

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I make a submission.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow speeches from one party. Even from other parties they did not get it. Only one Member spoke from those groups. Mr. Shamim got it and he got much more than his due.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Because the Member was to go to Ahmedabad, he was given a chance earlier. I must have time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Why should I be denied the opportunity?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no time left. The time decided yesterday is already over. Please do not go back on your decision. It must be completed today.

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका): जवाब कल हो सकता है। आज इनका मौका दिया जा सकता है।

MR. SPEAKER: I had allotted the time and they presented Mr. Shamim and he got it. I am so sorry, Mr. Mavalankar. I am not going to allow any more Member, I am going to call the Prime Minister now.

The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS AND MINISTER OF SPACE (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think the House knows that in all my fifty-six years, I have never shirked a battle nor a debate nor a difficult situation. And, therefore, normally, I have welcomed No-confidence Motions because they have allowed us to put forward our point of view. They have also shown us that in all these years the opposition has not been able to come up with a single new point.

All of us remember just a few months ago when we used to have a No-confidence Motion at the beginning of every single session of Parliament. When was that?—When they were expecting an election to come.

And now, again, because there is an election in the offing, the habit is starting all over again. Well, it does not matter. While I am talking of elections, I might as well answer a point raised by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, and perhaps Shri Samar Guha: about our so-called promise that there would not be an election. Now, Sir, we did have a meeting of the opposition leaders when we were in the midst of a war. We did say that while a war is on, it would not be proper to have an election. But once the war was over, what excuse did we have not to have an election? And so far as I remember, and I stand subject to correction.....

श्री हुकम चन्द कठवाय (मुरैना): बहा नहीं
SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:

बहा या नहीं कहा यह सबाल नहीं।

I asked what excuse was there. It does not matter whether those words were uttered at that time or not. I repeat what excuse could we offer to the country for avoiding an election in peace time? (Interruptions). There was no question of understanding. We had said that because there was a war, it would not be proper to have an election.

Now, just by shaking your head you cannot change facts.

Sir, it was said that there were deficiencies in the speeches on this side. I personally do not know by what standards these matters are weighed. I also have listened very carefully and in this debate, I have not missed a single speech. Even though I was not present in this room while the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee was speaking, I heard him from my room. But, I can affirm very strongly that the speeches from our side answered every criticism and every point that was raised from the opposition side.

I should like to congratulate the Finance Minister who has had to deal with identical points, twice over within a few days, which can be a frightful bore, and specially the Defence Minister for his brilliant speech which was full of humour yet had depth.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Much has been spoken about democracy. My colleague, Shrimati Maya Ray has dealt with the vision of the democracy that West Bengal experienced just a short while ago. Hence I do not think that we need to take very seriously the remarks made by certain Members on the other side. Regarding this matter we know also—perhaps the hon. Members might contradict me—but I would request all of you to read the records of the House—that some speeches may have been made in this House, but certainly, they were made to me in my room by Members of some opposition parties. Some people who were, at that time, in our party also blamed us time and again for being far too soft with the then West Bengal Government; urging that it should be dismissed because of its undemocratic character; that some strong action should be taken. It was I who insisted that while the Government was there, unless it fell on its own, we were not going to take any such step.

Now, the entire opposition is together in raising the cry of protecting democracy. Our party is the one that has brought democracy to India; which has laid the solid foundations of democracy and to-day also is determined and pledged to strengthen democracy and to widen it and deepen its roots in our country.

But democracy is not the licence to abuse, to make false allegations, to weaken the confidence of the country or to denigrate its achievements. This House knows the meaning of democracy. It has had an unsurpassed reputation of being a custodian of democracy in a world where in many countries, one after another, the democratic method is being given up.

