

अध्यक्ष महोदय : शाम को एक ले रहा हूँ। कल इसे ले लेंगे।

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I think the questions could be allowed now, Sir, and the Members may be permitted to put questions.

Mr. Speaker: I have said that I might put it up for another day. If he wants, Shri Hem Barua might put his question on that day.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक जानकारी चाहता हूँ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी मैं दूसरे माननीय सदस्य से बात कर रहा हूँ। इस समय श्री बागड़ी की बात को कैसे ले सकता हूँ।

Shri Priya Gupta: This is a very important question. Closing down of a national institution is a loss to the public. One day's delay in the discussion of the matter is equivalent to one year's loss. So, it should be discussed today.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: How to deal with this? I can call only one after the other. I will not allow this kind of thing. I cannot carry on the proceedings in this manner. When I call one Member, some other Member stands up and he just obstructs the proceedings. That cannot happen.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Sir, I have pleasure in informing you that Shri Vijya Bhushan Singh Dev of Jaspur has joined my party, and he may be allowed a seat accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

श्री बागड़ी : मैं आपसे एक जानकारी चाहता हूँ। श्री स० मो० नरजी को दस दिन आज 2 बजे पूरे हो जाते हैं। तो क्या 2 बजे के बाद

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इसका जवाब नहीं दे सकता। मुझे इसका पता नहीं है।

12.38 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will not take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri H.N. Mukerjee on the 1st August, 1966, namely:—

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

Shri R. S. Pandey

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): May I know when the Prime Minister will reply?

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने अपने भाषण में दो भागों के अवलम्बन की बात की थी। एक तो यह कि चुनाव के माध्यम से सरकार पर कब्जा किया जाये, दूसरे यदि चुनाव के माध्यम से वह कारगर न हुए तो कोई दूसरा रास्ता अपनाना पड़ेगा। यह दूसरे रास्ते का इशारा प्रजातंत्र के सामने और संसद् के सामने भी एक प्रश्न चिह्न है कि वह दूसरा रास्ता कौन सा हो सकता है।

आज तक सदन के बाहर और भीतर भी डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने लोगों से बार-बार कहा है “घेरा डालो, भारत बंद।” लूटो और मारो—

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फरूखाबाद) : मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : बँठ जाओ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: First there ought to be silence so that we might follow the proceedings. Such an atmosphere has developed here that members have to

[Mr. Speaker]

Speak at the top pitch of their voice to be heard. The atmosphere should be more intimate. There ought not to be any attempt at any great oratory or loud speaking. There ought not to be an atmosphere of arguing with the other and we should feel that intimately we are discussing certain things for the common good, so that we can hear each other even if we speak at a lower voice. Members begin at a very high pitch. I appeal to all of them to take this into consideration.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरे बारे में बिल्कुल गलत बात यहां कही जा रही है। या तो मुझे नियमों में जो एक यह नियम है कि कोई सदस्य किसी दूसरे से सवाल पूछ सकता है, उसके अनुसार सवाल पूछने दीजिये और या यहां यह कहने की इजाजत दीजिये कि यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है कि मैं सरकार को बदलने के लिए बन्द के रास्ते का कभी प्रचार करता हूँ। मैंने खाली यह कहा है कि जो अन्याय है उसका प्रतिकार तत्क्षण हो जाना चाहिये। मान लीजिये कि सरकार पांच साल के लिए बन गई और अन्याय हो गया। दो चार महीने में ही बड़ा अन्याय जैसे अकाल है, वह हो गया। उस वक्त बन्द, हड़ताल, विद्रोह सब कुछ करना जरूरी हो जाता है। इसके बारे में माननीय सदस्य जवाब दें, जो कहना हो कहें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जैसा आपकी स्पीच को दूसरों ने समझा है उसके अनुसार उनको कह लेने दीजिये। अगर आप फिर समझें कि उन्होंने गलत बयानी की है तो मैं आपको इजाजत दे दूंगा सफाई पेश करने की। लेकिन इस तरह से दखल न दीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस तरह से दखल देने की बात अब आप कहते हैं तो एक नियम है कि कोई भी सदस्य किसी दूसरे से सवाल पूछ सकता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सवाल इस तरह से नहीं पूछे जा सकते हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : मैं पीछे से बोलता हूँ इसलिये जोर से बोलना पड़ता है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : आप आगे आ जाइये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं सिर्फ आपके लिए नहीं कह रहा हूँ। सभी मੈम्बर्ज के लिए मैं कह रहा हूँ। और मੈम्बर साहिबान भी जोर से बोलते हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : एक बार मुझे डांट दिया गया था इसलिए कि मैं अपनी सीट से नहीं बोल रहा था। एक बार मैं यहां से बोला था और आपने मुझे डांट दिया था। इसलिए अपनी ही सीट से मैं बोलता हूँ अब।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि न्याय और अन्याय का जो निर्णय है वह भी इसी सदन पर छोड़ दिया जाना चाहिये। ये बन्द और घेरा डालने की बात कहते हैं। अब आप मान लीजिए कि रूलिंग पार्टी अन्याय कर रही है। आप जानते ही हैं कि हमारे यहां वाफो स्वातन्त्र्य है, उसका अधिकार सब को है, सब को बड़ा संरक्षण दिया गया है लिख कर अपनी बात कहने का और बोल कर अपनी बात दूसरों तक पहुंचाने का। शान्तिपूर्वक आन्दोलन भी हो सकते हैं। लेकिन प्रजातन्त्र के अन्दर यह कहीं नहीं है कि संसदीय प्रणाली के प्रति जनता की आस्था और जनता का विश्वास हम डिंगा दें। प्रजातन्त्र की जो जड़ें हैं उनको हथ हिलाने नहीं देगे। कोई भी किसी प्रकार का फोर्सिस्ट आन्दोलन नहीं होना चाहिये। कोई भी ऐजा आन्दोलन नहीं चलाया जाना चाहिये जिस में विद्रोह और आतंक की बात आती हो। अगर लोहिया जी इन बातों को मानते हैं तो उनकी बात हमें स्वीकार है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बारबार जो यह घेरा डालने की बात कही जाती है तो कभी

कभी ऐसा भी होता है कि आपकी पार्टी पर घेरा डालने की बात यहां हो जाती है। क्या यहां आपके खिलाफ घेरा नहीं डाला गया? अध्यक्ष महोदय ने मार्शल को जब आपके पास भेजा तो क्या उसको टंगड़ी मार कर गिरा नहीं दिया गया था? उसको बूसे भी दिखाये गये थे। यहां इस सर्वोच्च सभा में इस श्रेष्ठ सदन में यह सब कुछ होता है तो श्रीमन् इन पर क्या भरोसा किया जा सकता है। न्याय क्या है, अन्याय क्या है, इसकी परिभाषा इनकी स्वयं की है। स्वयं इनका एक शब्दकोष है, स्वयं इनकी एक कल्पना है, स्वयं ही एक प्रभु सत्ता की लालता है जिस के कारण यह कभी कभी बेचैन हो जाया करते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि एक लोहिया जी तो क्या सैकड़ों लोहिया जी भी इस धरती पर पैदा हो जायें और चाहे जितनी क्रान्ति का विगुल बजा दें हमारे देश की जो आस्था और विश्वास और श्रद्धा इस संसदीय प्रणाली के प्रति और आपके प्रति है, उसको डिगा नहीं सकते हैं। जनता जानती है कि जो निर्णय यहां लिया जाता है वह उसके कल्याण के लिए लिया जाता है। निर्णय जो लिये गए हैं उनकी लोहिया जी ने भर्त्सना की है। पार्टिशन से बे कर अबमूल्यन तक जितने भी निर्णय लिये गये हैं उनकी भर्त्सना इन्होंने की है। लेकिन जनता समझती है कि ये निर्णय उसके हित में लिये गए हैं। अभी पंजाब और हरियाणा के बारे में निर्णय किया गया है। अबमूल्यन के बारे में निर्णय लिया गया है। कर लीजिये क्रान्ति आप और ले लीजिये वोट आप। हम देख लेंगे कि कितने वोट आप लेते हैं। छः महीने ही तो बाकी रह गए हैं।

जब पार्टिशन हुआ, रक्तपात हुआ, उधर से उधर लाखों आदमी गए तब पंजाब के संबंध में सन्देह प्रकट हुआ था। जिस पंजाब ने बड़ा दुख सहा, जिसने बड़ी यातायातें सहनी-उसके प्रति बड़ा सन्देह प्रकट किया गया था। लेकिन हमने देख लिया कि वहां राष्ट्रीय सरकार बनी, कांग्रेसी सरकार बनी . . .

श्री बी० चं० शर्मा (गुरदासपुर) : पंजाब को छोड़ दो, मध्य प्रदेश की बात करो।

श्री राम सहाय राण्डेय : चुप रहो बूढ़े हो गए हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर यह मान भी लिया जाए कि वह, कभी कभी ऐसा करते हैं तो आपको नहीं करना चाहिये।

Shri R. S. Pandey: This is not a reflection on you. I never consider that you are old. You are as young as ever.

Mr. Speaker: I concede and confess that I am old.

श्री राम सहाय राण्डेय : उसके बाद देश की रचना भाषावार प्रान्तों के आधार पर हुई। हमने चाहा कि भाषावार प्रान्त बनें। विरोधी दलों ने बड़ा आन्दोलन किया। मैं आपका ध्यान गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। सभी विरोधी दल संगठित हो गए। थोड़ी बहुत उधर गड़बड़ी भी हुई। लेकिन हमारे चञ्चल साहब के नेतृत्व में महाराष्ट्र बना, गुजरात बना। गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र बनने के बाद वे लोग जो चुन कर आये थे आन्दोलन में फिर घराशाही हो गए, फिर अपने घर पहुंच गए। वहां के वहां पहुंच गए। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि निर्णय लेने की शक्ति, निर्णय लेने की क्षमता कांग्रेस में है। इस बात को जनता भी जानती है। निर्णय लेने के बाद अगर कोई हानि भी हमें नजर आई है तो उसका भी हमने आपके साथ निरीक्षण किया है, हमने आत्मनिरीक्षण किया है और उसको सुधारा है और अन्ततोगत्वा हमने देखा है कि जनता हमारे साथ है। पंजाब और हरियाणा के बारे में हमने निर्णय लिया है, अबमूल्यन के बारे में भी हमने निर्णय लिया है। ये दोनों निर्णय हमने इसलिए लिए हैं कि इस में जनता के कल्याण के दर्शन होते हैं। अबमूल्यन में ऐसा अर्थ-

[श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय]

व्यवस्था की झांकी मिलती है कि अन्ततोगत्वा हमारा विकास ही होगा। हमें पूंजी चाहिये और पूंजी इस लिये चाहिये कि हम अपने इस देश भारतवर्ष का विकास करना चाहते हैं। पूंजी आज हमें इस लिए चाहिये कि आज संसार के आधुनिकीकरण के संदर्भ में जबकि भौगोलिक सीमायें सिकुड़ रही हैं, एक दूसरे के प्रति सहयोग बढ़ रहा है, सहअस्तित्व की भावना का प्रतिपादन किया जा रहा है, एक दूसरे के आदान-प्रदान की प्रक्रिया का साक्षात्कार हो रहा है, और इस सब को देखते हुए हम चाहते हैं कि हम अपने देश का विकास तेजी से करें। रूस जहां पर कि रेजीमेंटिड इकोनामी है, वह भी दूसरों की सहायता ले रहा है। इटली की एक बड़ी फर्म से कोलैबोरेशन करके वह अपने यहां मोटरें तैयार करवा रहा है। पूर्वी यूरोप के देश एक दूसरे से पूंजी विनिमय करके कारखाने लगा रहे हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि हम से यहां यह कहा जा रहा है कि हम अमरीका के दबाव में आ गए और हमने अवमूल्यन कर दिया या हम अमरीका के दबाव में हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि न तो हम अमरीका के दबाव में हैं और न रूसके दबाव में हम आ सकते हैं। हम किसी के दबाव में नहीं हैं। जो हमारे साथ यित्रता करेगा उसके साथ हम सौहार्द और स्नेह का व्यवहार करेंगे। अमरीका से टेक्नाकल एजुकेशन के मामले में, फाउन्डेशन के मामले में, अज्ञान के मामले में, पूंजी के मामलों में सख्योग हमने लिया है और मास्को से भी सहायता हमने प्राप्त की है। हमें कोई शर्म नहीं है। शर्म इसलिए नहीं है कि हम इस देश की आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। हमने आधुनिक विचारधारा को अन्तर्गुप्त अपने आपको ढाला है। यह बात पुराना हो चुकी है कि जितना कपड़ा ही उतनेवर पसारी। आज के युग में हमें अपना उत्पादन बढ़ाना है, हमें अपनी सम्पत्ति का बढ़ाना है, और इस ध्येय की पूर्ति के लिए जित्त के पासदेने के लिये कुछ है उससे हम वह लेंगे और जो हमारे पास है उसकी हम दूसरों

को देंगे। इस आदान-प्रदान की प्रक्रिया में हम अपना विकास करना चाहते हैं।

ऐसी अवस्था में या तो आप यह कहें, विरोधी दल वाले यह कहें कि हमें विदेशी पूंजी नहीं लेनी चाहिये और अगर वे ऐसा कहते हैं तो उनको साथ-साथ जनता को जा कर यह भी कहना चाहिये कि जनता के कल्याण के जितने कार्य हैं वे हम को नहीं करने हैं, कालेज, स्कूल, सड़कें, बिजली, डैम आदि हमें नहीं बनाने हैं, खेती का उत्पादन हमें नहीं बढ़ाना है, आधुनिकीकरण की तरफ हमें नहीं जाना है और ये जो सब चीजें हैं इनको उठा कर हम एक तरफ रख दें। लेकिन अगर आप यह कहने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं और आप चाहते हैं कि देश का विकास हो तो जो देश सहायता और सहयोग के लिए हमारे पास आयेगा, उसकी सहायता और सहयोग हम स्वीकार करेंगे।

यह ठीक है कि अनाज की कमी है। दो वर्षों से वारिश नहीं हुई है लेकिन आप देखें कि यह अनाज की कमी यहां पर भाषणों की वर्षा करके पूरी नहीं हो सकती है, इसके बाहर पानी नहीं बरस सकता है। जब वर्षा होगी तब खेती होगी, यह कटु सत्य है। दो साल वर्षा नहीं हुई। आप यह भी देखें कि चीन और पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण हम पर हुआ। हमें अपनी रक्षा व्यवस्था पर बहुत अधिक खर्च करना पड़ा। अगर हमारे चीन समर्थक दोस्त चीन को कहते कि आक्रमण न करो और वह आक्रमण न करता तो क्या हमें कुत्ते ने काटा था जो हमने चार सौ करोड़ के बजाय एक हजार करोड़ रक्षा व्यवस्था पर खर्च किया। वह सरकार न करती। लेकिन वे हमारे दोस्त चीन से साठ गांठ करते हैं, तैयंगाना की क्रान्ति का सन्देश उसको देते हैं और कहते हैं कि सीमा खाली पड़ी है चले आओ, यहां पर दुर्भिक्ष पड़ा हुआ है, तुम चले आओ और आक्रमण कर दो।

फिर जब चीन खामोश बंठा है तब यहां घेरा डालो की बात करते हैं, उनके साथ सांठ-गांठ करते हैं जो इस तरह के नारे बुलन्द करते हैं।

कल हमारे गोपालन जी ने कहा कि बड़ी भ्रूणा हो रही है, इस सरकार के बुरे दिन आ गए हैं। हमारे त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा कि इस सरकार के दिन पूरे हो गए हैं और इस को भाग जाना चाहिये। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि दिन तो इनके पूरे हो गए हैं और इस बात का हमें दुख भी है। दुख इस बात का है कि जितनी तादाद में ये पत्र हैं इतनी तादाद में भी ये आगे नहीं आ पाएंगे क्योंकि कोई सच या स्वस्थ बात ये जनता तक नहीं पहुंचाते हैं।

ये विरोधी दल कांग्रेस के विरुद्ध गलत प्रचार और प्रापेगेंडा करते हैं। इन में से एक दल चीन के साथ लगा हुआ है।

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): He need not have any such doubts. We will come back in larger numbers.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय: जहां तक श्री रंगा का सम्बन्ध है वह पब्लिक सैक्टर के खिलाफ है। एक ओर तो वह कांग्रेस सरकार के विरुद्ध अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव लाते हैं और दूसरी ओर वह सर्वदलीय राष्ट्रीय सरकार की रचना की भी मांग करते हैं। मालूम नहीं कि उनको क्या हो गया है। उन के सबसे बड़े राजनीतिक आचार्य श्री राज-गोपालाचार्य कहते हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट हमारे दुश्मन नम्बर एक हैं लेकिन श्री रंगा एक सर्वदलीय राष्ट्रीय सरकार की रचना का सुझाव देते हैं और उसमें शामिल होना चाहते हैं। आपने देखा होगा कि जब कभी ग्रहण लगता है तो भिखारी सड़कों पर चिल्ला चिल्ला कर कहते हैं "दो दाक, छूटे ग्रहण"। इसी प्रकार श्री रंगा कहते हैं कि हमको राष्ट्रीय सरकार में शामिल कर लो हम

राष्ट्रीय संकट का मुकाबला करने में आपकी मदद करेंगे। वास्तव में राष्ट्रीय संकट तो वे पैदा कर रहे हैं। हम तो राष्ट्रीय संकट का इलाज कर रहे हैं।

श्री रंगा के पड़ोस में बैठे हुए हैं श्री मुकर्जी। वियतनाम के बारे में वह कहते हैं "तौमार नाम, आमार नाम, वियतनाम, वियतनाम"। लेकिन उनके राजनीतिक दल के तीन वर्ष के इतिहास में, पूरे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के दौरान में, क्या उनके भाषियों में से किसी ने कभी यह भी कहा "तौमार नाम, आमार नाम, भारत नाम, भारत नाम"? कभी नहीं कहा है। उनकी डोर कहीं, पतंग कहीं और टुनकियां कहीं है।

श्री मुकर्जी ने परसों वित्त मंत्री के सम्बन्ध से कहा कि वह ढोल उठाए हुए हैं, जिसको कोई दूसरा बजाता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग परस्पर अपना ढोल बजाया करते हैं, यह कोई बुरी बात नहीं है, लेकिन उनका ढोल तो इतनी दूर से, रूस से बजाता है और श्री गोपालन का ढोल चीन से बजाता है। इसके अलावा आप ने वैंड में देखा होगा कि अगर बड़ा ढोल है, तो कोई दूसरा उसको बजाता है और इसमें कोई अनुचित बात नहीं है।

Shri Nambiar: These accusations were denied earlier. So, there is no point in repeating them. Also, I want to raise a point of order. If somebody says that some people from abroad are holding the strings and these leaders are acting on the orders from China, it is a very serious accusation.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय: अब आप लोहिया जी पर आ जाइये। उन्होंने चुनाव के लिए क्या स्टेटेजी बनाई है? उन्होंने कहा कि महिला प्रधान मंत्री है, लेकिन उन्होंने चौबीस करोड़ महिलाओं के लिए कुछ नहीं किया है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि घरों में धुआ निकलने के लिए चिमनियां बना दी जायें,

[श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय]

नाकि उनकी आंखें खराब न हों। वाह! घरों में चि.नियां तो हम ही बनायेंगे, लेकिन इस प्रकार की बातें वह कर श्री लोहिया चौबीस करोड़ महिलाओं के वोट प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं।

उन्होंने आगे कहा कि महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि अगर भंगी की लड़की प्रधान मंत्री होगी, तो उनको संतोष होगा। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हमने अपने संविधान में यह स्पष्ट कर दिया है कि इस देश में जात-पात नहीं होगी।

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : नौकरियों को और अपने कारनामों को देखें और बतायें कि जात-पात है या नहीं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : प्रजातंत्र के लिए सबसे बड़ा दिन वह था जब हम ने भारत की एक पुत्री को भारत के प्रधान मंत्री के स्थान पर बिठाया जो आज इतना महान उत्तरदायित्व को वहन कर रही है।

इसके बाद डा० लोहिया ने यह कहा कि इस सरकार के द्वारा हरिजनों पर गोलियां चलाई गईं। वह कुछ नाम भी लिख कर ले आए और कहा कि वे सब चमार थे जो कि गोली से मारे गए। यह मैटर आफ एन्क्वायरी है। मैं नहीं जानता कि वे लोग चमार थे या नहीं। डा० लोहिया ने कहा कि कांग्रेस हरिजनों और आदिवासियों में लगभग अस्सी प्रतिशत सीटें जीत जाया करती है— इसलिए उनके वोटों को तोड़ा जाये। महिलाओं के बारे में उन्होंने कहा कि उनके लिए कुछ किया ही नहीं गया है। उनके सेक्स का व्यक्ति प्रधान मंत्री है और फिर भी उनके लिए कुछ नहीं किया गया है!

इस प्रकार जब लोहिया जी को चौबीस करोड़ महिलाओं और आदिवासियों तथा हरिजनों के बहुसंख्यक वोट मिल जायेंगे, तो वह अपनी सरकार का निर्माण करने के लिए की गैं बैठ कर आयेंगे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस पालकी को ढोने वालों में भाननीय सदस्य भी रहेंगे।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : जब वह पालकी पर बैठ कर आयेंगे, तो एक कंधा लगायेंगे श्री लिमये, एक कंधा लगायेंगे श्री यादव, एक कंधा लगायेंगे वागड़ी जी और एक कंधा लगायेंगे श्री किशन पटनायक और वे लोग यह कहते हुए आयेंगे, “रास्ता खाली करो, प्रधान मंत्री आ रहा है।” मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह दिन बहुत बहुत दूर है। वह “घेरा डालो” और “बन्द” के माध्यम से प्रधान मंत्री के पद पर पहुंचना चाहते हैं, लेकिन उनके लिए प्रधान मंत्री के उत्तरदायित्व का निर्वाह करना बहुत दूरत दूर है।

यह हाल है इन विरोधी दलों का !

जहां तक हमारे दल और सरकार का सम्बन्ध है, उनको इस बात का एहसास है कि देश में अनाज की कमी है और उद्योगों के उत्पादन में भी कमी हुई है, जिसका कारण है वर्षा का न होना और युद्ध। हमारे दल ने इस बारे में स्पष्ट आत्म-निरीक्षण करके—जैसा कि आचार्य कृपालानी ने हमें कहा है—कुछ निर्णय लिये हैं और आगे भी आवश्यक कार्यवाही की जायेगी।

आचार्य कृपालानी को तो मैं भूल ही गया। वह हम लोगों का ही आत्म-निरीक्षण करने की बात कहते हैं, विरोधियों को नहीं कहते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं तो यह अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव को पेश करने के पक्ष में नहीं था, लेकिन क्या करें, ये कांग्रेसी अपने मन की भावनाओं को प्रकट नहीं करते हैं। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लोहिया जी के बारे में वह जो सोचते हैं और जो प्राइवेटली कहते हैं, उसको वह सदन में क्यों नहीं कहते? और कम्युनिस्टों के बारे में वह जो सोचते हैं, उसको वह सदन में क्यों नहीं कहते हैं? ये सब

उपदेश वह केवल हम लोगों को ही देते हैं। आत्म-निरीक्षण हम ही करें और अपनी भावनाओं को हम ही व्यक्त करें ! आत्म-निरीक्षण की बात को हम स्वीकार करते हैं।

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): I am sorry, I told Congressmen to go a little within themselves. I withdraw my words.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : मैं तो आचार्य कृपालानी का आदर करता हूँ। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, आत्म-निरीक्षण के उपदेश को हम स्वीकार करते हैं। लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि चूंकि देश में चीजों की कमी है, भाव बढ़ रहे हैं और इस सम्बन्ध में औद्योगिक विकास और उत्पादन के लिए बाहर से काम्पोनेंट्स और रा मँटी-रियल मगाने के लिए हमको रुपये का अवमूल्यन करना पड़ा है। इसके बाद देश के विकास और अपनी अर्थ-व्यवस्था के सुधार के लिए जो भी फालो-अप एक्शन आवश्यक होगा, वह हम लेंगे।

हम चाहते हैं कि कृषि-उत्पादन में कैपिटल इन्वेस्टमेंट करके किसानों को दिया जाये। चूंकि वे राष्ट्रीय आमदनी का 45 प्रतिशत कांट्रीब्यूट करते हैं, इसलिए इसी अनुपात में उन पर खर्च किया जाना चाहिए। खेती हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था और पूंजी का आधार है। अगर उसको शक्ति मिलेगी तो हम अपनी इंडस्ट्रीज को भी अच्छी तरह से चला सकेंगे। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा उत्पादन बढ़े और उसके लिए हम सब कुछ करेंगे—जो कुछ भी साधन आवश्यक होंगे, उनको हम उपलब्ध करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे।

जहां तक भावों के बढ़ने का प्रश्न है उसकी चिन्ता हमको भी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सुपर मार्केट के अलावा हमको और भी हजारों दुकानें और फ़ारेन कंट्रीज की तरह की मौबाइल शाप भी खोलनी पड़ेगी। मैं सरकार से यह भी अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि जितने जमाखोर हैं, जो आवश्यक

वस्तुओं का संग्रह करते हैं, उनके खिलाफ बड़ी सख्त कार्यवाही की जानी चाहिए। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो अपील की है, उसका प्रभाव होगा और जिन लोगों के पास अनाज का स्टॉक है, वे उसको बेवेंगे। लेकिन अगर वे ऐसा नहीं करते हैं, तो कानून का सहारा लेकर वे तमाम आवश्यक वस्तुयें बाहर निकाल ली जायें, ताकि प्राइसिंग न बढ़ने पायें।

जिन देशों ने हमको अनाज की कमी को दूर करने के लिए सहायता दी है, हम उनको बधाई देते हैं। इसमें हमको कोई शर्म नहीं है। देश में अनाज की कमी होने के कारण हम लोग अमरीका के प्रभाव में नहीं गए हैं। अमरीका ने हमारे साथ सहयोग करके हमको पी० एल० 480 के अन्तर्गत अनाज दिया है। हम श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम को भी बधाई देना चाहते हैं कि उन्होंने विरोधी दलों की आलोचना से प्रभावित हुए बिना और उनके दबाव में न आकर इस देश को बचाया। जब हमारा देश स्वतंत्र नहीं हुआ था, तब बंगाल में लगभग 23 लाख आदमी कुत्ते की मौत मर गए, लेकिन जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा है, भौगोलिक सीमाओं के सिकुड़ने और संसार में सहयोग और सह-अस्तित्व की भावना होने के कारण आज वह स्थिति उत्पन्न नहीं हुई है। अमरीका वह मित्र है, जो हमारे काम आया। इसमें प्रो-अमरीकन होने की बात नहीं है। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर रूस के पास अनाज होता और वह हमको देता, तो हम उसका स्वागत करते। इस समय हमारी आर्थिक योजनाओं के सम्बन्ध में रूस हमारी जो मदद कर रहा है, हम उसका भी स्वागत करते हैं। जो भी राष्ट्र हमारी सहायता कर रहे हैं, हम उनको धन्यवाद देते हैं और उनके सहयोग का स्वागत करते हैं। हम इस बारे में एपॉलोजिटिक नहीं हैं।

हमने अपने देश में तहलके भी देखे हैं हलचल भी देखी है और क्रान्ति भी देखी। 1942 के आन्दोलन में जब "करो या मरो"

[श्री राम सहाय पान्डेय]

का नारा लगाया गया था, तब ये कम्युनिस्ट कहाँ थे? तब ये दूसरों का ढौल बजा रहे थे। आत्म-निरीक्षण का उपदेश हमको मालूम है। हमको यह भी मालूम है कि राजनीतिक जीवन में जनता के साथ स्पष्ट व्यवहार करना चाहिए। जनतंत्र के संरक्षण के लिए कृत-संकल्प होकर जो कुछ भी करने की आवश्यकता होगी, वह हम मजबूती और दृढ़ता से करेंगे। हमें विरोधियों को अच्छी बातें स्वीकार्य हैं और बुरी बात त्याज्य है। न जाने कितने आए क्रान्ति करने वाले! जो लोग क्रान्ति की बात करते हैं वे अपने घर में क्रान्ति करें। उससे उनको लाभ होगा। हमको जो जन-आन्दोलन और जन-क्रान्ति की धमकी दी जाती है उसके बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता कांग्रेस के साथ है और उसके साथ रहेगी इसलिए कि कांग्रेस प्रजातंत्र में आस्था रखती है, विश्वास रखती है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कांग्रेस तो बन्दूक चलाती है—बन्दूक, बन्दूक।

12.00 hrs.

