

not too late. There is no question of his being disallowed to raise that matter, merely because he did not raise it earlier before me.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I shall see you in the chamber, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall be only too glad if you do that.

The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the General Budget.

#### GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

**Shri Gadgil (Poona Central):** During the last three days, the Budget proposals have been criticised by various persons from the points of view of Party affiliations and partly from temperamental peculiarities. But, one main point that I was able to find out from the general trend of criticism was that hardly any of the speakers has fully realised the object for which the Budget stands. They have followed more or less lines of criticism with which we have been familiar in the past.

Now, for the first time, the Budget has an objective not merely to find out money for expenditure for the next year, but, by a system of public expenditure and investment, by regulation and control of investment, in the private sector, as also by a system of taxation, a certain objective is sought to be achieved. That objective is one of the objectives for which the Five-Year Plan stands. I might say that this Budget is a performance with the Five-Year Plan playing the back music. It is evident that after this country has attained freedom, that freedom must be made meaningful and its benefits must be experienced in the life of the people at large. Hence the emphasis on the economic betterment and raising of the standard of life of the people in this country. That standard of life is not to be raised some years hence. Just as many of us wanted freedom in our life time, similarly many of us want plenty and prosperity in our life time. The democratic Government and the whole democracy in this country will be judged by what happens and to what extent the Five-Year Plan is successfully implemented. If we are not able to implement in a substantial way the Five-Year Plan, I feel we will be not justified in saying that the grave duty that was cast on this generation has been properly discharged. It is therefore necessary that all attempts and

all efforts should be made to see that the Plan that has been before the country and which has been adopted by the Government and the Parliament is successfully implemented. There are certain things with which many people may not agree. But, the broad fact remains that this is the first time to introduce an economy in which there will be regulation and some control and the whole economy will be integrated to some definite objectives.

The main objective of the Plan is to find employment all round and raise the standard of life. This is a very big task especially in a country like India which is proverbially poor. Although it is rich in certain resources, it has not got enough resources, particularly financial, to undertake a Plan on a much wider scale than the one adopted. So far as unemployment is concerned, we have to take into consideration the working population of 133 million people. The Plan contemplates to find employment for 50 lakhs in the course of five years. Let us see what it means to give employment to 5 million people. Between the years 1946 and 1951, it is stated by the President of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce that employment has increased in the factory sphere by 3 lakhs, or, in other words, by 15 per cent. During this period, investment has been Rs. 490 crores. If we are out for full employment and if only by that standard we can judge the success or otherwise of the Plan, then equitable distribution becomes a matter of great importance and we have to see how, what was earned in the course of these five years, has been distributed, at any rate, by way of wages for the working classes. We are told that the real wages have increased by 21 per cent, although the money wages have increased by 25 per cent. For my part, I do not consider this to be enough although it may compare well with certain other countries. But, an employer who depresses wages is a public danger. We are keen on giving employment all round for unemployment is the greatest danger to the stability of the State. To be unemployed is not a crime that the individual commits. But, definitely if there are hundreds and hundreds of people unemployed, it is a matter for serious consideration whether there is something wrong with our economic organisation and the system of taxation and other matters connected therewith. During the last war, it was difficult to get an ordinary domestic servant. When I was released from jail in August 1944, I found in Poona it was impossible to get even an

[Shri Gadgil]

ordinary labourer because everybody found employment in the Government factories nearabout Poona city and the suburbs. As the war ended and peace was restored, the experience has been that unemployment is on the increase. It virtually means that when there is war there is full employment and when there is peace, there is unemployment and further poverty in the Community. What a tragedy!

In increasing the employment by 15 per cent., the investment during the period I have referred to was Rs. 400 crores. If therefore we want to increase 100 per cent. employment, it comes to an investment of Rs. 2,300 crores. If we go by the figures given by the Planning Commission—we should find employment for 5 million people—various estimates are made on how much industrial investment must be there in order to find industrial employment, gainful employment for one person. On the basis of average wages per year the calculations range from Rs. 4,500 crores to Rs. 8,000 crores. If we have to solve this problem—and we must solve it, otherwise the future is very bleak—it means that we must have enough finances of such a size that the initial push that must be given to the stagnant economy will be effective and that in a short time, the spiral of development may start. For that purpose we have to see what has been provided in the Plan. In view of the magnitude of this problem, Rs. 2,069 crores look a small sum. Even here, the Finance Minister has to have recourse to deficit financing and he has provisionally put a ceiling of 290 crores. Critics here and critics outside are generally of the view that this ceiling will be pierced because 365 crores cannot be got by taxation or by loans or by foreign aid.

If that comes out true, then we will have to depend more and more on deficit finance. Now, we have to consider whether recourse to deficit finance is the best that we can do under the circumstances. Deficit finance is something which if done by a private person would amount to sharp practices, but when done by the Government for the public and in the interest of the public becomes automatically a path of wisdom. Now, my esteemed friend, the Finance Minister, only a few days ago while speaking in this very House stated about deficit finance as follows:—

“Deficit finance is a very untidy and disorderly way of taxing the people. It simply means that the

rich made richer and the poor poorer. There is no discrimination and you are left with no chance Government takes the money in the way of higher prices”.

On the same lines Prof. Vakil has criticised and he says in taxation we can at least have the opportunity of equitably distributing it; if it is a question of loans, we can mobilise the surpluses from the savers; but in deficit finance, unconsciously, without our knowing it, we become poorer and poorer. But things have changed and the Finance Minister considers that the climate is now favourable to have recourse to deficit finance, and in support of this he pointed out that the price level is nearly stabilised. Now, economic judgments honestly given may differ. On the same facts and on the same data, he has come to the conclusion that the climate is now very favourable, or rather favourable, for having recourse to deficit finance. Others may differ from him. But without going into the question whether the one view is correct or the other view is correct, what I am feeling is that there is no other way but to accept the proposition put forward by the Finance Minister. If we must implement the Plan and if after going through our taxation system generally we are unable to make any further addition to our resources, at any rate this year, then we must accept the inevitability of deficit finance. After all, deficit finance is just like poison and if taken moderately and under certain circumstances acts like a tonic. Therefore, there is nothing wrong; but the wrong comes in when the sense of proportion is given up and the conditions prescribed for that deficit finance being governed are departed from.

Now, the only question that we have to decide, if we accept that deficit finance is a clearly established necessity, is: to what extent and under what circumstances should deficit finance be indulged in, and what measures should we take to prevent its hardship? It is not necessary to repeat what are those conditions under which recourse to deficit finance is good. They are well known. But I might state that if deficit finance is to be utilised not for the purposes of consumption but for capital investment, much of the evil disappears. Just as when competition ends into cooperation vices become virtues, and malpractices become standards of good conduct. Immediately if we consider deficit finance in this aspect, then our prejudice must give place to a consideration of its utility

Now, it is not, as was considered in the United States, a non-taxed loan; it is not that. But you may call it euphemistically deficit finance. But it is really introduction of new money into the community or the currency of the country. Now, the method of operation may be that you either create cash, i.e., actual new money, or you expand the credit. If you do the first, then the Reserve Bank will buy new issues of Government Securities and in the Public Deposit Section of its Banking Branch credit will be taken and new money will be available. If we resort to the second alternative, viz., of expanding the credit, then you work through the Scheduled banks. But what seems to be the policy of Government—and I should think that it is correct for the time being—is that they are thinking of having the first alternative. Now, there is nothing wrong in it. Let us not be wedded to orthodox theories, quantity theory of money, this, that and the other. I might read here what has been written by 'A critical Keynesian' in one of the issues of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. He clearly says:

"There is no reason to feel embarrassed about it; far less should they regard themselves subject to any obvious criticism that any significant increase of money supply resulting from their inflationary finance should necessarily mean a significantly higher level of prices in the country. So long as the shortage of consumers' goods is not a pronounced feature of the general economic situation, the price effects of a higher income level need not be a serious problem for the planners and the Government to cope with."

But the conditions which he has prescribed are worth consideration, Sir.

"It does mean that when the consumption has been held in check by maximum taxation and when savings have been mobilised to the maximum extent by fullest exploitation of interest-elasticity. It is good enough economics to finance the still remaining requirements of the development programme with the creation of new money which the modern technique renders possible."

and he has in the end stated that the function which deficit finance must play is the residuary function. The Government must try to find out as much from taxation, from compulsory loans or savings and if they fall on that front, then only recourse should be had to deficit finance.

Now what is the position so far as direct taxation is concerned? I do not want to interpret in details what has happened in the course of the last four or five years. The percentage of direct tax has gone down considerably with a corresponding increase in indirect taxation, as was pointed out by the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party. The question is: can the community bear a little more taxation in the present circumstances? Take, for example, the yield from the land tax. In 1946-47 it was Rs. 25 crores. After the war it has gone up only to Rs. 30 crores and the prices of production have gone so much. There is scope for it there. For political reasons we may not do it; that is another matter.

Similarly in the matter of direct taxation, 7 persons in 3,600 pay income-tax: roughly—0.23 per cent. of the population, whereas in U.K. it is 44, in U.S.A. it is 37 and in Canada it is 20 per cent. The further relief by way of exemption given by the Finance Minister was welcomed by me, I must confess, in some weak moment. The average annual income in India is roughly Rs. 280 and the exemption limit comes to 15 times that. Now, that is Rs. 4,200; up to Rs. 4,200 you are absolutely free. It is for our consideration, if we are really earnest and want to solve problem of unemployment; and to secure full employment to every able-bodied man and woman in this country—for everybody knows that unemployment immobilises talent, freezes initiative, creates many psychological problems and ultimately the reactions that follow are not in the best interests of the country,—if we are anxious that the poverty of ages must be eliminated, then we must readily accept sacrifices in the present so that the future of this generation as well as the future of the next generation will be bright.

In the private sector of the industry, they are glad because Government have taken recourse to deficit finance. It suits them. If the Plan was to be financed more by taxation, direct and indirect, then they would not have welcomed it. However, this is not the time to criticise 'hem since they are in a mood to cooperate with the Government. This is all to the good. I never doubted whether they wish or not; they must cooperate with the Government. For in our mythology Lakshmi must shampoo the feet of Lord Krishna or Vishnu because Vishnu represents power and wealth must ultimately be subordinate to it. There is no doubt about it. I am glad they want to co-operate. If they play their part, they must at least carry into

[Shri Gadgil]

practice some of the admonitions given by Schuster who was called from thousands of miles for advice and consideration. He has told them, restrain your personal expenditure, restrain dividends. In fact, I have been representing time and again that there must be a limitation on dividend. In fact, if the industrialists for five years take a vow that they will not take one pie by way of dividend and plough back the entire earnings or surpluses into their concerns...

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur).** Do you believe in such vows?

**Shri Gadgil:** I believe as much in them as I believe in you.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Both hon. Members will kindly address the Chair.

**Shri Gadgil:** The point is that there is enough room for additional taxation. In the course of the last 5 years what has happened in the matter of income-tax? Here is a table which will show that the relief has been more and more if your income is more and more. If it is 2 lakhs, it is more; 3 lakhs, still more; 4 lakhs, still more. For example, in the case of anybody getting more than 10 lakhs in 1947-48, 91.7 per cent. of his income was taxed, it is today 70 per cent. Now, for the lowest group Rs. 5,000 it was 3.1 per cent. in 47-48, now in 48-49, it is 2.3 per cent. And, if you consider the percentage of income pocketed by the top blocks you will find, in spite of what we have said in our Constitution, that we want to prevent concentration of wealth, concentration is going on. I am sure, the Taxation Committee will certainly go into this aspect. I have said often that, Budget is an instrument of policy and taxation should not be considered merely as something to find out finance. It has a social and a sociological aspect. If you want to remove the inequalities and assure a fair distribution of national wealth and dividend, then you must make use of the Constitution in a revolutionary manner, unless you are prepared for a direct revolution. The alternative to direct revolution is the revolutionary use of the Constitution and I have no doubt, although this year the Finance Minister is quiet on this front of direct taxation, I think he is looking before he wants to leap. Let us see what he does next year. For the time being, I feel, here is an opportunity for the private industrialist to show that this concession which is being given continuously for the last 4 years is not abused and that he plays his game. The problem, as I have said, is very

big enough. We must mobilise all our resources. If, for example, the Finance Minister just takes five rupees from each employee of the Central Government by way of compulsory savings he will be able to have Rs. 1,50,00,000 per month. He can extend that to Trade Union people with their consent and I am sure if the labourers know, if the middle class people know that there is equality of sacrifice and if they do as much and the richer classes will be made to do as much, there will be greater enthusiasm shown, because there will be a sense of confidence that nothing unjust is being done and everywhere a square deal is promised.

Somebody said yesterday 'Rinam krithwa Ghritan Pibeth'. Now, it is a bad thing in the life of an individual. But the credit of the Government is always measured by the amount of loan it can secure. So, it is no question of looking down on a policy of this kind. I am sure that if the tax question is seriously gone into, if there is a general drive for compulsory saving, I have not the slightest doubt that we shall be able to gather much and as I said, the function of deficit financing will be then residuary. In good old days, when the State was really a welfare State, that noble idea was nicely illustrated by Kalidas when he said about Aja.

स पिता पितरस्तासां केवलं जन्महेतवः

He was their father and theirs fathers were only responsible for their birth. In Manu Smriti it is stated that—

मातापितरो सुशीला भार्या बालकाश्च  
पापशतेनापि रक्षितव्याः :

Parents, chaste wife and minor children must be maintained even by doing a hundred sins. I will only expect the Government to accept that aged people, unemployed people, decrepit people, illiterate people, are the first charge on their resources. The obligation to give pensionary benefits to the aged, to find out employment for those who are willing to work, to remove illiteracy, to provide medicine, must be discharged not by papa shatane but by kar shatane, if necessary. And if the Finance Minister is anxious to know how hundred taxes can be levied I shall, with your permission, read a long list given by Sydney Smith and end my speech, Sir

"We have taxes upon every article that enters into the mouth

or covers the back, or is placed under the foot; taxes upon everything which is pleasant to feel, smell, or taste; taxes on everything in the earth; or in the waters under the earth; on everything that comes from abroad, or that is grown at home; taxes on raw material; taxes on every value that is added to it by the industry of man; taxes on the sauce which pampers man's appetite; and on the drug which restores him to health; on the ermine which covers the judge, and the rope that hangs the criminal; on the poor man's salt and the rich man's spice; on the brass nails of the coffin, and the ribbons of the bride; on bed and board-couchant or levant—we must pay. The school-boy whips his taxed top; the beardless youth manages a taxed horse, with a taxed bridle, on a taxed road; and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine, which has paid seven per cent., into a spoon, which has paid fifteen per cent., flings himself back upon his chintz bed, which had paid twenty-two per cent., and expires in the arms of an apothecary, who has paid a licence of one hundred pounds for the privilege of presiding over his death-bed. His whole property is then taxed from two to twenty per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel; his virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble and he is gathered to his fathers to be taxed no more."

**Shri C. D. Pande** (Naini Tal Distt. cum Almora Distt.—South West cum Bareilly Distt.—North): It is a joke.

**Dr. N. B. Khare** (Gwalior): The death duty is there.

**Shri Gadgil**: Apart from the joke—and indeed it is meant as a joke, what I wanted to make out was that even in the present circumstances there is enough scope for raising the direct taxation not merely for the sake of financing the Plan, but even more so for putting an end to the inequalities in the matter of wealth and economic well-being. That is the aspect which is far more important to me than the other one.

**Dr. Krishnaswami** (Kancheepuram): After having listened to the powerful speech of my hon. friend, I feel that I would have to strike a rather pedestrian note this evening. I should like to start by making a few initial observations on the Budget which may not be strictly related to the Budget

proposals but which have undoubtedly some value. It may be universally agreed that the Budget should give a clear and coherent picture of the nation's finances. Does the present Budget do so? I venture to suggest that the array of figures presented to us stand in need of considerable improvement in the method of accounting, and I should like to place before the Finance Minister certain facts which might have escaped his attention and to which I wish he devotes his attention at least in the near future.

Take the general statement of revenue and expenditure. On page 2, we find under the heading, Union Excise Duties, an amount of Rs. 94 crores. Then there is another item. Taxes on income other than Corporation taxes. Now the difference between these two items is that while union excise duties have reference to a gross amount, i.e., the amount which is there without having been distributed to the States, taxes on income other than Corporation taxes have reference to a nett amount. In the same tabular statement when we have a gross amount and a nett amount put together, it does seem to be extremely difficult to make out the scientific basis for such sort of drawing up of accounts. Take page 3, where you have the expenditure met from the revenues of the Central Government. Here are certain very fine figures which would throw a new light on the way in which we draw up our accounts. On irrigation, we spend about Rs. 18 lakhs; on electricity, we spend about Rs. 11,000; but the item that bulks very large is miscellaneous and under this miscellaneous item we spend about Rs. 53 crores. Under this "miscellaneous", there is a miscellany of items, and it is extremely difficult for us to make out how exactly this expenditure is being diverted among the different uses, and the very basis of accounting is such as would prevent you from really understanding what exactly accounts mean.

If Oedipus could not have solved the riddle of the Sphinx, I certainly venture to think that we legislators would find it extremely difficult to make out the basis on which some of these accounts are drawn up. I am in no mood to indulge in merely petty, carping criticism, but I am bringing these facts to the notice of the Finance Minister, so that at least in future we might have a different and more scientific system of drawing up accounts.

Now, take the Explanatory Memorandum. On page 3, here is an item

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

which might have arrested the attention of most hon. Members who had devoted some attention to the Explanatory Memorandum. There is an expenditure of Rs. 2.13 lakhs said to have been incurred on the issue of new loans in 1952-53. As is well known, no new loans were issued by the Government of India. So, I would like to know from the Finance Minister how he spent these 2.13 lakhs on the issue of a loan which was raised in the market at all. Again, on page 13, here is something which will be revealing. Here, you have what is known as the Privy Purses and Allowances for Indian Rulers. It is said that we are to give Rs. 4,76,33,000 to Rulers, but on page 44, the figure seems to have swelled up to an entirely different amount, for you have there a figure of Rs. 5,40,84,000. I do not say that something very serious has happened, but I do suggest that there ought to be an attempt to make up the accounts in the right way and to give a clear interpretation to what has really happened.

This is not the fundamental basis of my criticism of the method by which we are drawing up accounts. I should like to enunciate a principle which, I think, will have universal acceptance in this House. As long as the Budget was not integrated with the economic policy, these great variations between estimates, supplementary estimates and revised estimates and actuals were not of any importance at all. We could certainly allow many of these figures to vary, because in those days when we did not have the economic policy closely integrated with the budgetary and fiscal policy, it was quite possible to have variations between estimates, revised estimates, supplementary estimates and actuals, but today the position is quite different. The scope of the public sector has widened. We have a number of enterprises under public control, and here let me point out that in the Explanatory Memorandum the account that is given of many State enterprises which have been taken over by the State is very brief and perfunctory. One finds in the accounts some stray references to estimates and the manner in which those enterprises are working, but what we are interested in is how exactly the actuals have been distributed; what is the method that has been employed to find out which particular enterprises are working profitably and how far it is necessary for the general exchequer to subsidise some of these enterprises.—in other words, what is called for is a revolution in the method of our accounting. We should

have, what is known as the trading accounts opened and maintained on scientific principles.

Today, what is the position? Even so far as the present state of the finances is concerned, the Explanatory Memorandum has pointed on page 15 that for the particular year 1951-52 they have not yet been able to estimate the actual revenue and expenditure. It is said there :

"The figures given under actuals, 1951-52, are provisional, as the accounts for that year have not yet been finally closed."

