

12.00 hrs.

**MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN
THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
Contd.**

Mr. Speaker: The House will take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri N. C. Chatterjee on the 11th September, 1964, namely:—

“That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers.”

The Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have tried to keep the level of the debate high and I am thankful that they did not consider it advisable to indulge in personal attack or to refer to certain individual matters. On the whole the speeches, although critical—and highly critical—were such that one could not take objection to them. I must, however, admit that the most disappointing speech was from Shri Hiren Mukerjee, as I had expected much better from him.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): You like the Swatantra Party.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would like the hon. Members kindly not to interrupt because I have not done so. I felt clearing up many matters while hon. Members of the Opposition were speaking, but I deliberately avoided it. Therefore, I would beg of hon. Members kindly not to interrupt till I have finished.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Interruptions would sharpen your tongue.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Even in this debate reference was made frequently to the food situation. I do realise that the situation is still difficult and I can well understand the

concern of hon. Members over this matters; but I need not go into details as the Food and Agriculture Minister has already dealt with this problem in an elaborate manner.

The main point before us today is: How do we deal with the present situation—I mean, the difficulties about food? There is no doubt that we have to take two steps. Firstly, we have to get foodgrains from within the country, from wherever it is possible or from wherever it is available, whether it is Punjab, Madhya Pradesh or Andhra Pradesh. How do we get it is a separate matter on which much has been said. The second alternative is to import from abroad. At the present moment howsoever we may dislike the import of foodgrains from abroad, there is no choice for us but to depend upon imports from different countries. If in the course of the next few months we are able to import a good quantity of wheat and rice, it would be possible for us to tide over the present difficulty.

Fair price shops are very important. Perhaps, I might not have followed Dr. Lohia correctly or fully, but he said that there was an idea of closing the fair price shops. As far as I am aware there is no such intention at all. In fact, we want to increase the number of fair price shops and we may have to do it in the course of the next few weeks, if it is found necessary.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): भाषण पढ़ा मेरा आपने?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री: मैंने कहा है मेरी गलती हुई गई होगी। लेकिन मैं यहाँ बैठा था और मैं आपके भाषण को सुन रहा था।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: यह मैंने नहीं कहा था। मैंने खाली यह कहा था कि

सस्ते गल्ले की नीति को सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब छेड़ना चाहते हैं।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But what is important is that these fair price shops should be managed well. There is no point in hiding the fact that from the fair price shops here is a good deal of leakage. I was told that in one of the States, about 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the cereals provided to the fair price shops were smuggled out or leaked out and they were sold in the open market. Therefore, it becomes essential that there should be a constant vigilance and watch over these fair price shops. I might also add that specially in the rural areas the fair price shops have not functioned properly and it is important, of course, that the administration should deal with it. It would also be advisable for the panchayats to take more interest in it and for other non-officials to keep an eye on the better functioning of the fair price shops.

It has also to be remembered—I have not got the exact figures with me just at present—that we have during the last three years subsidised foodgrains of the fair price shops to a very great extent. I think in 1961, it was roundabout Rs. 15 to 16 crores; it increased to Rs. 21 crores in 1962; it rose up to Rs. 36 or 37 crores in 1963 and it seems that in the year 1964 the figure might go up to Rs. 50 crores. So, it is obvious that the Government is keen and particular that those who cannot afford to purchase foodgrains in the open market should get foodgrains at cheaper prices from the fair price shops and the Government will be prepared to subsidise as much as they can till such time these fair price shops are essential and necessary.

As I said, there are still some difficult areas and specially Uttar Pradesh is badly affected. North Bihar is also in a difficult situation and those

areas which have been affected by flood are in a bad way. Even the Punjab which is a granary of food for us, for the country, or at least for the northern part of our country, is under serious difficulties especially in the Rohtak-Jhajjar area and, of course, a large area of Delhi is also in an exceedingly bad way. So, these flood affected areas have to be helped much. There are problem similarly in Gujarat and in the rural areas of Maharashtra. There also much is being done and—I would not say because perhaps the Members from Maharashtra might get somewhat angry—they are at the port and as soon as the food grain is unloaded, they manage to keep it with themselves. However we do not mind it because Maharashtra is a deficit State and if they manage to get foodgrains in some way or the other we should not resent it.

Shri Hem Barua: You encourage it.,

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But apart from this problem of flood, what is more important is the water-logging in Punjab and in parts of U.P. and in some other States. I think that if the problem of water-logging is solved in Punjab, we may get about 2 lakhs tons or at least about a lakh tons of wheat from that area. It is a very fertile area, but large tracts are unculturable or have become unculturable because of water-logging. It is not even possible for them to sow their rabi crops. Formerly, of course, when an area was affected by floods, the kisan was not able to sow the kharif crop or the kharif crop sown was damaged, but they depended upon the rabi crop. But in the flood-affected areas, the situation has come to such a pass that there is the danger of their not being able to sow even the rabi crops. In the water-logged areas, the things are still worse, As I said, for years together, they have not been able to produce anything.

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

I am referring to this matter because I feel that very special attention is called for by the different Departments concerned. I do not know, but I am merely expressing the view of an expert or a great engineer; he has said that because of the canals which have been constructed during the last few years, and some of the bridges of the railways or the culverts of the railways and also because of some roads which have been built, many areas have been affected, and because of there being no co-ordination between the different departments, the water-logging persists or it has resulted in continued water-logging.

I am sorry I am critical of the Government or of the administration, but I can with my own experience say that no department is prepared to shoulder the responsibility. If you mention it to the railways, they say 'We have nothing to do with it; the bridges or the culverts were built a long time back'. If you go to the Transport Ministry, they will say 'Well, the roads are all right, and, therefore, there should be no problem'. If you refer to the Irrigation Department, of course, they are a law unto themselves.

Shri Hem Barua: It seems that there is no co-ordination. That is a reflection on yourself.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am accepting it; I have myself said that; I should be held responsible for that. But what I want to emphasise is that the administration has to realise its responsibility in this matter. This kind of working in water-tight compartments between one department and another must go.

I think the responsibility must be fixed, and we cannot function in the present manner. It is not that I am mentioning it here only. In fact, when I met the secretaries of all the Ministries, I emphasised this fact, and I appealed to them and also advised them that there should be better co-ordination. We are a very big and

vast Government, and naturally, every Ministry is becoming bigger and bigger. It becomes, therefore, essential that there should be proper co-ordination.

I would like only to add one more sentence, namely that it is essential that loading, unloading and also quick despatch to different areas should be expedited and arranged efficiently. Of course, as regards loading and unloading, it will be the ports which are mainly concerned. Then come the railways. Things have considerably improved during this period. There has been quick loading and unloading. As regards labour, there was some difficulty, but they have responded well and the railways have also carried on their work efficiently and effectively during this period.

This is, of course, for the short period, if we are thinking of the short-term. As I said, I do not want to take a complacent view. I think our responsibility is very great and I see difficult days ahead, at least for these two months September and of October. Till the new harvest has come, there will be difficulties ahead.

Shri Hem Barua: More difficult than the present?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: May be, at least for a month. But I do not want in any way to create some kind of a feeling of demoralisation in the country or amongst ourselves. I have no doubt that we will be able to tide over the present difficulty without any serious trouble.

As for the imports which are to come, there has been some delay because of difficulties in the American ports. Yet, several countries have helped us in diverting their ships to India and it would, therefore, be possible for us to get adequate food during the third week of this month.

As I said, I do not envisage any special difficulty to feed our people. May not be to their entire satisfaction

yet we will not have to face any special situation.

But eventually and essentially, what is most important is the increased production of foodgrains. Towards this end, I would merely mention two new steps which we propose to take. There is the production side of it and there is the distribution part. In so far as production is concerned, the Food Minister has announced that we want to fix the price of foodgrains for producers. I say that this is a revolutionary step. It has not been done so far, although we have been thinking about it for some time. Yet I cannot ignore what Dr. Lohia said the other day. Lohia Saheb said that if we give higher prices to the producer, it would mean constant increase in or higher price of foodgrains. It is an aspect of this problem which will have to be carefully considered. And it has also to be realised that for a country like the United States of America, it is easy to fix high prices or higher prices. Their economy is an economy of prosperity. Our economy is an economy of, I won't say poverty, but anyhow....

