

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इनके लिये आपको नहीं कहना चाहिये। अपने लिए जो चाहें कहें।

श्री बूटा सिंह : अपने लिए मैंने कहे हैं। अगर यह समझते हैं कि इनके लिए कहे हैं तो मैं वापिस लेता हूँ।

मैंने भी यत्न किया था कि पंजाब के जो लोग सरहदों पर रहते हैं उनके बारे में कुछ विचार किया जाए तो आपने रूलिंग दी थी कि जिस मामले के बारे में कोई मोशन नहीं है, हाउस के सामने वह मामला किसी शकल में नहीं है, न क्वेश्चन में है न रिपोर्ट में है उस पर विचार करना न सदन के नेता का और न ही आपका कोई मौका बनता है। जो मामला स्वामी जी और शास्त्री जी ने उठाया है इसके बारे में भी वही शर्त लागू होती है। न तो कोई मोशन है पार्लिमेंट के सामने और न कोई प्रश्न है और न कोई रेजोल्यूशन है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो पार्लिमेंटरी कमेटी बनी है उसने अभी तक अपनी कोई रिपोर्ट नहीं दी है। शर्मा जी ने जो कुछ कहा मैं उसके साथ अपनी सहमति प्रकट करता हूँ। इन हालात में किसी किस्म की बात कहना या किसी किस्म की धमकी देना पंजाब को जलाने की या पंजाब में ऐसे हालात पैदा करने की धमकी देना, मैं समझता हूँ ऐसी बात है जिस पर एतराज हो सकता है और इसका मैं बड़े जोर से विरोध करता हूँ। इस मामले पर कोई विचार नहीं होना चाहिये तब तक जब तक कि पार्लिमेंटरी कमेटी की और कैबिनेट सब-कमेटी की कोई रिपोर्ट नहीं आ जाती है।

श्री सत्यनारायण सिंहा : करीब करीब जो मैं कहना चाहता था उन्होंने कह दिया है। आप तो पार्लिमेंटरी कमेटी के अध्यक्ष हैं। अभी उस कमेटी की कोई रिपोर्ट सामने नहीं आई है। कैबिनेट सब-कमेटी की भी रिपोर्ट

अभी तक नहीं आई है। इस बीच वर्रिकिंग कमेटी जो कांग्रेस की है उसकी सिफारिशें सामने आई हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक कोई मामला साफ न हो जाए, जब तक आपकी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट न आ जाए, हाउस क्या डिसकस करेगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि क्या कहा जाए।

13.40½ hrs.

FIXATION OF MINIMUM PRICE FOR SUGARCANE DURING 1966-67

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Govinda Menon): Government have considered the question of fixation of minimum price of sugarcane payable by sugar factories during the season 1966-67 which would commence in October-November, 1966 and for which plantings are in progress at present. The Government have decided that the basic minimum price would continue to be the same as during the current season, namely, Rs. 5.36 per quintal (Rs. 2 per maund) linked to a recovery of 10.4 per cent or below subject to an increase of 4 paise per quintal for every 0.1 per cent increase in recovery above 10.4 per cent. The prices payable by individual factories shall be fixed on the above basis before the commencement of the next crushing season in October-November, 1966.

13.42 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the general budget. Shri D. N. Tiwary may now continue his speech.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अपना भाषण प्रारम्भ करने के पहले मैं आप का ध्यान इस स्थिति की तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ पर बजट डिस्कुशन हो रहा है और कोई कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर यहाँ नहीं हैं। न फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर हैं न प्लैनिंग मिनिस्टर हैं न कोई और है।

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): It is terrible.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) : पहले इस के बारे में चर्चा हो चुकी है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने इस बात की हिदायत भी दी थी कि जब इतनी महत्वपूर्ण बहस हो तो कोई न कोई मंत्री यहाँ पर रहना चाहिये। लेकिन उस हिदायत का पालन नहीं किया गया।

Shri Maurya: Twice or thrice we have already warned Government. This is really intolerable.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने कहा हुआ है कि किसी मंत्री को बुला लिया जाये। एक मंत्री तो जरूर रहना चाहिये।

13.43 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

Shri Maurya: It is strange that an army of 53 Ministers cannot spare even one Cabinet Minister to be present here.

Shri Buta Singh (Moga): Unless the Treasury Benches are represented by a Cabinet Minister, Shri D. N. Tiwary should not begin his speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri B. R. Bhagat is there.

An hon. Member: He is not a Minister of the Cabinet.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): Three Ministers are there. Moreover, this is lunch-time.

2760 (Ai) LSD—7.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I have drawn your attention to this fact so that I may know whether to begin my speech or I should sit down.

Shri Buta Singh: The hon. Speaker has given his ruling already that a Cabinet Minister should be present here.

Shri Ram Sewak (Jalaun): That was only during the discussion on the President's Address.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The budget is an important as the President's Address.

Shri Buta Singh: You are doing something contrary to what the Speaker had ruled.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are three Ministers present here.

Shri Maurya: It is a question of principle; at least one Cabinet Minister must be here at the time of the discussion of the general budget. There is no question of saying that three Ministers are here. At least one Cabinet Minister must be here.

Shri Buta Singh: That means that the Speaker's ruling can be overruled by you?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When the hon. Member Shri Buta Singh speaks, a Cabinet Minister will be here.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Why is there this discrimination that when he speaks a Cabinet Minister will be here but when I speak a Cabinet Minister will not be here?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): The hon. Leader of the House is just coming—and he is here now.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : गत सन्ध्या मैं बतला रहा था कि बिहार में खनिज पदार्थों

[श्री डा० ना० तिवारी]

की बहुलता होते हुए भी वहाँ गरीबी बहुत अधिक है। क्या कारण है कि आज तक उस को प्रोव करने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया गया। बाहर के लोग जा कर बिहार की घरती की छाती फाड़ कर फायदा उठाते हैं और वहाँ के लोगों को केवल कुलीगरी या क्लर्की करने के भलावा कुछ हाथ नहीं धाता।

मैंने कल बतलाया था कि बिहार की पर कैपिटल इनकम लोएस्ट है। बिहार में डिपेन्डेंस ग्रान ऐग्रिकल्चर तीन तीन प्लैन के बाद भी बढ़ती गई। सारे देश में कृषि पर निर्भर लोगों की संख्या 70 प्रतिशत है। बिहार में वह 86 प्रतिशत है और नार्थ बिहार में वह 90 या 91 प्रतिशत है। खेद तो यह है कि इस सदन में तीन तीन प्रधान मंत्री यू० पी० के हुए...

श्री मोर्य : इलाहाबाद के हैं।

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : और हमारे लीडर आफ दि हाउस आज नार्थ बिहार के हैं। लेकिन अभी भी पूर्वी यू० पी० या नार्थ बिहार की तरफ उन लोगों का ध्यान नहीं गया। मालूम नहीं कि यह लोग शरमाते हैं कि अगर नार्थ बिहार या पूर्वी यू० पी० के मामले को ले लेंगे तो पैरोकिअल कहलाने लगेंगे या और क्या है। जहाँ पर प्रति व्यक्ति आमदनी 82 या 86 रु० प्रति वर्ष है वहाँ के लोग कैसे जोवन यापन करेंगे इस की चिन्ता न प्लैनिंग कमिशन को है न फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री को है, न लीडर आफ दि हाउस को और न प्राइम मिनिस्टर को।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude his speech now.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I have just begun.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): He had begun yesterday.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Two or three minutes were taken on the question of a Cabinet Minister being present here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yesterday, the hon. Member had taken 14 minutes, and today he has already taken 3 minutes; so, in all, he has taken 17 minutes.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Two or three minutes were taken in the discussion whether a Cabinet Minister should be here or not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are many other Members belonging to the hon. Member's party who are wanting to speak.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I shall finish shortly and I shall not take more than five minutes.

मैं बतला रहा था कि ऐसे चंक की, जो कि केरल से बड़ा है, गुजरात से बड़ा है और जो पंजाबी सूबा बनने जा रहा है उस से भी दुगुना होगा, भ्रवहेलना कर के, उन्हें सदा गरीबी में रख कर और अगर प्लैनिंग कमिशन या फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री समझती है कि देश तरक्की करेगा तो यह उनका भ्रम है। प्लैन के माने होते हैं एक सारा शरीर। अगर शरीर के किसी अंग को कमजोर रखा गया तो शरीर स्वस्थ नहीं कहा जा सकता है। उसी तरह से देश के किसी अंग को बहुत गरीब रखा गया तो यह नहीं हो सकता कि देश समृद्धिशाली हो जाये, ताकतवर हो जाये।

नार्थ बिहार में कोई इंडस्ट्री नहीं है सिवा चीनी मिलों के। हालांकि वहाँ बहुत सी इंडस्ट्रीज हो सकती हैं लेकिन आज तक इस के लिये कुछ नहीं किया गया। घ्राप देखिये कि वहाँ पर कितना डिस्क्रिमिनेशन है। वहाँ पर बिजली का रेट सारे देश से दुगुना है। वहाँ पर 24 पैसे, 25 पैसे बिजली का रेट है जब कि सब जगहों पर 10 या 11 पैसे है। फूड अवेविलिटी के बारे में भी वही दशा

