

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I move:

"That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

12.44 hrs.

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri J. B. Kripalani on the 19th August, namely:—

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

Shriati Subhadra Joshi may now continue.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (बलरामपुर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे पहले कि कल जो बात मैं कह रही थी, उस पर आगे दलीलें दूँ, एक और बात की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूँ। हमारे यहां पर एक माननीय सदस्य डा० लोहिया साहब हैं। वह हिसाब किताब बहुत लगाते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के पैसे का। गरीब लोग टैक्सों के रूप में जो पैसा देते हैं, उसका वह बहुत हिसाब किताब रखते हैं और बताते हैं कि किस तरह उसको खर्च किया जाता है, कैसे वह खर्च होता है। मेरा ख्याल है कि जब वह बोलेंगे तो अपने भाषण में वह बहुत हिसाब किताब सदन के सामने रखने वाले हैं। मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करूंगी कि वह इस बात का भी हिसाब किताब लगायें कि उनकी पार्टी के लोग सदन का कितना समय खर्च करते हैं जो ठीक नहीं खर्च होता है और उस में टैक्स देने वालों का कितना रुपया रोज जाता है। जमातों के लिये प्रापेगंडा करने की जगह बाँर है। या

हम लोग जितने पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य हैं, जनता के नौकर हैं, उनकी भाषा में। फिर चाहे वह डा० लोहिया साहब हों या उनकी जमात के दूसरे सदस्य हों, चाहे मैं होऊँ या प्रधान मंत्री हों। जनता हमें तनख्वाह देती है और वह हम से आशा करती है, हमसे अपेक्षा करती है कि हम लोग यहां आयें और संजीदगी के साथ जनता के प्रश्नों पर विचार करें, कानून पास करें और जो भी काम करें, संजीदगी से करें। अगर हम लोगों में से कोई भी सदस्य या कोई भी जमात अपने प्रचार के लिये इस सदन का एक मिनट भी खराब करती है तो वह जनता के साथ न्याय नहीं करती है, जनता के साथ अच्छा व्यवहार नहीं करती है। मैं लोहिया साहब से दरख्वास्त करूंगी कि आज वह हिसाब किताब लगा कर सदन को या भी बतायें कि जब से उन्होंने तथा उनकी पार्टी ने या नई पालिसी अख्तियार की है, यहां हुल्लड़बाजी मचाने की, तब से जनता का कितना पैसा उन्होंने खराब किया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कल कर रही थी कुछ बातें जनसंघ के बारे में। जो जमातें इस शामिल बाजे में हैं और जिन्होंने अपनी आवाज बुलन्द की है, उनका मैं जिक्र कर रही थी। जनसंघ का नाजी तरीका है, लोगों को बढ़काने का, लोगों को डराने का। कहा जाता है कि ईश्वर गंजे को नाखून नहीं देता। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता इस जमात के साथ में कभी भी ताकत देने वाली नहीं है। यह जमात हिन्दुस्तान की संस्कृति और धर्म की रक्षा करने वाली अपने को समझती है और बहुत बढ़चढ़ कर इन बातों का नाम लेती है। चूंकि समय बहुत कम है, इस वास्ते मैं ज्यादा डिटेल्सज जाना नहीं चाहती हूँ। मैं एक नमूना आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूँ। मारे देश में भगवे झंडे के प्रति लोगों का बड़ा प्रेम रहा है, बड़ा प्यार रखा है। इस रंग के प्रति उनका इतना आदर रहा है कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में किसी ने

भगवा रंग देख लिया, तो उसके सामने अपना सिर झुका दिया। भगवा रंग त्याग और तपस्या का रंग रहा है। लेकिन जब से इस जमात ने उस रंग को तथा उसके झंडे को अपनाया है, जनता के अन्दर नफरत फैलाई है, भाई भाई और पड़ोसी-पड़ोसी को अलग कर दिया है, जब से इस जमातसे इस रंगको लेकर इयूमन बैल्यूज को चेंज कर दिया है, जब से उसने यह कहना शुरू कर दिया है कि जो सबसे ज्यादा मारता है व सबसे ज्यादा बहादुर है, जो सबसे ज्यादा लूटता है, वह सब से बड़ा हीरो है, तब से इस रंग को देख कर लाखों मातायें अपने बच्चों को आंचल में छिपा लेती हैं। उस रंग की आज यह हालत हो गयी है। ईश्वर न करें, कभी उनके हाथ में ताकत आ जाये, तो नामालूम ये क्या करने वाले हैं।

कल जब मैंने बहुत सी बातें बताईं तो इस दल के सदस्यों की तरफ से कहा गया कि आगनाइजर हमारा अखबार नहीं है, आज उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं उनका मैनफैस्टो अपने साथ लाई हूँ और उसमें से कुछ बातें आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूँ। उनका जो आर्थिक कार्यक्रम है, वह नेशनलाइजेशन के खिलाफ है, कैमिकल फटिलाइजर इस्तेमाल करने के खिलाफ है। बी० सी० जी०, वैक्सीन अगर बनेगा तो एक स्पेशल कमेटी बनाई जायेगी जो तय करेगी कि वह ठीक है या ठीक नहीं है। आयुर्वेदिक सिस्टम को नेशनल सिस्टम बनायेंगे, दूसरे सिस्टम बन्द कर देंगे। कार्यक्रम में सबसे बड़ा जो कार्यक्रम है वह है सारे नान-हिन्दूज को नेशनलाइज करने का, सभी जो हिन्दुस्तान में रहते हैं, उनको नेशनलाइज करने का, उनकी जो वालंटियर कोर है, आर०एस०एस उसके कहने के मुताबिक ईसाई, पारसी यहूदी मुसलमान आदि हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक नहीं है। जनसंघ का कहना है कि नान-हिन्दूज को नेशनलाइज करेंगे। मैं आदर पूर्वक मसानी साहब से पूछना चाहती हूँ, मुस्लिम लीग के आइयों से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि इस शामिल बाजे में शामिल होने से पहले क्या उनको

नेशनलाइज कर लिया है बड़े साहब ने? किस तरह से वे कर लिये हैं क्योंकि वे हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक नहीं है, इन लोगों के कनेक्शन के मुताबिक।