In India not only in this House but on outside platforms and other forums, parties and individuals have complete freedom of expression. Government has done nothing at all to abridge this freedom. Nor does it

have any intention of doing so in the future. I have made this commitment at every single public meeting. And I shall continue to make it. Not only to make it in words but I shall continue to act accordingly, because this is an article of faith with us. We do not just talk about it; we have lived upto it and we have worked for it. That is the reason why there is democracy in this country today. But, democracy does impose certain responsibilities. There is certainly responsibility on the majority party to ensure that the voice of the minority is not suppressed. But, at the same time, there is also a responsibility on the minority, which is the opposition. Does it accept the verdict of the majority of our people or does it not? I submit, Sir, with all humility, that from the day that we have been elected to this House, we have heard voices from the opposite side claiming that they are the ones who represent the people; they are the ones who were elected to this House by the people; perhaps we on this side have somehow got in through a backdoor! According to them, it seems that we have not been elected at all. Please read the records to refresh your memory about what has been said.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
Nobody has said that.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :
Democracy imposes responsibilities at all times on the Opposition, but more, specially, in times of crises, not to create further difficulties or to block programmes which have been accepted and passed by Parliament. These programmes are not the whims of the Prime Minister or her colleagues; these are programmes which have been brought to Parliament and accepted by Parliament. There should not be opposition for the sake of opposition. I am not going to dwell on the question of how responsible or irresponsible have been the actions of certain Opposition Parties during

this period of acute economic crisis. This is something which the public is well aware of.

'Fascist' is another word that is bandied about. I have explained on previous occasions that I have had some experience of fascism. I have visited Fascist countries during this sort of rule and, I think, we have some knowledge now of what is happening in certain countries. I do not think anybody in the world will contradict that our party has had the most consistent record of fighting against fascism, more than perhaps any other country.

An Honourable Member has dwelt on the question of security. I am one of those who do not believe in this sort of security arrangements. Hardly a day passes without my trying to fight them. Yet in spite of my security arrangements, can you name today any single leader of Government who is so often so close to so many people for so many days in the year, year after year, security or no security? How close are the people with me when I tour the various parts of the country! We have been close in our relations with the people. We take them into confidence and that is why they have given us their confidence.

We may not always be able to protect them from all hardships, due to events beyond our control or perhaps due to our own failings, our own shortcomings. We have not cut ourselves off from the people, we have gone to them, at least I can say for myself that I have gone to them and I have admitted the mistake, when we have committed one. We know we have committed mistakes. But we know also that nobody in the world can run a country of this size without committing mistakes. Even experts from other countries have had occasion to exclaim that they have never "seen a problem of this size"! For instance, we have had an expert to advise us on the Brahmaputra. He turned to me to say that that he had

dealt with river problems but that "this was a sea, not an ordinary river . We are trying to chart uncharted seas. Similar problems have been faced by some countries but never on such a gigantic scale, never in a democratic system, never with these different levels of development where we have a wide range of people from the tribal areas who so far had little opportunity for development, who were cut off from education and from every other kind of amenity even from administration, to various other sophisticated sections. Never at the level of poverty in which our foreign rulers had left us.

We do make mistakes, and perhaps so long as we are human, we shall continue to make mistakes. All we can promise the people is that when we have made a mistake, we should try to rectify it. We do not wish to cover it up. Some people do try to cover up; I am not saying that they do not. But it is our effort that shortcomings should be revealed and we should attempt to find a new way, if necessary.

My friend, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, seemed to be allergic to the words 'character assassination'. But how else do we describe the remarks that are made from the other side? If there is another appellation for it, we can certainly use it, but the meaning would be the same. You may give this name or another, but it means the same thing.

What we have said is that if there is a *prima facie* case against any person, there must be an inquiry. But there cannot be an inquiry on every irresponsible allegation that is made. Shri H. N. Mukerjee insisted that because allegations were made, replies should be given. With all due respect to him, I would say, as Babu Jagjivan Ramji has said, that all these questions have been asked not once but week after week, session after session, and every time a reply has been given by the Minister in charge,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Sometimes when I have been there, I have also spoken. Even in the course of this debate, when allegations were made, they were promptly refuted.

There is a concerted move to try and spread this atmosphere of—I can only call it—dirt. May be it is in the hope that some of it will stick. And some of it may stick, but if there is no truth in it, what can we do? There is nothing that we can do about it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: An inquiry. That is all.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: And how much time and energy is spent in this witch-hunting. No matter how many times a lie is repeated, it does not become truth, nor do facts change just because the Opposition would like them to be otherwise.

