

connected with me, it is pure fabrication. If it is equally sought to be associated with my very distinguished friend Mr. M. S. Pathak, it is a worse fabrication. I seek, through you and through the hon. Members from both sides of the House protection that a citizen of this country needs against calumny, against character assassination and against impetuous and itemperate language against the honour and dignity of a Member of Parliament.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: May I point out....

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta South): He can refer to it when he replies at the end of the debate....(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to make a submission in connection with his personal explanation. I have produced the photostat copies of telegrams that suggest....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He had made this point and the Minister has given a personal explanation.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am telling you that to the best of my knowledge, these photostats are taken from the original documents. I take responsibility for them. Let there be a thorough Parliamentary probe into this matter and let the truth be established. Let this photostat copy be examined by members.

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever he wanted to say, he has said yesterday.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: This is from General Pinto to Dadachandji at Mussoorie to the French firm to host him in Paris and arrange for hotel and pay for all this. This is the substance of the telex. Let this be gone into. If it is proved wrong, I shall be only too happy. If it is proved that I have done anything maliciously, I shall get the punishment which I deserve.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: I would not seek a debate on this issue....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Naturally.

SHRI D. P. DHAR:....because, it is not an issue that is to be debated. Because, what I have said was with the deepest regret and deepest anguish. I have a feeling, and I hope I am right in my feeling, that the hon. Member has fallen a dupe to some sort of fabrication.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am asking him to prove it.

SHRI D. P. DHAR: It would have been very gracious of him to have referred the matter to me, corrected his facts, as I was at his disposal.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am not convinced; not in the present case, in any case.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): How does the House know the truth?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (गालियर):
 एक आरोप लगाया गया है लेकिन उसका खंडन किया गया है। इस में सत्य क्या है इसका पता कैसे लगेगा? आप सारे मामले को देखिये या हाउस की कमेटी सारे मामले को देखे।

SHRI D. P. DHAR: Sir, may I make a submission? I place myself entirely at your disposal and I leave it to you to examine all these things.

12.29 hrs.

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

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव (आजमगढ़):
 अध्यक्ष जी, श्रीमती बोंड़ी देर पहले माननीय वाजपेयी जी ने कल जो बात इस सदन में कही थी और जिस संदर्भ में कल कही थी उस बात को उन्होंने आज फिर कहा है और कहा है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी की आज स्थिति ऐसी हो गई है कि वह सरकारी मशीनरी का इस्तेमाल किए बिना चल ही नहीं सकती

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

है और इसका कारण यह है कि जनता उसके साथ नहीं है। इसलिए होम गार्ड और दूसरी चीजों की मदद ले कर वह अपने जलूस निकालती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन लोगों में मैं नहीं हूँ कि इस तरह के आरोप को चुपचाप बर्दाश्त कर लिया जाए। मैंने इसको चुनौती के रूप में स्वीकार किया है। मैं इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने भी इस बात का पता लगाया है। इस देश में हम अपनी आजादी की पच्चीसवीं रजतजयन्ती मना रहे थे। इसमें किसी पार्टी या दल विशेष का सवाल नहीं था। सारा देश और राष्ट्र, सरकार और सारी जनता उस समारोह में हिस्सा ले रही थी। (व्यवधान) उस अवसर पर कांग्रेस पार्टी ने न तो होम गार्ड की सेवाओं को अर्जित किया था और न पुलिस और फौज की सेवाओं को अर्जित किया था। जिस संदर्भ में श्री वाजपेयी ने कल इस बात को कहा था, उस में मैं ने उन्हें उत्तर दिया था। मैं जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप यह सभझते हैं कि मैं ने कोई गलत बात कही है, तो मैं इस सदन की सदस्यता से त्यागपत्र देने के लिए तैयार हूँ। आप इस बात का निर्णय करें। मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ, जो कोई बात कह कर उस से मुकर जाते हैं। हमारे सार्वजनिक जीवन में जो नियम हैं, जो शिष्टता है, मैं सभझता हूँ कि हम सब को उन का आदर और सम्मान करना चाहिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वानियर) : बड़प्पन तो यह है कि माननीय सदस्य उस बात को मान लें।

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : जैसा कि मैं ने कल प्रारम्भ में कहा था, जिस तरीके से यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाया गया है और जिस तरह के मुद्दे और सवालता इस प्रस्ताव में उठाये गये हैं, वे इस बात का प्रमाण हैं कि विरोधी दल की जो पार्टियाँ इस प्रस्ताव को

पेश करने में सम्मिलित हैं, उन के पास सरकार की किसी नीति या कार्यक्रम के आधार पर, या सरकार की किसी बड़ी असफलता की बुनियाद पर, उस से त्यागपत्र मांगने के पक्ष में कोई बात नहीं है। केवल छोटे छोटे सवालों को उठाया गया है।

कल श्री वाजपेयी ने इस सदन में एक टेप रिकार्डर अपनी टेबल पर रखा। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि टेप रिकार्ड में जो बातें हैं, वे असत्य हैं। अगर किसी कर्मचारी या अधिकारी ने कोई गलती या अपराध किया है, और उस का साक्षात् प्रमाण है, तो सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि वह उस के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करें, उस के विरुद्ध उचित कदम उठाये। (व्यवधान)

लेकिन मैं श्री वाजपेयी से जानकारी के रूप में पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस से पहले कि उन्होंने उस टेप को इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया, क्या उन्होंने उस टेप-रिकार्ड की वार्ता को दिल्ली प्रशासन के किसी उच्चाधिकारी के सामने प्रस्तुत किया और कहा कि आप के कर्मचारी ने यह अपराध किया है और क्या उन्होंने भारत सरकार के, जिस के खिलाफ उन्होंने यह अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव रखा है, गृह मंत्री के कमरे में इस प्रमाण को ले जा कर प्रस्तुत किया और यह मांग की कि वह इस बारे में कार्यवाही करें। अगर भारत सरकार का गृह मंत्री या दिल्ली प्रशासन का सर्वोच्च अधिकारी इस सम्बन्ध में कोई कार्यवाही करने से इंकार करता, जो श्री वाजपेयी इस प्रश्न को इस सदन में उठा सकते थे।

लेकिन इन प्रश्नों का प्रयोग किया जा रहा है केवल इस लिए कि सरकार पर सार्वजनिक रूप से, और एक अवांछित तरीके से, आरोप लगाने की कोशिश की जाये। मैं नहीं कहता—कोई भी नहीं मानता—कि इतने बड़े देश में, जहाँ इतना बड़ा प्रशासन है और

इतनी बड़ी समस्याएँ हैं, कठिनाइयाँ नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने अपने जीवन और राजनीति में एक पद्धति स्वीकार की है। आज हम एक कठिन परिस्थिति में से गुजर रहे हैं। महंगाई सम्बन्धी विवाद के दौरान मैं ने इस सदन में यह स्वीकार किया था कि बड़ी हुई कीमतों के कारण हमारे देश की जनता परेशान है और उस को मुसीबतों और परेशानियों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। हम उन कठिनाइयों को दूर करने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। अगर हमारे प्रयास जान-बूझ कर कम होते, अगर हमारी ओर से बड़ी गलतियाँ होतीं, तो मैं इस अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव या सरकार की अलोचना के औचित्य को स्वीकार करता।

लेकिन यह प्रश्न नहीं है। आज प्रश्न यह है कि इस मुल्क में एक विचारधारा के लोग, कुछ राजनैतिक दलों के लोग, एक संगठित और नियोजित रूप से इस देश की जनता के मनोबल को तोड़ना चाहते हैं, यहां निराशा और मायूसी का वातावरण और माहोल पैदा करना चाहते हैं।

हमारा देश एक संकट के दौर में से गुजर रहा है। हमारा देश पिछले दो वर्षों में कोई मामूली संकटों के दौर से नहीं गुजरा है। उस को आक्रमण का—ऐसे आक्रमण का, जो साधारण आक्रमण नहीं था—सामना करना पड़ा। इस के अतिरिक्त देश को एक असामान्य सूखे का सामना करना पड़ा। श्री वाजपेयी इस बात को जानते हैं। श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु शायद इस को मानने से कार कर दें, क्योंकि सच्चाई से शायद उन का कोई वास्ता नहीं है और वह सब कुछ जान कर भी उस की ओर से आँख बन्द करना जानते हैं।

इस अवधि में हमारे देश के लाखों कोड़ों मीठ लोग सूखे के शिकार हुए।

लाखों करोड़ों लोगों को सैकड़ों मील की दूरी से पीने का पानी पहुंचाना पड़ा। उस संकट के जमाने में इस सरकार ने पांच अरब पया जनता पर खर्च किया, ताकि उस के रोटी के सबाल को हल किया जा सके, उस की जिन्दगी की कठिनाइयों को दूर किया जा सके। यह एक बहुत बड़ा प्रयास था।

हम यह न भूलें—जो हमारे नेता, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, ने इस देश की जनता को बराबर बताया था—कि यह देश महान् है और इस को समस्याएँ भी महान् हैं। उन को हल करने में हमें समय लग सकता है, लेकिन अगर हमारी दिशा ठीक हो, हमारा इरादा पुख्ता हो और हमारी नीति और हमारे कार्यक्रम जनता के हित में हों, तो हम आगे बढ़ सकते हैं।

श्री वाजपेयी ने एक गम्भीर आरोप लगाया। उन्होंने कहा कि सरकार के कारनामों की वजह से इस देश में जनतंत्र खतरे में है, जनता में निराशा की भावना पैदा हो रही है, प्रधान मंत्री खुद इस देश में हिमा का वातावरण पैदा कर रही हैं। मैं आप को 1967 और 1971 के बीच के जमाने की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ, जब हम इस देश में कठिनाइयों के दौर से गुजर रहे थे, जब हमारी जनता हम से निराश हो रही थी और उस ने कांग्रेस को छोड़ कर एक बेहतर विकल्प की तलाश की थी। उस समय ये पार्टियाँ मुश्तलिफ रंगों में, मुश्तलिफ कार्यक्रमों के साथ, मौकापरस्ती की बुनियाद पर शासन में आई थीं। सारे देश में लगता था कि प्रजातंत्र टूट रहा है। इस देश में ही नहीं, देश के बाहर भी कुछ शक्तियाँ यह उम्मीद लगाये बैठी थीं कि भारत में प्रजातंत्र की जड़ें हिल रही हैं, कमजोर हो रही हैं, आज सूबों में जो अराजकता की हालत हो रही है, वह कल दिल्ली में होने वाली है।

ऐसे वातावरण में इस देश की जनता की भावना को पहचान कर, उस की कठि-

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

नाइयों का एहसास कर के, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने—हमारे देश के नेता ने, कुछ कदम उठाये। आज उन की भी आलोचना की जाती है। श्री वाजपेयी ने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इस देश को चुनाव की विभीषिका में झोंक दिया। 1971 में विरोधी दलों की ओर से यह चुनौती दी गई थी कि प्रधान मंत्री को बहुमत प्राप्त नहीं है, देश की जनता उन के साथ नहीं है, उन को जनता के सामने जाना चाहिए। आप को याद होगा कि उस जमाने में कितने अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव इसी सदन में पेश किये गये, कितनी बार प्रधान मंत्री से इस्तीफा मांगा गया, कितनी बार सरकार से त्यागपत्र देने के लिए कहा गया।

प्रधान मंत्री ने इस देश की उस परम्परा में विश्वास करते हुए, जो इस मुल्क को गांधी और जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने दी, है, उस देश की राष्ट्रीय कांग्रेस ने दी है, जनता के आन्दोलनों ने दी है, यह बेहतर समझा कि अगर हम ने इस रास्ते पर चलना है, उन नीतियों को कार्यान्वित करना है, तो हम जनता के सामने जायें। 1971 में प्रधान मंत्री ने विरोधी दलों की चुनौती को स्वीकार नहीं किया था, बल्कि उन्होंने जनता के सामने जाना अपना कर्तव्य समझा था। उन को इस देश की जनता पर यकीन, भरोसा और विश्वास था। उन्होंने संसद को भंग किया और देश की जनता के सामने गई।

उस समय देश में इस से भी ज्यादा निराशा का वातावरण था। ये आरोप लगाये जा रहे थे कि सरकार ने देश की जनता को धोखा दिया है, सरकार ने इस देश को किसी दूसरे देश के पास बेच दिया है, हमारी किस्मत को बंधक रखा दिया है। जनता के सामने दो विकल्प थे। एक तरफ हमारी पार्टी और हमारे नेता का दिखाया हुआ रास्ता था, जिस में जनतंत्र और संसदीय व्यवस्था में आस्था और उस के अन्तर्गत जनता के लिए उठाये गये कदम, नीतियां और कार्यक्रम थे और दूसरी तरफ ग्रांड एलायंस;

महागठबन्धन, की ताकत प्रतिक्रियावाद, साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियों, निहित स्वार्थों और पैरसे की मिली हुई ताकत थी। यह दो विचारों, दो नजरियों और दो दृष्टिकोणों का टकराव था।

उस अवसर पर इस देश की महान जनता ने यह साबित कर दिया कि वह हमारी पार्टी के साथ है और जनतंत्र में उस का विश्वास है।

आज कहा जा रहा है कि देश में निराशा है, लोगों का मनोबल टूट रहा है, प्रजातंत्र खतरे में है। जो लोग प्रजातंत्र के नाम पर बोलने का दावा करते हैं और प्रजातंत्र की वकालत करते हैं, वे जानते हैं कि अगर इस देश में प्रजातंत्र मजबूत होगा, जनता की चेतना और शक्ति बढ़ेगी, अगर संसदीय व्यवस्था मजबूत होगी, तो ये प्रजातंत्र की दुहाई देने वाले, जिन की मौखिक हमदर्दी और सहानुभूति प्रजातंत्र के साथ है, कहीं दिखाई नहीं पड़ेगी। सही बात तो यह है। इसलिए प्रजातंत्र के नाम पर प्रजातंत्र के खिलाफ काम करने वाली ये ताकतें हैं।

हमारे मित्र ज्योतिर्मय बसु ने कहा कि इस देश में केन्द्र सरकार के पास रिजर्व पुलिस क्यों है? क्यों करोड़ों रुपया उस के ऊपर खर्च होता है? इस देश की जनता ने केन्द्र की सरकार को, जो हमारी पार्टी की सरकार है, उस को देश का शासन संचालन करने की जिम्मेदारी दी है। बंगाल के अन्दर जिस वक्त ज्योतिर्मय बसु की पार्टी की सरकार थी, उस वक्त अगर ऐसी शांति और व्यवस्था की हालत बन सकती है कि मूरज छिपने के बाद बंगाल की हमारी मां और बहनों का सड़कों पर चलना अरक्षित हो जाए, वहां लोगों का जीवन चलना मुश्किल हो जाय, वहां की जनतांत्रिक व्यवस्था खत्म हो जाय.....

श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु (डायमंड हार्बर)
अभी दिल्ली में क्या हो रहा है ?

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : बंगाल की वह सरकार अगर वहाँ की जनता की शांति और व्यवस्था की, उनकी इज्जत और मर्यादा की और उनके जीवन की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती थी, तो मैं इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि अगर इस देश के किसी भी भाग में चाहे किसी भी पार्टी की सरकार वहाँ हो, अगर वह सरकार शांति-व्यवस्था बनाने में असफल हो जाती है, जनता की सुरक्षा नहीं होती है, तो एक करोड़ नहीं एक अरब रुपया भी अगर खर्च करना पड़े तो केन्द्रीय सरकार को करना चाहिए देश की जनता की रक्षा के लिए। उस के लिए हमें कोई शर्म नहीं है, उस के लिए हमें कोई परेशानी की बात नहीं है।

आज एक अजीब सी बात है। मैंने यहां कहा कि यह गठबंधन क्यों? इस गठबंधन की बात का कल भी मैंने जरा सा संकेत किया था। उत्तर प्रदेश का चुनाव और उत्कल का चुनाव, इस का स्वप्न इन को दिखाई पड़ता है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है, शायद अटल बिहारी जी बतायेंगे, कि जब से निक्सन और चाउ एन लाई के हाथ मिले हैं तब से शायद ज्योतिर्मय बसु और अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के हाथ मिलने लग गए हैं। इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव में उस का कुछ आभास हमें दिखाई पड़ता है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री समर गुह (कंटाई) : निक्सन और ब्रेजनेव के हाथ क्यों मिल रहे हैं? "व्यवधान"

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : श्रीमान् अभी मेरे मित्र ने कहा कि निक्सन और ब्रेजनेव के हाथ मिल रहे हैं, वह क्यों मिल रहे हैं? सही बात है मिल रहे हैं। पर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, अटल बिहारी जी ने कल क्या कहा? उन्होंने कहा कि इस देश में ब्रेजनेव आ रहे हैं हमारे राष्ट्र के एक आदरणीय नेता हैं, हम उन का सम्मान करेंगे। उन्होंने एक सही बात कही। मैं उन को फिर से याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ, यह एक अच्छी बात उन्होंने कही। . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : क्या यह सबूत है इस बात का कि माओ और निक्सन के जो हाथ मिल रहे हैं उस से प्रेरित हो कर हम यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाए हैं?

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : जी नहीं। मैं उस बात को नहीं मानता। लेकिन अटल बिहारी जी ने दूसरी बात क्या कही? उन्होंने कहा, ठीक है रूस के नेता आ रहे हैं, लेकिन एक गरीब भारत, एक निर्धन भारत जो अपना डिफेंस नहीं कर सकता, जो भीख मांगता है अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए ऐसा भारत क्या सम्मान देगा?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : भीख मांगता है यह मैंने नहीं कहा।

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : श्रीमान्, मुझे याद आती है, इस देश में ऐसे लोग हैं, बद-किस्मती इस देश की है कि ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्हें अपने देश का गौरव, अपने देश का सम्मान, अपने देश का बड़प्पन दिखाई नहीं पड़ता। भारत गरीब हो सकता है। आज गरीब हम हैं। हम आर्थिक रूप से कमजोर हो सकते हैं। हमारी फौजी ताकत दुनिया में बड़ी नहीं हो सकती है। लेकिन आज दुनिया के अन्दर भारत की प्रतिष्ठा, भारत का सम्मान इसलिए होता है कि भारत ने कुछ आदर्श, कुछ सिद्धान्त दुनिया को दिये हैं। हमें इस बात का गौरव है कि हमारे ही देश के, हमारे ही नेता ने, हमारे ही प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जो पंचशील के सिद्धान्त दुनिया को दिये, आज सारी दुनिया के एक एक देश, एक एक राज नेता इस बात को कहते हैं और किसी भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन में जाइये, श्रीमान्, आप को तो बहुत गौरव इस बात का है, कितने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों में आप गए हैं, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलनों में आज पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को आदर के साथ, सम्मान के साथ लोग याद करते हैं और अभी कुछ ही दिनों पहले की घटना है, श्रीमान्, आप को

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

हमारे अध्यक्ष के रूप में, दुनिया की संसद के लोगों ने अपना अध्यक्ष चुना, जैसा आप ने उस दिन ठीक कहा था कि वह आपका भादर तो था ही लेकिन वह भादर इस देश के प्रति और इस देश की संसद के प्रति भी था, तो इन सारी बातों को वे भूल जाते हैं। मुझे अफसोस होता है।

बाजपेयी जी बड़े राष्ट्रीय विचार के व्यक्ति हैं। मैं उनका सम्मान करता हूँ। लेकिन उनकी राष्ट्रीयता की एक गलत दिशा है, उनकी समझदारी गलत है, अफसोस तो इस बात का है। देश के गौरव, देश के सम्मान, देश की उपलब्धियां चाहे वे कम हों, उन से आखें बन्द करने की कोशिश वह न करें। राष्ट्रकवि मैथिली शरण गुप्त जी की केवल एक कविता मैं उन्हें याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था :

जिसको नहीं निज देश और निज जाति का
अभिमान है

वह नखीनही है पशु निरा है और मृतक
समान है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : वह जाति
कौन सी है ?

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : वह जाति है
भारत की तमाम जनता, हमारी राष्ट्रीयता
जिसमें हिन्दू भी हैं, मुसलमान, सिख ईसाई
आदि सभी हैं। हम किसी जाति पर नहीं
जाते न हमारी जाति और महत्त्व की कोई
राजनीति है।

अपनी डी० पी० धर साहब ने यहां अपनी
बात कही। कितना अफसोस होता है
हमारे बसु साहब इसको नहीं मानेंगे। श्री
धर इस साज पैरिस गए भी नहीं लेकिन

उन्होंने कहा कि कार उनके डिस्पोज-न पर
और स्टीमर उनकी डिस्पोजल पर। बड़े
अजोबो अन्दाज और लहजे में उन्होंने कहा कि
वह पैरिस गए थे विल का इलाज कराने के
लिये। उनका मतलब था शायद ऐशोभाराम
करने के लिए गए थे। इस तरह की बातों से
अटल बिहारी जी जानते होंगे हिटलर का
साथी गोपवल्स आज जहन्नुम में है या जन्नत
में है, इसकी जानकारी शायद उन्हीं को होगी
लेकिन वह भी शर्माता होगा। इस तरह की
असत्य और निराधार बातें इस सदन में कही
जाती हैं। आज एक सगठित रूप से कारेक्टर
एसेसिनेशन की बात की जाती है।

बार बार मासति की चर्चा की गई,
मैं उस पर अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता। हमारे
मंत्री जी उससे सम्बन्धित हैं वह उसकी बाबत
अपनी बात कहेंगे। लेकिन पिछले दिनों
जब से मासति बना, लगातार और निरन्तर
उसका सवाल उठाया जाता है। क्या कल
के अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के लिए वही सवाल
था जिस के ऊपर ज्योतिर्मयु बसु ने, अटल
बिहारी जी ने और हमारे हीरेन्द्र नाथ मुखर्जी
साहब ने कहा। उन्होंने एक अच्छे तरीके
और अच्छे इरादे से कहा कि अगर सरकार
के ऊपर आरोप होते हैं तो सरकार को या
तो उन को दूर करना चाहिये या चुनौती
देनी चाहिए। मैं तो मानता हूँ उन की बात
को। जो मंत्री पर आरोप लगाए गए उन्होंने
उस का खण्डन किया उस की चुनौती दी और
उन्होंने उन बातों को सदन के सामने रखा।
एक बार नहीं, श्रीमन्, जब से मासति बना
है बराबर एक एक सवाल का स्पष्टीकरण
किया गया है, एक एक चीज बताई गई है।
किस नियम के मुताबिक अधिकरण हुआ,
कैसे उसका कम्पेशन दिया गया, कैसे वह
कम्पनी बनी हुई है, कोई वह जब में रखने
वाली चीज तो है नहीं, अगर वह कम्पनी है तो
कम्पनी है। उसके नियम हैं। हरयाना
सरकार ने केवल मासति के लिए नहीं बल्कि
अपने प्रदेश के उस हिस्से के लिए जमीनें

उपलब्ध की हैं, कम्पेन्शेशन दिया है, भ्रदालतों के अन्दर मामले गये हैं, उसके फैसेले हुये हैं। जो कुछ भी उस के नियम हैं, कानून हैं, देश की जनता के सामने हैं। हीरेन्द्र मुखर्जी साहब से मैं नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ, एक बार नहीं अनेक बार, प्रधान मंत्री ने और इस सदन के अन्दर हमारे मंत्रियों ने उस का स्पष्टीकरण किया है। प्रधान मंत्री ने देश की जनता के सामने उन बातों का स्पष्टीकरण कर दिया क्योंकि व्यक्तिगत रूप से उन का नाम उस के साथ जोड़ा जाता है। लेकिन क्या ये ताकतें इस स्पष्टीकरण से चुप बैठने वाली हैं? क्या उन्हें उस से संतोष होने वाला है? नहीं। वह जानते हैं कि ग्राज सौभाग्य से और उन के दुर्भाग्य से, देश की जनता के सौभाग्य से, भारत के सौभाग्य से और उन के दुर्भाग्य से इंदिरा गांधी इस देश की आशाओं और आकांक्षाओं की प्रतीक बनी हुई हैं। ग्राज उन की प्रतिमा को तोड़ने के माने हैं उन आदर्शों के ऊपर हमला, उन मूल्यों के ऊपर हमला, उन नीतियों और कार्यक्रमों के ऊपर हमला जिस दिशा में वह देश को ले चलना चाहती हैं, उस के ऊपर हमला। उन्होंने एक बार नहीं अनेक बार कहा है कि देश संकट के दौर से गुजर रहा है। उन्होंने इस बात को कहा है कि हम को परेशानियाँ हैं। उन्होंने इस बात को कहा है कि मुझे ठेस लगती है, मझे दर्द होता है। मैं जानता हूँ कि किस तरीके से देश के नौजवानों की बेकारी से उन के दिल को ठेस लगती है। मैं जानता हूँ किस तरीके से इस देश की गरीब जनता ने सब से संकट के काल में हमारा साथ दिया इस में कोई हमारी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, हमारी पार्टी शासन में आती या नहीं आती, इस का प्रश्न नहीं है, लेकिन सन 1971 में वह आदर्श वह सिद्धान्त, हमारे वह मूल्य जिन को चुनौती दी जा रही थी, हमारे लिये वह सब से ज्यादा प्यारे थे, हम उस के लिये लड़ रहे थे। इस देश की गरीब जनता, निरीह जनता, गांव में रहने वाली जनता, निसलर

हो सकती है कमजोर हो सकती है, उस को इतिहास और भूगोल का ज्ञान नहीं हो सकता लेकिन अपने अनुभवों और संघर्षों के अनुभव से इस देश की जनता उन आदर्शों को, उन मूल्यों को धार करती है, उन कठिन परिस्थितियों से निकली है और ग्राज भी जब कि वह परेशानी है, कठिनाइयों के साथ संघर्ष करने में रत है, हम उस के लिये रास्ता निकाल रहे हैं।

क्या हम इस बात को भूल जायेंगे— ग्राज की इन कठिन परिस्थितियों में भी अगर यह देश 53 हजार करोड़ रुपये की पांचवी योजना बना सकता है, अगर यह देश इस बात का इरादा कर सकता है, संकल्प कर सकता है कि इन 25-30 लाख नौजवानों को जो बेकार हैं, उन को रोजगार देना है, अगर यह देश ऐसी स्थिति में जा सकता है कि हम दुनिया के किसी देश के सामने भीख नहीं मांगेंगे, हमारी नीति साफ है, ग्राज से नहीं पहले से साफ है और हम ने कहा है कि हम दुनिया के किसी देश के खेमों में शामिल नहीं होना चाहते हैं, भारतीय जनता और राष्ट्रीय हितों के ऊपर दुनिया की ताकतों के साथ सौदा नहीं करना चाहते हैं।

ग्राज ने ब्रेजनेव साहब का नाम लिया— वे हमारे मिल हैं। सोवियत देश के साथ न केवल हमारे आपसी संबंध सुधरे हैं, न केवल आपसी मदद की है, दुनिया में शान्ति और अमन के लिये, सांप्रज्यवादी ताकतों के खिलाफ, जंग के खिलाफ, दोस्ती के लिये हम ने मिल कर काम किया है सोवियत संघ ने हमारे देश की किसी कीमत पर नहीं कोई शर्त लगा कर नहीं, हमारी नीतियों के अनुकूल मदद की है, हमारा साथ दिया है और ग्राज हम इस स्थिति में हैं कि हम दोनों एक-दूसरे की मदद कर सकते हैं, दोनों का सहयोग कर सकते हैं, केवल दोनों देशों के हित में ही

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

नहीं, दुनिया के हित में सहयोग कर सकते हैं और इस पर हमें गर्व होता है। लेकिन दुख इस बात का है कि इन विरोधी दलों ने हमेशा, पिछले 25 सालों के बराबर यहीं प्रचार किया है यह देश रूस के हाथ बिकता जा रहा है, कम्युनिस्ट हुआ जा रहा है। जब हम वियतनाम युद्ध के खिलाफ आवाज उठाते हैं—तो यही लोग कहते हैं कि हम वियतनाम के लिये क्यों आवाज उठाते हैं। अरब-ईजराइली झगड़ा होता है तो कहते हैं—भारत क्यों आवाज उठाता है। बंगला देश के शरणार्थी आते हैं तो कहा जाता है कि भारत क्यों उन का भार वहन करता है। भारत के—जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक बार नहीं उनके बार कहा है कुछ आदर्श हैं, कुछ असूल हैं, कुछ सिद्धान्त हैं, जिन में ही विश्वास करते हैं। हमारी अपनी कठिनाइयों के बावजूद देश की कुछ परम्परायें हैं—जब हम आजादी को लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे, उस समय अफ्रीका में जुल्म हुआ, गांधी ने आवाज उठाई, जब हिटलर और मुसोलिनी ने जर्मनी में जुल्म किया तो जवाहर ने उस के खिलाफ आवाज उठाई, जब चीन जुल्म हुआ तो जवाहर ने उस के खिलाफ आवाज उठाई। इस देश की शान्दार परम्परायें रहीं हैं। संकट के होते हुए भी बंगला देश के एक करोड़ शरणार्थी भाई-बहनों को गले से लगाया। मैं इन संस्कृति और सभ्यता के अरलम्बरदारों से कहना चाहता हूँ—हम जानते थे हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति खराब है, हम जानते थे—हमारे यहां गल्ले की कमी हो सकती है, हम, 71 शासनव्यवस्था इतना बोझा बरदाश्त करने के काबिल नहीं है, लेकिन जब पड़ोसी देश के एक करोड़ भाई-बहिन, जिनकी जिन्दगी, जिनकी इज्जत अपने मुक में, अपनी धरती पर महकूज नहीं थी, इस विश्वास के साथ, इस यकीन के साथ भारत की सरहद लांच कर भारत की धरती

पर आये कि हमारी इस मुसीबत की घड़ी में भारत के भाई-बहिन हम को अपने गले से लगायेंगे, तो हमने उन को गले से लगाया—यह आदर्श का सवाल था, असूलों का सवाल था। लेकिन आज इस तरह की बातावरण पैदा करना—जैसा श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी साहब ने भी कहा था और मैं भी मानता हूँ यह एक पॉलिटिकल स्टंट है, राजनीतिक चाल है, देश के राजनीतिक वातावरण को बिगाड़ने की एक योजना है यह जानते हुए हुए कि रूस के साथ हमारे संबंध अच्छे हो रहे हैं, उन का एक बड़ा नेता हमारे देश में आ रहा है, हमें उन का सम्मान करना है, उसकी इज्जत करनी है—ऐसे मौके पर इस प्रस्ताव को यहां लाया गया..