12.50 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

अब मैं कृपलानी जी के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ। उन्होंने गांधी जी को कोट किया है। मैं भी सोच रही थी कि गांधी जी को कोट करूँ, पर उनके कोट करने के बाद मैंने यह विचार छोड़ दिया। मुझे याद आ गया कि अग्रेजी की एक कहावत है : "डेविल कोटिंग स्क्रिप्चर्स"। मैं उसी को कहना चाहती हूँ। मालूम नहीं वह पार्लियामेंटरी है या नहीं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : है।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : उन के गांधी जी के कोट करने के बाद मैंने गांधी जी को कोट करने का विचार छोड़ दिया। उन्होंने करप्शन की बात कही। वे बुजुर्ग हैं, मैं इस में नहीं जाना चाहती कि वे किस तरह से कश्मीर कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी की इजाजत के बिना चले गये। वहाँ क्या करके चले आये यह मुझे कश्मीर के लोगों ने बतलाया। लेकिन मुझे इस का व्यक्तिगत ज्ञान नहीं है। मैं आचार्य जी से आदरपूर्वक पूछना चाहती हूँ कि अमरोहा में क्या सैकड़ों कार्यकर्ता खादी भंडार के नहीं थे? खादी भंडार सरकारी संस्था नहीं है लेकिन एक खास कार्य के लिये चलाई गई है, एलेक्शन लड़ने के लिये नहीं है। सैकड़ों वर्कर्स आये और कई घंटे वहाँ बैठे। मैं आदरपूर्वक पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या वे छुट्टी ले कर आये थे, क्या प्रिविलेज लीव ले कर आये थे, क्या कैंजुअल लीव ले कर आये थे? उनको जो इतनी छुट्टी मिली क्या वह उनको हर साल मिलने वाली छुट्टी है? मैं यह बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि मेरे पास कई कार्यकर्ता आये और जार जार रो कर कहने लगे कि हमें दो रोटी के टुकड़ों के लिये

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

इस काम के लिये मजबूर किया जा रहा है। जो यहां पर उन की जमात के लोग हैं उनकी बात नहीं कहती लेकिन जो दूसरे एम्प्लायीज हैं उनकी बात कहती हूँ। खादी भंडार के लोगों ने कहा कि वे एक एक तार कात कर जिस खट्टर के झंडे को बनाते हैं, कांग्रेस के झंडे को, जिस को हम लोग खरीद कर लेते हैं, दो रोटी के टुकड़ों के लिये उनको मजबूर किया जा रहा है कि वे उस को अपने पैरों के नीचे रो दें। और उस पर साईकिल का झंडा लगायें। यद् मैं वहां के एम्प्लायीज की बात कह रही हूँ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कृपलानी जी का झंडा क्या था ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : उन्होंने कहा कि हम नौकर हैं। हमारा दिल रोता है। मैंने अपनी जिवंदगी का बेहतरीन समय गांधी जी का नाम ले कर बिताया, कांग्रेस का नाम ले कर बिताया है। उन्होंने कहा कि आज हमारा दिल रोता है जब हम को नौकरी के लिये मजबूर किया जाता है कि हम गांधी जी के हत्यारों के साथ मिल कर काम करें। वे जार जार रोते थे। मैं करप्शन की बात करने वालों से पूछना चाहती हूँ . . .

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I say something on this? Because this question has been raised.

Some Hon. Members: She is not yielding.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But I should give an explanation.

Mr. Chairman: She is not yielding.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : इस वक्त आचार्य जी सरकार में नहीं हैं। एक छोटी सी जमात उनके नीचे है, खादी भंडार। अगर उसके कर्मचारियों को इतनी बड़ी तादाद में वहां बला जा सकता है कि वे जायें और एलेक्शन

के लिये काम करें, तब अगर कल हमारी सरकार को करप्ट साबित करके व. और उनके साथी कुर्सी पर आ जायेंगे तब जनता को देखना चाहिये कि क्या होने वाला है।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I should give an explanation. Am I not entitled to correct a mis-statement?

Chairman: The hon. Members had a free field to say what they liked. There is no necessity of correcting the Member then and there. There are others who follow the Member from your side, and they can try to correct, but there is no point in interrupting the speech.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I want only to correct a mis-statement.

Mr. Chairman: It is not a question of correction at every stage. There were so many mis-statements in so many speeches. The time of the House cannot be given for correcting every statement made by every Member.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But I have to give a personal explanation.

Mr. Chairman: Let her complete her speech.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I cannot even offer a personal explanation?

Mr. Chairman: Let her finish her speech. Then we shall see, if there is anything.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : अब मैं आपके सामने एक दूसरी बात जमात की रखना चाहती हूँ। मसानी सा ब ने बड़े दर्दनाक शब्दों में बात शुरू की और शुरूआत ऐसे की जैसे कि उनकी शिकायत कांग्रेस सरकार से यह है कि कांग्रेस सरकार ने समाजवाद का नाम लिया तो मगर समाजवाद ला नहीं रही है। उन्होंने अपना भाषण ऐसा या जैसे दिवे समाजवाद के बड़े हामी हैं। मुझे आप से अदब से अर्ज

करना है कि उनकी स्पीच के आखीर में जा कर साफ हो गया कि समाजवाद की वकालत से उन्होंने शुरू किया और बाद में प्राइवेट एंटप्राइज पर पहुंच गये। सब चीज साफ हो गई फिर भी मुझे कहना है कि य जमात टैक्सों का नाम ले कर, हाउस के अन्दर और हाउस के बा र गरीबों का नाम ले कर, बेरोजगारी का नाम ले कर पुराने राजाओं और महाराजाओं को और उनकी सत्ता को वापस लाना चाहती है। मैं आचार्य जी के आचार्य को कोट करना चाहती हूं। आचार्य जी के आचार्य राजा जी (Interruptions) उन्होंने "स्वराज्य" में कहा :—

"The hereditary principle would best suit such positions of honour and rank which are important, though not associated with real political authority. This is illustrated by the great popularity and continuing vigour of the institution of monarchy in England. In a lesser, but no less striking way this is demonstrated by the popularity and position still enjoyed by some of the bigger personalities among the rulers of the defunct Indian States. The Chief Ministers in these areas who enjoy vast political and other powers, have failed to reach upto the dignity and popularity still enjoyed by the ex-rulers."