On the opposite side there is a measure of paucity of ideas, of work, of programmes. Perhaps that is why, as somebody remarked just now, the Opposition is reduced to the dire strait of concentrating their fire on this aspect of our public life.

I do not want to talk about Maruti, because all the questions that have been asked have been replied to, time and again. What I have said and my Ministers have said—I have said it in public meetings—is that no favour has been shown, no rules have been violated, no injustice has been done to anyone. Whatever salary or consulting service there is according to the rules. Those rules may be wrong. Then let us decide that we change the rules. But while those rules exist, you cannot say that different rules should be applied to different people.

Babu Jagjivan Ram has already dealt with the land question. For months, although the Opposition has gone all out to discover something wrong, they have not been able to do so. Nothing irregular has been done. I can assure you that I shall

not countenance any violation of the law or of rules or of procedure.

To give another example of the manner in which such malicious and false talk or writing is indulged in, the party to which one hon. member opposite belongs started, at the very time that I gave away the only house I have ever owned, a canard of my owning a house in every State, may be in every country in the world! When an hon. member who questioned me about it in the corridor, wrote to them, they replied: "She has only said it is mischievous and malicious; she has not said that it is not true!" When a specific question had been asked of me in Parliament, 'Did I own a house anywhere?' and I had said 'No', obviously that includes a villa in Rome or anywhere. As everybody very well knows, I do not have a foreign account either.

It was also sought to establish that I had land, vast stretches of land, in every State. Such questions are also asked—'Have you not got land in such and such State?' Such wrong accusations go on and on and on.

Another story that is being spread—nothing to do with land or anything—is that I am passing away with cancer. I received this news from a number of Chief Ministers, that the workers of a political party have been spreading such rumours in the villages.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Heard for the first time.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am sorry that you do not keep up-to-date with your parties. This shows that you are just as ignorant about them as about other matters in the country.

Some people now speak of the INA who at the crucial moment were on the wrong side of the fence. (Interruptions).

There are parties who have not started denigrating the Government only today. They have tried to denigrate the national image, they have spoken against Gandhiji, they have spoken against Jawaharlal Nehru, they have spoken against all our policies, all our programmes from the very beginning. So for them this is nothing new. For them, everything has been wrong. In fact, a large number of them, those who were old enough, denounced us for pursuing wrong path even before independence and for the manner in which we own independence. Even in this House very recently an insinuation was made that it was not the people's movement which won freedom. I hope that all of you noted that remark. I hope that you will go and inform the people.

We have talked of law and order. An Hon. Member—I think it was either Dr. Karni Singh or perhaps Shri H. M. Patel—spoke about leaving the students alone.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Dr. Karni Singh talked about population limitation.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Amongst other things.

I am in entire agreement with him that students should not be exploited for any purpose, political or otherwise. What is happening today? I got a message just a little while ago regarding the IIT, Delhi. A political party is holding meetings within the compound of the institution—and this was one of the very good technical institutions—inciting the workers to beat up the heads of departments. Is this the way that we are going to deal with law and order? Is this the way that we are going to encourage education in our country? The same situation exists elsewhere also. I do not want to name the institution. In another city the IIT was the very best in India until a particular party established a unit there. Today it is in constant trouble and hardly any

worthwhile work is being done there. One could duplicate these instances any number of times. This would be bad enough at any time, but what is worse is that this is the party that talks in the name of Indian culture. This is the party that talks in the name of the Hindu religion.

It is the same regarding their talk of democracy. Honourable Members have heard of the attack on a newspaper. I do not know what the newspaper wrote. I did not even know that such a newspaper existed in Shahdara till this news came, but there was an attack on it. Shri Vajpayee mentioned that he was very deeply concerned but obviously not about the attack. (*Interruptions*).