है। आपने एकानामिक सर्वे में दिया है कि 15 या 16 ग्रॉस अबलेबिलिटी होगी, लेकिन बिहार में 11 ग्रॉस। हर मामले में आप देखेंगे कि बिहार के साथ और खाम कर नार्थ बिहार के साथ डिस्ट्रिक्मिनेशन किया जा रहा है। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर कौन सी प्लैन वहाँ के लिये बनाई गई। न प्लैनिंग मिनिस्टर और न फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर को कभी सोचने का समय मिला कि वह इस स्थिति को सुधारें, जो बैकवर्ड एरियाज हैं उन को तरजीह देने पर विचार करें।

श्री मोय : एक फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर बिहार के हैं।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : मैंने तो कहा कि लीडर आफ दि हाउस ही बिहार के हैं।

मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि नार्थ बिहार को कृषि करने वाली जमीन बहुत उपजाऊ है। लेकिन अधिक उत्पादन करने के लिये साधनों की आवश्यकता है। साधनों में से कौन सी चीजों की आवश्यकता अधिक है? पानी, बिजली और फर्टिलाइजर। इन तीनों का ही दाम वहाँ बहुत महंगा पड़ता है। वहाँ पर कोई भी बिजली ले नहीं सकता। इस संबंध में न यहाँ के कृषि मंत्री को न लीडर आफ दि हाउस को चिन्ता है न प्राइम मिनिस्टर को चिन्ता है। लेकिन वहाँ के लोगों को साधन नहीं दिने जाते हैं जिस से कि वह कृषि का उत्पादन बिहार में बढ़ा सकें। अभी बिहार में बिजली का रेट बढ़ा दिया गया, पानी का रेट भी बढ़ा दिया गया है। अगर आप समझते हैं कि इस रेट पर किसानों को अधिक पैदा करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन दे सकेंगे तो यह भ्रम है।

मैं अधिक समय न लेता हुआ कल और आज की बातों को केवल दो मिनट में कह कर समाप्त करता हूँ। मैंने कल कहा था कि . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If every hon. Member goes on exceeding the time in this manner, then how am I to accommodate more number of Members who want to speak?

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I wanted five minutes out of which I have taken already three minutes, and I shall finish in two minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken already five minutes. कृपा करके खत्म कीजिए।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : मैंने कहा था कि जब बजट बनाया जाय तो प्रान्त और केन्द्र के बजट के कारण जितना भार किसानों पर पड़ा है या गरीबों पर पड़ा है उसको देख कर ही कोई टैक्सेशन लगाया जाय। अगरचे दोनों जगह को स्टेट्स की और यहाँ की कर व्यवस्था को न देख कर कर लगाते चले जायेंगे तो लोगों की रीढ़ टूट जायगी और वह पनप नहीं सकेंगे। दूसरी बात मैंने कही थी कि किरासीन और डिजिल आयल के ऊपर से कर हटाया जाना चाहिये। यह गरीबों और किसानों के नित्य इस्तेमाल की चीजें हैं। इनका अधिक दाम होने से न उत्पत्ति बढ़ सकती है और अन्न की पैदावार कम हो सकती है। तीसरी बात मैंने यह कही थी कि जहाँ तक कि स्टेट और केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों की बात है उनके वेतन मान में, उनके मंहगाई भत्ते में कोई सामंजस्य ऐसा होना चाहिए कि एक न बहुत ऊंचा हो और दूसरा न बहुत नीचा हो। लेकिन आज क्या है? प्रेशर से या जिस तरह भी हों आज सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज का महीना बढ़ता जाता है। मैं नहीं कहता कि वह नाजायज है। लेकिन स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स के पास साधन नहीं हैं कि उनके कर्मचारियों का महीना या मंहगाई भत्ता बढ़ सके। बिहार में नानगजटेड एम्प्लायीज बढ़ोतरी के लिये आन्दोलन करने के लिये जेलों में सड़ रहे हैं क्योंकि बिहार के पास न साधन होता है और न उनकी डिमांड

[श्री डा० ना० तिवारी]

मंजूर होती है। ऐसा डिस्क्रिमिनेशन सर्विसेज म न कीजिए। प्रार्थिविशियल और यूनियन गवर्नमेंट की सर्विसेज में डिस्क्रिमिनेशन नहीं होना चाहिए। हां, स्थान और काल की बजह से थोड़ा डिफरेंस होता है। लेकिन वह इतना अधिक नहीं होना चाहिए कि मालूम पड़े कि एक फेवर्ड है और दूसरा डिस्क्रिमिनेटेड है। इन मुद्दाओं के साथ जो बजट प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, मैं उनका समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I thought that after Jaipur, we of the Congress Party—it is my Party also—had re-dedicated ourselves to socialism, that the Budget would be an indicator for the Fourth Five Year Plan to expedite the nation's progress towards socialism; I thought this Budget would guide us to the steps that the Indian economy has to take to reach the goal of self-reliance; I also thought that this would be a Budget which would help at least in achieving the objective of the Third Five Year Plan of increasing the national income, producing enough food and lessening the concentration of economic power and wealth as also increasing the average per capita income in the country.

The Economic Survey given by the Finance Minister points out the ills and malaise of the economy and thereby implied that the objectives of the Third Five Year Plan could not be fulfilled. In Part A of the Budget speech, the Finance Minister details and diagnoses the disease of the economy. But in Part B, his proposals reflect a pitiable mixture of retreat before the aggressiveness of the corporate sector and a few colourless concessions to the middle classes.

What does the Finance Minister say in the Economic Survey? He says it is a year of great strain all round. It is true there is inadequate performance of industry. It is true that balance of payment position was very difficult—though Government gave

Rs. 2 crores to the industrialists of this country to roam about the world; whereas the Speaker of the Lok Sabha could not get £ .10 for his treatment, some industrialist could get £.10,000 to roam about! So the balance of payment position was difficult!

Then there was Pak. hostility which consumed some of our resources. Then there was a pause in aid from that senior partner of the commonwealth, UK, which was very kind to us in stopping aid. Debt service payments had increased from Rs. 100 crores to Rs. 120 crores per year. Prices continued to rise.

All this had upset our economy. A perfectly true analysis in the first part of the Budget speech of the Finance Minister. He also said that the States are merry-making by spending Centre's money and showing bravado by overdrafts on the Reserve Bank. All this gave the Finance Minister a big deficit.

All this is absolutely true. I thank him for giving this very correct analysis in the first part of his statement. But I would like to know what were the efforts made actually by the Finance Minister to reverse this trend of upset. It has now become a consistent policy of Ministers of this Government to give a dark picture so that someone in Holland may ring a bell or some children could go about collecting their pocket money for us, so that the Finance Minister may have a trip to America to get a little more of PL-480 assistance or some other extra aid for this country.

But I do not take such a dismal view in the light of the fact that there has been a substantial increase in monetary circulation, though it is said that the capital market is very stringent. Rich friends in this country talk day in and day out about money market stringency, though the monetary circulation has increased by 5.6 per cent. Though equity prices have shown a decline, the profits of industry

have not. Last year, 221 companies declared their balance sheet; a majority of them showed a good profit for themselves.

Again, for the first time, PL 480 assistance has been taken as a factor of strength for the Indian Budget, as a great achievement for us, for we Congressmen and our Government. That PL 480 assistance is considered in such terms to this country is a matter of shame to us, all of us, and this big bureaucracy, the so-called intelligent men in this country who show that pattern of democracy. . .

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Fossilised.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: . . . these fossilised men who think in such terms, that PL 480 is a fortuitous addition to the exchequer of this country, but which has actually made the economy much more unstable.

I ask what are the signals that are beaming in respect of the Indian economy from this analysis? There are contradictory pulls, some are good, others are bad. But I say all these things should not have allowed us to come to the conclusion to which the Finance Minister has come. Industrial production has shown a setback, but in essential basic industries like cement, steel and oil, we have gone up. Even defence expenditure, about which we had fears, has risen by only 25 crores or so. Even the Tashkent spirit has helped us to avoid a further escalation, not in war, but in expenditure. In spite of all this, there is no sign of an attempt on the part of Government to improve the economy. I thank the Finance Minister once again for referring to the current year's 'difficulties and disturbances' and for saying that any attempt at immediate remedial measures must form part of an integrated long-term policy. Perfectly all right. He says that any attempt to achieve 'specific immediate objectives, to quote him,

must be in consonance with the national policy of "promoting growth while furthering the social objective of reducing inequalities of income and wealth". Very nice, absolutely in keeping with the Congress's socialist policy resolutions. He has also proclaimed in the first part of the budget that the compulsion of development might make it necessary to increase the tax, but it would be desirable to extend it, to quote him again, "to cover more fully those who benefit from development". Very nice, absolutely and 100 per cent correct. He also says that the budget is not merely a balance sheet of the Government, but "is a major instrument of implementing our plans and policies".

But after all this analysis, when he comes to the second part of the budget, the operative part containing the proposals, I find a shadow, a great gap between profession and performance. I do not know whose shadow or ghost it is, whether it is the shadow of the tea planters, or the shadow of the stock exchange or that of the 'man-eaters' in the words of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. Certainly, it is the shadow or ghost of the tea planters or the stock exchange or the 'man-eaters' who are looming large in this country. They have certainly almost made the Finance Minister nervous and prevented him from taking a proper perspective view of the ills and malaise of the economy with a view to applying the necessary correctives, ills and malaise of the economy that he himself suggested, which I have quoted already. He has done nothing except for one thing. He has made some simplifying attempts for complicating accounting procedure and rounding off some income-tax figures. The rest of the efforts are to remove the so-called psychological irritants for those who are singing the chorus of stringent money market, those who are singing the adverse investment conditions in this country, who are talking of so many impediments in this country. Therefore, the Finance Minister comes to the familiar game, and that familiar

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

game is to raise the excise duty on consumer goods, which he says is not raising revenue, but for restricting consumption. If it is so, why excise duty on cloth, why not physical control on the import of cotton? So, this is an argument which does not go down the throat of a student of economics like me. Nobody will be befooled by this argument.

