

[Shri A. C. Guha]

Rule 254 read with sub-rule (1) of Rule 311 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, one member from among themselves to serve as a Member of the Committee on Estimates for the unexpired portion of the term ending on the 30th April, 1964, vice Shri Lalit Sen ceased to be a member of the Committee on his appointment as a Parliamentary Secretary."

Mr. Speaker: The Question is:

"That the members of this House do proceed to elect in the manner required by sub-section (3) of Rule 254 read with sub-rule (1) of Rule 311 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, one member from among themselves to serve as a member of the Committee on Estimates for the unexpired portion of the term ending on the 30th April, 1965, vice Shri Lalit Sen ceased to be a member of the Committee on his appointment as a Parliamentary Secretary."

The motion was adopted.

COURT OF WARDS (RULERS OF INDIAN STATES) BILL*

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the superintendence of the estates of the Rulers of Indian States by the Court of Wards in certain States.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the superintendence of the estates of the Rulers of Indian States by the Court of Wards in certain cases."

The motion was adopted

Shri Hathi: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12.07 hrs.

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

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

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

Shri Hanumanthaiya may continue his speech.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on Friday, I was speaking on the subject of bundh. The opposition parties of Maharashtra felt greatly elated with the success of their Maharashtra bundh. Mahamahim manohar Lohia and others are now threatening us with Bharat band. This reminds me of Dhasa Bund and its breach. So long as Dhasa Bund and other drains contained the flood waters everything was normal. But when it over-flew and was breached, part of Delhi was inundated and even the very water for our daily drinking became contaminated. This Bharat bundh, if successful, will result in similar disasters to our mother land. The flow of popular emotion must be properly controlled and channelled. If you make it over-flow the bunds of legal and constitutional propriety and make a breach in it for partisan purposes, the pure waters of popular government will become contaminated. The nation will suffer from this contamination of lawlessness, disorder and defiance. Let not the opposition parties bandy about the word bundh. If they try to do Bharat bundh the

*Published in the Gazette of India Extra-ordinary Part II, Section 2. dated 14-9-64.

people of Bharat will think that you placed the party before the country, that you tried to exploit and instigate the wage-earning and salaried classes against society as a whole. Shri Chatterjee was arguing at length that there is no necessity for the national emergency to continue. But the protagonists of Bharat bundh will be furnishing an additional argument for continuing the emergency.

The new and learned Member of the Swatantra Party felt aggrieved with the amendments we have effected to the Constitution. He said that these amendments eroded the fundamental rights of the citizens and that we were bending the Constitution to our will. His righteous indignation rose to the pitch of charging us with contempt of Supreme Court.

Is the Congress Party guilty of these charges? Let me examine the charges in the legal and constitutional way. Among all the fundamental rights the most fundamental ones embedded in the preamble to the Constitution are (a) justice, social, economic and political, (b) equality of status and of opportunity. Then the Constitution directs that the ownership and control of material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good; and that the operation of the economic system should not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.

The Constitution has conferred responsibility on Parliament to reconstruct society on the foundation of these concepts. These concepts are the very soul of the Constitution. If in the discharge of these responsibilities there are any impediments, legal or otherwise, Parliament is in duty-bound to remove them. The Supreme Court and the High Courts are not entrusted by the Constitution with the task of reconstructing society or making laws for the people. They are simply charged with the high task of interpreting the Constitution. Very

often our professional zeal propels us to think that the court is superior to and master of Parliament. The authority to interpret the law is not higher than the power to make law. The responsibility to interpret the Constitution does not overshadow the responsibility to amend the Constitution for the purpose of giving society the content of justice and equality. I grant that the courts should be independent from all illegal and underhand interferences. But when the judgment of the High Court is over-ruled by the Supreme Court, you do not call it interference, nor contempt of court, because the law authorises it. Constitutional amendments made by Parliament, likewise, cannot be called contempt of Supreme Court because it is in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution that amendments are made; those amendments are made after they have been approved by the majorities in Parliament as provided in the Constitution itself.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): What about the appointment of some persons as Ministers when they have been indicted by the Supreme Court earlier?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: In this case the opinion of the Supreme Court is *obiter dicta*. I am trying to explain it from the legal point of view. According to the constitutional practice, whether the *obiter dicta* should be taken into consideration or not is left to the discretion of the Prime Minister. If you feel that the Prime Minister has done a wrong thing in taking or retaining a person as Minister, it is up to you to take whatever steps you can according to the provisions of the Constitution.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, on a point of order. When the hon. Member says that the judgment of the Supreme Court is *obiter dicta*, do you agree with that position? You have been a Judge yourself.

Mr. Speaker: Apart from the actual findings on the issue before the court, sometimes there are certain observations which are merely obiter dicta. But I cannot say anything about the particular case he has in mind.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I appeal to you that the issue before the Supreme Court was not whether he should....

Mr. Speaker: He need not labour much on this point.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Bara Banki): What is the opinion of the hon. Member about it?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I will tell you when I become the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Is it going to be soon?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): He is hoping.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Legal experts say that sovereignty vests in the Constitution. True, sovereignty vests in the Constitution in law, but in fact as well as in law sovereignty vests in the people of India and the Parliament is composed of the elected representatives of the sovereign people of India. Therefore Parliament is the representative and repository of the sovereignty of the people of India. If Parliament amends the Constitution to promote justice and equality, the wise and sober new Swatantra Member who is not here, Shri Dandekar, cannot afford to call it contempt of Supreme Court. In fact, those who talk in this way could be accused of contempt of Parliament, even though in its magnanimity Parliament may not take notice of contempt committed by Shri Dandekar and its detractors.

If Shri Dandekar and members of his Party think soberly for a moment, they will see the incorrectness of their argument. If they come to power, they will surely effect several amendments to the Constitution to abrogate all amendments made by

the Congress. Would they like to be tied down by their present arguments? Will they allow all socialistic amendments made to the Constitution stand when they are in power?

Shri Chatterjee, when he was speaking about his land of Bande Mataram and refugees, was subjecting his otherwise all-India heart to great parochial pressure of region and language.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Nothing of the kind. It is an all-India responsibility. The refugees are a national responsibility.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I never, for once, felt that Bande Mataram was not the song of India until Shri Chatterjee spoke of it the way he did.

The Government of India has so far spent Rs. 401 crores for the rehabilitation of refugees and is now spending afresh Rs. 7½ crores for the rehabilitation of the new refugees. This total of Rs. 408½ crores, if divided *per capita*, will work out to almost Rs. 10 per head in India. If accusations are made against Government and the rest of India, in spite of all help given, expenditure incurred and sympathy shown, we can only construe this as a slap on the face of a friend. In Shri Mahavir Tyagi you will find an understanding friend who will serve the refugees providing them with all possible facilities, pocketing all the insults and accusations made against the Government.

Shri Dandekar made another point. He dissociated himself and his party with the no-confidence motion. It was rather helpful, though it was very embarrassing, particularly when he said that this Government has inherited the situation not entirely of its own. He found fault with the overpowering personality of our late Prime Minister. May I say, Sir, that we of the Congress organisation hold Nehru in such high esteem as to say that if Gandhiji is the Father of the Nation, Nehru is the founding father of our economic progress.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): It is not a question of an individual, but it is a question of policies followed.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I agree with you; that is why I am making this statement. We own Nehru's leadership not only now but we stand committed to what he has done for the last 17 years. I am subscribing to your argument.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Talk of the party, not of a person.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I am answering to Mr. Dandekar who said it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He did not say that.

Shri Hanumanthaiya He did.

For the period he was in office, Nehru alone, among the leaders of newly independent nations, laid enduring foundation of stability, democracy and socialism in India. Our task now is merely to build the super-structure on that well-laid foundation.

Cry against corruption is timely and justified. I am one with Shri Chatterjee and his friends on this subject. Collection of funds seems to be, in varying degrees, the common way of all parties. Those collections sometimes lead to corruption. The election system has to be so radically reformed as to make it cheap and easy. This is an all-party question. All the parties in India have to think together, formulate rules of conduct and implement them with sincerity.

Corruption in official hierarchy has come to be felt by the people. Government is taking a series of steps for its eradication. All the political parties are earnest in making Government take effective steps. It is this all-party approach that has taken some shape in the form of Sadachar Samiti. Our Home Minister is making sincere and determined efforts to eradicate corruption from public and official life.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Cabinet is divided on that issue. His own colleagues are divided on that issue. They do not support him.

Shri J. B. Kripalani Now they will all support him.

Shri Hanumanthaiya Let us all rise above party labels to belabour the corrupt, wherever they are, in places high or low.

The learned Member, Shri Chatterjee, called the Congress Party a steam-roller. I construe it as a kind of compliment. It is true that the Congress Party has much steam.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You let off that steam!

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The fuel for the steam has been the suffering and sacrifice of honest Congressmen whose existence Shri Chatterjee in his own way conceded. The steam has kept the Congress Party . . . (Interruption). May I request the hon. Member not to take the trouble of making the running commentary? If he is too much qualified for it, he will find himself in the All India Radio station.

This steam has kept the Congress Party in high motion for the last 17 years; and it is likely to do so for another decade or two.

It is also true that Congress has been a roller in a way. This roller has relentlessly levelled down the heaps of highnesses, Exalted and otherwise, the mounds of jagirdars, inamdars and talukdars. This roller crushed caste hierarchy to smithereens. It has also very chivalrously crushed the age-old eminence of men over women. We have brought about equality of sex in the Constitution as well as in law in regard to appointments and remuneration. That is what I mean. And now this roller is making an earnest attempt on heaps of wealth, hoarded and otherwise, on wealth hidden with stars—I mean cinema stars—and in cells, lockers in

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]
the banks and on the flours. Today's papers have made it known that the police raided flour mills and was able to catch all the black money available there.

At the steering-wheel of the steam-roller sits the new Prime Minister. We find in him humility and sincerity, determination and detachment. He deserves the confidence of Parliament and the country. Shri N. C. Chatterjee and the Members of the Opposition want that we should tackle corruption, that we should repel the aggression committed by China. In order to achieve these successfully, let us raise this new Prime Minister from the status of the leader of a party to that of the leader of the nation. That is my humble request.

Mr. Speaker Now, Shri Khadilkar.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): You are calling me, Sir?...

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur) rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri H. N. Mukerjee might begin now.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, only a couple of days ago, Government used its majority in the House to secure a vote of approval of its food policy where particularly its egregious failure stinks in the nostrils of our people. It is our duty and our obligation as Members of Parliament to reflect the indignation of our people who will not be fobbed off by such manoeuvres in this House. Indeed, it is when these things take place that we understand what used to be meant at one time by the expression which was common in the phraseology of our national movement, namely 'brute majority'. By such majority, a Government can hold on to power but it loses the confidence and the affection of the country. And I aver, though I know that there is a majority in this House behind Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, it has no majority today in the country.

The Congress Government in Kerala has just paid the wages of its mounting sin. It had to go. Its misdeeds had piled up so much that it just had to go. The chain of Congress supremacy in India has broken at its weakest link. The Union Government today may imagine itself to be immune from such things. But if the people's hunger and despair continue to mount, the day is perhaps not too far when it will have to go also.

I say this as much in sorrow as in anger. After Jawaharlal Nehru was no more, the people were ready to stand by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in the hope that his administration would work genuinely for their interests. They knew and we knew, and we said it, that there were problems which Jawaharlal Nehru himself had left unsolved, problems that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and his friends could not solve overnight. But our people expected, and they had a right to expect that the agony of the people would not become so dreadful and so intolerable so soon after the calamity which was the death of Jawaharlal Nehru. And all this happened, in spite of whatever Shri C. Subramanian might have tried to say, on account of the Government's utter failure.

The problem of food and high prices has become so acute and all-pervading a crisis, a man-made crisis caused by the greed of a few whom the Government does not check because it does not wish to do so. On the immediate and effective solution of this crisis depends not only what is going to happen tomorrow and the day after, but on the immediate and effective solution of the present crisis depends the continuing progress of Indian planning, the stability and advance of Indian democracy, the integrity and strength of our foreign policy and indeed the entire legacy of Jawaharlal Nehru—all this and nothing less. I wish Mr. Shastri and his friends ponder that all this and nothing less is at stake. Shri Shastri who swears by Jawaharlal Nehru

does not appear to realise this. He does not seem to understand the full meaning of the Swatantra Party's new-found softness towards him when they dissociated themselves in a particular way from the no-confidence motion. This was very clear when my friend, Mr. Masani, who is not here, spoke on the food debate or when Mr. Dandekar, in his maiden speech, which it is parliamentary etiquette not to criticise, even spoke of the good results he expects from the passing away of the over-powering personality whose mantle has fallen on Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Meanwhile it will not be easy to forget that for demanding implementation of well-known policies, the striking workers of Ahmedabad were shot dead, satyagrahis sent in their thousands to jail and leaders of workers arrested under the Defence of India Rules, while the very anti-social elements who have their cleverly hooded spokesman inside the Government as well as in this House, who have manipulated this crisis which was by no means unavoidable, who are exploiting this crisis through profiteering and price racketeering, they are all being sought to be appeased. The food thieves control stocks and manipulate markets, in spite of whatever Mr. Subramaniam might choose to say. They are powerful inside the Congress. They paralyse Government action and they go on with impunity hoarding, rigging prices and grabbing super-profits. Mr. Subramaniam knows very well—sometimes he lets it out—that the real hoarder is the wholesaler, backed by bank advances, who also operates as the agent for the masters of unaccounted money, who find that speculation and cornering food stocks is the most paying proposition at the moment. But Government cannot be tough with the hoarders, in spite of the hoarders being not only tough, but cruel with our Government. Government could do the de-hoarding with the help of the people. Gov-

ernment could mobilise the assistance of the gram panchayats. As far as we are concerned, 200,000 members of the Communist Party of India and members of other parties would volunteer for this kind of work. But, of course, Government does not want it.

Even after State-trading starts, Government does not seem to realise—and this is an urgent moment in the life of our people—that anti-hoarding legislation and active measures in that regard will be necessary and it should start at once and make purchases direct from peasant producers; for, even with State-trading and statutory prices when they come, if they come, the private sector must be compelled to behave or else, it will control the projected Foodgrains Corporation, operate its own price line and gamble with the lives of the people. To all these things, unfortunately, Government is indifferent and no better proof for this callousness can be found than the speech which was made the other day in this House by the Food Minister. The Minister of Food thought he was making a debating point, but what is just not true cannot pass muster. He said, it was the opposition that had joined hands with the trade to create a crisis of confidence.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): I did not say "joined hands". I said, whether they wanted it or not, they created a situation in which the hoarder found a fertile ground for speculation.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have always believed in the maxim that since we have no sincerometer, we cannot find out what is in the mind of a man. The devil himself cannot find what is in the mind of man.

Shri C. Subramaniam: The hon. Member knows his mind.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know my own mind, because I play with a straight bat, even if the pitch is queered by certain people. I hit straight, I never hit below the belt. I drive to the boundary and you cannot stop it.

The Minister chose to say that the opposition's action resulted in the creation of a crisis of confidence. Where, I ask, does the Minister have his habitation? Is it possible for the opposition to create conditions in this country where this sort of crisis which has taken place is manufactured? On the contrary, the Minister himself has said that the availability of unaccounted money on a big scale to big producers, middlemen and wholesale traders had accentuated this crisis. These offenders get away with impunity, with no fear of punishment. This Government which connives with all these real enemies of the people, even in big cities like Delhi, Calcutta or Bombay, does not take recourse for instance, to the Defence of India Rules, for, dehoarding purposes. Traders in this city of New Delhi, under the benign eye of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi, made a show of displaying prices, but then they discarded the plan, so that they can increase the price before the new crop comes in, before Mr. Subramaniam comes into the picture at all. Right under the nose of the Central Government, traders misbehave and they do not care a tinker's curse for the neck heroics which the Food Minister indulges in this House.

It is a very serious matter. It is no good for the Government merely to say that the opposition has created a crisis of confidence. If the Government cannot deal with a situation like this in the country, it has no business to be where it is. It has lost the confidence of the people. Government does not even help the retailer, the small man, who is getting fed up and frustrated with the wholesaler's tactics. In Calcutta, I know the fish retailers, sick of playing hide

and seek with the public, are willing to sell at the controlled rates, but the wholesalers have their own tactics and Government does not help the retailers.

The Minister thinks that agitation cannot help in the solution of the food and price crisis. Trying to second him in his own peculiar way, my friend who preceded me, Shri Hanumanthaiya, said that the opposition contaminates the pure waters of political life in which he seems to wallow. Agitation does not drop from the skies. Is it open to a few mischief-makers to get the masses of our people to be on the move against Government? Is there anybody in this country today who wants agitation for agitation's sake? Does a man like Mr. Chhatterjee, who is an eminent lawyer and who has been a High Court Judge, think of agitation for agitation's sake? The fact of the matter is—this is where this leadership of the country in the Government has dragged the country—that the public are convinced that the Government would not move without agitation, without struggle, which alone can put the fear of God in the minds of Government and in the minds of those with whom it connives.

Let the Food Minister call us whatever civilised names he can think of, but that does not exonerate his failure. It just does not make sense in a parliamentary way that the Minister comes forward to say "I am very sorry. There is a crisis of confidence, but the opposition is responsible for it. I am sorry I cannot do anything about it." It is a pity that parliamentary conventions in this country have reached such a pass that a Minister tries to foist the blame for a crisis on the head of the opposition and tries to exonerate himself of all blame in this matter. Nothing can exonerate the kind of failure which the food administration has perpetrated. When food stocks were adequate, our people have suf-

ferred. There is no answer to it, morally speaking. I can understand the Government putting in its resignation and coming back again perhaps after re-forming its brigade. It would have had some sense in a parliamentary way, but the kind of behaviour which the Government is showing reduces us to only one alternative and that is, we try to express, with whatever strength or lack of strength we have in this House, the lack of confidence of the people in the administration.

The rise in food prices is only part of the problem which the Government has bungled and mismanaged. There is a general all-round increase in prices, a sort of runaway inflation which Government has been able to do nothing to tackle. Indian planning, just completing 13 not very lucky years, has lacked a national price policy which has been sometimes talked of, but never implemented. Our planning provides no institutional guarantees to enforce such a price policy. Uncontrolled and uncontrollable prices disrupt all plan targets and wipe out whatever welfare gains have been achieved by our people. Our people's patience has been sorely tried and the cup is now full. The Food Minister will base his policy on higher production. He told us the other day of remunerative and incentive prices for the farmer. Well and good. A very good idea which everybody supports. But the pattern which will follow this kind of declaration by Government is very well known and we can guess what is going to happen from previous experience. The real farmer will not get remunerative prices, but the moneyed intermediary, already busy advancing money to the cultivator to grab whatever he can get of the new crop, will pocket the gains and the interest of the consumer everywhere will be disregarded. Prices rise, stabilise at a high level; rise again, are further stabilised. This is an unending spiral which can be

only countered as far as food prices are concerned by an effective system of rationing and controls and that sort of thing, but they are methods which Government cannot operate in a manner different from what is Government's proven speciality, namely, incompetence and corruption.

Perhaps this should be no surprise, this incompetence and corruption. Far from Punjab to Orissa, from UP to Kerala, the Congress seems today to consist of demoralised, selfish groupings who bring no healing touch to the people when they are afflicted whether by floods or by high prices or by any other kind of disaster, a conglomeration of factions with no loyalty to the people, no loyalty to causes but only some sort of understanding that they are behind one boss or the other. At the highest organisational level, the Congress today seems to rely on consensus, on mediocrity and escape from principle. It gives me no pleasure to say this. So many of us have been in the Congress. I can claim to have been in the Congress at a time when some of these colleagues of Shri Shastri had never thought of being even within miles of the Congress organisation. 'Men are we and must grieve when even the shade of that which once was great is passed away'.

That is what has happened to the Congress. Incompetence is only a natural upshot of the degeneration which has taken place in the life of the Congress. That is why we hear so much talk about corruption. Once upon a time perhaps, the former Chief Minister of the Punjab, Shri Kairon, was called the 'one and only Kairon', but he has found many competitors in notoriety. And there is a Chief Minister of Kerala who has just had to get out of the place. He had corruption piled up so high that the former President of the State Congress Committee, the late Shri C. K. Govindan Nair, asked for an investigation. It is a thousand pities that

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee] even Jawaharlal Nehru persuaded himself through a mistaken sense of party loyalty to give a personal verdict and exonerate a man whose record of corruption stinks to high heaven so that he has had to quit.

In regard to Kerala, the Congress has a most unpleasant record of manoeuvring over the so-called liberation struggle against the only honest and popular administration that Kerala ever had . . .

Mr. Speaker: He will confine himself to the Central Government here and not refer to what happened in Kerala.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: On a point of order. This is a very serious point of order. He is making an election speech for the Communist Party of Kerala here. To criticise any State Government or its Chief Minister for corruption when they cannot answer on the floor of the House—I can only characterise it as hitting below the belt.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He is only an 'ex' like Shri Hanumanthaiya.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The hon. member will also soon be an 'ex' if there is a general election—with his antics. Therefore, let him not worry about it. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I am not yielding.

Mr. Speaker: Not yielding to me?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: He must confine himself to decent discussion. I cannot tolerate this . . .

Mr. Speaker: He is not yielding to me. I have already told him that he should confine himself to the Central Government and not go anywhere else to any State.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: But the hon. Member did not listen.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): The matter was referred to the Central Government, but the latter took no steps.

Shri Daji (Indore): There is President's rule there now.

Mr. Speaker: We are not discussing Kerala now.

Shri Daji: This Parliament is responsible for Kerala now.

Shri Sheo Narain (Bansi): On a point of order . . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I hope I shall look after myself.

I am scrupulously trying to confine myself to what is within the ambit of the Central Government. In regard to a State which I have mentioned, namely Kerala, it was essentially the Central Government which had advised the imposition of President's rule on account of what it considered to be the exigencies of a 'liberation struggle'. It was on the advice of the Central Government again that certain changes were made and the 'affair' of Thanu Pillai took place in that State. I only want to say that double or even triple standards of political morality have been observed by the Central Government in relation to a particular State of the Indian Union. I mention this only as a background to the present-day activity of the Central Government, which is an amplification of its earlier role of politically immoral activity. That has happened; I may be wrong as far as you are concerned and your judgment is concerned, but as far as parliamentary responsibility is concerned, I am not going beyond that.