Talking of amenities for the people, just 10 minutes ago, I received a report of a lightning strike from this morning by a Jan Sangh controlled union at the Wazirabad Head Works. Most areas of Delhi are without water. (*Interruptions*). Everybody knows the capacity for mischief. Just two people can make mischief anywhere. May I know what control could one have over them? To set fire to a house, to set fire to a bus, to destroy something, you do not need a large number of people there nor a union. It is constructive work which is difficult.

I have always had great respect for Shri Samar Guha, but I am afraid that noticing the manner in which he flares up about anything at all it seems to me that it is not Uttar Pradesh but he himself who is soaked in kerosene.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But there is no scope for us to bathe in kerosene! (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: He is already spent up.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The hon. Member Dr. Karni Singh was riding his pet hobby-horse. I wish I had the time to ride just one horse.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi] leave alone two horses. It was one of the activities that gave me great pleasure when I was younger. On one occasion I tried to get some fresh air by riding a buggy but all types of political, economic, international,—every kind of—

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Cultural.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Also cultural,—implications were attributed. When I came down from office, I was astonished to see a large number of photographers. I told them that this was not a stunt; this was an experiment and I did not know whether it would work. Unfortunately due to reactions everywhere it was an experiment that did not work—to my great disappointment.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But you were photographed.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I did not know that I would be. Then, in reply to Dr. Karni Singh, I may say this. I do not often speak for women, but I think there are occasions when one has to raise one's voice. I think the women's Lib movement will certainly resent the hon. Member calling me a man.

MR. SPEAKER: We men do not resent it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We have never supported either the Communist Party, or any other party. We here are supporting Congress programmes. We welcome support from anybody who gives support of our policies, but we have never moved a millimetre, or whatever is less than a millimetre, from our declared programmes. Most Congress programmes are not new programmes. We may couch them in new words but these programmes were accepted by the Congress Party a long time ago, even before the split. Therefore, there is no question of any flux or indecision on our part. It is true that we cannot always go ahead as fast as we

should like to do, but our direction is clear for all to see, whether it is in regard to our industrial policy or another policy. Sometimes a little adjustment has to be made. For instance, we thought we would not give licences to the Big Houses. But when we found that the development of some of the background areas was stagnating, we decided to give licences for those areas. But I may tell his House that this has not helped much. Even the Big Houses are reluctant to go to places where the best facilities are not available. Of course, this does not apply to all Big Concerns. You have all heard an hon. Member speak of his experience regarding a factory which was to have come up in his constituency about four years ago.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Who is the hon. Member?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I leave it to you to guess. He is a good friend of yours. I hope Shri Mishra will not deny the friendship.

A question has been posed whether there should be legislation or the Gandhian way of persuasion. I can assure this House that I am all for persuasion. But has persuasion worked in a single case? Only the other day there was a meeting on the whole concept of trusteeship. How many of the businessmen who attended it are willing to adopt what Gandhiji meant by trusteeship? On the contrary, they consider it to be an extreme view, going to a limit which businessmen found impossible to follow.

Mention was made of my Mathura speech. Babuji has already replied to the DMK. He has taken the words out of my mouth for that was what I was going to say to my friends of the DMK. What I stated in that speech was for that particular occasion. One or two political parties were shouting slogans. My remarks did not apply

to a party which was hundreds of miles away from Mathura. I have not accused the DMK of demanding Separation. What I did say clearly was that the DMK were very close to a person who is advocating it, yet I had not heard any Member of the DMK announce that "we are with this person, but we differ with him on this specific point". That is the small point I had made.

We have the support of the Communist Party on some matters, but we differ from them on a number of other matters and do not hesitate to clarify the position. The honourable leader of the DMK also drew a picturesque metaphor about the Ship of State not progressing fast enough.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I did not make it; it was a quotation from *Patriot*.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Somebody made the comparison. You quoted it. I thought that you approved of the phrase when you quoted it. As we all know, quotations are used with a motive, sometimes leaving out those portions which do not support one's argument. I do not know whether you did so in this case.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: No.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Now the only question is, if a ship is not going fast enough, do we speed it up or do we sink it? This is the question before the country. It is obvious that there is an attempt by some people—I am not saying, by you or any particular party—to sink the ship, in the hope that another ship will crop up from the bottom of the sea or may be fall from the heavens.

