि शायद आज देश में भी एक भ्रम फैलाने की कोशिश कुछ लोगों की तरफ से हो रही है, देश की प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतों की तरफ से, देश की रूढ़िवादी और अपरिवर्तनशील ताकतों की तरफ से हो रही है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने जो वातावरण सारे देश में पैदा किया है वह बहुत दिन तक रहने वाला नहीं। उनको गहरी माथूसी हुई है, गहरी निराशा हुई है इस बजट को देखने के बाद। (व्यवधान) सब से ज्यादा निराशा शायद श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा को हुई है, और इसलिये वह बहुत परेशान हैं।

**श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा :** पश्चिमी बंगाल में आशा ही आशा दिखाई दे रही है। मैं बड़ी खुश हूँ।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव :** समापति महोदय, मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम बजट पर शान्त चित्त से विचार करें और गम्भीरता से विचार करें तो यह बजट देश में पैदा हुई आशा, देश की आम जनता में पैदा हुई जेतना और देश

की जनता की आशा अकांक्षा का प्रतिबिम्ब है। इस बजट को पेश करते हुए इस बात को ध्यान में रक्खा गया है कि देश में पिछले पांच-छः महीनों में ऐसा वातावरण पैदा हुआ है जिसमें हमने इस बात का देश की जनता को निरंतर विश्वास दिलाया है कि पिछले 20-22 साल के विकास के बाद अपनी कमजोरियों को हमने देखा यह बात नहीं है कि पिछले बीस वर्षों में देश की प्रगति नहीं हुई, देश में निर्माण हुआ बड़े पैमाने पर, लेकिन कुछ बड़ी कमजोरियां देश में देखने में आईं और हमारे देश के समाज का जो निर्बल वर्ग है उसकी स्थिति अच्छी नहीं रही। विषमता समाज के कुछ वर्गों में बढ़ती ही चली जा रही है। बड़े पैमाने पर जो गरीब लोग हैं, मेहनत करने वाले लोग हैं उनके अन्दर और धनी वर्गों के अन्दर विषमता बढ़ रही है। (व्यवधान)

**सभापति महोदय :** आप चुप रहिये। आप को मौका मिलेगा तब आप जवाब दीजियेगा।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव :** इसलिये मैं कहूंगा कि इस बजट को पेश करते हुए सरकार के सामने मुख्य रूप में तीन बातों का ध्यान था। तीन आधार हैं इस बजट को बनाने के। पहला आधार यह है कि समाज का जो पिछड़ा वर्ग है, गरीब वर्ग है उसके निर्माण के लिये, उसकी कुछ सुविधा बढ़ाने के लिये हम इस बजट के द्वारा एक कदम उठा रहे हैं। दूसरा आधार यह है इस बजट को बनाने का कि पिछले बीस-बाइस वर्षों में समाज के जिन वर्ग ने सम्पत्ति अर्जित की है, पैसा कमाया है, विकास और निर्माण का फायदा उठाया है, अगर कोई टैक्स लगना है तो उसका बोझ केवल उसी वर्ग पर पड़ना चाहिये। इस बात की तरफ भी कुछ कदम उठाये गये हैं। तीसरा महत्वपूर्ण आधार जो इस बजट के अन्दर रक्खा गया है . . . . (व्यवधान)

**सभापति महोदय :** जो भी आप की पार्टी के मेम्बर यहां जवाब देंगे उनको आप यह प्वाइंट्स निम्बा दें, वह इसके बारे में बोलेंगे।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत दास :** तीसरा आधार इस बजट के अन्दर जो पेश किया गया है वह यह है कि हमारे देश के विकास और निर्माण की जो गति पिछले डेढ़-दो वर्षों में रही है कृषि के अन्दर, जिसको सबने माना है, उसमें उसका विकास हुआ है। और उसका लक्षण यह है कि जिस चीज के लिये इस देश में निरन्तर चिन्ता व्यक्त की गई कि हम खाने के लिये दूसरों पर निर्भर करते हैं, उसमें उन्नति हुई है। हमारे उद्योग क्षेत्रों में पिछले दो सालों में जो रिसेशन का पीरियड था उसमें कमी आई है। हम देखते हैं कि हम अपनी अर्थ-व्यवस्था में स्थायित्व की तरफ बढ़े हैं। बजट के अन्दर इस बात का भी ध्यान रखा गया है कि हम कोई ऐसा कदम न उठाएं जिससे हमारे विकास और हमारे निर्माण की जो गति है, जो प्रगति है उसमें कोई बाधा पड़े इस बजट के कारण। यह तीन मुख्य आधार हैं जिनको हमने इस बजट के अन्दर रखा है, और मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि देश की तमाम जनता ने और देश के समाज के हर वर्ग ने इस दृष्टि से इस बजट का स्वागत किया है कि यह बजट देश की वास्तविक स्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए बनाया गया है।

इस बजट की आलोचना केवल उन लोगों की तरफ से हुई है जो राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण से हर चीज के अन्दर कमजोरी देखने की कोशिश करते हैं। हिन्दी में एक कहावत है कि "सावन के अन्धे का हर चीज हरी हरी दिखाई देती है।" इसी को थोड़ा सा बदल कर मैं नई कहावत कह दूँ तो वह इस तरह से होगी कि "जो राजनीतिक अन्धे हैं उनको हर चीज बुरी ही बुरी दिखाई देती है।" हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के कुछ लोगों की जो आलोचना है वह इस बात का प्रमाण है।  
(व्यवधान)

**श्री रामसेवक दास (बाराबंकी) :** यह कहावत तो प्रायः पर ही फिट हो गई।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत दास :** इस बात का भी हम देखें कि एक आलोचना श्री अशोक मेहता ने

यह की कि इस बजट के अन्दर कुछ ऐसे भी कदम उठाये गये हैं जो अच्छे हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि इस बजट के अन्दर जो हमारे देश के सबसे गरीब वर्ग के बच्चे हैं, जो आदिवासियों के बच्चे हैं, जो शहरों की गनी बस्तियों में रहने वाले बच्चे हैं उनके लिये एक कदम उठाया गया लेकिन उसमें लिए महज 4 करोड़ रुपयों की व्यवस्था की गई है। मैं जानता हूँ कि सरकार इस बात से परिचित है कि हमारे देश के अन्दर इस एज ग्रुप में 5 करोड़ ऐसे बच्चे हैं जिनके लिये पीपुलिक आहार की व्यवस्था करने की आवश्यकता है ताकि उनके व्यक्तित्व का विकास हो सके। इसके लिये बहुत बड़ी रकम की जरूरत है। लेकिन यह पहला कदम इस दिशा में है जो हमने इस देश के 20 लाख बच्चों की जिन्दगी को अच्छी बनाने के लिये, उनको भयंकर बीमारियों के चंगुल से निकालने के लिए हमने उठाया है। आज आलोचना की जाती है कि केवल 20 लाख बच्चों को उससे लाभ हो सकेगा। मैं कहता हूँ कि उनकी निगाह में 20 लाख बच्चों की जिन्दगी का चाहे कोई महत्व न हो, लेकिन अगर एक भी बच्चे की जिन्दगी को बेहतर बनाने के लिये कोई कदम उठाया जाता है तो वह सराहनीय कदम है। एक अच्छा कदम है और हम को इस बात का स्वागत करना चाहिये कि एक महत्वपूर्ण कदम उठाया गया है।

इस बजट के माध्यम से हम ने बीस वर्ष के बाद पहली बार यह व्यवस्था की है कि जो हमारे उद्योगों में काम करने वाले कर्मचारी हैं, सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, छोटे लोग हैं, अगर उनमें से कोई मरता है तो उसके मरने के बाद कम-से-कम 40 रु० पारिवारिक पेंशन का प्रबन्ध हम कर सकें ताकि मरने वाले के बीवी-बच्चे दर-दर के भिखारी बन कर ठोकर खाते न फिरे। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह एक सही कदम है, गरीब लोगों की आंखों से आंसू पोंछने का कदम है, उनको रोटी का सहारा देने का कदम है। आज चाहे जो इसका उपहास करे लेकिन देश की गरीब जनता इस कदम का स्वागत करेगी। मैं समझता

हूँ कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों की जिन्दगी, जिनकी सख्या बहुत बढ़ी है, आज 10 और 5 रु० पेंशन पर मुनहसर करती है। आज हम इस बात की क्या गारंटी देते हैं? यह कि इस कल्याणकारी राज्य में, इस सरकारी व्यवस्था के अन्दर हम तुम्हारी पेंशन को बढ़ा कर कम-से-कम 40-६० रखना चाहते हैं और यह कदम है इस दिशा में। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस कदम को उठाने से सरकारी खजाने पर करोड़ों रुपयों का बोझ पड़ेगा, लेकिन हमने इसको इसलिये उठाया है कि हम चाहते हैं कि समाज का जो निर्बल वर्ग है, कमजोर वर्ग है उसकी हम सहायता करें और उस के भविष्य को सुरक्षित बनायें।

इस बजट के अन्दर आदि से अन्त तक जो मुख्य बात है उसको आप देखें। आद्योपान्त ऐसी धारा बहती है उसके अन्दर कि जितने टैक्स लगते हैं वे समाज के लोगों को सुविधा देते हैं, लेकिन इस बात का निरन्तर ध्यान रखा गया है कि जो सबसे गरीब वर्ग है, सबसे निर्बल वर्ग है, उसके लिये हम कोई कदम उठायें। शुरू में आखीर तक बजट की यही दिशा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इस दिशा में सही कदम है। अगर किसी पत्र ने इस बात की आलोचना की है, जैसा श्रीमती मुचेता कृपलानी ने कहा है, कि इस बजट से नये युग का प्रारम्भ होता है, तो वह आलोचना सही है क्योंकि इस बजट से उस युग का प्रारम्भ होना है जिसमें जो इस देश का उपेक्षित वर्ग है, इस देश का निर्धन, इस देश का गरीब और सबसे पिछड़ा वर्ग है, चाहे वह मेरा इलाका हो या किसी दूसरे का, उनकी और सरकार का ध्यान गया है। पिछले पांच छः महीनों में इस देश में जो कुछ हुआ है उसके अनुकूल इस बजट में व्यवस्था की गई है।

इस बजट में इस बात की भी व्यवस्था की गई है कि हमारे जिन लोगों ने सम्पत्ति अर्जित की है, जिन्होंने पैसे कमाये हैं, उन पर टैक्स लगाया जाये। भले ही यह छोटी-छोटी बातें हों लेकिन उसके पीछे भावना यह है कि जो

ऐसी कम्पनियाँ हैं उनके खर्च को टैक्स के नीचे लाया जाय। जो टैक्स के ऊपरी ढाँचे के अन्दर आती हैं, जिनकी घामदनी ज्यादा है, उनको ऊपर टैक्स का ज्यादा बोझ पड़े। इस तरह का कदम उठाने का अर्थ है कि हम समाज के अन्दर अपनी जनता के अन्दर एक सामाजिक न्याय इस बजट के माध्यम से स्थापित करना चाहते हैं।

अभी इस बात की आलोचना की गई कि कारपोरेट सेक्टर को टैक्स से क्यों छोड़ दिया गया। श्रीमती मुचेता कृपलानी ने भी कई सवाल किये। लेकिन मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि पिछले तीन-चार वर्षों में जितने बजट इस सदन के अन्दर पेश किये गये उनमें से एक के बाद एक में हर साल कारपोरेट सेक्टर को लगातार कमेशन दिये गये थे। हमने उनके कमेशन को बंद किया है इस बार। कोई कमेशन बजट के अन्दर नहीं है। क्या यह सही दिशा में कदम नहीं है?