Shri Hem Barua: Of development.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: What I would like to appeal to hon. Members is this, that they should kindly lend their help to us in this regard. It is very easy to form unions and organisations and demand higher wages, and I think it might be done. But to begin with, if we start with that kind of thing, if any political party starts with that kind of agitation, my feeling is that it will be killing the scheme itself. It is desirable that this matter should be considered by an objective authority, by an objective body, a body of experts which should consider the question of fixation of price for an *ad hoc* announcement, because we do not want to delay the matter much. The prices for rabi crops have to be announced soon, because sowing will begin some time in the month of

November, or slightly earlier or later in some places. Therefore, the announcement for the rabi crop about the price for the producer has to be made soon. We have appointed a committee of some of our experts and officials here in the Centre, with Shri L. K. Jha as its Chairman, and Finance, Food and other Ministries concerned are all represented on it. Their report will be submitted I think in the next week in so far as producer's prices are concerned. By the end of this month I hope they will also be able to submit their report in regard to the prices to be fixed for wholesalers and retailers. This work has also been referred to them. So, it is a difficult task, no doubt. But this committee, at least for the next year, will do this task. After that, I hope, in the month of January, the Prices Commission will be set up, and it would be a permanent body, and will, of course, continue to do this work in future.

I do not want to say much on how the kisan should be helped in regard to increasing production. Much has already been said. It might be said that I take a conservative view, but I feel that in the given circumstances what is essential is that the kisan should be helped to the utmost in a small way. What I mean is: may be, mechanised farming etc. is good, and we may have Suratgarh farms, not one but others also. We should have them as experimental, demonstration farms. It would also help us in adding to our present food production, but by and large, it is not possible for the cultivator to take to mechanised farming. I fear that if we do that, we will have to import machinery from outside in large quantities and we will have to add to our loans and to our foreign exchange. And secondly, if we take to mechanised farming etc. now difficulties will arise as there is no technical personnel available; some are there, but if we do it in a large measure, unless we have got the personnel, the result would be that

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

this machinery will continue lying unused for months and months together. So, instead of being beneficial to the kisans, it would be definitely harmful. As I said, we may go in for this at a later stage, but just at present, what is needed is that the kisan should get water, the kisan should get better seeds, the kisan should get manures, the kisan should get the necessary credit facilities. If we can give these things to the kisan, I have absolutely no doubt that he will produce the results.

I remember very well what Pandit Jawaharlalji used to say. He always emphasized this, and said that he did not want these big bull-dozers, tractors etc, that he only wanted to give the kisan slightly improved ploughs and other improved implements which could be produced in this country. If any repairs etc. were necessary, he said the kisans themselves could do it, or people should be taught and trained to take to that work. I feel exactly the same way, and therefore, I would suggest that the Government should concentrate on this, and I have no doubt that the hon. Members will also agree with it.

One thing more, I have said earlier, and I might repeat it, that the community development blocs will have a special responsibility in this matter. I have suggested, and Shri S. K. Deyji, my colleague, has entirely agreed with it that the community development blocks, during the next few years, should concentrate on increased food production and nothing else. They can, of course, do other things, but the main part of their work would be helping the kisans to increase their production. I would go even to the length of suggesting that it should be the responsibility of the community development officers to survey each and every field; there should be a proper survey made as to what has been the production of a particular field, what progress was made during the next six months, or if there was no progress made, what were the obstacles and

what were the difficulties of the kisans. Those difficulties and obstacles must be rectified. There should be a regular chart. I do not suggest that we should merely work on paper. My desire is, in fact—I may perhaps be wrong,—but I sometimes feel—that all the jeeps from the community development blocs should be withdrawn.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Yes, Sir. Very good.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Congratulations for this.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It may be that I may be making an exaggerated statement, but I feel that unless the workers and the block development officers walk on foot, they will never visit the villages.

Shri Raj Brij Singh (Bareilly): Does it apply to Ministers?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Let the officers there, or the workers, visit only a few villages, I would not mind; if they can, let them visit all the villages, but let them visit at least a few, and concentrate on their work and actually mingle and mix with the kisans. Then alone they will be able to enthuse them.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): What about the Ministers?

Shri Brij Raj Singh: May I ask them what they were doing till now?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: If the hon. Members want, they can put questions later on.

Shri Hem Barua: It is your pious wish, or is it going to be implemented?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: This is not going to be a pious wish, and I would go to the length of telling the House that it will be our job, the job of the Ministers, to go and stay in

villages. I am suggesting all this in all seriousness, because I think that whenever we go to any city, of course, the bigger cities apart, whenever we go to any other city, it would be much better for us to stay in a village rather than in a dak bungalow, and I suggest this because when I advise my officers or officers of the Government, when I advise the block development officers to go and mix and live with the people, it would not be advisable on our part to remain behind, for the Ministers not to set a real and good example.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : यहाँ की बड़ी कोठियों को भी कुछ ठोटा करने का विचार है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप उन में किसी को किराए पर लेना चाहते हैं ?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I say this. I want to draw up some kind of a plan or scheme for this. I do not want to make the task of the Ministers or others impossible. But some kind of a plan or scheme has to be drawn up in accordance with which we have to function without of course creating any kind of impediment in our work.

As I said the real problem is increased production. I would not say that this problem is going to be solved or self-sufficiency is going to be achieved in the course of the next one or two years. We must think in terms of at least 6-8 years during which we will have to build up a reserve as well as do our utmost to increase our agricultural production but this progress should be a steady progress and should as far as possible be a progress from year to year. However, one cannot completely ensure that there are no troubles for the cultivators, for the kisans and the rural areas. There may be floods or droughts; there may be frosts and what not. So, these things will also have to be kept in mind. I know even a great country like Russia which

has done wonders, is still faced with shortage of foodgrains. I find, not recently but about a year or two before, whenever Premier Khrushchev spoke he was critical of the work of his agricultural department and recently, I am not quite sure of the figures but about a million tons of foodgrains....

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati): 12 million tons; I have the correct figures.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Whatever it is, they have imported foodgrains from the United States or, may be, from some other countries. Perhaps it is mostly from the United States. I am not saying this in any deprecatory spirit at all. I am merely mentioning this fact that we should realise our difficulties. If a country like the USSR sometimes finds it convenient to import or necessary to import, you can well imagine what our position in this country will be, faced as we are with many problems.

Shri Hem Barua: Let us not draw inspiration from Russia.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Now, about distribution: it is important. The Food and Agriculture Minister has already spoken about the setting up of an All India Foodgrains Corporation. It is also a new step we want to begin with. Of course we do not want to monopolise or create monopolies in the sense that the Government only will deal with foodgrains. It is an experiment and I think we should carefully start with it and try to succeed. The Foodgrains Corporation will start its work, I cannot say exactly when, perhaps very soon; maybe sometime in January or perhaps a month later. It is in a way State trading and if we succeed in it we can take another step. I may be excused if I say that it is not a question of any ideology; there is no question of ideology involved in so far as food matters are concerned. It is an

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

essential thing and it is the responsibility of the Government to give food to the people at reasonable price. It should be seen that there is no scarcity or shortage. This should be our objective. Some hon. Members have said that we are now going over to State trading. Perhaps some hon. Members from the Opposition are critical of us. But may I say in a country like Japan which believes only in or mostly believes in private trade, in a country like Japan the State procures all the foodgrains or rice produced in Japan: complete and full procurement by the State. Not only that. Distribution also is done by the Government of Japan. I am told that 36,000 or 40,000 retail Shops—somebody says 54,000 retail shops—are in Japan to distribute them. They do it because as I said their objective is to supply foodgrains at reasonable prices to the consumers and also give adequate price to the producer. These are the two objectives before them. I am told that they have done it very well and very effectively. One thing has to be remembered; they subsidise foodgrains on a very big scale maybe. 100 crores or 125 or 136 crores. The amount is very big. Therefore, while we talk of this, we have to remember our general economic position. It would not be so easy for us if in India we have to give about Rs. 136 crores as subsidy as we will be faced with a very difficult situation. . . (interruption)

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Re-align the income-tax.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not want to deal with it now. I am already taking much time.

