

[Shri Kappen]

cumstances and unusual draught and floods and other things, we were able to feed the millions of India in the last 18 years, maybe, with PL. 480 wheat. On the other hand, let us look back into the history of India. Every five years there was a famine and the last one was in Calcutta and lakhs of people died. All these 18 years no such thing happened. We have done another great thing. We have laid solid foundation for industrial development in this country. We have built up the basic industries which are going to generate further industrial development in this country. I have had the good fortune to visit some of the industrial institutions run by the Government. I was not alone; several Members of Parliament from the Opposition also were with me and Mr. U. M. Trivedi was there; unfortunately, he is not here now; he is an honest man. We all witnessed when we went to the rifle factory at Ishapur what is being done there. We went to the Chittaranjan locomotive factory and various other institutions in the country and we were thrilled at what is being done. In fact without consideration of party or group affiliations all of them praised what is being done. We have been able to win the Pakistani war and our jawans were able to prove that the invulnerability of the American tank is a myth. How was it done? It was done because arms were produced in our ordnance factories we have laid the foundations for industrial development in this country. So, it is not correct to say that we have been wasting money. On the other hand we have built solid foundations for industrial development. Therefore, we have nothing to be ashamed of. We can face the country in the coming general elections. Our people may be poor or illiterate but they have abundant commonsense. They know that this opposition cannot deliver the goods and that the Congress should be there at least for good administration. In the last eighteen years, we have given them good administration where their life and property

were safe. Therefore, we know as a matter of fact that we are going to be returned with a thumping majority. Now, Mr. Gopalan and his people know very well that fact. After the last general elections, the Congress in Kerala has come out stronger. In the next general elections they are going to face a stiff fight. The wonderful thing is that they are having alliances with the Swatantra party! That is for defeating the Congress. Mr. Gopalan maintains that Congress is weak in Kerala. I challenge Mr. Gopalan: we shall meet at the polls.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** What about the Palai Bank?

**Shri Kappen:** Palai side also, we are going to win with a large majority. I have spoken about devaluation and the next thing that is to be done. What are its benefits if we properly use it? The benefits are, firstly, that imported things become costly. Then, we will have a tendency to resort to import substitution. Of course the price line has to be maintained strict measures have to be adopted for maintaining the price line. Therefore, with regard to this no confidence motion, I appeal to the Mover of the motion my friend Mr. Mukerjee to gracefully withdraw the motion.

15.58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

If he is not prepared to do that, I request the House to vote it down.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are all aware that we have had so many no-confidence motions that they have lost much of their impact. Even so, I welcome this one because it gives us an opportunity of hearing the views of the Opposition; it gives the Opposition an opportunity to contradict one another and within themselves to answer their own argu-

ments. Fortunately, some of the speakers on our own side have also met these arguments very ably and there is really not very much more for me to say.

I have a sense of unreality, sitting here these two days, listening to the speeches here in this House and also in my room. About three years ago, I was sitting in the gallery upstairs when there was a similar no-confidence motion against my father and he said on that occasion: "What has brought together in this curious array, these various Members? It is obvious that what has brought them together is a negative, and not a positive fact." This negativeness was very much there in the speeches made here. The Opposition during this debate was very much the same, not only in the diverse and even contradictory views which were expressed but in the absence of any logic or any sense of purpose.

16 hrs.

When the motion was tabled, I had the impression that devaluation was going to be the main point which the Opposition Members had against the Government. However, in this remarks, the Mover of the motion did not even mention one argument against devaluation. The thread of devaluation which ran through most of the speeches; however, the fear was not whether devaluation was good or bad but whether we were pressurised—and it was very emphatically stated on the other side that we were pressurised,—I want to state equally emphatically that we were not pressurised. That is not to say that we were not advised by the International Monetary Fund to take certain measures; we were also advised by our own economists, as well as economists outside the Government, not only now but for a very long time. In fact, one renowned economist who is supposed not to support devaluation now had supported it in an article just six months before we took the action.

I think it was the hon. Member, Shri Manoharan, who asked us whether we had in fact consulted other people. I want to tell him, as our Finance Minister had stated, I think, in this House, that we had consulted not only our own economists but technical experts and economists outside the Government also, and we remain in touch with different economists.

