

## COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

## FORTY-SEVENTH REPORT

**Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga):** Sir, I beg to present the Forty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.10 hrs.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, the House will take up further consideration of the No-confidence Motion.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस संबंध में एक निवेदन करूंगा कि पूर्व निश्चय के अनुसार आज पहले कृष्यात बाल्काट मण्ड पर बहस होगी

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मुझे वह याद है ।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** मेरा निवेदन यह है कि उस पर आज प्रथम बहस चलती क्योंकि एसा पूर्व निश्चय कर लिया गया था ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** उस पर पहले ही बहस होगी लेकिन चूंकि एक ही डिबेट है और पिछले दिन की एक तकरीर अभी जारी है इसलिये मैंने सोचा कि 8 मिनट वे ले लें, चार, पांच मिनट और लेंगे और वह स्पीच खत्म होने पर इसको ले लिया जायगा ।

**Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur):** Sir, I abide by your decision entirely, but I had understood that the debate on

the Murud incident was, according to the Bulletin, under your own direction, fixed at a certain hour and the debate on the No-confidence Motion was to continue after that. Therefore, I supposed that I was to begin this.

**Mr. Speaker:** There was no hour fixed. The only thing was that we would take it up separately. We fixed it for Tuesday, but having regard to his convenience, the House agreed to take it up on Wednesday. We are taking it up just after five minutes. The House will now take up further consideration of the motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers moved by Shri N. C. Chatterjee on the 11th September, 1964. Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma to continue her speech. She has already taken 8 minutes.

**Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khammam):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, Andhra Pradesh Bund was 99 per cent failure. The present food policy should satisfy both the Communists and the Swatantra Party because of the fair prices fixed for the farmer and I am sure that several farmers have expressed that it is a reasonable price and there is a decision to undertake State trading in foodgrains gradually.

Some Members said about the personality cult. Even after the sad demise of Jawaharlalji, they are still pursuing it. I feel that it is the Opposition that has started the negative personality cult in the country. I do not understand why there should be so much controversy about the decision of the Government to declare the previous Prime Minister's residence as a national memorial. In this very House, we heard Dr. Lohia speaking about the furniture, the carpets and all these things of the Prime Minister's residence. The previous Prime Minister was requested, when he became the Prime Minister, to stay in that House. So, whether he liked it or not, he was staying in this House. Now, what is

[Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma]

wrong if the Government decided to declare it as a national memorial and the Prime Minister's residence is shifted to a simpler and smaller house. Dr. Lohia's utterances after the demise of our beloved Prime Minister are resented throughout the country. He said: Our Prime Minister has given jewels to his family and ashes to the country. This is what he says about the ashes of Jawaharlalji.

Regarding the amendments to the Constitution, I have seen a number of private Members bringing forward so many amendments to the Constitution especially from the Opposition side. Why should they blame the Government in this regard?

Again, regarding our policies, Mr. Dandekar wanted to give an opportunity to this Government to change its policies. It is not so simple as that. Our policies had been debated in Parliament for years and years and they were found to be sound and they were endorsed by the people at large. Shri Jawaharlal himself in his Autobiography has said:

"If I were given a chance to go through my life again with my present knowledge and experience added, I would no doubt try to make many changes in my personal life—but my major decisions in public affairs would remain untouched. Indeed, I could not vary them for they were stronger than myself and a force beyond my control drove me to them."

Nehru's way is the correct way. He stood for the relation of the past and the present akin to the relation of the Mother and the child where the Mother endures in the child but the child is an independent entity in itself. This was the true significance of Nehru to India. He meant a wholesome synthesis of the past and the present of the East and the West, of the ancient and the modern, of the

philosophic and scientific attitudes. To the Indian people, no other attitude could be more natural and more useful. The vision of India which he conjured up, the foundations of ideology which he laid, the pattern and policy which he formulated will endure for a long time. I want them to endure without being a routine beaten track without solidifying into fanatic and unpragmatic postures since this contains the essence of what Nehru always preached and stood for.

Sir, regarding the economic policies, I would like to explain them but I do not have much time here to explain them. Jawaharlalji has explained them. I would like Mr. Dandekar to read the debates where our previous Prime Minister has explained them. I do not like to use the word 'late' because I never consider Jawaharlalji as dead; he is ever living, he is *amar* and he is always living in our hearts. I would like my hon. friends to read those speeches.

My hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani also had advanced an argument on the same lines before and asked 'Why do you want a steel plant?'. Jawaharlalji has given an answer to that question. I shall just read out one or two sentences from Jawaharlalji's reply to Shri M. R. Masani's question: Regarding the strategy of economic development, Jawaharlalji said:

"Our strategy of economic development is first and essentially agriculture, modernisation of agriculture, the training of our rural masses to change their outlook to use new methods, tools and at the same time lay foundations of an industrial structure by building heavy industries, above all, power."

He also said:

"With the money available with us, are we going to give some present benefit today or kept it for tomorrow or the day after? By spending the money we have we can get some petty benefits today but that will not yield any permanent benefit, and one has to find a healthy balance between today's benefit and tomorrow's. This business of steel plants etc. is for tomorrow's benefit."

We cannot get tied up economically with the countries of the West or of the East, as Shri Dandekar wanted us to do when he said that we should get more and more instruments and equipment from the West. If we get tied up with those countries, that would mean that our industrial growth will be prevented, and that is not the way of getting our country industrialised. Again, placed as we are, an industrial base is most important from the point of view of military strength and defence strength. Even for agricultural implements, small industries are needed today.

There may be some difficulties in the implementation of our policies. There may be difficulties arising out of the limitations inherent in the situation. That was because we had a legacy and we had a particular situation handed down to us, such as a backward economy, immature political institutions, an inhibited society sandwiched between the compulsions of a fast changing world and the stagnant outlook generated by centuries of slavery and exploitation. This was the mightiest challenge facing the young nation and this challenge was accepted under the leadership of Panditji.

Again, there was also the failure of the human element, and most of the failure can be attributed to the failure of the human element.

The total war started by our Home Minister on corruption has to be encouraged. Socialism and democracy cannot prosper where the atmosphere is so charged with graft and self-aggrandizement and an ever-increasing gulf of disparities. Our socialism has yet to take roots and this can happen only when we have the courage to maintain ideological clarity in all that we do. Any sound socio-economic system and particularly socialism contains within itself adequate correctives to counter the vagaries of the human element. The prevalence of vagaries is used as an argument against socialism and the forces of socialism are not allowed to operate. This is the age-old trick of detractors. The most effective way of obviating the failures of the human element is to pursue relentlessly the ideology for which we stand. The panacea for the ills of socialism is more socialism.

Whether it be the food situation or the question of prices, corruption or inefficiency, poverty or backwardness, whatever be the particular malady, a scrupulous ideological approach alone can do the trick.

The banyan tree which was giving shade to all of us is no more. Let us now see how much shade the other trees can give us. Their growth will no more be stunted, provided they have the inherent capacity to grow. The great virtue of democracy is that it has mysterious ways of replenishing human material. Even under the shadow of a national tragedy, I hope that the hitherto untapped capacities and dormant energies of the present leadership will spring into full bloom.

I shall conclude my speech with what Shri H. N. Murkerjee said during the debate on the no-confidence motion last time. He said:

[Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma].

"But I feel that it is fair to remember that raking up the past might not always be a good thing, and if we remember the past, when we all wanted to move together in the tasks of maintaining the dignity of the country, securing the country's development, then we should not be unconscious of the obligations which we continue even today."

Here again I would repeat what our previous Prime Minister was so fond of saying:

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

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai.

श्री मौयं (अलीगढ़): सूचना के प्राधार पर जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव चल रहा है उस पर 17 हस्ताक्षर कर्ताओं में से मैं भी एक हूँ। शुक्रवार से मैं प्रतीक्षा कर रहा हूँ बोलने का अवसर पाने की। कब मेरी प्रतीक्षा पूरी होगी, क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें। आपको वक्त पर पता चल जाएगा।

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of my discussion is the unauthorised and illegal landing of one Mr. Daniel Walcott at Murud in Ratnagiri on the western coast of Maharashtra. The second visit of Mr. Walcott,—or shall I say, the second pilgrimage of Mr. Walcott?—to the sacred shores of this holy land of ours?—highlights the total chaos that prevails at our ports, at airports, harbours, all the numerous points of contact we have on our long and extensive border with our neighbours. It shows—I hope I will not be accused of exaggeration when the hon. Minister replies, as they did last year when I raised the matter in this House—it highlights the unparalleled, the unprecedented smug-

gling that goes on in this country, the shocking and incredible incompetence and corruption in the administrative services. This small episode shows the shocking state of our security, of our vigilance and lack of integrity. This episode highlights those dangerous weaknesses in the strategic spots of our national life.

I will first take up the facts regarding what exactly transpired, at Murud on the 8th June 1964 and later on the 9-6-1964 at Bombay. There is a statement circulated by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs. For some mysterious reason, the statement never mentions Mr. Walcott. It talks of one Mr. Philby. It is common knowledge that Mr. Philby is nobody but Mr. Walcott. I am reminded, by the strange restraint on the part of the Government to mention Mr. Walcott by the name, of the restraint of old-fashioned Hindu women who will never refer to their husbands by their names.

Shri D. C. Sharma: (Gurdaspur): But he did not marry a Hindu woman.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Walcott lands on the coast.....

Mr. Speaker: Traditionally, it is not the husband that goes veiled; it is the wife that goes veiled.

Shri Nath Pai: I was only referring to the limited aspect of it.

Mr. Walcott lands there, and what happens? Normally, a smuggler, a racketeer, a man wanted by the law of the country, would try to take to hiding, to hide himself so that he cannot be tarced. The Government of India is negotiating for the extradition of Mr. Walcott with the Government of the United States of America, with the Government of France, and God knows with what other governments. But under the very nose of the Government, when the Government is carrying on these negotiations for his extradition, Mr. Walcott happily and confidently carries on his depreda-

tions, sure in his knowledge gained by his long experience of this country that there is nothing to detect him, nothing to stop him, nothing to prevent him.

How does he put us to ridicule? Promptly this adventurer goes from where he has landed, not to his hiding spot, but to the arms of our security, the police station. And what does he do there?

He asks the police officers to give protection to his aircraft, and our police oblige him by sending two guards to guard the aircraft of the smuggler. Why is he so bold? He has taken the measure of our security, he knows the measure of the integrity of our services. He asks them to help him to proceed to Bombay, and he succeeds in doing that. He reaches Bombay. There, he has a rendezvous with his other accomplices and colleagues. They meet and proceed to a hotel, where one Mr. Novak has been staying for a long time, for more than three weeks. Had the security service, intelligence service, anti-corruption branch of this country been even partially vigilant, they would have watched the activity of this Novak who used to make international calls pretty regularly from the hotel in which he was staying. But, it was nobody's concern.

They meet there, take a taxi and proceed to the airport. And what happens at the airport is something which normally happens in the days of the Haroun EI Raschid, but Mr. Nanda has become a modern Haroun EI Raschid; he even went in disguise to trace the blackmarketeers in Delhi. So, no surprise that we are having a repetition.

There, Mr. Walcott manages to mix with the incoming passengers of a plane which had just landed, goes into the airport, passes through customs, immigration, health, crosses the barrier, buys a ticket and then imme-

diately boards a plane to proceed to Pakistan.

After the horse has run away, of course the security apparatus of India is activated as usual, and it busily starts to trace him.

There are some questions about this which I should like to raise before I say anything else. The statement says:

"Unfortunately, it could not be transmitted to the Controller of Civil Aerodromes on the night of June 8 on account of bad atmospheric conditions and was received by the Airport Control Tower in Bombay at 7.32 A. M. on June 9, 1964".

Information was sent by a constable that one Mr. Philby and one Mr. McAllister had landed there and were proceeding to Bombay. Finally the Aerodrome Officer receives this information at 7.30 in the morning. What steps does he take to stop Mr. Philby, i.e., Mr. Walcott, and Mr. McAllister from boarding the plane, because it is four hours after the information reached the Aerodrome Officer that they boarded the plane for Pakistan? I would like to know what the Aerodrome Officer was doing.

The Aerodrome Officer of India have a pattern of behaviour. Last year, Mr. Philby i.e., Mr. Walcott had done the same kind of trick at the Safdarjung Airport. We had tried to raise the matter, and, at a later stage I will have time to motion the reaction of the Government to that episode. At this stage I will be saying this much that the Government at no stage has explained in this statement as to what prevented the Aerodrome Officer from alerting other people that a plane had landed and they had to locate the people who had landed there. Four hours elapsed. There were actually more hours which the Government had at its disposal if it wanted honestly to discharge its duty, because, between his landing and emplaning for Karachi, there were more than 24 hours, but morning was done. The ex-

[Shri Nath Pai]

plantation is that the message sent from Murud did not reach Bombay, but this particular message, the statement says, had reached.

Now, I want to know another thing. Why does he feel so bold to proceed to the police station? He simply knows that there is nobody whom he cannot fool, he simply feels that there is nobody whom he cannot bribe. This is the measure of our administrative competence, intelligence and integrity that an international racketeer has taken.

Looking at the periodic depredations of Walcott, one feels that India is fast becoming the hunting ground for adventurers like Mr. Walcott. It is the paradise for the racketeer, for the profiteer, for the blackmarketeer. In the past, because of our culture and civilization this land used to attract and invite great scholars and explorers like Huien Tsang. It was the promised land for the seeker after the truth. Today, it is the most promising land for the seeker of fortune. For anybody who wants to make quick money in the shortest possible time, here is the land, India. No risks involved; no capital required; unlimited profits guaranteed; come to India.

The debate has been raging in this House. Mr. Speaker, whether this country is following in the footsteps of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, of Shri Shastri; whether we are following Nehruism, Shastri-ism or socialism; there is doubt about all this. But there is no doubt whatsoever about where we are going. This country seems to be imperceptibly but definitely marching towards some kind of a thing which broadly may be described as Walcottism. What do I mean by this? It is this strange alliance among the ruthless racketeer, unscrupulous profiteer and the corrupt official. All this is watched by the Government which is sometimes negligent, sometimes indifferent and sometimes helplessly watching what is happening. Walcottism is the symbol of all these.

Supposing Walcott's communication to his accomplice Novak had reached him, it is conceivable that the Government would never have heard that Walcott had come and gone. It was a failure of a certain message pertaining to this plane which he has sent from Karachi; it did not reach his accomplice so he had to proceed from Murud to Bombay. Had that message reached Mr. Novak, he would have taken the same plane and returned to Karachi and this country would never have heard about him. We do not know how many visits he had made to this country or how many more Walcotts there are in this country operating. Indian and of course foreign Walcotts because he is a symbol of a particular type of mentality. I know Government's reply we have a vast coastline. In my own district on the coast of Maharashtra itself, there are 200 miles of sandy beach which offers ideal facilities for landing of small aircraft. What can we do? That would be the reply. In their eagerness to secure this point against me and those who support me, I warn them, let not the Government advertise and proclaim India's total inability to defend its coastline because that is a temptation. How can we go on guarding every inch? Ours is a vast coastline. If you are going to secure this point against me by saying that every inch of our coast and our border cannot be protected and guarded and looked after, please say so; that this country and its defence is too big a task for you and leave it to somebody who does not think that it is too big to guard but is proud to accept the challenge and defend every inch of its soil. All these happened in the midst of the Emergency! A wanted criminal and an international racketeer comes, makes a mockery of the law, goes to the main city of the country and meets his accomplice and proceeds to the airport. We do not know whom else he has met in between. There are reports in the papers that Walcott is only a facade for more

respectable names; that Walcott is only a link in doing something on a gigantic scale, racketeering and smuggling.

I know that the gold control order was promulgated by the Government: (a) to stop smuggling, (b) to bring down the price of gold and (c) to bring forth the gold which is hidden in the houses of this country for developmental purposes. We know how magnificently all these three ideals have been achieved. We know that the price of gold today is high. But what was the Government doing—hunting the little goldsmith in your village, Sir, who converts the peasant's little ornament into something new his wife wants. Walcotts and their supporters and their allies and their accomplices and those who back them can come and do what they like and get away and it is only afterwards that this country knows about it. The Finance Minister is not here. His department is concerned. Not only his; the Home Department is concerned; the excise is concerned; customs is concerned, police is concerned and the security and in a certain manner defence is concerned. This is superficial attitude,—that we exaggerate! I hope for Heaven's sake they will not build the petulant charge against us, that it is exaggerating something. I will be saying towards the conclusion of my speech the relationship between such massive, large-scale, organised smuggling, international smuggling, and the danger to security and defence, and its implications in the terms of the enemies of this country.

Here, I would like to ask the second question to the Government: how is it that he could go to the airport and get mixed with the incoming crowd? What was the security staff there doing? If you go to the airport, Sir,—as you sometimes do—you know how many are the barriers—though you are a VIP and a distinguished son of this land—through which you must pass. At every stage, you will be stopped and asked a myriad questions.

You cannot leave the airport. But Walcott can go. He holds the magic key to everything in India. He can open any door; he can pass through any barrier; he can get anywhere. My worry is not about this insignificant, little, international adventurer, but the question is, how many more there may be behind him. We have caught one; how much must be hidden behind? It is just like the iceberg which displays only one-fifth, but the other four-fifths is submerged and that is the real danger. (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Speaker, only this morning's papers have disclosed something. In Bombay there was a haul. What was the haul? Five million. I was associated in a very small manner with a certain enquiry. It was confided to us. Now that six months have passed after the submission of the report, I can take the liberty of disclosing part of the whole evidence: the smuggling that is checked in the country may be hardly 10 to 20 per cent of what really takes place. Walcott grimly reminds this country of what is happening. All this talk of saying foreign currency becomes meaningless, when such a massive smuggling is allowed. The reply will be apart from saying how can we do it, what can we do about this vast coast of ours. May I know or not from the Government whether a written complaint was lodged by a certain citizen from the same area, that Murud and its surrounding areas are the smugglers' dens, that Arabs coming from Kuwait and other places come and land, and the yellow metal passes, that this goes on pretty regularly in an organised manner, not because of the skill of these people who come with their audacity and their bravery, but many people have succeeded in making their accomplices do it. I hate to bring charges against the administrative services unless I feel deeply convinced (a) that it is correct and (b) that we must raise it; but this kind of massive, large-scale smuggling goes on there with the connivance and some-

[Shri Nath Pai].

time the acquiescence of those who have been posted by the Government of India to stop it. As an Indian proverb says, when the fence itself has taken—which is supposed to guard against this thing—to this kind of activity, who will protect the field? Those who have been posted to look after these things and see that no such thing happens have become accomplices, and that is why this happens there.

We had a previous haul of Rs. 8 million only a few miles from there. Now this episode comes, and we get in, not because of our alertness but by something different; not because that the police have discharged their duty; he comes and passes.

The next question also will not be answered: how did he smuggle himself? How did he join the incoming team? Nobody has replied. It means that chaotic conditions prevail at the airport, and as a result of this disclosure, now, honest visitors from abroad are harassed. The other day in Bombay, those who had already boarded a plane were compelled to come down for a search because the search was not enough. What a country? The innocent will be persecuted; the guilty will get away! Can we not change our patterns now?

Another thing happens. He comes in. The emigration officer—a vigilant man obviously—discovers that the two names, Mr. Philby and Mr. McLister—are not on the list of passengers of this plane. He raised an objection. But then—here is the question—an official of the Indian Airlines Corporation promptly inserts the names, writes the names of these two passengers. Now, he has been arrested. Is he the only one, some minor officer? Are not there many like him, and why did he do it? What are the standards? Here is an official of a nationalised enterprise who did that, and I do not know for what motive, because I have not seen any statement from the Minis-

ter, and whether it was lucre of gold or money or something—that Mr. Walcott succeeded in greasing the palm and compelling this officer in the presence of police officers to enter the names which were not there. Then they come out and then they go. Last year the Government ridiculed me; warned them not to do it and note the proper meaning and significance of this. I warn them to see it in its proper perspective. Today it is not I only who stands ridiculed; the whole country stands ridiculed.

What happened on the 8th June, 1964 was implicit, inexorable and inevitable in the light of what happened in this House on the 19th November, 1963. Like a Greek tragedy reaching its climax inexorably and relentlessly, Walcott was bound to come. Why? He had boasted and he had failed; he regularly comes and goes. I am going to read the Minister's reactions. The Minister laughed at it and ridiculed those who supported me. He said that we were spinning yarn, that we were telling a cock and bull story. I know Shri Raj Bahadur and Shri Nanda are earnest and honest souls and I think as Ministers go, they try to do a good job in this country. But when this matter was raised and we discussed it in this House it was duly defeated by pressing into service that massive, blind majority, with its press button mentality, whose conscience can be smothered and whose patriotic urges can be suppressed by cracking the whip of party discipline.... (*Interruptions*). Every word is constitutionally correct, Mr. Speaker. Let me complete my sentence. I will repeat every word—by pressing into service the massive, pliant majority, which the Government commands, whose patriotic urges and conscience can be smothered and suppressed by the Government by cracking the whip of party discipline...

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur):**  
It is highly objectionable, Sir.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** He says, massive blind majority whose patriotic urge is smothered.

**Shri Nath Pai:** It may be unpalatable, but it is true.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is only unpalatable; it is not proper to say that the conscience of anybody much less that of a large number or a party, can be suppressed so easily by pressing the button or by the whip. Every party has that right to discuss a matter in their own meeting and every party proceeds like that in a democracy. They agree to abide by the decisions they have taken there. Therefore, they come into the House and abide by that whip issued to them. To put it in this manner is not fair to any party or to the democratic system also.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member referred to patriotism. I request that those words should be expunged.

**Mr. Speaker:** Did I not refer to that?

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** You did not refer to that.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not propose to expunge anything. My remarks and his observations would remain there.

**Shri Nath Pai:** As you know, Sir, I am always only too willing to be guided and led by you. In this matter, may I remind you, Sir, of the remarks used in this House. It was not something which I was using on the spur; I had weighed it and considered it. May I say that "Government whose conscience has been drugged, whose ears have been plugged, which has been blinded by the lust for power" are parliamentary phrases, Mr. Speaker? Whereas I will respect your opposition to this and I mean no disrespect, what is the phrase I used? Many Congress Members were feeling with me, were

agreeing with me and they supported me. But still it was duly defeated by depending on the majority. In this no aspersions are cast on their patriotism.\*\*

**Mr. Speaker:** As he repeats it, it would be expunged. (*Interruptions*). So far as the Government is concerned, I have absolutely no objection to it.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central): Is it your ruling that the usual cut and thrust of parliamentary debate is going to be drastically modified, because if in this way one is to order one's formulations, it is an impossible proposition to function in Parliament. If you refer to the parliamentary proceedings in any respectable country in the world, you will find much more vitriolic language.

**Shri Nath Pai:** I quoted from the proceedings of the Central Assembly.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not concerned with what happens elsewhere. We have our own genius, our own traditions and other things that we have to observe. So far as the remarks that he made about the Government are concerned, I have absolutely no objection.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedi:** It is actually directed against the Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, Sir; "patriotism of the members of that pliable majority" cannot be....

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedi:** It is the Government which is suppressing their patriotism.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, Sir; it cannot be suppressed unless those Members also are agreeable to that being suppressed; it can't be done otherwise.

---

\*\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** Shri Nath Pai has been very clear. He said that by the cracking of the whip the patriotism of the members was smothered. There were members in the Congress Party—even now there are members in the Congress Party—who agreed with most of the things that the Opposition said. They agreed. But somehow or the other their patriotism is smothered by the party discipline, and he pointed out the facts. It is a fact.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** In parliamentary debate and parliamentary discussion even at academic levels the whip system, particularly in the British House of Commons, comes in for even more vitriolic attack than what Shri Nath Pai has chosen to make in this House. If you put a ban on this kind of thing, we would rather not function.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Shri Nath Pai has simply pointed out the facts. Sir, I invite your ruling on a particular point. I want to know whether Members of this House have a right to point out facts or not, however palatable or unpalatable they might appear to be. I want to know whether these facts are to be expunged from the proceedings or not.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedi:** May I humbly submit.....

**Mr. Speaker:** There ought to be some end to this.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedi:** You may agree or you may not agree, Sir, on this question, but is it proper for the Chair, after having expressed certain views on the matter, to expunge what has been said, which is not unparliamentary, which may not be, according to you, fair—as you said earlier? You are actually creating a precedent, and in all fairness I request you that this order of expunction should be re-considered (Interruption).

**Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha):** Have not ministers and members of the Congress imputed motives to the opposition members?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedi:** Even greater. (Interruption).

**Shri Hem Barua:** On more than one occasion they have challenged our patriotism.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** They are taking advantage of their brute majority.

**Shri Hem Barua:** The Congress Party capitalises on that. They have challenged our patriotism on more than one occasion.

**Mr. Speaker:** The whole thing should be taken in its proper perspective. What has happened? Hon. Members in the Opposition should not forget the sequence of events. He made certain observations. I said they were not fair and that the conscience or the patriotism of Members should not be attacked in that manner. (Interruption). When the demand was made for expunction of those remarks I said: "No; I am not in favour of expunction; his observations as well as my comments would remain on the records". I refused to expunge them. But even when I had said that it was not fair, he stood up and repeated the whole thing. (Interruptions.)