The Minister of Railways (Shri S. K. Patil): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am standing to intervene in this debate. For the last two days and more I have been listening to and reading the speeches made by both the Opposition Members and Members of my party and I was trying to apply my mind to this very important question, although the speeches covered 90 per cent the question of devaluation, whether anybody has suggested any remedy, any alternative scheme or any follow-up action which really would help the country.

Now, I am not going to be very critical of the speeches that have been made by the Opposition Members—I have respect for them—but they must know that to take political advantage of every situation is not the only strategy to advance their claims and perhaps a desire one day to form

a government in this parliamentary democracy. From that standpoint if I look at these speeches I find nothing but politics.

Now let me come to my hon. friend, Professor Mukerjee. I shall at once assure him that I have got a very great respect for him and his ideological sincerity but he was so much lost in that ideological sincerity, which nobody doubts, that he had nothing but Vietnam on his brains. Even devaluation would have been acceptable to him if something had been done in Vietnam. Therefore, to him Vietnam was the main thing; devaluation was not the problem but Vietnam was the problem. I give him credit for that because that type of ideological sincerity should be in everybody, but it should not make him so purblind that he cannot see the question that is before the House or before the country. He went on in a kind of poetic fancy and imagery about Vietnam and got himself so much mixed up in that dense Vietnam jungle that he did not know how to find his way out.

Now that is not the position. I am merely saying that we are not looking to that from that limited scope. If he wanted to attack our policy on Vietnam there were enough occasions and he would get them, but Vietnam is not a kind of El Dorado, the end-all and be-all of his existence and our existence. Luckily or unluckily, there are two Vietnams and we have taken to a policy. Our policy is in complete accord with our policy of non-alignment. We have not taken sides in that. Therefore, because we did not see hundred per cent eye to eye with him, everything is wrong and for that matter devaluation is wrong is something which really I cannot understand.

Our Vietnam policy, if I may say so, is born out of our policy of non-alignment. We have a special responsibility in this region and we are prepared to discharge it. It is in the

consciousness of that special responsibility that our Prime Minister made an appeal to everybody, not only to one party, for a Geneva type conference, because she thought that unless they came to the table these things could not be discussed in a peaceful atmosphere. Unfortunately, that could not be done because the nations concerned are committed to something. They also have got their political ideology and, therefore, they could not respond to that. Is it the fault of the Prime Minister of this country, that that did not happen? Our fervent prayer even today is that that should happen so that our voice in asking the United States of America to stop the bombing should really be in operation, be effective and the bombing will stop, so that they will sit together and do something. I do not go into that question at all, but to attack devaluation through this medium of our attitude towards Vietnam is something which really is out of court so far as this motion is concerned.

Shri Nambiar: They are two different questions.

Shri S. K. Patil: I can assure him that the policy is that the Vietnam question has ultimately to be resolved. Nobody likes this bloodshed; surely, India does not like it at all. Nobody likes escalation of the war. There is escalation of the war, there is no doubt about it. We want to stop it. That is the desire of everybody in the world. We do not take any special credit for it. Therefore, I assure him, through you, that I am quite sure that every Member of this House, be he a Member of the Opposition or of the Congress Party, will stand unitedly behind the Prime Minister in wishing a speedy end of this Vietnam question.

Many Members when they made their suggestions raised some questions. I am going to take up those questions and answer them so far as devaluation is concerned. Devaluation ought not to be looked at from the

political standpoint, although it may be one of the points. I do not disagree on that. But from the economic point of view whether it was necessary, whether it was avoidable, whether it could have been delayed, whether there was any alternative, whether we could afford a different thing—these are the questions that are germane to the discussion and I shall apply myself to these questions.

A question has been asked as to whether this devaluation has been forced upon us. By whom? Naturally, by America. For anything that happens in the world America must be brought in; otherwise, they think that possibly their profession is not perfect... (*Interruption*). I have listened with the utmost patience to my hon. friend, Professor Mukerjee and I have admired in part his speech, not the whole, but I did not interrupt him.

Now the question is: was it really avoidable; is it something that has been forced on us? Everybody in this House and in this world knows that for the last 15 years we have been having a planned programme, that we have been by our own volition or option tied to a plan. Three plans have already gone. If we wanted to have a different kind of plan where no foreign money or anybody's help was necessary for it, that is a different matter. It was open to us to have a plan of that type. But we thought that if in the initial stages we took the help, possibly our work would be quickened, our industrial and agricultural development would be quickened. That is why we have accepted this aid, not a little aid but an aid running into thousands of crores of rupees. All those loans have got to be serviced, the money has got to be paid back. All those concerns that have been started with that foreign help have got to be run efficiently. The raw material, whether it is 5 per cent or 15 per cent, which is necessary in order to run those concerns has also got to be

[Shri S. K. Patil]

obtained. Therefore if it was possible to do all that by a magic wand or a miracle. I could have quite understood it. But one must pause and ask a question whether it was possible to do that.

I shall give you some picture of the indebtedness and the responsibility that we as a nation have accepted and it is up to us to consider how we are going to discharge that responsibility and whether, in the absence of devaluation or any other alternative scheme, the discharge of that responsibility was possible. On the 1st April, 1966, that is, only two or three months ago, the total outstanding foreign debt was of the order of Rs. 2,919 crores. This is according to the pre-devaluation figures that I am quoting. Loans which are required to be repaid in foreign currency are of the magnitude of nearly four million dollars, that is, Rs. 1,887 crores. Loans to be repaid in the form of export of goods are also Rs. 261.9 crores. Sometimes we barter and, therefore, that is already pledged and is gone. Then, PL-480 loans, non-convertible, although they are in rupees, are of the order of Rs. 770 crores and so on. When this responsibility is upon us, when we have accepted this form of our industrial development, is it up to us to say at a point when because the value of our rupee in the foreign market has dropped, we are not getting any loan, that does not matter, let us go it alone, we do not care? That attitude is impossible. That attitude is dishonest for the simple reason that we have made the world to understand and the countries from which we took the money to understand that we shall service the loans, we will pay the interest and the corpus according to whatever agreement we have made. Having done that, it is not open to us to say that this could have been done. There was a remedy. Sometimes, it would be asked: Has China any difficulty about the foreign exchange? Has Russia any difficulty about the foreign exchange? Russia is a developed country and, therefore,

they could not have that difficulty. Let us take China. Has China any difficulty about foreign exchange? No. Why? They do not depend upon the foreign exchange. Their system is quite different. Whenever they want something for which the foreign exchange is required, either they give gold or they barter commodity for commodity. Therefore, that is easy for them. They do not take loans of that type that have got to be serviced in the manner in which we have got to do.

I was sitting and calculating our requirement of gold during the first two or three years and right upto the end of the Fourth Plan as to how we could have even postponed this inevitable decision that we took on the 5th June to devalue the external value of the rupee. If we had gold to the tune of nearly Rs. 500 crores through which we could have done this servicing of the loan for the time being and also to liberalise the imports which were necessary in order that our industrial production should not stop or should not lessen its speed, then surely we could have done it. We have not got that. We are not on the gold standard. As many as 35 years back, the world had gone out of it. In 1931, Great Britain, as it was then called, went off the gold standard. Along with that, very many nations went off the gold standard. Some of them were never on the gold standard before. Apart from that, if our efforts had succeeded in having gold of the value of Rs. 500 crores, Rs. 1,000 crores, possibly it would have been delayed and some other methods could have been found in order that we could delay, postpone, or, perhaps, avoid this inevitable necessity of having the devaluation. Having not got that, we had no other way but to do what we did.

Shri Nambiar: How can devaluation be an answer?

Shri S. K. Patil: Please don't interrupt me. You will have enough time. You need not get up every time just like a jack in the box.

The role of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund has also been questioned. These are international organisations. They are not sitting there for political purposes. They do not advance one ideology or the other. If the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund came to the conclusion independently, because it is their business to watch the currencies of the various countries, that our rupee was not a rupee, that it was only 75 per cent rupee or possibly 25 per cent something else, then, surely, it was their duty to advise us. They advise everybody on that. Ever since the International Monetary Fund has been established, such advice has been given to nearly 10 to 12 countries, that the time has come when their currency has to be devalued for the simple reason because it has not got the parity with the external value which is claimed on its behalf. If we could have two types of currency, one for inside and one for outside, it is a different thing. India could not do that. Many countries have that kind of thing, that there is one type of currency inside which is not affected by the external value, the external value is something different.

May I remind the hon. Members opposite who know perhaps better about Russia's economy than I do? Some years ago, even the rouble which is a very mighty thing, which is perhaps sounder than even the American dollar today, had one internal value and another external value, nearly a difference of 50 per cent. There is nothing wrong about it. This devaluation is not really something that has come only upon us and that has not come upon others. Ever since the end of the last War—I do not go before that—many countries have devalued their currency. Nine or ten countries have devalued their currency. Many of them have come out triumphantly, like France, Yugoslavia and Greece, and some of them have not. The question of devaluation is not merely confined to us alone. This is the second time that we are

devaluating our rupee. There is nothing wrong about it. The only question is: What is the follow-up action? What is to be done now? That is the question I shall deal with a little later on.

Was devaluation avoidable? I have answered it partly that devaluation was not avoidable because within these months you had to find the money to service your loans, to pay back the interest as well as the corpus, whatever it is. I have got the figures. I do not want to tire you out by giving the figures as to how much was the total that we had to pay this year and till the end of the Fourth Plan. We had to find that money from somewhere. More than that, our industrial potential was going down steadily because we had no raw material with which to keep on going. If it is going down, it becomes our duty to see that it is lifted up. Therefore, there was no alternative to this and this was not avoidable. That is why that decision had to be taken.

Could it have been postponed? Many people tell us why not postpone it because this is the Election year. There, I can refer to my friend, Acharya Kripalani, I have great respect for him, and he really put his finger at the right type of button when he said that the Congress has got one knack and that is, when there is a difficulty, they unite and stand together. That is really the one good thing in his speech, and that he said because he has not yet forgotten his days when he was closely associated with the Indian National Congress. Here it is. We are told that because we have got the elections and we want to take advantage of that, there should have been no devaluation. It would be unlike the Indian National Congress. If devaluation had to be done, if it was in the larger interest of the people, then, surely, it would have been a dishonesty on the part of the Congress Government to postpone it in order to get a popular verdict and win the elections. We shall rather prefer to lose the elections but will

[Shri S. K. Patil]

not be guilty of doing things which are not in the larger interest of the people. We do not want that, for the simple reason that people expect us, and they have expected us all these 70 to 80 years that the Congress has been there, that it is the Congress organisation which is capable of taking decision when it is in the interest of the country. No matter whether they are popular or otherwise, that decision has to be taken. I challenge—challenge is a bad word—I offer it to my friends opposite that we shall enter the elections with devaluation and we shall come out successful with a verdict by the millions of people that devaluation was the right course for us to take and, therefore, it was taken.

It was a difficult decision indeed and, therefore, the Prime Minister and the Cabinet had to do it. Here, my friend Prof. Mukerjee knows one thing. I am quite sure he will concede that to me that when a decision comes from the Cabinet, to go round and say that the Prime Minister is responsible, a few honourable Ministers are responsible, this or that, and, therefore, the other Ministers are not with it, is something I cannot understand in a parliamentary democracy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): That was never said. I said the whole assorted lot of you.

Shri S. K. Patil: Including the ill-assorted lot sitting opposite.

What I am saying is this that the decision was taken in the manner in which the decisions are taken. These questions are not discussed in bazaar places or on the roads or in a sort of *bandhs* or other violent demonstrations that the people might be indulging in. The question has been asked as to why is it that the Finance Minister and the Planning Minister have been saying that we are not going to devalue the rupee. May I ask: Is there any Minister in the world so stupid as to say that he is going to

devalue except at the time he wants to devalue the currency? I have never understood that. Even when I know that something is going to happen tomorrow, I am going to say emphatically that it is not so until it is done. Therefore, just to say that the Finance Minister and the Planning Minister or any Minister should have gone on beating the drum right from the beginning, that it should have been done earlier is not correct; surely, that is not done. It has been asked by several Members as to why the Opposition Members were not taken into confidence, why the Government Members also were not taken into confidence and why our Party Executive was not taken into confidence—why none of them was taken into confidence. Even, in a budget, we do not take people into confidence. In the case of the budget, a copy of the budget is given to us half an hour or an hour before it is going to be presented to the House. We have either to have it or leave it. There is no option. One day, I remember, I got so much disgusted that I went to the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, and I asked, "Did it happen in your time like that or has it now started in our time?" He said, "That was my question also when I was a Minister of the Wevell Cabinet and I was told that the budget is to be put like that." The same system continues. It is so of the budget where the stake is comparatively smaller. Now, in this matter of devaluation we should have talked about it, in the bazaar place, consulted everybody or consulted even a few chosen people or even the Leaders of the Opposition Parties—that could not have been done.

I can tell my hon. friends here that there are in this world some financial tycoons—I know a few of them—whose only business is to manipulate the currency. They make at the end of the day a million dollars or lose a million dollars not by doing any work or by any industry or producing anything, but by figures and statistics; they have got the capacity of

buying and selling the currencies of the world and possibly hundreds of crores of rupees would have been lost to this country if such a premature disclosure of this devaluation had been made. Therefore, it was not possible for anybody really to do this or to take the advice of anybody.

What was the responsibility of the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister becomes the easiest target for everybody because she is the Head of the administration. She might not have taken the initiative; nobody takes the initiative in everything; if I say, in case something is to be done in the Railways, that the Prime Minister should take the initiative, that can hardly happen. Therefore, things are done in the usual course. When the hon. members opposite sometimes make their own government, they will find that their system is not very different from the system that the Congress Government is adopting. So it is done in the usual way; the Finance Minister does it; the Planning Minister does it; somebody else who is interested in that does it; the question is discussed with experts; we have got experts also with the Government; after discussing that, they come to the conclusion that this is inevitable, this cannot be delayed even by a day; if we delay, possibly the devaluation might perhaps be more dangerous than today; instead of 7.50, I do not know, it might have gone up more because many other things would have added to it. Therefore, this is the proper time, both economically and also politically, so that we shall go to the people and say that we had the courage and the capacity to take this decision and put it before them; if they find that we did something wrong, surely they could vote us out. (*Interruptions*).

I shall be delighted if my hon. friend has got those dreams which will be fulfilled in the manner in which he desires. I think he should be thankful to God that it should be so, but we have our own God also.

This was done in the manner in which the Cabinet decisions are taken.

It was not done by the vote of one. There were no dissensions in the Cabinet. Of course, it is not for me to say that; the Prime Minister would, in her reply, say that. I can tell my hon. friends that many of us were pained and surprised; even the Prime Minister was pained. This is not a decision which anybody could easily have taken. We pondered over it; we considered it; we met the experts and discussed that for a few hours before actually going to the Cabinet. And when, in the Cabinet, everything was explained—I may say that I am not divulging a secret—every one agreed and it was a unanimous decision of the Cabinet that devaluation of the external value of the rupee was unavoidable and it had to be done. There is no particular blame that attaches either to this Minister or to that Minister. Why should any Minister be singled out, I do not know. There was a time when I was also lucky to be singled out. I do not know why they have forgotten that. I always like that. When they single me out, believe me, I shall get a few thousand votes more, but I do not mind that. Really it is not good, it is not proper, it is not according to the decorum of the Parliamentary practice everywhere that you should single out a Minister and say that so-and-so was for it and so-and-so was against it; that because some persons made statements on the Radio, they must be more responsible than those who did not make any such statement. In that case, I shall ask all my colleagues to make statements so that this kind of misunderstanding would not arise that there were differences of opinions.

If you come to follow-up action, I can understand that. If there were members here who had said that in the follow-up action, certain things should have been done but they are not done, then I would join them in that and say that the pace of progress must be accelerated. We must have the capacity to take decisions; even unfortunate decisions must really be

[Shri S. K. Patil]

given to officers, whether they are Secretaries or Ministers, so that the follow-up action becomes quicker. Unfortunately sometimes it is said that during the two months—in another two days it will be complete two months—the devaluation has come, we have not done anything as prompt as we should have. I can understand that because that would help us in being more prompt in doing things; it would increase our capacity to take decisions, good, bad or unfortunate. I would rather prefer an officer or executive who is capable of taking a decision—at times even a wrong decision—to an officer who does not take a decision and the file goes on moving for weeks and months. If this is to be done, I can understand that. What is to be done in the follow-up action? Many people talk to us that the prices have risen. Now this is a very unfortunate thing and although there might be a little difference of opinion about it, there is no doubt that prices have risen. I can quite understand that. Although this is devaluation of the rupee in the external market—not internally—I do not see any reason why the prices of vegetables or raw coconut should go up by 50 per cent. These are things that sometimes happen. They have got to be stopped; they have got to be controlled and everything that is necessary for this purpose has got to be done. What is really necessary is that we must have the organisation, just as we have got the organisation. We could not have got that organisation before because that would have told the people what we are aiming at. We are building up fast that organisation in every Ministry, particularly in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, so that prices do not rise. It is our responsibility to see that prices do not rise.

When questions were asked about freeze on wages, my colleague, the Labour Minister said very rightly—I join with him—that there cannot be a freeze because the labour has also got to pay money; so, there shall be

a freeze on wages only after there is a freeze on prices. I would say that, even if there was no devaluation, one way of really stopping all this run-away prices is—and this will be the greatest thing that will hit us in elections and elsewhere—that the prices have got to be stabilised. How often have I said in the Railway discussion that, although in having the chance that we had some years ago, we lost crores of rupees, I am prepared to lose crores of rupees, but I want to keep by 14 lakhs of railwaymen satisfied by giving them everything that is necessary for life, so that their living standards do not get depressed. Therefore, it must be our constant effort to see that all those items that go to make what is known as the cost of living ratio—all of them because they are considered to be the necessities of life—have got to be done and the prices must be fixed sooner. When that is done, surely the wage freeze can be done. Here is a country—I am talking of Great Britain—where socialism started long before we started it and yet, here is the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, who has got the capacity to say that there shall be a freeze but at the same time he has warned that this can only be given after the prices have been frozen. That is exactly what we intend to do and what must be done.

There were many criticisms about P.L. 480 because P.L. 480 has been a red rag to the bulls Opposite. I do not know whether I was criminally responsible for it or was in any other way responsible for a big deal. But I say that not only is America doing it, but everywhere, in every country it is done; wherever we have got anything less, we get them from others and wherever we have got anything more, we give to others. And P.L. 480 is not a charity. It is a charity—if you so call it—only in the sense that instead of in dollars, we pay in rupees. There is nothing wrong about it. They have also surplus wheat. What is it meant for? Till we attain self-sufficiency in agriculture, there is nothing wrong in accept-

ing it. Therefore, we have been accepting it. Why should there have been such an objection to it? Because it is American wheat, there is an objection. My friends Opposite must be knowing that Russia, during the last two years and for another year to come, has agreed and made agreements with other countries—Canada and others I do not know whether the United States comes in to buy three billion dollars worth of wheat from these countries in order to keep it. These great countries do not merely live from year to year, but they keep a year's stock. Sometimes war comes or something happens; so, they want to keep a stock. Therefore, it is not India alone that does it; even Russia does it; China does it; everybody does it. In an emergency like this, if Government does it, what is wrong about it?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Do they have an agreement like the PL-480 agreement where they do not have the right to say anything about what is going to be done with the money? That is the main point.

Shri S. K. Patil: The money is supposed to go back; it is supposed to go back. Sometimes, they do not want the rupee and we have not got dollars. If we increase the trade, possibly it might go through the trade. The point is that we should really be in a condition where we shall get the foreign exchange. But there is a general agreement right from the very beginning that this money is not meant to be just thrown there and so on. Therefore, that is not an important point. The important point that I am going to make is this. I wish the nation could have been trained in one discipline namely that when there is not enough food we shall do with whatever food we have got. Do these sponsors of the *bandhs* and the violent agitations believe in that?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Yes, we do.

Shri S. K. Patil: Do they have that kind of patriotism and do they serve

the people in that way? On the other hand, in about 90 per cent of these *bandhs*, if there is anything to infuriate the masses, it is the question of the paucity of food. This is how these *bandhs* arise. They do not advise the people that because we have got less rice, therefore, let us do with less rice, or because we have less wheat, let us do with less wheat. On the other hand, they tell the people to demand 'No we must have the full quantum that is necessary'.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about blackmarketing? We want to know what has happened to the blackmarketeers and hoarders? The hon. Minister is not answering that question. There is enough food in the country but it is there in the black-market.

Shri S. K. Patil: They advise the people to ask for the full quantum. That is how all these things have been happening.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: There is enough food in the country but it is available only in the blackmarket.

Shri S. K. Patil: The hon. lady Member need not be so jittery about it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about blackmarketing?

Shri S. K. Patil: These are some of the home-truths. I know that they are not very pleasant. Surely, all the truths that emanate from the other side are also not pleasant to us, but we must take the pleasant with the unpleasant. That is parliamentary democracy everywhere in the world.

In all these violent processions and so on, there is one thing that is exploited, and that is the hunger of the people in the country. My hon. friend Acharya Kripalani said yesterday that these angry young men had become angry because they had not got power. Therefore, what do they do? They take with them a hungry old man in order to have processions in Calcutta

[Shri S. K. Patil]

and everywhere, so that even if there was any discipline in a government to maintain law and order and it was possible to maintain it, that also could not be done. Therefore, this kind of approach has got to be avoided.

I do not want to take the time of the House any longer, but I would just refer only two questions before I conclude. The first question is relating to agricultural production. So far as agricultural production is concerned, we are doing enough in that regard, but I would like to impress and stress this point more and more that unless India become self-sufficient and self-reliant in five years, with Nature helping us and our efforts and our labours bearing fruit, there is no future for this country. Devaluation and all its rigours and all this bitterness would be forgotten if really this season turns out to be a very good season; it may not be the best, but surely I am hoping that after the monsoons and the rains that have come in, this season will be better; and that should be better, and our efforts should be in that direction, so that agriculturally we can become self-sufficient before even we think of the industrial output etc. Although both have to go side by side, I give more importance to this, and therefore, this should be done. If that is done. I am quite sure that there will be no occasions hereafter for this loot, arson, these sabotages etc. Somehow, I have always been the victim of sabotages, because, as I have said very often, the railways are like an unhorned cow; she has no resistance. 57,000 kms. of railway lines cannot be protected either by the Railway Protection Force or any force that Government can bring into existence. Therefore, on every conceivable occasion we find sabotages and arson and loot etc. It applies to everything, and not merely to the railways. I would say that these are not the methods to be followed. These are like poison. I may tell my hon. friends in the Opposition that poison is sometimes good because it cures some of the maladies, but it must

not be made the staple food of a community. Therefore, when they resort to this poison, let them remember that it is merely a temporary phase to cure a particular disease but they should not make it a habit of the people such that this becomes the staple food of a community. Therefore, recourse to such things must be avoided.

Lastly, I would make this appeal to the Opposition. No doubt, they have their ambition. In fact, everybody has an ambition for power, and I share that ambition with them. But are they going to give this demonstration to the people outside that if they come into power they are going to do what they are doing today, that is, indulge in arson, sabotage, loot, *bandh*, stoppage of work and so on? So, they must also realise this. The Opposition is respected everywhere, and we respect the Opposition. The other day we had taken a certain decision in the beginning but we changed it within twenty-four hours so that the Opposition should not feel that they would not be present in the House and they could have said something. Therefore, I would submit that when somebody points out to us that such and such is going to be the result, then we immediately apply the correction, whether we become popular or not. That was not a very popular decision to take; yet, notwithstanding all that, we took that decision because we thought that we should have the co-operation of the Opposition also with us. That is how it should have been done.

I can tell my hon. friends also about the historic necessity of our parliamentary democracy. We shall not be found wanting in the performance of our duties when the call for duty comes. The time when this decision on devaluation was taken was on such occasion, and, therefore, we took that decision. Either the people may condemn us for that decision or they may applaud us. But that is the decision that we have taken. If we have taken a wrong decision, it is for the people to vote us out in the elections and it is not for the Opposition to take

advantages of it from now onwards so that they may get more votes than they would get otherwise, saying "Your misfortune or your adversity is our opportunity to get a few votes more. I would submit that surely the voters ultimately are clever enough to see through that type of thing.