At no time have we said that devaluation was something which we would rush to do. On the contrary, we took this decision as our Finance Minister said, after very long thought, painful thought, and it was an unhappy decision. But it was a decision which we felt we had to take. Some hon. Members have tried to point out that we had to take this decision because of wrong policies followed over the years. This is absolutely incorrect. We took this decision: there was, of course, a certain amount of pressure of circumstances, the circumstances you are well aware of: the circumstances were the aggression on our borders, the tremendous strain on our economy put by this repeated aggression, by the drought and economic conditions which arose from these events. This compulsion was there. Nevertheless, I would like to repeat that when we took this measure, it was not a measure taken back to the wall; it was a measure taken with eyes open. It was a deliberate measure which we took in order to stop a worsening of the economic situation. It was a part of a confident, forward-looking approach, designed to place the Government in a better command over the economic situation, and we felt that the permanent and long-term effects of it would lead to a healthy and self-reliant growth of our economy.

We did not think then, nor do we think today, that it is a magic cure, that just by the act of devaluation all the ills will be cured or that the prices will be checked. The prices,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

mind you, have not been going up just this last month; the prices have been spiralling upwards in the last two or three years, and in spite of numerous measures and attempts to try and curb the rise, we have not been able to do so. So, devaluation was not going to achieve all this suddenly, but it was something which if followed by the right action could give the opportunity of again coming back to the onward progress which had been held up due to circumstances beyond our control.

Here I would like to remind hon. Members that there is no significant step which can be taken without difficulty. There is nothing that is worth doing which can be done easily. We have undertaken upon ourselves the tremendous task of building, taking forward this great country of ours and it cannot be done without difficulties which are of equal, if not of greater magnitude. So we were fully aware of the difficulties. We were also aware that this would give an opportunity to the hon. Members of the Opposition to take advantage of these difficulties and to take advantage of an unpopular decision. Nevertheless, because we felt this decision was right, we took the decision, knowing that it might weaken us, and it might make things more difficult for us, not in the economic field, but in the political field.

Prof. Mukerjee argued that if only we had nationalised our foreign trade we need not have devalued the rupee. Surely he is aware that even in countries which have nationalised the trade, they have had to devalue their currency. For instance, in January 61, the heavy rouble equivalent to 10 o'd roubles was introduced in the USSR and in fact, the rouble was devalued by 55 per cent, after taking into account the change in gold content. You are also aware, Sir, that another socialist-communist country, Yugoslavia, has also devalued her currency not so long ago. I was there

a few months ago and after talks with their Government—some of my officials had talks with their officials—we found that it had helped them to stabilise their economy. They felt that there again it was not pressure from outside, but it was pressure from their own internal circumstances.

Devaluation, we feel, if tackled the right way, if the follow-up is done in the right way, will immediately enhance the export prospects of all infant industries and indeed pave the way for exporting new commodities, to which Government's attention has been drawn in the past. It is in this larger context that we should appraise the devaluation decision. It is a pity that a subject of such obvious importance to the economy has evoked only rather superficial and sentimental comments from the opposition, mainly political in tone and ignoring almost completely the economic argument, which is the one which is relevant to the situation.

Prof. Mukherjee made an appeal for the revival of the Swadishi spirit. If the hon. Member has been following some of my tours in this country, he will have noticed perhaps that this is what I have been doing too, and this is what I consider the most important subject for us to take up now. But I feel that devaluation itself is no more than a device to penalise all those who patronise anything which is not Swadeshi. What does devaluation mean? It means that foreign currencies become more expensive. I do not want to go into the details of this economic argument. Perhaps the Finance Minister, when he speaks in the next debate, will go into these matters. Was there an alternative to devaluation? The alternative was to establish a closed society, to peg the rupee artificially and to take over total powers to direct the economy and the nation's man-power. Is this possible for us with our existing system, without the

whole-hearted single-minded cooperation of all the different people living in this country? Would we at this time have been able to get this cooperation, for instance, from hon. Members opposite? I do not think we would have been able to get it. As a matter of fact, I did talk with the various members of the opposition parties with regard to cooperation merely on the food front. I said that I knew that being an election year, they cannot fully support us on other matters, but food, being a matter of life and death to our people, was a matter in which perhaps we could get together. But I did not get any response. Therefore when this is the position, in view of our democratic freedom, complete freedom of expression which we offer—and I am glad to say that we offer it to all our people—we could not possibly have done this.

