

17.19 hrs.

**RESOLUTION RE : INCOME-TAX,
WEALTH-TAX, ETC. OF UNION
FOOD MINISTER**

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAN (Chitradurga) ; I beg to move :

"This House takes note of the widespread criticism in the country regarding the failure on the part of the Union Food Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram and other Ministers of the Government to file their Income-tax and Wealth-tax returns and also the serious financial irregularities committed by various Institutions with which the Union Food Minister is connected and resolves that a Committee of Members of Parliament be appointed to investigate these allegations and to make a report to the House."

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : I want to raise a point of order. This is very complicated matter and certain allegations have been levelled against the Minister. Unless we know all the facts, I think it would not be possible to discuss the matter properly. We will not be doing justice to the Minister. I request the Minister to supply all the facts. For instance we want to know under what section penalty notices had been issued, whether income-tax returns had been filed or not, for which year it had been filed. Unless we know all the facts it is not possible to do justice to the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You want full facts before the discussion takes place. There is no point of order. It is not for the Chair to give a direction. It is for the Minister to act on your suggestion at the proper stage ; I hope he will. Your submission is already before the Minister and the House.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Why cannot the Chair direct him to supply facts relevant to this discussion ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Chair has no such powers to direct anybody to make or not to make a statement.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj) :

This resolution had been introduced ; it is not going to be finished today. May I suggest that the further debate on this resolution may be continued next time. Why should we start it for just five minutes or three minutes ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : We shall have to continue this debate till 5.30 p.m.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAN : Of course it will greatly facilitate the discussion here if they could give all the relevant facts. A few days back a question was raised in House.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C.
SETHI)** : The hon. Member while moving the resolution said as follows :

"This House takes note of widespread criticism in the country. . . . Shri Jagjivan Ram and also other Ministers . . ."

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAN : That was the resolution I tabled. In the resolution I have stated 'Jagjivan Ram and other Ministers'. Perhaps it has been omitted by the Office. Please read the original.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Other Ministers must have removed 'other Ministers'.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is true in the original resolution which you had sent you have included 'other Ministers'. But the Speaker has decided to cut 'other Ministers'. Therefore, the Resolution as it appears in the Order Paper will be deemed to have been moved.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAN : I do not know ; the Office did not inform me.

SHRI PILOO MODY . Under what powers ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can ask the Speaker. As far as the House is concerned, it is this motion which is before the House. Why the Speaker cut it out, you can take up on another occasion in the proper form.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We are concerned only with this motion before the House. Mr. Imam may confine his remarks to the Food Minister and not speak about other Ministers.

श्री कबरलाल गुप्त : सभाति महोदय, यह घ्राज पहला मौका है कि जब स्पीकर साहब ने अपनी पावर से रिजोल्यूशन को काट दिया है। स्पीकर साहब काट सकते हैं, कम कर सकते हैं, बढ़ा सकते हैं, अगर वह रूलस के मुताबिक न हो तो। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कौन से रूलस आफ प्रोसीजर के मुताबिक, जब कि आनरेबल मेम्बर ने जगजीवन राम और अदर मिनिस्टर्स लिखा, तो अदर मिनिस्टर्स के बारे में क्यों अंग का मन्विवाचन किन रूल के मुताबिक उस को काटना चाहता है। चिन्तु ऐसी पावर स्पीकर को नहीं है कि जो मर्जी चाहे करे। वह जो कुछ बदल सकते हैं, वह रूलस आफ प्रोसीजर के मुताबिक बदल सकते हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि स्पीकर आफिस में मिनिस्टर्स को प्रोटेक्शन नहीं मिलना चाहिये। जो मेम्बर डिस्कस करना चाहते हैं उन को पूरा अख्तियार होना चाहिये। और मैं समझता हूँ कि स्पीकर साहब ने घ्रा इम बारे में बात करें।

MR. CHAIRMAN : You want to say that the Speaker has no power to do it.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : If you do not allow me to speak, how can I speak ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The point is very clear.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : It is not clear to me ; how can it be clear to you ?

आप स्पीकर साहब को कहिये कि कौन से रूल आफ प्रोसीजर के तहत उन्होंने यह शब्द काटे हैं ? और अगर उन्होंने अपने डिस्कीशन का ठीक तरह से इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है तो यह

रिजोल्यूशन में दुबारा आना चाहिये।

SHRI D. N. TWARY : My point of order is this. The resolution before the House was circulated sometime before and nobody took any objection in respect of any change made by the Speaker. The resolution is now before the House, and it has become the property of the House now. Nobody can add or subtract anything and if, according to him, the Speaker has done anything wrong, he might go to his Chamber, talk to him about this and get it rectified or corrected. We are not here to discuss any other thing but the resolution as it is before the House ; we cannot discuss anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN : May I enquire from Shri Imam whether he noticed the change in the resolution and whether he enquired from the Speaker or his Secretariat ?