The ultimate arbiter in this matter in a democracy is the ballot-box. That will decide whether the decision that we took was a right decision or a wrong decision. Let us approach that ballot-box, and let not my hon. friends and ourselves go step in step, but with mode of action which are proper, which would not be actions of the type that they take but which would conform to the highest standards of parliamentary democracy. If they do that, then there is nothing in the world that could stand between us and the prosperity of this country. I would plead that it is not with a view to scoring any election advantage or any debating advantage that I have intervened in this debate, but because I like the idea that in this constructive task before the country the Opposition should be with us, and with that hope, I shall conclude.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this no-confidence motion was not unexpected, at any rate to me, because of the difficult food situation, the spiralling prices and the bomb-shell decision to devalue the rupee. It was not unexpected for another reason: the approaching general elections. But I would say as a lawyer and in fact, as the second seniormost Member of this House that in the factual context I cannot help feeling that this no-confidence motion is unreal.

As May's *Parliamentary Practice* point out, when there is a non-confidence motion, Government looking to the exigencies of its own business, does try to give a reasonably early date for discussion. As far as I am aware, there is no convention that there must be absolute priority given to a no-confidence motion. I do not think that that is the correct position at all.

Further, the first postulate of a no-confidence motion is a potential alternative government. Now, we know that at any rate today, through democratic or parliamentary processes, there is no potential alternative government. Because of that, I always feel that a no-confidence motion in this context lacks not only constitutional and parliamentary significance, but it is nothing more than an exercise in parliamentary illusion. I am not blaming the Opposition for the fact that there are so many splinter groups. It is a legacy of political conditions in the country. The fact is that the Congress Party is a projection of a pre-Independence struggle, by a monolithic party, if you like; yet, from politically scientific sense, the Congress is not a party; it is a movement; it was and is a movement; if you like, for some people, it was a political band-wagon. That is why even today you get in the Congress Party a wildly heterogeneous group consisting of elements ranging from crypto-communists to dyed-in-the-wool capitalists, from princes to paupers, from sadhus and would-be-sadhus and hypocrites to hard-drinkers and *bon vivants*. But that characteristic is also reflected in the Opposition groups, but that is because there is this basic weakness in our democratic structure and in the country. Whatever the reasons, there has not been, in the normal democratic sense, an ideological, political polarisation. So far as paper promises are concerned, so far as slogan mongering is concerned, the Congress Party has completely stolen the thunder of the socialist groups on this side. With the emergence of the Swatantra—I hope they will like what I am saying—I feel there is now some semblance of polarisation in the democratic sense, on the analogy of the older democracies, that the Congress can be said to represent the socialist thinking, if you like, and the Swatantra, the conservative thinking.

In this context, the only sort of opportunity that a no-confidence motion can give is an opportunity for criticism, and by some elements an opportunity

[Shri Frank Anthony]

for abuse or near-abuse. When it comes to criticism, perhaps I can do it more effectively, within the framework of parliamentary decorum, I can do it more effectively than most Members of this House.

I would say this: only God knows the number of sins of commission and omission that can be laid at the door of the Congress Party. I am among those who have always felt that planning was absolutely necessary to orderly economic progress especially in a developing society. But I must say this about our Planning Commission, that, to my mind, it has been an instrument of near economic chaos. I feel that the Planning Commission has been allowed to function in this country as a Super-Cabinet of people indulging in all kinds of wild-cat theories not related in any way to realism. They have with supreme, almost cynical, irresponsibility done this because they have exercised power without responsibility. I say this also—and I say it without pointing a finger—that the supreme tragedy for the country is that the Planning Commission has been dominated by pretentious theorists, by slogan- and ism-mongers without any semblance of practical sense or capacity.

For paper plans, they have a record. For execution, they also have a record, but it is a stinking record. I say also that the gap between promise and performance, so far as the Planning Commission is concerned, has always been there and that gap continues to widen. And what I join issue with is this: the promise is always couched in a pretentious economic jargon. The promise is there; but the execution is typical, as I said, of people without any practical sense or capacity.

What I am sorry about is this, that there has been no semblance of any business sense so far as the Planning Commission is concerned. There has been no attempt to envisage the difficulties—I will come to what Shri Patil said. There has been no desire

to live within our income, to live within our means. Above all, there has been no minimum sense of financial discipline not only at the Centre but more especially in the States.

I am glad that the Prime Minister is here. Let us, as Shri Patil said, learn from our mistakes. I say that there has been—and that is one of the tragedies for this country—utter economic lawlessness, each Ministry trying to get the largest possible slice for itself, without any regard for minimum business norms. And you see what is happening. No semblance of priority. Priority is being given to projects. Why? Because they are prestige projects, because they are projects from which political patronage and power flow. And we see the demoralising spectacle of virtually bankrupt States, in spite of ever-increasing taxation, the demoralising spectacle of these virtually bankrupt States being allowed to continue to live on overdrafts from the Reserve Bank.

I concede that a certain amount of aid, foreign aid, is absolutely essential, particularly to a developing society. As Shri Patil mentioned, even advanced societies like Russia and Britain are still receiving aid. But I join issue with our planners because they are unrealistic, profligate planners; they have made us abjectly and increasingly dependent on foreign aid. Today, in spite of the brave words that Shri Patil has uttered, we are completely at the mercy of foreign aid-givers, especially the American aid-givers. I am not going to try and rationalise it, as Shri Patil has done. He said and I agree that it took courage, in a sense political courage. But he put his finger on the crucial point—he said they had no alternative.

On devaluation, our economic arm was not twisted,—it was broken—by the Americans. This is also true—and I say it with regret—that today American policy-making is dominated by blatant, gross arm-twisters. During the refinement of the Kennedy re-

time, there was none of this gross, blatant arm-twisting. Aid was not rubbed into a country although it was an Asiatic country. But today what is happening? Today—I say it with a sense of shame, because as Shri Patil said, we had no alternative—today we have been made to lick the American boot, and after having licked the American boot, we are still being made to wait in the wings abjectly like beggars for the doles the Americans may give us. In his private moments, it must make every self-respecting Indian's soul recoil.

Nobody has been a more bitter opponent than I of the horrors and bestiality—in spite of my good friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee—of the de-humanisation interest in communism. But sometimes in my anguish, looking at the way we have had to lick the American boot—sometimes even I feel that I would almost prefer all the horrors of communism for India rather than have to lick the American boot, if that is the price we have to pay for our democratic survival.

Having said this, I want to say something about the administration. Shri Patil talked about follow-up action.

Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal (Jainagar): On a point of order. Is it parliamentary to say that we have licked the American boot?

Shri Frank Anthony: Of course, we have licked it.

Mr. Speaker: Perfectly all right. It happens so often.

Shri Brij Raj Singh (Bareilly): Nobody will find licking also.

Shri Frank Anthony: Shri Patil talked about follow-up action. Let us look at our administration. To say the least, it is suffering from dropsy, unhealthy swollenness. Apart from the huge armies of virtually un-employed clerks and peons, there are increasing armies of Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Additional Addi-

tional Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Additional Joint Secretaries . . .

An hon. Member: Under Secretaries.

Shri Frank Anthony: You have also your armies of Ministers, Cabinet Ministers, Ministers of State, Deputy Ministers. Each one of them has become, and will continue to be, a built in focus for waste and extravagance.

On the food front also, I say that there has been endless tinkering and there have been empty, unattainable promises. I remember—I think it was in 1951—that I criticised the then Government. I said, 'If you carry on at this rate, in this unrealistic way, even in ten years you will not be able to achieve self-sufficiency in food'. The then Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, got up—he was angry with me—and said 'The Member does not know what he is talking about. In two years, if we do not achieve self-sufficiency in food, we will resign'. That was 15 years ago.

I could go on adding to the catalogue. But I want to look at the other side of the medal too. I will deal with the Opposition. I want to be a little objective. I am completely unconvinced that any of the Opposition groups or any combination of Opposition groups will ever, if they return to power—which I do not think they will—be one whit better than the Congress Party.

I am convinced of this too, that except for the Swatantra and the PSP, I do not believe that most of the opposition groups are even committed to democracy and its basic implications. And I say this with great respect to them, whatever their protestations, that some of them are self confessed anarchists, other are obvious anarchists; whatever their labels, some of them are anarchists in practice. I say this also that for some in the opposition groups, whatever their protestations may be, democracy has no meaning whatsoever; for them, democratic freedoms are only the instruments for destroying democracy.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

In spite of the many sins that the Congress Party has committed, as Mr. Patil has said, I have no doubt that a large section of the electorate will continue to vote for it. Acharya Kripalani says that when he goes to clubs and he meets people, everybody abuses the Congress. I suppose there is nothing much else they can do. He never asked the further question: "When it comes to a question of voting, whom will you vote for?" Some say; we will not vote; and others say, perhaps like me: better the devil I know than the devil I do not know. Others say: at least if you vote for the Congress, you are in the frying pan, but if you vote for the opposition, from the frying pan you will be jumping into the fire. That is why, from this negative aspect you will find, and I have no doubt, that the Congress will still get a majority of the votes, because of this negative, but powerful reason.

I would also say this I am trying to be a little objective. It is wrong for people to say that the country has made no progress. I feel that it is quite wrong because it projects a distorted image abroad, it demoralise our people at home. I am perhaps the only Member in this House—although I am sometimes abused by people who do not know better—with a real all-India constituency. I tour the country more than anybody else, and because I see the country as a whole, I see signs not only of progress, but of remarkable progress. There is pulsating industrial expansion. I have the figure here. For the first quarter of 1965-66 industrial expansion rose by 10 per cent. In many fields—metals, chemicals, machine tools and a whole host of consumer industries—we are supplying our own needs indigenously. And one of the main reasons that we were able to teach Pakistan a well deserved lesson was because in the critical field of defence production we have achieved increasing self-sufficiency.

Even on the food front—we may abuse the Government, but let us ana-

lyse the figures—there has been not negligible progress. In 1964-65 there was 88 million tons of food production. In a period of ten to twelve years food production has been doubled. And I have got this figure too. Even the annual increase of our gross national product has been not negligible. In 1964-65 we registered a 7 per cent increase in our economy, better, from the point of view of gross national product, even than Britain and America. The British gross national product went up by 2.6 per cent and the American by 3.1 per cent. But when it is worked out in terms of our population explosion, it is then that the picture of our *per capita* increase becomes not only dim, but dismal—because of this Malthusian curse, it hangs like a pall over the people of the whole of Asia. I do not know where Acharya Kripalani got his figures from. He said that the other countries have done better than us. They have not I have got the figures of the *per capita* annual increase. Because of this astronomical population explosion, so far as India is concerned, it was 1.5 per cent; Pakistan was less, 1.2 per cent; Indonesia was even less, 1.1 per cent; Ceylon was only 0.7 per cent. Japan alone, because Japan by ruthless realism, ruthless methods, has got over this Malthusian curse, has achieved a unique *per capita* annual increase rise of 7.9 per cent, and that is why I say that one of the first tasks of the Government will have to be somehow or other to get on top of this population explosion. I do not know whether this looping the loop is going to be very effective. But what is happening?

One million Indians are being born every month. Official statistics show that at this rate perhaps you will have to put two million additional acres under the plough each year. For every Indian baby born, you have to get an additional finance of Rs. 100 only for you irrigation. How can we face it?

I will be concluding now. I say this. What can we do?

Abuse is not going to be of help. No Government in the world by a magic wand can produce the required results. I say this. Even for the progress that we have achieved—and it is not negligible—even for that quantum of progress, certain preconditions are necessary. What are these preconditions? To my mind, stability, discipline, ruthless realism.

So far as stability is concerned, whatever we may say of the Congress Party, it has given not negligible political stability, not in a two-by-four country. When my British friends talk to me, I say: "Why do you make comparisons? Comparisons are not possible. You are not even a two-by-four country, you are a one-by-two country." The Congress Party has given political stability, it has given it to a subcontinent, it has given it to the largest democracy in Asia.

So far as discipline is concerned, I do not believe that anybody from the Opposition is going to induce discipline overnight in our people. Let us admit this to ourselves. There is a certain built-in indiscipline among our civilians. There is a general atmosphere of indiscipline in the country. It contrasts so much with the discipline of the army. And I say this. Why is there this atmosphere of general indiscipline in the country? It is because it is led by the agitating, the undisciplined politician. That is why there is this atmosphere of indiscipline in the country. You see what is happening. The average politician thinks he is either a law unto himself, or he thinks that he is above the law. And we see this too,—Mr. Patil has referred to this in different language—we have today chaos-committed, anarchist-minded politicians whose stock-in-trade seems to be—I mean the people are frustrated, they have their difficulties—to exploit this frustration, these difficulties, to mislead these people, to instigate them to mob violence, to make them destroy not Mr. Patil's property but railway property, the property of the nation, and most shameful of all, to make them attack innocent men, women and children.

There is this other contrast which the armed forces supply, a contrast which represents the ideal of national integration. What does the agitating, undisciplined politician do? Here we get this ideal in the Army of national integration, freedom from communal, caste, regional, linguistic differences. But the average, undisciplined, agitating politician, to secure some petty, political advantage, is the person who accentuates communal, caste, regional and linguistic differences.

I will end by asking three questions. Where is the ruthless realism going to come from? Will it come from the Opposition? Who is going to tackle corruption? Let us admit that there is corruption. I have said this before, and I say it now, that with the proliferation of the so-called instruments of democracy, there is the proliferation not only of inefficiency, there is the proliferation of corruption. Your corporations, your municipalities, many of them in the custody and control of opposition groups, are rank dens of inefficiency and corruption. As you go lower down, you go to your panchayats, what are they? They are the worst hotbeds of caste, of sectarianism, of prejudice. And who today wants this proliferation more than the opposition groups? They are the people who shout for more legislatures. They want a legislature in Delhi. I said: for God's sake, save the much-scourged citizen of Delhi. They want more legislatures, they want more corporations, they want more municipalities, they want more power for the panchayats, more hotbeds, more potential hotbeds for corruption and inefficiency.

14.00 hrs.

I know some Members will not accept this very kindly, but who is going to stop this huge destruction of our foodgrains by utterly useless cattle and other animals? I was reading a survey by the Central Food Technological Research Institute. They said, I do not know whether this is correct, that 50 per cent of our foodgrains are destroyed by useless cattle and animals. Who has the

[Shri Frank Anthony]

courage, not even the Swatantra Party, to suggest the destruction of our useless cattle? I concede, because I argued it, a complete ban on cow slaughter, but what about all the other useless cattle? Eighty per cent of our cattle, it is a conservative estimate, are utterly useless. Apart from the fact that we can never have any semblance of modern animal husbandry, they are a tremendous burden on our food and fodder resources, who is going to decry this superstition about monkeys—they are one of the worst destroyers of food crops in the country—not even Mr. Subramaniam. Now because of some kind of, call it what you will, mediæval obscurantist, primitive approach of some people, we cannot even export them, although they were earning foreign exchange. Because of this Mr. Subramaniam said: I am utterly helpless; I cannot do anything about the tremendous destruction of food by monkeys. Who, finally, is going to help us get rid of slogans? Perhaps the Congress would not help us much. Look at this exercise in hypocrisy, the slogan of prohibition costing us, some member of the planning commission said, Rs. 200 crores a year. Who is going to relieve us from these exercises in hypocrisy? Illicit distillation is a cottage industry. Our enforcement services have been completely corrupted by these exercises. Who is going to relieve us from the slogan? I do not think the Opposition is going to do it. May I finally say this? I agree with Mr. Patil, what is the good of a post-mortem? I say that the Americans broke our arm. No other Government could have taken any other action. But today we are facing what I would like to call a war, a war for our economic, our democratic, survival. In this context, it is axiomatic that to survive in facing a war we have to have stability; we have to have discipline; we have to have ruthless realism. I say this to the Congress party. The primary duty and the responsibility is theirs. If they fail, they will not only destroy themselves, but worse than that—because, although I

wish some parties like the Swatantra well, there is no party that is going to emerge in the near future sufficiently strong to guide the country; they will destroy not only themselves—they will destroy democracy. I say this in conclusion that what the country does not need—I am quite clear about that is the instability and indiscipline that must flow from opportunistic, make-shift, rickety alliances between disparate political elements without the semblance of any common programme. Because of that, Sir, I oppose the motion.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, listening to this debate, I have been struck by the lack, fantastic lack of realism in all speeches apart from the last, in the debate that has taken place so far, because we are facing a deepening economic crisis should we not think in those lines? It is my hon'ble friend Mr. Mukerjee who sets the ball rolling in this respect. I do not want to dwell on the point of his relations with the USA; for I know that is like a red rag to a bull. I leave that apart. But I would ask him this. In his perfect Oxford diction with an eloquence which almost surpassed his earlier eloquence he said things and some of them in order to be hard hitting sometimes verged almost on the border of extreme discourtesy. He has picked out three ministers and said many things. I do not say that in all aspects I agree with the government, I will come to that point later. Because we do not agree on all points, we bring these things up and we have them rectified very often. But that does not mean that the *bona fides* should be questioned in this manner. To say that they are attempting to sell the country to USA or other countries is going to fantastic lengths and even Mr. Mukerjee knows that these are not true. And Mr. Mukerjee made no contribution at all to the vital economic issues of today, the national issues which exercise our minds.

14.04 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Prof. Ranga was an old colleague of mine even from the Central assembly days and of course he will say everything that is diametrically opposite to what Mr. Mukerjee says. His point is that we are too obsessed with the USSR. He has made, due to his leader, a new point that we should have a government of talents in the country. I ask him: unless we have a government, which is a national government made up of the different parties, how can this be done? Is there any opposition group which is grown and well-developed party in parliamentary terms so that their talent could be included in a national government of different parties? Or, is it an Oligarchy that he wants? There is intellect in the country no doubt but they will not be representatives of the people unless they have been elected by them.

Then we come to another professor, professor Hem Barua. To some extent I would say that between the two contradictory arguments of Prof. Ranga and Prof. Mukerjee, his was a *via media* and his speech was a support to the Government in an indirect way. But I found—I questioned him even then—that his obsession with China in the sense that he seems to think that because the Chinese put forward certain figures—they are known to be great propagandists—those figures are correct. Statistics are sometimes referred to in this context as “lies, damn lies and statistics”. If statistics are known that way and they can be brought in any method of compilation what is likely to be the position in China? Therefore, to compare us with them; even for a moment and to say that we are facing difficulties while China is not; she is going in for all these purges, is wrong; it is wrong for Mr. Hem Barua particularly to believe.

Let me now come to Mr. Gopalan. Mr. Gopalan is now a defender of the Chinese. He has forgotten his own country. It is well known that he has even quarrelled with his

neighbour. The point I want to make here is this. He has talked about bandhs all over the country, bandhs in West Bengal, bandhs in Kerala and all the rest of it. Other people have spoken about it. I do not want to waste my time on it except to say this to him. What about the purges that are going on in China today? What would happen to the government services whom he is encouraging to go on strike today? If he were to come to power, would there not be purges? Would they dare even to raise their voices, far from marchings and demonstrations. The Government servants who are incited by him must remember that it is easy to take advantage of democratic institutions and exploit them but when their freinds come to power they will not be able even to murmur; they will be purged.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Not shot down.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Whether they are purged or shot down, what way we do not know. These are the methods of the left communists.

I have the greatest and highest respect for him—Acharya Kripalani. He was at the helm of affairs at the Congress in the most difficult days and his advice is something that appeal to us and we should give the highest consideration for it is for our own good. The only thing that I would like to tell him in all humility is that, left him not feel frustrated; let us not lose confidence in our own powers to rectify our mistakes, and to get over our drawbacks and deficiencies. There will be some drawbacks and deficiencies; no human government, no human party can be there without having this. Now, what happened? Why have we come into the present situation as we have? Let me just recapitulate for a moment what has happened; I know that others have also spoken on it. In the first instance, everybody must agree that we had reason for taking certain postures, and for having a feeling of cautious optimism during the

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

first two Plans and even up to the second year of the Third Plan, because we not only kept to our targets but we even went beyond the anticipations in some aspects, and therefore there was no question of being dissatisfied in an overall way, though we were dissatisfied. The Congress party itself was dissatisfied in many matters and constantly we brought to their notice the deficiencies of an administrative system which is antiquated in many ways and which should be changed. This is a matter which we have brought up again and again, and it has been changed to some extent, though not revolutionised or changed to the extent we want.

Now, I come to the point which Shri S. K. Patil made about the loan. Loans up to a certain extent are inevitable in a system of developing economy. I cannot say that I agree with Shri Patil all the way about this matter, but I do agree that we did have to take loans and we have to pay them back. We as an honourable nation should pay back what we have taken as loan, and its interest. Therefore, there is no doubt that we reached a difficult and critical stage when our foreign exchange began to get depleted. This happened really because we had to spend for the twin purpose of development and defence after the Chinese invasion. Our then Prime Minister—and this House endorsed it—said and proclaimed that we shall go on with the twin purpose of development and defence, no matter whether it is the Chinese or anyone else who invades? The whole House endorsed this. It would be difficult to keep down the inflationary trend because many more projects, defence projects, for which we had to find foreign exchange and money, had to be proceeded with, and naturally that made further depletion necessary, and so we went on. No doubt, after the mid-term appraisal of the Plan we should have taken even more drastic steps about certain matters, but it is not always that one does

everything as exactly as one should have and exactly at the right moment. Anyway, these are the facts and this was the position that was inherited by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and they have devalued our currency.

There may be differences of opinion as to the timing of devaluation. Personally, I would have liked that some of the correctives that we have taken should have been taken long before, but if we had taken those correctives I do not say that devaluation of a currency which has depreciated in foreign markets might not have taken place; but this could have been assured today, namely, that whatever way it could be done, it should not be the South American way which will lead to further devaluation. It should be perhaps the Yugoslavian way, bringing economic recovery and that could have been assured.

I appeal to the whole House and to those who have brought this no-confidence motion, which is brought before this House not infrequently, that this is a national crisis and to meet that, every responsible person in this country and every representative of the people should combine together in one endeavour; and that endeavour should be to check the rising prices and to bring down this inflationary trend in such a manner that we are able to effect that after this devaluation no further devaluation follows, and instead, our economic recovery starts. That is the main problem of today.

I have many things to say. Shri Patil said about concrete suggestions. I have many concrete suggestions to make and I shall take that opportunity when the economic debate takes place. But today, I only want to point out that it is perfectly true that when the Prime Minister took this decision, and when the Cabinet took this decision, to devalue the rupee, they knew how unpopular it would be to many people, and how it would give a handle for exploitation against

us in the elections. There are those who think that not only on economic grounds but even on political grounds the timing of devaluation is wrong. Why? Because the elections are before us. This may have been the feeling among some party members. But they have also been convinced that in this country, the Congress Government has a record, and that record is that no matter how difficult it is, how unpopular it is, where a national crisis is before us, we must take a decision in the national interest and not in our own party interest.

It is quite true that in the buses and trams—I think Acharya Kripalani has said it—and in the market place, in the clubs and indeed everywhere else, there is a good deal of discussion about the Government, and about the Congress party. There are many who will criticise but who will vote for us. Why? Because they want a stable government and they want a Government which they know will ultimately, in spite of their mistakes and deficiencies, have the overall interests of the country before it, and not any other interests. I may or may not agree to the timings of the devaluation. I am not talking about that. But that it was an unpopular decision which could be exploited by the Opposition parties was known to the Prime Minister and still she took that decision, and that is something which the country knows and for that reason, no matter what is said against us, we shall win through again in the elections. But elections, which may be important in a democracy, are not of that importance, and are not so important as the economic recovery today.

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

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I shall conclude in a few minutes. I must say one word about what the erstwhile, Dr. Lohia, said. He was a protegee of Pandit Nehru for many years and was sponsored into politics by him. I would like to say one word about what Dr. Lohia said about the Prime Minister of India and women. Who

is he to talk about women? The women of India are behind the Prime Minister of this country. Who is he to say about it? I know as a woman, that when I go to the villages, there is a thrill in the country and in the countryside amongst the women, that there is a women Prime Minister, and they know that she has no magic wand and that in six months' time or in six years' time or even in 18 years' time, the backlog not only of the 200 years of British rule but the backlog of the long period before that could be washed off so soon; because no country could become a slave country unless it has had a longer period of downward trend. They know that it is not possible for her to make the impossible possible. They know her sincerity and integrity and they know that this Congress Government will deliver the goods; may be we will muddle through and we may make mistakes, but we shall eventually act up to our faith.

Lastly, this agitational approach, approaching violence, does make it difficult for the Government to proceed always as it should. Therefore, I would suggest that this agitational approach, and disturbances that are created and things like that only make it more difficult for us to bring about the economic recovery. I can only look at it from that angle. Finally, let us not forget that when we gave to us the Constitution, whose preamble I will not repeat for lack of time, which says that it is through the democratic way that we shall build a socialist State, we undertook a very difficult task. We know we had difficulties, but along this road we shall be up against many impediments and we shall have to overcome them. Today, the difficulties that we are facing are not so spectacular as the invasion by China, or the invasion by Pakistan, and its subsequent withdrawal. None the less; it is as important and necessary for us to contend with and overcome the economic crisis, because ultimately it is not military strength, but our economic strength through which we shall have

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

regained our position amongst the nations of the world.

Shri P. K. Deo: Sir, with the Council of Ministers in the dock, I, in the name of the people of India, charge them with grave dereliction of duty (1) in persistently following wrong economic policies for 15 years which led to inevitable insolvency, (2) in not being able to give two square meals a day to its people and in failing to control the soaring prices of all goods, specially the essential commodities, (3) in creating artificial scarcity and famine conditions in the country wherein by their callousness and complacent attitude hundreds of people have died of starvation and 25 per cent of the lands are lying fallow for want of seed and money in spite of this year's good monsoon, (4) by not being able to check corruption and nepotism and political patronage in this country, (5) in bringing an end to the rule of law by clamping down on this country the state of emergency and encroaching upon the fundamental rights of citizens and taking recourse to firing on labourers, students and peaceful demonstrators in order to liquidate the political rivals (6) in neglecting agriculture all these years and robbing the peasant of his right over his land, (7) in failing to preserve the integrity and sovereignty of the country and in not ousting the intruders from the sacred soil of our Motherland and (8) lastly by following a foreign policy of vacillation and confusion, thereby exposing the country to Red Chinese expansionism.