**Shri Nath Pai:** If you give me one minute, I will explain.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I will have the record checked up. There ought not to be any excitement about it.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore):** If it is a question of disallowing any aspersion about the patriotism of members, I think on more than one occasion Members of that side have cast very serious aspersions on the patriotism of members of this side of the House. On

such occasions, though we have protested and said that they are very unfair charges, not even on one occasion have such remarks been asked to be expunged. Now the situation is exactly the same. Since this has happened on many occasions in this House and on no occasion have these remarks been expunged, whatever we may feel about the fairness or unfairness of such remarks, since they are parliamentary and nothing unparliamentary has been said and since such remarks are always used in parliamentary debates, I would beg of you not to insist on its expunction. Otherwise, we will have to take very serious.... (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri Nath Pai:** Mr. Speaker, if you recall my words, they were not repeated just to annoy you or the House; I must emphasize it again in all humility. I referred to you.... (*Interruption.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. We should be more serious in deliberating.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In order to remove any misapprehensions in their minds, I cited a former remark uttered on the floor of this House; I quoted "the drugging of the conscience", not from the House of Commons. These are words used on the floor of this House. It has never been my practice—I am sure, Sir, you would bear witness to that—to cast any aspersion on anybody, however big or small he might be. I said, you would recall, that on the previous day when the motion was moved you were constrained to remark that there was not even an opposition and you said this was the first time that an adjournment motion was allowed without even a dissenting voice. Those facts must be borne in mind. The next day supporting speeches were made and duly it was defeated. What happened? They agreed that these are dangerous things, these are disturbing things, something must be done but nonetheless it was defeated under

the crack of the whip. If it cannot be mentioned please educate me and the House on this subject. Otherwise, parliamentary debates would be meaningless. Sir, you are the guardian of the rights of the House and you do it, I must say, in an admirable way. But may I point out that I am most distressed to find that my remarks are to be expunged because a protest is made on a point of order which is totally uncalled for. No defiance of your orders was made, no aspersion was cast; so you should guide us as to the reasons for which these remarks were expunged. It is for my future guidance; it is not challenging your authority, so that we know what the position is. I know the list of unparliamentary words.

Now, in order to remove any misunderstanding, may I say that this is not something that I said on the spur of the moment? I never write my speeches. But this particular paragraph was written down by me. I did not just fling it. I wrote it down, when I was studying my last year's speech on this motion. Here is the written text.

I do not find there is any authority, except, of course, your authority—you are free to create a new precedent—and I am constrained to say that the whole point in a debate will be lost if such parliamentary expressions that these people who felt and agreed with it did not do so because of the majority and the crack of party whip and party discipline are not to be allowed. Please guide me as to what is wrong in it? Is there any aspersion on any member in it?

**Shri Hanumanthaiya** (Bangalore City): Sir, kindly allow me to explain our stand.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Sir, I want a reply. I am not yielding to Shri Hanumanthaiya. (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** I agree with the good intention of the hon. Mem-

[Shri Hamumanthaiya]

ber, Shri Nath Pai. But he should realise that it was an adjournment motion the passing of which meant the dismissal of the Government. Whether we should take such an extreme step on this minor matter was left to us. Because, if we vote with the opposition, the Government would go out of office.

**Shri Hem Barua:** We do not think it is a minor matter. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** Therefore, in order to implement the suggestions made by the Opposition in regard to corruption, there are various appropriate measures open to the majority here. We do it more successfully than these people can possibly do. Merely because we refrain from turning out the Government on the plea of Shri Nath Pai, he should not accuse us of want of patriotism and suppressing conscience. There is a proper remedy for every disease. He cannot ask us to dismiss the Government on every petty issue that is coming up before the House.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** The disease is incurable. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I have already requested hon. Members to be patient. There ought not to be any excitement here.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan** (Kcsergod): There is a reason for the excitement. If you look at the proceedings, you will find that every other day we had been called, especially members of the Communist Party, traitors, non-patriots and so on. They may not agree with our policy but to call us traitors every day. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Whenever such an instance has been brought to my notice, I have always reprimanded the members who have behaved like that. I have always done it. I should not be charged that

I have ever refrained from asking members not to use such words. Even in the case of the Communist Party, I have defended them on every occasion when it has arisen. Here the hon. Members should realise that as soon as a demand was made for expunction, I refused to do it. They forget that.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** You have done it later.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Subsequently, you have done it. You felt that he asserted this point of view. But he says: no, I have only explained it. After that, what is proper for you to do? Expunge it?

**Mr. Speaker:** Then, where was the need for the explanation? When I have said that my remarks as well as his observation would remain on the record and I would not expunge them, there was no need to explain any further except . . . . (*Interruptions*) to lay stress on that and to repeat it deliberately.

**Shri Nath Pai:** No, Sir. That was far from my intention.

**Mr. Speaker:** At least that is the impression that Shri Nath Pai has created in me. Otherwise, it was not a demand from anybody then that they should be expunged.

**Shri Nath Pai:** It was done on a point of order when I explained it.

**Mr. Speaker:** When the demand was made, I refused to expunge it. He should take it when I say that I refused to do it purposely. I said: no, my comments and the observation of Shri Nath Pai would remain on the record.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Now he has explained that it is not a deliberate attempt to repeat, as you took it to be, in view of that, I would request you to reconsider your

decision and let these remarks remain on the record as they are.

**Mr. Speaker:** He should not compel me to withdraw my orders when I have once passed them. But I will look into the record when it is available to me; now it is not available. Then, I would have it read out to them and try to explain it. As soon as I get it, I am prepared to sit with the Members and consider it.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Before I proceed, may I know for my guidance, whether I am to understand that the words are not expunged, that we will sit together, discuss and then a decision will be taken?

**Mr. Speaker:** The order is there. We will discuss and see that.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In that case, I do not see any point in proceeding further with the debate, because it is a mockery of democracy.... (*Inter-ruptions.*)

(*Shri Nath Pai and several other hon. Members of the Opposition then left the House*)

13.00 hrs.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur):** Sir, while not one of us would like to detract from your authority—that is what has persuaded some of us to stay behind in the House—I would like to request you and beseech you that the order to expunge may be held over until at least you have seen the record.

**Mr. Speaker:** The order has been passed. If it is a mistake I am prepared to suffer the consequences. I would not like to remain if there is a mistake; but I would not withdraw that order. I had told them that I was prepared to sit with them and consider it. I have always said that if there has been some mistake we can see if something could be done about it. But if a condition is to be extracted from me and if their presence here was contingent on this promise from my side that the order

would be withdrawn or that the order was not there, that I cannot do. It will remain there. I have passed the order and I cannot withdraw it in this manner. Of course, I was prepared to discuss it as I told them, but the order cannot be withdrawn whether it is right or wrong. That is there.

Now, is that discussion intended to be continued? I think, we might proceed with the No-confidence Motion.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** It can be continued.

**Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur):** What I would like to suggest is that the present motion may be deemed to have ended.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** No, Sir; I do not agree. We have to continue it.

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

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri):** This motion was brought forward by the hon. Members of the Opposition and it would be desirable that the discussion is held when they are present. In case they do not want to speak on this motion any further, you cannot help it. Then, we will have to go over to the other item, that is, the No-confidence Motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** We might take up the No-confidence Motion then.  
Shri P. R. Chakraverti.

**Shri P. R. Chakraverti (Dhanabad):** Sir, it is strange that an astute scholar, an able parliamentarian, an eminent jurist and a highly prized advocate, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, has come forward with a motion which smacks of something which has nothing in itself of relevancy, propriety or reasonableness or roundabout it. Indeed, he has tried to spread the net wide so as to bring within its canopy all

[Shri P. R. Chakraverti]

the discordant elements, all the dissidents, desperate, incongruous, incoherent, unreasonable elements together; but, as you have noticed, Sir, the Swatantra Party has refused to respond to the endearing offer of the hon. Mover of the Motion; so, also some other stalwarts, namely, Acharya Kripalani and Shri Anthony, who are remarkable for their choicest invectives against the Government and who only last year moved a No-confidence Motion and tried to denounce the Government with the choicest words found in their vocabulary. Indeed, the gracious lady, charming with all her enchantment, fragrance and elegance—I mean, the Swatantra Party, which still seeks to retain her distinct individuality—refused to yield to the chivalrous move of Shri N. C. Chatterjee.

But what are the points that are sought to be raised? No doubt, it was an attempt to make it an all-comprehensive thing, but what it essentially lacked is pointedness, poignancy, propriety or purposefulness. Some discordant elements get together and try to mislead the country raising the bogey of corruption, inefficiency, nepotism and all other terms which have no meaning whatsoever when it is considered in the context of a country which is a developing country and is trying to extricate itself from the age-long stupor and backwardness. Indeed a newly-liberated country has to grapple with the confrontation of freedom and in that process what attempts are being made has to be the main issues to be discussed here.

But, unfortunately, when we go to the points raised, I find that the volume of oratorical outbursts which have sought to regale the listening House, certainly not in resonant voices, gave the semblance of only high-sounding heroism. I may point out that it is a juxtaposition of the personal projections of these differing

elements which have sought to combine under this canvas of the apparently innocuous or innocent motion.

Shri Kripalani in his overjealous expression of his own patriotism wanted to question the patriotic urges of the people who are sitting on this side. Unfortunately, he did not cast his glance towards the people just sitting near about him. At least we are all ex-colleagues, ex-fighters and also ex-devotees of the principles for which the Congress stood all along from the beginning to the end, namely, the pursuit of the ideal for which we have worked. He was a compatriot and a colleague of ours. When he comes out with all his choicest invectives and tries to question the motives of the people who, according to him, are the P.I.P.s—post-independence patriots, I should say that the wind is on the other cheek. It is the young people, ardent and energetic, wanting to do some positive action who have a grievance on this score, namely, that they had been denied the advantage, the privilege which the liberators and the participants in the liberation struggle had of working with Gandhiji. Shri Kripalani had the privilege of participating in the freedom struggle of India, while these young people who are today coming forward to take their part in the building up of the new country, the liberated India, did not. They have the grievance that they had no opportunity because they came two or three decades later. So, naturally, it does not lie with anybody on the other side to question the patriotism of the people and dub them as PIPs, post-independence patriots.

When the Swatantra Party spokesman was trying to show sympathy with the Ministry headed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and his colleagues and reminding us of the legacy bequeathed to this Ministry by its predecessor headed by the great leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, he wanted to say that the dominating personality

of Jawaharlal Nehru has left a legacy which is hard for Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to extricate from. Naturally, he has reasons to sympathise with him. The Swatantra Party spokesman has reminded us of the legacy. Indeed it is a hard legacy that we have to carry on our shoulders. It started with the Father of the Nation when he threw the challenge to British Imperialism with the words, "This Government is a satanic one; we shall break it to pieces". It is the legacy of Jawaharlal Nehru who in 1929 unfurled the flag of independence on the bank of Ravi and pledged that India wanted nothing except the full-fledged freedom. It is the legacy of the period when Jawaharlal Nehru came to Lucknow to preside over the Indian National Congress and declared in unmistakable terms that the goal of Congress was the achievement of democratic socialism. It was the legacy of the chivalrous act of the young boy of 16 years who mounted the gallows with his last sentence: Jai Hind; Vande Mataram. It is the legacy left by the peasants of India who allowed all their households, cattle and everything to be auctioned refusing to pay the penalty imposed on them by the British imperialists. It is the legacy of the daring young friend of mine who woke up from his bed at 4.30 A.M. and asked the sepoy, "Is the time up?" and walked up to the gallows and said Vande Mataram. It is the legacy of courage when hundreds and thousands of men and women of India faced the bullets and bayonets with full-throated voice of Vande Mataram. If today there is the administration headed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, a burden which Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri cannot extricate from, I would like to ask my friend from the Opposition to understand what does it signify, what does this Ministry signify and what does Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's life signify? It is an answer to the challenge which India gave long ago to the British imperialism that everybody suffering from destitution, poverty and any other form of

deprivation has to be freed from its onerous yoke. And, therefore, today Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's Ministry is the symbolic expression of the aspirations of the people to grow in full-fledged manner. India is trying to grow; India has accepted the path of democratic socialism. In the process of its march to democratic socialism, it has to surmount obstacles.

When I was in London, I was asked, "How could you exercise the right of adult franchise when the millions of your people are illiterate?". I said, "Yes, Sir. We know that India's multitude, hundreds and millions of Indians have been passed down under the servitude of your imperialism and subjected to all forms of privations of life including poverty and illiteracy and yet it is India's multitude who have placed today the Ministry in power and, therefore, if they have been given the right of franchise, it is the recognition, the expression, of the gratitude which the people in power owe to the multitude of millions who have put them there."

Now, if these people have come together under the leadership of Mr. Chatterjee, what do they represent? Unfortunately, when the charming lady, the Swatantra Party, with her distinct individuality, remarkable by her glamour and the so-called culture of the three R's namely, Rajaji, Ranganaji, and Restji walked out and the poor Mr. Chatterjee despite his charms and eminence was looking on helplessly. Sir, India today is trying to grapple with the problems which are unique in character in the world with one mission, namely, the achievement of democratic socialism. I am sure, you will endorse my suggestion that if I try to take a view of the world from one corner of the Far-East to the Middle West, we will find that no country except India has taken the vow of reaching the goal of democratic socialism. No dictatorship, no super-imposition is likely to be tolerated in India. It is a great and heavy task and in that great task

[Shri P. R. Chakraverti]

if we have any lapses, let us sit together and understand what are the difficulties and then in that process we shall find out how we have to correct ourselves.

Sir, is there any practical suggestion from the other side except the vituperative denunciations which they are accustomed to do? Is there anything except those meaningless adjectives and invectives used against the Government dubbing it as inefficient and worthless? I would rather wish them to be present here to understand the things. Sir, it was in 1950 that a distinguished Senator of U.S.A. remarked:

"With each swing of the pendulum, the time to save civilisation grows shorter. When shall we get about our business? Destiny will not grant us the gift of indifference. If we don't act, we may be profaned for ever by the inheritors of a ravished planet. We will be reviled as cowards rightly, for a coward can flee the awesome facts that command us to act with fortitude. The time of supreme crisis is a time of supreme opportunity."

So also does the greatest historian A. Toynbee, say:

"History never happens. It is brought about by the free decisions of men, as they decide whether to be courageous or cowardly in the face of tomorrow."

Sir, what is required is a searching examination to determine what is our goal and what steps we have taken to carry out our professions into actual practice. Is there anybody on the other side who can genuinely question the motives of the people who are in office that they are not trying to understand their problems? Maybe, in that endeavour, there may be so many lapses and in a country which is beset with so many problems it may happen. As Jawaharlalji used

to say, India is a country of 450 million people with 450 million problems. He meant it so.

When I was in America, I was asked, "How is it that Mr. Morarji Desai, your Finance Minister, comes here for a morsel of food when you call India as a land of agriculturists?" I said, "Yes, Sir. It is an unfortunate fact." Then I asked them: "Do you know what are the main crops of India?" As a student of economics, I wanted them to tell me, what are the main crops of India? I told them that they are, malaria, kalazar, cholera, typhoid and all forms of preventible diseases which are taking a heavy toll of millions and millions of our people. I told them that these are the legacies left by the British power for us. So, I told them, "If Mr. Morarji Desai comes there asking for a little help under the name of P.L. 480 or anything else, it is because of the destitution and deprivation from which India, the millions of her people have been suffering. That is why we come to you. We do not come to you as beggars. We understand our problem and place our problem to you. Our whole plan and programme is there. We do not hide anything. When you are convinced that that is a genuine attempt to solve the problem, you come to help us."

Sir, we must know that the picture that is being revealed by the Opposition does not give a true reading. We know the moral standards in which we rest our faith are marked by immoral tolerance of tax-evasion, false expense statements, accounts of fake advertisement, the thumb on the scale, the adulterated food article and the exploitative means for self-gratification. Did any of them come forward with any practical suggestion to deal with any of these problems? As we found, in Bombay when there were recent raids on the houses of some persons, a spokesman of a big Party, a progressive Party came for-

ward to say, "Well, they have collected this hard earned money. Why should Government pounce upon their houses?" So, this is the way we get the co-operation from these so-called progressives and emancipators of people. It is a moral gap that is developing between our so-called belief and performance. We shall not allow that, because the moral gap can become an increasing danger to our survival as a free society.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee was kind enough to quote a few lines of poetry from one of the foremost poets of America. I would like to remind him—unfortunately he is not here at the moment—that the cultured man as he is, he must know at least this poem by one of his own countrymen, namely Poet Tagore, who said:

"Where the mind is without fear  
and the head is held high,

Where knowledge is free,

Where the world has not been  
broken up into fragments by  
narrow domestic walls,

Where words come out from the  
depth of truth,

Where tireless striving stretches  
its arms towards perfection,

Where the clear stream of reason  
has not lost its way into the  
dreary desert sand of dead  
habit,

Where the mind is led forward  
by Thee into ever-widening  
thought and action,

Into that heaven of freedom, my  
Father, let my country  
awake."

So, it is the attempt today on the part of all of us, whether it be that of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri or his colleagues, it is the joint responsibility of the people of India and those who speak on behalf of the emancipated millions and millions of people, who have been a prey to age-long

degradation and destitution, to come forth and accept the challenge.

The other day, I was reading a nice poem by a poet from one of the recently liberated countries, namely Ghana, and I shall end my speech with this quotation. That poem is entitled 'New Look', and that has been written by Mr. Michael Dei-Awang of Ghana. He said:

"Do not stain....".

And that is my appeal to the Opposition today.

"Do not stain the sea of my heart  
With streams of sorrow and of  
pain,

In the golden morrow that lies  
ahead,

I'll play my part on life's new  
stage, and bear my fate, ob-  
livious of your rage and hate,

I'll shout the mission of my race  
Until the foundations of creation  
rock and tremble,

And the face of mankind wears  
a new look of harmony and  
of peace."

That is the message of the poet of the newly liberated country of Ghana. I also join with him in the chorus and again appeal to my hon. friends in the Opposition that let them not try to smear us, let them not try to throttle today all the attempts which are being made jointly to see that India marches to reach its fruition, namely the achievement of democratic socialism.

**Shri Oza (Surendranagar):** While opposing this motion of no-confidence, I do not for a moment desire to under-stress the feeling of anxiety over the present situation, felt by the Members who have sponsored this motion. I not only share the anxieties but feel the burden greater, because I happen to be, though humble, a member of the ruling party. I do not doubt their patriotism either, and I request them not to doubt the

[Shri Oza]

patriotism of those on this side of the House also.

Still, I am constrained to observe that the Opposition has been behaving in the most irresponsible manner both inside and outside the House. In a puerile childish attempt, vying with each other, to catch the advantage which they believe has accrued to them, they are indulging in all sorts of practices. In their enthusiasm, some of them forget that they are putting at stake the very concept of democracy which has accorded them these opportunities.

13.24 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

According to my humble opinion, at no time in our recent parliamentary history the absence of a healthy Opposition was felt as is being felt today. I am sure that if there had been a strong and healthy opposition capable enough to take over in the near future from this Government, they would not have dared to bring forward such a motion, for the simple reason that they themselves would have been put in the docks and there would have been no replies from them. What is needed is not an alternative government but a good Opposition. That is what is needed in our country today.

Talking about the economic situation over which many hon. Members have spoken, I only want to tell them that we had only a few years back inherited a colonial economy, and we have accepted a full-fledged democracy. The masters, the vast masses, the starving masses of India, are groaning and they have become impatient. Unless we make rapid economic strides, the situation will endanger the very foundations of democracy. We cannot think of slowing down. The road to pros-

perity for a nation like ours is not easy. In the past, some countries had colonies and other conditions conducive to large savings, large investments, and, therefore, rapid growth. Some, even today, under the totalitarian regime and under totalitarian conditions, can create the illusion of rapid economic growth. But in a country like ours having a vast population with low standards of sustenance and existence, low consumptions and low savings, growth is very difficult. Still, we have to march on.

Sometimes, in our pilgrimage to prosperity, we can come across good weather, beautiful green lands and so on, but sometimes, as we are doing perhaps today, we come across bad weather, bad patches etc. When we come across such bad patches in our economic progress, should we turn round and say that 'Let us abandon this pilgrimage? That is not possible. We cannot change horses in the mid-stream. We have got to go ahead. As our late Prime Minister used to say, we are riding a tiger; we cannot slow down the tiger; we cannot get off the tiger; we have to get on it and keep him running all the while.

But what is being asked of us today by our friends from the Swatantra Party? They say 'Abandon everything and put the whole thing in the reverse gear.' Once in a while, they may be right about something happening here or there. For instance, because of the deficit financing and prices going up etc., they may turn round and say 'Did we not say that this was going to happen'. It does not matter if they are wrong a thousand times, but once in a while if they are right, then just like an old nagging spinster, they turn round and say 'Did we not say so?'. I think that that is not a healthy attitude that is required for the development of the country. I am sure that without heeding to these counsels of despair, we shall march ahead and reach the desired goal.

Talking about the food situation and the rising prices, in my humble opinion, the time has come when Government should tell the people very frankly and boldly, whatever the consequences, what Churchill said when he took over from Chamberlain. He did not mince words. He said 'I have only blood, sweat and tears for you', and still the people supported him and marched along with him to ultimate success in the last World War.

I think in the same way that we have reached that stage in our economy when a certain amount of discipline and austerity is absolutely inevitable. I shall come to that a little later. But, for the time being, I would say this. Is it the first time that this country is facing such a situation of food shortages and rising prices? Let us turn to our own history. As early as 1910, before even the First World War, prices were rising in this country, and to a certain extent, very rapidly. The then Government of India, therefore, had to appoint one committee. That committee selected the period 1890—1912 for investigation and went into all those details. The report of this committee makes very interesting reading. If you look to history, you will find that history can teach us some lessons. I would refer you to the rise which took place about fifty years back. Particularly during the quinquennium years 1907—11, there was an increase of 40 per cent in the prices of foodgrains and oils. The Government of India appointed a committee under the chairmanship of one Mr. Dudd, and I think that the House will be interested to know the findings of that committee. The said committee has come to this finding:

"The shortage, in the opinion of the committee was due to the growth of cultivation not keeping pace with the growth of population"—

as we are feeling today.

The second reason—

"Unseasonal rainfall",

The third reason—"substitution of non-food for food crops"—the same condition is prevailing today; and fourth, "inferiority of the new lands taken up for cultivation".

So, as early as 1910, the Committee came to these findings—what we are finding today also. Can we say that 50 years ago, the same reasons as have been ascribed by the Swatantra Party were prevailing? They have an allergy to land reforms. There were no land reforms then. Still that was the situation. They have contempt for planning that we have undertaken. There was no planning then; still that situation had prevailed 50 years ago, when the total population of undivided India was half of the population today. Even then this was the condition. In spite of that, in 1910, this country faced such a situation. No wonder that this large population today has brought us face to face with some difficulties. But in my humble opinion, though the food problem has been discussed thoroughly and in detail here and the Food Minister has also replied to all the points raised, a greater discipline and austerity are required to be enforced in this country.

What have we got today? Today we have planned production, planned saving and planned investment, but we have got unplanned distribution and unplanned consumption. I think such an anomaly cannot be allowed to be continued in our economy. When we have everything planned, when we have deficit financing, taxation, compulsory savings and voluntary savings, all these things, to leave absolutely untouched the distributive and consumption systems will be an anomaly which will ultimately bring us into greater trouble.

I remember in 1954 when controls were given the go-by we had two

[Shri Oza]

very good monsoons and at that time we had very good stocks of foodgrains imported from abroad. This enabled the late Shri Kidwai to de-control everything. He became a hero. But we do not always have good monsoons; we do not always have good stocks. I am sure if Shri Kidwai were alive, with the same courage he would have introduced some discipline and austerity here and there in our economy.

I beg to suggest that the big cities which are the pumping grounds for big intake of foodgrains should be cordoned off and put on pucca rationing. This should apply to all big cities having a population of 5 lakhs or more. No free movement of grains should be allowed to go there. Every citizen should be put on pucca rationing. Unless we do that, I do not think we are going to tackle the situation effectively and for all times to come. We cannot afford to import foodgrains and build up stocks by that process for all times. Unless we ourselves try to gird up our loins and try to instil a sense of discipline and austerity in our community, I think we are not going to be looked at with respect by people who always say 'Look here. In spite of all your planning and all your boasting, you are going with a begging bowl to all countries round about'. I think that is a situation from which we should come out as early as possible.

Talking about corruption, another plank of the Opposition attack, nobody disputes its existence, apart from the question of degree. Everything has to be done to eradicate this social evil by all sides. I wonder how it can be a matter of no confidence. I do think in any parliamentary system we can have such a motion—there is corruption; therefore, we have no confidence in this Government. Nowhere else has such a motion been brought forward on this ground. It is only because we have got these splinter groups who vie with each other to cash in on the situation that

has arisen. They think—'We would be left behind. Let us be very vigilant and bring forward such a motion so that we can catch the eye of the public and the press'. But in doing so, they sometimes do not exercise their discretion properly.

But, as I said, corruption is a social evil. For that, law alone will not be sufficient. Having accepted this Constitution and the rule of law flowing from it, to put the whole responsibility on Government is not the way of solving this problem. At the most, we will be able to minimise corruption, but to talk of eradication of corruption completely from society is like talking of having an ideal society in which there will be no vices. Corruption is a vice; there are so many other vices also in society. Can we remove all vices from society? Telling lies is a vice. On that ground, can there be a censure motion in the House—that some people are telling lies; therefore, this Government should be removed?

Corruption is a social evil. When instances have been pointed out to Government, steps have been taken by Government. If when concrete instances are pointed and no action is taken, there can be a no-confidence motion saying that such and such Minister in the Central Cabinet is corrupt; these are the facts. If the Government fails to take steps, certainly there can be a vote of no-confidence, as is done in other countries also. But to attempt to censure Government because generally there is corruption is not the proper way to go about it. Is there no corruption in social bodies, social institutions, religious institutions, educational institutions and private business?

This being the position, Shri Nanda, the Home Minister, has rightly launched a movement. Unless people co-operate, we are not going to effectively check this evil of corrup-

tion. We have laid down in our Constitution that before any officer or person can be punished, he shall be given a fair trial before an independent judiciary. Evidence will be supplied. Who is going to supply evidence? Members of the public should come forward with direct evidence, if they have. Only then we will be able to effectively check corruption and eradicate it to some extent. I do not think merely by bringing forward no confidence motions we will be able to help the movement to eradicate corruption from our society.