14 hrs.

He has, in his budget, said that inflation is the great trouble of the Indian economy, but along with that he has resorted to a surge of indirect taxation on the people of this country, and thereby has not made any attempt to reduce inflation but to add to the inflation in this country. By putting up excise duties, he has shown that he has absolutely thrown away the concern that he showed in the first part of his budget against inflation, and has added to it.

I want to remind the Finance Minister of what he has said in his Economic Survey, of taking more from those who had benefited from development and mopping up incomes which serve no functional purposes. Where are those good policies which you laid down in the first part that you shall take more from those who have benefited from development? Are these indirect taxes from those who have really benefited in this country?

Three Plans have made the poor poorer and the rich richer. Every year the Plan only puts up 3 lakhs or 4 or 5 lakhs people in the upper strata of income who go happy-go-merry in this country, and the rest are where they are. I throw out a challenge. Who are the partners in the national income? The partners are four, rent, interest, wage and profit. I want to know from the Government, let them put up facts and figures that in these years, compared to the price rise, how far the first partner, rent, the second partner interest, and the third partner

wage have increased. I know you have given Rs. 500 for the Secretaries, Rs. 250 for the Deputy-Secretaries, and now only yesterday Rs. 100 for the Under Secretaries, the big army that are developing the plan, for implementing the series of plans in our country. I know that, but compared to the price rise which are the partners in the national income which have benefited? Only one partner, and that is profit, the fourth partner in the national income, has benefited in this country. Therefore, I say the Finance Minister did not take care to implement his own professions, what he said in the first part of the budget.

श्री भोवत : कथनी और करनी में अंतर है ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I agree, that is what I am saying. Why this difference between profession and performance? Why that shadow which comes between the first and second parts of the budget? What happened to the Monopolies Commission's Report? Why not take that dirty piece of report, because that says that while concentration has been there, it has benefited the economy of the country? Why not take the help of that report? Therefore, I say this budget is a mechanical adjustment, giving no relief to the needy.

Income-tax in the lower brackets have been to some extent lessened, but the excise duty has completely neutralised the same, and concessions have been given in direct taxes. What are the concessions in direct taxes? The expenditure tax has been removed. I lodge my strongest protest against the abolition of the expenditure tax. When Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari came first, he imposed the tax. Mr. Morarji Desai removed it. Again, when Mr. Krishnamachari came, he put the tax. and thanks to Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri now, it has been removed. This only shows that this Government can throw up any good principle under

the pressure of those who always sing the song that it is not workable.

What are the arguments given for removing it, along with the gift tax? Under the gift tax, who will benefit? Only the higher strata, not the lower. I say that day is not far off in this country when charity and business will be synonymous. Charity will be opened, trusts will be opened, and there will be mutual taking from each other, as the structure of the gift tax is today in this country, thanks to the Finance Minister.

I say this expenditure tax is a matter of principle. They say the revenue was very marginal. I ask the Minister sitting here, our Law Minister, who the other day said that he knows economics also: if the revenue was very marginal in expenditure tax and gift tax, may I know why they were irritants to the businessmen? If the revenue was very marginal in this direct taxation, why remove it? The fact is not that. The fact is that there is pressure of the business tycoons in this country who try to control the democracy in this country, they want to make it an industrial democracy in the name of a few business houses, they have been trying to sabotage the entire plans in the past few years. So, the giving of this concession in direct taxes must be viewed in the perspective of the objective which the Finance Minister has laid before us in the first part of this budget.

He is also giving preferential treatment to foreign capital coming to this country. Very good, you must invite equity capital, because you have shown inefficiency, therefore how you can do your own investment. Therefore, give that, but why not give the maximum return to the equity capital coming from foreign countries instead of surrendering your sovereignty to this fertiliser company by giving them the right to distribute and fix the price. I have made observations like this in this House many times, but I say once again that if Government leaves price control and distribution policy in the

hands of this distributing company from America, they will not only go to the district and village, but will mortgage our economy and our democracy. We shall take all possible action to resist it. Therefore, I say even in this sphere, Government should think of it.

I remind the Prime Minister of her great, late, lamented father who, when he saw the agreement with VOA after it was signed, took courage to revoke it. I call upon the first woman Prime Minister to take courage in both hands and scrap this fertiliser deal. I do not say do not bring in the capital. Bring in the capital, give the maximum return of 20 or 25 per cent, but do not surrender the sovereignty of the country in the matter of distribution and price control.

Therefore, in this budget, where are those professions of the Finance Minister saying that it is a budget designed to give a good start to the Fourth Plan, for the growth of our development? On the other hand, what do we find? The growth of development of this country has slowed down, and the Finance Minister has accepted the inevitability of a further slow down of planned development, especially in the public sector, as a compulsion on him. On the one hand, non-plan expenditure will go up, and there will be no increase in development expenditure. I ask: where is the sign of economy in the budget?

Much against my wish I shall quote the Labour Government, this senior partner of the Commonwealth who had betrayed us all these times. I go back to January, 1965, when the Wilson Government decided to have economy in the budget. The Cabinet decided that by 1970 they will have a general cut in expenditure by 3½ per cent per year. That means by 1970 they will have a total cut in non-planned expenditure of 23 per cent, and every year they are presenting a white paper. When Mr. Wilson is going to the polls, it is a great strength to his party that 3½ per cent should be

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

cut in the annual non-planned expenditure. Where is that sign—I ask Shri Bhagat, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance—of urgency to cut the expenditure? Where is that sense of urgency shown? No; there is nothing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Only two minutes, Sir. This Government is following the Parkinson's law. But I must say that even Parkinson's law has been outdone, outmoded and outdistanced by the present extension law, so to say, of the Government. Nobody wants to retire from Government in this country. They never retire unless they want to. Unless one wants to retire, one dies in service. Somehow or other, they just manage to stick on. This country may live without a Gandhi, Nehru and Shastri, but the administration cannot live without those experts who are pervading everywhere, even after they reach 58 years of age. I would just give an example to bring home this point to the Government.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Even after 68.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I accept the amendment of the hon. lady Member. In March, 1965, the number of persons of 58 years of age and over was 132. Out of them, 62 were under re-employment. This is how they go on. I shall give just another example, of this extravagance. In the community development blocks, the number of Jeeps, pick-ups and station wagons is 4,557. What was the total cost of these vehicles? It was Rs. 5,57,22,020. What is the annual expenditure on repair and maintenance of these vehicles? It was Rs. 1,23,30,658 in 1963-64 and Rs. 1,33,69,000 in 1964-65. This is the economy of this Government.

Therefore, I will conclude by saying that I do not find in this budget any

sign to lessen the inequality of income and wealth. On the other hand, I find there is lessening of development; there is no economy; no reduction in the inequality of income and wealth. Let me say one word in conclusion. The late Winston Churchill was a great man; he was a good man; he was a great politician, a good leader. But he did not know that the poor man existed. Similarly, the Finance Minister in this country is a very honest man, a good man. But I doubt if he knows that the poor man exists in this country.

Finally, let me conclude. Let not history write that the Congress party won freedom, but lost democracy in this country. I therefore call upon my Government, on my good friends over there, leaders in the Treasury Benches, to take courage to meet the wishes of the people. 500 millions of our countrymen are still struggling hard to find the socialist things in the socialist government of this country. Let the Government show them something today and we will see the day after.

Shri Eswara Reddy (Cuddapah): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it has now become clear from the Finance Minister's budget speech that due and proper attention has not been paid to the famine-affected areas and sufferers in the scarcity areas. The Food Minister's announcements in connection with this do not give or promise adequate relief to the scarcity affected areas. It seems that the Government does not realise or understand the magnitude of this problem. About seven or more States in this country are affected by drought and especially the agricultural labourers in the rural areas of these affected areas are the worst sufferers. They are already overburdened and poverty-stricken and backward, and they have no employment, no food, no fair price shops in the villages, and they form the bulk of the affected population in the rural areas. Even the peasantry also is feeling helpless, unable to feed the

members of their family, unable to feed their cattle and unable to carry on the future agricultural operations. As days pass on, the situation is going from bad to worse. But the Finance Minister does not give any suitable answer as to how he is going to meet this situation which is very grave. It seems he is interested more in creating capital markets for the monopolists, and in creating a favourable climate for investments by foreign capitalists.

Shri C. Subramaniam has outlined some proposals as to how to combat the scarcity conditions. Let us see how they are being implemented at the lower level. I, for instance, come from a district called Cuddapah which is a part of Rayalaseema, comprising four districts contiguously and which has a population of 70 lakhs. In the economic history of India, it is known as the blackest spot on the famine map of India. The rainfall there being on an average, between 15 and 30 inches, and without adequate irrigation facilities this area has become vulnerable to recurring famines. I do not want to dilate or waste the time of the House by enumerating the series of famines that ravaged the Rayalaseema area in pre-Independence days. Just after Independence, in 1952, we had the severest famine there, and even the official reports say that it was unprecedented. In between 1952 and 1966, we had four more famines. We did not have even breathing space to recuperate from the ravages of the first famine, before another famine struck on our heads. This year, we are again in the clutches of famine.