Coming to the first point, here is the culprit who brought this nation to irremediable bankruptcy and proclaimed it in a public confession by devaluation of the rupee on 6th June, 1966. Government scored four consecutive sixers or over-boundaries when they officially recorded that (1) extravagance, (2) insolvency, (3) rising prices and (4) their inability to rule and keep the house in order have crossed their previous boundaries. All along they never played a straight bat. They played a crossed bat thereby exposing the country's national and economic wickets to grave danger.

The rupee all along throughout the ages was a very honest rupee; it stood high and firm throughout the ages except probably during the short period of the rule of Mohammed Tuglaq. who minted leather currencies and was dubbed by historians as a mad cap. In the first half of this century, this honest rupee has been able to build a handsome reserve of a sterling balance of Rs. 1547 crores in 1947, even though previous to that, it had to pass through inflationary economy during the second World War. Since then this Government has been guiding the destiny of the nation. Government has been allowed by the brute majority of this House to tax the people relentlessly and this House has been giving them full support.

Many prosperous nations have extended a helping hand to this Government, so that they can overcome this economic crisis. USA has given Rs. 3,000 crores as aid during the last three plans as against Rs. 600 crores by the rest of the world. USA's assistance to India is more than double that of any such assistance to any other country. This country is the biggest debtor to the World Bank having borrowed 735 million dollars. USSR also has been helping us. USSR's help amounts to 6.7 per cent of the total foreign aid utilised by India as against the American utilised aid of 58 per cent. USA has all along come to the rescue of this country in time of war and in time of peace. You can imagine what would have happened if American aid would not have been available when Chinese committed aggression on India. Secondly, when there was acute food crisis throughout India, it is with American aid that we have been able to abate the crisis.

All along we have been giving a note of caution from these benches to the Government to observe strict financial discipline. Have they done it? There has been reckless spending and wasting of the poor taxpayer's money and the foreign aid, throwing to the winds all financial rules. There was indiscriminate deficit financing, excessive taxation, adoption of imprac-

ticable giant plans and seeking to invest non-existent resources in wrong priorities in favour of slow and low return-giving public sector, where the average return is 0.6 per cent. In reply to a question in the last session the Planning Minister agreed that we have been asking for Rs. 4000 crores worth of foreign loan, of which Rs. 1350 crores are to be spent for repayment of interest on capital. Now after devaluation it must be much more. Is it the proper way to handle the finances of this country? They have done it in the most reckless way. If I may say so, they have been following the principle of Charvak:

यत्त्रज्जोडात्तुत्रजोडात्, ऋणं कृत्वा घृतं पिवैत् ।
भस्मीभूतस्य देहस्य, पुनरागमनम् कुतः ॥

He said, "Have a merry time and spend as you like, because what is the guarantee that you will have a re-birth?" They know

भस्मीभूतस्य काप्रेसस्य पुनरागमनम् कुतः
there is no return of the dying Congress. So, they have been spending recklessly the poor taxpayer's money. At last it has come to a crisis. The time bomb has exploded and bankruptcy was registered in official devaluation of the rupee by 36 per cent. No less a person than the Finance Minister himself admitted in his statement that it was "beyond the capacity of the Government to bring down the general price level in the country to the level that prevailed 5 years ago even". This is the state of affairs. Immediately after devaluation, the Governor of the Reserve Bank said in a statement that the decision was taken after all means of stabilising the country's economy were tried and failed. The laws of economics do not respect the nations or national frontiers. They have already devalued the rupee. Government's action is only *de jure* recognition of a long-standing *de facto* position; to put it more accurately, it is 50 per cent *de facto* recognition because in the free market, the rupee stands at 10 cents whereas the official recognition is 14 cents of the American dollar.

Even after this, if we take to the road of financial discipline, as UK, France or Yugoslavia did, we may have an economic re-birth. But if we follow the path which was traversed by Indonesia and if we get enmeshed in the net of rising prices, there will be further devaluation and it is sure to come. Have we done that? The price-line has to be held at any cost. The highest priority should be given to stabilise the prices. But we have not done anything in this regard. In the *Supplement to the Economic Review*, which is a Government publication, it is stated:

"In the three years ending March 1966 the price level rose by 36.5 per cent; the wholesale prices of food articles rose by 42.1 per cent and the working class consumer index shows an increase of 33.8 per cent." It has been further stated in the Bulletin of Wholesale Prices in India that rice is being sold at Rs. 130 per quintal in some parts of the country. We know very well that in non-rationed areas rice is being sold at Rs. 2 per kilo. When this is the price level, how could the people manage their livelihood, their purchasing power being what it is. No less a person than Shri L. N. Mishra, a member of the Cabinet, has criticised the price policy of this Government. In a broadcast on the 27th of last month he stated that the general price index was up by 40 points in 13 years in the Nehru regime; that is, about 3 points per year, under the present regime it is up by 23 points per year and rose by 46 points in two years. When the Ministers themselves are criticising this you can very well imagine that it is nothing but a divided house.

The people who are hard hit by the rise in prices are the people with fixed incomes. The poor and the middle class people are hit hard. Have you thought about them? Are you thinking of another Pay Commission? How could you say that you are going to freeze the wages? Unless you freeze the prices there is absolutely no sense in talking of freezing the wages.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

It is no use putting the blame on the traders or the manufacturers for the rise in prices. It is the Government which has been raising the prices. Have you forgotten that immediately after devaluation the Asoka Hotel raised their tariff by 10 to 20 per cent and the Indian Airlines Corporation, another Government undertaking, by 10 per cent. There has also been a rise in the price of imported wheat. Even though the Government is saying that the price has to be controlled, in the same breath it is raising the prices in Government undertakings. Therefore, it is no use blaming the traders or manufacturers. The usual law of demand and supply will play to fix the prices.

To cope with the rising demands the main impediments for production are to be removed. What are the main impediments for production? The suffocating controls, permit and licences and quotas which open the floodgate of corruption and political patronage, they must go. More incentives should be given to the people, both agricultural and industrial, for increased production. The mystic phrase of land reform embodied in the Seventeenth Amendment, which robs the peasant of his right over the land, should be repealed. If that is not done, the target of 120 million tons at the end of the Fourth Plan will be a moonshine.

After 18 years of independence we have not been able to give our people two square meals a day. There have been many cases of starvation. Lately, in Orissa there was a famine and the Prime Minister was there. We are grateful that she visited that place. We also shared the anxiety with her. But I am very sorry to say that all the directives she gave have been watered down by those who are on the spot. Those who are supposed to implement her directives are doing just the opposite. She directed that all the relief works should be entrusted to the panchayats, panchayat samitis, to the village committees.

But nothing of that sort is being done. All works are being entrusted through the rural engineering organisation to the favourite contractors and a deal is struck in invariably every case before the contract is given as to how much they are going to give to the Congress Election Fund. This is how the Congress is making political capital out of the misery and suffering of the people during the famine.

The Prime Minister stated that the cultivators are to get taccavi loans at the rate of Rs. 100 per acre up to a maximum of Rs. 800. But nothing has been done in this regard. So far as my district is concerned, a sum of Rs. 1.35 crores has been distributed. There are 2,50,000 cultivators in Kalahandi District. The average comes to Rs. 55. It is a scene to watch every day thousands of cultivators going to the district headquarters for taccavi loan and return empty-handed. The result of it is that 25 per cent of the land is lying fallow in spite of a very good monsoon this year. They do not have the cash for the seeds. In the distress sales they have sold everything—their cattle, utensils, agricultural implements, everything—and nothing is left with them.

Now I will come to the Defence of India Act. We have been told time and again that it would not be extended a day longer than needed. But what is happening? Instead of bringing the hoarders or profiteers to book—of course, (the Government is the biggest hoarder)—it is being used to victimise the political opponents. Emergency powers abrogating the fundamental rights and short-circuiting the ordinary process of law has become a matter of administrative convenience. The firing on students, labourers, adibasis and peaceful demonstrators has become the order of the day, whether it is Bastar or Banda, Calcutta or Kalahandi. The cat will be out of the bag when the Pande Commission report reveals the brutalities committed by Government in Bastar.

The trigger-happy rulers have used this method to liquidate their political rivals. They want a blanket continuance of the emergency powers and the Defence of India Act. That is why an amending Bill has come in the name of amending the Defence of India Act. Even though they say that they want to restrict the scope and operation of the Act only to border areas, they want much more powers. The Unlawful Activities Prevention Bill is also another method to arm the Government with more powers on various pretexts so that they can clamp them down on political rivals.

The Chinese threat is only a bogie. Nothing has been done to wipe out the scar of humiliation and defeat at the hands of the Chinese. We have more or less acquiesced in the illegal possession of a part of our country by China.

Coming to foreign policy, I beg to submit that we must follow a consistent and realistic foreign policy. We have to realise that China is posing a big threat to the freedom of South East Asia. Who does not know that China is functioning through a satellite in North Viet Nam? After South Viet Nam is gulped, then Laos, Thailand, Malaysia, Burma and India are in the Chinese menu card. They will be gulped one after the other. To those who say that American bombing has to be stopped, I would like to point out that in modern warfare fighting is not confined only to the battlefield; the military bases behind the battle front have to be attacked. Have we not bombed Sargoda and Peshawar and opened a second front in Lahore to deal with the Pakistani infiltrators in Kashmir? So, it is a part of the game. Therefore, for India's sake, we will have to support it even though we may feel sorry for the loss of lives there. Because we know that China has been fighting through a satellite called North Viet Nam, for India's sake we will have to support the American bombing of the military bases in North Viet Nam.

Our practical and precept should be consistent. We could not blame others for doing the same thing which we did when we were attacked. It is wrong. As Chairman of the International Control Commission we have rightly suggested the convening of a Geneva-type Conference and we should stick to it. But are we sticking to it? We have been constantly changing. When our Prime Minister comes in contact with foreign dignitaries, she undergoes some metamorphosis. In Cairo she said that first there should be the convening of the Geneva-type conference and then, secondly, there would be stoppage of the bombing. She goes to Moscow and she says that first there should be stoppage of bombing and then convening of the Geneva type conference and reversed the order.

The Soviet Union has been flirting with Pakistan and the illusive relationship between Soviet Union and Pakistan has been a matter of great concern to us. The Soviet Union has been silent all these years over the Soviet-Pakistan arms deal. The Russian Defence Minister will be shortly visiting Pakistan. A high-power military mission went from Pakistan to Russia. These visits are not for sightseeing. These visits are not sponsored for the sake of tourism. We all know that something has been brewing and we should be clear as to what is going on behind the screen between Pakistan and Russia. Unless we play our cards properly we will be in the soup again.

Coming to corruption, it is a cancerous growth. In this field we hear big names, like Pratap Singh Kairon, Biju Patnaik, Biren Mitra etc., who have flourished in dubious and corrupt practices under this Government's mantle of protection. Some of them are trying for a comeback.

There should be the institution of an ombudsman. But I do not think that it is going to take place so long as Nandaji and his so-called sada-char are there.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

I would like to point out that frustration has been there everywhere. You go to any part of the country, there has been frustration. The Government has been stubborn and unresponsive. We saw the glimpse of the frustration on the opening day of Parliament. We should not play to the elements of chaos; at the same time, I would like to blame the Government also. On the first day they projected an image of strength and firmness but lastly they lost the game by a subsequent *volte face* and brought the Parliament and the Speaker's dignity to ridicule. These things should not happen.

This Government has all along been trying to throttle the Opposition, firstly, by corrupting the voters, by exploiting their poverty and ignorance; secondly, the Opposition MLAs and MPs are being purchased to further boost the brute majority of the party in power; thirdly, Opposition leaders are being lured away by offers of fishes and loaves, jobs and positions. These things have to be stopped. Unless the Government mend they have to end.

Lastly, I repeat the famous words of Cromwell which he said to the Long Parliament and which were repeated by Mr. Amery to Chamberlain:—

“You have sat too long here, for any good you have been doing. Depart I say and let us have done with you. In the name of God! Go.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Mathura Prasad Mishra.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katiyar): There is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung.... Now there is quorum. Shri Mathura Prasad Mishra.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (बेगूसराय) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश में कुछ अरसे

से जो अशांति उपद्रव और हिंसा करने की कोशिशें हो रही हैं, राजनीतिक कोशिशें और उस से साथ ही पहले विधान सभाओं में जो चीजें होती थीं, वहां से चलकर अब यह देश की संसद में लोक तंत्र को, लोकतंत्रीय पद्धति को और संसदीय शासन को अप्रतिष्ठित करने का प्रयत्न हो रहा है और यह चीजें आयोजित ढंग से हो रही हैं। यह नहीं कि कहीं आकस्मिक ढंग से किसी क्षण के गुस्से में ऐसा होता हो, यह बात नहीं है। बल्कि इनके पीछे एक योजना है। देश में यह जो अशांति और उपद्रव पैदा करने की राजनीति कोशिशें हो रही हैं और राजनीतिक कोशिशें हो रही हैं देश में प्रजातंत्र को अपमानित करने की, विनष्ट करने की देश के अन्दरके एक प्रतिष्ठित पत्र ने इसका विश्लेषण करने की कोशिश की है।

एक माननीय सदस्य कौन सा
अखबार ?

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : आप सुनिए पहले उनका कहना है कि पिछले बीस वर्ष में तीन तीन आम चुनाव हो चुके और कांग्रेस का प्रबल बहुमत देश में और राज्यों में रहा। दूसरी तरफ जो विरोधी दल हैं, वह आपस में इतने बंटे हुए हैं कि इनका नजारा तो यह है कि कांग्रेस बेंच की तरफ से कोई कुछ न बोले इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव पर तब भी विरोधी अपने आपस में एक दूसरे की बात को, दलील को ऐसे बढ़िया तरीके से बांटते हैं कि क्या कहना लेकिन उस अखबार ने कहा है कि चूंकि विरोधी दल इतने बंटे हुए हैं और बीस वर्ष हो चुके उन्हें अब कोई आसार नहीं नजर आता कि उनमें से कोई सरकार बना पायेगा या वह मिलकर भी बना सकेंगे। यह वह जानते हैं, इसलिए उन में एक बड़ी भयानक निराशा, बड़ी भयानक नाउम्मीदी आ रही है। इसी से उनमें एक गैर-जवाबदेही

का भाव फैलता जा रहा है। इसी से उन्होंने वह नज़ारा देश में खड़ा किया : और इस अखबार में सम्पादक के नाम पत्र में एक सज्जन ने यहां तक लिख दिया कि अब समय आ गया है कि विरोधी दल जो नहीं कर सकता उसे खुद कांग्रेस को करना चाहिये डाक्टर बोहिया लम्बी बातें करने में बड़े तेज हैं, मुझे उनके लिए बड़ा आदर है, वह कांग्रेस में रहकर देश के राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में हिस्सा ले चुके हैं। लेकिन बीस वर्ष से उन को भी तो मौका है कि वह एक बढ़िया स्वस्थ प्रजातांत्रिक विरोधी दल बनाते। लेकिन उन्होंने क्या किया ? जितनी प्रजातांत्रिक विरोधी ताकत थी उसको तोड़ने की कोशिश ही उन्होंने। प्रजा समाजवादी दल को तोड़ा समाजवादी दल को तोड़ा, अपने दल को तोड़ा और आखिरी उन्होंने क्या किया है ? आखिरी बार अब वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से गले लग रहे। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से गले लगकर इस देश में और दुनिया में प्रजातंत्र के दल और लोग न जाने कितने ऐसे हैं जिनकी लाशें पड़ी हुई हैं। मैं ईश्वर से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि लोहिया साहब की राजनीतिक लाश अगले साल न निकले। लेकिन इसके लिए हमारा एक ही निवेदन है कि अगर उन्होंने यह तय कर लिया है कि गुस्से में, हताशा में, कम्युनिस्ट से गलबाही करके वह कुछ कर सकेंगे देश में तो कुछ न कर सकेंगे। इसलिए उन्हें चाहिए कि वे अपना और अपने दल का बचाव कर लें। हां, तो अखबार ने यह लिखा है कि अब समय आ गया है कि विरोधी दल में जो यह हताशा आ गई है, निराशा आ गई है। हमारे एक मित्र ने कहा कि देश में निराशा है, देश में निराशा नहीं है, बल्कि विरोधी दल में निराशा है, यह मैं मानता हूं, उस के जवाब में उस अखबार ने लिखा है कि कांग्रेस को ही चाहिए कि वह दो टुकड़ों में बट जाय और एक विरोधी दल बन जाय, एक शासक दल में रहें और वहीं अन्य विरोधी दलों को अपने में जज्ब कर ले। मैं पूछता हूं कि

अजीब अन्याय की बात है कि अब कांग्रेस से कहा जा रहा है कि तुम शासन भी चलाओ शासन का दल भी तुम्हीं बनाओ और विरोधी दल भी तुम्हीं बना लो। यह चीज कांग्रेस से उम्मीद करना या किसी से उम्मीद करना कोई समझ में आने वाली बात नहीं है। लेकिन यह तो विरोधी दल और उसके नेताओं को बैठकर सोचना चाहिये। वह जो असफल हुए हैं तो उसके कुछ कारण हैं। हमें भी दुख है देश में प्रजातंत्र के लिए जरूरी है कि दो तगड़े दल होने चाहिए। अच्छा तो यह है कि जिसमें एक दल दूसरे दल को हटाकर देश की बागडोर अपने हाथ में लेने को तैयार हो सके। देश को भी भरोसा रहे कि जो दल शासन चला रहा है वह अगर ठीक से काम न करे तो दूसरे दल को बुला सकता है, दूसरी संस्था को बुला सकता है। लेकिन यह नहीं हुआ। तो इसके लिए भी कसूर हमीं को दिया जाय यह कोई न्याय की बात नहीं है। मैं एक प्रजातंत्र के, लोकतंत्र के भक्त के नाते यह कह रहा हूं। और फ्रेंक एन्यनी ने ठीक कहा है कि विरोधी दल में सिर्फ स्वतंत्र पार्टी और प्रजा सोशलस्ट पार्टी को छोड़ कर और स्वतंत्र सदस्यों को छोड़ कर बाकी लोकतंत्र-विरोधी हैं।

कम्युनिस्टों का लोकतंत्र में कोई विश्वास नहीं है। वह तो इस को जितनी जल्दी हो सकता है, तोड़ कर खत्म कर देना चाहते हैं। उनका इरादा साफ है और लोहिया साहब ने उन के साथ गठबन्धन कर लिया है, अपनी निराशा और नाउम्मीदी में हिराकरी करने के लिये। यही दो दल हैं और कुछ स्वतंत्र लोग हैं, अगर वे बैठकर सोंचे तो क्या कोई बढ़िया, स्वस्थ प्रजातांत्रिक विरोधी दल देश में नहीं बन सकता ? इतनी निराशा की बात वह बताते हैं ठीक है कि देश में असंतोष भी है। तो क्या उस असंतोष को संगठित कर क्या एक बढ़िया प्रजातान्त्रिक विरोधी दल वह नहीं बना सकते ? लेकिन वह ऐसा नहीं कर सकते क्योंकि उनका रास्ता गलत है।

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

इसी लिये वह आज ठीक से देश को नेतृत्व नहीं दे सकते हैं और जब वह इस में सकल नहीं हो पाते तो इस का दोष भी कांग्रेस के माथे पर लगा देते हैं।

श्रवमूल्यन को लेकर बहुत बातें कही गई हैं। श्रवमूल्यन का क्या प्रभाव देश पई पड़ रहा है, यह चीज तो एक्सपर्ट लोगों के लिये हैं, लेकिन जहां तक चीजों के दाम बढ़ने का सेवाल है, देश में मंहगाई है। किसी दोस्त ने कहा था कि 30-35 वर्ष पहले यहां तीन रुपये में एक मन चावल, एक रुपये में एक सेर घी और एक रुपये में 15 सेर दूध मिलता था मजदूरों को चार आना मजदूरी मिलती थी। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि मंहगाई एक हद से ज्यादा हो जाय तो बुरी चीज है, लेकिन मंहगाई ऐसी चीज नहीं है कि इस से इतना घबराया जाय, यह एक रेलेटिव (सापेक्ष) चीज है, इसे इतना हौवा बनाने की जरूरत नहीं है जितना की हमारे विरोधी दल बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। कोई चीज भी उनको मिल जाय, वह उसको ही लेकर तूफान खड़ा करना चाहते हैं।

मैंने एक किताब में पढ़ा था कि आज से 100 वर्ष पहले एक रुपये का सवा मन चावल, एक रुपया का तीन सेर घी, एक रुपये का आधा मन दूध मिलता था। वह जमाना कोई अच्छा जमाना नहीं था इस देश के गरीब लोगों के लिये। इसे लिये कि जो लोग इन चीजों को पैदा करते थे उनकी उस वक्त क्या हालत थी? उस समय एक सब डिवीजनल मैजिस्ट्रेट की हैसियत का एक ग्रंथेज 20-20 नौकर रखता था। यह बात मैं 1860 की कह रहा हूँ। उपाध्यक्ष जी, अगर यह मंहगाई नहीं आती तो आज क्या स्थिति होती? वास्तव में मंहगाई आई पिछले महायुद्ध के बाद। मैं एक गांव का रहने वाला हूँ और इस देश में 50 लाख 60 हजार गांव हैं, हमारे देश के ये 60 हजार

गांव, यदि मंहगाई नहीं आती, तो महाजनौ, जमींदारों और सूदखोरों के पास गिरवी हो जाते एक बीघा जमीन भी किसी किसान के पास नहीं बचती।

मैं अभी एक गांव में लगातार सात दिन तक रह कर आया हूँ। वहां पर गांव में किसान घूसखोरी के खिलाफ बोलते थे, सामुदायिक विकास खण्ड बढ़िया तरीके से नहीं चल रहे हैं, इसके खिलाफ बोलते थे, उनको पानी नहीं मिलता है, इस के बारे में बोलते थे, लेकिन वहां पर श्रवमूल्यन और मंहगाई के बारे में किसी को बहस करते नहीं देखा। मैं मानता हूँ कि यह शहरों का सवाल है रूपये का इतना सस्ता हो जाना बुरा है, मंहगाई बुरी चीज है अगर मन्दी बुरी है तो मंहगाई भी बुरी है लेकिन शहर में कितने लोग हैं। 80 प्रतिशत लोल गांवों में रहते हैं, शहरों के भरोसे आज जो लोग यह अवाज लगा रहे हैं कि कांग्रेस चुनाव से हट जाय, उनको मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ शहरों को सम्भालना प्रकार के लिए मुश्किल नहीं है। शहरों में राशनिंग किया जा रहा है, सरकारी लोगों को सब्सिडाइज अनाज दिया जायगा, यह मजदूरों को भी दिया जाना चाहिये। दामों पर रोक भी लगाई जानी चाहिये। लेकिन एक प्याली में तूफान खड़ा कर देने से हम नहीं डरते हैं, लोहिया साहब को अगर इतनी उम्मीद हो जाती तो इस तरह की धमकी नहीं देते कि हम दूसरे रास्ते से भी आगे आयेगे, अर्थात् हिंसा के रास्ते से, उपद्रव के रास्ते से सरकार को बदलने की कोशिश करेंगे। क्या लोहिया साहब, आप तो आज रास्ता लेकर निकले हो, नुम्हारे बड़े भाई, जिनके पीछे दौं विदेशी सरकारों की ताकतें हैं, वह कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी पचास वर्ष से इस देश में इस प्रोग्राम को लेकर बैठी है, लेकिन सफल नहीं हो सकी क्या धमकाते हो, इन

बातों से ? लेकिन सवाल यह नहीं है, सवाल यह है, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि यह मंहगाई क्यों आई ? कुछ तो विकास करने वाले देशों के लिये, जो योजना पर चलते हैं, विकास करने में लाजमी हो जाता है मंहगाई का आना। उस हद तक तो मंहगाई फायदे की चीज है। जैसे आज किसान को उसकी उपज का वाजिब मूल्य मिल रहा है। शहरों में जब 50-60 रु० मन चावल बिकता है तो किसान को उतना पैसा नहीं मिलता है, उसका नफा बनिये बीच में ले जाते हैं। किसान तो उसको 30 रु० मन या 25 रु० मन के भाव से बेचता है। लेकिन आज उसको उस के माल का वाजिब दाम मिल जाता है। कुछ मंहगाई का कारण हमारी योजना में असन्तुलन का आना है, असन्तुलन कैसे हुआ ? इस का कारण यह है कि योजना वृद्ध विकास पहले किसी लोक्तान्त्रिक देश ने नहीं किया था, कम्युनिस्ट देशों में योजनावृद्ध विकास हुआ, और उन से ही हमने इस चीज को लिया। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि कम्युनिस्ट देशों से हमें सीखना है, इसमें मेरा विरोध नहीं है, उन में कोई अच्छी चीज है तो हमें लेनी चाहिये लोक तन्त्र के जरिये योजनावृद्ध तरीके से विकास करने का यह पहला प्रयोग इस देश में हुआ, यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात है, लेकिन हम ने क्या किया कि उन्ही का नारा उन्ही की योजना को अपना लिया और यही चीज योजना भवन में चली गई जिसका नतीजा क्या हुआ कि हम ने अपने देश का सब से बड़ा उद्योग—खेती को छोड़ दिया। मार्क्स ने किसानों को क्रान्ति का दुश्मन मान रखा था और हर कम्युनिस्ट अपने दिल में किसान का विरोधी है। इसी लिये स्टालिन ने चर्चिल से इस बात को कुबल किया था कि रूस में खेती का साम-हिकरण करने में उनको एक करोड़ किसान कुलक की जान लेनी पड़ी। माओत्सेतुंग ने कितने करोड़ किसानों की जान ली है, यह बात आज किसी से छिपी नहीं है।

इसी चीज का असर हमारे यहां भी पड़ा। 15 साल में हम ने खेती का तिरस्कार किया खेती को जो प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिये थी, वह नहीं दी। पहली योजना में तो दी, लेकिन दूसरी और तीसरी योजना में नहीं दी। बड़े बड़े उद्योगों में पैसा लगाया, लेकिन बड़े उद्योगों में पैसा लगाने से रिटर्न देर से आती है, उन में रिटर्न कम मिलती है, इस कारण से मंहगाई बढ़ी। इस का फायदा कौन उठा रहे हैं, ये कम्युनिस्ट लोग, जो आज भी चिल्लाते हैं कि बड़े उद्योगों को मत छोड़ो। खेती के बारे में इन का क्या नारा है ? भूमि सुधार करो; भूमि सुधार करो, इस के सिवा खेती के बारे में इन को कुछ नहीं कहना है। क्योंकि ये जानते हैं, इन को डर है किसानों से, ये डरते हैं किसानों से।

हम से यह गलती हुई है, हम यह मानते हैं और हम वहेगें अपने वित्त मंत्री जी से कि इस को हमें सुधारना चाहिये। हम कहेंगे अपनी सरकार से कि इस गलती को सुधारना चाहिये। सिर्फ बातों से नहीं, पिछले प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने कहा था कि एक महीने में एक बार मैं गावों में जाऊंगा। मैं आपको व्रत लेने के लिये नहीं कहता हूं, लेकिन वित्त मंत्री शचिन्द्र चौधरी से कहता हूं, प्रधान मंत्री यहां इस वक्त होतीं तो उन से भी कहता। वित्त मंत्री तो सुना है कि 25-30 हजार रु० महीने की कमाई की वकालत छोड़ कर आये हैं, शहर के रहने वाले हैं, लेकिन देश का भला चाहते हैं, देश को अनुप्राणित करना चाहते हैं, तो बिना सूचना दिये हुए गावों में जाइये, और हल के पीछे जो किसान खड़ा हुआ है, उसकी पीठ पर हाथ रख कर उसे भरोसा दीजिये कि आप उसके पीछे रहेंगे। वह यदि आज हल के पीछे है तो आप उसके पीछे हैं, याद रखिये, इस देश का भाग्य बदल जायगा। मैं इन बड़े बड़े कारखानों को बन्द करने के लिये नहीं कहता हूं, वह भी जरूरी हैं, लेकिन इस से भी ज्यादा जरूरी हैं, खेती की पैदावार। अगर आप आज किसान के पीछे

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

खड़े हो जाय तो यह देश आगे बढ़ सकता है, उसके रास्ते में जो रोड़े पड़े हुए हैं, वे हट जायेंगे, उसकी जन्जीरे टूट जायंगी और इस देश की किस्मत बदल जायगी। मैंने सुना है कि बड़े बड़े भवनों के बनाने में तीन हजार करोड़ रुपये अब तक खर्च किये जा चुके हैं, इस की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी, इस से कोई फायदा नहीं हुआ है, नुकसान हुआ है।

मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने घन्टी बजा दी है। लेकिन एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे दोस्त बड़ा चिल्लाये वियतनाम के बारे में, कविता कहने लगे लेकिन मुझे याद है कि इस देश पर जब चीन ने हमला किया था सन 1962 में, इतना बड़ा हमला कि बोमदिला तक चले आये, हमारे लोगों को पकड़ कर ले गये, और इस हाउस में जब चीन का सवाल आया, तो हमारे ये दोस्त ठण्डे काष्ठ की तरह चुप बैठे रहे। पाकिस्तान का आक्रमण हुआ, उस समय भी इनके दल में कोई उबाल नहीं आया। सारा देश देशभक्ति से उबल रहा था, लेकिन ये ठण्डे पड़े रहे। लेकिन वियतनाम के नाम से उन के मुँह पर कविता आती है। घन्य हैं वे लोग जो अपनी देश मां की पुकार पर काठ की तरह ठंडे पड़े रह सकते हैं और दूसरे देश की पुकार पर, परदेश की पुकार पर गर्मी में हिमालय की बर्फ की तरह पिघलने लगते हैं। वह घन्य हैं लेकिन उन्होंने यही सीखा है। उन्होंने परदेश भक्ति सीखी है, देशभक्ति नहीं सीखी। उन्होंने 20, 25 या 50 वर्षों से इस देश में यही किया है।

15.00 hrs.