What follows from this? It is that we are today handicapped in our criticism of many of these estimates, and today the variations are much greater than they were at any time in our national history. For instance, the provisional estimate of the actual amount of revenue realised in 1951-52 was Rs. 128.3 crores. According to the Finance Minister's estimate of what the surplus would be in 1951-52, it was only Rs. 92 crores or thereabouts. So, a variation of Rs. 28 crores occurred, and it is a significant amount which will have to be taken into account. I do not for a moment suggest that we can immediately arrive at a balance between these various transactions, but I do hope that the Finance Minister will give this matter his attention, as also those who work under him, and I also do hope that it will be possible for them to have an explanatory chapter on how these various suspense items move about from one particular period of time to another. We should like to have more light on how these things are being done. We should also like to have a greater split-up of the various items under "miscellaneous". When you see Rs. 53 crores under miscellaneous and only Rs. 11 thousand or thereabouts under electricity, we are reminded of the system of accounting which some of us used to practise when we were studying in hostels for the purpose of sending accounts to our homes, namely of specifying those items which we spend on hostel and college fees and including under "Miscellaneous" all those forbidden expenditure which we do not want our parents to know, or realise. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I therefore think that this is a matter which ought to be taken in hand by the Finance Minister. In more respects than one we are specially qualified to investigate by which a modern, scientific and up-to-date method of accounting can be introduced into our economic system.

That apart, I should like now to make a few observations on the Budget. This Budget marks a turning point in the history of our country. It is no use attempting as some of my friends have done either to deprecate the budget very strongly or to suggest that we are not witnessing a new revolution in our methods of fiscal training and technique. I want it to be quite clearly pointed out to my friends that we are now facing the lean years of Indian finance. Hitherto we had revenue surpluses which were a form of public saving and which were meant to be utilised for capital development. Hereafter this form of revenue surplus would not be available. We have, therefore, to find out ways and means of implementing our great programme of national reconstruction at minimum cost. My point is that the deficit on revenue account would be of the order of about Rs. 19 to 20 crores. Here, let me point out that I do not agree with those of my friends in the Finance Department who have attempted to suggest that the Rs. 9 or 18 crores which are obtained from Pakistan should be put to the revenue side of the budget; they are to be put on the capital side. But that does not seriously alter the trend of my argument. What I am suggesting is that we would have to be prepared for a deficit of a much higher order even on the revenue side. That itself should make us realise that there are very many problems which we have to face and that we have to undertake ways and means of increasing the resources of our country, so that it might be possible for us to have a greater amount of surplus or a greater amount of public saving for the purpose of financing capital development. The Finance Minister in the course of his speech, Mr. Deputy-Minister, pointed out that the deficits during the past two years were of the order of Rs. 83 crores. I venture humbly to disagree from him because I feel that when we are talking of deficits we must take into account the overall deficit incurred by the Centre and by the States and that would be of the order of Rs. 212 crores. During the years of relatively light expenditure we had a shortfall of about Rs. 212 crores. Undoubtedly now when we are going to have a very great amount of expenditure we might have a greater amount of deficit and we would have to find out ways and means of trying to meet our capital expenditure. What is the solution?

Some Members have pointed out that deficit financing is good; others have pointed out that it is poison. One hon. Member who preceded me pointed out, that it could be taken like

a tonic. Now, I am not willing to enter into the merits of deficit financing or demerits of deficit financing in an academic spirit. The time has now come when we should face realities. I do suggest that we have to indulge in deficit financing because without indulging in deficit financing it would not be possible for us to indulge in capital expenditure on such a large scale. But when we are talking of the scope of deficit financing I would like to place before the House and the Finance Minister the two great limitations which face us. The first limitation that faces us is that concerning the internal price level. The hon. the Finance Minister referred to the cost of living. He said that he was going to keep a watch over the cost of living, so that it may not shoot up within a short period and make a mess of the plans of capital development. But there is another limitation which has also to be borne in mind, a limitation which has not received as much notice as it should have done in all the discussions that have taken place on deficit financing. That limitation is the external limitation or the limitation which arises on account of our balance of payment position. I think this is as important, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as the internal price level and I should like to elaborate that particular point a bit more because I feel that a time will shortly arrive when we might have either to reconsider our policy or might even have to leave the sterling club of which we are a member.

The second serious limitation is as serious as the first. What would be the consequences of deficit financing on our balance of payments? The Finance Minister in his budget speech on page 6 or 7 points out that so far as the balance of payment position is concerned, they have now, whether it is by accident or design, a favourable balance and they have contributed about Rs. 63 crores to the Dollar Pool during the past six months. But the moment we indulge in deficit financing we would have to be prepared to a worsening of our balance of payments. Now, when we are a member of the Sterling club, we have also to understand that there are certain rules and obligations which we have to observe. If all members of the sterling club became gay, which is what deficit financing means, then the club would have either to be rapidly liquidated or would have to wind up its affairs due to its resources being exhausted. But if one member even turns gay there are obvious limitations on the amount of gaiety that he can indulge in. Therefore, from the point of view

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

of deficit financing, we have to understand where exactly we ought to put the pressure, to see that our balance of payments does not deteriorate. The Finance Minister who is very cautious and canny in this respect made an announcement that we were going to have deficit financing of the order of Rs. 140 crores. Undoubtedly it had an excellent bullish effect on the markets and certainly the prices began to look up. But I would like to point out in this connection that the very fact of businessmen being most optimistic about the rise in prices, while undoubtedly valuable must give some cause for misgiving in high financial quarters. The moment a businessman begins to think that the internal market is looking up and that they can look only to the internal market that moment they will begin to cater towards the internal market alone forgetting the external market or the export which is as important and which would have to be taken into account by all businessmen. Deficit financing, therefore has a scope, but the limitations are very much more important and I should have wished my hon. friend the Finance Minister to have come out with definite and specific proposals as to how he is going to siphon the surplus and the measures he is going to introduce for the purpose of keeping the cost of living in checking and also for improving our balance of payments position.

There is, for instance, one method which can be resorted to and which has been resorted to by other Governments who have indulged in deficit financing to a very large scale and that is that of stepping up exports for certain reasons with a view to having foreign exchange. But how those exports are to be stepped up, at what prices we are to requisition a portion of the productive capacity and what are the various methods that we have to adopt to keep the cost down all these are matters of high policy on which we cannot take a decision very quick. I do think, in this connection that some of the expedients that we have resorted to for having an enquiry committee into certain of these industries might be kept at a very much larger scale. The tea industry, for instance, has a committee which has been constituted to enquire into cost and prices. Similarly in a period of inflationary activity deficit financing is going to lead to a great deal of inflationary activity and we must have various committees constituted to enquire into the conditions of these industries and to prevent cost from stepping up because if cost begins to step up, that moment your Plan

would certainly have to be revised radically in favour of higher cost and that would also minimise the amount of effort that you can contribute to your Plan.

4 P.M.

I should also like to point out that schemes relating to compulsory saving have to be taken in hand. Take for instance this idea of compulsory saving which has been voiced forth on several occasions. Certainly, in a period of buoyant activity few people will be found to grumble if we have a system and a scheme which siphons a portion of the surplus not merely of salaried groups but of Income-tax payers and also payers of land revenue. The only thing which we have to bear in mind is that the individual must also be given an incentive to save more, and for this purpose the funds that he saves must be allowed to be invested in a larger variety of enterprises. I think that this is a thing which ought to be taken in hand immediately. Probably, had the Finance Minister given expression to these various schemes which he had in view, the bullish effects on our stock exchange would not have been as great as they were. I do not blame him for having obtained certificates from those who are producers or merchants. I am not one of those who hold the view that anyone who gives a certificate is necessarily to be suspected. But I do think that when we are having a large national policy we have also to bear in mind what the effects on the economy would be. In almost every underdeveloped economy we would have to resort to this expedient of deficit financing, and I think that for a long period to come we will have to indulge in this. But at the same time we must be aware of the limitations. I am not one of those who think that we can afford to get out of the sterling club immediately or in the near future. I have this reason. I think we would have from Rs. 100 to Rs. 200 crores deficit of our balance of trade account, and it would be impossible for us unless we are part of a big group of countries, to fulfil our international obligations. But the very fact of our remaining in this club, must make us realise that we have to concentrate on certain types of desirable activity so that our balance of payments position may not worsen and so that we may have an opportunity of promoting internal effort within our country without at the same time being called to check by others because we have exhausted the sterling reserves or because we have not contributed sufficiently to the pool of the club of which we are a member.

**Col. Zaidi** (Hardoi Distt.—North-West cum Farrukhabad Distt.—East cum Shahjahanpur Distt.—South): Sir, I am thankful to you for affording me this opportunity to say a few words about the budget proposals. This year the budget has been dominated, not only in the minds of its framers but also in the minds of other people who are busy discussing it, by the Five Year Plan. It has been prepared under the shadow of the Five Year Plan. That is the most important factor to discuss and to think about. Therefore I propose to confine myself to some aspects of the Five Year Plan.

For generations my countrymen have lived in despair and despondency. They have felt like poor and helpless pigmies who were not capable of anything big. We are all very happy and proud to see that not only are we—I mean not only the Government but all of us—thinking big, but we also have the courage to act in a big way. We have ceased to be timorous and halting, and can be bold and dynamic. We have to fight a very long and continuous battle against poverty and penury, and we have to make up a tremendous leeway. Therefore, as Mr. Gadgil has rightly pointed out, either there will be a revolution or we shall have to be revolutionary in our methods of work and in the way we apply ourselves to the achievement of big targets.

The fulfilment of the Five Year Plan and the Plans to come thereafter is a national "must". Every sacrifice has to be made and everything possible has to be done, not only by the Government but by all of us, to see it properly implemented within the shortest possible time.

A very distinguished industrial magnate said yesterday that the Plan will fail on financial grounds. I hope I am not misquoting him. Many people that I have spoken to have also entertained doubts regarding the completion of the Five Year Plan, on financial grounds. They think that it is too big, that we shall not have the money.

But I have no grounds for pessimism. I know that nations and peoples have got tremendous reserves of will power, elasticity, resilience. I remember that when the First World War broke out a very distinguished gentleman—I think it was Norman Angel—predicted that the war would be over within a few months because the whole economy of Germany would be shattered to its foundations within a few months. But somehow the Germans belied that expectation and the war went on for four long years. Similarly,

coming nearer home and talking of a comparatively backward and poor country, it was said—with some sort of undesirable satisfaction—that a certain Prime Minister was taking on a very big country, that he was being stupid, that money was pouring into his country through oil royalties and that the economy of the country would be completely shattered and there would be a revolution and people would want his head on a charger. More than a year has passed. That country has not received one penny in the shape of royalties on oil. But the country is still going on, and that Prime Minister is still going strong! So nations, if they are determined, can do wonderful things.

Now that we are not only awake but are on the march, we hope we shall be able to do big things. For too long we have looked upon ourselves as pigmies. But I hope that like the builders of the Taj we shall now begin as Titans. I hope we have already begun as Titans, and pray that we may finish as jewellers.

So, as I said, I am not pessimistic at all about the lack of finance or anything like that. Certainly there are reasons to be a little uneasy in one's mind about deficit financing. But whatever the drawbacks and whatever the dangers, we have to face them. After all, if we are at one with our Prime Minister who more than two years ago was pleased to say that he would put the question of Food on a war footing, if we are serious about fighting the war against hunger and poverty in our country, then, like every country which has been at war either in the First World War or the Second World War, nothing is too much for us.

We have got to finance the Plan somehow and we must find the resources necessary for it. Although I would not criticise the Finance Minister for his proposal regarding deficit financing, we certainly have to be continuously cautious and we must review the position continuously. We must be vigilant. Although two years have passed and a lot of work has been done, no report about the progress made is yet ready. This sort of thing is not satisfactory. We must be told continuously, not only we, the Members of Parliament, but the country also must be told continuously, what progress has been made and how the estimates have been adhered to, what the actual cost is, how it compares with the original estimates and so on. We must keep a very vigilant eye on the progress of the Five Year Plan. Although, as I said, two years have passed, we have not been given sufficient information about the various

[Col. Zaidi]

aspects of at least the important projects. It is the duty of the House to be very vigilant and to see that money is not wasted, that it is put to the maximum possible use.

I would like to ask the Finance Minister one question and it is this. If, because of the deficit financing, there is some inflation and prices rise, the rise in prices should also increase the estimated cost of the various schemes of the Five Year Plan. Therefore, will the solution for finding money lead to the need for more money due to the rise in costs? I am sure the explanation must be in his mind and that he will be pleased to vouchsafe a reply to satisfy me.

I will come now to the main point. How is it that although this wonderful Five Year Plan is before us—this is really a wonderful plan; it is really magnificent, it is wonderful; it fills us with excitement—we find there is not much enthusiasm in the country in spite of all these things. Why is the country not feeling enthusiastic on account of this Plan? Why has it left people cold? There is no use denying and I, for one, will not deny that people at large are not enthused. They are not getting excited over this Plan and we must try and analyse the reasons for it. I do not criticise the Plan. It is very good. It has been very well conceived and many foreign experts have paid their tributes to this Plan,—not that I attach great importance to what the foreigners who come as our guests tell us about the Five Year Plan but the fact remains that many foreign experts have expressed their satisfaction with the Five Year Plan. With all humility, I would like to say if not to the Minister for Planning, at least to the Finance Minister who also is so closely associated with the Five Year Plan—how we have gone about this business. We have gone about this business in a big way, like a big country like America, like a country which has big resources. I am glad,—that we have got resources. I would like to state that I am not poor. A country so big as India which God has made rich may be proud to feel that it is rich but apart from that, we are poor, we are not America yet or even England, Italy or Japan. We sat down in a few rooms at the Centre, started making plans on paper which were big, which were colossal and which will change the face of India. I agree that when the Plan is implemented, the difference to India will be colossal but if any plans fail, the failure also will be equally colossal. Till a few years ago, those who are Chief Engineers today were used to

the donkey and mule economy. I know of some big dams in India. I saw some dams in Mysore. Those were not built with all these big machines coming from America. They were built through a sort of P.W.D. economy, the old economy of our Indian P.W.D. They used donkeys and mules. Those people who used mules and donkeys have become today Chief Engineers. Due to various circumstances and through natural progress they are Chief Engineers and they are spending crores of rupees on machinery about which they have not any idea. It is not in their bones. It is not in their blood. They are not Americans used to machinery. They are not in love with big machinery like the Americans, like the Germans. Because of this we borrow experts. We also borrow, if we cannot buy, or we accept machinery as gifts from abroad.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Machinery seems to be the donkey of the day.

**Col Zaidi:** Yes, Sir, but you will see my point. All this big planning is good but in this planning, the masses had no part. Not only the masses have had no part, the Congress workers and other public workers have had no part. Members of Parliament and legislators have had no part. It is worked from the top. Getting hold of experts, Indian and foreign and making use of foreign machinery is good but at the same time let there be another type of plan prepared in the villages, in the districts. Submit these plans to the State, get them checked and vetted. Then from every State, proposals should be sent up to the Centre so that when the plan is ready, every district will also know what is going to happen. I represent three districts—Hardoi District, Farrukhabad District and Shahjahanpur District. People ask me "What is going to happen in our district as a result of the Five Year Plan?" I used to reply "Have you not heard about the Damodar Project?" They say "What is going to happen in Hardoi District?" I used to say "Something will happen here. We are one country and whatever happens in Hirakud and Damodar will also benefit you. Do not be parochial, selfish and narrow-minded." This is human nature. They laugh at me. They say "Tell us something about Hardoi District. If not Hardoi, tell something about the next district." But there is nothing to say to them.

**Dr. N. B. Khare:** There are donkeys there.

**Col. Zaidi:** Give a chance for the people to participate and say what they want. What they want are only little things. They do not even think in terms of flood control and the

generation of millions of kilowatts of energy, to consume which you require development over a period of twenty to thirty years. What the men in the countryside want is some little water, improved seeds, money for buying cattle, and if they are a little advanced and enlightened,— as they are now I assure you—they want a tubewell. Give them a tubewell. Where there is water standing, and where water has collected after the rains, give them canals, and not only that, but drainage also. These little things are of tremendous interest to the countryside, and if these little things are attended to, in which the people would also take part, then there will be tremendous enthusiasm among the people. You can generate enthusiasm by this means. Instead of that, we have got only one-sided progress.

We have built many national laboratories. The way they have been built is really wonderful. They are the best in Asia, and perhaps they are amongst the best in the world. I am really very proud of them. But what has happened? The very best scientists and research workers have been taken away from the Universities. I have talked to a number of Vice-Chancellors, and what I am stating now is an absolute fact. They are finding it difficult to attract or even to retain in service any first-rate men in the realm of science, because these growing national laboratories are attracting all of them, to themselves. So, the universities where research work is really carried on, in the beginning, are not attended to. And it is at the top, again, that you have the national laboratories. The same thing was done in Australia during the war and the Australians have corrected their mistake later on. They also concentrated on national laboratories, at first, to the neglect of the universities. Now they are trying to undo that mistake, and they are concentrating more and more on universities, which are the real places of research, and from the universities are to be fed the national laboratories. We have to work on a smaller scale, and diffuse our energies, and programmes.

What has upset me again, is this pamphlet on the Japanese method of paddy cultivation. I am very tired of hearing about the Japanese method. In the very first page, the pamphlet says:

“Many farmers produce only 10 maunds per acre, but farmers trying the Japanese method produce as much as 30 maunds.”

Here and now, I tell you, Indian farmers are producing, not as much as 30 maunds, but as much as 50 maunds. *(Interruption)*. This book says that

farmers trying the Japanese method produce as much as 30 maunds. I am saying that I know Indian farmers, who, without the Japanese method are producing as much as 50 maunds, and in some cases, even more than that. There is a farm in Dabra in Gwalior State,—I have got photographs of that farm, and I would like to show them to my friends who may be interested to see them—when I saw the pictures of that farm, I found some bamboo growth, and believe me, it looked like bamboos, but it was a rice crop. It was of such a tremendous height. But still, no one talks of the best Indian farmers, who are producing 50 and more maunds per acre. Why not get hold of their methods, which are native to the soil of India? Why not get hold of the methods which people are adopting here? Boost up your own countrymen. Why do you not boost up your own countrymen? Why boost up the Japanese in our country? It is silly—it is both unparliamentary and uncharitable, and so I would not say silly,—but this pamphlet about the Japanese method of cultivation just provoked me. I would like to hear about my own countrymen who are producing 30, 40 maunds per acre, and their methods of farming should be popularised in India; they should be boosted up, and a pamphlet should be written about them, because they are using Indian methods.

So long as we are promising the moon to our people, so long as we are promising a better future, and so long as the people are not given the chance to participate in our programmes, so long, will there be no public enthusiasm. What galvanised the people of England was not the promise of a new empire by Churchill. They felt electrified, galvanised, and determined with an iron will, to fight all adversities under all circumstances during the last war, when Churchill promised them, not a new empire, but blood, sweat and tears. It was the offer of the blood, sweat and tears, which electrified England, not the promise of an empire. What did Mahatma Gandhi promise our countrymen? He did not promise us wealth and material greatness. He asked us to sacrifice, and go to jail with him, and all the country went with him. The country was on fire, but the country is not on fire today, in spite of the Five Year Plan. We are promising the people most wonderful things, and yet the people are not electrified. They are not on fire.

**Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada):** We are in fire.

**Col. Zaidi:** Money and material resources, about which some countries

[Col. Zaidi.]

have talked so much, will not enthuse my countrymen. Materialistic prosperity will not galvanise our people, and it is only the Gandhian voice, that calls for sacrifice, that will appeal to us. We believe that our springs are in spiritual soil, and it is only the things of the spirit that appeal to us and electrify us.