I would therefore wish to say that the Congress has shown what I have just told you, not just double, but triple standards of political morality. And then, the corruption, the incompetence and worse, the defaults

accumulated so much in Kerala that they had to go, the Ministry had to go and then the Government had to intervene and had to come to Parliament and announce again the imposition of President's rule. It is a matter of shame; it is a by-word. The activity of Government in re Kerala is a matter of shame. For instance, such a thing has happened very probably with the Central Government's consent because DIR arrests are made and when DIR arrests are made, the Central Government is kept informed about it. Seven members, seven Communist members of the Kerala Assembly, were arrested at the time when the Congress ministry expected the Muslim League to vote on their side, and in the absence of those seven members, detained without reason, they were expecting to get a majority. It was only when they discovered that the Muslim League would not support them against the no-confidence motion that they released slowly those seven Communist members whom they had taken away. This is a matter which relates to the Central Government. The application of the Defence of India Rules to Kerala is not a matter which affects the judgment of insignificant people who operate in the administration of that part of our country. I am sorry to have to say today that the record of the administration in that part of our country which has justified the introduction of President's rule is something of which one should be ashamed

Mr. Speaker: Whatever be his own impressions and opinions, the DIR is also administered by the States though it is a Central Act. Therefore, we cannot hold the Centre responsible for putting any particular individuals in detention when it is done by the State.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have only said that the Central Government is always informed.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing altogether. But it is the responsibility of the State Government.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I think the Centre cannot escape its responsibility. It is a joint responsibility.

An Hon. Member: The report is there.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot proceed on that basis.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It will be for the Home Minister to repudiate what I have just tried to say, namely that the Centre was in the know in regard to these arrests which have a motivation, a political motivation of the narrowest and most immoral kind, and that is what makes people think in that part of the country, of this Government, the latest leadership, the Government which sits here, are not only incompetent but corrupt at the same time. That is why we find—I am not going to discuss what is happening—that things come up even here, calling attention notices which relate to what happened in U.P.—the former United Provinces, which the late Maulana Mohammad Ali called the Disunited Provinces, where you get such things as the Gonda affair.

I cannot go into details, I would not, there are so many other things, but this is a fact of which we cannot but take cognizance that as many as six Chief Ministers are under a cloud today, and one of the Chief Ministers, namely the one in Orissa . . .

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): Is it desirable, again, that he should refer to people who are not here to defend themselves?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Does he know what I was going to say about him? There was a statement that he was selling his assets and liabilities for one rupee, and then money orders

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

went to him from all parts of India to buy his assets as well as liabilities, and then he said that he was now virtually an undischarged, undeclared insolvent.

Mr. Speaker: What was the responsibility of the Central Government in that connection? The Chief Minister advertised that he was prepared to part with his assets for one rupee, and money orders went there, then he said he was an insolvent. Was that the responsibility of this Government? (*Interruptions*). No. We should remain within the ambit that is allowed for this no-confidence motion. He has said so many things, he might have many more things to say, but that should be about the failures of this Government. We should not go beyond that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I rise on a point of order. You say that in this particular motion of no-confidence we should not mention against the conduct of some Ministers. For instance in Orissa—the hon. Member mentioned Orissa and he mentioned the ex-Chief Minister—our information is that because of the mounting corruption charges, the Centre has deputed the Director of the Central Intelligence Bureau for investigation. Should we not mention it?

Mr. Speaker: No. He would not mention it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No corruption cases can be mentioned?

Mr. Speaker: How can I make a general statement? So far as the Central Government is concerned, every one has the right to mention.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Every morning you, along with others who have the mortification of looking at the newspapers, have to read about the Prime Minister's having parleys with all kinds of people in order to bring about solutions of what are apparently insoluble problems in some parts of the country. And the

Director of Central Intelligence is also deputed.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mukerjee would realise that Mr. Shastri might be doing certain things as a Member of the Congress High Command. There might be many complaints coming to him which he has to deal with. Now for the present, I am concerned with what has been done or permitted to be done by this Government, and not with other things.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): On a point of order. The Prime Minister cannot abdicate his responsibility of looking into the memorial presented to the Government of India through the President, making certain serious allegations against the Orissa Ministers. He is not a Congress leader alone, he is the Prime Minister of this country. He is looking into the matter, and this is the proper forum to highlight a charge like this.

Mr. Speaker: No. It will depend upon the particular matter.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order. The memorial submitted to the Prime Minister and the President against the Chief Minister of Orissa contains among other things this charge also. Therefore, it is relevant.

Mr. Speaker: Was any memorial mentioned by Mr. Mukerjee? Generally, we cannot take all these things that have been happening in the States. If this was the charge that this Government has failed to take action on any petition made or memorial submitted, that would have been a different thing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is what he meant.

Mr. Speaker: How can I say?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You were pleased to stop me at my first sen-

tence relating to Orissa, and you, surely, could not quite anticipate what I was going to say, but I will not labour this point. Enough has come out.

Here is a Government which, in relation to Kerala, in relation to Orissa, in relation to U.P., almost everywhere, has behaved in a manner which shows that it cannot check corruption in its own ranks. People high up in the Congress Party and in the administration so behave that the President has to be pestered with petitions, copies of which I am sure, are received by the Prime Minister in his official capacity. These are matters which are of common knowledge. I shall not go into details, but leave it to some of the other people who know more about the rather stinking performance which is going on in the States.

Inside the Cabinet there are some Ministers on whom Nandaji's Sadachar movement is going to have some effect. I wish to help him to succeed in this movement, which is a very eminently noble one. There are in the Cabinet some Ministers who I say, with all respect, should clear themselves before they can be where they are.

There is one Minister who was the Chief Minister of a State, and because of some prejudicial judicial observations made against him—that is what we saw in the papers—he resigned his Chief Ministership. He arrogated to himself all credit for having given up an office of great power and perquisite and control. And he comes to this House as a Central Minister. I want him to clarify the position, what exactly has happened. If he had to give up his Chief Ministership on account of certain observations about him by a High Court or Supreme Court Judge, then we do not know where we stand, but, of course, he has not thought it fit to clarify his position.

There is another member of the Cabinet. I have got papers which I sent to Jawaharlalji when he was alive, and I also informed Mr. Santhanam about it. He publicly admitted in a statement to the press that he had acquired substantial landed properties—no doubt, with his own money, I am not casting any aspersions, but he had acquired during his pendency as Minister substantial landed properties in one of our big cities through certain benamdars who did Government contracts. The charges appear in the press, and to our embarrassment, some of these charges are also anonymously sent to us about the former Finance Minister and so on and so forth.

A former Deputy Finance Minister is not in this new Government, but we heard about charges against her. We heard about questions being asked in the other House in that regard. We were rather polite here, we never raised this question. Against this particular individual, I have personally nothing but regard, but it is not fair to the person concerned, it is not fair to this House that this sort of thing should remain unclarified.

I do not want to beat a horse which is rather too ugly to look at, but these are matters which are before us. I am not interested in the charges. The charges may be faked, may not be faked, I do not know, but I say that this Government has not the strength of character and the courage to come forward and say that their records are clean when they are besmirched by reports which are having free currency all over the country and also abroad. I have noticed American papers, in particular, utilising this kind of thing to slander the name of our country. That is why I say that this Government should explain their position in regard to these matters.

I refer to corruption not because I am interested in these pettifogging

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]
little operations of X, Y or Z, but because big money, operating in a hundred ugly ways, is behind all this unsavoury business, and it is good that occasionally some effort is made to see that this canker of corruption is eliminated. Shri Nanda may feel embarrassed if I offer him my support, but in my State of West Bengal, the Chief Minister was going to appoint a Sadachar Committee with a retired Chief Justice as Chairman, but he has drawn his horns in after an attack came on the Sadachar Samiti from certain quarters. The Santhanam Committee report must not be pigeon-holed; it must be implemented; its ambit has got to be expanded. The Das Commission report has to be followed up. And similar reports have got to come in regard to so many other things which are reportedly happening in different parts of our country. And I say this because the Prime Minister must satisfy the people. There must be no shielding of wrong-doers. I am a trifle tired with the good intentions which seem to shine in the faces of Shri Shastri or Shri Nanda when I look at them. If they do not have the requisite strength and determination, their good intentions will pave the way to a not very desirable destination.

13.00 hrs.

Meanwhile Shri Shastri has brought together a chaotic team, pulling in different directions, which he calls his Cabinet. They cannot deliver the goods. There is a moral collapse; there is stagnation. The Cabinet is full of go-slowers, the cautious and the unenterprising who are dominating the thinking of the Government. And even the stomach for a real contest of principles seems to be non-existent in the Cabinet. Years of absolute power, money making, licence peddling, and what is called fixing have spread the cult of the *status quo*. That is why targets of the Fourth Plan, approved by Jawaharlal

himself are in danger of being lowered. On the plea of so-called consolidation the direction of the country's economic development is being sought to be altered. When we should find the instruments for speedier and more effective implementation of bigger and bigger development programmes and when a new and purposeful content has to be injected into an expanding effort, Government thinks of curtailing of the present efforts. The idea that smaller and more compact economic effort will yield more substantial results is wrong. Such has never been the answer to poverty in a period of development.

The Government indicates the inclination towards a smaller indigenous effort but a widening of activity on the part of foreign capital. The timorous thinking of Government seeks to cushion its crisis through foreign aid and foreign capital. The Finance Minister and the Minister of Commerce speak very knowingly, when they go abroad, of a new climate in India. Fertiliser production has been opened up on special terms for a United States Consortium. The Minister of Steel and Mines makes a bid for the headlines with thinking aloud on the idea that steel production might be made available for private foreign enterprise. And there is nearly lunatic talk of suspending projects, concentrating on unutilised capacity, de-emphasising heavy industry, etc. etc.

The other day Shri Dandekar spoke about our country needing only an agricultural kind of progress. He forgets that for many years imperialism kept us as an agrarian hinterland of their own metropolitan economy. And he is perpetuating the same sort of thing. And Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is getting plaudits from his new friends: he is very admirable nowadays. Shri Masani said that he is toning down industrial projects relating to heavy industries.

I charge him with having a split personality. He professes to be loyal to the ideals of Jawaharlal Nehru, but he is somewhat incoherent. He seems willing to wound the basic concepts of the Plan but yet afraid to strike. But his hands will be forced at this rate by the neo-pragmatists in his Cabinet. Jawaharlal Nehru himself in his *Autobiography* had quoted what was said once, "You cannot jump over an abyss in two leaps, you have to make a special effort and go across in one jump over the abyss. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri seems to be forgetting it. That is why there is complacency about PL 480. I do not see my friend Shri Patil here. But that is his contribution to the projected decline and fall of the Indian economy. But we are complacent about it.

It was Jawaharlal Nehru who left behind the perspective division papers on the Fourth Plan based on a 7.6 per cent growth-rate which was the minimum necessary to move forward to a self-generating economy. And we discover not only Shri Shastri talking in a doubtful way but Mr. Wood of the World Bank saying that we should concentrate on agricultural work, like Mr. Dandekar says, and that we should not aim at anything more than a five per cent increase. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was almost always a pragmatist, no doubt about it. But his pragmatism had a positive, dynamic role. He kept basic purposes unchanged; he adjusted from time to time only the means of achieving them. The pragmatism in that sense is only a method not a policy in itself. But it is as a policy that pragmatism is being sold, and the way to reaction is paved with these pragmatic bricks which are now being supplied to the country by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

That is why in regard to foreign policy we find a sharp twist given to

the right by the performance of Shri Krishnamachari in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. He tried a sort of bargaining, a sort of horse-trading, by being as eloquent as he could be over Malaysia, hoping that by that means he could get the British to agree to Pakistan not including the Indo-Pakistan reference in the communique. But of course it did not work; he got a rebuff over the Indo-Pakistan relations and his hymns of praise of Malaysia, about which he should be careful. He goes to Kuala Lumpur and unnecessarily butts into a region which at least does not belong to him, which belongs to Shri Swaran Singh. Now that he is here he should look after this sort of thing. And where even America is afraid of "confrontation" problems, he goes into a china shop like a particular animal rushes in and makes all kinds of statements. Then again, what hurt this country most of all is that when the Finance Minister accompanied by another Minister, went to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference he took a tepid stand in regard to the rights of the African people. That is why a man like General Ayub could pose as a champion of the Afro-Asian people in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and in the London press conferences which were held. He did not take the kind of forthright stand which would have come naturally to a man like Shri Shastri or Shri Nanda if they had happened to go to the London conference. He did not do that. After all, he has come to the Congress only the other day. After all, he has never shared the exhilaration which some of us on this side have had in our days in the Congress. How can we expect a man like that to represent this country?

When Jawaharlal used to be in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences he would raise the dignity of our country in the eyes of the world. But Shri Krishnamachari has

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

brought back indignity, he has brought back a picture which is by no means pretty to behold. And that is why we feel that the Finance Minister and his like should not be trusted with the governance of the people or the honour of our India.

That is why—I wish to conclude now—I have recalled from time to time the Prime Minister who has passed away, and every time we use the expression Prime Minister we think of the man who is gone. In the last months of his life he was stricken in health. He was burdened by work which would have broken the back of anybody half his age. He was surrounded by people who had either never known or had forgotten the passion of that trust with destiny about which he spoke so beautifully at midnight on the 15th August, 1947. But to the end that man was a non-conformist, he was an experimenter searching for clarity and perspectives, determined to find the answer to the problems of India. I see there my friend Shri S. K. Dey, Minister of Community Development, and he told us at a meeting of the National Council of Community Development how he had seen Jawaharlal a short while before he died, talking on some aspect or other of community development. And he had told him "Look here, we have to hurry, there is very little time". That was the sense of urgency which he had about it. And that is why he wrote on a pad those words of an American poet. Robert Frost:

"The woods are lovely, dark
and deep,
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

We too, Sir, have our promises to keep; we too have miles to go before we sleep. If Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and his friends do not remember

their responsibility, if they are taken in by the words of praise which are thrown to him by the Swatantra stalwarts in this House and in the country, God help India.

That is all that I have to say, Sir.

Shri Khadilkar: Mr. Speaker, Sir on this occasion certain grave issues are raised and I do not want to counter the opposition arguments in the manner of a country lawyer. Last year, Acharya Kripalani moved a no-confidence motion in this House and it was of the same omnibus nature, one line motion and it was supported by groups or heterogeneous elements from the Opposition. This time the same type of motion has been put forward by an independent Member. There is a difference and that is that on the last occasion the Communist Party dissociated itself, declaring its faith in Nehru's leadership; they wanted the reorganisation of the Cabinet then. On this occasion, the Swatantra Party has kept out and lent some support to the Government hoping perhaps that Government might be persuaded to toe their lines in future. This is the situation in which we are discussing the no-confidence motion.

The issues raised are of fundamental nature, some of them. Some are frivolous. Therefore, I shall take what has been said by the Swatantra spokesman and what has been said by the communist right leader, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee. Let me dispose of Mr. Mukerjee first (Interruptions.) I was surprised when I heard the speech of the right wing communist party leader because on 15th August the party organ the *New Age* pleaded for a united front with this Government. Not only that. I know and I am prepared to produce documentary evidence even now to show that the right wing communists are prepared to form a coalition with the Congress Government. (Interruptions.)

Shri Daji: Produce that document.

Shri Khadilkar: When that is the assessment of the situation by the Communists, it does not lie in the mouth of the communist leader, when certain fundamental issues are discussed, to just highlight certain failings of the Government . . . (*Interruptions.*) I have studied the documents of the right wing and the left wing and with a full sense of responsibility I am making this statement.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been ruled in this House when we refer to a particular document, we can ask that that particular document be placed on the Table of the House and the Chair has generally upheld such a request. Therefore, we appeal to you to ask Mr. Khadilkar to place before the House the document which he says he has in his possession, to prove that the Communist Party of India has asked for a coalition with the Congress Government?

Mr. Speaker: Mere reference or mention of the document does not compel a Member to put in that document here. If some part of it is quoted or mention is made about that, then I can certainly compel him to do so. Otherwise, he has to substantiate it.

Shri Daji: The ruling is that you should substantiate what you have said. . . . (*Interruptions.*) It is absolutely a false statement; we will have no coalition with this Congress Government.

Shri Khadilkar: They say, Sir, that there is a good progressive section on this side and they are prepared to form a united front with them; they go even further and say: if this progressive section prevails, to strengthen them we are prepared to form even a united front. . . .

Shri Daji: That is quite different from a coalition Government.

Shri Khadilkar: Please listen. Their conclusion is logical. I am not interested in intra-party controversies. Sir, they have taken a lot of time.

13.15 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

At the present juncture, the Swatantra Party finds it convenient to offer some sort of a support to the Government. How far will it be helpful to the Government? Accepting that support how far shall we be adhering to our policy laid down by the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? On these questions, we will have to disabuse the mind of this House and the public at large that we do not want to give up those policies. The high priest of that party has made it clear since Panditji's death that his party Shri Rajagopalachari should soft-pedal. He is a great strategist. The other day Mr. Masani spoke on the food debate. Shri Dandekar spoke on this motion. They have projected their philosophy. On the last occasion, Shri Masani condemned the leadership of Nehru while speaking on that motion. On that occasion, I said that Mr. Masani was driving a wedge and that he wanted to isolate Nehru and advised the Congress Party to disown him and disown his policies. Therefore, we must be very cautious about this support that is coming now.

What is it that is being discussed in this House? Is it the seventeen years of Panditji's rule? Is it the legacy that he left us that is to be debated? Or, is it certain failures of the Government in specific fields like food or prices or corruption? My humble submission is that the issues are being mixed up. If the Opposition takes advantage of this situation and tries posthumously to bring before this House a vote of censure on a leader no less in stature than that of Pandit Nehru and his policy which we have endorsed from time to time. I feel that this is the time when the party and the Government must rebut everything that has been said from the Opposition on this aspect of basic policy. Fortunately, for me, only yesterday in Moscow our President has put in a nutshell what our policy is: anti-capitalism or

[Shri Khadilkar]

socialism at home and anti-imperialism abroad. This policy has emerged from the national struggle that we waged against our foreign masters. What is the legacy of Pandit Nehru? He evolved a consensus; many people make fun of it. I have heard it. But what is the national consensus or ideological consensus that was evolved by Pandit Nehru during the last 17 years of his rule in this country? What is the assessment of an independent political observer? Here I shall quote what Morris-Jones has said about the base on which this country stands.

He says:

"Perhaps (it is a possibility to be admitted) India without Nehru's leadership might not so firmly have acquired this political system, might not have been able so quickly to let it take clear shape. But now the network of canal courses along which power has to run is cut deep into the political soil and limits are set. No one will quite walk in Nehru's exact footsteps, but Nehru's great achievement may be to have made this unnecessary. There is a good path. Nehru laid the path."

This is the assessment of a great scholar who has studied our parliamentary system and written a very classical monograph about it. You must have seen it. If this is the position, the democratic superstructure that is standing, the structure on which India is standing today, look at the wide world. Everywhere it has crumbled; nowhere have the parliamentary, representative institutions survived 17 or 18 years after freedom. Why? Because the common people's urges are not contained within the democratic framework and that is Nehru's legacy. He has laid down a durable democratic foundation for our institutions and if the present Government is taken unawares, perhaps unwittingly, if the extended support of Rajaji on the basis of cer-

tain policy projection is accepted, I think the basis of this democratic superstructure will be shattered and undermined. I would like to warn this Government and the people and the Parliament, because today, after Panditji's death, what is happening? With his vision, he has seen the widening horizons of history. He has seen the emerging world in which issues of peace, co-existence and socialism were the primary issues of peace before the independent nations all over the world. In such a context, we are supposed to debate these issues.

I am not prepared to take in what Shri Dandekar said the other day very lightly. He thought that this was a Board Meeting. He referred to this as if we were share-holders and we were interested in speculation and equity market and how our economy affects it. I am puzzled. He does not realise the things; he made fun because there is decentralisation. But he has not yet gone to the processes of democracy. The kind of dynamics of politics that this country has adopted made it clear it is not a formal democracy. There we stood. It is an active participation of the people at various levels which has been encouraged. It might have resulted in some sort of abuse; there might be a few pedlars of influence in the countryside, as he mentioned the other day, who might be making use of the power and prestige for their selfish ends, but that does not mean that this political process, the active participation of the people should be discouraged or condemned in this House, because this House not only has given a Constitution; it is there; it is the charter. It is the basis of the sovereignty of the people. But it has encouraged the active participation at different levels and in different institutions, co-operatives and other things. That is the important aspect.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khanmam): We had 80 per cent of the elections which were unanimous.

Shri Khadilkar: What did he advocate? Let us try to analyse it. He said that let this country restrict itself and concentrate on agricultural production, first, and import steel. What does this mean? It means that this country should remain the hinterland of backwardness in the advancing world. I would like to appeal to the Government to realise that the compulsions of the situation demand that we must advance faster on a bigger scale and whatever the difficulties, you cannot have development without tears. There are bound to be difficulties; there is bound to be storm; there is bound to be stress and inflationary pressure. You have got to counteract them, but one basic thing is, we in this country are not going to remain the raw material producing hinterland of the advancing countries of the west.

Dr. M. S. Aney: No agriculture?

Shri Khadilkar: He has made an argument—and I entirely agree with him—that we must curtail the import of food. Certainly! About the importation of food, sometimes the people feel how long this subsistence economy has to be maintained, because, for the last 10 years, 25 per cent of the wheat we consume is coming from PL 480. How long is it to continue? I will come to the food question a little later. But when I said this consensus aspect, I want to point out to this House one thing: the idea of consensus was not some inner voice of some Congress leaders which elected our new leader, Shri Shastri, on whom the mantle of leadership of this country has fallen after Pandit Nehru. The consensus was evolved, within the democratic superstructure. At the present juncture he said that if you want to avoid the model of class conflict and keep the ideological temper low, you must try to reach some sort of agreement on the basis of which we can make advance, and that consensus, according to me, is reflected and very properly reflected in the resolution on socialism and democracy that the party has adopted

recently. Therefore, I humbly submit to my friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee, that the consensus is not an idea. It is part and parcel of that heritage. Are we going to debunk it because Panditji is no more? Are the Swatantra party trying to debunk the idea of planning and debunk the idea of non-alignment? The other day in Delhi the Swatantra spokesman said that we should have a military pact with the west. So, for military protection, he is ready to take the western umbrella; for other things, the western imports; and you go after the ploughs as you used to go and be proud of your freedom. What did Panditji do during his lifetime? He consolidated the freedom and made India a proud nation in the eyes of the world, and he forged new links with the world outside.

Our Foreign Minister is moving about meeting our neighbours. The declaration made in Moscow only yesterday—our President is now in Moscow—and the declaration made from Ceylon reflect the legacy of Pandit Nehru. The Opposition or those friends who attack our foreign policy as well as planning, the spokesmen of the Swatantra Party, ought to realise that.

The main question today before this House is this. It is not proper for me to maintain that the Government has not committed mistakes; no Government can claim that. Shri Lohia has passed a no-confidence vote on the whole Opposition yesterday publicly and he has said that the Opposition has failed the people more than the Government. I do not know whether the report is correct. Already he has passed a vote of no-confidence in the Opposition *vis-a-vis* the people. When I say that, we must look at these problems from this angle: there is the question of food and food policy; there is the question of corruption. Can we say that in what has been done we have not committed mistakes? I do not think we can carry conviction with the people. The basic policy is there; but certain mistakes are committed; they must be

[Shri Khadilkar]

avoided and it is the duty of Parliament—all put together and it is not a party issue—to avoid mistakes in the future.