इस में कोई शुबहे की बात नहीं रहती। आज भी टैक्सों का नाम लेते हैं कि टैक्सों से हिन्दुस्तान को छुट्टी नहीं मिली। पन्द्र वर्ष में सरकार ने जनता की तरक्की नहीं की है। समाजवाद नहीं आया है। यह लोग उसे डिफेन्ड करने को आ रहे हैं। सभापति महादय, कांग्रेस सरकार को तो पन्द्र वर्ष ही हुए। राजा महाराजा तो हजारों वर्षों से इस देश में राज्य करते थे, अंग्रेजों के आने से पहले भी राज्य करते थे। आज वे डिफेन्स की बात हम से कहते हैं, हालांकि सन् १९६० में राजाजी ने कहा था कि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट बार साइकोसिस

क्रिएट कर रही है। अंग्रेज हिन्दुस्तान में आये तो वे सिर्फ व्यापार करने आये थे। जिनकी मदद से स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के लोग आज हिन्दुस्तान के डिफेन्स की बात करते हैं। उन्होंने आपस में लड़ लड़ कर, झगड़ झगड़ कर अंग्रेजों का उस समय साथ दिया और हिन्दुस्तान को गुलाम बना दिया। क्या आज हिन्दुस्तान की जनता इस तरह के लोगों के हाथों में हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की रक्षा सोपने वाली है? आज गरीबी की बात करके वे कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को टैक्सों से मुक्ति दिलाने वाले हैं। लेकिन वे कुछ भी नहीं दिलायेंगे। आज भी हिन्दुस्तान के कोने कोने में लोग घूमते हैं, जहां पर लोगों के हाथ तुड़वा दिये गये, झोपड़ी उड़ा दी गई, जला दी गई, झोपड़ी की इज्जत उतार ली गई। वह लोग जो टैक्स लेते थे या नहीं लेते थे मगर गरीब की सारी कमाई उठा कर ले आते थे, आज मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहती हूं कि बेरोजगार के लिये आज उनके अन्दर दर्द है, गरीब के लिये उनके हृदय में दर्द है, कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता से वे कोई टैक्स नहीं लेने वाले हैं, कभी लिया नहीं उन्होंने, लेकिन आज जो बड़े बड़ें ताजमहल हैं, लाल किला है, जयपुर के महल, आमेर के महल, जयपुर का राम बाग हैं, यह सब कैसे बने हैं, यह मैं आप से पूछना चाहती हूं। न तो कभी इन में से किसी को काम करते नहीं देखा, कभी किसी के हाथ में छाले पड़ते नहीं देखे। क्या यह मजदूरी किया करते थे, क्या य टोकरी उठाया करते थे, क्या कारखानों में काम करते थे? आखिर कौन सी घन दौलद से यह महल बनाये गये हैं? वह सब किस के घन और दौलत से हुआ है? यह हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब किसानों और मजदूरों की पसीने की कमाई है। इस लिये आज जब यह लोग कहते हैं, जिस तरह से आचार्य कृपालानी ने कहा, कि हम जनता के लिये कह रहे हैं, मैं भी पीपल के लिये कह रही हूं, मैं हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के लिये कह

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

रही हूँ। मैं भी पीपल से कह रही हूँ कि मत धोखा खाओ इन आंखों में आंसू देख कर, ये हिन्दुस्तान की गरीब जनता के लिये नहीं हैं, ये अपनी खोई हुई सत्ता को वापस लेने के लिये कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

13 hrs.

मेरा तो यही निवेदन है, सभापति महोदय, कि ये लोग हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर समाजवाद नहीं चाहते। रंगा जी ने बार बार इस सदन में कहा है कि इस समाजवाद प्लान को हटा देना चाहिये स्क्रैप कर देना चाहिए, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर समाजवाद नहीं चल सकता। स्वतंत्र पार्टी को समाजवाद नहीं चाहिए। जनसंघ को फरटीलाइजर नहीं चाहिए। खाद नहीं चाहिए, पुराने तरीके चाहिए, उनको मशिनरी नहीं चाहिए। ये चीजें उनके मैनीफेस्टों में कही गयी हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हाथों में छाले पड़ गये मालूम होते हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आपके मुंह में छाले नहीं पड़ गए यह बोलते हुए।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : तो इस तरह के प्रोग्राम ले कर ये लोग आपसे में शामिल हुए हैं। जैसा कि मैंने कल कथा था, अब उनका अलग अलग बाजा नहीं बज सकता तो वे शामिल हो कर बाजा बजाते हैं। अगर आज उनसे अलग अलग बजाने को कहा जाए तो उनका बाजा नहीं बज सकेगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कांग्रेस में अलग अलग बाजा बज रहा है।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : इसमें सभी शामिल हो गए जिनका बाजा बजता है और जिनका नहीं बजता वे भी। कोई खाली बिगुल ले कर खड़ा हो गया। सदन ने यह कानून बनाया है कि इस तरह के प्रस्ताव के लिये कम से कम ५० वोट चाहिये। किसी तरह से उन्होंने इतने

वोट जमा किए और शामिल हो कर खड़े हैं। यह सब हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को धोखा देने के लिए है। मैं आप से प्रार्थना करूंगी और कहूंगी कि सदन इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करे और इस प्रस्ताव को अस्वीकार कर दे।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Sir, it is an attack on an institution; it is not only an attack on me but upon an institution and I must be allowed to clear the position and say what position the Gandhi Ashram occupies.

Mr. Chairman: Would it take a long time?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: No..... (Interruptions).

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: You can raise the point of order afterwards. I am not allowing him more than two or three minutes. I have now called Shri Kripalani.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): The point of order raises only in respect of the statement that he is going to make..... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Chairman: Let him have his say.

Shri A. P. Jain: The point of order is about that.

Mr. Chairman: I have listened to it; I said that I would give him an opportunity after the speech. I cannot give more than 2-3 minutes. If there is anything which is not relevant or which is going to be another speech, I have got the right to stop it..... (Interruptions.)

Shri A. P. Jain: It is a question of principle.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The Chair has given me permission.

Shri A. P. Jain: Let me raise the point of order.

Mr. Chairman: You can raise your point of order after I hear Mr. Kripalani.

Shri A. P. Jain: It relates to his explanation.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You can name him.