I would sum up by saying that if you want to build up a finer India, and a more prosperous India, if you want to have big machines and national plans, see that you not only ask the people for co-operation, but ask them seriously to make sacrifices for those plans. Otherwise, without their close co-operation and without their making sacrifices for it, the country will never respond warmly to it.

**Shri K. K. Desai (Palar):** It is very difficult to give any very definite opinion about this Budget for the year 1953-54. This Budget appears to me to be really a departure from the ones which we have had during the last four or five years. During the last four or five years, I think, the country had at the end of every year, in actual receipts and expenditure, some surpluses. Those surpluses roughly amounted to about Rs. 200 crores. But this year, for the first time, the hon. Finance Minister has placed before us a Budget which shows some deficit to the tune of about Rs. 3 crores. The reason given by him is that it was necessary during the last three or four years of inflationary period, to mop up by taxation some amount, with a view to have a little deflationary effect, so that the prices might come down. It is a sound reasoning. The steps taken during the last four or five years may have got some effect also, but let us see what the effects were.

The hon. Finance Minister in the course of his speech said that the wholesale prices have come down compared to the peak of 1951 by about 57 points. It is well and good. But how has that fall in the wholesale prices affected to actual cost of living of an ordinary worker or a middle-class man? The cost of living index, on the contrary, shows, if I may say so, almost the stable conditions that obtained in 1951. I need not go into these figures. I may analyse them and prove that in one or two centres the cost of living has gone up by 4 or 5 points. At the most, one can be satisfied that the cost of living index on the average during the year 1952 was more or less the same as in 1951. The reason why I have placed all these facts before the House is to show that

the inflation as it really affects the common man has not been reduced in any shape or form. Therefore, the Finance Minister should have been well advised in continuing a policy of taxation. He has pleased some sectors of our community and almost every day we are hearing that the Budget has given satisfaction. This is a very modest Budget as I would like to describe it. But, this is not a Budget for development purposes. If we go into the figures of revenue and expenditure during the last five years,—I was struck when I was studying these figures—we will find that Excise duties which were round about 50 crores five years ago have gone up in this Budget to 94 crores. The same story can be repeated about Customs duty. Customs duties have also gone up from 126 crores to 170 crores. Who have paid all these duties?

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Obviously, all the indirect taxes were to a considerable extent paid by the consumer, that is, the common man. As against that, I would refer to the reliefs given to business and industry during the last 3 or 4 years, to which I have had occasion always to refer during the last 3 or 4 years. I have always criticised the Finance Minister, saying, 'You are robbing Peter to pay Paul'. On the one side, excise duties were going up whereas on the other side continuous reliefs were given to the Income-tax payers, Super-tax payers, Capital Gains Tax payers. All that is past history now. As I calculated when I spoke on the Budget last year, the reliefs amounted to about 40 crores. During those peak years reliefs were granted. Of course, I am happy that this year the Finance Minister has not come forward with any proposal to give some relief to those friends. But, at the same time, the resources and capacity of that section of the community to bear the burden of developmental expenditure has not attracted his attention. I personally believe that instead of trying unnecessarily to create a sort of a psychological climate for big business and industry, he should have gone in for raising the tax on those earning Rs. 10,000 and more. That would have certainly given an enthusiasm to the people.

Last year, I paid a tribute to the Finance Minister. I said, here is a Finance Minister who is trying to write for us a new economic theory, that is, financing capital expenditure from the surplus in the Budget. It was criticised then. But, I was one of those who, along with my other friends, paid a

tribute to him. But, I withdraw that tribute now because he has again reversed the gear. Instead of raising some revenue for capital expenditure on development programmes, he has sat quietly and allowed big business and industrialists and the rich people to go away free from any additional tax. Of course, he has satisfied them and that satisfaction can be seen today from the various so-called reactions in the Press. I do not grudge that. But, I must say that deficit financing to which he is now committing the country should be looked at from all points of view. I am one of those who believe that deficit financing is inevitable if we want quick development and there is complete justification so far as the Finance Minister is concerned for going in for deficit financing. But, I believe that deficit financing should, simultaneously, be associated with mopping up operations in the form of taxation. That he has forgotten. What you normally do is that you put in some money for development and thus create purchasing power but one does not know where that purchasing power will ultimately accumulate. By a process of capital formation under the existing capitalist organisation, it might again gravitate to big business and industry. So, the policy of taxation which he has followed this year, is, in my opinion a little dangerous. He should have, at the same time, gone in for gradual taxation, as I said, by raising taxation rate for those persons who are earning Rs. 10,000 and more. This is my first criticism about deficit financing, coupled with the development programme and absence of fresh taxation proposals. As I said, during the last five years, on the one side taxation has gone up. Particularly my objection is to taxation going up in respect of Excise duties and custom duties. These duties are, as a rule, paid by the common man. Simultaneously, as I said, taxation has been reduced on the other side: Income-tax rates have been reduced, Super-tax rates reduced, Capital Gains Tax abolished, Corporation tax reduced, rates of tax on higher incomes have been reduced. A larger depreciation allowance has been given; more depreciation allowances for new capital expenditure have been given to the extent of about 45 per cent. of the total capital value. It is not a small thing. All this money, which, according to the taxation proposals of 1948 and 1949 belong to the nation, has been given to big business.

I would like to ask a straight question from the Finance Minister—whether his current taxation proposals are calculated to bring about gradually a reduction in inequality? I do not say

'Let everybody have the same income' but whether on the basis of present incomes the gap will be removed. My answer to that, Sir, is 'No'.

**The Minister of Revenue and Expenditure (Shri Tyagi):** The estate duty will do something.

**Shri K. K. Desai:** I do not know how the estate duty will work. Anyway let us see when it comes.

**Dr. M. M. Das (Burdwan—Reserved)—Sch. Castes:** He will again revise his opinion. Do not worry.

**Shri Tyagi:** He will adopt my opinion.

**Shri K. K. Desai:** Now there is one other point to which I would like to make reference within the short time at my disposal. On the floor of this House at various times we have heard that there is much that is needed as far as the public administration is concerned. On the floor of this House as well as of the other House as also on the floors of the various Assemblies we hear complaints of corruption. Whether these complaints are true or untrue one cannot say. But there is wide-spread belief in the country that there is corruption. It may be said on the side of the administration that the complaints are exaggerated. Maybe so. But it is not necessary only that the administration should be non-corrupt but the people should believe that it is non-corrupt. And I may suggest for the consideration of the Government that most of these cases arise because probably there is some lacuna in dealing with persons who are corrupt or who are corruptors. Though we have ourselves put in one legislation, that legislation has been found to be a little bit futile.

Two minutes more, Sir, I think the time has now come when the disease of corruption should be considered as an 'emergency' and if necessary, the Constitution may be changed or suspended with a view to put up summary courts for trial which are not bound down by the lawyer's procedure—High Courts, Supreme Court, etc.—and such tribunals should administer summary, even-handed justice in respect of complaints that are being made. That is the suggestion I would make to the Government.

Now there is one last point. Again my old friend from Kolhapur made some reference to the question of Prohibition yesterday. I know that the gentleman represents the Kolhapur district. But in this particular respect

[Shri K. K. Desai]

whom does he represent? I do not know whether he represents the liquor vendors, liquor merchants or the rich people who have to pay some alternative tax in view of Prohibition in Bombay. As far as those people from whom crores of revenue are collected, i.e. the poor people of the country, are concerned, I have the privilege to be with them for the last 30 years and their lives have been made happy. If a plebiscite is taken among those poor people who were addicted to drink because drink was made available to them for revenue, I have not the least doubt in my mind that they will solidly vote for Prohibition. But the people who are making all these complaints and who are raising all these issues are those people who are interested in the liquor trade or who have to pay some alternative tax because of this excise duty having been abolished. The poor have been considerably benefited. But some sections of society have to pay the tax. At the most it is only a shifting of the incidence of taxation.

I am sorry, Sir, I have not got the time. I have got many other points which I could have developed, but I will take some other opportunity.

**An Hon. Member:** Prohibition is hancing.

**Shri K. K. Desai:** I have got no time. Otherwise, I would have gone into details.

**Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak):** Before I begin, I must sincerely congratulate the previous speaker, Mr. Zaidi, for his beautiful speech.

With regard to accountancy about which the hon. Member, Dr. Krishnaswami, complained, there is an old rhyme that says:

“Never ask of money spent  
Where the spender thinks it went  
Nobody was ever meant  
To remember or invent  
What he did with every cent.”

Unfortunately, this is the people's money and we are constrained to ask certain questions for information because we are in doubt. We are not specialists. We are just laymen and financial and monetary theories are not everybody's business.

Now the Finance Minister has been compared by Schwarz to the Housewife. He says—you should give her not only what you can and what she asks for. You should give all your income—in fact, your whole income.

Well, it depends upon the housewife. I do not know whether she still follows the old-fashioned squandermania or whether she understands that times have changed.

Now, my difficulty in discussing this budget is: on what basis are we to discuss it? For instance, if we are to take the old, orthodox, out-dated capitalistic monetary theory, then there is no quarrel.

**An Hon. Member:** *Via media.*

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** We have then to accept that in the capitalistic system there are inherent defects—the so-called boom periods and depression periods. Now, learned economists have not been able to explain why this is a peculiarity of capitalistic economics—this so-called rise and decline. The great Hayek calls it ‘an unexplained residue’. Therefore, I cannot apply functional finance theories, nor even the Keynesian analysis which, I am told, the hon. Finance Minister is so enthusiastic about, much less the socialistic economic theories. A budget should be an accurate and concrete picture of the economic conditions of a country in the present and visible future. It should not only state the present state of our finances, but also why they are so. A clear-cut analysis of basic factors underlying them, of trends of rise and decline, stability or instability and portents for the future—that is what it should do.

From what I could gather from the budget speech of the Finance Minister, he has tried to make out a very cautious plea that he is trying to stem the rot that has set in. In certain places he says things have risen; there has been improvement, but it may not remain for long. We have to apprehend that this may not remain for long. So it is like tight rope-walking; a little this side and you fall down this side, a little that side and you fall down that side. So this is the picture of uncertainty that I have got.

Secondly, this is also an inherent defect of the capitalist economy. Boom periods come and then go down. For instance, if we take only recent times, the boom period in India was during the war up to 1946. Investments increased, exports increased and then started the debacle, from 1946. If you look at the Indian Blue-book, which came so late, I am sorry, it shows that Indian capital was disinvesting more than it was investing. Then came the Korean War and America wanted to stock-pile. Then our boom went up again, we exported a lot, the Government got a lot of

money over the export duties; everybody was very happy. 1951 was the high water-mark. The Railway Minister was also very happy. He showed a very good surplus; then came the downward trend. Now, I will give you telegraphically because I have not got the time, what are the inherent defects that I have found in this Budget. The economic situation is most highly uncrystallised. He has not touched it. The Finance Minister's assertion that there is improvement over last year is disproved by the fact I give now. More than half the industries have registered a decline. The apparent over-all increase is due to weightage of textiles. There is no vertical balance in industrial development; it is lopsided. Factory employment is 97 this year as against 97.7 last year with 1950 as 100. Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain, I am told, in his day before yesterday's speech said everything had gone up. You know statistics; you can quote the same statistics to prove your case and the same statistics to prove the case against you also. The value and volume of foreign trade is the lowest in the last 32 months. Labour exchanges have more and more unemployed. The Central and State Governments' surpluses have been wiped out. Madras which had 90 crores and Hyderabad which had 37 crores are now deficit. The cash balances of the Centre and the States have been reduced to zero. They stood at 273 crores at the Centre alone only two years ago.

#### Industries :

Out of 79 crores capital expenditure for 1952-53, we have now allotted Rs. 1½ crores. Out of capital expenditure of Rs. 200 crores, 6.75 crores have been allotted. This is what is said in page 17 of the Budget speech:

"The provision for capital outlay in the revised estimates has largely been regulated with reference to the progress of expenditure on the various schemes. The reduction of Rs. 20 crores in the expenditure is mainly due to a saving of Rs. 8.29 crores in the provision for defence capital outlay and Rs. 3.15 crores in the provision for capital outlay on industrial development, mainly in the provision for development of the shipping industry and the setting up of a steel plant."

In other words, there is no desire at all. In fact, there is a complete attempt not to develop our industries at all.

Now, there is another question. The report of the Finance Commission on 535 P.S.

page 60 says that out of 91 crores of Revenue Reserve which all the States had in March 1950, only 38.27 crores will be available at the end of this month.

We talk of deficit financing as if it is going to begin now. It has begun long ago. According to *Commerce*, 27th February, out of Rs. 115 crores raised as loan which are to mature in 1953-55 as much as 75 crores were contributions by the Reserve Bank. If this is not deficit financing, I want to know what it is. A small surplus of 3.75 crores is converted into a deficit of 3.79 crores. There is a nominal surplus of 45 lakhs on revenue account. I am going to draw your attention to something more. There is a deliberate attempt to inflate budget figures. In the anxiety to present a balanced budget, the figures have been deliberately inflated. Changes between Revenue and Capital Account are unwarranted. The over-all deficit is given as 79 crores for 1952-53 and 140 crores for 1953-54. But is that all? The revised estimates for 1952-53 are based on the actuals for the first ten months. It may be good and convenient arithmetic but bad economics to disregard the actual downward trends witnessed during the last 6 months, and to multiply the actuals by 6/5. I will give you, Sir, the figures. I cannot explain it because it will take a long time. For import duties there is an inflation of 8 crores; export duties inflation of Rs. 12 crores; Union excises inflation of Rs. 6.5 crores; income-tax on Corporations an inflation of Rs. 4.5 crores; income-tax on other than corporations, 2.5 crores. These give you with other factors which need time to clarify a deficit of 31 crores. There are then 9 crores expected from Pakistan; they are carried forward to next year. It was doubled to 18 crores. If the Government were forced to pay food subsidy and 18 crores from Pakistan are not forthcoming, the deficit may not be Rs. 140 crores but 70 crores more, that is, Rs. 230 crores.

Then regressive direct taxation. In 1947-48 it was 47 per cent. In 1953-54 it is 28 per cent. Naturally, indirect taxation will rise. Due to this policy, railway returns and postal returns are falling. The peak return was in 1950. Now there is a downward trend. The surplus of 18.3 crores has come to 9.5 and 9.3 crores estimated for 1953-54. A deterioration of 14 crores from the original estimate takes place.

Now, coming to internal debt. It stands at 2173 crores at the end of 1953-54 and the interest we have to pay has risen from 63 crores in 1948-49 to 75 crores in 1953-54.

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

Now, coming to industrial policy. The Prime Minister on 9th April 1949 made a speech in which he said:

“Not enough indigenous capital in India.”

He did not know the figures or the causes of capital shyness. The Indian Economic Plan, 1944 puts internal resources at 4,000 crores in 15 years (p. 47). Nehru says:

“The Know-How will not be available from abroad unless foreign capital is permitted to enter India.”

Already in 1948 the Commerce Department allowed foreign investment on the following terms:

“Duty free import of machinery. Tax concessions and Double depreciation allowance.”

The result has been that British investments have risen from 2.81 crores in 1948 to 28.18 crores by June 1952. What is the result? They have started their factories here and our own small scale industries and manufacturers have been destroyed. So, this is our policy. I fail to see how under these circumstances we are going to talk about development of our industries, protection of our small industries and all that, when you are allowing British capital on the one side and American capital on the other side to come in through the back-door by these methods?

Finally, deficit financing. I will take only two minutes more. Take the capital budget. Out of Rs. 203 crores, Rs. 132 crores go to the States. The total bill for the Five Year Plan is about Rs. 2,069 crores, i.e., about Rs. 417 crores per year. For three years from 1950, we should have spent Rs. 1,242 crores. Actually, we have only spent Rs. 1,000 crores, and there is a balance of Rs. 242 crores. Where is that money to come from? Originally, the deficit was to have been met from budget surpluses. The Centre and the States are bankrupt. They have no surpluses. Internal borrowing is not promising. Last year, only Rs. 730 lakhs were capable of being raised as against a stipulated borrowing of Rs. 25 crores. That is our borrowing credit in the Indian market.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram** (Visakhapatnam): It is a rope trick.

**Dr. Jaisoorya:** Within the next two years, at least Rs. 1,038 crores have to be found. By mobilising sterling resources and other loans, not more than Rs. 300 crores can be envisaged.

This leaves at least Rs. 738 crores to come through foreign loans if other means fail. For the sake of argument, take it as Rs. 600 crores. Is it possible that such a large sum would be forthcoming in two years? It is impossible. Therefore, deficit financing for at least Rs. 500 crores will be necessary. Deficit financing is already there, but the total deficit financing adding other deficits may turn out in the end to be over Rs. 1,000 crores. Deficit financing has no basis in an agricultural country. Only in an industrial country with closed economy where you can dump your manufactured goods in external markets, can it work—as had happened in Germany. I know more about deficit financing than almost any hon. Member sitting here.

Finally, here is the cat out of the bag. “India will require 1.31 billion dollars by way of foreign assistance for the Five Year Plan to be successfully completed by the end of March 1956. According to an official analysis by the Ministry of Finance although the possible sources of such aid have not been specifically mentioned in the Report, the top officials of the Planning Commission and the Government have often expressed the view that if any substantial assistance comes, it can only be from the United States of America.” I have quoted this from the *New York Times*, dated 9th February, 1953.