I undertook an extensive tour in the affected areas of my district and submitted my appraisal of the situation, my suggestions and proposals to the Prime Minister, to the Food Minister and to the Minister of Irrigation and Power. Let me tell you how the State officials, for whom our Food Minister is all praise, are tackling this issue. At the outset, I have to point out the very absurdity of the criterion that the local officials are enunciating

as to the declaration of scarcity areas. They proceed on the basis of a taluk. If they find that the total yield of that taluk is more than 50 per cent, that taluk will not be declared as a scarcity area or a drought-affected area, though there are many villages which are completely drought-stricken. But when the whole taluk is not declared as a famine-affected area, those villages which are completely affected can at best get kist remission but will not get any part of the relief works. This is very absurd. After all, the kist remission is no relief measure. If this criterion or principle is extended a little, we will see its absurdity very glaringly. Suppose a district has a total yield of 50 per cent, then that district will not be declared as an affected area. Suppose the State has got 50 per cent of the normal yield, that State will not be declared as an affected area. In the same way, if the whole nation has got 50 per cent of the normal yield, everything is supposed to be OK, and there is no scarcity, no drought, nothing of the sort. And so, there will be no famine relief works. This is a very absurd thing. This is how the officials are trying to minimise the extent and serious nature of the affected areas. What I demand, therefore, is that every village which is given the kist remission should also be entitled to have relief works such as minor irrigation works, loans, road construction, supply of fodder, opening of fair price shops and so on every village which is given kist remission should be eligible for these relief works.

Now let us see, even in these declared areas, which have been affected by scarcity or drought, what the Government is doing, and what are the relief measures that have been implemented in these areas. In the whole of Rayalaseema, comprising four districts, the Government has given about Rs. 60 lakhs. Out of the total population of about 70 lakhs, to put it at the minimum, at least 30 lakhs to 40 lakhs of persons are seriously affected by drought; and so, when this sum

[SRI ESWARA REDDY]

of Rs. 50 lakhs is divided among all these affected persons, it comes to just Rs. 2 per person. Is it a relief? With just Rs. 2 per year, per person. How are you going to alleviate the distress of these people with this niggardly grant? It will not be sufficient even to wipe out the tears that they shed for the whole year. This is a very sorrowful state of affairs and these measures are very insignificant and very meagre. Unless and until major, medium and minor irrigation projects are taken up immediately in the famine-affected areas of Rayalaseema, unless electrical schemes already sanctioned are given priority and taken up, unless large-scale well construction is taken and pump sets are given, there can be neither immediate provision of work nor permanent relief for the future. The second stage of the Tungabhadra high level project should be taken up immediately. It irrigates the areas of Anantapur and Cuddapah districts. The first stage is going to be completed very soon. Necessary amount should be allotted for this project and it should be completed as early as possible, so that at least in some areas of Rayalaseema famine can be eradicated soon.

As far as I know, measures to combat scarcity conditions proposed by Mr. Subramaniam are only suggestions and guiding lines for the States to do the whole job. He told the Lok Sabha recently that his assistance will be about Rs. 20 to Rs. 30 crores to the States. But looking at the magnitude and enormity of the problem, it is very insufficient and does not touch even the ring of the problem. No State with its limited resources can tackle this issue successfully. The Centre alone has to take the entire responsibility if justice is to be done to the famine-affected areas. Therefore, I appeal to the government to set up a famine control board at the Centre with Rs. 500 crores at its disposal for the whole plan period, to commence relief works immediately in all the scarcity affected areas of the country.

This is not a new idea of mine. There is already a flood control board at the Centre to check the devastation caused by floods. But floods are not the only result of the vagaries of the monsoon; they cause famines also. Why should our government close their eyes to this aspect and to the other side of the same coin? Mr. Subramaniam proposes to set up a Desert Development Board and a committee for the agricultural development of Hill areas also. Why not in the same way set up a famine control board? We hear a famine cell has been opened in the Planning Commission, but a cell can only plan or give some suggestions; without any funds at its disposal it cannot do the job.

Ours is a vast country with uneven development. There are developed areas, backward areas and famine-affected areas. Is it not the first and foremost duty of the government to come to the rescue of the most affected areas, whose very existence is in danger, and to see that they catch up with rest of their brethren in the advanced areas? Government recognise social disparities and they are giving some concessions, though not very satisfactory, priorities and reservations to the scheduled castes and tribes, who are most socially suppressed and oppressed. Similarly, famine-affected areas are also suppressed and oppressed by natural calamities. If they demand some priorities and preferences to rescue them from natural calamities, why should there be any objection? If government persists in this adamant attitude of keeping regional imbalances for ever and keeping famine areas as famine areas for ever, the forces of disruption will emerge and take undue advantage of this dissonance; and, they may strike at the very roots of national integration. Sooner the government realises this danger, the better for the country and the people. Otherwise, out of its own folly and blunder, government will be creating more Nagas and Mizos right in the heart of India. So, I appeal

to the government again to understand the needs and mood of the people—they are in a very desperate condition—and take the entire responsibility to do something concrete and substantial for them. The centre alone can and should alleviate their distress by setting up a famine control board with adequate funds at its disposal.

In conclusion, I may draw your attention to one point. Recently the provincial Kisan Committee held its conference. It decided to stand by the famine-stricken people of Rayalaseema in their effort for the redressal of their grievances from the government. If the government is not going to take up this issue, there may be very great resentment, discontentment and agitation. Under such conditions, we have to stand by them and see that their grievances are redressed. But the government seems to postpone the matter as long as they can. When an agitation is started and people want to assert themselves, they say, this is all violence instigated by political parties and all sorts of slanderous statements are made. Even before that time comes—I do not say it as a warning—I am appealing to the government to understand the feelings of the famine affected areas of all the States and come to their rescue. No State can take that responsibility on its own and tackle the issue successfully. Only the centre can do that work.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvellia): Sir, I rise to support the budget proposals that have been presented to the House by the hon. Finance Minister. It is indeed a very difficult task for any Finance Minister to frame the budget of a country like ours especially so when the country has before it the twin tasks of defence and development. I must say that the Finance Minister has addressed himself to this difficult and delicate task with a commendable amount of diligence. Sir, I do not support the budget since I consider it to be a revolutionary budget, calculated to introduce socialism in one year or to sound the death knell

of capitalism and the private sector in one year. I did not expect that the Finance Minister or any Finance Minister would come before the House with proposals in a budget which would enable the country to achieve the essence of a revolution in the course of a month or twelve months.

Sir, it is neither a revolutionary budget nor a regressive budget; it is a realistic budget. It is neither a depressionist budget, as the hon. member for Rajkot said yesterday, nor is it a defeatist budget, as my hon. friend, opposite, Mr. Mukerjee, said yesterday. I would call it a moderately deft budget. No one likes taxes. It is not given to many Finance Ministers to go before a Parliament and say, "Lo, and Behold! I will wave my magic wand and taxation would disappear." I can recall, in recent days, the example of a distinguished Prime Minister of a friendly country—who is no longer the Prime Minister of that country—Mr. Khrushchev, who promised that very soon there would be an attenuation of taxation, that taxation, perhaps like the State itself, in theory, would whither away. I am not suggesting that Mr. Khrushchev had to pay the penalty for it. But it has not fallen to many Finance Ministers or Prime Ministers to make such promises which almost sound empty promises to the people.

Sir, one has to remember that the Finance Minister has had to work within the four corners of the conditions in which we find ourselves today. He could not ignore the economic conditions that obtain in this country. He could not ignore the kind and extent of resources that we have. He could not ignore the social objectives that this country has adopted. He could not ignore the declared goals of the party to which he belongs, the party which is running the government of this country; nor could he ignore the methods through which his party and his government want to achieve these goals, namely, the methods prescribed by democracy. Nor, was it possible for him to ignore the

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

fact that we have accepted a system in which for some time at any rate, there would be co-existence of the private sector and the public sector. Given all these facts, which cannot be wished away, I do believe that the Finance Minister has formulated his budget proposals with considerable degree of diligence.

Sir, what we can expect of the Finance Minister in such circumstances is that he should maintain the direction in which we want our nation to go, the pace with which we want to progress towards socialism which is our accepted objectives. I do submit that nothing in this budget has put a limit on the public sector. Nothing in this budget has provided for any enlargement of the private sector. Nothing in this budget has facilitated the concentration of wealth or ownership in the hands of a decreasing number of people.

Now, my hon. friend, Shri Masani, the Member from Rajkot, who spoke yesterday, painted a picture of unrelieved misery and failure. He was very eager to prove that he too was a success in the profession of prophets or astrologers. He read out from his previous speeches and tried to show to the House how his prophecies of gloom and doom had virtually come true. I do not want to grudge him the pleasure and the privilege of being a prophet or a false prophet of gloom or doom. But the picture that he painted was unrealistic, the picture was not one that could be sustained by reference to facts.