Mr. Chairman: He must proceed now; it must be relevant to the point.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Gandhi Ashram is an institution which produces Khadi. By being members of the Gandhi Ashram the members have not lost their citizenship rights and I allow members to take part in politics because this Ashram was founded for political work and khadi is also one of its activities. Some of the members of the Gandhi Ashram are in Government. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, Hon. Members should co-operate with me in maintaining order in the House.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The Secretary of the Gandhi Ashram has been for the last ten years standing on the ticket of the Congress; he has been a Minister in U.P. In his constituency also the Gandhi Ashram people went and worked.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I know it; I say it. In Allahabad, they have worked in the constituency of our Prime Minister. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Chairman: He should state facts and conclude.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am giving the facts. Then, one of the trustees of that Ashram is our Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): was.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He could have at that time or even afterwards found out whether there was any irregularity.

Shri Tyagi: (Dehra Dun): Does he belong to your Ashram?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: So, they have freedom to act as citizens of India and if they could bring one man, one member of the Ashram who says that he was coerced to work for me, I will resign my seat here. . . . (*Interruptions.*) I give freedom even to my wife to do what she likes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion moved by Acharya Kripalani. Listening to the speeches that have come so far from the Ruling Party, it appears that they are trying to make the point that the Opposition is not of one mind and they being not of one mind, weight should not be attached to what the Opposition has to say. This argument is the most fallacious. The Congress Party must also realise that although some of the Opposition Members do not see eye to eye on certain points and act diagonally opposite on some matters, they have expressed similar views on some points. Then, the Congress Party should also know that there are so many amongst them who do not agree expressly with the economic programme of the Congress Party and there is a good deal of bickering is going on and these bickerings are available for everybody to see in U.P., in M.P., in Kerala and in Gujarat, wherever you cast your eyes. If you turn round and see there are dissidents in Punjab. But this is no argument. Let us take the highest common factor that is available in the arguments and then decide whether the accusations that are levelled against the Congress Party are fit enough to hang down your heads in shame. If it is so, please get out; please go. Not that I make any personal accusation against anyone of

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

you. I do not. I am one of you; I was with many of you; I know that some of you have been very valiant workers. It is a pity that today I have to call upon our Prime Minister, a very valiant figure in the struggle of our country, to quit and give peaceful possession of the office which he holds. It is not with nay desire to run down the Government in a particular manner that this aspect is being put. The position is this. We cannot go on saying always, if Shri Nehru goes or if the Congress party goes or if the present Ministry goes, what will happen. Who comes in? Why should this proposition of "who comes in" be made? Is there a dearth of people in the country? Amongst you also there may be many who will be able to run it. The present set must change.

An Hon. Member: People die.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: People die. What did Gandhiji say when the Quit India movement was started? It was the pet argument of the British that if they went, "what would happen?" Chaos will happen. What Gandhiji was saying was "let there be chaos. You get away; you go away. Leave it to God, or whatever it is." Therefore, let us not put in any excuse and say "For God's sake we are there." You are not there for our sake. You are there for the sake of the country. You are there for national cause. If the nation says "you go," you go. *(Interruption)*.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): The nation says that the Prime Minister should stay. *(Interruption)*.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya will get an opportunity probably to reply to me and so he need not disturb me. I have heard with very great equanimity of mind the accusations that Shrimati Subhadra Joshi always showers upon the Jan Sangh. I have heard her patiently. She always walks out after

she speaks. So it is very difficult for me to tell her anything.

13:12 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

For 17 years our Prime Minister and many of his colleagues are there. Many things have happened in our country. What has led to the present position by which the Opposition has made up its mind to come before the House and move this motion? Where should the Prime Minister look? He must look at his friends, the Abdullas, Patnaiks, Menons—

An Hon. Member: Trivedis.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: If he calls me a friend, let him please look at me also, when I am telling him the positive truth which others dare not tell. Then after exhausting his friends, he must look to the *bhai*, Chou En-lai. He has trusted these friends and these friends have misguided him and have misled him. That *bhai* has cheated him and stabbed him in the back.

Shri Tyagi: That is what you are doing.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: One after the other let us take the picture which comes before us ever since partition had taken place. Jinnah, to begin with, had demanded that the whole of Punjab should go to him; the whole Bengal, the whole of Assam and the whole of Tripura should go to him. This was opposed and when the new picture was presented to him, he got very furious. But probably he was also fond of becoming a Prime Minister or a President and he ultimately yielded. What was the result? He got what we call a truncated Pakistan and we got what we call Hindustan with its limits shorn off. But he persisted in his policy of getting back these lands. He had his eye on Kashmir and had his eye on Assam. He had his eye on Tripura and the pressure of

Pakistan's continued in those directions. We have the picture of Kashmir. We can never forget it. The rulers of all the big States—Gwalior, Mysore, Baroda—simply signed and we had the integratin into our country. The same happened with the ruler of Kashmir. He signed, and yet, because of Sheikh Abdulla our Prime Minister agreed to have what we say a plebiscite. Why did it become necessary for us to have it and what is the trouble that is going on? That trouble started in 1947 and it has not yet ended. We made very brave speeches. We demanded back every inch of the land that has been taken from us and across which the ceasefire line was drawn. But have you succeeded in it? We are yielding. We are yielding by a slow process so that the people may forget the past. Thousands of square miles of our land have been taken away by Pakistan and we have done nothing whatsoever to demand them. And then over it came that great friend Chou En-lai who took away another 12,000 square miles of our land in Ladakh.

Having suffered all this, now, what are we negotiating? To save that Ladakh or to fight for that area of Ladakh—it may or may not prove useful to us—we are negotiating to give up the whole of Kashmir as a gift to Pakistan. Why are the negotiations on? They do not endear you to the country at large.