When the ex-Finance Minister, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, delivered the Dada-bhai Naoroji Lectures at Bombay, he gave a warning to the Government. He said because the party has an inherent tradition of a certain allergy to controls it will come to grief. Today, so far as the food question is concerned, it is not a question of arguing or fighting. It is not merely a question of carrying conviction with the people. The task we have to perform is this: we have to live a life linked with the life of the people, and then alone democracy will have some meaning and life in it. Therefore, in that context, I would say that a long-range policy for the last 15 years is lacking. It was a hand-to-mouth policy that has been prevailing so far. It is for the first time the other day that the new Food Minister said, "I want to lay down an all-India food policy; and an all-India price policy." This is a good thing, and I wish him success. I wish all the opposition parties also will lend full support to his effort at coming to a conclusion and laying down a long-term policy so far as food is concerned.

But one thing must be made clear. We have inherited, because of the old colonial rule, a certain tradition of business and trade in this country. In colonial rule the traders and businessmen had acquired a tradition of speculation and hoarding. Is this Government, when it says that it stands for socialism, going to tolerate any longer this old tradition of being tied down by the threats of wholesalers and deviate from its course?

Secondly, regarding inflation and prices, in the west, when the Labour Party was in power, Sir Stafford Cripps was in charge and he laid down a policy. He said: "This is an era of austerity and it is the duty of the Government to protect the lives of

the common people and insulate them against the price rises because in this period of shortages certain rises are inevitable." Unfortunately, because of certain lacunae in our planning this self-insulating mechanism within the planning framework is completely lacking and, therefore, we have come to this pass. I am not sure whether we shall be able even to stabilise the prices at the present level if we follow the advice of Shri Dandekar. He has a distinguished career. He was a head executive. He is a great economist. I know he argued his case in a board-meeting-manner and we are likely to be taken in. What is the purpose? Obviously, to keep a grip on the consumer industry? In this country, I know, there is consumer goods shortage. There is free market in the consumer goods industry and people are making fortunes. He posed the question of monopoly. I may point out that in the cement industry the majority of production is controlled by only three houses. Is it not a monopoly tendency, I would like to ask him. What is monopoly needs to be defined, and Government is right when it appointed a commission to go into this aspect. I have no time, otherwise I can give figures regarding the dispersal of industries; but one point is clear, that unless the Finance Minister is prepared to make a co-ordinated approach, determine the priorities and take a firm stand regarding insulating the lives of the common people against the vagaries of traders and fluctuations in production by evolving a very long-term policy regarding food, we will not be able to save the situation. We should not give any false sense of relief. We will have to suffer this crisis for a long time. We will have to live through the crisis, and a developing country like ours cannot escape this responsibility. We cannot make any promise, because it would be a false promise. Because one year's harvest is good, we cannot immediately dispense with all controls and other machineries. The next year's harvest may be bad and

then we will have to say that we have no machinery. This type of hand-to-mouth living of a Government, of a great country presided over so long by a great man like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is not becoming of anyone. It is difficult to carry conviction to the people. Therefore, on certain policy matters a little self-critical and self-analytical approach is more convincing than saying that we are doing this and we are doing that.

Then, one word about corruption. There is a lot of talk about it. The Santhanam Committee was appointed. When it was having its deliberations, I remember an occasion when the question came as to whether the political plane should be included in it, the then Home Minister—he is now our Prime Minister—Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had a discussion with us and he said: "The immediate necessity is to improve the social climate and if you think it is necessary certainly you can make recommendations." I would like to plead with the Opposition that when the atmosphere was slightly poisoned, slightly demoralised for the first time without waiting further the then Home Minister took the initiative and appointed the Committee. Now it is for us, this House and the Government, to take whatever measures are feasible within their competence. Then, there is the Das Commission. This Das Commission is a historical landmark. We in this country are prepared to expose a Chief Minister who was a good administrator for several years (*Interruption*). The Government did not deter from its duty. The Government published the report and the findings are before this House.

Therefore, I would plead with this House one thing. In a developing economy, what is the nature of corruption has been clearly brought out in the first chapter of Santhanam Committee's report. You cannot wish away corruption. It is a social problem. It is not simply a moral problem. *Sadachar* and other things help to create an atmosphere for that. To

that extent they are good. But they are not the final solution. I would, therefore, plead with the new Prime Minister that in this country and at this juncture—because in western countries there are studies made about corruption—we need not be ashamed. I have studied those reports. No doubt, this corruption is corroding the very foundation of our society and our moral integrity. I entirely agree there. But we must take a perspective view, a proper view of it. The Opposition clamouring here day in and day out saying that we are corrupt is not going to help the process of eradicating corruption. About the Government at the Centre and in the States, whoever might have taken the reins, the people must not feel doubtful about its character or its integrity. It is a question of conviction. Nobody should sit on the Government Benches who has no conviction regarding socialism or democracy. Character, conviction and competence or merit are the three things that are called for, whoever may sit there. On this basis only they will be respected by the people and they will be able to carry conviction to the people regarding their policies.

Shastriji has taken over the responsibility of this country at a critical time. We are in a period of new transition because a towering personality has disappeared. We feel his absence every moment of our life. Though he is no more he is with us ideologically. He is with the masses because he has generated an awakening in the mind of our masses. That is our strength. At this juncture this House should have full confidence in him and in his capacity to face the people not only in this country but in the wider world. We are not alone. Our relations with our neighbours, our relations with the Soviet Union or the people in the communist camp, the Socialist camp and in the west, are being watched.

At this juncture, the task before the new leadership is this. It is imperative at this stage to maintain order in

[Shri Khadilkar]

the midst of change to hold the temper of political struggle low and to maintain a balance between co-operative and competitive elements in the operation of democratic institutions. The work of consolidation and integration is not yet over. The task is to meet the impending critical problems with equanimity, to keep the ideological temper low and to put down with a strong hand the forces of disruption whenever they raise their ugly head. As Shri Mukerjee reminded, not only the Prime Minister, we are proud of the heritage of Nehru and what he taught us. It is not simply non-alignment, peace, socialism and democracy but the legacy of consensus of ideological and other nature. If we are loyal to him, we must keep the promises made with our people.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the other day in this House when more than fifty Members got up in support of the no-confidence motion I was more amazed than shocked. But I was surprised that Shri J. B. Kripalani and the members of the Swatantra Party, who were the most vocal in bringing the no-confidence motion resolution last year, were silent. But the cat was out of the bag when I heard the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Dandekar, a former member of the Indian Civil Service, which has been described in this country as neither 'Indian' nor 'Civil' or 'Service'. I do not want to quote extensively from his speech, but a sentence I would like to read before you. He said, that he does not believe that the people ought to be hanged for the sins of their fathers. Again he has stated that there is one overwhelming personality who over the past seventeen years has been the *de facto* government in this country. The cat is out of the bag. We realised for the first time that the party to which Shri Dandekar belongs has neither a policy nor a programme, nothing except opposing the Congress. The only thing noticeable in them is that they have been allergic to our

late great Prime Minister, that they have been allergic to the liberator of this country, that they were mad with the person who had brought freedom to this country, who had placed big business in its place and ended the princely order in this country; this is what the country should realise. Here I want to tell Shri Dandekar that today Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri may be the Prime Minister—he is the Prime Minister—but it is the reflection of that man which guides this country, it is the reflection of that great personality which will lead this country and, as far as this country is concerned, it will stand like a huge rock on the great heritage that we have got from Jawaharlal Nehru. I can go still further and say that if any government comes—I do not visualize any such government—which deviates from the policies and programmes enunciated by that great personality, that government will not continue even for a day. Therefore, to think that this government at any time will deviate either from the foreign policy or domestic policy or fiscal policy enunciated by one of the greatest men that this country has seen, by one of the greatest men that this world has seen, is to live in a fool's paradise. Let it be clearly understood.

I find that the members of the Jan Sangh, members of the SSP, members of the Right Wing and Left Wing of the Communist Party are in support of this resolution. I would like to ask my hon. friends on that side of the House, what is common between them. My hon. friend, Shri H. V. Kamath of the SSP is not here at present and perhaps he would be annoyed with me. He would like, his party would like, Congressmen to ride on horse backs, unsheathe their swords and march on to Assam and unto Peking. Shri Anandan Nambiar is angry with us that when we receive rude letters from Mr. Chou-En-lai we do not reply them by love letters. Shri Hiren Mukerjee is too urbane to have any motives but probably he is afraid

of being described as Rightist in his own ranks; so he wants to swing towards the Left by attacking the Congress. Therefore, can such a resolution, can such a motley crowd, bring about a change in government?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: All are united that this Government should go.

Shri Ansar Harvani: I quite agree with Shri Banerjee that all of them are united that this government should go. But in spite of their unity, this government will not go. Even if this government were to go, what will happen? Will they be able to form a government? This motely crowd will not be able to form a government. We have seen when once the Communist Party formed a government in Kerala what was the fate of it. In other States also we have seen what they have done.

The greatest misfortune of my friends like Shri S. M. Banerjee is that they have joined camp with Shri U. M. Trivedi and other reactionaries who are sitting on that side of the House. There should be unity of purpose, unity of objective, unity of programme, unity of policy, something positive; unity of negativity is absurd and even infantile.

Therefore, as far as this government is concerned, it has been in Power only for the last three months. As far as the foreign policy is concerned, not one single change has been made in that policy during this period. Last time when we discussed the no-confidence resolution, the gallant knights of the Swatantra Party accused us of following the non-alignment policy. They demanded that here and now we should give up the non-alignment policy and join the Western camp, because they expected that huge arms aid will be received by this country only when we give up our policy of non-alignment. But, as a result of our policy of non-alignment, only yesterday, our Defence Minister has returned from the Soviet Union after signing an agreement for massive military aid. If we had given up the non-

alignment policy, would it have been possible to get massive military aid, massive economic aid that we are getting from the East European countries? If non-alignment had been given up, would it have been possible to have a Bokaro in this country? Of course, Shri Dandekar would not like to have a Bokaro in this country. Because, if he has his way, the people of this country will be reduced to hewers of wood and drawers of water, depending on agriculture with the same old plough and no industries.

Then we have been attacked for our domestic policies. As we all know, a few months back as a result of the provocation in Eastern Pakistan, certain parts of our country were in the grip of riots. I take this opportunity to pay my tribute to our great Home Minister, who fought this tendency with iron hands. He brought peace in Calcutta, Jamshedpur and other parts of the country where communal riots were threatened. The wonderful work that the Home Minister has done in this matter will go down in the history as a great work for national integration, for keeping and maintaining the unity of this country.

Then, much has been talked about corruption. We have been talking about corruption for years. Corruption is not a new thing. But to say that this government has failed to fight corruption is a statement which I cannot understand. There were charges of corruption against a powerful Congressman, a former member of the Working Committee, a powerful Chief Minister. The Das Commission was appointed and within three days of the receipt of its report, the recommendations of the Das Commission were implemented. I ask, has any government, has any democratic government in the whole world, implemented the recommendation of an independent commission within three days? It was not delayed for more than 48 hours and that is a tribute to our government.

In the field of economy, I quite admit that the food situation is bad. I

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

quite admit that the people living in some parts of the country are suffering due to shortage of food. I quite agree that much can be done to relieve the food situation. But we cannot solve the food situation by just attacking the government by *Maharashtra bandh*, by *Bharat bandh*, by *Delhi bandh* and that sort of demonstrations. I would like my hon. friends on that side of the House, instead of engineering these agitations of *Maharashtra bandh*, *Bharat bandh* and so many *bandhs*, to go to the villages and to teach our half-educated or semi-educated peasantry in the modern ways of agriculture. If they do some such constructive work, that will be more useful to the country.

Then, this no-confidence resolution has become an annual feature. Last year it was brought up and it created a lot of sensation. Then Shri J. B. Kripalani was the sponsor and the greatest supporter of that resolution was the Swatantra Party. This time they are sitting silent, hoping against hope that there may be some division within our ranks.

An Hon. Member: You are already divided.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Let me tell them, we are not divided; we are standing like a rock with the heritage of a great man and we will continue to march with the traditions of Jawaharlal Nehru. As long as this country is led by the Indian National Congress, which is the inheritor of the traditions of the glorious and progressive outlook of Jawaharlal Nehru, India will march towards peace, freedom and progress.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Aney.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, may I sit down and speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to in-

tervene in this momentous debate at this early stage.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee, one of the most eminent members of the Supreme Court Bar and a jurist of great reputation, introduced the motion in a speech that was heard with wrapt attention by the whole House. In explaining why he was pressing the present no-confidence motion, he categorically referred to the following eight grounds, namely, the failure to protect our economic independence; utter dependence on foreign imports of food; increasing submission to private monopolists; failure to hold the price-line; failure to provide security of life and property; failure to maintain purity of elections; failure to protect the interests of our nationals abroad and failure to maintain territorial integrity of the country. These are some of the grounds on which, he was compelled to take this step. I adopt them all as my own grounds also.

Some hon. Members of this House feel that though the charge-sheet is a formidable one and well-grounded in facts, events and incidents for which the present Ministry, which is only a baby of not more than three months old, cannot be held responsible. There is some show of plausibility about this contention. It is, however, the same political party, which was in power for 17 years, which is in power now and the members of this Ministry and of the political party had been among the supporters of the policies which the first Congress ministry followed since the declaration of India's independence. The plea of alibi is not available to them. To remove all doubt, the Prime Minister in his speech on assumption of office had unequivocally declared that the change of ministry does not mean any change of policy. Their occupation of the high office, at least by some of them, may be three months old, but their association with the policies and their authors has been as old as the life of the Indian Republic itself.

To the long list of formidable charges I want to add a few more. They mostly arise out of the failure of the Government to carry out some of the most important obligations imposed upon the Union Government by the Constitution itself.

The founders of the Constitution gave the people of India in their capacity as their representatives in the Constituent Assembly a Constitution, a common name to their motherland, its geographical limits and boundaries, fundamental rights, a President, a Supreme Court, two Houses of Parliament, common national flag and a common official language with Devanagari script. These are the essential elements of which the Indian democracy is made by the founders of the Constitution.

I will first take up the question of official language. Under article 343, the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script and the English language was permitted to be used for a period of 15 years for all official purposes for which it was being used before the commencement of the Constitution. In article 344 detailed instructions were given for the appointment of a committee and a commission for the sake of making preparations to instal Hindi duly in the place of official language of the Union. At the end of 15 years a special officer for linguistic minorities' interests was to be appointed and under article 351 directions were given for the development of the Hindi language, particularly to enrich Hindi by assimilation of the phrases and usages of the regional languages which were to be recognised as the official languages of the States.

This whole programme of building up the official language of the Union and the official languages of the States drawn up with particular care by the Constituent Assembly has been culpably neglected by the present Government. Not only that; by recently

passing the English Language Bill the fate of Hindi as the official language has been kept hanging in suspense indefinitely.

A great duty was neglected deliberately and a new policy was adopted by which the nation will be using the English language as the official language to the dismay and disgrace of independent India for an indefinite period. I recently found that some of the statues of the Viceroys and Governors-General are being removed and kept in some obscure corner of the museum in Delhi. It is a good move so far as it goes, but it cannot serve the purpose of kindling up the spirit of national unity and national solidarity in the hearts of young India so long as you keep alive the English language as the official language of the Indian Republic. Silent statues of marble and bronze, an eye-sore to the liberty-loving citizens of free India were only relics of our foreign domination that had now no power to influence the Indian people, but the retention of the English language as a subject of serious study for 10 or 12 years more and as a medium of instruction in colleges and universities and giving it a dignified status as the official language of India does prolong the day of the birth and growth of the Indian culture on account of its dampening influence on the minds of the young men and women of India. It is a standing hurdle in the way of India's full growth to its own stature according to its own genius. By the declaration of independence we have only thrown out the coat of external slavery and foreign domination, while we are strenuously trying to retain the inner garment what the Vedantists call as *Karandeha*, which influences the thought and the ideals and which moulds the character of the country. The Congress Ministry, in my opinion, has been guilty of culpable negligence of its first and foremost duty on account of its policy of indecision, hesitancy and tendency to compromise at the sacrifice of the principle of nationalism itself.

[Dr. M. S. Anney]

Now I turn to the second charge that I wish to add to the list of charges which my learned friend, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, has read out. It is the charge of faithlessness of the Congress Party to the spirit of the very Constitution under which the elections were held placing them in power. During the last 17 years the Congress Party had approached the Parliament 17 times to amend the Constitution. Some students of constitutional law had brought it to the notice of the members of this House that the American Constitution which is more than one hundred years old has been amended not more than 15 times during this long period. That may be taken as a measure of the sanctity in which the Americans hold their Constitution. The Government of India generally comes to the House for an amendment of the Constitution whenever a High Court or the Supreme Court holds that any Act of the State is *ultra vires* of any article of the Constitution or of the fundamental rights. They submit to the judgment of the Supreme Court only for the sake of approaching the Parliament for amendment of the very constitutional provision itself. And very often they introduce in their amending Bills a clause to give a retrospective effect. Insertion of a retrospective clause is the euphemistic way of telling the Supreme Court that the executive Government will not allow the march of the administrative machinery to be hindered by the decisions of the Supreme Court. That is the way in which it is done. You change the law.

14.00 hrs.

Now, I must bring to the attention of the House only two cases. First is the article relating to rights to freedom as enumerated in article 19 of the Constitution dealing with the Fundamental Rights. This was amended in 1951 by what is known as Constitution (First) Amendment 1951, Section 3. It is a substitution for original clause (2) with retrospective effect. The

effect of this amendment is to leave the arbitrary powers exercised by the executive authorities by operating existing laws completely unaffected although they may be opposed to the liberty conferred under article 19. Now, the result is that the fundamental right to liberty conferred under article 19 does not exist and never existed in respect of matters mentioned in sub-clauses 2 to 6 of the clause as amended. This is an example of the scant courtesy shown by the Ministry to the Constitution.

In spite of the Constitution, all the arbitrary and discretionary powers which are more or less of a dictatorial nature exercised by the executive under the old pre-Constitution laws are in operation. The Constitution is to that extent a dead letter.

Now, the Members of this House know that one of the cardinal principles enunciated under the chapter on Fundamental Rights is under article 13 that laws inconsistent with or in derogation of the Fundamental Rights shall be void. This was not meant to apply to laws to be made thereafter but to all laws in force in the territory of India immediately before the Constitution.

The original Constitution specifically provided that no person shall be deprived of his property by the authorities without payment of adequate compensation even for a public purpose. Evidently, the question of compensation was a justiciable one. The provision was intended to safeguard the rights of private property against inroads on them by the State or the Union Government bringing about a change in the conception of property such as the socialistic pattern invariably implies. There were enthusiasts among the Congress Ministries in certain States and they were anxious to introduce land reforms on socialistic lines. They soon discovered that the Constitution by providing

for adequate compensation as a necessary condition for acquisition of land has thrown a great obstacle in the march to the desired goal of socialism, a social revolution. I have had long talks with Sardar Patel and Dr. Rajendra Prasad on this question of adequate compensation when I had to concern myself more intimately to understand the nature of the far-reaching reforms which a Minister of Bihar was anxious to introduce in the State of Bihar. The matter went before the Supreme Court and the right of the State to acquire property without adequate compensation was not held tenable under the Constitution. That is the genesis of the Constitution (Fourth) Amendment Act of 1955.

The original clause 31 of the Constitution was substituted by the amended clause 31 and two new articles 31A and 31B. The articles 31, 31A and 31B are sweeping in their effect and brought the land-holder who regarded himself as safely entrenched under the articles of the Constitution as they originally stood, face to face with a socialist revolution which virtually negated the institution of private property to a very great extent at least when they want acquisition for what they regard as a public purpose.

I make bold to say that this whole change of the conception of private property, the vesting of extra-ordinary rights in the State for acquisition and keeping the decisions of the executive officers outside the jurisdiction of the judiciary was unfurling the standard of a social revolution and was wholly in violation of the principles in which Mahatma Gandhi and his thousand and one followers in the Constituent Assembly and in the country implicitly believed. Socialist revolution is in the ultimate analysis based on the principle of class-war, a principle Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress had always regarded as dangerous and wholly unacceptable. The theory of trust which Mahatmaji propounded and wanted to be the basis for the economic policy of India is openly rejected by those

who have manoeuvred to bring about this cataclysmic change in the economy of India, the consequences of which are now showing themselves in the growth of unrest among the general public, want of respect for the rule of law among the citizens and absence of discipline among the students. These are serious symptoms and I pray Almighty that He may guide the people and their leaders who are in office or out of office rightly and help them to steer the ship of the State safely between Charybdis of the socialism and Scylla of the communism. Services are getting sceptical and the pious purposes sometimes meet with obstruction.