One matter which has, naturally, aroused the concern of the House, and of the Government too, is the increase in prices of essential commodities. As I said, this is not something that has suddenly come into being after devaluation; it was a process that was there and it was getting out of hand even before.

Devaluation by itself is not solely responsible for any increase in prices which may have taken place even after devaluation except of course in those goods which are imported goods. We have to deal with this matter. We have started various shops. I fully realise that they are not adequate, that far greater measures will have to be taken and that such stores will have to be opened not only in all the urban areas but in our rural areas as well. We cannot, in this matter, neglect the rural areas which need more help from us.

Hoarders and anti-social elements have been prosecuted not only in Delhi or Punjab, which have received a certain amount of publicity, but

in other States also although it has not been publicised. But I agree that perhaps as much as could be done has not been done. I want to say here, and all those hon. Members who have perhaps read my speeches or heard them earlier will support me, that this is something which I have been very conscious of all the time. We are not perfect. We make an attempt to do some thing. We do not always succeed, nor can we always succeed. We have taken up tremendous programmes. Whenever we have taken up these programmes, the cry has been that it is too big a thing, we cannot do it. Yet we have braved it and we have tried to do it. You cannot expect cent per cent success, but in a large number of things we have succeeded.

Now, what, sometimes weakens us in a way, but which is also helpful is the criticism. When I say weaken, I do not mean Government, I am not referring to the Government but I am referring to any particular programmes. If I may draw the attention of hon. Members, some years ago the Asoka Hotel was built. It had hardly been completed when questions began to be asked in this House as to why it was running at a loss. Whenever a programme has been started, even before it gets on to its feet, there is an avalanche of criticism and questions are put as to why it is not working, what are the mistakes and so on, so that people who are working there naturally get discouraged and they do not know whether they should go on with it or should not go on with it in spite of orders and so on. These are some of the difficulties which are faced when we take up new programmes. Everything we have done in India is new. Even democracy is new. Democracy has existed for very many long years in many countries, and yet in the manner in which we have brought it in India, in this vast country to have adult franchise, it was something very new to the world. I remember the debates in

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

foreign newspapers at that time. All prophesied that it would not work, it was too big, there would be riots at election time which we simply would not be able to control. But one by one those things have been achieved, in spite of the tremendous difficulties which we had to face.

I spoke about follow-up action. The Opposition has not come up with very many positive suggestions. Whatever constructive suggestions have been made will certainly be fully considered and given due weight. I am glad to say that some of my own party members, the hon. Member, Shrimati Subhadra Joshi and others, have also made various suggestions, and they are worth going into and fully considered.

I have a long list with me here but I do not want to go through the entire list. The most important point, of course, is holding the price line of articles of mass consumption. The second is stimulating exports or liberalisation of those imports which will help as in our exports or which are essential for some of our purposes. But we do not intend at all to liberalise the imports of articles which could even remotely be considered as luxuries.

I was not fortunate enough to be in the House when the hon. Member, Shri Masani was speaking. I was told that he quoted from something which I said; but it was out of context. I was then speaking at a small meeting of people who were engaged in some of our public sector undertakings. The meeting was specifically called to see how we could build up efficiency and how we could increase our production. So, naturally, I picked up points of criticism, points which I thought should be discussed there in order to help them and to help the discussion. At no time was it my intention to run down our public sector. I think we have made mistakes, we have been

slow in certain things, we have some times had the wrong person in a particular job but, on the whole, they have done very well. This is not the time, again, to go into the list as to which ones have produced good results. I am sure, hon. Members are well aware of this. The hon. Member, Shri Frank Anthony said yesterday that anywhere you go in India you can see the results, the changes which have been brought about. It is not a question of having one big prestige project, because every big project gives rise to thousands of small ones; thousands of jobs come up and give opportunities to all kinds of people to start their own small concerns.