Let us look to the west and to the east. What is happening? We have been crying hoarse on this question of infiltration of Pakistani Muslims into Assam. A huge number is coming. Only last week we were given a table in which it was indicated that only 26,000 have been detected to have not left after they have been found out. This number is sometimes admitted to be more than 2,60,000, and admitted sometimes by the Government itself to be four lakhs and according to the public at large it is 26 lakhs. Our Prime Minister said,

"I stopped that deportation because it might have some repercussions". It gives a propaganda value to the Muslims of Pakistan, to Bhutto and to Gen. Ayub. What is that? The propaganda that it is the Indian Muslims who are being squeezed out gets in hand. We have not raised our voice even in the United Nations when the question arose to call for a declaration that genocide has been carried out purposefully by Pakistan. What is the present number of Hindus that are left now in Pakistan? How many were there when we partitioned? What is their number? Every time they have poured into our country. Certainly it was our duty to accept them as they were Hindus for this purpose, but at what cost? We are ourselves overpopulated. We are not demanding any piece of land from them. We yielded to Pakistan; we gave them Berubari because they wanted Berubari. We held a plebiscite for Sylhet and we gave Sylhet. We dare not ask for a plebiscite on the question of Karachi where we were 56 per cent. We dare not ask. Now, can we open our own eyes, knowing our own facts? Why do we dilly-dally? Why do we vacillate to carry out a policy which we are bound to carry out for protecting our border, for protecting our land, for protecting our subjects? Sir, this is the fate on the north and on the east.

Sir, that occasion is not forgotten by us when nine months back we rose as one man and made a solemn declaration in this House that we will drive out the Chinese, that we will fight till the last man and the Chinese must go. Some people make joke of us. Some people once in the Ministry and now in the House make fun of it and ask how we will fight till the last man. This was a solemn occasion and on that solemn occasion a solemn declaration was made in this House. Each one of us standing took a vow that we will fight till the last to drive out the enemy. Have we succeeded? Again the same vacillating spirit and the policy of appease-

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

ment has started. Are we the only persons who are afraid of death? Are we the only persons in this world who are going to be killed? Is it that we have to hang down our heads in shame saying that we are cowards, that we are acting timidly, all others are brave, the Chinese are brave, we are weak and we cannot fight the Chinese? Sir, we made a bad show. Yet, when now the opportunity comes we dare not walk one inch into the territory which has been vacated. Why? Because we are afraid of war. If we are afraid of war, the whole world is afraid of war. If we are afraid of killing, others are equally afraid of killing. Why should we be the only persons who always think in terms of being killed? I say, Sir, the time is ripe for us to make a march. I do not say these are mere brave words. No. It is a question of taking a decision and acting according to that decision without any vacillation. We should proceed ahead.

It is not only on that account that the public are feeling against the Government. That is one aspect. The other is corruption. What has happened to corruption? Has it gone down or has it only increased? Let us search our conscience and let us find it out whether we have been able to check corruption. It has grown so much that in some places amongst the non-officials, I should say, the contractors and others dealing with the Government, it has become a naturalised thing. They think that it is natural for them to be corrupt and unless they are corrupt they cannot get their work done and that anybody who is not corrupt is treated as a ninny, a nincompoop. They believe that such a man is not respected and he loses all his rights. I very recently came across a firm whose whole business in Delhi consisted only of providing first-class and air-conditioned travel facilities free of charge to certain officers who used to come from Calcutta or go from Delhi. That firm is doing no other business whatsoever, not even one penny worth

of any other business. Yet that firm is there and it represents big business magnates. Thousands of cases of under-invoicing have been detected by us. Many of the records have been destroyed. Records are not available even in the Reserve Bank of India. Five-year-old and six-year-old records have disappeared. The income-tax department insist upon the poor merchants to produce records even 12 years, 15 years and 18 years old, but in the case of the Reserve Bank, in the case of bankers, those records have disappeared.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Poor merchants do not pay any income-tax.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: All are your friends. Your turn also will come.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Because you know them very intimately, they seem to be your friends.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You also know them as intimately as I do, but you protect them, I do not.

Leaving this question of corruption, the top problem of food is before us. When I talk about food, I have got a very competent Minister before me. I have always looked upon him as a very competent man along with Shri Morarji Desai. I do not know why Shri Morarji Desai and Shri Patil have been picked up by the Communist Party and singled out for going out of the Ministry. If it is a question of competence, they are very competent. The question is this. What is the muddle that has taken place in our food administration which has brought about this situation? The muddle is corruption, corrupt officials, corrupt report from the State ministries, false reports from the States. The Minister here at the Centre act on the reports received from the States. They want to hide the actual stocks. They do not want to tell the truth even to the Ministers of their own party at the

Centre on whom they ought to have complete faith. That creates trouble.

What about sugar? Any amount of sugar was available more than six months back. What has happened suddenly? It has disappeared. You are quite happy in Delhi where you will get any amount of sugar you like to eat. But we who live in the villages are given only half kilo per month.

An hon. Member: One-fourth kilo.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: At least in my village it is half kilo. Can you imagine how I can maintain myself with half kilo sugar per month?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Why not?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We will maintain ourselves with even a quarter kilo of sugar if necessary. But how are we to maintain ourselves like that when you can purchase here one kilo every day if you like and we get only 500 grams in the villages. The question, therefore, is only this. The public are feeling as to what has happened about this food problem. Every day the prices are rising. Only today during the Question Hour it was said that we had a buffer stock of wheat and because of that buffer stock we were able to control the price of wheat. With very great respect, Sir, may I say to Shri Patil that continuously from 1959 the price of wheat has been slowly but surely going up and up. From Rs. 14 it has gone up to Rs. 22 in certain markets. A man who was able in 1939 to purchase wheat at the rate of Rs. 2 and maintain his family even though he was getting only Rs. 30 as salary, he has today to give Rs. 88 to get four maunds of wheat and even with a salary of Rs. 100 he is not able to maintain his family. That is the position that we see today.

What have we achieved in the direction of more production? Is food grown more? Have we achieved anything? I most respectfully submit, no. The growth is not what was anticipated and we are not doing anything in that direction. Why is it so?

As I have often remarked, this community development project is a wash-out. Please do something in this matter. This sixth wheel of Planning Commission must go. It has not served any purpose whatsoever. Let there be planning. There may be good planners. Proceed with the plans, make the country flourish and make it grow more. Every one of us will be happy.

If socialism means that you destroy one thing and build again, I do not believe in it. That is why I very seriously object to the Gold Control Order which has been passed under the colour of the Defence of India Rules. What is this Gold Control Order? If I have your permission, Sir, I will lay on the Table of the House these 387 telegrams that have been received by me from different parts of India. They are pouring in even now.

An Hon. Member: They may be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They cannot be laid on the Table. He may read one or two of them.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: If the rule permits, I can lay them on the Table. I will read only one because the contents are practically the same. It says:

"Gold control fails Government fail Rehabilitation of goldsmiths fail Morarjibhai should resign Withdraw gold control rule".