As regards corruption in the services, it is true that our services are behaving in a way which is somewhat irresponsible. I am also a witness to that. I have some direct knowledge of it in the past. What is happening today is that in the services there has developed a sort of feeling that if you do good work, nobody is going to appreciate it; if you do not do any work or if you do work badly, nobody is going to touch you, because the Unions are there and the requirements of the Constitution are there. This feeling is very bad and unless drastic steps are taken as soon as it is possible, I do not think we will be able to gear up our administrative system to a standard whereby good work will be appreciated and bad work will be put down. Unless this feeling is generated, I do not think we can expect any good results from these administrative services, however much we may have cells, O. & M. divisions and so on—I do not know how many cells have been created to tackle this problem. But unless the problem is tackled fundamentally, at the very roots, I am not hopeful about any change in the present administrative system. Even if it is necessary to amend articles 311 and 314, please do it, because all the civil service regulations flow from those articles. Unless you change those article and change your rules and regulations, and unless the service people feel that if they do good,

hard, honest work, it is going to be appreciated, and that if they do nothing or do work badly, it is going to be punished, I do not think we are going to improve conditions in this country.

As I said, I appreciate the anxieties and the sentiments which prompted the Members of the Opposition to bring this no-confidence motion. After all, we are facing a situation in this country wherein every conscious citizen is worried. It is such a situation, but the remedy is not shouting, the remedy is not creating demoralisation in our people; the remedy is to adopt a constructive and co-operative attitude, to ask the people to do their part of the duty. If we have come across a bad patch, we have to face difficulties like bold people and march ahead. That is the only way of solving this problem. I am sure, under the able guidance of our new Prime Minister, we will be able to go ahead, whatever the difficulties, they will be surmounted, and I am sure the Opposition will also on further sober thinking adopt a more constructive attitude.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar** (Fatehpur): It is rather strange that whenever a no-confidence motion is brought forward, individual praise of the Prime Minister or any other Minister is put forth by a certain section of the House. I say these two issues are quite separate. Whenever a no-confidence motion is brought, it is not the Prime Minister or any other Minister of the Council who is individually under criticism. As regards Shri Shastri, I can join hands with my friends of the Congress benches; he is, of course, a man of the highest integrity, I have got all praise for him. But we have brought this no-confidence motion on account of the policies of the Government which he has been pursuing throughout.

Is it not a fact that—my friends on the left will bear me out—that

[Shri Oza]

after this rule of 17 years, today the condition of the ordinary citizen in this country economically, politically and morally is at a very low ebb? It is not the Opposition Members alone who indulge in all sorts of criticisms of Government's policies. I may recall the words of the late, lamented Prime Minister who said very clearly that during twelve years of Congress regime, a handful of businessmen in the country had been able to amass much more money than they could during a hundred years of British regime. Does it show that you are really heading towards socialism for which you claim to stand?

The food situation has been discussed in this House. Is not the condition prevailing at present the worst condition which we have ever faced in our living memory? It has come to this that a person who has got money is not able to get the requisite foodgrains to fill up his empty stomach. This is chaos, this is confusion, there is a regular famine prevailing throughout the country, and still you can shut your eyes and say that things are all right, there is nothing to discuss or to bring a no-confidence motion about. Prices have gone up so high that the cultivator, the labourer and the middle-class man is hard hit; he cannot afford to pay the price, nor can he get a rise in his income proportionate to the rise in prices, with the result that the starving stage has come. As I said, we have not come here to criticise individually the Prime Minister or any other Minister, but the policy of the Congress Government which has been pursued during these years has led the country to face this condition which we are facing at present, and that is why we bring this no-confidence motion.

Lack of confidence in the Government is not limited to this House. There is a clear lack of confidence outside by the general masses that are facing these hardships.

May I put another question? Have we advanced at all politically, have we succeeded in infusing political or national awakening in the country? The primary question of the national language has not been solved. It is a matter of shame, we hang down our heads in shame, that such a big and independent country like ours has not been able to have Hindi as our national language. We have failed there.

Again, we have prescribed a national dress for those going abroad officially, but may I ask if the Ministers who go abroad adhere to this national dress at all? These are not petty matters.

We have failed totally in bringing about a national awakening or political awakening or any sort of awakening at all in the masses. It is on account of this that friends in the Congress benches come forward and say that there are dissensions among the Opposition parties, and hence dissensions among the ruling party may also be tolerated. It is not the Opposition parties which are at the helm of affairs governing the country. It is the Congress Party which is at the helm of affairs, governing the country, and if there are dissensions and indiscipline as in the State of Kerala, is the Congress Party feeling secure anywhere, in any State, or even at the Centre, if for a moment the Congress Members can think of voting openly against their own cabinet? So, this state of insecurity and indiscipline among the ruling party will cause great havoc, and they will not succeed in governing the country properly. So, my submission is that dissension in the Opposition can be tolerated, but dissension in the ruling party will adversely tell upon the administration of the country.

What about the democratic socialism which you have preached? Are you sincerely implementing it? When the Constitution was framed, was the

Rajya Sabha created only for the purpose of making Ministers of Cabinet rank without facing the masses? I do not mean to say that there is no sanction in the Constitution for it, and that it is not according to the provisions of the Constitution, because there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent it. But may I ask those Ministers who come through the Rajya Sabha whether it is justified morally, and whether it is in consonance with their responsibility to the masses or to this House of the People that, without having to face the electorate, they have been allowed to become full-fledged Cabinet Ministers? I think it is a negation of democratic socialism which the Congress Party is preaching by making Cabinet Ministers of those who had not faced the electorate. They are popular Ministers responsible to the House of the People and the masses.

I was completely surprised by the argument put forward yesterday by my hon. friend, Mr. G. N. Dixit that Mr. Chatterjee's motion was uncalled for and barred by *res judicata*. Is it a proceeding in a court of law that since some months back a similar motion was ruled out and so the same motion could not be brought forward? These are flimsy grounds. I was amazed also by the speech of Mr. Morarka because he said that the Swatantra Party should be satisfied because if any Government has satisfied the private sector it is the Congress Government. I ask: did he hold the brief of those businessmen or millowners in defending the Government against the no-confidence motion? He admitted that the Government had bestowed favours on vested interests. There were other arguments also and they said that the Swatantra Party had split and the PSP had split. Are they prepared to accept the members of the Swatantra Party whom they were till yesterday calling as rank communalists? They called them as patrons of vested interests. This does not show that the

Congress is becoming popular; it simply shows that the Congress has come to this stage that they welcome anybody from any party, be it the Muslim League or Jan Sangh or the Swatantra Party. If the Congress Party were popular they would not do these things.

**Mr. Chairman:** Has the Congress any Swatantra Party member so far?

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** Only the other day I read in the papers: yes, Kamaraj, President of the Congress Party and the High Command have favourably considered the merger of fifty members of the Swatantra Party. I am saying this on the authority of that press report. Is it something of which the Congress can boast of? Have all these members changed their ideology? We represent some ten lakh of population, each one of us, here and we should put sincerely and honestly our hands in our heart and say what relief has been given to the masses.

There is a brute majority and I know the result of this motion; it will be ruled out. But the masses are starving and they are suffering on account of the soaring prices. There is discontentment in the country and there is no other way to ventilate grievances and our resentment inside and outside this House in a democratic and peaceful manner.

So many applauses have been repeated about the late Pandit Nehru. I should not perhaps say 'late' because the hon. lady Member said that she was hesitant to use the word 'late' because Pandit Nehru was immortal. I fail to understand if we in opposition say otherwise. We have got all praise for Pandit Nehru. But what about the policies of the Government? We have come to criticise only the policies of the Government and ask whether they have really succeeded economically, politically and morally in the country.

Two decades back, even in our rural areas we used to hear per-

[Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar]

sons saying: I will not tell lies because I have got children. Now the stage has come when they say: why should I not accept bribe and tell lies because I have to feed a large family of children. This is what has come about during these 16-17 years. When there is the question of any job, people in the rural area or even in the urban area ask: what is the regular monthly pay and what is the other income from outside? That is how things are going on. In this respect, I welcome the sentiments of the Home Minister, Mr. Nanda. He has pledged to root out corruption. There are difficulties. I would again say that it is his own partymen who are dragging him and not the Opposition. The Sadachar Samiti was formed. It is not the Opposition which has condemned its formation. As a matter of fact, we all stand for such attempts. It is the members of the Congress High Command and of the Ruling Party who have openly challenged the formation and working of such samiti. It is a pity that even about eradicating corruption, there is difference of opinion among the members of the ruling party. What can I say?

In the end I will only say that if things are going on like this, if the Kerala affair and the Orissa affair, the Punjab affair and the U.P. affair are allowed to continue like this, it will not be long before the ruling party will see its end and also be out of office.

श्री चंद्रमणि साहू श्रीधरी (महुआ): जनाब सदर साहब, सरकार के खिलाफ़ लाए गए अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर इस हाउस में तमाम मुखालिफ़ पार्टियों—कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और दूसरी पार्टियों—की तरफ़ से बहुत जोरदार भाषण हुए हैं, जिन को हम लोगों ने सुना है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार के खिलाफ़ अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाने की बिल्कुल जरूरत नहीं थी। जरूरत तो इस बात की है कि हम सब कंधे से कंधा मिला कर मुल्क में बकायतनी का

सामना करें, गरीबों के घरों में खाना पहुंचावें, और उन की तकलीफ़ें दूर कर के उन को राहत पहुंचावें।

1942 की मूवमेंट के वक्त] महात्मा गांधी और जवाहरलाल जी से ले कर कांग्रेस के फ़ालोअर्ज और वालन्टीयर्ज जेलों में बन्द थे। मुल्क के बड़े से बड़े रहनुमा और सिपहसालार जेलों में बन्द थे। उस वक्त बंगाल में कहत पड़ा। आप को मालूम नहीं होगा कि उस वक्त बहां की सड़कें लाशों और भूखे लोगों से भरी हुई थीं। उस वक्त मुल्क में अंग्रजों की हुकूमत थी। अपोजीशन पार्टियों के दोस्तों ने उस वक्त यह नहीं सोचा होगा कि हम उन भूखे और नंगे लोगों को मदद पहुंचाने के लिए उपाय करें और पब्लिक के सामने क्षोली फैला कर उन लोगों की खिदमत करें। उस वक्त कांग्रेसमैन सीखचों में बन्द था और वर्तनाबी सलतनत के जुल्मो तशहूद का मुकाबला कर रहा था। हमारे पास कुछ नहीं था, हम भूखे थे, हम जेलों में बन्द थे। उस समय भी हमने फास्ट किया है और सूबा बंगाल के गरीब और यतीम लोगों के नाम पर अपने पेट काट कर खाना भेजा (Interruption) आप कान खोल कर सुन लें जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ। शेर कभी कभी बोलता है और आप तो हमेशा ही बोलते रहते हैं। जब शेर बोलना शुरू करता है जब शेर चिघाड़ना शुरू करता है, तो जो दूसरे होते हैं वे घबरा उठते हैं। आप घबराएँ नहीं और मेरी बात को ध्यान से सुनें ...

14.00 hrs..

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी): श्री शेर कह रहे हैं या सेठ कह रहे हैं ?

श्री हुकमचन्द कछवाय (देवास): शेर तो बोलता ही नहीं है।

श्री चंद्रमणि, लाल चौधरी : आपको भी मौका मिलेगा और आप मेरी बातों का जबाब दे सकते हैं। इस तरह से टोकने से कोई फायदा नहीं होता है।

जो खिलाफत की बात करते हैं उन में वह जुरंत नहीं है, वह ताकत नहीं है, कि कि दूसरों की बात को भी सुन सकें। उन में एकताई की, सहयोग की और दोस्ती की भावना नहीं है। ये तो यही चाहते हैं कि किसी तरह से इस सरकार को उखाड़ फेंका जाए, इसको किसी तरह से गिरा दिया जाए। मैं उन के जज्बात को समझता हूँ, इनके कामों को जानता हूँ, इनके कारनामों से ये बाकिफ हूँ।

हमारे इस हाउस में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वाले बहुत बड़ चढ़ कर बातें करते हैं। लेकिन आप जा कर देश के कोने कोने में देखें कि यही कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वाले गरीब लोगों के साथ, गरीब मजदूरों के साथ, गरीब हरिजनों के साथ खिलवाड़ करते हैं, उन के सीनों पर खिलवाड़ करते हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता का मैं आपको एक किस्सा बतलाना चाहता हूँ। मुजफ्फरपुर में कमल कुमार बोस एंड अदवर्ज की बात मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर गरीबों की जो जमीनें थीं, जमदारियां थीं जब सीलिंग कायम होने लगी तो सभी को उन्होंने हटा दिया और अपने कब्जे में उन जमीनों को ले लिया। बड़ी बेरहमी से उन्होंने उन छोटे छोटे लोगों को बेदखल कर दिया और जमीन अपने पास कर ली। ये तो हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों की हरकतें हैं। (Interruptions) प्वाज) मुजफ्फरपुर, बिहार में, थाना कारटी की यह बात है।

Mr. Chairman: Please address the Chair first. Then all these interruptions could be eliminated.

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय (रसड़ा) : एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। उस घादमी का नाम इस सदन में नहीं लिया जा सकता है जो

जबाब देने के लिये यहां हाज़िर नहीं है। अभी माननीय सदस्य ने एक घादमी का नाम लिया है जो खुद जबाब देने के लिए मौजूद नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनके नाम को कारवाई से एकसपंज कर दिया जाए।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I do not allow any interruption in speeches. If you want to say anything, please ask your party to reply to it.

श्री चंद्रमणि लाल चौधरी : जो सच्ची बात है वह मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूँ। गलत बात मैं नहीं करता। हमारे भाइयों को बौखला उठना नहीं चाहिये। यह बौखला उठने वाली बात नहीं है। उनकी तरफ से जो कुछ कहा जाता है उसको सुन कर हम घबरा नहीं उठते हैं और उनको भी घबरा उठना नहीं चाहिये। हम लोग जब बोलते हैं तो हमारी बातों का जबाब आपको तर्क से देना चाहिये।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मुजफ्फरपुर में अभी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और दूसरी पार्टियों की तरफ से भूख हड़ताल का आयोजन किया गया था और प्रदर्शन किये गये थे। मुझे अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि मासूम लोगों को, गरीब लोगों को और कुछ महिलाओं को इन्होंने पैसा देकर उस जलूस में शामिल किया और कतारों की कतारें इस तरह का लालच दे कर निकलवाईं। उस प्रदर्शन में उन से कहलवाया गया कि सरकार को उलट देने की कोशिश करो। और इसी तरह के दूसरे नारे भी लगवाये गये। दो चार मजदूरों को जिन को इन मितों ने पैसा नहीं दिया, उन के साथ इनका झगड़ा हो गया। झगड़ा होने पर मैं घटनास्थल पर गया और मैं ने पूछा कि असल बात क्या है, वाका क्या है। उन्होंने कहा कि हमको झंठे ले कर चलने के लिए कहा गया था और हम से दो रुपये रोज देने का वायदा किया गया था कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और दूसरी पार्टीज की तरफ से लेकिन अब पैसे नहीं दिये जा रहे

[श्री चंद्रमणि लाल चौधरी]

है। इस तरह की जो बातें हैं, इन से आपकी कोई शोभा नहीं बढ़ती है। इस तरह की बातें नहीं होनी चाहियें।

मैं दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कोई सरकार आज मुल्क में हो सकती है तो वह यही सरकार हो सकती है जो इस वक्त काम कर रही है। इसको जनता का पूर्ण विश्वास प्राप्त है। अगर लोगों का रहनुमाई करने की किसी में शक्ति है, अगर लोगों की पेशवाई करने की किसी में ताकत है, तो कांग्रेस पार्टी में है, श्री लाल बहादुर जी शास्त्री में है जिन पर मुल्क के गरीब से गरीब और यतीम से यतीम आदमी का, हरिजनों का और बैंकवडं क्लासिस का, गिरी हुई क्लासिस का, पूर्ण विश्वास है। अगर किसी व्यक्ति को प्रधान मंत्री बनने के लिये जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी चुन सकते थे तो वह श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ही थे। उनको उन्होंने चुना था और तबीयत से चुना था। जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी की तरह से हमारे शास्त्री जी पब्लिक की नब्ज को जानते हैं। जवाहरलाल जी ने पब्लिक की नब्ज को टटोल करके ही उनका चुनाव किया था। इसीलिए इनको जवाहर लाल जी ने अपने पास रखा था, कैबिनेट में रखा था कि मुल्क को शास्त्रीजी की कल जरूरत पड़ सकती है। जबभी जरूरत हो उस समय शास्त्री जी तैयार रहें। जिस तरह के अच्छे अच्छे काम शास्त्रीजी कर रहे हैं, उन से जवाहरलाल जी की आत्मा खुश हो रही होगी। शास्त्री जी मुल्क के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, सच्चे अर्थों में प्रधान मंत्री हैं। वह गरीबों के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, यतीमों के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, हरिजनों के प्रधान मंत्री हैं। उन को पूरा पूरा सहयोग दिया जाएगा तभी देश का कल्याण हो सकता है, अन्यथा नहीं।

लड़ाई की बात भी हमारे दोस्त बहुत जोर शोर से करते हैं। मैं उनको बतला ना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त जो लड़ाई चल रही है

वह अमीरी और गरीबी के बीच में चल रही है। इस लड़ाई में गरीबों की जीत होगी, इसमें कोई शक की बात नहीं है। अमरीका और रूस से पैसे लेने वाले लोग, उन मुल्कों के राजदूतों के अगल बगल में चक्कर काटने वाले लोग, जरा अपने कलेजों पर हाथ रख कर सोचें कि क्या उनकी पालिसियों पर चल कर देश का कभी कल्याण हो सकता है। क्या मीर जाफर और जयचन्द का पार्ट प्ले करके देश की रक्षा की जा सकती है? क्या उस तरह की बातें कर के हम मुल्क को ढाई तीन सौ वर्ष पीछे नहीं धकेल देंगे जिस तरह से उन्होंने धकेल दिया था। हमारी जो गलतियाँ हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे हमें बतलाई जायें। उनकी जो गलतियाँ हैं उन को हम बतलायेंगे। हमें चाहिये कि हम अपने आप को दुहस्त करने की कोशिश करें। मुल्क के सामने आज जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं, आज जो समस्याएँ हैं, उनको हल करने के लिए हम सब को कंधे से कंधा मिला कर हल करने की कोशिश करनी कहिये। जो भी आलोचना हम करें, वह रचनात्मक आलोचना करें। ऐसी आलोचना हम न करें, जिस से मुल्क कमजोर हो, मुल्क को हम ख़ाई में धकेल दें। यह नियायत शर्म की बात है कि आज के हालात में इस तरह का प्रस्ताव यहाँ लाया गया है।

आज हम चारों तरफ दुश्मनों से घिरे हुए हैं, हमारे बाईर आज महफूज नहीं हैं। हिन्दुस्तान को हर कीमत पर अपने आत्म-सम्मान की रक्षा करनी है। उसके सिपाही बोर्डेज पर खड़े हुए हैं और देश की रक्षा कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि बाईरों दुश्मन भी हैं, उन से भी हम दोस्तों का बरताव करें, लेकिन किसी भी सूरत में अपने आत्म-सम्मान को ठेस न लगने दें। अपनी भूमि की रक्षा के लिए, अपने देश की रक्षा के लिए हमारे मुल्क के नागरिकों ने अपना खून बहाया है। हमें उसकी रक्षा करनी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जो दुश्मन हैं उनके

ोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ायें और अगर कोई मामला सुलझ सके तो सुलझाने की कोशिश करें, उसके लिए हमेशा तैयार रहें, लेकिन अपना आत्म-सम्मान खोकर नहीं, देश की प्रतिष्ठा खो कर नहीं। हम लड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं। लड़ाई और लोग चाहते हैं, हम नहीं चाहते हैं। लड़ाई से जो मुल्क को बचा लेता है वह बहुत बड़ा हीरो होता है, देश का बहुत बड़ा रत्न होता है। लड़ाई का नतीजा क्या होता है? उसका नतीजा यह होता है कि मुल्क हजार दो हजार बरस पीछे धकेल दिया जाता है।

यहां पर बहुत से जोशीले भाषण दिये जाते हैं, बहुत जोश दिखलाया जाता है और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बारे में बहुत सी बातें कही जाती हैं। कहा जाता है कि बोर्डर पर हम सक्रिय हों। जो कुछ बोर्डर पर घटनायें घट रही हैं, उनका हम मुकाबला करें। यह सब ठीक है। हमें इन वारदातों को रोकना है और हमें इस तरह की चीजों का जवाब देना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं इसके साथ साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब या हमारे शास्त्री जी कोई ऐसे व्यक्ति नहीं हैं कि जजबातों में अब जायें, जजबातों में आकर जंग का एलन कर दें। हमें हर मुमकिन कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जंग से बचा जाए। लेकिन इसका मतलब यह हरगिज नहीं है कि मग्न अपने सम्मान को खो दें। अगर हमारे आत्म-सम्मान को धक्का पहुंचेगा, हमारे मुद्दे के मफाद को धक्का पहुंचेगा तो उस संकट का मुकाबला करने के लिये मैं पहला खूब होऊंगा, मैं पहला आदमी होऊंगा जो यह कहे कि इस संकट का डट कर मुकाबला किया जाए।

देश में कई घटनायें घटी हैं, देश के सामने कई समस्यायें हैं। मेरे दोस्तों ने कहा कि सरकार ने यह काम नहीं किया, वह काम नहीं किया। मुल्क के सामने अकाल की स्थिति है। मैं उनको एक बात बतलाना

चाहता हूँ। जब मैं सिनेमा में जाता हूँ तो वहां पर बहुत भारी झुड़ लोगों की पात हूँ, मामूली आदमियों की पाता हूँ, जो मिडिल क्लास के लोग भी नहीं हैं, उनकी पाता हूँ। वहां ये मामूली लोग टिकटों के लिए परेशान मुझे नजर आते हैं और जो थोड़ी देर से पहुंचता है, उसको निराशा लौटना पड़ता है, उसको टिकट नहीं मिलती है। अधिक पैसे देकर लोगों को कई बार टिकटें खरीदनी पड़ती हैं (Interruptions)। मेरे दोस्त जो इस तरह से टोक रहे हैं उनको शायद मालूम नहीं कि चीन में जब अकाल पड़ा था तो वहां पर माता पिताओं ने बच्चों को, मामूम बच्चों को बेच बेच कर अपने पेट भरे थे। इससे हमारा मुल्क कहीं अप्रसर है। हमारे यहां कोई अकाल नहीं है, इसका पता सिनेमा से चलता है, एंटरटेनमेंट टैक्स से चलता है। आप इसके लिए चाहे जितनी दलीलें दें, लेकिन हम जानते हैं अच्छा तरह से कि मुल्क में कहीं पर भी अकाल नहीं है। हां, यह आप कह सकते हैं कि यहां पर गरीब और अमीर की लड़ाई है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सिनेमा शहरों में हैं, देहातों में नहीं।

श्री चंद्रमणि लाल चीवरी : देहातों से अनगिनत लोग बैलगाड़ियों पर बैठ कर सिनेमा देखने आते हैं, महिलायें बैलगाड़ियों में बैठकर आती हैं। अगर आप इस पर पर्दा डालना चाहते हैं तो इससे काम नहीं चलेगा। सच्चाई को मैदान में आना चाहिये, और लोगों को एक की बात बतलानी चाहिये। हमारे विरोधियों को हमेशा पार्टी बेसिस पर नहीं सोचना चाहिये, मुल्क को बनाने में सहयोग भी प्रदान करना चाहिये। इस के लिये खुल कर सामने आना चाहिये।

बहुत से लोगों ने मुखालिफ पार्टियों का नाम लिया, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी का, जन संघ का कि उनको कांग्रेस में क्यों लिया जाता है। सब लोग जानते हैं कि जिस तरह से हमारे

[ श्री चंद्रमणि लाल चौधरी ]

देश का सबसे ऊंचा पहाड़ एवरेस्ट है, उसी तरह से कांग्रेस है। उसके अन्दर छोटे विचार नहीं हैं। जो भी हमारे दामन में लिपटने आता है हम उसको ठुकराते नहीं। हम कहते हैं कि अगर तुमने अपने सिद्धान्तों में परिवर्तन कर लिया है तो आओ, खुले आम आओ। हम तुमको अपनाने से कभी घबराते नहीं। लेकिन मैं विरोधी लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनके यहां कोई इस तरह की दावत है। चन्द भाई हम से पूछते हैं कि हम उनको क्यों लेते हैं। हम उनको लेने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं अगर मुल्क के लोग नहीं चाहते हैं। अगर मुल्क के लोग नहीं चाहते हैं तो कोई डिजीजन नहीं होगा। इसमें आपके घबराने की क्या बात है। शास्त्री जी, कामराज जी, जो भी हमारे देश के नेता हैं वे पब्लिक की बातों को, काफी समझते हैं जनता की बातों को, गरीबों की बातों को। हमारे बागड़ी साहब भी तो गरीबों के बड़े भारी प्रतिनिधि हैं, झोपड़ियों वाले लोगों के लिये हमेशा कुर्बानी करने के लिये तैयार रहते हैं। क्या वे नहीं जानते कि आज गरीबी और अमीरी को लड़ाई है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आज प्रधान मंत्री से लड़ाई करते हो तो अमीरों की पार्टी में मत शरीक हो, गरीबों की पार्टी में आओ जिसमें शास्त्री जी गरीबों की पेशवाई करते हैं।

कहा जाता है कि बे लोग काम करना नहीं चाहते, फिर्कापरस्त पार्टियों में मुन्बिला रहें। इसे सोच कर मुझे एक नज्म याद आ गई जिसे सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

या खुदा, हिन्दोस्तां को बह्श ऐसे आदमी  
जिनके सर में मगज हो और मगज में  
ताबिन्दगी

जो जियें तदबीरो तस्खरे जहां के वास्ते  
और भरें भी तो फकत हिन्दोस्तां के वास्ते  
जिन से शमा फिर हो रोशन तरज  
मेहरे मुनीर

शुबहयूब जुआर में जकड़े न हों जिन के जमीर  
ना सजा भीहाम कर सकते न हों जिनका  
शिकार

मायबाजी पर न हो जिसके अक्रायद  
का मजार,

या खुदा नाजायज वह कुफो ईमां से  
बचा

अपने हिन्दू से बचा, अपने मुसलमा से  
बचा

रुके रफियत से न हो जो आशानाी  
आदमी

दे हमें वारे खुदा हिन्दोस्तानी आदमी  
अलगरज, मेरे वतन को जिन्दगी दे  
ऐ खुदा

आदमी दे, आदमी दे, आदमी ऐ खुदा।

हम उन फिर्कापरस्त पार्टियों पर कांफिडेंस नहीं करते। आर० एस० एस०, जन संघ और न जाने कौन कौन सी पार्टियां हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हैं जो फिर्कापरस्ती के नाम पर बुलन्द होना चाहती हैं। लेकिन यह गैर-मुमकिन है कि वह बुलन्दी पर आ सकें जिनके अन्दर कम्पूनल पनाह की राजनीति है। कहीं बजरंगबली का नाम है और कहीं अल्लाह अकबर का नाम है। इस किस्म की पार्टियां आज हिन्दुस्तान में चलाने के लिये मुल्क तैयार नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान में वही पार्टियां जिन्दा रहने की हकदार हैं जो सारे देश के अन्दर रहने वाली सारी कौमों को अपना भाई समझेंगी, चाहे वह सिख हों, चाहे ईसाई हों, चाहे ब्राह्मण हों या किसी भी जाति धर्म की हों। हम किसी धर्म की आड़ में शिकार नहीं खेलना चाहते। हम सारे धर्मों की इज्जत करते हैं और साथ साथ अपने धर्म की मर्यादा

को भी रखना चाहते हैं। हमारी कांग्रेस में यही सिद्धान्त चलता है।

मैं एक बात की तरफ और ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। बहुत से हमारे दोस्तों ने कहा कि शास्त्री जी की जो कैबिनेट है वह काम करने लायक नहीं है। और नहीं मालूम क्या कहा उन्होंने कहा। लेकिन शास्त्री जी की कैबिनेट ने और श्री नन्दाने जिस भ्रष्टाचार निवारण समिति का निर्माण किया उस से हिन्दुस्तान के पूँजीपतियों के दिल को बड़ा घक्का लगा, वे उखड़ पड़े हैं। वे देखते हैं कि उनके पास पैसा रहने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, ऐसा मोड़ हमारी सरकार ने लिया है। इस लिये वह लोग कुछ लोगों को पैसा देते हैं, कुछ मेम्बरो को कहते हैं कि तुम सरकार की मखालिफत करो जिसमें उनका खजाना, उनकी जिन्दगी और उनकी भ्रष्टालिकायें आबाद रहें और सारा काम चलता रहे। मैं आखिर में एक ही बात कह कर बैठ जाऊँगा :

“शमा पर परवाना तन्हा जलता है”

इस देश के गरीब, और यतीम लोग लाल बहादुर शास्त्री पर मरते हैं।

**Shri P. G. Menon (Mukundapuram):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was overwhelmed by a feeling of unreality in having to reply to a no-confidence motion, when the sponsor of the motion and most of the supporters of the motion are not present in the House. I have been also feeling that there is a streak of unreality over the whole motion from the day and the hour when it was moved up to this point of time. What better evidence can there be regarding the lack of purpose and the absence of seriousness behind this motion when the sponsor of the motion and the supporters of the motion are keeping away from the debate deliberately, not because there was anything wrong in the conduct of the motion or in the replies given to the motion, but because they felt aggrieved over

something else. I should think that in this House, which is the most august body of the people of India, no group of people should resort to this kind of irresponsibility, after having moved a motion, to leave the House without caring to hear what the Government or the supporters of the Government have to say in reply to the motion.