Now, the Fourth Plan is based on the follow-up action, what is to be done to gear up the economy. There has been much talk about whether we should have a big Plan or a small Plan. I personally think that this big or small has no relevance. Big related to what or small related to what? I believe, as someone mentioned, perhaps Shri Krishna Menon, not in this House but somewhere else, that no matter how small our plan is, it will still be a very big plan because of the size of the country.

Perhaps you have seen that the size of the Plan is something like Rs. 16,000 crores for the public sector. But, as I said, I do not look at the Plan in terms of money. What I feel is that the Plan must be big enough to utilize more fully, not only our existing industries and agricultural potential, but it should be able to correct the imbalance in our economy, and fill in gaps in our production which make us dependent on aid. The Plan must also lay some base for future growth; otherwise, at the time of the next Plan we will find ourselves exactly where we are at the beginning of this Plan. So that the maximum we can do is the minimum which we must attempt. It is with this spirit that we must look at planning and the next Plan.

Some hon. Members, for instance, Professor Ranga and his party, would like to have a small Plan which would result in freezing poverty at the lower rungs. I feel that such a Plan would be in favour of the more affluent sections of the society and, therefore, it would make self-reliance a receding goal.

The policy we have followed, or the path we have followed, has been such that we are bound to come in conflict with people on either side of us. On some matters we are in conflict with one side and on some others with the otherside. So, whether anybody likes it or not, this Government is determined to go ahead with the expansion of the public sector. We are determined to go ahead with measures to correct the inequalities of the economic system.

That is why we have taken a decision the other day with regard to managing agencies. If wealth remains in a few hands, apart from the injustice of it, it will disturb the stability of the country. The whole idea of planning or of building up the economy is to build the muscle of our nation.

I have stressed in the Planning Commission and elsewhere that we must give very special consideration to landless agricultural labour. Although I feel that there has been tremendous progress in India since independence, this is one section which has really had a very hard time and which is deserving of very special consideration. Similarly, although many programmes have been initiated, the Tribals, the Harijans and the backward classes are the sections of the people who deserve and should get far greater attention than they have been getting. We want to make every effort to do so in our next Plan. We want to try to benefit all the underprivileged... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Barabanki):** What is the concrete, precise

programme for Harijans and the backward classes?

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members should now hear patiently.

**श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्भलपुर):** जब भाषण दे रही हैं तो कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम भी बनला दें।

**अधक्ष महोदय:** यह तो नहीं हो सकता कि जो आप चाहें वही वह कहें। उनको मौका है कि जो वह चाहती हैं वह कहें। आपको सुनना चाहिये।

**श्री किशन पटनायक:** बेकार भाषण तो नहीं देना है।

**Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuruzha):** You will agree that we have a right to expect of the Prime Minister to explain in concrete terms what she wants to do for these people.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** The Plan is still in the process of being formulated. I have just said that these are the guidelines which we have put for the Plan. We are surely not going to hide the Plan from the hon. Members of the House. It is going to be placed before them and they will have full chance to discuss it and give their criticism at that time.

**Shri Umanath:** After Johnson saw it!

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I must resent very strongly this type of a remark from the Opposition Members... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Surendraath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** There are small interruption here on this side, but what is happening on the other side.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am asking both sides. Members on both sides must be patient and hear the Prime Minister's reply.

**Shri Ragbunath Singh (Varanasi):** We are patient but they are not... (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** There has been much talk of honour or loss of honour. If anything is going to bring India down, it is the view we form of ourselves. I can assure the hon. Members that I have had the opportunity not only of going abroad now, not only of meeting Government people but meeting very large sections of the public, in whichever country I have been and, I think, hon. Members are aware that even in India I have some opportunity of meeting people—villagers and other people—and since devaluation I have also been to two States of India and the hon. Member, Shri Gopalan, will know that in spite of his efforts in Kerala, the people in Kerala, in spite of a fervent appeal made to them that they should boycott my visit and that they should greet me with black flags from airport to all the functions—there is nothing shameful in that; they have a right to show black flags if they think like that....

**Shri Umanath:** They were arrested in Madras.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I am sorry, they were arrested in Madras and I expressed my sorrow and regret both to the Government and to the people who approached me.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** How many people were arrested?