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, I am on a point of submission. When an hon. leader of a country is coming it is absolutely wrong on the part of the Congress Party members and the Government to attribute motives on the members of the Opposition. It is absolutely wrong and undignified on their part to do that (*Interruptois*)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): If their arguments are so hollow, let them sit down.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: There is sheer politicking behind this no-confidence motion, and, therefore, this no confidence motion needs to be replied to. This is sheer politicking. They want to malign Government for nothing and that is why they have brought forward this no-trust motion, and they need a political reply for it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: He should not bring in the visit of foreign dignitaries etc. into our internal discussions....

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Why did he not wait for a week? What explanation has he got for this? (*Interruptois*)

आखिर ऐसी क्या जल्दबाजी हो रही थी, एक हफ्ता क्यों नहीं रुके ? एक हफ्ता रुक जाते तो क्या आसमान टूट जाता ?

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव: श्रीमन् में विरोधी दलों से यह आशा करता हूँ, यह उम्मीद करता हूँ कि जब हम ने इस देश में एक संसदीय व्यवस्था को माना है, प्रजातन्त्रीय प्रणाली को माना है, तो विरोधी दलों का काम केवल हर चीज का विरोध करना नहीं है, राष्ट्र के जीवन में ऐसा भी समय आता है जब हम को मिलकर काम करना पड़ता है—लड़ाई का समय आता है, कोई प्राकृतिक आपदा आती है, संकट आता है तो हमें मिल कर, सहयोग से उन कामों को करना पड़ता है—मैं एक ही अनुरोध कहूँगा कि हम कम से कम एक ऐसा रास्ता निकालें—कुछ ऐसे प्रश्न हैं जो जाता से संबंध रखते हैं, जो राज्यों से संबंध रखते हैं, उन पर मिल कर एक साथ काम कर सकते हैं। आप की विरोध की अपनी परम्परा है, अपना अधिकार है, उस को कीजिये, लेकिन इस देश में निराशा और मायूसी का वातावरण पैदा न कीजिये। अगर निराशा और मायूसी का वातावरण पैदा करना चाहेंगे तो जनता में आप का विश्वास कम हो सकता है, लेकिन इस देश की जनता अनेकों बार संकटों से गुजरी है, अनेकों तूफान आये और निकल गये, इस देश की जनता ने अपने सहयोग से, अपनी देशभक्ति से इन चीजों का मुकाबला किया है, उन का सामना किया है, लेकिन आप के लिये यह एक अनपैट्रियोटिक काम होगा। जब देश संकट के जमाने से गुजर रहा हो, जब देश परेशानी में हो, तो केवल छुद्र राजनीति के लिये, पोलिटिकल नारे—बाजी के लिये, काम करना देशभक्ति नहीं है।

इन शब्दों के साथ—मैं चाहता हूँ यह सदन, जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव केवल राजनीतिक

स्टंट के लिये लाया गया है, जिस के पीछे कोई बुनियाद नहीं है, जिस के द्वारा देश के सामने एक गलत तस्वीरपेश करने की कोशिश की गई है—उस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को यह सदन ठुकरा दे।

MR. SPEAKER: I have now to call Shri Sezhiyan to speak....

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): Shri Shamim says that he is going away and so, let him speak earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: So, Shri Shamim will now speak, because Shri Sezhiyan has accepted his precedence.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): Are you calling me, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Since he is going away, I am calling him. But why should he go? I do not think that there will be any plane for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he also saying like Shri Piloo Mody that he is going away so that he could speak earlier?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: No, Sir I have my ticket here. This is the only flight which is going today. All other flights have been cancelled.

MR. SPEAKER: Why should he go? What has he to do at Ahmedabad.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I have a very important piece of work there.

13.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Three Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

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

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is not a very pleasant task for a member of

[Shri S. A. Shamim]

the Opposition to express his confidence in the Government. That I will not do. It is a very unpleasant task to express lack of confidence in the Opposition. That I will do, Sir. But first things first.

There is no doubt, and there can be no two opinions, that this Government has failed the people of this country, that corruption is rampant and that this Government has let down the people. Not only on the front of rising prices, but on all other fronts also, the Government has failed the people. Shrimati Gandhi got a massive mandate. I am sure she got it genuinely. I do not subscribe to the Russian ink theory put forward by Shri Balraj Madhok and supported by my friend, Shri Piloo Mody.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Never. It must be struck off the record.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: But I am sure that the people must have been disillusioned and disappointed with the performance of the Government.

Very recently, only a few days ago, speaking on the adjournment motion, I have spoken my mind about the Government's performance the broken promises and the hopeless state of affairs in the country. I do not want to make amends. I want only to say that during these 10 days, the situation has worsened and it has not improved. That is as far as this Government is concerned. But in everybody's life there comes a moment of truth when he shall speak nothing but truth, and I think my moment of truth has also come, and that moment of truth is that if the Government has failed this country, if Mrs. Gandhi has failed this country, so has the Opposition failed this country.

Sir, the Government has been impeached; the Government has been charged.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): We have not failed.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I will have occasion to mention about your performance also, if you kindly bear with me.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I am following you.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: It is right that the Government has been impeached. The Government has rightly been charged, but I will impeach the Opposition. I impeach the Government; I charge the Government, and I also sense there is a conspiracy between the Opposition and the ruling party to keep the Government in power.

Sir, what is it when people lose faith in the Government they would like to look to? They would like to have a replacement; they would like to have a better Government than they are having. Has this hotchpotch Opposition been able to provide that alternative? The answer is "No". And that is why I say that there is a conspiracy to keep Mrs. Gandhi in power, because people cannot change a Government by listening to parliamentary performance, by witnessing parliamentary performance and listening to brilliant speeches. They would like an alternative.

If I am not letting out a secret, the implications of this no-confidence motion are that Mrs. Gandhi's Government must go and a new Government must come, a new Government from these sides. These are the implications. But I am not letting out a secret if I tell you that this Opposition could not agree upon who will move this no-confidence motion. The Opposition had to fight amongst themselves; one party insisted that it is me. Are we going to tell the people of this country that we are the alternative? I am ashamed. I am fed up with this Government. I do not want this Government to stay for a day, but they have decided to keep this Government at least for three years.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why do you say, "they"?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: It is not within my power. Otherwise, I would say that this Opposition which is trying to replace this Government must provide a viable alternative.

I was in Uttar Pradesh recently. I had occasion to talk to so many people; the people are angry, the people are dissatisfied with this Government. And, as an Opposition Member, I did tell them they must vote this Government out. The answer was, "Yes". We are so distressed; we are so angry; we are so annoyed that we do not want this Government for a day." And they asked, "Who would you recommend, that we should vote for?" I could not tell them that my friend Piloo Mody could be the alternative; they would have laughed and died of laughter. They would have laughed to death. Then I could not tell them Mr. Vajpayee is the alternative because they would have wept and wept to death. I do not want the people to die. We want the people to have a healthy opposition, which is ready to replace the Government which has bungled on all the fronts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like yourself.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Like myself? I plead guilty but have you the courage to plead guilty? No. You try to find scapegoats and say that there is a rise in prices in other countries. You say Bangladesh. If you had the courage of conviction, you would have said that we have bungled and failed.

You have everything; you have money; you have power, but you do not have the moral courage. I am sure that during all these years, three years, you are going to be in power you are not going to develop that also.

I am not very happy with the trend of the debate. It is the job of the Opposition to expose the Government. We have done. But I am sure we have not done it in the most effective manner. Changes have been levelled. It is all right to level charges, but if

the Government misbehaved, if the Government has been unfair, that is no reason for the Opposition to misbehave or to be unfair. We by our own conduct must prove to the rest of the country and to the world at large that we are better people to take over this Government. We have not done that. My very dear friend Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has attacked my arch-enemy, Mr. D. P. Dhar. I would love to join Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu in telling Mr. D. P. Dhar that he has misbehaved. But I am sorry to say this time it is not Mr. D. P. Dhar; it is my dear friend Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu who has misbehaved. I have personal knowledge that Mr. Dhar did not go to Paris but I heard from my dear friend that he did go.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I never said it.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: That is the impression you have created.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You may hold the brief for anybody you choose but do not put words into my mouth.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I had anticipated this interruption. I would have been surprised if the interruption had not come. My learned friend Jyotirmoy Bosu's description and definition of a democrat is that all those who agree with him blindfold are democrats. I have many other things to say about Mr. Dhar; I have spoken against him and I will speak against him in future, but we must be able to carry conviction outside. I am afraid we are not able to carry conviction. The Opposition wants to dislodge the Government; they must; the sooner that is done the better. When I am speaking from the Opposition Benches, I am speaking with an element of anguish.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA (Buxar): Why don't you teach them inside?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I am not their Deputy Leader. People are looking to the Opposition and we must do something. But even on an ideological plane have we anything in common with Mr. Bosu or with Atal Bihari Vajpayee? No. Mr. Shyam-nandan Mishra can tell you about Congress (O) alternative. But I hear a different version from other men from the Congress (O). Madame Tar-keshwari Sinha says something else. Mr. Kamraj hobnobs with the ruling party in Tamilnadu. I did tell people that they must vote for the opposition. But which Opposition Party? Socialist Party? Which brand? Raj-narain brand or Limaye brand? Some of them in the Opposition at this particular juncture are very keen to vote for Mr. Piloo Mody? But Mr. Piloo Mody alone is the party; he is the leader. He is my counterpart, so to say; he is also independent; I am also independent. He is in good company. Nobody follows me nobody follows him.

But the failure of the Opposition to unite to throw the Government out is no solace to the ruling party because they are the repositories of the trust misplaced by the people in them. They have betrayed them. Whether the opposition is equal to the task or not, that is beside the point. The point before the country is whether it is going to have a clean Government. I agree with 98 per cent of the instances quoted by Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, stories of rampant corruption from the Ministers down to Tom, Dick and Harry; it stinks. They talk of the image of the country abroad. One Minister was saying: You must travel by AVRO even at the risk of your life because that is the plane we have made. This is a bizarre argument.

Why am I not associating myself with the no-confidence motion? Because it has certain implications. Parliament should not use such effective weapons just for drama and sensation. I am not associating myself because I do not think that the situation at this stage is ripe enough.

SHRI PILOO MODY: On a point of order. The hon Member has said that he is not associating himself with the no-confidence motion. I do not know why he has been allotted time from our side. It is only natural that he should be allotted time by the Congress Party.

In the order of speakers you should have called one from the opposition.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

SHRI PILOO MODY: It is wrong that he should have been given time from our time. Also I do not think we have any time to give to neutrals either.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When you come here we will do that.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: The leaders of the so-called opposition have taken upon themselves to order their members and other members what to speak and how to speak do not belong to Shri Piloo Mody's party. I belong to a party of conscience. I have no other party. I must say what I feel. If I feel I must criticise the Government I will. If at a point of time I feel "no, I must criticise the opposition", I will not hesitate to criticise the opposition. That is why I have not joined any particular political party. I have the right to criticise the Government, but that I will do when I want and not when Shri Piloo Mody wants. I am also speaking during the time allotted to me and not allotted to Shri Piloo Mody or his party. I am speaking here as an Independent as a matter of right. Perhaps Shri Piloo Mody does not know that I won the parliamentary elections with a greater majority than he has got. So, I

have got a greater claim to the time of Parliament than he has. I say that each member must have the freedom to say what he wants to say. It is not for Shri Piloo Mody to say what I should say.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. My hot-headed friend has misunderstood my point of order. I am not stopping him from saying what he likes. I hope he will dig deep enough into his conscience and say what he wants to say. I am not contesting that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not

SHRI PILOO MODY: You should hear and then rule on my point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are starting right at the wrong end.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You will have to allow me to make my point of order before you give a ruling. My point of order is quite specific. I am not saying anything as to what Shri Shamim should say. I say that in the order in which you call the speakers there is a certain inconsistency, which I am bringing to your notice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I take it that this is a grouse against the Chair; I would not take it that it is a reflection on the Chair.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Not at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now that you have raised the point of order, let me dispose of it. In the first place, I would like to say that calling members to speak is the prerogative of the Chair. I would not like this impression to go out that the Chair is trying to show favour to anybody. In this case we have certain conventions by which we call members to speak according to groups. Shri Shamim has made a special request and Shri Sezhiyan,

who is scheduled to speak next, has agreed to that.

SHRI S A SHAMIM: Sir, I am glad that you have dismissed this point of order with the contempt it deserves. Because, the Independent members have a right to express their own voice and not be tape-recorders of other parties.

Concluding, I would like to say that I have no confidence in the Government. I would like to place this confidence somewhere. I am requesting the members of the opposition to show me the place where I can place my confidence. I cannot live in a vacuum. And what is true of me is also true of the country. The country may be fed up with the Government. But if I beseech Shri Piloo Mody and others to give an alternative, am I committing a sin? I am giving you a place of honour which you do not deserve. I am requesting you to provide an alternative. Shri Basu and Shri Piloo Mody amongst themselves will have to decide whether it is going to be the Swatantra philosophy or the Communist Party-Maxist philosophy which is going to rule this country. In that case, I would give my vote to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and not to you. But Shri Bosu will have to take me as an independent with him so that I can present my views here.

The Parliament is an important forum. It should not be used just to win debating points only. Yes, debating points—we have been winning and losing at times. But what is more is that this important forum should be used for effective measures carrying conviction outside. What is happening today? I would like to quote a very famous British Member of Parliament Mr. Wood Knot Well. What is true of British Parliament is, more or less, true of this Parliament, or it is becoming so. He said:

“This Parliament is an increasingly irrelevant garage a repository of illusions and a graveyard of talents, that is out of touch with

[Shri S. A. Shamim]

the complex needs of modern society."

In conclusion, having said what I had to say about the Government, I still consider myself in spite of Mr. Piloo Mody, belonging to this side and I am asking my friends to prepare themselves for a bigger role.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta South): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the No-Confidence Motion moved by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu belonging to the C. P. I. (M) group in Parliament and supported by many other Opposition parties, excepting the C. P. I. has been under discussion since yesterday. Many Members on the Congress side and on the Opposition side have spoken on it.

It is a fact that the Members of the Government party accepted at the time of the discussion on the adjournment motion that there are difficulties of the people and the people are really feeling and, in some cases, are anxious and they want immediate solution of the price-rise problem. But the No-Confidence Motion brought forward by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, definitely, would not give a new direction to the people, as if people may get relief immediately, if the Government resigns or if the Government, according to the wishes of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, immediately goes, in the event of the House accepting the No-Confidence Motion, and vacating the office immediately. The people will also demand to know what actually the Opposition parties will give to the nation at the moment, any programme, any policy, any new direction, or only speeches.

I used to know that the C. P. I. (M) group of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) group. But now I find for the last 1½ years the C.P.I. (M) group stands for: 'C' for 'Congress' phobia, 'P' for 'Police' phobia, 'I' for 'Indira' phobia and 'M' for 'Maruti' phobia. These are the four

phobias from which they are suffering for the last about two years—the 'Congress' phobia because they were badly defeated in 1971-72 elections in West Bengal; the 'Police' phobia because they tried to utilise police for their own purposes for two years in West Bengal and, ultimately, they were exposed; the 'Indira' phobia because so long as Mrs. Indira Gandhi heads this Government, the chances of their survival are less and the 'Maruti' phobia because of the two car projects in India, one small car project, that is, Maruti Limited vs. the big monopolistic project, that is, the Hindustan Motors Limited. They are making accusations against Maruti. It is not accusing Mrs. Indira Gandhi personally; it is not accusing the Government but it is because they are to accuse as they have been paid, they have been briefed, by Birlas, the monopoly houses, who do not want a small-car project and they want to curb the young engineers' talent in the field of car technology or any other such field.

These are the basic conceptions of the C. P. I. (M) group. Then yesterday, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu raised certain questions saying that the Government was anti-democratic and that anti-democratic character has been projected by the Government. The only fault is that the Government is protecting anti-democratic forces in the name of democracy, the anti-democratic force of the C.P.I. (M) for the last 1½ years. Further, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu raised a question that the Government is protecting hoarders and black-marketeers and that the Government is allowing black-marketeers to create a more difficult situation. I would like to submit that exactly at the time when Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu yesterday moved the No-Confidence Motion in the House, at that time, in West Bengal, three or four hoarders and black-marketeers were arrested by the

Government. Who went to release them from the court? The House should know that it is the leading Member of the C. P. I. (M) who went to the court to get them released. (*Interruptions*) I can disclose the name, if you want. It is the leading Member of the C. P. I. (M) who went to the court.

I would like to put another fact before the House. One month ago when the young members of the Congress party gheraoed a market to detect five hoarders and they were arrested and paraded in open streets the leading members of the CPM Group, together with a panel of lawyers not only telephoned to the police and the Food Minister but they were also present before me in the court for their release on bail; they demanded it.

What I want to say is that this Party is definitely in league with those who want to corrupt the atmosphere and make the situation difficult to Government; they want to disturb the whole set-up, whether it is distribution or procurement. They have thrown a challenge that they will procure more than what Government wants to procure. I accept their challenge. Let us break the target of the Government and procure more by the joint initiative of Communist Party of India, the CPM, the Jan Sangh and the Congress. Jan Sangh was silent during wheat procurement. They went to the farmers and also the Farmers' Association and asked them not to sell the wheat to Government. They provoked the people to create riots in Nasik and in many other places in northern India. I know of two or three incidents.

Again, yesterday, Jan Sangh took the second line. I am not accusing Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu. His party is a small one; they are acting as a retail agent of the wholesale party of Grand Alliance Jan Sangh. Jan Sangh has successfully managed the game. Yesterday at Shahdara what happened?

I am not accusing the Jan Sangh for their motives because it is a Party made for such things; there cannot be any motive; the Party stands for this; whosoever comes forward with any progressive policy or atmosphere, they should destroy it. In Shahdara the day before yesterday some students definitely gheraoed some boys of Jan Sangh and also the Jan Sangh's local office there for certain activities of Jan Sangh people, by RSS Vidyarthi Parishad. Whether the police were silent or active, is a matter for the Home Ministry to investigate. To take revenge for that, the Jan Sangh people organized a gang yesterday, not to attack the police station because the police was inactive or active but to compel the police to create a situation in the city which can ultimately lead to them in Delhi University Campus led by the Vidyarthi Parishad boys, destroying the whole atmosphere before Mr. Brezhnev's arrival. I do believe that there are, in this, the hands of those who want to destroy the atmosphere and situation at the moment and they are in league with Jan Sangh and also CPM.

I want to know, if the Government resigns on the basis of this motion, what alternative will Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu give to the people? Joining hands with Jan Sangh? What have they done in West Bengal? What are they going to do in Orissa? In the motion only the elections of Orissa and U.P. have been mentioned and not Manipur or any other place. It clearly shows the motive of the CPM and the actual exposition of the Jan Sangh for which they stand.

I do believe that in this country the way we are functioning, it is very difficult; we have to work with the cooperation of all political parties. Our Prime Minister, not once but repeatedly, has said, 'I want the cooperation of every one and even suggestions as to what should be done at the moment'. We know that the black money is operating everywhere. We know of retired officials, those who

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi]

have the lowest amount in the Provident Fund, building houses in Vasant Vihar and many other places of India. There is no doubt that there is a tremendous flow of black money which is polluting the whole atmosphere. But I would ask one thing. In a crisis like this, is it the task of only the Government and the ruling party to protect democracy? Is it also not the task of those who are opposing the Government to strengthen the hands of democracy? Is it the task of only Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the Congress Government to procure wheat and rice from every village? Is it also not the task of Jan Sangh and CPM to make this policy a success? I would like to know to how many villages Jan Sangh and CPM volunteer friends went to make Government's policy of procurement of foodgrains—wheat and rice—a success? They are charging our Government in West Bengal, the Government of Dr. Siddhartha Shankar Ray, and they are also charging our Government at the Centre. I want to know, when they were in power, whether they had taken any decision to take over procurement of rice or had procured more than what Government is procuring today. What is the production today? Our production in the eastern part, in Assam and Bengal, averages 30 lakh tonnes, and we have already declared that we will procure six lakh tonnes. What did they procure when there was a bumper crop? They had completely failed in that. It means that they are not only ineffective but they also want to make the whole administration ineffective; they want to pollute and vitiate the whole atmosphere. This was clear from the filthy languages and the derogatory remarks which he used to assassinate the character of our leaders.

I am glad that our Party and the Government have the courage enough to bring the Ministers to the floor of the House and give the necessary explanation. They have given it. But I want to know about their leaders, those who have committed mischief

and blunder. Fortunately, people did not send them to the Parliament. They are outside the Parliament. If any trial was conducted for them by any committee, the whole Party will be shifted away from the Indian sub-continent. I know it. But the problem is that in the framework of the Indian democracy they are allowed to function. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, unfortunately, is in the Marxist Communist Party. I do not know the philosophy of Karl Marx to which Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu belongs.

Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu accused the Government of class character. He tried to assassinate the character of Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra and of Shri D. P. Dhar. I do not want to try to assassinate his character because I had my education in this Party and this Party at least gave me something which is called political education, not the education which Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu got. I want to know the way he did yesterday, our Ministers replied to it. I know he will again do it because he cannot avoid it. He is neither Marxist nor a Leninist, nothing. His whole career has always been a career of an opportunist and he is going to destroy the Marxist Communist Party also. I am sure of it... (*Interruptions*). His speech of yesterday has not been accepted and approved by his own Party leaders. I know it. The way he made the speech yesterday, he wants all the Members of Parliament to emulate. Yesterday, I was ready to go to a film, a comedy, going on in Delhi, but the moment I came to know that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu would speak, I decided to come to the House to listen to his speech because that will give me a better recreation than to go to the picture house. I did not expect that he would produce all the things that are present in a commercial film—sex, scandal, nasty things and song. Of course, music he cannot because of his tone... (*Interruptions*) One thing I am glad about. Whatever remarks Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu made.

they were not against the Government; they were out of his own will, the will by which he is being predominated in his Party. He is a great leader, a leader who is bringing no-confidence motion against the Government. What sort of leader is he? His Party gave the dictum, 'Go and court arrest in Calcutta demanding justice for the poor peasants'. All of them, I am glad, have gone and led the people to court arrest. But he did not. He said, 'There are naxalites in the jail. Outside the jail there are the Congress people. They are exposing me and inside the jail there are naxalites and my only safest place is the decorated and the privileged floor of this House' (Interruptions) I know it. But that is not the way to expose the Government.... (Interruptions).

So, I submit that this no-confidence motion is politically motivated and it is a dangerous thing and especially, at the time of such a crisis, it is not fit enough for any democracy, more so for a parliamentary democracy or for regulating the democratic government (Interruptions). But I do believe that whatever steps the Government have taken are not adequate, but adequate steps would be taken very soon to-day or tomorrow and I believe this is no time for a compromise. This is no time for a compromise with those forces who speak for democracy but are out to destroy democracy. This is not time for a compromise with those who speak for industrial progress but who ultimately want to monopolise the whole industrial sector. But, unfortunately, compromising all these things, we have produced, the society has produced industrialists like Mr. K. K. Birla, a Congoist like Mr. Patil and a Marxist like Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu. It is the fault of the society. I know it. It is because of the compromise. This is no time for a compromise. It is time for confrontation. The country is facing a crisis, the crisis is leading to confusion and let the confusion lead us to confrontation and let the confrontation

lead us to revolution. I really believe in it and all the democratic forces will join us and even if it is 'so, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu's party and the Jana Sangh will never co-operate with any of the programme of the Government whether it was the Government of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or it was the Government of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri or it is the Government of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Even if they do not co-operate, let us accept the challenge and in the words of Rabindranath Tagore: *Jadi Tor Dak Sune keo Na Aase Tabe Ekla Chalore*. Let us go alone. We shall face the people. We shall definitely stand by the people. Who said that the people are not with us? I do agree that when people do not get food in the villages of Maharashtra or when people do not get drinking water in Orissa, naturally they do not feel inclined to greet the Minister of the Government whether he belongs to the Congress Party or any other Party in a manner that he deserves, but the Ministers and the members of my Party are ready to go to the people and explain, 'it is for this reason, you are hungry' and 'It is for this reason you are not getting food'. I would like to share my food with you, please wait. But I do believe we do not like to depend upon foreign aid. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu must explain to the House as to how much foreign aid we used to get during 1967-68 and how much we are getting now. Now, we are paying the debts. Unfortunately, our plan economy is oriented in a manner in which we have to depend most on the western power, I mean, the Americans and as a result of which our country faced a serious crisis in 1969 and we declared to the people that it is wrong and we would like to change the whole set up. The 1971 revolution in the Congress Party and the revolution in the Government was not a revolution for the election victory.

It is a revolution to change the old system and to bring in a new order and that new order cannot be generated within 2 years. While you have to face drought, while you have to face

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi]

foreign aggression, you have to create an atmosphere, to educate the people in a new manner, in a new dimension. For that the Government wants to have the cooperation of all the progressive political forces. My learned friend from the opposition should understand this thing. Has it ever happened in the history of the world, in any country, that a change of politics, of new economic confrontation has taken place within a short span of 2 and a half years?

Our Administration is corrupt some cases we know it; in some cases officers do not listen; we know in some cases politicians too do not do the correct things. But the overall change was the slogan of 1971 election to Parliament. It was not election-oriented. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu said that Congress Government's programme is election-oriented, not production-oriented. I accept that election orientation means the will of the people, which is expressed in their votes, which will ultimately accept the Government or throw away the Government. We are ready to accept that challenge. People are with us.

I am sorry Mr. Bosu and the Jan Sangh Leader, Mr. A. B. Vajpayee chose this chance at the moment when a fresh initiative is going on. The Fifth five-year plan is going to be started in 1974. They are doing this at a time when discussions on economic cooperation are going to be held with friendly countries, with socialist countries. They are supporting those deliberately who said, let the public sector go on losses.

They are supporting those who are waiting to see that our procurement programmes fail. They are helping those people who are waiting to see that the harmony and the integrity of the people be destroyed. That is what they are doing. I charge them. The Jan Sangh party's and the CPM party's cooperation is not a cooperation of theory or philosophy. It is not a cooperation of vote orientation. It is a cooperation of those forces in India against whom we fought in 1971

against whom we are standing and against whom we shall fight till the last. It is a contradiction. We are ready to prove it. If there is corruption within us, our party is able enough to rectify it. What is it that they are charging? It is only in our Government where a Minister did something wrong, we removed him from Ministership. I feel proud of my party. If a comrade of my party does something wrong or takes the law into his hand, my Chief Minister, my Government, does not spare him to move in a free society but put him in jail. What did they do when they were in power? They killed thousands of working class. Now Mr. Samar Guha's party, Socialist Party, joins hands with CPM. Do they not know what CPM did in Bengal to kill their own friends. Professor Samar Guha every time wears Netaji's symbol. I salute him. Sir, he is a great patriot. He loves Netaji. But if Netaji would have been with us today somewhere in Bengal or some other place, he would have seen that Professor Samar Guha is speaking for a national programme, national socialist movement, with the ideal of Netaji, and on the other hand, conniving with the communalist heterogeneous elements and forces outside, and those who are representing the Marxist Communist party. Netaji would have left him. Mr. Samar Guha also would have left that gang. I know it. I know Professor Guha is not liking this sort of harmony with the CPM but he cannot say it. He has no young followers. I appeal to him, let him dissociate with this system, let him destroy this system.

This No-Confidence Motion shows that they have no confidence in the people. That is number one. Number two is, they have no confidence in their workers. They cannot control party workers. The party workers are failing them, particularly Jyotirmoy Bosu. They have told Jyotirmoy Bosu: Sir, you told us that we don't accept the Congress Government in West Bengal, it is a bogus Government. Again you inspire us, vote against the Congress Government. What is this? Is this hypocrisy? One day you told us there is no vote cast for the Congress. Only a few days ago they spoke before a public meeting: Oh, how many votes you gave for the congress? What are you getting now? So, I say, they are really hypocrites. They cannot control their workers. They have no confidence in the workers, nor have they confidence in the people. They have only confidence on their alliance which they are going to do with some other forces within the country.

They will not be able to jeopardise our country's progress. I think wisdom will dawn on the Marxist Members, I mean the C.P.M.; to withdraw this no-confidence motion. Lenin, though; he stood for revolution; he always pleaded for the cooperation of the larger progressive forces even in a national democratic front. I hope that wisdom of Lenin or Karl Marx will dawn on Shri Bosu to withdraw the no-confidence motion. If that does not permit them to do so, then I can only express my sorrow. In our country there are Members of Parliament, there are Ministers; there are officers and there are police forces who try to do something, but they are not permitted by their Group or Party Members. Shri Bosu, perhaps; has been trying to do that sort of thing in that Group. I am sorry for it. I believe that our Government will follow the correct policy and we know where the danger lies. We are ready to fight that out and we are ready to sacrifice. Let us not depend on foreign aid. We are starving and if this is true, then let us starve more

without taking the aid of U.S. Let us not bind our hands with U.S. for their aid for years and years. Let us have self-restrained economy and let us be self-reliant for the requirements of the country. For that reason I believe cooperation of everybody is a must. Our friends here are not cooperating but they go on trying to confuse the minds of our people taking advantage of their illiteracy and taking to them that the policies followed by Government headed by Shrimati Indira Gandhi are wrong.

It is not wise on the part of the Opposition to confuse the people's minds. They should allow the people to cooperate with Government in the tasks undertaken by the Government. If there is something wrong in the policy of Government let them correct us. Food is a national cause for the people. For the cause of the people's movement, let us have the cooperation of all the forces—whether it is the C.P.M., J.S. or any other party. If they do not cooperate with us and if they go on doing things in this manner, then we cannot help that. We have to take a right stand in all matters. I would request through you that let us not wait before it is too late and before the situation gets aggravated but let us take up the challenge and not compromise ourselves by a constant confrontation and go ahead with our programmes in a better way.

With these words I believe that Members of Opposition who have moved this No-confidence motion will withdraw. If they do not withdraw that, at least they should be prepared to cooperate with us. And let the people see whether we are taking the right course or not for the larger interests of the people.

With these words I conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, I have a personal explanation to offer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No please.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It has been allowed in the case of others.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hear me first. I do not know under what circumstances personal explanations were allowed here. I shall go by the rules and well laid directions of this House. If you want to make personal explanation you should write it down on a nice piece of paper and send it on to me for my consideration and then you will read it out. But, no debatable matter can be raised. I cannot allow it off-hand.

I see that you are in the list of speakers.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am not violating your directives.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please listen to me. You are disobeying me because I am on my legs and you are not sitting down. Now I say that you are in the list of speakers. And you can take that opportunity of replying to these things. Why take it up now? Please cooperate. Mr. Sezhiyan.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, while supporting the no-confidence motion moved by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, at the outset I would like to make one thing very clear regarding the reference made by the respected professor H. N. Mukherjee yesterday that this seemed to be a pre-meditated demonstration on the eve of the visit of the representative of a friendly country to our land. On behalf of the DMK, I want to say even now that we join others in the Government and outside in extending a hearty welcome to Mr. Brezhnev, and we reiterate our firm support to the Indo-Soviet friendship which we have all accepted. When the resolution came in this House on the Indo-Soviet friendship treaty, we wholeheartedly gave our support to it. Nothing has been done to reverse our opinion. We still stand by that, and I hail the visit of Mr. Brezhnev to this country as furthering the interest of peace in this region of the world.