17 hrs.

**श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा :** अब तो कारपोरेट सेक्टर को छुट्टी मिल गई है, यह आपको जानना चाहिये। साढ़े तीन लाख रुपया जो इनवेस्ट करेंगी कम्पनियाँ उनके लिए भी छुट्टी।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत दाबब :** और भी कई महत्वपूर्ण बातें इस केंद्रीय बजट के अन्दर हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस देश से अगर गरीबी को मिटाना है, अगर खूशहाली लानी है, जनता की जिन्दगी को बेहतर बनाना है, तो केवल केंद्रीय बजट से ऐसा नहीं किया जा सकता है। हमारे क्षेत्र बंटे हुए हैं। देश में राज्य सरकारें भी हैं। अगर किसानों के लिए काम करना है, उनका स्तर ऊंचा उठाना है, भूमि मुधार करने हैं, मिर्चाई के लिए पानी की व्यवस्था करनी है, तो यह जिम्मेदारी सबिधान में राज्य सरकारों के ऊपर सौंपी गई है। इस बात को जानते हुए भी कि राज्य सरकारें बहुत सी कमजोरियाँ दिखा

[ श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव ]

रही है और राजनीति का शिकार बन कर चाहे उनको ये कंमेशन देने पड़ रहे हैं, लेकिन इस तथ्य से आखें नहीं मूदी जा सकती है कि उनको यहाँ असमानता बढ़ती जा रही है, क्षेत्रीय विषमता बढ़ती जा रही है। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने फिर भी इस बजट में देश के छोटे-छोटे किसानों की तरफ ध्यान दिया है और तीन सौ करोड़ रुपयों की व्यवस्था बजट के अन्दर की है ताकि छोटे किसान जिनका मिर्चाई का लाभ नहीं पहुँच पाता है, अब उसका लाभ उठा सकें। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह एक महत्वपूर्ण कदम नहीं है और सही दिशा में एक कदम नहीं है।

हमारे देश में ये जो गन्दी बस्तियाँ हैं, एक अधिशासक है देश के लिए और हमारे अच्छे और बढ़ते हुए खूबसूरत शहरों के लिए। अब चाहे हमने उसके लिए केवल दम करोड़ रुपया ही रखा है लेकिन यह उस भावना को प्रदर्शित करता है उस उद्देश्य को परिलक्षित करता है, जिसकी ओर हम बढ़ना चाहते हैं। हमने संकल्प किया है कि इनको हम खत्म करेंगे और उसकी शुरुआत हमने इस बजट में की है।

ये जो सब काम है इनको करने के लिए बड़े पैमाने पर साधनों की जरूरत है। आलोचना की जाती है कि गरीब जनता के ऊपर टैक्सों का भार डाल दिया गया है। यह सही है कि चाय पर थोड़ा सा टैक्स लगाया गया है। लेकिन वह किस क्वालिटी की चाय है जिस पर टैक्स लगाया गया है, इसको आप देखें और वह चाय कौन लोग पीते हैं, इसको भी आप देखें। अच्छी किस्म की जो चाय है उसके ऊपर थोड़ा सा टैक्स लगाया गया है और हिन्दुस्तान के गाँवों में रहने वाले जो चालीस करोड़ लोग हैं, उन पर इसका कोई असर नहीं पड़ता। उनके घरों में लिटन और बुक बांड में बंद डिब्बों वाली चाय नहीं पी जाती है। अब अगर बढ़िया चाय पर दो पैसे का टैक्स लगता है तो इनको दर्द होता है। दर्द उनको होता है जो ऐश व आराम से रहते हैं,

जो अच्छी जिन्दगी बिताने वाले लोग हैं। गरीबों का नाम लेकर वे चाहते हैं कि चाय पर टैक्स न लगे। हमने इस बजट में कोशिश की है कि अगर चाय पर टैक्स बढ़ाया जाए तो खुली हुई चाय जो है उसके ऊपर टैक्स न लगे। हमने यह भी कोशिश की है कि मिट्टी के तेल पर अगर टैक्स बढ़ता है तो वो अच्छी क्वालिटी का मिट्टी का तेल है, उसके ऊपर ही दो पैसे लिटर के बड़े लेकिन जो मिट्टी का तेल गरीब आदमी इस्तेमाल करता है, उनको ऊपर न बढ़ने पाए। हमने कोशिश की है कि अगर चीनी पर कर बढ़ता है तो कंट्रोल की चीनी जो गरीब आदमी खाता है, उस पर टैक्स न बढ़े और अपने कंटे में ज्यादा चीनी खाने वाले अगर लोग हैं, उन पर अगर टैक्स लगता है तो दर्द इनको होता है। जहाँ तक सिग्रेट पर टैक्स बढ़ने का सम्बन्ध है, हमने कोशिश इस बात की की है, ध्यान इस बात का रखा है कि कैंची की सिग्रेट पीने वाले जो गरीब आदमी हम देश में है और जिनकी संख्या 95 प्रतिशत में ज्यादा है, उस पर अगर दो पैसे टैक्स लगता है तो गोल्ड फ्लेक-फिल्टर, गोल्ड फ्लेक या ईडिया किंग पीने वाले जो लोग हैं उनको बीस पैसे ज्यादा देने पड़े। लेकिन यह लोग तो चाहते हैं कि सिग्रेट पर टैक्स ही न लगे। यह जो दृष्टिकोण है यह निरंतर बजट में देखने को मिलता है।

हमारे देश में एक बहुत भयंकर समस्या है जिस को हमको हल करना है और वह बेरोजगारी की समस्या है। इस समस्या का मुकाबला हम लोगों को आने वाले जमाने में करना पड़ेगा। जो धीकड़े मुँह मिले हैं उनके अनुसार नवम्बर, 1969 तक इस देश में 36 लाख नौजवान बेकार थे जिन्होंने अपने नाम एम्प्लॉयमेंट एक्सचेंज में रजिस्टर कर रखे थे। ये थे नौजवान हैं जिन्होंने एक वक्त रोटी खाकर पढ़ाई की है जिनको माँ-बाप ने हर तरह की मुमोबत उठाकर उनको शिक्षित बनाया है। शिक्षित होकर आज वे लोग बेकार बैठे हुए हैं। उनकी आँखों के सामने भ्रष्टाचार है। इस समस्या को मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता

हैं कि फौजी स्तर पर, वार फुटिंग पर हल किया जाय। केन्द्रीय सरकार राज्य सरकारों को बुला कर उनकी मीटिंग करके, योजनायें बनाये और इस समस्या का समाधान दूँगे। सरकार को इस बात की जिम्मेदारी लेनी चाहिये कि ऐसे लोग जिन्होंने अपने नाम इम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंजिंग में रजिस्टर करा रखे हैं, दो साल के अन्दर अगर उन्हें सरकार नौकरी नहीं दे पाती तो यह जिम्मेदारी सरकार को अपने ऊपर लेनी चाहिये कि उनका भरण-पोषण हो, उनका जीवन-यापन हो। सरकार को इस सम्बन्ध में कृद्ध कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे। सरकार को निर्णय करना होगा कि 55 साल की उम्र के बाद किसी को वह नौकरी नहीं देगी जब तक कि बेकारों की लिस्ट में एक भी बेकार बैठा हुआ हो। सरकार को कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे कि हमारी पूरी अर्थ व्यवस्था के अन्दर इस प्रवेर से परिवर्तन किया जाए कि हम लोगों को रोजगार दे सकें। यह बड़ी भारी समस्या है जिसकी तरफ सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

दूसरी समस्या जो हमारे देश के सामने है वह क्षेत्रीय असमानता की है जो बढ़ती ही जा रही है, क्षेत्रीय विषमता की है। इस समस्या की राज्य सरकारों ने राजनीतिक कारणों से उपेक्षा की है। जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके हैं, जो गरीब इलाके हैं, जिन इलाकों का आज तक विकास नहीं हो पाया है, उनकी निरन्तर उपेक्षा ही होती चली गई है। केन्द्रीय सरकार तथा प्लानिंग कमिशन ने पिछली बार एक निर्णय किया था जिसके मुताबिक यह तय हुआ था कि केन्द्र रुपया राज्य सरकारों को दे देगा लेकिन तब पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों पर उसको खर्च किया जाना है और कौन से इलाके पिछड़े हुए हैं, इसका निर्णय राज्य सरकार करेगी, उसके लिए क्या योजना बनानी है, यह राज्य सरकार की जिम्मेदारी होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि समय आ गया है जब केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपने इस निर्णय पर फिर विचार करना होगा, केन्द्रीय सरकार को बढ़ती हुई क्षेत्रीय असमानता और बढ़ते हुए क्षेत्रीय असन्तुलन की जिम्मेदारी केवल राज्य

सरकार के ऊपर नहीं छोड़नी होगी। यदि राज्य सरकारों पर ही इसको छोड़ा गया तो इससे और ज्यादा समस्याएं पैदा होंगी। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने इस बजट में इस बात का संकेत दिया है कि कुछ ऐसे जिले और क्षेत्र चुने जाएंगे जो पिछड़े हुए हैं और केन्द्रीय सरकार उनके वास्ते कुछ योजनाएं चलायेंगी। मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस योजना पर बड़े पैमाने पर सरकार को खर्च करना चाहिये और इसकी जिम्मेदारी केन्द्र को अपने ऊपर लेनी चाहिये।

**श्री शिव नारायण :** पटेल कमिशन का जिक्र करो।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव :** मुझे वह दिन याद है जब उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों की समस्या को लेकर इसी सदन में उस प्रदेश के एक माननीय सदस्य रोने लग गये थे, उनकी आंखों से आंशु गिरने लग गए थे जब उन्होंने उस क्षेत्र की गरीबी की चर्चा की थी। जवाहरलाल जी उस वक्त प्रधान मंत्री थे। यहां से जाने के बाद उन्होंने उस माननीय सदस्य को बुलाया और उसके पश्चात पटेल आयोग की नियुक्ति की। देश के सबसे ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए, सबसे ज्यादा गरीब और तबाह इलाके उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिले हैं, झाजमगढ़, गाजीपुर, बलिया, देवरिया, मिर्जापुर और उनका लिए उन्होंने कहा कि योजना बननी चाहिये। उन्होंने उस कमिशन को इसके लिये स्थापित किया। उस कमिशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी। मुझे अफमांस है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन के हमले के बाद हमारा ध्यान देश की रक्षा की तरफ चला गया तो उसके बाद हमने उस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट को लागू करने की जिम्मेदारी राज्य सरकार पर छोड़ दी और राज्य सरकार ने उस रिपोर्ट को रद्दी की टांकरी में डाल कर रख दिया। मैं मांग करता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार फिर से पटेल कमिशन की सिफारिशों को लागू करने की जिम्मेदारी अपने ऊपर ले।

**श्रीमती सुचेता कृपलानी :** पैसा देना बन्द कर दिया गया था इस वास्ते इस को स्पष्ट कर दिया गया।

[ Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani ]

The scheme, at my intervention, was extended to two more districts. But after working for two years, it was dropped because the sanctions were not released by the Centre.