मेरे कुछ साथियों को याद होगा 1930 में बम्बई में उन्होंने तिरंगा झंडा जलाया था। जो लोग बम्बई में तिरंगा झंडा जलाते थे वही आज गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं।

आप को याद होगा कि आजादी के पहले यह लोग गांधी जी को क्या कहते थे। मुझे अच्छी तरह से "जनयुद्ध" की बात याद है।.. (व्यवधान) मुझे "लोकयुद्ध" का वह चित्र याद है जिस में उन्होंने सुभाष बाबू को तोजो का कुत्ता बनाया था। क्या मुँह है उन का कि गांधी जी के नाम पर, जवाहरलाल नेहरू के नाम पर, सुभाष बाबू के नाम पर, वह हम से अपील करें। अब वह जवाहरलाल जी का नाम बहुत लेने लगे हैं। जवाहरलाल जी की प्रियदशिनी इन्दिरा जवाहरलाल जी को नहीं जानती लेकिन यह जानने लगे हैं। वे उन के नाम पर हम को सीख देते हैं। हमारे यहाँ गांव की एक कहावत है कि दूसरे की मां जब तुम्हें बहुत प्रेम करने लगे तो समझ लो कि वह डाइन है। इस लिये हमारे लोग और देश के लोग इन कम्यूनिस्ट भाइयों या दूसरे विरोधियों के घेरे में नहीं पड़ने वाले हैं।

अन्त में मैं एक जातक कथा कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। एक गांव में एक आदमी शाम को पहुंचा जो दूसरे गांव का रहने वाला था। उस के पीछे एक बैलगाड़ी थी जिस में उस का सामान लदा था। गांव में प्रवेश करते ही एक बूढ़े से उसकी मूलाकात हो गई। उसने बूढ़े से पूछा कि यह गांव कैसा है, मैं इस में बसना चाहता हूँ। बूढ़े ने उस से कहा कि पहले यह बतलाओ कि तुम जिस गांव से आये हो वह कैसा था। उस आदमी ने कहा कि उस का नाम मत लो, वह गांव बहुत बुरा है, वहां बड़े दुष्ट और शैतान लोग रहते हैं। इसी लिये तो वहां से भाग कर मैं इस गांव में शरण चाहता हूँ। बूढ़े ने इस पर उठ कर उस से कहा, तब यह गांव उस से भी ज्यादा बुरा है। उस से ज्यादा शैतान है और वहां से भी अधिक दुष्ट लोग यहां रहते हैं यहां तुम्हारा वास नहीं हो सकेगा। जाओ किसी दूसरे गांव का रास्ता लो। और वह

आदमी अपनी बैलगाड़ी ले कर आगे बढ़ गया। उस के जाने के थोड़ी देर बाद दूसरा आदमी आ पहुँचा। उस के पीछे भी एक बैलगाड़ी थी। वह भी उस बड़े आदमी से मिला और सवाल किया कि यह गांव कैसा है। बूढ़े ने कहा कि पहले यह बतलाओ कि तुम्हारा गांव कैसा है जहाँ से तुम आ रहे हो। उस आदमी ने कहा कि कुछ मजबूरियाँ हुईं जिस के कारण मैं उस को छोड़ कर चला आया हूँ नहीं तो वह देवताओं का गांव है और वहाँ पर रहना स्वर्ग जैसा है। मैं बड़ा दुखी हूँ कि उस को छोड़ कर मुझे चलना पड़ा और दूरी जगह पनाह खोजनी पड़ी। बूढ़ा उठा और उस ने कहा कि तब तुम्हारा यहाँ स्वागत है। यह गांव देवताओं से भी बड़े देवताओं का गांव है। यहाँ सभी साधु रहते हैं और यहाँ रहना स्वर्ग क्या स्वर्ग से ज्यादा है। मैं आपका स्वागत करता हूँ।

Shri Karuthiruman (Gobichettipalayam): After hearing the arguments of all our Opposition members, I feel that there is nothing in them except the good old stories expressed in so many other debates of the Opposition. I would like to quote an eminent leader of the world:

"If we do not manage to conduct a concessions policy and attract foreign capital to our concessions, we can hardly consider any serious practical measures to improve our economic position. We cannot seriously entertain the idea of an immediate improvement of the economic situation, unless we operate a policy of concessions, unless we discard our prejudices, our local patriotism, discard to some extent our craft patriotism, and to some extent the idea that we can do our own "exploring"."

Further he says:

"... chiefly about the great need to increase the food supply —is not intended for admiration

or for a show of great love for various resolutions (which the Communists have been doing with great zeal), but as a call to increase the quantity of food-stuffs at any cost. That is something we cannot do without the help of foreign capital. This should be plain to every one who takes a realistic view of things. That is why the concessions question became important enough to be dealt with by the Party Congress."

Further he says:

"Let me add that we have not yet concluded a single concessions agreement. We have already given expression to our disagreements of principle—we are past masters at that sort of thing—but have not yet secured any concessions. I suppose this will make some people happy, which is unfortunate, because if we fail to attract capital to our concessions, we shall merely prove that we are poor businessmen. But then, of course, the Communists can always have a field day with resolutions, filling up all the stocks of paper that we have. Here is Point One!"

Lastly, the great leader says:

"You know that we must have that improvement at all costs. We shall not grudge the foreign capitalist even a 2,000 per cent profit provided we improve the condition of the workers and peasants. It is imperative that we do it."

This is expressed by Lenin. I want to put it before our Communist friends. They can refer to this. It is published cent per cent in Moscow. They say that we should stand on our own legs and that we should not invite foreign capital. Lenin has said that he would not mind even a 2,000 per cent profit to foreign capi-

[Shri Karuthiruman]

talists if, by that, the condition of the people would improve. I do not know how these people criticise our inviting American help. They are allergic to Americans; that is why they say this. If our food imports come from Russia, then they would be happy. I am very sorry Prof. Mukerjee said that our food imports under PL. 480 made Shri Subramaniam get one thousand ships on his face. I say that even thousands and thousands of good phrases, even a calculated and written speech, of Prof. Mukerjee will not add even a single blade of corn in the field. We should improve our agriculture; we should improve our economic situation. Merely giving resolutions and no-confidence motions will not improve the economic situation. These Opposition members never co-operate with the democratic set-up. They should give a healthy criticism; they should give a constructive argument; we can understand that. Whenever there is rise in prices, they say that wages should increase. Suppose, we give more wages, then they say that prices have risen. There is a saying: there is a kind of fish which, by showing its head, will claim to be a snake and by showing its tail, will claim to be a fish. That is what the go to the people and say, "demand more; do not do work" because they want to create a scarcity condition. Therefore, they decry our achievements over the past 15 or 16 years. We are proud of our achievements. Even the foreign people—Americans and Russians—who come here appreciate our improvements. In 1955-56, our cereal production was only 55 million tonnes; in 1964-65 it was 80 million tonnes. Is it not an achievement of the three Five-Year Plans. There may, of course, be shortfalls; there may be failures of monsoons and all those things. But they all attribute it to the Congress Party in power and say that, if they are in power, they can do this and that.

Coming to devaluation, devaluation is not a new thing. The Swatantra

Party was criticising that. They should know that the leader of the Swatantra Party, the founder of the Swatantra Party, founded the devaluation in 1937 by giving debt relief loan to the agriculturists and in 1952 by giving moratorium. Rajaji was the first man to do that. If ours had been the first country which had devalued its currency then it could be said that we had done a wrong thing. But so many other countries had devalued their currencies in the past, and we have only done now what they had done before. Sir, I am not an economist, nor am I a student of political science. As a poor farmer, what I can say is this. Suppose I take one bag of rice to the market, and I offer it at Rs. 70. Suppose the people who come there offer only Rs. 50 for that bag. Then, is it wise for me to sell that bag of rice at Rs. 50 and so and produce one more bag, or is it wise for me to say 'No, no, I would not sell for Rs. 50; I would sell this only for Rs. 70.'? If I say the latter, then that would mean that I would have to take back that of rice: I would not only not produce more rice thereby but I would also be in difficulty in regard to money. This is the simple way in which a poor man or a layman understand devaluation. Our rupee has got a certain value; it is not so much as we were thinking it to be. The external value of the rupee has also been less. That is why we have devalued it.

Now, we should concentrate on the post-devaluation efforts that we have to make. We should see that our food production is increased, and that the price levels are maintained at such a level that they would not hurt the ordinary people.

In our country, unfortunately, whether devaluation or no devaluation, there is a general tendency on the part of the traders to increase the prices. I can say that we lack in national character. Recently, I had been to Britain. There was a strike

by the seamen there, which lasted for 45 days. In spite of that strike, the prices of the articles had not risen even by a penny. The people who were going to the market for purchasing things did not have to pay even a single penny extra. Even the shop-keepers there would not sell anything at even a single penny more. That was so because of the national character that they had, because of the interest that they had in the national economy.

Here, I congratulate the Government on their having taken this bold decision to devalue the rupee. As Shri S. K. Patil has said, national interest is more valuable than the interests of the party. The Congress Party has demonstrated to the people in the country and to the whole world that they care for the nation first and then only for the party. Of course, the argument is advanced that this decision could have been postponed and all that. I am not well-versed in these things, and so, I would not go into those things.

So far as I am concerned, I would urge that after devaluation, we should see that there is greater production effected. If there is greater production, then the prices can be stabilised. Simply moving a no-confidence-motion is not the way to maintain the prices. Let my hon. friends opposite go to the people and say that they have to do such and such things. Let them educate the people and advise them. But I find that instead of educating the people they want to create trouble among the people. They want to organise *bandhs* and agitations and so on.

The Communist friends think that now they can go to the people and they will return victorious. But I know what the political power of the Communists is. In the composite State of Madras, in 1952, there were 62 communists. When the State had been divided in the Madras portion there were 21 communists; the leader of the communists, Shri Ramamurti said at

that time claimed that 'We shall go to the people and we shall see', but, alas! he was defeated; he was not defeated just ordinarily but by a margin of about one lakh and a few thousands of votes. In 1957, only 4 communists had come out successful in the elections to the Madras State Assembly. In 1962, the credit that they have is that they have only two communists there. Even that strength will be wiped out in 1967.

Shri Nambiar: We challenge him. Let us see.

Shri Karuthiruman: We accept that challenge, and the people will decide, and my hon. friend will see the fate of the communists in 1967.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): Not here, but in Tamil Nad.

Shri Karuthiruman: Yes, we are prepared to face it.

As regards the DMK, they are making charges on the Government there and they have tabled a no-confidence-motion. But what is the way in which they have administered the Madras Corporation? They have been there for nearly six years now, but there is nothing but corruption and nepotism under the DMK's rule there. They cannot manage even a small corporation there; they cannot have proper roads, and they cannot ensure proper supply of water to the people of the city, and they are at the helm of affairs they want to capture power and form a government. I would submit that even the Central Government may order an inquiry because there is so much of corruption and nepotism under the rule of the DMK in the corporation there.

Shri S. Kandappan (Tirchengode): We are prepared to face the inquiry.

Shri Karuthiruman: They shall have to face it.

Shri S. Kandappan: In the corporation our number has increased after successive elections.

Shri Karuthiruman: No doubt, the no-confidence-motion can be discussed, and the main issue is, of course, devaluation. No doubt, it has been stated that the prices have risen after devaluation. But I would like to point out that even during the ordinary times, during this period, generally there is an increase in prices. Therefore, they cannot attribute this price rise to devaluation as such. It is only the mother-in-law attitude of the Opposition Members that makes them say this kind of thing. Here, I would like to quote what the great poet Thiruvalluvar has said about what constitutes a good nation. He has said that a good nation is one which is devoid of so many parties, devoid of internal enemies and devoid of people who are owing allegiance to other countries. Thiruvalluvar has said:

*"Palguduvum pazhseyyumu
utpagaiyumu Vendu alaikkum kol-
kumbum illathathu naadu".*

'Nadu' means a nation. Which is a good nation? That is a good nation which is 'palguduvum pazhseyyumu utpagaiyumu illathathu', that is, a nation which is devoid of so many parties, red party, black party, black-red party, bluish party, yellowish party and so on. If it is one colour, we can understand: if it is one Opposition party, we can understand. But there are different parties and different colours and different ideologies.

An hon. Member: With rainbow colours.

Shri Karuthiruman: But there are many colours which cannot be tackled at all. That is the first thing.

The second thing is that the nation's interest must be put first; if that is done, then we can improve anything. We should see that the peasant proprietorship is guaranteed. Only under the Congress Party the peasants have got those rights. It is only on the basis of the democratic and socialistic policy of the Congress that we can deal with all these people. Only the Congress Party can deliver the goods;

no other party can deliver the goods. That is the only party under whose rule everybody is happy.

Then, I would like to quote what the great poet Kambar has said. He foresaw in the twelfth century that everything was possible provided we had one invaluable thing, namely national character. He said:

*"Kalam surakkum nidiyam
Kanakida Nilam Shirakkum nila-
valam nanmani Pilam shirakkum
peridarkariya nan kulam surak-
kum ozhukkam kudigalaam."*

This means that by international trade we can amass so much of wealth. Secondly, we can have construction of big projects like the Bhakra-Nangal which can help in increase in production. Then, we can have lignite mines etc. and by all this, we can increase the wealth of our country. All these things are possible. The people of Ayodhya were so happy that they indulged in so many things. They could do all this because they had national character which was the most invaluable thing. That is what the great Kambar has said. If that national character is there, then the people can be happy.

Here, we need national character. We should cultivate national character. If we have national character and cultivate it, then we would all join together, irrespective of whether one is in the Opposition or not, and we shall have the national interest in mind.

With these words, I oppose this no-confidence-motion, and I am sure that in 1967 the people will express no-confidence in the Opposition.

श्री श्री शंकर कवकड़ (फतेहपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह कहना असत्य है कि विरोधी दल वाले बिला कारण सरकार के प्रति अविश्वास का

प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत करते हैं। वास्तव में देखा जाए तो इस प्रकार का जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया गया है वह पीड़ित जनता की आवाज़ के कारण ही किया गया है। वास्तव में कांग्रेस के शासनकाल में जो आर्थिक दशा जनता की खराब हुई है और जिस पीड़ा में भारत की जनता मुबतला है, उसका एक मात्र कारण यह सरकार है और उसी का प्रतीक यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव है।

एक कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्य ने अभी गांधी जी का नाम लिया, उनके नाम की दुहाई दी। मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद अब वह समय आ गया है कि उधर के लोग इस मामले में ज्यादा दंभी होंगे। अविमूल्यन के बारे में काफी बहस हुई है। मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। परन्तु एक चीज़ जो इस सदन में सिद्ध हो चुकी है उस पर मैं अपने विचार आपके सामने रखता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब तो किसी भी तर्क की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि जो निर्णय अविमूल्यन के बारे में इस सरकार ने लिया है वह अमरीका और विश्व बैंक के दबाव में आ कर लिया है। इसके बारे में मुझे कुछ भी दिक्कत नहीं होगा अगर मैं कांग्रेस की कार्यकारिणी में जो बहस हुई और जो अखबारों में प्रकाशित हुई उसका हवाला श्रीमान्, दूँ। हमारे भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री ने इस बात को ललकार कर कहा, गर्जना इस बात की कि मेरे ऊपर भी इस प्रकार का दबाव पड़ रहा था लेकिन मैंने तो वर्षों तक उस दबाव को हटाया लेकिन मौजूदा वित्त मंत्री उसका शिकार बन गए। जब इस प्रकार का आरोप सरकार के खिलाफ लगाया जा रहा है और यह स्वयं सिद्ध भी है कि बाहरी दबाव के कारण यह निर्णय लिया गया है तो यह सुन कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ जब एक बड़े कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्य ने और जो

पुराने सदस्य भी हैं, कहा कि इस प्रकार के निर्णय पर न तो इस सदन में बहस की जा सकती है और न ही इस प्रकार का निर्णय यहां सदन में लिया जा सकता है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि गांधी जी का नाम लेने वाली यह सरकार एक तरफ इस बात को कहने के लिये क्यों तैयार हो जाती है कि ऐसा करने का बिल्कुल कोई इरादा नहीं है और दूसरी तरफ वह क्यों इसके बिल्कुल खिलाफ जा कर ऐसा निर्णय लेती है ?

क्या ये गांधी जी के बताये हुए शुद्ध साधन हैं कि हमारे खाद्य मंत्री, श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् मद्रास में जाकर यह भाषण देते हैं कि राजनीति में शासक दल के जो सत्ताधारी लोग हैं, उन को यह अधिकार है वे सफेद झूठ—अंग्रेजी में उन्होंने “व्हाइट लाई” कहा है—बोले। मैं और देशों की बात नहीं करता हूँ, लेकिन जो हमारी अपनी राष्ट्रीय परम्परा है, जो गांधी जी के द्वारा स्थापित परम्परा है, जिसके आधार पर इस राष्ट्रीय सरकार का निर्माण हुआ है, क्या उन परम्पराओं को दृष्टि में रखते हुए इस सरकार के सदस्यों को यह शोभा देता है कि वे कहें कि सफेद झूठ बोलना उन का अधिकार है ?

उस को भी छोड़िये। अभी हाल ही में हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने राष्ट्र को जो वक्तव्य दिया, उस में दो बातें उन्होंने बड़ी साफ कहीं, जिन से यह सिद्ध होता है कि शासक दल के राजनीतिक नेताओं में ईमानदारी और दयानतदारी छू कर भी नहीं है। राष्ट्रपति जी के शब्द ये थे : “वि हिस-अर्द्धर इन दि कंट्री इब आन एकाउन्ट अफ लैक अफ आनेस्टी एण्ड इन्ट्रिटी”।

क्या आप मुझे इजाज़त देंगे कि मैं दयानतदारी के शब्द के बारे में कुछ कहूँ ? अगर किसी छोटे या बड़े सरकारी

[श्री गोरी शंकर कक्कड़]

कर्मचारी की इन्टेग्रिटी या दयानतदारी के बारे में कोई शुबहा भी होता है, तो उस को सरकारी नौकरी से सदा के लिए हटना पड़ता है। इतने बड़े राष्ट्र के राष्ट्रपति के इस वक्तव्य से साफ़ जाहिर होता है कि हमारे शासक दल के नेताओं की क्या स्थिति है, लेकिन उन पर इस का कोई भी असर नहीं होता है।

आज उस तरफ से लोकतंत्रीय पद्धति और तत्वों को बड़ा महत्व दिया जाता है। क्या लोकतंत्री तत्वों के यही माने होते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश जैसे बड़े प्रदेश में कांग्रेस सरकार के द्वारा ढाई हजार व्यक्तियों को जाब्त फ़ौजदारी की धारा 151 में गिरफ्तार किया जाये ? और उन लोगों को किस परिस्थिति में गिरफ्तार किया जाये ? जब वे रात को अपने घरों में सो रहे हैं, तो तड़के पुलिस जाकर उनको जाब्त फ़ौजदारी की धारा 151 में गिरफ्तार करती है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने कानून पढ़ा है और आपने भी उसका अध्ययन किया होगा। क्या जाब्त फ़ौजदारी की धारा 151 के ये मानी होते हैं कि जो शांतिमय नागरिक अपने घर में सोया हुआ है, पुलिस जा कर, उस को आवाज़ लगा कर, उस को उठा कर गिरफ्तार कर ले ? जो व्यक्ति अपने घर में सोया होता है और जिस को पुलिस जा कर जगाती है, क्या कोई तत्कालीन शांति-भंग की सम्भावना हो सकती है ?

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस देश में कानून की अवहेलना इस हद तक की जायेगी, वहाँ लोकतंत्रीय शासन की जड़ें मजबूत नहीं हो सकती है। मैं तो कहूँगा कि यह संविधान की अवहेलना है। हमारी पार्लियामेंट ने सी० आर० पी० सी० और आई० पी० सी० को बनाया

है और अगर उन कानूनों की अवहेलना की जाये, तो यह संविधान की अवहेलना है। क्या लोकतंत्रीय पद्धति में विश्वास करने वाली सरकार कभी इस और भी ध्यान देगी कि क्या ऐसी अनोखी परिस्थिति भी पैदा हो सकती है ?