Sir, it is up to him, especially in a year like this, to paint a one-sided picture and to refuse to look at the other side of the picture. But this House cannot ignore the other side of the picture. What is the other side of the picture. He said yesterday that agricultural production had fallen. It is true that agricultural production has fallen during the year that has

elapsed. But can it be said that there has been no increase in agricultural production in this country? It cannot be forgotten that from 50.88 million tons in 1950-51 agricultural production in this country has gone up to 88 million tons today.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar): What about the increase in population?

Shri Ravindra Varma: Surely, there is an increase of population today, but I am now speaking about the increase in our agricultural production. I am very glad the hon. Member is concerned at the increase in population. I shall refer to it if I get the time.

It is true that agricultural production increased by 10.5 per cent in 1964-65, 3 per cent in 1963-64 and there was a decline of 5 per cent in 1962-63. But, I would like to point out, in this connection, that even in a country like the Soviet Union the rate of growth of farm output has increased only by one per cent in the year 1965 as against 12 per cent in 1964.

Sir, there was a reference to industrial production. It is true that industrial production has not been able to keep up the pace of improvement in the last year for reasons which are very well known to the hon. Members of this House. Sir, there was an increase of 7 per cent in 1964-65, 8.5 per cent in 1963-64 and 7.7 per cent in 1962-63. The rate of growth during the first months of last year was as high as 7.3 per cent. Here again I would like to refer to the case of the USSR and point out how the rate of growth was 8.6 per cent in 1965 as against 7 per cent in 1964, and how it was only in 1965 that they succeeded in stemming the steep fall in the rate of growth in industrial production in the USSR.

Again, Sir, if you turn to the production of machinery you will find

that we were producing Rs. 10 crores worth of machinery a decade ago whereas today we produce Rs. 500 crores worth of machinery. The generating capacity has gone up from 1.7 million kw in 1950 to 8.5 million in 1965. In the same way we have made phenomenal progress in education. We need not go into each of the sectors of our social life to point out how in the last 15 years, "in spite of the planning" which Shri Masani bemoans this country has achieved progress. Whether it be in the case of production of steel or of the capacity for refining petroleum or of the increase in our exports, we will see that there has been steady progress.

Now, Sir, I do not want to deny the fact that the last year, no doubt, was a year in which all our expectations were not fulfilled. The reasons for these are not unknown to Shri Masani. Everyone knows that in the last year we had to face a severe drought of the kind which no one can recall in this country. It is known that this affected agricultural production and industry, and that this in turn affected our capacity for exports. It is known too that during the last year we had to face the heavy burden of increasing our defence potentialities. We had to face the challenge that Pakistan flung against us. We had to face the possibility of double aggression on our frontiers. We could not do that without increasing our expenditure on defence. Sir, we must also remember that in the midst of this pre-occupation with increasing our defence potential, we had to face the fact that many of our friendly countries which were extending aid to our country chose to switch off the assistance that they had guaranteed to this country. So, without assistance which was guaranteed from outside, with the increased responsibility for increasing our defence potential in a short time, having to face the problems posed by the unprecedented drought, I do admit there was some kind of a set-back in the rate of progress. It is not possible for this House to ignore these factors

when it tries to evaluate the achievements of the previous year.

My hon. friend, Shri Masani while referring to the budget proposals of the Finance Minister, said yesterday, that he found that the remedies and objectives that the Finance Minister had outlined, formulated in Part A of his speech were un-exceptionable, but he could not agree with the manner in which he had tried to translate these objectives into proposals for taxation. Shri Masani bemoaned what he called over-dependence on foreign aid. The Finance Minister himself has stated in his speech that we do not want to be eternally dependent on foreign assistance. We do not want to avail of any foreign assistance which means an abridgement of our sovereignty. My hon. friend from Bhagalpur, a few minutes ago, referred to some strings being attached to foreign aid and almost suggested that we had accepted an abridgement of our sovereignty in the assistance that we had accepted. I stoutly deny this. I do not think that this Government is a government or this party is a party which would put up with the acceptance of any assistance that would be an affront to our national dignity or an abridgement of our sovereignty. This position has been amply made clear by the Finance Minister in his speech.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapur): Nothing else than tall talk.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I know very well that there can be all kinds of assistance. I know too that many countries have offered assistance to this country. We have received assistance from the Soviet Union; I do not deny it. But, after all, we can seek and receive assistance only according to the capacity of the country that offers assistance. Why is it that when we go through the extent of assistance that we have received from different countries, we find a tremendous disparity between professions, or perhaps willingness, and the actual extent of assistance that we have received? I do not wish to enter into that question at length because I want

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

to deal with some other points. I do not want to be deflected from what I want to say.

Sir, as far as development is concerned, we must remember that in this country we are facing the problem of achieving rapid economic development for 450 million people through democratic methods. It is a gigantic problem. We have tried in the past few years to harness our internal resources with the maximum of goodwill from all sections of our people. We have tried to maximise the foreign assistance that we can get from every quarter, on the basis of equality, on the basis of national self-respect. It is wrong to suggest, as the hon. Member from Rajkot did yesterday, that we are depending and over-depending on foreign assistance. If he only cares with his excellent acumen for, statistics to tally up the total of the amounts budgeted for by all the States and the Centre he would find that foreign assistance is responsible for not even 10 per cent of the total money spent by the Governments of this country for the betterment of the living conditions of our people. While the total budget shows that Rs. 5,800 crores are being spent by the States and the Centre, the total foreign assistance that we have received per year is about Rs. 450 crores or 500 crores or perhaps a little more, but not more than that. Now, if my hon. friend from Hajipur will bear with me, if it is possible to total up the budgets of expenditure and income of the panchayats of this country, the local bodies of this country, so that a total picture may be evolved of the way the national resources are mobilised and spent, then one would see that the foreign assistance that we receive amounts only to 2.5 or 3 per cent of the total budget of this country.

Shri Masani says that increasing foreign aid from Rs. 450 crores to 700 crores or 800 crores will be too much. He says it will be too much to expect. He asked the question yesterday: who will give us this assistance? It is not

the first time that Shri Masani asks this question. Sometimes it appears to me that it is perhaps much easier to satisfy the World Bank, or AID or Sir Norman Clipping, or some one else, about the conditions under which we function in this country, about the stability of this country, about the economic viability of this country, then to convince the hon. Member for Rajkot, because, these world organisations are only concerned with stability, with economic efficiency. My hon. friend opposite, the Member for Rajkot, is not satisfied with that. He will be satisfied only if his philosophy of freedom for the few is accepted. He will be satisfied that these undertakings are viable, are functioning well, and he will think that we are qualified for foreign aid only when we adopt his economic philosophy, namely, the philosophy *laissez faire*.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude.

Shri Ravindra Varma: Sir, you should give me more time because I want to deal with the points raised by some hon. Members who spoke before me. I hope you will bear with me.

Now I want to refer to the question of increase in Governmental expenditure to which many hon. friends who spoke before me made reference. Many hon. friends referred to the proliferation of personnel in administration. No one is more conscious of this and of the fact that this has to be avoided even in a welfare State, in a democracy, than the hon. Finance Minister who has made special reference to the fact that it is essential for the Government to set an example by practising austerity and by cutting out relentlessly every avoidable item of expenditure.

But it is one thing to say that there should be economy; it is yet another thing to describe it as a panacea. Another suggestion of Shri Masani's was a cut across the board, or some

such American expression, a general cut of 2 to 3 per cent applicable to all item of expenditure other than defence expenditure. This time he exempted defence expenditure, I do not know why. I say so, because, formerly his party has often talked of the virtues of delinquency, and argued that it is possible for us to avoid expenditure on defence if we enter into a military alliance with some other country. I am grateful to him that this year he did not repeat that argument. But the suggestion that if there is a 2 to 3 per cent cut across the board it would lead to economy is a dangerous suggestion. I am not against economy; I am for economy. But, then, one must understand what retrenchment would lead to, what is meant by non-development expenditure. Yesterday, the hon. Member for Barh also complained that there had been a tremendous increase in non-developmental expenditure. What is the connotation of the word "non-developmental expenditure"? How was the figure of 2770 crores arrived at by the hon. Member for Barh? If the non-project expenditure or non-developmental expenditure means expenditure which does not lead to the production of physical commodities, then I suggest that it is a rather dangerous definition. A State like ours has to spend money on education. A State like ours has to spend money on public health, on public utilities and social service. These do not produce physical commodities. But you cannot classify them as non-developmental or unnecessary expenditure. That would be a dangerous classification. If, therefore, there is an item-wise analysis of expenditure it will be seen that our Government, which believes in the ideal of a welfare State, has spent money, has increased expenditure on services which lead to "investment in men", "in human resources", so that the ability of men, the potentiality of men may increase, so that the personality of men may flower, and that certainly is not a non-developmental expenditure.

Sir, Shri Masani referred to the increase in the expenditure on police. I

am sure Shri Masani is a very diligent student. He must have seen, therefore, that the suggestion was not for increasing expenditure on traffic police in Delhi, though perhaps an efficient traffic police is very necessary. The expenditure was and is to be on border security police. Now it is very easy for this House to appreciate, given the circumstances in which this country is situated, with troubles on the border, in the hill areas of our country, across the frontier, how it is very necessary for us to have an efficient border security force. The expenditure on border security is not borne under the head "army". It is borne by the police because the border security force is classified as a police force. Ignoring all these things, if you say that any addition to the expenditure on Police is, an avoidable administrative expenditure, unproductive expenditure, expenditure meant only for the preservation of law and order or for waving the lathi over the heads of the people, I say that it is a distortion of facts which this House cannot entertain.