We were also reminded, as we are in most such debates, that the Congress is a motley crowd. So it is. We are rather proud of our diversity. Within this diversity, there is a great deal of unity. We know that sometimes some people indulge in groupism or talk against one another. But once a policy is decided, we go ahead. However we have to deal not only with statistics but with human beings. Human beings in our party are the same as outside—after all, we are not

a different race. I think, you will at least concede us that. Some of our members may want to retard a particular programme that they do not approve of; they may want to modify it in some way. But I do not think that anybody can doubt our intentions, our dedication to our programmes and our determination to put them through.

Most of our States have implemented them. I concede that sometimes when we pursue them, their implementation leaves much to be desired in single sphere. This is unfortunate. I am deeply concerned about it. We must do all we can to see that implementation is improved all along the line. But to compare the internal differences of our party with the type of differences which exist on your side, is in my view absolutely ridiculous.

I now come to my good friend, Shri Shyamnandan Babu's remarks—you are also my friend even though you may be somebody else's. When I spoke about the necessity of a financial wizard, perhaps the honourable Member thought I had him in mind. Actually, as I have explained on another occasion, I was not speaking about India at all. I was trying to analyse the world situation and saying that there was hardly a country in the world today which had managed to escape from some kind of financial crisis. What can this be due to? Something must be wrong in the system. Something is wrong in our system here. I am not denying it. I would be the first person to admit the need for very radical changes. But to some extent we are tide to world currencies and trends. This is not an excuse nor am I saying that this is the whole of our trouble here. I am not, in any way, trying to shirk our responsibility. Our responsibility is considerable. When one makes an assessment of a situation, one has to mention all the relevant factors which are contributing to it.

One of the factors is that in almost every country—Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu or somebody else may claim that this

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi] does not exist in socialist countries. Probably, it is because they have an entirely different system and we do not have that system. We know that in those countries also, they went through hell before they emerged; they went through starvation before they emerged; they went through every kind of difficulty, every kind of repression, before they came upto the stage where they are now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Every-body shared it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Maybe, they shared it. But the point is that there were enormous difficulties. (Interruptions) Maybe, some people shared against their will and others were not there to share.

So, even though the reasons may be quite different, the effects may be quite different, there is no doubt that what is happening in the world is having its effect in India. No matter how much we try, it will continue to have an impact on us.

When I spoke about things getting better, I did not say that the entire situation was changing. But I did say that the food situation was slightly better and various other items. For instance, there is no doubt—I do not want to go into details of public sector functioning—that some of our public sector undertakings which were not functioning well have improved considerably. There are also many other aspects which could be called the silver lining in our difficult situation.

One point to which I forgot to refer earlier concerns the complaint that I had not appreciated the help of the Opposition during the Bangladesh crisis. I do not think this is true. Even in my public meetings I did mention that, in this matter, the Opposition parties and all the people of India had stood as solid as a rock and that was how we achieved our wonderful victory and we could withstand the great challenge.

Hon. Member Shri H. M. Patel spoke about offshore drilling. His reference

I think, was to the Tenneco offer. So far as I remember, the proposal was not accepted because it meant that half the oil which was produced would go to the collaborating company. This was what weighed with us at that time. There was no question of any ideology standing in the way. In the Bombay High exploration, the collaboration for a survey is with a French firm, the platform 'Sagar Samrat' was made by Mitsubishi of Japan, and the drilling contract has been taken up by an American company, M/s. Offshore International. But it is true that, in items like oil, which can vitally affect not only the economy but which in other countries has interfered with politics, economics and so on, one has to be very careful, and I do not think that one can entirely ignore ideology in such a case. As a matter of fact, even in the present situation, this is very relevant.