कहा जाता है कि कम्युनिस्टों ने अहिंसात्मक कदम उठाया और संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी वाले भी उन के साथ मिल गए। परन्तु उत्तर प्रदेश जैसी बड़ी स्टेट में सरकारी कर्मचारियों के द्वारा सरकारी दफ्तरों का जो बहिष्कार हुआ, उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वहाँ की सर्वोच्च अदालत, हाई कोर्ट, बारह दिन तक ठप्प रही और वहाँ कोई काम नहीं हुआ। ये सब बातें अनहोनी हैं। क्या यह किसी राजनीतिक दल का काम है ? यह सरकारी कर्मचारियों, सरकार के मुलाजिमों, का काम है, जिन को सरकार वेतन देती है।

इस परिस्थिति का कारण यह है कि सरकार ने प्रजातंत्रीय पद्धति को चलाया परन्तु उसने इस बात पर कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया कि राष्ट्र के नागरिकों, बहुसंख्यक जन-साधारण, को खाने-पीने, रहने के साधन उपलब्ध हों और उन की दैनिक आवश्यकताओं की पूर्ति हो। कोई भी लोकतंत्रीय पद्धति अपने तत्वों के आधार पर कभी किसी देश में नहीं चल सकती है, अगर उस देश के सर्व-साधारण नागरिकों की दैनिक आवश्यकताओं को पूरा न किया जा सके।

मुझे यह कहते हुए भी बड़ा दुख है कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय सरकार, जिसने उन्नीस बीस साल तक इस देश में शासन किया, शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में कोई राष्ट्रीय पालिसी नहीं अपना पाई। जब कभी इस बारे में प्रश्न उठाया गया, तो जवाब दिया गया कि

यह प्रदेश का विषय है। चागला साहब ने स्वयं स्वीकार किया कि यह प्रदेश का विषय है और प्रदेश इस बारे में सहमत नहीं होते हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि राज्यों में भी कांग्रेस की सरकारें हैं और केन्द्र में भी कांग्रेस की सरकार है। अगर यह सरकार शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में कोई राष्ट्रीय नीति अपनाना चाहती है, तो कांग्रेस का हाईकमांड स्टेट्स के चीफ मिनिस्टर्स और वहाँ के कांग्रेस दलों को मजबूर कर सकता है कि वे इस बारे में प्रस्ताव पारित करें। परन्तु मैं कहूँगा कि इस सरकार के इरादे बद हैं। यह सरकार कोई भी राष्ट्रीय कार्यक्रम चलाने के सम्बन्ध में कोई कदम नहीं उठाना चाहती है। इसलिए उसकी नीतियाँ दूषित हैं।

अवमूल्यन क सम्बन्ध में श्री पाटिल ने बड़े जोरदार शब्दों में बड़ी सुन्दर स्पीच दी और कहा कि हम परिस्थितियों में ऐसे फंस गए थे कि हमें अपने देश के आर्थिक हित में अवमूल्यन करना पड़ा। उन्होंने यह भी बताया कि अवमूल्यन के बाद हमको बहुत बड़ा कदम उठाना है। मुझे इस बात पर बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह निर्णय लिया कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के खर्च में दस परसेंट कटौती की जायेगी। लेकिन क्या स्वदेशी भावना वाली सरकार के लिये यह लज्जा की बात नहीं है कि उस ने पुरानी राष्ट्रीय लहर से हट कर चलना शुरू कर दिया है? जहाँ 1955 में हमारे यहाँ केवल 55 स्टाफ कार्ज और लक्जरी कार्ज थीं, वहाँ आज मिनिस्टर्स 136 गाड़ियाँ इस्तेमाल करते हैं। उस दिन श्री मनुभाई शाह ने कहा कि उन पर कोई विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च नहीं होती है। परन्तु मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर्स जिन बाहर से आई हुई स्टाफ कार्ज और लक्जरी कार्ज का प्रयोग करते हैं। क्या वे स्वदेशी भावना की प्रतीक हैं। यहाँ के दूतावासों से खरीदने के

लिये उन कारों पर जो रुपया खर्च किया गया अगर वह रुपया दूसरे लाभकारी कामों में व्यय होता, तो ज्यादा ठीक होता।

आज कहा जाता है कि संकट-कालीन समय में ब्लाकों की इमारतें और स्कूलों की इमारतें नहीं बनेंगी, देहाती क्षेत्रों में किसी तरह का भवन-निर्माण नहीं होगा, परन्तु जब मैं दिल्ली की सड़कों और गलियों में निकलता हूँ, तो मैं चकित हो जाता हूँ। जो इमारतें पुरानी बनी हुई हैं, इस संकट-कालीन समय में उन को गिराया जा रहा है और उन की जगह पर नई इमारतें का निर्माण होता चला आ रहा है। मैं अपनी साधारण बुद्धि से कहता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट के निकट जो इमारत गिराई जा रही है, उस को गिराने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी।

आज स्थिति यह है कि हम पर कर्ज बढ़ता जा रहा है। हमारे यहाँ जो परम्परा और संस्कृति है, उस के अनुसार अगर किसी को कर्ज का धन मिले, तो उस को खर्च करने में किसी तरह का मोह या अंकुश नहीं रहता है। लेकिन इसकी उपेक्षा कर के सरकार द्वारा तंगा नाच हो रहा है।

उस दिन श्री भागवत झा आजाद ने भी कहा है—सौभाग्य से वह इस समय उपस्थित हैं—कि यहाँ पर कम्युनिस्ट दल के वक्ता बोले हैं और स्वतंत्र दल के वक्ता भी बोले हैं और एक दूसरे में टकराव है। उन्होंने यह कहा कि भानमती ने कुनबा जोड़ा, कहीं का ईंट कहीं का रोड़ा। मैं अपने मित्र से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनकी आज की अपनी कांग्रेस संस्था एक चू चू का मुरब्बा

[श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़]

नहीं बन चुकी है ? जिनको वह नफरत से देखते हैं, उन्हीं के प्रान्त बिहार में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ जो लोग कांग्रेस के अन्दर पचास की तादाद में आये हैं क्या मेरे मित्र भागवत झा आजाद उनको प्रतिक्रियावादी नहीं समझते जिनको कांग्रेस ने अपनाया है ? मैं अपने मित्र झा साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अभी उत्तर प्रदेश की मुख्य मंत्री ने बड़ी शेखी से कहा कि आजमगढ़ में उन्होंने 2 हजार कम्युनिस्ट वर्कर्स को कांग्रेस में शामिल कर लिया। मैं झा साहब से पूछूँ कि इस प्रकार के लोग कांग्रेस में आयेगे, हमारे इस लोक-सभा के प्रतापगढ़ के जनसंघ के माननीय सदस्य कांग्रेस में शामिल हुए, क्या मैं उनसे पूछूँ कि इस प्रकार के व्यक्ति जब कांग्रेस संस्था में आ जायेंगे तो क्या वह एक बहुत बड़ा भ्रमनती का पिटारा नहीं बनेगा ? और क्या उनके व्यू, उनके ख्यालात, उनके विचारों में टकराव नहीं होगा ? जब वह बैठेंगे तो श्रीमन्, क्या वह एक ही बात सोच सकते हैं ? आज खुद ही हम देखते हैं, खुद हमारे मित्र, कलकत्ते में कान्फरेंस होती है तो कहते हैं कि यह कांग्रेस के लेफिटिस्ट्स की कान्फरेंस है, यह कांग्रेस के राइटिस्ट्स की कान्फरेंस है। एक हमारे मित्र ने कहा कि कांग्रेस शासन का काम भी करे और कांग्रेस विरोधी का काम भी करे, यह आप लोग मजबूर कर रहे हैं। मैं तो श्रीमन्, कांग्रेस दल से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस तो स्वयं यह कर रही है। हर जगह पर यह नंगा नाच कांग्रेस ने खुद किया है, विरोधी दल के कहने से नहीं। मैसूर में क्या हुआ ? बंगाल में क्या हुआ ? उत्तर प्रदेश में क्या हुआ ? श्रीमन्, हर प्रदेश में कांग्रेस सरकार शासकीय दल और विरोधी दल अपने में से ही स्वतः बनाने के लिए तैयार है। मुझे इस विषय में केवल यह कहना है।

पहले आशा की जाती थी कि जब राष्ट्रीय सरकार आयीगी, इन्हीं नेताओं के

द्वारा, हम लोगों के द्वारा यह कहा जाता था कि जब राष्ट्रीय सरकार का निर्माण होगा तो सर्वसाधारण व्यक्ति को राहत मिलेगी, आराम मिलेगा। और श्रीमन्, आज यह नकशा सामने है। आज होता क्या है ? जो बड़े बड़े सरमायादार हैं, जो बड़ी बड़ी पूंजी वाले हैं, लाखों रुपये का इनकम टैक्स का बकाया उनके ऊपर और पड़ जाता है तो आखिर में वह बट्टेखाते में डाल दिया जाता है। कानपुर के एक व्यक्ति का नाम आप सभी जानते हैं और फिर उन व्यक्तियों को कांग्रेस का बड़ा ऊंचा नेता माना जाता है। और इधर क्या होता है श्रीमन् ? अगर एक गरीब कृषक जो दो रुपये मालगुजारी देता है, उसका एक साल का भी बकाया पड़ गया तो उसको हवालात के अन्दर बन्द कर दिया जाता है। कभी आशा नहीं की जाती थी कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय सरकार इस प्रकार की नीति अपनायेगी इस देश में। होता यह है श्रीमन्, कि जो धन अधिक संग्रहीत करते हैं उनको संग्रह करने के लिए और भी अवसर दिया जाता है। हर प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन दिया जाता है। आज हमको बड़ी खुशी है कि पंजाब ऐसे प्रदेश में जहाँ राष्ट्रपति का शासन है, एक गवर्नर ने जाकर के जिस दिलेरी से दिन दोपहर डाका मारने वालों, दिन दोपहर कतल करने वालों के खिलाफ जो स्टेप लिया है, जो कदम उठये हैं, वह प्रशंसनीय हैं। परन्तु मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि और प्रान्तों में जो हमारे निर्वाचित मुख्य मंत्री और मंत्री बैठे हैं, कभी उन्होंने इस प्रकार के कदम उठाने को सोचा भी है ? कभी उस प्रकार का उनका ध्यान भी गया है ? उसका केवल एकमात्र कारण यह है कि अगर ऐसे लोगों के खिलाफ इस प्रकार से सख्ती का कदम उठया जाय तो उनको शंका है कि कल एक व्यक्ति का जन्म-दिवस मनाया जायगा तो 65 लाख रुपया कहां से आयेगा ? श्रीमन्, उत्तर प्रदेश का मैं रहने वाला हूँ। मुझे लज्जा आती है।

मैं सी० बी० गुप्ता साहब की बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ। परन्तु जिस साधन से, जिस जरिये से धन एकत्रित हुआ है जिलों में उससे आंख बन्द नहीं की जा सकती। जिला परिषद् के अध्यक्ष कांग्रेस के जिन जिलों में थे उन्होंने सौ-सौ रुपये प्राइमरी स्कूल के टीचर्स का एक-एक महीने का वेतन लेकर के यह 65 लाख या 66 लाख रुपया इकट्ठा किया है। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ 65 लाख क्या 65 हजार रुपया भी जनता से जाकर के मांगा जाता स्वतः तो इकट्ठा न होता। इस प्रकार से अंग्रेजी शासन के समय जिस चीज की हम निन्दा करते थे श्रीमन्, आज वही चीज हम हर कदम पर कर रहे हैं। असल में दिक्कत यह है कि जब मैं यह कहता हूँ कि यह कांग्रेसी दल एक चूँ चूँ का मुरब्बा बन गया है तो उसका कारण है। वह यह कि इसका मस्तिष्क किसी बात पर साफ निर्णय नहीं ले पाता। इनके जो निर्णय होते हैं वह निर्णय स्पष्टता से नहीं लिये जाते। होता क्या है कि समाजवाद की दोहाई देने वाले सरमायादारी से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं। श्रीमन्, यह मेरा ख्याल नहीं है, पंडित नेहरू जब जीवित थे उन्होंने व्याकुल होकर अपने मरने के एक वर्ष पहले यह कहा था कि मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि हमारे शासन काल में मूट्ठी भर सरमायादारों ने जो धन संग्रहित किया है वह ब्रिटिश काल में सौ साल तक उनको उतने धन को इकट्ठा करने का मौका न मिलता। आज यह कहा जाता है कि नेशनल पालिसी बनायेंगे हम समाजवादी ढंग की व्यवस्था करेंगे। आप देखें हमारे संविधान में दिया है प्राइमरी एजुकेशन के बारे में कम्प्लेसी और फ्री एजुकेशन। परन्तु क्या मैं आप के द्वारा अपनी सरकार से पूछूँ कि आज प्राइमरी एजुकेशन में प्राइमरी पढ़ाई में जो मतभेद है, जो गरीब बच्चे हैं वह तो प्राइमरी स्कूल में पढ़ते हैं परन्तु ब्रिटिश शासन की जो पद्धति थी मान्टसरी स्कूल, ब्यायज हाई स्कूल, जूनियर हाई स्कूल की जो पद्धति चली आती थी वह अब भी

कायम है और मुझे बड़ी लज्जा है कि जो आई० ए० एस०, पी० सी० एस० के बड़े बड़े अफसरान हैं, उनके बच्चे और हमारे इन राष्ट्रीय नेताओं के बच्चे जो कि मिनिस्टर और डिप्टी मिनिस्टर हैं वह कभी भी साधारण प्राइमरी स्कूल में नहीं पढ़ेंगे बल्कि इन्हीं ब्यायज हाई स्कूल में पढ़ेंगे जहां सौ डेढ़ सौ रुपये मासिक का खर्चा होता है। कारण यह है कि आज भी हमारे यूनिवर्सिटी पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन की नीति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ बावजूद इसके कि हिन्दी को राजभाषा कहा गया परन्तु आज अंग्रेजी और अंग्रेजियत को पनपने देने के लिए उन ब्यायज हाई स्कूल में हमारे राष्ट्रीय नेताओं को अपने बच्चों को भेजने में जरा भी लज्जा नहीं आती है।

श्रीमन्, मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि उनके लिए यह समय नहीं आया क्या 18-19-20 वर्ष तक शासन करने के बाद इस पर उन्होंने ध्यान नहीं दिया कि हमको अपने को स्वच्छ करना है, हमको अपने में राष्ट्रीय भावना पहले पैदा करनी है। श्रीमन्, कहा जाता है कि जो चीज भी सरकार की तरफ से उठायी जाती है, अभी स्वर्गीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री का एक जिक्र किया गया, उन्होंने यह कहा था कि यह आवश्यक होगा कि हमारे मिनिस्टर, हमारे कैबिनेट रैंक के सदस्य बिना प्रोग्राम दिये हुए कम से कम तीन चार बार देहात में जाया करें। श्रीमन्, कहने की बात थी। मैं उनके बारे में कुछ कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। परन्तु जो हमारा शासक दल है, हमारे जो मंत्रिमंडल के सदस्य हैं उनमें से क्या श्रीमन्, मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कभी भी कोई माननीय मंत्री इस प्रकार का प्रोग्राम रखेंगे? श्रीमन्, इसी सदन में मैंने एक बार कहा था कि आप कभी भी अष्टाचार को दूर नहीं कर सकते। आप कभी भी असलियत पर नहीं पहुंच सकते कि शासन में क्या हो रहा है जब तक कि आप वेष-भूषा बदल कर, बिना अपना प्रोग्राम दिये हुए डिस्ट्रिक्ट यूनिट्स में न जा कर के चक्कर

[श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़]

लगायें। उस समय यह आपत्ति स्वीकर
महोदय ने उठायी थी—

“Mr. Kakkar, it would not be feasible.”

मैंने यह जवाब दिया था कि

“It would be most practical and possible.”

मगर एक खतरा जरूर है, और वह खतरा केवल इस बात का है उनकी जान का खतरा नहीं है, माल का खतरा नहीं है कहीं पर एकाघ थपड़ पड़ जाने का खतरा है। स्वर्गीय रफी अहमद किदवई जब तक जिन्दा रहे, उत्तर प्रदेश में जब तक गृह मंत्री रहे, कभी कोई प्रोग्राम उनका नहीं रहता था, थाना एक मील दो मील रह गया तो वह अपनी मोटर रूकवा देते थे। एक गन्दी शेरवानी और एक फटा हुआ पैजामा उनके पास रहता था जिसको पहन कर वह थाने में जाते थे और थाने में जाकर खलीफा से कहते थे कि मैं पीड़ित हूँ, मैं पिटा हुआ हूँ मेरी रपट लिखी जाय। उस समय वहाँ का चीफ यह कहता था—चलो जी सवेरे सवेरे आ गये अभी न कोई बोहनी हुई है, न पैसा मिला है, आ कर हमारा वक्त खराब करते हो, एक-आघ धक्का सह लेते थे, परन्तु होता यह था कि वास्तव में जो भ्रष्ट हैं उनका पता लग जाता था। लेकिन इसके मुकाबले में आज क्या होता है कि महीनों पहले तारीख निश्चित होती है, दिन निश्चित होता है, फिर बड़े साजो-सामान की उनके लिये व्यवस्था की जाती है और डिप्टी कमिश्नर अपनी इच्छा से पहले से जिन ब्लाकों में उन्होंने आर्टीफीशियल कुछ बनावटी चीजें की हुई होती हैं, वहाँ पर ले जा कर दिखला देता हैं और फिर वे वापस आ जाते हैं। मैं ज्यादा दूर न जाकर केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज की सरकार जो कि कांग्रेस की सरकार है, जहाँ तक उसका जनता से सम्बन्ध है वह अपना विश्वास खो चुकी है। इस 1967 के चुनाव के जो भी

नतीजे हों, लेकिन मैं उन विरोधी दलों की तरह से सरकार से निवेदन करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि वह अपनी गद्दी छोड़ दे और चली जाय। परन्तु मेरा यह विश्वास है कि आगामी चुनाव में जनता इस चीज को सोचेगी और आज जो इतना बड़ा अमन्तोष सरकार के प्रति जनता में फैला हुआ है, वह उस पर विचार कर के अपना निर्णय लेगी।

श्रीमन्, आज यह होता है कि बड़े बड़े व्यवसाय जहाँ पर बाहरी पूंजी लगी हुई है, विदेशों की पूंजी लगी हुई है, जहाँ उनको काफ़ी मुनाफ़ा होता है—मैं एक मिनट के लिये आपको हिन्दुस्तान लीवर कम्पनी लि० के बारे में एक बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ। 1956 को उनको 2.24 करोड़ रुपये का फायदा हुआ, उसके बाद 1965 में 4.37 करोड़ रुपये का फायदा हुआ, परन्तु आज उन्होंने अपना एक इन्टीग्रेशन प्रोग्राम बनाया है। पहले उनकी चार ब्रान्चें दालदा और सोप की अलग चल रही थीं, कर्मचारियों को कम करने के लिये उन्होंने सबका इन्टीग्रेशन कर दिया है। श्रीमन्, 500 से ज्यादा कर्मचारी सरप्लस लिस्ट में पड़े हुए हैं और उनको इस बात का बड़ा भय है कि वे वहाँ से सर्विस से निकाल दिये जायेंगे।

अन्त में श्रीमन्, मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज तो वह समय आ गया है कि यह जो हमारा सत्तारूढ़ शासकीय दल है और विशेष तौर पर कांग्रेस पार्टी है, उसके बारे में 26 फरवरी, 1966 के बिल्ट्ज़ में जो सूचना प्रकाशित हुई थी, उसका हवाला देकर मैं अपना स्थान लंगा। उसमें, श्रीमन्, यह लिखा हुआ है—

Anatomy of white caps, Blitz dated February 26, 1966.

Sri White cap N.P.I (U.S.): The name given to a self-constituted committee of persons who generally commit outrageous acts under the guise of serving the country.

That is the definition which has been given in the Blitz.

अगर यही दशा हो गई है तो फिर जनता का विश्वास इस सरकार में नहीं है। इसलिये मैं बड़े जोरदार शब्दों में इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा (बक्सर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर बहस का आज तीसरा दिन है। मैंने इन तीन दिनों में विरोधी पार्टियों की तरफ से यहां पर जो बातें हुई हैं उनको भी गौर से सुना और हमारे पक्ष से, कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से जो बातें हुई, उनको भी गौर से सुना। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि आज जो हमारे रेल मंत्री श्री पाटिल साहब का भाषण हुआ, खास तौर से अवमूल्यन के सम्बन्ध में, विरोधियों के जवाब के रूप में मेरी पार्टी की तरफ से अगर कोई भाषण न हो, तो भी मैं समझता हूँ कि जितनी बातें इस बहस के दौरान में हुई हैं, उनका उचित जवाब मिल चुका है। लेकिन फिर भी चूंकि हम विरोधी पार्टियों के दोस्तों ने, खास तौर से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के दोस्तों ने कुछ बातें, इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के बहस के दौरान कही हैं, जिसके सम्बन्ध में मैं इस सदन में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ।

सब से पहले मैं इस बात के ऊपर सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि विरोधी पार्टियों की तरफ से तीन तरह की बातें कही गई हैं—पहली बात तो श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी और ठीक उसी से मिलती जुलती श्री गोपालन की तरफ से कही गई है, जो दो परस्पर विरोधी पार्टियों में बंटे हुए हैं, लेकिन फिर भी दोनों की बातें एकसी हुई और एक दूसरी तरह की बात स्वतन्त्र पार्टी की तरफ से हुई और एक तीसरी बात जो खिचड़ी पार्टियां हैं, छोटी-छोटी पार्टियां हैं, अभी कक्कड़ साहब, जो शायद स्वतन्त्र हैं, उन्होंने कही है। संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, प्रजा-सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने कही है। उपाध्यक्ष

महोदय, मैं इन पार्टियों को खिचड़ी कहता हूँ, इसका भी कारण है, जो बाद में बतला सकता हूँ। इस समय तो ये तीन तरह की बातें इस सदन में अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के दौरान में हुई हैं।

स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में इस समय मैं बहुत कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, इसलिये कि सभी लोगों को मालूम है कि स्वतन्त्र पार्टी इस देश के जो सरमायेदार लोग हैं, जो पूंजीपति लोग हैं, जो पैसे वाले लोग हैं, उनको नुमाइन्दगी करती है और उनकी बातें ही ज्यादातर हमारे देश के अन्दर फैलाना चाहती है। प्रजा-सोशलिस्ट पार्टी और संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में भी मैं कुछ ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। क्योंकि प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी और संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी मिलकर संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी बनीं और फिर प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी अलग हो गई, इस प्रकार इनका मिलने बराबर होता रहता है सौदेबाजी के आधार पर। जब तक उनका आपस में सौदा ठीक नहीं होता मिलते और बिछुड़ते रहते हैं।

मैं इस वक्त खाम तौर से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ और जब मैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ तो मेरे सामने, मेरे जैसे कार्यकर्ता के सामने, लेफ्ट और राइट में कोई भेद नहीं होता है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि राइट कम्युनिस्ट लेफ्ट कम्युनिस्ट से ज्यादा खतरनाक हैं। इसलिये कि जो लेफ्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है, उसने खुले आम चीन का समर्थन किया और जब उनके ऊपर कोई इस तरह की कार्यवाही होती है, जब कि वे देश और समाज के हित के खिलाफ कोई काम करते हैं और अगर वे जेलों में बन्द कर दिये जाते हैं, तो उनका ढोल बजाने के लिये, उनका गाना गाने के लिये, यह राइट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी अपने को अलग करके उनकी बातों का समर्थन करत

[श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा]

रहती है। इसलिये, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप जानते हैं कि जो गलत काम करता है उससे ज्यादा दोषी उसका समर्थन करने वाला होता है। इसलिये जहाँ तक मेरा सवाल है मैं इन दोनों पार्टियों के सम्बन्ध में कोई भेद नहीं मानता हूँ।

मैं इस कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में दो-एक बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। आपको और इस सदन को, सारे देश को याद होगा कि जब हम आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे, आखरी लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे 1942 में, किस तरह से इन्होंने हमारे देश के साथ गद्दारी की। हिन्दुस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी जो आज लेफ्ट और राइट में बटी हुई है, उसने अंग्रेजों का समर्थन किया, उस लड़ाई का विरोध किया। उसके बाद, अद्यक्ष महोदय, देश आजाद हुआ। सब ने खुशियाँ मनाई, सब ने आजादी की हवाई में खुशी मनाई, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने क्या किया? 15 अगस्त, 1947 से लेकर 1951 और 1952 तक, जब बुलगानिन साहब इस देश के अन्दर आये, यह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी बराबर यह कहती रही कि इस देश की सच्ची आजादी नहीं मिली है। यह सड़ी-गली आजादी है, मजदूरों और किसानों को आजादी नहीं मिली है। जब बुलगानिन साहब ने कहा कि सचमुच हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ है, थोड़े दिनों में हिन्दुस्तान ने बड़ी तरक्की की है गुलामी की जंजीरों से छुटकारा पाकर, तब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग मानने लगे कि हिन्दुस्तान सचमुच आजाद हुआ है। उस के बाद क्या हुआ। जब देश के अन्दर घोषित किया गया कि औद्योगिक शान्ति होगी, देश के अन्दर उत्पादन बढ़ाना होगा, देश के लोगों को सुखी और सम्पन्न बनाना होगा, तब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने उस इंडस्ट्रियल पीस रेजोल्यूशन का विरोध किया। उन्होंने उस को नहीं माना, और शान्तिमय तरीकों

को अपनाने के बदले उन्होंने मजदूरों के झगड़ों को तय करने के लिये जगह जगह देश में हड़तालें और बन्द के नारे लगाये और आज भी वह उन को चालू रख रहे हैं। मेरा विश्वास है कि अगले छः महीनों में यह बन्द और हड़ताल की गाड़ी और भी तेज होगी क्योंकि वह हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को सुखी नहीं बनाना चाहते। उन का एक ही काम होता है, अगर कम्युनिस्ट सिद्धांतों को आप पढ़ें, उनका विश्वास शान्ति में नहीं है, समृद्धि में नहीं है। वह चाहते हैं कि देश में बदअमनी फैले, वह चाहते हैं कि देश के अन्दर असन्तोष फैले, वह चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर भूखमरी फैले, और यही कारण है कि ... (व्यवधान)

Shri Nambiar: Are the Communists responsible for the rise in prices? We did not want it; we never wanted it. You raised the prices.

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा: मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस तरह की परिस्थिति देश में कायम करना चाहते हैं क्योंकि वह जानते हैं कि अगर देश के अन्दर शान्ति रही, देश में समृद्धि बढ़ी, देश में खुशहाली हुई तो, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को कोई पूछने वाला नहीं है। आप जानते हैं कि हैजा, कालरा जिस तरह से गन्दे एटमास्फियर में फैलते हैं उसी तरह से यह अराजकता के एटमास्फियर में फलते और फूलते हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की हमेशा यही धिअरी रूढ़ि है, चाहे यह देश हो या दूसरा देश हो।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया अपने को समाजवादी कहते हैं, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस होता है कि वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के पृष्ठल्ला बन कर उन के साथ इस लिये गठबन्धन करना चाहते हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की ताकत देश में बढ़े और इस देश के अन्दर लोगों को और ज्यादा

नुक्सान पहुँचे। मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक एक बन्द से और एक एक हड़ताल से कितना नुकसान होता है। जैसा रेलवे मंत्री ने इस सदन में कहा कि जब कलकत्ता में गड़बड़ी हुई तो रेलों को जलाने की क्या जरूरत थी। रेल जो राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति थी उस को जलाने की क्या आवश्यकता थी। लेकिन (ध्यक्षमान)

Shri Namblar: There should be a limit.

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा: इस तरह की हरकतें यह इस लिये करते हैं कि यह जानते हैं कि इन तरीकों से यह अपने काम को आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं। लेकिन अफसोस की बात यह है कि...