As I said, they do it and they have done it well. But there are some snags in it. I would not like to go into them. It is, therefore, important to understand that as a matter of theoretical policy only we do not do this or that. There are various practical steps to be taken, various practical aspects to be taken into consideration and then we have to decide

as to what is best for the country as a whole. We will not hesitate to go to the farthest length to help the producer and the consumer in so far as the supply of foodgrains is concerned.

I might add one thing more. There is a feeling in the States that they have to depend upon the Centre. I am sorry I am a bit critical but it is true that the States depend so much on the Centre for the supply of wheat or rice. It has become necessary and they might do so. But this trend has to be changed and a new psychology has to be created in the States and the States should think in other terms. States which are actually deficit will have some problems, greater problems than the surplus States; even those States which are more or less self-sufficient, if not surplus, can meet their needs and requirements. Even they depend on the Centre and, therefore, it has its own adverse effect on the administration. They do not put in their best effort to produce more because they know that ultimately the Centre will find foodgrains. This is not a very happy situation. Sometimes I feel that, for a few years, if it really becomes necessary, the Centre might take the responsibility of feeding the bigger cities and for the rest of the area the States must find their own cereals and foodgrains, whether that is wheat or rice or coarse grains. The present position is coarse grain is not generally being consumed and people ask for more wheat and more rice. But if we try, as I said to introduce this kind of a scheme, cities would be the main problem of the deficit areas as well as some of the surplus areas.

We will have to examine this matter, but in order to change the present trend, if it is essential the Centre might, for a few years, say that we take their responsibility for the bigger cities. I do not confine myself to Calcutta. Bombay, Madras or Delhi; there are other cities also, for example, Kanpur, Lucknow, or Allahabad or Patna as

other similar cities. I hope that this aspect of the matter will be considered so that the States try to become more self-sufficient.

I wanted to refer to some of the other matters: the high prices of other articles or commodities which are of common use like cloth, sugar, vegetable oil, oil, vegetables match-boxes and even bicycle tyres and tubes, salt, etc.

Shri Lahri Singh (Rohtak): Milk, butter.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It will take much time and therefore, as I said, I would not go into this matter, but it is essential that at least for some of these items—they may be 8, 10 or 12—their prices should be fixed and they should be sold only at fixed prices. Of course, for cloth, a scheme has already been drawn up, and the Ministry of Commerce has decided that the prices of the popular varieties of cloth will be controlled by law—that is sarees long cloth dhoties, drill, shirting etc. I do not know much about the varieties of cloth. These common varieties, popular and cheaper varieties of cloth should be sold at reasonable prices. Shri Manubhai Shah has informed me that very soon the prices will be controlled by law, statutorily controlled; there will be no longer voluntary control.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Will there be stamping?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes; there will be stamping.

Shri Hem Barua: Drugs and medicines?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I might inform the hon. Member that in so far as drugs and medicines are concerned, my information is that the prices have not gone up at all.

Shri Hem Barua: Exorbitantly.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Not at all, I may inform the hon. Member

that I sent some of the officers to the shops; they went quietly; the shopkeepers had no knowledge, and a surprise check was made. Not that they want as officers; they made purchases and after having made the purchases, they came and reported to me; they gave a report to the department. In so far as matches were concerned, they said they wanted vouchers but the vouchers were not given to them. In one shop, matches were being sold at a premium of one paisa. All these reports have come. In so far as medicines and drugs are concerned, they are being sold at a reasonable price and almost at fixed prices.

As I said, I am more particular or more keen that the common man should get this relief. Of course, there are richer people; they could purchase superfine cloth or might take superfine drugs. Let them pay for them, but we feel and our real concern is for the poorer and weaker sections of society.

I think I have said much about the food position. Let me now go over to industry. Whether it is agriculture or industry, they have all to be viewed under the shadow of our Plans, under that umbrella, the Five Year Plans. Both agriculture and industry form a vital part of the Plan. In so far as Planning is concerned, I need not repeat that it is absolutely essential for our country, and unless there is some body which could consider these matters objectively and is in a position to prepare an integrated plan, we will be faced with enormous problems. There has to be an integrated plan otherwise if there is no plan or no Planning Commission there will be some kind of chaos: every Ministry, Planning Commission, there will be some kind of chaos: every Ministry, every department running for itself, and the people as a whole would naturally suffer. Therefore, the philosophy of Planning is wholly acceptable to us and, as you all know, the third Plan is continuing and will continue, and we are in the midst of preparing the fourth Five Year Plan.

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

I was rather amazed to listen to the speech of Shri Dandekar. Shri Dandekar tried to paint a picture in which, during the last 17 years—perhaps he wanted to say that during the last 17 years—we have not been able to achieve practically anything. Instead of having solved the problems, he said we have created problems. I can understand Shri Dandekar expressing that view, because he has had very little to do with public life. I do not question his ability and his knowledge, because I have some experience of it, as he functioned as an Officer in the field of shipping.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
लेकिन ज्यादातर ऐसे ही लोग प्रभु मंत्री
के साथ हैं।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: When I was Transport Minister, he was with the Scindias; he was deputed by the Government of India to serve there; his services were lent. I know, and I am told, that he was one of the most brilliant ICS officers; yet, it does not mean that he really is in contact with the wishes and desires of the people or that he is in a position to really to understand the problems of the common man. He may be or he is a modern man and he must be in touch with modern society I am not unfortunately. (*Interruption*).

Shri Hem Barua: How do you distinguish a modern man from you?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am sorry; Shri Hem Barua is also not.

Mr. Speaker: Members might be taken as the standard: on the one side there is modernity, and on the other side, there is the old.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would like to quote some figures; hon. Members of the Opposition express their doubts, but I may mention some figures. During the last 17 years, the per capita consumption of foodgrains

has gone up from 13.5 ounces to 15.3 ounces; that of cotton from 10.98 metres to 14.63 metres. This has happened between 1951 and 1963. I would also like to quote some figures regarding the increase in per capita consumption of a number of items in respect of which there is every reason to believe that it is not the rich who have stepped up their consumption but the middle and the lower income-groups who are now consuming more. Take, sugar for example. In 1950-51, the consumption per annum per capita was 3.2; in 1963-64, it was 5.2—an increase of about 63 per cent. In tea, there has been an increase of about 27 per cent; vanaspati, 73 per cent; paper, 179 per cent; bicycles, 251 per cent; sewing machines, 244 per cent, and electric fans 281 per cent.

This will indicate as to what has been done in the field of production and, also, how consumption has increased. I am sorry, I had some other figures also but I do not want to take more of your time. I would like to say that these 17 years have been the years of a mighty endeavour by the people of India under the leadership of a great and noble leader, Pandit Jawaharlalji, for uplifting the masses from the abyss of poverty, disease, squalor and ignorance. In that process, certain problems have undoubtedly arisen, but they are necessarily the problems of a developing economy. There is an unavoidable period of travail which a country has to go through in order to attain prosperity. During these 17 years we have adopted for ourselves a democratic constitution, we have held three general elections and we have set firmly the democratic system of government in our country. Inevitably, in the process of development problems, even serious problems, arise, but they cannot be viewed in isolation. We have numerous problems to face, but these are the problems of a nation which is marching ahead. We are proud of this legacy and we are accordingly honoured by the trust which has been

placed in our hands after the departure of our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, much has been said about corruption. As the Home Minister said the other day, I was responsible for the setting up of the Santhanam Commission, and I fully remember that although the question of political people whether in Government or in some other capacity, as Member of Parliament or Members of Assemblies, was not covered by the terms of reference given to them, when Shri Santhanam asked me as to what he should do in this regard I did tell him that I shall be grateful if he will or the Santhanam Committee will give its informal views on the matter to me. They have done it, and it is now necessary that we should consider their recommendations most carefully and try to adopt them.

In so far as dealing with this matter is concerned, well, Nandaji has been good enough to pass on the responsibility to me. While speaking the other day, he said that in so far as the political part of it is concerned it is the Prime Minister who will have to take the responsibility to deal with that matter. Well, it is a very difficult and delicate task but I do not want to shirk that responsibility. It is, however, important that there should be certain conventions. The law is really not very effective in these matters. It is exceedingly difficult to prove a case or to prove the charge. Therefore, certain conventions have to be built up. In that regard, I would like to say that we, all the ministers, will have to agree to this, that once the Prime Minister or the Chief Minister tells any one of his colleagues that he feels there is a *prima facie* case or he feels that there is something which is not correct, the minister should immediately tender his resignation.