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** But where they were not arrested was in Kerala and there the people came in very large numbers...*(Interruption)*.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon):** We have always been good to you.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** Thank you.

What I was saying was that I wish hon. Members would consider what effect their remarks have when they make them on the floor of this House. I was very sorry to hear a phrase fall from Shri Frank Anthony's lips, something about licking boots.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** Even he has to say that.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** If he says it and if people outside take him seriously, then indeed our position is a bad one.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Cancel his nomination.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** But without that if you go out and meet people outside, you will find a very genuine appreciation of the tremendous effort which we are making in this country. Let me say that this effort is not the effort of the Government. The Government puts down the Plan; it shows the way. But the effort is the effort of the Indian people. What we have done here has been done by the Indian people, whether it is in industry or whether it is in agriculture. With all the shortfalls in agriculture, we have achieved 75 per cent increase in production. Who has done this? It is the Indian people who have done this. When we are talking of shame, when we are talking of failures, let us remember whom we are talking about. Let us remember that the only thing that counts in the world, no matter how down you are, how poor you are, how broken you are, is hope and confidence and I must say with great sorrow that members of the Opposition are today breaking the hope and self-confidence of the Indian people. It is not a question as to with what feeling it is done; it is a question of what results it produces and this is the result which it is bound to produce: if you keep on telling a person that nothing is being done, he will naturally wonder whether what he sees himself is right or not.

Prof. Mukerjee spoke with great emotion about Vietnam. On the other side, the hon. Member, Mr. U. M. Trivedi, said that we should keep entirely aloof from Vietnam. The Viet-Nam conflict has to be viewed in the general context of various tea-

sions in Asia and Africa. We believe that the continuation of the war in Viet-Nam is a threat to world peace, is a threat to India too. We are vitally concerned in the peaceful settlement of Viet-Nam.

Prof. Mukerjee was a little sarcastic—may I use that word—about my own feeble attempts in this matter. But I can assure him that in none of the countries which I visited after making that statement did any of the leaders share this hon. member's opinion either of the attempts or of what I had said. So far as the other countries are concerned, there are many in Asia, Africa and Europe who have welcomed it warmly. Why did I make the attempt? He made a caustic comment; that in Calicut I said I did not have anything to say and soon after I said something. What I said in Calicut was that there was nothing new that one could do. What I said in my broadcast was, in fact, nothing new. I did feel so strongly about the whole problem that I said it; the time was such that something had to be said even if it was a repetition of what we had said before. We have not changed our attitude regarding Viet-nam either when I was in the United States or when I was in the U.S.S.R. or when I was just here in Delhi, our attitude has been the same. But our concern has been a growing concern because the conflict is growing and we fear escalation.

The other question which somebody put was why did we say "Geneva-type Conference" instead of Geneva Conference. This is because that this Conference should have the participation of all the parties concerned in the hostilities and that will mean inclusion of the National Liberation Front of Viet-Nam as well as the United States of America and other vitally interested parties who were not originally in the Geneva Conference. This is the reason why that word had to come in there.

It is interesting that the criticism of my suggestion as it was made by

the hon. Member, Shri A. K. Gopalan, is practically the same as that put out by the Peking Radio. It is significant also that China is the only country which has rejected my suggestion straightaway.

Prof. Mukerjee quoted extensively from Bertrand Russell. I respect Lord Russell very greatly.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod):** What harm is there in saying that it is Johnson's voice that she is repeating?

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I think it is very harmful because it is not true nor did anybody whom I met say so. As I said, they did not share the opinion which some of the Opposition members have vouchsafed.

Shri A. K. Gopalan or rather Professor Mukerjee fully knows that this is what Peking Radio also says about the Soviet Government. They are also supposed to be lackeys of American imperialism or I do not know what, because I am not very well up in this phraseology.

I was talking about Bertrand Russell. I admire him and respect him as a philosopher, as a scholar and as a mathematician. But we cannot agree with everything that he says. For instance, we know what he said about the Chinese aggression on our territory. He thought that India had committed aggression and he had said so very strongly. Therefore, we cannot be guided in our policy or in the determination of our national interest by any outsider's remarks, no matter how eminent he may be.