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar):** On a point of order, Sir. When the discussion on the Murud incident has been suspended and is not being considered, he cannot refer to it now.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** When the walk-out was staged, the no-confidence motion was not under discussion. It was the Murud incident that was being discussed. The hon. Member is wrong in saying that the Opposition Members are not attending to the reply to the motion.

**Mr. Chairman:** There is no point of order in this. It is a matter of understanding. When 2½ hours were allotted to the discussion regarding the Walcot affair, it does not prevent the House from taking up any other business when that particular business collapses. If the sponsors of that motion have chosen to be absent from the House, the rest of the business of the House will not stand suspended. The hon. Member may continue his speech.

**Shri P. G. Menon:** If those who wanted this motion to be discussed here were sincere about it, purposive about it, they would have been present when the discussion on that motion was going on.

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:** They are present.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is a procedural matter. There is no point of order. The Speaker has decided that the discussion on the no-confidence motion will go on.

**Shri P. G. Menon:** I am glad that some at least of the supporters of the motion are here. Out of a feeling of helplessness that their comrades are not here, they are raising objection to what I am stating.

Apart from this, there is a great deal of unreality about the motion. As I have understood it, a no-confidence motion is a great political occasion in the life of any legislature. That is an occasion in systems of democracy such as we are having when an opposition party puts forward an alternative programme to the programme of the Government. In that way alone does it contribute to better administration, to better representative government. Even where the Opposition is in a minority, and in a very small minority as it is here, a purposeful Opposition will be in a position to put forward an alternative programme which, according to them, the Government of the day should adhere to and which, according to them, they would adhere to if called upon to carry on the administration of the Government. That kind of attempt is given up and time, out of number the Congress Party is accused of having a brute majority—I do not want to use that word, but we have a good majority and it is not a matter of shame that a political party has a good majority in Parliament. Is it a matter of shame to us?—If the people of the country thought that a large number of Congressmen should represent them, if a large majority of constituencies should return Congress candidates to Lok Sabha, then that is the will of the people and it is not proper time and again to refer to the will of the people and attempt to ridicule it by saying, "you have a brute majority there". But even when a government has a large majority behind it, it will be open to an Opposition to put forward points of view in order to change the course of the administration, and that is exactly what is lacking here.

This is not an attempt to find fault with the division in the Opposition. But here are a few groups in the Opposition who criticise the policies of the Government, each from their own point of view. Therefore, it has appeared to me that this is an occasion not of a No-confidence Motion but when every group in the Opposition gets up and pledges confidence in their own programmes. No alternative is put forward.

It has been said by Shri Dandekar, representing the Swatantra Party, that he is not supporting the No-confidence Motion and that has been made much of. But so far as the Government and the Congress Party are concerned, it makes no difference. Shri Dandekar, fully armed with all the views he has against the Government, gave vent to those views and said that for the time being he does not propose to vote for the No-confidence Motion. Assured as the other Members of the Opposition are that the No-confidence Motion will not be passed, they say that they would vote for the No-confidence Motion. What difference does it make?

So far as the Congress Party is concerned, every group in the Opposition has put forward its views about the programme of the Congress. The question is, is there anything in common between the views expressed by the various groups here? This, again is not an attempt to find fault with the stand of the Opposition. It is possible for the Opposition here to function only in that manner. Take, for example, the various grounds raised by the spokesman of the Swatantra Party eloquently on the floor of the House regarding the policies of the Government. Do others support their views?

Now, it is necessary, when these criticisms are put forward again and again, for the members of the Congress Party and the Government to clear the ground, and it is in that spirit, therefore, that I wish to refer to some of the points. For example, the Swatantra Party is complaining that after

the passing of the Constitution by the Constituent Assembly 15 years back, a large number of amendments to the Constitution have been placed on the statute-book. They would think that the wisdom of the country was at its pinnacle in November 1949 when the present Constitution was passed. Seventeen or eighteen amendments have been made. I do not plead guilty to that. Do the other Members of the Opposition here take exception to the large number of amendments which were made to the Constitution from time to time? Let us remember that the chapter on fundamental rights is not the only chapter in the Constitution. So far as Parliament is concerned and so far as Government is concerned, there is another very important chapter in the Constitution. Refer to the chapter on the directive principles. I will, with your leave, Mr. Chairman, read article 7 of the Constitution. Article 37 reads:

"The provisions contained in this Part shall not be enforceable by any court, but the principles therein laid down are nevertheless fundamental in the governance of the country and it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws".

Therefore, so far as Parliament and the Government are concerned, a fundamental duty is laid down. This duty was also laid down by the Constituent Assembly. The Constitution says that the directive principles, wherein is enshrined equality, justice, provision against concentration of power etc., are fundamental in the governance of the country. Therefore, any Prime Minister of India, when he attempts to have legislation for the purposes laid down in the directive principles and finds that one or two of the fundamental rights in the other part comes into conflict, has a duty under the Constitution, to move for amendment of the Constitution. This is, Sir, the political and constitutional

justification for some of the amendments of the Constitution, and there is absolutely no meaning in attacking the Congress Party for having passed these amendments; and on that attack the other Members are not joining hands.

Then, the Swatantra Party appears to have an allergy towards our public undertakings. They are exuberant about the private sector, and one of the occasions when, Shri Dandekar said, they would fight the Government will be when there is any inroad into the rights of the private sector. The Congress Party, supporting as it does the policy laid down by the Government, is not against the private sector. Some hon. Member here said that under the Congress regime the private sector has been growing richer, richer and richer. It may be so, because under the Industrial Policy Resolution we are committed to support the public sector and also to protect the private sector so long as that policy is there. The fact is this. Today, there is no real private sector in the country as is usually understood. There is a protected market in India today. There is a planned economy, a system under which no industry would fail because the requirements of the people are assessed and the private licensee—the better term will be private licensee and not private sector—has to be supported by the State from out of State-sponsored institutions. That is the situation at present.

Shri Dandekar made a statement that everywhere in the world progress and development took place on account of the operation of the private sector. Historically he is correct. Because, in America, in England, in Germany, Japan and other advanced countries of the world it was the private sector which developed the industries. But will he please remember that in those countries the captains of industry did not run after government for foreign exchange resources, did not run after the government for

[Shri P. G. Menon]

foreign collaboration arrangements, did not run after the government for all sorts of protection? Early in the 19th century, with the advent of the industrial revolution, people in the private sector carried on experiments, carried on adventures and with their own resources developed the industries in those countries. But that is not the situation here. Therefore, when the Swatantra Party members complain of controls, of licences, of all sorts of pin-pricks and cry hoarse for the private sector, they are doing it out of context; there is no such private sector in India today.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** They are with you now.

**Shri P. G. Menon:** But for the public sector, would we find the development which we see today?

**An Hon. Member:** You are helping them.

**Shri P. G. Menon:** I am coming to that. The largest investment in the public sector is in steel. With all the abundant resources of iron ore in India, is it the view of any member of this House that we should still import steel, and that all our resources by way of iron ore should lie waste? The greatest charge against the British Government, which exercised authority in India for about two hundred years, is that they kept us as hewers of wood and drawers of water without developing the resources of the country. Though we had a railway system here, they did not manufacture railway engines. The national government had to come to power to do that. Now more than one thousand railway engines are manufactured every year in the public sector in Chittaranjan. Does anybody say that this should be stopped and we should import railway engines so that we may concentrate on food production only? That is a matter on which the other members of the Opposition are not in agreement with the Swatantra Party. Therefore, how can there be an alternative policy?

He was followed by Professor Mukerjee, who made a very eloquent tribute to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We were all glad about it. He appeared to say that he is attacking this government because the policies laid down by Panditji are being given the go-by and there is a change in policy. He is not here but I would like to ask him through you, when Panditji was the Prime Minister, did he not vote in favor of a no-confidence motion? When Panditji who, according to him, was the embodiment of the principles for which he stands, was leading this government, then also there were these annual no-confidence motions and speeches. Therefore, I say that there is a streak of unreality in these motions.

There was a good deal of reference to corruption. Personally speaking, I do not believe that corruption has increased in the country during the last ten or fifteen years.

**An Hon. Member:** That is news to us.

**Shri P. G. Menon:** Many more things would be news to you. The hon. Member has not understood what the Home Minister has stated and what I am going to say. He is impatient and, therefore, interrupting. What I am saying is, there has been a greater awareness of corruption in recent times. There is a real difference between the growth of corruption and the growth of awareness of corruption. It is the Congress Government that is responsible for making the people aware of the situation. I certainly believe that during the second world war there was more corruption in the country than is prevalent today. I do not believe that the Government servants are more corrupt today than they were 15 or 20 years ago. Now that the Congress Governments everywhere have awakened to the situation, on account of the better education in the country, better democratic sense in the country, better sense of responsi-

bility in the administration, they are making us more aware of the existence of corruption in this country. That is what Shri Nanda has done and what the Government is doing. Now, on account of your temporary interest in finding fault, I request you not to let down the services in the country, the people of this country. On account of the interest of the Opposition temporarily to throw mud against the Government, if they say that corruption is on the increase, it will be doing a positive disservice to the country.

There is corruption in this country, but what has increased according to me is awareness of corruption. And we should be glad about it. Shri Nanda has taken the broomstick, so to say, to cleanse the Augean stables. The accusation of the Opposition about corruption in the administration is like saying that it is because of Hercules, who wanted to clean the Augean stable, there is uncleanness in the stables. What the Congress Government is doing is to eradicate corruption, to make the people aware of corruption, to call upon the people not to tolerate corruption. It is not a case of corruption being on the increase. Then, so many irrelevant statements have been made about very many other things. I do not want to indulge in equal irrelevances. Professor Mukerjee referred to the conditions in Kerala. What are the conditions in Kerala? What is the abnormality there?

**An Hon. Member:** President's rule three times.

**Shri P. G. Menon:** My friend over there does not understand me and thinks that interruptions will create trouble for me.

What has happened in Kerala? A few members of the Congress Party went to the other side, the party lost its majority and the Government fell. That can happen anywhere. Then allegations of corruption were made by some people against the Chief Minister which have been denied by the other party, and

an inquiry by the late Prime Minister showed that there is nothing in that charge. I do not want to enter into that controversy. At the same time, Professor Mukerjee said that the only government which was not corrupt was removed five years back. I do not object to his having a flattering unctiousness upon himself that the government of his party was pure, good, great and all that. Let him entertain that feeling. But I do not agree with him. That is all. Not only I but millions of people of my State do not agree with him. Also the High Court Judge who was appointed to inquire into certain transactions and charges also did not agree with him. That is what has taken place. I do not want to say anything more. I oppose this motion and I believe that this motion will be defeated with a huge majority.

**Shri Badrudduja (Murshidabad):** Mr. Chairman, it is after a great deal of hesitation that I am taking part in the debates this afternoon. As an independent Member of this House, attached to no party, no group for the last 17 years, in my political life after independence, I have dissociated myself from the No-confidence Motion for reasons of my own; firstly, because I feel that this new administration, which has just assumed the reins, should have ample time and opportunities to tackle very serious problems of the administration—problems big with the fate of the nation.

The second consideration which has moved me not to associate with this No-confidence Motion is the fact that a combination of parties and groups in the Opposition, with differing and, at times, conflicting ideals and ideologies, diametrically opposed views even on political and economic issues, can hardly deliver the goods, far less holding out the prospect of an alternative administration in the event of the Congress Government going out of the picture. The alternative to this Congress administration at the

[Shri Badrudduja]

present moment, with the country seething with discontent, is nothing but chaos and confusion, nothing but a desperate situation which will tend to disintegration and disruption of the whole fabric.

The third consideration, which is the most compelling one, that has induced me not to associate with this No-confidence Motion is the fact that I personally have no confidence—not myself alone, but 60 millions of Muslims in India, 120 millions of Scheduled Caste people, the Swatantra Party, the Republican Party, the Muslim League Party and, if I may be permitted to add, considerable volume of Hindu opinion; perhaps, the majority of the majority of the majority have no confidence in the hon. Mover of the No-confidence Motion. I myself have no confidence in the hon. Mover of the No-confidence Motion.

But Sir, while recognising the historic role of the Congress in shaping the destinies of the nation, moulding and integrating the dying forces of India towards the track of political and social evolution in the dark days of British imperialism, I cannot shut my eyes to the failure of the administration in various directions. First of all, I should like to emphasise the inefficiency of the administration to tackle the food problem; its lack of a realistic, integrated approach to the problem; its production, its procurement and effective distribution; government's lack of an objective assessment of the food situation in the country in all its bearings and implications and repercussions upon agricultural economy in the land.

I am not against industrial advancement as such. I want that agricultural and industrial advancement should run *pari passu* and contribute to the prosperity of the nation. But I am opposed to our planners' defective planning which laid greater emphasis on industries in preference to agriculture during the Second and the Third Five Year Plans. This, and

the unnatural conversion of some paddy-growing fields, in some States like West Bengal, into jute areas for earning dollars from the dollar-earning countries of the world and, what is more, the administration's failure to offer incentive to the producer in the shape of better seeds, better fertiliser and better education in the modern techniques and methods of production have led to all this stagnation in agricultural production. Last but not the least, the complacency and the softness of the administration towards blackmarketers and hoarders has encouraged them to hoard up the stocks, creating an artificial scarcity in the land which has been the despair not merely of the people, but of the administration itself.

I would not emulate the example of my hon. friend over here by indulging in insinuations about the Government's liaison or collusion or conspiracy with the financial combines and hoarders. I am myself of earth and earthy and made of the same corruptible flesh that others are made of. Living in glass-houses I should not throw stones at others. But I believe that this softness of the administration, this complacency of the administration has encouraged the blackmarketers and hoarders to hoard up their stocks. This hoarding, deficit financing, and an ineffective distribution of foodstuffs that is available in the country have led to a sharp rise in prices which have soared higher and higher till they have reached beyond the purchasing capacity of the consumer. If Government had been a little more cautious, if they had a little more vision of the future, if they took warnings betimes, if they only plugged the loopholes and gaps through which these stocks go into the bottomless pit, there would have been no food crisis with imports pouring in from America and other parts of the world and with 35 per cent increase in food production in the country during the last few years. The population explosion has not affected the position in the least. 33 per cent of population increase during three

years and 35 per cent of increase in food production cancel each other. With these imports, with this plugging up of the gaps and with these checks and curbs on advances against agricultural commodities, we might have created a favourable food situation in the country. A little more realistic approach, a little more pragmatic approach, which the present Government is trying to make, would have saved the situation. Sir, I am very much emphatic on this point. A ferocious lion warns the weary traveller across the path against the danger by its roar; a poisonous cobra reminds him of the danger by its hisses, but more ferocious than the lion, more ravenous than the wolf, more poisonous than the cobra, this human vampire steals on unawares on his brother man, sucks his life blood and lays him prostrate.

I appreciate the healthy measures that the present Food Minister has adopted. In order to check the tendency, to speculative hoarding, he has requested the various State Governments, including West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Mysore, to fix the maximum wholesale and retail prices for foodgrains in the country and has introduced other checks and curbs as well. The curb has been imposed that advances from banks against agricultural commodities must be tightened all the more. And other measures have also been adopted. I need not discuss those at the present moment; but I assure this Government that these are the measures, if implemented in the proper way, will usher in a brighter future.

There are also disparities in income. 270 millions of people in the country, from day's end to day's end, drag on in a long-drawn out struggle, unrelieved by any ray of hope, soaring prices, starvation, miseries, poverty, disease—all these stare them in the face. What is the lot of these people who are the mainstay of this country and on whose suffrage we owe our positions in Parliament? Not only our humble selves, but even Ministers holding responsible positions in the country owe their positions to the

suffrage of these 270 millions of people. But what is their lot? They cannot produce administrators, thinkers, philosophers, statesmen, politicians, diplomats, Chief Ministers and Prime Minister. From day's end to day's end, they drag on a miserable existence. Against it, there is surfeit and plenty among the few; fashionable dissipation, midnight orgies, wild revels and mild sensations of the ball-room.

I am now coming to the question of corruption which has been discussed threadbare by many hon. Members in this House. I need not dilate upon it at length. My hon. friends on the other side will not misunderstand me. I have the same feelings about corruption as hon. Members on the other side of the House have. We share this feeling about corruption. It has permeated through and through. It has been eating into the vitals of the administration, into the vitals of the body-politic. Sir, I am fully conscious of the grave responsibility of the administration as also of the members of the Opposition in this connection. Startling disclosures in Kairon's case, the observations of the Supreme Court and the Das Commission have already torn up the veil that concealed the ugly picture. Thanks to the initiative of my hon. friend, Mr. Abdul Ghani Dar in the other House and his other associates and colleagues outside like Chowdhury Devi Lal, the entire structure, based upon fraud and deception, on bribery and corruption, collapsed like the house of cards. There have been other startling disclosures too. I am not going to pry into the secrets of the State administrations. But I can assure this Government and the hon. Home Minister—I congratulate him on the admirable stand he has taken in this connection—of our unstinted cooperation in this noble task of eradicating this malaise from the body-politic of India.

14.51 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, the prosperity of a country, as Luther rightly observed,

[Shri Badrudduja]

does not consist in its fabulous wealth or magnificent buildings but in its men of education, culture and character. As the Holy Koran says:

Laqaḍ Katabna Fizzabura Mim  
Badizzikra

Inna-ul Arza Yoresoha Abadus  
Salehun

It is laid down in the Gospels—the Books that only those righteous men who struggle, suffer and bleed for the cause of righteousness, truth and justice on earth; only those who subordinate their personal considerations to the supreme demand of the nation, only those who efface themselves for the welfare of millions in the country, shall alone have the right to rule the land and inherit the earth.

Sir, I am not very much enamoured of a particular system of administration. To my mind, the character of an administration is immaterial, democratic, bureaucratic, autocratic or theocratic, provided men at the helm of affairs are men of vision, men of imagination, men of unimpeachable integrity of character, of sanity of judgment, of lofty idealism and burning patriotism which characterise some of the great leaders of our country.

Some Members of both Houses of Parliament, met on Sunday last under the chairmanship of Acharya Kripalani and we constituted ourselves into an anti-corruption front for the purpose of convening a conference on the 19th or 20th of this month in order to devise means, in order to devise effective remedies to eradicate this evil for all time to come, to throw it out root, branch and all. I do not know how far the hon. Home Minister will succeed in his noble task.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri Badrudduja:** I will finish in a few minutes.

He has got to fight not merely against the legacy of corruption of the last 17 years but he has also to fight against the legacy of corruption, the legacy of nepotism, of favouritism, of demoralisation, degradation and humiliation which has been brought about by foreign domination in this country. He has got to fight against all these. But I can assure him of our cooperation in every possible way.

The second problem which I propose to discuss is the most baffling of all problems. The other day when there was a talk of paving the way for international understanding, inter-communal harmony between Pakistan and India, there was some sort of suspicion creeping in the minds of hon. Members. Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan is trying in his own way to explore all possible avenues of settlement between India and Pakistan. All avenues must be explored for the settlement of the long-standing dispute which is fraught with certain possibilities of good for both the countries. At any rate, we Muslims, the members of the minority community, feel that at least in the interest of 60 million Muslims in India and 10 million Hindus in Pakistan, it is necessary that all disputes and controversies between Pakistan and Hindustan must be settled and set at rest. If not anything, in order to contain China, in order to fight the menace of China in every possible way, it is necessary to strengthen the bonds of amity and friendship between the two neighbouring countries. China is stealing a march in the diplomatic sphere and China has made up with De Gaulle in France who is dreaming the dreams of Napoleon; China has penetrated into Africa; China has gone into all the neighbouring countries. It is necessary in the interest of our safety, in the interest of our security, in the interest of our solidarity, in the interest of our integrity, in the interest of our

future possibilities, that amity and friendship and goodwill must be fostered between the two countries, that Pakistan and Hindustan must combine for a joint front to fight the common menace.

Sir, before I come to this ticklish communal problem which has baffled the attempts at solution so far, I would like to emphasize that historical cause, and conditions, factors—political, social, cultural and religious, mostly psychological and emotional—which led to the partition of India, generated forces which reacted most unfavourably on the minorities of both sides of the border.

Whatever might be my feelings about the State administrations of West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, whatever might be the misfortunes of the Muslims, whatever might be their difficulties, whatever might be the reverses through which they passed, however serious might be the holocaust, however terrible might be the genocide and massacre of innocent people on both sides—I am here to reiterate with all the emphasis at my command my grateful appreciation, my gratitude to the Central Government, particularly to the Home Minister—when the State Governments failed to rise to the occasion—he rose to the occasion. Thanks to the hon. Home Minister's sagacity and wisdom by his firm decision and prompt action he not only arrested the drift but saved the desperate crisis which threatened the extinction of Muslims in various parts of India.

Sir, my time is up—I wish I had enough time to discuss the matters further. I am grateful to you and I shall conclude with these few words. I may assure the administration that I am its well-wisher in the sense that I shall ever try to assist this administration in all its noble task for the welfare of the people. Whatever might be the political complexion, the religious persuasion or the social affiliation, it is the primary duty and the responsibility of the citizens of

the State to cooperate with the administration when it is bent upon improving the conditions of the people in the country.

Before I sit down, may I appeal to the Government to rise to the occasion, to see with their own eyes the signs on the wall. Dark and ominous clouds are fast gathering overhead, threatening to burst upon their shoulders any moment, midnight gloom and darkness treads the horizon. Sir, I have seen mighty Hitler going down; I have seen Mussolini going down; I have heard of Napoleon pining away in miseries in the Isles of St. Helena; I have seen the mightiest Government, the British Government, crumbling to pieces like the baseless fabrics of a vision. Mr. Chairman, mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small; sooner than perhaps you and I can conceive of, this Congress administration if it fails to rise to the occasion, if it fails to ease the situation, if it fails to implement the assurance held out and redeem the pledges that it has given to the nation, it will go down to history unwept and unsung.

15.00 hrs.