Therefore, let us not cloud the issue here with any foreign country.

This is a motion against the performance of the Government, against not even the individual Ministers but the ministry as a whole. It is a motion on the performance of the Government or Ministry that we are discussing here. Therefore, I do not want this motion to be treated as anti-Soviet or pro-Soviet. Let us not bring those issues into this motion. This is the first thing that I want to make very clear at the very outset.

I am also not unaware of the arithmetic of the strength of the various parties here and the outcome of the no-confidence motion. But on that score, the Opposition is not precluded from making criticism of the Government, whether it be in the form of a censure motion or in the form of a no-confidence motion.

Also, again and again, we hear some hon. Members saying that a motley array of the Opposition is trying to bring a no-confidence motion against the Government. I do not want to say much on it. If my hon. friends were to analyse, in the ruling party itself, they would see the same motley representations. Apart from this, it is no consolation, it is no solace and it is no argument to say that on the one side we have got the CPM and the Swatantra, the Jan Sangh and the Congress (O), the DMK and the Muslim League. The point of discussion here is not the unanimity of the Opposition but the performance of the Government. If my hon. friends have anything to say on that, let them say it. Otherwise, this will boomerang on the Congress (R) also, because in the State of Tamil Nadu where a non-Congress Government is functioning, month after month, session after session, some censure motion or some no-confidence motion comes up, and often times, the no-confidence motion is brought forward by the Swatantra and wholeheartedly supported by the Congress R, the Congress (O) and other Members there. This does not mean that they have all come together. I would not say so.

Therefore, let not hon. Members come forward with the argument of motley array and so on. If that argument were to be accepted, then logic will lead my hon. friends to an unenviable position in the State of Tamil Nadu where times without number, they have joined other parties like Swatantra, Congress (O), etc in the no-confidence motion.

Even before the no-confidence motion could be brought forward here, on which we are to discuss the performance of the Government, the hon. Prime Minister has in her Mathura speech almost passed no-confidence against all the Opposition parties. While laying the foundation-stone of the biggest refinery in India at Mathura on October 2, the birthday of the revered Father of the Nation, the Prime Minister has made some trenchant remarks. The press report says:

"Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi today hit out at the Opposition parties, which, she said, did not have any programme, were not interested in ameliorating the lot of the poor and were against socialism."

At least while laying the foundation-stone of a refinery, this kind of unrefined remarks could have been avoided. One may not agree with the Opposition, just as we in the Opposition do not agree with many of the things that Government have said or done. But on that score to say that the Opposition parties do not have any programme, they are not interested in ameliorating the lot of the poor and are against socialism is not fair. I for one would like to know whether from 1971 onwards or even from 1962 onwards,—because I have been here from 1962 onwards—we have opposed any of the socialistic measures brought forward by Government. I have gone through the list of all the Bills that have been passed in this House. As many as 84 Bills were passed in 1971 and many Bills have been passed thereafter.

Let anybody point out on instance where the DMK has opposed any socialist measure brought in this House. I can name a number of pieces of legislation where we gave wholehearted support to the Government. There are the Constitution amendments, the Coking Coal Nationalisation Bill, the Payment of Gratuity Act, the Rulers of Indian States (Abolition of Privileges) Bill, the Nationalisation of General Insurance Bill, the Payment of Bonus Act and so on. I can cite many other legislations, where we gave wholehearted support to Government. We gave wholehearted support to all the socialist measures brought in here. But just because we believe in socialism, it does not follow that we follow you in all the steps that you take. When the Simla Pact was discussed here, we gave unreserved support to it. When the Indo-Soviet Pact was discussed here, we gave Government full support. Therefore, just because we do not agree with you in some matters and just because we sit in the Opposition, I do not think such a charge can be levelled against us.

Without going further into this matter, I would like to quote here an independent and unbiased member of the journalistic profession, Shri G. K. Reddy. He has put it very clearly in *The Hindu*. I think this paper does not belong to any Opposition party, nor is it sympathetic to us in the least. This is what he has written:

"This peculiar feature of the present day Indian politics makes Mrs. Gandhi blame the press and the Opposition for many things that go wrong in the country and smell a deep conspiracy behind all that is being said and written about the Government's poor performance on the economic front. If the abnormal price rise is sought to be explained away as part of the world-wide inflationary pressures, the ruling party's inability to come forward with a response equal to the present challenges is

[Shri Sezhiyan]

blamed on the refusal of the Opposition to co-operate with the Government in the larger national interest."

He says further:

"One of the anomalies of Indian democracy has been that instead of stability, a massive majority breeds complacency and makes the ruling oligarchy both lethargic and indifferent. The strong temptation to wield the big stick to stamp out dissent within the party in the name of enforcing discipline, denounce the Opposition as unpatriotic and anti-people, and browbeat the press by branding its criticism as motivated and malicious has not enhanced the ruling party's prestige or restored the public faith in its capacity to overcome the current crisis of confidence that is sapping the morale of the nation. And the Government has not been able to prevent the impression from gaining ground that it has either already lost or is rapidly losing the grip over the economic situation."

When you are not able to handle the economic situation properly, you have only to blame yourselves, not the Opposition. Even now, I want to know at what stage you wanted the co-operation of the Opposition which was denied and at what stage the Opposition failed you. As Shri Reddy has observed, because of the massive majority, there is a complacency on your part. I can well understand that.

The hon. member who preceded me said at one stage that he had a cinema engagement yesterday but had to cancel it to attend the discussion on the Motion of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu when he knew that it was coming up. If this is the kind of statement that a member comes and makes in this House, I think we can come to our own conclusions.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: He has gone back to the cinema house.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Now I come to more basic problems. The nation's eco-

nomy has plunged into its worst crisis since independence. With galloping inflation, growing unemployment, steep rise in prices, unfulfilled hopes and unkept promises, with wages remaining stationary and prices soaring very high, the country is in a very bad position.

I am not pleading for many other things. I am pleading for the average worker in the factory. I have taken the figures from the Director, Labour Bureau's statements. The wages have been increasing from 1961. These are the average annual earnings of workers employed in manufacturing industries. For 1961, the figure was Rs. 1540, for 1962 it is Rs. 2,112, for 1969 it is Rs. 2,591, for 1970 it is Rs. 2,725. In 1971, it has come to Rs. 2,642. Since 1961, the average income of a factory worker has gone up from Rs. 1540 to Rs. 2642. It is a very good thing. But look at the real wages earned by him. With the base as 100 in 1961, it is seen that the real wages have gone down from 100 in 1961 to 99 in 1971. The real earnings of a worker in a factory, though in the current valuation the average has gone up from Rs. 1,540 to Rs. 2,642, have gone down from 100 to 99. That means, with the increasing requirements and needs, to maintain a bigger family and other things, his real earning or income has gone down. What have you done to mitigate the sufferings of the poor man? This is for the year 1971. In the last two years it would have gone even further down.

In this matter, the various hopes and assumptions made by the Finance Minister and others have not come very true. In the last session when there was an adjournment Motion on the price levels, the Finance Minister Mr. Chavan, was very kind enough to inform the House that this was only a passing phase. I was enthused to learn that it was only a passing phase and that the golden days are not far off. But this time, he said that at least if we are able to peg down the prices at the highest level which they have reached it would be better.

Then, Mr. Subramaniam when he was speaking at Madras, on 12th September, said that the expected prices to fall "substantially" in a few months. I do not know the definition of few "months", but they have not fallen. They have been increasing rapidly like anything.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You had better be a little soft of Mr. Subramaniam. You helped him to come to this House.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: At Krishnagiri. We expected him to deliver the goods, but the expectations have not been fulfilled. That is why I am saying it.

Then, even the Prime Minister, speaking at Supa in North Kanara, on 29th October, is reported to have said that "the worst was over for the country's economy and from the next month onwards things would improve for the better." But, unfortunately, on the very same day, on October 29th, the Reserve Bank of India's Report was published and therein they have given a categorical reply that the prices which have risen are not going to come down. That is the finding of the Reserve Bank in the report published on the very same day when the Prime Minister was speaking in North Kanara.

Therefore, I would like to know from the Finance Minister and this Government what is the strategy that they have adopted and what was the impact, and why the prices are rising like anything. Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, also is puzzled. Speaking on October 27th at Rae Bareilly, she said: "there was some basis for the rise in the prices of certain commodities the production of which was adversely effected, but there was no justification for an increase in the prices of other commodities, the production of which was better than in the past." If you take any book on economics, the first thing they say is that the chief characteristic of inflation is that "the price rise is unforeseen and uncontrolled." I can quote another famous author who has said that "in-

flation means an unanticipated, unprovided, rapid and substantial increase in prices above normal level, where there are no controls. When there are controls, inflation reveals itself in long queues, black markets, hoarding, etc." Therefore at the time of inflation, the chief characteristic is that the price rise appears to come unannounced.

In this regard, the Finance Minister also, who was opening a television station at Poona said, when the people there asked for *roti*, that is, bread and food, said "We are going to bring food and television." I think he would succeed in bringing food on television so that people can see the rich food that they were taking in good old times at least in the picture.

15.00 hours

They say that the opposition does not believe in socialism. In some years there was less of production but the business circles manage to reap huge profits. Take for instance sugar production. In 1970-71 sugar productions was 37.4 lakh tons and 39 leading companies earned a profit of Rs. 8.82 crores; after adjustment of taxes, the profits were calculated by the Financial Express to be Rs. 3.4 crores. Next year, that is in 1971-72, production fell down to Rs. 34.8 lakh tonnes but the profits went up to 19.29 crores; after taxes they amounted Rs. 9.63 crores. Production goes down but profits of the big business go up. Is this the working of socialism in this country?

They say that prices have risen in many parts of the world. The point is that here the rise has been steeper and continuous. In other countries price rise is accompanied by higher wages, more production, more employment and larger supply of consumer goods. In India the reverse seems to be the case.

Many Members referred to the war in Bangla Desh and ten million refugees who came here. I do not want to go into that. I was in the Public

[Shri Sezhiyan]

Accounts Committee and I have some knowledge about these expenditures. I want them to publish a paper giving the quantum of amounts spent on the refugees, how much was the reimbursement, etc. After 1947 holocaust, fifteen million people came here and settled down. Still the economy was able to absorb them. The influx of refugees and the Bangla Desh crisis should not be used as a scapegoat. We supported the work done by the Government; we appreciated the achievements of the Prime Minister in the Central Hall we held a function. But our expenses and expenses should not be repeated day in and day out as an excuse for other failures. It may hurt the feelings of the people of Bangla Desh.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: No one is bringing in Bangla Desh in the last two days of debate.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: My only request is: if you are serious, please quantify the amount. I know it; I do not want to say it myself. If you want, I can give you the figures for the entire operation.

Now I want to make one point clear about my own party. We are being criticised very much on the score of our demand for State autonomy. They say that we are following a divisive policy and that we are trying to revive the separation theory and so on. Our demand for State autonomy is not something new. We fought the elections in 1967 on that basis. In 1971, even when we had an arrangement with the then Congress (R) and fought the elections, we put this very clearly in our election manifesto. We said:

"Although the Indian political system is described as 'Federalism', because the scales happen to be weighted in favour of the Centre and there are impediment in the way of the States functioning effectively in the spheres of Administration and Finance, we are of the opinion that without in any way impairing the objective of an India

strong, only such powers should be entrusted to the Central Government as would enable it to function in those spheres necessary to ensure a strong India. The rest of the powers should be passed on to the States and in order to bring about this position, the Constitution should be suitably reviewed and amended."

We had further stated:

"We would like to make it clear that the demand that the States should have more powers in the sphere of Finance is not impelled by the desire that those in the States should enjoy more powers; on the other hand, our demand for State Autonomy arises because the State Governments are closer to the people and only after the State Governments take over these powers from the Centre, would they be able to serve the people in a manner expected of them."

Therefore, it is not a new demand. We have put it in our election manifesto in 1967 and also in 1971. It is also not a sin to demand for State Autonomy because I am merely repeating what was said by many Congress Members in a Congress Working Committee meeting in 1946 when they passed a resolution on this subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he speaking on the No-Confidence Motion or on the Congress?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Because this charge has been made against us, I want to make our stand very clear. The resolution of the Congress Working Committee in 1946 says:

"The Congress has envisaged a free democratic State with the fundamental rights and civil liberties of all its citizens guaranteed in the Constitution. This Constitution in its view, should be a federal one

with a great deal of autonomy for its constituent units and its legislative organs elected under universal adult franchise."

So, they were also arguing for State autonomy earlier.

I want to make it very clear that we are not against a strong India, we are not against a united India. In fact, we want a strong Centre, if not a stronger Centre, in its own sphere. All the powers that they want, they should have. I am one with the people who say that we should have a stronger Centre.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: Is the demand for a strong Centre the demand of the DMK also?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: We do not want to divide the country, politically or even party-wise.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): Is this his opinion or the opinion of his party

SHRI SEZHIYAN: This is the opinion of the party. We do not want to divide India.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: We are glad you are following the Congress Party Resolution.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: We do not want to divide India. In fact, it is because of the DMK that both Congress (R) and Congress (Q) are coming together in Tamil Nadu. So we are not a divisive force, but a uniting one.

Some hon. Members were saying that we are being influenced by other countries and we are trying to see that American capital comes in. I for one have been always insisting that dependence on foreign capital is injurious to the country. We should try to achieve self-sufficiency and I am one with that view. The suggestion that foreign capital should be invited

is not preached by us but it is preached by Shri C. Subramaniam.

This is what he is reported to have said under the heading, "Opposition to Foreign Collaboration Deplored":

"New Delhi, Oct. 31.

Mr. C. Subramaniam, Union Minister for Industrial Development, today came out with some significant remarks on his attitude both to foreign capital and the tendency to raise an outcry whenever the Government cleared a project to be implemented by a foreign company.

The Minister made these remarks while addressing a press conference on the new Secretariat for Industrial Approvals (SIA) coming into being from tomorrow—i.e. from November 1—"I wish", he said, "We develop a self-confidence that we cannot be exploited by foreign capital."

Therefore, he is the person who welcomes foreign capital in the country. Don't put the blame on us. We are not inviting foreign capital. It is your own Minister who has made this statement. If at all you have got any quarrel with it, you settle it with him before coming here.

As regards this No-Confidence Motion, all the parties on this side have given support to it and, if not formally, informally, the C. P. I. has also given the support in substance and spirit to the No-Confidence Motion.

Many of the people are saying that the C. P. I. has become a hand-maid of the Congress party. I do not think so. They have got an independent status of their own. They are not in the good books of the Government also. I am quoting from the Prime Minister's interview to *Patriot* and *Link* on the occasion of Nehru Jyanti that is, on 14th November, 1973.

[Shri Sezhyan]

There, a question was put:

"Q: One section of the Opposition which supports many of your policies, i.e. the Communist Party of India, they say that when they went into action against hoarding, the police generally roughed them up."

And the Prime Minister's reply was:

"PM: This is true, but as soon as we heard about it, we sort of took (action). What sort of action did they take against hoardings? Our information is, they usually went to the smaller shopkeepers.

They were more concerned with getting kudos rather than that the grain should come out. And then (by such actions) you are encouraging people to take the law into their hands."

This is the opinion of the Government. So, C.P.I. are not there. They are in the Opposition. Don't try to divide us. The C.P.I. also belongs to our side.

A massive mandate was given to this Government on the slogan of *Garibi Hatao*. I was one of those who wanted this to succeed. The country has not grudged you any of the powers that you want. You have got a two-third majority here. Even if some of the parties on the Opposition are against your moves, you can always put through your socialist programme. You have got a big majority here. We will be there to help you. We have been helping you all along. If you fail to do that, if it is not our fault. It is your fault. You have failed in the socialist programme; you have failed in your *Garibi Hatao* programme given to the country.

Lastly, I would like to quote from the *Patriot* because if I take any other paper, it may not be acceptable to the Congress party. This has been published on 14th November, 1973, on the occasion of the Nehru Jyanti.

If I had been the editor, I would not have put it at least on that day when the Nehru Jyanti was being celebrated. Strangely enough, that paper has come out with a true sentiment.

Writing about late lamented Jawaharlal Nehru, it says:

"He had also the courage to lay the foundations of planning with a clear perspective of economic independence combined with social justice. For this momentous voyage, he set the keel boldly in the mid-fifties. If the goal is still far away, if the ship has made little progress, that is mainly because those who came after him allowed themselves to be led astray by powerful vested interests, both indigenous and international."

The whole country knows who came after Jawaharlal Nehru to man this Government. To them this compliment is paid.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am rising for a very brief intervention in the debate on this no-confidence motion. Of course, in the body of the motion itself, they have made a mention of some of the economic factors or economic reasons for moving this motion. But the major part of the speech of the Mover—I had heard him with care—was motivated more for political purposes and intended merely to use the occasion for character assassination and making wild allegations against the leader of the party. Of course, they have a right to move a motion like this under the Rules of Procedure and even according to the right of making use of the Parliamentary method to voice their views, there is nothing wrong about it. But I hope that those who are moving the no-confidence motion are really aware of the fact that a no-confidence motion is a very serious business. It is not merely a question of making certain worn-out arguments or throwing at the Party

in power certain worn-out allegations and repeating them umpteen times. That is not enough because moving a no-confidence motion means taking the responsibility of providing alternative policies and programmes. Can this group of people who have moved this motion claim to have alternative policies even in the economic field? Have they got any alternative programme?

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, while moving the motion, said that he was speaking on behalf of the Indian people. I have never heard a more interesting joke than this. I do not know what they have to do with the people. These are the very people whose policies and programmes and whose leadership were rejected unequivocally by the people of India for the last 25 years and as recently as 1971. If they want, certainly they have another opportunity in the coming few months when they can try their luck.

SHRI B. P. MAURYA (Hapur):
In U.P., they have no chance

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
I am making a mention of that itself. They can certainly try that. But, at least they cannot say that they are speaking in the name of the people. I think, our party and the leadership of our Party know the people more than what these people can ever dream of because they have nothing to do with the people.

Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, they have made a mention of a certain economic situation developing in the country for the last 1½ or two years. And that situation is the situation of inflation. We have debated this question, we have discussed this question; we have tried to meet some of the arguments advanced by the Opposition. Even some members of our own Party criticised the Government and perhaps rightly. But the point is this. When we are looking at the problem in a deeper manner, asking the Government to resign and

accepting the responsibility by giving alternative policies, one must try to know what exactly is the present economic situation, why it has been brought about like this, and what are the solutions for it. Everybody was asking what was the strategy of the Government to meet the situation. We have, many times, tried to explain the strategy. We have, many times, tried to say how we want to deal with the problem. We are certainly looking at the problems, not with complacency but with a little sense of confidence, because we have to lead the people we have to look after the people. We cannot just give a cry of frustration.

But may I say one thing? As the hon Member, Shri Sezhiyan, was just now speaking, he spoke very well, I must say, but I thought that he was not speaking on the no-confidence motion of this House but as if he was trying to reply to the no-confidence motion against his Party. Well, if he cannot get that opportunity there, possibly we have provided him that opportunity here.

The point that he tried to define was inflation which is something unanticipated and unprovided for. . . (Interruptions) Price rise, yes, that is exactly what we are discussing. The point you have raised in the no-confidence motion is the same issue. The price rise is reflected in the inflation or inflation, as it is, is reflected in the price-rise (Interruptions) If inflation is a common factor for all the economic situations in the world to-day, for many years it has been there and it is going to remain there for quite some time. If it is unanticipated and it is unprovided for, that I am prepared to accept this description, that itself gives the answer to the situation, because this was not something which was anticipated and this was something which was not provided for because this has come suddenly and unexpectedly. Therefore, when we say that it is a passing phase—things which have come unexpectedly and

[Shri Yashwantrao Chavan]

unprovided for are always a passing phase, it is in that sense that we should try to understand the situation.

Upto the end of 1971 there were any shortcomings in the economy and there were many distortions in the economy but the seriousness of the problem which we are facing today was not of the same proportion at that time. Suddenly from the beginning of 1972, the situation certainly became a little difficult and certainly it is very difficult even now I do not deny it. It is no use running away from the responsibility. Maybe that whatever we have done so far to meet the situation is not enough. I am prepared to accept it and I concede it. Certainly we have to make more efforts about it. Whatever may be the deficiencies in the policy we have to correct them and for that matter whatever blame we have to accept, I will accept it on behalf of the Government. I have no reservations on it. But what is the answer to the situation? What is your explanation? How do you analyse the present situation? The present situation, if it is analysed properly, has arisen out of two very difficult situations. If I try to again mention those things, they will say that I am repeating the same things. What can we do? We are dealing with history and history does not produce fictions and you cannot meet the situation with the help of fiction.

The economic situation arose because of a certain difficult situation on the front of supplies. When we are dealing with the problem of prices particularly, naturally we have to deal with the problems on the front of demands and on the front of the supplies. There were certain factors on the side of demand which are responsible for it and there are certain factors on the side of supply which are responsible for it and you have to deal with both these factors. But, particularly, in

a country like ours, in a developing economy like ours where a large population has to be looked after and particularly, where the large population is below the poverty line and where supplying them with the material of food articles itself becomes an important matter of the family budget, in a country like this, the factors which are responsible for the supply, the shortages, the wages and the shortages of mass consumption goods become very important factors. And it is this shortage which, really speaking, is reflected in the food production. That was mainly responsible for it.

In order to deal with this problem, we took certainly some very courageous steps. The important step was the wheat take-over. What was the attitude of many political parties on that side at that time? Even when we decided to take over the wheat trade, we had certainly anticipated that some of these forces which were then dealing with the wheat trade, possibly might divert the resources and bring about certain pressures in other fields and in other areas. But we thought that possibly we will meet the situation by importing wheat and other things. But, unfortunately, in the world market at that time, not only the prices were rising but there was the question of availability of these important items of food. This was also unanticipated and unprovided for.

So, some of these problems arose because of certain situation and we have to fight the situation today. Our strategy to meet the situation is this, that we will have to make a frontal attack on the shortages and this can be done mainly by concentrating our efforts on the production side. Three areas of production are important. One is Agriculture. Second is the production of certain mass-consumption articles and goods, wage goods, as they are called. And, thirdly, it is the production of some of the scarce materials like steel,

like fertilisers, etc. (An hon. Member: Cement) Cement comes under the category of mass-consumption articles. But some of these things are more important. We will have to concentrate our efforts on these areas. This is our strategy to deal with the situation. Of course, on the demand side, we will have to see that money supply is restricted.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chattapur): Demand also is reduced.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Yes, demand also is reduced. That of course we have explained. Therefore I am not taking that particular point. I am taking this particular matter because here lies the strategy in which this country, all the political parties, the entire leadership of the nation has to involve itself. As you know we had to import some of the commodities which had been in short supply. We are doing it. In case of edible oil we had to import. In case of foodstuffs as you know we have imported substantially. We have obtained as a loan substantial quantities of wheat also from Soviet Russia. So, these steps we are taking but in the case of production it is not going to be merely wishful thinking. It requires certain planning. It requires certain organisation. It requires certain preparation of the people for that matter. May I ask: What is the programme of the opposition in this matter? In a condition like this, what is required is to mobilise the nation. What is required is to get a sense of discipline in the people. What is required is to have a sense of unity.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Participation more . .

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Your participation is seen here, a participation in no-confidence motion. Instead of doing that, what they are doing is, to create a sense of frustration among the people. Is it the

answer to the situation? Forget about power. We are in power because people want us to be in power. But if you want to do any service to the nation what is your responsibility? People are angry, I know, because they don't get enough food. They are angry with us, but as I said on a former occasion in this House, the people get angry with those people whom they respect. They are angry with us because ultimately we are the people who are responsible for them and ultimately it is we who can possibly sometimes stand by them and do something about it. Therefore they are angry with us. But what are you doing? And, in the way in which you talk about the Prime Minister in this House any Indian will feel ashamed of what you said that day in the House. For a couple of years before, every Indian in this country and every Indian outside this country felt proud because he was an Indian and that was because history was brought about by the Prime Minister of this country and today you are speaking like this. You are taking some sort of worn-out allegations, meaningless allegations which have no substance and try to play them about. I was rather surprised that even some of the senior Members of this House who are not with this no-confidence motion also said that some answers should be given to these. Do they seriously think that some of those allegations are worth even mentioning in this House?

What is required and what is necessary in this country is to stand unitedly to see the problems of the people and to solve them. For that matter Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsi did make an appeal to you for cooperation. But, they don't know even the word 'cooperation'. How can they give cooperation? If they do it, well and good, I will certainly welcome it. I will be glad. I certainly would love to have their cooperation. But how can they give it, because they are never trained to give cooperation?

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

I would say that he is a fountain-head of frustration. The only thing that you can get from him is the sense of frustration, sense of frustration and nothing but frustration.

And, therefore, Sir, the strategy for meeting the present situation in the country is to create a sense of discipline in the country. Somebody said that there is a slideback from the progressive policies in this country. I would like to say that this Government has never stood for the *status quo*. We have always stood for structural change, more change, progressive change, social change, change in the economic structure; and we have acted on that basis.

Even after 1971 elections you can see the series of steps that the Government have taken. They show that this Government stands for social transformation; this Government stands for structural changes in the economic and social fields. And when we try make the social structural changes, some vested interests get affected by them and they get dissatisfied with them. Certainly in a situation like this they try to exploit that situation.

What exactly is being done to-day? We took steps, for instance, to nationalise general insurance; we took also steps to take over the coal-mines. We took over wheat trade. We have taken many steps.

I shall also come to the steps taken about the labour. I shall come to that important point later.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about rice trade take-over?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Wait for some time for that. What we have done, you have not understood. What are you going to do? You are not going to understand what we have done. If I put my cap on your head, possibly, you might understand it. My point is this. I would like to ask the hon. Members

to think for a minute what we have done in the last three or four years. Many progressive steps have been taken by us. For the sake of the labour movement in this country we tried to take over a large number of textile mills. We have done this with a view to seeing that the unemployment that was likely to be caused to some as a result of shutting down of the textile mills is avoided. For this taking-over of textile mills should be done very effectively.

As regards bonus, we have been trying to find out the problems of the employees and to meet their demands. This is for government as well as for non-government employees. We have taken many more steps to meet their demands as far as possible. The only thing about bonus is this. Of course, the report of the Bonus Committee is yet to come. As far as bonus is concerned, in the last four or five years, we have certainly taken more progressive steps. In this matter, ultimately, the whole thing has to be fitted into the national economy. We are going to consider this from the national point of view. But, are you going to consider this problem from the national point of view or are you going to look at this problem from the sectarian point of view or from the point of view of the political party or from the regional point of view? Or are you going to look at this from the national point of view? In this matter, we have to look at this from the national point of view. Unfortunately, that has not happened in your case. Therefore, the strategy that is required is that we will have to concentrate on our production efforts and we will have to create a sense of national discipline and certainly we will also have to look to the progressive measures too in the interests of the labourers. I quite agree. When we concentrate our attention on production efforts, certainly, we can bring about a certain flexibility. There was a talk about the sliding back in the policy of

the Government about the monopoly houses. If at all you have to concentrate on the production of mass consumption goods and on the scarce materials, I say you will also have to concentrate your efforts to produce more in the shortest possible time. Instead of doing that you immediately try to create a confusion in the minds of the people. This is certainly our strategy which will certainly save us out of the present difficulty.

✓ Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the major issue that was raised in this debate was about our economic situation as we see it to-day. According to me, what is important is how and in what manner we can tackle this economic situation. We have outlined that in brief as to how it can be done. At the present moment, we are considering a no-confidence motion. I would like to request Shri Bosu that in a quieter moment, he can ponder over this. If he has got the national conscience he would certainly regret whatever he has stated here and the manner in which he had said it. I have a hope for this. But, I am not sure whether he will ever act on this. I can only hope that wisdom will prevail on the hon. Members of the other parties—I quite agree that one party is not the same as the other party as Shri Sezhiyan was saying—I quite agree with that—but, at the same time, Shri Sezhiyan spoke about other things. May I ask him: does he support what Shri Bosu has said while moving his resolution?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Which part of that Resolution you want me to agree?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: There is only one part in his speech.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Which part of his speech?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Mud-slinging and character assas-
2261 LS—10.

sination, which was the only part of his speech.

I had left out one point, which I would like to deal with now, and that was a rather very subtle argument that was made by some Member who spoke on this motion. He said that this Government had a very wholesome foreign policy but found out something unwholesome in the domestic policy, and therefore, there was some sort of protest and possibly anger about it. Theoretically, one can perhaps make a distinction between foreign policy and internal policy. One can do that. But it is all theoretical, I would say, because a country which produces a wholesome foreign policy cannot do so unless it has got a fundamentally wholesome internal policy. A country which has certainly produced and followed a very effective and progressive foreign policy cannot do so if it has got a non-progressive policy or a reactionary policy at home. There may be certain temporary difficulties. Those who stand by the wholesome foreign policy of this Government must also stand in difficult times by them in the case of the internal policy also. To say that there is something very good in the foreign policy but they cannot stand by the internal policy is not fundamentally correct. What is wrong with the internal policy except that we are passing through difficult times?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Surrender to monopoly.

AN HON. MEMBER: And to black money.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: What about the steps that we have taken for the last so many years in the present situation of the country? A powerful strong foreign policy can be sustained only by certain progressive forces in the internal policy, and, therefore, it will be very wrong....

