

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I introduce the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: What does he want me to do?

12.05 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): May I seek a clarification? Yesterday, the debate on the Murud incident was interrupted because it appears there was some misunderstanding. From the official record, which I have just seen, it is very clear that the original observations of Shri Nath Pai and your remarks thereon are still on record. It appears from the later discussion that the Opposition Members, some of them thought and some of us also felt, that everything was expunged, but the position is absolutely clear from the official version now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I do not think we thought that.

Shri Khadilkar: But that was my impression, and some of the Opposition Members did feel that way, and they have confessed it to me.

Again, you have made an observation, before the Opposition in their resentful mood thought it wise to walk out, that you were ready to discuss this matter with the Opposition if they felt aggrieved about certain remarks of theirs being expunged. That is an observation on record. In the circumstances, I would feel that once this misunderstanding has been cleared the Opposition should resume the original, normal, cordial relations. And this House should get an opportunity, that is more important. Certain allegations have been made or statements have been made by my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai in his opening speech on the Murud incident, and they should not go unchallenged. So, I would suggest, and request, even the Members of the Opposition now that they should resume the debate.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): I strongly object to the expression "cordial relations". We are very cordial. Walking out is an established parliamentary practice. We are not discourteous or antagonistic to you. You should expunge this.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): May I submit that instead of following parliamentary tactics which can sometimes be of dubious nature, we should all follow the regular parliamentary procedure and the Rules of Procedure laid down in the guide to the Members of the Lok Sabha?

Mr. Speaker: I have not followed what Mr. Khadilkar wants me to do.

Shri Khadilkar: My suggestion is that the interrupted debate on Murud incident should be resumed in the House today. That is my positive suggestion.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barackpore): So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly clear of what you had said and that is exactly what is there in the records; so I do not agree with Mr. Khadilkar because the first part had been kept. That is why we could find no logic why the same thing which was repeated a second time should be expunged. But that is beside the point.

The point is what we should do now. You had said that you would meet the Opposition. We had hoped that you would call for us yesterday and I think the Marshal came to us in a very indirect manner and said we should go and meet the Speaker. It is much better if you could convene a meeting where we could discuss the matter. Then, I am sure some way may be found and you can explain to us there how we have erred and we can also put our point of view and then arrive at a decision. That is my proposal.

Mr. Speaker: I have absolutely no complaint against the Opposition now that the hon. lady Member has said that she understood it quite well. I had thrice repeated that the observations made by Mr. Nath Pai had not been expunged and they remained there are they were.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): But your last words were that they should be expunged.

Mr. Speaker: I had said that it was not fair to say like that though I do not hold them to be unparliamentary. I did not order their expunction. I had only said that it was not fair. When it was repeated again, after I had said that it was not, then I had expunged it. To repeat it again and insist on that was, I felt, an insult to the Chair. (*Interruptions.*) Not only yesterday but so many times earlier also.

I have repeatedly said so many times that I never claimed to be infallible. I might make mistakes. It is the Chair that is infallible—not myself. So, the Chair's decision cannot be challenged. Otherwise, mistakes are there. Hon. Members certainly might differ from me. But I have said so many times that whenever an hon. Member feels aggrieved he could just write to me or if he cares he could come to me and we could sit together and discuss. I repeated it yesterday, I am prepared to consider. But then that was not accepted. What I felt was that a condition precedent was asked for: first I should revoke the order that I had passed and then only the Members would agree and discuss with me. I said: no, it is not fair. The order when once passed remains. If we discuss it and really I am convinced that I should review it I am prepared to review it, if certainly hon. Members can convince me; I am open to conviction always.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I am sorry to have to be butting in, but Shri Khadiikar quite

unnecessarily seems to have brought in certain matters. You have been pleased to make certain observations. There is no question of cordiality having vanished. We made a gesture. You have made it clear and...

Mr. Speaker: though there is one complaint, if I may be permitted to put it. So much stress is being laid on this. Every hon. Member who spoke yesterday laid stress on parliamentary principles and democracy and said that it was being smothered and their liberties were being suppressed, but may I ask whether in any other Parliamentary democracy there is ever a procedure laid down or whether this is resorted to, that is, the Opposition or any Member should walk out as a protest against the decision of the Speaker?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: There are many examples in our own Parliament, in the first Parliament and second Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: In the Indian Parliament, there are. I agree with the hon. lady Member. But though, elsewhere in the world, there are discussions and uproars—there is everything—much more than we have here, as soon as a decision is given by the Speaker, that is accepted there and then. But we are developing here a new procedure, not only at the Centre but in the States as well, namely, it is not only against the Government that walk-outs are staged but against the decision of the Speaker. I am congratulating the Opposition; I am saying that in a lighter mood. It should not be taken seriously; though they could not combine against the Government, they have combined against me!

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not wish to butt in and I do not wish to be dragged into any controversy over what has been said, but there is one submission which I think we owe it to ourselves to make clear to you, and that is, while we have the utmost intention to uphold the dignity

and the authority of the Chair—because without that the Opposition particularly cannot function in a House like this—we have had, with considerable unhappiness, to notice that certain things do from time to time happen which do not have an analogy in other places, in a place like the British House of Commons, where such a thing as expunction hardly ever takes place and if it does take place it takes place in conditions very different from what prevailed yesterday. It is only because of certain things which happen from time to time that we have to make certain gestures in order to uphold the right of the Opposition in regard to this.

I do wish to say that our objection yesterday was to your having been pleased to rule out certain statements made by Shri Nath Pai as being worthy of expunction which we thought was entirely the repetition....

Mr. Speaker: What is that statement?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You objected to what you considered to be Shri Nath Pai's repetition of his earlier observations.

Mr. Speaker: That earlier thing remains.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It remains.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, what has been expunged is already there on the record.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You will kindly bear with me for a moment. What Shri Nath Pai did say was not in a recalcitrant manner to repeat his observations but only to explain, in what is considered to be the most appropriate parliamentary language, that what he had said earlier was entirely in conformity with the traditions of a real parliamentary body. To be upbraided for that and to have those words expunged and for you to say that you would not consider the matter at that point of time and this

expunction would remain, was something which cut us to the quick, and therefore, we did have to make a gesture only in order to uphold the right of the Members of the House including Members of the Government. But he used language which is completely parliamentary. That is the submission I would like to make.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, although you said that since he repeats it, you are expunging it, we took it that the entire passage regarding that matter has been expunged from the proceedings. But we find today that it is not so. Only the repetition has been exercised. I do not question your ruling, but we disagree on this point that a matter which was not considered to be unparliamentary at the first time and which was not expunged first was expunged later because of certain other reasons.

It is not a fact that we combined against the Chair. It was a spontaneous action of the entire opposition in order to assert its rights and privileges. Here, of course, we are following a different procedure and I think it is sound in principle, because as you have already stated, we cannot challenge the ruling of the Speaker neither can we discuss it in this House. So, the only other parliamentary method left to us to record our protest or resentment is to walk out. We are doing that not because, as Mr. Khadilkar hinted, we have no cordial relations with the Speaker or we in any way want the prestige of the Speaker to be lowered. It is not so; it is only an ordinary parliamentary right when resentment has to be expressed in some form or other. We have been following that procedure and I think it is sound in principle also.

Shri P. K. Deo: I was not here yesterday, but after going through the records—I bow to your ruling—I feel that you are creating a very bad precedent for the future.

Mr. Speaker: He could not join yesterday; now he wants to join. Let those who were here clarify the situation that arose yesterday.

Shri P. K. Deo: The matter has been seized by the House and every Member present here has got the right to speak on it. So, I am placing my observations before you. I feel that a very bad precedent is being created. First of all, which are the matters which can be expunged? I feel, after going through the records, that there was nothing unparliamentary which could be expunged, specially when in the first instance, you have allowed it to be recorded. If it appears to be unfair to the Chair, simply on that ground that the Chair felt it unfair and it should not be repeated, that it should be expunged, I most respectfully submit, is wrong.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): I think we should consider this matter in the context of the sequence of events that took place yesterday. There were certain observations made by Mr. Nath Pai, to which objection was taken and you were good enough to rule that though the observations were not unparliamentary, they were not fair. That was the opinion expressed by you. If later on Mr. Nath Pai repeated those observations, it meant that he did it as a protest against your ruling. Whatever your ruling may be, irrespective of its merits, it must be accepted. You were good enough to say that you would be prepared to hear Mr. Nath Pai and other Members of the opposition and be prepared to reconsider the matter. I think that was a correct observation. I think after all that has happened and after what you have said, there is no reason why this matter should be further discussed. I request my hon. friends that they may meet you in your chamber for a discussion and ultimately your final decision should prevail.

श्री-शैल्यं (अलीगढ़): कल जो वाक ब्राउट हुआ था उस में मैं भी शामिल था। रिपब्लिक पार्टी के बारे में कोई गलत फहमी, श्रीमन्, आप को न हो जाय इसलिये मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। कोई भी शब्द या कोई भी बात जो कही गई है अगर वह अन-पालियामेंटरी नहीं है यदि वह किसी विशेष व्यक्ति को अच्छी न लगे इसलिये उसको एक्सपन्ज नहीं किया जा सकता है। लेकिन चूँकि उस का रिपीटीशन हुआ है इसलिये उस को एक्सपन्ज किया गया है। ऐसी कोई भी मिसाल वैसे तो आप का फंसला हमारे सिर आँखों पर लेकिन ऐसी कोई भी मिसाल दुनिया के किसी पालियामेंट में नहीं मिल सकती। कोई भी बात जो अनपालियामेंटरी नहीं है केवल उस का रिपीटीशन हुआ है इसलिए एक्सपन्ज किया जाये, यह ठीक नहीं है। केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक आप के सम्मान का प्रश्न है, वह हमारे हृदय में था और सदैव रहेगा। हमने अपने अधिकार की रक्षा के लिये सदन का त्याग किया था।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, may I say one thing?

Mr. Speaker: It has already been stated by so many.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: When Shri Nath Pai.....

Mr. Speaker: All that is clear from the records and it has been quoted by many.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am not reading from the records. When an objection was taken by an hon. Member on the other side you rightly observed that the remarks should not be expunged because according to the rules you did not find them defamatory, indecent, unparliamentary or undignified. But when Shri Nath Pai repeated those remarks—you actually asked Shri Nath Pai not to repeat

those remarks—which were neither unparliamentary nor indecent or undignified you ordered that they may be expunged. Sir, I bow to your ruling, but there have been instances in this House when, for instance, Shri Hem Barua, said something which you thought that the Member was saying despite your ruling or observation that he should not say, you asked that those remarks should not go into the proceedings. You never said then that you were expunging those remarks. Therefore, I think, Sir, this matter requires reconsideration.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indians): Sir, I am not going to comment on the rightness or wrongness of your decision; I do not think it is within our competence to do so. I may disagree violently with your decision, but I think it is very necessary for us to respect certain basic parliamentary values. There is a recession, I say with great respect, of certain basic parliamentary values. If, I say with great respect to my hon. friend, Shri Dwivedy, what he says is accepted as a convention—you may be entirely wrong, I am prepared to argue with you in your chamber—that it is a legitimate exercise of parliamentary right to walk out as an expression of resentment against the Speaker, then every day, because you rule something out of order, we will have constant walkouts. That is what I am afraid of (*Interruptions*). What I feel is this. I may be able to argue the cases much better than they can. I feel for many reasons that we would not have to function if this kind of thing takes place. But what I am canvassing here is that we cannot walk out in protest against a ruling from the Chair however wrong it may be.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The ruling is not challenged. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, as I am one who in a minor way is connected with what has

transpired, may I say one thing? You said in your wisdom just now that it is only in the Parliament of India that such things happen. Yesterday I had raised some quotations. May I point out to you, Sir, when you said promptly that we are not concerned with what happens in other Houses you wanted originality. This House tends to be original. It follows the advice given by you. There was no question of combining against your ruling. It was all spontaneous. It was not by way of humiliation, but we must confess that we felt very humiliated. We never had any quarrel with you and I would repudiate any suggestion that the atmosphere here has been either lacking in decorum or the relationship of cordiality does not exist. That is not the thing. I must just tell you how exasperated I felt. I felt humiliated; I am not hiding it from you. It was never.....

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Exasperation is a two-way commodity. He was exasperating the House and the majority.

Shri Nath Pal: Not at all.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Shri Hanumanthaiya is a public prosecutor or what?

Mr. Speaker: If Shri Banerjee is a public defender, then he can be a public prosecutor.

Shri Nath Pal: Even today I had persuaded myself to remain absolutely quiet, because, so far as I was concerned, I do not think that the feelings of an individual should be ventilated in the House. But for me the feeling was associated with certain rights. You said that I was trying to rub in. I am afraid, it was not my intention and it was far from what actually happened. May I draw your attention—I am absolutely sure that with your studious nature....

Mr. Speaker: Suppose, I misunderstood you; I thought, you were rubbing in and you were not rubbing in. (Interruption).

Shri Nath Pai: Will they have patience? Why are they afraid of listening to arguments?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: We are afraid?

Mr. Speaker: I will request hon. Members to have patience.

Shri Nath Pai: At the game of interruption, I think, they should be a little cautious with me. I enjoy interruptions, but if they overdo it to the point of stopping me from speaking, I do not think, they will be very happy about it.... (Interruption)

व्यवहार मत करो, मुझे बरतने का कौशल मत करो।

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It is a question of threatening and using..... (Interruption).

Shri Nath Pai: You are trying to threaten me.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: That is not right.

Mr. Speaker: If Shri Nath Pai allows me to do it, I will stop him; but he should allow me to do that and not that he should take it upon himself. If he gives me the time, I will do that. It is my job.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I appeal to you, Sir.....

Mr. Speaker: I will request him not to interrupt. Let us hear because all that happened yesterday is very unfortunate and everybody is interested in seeing that we clear that misunderstanding or whatever it was. There is no use in interrupting again and again.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I am appealing to you to give us the same consideration that you are giving to the Opposition Members. That is all; nothing more than that.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): I rise on a point of order.

Shri Maurya: These words should be expunged as they are against the chair.... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Now Shri Hanumanthaiya must have found that there are so many friends of mine on this side who are prepared to fight for me. Therefore he will remain silent.

Shri Nath Pai: I feel, Shri Hanumanthaiya is really a fine parliamentarian.

Mr. Speaker: Why carry on like that? Shri Nath Pai is unnecessarily trying to provoke him.

Shri Nath Pai: As I was submitting to you, may I say that somehow we have got very different impressions as to what we were trying to do. But looking at the record, which should be the guide for all of us, I thought, I was constantly trying to uphold your authority and, at the same time, pleading for what I regarded as the right of a Member of the House. Here is the testimony of the official record:—

"Sir, I am always only too willing to be guided and led by you. I am not opposed to what you are saying, but may I plead"....

these are the words I used—the page, if you have the record with you is 2962, Lok Sabha Debates, where I say:—

"No defiance of your orders was made, no aspersion was cast: so you should guide us as to the reasons for which these remarks you feel inclined to expunge."

Can anybody plead his cause, his hurt, his grievance more politely and in a more parliamentary manner? I do not know. But I say that maybe I am grieved, I would like to be guided. Further, I said:—

"I do not find there is any authority, except, of course, your authority—you are free to create a new precedent—and I am constrained to say that the whole point in a debate will be lost if such parliamentary expressions you will not be pleased to allow. I want to know whether a precedent is to be made."

What is this? In these tones I plead. There was never any intention to rub in. I sought your indulgence and of the House. If what I say causes any hurt in any part of the House, I should have a chance to try and convince those who are offended. That is what I wanted. What I was repeating was not hurling defiance. Again and again that phrase is used. I only wanted to explain to those who objected to what I was saying. That opportunity is always given and after hearing you have given your rulings, "Now that the Member has explained, there should not be any trouble". I was exercising this well-established precedent of my right to remove misunderstanding because objection was taken to what, I thought, was very parliamentary, very normal and far more milder. Here again, I would not go into the wrongness or rightness of it.

You had raised a point on which my very distinguished friend, Shri Anthony, has come forth—I do not say, to your rescue—with all the respect he commands and has pronounced almost like a Daniel that in challenging something we have been trying to lower the standards. I strongly repudiate any suggestion, whether deliberately meant or otherwise, that by what we were doing in pleading with you or in arguing with you or in submitting to you that your decision

may be reconsidered, the intention, the effort, was directed towards either lowering your authority or the prestige of this House. This is an insinuation which I would like to be totally rejected by us.

Secondly, so far as the ruling is concerned—you will concede—I may not be as great an authority as Mr. Frank Anthony is....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Because you are not nominated.

Shri Nath Pai: But in a humble way, may I point out.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Whether nominated or elected, all Members are equal. It is not fair. (*Interruption*)

Shri Nath Pai: May I point out in a light vein, as you said something earlier, that referring to a Member as nominated has been held by previous Speaker as unparliamentary? I am reminding my friend Mr. Banerjee.

Now, the question came: Is it a challenge? It was not the spirit of challenge. All of us are trying to be very careful about maintaining the decorum. In my very remark, there is this phrase:

"You, Sir, are the custodian and the guardian of the rights of the House."

But we felt, Sir, that just as your prestige is the prestige of the House, the prestige of the Members is also not distinguishable from the prestige of the House. It is a collective thing which all of us are pledged to uphold. It was not that spirit of challenge. You asked: Shall we have walk-outs everyday? Sir, you know the procedure. When the Member is feeling aggrieved, shall we resort to in the case of a much respected Speaker like you the extreme remedy? Is he insinuating that because we feel aggrieved, we should go to the

[Shri Nath Pai]

extreme which nobody would want? Then, the remedy, according to the logic of Mr. Frank Anthony and those who were supporting and applauding him, would be that every time you disagree with the Speaker, you move a motion of no-confidence. It is making a mockery of parliamentary procedure. What we did, therefore, was the only thing left to us. It was not the question of disagreement. We thought that certain rights, certain principles, were involved. We pleaded with you. You, in your wisdom, thought you could not reconsider it. We thought that we will be failing in our duty—our duty is not only to represent the country but also to uphold the rights of the House—and, as we conceived it, we followed that course.

Sir, I would like to assure the House that we have not tried to depart from the decorum, the dignity, of the House. But I do hope, the dignity of the House is a collective thing and just as the authority of the Speaker which needs to be permanently upheld and sustained the prestige and the individual self-respect of Members is not to be differentiated from the authority of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I am happy to hear the hon. Members here. They have been very helpful in this respect today. If really they are very particular in upholding the dignity of the Chair, I assure them I am equally particular that the prestige and the dignity of all the Members must be upheld and I have been trying to do it. I do not think the Members of the Opposition had ever the complaint that I had not defended them whenever there was an opportunity.

Now, the question comes about yesterday's affair and the misunderstanding that is there. Firstly, I hold that—it may be wrong as Mr. Anthony says—thought it is not unparliamentary and I am not going to

expunge it, it was not fair to repeat it. When this is the remark that I make, whether the Member in the face of that should try to rub it or repeat it is what I put to the hon. Members of the Opposition. Is it fair to repeat it, though I have not held that unparliamentary? The portion that has been expunged also remains on the record in his previous part of the speech. So, there is no doubt so far as its inclusion in the speech is concerned. That remains there. Now, if that was objected to and when there was an uproar or some apprehension, I only asked him that he might not repeat it. Once it has been held that it is not unparliamentary and I have not expunged it, then is it not for the Member to move on to the next point instead of just trying to repeat it again? That was my objection; nothing beyond it. That was taken in a different sense.

It has been said that this walk-out is the only remedy that the Opposition has got short of no-confidence. In fact, what impression yesterday's walk-out and the earlier one created on me was that it is just as good as a motion of no-confidence. That was what I felt.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: So far as we are concerned, we have no such feeling.

Mr. Speaker: I am just disclosing my mind now. You just imagine that. Take the whole thing into consideration. The Speaker gives a judgment; he gives a decision. It is possible you may not agree with it; it is possible it may be wrong also. I do not claim that I do not commit wrongs and I do not commit mistakes. How is democracy to be run? Should that be discussed whether it is correct or it is incorrect here in the House at that moment? Should a discussion take place here and all the Members should express their opinions here? Then, if I cannot agree with some of the Members, should it be followed by a walk-out that they have not been

able to convince me? They should think over it in calmer moments and then come to a decision as to what would be the best procedure and method by which this democracy can be run. It may not be in their minds to insult me—that is all right—but the question is whether that discussion follows immediately when I give a decision. The question is whether it is possible to run the democracy like this. The question is whether every decision is to be discussed here. Of course, there would be some Members who cannot agree and they might have justification also—there is no wonder—but at that moment what my request is that it is to be obeyed. Every time, I have said that we can sit down and discuss the things and I am prepared to review it if really I find I have committed a mistake. But somebody shall have to decide.

Now, let us see the alternative method. Instead of following this procedure that I shall give a decision, then it might be the subject of discussion here and then if the Members do not agree, they should express their dissatisfaction by staging a walk-out. This is one thing. The second thing would be—I was just considering that—why should I take it upon myself and that I should follow the American method that the House has the appellate right, that the House might decide it whenever a decision is taken. I should hear one or two speeches and then put it to the House. Would that be really practicable or shall we be able to work this democracy if this is resorted to? Instead of exposing myself to that danger, that the decision might be discussed, then disagreed and then a walk-out staged, would they advise me that I should put it to the House and would that be a good solution or an alternative to that?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Sir, for the last 12 years.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We are calmly considering these things for our guidance and there ought not to be any impatience. These moments here will not be misspent, I suppose.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Sir, for the last 12 years, we have followed and built up certain conventions and I am sure nobody in this House, including all my friends on the other side, would say that we have not been functioning as a democracy for the last 12 years. We have had the right of walking out. We have exercised that right, whatever Mr. Masani might say, and I do not think that anyone would claim that we have done it in such a way that the whole functioning of democracy has become a farce. We have used that right with expediency; we have used it occasionally and rarely. But we have used it. Therefore, the question does not arise as to whether this should be applied to the majority to rule out as being right or wrong. I think there is absolutely no fear on that score. I do not want to be referred to the House of Commons in England. We have been building up our own traditions.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: As a matter of fact, I may remind you, Sir, that yesterday morning there was an occasion when I thought your ruling was completely wrong and I thought if I come to your chamber I will be able to convince you. But we did not walk out on that issue. But, surely when we feel very strongly, and very rarely so, we use this right. I do not think that that is going to harm democracy at all. It is going to help in keeping up the respect both of ourselves in the Opposition, and I hope sometimes also of even the ruling party as well as of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: It was in 1953 also that my predecessor held that a walk-out as a protest against the decision of the Speaker was an insult to the Chair. That was held so by Shri Mavalankar in 1953. I am not depriving the Opposition of their right.

[Mr. Speaker]

But I am just putting it to them to consider whether this right so exercised does not humiliate and insult the Speaker?

Shri Nath Pai: It is only when the Opposition also feels very strongly and they feel aggrieved that they resort to this.

Mr. Speaker: This contagion has gone round in all the States, and everybody in this country is familiar now with the grounds on which these walk-outs take place. It has become so common. So, at least here, we shall have to think over it, and I appeal to the hon. Members also to consider it again whether really it promotes democratic principles at all.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): I wonder whether you would permit me also to say something.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I have just a minute? It is a pity that you are interpreting our actions yesterday as being virtually tantamount to an expression of lack of confidence in yourself. Shri Nath Pai has been referred to as unequivocally telling you very definitely that it was farthest from our intention. But what happened yesterday? If you think of the sequence of events, it was a spontaneous act over which I am afraid I am not prepared at this present moment, pending further discussion, to express myself in the way in which my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony did, for instance, and I say so for one particular reason.

Including you, as far as I have been able to know you, many of us in this House are thin-skinned people, sensitive to attack and that sort of thing. But when we come to this House for purposes of debate and controversy, we have to put on the hide of a rhinoceros. We have to have that kind of thing; we have to give and take blows all the time. What happens in Parliament when it is properly regulated is that the cut-and-thrust of the debate is conducted in a refined manner. I would much

rather be attacked by the rapier thrusts of Shri Nath Pai than by the bludgeon blows of Shri Hanumanthaiya, to give two examples. It is necessary in Parliament from time to time to have refined methods of attack being practised through the use of words. You are here only to see that the use of words is parliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: But what should those like me who have no such command over the use of words do?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Yesterday, what happened was the use of words in a particular language which is not our own, which we did not learn at our mother's knee. But Shri Nath Pai used words—I do not know if my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony was here at that moment....

Shri Frank Anthony: I was.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Shri Nath Pai used words which, as far as I could make out—I may be wrong—perfectly appropriate and perfectly parliamentary and with a kind of intellectual subtlety about them, which should be the delight of parliamentary debate. Is that to be stopped because of a certain sense of peculiar dignity? I am very sorry to have to say it,—but I do not mean any disrespect to you, and you know it very well—that I feel that it is in the interests of parliamentary debate and in the interests of controversy as it ought to be conducted in the forum of this House, that there should be some kind of latitude and toleration. As regards this House, we can claim that we are different from many of the State Legislatures; I have no right to malign them. But we have tried to build up such traditions as would really redound to the credit of Indian democracy, and to that result, the Opposition has made perhaps a larger contribution than even the Members of the ruling party.

Shri M. R. Masani: I did not have the opportunity to be here when this incident took place yesterday. But it

seems to me that there are three points raised, and it is good of you to provide us with an opportunity to express ourselves on those points.

In so far as the words used by Shri Nath Pai are concerned, if they were not unparliamentary, then I think that it would be agreed that they should remain part of the record of the House. If a thing can be said once, then the question arises whether it can become improper because the same words are repeated a second time.

As regards the second point about a walk-out, I am entirely in accord with yourself, and I have always held the view that to walk-out against a decision of the ruling authority is not playing the parliamentary game according to the rules. (*Interruptions*).

Some Members of the House may do something which you and I might consider not to be consistent with the highest standards of parliamentary behaviour. I deplore walk-outs against the decisions of the Chair, and I would be most reluctant and loath to participate in them. But supposing a group of Members were to have a different idea about their obligations, would it be right for you, Sir, as the custodian of the privileges not only of the whole House but of every single Member of the House, to abdicate your functions and to hand them over to the decisions of a majority? I am mentioning this because you are the protector not only of the minorities in the Opposition but even of the conscience of one single Member who may be against the whole House and against whom the whole House may also be, to whichever party he may belong.

Mr. Speaker: What is the remedy if.....

Shri M. R. Masani: I would appeal to you that you should not be provoked by what you might consider as an improper expression or contempt against yourself but you should continue to be the guardian of the

privileges of this House and of every individual Member, and that your right to protect all these Members should not be surrendered to the whims and fancies of any numerical majority that there may be in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Again and again it has been asked why when once it has been held that it is not unparliamentary there should be a ban on its repetition. But I have tried to explain that I had held that it was not unparliamentary, but even when expressions are not unparliamentary, then too some expressions are there which ought not to be said at that moment. That was all that I said, that it was unfair and it should not be said. This was all that I said. On earlier occasions also—I may have missed sometimes—whenever the patriotism of a Member has been questioned, I have intervened and said that that should not be done. When once I say that much that it is not fair, then the question is whether it can be repeated a hundred times after my having intervened on the question....

Shri Nath Pai: I may submit that it was explained only once.

Mr. Speaker: I am taking a hypothetical case, and not the hon. Member's.

Shri Nath Pai: But the context is mine.

Mr. Speaker: I am putting it to Shri M. R. Masani now. When I just come to a conclusion that a thing is not unparliamentary but it is unfair, and it should not be said, the point is whether after that, it would be fair to repeat it.

Shri P. K. Deo: It may be unfair, but it should not be expunged.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I suggest that the whole point has been discussed for enough time now, and we have understood each other, and it may be dropped now?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): May I make one submission?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Shri J. B. Kripalani has said that it should be stopped now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I was not present when this incident took place. I do not want that this controversy should proceed in any manner. I am also of the same opinion that the controversy may be closed here. But there is one remark which fell from your mouth, namely that you would like to adopt this alternative or that you have this alternative in your mind that the decision on such matters may be left to the whole House; we resent it very much, much more than any decision coming from you; we welcome your decision at all times, because we have full faith in your integrity and your good-will for the whole House. We would certainly not like the idea, even for a moment, that decisions on points of order or decisions on the question whether a Member's point is right or wrong may be left to the whole House. I would, therefore, say that you should continue to be the guardian of our rights.

Mr. Speaker: That is the desire of the House—we have now spent more than 40 minutes on this. We might proceed now.

Shri P. K. Deo: I fully agree with what Acharya Kripalani has said, that there should be an end to this matter. But may I submit that the House should not be deprived of an important debate like this? So we may resume this debate on some other occasion because there are so many speakers anxious to speak.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I think it is only fair that the discussion of this important matter should be resumed.

Shri P. K. Deo: That is the view of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs also.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection, if the House desires it.

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi): There are so many other important matters.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Our difficulty is this. We have already spent one hour on this. Tomorrow the no-confidence motion has to be voted upon.

Mr. Speaker: Exactly after the question hour, I will call upon the Prime Minister to reply. The miscellaneous business will be taken up at 2.15 P.M.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Yesterday on this discussion, perhaps Shri Nath Pai had taken half an hour. If this discussion is to be resumed, two hours will have to be found.

Mr. Speaker: Yes two hours, that is till 3 P.M.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Some important Members on our side will then be shut out.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We have already discussed this matter with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. He came here and asked, 'What should we do?' I suggested to him to propose to you that, if you are agreeable to resuming the debate, we could have it tomorrow, two hours before the non-official business, and then the whole debate may be replied to on Monday. This could easily be done.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: On Friday, we may not get time because of non-official business. I think it will be better if we take it up independently on Monday after question hour. Otherwise, Shri Nath Pai is ready to resume even now.

Mr. Speaker: He might resume now.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Then what happens to the debate on the no-confidence motion?

Mr. Speaker: After this is finished we will continue it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Does it mean that only Shri Nath Pai who has raised this matter about Mr. Walcott will be able to speak? He is not the only Member who wants to speak. We would like to have two hours for the debate.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सुझाव है कि इस बहस को अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव की बहस से अलग कर दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो फैसला पहले हो चुका है हम उसी पर कायम रहेंगे। माननीय सदस्य श्री नाथ पाई, अब शुरू करेंगे और यह बहस तीन बजे तक चलेगी।

Shri Nath Pai: I had begun on the understanding that as you had been already pleased to direct that this particular debate which we are raising will be replied to independently and not along with the reply to the other debate, it would come at the end of the 2-1/2 hours which you were pleased to reserve for this.

I was submitting yesterday that when my motion was defeated, it was not so much the defeat of my motion which was a matter of concern to me, but it was the spirit in which the debate was met by the Treasury Benches that was really astonishing. In order to bring home the points which I then tried to make, I would like to emphasise some of the points that were made by way of meeting the adjournment motion by the two Ministers who intervened on the side of Government, Shri Raj Bahadur, who was then in charge of Aviation, and Shri Nanda, the Home Minister. Shri Raj Bahadur was a little irked the other day that in the adjourn-

ment motion I had quoted some of the remarks he had made; he said I was quoting them out of context. Knowing that normally Shri Raj Bahadur does not take offence...

The Minister of Transport (Shri Raj Bahadur): I said it in the Lobby, not here.

Shri Nath Pai: I had agreed publicly that I am not going to refer to those remarks which he thinks will give a wrong impression. But this is what he said, these are quotations to which he need not have objection, which he cannot accuse me of quoting out of context. After having heard all the submissions I had made about Mr. Walcott, about the implications, about the significance and about the inherent dangers in this kind of thing happening again and again, Shri Raj Bahadur comes and replies to me: 'Walcott was a man of property; that he was flying aircraft, that our own nationalised airline used this aircraft'. One of my objections was that you employed a man without knowing his full antecedents. You never bothered when getting the services of a man to fly aircraft in this country about not only his technical efficiency and ability, but about his integrity, about his character, about his antecedents, about the background of the man.

What was the background of the man? When he was employed by the IAC and Air India to do some errands for them in this country, he had already a black record in France and in some other countries. For raising this—it is a fact and you know it—I was accused and challenged: what are the sources of your information? Sometimes one wonders. Our ancient scriptures say ignorance is a crime. But according to some of the Treasury Benches, to be knowledgeable, to be informed, is a crime.

The plane was going, according to Shri Raj Bahadur, between various parts of the country—Bombay, Lahore

[Shri Nath Pai]

and sometimes Jaipur. Of course, he was flying. But he was not carrying his messages only. He was carrying something else. Had the Government been vigilant—here I am not blaming Shri Raj Bahadur, because his department was not concerned with it; it was some other apparatus, some other arm of the Government which was concerned and which ought to have been vigilant—we would have found out. He was not carrying, again I repeat, only messages; he was carrying many contraband goods, and he knew what a lucrative trade he could have. But nobody was alerted. It was nobody's concern.