Criticism has been voiced about the President's Rule in different States. So far as Uttar Pradesh was concerned, this came about with reference to a very specific situation. As was explained in this House, the ruling party had a big majority. There was no doubt whatsoever about the majority. However, the situation created by police indiscipline was not an ordinary one. And we could not at that moment guess what its ramifications would be, not only in U.P. but perhaps in other parts of the country also and, therefore, we thought it wiser to play safe. We have to compliment the State leadership. They could have said, 'No; we are going to stick on to the Government'—but they viewed the entire situation in the national perspective. And that is why the then Chief Minister advised the temporary imposition of Central rule. It is now being alleged that the installation of the popular government is with a view to utilise official machinery for election purposes. We knew that election was coming. So what was the need of removing the

Ministry, if it was only a question of using it? The Ministry could very well have remained until the elections. Obviously, this criticism is politically motivated.

So far as Andhra is concerned, the situation in which the President's rule had to be imposed was entirely different. There was a breakdown of law and order in which all parties—and I am very sorry to say that our party was also one of them—had a hand in creating this situation. The administration had come to a complete standstill. The period of President's Rule has been utilised to try and find a consensus in respect of the overall political and economic problems of the State, and I am sure that there will soon be a popular Government, even though no elections are in sight.

A reference has been made to the High Court judgment in Orissa. I do not wish to refer to the judgment, but I should like to say that the Governor was justified in entertaining a doubt about the reliability of the majority of the Opposition because of the manner in which the fall of the government had been about. And this doubt was further strengthened by the statements of prominent leaders of the Opposition themselves when they insisted upon an early formation of the government because they felt that otherwise some of their followers might defect.

20.00 hrs.

The third point is that the budget has not been passed and in view of the above doubt, it had to be assured that it should be passed in accordance with the constitutional provisions which might not have been possible through an unstable government. Hon. Members opposite have understandably, overlooked the case of Manipur where in a similar situation, where our Party could have formed the Government, we did not allow them to do so.

I do not want to take more time of the House. But I should like to make just one point. No one has said and certainly I have never done so,

that all our troubles are due to Bangladesh or the war. But can any one in this House or anywhere in the world deny that that was a major crisis whose seriousness cannot be gauged by the amount spent? It was a major crisis which dislocated every part of the administration and imposed a very heavy burden on us. A burden of this dimension cannot simply be shaken off in a year or so. Hon. Members will remember that I said so in this House even before the burden fell on us. I said that the people wanted certain actions to be taken. We were conscious of our duty and would certainly help the people of Bangladesh but that we would have to pay the price for it later on. This is not the whole of the story, so far as our present problems are concerned but it is an important part of the story and when you are assessing the situation, you cannot leave out any part of the assessment merely because it is inconvenient or took place some time ago.

As I said earlier, there have been failings in our functioning and nobody will deny that the economic situation is a serious one. I do believe that it is not as serious as it was sometime ago because of the improving food situation. On the other hand we have other more serious problems, such as petroleum, we could not possibly have foreseen or the manner in which the Middle East situation erupted. These events are beyond our control.

We have other serious and urgent problems. I do not want to go into economic questions since Shri Chavan has dealt with them not merely now but as late as last week in reply to the Adjournment Motion and when the same points were raised in Question Hour.

Sir, I am the daughter of a historian. I have had the privilege of seeing history being made and I have also had some small hand in the making of history myself as part of our remarkable national movement. I do not live for one or two elections. In every single speech, whether to my

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi] party or to the public, I have made it clear that elections come and go, but our duty is not merely to win—any political party wants to win elections—but that should not be our goal and that should not be the focus of our attention.... (*Interruptions*). We do not work for the present. We are looking ahead to the future. India has had a long history but it has a still longer way to go.

We have dreamt dreams for India. We have seen visions of the future that we wanted for our people and it is for them we work and struggle. We are not going to be diverted by men of little faith and no vision, people who talk of India's civilisation but visualise it only in terms of narrowness and communalism. We have not been diverted and we are not going to be diverted from our path and our duty.

Those who swear by the caste system lecture to us about the conditions of the Harijans. Our own concern is for the Harijans and I must express my agony and deep distress at the fact that, in spite of all our laws, we have not been able to change the attitudes of our people.