**श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव :** श्री चन्द्रभान गुप्त को डिफेंड करने की जिम्मेदारी भी आप अपने ऊपर ले रही हैं। श्री चन्द्रभान गुप्त डिबेलेपमेंट काउंसिल के अन्दर आए हुए थे। वहाँ पर यह निर्णय लिया गया था। खुद उन्होंने इस बात की जिम्मेदारी ली कि वेन्द्र यह स्थापना राज्य सरकार को दे दे और राज्य सरकार पिछड़े हुए इलाकों पर इसको खर्च करेगी। वेन्द्र से रुपया लेने के बाद उस राशि को पिछड़े हुए इलाकों पर खर्च नहीं किया गया। यह तथ्य है और इसके ऊपर आप पर्दा नहीं डाल सकती हैं।

**श्री शिव नारायण :** अब तो चरणमिंह की गवर्नमेंट है। अब करा दो।

**श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव :** यह आलोचना की जाती है कि हमारे सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्योग घाटे में चल रहे हैं, इसलिए उनको बन्द कर दिया जाये। अभी श्री मधोक ने भी यही मांग की। इस देश में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के विरोधी वे लोग हैं, जो इस देश की प्रगति के विरोधी हैं, जो इस देश की गरीब जनता के हित में काम करने के विरोधी हैं। सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बारे में यह आलोचना कोई नई नहीं है। यह आलोचना 1947 में ही की जा रही है और खासतौर से 1952 के बाद सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के विरुद्ध यह आवाज ज्यादा जोर से बुलन्द की गई, जबकि इस देश में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्योगों की स्थापना बड़े पैमाने पर की गई।

प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं कहा है कि पिछले वर्ष सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के अपने आन्तरिक साधनों से उसके विस्तार के लिए 162 लाख रुपये मिले और हम आशा करते हैं कि वर्तमान बजट में वह रकम बढ़कर 202 लाख रुपये हो जायेगी, अर्थात् उसमें 40 लाख रुपये की वृद्धि हो जायेगी। सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र का मुनाफा बढ़ रहा है और उसका विकास हो रहा है और इसलिये

यह आगे विलकुल बेबुनियाद है कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र एक गेरासाइट की तरह काम कर रहा है। वस्तुस्थिति यह है कि हमारे देश में निर्माण के लिये, हमारे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को मजबूत बनाने के लिए, हमारे देश के उन सामाजिक और आर्थिक लक्ष्यों को हासिल करने के लिए, जिनके द्वारा हम इस देश को खुशहाली और समाजवाद के रास्ते पर ले जाना चाहते हैं, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र एक मुख्य आधार है और वह भविष्य में भी बना रहेगा। इस तरह की बेबुनियाद आलोचनाओं में इस देश में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र बंद नहीं होने जा रहा है।

माननीय सदस्य, श्री अणोक मेहता ने कहा कि यह बजट न तो चाक है और न चीज है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि अगर श्री मोरारजी देसाई का बजट चाक था, तो यह बजट भी चाक है और अगर यह बजट चीज है, तो श्री मोरारजी देसाई का बजट भी चीज था। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि बजट और अर्थ-व्यवस्था को देखने का यह दृष्टिकोण विलकुल गलत है। यह बजट न चाक है न और चीज है। यह बजट एक सराहनीय और सहस्रपूर्ण कदम है इस देश की गरीबी को दूर करने की दिशा में और उन सामाजिक तथा आर्थिक लक्ष्यों को प्राप्त करने की दिशा में, जिन को हमने अपने सामने रखा है।

मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बजट के रूप में एक सहस्रपूर्ण कदम उठाया गया है देश की सामाजिक विषमताओं को दूर करने के लिए, अमीरी और गरीबी की खाई को पाटने के लिए, देश के सबसे निर्बल लोगों को सबसे ज्यादा सहायता देने के लिये। पिछले बीस बरसों में जिन लोगों की आमदनी बढ़ी है, हम उन पर टैक्स का बोझ लाद कर, उससे प्राप्त धन को देश के निर्माण के काम में लाना चाहते हैं। हमने कभी यह दावा नहीं किया है कि इस बजट के माध्यम से इस देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना होने वाली है। जो लोग समझते हैं कि किसी देश में बजट के माध्यम से समाजवाद की स्थापना होती है, न उनको समाजवाद की जानकारी

है और न वे समाजवाद की परिभाषा को जानते हैं। बजट के माध्यम से समाजवाद की स्थापना नहीं हुआ करती है। देश की आर्थिक और सामाजिक शक्तियों और सम्बन्धों को नियंत्रित कर के और उत्पादन के साधनों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सरकार के कब्जे में ला कर ही समाजवाद की स्थापना होती है और यह बजट उस दिशा में बढ़ने वाला एक कदम है।

श्रीमती मुचेता कृपलानी ने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने 175 करोड़ रुपया अपने हाथ में रख छोड़ा है, राज्यों में बांटने में जिसका उपयोग शायद वह विभिन्न स्टेट्स में भेदभाव करने और अपने राजनैतिक मकसद को पूरा करने के लिए करेगी। (व्यवधान) उन्होंने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री पोलिटिकल परपज के लिए 175 करोड़ रुपये अपने हाथ में रखना चाहती है। (व्यवधान) प्लानिंग कमीशन ने कुछ आधार बनाए हैं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार और राज्य सरकारों में धन का बंटवारा कैसे होगा। फिनांस कमीशन ने भी इसके लिए कुछ आधार तय किये हैं। लेकिन इन दोनों कमीशनों द्वारा ये आधार निर्धारित किये जाने के बावजूद राज्य सरकारों द्वारा निरंतर केन्द्रीय सरकार पर यह दबाव डाला गया है कि उनके साधन कम हैं और अपने विकास के लिये उन्हें रुपया चाहिए। राज्यों की उन मांगों को ध्यान में रखते हुए इस बजट में राज्यों को मदद देने के लिए रुपया रखा गया है। किसी एक राज्य को मदद देने का प्रश्न नहीं है। मुख्य मंत्रियों से परामर्श करके, नेशनल डेवेलपमेंट कौंसिल द्वारा तय आधारों को दृष्टि में रखते हुए और प्लानिंग कमीशन से सलाह-मशवरा करके यह निर्णय किया जायेगा कि राज्यों को यह रुपया किस आधार पर दिया जाये। यदि किसी राज्य की अपनी विशेष समस्याएं हैं, किसी राज्य में कहत पड़ गया है, किसी राज्य में पिछड़े वर्गों की समस्याएं हैं, तो उन बातों को देखते हुए, कुछ निश्चित आधारों पर, यह रुपया बांटा जायेगा। इसलिए माननीय सदस्य का यह आरोप बिल्कुल बेबुनियाद है और एक राजनैतिक उद्देश्य से नगया गया है।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : मैं एक शेर मुन्नाना चाहती हूँ। 'मालिब वजीफखार हो, दो शाह को दुधा, वो दिन गधे कहते थे. नौकर नहीं हूँ मैं।'

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Chairman, if I may say so, this Budget has got two parts. The first part belongs to the Prime Minister and the second to the bureaucrats. In the first part, she has stood up to her promise and has presented to the country a refreshing new look. There is no use finding fault with her that she has not been able to usher in socialism through this budget. She has given a new direction. Otherwise, you cannot explain the whole enthusiasm that has been exhibited throughout the country within the last six months.

17. 18 hrs.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the Chair]

It is easy to pick up several faults in the framing of this Budget. I myself will be able to do it. But with all my orthodoxy in looking at budgets, I find there is something that happened in this country which perhaps we may not be able to define but a new enthusiasm has come up, a new sunshine has shone and a new awareness among the people is discernible that hereafter they are participants in the wealth and progress of this country. Eighty per cent of the people now feel that they are no more second class citizens to be exploited by the big business and the bureaucracy which is in the hands of the big business and the Ministers who are in the hands of the bureaucracy.

That is the change that has come. That is the reason why people like myself say it is a budget worth looking at. It may contain all the faults which Shri Ashoka Mehta pointed out, all the shortcomings which Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has highlighted and all the great faults which the great business representative, Shri Masani, has drawn attention to. But like in Hindu law where there is what is called obstructed heritage, she has inherited a

[ Shri Tenneti Viswanatham ]

great backlog of 20 years. Therefore, it is not always easy to clear up the whole thing in a day.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : From whom?

SHRI TENNETI VISHWANATHAM: From those who have presented. Budgets for the last twenty years, who have been showing concession after concession to the big business, who have been pampering the businessmen at the cost of the common man of this country. These big businessmen have always got a great knack of presenting things in a beautiful way, otherwise they will no longer be businessmen. They come and teach the Ministers several things, but every time they see to it that it is to their advantage. Therefore, in spite of all the good wishes which the Congress men entertained and expressed, the result was that something else has happened which is far different from their wishes.

You might remember that prof. Mahalanobis arranged pyramids and models and then gave plans. I think Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao was one of the economists and a great number of economists including the present Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, etc. were the advisers of this Government. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, once he trusted a man, trusted him completely. He trusted these people completely and left everything to the Planning Commission. What happened? After they planned and planned for ten or 15 years they found that the plan led all the wealth into the hands of a few people, and then they themselves began writing reports.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: It was found out in Jawaharlal's own days.

SHRI TENNETI VISHWANATHAM : Yes. After two plans, people began to criticise on the floor of the House and everywhere in the country that high taxes were being levied but the wealth was going somewhere else. At first Panditji said that everything was all right, but

then the criticism grew in volume and Panditji appointed Prof. Mahalanobis. He produced a report and then came the Monopolies Commission and other commissions. It took a number of years for the people to realise, for the politicians to realise, and for all those who were in a state of snug complacency to realise that the whole thing has gone wrong, and the great offence, if I may say so, of the present Prime Minister is that she wanted to clear the mistakes and set the country on a new path. All that has happened is that, but even stronger personalities than Indiraji could not resist these bureaucrats. And she has also not been able to resist, and that is why at the end of speech she added a very plausible sentence. She said that she had avoided both the faults, the fault of doing too much and the fault of doing too little. It is a beautiful sentence and I liked it very much, but even if she had gone a little further, it would have gained acceptance in the entire country.

As I said, the first part belongs to her and she gave a few directions, she opened a few windows. In the last 20 years there was progress, but there was no progress for 80 or 85 percent of the people. For them it was dismal darkness and for the first time the window was opened and the first ray of sun light entered into their vision. But one need not be angry if she has done that. If she has done that, why should others be angry? They should be glad.

But anything that is done can be spoiled if the administration is not run well. Therefore, it is the first duty of the Prime Minister to tone up and clean the entire administration. Apart from isms, as one old English poet said, for form of government let whatever fools contest whatever is administered best is best. All the aims and objectives will fail if the Administration is not cleaned up. Therefore, she must have a special machinery to see that all the reactionary bureaucrats are given full pension and made to retire, unless they change their ways. The difficulty with the bureaucrat is that there is nothing wrong inherently with him; he is an excellent man,

a brilliant man and an intelligent man. That really is our trouble. Some of them are very bright boys and by the age of 24 or 25 they get into office and come up. But they are secluded from public life, except when they here a few speeches on the floor of the House in Parliament or the State Assemblies. They do not ordinarily hear the voice of the people or people's representatives; they have no change and the conduct rules have been so framed that they do not accompany any Ministers in public meetings that do not accompany any politicians. I wish they are asked for at least once in a year to go with the politicians, not to become the tools of politicians or ministers but to understand what the people are thinking and saying and what the country is like. I would even say that some of them might be given permission to contest elections. Then they will understand people's mind... (*Interruptions*). Not after retirement, but while in service. So that they have an experience of an election, going to the constituency and looking to the people. There is no use saying people are illiterate; it is your material; or that the politicians are half educated, that is your material; you cannot help it. If they are all half educated, you have to get on with them. Unless bureaucracy revises its outlook on life, all the good wishes expressed in part A of the Prime Minister's speech will be in vain. Therefore, the first thing is to change their outlook.