I conclude with a quotation from Manu, the first law giver of mankind:

अदंडयन दंडयन राजा,
दंडनश्चैव दंडयन,
अयगो पशुदाप्नोति ।

The king that punishes those who should not be punished and does not punish those who ought to be punished is censured by the people at large. I shall not repeat the last line in the hope that through the grave of God a new light will flash and a new way may be opened so that the crisis that threatens our nation may be avoided.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव इस सदन में और इस सदन के इतिहास में हमारी इस लोकतंत्रीय प्रणाली के इतिहास में दुबारा रखा गया है। वैसे लोकतन्त्रात्मक प्रणाली का व्यवहार और उस की व्यवस्था यह होनी चाहिए कि हम जब यह समझ लें कि अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के माध्यम से हम देश के जनमानस को तैयार कर सकते हैं और सरकार के सत्कार्ण्ड दल की दुर्बलताओं का उल्लेख कर के हम एक ऐसा जनमानस तैयार कर सकते हैं कि हम सरकार को बदल दें और सरकार के स्थान पर विरोधी दल स्वयं बैठ जाय।

[श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय]

किसी भी स्वस्थ प्रणाली का आधार यह होना चाहिए कि विरोधी दल के पास शक्ति हो, विचारों की मान्यता हो और राष्ट्र का समर्थन हो। इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर जब वह आये तो एक यह सत्ता हो कि हम सरकार को बदल सकते हैं। पिछली बार देश के कर्णधार आचार्य कृपलानी ने एक अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव रक्खा था। उस के समर्थन में 73 लोग खड़े हुए। बड़े बड़े भाषण हुए सरकार की बड़ी आलोचना हुई। उस के बाद क्या हुआ ? वह प्रस्ताव धराशायी हो गया। आलोचनाएं अपने स्थान पर कुंठित हो गई और सारे देश का समर्थन हमारे साथ रहा, कांग्रेस दल की तरफ रहा। क्या ही अच्छा होता कि जनमानस तैयार किया जाता। आप का बहुमत 50-50 और 49-51 के बराबर हो और यह निर्णय देश पर छोड़ दिया जाय। यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव है। यह चार्ज हैं, यह आरोप हैं और जनता का समर्थ मिले। आप जिस तरफ बैठे हुए हैं वहां से बदल कर उस तरफ बैठें जहां हमारे प्रधान मंत्री शास्त्री जी बैठे हैं। एक अच्छी बात हो सकती है, एक स्वस्थ प्रणाली की बात हो सकती है। देश का वरडिक्ट ले लीजिए और अगर वह आप को फेर करे तो आगे आ इधर आ कर बैठिये। लेकिन यह कल्पना हो कि चार सतरों के प्रस्ताव को रख कर अष्टाचार, देश की विभिन्नता, फूट, मंत्रिमंडल की फूट, खाद्यान्न की कमी और वस्तुओं के भावों के बढ़ने के कारणों को रख कर आप यह चाहें कि सरकार को हम बदल दें तो आप उस में सफल नहीं हो सकते हैं। इन कारणों को आप ला सकते हैं लेकिन सरकार को बदलने की क्षमता आप में नहीं है, सत्ता आप में नहीं है। इस प्रकार की प्रवचना और वितण्डावाद इस सदन में उपस्थित किया जाये, सिवाय इस के कि आरोप लगाये जायें, मैं समझता हूं कि यह प्रजातंत्र की स्वस्थ प्रणाली के विरुद्ध है और इस से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता है।

कौन सी ऐसी बात है कि विरोधी दल ने कही हो और उस को हम ने न कहा हो ? खाद्य स्थिति को ले लीजिये। आज से नहीं, श्रीमन्, डंके की चोट पर सदैव हम ने इस बात को कहा है। हम ने फैंक्ट्स एंड फीगर्स, अंक और गणित, स्टैटिस्टिक्स देकर यह कहा है कि हम ने 3.5 के प्रोडक्शन की तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में कल्पना की थी लेकिन वह घट गया। हम समझते थे कि तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्त में 100 मिलियन टन अनाज होगा लेकिन नहीं हुआ। हम ने इस बारे में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा। जब हम ने देखा कि हमारे अपने देश में अनाज की कमी है तो हम ने फिर अमरीका से पी० एल० 480 के मातहत निगोशिएट किया। यह बात कह देना बहुत आसान है कि हम एक दाना भी अन्न का बाहर से नहीं मंगाएंगे। ऐसा करना हमारे स्वाभिमान के विरुद्ध है। यह बात बड़ी सैटीमेंटल है। सुनने में अच्छी लगती है लेकिन अगर हम ने पी० एल० 480 के मातहत अनाज न मंगाया होता तो यह विरोधी दल वाले पता नहीं क्या कुछ कर डालते। यह महाराष्ट्र बंद, गुजरात बंद, बिहार बंद के आन्दोलन और अन्ततोगत्वा भारत बंद और संसार बंद यह सारे अनर्गल नारे देश की जनता को डिमोरैलाइज करने और उन में एक निरुत्साह की डेफीटिज्म की भावना पैदा करने के लिए और लोगों में दुराग्रह पैदा करने के लिए लगाये गये और यह सब तब हुआ जब कि हम अमरीका से पी० एल० 480 के मातहत अनाज मंगा रहे हैं। अगर कहीं एक आदमी भी, हमारा एक नागरिक भी अनाज की कमी के कारण मर जाता तो उस की लाश लेकर इस सदन के सामने हजारों आदमी प्रदर्शन करते और हमारी सरकार को डिस्ट्रोन करते। लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि वे शायद इतिहास भूल गये हैं क्योंकि अंग्रेजों के भारत से जाने के पहले बंगाल में और बंगाल की सड़कों में लाखों आदमी मौत के घाट उतर गये, भूखों मर

गये । उस समय हमारे देश पर उस बाहर की हुकूमत का शासन था । हम ने उस का विरोध किया । लेकिन 1947 के बाद जब हमारा देश स्वतंत्र हुआ, दावे के साथ हम कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी या किसी भी विरोधी दल को चुनौती देते हैं कि वह यह सिद्ध कर दे कि अनाज की कमी के कारण एक भी नागरिक हमारे देश में मरा है ।

श्री बाजी : कई मरे हैं लेकिन आप उस के लिये कह देते हैं कि हार्ट फेल होने से मरते हैं ।

श्री राम सहाय पांडेय : यह कहना गलत है कि देश में अनाज नहीं है ।

श्री बाजी : अनाज होने से क्या हुआ अगर उसे गरीब जनता ने न सके ? लोगों के पास आज पैसा नहीं है । अनाज को सस्ता होना चाहिये । अनाज होना ही खाली काफी नहीं है । इस कारण जो मरते हैं उन के लिए कह देते हैं कि वे हार्ट फेल होने से मरे ।

श्री राम सहाय पांडेय : मैं इस को फिर दुहराता हूँ और दावे के साथ इस बात को कहता हूँ कि एक भी नागरिक अनाज की कमी के कारण या उस को प्राप्त न हो सका हो, नहीं मरा है । एक प्रतिज्ञा हम और दुहराना चाहते हैं अपनी सरकार से । चाहे कैसे ही कठिन दिन हम को क्यों न देखने पड़ें, हमारा यह पूरा प्रयत्न होगा कि एक भी व्यक्ति अनाज की कमी के कारण न मरने पाये । यह हमारी सार्वभौम सत्ता सम्पन्न प्रजातन्त्री सरकार है और यह हमारी प्रतिज्ञा है जोकि हम ने की है ।

जहां तक कीमतों का सवाल है, विरोधी दल ने जो कुछ कहा, बहुत बातों में हम, उसमें उन के साथ सहमत हो सकते हैं । हम इस बात से सहमत हैं कि अगर जमाखोरों के पाम अनाज छिपा पड़ा है तो उस को पकड़ा जाय और उन के खिलाफ सख्त कार्यवाही की जाय । विरोधी दल यदि उस में स्थिति के संचालन और स्थिति के अनु-

शीलन, उस की ठीक बनाने में हमारे साथ सहयोग करता है तो हम उस का स्वागत करेंगे । विरोधी दल वाले जब जमाखोरों और मुनाफाखोरों के खिलाफ कोई बात करते हैं तो इस का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि हम कांग्रेस वाले कोई ऐसा समझते हैं कि जमाखोर व मुनाफाखोर कोई बहुत अच्छे लोग हैं । हम भी उन की ध्वनि में अपनी ध्वनि मिलाना चाहेंगे और चाहेंगे कि अगर देश में ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि अनाज को ठेकों में, कोठों में बंद किये हुए पड़े हैं और इसलिए रखे हुए हैं कि उस से अधिक लाभ कमायें तो उन को पकड़ कर उन के खिलाफ सख्त कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये ।

यदि आप यह समझते हों कि मुद्रास्फीति के कारण दाम बढ़ गये हैं तो एक कमिशन ऐपायेंट कीजिये यह देखने के लिए कि यह मुद्रा, अनप्रोडिक्टिव वैल्यू जो नांटों की शक्ल में बाजार में घाई है क्या इस मुद्रास्फीति के कारण चीजों के भाव बढ़ गये हैं । भाव बढ़ने के जो भी कारण हों उन को निर्धारित कीजिये और उन को देखने व समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये । मुद्रास्फीति के कारण भाव बढ़े हैं हम इस को मानते हैं लेकिन यह बात कि पिछले 6 महीने में मुद्रास्फीति के कारण ही भाव बढ़ गये हैं, इस बात की खोज होनी चाहिए । जैसा कि मैंने कहा एक कमिशन बिठाया जाय जो कि यह खोज करे और पता लगाये कि मुद्रास्फीति के कारण अगर भाव बढ़े हैं तो उस का क्या कारण है ।

जैसा कि श्री नन्दा जी ने यह प्रयत्न किया कि अनएकाउण्टेड मनी पकड़ा जाय, जो ग्रैंडरपाउण्ड मनी है, ब्लैक मनी है, वह पकड़ा जाय । एंजियल क्मोडिटीज के भाव बढ़ने के अगर कुछ कारण हो सकते हैं तो उन की भी रोकथाम करने की कोशिश की जाय । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक उपाय हो सकता है, एक स्वस्थ उपाय हो सकता है । अगर अनएकाउण्टेड मनी के कारण एंजियल क्मोडिटीज के भाव बढ़ते हों या

[श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय]

बढ़ने से न रुकते हों तो हमें उस के वास्ते सख्त कदम उठाना चाहिए। हम इन बातों को कभी छिपाएँ नहीं। अनेकाउटेड मनी को बाहर निकालने के लिये नंदा जी ने जो ऐक्शन लिया है मैं उस को साधुवाद कहता हूँ।

उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में एक सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि हमें इस समस्या को एक सांस्टिटिक माइंड के साथ एप्रोच करना है। हमारे किसान गांवों में रहते हैं जहाँ कि आधुनिक विकास अभी नहीं पहुँचा है। वहाँ अभी भी बिजली, सड़क आदि की व्यवस्था समुचित नहीं है। अन्य सुविधाओं का भी वहाँ पर अभाव है। उत्पादन बढ़ाने और देश को उन्नतशील बनाने के लिये जितना एप्रैटस हमें चाहिए वह हमें अभी सुलभ नहीं है और उस का हमें अभाव अभी तक है। अब जरूरी सांस्टिटिक एप्रैटस के अभाव के रहते, तीन एकड़ धरती हो, चार एकड़ धरती हो और हम चाहें कि वह अधिक से अधिक अन्न पैदा करे, वह कैसे संभव हो सकता है? हम ने कल्पना की थी कि 3.5 मिलियन टन अनाज का उत्पादन होगा। जो साधन हमारे पास थे, जो एप्रैटस हमारे पास हैं उस को सामने रख कर हम ने अनुभव किया कि तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में हम 100 मिलियन टन अनाज तैयार कर लेंगे। एक तरफ हमारी आबादी बढ़ गई है जिस की वजह से अनाज की मांग ज्यादा हो गई है और इस कारण से कमी अनुभव की गई है और दूसरी तरफ अनाज के उत्पादन में कमी हो गई है और इस कारण से हमें कष्ट का सामना करना पड़ा और हमारी सरकार ने जनता के सामने अपना लेखा-जोखा, अपना पत्रक रखा है। अभी उस दिन जो यहाँ पर बहस हुई थी और उस बहस के दौरान में जो भी डाटा दिया गया है, जो भी फैक्ट्स दिये गये हैं, जो भी अंक दिये गये हैं, हम समझते हैं उन को दे कर देश के सामने एक ऐसा चित्र

उपस्थित किया गया है जिस से निराश होने की कोई बात नज़र नहीं आती है। अनाज की अगर कमी है तो उस कमी को हम पूरा करेंगे। उत्पादन बढ़ाने के प्रयत्न किये जायेंगे। मंत्री महोदय ने बताया था कि उर्वरक, अच्छा बीज, ट्रैक्टर, आदि की व्यवस्था की जाएगी। सिचाई के हिस माइनर इरिगेशन की व्यवस्था की जाएगी। ये जो सब चीजें हैं, इनका टाप प्रायोरिटी दो जाएगी इसको एक बेसिक इंडस्ट्री मान कर के वार-फुटिंग पर इस को हल करने की कोशिश की जायगी, अधिक से अधिक उत्पादन करने की कोशिश की जायगी। जितनी और देश में समृद्धि लाने की धारयाँ और प्रक्रियायें हैं, वे तब तक सफल नहीं हो सकती हैं जब तक कि हम अनाज की, खाद्यान्नों की और किसान की स्थिति को ठीक नहीं कर देते हैं। उस को अच्छी प्राइस दी जाय, इस का भी उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि हम एक ऐसा कमिशन नियुक्त करेंगे जो इस की जांच करेगा और जांच करने के बाद एक रिप्युनरेटिव प्राइस किसान के लिए वह फिक्स करेगा। मैं समझता हूँ इस प्रकार से सोचने और इस प्रकार से काम करने का जो ढंग है उस से किसान को आश्वासन मिलता है कि अगर वह श्रम करेगा, अपना पसीना वह बहायेगा और धरती के गर्भ से अधिक अन्न पैदा करेगा तो उस को पुरस्कृत किया जायगा। भावों की वृद्धि को रोकने के लिये सरकार ने जो कदम उठाये हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि विरोधी दलों को उन का स्वागत करना चाहिये।

जनसंघ के नेता श्री त्रिवेदी जी ने माननीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी की बड़ी आलोचना की है और कहा है कि उन्होंने जयप्रकाश जी के ऊपर अपना वरदहस्त रखा है और उनको आशीर्वाद दे कर पाकिस्तान भेजा है। उन्होंने जयप्रकाश जी को इसलिए पाकिस्तान भेजा है कि वह काश्मीर को

पाकिस्तान के हाथ में गिरवी रख दें, या काश्मीर को पाकिस्तान को दे दें। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन की इस बात पर विचार करने से पहले जनसंघ की जो विचारधारा रही है, उसकी जो पृष्ठभूमि रही है, उस को जान लेना बहुत जरूरी है। उस पृष्ठभूमि का बिना समझे या उसकी बिना कल्पना किये हुए उन की इस बात पर विश्वास कर लेना ठीक नहीं होगा। हमारे त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा है कि जयप्रकाश जी को शास्त्री जी ने यह आशीर्वाद दे कर पाकिस्तान भेजा है कि काश्मीर को चांदी की तश्तरी में रख कर वह अयब साहब को भेंट कर दें। अगर उन की इस बात पर अच्छी तरह से विचार न किया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह के प्रचार से एक आन्दोलन पैदा हो सकता है हमारे देश में। अभी तीन रोज पहले ही इस सदन में धारा 370 जो संविधान की है, को निकाल देने के बारे में बहस हुई थी और यह घोषणा करने को कहा गया था कि काश्मीर हमारा अविभाज्य अंग है। उसका हम सभी ने समर्थन किया था। काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में एक बार नहीं अनेकों बार, सुरक्षा परिषद में, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीतिक मंचों पर, स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू जी ने इस सदन में और बाहर भी, वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने इस सदन में तथा बाहर भी कई बार कहा है कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में हमारा जो निर्णय है वह अन्तिम है। हमारे चागला जी ने भी यह कहा है कि हमारा जो निर्णय है वह अन्तिम है और उस को बदला नहीं जा सकता है। तब कनकौबिट फौर्म में, कल्पना कर के काश्मीर के बारे में इस तरह की बातें कहना उस प्रकार का वातावरण सारे देश में पैदा करना है जैसा कि इलैक्शन के दिनों में किया जाता है कि काश्मीर जा रहा है, काश्मीर जा रहा है। मैं जनसंघ के नेता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में हमारा जो निर्णय है वह अन्तिम है, हमारी सरकार का जो निर्णय

है, वह अन्तिम है, जयप्रकाश जी का हमारी सरकार से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। वह चाहें तो पाकिस्तान जा सकते हैं। अगर त्रिवेदी जी भी जाना चाहते हैं तो वह भी जा सकते हैं, उन पर कोई रोक नहीं है।

श्री कमल नयन बजाज (वर्धा) : चले तो जायेंगे लेकिन आ नहीं पायेंगे, आने पर रोक लग जायगी।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : जहाँ तक काश्मीर का सम्बन्ध है, हमारी नीतियों का और हमारे सिद्धान्तों का सम्बन्ध है, हम अटल हैं और अटल रहेंगे। काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में हमारा निर्णय अन्तिम है और उसकी एक इंच धरती भी पाकिस्तान को नहीं दी जायगी।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाय (देवास) : कब तक यह पूरा होगा ?

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : आप धीरज रखें, पूरा हो जायगा।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाय : सतरह साल से तो धीरज हम रखे हुए हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : स्वतंत्र दल के नेता श्री डांडेकर ने बड़ा विवाद हमारी योजना

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : काश्मीर के संबंध में आपकी पार्टी का क्या निर्णय है, उसका बटवारा होगा, पाकिस्तान को और देना है या उससे लेना है ?

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : काश्मीर नहीं जायगा, आप चिन्ता न करें।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाय : सतरह साल से तो काश्मीर का मामला पड़ा हुआ है। कितना ही रुपया खर्च कर दिया गया है। और कितनी परेशानी हुई है।

160 61

श्री राम सहाय पांडेय तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार प्रकट करते हुए श्री ~~संबेकर~~ ने जो स्वतंत्र दल के मुख्य वक्ता थे, एक विशद चित्र देश के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है और कहा है कि हमें बेसिक इंडस्ट्री अर्थात् कृषि पर, अनाज पर, निर्भर करना चाहिये और पी० एल० 480 के अन्तर्गत अनाज न मंगा कर के हमें स्टील मंगाना चाहिये। यदि ऐसा किया गया तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा और तब उन्हें कोई दुःख नहीं होगा। अनाज अगर मंगाया जाता है तब तो उनको दुःख होगा और अगर स्टील मंगाया जाता है तो उनको दुःख नहीं होगा। योजना बनाते समय, मैं उनको बतलाना चाहता हूँ, कि हमारा जो दृष्टिकोण था वह एक वैज्ञानिक दृष्टिकोण था। हमारा जोर इस बात पर था कि हमारे बड़े तथा छोटे उद्योग दोनों बड़े। हमारे छोटे उद्योग बड़ें जिनमें गांधी जी की आत्मा थी और बड़े उद्योग भी बड़े जिनमें आधुनिक वातावरण की छाप है और इन दोनों के साथ साथ हमारा कृषि उत्पादन भी बड़े जिस में किसान की आर्थिक अवस्था की छाप है, जिस से उसकी आर्थिक अवस्था अच्छी हो सकती है। हम चाहते थे कि बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज की आधारशिला रख दी जाए और कृषि उद्योग, कुटीर उद्योग, सब के सब धीरे धीरे साइड बाई साइड पनपें। इन सब का प्रावधान प्रथम, द्वितीय तथा तृतीय योजनाओं में किया गया था। जिस तरह से अंग्रेज कहते थे कि तुम अनाज पैदा करो और खाओ लेकिन सुई तक। म. बा. १ से इम्पोर्ट करेंगे, उस तरह की चीज आज नहीं चल सकती है। स्वतंत्र भारत के निर्माण में, स्वतंत्र भारत की अर्थ नीति के निर्धारण में हमें सभी एस्पेक्ट्स को सामने रख कर चलना होगा। हमें लोहा भी चाहिए, सीमेंट भी चाहिए। हम क्यों लोहा बाहर से मंगायें? बोकारो प्लांट के बारे में बातचीत चल रही है और दस बारह मिलियन टन फौलाद हम यहां तैयार करना चाहते हैं। अनाज पैदा करने के

लिए जिस ढल की जरूरत पड़ती है वह ढल भी अच्छा नहीं होगा अगर लोहा अच्छा नहीं होगा। एक बात से दूसरी बात जुड़ी हुई है। बिजली के माध्यम से, छोटे छोटे कल पुरजों के माध्यम से उद्योगों का विस्तार करके हमें उनको गांवों की तरफ ले जाना है। आप गांवों में लोगों को काम दे देंगे तो भी कुछ नहीं होगा जब तक कि आप बिजली नहीं देंगे, छोटे छोटे प्लांट्स नहीं देंगे, मशीनें नहीं देंगे, उनकी मदद नहीं करेंगे, उदकी ट्रनिंग की व्यवस्था नहीं करेंगे, उनके लिए पूंजी उपलब्ध नहीं करेंगे उनके अन्दर इत्साह पैदा नहीं करेंगे। अपनी अर्थ नीति में हम को गांवों में छोटे छोटे उद्योगों, खेती, बड़े उद्योगों, कुटीर उद्योगों, आदि सब का समन्वय करना है ताकि हम किसी चीज में भी पीछे न पड़ जाएं। अगर हमारे पास बोइंग है तो एक तरफ तो वे हों और दूसरी तरफ साइकल भी हों और साइकलों के बाद स्कूटर भी हों और स्कूटरों के बाद मोटरें भी हों। इस तरह से हमें अपनी अर्थ नीति को आगे बढ़ाना है।

अगर मैं कम्युनिस्टों के बारे में कुछ न कहूं तो मेरा यह भाषण अधूरा रह जाएगा। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट नेता ने कहा है कि मंत्रिमंडल में फूट है, अनेक विचारधाराओं के लोग मंत्रिमंडल में हैं। उन से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां जो कुछ भी है, वह स्पष्ट है, जितनी धारारें हैं, गंगा, यमुना, सिन्धु, गोसावरी, सरस्वती, सब आपकी देखने को मिल जायेंगी लेकिन आपकी धारा में क्या हैं, आपके विचार क्या हैं, इसको भी तो आप देख लीजिये। एक दल चीन से लया हुआ है और दूसरा रूस से। जब आप कान्फ्रेंस करते हैं तो हमारे देश के जो सब से बड़े शत्रु हैं ~~वाङ्मय-वादी और माओ-जो-सुंग~~ उनके चित्र सामने टांग करके आप प्रस्ताव पास करते हैं। जब इस प्रकार की आपकी विचारधारा है तो किस प्रकार से आप हमें उपदेश दे सकते हैं, किस तरह से हमें कह सकते हैं कि हम कुरूपान दूर

नहीं करते हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी ने कामनवैल्य कान्फ्रेंस में ठीक ठीक रिप्रिजेंटेशन नहीं किया है। उन्होंने ठीक ठीक किया है या नहीं, यह हमने देख लिया है। उन्होंने बहुत ठीक तरह से किया है, बहुत अच्छे ढंग से किया है। जो परम्परायें थीं, और जिन को आदरणीय स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू जी ने डाला था, उनको उन्होंने कायम रखा है। हमारी प्रतिष्ठा में, हमारी गरिमा में कोई कमी नहीं हुई है। वा. कामनवैल्य कान्फ्रेंस में गये और वहाँ पर काश्मीर का सवाल आ गया। अब उसकी डिटेल्स क्या हैं, कैसे आया, ये सब हमारे पास नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं इतना अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है।

जो मंत्रिमंडल शास्त्री जी के नेतृत्व में बना हुआ है, उसको मैं साधुवाद देता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि वह देश का नेतृत्व आज के लिए नहीं, कल के लिए नहीं बल्कि शाश्वत रूप से करता रहे और वह देश के जनमानस को साथ ले कर चलता रहे। अगर चीनवादी, रूसवादी और अब ये सड़कवादी भाषण देते हैं और जनसंघ वाले काश्मीर के नाम पर या गाय के नाम पर कुछ कहते हैं, तो मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि हमारा यह प्रजातंत्र राज्य इस तरह की बातों से प्रभावित हो सकता है या आपकी बातों पर विचार कर सकता है। देश की डिमांडेंसी का बडिक्ट हमारे साथ है। देश की जनता का बहुमत हमारे साथ है और शाश्वत रहेगा।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के व्यक्तित्व का प्रश्न है, मेरे दिल में उन के लिये सम्मान और आदर है। पुराने जमाने में र. है और जब से वे प्रधान मंत्री हुए हैं तब से भी। किन्तु यह प्रश्न व्यक्तित्व का नहीं है। यह प्रश्न उन की सरकार का है, उन की नीतियों का है और इस का है कि इन तीन महीनों में क्या कुछ हुआ है। बहुत से साथी