श्री ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिषी (सागर) :  
सभापति महोदय, मैं आप का बहुत धाभारी हूँ कि आप ने मुझे मौका दिया कि जो यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव उपस्थित है उसका विरोध करूँ। मैं विरोध इसलिये नहीं कर रहा हूँ कि मैं इस तरफ बैठा हुआ हूँ। जिस तरह इन बेंचों और उन बेंचों के बीच में कोई बड़ा भारी अन्तर नहीं है, उसी तरह से वैचारिक दृष्टि से देश का हित सोचने में, मैं नहीं समझता कि हम लोग कोई बहुत बड़ा अन्तर रखते हैं। लेकिन दुःख तब होता है जब हम देखते हैं कि यह प्रस्ताव ऐसे वक्त लाया गया, जो वक्त कि इस देश की स्थिति पर नजर डालते हुए बड़ा गैरमौजू वक्त है।

प्रजातंत्र में किसी भी दल को सरकार के ऊपर अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाने का एक प्रजातन्त्रात्मक हक होता है, इस बात को मैं स्वीकार

[श्री जवा० प्र० जगतिषः]

करता हूँ। लेकिन मनुष्य को जो भी राइड्स मिलते हैं उनका एक संतुलित तरीके पर उपयोग हो यह निहायत जरूरी है। मैं देखता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा हमारे विरोधी मित्रों ने इस वक्त इस देश की ताकत नहीं बढ़ाई है। इस देश की ताकत बढ़ाने के बजाय उन्होंने दुश्मनों की ताकत बढ़ाने में मदद पहुंचाई। इस देश में जो समस्यायें हैं उन को हल करने में उन्होंने मदद नहीं पहुंचाई है। मैं नम्रतापूर्वक पूछता हूँ कि क्या यह प्रस्ताव उन समस्याओं को हल करने में सहायता पहुंचा सकता है? क्या अन्न की कमी को, जिस के कारण हम और और सब निश्चित रूप से परेशान हैं दूर करने में यह प्रस्ताव सफल हो सकता है? जो अनैतिकता की बात कही जा रही है देश में, वह निश्चित रूप से हम सब के लिये एक दर्द की बात है। उस अनैतिकता को दूर करने के लिये हमारा शासन मजबूती से कदम उठाने का संकल्प कर के कुछ आगे बढ़ा है। उस संकल्प को मजबूत करने में क्या यह प्रस्ताव मदद करता है? हम देखते हैं कि पिछले तीन महीनों में और उस के पहिले भी हम ने जो अच्छे कदम उठाने की कोशिश की, उन कदमों को कमजोर करने में हमारे विरोधी दल के मित्रों ने कार्रवाइयां की हैं। यह बहुत जरूरी है कि जब इस तरह का प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने आता है तो देश के लोग इस बात को समझें कि अपोजिशन किस मंशा से यह प्रस्ताव ला रहा है।

मैं कहता हूँ कि आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने बड़ जोरों के साथ इस सदन में यह बात कही कि जो सदाचार समिति बनाई गई है वह किस लिये बनाई गई है। कांग्रेस के होत हुए सदाचार समिति के निर्माण की क्या जरूरत थी? उन्होंने कहा कि चोर के पीछे चोरों को लगा दिया और वह चिल्लाते जा रहे हैं: चोर, चोर, चोर। मुझे बड़ा दुःख है कि उन के जैसे बड़ आदमी के मुंह से सदन के सामने इस प्रकार के शब्द कह गये। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या

सदाचार समिति में काम करने वाले सब लोगों के काम को उन्होंने देखा है? क्या सदाचार समिति में काम करने वाले लोग चोर हैं?

एक माननीय सदस्य : हां।

श्री जवा० प्र० जगतिषी : यह आप की नजर का दोष है। मैं आप से पूछता हूँ कि इस देश में सदाचार समिति के अन्तर्गत काम करने वाले जो मित्र हैं उन सब को वे जानते हैं? क्या उन सारे मित्रों के चरित्रों की सूची उन के पास है कि उन का जीवन किस प्रकार का था? क्या आचार्य कृपालानी ने इस बात की जताश की है? मेरा विश्वास है कि इस समिति से के अन्तर्गत काम करने वाले जो आदमी हैं उन में बहुत से लोग ऐसे हैं जिन में प्राचार्य कृपालानी के चरित्र की बुलन्दी है। हम ने उस समिति का निर्माण इसलिये किया कि दुर्भाग्य से आचार्य कृपालानी और उनके जैसे दूसरे लोग जो कांग्रेस से अलग हो गये हैं वे एक कामन प्लेटफार्म पर इकट्ठे हों और देश में जो अनैतिकता आ गई है, और निश्चित रूप से आ गई है, उस को दूर करने का प्रयत्न करें। पाश्चात्य शासन और भौतिकता की तरफ रुख होने के कारण तथा युद्ध के बाद एक लिंगेसी हम को मिली, जो कि युद्ध का एक निश्चित परिणाम हुआ करती है और किसी भी देश को यह परिणाम भोगना पड़ता है, उसे दूर करने के लिये और एक अच्छा वातावरण तैयार करने के लिये हम लोग सम्मिलित हों। राजनीतिक दृष्टि से हम भले ही डिफर होते हों, लेकिन जहां तक राष्ट्र के निर्माण का काम है, उस अनुष्ठान में हम सब इकट्ठे हों। इसलिये कांग्रेस शासन ने सदाचार समिति का निर्माण किया कि सब तबके के लोग उस में इकट्ठे हों, आचार्य कृपालानी और उन के जैसे दूसरे लोग भी आयें कि जो कि इस देश में नैतिकता के उत्थान पर विश्वास करने वाले लोग हैं। इसलिये इस समिति का निर्माण हुआ। इसलिये उस का निर्माण नहीं किया गया कि चोरों को

इकट्ठा किया जाये और वह लोग झूठा नारा बुलन्द करे चोर चोर कह के और देश में एक गलती का और स्वार्थ साधना का बातावरण निमित्त करे। श्रीनन्दा ने जो कदम उठाया, उस कदम ने निश्चित रूप से इस देश के अन्दर एक नई फिजा पैदा की है, इस देश के लोगों के दिलों में एक नई आस्था पैदा की है, नया विश्वास पैदा किया है। इस कदम की निन्दा करके मैं समझता हूँ आचार्य जी ने कोई अच्छा काम नहीं किया है। देश में जो मजबूती आनी चाहिये, उस मजबूती को कम करने की दिशा में यह काम हुआ है, ऐसा मेरा निश्चित विश्वास है।

यह ठीक है कि आचार्य कृपालानी को हमारे दल में खराबी दिखती है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस दल में खराबी नहीं है? किस दल में झगड़े नहीं हैं? आचार्य कृपालानी जिस दल को ले कर चले थे, जिस दल के नेतृत्व की बागडोर उन्होंने उठाई थी, आज उस दल की क्या हालत है? वह तीन तरह हो गया है और आचार्य कृपालानी जो संगठन की कुशलता रखते हैं वे दस आदमियों को भी अपने दल में सम्मिलित कर के नहीं चल सके। उन को स्वयम् वह दल छोड़ना पड़ा और अलग रहना पड़ा। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में स्वस्थ प्रजातन्त्र के निर्माण की दृष्टि से निष्पक्ष लोगों का यह कर्तव्य है कि वे सब जगह एकता बना कर रखें। अपोजीशन के लिये वह बहुत जरूरी है कि वह एक स्वस्थ विरोध तैयार कर सकें, ऐसा विरोध तैयार कर सकें जो एक प्लास्टिक गवर्नमेंट देश को दे सकें। यह बहुत बड़ा उत्तरदायित्व है। आचार्य कृपालानी, डा० लोहिया और हम सब का, जो कि इस तरफ हैं, यह उत्तरदायित्व है कि वे इस बात की कोशिश करें कि इन देश को एक स्वस्थ विरोध दें जिस में एक कांग्रेस न हो। हमारे यहां मतभेद है लेकिन हम उन को मिटा सकते हैं और हम ने उन को मिटाया है। पिछले दिनों जब दुर्भाग्य से हमारा नेता, हमारा राष्ट्र प्राण उठ कर चला गया तब हम ने अपनी

एकता का परिचय दिया। हम ने सारे मतभेदों को डुबो कर के और झुला कर के एक नेता इस देश को दिया, और इस के कारण इस देश की इज्जत बनी और उस के पीछे हम कदम व कदम एक दिल और एक प्राण हो कर जुटे हुए हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि बाहर भी इस देश की इज्जत बने और इस देश में भी जो काम हमारे देश के महान् नेता ने सामने रक्खा है, और जिसे हम आवश्यक समझते हैं, देश की दृष्टि से उसे हम मिल कर करें। यहां पर जो बात फूट की कही जाती है वह केवल हमारे यहां ही हो, ऐसी बात नहीं है। हम ने देखा है कुछ लोगों को तो उनके घर के लोग भी साथ नहीं देते हैं। उधर के लोग अपने घर में भी एक दल नहीं बना सके। अगर पत्नी एक तरफ है तो पति दूसरी तरफ है।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करना) : पति और पत्नी में फूट डलवाने के लिये ही तो प्राण ने हिन्दू कोड बिल बनाया है।

श्री उवा० प्र० ज्योतिषी : जिन के यहां य. हालत है आज वे ही हम से कहते हैं कि हम में फूट है, हमारे मंत्रिमंडल का यह हाल है कि मंत्री के अलग होने के बाद हम उस की आलोचना करते हैं। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि यह हमारी चारित्रिक बलन्दी की बात है और हमारी पार्टी की विशेषता है कि अगर हमारी पार्टी का कोई आदमी गलती करता है, मुख्य मंत्री भी कोई गलती करता है, तो हमारी पार्टी उस थोड़ी सी गलती को भी देश के सामने रखती है और कहती है कि हम ईमानदारी के समर्थक हैं, गलती के समर्थक नहीं हैं। यह हमारी कांग्रेस की विशेषता है, हमारी गवर्नमेंट की विशेषता है। हमारे देश में छहर उधर जो गलतियां होती हैं उन की तरफ हमारी पूरी-पूरी नजर है। हम ने दास कमिशन बिठलाया। दास कमिशन की जो फाइंडिंग हुई उन के मुताबिक जो कदम उठाना चाहिये वह हम ने उठाया। जरूरत इस बात की थी कि आज नन्दा जी का अभिनन्दन किया जाता, जरूरत इस बात की थी कि हमारी सरकार को और प्रोत्साहन

[श्री: ज्वा० प्र० ज्योतिष ]

दिया जाता, इस बात के लिये कि हम ने एक अच्छा कदम उठाया है, भ्रष्टाचार के खिलाफ। अगर इधर उधर कहीं खामी है तो उस को दूर करने के लिये हम ने मजबूती से कदम उठाया है। लेकिन अपोजीशन ने ऐसी बात करने के बजाय भ्रविषवास का प्रस्ताव रखा है, यह एक दुःखद स्थिति है।

यह बात कही जाती है और बड़े जोरों से कही जाती है कि हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति जो है वह विफल हुई है। कुछ दिनों से हमारे यहां अपोजीशन ने इस बात को उछालना शुरू किया है। ये अरुवाहें फैलायी जाती हैं, यह बात कही जाती है कि हम अपनी इज्जत को खतरे में डाल कर पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता करना चाहते हैं। ये आखिर किस के दिमाग के किस्म हैं ? हमें ताज्जुब होता है। हमारा पार्टी ने मजबूती के साथ इस बात को अनेक बार घोषित किया कि हम ऐसा कोई भी फैसला या समझौता नहीं करने वाले हैं जिससे इस देश की इज्जत को आंच आवे। अगर इस देश का कोई आदमी ऐसी बात करता है, अगर बाहर का कोई आदमी ऐसी बात करता है, तो उसके मानी यह नहीं होते कि उस को गवर्नमेंट का बैंकिंग है या कांग्रेस पार्टी का बैंकिंग है।

इसी तरह से चाइना से अक्सार्डिचिन के बारे में समझौता करने की बात कही गयी। यह ठीक है कि हम संसार में किसी भी देश से झगड़ना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन यह भी सत्य है कि हम कोई असम्मानजनक काम नहीं करने वाले हैं। यह बात हमारी सरकार की तरफ से अनेक बार यहां कही जा चुकी है। फिर भी यह बात बार-बार अपोजीशन की तरफ से कही जाती है कि चीन के मामले में अथवा पाकिस्तान के मामले में हम कोई ऐसा कदम उठाने वाले हैं जो इस देश के सम्मान के लिए ठीक नहीं है। मैं कहता हूँ ये गलत चीजें हैं। यह भ्रम है, अपोजीशन

को इस भ्रम को अपने मस्तिष्क से निकाल देना चाहिए। इस देश में अच्छा वातावरण बनाने की दृष्टि से यह बहुत जरूरी है कि इन भ्रमों को अपोजीशन के दिमाग से जितनी जल्दी हो सके निकाल दिया जाये।

यह ठीक है कि इस समय अन्न का संकट हमारे सामने है। लेकिन जो यह कहा जाता है कि यह संकट शासन के फ्लेबोर के कारण है, शासन की गलती के कारण है, यह गलत बात है। हम ने जगह जगह बांध डाल कर जो पानी हजारों वर्षों से वहां चला जाता था उसको रोका है, जो काम कि इससे पहले किसी शासन ने नहीं किया। हम जितने साधन जुटा सके हम ने इस में लगाये। हमारे पास जो भी साधन थे उनको ले कर हम ने फरटीलाइजर फैक्टरीज खड़ी कीं। हमारे पास जो भी पैसा था उसको हमने देश के अन्दर फैलाने की कोशिश की ताकि किसान अपनी खेती को उठा सके। लेकिन यह बात सच है कि हमारे पास कोई भलाउद्दीन का चिराग नहीं है और ऐसा नहीं है कि जो बात हम कहें उसका अरसर देश के हर गांव पर तत्काल हो जाये। हमारे गांव पिछड़े हुए हैं। उन गांवों के निवासियों के हाथ पैरों में ताकत लाने के लिए जितना हम कर सकते थे हम ने किया। लेकिन यह सच है कि जितनी ताकत हम को उन्हें पहुंचानी चाहिए थी हम नहीं पहुंचा सके क्योंकि वह हमारे पास नहीं है। जितनी ताकत हमारे पास थी, उसको लगाकर जो परिणाम निकाले जा सकते थे वे हम ने निकाले।

यह ठीक है कि जितने टारगेट हम एचीव करना चाहते थे हम नहीं कर सके, लेकिन इस में हम असफल हुए यह बात नहीं है। अगर बेतहाशा बच्चे देश में पैदा होते जाएं और इन्द्र अचानक यदि हमारे ऊपर कुपित हो जाएं और कहीं बहुत वर्षा हो और कहीं बहुत कम हो, तो हजार प्लानिंग

के बावजूद हमें दिक्कत आ सकती है। तो यह जो अन्न की कमी हुई है, अगर आप इस देश का इतिहास देखें तो आप को पता चलेगा कि हर दूसरे तीसरे साल में अकाल पड़ता है। हम ने उस अकाल की इंटेंसिटी को मिनिमाइज किया है। हम ने देश में वैसा अभाव नहीं आने दिया जैसा कि उस समय आया था जब कि बंगाल में अकाल के कारण 33 लाख आदमी मर गये थे।

यह ठीक है कि अन्न इस वर्ष कम रहा। हम ने खुद सोचा था कि बाहर से गल्ला कम मंगाएं। अपोजीशन बार बार कहता था कि हम बाहर से बहुत गल्ला मंगाते हैं। हम ने भी सोचा कि बाहर से कम गल्ला मंगाना चाहिए और इसलिए हम ने गत वर्ष बाहर से कम गल्ला मंगाया और सोचा कि देश में ही ज्यादा अन्न पैदा किया जाए और जो पैसा हम बाहर गल्ला मंगाने पर खर्च करते हैं उसे इस देश के किसानों को बांटा जाये जिससे किसान की ताकत बढ़े। इस कारण हम ने बाहर से कम गल्ला मंगाया। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से कहीं अधिक वर्षा हो गयी और कहीं बहुत कम हुई इसलिए फसल खराब हो गयी। इस चीज पर हम काबू नहीं कर सकते थे। कोई सरकार इस चीज पर काबू नहीं पा सकती थी। देश में कुछ स्थल हैं जहाँ पानी कम बरसता है, हम सूखी नदियों में पानी नहीं ला सकते। देश में कुछ ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं जहाँ सिंचाई के कोई साधन नहीं हैं, कुछ में ये साधन उपलब्ध किये जा सकते हैं वें किये जा रहे हैं। तो इन चीजों के कारण जो दिक्कत कांग्रेस शासन को आयी वह किसी भी पार्टी के शासन को आ सकती थी। इन सारी चीजों को इसी प्रस्पेक्टिव में सोचना चाहिए।

मुझे बहुत सी बातें कहनी थीं, लेकिन समय नहीं है। मैं केवल इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय जो यह प्रस्ताव आया है यह बहुत गैर-मौजू प्रस्ताव है। आज हम को शास्त्री जी के हाथ मजबूत करने चाहिए।

उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी सेंट्रलिस्ट पालिसी है। मैं कहता हूँ कि निश्चित रूप से हमारी सेंट्रलिस्ट पालिसी है, यह कहने में हम को कोई झिझक नहीं है। सोशलिज्म हमारा गोल है और उसी तरफ हम बढ़ रहे हैं। और इस काम में हम सब लोगों को साथ ले कर बढ़ना चाहते हैं। सब लोगों से मेरा मतलब उन लोगों से नहीं है जो चोरबाजारी करते हैं, लेकिन मेरा आशय उन सब लोगों से है जो चाहे राइटिस्ट हों या लेफ्टिस्ट हों। जो तेजी से चलना चाहते हैं और जो ग्राहिस्ता चलना चाहते हैं उन सब आदमियों को हम अपने साथ सोशलिज्म की ओर ले जाना चाहते हैं। यह कहने में हमें कोई झिझक नहीं है।

कुछ लोग इस बात से मायूस होते हैं कि हम उनकी रफ्तार से नहीं चलते। हम कहते हैं कि हम अपनी सम्मिलित रफ्तार से चलेंगे, चलने वाले हम सब हैं। हम ने जो योजनाएं बनायी हैं और देश के सामने रखी हैं वे निश्चित रूप से ऐसी योजनाएं हैं जो देश की गरीबी और भुखमरी को दूर करेंगी, और जिन संकल्पों को ले कर हम चलें हैं उन संकल्पों के आधार पर हम देश को बराबर आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, जो प्रश्न हमारे भाइयों ने उठाये हैं वे विचारणीय जरूर हैं, लेकिन अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव के द्वारा उनको हल नहीं किया जा सकता।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): सभापति महोदय, शास्त्री सरकार नेहरू सरकार से ज्यादा बुरी है यह दोष समय का है शास्त्री जी का नहीं है। जब कोई फल पकता है और पकने के बाद सड़ने लगता है तो समय के साथ उसकी सड़न बढ़ने लगती है। यह महाकाल की माया है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर नेहरू जी की सरकार रही होती तो वह लोक-सभा से और चुनाव से इतना न भागती जितना कि शास्त्री जी

## [डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

की सरकार पिछले तीन महीनों में भागी है। तीन नये मंत्री नियुक्त हुए, दो बड़े और एक छोटे। तीनों को संसद् के अन्दर आना था। चुनाव का मैदान खाली था। लेकिन शास्त्री सरकार ने फैसला किया कि तीनों चुनाव के मैदान से भाग कर, जनता की छाप न ले कर संसद् के अन्दर घुस आयें। इस तरह से इन तीन महीनों में शास्त्री सरकार ने लोक-सभा की और जनता की अवहेलना करके दिखायी। और खास कर एक चुनाव का मैदान तो ऐसा था कि उसके लिए कहा जाता था कि वह तो सरकार के पक्ष के एकाधिकार में था। उससे भी यह सरकार भाग गयी। फिर भी सरकारी पक्ष के लोग कहते हैं कि पिछले साल में जितने चुनाव हुए उन में कांग्रेस पार्टी जीती। इससे बड़ी तसल्ली नहीं लेनी चाहिए, क्योंकि जब कभी कोई मकान गिरता है तो वह धीरे धीरे नहीं गिरता, चार, छः दस दिन या साल में नहीं गिरता, घड़ाके से एक दिन गिरा करता है। इसलिए सरकारी पक्ष के लोगों को सावधान हो जाना चाहिए।

और उस के साथ साथ वह यह कहते हैं कि दूसरी पार्टियों के लोग कतार लगाये खड़े हैं कांग्रेस में घुसने के लिए। तो उन्हें यह भी याद रखना चाहिए कि रोम साम्राज्य, मुगल साम्राज्य अपने आखिरी दिनों में बहुत से लोगों को खींचते रहे क्योंकि एक लूट की सी हालत रहती थी और लोग सोचते थे चलो घुस चलो, जो हाथ लगे ले लो, जो हतबा मिलता है, जो धन मिलता है ले लो।

जिस तरह से यह शास्त्री सरकार लोक-सभा और चुनाव से भागी है उसी तरह से यह लोक-सभा और बहस से भाग रही है। मैं ने इस सवाल को उठाने को कोशिश की कि किस तरह से लोक-सभा के सत्र छोटे होते जा रहे हैं। मान नय संसद् कार्य मंत्री ने जवाब दिया, ठीक जवाब दिया, कि वह

चुनाव क्षेत्र को पोसा करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस संसद् के बहुत से सदस्य चुनाव क्षेत्र को पोसते हैं। वे अपने यहां के पांच लाख मतदाताओं और दस लाख जनता को नहीं पोसते लेकिन वहां जो हजार पांच सौ वोटों के ठकेदार होते हैं उनको पोसते हैं। उनको तकावीं दिलाते हैं, अनुदान दिलाते हैं, कर्ज दिलाते हैं, वजीफे दिलाते हैं और तरह तरह के काम करते हैं। इसी कारण आज हमारा संसदीय जीवन भ्रष्ट हो गया क्योंकि सदस्य अपने चुनाव क्षेत्र में उन हजार वोटों के ठकेदारों को पोसते हैं। माननीय संसद् कार्य मंत्री और ऐसे ही लोग इन ठकेदारों को बंदूक का लाइसेंस दिलवाते हैं। मेरे जैसे लोग भी अपने चुनाव क्षेत्र को पोसते हैं और इस तरह पोसते हैं कि हम उस जमाने को लाना चाहते हैं जब अपने देश के अन्दर या तो बन्दूक के लिए लाइसेंस की जरूरत न पड़े या फिर किसी को बन्दूक न मिलेगी। या तो सब के पास बंदूक रहेगी या किसी के पास बंदूक नहीं रहेगी। यह भी चुनाव क्षेत्र पोसने का तरीका है। संसद् कार्य मंत्री और उन के जैसे लोग इन हजारों वोटों के ठकेदारों को वजीफे और कर्ज दिलाते फिरते हैं जबकि हमारे जैसे लोग कोशिश करते हैं कि जो कुछ भी सरकार की तरफ से अनुदान वगैरह है वह या तो उम्र के हिसाब से समूह को लेकर हो या आमदनी के हिसाब से समूह को लेकर के हो। मैं फर्रुखाबाद के लोगों को और वहां की धरती को नमस्कार करता हूँ कि इतनी बात साफ़ कर देने के बावजूद भी उन्होंने मुझे चुना। मुझ से इस की अपेक्षा नहीं की कि मैं किसी एक ठकेदार को या हजार, पांच सौ आमदियों को फायदा पहुंचाऊंगा। अगर मज्र से बन पड़गा तो मैं सब को फायदा पहुंचाऊंगा। अगर इसी तरीके से सरकारी पक्ष के संसद् और लोक-सभा के सदस्य लोग अपने चुनाव क्षेत्रों को पोसा करते तो देश का बहुत बड़ा भला हो जाता।

मेरे मन में एक कसक जरूर है कि मैं फर्रुखाबाद के लोगों को पुल नहीं दिला पाऊंगा वह पुल खाली फर्रुखाबाद के लिए ही नहीं बल्कि उत्तराखंड में चीन की सेनाओं का सामना करने के लिए कम से कम 10-12 फीट की बचत हो जाती अगर वह पुल होता। करोड़ों रुपयों की बचत हो जाती लेकिन इलाहाबाद में एक रेलवे स्टेशन को जोकि अभी 50 वर्ष और चल सकता था, तोड़ कर के इलाहाबाद को नया रेलवे स्टेशन मिल गया है क्योंकि वहां का जो सदस्य है वह अपने चुनाव क्षेत्र को इसी तरीके से पोसा करता है।

संसद् कार्य मंत्री महोदय यह भी जरा सोचने की कृपा करें कि बिहार राज्य में दक्षिण बिहार में आबादी कम होते हुए भी 5 विश्वविद्यालय हैं और उत्तर बिहार में आबादी ज्यादा होते हुए भी केवल एक विश्वविद्यालय है। मिथिला में विश्वविद्यालय बनाने की इतनी बड़ी मांग है लेकिन वह मिल नहीं रहा है क्योंकि वहां के लोगों की आवाज में इतनी ताकत नहीं है और इतना दबाव नहीं पड़ता है।

मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यह सरकार पिछले 17 वर्ष से प्रान्त को प्रान्त से लड़ाती रही है, जिले को जिले से लड़ाती रही है और गांव को गांव से लड़ाती रही है। आशाएं और आकांक्षाएं बढ़ाती रही है और जनता के मन को तोड़ती रही है। राष्ट्रीय एकता नहीं है बल्कि अपनी अलग अलग भावना है कि चलो भाई मोका आया है कि यह नया संसद् सदस्य अपने यहाँ से बना या नया मंत्री बना, इससे कुछ मिल जाये तो ले लो।

जहाँ मैंने आप को पिछले 17 मई के की इस सरकार की यह सब बातें बताईं विरोधी पक्ष की तरफ से भी मैं कुछ चीजें कहूँ क्योंकि मुझ से अक्सर श्री श्यामलाल सराफ़ कहा करते हैं कि तुम बतलाओ कि नुम्हारा क्या कार्यक्रम होगा। उनके अलावा श्री खाडिलकर ने बहुत चाहा और उन के साथ श्री अंसार हुरवानी और पांड जी ने