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): It is a wrong theory.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
If he were to accept my theory as a correct theory, then he would not stick there. I am sure that he has to say that my policy is wrong and my theory is wrong. If he accepted my theory, he would not be sitting there but he will be sitting on this side. The point that I was making was that it is not very correct to make a fundamental distinction between the foreign and the internal policy. As I was saying the other day, the policy of a nation is an integrated whole. The foreign policy does not fall from the heaven. It grows out of the people's life. It grows out of certain attitudes that people have learnt or cultivated for so long a time. It does not come about just like an accident. The foreign policy of this country is not an accident. It has grown out of the aspirations of the people and certain attachments and certain loyalties to certain progressive principles in this country. Therefore, hon. Members cannot make a convenient distinction between foreign policy and internal policy for the purpose of accepting one and rejecting the other. One has to stand by the policy as a whole. I am sure that this country and the leadership of this party has given a very integrated wholesome national policy, whether it be internal or external and it is this policy that will see this country through many difficult times, and I am sure a day will come when all those who are asking for and supporting the no-confidence motion will come forward and say that they made the mistake of their lives in moving this no-confidence motion.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now Dr. Karni Singh.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I thought I was to speak next. Is my hon. friend also going away? I did not know about it.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has to speak next, because the UPG has more Members.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But generally it had not gone like that earlier. According to the system followed earlier, it was my turn to speak.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He can check up at the Table about the numbers. It depends upon the numbers.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It has not been the case so far.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would request Shri Mishra to check with the Table about the order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: That has not been the practice before. If you say that he has to speak now, then we shall have to go into it further and see how many times it had been done. I am prepared to make way for any hon. Member, but not out of this consideration that you have mentioned. This is not fair. If it is not a precedent, I shall give away. But if it is a precedent, I will have to insist on my right. Please go into the record.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Let Shri Samar Guha speak.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. Why don't you leave the House to me? These are such trivial matters. I would discuss it with you. You kindly meet me. Let us not do this on the floor of the House. You will be satisfied. Let us not take up these small matters here. You can leave this to me now.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If it is not a precedent, because in the past the procedure followed completely different.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: His is a congeries of individuals. There must be some uniformity. If this is not a precedent. On that basis, I can give way. I cannot yield otherwise.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would only say this (*Interruptions*). I do not understand. What do you want to be done in this House? I hope we are discussing something serious. I would request Mr. Mishra not to insist on anything at this stage. Let me discuss this with him quietly after this and then we can find out what is the position. For the moment, Dr. Karni Singh.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: My submission is this. I do not grudge Dr. Karni Singh being given precedence to others. But I only raise one point.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not giving precedence to anybody.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I will be happy if he speaks. But what I want to draw your attention to is that it is the national parties that have been reorganised by the Election Commission which are given precedence in this House. This has been the practice in the last Lok Sabha. Up till now, this has been the practice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Okay. You have made your submission (*Interruptions*). If you think that this House can be run only by many members talking at the same time, and the Chair should be a stone sitting down and doing nothing. I think we have to evolve a new parliamentary procedure.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattu puzha): When Members start commenting on your decision, we must speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. Now I am saying that what Shri Guha said will be considered. For the moment, Dr. Karni Singh.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But for the hon'ble Deputy-Speaker to be ignorant of this is something which we cannot understand.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a charitable (*Interruptions*).

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner.): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am sorry at this very crucial part in this debate, the members of the Opposition are already showing their weakness and trying to argue among themselves. I do not know what the people in the rest of the country would think if we came to power (*Interruptions*).

SHRI A.K.M. ISHAQUE (Basirhat): I assure you you will never (*Interruptions*).

DR. KARNI SINGH: Sir, I do not know what the procedure is that we follow now. But in the 22 years that I have been here, I know that when the Chair recognises the Member or catches his eye, whoever catches the speaker's eye, then he is called. I think if we go back to that old procedure, which was a better system, it would be easier. Whoever you see first, you call him, so that even a junior, if he catches the Chair's eye, will get a chance of opening the debate. I would suggest that that procedure may be followed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Anyway, leave it to the Chair now.

DR. KARNI SINGH: The country is passing through a very grave crisis, and I do not think that we can treat this matter in any sense of levity. Great problems are there before the nation, and as Mr. Chavan has very rightly put it, it will call for the national will and will call for national co-operation all round to achieve quick result. I would, therefore, request the hon. Prime Minister that that kind of national co-operation could be forthcoming; but a gesture is needed from the Government to have a national government at the Centre. (*Interruptions*)

Rising prices, scarcity of food, lack of essential commodities in the country and the children crying for milk in a constituency like mine which supplies Delhi with milk, are situations that cannot be forgiven. And the Government must fairly and squarely take the blame for that.

[Dr. Karni Singh]

I have seen many, many no-confidence motions moved in this House, but this one, as the people on the streets are now saying, is an exercise in futility. I am sorry to admit that is a fact, but for us in the Opposition there is no alternative except to focus public opinion through the means of a no-confidence motion. We know perfectly well that we shall not be able to carry this no-confidence motion to its logical conclusion which is to form an alternative government.

Sir, I feel that the people of our country gave the present ruling party a massive mandate, therefore many of us who were staunch opponents of the Congress party bowed down to that massive mandate, because we believe in democracy. However, it seems a very, very sad state of affairs that at the end of three years, with the tremendous wave of public support and the massive mandate, the Government should have thrown over all this wonderful opportunity straight out of the window, and today, at the end of three years we find our country in a tremendous mess as it is. It is a golden chance that the Government had to build a new, great, dynamic India, but they have failed. I had hoped that the *Garibi Hatao* slogan would not remain as a slogan but in fact be implemented in a way by which the man on the street would be benefited. That dream has failed.

There are many major contributing factors for today's condition. I am not an economic expert, but I do feel that the hon'ble Prime Minister, who is the only "man" in the Cabinet as the saying goes, should have the courage to get up and say that "I shall not ride two hores," the two horses being communism and democracy. I think the time has come when the Prime Minister should make up her mind, "Is India going to be red or to remain a democracy?" And she has to stop hobnobbing with the communist party. I think this has been one of the biggest contributing factors for the problems created in the country today, because nobody knows what is going to be the future

of our country. Will we be slaves of the Red Flag or shall we be a free country, a free people as Gandhi and Nehru wanted us to be? That decision, I think, Mrs. Gandhi has today to take now finally. I know she has the capacity and the courage to do so, and if there are any people in her Cabinet or in the political party that she represents, who are pushing her into a corner to support the communists, I hope she will have the courage to say, "Get the hell out; I am going to take the country on the path on which my father took them, the path of democracy, the path on which human beings can live like human beings."

I am very sorry to disagree with my dear friend Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu who talked about democracy and communism existing together. There is no such thing. Which country in the communist bloc has the freedom which we have? We have seen the lessons of Czechoslovakia; we have seen the lessons of Hungary. We do not want these lessons to be repeated in our country if we can help it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : But they are deprived of one freedom; they have no freedom to starve as you have here.

DR. KARNI SINGH : That is one way. If there is no way out, if we have to be red just to satisfy us from starvation, let the Prime Minister openly declare: we shall be red, this Government shall give free food to everybody, employment to everybody, housing and old age insurance and social security for all. Make up your mind. Do not leave the people in a flux, not knowing which direction the country is going.

I am happy to say that the Prime Minister has shown strength of courage. She is veering away from the communist menace; the sooner she does, the better it is for the country. She will have to take many many strong steps... (*Interruptions*) I am not opposed to nationalisation but I say that nationalisation should be resorted to only if you can supplement it with a better system; do not make

a mess out of it like you did with coal or bank nationalisation or grain trade .. (Interruptions) Privy purse? Privy purse is finished; that is ancient history.

15.52 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why he is angry.

DR. KARNI SINGH: I am not. If I were angry, I would not support you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Are you supporting?

DR. KARNI SINGH: I am supporting them to the extent that we cannot throw them out. I shall make my position clear. I have been a Member of this House for 22 years in the opposition. I have never defected and I have no such intention at all. If I can see an opposition Government coming in, I shall vote for it. First and foremost, I do not vote for a Government that falls the next day .. (Interruptions) The country has lost its sense of national participation. The more the Government takes over the functions the people can perform better, the more the sense of national participation is lost. Today an average citizen feels he is lost. The whole situation is pathetic. You go out in the streets and ask a common man; for God's sake why did you vote for the Congress? He will say today he made a mistake. If he asks me; whom shall I vote for now, I have no answer. May be, in six months I may have one, but not today.

Take the question of the existence of corruption in our country. About a year ago when we talked about corruption we knew it was merely a 'political cliche'. Today it is not so. Every one of us sitting in this House wants to get his car permit or gun permit or similar daily needs. If you want to get anything, "chaipani" is there. Either you pay the "chaipani" or wait for one month. Can that kind of situation exist in any advanced

country? The day the country and the Government accepts corruption as a means of every day living that day is the end of democracy. I am sure the Prime Minister and her colleagues would not like us to accept such a situation in our country. Government brings in new laws, absurd legislation daily. The result is corruption. A man is expected to pay 200 per cent of his income as direct tax ... (Interruptions). There is no social security and no old age insurance in India. Who is going to look after the citizens when they are old or ill?

Somebody referred to black money. I entirely agree black money is bad. But black money has been used in politics too frequently. I have asked Mr. Chavan last time when I was speaking on the Finance Bill, and I will ask the Prime Minister today also. She is in a great position today to say that no black money shall be used by the new Congress in the elections in U.P. or in any other place. If the ruling party is using it and if anybody in the country can find it out then steps will be taken which would be far more rigorous than for any other citizen. Those people who rule must set a better standard.

Rajasthan Government have recently introduced a most absurd legislation and brought in urban property ceiling on a piece of land that attracts both urban and agricultural ceiling. Many of you might ask how it was possible. But I have got a letter from the authorities quoting the legal department of the State, which says that it is perfectly legal that one piece of land may be both agricultural and urban and attract both ceilings.

This is extraordinary. I feel that the more absurd legislations you bring in, the more deterrent punishment you make, the more people you will have to put into jail. Instead of the Gandhian Government looking after the people, getting their love, respect, confidence and understanding, you will be making them do something through the threat of sending them to

[Dr. Karni Singh] :
jail. I would like to know from the Prime Minister how many jails you are going to construct?

Are you going to make 570 million do the right thing because you constantly threaten them with imprisonment? Why do you not make legislation which is reasonable, which is within the human power to follow?

Strikes are one of the major problems today that are destroying our country. I would like to ask my friends across whether they are not responsible for teaching the people to go on strike against the private industry. I hold no brief for the private industry, I know nothing about industry, but the fact is when you teach one group of citizens to strike against a given authority, how can you prevent the brother of that person, who may be working in the public sector, from going on strike too? What you did in the private sector is boomeranging, against you in the public sector. Unless all of us in this House co-operate and stop these strikes and increase our man-hours of work to have more production, we will not be able to achieve the self-sufficiency that we need.

Take the moral fibre of this country. I do not think it needs any canvassing or guessing from my side. You know perfectly well that the moral fibre that existed in this country 25 years ago does not exist today. I agree that it is a global phenomenon. But some of the laws that are brought in lead to further degradation of the moral fibre. I understand that there is some new law which the Finance Ministry has brought in which says that if any person conceals his income or does not pay the income-tax or what not, if his employee informs the Government of this fact than ten per cent of the tax recovered from that person will be paid to that employee. I have nothing against it generally because every honest citizen is expected to pay his taxes. But if money alone is the criterion then it may very well happen that the brother of that employee

may be working with the Prime Minister or the Defence Minister and he may be handling secret files. Such a person would be open to bribes from Pakistan, China or some other unfriendly country. If you encourage one brother to work against his employer, what is there to prevent his brother who incidentally is working for Government, also work against his employer? I think by this procedure you are starting a vicious circle.

जैसे हिंदुस्तानी में बहते हैं—“झाब की शर्म” जब झाब की शर्म चली गई तो क्या रहा ?

I feel that legislations have got to be very carefully planned because you are dealing with human material. This country is evolving into a great democracy. At this stage if you bring in a wrong legislations, it will affect the thinking of not only the present generation but also the thinking of their children and even grand children. I think the Prime Minister is well aware of these things. By this legislation you may make a few lakhs of profit but if you make an employee go against the interests of his employer, tomorrow it can very well happen that the employer is the Government of India. Therefore, I think these are very very dangerous ideas.

Another thing in which I feel the opposition and the Government could contribute is in keeping our hands off students. The students must be made to study. For God's sake, do not bring them into politics. Once you bring them into politics, it is difficult to guide or control them.

There is general stagnation in industry and that is due to the uncertain policies followed by the Government. This policy has caused a great deal of set back in industrial production. I feel that it is absolutely necessary that the Government must give top-most priority to this and create a clean atmosphere in the country so that we can stop this guessing game.

If Mr. Brezhnev visits this country he must be shown the greatest respect by the Government and the people of our country. This motion which we are discussing today has nothing to do with Mr. Brezhnev's visit. It is our internal matter.

I will end by saying one more thing which I have been saying so long. I had told Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, whose memory I worship years back in this House that unless population control was brought in through some strong measures, a day would come when there would be standing room only left for mankind. A situation like this can very well arise. I have spoken about this to the hon. Prime Minister who belongs to the dynamic younger generation. I know she realises only too well that India shall not be in a position to feed 100 crores of people in 25 years from now. If she can, well and good. But I would like to read out from a small reply that was given by Shri Shinde on the 30th of November last year when he referred to my remarks.

"From the year 1966 onwards, the population increase has been of the order of 14 per cent...."

This is not clear. But I imagine he meant for the last seven years (1966-1973). Then, it says:

"...I am giving the exact percentage. It has been 14 per cent increase. When we take into consideration this increased growth rate then, what would be the additional requirements of foodgrains? According to our calculations it comes to the order of 12 to 13 million tonnes roughly."

16.00 hrs.

It is all very well for you to talk about socialism; it is all very well to

talk about Garibi Hatao. But I want to know one thing. Every developing country in the world has accepted the fact that population increase which is out of control, known as "population explosion," is more dangerous to mankind than the hydrogen bomb. You do not need a computer to work out these figures, in relation to food, in relation to employment, in relation to housing, in relation to rise in prices, in relation to our daily consumption. The number of additional mouths produced every year to be fed will be a major factor. I know that our Communist friends do not believe that there should be population control. Even China today has gone in for population control. (Interruptions) I read it in a book. If they have done it, all bad luck for them. Japan has gone in for population control. They have solved the poverty problem. Both are Asian countries. I am sure, the Prime Minister who is the leader in the Asian countries, would follow one of the either methods employed by either the communists or the free worlds.

The major decision that the Government has to take now is to give the top-most priority to the family planning programme. I believe, the other day, the Minister for Planning wanted to reduce the amount in the Fifth Plan on 'Family Planning' thought it was an utter insanity that anybody could think of. I believe that has been restored. I thank God for that. I feel, if you want to prevent equalor, hunger, poverty and misery

[Dr. Karan Singh]

in this country, then no family should produce more than three children. I think, you Madam, will agree. I am sure if you say that, you have the capacity to implement it. I have that much confidence in you.

I would request the hon. Prime Minister who has shown a great deal of strength and courage—unfortunately for the opposition or fortunately, she is the only person in this country who can rule the country at this stage with a stable government because the Opposition strength is well-known—to make sure that the almighty vote, the almighty Chair, takes the second place in the country and that the need of the country takes the first place. I hope, she will act strongly. Whatever her policies are, whether it would be communist or democratic, I hope, she will act strongly. When she acts strongly, I hope, she will act with conviction and not be swayed away by matters like whether she wins the next elections or not. If the Government makes up its mind and say “We shall be prepared to lose the elections but we shall not let down the people of our country”, then I am sure, they will solve all the problems. If you (P. M.) would do that, nobody can oust you also.

One last word without which my speech will not be complete. As an Opposition Member, it is my endeavour as much anybody else's to see that the Opposition Government comes to power. But I will say this that the man in the street is asking a ques-

tion: Whom shall I vote for? That answer is for our leaders to supply. I am quite convinced that our leadership in the Opposition will rise to the occasion. The leadership is there. If that is done U. P. is your test case. I will support what Mr. Madhok, I think, said that there are many parties in India which are “B Teams” of the Congress. (*Interruptions*) I hope, that will never be proved so.

The Opposition today is to be blamed for the conditions in the country because they allowed the ruling party so much sway. It is upto us to unite and create a new democratic socialist party. (*Interruption*) Then we can get up and tell the people of our country that we in the Opposition are serious about what we are talking. Otherwise, it is nothing more than playing fun and games, and in the present crisis, there is no time for fun or game. The Opposition has to be serious about it, and they must be able to tell the people, ‘From here and now we are prepared to form a Government provided we get the majority, provided we get your votes; and give the country an alternative government’ and then leave it to the people to decide whom they want to vote for.

I want to conclude my speech with the hope that the Prime Minister will be able to be firm through her policies of certainty and getting public cooperation and participation, and will be able to bring sunshine and laughter into the homes of our Indian people once again.

जी ए० बी० लॉरी (बक्सर) - अध्यक्ष महोदय, सबसे पहले मैं, हमारे पूर्ववक्ता डा० कर्णीसिंह जी ने जो कहा है, उसी से प्रारम्भ करना चाहता हूँ। डा० कर्णीसिंह जी ने यह कहा कि हमारी पार्टी और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं होनी चाहिये कि वे इस देश की हुकूमत में रहें या न रहे बल्कि देश के लोगों की जो खिदमत है उसमें ज्यादा दिलचस्पी लें। मैं उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसका जिक्र श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु ने अपने भाषण में किया और बार-बार उसका समर्थन कांग्रेसी जी ने भी किया कि वह जो पार्लियामेंट का मध्यवर्धि चुनाव था वह मध्यवर्धि चुनाव पार्लियामेंट को पहले भंग करके किया गया, उन समय कांग्रेस पार्टी ने और प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने, जो देश की हुकूमत उस वक्त भी चला सकती थी, 14 महीने पहले पार्लियामेंट को भंग किया और देश में चुनाव का आवाहन किया। मैं समझता हूँ जिस समय उन्होंने इस चुनाव का आवाहन किया उस समय भी उन्होंने यह कहा था और सामंती पर मैं इस मोर्चे पर उभरना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी या कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेताओं को पद की खोजपता नहीं या पद पर चिन्ते रहना चाहते तो जिस शासन को वे चला सकते थे उसको 14 महीने पहले भंग नहीं करने। लेकिन उन्होंने उस समय इस बात को महत्त्व दिया जैसा कि हमारे आईने जिक्र किया कि जो हालात उस समय देश में थे और जिस तरह हालात पार्लियामेंट में थे और जो काम हम करना चाहते थे देश में लोगों की खिदमत का, लोगों को आगे बढ़ाने का, लोगों को भलाई का काम जो हम करना चाहते थे वह उस समय जो पार्लियामेंट की हालत थी उसमें हम नहीं कर सकते थे और इसीलिये उन्होंने पद का लोभ छोड़ करके, पद पर 14 महीने बने रहने का लालच छोड़ करके या लिप्ता छोड़ करके, पार्लियामेंट को भंग किया, देश

की जनता के सामने कांग्रेस पार्टी गई और उस समय चुनाव में जो नतीजा हुआ वह विरोधी पार्टियों के लोगों ने देखा।

अभी हमारे दोस्त ने इसी सन्दर्भ में कहा, जिस तरह से 1970 में पार्लियामेंट को भंग किया गया, आज भी समय आ गया है जब कांग्रेस को पार्लियामेंट भंग करके चुनाव में जाना चाहिये। इसका उत्तर शायद पहले मिल चुका है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज की परिस्थिति और उस समय की परिस्थिति के बीच के अन्तर को अगर विरोधी पार्टी के लोग समझ नहीं सकते हैं तो उसमें कांग्रेस पार्टी का कमी नहीं है। यह उनकी ही समझ का दोष है और उनकी ही गल्ती है कि वे सन् 1970-71 और 1973 के बीच में स्थिति का अन्तर नहीं समझते हैं। 1971 के बाद कांग्रेस पार्टी को अब नौ नौ बर्षों में अधिक का बहुमत प्राप्त है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ बाजपेयी जी से और विरोधी पार्टी के लोगों से कि थोड़े दिनों के लिये जब उनको कुछ राज्यों में सचिव सरकार बनाने का मौका मिला, मिली-जुली सरकारें उन्होंने वहाँ पर बनाई थी तब क्या वे भूल गए कि उनकी पार्टी के लोग किस तरह से पद पर लिपटे रहना चाहते थे और आखिर जब तक वे मजबूर नहीं किये गये तब तक उन्होंने उभरना नहीं छोड़ा।

माननाय बाजपेयी जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में कांग्रेस की सरकार इसलिये स्थापित हुई अभी कि कांग्रेस मतांकुश रहे बरग चुनाव नहीं लड़ सकती है। मैं उन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 1971 में बिहार में इन की सचिव सरकार थी जब पार्लियामेंट का चुनाव

[श्री ए० पी० शर्मा]

मालूम है और बराबर उन्होंने इस बात को कहा है कि हम गांधी की और जवाहरलाल जी का जो रास्ता था, जो तरीके काम करने के थे हम उन्हीं पर देश को तेजी से आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं। यह उन्होंने पब्लिक स्टेटमेंट दिया है और उनही पर यह पार्टीचल भी रही है। मैं नहीं समझ पाया हूँ कि इस में ऐसी अवस्था में सन्देह की कैसे गुआइश रह जाती है।

श्री कर्णी सिंह जी ने यह भी कहा कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में गवर्नमेंट पार्टी यानी कांग्रेस ने स्ट्राइक्स को एनकरेज किया है और इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि उनको उसका फल पब्लिक सेक्टर में जहां सरकार खुद मालिक है भोगना पड़ रहा है। लेकिन कांग्रेस पार्टी की न यह नीति है और न ही दूसरी तरह से उसने हड़तालों का प्रोत्साहन दिया है। जो लोग गलत ढंग से हड़ताल करते हैं कांग्रेस पार्टी ने और सरकार ने इस बात को माना है कि वह ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन हड़ताल करना मजदूरों का प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार है, डेमोक्रेटिक राइट है और उस राइट का वे कब इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं और कब नहीं, इसका फैसला करना उनका काम है। लेकिन जब देश में चीजों का उत्पादन कम हो रहा है, हमें गल्ला चाहिये और अगर वह है तो एक जगह से दूसरी जगह जो उसको पहुंचाना है, कोयले के उत्पादन में वृद्धि करनी है, लोहे के उत्पादन में करनी है, एक जगह से दूसरी जगह रेल से, यातायात के दूसरे साधनों से उसको उन जगहों में पहुंचाना है जहां पर उसका उत्पादन नहीं होता है, ऐसी स्थिति में आए दिन बंद और हड़ताल की जो बात होती है उसकी हम निन्दा करते हैं, उसका हम समर्थन नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन जहां मजदूर सही रास्ते पर चलने के वावजूद भी, समझौते के रास्ते पर चलने के बाद भी, आरबिट्रेशन उसकी मिलता है या नहीं मिलता है या आरबिट्रेशन के फैसले को अगर मालिक नहीं मानता है फिर चाहे वह सरकार हो या निजी उद्योगपति हो और उनकी मांगे जायज मांगें हैं तो मजदूरों

को हड़ताल करने का हक है और कांग्रेस पार्टी इस हक को मानती है और यही वजह है कि मजदूरों का जो डेमोक्रेटिक राइट है उसको हम किसी भी तरह से छीनना नहीं चाहते हैं, उस में कोई बाधा डालना नहीं चाहते हैं। कोई भी उदाहरण उन्होंने इस सदन के सामने पेश किया जिससे यह साबित हो कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने या उसके कार्यकर्ताओं ने किसी जगह पर स्ट्राइक को प्रोत्साहन दिया है।

जहां तक इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का उद्देश्य है, तीन बातों का मैंने जिक्र किया है। उन में से कोई भी बात इसके अन्दर नहीं आती है। सिवाय इसके कि इसको भी इन्होंने आए दिन का एक तमाशा बना दिया है खास तौर पर। कुछ न कुछ आए दिन ये सदन के सामने ले आते हैं चाहे अविश्वास के द्वारा या और किसी तरह से और हमारी सरकार के जो नेता हैं या कांग्रेस पार्टी है उसका चरित्रहनन करने की कोशिश करते हैं और अवसर प्राप्त करते हैं आलोचना करने का। मैं तो कहूंगा कि this is misuse of the privilege or the right of the Opposition Party.

इसका यह दुस्प्रयोग है। इनको मालूम है कि आज थह बहस खत्म होगी तो इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का क्या हल होने वाला है। लेकिन फिर भी चूंकि इनका उद्देश्य मे लाइन करना है, हम लोगों की व्यक्तिगत रूप से भी निन्दा करना है, इसीलिए इस तरह की बातें ये कहां लाते हैं।

बाजपेयी जी को एक बात मैं अन्त में कहना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कल एक नया स्वांग इस सदन में रखा और एक नया दृश्य सदन के सामने उपस्थित किया। वह एक टेप रिकार्डर ले आए। पिछले दिनों आपने देखा कि सदन के सामने कोई अपना कुर्ता फाड़ लेते थे, धोती फाड़ लेते थे और पुलिस की लाठी से अगर किसी को चोट लग गई तो स्पीकार की टेबल के पास जा कर उनको वह दिखाते थे,

ऐसी भी गिर गया और चोट लग गई तो वह जा कर आपको दिखाने की कोशिश करते थे। इसी पर बहुत बहस हुई है। इस तरह की बात क्यों होती है यह आप भी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। कल वाजपेयी जी ने नया दृश्य उपस्थित किया। टेप रिकार्डर में क्या था? वाजपेयी जी एक राष्ट्रीय नेता हैं, उनकी पार्टी राष्ट्रीय पार्टी होने का दावा करती है। लेकिन इस तरह की बातें जब वह करते हैं तो मुझे आश्चर्य होता है। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस देश में, किस सूबे में या किस जगह जहाँ सरकारी कर्मचारी काम करते हैं चार, दस, बीस या पचास बे गलती नहीं कर सकते हैं? क्या था वह दृश्य? किसी इंस्पेक्टर पुलिस ने या हावलदार या कांस्टेबल ने क्या बात कही। प्रस्ताव ये पेश करते हैं अविश्वास का सरकार खिलाफ और नजारा उपस्थित करते हैं कांस्टेबल और सब इंस्पेक्टर का। क्या यही तरीका है अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पेश करने का इनकी पार्टी का और इन जैसे लोगों का? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की छोटी छोटी बातों का हवाला दे कर ये अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का मखोल उड़ाना चाहते हैं, उससे खिलबाड़ करना चाहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि विरोधी पार्टी वालों को यह चीज शोभा नहीं देती है।

और मिलों ने भी कहा है और मैं भी अपील करूंगा अपने विरोधी दल वालों से। बहुत से सवाल राष्ट्र के सवाल होते हैं, जैसे खाद का है, अर्थ व्यवस्था का है। ये राष्ट्रीय सवाल हैं। इन में त्रुटियाँ हैं—हमारे पूर्व वक्ताओं ने स्वीकार किया है कि यह बात नहीं है कि जो हम करते हैं वह सब ठीक है—तो उन त्रुटियों को सुधारने के लिए, ये अपना-योगदान करें, विभिन्न कार्यक्रमों को सफल बनाने के लिए जो राष्ट्रीय योजनाएँ हैं उन में अपना सहयोग दें। ये राष्ट्रीय सवाल हमारे सामने हैं, ये कोई पार्टी और कोई व्यक्ति के सवाल नहीं हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस अविश्वास के प्रस्तावता विरोध करता हूँ और मुझे विश्वास है कि इसको रद्द कर दिया जाएगा। मतदान का जो नतीजा होने वाला है वह सब को मालूम है। लेकिन मैं तो इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को अभी से रद्द करता हूँ।

✓ SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the impression that is created on my mind, and I think any objective listener would also share it, is that the Government have absolutely no case, so far as the no-confidence motion is concerned, and the battle of the Opposition is almost as good as won. We do not have much to do to the replies made by the hon. Members from the other side. Although the ruling party did field what they might have considered as a number of star speakers since yesterday, the ineffectiveness of their reply was not only pathetic but also in some measure disarming to the Opposition. Because of the ineffectiveness of the reply, there is absolutely nothing with which we have to grapple. That is our difficulty and the predicament in which we find ourselves.

My hon. friend Shri Bali Ram Bhagat who took the floor as the first speaker from the other side really looked like Bali Ram Bhagat and not as Bal Ram Bhagat. Mr. Bali Ram Bhagat has really been a sacrificial ram since the last general elections. I have all sympathy and commiseration for him. At least he did not give me the impression of speaking like a valiant or vigorous warrior. He was speaking not like Bal Ram but like Bali Ram.

I find that my hon. friend Shri Salve is fortunately in his seat, but I did not find in him also his usual zest and gumption. We always expect some salvo from him, but Mr. Salve was without salvo on this occasion. But I must say that as a sincere and loyal Member of the party, he did warn the Government that if they went the way as they had been doing so far, the people would no more suffer them.

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

He made it absolutely clear.

Then the hon. Secretary-General of the ruling party, Shri Chandrajit Yadav took the floor, and true to his name Chandrajit, that is, the moon-walker or the moon conqueror, his arguments suffered from weightlessness. Quite naturally

And what to speak of my hon friend, the Finance Minister? When he was speaking only a few minutes ago he was trying to reply to what he considered to be the economic points. May I say that I have all respect for him in many matters but not in the matter of economics? Therefore, I almost liked the idea of the hon Prime Minister when she said that the country needed a financial wizard. But even after this remark of the hon Prime Minister's, he was trying to pretend as a financial wizard which he has failed to be all these years he has been in his present office.

What did my hon friend, Shri Chavan, say? He said that although everything may be wrong with the world, everything is right with this Government. That was what he wanted to convey to us. Quite naturally Shri Yeshwantrao Balwantrao Chavan has neither yash nor bal at the present moment so if his reply was completely pale and anaemic, nobody should be surprised about it.

He was asking what was the answer of the Opposition to the situation we were facing. The Opposition from time to time has given answers to many of the problems that confront the country, and yet it seems that all that we have said has been like throwing water on a duck's back, all those ideas have, apparently, not seeped into his mind.

He wanted us to bring to bear a national point of view. In fact, that is precisely what we are trying to do. And what the other side is trying to do, I must say in all humility, is only the election point of view. In fact, that is bound to be so because we have a Prime Minister, with

all her charm and with all the gifts that she possesses, who is a unidimensional Prime Minister, a one-dimensional Prime Minister who functions only in the dimension of elections. She does not function in any dimensions of national interests. She is always at the hustings, and a Prime Minister who is always at the hustings is certainly bound to be a Prime Minister who would be afraid to be right. So, we have a Prime Minister who is afraid to be right. She does not take a national view and the country is declining every day in every way. If the Prime Minister or the members of her party do not realise it, one can only be sorry for the country.

The constant refrain in the speeches of the hon members from the other side was, one, wrong motivation and two, character assassination. These are the two bange of their drum nothing else. Even Shri Chavan when he began prefacing his speech he spoke of character assassination and wrong motivation. May I ask the hon members opposite whether they think that we alone have motives and they have none, they are Mahatmas and they have entered into a state of nirvana? What kind of argument is this? It just does not wash. This is the kind of plea that you would like us to swallow. Is the country going to pocket this kind of plea that it is all because of character assassination?

Now here are your failures galore and yet you say we go for character assassination! The failures are enough to bury you fathoms deep and you are going to be buried fathoms deep. This would not be because of any character assassination.

What did they say? Even my hon friend Shri Salve, and some others said 'Please beware of the ultimate result. You are going to be beaten down in voting'. That is the voice of physical strength. I do realise that in this House murder is decided

by majority. That is if you commit murder. You can get away with it, if you have number, on your side. But posterity will never forgive you for the murders that you have committed and in fact there are quite a few albatrosses round the neck of this Government. I am going to enumerate some of them during the time that is available to me.