SHRI J MOHAMED IMAM : It was not intimated to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The resolution was circulated.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM : It was circulated ; but I was particular about the original resolution. But actually, when the change was made, the office ought to have intimated to me as they do in other cases. Those words have been deleted ; that is an omission. So far as I remember, it was not brought to my notice ; it was not intimated to me.

श्री मधु लिये : (मुँगेर) सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान नियम 174 की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ। रिजोल्यूशन के बारे में हमारे यहां नियम है, और अध्यक्ष महोदय को जो अधिकार है वह नियमों के तहत है। तो मैं आप की और सदन की जानकारी के लिये नियम 174 पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"The Speaker shall decide whether a resolution or a part thereof is or is not admissible under these rules and may disallow any resolution or a part thereof when in his opinion it is an

[श्री मधु लिमये]

abuse of the right of moving a resolution or calculated to obstruct or prejudicially affect the procedure of the House or is in contravention of these."

अब रूल्स में कंडीशन्स दी हैं। मैं पूरा नहीं पढ़ता हूँ, नियम 173 में ये सारी कंडीशन्स दी हुई हैं, और शायद यह हो सकता है

"It shall raise substantially one definite issue"

मेरी राय में माननीय इमाम का जो रिजोल्यूशन था वह बिल्कुल नियमों के मुताबिक था।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue it on another occasion. Now, we will take up the half-an-hour discussion.

17.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

UNSATISFACTORY STATE OF INDIAN ECONOMY

SHRI R. BARUA (Jorhat): This half-an-hour discussion arises out of the answer to my question about the "unsatisfactory state of Indian Economy" on 17th November. At a time when agricultural production is looking up, when the recession period is over why do I call it unsatisfactory state of economy? Recently in a conference of economists organised by the National Council of Applied Economic Research, almost all of them were perturbed at the stagnation and immobility of the economy of the country. The irony of it is that it is happening at a time when the climate for growth economy was almost present. The prosperity of a country can be seen *prima facie* if we look into the per capita income and per capita consumption of essential commodities by the common man. If we apply that Standard, we find that the per capita income of our country has not gone up and it is very low in comparison to the rest of the world. About consumption of foodgrains, in 1968, in which year we had the best of production, the per capita availability of foodgrains was 166.6 kg, i.e. 3.7 per

cent less than in 1965 when it was 173 kg. It is a sad state of affairs at a time when one goes about saying that the green revolution has started. What is more, in 1969 we have not been able to keep up the tempo of increase and the agricultural production in 1969 is almost the same as last year.

Look at the consumption pattern of cotton cloth, edible oil and sugar. It is 11 per cent, 14 per cent and 17 per cent respectively less in 1967-68 and compared to 1964-65. On the contrary, look at the affluent few. From 1961 and 1966, production of motorcars rose by 27 per cent, of air-conditioners by 44 per cent, of refrigerators by 292 per cent, of confectionary by 52 per cent and of art-silk fabric by 51 per cent. Add to it the enormous increase of luxury flats and residences especially in the large urban areas and also the vulgar expenditure on marriages, ceremonies, and meetings. There is no check for diverting scarce resources to more useful and purposive production. In a truly developing economy, year after year, the common man should have a better standard and better consumption, but here we see it is in the reverse direction.

We are constantly facing demonstrations, strikes, gheraos, etc. We are apt to blame our communist friends mostly for it. Politically speaking it may be true, but is it not a symptom of the unhealthy economic state of affairs because of which the workers are dissatisfied? Therefore, it is wrong to say that it is just the machination of a few political parties. Let us go to the basic truth of it. Why was there trouble in the Hindustan Housing Factory as a result of which a part of the factory was burnt by the workers?

This shows that the price level is such that the workers cannot make both ends meet with the money that they are getting. What is the tendency of the price level? It is rising alarmingly. According to the Reserve Bank Report:

"The price level remained on the whole stable (apart from reasonable movements) upto end-January 1969. Since then, however, there has been a disconcertingly sharp upward trend. In the result, the price stability that had characterised the pre-