श्री शिक्करे (मरमागोआ): मैसूर में कौन जलाता है।

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा: इन तमाम बातों को करने के बाद भी, मैं खास तौर से मजदूरों के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि कल श्री गोपालन ने कहा कि यहां पर हिटलरिज्म होने जा रहा है और लाफूल ट्रेड यूनियन एक्टिविटीज को खत्म किया जा रहा है और ट्रेड यूनियन लीडर्स को बन्द किया जा रहा है। जितने भी यह हमारे साथी हैं उन्होंने मजदूरों के क्षेत्र में काम कर के देख लिया पिछले बीस वर्षों में, और उससे पहले भी। उस के बाद आज हालत क्या है। सन् 1960 में इन तमाम विरोधी पार्टियों ने मिल कर देश में एक सिविल रिबेलियन कराने की बात सोची थी। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों उन्होंने मजदूरों के साथ गद्दारी की, उन को आगे बढ़ा कर उन्होंने क्यों अनकंडीशनल सरेन्डर किया जिस के फलस्वरूप आज भी बहुत से लोग नौकरियों से निकाले गये हैं। उन लोगों का काम ही यह होता है कि लोगों को पहले आगे बढ़ायें और उसके बाद जिस तरह से आग लगा कर लोग पीछे से पानी ले कर चलते हैं

उस को बुझाने के लिये उसी तरह का नाटक रचायें। जो यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव आया है उस के पीछे एक ही उद्देश्य है, और वह यह है कि आगे जो चुनाव आने वाले हैं उस समय के लिये वह तैयारी करें और उसी के लिये यह रिहर्सल हो रहे हैं। मुझे तो यह भी अदेशा है कि इस तरह के अविश्वास प्रस्ताव अगले अधिवेशन में भी यहां लाया जायेगा ताकि अपना तांडव यह देश के लोगों के सामने दिखलावें।

अब मैं इन लोगों की विदेश नीति के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने वियतनाम के संबंध में बहुत सी बातें कहीं। कुछ और लोगों ने भी इस बात को कहा है। लेकिन मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ पर उन्होंने वियतनाम की बातें की, वहाँ जिस समय चीन ने हमारे देश के ऊपर आक्रमण किया था उस समय जितनी भी देश की राष्ट्रीय मजदूर संस्थाएँ थीं उन्होंने चीन का विरोध किया, चीन को कंडम किया, चीन के खिलाफ आवाज उठाई, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का जो संगठन है, ए० आई० टी० यू० सी० है उस ने उस समय क्या किया। जब हम नेशनल डिफेंस फंड में मजदूरों से चन्दा जमा करवाना चाहते थे देश की रक्षा के लिये उस समय उन्होंने ने उसका विरोध किया। (ध्यक्षमान)।

Shri Namblar: All this is wrong, not a fact.

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा: मैं आगे चल कर उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने उस वक्त चीन का विरोध क्यों नहीं किया। उन की फिलासफी क्या थी। उन की फिलासफी यह है और वे सदा कहते हैं कि

“Communist countries never invade another country, or a democratic country.”

वह कहते हैं कि वह तो गले लगाने के लिये आ रहे हैं, हमारे लिबरेशन के लिये आ रहे हैं।

[श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा]

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर चीन हमारे देश के ऊपर आ जाये और उस का कब्जा यहां पर हो जाये और इस तरह के लोग हमारे देश के अन्दर रहें जो यह कहें कि चीन हम को गले लगाने के लिये आ रहा है, तो इस से बढ़ कर गहारी और क्या हो सकती है।

मैं तो कहता हूँ कि अपने देश की बातों को छोड़िये। वर्ल्ड ट्रेड यूनियन आर्गनाइजेशन जो है वह दो भागों में बटा हुआ है। एक इंटरनेशनल कांफिडरेशन आफ फ्री ट्रेड यूनियन्स और दूसरा वर्ल्ड फेडरेशन आफ ट्रेड यूनियन्स मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वर्ल्ड फेडरेशन आफ ट्रेड यूनियन्स से इन का संबंध है क्या उसमें चीन की हरकत को कंडम करने के लिये ए०आई०टी० यू० सी० ने कोई प्रस्ताव रक्खा मेरे कह ने का मतलब यह है कि देश के अन्दर जो कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी है, चाहे वह लेफ्ट हो या राइट हो, वह दोनों एक हैं। बल्कि मेरी समझ में तो जो राइट कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी है वह ज्यादा खतरनाक है बनिस्वत लेफ्ट कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के।

मैं कुछ शब्द अपने दोस्त श्री त्रिवेदी के संबंध में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। श्री त्रिवेदी ने अपने भाषण में कम्यूनिस्टों के साथ विरोध जमहिर किया और उन्होंने भी चीन के सम्बंध में यही बातें कहीं। मैं उन की पार्टी के लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस तरह का समय आता है जहां पर कि कांग्रेस का विरोध करने का सवाल होता है या सरकार का विरोध करने का सवाल आता है तब हालांकि उन के सिद्धांत कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी से नहीं मिलते फिर भी वह कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का साथ देने के लिये क्यों तैयार हो जाते हैं, इस तरह के अविश्वास प्रस्ताव में वह क्यों शामिल होते हैं। उन का उद्देश्य तो अपनी पार्टी को आगे बढ़ाने का होता है।

श्री मनोहरन जो कि मद्रास राज्य के डी० एम० के० के सदस्य हैं, अभी अभी बड़ा उबाल खा रहे थे। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया तो अंगड़ाई लेते हैं लेकिन श्री मनोहरन उबाल खाते हैं। वह लड़ लड़ कर मद्रास राज्य में अपना राज्य काथम करने का स्वप्न देखते हैं। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब वह अपने को नेशनल पार्टी कहते हैं, देशभक्त पार्टी कहते हैं तब फिर वह इस तरह की पार्टी का साथ क्यों देते हैं जिसे कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी कहते हैं। जैसे कि श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी कहा करते हैं कि डोल किसी की ओर फाइनंस मिनिस्टर उस को ढो रहे हैं, उसी तरह से मैं भी मनोहरन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो चीन क और रूस का डोल को हमारे देश के अन्दर बुलाना चाहते हैं उस डोल को वह क्यों कैरी कर रहे हैं। आज सब से ज्यादा यह सवाल हमारे सामने है।

Shri S. Kandappan: Right Communist Shri Mohan Kumaramangalam has been appointed as the Advocate-General of Madras by the Congress; not by the DMK.

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा : आखिर में कुछ शब्द और कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगा। कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का सब से बड़ा विरोध है कि अमरीका से गेहूँ क्यों मंगाया जाता है। मैं उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1951 में इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस नैनीताल में हुई थी। उसमें उन्होंने अमरीका के सड़े गेहूँ का हवाला दिया था। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि चूँकि अमरीका का गेहूँ है क्या इसी लिये वह सड़ा हुआ है और रूस से अगर कोई चीज आती है तो वह बड़ी मीठी लगती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर चीन से वैसी कोई चीज आती तो जल्दी हजम भी हो जाती और उसमें कोई पेट की गड़बड़ी भी नहीं होती।



जैसा हमारे दल के वक्ताओं ने कहा है, मैं भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश की नीति, हमारी सरकार की नीति और हमारी पार्टी की नीति वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम की है। हम दुनिया में किसी के साथ भी झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहते हैं। हम दुनिया में सब के साथ दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं। इस लिये जो कोई भी देश ऐसे समय में हमारे काम आता है और हमको गुलाम बना कर नहीं बल्कि दोस्ती के नाते, बराबरी के मुकाबले में, तो हम उसकी मदद हासिल करने के लिये तैयार रहते हैं। लेकिन अगर इस बात से श्री हीरेन मुर्जी को मुखालिफत है और वे कहते हैं कि बाहर से हमको मदद नहीं लेनी चाहिये तो मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह सिर्फ अमरीका का ही नाम क्यों लेते हैं। रूस की बात क्यों नहीं करते, दूसरे देशों की बात क्यों नहीं करते? इससे यह साफ जाहिर होता है कि इनकी जो नीति है वह दूसरे देशों द्वारा मंचालित होती है।

एक और बात अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। यह मानी हुई बात है कि हमारे देश में अनाज की कमी है, उत्पादन हमारा उतना नहीं बढ़ा है जितना बढ़ना चाहिये था। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश के लोगों को खाना मिल सके। तब क्या हम सचमुच चाहते हैं कि अमरीका से गेहूँ न आए और इसलिये न आये कि हम अमरीका के अरसर में आ जाएंगे? यह बात नहीं है। ये तो यह चाहते हैं कि किसी भी दूसरे देश से और खास तौर पर अमरीका से गेहूँ न आए और यहां के लोग भूखों मरें, यहां के लोग परेशान हों, यहां पर अराजकता फैले और इस सबका फायदा ये उठा लें। मेरा अनुभव यह बताता है कि जब कोई काम हम अच्छा भी करते हैं तो भी हमारे दोस्त हमें क्रेडिट नहीं देते हैं, कांग्रेस को उस अच्छे काम का क्रेडिट नहीं देते हैं। अगर हम से

कोई गलती हो जाए तो उसका फायदा उठाने के लिये ये बराबर तैयार रहते ही हैं। मैं आपको एक घटना सुनाना चाहता हूँ। हमारे यहां के भूतपूर्व मुख्य मंत्री डा० श्रीकृष्ण सिन्हा ने इलैकशन के समय में एक बात कही थी। मुझे चूँकि यह याद आ गई है इसलिये मैं इसको आपको बता रहा हूँ। इस बात को कह कर मैं समाप्त कर दूंगा। उस जमाने में गांव के छोटे छोटे बच्चों के लिये मिल्क बार खोले गये थे। कई जगहों पर दूध बंटवाना शुरू किया गया था। इन लोगों ने तब यह कहना शुरू कर दिया था कि देखो, चुनाव आ रहा है और दूध बंटवाया जा रहा है, चुनाव आ रहा है और लोगों को भोजन दिया जा रहा है। मुख्य मंत्री ने तब इसके जवाब में यह कहा था कि चुनाव आ रहा है तो क्या मैं लोगों को भूखों मर जाने दूँ, बच्चों को दूध न दूँ, लोगों को विष देकर मार दूँ। जब ये हमारे दोस्त इस तरह की बात करते हैं कि दूसरे देशों से हमें अनाज नहीं मंगाना चाहिये और खास तौर से अमरीका की इस सम्बन्ध में जब ये बात करते हैं तो वह ये इसलिये नहीं करते हैं कि हमारी प्रतिष्ठा को हानि पहुंचेगी या हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था को कोई हानि पहुंचेगी बल्कि इसलिये ये इस बात को कहते हैं कि इनको मालूम है कि गल्ले की कमी है देश में, अनाज की कमी है देश में चीजों की कमी है देश में और लोगों की जो आवश्यकतायें हैं उनको हम पूरा नहीं कर सकते हैं इस वास्ते, अगर उनकी जरूरतें पूरी नहीं होती हैं तो देश में गड़बड़ी पैदा होगी, अराजकता पैदा होगी तब इनका जो विष का पेड़ है, उसको फलने फूलने का मौका मिलेगा और ये उस असन्तोष से ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा उठा सकेंगे।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के मजदूर वर्ग ने बहुत बड़े बहुमत में होकर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को तथा दूसरी लैफिट्ट पार्टीज को रिजैक्ट किया है। आई० एन०

[श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा]

टी० यू० सी० की सदस्य संख्या इस वक्त 20 लाख है जब कि इन तमाम पार्टियों की कुल मिलाकर दस लाख भी नहीं है। सारे हिन्दुस्तान में जिस तरह से मजदूरों ने इनको रिजैक्ट किया है उसी तरह से इनको मालूम हो जाएगा कि सन् 1967 में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता इनको किस तरह से रिजैक्ट करती है। ये बन्दों और स्ट्राइक्स की उस समय बात करते हैं जब कि उत्पादन बढ़ाने की सब से ज्यादा आवश्यकता है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जब इनको सबक सिखायेगी तब इनको वह बुरे दिन याद आएंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से देखा जाए और इसको एक राजनीतिक चाल समझ कर रह कर दिया जाए।

16.03 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to register my opposition against the motion being debated on the floor of the House now for two days. I do not do so merely on the basis of my side or your side; I will see to that when I vote. But there is no obligation upon me to participate in the debate if I had no arguments. Secondly, what I am registering my opposition to is not that a motion of censure is moved, but this particular motion. I believe myself and I say this not in a spirit of formal tolerance of cynicism regarding the right of the opposition to move for censure of the Government. The right of the opposition to move for censure is a legitimately established matter of parliamentary procedure. So far as I understand, unless there is a situation where the opposition is willing to take over the reins of Government, its purpose is to raise a debate, so that suggestions from the other side as well as from the Government side may come forward. It is not as though this House is divided into two lobbies at the time of the debate.

Now, before us is an opposition which has in its unserried ranks rather a heterogenous group and the motion has opened the floodgates of

the opposition, rather the oppositions and we heard a very large number of criticisms which cancel each other. But, before I proceed to that, I want to pay my tribute to the Mover of this Resolution who, with his unsurpassed eloquence and that degree of restraint as can be expected from the leader of the opposition has put his case before us. This being the purpose of this motion, I would like to look as to what has been said at that time.

There is no doubt that there is a certain amount of anger, a certain amount of cynicism and abuse of the opponent in the arguments that come from both sides. But, so far as I know, if it is an attempt on the part of the opposition to invite other people into their cave, I do not know, they did not succeed. I do not want them to come over here. They are rather a burden upon ourselves and I hope there will be no further exodus. But what has been revealed is that the opposition to the Government as coming from different sides create a peculiar situation, that those who are generally spoken of—I do not know the exact meaning of this—as Left, they move so far left that they get into the right and those who are on the right, they move so far on the right that they get to the left, and there is encirclement with the result that they get together.

At the same time, it must be said that the Mover of the Resolution and the Opposition as a whole had taken no risks; that is to say, there is no risk of this country being left without a Government, or an interregnum or a sudden change because the motion would not be carried, I very much doubt, even if the whole opposition vote for it. Equally, they carry no burden because they do not take anything more.

Of the demands that are made, one is first of all, the Government should go. No doubt, the Government will go next March, there will be a caretaker Government and the Government will come back again. Secondly, asking the Government to go is only saying that they are in disagreement with certain policies, and that I will refer to. I

believe that it may be said that the main points raised are one, in regard to devaluation, and the other in regard to international policy and Indo-China and the third about moral values that the Congress should attach to themselves.

With regard to devaluation the main complaint, so far as I could make out, was that the Finance Minister was carrying a drum which he allowed his colleagues to beat. I think it is a good example of team spirit, that is, dividing labour, or it may be that the drum is too big that he cannot get his hands out. Then it is also possible, that they are objecting that they were not allowed to beat the drum here for the first two days. In any case, it is an example of team spirit; if it really means collective responsibility as my friend, Shri Patil tried to convince about it, even though it is difficult to convince me about that, then it is a great advance. The other part of the remedy that he has proposed is what is called a national Government. Now, this observation was preceded by the observation that what the Government of 63 or 65 people is concerned with is keeping their own seats. If a person who advocates the formation of a national Government happens to be a leader of an opposition group, then it may be said that he is ensuring a seat in the Government and nothing else. Therefore, it appears to me that the approach is much the same in all these matters.

Then, we have also been advised on the moral character of the Congress. Obviously if the moral position of the Congress was such, the author of the suggestion would have left long ago.

I am not going to be provoked, either by the speeches on this side or on the other side, to go into the question whether devaluation was inevitable or not. I have a kind of mind that does not regard anything as inevitable. I do not believe in the economic determinism of any kind. Therefore, I do not want to speak on inevitability of one thing or the other.

An hon. Member: Speak up your mind.

Shri Krishna Menon: What I want to submit is that we have a parliamentary system of Government where the Government is responsible to Parliament. Now we have a situation in our country where various economic, social, political and other factors which already existed have either been accentuated or altered in the context of devaluation.

In other words, devaluation has taken place and it does not serve any purpose for me at the present time to go into the question whether it could be avoided or otherwise. The fact is that it is here and I have to look at it as to what is the consequence of it, how we are going to follow it up and for what purpose. The first is to avoid further devaluations because it is always the practice that one devaluation is followed by another. Devaluation, devaluation, demonetisation and then collapse—that is how it goes. There I want to see that the conditions which follow should be of a character that do not lead to further devaluation.

I am not one of those people who have objections either to the American Government or any other government putting forward its own point of view whether I like it or not. You must expect them to do, either by persuasion or by whatever method, what they think is right in their own interest. It is up to us to accept it or not. Therefore I am glad to be able to tell you that in the post-devaluation period and arising from it, there have been considerable indications that the circumstances that may lead to further deterioration are sought to be stopped by Government.

I belong to a party supporting a government that is totally, irrevocably and, what is more, unalterably committed to socialism.

Shri Nambiar: Committed.

Shri Krishna Menon: Neither the the prestige of the Government does Government nor the Opposition nor even the majority of Members of Parliament on this side can alter this because the economic factors in the country are such that it cannot survive this mass of poverty without certain equalitarian distribution. . . . (*Interruption*). I do not think he can add anything to this. I am glad to think that the Government having reiterated this position in the face of all these difficulties, it is my duty to see that for the strength that they require to carry out these measures—and they have been difficult ones—should have the support not only of the party of the Government but the country as a whole.

The follow-up action is not merely a matter of sentiment but it deals with a large number of administrative actions, reorientation not of policies—it is very difficult to draw a line between policy and administration—but in regard to various policy matters. Therefore, we have to bear in mind one thing. We have to assist in the following up of this. It will be wrong for the Opposition to think of all of us as yesmen. We have three S's—socialism, swadeshi and self-reliance. It is common ground that devaluation has created certain onerous burdens and those onerous burdens have been considerably increased in our debt service charges and the accession in the quantum of money that has to be paid out for import purposes. Also, we may add to it, whether it was justified or not, that this kind of a thing always gives a shake-up to the Government. A shake-up is of two qualities, but it is a shake-up all the same. Therefore its position in the world also is not affected, is not influenced in that way.

The material conditions or requirements that are called for in carrying this burden are not either economic or technical or anything of that kind but are a greater and fuller involvement of our people in the development of this land. That involvement is possible only in conditions where

not get pulled down. There is no question of blowing up this Government but what is called in the English papers about the British Government today of trying to puncture which is not going to be of great assistance to us. The greater involvement of the people, therefore, means that there must not be in the minds of our own people a feeling that it is a government on sufferance. We are not a government on sufferance. Therefore that impression should not be sought to be conveyed to the people. Whether I belong to this party or the other, because it is a national problem, the image of the Government both domestically and in foreign fields must not be such. When a representative of this country speaks at international conferences, it is not the military, economic or other resources in the world, or lack of them, but the feeling that behind him are the masses of our people. Therefore, that image has been kept up.

The third requirement is that whatever may be the circumstances, we must have a definite and insistent move towards what is called self-reliance. Now, great many quotations and counter-quotations have been made here which, I may say with great respect, are unrealistic. No one, neither a Member of the Opposition nor a Member on this side, has said that you must have foreign aid or you must never have anything of the kind. It is a question of when, from where and how much. Pandit Nehru has been repeatedly quoted on this. In 1952, when the question first came up, what he said was this. The terms for accepting foreign aid and the possible risk following from this were mentioned by Nehru in the Indian Parliament on December 15, 1952:

“Provided we are strong enough ourselves, I really do not see why we should be afraid of accepting the kind of aid that would help us to progress more rapidly. With that aid, we could do many things which we would otherwise have

to postpone. Foreign aid involves a slight risk, not so much of being tied down as of compromising in a moral sense. There is no reason, however, why we should be afraid of accepting foreign aid if it does not influence our policy or activities in any way."

Therefore, it is upto us. There are countries which are totally opposed in ideologies. Yugoslavia is an outstanding instance. It accepts a large quantity of foreign aid. It is not the acceptance of the foreign aid but the conditions under which we take it and the pressures to which we subject ourselves.

Only two days ago, the Governor of the Reserve Bank speaking about taking foreign aid said that there comes a time, there is a limit, when it may affect our policies and when it becomes not desirable. Therefore, we should not say either 'Yes' or 'No'. That is not the answer. It is a question of flexibility. This involves a great deal of flexibility and when flexibility is introduced in the institutions, in the administration of the Government, the Government carries a very heavy burden and in carrying that burden also there must be the support of the people as such and a more scientific approach to problems, as I said, in regard to foreign aid, whether it is agriculture or industry, has to be taken.

Now, there have been observations from both sides of the House—I regret to say there have been observations from this side also—that the present devaluation is the result of economic policies followed over a long period. I have no time to develop this point because I am speaking against the clock. All that I need say is that whatever policies of this Government were till 1961-62, they had been ratified by the electorate. So, there is a limitation and you cannot go back from them. It had been decided by the electorate at the last elections that whatever was done upto then was

all right, that they had confidence in us and they sent us back. Similarly, this Parliament, time after time, has approved the policies of the Government during this period. Therefore, raising this question is either an attempt on the part of the people to say this is inevitable or to say that the whole Plan must be thrown out.

Then, we come to the question of what we have to avoid most. We have to avoid over-dependence upon aid because if our development is given out or is possible only if we get aid, then we give over the decision to the aid-giver, that is, if you say, "There can be no development unless I get aid", then the aid-man will say, "I will not give it this way." Therefore, that is one thing we have to avoid.

There is another reason why I say the motion of censure is wrong at this moment. One of the main factors we have to deal with is the Plan. In the last few days—our information comes from the newspapers or the meetings and so on—the Plan which appeared running the risk of being scuttled, either from within or without, which was incurring a great deal of attack mostly from big business interests because the Plan by definition is against private enterprise, has been diverted. The Prime Minister announced the other day the quantum of allocation for the public sector and, what is more, it seems to be realised now that the size of the Plan, one way or the other, has to take into consideration the fact that the people should not be thrown out of work, that standards of life should not go down and that we have to provide a certain margin for the increase of population. And what is more, the balance between the various sections should be maintained. The Plan carries its own momentum, I hope, as time goes on and I have no doubt that it will. This kind of prescription comes from abroad that you must give priority to agriculture as if we do not know. The people who say that you must

[Shri Krishna Menon]

give priority to agriculture are the people who said 15 years ago, "you grow grains and we will give you planes"; that is to say, they were afraid of the industrial advancement of this country; it is these people who offer this advice in season and out of season. It is not possible to develop agriculture without industry any more than it is possible to develop industry without agriculture. This is a very unrealistic division and, therefore, the Plan that is conceived by the Government is seized of this. I will not develop this point further because of want of time.

The next item that we have to think of is the resources available for the Plan. This problem of resources is not peculiar to our country. This problem of lack of resources is also suffered by the richest countries in the world which are also affected by the same problems as devaluation. So far as resources are concerned, I speak for myself that it would be almost impossible for us to find the resources for development unless we control the sources of credit, establish different philosophies in regard to credit-worthiness and also recognise the value of man apart from the bankers. That is to say, the first step that has to be taken is to see that money-machine does not become the hand-maiden or the servant or the vassal of those who are already monopolists, whether you call that nationalisation of banks or otherwise. It does not mean substituting a civil servant for a competent banker; that is not nationalisation. It means taking the whole purpose of it. It also means garnering of the resources that are available in the country by a very large-scale spread of the institution of insurance whereby the desire of the people to avoid risks and provide against them is exploited for the purpose of enhancing the riches of the country. That insurance is not only covered by life insurance and fire insurance, but in developing countries so many things have to be looked after because the investment is con-

siderable; whether it is failure of harvest or drought or war, whatever it is, these should be insured against. If such an insurance is done in this country, then the Government should be able to garner a large quantity of resources. What is important is that it should be under public control.

The next point that I want to go into is conservation, conservation of resources, whether in regard to food-grains or in regard to steel or in regard to Parliamentary time or in regard to use of buildings; whatever it is. Conservation is a creation of wealth. I will not go into examples, but it is known that either for lack of scientific knowledge or for various other reasons, very large quantities of material that are necessary for development are wasted. That is all right in the United States because they work on the economy of waste; that is to say, if they do not waste, they cannot survive. But we cannot afford to do that.

Then I take the other things one after the other. It is impossible to speak about development in our country without speaking about agriculture. Agriculture is always allied to population. Whenever there is an economic problem, I think it is usually asked, "what are we to do with population explosion". I have repeatedly said that population does not explode, but only grows. I think the best wealth of our people is population. Family planning is for other reasons and for other purposes.

In regard to agriculture, it cannot be regarded merely as a technological proposition. It is not only a problem of chemical technology but of social engineering as well. Government realises, whether in Party circles or otherwise, that there is a comparative slackness in the implementation of land reforms or in enabling the person who cultivates the soil to feel that he is cultivating it for himself and not for somebody else.

The second is the technological advance that has to be made in the passage of the produce of agriculture to the stomach, which is at the back of all social engineering, where either by large-scale procurement or by monopoly procurement or by using the powers of the State one has to see that the phenomenon that those have more shall have still more and those who do not have anything shall not have anything at all has to disappear. That means the control of the machinery of distribution to the extent that is necessary. This is not a dogma or a philosophy or anything of that kind. It is merely to see that it does not stick in the conduit-pipes either of distribution or anything else, or in a physical way as such.

The advancement of agriculture also makes us hit up against the problem of the inputs into agriculture. The present Minister of Agriculture follows a philosophy of larger inputs. Nobody quarrels with that provided the balances are maintained. I believe that no argument about input into agriculture should put us in a position of mortgaging our future; that is to say, the commitment in regard to foreign fertilisers or foreign seeds or whatever it be should not on the one hand be of a character that might impoverish our soils or contaminate our crops and on the other hand place us in debt for a long time.

It is equally true, just as we say about foreign resources, that in times of scarcity food may have to be imported. But it is no incentive to the farmer if every time you want more you go somewhere else. In that case, why should he produce more? Therefore, this has to be balanced in this way. Here again, this is not recitation of something academically, but Government seem to be conscious and they seem to be more anxious about this than ever before. because I read only two days ago in a newspaper which is usually one of the newspapers that seem to know the mind of the Government, that the

policy in regard to food would be of a character where the import of foodgrains would be restricted to somewhere about 3 million tons, and the remainder would be collected by procurement. I have always held the view that by going away from agriculture, this country will not be able to feed itself and deal with both the social and evil consequences of scarcity unless we are a nation for the purpose of feeding itself only. There are other implications of this also.

While it is true that we have a federal Constitution, we are not a confederal country. There is only one country here. Sometimes people come and tell me 'In your country. . .', as if Kerala which is my part of the country is not a part of this country; it is not my country, but it is a part of this country. So, we have to take all this land as part of one country. I am glad that gradually there is a growing recognition in the ruling party itself that this division of this country into various sectors for the purpose of feeding itself, however difficult it might be to overcome it, has to go.