Sir, I also want to suggest that our Chief Ministers hold very responsible positions. They run the whole State, very big and important States—and

even smaller States are in no way less important. Therefore, the Chief Minister cannot also shirk his responsibility. It is neither wise nor good for the Chief Minister to pass on all his problems to the Prime Minister. The Chief Minister they must deal with their own colleagues first. Of course, if they find it almost impossible to deal with them they can certainly refer the matter to me and I shall try to deal with it as best as I can.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli):
What about the Chief Minister?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Well firstly, I would like that the Chief Ministers should remain above board and there should be no finger pointed towards them. I am sorry, some things have been said in this House about the Chief Ministers, but I can say that in some of the cases when formerly enquiries were made nothing was really found. I know in a number of cases Panditji looked into the matter himself (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Kairon?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am not referring to Kairon. I shall say word or two about Kairon also. But in so far as other Ministers were concerned, I know he himself went over the whole file, page after page, read them and yet he said he was not the fit person to give any opinion and he referred the matters to a very high legal authority.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is why Sanyal has been killed.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It is not fair, not proper, to make that kind of reflection. Of course, the hon. Member must depend on what the Home Minister has to say on that matter. An enquiry is already being made. As I said, in some cases which were very fully and thoroughly gone into nothing practical came out. It has become a fashion of the day, and

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

I must admit, I say it with shame and sorrow, that members of our party in the States have not behaved properly, in the sense that they level charges, they make allegations without proper enquiry. I do not deny their right to do it, but what I want to tell them is this: as Members of the Congress Party their first responsibility is to the organisation.

Shri Hem Barua: To the country and to the people, not to the organisation.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I say it in this sense because . . .

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : पहले देश को देखना चाहिये और बाद में पार्टी को ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: After all, I do not say that they are not responsible to the country, but the point is that they are members of an organisation which must look into all these matters. What they do is, they go to the Press first and to the organisation later on. It is, therefore, that we hear so much about complaints having been made against various Chief Ministers.

What I was suggesting was this. The allegation should be made in a responsible manner, and if there are complaints against the Chief Ministers I know they will have no hesitation either in asking for an enquiry, or, if they so desire, in referring that matter to the Prime Minister, and I shall try to deal with it. (*Interruptions*). Please do not interrupt me.

13.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Prime Minister is dealing with corruption. Because the ruling party is the Congress Party, the charges are against Congressmen. (*Interruptions*). Order order. There was a question put, "what about the Chief Minister?"

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Sir, I was merely emphasising the fact that

the Chief Ministers have also to realise their responsibility which is indeed great; they do so, and I would like to leave most of the matters to them. If there are, as I said complaints against them, it is up to them to decide and refer them to me. But I would be the last person to give an impression to the world that this country is seething with corruption.

I say, Sir, with a full sense of responsibility that India is a place where integrity is given the highest consideration and the highest respect. In this country the Prime Minister is, I mean, practically given a secondary place. If there is a good, honest man like Vinoba Bhave I have no importance in the eyes of the people as Prime Minister. Of course I leave out Pandit Jawaharlalji; he was a different person altogether.

Shri Nambiar: You are too humble.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But Vinobaji, for example, lives just like a sadhu. He is given the highest respect and the highest consideration in this country. I can say, Sir, that by and large this country is an honest country, this country has maintained certain standards.

Secondly, I would also like to say this. Hon. Members have to realise the fact that either officers and Ministers have a certain right to exercise discretion.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Why not bring Vinobaji into the Government?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Well perhaps neither Acharya Kripalani nor Vinobaji will ever come to this side!

But I say that we have a right to exercise our discretion. If there is no discretion provided for the Ministers, the administration will become wooden and unresponsive. Whether it is the

officers or the Ministers, they have to exercise certain discretion and not exactly go inch by inch and word by word according to rules and in support of the rules. I remember, in jail, if the rules were strictly observed I could not move alone, because the rule is that you have to move in twos, you have to walk in twos, you have to eat in twos. I know, in Uttar Pradesh at least these rules are there.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : जोड़ा, जोड़ा ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes. Shri Banerjee has some idea of it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have not.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : पुराने समय की बात है ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : श्री बनर्जी की प्रती हाल में मिला है ।

And I said it will be most unfortunate if the officers, if the administrators will waver in taking decisions at the right moment and for the right thing. Unless we have that faith in them it would create enormous difficulty, because most of the administration is run by the administrators, by the officers, and not by the Ministers. These aspects have to be borne in mind.

In this connection I might also refer to what was said about the inclusion of Shri Sanjiva Reddy in the Cabinet. I have no time; otherwise I would have referred to what Shri Hiren Mukerjee said about the present Cabinet. But I shall not go into that now. He has every right to criticise us. Perhaps I might take some other occasion to reply to his charges. However, about Shri Sanjiva Reddy, some remarks were made about his inclusion. But I might say that hon. Members are perhaps aware that the nationalisation of transport has been strongly opposed by those who are al-

ready engaged in this business. I know it for a fact. I have been also Minister for Transport in Uttar Pradesh and I had to deal with it. In fact it was Uttar Pradesh which took up the nationalisation of road transport first, and I fully remember that whenever any route was taken over there were protests from the transport operators, and there was a good deal of litigation also.

The same thing happened in Andhra. I think the House may perhaps be aware that the High Court of Andhra gave the verdict that the allegations were not proved . . .

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: No, no.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: The Supreme Court, however, held that the allegations against the Chief Minister stood un rebutted. This was the only remark, I mean the main thing—I am not quoting the exact sentence of the Supreme Court Judgment. But their objection was mainly on the fact that the allegations stood un rebutted. Shri Sanjiva Reddy was not a party . . .

Shri Koya (Koshikoda): Then why did he resign?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Please wait. Since it stood un rebutted, since he himself did not file any affidavit—well, it might be said, “why did he not file an affidavit?”. I might say that he would have filed an affidavit unhesitatingly. But the fact was that the legal advice was that it was unnecessary for him to do so. The High Court itself observed that it was not necessary for Shri Sanjiva Reddy to have filed any affidavit. So the House will see that there was some difference of opinion even between the High Court and the Supreme Court. But it was the advice of the legal department of the then Chief Minister, Shri Sanjiva Reddy not to file an affidavit. He could not do it on his own. He took the advice from them and accepted it. I would say, Sir, that this was purely

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

a technical non-compliance of procedure.

I do not want to mention as to what we did in a similar matter about Mr. Kairon. A similar case had happened. It was mentioned in this House, and it was said then also that as it was purely a technical matter, Mr. Kairon need not resign. And he did not resign.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapore): It was very wrong.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But Shri Sanjiva Reddy felt that after the verdict of the Supreme Court he should not remain in office. I think instead of expressing our appreciation for that gesture it would be unfortunate if we criticise him for it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Have you read the Supreme Court Judgement? It is very clearly stated that Shri Sanjiva Reddy actually influenced the Corporation who only a few days ago had taken another decision; and the authorities said that it was because of the opinion of Shri Sanjiva Reddy that in a part of Kurnool, it was nationalised and in another part it was not. And the other part was where the transport owners had supported him.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would be prepared to discuss with the hon. Member the whole judgement. I have not read it but in the last portion they have concluded in this way that as these charges have not been rebutted, therefore they felt that these charges stand.

Shri Narasimha Reddy (Rajampet): Was there no *mala fide* behaviour of the Chief Minister?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: No. When Shri Sanjiva Reddy decided to resign, this matter was referred to the Central Parliamentary Board. They considered it and they commended the action of Shri Sanjiva Reddy which was in consonance with the

high traditions of democracy. In fact the Parliamentary Board placed on record its deep appreciation of the keen sense of duty displayed by Shri Sanjiva Reddy. But because of his personal feelings the Parliamentary Board accepted his resignation. I do not think there was any question of any kind of ban on his rejoining the government. Therefore, I do not think there should be any valid objection to his inclusion in the Cabinet.

Now I would like to refer to what Shri Hiren Mukerjee said the other day. He charged me with a number of things. He suggested that I had deviated from Pandit Nehru's policies. If he will permit me to say so, it should not be difficult for a professor to know the correct position. But since he happens to be a Communist, it is difficult for him to think outside the framework of the Communist idea. May I tell him that a democracy there is nothing like deviation or deviationist? It does not find a place in the dictionary of a democracy. In a democracy there is every opportunity for re-thinking and freedom for the formation of new schemes and policies.