Not only that. There is corruption, jobbery. There are those who are not corrupt in the sense that they take money and all that; perhaps they can be found out. There are persons who are victims of a passion for jobbery and favouritism; they spoil administration; they create frustration in the minds of those who come into contact with the officers and sometimes instead of pushing up the level of administration, they push it down. Some special machinery has got to be set up to take care of these things. I do not say that the majority of officers are corrupt; the majority of them are good. Otherwise we would not be having even this kind of healthy life in this country after twenty years. We have been able to run the country democratically and hold free and practically fair elections for so many years, while in other

countries, corruption mounted so high that Governments tumbled down. So, it is not my contention or allegation that all officers are corrupt. My complaint is that their outlook is not good. A few of them are corrupt but they should not be shielded. If you talk of giving a new deal to this country and you shield even one big corrupt officer, you will be guilty of betraying the whole country. Therefore, it is very important that new kind of machinery, I do not know what kind of machinery she will have is set up to combat this particular thing.

Then there are other officers who discriminate—terrible discrimination—on either language ground or on regional grounds. Some care must be taken about this. If the top most people in the office—Secretariat or in the departments—are careful about this, perhaps at the lower rungs, this can be set right, but it must be set right. You do not know how many people come to us, Members of Parliament, complaining that "We are being suppressed because we belong to this particular region, I am being suppressed because I do not speak that gentleman's language." The grievances may be quite unfounded or there may be semi-truth in them. I have always been saying that our departments might have their own small tribunals to look into the grievances of these officers. When there is a grievance, the man must be given an opportunity to go straight to that officer or the tribunal and put forth his case, and when that man looks into the papers and hears the person who has committed or caused the so-called trouble of this kind, he can advise the government and the advice can be followed in most cases. But the Government does not do it. On the other hand, they feel, every superior officer feels, or insists, that all the subordinates are his slaves. There are the Government Servants' Conduct Rules framed, for the first time, I believe, in 1857, and they are gradually being amended every decade and they are still continuing. They are treated as slaves. I have known how even a Deputy Secretary who was perhaps senior enough to become the Secretary in a few days was so obediently and slavishly waiting upon the pleasures of his Secretary. I have seen it in two or three States. I have not been able to see the Secretariat functioning here. Then there

[ Shri Tenneti Vishwanatham ]

are officers who are called non-gazetted officers,—UDCs, LDCs, and so on. The Government Servants' Conduct Rules prevent them from coming to us even when there is a grievance. Why? When there is no machinery? However, it has become a habit for Members of Parliament as also members of legislatures that notwithstanding the rules, we are writing to the Ministers. We had a fight also in the Assembly at Hyderabad. They said, "He has offended the Government Servants' Conduct Rules." He has not offended really; when he does not get a hearing in respect of his complaint, when his paper is lying unattended to for six or seven months or sometimes two or three years, and if he writes another reminder, the only answer would be, "If you writes another reminder, you will be suspended, or disciplinary proceedings will be taken against you, if you write again." Therefore, the Government servants must be given a fairer deal at all levels: Secretary or Deputy Secretary, Superintendents, Clerks—at all levels. Unless there is a satisfaction, unless there is some contentment, unless there is a feeling that their complaints are heard, that no injustice is done to them, they will become reckless and fall into a state of frustration; they will not help you to weed out the dishonest man or weed out corruption. They will resort to what is called Work to Rule business. Therefore, if the new deal has to succeed, I am appealing to the Prime Minister that she must set up some new machinery in order to see that things go right and better.

At I said, the second part of the budget belongs to the bureaucrat. Why did I say that? By force of habit, they have increased the excise duty. Taxes on sugar, kerosene and even petrol have been increased. They think that petrol is also a luxury article of consumption. Preserved foods, the containers containing the foods, etc. all must be taxed. It is a mere force of habit that they progressively increase the excise duties and therefore they wrote those paragraphs. The Prime Minister had to yield to it, because she got the first part all right. I learnt from an experienced minister this thing you

tell the Secretary. What you want and he will do it for you, but if his files or some other files come, do not question them, but just sign them. Then everything will be all right. Sir, such a minister is called a first class minister, who understands realities. We have had such first class ministers for the last 22 years and this has led to the present dismal situation we are facing. Having had some experience, though no. at such a high level like this, I am cautioning the ministers to be wary when they deal with bureaucrats. The excise duties on sugar, preserved foods, etc. must go. I do not know why there is not so much agitation against these levies as against the increase in the third class railway fare. I do not know why we MPs have not been able to put pressure upon her to cancel the increases in these excise duties, which increase the cost of living and the burden on the commonman disproportionately.

Coming to the third part, when Mr. Boothalingam recommended that the exemption limit should be Rs 7500, Government did not agree. Now they have put the limit at Rs. 5000. We are thankful for this small concession, but even if the Prime Minister raised the exemption limit to Rs.7500, she would not have lost much. She has increased the rates above the Rs. 40,000 slab. Why not have this limit at Rs. 25,000 instead of at Rs. 40,000? It is because those who advised her come within that range of Rs. 25,000 to Rs.40,000. They may not be aware of it. The bureaucrat has no bad intentions, but he did it almost by instinct. I have made some calculations and I find that if she had raised the exemption limit to Rs.7500, she would have lost just half of what she would get by levying the higher rates of tax from the limit of Rs. 25,000 onwards instead of Rs.40,000.

**SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda) :** If the exemption limit is raised to Rs.7500, they will say the MPs have exempted themselves.

**SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM :** Whatever exemptions there are for the MPs, let them go. Let it not be said in this country that while giving a new deal, the MPs fended for themselves. If the public

feel that the MPs are having too many advantages, let the advantages may go. All that is wanted for an MP is some facilities to function effectively; nothing more than that. If these things can be given, let not a single pie be given to any MP. Let the Government give everything to the MP's in kind; let them receive the MP's at the railway station and the aerodromes, as they receive their sons-in-law and let them send them back. Then we do not want to handle a single pie.

The essence of democracy is rule of law, majority rule and the protection of the rights of the minorities; whether they are regional, linguistic, religious or other minorities, the rights of the minorities is the special care and charge of the majority and those who are ruling. Unless that is done we cannot have real national integration.

I will give you the instance of a person working in the Sanskrit Vidya Peeth at Tirupathi (A.P.). Some charges were framed against him like that he was not attending to the library work or coming or taking track of books. Perhaps they feared that those charges could not be proved. So, they thought that they must give still further stronger grounds. So, a charge was framed in November 1968 that he sent an article to *The Hindu* of Madras in December 1967 entitled "The Hollowness of the Argument for Hindi" and another article to *Educational Review* of January 1968 about the agitation in Hindi States.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN :** The articles were sent by his son.

**SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM :** In that case, it is still worse. But let us assume that he has done it. He was charged as "being disloyal to the Constitution and striking at the very root of the Constitution." The Sanskrit Vidya Peeth has nothing to do with Hindi. Further, this is happening after the Centre has passed an Act that English shall continue as long as the non-Hindi-speaking States want it. There are a number of Departments where promotions are not given, or increments withheld if officers do not pass the Hindi test. These are not conducive to national unity or national integration. Instead of

trying to settle all differences, compose all differences, if you give pin-pricks then you can never have real national integration. I know that Ministers and top-most officials might not be aware of these things; but even if somebody lower down in the hierarchy is doing this, government has got to bear the brunt of it. I want to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this because she has said of the parting of the way between the old and the new, ringing out of the old and the ringing in of the new. Therefore, those who are in the new, let them all have some kind of consolidation physical and mental.

I have already said that the poor man was neglected. The middle class is being gradually squeezed out. The educated middle class is something like the vertebral column of the Nation. If we want to preserve our constitutional democracy, it is the educated middle class which is its real the watchdog. If you nourish the poor people who constitute 80 to 85 per cent of the people you are nourishing the nation. If you are nourishing the middle-class man, you are nourishing democracy. It is absolutely necessary that whatever steps we take, these things must be borne in mind.

In the matter of production and consumption of several articles, we are in a very backward state compared with foreign countries. Everybody knows that. In the matter of crude steel, electric energy, petroleum products, cement, aluminium, copper, sulphuric acid, chemical fertilisers—so many things—we are far behind. Even in the case of the milk we seem to be the lowest in production and consumption. Excepting Japan and Philippines, I find that even in the case of milk in this land, which was flowing with milk and honey, and which has such vast agricultural land with a population of 80 per cent depending upon agriculture, we are short of milk and milk products.

Milk is the very basis of our life. Milk must nourish our children. There is no milk for children; therefore, there is no strong nation. If there is no strong nation, there is no balanced thinking. If you want real balanced thinking, you must have your own milk. You are killing milk with

[ Shri Tennati Vishwanatham ]

several things. Several kinds of new things have come and they are killing the buffaloes and the cows. Do not think that only those people who eat them are killing them. Those people who are bringing tractors are killing them; those who are importing milk powder are killing them chemical fertilisers add to this. Therefore cows are slaughtered in several ways. If you want to improve our economy, the cow is the basis because you say that 52 per cent of our national product is still agricultural produce.

In order to improve production of the various things which I have said, what are the steps which the Prime Minister is going to take? It is true that after bank nationalisation money has been released. The money which is available in the States, in the Centre and in the nationalised banks should all be treated as one fund, which is a common fund, for the development of the entire nation. There is no use in each State trying to make its own Plan, the Central Government making its own Plan and the banks being merely given a direction to increase their loans to the poor men or the cooperative societies. There must be plan for this. What is it that we want? If we want certain things to grow and flourish, we have to set apart some things. The most important things which attracted the attention in Gandhiji's centenary year were common necessities. In India what we do not have. . . . . (Interruption)

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

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : I thought, I had some 30 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have exhausted all the time.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : Then, I will not exhaust your patience.

She must treat the entire fund as one national fund and the allocations and priorities must be decided here by a common body. The National Development Council might constitute a small sub-committee for

this purpose and utilise all the funds for the various allocations. Each financial institution in each State is making its own priorities it has got its own favourites or priorities. In Andhra one priority, in UP another and in Maharashtra yet another—all different priorities. So also the banks and the State Governments and the national Government here. The entire fund must be treated as one common fund and priorities assigned so that they will be like sluices of a huge dam and you open the sluices in the direction in which you want.

There is great extent of land for development which is either being assigned or taken over by persons who have no land otherwise. But that land belongs to this country and has got to be developed. Therefore there is no use fighting that the Communists went and occupied the land without authority or that man had no authority to occupy that land. The land belongs to you, the man is there and, therefore, let him utilise it. You must have some reclamation boards. For drinking water, there is no use giving money for wells as was done in the olden days. Perhaps it was absolutely necessary to meet urgent needs, and you might have to give them. You might direct the banks, you might direct the State Governments and you might sanction loans for drinking water in some places. But it would not solve our problem. Nearly 40 to 50 per cent of the villages in our country have only brackish water to drink. Where we have got wells, they are not wells with potable water. Therefore, what I say is that in this country where we have got huge iron ore deposits, we can have any length of cast iron pipes. There are huge rivers which are submerging north Bihar and Bengal. So by cast iron pipe lines we can connect all the rivers and by booster pumps and cast iron pipes we can have the water supplied to any part of the country. We can create a water grid for drinking water supply. There should be a Land Reclamation Board, There must be a Water Board. Unless these things are done, rural needs and rural water supply problem cannot be solved.