डा० सैय्यद महमूद (चम्पारन—पूर्व) :

सभापति जी, मैं ज्यादा वक्त इस हाउस का जाया नहीं करना चाहता और शायद जब से यहां आया हूँ कभी बोलने की हिम्मत नहीं की। मैं चालीस बरस तक बोलता बोलता थक गया हूँ इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि जितना कम हम लोग बोलें उतना ज्यादा बेहतर है। बदकिस्मती से हम लोग इस मुल्क में ज्यादा बोलते हैं। आज मैं ने डरते डरते बोलने की हिम्मत की। मैं तो चार घंटे इन्तजार करते करते थक गया था और जाने ही वाला था कि आप ने बुलवा लिया। इसलिये मैं चन्द शब्द कहूंगा।

बजट के मुतालिक इस में कलाम नहीं कि इस मुल्क में टैक्स यहां की आबादी के ५ फ्री सदी के हिसाब से बसूल होता है। इंग्लैंड में पचास फ्री सदी आबादी पर टैक्स

बसूल होत है। इस के माने यह है कि करीब करीब सारी मेल पापुलेशन (male population) वहां पर टैक्स देती है। ऐसी हालत में बजट बनाने की, और वह भी उस वक्त जब कि बड़े बड़े काम करने हैं, इतने बड़े बड़े काम जो कि शायद कोई मुल्क शुरू में करने की हिम्मत न करता, हम ने हिम्मत की है। इस में कलाम नहीं कि फ्राइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने बजट बना कर और उस के लिये फ्राइनेन्स मुहय्या करके एक बड़ा अच्छा काम किया है। गो बजट पर बहुत से एतराज हो सकते हैं, जैसे कि किये भी गये और बाज जायज एतराज भी हो सकते हैं, लेकिन एतराज एक और चीज है। फ्रिल जुमला यह कहा जा सकता है कि बजट बहुत ज्यादा तसल्लीबख्श रहा है और उस ने मुल्क के हर तबके को खुश करने की कोशिश की है और किया है।

अभी कहा गया, शायद गाडगिल साहब ने कहा, कि और टैक्सेशन लमाना चाहिये था, लेकिन नहीं लयाया। बेशक, यह ठीक है, जैसा उन्होंने कहा कि सोशल जस्टिस (social justice) के लिये टैक्सेशन लगाना जरूरी है, लेकिन जब कि अभी हम ने टैक्सेशन एनक्वायरी कमेटी (Taxation Enquiry Committee) मुकरर की है ऐसी हालत में हम को इस साल टैक्स नहीं लगाना चाहिये था, इसलिये कि हम को उसूल तय करना है, उस के तरीके तय करने हैं, इस वास्ते यह टैक्सेशन नहीं हुआ तो कोई बेजा बात नहीं है।

यों एतराज तो बहुत हैं एक एतराज यह भी किया जाता है और शायद सही है कि अगरेजों के जमाने में अर्न्ड (earned) और अनअर्न्ड इन्कम (unearned income) में फर्क किया जाता था, लेकिन आप ने इस में कोई फर्क नहीं किया। इस से स्टेट को बहुत बड़ा नुकसान हुआ। अगर नये टैक्स

की जरूरत नहीं थी तो भी पुराने टैक्स की अनामली (anomaly) को दुरस्त करना चाहिये था। लेकिन जो पुराना तरीका अंगरेजों के जमाने का था उस से स्टेट को ज्यादा फायदा होता था, उस पर ज्यादा तबज्जह देनी चाहिये।

इधर उधर एतराजात तो बहुत से हैं लेकिन फिर भी इस में कलाम नहीं कि बजट ने काफी तरीके से मुस्तलिफ़ तबकों को खुश किया है। मिडल क्लास के लोगों को भी कुछ थोड़ा बहुत खुश करने की कोशिश की गई है। वह त्यागी साहब के अफसरों के लिये किया गया है। इस ख्याल से नहीं किया गया है कि लोगों को आराम मिले। सिर्फ़ छः सौ रुपये इस में बढ़ाये गये हैं। अगर उन को छोटे छोटे डिपॉजिट (deposits) बढ़ाना था तो अगर उस को पांच हजार करते तो ज्यादा बेहतर था।

यह खंड अलफ्राज कहने के बाद चूंकि बजट का ताल्लुक प्लैनिंग (planning) से है, फ्राइव इयर प्लैन (Five Year Plan) से है, इसलिये उस के मुताल्लिक भी कुछ कहूंगा। फ्राइव इयर प्लैन मेहनत से तैयार किया गया है। उस के मुताल्लिक बहुत सी बातें कहीं जा सकती हैं कि उस में यह कमी है, बंध कमी है हैं भी बहुत सी कमियां लेकिन फिर भी मजमुई हैसियत से फ्राइव-इयर प्लैन एक बेहतरीन डॉक्यूमेंट (document) तैयार हुआ है जिस की तारीक़ बाहर के लोग बहुत ज्यादा करते हैं। लेकिन हम खुद उस की कमियों को जानते हुए भी उस की तरफ़ मुतबज्जह नहीं हैं। यह और बात है कि हम को मुतबज्जह करने की कोशिश की गई है या नहीं। इस के मुताल्लिक फिर अर्ज करूंगा। लेकिन यह ठीक है कि बदकिस्मती से हमारे मुल्क में अपने काम की तरफ़ तबज्जह नहीं है, उन

### [डा० सैय्यद महमूद]

कामों की तरफ जो हिन्दुस्तान ने इस बंकेत किया था कर रहा है। तमाम दुनिया की नजरें उस की तरफ हैं और तमाम दुनिया उस की तारीफें कर रही है। मैं उस की फ़ेहरिस्त नहीं गिनाना चाहता जो हिन्दुस्तान के काम हैं क्योंकि उस की एक लम्बी दास्तान होगी लेकिन एक दो बातें कहना चाहता हूँ जिस से पता चलता है कि हमारे मुल्क ने कितने बड़े बड़े काम किये हैं।

पहली चीज जो आजादी के बाद हम ने की और जिस की मिसाल शायद दुनिया के इतिहास में नहीं मिलेगी, वह चीज थी फ़िउडलिज्म (feudalism) के बूत को बिना एक कतरा खून बहाये हुए तोड़ना। यह कोई आसान काम नहीं था, इस को बेशक रूस ने किया, चीन ने भी किया, लेकिन किस कास्ट (cost) पर? कितने इन्सानों का खून बहाया? लेकिन जिस डिमाक्रैटिक तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान ने बिना एक कतरा खून बहाये हुए फ़िउडलिज्म के बूत को तोड़ा वह एक काबिले तारीफ़ चीज है।

दूसरी चीज यह है कि हम ने एक बहुत बड़ा तजुर्बा ऐडल्ट सफ़रेज (adult suffering) दे कर किया है। एक ऐसे मुल्क के लिये जिस ने अभी आजादी हासिल की हो, उस मुल्क के लिये जिस में ८० फ़ी सदी आदमी जाहिल हों, यह एक बहुत बड़ी हिम्मत का काम था। इस में कलाम नहीं कि बहुत से लोगों ने इस की मुखालिफ़त की, लेकिन हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जिन में हिम्मत की कमी नहीं है इस को कर के एक बहुत बड़ा रिस्क (risk) भी लिया। यह रिस्क होते हुए भी बहुत हिम्मत का काम था। इंग्लैंड में पहली लड़ाई के बाद जा कर ऐडल्ट सफ़रेज हुआ है, लेकिन इस मुल्क में ऐडल्ट सफ़रेज करने का नतीजा यह हुआ कि हम ने शुरू से ही जनता का राज्य कायम करने की

कोशिश की और जनता का राज्य कायम कर के दिखला दिया। हम ने आते ही जनता का राज्य कायम कर के केपिटलिस्ट एक्सप्लॉयटेशन (capitalist exploitation) को खत्म करने की कोशिश की। अगर यह हम न करते तो आजादी के बाद मुल्क में कैपिटलिस्ट एक्सप्लॉयटेशन बहुत ज्यादा होता।

डिमाक्रैसी के साथ हम एक और बड़ा एक्सपेरिमेंट कर रहे हैं, डिमाक्रैसी कायम कर के हम ने जनता का राज्य शुरू किया है और उस के साथ साथ अब हम प्लैन्ड एकानमी (planned economy) को कायम करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। यह बहुत यूनिक एक्सपेरिमेंट (unique experiment) है जिस की तारीफ़ें दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्क भी कर रहे हैं। यह और जगह भी हुआ है। रूस में हुआ, चीन में भी हुआ है लेकिन वह डिमाक्रैसी के साथ नहीं हुआ है। जैसा कि आप को मालूम है वह दूसरे तरीके से हुआ है लेकिन डिमाक्रैसी के साथ प्लैन्ड एकानमी का एक्सपेरिमेंट हम दुनिया में पहली मर्तबा कर रहे हैं और उम्मीद है कि हम इस को कामयाबी के साथ खत्म करगे। इस में कलाम नहीं कि इस काम को पूरा करने के लिये मौजूदा लीडरशिप ज्यादा मुनासिब है इसलिये कि यह वही लीडरशिप है कि जिस ने मुल्क के लिये आजादी हासिल की है। उस ने मुल्क में इत्मीनान दिलाया है क्योंकि मौजूदा लीडरशिप मुल्क में इतना बड़ा काम कर चुकी है इसलिये इस पर लोगों को इत्मीनान है। इसलिये इस ने जो काम शुरू किये हैं गालिबन वह इन को खत्म करेगी और जनता भी उस का साथ देगी। इस में कलाम नहीं कि हम ने बहुत सी गलतियाँ की हैं और करगे और शायद अब भी कर रहे हैं लेकिन बाबजूद तमाम गलतियों के अगर मजमूई हैसियत से हम देखें तो हमारा काम

अजीमुषान है और बर्हसियत एक हिन्दुस्तानी के हम को उस पर फ़ख़ होना चाहिये । यह और बात है कि हमारा दिल यह चाहे कि हम और बड़े बड़े काम करें और इन कामों को जल्द ख़त्म करें । यह स्वाहिस हो तो कोई हर्ज़ नहीं लेकिन उन कामों को नजरअन्दाज़ करना और उन को निहायत मामूली समझना और यह कहना कि नहीं कुछ नहीं हो रहा है, यह तो गालिबन एक हिन्दुस्तानी के लिये मौजू नहीं है, खास कर ऐसी हालत में जब कि दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों के रहने वाले उस की तारीफ़ें करते हैं । श्रेषक यह बात है कि इस फ़ाइव इयर प्लान में कैपीटलिस्टों को भी मौका दिया गया है । पहले तो उन लोगों को इस पर बहुत एतराज था और वह कहते थे कि यह कामयाब नहीं होगा । उन को शुबहा था । लेकिन वह भी शायद मजबूर हुए और वह भी अब समझने लगे हैं कि कामयाब होगा । अभी गुजश्ता चन्द रोज से हम को मालूम हुआ है कि वह भी कोआपरेषन (co-operation) करने की सोच रहे हैं और उस को कामयाब बनाने में उन की भी पूरी कोशिश होगी । इस का उन्होंने ऐलान किया है ।

दूसरी पार्टियां भी अगर इस में गबर्नमेंट के साथ कोआपरेषन करें तो जाहिर है कि बहुत बेहतर है । जाहिर है कि जो पार्टियां इस फ़ंडामेंटल (fundamental) से ऐभी (agree) करती हैं कि डिमार्केसी के साथ प्लान्ड इकानमी हो सकती है उन का कोआपरेषन हो सकता है । हां, जो पार्टियां इस फ़ंडामेंटल से ऐभी नहीं करतीं उन से कोआपरेषन मुमकिन नहीं है । अभी तरह तरह की खबरें सुनने में आ रही हैं । कहा जाता है कि प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी से कांग्रेस का सम्बन्ध हो रहा है । इस पर मैं ने बहुत एतराज भी सुने हैं, कांग्रेस सरकिल्स में भी एतराज हो रहे हैं, लेकिन अगर

वह इस फ़ंडामेंटल से ऐभी करते हैं कि डिमार्केसी के साथ प्लान्ड इकानमी रह सकती है और उस को कामयाब बनाया जा सकता है, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के साथ कोआपरेषन करने में क्या हर्ज़ है और क्यों इस पर एतराज किया जाना चाहिये । यह चन्द अल्फ़ाज़ मुझे फ़ाइव इयर प्लान के मुताल्लिक कहने थे और मैं इस पर आप का ज्यादा वक्त सर्फ़ नहीं करना चाहता ।

दूसरी चीज़ जो मैं अर्ज करूंगा वह यह है कि डेफ़िसिट फ़ाइनेन्स (deficit finance) के मुताल्लिक तो मेरी कृष्ण करने की अहलियत नहीं है, इस पर मैं नहीं बोलना चाहता, लेकिन यह जरूर कहूंगा कि मुमकिन है कि सन् १९५०-५१ के इंडेक्स फ़िगरस (index figures) काबिले इत्मीनान हों, लेकिन उस से पहले सन् १९४७ से सन् १९४९ तक के इंडेक्स फ़िगर तो काबिले इत्मीनान नहीं थे । जो इंडेक्स फ़िगर सन् १९५०-५१ के हैं, जिन पर भरोसा कर के हमारे फ़ाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह रखा है, बावजूद पहले से उन में कुछ कमी होने के अब भी बहुत कुछ ज्यादा है और अब भी काफ़ी इनफ़्लेशन (inflation) है और उस में कुछ ख़तरा जरूर है । लेकिन उम्मीद है कि फ़ाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब इस बात को देखेंगे कि अब मुल्क और ज्यादा इनफ़्लेशन को बरदास्त नहीं कर सकता है । अगर इस डेफ़िसिट फ़ाइनेन्सिंग से आर ५-लेशन बढ़ा तो तबाही का ख़तरा हो सकता है । इस वास्ते यकीन है कि वह इस पर काबू पायेंगे और इस को समझते हुए वह इनफ़्लेशन को कम करने की कोशिश करेंगे और उस को बढ़ने नहीं देंगे ।

डिफ़ेंस (defence) के मुताल्लिक मैं चन्द अल्फ़ाज़ कहूंगा । वह यह है कि अंग्रेजों के जमाने में लड़ाई के वक्त जब कि उन्होंने

## [डा० सैय्यद महमूद]

११० करोड़ खर्च किया था तो सारा मुल्क चिल्ला उठा था कि हमारे मुल्क को तबाह कर दिया और वह ११० करोड़ हम को इतना गिरा था कि मुल्क में एक सिरे से दूसरे सिरे तक यह आवाज उठी कि मुल्क बरबाद हो रहा है। लेकिन आज तो हम सुलह के वक्त भी ३०० करोड़ खर्च कर रहे हैं, दो सौ करोड़ नहीं क्योंकि उस वक्त पाकिस्तान भी इस मुल्क में शामिल था। तो अगर ११० करोड़ खर्च कर के मुल्क तबाह हो रहा था तो यह ३०० करोड़ खर्च करके वह कब तक चल सकेगा। इन तीन सौ करोड़ को खर्च करके हम इतनी तो ऐफीशेंसी ला नहीं सकते कि जिन बड़ी बड़ी सत्तनतों से हम को खतरा हो सकता है उन का हम मुकाबला कर सकें। यह तो नहीं हो सकता। सिर्फ यह हो रहा है कि हम को पाकिस्तान पर और पाकिस्तान को हम पर शक है और शक है। इस शक व शक की वजह से हम ३०० करोड़ खर्च कर रहे हैं। यह कहां तक मुनासिब है? पाकिस्तान कहां तक ऐसा करता रहा है कि वह हम पर हमला करके हम को नुकसान पहुंचा सके? लेकिन यह बहुत कंट्रो-वर्शाल (controvertial) बात है इसलिये इस पर मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता। लेकिन इस में मैं कलाम नहीं कि इस खर्च को चाहे हम तो कुछ वक्त तक बरदाश्त कर सके लेकिन पाकिस्तान तो नहीं कर सकता। मुझे तो ताजुब है कि वह अब तक इसे कैसे बरदाश्त कर सका और १०० करोड़ खर्च करने की वजह से अब तक क्यों तबाह नहीं हो गया।

राजस्व तथा व्यय मंत्रो (श्री त्यागी) :  
पाकिस्तान की तरफ से कोई खतरा होने के ख्याल से यह फौज नहीं रखी जा रही है। खर्च इसलिये बढ़ रहा है कि पुराने जमाने में हिंसा होनी ही होती है।

का बहुत काफ़ी सहारा था और अब उस को मुकम्मिल तरीके से अपनी फौजों को सेल्फ सफ़ीशेंट (self sufficient) बनाना पड़ रहा है।

डायटर सैय्यद महमूद : बहरहाल मैं यह अर्ज करता हूँ कि अगर आप अपनी फौजों को इतना ऐफीशेंट बना सकें कि जो खतरा साउथ ईस्ट एशिया (South East Asia) और मिडिल ईस्ट डिफेंस आरगेनायजेशन की वजह से हो रहा है उस का मुकाबला कर सकें तब तो बेशक ठीक है। लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि यह २०० करोड़ तो क्या ५०० करोड़ खर्च करके भी आप इस खतरे का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं। मैं पहली मर्तबा बोल रहा हूँ इसलिये मुझे डिसकरेज (discourage) न कीजिये। तो बहरहाल यह खतरा हम को जरूर नाहक है जो कि नई पालिसी से हो रहा है। अनरीका जो कि साउथ ईस्ट एशिया का डिफेंस आरगेनाइज करके आर दूसरी मीडो (medo) को खड़ा करके जो हम को आइसोलेट (isolate) करना चाहता है, इस का हम मुकाबला किस तरह से कर सकते हैं यह हमको जरूर सोचना चाहिये।

अगर हम एक एफीशियेंट आर्मी बना सकें, अगर हम ऐसी आर्मी (army) बना सकें जो इन खतरों का मुकाबला कर सकती तो बेशक "बचम मारोशन दिले माशाद।" लेकिन जाहिर है कि यह तो हम बदकिस्मती से नहीं कर सकते। तो इस के लिये दूसरी तरकीबें सोचनी चाहिये। और क्या तरकीबें हैं जिन से हम इन खतरों का मुकाबला कर सकें? यह ठीक है कि पाकिस्तान ललचाई हुई नजरों से मीडो की तरफ देख रहा है। यह हमारी बदकिस्मती है। मगर पाकिस्तान और हम इस को नहीं भूल सकते कि पाकिस्तान की

कमजोरी हमारी कमजोरी है, और खास कर मिलिटरी सेंस में तो बहुत ज्यादा है। इस लिये हम को कुछ ऐसा तरीका अतियार करना चाहिये कि जिस से हम ऐसे खतरो का, जो मीडो या साउथ ईस्ट एशिया आरगे-नाइजेशन बना कर हम को आइसोलेट करने की कोशिश है, मुकाबला कर सकें। इस खतरे का मुकाबला मेरे ब्याल में सिर्फ रुपया खर्च कर के तो नहीं कर सकते। हम में इतनी ताकत नहीं है, हमारे पास इतनी दौलत नहीं है। २०० करोड़ क्या ५०० करोड़ में भी नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन एक तरीका है, शायद वह तरीका कामयाब हो सके। वह यह है कि हम को और पाकिस्तान को जिस तरह से भी हो, ज्वाइंट डिफेंस (joint defence) या कामन डिफेंस (common defence) करके इस खतरे का मुकाबला करना चाहिये। सवाल यह है कि यह क्योंकर हो। आज पाकिस्तान खुद अपना इंटरैस्ट (interest) नहीं समझता है। यह हम जानते हैं। जब बच्चा तालीम हासिल नहीं करता और खुद अपना इंटरैस्ट नहीं समझता तो पुराने जमाने में उन बच्चों को सजा दी जाती थी। लेकिन मौजूदा तालीम का तरीका दूसरा है, वह सजा का तरीका नहीं है। मौजूबा तरीका यह है कि जिस तरह से भी हो उस को समझाइये, बार बार समझाइये और उस को अपने खतरे से वाकिफ करिये। इसलिये इसी तरह का यह मौजूदा तरीका पाकिस्तान के साथ भी अस्तियार करना चाहिये। ज्वाइंट डिफेंस का तरीका अस्तियार करना चाहिये। पाकिस्तान नाम तो हो गया, ठीक है, लेकिन मानिये कि दिल्ली में एक बड़ी दीवार कर ली जाय और नई दिल्ली का नाम पैरिस रख दिया जाय और आप समझने लें कि पैरिस हो गया तो आप समझ लें, मगर जागराफी तो नहीं बदल सकते। इसलिये हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की, बदकिस्मती है कि ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन अलदबा

है, नाम भी अलहया है नाम तो कोई चीज नहीं है, मगर उन खतरो का जो इस तकसीम से हुए हैं, मेरे ब्याल में एक वाहिद इलाज यही है कि हम जिस तरह से भी हो, कामन डिफेंस और ज्वाइंट डिफेंस करके और वेस्टर्न एशिया की कौमों से फिर अपना सम्बन्ध जोड़ कर दुनिया में सुलह और अमन कायम करने की कोशिश करें, जो कि हम कर सकते हैं। मेरे ब्याल में यह नामुमकिन नहीं है। वह हमारी डिप्लोमैसी (diplomacy) का और हमारी स्टेट्समैनशिप (statesmanship) का तकाजा है कि हम यह काम करें। पाकिस्तान से कामन डिफेंस या ज्वाइंट डिफेंस की कोशिश करें। यह जो वेस्टर्न एशिया के मुल्कों को मीडो बना कर उन को फांसने की कशिश हो रही है और जो उनकी नदरें हमारी तरफ लगी हुई हैं.....

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member has taken more than twenty minutes. I did not interrupt him as it is maiden speech but may I just request him to bring his remarks to a close now.