I said on the very first day of my election, and on more than one occasion later, that the Government of India will continue to follow the policy of Nehruji in international matters and democratic socialism will continue to be our objective in our domestic policy. In spite of that, Shri Hiren Mukerjee has made so much criticism of what he thinks I have done or propose to do. I would not have said all these things, or what I want to say now, but I it is time that I might make it quite clear as to what my attitude is in regard to this particular objection raised by Shri Hiren Mukerjee. Otherwise, every time, quite frequently, either Shri Hiren Mukerjee or his colleagues will get up and say that I am deviating and start censuring me.

May I repeat that in a democracy there is full freedom for re-thinking

and independent thinking? May I also remind him of what happened during our freedom struggle days? I know it personally at least for the last 40 or 42 years. What happened when Mahatma Gandhi took over the leadership? There was a complete overhaul, complete change in philosophy, policy, technique and programmes. Mahatma Gandhi completely deviated from Lok Manya Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh and Lala Lajpat Rai.

Shri Hem Barua: Please do not use the word "deviated".

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am sorry. I quite agree with him. I am using it for the benefit of Professor Mukerjee; he might be able to understand it better. Till then the policy was that there should be tit for tat. Lok Manya Tilak went to the extent of suggesting that he would be agreeable to responsive co-operation. Shri Aurobindo and many of his other followers felt that there was no alternative but to resort to arms and use weapons and arms in order to fight the British Government or authorities. Then comes Mahatma Gandhi. He completely disagrees with them and adopts a new philosophy and a new technique. Will you condemn Gandhiji for this? I hope Professor Mukerjee will be good enough at least to excuse Gandhiji if not me?

And may I say what happened in the case of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru himself? In a way, Gandhiji was the preceptor of Jawaharlalji, *guru* in a sense, because Jawaharlalji was not taking part in politics in all seriousness in the Home Rule days; he took seriously to politics when Gandhiji came into the field, because he felt that here was a man who believed in revolution, who believed in change and who believed in action. So, he was attracted towards Gandhiji. But did he entirely agree with Gandhiji? No. And yet could you find a more loyal and devoted person to Gandhiji than Jawaharlalji? I say, he loved Gandhiji

immensely and he gave his fullest loyalty to Gandhiji; yet, he had his own way of thinking, independent way of thinking. Although he did not believe in non-violence, yet when he found the way Gandhiji worked it and the success he achieved, he said "I am a complete convert to non-violence and non-violent techniques". Of course, it did not mean that he accepted non-violence as a creed. He didn't. And yet when Gandhiji said "if you want to achieve good ends, you must adopt good means also", it attracted Jawaharlalji most. I remember that because he talked to us about it and he also made public statements. If possible, I shall refer to a part of his speech which he delivered at the banquet given to Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin where he said that he believed in good means. Therefore, without fully agreeing with Gandhiji, he had his own way of thinking and approach.

He was a man who stood for peace and non-violence. In the 'message of non-violence he saw a picture of peace in the whole world. In his mind he felt "here is a man who is preaching non-violence". Of course, his idea of its application was not restricted to India. Gandhiji had said "if you succeed in India, this message will spread throughout the world". But Nehruji had an international approach. So he in his own way took non-violence to the world platform, to the world forum and in a practical way preached disarmament, worked for it and did his best to make various proposals so that disarmament may be successful. He saved many wars, or a few wars, by what he did to maintain peace in the world. When he joined the Government, it was not possible for him to put into effect each and every idea of Gandhiji. But this does not mean that he was in any way disloyal to Gandhiji or he did not do what was right.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्राप का श्री क्या श्री नेहरू से वही रिस्ता रहेगा जो उनका गांधी जी से था ?

बी लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : मैं उस पर भी कुछ कह दूंगा। मैं कोई बात छिपाना नहीं चाहता। जो बात सच्ची है वह बता दूंगा।

Why restrict ourselves to India? What is happening or what has happened in Russia? What did Lenin do? When the first Communist Government was formed, Lenin tried to put into effect fully all the policies enunciated by Marx in *Das Kapital*—free kitchens, free travelling, free stamps; every thing was almost free. Everybody could go and take his food from the Government kitchen. Then, there were several programmes of nationalisation etc. What happened? Lenin found after some time that it was impossible to work some of them. So, he announced a new economic policy (NEP) and it was put into effect. It was departure from what Marx had actually said in his book.

Now, Lenin goes and Stalin comes. What does he do? I need not tell the House—everyone of you is aware—as to what Stalin did. In fact, he was totally different from Lenin. I consider Lenin to be one of the biggest revolutionaries of the world. But if I might say—I hope, I would be excused—I consider Stalin not to be a revolutionary at all. Whether one agrees with it or not is a different matter, but Stalin used the Government machine for continuing his rein over the Soviet land until he lived. For him it was just a struggle for power throughout his life.

Now, let us consider the policy Premier Khrushchev is pursuing. He has censured Stalin—and his policies also—in the strongest terms possible. The basic ideology is wholly acceptable to Premier Khrushchev—in fact, he is the greatest exponent of this theory in the modern times—but he has flatly refused to tread the beaten track and has adopted a new programme and technique.

I need not refer to Mao Tse-tung who is another important figure in the Communist world and whose ways of doing things are known, or perhaps well-known.

As I said, I consider Premier Khrushchev to be one of the most important distinguished leaders of the world. I say so because he refuses to walk on the beaten track. A leader generally, if he is really the leader, does not walk on beaten tracks because in the political field situations change, men change, conditions change environments change and the real leader must give the reply to the changing conditions.

Shri Namblar This proves the statement of Shri Hiren Mukerjee. You are arguing in support of him.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I know you would say that.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: May I suggest one thing? I entirely agree with the Prime Minister; but then the Government Bench should use the name of our late Prime Minister sparingly to justify their conduct. They should stand on their own basis. Then, there will be no occasion for the Opposition to attack. I think, it is very necessary that very sparingly his name should be brought in to justify any conduct of the Government.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: We will try to work on our own as far as possible. We do not want to drag in the name of Pandit Jawaharlalji for covering our lapses and inefficiencies. We will never do that. We must own the entire responsibility for what we do. But we cannot forget our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlalji, our Prime Minister, our hero with whom we worked for 40 years, for about half a century. We can never forget him; we will ever remember him and we will try to follow in his footsteps in the best manner possible.

But I might add that I have learnt two things from him. I say this in all sincerity and in all earnestness. Therefore I will be brutally frank because it is better that I clear up my position. As I said, I had learnt two things from Panditji. The first was his great capacity to work with his colleagues who even differed from him in certain matters. It was not easily possible in the vast organisation of the Congress—I am talking of the pre-independent era—for everyone to see eye to eye with each other. I know, Acharya Kripalani himself differed a good deal; Sardar Patel and others differed, but I do not want to name them here. But it was possible for Jawaharlalji to have carried on with all of them. When he took the reins of Government, he adopted the same policy. He formed his Cabinet with all those who had played the most eminent part in our national struggle.

I know Shri Hiren Mukerjee criticized me about the formation of the Cabinet; but I might tell him that in the present context, it would be suicidal if the Congress did not give a united leadership and thus carry the whole country with it. May I say that I knew Jawaharlalji better than most of those who are sitting on the Opposition Benches? He was one of the noblest men and never wanted to hurt the feelings of others; yet, of course, as you know, he was our biggest hero and a great fighter?

May I, with your permission, Sir, relate a small story? When Jawaharlalji differed strongly with Tandonji, who was then the Congress President, he was of the view that Tandonji should resign from his office, I came all the way from Lucknow to speak to him. I would not like to go into the details. But when Jawaharlalji was elected the President of the Indian National Congress, he was good enough to ask me to work with him as the General Secretary. I told him about my embarrassment. He did not

tell me anything then. But I was surprised when he told me the next morning that he had himself approached Tandonji and asked him to become a member of the Working Committee. Tandonji was deeply touched by this offer and readily agreed to accept it. Panditji again asked me to accept the General Secretaryship which I did and tried to serve him with the utmost devotion.