Then I come to the question of prices. It is not possible either for this government or for any government to continue—by 'government' I mean a democratic government; any government, I suppose, with force can rule for some time—unless the prices are regulated. The regulation of prices simply means this that the optimum amount of commodities and services are available to the largest number of people, if not to the whole of them. This is what is meant by the control of prices in a system where the goods are not distributed freely. That becomes accentuated now in our community because the great necessities of life such as the care of health, education, housing etc. are all matters of buying and selling and not of provision. If our community were such that education had not to be paid for, housing had not

[Shri Krishna Menon

to be paid for, and health services had not to be paid for but would be part of the public service, then the whole price structure would perhaps play a role with lesser significance. But so far as we are concerned, our survival is dependent upon the holding of this price-line. This holding of the price-line does not mean keeping the prices where they are, but it means making available to the people those essentials of life which make the largest number of people, especially the poor people, happy. Since you have already rung the bell, I would only like to say this that whatever regulations may be introduced, and whatever law may be passed, and however much we may disregard fundamental rights or anything of that kind, it would not be possible to hold the price-line by legislation. Prices can be held only by the control of the essential produce at the source and also by the necessary degree of control in regard to the flow of it; that is to say, unless there is procurement of these essential goods it would not be possible to hold the price-line. Whether Government nationalises the production or not, the main thing is that it must be under the control of the community so that nobody can hold the community to ransom. That is what I would like to say with regard to prices.

Now the only other item with regard to this development is that concerning foreign trade. In regard to foreign trade, one of the arguments that has been put forward as the reason or justification for the purpose of devaluation is that it would enable us to deal with our adverse balance of trade. I am not going into that question; I do not want to indulge in predictions of one kind or another. But if we have to have more foreign trade and wipe out our deficit of nearly Rs. 500-600 crores—in regard to the United States four or five years ago, our adverse foreign trade balance was Rs. 800 crores and today it has gone up to Rs. 3,000 or 4,000

crores or something of that order—the only way to wipe it out, it is true, in these liberal days of today, is to see that we pay for our imports by our exports. There is no other way, unless you borrow. Therefore, the largest quantity of production that is required for export purposes must materialise if we are to attain this objective. You cannot export what you have not got. That is to say, unless surpluses are created, it is not possible to export. The creation of surpluses means not only technological development but also all the other things that go with agriculture, and the realisation that our country changes and so does the world change, and that there is no particular sanctity attached to what are called conventional exports and there should be no antagonism to other exports which are not conventional exports. And this cannot be done by merely demanding austerity from the people. That may work for a few days. If you ask them to starve on Monday, they may eat double the quantity on Tuesday.

Shri Nambiar: Well said.

Shri Krishna Menon: Therefore, it is necessary to create these surpluses which means not entirely but in certain strategic regions nationalisation of foreign trade. That does not mean the setting up of a State Trading Corporation and introducing the methods of the civil service in trade. That is not what is meant. By handling those essential things which are required by people, in those areas by proper marketing organisation and knowledge of the requirement of the people, we can create new fields of exports and produce the goods only for that purpose. We may not even want them ourselves; we only become the shopkeepers and manufacturers of the world to the extent required.

Therefore, the advance of foreign trade has to be thought out in this way. It is now admitted by Government—as critics have said before—

that all these various devices that we have been trying, call them incentives—have done more harm than good. These have not promoted any trade. We must recognise the fact that we have been priced a lot out of the world market; what is more, we have not only been priced out, we have been qualified out of the world market because of our lack of standardisation. We have to create confidence in this respect. That is another reason why Government should come in in this.

There are one or two other matters. One is with regard to foreign affairs. Both Shri Mukerjee on the one hand and Shri Patil on the other have spoken on Vietnam. This is not a foreign affairs debate and I am not going to go into details. But let it be understood that we carry a very special responsibility in this matter. I say to the Opposition that this is the least apt time to have put Government in the pillory on this matter. In Shri Mukerjee's own words, the Prime Minister is supposed to have said—I have not heard of it; I have not been to Kerala recently—that we can do nothing. Let us assume that that is true. A few days afterwards, she said we must do something. That is an advance. Especially when with very great difficulty, the Government are trying to do it, that is not the time to say 'no'.

With regard to this, the main difficulty is not with Government but with a large number of people who think that America's Vietnam adventure has an evangelical or moral character. I think, therefore, it is better for us to realise that this is not a new policy. Ever since the death of Roosevelt, the policy of adventure, of invasion, has been followed. That was when Nixon went over and the Vietnamese had to compromise.

I will just read two extracts. *The New York Times* said in 1950:

"Indo-China is a prize worth a large gamble"—not to stop

the Chinese from coming to India—

"In the North are exportable tin, tungsten, manganese, coal, lumber and rice; rubber, tea, pepper and hides. Even before World War II, Indo-China yielded dividends estimated at 300 million dollars per year".

"Our own State Department told us what this war is about as clearly as anyone could wish only one year later".

We have only partially exploited South-east Asia's resources. Nevertheless, South-east Asia supplies 90 per cent of the world's crude rubber, 60 per cent of its tin and 80 per cent of its copra and coconut oil. It has sizable quantities of sugar, tea, coffee...."

That is the economic motive. People need not be squeamish about the use of the word "imperialism". This is what imperialism means. Imperialism is not in the flag or soldiers marching, it is the economic domination of a country in order to obtain cheap raw material and to have a market for selling its goods. That is from *New York Times*, and you know it is a newspaper in a free country.

Then comes President Eisenhower just after he was elected President of the United States. And what does he say?

"Now let us assume we lost Indo-China. If Indo-China goes, the tin and tungsten we so greatly value would cease coming. We are after the cheapest way to prevent the occurrence of something terrible—the loss of our ability to get what we want from the riches of the Indo-Chinese territory and from South-east Asia."

I read this not in the way of carping criticism, but because there is a genuine feeling among people that

[Shri Krishna Menon]

this is a holy war of some kind. Unless it is in our national interests it is not a holy war.

I leave it at that except to say that now we have in this matter advanced, or rather decayed into the further stage where the Government must have the feeling that the entire House is behind them, because what is called the demilitarised zone, for your information, is but six miles in width, nearly four miles on the north of the Ben Hai river and two miles on the south. There is no such thing as a river, it is a water course. It is now said that in the southern region, the South Vietnamese part of the region, in that narrow strip, there is concentration of North Vietnamese troops,—how they skipped over the four miles one does not know—and therefore they are bombing. What is our concern in this matter? Mr. Patil spoke today about our special responsibility. Here, I want to ask the Government: has this not become now a war of the interventionists against our own people, because this demilitarised zone is policed by Indians, Canadians and Poles? This demilitarised zone is under our control, and it is we who are being dislodged by the bombing that takes place.

The Prime Minister has made it quite clear that there can be no progress in this matter until bombing stops by the interventionists. These interventionists would do whatever they like. Anyway, I am not going into the question of the horrors of this war. Therefore, when it is said that you must return to the Geneva principle, it merely means that the interventionists must go out, because the Geneva principle means Indo-China must remain neutral.

I come to the last point. We are members of the International Monetary Fund. It is my submission to the Government that all these years we have not used our position with sufficient daring. I believe we sub-

scribe 600 million dollars, which is now going to be raised by 100 million dollars or so. We have submitted to their rules, when the accommodation that we can get from them is a very small proportion, there is a fight going on about it. And the devaluation proposition and all the circumstances that go with it are not peculiar to us. What are they? They are, first of all, the difficulty of internal credit, adverse balance of trade and a punctured Government. Germany, Britain and the United States are all in this position. The United States are very considerably affected by adverse balance of trade, which is increased by 15 million dollars of expenditure in Indo-China, and by scarcity of goods; it has got difficulty of internal credit, and it has also a punctured Government in the sense that the present Government has only 40 per cent of the support of the people. Therefore, it is necessary for us to take a positive position in the affairs of the International Monetary Fund and see that the International Monetary Fund is not the handmaid of somebody else. The Committee of Ten has been sitting for a long time and produced no results on the problem of world liquidity, and it cannot be solved here. I say the time has come for us to demand that the dollar shall be devalued.

Shri Namblar: Well said.

Shri Krishna Menon: Because, if the dollar is not devalued.....(*Interruptions*). This is lack of understanding. While the Pound is devalued alone, we are in the soup, we go further down. That is why in this House I have said that we devalued in 1949 and we have devalued now, but these are two types of devaluation. In 1949 we devalued when the rupee was strong, we had considerable foreign balances, and we devalued in order to save the Pound, the standard currency. I was one of the people who very strongly advocated devaluation at that time. Now, I think we must boldly say,

boldly join France and Germany not only France and Germany but the German bankers and the Dutch bankers in saying that the dollar must be devalued and if the dollar is devalued then I think we can retain our position. That is the way to wipe out the result of devaluation. Mr. Wilson in Washington yesterday suggested that there must be devaluation of the dollar. Therefore, we must proceed in this manner, asserting our position in the IMF and not take the view we have always taken. It has now been proved that the World Bank has not much control over those people but they seem to have too much control over us. Therefore, we must not put all our eggs in one basket but negotiate with other countries separately. That is also increasingly the view of the Government.

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

Shri Krishna Menon: I conclude by saying that what we are concerned today in this post-devaluation period is with follow-up action in which the Government requires the full support of our people, in measures such as import substitution. It is possible because this is a national problem; it is not a party problem. No one can escape the effects of devaluation. Price rise is not confined either to the Opposition or the Government party. So, while this motion is one where the criticism of policy is justified, it is said that two men beat the drum or three men beat the drum, still the drum is there. Therefore, I would submit that this particular motion of censure must be taken merely as a parliamentary device just as you want to cut one rupee if you think that the Government is not spending enough; if you think in a particular estimate, say education, you must spend 5 crores, you do not say that you must spend 5 crores but you cut the demand by 100, but that does not mean that you want it to be cut. So, I take it as a parliamentary device in that way. I want to express the view that the

last few days, particularly the stimulus of devaluation must activate us in such a way that further devaluations do not come in and what is more we do not take orders from other people.

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय (रसड़ा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर बोलने का अवसर दिया।

16.43 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में जो अविश्वास प्रस्ताव आया है मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। अभी अभी माननीय श्री कृष्णा मेनन के भाषण से पहले कांग्रेस के दो बड़े सदस्यों ने अर्थात् श्री पाटिल और श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय ने जिन तरह के भाषण इस सदन में दिये उनसे मुझे बड़ी निराशा हुई है और मुझे ऐसा भालूम होता है कि कांग्रेस के लोग और उनकी यह दलीय सरकार पूरी तरह इन मुल्क में बेइयाई पर उतर आई है। उसका पेशा बन गया है समस्याओं से आखें मूदना अगोजीशन को गाली देना देश में बढ़ते हुए असन्तोष को लाठी और गोली से दबाना। मुझे आशा नहीं थी कि माननीय पाटिल जैसे लोग इस तरह की बातें करेंगे जो कि एक बाजारू तकरीर के अलावा और कुछ नहीं है। सिर्फ बाजार में इस तरह के भाषण किये जाते हैं। आज हिमालय से लेकर कन्या कुनारी तक पूरे देश में असन्तोष फैला हुआ है। क्या कांग्रेस के सदस्य इस बात से इन्कार कर सकते हैं कि इस राज्य में अष्टाचार है क्या कांग्रेस के सदस्य इस बात से इन्कार कर सकते हैं कि चचा भतीजा वाद इस राज्य में है क्या कांग्रेस के सदस्य इस बात से इन्कार कर सकते हैं कि इस देश में भुवनेरी है क्या क्या कांग्रेस के सदस्य इस बात से इन्कार कर सकते हैं कि आज खुद उनकी पार्टी के भीतर जो अराजकता है वह किसी

[श्री सरजू पाण्डेय]

दूसरे दल में नहीं है। उनके भाषण में इन सब बातों का जवाब आना चाहिये था। मगर वह बजाय इसके विरोधी पार्टियों को गाली देने लगे और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर तरह तरह के आरोप लगाने लगे। वह कहते हैं कि हम देश में प्रजातन्त्र को नहीं फँलने देना चाहते हैं विरोधी पार्टियों के लोग असन्तोष पैदा करते हैं। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपकी सरकार अपोजीशन के विधायकों को लाठी से पीटोगी जेलों में बन्द करेगी उनको सड़कों पर घसीटेगी तो क्या आप उम्मीद करते हैं कि इस देश में अमन रहेगा। यहां पर श्री राम सेवक यादव बैठे हुए हैं जिनको बाराबंकी की पुलिस ने मारा उनको घसीटा और उनका कुर्ता फाड़ा। उसके लिये क्या आपको तकलीफ नहीं होती। मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ...

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह गलत है।

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : सही है। इस तरफ वह बैठे हुए हैं। आखिर बांदा में, बंगाल में, केरल में और बस्तर में तथा दूसरी जगहों में पुलिस ने क्या किया। मालूम हुआ कि उत्तर प्रदेश बन्द के सिलसिले में कार्यकर्ताओं को पकड़ कर पीटा गया है हवालात में बच्चों को मारा गया है जबकि वह बच्चे कुछ नहीं कर रहे थे चुपचाप शान्त प्रदर्शन कर रहे थे। मैं जो कुछ आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ उससे कुछ सीखिये।

आज चाहे घमकी कितनी भी दीजिये हम कहते हैं कि वोट में आपको हरा देंगे। लेकिन मैं यह भी कहता हूँ कि आप जरूर जीतेंगे अगर हिन्दुस्तान के मुनाफाखोरों और चोरों के पैसे पर आपको वोट लेना है। इस तरह से आप जरूर जीतेंगे और जीत कर आते रहे हैं। अभी अभी एक माननीय सदस्य बोले थे। मुझे सब कुछ मालूम है लेकिन मैं उनकी व्यक्तिगत आलोचना नहीं

करना चाहता जिस तरह से धनिकों के पैसे पर वह वोट खरीदते हैं। जो कुछ संविधान ने निश्चित किया है अगर उसके आधार पर आप चुनाव लड़ें तो मैं दावे से कहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के लोगों को मुंह की खानी पड़ेगी। मगर आप इसकी परवाह नहीं करते हमको गाली देकर दबाना चाहते हैं।

सी० बी० गुप्त की बात इस सदन में कही गई जिनको 45 लाख रुपया दिया गया। वह किसका पैसा है। सारे का सारा गरीबों का पैसा है। क्या आप समझते हैं कि सी० बी० गुप्त को जो पैसा दिया गया है वह देश के कल्याण के लिये दिया गया है। आप अपना दिल टटोलिये सिर्फ हमको गाली देने में काम नहीं चलेगा।

आज मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ एक बात की कि खुद पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपनी किताब "मेरी कहानी" में लिखा है कि जब साइमन कमिशन देश में आया था और कांग्रेस के लोगों ने उसका बायकाट किया था उस समय काले झंड दिखलाने का प्रोग्राम बनाया गया था और उसमें मेरी माता जी भी थी और उन पर पुलिस ने लाठी चार्ज किया था। पं० नेहरू ने "मेरी कहानी" में लिखा है कि उस समय वह जेलखाने में थे। उन्होंने लिखा कि जिस समय मुझे सूचना मिली कि मेरी मां को पुलिस ने लाठी से मारा है मैंने अपना धीरज खो दिया और अगर मैं बाहर होता तो पुलिस की लाठी का जवाब देता। मैं गांधी जी की सोलह सालों की अहिंसा को भूल जाता। अगर आपकी पुलिस निहत्थे लोगों पर लाठियां चलायेंगी स्त्रियों के साथ व्यभिचार करेंगी तो लाजिमी तौर पर इस देश में अमन और शान्ति कायम नहीं रहेगी। अगर आप मेरी बात को झूठ बतलायें तो मैं इसके लिये प्रमाण देने के लिए तैयार हूँ। अगर आप में हिम्मत हो तो मैं सारी चीजों को इस सदन में

रखने के लिये तैयार हूँ। मैं आपको सबूत दूंगा। आप एन्क्वायरी कराइये। अगर वह झूठ हो तो सदन जो सजा चाहे मुझे दे सकता है। मेरे पास पूरा सबूत मौजूद है।

उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार और बंगाल की सरकार कहती है कि देश में अन्न की कमी है। तो इस के लिये क्या हम जिम्मेदार हैं। क्या हमने कहा था कि पानी का इन्तजाम मत करो, क्या हम ने कहा था कि देश में जमीन के लिये सही कानून मत बनाओ, क्या हमने कहा था कि इस देश में बैठ कर मौज उड़ाओ और विकास के नाम पर दुनिया भर के नाच नाचों। आप अपोजिशन के ऊपर लांछन लगाते हैं कि साहब यह काम नहीं करना चाहते और आप विकास के नाम पर भ्रष्टाचार करते हैं भाई भतीजों को भरती करते हैं। जिस समय चीन ने हमला किया तब कहते हैं कि हम चुप रहे। जिस समय चीन ने हमला किया उस समय तुम्हारे पास जीप भी नहीं थी। सड़कें भी सिर्फ कागज में ही बनी थीं, और उन अधिकारियों को आप ने तरक्की दी। विरोधियों ने थोड़े ही कहा था कि जीप तक न दो, सड़कें न बनाओ वहाँ से मार खा कर भागे और गालियाँ विरोधियों को देते हैं। बतलाइये कि क्या हम ने सड़कें बनाने के लिये मना किया था, हम ने कहा था कि जीप को ले कर मेले देखो हम ने कहा कि जीप ले कर तमाशा बनाओ। आप जिम्मेदार हैं देश में अन्न संकट पैदा करने के लिये, आप जिम्मेदार हैं देश में सिंचाई न देने के लिये, आप जिम्मेदार हैं सारे अनाज के संकट के लिये जो देश में पैदा हुआ है।

अमरीकी अन्न खाने की बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि हमारे अमरीकी अन्न खाने से दर्द होता है और रूस का अन्न खाने से हम खुश होते हैं। हम ने कहा कि दर्द हम को नहीं होता, आप को ही होता है। हमें तो कोई एतराज नहीं है, अगर हमारे यहाँ कमी है तो किसी भी देश से ले आओ।

मगर हम ने एक बात कही थी कि किसी भी देश से लो लेकिन उस की वफादारी की कसम न खाओ, उस का कलमा मत पढ़ो। आप यह चार्ज विरोधियों पर लगाते हैं, लेकिन मैं आप से पूछता हूँ कि बड़े बड़े कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर से ले कर राज्य मंत्रियों तक ने क्या घूम घूम कर यह भाषण नहीं दिया कि पी० एल० 480 का अन्न खाना पाप है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि आप क्यों कहते हैं कि अन्वमूल्यन से बहुत परेशानी है। क्यों नहीं मोरारजी को कांग्रेस से निकालते, क्यों नहीं टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी को कांग्रेस से निकालते।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कामराज को भी।

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : क्यों नहीं कामराज को निकालते। यहाँ डा० राम सुभग सिंह बैठे हुए हैं। यह सुबह मुस्करा रहे थे। अब आप अगर देश की बात को भूल कर गलत बात कहते हैं, छिपाने की बात करेंगे तो देश इसको बरदाश्त नहीं करेगा। कृपलानी जी ने जो बात कही थी वह सही कही थी। चाहे आपका फिजिकल एनिहिलेशन न हुआ हो, शरीर से आप न मरे हों लेकिन देश इसको अच्छी तरह से जान गया है कि आप में आत्मा नहीं रह गई है। इस बात को देश के लोग अच्छी तरह से समझ गए हैं। यह बात भी सही है कि अपोजिशन कमजोर है। लेकिन आप अपनी कमजोरी को देखें। आपको देश पर शासन करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं रह गया है। देश की जनता आपको नहीं चाहती है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : कुशासन कर रहे हैं। डूब मरो, यमुना में जा कर।

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : आप बड़े सिद्धान्तों की बात करते हैं। गुट निरपेक्षता की बात करते हैं, अहिंसा की बात करते हैं, दुनिया भर के जितने अच्छे अच्छे सिद्धान्त हैं उनको बात करते हैं। हम को आप कहते हैं

[श्री सरजू पाण्डेय]

कि तुम तो रही हो सन् 42 में तुम ने अंग्रेजों का साथ दिया था। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी में बैठे हुए आधे से ज्यादा लोग आज ऐसे हैं कि जिन लोगों ने अंग्रेजों के जूते चाटे थे, जो अंग्रेजों के जूते चाटते फिरते थे जिन्होंने कांग्रेसियों को पिटाया था और उन पर गोली चलाई थी। आज वही लोग कांग्रेसी बन गए हैं, कांग्रेस की तरफ बैठे हुए हैं...

श्री रामसेवक थादव : मंत्री हैं।

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : आज जब कांग्रेस में ऐसे लोग बैठे हुए हैं तो मैं यहां पर दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि दूसरे मेरे साथी यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं जिनकी अतिनां पूरी उम्र आपकी है उतनी उम्र उनका जेल में रिमिशन हो चुका है, उतनी वे जेल में रिमिशन पा चुके हैं। जो सही अर्थों में देश भक्त हैं वे तो हमारी तरफ हैं और चोर बाजारी करने वाले जो देशभक्त हैं वे आपकी तरफ हैं।

चीन की यहां बहुत बात की जाती है। उसके साथ साथ हमारे बारे में भी बहुत सी बातें कही जाती हैं। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कौन चीन को लोहा भेजता है, कौन देश से चावल भेजता है? कई चोर बाजारी करने वाले ऐसे लोग भी हैं जो कि पाकिस्तान को सिमेंट भेजते हैं। क्या ये सब कम्युनिस्ट हैं या जनसंघ के लोग हैं या स्वतंत्र पार्टी के लोग हैं। आपकी तरफ जो बैठे हुए हैं वे भेजते हैं। उनकी आप वकालत करते हो।

श्री रामसेवक थादव : बंगाल के मंत्री राजस्थान के मंत्री उस तस्कर व्यापार में शामिल हैं।

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : और जब कोई पकड़ा जाता है और उस पर कार्रवाई होती है तो मुझे यह भी मालूम है कि उस में क्या होता है। कानपुर का एक महाजन था

जो तस्कर व्यापार में शामिल था। इसी सदन में सवाल उठा था। उत्तर प्रदेश के एक मंत्री ने टेलीफोन पर डिस्ट्रीब्यूट मैजिस्ट्रेट को कहा कि इसको जमानत पर रिहा कर दो। आप सारी चोर बाजारी के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं, आप भुखमरी के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। इस में धमकी की कोई बात नहीं है, कोई डराने की बात नहीं है। मुल्क में कोई नहीं चाहता है कि हिंसा हो। लेकिन अगर लूट होती है, अगर हिंसा होती है तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी कांग्रेस पर है। हम लोग पागल नहीं हैं। हम उसके लिए जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं। अगर आप के व्यवहार से कोई पागल होता है तो आप खुद दोषी हैं और आप को अपने दोष को स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये। आप इसके लिए जिम्मेदार हैं, हम नहीं। देश में जो अराजकता है उसके लिए शासन में बैठे हुए लोग, आप लोग जो उधर बैठे हुए हैं, आपके जो सारे अधिकारी लोग हैं वे जिम्मेदार हैं। लोहिया जी ने ठीक ही कहा था इस देश में लूट चल रही है और सारे देश का जनता का खून आप पी रहे हैं। एक तरफ तो लोग भूखों मरते हैं और दूसरी तरफ इस सदन को मजाक बनाया जाता है और कहा जाता है कि विरोधी पार्टी वाले आन्दोलन कर रहे हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि आज देश का विश्वास आप पर से उठ चुका है। आपको चाहिये कि आप शासन छोड़ दें। अगर आप नहीं छोड़ेंगे तो इस देश की जनता निकट भविष्य में आप से शासन की बागडोर छुड़वा देगी। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि जो करनी आपकी रही है, उसका फल आपके सामने आएगा। जितने बड़े देशभक्त आप हैं उसको सब जानते हैं। हम अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि दुनिया में पूंजी पति वर्ग की नुमाइंदगी करने वाली पार्टी कभी भी देशभक्त नहीं हो सकती है। देश में जो बेचैनी इस वक्त है उसके लिए जिम्मेदार आप हैं। देश की गरीब जनता पर मुझे पूरा भरोसा है। उसने जिस तरह से दुनिया में राष्ट्रीय

आजादी की रक्षा की है उसी तरह से वह यहां भी करेगी। इस काम को विरोधी दलों के लोग करेंगे। आप इसको नहीं कर सकते हैं। आप तो हारे हुए सिपाही हैं। बूढ़ों की कतार ले कर आप बैठ हुए हैं। ये कुछ करने वाले नहीं हैं।

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North): Sir, I have heard many speeches from the opposition and I do not think this no-confidence motion has any proper basis or ideology behind it, because the opposition has nothing in common except their hatred towards this Government and the Congress organisation. That is so to say a very negative approach in this matter. So far as we are concerned, our approach is based on socialism, democracy and the development of the cooperative sector.

It is said that we are deviating from the path of Socialism. Here I must mention that Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia and other Socialist countries are still in the stage of building up Socialism. Therefore, there is nothing wrong if we are also in the stage of building Socialism. All our financial and fiscal policies are so regulated that we can have control from the point of view of the whole range of economy so that we can attain our goal towards Socialism.

Some time back a veteran Communist leader, Shri Bupesh Gupta, said in the course of a speech "as and when we attain power, we do not mind the capitalist economy continuing for some time to come." In China they have tolerated the nationalist bourgeoisie. So, there is nothing wrong if we tolerate the private sector in a planned economy. Through our fiscal and monetary policies we have got control over both the public and private sector. So, nothing comes in the way of our regulating the various sectors of our economy so that we can attain our goal.

Coming to prices, there is agreement in this House that the prices have to be brought down, if necessary by taking some drastic steps. The Finance Minister has already announced that we shall reduce the size of the Plan and effect economies in expenditure in both the Centre and in the States. The utmost economy is being effected in non-development projects. These are concrete measures. It is necessary that we take some effective measures to have some control over the business community which takes advantage of situations. More often than not, it is having its way and creating trouble for the country. In Punjab the Governor had taken some drastic measures which had a telling effect. About 800 traders were arrested and it had some effect on the price level.

I agree with hon. Members that one supermarket will not make any difference overnight. But if supermarkets and co-operative societies are established not only in Delhi but all over the country, it will have some effect on the price level. But we have to wait for some time to get that result.

Devaluation has created some situation by which we have to stand because devaluation was inevitable. So, we have to stand by what has happened. As my other colleagues stated, the follow-up measures have to be taken. We are doing it in both the Centre and in the States. Some drastic measures are being taken. As an example, the case of the United Kingdom was mentioned. They have taken some very severe steps in the various sectors of their economy so that the value of the pound sterling could be maintained.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can continue his speech the next day. We will now take up the Calling Attention Notice.