An atrocity here or an atrocity there is deplorable, it is to be condemned. But, by itself it can be dealt with. The real problem is the attitude of thinking and this has not changed.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What about the attitude of the Harayana Government?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, whether it is Government or whether it is political parties, that particular question has nothing to do with Harijans. That is a question of land, which I believe is being sorted out. The land problem has not arisen because the people are Harijans. But there are parties, there are groups who believe ardently in the caste system and that is what is perpetuating the divisions in our society and preventing integration.

Hon. Members opposite are fond of urging the people to reject me. Now,

if this happens, it will not be the first time in history, our own history or of the world, that some one has been falsely charged and falsely implicated or that people have been made to believe such falsehood. But I have not the shadow of a doubt that whatever may be said now, whatever may be done, history will vindicate me, history will vindicate our party.

Hon. Members have loudly called for elections. If we take our minds back to the last time—I am talking of the time before the last Parliamentary elections—the self same demand was voiced. Yet when we opted for election, the very same people accused us of being undemocratic. This is the first time in the world, I think, that anybody has equated the holding of elections with negation of democracy. We took the opposition at their word. They resented this deeply but all of us are here, including Hon. Members opposite, because of those elections and the people's verdict.

Now, Sir, I have finished. I should like to draw attention to the one more rather sarcastic comment of an Hon. Member about unilateral love for the people.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: People have unilateral love for you. You are giving them unemployment. You are giving them high prices. So, people have unilateral love for you.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: If the Hon. Member believes in democracy, he should accept the people's right to decide whom they should love. It is for the people to judge everybody's weaknesses and faults, to weigh them, and decide, what, in the ultimate analysis, they believe to be in their interests; who, no matter what their shortcomings and faults may be, can maintain the stability and the unity of the country and go ahead towards the declared goal. If it is a question of one-sided love, as far as the people are concerned, we shall always give them our love, whether they are with us or not. We shall

give them our love, we shall give them our service, and I am sure that the people will also stand by us.

So, I appeal to the Hon. Members to reject this No-confidence move which is obviously entirely politically motivated and, although they have resented Prof. Mukerjee's statement, I must say that the timing does seem highly suspicious.

SHRI B. P. MAURYA (Hapur): Mr. Bosu, you have no case.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Mr. Speaker, Sir. My party has one hour and thirty minutes. I have taken less time than that.

MR. SPEAKER: You can take thirty minutes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Kindly bring the House to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Everybody is here. You cannot force them to listen to you.

SHRI B. P. MAURYA: He has no case.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Mr. Speaker, Sir, will you kindly bring the House to order?

MR. SPEAKER: Everybody is in order. You please carry on.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Sir, I rise on a point of order. You, Sir, on an earlier occasion, gave a ruling that the mention will not be made of any Member of the other House. Of course, the Ministers can, when they reply.

I would request you to ask Shri Bosu not to make any reference to any Member of the other House. You have already given a ruling on this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: In that context, may I make a submission, Sir, if you would be good enough to permit me?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu, I think it is not proper. You wrote to me and I am going into it. Please don't pick up a quarrel with the member of the other House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You will kindly listen to me when I am on my

legs. You will kindly go through the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall look into it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I have not mentioned anybody's name, on the floor of this House who belongs to the other House.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Of course, you said 'Member of the Rajya Sabha' but you have not mentioned the name of the Member.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, at the very outset, I should make it clear that this Motion of No-confidence has no relationship with the arrival of the guest, Comrade Brezhnev to this country. He is coming on the 26th whereas this motion is discussed on the 22nd. This is a propoganda that has been made. That is the only way by which they can take shelter.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But, they won't accept your explanation.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am neither a minister nor a Congressman. What all I say is for the good of the common people—working-classes and the toiling and weaker sections of our country. We hoped that they will bring relief to them when we raised such issues. At least on such issues which are of common interest for the people I thought they would join with us. They may differ politically. But, outside, is there anything that you can't do? What about the class composition of the ruling party? You would have better gone to the Swatantra Party as a great follower. I am sure that Shri Shyamnandan Mishra became a socialist in one night and he is now sitting here. I can perhaps prepare a list of such members to show what is their background and what sort of socialism they have in their pockets. It is all sheer opportunism.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: What is your class character?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I shall come to that. I may have betrayed