The problems of Viet Nam is complex, and one thing which we keep on saying and which we feel deeply about is that there cannot be a military solution our sympathy is fully with the people of Viet Nams. It may be remembered that the end of world War II is the beginning of their war of independence and their struggle is not yet over.



[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

There was another remark about our conflict with China, because I said somewhere that it was not merely a military conflict. I wonder what the Chinese leaders themselves would say. Do they consider it an ideological conflict or do they consider it merely as a military conflict? My father wrote in 1963: "The challenge from China as it has revealed itself is not only to our foreign policy but to our domestic policy as well."

Even at Nathu La which is so far from Peking, the Chinese are highlighting their ideological conflict with us and urging our brave and patriotic officers and jawans to desert their troops. Our conflict with China is not a conflict with communism. As hon. Members know, we are friendly with other communist countries, with the Soviet Union and with other countries. What their tensions are with China is none of our affairs.

The other important question is that of the Tashkent Declaration. A great deal has been said about it, and I do not think that more has to be said here except that I would like to reiterate that friendship would bring benefits to both nations, and also that we do not believe that Kashmir is the basic cause of our differences but that it is only a symptom of the basic disease.

Now, we have noticed ominous signs or rather contrary tendencies which have caused concern to the Government and to the hon. Members of this House. Government is fully alive to its responsibilities for defending the country, and let there be no illusion that mischief can be created in Jammu and Kashmir with impunity. I must make it clear as did my father in 1957 and Shastriji in 1965 that any attempts from outside to create such mischief in Jammu and Kashmir will be dealt with in the same way as if they were directed at any other part of the country.

At the same time, I would like to assure Pakistan that we shall also react most favourably to any friendly approach which they may make. Pakistan is constantly saying that there must be a change of heart on our part. Well, I think that our hearts are in the right place but they just do not want to see it.

The world is in a very critical situation, and many factors have contributed to this. International relations are undergoing profound changes. The non-aligned nations must forge new sanctions to save their own independence and world peace. New power centres are developing; new dangers are crystallising. And the immediate danger is the tendency to treat Asia and Africa as the testing ground for war games.

There are no simple answers to find the path of peace, but India will always continue to play a major or as big a role as she can in reducing tensions, in preventing wars and in safeguarding peace. This is our approach and this is different from noisy and hollow demonstrations; and I do believe, far more effective too. In order to play any of these roles, in order to strengthen our borders we must strengthen our economy, we must build up our unity and march steadily towards our goals of socialism, of democracy and secularism in our internal affairs, and peaceful co-existence, non-alignment and devotion to peace in our external affairs.

I have reserved to the last what worries me most, even more than the economic crisis or foreign relations, and that is the growth of violence and the threat it poses to democracy in India. Our democratic system, our parliamentary structure and the agencies of public life which have been patiently built up on the principles of non-violence and tolerance are being threatened.

**Shri Kishen Pattnayak:** Police democracy.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I feel we must exert ourselves...

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** See Gujarat.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I repudiate the theory that violent incidents which we agree are harmful are the result of people's dissatisfaction; rather it is a case of a handful holding the rest of the community to ransom. Several hon. Members have mentioned that it is the knowledge that people will not call some of these Opposition parties to responsibility which makes these parties resort to violence. Many of the demonstrations which are called are, I know, meant to be peaceful demonstrations, but we all know that large-scale agitation once launched goes out of control and goes into the hands of anti-social elements..... (Interruptions). In these very difficult times, it is in the interest of the country and of all of us to see that this kind of violence does not take place. It is my earnest prayer to the people of the country not to be taken in by these things. I do not at any time say that they should not ventilate their grievances or that they should not be helped to ventilate their grievances, but not if it is going to lead to violence or if it is going to aggravate the conditions it is sought to relieve.... (Interruptions).

**श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) :** साधुओं को क्यों पकड़ा है ? वे तो शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन कर रहे थे । उनको क्यों नहीं छोड़ते हो । उनको क्यों जेल भेजा है ?

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** I should like to take this opportunity to appeal to hon. Members and, through these chosen representatives of the people, to the country at large to pause and consider where we are going to. What is the future we want to build for our children and for our children's children?