That was his method; that was his technique, whether on the national scene or in the international sphere, his method was that of co-operation even amongst diverse elements. I know, as I said, he differed very strongly with Tandonji and, if he could deal with Tandonji in that manner, the House can easily imagine what would be his attitude towards others with whom he might have differed slightly here and there, but was more or less in a position to work with them very well.

Shri Hem Barua: You must call that high-class diplomacy.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I entirely differ from Shri Hem Barua, if he will permit me to say so. I should not discuss Panditji, but I felt that Panditji was one of the innocent men going about on this earth and in this country. I may repeat what I told Panditji one day. I said, "I am a much cleverer man than yourself, Panditji".... (Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua: That is why you are there.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Of course, if he knew that a person was bad then he would not believe him, but if any person went to him and told him his difficulties or said, "All this is quite wrong; I am being maligned", he believed in it. Yes; because it was just out of his innocence. When I analyse myself, I feel, I am not so honest. An honest man, generally, will not accept others as

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

dishonest unless it has been proved. I went and told Panditji, "Panditji, these people come to you. You are the biggest leader. You are the Prime Minister. We come before you and present ourselves in the best of forms possible". When we went to him, of course, we all bowed..... (Interruption) and tried to be as good as possible. He was, as I said, so good. In these matters it was difficult to find another man so noble, so high and so good. This was his quality, I mean, carrying the diverse elements with him. Gandhiji's greatest gift was this that he was able to carry the entire nation with him. Of course, on basic fundamental matters, when he differed, he differed and those who differed were kept on. But generally, by and large, Gandhiji's effort was to carry the whole nation with him. After Gandhiji, there was another man. It was his policy too, as far as possible, to carry the differing elements with him.

May I, Sir, with your permission quote what Panditji said at the banquet given in honour of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev? Talking of the growing understanding between India and U.S.S.R.—it does not only relate to U.S.S.R; hon. Members will find his general approach to other problems also—he says:

" . . . Understanding and friendship have progressively grown even though the paths we have pursued in our respective countries have varied."

Mark these words; he is so clear and categorical. He is speaking before Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev. He says:

" . . . Understanding and friendship have progressively grown even though the paths we have pursued in our respective countries have varied."

Further, he says:

"We in India have been conditioned by our heritage and by our great leaders as well as by the peaceful methods we adopted in our struggle for freedom. Much more so, therefore, do we believe in world peace and co-operation. We believe not only that the ends to be achieved should be good but also that the means employed should be good or else new problems arise and the objective itself changes."

Mark these words; they are very important. They are being addressed to two great leaders of Russia.

Then he said:

"We believe also that the great cause of the human progress cannot be served through violence and hatred and that it is only through friendly and cooperative endeavour that the problems of the world can be solved. Hence, our hand of friendship is stretched to every nation and to every people."

Then, at the end almost he says:

"We are in no camp and in no military alliance. The only camp we should like to be in is the camps of peace and goodwill. We should include as many countries as possible and we should be opposed to none. The only alliance we seek is an alliance based on goodwill and cooperation. If peace is sought after, it has to be by the methods of peace and the language of peace and goodwill."

Sir, I think these few sentences paint very clearly and completely the stand of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I think, if we are honest enough—I hope we will be honest—I have no doubt that we will pursue the same policy.

Sir, may I take another 15 minutes?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक प्रश्न है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या नेहरू जी के रास्ते पर चलने से सब समस्याओं का समाधान हो सकेगा और चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान की जो भूमि ले ली है, क्या सरकार उस को वापस ले सकेगी ?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister wants about 15 minutes.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri I shall take less than that.

Mr. Speaker: How long is Mr. Chatterjee going to take?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): I wanted half an hour.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Members agree having this voting immediately after that or would they want some other time?

Some Hon. Members: Immediately after that.

Mr. Speaker: I have invited the German Delegation for lunch and they are waiting there, I had to be there at 1.15 p.m. If I might be excused for some time, I might go and just receive them. The hon. Prime Minister will kindly continue his speech. I will be excused, I suppose.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Why not have a break for an hour or so?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): We can have a break for lunch.

13.36 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Sir, I have also to add that I cannot function entirely on my own. Is it thought by Prof. Hiren Mukerjee that it is all entirely my own doing—I am sure he does not accept it but any-

1120 (Ai) LSD—6.

how he has said it practically in so many words—I am, Sir, a member of an organisation, a political organisation, and I sit in this place on behalf of that political organisation. That organisation has recently amended its objectives, its goal, and the Congress—I am referring to the Congress organisation—has adopted democratic socialism as the objective for the Indian National Congress.

13.37 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The mandate is quite clear and it is under that mandate that this Government has to function, it is not an organisation of some individuals. It is the biggest political organisation in the country today. And all I can say is that the Congress, the Congress President and all its members, whether of the higher bodies or the lower bodies, are all in the hands of the common people. It is on account of this that the Congress will always find it impossible not to identify itself with the masses and with the common people. Its existence will vanish the day it will drift apart from that policy. Therefore, it is clear that we have to implement the policies enunciated, or the objectives which have been adopted, by the Indian National Congress. So, I do not function here as an individual. I cannot deviate from the basic fundamental policy. This amendment was made during Panditji's life time and I have no doubt that the Congress will implement it. We will try to reach that objective and we should be in a position to reach it as early as we can.

13.40 hrs.

May I appeal to Shri H. N. Mukerji that he should not try to divide us? Of course, he talked about me and about my other colleagues. But even

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

in that small good thing, while referring to anti-corruption, he gave his sympathies for Shri Nanda because in his view other Members of the Cabinet had completely isolated themselves from it. I was amazed at this, coming as it did from Shri H. N. Mukerjee—these tactics may be good outside, but not in Parliament at least—from a sober, wise and able man like Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

An Hon. Member: Corrupted by communism.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I cannot fall a prey to his tactics. I am clever enough in that way. But I sympathise with him. It is not that I am completely upset, but I am merely upset over what he said personally about me *vis-a-vis* Panditji. This has hurt me, I must say, I was not able to raise my head that day and I could not look into his eye; I must admit. It hurt me deeply. As regards his criticisms about our policies, about our way of doing things, about administration etc. I am prepared to accept many things and admit many things and shall try to rectify them. But this kind of personal references and personal attacks, I feel, was wholly unjustified and was absolutely wrong, and it does not behave an hon. Member here.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I would like the hon. Prime Minister to point out where exactly was the personal attack.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: He did say it. He has tried to say throughout that I was deviating from Nehru's policy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Does not the hon. Prime Minister know that when the Prime Minister is referred to, he is referred to as representative of the entire Cabinet and not as an individual?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: He did say that. I would submit that you

have to look to our decisions, the decisions of the Cabinet, and the decisions of the Government. As regards statements by Ministers, of course, there should not be complete freedom, there should be restraint, and yet the Members of the Cabinet do express their views sometimes in one way and sometimes in the other way, but by and large, they have the collective responsibility, and every Minister has to realise and understand the fact that the decisions of the Government are final and nothing should be said against the decisions taken by the Government as a whole.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I would like the hon. Prime Minister to point out one single sentence where I had made a personal attack? Let him refer to the record and do it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I was going to say that I sympathised with him, because his main problem is not this Government at the present moment,....

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: To tell the truth, I think that it is a misrepresentation....

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: His main problem is our friend who is at the present moment sitting to his left, not Shri Surendranath Dwivedy or Shri U. M. Trivedi but perhaps Shri A. K. Gopalan (*Interruptions*). I do not know whether Shri A. K. Gopalan is called leftist because he sits to his left or because of other reasons....

Shri Tyagi: That is because he had left the party.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But in any case there is a division in the Communist Party.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: So, what?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: We were also rightists and leftists, but now there are rightists and leftists in the Communist Party also.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is absurd.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Therefore, I feel that he has to compensate for his policies, for his rightism, by making such strong personal attacks, and putting a false show.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Where was the personal attack?