ऐसे भी हैं जो कहते हैं कि तीन महीने ही तो हुए हैं, अभी कैसे इस की चर्चा करते हो। वास्तव में कांग्रेस दल वाले खुद ही कहते हैं कि वे अपनी पुरानी नीति पर ही चल रहे हैं, इस लिये यहाँ पर तीन महीने का प्रश्न नहीं पैदा होता। मैं थोड़ा बहुत यह बतलाने का प्रयत्न करूँगा कि इन तीन महीनों में जो घटनायें घटी हैं वे इस बात का प्रमाण देती हैं कि यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव यहाँ लाया जाय, और हम विरोधी दल के लोगों ने इस को लाकर देश के प्रति अपना कर्तव्य पूरा किया है।

अभी श्री पाण्डेय कह रहे थे कि बहुमत उन के साथ है, जनता उन के साथ है। मैं इस सदन में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि उन में नैतिक बल है तो वे जनता के सामने तीन बातें रख दें अर्थात् यह कि जनता सुखी है या दुखी है अथवा महादुखी है। एक बैलट पेपर छपवा लें और इन तीन बातों पर वे जनमत संग्रह करवा लें। और जनमत संग्रह में दो तिहाई से ज्यादा लोग सुखी और महादुखी हों तो वे यह गद्दी छोड़ कर चले जायें। इस प्रकार से बहुमत के आधार पर होने का गीत गाने से यहाँ काम नहीं चलेगा। यदि आम जनता में यह तकलीफें ज्यादा तादाद में न होतीं तो यहाँ किसी प्रकार का भी 'बन्द' नहीं चल सकता। कोई जादू कम्प्यूनिस्टों या जनसंघ वालों के पास नहीं है। आम जनता आज तकलीफ में है और जब उन से उस का विरोध करने के लिये कहा जाता है तो वे आप की आँखें खोल कर आप को उन्हें दिखलाने की कोशिश करते हैं।

प्रश्न यह है कि इस सरकार ने क्या गलती की। सबसे पहले आप अनाज के बारे में देखिये। उन की गलती का पहला नमूना यह है कि जब उन का स्टॉक खत्म होने वाला था तो इस बात को छिपाने के लिये उन्होंने यह नारा लगाया कि यह बीमारी कहीं और है। और इस सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री को यह कहने के लिये मजबूर किया कि पन्द्रह दिन के अन्दर

[श्री काशीराम गुप्त]

जमाखोर लोग अपना अनाज बाहर लायें वरना सख्त कार्रवाई की जायेगी। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ, वे हम को बतलायें कि उन की पन्द्रह दिन की अवधि के बजाय महीना से ज्यादा हो गया, कोई भी जमाखोर पकड़ा गया है। अगर कोई जमाखोर नहीं पकड़ा जा रहा है तो इस का क्या कारण है। हमारे खाद्य मंत्री महोदय का काना है कि इस का कारण यह है कि लोगों ने अनाज काउंटड मनी किसानों को दे दिया। अगर उन्होंने किसानों को दे दिया तो आप यह तकलीफ करें कि किसानों को समझा दें कि वे उस पैसे को वापस न करें। जो पैसा किसान के पास है वह किसान के ही पास रहे। लेकिन वह तकलीफ भी आप नहीं करते। नतीजा यह हुआ है कि अनाज मंगा हो गया है। मैं अभी अभी उत्तर प्रदेश में एक जगह गया था। वहाँ पर हालत यह हो गई है कि जो व्यापारी इस लिये अनाज जमा रखते हैं कि वे बीज के वक़्त पर गेहूँ और चना देंगे, उन सब ने उसे बेच दिया है। 1 रु० सेर पर। वे कहते हैं कि हमें रखने की क्या ज़रूरत है। जो आज एक रुपया दे रहे हैं वे बाद में सबा रुपया तो देंगे नहीं, इस लिय सब बेच दो। आ उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग भूखों मर रहे हैं और भीख मांग रहे हैं यहाँ की सरकार से। यहाँ की सरकार ने वादा किया है कि वह उन्हें पचास लाख मन बीज के लिये देंगे। ऐसी हालत हो गई है फिर भी वे गर्व करते हैं इस बात कि हम यह कर रहे हैं, वह कर रहे हैं। यह निश्चित बात है कि इस प्रकार काम नहीं चल सकता कि आप बहुमत में हैं इस लिये जो आप कहते चले जायें जनता इसे गवारा करेगी या मान लेगी।

मैं केवल खाद्य मंत्री की बात कह कर ही समाप्त नहीं करूँगा। मैं आप के सामने और इस सदन के सामने एक तथ्य रखना चाहता हूँ। सब से पहले सुरक्षा मंत्रालय के सम्बन्ध में। सुरक्षा मंत्रालय जैसे महकमे से

हमें यह आशा होनी चाये कि वह खर्च की बरबादी नहीं करेंगे, उन के यहाँ अव्यवस्था नहीं होगी, उन के यहाँ भ्रष्टाचार नहीं होगा। वहाँ की स्थिति का एक नमूना मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। अलवर में एक ए० एस० सी० सेंटर खुला। अगर इस प्रकार की चीज कहीं खोली जाये तो पहले उन के बारे में पूरी जानकारी कर लेनी चाहिये। सोच लेना चाहिये कि जो रुपया इस के वास्ते खर्च हो रहा है क्या उस का सदुपयोग होगा। किन्तु करोड़ों रुपये लगा कर इमारतें गुरु की गई और अब कहा जा रहा है कि उस को बन्द किया जा रहा है। वहाँ पर जो भूकान बने हैं वहाँ दूसरी पलटने रखी जायेगी। अगर जनता के रुपये के साथ इस प्रकार से खिलवाड़ किया जाये, और वहाँ भी सुरक्षा मंत्रालय के द्वारा जो व्यवस्था के लिये मण्डर होना है, तो दूसरे विभाग की क्या दशा होगी। यदि कोई न्यायिक जांच इस के लिये बिठलाई जाये तो यह मान्य पड़ेगा कि वहाँ किस प्रकार से ठकेदारों को रुपया लुटाया गया, किस प्रकार आफिशल्स से मिल कर जो चीज बाजार में एक रुपये में मिलती थी उसे वहाँ तीन रुपये पर बेचा गया, किस प्रकार से बड़े बड़े ठकेदारों को वहाँ मोनोपली दी गई। लेकिन इस के लिये सम्भवतः हमारा सुरक्षा मंत्रालय परवाह नहीं करता है क्योंकि वह सुरक्षित है। इस लिये यह कहना कि सब कुछ ठीक हो रहा है यह ठीक नहीं है। अन्दर ही अन्दर अशांति सुलग रही है, वह बढ़ रही है और किसी दिन एक दम से सामने आ जायेगी।

श्री इन्द्रजीत लाल मल्होत्रा (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : उस पर पानी डाल देंगे।

श्री काशीराम गुप्त : पहले काश्मीर का फैसला तो कर लो पानी डाल कर।

इसके बाद जो बाढ़ आ रही है मैं उनके बारे में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। अब की बार एक नई बात सामने आई है। आज

ज राज्य सरकारें हैं वे विदेशी सरकारों की तरह पर एक दूसरे को विरोध पत्र भेज रही हैं, कभी राजस्थान सरकार पंजाब सरकार को भेज रही है कभी पंजाब सरकार राजस्थान सरकार को भेज रही है, कभी मैसूर का झगड़ा चलता है, कभी कहीं लड़ाई होती है। कहीं पर करोड़ों रुपये का घोटाला हो रहा है। आज उत्तर प्रदेश की मुख्य मंत्री श्रीमती सुचेता जी कहती हैं कि बाढ़ का पानी नहर में डाला गया जिससे उनके यहां बाढ़ आ जायेगी। झलवर की साहिबी नदी के बारे में कहा जाता है कि उससे ढासा बांध टूट जायेगा। जब सारा देश एक हो चुका और हमारे यहां के इरिगेशन ऐंड पावर मिनिस्टर श्री के० एल० राव हैं जो सब बातों को जानते हैं कि बारिश जरूर होगी, प्रागे भी होती रहेगी तो फिर क्या उसका उपाय वे आपस में लड़वा कर करवाना चाहते हैं। और दूसरी जगहों की बातों में न जा करके मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार की बात करना चाहता हूँ। लाखों करोड़ों लोग जहां खतरे में पड़ गये, करोड़ों का नुकसान हो गया, गांव बरबाद हो गये और यह सरकार आपस में लड़ रही हैं। इस से ज्यादा शर्म की बात और क्या हो सकती है जो स्थिति यहां हो रही है, और यह लोग ऐसे हैं जो इस बात को छिपाये बैठे हैं।

इससे प्रागे बढ़ कर मैं एक और मंत्रालय की बात कहना चाहता हूँ। वह है वित्त मंत्रालय, जिसके माननीय मंत्री संभवतः यहां होंगे। कुछ दिन हुए यहां पर जो खनिज के कार्य होते हैं उनके बारे में जो इनकम टैक्स की प्रणाली है उसके सिलसिले में हाई कोर्ट का एक बड़ा फैसला हुआ कि जो उनकी रायल्टी होती है उसको कैपिटल खर्च माना जाय या रेबन्सु खर्च। कोर्टों के जो फैसले होते हैं वह तो चलते-रहेंगे, उनसे वास्ता नहीं, यूजीपतियों पर क्या असर पड़ेगा इससे भी कोई ताल्लुक नहीं, लेकिन इस सरकार को यह न पता मालूम कि इसका नतीजा क्या हो रहा है। जिस प्रकार आज महंगाई के कारण

खाद्य स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में भागे फिरते हैं, उसी तरह से जब यहां भी वही भयंकर स्थिति आ जायेगी तब उनको होश होगा। हालत यह हो रही है कि सब से पहले छोटा मरता है हमेशा। सब से पहले जो बीमारी आई है उसका असर यह हो रहा है कि ज़िम प्रकार से इनकमटैक्स डिपार्टमेंट की ओर से रिटर्न्स मांगे जा रहे हैं उससे गड़बड़ी फैलने वाली है। जिस कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी ने 40 या 50 हजार रु० का ठेका लिया है और जिसकी इनकम 5 हजार रुपये की भी नहीं है, उससे कहा जायेगा कि 10 हजार रु० साल के हिसाब से तुम 6 साल का टैक्स लाभो 60,000 रु० और यह अपना दिवाला निकाल कर भेंट जायेगी। उसके बाद कुछ व्यक्तिगत फर्म्स आदि का नम्बर आयेगा उस के बाद राज्य सरकारों का नम्बर आयेगा। क्योंकि जब उनकी इनकम घटेगी तो संरक्षण देने वाली या भंडे देने वाली मुर्गी मर जायेगी। तब राज्य सरकार कहेंगी कि हम मरे क्योंकि उनकी जो इनकम है, जो आमदनी है, वह गिरने जा रही है। और तब उससे प्रागे क्या है। जो स्टील प्लांट वाले बैठे हैं भाराग के साथ, उनकी भी बारी आयेगी।

जो सुझाव उनके सामने दिया जाता है तो तीन तीन चार चार महीने तक जवाब नहीं मिलता। इस प्रकार का अन्धेर सरकार में चलता रहे और फिर सरकार के लोग दावा करें कि हम बहुत कुछ कर रहे हैं, इससे ज्यादा शर्म की बात और क्या हो सकती है।

श्री चन्मसिंह लाल बीबरी (मद्रास) :
डिप्टी स्पीकर महोदय, माननीय मेम्बर सरकार के लिये बार बार "शर्म की बात है, शर्म की बात है" कह रहे हैं। यह अनपार्लियामेंटरी है, इसको निकाल दिया जाना चाहिए।

श्री काशीराम शुक्ल : संभवतः धानरेबिल मेम्बर पार्लियामेंटरी लैंग्वेज के बारे में विज नहीं है।

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

मेरा यह कहना है कि जहां एक ओर प्रधान मंत्री और नन्दा जी कहते हैं कि हम भ्रष्टाचार को समाप्त करेंगे और राजनीतिक भ्रष्टाचार को समाप्त करेंगे, वहां वे उसको बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं। इसके सबूत में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब विरोधी दल इकट्ठा होने लगे तो उनको धर्म भ्रष्ट करने का प्रयत्न किया गया। प्रजा समाजवादी और समाजवादी एकत्र होने लगे तो कहा गया कि आजादो काँग्रेस में, यहां भी समाजवाद है। उनके लिये तो हम मान भी ले कि यह कहा जा सकता है कि काँग्रेस में समाजवाद है। लेकिन कल परसों बिहार में कह दिया गया स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के लोगों से कि काँग्रेस में आजादो। क्या वह भी समाजवादी बन गये। जो लोग यहां भ्रष्टाचार के रोकने की बात करते हैं वह बाहर भ्रष्टाचार के बढ़ावा देते हैं। और कैसे लोगों को टिकट दिया जाता है, जिन के ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप लगे हैं जिन के ऊपर गुड़ के घोटाले के आरोप लगे हैं। ऐसे लोगों को आज राजस्थान में टिकट दिए जा रहे हैं मैं बता दू कि राजस्थान के अन्दर आग सुलग रही है और भीतर ही भीतर जो दशा केरल की हुई है उसी प्रकार की दशा राजस्थान में भी न हो और जो दशा केरल में हुई है वही मैसूर में भी न हो। ऐसा वहां भी हो सकता है।

अन्त में एक बात कह कर समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ, और वह यह कि हम जो विरोधी दलों के लोग हैं हमें भी एक चेतावनी लेनी चाहिए। वह यह कि या तो हम अपने छोट छोटे दलों का विलय तेजी से कर लें और अगर यह संभव नहीं है तो हमें फैसला करना चाहिए कि हम अगले पांच साल तक चुनाब नहीं लड़ेंगे, कांग्रेस वालों को ही लड़ने दो। हम तो बाहर रह कर भी काम करेंगे। जब कांग्रेस वाले भ्रष्टे रह जायेंगे तो उनकी पोल खुलेगी और जनता को पता चलेगा कि वे किस प्रकार टिकटों के

लिए आपस में लड़ते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि विरोधी दल पांच साल के लिए सब्र करे। वरना हम दलदल में फँस जायेंगे और इस प्रजातन्त्र को खत्म करने की जिम्मेदारी केवल कांग्रेस की न होकर हम सब की हो जाएगी।

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal):
For the last two days we have been hearing criticism of the Congress Government by some Members of the Opposition. Shri Chatterjee is an eminent lawyer, and he has got the capacity to turn a weak case into a strong one. He has used his talents to great effect. He said that there was crisis everywhere, poverty and misery all round, that people who come from Pakistan have to be rehabilitated, even they are suffering. He talked about corruption and the mission of Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan to Pakistan. Shri Trivedi also joined and sang the same tune.

Take the question of the rehabilitation of the refugees, one of the charges of Shri Chatterjee. There have been other countries who were faced with similar problems. What did they do? The Jews from Hitler's Germany poured all over the Continent, and though Palestine was declared to be their homeland, Great Britain blocked them in Malta island because they were afraid of their being spies. After the Great War, there were a number of refugees because of the war in many countries in Europe, and with the help of the rich countries and also with the help of the United Nations, it took then ten years to settle those refugees.

Here, there have been refugees pouring in the millions. I ask Mr. Chatterjee and all those who criticise the policy of the Government of India to give the instance of even one country, right from the days of Moses and the great exodus to the present day, where such a large number of refugees came into a country and were rehabilitated without getting one paisa of foreign aid or any charity from any private organisation. Is the private sector to come in only where

there is profit? What were they doing? Did they offer any helping hand, I ask my hon. friend Mr. Masani. This is a great achievement of India which deserves to be written in letters of gold in the history of the world.

After that, they come round and say that the refugees have not been rehabilitated. I ask you: are there refugees anywhere else in the world who can actually dictate terms as to where they should be settled, on what sort of land? They see one place, they are not satisfied, they want to go somewhere else. We bear with it because there is sympathy in this land for the poor sufferers who have come from Pakistan, but that does not mean that it should be made a basis for political exploitation by other parties. The refugee problem has become a question of political exploitation.

About Kashmir, there has been a great deal of criticism of the mission of Jaya Prakash Narayan to Pakistan. I also do not agree with the stand he has taken, because I believe that you must be steadfast and firm on some basic issues, that there should be no compromise, no change in that stand. I believe more in the strength of ideas than in the strength of arms. Therefore, I do not agree with the stand which Shri Narayan has taken. At the same time you cannot spurn this question, in what way goodwill can be created. It is all right to talk about marching to regain land from China, marching against Pakistan. Shri Trivedi seems to delight in it. But whatever the sword touches, it divides, it can never be the basis of unity. So, if we are eager to seek some way besides this cult of the sword, is that anything to be condemned?

Take the question of Nagaland, for instance. When there was a talk or some correspondence between the Prime Minister and Rev. Michael Scott, there was a hue and cry from the Opposition saying that we were surrendering Nagaland, that we were

talking with a person who had given refuge to Phizo and all that. The Prime Minister at that time said that the basis on which any talks could be held on the issue of Nagaland was settled, and only minor adjustments could be allowed. What was the result? The same Rev. Michael Scott, instead of being a messenger of evil, has been the cause of a satisfactory settlement of the problem.

Similarly, Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan is sent, for whatever reason, to create goodwill, and at the same time Pakistan understands that India's stand is based on the declaration of our late Prime Minister. What is the harm? They are not children. If Jaya Prakash Narayan says that he is for a plebiscite, President Ayub will not simply jump. He knows the things that are happening here. Today, in both Pakistan and India, feelings have been roused. This has to be controlled and brought to normality, but that does not mean that you are going to change your fundamental stand.

Mr. Chatterjee wanted the Prime Minister to guarantee that there will be no question of giving any part of Kashmir to Pakistan. What guarantee does he want? Does he not know the Constitution of India? Ours is not a confederation, it is a federal Constitution. In our Constitution accession of territory is possible, but there is no provision for ceding even one inch of land from this country. You know what happened about Berubari: we had to change and amend the Constitution to make that thing possible. How can Mr. Shastri or anybody else from the Government of India simply negotiate and give away Kashmir, without bringing the matter to the House and thrashing it out? If a thing like that happened, it is not a question of the opposition. There will be a split right from the top to the bottom even in the Congress Party. So what is the idea of making capital out of these things? Therefore, let us be quite clear in our minds that whatever Mr. Chagla has said or Mr. Shastri has said only

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

means that what Prime Minister Nehru said stands, but even after having said that we are still keen to have friendly relations with Pakistan and even with China.

Sir, we talk about the atom bomb, we condemn aggression and all that. But what is the sad story? Only those countries who possess the atom bomb are at peace, whereas among those countries who talk about peace and unity there is split, fight and so on. Look at the map of Asia. There is conflict everywhere. A poor country, a poor continent, cannot afford all the squabbling and killing of each other for some territories here or there, and forget the major issues. We have to care for the prosperity of the whole of Asia and the African Continent. That is the question before us.

The major part of the speeches was of course about corruption. And somebody said that Congressmen are corrupt because they want to have money from the big business and that big business gives some funds to the Congress because they have to support it. Suppose we stop this. I am also supposing that all the Members of the Opposition simply fight the elections without spending any money. All that let us suppose. And suppose we stop this. It is an established fact which nobody can deny that to fight elections in this country means money. How many of us can afford twenty-five thousand rupees? I for my part, if I had not got help from the Congress Party, would not have decided to fight it at all. Similarly in the case of many people. So, if you stop the normal course of giving contributions and putting them in the books of the company, what will happen is that you will get the money, but you will get black money, which is much worse.

Therefore, if you want to remove corruption, the first thing you have to do is to see that the expenses of election are reduced. We all have to fight elections and spend money some

more some less. Therefore, go to the basic root of the question and see what can be done. I am glad the Election Commission is meeting parties to devise methods. I hope all friends of the opposition will try to meet this question of corruption and settle it.

Then I would like to say a few words about our new young friend Mr. Dandekar who has come from Gonda. He also talked about corruption. If there was no corruption in that constituency, he would not have been elected! And we are not condoning corruption. We are the first to say that corruption should be rooted out. And in this huge country where thousands of elections are held, if there is corruption here and there, we have got the Election Tribunals and we can see that it is rectified. Nobody wants unfair elections. So in their heart of hearts they know that the elections all over the country have been by and large quite fair. It is recognised not only here but abroad.

Mr. Dandekar's theory is that all this public sector is really a monopoly and a waste of money, and we should not import a grain of wheat and so on, and he is not ashamed of importing steel and so on. I ask him this question. He talks about freedom of enterprise and that there is no concentration of wealth. Take the question of agriculture. 42 per cent of the agriculturists of this land hold only 1.8 per cent of cultivated land, and 0.2 per cent of holders in this country hold as much as 6 per cent of cultivable land in this country. Is it not a concentration of wealth? Take industry. One single house—I will not name it—has got interests not only of textiles, sugar, paper, rayon, jute cotton, silver and gold but also newspapers. They talk about monopoly of the public sector. Is this chain of papers not a monopoly of the private sector today—a few persons holding the whole press? They are not only holding money in their banks but are also trying to control

the minds of the people of this country. That is the monopoly. And if the Government sometimes restricts—I hope it does—this newsprint so that some poor private person who wants to run a paper may get a chance, what harm is there? That is the position. And if this thing goes on it is not that the public sector will have a monopoly, even hotelwala's and panwala's will become employees of a chain of stores from one end to another. That is the position today.

I will conclude only by saying this, because no other party has been in power and it is difficult to compare what they will do. They could not unite even on a single thing as to what the subject of the motion should be. Therefore let us see and compare with other countries. India today, thanks to the work of the late Prime Minister and of the Congress Party in the last seventeen years, is the only country in the whole of Asia which has maintained democracy in the whole continent. Is it not an achievement? India, in spite of the massacre of thousands of Muslims and Hindus, in spite of that running, sore has adopted secularism as its ideal and is maintaining it. Is it not an achievement? Not only that. On the question of non-alignment we stuck to it in spite of attacks from Pakistan and China. We did not lose courage or go to this country and that and say "we will align with you, come and help us". We steadfastly held to that banner and in spite of the danger to our borders we did not flinch, we kept steadfast. We won the respect of the whole world, and wherever freedom was in danger it was India that came and put up a fight. Is it not an achievement? What more do you want? Surely there will be mistakes, there will be some corruption, sometimes even Himalayan blunders. If you take it all in all, the achievement of the Congress Party in the last seventeen years is a glorious chapter in the history not only of Asia but of the whole world. Therefore, when my friends

feel that we have not gone further ahead as they want, let them pause for a moment and turn back and look and see how many milestones we have already passed. Our hearts are good. Our intentions are simple and straight. Our goal is clear and we want to reach it. The country knows distinctly well that the goal will be reached.

15.00 hrs.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): Sir, while supporting the motion of no-confidence it is possible to catalogue a list of failures of the Government that has contributed to this crisis in confidence. The Food Minister has this morning given ample evidence of the administrative failure that caused the food crisis. That is one part of the picture only. He has very cleverly omitted to state that the buildup of the food crisis was during the last year or two and what we witness today in the past two months was the result of Government's faulty policy. I need not go into the details of this failure because it is necessary when discussing this motion of no-confidence to stop and examine the main causes of failures that face us today.