We do not know whether the hon. Prime Minister would be able to make up for the deficiency in the debate from the other side; evidently she cannot because she has neither the logic nor the facts on her side, and on such occasions, she generally allows her anger to get the better of her charm and her baldness to get the better of her persuasiveness. I hope that does not happen.

But I am absolutely clear in my mind that we have come to a stage when we could not take a relaxed view of the situation and if we did we would be considered to be a feeble-minded Opposition and an irresponsible Opposition. If we are bringing up this motion, it is not a day too soon. In fact, we owe an explanation to the people who have been immensely suffering in every possible way and who ask why did we not bring it up earlier.

That brings me to another issue which has been tried to be injected into the mind of some hon. Members. It has been said that this motion has been brought up to coincide with the visit of a foreign dignitary. I would like to extend a wholehearted welcome to the honourable guest, who is coming a few days later, on behalf of the entire Opposition. But may I say this is the pure fantasy of the ruling party? What about our gestures in the past? Did we not postpone the no-confidence motion when the Prime Minister was to attend an international conference in Algiers? It was largely because of international considerations that we postponed it on that occasion. And yet, there are some Hon'ble Members and particularly the hon. Members of the Communist Party, who would al-

ways like to have one plea or another for escaping a no-confidence motion, who imagine that there was some kind of a connection between the visit of Mr. Brezhnev and the no-confidence motion. But how is that party going to explain that only two Members happened to be present on this auspicious occasion, or inauspicious for them, when the no-confidence motion was going to be moved?

We consider it to be a national duty—and we do not come with any sense of hesitation about this—to say to this party, "For God's sake, go; we cannot suffer you any further." The country has indeed begun saying so clearly. It is not a question of majority here. But my friends on the other side have blinded their eyes and stopped their ears to what the by-elections have told them in very clear and unmistakable terms—some of these by-elections to the Lok Sabha. (Interruption). Yes. By-elections to the Lok Sabha. Take Ahmedabad; take Banka; take Dindigul. But what is the message of these by-elections? Could there be a more humiliating defeat than in Dindigul where your party got only 11,000 votes out of 5,65,000 votes, when your candidate lost the security deposit? Not only did he lose his security deposit, but this very person, when he had been held as a Swatantra Party candidate, had secured 150,000 votes; and your progressive party could get him only 11,000 votes. And this in spite of messages and 100,000 pleasing photographs of the Prime Minister were that sent to the electorate? The electorate was so callous; they did not respond to the appeal of the hon. Prime Minister. Almost a mad person had contested me in 1957. No person went round the polling booths for him. Yet he was able to secure 18,500 votes or so. This gentleman got only 11,000 votes. Take again the Banka election. Here is the hon. Member Mr. Madhu Limaye who was their candidate lost their security deposit. In spite of all they had done? Do you know that on the Ahmedabad

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

Parliamentary election, you have lost in all the seven Assembly seats which comprise this seat? Only a few months before, you had won in all those seats and in the Parliamentary elections also.

✓ One does not know how the hon. Prime Minister feels when she opens newspapers every morning. Is there any news in the newspaper to cheer her up when she opens the pages except that the people of India are heroically putting up with the miseries and sufferings inflicted on them by the mismanagement of the economy and the polity of the country by the ruling party? Any Government which tries to live on pretences, hypocrisies, subterfuges, slogans and self-delusions as this Government had done—it is true of parties as it is true of individuals—any one living on negations is bound to be negated. Therefore, my conclusion is that it is the moral hollowness of the ruling party, that is at the root of the crisis that is threatening to overwhelm the country.

What is the picture of India of November, 1973 when this no confidence motion is being discussed in this House? What has been the picture of the glorious regime of Mrs. Indira Gandhi? I respectfully ask of the House and the country to consider whether the ruin of the country could have been more total than it is at the present moment either in the moral or the political, social or the economic fields? Let them tell us if there is a field in which they have chalked up progress. It is a challenge thrown to them. If you are not able to chalk up progress in any field and if you ask us what is the answer, then I say the answer is you get out, the country will find a solution. Do not go by the plea that the opposition does not have solidarity among them. The country will find a solution. There is complete agreement on this that you have messed up in every field. Did you not concede as much yesterday? That is what the Hon'ble Member Mr. Salve said when he told us that

we were indeed facing a very difficult situation, almost a calamitous situation.

✓ If that is so, the question with which we have to grapple is: who has brought about this calamity on the country? Is it the handiwork of the Opposition or is it the creation of this Government? If you were honest enough to say it was largely the responsibility of your Government but to some extent also of the political constellation in which we have a share, I may have to say something very sincerely about it. Since one cannot expect from you any kind of sincerity, I must adopt a different line.

✓ Your capacity, of course, to ruin the country, seems to be almost breathtaking. No Government in the world would have brought about this kind of a situation.

✓ Some hon'ble friends asked me the question what about the role of the Opposition in this regard. I ask them in return: when did the Opposition not cooperate with the Government on national issues? It is the Government which has failed them and betrayed their confidence.

✓ We co-operated to the fullest measure on the Bangladesh issue. But what happened soon after the Bangladesh development? Against the promises made to the Opposition, you announced the holding of the elections to the Assemblies. Were we not discussing with the Prime Minister the Bill which was to be finalised for postponing the elections? If that were so, why did you announce the holding of the elections on the morrow of the Bangladesh victory? Because you wanted to capitalise on your victory. Therefore, my hon. friend, Shri Jyotirmoy Basu, is quite right in saying "please do not flaunt this massive majority". The massive majority is the product of black money and the misuse of official machinery. Therefore, there has never been any substance in this majority. That is why you have been throwing up your hands everywhere.

Where are you ruling the country? Is Mrs. Gandhi ruling the country or is it the high prices which are ruling the country? Is it the unemployment which is ruling this country or is it Mrs. Gandhi who is ruling this country? If you could draw a line and say that prices would not be allowed to rise beyond this level, if this economic writ runs, then you could say that she is the real Prime Minister. If she draws a line and says that unemployment would not be allowed to rise beyond it—in fact, unemployment would be curbed or brought down—, if this economic writ also runs, then you can say she is the real Prime Minister of the country. Otherwise, Mrs. Gandhi might strut about within the four walls of this Lok Sabha and announce to the world that she was ruling the country, but that would not convince anyone.

Take, for example, the question of prices. In 1971-72 there was so much of international pressure; there was the Indo-Pak war and there so much of pumping in of additional money. There was considerable increase in money supply, but the prices did not rise in 1971-72. Did you give any credit to the Opposition for this? You did not give any credit to the Opposition for this? You did not give any credit to the Opposition that they did not exploit your difficult position during the Indo-Pak war when the economy had to face so many stresses and strains. Today if you try to shove all the wrath which you are facing from the people on our shoulders, you will not succeed.

Before I come to the economic aspect, let me say something about the state of democracy in our country. I have no manner of doubt that at the rate at which the ruling party is going it will soon have succeeded in destroying both democracy and socialism. Even socialism has been made a dirty word by the ruling party. If the rising prices is socialism, if the mounting unemployment is socialism, if the increasing disparity is socialism, we will have to change the definition of socialism. You have indeed made this socialism into a dirty word.

Look at democracy. How is it being run? Even this morning it was established that it is not 'State' but it is 'estate'. The Constitution has been used for serving the ends of the ruling party. Article 356 of the Constitution has been used for party purposes for rehabilitating the party in power in U.P. Andhra and Orissa. Article 356 was never meant for rehabilitating a party. It was never meant as a rehabilitation clause of the Constitution so that when Shri Kamalapati Tripathi got well after the shock of the PAC rebellion, he or his party could again come to power. That was never the intention of Article 356. Again, if was never the intention of Article 356 to prevent a majority from taking over the administration of the country. But that is precisely what has been done in Orissa. The High Court has already decided that the Opposition had the majority. If you do not agree with the decision of the High Court, why do you not go in appeal to the Supreme Court? The strictures have been passed by the High Court on the Governor of Orissa. In effect, the High Court has said that the Governor was not true to his oath. The High Court has said that the Governor did flout the conventions of parliamentary democracy. The High Court has said all that. And yet the Governor is going on merrily well. Any other Government would have recalled that Governor, dismissed that Governor. But that is not going to be. Because he did what was the command of the ruling party here.

Then, the Election Commission itself which is expected to run the elections objectively and impartially is sought to be polluted. Now, my very respected friend, Mr. Kamalapati Tripathi, is going to be a product of the polluted election to the Rajya Sabha. The seat which he is going to occupy was vacated by Col. Mohan and that seat has been kept in abeyance for the last one year. That is precisely at the command of the ruling party. Could you believe that it could happen in any part of the world that the people of a State would be deprived

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra] of their due representation? That is what is happening. Therefore, we are coming close to a situation which is getting desperate. The situation is almost on all force with Sri Lanka's. There, the new Constitution has increased the powers of the Government enormously. They have been increasing their powers, month by month, by Emergency decrees. They have taken complete control of the press.

Now, this morning, the newspapers brought us the happy tidings that all the newspaper agencies are going to be brought under a Corporation. That is precisely what this Government might be expected to do.

The main reason for the tragic and even the dangerous situation that confronts the country is that we have a Government which is only the purveyor of populism. This has brought about a dangerous law and order situation, and also due to the fact that the morale of the law-and-order keeping agency has been eroded everywhere. There used to be times when any girl in her teens could travel from Lahore to Calcutta alone in any compartment. I ask the hon. Members on the other side whether those conditions exist now. Even in the good old days, quite a few years ago, that was the condition. But that is not the condition today.

In the economic field, what has economic populism brought about? Many persons had thought earlier, and many hon. friends on the other side, because of expediency and because of enlightened self-interest, trumpeted that the Prime Minister has come forward with a foot extended forward for some big reforms, that she has rolled up her sleeves for a revolution in the country. What do we find today? All that the ruling party has been talking of has been proved to be a poppy-cock. It has no coherence. An ideology which has no coherence, which does not think of the results, is bound to fail. Whatever they have been talking about has neither the rhythm of a peaceful trans-

formation nor even the strident notes of a revolution. And yet they have been labouring under a delusion that they are still liked by the people. Now it seems that the pseudo-radical euphoria in which they had been indulging or luxuriating for some time has ended. But after having mounted this tiger of pseudoradicalism, they would not be allowed to dismount. It would be difficult for them to dismount. And if they want to dismount, the CPI, the right Communist Party, would not allow them to do that. And that is what is happening at this moment.

Therefore, it has consistently been a story of stagnation and inflation during the last three years of the massive mandate rule. We, therefore, call it a phenomenon of 'stagflation'. It has been a period of negation of socialism.

✓ Many hon. friends have already mentioned what kind of economic problems the country is facing, and I would not like to repeat them. But I would say that this Government has to its credit the highest ever price level since independence. Never in the country after independence prices had risen that high; this is the highest-ever after independence. Never had unemployment risen so high after independence.

✓ Prices rose by 22 to 23 per cent during the course of a year. And they had been saying that this was a world phenomenon. But in no country, except Chile and some Latin American countries, prices had risen that high. And in many of the countries they had got the capacity to absorb this price rise. But if you have got a population to the extent of 50 to 60 per cent below poverty line, you do not have the capacity to absorb. But that, the hon. gentlemen on the other side would never appreciate.

Coming to unemployment, can you think of any country where unemployment is rising at the rate of 34 per cent per year—general unemployment—and educated unemployment rising at the rate of 43 per cent per

year? These are all the figures from the employment exchange registers. And the regional variation of educated unemployed is such that, in West Bengal, in one year the number of educated unemployed has spurted by 75 per cent! That is the figure given by the ex-Economic Adviser to the Government of India, Mr. Ashok Mitra. This is the situation in the country that you have about 3.5 million educated unemployed on the registers of employment exchanges. Mind it, Mr. Speaker, in Sri Lanka, when the number of educated unemployed was only 18,000 there was almost a seismic upheaval there. So what we in this country are facing, you can well imagine.

Then what about the increasing disparities? After all, socialism is about equality. Inequality in this country is increasing at the rate of about 32 to 33 per cent—this again is on the basis of the figures that they have supplied to us. They have said in reply to a question that the monopoly houses had been increasing their assets at the rate of 10 per cent per year. That is so far as the peaks in the economy are concerned, their assets have been rising at the rate of 10 per cent per year. And the poor people have been going down at the rate of 22 to 23 per cent per year due to the price rise. That being so—the bottom is going down and the peak is going up and thus, the disparity is increasing at the rate of 32 to 33 per cent. This is accentuating inequality in this country.

What a fine and unenviable record, indeed, they have put up so far as socialist advance is concerned!

So far as monopoly houses are concerned, in February last, they changed the licensing policy. The House had not been able to go into the changes in the licensing policy, and now they have changed the very definition of big business houses. So this is what you find in respect of the socialist advance in this country.

17.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker, what about black

money? Recently, a committee of our House, the Public Accounts Committee, made certain revelations which could indicate to the House how the tax-evaders are being dealt with and in what manner. The Income Tax Department launched prosecutions for concealment of income in a mere 23 cases in 1968-69 and in 40 cases in 1969-70. If the number of tax-evaders is so infinitesimally small, then what is the need for our tax laws? With regard to prosecution, the study has been more interesting. The cases in which convictions were obtained were only 4 in 1963-69 and only 3 in 1969-70 and, remember, Mr. Speaker, that all the intelligence departments are concentrated in the hands of the Prime Minister both the political and the economic intelligence, and yet the tax-evaders have been going scot-free.

Ultimately, the position of the country is bound to go down on the international map. Even in the economic sense, during Mrs. Gandhi's regime, the position of the country has gone down in the matter of GNP from 6 to 7 and we, the proud citizens of the country, do not ever realise that our country is going down on the international map?

My hon. friend, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee, talked about the basic soundness of our foreign policy. I also belong to that group of persons who would like to be completely wedded to the policy of non-alignment. Have not this Government made the policy of non-alignment suspect in the eyes of the people? Then, how do we matter in this world? We were told that we and the Soviet Union are great friends and it should be a matter of pride. Indeed, it is a matter of pride that we are great friends. But are only these two friends going to save peace in the world? Are we not facing a situation of relative isolation? And if we do not count for anything in the South-East Asia, if we do not count for anything in the confabulations that are going on with regard to restoration of peace in the

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra] Middle East, then where are we going to count for? This country does not count. The world does not take note of us, it simply passes us by.

Finally, I would like to say about one thing. Much about it has been said by many hon'ble Members and they have, in fact, given so much documentary proof. So what about corruption? May I say that that is one of the factors which has been corroding our democracy and this matter gives us a great deal of anxiety. It is not Mr. S. N. Mishra who has been talking about corruption or the hon. Member, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, My hon. friend, Shri Hanumanthaiya is here. He went on a fast and prayer for three weeks in the Nandi Hills during September-October 1972. He is here to reply if necessary. He subsisted on fruit juice for three weeks.

And what was the object of his prayer? The object of his prayer was that God should cleanse his party of corruption... (Interruptions). This is the greatest testimony that one can give.

Now, certain things have been said about the Chief Minister of Haryana. You know in this House we have been agitating for the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry into the conduct of Shri Bansilal. Now, we are told that the Comptroller & Auditor-General has submitted a report on the Haryana Government which is damaging. Yet, this Government has been anxious to give him a clean chit. This had something to do with the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, that so far as my hon. friends, the Ministers are concerned, the hon'ble Minister, Mr. D. P. Dhar is here. He is a Minister whom I not only respect but I also love... (Interruptions).

SHRI A. K. M. ISHAQUE (Basirhat): What happened to you, Dhar Sahib?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: ... because his manners are so winsome. I cannot entertain any suspicions about his integrity. Let it be

quite clear. But I may say that there are some freinds about whom accusations have been going on for some time. I have great deal of sympathy for my hon. friend Shri L. N. Mishra. He is under heavy fire. He is under heavy attack and it is indeed a great burden that he is carrying. Even this morning my friend Shri Madhu Limaye has submitted an additional Memorandum, as if what had been submitted earliar was not enough. But my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee rightly insisted that some points have to be made clear. And, one point that was said with regard to my hon. friend Shri L. N. Mishra was about grant of licences for stainless steel. There was something suspicious about it. But they said, licence was granted by his predecessor. But the point is not that the licence was granted by his predecessor. The point is that the terms and conditions of licence were changed. Let the hon. Minister say whether the terms and conditions of that licence were changed or not changed. If they were not changed, we have nothing against him. If they were not changed under his regime let us be told about it.

Again, about that young officer whom he brought from his previous Ministry, Mr. Darbar, we will stick to our position. There is something against him on record and now perhaps the record is being manipulated.

Mr. L. N. Mishra has also to account for one thing which happened in his area because he happens to be a leader of some importance. Two ex-Chief Ministers were recently be laboured there. It is alleged that it was due to the manouvres of the rulling party and of his own that the political leaders of such a status and standing as the two ex-Chief Ministers of Bihar were badly belaboured recently.

✓ All in all, we are quite justified in demanding, Mr. Speaker, that the continuance of this Govt. is going to be catastrophic. Two basic mandates they claim to have secured. One was 'garibi hatao' and what we find today is, instead of 'garibi hatao' we have

got 'garibi bhulao' You talk about the principles of Mahatma Gandhi. Prohibition was something which was dearest to Mahatma Gandhi. What have you done about it? How many liquor shops have been opened in the City of Delhi? So instead of *garibi hatao*, what you are doing is *garibi bhulao*.

If the Government had been moving in the direction of *garibi hatao*, even if the pace had been a little slower we would have put up with it. But what has happened is quite contrary. Some years ago only 40 per cent of the people happened to be below the poverty line. Now they are about 60 per cent. *Garibi* has widened and deepened under your regime.

The other mandate was about social change. This Government has not been able to bring about the basic social change. We have got all the vices of a colonial regime. Indiscipline has increased; habit of work has not changed and we are declining. The country is in great trouble, in great turmoil and this Government has therefore no justification to exist.

रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) :

जनाब अध्यक्ष जी, बहस के दौरान मैं बहुत से सदस्यों ने यह कहा कि यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव एक पोलिटिकल स्टन्ट है। सही बात यह है कि विरोधी दल के हाथ में अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव एक राजनीतिक अस्त्र है, और यह मान लेना चाहिये कि इन्होंने जब अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव दिया तो उनका मकसद सिर्फ उतना ही था, उससे अधिक नहीं। जब मकसद उतना था तो उसको कुछ आवरण देना जरूरी था, और आवरण देना जरूरी था तो आज देश की जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं उनमें उसे लपेट देना था, कुछ महगाई बढ़ रही थी उसमें लपेट देना था, कुछ दाम बढ़ रहे थे उसमें लपेट देना था। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि आखिर यह किस लिए। यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव किस लिये है? क्या कभी किसी ने यह दावा किया कि हमने देश की गरीबी हटा दी?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : कम से कम उपाय दिशा में चालिये।

श्री जगजीवन राम : अगर देखने वाले को सिर्फ अंधकार ही अंधकार नजर आये, कहीं प्रकाश, कहीं प्रगति नजर न आये तो किसका दोष? आंखें तो देखने वाले के लिये ही होते हैं। लेकिन यह वर्षा भी इस पक्ष का दावा नहीं रहा है कि हमने गरीबी हटा दी। कभी हमने दावा नहीं किया कि देशवासियों का जीवन उतना स्तर उंचा होना चाहिये उतना उसको उठा दिया। यह कभी दावा नहीं किया कि बेकारी की समस्या सुलझ गई है। हम तो बराबर यही कहते रहे कि ये सारी समस्याएँ हैं जिनसे देश को लड़ना है। और प्रधान मंत्री ने बार बार कहा कि हमारे सामने ये समस्याएँ हैं जिनके साथ हमें संघर्ष करना है।

परिस्थिति गम्भीर है, आपने सबने कहा। कोई नहीं कह सकता कि परिस्थिति आसान है। श्याम बाबू, आपने पूछा कि परिस्थिति आ कैसे गई? आप अर्थशास्त्र के विद्यार्थी हैं, राजनीति के भी हैं। पिछले तीन वर्षों के माली हालात का अध्ययन करके क्या आप इस निष्कर्ष पर नहीं पहुँच सकते हैं कि जो कुछ हुआ उसके लिये कारण था? मैं मानता हूँ अगर सही तरीके से आप सोचेंगे तो आप पायेंगे कि जो परिस्थिति आयी है उसके लिये कुछ ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ थीं जो हमारे काबू के बाहर की थीं। ठंडे दिल से आप सोचेंगे इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को जो आपने आवरण से लपेटा है उसका निरीक्षण करेंगे तो आप इस निष्कर्ष पर जरूर पहुँच जायेंगे कि जितनी परिस्थिति बिगड़नी चाहिये कम से कम सरकार को आपको इसके लिये श्रेय देना चाहिये कि उतनी परिस्थिति हमने नहीं बिगड़ने दी। जो हालात पिछले तीन सालों में हमारे सामने आये, जिनका वर्णन मैं विस्तार से करना मुनासिब नहीं समझता, उसमें अगर देशके अन्दर यह शक्ति नहीं होती,

[श्री जगजीवन राम]

और मैं मानता हूँ कि भारत की जनता में यह दृढ़ता नहीं होती, तो आप लोगों ने जो परिस्थिति पैदा करने की कोशिश की थी उस में देश नहीं अधिक संकट में जाता।

आप ने कहा, किसी विपक्षी सदस्य ने बोलते हुए कहा कि आप इस बात की पूर्वाह्न न करें कि आप सत्तारूढ़ रहेंगे कि नहीं रहेंगे, जनता की आकांक्षाओं का ध्यान करें। तो मैं कहता हूँ कि जनता की आकांक्षाओं का ध्यान कर के ही हम सत्तारूढ़ हैं, दूसरी तरह से नहीं हैं। अगर कोई भी सत्तारूढ़ होना चाहता है तो उस के लिये एक ही मार्ग है जनता की आकांक्षाओं का आदर करना, उन की पूर्ति के लिये प्रयास करना। और उस के लिये एक ही लक्ष्य होना चाहिये कि हम जनता के साथ एकरूपता कैसे स्थापित कर सकते हैं। और अगर हमारा दल और किसी चीज का दावा नहीं कर सकता तो इतना दावा जरूर कर सकता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में अगर किसी राजनीतिक दल ने जनता के साथ एकरूपता स्थापित की है तो वह कांग्रेस है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता निरक्षर हो सकती है लेकिन नहीं है। भले बुरे को उस को अच्छी तरह से पहचान है। किन परिस्थितियों में कौन उस का साथी है इस की परख भी उस को है।

आज जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आप लाये, उस का मकसद मेरे भिन्न श्री ज्योतिर्मय बस ने साफ़ कर दिया। बड़े सुन्दर वाक्य का इस्तेमाल किया है— to demolish and annihilated the Opposition आप को इसी बात का डर था कि आगे आने वाले दिनों में विरोधी दल का अन्त हो जायगा इसलिये आप कोशिश कर रहे थे इस मूढ़े पर भी इस सदन में कम से कम सब को इकट्ठा कर दें। उस में कितनी सफलता आप को मिली वह डा० कर्णी सिंह और आप के बीच में जो कुछ अभी अभी गुजरा वह सब को मालूम हो गया। आप ने अपने भाषण को समाप्त करते करते यही

कहा था कि यह जगह हम खाली कर दें। मैं सोच रहा था खाली कर देने पर श्याम बाबू और डा० कर्णी सिंह आयेंगे क्या? और अगर आयेंगे तो जो नजारा आज पेश हुआ था देश के शासन के लिये वही पेश होने वाला है। हमारे देश की निरक्षर जनता भी वह समझती है कि साझे की बत्ती भी ठीक नहीं होती, साझे की दुकानदारी भी नहीं चलती, तो फिर साझेदारी की सरकार कैसे चल सकती है। यह मैं कोई कोरे मिद्धान्त की वाक्य नहीं कर रहा हूँ, यह दिन रात के तजुबों की बात है।

एक अन्यायीय सदस्य : केरल में चल रही हैसाझेदारी की।

श्री जगजीवन राम : केरल का क्या प्रमाण दे रहे हैं। आप के दल ने कितने गठ-बन्धन किए और सब बेकार रहे। आप ने उत्तर प्रदेश का क्यों नहीं फिक्र किया। और एक बड़ी सुन्दर बात हुई, मैं मानता हूँ कि 1967 के बाद भारतीय जनता के लिये एक सुन्दर प्रयोग का अवसर आया था। 20, 21 साल में सिर्फ एक ही राजनीतिक दल कांग्रेस के शासन का उन को अनुभव था। हर एक दल का अलग अलग अनुभव करना पड़ता तो न मालूम कितने साल लगते। 1967 में तो सभी दलों का अनुभव उन को हो गया। और इसलिये आप को मान लेना पड़ेगा कि 1967 के अनुभव से उन्होंने पा लिया कि कांग्रेस में खराबियां हो सकती हैं, लेकिन देश को चलाने की क्षमता अगर है तो सिर्फ कांग्रेस पार्टी में ही है।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : क्यों हवा में बातें कर रहे हैं।

श्री जगजीवन राम : बात यह है कि हवा में जो बातें हो तो उस का जवाब भी कुछ हवादार होना चाहिये। मैं बैठे बैठे यही सोच रहा था कि आखिर अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव क्यों है। आप ने कहा उत्तर प्रदेश का चुनाव आ रहा है, उड़ीसा का चुनाव आ रहा है, पोडीचेरी का चुनाव आ रहा है। तो मैं भी

तो यही कह रहा हूँ कि आप भी तो यही सोच रहे हैं।

लेकिन मैं आप को स्मरण करा देना चाहता हूँ कि इंसान की स्मरण शक्ति थोड़ी छोटी होती है। क्यों आप भूल जाते हैं 1971 को? क्या उसका तजुर्ना आपको नहीं है? बनाया था आपने एक गठबंधन चार पार्टियों की चौकड़ी भी बनी थी। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने देख लिया था कि यह जो रथ है, चौकड़ी है इस में जो चार घोड़े जुते हैं उन में से एक का मुँह पूर्व की ओर है, दूसरे का पश्चिम की ओर, एक का उत्तर की ओर और दूसरे का दक्षिण की ओर। अगर इस रथ पर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के शासन की सवारी हो गई तो वे घोड़े कहाँ ले जाएंगे?

सदन में मैं घोड़ों की उपमा नहीं दूंगा। लेकिन यहां कुछ पार्टियों का गठबंधन करके आपने यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव रखा है। आपने कभी सोचा है कि अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का अर्थ यही तो होता है राजनीति में कि अगर आपको उस में सफलता मिल गई तो शासन को सम्भाल सकेंगे...

श्री श्यामनन्धन मिश्र : चुनाव में चलिये।

श्री जगजीवन राम : वह तो चल ही रहे हैं।

अर्थात् मैंने कहा सदन के सदस्यों को स्मरण होगा कि इंसान की स्मरण शक्ति छोटी होती है। अभी एक दो साल पहले नहीं बल्कि चन्द मिनट पहले श्याम बाबू शिकायत कर रहे थे कि बहुत पहले आपने चुनाव कर दिया 1971 में...

श्री श्यामनन्धन मिश्र : क्योंकि हमारे साथ आप बात कर रहे थे स्थगित करने की।

श्री जगजीवन राम : सारा दाव आपको बता करके हम करते? आप विपक्ष में काम

भी करें और यह मंशा रखते हैं साथ साथ कि एक दिन हम को परास्त करके उस जगह पर पहुंच जाएं जहां हम हैं और आप यह भी उम्मीद करें कि हम विपक्ष को शक्ति देते रहें तो यह बड़ी अजीब बात है। इसलिए इस में सारा मानना यह था।

यह ठीक है कि लोगों को परेशानी है, अनएम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ा है, दाम और मंहगाई बढ़ी है, चीजों का मिलना कठिन हो रहा है। लेकिन सब कुछ होने के बावजूद भी लोग कांग्रेस से चिपटे हुए हैं उसको कैसे भूला जाए...

श्री श्यामनन्धन मिश्र : यह यूनिट्रल लव अफेयर है। जनता आपके साथ नहीं है।

श्री जगजीवन राम : कांग्रेस का लव अफेयर यूनिट्रल नहीं होता बाई-द-वेय होता है। इसको आप भी मानेंगे (इट एम्प्लाय) अभी आप दायरे में नहीं आए हैं। अगर आप प्रयत्न करेंगे तो उस में भी हम लोग कोताही नहीं करेंगे।

17.28 hrs.

[SHRI N. K. P. SALVE in the Chair]

मैं कह रहा था कि यह बात ठीक है कि परेशानियाँ हैं। लेकिन साथ साथ मैं यह भी कह रहा था कि अंधकार में भी कुछ प्रकाश की किरण है। मुल्क टूटने वाला नहीं है। इस मुल्क की जनता इस देश को बरकरार रखने की शक्ति रखती है। जनता जानती है कि दुख के बाद सुख के दिन आते हैं। मैं आंकड़े नहीं दूंगा। दे सकता हूँ। मैं यह नहीं कह सकता हूँ कि दुनिया के और कितने देशों में हमारे जितने दाम बढ़े हैं। लेकिन यह तो आपको मानना पड़ेगा कि एक ऐसा साइकिल आया है कि जिन वक्त दुनिया के सभी देशों में चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ी हैं, मंहगाई बढ़ी है जो समृद्धिशाली देश हैं वे अपने यहां के उस वर्ग की जिस को मंहगाई की वजह से ज्यादा परेशानी होती है, उस परेशानी से बहुत हद

[श्री जगजीवन राम]

तक बन्ना लेते हैं। लेकिन हम एक उस विकासोन्मुख देश हैं। हम भी चाहते हैं कि हमारे यहाँ तेजी से तरक्की हो ताकि हम भी समृद्धिशाली बन सकें, हम अपनी जनता के जीवन स्तर को ऊँचा बना सकें। हम भी चाहते हैं कि शताब्दियों से हमारे मध्ये मढ़ी हुई गरीबी को हम अपने ऊपर से हटा दें। लेकिन क्या आप और हम इस पर मिल कर नहीं सोच सकते हैं कि शताब्दियों से मध्ये मढ़ी हुई गरीबी को कैसे मिटाया जा सकता है और क्या इतने ही दिनों में उसका अन्त किया जा सकता है? अगर आप ईमानदारी से इस पर सोचेंगे तो आपको भी सहमत होना पड़ेगा कि जितना कुछ किया गया है पिछले पच्चीस साल में और जितना कुछ हुआ है उस पर देश को गौरव ही हो सकता है, ~~कुछ~~ कोई शक नहीं है। हमारे साधन सीमित हैं। परम्परावादी समाज हमारा रहा है। परम्परावादी समाज से हम अपने को निकालें जो न सिर्फ हमारे सामाजिक छम्बन्धों में ही परेशानी पैदा करता है बल्कि जो हमारे उत्पादन पर भी आघात करता है। इन परिस्थितियों में जितनी हम लोगों ने प्रगति की है चाहे वह भारी उद्योगों के मामले में हो, कृषि के मामले में हो, सिंचाई के मामले में हो, लोगों को शिक्षित करने के मामले में हो, आपको मानना पड़ेगा कि सीमित साधन होते हुए भी, परम्परावादी समाज हमारा होते हुए भी वह ऐसी है कि जिस पर किसी भी देश के लोग संतोष और गौरव अनुभव कर सकते हैं, और संतोष का यह विषय हो सकता है। इस तरफ आप क्यों नहीं देखते हैं। यह तो राष्ट्रीय संकट का समय है। हिन्दुस्तान की गरीबी को मिटाना है और यह संकल्प किसी एक खास पार्टी का नहीं होना चाहिये यह तो प्रत्येक समझदार हिन्दुस्तानी का होना चाहिये। मैं मानता हूँ कि चाहे हम इस तरफ बैठे हों या उस तरफ बैठे हों, हम सब देश भक्त हैं। हम सब चाहते हैं कि देश तरक्की करे, देश से गरीबी मिटे। अब उस में क्या यह

आवश्यक नहीं था कि इस वक्त जो परेशानी है मंहगाई की देश को उस परेशानी को बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न न किया जाता बल्कि लोगों को हिम्मत दिलाने की कोशिश की जाती। इसी बात की आवश्यकता थी। यही हम आप से आशा भी करते थे।

मैं आप सब से बहुत आग्रह के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस बृष्टिकोण से भी सोचें और देखें कि बहुत सी बातें जो आपने कहीं हैं वे सही होते हुए भी जिस लहजे में अपने उनको कहा है उस लहजे में न कह कर दूसरे लहजे में कह करके राष्ट्रीय हित में जो हो सकता था वह कह सकते थे और उनको रखनात्मक बना सकते थे, गठनमूलक बना सकते थे।

इसी चीज की आवश्यकता है। गरीबी तो है लेकिन देश गरीब नहीं है। इस में कोई मतभेद नहीं है। बेकारी बढ़ गई है इस में भी मतभेद नहीं है। शिक्षित लोगों को कालेज से निकल कर परेशानी रहती है इस में भी कोई शक नहीं है....