Lastly, a word about the slum clearance work. Half the imbalanced in the thinking

of the educated man and the semi-educated man and the semi-employed man in the cities is due to the slum conditions in which he is obliged to live. Slums are not merely those cottages which contain only 100 sq. ft. There are buildings, masonry buildings and huge structures which provide only slum conditions to the people who live there and these slums should be cleared immediately in all the urban areas. Some revolving fund is sought to be made. But that is not enough. A sum of Rs. 200 or 300 crores should be set apart for this. A sum of Rs. 40 to 50 crores should be set apart for drinking water. A sum of Rs. 400 crores must be earmarked for rehabilitation and housing of these people. Unless these things are done, you cannot get balanced thinking and among the common men you cannot complain that students are restless and students are indisciplined. There is no nourishment. You do not give them even handpound rice. You give them white rice, white sugar and white bread which a famous English doctor said, are the enemies of mankind. What is happening to us? Our nourishment is gone. Our nutrition is gone. Even our peasant are not able to ill the land or do the work in the farms. Therefore, we must have a new approach to health problems and here I would like the Prime Minister to withstand the criticism from businessmen and concentrate her attention on the 85% of our population who are poor. In nourishing them, you are nourishing the entire nation. These are the men who produce the raw materials necessary for our industry. What was the cause for the recession? Recession came because the drought came and there were no agricultural products for the industrialists. Nourish the *kisan*, you nourish the nation. Nourish the poor man, you nourish the nation. Don't kill the middle class because he is the vertebral column of your constitution

17.54 hrs.

[ SHRI K.N. TIWARI in the Chair ]

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीबाई (मेडक) : सभापति महोदय, मैं प्रधान मंत्री को बधाई देना चाहती हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत प्रच्छा बजट पेश किया है।

आपको यह बात मालूम होना चाहिये कि बहनें फाइनेन्स की महिर होती हैं, और कितना भी रुपया दो, वह डेफिसिट बजट पहले बनाती हैं, लेकिन साथ ही यह बात भी है कि हर एक घर में वह आखीर में कुछ न कुछ बचा लेती हैं। अगर 100 रु० दो तो 2-4 रुपये बचा देगी और 1,000 रु० दो तो 40-50 बचा देगी। भ्रन्त में डेफिसिट बजट रखना औरतों का काम नहीं है इसके लिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री को बधाई देती हूँ और जो बजट आया है उसके लिये धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

हमें यह देखने में आता है कि हमारा बजट रोज रोज बढ़ता जा रहा है। जब मैं पार्लियामेंट में आई थी तब 700-800 करोड़ का बजट होता था, यानी 1,000 करोड़ से कम, लेकिन आज 3,000 या 3,500 करोड़ तक वह पहुंच गया है। बजट बराबर बढ़ता जा रहा है और हमारी ताकत घटती जा रही है। जो भी प्रजा के प्रतिनिधि हैं उनकी ताकत दिन प्रति दिन घटती जा रही है इस लिये अफसोस होता है। इस समय जो भी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज हैं वह खुद तैयार नहीं हैं, वह सिर्फ दूसरों को नसीहत देने के लिये हैं। जब हम लोग पहले यहां आये थे तब हम लोग बड़े अच्छे काम करने वाले थे लेकिन आज ऐसा हो रहा है कि जो ज्यादा शरारत करेगा, ज्यादा हुल्ला गुल्ला करेगा, उसकी बात सुनी जायेगी और दूसरों की बात पर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है। इस तरह से यहां पर कोई भी काम नहीं हो पाता है। जब हमारा 1,000 करोड़ रुपये का बजट होता था तब काम ज्यादा होता था लेकिन आज उतना काम नहीं हो पा रहा है।

मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि पहले जब हमारा बजट कम होता था तब जनता के लिये काम ज्यादा होता था, लेकिन करोड़ों रुपयों के टैक्स लगा करके भी, जो हम जनता के एक एक आदमी से लेंगे, दिल्ली के बाहर पैसा नहीं जायेगा। इस बात का मुझको बड़ा अफसोस होता है। मैं आपको इसके कुछ उदाहरण देना चाहती हूँ। चाहे किसी स्टेट में हो या सेंटर में हो, जितना बजट होता है उसका 60-70 परसेंट

[ श्रीमती लक्ष्मीबाई ]

ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर खर्च होता है। रोज रोज महकमों बढ़ते चले जाते हैं, लेकिन दिल्ली शहर से गांवों को पैसा नहीं जाता है। आज गरीबों के लिये क्या काम हो रहा है, इसके बारे में हमसे पूछना चाहिये क्योंकि हमको जनता की तकलीफें मालूम हैं। आज अक्सर कहा जाता है कि पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज कायम हो रही है, पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज से सारा काम हो रहा है, लेकिन पब्लिक सेक्टर में काम करने वाले भी हमारे ही बच्चे होते हैं, हमारे बेटे और हमारे भाई होते हैं मगर पब्लिक एंटरप्राइजेज को देखने से मालूम होता है कि सब जगहों पर घाटा हो रहा है। आखिर यह घाटा कौन करा रहा है? कौन झतान है जो वहां पर बैठा हुआ है? मैं कहती हूँ कि वहां पर हमारे ही भाई तो हैं। मिसाल के लिये आप सूरतगढ फार्म को देखिये। वहां पर मैं 1958 में देख कर आई थी कि वह कितना बड़ा था और हम समझते थे कि उससे हमारा काम बन जायेगा। वह हमारे यहां के खाद्य उत्पादन में हाथ बटायेंगा और हमको दूसरे मुल्कों पर निर्भर नहीं करना होगा। लेकिन आज उसकी कंडिशन देखने से मालूम होता है कि वहां पर लास ही लास है और जितना हम समझते थे उतना वहां काम नहीं हुआ। इतने समय के बाद भी एग््रीकल्चर से जितने परसेंट ईल्ड हम उम्मीद करते थे उतनी नहीं मिलती है और दूसरे देशों से मंगाने के प्रपोजल आते हैं।

मैं दूसरी मिसाल भी देना चाहती हूँ। फूड डिपार्टमेंट स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन के द्वारा व्यापार करता है भनाज लेने देने का। किसानों के पास से स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन भनाज लेता है और अपने पास रख लेता है, बाद में वह उसको डिस्ट्रिब्यूट करता है। व्यापार करने वाले हमेशा ऐसा करते हैं कि अगर वह उस में 100 करोड़ रुपये लगाते हैं तो 100 करोड़ निकाल करके भी 15-20 करोड़ ४० मुनाफा उस पर कमाते हैं, लेकिन एस. टी. सी.

की हालत यह है कि उस को 58 करोड़ का लास हुआ है। आखिर यह सब कौन कर रहा है? हम गरीबों से एक एक पैसा कर के लेते हैं और यहां पर करोड़ दो करोड़ नहीं सैकड़ों करोड़ रुपये नुकसान देते हैं।

किस तरह से टैक्स की राशी को एफिशिएंटली कलेक्ट किया जा सकता है, इस तरफ आपको ध्यान देना चाहिये। एफिशेंसी के साथ काम करने का ढंग हमारे पास होना चाहिये। किस को पकड़ना है और कौन टैक्स की चोरी करता है, उसका अच्छी तरह से पता लगाया जाना चाहिये।

18.00 hrs.

पिछले साल जो बजट रखा गया था उस में डायरेक्ट टैक्सिस को कलेक्ट करने लिए जो स्टाफ होता है, उसके लिए अम्मी लाख रुपया ज्यादा रखा गया था। इस साल और 55 लाख रुपये की मांग की गई है। आपने आफिसर्स और स्टाफ की संख्या को तो बढ़ा दिया लेकिन क्या उसी हिसाब से आप ज्यादा टैक्स कलेक्ट भी करते हैं? ऐसा मालूम नहीं पड़ता है। आपने 32 एडिशनल कमिशनर्स आफ इनकम टैक्स की मांग की और 32 स्टेनोग्राफर्स, 32 यू. डी. सी., 32 एल. डी. सी. की भी उसके साथ साथ मांग की है। लेकिन आप देखें कि पिछले साल के मुकाबले में वैल्यू टैक्स में रती भर भी बूढ़ी नहीं हुई है। 1968-69 में जितना बसूल होता था उतना ही होता है। गिफ्ट टैक्स भी पिछले तीन साल से लगातार 1 करोड़ 50 लाख है। आप महकमों का तो एक्सपेंशन करते जाते हैं लेकिन टैक्स आपका उतना ही कलेक्ट होता है, इसको आप देखें। आप जो एक्सपेंडिचर है, इसको घटायें। यह बढ़ता जा रहा है। जितना परसेंटेज आप ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर खर्च करते हैं, उसको आप कम करें। मैं मानती हूँ कि भ्रष्ट लोग भी हमारे ही हैं और हम भी उनके हैं। लेकिन

आज यह प्रवृत्ति देखने को मिलती है कि जो हैर्डज आफ डिपार्टमेंटस् हातों हैं वे अपने महकमों को बढ़ाते जाते हैं। इस पर आपको रोक लगानी चाहिये। मैं एक कमेटी में गई थी। वहां भी यही शिकायत सुनने को मिली थी। वहां पर कहा गया था कि 75 परसेंट जो रुपया है वह आने जाने में और एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में खर्च हो जाता है। वास्तव में जो रुपया गांवों में जाना चाहिये और जिस काम के लिए वह रखा जाता है, उस पर खर्च नहीं होता है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से जोकि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर भी हैं कहना चाहती हूं कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर जो खर्च का परसेंटेज है, उसको वह कम करें।

गरीबों को राहत दी जानी चाहिये। जो वहनें हैं, वे इसको अच्छी तरह से जानती हैं। बच्चों के लिए फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने चार करोड़ की राशि रखी है। हम इसका स्वागत करती हैं। यह बहुत ही अच्छा पग उन्होंने उठाया है। हमें इस पर गर्व है।

लेकिन आप देखें कि आज कितना ज्यादा टैक्स लोगों से बसूल किया जाता है। जिसकी पांच हजार रुपया महिना भ्रामदनी है उसके पास टैक्स देकर केवल दो हजार ही बचता है साठ हजार उसकी साल की भ्रामदनी होती है लेकिन उसके पास 24 हजार ही बचता है। बाकी टैक्स सरकार ले जाती है। क्या तीन हजार महिना उस पर टैक्स लगाना ज्यादा नहीं है। रात दिन काम करके वह पांच हजार कमाता है लेकिन उसके पास केवल दो हजार ही बचता है। वह जब देखता है कि सारा पैसा तो टैक्स में चला जाएगा तो वह कुरप्शन करता है। दो हजार से उसका खर्चा नहीं चलता है। तब वह दूसरा व्यवहार करने पर मजबूर हो जाता है। टैक्सों को इतना ज्यादा बढ़ा कर आप लोगों को तंग कर रहे हैं। वे टैक्स देने को तैयार हैं लेकिन इतने ज्यादा टैक्स आप न लगायें कि वे दे ही न सकें और उनको मजबूर होकर दूसरा व्यवहार करना पड़े। जो एक लाख रुपया कमाता है साल का

उसको 72 हजार टैक्स का देना पड़ता है और उसके पास केवल 28 हजार ही बचते हैं इससे क्या उसका काम चल सकता है ! जो हैर्डज डिपार्टमेंट के हैं, उनको इस पर सोचना चाहिये। मंत्रियों को उनको ठीक सलाह देनी चाहिये। मंत्री लोग तो आयेंगे और चले जायेंगे लेकिन ये अफसर लोग तो सदा रहने वाले हैं। इनको इनकी खुशामद में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये। एक बहुत अच्छा राजा था। एक दिन उसके बाग से कोई आदमी बैंगन ले कर आया। राजा ने कहा कितना सुन्दर बैंगन है। उसके मंत्रीगण बोले कि इसके सिर पर किरौट है, यह सुन्दर क्यों न हो। राजा बहुत खुश हुए और उन्होंने कहा कि माली को इनाम मिलना चाहिये। मंत्री लोग भी बहुत खुश इस पर हुए। रात को जब राजा ने बैंगन खाया तो कांटा उनके मुंह में चुभ गया और उनका मुंह दर्द करने लग गया। उन्होंने सुबह आ कर मंत्रियों को कहा कि यह कितना खराब बैंगन है, मैंने इसको खाया तो मुंह में कांटा चुभ गया और मेरा मुंह दर्द करने लग गया। मंत्रियों ने कहा हां आप ठीक कहते हैं, इसी लिए तो इसके दुम लगी हुई हैं। राजा जो कहता वही मंत्री लोग कहते। लेकिन आपको ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये। सही राय आपको सरकार को देनी चाहिये।

18.05 hrs.

[ MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair ]

अब आप वैल्य टैक्स को लें। मान लें कि मेरे पिता ने जब हमारे गांव की आबादी दो चार सौ थी तब एक मकान बनाया था। पच्चीस हजार में उसको बनया था। लेकिन आज उस गांव की आबादी दस हजार से ऊपर पहुंच गई है। अगर आप उस मकान की कीमत दो लाख एसेस करते हैं तो उस पर वैल्य टैक्स देना पड़ेगा। अब अगले साल आप इसको तीन लाख बना सकते हैं और चौथे साल इसको चार लाख बना सकते हैं। इस तरह तो उस पर वैल्य टैक्स की राशि बढ़ती ही जाएगी। अब मानलो

[ श्रीमती लक्ष्मीबाई ]

कि कोई कहता है कि पचास हजार तुम ले लो और अगर आपने इसको चार लाख ऐसेस किया है तो साढ़े तीन लाख मुझे दे दो, तो इसका आपके पास क्या जवाब होगा ! लोग इस तरह की बातें कहेंगे। हमें भी लोग इसके बारे में पूछेंगे। इस वास्ते इसका भी आपके पास जवाब होना चाहिये। आपने कुछ नहीं कहा है कि कितने साल बाद उसका सर्वे होगा। दस साल के बाद या बारह साल के बाद या हर साल होगा। आपको सोच समझ कर कदम उठाना होगा। रूज इसके बारे में आपको सोच समझ कर बनाने होंगे। प्रशासन को तो आप लोग खलाते हैं, हम तो खाली बात करते हैं। किसी चीज को किस तरह से इम्प्लेमेंट करना है, यह आपका काम है। इस वास्ते जब आप इसके बारे में रूल बनायें तो खूब सोच समझ कर बनायें।

दिल्ली को ही आप लें। यहां कितनी बिल्डिंग बनती जा रही है और कितनी ऊंची ऊंची बिल्डिंग बनती जा रही है। लेकिन वैल्यू टैक्स आपका कितना बढ़ रहा है, कुछ भी नहीं। वही 1 करोड़ 50 लाख। आपके बड़े अफसरों को नहीं मालूम कि कहां क्या गड़बड़ी होती है। मुझे मालूम है। आपका जो स्टाफ होता है, जो इंस्पेक्टर वगैरह होते हैं वे लोगों को जाकर बता देते हैं कि इस तरह से हिसाब रखो, एकाउन्ट इस तरह से दिखाओ और आपको टैक्स उतना इस वजह से नहीं मिलता है जितना मिलना चाहिये। दिल्ली, बम्बई, कलकत्ता आदि में ऐसे भूकान बने हुए हैं जो आसमान को चूमते हैं। लेकिन वैल्यू टैक्स में आपकी जो कलैकशंस है, उनमें कोई वृद्धि नहीं होती है।

आप गिफ्ट टैक्स को लें। दिल्ली में मैं शादियां देखती हूँ तो वहां यह देखने को मिलता है कि एक लाख रुपया एक शादी में खर्च कर दिया जाता है। लेकिन गिफ्ट टैक्स में आपको

पैसा आता नहीं है, वह बढ़ता नहीं है। इसका मतलब है कि चोरी हो रही है। आप लोगों को चोरी करना सिखा रहे हैं। आप लोगों से चोरी करवा रहे हैं उनका कारेक्टर आप गिरा रहे हैं।

आपने वैल्यू टैक्स रख दिया है, वे ज्यादा जायदाद भी नहीं बना सकते हैं। आपने एक्स-पेंडीचर टैक्स रख दिया है, ज्यादा वे खर्च भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। आपने गिफ्ट टैक्स लगा दिया है और अब वे दान आदि दे भी नहीं सकते हैं। उनको दूसरे ही रास्ते इन टैक्सों से निकलने के निकलने पर आपने मजबूर कर दिया है वे सारा रुपया बैंक में तो रखते नहीं हैं। किताबों में भी सारा नहीं दिखाते हैं। इधर उधर पैसा वे रखते हैं। इन टैक्सों की वजह से चैरिटेबल परपजिज के लिए जो वे पैसा दिया करते थे वह भी बन्द हो गया है। चैरिटी का काम भी खत्म आपने कर दिया। एक लाख में से 72 हजार आप टैक्स के रूप में ले जाते हैं। मैं आपको एक सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ। चैरिटी में कोई पैसा अगर दे तो उसको रिलीफ आप दें। कोई चैरिटेबल काम अगर वह करता है, तो उसको आपको रिलीफ देना चाहिये।

अगर कोई आदमी अपने शहर, गांव या गली में ग्राम लोगों के लिए कोई कुआं, तालाब या दबाखाना आदी बनाना चाहता है, तो उसको एनकरेज करना चाहिए। यदि कोई आदमी ऐसा काम करता है, तो उस से पिछले दस साल का रिटर्न नहीं मांगना चाहिये। सरकार के पास इस तरह के काम करने के लिये साधन नहीं है और अगर कोई आदमी ऐसा करना चाहता है, तो उसको एनकरेज नहीं किया जाता है—इतना ही नहीं, उसके मार्ग में कठिनाइयां पैदा की जाती हैं। सब बड़े बड़े आदमी अपना रुपया बैंकों में नहीं रखते हैं। नाम के लिए वे बैंक में एकाउन्ट रखते हैं, लेकिन वास्तव

में वे सारा पैसा घर में रखते हैं। बैंकों में रुपया रखने से उनको कोई रिलीफ नहीं मिलता है। इसलिए यदि कोई आदमी सब लोगों के इस्तेमाल के लिए कोई कुआं, तालाब या हास्पिटल बनाता है, तो उस को चैरिटी रिलीफ दिया जाये और उस से पिछले दस साल का हिसाब न मांगा जाये। इस प्रकार शहरों और गांवों में सार्वजनिक हित के बहुत कार्य होंगे।

सरकार के वर्तमान कानून का परिणाम यह है कि लोग सार्वजनिक हित के कामों पर पैसा खर्च करने में झिझकते हैं। उदाहरण के लिये मैं जो यतीमखाना चलाती हूँ, जब मैं उस के लिए चन्दा मांगने के लिये एक आदमी के पास गई, तो उसने एक हजार रुपये तो दे दिये लेकिन अपना नाम बताने और रसीद लेने से इन्कार कर दिया, क्योंकि इस प्रकार रुपया देना एकसेपेंडीचर टैक्स के अन्तर्गत आ जाता है। इस लिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि इस तरह के चैरिटी के काम के लिए टैक्स में रिलीफ दिया जाये।

सरकार टैक्सों आदि द्वारा चाहे जितना भी रुपया इकट्ठा करे, जब तक देश में शान्ति नहीं होगी, तब तक उस की प्रगति नहीं हो सकती है। अगर किसी घर में बच्चे आदि बीमार हों, तो वह घर पनप नहीं सकता है। मैं तेलंगाना की समस्या के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ। तेलंगाना मूवमेंट पिछले चौदह महीनों से चल रही है। वह कोई मामूली बात नहीं है। पहले हम हैदराबाद जैसी बड़ी स्टेट के भाग थे। हमारे पास रेसवे थी, मिन्ट था, सब कुछ था और हम बहुत इज्जत से रहते थे, स्वर्गीय पंडित जी ने तेलंगाना के लिये कुछ सेफगाइज रख कर उस को कन्डीशनली आन्ध्र प्रदेश में मिला दिया। दस साल तक उन सेफगाइज को इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया गया। हमारे यहां के लोगों को स्कूल-कॉलेजों में एडमिशन और मुलाजिमतों आदि के सम्बन्ध में बहुत दिक्कतें थीं। सरकार ने हमारी मूवमेंट को पसन्द नहीं किया और उस का दमन

किया। उस मूवमेंट में हमारे तीन सौ बच्चों की जान गई। छात्रों का एक साल की पढ़ाई खत्म हो गई। वहां की गवर्नमेंट को हमारे साथ कोई सहानुभूति नहीं है। सेट्रल गवर्नमेंट को मालूम होना चाहिए कि यह एक मास मूवमेंट है। तेलंगाना क्षेत्र के पास जो 107 करोड़ रुपया था, वह हम पर खर्च नहीं किया गया और उसका कोई हिसाब नहीं रखा गया। अगर गाय को चारा न दिया जाये, तो वह दूध कैसे दे सकती है? हमारा एक गरीब एरिया है। अगर उसके विकास के लिए प्रयत्न न किया जाये, उसके लिये रुपया खर्च न किया जाये, तो वह कैसे प्रगति कर पायेगा? हमारे यहां डेवेलपमेंट की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। लोगों को मुलाजिमत नहीं मिलती है।

इस लिए यह आवश्यक है कि सेट्रल गवर्नमेंट को इस मामले में इन्टरवीन करना चाहिये। वह मूवमेंट चार दिनों से फिर शुरू हो गया है। बच्चों के कालेज बन्द हो गये हैं। यह प्रजा राज का युग है, यह डिक्टेटरशिप का जमाना नहीं है। छोटी सी आसाम स्टेट में आसाम, मेघालय और नागालैंड, ये तीन स्टेट्स बना दी गई हैं। लेकिन 130 लाख लोगों के हमारे क्षेत्र के लिए कुछ नहीं दिया जाता है, जिसके पास रेवेन्यू है, साधन है, सब कुछ है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ही हमारे साथ न्याय कर सकती हैं। हमको आज भी उन पर विश्वास है। वह जल्दी से जल्दी हमारे मामले को साल्व करें, वना नतीजा खराब होगा। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर और इस सदन से कहना चाहती हूँ कि वे हमारे लिए कुछ करें।

आपने मुझे टाइम दिया इसके लिए मैं धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

श्री काशीनाथ पाण्डेय (पदरीना): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने प्राइम मिनिस्टर का बजट भाषण बहुत ध्यान से सुना और जो माननीय सदस्य अब तक बोल चुके हैं उनको भी सुना। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने

## [श्री कार्शनाय पाण्डेय]

इस बजट में कुछ ऐसे कदम उठाये हैं, जिन को देख कर कहा जा सकता है कि उनके दिल में गरीबों के लिए तड़प है। लेकिन मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह किस कीमत पर हो रहा है इस बजट के द्वारा जो टैक्स लगाये गये हैं, उनमें जो इनडायरेक्ट टैक्स हैं, उनका सीधा बोझ गरीब आदमी पर पड़ता है। सरकार की ओर से कहा जाता है कि यह बजट सोशलिस्टिक है, समाजवादी है। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि कुछ हद तक इससे गरीबों का लाभ होने वाला है। पर यह तो मियां की जूनी, मियां का सिर वाली बात है। चीनी, चाय, केरोसीन आयल और सिगरेट पर जो टैक्स लगाया जा रहा है, वह गरीब लोगों से ही वसूल होगा। गरीबों से यह इनडायरेक्ट टैक्स वसूल करके कहा जा रहा है कि हम बच्चों को विटामिन खिलायेंगे उनके नरिशमंट के लिए पैसा खर्च करेंगे और रूरल वक्स प्रोग्राम के द्वारा कुछ लोगों को रोजगार देने का उपाय करेंगे।

इस वक्त हमारे यहां शहरों में बेकारों की संख्या लगभग 70 लाख और गांवों में 80 लाख है। चौबीस-वर्षीय योजना के अन्त में वह संख्या 2,80 लाख होने वाली है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि रूरल वक्स के सम्बन्ध में जो व्यवस्था की गई है, उसमें कितने लोगों का काम मिलने वाला है। तीन लाख का। जहां समस्या पहाड़ जैसी है, वहां सरकार ने उपचार किया है दाल में नमक के बराबर। फिर भी सरकार इसको समाजवादी बजट कहती है।

जैसा कि कल श्री भर्षोक मेहता ने कहा था, सरकार चार करोड़ रुपये खर्च करके बच्चों को ऐसा खाना देना चाहती है, जिससे उन की तन्दरस्ती और दिमाग बनने में सहायता मिले। कितने बच्चे है देश में? पांच करोड़ बच्चों के लिए साल में चार करोड़ रुपये खर्च गये है। यह है सरकार का वह समाजवादी प्रोग्राम, जिससे बच्चों का मस्तिष्क

बनने वाला है और इसी को लेकर यह सरकार डींग हांकती है कि यह बजट समाजवादी बजट है। इस बजट में फ्री शुगर का दाम बढ़ा दिया गया है। फ्री शुगर का दाम बढ़ा। लैबी शुगर का दाम भी कुछ बढ़ गया। पर यह हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर भूल गई की चीनी बनती है किसानों के खेत से। गन्ना वहां पैदा होता है और वह गन्ना आता है फेक्ट्रियों में। मैं बड़ा खुश हूँ और उनको धन्यवाद देता यदि चीनी का दाम तो बढ़ा पर वह यह भी कह देती कि गन्ने का दाम भी इतना बढ़ गया। लेकिन इस पर कोई बात उन्होंने नहीं की। इससे आप समझेंगे कि और चाहे जो कुछ भी उनका बजट कहा जाय, यह मैं कह सकता हूँ कि किसानों का बजट यह नहीं हो सकता।

दूसरी बात यह भी उन्होंने कही कि जो डेफिसिट है 225 करोड़ का उससे प्राइसेज नहीं बढ़ेगी क्योंकि जो खाद्यान्न आने वाला है बाजार में उसके दाम ज्यादा नहीं होंगे। यह भी इस बात का प्रतीक है कि किसानों के प्रति कितनी उनकी सहानुभूति है। वह चाहती है कि किसानों के खेत में पैदा हुई चीजें तो सस्ता बिके। किसान केवल गल्ला ही खाता है ऐसी बात तो नहीं है, किसान कपड़ा खरीदता है, किसान का हल फाल भी खरीदना होता है, किसानों के जरूरत की जो कुछ भी चीजें हैं उनके दाम देखिए, उनके फावड़े बनाने में भी स्टील के दाम बढ़ जाने से प्रसर पड़ेगा, सब के दाम बढ़ गए। जो गल्ला पैदा होता है उसमें भी खाद के दाम बढ़ जाने से उसकी लागत बढ़ जायगी। और फिर भी आप कहती है कि चूँकि किसानों का गल्ला सस्ता मिलेगा इसलिए डेफिसिट से प्राइसेज आगे नहीं बढ़ेंगी। मैं उदाहरण देता हूँ। जब भी डिफिसिट फाइनेन्स हुई है तब होलसेल प्राइसेज का इंडेक्स बढ़ा देलिया। क्योंकि डेफिसिट फाइनेन्सिंग भी एक अजीब तरह की चीज है। जितना बजट की स्पीच में डेफिसिट लोग बताते हैं उतना अन्त में नहीं होता है। अब की भी मेरा स्थान है 300

करोड़ का डेफिसिट यह जा कर पड़ेगा और उसका बोझ हम सब लोगों को उठाना पड़ेगा। वह कैसे पूरा होगा? एक तो यह कि हम बैंक से उधार लेते हैं, मार्केट से लोन लेते हैं, दूसरी बात यह है कि रिजर्व बैंक भी दूसरे बैंकों के धु हमको उधार देता है। वह कहाँ से पूरा होता है? वह हमारे इन गरीब आदमियों से ही पूरा होगा। उस डेफिसिट का प्रभाव कीमत पर पड़ें बिना नहीं रह सकता। इसलिए मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कहना ठीक नहीं है कि कीमत नहीं बढ़ेगी। दूसरे जैसा मैं कह रहा था कि किस तरह से होल सेल प्राइमेज बढ़ी है, वह देखिए जरा सा। 1965-66 में 137.5 होल-सेल प्राइसेज थी, दूसरे साल में 158.24 हो गई तीसरे साल में 160.3 और चौथे साल में 165.1 हो गई। अब फिर आप देखेंगे कि इस डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग के बाद में होलसेल प्राइसेज कितनी बढ़ी है। पहली बात तो यह है कि उधर चीनी का दाम बढ़ा, केरोसिन का दाम बढ़ा, चाय का दाम बढ़ा। किसानों को जिन चीजों को खरीदना है उनके दाम बढ़ गए और इधर होलसेल प्राइस भी बढ़ जायगी। इसका मतलब होगा कि गरीब आदमी पर कितना बोझ इस टैक्स की वजह से पड़ रहा है यह आप माँचिए।

देखिए, मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू सोशलिस्ट नहीं थे और इन्दिराजी सोशलिस्ट हैं। बड़े जाँरो से हमारे चन्द्रजीत भाई ने समर्थन किया हालांकि मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं तो शुरू से कांग्रेस में रहा और आज भी कांग्रेस में हूँ मैं। पर हमारे चन्द्रजीत भाई पहले कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में रहे। मेरा क्याल है कि कम्युनिस्टों का जो समाजवाद है वह हमारे कांग्रेसियन से बिल्कुल डिफरेंट है क्योंकि वह मार्क्सवादी समाजवाद है। हमारा समाजवाद प्रजातांत्रिक समाजवाद है। दोनों में फर्क है। और मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूँ कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू इम देश के प्राइम मिनिस्टर थे तो चन्द्रजीतजी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में थे यह समझते थे कि यह गवर्नमेंट री-एक्शनरी है, पंडित

जवाहरलाल नेहरू री-एक्शनरी हैं। लेकिन कांग्रेस के स्वरूप में कुछ नहीं तब्दीली हुई। उसका आर्थिक ढांचा, उसका धार्मिक प्रोग्राम भी वही रहा। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जब नहीं थे तब फिर वह कांग्रेस में आ गए। इंदिराजी जो अब प्राइम मिनिस्टर हुई हैं। उसके पहले ही यह आ गए थे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पहले वह समाजवादी नहीं थे? अगर आप यह समझते हैं कि पहले भी कांग्रेस समाजवादी थी तो जो आप कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में क्यों रहे। क्या यह सोचना आपका सही था और अगर यह सोचते हैं कि कांग्रेस समाजवादी नहीं थी अब समाजवादी है तो जो आप कांग्रेस में क्यों उस समय आये जब कांग्रेस प्रतिक्रियावादी थी। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ आखिर जो हम यहाँ चुन कर आते हैं वह इसलिए कि अपने क्षेत्र के लिए कुछ काम भी करें। अगर हम कुछ काम न करें तो कौन हमें बोट देगा? हम विश्वनाथ गहमरीजी का आज भी याद करते हैं जो पूर्वी जिलों के लिए वह यहाँ रोए थे। पंडितजी प्रभावित हुए और पंडितजी ने उसके लिए पटेल कमीशन की नियुक्ति की। पटेल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आई। उमके अनुसार कुछ रोड्स बननी चाहिए, कुछ म्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज बननी चाहिए, कुछ दूसरी चीजें बननी चाहिए यह सारी बातें हुईं। अब स्वयं अगर इस फंड में यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट को जुटाना था तो फिर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के लिए पटेल कमीशन बनाने में फायदा क्या था? लेकिन अभिप्राय यह था कि पटेल कमीशन बनेगा और देखेंगे कि दरअसल यह इलाका कितना गरीब है जिसकी तरफ केन्द्रीय सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिए। इसीलिए वह कमीशन बनाया गया। दो साल तक तो सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने रुपया दिया और उमके बाद में बाबजूद इसके कि इंदिराजी समाजवादी हैं, मुझे इसमें कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, मैं मानता हूँ, मैं उनका बहुत आदर करता हूँ, वह हमारी बहन हैं लेकिन मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनके ही समय में यह पटेल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर काम होना ठप हो गया। वह दोष लगाना चन्द्रजीतजी का कि यू. पी. गवर्न-

[ श्री काशीनाथ पाण्डेय ]

मेंट ने रुपया नहीं दिया कहां तक उचित है ? यह बात तो इस हाउस में उठी थी और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने यह कमीशन बनाया था इस उद्देश्य से कि यह पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है, इसकी सहायता होनी चाहिए। मैंने एक नोटिस भी निकाली थी जब इंदिराजी उबर गई थीं। मैंने कहा कि पूर्वी जिलों के लोगों ने क्या बिगाड़ा है ? 1857 के बलवे में मंगल पांडेय जो बलिया के थे वह पहले आदमी थे जो उसमें शरीक हुए। यही नहीं बहुत से सिपाहियों ने जो गाजीपुर और बलिया के थे 1857 के बलवे में भाग लिया और वह मारे गए। इसलिए अंग्रेज पूर्वी जिलों को दुश्मन की तरह समझते थे। न वहां कोई नहर है, न कोई ट्यूबवेल, न कोई सड़क, किसी चीज का प्रबन्ध उन लोगों ने वहां नहीं किया। इसलिए जरूरी था कि वहां के लिए कमीशन बनाया जाता मैं आपको और बताता हूं कि तीन हमारे प्लान बीत गए। सन 1951-52 में यू.पी. की पर कैपिटा इनकम 259 थी और तीन प्लान के बाद में पर कैपिटा इनकम 238 रह गई। मैंने यह बराबर कहा कि इसमें किसका दोष है और चीफ. मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा कि इसका पता लगाया जाय। लेकिन इंदिराजी ने यह नहीं बताया कि किसका दोष है और क्यों यह पूर्वी जिले पिछड़े रह गए। उन्होंने यह कहा कि यू.पी. के लीडर झगडा करते हैं इसलिए वहां की पर कैपिटा इनकम घट गई। गुप्ताजी ने कहा कि घाप एक कमीशन बनाकर पता लगाइए कि कौन जिम्मेदार है इसके लिए ? आखिर सबकी पर कैपिटा इनकम बढ़ी लेकिन यू.पी. की घट क्यों गई इसकी कोई जांच होनी चाहिये। लेकिन इसके लिए वह तैयार नहीं है। केवल यह कह देने से कि यू.पी. के लीडरों के झगड़े की वजह से यहाँ पर कैपिटा इनकम नहीं बढ़ी, कामन सैन इसको नहीं समझ सकता, मैं तो यह समझता हूं कि यह लोगों को बेवकूफ बनाने की बात है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह भी दुर्भाग्य था कि हमारे प्रदेश के ही तीन प्राइम-मिनिस्टर इस यू. पी. के हुए, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के बारे में मैं कह सकता हूं कि उनका यह ख्याल था कि यू.पी. की तरफ मैं ज्यादा ध्यान दूंगा तो लोग यह कहेंगे कि पंडितजी चूंकि यू. पी. के हैं। इसलिये यू. पी. के उपर ज्यादा ध्यान देते हैं। पर इंदिराजी ने भी क्या किया ?