This was the spirit they displayed in meeting my points. Shri Raj Bahadur said this when I said he was a 'wanted' man; much play was made about the word 'wanted' because at the time he took off, he was not wanted. What a brief officials can make about serious parliamentary matters? Is it part of the wisdom of the Minister to rely upon such superficial briefs? The position was taken that since Mr. Nath Pai referred to a man who was wanted by the police and since he was not wanted at the exact minute, Mr. Nath Pai's motion of adjournment falls to the ground! This is how certificates of character and of good behaviour are given by the Ministry to Mr. Walcott.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Devil's advocates.

Shri Nath Pai: There was this specimen. The first violation was on the count of fuelling of the aircraft in hangar. There was violation before he took off. This is a very serious offence under our law, under international law, for a private man to fuel without proper authority a plane in hangar. But that did not bother them.

There are three minor offences against him. Mr. Walcott did not possess a licence, and there was the

court order. There are five different charges against him, according to Shri Raj Bahadur. Still, Walcott, according to Shri Nanda, was free to go. In order to defeat, in order to spike, the charges of the Opposition, they never stop at anything; they will use any argument and then come round and say 'You are making your case on your eloquence'. Here is what Shri Nanda said. I know he has made a very spirited reply, according to press reports, in his intervention yesterday. I find that Shri Nanda and high spirits do not go together. Every time Shri Nanda becomes spirited, he shows a tendency to depart from the rigid path of truth. I would like him to ponder, because it is only the mild mannered Nanda who sounds somehow more convincing. Yesterday he tried to be more convincing by being spirited, and I think the effect, though very good for eloquence, was not particularly good so far as the case of the Government was concerned.

13 hrs.

But Shri Nanda was spirited once again last year. This is what he said: Shri Nath Pai's case was a story based on make-believe, it was hardly a case for an adjournment motion. I would like to know from Government if this was not a case for an adjournment motion, was this a case for moving a motion of thanks to the Government? I would like to know, because this was what was told to me, that I should not have moved it.

Shri Nanda further says, to defeat Shri Nath Pai and those Opposition Members who participated: "There was no security involved in this case. Walcott was free to go wherever he wanted to go." And when a senior Member, Dr. Aney, interrupted and asked why they had sent two Hunter planes of the IAF to chase Mr. Walcott, what was Shri Nanda's reply? These planes ought not to have been sent, it was superfluous. In order to ridicule me, he was ridiculing the defence apparatus. The Foreign

Ministry had ordered the Defence Ministry to send a plane, but in order to defeat Shri Nath Pai, they were prepared to make a mockery of their own administration.

And then, this is the climax: "There was no question of police, there was no question of any warrant, no question of surveillance." This was the spirit in which the debate was taken by the Government. They won the debate, but India lost something.

Had they drawn the necessary conclusions, had they paid some heed to what I had to say in all passion, things might have been different. I had repeatedly emphasized that such an issue which touches on the security, on the honour of the country, should not be made a party issue. I told him that he might be replying as a Minister, but as a citizen at least he was concerned with such an alarming state of things, and that he should take a proper perspective. I pleaded with him to appoint a committee to go into the matter. They said there was nothing to be worried about.

Now, they are realising. Now, Shri Hathi, in his statement to the House, admits that this a serious matter, that this is a delicate matter, that this is a complicated matter. It required Walcott to come a second time to teach them this simple lesson that his acts are not as simple as they dreamed, that they are dangerous, wrought with grave consequences to this country. But then, Shri Hathi's statement tries to impress this House, that is the usual technique, by saying that there are several delicate and complicated aspects of this case which, owing to its importance and possible international ramifications, is being investigated and then come big names like Interpol.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What is the delicacy about it?

Shri Nath Pai: I do not know. Therefore, the hint is: do not discuss it in detail; the hint is that the House should not be seized of the matter, that we should not discuss it.

We know the achievement of these investigations, this Interpol investigation. We are told two officials were sent to England, and this morning's paper has this to say: "Extradition of Walcott—Inadequate Evidence." This is what we are told by the press. It may be a wrong report, but the report from the wording, seems to be a leak, an organised leak which has come from official sources. It has come very timely for us.

Two officials were sent. I never mention officials in my speeches. This report says:

"Two officials who had gone to the U. K. in connection with the extradition of Walcott are returning empty-handed."

Why? Because the U. K. Government thinks that the Indian police have no evidence. What a sad comment on the way the whole case has been bungled! The Walcott case continues to be an essay in bungling by Government, and is in a class by itself. They sent two officials to get the extradition of this man, but the country concerned declines to comply with this request. Why? Because there is no evidence. There is a mountain of evidence about the crimes committed by Walcott. It will require only an administration like that, an officialdom like that, which can make such a poor case out of it, that we will be told by the British that we have no evidence. What a sad commentary! What a way we are disgracing the whole affair!

I would like to say, apart from this, another very important thing. Last year I had tried to show some connection between what Mr. Walcott was doing and our security as a

[Shri Nath Pai]:

whole. They are continuing to bungle. The normal remedy of this Government, whenever they are in difficulty, whenever they cannot face a problem, is to bring a foreign expert. We do not know how to produce grains. Of course, we went for P.L. 480. We did not know to unload them in Bombay. So, two experts from America were imported. We do not know how to stabilise prices. So, Americans have been brought to advise our experts how to go about stabilising prices. May I suggest to the Government that they should give serious thought to the question whether they would not like to bring an American expert to deal with Walcott. And in order to see that we are really non-aligned, we should ask the Russians also for an expert, so that we have got the experts and we remain non-aligned.

Shri Tyagi: Why are you ridiculing? I can understand arguments, but he is ridiculing.

Shri Nath Pai: You need to be ridiculed, you know that.

They are very much concerned about their ridicule. I know that deeply in his heart he agrees with me. The smile on his face shows that. But being on the Treasury Benches, and as the only Minister sitting there, he is pretending he must protest. I would suggest let not the Treasury Benches pretend I am ridiculing. I did, but remember this, the whole country is being ridiculed. The world knows what is happening. This big, gigantic farce is being enacted on the stage of India. You can suppress the discussion here, but what about what is appearing in the French press, in the English press, in the American press? Walcott, an ordinary adventurer, has been raised to the status of a major here by the doings of the officialdom of India.

I was coming to the link that exists between Walcott and the whole rickety state of our security appa-

ratus, the strange way in which our Excise Department, our Customs Department, and, may I say, the Defence and security apparatus functions in this country. We have only yesterday raised what happened in Goa. Mr. Montero, a tormentor of the patriots in Goa, a man who was a sadist and a specialist, at whose hands some Goan and Indian patriots died in the lock-ups in Goa, he had a measure of the security of India. He is a man wanted by the Government of India. I hope I will not be told now that he is not wanted. He was a criminal. He has committed crimes, including murder of our patriots. That man came to Goa. They will not deny it. Openly he comes from Karachi, helps in installing bombs, and he does not blow to pieces only some shops and the municipal offices; he not only kills one innocent Indian citizen; he blows rocket high the reputation of India. An ex-Portuguese colonial official can come back, have his accomplices, instal a bomb and get back safely to Karachi; his other accomplice has gone back. Day before yesterday we read in the papers that an American young lady, wanted by the police, charged with theft, got out of Delhi. Anybody can get away. But, I tell you, the Lord Mayor of Poona wanted to go to attend a conference of Mayors in Warsaw, he was stopped. We do not have foreign exchange, it is not possible. Walcott is making, by this smuggling, a mockery in the first place of your foreign exchange, and your security. There is no foreign exchange for a Lord Mayor to go to an international conference, but for Mr. Walcott, all the gold, all the foreign exchange, available at his sweet disposal.

I would like the House to ponder and think once again before saying that I raise here stories and dramatise? What is the drama? If it is a drama, it is a tragedy for this country when you go on behaving repeatedly like this. In spite of warnings, you are going on like this.

I would like the Government to pause, the House to pause and ponder, over a very serious aspect of the Walcott case. There is a direct link between large-scale, organised massive, internationally run smuggling across the border of a country and the security and the defence of a country. The secret ways and paths and spots used by smugglers are possibly the landing stages for a potential invader. You may be dismissing what we submit with your majority, but the military headquarters and the intelligence headquarters of our potential enemies sit down, study and scrutinise the meaning of this. A country which cannot prevent the taking off from the capital last year of Mr. Walcott, cannot prevent a second landing, cannot stop him from leaving a third time, will that be the country to stop a massive invasion when it comes? These conclusions become inevitable because there is no intelligence of any kind shown in this country.

The Chinese have a proverb: if a man slaps you once, it is his fault; if a man slaps you twice, it is your fault. But if a man like Walcott slaps you three times, what are we going to do? And he has slapped us not once, not twice, but at least three known times. God knows how many more times he has slapped this country. I ask them will they be content with telling what Mr. Hathi had told us in his statement? Mr. Hathi is a sober man. I must say, having criticised them and castigated them, that the statement within the limits set by the prestige of the party and the Government has tried to be forthright. We are told that a committee would be set up to go into the matter but I want to tell them that I am not interested in a departmental committee. These departmental committees produce tailor-made, made-to-order reports. They find only the shrimps and not the sharks. In fact they have already done it. A police constable has been

dismissed and a head constable had been suspended. What a tremendous way of dealing with such a massive problem? Invariably they say that nothing goes wrong; it is the smallest fry, the smallest cog in the wheel that they find guilty. We want them to have the courage and see the seriousness and magnitude of the problem posed by Mr. Walcott and the like and appoint a parliamentary committee. We want to go and see what is happening about the security, and about the intelligence of this massive smuggling. We want to tell the nation what can be done. I am not going to be content with the promise of a departmental enquiry. It is extraordinary that when a department is charged the department will enquire! A man is accused. He will sit as judge and tell us that everything is all right! Who is the accused in the country who will not tell us: I have enquired into the matter and I am satisfied that I am innocent. When the department is wrong and when the Government is wrong, who is to conduct an enquiry? Not Parliament? Not an independent enquiry? I do not mean an independent judicial enquiry. A judicial enquiry is not called for but an independent enquiry in which Parliament will be properly associated. It will go to the very root cause of what is happening and say how is it that such things happen without any kind of inhibition, those who can come and laugh at us and get away, Monetros and Lair Alis and Bhupats and the hero of them all, Mr. Walcott. It is not one isolated incident. It is a long and sad record of this Government.

Before I conclude, may I tell them that I feel so agitated and grieved and I would like them to share my grief over this. I would like to tell you what the people of the world feel about your security when you are having like that. Mr. Walcott last year had boasted in Karachi: "Well, I promise you I will go again to India." He kept his promise. But

[Shri Nath Pai]

Government has failed in keeping its promise that we will get him punished and there is no hope of the Government doing it. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is somehow humiliating to the self-respect of a country that in punishing the culprit we need the co-operation of others. Our own arms should be so strong and our vigilance should be so genuinely vigilant that we need not have to go to Whitehall and London saying: please help us in punishing our culprit. When shall we be so strong so that Mr. Walcott cannot come into this country with impunity? That Montero cannot come here, Montero who blew up a house of our municipal corporation and goes and says: I have done it. Montero is boasting: "I have done it". Where does all this lead to? After the murder of Gandhiji, an American soldier said this of our country: "there is no security; there is no defence; with one single bazooka I can conquer the whole of India". (*Interruptions*). I too resent it. I know too that he will not be able to do so. But this is the impression you give to others, not to me. Mao Tse-Tung thinks of India's defence apparatus like this. "Indian Army? Where is it? Invincible in peace and invisible in war?" Walcott has only dramatised what they say. I want the Government to face this issue with its full implication, with its full significance. Let them courageously say that something has been remiss with our department of excise. Do not make it an individual's prestige. India's prestige is greater than the prestige of any department and that prestige needs to be upheld. There is something terribly wrong with the excise department and the customs department and the whole connected apparatus. I do not want to rhetorical reply. As an individual Member and a citizen of this country, learning the lesson Walcott has taught us, I say that we should try to draw the necessary conclusions and put in order our house so that future Walcotts are not tempted to come and humiliate this country.

Mr. Speaker: I have to fix a time-limit for the speeches. The Minister would be called at 12.30. I think ten minutes for every hon. Member would be all right.

Shri Solanki (Kaira): Mr. Speaker, since yesterday we are discussing Walcottism and after Mr. Nath Pai's careful study of the whole thing there is no mystery in the Murud incident.

13.16 hrs.

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

The only mystery which remains unsolved is the security arrangements of the Government of India. Before this, the only Walcott I knew was Cecil Walcott of West Indies, a famous cricketeer. But recently an international smuggler by the name of Daniel Walcott has hit the headlines. He is not only wanted by our Government; six other countries including France and also the INTERPOL are after him. Two Indian officers who were sent to England are now holding talks in Paris about this man and they are trying to find out where Mr. Walcott will hit again. Twice he has entered our country breaking our security arrangements and he escaped twice. There is nothing at present that we can do. The only lesson that we can draw from the incident is that we should tighten our security arrangements for the future. We are facing an Emergency and we have the Defence of India rules and we talk of tightening of the belt and being alert but international smugglers of the calibre of Walcott enter our country and escape without any hindrance. It does not pain me that we are unable to catch him; six other countries are unable to catch him; they are also after him. What pains me is that our security arrangements are so slack and under this slack security arrangement Walcott found his escape. I wish to stress this point. If Walcott, during his second visit landed at Murud near Jajira, we would have never known it; perhaps the House would not have had this debate. Be-

cause that Murud is really a paradise for smugglers and he could have completed his business unnoticed and could have taken off. Unfortunately for him and fortunately for our future precautions, he landed at the wrong Murud. Apparently, there are two Muruds on the western coast, and he landed at Murud, a place near Dapoli, where his plane got stuck, and it was seen by several villagers who come rushing to him, and they found that two foreigners had got off the plane. From that very time these two people had got off the plane, the villagers took them for foreigners, particularly as they were white-skinned *gora sahebs*. We still have an inferiority complex for *gora sahebs*. Therefore, even the police officer who came rushing in after hearing the arrival of these people did not bother to investigate into the matter. Further, the two people told him the story that they were to land here because they were short of petrol. At that point, I would like to know—the statement does not make it clear—whether there was any proper enquiry made, whether they were really short of petrol or they really lost their course where they wanted to go—Murud of Janjira—and landed at a wrong place. I do not know personally whether that investigation was made. These two people told the police authorities there that they wanted to go to Bombay and they would be bringing some technical help and then they would take the plane, and that in the meanwhile these people should protect the plane. Even at that time, when they got off the plane, they had some heavy load in their baggage. That baggage was not searched on the spot because they never suspected that they would be carrying gold or wrist-watches.

The two people then asked for a transport. There was a taxi-driver who was called on the spot. He refused to take them suspecting they were carrying something which was not in the official manner; there was something which he suspected, may be they were carrying probably wrist-

watches and gold. So, that taxi-driven refused to take those people, but our security officers were there who kindly obliged these people by purchasing State transport tickets for them to start from Murud to Bombay. Even at that time, they did not bother to check their belongings; and they came to Bombay.

Thus, they spent in this country nearly 36 hours. The whole incident took place within 36 hours, from 8th June to the noon of the 10th June. During these hours, neither the people of Dapoli-Janjira could contact the Bombay officials nor the Bombay officials could be alerted by the airport staff or anybody who might have traced the plane inside the country. Nothing happened to these people. They just went about their business quietly; in Bombay they met their men, they made their contact and disposed of their goods which they were carrying, and they were perfect, legal passengers for the flight to Pakistan! When they went to the airport, apparently they had nothing that could be checked, and the customs authorities found nothing wrong with them.

The question of their inserting the names in the passenger list remained, and it was quite happily and agreeably done by the airport officials! Therefore, even there, it was not a problem. After taking off to Pakistan, the names of Philby and McLister were found by an airport correspondent, not by the security officers; but an airport correspondent traced the names of these two people and suspected foul play and reported the matter that Mr. Philby could be Mr. Walcott,—could be an international smuggler—and there was something wrong in this. That means, that after this incident, our security officers started taking measures; it was too late for them. The people had already escaped. It was believed that they were carrying smuggled goods worth nearly Rs. 1 crore.

Only recently, it was flashed in the newspapers of Gujarat State—there are several newspapers which carried

[Shri Solanki].

the news—that on the 11th September, nearly Rs. 75 lakhs worth of gold were sold at Daman, and it is believed to be the load which was carried by Walcott when he visited our country. I personally believe that the recent raids on the flats of cinema stars and the check of those lockers, etc., is linked somehow with this and is a follow-up of Mr. Walcott's affair. It is possible that we are facing not only one person by the name of Mr. Walcott but a chain of smugglers in our own country who are helping this man, and obviously without any internal help, this man cannot come and go freely as he likes or chooses, and also issuing warnings to the Government that he can visit this country and land anywhere he likes at any time. It certainly leads us to believe that there are smugglers inside our country and therefore not only that security arrangements for external intrusion into this country should also be tightened but also, we should be very careful about the crooks who exist in our own country, because they are the people who collaborate with such persons and help in that trade.

Now, I would like to ask the Minister of State some questions which arise from this incident. As I told you, we have only stories to tell at present because Mr. Walcott has already gone. I would like to know whether the Home Minister has any idea as to how many people under the garb of Mr. Walcott regularly land on our soil and carry on spying activities for the enemy countries. When I am speaking now, the figures I have got go to show that there are nearly 3,000 Pakistanis who are on transit visa, who are supposed to go back to their country and are not even traced by the police; they are looking for them; those people have not gone back to their country. Before this, there was an incident—this was one instance—in regard to Azizul Islam, one spy from Pakistan, who was recently arrested in Calcutta after being

in this country for four years. Therefore, I believe that there must be other people in the country—people of this nature indulging in this business—who are helping Mr. Walcott or are indulging in other spying activities.

Secondly, I want to know whether the Government of India has at all any knowledge of the activities of such persons or not. Thirdly, if such people can come and go without let or hindrance, what is the guarantee that our entire security is not exposed to them? Fourthly, has the Government of India any idea about the humiliation which our country has to face before the world as a result of Mr. Walcott's second escape.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should finish now. He has already taken 12 minutes.

Shri Solanki: Just two minutes, Sir. One important point which I want to bring to the notice of the Minister of State is this. On the day of arrival of Mr. Walcott in France, when he escaped from here the first time, he was arrested in France. Even at that time, no effort was made to contact the authorities there. We would have asked the French Government to help us and the Interpol could have been contacted for the purpose of tracing the man who escaped from here, and taken action against him. I would like to know why the Minister has failed to do that.

All these questions are important questions and they threaten the security of our country; it is not only in regard to the business of smuggling; more important than that is the security and defence of our country. It is this security which requires careful attention, and I would hope that the Minister would look into the matter.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Sir, the entire circumstances surrounding the landing in Murud point to certain

failings of this Government, endangering the security of the nation and of our economy. Referring to the conduct of the police in letting the culprits go scot-free, the Government statement says:

"There being no reasons at that stage to suspect the version given out by them, the Head Constable noted down their names and the numbers of their passports and placed no further restriction on their movement."

The other day, in reply to a question, the Minister admitted that in so many words—Murud was a centre of smuggling. Only two years back, Rs. 80 lakhs worth of contraband gold was seized from that centre; and smuggling is after all from foreign countries. Yet, it is unbelievable that this police station which is aware of Murud being the smugglers' paradise should not suspect the foreigners when they forelanded at such a place.

The *Times of India* of 13th June writes:

"After landing at Murud, Captain McLister was in a great hurry to leave; he offered Rs. 150 to a taxi-driver to take him to Bombay. The taxi-driver, suspecting the *bona fides* of the captain, refused."

Is it not surprising that the police would not suspect where an ordinary taxi-driver suspects? Normally, the planes are to keep contact with the control tower every half an hour on their location and the moment the contact is lost, automatically the district magistrate and police stations around the probable area are alerted. Is it not surprising, Sir, that in the absence of any such information from civil aviation authorities, the telegram of this landing in Murud did not rouse any suspicion of the officials at the District Superintendent's office? It is strange to note, Sir, that the police inspector did not find it necessary to enquire about the where-

abouts of the occupants, especially when it is stated that the Head Constable omitted to mention it in his message.

It is admitted by the Government that the Controller, Civil Aerodromes, received the message at 7.32 A.M. in the morning. He at least knew for certain that that was a plane which evaded any contacts with the tower. And yet, how did it happen, Sir, that the Controller did not alert the police and the security forces, till 11.30 A.M. when the foreigners escaped by the Pakistan International Airways?

Sir, these circumstances coupled with the fact that they could requisition the State Transport Bus and get clearance through an IAC official show the existence of a powerful ring within our administrative machinery cutting across police, civil aviation, customs department and IAC, in league with international smugglers and gun-runners. Secondly, our Government had sufficient forewarning about the existence of such elements in our administrative machinery even at the time of Walcott's escape. It is a fact, Sir, that the chowkidar posted near Walcott's plane warned the Senior Air Traffic Control Officer and the Deputy Assistant Aerodrome Officer four times about the impending escape of Walcott—first time when Walcott brought battery and started working, second time when Mr. Walcott brought petrol, third time when Mr. Walcott started working on the engine and fourth time when the chowkidar rushed to the officer in person and reported his suspicion. And yet, these officials refused to take any action and allowed Walcott to escape.

Why did this Government not weed out such elements from our administration? Government had sufficient powers to clean the administration of such elements. Yet, they were busy using these powers to ferret out people with some progressive views in the Government service and throw them out dubbing them as communists. In the bargain, they retained the real culprits in Government ser-

[Shri Umanath]

vice who were in league with international gangsters. Let this Government at least now see that communist-baiting will lead to results prejudicial to the nation's real security.

This Government statement on page four says:

"Instructions have also been issued on the procedure to be followed by State Governments and local officials in the event of unauthorised landings by foreign aircrafts outside airports either due to navigational or engine failure or for purposes affecting national security".

This means that this Government had not issued any such instructions so far. It is two years since national emergency was declared and even now it continues to be in existence. People were made to undergo ARP exercises at one stage. And yet, this Government had not issued instructions so far, as to the procedure to be followed by State Governments and local officials in the event of unauthorised landing by foreign aircraft outside airports for purposes affecting national security. Is it not obvious, Sir, that this Government has been bluffing the people when they talked of having taken this security measure and that security measure?

Sir, powerful forces within this country are behind these foreign intruders. These are the very forces of big business, who have mastered the art of under-invoicing and over-invoicing of exports and imports, the art of accumulating foreign exchange in foreign countries behind the back of the nation, the art of cheating and depriving the nation of its legitimate share of foreign exchange. These are the very forces, who when they want to bring back their foreign black money, convert it into gold and smuggle it into the country. This class of traitors and saboteurs of the country's security and of the economy is given birth to and reared by the Government's policy of building capitalism

under the garb of democratic socialism. Nationalisation of export-import trade would at one stroke eliminate the scourge of over-invoicing and under-invoicing, save for the country substantial foreign exchange and deal a crippling blow to the smuggling industry. But the seventeen years have proved beyond doubt that for this Government the interest of big business is above national interests and this explains their bitter resistance to the take-over of export-import trade.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I do not want to condemn the Government or find fault with them, though I think they are in the dock and they have to answer for the vacuum in our security. But I want to deal with the constructive aspects of the situation. Our country is really in serious danger and we are taking things very easily. Our whole coastline is exposed to danger. We have not counted the miles which stretch across our coastline. Even in the last war, a Japanese sub landed and three or four young men were deposited here. They were sentenced to death. They belong to the Indian National Army.

I met a young lady who went to Mahatma Gandhi to plead for her husband, one of those landed by the Japanese submarine. She was a very bold woman—Bela Mitra—niece of Netaji. She is no more, but she saved the life of her husband. Today there is a railway station in her name. I had the pleasure of meeting her when she was going to plead with Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi took up her case and that of the three other men with Lord Wavell and they were saved from being hanged. But that was a patriotic expedition and Bela Nagar is now a station in Bengal opened by my friend, Shri Shahnawaz Khan. That was a patriotic mission. But these are nefarious traders and they should be exterminated.

We are very easy-going. The telephones of Members of Parliament are tapped. If we go to Russia and China, they have no faith in the patriotism of our own men that our men will not sell their country. There are a number of hirelings who can be hired for a very small sum. Sir, I came in a hurry and I could not bring that book which contains the testimony of the Military Attache of the Hitlerite Government at the Court of St. James just before the world war started. He said in his book: "I could not find a single Britisher to do work for Nazi espionage." That was in times of peace before the world war II started. He said in his testimony that he failed to hire a single Britisher to do espionage work for him. Can we say that of ourselves, of our military men, of our Air Force, of our police stations and of our higher officers? Some of them are ready to sell their country for a mess of pottage, just as we did for the East India Company.

We are going to have a foreign hotel Why should foreigners come into the hotel industry? These hotels are going to be centres of espionage. We have no alert managers, no alert supervisors, no alert maids. Even the maids in foreign countries are maids who do work for their country. Maids run the hotels in other countries doing menial work. I met a hotel executive only yesterday in Delhi. He said he reported to the police a young man who wanted to visit the Pakistan Air Attache. He reported against him and was arrested. We want our people to alert, whether they are running a hotel or running an airline. Our country is in serious peril. Nobody worries about our long coastline. We have got young fishermen who should be trained and put on a sort of home guard duly on our long coastline. But nobody taps these resources.

When I was attending the last election rally of the late President Kennedy at the Coliseum in New York, I was having a small bag with the same one which I carry daily to

Parliament. A policeman came to me and asked me to open the bag. When he resisted and insisted, I finally yielded. I opened the bag and what did he find? An apple. I am very fond of fruits and I had kept an apple there. When I told him, "My Mahratta policeman in Bombay is far superior to you" he ran away from me. I must pay a tribute to the Mahratta policeman; he is alert and above being bribed and can discharge his duty efficiently indeed—being Indians best policeman. The other day he did a good job in reporting this matter, at Murud; but nothing came out of it at the other end.

The last District Manager of the Air India International goes about scotfree; but he had Walcott in his House, but the Minister gave an evasive reply. We want our Ministers to be as truthful as Jawaharlal Nehru. Jawaharlal Nehru told everything to the House, spontaneously, truthfully and whole-heartedly. It was a joy to hear him. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is doing the same thing. But the small fries do not do that way. We must have the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the interest of our motherland. Ministers cannot be evasive and elusive or mysterious in their replies and they should not hide facts.

If the former Air-India Manager had Walcott in his house, the whole chain must be exposed, the whole chain must be exterminated. It's time we took stern measures. It is no use attacking Parliament Members. Run after big fries, run after big individuals, run to earth shady missions and other organisations. We can catch people and bring them to book. Nothing of the type is being done. Our men in the police force must be the eyes and ears for the Government. Quite many journalists from foreign countries are agents of their own government here. A number of foreign journalists are here. Our own journalists must be very patriotic; otherwise we cannot help our-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

selves. They should place the country first and everything thereafter. If our country is on firm foundations, we are sure of ourselves.

Ashoka Hotel is a first class hotel. Hilton hotels are coming to India. Why do you allow foreigners to start hotels in India. Can't we run our own hotels. In the name of tourism you allow foreigners to run hotels. Walcott came and dumped arms in the Ashoka Hotel and went scot free! These are the things that worry us. I am worried about the constructive work of our safety. I am not condemning this Government or the Ministers. I want them to be forthright and spontaneously tell the whole story in all its truthful aspect.

What about gold smuggling. There was the notorious case of a leading bullion merchant in Bombay whose family has erected a clock tower for the University and yet his whole firm was doing smuggling. The story came out in all the newspapers. But he had built family connections and he indulged in smuggling; and yet no severe punishment was meted out to him.

I shall give my own example. I was in my own constituency. I was coming after a very strenuous tour. I was searched by the Customs. I handed over the keys and asked them to search. It was over five years ago. When I know my case is just I never speak but I can fight it very well. I wrote to the then Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, a long letter. I mentioned that at the London Airport nobody touched my things. The London Airport officials are said to be the best in the world. They only ask: "If you have got anything objectionable keep it here and take it away when you go". But here, because somebody was opposed to my being elected he got the officials to search my things. I told them that I neither smoke nor drink and I had no money for smuggling. Yet they searched

me. I am grateful to the Prime Minister and also the then Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai for the enquiry that was held and punishment being meted out. But what is the use? When a Member of Parliament can be unjustly searched, what about the dignity of a Member if he is searched like that? If my hands are clean I am not worried about anybody. I was then wondering whether I should embarrass the Prime Minister and as one of his dear colleagues, the late Maulana Azad had just passed away. But I said nothing then. I am saying this here after five years. Our police are worrying about small things.

Are our police people alert? Do they do good job? Does not Central Intelligence Bureau do a good job where foreign nations are concerned? Men and women are planted in various places in Delhi. Delhi is full of these silent things. All information is in foreign embassies. You and I do not know it. How does it happen? It goes out from men in high authority under cover and without our knowledge. These are things which we have to stop. Our country is in extreme danger. The Chinese have been in NEFA. Have they not been told everything about us? They know everything about us. We are today in a state of emergency and in that state of emergency a foreign national comes to Ashoka Hotel, dumps arms there, gets away, comes again, goes back and comes for a third time—perhaps this may be his thirtieth visit! Men at our airports, men in our airlines, men at our sea ports have all to be alert and patriotic. They must surrender all these suspicious characters. Therein only will the safety of our land lie.

Now, this Walcott incident has taken place. We were sleeping in a kind of insecurity. We were sleeping in a state of complacency forgetting everything. Today this Walcott question has come as a warning. This is a red signal to us. It is time that we

did something and we put our country in proper shape. Why should wives of big officers. I make bold to say, be found in the embassies? Why should they even go for parties there, private ones? I want the Home Minister to draw a list of the people who shall attend such parties and ban the wives. Even if I had been in their position I would have easily handed over the secrets. I admit, human flesh is exposed to weakness. If somebody offers so much money my mouth may open and perhaps I will accept in a lesser light. Why put temptations in the way of the wives of high ranking officials who are found in the embassies? Various temptations are placed in various forms. As a matter of fact, I am a member of the Small Newspaper Enquiry Committee. We sent out a questionnaire asking how much temptation was offered for putting a picture in the paper or for putting a news paragraph. One of my own members of the staff came out saying that Rs. 200 was offered for one article. From that time I see every article before it is put in. All kinds of things are done. Both the eastern and western embassies are full with enormous sums of money ready to take over men who can sell the country.

Sir, I shall not say more. But this Walcott incident is a God-sent incident. I am thankful to Shri Nath Pai and others who have taken a lead in this matter. These are not party questions; these are national questions and these are questions on which we have to think together.

Shri Nath Pai: That should be the spirit.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I support all the points of Shri Nath Pai and the demand which he has very humbly made to appoint a parliamentary committee to go into the whole question. I have gone through the statement laid on the Table of the House by Shri Hathi:

I am afraid, I do not find any convincing argument in that. This is the second or third time that Shri Walcott came to India with his aircraft and landed in Murud. Is it not a fact that Shri Walcott had been to this country even in 1963, and before he came, a Bengali daily of Calcutta published the photo of a big car and said that the car belonged to a big international smuggler. This was also pointed out to the Home Ministry and to the various agencies which were responsible to unearth such things. Yet no notice was taken. Did the Home Minister not know what was going on in Hotel Ritz in Bombay? Did they not get any statement from the manager of that hotel, Mr. Mario, where international smugglers used to stay or were staying? Mr. Dodge, Mr. Novak and even Mr. Walcott were staying there. I think Mr. Mario gave some statement but no notice was taken and this Walcott incident was not taken up so seriously. Both the Ministers who replied to my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai ridiculed it by saying that it was something like a cook and bull story. But Mr. Walcott's next visit to our country and his escape has proved that he has termed both the Ministers . . .

Shri Raj Bahadur: On a point of explanation, Sir, I am not intervening in the debate and so may I explain this cock and bull story affair because it has been mentioned twice? I did say something like that in the course of the debate that took place on this matter on the earlier occasion, but that was in reference to a particular context. The context was the statement made that Mr. Walcott, when he escaped from the Safdarjung Airport, flew over the jail was seen throwing packets of biscuits and cigarettes and shouting "Hello" to the inmates of the jail where he was lodged as a prisoner. That particular part of the story could not be substantiated by any investigation whatsoever and it appeared to be very much of a fantasy. In that context I said

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

that it was a cock-and-bull story. I only said that to assure the House that I did not mean any reflection on any hon. Member. I maintained that we are not proud of the incident. That I maintained at that time also. We are as anxious to do our part of the duty as anxious to do our part of the duty anxious about it.