**डा० सैय्यद महमूद :** अच्छा साहब, लेकिन वहरहाल मैं साल भर नहीं बोला, तो कुछ तो आप की रिआयत करनी चाहिये।

**Mr. Chairman:** I have already given him more than twenty minutes.

**डा० सैय्यद महमूद :** बहुत अच्छा, मैं छोड़ता हूँ। लिंग्विस्टिक प्राविंसज (linguistic provinces) का भी बड़ा जोर है और हम पर हर तरफ से इस के लिये बोझार है। एक तो हम ने अभी बनाया है और दूसरे लिंग्विस्टिक प्राविंसज की तरफ बहुत शोर है। लेकिन मेरे ब्याल में प्राविंसज लिंग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर बनेंगे तो मेरे सा चाहे और कोई करें न करें, मगर टंडनजी जरूर इतिफाक करेंगे कि उस से मुल्क की तबद्दी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि एनामिक और जोगराफिकल बेसिस (geographical

[डा० सै. द. महमूद]

basis) पर प्राविसेज बनने चाहियें या हमारे प्राविसेज होन ही नहीं चाहियें, सिर्फ डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स ही हों। इस से जो बड़े सख्तरे प्राविंसियल काम वगैरह के लिक्विडिटीक प्राविसेज बनाने में है वह मिट जावेंगे, अगर हम सिर्फ सेंटर रखें और प्राविसेज को उड़ा दें।

**Shrimati Sushama Sen (Bhagalpur South):** I am thankful to you for having given me this opportunity, at long last, to say a few words on the Budget. Already much has been said and I think the Finance Minister has come in for his share of congratulations as well as criticisms. So there is not very much to say, but I should like to say a few words.

The increased development expenditure and the absence of any new taxation has earned for the Budget even a good response from the businessmen. I specially welcome the relief given to the middle classes by raising the exemption limit of Income-tax in respect of personal income from Rs. 3,600 to Rs. 4,200 and in respect of undivided Hindu families from Rs. 7,200 to Rs. 8,400. No doubt this is some relief to the middle classes. But I would request the Finance Minister, if he could, to raise this exemption limit from Rs. 4,200 to Rs. 6,000 as that would give substantial relief to the middle classes.

I am indeed glad that the Taxation Enquiry Commission has been appointed with Dr. John Mathai as the Chairman, and I am sure that many of the vexed problems may be solved through this Commission.

At the same time I would request the Finance Minister to put off the Estate Duty Bill for the present, since this Enquiry Commission has been appointed and they may go into this question. For I feel that it is not an opportune moment to put on more taxes on the people. Already, as Mr. Gadgil has pointed out, there are so many taxes on the people. The people are over burdened by taxes and they are just trying to recover their stability. So, in regard to Estate Duty I would ask him to consider about it. My reason for asking it to be postponed is, as I have said, that the people are still facing economic distress. And then our Government is not able to offer the amenities which other countries have, where the Estate Duty exists, such as free compulsory education for children, free medical aid, homes for the poor and the destitute, old age pension, etc. So my

humble suggestion is that this point may be considered by the Taxation Enquiry Committee.

I agree with the Finance Minister that there is a brighter side of the picture and that instead of continually harping on our poverty and bewailing our lot we should also see the bright side. We are making encouraging progress towards laying the foundations of a welfare State, and with the co-operation of all and the implementation of the Five Year Plan I am sure, Sir, that we should be able to lay the foundations and fulfil the dreams of New India.

It is indeed encouraging to know from the Finance Minister that there is a tendency of lowering food prices all over the world; and in that case the prices in our country too would be lowered.

At the same time he has doubts if we shall ever go back to anything near the pre-war prices and to start our indices from September 1949. He says "We did *prayaschitta* for the currency sins for revaluing the rupee". But I see no reason why we cannot go back to the pre-war prices gradually, with all the schemes of development materialised and with rigorous economy in administrative expenditure. A pruning of non-productive expenditure has also to be effected in civil and military bills.

Regarding Defence, for obvious security reasons, I do not agree with my friends who say that the expenditure should be curtailed. It is not advisable to take any undue risks and slacken the defence arrangements. Indeed, defence is one of our valuable assets although, strange to say, there seems to be adverse opinion in some quarters. I agree with what General Cariappa once said that God and Army are remembered only when there is trouble. The Army consists of the most disciplined and loyal set of young men. It would not be proper to effect much retrenchment on the pay of these officers as it would not be an incentive for the right type of young men to join the Army and it would become ineffective and inefficient. I believe already officers who were drawing Rs. 1,400 as their pay are now getting only Rs. 700 and about Rs. 100 as allowance. That is they are getting about half of what they were getting before.

It is very hard for those officers on field duty to establish separate establishments for their families and for their children and I would specially appeal to the Finance Minister to see that the family allowances and the children's allowances may be restored to those officers who are on field duty.

Economy in Army could be effected in other ways. There is scope for more efficient operation of defence industries which process seems slow and by purchase policy of utilising goods and stores indigenously manufactured. Preference should be given to country-made war materials such as could be produced here and they would be cheaper than foreign-made goods. I may also suggest that the armed forces who are not on field services or under any operational commitments could be utilised for giving military training to the youths in schools and colleges which would teach discipline and loyalty. The University Authorities should make military training as part of their compulsory education just as they have adopted social, domestic and political sciences. The National Cadet Corps is already inculcating military training in some Universities such as Bombay and Central Provinces and it would be advisable for all the other Universities to follow suit and to adopt this course.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If I may suggest, the financial position of the country should improve if we get quick returns from the huge sums of money being spent on multi-purpose projects and industrial schemes. Apart from the five big River Valley Projects which will take time to materialise and give results—but even in the process of its work, it can help and I believe the Damodar Valley Corporation is already giving some benefits—the smaller projects under the minor irrigation work should mature within a couple of years and give sufficient returns. For instance, I place before you from first hand knowledge of conditions in my constituency, which is a rural area in South Bhagalpur. Some areas are bordering on the Chota Nagpur hills and these are hilly tracts with rocky soil where no kind of irrigation is possible until we have a boring plant for sinking tube wells. Now, the State Government is unable to meet this expenditure as 25 per cent. of this grant has been curtailed by the Central Government. So, it is possible only if the Central Government provides the boring plant which costs. I suppose, a couple of lakhs. I have already approached the Minister for Irrigation but as the Finance Minister is the final authority, I would request him to look into this question. This would help to irrigate a large portion of tracts which were lying useless and make them self-sufficient in food. In times of drought which occurs almost every year in my constituency, the poor landless labourers live on

some grains and leaves of trees which are very undigestible. I have seen this with my own eyes.

Last September, when there was scarcity in these areas, the Chairman of the District Board, made a survey and in his report he said that the distress of the people could only be removed if irrigation facilities were supplied. Besides tube wells, he advised Government to take up at an early date the Eklahi Bund Scheme. This scheme would not cost much. At the same time it could irrigate about 50,000 acres of land. This is only in my constituency. I am sure this must be the case in many other places and if everybody gets the same facilities from the minor irrigation projects, I am sure much of the expenditure on imported foodgrains could be curtailed. Such small schemes not costing much, must make many places self-sufficient in food and from these small savings, we can make big things.

This brings me to the Small Savings Scheme. The Finance Minister has emphasised that we shall have to turn increasingly to the small saver to provide the money required for developments. I am glad to find that at long last the women of the country have been given an important part to play in this scheme and steps are being taken to entrust social women's organisations with the furtherance of the movement.

The Women's Savings Week to collect contributions for small savings scheme has already started its work and the Prime Minister in his message has said "I hope that the women of India will give a lead in this matter to the men". I am sure we shall give the lead in this matter and many others if we are given the chance.

Shri Anandchand (Bilaspur): I am grateful to you for having given me this opportunity to speak. You have heard in this House a lot of talk about the budget from experts in the field but now I crave your indulgence to hear a few words from an absolute layman. The general budget—as I see—and I studied it with as much care as I could devote to the subject—is a balanced one without any effort having been made to burden the population with extra taxation. The Finance Minister in the opening part of his speech mentioned the general index number of wholesale prices and he was very confident that there was a drop in them which meant that the prices were easing and that the economic conditions were improving. If we see, however, the index of prices, so

[Shri Anandchand]

far as the essential commodities for the working classes are concerned to which, I gave some attention, we find that in Bombay, in 1951 December, the index of price for working classes was 331 which in 1952 December had risen to 346. In the same way, in Calcutta and Madras, the index prices were 370, 346, and 337, 327 respectively. It might be that the general index number of prices for some commodities has appreciably fallen, but that does not mean that so far as the man in the street is concerned, he has had any relief in the matter of prices. The same index numbers, when connected with certain industrial articles like sugar, kerosene, cotton manufactures and leather goods also shows a rise as compared with last year's. Especially, the rise in leather goods is very great. To my mind, it is a clear indication that those commodities so essential to life have not fallen in prices to an appreciable extent, and we have to pay for our kerosene, cotton goods as well as leather goods, as much as we did in the past. The living conditions, I beg to say, in this country can only improve, if there is more production, and that production can only be brought about by a very good handling of the Five Year Plan. I am glad to say that the Budget for 1953-54 has been made out on the basis that it is the third year of the Plan. Indeed it could not be otherwise, for the simple reason that when we have once adopted the Five Year Plan, till 1955-56, we have to so make the Budget, that its provisions fit in with the general structure of the Five Year Plan, and the development envisaged therein.

Here, I would, however, like to say a few words about the working of the community projects. The community projects, to my mind, are a very essential feature of the Five Year Plan, especially in relation to agriculture. I am glad that a serious effort is being made to make them a success. There have, however, been a few shortcomings, in my opinion, in the actual working of these community projects, especially in so far as supervision is concerned. I was very very curious to find out what machinery the Centre had devised for the execution and the supervision of these projects. We in Bilaspur have a block which is managed by a community project officer, who is there on the spot, and his work is supervised or inspected only once in a while by the people from the Centre. I found that the people who came from the Centre to see the working of these community projects on the spot, are invariably people who were administrators rather than experts in their own fields. It

might be a good thing to have a man in charge of the field operations of these community projects, who is an administrator. That is admitted. But when it is a case of going there to find out how much wheat was grown in a particular acre, whether reclamation of land has been done under the project, and whether the villagers have really made the road which they say they have, we want people who are really experts in their own fields, experts in agriculture, irrigation and so on, so that when they visit the community project blocks, and see their working for themselves, they will be able not only to see whether the work has actually been done or not, but also be able to advise the men on the spot, with their superior technical knowledge, as to how the working of the community project can be improved.

Now, I would like to turn a little while to the income and expenditure side of the Budget. From whatever study I have been able to make, I find that the revenue side of the Budget has become practically static in the last few years. Although the income has increased this year from about Rs. 401 crores to about Rs. 438 crores, still that increase is not in the taxation structure. If we see that the taxation structure, we find that the Budget proposals for 1953-54 show a gross income of Rs. 438 crores, out of which the tax revenue comes to about Rs. 338 crores only.

Another thing that I found, in these revenue figures, was that the percentage of cost of collection of taxes is very high. For instance, our revenue from customs in 1951-52 was Rs. 231 crores, and the revenue for union excise duties was Rs. 85 crores. The cost of collection of this was only Rs. 8.3 crores, that year. For 1953-54, the revenue from customs is Rs. 170 crores, and that from union excise duties about Rs. 94 crores, which means about Rs. 264 crores in all. But the cost of collection has gone up to Rs. 23 crores, which is really a jump of more than thrice the figure of the previous year.

**The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh):** It includes Rs. 17.5 crores excise duties, which are transferred to the States.

**Shri Anandchand:** I beg your pardon. I thought that they were not included in it. I would only like to know, why the excise duties were not there in Rs. 8.3 crores in 1951?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** They are being transferred this year.

**Shri Anandchand:** There is one other thing which I would like to point out. In other tax collections, the revenue collected is Rs. 2.16 crores, while the cost of collection is Rs. 1.45 crores. That means that in collecting about Rs. 2½ crores, we are spending about Rs. 1½ crores. I hope I am not wrong in what I say. Here again, the cost of collection is high.

Coming to the Revenue figures for civil administration during 1953-54, I find that the figures are placed at Rs. 11.18 crores. But the heads under which this collection is to be made were not found in the memorandum. I have no quarrel with that. And I wanted to say at the very beginning that so far as I am concerned, I have found the presentation of the Budget in all these volumes, and the various explanatory memoranda, as most illuminating, and I do not agree with my hon. friend from Madras, who said that there are many lacunae in it. I think especially he found one lacuna regarding the allowances of rulers. I think he said that it was about Rs. 540 lakhs in the explanatory memorandum, whereas in the actual figures of the Budget, it is about Rs. 4 crores and some lakhs. I personally think that the explanation is—subject of course to my being corrected by the hon. Finance Minister—that a sum of about Rs. 60 lakhs or so has not been accounted for, because it has been accounted in the Centrally administered areas i.e. Part C States. If we add this figure, I think we get the figure of Rs. 540 lakhs easily made up.

As for the other revenues, they include revenues from forests, from general administration, from excise duties and so on. Probably this head refers to income available from the Part C States and otherwise, because they deal with incomes which are under the provincial heads. Coming from a Part C States, I would like to put forward one suggestion in this regard. The expenditure on these Part C States is growing, and it must grow, I think, with the demand of time and the demand of the people for better amenities, but very little effort has been made to see that there is an increase in the revenue side of the Budget. In some Part C States, in Cutch, Bhopal, and Tripura, the revenues are less than what they were in 1949-50. I would beg of the Finance Minister to go into this question and see that the finance officers who are in the Part C States, not only devote their time to sending large and inflated expenditure figures, but also to finding out new avenues and additional sources of revenue, so that these States are not always deficit and a drag on the Centre.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):** Why not do away with them?

**Shri Anandchand:** I was going to come to that. Some hon. Members here have voiced a very strong feeling that we must do away with these Part C States because they are a burden. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend from Bhopal was very emphatic as I read his speech yesterday that they should be done away with. About that, I am not prepared, with the limited time at my disposal to present to you any detailed thesis to show what was the need or what was not the need. But, I would like to say one thing and that is this. The Constitution of India was devised by the Constituent Assembly of India after long deliberation. As a matter of fact, the Constituent Assembly came into being in November or December 1947 and the Constitution was adopted in November, 1949 and it was actually promulgated in January 1950. We had some very excellent people in the Constituent Assembly representing India, and the aspirations of its people. They knew the difficulties with which they were faced. They surmounted those difficulties and they gave India a Constitution which is not rigid. If today Parliament feels that there are certain areas and certain States which are a drag on the Centre, by all means do away with them. But in my opinion, if we go back to the history of these Part C States, there has been a reason for bringing them into being. They are not mere accidents of history which have been put in the First Schedule of the Constitution. Surely there were weighty reasons and I am sure if we go into the memorandum that the late Sardar Patel presented before the Constituent Assembly when the Constitution was being finalised, we will see what was the necessity for these Part C States. Take a Part C State like Cutch, for example. It is a border State between Saurashtra and Pakistan. Take another State, Manipur. It is on the border of Assam and Burma. Today, possibly, there are reasons for which we may feel satisfied that they could be absorbed. But, even there, I would respectfully submit that the wishes of the people should be the primary consideration. I think the wishes of the people can be the only criterion as to what should and what should not happen, to a State in India, established under the Constitution. Surely, if the people of Andhra can create a State which did not exist and if this House is going to accept a new State which was not there in the Constitution because the people there want it, will the House refuse the people the right to continue their existence in a State if they so desire? State which has

[Shri Anandchand]

been there in the Constitution. That is all I would like to say on that point.

Two minutes more and I shall finish. This is also my first speech in this House and like my hon. friend, here, I may be given two or three minutes more so that I may say something. So far as the expenditure side of the Budget is concerned, I think the Defence expenditure, about which there has been so much criticism, is a justifiable expenditure. It may be that the Indian defence forces today are not very strong. We cannot be strong. We have not got those defence industries which could help us in the building up of a better defence force. Our Air Force is, in my opinion, a more child yet. We have not got the machinery and equipment which go to make tanks and other arms. We have a long border with Pakistan to protect. I am not saying that Pakistan is going to fight with India. There is no immediate or remote danger of that. But, that does not mean that we should not be prepared. The strength of a person is the best sign of his security, and I think the defence services as such should be strengthened as much as possible.

Of course, the hon. Finance Minister said last year that a critical examination was being made to effect economies in the defence expenditure. This time he has been pleased to say that the process of this examination will be a continuous one. Are we to understand that this continuous process would only be with a view to see that the ceiling for expenditure on Defence forces is not going to rise over the figure of 200 crores, or does it mean that in this process of examination there will be at least some adjustment, some saving somewhere, so that the expenditure which is avoidable may be avoided?

Regarding the civil administration,—you gave me a couple of minutes and perhaps that time is over—I would only touch upon one subject, that is the subject of the States Ministry. As hon. friends here seem to be very much interested in the problems of Part C States—I did not know they were so interested—I would like to say a few words about the administrative problems of these States, and I would beg the hon. States Minister in his own time to consider them properly and see whether some remedy could not be provided. It was very heartening to find in the news reports or Press reports, I should say, that there was a meeting of the Chief Ministers of Part C States. It was said that they were experiencing certain difficulties

in carrying on the administration because of paucity of administrative machinery, too much guidance or interference from the Centre and non-availability of properly constituted High Courts in these States. I am not concerned with what interference the Centre does. Perhaps it is a good thing. We are in the initial stages of democracy and I think the Centre would be well advised to exercise great caution in the working of these Ministries which have just come into existence. I will however say this. In these States which are small in structure, there is always a kind of a cesspool development in the administrative services, because there is no transfer from one to the other. There is no common cadre of administrative services. What happens is this. A man who was perhaps a district magistrate 20 years ago is still a district magistrate, because he cannot be changed. There is no cadre to which he can be transferred from one State to another. The needs of these States are so limited and the resources also so limited that the administrative services cannot be duplicated. If there is a Civil Surgeon, there is only one; there cannot be two because two are not needed. These officers develop their likes and dislikes in the administration over a period of years, and I think it is necessary to give some relief to the people. I think the proposal made by the Chief Ministers of these Part C States about a common cadre, about which there is also reference in the Five Year Plan on the Administrative Chapter, may be a very good thing if the hon. States Minister could look into that problem and do something.

The other thing, about the High Courts; this is an urgent necessity. Today, in every State in India, whether it is Part A or Part B, there is a properly constituted High Court under the Constitution functioning with Judges, a Chief Justice and so on. But, in these Part C States except Coorg which has been attached to Mysore and except Delhi which is now getting a Circuit Court, the highest court of appeal is a one man court of the Judicial Commissioner. A Judicial Commissioner getting a pay of Rs. 1,000 or 1,500 a month. I would submit, is not a person who, today, in modern democracy or in the democratic State of India should exercise these powers of life and death, functions of *habeas corpus* and other things, which a properly constituted High Court is there to do. I would respectfully make a suggestion. As far as possible,—that would not mean any additional expenditure—the High Courts of these

Part C States can be the High Courts of their adjoining Part A or Part B States so that the people in these States can get the same justice which the people in the other parts of the States are getting. I would have liked to make many more points; but the time was limited.