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : फिर भी आपका रुतबा बढ़ रहा है।

श्री जगजीवन राम : इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि फिर भी देश का रुतबा बढ़ रहा है और इस पर आपको भी संतोष होना चाहिए। हमारी कुछ मालिक नीतियों के कारण ही यह सम्भव हो सका है। हमारी समस्त नीति उसका कारण रही है कि गरीब होते हुए भी दुनिया में हमारी आवाज की कीमत है। इस में कोई शुबहे की बात नहीं है। हमारी सशक्त नीति, न्याय संगत नीति का कारण यह रहा है कि हम आर्थिक बृष्टिकोण से विकासोन्मुख देश होते हुए सैनिक शक्ति में दूसरों की समता में नहीं होते हुए भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में हमारी आवाज की इज्जत होती है इस बात से आपको भी संतोष होना चाहिये।

एक और चीज है। कांग्रेस एक राष्ट्रीय मंच रहा है यह तो आप मानेंगे। एक राजनीतिक दल बनने पर भी उस चीज को हम भुला नहीं पाते हैं कि हमारा राष्ट्रीय मंच है। उसका लाभ आप उठा लेना चाहते हैं तो आपको उस में कभी कामयाबी नहीं मिलेगी। आपके भी कुछ तजुबों रहे हैं? यह तो आप भी मानते हैं कि कांग्रेस एक राष्ट्रीय मंच रहा है। हम कोशिश करते हैं कि हम एक दल के हों गये तब भी कभी कभी दिमाग में आ जाता है कि हम राष्ट्रीय मंच है। ऐसी हालत में कुछ हमारे साथ अगर इस तरह से बात कर लेते हैं तो आप क्यों समझते हैं कि कांग्रेस में फूट पड़ रही है?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : जैसे तत्वों से आप घिर गये हैं, क्या आप उस से खुश हैं

श्री जगजीवन राम : आप को खतरा बना हुआ है कि कहीं कांग्रेस सारे विरोधी दलों को निगल न जाये। (हयबबान) आप श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसू के भाषण को पढ़ लीजिये आप को वही बात मिलेगी। इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को लाने में उन्होंने ही नेतृत्व दिया है। कम से कम इस मामले में तो वही आप के नेता हैं।

कांग्रेस अपने अन्दर सभी नीतियों का विश्लेषण कर के जिस निर्णय पर पहुँचती है, उस पर श्रद्धा से कायम रहती है। आपस में मतभेद होता है, और वह सशक्त राजनैतिक दल का परिचायक है। लेकिन एक दफ़ा जब निर्णय हो जाता है, तो उस पर सभी एक-राय हो कर काम करते हैं। मैं इस बात को इसलिए साफ़ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि आप यह न समझें कि हम विरोधी दलों को खत्म करना चाहते हैं?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : अब कुछ डर नहीं है।

श्री जगजीवन राम : अब डर क्यों रहेगा, अब तो वाईलेटल होनेकी बात है?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : पता नहीं, विन खतरों के आधार पर आप यह कह रहे हैं।

श्री जगजीवन राम : मैं किसी खतरों के आधार पर नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं तो आप की सज्जनता के भरोसे कह रहा हूँ।

मैं श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसू और उन के साथियों को भी आश्चर्य करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वे सही मानों मैं स्वस्थ प्रजातंत्र में विश्वास करने लगे, तो हम लोग चाहेंगे कि इस मुल्क में प्रजातंत्र को चलाने के लिए एक सशक्त और क्षमताशील विरोधी दल रहे—चाहे कोई भी हो। इस बात की आवश्यकता है। मैं उन को यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार का यह बराबर प्रयत्न रहेगा कि देश में प्रजातंत्र का मूल मजबूत बने और गहरा जाये। आज वही एक चीज है, जो सिर्फ़ इस देश के लिए नहीं, बल्कि दुनिया के लिए भी शान्तिमय, स्वस्थ और विकसित जीवनका संदेश दे सकती है।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हर वक्त कुछ उन बातों को कुरेदते रहना, जिन पर सदन में कितनी ही दफ़ा बहस और फ़ंसला हो चुका हो, राष्ट्रीय जीवन के लिए, और संसदीय जीवन के लिए भी, अच्छा नहीं होता है। जैसे मारुति का प्रश्न है? वह कितनी ही दफ़ा उठाया गया और कितनी ही दफ़ा उस का जवाब दिया गया। लेकिन उस में से कुछ न कुछ शोषे निकाले जाते हैं। आखिर कहीं उस का अन्त तो होना चाहिए। कई दफ़ा उस का उत्तर दे दिया गया है। मैं उस को दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ वह संसद् की प्रोसीडिग्स में आ चुका है।

उस से मेरे मंत्रालय के संबंध का प्रश्न उठाया गया। जवाब दे दिया गया—और श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र को तो लिखित उत्तर भी दे दिया गया था—कि हमारे यहाँ से जो एक नोटिफिकेशन हुआ था, उस में यह गन्ती जरूर रही कि हरियाणा सरकार के जिस

[श्री जगजीवन राम]

अधिकारी के पास वह जाना चाहिए था, वह उस के पास नहीं भेजा गया। इस लिए हारियाणा सरकार को जानकारी नहीं थी, लेकिन साथ ही जिस वक्त हरियाणा सरकार ने जमीन अधिग्रहण करने का यह काम किया, उस वक्त वह नोटिफिकेशन अमल में नहीं था।

मैं इस प्रश्न का एक अन्य पहलू सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। लैंड एक्वीजिशन एक्ट का यह तरीका है कि यह बताया जाता है कि किसके लिए और किस मतलब के लिए जमीन ली जा रही है? उस वक्त यह जमीन हरियाणा सरकार के डेवेलपमेंट के काम के लिए ली गई? और वह जमीन लेने के बाद से हरियाणा सरकार ने वहाँ उद्योगों के विकास के लिए मारुति इंडस्ट्री के साथ साथ और भी कितने लोगों को जमीन दी।

कुछ सदस्यों ने शिकायत की है कि जो मुआवजा दिया गया, वह मुनासिब नहीं था, कम था। लेकिन वे भूल जाते हैं कि लैंड एक्वीजिशन एक्ट में इस के लिए जोरास्ता खुला है। अगर कोई समझें कि मुनासिब मुआवजा नहीं मिला है, कम्पेन्सेशन सही नहीं है, तो वे निर्धारित आर्म को अख्तियार कर सकते हैं। मैं सदन को बताना चाहता हूँ कि जिन 490 व्यक्तियों की जमीन ली गई है, उन में से सिर्फ 120 व्यक्तियों ने दावा किया है कि उन को जो कम्पेन्सेशन मिला है, वह सही नहीं है? इस मामले पर मैं अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि यह मामला कोर्ट के सामने है?

श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु ने एक दूसरी बात यह कही कि 1957 में कुछ जमीनों को छोड़ देने की बात हुई? 1957 में पंडित जी प्रधान मंत्री थे तब उन से कुछ लोगों ने कहा था कि जो जमीनें ली गई हैं डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से उन को छोड़ देना चाहिए? यह फैसला हुआ था कि जो जमीन डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री

की जरूरत की नहीं होगी, वह छोड़ दी जायेगी और वे जमीनें छोड़ दी गई थीं।

श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु यहां नहीं हैं। दिमांग उन का तेज है, मस्तिष्क परिशुद्ध है। वह परिश्रम भी करने वाले हैं। मुझे आशा है कि अगर वह गन्दी बातों को न देख कर सही बातों को देखेंगे, तो देश की अधिक सेवा कर सकेंगे?

मैं विपक्ष के सभी नेताओं से सानुनय आग्रह करूंगा कि देश की इस गम्भीर समस्या के रहते कोई ऐसा काम नहीं करना चाहिए, जिस से समस्या और बिगड़ जाये बल्कि यही काम करना चाहिए कि समस्या सुधर जायें, ताकि देश की शक्ति बने और देश का मस्तक ऊंचा हो सके?

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I at the outset say that I greatly enjoyed the Defence Minister's speech. It was scintillating, full of witty sallies. But it seems to me that this is not the occasion when by merely making a witty speech, you can answer the charges that have been levelled against the Government's conduct or affairs.

When No-Confidence Motion is brought forward, it is not merely that we should be prepared for an alternative Government. But it is also to give expression in the sort of circumstances in which the Opposition is placed today to the feelings of the general public. It must not be forgotten, when the ruling party claims to represent the people that they are not the sole representative of the people, we also do so on the Opposition side. Even in 1971, the percentage of votes that they received was of the order of 40, and the majority of the votes were polled by the Opposition parties, so that, to say that they alone represent the people is to say something which does not accord with facts. But I do not wish nor wish to enter further into that.

The Defence Minister seemed to carry on a wordy duel with his former colleague, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra. Whether he got the better of that or not, I would not like to say anything, but it did seem to me that he was certainly more successful in many of the repartees, in many of the sallies that he made. I would have expected him to go more into the merits of the case. After all, the no-confidence motion says that this Government has not carried on the business of Government as is expected of a good government. And what do you expect of a good government? You expect a good government—when we are talking of a government in a democratic set up to look after the affairs of the people, the common men, and provides them with certain basic facilities. First, it would ensure that law and order is maintained so that people can go about their business without any anxiety. Then, it would create conditions in which people may rest assured that, in their old age, what they have saved will be worth what they thought it would be when they started their savings. A good government would also ensure that whatever is essential for a reasonable living can be obtained by the ordinary man without any difficulty and at reasonable prices. There are other things also which such a government ought to do. But I would confine myself, for the time being, to these three points.

First of all, let us consider the maintenance of law and order. Can this Government really say that it has maintained law and order as efficiently as it ought to? Even in Delhi today it is not safe for people to go about, after dark, in complete safety, travelling in a rickshaw or taxi or even by bus, all alone. Have we not read of incidents which had led to the actual death of people travelling in this manner in Delhi and not so very long ago either. Does a day pass, when we open the newspaper, without our seeing reports of riots, reports of police firing on students or on those who have gone on strike or on unemployed people? And both sides usually have recourse to violence. Why is it that there is recourse to violence so readily

and so frequently? It is only because most people are today convinced that, unless they agitate and with violence, they are not going to be listened to. Regarding safety of the things in Delhi, I would say further that in the last few weeks, there have been instances where safe deposit vaults of banks have also been raided and successfully.

It seems to me that the Government have not yet realised—I am speaking at the moment only of the Police administration—that we are no longer living in the early decades of the 20th century; events have moved so rapidly that to deal with the problems of law and order, to day, you require a Police force of a very different kind, differently recruited, differently organised, differently equipped and differently trained. They also ought to be differently paid and differently housed. When we had this trouble in UP, what were the reasons? Quite apart from anything-else—I do not wish to enter into the details of that—but one of the major reasons undoubtedly was the time taken in dealing with their grievances which have been admitted to be legitimate grievances. Is this a sign of good government, a government which wishes to ensure that its people can move about freely and without anxiety?

Now, when we come to the question of inflation, inflation, it is said, is a global affair. This word 'global' has come in very handy. There are so many things that are global. One can also say that there is dissatisfaction with very many governments and dissatisfaction with the Government is also of a global nature, but it does not take us anywhere. Let us consider the degree of inflation that has taken place in this country. Is that the kind of inflation that makes for happiness for the ordinary man? Has anybody envisaged the kind of difficulties which it creates for the ordinary man? When the currency loses its value so rapidly and when it is considered with other developments, when even the essential requirements for a reasonable living are no longer

[Shri H. M. Patel]

available readily, their sufferings become almost unbearable. Consider to-day what is it that one can get in this city without any difficulty? Is it possible to get what you want of your food requirements without difficulty? Can you get cloth at a reasonable price and in ample quantity? Is kerosene available freely and as needed? Edible oil—though the conditions have improved to-day, but a few weeks ago, all these commodities were extremely difficult to get. Now, I think even the cooking gas has become a problem for many people. These are not the requirements of a very special nature or of a sophisticated nature so that there should be any difficulty.

How have these difficulties come about in the availability of these commodities? It is not enough to say that every body is aware of this, that we have done extremely well in certain other matters and, therefore, this explains itself. But does it explain itself? What is the reason? Why is it that these essential commodities are in difficult supply? The Finance Minister gave a reply that they have been taking steps to meet this by increasing production. And what are the steps that they have taken for increasing production? He mentioned some. But it seems to me that not one of those steps could be said to have been designed to increase production. Let us take first the nationalisation. He said that they have nationalised coal mines, and coking coal mines. Has that led to increased production? Although the Minister said the other day that this had led to increased production, I think that was not absolutely in accordance with the facts. He referred to figures before the mines were taken over. The production of the coal mines subsequent to February 1973 has certainly shown a decline. In any case, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Why is it that the Railways have had to cancel hundreds of trains for want of coal? If they were short of coal, it can be only because coal was not available.

Coal was not available because production had fallen. He said also that they took over wheat trade to increase production. How that could have the effect of increasing production. I do not understand; there can be no connection between the two. The wheat trade takeover on the contrary created a sense of uncertainty in the minds of the farmers for the future. But what intrigued me most was what he said with regard to the arrangements for importing wheat. He said conditions happened to be difficult in the world market when the decision was taken. But I think he made a mistake in his chronology. He said that as soon as the decision was taken to take-over wheat, they had prepared for the import of wheat, then I would have said there would have been no difficulty whatsoever in the world situation at that time for the procurement of wheat. So there would seem to have been no proper coordination even in the Govt, in this respect and this is really a serious charge against the Government. Even in matters where they adopt right policies the implementation is so terribly defective that nothing really succeeds. I would like to give an instance for that. The Defence Minister claimed special conditions obtained during the last three years. One of these undoubtedly was the shortage of power. Was that due to the fact that there was shortage in rainfall? Is that the only reason? That is not so. It is admitted that these power stations had been working at 40 per cent of their efficiency. Who was responsible for this efficient functioning and manning of power houses? Who was responsible also for not putting up new generating stations in accordance with the plans that were made? We have ended up the Fourth Five-year Plan or we shall end up with a shortage of four million kilowatts of energy which means the power shortage will persist throughout the Fifth Five-year Plan and it would even exceed that. What does power shortage lead to? Power shortage results in serious loss of production. Power shortage affects

agricultural production, rural electrification on which depends rural development.

The Treasury Benches tell us about running the government efficiently. Let us not talk about personalities. Let us talk about plans and programmes. The Defence Minister said about achievements during the past 25 years, and said, we had reason to be proud of what we have achieved. Undoubtedly. So should we all. But I would say, when discussing amongst ourselves that our achievements would have been infinitely greater had we managed our affairs much more efficiently, as efficiently, as we ought to have done.

Who is responsible for that lack of efficiency? Is that also failure of the Opposition or is that the failure of the Government—the Administration? Why has it failed in that respect? Because, corruption has entered at every level of governmental administration. This is known and yet, what steps are being taken for removing corruption when charges are levelled against ministers and memoranda are given about those charges supported by a detailed account of each charge and signed by a number of responsible people? If those charges are ignored, is that character assassination to refer to such things? Is it character assassination to refer to it when these are not being dealt with in the manner that they should be dealt with? If a Government is anxious to have honest administration and the first criterion of a good Government is honesty in administration, what is there to prevent them from ordering an independent inquiry? That is all that is asked for. Is that character assassination to ask for the matters being inquired into properly?

I think, Mr. Chairman, this House is well aware of what was done by the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when complaints mounted against the late

Mr. Kairon, Chief Minister of Punjab, an extremely able man and who did really remarkable work for that State and, yet when those charges were made, substantiated at least by those who made them, the prime Minister, Shri Nehru agreed to an inquiry being conducted by a Supreme Court judge. That is all that is asked for. Why should there be any hesitation in ordering an inquiry into those charges that have been levelled? For instance, take the case of the Chief Minister of Haryana or the Railway Minister. The latter says that he can reply to every charge completely. Well, if he can so reply what is anybody afraid of? This is something which the Government may well consider. It ought to be the claim of Government that it is always honest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patel, your time is up.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Sir, I have not even touched some of the points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patel, I have given you three times the time that is allowed to your party.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: At least half an hour's time must be given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When your turn comes you will plead when the Speaker will be here.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: In the Business Advisory Committee, it was decided that every organised party will be given at least 45 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a chart before me to consonance with the agreement arrived at in the B.A.C. And I am going according to that. Please conclude.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Will you permit me to have a few minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Please go ahead?

18:00 hrs.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Take the case of shortage of commodities. There is great anxiety about oil shortage. That is quite legitimate. This, however is a matter which was not known to-day only. Our own production of oil has always been very limited. There was a time when we thought that there was no oil to be found in the sub-continent. Some ten years ago, we took up the question of off-shore drilling. At that time there were well drawn up offers for the off-shore oil exploration. But, the Government deliberately rejected the offers which were of great value to this country at that time. On what ground—ideological. Nothing was considered on merit. An American firm made *prima facie* a good offer. It offered to bear all the expense of the drilling. Whatever be the expense, it would be at its expense. If oil was found, then and then only a certain percentage—it asked, I think, for 20 per cent—was to be given as its share. If no oil was found, the entire expenditure on exploration would be at its cost. It also said that it was open to negotiation on the question of the quantum of whatever was to be made available to it. That offer was never considered. To this day, what has been the result of this. We thought that we would go ahead with others but they had no experience of off-shore drilling, and the result has been that at the end of this long period, no progress whatsoever has been made, and with such little tentative efforts as have been made with one rig. It has also now had to be admitted that it does not look as if it can make much progress by itself. Who is responsible? What is the cost to this country? Who calculates it? Nobody....

DR. KAILAS (Bombay South): When was the decision taken? It was long before. When was the decision taken not to allow the US firm to do it?

SHRI H. M. PATEL: It was a decision taken when the present Prime

Minister was also Prime Minister. I can only tell my hon. friend that the present Prime Minister was also then Prime Minister. He can rest assured that when I make a statement of this kind, it is based on facts, and I do not draw upon imagination.

DR. KAILAS: Which year?

SHRI H. M. PATIL: Unfortunately, I have not got the year, are, but I have mentioned the time, that it was under the Prime Ministership of the present Minister. That probably gives quite enough information.

Then, I would like to mention about fertilisers. I think it is an extremely important subject for those who say that agriculture has been next their heart. Fertilisers are most important. The importance of the fact is that only with sufficient fertilisers could there be a green revolution. This is well known. Green revolution does not happen of its own accord. You know that the chemical fertilisers that we produce are not sufficient to meet even 50 per cent of our requirements. For years, the Agriculture Ministry has worked on the role that organic manure can play and the extent to which organic manure can help in production. There is also green manure which has also its value.

I asked the hon. Minister only yesterday whether they had any policy in regard to the development of organic manure. All the reply that I got was that they had written to the State Ministers. Then, what is the function of the Agriculture Ministry? These long-term matters, these vital matters as would ensure adequate supply and adequate production of manures must be the business or duty of a good Government.

I was reminded of this, when the Defence Minister was speaking, that when in doubt, Mark Twain has said somewhere, speak the truth. I think when in doubt, our rulers say, enunciate, preach austerity, practice conscience some slogans, some noble principles preach austerity practise con-

spicuous consumption and waste, and expand currency

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
And seek co-operation.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: This seems to me to be what our rulers seem to have evolved as their policy.

The Finance Minister said that Government had been taking many steps for meeting the economic situation and for ensuring economic development. I would venture to give this suggestion for his consideration that for economic development, one requires clear and disinterested thinking—I would emphasise both these words 'clear' and 'disinterested'; the word 'disinterested' is particularly important—the capacity to master innumerable details and make a coherent whole out of them, continuous watchfulness in implementation, which is never done, quick solving of local difficulties, prompt encouragement to the deserving and equally prompt punishment to the unworthy.

All these, in addition to honesty and fairmindedness, are necessary for economic development. Can we say that we notice all these factors in the actions of the Government? I think the answer would be 'No.' I do not wish to enlarge further since I see the Chairman getting very anxious.

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत (पूर्व दिल्ली):
सभापति जी, बाबूजी ने जो अपने विचार इस सदन के सामने रखे उसके बाद मुझे विरोधी दलों से कुछ सहायता मिली है। श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र जी उठ कर चले गये, मैंने नोट किया कि उनको तीन बार जब से रूमाल निकाल कर पसीना पोंछना पड़ा और श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु ने खीरियत यह भी कि सदन से बाहर ही रहें। एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है जिस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करने की जरूरत है। हमारे विरोधी दलों का कहना है कि आप हट जाइये, देश अपने आप बदल बूढ़ लेगा, देश आपको नहीं चाहता है, देश आपका बदल दू लेगा और

स्वयं उनका यह भी कहना है, डा० कर्णी सिंह ने कहा तब दूसरे लोगों ने भी कहा कि हम तो बदल नहीं हो सकते हैं। और भी बहुत कुछ कहा गया मैं उसका दोहराता नहीं। हाउस में जो कुछ हुआ उसके बाद जब अपोजिशन और विरोधी दल स्वयं यह मानते हैं कि वे अकेले या मिलकर देश में कोई बदल आज की सरकार का नहीं हो सकते तो सोचने का बात है कि ऐसा क्यों है। आखिर 25 सालों में विरोधी दल अकेले या मिलकर भी कांग्रेस सरकार का बदल नहीं बन सके जबकि उनके कहने के मुताबिक कांग्रेस सरकार ने देश का नाश कर दिया है, गलत नीतियों को अपनाया है, जनता नाराज हो गई है, तूफान उठने वाला है—इसके बावजूद भी कि यह सब बातें जनता के सामने रखते हैं, कहते हैं फिर भी आखिर में यह सवाल क्यों है कि अपोजिशन इस देश की मौजूदा सरकार का अल्टिमाटम नहीं बन सका, मैं समझता हूँ अपोजिशन के लिए और देश के लिए यह एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। मुझे खुशी नहीं है इस बात से कि अपोजिशन इस हालत में रहे या अपोजिशन किसी समय भी इस देश में अल्टिमाटम बनने की स्थिति में न आये। इस बात से मुझे खुशी नहीं है और देश के लोगों को भी सोचना चाहिए कि आखिर इसका कारण क्या है? इसका सीधा कारण यह है कि कोई भी दबल सरकार का तभी बन सकता है जब वह बड़े काम करे और बड़े काम वे ही कर सकते हैं जिनकी नजर बड़े कामों पर जाये। इस देश के लिए यह दुर्भाग्य की बात रही है कि हमारे विरोधी दलों की नजर बड़ी बातों की तरफ नहीं रही। हर देश में किसी न किसी समय कोई न कोई संकट, कोई न कोई कठिनाई आती है। हमारे देश में भी पिछले 25 सालों में, अगर हम पीछे जाकर देखें तो मेरे ख्याल में एक एक कदम पर कोई न कोई कठिनाई, कोई न कोई चुनौती देश के सामने आई है। लेकिन हुआ क्या है? हमारे विरोधी दलों

[श्री एच के एल भगत]

ने बजाये इसके कि देश के हित में सोचकर जनता के हित में सोचकर उस कठिनाई को हल करने में मदद करे या उसकी तरफ कोई कदम बढ़ायें, उन्होंने उस कठिनाई को और कठिन करने की कोशिश की है, उस संकट को और गम्भीर करने की कोशिश की है, उस संकट को और ज्यादा बढ़ाकर जनता में दिखाने की कोशिश की है लेकिन उस संकट को टालने के लिए या संकट के समाधान के लिए जो भी काम सरकार ने किया है उसकी भी निन्दा करने की उन्होंने कोशिश की है ।

हमारे वाजपेयी जी शब्दों के प्रयोगमें, हर-फेर से शब्दों के प्रयोग में बड़े माहिर हैं । उन्होंने कहा कांग्रेस की नीतियां न प्रो-डक्शन ऑरिएण्टेड हैं, न डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन ऑरिएण्टेड हैं । बल्कि एलेक्शन ऑरिएण्टेड हैं । यह ठीक है कांग्रेस की नजर चुनाव पर रहती है, जनता पर रहती है, परन्तु जनसंघ की नीतियां ऐसी नहीं होती जो जनता के हक में हों और उसकी हर बात में डुप्लिसिटी होती है । नजर उनकी भी चुनाव पर रहती है । मैं उसकी एक मिसाल देता हूं । वाजपेयी जी ने कहा मुस्लिम लीग को कांग्रेस प्रोत्साहन देती है । मुस्लिम लीग भी चर्चा करते हुए उन्होंने कांग्रेस सरकार की निन्दा की । मैं जानना चाहता हूं भारत में मुस्लिम लीग के फिर से खड़े होने पर वाजपेयी जी खुश हैं या नाराज हैं ? वे उसका नाजायज फायदा उठाने के लिए मुस्लिम लीग को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं या कम करना चाहते हैं ? मैं हकीकत बता रहा हूं दिल्ली में मुस्लिम लीग ने पहला पब्लिक जलसा राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ के वालंटियरों की मदद से जामा मस्जिद के इलाके में किया और यह सच्चाई है वहां के लोग जलसा नहीं करना चाहते थे । वह कहते थे कि गलत बात हो रही है, यह जलसा नहीं होना चाहिए । जनसंघ और राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ के लड़कों ने कहा जलसा करने का इन

को अधिकार है, हम इनकी रक्षा करेंगे । और उन की मदद से उन्होंने जलसा किया । दिल्ली में मुस्लिम लीग की मदद करने के लिए और हर वक्त, आज का मदरलैंड अखबार आप देखें, इस से पहले का देखें, मुस्लिम लीग का नजरिया जितना मदरलैंड अखबार में पब्लिश होता है शायद ही किसी अखबार में होता हो, पाकिस्तान के नेताओं के जो बयान भारत के खिलाफ जाते हैं जितने मदरलैंड में छपते हैं उतने किसी और अखबार में नहीं छपते । तो जनसंघ चाहता है कि मुस्लिम लीग का जहर और बढ़े ताकि उस का फायदा इन को पहुंचे । तो जनसंघ हो या मुस्लिम लीग हो ।

They are poisons of the same brand in different bottles and with different labels.

इसका कारण है कि इन की हर बात में डुप्लिसिटी है । उस का नतीजा यह है कि लोग इन पर विश्वास नहीं करते हैं ।

एक बात उन्होंने कही कि डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन ऑरिएण्टेड हमारी नीति नहीं है । तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं माननीय वाजपेयी जी की पार्टी चाहती है कि कभी डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन ठीक हो ? क्या आज की या आगे आने वाली जनरेशन कभी भूलेगी कि जब इस देश में बड़ा भारी संकट था, आज भी संकट चल रहा है, देश की सरकार रेल गाड़ियों में पानी भर कर पिलाने के लिए लोगों को ले जा रही थी, देश की जनता लाइनों में अनाज के लिए खड़ी हो, और सरकार अनाज के लिए कोशिश कर रही थी कि अनाज इकट्ठा करे, बाहर से मंगा रही थी, उस समय जनसंघ के नेता गांव गांव और शहर शहर घूम कर किसानों के साथ बड़े व्यापारियों के साथ मिल कर उन की जेब में नोट डाल कर यह कह रहे थे कि सरकार को अनाज न दो । जिस पार्टी ने देश में इतनी जबरदस्त क्राइसिस के समय पर प्रोप्योरमेंट ड्राइव

को सबोटज किया, क्या देश इन को कभी भूल सकता है? क्या यह इन्कार कर सकते हैं कि इन्होंने नहीं कहा कि दाम बढ़ाओं और किसानों से कहा कि सरकार जो अनाज मत दो ?

श्री अटल बिहारी बालपेयी (खालियर): जरूर कहेंगे, और आप ने किसानों की मांग मान ली ।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : एक तरफ यह कहना (व्यवधान)

समापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठें । यह जरूरी नहीं है कि आप उन की बातों से सहमत हों । उन्हें अपने विचार रखने दीजिए ।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : इस से बड़ी हिपोक्रेसी और क्या हो सकती है कि एक तरफ सरकार पर यह इन्जाम लगाया जाय कि अनाज सस्ता दो और दूसरी तरफ कहा जाय कि अनाज मत दो, अनाज को मंहगा करो । इस से बड़ी हिपोक्रेसी और क्या हो कसती है । वैसे में वाजपेयी जी का आदर करता हूँ, लेकिन एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनसंघ ने और इन के साथियों ने (व्यवधान)

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : माननीय भगत के लिए यह कहना कि सरकार से अनाज की नीति के बारे में जनसंघ का मतभेद था, यह तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ । मगर जिस नीति से हम सहमत नहीं उस को सबोटज करने का आरोप हम पर कैसे लगाया जा सकता है ?