Shri Nath Pal: On a point of personal explanation because the reference was to me. I very much welcome normally fair and straight forward as he is—that he has come forth and clarified the statement. He said that I had given to the House a cock and bull-story and I pleaded with him that I did not make the story, it had appeared in very reputable national dailies and I had reproduced it. He ought to have said that the reports that Shri Nath Pai is getting are wrong, as appearing in the press; but instead, he had said that we were making a cock-and-bull story. The whole approach was in that line. That is what we have objected to.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I was referring to this cock-and-bull story.

Shri Raj Bahadur: That is over now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He has dodged both the Ministers and their agencies. He has proved to the world that he dodged both the Ministers, the Transport Minister and the Home Minister, and converted them into a cock and a bull. They were fighting each other; but they could not actually catch Mr. Walcott.

Shri Raj Bahadur: I do not know whether it is fair.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There is nothing unparliamentary. A cock is always fighting and a bull is also fighting.

An Hon. Member: This is not parliamentary.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is purley parliamentary; nothing else. My con-

tion is only this that, according to the statement of the hon. Minister, it appears that he joined the entire crowd and became a passenger. He was supposed to have come from a plane which was coming from East Africa. Did he have a yellow fever certificate? Was it checked? I know, Mr. Walcott, at that time known as Mr. Philby, had no yellow fever certificate and this was not checked. So, this is all intentional and the officer at the airport wanted to help him. A piece of gold to this officer; a piece of diamond to that officer or his wife and that helped Mr. Walcott to come to this country thrice or four times and escape nicely and so gracefully condemning the entire security of this country.

Then, another question arises. This smuggling was going on and this was brought to the notice of Shri Dewan, the Deputy Director, Revenue Intelligence. It was brought to his notice that an international gang is working and that it considers India to be a smugglers' paradise. According to a person, who has written a book, India has been converted into a land of smugglers and it is a paradise for smugglers. What happened? Did Shri Dewan report to the Central Board of Revenue about the whole thing?

Then, is it not a fact that one international smuggler, Mr. Dodge, who was being tried by the Presidency Magistrate in Bombay, was converted as an approver, though the Presidency Magistrate did not accept him as an approver, and that against the order of the Presidency Magistrate the Police went into an appeal. He was being tried along with two other smugglers of a national scale, Sarvashri Thadani and Thirani. They were tried, but Mr. Dodge, a French national, who is actually a partner of Mr. Walcott, Mr. Novak and other international smugglers, was granted bail and it was said that he should not be tried because he will work as an approver.

When the Presidency Magistrate refused to accept him as an approver, what was the fun of the Police going into appeal? Why did the Police go into appeal?

Then, is it not a fact that there is one jeweller, called Nanubhai Jewellers, in Bombay, who, I am told, is always interested in selling international jewels and international gold that he receives? He is a big jeweller. Then, is it not a fact that the son of an ex-Cabinet Minister is very intimately connected with Nanubhai Jewellers? Is it not a fact that that, after the Murud incident, there was a search of the residence of this son of an ex-Cabinet Minister?

An Hon. Member: Central or State?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Central Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No names please.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am not mentioning names. Is it not a fact that this Nanubhai Jewellers was also connected with another *bhai* and both the *bhais* were working to distribute smuggled gold and diamonds? This is a matter of great importance. I know, this Government becomes too weak when some big jewellers' interests or those of the sons of big Cabinet Ministers are concerned. Then, what will happen? The same thing will happen that happened in the month of August. You know better than I.

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi (Balrampur): On a point of order. The hon. Member talks of a son of an ex-Cabinet Minister. Now, there are so many ex-Cabinet Ministers. I am afraid, their sons will protest.

Shri Nath Pai: Let them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has not mentioned any names.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have not mentioned any name, but if she provokes me to mention the name, I will.

When there is a question of corruption or investigation, I know, in this country investigations have proceeded against Tarkeshwari Sinha to Mala Sinha. Recently, in Calcutta 30 members of a big family, the Birla family and their associates were searched. Because one Mr. Birla—I do not want to name him—was taken in a police van of the SPE, there was a telephone here to the Home Minister. The Home Minister did not oblige, so there were approaches to all Cabinet Ministers. If this thing continues, I am sure, there will be thousands of Walcotts.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): I could not follow what he said about a telephone to the Home Minister.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am told that there was a telephone call to the Home Minister or to the Ministry to the effect that this was most unfair that the brother of such-and-such Birla, who has donated so much and who is responsible for the economy of this country, was taken in a Police van.

Shri Hathi: I have not received any such telephone.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The name of Raj Kapoor was announced; the name of Mala Sinha was announced; the name of Vijayanthimala was announced. Then, how is it, when 30 members of the Birla family who are still shrouded in a cloud are concerned, their names did not come out?

I am told that with the help of all these big families Walcott has proved to be an international smuggler of gold and diamond: Go to India, go to that paradise, have a joint front with the national racketeers and do international smuggling with the help of those national racketeers which will

[Shri S. M. Banerjee].

bring you money. So, I say that a committee of Members of Parliament is absolutely essential to unearth three things; firstly, whether international smuggling has increased; secondly, whether our security is safe; and, thirdly, whether those who have the power and who hold the reins of this country are also a party to it and with their help the racketeers are racketeering, blackmarketing, hoarding and smuggling.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I think, Shri Nath Pai has advocated the cause very ably and I congratulate him on that. But the fact of the matter that there are some persons who cry murder when their little finger is hurt. It is true that the case of Walcott's escape on the first occasion is indefensible. It is also true that what happened this time in the case of Mr. Walcott and his accomplices cannot be defended on any rational grounds. All these things are true, but the fact remains that too much has been made of these two cases. There is a lack of sense of perspective; there is also a deficiency of sense of proportion. Now, to think that our country has become a haven for smugglers, that all the big houses in this country are allied to these smugglers, that there is something nefarious going on all over the country....

14 hrs.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I think he should use his ear-phones. He should not take the advantage of his age. He should better use his ear-phones.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am not talking about you. Your speech was not worth listening to.

Sir, what I was submitting very respectfully was that the facts given by Mr. Nath Pai are incontrovertible and they show something rotten in the State of Denmark. We should put it right straightway; we should tighten up the police; we should try to tighten

up our security at the airports; we should also try to have more men to guard our coastline and we should also see that all those persons who are suspect in our eyes in the way of smuggling and other things should be brought to book. I do not deny that. But I submit very respectfully that sometimes you may magnify a case beyond its natural consequences, beyond its relative importance and beyond its degree of utility. That is what is happening. I think my friend Mr. Nath Pai has made a great hero of Mr. Walcott. I am very sorry for that.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: He has made a great rogue of him or a hero of him?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think it all depends upon the understanding.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You have got a better understanding. You carry on with your understanding. (*Interruption*).

Shri D. C. Sharma: I want to submit very respectfully that Mr. Walcott has been made out to be a great great adventurer, a great great smuggler, a great great dispenser of everything. I think Mr. Walcott is a smuggler . .

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : दो बार भा गया और धोखा दे गया, इस से ज्यादा और क्या हो सकता है ।

श्री बी० चं० शर्मा : वह आप को भी धोखा दे सकता है, सब को दे सकता है । इस में कौन सी बात है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : वह आप को भी धोखा दे गया और सरकार को भी दे गया ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Swamiji, you do not understand English; why are you butting in?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप इतना बड़ा अपराध छिपाना चाहते हैं ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: You do not understand English. Why are you talking like that?

Sir, I was submitting very respectfully that too much has been made of this affair and all kinds of extraneous factors have been brought into this case. Mr. Nath Pai was referring to a drama and said that it was a tragedy. It has not become a drama any more. It has become an epic and in that epic all kinds of corrupted Indians, Americans, Interpol, French, etc. have all been brought. So, I say very respectfully that though I agree with the major part of what Mr. Nath Pai has said, I would say that too much play should not have been given to Mr. Walcott and too much insistence should not have been made on the security and other things of our country. It is one thing to highlight our weaknesses—I do not say that our weaknesses should not be highlighted—but it is another thing to highlight them beyond all bounds. That is what has happened.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : कैसे बतलाया जाये,
प्रकार बतलाया ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Swamiji, you do not understand English and why do you interrupt? (Interruption).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप कह क्या रहे हैं ? मैं पूछ रहा हूँ कि क्या आप इसे स्वीकार करते हैं ।

श्री नाथ पाई : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का सवाल । आप काफी निन्दा मेरी कर रहे हैं, इस पर मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन आप बार-बार कहते हैं कि स्वामी जी समझते नहीं हैं यह अच्छी बात नहीं है । शायद माननीय सदस्य जानते नहीं हैं कि पार्लियामेंट के लिये एक तजवीज की प्रस्तावित बहुत चल रही है कि जो लोग अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते हैं उन के लिये अंग्रेजी भाषण का हन्दी में अनुवाद किया जाता है । आप अनुवादकों की निन्दा क्यों करते हैं ?

1103 (A) L.S.D. 1-16.

श्री बी० च० शर्मा : वह अंग्रेजी जानते हैं । लेकिन स्वामी जी और मुझ में बड़ा प्रेम है ।

Sir, we have to understand the implications of this case, the significance of this case and, I believe, no parliamentary committee can be adequate in dealing with this problem. I also say that no departmental committee can deal with this problem adequately. There should be a committee consisting of those persons who are engaged in helping out smugglers and who are engaged in helping spies. A kind of that committee should be appointed and that committee, I should say, should be under the chairmanship of the Minister of Home Affairs. I think no committee consisting of any other type of personnel can deal with this question. That is one point.

The other point that I want to make is this. What is going to happen to the security at airports? One friend of mine said that in other countries no questions are put. Well, I think, his experience is very happy. But I know some of my friends who have been held up at the airport of London in the belief that they might have something. I think the Home Ministry should compile a list of those persons who are engaged in smuggling, whether on the international scale or on the national scale, and that list should be supplied to all the persons who run our airports. That is one thing that should be done. Then, Sir, the Home Ministry should also have a list of persons along with their photographs who are engaged in the espionage of our country. Of course, it is very difficult to discover spies but a list of those persons should also be supplied to all the persons who are at the airports and who are also at other ports of embarkation and disembarkation. I feel that though Mr. Nath Pai has rendered a good service to our country, I think by overplaying this thing he has tried to place our country in a very unfavourable

[श्री ही० च० वर्मा]

light in the eyes of the other countries. He has tried to dramatise too much.

Shri Kaya: You mean Walcott?

Shri D. C. Sharma: He has tried to dramatise too much the exploits of Mr. Walcott. Mr. Walcott, I think, is a very shabby adventurer; Mr. Walcott is a smuggler; Mr. Walcott is a criminal of the first kind and Mr. Walcott is a person who does not deserve any sympathy at any hand. But, I think, the time of the Parliament taken on Mr. Walcott is not justified. I plead that remedial action should be taken against all these things. Our country is not a paradise of smugglers; it is not a paradise for persons who are doing all kinds of criminal things. I do say, my country is sound at heart and nobody can touch the security of this country and also the goodness and the sense of security of our people.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: This debate raises a very important point, and that is a point to be considered. It is not a question of any smuggler like Mr. Walcott succeeding in smuggling. It is not that Mr. Walcott has been able to repeat that performance. But what is most annoying for our country to notice is this—if Mr. Walcott had the audacity to hoodwink us not once but twice and in a spirit of bravado, after his first flight, would it not be proper for us to consider whether our security measures are so sufficient and so strong as to prevent our secrets leaking out? If the smugglers can come to our country whenever they like and go away whenever they like, there is every reason for us to believe that Chinese are also coming into country and taking out our secrets so often. If I remember aright, I tried to contact the Home Ministry for an aeroplane, because this aeroplane was flying over a place where I am living, and which is the headquarters of the Central Reserve Police.

Shri Isher J. Malhotra: Which place?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: This aeroplane continued to fly over Neemuch and it continued to fly six times over that area. It was rumoured that at a place about 9 miles from there, some air crash had taken place. We had rushed out to find out where that air crash was, and ultimately, this aeroplane disappeared, and up to date I do not know whether the Home Ministry has been informed about it, although I had contacted the commander of the station to make a note of it, and till today, there has been no news about it.

We live in a centre in this India from where unfortunately we are not well supplied with news, because the papers are published from the big cities in India and there is no representative of any press there, and, therefore, the publicity could not be reached.

Very recently, on the 6th or 7th of this month, an aeroplane from Pakistan came, a regular air service from Pakistan. People coming from Pakistan are not allowed to come straightway, but they have to come through the customs barrier. But it was brought to my notice that some man, I have not been able to find out who that gentleman was, although I rang up the Deputy Superintendent of Customs there as soon as I received the news—was received by Sheikh Abdullah, and there was also another gentleman along with him; they were not taken through the customs barrier but brought outside straight into the place where all other inland passengers were waiting.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): To the VIP gallery.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I want to know why such a thing was done. If we know that smuggling is going on between India and Pakistan, why should such a thing happen? We

know that even when we return to India—sometimes you are there, and I am there and many of us are there who return from abroad—from our trips abroad, we have got to pass through the customs barrier, although the customs people are very polite to us. It is the duty and function of each citizen that he acts honestly and he acts above board. I would like to know why this special facility has been given to a particular person. Who is to decide that this facility has to be given? If this discretion is given to the officers at the barrier, you know very well that they will exercise it according to their arbitrary and whimsical nature and according to their whims and pleasure.

At the time when this Walcott incident took place, I wrote a letter on this point to the late Prime Minister. What I felt was that the inferiority complex of most of our officers vis-a-vis the white man persisted and persisted to the extreme so far as Delhi was concerned.

An Hon. Member: That is not true; *voh galat hai*.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It may not be so according to my hon. friend but according to me it is a daily occurrence, I have noticed that that is not so in Bombay. In Bombay, an officer has still got the guts to stop a man, whatever be the colour of his skin. But that is not so in Delhi. The Walcott incident had happened in Delhi on the first occasion.

The same unfortunate thing happened at Murud. Who was the person who allowed him to get into the aeroplane? Who was the person who entered his name in the list? How were the names of two persons entered in the list of passengers, who had not come by that aeroplane? The manifest is already given, and in the manifest, how could two names be added? It passes my comprehension. It was because these two names were added that they were immediately

booked by the Pakistan Airways and they were taken out from this country. It is a most shameful episode for any country, much more so for us, because we cannot identify white skins, though we are not white-skinned people. The white man could have been spotted easily and it could easily have been said that they were not persons who belonged to this country, and yet we find that they were allowed to go without any check. Their passports were not checked; they were not identified; it was the same old story that any passport will do. Any passport would do, the face is not to be seen; the photo is not to be identified, the signature is not to be taken, and nothing of that kind is to be done, and the men are just allowed to go. All those difficulties arise and face us whenever we go abroad; even when we are with the Government delegations, very often we are troubled. Yet, these foreigners were allowed to escape. It is this aspect of the case which must be examined by us so that it may not be repeated.

It is unfortunate that every now and then our secrets are leaked out to foreigners. An incident takes place here, but it is broadcast from Pakistan before the news even appears in the press in India. The thing happens in our country, and immediately it is broadcast from Peking before we get to know anything about it. How this kind of thing happens in our country is a thing for the Government to find out. We know that there is infiltration of foreign elements, not in the sense that there are foreigners, but in the sense that there are well-paid agents of foreigners who have infiltrated in our government services. On account of that infiltration, each and every secret which we called as a secret is carried to the others and in a very cheap and easy way, and we are the sufferers as a result of it.

Till this incident took place, most of us did not know where Murud was. How could these smugglers

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

land at Murud? The story was afloat about three years back that an aeroplane had landed in Jhalawar, Jhalawar has been a great smuggling centre for opium; I cannot say whether it is so or not today. But opium was smuggled by aeroplanes from that area, and yet there was no news about it, and because there was no news, therefore, Government kept quiet.

Therefore, will Government agree to this small demand that has been made by Shri Nath Pai that a committee may be appointed to go into this whole affair to find out where the loopholes exist and to suggest measures to plug those loopholes? Let there be a committee of some honest citizens who without fear or favour can come to a finding and a decision and make recommendations to Government on these points, namely whether or not this hoodwinking was done deliberately through the services rendered by persons who were fond of a little piece of gold or whether it was done by a very shrewd personality, a very cunning man who threw dust into the eyes of our officers and escaped. These are the two points on which we must come to a decision one way or the other, so that we may know which portion of this story is true.

With these words, I support this motion.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I admit that this debate is a most important debate and therefore I had been looking forward to the turn which the hon. Member, Shri Nath Pai, who initiated it, would give to it. But I am sorry to say I rise as a disappointed man.

I thought Shri Nath Pai would be justified in making out a vital point, how dangerous it is to keep vital areas on our west coast in complete isolation from the rest of the country. If the Murud incident highlights any-

thing for me, it is that the Konkarn area, which is an inaccessible area, remains virtually cut off from the rest of the country, and therefore, it has transformed itself ultimately into a paradise of smugglers. What the situation calls for is not a parliamentary committee to inquire into the Murud incident but that Konkarn should be connected with the rest of the country by good motorable roads and Konkarn should be transformed into another Kashmir, and a tourist resort, where not only smugglers but tourists will go and appreciate the scenic beauty of Konkarn and which will strike terror in the hearts of smugglers.

Shri Nath Pai: May I remind him that New Delhi is the capital and it is, I think, connected with fairly motorable roads with the rest of the country. Mr. Walcott ran away from here.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: He escaped from jail. Jails are kept for prisoners and sometimes prisoners escape from jails. That does not raise any security question.

What I am driving at is that Konkarn should be connected with good roads with the rest of the country.

Shri Nath Pai: I agree with him.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I thank him. I thought it would naturally come from him.

Shri Nath Pai, in an attempt to ridicule the security apparatus of India, has eulogised Mr. Walcott. This reminds me of Hollywood cinema themes where smugglers and thieves and criminals are shown up as heroes with rosy background so much so that this ultimately leads to further criminalities. If Shri Nath Pai was serious in highlighting this factor, he need not have praised Mr. Walcott in the way he has done.

Shri Nath Pai: On a point of personal explanation....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not in his usual seat.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not know if he was present in the House when I spoke. He is, I think, a serious Member, a promising one whom the ruling party has. I called Mr. Walcott a minor man, I called him an insignificant man. I said it is a pity that this House has to mention him. I said it is a pity that the name of a minor man, an American adventurer, has to find a place in the annals of my Parliament. I said it is extraordinary that a small man is ridiculing the security apparatus of my country.

If the hon. Member wants to attack me, let him do so on the basis of what I have said and not on the basis of some fiction.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I am sufficiently intelligent to distinguish between fiction and truth. I have heard him with patience and after that I am saying this.

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Gagar): Shri Nath Pai had quoted an American soldier to have said that he could alone conquer the whole country.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: In an attempt to ridicule the security apparatus, he has used very strong words. But he did not have the courage to tell Mao Tse-tung on the floor of this House that his army had been crushed in Ladakh. On the other hand, he was quoting him to say that the Indian army had proved itself to be invisible in war. He did not have the courage to say that because of the attack by our army, the Chinese army had to withdraw from this land.

श्री ए. सि. चौधरी (महेन्द्रगढ़) :
कुछ तो शर्म करो इतने जूते करऐसी
बातें त्त करो। बुझूल का हमें बखबी पता
है किब हां हमारी क्या हालत हुई

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Members cannot stand up and go on speaking like this without catching my eye.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I always subscribe to the view that the security apparatus of a country is a thing which has to be very closely guarded and cannot be kept open. It is like a woman's virtue. It is a question of trust. Security is best left to the administrators. The maximum that a responsible citizen can do is to pass on such information or material he has concerning security matters to the officers concerned and leave them to deal with it effectively. But my hon. friend, in an attempt to focus this security lapse, has also given this entire security question an approach which appears to me to be a toples approach.

An hon. Member: Headless approach.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: There are countries in this world which believe in the toples approach, but India is not one such country.

Therefore, in criticising the security apparatus and security lapses of the administration, I thought my hon. friend would not go to the extent of suggesting a parliamentary committee to go into the whole question of security. I feel a parliamentary committee is least equipped for it. If at all such committees could prove successful, they would have succeeded elsewhere in the world. But past experience shows that no parliamentary committee has ever proved successful in tackling vital issues of security. I feel security has to be dealt with the seriousness it calls for. That seriousness can be there only if there is a certain amount of restraint in speaking on security questions. I am sorry to say I could not even invent that restraint on the part of the hon. Member.

Mr. Walcot has escaped and has ridiculed, to some extent, our security arrangements. I think his escape has something definitely to do with the security of this country. But the

[Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh]

remedy for dealing with it and strengthening our security apparatus is on the lines suggested in the statement of the hon. Minister. If there is any insistence by Parliament, it should be that the remedies should be very strictly followed. Apart from that, I feel that Mr. Walcott is also connected with smuggling activities. I dare say in every civilised country smuggling activities are very often found.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): It is part of civilisation.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: My hon. friend says it is part of civilisation, though it is not a civilised part of it. I feel that smuggling has to be checked. But if there is a stray case of smuggling succeeding, it can become a question of confidence in Government—this is something which passes my comprehension. We must have some sense of proportion. If we have, smuggling activity cannot in any civilised parliament be a subject matter for confidence or no-confidence in Government.

I feel Government has been sufficiently successful in checking smuggling activities. I do trust they will completely eliminate smuggling from this country if possible, if not at least minimise it as much as possible.

Shri Hathi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I heard Shri Nath Pai and other Members. I may say that at least so far as this particular subject is concerned, I do not take it to be a subject for debate only; I take it in the manner in which we should all take it. It is a matter where one has to be serious; I think I can assure the House that Government is as serious as the Members who have taken part in the debate. It is from that point of view that I do not want to merely make debating points out of the various points raised by Shri Nath Pai and other Members.

I would have been in a position to explain things in greater detail. I do not mean to explain in the sense

that everything is all right. But the circumstances in which the two foreigners came and could go, the object with which they had come, and all the antecedents etc. have to be cleared. But I am handicapped in two ways. In the first place we are yet in a stage of investigation. Therefore, it may be that we may have information, but unless that information is corroborated by evidence which can be supported and which could stand the scrutiny of a court of law, there are chances, for instance, of these statements being misused. Mr. Trivedi being a very able lawyer would appreciate that if a statement is made today on behalf of Government as having been made by a particular witness, another witness may make quite a contrary statement, then there would be contradiction between the two witnesses' statements, and perhaps the case may fall through. He can well appreciate it.

It is therefore that if I do not at this stage give all the facts to the House, I would say and I would assure the House that it is not because I want to keep anything back from the House. Far from that, it has never been my practice to keep anything back from the House or to hide anything. And what is there after all to hide? If things have happened, they have happened. If it was not proper, it was not proper. If lessons have to be taken, they have to be taken. If something more has to be done, it will be done. So it is not that I am hiding anything or that I want to keep back anything. But my difficulty is that today we are in a stage of investigation and therefore I cannot give all the facts, although we may have them.

I would also like to bring to the notice of this House through you, Sir, another aspect of this case, and it is this. Mr. Nath Pai said that we are negotiating with other countries for extradition. It is not a question of negotiation: it is a question of judicial proceeding. If there is an extradition case, then it is a question of proceeding by law according to the procedure laid down. And the procedure would

be that we have first to prepare a *prima facie* case, to fix the identity of the accused, to collect evidence to show that he has committed the offence. Now, in this it is not merely the newspaper report or the statement made by one person here or one person there; it has to be corroborated, it has to be proved, and proved at a judicial test that the offence has been committed. After we do it here in our court, it will have to be taken over to the British court or the other countries' courts from where the accused has to be extradited. And that court will also see whether the facts as brought out from the evidence are sufficient to *prima facie* establish the charge which has been levelled against the person to be extradited. Along with that, when it is a question of surrendering an accused for trial to another country, that country would also wish to assure itself that the person extradited or the person surrendered by the nation to other nations will be dealt with purely according to the law and that the sentence imposed upon him will be according to the measure or the magnitude of the offence and that there will not be any extra-judicial pressure or consideration brought to bear in effecting a sentence on the person whom they surrender.

Therefore, if the absconder has committed an offence, he has committed an offence. But let it not be allowed to appear as if this man has done something which has ridiculed the country, for which this Parliament and the Members of this House and the whole country are so much angry, so much agitated that we will try to take vengeance for what he has done. So my point is this—there is an offence committed, he will be punished, he should be punished—but that impression we should not allow to go abroad that he will be treated not according to law but according to our vengeance or other considerations. That is the only thing which I wanted to bring to the notice of the House as a caution.

Mr. Nath Pai then said, why do we take the help of foreign countries or why don't we—he said we should bring an American. Mr. Nath Pai, I should say, is a very senior Parliamentarian, an eloquent speaker, he put his facts very strongly. But sometimes he also has a lighter side of him. And he wanted an American expert to look into the case of Walcott because he thought that our officers have been deputed abroad to take the help of foreign agencies; why should they go?

Now, I may just mention here that it is not a question of any expert aid or that our police are not competent. They have gone in order to collect evidence. Smuggling of goods means that some goods have been brought from other countries. Now, it is not only this country, but there are five or six other countries where we suspect a gang ought to have been working, and we have also information. Now, it will be a connecting of these incidents and the various links, and therefore it is that we have deputed two police officers to investigate into this incident and to find out or collect the necessary information to build up the evidence.

Then, Mr. Nath Pai said, if everywhere we want foreign experts, what are our police doing. It is not a question of foreign experts everywhere. This agency which I have mentioned in the statement is already at it, because as the information goes, the name of John Philby is a forgery and it appears from the investigation that he has obtained a passport from the United Kingdom on a forgery. And therefore, it is not only that he has committed an offence here but it seems from the evidence that he has committed an offence there also. So they are already investigating into it.

Shri Nath Pai: If the press report is true, they have come empty-handed; the two officials whom you sent, they have come empty-handed.

Shri Hath: I am coming to that.

[Shri Hathi]

As I was saying, Mr. Nath Pai is otherwise a master of facts. He collects facts from Ministers' statements, from official documents, from official reports, from newspapers and from all other sources available to him. But when it wants to use them, he can use at his will any fact that he has got.

Now, this morning's paper gives some report, and that was that the two officers have returned empty-handed. They have not returned, they are still there. (*Interruption*). I have seen the report in this morning's paper.

Shri Nath Pai: If you will permit me, Sir, I will place the cutting from the *Times of India* on the Table.

Shri Hathi: I have seen it this morning . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may take his word.

Shri Hathi: I never said that Mr. Nath Pai has said something from his imagination; I have never said so. I said he collects his facts, and I said that he has cited the newspaper report this morning. The newspaper report is not correct. They have not returned.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: But they are in the process.

Shri Hathi: Then the question is that these reports are not always correct. And it would not be safe—and specially, as I said, if it was a question which was on facts, established facts or facts proved by evidence, then it would have been a matter for me and Mr. Nath Pai to debate on those established facts.

Here, certain facts have to be established, and when these facts have to be established, neither would it be fair on my part to rebut authentically what he has said, because I cannot do so, because the facts have not been established, nor would it be proper for him to base his arguments on facts which have yet to be proved.

For example, he mentions that had one of the accomplices of these two foreigners been there according to the signal received, then they would have come and gone away. That a signal was sent by this gentleman to his accomplice here, and that the accomplice failed to reach there in time, is a piece of evidence which has to be proved. I do not know the source of information of Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai: Would you associate me with your committee? I will establish it.

Shri Hathi: If that fact can be proved and established, then it can be a debate on established facts, but that very point has to be yet proved. For that, evidence has to be obtained, and investigations have to be made. That clue might have been given by some interested party. When we have to deal with a man who has been notorious not only here, but notorious in all other countries, we have to be very careful and guarded to see that he does not take us on a wrong track by some information which he throws here and there. I do not know the source of his information at all.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You have said that the British Government agrees that he was here on a forged passport. That is an evidence, and that is a clear fact. It is a crime against that country and our country. That itself should be enough.

Shri Joachim Alva: There is another point. Government has not challenged the information given that Mr. Walcott was the guest of the former District Manager of Air India, who is no more there.

Shri Hathi: I will reply to that.

As for what Shrimati Renu Chakravartty said, even that is not an established fact. This is what we presume from what we have got during investigation, but it has yet to be proved.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Did he not stay with Mr. Menon?

Shri Hathi: Which Menon?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The sales manager.

Shri Hathi: Let us not again complicate the issue. There are two issues. One is Mr. Walcott's escape from Safdarjung airport, Delhi. The other is the Murud incident. I am discussing the latter incident. The question which Shri Alva asked perhaps refers to the Safdarjung airport. The person may be the same, but as I said in my reply to Shri Nath Pai, we have yet to ascertain the identity and prove it to the satisfaction of the court.

Shri Joachim Alva: If the first thing had not happened, the second would not have happened at all?

Shri Hathi: Whether the second would have or would not have happened if the first had not happened is a different matter, but I am not concerned with that. What I am saying is this, that we have connected the first incident with the second incident on the presumption that this gentleman who had come to Murud and who had gone away was the same gentleman who went from Safdarjung airport, and it is on this presumption that we have been working.

As I said in the very beginning, had this fact been proved, then everything is very clear. That is my difficulty.

Anyway, during the debate, various other points have been brought out about foreign exchange, about Birlas and Tatas.

Shri Nath Pai: He is making a serious effort. May I help him? Before you answer the other points, which you need not if you do not like, please tell me this very simple thing.

How is it that the aerodrome officer, who, according to you, got the information four hours before, failed to do anything about it??

Shri Hathi: I am coming to that.

Shri Nath Pai: Why do you go to Birlas and others? Don't be in a hurry.

Shri Hathi: I am first wanting to dispose of these things. I only want to say in passing that it does not directly refer to the particular incident, but so far as I am concerned, I did not receive any telephone call from anywhere. I have not received any telephone call from anybody.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: But there were searches in Birla's house.

Shri Hathi: I have not received any telephone call. If there are searches, if the police have got information, they will do their duty, and they have been doing it.

So far as the other incident is concerned, I will come to that, because I think that is an important part. The incident can be looked at from the point of view as Shri Nath Pai has very ably stated. Two foreigners come, they land here, and then they go to Bombay, then they go away, escape. How did all these things happen? That is exactly the point.

14.46 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I have tried to make it clear in my statement, as clear as I could, and state the facts as they are. The plane landed at Murud. As soon as the plane landed, the villagers and the village headman gathered. They find two foreigners, they take them to the police station. The police officer on duty, a head constable, sees their passports, enters their names, and sends a message. Unfortunately, he took them as people in distress

(Shri Hathi)

because they said their plane had engine trouble, and therefore they had to forceland. He sent a telegram. It is a rather jumbled telegram, but still he mentions certain things in it. The telegram reads:

"One British Royal Plane No. GJASNS landed on sea beach of Murud (Ratnagiri) at 9 A.M. today due to some breakdown in engine. Pilot MISTER B. M. C. Allister and FITTER Fils John Agent, both of England are well. Plane kept under Police bandobast. No damage. Murud situated about 7 miles from Dapoli Pol. Stn., Harni Road in Ratnagiri district. Instructions solicited."

The two foreigners come and tell him they were going from Amritsar to Bombay, they had engine trouble, and they had to forceland, and then, asked his help. The first thing that this man does is to see their passports. They were British passports. Then, he sends two policemen to keep a watch on the aircraft. Then, they wanted to go to Bombay to get a technical man from there. They came to Bombay. What happens in Bombay next day? They try to go away. Before they could go to Pakistan, they should have the stamp of having landed in India. They come to the international line where the East African passengers were, and they try to come out of the customs barrier.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: How did they do that?

Shri Hathi: At that place, the immigration officer on duty checks the passports, the immigration cards and sees that these two passengers are extra. So, at this point, these two people were already located. At that point of time, he tells the IAC officer on duty that he has got so many passengers on this passenger list, but there are two more passengers. The officer on duty there goes into the office, returns after some time, and

adds the name of these two passengers in the list.

He thought that they were bonafide passengers and therefore, the immigration police officer who was on duty saw that their names were entered and allowed them to go. This officer has been arrested. It is something which requires a more thorough investigation as to why did that particular officer enter the names of these two passengers as bonafides passengers. Had he not entered them, they were already detected and they were found to be extra and they would not have been allowed to go. It may be due to some bribery; he may have taken money from these two people. I do not want to make public what statements he had made. Perhaps he gives some reasons which so far as the Government is concerned are not satisfactory and they are not sound reasons. We are not satisfied with his reasons as to why he entered these two names. That man was immediately arrested. Of course the passports were there. The police officer on duty allows them to go out because he gets the authority that they are bonafide passengers. This matter requires though investigations and we shall look into the matter further.