श्री ए० ऐन० बिद्यालंकार (जालन्धर) :

चेयरमैन साहब, मैं समझता हूँ कि जो बजट इस साल पेश किया गया है वह आम तौर पर प्रोग्रेसिव (progressive) है यानी वह तरक्की की तरफ ले जाने वाला है, उस का झुकाव तरक्की की तरफ है जहाँ तक लोकमत का ताल्लुक है, अगर अखबारों को देखा जाय, या उन लोगों की राय को देखा जाय जो कि बजट के मामलों में कुछ दिलचस्पी रखते हैं, तो लाजिमी तौर पर मानना पड़ेगा कि बजट देश को तरक्की की तरफ ले जाने वाला है और फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब का जहाँ तक आउटलुक (outlook) और ऐप्रोच (approach) है वह तरक्की की तरफ है। लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ हम इस बात को नहीं भुला सकते कि जहाँ तक सर्वसाधारण का ताल्लुक है, उन के दिल में इस बजट से कोई उत्साह या स्फूर्ति पैदा नहीं हुई है और उन को कुछ ऐसा महसूस नहीं हुआ है कि इस बजट से उन को कुछ राहत पहुंचने वाली है। वह लोग जो सरकार की मशीनरी को चलाते हैं, जो अदना मुलाजिम हैं और जिनके हाथों से यह तमाम कारखाना चलता है, वह यह महसूस करें कि इससे हमें राहत पहुंची है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। मैंने कहा कि जहाँ तक आम स्टैंडर्ड्स (standards) का ताल्लुक है या जिस आर्थिक व्यवस्था के अन्दर हम रह रहे हैं उसका ताल्लुक है उस के हद्द के अन्दर तो यह मानना पड़ेगा कि हम तरक्की की तरफ जा रहे हैं और जो कुछ हम से बन पड़ रहा है हम कर रहे हैं लेकिन इस के साथ ही हम को यह बात देखनी है कि जो लाखों और करोड़ों

इन्सान इस देश में रहते हैं या वह हजारों आदमी जो इस मशीनरी को चला रहे हैं और जिन के कंधों पर देश की तरक्की निर्भर है अगर उन को कुछ उत्साह पैदा नहीं होता, उन को कुछ स्फूर्ति पैदा नहीं होती तो इसका अर्थ है कि हमारे और उन के दरमियान एक बड़ा भारी अन्तर है जिस को हमें परा करना है।

P.M.

इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जहाँ हम अपनी पालिसी तय करें और आम तौर पर हम मौजूदा बजट के अन्दर जिस पालिसी के ऊपर तमाम गवर्नमेंट चल रही है उस को सपोर्ट (support) करें वहाँ मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हम यह भूल न जायें कि अभी तक हम जनता के अन्दर वह उत्साह पैदा नहीं कर सके जो उत्साह हमें पैदा करना है। खास तौर पर मैं यह अनुभव करता हूँ क्योंकि मेरे सामने रोज कई लोग आते हैं वह लोग आते हैं जो कि इस गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी को चलाते हैं, छोटे छोटे मुलाजिम हैं, जिन की अवस्था यह है कि वह सत्तर सत्तर और सौ सौ रुपये में गुजारा करने पर मजबूर हैं। वह मेरे पास आते हैं और जब मैं उन के सामने बजट के पोथेखोल कर दिखाता हूँ कि हमारे पास फायनेंस (finance) की बड़ी दिक्कत है, हमारे पास धन नहीं है, आप लोग चाहते हैं कि हमारी तरक्की हो, आप चाहते हैं कि आप को हाउस रेंट अलाउन्स (house-rent allowance) मिले, आप चाहते हैं कि आप को दूसरी तरफ के अलाउन्स मिलें, आप चाहते हैं कि आप को मंहगाई भत्ता मिले, लेकिन हमारे पास धन नहीं है, कहां से पैसा आवेगा, तो उन को यह बात अपीज नहीं करती। जिस वक्त वह यह देखते हैं कि उन के दड़े बड़े अन्तर है जिन को बड़ी बड़ी तनखाह मिलती है, तो उन की वह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि उन को सौ रुपये लेने पर क्यों मजबूर किया

[श्री ए० एन० बिपालकार]

जाता है। जब उसी मशीनरी का एक दूसरा पुर्जा उसी मशीनरी को चलाने वाले को उसी तरह देशभक्ति के नाम पर अपील करते हैं और देश को आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं तो देश के नाम पर अपील करते हैं कि लोग काम करें और ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन (production) करें, तो उन को यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि यह हमारी तनख्वाह में अन्तर कैसा है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न है जिस को हमें सोचना चाहिये। यह एक बुनियादी सवाल है जिस पर हम को विचार करना है कि आया हम किस तरीके से चलें कि जिन लोगों के जरिये हम अपने देश की तरक्की करना चाहते हैं उन के लिये हम किस तरह से कोई रास्ता निकाल सकते हैं कि जिस से वह भी सुखी रहें और हम अपने देश की इकनामी (economy) को भी आगे ले जा सकें।

मैं समझता हूँ कि पहली बात जो हमको करनी चाहिये वह यह है कि हम कोई कमीशन कायम करें या इस के लिये कोई दूसरी तजवीज निकालें कि जो अन्तर इस वक्त तनख्वाहों का, अदना और बड़ी तनख्वाहों का अन्तर है, वह दूर हो। अगर हम उस को दूर नहीं करते तो लोगों के अन्दर वह विश्वास और वह भरोसा पैदा नहीं कर सकते कि जिसके जरिये हमें तरक्की करनी है, जो हमारी स्कीम में है उन को चलाना है। इसलिये पहली बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि हम अपने बजट को इस तरह का बनावें जिस से यह अन्तर दूर हो। अभी तक हमारे देश में अंग्रेजों के जमाने में हम कहा करते थे कि वह ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन टाप हैवी (top heavy) है, उस के ऊपर बहुत ज्यादा बोझ है, तमाम उस की मशीनरी

पर। अभी हम तमाम बजट के फिगर्स को निकाले तो दिखाई देगा कि वह काफी टाप हैवी है, हमारा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बहुत खर्चीला है।

इसी के साथ साथ मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि हमारे ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के जो डिपार्टमेंट्स (Departments) हैं, उन में कोआर्डिनेशन (co-ordination) नहीं है। हमारे डिपार्टमेंट्स में कोआर्डिनेशन चाहिये। उस के अन्दर सब से बड़ी बात जो हम देखते हैं वह यह है कि छटनी होती है, क्योंकि खर्चा बढ़ता है और उस खर्चा में कमी करते हैं इसलिये कुछ लोगों को वहाँ से अलग करते हैं। हमारे यहाँ बहुत से आदमी ऐसे हैं जो टैम्पोरेरी (temporary) हैं, दस दस और पंद्रह साल से काम कर रहे हैं, लेकिन अब भी उन को टैम्पोरेरी कहते हैं और उन को अलग कर देते हैं। तो एक तरफ तो उन आदमियों को जवाब दे देते हैं और दूसरी तरफ नयी भरती करते हैं। इस को भी देखना चाहिये। इन तमाम चीजों को हम कोआर्डिनेट कर सकते हैं। अगर एक आदमी की एक डिपार्टमेंट में जरूरत नहीं है तो क्यों नहीं दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट में जहाँ नयी भरती हो रही है उस को भेजा जाय और वहाँ वह काम करे। मैं तो यह भी जरूरी नहीं समझता कि हमारे दफ्तरों में सल्फीड् ही (clerks) काम करें। वे फ़िल्ड्स (fields) में क्यों नहीं जा सकते, अगर वहाँ दफ्तरों में उन की जरूरत नहीं है तो कुछ को फ़िल्ड्स में भेजा जा सकता है। हमारे कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट (community projects) हैं या देहातों में काम है, या दूसरे फ़िल्ड्स में काम है, उन के अन्दर वह काम कर सकते हैं। तो इस ह्यूमन लेबर (human labour) को, इंसानी मेहनत को, इस तरह

से प्लान (plan) करें और इस तरह से इस्तेमाल करें कि जिस से वह जाया न हो।

हमारी इकानमी इस वक्त मिक्सड इकानामी (mixed economy) है और मिक्सड इकानामी के अन्दर यह बात ठीक है कि हम बहुत तेजी से नहीं जा सकते। हम को तमाम तबकों को अपने साथ लेना पड़ता है जो कि इक्तसादी कामों के अन्दर और इक्तसादी ऐक्टिविटी में हिस्सा लेना चाहते हैं। लेकिन इस वक्त जो हमारी सब से बड़ी समस्या है वह आर्थिक समस्या है। उस के लिये हमें तमाम ध्यान देना चाहिये कि धन की कमी को कैसे पूरा करें। एक तरफ तो मैं ने कहा कि खर्च को कम करें, मगर दूसरी तरफ इस वक्त जो हमारा मौजूदा बजट है उस में मुझे ऐसा दिखाई नहीं देता कि उस से बचत को ऐन्कुरेजमेंट (encouragement) मिलता हो। गो मैं जानता हूँ कि हम लोग कोशिश करते हैं और बजट के अन्दर इस बात के लिये ध्यान रखा गया है कि सेविंग हो, इस के लिये कोशिश की जाय लेकिन सेविंग के अन्दर भी हम को मार्ग प्रदर्शन करना पड़ेगा। जो लोग ऊपर हैं, जो ज्यादा आमदनी वाले हैं, उन को मार्ग प्रदर्शन करना पड़ेगा। इस के लिये जो टैक्सेशन (taxation) की पालिसी है उस को इस तरीके से बनाना पड़ेगा और खर्च की पालिसी को इस तरीके से बनाना पड़ेगा कि जो लोग ज्यादा खर्च करने वाले हैं वह सेविंग करें, खर्च में कमी करें और बचत करें। क्योंकि वह बचत नहीं करते तो वह एक स्टैंडर्ड पेश करते हैं, वह खर्च में स्टैंडर्ड कायम करते हैं और उसका नतीजा यह होता है कि जो लोम गरीब हैं वे भी उसी स्टैंडर्ड पर आना चाहते हैं, उसी स्टैंडर्ड पर खर्च करना चाहते हैं। तो वालंटरी सेविंग (voluntary saving) जिस के लिये हम जनता से अपील करते हैं उस के लिये हमें खास

तौर पर कोशिश करनी पड़ेगी कि जो ज्यादा धन वाले हैं, ज्यादा आमदनी वाले हैं, वे सेविंग ज्यादा करें। उन को बचत की तरफ ज्यादा प्रवृत्ति हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस के लिये हमें पर्याप्त कोशिश करनी है।

एक बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह विदेशी टैक्नीशियन्स (technicians) के सम्बन्ध में है। मैं यह मानता हूँ और मैं उन लोगों के साथ सहमत नहीं हूँ कि जो बिना सोचे समझे विदेशी टैक्नीशियन्स को मंगाने पर ऐतराज करते हैं। जो भी विदेशी टैक्नीशियन्स हम कहीं पर लगाते हैं उन पर ऐतराज करते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि बहुत से कम्युनिस्ट भाई इस बात पर सवाल करते हैं और ऐतराज करते हैं। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ और वह रुस की और दूसरे देशों की हिस्ट्री को देखें तो उन को मालूम होगा कि रुस के अन्दर सैकड़ों की तादाद में विदेशी कम्पनियां गई, विदेशी गये। रुस के अन्दर जो पहला फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five year plan) था उस का तो तकरीबन् जो दारोमदार था और इस को कामयाबी का राज था, वह तमाम अमेरिकन टैक्नीशियन्स के सिर पर था। तो इस लिये मैं इस बात के तो विरुद्ध नहीं हूँ, इस बात के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ कि विदेशी टैक्नीशियन्स बुलें जायें। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग इस तरह डिस्क्रिमिनेशन (discrimination) से काम लें, हम सोच समझ कर काम लें। अभी कुछ दिन हुए भाखड़ा और नागल के सम्बन्ध में कुछ मुलाजमतें निकली थी और कुछ इंजीनियर मांगे गये थे। उन इंजीनियरों के सम्बन्ध में जिस योग्यताओं के इंजीनियर मांगे गये थे, उस के लिये पचास या साठ दरखास्तें आईं। जो कमीशन इन इंजीनियरों के इम्तहान के लिये बैठा था उस में भाखड़ा और नागल के एक अमेरिकन टैक्नीशियन भी थे। खैर, अमेरिकन टैक्नीशियन रहें, मुझे ऐतराज नहीं

## [श्री ए० एन० बिद्यालेकार]

लेकिन वह ६० या ७० आदमी जो कि अपने आपको क्वालीफाइड समझते थे, जो उन क्वालीफिकेशन को और शर्तों को पूरा करते थे और क्वालीफिकेशन को देख कर इंटरव्यू के लिये बुलाया, उन के अन्दर ऐसी मिसालें हैं कि कई इंजीनियर आप के गवर्नमेंट के किसी डिपार्टमेंट के अन्दर ५०० या ६०० रुपये तनखाह लेते थे। तो उन से कहा गया, बाकी तमाम बातें ठीक निकलने के बाद, कि आया तुम इस बात के लिये तैयार हो, कि तुम को ६०० या ७०० रुपये दिये जायें और तुम भाखड़ा नांगल में जाने को तैयार हो या नहीं। उन को १०० रुपये ज्यादा आकर किये गये। यह कहा कि वहां खर्चा बहुत है, कई चीजों के बारे में, यहां कई बच्चे पढ़ते हैं उनका सवाल है बगैरह बगैरह। तो उससे कहा गया तुम इतने ही रुपये पर जाने को तैयार हो या नहीं। तो इस तरह से कई लोगों से दूसरे सवाल करने के बाद यह कहा गया, मगर उन्होंने इन्कार किया कि हम इतनी कम तनखाह में जाने को तैयार नहीं हैं। इस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि यह कह दिया गया कि चूंकि हिन्दुस्तानी टेकनीशियन्स, इंजीनियर, नहीं हैं इसलिये हम को बाहर से बुलाना पड़ता है और उस जगह पर १४०० रुपये का एक अमेरिकन या कोई विदेशी, में नहीं कह सकता कि अमेरिकन था या कौन, लेकिन एक विदेशी इंजीनियर उस जगह पर अप्वाइंट किया गया। अगर हिन्दुस्तानी इंजीनियर को आप ७०० या ८०० पर नहीं ले सकते, जो क्वालीफाइड हैं, यह महज अगर १०० रुपये ज्यादा पर जाने को ऐतराज करता है, तो उस के लिये यह कह कर कि यहां हिन्दुस्तानी क्वालीफाइड इंजीनियर नहीं हैं और विदेशी इंजीनियर को आप १४०० रुपये तनखाह देने को तैयार हैं, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि यह किस तरह

हक बजानिब है और किस तरह से यह चीज उचित हो सकती है। मैं नहीं कहता कि इस सम्बन्ध में कोई जान बूझ कर ऐसा किया गया। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इन चीजों में हमें अहतियात बरतनी चाहिये। आज हम इस मामले में वह अहतियात नहीं बरत रहे हैं जो कि हमें बरतनी चाहिये।

मैं जानता हूं कि कुछ लोग ऐसे भी आ गये हैं भाखड़ा और नांगल और दूसरे प्रोजेक्ट्स में जो कि मामूली काम जानते हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर जैसे वेल्डर्स (welders) हैं, तो वेल्डर्स की क्या जरूरत है, मामूली कारखाने में वेल्डर्स काम किया करते हैं, उसी तरह स्टोर कीपर्स हैं जो स्टोर कीपरी का काम करते आये हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि इन प्रोजेक्ट्स के लिये तो गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी यही है कि सिर्फ ऐसे टेकनीशियन्स लिये जायें जो बिल्कुल जरूरी हों और जिनके बगैर काम न चल सकता हो, केवल ऐसे ही आवश्यक टेकनीशियन्स मंगायें जायें, जो गवर्नमेंट की इस सम्बन्ध में डिक्लेयर्ड पालिसी (declared policy) है, लेकिन मैं आप के सामने यह अब करना चाहता हूं कि उस पर पूरी तरह अमल नहीं हो रहा है और मैं चाहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट की उस पालिसी पर पूरी तरह से अमल होना चाहिये।

मैं केवल एक आध बात और कह कर समाप्त किये देता हूं। एक चीज जो मैं कहना चाहता था वह यह है कि जो बजट पेश किया गया है उस के अन्दर इस बात का जिक्र नहीं है कि जो डिस्प्लेस्ड पर्सन्स (displaced persons) हैं उन को मुआविजा देने की बात कही गयी थी, उस बजट में इसका जिक्र नहीं है। मैं समझता हूं कि डिस्प्लेस्ड पर्सन्स को मुआविजा देने की बात एक ऐसी चीज हो गयी है की अब उस से

पीछे नहीं हटा जा सकता, गवर्नमेंट उस के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति का ऐलान कर चुकी है, और मैं समझता हूँ कि उस के ऊपर हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर को फिर से विचार करना चाहिये और उसके विषय में उन्हें कोई न कोई रास्ता अवश्य निकालना चाहिये ताकि जो डिस्प्लेस्ड पर्सनल्स हैं उनको मुआविजा दिया जा सके। इस के अतिरिक्त डिस्प्लेस्ड पर्सनल्स के पास जो पाकिस्तानी सिक्वोरटीज हैं और आज हकीकत यह है कि उन का पाकिस्तानी सिक्वोरटीज के ऊपर से भरोसा उठ चुका है, मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर इस सम्बन्ध में विचार कर रहे हैं, तो भी मैं आज उनकी खास तौर से इस विषय की तरफ तबज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब कि पाकिस्तानी सिक्वोरटीज पर से उन का भरोसा उठ चुका है और वह जब तक उन सिक्वोरटीज को बेच नहीं सकते तब तक उन को इस बात की रियायत देनी चाहिये कि वह उन को इंडियन सिक्वोरटीज के साथ बदल सकें, बदलने के लिये तो उन्हें रियायत देनी ही चाहिये और मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरफ खास विचार किया जाय, बस इतना कह कर अपना कथन समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री राघुलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आप का अत्यन्त आभारी हूँ कि आप ने मुझे आज इस बजट के ऊपर बोलने का अवसर दिया और विशेषकर इसलिये कि मध्य भारत को आज पहली दफा इस अधिवेशन में अपनी राय रखने का अवसर प्राप्त हुआ है।

जहाँ तक बजट का सम्बन्ध है, मैं वित्त मंत्री जी को उसको प्रस्तुत करने पर अभिनन्दन करता हूँ और बजट में जो लक्ष्य उन्होंने अपने सामने रखे हैं, उन का भी स्वागत करता हूँ। स्वागत इसलिये कि जिस सड़क पर हम चल रहे हैं और जो पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत

हम ने अपने लक्ष्य और उद्देश्य निर्धारित किये हैं और जिस रास्ते पर चल कर पांच वर्ष के भीतर हमें उस मंजिल तक पहुँचना है, हम देखते हैं कि उन लक्ष्यों और उद्देश्यों को अपने सामने रखते हुए ठीक ढंग से उस रास्ते पर हम अपनी गाड़ी को लिये जा रहे हैं और यह बड़े सन्तोष का विषय है कि उस गाड़ी में और अधिक वजन डालने का उन्होंने प्रयत्न नहीं किया है और ज्यादा भार न डालते हुए उस गाड़ी की उसी रफ्तार से आगे बढ़ाते हुए लिए चले जा रहे हैं और यह निश्चित है कि जो लक्ष्य हम ने इन पांच वर्षों में अपने लिए रक्खा है, उस तक हम अवश्य पहुँचेंगे।

वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने अपने भाषण में देश की आर्थिक दशा का चित्र खींचा है और यह प्रसन्नता की बात है कि कीमतें कम हुई हैं। जहाँ तक उत्पादन का सवाल है कई चीजों का हमारे देश में उत्पादन भी बढ़ा है। खाद्य की समस्या का जहाँ तक सम्बन्ध है यद्यपि यह कहा गया है कि खाद्य की स्थिति अभी अच्छी है लेकिन हमें इसी से संतोष नहीं कर लेना चाहिये। अभी भी हमारे देश में पंचवर्षीय योजना के जमाने में इधर पिछले दो वर्षों में भारत को जितना अनाज बाहर के देशों से मंगाना पड़ा उतना अनाज कभी हमारे देश में नहीं आया। श्रीमान्, आप को विदित ही है कि ४० करोड़ रुपया प्रति वर्ष हम लेम केवल अनाज होने वाले जहाँजों के किराये पर खर्च करते हैं और यह स्वयं इतनी बड़ी रकम है कि जब तक हम खेती में स्वावलम्बी नहीं होंगे और अनाज की अपनी आवश्यकता अपने देश से पूरी नहीं कर पायेंगे तब तक यह लम्बी रकम हमें किराये के नाम पर खर्च करनी है। इस के अतिरिक्त लगभग डेढ़ अरब रुपये का माल हमें बाहर से मंगाना पड़ता है और यदि हमें खेती और कृषाक के बारे में स्वावलम्बी होना है तो हमें कुछ

## [श्री राधेलाल व्यास]

ऐसे तरीके करने चाहियें जैसे कि अभी एक साहब ने बतलाया कि हम क्यों न जापानी तरीके अपनावें और प्रचार करें, परन्तु मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने इस वर्ष और गत वर्ष भी कृषि पंडित कायम किये और जिन्होंने अधिक अन्न उपजाया, उन को आपने इनाम भी दिये और उसका आप ने खूब प्रचार भी किया और अखबारों में प्रचार किया कि अमुक किसान ने एक एकड़ में इतना गेहूँ बोया, इतना उस ने चावल आदि बोया और इतनी अधिक पैदावार हुई, मैं यह नहीं समझ सका कि यदि वाकई मैं इतना अनाज पैदा हुआ और इतनी पैदावार उन्होंने की तो क्यों नहीं इस तरीके को सारे देश के सामने रक्खा जाता। उस के बजाय थोड़ी सी भी अगर किसानों ने अनाज के उत्पादन में वृद्धि की, तो यह देश बहुत जल्द ही एक आध वर्ष में ही पूर्ण स्वावलम्बी बन सकता है और मेरा तो अनुमान है कि यह चालीस करोड़ रुपये जो जहाजों के किराये में खर्च किया जाता है यदि वह किसानों को दिया जाय और वह भी मुफ्त में नहीं, बल्कि कर्ज के रूप में बगैर व्याज के दिया जाय तो मैं निश्चयपूर्वक कह सकता हूँ कि हमारे देश के किसान एक वर्ष ही में इतना अनाज पैदा कर सकते हैं कि जितनी देश को जरूरत है उतना अनाज वह उगा कर हम को दे सकते हैं और यह हमारा अपना पिछला अनुभव भी है कि सरकार द्वारा जिन जिन वस्तुओं पर नियंत्रण ढीला किया गया है, उन का उत्पादन निश्चित तौर पर बढ़ा है और मैं समझता हूँ कि खाद्य के मामले में भी जब तक यह नियंत्रण रहेंगे, तब तक हम स्वावलम्बी नहीं हो सकते इसलिये खाद्य के नियंत्रण को कुछ ढीला करने की जरूरत है। हां आप उन स्थानों पर जहां अनाज की कमी है जैसे दक्षिण में मद्रास, बम्बेई, त्रावनकोर, कोचीन आदि जहां पर दो तिहाई अनाज

खर्च करना पड़ जाता है, वहां आप नियंत्रण रखें तो समझ में आ सकता है, बंगाल और इन प्रदेशों में तो नियंत्रण ठीक हो सकता है और समझ में आने वाली चीज है लेकिन देश के बाकी दूसरे हिस्सों में तो नियंत्रण को ढीला करने की जरूरत है, अगर नियंत्रण ढीला होगा तो किसान को अनाज उपजाने की सुविधा होगी और बाजार में उत्पादन के अनुसार और मांग के अनुसार उसको अपने अनाज की कीमत मिलेगी और इस तरह निश्चित समय पर उस को बीज भी मिल सकेगा और इस तरह वह अपना उत्पादन बढ़ा सकेगा तो ऐसी स्थिति में नियंत्रण को और अधिक ढीला करने की जरूरत है। यह भी सही है कि हमारे देश में दूसरी वस्तुओं का भी उत्पादन बढ़ा है, जैसे रुई, चीनी, सीमेंट, स्टील, कागज, कार्टिक सोडा, प्लाईवुड और जूट इत्यादि, इन वस्तुओं का उत्पादन बढ़ा है लेकिन हमें केवल इतने मात्र से संतोष नहीं कर लेना है। मैंने पिछले अधिवेशन में बतलाया था कि हमारे देश में करोड़ों रुपये की ऐसी मशीनरी है कि जो बिल्कुल बेकार पड़ी हुई है, वर्षों से आइडिल (idle) पड़ी है और अगर आप उस के आंकड़े देखें तो मालूम होगा कि उस मशीनरी में करोड़ों रुपये की पूंजी लगी हुई है। उन का आज देश में कोई उपयोग नहीं हो रहा है, उन को काम में लाना चाहिये। दूसरे हम उत्पादन को बढ़ाने के हेतु प्रयत्न करें और आप देखते हैं कि इधर कपड़ा हम ने देश में काफी पैदा भी किया है और कर रहे हैं, लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि आज बाजार में ऐसा कपड़ा आ रहा है जो देखने में बड़ा सुन्दर रेशम सा मालूम होता है लेकिन एक दूका अगर धोबी के वहां से वह धुलवा लिया जाय तो वह बेकार हो जाता है। इसलिये आज कपड़े की क्वालिटी पर कंट्रोल होने की जरूरत है। ऐसा कपड़ा जो जल्दी

नष्ट हो जाने वाला और फटने वाला है वह देश की गरीबी को बढ़ाने में मदद देगा, उस की ओर हमें ध्यान देने की जरूरत है और अगर शासन ने इस ओर ध्यान दिया तो देश का करौड़ों रुपया जो बेकार नष्ट होता है, वह बच जायगा और इस तरह काफी बचत होगा और उस से हमारी आर्थिक दशा के सधरने में काफी मदद मिलेगी और देश की सम्पत्ति काफी बच जायगी।

यह भी खुशी की बात है कि सरकार का ध्यान काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज (Cottage industries) की ओर गया है और उस ने अभी उसी हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री (Handloom Industry) को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए कुछ सैस (cess) भी लगाने की व्यवस्था की है और धोती पर कुछ प्रतिबंध लगाये हैं। हमारे लॉगटर्म प्लान (longterm plan) का उद्देश्य यह है कि इस देश में हम को काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ाना है, छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों को आगे उन्नति के पथ पर बढ़ाना है और पनपाना है। अगर यह हमारा उद्देश्य है तो केवल एक धोती को लेकर ही यह समस्या हल नहीं होती। हमारे देश में बहुत से ऐसे उद्योग धंधे हैं जिन को बढ़ावा देना चाहिये जैसे रंगाई का काम है, आज वह बिल्कुल प्रायः नष्ट हो रहा है, उस को प्रोत्साहन देना है। इसी प्रकार छपाई का काम है। छपाई का उद्योग भी नष्ट होने जा रहा है। उस ओर हम दृष्टिपात करें, आज अगर मिलों में छपाई या रंगाई का काम बन्द हो जाय तो हजारों लाखों आदमी जो बेकार हो गये हैं उनको फिर धंधा मिल जायगा। इसी प्रकार से और भी अनेक छोटी छोटी वस्तुएँ हैं जो देश में बन सकती हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर महोदय इन तथा ऐसे अन्य छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों की आगे बढ़ाने के लिये प्रयत्नशील रहें और उस के

लिये जो भी संरक्षण हों वह पर्याप्त मात्रा में दें।

एक बात और भी है और वह स्वागत योग्य है कि उन्होंने टैक्सेशन एनक्वायरी कमेटी (Taxation Enquiry Committee) की स्थापना की है। जो उद्योग धंधे बढ़ रहे हैं या ग्रामोद्योग धंधों को जो प्रोत्साहन दिया जा रहा है उस का उद्देश्य केवल एक ही है और वह यह कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को काम मिले। लेकिन साथ ही हमारे देश में जो आबादी बढ़ती जा रही है, लगभग पचास साठ लाख प्रतिवर्ष बढ़ रही है, उस को देखते हुए जितने लोगों को रोजगार मिल रहा है उस से कोई प्रसन्नता की बात नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिये जरूरत है कि जिस वक्त टैक्सेशन एनक्वायरी कमेटी की स्थापना हो उस के साथ ही एक ऐसे कमिशन की स्थापना हो जो देख सके कि बेरोजगारी क्यों बढ़ती जा रही है और उस बेरोजगारी को किस तरीके से कम किया जा सकता है और किस तरीके से रोका जा सकता है। साथ ही टैक्सेशन एनक्वायरी कमेटी का स्कोप (scope) बढ़ा कर दोनों काम उस के सुपूर्व कर दिये जायें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रश्न बहुत आसानी से हल हो जायेगा। अगर इस की तरफ हमारा लक्ष्य नहीं रहा तो दिन प्रति-दिन बेकारी बढ़ेगी और जो कुछ थोड़ी बहुत आशा हम उद्योग धंधों से करते हैं उस से देश का काम होने वाला नहीं है।

डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग (Deficit Financing) के बारे में काफी कहा गया है और हमारा जो डेवलपमेंट प्रोग्राम है उस के लिये यह निश्चित है कि अगर हमें उसे पूरा करना है तो डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग की ओर ही कदम बढ़ाना पड़ेगा। लेकिन जब हम देखते हैं कि कुछ राज्यों की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है तो हमें दुःख

[श्री राधेलाल व्यास

हुए बिना नहीं रहता। मैं ने बार बार यहां पर आप के सामने कहा है कि आप मध्य भारत स्टेट को लोजिये। मैं चम्बल योजना के बारे में कहता हूँ कि वह एक पुरानी योजना है लेकिन उस को नई योजनाओं के साथ में घसीटा जा रहा है। आज मध्य भारत राज्य के बारे में जो ऐलान हुआ है उस में यह अवसर रक्षी गई है लेकिन पहले तीन वर्षों में इसे नहीं लिया जायेगा, बल्कि पिछले तीन वर्षों में लिया जायगा। पिछले कई वर्षों से इस पर काम हो रहा है और करीब सवा करोड़ रुपया खर्च भी हो चुका है। अगर केन्द्रीय शासन उस को नहीं लेना चाहता, और वह खर्च नहीं करना चाहता तो क्या वह रुपया बेकार जाने वाला है? आप का डेफिसिट फाइनेन्स है तो क्या आप दो करोड़ रुपया इस पिछड़ी रियासत को नहीं दे सकते जिस की जनता का विकास इस योजना पर निर्भर है? इस पर जो भी व्यय होगा वह केपिटल एक्सपेंडिचर (Capital Expenditure) होगा, वह कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं है जो नुकसान करने वाली है, वह तो पैदा कर के देने वाली है। मेरा अब भी ख्याल है कि वित्त मंत्री जी कुछ न कुछ रकम चम्बल योजना के लिये अवश्य दें। मध्य भारत सरकार ने तो लगभग ७८ लाख रुपया अपने दूसरे खर्चों से बचा कर इस योजना में लगाया है, और मध्य भारत राज्य तुल्य हुआ है कि इस योजना को अगले साल तक स्थगित न रखते हुए इसी साल में प्रारम्भ कर दें। तो इस राज्य की जनता की ओर, जिस में उत्साह है, जो आगे बढ़ना चाहती है, केन्द्रीय शासन को अवश्य ध्यान होना चाहिये और उस की मदद करनी चाहिये। वह एक ही योजना ऐसी है जो कि अन्डर कन्ट्रोलन थी और नहीं ली गई थी और जिस को अगर पंच वर्षीय योजना में रखा भी गया है तो चूँकि कोसी

रिहेंद्र आदि कि जो स्कीम है उस के आने की वजह से साथ में आ गई है। इसलिये इस और तो हमारे शासन का ध्यान जाना ही चाहिये।

एक बात में और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि एक बात के बारे में हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने कोई भी जानकारी नहीं दी है। उन्होंने खुद बतलाया है कि पंच वर्षीय योजना की सफलता के लिए केवल दो बातें आवश्यक हैं एक तो प्रशासन अर्थात् जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है वह एफिसिएन्ट (efficient) हो और आर्नेस्ट (honest) हो और दूसरी यह कि पब्लिक कोऑपरेशन (Public Cooperation) हो। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आर्नेस्ट और एफिसिएन्ट ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बनाने के लिये उन्होंने कौन सा प्रयत्न किया? क्योंकि पंच वर्षीय योजना की सफलता केवल इस बात पर निर्भर है इस काम की ओर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है और न कोई कदम बढ़ाये गये हैं। श्रीमान मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने कुछ बड़े जिम्मेदार अफसरों से पूछा कि आप लोगों में इतनी इनएफिसिएन्सी (inefficiency) क्यों है? उन का कहना है कि जो पुरानी प्रथा थी यानी जो क्लेरिकल स्टाफ (clerical staff) होता था उस को पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन की मार्फत भर्ती किया जाता था, आज वह प्रथा छोड़ दी गई है। नतीजा यह है कि काम तो उतना ही है और आदमी दुगने कर दिये गये हैं तब भी चूँकि वह निपुण नहीं हैं इसलिये उतना काम नहीं कर सकते हैं। मैं शासन से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस ओर देखें। जिम्मेदार अफसरों ने मुझे से कहा है कि यदि आषा भी स्टफ एफिसिएन्ट मिल जाय तो निश्चित रूप से वह ज्यादा काम कर सकते हैं। पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन की मार्फत ही भरती होनी चाहिये। डाइरेक्ट भरती बन्द हो जाने की जरूरत है।

इस के पश्चात् में कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री २२५० रुपये तनखाह लेते हैं; हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी, जो बड़े बड़े ओहदों पर रह चुके हैं वह केवल २२५० रुपये तनखाह लेते हैं तो हमारे सिविलियन अफसर आज तीन चार हजार रुपये तनखाह लें वह दुर्भाग्य की बात है। जिस तरह से हम एकानमी मेजर्स (economy measures) लेते हैं, हमारे मिनिस्टर स्वेच्छा से इस में कुछ कटौती करते हैं, हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने स्वेच्छा से अपनी तनखाह में कटौती की है, हम ने कानून से नहीं किया है, तो क्या अब सनय नहीं आ गया है कि हम सिविलियन्स से भी अपील करें कि वह भी स्वेच्छा से कुछ कटौती करें? अभी अभी राजप्रमुखों की एक कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी जिस में उन से अपील की गई थी कि वह भी अपनी प्रीवी पर्स (privy purse) वगैरह को कम करें तो इस देश के लिये जरूरी है कि सब लोग देश के साथ में रहें और जो बड़ी बड़ी तनखाह वाले कर्मचारी हैं जो बड़े योग्य और अनुभवी तो हैं ही लेकिन साथ में उन्हें यह देखना चाहिये कि उन को दूसरे लोगों के साथ में रहना है। दूसरे लोगों की आमदनी के साथ उन को अपनी आमदनी रखनी चाहिये। तो उन से भी सरकार अपील करे कि वह भी अपनी काफी तनखाह कम करें और देश के सामने नमूना पेश करें। यह कहा जा सकता है कि अगर उन की तनखाह कम भी कर दी जाय तो बड़ी तनखाह वाले इतने थोड़े लोग हैं कि उन से कोई खास बचत हो ने वाली नहीं है। लेकिन मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि चाहे जितनी कम बचत हो, लेकिन आज से दो साल पहले जिस प्रकार से पांच और दस रुपये किसी किसान ने इस बजट में भेजा था, जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री ने उस समय बतलाया था कि वह हमारे सामने एक मिसाल थी, इसलिये जो बड़े बड़े कर्मचारी हैं वह चाहे

कितने ही कम हों, लेकिन अपनी आमदनी कम कर के देश के सामने वह बड़ी अच्छी मिसाल रखेंगे कि देश के लिये हर एक को त्याग करने की जरूरत है। अगर आप की इजाजत हो तो एक मिनट में मैं सिर्फ एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि शिक्षा के मामले में कोई खास प्रयत्न नहीं किया जा रहा है। शिक्षा पर तो सारे देश की उन्नति का दारोमदार है। श्रीमान्, मध्य भारत जैसे राज्य में एक युनिवर्सिटी की बहुत जरूरत है। और इल्हाक से वहाँ के शासन ने पहले एक युनिवर्सिटी बिल (University Bill) पास भी किया था, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से केन्द्रीय सरकार रास्ते में आई और उस ने कह दिया कि इस समस्या को भी राजधानी की समस्या के साथ ही हल होना चाहिये। यह सन् १९५० ई० की बात है। पिछली मर्तबा हमारे यहाँ एक युनिवर्सिटी बिल आया था। अब भी केन्द्र की समझ में यह नहीं आया कि क्यों इस मामले में जल्दी की जा रही है। मैं केन्द्र से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि पार्ट बी० स्टेट्स में और पार्ट ए० स्टेट्स में एक मध्य भारत राज्य ही ऐसा है जिस की आबादी ८० लाख है और जिस का क्षेत्रफल करीब ४७ हजार वर्ग मील है और जिस में युनिवर्सिटी नहीं है। अंगरेजों के जमाने में उज्जैन में युनिवर्सिटी बनने वाली थी लेकिन अंगरेजों की वजह से नहीं बन सकी। स्वतंत्रता के बाद फिर ग्वालियर के लोकप्रिय शासन के काल में बनने वाली थी जिस के लिये महाराजा सिधिया ने एक करोड़ रुपये मंजूर किया था, लेकिन मध्य भारत राज्य के बन जाने से वह चीज न हो सकी। और अभी भी केन्द्र की तरफ से उस पर विचार हो रहा है। मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस पर सहानुभूति पूर्वक विचार करें और वहाँ जल्द से जल्द युनिवर्सिटी बनने दें।

[श्री राधेलाल व्यास]

इस समय मध्य भारत ने बेसिक एजुकेशन (basic education) की पालिसी को मंजूर कर लिया है। वहां ६०० ट्रेन्ड टीचर्स प्रति वर्ष निकलते हैं। कई ट्रेनिंग कालेजिज हैं। इस के अलावा वहां ६० अंडर ग्रेजुएट्स ट्रेन्ड निकलते हैं और ७५ ग्रेजुएट्स निकलते हैं। तो जो राज्य इतनी तरक्की कर रहा है वहां यह काम होना चाहिये। और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री जी इस ओर ध्यान देंगे और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी इस ओर ध्यान देंगे और इस युनिवर्सिटी के बनने में जो रुकावट आ रही है उस को जल्द दूर करेंगे। राजप्रमुख के पास जो १ करोड़ ६० लाख रुपया गंगाजली फंड का है वह निश्चित रूप से इस के लिये निकाला जा सकता है। और अगर केन्द्रीय गवर्नमेंट चाहती है की वह युनिवर्सिटी काम हो तो राजप्रमुख को प्रसन्नता ही होगी कि वह इस के लिये उस फंड सं रुपया दें।

अंत में मैं सभापति जी आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे यहां पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने का अवसर दिया।

Shri G. D. Somani (Nagaur-Pali): I have no intention of giving a certificate, about which my hon. friend Dr. Krishnaswami was talking some time ago, since anything like a certificate being given by any Member of the business community is likely to be misunderstood. But the fact remains that impartial observers both here and abroad have testified to the soundness and stability of our finances, which have successfully withstood severe stresses and strains of the changing economic factors, both national and international, and for this the fullest possible credit is due to the wise handling of the situation by our present Finance Minister.