On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister of this country chooses to report over and over again that somebody who happens to be in this instance made a personal attack. I know the language in which I spoke to a certain extent, and I want to find out where exactly was the personal attack. If I had made a personal attack, I would certainly say that I am sorry about it because I had no such thing in mind. I made a political attack. If the Prime Minister does not understand the difference between personal attack and political attack, I am very sorry. I did not want to say all this, and I never interrupted him throughout his speech, and I did not wish to do so, but he gives unnecessary provocation. He should know better than that.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I wish that he had the same feelings when he was actually speaking. Unfortunately, he referred to me as a split personality. He should not forget that fact. Can there be a worse personal attack on me than these observations?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I sympathise with you for your knowledge of the language.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I did not want to go into that, but I do feel that the observations made by Shri H. N. Mukerjee were highly objectionable and absolutely wrong. I felt amused that he should preach me about consistency. What did the Communist Party do? The Communist Party can enter into an alliance with the DMK and with any

communal organisation; because if it helps them in their election, they will do all that. I did not want to repeat these things. But who has got a split personality? Is it the leaders and members of the communist party or I who am sitting here? When he makes that kind of attack, he should not have forgotten this . .

Shri Nambiar: Which party joined the Muslim League in Kerala at the time of elections. It was the Congress Party which did it. You preach something else to others, but you practise the same thing.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I did not want to say all these things. The Communist Party, I am sorry to repeat it, was in doubt even when there was an aggression on this country by China.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: There was no doubt.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: They were doubtful. I might say that more or less, and of course they said it, that they put India and China on the same level. They said 'Oh' there is aggression? One does not know who the aggressor is'. And there was severe criticism even in those days, I know, of Panditji; himself and of the Government and also of others. These are past matters. I did not want to refer to them. But when they talk of split personality, I would say that if the members of the Communist Party cannot be clear in their minds as to who the aggressor was, I do not know what they are going to do with this country, and how they will conduct the affairs of this if they were to come to power . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: They will never come to power.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, I must give credit

Shri Kapur Singh: Ban them.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव आपके हैं और चीन के साथ रिश्ता भी आपका है।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But, anyhow, I must give credit to Shri H. N. Mukerjee for one thing. I would not like to be unfair to him at least now. It has now dawned upon him that the policies of China and Mao Tse-Tung are not correct, that they are wrong, and that theirs is an expansionist policy and a policy of aggression. This is what recently Shri S. A. Dange himself has said. But, anyhow, even if it dawns late, even if he gets to this after the sunset, even then it is good, and there is no harm in that.

I do not want to say much more, because I have already taken a good deal of time. I do not want to say much on international matters in this debate....

Shri Hem Barua: That was what we were interested in. We were interested in knowing something about China and our policy on the border dispute, Kashmir and all that.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: ... I say this because there will be a debate on international affairs, and perhaps my colleague will also deal with the matter. But I would like to say that it is clear that we have followed a well-set course for a number of years in the international field and in international matters. As I have said earlier, we believe in non-alignment and in the pursuit of peaceful methods for the settlement of international disputes. We are equally clear that colonies should not exist and that racialism should be resisted. Coexistence is a wholesome and absolutely sound policy which was initiated and strengthened by our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlalji. We wholeheartedly endorse it and it is a great achievement of the policy of coexistence that in certain matters even the biggest powers are coming

closer to each other. Any threat or danger of war would be ruinous for the world, specially for countries like India who are engaged in fighting an exceedingly difficult problem, that of poverty and unemployment.

About Shri Jaya Prakash Narain, I want to make one point clear. Reference was made to him by Shri Chatterjee. I might make it quite clear that he did not carry any letter from me for the President of Pakistan.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It was published in the papers like that.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It is absolutely wrong. Of course, he is very keen that India and Pakistan should come together. He feels that even communalism can be fought better both in India as well as in Pakistan, if both come closer to each other. I do not want to come in his way in his effort. In fact, I agree with him that it would be in the self-interest of both the countries to live in peace.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about Aksai Chin?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: In regard to Kashmir and the talk of Aksai Chin, some friends of the Communist Party are very happy. But when he talks of Pakistan, they become angry.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am not at all angry. I say he had no business to say that. If somebody talks about these things, you put him in prison. Why not put him in prison?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: In regard to Kashmir, I do not want to say much; there is also not enough time. But the late Prime Minister and I also have made public pronouncements on more than one occasion. The Government's stand remains the same. But I would, in any case, like to meet President Ayub for an exchange of views.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):
No harm.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I must say that I do not fancy the idea of keeping in complete isolation and not talking or discussing with others. We have always tolerated difference of opinion, and I feel pained when I see sometimes an exhibition occasionally of intolerance.

About China, I have nothing much to add. The position remains the same, although I do not rule out talks and discussions with them also, in case it is considered necessary.

I would like to recall what the late President Kennedy said in his inaugural address:

"Let us never negotiate but of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate".

I think that is the best principle which should be accepted by us in this country.

Shri Hem Barua: That is all right. We wanted to know about our immediate problem with China.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: As regards what is being done on our frontiers and for strengthening our defence forces, our Defence Minister would be making an elaborate statement.

Shri Hem Barua: I wanted to know on the political plane, our immediate problem with China.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I said that there is no change in the present position, and the Defence Minister would be making an elaborate statement on Monday. I hope Members will get enough information from that statement. I only wanted to add a word about Malaysia, we have no doubt good relations with Malaysia, and there is nothing new about it. It would be unfortunate if the sovereignty of Malaysia is disturbed by use

of force. We have, however, always supported the idea of Indonesia and Malaysia trying to settle matters between themselves.

I like the idea suggested by Shri Krishna Menon yesterday that the non-aligned nations conference should move in this matter and try to settle these differences.

I would like to conclude by affirming our firm faith in democracy and socialism. This is the objective and goal, as I said, of the Indian National Congress. An amendment was recently made. I am part of this great political organisation which has not only fought for and achieved independence for our country but has also during the last 17 years of independence, striven continuously to provide political stability as well as social justice to our people.

To my mind, socialism in India must mean a better deal for the great mass of our people who are engaged in agriculture, the large number of workers who are engaged in the various factories and the middle classes who have suffered much during the period of rising prices. These are what I call the common men of my country. As the head of the Government, it would be my continuous endeavour to see that these objectives are realised and that a social and economic order is established in which the welfare of our people is assured. Thank you.

श्री बागड़ी : प्रधान मंत्री इस बात को कहें कि चीन के पास जो जमीन है उसे दे कर सन्धि नहीं की जायेगी। प्रधान मंत्री इस बात का स्पष्टीकरण करें कि चीन के साथ अपनी जमीन को खो कर हम कोई फैसला नहीं करेंगे।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (विजनीर) : जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य के आरम्भ में कहा कि हम कोई अन्तरबाधा उन के भाषण में न डालें। यदि कोई प्रश्न हो तो बाद में

[श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

पूछ लिया जाये। शेख अब्दुल्ला के रिलीज होने के बाद काश्मीर में जो आन्तरिक स्थिति बिगड़ रही है और जिस तरह से वहां के राष्ट्रीय मुसलमानों को, वहां के एम०एल०एच० को और एम०पी०जी० को पीटा जा रहा है, खुले आम वहां पर बगावत की भ्रमकी दी जा रही है और यह कहा जा रहा है कि काश्मीर में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के आशवासन की कोई कीमत नहीं है, राय गुमारी हो कर रहेगी चाहे सूर्य पूर्व से पश्चिम में निकलने लगे, और ऐसी स्थिति में आप उस व्यक्ति को बार बार यहां बुलाते हैं और इस तरह से प्रोत्साहन देते हैं तो इस से काश्मीर की जनता में तरह तरह के सन्देह पैदा हो रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज प्रधान मंत्री हाउस के द्वारा देश को बतलायें कि शेख अब्दुल्ला के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार की क्या स्थिति है और उन के साथ ऐसा व्यवहार क्यों किया जा रहा है।

Shri Hem Barua rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can allow only two or three Members Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Hem Barua: Three.

Shri Nath Pai: The Prime Minister said that his Government remains committed to the solution of international disputes by peaceful means. May I know whether he believes in, or his Government is committed to, bringing about the vacation of what has been taken by aggression also by negotiations, and secondly, whether in view of what is appearing repeatedly about a rapprochement with China, he will give an assurance to the House that no settlement of any kind will be reached with the People's Republic of China which may involve the giving away of any part of Indian territory?

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar): I wish to ask one question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. We have had a long debate. There will be other opportunities also.