Shri Nath Pai: How long since has he been arrested?

Shri Hathi: Two months. He is now in jail. We should understand that this is part of the whole story and it has to be linked with the other incidents. This is the weak link. But for the failure of this individual it would have been easier and they would not have been allowed to go. The weak link is here. When we talk about tightening the security, I fully agree with the hon. Member. I do not want to make a debating point of that. Even in spite of the tightening of the security measures, there is some human fallure here or

there. If one man acts wrongly, then what has the Government to do? Either sack that man or punish that man and do anything with that man. That does not mean that the whole security system or the method is wrong. I do not want to take shelter by saying that everything is safe and that nothing has to be done. In fact, I myself went to Bombay to enquire into the question which Shrimati Renu Chakravarty asked. How did that happen? The question that struck you struck me also and I went to Bombay on the 10th to look at it as to how it had happened. The railings there are so low that they could be jumped over. These are points which could be looked into. (Inter-ruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, I do not want to interrupt him but I must say that I have used that airport many times; the lounge for the coming passengers is a very separate one. Unless he has managed to reach the tarmac and mix with them and unless he was helped by someone to do so or somebody was negligent of his duty, it is impossible.

Shri Hath: But who that somebody was or how he managed to do so are relatively less important as they were detected while they were coming out. Now what happened was that he was like an ordinary passenger when he came out and then he bought a ticket and he went by an ordinary plane. The first was his landing and the second was his going away. In between has happened this failure.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Did he go as a transit passenger? If so, what happens to his luggage?

Shri Hath: He had no luggage with him.

Shri Nath Pai: He has disposed of his goods: that means that there are people in the country who have taken his smuggled goods.

Shri Hath: We have to remember certain things. It was not an enemy

plane. We had suspected that he had come with some particular motive. One motive could be smuggling. Therefore, we have carried out raids on as many as 30 places and we have been able to get certain clues. We got some precious stones and other things. Merely because we got some precious stones it will not enable us to unearth the whole story; we cannot immediately locate it. Investigations are still going on. What I say is that we are not leaving these things unattended to or uninvestigated. We have tried to find out who are the other people who have helped him. We have been able to get two other persons' names and some other clues and we are trying to bring them to book and it will take some time. I cannot disclose all the facts, as I said, not because I want to keep anything away from this House. Let the investigations be complete and we shall put them before the Court and get them punished. It is not that we wish to keep things from the House. For extraditing them we have to convince the other country's court that according to their law there is an offence, and therefore, our task is a bit difficult. But I may assure the House that we have never been complacent and I do not think that even Mr. Nath Pai meant it so. This should not unnecessarily be played up too much to create an atmosphere as is the whole country is trying to take vengeance on this gentleman because he has gone away. That would affect our extradition proceedings. This is a warning, caution or request which I would request the House to take seriously. Therefore, I think that there is nothing so serious in this matter as to take recourse to a vote of no-confidence against this Government.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, I do not know if I have a right of reply but the important question that was raised in this House—you were absent, Sir,—was this. Trying to make pun upon the word used he has dodged the main issue. A respectable national daily says that the two officers who were

[Shri Nath Pai]

deputed are returning. He says that they have not returned but that they are turning. The essence of my statement was that they are encountering difficulties in the United Kingdom and that the mountainous evidence that is available is dismissed by the British authorities. What is the truth in that? It says they are returning empty-handed; that is, they have failed. Then there is another important question. In his own statement, he says that the aerodrome officer got the message at 7.32, Walcott and his accomplice left at 11. What did the aerodrome officer do during these four long hours regarding the suspects and about whom he got a telegraphic message? At least, let him answer that part of the question, if not the whole.

15 hrs.

Shri Hathi: So far as the newspaper-cutting saying that they are returning empty-handed, is concerned, it gives an impression that these officers were sent as if to bring back Walcott physically. They had gone there for the purpose of collecting information. Now, the newspaper also had very cleverly given two paragraphs, with the heading "returning empty-handed".

Shri Nath Pai: "Inadequate evidence" is the heading.

Shri Hathi: "Empty-handed" means they were sent as if to bring back Walcott! They were not going to bring Walcott physically back here. They were only there for the purpose of collecting the data and doing investigation. They are still doing that. They are not returning; they have not returned. That is the first point. Yet, they are there, busy with other countries; they are busy in other countries, collecting data.

Shri Nath Pai: Let them have a good holiday!

Shri Hathi: They are on duty; they have not returned.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any information that they have been able to collect some useful evidence so far?

Shri Hathi: They have been collecting; they have collected. The second point that Shri Nath Pai asked was this: when the aerodrome officer got a message at 7.25 or so, what did he do about the foreigners. But the message he got was about force-landing of the plane and not about the two persons; the persons' names were not mentioned. It was only that the plane had landed; so, they relayed the message to all the neighbouring stations as to whether any such thing had come. It was sometime in the afternoon that he got one message from Beirut or so that one small plane had gone away and it was going to Iraq. It was after that that they suspected this. The names of the passengers were not mentioned in that message.

Shri S. M. Banerjee rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai has had his turn.

Shri Nath Pai: One question, Sir. It is a question of fact. It is about the statement before the House which has to be treated a bit more seriously. I am not asking for something from some message or some newspapers. In the statement he says that the message to the aerodrome did not contain any statement. The statement says it was a copy of the message sent to the police. That means it contained all the details. I do not want to interrupt, but may I read from it? "This was received the same day". What was received? It was the message sent by the head constable. This was received the same day by the police inspector at Ratnagiri. In the absence of the District Superintendent of Police, he tried to relay the message by wireless, to the Controller of Civil Aerodromes. The message contained all the details. Unfortunately, it could not be received in time. It was received at 7.30. What is the point in saying that it was not!

Shri Hathi: I would not like to withhold this information at least; it is important. But the message which

went from Ratnagiri to the airport did not contain correct names. The message about landing was there, but not about their proceeding to Bombay.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I mentioned in the course of my speech that my information was that one officer, Mr. Tiwari, who is a Deputy Director, Revenue Intelligence, was informed of the whole affair. He went to the hotel and had some contact with Mr. Doze, another French national; he knew about the whole thing. I do not know,— and I want to know whether he is also placed under suspension and whether he was not responsible for asking Mr. Doze, another partner of Mr. Walcott, to appear as approver. What is the truth in that?

Shri Hathi: So far as this incident is concerned, this name or that name has not come to my notice.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Find out.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): We are anxious to know what has happened to those boxes with which Mr. Walcott landed in India. A question was raised about this in the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly and no proper answer or clarification was given. Secondly, what has happened to these fellows who have surreptitiously entered the customs enclosure or the transit lounge. What has happened to these officers who were in charge of vigilance to disallow or to prevent people who are not authorised to enter customs enclosure or the transit lounge? Has any action been taken against those officers who have failed in their duty to prevent these people from entering the customs enclosure?

Shri Hathi: I have replied to almost all these questions.

Shri Joachim Alva: Not a word about the coastal security.

Shri Hathi: I can do one thing. If Members want to ask questions, let them ask. I shall reply to them one by one.

Mr. Speaker: The last one only.

Shri Hathi: Yes; this is the last one. So far as the officer is concerned, he detected them already and it was therefore that he saw that these two people were not *bona fide* passengers, and therefore, he drew attention to it. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The House will now resume discussion on the No confidence Motion. Shri Krishna Menon.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I crave your indulgence to say at the outset that no Government, and particularly our Government with a vast majority like we have, and a party in power continuously for 17 years, has any reason to resent the motion of no-confidence in the House. I do not say this in a sense of superciliousness, but merely as a statement of fact. It is the right of the Opposition. The question arises whether because we may do something, we should do it. Before I go into further matters, I would like to say that this House, whether we like it or not, has an audience far vast and far more powerful than this Chamber or this country, and since the number of speeches are not proportionate to the distribution of opinion, it is likely to be regarded that there is a large volume of opinion in this House which has no confidence in the Government that has come in.

Having said that, I want to go on to point out that the debate we are having is based upon the resolution or motion moved by my learned and distinguished friend, Shri N. C. Chatterjee and supported by a large number of others. But the speeches are for visitors: those who have appointment have to wait and those who have no appointment have to take a longer

[Shri Krishna Menon]

time on priority: that means to say, the speeches that are made are by the people who say "we do not agree to this resolution" and it appears that they do not agree to it because they think that it does not go far enough.

I believe something was said here about the sins of the fathers being visited on the children. Normally speaking, it is quite unnecessary for anyone of us to defend either our late Prime Minister, as for example, his life and conduct, or to put in any special pleading, but there comes a time when there is a compulsion, even a moral compulsion upon oneself to express oneself on these matters. It was said, "the sins of the father." I would not go into the plural; perhaps it refers to Gandhiji. Then monopoly was mentioned. Monopoly always regards the approach and the prospect of social justice as sin; not only sin but original sin. Those who live by the profit motive and by the sellers' market and by subjecting the community to economic conditions of scarcity, they look upon planning as an anathema. Those individuals or groups particularly who are engaged in industries which are on the verge of nationalisation, they look upon the public sector with awe and as a spectre to be avoided. Therefore, that part of the debate has turned round, not on the hundred days or less than hundred days of this Government, but the entire record of this country since Independence. Perhaps I am wrong in saying "since Independence" because the speeches made in that part of the debate are something which disprove Independence, because of the conditions that have come since Independence, such as Planning, such as control of the economy, such as liberty, such as democracy. All these things are essential; democracy is also essential for people's vote and so on. So, all these conditions that have come in since Independence come under the censure vote. We have to treat that part of the debate in one compartment, because some people have put down their names to it and the others are

the uninvited guests into the resolution. And so, when we are treated to what is called semantic hypnosis—I do not know about hypnosis—there is only one thing worse than semantic hypnosis and that is semantic distortion. What is more, when people seek refuge under semantics, I believe there is no argument. So, we are obliged to go back over a period of 18 years.

Broadly speaking, it falls into three classes—the economic life of this country, its political and diplomatic achievements, and the ethical and moral contributions that the late Prime Minister and his colleagues have made. I will take them in the reverse order.

If there was nothing else to the late Prime Minister's credit, the respect he had for this House, for parliamentary institutions and the way he treated the opposition, sometimes to the irritation of some of us, itself entitles him to a place in parliamentary history which is unequalled. The respect he had for parliamentary institutions, sometimes carrying it to, I would not say ridiculous extent, but to inconveniently logical extent, entitles him to a degree of respect from all sides of the House.

Then we come to the moral values involved. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, do we know of any statesman, any Prime Minister, any executive head of the Government, who will come before a public assembly, and without any reservation confess to his faults? This is an example which amazes people, because generally Ministers are supposed to be here to do stone-walling, that is, not let the other side score and have the matter talked out, however long it takes. I have seen other legislatures, but I have known no other instance in the world.

Coming to the political and diplomatic field, it has been said that this was a period of squandermania, where planning has been subjugated to the individuality of the people, I think

the insistence is upon people. It might have suppressed the individuality of some people instead of a larger number of people having some individuality. That is what is meant by the approach to social justice. So, in terms of economics, during this period there has been so much progress in this country. Not that anyone is satisfied with it, not that this Government or any Government is free from blame; I will come to that later. Food production has gone up in this country by 50 per cent, cotton production by 100 per cent jute production by 50 per cent, though at the expense of food production in Bengal, sugarcane production by 90 per cent, again at the expense of food production. If calculations are right, at the end of the third Plan, 73 per cent. of all the male children and born in this country and 62 per cent. of the female children—I do not know why this difference, because there are equal numbers in the country—would have been through schools. I deliberately use the words "through the schools", because there is reason for it; I do not want to go into that. We would have spent in each one of these years more money on elementary education than was spent during the whole of the British period. There are people amongst us who say, either when there is attack by China or there is food famine, "let us shut down all schools and economise". That is the general approach even amongst some of it in spite of our knowing that no democracy can survive except with this degree of education.

The same thing applies to our defence. When independence came, this country had no defence mechanism. The army was at the beck and call of the imperial power; the policy was decided from Whitehall; its instruments were lying in Whitehall; its strategy also was determined in Whitehall. It is not my purpose to go into the details of this. But its capacity to be self-reliant has increased very many fold that we are able to think in terms of a modern

army and a modern defence force which have been thought of in this country only since independence.

While the first Industrial Commission was appointed in 1912, and this country in terms of aggregate production was still sixth in the world, it was still a backward country. My friend, Shri Raj Bahadur, is sitting there. At the time of independence, we had some 60,000 tons of shipping. Today we are approaching 1 million tons mark in shipping, though unfortunately we still carry a greater part of our cargo in foreign bottoms.

Coming to the political and diplomatic achievements, politically I think the late Prime Minister and his colleagues have been largely responsible for not committing the mistake of jumping a ditch in two leaps. If you jump a ditch in two leaps, you fall in it. Therefore, when we passed on from dependence on British rule to independence, there was no question such as the fitness of the people. Who is to decide who is fit or not? Irrespective of caste or creed, our men and women, literate or illiterate, they all became equal inheritors of the legacy of independence that was won. I would skip over this period rapidly. Thereby we have laid down the foundations of economic and social justice, because no democracy can survive without the extension of the democracy in the economic and social sphere. At the same time, once people have been enfranchised, you cannot put them back. Irrespective of what the monopolists may say, irrespective of what the anti-diluvians may say, it is impossible in this country to put back the clock of progress, irrespective of what anybody might say, because the masses of people of this country are awake.

Coming to the field of diplomacy and international relations, ours was a subject nation. It acquired the external status of independence somewhere in 1919, not with any content.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

In the last 17 years, it has not become one of the major States of the world, but its boisterousness is counting for something. You may easily dismiss that as merely ephemeral prestige. But it should not be forgotten—you know it is possible to acquire new prejudices, new likes and dislikes, but in the long run it is not possible to re-write history. Events have occurred and you cannot put them back. So, in the last so many years, in the first 12 or 15 years of our independence, at least to my knowledge, on three memorable occasions, this country's contribution prevented a world war. There is no better and more convincing witness—in a public meeting in Delhi when tributes were paid to the late Prime Minister, Mr. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State of the United States, who cannot be accused of any partiality towards our conduct in the UN, said; "The contributions of India in the UN had been constructive and on the side of moderation." No greater tribute could have been paid to us in that way. So, in the field of diplomacy, whether it is in the liberation of colonial countries or in telling the populations of Indian origin that nationalism is territorial and not racial, or in standing up against monopoly of mineral products, in that way great contributions have been made.

Regarding the role of the opposition in a parliamentary system, to my humble knowledge, Parliament consists of the two Chambers and the President. That makes Parliament. So far as this House is concerned, all of us and yourself make the Lok Sabha. I would be the last person to suggest . . .

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक व्यवस्था का प्राग है। वक्ता महोदय पिछले सत्तरह साल की बातें कह रहे हैं जबकि वर्तमान अविश्वास प्रस्ताव राज की हालत पर लाया गया है . . .
(*Interruption*).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): When we are hearing a good speech, he does not have the basic mind to understand the speech.

Mr. Speaker: Every member has the right to interrupt. There ought not to be so much of impatience. Reference has been made also to many things before Mr. Shastri's Government.

एक माननीय सदस्य : रेकरेंस क्या, सारा भाषण ही उस के बारे में है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य उस को सुनें।

Shri Krishna Menon: Sir, I am subject to be corrected by you. I believe I have not gone outside the record.

Mr. Speaker: No, no (*Interruption*). Order, order. Hon. Members may listen with patience.

Shri Krishna Menon: The vigilance of an Opposition and even, sometimes, what may be inconvenient to the Government, is essential to survival of parliamentary life as such, and if instances are wanted the debate we have had this morning, which has just ended, is an outstanding and a very telling instance how the Opposition in Parliament contributes to the integrity of public life, to the correction of Government and to making the Cabinet, alive to the problems. All this is very necessary. But to those who say that because we are a people who should become accustomed to a great deal of tolerance as no democracy can survive without it, my submission would have been that if it was a question of the Opposition parties not being satisfied with the conduct of the Government I fail to see why in the hundred days that preceded, the government's emergence during that period, no voice came forward for the calling of this Parliament. There was a crisis, they say, in this country. But nothing was done. When the late

Prime Minister was alive the smallest thing was to demand for a calling of this Parliament. Therefore, I submit, that this particular occasion that is chosen, when the country has passed through its worst shock in history, to submit a resolution, whatever may be its parliamentary implications, and to suggest that the existing government should be displaced, is not something that adds to its importance—I do not say this in any disrespectful way.

Secondly, I would say, if you take each of these particular matters it would have been very necessary for taking each of these particular problems and having a debate. Much has been said in regard to food. I want to say here that the policy adopted by Government—we are not talking about practice—takes us over one stile; that is to say, the Government, whether it knows it or not, has now accepted the position that the food problem, the so-called food crisis, is not a crisis of production or a crisis of resources but it is a crisis of prices created by the wholesale and retail merchants of the country wherein impose on the market conditions of supply of foodgrains to the market itself. It is not as if all those fundamental economic laws are altered. On the point of supply it is the market which is conditioned. To put it briefly, there are peculiar conditions in Indian agrarian economy where there is lower production and lower prices and higher production and higher prices. The wholesaler lends money to the cultivator. When

1103 (A) LSD—7.

the production is low he has less of security and he demands his money from the cultivator. When the cultivator says that he has no money he asks him to take his food to the market. So the small quantities of production come to the market. That is what happened in the period 1953—55 when Shri Kidwai was called in. There was really a surplus of production. During the period 1951 to 1963 there has been a steady rise in production and the production reached a plateau in 1963.

What is the present position? According to Government's statistics, with all its limitations, we have an availability of 13.2 ounces of cereals and 2.2 ounces of pulses per head of population including all infants one day old. This is slightly less than in previous years by somewhere about 0.5 ounces but it is more or less the same. The Government also says that the average consumption of an adult may be perhaps somewhere about 16 ounces, but at the same time they say that for women it is 8.6 ounces—women may not agree but that is the calculation—and for children it is somewhere about 6 ounces. What I am trying to point out is this. In the case of population, creating merely claptrap arguments about family planning etc., will not solve the problem. The population of this country will rise and by the end of this century there will be 750 million people. It is not a question either of preventing births or stilling births or, if you like, massive infanticide. There is no way. In Buddhist India there were two million people, when

[Shri Krishna Menon]

the British came there were 60 million people, and now there are 450 million. The population will rise, but we have to go back to the out-worn maxim that every mouth and stomach is born with a pair of hands. Therefore, it takes us to other factors where the productivity of the soil has to be considered.

What I am mentioning at the present time is this recognition by the Government to resort to State trading irrespective of how it works out. What creates a famine? It is the pricing process. On all the four famines that have occurred in India during the last 20 years, the Bengal famine in 1943 apart, it has not been a crisis of the production or the resources. In the case of the Bengal famine the problem was that rice supply was cut off from Burma and the British wanted foodgrains for other purposes and there was shortage. But today in 1964—I do not know about 1965—if anybody says that the next crop will be good and therefore there will be no famine, I will say, we will have to wait and see to what extent it would be possible to control the pricing process so that the supply of foodgrains to the stomach does not come from the farmer but from the market. At the same time, the quantum of food that comes into the market is less than 4 per cent of the total produce. Therefore, the Government is to be congratulated on having thrown its weight on the side of state trading.

Having said that, I would say that any control of the pricing process by partial measures is bound to fail. I have heard it said, why not take 25 per cent over and then try with that. What happens is this. You will buy up to 25 per cent and that is to be supplied to the needy population. When the Government quota is thus over, the field is then free for profiteers. This cannot be done in two heads in this way, with sectional or zonal control. I believe also that with the adoption of state trading, that is to

say, the willingness of Government as a policy to control the price mechanism, the whole question of zones will become redundant. There cannot be any question of the country being treated as sub-divisions. The whole thing comes under the Government.

Then, a very considerable amount of heat was sought to be raised with regard either to the faults of our previous foreign policy or in regard to the present. Now, in the short time I have all that I can say is, we have to thank our present Foreign Minister for the speech he made elsewhere saying that one or two people or a number of people saying somewhere or something does not change the policy of a government. So far as this party is concerned, so far as we are concerned, the foreign policy of this country is based upon national independent and national sovereignty and there can be no question of any of that being surrendered, and I think it would be a bad day if we who are in public life were to merely take our cue as to what is the policy from some headlines that we see in the newspapers.

So far as I am concerned, we are a country that keeps not only away from the war blocs but—here I speak with a degree of assertion—a country that ought to keep away from blocs even in the economic sense. Non-alignment is not merely freedom from military blocs, it is also freedom from economic alignment and moral alignment in that way. So, if our economy becomes subject to other countries, we are likely to suffer for it.

We heard a great deal about one Mr. Walcott having come over here. But what about thousands of Walcotts who go round as honoured guests in this country? Why do we exhaust our energies in straining at a gnat and keep on swallowing so many camels at the same time? Why is there this distinction in this way? The fact that the Government has accepted the invitation and our Prime Minister and Foreign Minister would be going to

Cairo to attend the Non-alignment Conference is, I believe, the final answer to those people who took askance on this policy. Non-alignment at the time it came out did not come out in that way. It gradually came up to that position. Now it has become a world conference of 56 countries of which 46 are full members and ten of them are Latin American countries. Therefore, both territorially and politically the diplomatic ambit has widened. So the acceptance of this invitation and the pronouncements of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister show that there is no change in our policy. Whether you talk about economic policy or foreign policy, I think, if I may say so, it is unrealistic to talk about somebody changing it one fine morning.

We have heard a great deal from the non-official side of the Opposition—I hope you understand what I mean—about the relationship between agriculture and industry. It is a purely artificial distinction. No agricultural country can survive without industrial progress because, after all, everything that a person uses is not grown in the ground, whether it be clothing, ploughs or kerosene oil or whatever it is. Therefore, without industry it is not possible for it to flourish.

There was a great deal of attack made upon heavy industry—I would not suggest any motives—the implication of which more or less is that this country must for ever submit to the economic predominance of western countries. There is no country that has progressed without being able to feed itself; or, if it cannot feed itself—for example, the United Kingdom has only five weeks of food supplies—it must have the money to buy it because of its industry. So, either we grow it or, what we cannot grow, we must be able to buy it. If the food is insufficient, we must be able to buy it and not beg for it.

So, when our Government goes to Cairo, we will proclaim to the world, if any proclamation is necessary, that there is no change in this policy. We stand in line and four square with the Afro-Asian countries, with Yugoslavia and some of the Latin American countries that have come in. In the past we have promoted the ideas of colonial liberation, of the independence in foreign policy and non-exploitation and, what is more, for full and complete disarmament.

Most of these countries have also subscribed to the doctrine of, what is called, no war; that is to say, if there are disputes, as between us and Pakistan, they should be settled without war. At any rate, we should commit ourselves not to change the situation by a resort to warlike action. I hope, it will be possible for the Government of India to promote by their diplomatic efforts and the good offices of countries like Ethiopia, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia and some others, at Cairo to establish something like a good offices committee to step in in the differences between Indonesia and Malaysia. There is a little understanding in this country of the great enthusiasm and anxiety of Britain's Empire as it is a sinister sign and we should not walk into the trap of Asians fighting Asians. I do not take sides in this matter because we are committed in one way or another, but I think it should be possible for the non-aligned conference in the usual procedure of the United Nations to set up some good offices organisation to bring down the tension as between these people.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up and I will end up by saying that I would not have intervened in this debate because if it is a question of the criticism of the policy of the Government of about 100 days. It is so unrealistic. If it was really so felt, there would have been pressures and troubles during the 100 days that intervened for Parliament to commence. No one either in this country or elsewhere will be convinced of the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

fact that communication system in this Chamber was not completed and therefore we could not meet! We could have met somewhere else. Parliaments have met in schools, kitchens, stables and all kinds of places in emergencies. Therefore, if this is merely shadow-boxing, I am afraid, in this case it is not a shadow, it is a spectre of tragedy. In this country there is no gratitude in public life and one must not look for it. But one must have some appreciation of the importance and the reality of facts of History! If I may say so without being misunderstood this country and this House owe some appreciation to, what is called, the ruling party, the majority party, of this country. We have been, whatever may be the processes that we have gone through, able to effect a smooth change over after the tragedy of last May much to the envy and chagrin of those who do not wish us so well. It is easy when we are too near events to dismiss them as though this man is pulling and that man is pulling. One man pulls and another man also pulls. But the fact of the matter is that there was recognition in the country and, more so, in the party that whatever may be the difficulties, that was not the time for us to pick bones as against each other. What was more important, as Lord Melbourne said after a difficult Cabinet meeting—he did not understand what was going on most Prime Ministers do not understand in departmental matters—he shut the door, stood against it and said, "Gentlemen, it does not matter what we say, but let us all say the same thing". This has been our approach to this problem.

Again, I would repeat, I would not in the slightest join issue on the question of criticism of policies. That will continue to go on, but I stick to the position that there should be no transfer of sovereignty of any part of this country, whether it be to China or to Pakistan or to anybody else because that will be a violation

of our Constitution, whatever may have been spoken of and proposed years ago. For example, the Prime Minister spoke to Liaquat Ali before the 25th December, 1947, about taking a plebiscite; but on that date he wrote that whatever we have said is finished; our position in regard to Kashmir is and always has been that the whole of the territory which was under the suzerainty of the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir is under the sovereignty of India. This is the position and will not be altered, let those concerned have no doubts about it. There is no power in this country, not even this Parliament, that can change it without an amendment of the Constitution and there is no Government today that will be able to sway public opinion in regard to the bartering away of our territories, whether it be in Nagaland, or in Assam or in Kashmir or in Ladakh, or anywhere else. I hold no brief for others but, after all, one has got one's own impressions.

It is to the credit of this Parliament that in spite of the fact that in the form of this there has been the criticism of Government—it is not for me to say; it is for you to judge—by and large it has been of a temperate character. I regret, the implication in these sins of the past is, as I say, monopoly, social injustice, the besetting sin, the original sin and we cannot even think about it. For an industry that is ripe for nationalisation and the persons connected with that, for an industry which is a social industry, the whole idea of the public sector is galling. They conveniently forget that in the mid-term appreciation of the Third Five Year plan, it is found that the industrial progress of this country has been up by 84 per cent, but that has been contributed to by the public sector and not by the private sector. It is because the public sector enterprises have pulled it up. The time must come when under the pressures of public opinion or the compulsion of events the public sector and the pri-

vate sector are synonyms not only to the way to commanding heights but to the way of peaceful evolution towards socialism as such.

Then, it is said that there may be some stepping down of heavy industry, this, that and the other. If I may say so with great respect, it is to misunderstand economics and the technology of industrial development. No one can go, pull a lever and say, "You stop this factory here and this production there". There is a momentum in it which cannot be changed. It is quite true that the Government or the administration may say, "Do not build so many houses or do not make them so picturesque or prestige houses and anything of that kind", but apart from that, the terms of development cannot be changed.

What worries me, Mr. Speaker, is the imposition or the coming in of the empires by the back door. It may be that I have an inhibition or an obsession about empires; but, I think, I know something of the habits of empires. When they cannot come by the front door, they come by the back door; they come by the side door; they come as our guests and do not depart. When the British came to India, a historian said mockingly, "India was never conquered by us, the British; we went there is a fit of absentmindedness and we stayed there". So, that is imperial habit, as now in the Congo.

Again, may I say with great respect, in parody of what was said by a great philosopher, "great causes and little minds go together and generosity," ladies and gentlemen of the Opposition, "is seldom the least of all virtues." We also ought to remind ourselves of what another thinker said. "Ignorance leadeth a man into a party; shame preventeth him from leaving it." This was said in the 17th Century, I may add today: some people often stay in a party owing to a mistaken sense of short-term values!

श्री श्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, नई सरकार का गठन होते ही अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का प्रकोप देश की शोषित जनता के रोष का प्रतीक है। मैं अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर हस्ताक्षर करने वाले सतरह सदस्यों में मैं था जिस समय यहाँ पर अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव के समर्थन में सदस्यों के खड़े होने की बात आई चकि प्रस्ताव इस प्रकार से आया कि मैं उस के समर्थन में यहाँ पर खड़ा नहीं हुआ था। उस के कुछ कारण थे। यह बात अपनी जगह सत्य है कि मुझे कांग्रेस सरकार में लेशमात्र भी विश्वास नहीं है, परन्तु यह बात अपनी जगह इस से अधिक सत्य है कि मुझे श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी में भी, जिन्होंने उस प्रस्ताव को यहाँ रक्खा था, लेशमात्र विश्वास नहीं है। इसी कारण मैं इस प्रस्ताव के समर्थन में खड़ा नहीं हुआ था। कांग्रेस की सरकार या कांग्रेस का जो सत्ताधारी दल है, सत्ताधारी वर्ग है उस के द्वारा कम से कम जातीयता का प्रचार खुल्लम खुल्ला नहीं होता, एक बड़ मनुष्य या एक ऐसा दल जो जातीयता में विश्वास करता है, वह किस प्रकार देश के लिये हितकारी हो सकता है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। इसी कारण मैं इस प्रस्ताव के समर्थन में यहाँ पर खड़ा नहीं हुआ था।

15.40 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

कांग्रेस की ओर से विशेषकर विरोधी दल के सदस्यों को काफी उल्टा सीधा कहा गया। जो कुछ भी कहा गया, मैं ऐसा विश्वास करता हूँ कि वह अपनी जगह पर बिल्कुल ही झूठ है। एक दफे भगवान बुद्ध को एक ब्राह्मण ने खाने पर बुलाया, भगवान गौतम बुद्ध वहाँ गये। जब वे वहाँ गए तो उन से उस पंडित ने कहा तुम बड़े धूर्त हो नीचों को ऊंचा उठाना चाहते हो, तुम बड़े नीच हो ऊंच नीच को मिटा कर सब को बराबर करना चाहते हो, तुम बड़े पापी हो, आत्मा और परमात्मा में विश्वास नहीं करते। इस पर भगवान गौतम बुद्ध ने कहा कि यह भोजन किस का है। ब्राह्मण ने उत्तर

[श्री श्रीधर]

दिया, मेरा। भगवान गौतम बुद्ध ने कहा कि अगर मैं इसे ग्रहण न करूँ तो यह किस के पास रह जायेगा, ब्राह्मण ने उत्तर दिया कि मेरे पास। भगवान गौतम बुद्ध ने कहा, "मैं उन अपशब्दों को जो तुमने कहे हैं, ग्रहण नहीं करता।" इसी तरह से विरोधी दलों की ओर से मैं कहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस वालों ने जो विरोधी दलों को कोसा है, उन को जो गाली दी है यदि हम उसे स्वीकार न करें तो वह सारे अपशब्द और गालियाँ जो उन्होंने दी हैं वह उन्हीं के पास रह जायेंगी।

यहाँ पर स्वतंत्र पार्टी के माननीय सदस्य श्री दांडकर जी ने भाषण दिया। उन की मेडन स्पीच थी, वे इस सदन में पहले पहल बोले थे। लोकशाही में एसी प्रथा होती है कि मेडन स्पीच की टीका टिप्पणी नहीं की जाती, उसे क्रिटिसाइज नहीं किया जाता। मुझे कोई खास बात ताज्जुब नहीं हुआ जब कुछ सदस्यों ने यहाँ पर उन की मेडन स्पीच को क्रिटिसाइज किया, परन्तु मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ। जिन का मैं बड़ा सम्मान करता हूँ उन हमारे देश के गृह मंत्री श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा जी ने, जो महान् विद्वान् हैं और जो लोकशाही में विश्वास करने वाले महान् पुरुष हैं, उन्होंने भी मेडन स्पीच को क्रिटिसाइज किया। यह कोई अच्छी प्रथा उन्होंने नहीं डाली।

जहाँ तक कांग्रेस सरकार का सवाल है मैं उस में इसलिये विश्वास नहीं करता कि उस ने अपने कर्तव्यों का पालन नहीं किया है। प्रत्येक सरकार के तीन कर्तव्य होते हैं :

1. To maintain the integrity of national boundary;
2. to do the welfare of the community;
3. to maintain the rule of law.