There have been criticisms on both sides. Some have described the Budget as pro-big business, as something which has brought about a boom in the stock exchange and as something which has brought about satisfaction in the business circles. The fact is that if there has been any satisfaction

it has been due purely to negative features of the budget and not because any positive relief in any direction has been given to business or industry. It is true, that there were certain fears in the minds of the business community that in view of the expanding and growing needs of the Centre, the Finance Minister might resort to certain further additional taxation and since those fears were not realised, there has been some slight recovery in certain stock exchanges, but that does not in the least mean that whatever relief and legitimate relief was due to the business and industrial community has received any adequate response from the Finance Minister.

We have got to face the fact that we are at present engaged in the process of development. People who talk about U.K. and U.S.A. conveniently forget that these are the most highly industrialised countries in the world and our taxation system, so long as we are engaged in expanding and building our economy must be adjusted and linked with the requirements of the expanding economy and should not be compared with the high taxation levels that may be prevalent in U.K. and U.S.A.

Friends have talked about unemployment. But whether the raising of the direct taxation levels will in any way mitigate unemployment is a question that should be considered. In my view the remedy is just the opposite. If the Finance Minister will be bold enough today to give substantial relief in direct taxation and give substantial incentive, then I think that might lead to an acceleration in the pace of development and expansion of production which alone will lead to the reduction of unemployment. So, it has to be considered whether it is relief in taxation which will lead to a reduction of unemployment or whether it is the raising of the taxation to the utmost levels which will dry up the resources and channels of capital formation and thereby not only retard all further development but might also throw the functioning of present industries out of gear. So, my submission is that when the Taxation Enquiry Committee has been appointed, it is only logical to expect that no substantial changes in the taxation structure will be made until the findings of that Expert Committee are known, until we know the incidence of taxation in the various sectors of our economy.

Now, coming to the question of deficit financing, I am afraid that my esteemed friend, Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand's attitude was somewhat different from the line of opinion in the business and industrial community.

Not that we advocate deficit financing for bringing any artificial rise in prices, but the fact is that those who have criticised deficit financing have not suggested any other alternative, or made any other constructive suggestion which will bring about necessary resources for the execution of our development plans. After all, the fact has got to be faced that whatever programme we have set out in the National Plan should go on unimpeded by any financial considerations. An assurance has been given by the Finance Minister that so far as financial resources are concerned, he will ensure that the Five Year Plan will not in any way be retarded. In this connection I can only say that deficit financing is one thing so far as the revenue budget is concerned, so far as normal expenses and expenditure are concerned. Certainly nobody would advocate deficit financing for meeting normal requirements which might be very undesirable. But when it is a question of doing something abnormal, of investing something in productive channels, then certainly some risk has got to be taken and I think the Finance Minister has been fully cautious in taking whatever measures he has, so far.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

We know the measures that the Government took for contracting money supply about the end of 1951 and certain other measures adopted which brought about a slump. Also, from time to time the Finance Minister did not hesitate to mop up the surplus, which as the records would show has been about Rs. 300 crores during the past four or five years. That shows the practical and realistic approach of the Finance Minister. When the circumstances warranted it he did not hesitate to finance capital expenditure by revenue surplus. But when the circumstances have changed and when there are signs of recession, when production has increased, to which there is no corresponding demand, certainly I quite agree with the Finance Minister that there is no undue risk in resorting to deficit financing as has been envisaged in the current budget. Without going much further into all this, I would now like to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to a most disquieting feature of his Budget, and that is the readjustment of excise duties on cloth. I think there has been some serious mistake somewhere in his Department and it is highly essential that the whole matter should be re-examined.

Heavy excise duties are really undesirable, especially on such goods as cloth whose importance for the public is next only to food. We have had a

long history of excise duty in the British period and I am aware of the struggle which the industry had to wage to get those excise duties abolished. It was all right during the inflationary period when these heavy duties were re-imposed upon the industry. But as the Finance Minister has himself admitted, the maintenance of the textile record production which we had last year will depend upon the exports that we are able to make out of our present production. That shows that he is satisfied that the internal demand is unable to cope with the production. Now, so far as textiles are concerned, the Government of India during the last several years either by way of social legislation or by other levies have imposed a heavy burden on the industry. The industry, therefore, has not been able to lower its manufacturing charges to an extent which will promote demand from internal sources.

Apart from the general question, I would like to examine the specific question of re-adjustment of excise duties on the textile industry. Here, for want of time I would not like to quote what the Finance Minister said in Part B of his Budget Speech. There is an impression in the House as well as in the country that this has been a mere readjustment of duties to cope with certain administrative difficulties. But if the position is analysed it will be seen that the position is something very much different than what he has said in his Budget speech.

If I may point out the schedule which was prevalent before the Budget was introduced, it was governed by the notification of the 9th May 1952 under which the fine cloth schedule was divided into two categories. The first category was for the group IX which means the varieties of cloth manufactured out of 40 warps and 40 weft. Under that category grey and bleached had 7 pies per yard and dyed and printed 9 pies per yard, with the proviso that an *ad valorem* duty would be charged, whichever is lower. Either this maximum of 7 pies or 9 pies or 5 per cent. whichever was lower was the schedule that was prevalent before the Budget was introduced.

Now it can be proved that a 7-9 pies maximum was never actually realised. I have got details of various sorts which used to pay from 4½ pies to 7 pies or 8 pies at the maximum, under the schedule. The increase in the excise duties on these categories of fine cloth, which are meant specially for the poorer and middle class sections of the community, is on the average at least 100 per cent. And

[Shri G. D. Somani]

there are sorts like the ones paying 5 pies per yard where the increase has been 200 per cent.

Similarly there were other categories, grey and bleached paying 11 pies per yard, and dyed and printed paying 1 anna per yard. For the entire range of fine cloth the excise duty varied from 7 pies to 1 anna, which was the maximum, but it was 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, according to which, so far as I can calculate, the average could not have been anything more than  $7\frac{1}{2}$  to 8 pies.

Here is a case where a hundred per cent. increase in excise duty has been imposed, and the Finance Minister has certainly said in his speech that the change is made to meet administrative difficulties and does not envisage any alteration in the duties out of this readjustment. May I make an offer to the Finance Minister, that I am prepared to underwrite the proceeds of the excise duty on the revised basis for Rs.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  crores more than what has been realised in the last year? According to my own estimate the increased proceeds will be something between Rs.  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 4 crores, on the schedule that he has imposed.

At a time when a lot of other levies have been imposed it is only fair—when he himself has given the impression in his speech that he does not want any increase or reduction in the duty and that it is only a question of readjustment—it is only fair that this readjustment of duties should be made on the basis of the intentions which he has expressed in his budget speech.

I certainly think that the care and anxiety which he takes in vouchsafing the correctness of his statement should ensure that it should be re-examined whether there has been something drastically wrong in making calculations in his Department. Otherwise this increase of 100 per cent. duty in varieties of cloth which are meant really for the poorer and middle class sections of the community would not have been readjusted in a manner which will mean so much additional burden on the industry. I therefore hope that this aspect of the excise duties on cloth will be properly examined so as to bring it in conformity with his intentions, as have been expressed in the budget speech, and that if any mistake or lapse has occurred somewhere it will be properly rectified.

One word more and I would have done. I was talking of deficit financing. What I say is that the Plan will not fail for want of financial resources, but it may fail for the lack of administrative efficiency and integrity, about

which so many have spoken. I would only make one submission in this connection, and it is this that in spite of all the weaknesses and the drawbacks of the business community there are a good number of businessmen with proved integrity, experience and talent whose services, if invited, can be available in an honorary capacity for supervising the execution of the several development projects that are under execution. We know that the ordinary administrative check up which is going on is not sufficient, and the Finance Minister must take extra care to ensure that so much of huge outlay that is being incurred for the execution of these development projects does not go a waste. In view of our past experience in so many things I think he will devise something whereby in the day-to-day working and administration of the outlay on these huge projects there will be some machinery to check up and to ensure the efficient administration of these projects. I think he can very well utilise the services of certain business people who have got so much of experience, integrity and talent and who may be willing to offer their honorary services to ensure that they offer their quota of co-operation in seeing to the efficient administration of these projects.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** At the very outset I like to convey my sincere thanks and gratitude to the hon. the Minister of Finance for one crore of rupees that he has allocated in this budget for the uplift of the backward classes. As a Member of the scheduled castes I will directly fail in my duty if I do not say even a single word of appreciation for what he has done to us. But while conveying our sincere thanks and gratitude to him I cannot but mention the callousness, apathy and light-heartedness with which our Home Ministry is tackling the problem of the scheduled castes and other backward classes.

Only the other day the Commission for the Backward Classes was appointed. Although a man of the stature of Kaka Kalelkar, who commands the confidence of the people, was appointed as the Chairman, yet the composition of this Commission as a whole was not very satisfactory. It is our considered opinion that in selecting the members the Government gave more consideration for bestowing patronage to some of the people than for other considerations.

Coming to the budget I must repeat what has been said by a large number of Members. The budget for the year

1953-54 expresses the firm determination of our Government to take up the execution of the Five Year Plan and to complete it within the specified time. The budget also reflects the confidence which the Finance Minister has in himself as well as in the fiscal, monetary and economic policies that he has enunciated and proposes to follow for this country.

As has been said by the Finance Minister himself, this budget has been prepared against the background of the Five Year Plan. The implementation of the Five Year Plan is a stepping stone towards the establishment of a welfare State in this country. The building up of a welfare State is no doubt a very difficult and tough job. This difficulty becomes more pronounced especially in a democratic country like India. There are no concentration camps in this country to enforce the work which Government likes to be done. There is no tyrannical government in this country which can exact labour service and implicit obedience from the people. There is no totalitarian government in this country which can stifle and silence the voice of the opposition as is done in some other parts of the world. We are a democratic country. We are a democratic people having full faith in the democratic form of government. We believe in the leadership that convinces and carries the people with it and does not force upon the people something by mere threats of concentration camps and physical liquidation. But in spite of these handicaps which every democratic State has to suffer I am happy to say that we have already turned the corner. Many of our schemes are being completed one by one. Many of our newly built factories have begun their production. The Mayurakshi project in West Bengal, the Lower Bhavani project, the Tungabhadra scheme and the large number of hydro-electric schemes and projects in Bundelkhand and other areas of U.P. are nearing completion or have already been completed. The much maligned and much criticised D.V.C. is going ahead of its schedule and a substantial portion of its work, the Tilaya Dam and the Bokaro Thermal Station, has already been completed. It is sad to think now a substantial part of our vocal intelligentsia are suffering today from mental and spiritual serfdom. These intellectuals shout from house-tops about schemes of far insignificant and minor character that are being completed in some other parts of the world; but they have not got a single word of appreciation to say for the big schemes like the Tungabhadra scheme, the Mayurakshi project, the Bokaro Thermal Station, the Tilaya Dam and others

that are being completed in this country.

The economic condition of the country has improved to some extent. Both agricultural and industrial production have gone up. The balance of payment position has improved. The food position which was the biggest headache of our Government for the last few years, thanks to the American wheat loan and to the ability and efficiency with which this problem was tackled by our hon. Food Minister, Mr. Kidwai, has improved to a great extent. All these have produced a tremendous psychological effect upon the people of this country and I have not a jot of doubt in my mind when I say that as a result of these achievements, the confidence of the people in the leadership of the Government has increased to a great extent.

The other day, my hon. friend from Calcutta, Professor Mukerjee, called us, the Members of the Congress Party in this House as laughing philosophers. With due respect to my hon. friend, I beg to submit that if the representatives of the plebeians in this House carry the joke to such an extent as to call Mahatma Gandhi as "their Leader", then we the Members of the Congress Party have no other alternative but to be laughing philosophers making the opposition our laughing stock.

A storm has been raised over the question of deficit financing. All other issues of the budget have been relegated to a position of secondary importance by this giant question. I claim to be no Economist and I am quite happy to leave this question entirely in the hands of the giant Members of this House like Mr. Gadgil and leave this question to be discussed theoretically and decided subjectively. Objectively, I am satisfied to find that the hon. Finance Minister is fully conscious of the possible bad effects of this deficit financing and that he is keeping a very vigilant eye on this matter and that under no circumstances, he will allow matters to go out of his control. When you know your enemy intimately and his capacity to harm you and you are at the same time particularly careful about him keeping a vigilant eye upon him, it is very seldom that your enemy is capable of harming you.

I take this opportunity for placing before the House the difficulties and problems of the largest and the oldest port, the port of Calcutta. The port of Calcutta has now become a problem for India. The importance of this port can be easily gauged from the fact that even today 50 per cent. of the

[Dr. M. M. Das]

total cargo of this country is handled by the port of Calcutta but in spite of this fact, the present capacity of this port is too insufficient to meet the demands made upon it. During July 1952, the average number of ships that were waiting in the port outside the jetties either to be loaded or unloaded were about 90. The insufficiency in the capacity of this port to handle the cargos has been aggravated by some of the jetties being damaged which have not yet been repaired and by inadequate number of berths, inadequate loading facilities, want of modern mechanisms like cranes, etc., want of locomotives and other equipment necessary for the Port Commissioners' Railway and absence of supply of the required number of wagons for carrying coal from the mines to the port. We understand that the National Harbour Board has recommended the sanction of Rs. 12 crores to carry out urgent and short-term improvements on this port but, to our disappointment, no sum has been allocated in the budget for this purpose. The Calcutta port is threatened with another danger of a far more serious character. The navigational channel of the port, the river Hooghly is gradually silting up. To investigate into this danger which is threatening the port, a Committee of Experts was appointed by the Government of India under the Chairmanship of Sardar Man Singh. This Committee of Experts, after due deliberation, came to the conclusion that the only measure that is capable of ensuring perennial headwater supply to this river Hooghly is the construction of a barrage over the Ganga. The Ganga-Brahmaputra Water Transport Board also considered this problem and they endorsed in full the report of the Expert Committee. The National Harbour Board in their recent meeting at Cochin has unanimously recommended that this scheme of Ganga Barrage should also be included in the Five Year Plan. I appeal to the Government to accept the recommendations of these three highly Technical official Committees and include this scheme in the Five Year Plan.

Shri K. K. Basu rose—

Dr. M. M. Das: I do not propose to enter into a controversy with you because, like you, I am not a spoilt child of this House and I do not get the opportunity to speak whenever I like as you people get.

Next, I come to the question of jute policy of our Government. The mills at Calcutta have been given the freedom of buying jute from Pakistan

where the price of jute is now far below the economic price. The result of this freedom given to the Calcutta jute mills to buy jute from Pakistan has been that the jute produced in our country is finding no market today. I think something of the nature of the Jute Control Board of the past will be necessary to remedy this. Further, my appeal to the Government will be that if such a course is taken, if some Control Board is established, under no circumstances, the authority of such a body should be given in the hands of interested parties as was done in the past by giving the authority to the Indian Jute Mills' Association.

The other day, my hon. friend, the acting Leader of the Communist Party, Professor Mukerjee, in his speech said that in the preparation of this budget, the interest of the people has been given a go-by. During the first budget speech of this Parliament in last May, the Leader of the Communist Party, Mr. Gopalan, while discussing the President's Address, said that it was a declaration of war upon the people of India. I have compared these two statements of the leaders of that party, one made at the beginning of the year and another at the end of the year and I am amazed to discover that during the course of one year, the Congress Government has improved so much from declaring a war against the people of India, that they have come to the stage of giving the interests of the people of India a go-by, during the course of the framing of the Budget. Perhaps this gigantic and colossal improvement has been due to the profitable and beneficial association of the Communist Members in this House.

Professor Mukerjee regretted that 45 per cent. of the total expenditure in the Budget has been earmarked for Defence. He compared this figure with the money allotted by the Chinese Government for Defence purposes, and he said that according to his information, only 22 per cent. of the total expenditure had been earmarked for Defence in China. I claim to be no 'Chinologist' myself, and I am no expert in Chinese affairs, in which every one of my hon. friends there is a specialist. But bitter experience has taught me only this, namely to take everything that comes from certain countries of the world with a grain of salt. Taking it for granted that Professor Mukerjee's 22 per cent. Defence Budget of China is correct, it has to be admitted that this 22 per cent. expenditure does not include the costs of the huge military equipments,

fighters, bombers, night-fighters, cannons and other military equipments that are pouring in China, as gifts from the big brother-in-faith.

From the ugly scenes that have occurred in this House, it is very difficult to restrain one's tongue, when once it is allowed to speak a few things about our Opposition in this House. At the beginning of the year, our hon. friends in the Opposition appeared like a big balloon, a multi-coloured balloon, full of gas, floating high in the air, and drawing the attraction of the people. Now at the end of the year, we find that the gas has come out, and the balloon lies flat on the ground, exhausted, shrunk and shrivelled.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it all necessary? I think all this is not part of the Budget.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** Many things have been said by my hon. friends in the Opposition that can by no stretch of imagination be called part of the Budget.

Anyhow, the most interesting feature of my hon. friends belonging to the most vociferous section of the Opposition is the prevalence among them of a new and peculiar psychosis, the Yankee phobia, or the dread for the Yankee, or the United States of America; in season and out of season, my hon. friends shout very often hoarse in denouncing everything that comes from America. (*Interruptions*). It is gradually developing into a very serious one. At the beginning, the symptoms are confined only to hysterical shoutings, but now it has developed into convulsions.

With these few words, I thank you for the opportunity that you have given me.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is now more than 7 o'clock. Is it necessary to sit any longer? What is the opinion of hon. Members?

**Several Hon. Members:** No, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House seems to be tired.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** Tomorrow, we shall have the discussion up to the end, and the hon. Minister can give his reply on some other day.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But tomorrow it is expected that this general discussion would finish.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** That is right.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The last hour of the day will be reserved for the hon. Finance Minister. If necessary, we shall carry on till 7-30 p.m. tomorrow. We shall have a sitting for half an hour more. That half an hour we can give to some more hon. Members. And they could limit their speeches also to ten minutes, by just stating the points, so that a number of other hon. Members also could participate in the discussion, and much can be said.

If the House is in a mood to sit for some more time now, I shall call another hon. Member. If it is not in a mood to sit, then I shall adjourn the House, till tomorrow.

All right, Mr. Muniswami. The hon. Member will have ten minutes.

**Shri Muniswamy (Tindivanam):** I must congratulate the hon. Finance Minister on the trouble he has taken in presenting the Budget, which is just based on the Five Year Plan, but at the same time I feel that we have to meet with a great disappointment. It has been repeatedly said by hon. Ministers, that they seek the co-operation of the public, for the implementation of the Five Year Plan. But I am at a loss to understand what attempts have been made to secure public co-operation.

At the very outset, at a glance, as far as the South is concerned, I can say that famine is prevailing in almost all districts in the Madras State, and every day we are seeing starvation deaths. I do not understand how the hon. Finance Minister has forgotten even to mention in his Budget speech the natural calamities that have occurred recently in the south. What I could find out in the Five Year Plan and the Budget Speech is that they have two organisations, one, the Bharat Sewak Samaj, and the other, the National Advisory Board. I may humbly submit that these two organisations are mostly consisting of Congress people only. They ought to have consulted all leaders of all parties, before anything was done. I must say that these two bodies have become out and out a party affair.

There is one thing that I must say in regard to backward communities.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow. I find that there is no quorum in the House. The House will now stand adjourned till 2 p.m. tomorrow.

*The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Wednesday, the 11th March, 1953.*