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : माननीय वाजपेयी जी यह कबूल करते हैं कि हम ने बिछ किया था, किसान को कहा कि इस दाम पर अनाज न दो ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता कि दिल्ली में जो दो म्यूनिसिपल वाई इलेक्शन हुए उन में यह मालूम हुआ कि जो लाइने लग रही थीं वे क्यों ज्यादा लम्बी होने लगीं ? जब मालूम किया तो पता चला कि जनसंघ के कार्यकर्ता जिन को राशन नहीं लेना होता था वह भी लाइनों में खामखवाह खड़े हो जाते थे फिर लाइनों को लम्बा करने के लिये ।

यह डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन के सिस्टम को इमप्रूव करना चाहते हैं? आप को नीति डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ओरिएण्टेड है क्या ? के आंस ओरिएण्टेड है । उन्होंने ने इन्दिरा जो को कोट किया जो प्री है वह इंतजार नहीं करेगा । अगर हंपरी आदमी दुकान लूट ले तो क्या जुर्न है ? लेकिन ओवरफैंड आप के कार्यकर्ता दुकानों पर हनला करते हैं, बार बार कराते हैं क्या यह उचित है ? और दिल्ली में आप कम कर रहे हैं ? फल ही आप ने एक बस जलवा दो । बस जलाना, पत्थर मारना, लूट मार के लिये लोगों को भड़काने का काम आप कर रहे हैं ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : यह आप का जमजात धंधा है ।

समापति महोदय : आप बार बार उन को क्यों टोक रहे हैं ?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : समापति जी, हम ने आप को कभी नहीं टोका क्यों कि आप का स्तर ऊंचा था । माननीय भगत जी बिल्कुल निम्न स्तर की बात करते हैं, जो स्वयं निम्न स्तर का आदमी है ।

समापति महोदय: अगर गलत बात वह कह रहे हैं तो कोई असर उस का नहीं होगा ।

[सभापति महोदय]

सही बात है तो असर होगा। किसी का नाम वह नहीं ले रहे हैं।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : सभापति जी, बात सच्ची है इसलिए कड़वी लग रही है। माननीय वाजपेयी जी ने कहा कि दिल्ली की कांग्रेस एक फंक्शन भी नहीं कर सकती। मैं उन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि म्यूनिसिपल इलेक्शन में बोट लेने के लिये यह घर घर गये थे, और हम ने कोई बड़ा एक्सटर्नल लीडर नहीं बुलाया, और हमने इन को हराया।
(ध्वजघान)

सभापति महोदय : आप सदन को रेन्सम पर नहीं रख सकते। जब तक वह अनपार्लियामेंटरी बात न कहें उन को रोका नहीं जा सकता। उन की बात संसदीय है। गलत हो सकती है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : कल जब आप मेम्बर के नाते बँडे थे तो कह रहे थे कि असिस्टेंट सब-इंस्पेक्टर का कथन कार्यबाई में से निकाल देना चाहिये। वह तो अनपार्लियामेंटरी नहीं था। आप कह रहे थे कि जरा घटिया स्तर का है। भगत जी के स्तर को क्या करे?

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : स्तर की बात है वाजपेयी जी कहते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि सच्ची बात बुरी लगती है। वाजपेयी जी जो अपोजीशन पार्टी के नेता है उनके स्तर को जरा देखिये। कल इन्होंने कहा कि तेल की आवश्यकता या पानी की आवश्यकता है, छोटी कार की आवश्यकता है या किसी और चीज की आवश्यकता है। मैं उन से जानना चाहता हूँ कि छोटी कार की आवश्यकता नहीं है तो क्या बड़ी कार की आवश्यकता है बिड़ला जी की? एक दिन वह बैल गाड़ी पर चढ़ कर आ गए। छोड़ दें कार को। क्यों आते हैं कार पर रोज चढ़ कर।

The Opposition failure in this case is because they have not been able to become an alternative to the Government because they believe in strategies, because they believe in theatricalities, because they believe in antics, because they believe in dramatics. They have not been able to have any honesty and sincerity of purpose. Even today, in this difficult situation, they think that they will be able to deceive the people. No party can become an alternative to this Government. No party can replace any party unless that party looks to be problems of the people.

ये स्तर की बात कह रहे हैं। मैं वाजपेयी जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हाउस में कौन सा उन्होंने स्तर स्थापित किया है? आप तो जानते ही हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री भारत के प्रजातंत्र की प्रतीक हैं—तकलीफ हो रही है इनको यह मैं जानता हूँ। जनता इनको सब समझती है। वाजपेयी जी ने पिछले तीन साल में कोई कसर नहीं छोड़ी है। प्रधान मंत्री पर हमले किए गए हैं, जनी इन्जाम लगाए गए हैं, मनमोहन वाते कही गई हैं। इस तरह से आप समझते हैं कि आपको ताकत बढ़ेगी? प्रधान मंत्री आज यहां आप की वजह से नहीं हैं।

She is there in spite of you; she will remain there in spite of you.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप प्रधान मंत्री की बगल से जरूर हैं, हम नहीं हैं।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : हमारा देश का बड़ा दुर्भाग्य है कि हमारे देश में जिन्मेदार, सोबर, समस्याओं को हल करने में योगदान देने वाली, मदद देने वाली अपोजीशन नहीं है, विरोधी दल नहीं है। इनके अपने तथा देश के हित में मैं इनको कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये सोचें कि कांग्रेस का बदल ये क्यों नहीं बन सके और क्यों नहीं बन सकते हैं? उनका कारण यही है कि... (ध्वजघान)

सभापति महोदय: इस तरह से चिन्ताने से काम नहीं चलेगा। यह उनका अधिकार है वह कोई अनपा लिमिटेरी बात कहें तो आप चिल्ला सकते हैं, खड़े हो सकते हैं। वनां वे अपना विचार व्यक्त कर सकते हैं।

श्री एच० एल० के भगत — आपको कसे अच्छे लग सकतें वह है विचार एक तरफ तो श्री ज्योतिर्मय वसु और उनकी पाटों हैं। और दूसरी तरफ वाजपेयी जी और उनकी पाटों में बिलोव करता हूँ कि ये दोनों पार्टियां असल में प्रजातंत्र में विश्वास नहीं रखती, दोनों फासिस्ट पार्टियां हैं और अगर इन के हाथ में कहीं शक्ति होती तो ये कभी देश में चुनाव नहीं होने देती। लेकिन अच्छी बात यह है कि देश न कभी इनकी शक्ति नहीं दी और न आइंदा इसक आसार ही है।

उत्तर पदश क चुनाव आनं वाल है। अभी सयहां एसी बातें कहीं जा रही हैं एल०बीजे के तौर पर कि सरकार यह करवा रही है, सरकार यह करेगी, हयकडें बरतगी, अन्कयव मीज क, अन्कयव तरीकी स चुनाव जीतना चाहती है।

This is only to create an alibi for a defeat which is expected.

नो चान्फिडेंस मोसन जो इन्होंने रखा है और जो बातें कही हैं वे सब पुरानी हैं और पुराने ढंग का ही इन्होंने ईस्तेमाल किया है। मैं कहूँगा एक तरह से सस्ती शोहरत हासिल करने की कौशिश की है। उससे यह उन्मीद करना कि इनको कोई फायदा पहुंचेगा तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इनको कोई फायदा नहीं होगा और न ही इस दंग को फायदा होगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Samar Guha. Before he starts, it is necessary for me to point out that there are four more speakers on the Opposition side and a good number of speakers in the Congress Party also. In accordance with the time allotted

by the Business Advisory Committee, your party has been given five minutes. This is not a chart prepared by me; this is a chart prepared in accordance with the decision taken by the Business Advisory Committee. The time being five minutes, I want you to keep this in mind and make your speech accordingly. I will try to accommodate as much as I can.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): May I point out to you in all humility that the time that was allotted to each and every party in this House has been extended, and I think that the same courtesy should be extended to the Socialist Party also. We ask for no more courtesy than what has been extended to the other parties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will endeavour my best to extend as much courtesy as I can. I hope, Mr. Samar Guha will reciprocate it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Babu Jagjiwan Ramji, in a recent article published in *Amrit Bazaar Patrika* on the occasion of the birthday of the Prime Minister, portrayed her personality as a new Messiah of democracy and socialism. Just a few hours before, the General Secretary of the Congress Party painted the image of their leader as an angel of democracy. If that be so, I will be happy. But let me tell you how, in this angelic democracy, election preparations are going on at the very citadel from where this angelic power is derived. It is in *Patriot* of 20th November, published by the compatriots of your party, where it is said:

"No check on kerosene sale in U.P.

"The State Government has removed all restrictions on the quantity of kerosene oil to be sold to consumers. The restrictions have been

[Shri Samar Guha]

removed both in the rural and urban areas. Consumers will be free to purchase any quantity from dealers.

"Announcing the withdrawal of restriction of purchase of kerosene today, the Minister for Food and Supplies, Mrs. Rajendra Kumari Bajpai, said that UP's monthly quota of kerosene oil had been doubled from 29,000 tonnes to 58,000 tonnes and an *ad hoc* quota of an additional 10 lakh tonnes of cement has been allotted to the State. This raises the annual cement quota from 17.60 lakh tonnes to 27.60 lakh tonnes."

Now this is the height of it. The new spirited and revolutionary Chief Minister who has been recently installed there—look at this angelic democracy—is preparing for the election. This is what he has said.

It is in to-day's paper, "The people of UP can bathe in kerosene if they like after December 12", Mr. H.N. Bahuguna said here to-day after his return from Delhi. Jagjivan Babu and many others are telling so much about the ethics of election, so much about the popular support and so much about the respect for law of the people. Now look at this. When the whole country is going without kerosene, where the traders and the consumers in the rural areas are closing their shop, when the night is beginning and it is getting to dusk when the students are wondering how they will appear for the examinations for want of oil, the UP people will 'bathe in kerosene'. This is the process of oil bath in the electoral machinery of UP. This is the angelic contribution of democracy to the Indian people.

Sir, in normal circumstances, bringing a no-confidence motion against the government is nothing but a futile exercise. But, what are we to do? When you have brought the country on the verge of a national disaster, when the whole country and almost the people have been

pushed to the point of exasperation and according to the press report just within the last few months, there have been 91 cases of food riots, *bandhs*, etc., when you take the decisive pleasure of suppressing the *bandhs* and the people's rights, what are we to do?

I want to remind these people. They take the oath in the name of Gandhiji. What did Gandhiji say? I quote: "The guarantee of freedom of a country does not lie in the strength of its armed forces, but in the capacity of its people to offer Satyagraha whenever there is any injustice done by the ruling authority." This is what Mahatma Gandhi said. What are we to do? You have your MISA. You have the DIR. You have your able machinery to suppress the people's agitation. You can take any measure whatsoever. What are we to do? How are we going to reflect the exasperation of the people? How are we going to reflect the inflation in the country? How are we going to reflect that the country is on the verge of a disaster? How are we to say that you have created a national crisis, crisis after crisis and a pool of crises and people in every sphere of life are drowned in the pool of crises? What will be our answer? What should the opposition do? We know what would be the fate of this no-confidence motion. But we consider it the honourable duty on the part of the Opposition to reflect the exasperated mood of the people, to reflect the lack of confidence of the people and to reflect what they feel about this government in this highest forum of the nation. It is with that object that we have tabled this no-confidence motion today.

I am not going to deal with much of the many corruption cases that have been stated. We know in the *sanctum sanctorum* of the ruling party there are innumerable Dharamputra Yudhishtiras. I know it. Yesterday, one Dharamputra Yudhishtira wanted to exonerate himself

from the charges made by his Party MLAs. I want to ask a few straight questions to that Dharamputra Yudhishtira. I want to ask whether it is a fact that when Shri L. N. Mishra took over the Foreign Trade Ministry, he established contact with an Indian National operating from across the Nepal border and allowed him to continue his smuggling activities in the open and in an illegal manner, whether he allowed him to send to India stainless steel, synthetic yarn fabrics and ready made garments on a big scale. Secondly, I want to know whether it is a fact that in the last quarter of 1971, contrary to the declared policy of the Government to import cotton through the Cotton Corporation or the STC and other Government agencies, Shri L. N. Mishra gave a cotton merchant of Bombay a permit to import one lakh bales of cotton.

Thirdly, I want to know whether Shri L. N. Mishra had relations with a businessman Shri Santosh Kumar Tulshan (Jhunjhunwala) and this businessman used all sorts of undesirable methods to influence Govt. officers and Ministers? A permit for exporting one lakh bales of raw jute was given to this gentleman although he had nothing to do with the jute trade. I want to know whether it is a fact that the Foreign Minister formulated a fraudulent scheme of barter and export houses. Against this import entitlement or import licence, stainless steel was imported by Tulshan and his Karnataka Exports in which the premium was very heavy. I want to know whether when Shri L. N. Mishra was the Foreign Trade Minister, he engaged one CBI Officer, Shri Darbari. For what purpose? The country knows about it. Is it not a fact that there was a comment against this officer by the Ministry of Commerce. Was it not a fact that this matter was referred to the Department of Personnel? Why have you taken this same gentleman in the Railway Ministry? Is it not a fact that the same Tulshan is now responsible for wagons? Although according to the Railway Ministry there is enough coal, the wagon are not moving and

the affairs are in a bottleneck. I don't want to attribute motives to any-body. Some people have said that you have become fund-collector for the election in U.P. and in Orissa. I don't want to attribute any motive. I want only to say, let the Government come out openly and have an enquiry about the whole matter and say whether this is a fact or not. Let him come out with facts and figures and statistics so that we may know the truth.

Sir, people have known about your slogan of *Garibi Hatao*. In this golden age of *Garibi Hatao* from 1971 to 1973 onwards in one year there has been an increase of consumer goods by 21 to 22 per cent. It means the retail price also rose by 40 to 50 per cent. There is another price ruling in the black-market which is running parallel with the open market today. It will be 300 per cent *Ad nauseum* the same reasons are being given. What do they say? Drought. What do they say? Famine. What do they say? Bangla Desh. What do they say? Continuous process. What do they say? Global reasons. *Ad infernum* the same reasons are given. I want to put one question to you. In a small country like England what did they do? They could produce only enough food which will last for five months. What did they do? They were also printing money like anything, to support their war effort and their war machinery I want to ask you one straight question. Is the Government willing to produce the consumer goods, the bread and the butter, the oil, vegetable and the eggs that are necessary for the poor people, for the common people? Why have you not done that? Why have you not prevented the prices of consumer goods and the essential commodities rising even by a few per cent? You talk of so many things. I see my friends laughing. This is the way they laugh at the face of the people, at the hunger of the people, at the starvation of the people; this is the way you laugh at the tears shed by people all over the country. This is what you are doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guha, may I suggest that you don't get excited like this?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, in this *garibi hatao* golden era, the national income has fallen from 7.3 per cent to 4 per cent. In 1970 it was more. The black money was in circulation in the year 1969—not according to me but according to Wanchoo Committee. It was Rs. 1,031 crores. Now, in this golden era of *garibi hatao*, it is Rs. 2,833 crores and that is according to the Wanchoo Committee Report. Out of 84 public undertakings with an investment of Rs. 5,000 crores, on an average, the losses incurred in 1971-72 come to Rs. 81 crores. About Bhilai, it is known—the loss is Rs. 38 crores. On the contrary, in 1970-71 out of 88 non-governmental companies, 76 incurred losses. This is based on statistics. What is socialism? Socialism does not mean bringing in nationalisation. Socialism means increase in production and equitable distribution of the same. In a democratic set-up socialism means people's participation.

I want to say something in the agricultural sphere. According to the Task Force that was set up by the Planning Commission, out of Rs. 27,000 crores that have been spent, 70 per cent of the irrigation benefits had gone to the big farmers—rich farmers—Rs. 7,000 crores had gone to others.

Coming to the land-reforms, out of the total available cultivable land in the country, only .7 per cent has gone to small farmers. Whom has the other available land gone? To *benami*. Even the Central Ministers own large farms. Your own members own such farms. Land is being held in the *benami* names. I say that in the *garibi hatao* golden era, the Task Force had lacked the political will. I ask a question as to who wields the political power in this country at the Centre and at the

States? Are you not exerting your political will to get back the lands from these big farmers?

Coming to the agricultural wages, a small farmer earns his wage from Rs. 2 to 3 a day. According to Government statistics Rs. 21 per month per head is the wage—this is not according to my figure but according to the Task Force Report. In 1956 about 6 per cent of the population of this country had a share of 36 per cent of the national income. In this golden era of *garibi hatao* 50 per cent of the population share 20 per cent of the national income. Why? Out of this 20 per cent, 3 per cent goes to the bottom while 17 per cent goes to the upper class. According to the Government statistics, at the end of the Third Plan, 42.7 per cent was below povertyline. Now it has gone up to 49 per cent. What does this mean? It means the people live below the standards.

Coming to unemployment, I shall give you the figures as furnished by the Employment Exchanges. In 1971 there were 50 lakhs and in 1972 there were 60 lakhs and in 1973, up to August only there were 81 lakhs. This is the gift of the *Garibi Hatao* golden era to the unemployed, to the poor, to our small farmers, to our landless and to our people in general.

As I have said, if anybody has discredited socialism all the credit goes to this Congress Party. What is a democratic set up and what does socialism mean? They have forgotten what socialism means in a democratic set up. If in a democratic set-up they try to aid the way of a totalitarian pattern of planning, what will be the result? And the result is what we see today. They talk of Gandhis. Gandhiji gave the way how socialism could be introduced in a democratic set-up. When Gandhiji used the words 'charkha economy', he always meant a charkha economy which meant devolution of political

power and economic power and there would be absolutely no concentration of political and economic power. But what do we find now? There is absolute concentration both of political and economic power.

About concentration of political power, I do not think I should say much. But I remember the day when there was a split in the Congress, and when the Prime Minister came to power through a means, which I shall not call moral but which was, I may say, amoral, when a nominee of the Congress Party was defeated by the Congress Party and its leader herself. Yet, I did not make any observation at that time. I wanted to reserve my judgment, because in revolutionary politics, means and ends are not always collateral. We were expecting something big. When she said that it was a social transformation which they wanted to bring about, when they were in the minority and they were talking of socialism, we gave our support and we were expecting eagerly something big and we wanted to give them all kind of constructive support. Even though they were in minority in this country, with the help of all of us, they could rule for about six months.

Then came the Bangla Desh crisis. A brilliant achievement has been made by the Prime Minister. I have nothing to hide. I had my highest admiration for her during that period, and I had said that she would be remembered as the Golden Sword of Bangla Desh liberation. I still maintain it. But after that, it was the shock of my life that I had. When the war had started, the Prime Minister had convened a meeting of the Opposition leaders and at that meeting, the Prime Minister herself proposed that the general election to the Assemblies would be postponed by a year, and she had asked Mr. Gokhale to bring forward a Bill within a week. But as soon as the war was over, what happened? The war was over, by the united will of the people, the united effort of the people, and the whole country was one, there was one flag,

and all the parties had wound up their flags and there was only one flag, and only one country and one nation and one leader. But what happened at the end of that national victory? I was rudely shocked when this achievement of the victory of the nation with the united will of the nation, and the united effort of the nation was cast in such a vulgar partisan manner. Shri Jagjivan Ram said 'Why should we give you the secret?' If this is the kind of secrecy which is going to be there, then it means that as a nation, you will be dashed to dust, all your ethics of politics will be dashed to dust, the whole morality of politics will be dashed to dust, and the whole democratic values will be dashed to dust.

18.47 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

In the 1971 elections, the Congress Party secured a massive victory. It was not a political victory for the Congress Party, but it was an emotional victory.

A national bouquet was given to the Prime Minister for the national victory, on behalf of the whole nation, that she had achieved against Pakistan in the Bangla Desh liberation war. It was a national bouquet which was to be taken as a symbol of the nation's feelings, but that was mistaken as a victory on the basis of their election manifesto.

Then what happened? You know the result of the power-madism that has overtaken infected the Congress party. Gujarat, Mysore, Bihar, Orissa, Manipur, UP, Andhra—the Governments of all these States have been toppled one after another. The anti-Defections Bill is kept in hibernation. We know in what an ugly manner the Governments of Gujarat and Mysore were brought down and their party government substituted. As soon as these MLAs were brought within the vertex of the Congress, in the alchemy

[Shri Samar Guha]

of Congress ethics, they immediately became golden, they immediately became purified, they immediately became progressive. Thus their Governments were established there.

MR. SPEAKER: His time is already up.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Please give me a few minutes. This opportunity does not come.

What happened in Orissa and Manipur? According to article 356, there was a constitutional breakdown. But by what token of logic, by what token of morality, were the Assemblies of UP and Andhra Pradesh suspended? They were kept in suspended animation. This is what is going on. The whole thing has been discredited.

Then as regards the gubernatorial posts, they have become a dustbin for the Congress waste. Discredited, defeated MPs are being dumped there. Not only is this being done. They are being used as instruments to violate and vitiate art. 356 of the Constitution of India. These people are being used as henchmen to replace the parliamentary system in this country to a totalitarian system. What a mockery has been made of the Constitution?

Coming to the judiciary, what has been the result of the supersession of the Judges? In a recent book written by Kuldip Nayyar *Supersession of Judges*, the late Shri Kumaramangalam is quoted as having said to A. K. Ray:

"Now you know how we reward people who help us. The result is this. Ninety per cent of the Supreme Court cases are cases in which Government are the litigant. How can the people expect judgment in the circumstances? There is a sharp decline in the number of matters coming before the Supreme Court since 25th April 1973. There is a distinct trend of dismissal of special leave petitions. A Delhi High Court has remarked:

'Do you expect any judgment can be given against the Government?'

If you have the courage, if you feel that the Constitution is an obstacle in the path of your progressive measures, in the path of social transformation, you should have the courage to convene a new Constituent Assembly.

They have equated the party with the country, with the State, with the Government. This is what has happened.

Now Mr. Brezhnev is coming to our country. Russia is a friendly country. Mr. Brezhnev is a great personality coming to our country from a friendly country. They have appointed a committee to accord a reception to him with the Congress President as the Chairman. Why not the Mayor? Why not the Vice-President of India in a National Committee to accord national honour to the foreign dignitary?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKISHNAN (Badagara): What is wrong with the Congress President? He represents the majority of public opinion in this country. He is also a distinguished member of this House and a national leader.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The present ruling party and the present Governments, both at the Centre and in the States, and the present democracy have been turned into a pantomime show of promptly-nodding heads under the charming spell of a personality cult. The ghost of totalitarianism is lurking. A reflection of it was seen when the Prime Minister reminded the country the other day that there is a possibility of the Chilean-type rule. The charge is on the other side where an absolute totalitarianism is sought to be established, the mad race for power has gone on to that extent in the country. The sooner this Government goes,—if this Government goes even in the hand of a devil—the better would it be for the country.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY (Raiganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this appears to be a season of no-confidence motions and utter fruitlessness with due apologies to Keats.

Hon. Members opposite have partaken of the heady wine of undocumented accusations and vilifications, and hence this incoherent chatter, or shall we say clatter, if illinformed criticism and misinformed myths.

The reverberating theme throughout the debate from the motley gathering opposite is one of negativism, negativism being the child of frustration and sired by the forces of disintegration.

Read the motion, Sir, Listen to the speeches. They speak of wrong policies. May we know what is right? Does memory fail me, or, did not the Prime Minister of this Government call all the Opposition parties to hold numerous meetings? But such a process will be termed anti-democratic by my friends opposite.

What happened to the questionnaire? Was there any unanimity? Was there any unity? Was there any agreement on any matter of import? But then, this lack of unity is not the only aspect of this motley mixture of parties when sitting in the Opposition. This conglomeration of parties have in fact been in and out of office throughout the length and breadth of the country, and what policies did they pursue at the time? May I ask what new glowing, bright light did they shed? What new path did they mark out, that we here have to be subjected to the howls and whines of affrant and discontent and vilification on the occasion of this motion?

They speak of being anti-democratic. If that does not raise the biggest laugh, I do not know what does. No one can deny that there prevail innumerable economic problems. But is it anti-democratic to tolerate bandhs and strikes vitally affecting our production to jeopardise further our economic life line in order to sabotage the

policies of the nation and ultimately of the people?

Is it democratic then to hold a whole nation to ransom, and to bring to a grinding halt the whole production in the public sector where the question of profits does not even arise.

We hear of the misapplication of the MISA. But then hundreds have been detained for hearing as well as for other anti-social activities and also for violent activities. We are always hearing of rampant corruption prevailing in the country as if it is only restricted to only one section of the population.

Speaking of West Bengal and the wheat bran incident raised by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, the West Bengal Government has been meticulously taking steps to bring to book the arch-conspirators in the case. But the interesting fact is, Mr. Speaker, Sir that at the very moment when Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu was mouthing loud protests at the measures taken, and insisting that alternative methods should be adopted, the Government of West Bengal was opposing the bail petition of Mr. P. D. Gupta, who was defending this man in the courts of law? Why no other person than the ex-Advocate-General of the second Marxist ministry in West Bengal and a trusted member and friend of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and his party?

19.00 hrs.

Whenever hoarders are arrested and paraded in the streets of West Bengal for their heinous crimes who is the counsel who rushes to their defence? Why this is the very same erstwhile Advocate-General of Jyotirmoy Bosu's party. May be the price involved goes to swell the coffers of their party funds, for every party has its coffers. Only recently we read of the cashier of their party being prosecuted for embezzlement, and interesting facts were disclosed regarding the figures of their collections.

[Shrimati Maya Ray]

Of course, in the highest traditions of Parliamentary practice that Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu follows, he chooses to level abject falsehoods, gross untruths and allegations against persons by name, who are not present in this House to either reply to them or to defend themselves. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu is a venerable man; Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu is an honourable man; Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu is a dedicated man, and we have to accept this as their definition of democracy and democratic ethics. But that character assassination is always indulged in as a last resort when there is political bankruptcy, utter bankruptcy. So, forgive them, Sir, for they know not what they do.

After all, we on this side do not have to sink to the level of asking why Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu resigned his commission in the British Army in the 1940s and joined a British commercial house. Or, again, why he resigned his post in the British commercial house and joined politics? Oh! no, we do not have to dig up such details, because we have too much else to think about. But, then, how sad one has to feel for Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu's plight! Look at this Maruti incidents. The whole issue is as dead as the dodo, but he is still obsessed with it. It is a psychopathic condition, it is pathetic! He is obsessed with personalities, including himself, of course, and not with problems, or people.

Again, coming back to the misapplication of MISA, no member of any party has been arrested as such. Only rowdies and anti-social elements have been arrested. Does the hon. Member claim them to be members of his party? If he does, it is his cup of tea. And the hon. Member is an expert on tea.

While on this aspect, let us keep the records straight. I am loth to dole out statistics normally, but this House is entitled to have correct facts and not to be misled by half truths.

In 1970 the number of political murders was 357; in 1971 the number was 1,009; in 1972 it came down to 101 and in 1973 the number is only 55. Out of these 55 political murders in 1973, 24 belonged to our party, the Indian National Congress. These figures are upto 1st November 1973 and exclude Calcutta figures.

Now I come to inter-party clashes in West Bengal. In 1970 the number was 664 and in 1971 it rose to 865; in 1972 it was 588 and in 1973 the number was 188. Coming to Naxalite violence, the number of incidents in 1970 was 1913 and 2602 in 1971. In 1972 it was 82 and in 1973 it was 43 upto 1st November. May I repeat once again that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu's party has not claimed the anti-socials arrested as being members belonging to his party.

Then, we come to the point that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu raised, that so much money is being spent on the security and protection of Ministers, and this to him is the yardstick of measure of popularity. The amnesia this gentleman is suffering from is incredible! Does he not remember the days when they had a massive majority in West Bengal, when Shri Jyoti Basu, the Home Minister used to move around with 4 van-loads of police, not to speak of them swarming about his residential house? The then Police budget rocketed to double the figures of all previous Governments. And we—a microscopic opposition, of first 55 and, then after Shri Shyamanandan Babu's disciples joined hands with Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, as they are doing only now, were only 35. That opposition we what they were afraid of. That is the reason why they doubled the Police budget and gave such protection to Mr. Jyoti Basu, the Home Minister of the erstwhile Marxist Ministry in West Bengal in 1969.

Be that as it may, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu still has security guards in Calcutta whenever he goes there. They all do. Why? Because the Naxalite

friends are on the prowl. They think that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has let them down during their massive majority days.

We are aware of the difficulties, but are the Opposition parties also aware of the difficulties? There were two terrifying droughts and one massive flood in the course of two years. May I ask: How many of the Opposition party Members visited these drought and flood affected areas in West Bengal? We went. How many of my hon. friends opposite went to the areas affected? We went. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: No please. Will you please sit down? Order, please.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: I am giving the facts. When there is so much of an emotional outburst, it is very difficult to speak.

But Mr. Samar Guha, the much talking Samar Guha, who is like an ill-tuned symbal (again with apologies to Sir Francis Bacon). Mr. Samar Guha went to his utter dismay, he went and found that not only had the Chief Minister already been to these areas, but most of the West Bengal Ministers had gone there, and done all that could be done in the circumstances. (*Interruptions*).

The hon. members opposite condescend to go only if they can create trouble and stir up the brew. Otherwise, you will not see even their shadows. These are the standards of their democracy.

Now what after all is the purpose of a no-confidence motion? First, it is to cause the fall of the Government. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, in his very opening, has conceded that they cannot defeat us by votes. In fact, even in the constituencies where they have defeated us by votes in West Bengal—I think it is in 14 or 18 constituencies—they had let down the people, their electorate, by declining to represent them in the Assembly, by declining to perform their legislative

duties on the floor of the Assembly in West Bengal and to pursue the democratic duty of raising their problems in that forum. Because after all 14 or 18 is a very minor number. But here I think they are 23 or it is 25. Look at their logic. Here they are willing to act as Opposition party against the Government in power which is formed by the Congress Party, but in West Bengal where the same Congress party forms the Government, they are not willing to act as Opposition party. This is their logic! This is their idea of democracy! It hardly behoves them to speak about democracy or how democracy works. Their definition and norms of democracy is something that we can hardly accept.

The second purpose of a no-confidence motion is to criticise the government. Fair enough. This is a vital and useful Parliamentary weapon. But here it has become very blunt. Day in and day out, every hour, every minute, every second, there is nothing but abject negative criticism and vilification of personalities and character assassination—a most disruptive approach.