भी कहा कि मैं विरोधी पक्ष की भी कुछ कमजोरियाँ बतलाऊँ। उन को मैं हमेशा बतला दिया करता हूँ। इस के साथ साथ जब मैं कोई नकारात्मक बात कहता हूँ तो उस में जुड़ा हुआ रहता है कि सकारात्मक चीज क्या है। ठीक है, सरकारी पक्ष का यह कहना बिल्कुल सही है कि विरोधी पक्ष खराब है। अगर उस में खराबी न होती तो यह हजरत लोग वहाँ बैठे कैसे रहते? विरोधी पक्ष तादाद में कमजोर है। उस से भी ज्यादा बड़ा दोष उस का यह है कि वह आपस में बंटः हुआ है और उस से भी ज्यादा बड़ा दोष उस का यह है कि यह कोई सम्यक विचारधारा को ले कर नहीं चलता बल्कि कांग्रेस के ही अन्दर के किसी एक गुण का यह परिवर्तित फोटो ज्यादातर विरोधी पक्ष के लोग बन जाते हैं। आचार्य कृपलानी हैं। कांग्रेस के मुक्त व्यापार और अमरीकी गुण के वे परिवर्धित फोटो इस तरीके से हैं जिस तरीके से कि श्री हीरेन मुर्जी कांग्रेस के राज्य व्यापार और रूसी गुण के परिवर्धित फोटो हैं। खाली कभी कभी एक बिम्ब पड़ जाता है कि यह लोग विरोधी हैं क्योंकि वहाँ के किसी एक गुण का यह बड़ा बड़ा हुआ आकार प्रकार है। यह हम लोगों की कमजोरी है। हाँ एक भयंकरता में छोड़े जा रहा था। बड़ी भयंकर हालत है हम लोगों की। कल जब मैं आचार्य कृपलानी को सुन रहा था तो मेरे मन में सवाल उठा कि आखिर वे किस बात से ज्यादा चिंतित हैं, दक्षिण एशिया में चीनी कम्युनिस्टों या साम्यवाद के घुस आने के खतरे से ज्यादा चिंतित हैं अथवा उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार के इधर-उधर हो जाने से ज्यादा चिंतित है? कुछ समय में नहीं आया। इसलिए हमारी तो बड़ी कमजोरियाँ हैं ही, बड़ी बड़ी भयंकर चीजें हम लोगों के अन्दर हैं लेकिन उस से कुछ आप नतीजा निकालिये। मन में यह भी कमजोरी है कि हम चाहते हैं दक्षिण एशिया में चीन को। मुझ को आप मत शामिल कर लीजियेगा। मैं तो उन में से हूँ जो कोशिश

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

कर रहे हैं कि किसी तरीके से यह विरोधी पक्ष कहीं पहुंच जाय और जब हम सुनते हैं कि हम को कम्युनिज्म से बचाना है, ऐसे लोगों के मुंह से जो कम्युनिज्म को बचाने के लिये खुद स्वशक्ति को बढ़ाने का काम नहीं करते पर-शक्ति की तरफ हमेशा देखा करते हैं। कहीं कुछ अमरीका से मिल जाय, कहीं कुछ आस्ट्रेलिया से मिल जाय, कुछ जापान से मिल जाय। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो पसन्द करते हैं कि हमें अपने दक्षिण एशिया को बचाने के लिए अग्रर चीन के दुश्मनों से हमें मदद लेनी जरूरी है तो मदद लेने में हिचकना नहीं चाहिये। जो लोग हिचकते हैं उन की देश-भक्ति की बुद्धि में, अग्रर ईमान में नहीं, जरूर कुछ न कुछ हिचक है। मदद लेनी चाहिये लेकिन अग्रर उस मदद के सहारे हम अपनी कार्यवाही को चलाते रहेंगे तो फिर मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि श्री गोपालन एक मानी में मुझे श्री कृपलानी से ज्यादा अच्छे लगते हैं। कम से कम देश का पेट भरने में तो उन का गुण ज्यादा जुकाम आता है। पेट भरा हुआ हिन्दुस्तान चीन के मुकाबले में ज्यादा अच्छे तरीके से टिकता है बनिस्वत एक खाली पेट के हिन्दुस्तान के। लेकिन उस के यह मानी नहीं हो जाते कि कोई खाली पेट भरना ही सवाल है। उस के साथ साथ दिमाग भरने का भी मामला है। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि श्री गोपालन और उन के जैसे लोगों के तरीके में एक खराबी है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के दिमाग को ठीक तरीके से चीन या कम्युनिज्म के मुकाबले में खड़ा नहीं कर पाते। ऐसी कमजोरियाँ धुसेड़ देते हैं जिससे मामला बिगड़ जाया करता है। इस-लिये मुझ जैसा आदमी कोशिश कर रहा है कि आज देश में जो जमाव खड़े हो जायें विरोधी पक्ष के। एक तो समाजवादी जमाव और दूसरा विरोधी पक्ष जमाव। दोनों बिलकुल अलग अलग हैं। मैं समाजवादी जमाव के बारे में जो बहुत सी बातें हैं उन में से कुछ को उदाहरण के लिये कहता हूँ। एक

मोटी बात थी। जैसे मिसाल के लिये खपत के ऊपर रोक लगा दी जाय। हजार रुपये महीने से ज्यादा खर्चा नहीं, जिससे कि पूंजी विनियोग हो। खेती कारखानों के लिये 12-15 अरब रुपया साल भर में बच सकता है। और 12-15 अरब रुपया ले कर के फिर हम खेती कारखानों में पूंजी को लगायें तो मैं आप से बतलाता हूँ कि हर साल कम से कम 10 सैकड़ा की हम आर्थिक उन्नति कर सकते हैं जबकि वर्तमान सरकार की आर्थिक उन्नति केवल दो सैकड़े की है।

खपत की आदतों को हम कैसे बदलें ? उदाहरण के लिए मैं बतलाता हूँ कि तीसरे दर्जे को छोड़ कर रेलगाड़ी में सब दर्जे खत्म हो जाने चाहिये। पंचायती और नागरिक स्कूलों को छोड़ कर बाकी सब प्राथमिक स्कूल खत्म हो जाने चाहिये। उस के साथ साथ जो हिन्दुस्तान के पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं, पिछड़ी जातियाँ, हरिजन, आदिवासी अथवा मुसलमान या ईसाइयों में भी जो पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं और औरतें, हिन्दुस्तान का यह बड़ा समूह जो दबा हुआ है उसे 60 प्रतिशत विशेष अवसर देना चाहिये।

इसी तरीके से अंग्रेजी भाषा को तुरन्त खत्म हो जाना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं श्री इन्दुलाल याज्ञिक की तारीफ़ करना चाहता हूँ और भरपूर तारीफ़ करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा आदमी मुश्किल से देखने को मिलेगा। उस आदमी ने संकल्प किया कि इस लोक-सभा में वह अंग्रेजी न बोलेंगे और वह अपने इस संकल्प को निभाये चले जा रहे हैं। सरकारी पक्ष में श्री याज्ञिक जैसा कोई एक आदमी निकले जो संकल्प करे कि मैं अंग्रेजी नहीं बोलूँगा ?

जब मैं अंग्रेजी बोलने के बारे में कहता हूँ तो अपने सब लोगों को बतलाता हूँ कि क्या आता है इस से मुझे मतलब नहीं। हिन्दी आये या न आये, हिन्दी जहन्नुम में जाय जहाँ चाहे, जैसा कि गांधी जी ने कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान चाहे जहन्नुम में जाय अंग्रेजों तुम भारत छोड़ो, वैसा ही कह

का अब समय आ गया है कि हिन्दी चाहे जहां जाय, अंग्रेजी को हिन्दुस्तान से निकालो। इस का माध्यम खत्म करो।

अब मैं आप को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूं कि चाहे जितने विधेयक यहां पर पास हुए हों लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान का संविधान साफ कहता है कि जनवरी 1965 के बाद से अंग्रेजी का प्रयोग हिन्दुस्तान में गैर-कानूनी होगा और जो विधेयक यहां पर पास हुआ है वह संविधान के बिल्कुल खिलाफ होगा।

अगर पानी मिल जाता . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : पानी नहीं लाने दे रहे हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तीन चार बजे का वक्त ऐसा है कि गला सूख जाता है। लेकिन कोई बात नहीं है। बिना पानी के ही बोल चले जायेंगे। कोई हर्ज नहीं है।

श्री शौर्य (अलीगढ़) श्रीमन्, माननीय सदस्य पानी चाह रहे हैं। क्या उन को पानी नहीं मिलेगा ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : लोक-सभा का दोपहर का समय बदलना कुछ अच्छा ही होगा। दोपहर को तो सोने का वक्त होता है मेरी उम्र और आप की उम्र के लोगों का। विदेशी नीति के बारे में मुझे कहना है कि भारत-भूमि और भारत-हित की रक्षा हर हालत में करनी है। उसी के साथ साथ विदेशी नीति का एक बड़ा पाया यह होना चाहिये कि रूस और अमरीका को साथ लाओ—खाली किसी नकारात्मक चीज के लिए नहीं, खाली अणुबम वगैरह की फोड़ को रोकने के लिये नहीं, बल्कि दुनिया से गरीबी वगैरह को मिटाने के लिए।

मैंने यह जो एक समाजवादी कार्यक्रम रखा है इस में आप ने देखा होगा कि उस का

सगुण रूप है, निर्गुण नहीं, खाली समाजवाद की माला जपना नहीं है। उधर और उधर दोनों तरफ ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं, जोकि केवल समाजवाद की माला जपते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान का एक प्राकृतिक झुकाव रहता है कि माला जपो—राम नाम की माला जपो, समाजवाद की माला जपो और उस के साथ दो चार विशेषण जोड़ दो और समझ लो कि उस से सारा मामला हल हो जायेगा। समाजवाद का एक ठोस कार्यक्रम होना चाहिये और मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जो कार्यक्रम मैंने रखा है, वह बैक-राष्ट्रीयकरण या किसी भी राष्ट्रीयकरण का चचा है, क्योंकि इस में बराबरी और समानता के साथ साथ पैदावार को बढ़ाने की जो बातें हैं, वे आप को और कार्यक्रम में नहीं मिलेंगी।

अगर हिन्दुस्तान की पैदावार को बढ़ाने के लिये कोई भी पूंजीपति तैयार होते हैं, कोई भी किसी ढंग के लोग तैयार होते हैं कि साल भर में दस सैकड़ा आर्थिक प्रगति की जाये, तो मैं कुछ देर के लिए अपनी समता और बराबरी की भावना को भी दबाने के लिए तैयार हूं। लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान ऐसा हो गया है कि बराबरी की भावना और आर्थिक उन्नति का काम, दोनों एक दूसरे के साथ जुड़े हुए हैं। वे परस्पर-विरोधी नहीं हैं, बल्कि अन्योन्याश्रित हैं। अगर एक को पकड़ने जायेंगे, तभी दूसरा मिलेगा, वना ये दोनों मिल नहीं सकते।

इसी तरह से मैं विरोधी पक्ष के जमाव की बात कह देना चाहता हूं। बिल्कुल साफ बात है कि अगर हम लोग कहीं आपस में ऐसा इन्तजाम कर पाये कि चुनाव-क्षेत्रों का बंटवारा हो जाये—माननीय सदस्य बहुत ताना मारा करते हैं—तो दो तीन साल में मामला ठीक हो जायगा। और सब कार्यक्रमों को लेकर विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों में आपस में चाहे जितना अलगाव रहा हो, लेकिन अगर इस साल भी वे इस एक बात को लेकर इकट्ठे हो गए होते कि महीन अनाज

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

घाट आने किलो और मोटा अनाज छः आने किलो हर जगह बिके, और वे तब तरह का शान्तिपूर्ण बनावत करने को तैयार होते, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इसी साल मामला खत्म हो गया होता इस सरकार का। लेकिन क्या करें ? विरोधी पक्ष तो अपने दिमाग के हिसाब से बहुत फटा हुआ है।

जहाँ तक उधर के लोगों का प्रश्न है, खासकर उनमें से जो वामपन्थी हैं, वे ताना मारने के बजाये इस बात को समझें कि यह सांचा ढाला जा रहा है, जाने कब ऐसा विरोधी पक्ष बन जाए। इस विषय में कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि तुम सिद्धान्तहीनता की बात करते हो, इस प्रकार तुम मौका देते हो कि सिद्धान्तहीन बन जाओ। काहे के सिद्धान्तहीन ? अगर महीन अनाज घाट आने किलो और मोटा अनाज छः आने किलो के प्रश्न पर लोग इकट्ठे हो जाते हैं, चाहे वे परदेशवृत्ति वाले हों और चाहे कोई साम्प्रदायिक हों, तो क्या उससे कार्यक्रमों का लेना-देना हो जाता है ? कार्यक्रम अपने अपने रहते हैं ? उस में कोई सिद्धान्तहीनता नहीं आती है।

लेकिन एक बात की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाऊंगा। जब जब जनसंघ के लोग सरकार के प्रति कुछ थोड़ी सी सद्भावना की वृत्ति दिखाना शुरू करते हैं—जैसा कि मुझ लगा है कि इन दिनों चल रहा है—, तब तब सरकारी पक्ष के लोग उनको गाली देने में भी कुछ कमजोर पड़ जाते हैं। आजकल जनसंघ की साम्प्रदायिकता कुछ कम हो गई है, क्योंकि मैंने सुना है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री और जनसंघ के बड़े बड़े नेताओं में बातचीत हो गई है, जिससे शायद रास्ता खुल जाए। इसलिये विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों को भी अब सावधान हो जाना चाहिए इस मामले में।

लोग यह भी कहते हैं कि अगर तुम कम्युनिस्ट और जनसंघ जैसे तरह तरह के लोगों का साथ दोगे, तो तुम्हारा चेहरा

धूमिल हो जायेगा। यह बात वही लोग कहा करते हैं, जिनका चेहरा है ही नहीं, क्योंकि चेहरे पर दाग तब पड़ता है, जब आदमी अपना कार्यक्रम छोड़ा करता है, और चेहरा अथवा कार्यक्रम बनाता रहता है।

फिर लोग समझते हैं कि घुसपैठ होने लग जायेगी। अगर कम्युनिस्ट और जनसंघी घुस कर हमारी कतार को बिगाड़ सकते हैं, तो हमें भी यह भरोसा रखना चाहिए कि हम भी अपने कार्यक्रमों को लेकर उनके अन्दर घुस करके उन के आदमियों को सुधार सकते हैं।

इसके साथ साथ कुछ लोग न्यूनतम कार्यक्रम की बात करते हैं। तो मैं कह दूँ कि न्यूनतम कार्यक्रम को अपनाना जरूरी नहीं है, क्योंकि जब चुनाव वगैरह खत्म हो जाते हैं, लोग चुन कर आ जाते हैं, तो उसके बाद भी कार्यक्रम बन सकता है। अभी अपने कार्यक्रम को लेकर चलो। चुनाव के बाद मिलवा-जुलवा अथवा न्यूनतम कार्यक्रम बन जायेगा।

अब मैं सरकारी पक्ष के लोगों को एक बात कहना चाहूँगा। वे समझें कि इस रास्ते पर चलते हुए ऐसी लोक-सभा हो जाये जिसमें सरकारी पक्ष के 275 सदस्य और विरोधी पक्ष के 225 सदस्य हों।

डा० च० धा० सिंह (बिलासपुर) :  
बड़ी उम्मीद है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तो कहने वाला था कि 275 सदस्य यहाँ के और 225 सदस्य वहाँ के हो जायें, लेकिन यहाँ के सदस्य में कम कह रहा हूँ, तब माननीय सदस्य बतायें कि क्या क्या चीजें होने लग जायेंगी। केरल का मामला याद है या न ? तब सरकारी पक्ष के बहुत से लोग माननीय सभापति महोदय, आप में से बहुत से लोग, जो मुझ से सवाल पूछते हैं, वहाँ से उठ कर—यहाँ आने लग जायेंगे और तब यह सरकार गिर जायेगी। इसका कारण यह है कि मैं इस बात को मानता

हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी में अभी भी ऐसे लोग हैं, जो हिन्दुस्तान को बनाने के लिए एक उग्र और राष्ट्रवादी कार्यक्रम को अपनाते को तैयार हैं, लेकिन उनमें यह हिचक रहती है कि कहां है वह दल, कहां है वह सशक्त समूह, जिसमें जाकर हम इस कार्यक्रम को भी चालू कर पायें और अपने अस्तित्व को भी बचा पायेंगे। ये दोनों हिचक उनमें हैं। और अगर कहीं उन के अस्तित्व को बचाने के लिए हम ने यह रास्ता दिखा दिया, तो... हो सकता है कि कुछ की गर्दनें इंकार में हिल रही हैं, लेकिन कुछ की गर्दनें स्वीकृति में भी हिली हैं। मैंने देख लिया है। कहिए तो उनके नाम भी ले लूं, लेकिन कहीं अगली दफा उन को टिकट न मिले, इसलिए मैं ऐसा नहीं करता हूँ।

मैंने आपके सामने विरोधी पक्ष के दोनों का नक्शा रखने की कोशिश की है। हो सकता है कि दोनों जमावों में—समाजवादियों और दूसरों में—कभी कभी थोड़ी सी टूट आ जाये, मामला ठीक न हो पाए, लेकिन उससे घबराने की जरूरत नहीं है। और खास कर जब यह सिद्ध हो चुका है कि जबकि पहली सरकार—हालांकि पहली सरकार और इस सरकार में कोई फर्क नहीं है—भुखमरी की सरकार थी और यह वर्तमान सरकार अकाल की सरकार है। मुझे इस बारे में कोई सबूत देने की जरूरत नहीं है। माननीय सुब्रह्मण्यम् का भाषण इस बात का सबूत है कि हिन्दुस्तान तो अब अकाल के मुँह में हमेशा ही जाता रहेगा।

माननीय अन्न मंत्र ने कहा कि कमी के क्षेत्र हिन्दुस्तान में हैं। उन्होंने उनको गिनाया। एक बात आप ने नोट की होगी कि कमी के क्षेत्रों में उन्होंने मध्य-प्रदेश या इलाकों को गिनाया और मध्य-प्रदेशों का कोई जिक्र नहीं किया—जैसे उर प्रदेश, बिहार, मध्य प्रदेश, और राजस्थान में कमी के क्षेत्र हैं नहीं हैं। लेकिन इस मंत्र-मंडल का दिमाग फटा हुआ है। मंत्रियों को मध्य-प्रदेश की कोई फिक्र नहीं है। जब वे कमी

के क्षेत्र गिनाते हैं, तो खाली तट प्रदेशों को गिनाते हैं। उनको पता नहीं है कि उत्तर प्रदेश या बिहार या राजस्थान में जितनी गरीबी है, उतनी तमिलनाद में नहीं है मेरे मुँह से एक गलत बात निकलने वाली थी, लेकिन मैं ऐसा नहीं कहूँगा। माननीय त्यागी जी को यह बात शोभा दे सकती है, लेकिन मेरे मुँह से यही बात निकलेगी कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में उतनी ही गरीबी है, जितनी कि हिन्दुस्तान के किसी इलाके में है, तमिलनाद के गरीब से गरीब इलाके की जितनी गरीबी है।

उसी के साथ साथ एक बहुत भयंकर बात माननीय अन्न मन्त्री ने अपने भाषण में कही थी। उन्होंने कहा था कि सस्ते गल्ले की नीति खराब रही है और अब उस नीति को छोड़ना पड़ेगा। भयंकर बात है। सस्ते गल्ले की नीति को छोड़ना पड़ेगा। नतीजा इ का साफु। गल्ला महंगा होगा। चार पांच दिन पहले अन्न मन्त्री कह चुके हैं कि महंगा गल्ला हो जाए। और अन्न के लिए भी महंगा गल्ला रहेगा। वह और भी महंगा होता चला जाएगा क्योंकि अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने का केवल एक रास्ता वह देख पाये हैं कि अनाज के दाम बढ़ाओ। किसान को फायदा मिलेगा तो वह अपनी पैदावार बढ़ायेगा। महंगे गल्ले की नीति को वह अपना चुके हैं। अगर यह अकाल की नीति नहीं है तो फिर और किस नीति कहें। यह अकाल की नीति है, यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो गया है।

**सभापति महोदय :** अब आप खत्म करने का कोशिश करें।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो गया है और आज मैं आप से प्रार्थना कर देना चाहता हूँ कि आप जानते ही हैं कि विरोधी पक्ष में अगर कोई सत्यक विरोध की शक्ति रखता है तो आप जानते ही हैं कि

[डा० राम मनोहर लॉहिया]

किस में है। आज आप मुझे पूरा बोल लेंगे दीजिये।

सस्ते गल्ले की नीति को छोड़ देने का मतलब साफ और स्पष्टतया यह होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की हालत खराब होगी। इससे हिन्दुस्तान की आमदनी नहीं बढ़ती है और जब मैं हिन्दुस्तान कहता हूँ तो मेरा मतलब हमेशा होता है उन तीस पंतीस करोड़ लोगों से जिनकी मजदूरी रुपया, आठ आने, डेढ़ रुपया, दो रुपये है। इनकी मजदूरी तो आप बढ़ायेंगे नहीं और अगर बढ़ायेंगे भी तो गधे की चाल से जबकि दाम आप बढ़ायेंगे तो घोड़े की चाल से बढ़ायेंगे। अकाल तो तब पड़ेगा जब ये लोग कहते हैं कि अन्न की पैदावार हम बढ़ायेंगे अनाज के दाम बढ़ाकरके। मैं कह देना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम 60-70 फीसदी हिन्दुस्तान की खेती ऐसी है कि दामों का उसके ऊपर प्रभाव नहीं पड़ता है और न पड़ेगा। जब उनके पूँजी दी जाएगी, खेती के लिए पानी दिया जाएगा, सुघरे हुए बीज दिये जायेंगे और तरह तरह के काम किये जायेंगे, तभी कुछ प्रभाव पड़ेगा। तभी कुछ हो सकता है। यह तभी हो सकता है जब खेती के लिए कम से कम दस अरब रुपया हर साल नए तौर से लगाया जाए। जब तक ऐसा नहीं होता है तब तक कुछ नहीं हो पायेगा। अब सबाल पैदा होता है कि दस अरब रुपया कहाँ से आयेगा। यह रुपया तब आये जब हजार रुपया महीना से अधिक का खर्चा किसी भी इंसान का हिन्दुस्तान में न हो तभी यह पैसा आयेगा और खेती में इतना पैसा लगाया जा सकेगा (इंटरप्शन)। इस तरह से जब आप बोल देते हैं तो रास्ता आप नहीं निकाल पायेंगे। मेरी शरण में आओ, तभी रास्ता आपको मिल जायेगा।

इसके अलावा बंगाल के चावल का यहां ज़रूर हुआ है। अन्न के भाषण में मैंने कहा था

कि किस तरह से बंगाल में जो बहुत बड़ी बड़ी चावल की मिलों के मालिक थे, और उनमें से मैंने तीन नाम गिनाये थे और दो मैं फिर से गिनाये देता हूँ, उन्होंने दाम बढ़ाये थे। एक तो श्री मन मोहन दास हैं जो सब से बड़े चावल के मिल मालिक हैं और दूसरे एक मन्त्री बंगाल के हैं उनके दामाद हैं जो पकड़े गये हैं और कुछ अरसे से जेल में बन्द हैं। तब मैंने इस और इशारा किया था। आज मैं आपको घटना बता देता हूँ। 27 रुपये मन चावल का बंधा हुआ दाम था। किसी कारणवश इन चावल की मिल वालों ने 8 रुपये उसको बढ़ा कर 35 रुपये कर दिया। फिर फुटकर बेचने वालों ने उसको बढ़ा कर 45 रुपये मन कर दिया। 27 रुपये से 35 रुपये और 35 रुपये से 45 रुपये मन। इसके लिए जमाखोरी की ज़रूरत नहीं है। किसी बड़े शहर में दो चार दिन के लिए अगर चावल या गेहूँ को दबा कर रख लिया जाए और उसको दबाया तभी जा जा सकता है जब सरकार की मदद मिलती हो, वर्ना नहीं, तो यह जमाखोरी तो है नहीं बल्कि इन वस्तुओं को कम कर देना है ताकि दाम बढ़ जायें। इन लोगों को पकड़ा गया मैं गरीबों के हित में पूछूँगा कि हम लोगों को तो शक में न जाने कब कब गिरफ्तार कर लिया जाता है, क्या कभी कभी शक में आप अपने दल के लोगों को भी गिरफ्तार करते हैं अपने दल के लोगों को भी तब गिरफ्तार किया करो। माननीय श्री अनूत्य घोष को भी कभी कभी शक में गिरफ्तार किया करो।

तब मैं यह भी जानना चाहूँगा कि बंगाल से यह चावल जो गायः हुआ है, यह कहाँ गया है? माननीय मुब्रह्मण्यम् साहब ने बार-बार पूछा है कि यह चावल कहाँ गया है। इस बात को सरकारी मंत्री नहीं बता सके हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके ऊपर एक कमिशन बिठाया जाए जांचने के लिए कि वह चावल कहाँ चला गया है। तब आपको पता चल जाएगा कि चावल खाली ठापारी

लोग ही नहीं दबाया करते हैं बल्कि राजकीय लोग भी दबाया करते हैं। विरोधी विधायकों की तरफ जितनी आप आखें रखते हैं वूडने के लिए कि कौन दाम बढ़ा रहे हैं उतनी ही सरकारी पक्ष में राजकीय अम्दमियों की तरफ भी ध्यान रखो कि वे कहां कहां क्या काम कर दिया करते हैं।

जैसे इस सरकार को अकाल की सरकार में कहता हूँ, उसी तरह से आप मुझे इजाजत दीजिये कि मैं इसको घोखे और झूठ की भी सरकार कहूँ। इसका कारण मैं बतलाता हूँ। संकट की घोषणा हो चुकी है। संकट घोषणा में हो, तब संकट घोषणा की जाए। तात्कालिक खतरे के सम्बन्ध में संविधान को मैंने आते आते भी पढ़ा था। प्रधान मंत्री और इनके जैसे लोग कहते हैं कि चीनी आक्रमण का कोई तात्कालिक खतरा नहीं है। एक बार नहीं बीसियों बार कहते हैं वे इस बात को। एक तरफ तो सरकार का कहना है कि कोई तात्कालिक खतरा नहीं है और दूसरी तरफ तात्कालिक खतरे के आधार पर इस संकट काल को वह चलाये जा रही है। यह कितना ज्यादा घोखा है, कितनी बड़ी झूठ है। नतीजा यह होता है कि भोपाल के भारी बिजली कारखाने के न जाने कितने मजदूर महीनों पहले से अभी तक बिना किसी मुकदमे के जेलों के अन्दर बन्द हैं. . . .