Shri Bade (Khargone): Now some goldsmiths are dying and yet some hon. Members are laughing. It is not a laughing matter.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not agree with the view that on that ground alone Shri Morarji should resign. But I do say with every emphasis at my command that the gold control rules have done the greatest damage to the country that could even be done. My estimate may be wrong and the number of goldsmiths may not be 20 lakhs. They are artisans who have learnt the art from their childhood, from their parents in their homes, not from any schools that we have provided for them. They want to preserve an old

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

art and that fits in with our traditions and our culture. Why were these 20 lakhs of goldsmiths thrown out of employment? For the sake of preventing gold smuggling. The other day a paper which is highly respected by Congressmen, *the Patriot*, published a news item that the Gold Control Order has failed and Rs. 2.68 crores worth of gold has been smuggled into during the last month. So, the Gold Control Order has not stopped smuggling; it is going on as merrily as before. Now, how are you going to rehabilitate all those goldsmiths?

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): Is gold smuggling going on as it was before?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The hon. Member may please sit down. His turn will come to speak.

You want to save a few crores by preventing gold smuggling and for that you have thrown out of employment hundreds of thousands of goldsmiths. Now you want to rehabilitate them by giving them Rs. 1,500 or 2,000 per-head. For what? Why waste this money? There is no justification whatsoever for this policy of permitting jewellery only of 14 carat gold. It is nothing but sheer obstinacy on the part of the hon. Minister to continue the policy that he has been pursuing so far. He must change his policy, look at the figures, study the conditions that are there....

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): He is incapable of that.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: No, he is capable of that. He must not hesitate to do what he feels is just and right.

Shi Tyagi: Do you want him to join your party?

An Hon. Member: Are you prepared to relieve him?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not want him to join my party; let him remain with you.

After dealing with the plight of the goldsmiths, I will come to another subject which has caused a lot of discontent among the poorer sections of

the society, and that is the introduction of the compulsory deposit scheme. A poor man who is drawing a salary of Rs. 125 or 130 is not able to make any compulsory deposit out of his savings. Yet, we are forcing him to do it. From where will he get the money to save and deposit? If he is a government servant, the only method by which he can increase his income is by having more and more of tips. He will feel himself drawn towards easy corruption. Therefore, I would submit that you should reconsider your views on this policy. One thing is patent, if anything has aroused the feelings of the poor man against you, it is the gold control order and the compulsory deposit scheme. Once the people have risen against you, it is difficult to pacify them.

Shri P. R. Patel: How are you going to finance the defence expenditure?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I will come to that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken 28 minutes while the total time allotted to his party is 29 minutes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would beg of you to give me forty minutes. The Speaker had agreed to give me forty minutes. It was settled on the day on which this question came up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time is distributed strictly on the basis of the strength of the party.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Anyhow, I would request you to give me more time.

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi was saying that we are against nationalisation. I am not averse to nationalisation of any industry for the benefit of the country and for the defence of the country; no, I am not. My party is not against nationalisation. I do not know from where Shrimati Joshi got this wrong information. But I am definitely of the view that we do not want nationalisation of every petty trade and small merchandise that are manufactured in this country. I will not agree to that.

Then she referred to the nationalisation of non-Hindus. She made a wrong translation of it. My party is the only party which proclaims that it does not believe in minorities. We believe in the Indian nation; one nation and one nation alone. My party has often declared that. I again declare here and now at the top of my voice so that she may hear that for me nationalisation only means *Bharatiyata*. Every Indian who lives in this land is an Indian first and Indian last. We do not recognise any minorities, be it a linguistic minority, religious minority, caste minority or any other minority. We must have only one nation. That is the only consideration that we must have; there should be no other consideration in our country. And once we decide or make up our mind not to recognise the most fatal thing that we ever recognised, the question of two nations in our country, our country will grow and become happier and happier as days pass. That is the position that our party has always taken, both here and in the various State Assemblies. So, there is absolutely no question of my party being against nationalisation.

Then, since I am speaking on behalf of the opposition, I would like to say, and I am sure everyone on this side of the House will join me in my view, for God's sake and for the sake of the country and for your own sake, do not utilise the Defence of India Rules for running down the opposition and for putting the opposition members behind the bars. That is not the proper way of doing

things. People have been arrested and put behind the bars because they happen to be Communists or members belonging to Jan Sangh, Swatantra, Praja Socialist or Socialist parties. That is not the right way of dealing with the Opposition.

It is our duty, our bounden duty, to have our own leader. It is our duty to establish an opposition against you which may succeed, which may aspire to succeed, in having a leader of its own. It is not for us to agree to this proposal that there should be one leader, just for the sake of Congress party. It is not proper. Therefore, to say that all those who do not believe in the existence of one leader and one leader alone are traitors. This, in my opinion, is using rather strong language, even if it is meant for the opposition. That method of approach should go.

Since the Deputy-Speaker is of opinion that I should not take a long time, I will finish my speech in another five minutes. I will now turn my attention to the foreign policy of this government. The foreign policy so far pursued by our Government has not shown that we do really believe in non-alignment. Have we believe in non-alignment? Or, are we non-aligned? This question crops up every now and then. We always think in terms of friends. We cannot afford to displease the Arabs because we are in a way aligned with the Arabs. So, we do not speak with Israel. Otherwise, why can we not recognise Israel? Why should we not have diplomatic relations with Israel? I cannot understand it. Then, when it came to the question of the rape of Hungary, we kept quiet. Are we non-aligned then? When it came to the rape of Tibet, we were non-aligned. Did we act like that because we were non-aligned or because the other party was a *goonda*? When it came to the question of Suez, although we were in the Commonwealth, we

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

jumped against Sir Anthony Eden. Why did we do it? So, it is very clear that there is no question of non-alignment and it is only a question of our yielding to pressures coming from *goondas* whom we cannot conquer, whom we cannot threaten. Tangiers was dear to us; Algiers was dear to us; Morocco was dear to us; all sorts of things were dear to us but our own people living in Ceylon and in Burma were not dear to us; our own people living in Indonesia were not dear to us! The policy of vacillation and throwing our own people at the mercy of others must end. He is a bad father who beats his own child; if he is strong enough, he beats the other.