(१) देश की सरहदों की रक्षा करना,

(२) देश की जनता का कल्याण करना ; और

(३) इन्साफ करना।

इन तीनों चीजों को यदि मैं यहाँ पर रखते हुए अपने विचार प्रकट करूँ तो बहुत समय हो जायेगा और शायद आप मुझे इतने समय की आज्ञा भी नहीं देंगे। जहाँ तक देश की बाउंड्री की रक्षा का सवाल है, देश की सीमा की रक्षा का सवाल है, हमारी कांग्रेस सरकार और कांग्रेस सरकार के दल के लोग अच्छी प्रकार से जानते हैं कि लाल चीन भारत माता के ऊपर, हमारी जमीन के ऊपर, चाहे आप ३० हजार वर्ग मील कहिये या ४० हजार वर्ग मील कहिये, भारत भूमि पर नाजायज कब्जा किये हुए है। यह अटूट सत्य है यह बात अपनी जगह पर सत्य है कि कांग्रेस सरकार अपना पहला कर्तव्य करने में असफल हुई है। जहाँ तक देश की जनता के हित का सवाल है, मुखमरी, भ्रष्टाचार, मिलावट ब्लैकमार्केटिंग, होडिंग, बेकारी आदि जितने अभिशाप हैं यह अपनी जगह पर प्रतीक हैं कि कांग्रेस सरकार असफल रही है। कमर तोड़ महंगाई और भूखमरी, जिस की आज भी सदन में चर्चा हुई और पहले भी हो चुकी है जब खाद्य समस्या पर प्रस्ताव आया था, इन सब को अगर देखा जाये तो दूसरे कर्तव्य के पालन में भी कांग्रेस सरकार असफल रही है।

मैं अपनी बात ज्यादा लम्बी नहीं करना चाहता क्योंकि समय नहीं है। जहाँ तक तीसरी बात का सम्बन्ध है, अर्थात् रूल आफ ला को मेनटेन करने का, उस का प्रतीक है, वह कौम, वह मजलूम लोग जिन को मजहब के नाम पर, धर्म के नाम पर, संस्कृति और सभ्यता के नाम पर हजारों वर्षों से सताया गया, जिन को लूटा गया, जिन की सभ्यता और अस्मत् को बरबाद किया गया, और अगर कोई शोषितों का रहबर उन की बात कहता है तो उस पर चार चार डिफेंस आफ इंडिया क्लब के केस चलाये जाते हैं स्वयं मैं इस की जीती जागती मिसाल हूँ। मैं कहता हूँ कि जितना शोषण देश के प्रकृत कहे जाने वाले, शोषित समाज कहे जायें

बाले लोगों का हुमा है उनका शोषण दुनिया में किसी कौम का नहीं हुमा । अगर किसी कौम का इतना शोषण हुमा होता तो वहाँ पर केवल टीका टिप्पणी ही नहीं होती, लोग करो या मरो का नारा लगा कर भागे बढ़ते और बहुत बड़ी बगावत मुल्क में कर देते । जहाँ तक रूल आफ ला की बात है, आप स्वयं जानते हैं कि एक आदमी को ग्यारह वर्षों तक जेल में रक्खा गया, करोड़ों रुपये नहीं तो कम से कम लाखों रुपये खर्च किये गये ताकि उस को इसाफ मिले । यदि वह आदमी गुनहगार था और उसे इस लिये गिरफ्तार किया गया था, यदि वह देश के खिलाफ बागी था, देशद्रोही था और उसे गिरफ्तार इसलिये किया गया था तो उस को ग्यारह वर्ष जेल में रखने के बाद छोड़ क्यों दिया गया । क्या रूल आफ ला इस बात के लिये कोई जगह देता है, क्या इस को कोई जगह वहाँ पर मिलेगी । इस सिलसिले में मैं इसी सदन के एक माननीय सदस्य श्री मुजफ्फर हुसैन की बात करूँ । उन्होंने सिर्फ यह कह दिया था कि अगर मेरे मजहब पर हमला होगा तो मैं बगावत कर दूँगा । इस पर उन्हें जेल में डाल रक्खा गया है । यह किस प्रकार का रूल आफ ला है । एक तरफ यहाँ करोड़ों रुपयों का गबन होता है और स्वयं श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी, जो हमारे आदरणीय फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर हैं, उन का कहना है कि एक हजार करोड़ रुपये हमारे यहाँ ब्लैक मनी है, अनप्रकाउटेड मनी है, जिस का पता नहीं है । उन को शायद मालूम हो कि किन के पास यह रुपया है । अभी छापा मारा गया, कुछ नाचने वाले, कुछ गाने वाले और कुछ आर्टिस्ट लोगों को पकड़ लिया गया । उन से ४५ लाख रुपया निकल आया । क्या मैं आदरणीय टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी से पूछ सकता हूँ कि चले ये शेर का भिकार करने के लिये, शेर से डर कर यह मानूँ, या शेर को भगाना चाहते थे यह मानूँ, कि चूही पर गोली छोड़ दी और शेर गोली की आवाज से भाग गया । कितने असफोस की

बात है । जब आप इस बात की महसूस करते हैं कि एक हजार करोड़ रुपये ब्लैक मनी का पड़ा हुमा है तो उस की निकालने का प्रयत्न क्यों नहीं किया जाता । क्या आप का इंटेलिजेंस ब्यूरो, आप की सी० आई० डी० इस बात की रिपोर्ट नहीं देती । सिर्फ हमारी रिपोर्टें देती है । हम यह कहते हैं कि अगर रोटी, रोजी और कपड़ा न मिला तो हम ग्रान्दोलन छोड़ देंगे तब हमारी रिपोर्टें आ जाती है, लेकिन यह रिपोर्टें नहीं आती कि ब्लैक मनी किस के पास है । मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक पूंजीपति के पास ब्लैक मनी है । मैं उस का नाम जानता हूँ लेकिन लेना नहीं चाहता । उस का धन रखा है, उस का सोना रखा है । क्यों आप उस के खिलाफ कदम नहीं उठाते । केवल इसलिये कि अगर आप उस के खिलाफ कदम उठायेगे तो कांग्रेस डूब जायेगी । उस पूंजीपति के खिलाफ कांग्रेस कोई कदम नहीं उठा सकती । मैं इस बात को खुले लफजों में कह देना चाहता हूँ । मैं कह रहा था कि जहाँ तक रूल आफ ला की बात है, इन्साफ का खून होता है, इन्साफ खरीदा जाता है, इन्साफ की खरीद व फरोक्त होती है । रूल आफ ला यहाँ नहीं रहा । यह तीनों कर्तव्य कांग्रेस सरकार पूरे करने में असफल रही है, तीन कर्तव्यों में से कोई भी पूरा नहीं हुमा । इसीलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि यह सरकार इन्तीफा दे दे ।

अब वह कहते हैं कि विरोधी दल में सत्ता नहीं है । अगर विरोधी दल में सत्ता नहीं है तो आप में से कुछ ईमानदार मिलेंगे, कुछ हम में से इमानदार मिलेंगे और ईमानदारों की सरकार बन जायेगी, हिम्मत वाले लोगों की सरकार बन जायेगी । जहाँ तक सरकार बनाने की बात है, यह भागे की बात है, लेकिन मकान कौन बनयेगा ? इसलिये पहले टूटे मकान को न तोड़ा जाये, यह कोई अच्छी तरह की दलील नहीं है ।

[श्री मं.यं]

मैं अपनी बात बहुत ज्यादा विस्तार में नहीं ले जाना चाहता लेकिन एक बात जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि मैं यहां पर भाज की लोक-शाही में, कांग्रेस में अविश्वास एक वजह से श्रीर करता हूँ। जनता को, भूखी जनता को, नंगी जनता को, परेशान जनता को विश्वास दिलाया गया कि वोट तुम को दिया गया है, बिड़ला के वोट में जितनी ताकत है उतनी ही ताकत घास काटने वाले षसीटा के वोट में भी है। तुम उस को ठं.क से इस्तेमाल करो तो तुम्हारी सरकार बन जायेगी। इस में देश की जनता को विश्वास है लेकिन आप की निगम एड कंपनी, आप के चीफ मिनिस्ट्रों के दमन चक्र, चीफ मिनिस्ट्रों के टेलिफोन और रिटनिंग ग्राफिसर जिस तरह से बैलट पेपर को तोड़ मरोड़ कर, बेईमानी से कांग्रेस को जिता देते हैं, सत्ताधारी वर्ग के लोगों को जिता देते हैं इस से लोक शाही में विश्वास करने वाली जनता को विश्वास नहीं है। इसलिये कांग्रेस सरकार में अविश्वास होता है। एक तरफ रोजी रोटी की बात होती है, हम कहते हैं कि रोजी दी जाये, रोटी दी जाय तब कांग्रेस सरकार कहती है कि हमारे पास नहीं है। अभी दिल्ली में ही परसों एक लाख लोगों की रोजी रोटी का सवाल हुआ। काला पहाड़ है वहां कुछ अछूत लोग, पिछड़े वर्ग के लोग हैं जो पहाड़ तोड़ कर रोड़ी बनाते हैं और आप के महलों को बनाने के लिये देते हैं। उन लोगों को वहां से अब निकाला जा रहा है, पहाड़ को उन से छीना जा रहा है, लेकिन वह कोई भारत सेवक समाज है उस को दिया जायेगा ताकि वह मिनिस्ट्रों को जिता सके, दिल्ली में बैठे हुए मिनिस्ट्रों को यह कोई अच्छी चीज नहीं कि एक लाख आदमी बेकार होने वाले हैं। इस से असन्तोष फैलता है।

जहां तक अछूतों की बात है, मैं केवल यह कह सकता हूँ कि अगर सरकारी नौकरियों को ही लिया जाये तो वहां पर भी अछूतों के ऊपर बड़ी बेइन्साफी होती है। एक आई०

ए० एस० अफसर का इस्तीफा माया है। एक आई० ए० एस० अफसर जो अछूत है, चूँकि वह गरीब था, मजलूम था, इन्साफ करता था, इसलिये उसे रोजी से हाथ धोना पड़ा। कोई आई० ए० एस० श्रीर वह भी अछूत भासानी से इस्तीफा नहीं देगा। उस का वहां पर तिरस्कार हुआ, उस का अपमान हुआ, उसकी हकतल्की हुई, उस को इतना दबाया गया कि उस आई० ए० एस० अफसर को जो कि यू० पी० में काम करता था, इस्तीफा देना पड़ा। यह इस्तीफा इस बात का प्रतीक है कि उस के साथ अन्याय हुआ है। उस ने अपने इस्तीफे में लिखा है कि मैं इस्तीफा सिर्फ इसलिये देता हूँ सरकारी नौकरी से कि हमारे साथ छूत छल बरती जाती है, हमारा तिरस्कार होता है समाज के अन्दर। ये तमाम बातें हैं जिनको लेकर मैं चलता हूँ।

अब मैं खेतहीन मजदूरों की बात को लेकर चलना चाहता हूँ। उनकी तरफ से मांग है कि यहां पर करोड़ों एकड़ जमीन बेकार पड़ी है वह उन को दे दीजिये। उसके लिए बार बार मांग करते हैं, लेकिन नहीं दी जाती। हम पहली अक्टूबर को इस पार्लियामेंट के बाहर एक पीपल्स पार्लियामेंट लगाने वाले हैं जिसमें देश के कोने कोने से एक लाख मजदूर भाग लेंगे। उनके लिए आप के पास कोई प्रोग्राम नहीं है। इसलिए मेरा विश्वास कांग्रेस सरकार से उठ चला है। मैं ने इस सम्बन्ध में एक शेर लिखा है, जो इस प्रकार है :

बात जो जबां पर है रुकेगी कब तक ।
सदाकत की गर्दन झकेगी कब तक ॥
सत्र का जाम लबरेज हुआ जाता है ।
देखते हैं उनकी शान मिटेगी कब तक ॥

मैं मानता हूँ कि हम कमजोर हैं, हम विरोधी दल के लोग कमजोर हैं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि अभिमान मत करो। रावण का अभिमान नहीं रहा, अश्वेत का अभिमान

नहीं रहा, आपका अभिमान भी नहीं रहेगा। मैं केवल इतना कहता हूँ कि अगर आप हम को चुनौती देते हैं तो पहले राष्ट्रपति शासन कराइए और फिर इलेक्शन कराइए। मैं देखता हूँ कि जनता में आप के प्रति विश्वास नहीं है। मैं जहाँ भी जाता हूँ, लोग कहते हैं कि हमें कांग्रेस में विश्वास नहीं है। कुछ मंत्रियों को, कुछ एम० एल० एज० को और एम० पी० जे० को तथा उन लोगों को जिनको परमिट मिले हुए हैं, कांग्रेस पर विश्वास होगा। लेकिन जितनी गरीब और शोषित जनता है वह सब कहती है कि हमें कांग्रेस सरकार में विश्वास नहीं है। यदि आप में पूरी देश भक्ति है, यदि आप को अपनी कठोर कर्मा देश भक्ति का विश्वास है तो हम आप की चुनौती को स्वीकार करते हैं, लेकिन पहले आप प्रेसीडेंट का रूल कायम कराइए और फिर इलेक्शन कराइए और फिर देखिए कि आप में से कितनों की जमानतें जप्त होती हैं। लेकिन आप प्राइम मिनिस्टर बने रहते हैं, मिनिस्टर बने रहते हैं और देश का दौरा करते हैं। उस समय कलेंक्टर और कमिश्नर और बड़े बड़े लोग आपका स्वागत करते हैं, तो भोली जनता यह समझने लगती है कि कांग्रेस ठीक है, इसको सरकार में लाना चाहिए। अगर आप वास्तव में अपनी ताकत को देखना चाहते हैं तो पहले प्रेसीडेंट रूल कराइए और फिर चुनाव कराइए।

श्रीमन्, मैं आप को नाराज नहीं करूँगा और बहुत जल्द अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूँगा। यहाँ पर उप चुनावों की बात बहुत चली और कहा गया कि उप चुनावों में कांग्रेस कितनी लौट कर आयी। मैं आप को बता दूँ कि जिन जगहों पर हम विरोधी दल वालों ने कांग्रेस को हराने की शपथ ली, वहाँ उनको हराया नावजूद इसके कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने और देश की बड़ी बड़ी ताकतों ने कोशिश की। उन स्थानों पर हम ने कांग्रेस को शरदन पकड़ कर गिराया। आप को

अमरोहा के उपचुनाव का नतीजा मालूम है आप को फर्रुखाबाद के उपचुनाव का नतीजा मालूम है और और भी जगहों के उप चुनावों के नतीजे मालूम हैं। आप ने फूलपुर में उपचुनाव क्यों नहीं लड़ा। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी, माननीय जवाहरलाल जी की पुत्री, जो मेरी बहिन हैं, क्यों नहीं आप ने उनको वहाँ से खड़ा किया। अगर आप ऐसा करते तो हम जमानत जप्त न करवा देते तो आप कहते।

मैं आपकी चुनौती को स्वीकार करता हूँ यदि आप देश के गरीब लोगों के पास जाएँ, शोषित लोगों के पास जाएँ, और उन लोगों के पास जाएँ जिनकी मासिक आय 500 रुपये से कम है और उन से मत प्राप्त करें। उनको आप की सरकार में विश्वास नहीं है। हाँ आपकी सरकार में विश्वास है एम० एल० एज० को, एम० पी० जे० को और कांग्रेस दल के लोगों को, वे आप को मत देंगे। लेकिन जो देश की शोषित जनता है, जो देश की पीड़ित जनता है उसको कांग्रेस में कोई विश्वास नहीं रहा है, और यह इस बात का प्रतीक है कि विरोधी दल कांग्रेस सरकार के खिलाफ अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाये हैं। क्या विरोधी दल के सदस्य यह नहीं जानते कि उनमें इतनी ताकत नहीं है कि वे सरकार बना सकें? हम यह जानते हैं। लेकिन हम यह प्रस्ताव अपना रोष प्रकट करने के लिए लाये हैं।

मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या आज देश में भ्रष्टाचार, गरीबी, भुखमरी, बेकारी, जातीयता नहीं है। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि कांग्रेस वालों को नाजायज फायदा मिलता है? मेरा एक चाज है जिसका जवाब दिया जाये। इस सदन में जितने भी मिनिस्टर हैं—दो तीन को छोड़ कर—कोई ऐसा नहीं है जिसका बेटा या भतीजा या कोई अन्य सगा बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों की कम्पनियों में दस दस हजार रुपये मासिक न पा रहा हो। इस बात का कोई जवाब दे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह आप से किसने कहा है ।

श्री शीर्ष : मुझ से आप के एक मंत्री ने कहा है ।

मैं कहता हूँ कि मेरी इस बात का कोई जवाब दे । एक दूसरे की तारीफ करने से काम नहीं चलेगा । मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे नन्दा जी बड़े ईमानदार हैं, लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि भ्रष्टाचार की गन्दगी के सागर में वे भी डूब जायें । मैं कहता हूँ कि एक दूसरे की तारीफ करने से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा । इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक फारसी का शेर याद आ गया जो इस प्रकार है : मन तुरा हाजी बगोयम तू मरा हाजी बगो । यदि एक दूसरे को कहें कि तू बड़ा ईमानदार है, बड़ा सदाचारी है, बड़ा सच्चा है और दूसरा पहले को कहे कि तू बड़ा धरमात्मा है, बड़ा सदाचारी है, बड़ा सद्भावना वाला है, तो इससे जनता और देश को कोई लाभ नहीं मिलेगा ।

मैं केवल अन्त में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बात सत्य है कि अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आया है, यह भी सत्य है कि जिस बंग से यह लाया गया है उसका मैं समर्थन नहीं करता । लेकिन यह बात भी आज सत्य है कि हम को और इस देश की शोषित जनता को कांग्रेस सरकार में कोई भी विश्वास नहीं है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे कब बुलाएंगे ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठिए ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं बैठा जाता हूँ, लेकिन आप मेरी बात तो सुन लें ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाय (बेवास्त) : पहले आप इन को समय दे दें, फिर फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर को समय दें ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मुझे तीन दिन से समय दिया जा रहा है । अब मैं आपके इस घाईर को नहीं मानता । मेरे धैर्य का बांध टूट रहा है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर समय रहा तो बाद में मिलेगा । आप बैठ जाएं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरी बात सुन लीजिए ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Congress Party has got twelve hours, and the Opposition groups have got eight hours. The Opposition groups have already taken the eight hours. It is out of their time that I am giving, and if there is time, I will call on a Member.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा निवेदन है कि . . .

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाय : इसका मतलब तो यह हुआ कि विरोधी दल को कोई बोलने का समय नहीं मिलेगा । आप कहते हैं कि हमने आठ घंटे ले लिए हैं और उनके 12 घंटे हैं । तो अब वह ही बोलेंगे ।

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : जिसके ऊपर चार्ज है उसको वैसा मौका मिलना चाहिए । यह बात स्वामी जी को और प्रपोजीशन को भी समझनी चाहिए । अगर कोई और मोशन होता तो हम समझ सकते थे कि प्रपोजीशन को व्हेटेज दिया जाए । लेकिन यह ऐसा मोशन है जिसके द्वारा हमारे ऊपर नो कानफिडेंस का मोशन लाया गया है । मुद्दालेह को मुद्दई से ज्यादा समय मिलना चाहिए ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा तो नाम तीन दिन से लिया जा रहा है, पर मुझे टाला जा रहा है । इसका क्या अर्थ है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मिनिस्टर का भाषण हो जाने के बाद आपको समय मिलेगा ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाब : इनको पहले समय दे दीजिए ।

श्री राजेश्वरानन्द : मेरी बात सुन लीजिए । मुझे तीन दिन से समय देने को कहा जा रहा है फिर समय नहीं दिया जाता, यह क्या बात है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठिए ।

श्री राजेश्वरानन्द : मैं किस आडार पर इस आर्डर को मानूँ । अगर आपको समय नहीं देना था तो आप मुझे जवाब दे देते ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाब : पहले आप स्वामी जी को दस मिनट का समय दे दीजिए, उसके बाद मन्त्री महोदय बोल लें । ऐसा हो तो झगड़ा समाप्त हो जाएगा ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not replying to the debate. The Prime Minister is replying tomorrow. After the Finance Minister, I will call other Opposition Members.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: My party is the second party here. We have not exhausted our time. I do not know how it is being said that already all the time given to the Opposition has been taken.

Shri Koya: And there are other groups which have not been represented.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have got the record here.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I have checked up the record.

Shri Koya: There are other parties also who have not got a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not possible to give a chance to everybody.

Shri Koya: The D.M.K. for example has not got a chance. There are others also.

16 hrs.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We sit for days together but we do not get any chance at all.

Shri Koya: The DMK Party with eight Members has not been called.

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाब : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कौनसा न्याय है कि जिस सदस्य के पीछे कोई ग्रुप नहीं है उसको तो चान्सीस मिनट दे दिये गये लेकिन जिसके पीछे ग्रुप है उसको बहुत कम समय दिया जाता है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not possible to give chance to everybody. The Chair had tried to give chance to every Party.

श्री बागड़ी (हिंसार) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । हर मੈम्बर को पूछने के बाद में अध्यक्ष महोदय ने समय दे दिया । अब अगर उसको वह समय न मिले तो फिर उसका जो प्रपवा अधिकार है उसके लिए वह मੈम्बर मांग करे या न करे, मैं आपसे यह व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ ? जब अध्यक्ष महोदय ने मੈम्बर को समय दे दिया कि मैं उस वक्त तुम्हें बुलाऊंगा और अगर उस वक्त उसे समय न मिले तो वह उसके लिए उपाध्यक्ष के सामने अपनी मांग रखे या न रखे इस पर आप व्यवस्था दें ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है ।

श्री बागड़ी : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कैसे नहीं है ?... (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाय : प्राप न्याय नहीं करेंगे तो कौन करेगा ?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरे अधिकारों की रक्षा कौन करेगा ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have called the Finance Minister.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of discussion on this subject and as my hon. colleague the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs mentioned, this Government is being charged with certain, maybe, deficiencies or, maybe, sins of commission or even omission. The charges can be made briefly but the answers have to be long. Therefore, I crave your indulgence to deal with the points that have been raised on the motion that this Government does not have the confidence of this House.

References have been made to foreign policy, internal political situation, to the defence programme and to the broad social and economic policies of Government. Some hon. Members have doubted the capacity of this Government to bring into the infrastructure of the economy any element of socialism and some others have criticised the present Government from deviating from the social and economic policies evolved under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru. There have also been personal attacks on me. I am not unaccustomed to such attacks by Members on the opposite side and I shall not join issue with them.

I propose to confine my remarks mainly to the criticisms of Government's economic policies and to deal, in particular, with the question of planning and development in the present context. I think, Sir, it is appropriate that the right perspective on the present economic situation is restored so that our view about the long-term policies is not vitiated.

Let me straightaway say that the price situation on which several comments have been made has been causing concern to Government. If I may add a personal note, this was one of my main preoccupations during my last tenure as Finance Minister. There are in the present price situation several elements which are disturbing and which require constant action by Government. Wholesale prices have risen by about fifteen per cent over the last year and there has been a particularly sharp increase in the prices of foodgrains, edible oils and other food articles. This order of price increase cannot certainly be allowed to be repeated; but a careful analysis is necessary of the causes behind this price increase before talking about runaway inflation or putting a stop to development expenditures and generally taking measures which would slow down the rate of growth of the economy.

Much has been said about monetary inflation and rising pressure of demand and so on. I shall deal with these presently. Before I do so, I do wish the House to realise that while demand has been increasing, there are factors on the supply side which should not be ignored. Although the facts regarding the decline in agricultural production are fairly well known, let me briefly restate them. Cereals production in 1963-64 was 2.5 million tonnes higher than in 1962-63; but this was just about sufficient to make up for the decline which had occurred in the previous year. Taking the two years together, there was hardly any increase; and there was in fact a decline of 1.7 million tonnes in the output of pulses. Aggregate foodgrains output, which had reached 81 million tonnes at the end of the second Plan, remained at the same level in 1961-62 and declined by 2.5 million tonnes in the next year. The production in 1963-64 was 79.3 million tonnes—1.7 million tonnes lower than what was achieved at the end of the second Plan.

While foodgrains production has thus been stagnant, market arrivals during the last crop season were significantly lower than in the previous year. In the case of rice, the decline in market arrivals was of the order of 19 per cent. This, together with the decline in the production of wheat and other cereals, has been mainly responsible for the pressure on prices.

Among other articles of common consumption, I shall refer to sugar, vegetable oils and cloth. In the case of sugar, production declined last year and although there has been an increase during the current year, the total output is estimated at only 25.5 lakh tonnes as against the target of more than 30 lakh tonnes. We opened the last season with a very small stock; and considering our export commitment of about three lakh tonnes, we have had barely 23 lakh tonnes available for current consumption. Since at least a minimum stock at the end of the season must be maintained, monthly releases of sugar have necessarily to be less than two lakh tonnes. Price and distribution controls have been imposed in the case of sugar; with a view to encouraging the production of cane, the price of cane was increased last season and correspondingly Government allowed in May, 1964 an increase in the price of sugar. The shortage is wholly due to insufficient supplies; and a fairly tight distribution arrangement has become necessary in almost all major towns.

Prices of groundnut oil have risen by about 30 per cent over the last year. Here again, production trends over the last few years are relevant. Groundnut production has remained constant around $4\frac{1}{2}$ million tonnes since 1959-60; in the last crop season, there was an increase in output and a record production of 5.3 million tonnes was achieved. This is despite a diminution in the acreage of land on which groundnuts were sown particularly in Andhra Pradesh area,

which amounts to very nearly a million acres. But production of other oilseeds, especially mustard, has declined. The output of rape and mustard has gone down by nearly 30 per cent this year as compared with last year.

Production of cotton yarn and cloth went up by more than five per cent, during 1963-64. A voluntary system of price control has been in force and while there has been an increase in the price in cloth, it has not been of the same order.

All this while population has grown at a rate of 2½ per cent per annum and demand has also grown as a result of continuing increase in Government expenditures on defence and development as also private expenditures, etc. During the first two years of the third Plan, prices showed a relative stability. If in the subsequent period prices have gone up, this is a reflection of the pressure of demand in the face of continuing stagnation in agriculture.

In short, supplies have not kept pace with the growth of demand. In a situation like this, one cannot blame the present price situation on the rise in demand alone. Is it suggested that because agricultural production has not increased sufficiently, we should go back on the decisions which we have already taken—decisions which are vital for the long term progress, stability and independence of this country? Is it suggested that the increased expenditure on defence which this House has voted for the last two years has not helped to strengthen our forces and to build up the nation's strength against a treacherous enemy? There may be some who may claim hindsight and suggest that all this defence build-up was not really necessary. They are entitled to their own assessment of the gravity of our border situation. I for one would reiterate my belief that it was a wise decision for us to step up our defence expenditures and to build up not merely the strength of our forces but also a sizeable organisation

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

for defence production. There can be no question of making any material cuts on defence expenditures. What about development expenditures? Is it suggested, again, that this country can afford to build up a viable defence without the necessary support of a strong and diversified economic structure? It is idle to think that a country can be strong militarily without being strong economically. I submit that the decision to go ahead with defence and development was one which cannot be reversed merely because there have been failures of supplies causing hardships in the short run. I would urge that a short-term view on this matter will be disastrous for the country's long term progress. The pressure of demand has to be in the upward direction since it must reflect our determination to press ahead with our programmes of development and defence. This is not to deny that certain pruning of expenditures with a view to avoid waste is necessary. Such pruning has already been undertaken.

Government have, during the last few years, kept before them the constant objective of financing successive increases in expenditures by non-inflationary means. And to a large extent this objective has been fulfilled. For instance, a major part of the increase in defence outlay in the last two years has been met by additional taxation. Deficit financing has been reduced. The total borrowing of the Central and State Governments from the Reserve Bank came down from Rs. 207 crores in 1962-63 to Rs. 195 crores in 1963-64. During the current fiscal year up to the end of August, the Central and State Governments borrowed Rs. 28 crores from the Reserve Bank as compared with Rs. 10 crores in the corresponding period of last year. With the proposed cut of Rs. 75 crores in Government outlays, it is expected that deficit financing during the current year will be lower than in the last year.

Shri A. P. Jain: What is the total up till now?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): The total has gone to Rs. 900 crores.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Over the period of two Plans.

Taking the Central Government alone, treasury bills worth Rs. 85 crores have been cancelled upto the first week of September during the current year. It is true that during the corresponding period of last year cancellations were larger by about Rs. 65 crores. But this deterioration in the ways and means position is only apparent. Our cash balance now is about Rs. 97 crores which is satisfactory. It is more than explained by the fact that instalments of Plan assistance to State Governments have been running this year at a rate of Rs. 15 crores more every month as compared to the corresponding months of last year. This fact alone accounts for larger disbursements by the Central Government of about Rs. 80 crores during the current fiscal year. Collections of customs and excise duties upto the end of August 1964 amounted to Rs. 454 crores as compared with Rs. 413 crores in the corresponding period of last year. Collections of income and corporation tax have been maintained at about the same levels as in the corresponding period last year. Considering the fact that in the months of April and May our collections of direct taxes were low for the reason that there had been an increase in the collection of direct taxes by over Rs. 60 crores in the month of March, this is fairly satisfactory. On the other hand, defence expenditures have been larger by about Rs. 15 crores during April-July this year, capital expenditures of railways larger by Rs. 22 crores and net receipts of Railways somewhat smaller by Rs. 8 crores. It is too early yet to predict the budgetary outlook for the current year as compared with the estimates

presented at the time of the budget. The point to note is that the most important factor affecting the ways and means position of the Central Government has been the substantially larger disbursements of Plan assistance to the States. In the current year, as against Rs. 575 crores which was allotted, the Planning Commission may well have a deficit of another Rs. 70 crores to Rs. 75 crores.

Even after taking credit for a larger Plan assistance, several State Governments have shown substantial deficits during the current year.

श्री राम सेवक दास : जो आंकड़े मन्त्री महोदय पढ़ रहे हैं, वे इसमें दिक्कत हुए हैं।

श्री हुक्म चन्द कल्याण : वे आंकड़े इस पुस्तक में दिए हुए हैं।

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The State Governments need to intensify their effort to mobilise non-inflationary resources for the Plan.

Monetary policy has also been used to check inflationary tendencies. Restraint on deficit financing itself is a major element in controlling money supply. Bank credit to the private sector has been regulated through selective credit controls. Advances against foodgrains for instance are now some Rs. 9 crores lower than a year ago. If, nevertheless, money supply has shown a large increase of Rs. 436 crores last year as compared to Rs. 264 crores in the previous year, two important factors have contributed to this. In the first place, about Rs. 100 crores of increase in money supply last year is purely statistical. A large part of the saving deposits which used to be classified as time deposits are now being classified as demand deposits; this change in classification has itself added to the money supply. Secondly, there was an improvement of Rs. 88 crores in foreign exchange reserves in 1963-64 (i.e., an increase of Rs. 43 crores in 1962-64 as against an equivalent decline in the previous year).

A decline in foreign exchange reserves leads to a decline in money supply; an increase contributes to an expansion in money supply. Thus the improvement in the balance of payments last year, welcome as it was, was reflected in larger money supply. These two factors together explain why the rise in money supply was much larger than in the previous year.

I do not wish to contend that there has been no pressure of demand in the economy; far from it. As I said earlier, the pressure of demand is a reflection of our defence and developmental effort. But it is a mistake to think that the situation is one of runaway inflation since the shortage of supplies arising mainly from adverse weather conditions for the last few years has been a major factor aggravating the price situation.

Shri Dandekar in his maiden speech displayed considerable virtuosity in dealing with his theme but since some of the points raised by him have also been raised earlier in the course of the food debate, I crave the indulgence of the House to refer to them. It was stated that the present price situation was the consequence of an undue emphasis on heavy industry, that the real basic industry for India was agriculture and if attention was concentrated on it, we would not have faced the same difficulties. The question is not so much of relative emphasis on heavy industry and agriculture; the resources that go into each of these are by and large non-competitive. There is nothing to prevent increase in agricultural production if at the same time Government establishes steel plants or invests in machine building. The fact that over 70 per cent of the population depends on agriculture is an argument as much for giving all facilities to agriculture as for creating conditions in which rapid increase in non-agricultural employment can be generated to relieve the pressure on the land. There is no escape for a country

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

like India from rapid industrialisation; and, in order progressively to reduce dependence on foreign assistance, there is no escape from the production of metals and machinery. This does not of course mean that programmes whether for agricultural improvement or in the field of industrial development may not have to be rephased over a period of time so as to ensure even progress in output all along the line.