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) :** यह जो लाखों लोग मारे जा रहे हैं, इसमें आपको हिंसा नहीं दिखाई देती है ?

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** Are we going to establish a co-operative society based on equality and dignity of the human being in which the fundamental freedoms and the wishes of the community are respected? Or are we going to rule by violence and by force? This is the question before us.

**An hon. Member:** Before you.

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** The seeds of conflict and disruption which are now being sown must not be allowed to take root. Even in this House, I was very sad to see that the attitude of indiscipline is being attempted and we have witnessed accusations and strong language against the Chair. I have admired the patience with which you, Sir, have laughed off some of these remarks made against you.... (Interruptions). We must remember what democracy means. Democracy is based on the rule of the majority. But we fully realise that the minority has an important function to perform and must be helped to perform it. We do not at any time want to come in the way of their performing it.

Lastly, I want to say that we have faced this no-confidence Motion with confidence... not only because of our numerical strength with which we are being constantly taunted by the Opposition Members...

**श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा (कोटा) :** इस लिए क्या सरकार जब चाहे मन्चाहा अत्याचार कर ले ?

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:** In so questioning our strength, they do not realise that it is not us they are taunting or questioning, but rather the electorate which has sent all these Members. But we face this motion with confidence because.....

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** अगर सरकार त्यागपत्र देकर चुनाव लड़े, तो एता लग जाये कि जनता कहां तक उसके साथ है ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जब साधुओं के लिए इतना कुछ कहा जा रहा है, तो कम से कम साधु जी तो आराम से बैठे रहें।

**श्री हुकम चन्द कड़वाय :** साधुओं को बे कुसूर पकड़ा गया है। उनको छोड़ दिया जाना चाहिए।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** साधुओं को पकड़ा जाये और हम चुप रहें।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** प्रधान मंत्री इलैक्ट्रेट की बात कहती हैं, लेकिन वह खुद कहां से चुन कर आई हैं ?

**Shrimati Indira Gandhi:**...because of our confidence in ourselves, because of our confidence in our policies, because of our confidence in our programmes, and lastly because of our confidence in the wonderful people of this very great country.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central): I am sorry to have to say that even though I was prepared to be disappointed; I was not quite ready to hear from the Prime Minister a speech compounded of innocence and of confusion which might have sat very well upon a young lady entering public life, but they are not good enough for the Prime Minister of this country.

A very conspicuous feature of this debate has been that there has been expressed an almost national consensus against devaluation which is the biggest single economic fact symbolising all the misdeeds of the Government. Those who spoke against my motion like Mr. Mathur, Mr. Azad and most pre-eminently Mr. Krishna Menon, pointed out arguments in their side which amounted to an admission that devaluation was wrong and that we have now somehow to manage a very difficult situation which has thereby been created. They were rather shamefaced about it, even Mr. Patil, and now the Prime Minister also joins Mr. Patil's appeal

to us to help Government to solve the problems which they have created by their own default. I say that it is no part of our job at least in this debate, there would be other debates, other occasions, but it is no part of our job in this debate to elucidate what we ought to do now that Government has committed a criminal act by way of devaluation. It is not for us now to pick the chestnuts out of the fire which the Government itself has brought about. But I know they have a guilty conscience about it.

**An hon. Member:** No.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** That is why they only....

**An hon. Member:** They have no conscience.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Possibly they do not have a conscience, but I do not go into that.

They tell us we should all unite in follow-up action to prevent the situation going too disastrously downhill. What was the essence of the only defence of devaluation which was sought to be made by Mr. Patil. He said, in complete disregard of what Jawaharlal Nehru had written himself in the second chapter of the volume on the Second Plan which I hope Mr. Asoka Mehta knows almost by heart, in complete defiance of the principles adambated there, he said that our three Plans were based on massive foreign aid, "we cannot get aid even for servicing our debts; so we had to devalue". From this it follows that without devaluation we are not going to get dollar aid and the entire planning was faulty, something to warm the heart of Mr. Dandekar or Mr. Masani on this side. This was the kind of thing which he said. My friend the Railway Minister is much too intelligent to hug the illusion which he tried to spread that organisations like the World Bank and the IMF give us purely "advice" from the economist's point of view