In my opinion the greatest charge that can be laid at the door of the Government is that it has not paid attention to the gathering crisis in character in our country. No nation can survive, let alone move ahead, if a sense of national purpose does not enthuse it in all the sections. This Government has neither tried to import nor communicate a national purpose to our people. Otherwise, how is it that in every walk of life, whether it be the field of politics or industry or in the field of trade union movement or in the schools and colleges there appears to be the same singular lack of purpose. It is no simple matter that the nation faces today. If it has to survive, not merely survive but to progress, people must be enthused and they must understand the purpose for which they live, for which the nation exists.

It is not difficult to examine the causes of this lack of purpose. As I

[Shri Alvares]

said earlier, this crisis of confidence has come in the time of the present Government. It is rather unfortunate that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, soon after assuming office should have been faced with this motion of no-confidence. But when we consider the continuity of Government and the responsibility of the Congress Party for the last many years, we cannot help arriving at the conclusion that this crisis has been building up steadily since Independence. Every section is pulling its own way, and we hardly find or notice any consciousness that we have to pull together. If it be the rich who want to make themselves richer even at the cost of the poor people, or if it be the Government that wants to be entrenched in power without any consideration, or if it be the poor people whom nobody takes cognisance of and who have no status in this country and who are irrelevant as far as we are concerned, everyone is pulling his own different way and naturally there are tensions created in society. It is not very difficult to list how this crisis intensified. During the time of the Chinese invasion, we were painfully aware of our deficiencies and also, if I may say so, we did not rise to the occasion that the challenge of China posed to us. Who does not know of the failure of our Army, the failure of the Government to prosecute the war and the failure of the defence committees to generate a will among the people to resistance. I remember that during that period persons vied with one another to get on the defence committees as if it was for some elective office. It will be surprising if I tell you that in the majority of the States after the formation of the civil defence committees, the State Governments have not convened even a single meeting till now and that is an indictment that this country, even at the time of such a crisis, faced with foreign invasion and danger of losing its sovereignty, could not rise up to the occasion and meet the challenge that was there.

The problem of corruption is another such crisis. We do not look at corruption from the proper angle. Corruption is a symptom of a deep malaise. Did we examine that malaise? Did we find out why it takes place or if it is there at all? More than two important spokesmen of Government have said that the existence of corruption is not such as is made out or that it is not as severe as it is in some European countries. It is obvious that the Government is not serious about eradicating corruption because it prevents people even from realising its intensity. If we have to wipe out corruption, we have to have such inviolable standards in politics, in industry, in administration and among the students. The standards must be scrupulously protected and maintained. But do we not know how the Congress practises the principles that it preaches? Do we not know that that inspite of code of conduct evolved by Mr. Sanjivayya when he was the Congress President that anybody who leaves his political party to join another must first resign his seat from the political party to which he originally belonged before he could seek admission to another political party, things are not happening that way? I say this without referring to any of the transfers that are taking place in this House. The Congress is the most guilty party in this respect among all the rest.

What is the state of administration today? How many Chief Ministers have had to quit their office because of the charge of corruption? The standard of public conduct must be very high. If they are set very high, the Chief Ministers must also rise to the occasion and be worthy of the office that they occupy. In State after State and in the Centre also, they had to leave their office because of charges of allegations of serious corruption. It is no satisfaction to tell us that it is the Congress that has asked its Ministers to quit for we remember that it is only after persistent demand

by Opposition and the people in this country that the Congress was forced to take this decision against its own better judgment and its own interests. And what of the future? Is there a single State in this country where a Chief Minister of the Congress can say that he is free from any charges of corruption? Today it is Uttar Pradesh; tomorrow it may be Bihar; the day after tomorrow, certainly, it is Mysore State. One State after another, not one Chief Minister is continued for long because always in the cupboard there are skeletons against potential Chief Ministers and other Ministers and corruption is so rampant that it has become the order of the day.

15.11 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

The second issue that I would like to point out for the cause of this no-confidence motion is the character of the Government. What is the character of the Government? What does it stand-by and what is its ideology? Right from Jaipur to Bhubaneswar, we were told that this Government stands by democratic socialism and that it does its best to implement a socialist policy. I myself have never believed that this Government was socialist; I do not believe that it was socialist even under the leadership of the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and I do not believe that it is socialist even today.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Ask Shri Mukerjee.

Shri Alvares: During the election of the present Prime Minister, if you remember, the issue of socialism came to the fore; I do not remember ever that there was any organisation, any effort, to inform the leadership, to elect somebody who at least had paid lip-service to the ideal of socialism. There are the lefts and the rights in the Congress—the physical left and the physical right—because, as I said earlier, there is no ideological stand

in the Congress, both the left and the right, and the Congressmen closed their ranks and set themselves against any ideological orientation, and demanded that a right, conservative in the Congress party should be elected. That is the meaning of the election of the present Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and that is the meaning of his phrase, "middle course". It is not only Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri who has described the policy of this Government as middle course; much earlier, while in America, the new Minister of Information and Broadcasting, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, described that the Government is a centrist Government; in terms of socialism, what does it mean? How can any Government that is socialist be centrist or middle course? These are things which are a contradiction in terms. The 'middle course' or 'centrism' is a position or a posture between two ideologies, between two opposites. If the position is one of conservatism meaning *laissez faire* and the other one is socialism, then I can understand centrism. Therefore, this idea of middle course is a very serious delineation, and coming from no less a person than the Prime Minister of this Government, the nature of the Congress ideology becomes immediately evident. With this ideology of middle course, this Government has once and for all turned its back upon socialism and the socialist pattern of society. Hereafter, we can well understand its policies, because the subterfuges have been shed and in the open a new conservative statement of policy, the policy of middle course, which is neither socialism nor socialist pattern of society, has been made.

While discussing socialism, one must understand what is the kingpin or the central idea of socialism. The central idea of socialism is quality, and this Government never possessed an egalitarian conscience which is the central theme of a socialist ideology. Never have we heard this Congress Government speaking of egalitarian-

[Shri Alvares]

ism; never have we known if this Government propounded the theory of equality, which is the central theme of socialism. Therefore, any Government without an egalitarian conscience is certainly not socialist, and my own appeal to this Government would be to shed the subterfuges. The absence of an egalitarian conscience, the theory of a middle course, and the posture of centrism are the characteristics of this Government. It is not, surprising, therefore, that the Swatantra spokesman who spoke on this no-confidence motion welcomed this statement of policy of the Government. He would not take part in this motion of no-confidence; he realised that the Government is shifting its position from socialism to centrism; from socialism to conservatism. Therefore, not only in Bihar where the Swatantra party has realised that there is a major shift in Congress policy, but in this House also, the Swatantra party, as its political analyst, realised the position and is coming closer and closer to the Congress position in this respect.

Mr. Chairman: What about the Socialist party members joining the Congress in large numbers? (*Interruption*).

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Political corruption of the ruling party?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He said earlier that the Congress party should demand that those members should resign.

Shri Alvares: Some members of the Praja-Socialist party did join the Congress party, and I just now explained the position of the Swatantra party. But there is a difference in the characterisation. Some of the PSP members who went to the Congress went in the hope that there was socialism before the policy of centrism and middle course was expounded by the Congress. The Swatantra party members feel or felt that the

entire Congress policy is shifting; they have no faith in the socialist policy of the Congress; their expectation is that the Congress policy is shifting and is coming closer and closer to the Swatantra party.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool) The middle course is between centrism and communism. (*Interruption*).

Shri Alvares: That is the issue so far as the position of the Congress in our country is concerned. May I now say a few words on the economic policy of the Government? We have debated for three or four days the issue of food. I said that this issue is nothing new. It began at the time of the last Government; it has been developing for the last three or four years, and this crisis will remain in this country for the next four or five years at least, unless the Government undertakes some very drastic reforms. What is the situation in the food front? The statistics of food imports into this country from America alone shows that the amount which has come in this year totals up to 5.4 million tons of wheat as against the production of 9.7 million tons. The American supply for our own consumption is more than half the amount of wheat that we grow in this country. They have supplied up to now Rs. 1,183 crores worth of foodgrains. The total loans including PL 480 is of the order of Rs. 4,000 crores. I am giving these statistics to prove that but for the American food and the loan of Rs. 4,000 crores as foreign aid, the people would not have tolerated this Government for as long as they have tolerated upto now.

The picture on the food front of the country is both humiliating and desperate. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Finance Minister, when he spoke in Tokyo two days ago, put forward the begging bowl and asked that debt payments should be rescheduled. In other words, he asked for

a moratorium for debt payments. We come to this position, when foreign loan comes to us and are not utilised to their full capacity, to the fuller authorisation, and at the same time, when we have to pay our debts, we want to go unashamed to those countries and ask that there should be a moratorium on debt repayment and therefore humiliate ourselves and this country once again. This country has been humiliated for the policies that the Government have been following. The entire people have to bear this humiliation, because the Government's economic policies are all faulty and there is no hope of any improvement.

Let us see the effect of our fiscal policy. It is important, when we discuss this No-confidence Motion, not merely to assail the Government on the issues of basic characteristics but to analyse the Government's policies on all fronts. What are the effects of our fiscal policies. I have, Sir, in this House, repeatedly asked the Government that they should demonetise the currency. The Finance Minister has stoutly and stubbornly refused saying that demonetisation is not necessary and that the selective controls exercised by this Government and by the Reserve Bank are sufficient enough to control unaccounted money. Here are statistics which belie the arguments of the Finance Minister.

What happened on the food front? The advances by scheduled banks on foodgrains rose from Rs. 49 crores in October, 1963 to Rs. 141.70 crores in May, 1964. It is fantastic. Who says the traders do not buy food at the producers level and then hoard it in order to squeeze the people and hold the entire country to ransom. In the case of our industry it was only Rs. 102 crores in 1962-63 as against Rs. 104 crores in 1963-64. Therefore, the food crisis that took place in the country, which permitted the hoarders to procure all the food and hold the country at ransom, was due primarily and entirely to the failure of

selective controls exercised by the Reserve Bank of India and by this Government. That means, in the sphere of fiscal policy, I am sure, this House will agree, the Government has failed miserably.

Let us take the question of industrial policy. What are the profiles of our economic policy? How does the country understand what the economic policy of our country is in the profile in which it has presented itself during the past few years. The Mahalanobis Committee's report has made out that not only are there monopolies of a large nature in this country but that there is a great concentration of economic power. This concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, these huge monopolies have not come up by accident. No big industry can be started in this country unless there is a purposeful decision by the Government and the "OK" by the Planning Commission. If monopolies have grown, if concentration of economic power has taken place, it is because this Government permitted it willfully or otherwise. Therefore, there is no use looking with innocence at people who ask this question and say that the most prominent profile has been that the rich has grown richer and the poor has grown poorer.

Again, during the discussion with the Planning Commission it transpired that those industries based upon in-organic raw materials made much more money, made higher rates of profit than those industries based upon organic or agricultural raw materials. The issue is not as simple as it looks. In this country the Government have succeeded in purposefully depressing agricultural prices so that the profits of industries based upon in-organic raw materials are much larger in the finished sector of our industries than what they are in at the producers' level in the villages. The example of sugar is an instance. It is not just simply a matter of accident that sugar production was low in this country. Sugar

[Shri Alvares]

production will be low so long as the sugarcane grower is not given a fair return for his produce. If there are controls that are not exercised properly and if the sugar industry is allowed to make un-conscionable profits, it is inevitable that the sugarcane grower will find some ways and means by which he will prevent sending his sugarcane to the mills and try to pass on the sugarcane for the production of gur. It is for this reason that the price of sugar and khandsari sugar rose and, also, sugar was in short production in this country. Therefore, if we have to correct this profile, if we have again to see that our industries develop in such a manner that industrial development also fosters agricultural development, we have to make sure that in our economy those industries that are based upon organic raw materials or agricultural produce are given a fair share of the total profits in the finished goods industry based upon these agricultural raw materials available in this country.

Finally, the issue of social development is a thing that very few people pay attention to. After all, what is socialism if there is merely industrial growth which can take place and social stagnation continues as it is continuing in our country? For socialism to be achieved there must be a parallel development of industries side by side with social development. Social mobility in this country is completely absent. Our people remain where they are tied down by caste and other social inhibitions, and because of the nature and circumstances of the policies and the lack of any social policy in our Plan the poor people either find no recognition of their problems, or if at all a recognition of their problem is there, it is so scanty and it is on such an austere basis that social development which should take place side by side with industrial development is entirely absent. Socialism demands that along with the

growth of industry inequities in our social system, economic and otherwise, should be eliminated. Unlike other countries we have social burdens of a very severe nature. Unless these are removed, unless these social inhibitions are eradicated, our people will not be enthused to make that effort that we must all make if economic regeneration must take place in this country.

On the basis of socialism, therefore, I would like to say this, that this motion of no-confidence is supported mainly because this Government has not paid attention to impart a social purpose to the people and to the nation, that the Government by its policy of middle course has given a go-by to socialist ideology, that the Government because of its wrong fiscal policies has caused a severe drain on the country's resources and placed it in a humiliating position vis-a-vis foreign countries who advances us the wherewithal for our economic development, that in trying to have a one-sided development of industry, social development which includes social mobility, has been completely neglected and, therefore, this Government cannot do good to the people. For these reasons, Sir, I support the No-confidence Motion.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Opposition have a right and privilege to move a motion of No-confidence, and it has been our anxiety always to understand and appreciate their view point, more particularly, when the Opposition is in a minority. When they are not in a position to replace the Government, it becomes specially our duty to have a sensitivity to the points and arguments made by the Opposition. Sir, the Motion of No-Confidence as known in parliamentary parlour, would have a real meaning and purpose if it were to replace the Government.

That is not the position at present, and we need not ridicule that position. But it would have served a great purpose if the motion of no-confidence had presented at least an alternative programme to the Government. If no alternative programme is presented, certainly the motion loses all its purpose and meaning, and that unfortunately is the position, because no two main speakers from the Opposition have been able to agree on any vital point or vital programme.

Therefore, it is not to be met almost as a motion of no-confidence. We have to take into consideration the various arguments advanced by them, the failures pointed out by them and try to place our viewpoint before the House. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that it was very significant that when the motion of no-confidence was moved, Acharya Kripalani who was in the House, who is the bitterest and biting critic of the present government who could not restrain himself even at the condolence meeting held in the Gandhi Chowk and came out with criticism sat stoically without giving his support to the motion of no-confidence. You must also have observed, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. and esteemed friend, Shri Chatterjee, rose to move his motion of no-confidence, there was a tense atmosphere in the whole House but by the time he had concluded his speech that tense atmosphere had disappeared, and not even those 17 members who had signed the motion of no-confidence were there to cheer him, to applaud him or to support him. That is the position, and that indicates that the motion of non-confidence, brought about by anger and indignation, had no real purpose and had no real support even from those who had signed it.

I will first deal with my esteemed friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, who today waxed eloquent and built his whole case—I will not go into the irrelevant material to which objection was taken; I will not wander into

the wilderness of the Kerala judgies; I will confine myself strictly to the major points which he made out—he built his whole case against the present Ministry by saying that the present Prime Minister has made a big departure from the Nehru line and he built his case on it. May I tell him that it is from the figment of his imagination that he has drawn his assumptions and conclusions? If anybody in the Congress Party understood the late Prime Minister Nehru and reflects his views and desires, it is Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, let it must be clearly understood. My hon. friend, Shri Alvares who spoke just now also said that when Shrimati Indira Gandhi spoke in foreign countries she said that we are following a centrist course. That lends further support to my contention that if Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri did not know what Nehru meant or what was his reflection, then who knows much better than these two people? Not Shri Hiren Mukerjee or Shri Peter Alvares or anybody else either on that side or this side of the House. Therefore, the entire edifice which he built on one assumption that there is a big departure from Nehru line falls flat to the ground.

I would also like Shri Dandekar to be disillusioned on this point that this Government going to depart from its well-considered and well-thought-out plan of industrial and economic development. Well, on occasions we have got to make a shift and we have got to emphasize a certain aspect. May I submit that if my hon. friends care to read the report on the Mid-term Plan and a note circulated by the Planning Commission on the action taken, they will find there the view of the late Prime Minister Nehru that greater emphasis should be laid on food and agriculture and larger allocations should be made for that. It is only that part which has been in the present context, and rightly so, em-

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

phasized by the present Prime Minister, who is sensitive and that is his great qualification—to the public demand and to the voice and to the agonies and miseries of the people.

Then, though we have already discussed the subject of food, it has been brought very much into the picture. I do not want to impose politics into food. I will deal only with facts which will not be disputed even by my friends sitting on the opposition. We all know that there is shortage of food. We all have a complaint against the hoarders. But may I tell my hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, that those who indulge in hoarding and blackmarketing are cleverer than the Communists and it is not so easy to catch them? Therefore, you have got to make out a proper plan and a programme so that you lay a proper trap and catch them unawares. You have got to do it from the very beginning, when the grain is with the agriculturist.

An Hon. Member: Why don't you tell them "I am going to catch you"?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That is why I said they are cleverer than any of you people here. I have also told the Minister of Food and Agriculture that they are very clever people and I know he is proceeding absolutely on sound lines.

Coming to food, in 1950-51 the availability of food for the entire country was about 54 million tons; it is accepted on all sides. Today, in the worst of the situation, the availability is 78 million tons. The rise in population from 1951-52 to date has been from 86 crores to 44 crores. Even though we are alarmed at the growth of population, it has not been more than 30 per cent whereas the increase in production is to the extent of 50 per cent, even according to the figures which are accepted by all. What do they indicate? They indicate, let it be clearly understood, that

the per capita availability of food, which means also the consumption of food, has gone up by 20 per cent. I do not have any complaint against it, because the consumption must go up. We were living at a semi-starvation level at a particular time and if the consumption is going up it is a happy sign.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Whose consumption has gone up? Who are those people?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: My hon. friend is asking who has started eating more. I do not think it is Tatas or Birlas because they were eating to their full even in 1950-51. So, this increase must have been in the consumption of the poor people. Let us face facts; let us understand the position. It is the poorer section which is eating more than that it was eating in 1950-51.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: According to you, those people who are starving now are well fed?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The increase in consumption could not have been by Birlas and Tatas and their *pichhlaggus*. They were eating *halwas* and *puris* even before. I have not the least doubt about it.

Shri Kishen Pattnayak (Sambalpur): Has he got any statistics to point out the income category which is consuming more? He must come out with statistics.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Whatever category you like. I leave it entirely to you. But it must be about 20 crores of people of India; it cannot be one lakh persons, whatever category it is. Maybe that it is quite correct that the lowest stratum has not benefited very much; I agree. I will agree to whatever you say, but you cannot dispute this fact that a large section of such people is there. For example, Punjab was deficit of

food at the time of partition; Rajasthan was deficit. The movement of wagons will indicate to you that it was so. Today both the States are surplus. We quite understand that the consumption of food will still go up much more because we were living at starvation level. There has been a shortfall. We are not happy about it. But that is not my point, my point is that it has gone up is a point which cannot be forgotten and it is a very important point of which you must take note.

Because only failures have been mentioned, still I am not going to give you the catalogues of achievements of this Government. I am not going to tell you how the post offices in rural areas have gone up to 272 per cent. I am not even going to tell you that the consumption of sugar which is so much talked about today is today at least 172 per cent of what it was.

An Hon. Member: Actually you are telling all that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There are many things. Let us take only one thing, namely, power. In Madras almost all the villages will be covered under the Third Plan.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What about Rajasthan?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I think, my hon. friend will bear me out that at a meeting at which he himself was present an MP from Madras—I do not know whether he was from the Opposition or not—told us that ever since his village has been electrified—I am only talking of rural economy—that which was all the time in debt has now become a surplus village earning Rs. 8 lakhs to Rs. 7 lakhs every year. What has made it possible? It was cheap power available to each farmer there which has made it possible. If we were to follow my hon. friend, Shri Dandekar, we will deny them cycles, power,

machinery, buses, wagons, railways. Now, 100 more trains have started running. There are 1,000 train services. You will have to deny all this to them if you follow the basic advice of our friend who, I am sure, after sitting here for a few months, will get himself educated according to the wishes and the desire of the mass of the people.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Go and see Hindustan.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What about his own State as regards electricity?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: In my State electricity has doubled or trebled, but we are actually unhappy about it and we are wanting more electricity. We have it only in 400 or 500 villages.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Is Rajasthan very prosperous?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: So far as food is concerned because more areas has come under irrigation and it has become a surplus State.

Now, let me turn to more important values on which my hon. friend, Shri Chatterjee, laid greater stress. I think, if this country is proud of anything, it is definitely proud of its fundamental rights. It is not the limited democracy that we have here. Here we have given roots to a full and free democracy which is the envy of the world and which has to set the pattern in this whole area. That is something of which everyone should feel proud. Let us not say things here, because what we say here is quoted everywhere outside, at least where the national interest demands it and I have not the least doubt the national interest is dear to every hon. Member sitting in the Opposition. Let us at least see both the good and the bad points. So, this is one of the things of which we should be very well proud.

Then, he also talked about the emergency. I hope the House will re-

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

member that we discussed the emergency and the complaint against the Government was that the emergency powers placed in their hands were not effectively and purposefully used. There was no case made out to wipe out the emergency, as a matter of fact. I am one with that feeling of the House.

Let us remember that we have set very high standards of parliamentary democracy to which our friends in the Opposition have contributed no less. But this definitely is a fact that those who are in power and who have been in authority, the Congress Governments, have always attached the highest importance to great values. That is for what Prime Minister Nehru will be remembered by posterity, for generations, namely, that he gave these great values. It is not that we go in for elections at the time of our choice. That would be perfectly democratic. That is a democratic principle in the UK. In the UK whichever government is in power it will go to the elections at a time most suitable to it, whether it is April, May, June, July, August September or October. But this Government has scrupulously kept the schedule and has always gone to elections in the month of February whether that was to its advantage or disadvantage. These are the important, basic and fundamental things of which the whole House and the whole country should be proud.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: What about the Orissa mid-term elections?

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): They were forced six months before the elections.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: So much has been said about corruption. You will remember, Sir, and the House will at once agree that I have never been sparing on this point. We have always tried to focus the attention

of the Government and, if necessary, to accelerate the process to see that corruption was rooted out and that immediate action was taken against the defulters. We continue to do so. But will anybody here disagree that during the last three months at least there has been a characteristic awareness of this problem by the Government as a whole? It is not, let us clearly understand, that it is Shri Nanda who is acting in isolation. Shri Nanda would never be able to function.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Why has he to act in isolation in this vital aspect? Why can he not have the collective support of his party?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I wish to tell my hon. friends that the Home Minister would never be able to function unless and until he had the support of the Prime Minister and of the party. I wish he had—and I am sure, he will have—the support of the entire House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why did you say 'in isolation' then?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is not, therefore, that I say that he is functioning in isolation. He cannot function in isolation. Let it be clearly understood. The Home Minister is charged with a particular responsibility; therefore, he will have to take the initiative in certain matters, but he has the definite support of the executive and of the party. There are certain ways and methods with which we may not be in agreement. I do not agree with this way of doing things. I am all the time saying that we must have an institution of Commissioner for parliamentary investigations because we must have an institution which will inspire confidence in the minds of the people. That is a must so far as I think; but that does not mean that we are not giving proper attention to that particular matter and that there has not been a clear

awareness of the situation. I think this Government deserves definitely to be congratulated on the most drastic steps which it has taken against its own partymen when it was found that democratic rights of the people and democratic values demanded it.