Several hon. Members complained about the continuing imports of foodgrains. We also wish to see that these imports are reduced, but the only way to do so is to achieve our targets of production in agriculture. It will be wrong for a country like India to continue to import steel either.

The lesson of the last three years is not that we reverse our strategy of the Plan and slow down development; it is that we should continually strive to improve the returns from investment in every field so that the rate of growth of the economy is speeded up.

In 1963-64, there has been a more than 4 per cent increase in national income as compared to 2½ per cent in each of the previous two years. Many of our newer industries are showing increases in output. For instance, the value of machine tools production has gone up from Rs. 6 crores at the end of the Second Plan to more than Rs. 18 crores in 1963-64; aluminium output has also increased threefold in the first three years of the Third Plan. In most engineering and chemical industries, the annual rate of growth ranges from 10 to 20 per cent. Among consumer items, production of radio receivers, for instance, has increased at the rate of 14 per cent per annum in the last two years, of rayon yarn at the rate of 16 per cent, of electric lamps at the rate of 18 per cent and of paper at the rate of 10 per cent. Power generation is ultimately the most reliable index of

industrial development and the installed capacity of electricity undertakings has increased in the last three years at nearly 11 per cent per annum. Traditional industries naturally cannot show the same spectacular increases. But the jute industry is now running to full capacity for the last two years and cotton yarn production is also being maintained at or near full capacity.

I do not see why the growth of our industries must be abruptly checked by a slowing down of investment outlays. The correct policy, on the contrary, is to remove the obstacles in the way of an even faster rate of growth in industry.

Obstacles and difficulties there always will be. Towards the end of the First Five Year Plan we had diffi-acute foreign exchange shortage requiring Government support. Early in the Second Plan, we faced an acute foreign exchange shortage requiring re-adjustments in the Plan. At the beginning of the Third Five Year Plan, again, we had difficulties on account of the shortages of power and transport which affected industrial output. Soon after the Emergency, there was dullness in the capital market and the question of augmenting facilities for industrial finance became important. At each stage we have been able to get over the difficulties by concerted action, by a re-adjustment of policies and by a re-deployment of our resources. I do not see why we should not be able to get over the present difficulties also in a similar manner without affecting adversely our long-term development policies.

In the field of industrial finance, we have, as the House is aware, taken a number of measures during the last year to augment the facilities. A Unit Trust has been started and it has already been able to collect substantial sums largely from small savers. The Development

Bank has also started operations. Shri Dandekar complained about the difficulties of raising funds in the capital market. While I do feel that the new institutional framework—which we are evolving—will help meeting the problem to some extent, I would repeat what I had said elsewhere that industry ought to learn to tap energetically the savings of the people. The attitude that one has only to come with an issue to the market in the expectation of finding the money one wants to raise may be suitable in advanced countries where capital markets are well developed and have a broad base. In a country like ours, the market itself has to be broadened over a period of time; and it is primarily the duty of the industries to cultivate the market, to meet its requirements so that eventually the market also responds to the needs of industry. There is no evidence to suggest that a really good issue which has been placed on the market has suffered lack of response. I want to see in this country a gradual establishment of conditions in which no worthwhile industrial venture, which promises to contribute to the growth of the economy, is held back for want of finance.

Some hon. Members referred to the existence of idle capacity in our industries. As I mentioned earlier, in two of our biggest industries, namely cotton spinning and jute textiles, there is no idle capacity as such. In fact we could do with a bigger cushion in both these industries in the way of installed capacity. In some engineering and chemical industries, capacity remains unutilised partly due to the shortage of foreign exchange for import of materials and components required for current production. This is a problem which Government is looking into partly by encouraging indigenous production of these materials and components and partly by obtaining non-project assistance on an increasing scale so that fuller utilisation of capacity is made possible. The proportion of non-project assistance to the total assist-

ance given by the members of the Consortium, for instance, has progressively gone up; and of the current year's commitments, nearly 49 per cent represents non-project assistance. With the help of these funds, we are able to increase the allocations of foreign exchange to priority industries. The recent IDA credit of \$90 million also aims at meeting the import requirements of three key industries in respect of which higher levels of production are being aimed at.

In brief, Government has constantly endeavoured to remove the obstacles to industrial growth by augmenting the facilities for finance, by giving valuable tax concessions to certain priority industries and by arranging for increasing availabilities of foreign exchange for import of materials required for current production. The index of industrial production has shown a progressive increase in the last few years. It has gone up from 130 (1956—100) in 1960 to 150 in 1962 and further to 163 in 1963. The average for the first five months of 1964 was 171.

References have been made to the problem of unaccounted money. It has been said that unaccounted money has been used for hoarding of commodities and has generally added to inflationary pressures. To a certain extent, it is true that the existence of unaccounted money tends to defeat regulation of credit through the banking system and adds to pressure of demand through conspicuous consumption. But the problem is not one capable of easy or immediate solution. Primarily, it is a matter of enforcing controls more effectively and checking tax evasion. Government have taken certain steps recently to unearth unaccounted wealth from the lockers of certain individuals; and Government is determined to persevere in this matter.

While I do not wish to minimise the gravity of the price problem, or draw any comfort from it, I would draw

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

the attention of the House to the fact that taking a longer view, the rise in prices in India has not been anywhere near the sort of increase which has occurred in many other countries.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Take the example of Brazil and it will comfort you very much.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Between 1950 (the pre-Korean war year) and 1963, wholesale prices have increased in India at an annual rate of 1.7 per cent; the increase in several European countries has been more than 2 per cent per annum. In less developed countries also larger increases in prices have occurred....

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: What about the food materials and other necessities of life?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point is that if the value of the rupee has declined, so have the values of other currencies. An average increase of 2 to 3 per cent per annum in prices appears to be a general phenomenon in the world and India cannot escape a gentle rise in prices.

The sharp increase in prices which has occurred over the last year is a pointer both to the necessity of raising production and to the need for regulating the distributive system. I have always maintained that stabilisation of agricultural prices in India requires Government to enter marketing operations on a large scale. We must also have proper policies in regard to the prices we pay to the agriculturists. Mr. Peter Alvares accused Government of purposefully depressing agricultural prices.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): So far no specific picture has come.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He gave the example of sugarcane. In fact, the minimum prices for sugarcane have been progressively increased. It is also not feasible to maintain sugar

prices at reasonable levels, if sugarcane prices are allowed to go up further. I am not saying that the grower ought to be satisfied with the return he gets today. All I am saying is that unless we have an integrated price policy, it will be difficult to stabilise the consumer's cost of living. It is a question of justice to the producer and fairness to consumer. In order to maintain the price level, Government has to take on increasing responsibilities not merely in the marketing of agricultural produce but also in regard to certain manufactured consumer articles. Equally it is important to evolve a long-term incomes policy. I do not deny that sharp increases in prices would call for adjustments in incomes in the short run, since the margin of tolerance in a poor country like India is necessarily limited. We have granted increases in dearness allowance to our employees, and wage increases have also occurred in industrial and commercial establishments. These, to my mind, are inevitable consequences of a sudden rise in prices, but they are also a warning signal and call for the utmost discipline in every sphere of activity so that failure in one direction does not generate the snow-ball effect of a wage-price spiral.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Where is that discipline?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I feel that Government should utilise the opportunity provided by this debate to indicate their line of thinking in regard to the Fourth Plan. The work of formulating the Fourth Plan is going on in the Planning Commission and in those departments of Government which are vitally concerned in this effort. We have not yet come to the stage of determining the magnitudes of that Plan. Nevertheless, it seems desirable and necessary that a certain amount of advance action in respect of the Fourth Plan is taken in the last year of the Third Plan. Such advance action might well determine the scope

and pace of the Fourth Plan development.

As in this Debate and also outside, references to the Plan in various forms have been made indicating that there is some kind of a struggle within the component parts of the Government and in the Planning Commission in regard to the dimensions of the Plan, I would like to say that the concept of this struggle is not to be found anywhere in Government sectors and seems only to be the product of lively imagination outside.

Shri A. P. Jain: And the struggle is good.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In envisaging anything for the future, no matter whether it is a plan for a big country like ours or a plan for a small family, it is but natural that there should be different ideas of what is ultimately needed and what is desirable. The idea of a planned effort is ultimately to put all these ambitions and aims together, weigh them against the resources available and the capacity to implement these targets and come to some decision which has to be acted upon.

I would like to tell the hon. Members of the House that as the size of the Plan grows with each Plan and this is as it ought to be the task of reconciliation between diverse claims becomes even more difficult and the area of difference in regard to resources available and in regard to our conception of what is desirable in the Plan becomes more difficult. A Plan for five years is in itself to some extent an abstract concept. It cannot be described in simple terms as so much being done per year as we often do in our annual plans. A planned effort has to be a compound effect. It is in this connection that I would like to refer to what some people say, namely that what is feasible must also be financially possible. It is not always so. If effort during the earlier years of a plan strengthens or accelerates the momentum of the economy then one can look to achieving larger tar-

gets in the final years of the Plan. I am mentioning all this only to indicate that there is a possibility of our anticipating larger increases in the third, fourth and fifth years of the Fourth Plan provided the advance action for the Plan is initiated in the last year of the Third Plan and followed up assiduously during the earlier years of the Fourth Plan. And it is with this view in my mind that I propose to deal with certain aspects of the Fourth Plan, which is now engaging our attention.

I would like to deal a little more fully with this constant charge both from the right and the left of the Plan's alleged neglect of either agriculture or of the heavy industries sector. If this charge is conceded, then obviously, there could be no Plan. We are not now in that stage of economic development which we were in 1954-55 when we could quarrel intelligently whether we should have 2.5 million tons of steel production or 6 million tons. The charge then levelled against Government of embarking on a scheme for 6 million tons steel production might have been maintained with a certain amount of plausibility. But today these charges can have no validity whatever. About the magnitudes of the Fourth Plan, I am not able to indicate precisely anything except to say that the panorama for the Fourth Plan is before us and that it does not permit the neglect of any one branch of economic activity to the advantage or to the highlighting of any other. Agriculture and allied operations, as we are conceiving them for the future, require tractors, pumps, electric power, drills and rigs, fertilisers, pesticides, refrigeration equipment, dehydration equipment, storage facilities, cement, special types of transport facilities and so on, all of which could be multiplied *ad infinitum*. These in turn will require pro-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

ducer goods the aggregates of which present a picture of considerable magnitude and would necessitate the production of basic materials like steel of various types, other metals, the development of the machine building industry and various other items all of which fall in the category of heavy industry. Does it not, therefore, follow that the various components of the economy are complementary and inter-dependent, and any highlighting of the one to the detriment of the other cannot ensure orderly progress which is the basis of any planned development? One can say that this argument is not valid for the reason that many things could be imported. True, we are even importing foodgrains, but that itself is the main justification for strengthening the agricultural production front so as to eliminate these imports to the level of the vanishing point. In the same way, we are importing more than a million tons of steel, in spite of the fact that we produce 6 million tons of ingot steel. Maybe we may have to import more in the future. But this is something which we progressively try to avoid, and hon. Members who have full knowledge of our foreign exchange situation, particularly in terms of a large Plan, would have no difficulty in agreeing with me that reduction of imports and to that end, substitution of imports by home products has to be one of the fundamental planks of our future plans.

Where then does this charge against Government or the Planning Commission of neglecting one sector to the benefit of the other, whichever it might be, come? May I, therefore, in all humility suggest that this kind of talk in the House and elsewhere by parties to the right and parties to the left, of our neglecting one sector and pushing up the other is not only completely meaningless but also, if I may say so, somewhat unintelligent?

In taking a view on the role of agriculture in the Fourth Plan period,

we have to take into account the fact that we are rapidly getting into a situation where further development has to be in terms of intensified cultivation and of improved productivity in agriculture rather than in terms of merely increasing the acreage. This calls for the deployment into agriculture of various material inputs like fertilisers and pesticides, improved methods of cultivation, better seeds, more rational application of water and the development primarily of agro-industries. These involve in turn a higher degree of planning for agriculture than has been the case in the past. Agriculture would, in my opinion, be entering into a phase where progress can only be by measures devised and co-ordinated at a degree of sophistication that we have customarily applied so far to other sectors of the economy like power or industry.

What should be our objective in the field of agriculture? It should be to achieve a rate of growth that would be in consonance with our progress in industry and in other fields of national economy. As hon. Members are aware, since our development began, industry has been growing at a rate somewhat in excess of 8 per cent while agriculture has grown at a rate somewhat less than half as much, and in the last three years, hardly at all. Taking the economy as a whole, there is no doubt that the slow progress of agriculture has had the effect of depressing the overall growth rate as a statistical average. Even more seriously it has had the effect of keeping at a low level the resources available from the agricultural sector for the country's growth as a whole. In the Fourth Plan, I cannot see how we can rest content with the attainment in agriculture as a whole of a rate of growth of anything less than 5%. This would mean, *inter alia*, a higher degree of administrative organisation, a higher degree of co-operation between the States and the Centre and a more intensified effort in those aspects of industry that have a bearing

on agricultural production, as for instance, in the production of fertilisers. Efforts have also to be made in the direction of stepping up of production of subsidiary and protective foods and of securing food economies by encouraging food processing ventures on a larger scale than till now. Again we have to carry further the approach underlying the package programmes whereby we concentrate on maximising our efforts in those areas where we can confidently expect high returns in a minimum period of time.

I fully share the view that both in the short term and in the long term our development efforts would be jeopardised unless we can quicken the pace of agriculture in the country. In the Fourth Plan we have, therefore, necessarily to devote adequate resources and undertake, in co-operation with the States, all the organisational and other improvements necessary to open up a decisive move forward in this vital field. As I mentioned earlier, a suitable price policy for the producer, as much as for the consumer, is an essential part of any programme that we may devise and we have, therefore, necessarily to examine this aspect both for the short and for the long term keeping in mind our objective of agricultural growth with a reasonable measure of price stability.

At the same time, I should like to re-emphasize that development of agriculture cannot proceed without adequate support from industry. This, in fact is one of the aspects of the higher degree of sophistication that I have already said should evidence our further efforts in agriculture. The Plan must be treated as an organic whole and there is no question of competition between progress in agriculture and development of industry, be it consumer industry, small industry or heavy industry. In the Fourth Plan therefore we propose further advance in the direction of a build-up of industry along the broad lines that we adopted for ourselves in

the Third Plan. To summarise these, we must endeavour to concentrate on:

- (i) Production of goods such as fertilisers, insecticides, agricultural implements including tractors, pumps, diesel engines etc. required so urgently for giving a boost to our agricultural programmes.
- (ii) Early completion of heavy engineering and other engineering industries already taken in hand and such additional projects as are deemed necessary for balancing the programmes and providing a sound basis for future industrial development.
- (iii) Stepping up production of both pig iron and steel from the expansion schemes in hand as well as those already contemplated at the present units besides Bokaro, and the establishment of additional capacity for non-ferrous metals, aluminium, copper and zinc.
- (iv) Increased production of consumer goods such as textiles, sugar, drugs, kerosene, paper etc.
- (v) Expansion of production of cement and other construction materials to meet the increasing demands.
- (vi) Production of petro-chemical products like synthetic fibres to substitute imported cotton and wool, based on products obtained concurrently with kerosene in our refineries.

In the organisational field, our policy in the Fourth Plan will continue to be on the lines set out in the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956. While Members of the Opposition have from time to time criticised that Resolution from differing, and mutually inconsistent, viewpoints, we have yet to recognise that it is within the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

ambit of that Resolution that satisfactory progress in the field of industry as a whole has been achieved over the past years. Within the broad framework of that Resolution, we should endeavour to adopt such methods as would promote industrial production, as in agriculture, in the largest degree in the minimum period of time and at a minimum cost.

Members are aware that, to a much larger degree than in agriculture, the shortage of foreign exchange has been an inhibitive factor in the growth of industrial production. From this point of view, efforts have to be made in the following directions:—

- (i) Complete the programmes in hand and secure as much output from each of them as possible.
- (ii) Utilise idle capacity by augmenting supplies of required components and materials to existing units and giving preference to priority and essential industries, wherever the availabilities fall short of overall needs.

Swami Ramachwaranand rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I suggest the House may sit till 6 O'clock to give an opportunity to Members who have not spoken.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:

- (iii) To give preference to expansion of existing units over establishment of new units wherever conditions justify, as this would help to secure additional capacity with minimum investment.
- (iv) In working out *inter se* priority between schemes of equal importance, to give preference to fast maturing schemes over those which are likely to have longer gestation periods.
- (v) Similarly in the case of industries which offer export

possibilities or import substitution, they would get preference over others not similarly placed.

Shri Koya: Read a little slowly.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Firozabad): Has the House decided to extend the time?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will sit till 6 O'clock.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: The House has not been consulted in the matter. Has the House been consulted in the matter?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am consulting the House.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: No, no. We are not sitting.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like to re-emphasize the importance of the last point, particularly from the foreign exchange point of view. A clear and unequivocal objective of future industrial licensing has to be import substitution in an increasingly large way, if we are to achieve over the next few years a solid basis on which to reduce our dependence on foreign aid and find within ourselves the sustenance for our further growth to the maximum extent. I should not be misunderstood when I talk of finding sustenance from within ourselves. I am not one of those that believe in an autarkic scheme of development.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Government has no objection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Government has no objection to our sitting till 6 O'clock.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: What is the special reason that a decision is taken like this to sit till 6 O'clock without consulting us?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are some Parties who have not spoken yet.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: That list can never be exhausted even if you sit till 7 O'clock. My suggestion is that we adjourn at 5 O'clock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The debate must close today .. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the House does not want to hear us, can we take it that they are withdrawing their motion of no-confidence. I am quite prepared to sit down if they want to do so. They have said what they wanted to say about the Government and I have at least to put before the country what we are doing and what we intend to do. If it does not please the hon. Members, well, they are quite at liberty to do what they can but they must permit us to go on. Government is entitled to be heard.....(*Interruptions.*)

I was saying that as our economic development becomes increasingly complex and advanced we would need more than even now, to keep in touch with technical progress abroad; we will have to continue to import new innovations, technical know-how and even new products. Self-sustenance, in my opinion is, best understood as the capacity to generate within oneself adequate potential for growth; if all the factors of growth are not available internally, as they would not be for quite some time, it would mean capacity to find from within ourselves resources to pay for their import... (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think there is too much of talk going on even in the Government Benches.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Any rational scheme of industrial development both from the economic and social points of view, must take account of the need to foster the growth of small-scale industry as also the need to spread the benefits of industrialisation over as wide a field as possible; and no Government run on democratic lines can overlook these two aspects. But at the same time no Government run on rational lines can afford to ignore hard economic factors and overlook important

economic factors like the proper location of industries or the economies of scale. I have had the uncomfortable feeling for quite some time that we have perhaps not given the cost factor as much importance in the past as we should have. At any rate it is now definite that with the increasing scale of our industrial efforts and with the call such efforts make on our limited resources, we should pay the fullest attention to the cost realities of any given situation. Within this requirement, I believe it would be possible and necessary that in our Fourth Plan we adequately define and provide resources for both small-scale industries and for the spread of industrial activity over the many regions of the country .. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He is making an important policy statement in reply to the debate. I think he should be shown the courtesy and heard patiently.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: For the progress that we need to make in agriculture and industry in the long run, we have to look to our infrastructure activities. That, in the Fourth Plan period, we are able to project concrete steps in agriculture and industry is partly due to the past decisions we have taken to increase availabilities of transport, of power, etc. Similarly, we have to take decisions now, and in the Fourth Plan period, in these very fields, if in later years we are not to be held up in agricultural and industrial progress. Hon. Members are aware that in the field of power, after some setback in the later years of the Second Plan, we started quite a number of projects—hydro-electric, thermal and nuclear—in the current Plan. Some of these projects have been finished and others would be completed between now and the first year of the Fourth Plan. In all, as I said earlier, the availability of electric power has been expanding at a rate of some 11 per cent per annum, which, as things go,

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

is not an unsatisfactory rate. We have, at the same time, also proceeded some significant way in the production within the country of equipment for power generation in both the public and the private sectors.

In the Fourth Plan, we have to continue the expansion of electrical generation. Here again, as in other fields of the economy, we are rapidly leaving the stage where the choices open to us were few and simple. The increasing complexities of the power and energy situation have been well brought out in the series of studies undertaken by the Energy Survey Committee whose final report would be available, I hope, in the next couple of months. The proper utilisation of the middlings output of our coal washeries, the proper balance between hydro-electric, thermal and nuclear and other forms of energy, the maximisation of decentralised generation as against long-distance transmission of power and the development not merely of an integrated grid system over the country but also of truly economic power stations generating electricity in bulk—all these call for the greatest degree of carefulness in planning our future power development. The Planning Commission has made some progress in this field and the House may be interested to hear that action has already been taken in respect of certain power schemes which, on the basis of all the criteria I have mentioned, would seem inevitable. In the months to come we shall plan such advance action in respect of other power schemes and indeed, wherever possible, in other fields of the economy as well.

I must here draw attention to a major factor in the development of power that has been causing me some concern. That is the problem of resources for power development and has two aspects. Firstly, there is the question of the power tariffs which in any well-regulated economy must be

so framed as to cover costs in full and leave over some resources for investment in further expansion. The second aspect is relevant to major projects which, either because of their cost or because of the technical difficulties of execution or because of both, may involve the assumption by the Central Government of a larger degree of responsibility than has been the case so far. Indeed, if in the years to come, we are to have a properly integrated regional and national grid with power being supplied at the lowest possible economic cost, we would have to consider fairly soon the administrative implications and come to satisfactory arrangements.

Passing on to the field of transport, while we must continue to expand railway facilities for the carriage of the larger freight cargo that would be implicit in the increased tempo of activities we expect in the Fourth Plan, we would have to pay a larger measure of attention to the development of our road system, as well. The total impact of traffic has got to a position where, broadly, there has to be development not only in the railway system but also in the road-way system. We are yet only in the early stages of a broad-based road system. We have already become fully aware of the many complications that have to be resolved in framing a sound road development programme on a soundly conceived and truly national basis. A number of studies are now going on which could be helpful in the formulation of such a programme. Notwithstanding all this, our sheet-anchor in the matter of transport will continue to be the railways for a very long time to come.

Since our capital investment on railways is considerable, which amounts to a very high figure—we should expect a much higher rate of return from this source of economic activity. In this context, it is worthwhile realising that the capital expen-

diture on railways having been made, the ratio of costs as between road and rail transport is six to one. This merely points out the necessity of making the maximum use of the cheaper method of transport to which there is already a committed expenditure. The concentration in the fourth Plan must therefore, inevitably be on maximising the utility and efficiency of railways and on the conservation of resources which may go waste in the present system unorganised road transport.

I have indicated so far some of the considerations in our mind relevant to key sectors of the fourth Plan; I cannot obviously go much further in the course of this debate into the entirety of that Plan which, as I have already said, is still in the making.

However, one other remark has necessarily to be made. In the field of employment, it has been our unfortunate experience that there has been an increase in the back-log of employment, from Plan to Plan. Obviously, in the Fourth Plan, we must aim at the provision of employment to the new entrants to the labour force which is assessed at about 23 million persons. This is engaging our close attention at present.

I have already referred to the advance action we have taken in the field of power development whereby preliminary work for certain projects that are demonstrably 'musts' for the Fourth Plan has already been commenced. We have been able to take similar steps in certain other fields of activity and shall, in the coming months, no doubt find more room for such advance action. In the production of fertilisers where, as the House is aware, our performance in the Third Plan is lagging somewhat behind our intentions, detailed projects studies have been completed for a number of additional plants, and we are on the look out for suitable technical and financial assistance for these projects. A major change in the

Fourth Plan in the field of Nitrogenous fertilisers will be that the programme will be very largely geared to petroleum feed stocks which would otherwise be surplus, resulting in considerable economies in production costs of fertilisers.

Advance planning in the fuel sector is also well in hand, and we have the advantage in this case of the specialised studies and projections made with the assistance of eminent foreign experts. The whole basis of planning of the fuel and power in the Fourth Plan will be developed more rationally as a result of these studies. Hon. Members are aware that the potential for coal output which is being developed currently will somewhat exceed the likely demand of about 80 million tonnes per annum by the end of the Third Plan, so that the problem of coal supply will be relatively easy in the earlier years of the next Plan. Advance approvals have, however, been given for further development of coking coal mines in the public sector, especially deep mining projects which will take a longer time to go into production. The planning of oil refining and distribution is being carefully coordinated with that of coal, and recently very careful demand studies have been made for petroleum products for the Fourth Plan period. Considerable advance planning has been completed for the size, location and timing of the new refineries and expansions required in the Fourth Plan and currently we are engaged in the delicate and complex negotiations with several oil companies who have shown interest in collaborating with the public sector in expanding and refining capacity. At the same time, adequate resources in men, material and funds have been placed at the disposal of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission. We are naturally hopeful that their efforts will be attended with success and our planning for the next few years to an extent will depend on the quantity of

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

indigenous crude oil which can be commercially exploited. Linked with the petroleum programme is not only the fertiliser production plans I have mentioned, but also a programme of production of petro-chemicals which should produce economically substantial quantities of synthetic products which will augment raw materials in short supply.

We have also completed detailed project reports for the expansion of all the three steel plants in the public sector, and I understand that the two main producers in the private sector are making good progress with the preparation of their expansion proposals. We have in fact gone further and taken steps to set up additional blast furnaces at Bhilai and Durgapur in advance of the Fourth Plan expansions, in order to relieve the shortage of pig iron. The House does not need to be told about the present stage of the Bokaro project, on which we are now finally embarked after a long period of waiting. Advance planning of steel, however, is a continuous process and does not end with Bokaro. Feasibility studies for certain other sites are now under preparation or under consideration.

I believe, Sir, that I have said enough both on the lineaments of the Fourth Plan and on the advance action that we are taking even now to refute any suggestion that this Government intends either to slow down industrial progress or to stop advance action on the projects of the future. There have also been other aspects of Government's economic policy of which hon. Members have made criticisms of varying degree of severity. The general theme appears to be that the present Government has deviated from the policies of our great departed leader. I shall refer to this again before I close. It has been said that excessive tax concessions have been given to the private sector; that the doors are being

thrown open wide to foreign monopoly capitalism; that in short the independence, for the fulfilment of which this country has been striving for the last 17 years, has been thrown overboard. Several hon. Members referred to the continuing imports of foodgrains, to our present dependence on foreign assistance for the Plan, to the growing burden of repayments and to the continuing foreign exchange difficulties. All these matters have been referred to, I submit, in a spirit of throwing doubt on this Government's ability and willingness to continue to strive for economic independence, to build up the potential strength of this nation and to bring prosperity and good living to its people. It is not for me, Sir, to go at any great length into all these questions; I am sure that the Prime Minister when he replies to the debate will deal with them adequately.

17 hrs.

For my part, let me reassure the House that there is not one economic or financial policy of this Government which in the slightest degree departs from the wider social objectives to which we are committed. It is patently absurd to suggest that I have thrown the doors wide open to foreign monopoly capitalists. Those who suggest this are blind to the role which foreign capital can play in the development of under-developed countries and are still labouring under some outmoded theories about the dangers of foreign capital. Not one policy of Government discriminates against Indian capital *vis-a-vis* foreign capital. The taxation policy is also so devised as to distribute the burden progressively; indeed a graver charge against our tax system has been that its progression is such as to act as a disincentive to savings and investments. It is no use tilting against one policy or the other and to generalise from it to suggest that this Government is not socialistic or that it cannot protect the economic indepen-

dence of this country. A nation with a population of nearly one-seventh of the world cannot now be subjugated politically or economically. Economic independence has to be achieved by hard effort. It means development over a wide front—in agriculture, in consumer industries, in metallurgical and chemical industries and in the basic capital goods industries. And this is what planning in this country seeks to achieve; and we are determined to pursue this programme to the best of our ability.

Before concluding I would like to say a word about this Government and its predecessor. An hon. Member opposite levelled the charge of this Government being schizophrenic. I am just wondering whether the hon. Member was seeing an image of himself in the mirror and mistook it for a general characteristic of the members of this Government. It has also become a common practice, Sir, sometimes to damn this Government offering it feigned praise and to say that it is no longer committed to the policies of the previous Government. Equally the charge is also....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We only say that after the death of Nehru this Government has become topless.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Equally the charge is also levelled against the Government that it has given the go by to the policies of the late Prime Minister. It used to be a practice of the past to divide the late Prime Minister from his party and while praising him condemn his colleagues and his party. But now it has almost become a fashion to say that the late Prime Minister was entirely different from the present government and that the present Government is following a completely new path of their own. As in the case of extremes both the points of view are unreal.