Sir, I do agree that there is an absolute necessity today, especially when expenditure is increasing, to see that there every pie that is spent by the Government is scrutinized and reduction in expenditure made where possible. Take, for example, the Community Projects Administration. I do not know whether the Community Project Administration, like Malvillo is more sinned against than sinning I expect some will say it is more sinned against than sinning. But let us look at the facts. Rs. 300 crores has been spent on this account. Out of this hardly Rs. 100 crores has been spent on programmes, and nearly Rs. 200 crores have been spent on administration, and incidentals.

Shri Masani had a three-fold solution to offer to the Finance Minister. He said that if one of these could be accepted by the Finance Minister, he could achieve the miracle for which every Finance Minister thirsts, to abolish or reduce taxation. He urged that the Finance Minister should not

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

give to the States the loans that he is proposing to give or he must decide on a 2 to 3 per cent over the board cut or he must decide that capital expenditure would be met only from capital receipt, from public debt and public borrowings.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now. He has already taken 20 minutes.

Shri Davindra Varma: I cannot deal another five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can take another minute or two. I have to accommodate other Members.

Shri Ravindra Varma: I cannot deal with some of the arguments in one sentence.

I was saying that it is not possible for me to deal with every one of these three suggestions. Sir, you have only underlined the fact that I do not have the time to do so. In fact, I am thankful to you for this support. But if you look at the items for which these loans are given or are proposed not unproductive items, that they are items for which a State can legitimately expect support from the Centre. I would wish Shri Masani and hon. friends opposite to consider what would have been their attitude if instead of Congress Governments in the States, there were a few governments run by Opposition parties. At that time if there were budgetary deficits, confusion or financial indiscipline, and the budget could be balanced only by support from the Centre, and if that support were not forthcoming from the Centre, I wonder what arguments would be advanced by my hon. friend opposite, Shri Masani and his friends.

Sir, I shall not deal with the other two suggestions of Shri Mansani except to say that they stem from the social philosophy in which he believes,

namely, the philosophy of *laissez faire* which Members on this side of the House cannot accept.

Sir, I do not want to deal at length with the taxation proposals but I must submit that to say that the taxation proposals put an inequitable burden on the corporate sector will be a travesty of truth. There is a list of concessions to the corporate sector. Abolition of expenditure tax, revision of the rates of gifts tax, abolition of tax on bonus shares, decision to give up the 12.5 per cent tax on domestic companies, changes in the base for the levy of dividend tax and the favourable change in the rate of surtax. If these are not concessions, what are concessions I would like to know.

I wish to conclude with a reference to my hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, who, unfortunately, is not here now. He said yesterday that this Budget meant a "good-bye" to socialism and he attacked pragmatism. When an hon. Member of Shri Mukerjee's persuasion attacks pragmatism, I do not know what exactly he means and whether he is arguing for dogmatism. I do not, even know whether he can define what is dogmatism and what is pragmatism. I sometimes feel that some of the devotees of dogma are so hesitant to leave the strange paradise in which the rule "To each according to his want, from each according to his capacity" is inscribed on the portal. They would only insist that this motto should be implemented from tomorrow especially it is others who are in power. His dialectical predilection or affection for the Planning Minister is something, that is, understandable, and I do not want to go into that question; however, when the hon. Member, Shri Mukerjee, referred to dogma and pragmatism, I wondered what constituted deviationism and pragmatism in his view, what constituted orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and who was the apostle and who the apostate. I wonder whether Professor Mukerjee can give a consistent answer to these questions at any time.

Sir, the need to improve our budgeting technique is something to which all of us have made reference time and again. I do not want to deal with it. There is necessity to reduce the gap between estimates and actuals; there is necessity to see that unspent surrenders every year do not total up to crores of rupees; there is necessity to hold the price line; there is necessity to maintain the value of the rupee; it is necessary to see that indirect levies do not add to the burden on the poor. As my hon. Friend, the member for Bhagalpur, said, it is necessary to see that nothing is done which would lead to the growth of monopoly or concentration of wealth; that everything is done to prevent the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a decreasing number of people. Everything should be done to see that regional and social disparities are ended.

Sir, I wish to conclude by referring to the way in which the two hon. Members opposite, Shri Mukerjee and Shri Masani, concluded their speeches yesterday. Both of them were obsessed with the fact that in a few months' time we are going to have the general elections. Both of them invoked the wrath of the people of this Government and this party. Shri Masani became almost indignant and said that we have been here for too long and the people are going to punish us for our mismanagement. Shri Mukerjee did even better. He is always indignant, and quivering with indignations, when he sees that people of this persuasion are on the Treasury Benches, whenever he realises that in spite of all the "revolutionary efforts" that have been made and are being made, people have repudiated these prophets of a false revolution. He, however, concluded his speech by saying that the indignities that the Ministry is committing will be wiped off by the people as is being done in Calcutta, Maharashtra and other parts of India. I wonder whether what Shri Mukerjee said was something that he wanted to say by way of imprecation or incitement or incantation. From the reports

2760 (A) LSD—8.

which appear in the press it seems very clear that it was not a pious piece of prophecy. I suspect that there is something deeper in this. The House has to evaluate the opposition that has been voiced by the hon. Members to whom I referred in the light of these undeniable facts.

Sir, I support the Budget proposals.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the most striking virtue of this Budget is its simplicity. There is no doubt that the Finance Minister has made neither any tall claims about the Budget nor has he indulged in any fiscal adventurism like his predecessors. Whatever may be the reaction of the vested interests, I feel that this Budget is somewhat refreshing as it is quite different from other Budgets.

A beginning, though a modest one, has been made in the direction of removing one by one those obstacles to increased production and other economic evils which have been prevailing in our society. The question crops up again and again in our minds as to why our Finance Minister could not do a little better in this direction. When we see the limitations around him, we have to say that it is a good beginning; but he has to go a long way to broom out all the rubbish and dust of economic evils which have been left by his predecessors so as to be able to give us a real production oriented socialist Budget.

An hon. Member: What a compliment she is paying!

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: By abolishing the expenditure tax, which according to my friend from Bihar was only irksome to the business class, he has done a great service to the income-tax department because they were busy achieving nothing. The administrative expenditure on expenditure tax was much more than the returns which used to be gained by the expenditure tax.

[Shrimati Savitri Nigam]

Sir, nobody can deny that by abolishing the capital gains tax on bonus in the hands of shareholders and reduction of the impact of dividends tax as well as reduction in the rate of sur-tax, the hon. Finance Minister has definitely tried to revive the capital market to some extent. It is quite apparent that if given an opportunity he would not feel shy of giving more concessions to the corporate sector in order to give a filip to investment, saving and capital formation. I lay a great emphasis on these three things—investment, saving and capital formation. The relief given to bonus shares has been a good step as there was no justification for taxing the national gains.

I am surprised to hear some criticism regarding the slashing of the gifts tax, but in my opinion he has given a new push to money circulation and a discouragement to tax evasion. There is no doubt that a wholesome effect has been made by this small concession offered to the corporate sector which will go a long way. About 35 per cent development rebate which has been offered to industries on the priority list, like tea, newsprint, will be helpful in boosting up the morale of the capital market and in creating a suitable climate for the improvement of these industries.

There is no doubt that the Finance Minister has shown considerable foresight by raising the income-tax exemption limit on personal allowance by Rs. 500. Increasing the personal allowance from Rs. 4,600 to Rs. 4,800 is all right; but I cannot understand the logic of qualifying it by adding "to a married individual having more than one child". Why is this premium being given, because this is against the family planning programme?

15 hrs.

[SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF in the Chair.]

It should have been given only to those who have not more than 1 child to ensure that the people are encouraged to have smaller families. Only

yesterday, my niece wrote to me that because of listening to your advice in the matter of family planning, her husband will have to pay Rs. 100 more because she has got only 1 child. Time and again, the sad plight of salaried class has been mentioned in this House. The dearness allowance which has been given to the Government servants from time to time has been neutralised by the rise in the price index.

There is no justification in keeping this Annuity Deposit scheme at all. I would beg of the hon. Minister of Finance to abolish it altogether.

I have no soft corner for any business or trade class. I want to give a fair deal to everybody who works in the interest of the nation. What surprises me most is that because of ideological reasons the people lose balance out of enthusiasm even when they discuss a serious matter. Yesterday, when one of the economic experts chosen by the Treasury Benches to speak on behalf of the Congress Party and the other one who spoke today were emphasizing the need of Bank Reform, Policy Reform, Social Reform, Economic Reform and all that, I felt like telling them, "What you need is Chloroform." By living in slogans and by our idealistic approach, we will only add to the chaos which is already in. We should be more practical to find out ways and means so that we may get out of this difficult financial position.

The percentage of sur-charge on the corporate sector and otherwise is pretty high and it may lead to slacken the pace of industrial production all the more. So, I would suggest that the hon. Finance Minister should reduce it from 10 per cent to 5 per cent.

Now, I would take the cause of the common man. From the common man's point of view, the proposals to increase excise duties on sugar, khandsari and diesel oil have been rather harsh. There is a great fear

in the minds of the people and in all of us that the prices may go up and the poor common man may be hit hard all the more because already the cost of living is constantly going up. If, like cigarettes, other luxury items had been taxed more, I would have welcomed it. But khandsari which is specially the poor man's food should not have been taxed. As the Finance Minister knows it very well, any such taxes are bound to lead to rise in prices.