दूसरी बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस देश में ऐसी अव्यवस्था फैली हुई है कि न तो किसी का शरीर सुरक्षित है और न धन सुरक्षित है। यह किसका दोष है ? मैं तो इस देश का प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं रहा हूं—या तो पंडितजी रहे, डेढ़ साल तक लाल बहादुरजी रहे और उनके बाद से इंदिराजी हैं। कौन इस बात का जिम्मेदार है ? जिसके पास धन है वह भी सुरक्षित नहीं है और जो गरीब है, वह भी सुरक्षित नहीं है। आखिर इस तरह की अव्यवस्था में कहां तक समाजवाद आ सकेगा ?

कुछ थोडा सा मैं शुगर इण्डस्ट्री के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। यहां से एक बात निकली कि शुगर इण्डस्ट्री का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये, बिलकुल राजनीतिक खेल था, यहां तक कि हमारे मि० उमानाथ ने भी कहा कि मेरी समझ में यह बात आ सकती है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सारी शुगर मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाय, मैं भी इसके पक्ष में हूं, कि हो जाय, इस के लिये कुछ काम किया जाय। मैं चूंकि इस क्षेत्र की यूनियनों को डील करता हूं, इस लिये जानता हूं कि वहां पर किस प्रकार का प्रबन्ध चल रहा है और मैंने पहले भी यह बात उठाई थी कि सारे देश की शुगर इण्डस्ट्री का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाय ताकि शुगर इण्डस्ट्री का कुछ सुधार हो, लेकिन हुआ क्या ? बाद में बाबू जगजीवनराम बोले कि यू.पी. का हो सकता

है, हमने लीगन ऑर्गेनाइजेशन लेना है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या विहार की शूगर इण्डस्ट्री या वनों की फॅक्ट्रीज यू. पी. से बहुत अच्छी है ? इस-समय समय बहुत थोड़ा है, वरना मैं आंकड़ों के साथ सिद्ध कर सकता हूँ कि यू. पी. की फॅक्ट्रीज बावजूद इस बात के कि उनमें बहुत सी पुरानी है, बहुत सि प्रदेशों की फॅक्ट्री के मुकाबले बहुत अच्छी है। लेकिन मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यू. पी. एक बेगिन्निंग प्रदेश है, वहाँ का मुख्य इण्डस्ट्री शूगर है। वही इण्डस्ट्रीज में आपने वहाँ भारत हैवी इलेक्ट्रीकल लगाई है, त्रिवेणी स्ट्रक्चरल लगाई है, ये दो-तीन फॅक्ट्रीज किन्तु आदमियों को एम्प्लॉयमेंट देती है। — 15-20 हजार लोग इनमें लगे हुए हैं, जबकि 100 करोड़ रुपया भारत हैवी इलेक्ट्रीकल में लगा है और 6 करोड़ रुपया त्रिवेणी स्ट्रक्चरल में लगा है जबकि वहाँ 71 शूगर की फॅक्ट्रीज हैं जो 1 लाख आदमियों को एम्प्लॉयमेंट देती रही है।

अभी चरण सिंहजी आये, उन्होंने एक स्कीम निकाली कि यू. पी. की शूगर फॅक्ट्रीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये और तुरन्त कुछ फॅक्ट्रीज लीं जानी चाहिये। उन्होंने इस बात का उल्लेख कर के एक कमेटी बना दी, उस कमेटी में कौन कौन है ? श्री बीरेन्द्र वर्मा, जो वहाँ के मिनिस्टर हैं, श्री गेंदा सिंह, श्री पृथ्वी नाथ सेठ—वाह रे नेगनलाइजेशन, अब सेठ ही इस पर विचार कर के रिपोर्ट करेंगे कि राष्ट्रीयकरण क्या चीज हांती है, यह है चौधरी चरण सिंहजी का राष्ट्रीयकरण और समाजवाद है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज देश का भला तब ही होगा, जब हम म्लोगन पर न जाये, कुछ कर के दिखायें।

श्री टी० विश्वनाथ अभी कह रहे थे, वह मिनिस्टर रह चुके हैं मैं तो कभी मिनिस्टर नहीं हुआ और जब वह मिनिस्टर थे, मेन्ट्रियों से डील करते थे, उस समय तो सेक्रेटरीज अच्छे थे, लेकिन आज जब वह पार्लियामेंट में आ गये, तो आज उनको वह व्यूरोक्रेसी सबः

खराब लगती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ—मिनिस्टर लोग मुझे माफ करें—आज इस देश का व्यूरोक्रेसी ही चला रही है, इसमें अलावा और कौन सी मशीनरी है, मुझे बतला दीजिये। कौन मिनिस्टर है जो सारी फाइलों को पढ़ता है और छान-बीन करता है—अगर हममें कोई गलत बात है तो बतला दीजिये। आज इंदिराजी की गवर्नमेंट है तो सेक्रेटरी कहें कि जैसी आपकी व्यक्तिगत पालिसी होगी, उसको करेंगे, कल सुचेताजी की गवर्नमेंट होगी तो वह उस की पालिसी चलायेंगे, तो उसमें दोष किसका है ? इसके जिम्मेदार आप हैं। 1947 में जिस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ, हम देश की फिजा दूसरी थी, हम कोई भी बात कहते तो वह सेक्रेटरी करते, लेकिन हमने खुद काम नहीं किया बैठे रहे, चुपचाप फाइलों पर दस्तखत कर दिये, अपना भत्ता और तन-स्वाह ली और आज दोष देते हैं व्यूरोक्रेसी को-नाच न जाने आगन टेढा।

शूगर इण्डस्ट्रीज की आंखें विविध हालत हैं और उसके लिये जिम्मेदार यह गवर्नमेंट है। यह गवर्नमेंट इतने दिनों से शूगर इण्डस्ट्री के लिये कोई पालिसी नहीं निकाल सकी, जिससे किसानों को उचित मूल्य मिलता और उत्पादन बढ़ता। दोता यह रहा है कि जब गन्ने का उत्पादन घटता है, गन्ने का दाम बढ़ा देते हैं और जब ज्यादा होता है, गन्ने का दाम घटा देते हैं आज भी किसानों की जबे खाली हैं, एक तरह से उनके साथ मर्दाना किया जाता रहा है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ इस देश में किन्तु लोग किसान हैं और किन्तु लोग बनिये हैं। किसानों की तादाद इस देश में सब से ज्यादा है। गेहूँ का देस लीजिये, गेहूँ ज्यादा हुआ, दाम घट जाते हैं, शार्टेज हुई तो अमरीका से गेहूँ आयेगा ताकि किसान का दाम बढ़ने न पाये। आपने किसान को इस तरह से रस्सी से बांध कर रखा हुआ जैसे बेल को भी कोई नहीं रख सकता। बहुत देर तक किसानों के जज्बात को छिपाने नहीं रखा जा सकता, इस देश का किसान उठेगा और अपना हक मांगेगा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri .

SHRIMATI ILA PAL CHOUDHURI (Krishnagar) : *rose*.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about the half-an-hour discussion ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please wait. Let her start.

SHRIMATI ILA PAL CHOUDHURI : When I heard the Member opposite. . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can continue tomorrow. Now we take up the half-an-hour discussion.

18.37 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

##### MANUFACTURE OF ATOM BOMB BY INDIA

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त (दिल्ली-मदर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे देश के चारों तरफ दो शत्रु हैं— एक चीन और दूसरा पाकिस्तान। चीन के पास 150 एटमबम हैं और चीन न्यूक्लियर पावर में जितनी प्रगति की है, शायद दुनिया की आशाओं से ज्यादा प्रगति की है। यू० एस० ए० गवर्नमेंट का एस्टीमेट भी गलत हो गया है। पाकिस्तान भी तेजी से उसकी तरफ बढ़ रहा है और आज हमारे देश में हमारा हिमालय और हमारे समुद्र हमारी रक्षा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। एक तरह से एटमबम हमारे लिये It is a must for our survival. हमारा सर्वाइवल इस के बगैर नहीं हो सकता। In spite of the Indian Army, Navy and Air Force, India is to-day defenceless against China.

उपाध्यक्षजी, मैं फ्रांस के एक बहुत बड़े जनरल को यहां पर कोट करना चाहता हूँ जो पिछले दिनों भारत में आये थे। उनका नाम था— जनरल प्रोफर, उन्होंने पेरिस जा कर एक आर्टिकल लिखा जो वहां के एक अखबार में छपा। उन्होंने लिखा—

“In the long run the principal menace to India's security comes from China's nuclear power.”

अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि चाइना जो हमारा शत्रु है उसके पास एटम बम हैं तो हमारे पास उसका क्या जवाब है, ये जो ट्रेडिशनल आर्म्स है ये उसका जवाब नहीं दे सकते। या तो हम किसी ब्लाक के साथ जायें, अमरीका या रूस के साथ जायें, लेकिन वह हमारी पालिसी नहीं है और होने भी नहीं चाहिये। दूसरा मार्ग यह हो सकता है कि हम खुद एटम बम बनायें या हम यह सोचें कि चाइना कभी एटम बम इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा और करेगा तो रूस या अमरीका हमारी मदद करेंगे— ये चार आल्टरनेटिव्स हो सकते हैं।

अब यह सोचना कि चाइना कभी एटम बम इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा— मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता, वह जरूर इस्तेमाल करेगा। लेकिन किम हालत में नहीं करेगा— आपका याद होगा 1952 में यु. एस. ए. ने चाइना को कहा था कि तुम 38 पैरलल कोरिया में क्रॉस न करो, अगर क्रॉस करोगे तो हम न्यूक्लियर पावर यूज कर सकते हैं, नतीजा यह हुआ कि चाइना ने उसको क्रॉस नहीं किया। 1958 में अमरीका ने चाइना को कहा कि वह न्यूक्लियर पावर का इस्तेमाल करेगा अगर उसने क्यूमाय और मत्सू आइलैंड्स को आक्यूपाई करने की कोशिश की। उसी तरह से रीसेन्टली 1966 में अमरीका ने उसको कहा कि तुम वियतनाम के मामले में इन्टरफीयर न करो, वरना न्यूक्लियर वैपनज का इस्तेमाल हो सकता है, परिणाम यह हुआ कि आगे बढ़ने की उसकी हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी। इसलिये यह कहना कि चाइना इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा, यह गलत बात है।

दूसरे— अगर वह इस्तेमाल करेगा तो क्या रूस और अमरीका हमारी मदद के लिये आयेंगे? दूसरे क्यों मदद के लिये आयेंगे।