The many of us, Sir, the name of Jawaharlal Nehru is something sac-

red. It will not fade even as we fade away. It does not matter, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, what the age of my association with the Congress organisation is. I admit it has been short. After all, what is a quarter of a century in the membership of an organisation. I remember that I was a member of the Congress organisation at a time when an hon. friend betrayed its policies and joined people who were against this Government and supported their policies. But I would be failing in my duty if I allow any Member of the Opposition to get away with the impression that they and they alone know Jawaharlal Nehru. Jawaharlal Nehru was not a part of the Opposition. Memories may be short. Hon. Members must remember that a vote of no-confidence was moved last year against the Government of Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri A. P. Jain: By these people.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: By these very people.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Jawaharlal Nehru was not a part of the Opposition. I proudly say that we on this side, were a part of him and he still remains a part of us. Many of us are here only because of him and we continue to be here after his death only because there is the urgent and insistent call of duty. I am mentioning this not so much to highlight my own and the Government's and the Prime Minister's affinities to our late lamented leader, but just to tell hon. Members of this House and to the people that to us and to me, a new entrant of 25 years to the Congress Jawaharlal Nehru was the Congress because Jawaharlal Nehru had no loyalties except the Congress all through his life. However much the Opposition may try he cannot be separated from the Congress organisation which he served, for which he lived, for which he died. The use of Jawaharlal Nehru's name cannot strengthen the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

voice of the Opposition in proclaiming their disapproval of the Government which he has left behind to carry on his work. But to most of us here he will still remain our guiding star. The path that he lighted will still remain our path, the guide posts that he installed will still remain the guide lines of our action.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Swami Rameshwaranand.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when Shri Subramaniam replied to the food debate, he made a statement..... (Interruption).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :

नेजदेकं मनसोजवीय नैनतदेवा आप्नुवन
पूर्वमपत् ।

तद्भावतो न्यान अत्यति तिष्ठत्
तासिमन् नपी मातरि स्वा दधाति ।

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बड़े संघर्ष के पश्चात् आपने मुझे समय दे ही दिया है, इसके लिए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करूंगा ।

श्री बजरत्न सिंह — कोटा (झालावाड़) :
माननीय सदस्य ने समय ले ही लिया है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं यह नहीं मानता कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने कुछ किया ही नहीं है । इस शासन ने बहुत कुछ किया है ।

श्री त्यागी : धन्यवाद ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : हियर, हियर ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जो कुछ कांग्रेस पार्टी ने किया है, उसका थोड़ा सा नमूना जो कि सबके सामने उपस्थित है, मैं आपके सामने रखूंगा । जब हम कांग्रेस में थे, तो सुना करते थे—पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने स्वयं कहा था—कि हम मुस्लिम लीग से समझौता नहीं करेंगे, क्योंकि वह मुसलमानों की जमाअत है और अगर मुस्लिम लीग समझौता करना

चाहती है, तो वह हिन्दू महासभा से करे । हम समझते थे कि कांग्रेसी इस बात पर दृढ़ रहेंगे, परन्तु मुस्लिम लीग से समझौता किया गया और पंडित नेहरू तथा सभी कांग्रेसी उसमें सम्मिलित थे । कांग्रेस ने मुस्लिम लीग से समझौता करके देश का विभाजन किया । इस सरकार का यह पहला काम है । अंग्रेज के वक्त यह देश अखण्ड था, अविभक्त था, चारों तरफ से सुरक्षित था, परन्तु कांग्रेस ने मुस्लिम लीग से समझौता करके हिन्दुस्तान के पूर्व और पश्चिम में पाकिस्तान बना कर इस भारत को सदा के लिए रणस्थल बना कर उपस्थित कर दिया । यह कांग्रेस पार्टी की पहली भूल है । माननीय सदस्य इस पर "हियर, हियर" कहें । इसका परिणाम क्या हुआ ? इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि चीन ने आक्रमण कर दिया । आपने देश का विभाजन न किया होता, तो यह आक्रमण न होता । अंग्रेजों के वक्त में भारत पर पश्चिम की तरफ से कोई आक्रमण नहीं कर सकता था क्योंकि अंग्रेजों ने अफगानिस्तान और भारत के बीच जो कबायली थे उनको कुछ देकर अपने अधिकांश में रख छोड़ा था । पूर्व की तरफ बर्मा को वे कुछ दे दिया करते थे । इसी तरह से नेपाल को दे दिया करते थे । इसी प्रकार से पश्चिम की तरफ अंग्रेजों ने तिब्बत को न केवल स्वतन्त्र स्टेट रख छोड़ा था बल्कि भारत सरकार ने उत्तर में ग्यात्से और यातुंग, इन दो जगहों पर अपनी सेना भी रख छोड़ी थी । तिब्बत का सारा व्यापार भारत सरकार के अधीन था, डाक तार विभाग आदि भी सब भारत सरकार के अधीन था । यह अंग्रेजों के समय की स्थिति थी । किन्तु जब श्रीमानों के हाथ में शासन की बागडोर आई तो उस समय आपने तिब्बत को चीन के हवाले कर दिया ।

यह कांग्रेस की ही सरकार है जिसने पहले पहल स्वतन्त्र चीन की सरकार को स्वीकार किया था । यदि यह चलती न की गई

होती, यदि तिन्वत में जब चीन का आक्रमण हुआ था उस समय तिन्वत के साथ मिल करके चीनियों का मुकाबला किया गया होता तो चीनियों की वहां पर कब्रें बन सकती थीं। यदि आपने ये सब गलतियां न की होतीं तो इतना भारी जो देश का नुकसान हुआ है, अहित हुआ है, वह सब न हुआ होता। आपकी करतूतें तो बहुत हैं, कितनी मैं गिनाऊं। आपके जो कर्तव्य हैं, वे प्रसिद्ध हैं।

महात्मा गांधी कहा करते थे कि पांच सौ रुपये से अधिक हमारा कोई मन्त्री नहीं लेगा। क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कि आज महात्मा गांधी के नाम पर वोट मांगने वाले लोग क्या पांच सौ रुपये महीना ले रहे हैं? यदि ले रहे हैं तो मैं आपको धन्यवाद दिये बगैर नहीं रह सकता हूँ। आप कितने रुपये महीना ले रहे हैं, यह आपका हृदय जानता है।

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

मैं जानता हूँ जो कुछ हो रहा है। एक मੈम्बर पार्लिमेंट चौदह हजार की कार लेता है और अठारह हजार में बेच देता है। यह भ्रष्टाचार का एक नमूना है जो मैं आपके सामने पेश करना चाहता हूँ। भ्रष्टाचार कहां नहीं है? म परमेश्वर की तरह वह व्यापक है। अभी हमारे टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी साहब बोल रहे थे। वह कितने अच्छे व्यक्ति हैं, इसको सारा भारत जानता है। मूंडड़ा काण्ड में जब वह पहली बार त्यागपत्र देकर गये थे, उस काण्ड के बारे में कौन नहीं जानता है। मालवीय जी को कौन नहीं जानता है। किस किस का नाम लेकर मैं आपको गिनाऊं? जिस तरह से ज्येष्ठ मास के पके तरबूजे के बारे में बेचने वाले से यह पूछने की आवश्यकता नहीं होती है कि कौनसा पका है, वे सभी पके होते हैं, उसी तरह से जो सामने बैठे हुए हैं, इनमें से किसी के बारे में यह पूछने की आवश्यकता भी नहीं है कि कौन भ्रष्टाचारी है। सब एक जैसे हैं। मैं किसी

माननीय सदस्य या माननीय मंत्री महोदय का अपमान नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। क्या आप नहीं जानते हैं कि जो कोठी लिये हुए हैं और जिस कोठी का पांच रुपये किराया हो सकता है, उसके पच्चीस रुपये लिये जा रहे हैं? यह सब किस से छिपा हुआ है? किसी से ये बातें छिपी हुई नहीं हैं। यह भ्रष्टाचार नहीं है तो क्या है? भ्रष्टाचार की जो सीमायें हैं, ये चारों तरफ फैली हुई हैं।

नम्दा जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपने कपड़े बदल कर, कांग्रेसी कपड़े न पहन कर, एक लाला जी के कपड़े पहन कर किसी भी स्टेशन पर चले जायें और स्टेशन वालों से पूछ कर देख लें कि उन्हें एक डिब्बा चाहिये गाड़ी का माल भेजने के लिए, उनको पता चल जाएगा कि उसका क्या रेट है। कोई वस्तु ऐसी नहीं होती है जिस पर उनका रेट बंधा हुआ न हो। छोटी वस्तु भी जायें तो रेल वाले चार घाने ले लेंगे। जो भी पैसे लिये जाते हैं, उसमें सबसे हिस्से बंधे रहते हैं। गाई का बंधा रहता है, सिपाही का बंधा रहता है। कहीं पर 21 कहीं पर 25 और कहीं पर 30 रुपये एक गाड़ी के डिब्बे के व्यापारियों से लिये जाते हैं। अगर इस में आपको कुछ सन्देह है, कोई शक वाली बात है तो आप मेरे साथ चलें, मैं आपको दिखा दूंगा। आप पूछते हैं कि किस प्रकार से भ्रष्टाचार रहेगा? आप जाते नहीं हैं और इस तरह की चीजों को देखते नहीं हैं। अगर आप जायें तो वह रुक सकता है। आप पहले वाले मासकों की तरह से वस्त्र बदल कर जायें और देखें तो आपको सारा पता लग सकता है। परन्तु जाये कौन? नीचे से ऊपर तक खाया जाता है। यदि पैसों के रूप में नहीं लिया जाता है तो किसी और रूप में ले लिया जाता है। लड़की के विवाह के समय दूज में ले लिया जाता है, लड़के की शादी में ले लिया जाता है। यह भ्रष्टाचार भगवान की तरह से व्यापक है। हमारी सरकार की जो विशेषतायें हैं, उनको मैं कहां तक गिनाऊं

[श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

जब कोई संकट आया करता था हिन्दू समाज पर तो मुसलमानों के शासन के समय और धर्मियों के शासन के समय भी, हिन्दू के नाम पर सब झकट्टे हो जाया करते थे, हरिजन से ले कर ब्राह्मण तक। आपने शासन सूत्र अपने हाथ में रखने के लिए हिन्दुओं को दो टुकड़ों में विभक्त कर दिया, हरिजन और गैर-हरिजन। टुकड़े कर देने से ही आपकी तसल्ली नहीं हुई। अगर आपको हरिजनों का भला करना था तो आप हरिजन नाम का प्रयोग क्यों करते हैं। हरिजनों के नाम पर तो यहाँ भूतपूर्व मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं और उनको लाभ पहुंचा है। अगर आपको सहायता करनी थी तो हरिजन के नाम पर सहायता न दे कर गरीब के नाम पर आप सहायता दे सकते थे और गरीब में सारे हरिजन भी आ जाते, ब्राह्मण भी आ जाते, ठाकुर भी आ जाते। हरिजनों का भला करना था तो गरीब के नाम पर आप उनका भला करते। आपने टुकड़े कर के रख दिये। इससे ही आपका सन्तोष नहीं हुआ। एक और क्लास आपने खोल दी, जिस को आपने बैंकवर्ड क्लासिस का नाम दे दिया। बैंकवर्ड क्लासिस में न जाने कौन कौन सी जातियाँ आपने शामिल की हैं। इतने से ही आपका काम नहीं चला।

और आगे बढ़ कर आपने हिन्दू कोड बिल बना दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों आपने इसका यह नाम रखा और किस के लिए आपने यह कोड बिल बनाया। इस बिल में कई धारारों हैं। एक धारा यह है कि कोई भी आदमी एक स्त्री के रहते दूसरी स्त्री से विवाह नहीं कर सकता। माना यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। दूसरा विवाह किन परिस्थितियों में हो सकता है और हुआ करता था, क्या आपने इस पर भी सोच विचार कभी किया है?

श्री शिव बारायण (दांडी) : नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन में यह सब कैसे था सकता है?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द: आप सुन तो लें मेरी बात।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों इस कानून को आपने हिन्दुओं पर ही लागू किया, क्यों

नहीं मुसलमानों पर भी इसको लागू किया? एक गला सड़ा मुसलमान आदमी भी आज तीन तीन बीवियों से विवाह कर सकता है। लेकिन आपने उन पर इस कानून को लागू नहीं किया। इस तरह से आपने हिन्दुओं को कुचलने का यत्न किया। आपका काम इससे भी नहीं चला। आपने स्त्रियों और पुरुषों को तलाक का अधिकार दे दिया। मुझे कोई खतरा नहीं। लेकिन जो कुछ मैं देख रहा हूँ, वह मैं आपने सामने रखता हूँ। आप भी देखें कि देश में क्या हो रहा है। सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति से ले कर आपके शासन काल से पहले तक कोई स्त्री पुरुष को तलाक नहीं देती थी, कोई पुरुष स्त्री को तलाक नहीं देता था। आज हजारों स्त्रियाँ पुरुषों को और हजारों पुरुष स्त्रियों को तलाक दे रहे हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन स्त्रियों का वृद्धावस्था में जो तलाक लेती जा रही है या जिन की तलाक दिया जा रहा है, सहारा क्या होगा? ये जो तलाक एक दूसरे को दे रहे हैं, इनकी जो श्रीलादे हैं, ये किन को माँ और किन को बाप कहेंगी।

सभापति महोदय : आप को दस मिनट मिले थे, अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं कोई अपशब्द नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मुझे बोलने दिया जाए। आपके कानून में बता रहा हूँ। ये जो एक दूसरे को तलाक दे रहे हैं इनके जो बच्चे हैं, इनका क्या होगा? पत्नी भ्रम आपने साथ नहीं इनको ले जा सकती है क्योंकि नया पति यह नहीं चाहेगा और पितृ भ्रम साथ नहीं रख सकता है क्योंकि नवीन पत्नी बनानी है ऐसी हालत में किस को बच्चीलाव माँ और बाप कहेंगी, यह भी आप जरा बता दें।

इस से भी आप का काम नहीं चला । बहुत और भाई का झगड़ा सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति से आज तक नहीं हुआ है । लेकिन आपने यह भी करवा के दिखा दिया है । आज हजारों मुकदमे बहनों और भाइयों के बीच में अदालतों में चल रहे हैं । यह किस की विशेषता है, यह श्रीमान जी, आप लोगों की ही विशेषता है । और किस की इस प्रकार की विशेषतायें हो सकती हैं ? लड़की ब्याही जाती है तो एक ही गांव में नहीं ब्याही जाती है । गांव से पचास कोम पर लड़की विवाह के बाद चली जाती है । लड़की का बाप जब मरेगा तो मान लो उसकी एक लड़की है और एक लड़का है । यह लड़की अपने भाई के साथ बटवारा करने के लिए आएगी और उस लड़के की जो धर्मपत्नी है वह अपने पिता की जायदाद में से हिस्सा लेगी, उसका बटवारा करने के लिए आएगी । मुझे कृपा करके आप अब यह बतलाइयेगा कि आपने यह जो प्रबन्ध रखा है यह विवाह का प्रबन्ध रखा है या बनवास का रखा है ? जमीन ऐसी नहीं है जिस को साथ ले जाया जा सके । जमीन तो वहीं रहेगी ; आप किस तर से व्यवस्था कर सकेंगे । जब लड़के और लड़कियां अलग अलग अपनी जायदादों पर रहेंगे, लड़का अपनी जायदाद पर रहेगा और लड़की अपनी जायदाद पर रहेगी तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या भ्रष्टाचार और व्यभिचार नहीं बढ़ेगा ? इस लिये आप ने जितने कानून आज तक बनाये हैं, मैं आप से नम्रतापूर्वक पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बँलों की जोड़ी पर रख लेने वाले लोगो जरा छाती पर हाथ रखो । क्या बँलों की आजादी नहीं आई, बँलों के बेटे बेटियों के लिये आजादी नहीं आई । आज हम देखते हैं कि भोवसा मारा जाता है ।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को दूसरे लोगों का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये, उन को भी बोलने का समय देना चाहिये ।

श्री रामेश्वरनाथ : मैं आप की बात माने सेता हूँ और सम्यक् करत हूँ । लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में कह देना चाहता हूँ कि आप की

गवर्नमेंट की जो सब से बड़ी विशेषता है देश के लिये यह है कि आप ने चीन को अपने भारत की भूमि सौंप दी । इस के सम्बन्ध में आप कानों में तेल डाल कर सो गये हैं । दुनिया में किसी भी देश ने ऐसा नहीं किया । इस सम्बन्ध में आप की बड़ी बदनामी हो रही है य आप के लिये सब से बड़ी दयनीय बात है ।

सभापति महोदय : अब स्वामी जी समाप्त करें । मैं श्री कोया को बुलाना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री रामेश्वरनाथ : यह मेरे साथ न्याय नहीं हो रहा है । मैं दो तीन मिनट में ही अपनी बात निवेदन करना चाहता था ।

सभापति महोदय : श्री कोया ।

Shri Koya: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we of the Muslim League Group are not supporting the no-confidence motion. We think the reasons for this stand of ours are sound and are supported by considerations of propriety and decency.

The new Ministry led by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri came into being only about three months ago. This is a Ministry of a new era that has come into being after the historic post-independence epoch led by the late lamented Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This new Ministry must in all fairness be given some time and chance to prove itself. They are appearing before Parliament for the first time after assuming power. They must be given some time to settle down, and see their way clear through the multifarious and tangled hangover of the past. This is the reason which impels us not to support the motion.

But this does not mean that the people are on a bed of roses and that they have nothing to complain about. On the other hand, there are several serious questions, external and in-

[Shri Koya]

ternal ones, that are crying for a solution as early as possible in the vital interest of the country.

First, there is the question of corruption. Corruption has got several aspects and facts, and the political aspect has assumed a very grave and glaring connotation at present. My hon. friend, Shri Govinda Menon, who spoke the other day on behalf of the Congress Party, said that corruption has not increased; only people's awareness of corruption has increased. I beg to differ from him. Really speaking, everyday we read in the papers about corruption charges against officials and Ministers, both Central and State, and people who are high-ups in public life. I have seen a cartoon in a language daily, where an officer is asking people who have come for getting things done, 'Have you brought some sadachar?' That is the term people are using for corruption.

As I said, corruption has got several aspects and facts, the political aspect having assumed a very grave and glaring form at present. There are charges of corruption made against people holding very responsible positions in the administration and elsewhere in the country. The Government has not so far, either in the past or in the present, paid that much attention as the matter deserves, probably due to party considerations. One person in the Government, Shri Nand the Home Minister, took up the matter earnestly and enthusiastically when he assumed his new office. But before he made any headway, even he was snubbed by the ruling party, and was pronounced by other responsible people as having a megalomania in this respect. I think this had probably dampened the right and correct enthusiasm he had in putting down corruption. This corruption has demoralised society and is gradually but surely sapping the vitality of the country. For one thing, the moneys intended for various plans and projects find their way elsewhere

and not to the fulfilment of the projects and plans. If this means is not controlled in time, it will lead to economic disaster.

This corruption has contributed a great deal towards the food crisis which is gripping the country at present. It is said that inflation due to development and defence activities has caused the spiral in prices, especially of foodgrains. Any Government, particularly one which has adopted planning as its fundamental method of work, must have been able to foresee inflation and its consequences and its planning must have taken proper measures to meet such contingencies. Too much concentration of attention on heavy industries, particularly manufacturing capital goods, has proved detrimental to agriculture and the industries manufacturing consumer goods. For one thing, this has produced scarcity of foodgrains and of consumer goods. The runaway prices of these articles would surely affect the present economy of the country immediately, and would not wait for the long term benefits which the heavy industries would or would not bestow on the country. If a man is dying today for want of penicillin, it is no use consoling him with the idea that penicillin in plenty will be available next year.

I have to state here emphatically that the evacuees from Burma and Ceylon are not receiving the same attention and consideration as refugees from elsewhere are receiving at the hands of the Government of India. The evacuees from Burma and Ceylon are Indian nationals and our own people. They have been sojourning in the other countries for generations, and have contributed to the economic development of those countries, while eking out their livelihood there. As a result of their hard work, many of them had naturally earned some money, which is their own property.

But, by the manner in which the nationalisation policies of those Governments are executed, or by some means or other, they are deprived of their hard-earned money, and sent out to India as penniless and helpless people. Hundreds of thousands of hard-working labourers are reduced to a miserable plight. If the Government of India had taken a firm hand over this question in time, as demanded by the interest and honour of our own country, this matter would not have reached the present calamitous situation. Tens of thousands of people, many of whom were occupying good positions in their own right, are forced to come away to their motherland, and it is sorrowful that even now prompt steps are not taken to relieve their distress. Certain enthusiasm which some authorities showed at the beginning in caring for these helpless people is waning away now, and we do not find the Government of India as much interested as is necessary in this matter.

Now, I have to refer to another really serious point, which, in spite of repeated promptings, does not seem to be receiving the attention of the Government of India. I refer to the imbalance and disparity as between one State and another in the matter of distributing the benefits of planning. One flagrant example of this disparity is that of Kerala. It is well known that it has got its own special problems due to geographical topographical and social conditions. Though it is rich in certain natural resources such as coconut, pepper, timber and sources of water, the planning of the country has not taken the necessary step of exploiting these resources to the best advantage of the State and the country. The people have to cry hoarse and incessantly for locating some large industries in Kerala State. The response of the Government of India is distressfully tardy and scanty. It is only after more than twelve years of agitation that the State has been able to get

one or two industries like the oil refinery and the shipbuilding yard. Out of these few industries the pytochemical industry has been taken away after wasting much energy and money over the preliminaries. It has been impressively pointed out by the technological survey of Kerala that generating power out of the numerous rivers in the State is one of the ready means of substantially promoting the economic condition of the State but it is not at all known what the Government of India is doing in this connection. In the meantime much useful water is going to the sea unused while the people are being afflicted with various economic ills. While the Government is engaged in promoting education in the country, Kerala because of its phenomenal advance in education is suffering acutely from educated unemployment in addition to the other forms of unemployment. The Government of India seems to have taken the least note of this special feature of Kerala. A word, Sir. Therefore, even the spread of education is proving a disconcerting handicap on the State of Kerala.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I have been watching this debate develop in the last three days, one interesting factor has emerged. It shows clearly that the new forces of reaction are aligning themselves in support of the Shastri Government. It also shows unfortunately how complacent the ruling party has become because of the big vote majority it carries in this House. They are unable to discern the cracks that are developing under that edifice. The edifice which today looks very strong and invincible may very soon be engulfed in darkness and abyss. This has happened earlier in history, and history repeats itself. It is small wonder that the Swatantra Party and Mr. Anthony who is an anti-communist who out-gold waters even Goldwater and the Muslim League are the supporters in the Opposition of the

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Government. It should make Government sit up and think instead of asking its supporters to quote as to what people said twelve years ago or to indulge in charges that the communists have extra-territorial loyalties. Yesterday Shri Nanda said that communists have extra-territorial faith—not loyalty. I do not know what he really means. If he means that we have faith in the understanding that the workers of the world must unite against international imperialism for peace, against capitalist exploitation, we loudly proclaim it. We want to assert that we communists believe that in every country the communists must work out their line of socialism according to the experience of the world communist movement and their mistakes and their success in the background of their own history. Revolutions cannot be exported. In the dark days when the Chinese invaded us, at that time, when many countries in the world did not understand the situation in our country, facing the organised attack of the Congress Party, attacks on our offices and houses and their utilisation of the Defence of India Rules, facing the attack of the Chinese Communist Party on the Indian Party, we stood by freedom, defence and development of our country. This is the old hackneyed argument. Even the committee on un-American activities says the same thing. Never-the-less one third of the world's population is today functioning under the Red Flag and India will be no exception.

In the no-confidence motion we want to highlight one major thing. It is the rule of big money which has been allowed to become so powerful by this Government, that big money pressurises it, the Ministers both at the Centre and at the States are corrupted by it. State power is corroded by it from within. This source of corruption is rampant in every sphere of life and it manifests itself in a hundred ways. Our charge is that the entire direction of Government

and its policies is being dragged in the way of big business either under the garb of pragmatism of Shri S. K. Patil or the 'food-not-steel' policy of Shri Dandekar and the Swatantra Party. Today the country is in the grip of the monopolists, traders, hoarders, profiteers, blackmarketeers and the Government is faced with their might. What does the Government do? It appeals to them and gives them grace for fifteen days. It hardly causes a ripple. They go about their job. It is a slap on the Government's face. Grain merchants and wholesalers have organised strikes. I am yet to hear if a single one of them had been arrested under the Defence of India Rules for having organised strikes.

It is reported that a proposal is being considered by Government to bring out black money by reducing the rate of income-tax from 70 per cent which is leviable under the law. My friend Mr. Tyagi is looking at me because he knows what fate has met his offer for bringing out evaded income-tax. This supineness of Government before big money is what bucks up the Swatantra Party. Are these trivial matters? Are they temporary difficulties? We say: no. There is today in our country behind the Cabinet a new development which did not exist during the Nehru regime. That is the birth of the Syndicate. When we bring this vote of no-confidence against the Cabinet, we have to see behind the Cabinet where a Syndicate functions. It is known as the syndicate in our country. Shri S. K. Patil, Shri Atulya Ghosh, an hon. Member of this House, our Minister Shri Sanjiva Reddy—all these are mentioned as being powerful members of the Syndicate. They are the king-makers, Cabinet-makers and the real policy-makers. This Syndicate—it may be asserted—is closely associated with big money. Shri Patil, when he was Food Minister, openly spoke of being the friend of traders. As Food Minister he fought doggedly

so that there would be no socialisation of foodgrains trade. He pinned his hope on talking big of buffer-stocks and building none, and of rushing to the United States to get aid under PL 480, whether he was Food Minister or not. His links with big business and with big money are well-known. As a matter of fact, only recently (one Vessanji Lalji) the gentleman who accompanied him, and who I believe sponsored his visit to East Africa, has been hauled up for gold smuggling. I hope it is a coincidence.

Take Shri Atulya Ghosh about whom my hon. friend Dr. Lohia spoke yesterday. Only recently, Shri Ghosh organised a purse for Shri Kamaraj. It will be seen how some of the biggest rice and oil dealers are today holding our people in Calcutta to ransom; those who are adulterating oil; these very people have contributed to this purse. Should we not have an enquiry into it? Are these trifling matters?

A big industrialist, Shri Atwal, a Member of the other House, is a close friend of Shri Atulya Ghosh, and on the very day when a case of bribery by giving a Fiat car by Shri Atwal to the D.S.P. who was entrusted with the investigation of the cases against M/s. Atwal Co. came up in Delhi, this very Shri Atwal was playing host to journalists on behalf of Shri Ghosh at his Canning Lane house. These are not trifling things; they show where the power behind the Syndicate lies and how power works.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee has already spoken about Shri Sanjiva Reddy, and I do not want to repeat it. But I ask, when we bring people to the Centre, do we do it because certain strictures have been given against such people by the Supreme Court? Have we gone into their whole past? What has been his record as Chief Minister? I have nothing against him personally and I do not know him at all. But the things that have been brought to light are things we should know: his career as Chief Minister, in

giving over the Taj Glass factory to one of the richest people in Andhra Pradesh, the Raja of Chellapalli; he gave it over for a song, this being instrumental in handing over the Andhra Republic Forge to the same Raja of Challapalli, who is a Minister, for a song. These are things which show in which way and in which direction the Government is moving. Are these people the torch-bearers of Nehru's practical socialism about which Shri Nanda spoke so much? I want to know from the Treasury Benches.

It is true that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said—I remember that speech, and I was present in the House—that “I cannot give a precise definition of socialism.” But he has given a precise definition of socialism in his earlier books. But he did not give it at that time. At least I am sure he would not say that these people would have been the torch-bearers of socialism. One thing is clear. These people are the kith and kin of Shri Dandekar, Shri Masani and the Swatantra party, not the Congress party which we know, in which we and our families were born. What about officials? The other day my friend, Mr. Mathur, spoke about the direction in which we are going to change the administrative machinery. I am not going to mention names of officials who are in Government. But we find that prominent ex-officials are today the backbone of the private industry. Mr. H. V. R. Ienger draws Rs. 9,000 from Party and Company. He draws Rs. 4,000 from Mettur Aluminium as Financial Adviser, because he cannot draw more than that; otherwise the company law administration will come in. I ask Mr. Dandekar and friends of the Swatantra Party: Are the rich getting poorer? Mr. N. R. Pillai has become the Director of one of the biggest mills—Indian Iron and Steel Company, Burnpur. Mr. C. C. Desai is connected with 20 different firms; I think 20 is the limit under the company law. In our colliery areas where the labour is most exploited, the Regional Labour Com-

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

missioner (Implementation) goes and joins the colliery firms, against whose owners' depredations we should really try to save the workers. In Delhi, there are big business houses with public relations officers. Has the Government tried to find out how they function? How powerful are the Birlas! If there is a Birla file, it moves quickly from top to bottom and from bottom to top, because they have their contacts there.

Let us take our own public sector companies. There is a well known business firm of Bajoria. Everybody knows how many cases are pending against this company in Calcutta for foreign exchange offences. One of the members of this Bajoria family is made a Director of BIC, Kanpur. I ask the Government: Are we being asked to hold our fortitude in a situation where prices are sky-rocketing beyond any logic you can bring forward by statistics of production? In the whole of India, the increase has been 25 per cent in 11 years. Today in 15 months, there is 27 per cent increase. In the last six months, price of rice has increased by Rs. 30 per 100 kilos. Mustard oil is adulterated and is out of the market. The price of coconut oil, ground-nut oil and everything has increased. From 1st June to 1st August, the index figure has recorded a further increase. In my State, the prices of all the dals have increased by Rs. 2 to Rs. 6. What are the ordinary people going to do? In this situation, on the basis of the cost of living index in Bengal, computed by Government it has shown that the index has come down and as a result of this the jute workers' wages have been cut by 60 paise by the biggest monopolists—Indian Jute Mills Association.

About the raids in Bombay, the raids on the houses of film stars have been publicised. Why is it that the raids that have taken place in the house of the son of an ex-Minister, his friends and partners have not

been published? Many memoranda have been submitted to the Government. I have got a file full of photostat copies of how this gentleman utilised the hospitality of bogus firms in London—associates of Killick Nixon and Sons; Shivrajpur Mines and all these things have been brought. Foreign exchange is being robbed and at the same time, not a single search has been made of this Shivrajpur Mines. The whole story of Kairon and his sons will be repeated if any enquiry is made on a bigger scale.

Sir, these are some of the points which I wanted to make and these are the main charges. On the one hand, when workers want Bonus, you do not allow big money which is accumulated at the top to be shared by workers. Shri Vasavada of the INTUC, Shri Dange of the AITUC and Shri Govinda Reddy of the other House have given a majority report to the Government. But the Government have amended this report in direction in which Shri Dandekar has given his note of dissent. On the other hand, the Central Government employees want that there should be arbitration on the question of the formula for calculating dearness allowance, whereas we in this House, the Members of the Congress Party, want an increase in the allowance of M.Ps. The basic salary of a Member of Parliament is Rs. 600 whereas when it comes to the question of the Central Government employees they are not given even an arbitration to consider a change of the formula of D.A.

These are the points, Sir, on which I want to indict the Government. I want to say, it is the power of big money which is turning them away from the people. People in Delhi cannot even have a glass of fresh water. The water is polluted with excreta and pollution and we tremble to drink even a glass of water. That is the situation. Therefore, I say,

the Government must realise that the people have no confidence in it.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : सभापति महोदय, शास्त्री सरकार पर दो अविश्वास प्रस्ताव आये हैं, एक विरोधी पक्ष की ओर से और एक कांग्रेस की ओर से। एक प्रस्ताव आया 7 सितम्बर को इस हाउस में और कांग्रेस पक्ष की ओर से जो प्रस्ताव आया था वह 6 सितम्बर को कान्स्टीट्यूशन क्लब आया। कान्स्टीट्यूशन क्लब में जो अविश्वास प्रस्ताव आया तो जिस संगठन की ओर से वह कन्वैशन बुलाया गया था तथा जिस संगठन ने वह प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया उसमें स्वयं गृह मंत्री नन्दा जी, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष यह सब लोग उपस्थित थे। पहले मैं उन के शब्दों को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ तब उस के बाद अपनी बात शुरू करूंगा। उन्होंने जो अपना यह पत्रक प्रकाशित किया उस में स्पष्ट यह शब्द हैं :—

“मौजूदा हालत को सब से ख़ास बात है गल्ले की कमी और दामों का संकट। जनता की तकलीफ़ और उस का असन्तोष पहले कभी इतना बढ़ा हुआ नहीं था जितना आज। जनता की निगाह में कांग्रेस की तसवीर बराबर धुंधली होती जा रही है। कांग्रेसजनों के आपसी झगड़े बराबर बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। इन झगड़ों का आधार विचारों का मतभेद नहीं बल्कि महत्वाकांक्षी नेताओं के पीछे चलने वाले गुटों का टकराव है और इन झगड़ों के कारण कांग्रेस का जनता से सम्पर्क बहुत कम हो गया है।”

श्री त्यागी : यह क्या कोई सरकारी डीक्यूमेंट है जो कि आप पढ़ रहे हैं ?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : त्यागी जी ने पूछा कि संगठन के प्रतिरिक्त क्या सरकार को भी कुछ कहा है, मैं वह शब्द भी आपको सुनाये देता हूँ।

“बदलती हुई सामाजिक व्यवस्था की आवश्यकताओं को पूरा करने के लिए शासन व्यवस्था में जो परिवर्तन होने चाहिए

ये वे नहीं हो पाए हैं और नीकरशाही का पुराना तरीका टालमटोल लालफीताबाद और जनता पर अविश्वास का रवैया बदस्तूर कायम है। शासन प्रणाली में तेजी से परिवर्तन लाने के लिए जिस महत्वपूर्ण कार्यक्रम की आवश्यकता है उस की ओर हमने एक ऐसा नजरिया अपना रखा है जिसका असलियत से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं।

मुद्रा के चलन पर सरकार का जरा भी काबू नहीं रह गया है और खेती तथा कल-कारखानों की पैदावार भी संतोषजनक नहीं रही है।”

यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव है जो 6 सितम्बर को दिल्ली के कांस्टीट्यूशन क्लब में आया था। अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को जिस सम्मेलन में रखा गया उसमें केन्द्रीय सरकार के तीन चार मंत्री भी शामिल हैं।

दूसरी बात जो मैं अपनी ओर से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि हमारी ओर से जो अविश्वास प्रस्ताव श्री चटर्जी द्वारा रखा गया जिसके कि समर्थन में कुछ भाषण हुए कांग्रेस ने अपनी ओर से उनका विरोध करने के लिए जिन पहलवानों को भेजा है उनमें से अधिकांश वे थे जिन्होंने शास्त्री जी की प्रशंसा में अधिकांश समय लगाया।

एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ अगर त्यागी जी शास्त्री जी के कानों तक उसे पहुंचा दें और वह यह है कि जार्ज बर्नर्ड शा के कमरे में यह लिखा हुआ था :—“मुझे मेरे चापलूस मित्रों से बचाओ।” मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमारे शास्त्री जी भी अपने कमरे में ये शब्द लिखवा कर लगवा लें। वह दुर्बलता जो कि पहले थी वह दुर्बलता शास्त्री सरकार में नहीं चलनी चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ समाचार पत्रों और कुछ व्यक्तियों की भावत हो गई है कि सरकार में से एक या दो व्यक्तियों को पकड़ कर उनकी प्रशंसा करना बाकी सारी सरकार की निन्दा करना।

श्री त्यागी : यह कहाँ से माननीय सदस्य ने कोट किया है ?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : जार्ज बर्नर्ड शा को मैं कोट कर रहा हूँ ।

दूसरी बात मैं खाद्यान्नों के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ । खाद्यान्नों के सम्बन्ध में हमें जो अभी सब से बड़ा खतरा दिखाई देता है उससे भी भयंकर स्थिति जो आने वाली है वह यह है कि हमारे देश की जन संख्या 2.4 प्रतिशत के हिसाब से बढ़ रही है यानी एक करोड़ प्रति वर्ष के हिसाब से आने वाले दशक में मेरा अनुमान है कि 8-10 करोड़ की जनसंख्या बढ़ जायेगी । सरकार की अगर यही दुर्बल नीति रही जिस प्रकार उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में अभी है तो मुझे खतरा है कि यह समस्या जो अभी अभाव के रूप में विद्यमान है आगे चल कर कहीं भयंकर महा अकाल के रूप में परिणत न हो जाय । सरकार ने इसके लिये कुछ नये उपाय निकाले हैं और वह कहते हैं कि इसका सफल हल है—राजकीय व्यापार (स्टेट ट्रेडिंग) ।

मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि देश में स्टेट ट्रेडिंग को चलाने के लिए जितने व्यक्तियों की आवश्यकता होगी क्या उसने उतने प्रभावशाली हाथ तैयार कर लिए हैं । अनुमान यह है कि जब इतने व्यक्तियों की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी तो लगभग 100 करोड़ रुपये सरकार को उन व्यक्तियों पर खर्च करने पड़ेंगे और यह सारे का सारा व्यय सरकार उपभोक्ताओं के कंधों पर डालेगी । क्या सरकार इस प्रकार से महंगाई को और नहीं बढ़ायेगी ?