Shri Tyagi: That is what you do.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Two things remain for me to mention. They are the Voice of America Deal and the question of Air Exercises. Divergent views have been expressed for reasons best known. We have to stand on our prestige when we have once signed a paper. The hon. Prime Minister remembers that. In this very House he mentioned when the Nagaland Bill was there that he gave an undertaking that he will name it Nagaland. It was on this single promise that it was named Nagaland although we all persisted and asked to name it Naga Pradesh or Naga Desh but not Nagaland. But the hon. Prime Minister said, "I gave the promise and we will carry out that promise." The same promise of the hon. Prime Minister comes on the question of plebiscite in Kashmir. If that is so, what makes the hon. Prime Minister to back out from that position when he had signed and initialled the Voice of America agreement? Right or wrong, it is there and it should remain for the prestige of the country. . . . (Interruption). I know, the Communist friends are also agreeable to this that the prestige of the country must remain.

On the question of air exercises we are going to sit as mere stools? We will watch how the others fly. We will enjoy the *tamasha*. But it is possible that this *tamasha* may also lead to your learning something. There is nothing wrong in learning from people the art of flying well, the art of defending our country, the art of taking big risks in flying. We are not well-equipped. We know that we are not well equipped. We had been sleeping over our defence and we had allowed things to drift. Therefore when our country is faced by the present position created by the Chinese monster and by the Pakistani mischief-mongers, I should say that we must be on the alert and should act not in a vacillating manner but in a manner befitting our country.

I should, therefore, say that a mountain moving bulldozer is necessary to scrap up and throw off the dead mass of the monstrous government which has gone out of gear and is indeed a deadweight on the Indian soil. Many mistakes have been committed by us and let us not repeat those mistakes. The first mistake that we committed is willingness to leave our affairs in a few faltering hands. We have done wrong. The second mistake is self-indulgence. That also must stop. The third mistake is an easy giving in to fear, timidity and cowardice. The fourth mistake, which many of us have committed, is hero worship. It should cease. The fifth mistake is belief and faith in the friends of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, like, Kairon, Abdulla and Patnaik. These things should go. I should say, let these things stay; the only thing is that this Ministry must go.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Sir, at the outset I must confess that I was disappointed when I listened to the speech of Acharya Kripalani when he moved his motion regarding want of confidence in the Council of Ministers. A person of his standing in our

public life who has spent the best part of his life in the company of Gandhiji and Pandit Nehru would, I thought, devote at this juncture some thought to the pressing problems that are facing us and would not drag the debate to the level of the market place. It was expected of him because I feel some fundamental thinking is called for. If he had thrown some light from a national angle on certain drawbacks in the situation, it would have been most welcome.

But what has he done? Unfortunately he has succeeded in bringing round together the most incompatible, chaotic, mutually self-contradicting elements together to agree to a one-line motion. This feat of his is comparable to the feat of our old well-known Acharya Panini. As you know perhaps, in order to impose a certain discipline on Sanskrit grammar and evolve a system, he lumped together three divergent creatures, *swa yuwa* and *maghawa* in his famous sutra. Among these three creatures there is nothing common and in order to impose some discipline, they were lumped together so as to evolve a system.

Unfortunately, there are two Acharyas sitting on the front benches of the Opposition. The ancient Acharyas had some self-imposed discipline but Acharyas here are not amenable to any discipline. That is perhaps their highest quality. He brought about the Swatantra, Socialist, Sangh, the SSS, unity to sponsor a motion and this House must take very seriously what that motion reflects or represents.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: National integration.

Shri Khadilkar: I will come to it whether it is disintegration or integration. That motion reflects bitterness and frustration of certain elements in this country who are incapable of keeping pace with the present revolu-

tion and a change in society and in the world. They are incapable of grasping the fundamental change that is taking place all around and in this country. Therefore, they are viewing things from a certain static angle.

The Grey Eminence, the High Priest of the Swatantra Party, Shri Rajaji, has laid down certain policies which were propounded in a clever manner by their exponent, Shri Masani. His speech was very clever but equally vicious. I am going to say why it is vicious and expose it. When I say "Grey Eminence", I would like to re-find this House and particularly the Jan Sangh friends that Grey Eminence was a well-known Pontiff in European history who by his diplomacy brought about chaos in Europe. That is well known. Even now what is Rajaji, the High Priest of the Swatantra, preaching? What is common between the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra? I cannot understand that. Only the other day he has written about Kashmir. We know his philosophy. When the question of Pakistan had not even taken shape, he gave shape to Pakistan and to the division of this country by persistent propaganda. "Divide and get whatever you might and rule over it."

Regarding Kashmir he came out with the statement, "Hand over Kashmir to some authority either under joint control or under international authority." A secessionist by temper he has advocated that. This House has considered secessionist activity as treason. I will not be surprised if, God forbid, one day His Grey Eminence gets hold of power in this country, he would advocate some sort of a secession of our territory to appease our enemy at the border without compunction. This is Rajaji with whom these Jan Sangh people are co-operating. (Interruption).

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): He is not here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is referring to his Party.

Shri Khadilkar: I am surprised what is common between those republicans who represent social proletariat in this country? What is common between them and Mr. Masani? I am surprised what is common between DMK who have their own philosophy and him? Whatever it is, I know some of them, young people coming from the hill areas, have their grievances. But why they have joined hands in sponsoring a motion of No-Confidence, I fail to understand.

Last, but not the least, I come to Dr. Lohia, as I know him since 1934 with his German background. Because he was brought up in Germany, he always stands on his head when he thinks about the problems. Perhaps, when he was studying in Germany, the fascist philosophy was rising and certain traits are still lingering in his philosophy that his followers should guard against. He calls it grass-root socialism. I expected, at least in the question of propagating socialism he will not make, as he has propounded again and again, any opportunist alliances with Opposition or with any other group.

Now, I would like to come to Mr. Masani. He has challenged the very fundamentals of our national policy. I am not worried about petty grievances voiced here and there. Acharya Kripalani is repeating his arguments, as we know, time and again in this House, which in his old-age perhaps is permissible.