I will also say a word about our foreign policy about which so much has been said. I think, our great Prime Minister—it will be realised at some time—has rendered a great service not only to this country but to the entire world by setting a new pattern in the international field. Let us not repeat non-alignment parrot-like. What was his positive and dynamic role in this matter must be appreciated today; certainly it will be appreciated by posterity and his name will go down in history in golden letters.

There are two groups as we were being told. There is the Eastern group. Where is that group now? China and Russia form that group. They two are apart. What about the Western group? France is making it uncomfortable for that group. It has no place in that group. Pakistan which thought it will get very much out of this group is smarting under that policy which it followed. It is smarting every day. If you follow their speeches, if you follow their action, you will find they are smarting under the past debris of their mistakes. It is the policy of the Prime Minister which created a great impact all over which encouraged the U.S.S.R. to understand that they have a friend—they have a real and a sincere friend—that they could relax and that their rigid attitude need not be there. It is this indirect impact of our policy which has been responsible for the reduction in tensions. It is this policy of non-alignment which has served a great purpose for the nations which have become independent during the past few years. They have all toed the line of non-alignment and they find it to their best advantage. Had this policy not been there, the whole of South-East Asia would have been

engulfed—I have not the least doubt about it—by communism and there would have been nothing but intrigues and factional troubles. There is a fertile ground in the sub-continent of Africa. It is this policy of non-alignment which has set a pattern, which is responsible for the reduction in tensions, and this Government follows that policy which is sound to the core.

It is to the credit of the present Prime Minister that he does not take any nation for granted. He has taken a particular care—and we must congratulate him on that account—that he has sent his Foreign Minister out to meet the heads of all our neighbouring States. A case was made out that our relations with all our neighbouring nations are not cordial and good. There cannot be anything farther from the truth that our relations with Afghanistan have always been very cordial; that our relations with U.S.S.R. which is another neighbour have always been cordial; that our relations with Burma have always been cordial; that our relations with Ceylon are better than that of any other neighbour that we have....

An Hon. Member: Indonesia?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: If you take Indonesia, you will find that we have had good relations with Indonesia. As a matter of fact, Indonesia, in all its decency, owes a great deal to this country. But if Indonesia takes a particular path, you cannot help it and I cannot help it. There is nothing for which this country could be held responsible that it has not gone all the way to be friendly with Indonesia. But if Indonesia goes in a different way, if it can only be friendly with China, you cannot help it. Maybe, it is because of their population, because of certain compulsions, because of certain desires and ambitions and all that. That is absolutely another matter. Then, our relations with Nepal had strained a little bit. But when Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri went there, it gave a turn and now our relations with

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]
Nepal are all that could be desired for.

An Hon. Member: That is why with the help of China a road has been constructed.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Let us understand the other country and their sentiments also. Let us not do anything to damage the relationship which we have built. They are wanting us to build a road; they are wanting us to build a dam; they are wanting us to build industries; they are wanting us to do so much for them and they have stated more than once that their relations with India would be cordial and they would be further strengthened.

Lastly, I would refer to my hon. friend, Shri Peter Alvares who spoke with great eloquence. I think he spoke with certain obsession and frustration because of certain split in his Party. What my friend said was that those people who had left were honest P.S.P. members—very respectable of course—and they were at the highest in the hierarchy. They are joining everyday and they are quite happy.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: They have already been bribed.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am answering my friend Shri Peter Alvares.

Shri Alvares: I said, they believed in Congress socialism and they are moving towards Swatantra idea.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Why were they disillusioned? They believed in Congress socialism. Congress socialism is there. I wanted to know only that. My friend said that they were disillusioned. The hon. Prime Minister had said, we will follow a middle course. They knew it much earlier. Srimati Indira Gandhi has told much earlier that we are centrists. How do you justify this? The plain fact is that there is a great gravitation towards Congress and if there is any split in your Party I think, you better not mention it here,

rather try to throw the ball in the direction where it cannot stay. What is the sense in it?

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : गलत है, गलत है। हमारे आदमी अशोक मेहता जैसे आप के यहां नेता बन जाते हैं।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Sir, I think, practically I have answered all indictments of my friends and I think they will do well in the best interests of the country to rethink what their attitude should be.

Mr. Chairman: Shri P. K. Deo.

श्री बागड़ी : सभापति महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Chairman: I have already called Shri P. K. Deo.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: He raises a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: I have already called another hon. Member. What is the point of order? Is it about his right to speak?

श्री बागड़ी : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि स्वतंत्र पार्टी इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में सरकार के पक्ष की है। इसलिये उसका जो समय है वह विरोधी दल के समय में से न काट कर कांग्रेस के समय में से काटा जाये।

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order in that. Shri P. K. Deo.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, nowhere in the history of democracy probably with the exception of France, a Government of hardly three months old has ever stood at the docks to face a No-Confidence motion.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is the immaturity of the Opposition. That is the reason.

Shri P. K. Deo: It is true that many previous Ministers have continued but, Sir, we all know that they never had any initiative or freedom to think or act independently under that so called banyan tree. As pointed out by the previous speaker of my Party, the present Government has inherited the legacy of 17 years of misrule, 13 years of planning with wrong priorities and reckless spending to the tune of Rs. 19,000 crores. Of this, deficit financing amounted to Rs. 1800 crores as a result of which the prices have shot up by 37 per cent. It has inherited a legacy of public debt to the tune of Rs. 90,000 million or more. In this period, direct taxation had increased by 85 per cent and the net of indirect taxation has been cast so wide that it has not left any conceivable consumer item. We are reaping the consequences as the cumulative effect of all this. So, we feel that though the subsequent months may unfold the real worth of this Ministry, this three-month old Ministry do not possess any magic wand that they will undo all the mistakes overnight. So, we, as responsible Members of the House, belonging to the largest opposition party in the country could not afford the luxury of associating ourselves in this no-confidence motion. However, we would not be lacking in giving punches at the various lapses and misdeeds of the Government during these three months.

16.00 hrs.

When this Ministry started functioning, there was great fumbling. The way there was permutation and combination of portfolios and notification after notification was issued, gave us an impression that it is a weak Government and probably susceptible to various pressures....

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma: On a point of order, Sir, it is the privilege of the Prime Minister to allocate port-

folios. How can he say the Ministry is susceptible to pressures, etc?

Shri P. K. Deo: The interruption should be intelligent. Please sit down.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is not yielding. There is no point of order.

Shri P. K. Deo: Up till now no effective steps have been taken to free the sacred soil of this country from aggression. We have more or less acquiesced in the illegal acquisitions of China.

Shri Sheo Narain: He is reading his speech.

Mr. Chairman: He is only consulting his notes and not reading.

Shri P. K. Deo: By occupying large chunks of Indian territory, China has been reaping the political and military benefits. We have always met the challenge by making a mild protest and all these protests have fallen on deaf ears. We are surprised to learn that the Chinese forces intruded as far as 21 miles inside Sikkim and there has been large concentration of Chinese troops in the Chumbi Valley. We learn that there has been large concentration of Pakistani troops at Telulia in East Pakistan and we fear particularly that it may not lead to pincer movement of the Pindi-Peking axis to attack the corridor which connects Assam and thereby isolate the eastern part from the rest of India.

We still pursue these futile talks. This morning's paper says that we still want to find out through the good offices of Ceylon if China is at all sincere to withdraw its military posts from Ladakh. Are we yet to learn the intentions of China? Do we not know actually what China is after? All these years, we have been wasting time on these futile talks. These loose talks give an impetus to pervert thinking of persons like Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan, who often says that Aksai

[Shri P. K. Deo]

China should be let out to China. There should be an end to all these talks and we should take definite steps to meet the challenge.

It is not a boundary dispute. The demarcation of India-China boundary is not going to solve the problem. Has the 38th Parallel in Korea or the 17th Parallel in Viet Nam solved the problem? In spite of ideological affinity, Mongolia does not feel safe from the covetous eyes of Colossus. The Chinese intention is to dominate the whole of Asia and only the economic prosperity and military strength of India can face the challenge of China. We are all grateful for the timely military aid from U.K. and U.S.A. at the time of the crisis, which turned the table of war. Thanks to USSR, we are told that Mr. Chavan's mission has been successful. But we should be sure that this Russian help would be forthcoming in case there is war with China. That has to be categorically ascertained, because since the last two years, we have been hearing that MIGs are coming. At times they say that MIGs are coming by ship. I hope they are not coming by bullock carts all these years. Anyway, we accept military aid from any source to strengthen our military posture against China, but we should be sure that the Russian aid will be available to us in case China makes another attack on the country.

Simply the acquisition of military hardware is not enough. It is the acquisition of genuine friendship that is all the more essential. Due to our diplomatic fumbling, China has stolen a march ahead of us in cultivating friendship. When we are losing our confirmed allies, China had been making new friends. My friend, Mr. Dinesh Singh, will bear me out that after he and Mr. A. K. Sen have visited the African countries, specially Malawi, Uganda and Kenya, a calculated and determined attempt has been made by China to cultivate friendship there. India all along had a reputation of being a fearless fighter for freedom and the

champion of oppressed people. That glamour has gone. Now we learn that Mr. Chou En-lai visited all the African countries and he stated that it is a fertile ground for revolution. That statement was immediately followed by the coup in Zanzibar and unknown persons trained in China like Baboo shot up into prominence. So, we shall have to take a lesson from this. China even goes to the extent of improving her trade relations with South Africa and Portugal. We sometimes fail in our diplomatic duty and in ordinary courtesy. We never bothered to send a message of goodwill when there was the meeting of the second African summit at Cairo while China was prompt in sending a message of goodwill. We should be careful when we will be going to the second non-aligned conference. I feel that it may be a trap and unless we play our cards properly, we may be put in such a situation that we will have to accept the *status quo* on the northern border. So, all these things have to be considered. We lack that genuineness of heart with which Tenku Abdul Rehman supported India at the time of the naked aggression by China. Of course, our Finance Minister has done a good job. I congratulate him. At the time, I feel it is a not adequate. In this Indonesia-Malaysia controversy, our UN representative should say in categorical terms that we are on the side of Malaysia. We should say that we support Malaysia and we cannot tolerate the interference by another nation, however great it may be, in the internal affairs of a neighbouring State. Though relations with Nepal have improved—for which I congratulate our present Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri—since his visit to Nepal last year, Indians' prestige has received a very rude shock in the neighbouring States. Indians are being squeezed out from Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and East Africa and Fiji Islands. It is high time that we use the good offices of our Missions abroad to ensure that the Indians there get equal and human treatment

and they are able to repatriate their assets when they come back, and whatever is taken over by the Government there should be duly compensated for. But we have been neglectful in that duty. Some of the posts of Ambassadors in important centres like Rangoon and Djakarta remained vacant till the other day.

The rehabilitation of those Indians who are coming here is a big problem, and we shall have to give them all facilities. Dandakaranya has been all full, as you, Sir, coming from that area or from very near that area are aware. We shall have to rehabilitate them, therefore, in the backward areas of Kashmir, NEFA and the Andamans, and I hope that the present Ministry will examine this proposal.

It is a good thing that the External Affairs Ministry has now a whole-time Minister who is not entirely new to this task, and it is now high time that we should shed the international ambiguity of non-alignment, and do some positive thinking and take action. Non-alignment has not led us anywhere. It has not solved even one problem of ours.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: On a point of clarification. Just now, the hon. Member has said that we can accept aid from the USSR . . .

Mr. Chairman: There may be contradiction the hon. Member's speech but they cannot be cleared on the spot.

Shri P. K. Deo: The hon. Member lacks understanding. If she is careful in listening, she will be able to appreciate my argument.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: I am asking this question because I understand. What his leader Shri Rajgopalachari has said is different from what the hon. Member has said.

Mr. Chairman: I can understand the capacity of the hon. Member to understand.

Shri P. K. Deo: Non-alignment may be quite good an academician or from the academic point of view. But non-alignment should not mean equi-distance from the USSR and the USA. It should be the closest proximity to both. In the present context, you may call, it by any other term also, if you like, but our foreign policy should be of the closest proximity to both the USSR and the USA. Fortunately for us, both are against China, because both understand that China is a potential menace to the world peace.

Taking advantage of this, we shall have to accept aid. American *bona fides* have been justified by their action at the time of the crisis. We are still in the dark regarding the *bona fides* of USSR. My respected leader Rajaji has said in categorical terms that we shall have to align with the West. In our defence preparations, we have been bled white, and the nation has been bled white. If we want to fight poverty, in the internal field, we cannot afford to spend a single paisa for our unproductive military equipment. So, we shall have to align, and I most respectfully agree to Rajaji's suggestion.

Coming to the food front, there has been a sign of relief. The Food and Agriculture Minister has stated that we have turned the corner of food crisis. It is very good. At the same time, I take the liberty to congratulate UK for having diverted the Australian wheat ships to Indian ports to save us from the food crisis, and also for the timely American aid at this time of need.

My hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur was saying that Shri Dandekar needed some education, because he was new, and that his statement that agriculture was getting a step-motherly treatment was all wrong. I take the liberty to educate Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, through you. It is absolutely correct when Shri Dandekar says that agriculture in this country has received a step-motherly treatment from Government. It is a fact.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

While the industrialist gets power for the aluminium plant at 3 p. per unit from the Rihand Project, the poor agriculturist has to pay 19 p. to pump much-needed water for his thirsty land. Is that not step-motherly treatment? 2 million acres of irrigation potential have remained unutilised, and there is every likelihood of this figure being raised to 5 million acres by the time we reach the end of the Third Plan. There is also insecurity of tenure. My hon. friend spoke of our Fundamental Rights. Our Fundamental Rights in the Constitution are like pie-crusts, and they are broken the time of convenience. The Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution has robbed the ryot of his freehold right, that is, the ryot who is the backbone of India's economy, and has classified him along with the zamindar or intermediary to wait for his liquidation. When that is the case, could there be any impetus and could there be any incentive of more food production?

I quite fail to appreciate the anxiety of Government to check the food prices. Their anxiety is quite incompatible with the deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 149 crores which they have resorted to in a period of six weeks, during June-July last, which has broken all previous records. Unless you call it planning or call anything worth planning, it is all humbug and throwing dust in the eyes of the people.

What is the value of the rupee today? The rupee is just 17 paise in value. You cannot increase the intrinsic value of the rupee by putting Pandit Nehru's profile on the coin. We strongly resent at this. If at all anybody's profile is to be put, it should be that of the Head of the State. We are against the personality cult. We shudder to think how the party in power which had brought forward legislation to the effect that a currency note will lose its legal tender if any political slogan written on it—

that was only to accuse the DMK—could on their own come forward with the proposal that the Indian rupee will bear the Prime Minister's profile. That is all wrong, and I strongly protest against it.

We are, I am afraid, heading towards an one-party government. When the late-lamented Pandit was there, I said that this country was not a zamindar of any individual. We do not want a dynastic rule to prevail in this country of course, my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee may advocate for an one-party state, as he has been advocating before the students of the Delhi University the other day; he thinks probably that one-party state is ideal for this country, but we cannot subscribe to that view.

Coming to the home front, I congratulate the hon. Home Minister for his bold declaration and determined effort to root out corruption. Corruption has been corroding the moral fibre of the nation, and increasingly debasing and demoralising the people. We want to make his hands stronger. We also want to make Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's hands stronger to fight out corruption.

The names of Shri S. R. Das and S. K. Das will go down in history for the yeoman services they have done, as a result of which one Cabinet Minister and one Chief Minister of a State had to quit. The report of Shri S. K. Das never saw the light of day, but that of Shri S. R. Das has seen, and from whatever we have come to know, he has done a wonderful work. And the most correct step is being followed up by Shri Nanda in bringing to book the various corrupt officers. But, at the same time, we are taken a back when a storm of protest and grumble is raised inside the party in power, when Shri Nanda takes any step to fight out corruption. Why should it upset them? Probably, it pinches their shoes. I can appreciate if corrupt people against whom such charges

have been levelled object to it. But why should innocent people like the Minister of Information and Broadcasting come out openly and accuse Shri Nanda for the steps that he has taken to root out corruption?

I cannot appreciate it.

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bagaha): That is a mis-statement. The Minister of Information and Broadcasting did not say that.

Mr. Chairman: I understand. But this statement have to be corrected by other Members.

Shri P. K. Deo: All those who have grown rich overnight and have accumulated fabulous wealth are the loudest exponents of socialism, and they swear by the poor people. While dealing with this degraded aspect of human behaviour, it is the call of duty, it is the call of conscience that has compelled me to bring to your notice a memorial presented on 13-8-64 to the President by the non-communist Opposition members of Parliament, and of the Assembly of my State and certain leading men. Besides narrating blatant facts of favouritism, nepotism, corruption and partisanship and political misconduct, they have urged Government to appoint a Commission of Inquiry under the Commission of Inquiries Act, 1952 to go into the question. I do not want to go into the merits of the question because it will not be proper to do so. I do not want to prejudice the inquiring officer at this stage. At the same time, I feel it my duty to bring to your notice that pending consideration of this question, many dramatic developments have taken place in a period of one month. A reign of terror has been let loose in my State and demoralisation has set in every walk of life.

Mr. Chairman: I must now intervene in regard to the method of arguing of the hon. Member. He is referring to a matter concerning a State Government.

Shri P. K. Deo: No. The Speaker gave a ruling this morning while Shri H. N. Mukerjee was speaking that if he had referred to the memorial, then he could have spoken of the corruption charges, to which he was referring. But as he did not, he should not do so.

Mr. Chairman: At the far end of his speech, he cannot go on dealing with these details.

Shri P. K. Deo: I am not mentioning details at all. I won't even mention one detail because I do not want to prejudice the inquiry. But since the presentation of the memorial, certain facts have occurred in my State.

Shri Rama Chandra Mallick (Jajpur): On a point of order . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken 23 minutes and he has only two minutes left.

Shri P. K. Deo: No, Sir. I have taken 10 minutes from Shri Reddy.

Mr. Chairman: That is a different matter. I have to go by what I have before me. I cannot take notice of any internal arrangements made by members of a party. I have to go according to the time-table I have here. I do not want all these details to be referred to concerning a State in connection with the no-confidence motion against the Central Government here. Let him please bear that in mind and proceed with his speech.

Shri Daji: He is trying to help Shri Shastri to punish the corrupt.

Shri Ram Chandra Mallick: My point of order is this . . .

Shri P. K. Deo: Most of my time is taken away this way.

Shri Rama Chandra Mallick: I am very glad you have given your ruling. The hon. Member just said something about Orissa, that a memorial

[Shri Ramachandra Mallick]

had been sent to the Prime Minister and the President. The matter is also under consideration. That being so, it should not be referred to here.

Mr. Chairman: I have taken cognisance of that.

Shri P. K. Deo: I only urge the Prime Minister to expedite steps in this regard. Delay on his part gives rise to all these complications in my State. A dissident Congressman, a former Minister, was beaten. The Chief Minister came out with an offer to sell his assets and liabilities for one rupee and he received money orders for more than Rs. 3,000. There have been police excesses in Shri Krishan Pattnayak's constituency for . . .

Mr. Chairman: These are points completely under the purview of the State Government.

Shri P. K. Deo: Lastly, the most dramatic thing that has pained all of us, for which we hang our head in shame, is the students' indiscipline which had led to the seizure of the Assembly in session.

Mr. Chairman: His time is up.

Shri P. K. Deo: You never gave me two minutes.

We do not want the repetition of Saigon here.

Mr. Chairman: Will he please listen to me? I have to rule out any reference to happenings in Orissa. Within two minutes he will please close.

Shri P. K. Deo: We feel so sorry that indiscipline should be let loose. It should be stopped. If democracy is to function, is to survive, all these things cannot be tolerated. So, I request that the Prime Minister should take steps in this regard and should expedite the appointment of an enquiry commission.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): On a point of order. My hon. friend is speaking without knowledge. Mr. Mitra has issued a statement asking for the appointment of a commission. It is in the press now.

Mr. Chairman: At every stage you cannot correct him.

Shri P. K. Deo: I most respectfully urge that firing a canon ball at the mosquito is not going to stop corruption in this country. It has to be tackled at the breeding place. Where is the breeding place? The breeding place is the permit-licence-quota-raj and nothing else. So long as there is favouritism, so long as scope is given to favourites of the Government to become rich overnight so that they could afford to pay to the election coffers of the party in power, these things will continue. The Swatantra Party has demanded that there should be an end of this permit-licence-quota-raj, and Rajaji has rightly pointed out that a high statutory body should be appointed for the distribution of these quotas and licences.

All the eyes of the world are riveted on the functioning of the biggest democracy. The entire world has been watching how we act, how we behave and how you give your ruling. We want democracy to survive at all costs. The primary duty of the Government is to see that the basic needs of the people are available at reasonable prices to them, and at the same time preserve the integrity of the motherland.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I rise to oppose this motion of no-confidence in our national Government. The best way to oppose this shallow move is to analyse and expose the motives of the parties behind this motion. That is exactly what I want to do.

The motley crowd opposite has brought this no-confidence motion not with any national motive for the betterment of the people; it is not

also likely, they know it, to solve any of the problems that are facing our country. But they know very well that this kind of political acrimony that this motion is encouraging is also going to aggravate the critical problems that are already facing us. Still, they could not care less about it, and they have brought the motion before the House just to serve their political ends. As long as this move is expedient to their political ends, they do not mind doing any such thing.

Mr. Chatterjee, who is supposed to be a great legal luminary, made a rather confused speech. It looked as if it was aimed more at publicity than having substance in it. He made several self-contradictory remarks. While he pleaded for the removal of the emergency, he forgot very clearly and cleanly what he had said earlier about the recent Chinese infiltration in Sikkim, and their continued occupation of our territory. To him it seems that Chinese intrusion or Chinese occupation of our territory is not sufficient reason for the emergency to be continued. Several such observations he had made, but instead of questioning them I would proceed to show how opposition parties here have taken this motion as a good publicity ground for their future electioneering campaign, whether it is for Kerala or for Orissa.

It is very apparent that the main supporters to this motion of no-confidence are the communists and the communalists in this House.

Shri Daji: Why? The SSP also have supported it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I said 'main supporters'. It was mainly moved by the communists and the communalists. One of the arch communalists in this country, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, has been the mover of this motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He cannot make that accusation about Shri N. C. Chatterjee.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: When it comes to prejudice and ignorance, nobody can... (Interruptions).

Shri Daji: He is saying that a Member of the House is an arch communalist. He should not descend to this level.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, on a point of order. Is it open to a Member to say that another Member is a communalist when that Member had relinquished his membership of that party, the Hindu Mahasabha long ago and when Government could not have the guts to ban that party?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. A non-communalist may equally object to it. I understand there is some latitude of debate in these matters. They can contradict it when there is an occasion. But there is no point of order in these things.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Shri N. C. Chatterjee had been President of the Hindu Mahasabha for a long time . . .