Then, I could not appreciate why the Plan expenditure is going to be less by Rs. 140 crores from next year. If he had imposed some cuts on the Planning Commission which has been referred to by so many Members as a *Pinjarpole* for giving refuge to the retired officers and all those people who are unwanted in every other department are shunted out to the Planning Commission.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): And also who are defeated in the elections.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: If any cut would have been imposed by the Finance Minister on the Planning Commission, I would have welcomed it. But I could not appreciate this cut of Rs. 140 crores in the Plan expenditure from next year. When we have accepted the method of planned development as our instrument to fight poverty and hunger . . .

Mr. Chairman: She should conclude now.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: The other Member was given 35 minutes. I have taken only 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: She has taken 10 minutes more than the time allotted.

An hon. Member: Ladies should be given more time.

Mr. Chairman: I accept that.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: When we have accepted the method of planned development and we have decided to raise the standard of living of the teeming millions of people by this planned development, this sort of cut is quite undesirable and, I think, it will be restored. The Finance Minister may put this question, when I am asking for the abolition of Annuity Deposit Scheme, when I am asking for restoring this cut, from where he would fill up that gap of Rs. 140 crores. I may give the answer that could be done very easily. One of the most effective methods would be to put a severe check on our non-productive expenditure and a more effective economy drive to be implemented by all Government Departments at all levels. Who could believe that 35 per cent of our total national income is being spent on the administrative set-up only? Why not our experts have a little more imagination to find out some suitable ways and means to economise expenditure by such schemes like voluntary retirement scheme or switching over of the people who are going to be retrenched because of economy drive to some technical departments? We know there is a great shortage of technical personnel in our country. Why can't this army of *chaprasis* and other Class IV Government servants be given some technical training and be absorbed in other technical department.

I would like to point out another very unhealthy tendency which has been growing in our country, that is, indiscipline which is prevailing amongst the States. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to why the States were allowed to indulge in such unauthorised withdrawals from the Reserve Bank and what was the Reserve Bank doing at that time? Could not the Reserve Bank report it to the Government in time? Why are other States which have not withdrawn these sums going to be punished for that? You are aware that already our country is facing a very big economic crisis. The foreign ex-

[Shrimati Savitri Nigam]

change reserves have reached to a very dangerous zone. Instead of the Food Minister who has demanded food from all corners of the world and who has brought a lot of humiliation because of this demand—bells are being rung and food coupons are being surrendered—if our Finance Minister had made this demand from the Indians who had settled abroad to send some foreign exchange to their home-land, to help their mother-land, I am sure, the results would have been very very helpful.

Shri Rameshwar Tantia (Sikar): There is the National Defence Remittance Scheme.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: Sir, the price index has already shown an upward trend. I want to ask the economic experts and the Finance Minister as to why they have not been able to adopt some dynamic method in these Budget proposals to eradicate this evil. Unemployment, rising prices and the rising cost of living are the biggest drags on our economy.

The capital growth has been very tardy. Everybody knows it Share market has been very dull. I would appeal to the Finance Minister not to depend too much on the army of experts but to adopt a house-wives' approach and to make the best out of the worst. Only by tightening up administrative machinery of the Finance Department, the Reserve Bank, the Income-tax Department, I am sure the hon. Minister can very easily fill up the gap.

There are many other evils responsible for this critical position. But the greatest evil is the black money to which nobody has made any reference so far. The whole House is aware and you are also aware that the Government has failed miserably in getting this money unearthed by two big disclosure schemes. And they have been. गुनाह बेलज्जत

First of all I was quite opposed to make any compromise with those people who have been dishonest and to put any premium on dishonesty. Once Government have decided to unearth this money by disclosure schemes, those schemes should have been made so flawless that more and more people would have been encouraged to unearth the black money which is in circulation and which is creating a havoc as far as our economy is concerned.

I would like to make the suggestion—it is still not too late—, if the hon. Finance Minister becomes humble enough to take the advice of the hon. members of this House, that he should revise these schemes by bringing in certain amendments and by this I am sure, he would be doing a greatest service to this country.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member may conclude now.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: I am concluding. In the end, whatever people may say, we cannot deny one fact that this budget has strengthened the hands of our Government in seeking the co-operation of all international institutions, in increasing larger flow of long term assistance and in solving the foreign exchange crisis, as this mild budget will surely act as a catalytic agent to achieve proper and healthy growth of our economy. This budget has also made one thing clear in the minds of private and public sectors that there is a great room for the growth of both these sectors as far as national economy is concerned, as far as industrial production and all types of production in this country are concerned.

श्री ह० च० सोय (मिहभूम) : माननीय सभापति जी, कल माननीय सदस्य, श्री मालवीय, ने इस बजट की आलोचना करते हुये कहा कि भुवनेश्वर प्रस्ताव के द्वारा, जो कि कलिंग पार्टी ने पास किया था, देश में व्याप्त

प्राथमिक असमानता और प्राथमिक क्षेत्र में मौजूद शोषण को दूर करने का जो आदेश इस सरकार को दिया गया था, उसके अनुसार तुरन्त कार्यवाही की जाये। उसके बारे में तो हमारी शिकायत है ही, लेकिन इस सरकार से हमें यह भी शिकायत है कि संविधान में राष्ट्र की ओर से उन चार करोड़ लोगों के प्रति जो प्रतिज्ञा की गई थी, जिनको हर तरह से शोषित और दलित रखा गया है, इतनी पंच-वर्षीय योजनाओं के पूरा होने पर भी उस प्रतिज्ञा को पूरा करने की दिशा में किसी विस्म की तरफकी नहीं की गई है और असमानता और शोषण दूर नहीं हुये हैं।

पिछले कुछ वर्षों से हम यह आशा करते रहे हैं कि बजट में इस बारे में कुछ संकेत मिलेगा। वित्तने ही फिनांस मिनिस्टर आये और गये, लेकिन फिर भी बजट में इस संबंध में किसी विस्म की चर्चा ही नहीं होती है। सभापति महोदय, मैं गमनता हूँ, कि आप उस दलाके में गये हैं, जहां हमारे देश के सब से पिछड़े लोग रहते हैं। जमशेदपुर में जो बहुत बड़ी फैक्टरी है, उसको देख कर लगता है कि बिहार का वह क्षेत्र बहुत ही आगे बढ़ा हुआ है। आप रांची के हैवी इंजीनियरिंग कारखाने में भी गये हैं। उस को देख कर लोगों को धोखा हो जाता है कि भारत का सब से समृद्ध दलाका यही है। जहां आप जमशेदपुर और रांची गये हैं, वहां आप उस दलाके के भीतरी क्षेत्रों में भी गये हैं, जहां आप ने नये आदिवासी लोगों को देखा होगा। उन लोगों की अवस्था से यही सुन्नत मिलता है कि इन सब पंच-वर्षीय योजनाओं के बावजूद हमारा विकास उचित ढंग से नहीं हो रहा है, जो कि सोशललिस्ट कहे जाने वाले देश के लिये सज्जा की बात है।

संविधान बनाने वालों ने डायरेक्टव प्रिसिपलज के रूप में संविधान में दलित और शोषित समाज के बारे में सरकार को

खास हिदायत दी थी कि उसके विकास और प्रगति के लिये जल्द से जल्द उचित कार्यवाही की जानी चाहिये। संविधान बनाने वालों को इस बात का भी डर था कि शायद आने वाली सरकार और शासन इस संबंध में कार्यवाही न करें। इसलिये उन्होंने संविधान के अनुच्छेद में यह व्यवस्था की थी कि दस बरस के बाद एक बमीशन की बहाली हो, जो इस बात की जांच करे कि इन लोगों के विकास के लिये जो कार्यवाही की गई है, उसमें कहां तक सफलता मिली है।

संविधान की इस व्यवस्था के मुताबिक डेवर बमीशन के द्वारा इस बारे में जांच की गई। आप ने पढ़ा होगा कि डेवर बमीशन ने साफ शब्दों में कहा कि राष्ट्र ने संविधान में इन दलित और शोषित वर्गों के प्रति जो प्रतिज्ञा की थी, उनके विकास और उरधान के लिये जो प्रतिज्ञा की थी, उसको पूरा करने में हमारी भारी असफलता हुई है। डेवर बमीशन ने यह भी कहा कि इस संबंध में हमसे जो गलतियां हुई हैं, आगे उनका सुधार कैसे किया जाये। लेकिन मुझे अपसोस के साथ बहना पड़ता है कि डेवर बमीशन की रिपोर्ट में जो मुख्य मुख्य रीकमेंडेशन दी गई थी, उनको कार्यान्वित करने की ओर सरकार ने अब तक कोई बंदम नहीं उठाया है।

उदाहरण के लिये डेवर बमीशन ने कहा कि कारखानों के नाम पर, नये शहरों को बसाने के नाम पर और दूसरे कारणों से हरिजनों और आदिवासियों को जो लगातार उनकी जमीनों से उच्छेद किया जा रहा है, उसकी जल्द से जल्द रोक थाम की जाये और जमीन संबंधी वर्तमान कानून में जो भ्रष्टचर्चें या गलतियां हों, उनमें जल्द से जल्द ऐसा परिवर्तन किया जाये कि जो जमीनें उनसे ली गई हैं, वे उनको वापस मिल जायें। लेकिन इस बारे में कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की गई है।