The Mover of this motion, Mr. Speaker, Sir, dares to utter the word 'murder'. Who, may I ask, has brought murder into West Bengal except the party to which Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu belongs? Is his mind so clouded with Maruti that he has forgotten those horrifying days after 1967? Several parties are represented here—Shri Tridib Chaudhuri, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri Samar Guha. I appeal to each of them to say truthfully and sincerely what each one of their party colleagues had said in West Bengal, both inside the house and outside, as to the murderous attempts made on them by the Communist Party (Marxist) in West Bengal not so long ago... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: If a personal reference is made, it is on record there how at the time of the UF rule

[Shri Samar Guha]

I have fought those murderous killers.... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: May I request you to kindly control him?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Is it very relevant, Sir? Are we discussing the Indian situation or the West Bengal situation? Is she defending Mrs. Gandhi or Mr. Siddhartha Shanker Ray? We want to hear the defence of Mrs. Gandhi and not of Mr. Siddhartha Shanker Ray.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: Again it is time to put the records straight, as to the number of murders and repression and alleged fascist methods in West Bengal. In 1973, the number of murders committed by CPM members upon the members of our Party and the members of the INTUC was 71. In Raniganj, so often quoted by Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, on 21st February 1973, Shri Deepak Bhowmick, an INTUC worker was murdered by a CITU supporter. On the 18th October, 1973, another Congress worker was murdered by a CPM supporter. In Chinsurati on 13th April, 1973, Shri Niren Ghosh was killed by CPM supporters. In Howrah on the 27th July 1973, two Congress supporters were killed by CPM supporters. On 7th June 1973, Shri Khudiram Singh of Rupanjote was killed by CPM supporters in Kharibari, my constituency. On 12th October, 1973, Shri R. C. Sharma (Assistant Manager of the Dheeteria Tea Estate in Darjeeling was murdered by CPM supporters. In Metelli, Jalpaiguri on 14th April 1973, a CPI worker was killed by CPM supporters and Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu dares to utter this word 'murder' when his party has brought the pattern of violence into the fabric of our political life and turned West Bengal into a jungle where the only law known was the law of murder, violence and bloodshed.... (Interruptions). Throughout Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has scant respect for any person, section of society or principles. For example, according to him, the

press is purchasable and in fact has allegedly been bought up by various personalities whom he has mentioned in this House. What the Press people think about this, I do not know, but I am sure they are capable of looking after themselves in respect of this allegation. The electorate that has voted his party members to the Assembly in West Bengal can go unrepresented for five years because they do not choose to perform their legislative duties just at their whim. The officers of the administration are all corrupt—that is what he thinks of the cross section of the whole of the nation. Only he and his partymen are the sole repositories of all that is holy, good and godly.

We have still two and a half years to go. There will be elections again and every one of my countrymen and country-women will decide once again whom they want. We shall wait for that day.

We, in this side of the House, have nothing to be ashamed of. There is nothing to be apologetic about and if any party has done anything to arouse the conscience of the masses as to their rights, it is our party and our party alone under the undisputed leadership, I am proud to say, of a woman, Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

With these words, I oppose this motion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday we had decided that the Prime Minister would intervene at 7 O'clock. But, it is already 7.20 p.m. Two or three more members are very keen to speak

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, please, no more speakers.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad) rose—

MR. SPEAKER: I have already given enough time to Mr. Shamim of your Group. I am not allowing you.

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

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

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

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

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

The Prime Minister.

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

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

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

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

बहा या नहीं कहा यह सबाल नहीं।

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

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

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

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

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

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

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

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

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

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

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
Nobody has said that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

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

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

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: An inquiry. That is all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Heard for the first time.

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

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

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

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

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

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Amongst other things.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: He is already spent up.

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

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

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Cultural.

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

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But you were photographed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: We men do not resent it.

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

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

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Who is the hon. Member?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SHRI SEZHIYAN: No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Every-body shared it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

20.00 hrs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: You can take thirty minutes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Kindly bring the House to order.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

legs. You will kindly go through the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall look into it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

my class but you have betrayed yours.

About the Prime Minister's reply, I am very sorry to say that that is the poorest reply that I have ever heard since 1957. Am I to understand that it was not properly prepared for her? It was more as an admiration of granting certificates for every sentence for herself, her Government and the party. Nothing is said about food—domestic item. Not a word is said about unemployment because, now, if she talks about it, she will have nothing but to cover herself because she stands exposed, very badly perhaps. She spoke at length about the United Front regime. But, what can we do? The entire jute press—newsprint and government advertisements—All India Radio—people call it 'All India Radio', I do not call it—is in your hands. This is the Goebblian's theory that you have been following—not me because, I do not have all the resources. Sir, the Prime Minister talked about the programme but, I talked about the programme and performance. Where is the programme and where is the performance?

She talked about elections. Everybody knows that in this country—not only in this country but people, all over the world, know that. I had quoted from the Times Magazine of London. What was the caption there—'Indira imports tugs for West Bengal'. I can bring that even to-day because that is in the Library. Everybody knows that the election has become a mockery in this country and there is no democracy functioning here.

AN HON. MEMBER: How is he here then?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister talked about making mistakes. Or was it a planned surrender to the monopolists? I had given figures yesterday showing the growth of monopoly in a few years, to the extent of 100 per cent in their assets. From all the term—financing institutions and

nationalised banks, money has been dumped on to them. One particular company, namely Mafatlals in two years has grown to the tune of 254 per cent on its assets. That is all. They have been allowed to reap as much profit as possible at the cost of poor people under the protection of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. That is the performance. As for the programme, of course, it is all available in the Library of the Lok Sabha. Another thing which I said yesterday and which I repeat today is the importation of multinational corporations, namely, the General Motors, Bell Telephones, ITI etc. because Mr. Jha, one of the draftsmen of devaluation of 1966 has advised that, because Mr. Nehru has advised that. That is the only parachute that she can have, because the aircraft has caught fire, and she should land at the cost of the parachutes supplied by multinational corporations, and yet go on telling the people 'Garibi Hatao, socialism is knocking at your door, wait for two more months, the magic wand is moving'. That is the position.

A strange thing that we notice is that her mistakes only benefit the rich people, but her mistakes have never benefited for once even for a change the poorer sections, the starving section. I saw my hon. friend Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao somewhere opposite, and one day he was waxing eloquent to oppose my move for demonetisation on the basis of the interim report of the Wanchoo Committee, which Madam Prime Minister never allowed to see the light of day because that would have been very inconvenient for her and she would have stood thoroughly exposed in that regard. He opposed demonetisation here. It is all on record. But only the other day I saw six economists submitting a memorandum where they have supported demonetisation. But I do not know whether he had taken the prior permission of the leader, and I do not know whether they will get his text next time, because demonetisation is something which cannot be had because there are going to be two elec-

tions, three elections and four elections, and so it cannot be done.

Tomorrow, there is a Governors' conference, and so people will be busy. But who are these Governors? Just now she mentioned about the Governor of Orissa, Mr. Jatti. We had seen Mr. Dharma Vira. Mr. Dharma Vira was a principal horse-trader, not trainer, but horse-trader who introduced very successfully in 1967 horse-trading in the political field in this country, and Mr. Jatti is the agent-general for the Central Government, for 1, Safdarjang Road in Orissa, doing the same business of scuttling parliamentary democracy. When a body like the High Court passes a severe stricture on the conduct of the Governor, it is only becoming of a person like the present Prime Minister who can defend the Governor to have taken some steps; had there been any sense of democracy or fairplay the Governor should have been recalled and dismissed. This was the only course left open, but this Government has the skin of a particular type of species found in the zoo-garden with a horn in the front, on which I do not want to talk much. They take great pride in that. I do not want to name it because it may be considered unparliamentary.

Then, they talked about bank nationalisation. Now we want to find out how much compensation they paid for the shareholders of the banks. What was the market price of the shares? As against Rs. 32 crores, they paid over Rs. 80 crores. What benefit have they been able to bring to the weaker sections of the society? Where are the annual reports? Why are they not being brought within the purview of a parliamentary committee? They are not being brought because things would become very inconvenient for them. I have been writing time and again about this. Money has to go back to Mafatlals. Otherwise, in four years' time how could they grow at the rate of 254 per cent after payment or so-called payment of taxes? You

see the list, gentlemen, you may oppose me, you may heckle me, you may try to interrupt me, but you can look at it for yourself, how much money has gone to 20 houses from public financing institutions, and on that how much money they have made by depriving the poor consumer. I quoted the instance of Cadburys and Dalda yesterday. This would show clearly that they are making money at the cost of the poor man's minimum meal in a day. This is how Government is flourishing.

About general insurance, I am very sorry that Mrs. Gandhi gave them a management commission of Rs. 32 lakhs a month for 15 months. We have never heard a thing like this. I am not talking about the jeeps, 500 jeeps and cars that were provided by Mr. Shah in 1971. That is another fairy tale, a wonderful story. But I am talking about the money that you dished out of the exchequer to oblige the tycoons of general insurance for 15 months at the rate of Rs. 32 lakhs. You talk about socialism. I hang my head in shame.

About the privy purses, they were getting less than Rs. 4 crores a year. Now you are granting a transitional allowance of Rs. 10.75 crores. How many in this House know about it? How many of them have reacted to it? This is her type of socialism.

I want to ask her: what happened to the urban property ceiling, what happened to the land ceiling, effective, real, genuine land ceiling? Mr. Fakhruddin Ahmed writes a pious note in the Ministry files. What have you done, Mr. Ahmed? You have cut such a sorry figure. I know it. Your Government is nothing but, as they say in Haryanvi:

भेड़ की खाल में भेड़िया ।

wolf in the garb of sheep (*Interruptions*). I speak Haryanvi sometimes.

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोतीहारी): यह बहुत खराब है। हम लोग भेड़ की खाल में भेड़िये हैं।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, no; withdrawn, withdrawn. You are not भेड़. you are wolves. (*Interruptions*).

Madam Prime Minister, you may not like to speak to me, but you could tell the House what happened to the diffusion of the ownership of newspapers. They approached you. They told you that if you did that, you would not get full coverage in the press. So now after sitting over it for three years, what has happened? Shri Gujral is very clever. He did not want to put it on his shoulders and cut his neck; he did not want to get accused and get thrown out. I know. He is a (*Interruptions*). He knows these things.

Now you are talking about delinking of ownership. What is delinking? I want the definition of 'delinking'. Shri Gujral will please tell me not today, but tomorrow, quietly, otherwise you will be sacked.

Then what about the anti-defection Bill? What about the promises she has made so abundantly during 1971 and 1972 elections.

गरीबी हटा दूंगा, यह बिना बना दूंगा वह बना दूंगा।

She promised the Howrah-Amta Light Railway. It came out in the papers. It is a light railway costing about Rs. 5 lakhs or Rs. 10 lakhs. Three years have passed. She has not to go and address meetings just now. Maybe by the time of the next elections, something else will be found out. So nothing has been done.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: Can you go and address meetings now?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I did it only the other day.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: You have to appeal to the CRP men. You cannot travel there.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I never do that. I never take their help.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: I have seen you....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: This is a ** I have never taken such help. You are a young man. Do not tell**

MR. SPEAKER: It is not parliamentary.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to find out what happened to the Industrial Policy Resolution—I expect you to hear me, Mr. Speaker. I make a bad speech sometimes. You have to hear me.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): On a point of order. According to the rules....

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I am not approving of the word he used. I have told him it is not parliamentary. It will not go on record.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: All right. I withdraw it and replace it by 'untruth'.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: That is not the point I wanted to raise.

The hon. Member is entitled to make his second speech by way of reply. But in this second speech, he is raising original points to which we will have to reply. Secondly, there is another question of propriety. Under the rules, at the appointed hour, the Motion has got to be put to vote. But the member is being accommodated. We want to know for how long and on what all issues. These points he is raising require a reply. Original points are being raised. Is it permissible?

MR. SPEAKER: When the member gets up a second time at the end of the debate to reply, he is expected to reply only to the debate. The debate

was long enough and I am all the time considering whether he is raising new points or the old points. I will tell you when I come to that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am trying to hurry up as much as possible because I am tired too.

Sir, I have read with great care the industrial policy resolution and I see in category 'A', which should be essentially the public sector, an item iron and steel. I want to ask the Prime Minister how is it that they are going in for a joint sector with the Tatas. The present production is two million tonnes and in the collaborated sector we will have four million tonnes, and I am told that for the drawing up of the project report, the entire cost will be borne by the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a new factor. Please reply to the debate.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: She talked about petrol and kerosene; she said "unforeseen circumstances." What is the actual rise in prices, due to the increase in the price of crude, for petrol? It is seven paise and you are levying an additional one rupee as excise duty. You want to collect more than Rs. 300 crores on this occasion because your deficit gap this time may be over Rs. 1,500 crores. So, you are doing this.

The same is the case with regard to kerosene. Why try to hoodwink people? Tell them frankly that this is the increase and this is the excise duty that we are levying on you. I think it was highly improper. That is how I put it.

They talked about the mandate. I have told you that there is no election in this country. They have adopted Hitlerian methods. We made some positive suggestions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, it is a debate of 12 hours. I have covered almost all the points in the speeches.

I must reply. It is my right. Kindly sit at rest. Kindly do not ring the bell.

MR. SPEAKER: Instead of replying to the debate, you are adding new material. If you are adding new material, then I have to ask them to reply.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We have given written suggestions to the Prime Minister that in irrigated areas, land over 12 acres, after giving the owner all the requirements of his family and for cultivation, the entire amount of crop should be procured. For non-irrigated areas, the marketable surplus should be taken from him; for non-irrigated areas it should be 15 acres. I might tell my young friend Shri Das Munsri that the United Front Government had fixed a target of six lakh tonnes of rice out of which we almost collected five lakh tonnes; 4.8 lakh tonnes, to be precise.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: I know it; but what is the total cost? And also the crop?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Ask your auditor.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: You please tell us.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Ask your auditor; I am not the Accountant-General.

Now, I do not want to go into what Mr. Chavan has said. But I only want to say about the co-operation and discipline about which Mr. Chavan talked. In the early sixties, there was no industrial stagnation at this rate. Production was fairly high. What did he do for the workers then? You showed them bannanas as you are showing them now. Therefore, production or no production, the worker remains at the starvation level. What

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

is the finding today? The real wages of a worker in the country in terms of the purchasing power of the money have gone down considerably. That is the finding of the survey conducted by the people who have knowledge. I am talking about 347 days. That is the position.

Mr. Chavan has talked about co-operation and discipline. I say, discipline to stand in the queue for going to the graveyard. It is the last call you have given.

I can say about price rise, India, as far as the United Nation's Survey of 1973 for the wholesale index rate is concerned, has the highest rate in the world, recording an increase of 115 per cent at the wholesale level. (*Interruptions*). The consumer price index has risen by 121 per cent although this country, after 27 years of 'historical' rule, has the lowest per capita income in the world. That is the glory we have got on our neck.

I have talked about the police repression and she said something to the effect that there is no repression. I have got telegrams of repression in the Annu Hydel Project, Himachal Pradesh, and in collusion with the police, the company management are killing the workers. I have talked today that they abducted a lady worker. Then there is the Usha Spinning Private Limited, Faridabad, and also the Engineering Works at Ghaziabad.

MR. SPEAKER: He should conclude now. After all, he is not replying to the debate.

SHR JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am replying to the debate. You cannot shut me out like that. If necessary, let us continue it tomorrow.

I would like to draw the attention of Madam Prime Minister and the House to a wonderful complimentary article written in *New Statesman* of England. It says:

"India is plagued by the worst crisis in its 26 years of independence and the head of state has chosen to do some plain-speaking, while the Prime Minister has withdrawn into a shell of enigmatic silence from which she emerges now and then only to berate the Opposition and what remains of the vocal press for spreading an atmosphere of gloom.

To be sure, chaos is not around the corner. But economic distress is widespread and deepening day by day. Prices of all foods have skyrocketed, a 20 per cent increase being registered in one month. So far as food is concerned, India has become a vast black market."

It says further:

"Eight demonstrators were killed by police bullets in Bhopal. In the course of a fortnight, nearly two million people took part in hunger marches all over India, thousands, including women and children, courting arrest in the fashion of the Mahatma who has been all but forgotten except for his *satyagraha* technique against misrule.

In Bombay and some other areas, the government invoked the war-time Defence of India Rules to arrest hoarders and profiteers only when Opposition parties threatened to set up a parallel administration for seizing hoarded food and distributing it to the hungry. While successive monsoon failures, massive deficit financing, the lag in industrial production and the compulsion of military preparedness *vis-a-vis* Pakistan and China over a decade have contributed to the dimension of the present crisis, its steady aggravation, with

no prospect of relief, can only be blamed on the administrative paralysis in New Delhi."

It goes on to say:

"Even more damaging to the Congress Party's image has been the rising tide of dishonesty and corruption at the higher levels. Mrs. Gandhi's set retort on this subject is that the prevalence of these evils is exaggerated. But only a few days back the Estimates Committee of the Bihar State Legislature alleged that several relations of Mr. L. N. Mishra, a member of Mrs. Gandhi's cabinet, have been making large gains out of government contracts for the giant Kosi river project designed to better the lot of the long-suffering peasants of the backward area Over the years not a single prominent politician has been sent to jail, even after being found guilty of gross misconduct by government appointed commissions of inquiry. The sad truth is that a morally bankrupt ruling party finds it politically expedient to turn a blind eye to their crimes."

Shrimati Maya Ray made certain observations and I must reply to them. She knows, as her husband knows, that Shri S. K. Acharya was once a great worker of my party. He is no longer a member of my party.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Sir, I invite your attention to rule 198(4) which reads:

"The Speaker shall, at the appointed hour on the allotted day or the last of the allotted days, as the case may be, forthwith but every question necessary to determine the decision of the House on the motion."

In this case, 8 O'clock was the appointed hour. That time is past. So, I

request that the motion may be put to the vote. . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Shri S. K. Acharya has made a great contribution in all spheres of life in Calcutta to charitable institutions, hospitals, universities and colleges. He is known to everybody. I do not know what Shrimati Maya Ray is talking about this gentleman. He is a practising lawyer. He is not our party member; we do not have any control over him. He has freedom to do what he chooses as a lawyer. If as a lawyer he chooses to defend somebody, I do not know how it can be questioned. If at all there is any impropriety, you can rise it in the Bar Council. This is not the proper forum to drag his name.

Now that the question of counsel appearing for parties is raised, may I know the names of the counsels who appeared before the Car Prices Commission on behalf of the Birlas? Was it not Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray and, if I am not mistaken, Shrimati Maya Ray? And what was their contention before that Commission? Their contention was that the car prices should be raised to benefit the Birlas financially. And what was his fees? I am told that for each trip all his expenses were paid—stay at Inter-Continental, plane fare and Rs. 10,000.

I do not wish to go into these things. But I have been provoked today. I want to ask Mrs. Maya Ray: Is it not a fact that he appeared before the High Court for the New Asiatic Co. of Birlas challenging the appointment of the Sarkar Commission which was to enquire into Birla company?

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: I have not appeared in a single case since I have been a Member of this House. You have to prove that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am only asking you. What about the Car Prices Commission. . . (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: I have not been paid by a single Birla concern since I have been a Member of this House. All these allegations are false. There is a limit to it. Do not bite off more than you can chew. Otherwise, so many things can be said about you too.... (Interruptions)

SHRI JOYTIRMOY BOSU: I am only asking you. I have not said anything.

About the bran scandal, I would like to know why a judicial inquiry is not being instituted? Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsi said that he wanted to save me. He said it yesterday. Let him say that again today.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: I was satisfied with the performance of the West Bengal Government afterwards. I found many of your friends were in league with that.... (Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I may tell you, I never had a security guard at my house at any time. Let her produce the documentary evidence. (Interruptions) Last year, when Shri Jyoti Basu and myself went to address a meeting in Berhampur, our car was smashed by policemen, 20 of them, headed by the P.A.C. inspectors, standing there silently, providing match-boxes for crackers and bombs to goondas. I have seen with my own eyes. My party lost 80 lives since March, 1972 elections. Today, wherever we organise a meeting, wherever the people flow in they usually impose Section 144 and chase them out.

I want to ask: Who is responsible for the murder of late Shri Hemant Bosu? Who is responsible for the murder of late Shri Mitra—your MLA? What about the stabbing of a student to death in the Vice-Chancellor's room? Now, you are reviving the police guerilla. Again, the Naxalites must come into the scene because the C.P.I. (M) is becoming too big. We

know all these things. Let us not talk about it.

I have talked about corruption cases Mr. D. P. Dhar made a submission before the House. I only wish him best of luck. Let there be an inquiry. Let us see whether the photostat copy that I have proded is genuine or fake. If it is fake, I shall be happy. If it is proved that I have maliciously fabricated something for maligning a Minister here, I shall take the punishment that the Committee may give to me.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi is talking about corruption and mud-slinging, it is strange. The Santhanam Committee in 1964 had made certain recommendations. Now, it is going to be 1974. Ten years have elapsed. It has been more inconvenient for her to implement the same. The funniest thing is that about Mr. Bansi Lal who is being charged by scores of MLAs and MPs giving specific details of corruption charges, nothing is being done. The people will say that it is again Maruti business. I do not say it here. Naturally, the suspicion will be that he is being protected for some obvious reasons.

Then, there is a very interesting thing. One affidavit was sworn by Mr. Gokhale, an eminent lawyer—I have nothing to say against him—and he said, in regard to allegations contained in the said two memoranda:

“Three colleagues and I, after careful and detailed scrutiny, came to the unanimous conclusion that no *prima facie* case existed for the appointment of a commission of inquiry under Section 3 (1) of the Act....”

In the same thing, he says:

“I express the unanimous opinion that any suggestion that a *prima facie* case for a commission of inquiry existed was premature in regard to these allegations..”

You are also a lawyer. If you want, I can send you this document..

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: This is in regard to State Electricity Board.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Yes; in regard to the State Electricity Board.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE): He was trying to suppress the relevant part, and you have brought it to the notice of the House. This was only with reference to the State Electricity Board in which a special audit is being carried out by the Comptroller and Auditor General.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Because he was under pressure.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I do not know whether it has been completed now. When the affidavit was made, that was in progress, and that is why the conclusion was reached that that charge was not a subject-matter of our report.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: When he was not cleared about those transactions, why were you so anxious to give him a clean chit?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Because he was under pressure.

Sir, I am quoting from the proceedings, what has been said by a Congress member. He says, "Mr. Chandrasekhar, M.P., a member of this House, perhaps knows; he has written a letter about the work of Mr Durbari". It is said, Sir, that Mr. Chandrasekhar had written specifically about Mr. Durbari to the then Minister of Foreign Trade who now happens to be the Railway Minister. Can he plead ignorance about the activities of such a person? "Is it not a fact that I have written a letter to the Home Minister"—whom he was asking to inquire into Birla affairs, and Mr. Durbari was indulging in favouritism to the Birla in respect of inquiry. The allegation made by Mr. Chandrasekhar—with all

the reputation that he has got over the industry, over the CBI circles—is that he—Mr. Durbari—has the reputation of counting currency notes. That is why, Mr. Durbari had an adverse comment; he was very much under cloud. In spite of that, by concealing that fact, Mr. L. N. Mishra, for his own convenience took him to the Ministry of Railways. Because, he is very good in counting currency notes. (Interruption) Now, Sir, I want to ask: was the Annual Confidential Report of Mr. Durbari not tampered with by Shri L. N. Mishra and also by the Department of Personnel? Is it not a very serious matter? I want to tell him that Mr. Tulsian came and said, 'It was all done before I stepped in'. There are two former Ministers sitting here. It is true that the export of ferro-silicon and importation of stainless steel was agreed to before but there were three rigid conditions which should have controlled this man's profiteering and dishing out the shares—he has given them the benefit. But the day this gentleman came, soon thereafter, he removed all the conditions, and the flood of profiteering started. About this one lakh bales of jute export, let us make an inquiry, whether Mr. Tulsian had, at any time, been a jute exporter. He was given because he paid a salami of Rs. 75 lakhs for *Garibi Hatao* programme. (Interruptions)

I only want to say this that this Government, which has been here from March 1971 till today, has completely ruined the country with all the evils that there are, and I say, Sir, that this Government has no right to stay here. They should resign. My no-confidence motion should be passed and adopted in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I will put the motion moved by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu to the vote of the House. The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 3] AYES [20.51 hrs.

Agarwal, Shri Virendra

Bade, Shri R. V.

Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh

Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagadish

Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.

Bosu, Shri Jyotirmoy

Chatterjee, Shri Somnath

Chaudhary, Shri Ishwar

Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib

Chavda, Shri K. S.

Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh

Dandavate, Prof. Madhu

Das, Shri R. P.

Deb, Shri Dasaratha

Desai, Shri Morarji

Dhandapani, Shri C. T.

George, Shri Varkey

Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh

Gowder, Shri J. Matha

Guha, Shri Samar

Haldar, Shri Madhuryya

Joarder, Shri Dinesh

Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao .

Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand

Karni Singh, Dr.

Kiruttinan, Shri Tha

Limaye, Shri Madhu

Malik, Shri Mukhtir Singh

Mavalankar, Shri P. G.

Mishra, Shri Shyamnandan

Modak, Shri Bijoy

Mohanty, Shri Surendra

Mukherjee, Shri Saroj

Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain

Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai

Patel, Shri H. M.

Pillai, Shri R. Balakrishna

Ramkanwar, Shri

*Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.

Roy, Dr. Saradish

Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar

Scindia, Shri Madhavrao

Scindia, Shrimati V. R.

Sazhiyan, Shri

Shakya, Shri Maha Deepak Singh

Sharma, Shri R. R.

Singh, Shri D. N.

Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan

Sivasamy, Shri M. S.

Solanki, Shri Somchand

Subravelu, Shri

Vijpayee, Shri Atal Bihari

Verma, Shri Phool Chand

NOES

- Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Alagesan, Shri O. V.
 Ambesh, Shri
 Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
 Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
 Appalanaidu, Shri
 Arvind Netam, Shri
 Austin, Dr. Henry
 Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Aziz Imam, Shri
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
 Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barupal, Shri Panna Lal
 Basappa, Shri K.
 Basumatari, Shri D.
 Besra, Shri S. C.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
 Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
 Bheeshmadev, Shri M.
 Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
 Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
 Chaudhari, Shri Amarsinh
 Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
 Chellachami, Shri A. M.
 Chhotey Lal, Shri
 Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
 Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
- Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Dalip Singh, Shri
 Darbara Singh, Shri
 Das, Shri Anadi Charan
 Das, Shri Dharnidhar
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
 Dhamankar, Shri
 Dharamgaj Singh, Shri
 Dharia, Shri Mohan
 Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
 Dube, Shri J. P.
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Engti, Shri Biren
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gohain, Shri C. C.
 Gokhale, Shri H. R.
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
 Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
 Govind Das, Dr.
 Gowda, Shri Pampan
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hanumanthiaya, Shri K.
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
 Hari Singh, Shri
 Hashim, Shri M. M.
 Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
 Jadeja, Shri D. P.
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri
 Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri
 Joshi, Shrimati, Subhadra

Kadam, Shri J. G.	Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran	Munsi, Shri Priya Ranjan Das
Kailas, Dr.	Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
Kakoti, Shri Robin	Murthy, Shri B. S.
Kale, Shri	Nahata, Shri Amrit
Kamala Prasad, Shri	Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
Kamble, Shri T. D.	Oraon, Shri Kartik
Kamla Kumari, Kumari	Oraon, Shri Tuna
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal	Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Karan Singh, Dr.	Pandey, Shri Damodar
Kasture, Shri A. S.	Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
Kaul, Shrimati Sheela	Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
Khadilkar, Shri R. K.	Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
Kinder Lal, Shri	Pandit, Shri S. T.
Kisku, Shri A. K.	Pant, Shri K. C.
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar	Paokai Haokip, Shri
Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.	Parikh, Shri Rasiklal
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.	Partap Singh, Shri
Kulkarni, Shri Raja	Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
Kushok Bakula, Shri	Patel, Shri Arvind M.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.	Patel, Shri Natwarlal
Laskar, Shri Nihar	Patel, Shri Prabhudas
Lutfal Haque, Shri	Patnaik, Shri J. B.
Mahajan, Shri Vikram	Peje, Shri S. L.
Mahajan, Shri Y. S.	Pradhani, Shri K.
Maharaj Singh, Shri	Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath	Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini	Rai Shrimati, Sahodrabai
Majhi, Shri Gajadhar	Raj Bahadur, Shri
Malaviya, Shri K. D.	Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.	Ram, Shri Tulmohan
Mallikarjun, Shri	Ram Dhan, Shri
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain	Ram Sewak, Ch.
Maurya, Shri B. P.	Ram Surat Prasad, Shri
Melkote, Dr. G. S.	Ram Swarup, Shri
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Ramji Ram, Shri
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Mishra, Shri Jagannath	Rana, Shri M. B.
Mishra, Shri L. N.	Rao, Shri Jagannath
Misra, Shri S. N.	Rao, Dr. K. L.
Modi, Shri Shrikishan	Rao, Shri K. Narayana
Mohsin, Shri F. H.	Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi

Rao, Shri Nageswara	Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama	Shankaranand, Shri, B.
Rao, Shri Rajagopala	Sharma, Shri A. P.
Raut, Shri Bhola	Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Ravi, Shri Vayalar	Sharma, Shri Madhoram
Ray, Shrimati Maya	Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
Reddy, Shri K. Kodanda Rami	Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
Reddy, Shri K. Ramakrishna	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal	Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa	Shastri, Shri Raja Ram
Reddy, Shri P. Ganga	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha	Shenoy, Shri P. R.
Reddy, Shri P. V.	Sher Singh, Prof.
Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das	Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Shivnath Singh, Shri
Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri	Shukla, Shri B. R.
Sadhu Ram, Shri	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Salve, Shri N. K. P.	Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
Samanta, Shri S. C.	Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Sanghi, Shri N. K.	Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sankata Prasad, Dr.	Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri	Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
Sathe, Shri Vasant	Stephen, Shri C. M.
Satish Chandra, Shri	Subramaniam, Shri C.
Satpathy, Shri Devendra	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Savant, Shri Shankerrao	Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati	Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Sethi, Shri Arjun	Swaran Singh, Shri
Shafee, Shri A.	Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Shafquat Jung, Shri	Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri	Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
Shailani, Shri Chandra	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Shambhu Nath, Shri	Tombi Singh, Shri N.

Tula Ram, Shri

Tuisiram, Shri V.

Uikey, Shri M. G.

Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Vekaria, Shri

Venkatswamy, Shri G.

Verma, Shri Balgovind

Verma, Shri Ramsingh Bhai

Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath

Yadav, Shri Karan Singh

Yadav, Shri N. P.

Yadav, Shri R. P.

Yadav, Shri D. P.

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the

division is:

Ayes: 53; Noes: 247.

The motion was negatived

MR. SPEAKER: Now that it is all over, we will go home and have some peace and rest.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, आज पानी नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी कहती हैं कि जनसंघ वाले पानी की हड़ताल करा रहे हैं। सरकार में पानी नहीं है, पानी कहां से आयेगा। (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

20.50 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, November 23, 1973, Agrahayana 2, 1895 (Saka).

*The following Members also recorded their votes:—

AYES: Shri B. N. Reddy.

NOES: Sarvashri Banamali Patnaik, Umed Singh Ratnia, Shyam Sunder Mohapatra and Shrimati B. Radhabai A. Rao.