Shri Daji: And he has left it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: This is very well known. I was saying about the leaders of the Jan Sangh and I would proceed to show how Shri U. M. Trivedi, who unfortunately is not here at the moment, made some very false and astounding statements in his speech yesterday. He said that when there was the Chinese aggression on India last year the Malaysian Prime Minister who was here then went out of his way and made an all-out statement supporting our stand against China. This is true. Then he proceeded to say that we have failed to support Malaysia in their struggle against Indonesia. This is either closing his eyes to facts or it is outright cheekiness to say this. Because, the other day in Kuala Lumpur our Finance Minister made a statement giving unequivocal support on behalf of the Government of India to the stand that Malaysia has taken in this concentration against Indonesia.

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

Again, while mentioning something about the Das Commission he said that a commission like this has to be appointed in several States, and he mentioned the name of Madhya Pradesh also. He comes from Madhya Pradesh and he should know that the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh made an offer himself in respect of the charges which had been levelled against his Ministry—not personally against him; nobody during the no-confidence motion in the Madhya Pradesh Assembly made any personal charge against the Chief Minister himself. But the Chief Minister offered in the Assembly that if any of the opposition leaders made any of these charges on affidavit he would welcome the appointment of any commission to go into this. This offer of course was not accepted; nobody acted upon it. I am only trying to illustrate what the Jan Sangh leader has said here. Knowing that it was false, he brought it to support his false case.

Similarly, Prof. Mukerjee while referring to the national scene here mentioned the resignation of Shri Sanjiva Reddy. Well, everybody who knows the political life of this country appreciated very greatly the step that Shri Sanjiva Reddy took in resigning the Chief Ministership, when it was not necessary, just to uphold the democratic traditions of this country and to set up healthy precedents. There was nothing against him personally in the High Court judgment. It was not necessary for him to resign. But he thought that his resignation would set up healthy traditions of democracy. And his action was widely applauded.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: Even Mr. Mukerjee applauded it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: But instead of praising this kind of action, just to suit their political ends they twist the matter like this and try to show it in a bad light so as to strengthen their case. Of course it was not

very surprising when Mr. Mukerjee said it, because he is no respecter of democracy or democratic traditions and it was right that he said so rather than any other leader of the opposition. Mr. Trivedi, again, in a very indiscreet manner I must say, made certain criticisms against the Election Commission in this House. That is extremely improper and coming from the leader of the Jan Sangh, it only substantiates their reputation. I do not want to say anything more because it was absolutely improper to make such insinuations against the Election Commission.

The speaker before me, the ex-Highness, was talking of democracy and he was advising the Government to align with the western countries without realising that many of the newly independent countries which have aligned with the western power bloc or even with the eastern power bloc have gone to dogs. There, democracy is gone; their independence is gone and they are all in terrible trouble. These people want to close their eyes. They have the cheekiness to stand up here and say such things. He was the only Member, a solitary exception, who could stand up in this House and say: we should align with the west. It is absolutely non-sensical and no Member in his senses will say so. But he in his wisdom found out things like this and said so here.

The Mover of the Resolution was pleased to refer to the crisis of development, social, economic and political. Students of political science know that in a country which becomes independent, the crisis begins right from that point. When independence comes, crisis begins, in varying forms. The people of the country try manly and manfully to overcome the crisis of development and mould the country according to their desires. So, this kind of crisis which we are facing today is not a new one. It has been coming in various forms, sometimes in low tension and sometimes in high tension. But it seems that these

people are trying to take advantage of the demise of the great stalwart of our country, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, immediately after his sad demise they have brought forth this no-confidence motion. I was also surprised that the Swatantra Party did not align itself with this motion. It looks as if they have adopted a new strategy in national politics. They are probably trying to introduce confusion or drive a wedge inside the Congress itself by trying to show that they are behind the Prime Minister in his new approach to planning. But to the Members of our Party and to ourselves, it is absolutely apparent that the Prime Minister's approach to planning is the same as that of Pandit Nehru; there is no difference at all. His statement or his letter to the Planning Commission has been grossly misinterpreted. He had made it clear to us several times that the basic policy continues to be the same. I am sure the Swatantra Members will be completely disillusioned with their new-found love for our Government. We often hear complaints about steam-roller majority of our Party. It is very surprising that they should always mention it as if it is something bad or that the Congress is guilty of having a steam-roller majority. It is absolutely plain that whatever majority we have is because of the collective will of the people.... (Interruptions).

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Whatever we do, we do on behalf of the people who voted for us, and when people give us the majority and the majority support to us, it is our right to help them and do what we feel in our collective wisdom.

It is again a pattern of political life which is evident in the Lok Sabha. You see the strength of the Congress Party which is 350 or thereabouts. The strength of the next party comes down to 19. How is it? It is not the fault of ours that they are only 19. Let them get the people's confidence

and come here in greater numbers. About these Opposition groups, I am sorry to say that even when our rules of procedure here which are so liberal, do not justify even the recognition of this crowd of individuals as a group. None of the groups today in the Lok Sabha are recognised—not to say about parties. The recognition as a party is a different matter altogether. Even the groups are not recognised because they do not have sufficient numbers, and yet, they come and stand up and talk as if they are representing the people who have elected only the Congress as the majority party (Interruptions).

If you look at the affairs in our country, in the context of history and the historical development of 40 centuries that our country has passed through, you will see that in 17 years we have done rather well, and that has been recognised by all impartial observers all over the world. Nobody has ever said that we have not done as well as we could have. Now, if you compare our achievements with those of newly independent countries—our social and political and economic gains in the last 17 years, compared to those of the newly independent countries which have won their independence after the second world war—you will see that we have done better than all of them. When we compare our social, economical and political conditions with those which have been prevailing in Indonesia, Laos, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Burma, Korea, Pakistan, Ceylon and other newly independent countries in Africa, and compare their conditions with ours, we will see that we have done better than they. You do not have to go and compare ourselves with Japan, Germany, Russia or the USA. If somebody wants to twist and close his eyes to facts, he is welcome to do that, but the people of the country cannot be deceived and cannot be misled by such false statements. The people have given conclusive answers to the Opposition parties in the first General Election, and in the second General Election,

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

and in the third General Election they have given the bluff and the rebuff to those parties, and I am sure in the coming General Election also they will get the appropriate reply from the people of the country. (*Inter-ruption*).

We feel sorry, and it is bad for our democracy that the Opposition parties are degenerating more and more as our nation grows. You will see they are splitting; there are splinter groups; they are rushing for entry into the Congress here and there. We may or may not admit them, but it is not good for our democracy. We want them to stay where they are.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Give us a list of Do's and Don'ts.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Let them prosper where they are and let them try to gain the people's confidence from where they are. It is no compliment to us and it is a very bad thing for them if they always try to enter the Congress at the slightest pretext.

I am sure that the Opposition parties will serve the people's ends and their own ends better if they leave the cheap publicity stunts and leave the agitational approach to our national problems. We have been seeking their co-operation in national building, and we want their co-operation with the Government in the tremendous difficulties that face our nation; and I am sure that the Opposition parties will leave their false tactics and co-operate with us.

Thank you.

श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा (बक्सर) : सभापति महोदय, जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव श्री चटर्जी साहब ने पेश किया है मैं उसका विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं ने इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में काफी गौर से खास तौर से चटर्जी साहब, श्री दंडेकर और श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी की

बातों को सुना, यों तो और भी विरोधी पार्टी के लोगों ने इस प्रस्ताव के हक में कुछ न कुछ कहा है, लेकिन मैं सिर्फ इन्हीं तीन सज्जनों के सम्बन्ध में दो एक बातें कहना चाहता हूँ।

अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव की तरफ देखते हुए, सभापति महोदय, और जो चटर्जी साहब ने इस सदन में भाषण किया उसके ऊपर गौर करने पर यह बात साफ जाहिर होती है कि इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के जरिये उन्होंने सरकार के सामने कोई ठोस सुझाव नहीं रखा। आज देश में उनके विचार से जो हालत है अगर उस में सुधार करने की बात वह कहते तो समझ में आ सकती थी, लेकिन श्री चटर्जी ने अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पेश करते हुए जिन बातों का उल्लेख किया अपने व्याख्यान में वे सारी पुरानी बातें थीं, उन्होंने रिहैबिलिटेशन के प्राबलम के बारे में कुछ बातें कही, उन्होंने इस बात का जिक्र किया कि जो रूलिंग पार्टी है, कांग्रेस पार्टी, उसके कोष में कुछ पैसा लेने के लिए देश में बहुत सी गलत बातें की जाती हैं। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि जो विरोधी पार्टियाँ हैं, खास तौर से जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी या स्वतंत्र पार्टियाँ हैं, इन पार्टियों को किस कोष से अनुदान मिलता है, किस देश से मिलता है और किस रूप में मिलता है। मुझे मालूम नहीं, उनको अच्छी तरह मालूम है। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक रिकगनाइज्ड चीज है कि किसी भी पोलिटिकल पार्टी के कोष में कोई भी व्यक्ति या लोग अनुदान दे सकते हैं। फिर इस बात का बार बार जिक्र क्यों, और वह भी ऐसे लोगों के जरिये जो इस देश से ही नहीं बल्कि विदेशों से भी किसी न किसी रूप में मदद लेते हैं, और खास तौर से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी तो अपने विचारों तक के लिए विदेशों की तरफ देखा करती है और मदद लेती है। इसलिए मैं इस मौके पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की बातें करके समय समय पर अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव नहीं लाना

चाहिए। (*Interruptions*) तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये पाटियां अपने देश से ही नहीं बल्कि विदेशों से सहायता लेती हैं। स्वतंत्र पार्टी भ्रमरीका का गाना गाया करती है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी रूस और चीन का गाना गाया करती है। ऐसे लोग जो दूसरे देशों से सहायता लेकर अपने को मजबूत करते हैं, वे इस बात से क्यों परेशान होते हैं कि देश के कुछ लोग किसी पार्टी को मदद करते हैं।

मैं आप से और सदन से भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का उद्देश्य सिवा सरकार को बदनाम करने, देश में लोगों के बीच में असंतोष फैलाने या अगले जो चुनाव आ रहे हैं उनके लिए अपनी बातों को लोगों के सामने रखने के और कुछ नहीं हो सकता। यह जानते हुए कि इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का नतीजा क्या होगा उन्होंने यह प्रस्ताव रखा है। जो नतीजा गत वर्ष रखे गये अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का हुआ वही इसका मत लेते समय होगा, बल्कि इसकी ओर भी बुरी हालत होगी और इसे और भी कम तादाद में मत मिलेंगे। अगर उसका उद्देश्य सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षण करना था तो यह और तरीके से भी हो सकता था, इस के लिए अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाने का औचित्य नहीं था।

श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी ने होरडस के खिलाफ कार्रवाई करने की बात कही है। मैं इस का दिल से समर्थन करता हूँ। लेकिन उसके साथ ही साथ मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती अगर मुखर्जी साहब उन लोगों की कार्रवाइयों के बारे में भी कहते जो कि उनके दल के लोग या जो लोग उनकी पार्टी में नहीं हैं, जैसे श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी, आज कर रहे हैं। आज जब कि देश में अन्न की कमी है और दूसरी चीजों की कमी है और दूसरे देशों से अन्न मंगा कर लोगों तक पहुंचाने की आवश्यकता है, उस वक्त ये लोग यातायात की हड़ताल कराने की बातें करते हैं, रेलों की हड़ताल कराने की बातें करते हैं, भारत बन्द की बातें करते हैं।

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ऐसी बातें करने से देश की खाद्य समस्या हल हो सकती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो लोग ऐसी बातें करते हैं वे देश को या देश के लोगों को मदद नहीं करते बल्कि देश के साथ विश्वासघात करते हैं। वे देश विरोधी काम करते हैं। और जिससे कि मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि जैसा अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने आया है और देश के लोगों ने और खास कर मजदूर वर्ग ने उन के भड़काने में न आ कर इन को जो जवाब दिया और समय समय पर इन के ऊपर जो अविश्वास लोगों ने किया उस को आप ध्यान में नहीं रखते हैं।

मैं इस मौके पर आप के सामने यह भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि जहां पर इन चीजों की कमी है वहां पर हड़ताल से या भारत बन्द के नारे से इस का निकास नहीं हो सकता है और इसलिये मैं इस सदन में यह कहना चाहता था कि इन लोगों को अगर पार्टी की कोई सेवा करनी है, अगर पार्टी को कुछ भी आगे बढ़ाना हो तो वह पार्टी की सेवा अधिक अच्छे तरीके से कर सकते हैं अगर यह अपनी पुरानी हरकतों को छोड़ दे।

एक तरफ श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ से देश में कम्युनिज्म लाना चाहते हैं दूसरी तरफ दांडेकर साहब देश में कैप्टलिज्म लाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक इस कांग्रेस सरकार का सवाल है दोनों विरोधी हैं, हालांकि उनके सिद्धान्त एक-दूसरे से बिल्कुल विपरीत हैं तो भी वे आपस में एक-दूसरे से मिल कर कांग्रेस सरकार के खिलाफ बराबर खड़े हो जाते हैं। यह एक विचित्र मेल है ऐसे लोगों का जो बिल्कुल ऐक्सट्रीम में रहने वाले हैं, दो परस्पर विरोधी शक्तियां आपस में हैं, दोनों के सिद्धान्तों का कोई मेल नहीं है लेकिन जहां सरकार के विरोध करने का सवाल आ जाता है वे परस्पर विरोधी शक्तियां आपस में इकट्ठा हो जाती हैं और मिल कर सरकार का विरोध करती हैं।

[श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा]

सभापति महोदय, मैं आप के सामने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सम्बन्ध में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आज देश के लोगों के लिए बहुत वफादार बनता चाहती है, उसकी मुसलियत आप को, सदन को और देश के लोगों को, सभी को मालूम है। यह ज्ञान कर आश्चर्य होगा कि जो कांग्रेस के बीच में झगड़ा होता है और जिसका कि जिक्र मुकजी साहब ने किया कि कांग्रेस के लोग आपस में अपने स्वार्थ के लिए लड़ते हैं लेकिन मैं क्या इन से पूछ सकता हूँ कि यह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आपस में क्यों लड़ती है? वे लोग आज किस बात के लिए आपस में लड़ते हैं? वह लोग अपने स्वार्थ के लिए नहीं लड़ते हैं तो किस के फायदे के लिए लड़ते हैं? यह तो स्पष्ट है ही कि वे देश के फायदे के लिए नहीं लड़ते हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी इस बात के लिए लड़ती है कि कौन अधिक से अधिक चीन को मदद कर सकता है और कौन अधिक से अधिक रूस को मदद कर सकता है? भारत की मदद करने का कोई सवाल नहीं है। दरअसल देखा जाय तो पिछले सत्तरह साल की आजादी के दौरान इस वर्तमान सरकार ने जो हिन्दुस्तान की सेवा की है और इस सरकार के जरिए जो कुछ भी देश में हुआ है, मैं ने पिछले अविश्वास प्रस्तावों के सम्बन्ध में भी कहा था कि अगर कोई आदमी आख बंद कर के बले तो उस को कभी भी कोई शोस्ता नहीं दिखा सकता है। देश के अन्दर क्या हुआ है वह दुनिया के सामने है। बाहर के लोग आकर छतरी से कम्युनिस्ट देशों के लोग आकर भारत की प्रगति की तारीफ करते हैं उस को दाव देते हैं लेकिन जो उनके एजेंट लोग हिन्दुस्तान में हैं उन को दीख नहीं पड़ता है कि भारत में क्या प्रगति हुई है और तभी इस तरह की बातें करते हैं। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि इस तरह के अविश्वास प्रस्तावों द्वारा अपनी बातें समय समय पर लाना और सदन का समय लेना और देश के काम में कोई सुधार की बात न करना विरोधी दलों द्वारा देश

या उस की जमता की कोई सेवा करना नहीं है बल्कि अपना स्वार्थ सिद्ध करना है।

उनकी ओर से करप्शन की बातें की जाती हैं। जहाँ तक करप्शन का सवाल है, यह ठीक है कि करप्शन के खिलाफ जो कामवाही होती है उस से सभी लोगों को अपना योगदान देना चाहिए। लेकिन इस सवाल में मैं यह सवाल करना चाहता हूँ कि सचमुच करप्शन कांग्रेस पार्टी के अन्दर ही है या कांग्रेस के लोगों के अन्दर है? मैं यह दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि इस देश के अंदर विरोधी पार्टियों के अंदर ऐसे लोग हैं जिन में भी बहुत भ्रष्टाचार भरा पड़ा है लेकिन उस का जिक्र यहां पर नहीं होता है।

विरोधी पार्टी के लोगों का यह आज प्रोविलेंज बन गया है कि कांग्रेस चूकि हुकूमत में है, उस के 100 काम करने में अगर एक भी कहीं गलती हो जाती है तो बड़े से बड़े रूप दे कर उसे लोगों के सामने रखना चाहते हैं। इसलिए मैं इस मौके पर अपनी विरोधी पार्टियों के सदस्यों से य. निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि करप्शन दूर करने का जो तक सवाल है, जरूर दूर करें, कांग्रेस पार्टी के साथ लगे, संगठनों में आपस में बैठ कर लगे। देश में जो भी करप्ट लोग हों, चाहे वे किसी तबके के हों, किसी भी वर्ग के हों, उन को जरूर कड़ी से कड़ी सजा दिलाने की कोशिश की जाय लेकिन उस करप्शन का भी अपना एक राजनीतिक दांवपेंच बना कर अपनी पार्टी का स्वार्थ आगे बढ़ाने की कोशिश करना देश के लिए बहुत बुरी बात होगी।

मैं इस मौके पर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की जो छतरी से मामूली टैक्टिक्स है उस के सम्बन्ध में भी जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। पिछले दिनों जब भारत पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री स्वर्गीय श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जीवित थे तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी बराबर से, यह उस की टैक्टिक्स थी, फैंसली की तारीफ करती थी और उन के

जो दूसरे साथी मंत्री थे, उनकी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वाले शिकायत करते थे, उन की निन्दा करते थे। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की उस टैकटिक्स में आज भी कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। आज एक बात जरूर बढ़ गयी है। मैंने देखा कि हीरैन मुकर्जी साहब ने पंडित जी के मरने के बाद भी आज उस की बड़ी तारीफ की है। उसके साथ ही साथ उन्होंने वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री की तारीफ करने के अलावा वर्तमान होम मिनिस्टर साहब को भी उस तारीफ की अपनी लिस्ट में शामिल कर लिया लेकिन बाकी के जो और उन के साथी मंत्री हैं, उन की शिकायत की, उन की टीका टिप्पणी की। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की इस हरकत को खूब समझते हैं और उस के प्रति जागरूक हैं। वे अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं कि इस तरह की हविधा की जो बातें होती हैं वे लोगों के ऊपर कोई असर नहीं कर सकती हैं। खासतौर से कांग्रेस पार्टी के अन्दर तो उस का कोई असर नहीं हो सकता है।

यह हो सकता है कि कांग्रेस एक प्रजा-तंत्री पार्टी है, कांग्रेस एक प्रजातन्त्रात्मक संस्था होने के नाते आपस में लोगों में कोई न कोई बातों में मतभेद हो सकता है लेकिन जहां तक विरोधी पार्टियों का सवाल है और जहां तक खासतौर से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का सवाल है, मैं आप को यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस में हर एक आदमी का दूसरे आदमी से इतना प्यार है कि वह किसी भी विरोधी पार्टी को अपनी कांग्रेस पार्टी के विरुद्ध कोई भी एड-वांटज देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। इसलिए मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो पुराना ढंग है कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का, काम करने का उसे वह अब छोड़ दे। दुनिया में काफी परिवर्तन हो रहे हैं। दुनियां काफी तरबकी कर गयी है और उन्हें भी अपने पुराने ढंग को छोड़ देना चाहिए। श्री हीरैन मुकर्जी इस समय यहां पर मौजूद नहीं हैं। मैं हीरैन मुकर्जी साहब, उन के बहुत से साथी, पांडे

जी और बाहर से खासतौर से मददगार बनर्जी साहब को यह आग्रह कर हूँ कि इन पुराने तरीकों से काम करने से कोई ज्यादा फायदा नहीं हो सकता है।

सभापति महोदय, मैं केवल दो बातें स्वतंत्र पार्टी के जो माननीय सदस्य श्री दांडेकर हैं, उन के व्याख्यान के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने प्लानिंग का विरोध किया। खास तौर से पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडर-टेकिंग के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने यह कहा है कि काफी गड़बड़ है जिसकी वजह से देश की ग्रंथ नीति में काफी दिक्कत पैदा हुई है। मैं इस मौके पर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक बार हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू जी ने कहा था कि दुनियां के प्रंदर जितने तरीकों से गवर्नमेंट चलाई जाती हैं, उन सब तरीकों से चलाई जाने वाली गवर्नमेंट्स में कुछ न कुछ दोष होते हैं। डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से भी जो सरकार चलाई जाती है उस में भी कुछ दोष होता है लेकिन दोष होते हुए भी जो डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से सरकार चलाई जाती है, वह दुनियां के जितने गवर्नमेंट्स चलाने के और तरीके हैं, उन से यह बहुत अच्छा तरीका है और इसीलिए हम ने डेमोक्रेसी को मंजूर किया है। इस तरीके से अगर पब्लिक सेक्टर के जरिए देश में काम चलना है, उस में अगर कोई त्रुटि भी होती है, कोई कमी भी होती है तो हमारा काम यह है कि उस कमी को हम दूर करें न कि पब्लिक सेक्टर के तरीके से जो काम चलता है उस की हम निन्दा करें। श्री दांडेकर को मैं विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में थोड़ी बहुत कोई परेशानी या दिक्कत हो, कुछ नुक्सान भी हो तो भी हम पब्लिक सेक्टर के जरिए ही इस देश के प्रंदर उद्योग चलायेंगे प्राइवेट सेक्टर के जरिए नहीं। जिससे इस देश के अन्दर जो मोटे, मोटे लोग हैं, पूंजीपति लोग हैं उन को और बढ़ावा मिले और उन की ज्यादा से ज्यादा तरबकी हो। इस तरीके से प्राइवेट सेक्टर से अगर उद्योग

[श्री: प्र० प्र० शर्मा]

चलाये जायेंगे तो गरीब लोग और गरीब होने चले जायेंगे और अमीरों की पूजा और अधिक बढ़ती चली जायगी।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ और मैं इस प्रस्ताव को एक राजनैतिक प्रस्ताव मानता हूँ, दाँव

पेच वाला प्रस्ताव इसको समझता हूँ। साथ ही साथ आपने जो मुझे समय दिया है इस के लिए मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

17.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, September 15, 1964/Bhadra 24, 1880 (Saka).