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : छः महीने हो गये हैं।

श्री राम मनोहर लोहिया : कोटा में व्यापारी लोग फिर इसलिए गिरफ्तार किये गये हैं कि उन्होंने सरकारी जुल्मों के खिलाफ एक पर्चा निकाला था। मैं विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों को भी यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि

नागरिक आजादी सब के लिए एक जैसी होती है। अगर मजदूरों के लिए गैर-कानूनी गिरफ्तारी के खिलाफ आवाज उठाते हो तो आपको व्यापारियों की गैर-कानूनी गिरफ्तारियों के खिलाफ भी आवाज उठानी चाहिये। तभी आप जुल्मों को रोक पायेंगे।

हम लोगों के बीच के एक सदस्य मुजफ्फर हुसैन साहब को न जाने कितने महीनों जेल-खाने में बन्द करके सरकार ने रख छोड़ा है। मुझे बहुत ही अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अब उनके बारे में न जाने किस किस प्रकार की बातें कही जाती हैं। ये सब चीजें क्यों चलती हैं? मुझे बोलने से पहले एक पर्चा दिखाया गया है पटना का। इस में लिखा हुआ है कि एक व्यापारी ने पुलिस की हिफाजत और रक्षा चाही है क्योंकि एक बड़े कांग्रेसी नेता जो शायद वहाँ के पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० के मंत्री हैं उन्होंने उसको धमकाया है कि हम तुम को देख लेंगे, तुम्हारे सारे कुटुम्ब को देख लेंगे। आप चाहें तो यह अखबार आप भी देख लीजिये।

अब मैं चीन की बात करना चाहता हूँ। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी जरा सोचें कि वह चीन के बारे में क्या कहते करते हैं। वह कहा करते हैं कि हम सम्मान हिन्दुस्तान का नहीं खोयेंगे चीन के साथ समझौता करके। जब कभी मैंने नोट किया है वह यही शब्द इस्तेमाल करते हैं, "सम्मान, सम्मान, सम्मान" इसका कोई अर्थ नहीं होता है। वह साफ क्यों नहीं कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन को खो करके हम चीन के साथ समझौता नहीं करेंगे? जमीन, भूमि शब्द का इस्तेमाल वह क्यों नहीं करते हैं। "सम्मान" शब्द का जब चाहे गोलमोल अर्थ निकाला जा सकता है। कम से कम एक बार विल्हुल ग्राफ शब्दों में उनको कह देना चाहिये कि हम चीन के साथ अपनी भूमि दे कर समझौता नहीं करेंगे। समझौता जब मैं कह रहा हूँ

[डा० र म मनोहर लोहिया]

तो छोटा मोटा इधर उधर कुछ हो जाए तो उससे मेरा मतलब नहीं है क्योंकि आप जानते हैं कि मैं लड़ाई पसन्द नहीं करता हूँ। चीन के साथ संधि नहीं करेंगे तब तक जब तक हमारी जमीन का कोई भी अंश चीन के कब्जे में रहेगा, इस तरह की घोषणा वह क्यों नहीं करते हैं? ऐसा करना लोक-सभा का मान करना होगा। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री लोक-सभा का हमेशा अपमान किया करते हैं जब वह सम्मान शब्द इस्तेमाल करते हैं, और जमीन नहीं करते हैं। लोक-सभा बिल्कुल साफ इसका फैसला कर चुकी है कि जमीन को खो कर हम चीन के साथ कोई संधि नहीं करेंगे।

इस सरकार में संकल्प शक्ति नहीं है, यह मेरा सबसे बड़ा आरोप इस सरकार पर है। जब यह सरकार बनी तब मैं हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर था। इस सरकार का एक एलान मैंने पढ़ा कि दिल्ली में जो विदेशी मूर्तियाँ हटे वे सड़क हटा दी जायेंगी। मेरे मन में थोड़ी देर के लिए एक मामूली सी सद्भावना इन के प्रति पैदा हुई। सब मूर्तियाँ हटा दी जायेंगी, इस सरकार ने बनते ही यह एलान किया। अब क्या एलान होता है? अभी आठ मूर्तियाँ बाकी हैं और कहा जाता है कि इस साल तीन हटेंगी और बाकी इस साल नहीं हटेंगी। मालूम होता है कि इस सरकार पर दबाव पड़ा है, या तो अंग्रेज साम्राज्यवादियों का दबाव पड़ा है या कांग्रेस के अन्दर से ही कुछ अंग्रेजों के पक्ष में जो तत्व हैं, उनका और उस दबाव के कारण माननीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री अपने संकल्प को पूरा कर नहीं सकते हैं। तीन महीने पहले वह फैसला दे चके हैं। और फिर उनका नतीजा क्या हुआ। हर तरफ से दबाव पड़ा। काश्मीर के मामले में आप समझौता करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि माननीय मोरारजी देसाई उन को यह समझौता करने नहीं देंगे। खुद

उन के दल के लोगों में बड़ी भारी फाँक पड़ेगी, और तब देश के अन्दर बड़ा विशाल बहुमत नहीं तो एक तत्व रहेगा जो उन का साथ दे जायेगा। तब माननीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री कमजोर पड़ जायेंगे और कहेंगे कि अब उस के सामने कहाँ जायें। अब मैं देख रहा हूँ कि अक्सर चिन और चीन के मामले में भी माननीय मेनन साहब कुछ मजबूत होते जा रहे हैं। तब और ज्यादा दरार बढ़ जायेगी। कहां से वह निकाल पायेंगे संकल्प शक्ति इन सब कामों के करने की। इस के अलावा विनियोग के मामले में एक तरफ तो मोरारजी जी कहेंगे कि व्यापार को ले कर विनियोग करो, पूँजी को इकट्ठा करो, और दूसरी तरफ भागवत झा जी कहेंगे कि नहीं हजार रुपये की बात मानो तब विनियोग करो। तब माननीय शास्त्री जी किस के साथ चलेंगे और अपनी संकल्प शक्ति का परिचय देंगे। उन में संकल्प शक्ति नहीं है, इस सरकार में संकल्प शक्ति नहीं है। मैं यह पिछले 17 बरसों की बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ, पिछले तीन महीनों की बात कह रहा हूँ। इस संकल्प शक्ति की बात करते हुए, मैं थोड़ा सा चापलूसी का भी जिक्त कर दूँ।

आप जानते हैं कि चन्द्रशेखर आजाद बड़े भारी राष्ट्रप्रेमी थे। उनकी गाथा मैं यहां नहीं कहता, लेकिन उन को जिस मैदान में अंग्रेजों ने, या दस, बारह अंग्रेजों ने गोली मार कर मारा था, इस कृतज्ञ जनता ने उस का नाम आजाद पार्क रख छोड़ा था लेकिन इस अकृतज्ञ सरकार ने उस पार्क का नाम बदल कर श्री मोतीलाल नेहरू पार्क कर दिया। यह चापलूसी थी कि आजाद पार्क से उस का नाम मोतीलाल नेहरू पार्क कर दिया गया। इस के कौन कौन से उदाहरण मैं बतलाऊँ। यह जो चापलूसी चलती है उस से लोभ वृत्ति होती है और फिर उस से अविवेक होता है, फिर सच और

मूठ के फर्क का खात्मा होता है और देश का सत्यानाश होता है ।

अब खत्म करते हुए क न चाहता हूँ कि आप खुद मुझ को हमेशा तंग किया करते हैं कि जरा तुम बतलाओ तो सही कि तुम क्या करोगे । माननीय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री को मैं सलाह भी दे देना चाहूँगा क्योंकि आखिर वह किस गुण के सहारे प्रधान मंत्री बन पाये हैं, इस पर वे जरा ध्यान रखा करें और तब देश के खून में जो यह चापलूसी घुस गई है उस को थोड़ा सा सम्भालने की कोशिश करें । अभी तक नहीं सम्भाल पाये तो प्रागे ही सम्भालें और इस का नतीजा अच्छा निकलेगा ।

आ सरकारी पक्ष के मामले में श्री हनुमन्तैया की बात का भी थोड़ा सा विचार करूँगा । वे बड़े भारी कष्ट भोगी हैं आप के बीच में ।

श्री हनुमन्तैया : अंग्रेजी में बोलिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जब आप मुझे इडली खि लायेंगे घर पर तब मैं दो चार शब्द अंग्रेजी के भी बोल लूँगा ।

पुनर्वासि मंत्री (श्री श्याम) : बिना रिश्वत लिये हुए नहीं बोलेंगे ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : खैर इस वक्त नहीं, फिर यह देंगे घर में जो सावजनिक नहीं ।

जो मंत्रि परिषद् के पचास से भी ज्यादा भी हैं उन में से जेल गये हुए कितने लोग हैं, माननीय हनुमन्तैया जी जरा बतलायें तो सही । पन्द्रह से ज्यादा नहीं निकलेंगे । अब आप का सरकारी पक्ष वह नहीं रह गया है जो गांधी जी के जमाने में था । अब आप के अन्दर 25 या 30 प्रतिशत से

ज्यादा आदमी नहीं हैं जो देश की आजादी के लिये जेल गये हुए हैं, लेकिन इधर जो दल हैं उन में से 70, 80 या 90 प्रतिशत आदमी ऐसे हैं जो देश की आजादी के लिये जेल गये हैं । इसी के साथ साथ जब आप देखेंगे कि एक लाख रुपये से ऊपर की सम्पत्ति वाले लोक सभा और राज्य सभा के अन्दर कितने कांग्रेसी हैं तो जो आप के साठे चार सौ या पांच सौ लोग हैं उन में से ऐसे 100 से ज्यादा निकलेंगे । इसी तरह से अगर आप पिछले सतरह सालों के कर्जों की माफी का हिसाब लगायें तो कर्जा माफ किया गया है बड़े बड़े लोगों का । एक तरफ बड़े बड़े वित्त विनियोग की फर्म हैं, कारखाने हैं, बड़े बड़े बोटों के ठेकेदार हैं, उनके कर्ज माफ किये गये हैं, लेकिन छोटे मोटे किसान जो तकावी लिया करते हैं, उनकी नीलामी होती है, उनको जेल में डाला गया है । यह है इस समय की कांग्रेस का चरित्र । ठीक है । विरोधी पक्ष में भी कुछ राजा लोग हैं, उन के निजी कोष को, जिस को आप प्रीवी पर्स कहते हैं, क्यों नहीं खत्म करते । पहले प्रधान मंत्री कहा करते थे कि हम वचनबद्ध हैं । लेकिन क्या लाल बहादुर जी भी वचनबद्ध हैं । उसे क्यों नहीं खत्म करते ।

एक और बड़ी जबदस्त बात होती है देश में जिस के ऊपर आप को भी ध्यान देना है । सिक्के, कोष, कसम, घर, यह सब चीजें खूब चलती रहती हैं । मैं कसम के बारे में श्री लाल बहादुर जी से एक बात पूछूँगा । मैं ने एक पत्र लिखा था लेकिन उन्होंने जवाब नहीं दिया । शायद कुछ शर्मा गये । उन्होंने यह बात छोड़ दी शिक्षा मंत्री के ऊपर । माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री बेचारे क्या जवाब देंगे । उन की कौन सी जनतन्त्र की परम्परा रही है, उन की कौन सी विदेशी शासन से लड़ने की परम्परा रही

[डा० राम मोहर लॉहिया]

है। मैं ने साफ लिखा था कि एक करोड़ के करीब लोगों को कसम दिलाई गई है। विद्यार्थियों को, अध्यापकों को, श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू के नाम पर कसम दिलाई गई है। एक तरफ तो आप संविधान बनाते हैं जिस में लिखा हुआ है कि आत्म की और सोचने की आजादी है, वहां पर आप ईश्वर का नाम लेते हुए भी हिचकते हैं, और जो लोग ईश्वर शपथ नहीं ले सकते उन के लिये संकल्प लिखा गया है और दूसरी तरफ आप कसम खिलवाते हैं व्यक्ति के नाम पर। जब मैं पत्र लिखता हूँ तो बेचारे डाल देते हैं उस बेचारे आदमी के ऊपर जिस की कोई परम्परा नहीं रही। इस प्रश्न पर आप को खुद सोच विचार करना चाहिये था। आखिर एक जमाना था जब आप के सामने राज्य और सरकार का फर्क आया था। याद कीजिये, उत्तर प्रदेश में कसम दिलवाई गई थी पंचों को। उन से कह दिया गया था कि तुम सरकार के वफादार हो, तब हम ने सवाल उठाया था कि वह गलत कसम थी। हम राज्य के वफादार हैं, सरकार के नहीं। जहां तक मुझे याद पड़ता है तब आप ने उस कसम को वापस लिया था। यह जो बड़ा भारी पाप हो चुका है आप की सरकार से कि एक व्यक्ति के नाम पर कसम दिलवायी है, उसे वापस लीजिये। इस के साथ साथ जरा आप इस पर भी ध्यान देंगे। मैं ने काफी इतिहास देखा है। मुझे पता नहीं कि कहीं पर भी आप को गौतम बुद्ध की प्रतिमा को छोड़ कर अशोक की प्रतिमा मिली हो। या अशोक के सिक्के चले हों। कहीं पर भी ईसा मसीह को छोड़ कर पीटर और पाल की प्रतिमायें बनी हों। लेकिन आज यह सरकार इतनी भयंकर कार्य कर रही है कि महात्मा गांधी को छोड़ कर उन के चेले, वह चाहे जितना बड़ा हो, की प्रतिमा, उस का सिक्का और उस का कोष चला रही है। किस चीज के ऊपर

वह इस चीज को ठीक कह सकते हैं। मैं इस मामले में अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन कांग्रेस वालों में जो भी थोड़ी बहुत भावना रखते हों, उन से मैं अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर वे क्या कर रहे हैं। इस के क्या नतीजे निकलेंगे। इस से आप कोई माननीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की पूजा नहीं कर रहे हैं, उन का आदर नहीं कर रहे हैं, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अपने स्थान की सुरक्षा करने के लिये आप आज इस तरह का कुकर्म करने के लिये तैयार हैं।

इस के साथ साथ आप यह देखिये कि आखिर स्मारक कहाँ बनाया जाता है। यह मत सोचना कि जो आदमी मर गया है में उस की शान में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं उस की शान में जल्दी कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता जब तक आप उकसायेंगे नहीं। लेकिन इस को देखिये कि आप क्या करना चाहते हैं। एक चार करोड़ रुपये की सम्पत्ति को स्मारक बना देना चाहते हैं लेकिन यह नहीं दूँडते कि वह जगह जहां वह आदमी पैदा हुआ उस को स्मारक क्यों न बनाया जाये। आप इसलिये ऐसा नहीं करते कि आप को हिचक लगती है, शर्म लगती है क्योंकि पता चल जायेगा कि वह आदमी एक गरीब के घर में पैदा हुआ था, और देश के लोग उसे गिरा देंगे जब पता चल जायेगा कि माननीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू एक गरीब के घर में पैदा हुए थे। उस घर को जा कर दूँदो, इलाहाबाद में वह स्मारक बनाओ जिस में सारा देश उसे जान जाये। लेकिन मालूम होता है कि सरकार यह चाहती है कि यह भ्रम सारे देश में फैला रहे कि वह कितने त्यागी थे, कितना त्याग उन्होंने किया, कितना धन छोड़ा, कितना ऐश्वर्य छोड़ा। आज देश में उस त्याग की भावना जगाम्रं: जो गरीब लोगों के अपने दिल में है।

सभापति महोदय : अब आप का समय समाप्त हो गया ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं दो चार मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ ।

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. Member conclude now. I wish to call the Home Minister,

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : गृह मंत्री से किसी जमाने में मैं ज्यादा बोला करता था । गृह मंत्री तो बेचारे बाद के आदमी हैं । हम अपने को जरा उन से थोड़ा अच्छा समझ बैठे । खैर, यहाँ कानून बिसाई होने लगी है । यहाँ पर मैं आप को बतलाऊँ, कुछ बड़े लोग हैं, उन के लड़कों को बचाने के लिये दिल्ली की पुलिस की तरफ से भी कारवाई अभी तक चालू है । उस के साथ साथ अगर कोई एम० एल० ए० या एम० पी० होते हैं तो वे नाजायज तौर से उन लोगों से कार्य करा लेते हैं मैं फर्हखाबद का एक उदाहरण दूँ । उसके साथ साथ पुलिस वाले कई दफ लोगों को पकड़ते हैं बाजार से । मैं आप को संकिशा नाम के क्षेत्र का किस्सा बतला रहा हूँ । रात के बक्त कहीं कोई झगड़ा नहीं हुआ । पीठ में गोली मार कर या छाती में गोली मार कर कहते हैं कि यह तो मुकाबला करते हुए मारे गये । संकिशा में चार आदमी मारे गये, इटावा में भी इसी तरह से लोग मारे गये । मैं गृह मंत्री जी को एक चेतावनी दे रहा हूँ कि श्री सान्याल के बारे में जरा खबरदार रहें और तब तहकीकात बरीरह करें ।

यहाँ कहा जाता है कि भूख से मौत नहीं हुई । नो भूख से मौत के मैं न कई नाम बतलाये हैं । यह सही बात है कि अध्यक्ष महोदय न मुझे एक ताना मारा कि तुम अकेले पड़ गये हो । सचमुच मैं निकम्मा प्रबेला पड़ गया हूँ ।

लेकिन मैं कहा करता हूँ कि हम उन दो जमातों को जल्दी इकट्ठा कर लें कि हम आप को न्यूता दे सकें कि आप उस जमाव के अन्दर आयें । मैं अपने कांग्रेसी मित्रों से यह तो नहीं कहता कि इन सब बातों को सोचने विचारने से अगर उनके मन पर प्रभाव पड़ा है तो वे इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के पक्ष में वोट दें, लेकिन मैं एक पुराने सहकर्मी के नाते कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप किसी के साथ वोट मत दो और इस तरह दिखाला दो कि कांग्रेस में कम से कम दो चार दस ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि किसी मसले पर ठीक तरह से सोच कर अपना मत देते हैं ।

16 hrs.

सभापति महोदय : होम मिनिस्टर ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मुझे समय मिलना चाहिए ।

सभापति महोदय : कल मिलेगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : सवरे से मुझे बिटा रखा है यह कह कर कि आप को समय मिलेगा । अब आप कह कर मुकरते हैं । मुझे बुलाना चाहिए, मुझे बोलने का मौका देना चाहिए ।

सभापति महोदय : आप बैठ जाएं, आज मौका नहीं मिलेगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा नाम लिखा है । सभापति ने विश्वास दिलाया था । मुझे विश्वास दिला कर आप कहते हैं कि आज मौका नहीं मिलेगा । मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया जाए ।

सभापति महोदय : गृह मंत्री के बाद जो टाइम बचेगा तो आपको मौका दिया जाएगा ।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** यह मैं नहीं मानता। गृह मंत्री बाद में बोलें, आप अपने वचन पर दुड़ खाँ और मुझे मौका दें। मेरे साथ न्याय कीजिए। आपने विश्वास दिलाया था।

**सभापति महोदय :** आप आज बैठ जाएं, कल मैं मौका दूंगा।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** यह मेरे साथ अन्याय है।

**सभापति महोदय :** कोई अन्याय नहीं है।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** यह बड़ा अन्याय है कि आप विश्वास दिलाकर भी मुझे मौका नहीं देते हैं।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barackpore):** May I know when the Prime Minister will be replying to the debate? Will he be replying tomorrow or on Friday? If that is known, then we can understand how much more time is left.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri):** On Friday.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** That means the whole of tomorrow is available for this debate to continue.

**Mr. Chairman:** It would be possible to accommodate both or them tomorrow.

**श्री श्रीय :** सभापति महोदय, जिन 17 सदस्यों ने अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को प्रस्तुत किया था उनमें से मैं भी एक हूँ। फिर क्या बजह है कि मुझे अभी तक बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला? इस सदन की यह परम्परा है कि जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तावित करने वाले सदस्य होंगे उनका नाम पहले दिया जाएगा। मेरा नाम नहीं लिया गया, इसका मैं कारण जानना चाहता हूँ।

**Mr. Chairman:** You will get your chance tomorrow. Please resume your seat. Let us hear the Home Minister now.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, it was well known that the Opposition would not show any indulgence to this Government—whatever may have happened in the past. It was anticipated that our friends on the other side will pounce upon any little thing, any little flaw on the part of the Government and they will not be prepared to ignore the smallest imperfection or deficiency. That anticipation has come true. The No-Confidence Motion is an embodiment of that attitude.

The Opposition is welcome to bring up and criticise any imperfection or deficiency of the Government. We are prepared to be judged by exacting standards. We would ourselves earnestly apply to ourselves even more exacting standards.

In this period of three months the Opposition has not allowed any grass to grow under its feet. Whatever it could lay hands upon, whatever it could get hold of—including the hon. Member who spoke before me—it has hurled at the Government. Instead of what would normally be the material, the basis for a No-confidence Motion—something of grave consequence—something for which the Government can be held to be responsible . . .

**An Hon. Member:** Food crisis.

**Shri Nanda . . .** the Opposition has taken advantage of some temporary difficulties in the food situation which are being resolved.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** Is it a temporary one? For the last 17 years we are facing it.

**Shri Nanda:** This is all what they could confront the Government with in the No-confidence Motion. Why has there to be such a hurry? It is

because they are afraid that if they miss this opportunity, in course of time, in the months that are coming, they will not be having anything more weighty or anything more substantial for raising their opposition or for bringing forward a No-confidence Motion. I am sure that even this slender material on which they are basing their case is not going to be available to them hereafter.

The situation, I am sure, is going to get better and better. They will have no further opportunity of this kind. I speak with conviction and confidence. It is not surprising that some of the members would magnify out of all proportion. I am not surprised at it if the hon. Member Dr. Lohia does that. But I am thinking of another hon. Member who is not here now, my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani. He is a Gandhian and we come from the same fold. He was a senior member and I was a very junior member. We were taught that we should eschew exaggeration. There was plenty of it in his speech. He always mixes satire with serious utterances and one does not know what is what. Beneath that veneer of humour there is always an under-current of bitterness, and that is possibly answerable for the kind of things that fell from his mouth.

Hearing the speeches of some hon. Members one would be led to believe that all this period of 17 years in this country has been just wasted completely and no good has come out of it. This is exaggeration. This is magnifying things hundred-fold and out of proportion. As I said, this is far from truth. There are, of course, figures that I can cite showing the growth of various sectors of economy in this country during the Plans. I do not want to take up the time of the House in citing many statistics, but it is very well known that agriculture, which has been greatly talked about here, during the period of the First and Second Five Year Plans re-

gistered an increase in production by 46 per cent. The increase in the case of industries during the two Plans is 95 per cent. Its significance will be realised when it is understood what the position at the initial period was—a period of handicaps and struggles. When we made a start, there was a swamp of stagnation, which had to be cleared and the ground had to be prepared for economic and social reconstruction. It is in that perspective that we have to judge the performance of this country during the Plans. We have made big strides in agriculture, irrigation and power, industry, specially machine-building and other basic industries; there has been enormous expansion of social services, especially education; much more so of technical education. To give an example, the number of students who were admitted to the engineering colleges at the beginning of the First Plan was 10,000. At the end of the Second Plan it was nearly 40,000. I hope hon. Members will understand and realise the significance of these figures. Our engineers are able to perform big and complex industrial tasks. These high skills are not obtained in a day. They are the foundations of the progress of this country in days to come. Apart from that, the signs of progress—the evidence—is scattered all over the country—everywhere. Can we not see that? This is the achievement of the nation, not of a party. Let us not belittle our own achievements before our people and people outside.

The foundations have been laid for a much more rapid progress in the country in future. It takes much greater effort to lay the foundations; the results are not visible immediately—soon; it takes time. But, then, the structure and the superstructure will rise more quickly. This is what is happening in the country.

The record of progress of this nation, in comparable conditions, I should say will be something for

[Shri Nanda]

which we can derive some amount of satisfaction. Maybe, it is wholly inadequate considering our needs—the needs of this country, the growing population—and we should certainly make more vigorous efforts, and whatever stands in the way of more rapid progress should be removed. There have been impediments and they have been removed. Let us remember, all these have to be carried through while preserving the democratic values and the democratic framework. This is an important feature of the economic history of this country during these years.

Among the principal counts of charges of the opposition against the Government, food figures profusely in spite of the fact that there was a special debate and the food policy of the Government was approved and adopted by an overwhelming majority. This word "majority" brings to my mind an observation made by the hon. Member, Shri Hiren Mukerjee. In a moment of self-forgetfulness, he used the word "brute majority". Sir, I have great admiration for his eloquence. He is a cultured man, familiar with the delights of good literature. But it seems at that time he departed from that dignity in his choice of words and phrases, which does not bear elegance of his usual eloquence.

16.15 hrs.

Instead of dubbing the majority of this Government as a brute majority, he should think of another word.

**Shri Solanki (Kaira):** He should speak a little louder. We cannot hear him.

**Shri Nanda:** How did this majority come about?

**An Hon. Member:** The Gonda way.

**Shri Nanda:** Have we any respect for the people of this country? I say this majority was produced by the votes of millions of people of this country, millions of men and women of this country, by the ways and processes of democracy. The present majority is not just a chance occurrence. With the help of the votes of crores of people of this country, citizens of this land, this majority has materialised at every General Election three times. And this was by the free exercise of the franchise which our people had. Do friends on the other side imagine that by this kind of tactics, including that adopted by the hon. Member, Dr. Lohia—he has been talking of some kind of permutation and combination which will possibly place him on some higher pedestal—they would be converting their minority into a majority and our majority into a minority? This is a legitimate aspiration of any Opposition; but they have little chance as far ahead as we can see. Why? Because theirs is a wholly negative role and futile approaches to the people, including these *bandhs*, this *bandh* and that *bandh*—everything is *bandh*. Those who only think of *bandh* can never go forward or take this country forward.