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : जहां तक काश्मीर की बात है शेख अब्दुल्ला की रिहाई हुई, और किसी आदमी को आप दस बारह साल बाद अगर रिहा कर दें तो इस में कोई बड़े गजब की बात नहीं है। दूसरी बात यह कि जब दस, बारह या आठ नौ साल बाद कोई आदमी छूटा है तो उस के दिल में कुछ बातें रहेंगी ही। साथ ही साथ यह भी है कि जब वह गिरफ्तार हुए तब भी उन के कुछ खयालात और कुछ विचार थे। निकल कर उन्होंने उन विचारों को जाहिर किया है, प्रकट किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में कोई घबराने की बात नहीं है। यह सही है कि विचार के प्रकट होते होते अगर कोई ऐसी बात लगे कि प्रेक्टिकली कुछ ऐसी बात हो जायेगी जो देश की शान्ति को खतरों में डालेगी, तब जरूर कार्रवाई की जाती है।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : इसी हाउस में आप के यह शब्द थे कि बोलने की स्वतन्त्रता है। लेकिन अगर कोई आदमी ऐसे बोलेंगा जिस से देश के किसी टुकड़े को अलग करने की बात पैदा हो तो सरकार उसे कभी बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकती है। ऐसी स्थिति में जब शेख अब्दुल्ला ऐसी बात कह रहे हैं तो सरकार उसे बर्दाश्त क्यों कर रही है।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : शेख अब्दुल्ला ने उस के बाद इस अलाहदगी की बात को काफी धीमा कर दिया है। हाँ, यह जरूर है कि काश्मीर के बारे में उन की अपनी साफ राय है, लेकिन वह कोई ऐसी स्थिति और सिचुएशन नहीं पैदा करना चाहते जिस से देश में या मुल्क में अशान्ति हो। खास तौर से उन को इस बात कि फिक्क है कि वे कोई ऐसी बात न करें जिस से साम्प्रदायिक फिजा, कम्युनल सिचुएशन बिगड़े। तो इन सब सूत्रों में मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि हमारे लिए कोई ऐसी चिन्ता या परेशानी की बात है? एक बात।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो काश्मीर का संकट है वह उन का आपस का ही है। कुछ लोग शेख साहब का समर्थन करते हैं और कुछ लोग उन का समर्थन नहीं करते। उन का आपस में थोड़ा बहुत संघर्ष होता है। उसका इन्तिजाम गवर्नमेंट करती है, रोक थाम करती है, गिरफ्तारी करती है, पकड़ धकड़ करती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मामले को हमें धीरज से लेना चाहिए। और इस के बारे में तो कोई फैसला जब भी करेंगे तो सोच विचार कर धीर अचछी तरह से देख भाल कर करेंगे कि देश को नुकसान न पहुंचे। ऐसा फैसला हम बिना सोच विचार कैंमे कर सकते हैं।

जहां तक चीन की बात है, उसमें आज मेरे लिए कहना कि बेकेशन हम करा देंगे या

14.00 hrs.

Shri Nath Pai: You said that this Government is pledged to the solution of international disputes by peaceful methods and negotiations. Does this formula apply to bringing about a vacation of aggression, and may I know whether in the impending negotiations to which you made reference towards the conclusion of your speech, —may we have an assurance—that no agreement will be reached with China which may involve the giving away of any part of what we call Indian territory?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : जहां तक बात-चीत की बात है, मेरी अपनी राय यह है कि मैं कभी बातचीत के रास्ते को बन्द नहीं करना चाहता। लेकिन शायद डा० लोहिया साहब नाराज हो जाएंगे, लेकिन अगर सम्मानपूर्वक बात करने का मौका मिले तो हमें बात करने से इन्कार नहीं करना चाहिए यह मेरी राय है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं कहां नाराज हूँ। मैं तो बात करने के लिए हमेशा तैयार हूँ। जब मैं आप से बात करने को तैयार

रहता हूँ तो आप चीन से जरूर बात करें। लेकिन आप हमेशा अपने भाषण में कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान का सम्मान खो कर चीन से सन्धि नहीं करेंगे—मैं समझता नहीं कहता—उसके बजाय आप यह कहें कि हम हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन को खो कर चीन से कोई सन्धि नहीं करेंगे। यह बात साफ कर दीजिए।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : जहां तक भारत की जमीन का कोई टुकड़ा देने का सवाल है, कोई एक व्यक्ति चाहे वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर हो, उसके लिए ऐसा करना नामुमकिन है। मैं खुद ऐसा नहीं कर सकता।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : 15 अगस्त, सन् 1947 से आप यही कहा करते हैं

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : लेकिन जमीन देने न देने और लेने न लेने का सवाल अलग है। उस तरफ हमारी राय साफ है। लेकिन यह बात जरूर है कि पता नहीं कि किस वकत डा० लोहिया साहब हमारे जो आज हमारे खिलाफ हैं कल शायद हमारे दोस्त हो जाएं . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तो अभी भी आप का दोस्त हूँ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : उधर से जो उद्धरण दिया गया उनमें कहा गया है कि दुनिया में शान्ति लायी जा सकती है By peaceful methods, by peaceful approach, by peaceful talks, by peaceful discussions. लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि जब हम थोड़ा सा भी उस सिद्धान्त पर चलना शुरू करते हैं तो य. स. समझा जाता है कि हम कमजोरी दिखा रहा हैं। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो आदमी शान्ति से बात कर सकता है वह कमजोर नहीं है, वह दिल में मजबूत हुआ करता है। और अगर हम चीन से शान्ति से बात कर सकते हैं—ऐसा मैंने पहले भी कहा है और आज भी कहता हूँ—तो हम वैसा करेंगे लेकिन क्या नतीजा होगा यह नहीं कहा

[श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री]

जा सकता। लेकिन जो राष्ट्र को नुकसान पहुंचावे वह भारत सरकार के लिए करना कैसे सम्भव है।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जो भूमि चीन के पास है उसके लिए क्या करेंगे यह बात साफ करिए। वह यों ही रहेगी या आप वापस लेंगे ?

Some hon. Members rose--

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. No more questions. Shri Chatterjee.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: We have listened to the Prime Minister for two hours, a little over two hours. We regret we are still unconvinced. We are sorry that he did not make a more pointed and more compact reference to some of the points which we made in the course of the debate.

We wanted a categorical and clear statement from the Prime Minister that there shall be no deviation from the policy announced by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and there shall be no surrender of Indian territory and nothing will be done without the permission of Parliament. We wanted to know what steps are being taken to push out the aggressor from Indian soil. We are not concerned to know what the Defence Minister has been doing for the purpose of getting some ammunition or weapons from other countries. We want to know what real steps are being taken, apart from begging from other countries, for the purpose of upholding our national sovereignty and our integrity and for riding the country of the aggressor. That is the point which we wanted to know. We are not satisfied with the answer that has been given by the Prime Minister.

It is not a question of negotiation. Our apprehension is that the Government is too much committed to the Colombo proposals, and that there will be continuance of the present stalemate, that nothing serious will be

done for the purpose of vindicating India's honour and India's territorial sovereignty. We wanted some clear indication of policy, and we have not got it.

The first speaker from the Congress ranks who replied to our points was Shri Hanumanthaiya. As was expected from a gentleman of his position, he paid a compliment to the Mover for his speech, which he characterised as dignified and argumentative. I am thankful for the compliment. We did not descent to personalities or indulge in individual declaration or denunciation. I am sorry that that has not been kept up by some Members of the House.

I also regret that Shri Hanumanthaiya let slip one expression which hurt me. He talked of parochialism or provincialism. When we talk of the intense misery of the millions of refugees who are coming out from East Bengal, we want to emphasize that this is not a parochial problem, that this is not a Bengal problem, that this is not a provincial issue. It is a national problem, it is an all-India problem, and even a Congress leader of West Bengal issued a statement the other day strongly deprecating the inaction on the part of the Rehabilitation Ministry, and pointing out that in the matter of rehabilitation of millions of refugees, where a little had been done much remained to be done. That is not a problem which is parochial, and we should not be charged with provincialism on that score.

The other day a resolution was moved in this House by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, and the hon. Members from the Congress benches supported that resolution that having regard to the attitude of Pakistan and the deliberate policy of minority bating and squeezing out it is essential that the entire problem should be treated on a war footing, and that resolution was passed unanimously by