इसके अतिरिक्त जब यह सरकार राजकीय व्यापार करने में लग जायेगी, बाजारों को सम्भालने में लग जायेगी, तो उत्पादन की ओर से उसका ध्यान कम हो जायेगा । हमारे लिए रक्षा का प्रश्न उससे भी अधिक आवश्यक और महत्वपूर्ण है । राजकीय व्यापार करने के परिणामस्वरूप

उसकी ओर से सरकार का ध्यान बिल्कुल समाप्त हो जायेगा । राजकीय व्यापार की योजना बड़ी समयसाध्य और व्यय-साध्य है । ऐसी स्थिति में बजाय इस उपाय को करने के, बजाय यह नारा लगाने के अच्छा यह होता कि सरकार उत्पादन को बढ़ाने की ओर अधिक ध्यान देती ।

जहाँ तक उत्पादन बढ़ाने का प्रश्न है उसका सब से उत्तम उपाय यह है कि कृषि से सम्बन्धित जितने भी विभाग हैं वे एक ही हाथ में होने चाहिए । मैं आपको अपने प्रान्त उत्तर प्रदेश की स्थिति बताता हूँ । वहाँ पर पांच मिनिस्ट्रों के हाथों में यह विभाग हैं । खाद्य मंत्री अलग है, कृषि मंत्री अलग है, सिंचाई मंत्री अलग है, सहकारी मंत्री अलग है सामुदायिक विकास का मंत्री अलग है और कुछ दिन पहले तो गन्ना विकास का मंत्री भी अलग था । आप बतायें कि इस अवस्था में प्रोडक्शन बढ़े, तो किस तरह बढ़े । इसका परिणाम यह है कि समय पर उपयुक्त साधन न मिलने से खेती की पैदावार दिन-प्रति-दिन गिरती चली जा रही है ।

खाद्यान्न के सम्बन्ध में दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज पंजाब में गेहूँ का भाव 24 रु० मन है दिल्ली में उसी गेहूँ का भाव 32 रु० मन है, गाजियाबाद में उसका भाग 40 रुपये मन है और बम्बई तथा कलकत्ता में उसी गेहूँ का भाव 60 से 70 रुपये के बीच में है । अगर यह सरकार देश में समाजवाद लाना चाहती है तो उस समाजवाद का अर्थ यह है कि अगर भूखों ही मरना है, तो सारा देश एक-साथ भूखा मरे । यह क्या हंग है कि एक राज्य में गेहूँ 24 रुपये मन बिके और दूसरे राज्य में 60 से 70 रुपये मन के बीच में ? सरकार ने क्षेत्र बना कर देश के बीच में जो दीवारें खड़ी कर दी हैं, एक प्रान्त में दूसरे प्रान्त के प्रति जिस संकुचित भावना का विकास वह करती जा रही है,

उसको उसे समाप्त करना चाहिए। जिस दिन सरकार ने गुड़ पर से प्रतिबन्ध हटाया, तो राजस्थान में गुड़ का भाव 70 रुपये मन था और प्रतिबन्ध हटने के तीसरे दिन गुड़ का भाव घट कर 40 रुपये मन हो गया। सरकार को इससे अनुमान लगाना चाहिए कि उसके द्वारा इस प्रकार से क्षेत्र बनाने का कितना नुकसान होता चला जा रहा है।

एक बात मैं बाहर भी कहता हूँ और हम मदन में भी कना जाता हूँ कि हमारे देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि अब तक जितने भी हमारे कृषि और खाद्य मंत्री हुए, उन में से एक दो व्यक्तियों को छोड़ कर अधिकांश व्यक्ति वे थे, जो इस समस्या से सर्वथा अपरिचित थे। आज भी दुर्भाग्य यह है कि जो व्यक्ति नेहरू मिनिसट्री में स्टील का स्पेशलिस्ट माना जाता था, देश की इतनी भयंकर और गम्भीर समस्या—खाद्य समस्या—का दायित्व उसको सौंप दिया गया है। क्या अनुभव है उनको इस विभाग का, सरकार यह भी तो उत्तर दे।

अच्छा हो कि इस समस्या का युद्ध-स्तर पर समाधान किया जाये। प्रधान मंत्री के हाथों में आज-कल सिवाय अणुशक्ति विभाग के और कोई विभाग नहीं है। इस समय उनके पास समय भी है। इसलिए वह इस दायित्व को स्वयं अपने कांधों पर लें और जब तक इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं होता, प्रधान मंत्री को ही कृषि और खाद्य मंत्री का कार्य करना चाहिए।

विदेश-नीति के सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना यह है कि सौभाग्य से हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री, श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू, का व्यक्तित्व एक एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व था। और सौभाग्य से ही अब उनके उत्तराधिकारी जो दूसरे प्रधान मंत्री आए हैं, उनका व्यक्तित्व उतना अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नहीं है, जितना कि राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व अधिक है। इस समय हमारे देश की स्थिति कुछ ऐसी हो गई है कि जब हमें राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व की आवश्यकता अधिक

है, ताकि हमारी समस्याओं का राष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से समाधान हो। अब तक अपनी समस्याओं का समाधान करने में हम इस बात का ज्यादा ध्यान अब तक देते रहे कि दुनिया हमको क्या कहेगी। देश के 47 करोड़ लोगों का भाग्य किस बात में सुरक्षित है, इस बात की भी अब हमको चिन्ता करनी चाहिए।

इस बारे में मैं दो तीन आवश्यक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। पड़ोसी देशों से अपने सम्बन्ध सुधारने के लिए सरकार ने जो प्रयास किया है—उस में वह कितनी सफल हो पायेगी, अभी यह तो कहा नहीं जा सकता है, क्योंकि अभी तक सफलता की किरण दिखाई नहीं पड़ी है—उसके लिये मैं समको साधुवाद देता हूँ। हमने देखा है कि नेपाल, इंडोनेशिया जैसे छोटे-छोटे पड़ोसी देशों में हमारे राजदूतावास इतने दिनों से खाली पड़े हुए हैं। क्या सरकार के पास कोई उपयुक्त प्रतिभायें नहीं हैं, जिनको वह राजदूत बना कर वहाँ भेज सके? इतने महत्वपूर्ण दूतावासों को खाली छोड़ देना हमारी विदेश-नीति का एक बहुत बड़ा खोखलापन है।

दूसरे आज परिस्थिति की पुकार और समय की मांग यह है कि दलाई लामा को बौद्ध देशों में भेजा जाये। अब उनको हिन्दुस्तान की चार-दीवारी में बन्द नहीं रखना चाहिए। वह वहाँ जाकर अपने दुखड़े को बतायें तो सही। इससे हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति एक अनुकूल वातावरण पैदा होगा। दलाई लामा को हिन्दुस्तान में रख कर एक बड़ी भारी भूल की जा रही है।

चीनी दूतावास के अन्दर एक सैकंड सेक्रेटरी हैं, जो कि चीनी आक्रमण से पहले भी सेकंड सेक्रेटरी था और उनका नाम है चेन लू-चिह। यह वह व्यक्ति है, जो चीन के आक्रमण के समय तिब्बत में चीन के गुप्तचर विभाग (इंस्टेलिजेंस डिपार्टमेंट), का हेड था। आक्रमण के दौरान जो भारतीय

[श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

सैनिक वहाँ बन्दी हो गए थे, उनके मस्तिष्क में चीन के अनुकूल वातावरण बनाने का दायित्व इसी व्यक्ति को सौंपा गया था। जब यह व्यक्ति पहले सेकंड सेक्रेटरी था तो उस समय भी उसकी गतिविधियाँ हमारे लिये सन्तोषजनक नहीं रहीं। अब वह दोबारा भारत में चाइनाज एम्बेसी में सेकंड सेक्रेटरी बन कर आया है। दिल्ली में उसकी जो गतिविधियाँ चल रही हैं, उनके बारे में सरकार के गुप्तचर विभाग ने उसको रिपोर्ट दी होगी। क्यों नहीं भारत सरकार चीन सरकार को लिखती कि इस प्रकार के व्यक्ति को यहाँ से हटा लिया जाये ?

जहाँ तक भ्रष्टाचार का सम्बन्ध है, मैं केवल इतना ही कहना चाहूँगा—श्री हाथी वहाँ हैं, वह नन्दा जी को कहें—कि अगर सामान्य भ्रष्टाचार को समाप्त करने से पहले राजनीतिक स्तर पर जो ऊपर के भ्रष्टाचार हैं, उनको समाप्त किया जाये, तो नीचे के भ्रष्टाचार स्वतः समाप्त हो जायेंगे। सरकार के जो छोटे छोटे डिपार्टमेंट हैं—खादी कमीशन, समाज कल्याण विभाग और भारत सेवक समाज, सरकार इन तीनों के भ्रष्टाचार को पहले समाप्त कर दे और फिर देखे कि उसने देश में कितने पुण्य का कार्य किया है।

भ्रष्टाचार को दूर करने के सम्बन्ध में मैं सरकार से यह भी जानना चाहूँगा कि क्या भ्रष्टाचार का कानून—क्रिमिनल प्रोसीज्योर कोड—व्यक्तियों को देख कर लागू होता है। दिल्ली की पुलिस गुड के स्कैंडल की रिपोर्ट दे चुकी है। सामुदायिक विकास मंत्री, श्री एस के० डे ने राज्य सभा में कहा है कि वह रिपोर्ट दे चुकी है। जिन आदमियों को दोषी ठहराया गया है, उनमें संसद् के दो सदस्य भी हैं, उनमें एक सैंट्रल को-ऑपरेटिव स्टोर के चेयरमैन थे। क्या सरकार ने उन के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही की है? या फिर क्रिमिनल प्रोसीज्योर कोड शकल देख कर काम में लाया जाता है?

भारत सरकार के एक जिम्मेदार आदमी

श्री धर्मयश देव, के छोटे भाई की कार पीछे चुराई गई थी और उस चोरी में एक्स्टर्नल एक्वेयर्ज मिनिस्ट्री के ज्वायंट सेक्रेटरी का लड़का सम्मिलित था। और भी बड़े बड़े आदमी उसमें सम्मिलित थे। इस केस को कैसे दबा दिया गया? एक ओर सरकार भ्रष्टाचार समाप्त करना चाहती है और दूसरी ओर इस प्रकार के व्यक्तियों को बचाना चाहती है। तो फिर वह भ्रष्टाचार को किस प्रकार समाप्त कर सकेगी? हजार नन्दा भी इसमें सफल नहीं होंगे।

डा० लोहिया की उस बात से अपनी सपुमति व्युक्त करते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने प्रधानमंत्री-निवास को श्री नेहरू के नाम से सुरक्षित रख कर उन के साथ बहुत बड़ा अन्याय किया है। अगर नेहरू जी स्वयं इन विचारों के होते, तो जैसे उन के नाम पर सरकार सिक्के चलाने जा रही है, वैसे ही उन्होंने भी गांधी जी के नाम पर जरूर सिक्के चलाए होते। लेकिन वह स्वयं इस प्रकार के विचारों के नहीं थे। सरकार उन के सिद्धन्तों के विपरीत जा रही है। उन का स्मारक शान्ति वन या इसी प्रकार की और कुछ चीजें हो सकती थीं। अथवा उन का सब से बड़ा स्मारक तो यह है कि चीन ने हमारी जो धरती ली है, वहाँ से उसको धक्का दे कर बाहर किया जाये और आजाद काश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान में मिलाया जाये।

अन्त में मैं स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री, श्री नेहरू, की कमिटेमेट्स के सम्बन्ध में दौं शब्द कहना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने इस प्रकार के कुछ व्यक्तिगत आश्वासन दिये हुए थे, जिन से वह एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व होने और सोचने का ढंग अंचा होने के कारण निकल नहीं सके। जैसे शेख अब्दुल्ला को कुछ उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया हुआ था। गोम्हा-दमन-दीव के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने कह दिया था कि उसकी संस्कृति अलग होने से उसको अलग रखा जायेगा। इसी तरह से पांडीचेरी-यमन-कारीकल-माही जैसी छोटी छोटी बस्तियों को किसी आश्वासन के आधार पर ही उन्होंने अलग रखा हुआ था।

नागालैंड के सम्बन्ध में भी इसी तरह का उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया था। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि शास्त्री जी उन कमिटमेंट्स से बन्धे हुए नहीं हैं। चूँकि उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में किसी को किसी प्रकार के आश्वासन नहीं दिये, इस लिए वह नये ढंग से अपनी नीति का निर्माण करें और उन कमिटमेंट्स से भागे हो कर इन बातों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ स्पष्ट निर्णय लें। जिस प्रकार से अब तक ये समस्याएँ उलझी रही हैं, वह उन को अब उस प्रकार से उलझायें नहीं। चूँकि इन तीन महीनों में उन समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं हुआ, इस लिए मुझे विशेष रूप से उन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना पड़ा है।

धन्यवाद।

Shri Muthu Gounder (Tiruppattur):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the no-confidence motion. We know well that this no-confidence motion will fail. However, it is a fact, and it cannot be refuted, that great confidence that the people, the masses, of India who were having in the Congress Party has begun to diminish gradually day by day. That fact cannot be refuted. It is natural that the masses of this country were having great confidence in the Congress Party which was responsible for achieving the freedom for our country. But now after 17 years, we are seeing that the confidence that the masses are having in the Congress Party is gradually going down. After seventeen years of independence, the masses were expecting from the Government a good Government and an efficient administration, and in fact, everything good. They were paying taxes without murmuring. They were working hard. They were trying and giving what all they can give to make the Five Year Plans a success. In spite of their hard work, after seventeen years, they find that their standard of living has not improved considerably. Therefore, they are disappointed. They have lost hope in the Congress Party which is now ruling this country.

1103 (A) LSD—10.

18 hrs.

However, we shall admit and we cannot deny that there has been some progress. There has been some progress, as detailed by the hon. Minister of Finance. There has been progress in the industrial sector, in heavy industries, medium industries, small-scale industries, farming, health, education and other sectors. So, we cannot say that there is no improvement at all. But the improvement is not in direct proportion to the huge amounts that we have spent on our Five Year Plans and to the huge loans that we have got from foreign countries.

Very often, we hear from the Treasury Benches that our country is exporting finished goods worth several crores of rupees. And the Treasury Benches are claiming that India which was all along a country which was importing finished goods from other European countries and other modernised countries is in a position now to export some finished goods, engineering goods and also some consumer goods. I have to admit that that is true. But while we are in a position to export some commodities, we cannot jump to the conclusion that we are able to provide all those commodities to all of our people. For instance, we are exporting cycles. But we cannot come to the conclusion that we are able to provide everyone who needs a cycle with a cycle.

Nowadays, we are also able to see that we are exporting our textile goods, that is, cloth. But in the rural areas there are people, I can say, about 20 crores of people in our country, who are still not properly clothed. Therefore, we cannot boast that we are exporting cloth.

We are also exporting shoes and finished leather goods to some countries. I can show you and to those hon. Members who might be pleased to come and see my constituency, that there are thousands of people, and thousands of labourers in my

[Shri Muthu Gounder]

part of the country, whose feet have not so far come in contact with any chappals or shoes so-called. This is the condition of our people. So, we cannot take pride in the fact or credit for the fact that we are now in a position to export. No doubt, we are exporting some finished goods, some engineering goods and other things, and by doing so, we get some foreign exchange. By getting foreign exchange, we again develop our industries. But the income that we are getting on account of these industries is going into the hands of only a few. This is not something which we are saying from the Opposition Benches only, but even the Mahalanobis Committee which has gone into the distribution of income and wealth recently has submitted a report in which it has been very clearly stated that about 20 per cent of our population is having about 70 per cent of the income of our country. So, there are still about 50 per cent of the people in our country who have not seen or enjoyed whatever comforts and conveniences could be given by modern science and modern techniques. So, we cannot claim, and especially the ruling party cannot claim that on account of the Five Year Plans, they have improved the working conditions or the living conditions of the poor people in our country. It is true that there has been improvement in the national wealth, but that has gone into the hands of a few. At this time, Government are not in a position and are not competent enough to distribute this increased wealth or income on a uniform basis among the landless, agriculturists and the poor people. But they now come forward and say or proclaim that their objective is democratic socialism. We wonder whether the ruling party knows anything about either democracy or about socialism.

But in practice they do not follow democracy or socialism. That being so, we do not know how they are going

to combine both these things. The elementary requisite in a democracy is to give some regard to the Opposition parties and also to have patience to see that the Opposition parties grow on sound and healthy lines. They should have at least that patience or tolerance. But we see in our country that the ruling party is using and misusing all the available laws and legal provisions to curb all Opposition parties.

There are the Defence of India Rules. They are meant for the defence of India. But in practice, we have found that perhaps these rules are not to defend India but to defend the ruling party from the Opposition parties.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli):
Well said.

Shri Muthu Gounder: This new interpretation is substantiated by the fact that whenever they require to deal with Opposition parties, they invoke these rules and send them behind bars. Even in Madras State, the ruling party, the Congress, failed to stand against us on the political platform by opposing us and our ideologies in the democratic way. They were not able to give reasons on the platform. But they have found a way out by amending the Constitution with a view to hit this very party, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam. We were clever enough. But this is the way they are dealing with the Opposition. Still they say they are democratic. How can democracy function if Opposition parties are curbed and annihilated, when they are not given proper encouragement at least to grow on some healthy lines? So they do not have the right to speak about democracy.

Then socialism. It is a wonder that Congress people speak about socialism. With Birlas on the left side, Tatas on the right side, with pattagars, jagirdars and very many big landlords

and business magnates and bus and press proprietors on all sides supporting them, the Congress taking their money for elections, for everything, still to talk of socialism is not only a sin but an insult to the very word 'socialism'. It is an insult to Marx, Engels and anyone who is a real socialist or social reformer.

On account of these policies, they are losing the confidence of the public. In Madras State, I can say on evidence that the DMK is gaining ground slowly but certainly. There were bye-elections in our State. Only on two occasions, did the Congress and the DMK have a direct fight. In those two bye-elections, we won. Not only that. Before 1964, the DMK were not having control over any municipalities; now we have DMK chairmen in 12 municipalities. We are controlling the Madras Municipal Corporation, in spite of a very severe fight put up by the ruling party, by utilising the Government forces; Government money, Tata-Birla money. In the 1957 elections to the Assembly, we won only 15 seats. Now we are 50 strong in the Assembly. Slowly we are growing. People are losing confidence in the Congress party. Instead of going something to provide at least some food and shelter to the downtrodden public, the downtrodden masses, the Government is gearing up its machinery at its disposal and doing its best to introduce and impose Hindi as the official language. In this House, the late Prime Minister gave an assurance. . .

Mr. Chairman: He should conclude now.

Shri Muthu Gounder: I think I am entitled to as much time as other Members. I am supporting this motion whereas though the Swatantra Group was opposing it, they were given 30 minutes. I am entitled to 30 minutes or more.

Mr. Chairman: There is no time left now. He may take two minutes more.

Shri Rajaram (Krishnagiri): He is the only speaker from our Group. If it is not possible to give time today, he may continue tomorrow.

Shri Muthu Gounder: The Government wants to impose Hindi. The late Prime Minister's assurance to this House was that Hindi would be made the official language only if a request to that effect comes from the non-Hindi people. We did not make any request to make Hindi the official language. The Govt. instead of attending to very many other urgent things, like providing food and shelter, wants to impose Hindi, directly or indirectly, using Government money, the exchequer's money and its influence. We have also sent memoranda to Government. We have already requested Government on the floor of the House not to proceed with this. We have stated that this is not proper to declare Hindi as the sole official language of this country. On this issue, we are courting arrest. Hundreds of our young men and women are in jail for opposing this Hindi imposition. We are prepared to sacrifice anything, even our lives. We will not accept Hindi as the sole official language. Life is not worth living for us if we are made second-rate citizens. That will be the position for us if we accept Hindi as the sole official language. We are prepared for any sacrifice in consequence of the stand of ours.

As far as foreign policy of this Government is concerned, I have to say one or two words, and after that I shall finish my speech. There are a lot of Indians, especially South Indians in Burma. They are put to a lot of difficulties, no doubt on account of the national policy which the Government of Burma is pursuing, nationalising certain aspects of trade like shops and so on. Our people, especially the Madrasis and the Andhras and others are sent out of Burma without a pie in their hands. We are receiving thousands of people loaded

[Shri Muthu Gounder]

like cargo from every ship. They had made a lot of assets which they had left in Burma now, and under international obligations, I think our Government can press through our embassies for getting at least some fair compensation for the assets they have left. But I find that the Government is meeting only the very little of the demands.

In Ceylon there was a discussion last week. Our hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs was there in Ceylon and he discussed many matters with Shrimati Bandaranaike. The burning question wherein nearly eight lakhs of people in Ceylon of Indian origin are involved, since they are called Stateless subjects, was only touched at the conference, according to the news we have received, whereas the subject of mutual exchange of cultural delegations formed an important part of the discussions. That is now a burning question; in Ceylon, eight lakhs of people are considered as Stateless persons. This Government is not very much interested in getting them citizenship rights in Ceylon. If the Government had taken keen interest, they should have been by this time become pucca citizens of Ceylon because there was a pact signed between Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri Kotelewala which was not fully executed or implemented, and because it was not fully implemented—that is the reason why—eight lakhs of people in the Indian ocean region remain as Stateless persons. Finally,....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has taken more than 15 minutes. I have to call another Member now. He must finish.

Shri Muthu Gounder: Only one more point I would make and that is about our Salem steel plant. We have been speaking here and outside also for many years about the Salem

steel plant. We were told that after getting lignite from Neiveli, the Salem steel plant would be started in the Third Plan. Even on the floor of the House, Mr. C. Subramaniam, who was in charge of Heavy Industry then, gave the assurance on more than one occasion that the Salem steel plant is a feasible thing and it will be started in the Third Plan itself. So, I plead with the Government to implement this assurance given on the floor of the House and set up the Salem steel plant in the Third Plan itself.

श्री बागड़ी : सभापति महोदय, वैसे तो रिवाज पूरा करने के लिये मैं दो चार शब्द जरूर कहूंगा वरना यह कोई तरीका नहीं है कि अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर जो समय मिला हो उस के मुताबिक हमें समय न दिया जाये। सिर्फ मर्यादा पूरा करने का मौका दिया जाये, यह तो सिर्फ हाथ लग जाने वाली बात है। जहां तक रिवाज पूरा करने की बात है, चूंकि उस के लिये हमारे नेता ने कहा है इस लिये मैं उसे तो पूरा करूंगा ही वरना यह कोई तरीका नहीं है कि हम को जो समय मिला था उस के मुताबिक पूरा टाइम न दिया जाये।

मैं एक एक मिनट में पांच, छः बातें कह कर खत्म कर दूंगा। पहली बात तो आप की मार्फत मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि शास्त्री सरकार के बारे में एक ही बात सदस्य लोग कहते हैं कि तीन महीने की सरकार है, यह बहुत थोड़े दिन की सरकार है इस लिये शास्त्री सरकार के खिलाफ अविश्वास प्रस्ताव नहीं आना चाहिये। तीन महीने में ही यह सारे पाप नहीं हुए हैं! मैं तो एक ही बात आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि जितना भ्रष्टाचार, जितनी मंहगई और जितने पाप इस समय देश में हो रहे हैं क्या वह स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने ही बढ़ाये थे, क्या यह सारा दोष आप स्वर्गीय पंडित जी के मत्थे पर ही रक्ड़ेंगे। क्या उन के साथ मंत्री लोग नहीं थे, क्या शास्त्री जी उस वक्त मंत्री नहीं थे।

दूसरी बात मैं आप की खिदमत में यह प्रज्ञ कर्णगा कि महात्मा गांधी शहीद हुए थे जब कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का अपनी स्वभाविक मृत्यु से स्वर्गवास हुआ। जिस जगह पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का स्वर्गवास हुआ वह जगह 4 करोड़ ६० की है और जहां गांधी जी शहीद हुए थे वह 8 लाख ६० की है। गांधी जी त्यागी थे और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू आजाद हिन्दुस्तान के राज्य में सब से बड़े भोगी। इस देश की मर्यादा भोग और त्याग की रही है। शास्त्री सरकार ने सब से बड़ा कलंक इस देश के उस त्याग की मर्यादा पर लगाया है। मैं तो कहूंगा कि मुहम्मद को छोड़ कर अबू-बक की प्रतिष्ठा करने वाले आखिर में इस तरह जाया करते हैं। इस बात का मेरे पास प्रमाण भी है। शास्त्री जी ने मजिद कहा कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू लेना नहीं चाहते थे वह देना नहीं चाहते थे। मेरे पास घनश्यामदास बिड़ला की चिट्ठी है, पंडित जी की चिट्ठी है, लेकिन चूँकि समय कम है इस लिये पढ़ना नहीं चाहता। हां अगर आप चाहें तो मैं उसे जरूर पढ़ कर सुना सकता हूँ क्योंकि वह मेरे पास रखी हुई है। बिड़ला जी बिड़ला हाउस को प्रधान मंत्री निवास के लिये देना चाहते थे लेकिन गांधी जी के शहीदी स्मारक के वास्ते नहीं देना चाहते थे। इस से मालूम होता है कि या तो बिड़ला जी इतने बेईमान हैं कि शक्ति के पीछे भागते हैं जिस में कि प्रधान मंत्री चाहे रह भी जायें लेकिन गांधी जी का स्मारक न बने, या फिर प्रधान मंत्री और यह सरकार इतनी निकम्मी है कि जो देश की जनता की आशाओं को तो कुचल सकती है लेकिन एक आदमी की बात को नहीं कुचल सकती।

दूसरी बात मैं आप की मारफत यह प्रज्ञ कर्णगा कि कहा जाता है कि उद्योगों ने तरक्की की है। अंग्रेजी राज्य के दौरान जब हिन्दुस्तान गुलाम था तो उद्योग के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान का आठवां दरजा था। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस 17 साल के कांग्रेसी राज्य

के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान का उद्योग में कौन सा दरजा है। क्या आठवें या सातवां या छठा दरजा हो गया। कोई मुझे बतला दे। यह उद्योग में तरक्की की है।

बहुत से लोगों से सुना है कि अन्न की क्या दशा है। कहते हैं कि अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ा है पर साथ ही आबादी भी बढ़ गयी है। खेती की जमीन भी तो आबादी के साथ बढ़ी है। लेकिन कहते हैं कि आबादी के मुताबिक उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ा है। मैं कहता हूँ कि आज अनाज का भाव जो बढ़ रहा है यह देश को तबाह कर रहा है। इस वक्त बीज के लिए चने का भाव 35 रुपया मन है। इस बीज को डाल कर के किसान कमी भी खेती नहीं कर सकेगा, खाद्य नीति फेल होगी और पैदावार कम होगी।

इसके बाद मैं इमरजेंसी के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। कहते हैं कि इमरजेंसी है, उसके लिए युद्ध कोष में चन्दा दो। आपको यह जान कर ताज्जुब होगा कि इस सारी लोक-सभा और राज्य सभा में कुल 11 आदमी युद्ध कोष के लिए चन्दा दे रहे हैं जिनमें चार तो विरोधी दल के हैं, उन में एक मैं हूँ और एक डा० लोहिया हैं, और केवल सात कांग्रेसी सज्जन हैं जो कि युद्ध कोष में चन्दा देते हैं, और फिर कहते हैं कि देश के अन्दर इमरजेंसी है। जब देने की बात आती है तो इमरजेंसी नहीं है, लेकिन जब हम लोगों को गिरफ्तार करने की बात आती है तो कहते हैं कि इमरजेंसी है।

एक बात मैं और प्रज्ञ कर्णगा बैंकों के बारे में। यहाँ पर श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी नहीं हैं। पहले बैंकों से शेर खरीदने के लिए 50 सैकड़ा तक कर्ज मिलते थे लेकिन अबतक, नवम्बर तक सौ सैकड़ा की छूट हो गयी। अगर आप इसकी तह में जाएँ कि सरकार ने ऐसा क्यों करवाया तो आपको पता चलेगा कि वित्त मंत्री साहब के रिश्तेदार या कुन वाले या दोस्तों का सट्टा बाजार में दिवाला

[श्री बागडू]

पिट रहा था, इसलिए उन को बेंकों से छूट मिल गयी।

इसके बाद एक और बात आपकी खिदमत में प्रश्न करूंगा।

श्री यमुना प्रसाद शंख (जयनगर) :
सभापति जी, आप कोरम को भी जरा देखें।

Mr. Chairman: He is the last speaker. Hon. Members will listen with patience.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : कोरम का प्रश्न उठाया गया है तो ध्यान दे लें।

श्री बागडू : मैं एक ही बात कह कर समाप्त करूंगा। इस वक्त देश के अन्दर अष्टाचार बहुत है। उसको दूर करने के लिए नन्दा जी ने सदाचार समितियां बनायी हैं, लेकिन बाहर लोग उनको समाचार मलियां कहते हैं, कि नन्दा जी ने अपनी बातें समाचार पत्रों में छपवाने के लिए इन समितियों को बनाया है।

भाज कल मिलावट की बहुत बात चल रही है। हमारे प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी ने इस बात को छोड़ दिया। मिलावट यहां तक बढ़ गयी है कि स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री की फर्जी राख को देश में चारों ओर छिड़का गया।

यहां वसीयत की बात कही गयी। यह वसीयत की बात बड़ी भयंकर होती जा रही है। हम ने सुना है कि प्रतापसिंह कैरों भूतपूर्व मुख्य मंत्री, पंजाब, ने भी एक वसीयत की है कि मेरी राख के तीन हिस्से किए जाएं। एक हिस्सा मेरे पुत्र और पत्नी के सिर में डाल दिया जाए, एक हिस्सा कैबिनेट के मेम्बरों और असेम्बली के उन मेम्बरों के सिर में डाल दिया जाए जो मेरे पक्ष में उठा करते थे और तीसरा हिस्सा केन्द्र के पार्लिया-

मेंटरी बोर्ड के उन भाइयों को दिया जाए जिनकी बदीलत बे गद्दी पर बैठे हैं।

एक बात और कह कर मैं क्षमा चाहूंगा। भाज देश की हालत बहुत बिगड़ रही है। हमारे नन्दा साहब फिर भी मैमैन चैन की बात करते हैं। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इसी 4 तारीख को इसी बिल्डी में कचहरी में बरसरे इजलास मेरे साथी मुलजिमों को मजिस्ट्रेटों ने पिटाया और इसके लिए मीटिंग की कि इन पर किस दफा में मुकदाम चलाया जाए। श्री गोपालन और डा० लोहिया ने इस चीज को खुब देखा है। इस तरह से विरोधी सदस्यों का अदालतों में अपमान किया जाता है। इसकी ओर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता।

सभापति जी, और एक बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करूंगा। सदन के साथियों, यह पर जो बात कही जाती है वह देश के पांच या दस सैकड़ा लोगों की कही जाती है। भाज हिन्दुस्तान में जो खानाबदोश लोग हैं, जिनके रहने के लिए झोंपड़ी नहीं है, जिनके लिए तालीम का कोई इन्तिजाम नहीं है, उनकी गिनती इस देश में बस करोड़ हैं। इनकी ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। अन्ज कांग्रेस सरकार के खिलाफ जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव धाया है उससे ज्यादा कुछ नहीं हो सकता। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के दलित वर्ग के 25 करोड़ लोग उठ जाएं और इस देश के अन्दर जो जात पात है और जो नापुरादी का अलम है उसके खिलाफ पुर अमन बगावत कर दें तो हो सकता है देश के अन्दर जो हालत है वह खत्म हो। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

17.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, September, 18, 1964/Bhadra 27, 1886 (Saka).