**The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi):** They are moribund.

**Shri Nanda:** These futilities will not take them anywhere. A No-confidence Motion has certain serious implications. There has to be some reality about a No-confidence Motion. The assumption is that the party or parties in the Opposition are prepared or are in a position or would be in a position to produce an alternative government which can do better than this Government.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** No; they cannot.

**Some Hon. Members:** Never.

16.18 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

**Shri Nanda:** What are these parties? Is it at all possible? Is that within the range of possibility? I have got some figures. There is not a shadow of a possibility of that kind. All the votes of the Opposition parties combined will not produce a majority—I am talking of votes, seats apart. What kind of combination is this? You cannot make a plus one and a minus one equal to two; plus one and minus one is equal to zero. That is what they are.

Take, for instance, one of the parties, namely, the Communists. There are some very amiable persons among them and sometimes I wonder how they have strayed into that camp. There is probably something which is hurting us when we see them. Why is it that they do not think this country to be good enough for them to give their whole loyalty to it? Why?

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** Answer.

**Shri Nanda:** There are visible and invisible strings which tie them to certain seats of power outside.

**An Hon. Member:** Answer.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur):** There is no answer.

**Shri Nanda:** Therefore, this country will never place its trust, its destiny in the hands of these people because in their hands surely independence will shrink and shrivel and freedom will vanish and evaporate. That is what will happen. Therefore, how can they expect ever to become a government of this country? But there is one helpful change in their ranks. There are the rightists and there are the leftists. Of course, in each faction there is a vast amount of spectrum of ideological shades. But it is a very healthy development (*Interruption*). So far as the leftists are concerned, I do not know who represents them here. They have no moorings which can link them with this land, this country, and they will

drift away. There will be no trace left of them in this ocean of Indian humanity. As far as the rightists are concerned—it may be impertinent for me to give any advice to them; I speak in all humility—let them not shed an iota of their socialism; let them assert positively their break with extra-territorial faith. Let them be assimilated in the democracy of this country. They can become a great factor for progress of this land. But, as it is, they will be neither here nor there.

Then, regarding the Samyukta Socialist Party . . .

**Shri Hiren Mukerjee:** May I raise a point in regard to this question of extra-territoriality . . . (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Let me hear.

**Shri Hiren Mukerjee:** Sir, over and over again, this question of extra-territoriality comes up. If extra-territoriality—very difficult word to pronounce—implies that any section of our people including us here in this House, have loyalties outside this country which guide their conduct, it is a fantastic distortion of the facts. It so happens that the communist movement is an international movement of an ideology which is international, just as the ideology of democracy is also international and Mr. Nanda may take it from me, if he cares to do so, that there is no question of extra-territorial devotion as far as the Communist Party, left or right or centre, is concerned.

**Shri Nanda:** I did not use the word 'loyalty'. I said, extra-territorial faith and he is himself saying the same thing.

Then, as regards the Samyukta Socialist Party, with all the past that has gone into the making of this Party of which our friend there now remains out. . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माप जसों को जीवने के लिये ।

**Shri Nanda:** This Party is a warning of what those who profess socialism should avoid. It is a story of wasted opportunities and a mockery of meaningful effort towards socialist goals. It is a symbol of instability in Indian politics.

Other Parties are not at all in line with the aspirations of this country and I need not say very much about them. The Swatantra Party, Sir, is a freak of Indian politics. Its emergence reminds us of the fact that we have still not done away with certain vestiges of feudalism, that vested interests have still a hold in this country . . .

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Very much so, especially your Party.

**Shri Nanda:** . . . and some people love to look backward rather than forward.

16.25 hrs.

Their presence here, that is, the presence of the Members of the Swatantra party is a measure of our unfinished tasks. They will have to transform themselves out of all recognition, to become a political force at all. When I talk of the Swatantra Party, I must say that I was not present when the hon. Member Shri M. R. Masani spoke, who continues to remain absent now . . .

**An Hon. Member:** It was Shri Dandekar who spoke.

**Shri Nanda:** No; I am talking of Shri M. R. Masani who first spoke in the food debate. He used some very choice and delectable phrases about us and about me particularly, such as 'old defender' 'guilty man' and so on. Among them there are good and intelligent persons. They have started—because they thought that once a new party started it must start at the beginning of history, therefore, they started somewhere around Adam Smith . . .

**Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur):** Not Adam Smith, but Adam!

**Shri Nanda:** . . . and they have not yet got away from it. I am sure they will see light some day.

But I was saying something about Shri M. R. Masani and about what he said about us. I shall not pray for redemption from this state of sin to which he has consigned me, in order to be launched into the paradise of free enterprise. I am not going to be launched into the paradise of free enterprise. As for himself, I hope that Shri M. R. Masani who has recanted his faith once will be able to recant it again.

As far as the structure of political life in this country is concerned, all Opposition Parties, as I indicated before, can get together only for some kind of a negative gesture as they have done now. But that is all. They have no confidence in one another.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** Have an analysis of your own party.

**Shri Nanda:** Therefore, the combined impact of all that they can do and say will be nothing at all so far as the policies of this nation are concerned; they are bound to cancel one another.

Therefore, with great humility, again speaking to the hon. Members, I would say that they must have patience, they must understand the content that they have to live with the fact that for a long time Congress will remain the sheet anchor of democracy and the hall-mark of stability in this country, the only political force which can save this country from chaos.

Hon. Members in this House, most of them do not want that chaos. There may be some who may have some lurking desire their hearts and who might welcome if such a situation might arise.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं चाहता हूँ गड़बड़। मैं बिल्कुल गड़बड़ चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप चाहते हैं, तो यहां नहीं कहना चाहिए।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं देश में जरूर गड़बड़ चाहता हूँ। माननीय मंत्री महोदय बार-बार जिस स्थिरता की बात करते हैं, वह केवल श्मशान की शान्ति हो गई है।

श्री अ० प्र० जैन (तुमकुर) : माननीय सदस्य तो अकेले रह गए हैं। वह तो केम्रास में चले गए हैं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : वह ब्रह्म हो गए हैं।

श्री शिव नारायण (बासी) : एकम् ब्रह्म द्वितीयं नास्ति।

**Shri Nanda:** People who have nothing at all to tie them to life, and who are disillusioned because everybody has left them and who therefore have nothing really to live for, can afford to say that.

I am reminded of Shri J. B. Kripalani again in this context. He reminded us of the days when Gandhiji raised the banner of revolt against the British Government. He was talking in the same strain, namely 'revolt'. But the fact is that the Congress Government was ready to take over power from the British Government.

I ask my hon. friend opposite whether he really wants this *gadbad* for the purpose of putting this whole country into a state of ruin and a state of chaos which will follow. He is talking of the happiness of the masses of the country. If chaos comes, then for many years there will be no peace no freedom and no progress for a country which goes into that state once. So, let us try to avoid that state altogether.

What will happen? Here the situation is not such that anyone of them can take over. Let me not be misunderstood. I am not ruling out criticism, trenchant criticism of any faults of the Government. It is obvious—I must confess—that the Congress has developed certain symptoms of ill-health. But the Congress also possesses an enormous reserve of vitality. (*An Hon. Member's No.*) The Congress has an enormous capacity for self-repair and self-regeneration. I am sure that the Congress will make itself fitter and fitter to shoulder the burdens of the nation.

In spite of many hours given to it in the discussion food has again figured very prominently. It has been a recurrent theme. But the Minister of Food and Agriculture dealt with this problem with remarkable candor. In some quarters, it was misunderstood. He made an objective presentation of the facts. He has expressed his sense of confidence that all the steps which are necessary are being taken to rectify the situation and to prevent its recurrence. Let us believe him. He has come to the House with utter frankness and, therefore, this also has to be accepted that we are in command of the situation; the situation is not slipping out of our hands.

Why is it that we have had to face this situation at all? Nobody can deny that it is a difficult situation for many people in the country, it cannot be taken lightly at all. Why has it arisen? I will explain briefly. Hon. Members who are familiar with figures and statistics of agriculture would be quite aware of the fact that there are very sharp ups and downs in agricultural production. This is due to the vagaries of nature. We have had the experience of a 12 per cent increase in agricultural production in one year, the next year 2 per cent and in the third year a minus. Like that this has been happening. But in both the Five Year Plans, the First and the Second—the whole of it—the good

[Shri Nanda]

and the bad together—gave us a very considerable move forward. But it is very unfortunate that the last three successive years were exceptionally bad. Taking the production of these three years, there has been no increase at all; there has been a slight decline. And the cumulative effect of this will be felt; it cannot be escaped, with all that we may do.

The average increase in agricultural production during the previous ten years was simple average rate of nearly 4 per cent. In the last three years, we have put more inputs into agriculture. Therefore, even if we might not have looked forward to a higher rate than 4 per cent, at least we should have had 4 per cent. Therefore, it is something else, something not under our control.

**An Hon. Member:** Defective planning.

**Shri Nanda:** We put more fertilisers; we have given more irrigation. All that has been done, and still this is the result. My explanation is that it is obvious that in the course of our forward march, we have struck a bad patch. This is, therefore, a testing time for the nation. A nation grows when it is able to face a difficult situation with determination and fortitude. This country will succeed in weathering this storm.

There is one other matter which was emphasised frequently—the politics of the Government. Charges were levelled at the present Government that the policies of the late Prime Minister were being diluted and undermined. As if deliberately to lend some kind of colour to the suspicion, the Swatantra Party—what was the provocation for them?—have expressed their gratification that there has been a shift in their direction. Both these assumptions are wrong. One is wishful thinking, and the other is pure alarmism. Both read into simple words materialisation of their own unfounded hopes

and fears. I may say that it is for the Prime Minister and he will speak with even greater authority, but I know his mind, I know what is being done in this Government, and I can declare that we adhere steadfastly to the precious legacy inherited from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Let it be clear. It is not just because these policies are associated with the name of the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru built up these policies; they were built up by him because these policies were the most suitable, most essential, almost quite inevitable for the good of this nation. It is not Jawaharlal Nehrus' policy, it is the nation's policy, and there can be no other policy for this country. This applies both to the internal and external affairs of the country.

But I may say one thing. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru avoided extremes. He was severely practical in his outlook, always keeping an eye on what was feasible and what was not feasible. I have here an extract from one of his speeches made when he moved the resolution regarding the Second Five Year Plan in the Lok Sabha on 23rd May, 1956. He says:

"Now, we have said that our objective is a socialistic pattern of society. I do not propose to define precisely what socialism in this context means, because we would wish to avoid any doctrinaire thinking, any rigid thinking, because even in my life I have seen the world change so much, I have seen so many other changes, that I do not want to confine my mind to any rigid doctrine."

And he said:

"One has always to remember that the primary function of a growing society is to produce more wealth. Otherwise, it will shrink, it will not grow, and you will have nothing to distribute."

Some of the few things that the hon. Member, Dr. Lohia, says on occasions are sound and good. In the course of the discussion on the food situation, he said that at this juncture what is required more is socialist production and not socialist distribution. I heard him say that, I have translated into English what he said in Hindi. That is what exactly has to be kept in view.

In this connection, again the Swatantra Party is very peculiar. They have taken for granted that our past policies were wrong and some departure is now being made. They have a special grouse against heavy industries and the public sector. Swatantra economics is misconceived. Our difficulties are not due to our Plan. They are there in spite of the advantage of planned development that we have had during these years. They talk of poverty. Can we hope to abolish poverty and to get rid of our dependence on foreign aid without the help of a powerful impetus to development which comes from the plans? There are now growing needs of a growing population, and then there is the problem of employment which is forgotten when the Swatantra economists think only of consumer goods, as if it is a static population. The population grows, and it is not only food they want, but also employment. How are we going to give them employment? In one year four million more are coming into the labour force, and at least three million have to be put in non-agriculture, though this is bad, because have to be thrown back into agriculture, though this is bad, because already the pressure on land is very heavy. It would only mean further depressing the standards of living of the people who are engaged in agriculture.

And then, there are also the needs of defence and that can only be met out of sustained development of industry. Then there are consumer industries. If modern techniques have to be applied to the production of goods

and services, machinery on an increasing scale has to be obtained. Can we afford to go on importing machines? The problem of foreign exchange would be formidable; it is just impossible. We have, therefore, to create the capacity to produce machines in this country even for the purpose of providing consumer goods to an increasing number of people in the country.

The hon. Members said something about steel. I thought hon. Shri Dandekar was a brilliant administrator and a good economist. Possibly the contagion of Swatantra has somehow damped his mind also and he says that we can afford to import steel but not food, as if the two have any comparison. We do not want either food or steel to be imported in this country. There is no need now to import steel. 4.5 million tons will be the additional production. How many hundreds of lakhs will be needed to import that? It is not also a surplus commodity like wheat in America.

Then, there was the onset of emergency also which has an intimate bearing on the situation. When the Emergency arose the need for strengthening our defences came up. Of course, this obligation was accepted by the nation cheerfully. But it involved a large expenditure and a very large draft on our material resources. This had to be done for the sake of the integrity of the country, for the preservation of its sovereignty and security. This had to be done and the price had to be paid. A decision was taken then not to curtail development, when we were entering upon a larger commitment on account of these developments. This had its consequences. When people ask us to do this and that and that also, then the consequences flow from it. The defence expenditure rose to enormous figures. Compared to the deficit financing, it is an enormous figure and when that comes into the economy, certainly the people of India have to face the consequences of it although we must try to see that they are

[Shri Nanda]

mitigated to the utmost extent possible. For the Swatantra neither defence, nor development is necessary.

I have now to come to one or two matters which concerned me as Home Minister.

**Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana):** Has he finished with Swatantra?..(Interruptions.)

**Shri Nanda:** There are so many absurd things there that I may exhaust the whole hour and yet not be done with it.

Then, frequent references were made to....

**An Hon. Member: Sadachar.**

**Shri Nanda:** Hon. Member is quite right... Sadachar. I hope the hon. Member realises that it is a good word for him, for all of us. This topic cropped up now and then. I may submit to you and to the House, Sir, that there should be no tendency either to exaggerate or to minimise things but we must face the situation as it is and fight it. I will not enter into any comparison with other countries. Even a little corruption here is bad for us; it is a drag on our economic and social progress. It creates risks for the stability—I say deliberately—and security of the nation. That is my understanding of the situation. In this connection, I would like to refer to a statement which I made sometime ago, and I would read a few lines on that, so that my own attitude is made clear. I said in that statement on 7th May, 1964:

“Our people are prone to exaggeration of their own faults. Very often the picture of corruption is overdrawn. There are many Government servants whose careers are free from any taint of corruption, applying even the strictest test. It is also true that not every

businessman has recourse to dishonest ways, and it is demoralising for the nation that because of the lapses of a few, sweeping statements should be made about persons in political life generally.”

That is a very clear and categorical statement.

Hon. Members were impatient: they wanted that I should say something about Sadachar Samiti. It has figured rather too prominently inside and outside this House. Let us look at things in their proper perspective (*Interruption*). In the first place, may I say that I do not lay any claim to be the initiator of this anti-corruption campaign? The credit for setting it in motion goes to the Prime Minister; right or not, whatever it is, he set in motion this campaign when he was the Home Minister. Was it not he, as Home Minister, who announced the appointment of a committee on prevention of corruption in 1962 with wide terms of reference covering all aspects of this question. (*Interruption*).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन को पहले अपना भाषण खत्म कर लेने दीजिये तब मैं आप को इजाजत दे दूंगा।

**Shri Nanda:** All this trouble started and this Samiti is the off-shoot of that, because, one of the recommendations was to have something based on the circumstances of the country, the social climate of the country. (*Interruption*). It is a good thing, anyway. Previous to this also, various steps had been taken to deal with this problem. It is not that the Government was entirely negligent about these things. The Prevention of Corruption Act had been passed in 1947, and in 1955 an Administrative Vigilance Division was set up in the

Home Ministry, to provide the necessary drive, direction and co-ordination. This was in addition to the Special Police Establishment which had been functioning for nine years. It was felt in 1962 that a more comprehensive review of the situation was necessary. The years 1962-1964 marked the beginning of the systematic and many sided effort by Government in ensuring the highest standards of integrity in administration. It can be claimed without exaggeration that in no other period had so much effort been directed towards the achievement of this objective.

Hon. Members have been asking questions about the Santhanam Committee's report. I can assure them that most of the recommendations of this committee have been adopted. I may mention a few. A Central Vigilance Commission, with wide powers, was set up; something which has no parallel anywhere—the Government surrendering its own powers in the hands of a judicial person for this purpose. The Commission is authorised to undertake the enquiry into any transaction in which a public servant is suspected or alleged to have acted for an improper purpose. Other steps have also been taken, and they are necessary, because punishing the guilty is not a complete answer to the problem. A comprehensive approach is necessary. No single remedy will suffice. The preventive aspect is certainly very important. I referred to the administration. I believe personally that 50 per cent or at least half—it is very difficult to give a precise percentage—of the evil could be liquidated by administrative reform. Administrative delays are a prolific source and various opportunities arise in the course of procedure, etc., which can be dealt with and overcome by having recourse to necessary reforms in this direction. Therefore, as I mentioned in the House this morning, various other things have been done.

The hon. Member wanted to know what was the idea. He is associated

with one of these ideas. Four teams are at work now—a member from the Ministry, a member from the Department of Administrative Reforms, a member from the CBI and an hon. Member of Parliament. One of them is Mr. Mathur. Various Ministries have been taken. The question is asked, what is the time-limit? The question of time-limit does not arise. We do not want a report; we want action. Go ahead and whatever you find is necessary to be done now, it should be immediately implemented. This way we are going to deal with all those Ministries.

The Government Servants' Conduct Rules and the Discipline and Appeal Rules are under revision particularly on the recommendations made by the Commission. An extensive amendment is being made to the law and procedure relating to corruption and a Bill for the purpose is being currently introduced. The Central Bureau of Investigation has been strengthened. About concrete results, I will just cite one figure. During 1963 the Special Police Establishment Division took up 1356 cases of bribery, corruption, misappropriation and other dishonest practices by public servants, corresponding to the figure of 1134 in 1962. I may say that the number of convictions that have been obtained in cases going to courts is very high and it is a very gratifying feature.

There is one thing about this matter of anti-corruption, which hon. Members will be keen I should tell them something about, and that is the various recommendations concerning people in high places. These recommendations have been carefully examined and I cannot say immediately all the details. A code of conduct for the Ministers has been worked out, which touches various important matters concerning the Ministers, as for example, the whole question of declaration of assets to the Prime Minister, any association with business which has

[Shri Nanda]

anything to do with the Government and various other things. There may be another occasion to deal with the details of that. The other thing is if charges are levied, what is to be done? There was a recommendation made that 10 Members of Parliament or an Assembly should come forward and some procedure should be evolved. We have given very close thought to that and we have come to the conclusion that we should do better than what we are asked to do. Why should we wait for 10 Members to frame charges? That is going to be our attitude. We are not going to wait for that; it is not necessary even for 1 member to frame any charge. The moment we know anything we will act. But we must understand that there is a tendency to make reckless and sweeping charges. So, something has got to be done about that also. If a person brings a charge, he must make an affidavit and if it is found that there is malice or it is unfounded and baseless, something should be done about that also. But when the Prime Minister has taken upon himself to attend to these things immediately, that should be enough. He will use any instrument—whether it is the agency in the Home Ministry or a Commission of Inquiry or having some kind of panel out of which he may choose certain names for this purpose. All these things will be open to him. We are to judge by the results. That is all that I can say.

There was one thing about the hon. Member Shri Mukerjee. He may be angry with me, but he has been very kind to me and I thank him for the sentiments expressed. But always, I feel, somehow he is out of place. He has said something about my colleagues not giving full support to the anti-corruption drive. This is a free country and this is a free party. There can be difference of opinion about some mode or some method. But all in the party are behind the Government in the anti-corruption campaign.

Every one of them and all my colleagues are behind it. So, far as the special reference to West Bengal, the State from which my hon. friend comes, is concerned, whatever else might have happened or not happened, one thing is true. It was,—his name was mentioned in a horrible context by the hon. Member and even though Shri Mukerjee did not mention his name he said that somebody was coming in the way of the appointment of the sadachar samiti there—I must inform him since it has become necessary to do so—the hon. Member of this House, Shri Atulya Ghosh, himself helped me in the formation of the Sadachar Samiti in that State, found out the name of a retired Chief Justice of the High Court of West Bengal and suggested it. Therefore, I do not anticipate that there could be any trouble from one quarter or another in this matter.

**An Hon. Member:** Very clever.

**Shri Nanda:** Cleverness in a good cause.

Sir, I have one or two other matters to which I would like to make a reference. It was said that we are applying the Defence of India Rules and all other weapons in our armoury.

**Shri Maurya:** D.I.R. was misused. I am a victim.

**श्री बाबूजी (हिसार) :** बंगाल के चावल के मिल-मालिकों के खिलाफ डी० आई० आर० क्यों नहीं इस्तेमाल किया ?

**Shri Maurya:** Four cases of DIR are manipulated against a little man like me.

**Shri Nanda:** In the first place, the complaint was that while we used these weapons for certain purposes, political etc., we are not doing any-

thing about the hoarders and profiteers. We have been very keen that the most vigorous action should be taken for detecting these offences and taking whatever action is possible. I may just give one figure. The number of persons arrested for hoarding and profiteering under this law was nearly 4000. 4000 persons have been arrested and detained in different parts of the country under various orders and laws relating to hoarding and profiteering.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** For how long have they been kept in detention?

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** ये लोग कितने दिन जेल में रहे ?

**श्री हुकम चन्द कलवाय :** उन में से कांग्रेसी कितने थे ?

**श्री स्वामी :** कांग्रेसी ब्लैक-मार्केटिंग नहीं करते हैं ।

**Shri Nanda:** The Defence of India legislation has been there and it has been used to deal with these anti-social elements.

Then, there is the other thing, the agitation regarding the food situation. In the press high figures have come about the number of persons arrested as if it is a big thing and a number of people have gone to jail. The large number meant nothing. Just as it was a symbolic *satyagraha*, it was a symbolic arrest.

**An hon. Member:** What about Kerala?

**Shri Nanda:** In Kerala also the position was not different. But there have been cases, I must admit and acknowledge, of looting, destruction and forcible entry where people are certainly being detained for taking further action. If anybody does any *gadbad* of that kind, he will not be allowed to go scotfree.... (*Interruptions*).

Regarding food agitation, when once the stock of volunteers diminishes, dries out, to what expedients these people are driven to get volunteers for the purpose of *satyagraha* I will now narrate. I have got information that there was a case where Government took hold of some of the shopkeepers for persistent default in the observance of the legal requirements. The merchants explained their difficulties and they were released. On their return they met some SSP agitators who assured them to get every shop-keeper released on condition that they join the demonstration of SSP, because the number of volunteers for their agitation was dwindling.

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** यः कहाँ की बात है, शायद आपने उनको वहाँ भेजा होगा ।

**Shri Koya:** What is the source of your information?

**Shri Nanda:** I will give it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** You know the tactics employed by the British Government. Do not go that way, the wrong way of looking at things.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the hon. Minister like to continue now or tomorrow?

**An hon. Member:** Tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us hear him. There are so many voices that I cannot hear him.

**Shri Nanda:** Is it your wish that I should continue now?

**Mr. Speaker:** If he requires only about ten minutes, he might continue now.

**Shri Nanda:** I do not want to intrude upon the time of the hon. Members tomorrow. Perhaps, they would like to rebut some of the things that I have said.

I would like to refer to one other thing about the emergency, which was mentioned by the mover of the

[Shri Nanda]

motion also. I ask them: is it for fun that we are spending all these big amounts on defence? Is it not a fact that we are trying to develop our defence potential and capacity, spending a very large slice of our resources and thereby putting our economy to the strain? If it is a fact, then it is a reality that there is some danger, there is some threat for which we are doing all that and putting our people to all that strain. If that reality is there, then there is no question of any necessity of further justification for the continuance of the emergency. In order to make effective preparations for defence we require those provisions, those powers. We require them for the purpose of effective operation of the defence arrangements; for nothing else. Internal peace in the country and law and order are also equally important for the sake of defence.

17.05 hrs.

Apart from what may happen as a consequence of some of the actions taken by them, for example, the closure of a whole industry on one day, we are told that prices increase, that production is not enough. If they will not scruple to give an order or ask the people, who are prepared to listen to them at the moment, to go on strike because they thought that they will be making some kind of a big effect, the people will not listen to them next time, I am sure. Does the whole textile industry in a centre like Bombay being closed for a day as also various other industries mean anything to production and prices or not? Those who know how marginal deficiencies in the supply of a commodity lead to an extra-ordinary rise in price will tell you that it does. And then, they will come back and say, "You are responsible for the rise in prices." They are responsible for the rise in prices.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** What about the lock-outs? An EMC and Jay Engineering Works? Why did you become silent spectators?

**Shri Nanda:** I do not want to go into the merits but I may explain that any lock-out of that kind is as anti-social as strikes are. I do not stand for lock-outs.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Why did you not disclose the names of 30 members of the Birla family? Why only Raj Kapoor's name was disclosed? Why did L. N. Birla come to Delhi? *(Interruption).*

**Shri Nanda:** I believe that hon. Members of the Opposition.....

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** एक दो दिन की हड़ताल से पैदावार घटती नहीं। मालिक हमेशा अपनी पैदावार बढ़ा लिया करते हैं।

**Shri Nanda:** I served the textile industry for 25 years as General Secretary of a trade union and I know more about the textile industry than the hon. Member. *(Interruption)* I believe that the hon. Members of the Opposition have had enough; therefore I would like to close. This debate has increased and heightened the confidence of the Government in its capacity to serve the people of the country well. The Government is sure to give a very good account of itself to the people of India and win their confidence in a much larger measure than before. Sir I have done.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Sir may I put one question to him?

**Mr. Speaker:** Questions can be put when the final is given.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Only one question.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Only one question.

**Mr. Speaker:** How can I allow so many questions? The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

17.08 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 17th September 1964|Bhadra 26, 1886 (Saka).*