[श्री ह० प० सोय]

इसके प्रतिरिक्त काका कालेलकर की अध्यक्षता में एक बैंकवर्क क्लासिज कमीशन नियुक्त किया गया, जिस की प्रोर से कई रीकमेंडेशन्स दी गईं। लेकिन, जैसा कि आप जानते हैं, ग्यारह बरसों के बाद भी आज तक सरकार ने उनको कार्यान्वित करने के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठाया है। इस से यही प्रकट होता है कि संविधान जैसी पवित्र पुस्तक में राष्ट्र की प्रोर से जो काम करने की प्रतिज्ञा की गई है, सरकार उस को नहीं करना चाहती है।

आपने यह भी देखा होगा कि डेबर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट, बैंकवर्क क्लासिज कमीशन की रिपोर्ट या शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्ज की सालाना रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा करने की बात जब होती है, तो—यह कहते मुझे अफसोस होता है—मिनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी एफेयर्स की तरफ से, जो कि अब लीडर आफ दि हाउस हैं, समय की दिक्कत बताई जाती है, जिस के कारण इन रिपोर्ट्स पर बहस नहीं होती है। हम को यह देख कर भी हैरानी होती है कि जब कभी इन रिपोर्ट्स पर डिस्कशन यहां स्वीकार कर लिया जाता है, तो अक्सर माननीय सदस्य उस डीबेट में उपस्थित नहीं होते हैं। आखिर इस बीमारी का क्या कारण है ?

श्री श्रींकार लाल बोरबा (कोटा) : माननीय सदस्य कांग्रेस को छोड़ दें, तो तभी यह बीमारी दूर होगी।

श्री ह० चं० सोय : मैं माननीय सदस्य के कहने पर कांग्रेस को नहीं छोड़ सकता। यह स्थिति में सुधार करना होगा।

युगों-युगों से हमारे राष्ट्रीय जीवन में जो इतना बड़ा कलंक चला आ रहा है, जो हम ने पाप किया है, लोगों के प्रति हम ने जो गलतियां की हैं, लोग उस के प्रायश्चित्त की बात सुनने तक की हिम्मत नहीं करते हैं। यह कैसी बात है ?

पंजाबी सूबे का जो मामला चल रहा है, उस से हमें पता चलता है कि हमारी सरकार केवल दबाव से ही काम करती है। हम लोग बिहार में झारखंड की मांग करते थे। हम ने यह सोचा था कि अगर हम राष्ट्रीय एकता को दृष्टि में रखते हुए प्रजातांत्रिक प्रणाली से चलें, तो हमारी जो भी कमजोरियां हैं, हमारे प्रति जो भी अन्याय किया गया है, वह दूर हो सकता है। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि यह सरकार केवल दबाव को ही मानती है, उस से ही चलती है। जैसा कि मैंने अभी बताया है, युगों युगों से, हजारों बरसों से, जो इतना बड़ा शोषण चल रहा है, जिस की प्रोर हमारे संविधान का भी संकेत है, सरकार उस को दूर करने के लिए कुछ नहीं करना चाहती है। सरकार क्या समझती है ? सरकार यह समझती है कि जब तक उस के साथ नागा लोगों की तरह युद्ध नहीं किया जायेगा, तब तक इस सम्बन्ध में वह कुछ भी करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। अभी जब मिजो लोगों ने युद्ध किया, तो जयप्रकाश बाबू जैसे उच्च नेता ने कहा कि उन को स्वतंत्र राज्य देना चाहिए। इस के क्या माने होते हैं ? यह कि जब तक लोग युद्ध न करें, सरकार मानती नहीं है। जहां इस प्रोर पर्याप्त बातें हम लोग करते हैं, वहां दूसरी तरफ हमारी सरकार इस देश के बाहर भी फौजें भेजती है कांगों में।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बजट पर बोलें ।

श्री ह० च० सोय : मैं यह इस लिए कह रहा हूँ कि मैं उनका दृष्टिकोण बदलना चाहता हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार अपने बजट के प्रस्तुत करने के दृष्टिकोण को बदले । हमारे देश के नेता लोगों को बड़ी चिन्ता है कि कांग्रेस के राजनीतिक अधिकारों में झगड़ना बनी रहे । इस के लिए उन्होंने वहाँ फौजें भेजी और खर्च भी किया । कहीं कांग्रेस की हम चिन्ता करते हैं, लेकिन अपने देश में दो करोड़, चार करोड़ ऐसे लोग हैं, जिनके राजनीतिक अधिकार कोई कीमत नहीं रखते । इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि संविधान ने जो हिदायतें हमें दी हैं, उस पर जल्द से जल्द अमल करना चाहिए । ऐसा न हो कि हम जहाँ राष्ट्रीय एकता के नाम पर प्रयत्न होने की मांग को स्वीकृत किये हुए हैं, फिर मांग शुरू न कर दें । जहाँ इस तरह लोगों की मांग स्वीकार की जा रही है, नागाओं को बिलकुल स्वतन्त्र करने की बात की जा रही है तो क्यों न हम अपने शारङ्ग की मांग को फिर शुरू न करें ।

इस लिये सभापति जी, इन्हीं बातों को ध्यान में रख कर मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस और अपना दृष्टिकोण बदले और पिछड़े हुए और दलित लोगों के बारे में सम्बन्ध संविधान के निर्देश के मुताबिक जल्द से जल्द अपनी की हुई गलतियों का सुधार करे और उस पर उचित कार्यवाही करके इनका उचित विकास करे ।

Shri H. V. Koujalgi (Belgaum): I thank you very much for the opportunity you have given to me to speak on this budget. As you know, the Finance Minister was all of a sudden called upon to shoulder this responsibility and he had very little time to prepare this budget and to study the economic situation in the country.

However, within the short period at his disposal he has prepared and presented the budget, and in my opinion, he has done his best under the present circumstances.

It is difficult for any Finance Minister to satisfy all views and all sections. Even yesterday, some hon. Members belonging to the Congress Party, to which party the hon. Finance Minister himself belongs, criticised the budget and said that he had not carried out fully the policies of the Congress. So, it is a very difficult job for any Finance Minister to satisfy all views. In my humble opinion, the hon. Finance Minister deserves our sympathy and congratulations.

In spite of all the best efforts of the Government we see that the administrative expenditure is increasing year by year, as compared to the increase in our national income. That is not a healthy sign and we almost see that we are going beyond our means. Secondly, we find that Government are running nearly thirty corporations in the public sector. We have invested very huge amounts in these corporations, but the yield that we are getting from them is very meagre. I would request the Finance Minister to see that at least in the future we get a reasonable yield from these corporations.

No doubt, there is some increase in our per capita income but in spite of that, when we go to the villages, we see altogether a dismal picture there. We still see there the poor man and the common man in his tattered clothes and living in his old insanitary houses. No doubt, there is some appreciable development in the villages such as the building of roads, the provision of drinking water, wells, health services etc. But in spite of all that, we see that the benefit has not reached the poor man and the common man. The condition of the agricultural labourer is not so good, and during the last two years it has gone worse, especially due to the failure of the crops. The wages

[Shri H. V. Koujalgi]

of the labourer have not gone high as compared to the rise in the prices. The wages which the labourer gets is not even sufficient for his maintenance since the prices of the essential commodities have gone very high. So, one can safely say that the criticism that has been made by some Members that the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer seems to be true.

The country is facing so many difficult problems. Especially the food problem has become a chronic one. Recently, we have seen agitations in many States, and still these agitations are threatening in many States. Government must see that we secure self-sufficiency in food at least within the next five years. We are expected to be self-sufficient as early as possible, and we are not expected to go from country to country asking for food every year. The hon. Food Minister has told us on more than one occasion that incentive prices should be given to the growers. Accordingly, each State has fixed prices in the respective areas, but in practice we find that the foodgrain which is sold at the rate of Rs. 50 to 60 per quintal in some parts like the Punjab or Rajasthan is sold in other States like Maharashtra or Gujarat at the rate of Rs. 100 to 150 per quintal. The pity of it is that the grower does not get the price fixed, but on the other hand, the profit goes to the middleman. Sometimes we see that even the States which are dealing in these foodgrains are purchasing at a lower rate and selling at a higher rate, thereby making a profit. That is highly objectionable, and there should be no such thing. It has been stated on more than one occasion that . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may resume his seat and conclude his speech on Monday next. Now, we have to take up the Private Members' Business.

15.29½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTIETH REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eightieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th March, 1966."

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eightieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th March, 1966."

The motion was adopted.

15:30 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS—contd.

Mr. Chairman: Further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Bibhuti Mishra on the 25th February 1966:—

"This House is of opinion that with a view to bring socialism in the country forthwith and to execute the Five Year Plan successfully, Government should bring about radical changes in its administrative set-up without the least delay".

Shri Bibhuti Mishra might resume his speech.

श्री बिभूति मिश्र (मोतिहारी): समापति महोदय, पिछली बार मैं कह रहा था कि प्रशासन में काफी सुधार होना चाहिये और उस सिलसिले में मैंने कहा था कि प्रशासन सम्बन्धी कार्यों में सुधार लाने के लिए जो कमेटी बने उस कमेटी के जिम्मे वैदेशिक कार्य