As far as others are concerned, they are also ventilating their grievances. But Mr. Masani has developed a consistent philosophy and placed it before the House in not so a subtle manner advising our party, "Beware, you and the country are likely to surrender your power and go out of office, unless you take lessons from me". What are those lessons? "You isolate your leader and find out a new leader who will be amenable to

Swatantra philosophy and rule the country". While playing this game, when he is advocating it, he is trying to be very very clever without giving any offence. And what he challenged? He challenged the fundamentals of our foreign policy. He challenged the fundamentals of our economic policy. I would appeal to this House that it is not a question of a formal vote on this occasion; it is not a question of negation of No-Confidence motion. I want this House to register a positive reaffirmation of their faith in the fundamentals of the policy of the leadership that has guided this country during the last 16 years. When I say this I say it with full confidence. These people stalwarts, sitting in the Opposition, have forgotten one thing that during the course of the struggle for freedom, it was not simply the urge to drive out foreign power. Behind that urge for freedom was a vigorous urge for social freedom, a radical social change. This fact was recognised by the leaders in our country. So many countries have failed in this. They failed to accommodate that social urge within the political framework and, therefore, they have several difficulties—changes of Government. The credit for realising necessity goes to this Government. Those who are dispassionate students of history, while analysing the social forces behind it will admit that this Government has successfully contained this social urge within a democratic framework and made democracy a viable thing. That has stabilised here. I say it with greater confidence. Whatever the embittered souls might say, the people, the responsible heads of the Governments in the West and the responsible press there recognise that all of the countries that have been freed, India is a viable and stable democracy. And, therefore, the Soviet Union as well as the Kennedy's Administration have come with massive aid not only for the sake of defence but at the same time to build up our economy. This aspect must be clearly understood.

Then, they argue that non-alignment has failed. Why? It is because China has attacked India. What a funny argument! They say, Pandit Nehru said again and again, and rightly said, it is not an attack of communism; it is an attack of China's present leadership, their expansionism and they consider isolating communism from this attack is something quite wrong. Mr. Masani argued that we must take shelter like Turkey, like Pakistan and like Iran under the protection of the west. What countries to compare! I would like to advise him to read the recent survey made by an Independent Economist regarding Turkey. Turkey is protected with military might but that economist has observed that two-thirds of the national income is swallowed up by that machine and Turkey could not make any significant advance. Does he want to recommend this course to us? Does the Acharya who has followed Gandhi want to recommend this course to this country? So far as non-alignment is concerned, I am proud to say, whatever our Prime Minister pleaded for the last 15 years is bearing fruit.

Now, recently, a certain understanding between two super powers has been reached. Somebody might say, what significance it has to us? They do not realise that because of this understanding, all the under-developed countries of the world are going to benefit. There can be a certain amount of assurance of peace: China feels that in this under-developed region there is the same old revolutionary urge which had its romantic appeal or edge. China is mistaken. The Soviet Union has realised that there is a greater hunger for development in this part of the world. The people have greater hunger for social justice and greater hunger for economic and other advance and certain stability. They want to attain stability. China wants to attack it and in this conflict when the Soviet Union and America have come to some understanding on this problem, we are assured, because of the lessen-

ing of tension in this region, we can think of building up of our democracy in peace according to our thinking, according to our national genius. This is a prospect it has opened. But who was the sponsor of the original motion? India was the sponsor in the United Nations. Short memories here on that side may not like to admit or remember this. I say with pride, it is we who sponsored it. We persisted in it. We were ridiculed in this House for this and still I can draw comfort in this thought that two big powers have come together and they have come together with the view that the problems cannot be solved basic conflict cannot be resolved with the military might but will have to be solved by some other method in Europe.

Then, they argue about the Voice of America deal or air exercises. Do they realise what they are saying? I would like to appeal to Acharyaji, "In this country do you want to intensify cold war?" We fought for the easing of tension in Europe and the stalwarts here Acharyajis, are pleading, "Oh, do whatever you like. It does not matter whether it brings cold war on our border." What is wrong in it, they say.

14 hrs.

But while you make that agreement, we must be very cautious that no ground is given even to our opponent to say that you are creating new tensions. This will not lead to any solution of the problem. What is the problem facing us? It is being said here on this side 'Oh, you have been defeated because they want to build up a certain psychology of helplessness and defeat in this country.' Do they realise that in some small corner of our country the army might have suffered a little reverse? Does it constitute a defeat? Do you want to build up a psychological defeat in this country or do you want to stand on strength because in the final analysis, we must understand very clearly that the problem of

[Shri Khadiilkar]

border conflict with China is not going to be solved by military might? We must be prepared; we cannot take chances. Equally important is the diplomatic front. Diplomatic front is a part of defence that must be understood and I am confident that one of these days, China will have to come round and discuss and ultimately we will have to sit together and solve this problem. On the border—if we go to war or China goes to war—China is not possibly in a position to go to war because we are strengthened by help from all the friendly countries, particularly America and Soviet Union, China knows it fully well.

Therefore, the perspective must be very clear. Those who shout about defence should understand the problem that we are facing to-day—problem of economic crisis, problem of shortages—which is the result of the Chinese aggression. I do not think that Shri Morarji Desai was very happy when he presented his budget. When he puts such a big burden is he not conscious that we are spending nearly Rs. 900 crores on defence?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He looked very happy.

Shri Khadiilkar: These considerations are bound to come up; dislocation in the economy is bound to take place. Let this House realise that they are clamouring for defence build up, they must realise that the defence and military machine sometimes eat up the whole economy and undermine democracy. Am I wrong if I accuse these people that they are bent on undermining democracy in this country and that it is their purpose in moving this Motion of No-Confidence?

Therefore, when I say the defence must be looked at in a proper perspective, the diplomacy is also part of defence, without fear or contradiction I can say then with faith that the policy of non-alignment—non-involvement—pursued during the last sixteen years

has borne fruit. To-day, we can say that we have the whole world on our side. Just as Hitler in the last war had to face in an isolated manner, the democratic might of the world, China is in the same predicament. India being a democratic nation, the socialist countries are behind us standing shoulder to shoulder and defending us and our freedom. This aspect, if we take into consideration, I am sure, every Member will realise that there is no weakness. But, the weakness is being generated by those taking advantage of our peculiar position created by the Chinese aggression and certain deficiencies in our economy. They want to build up a psychological demoralisation and defeat and helplessness: Shri Masani quietly would say 'Look here, your own Leader has let you down. Leave the economy in the hands of Free Enterprise; remove all controls and the Free Enterprise magnates will have the super-control over the economy.' Then Shri Masani will be very happy. He depicted a picture. It will be a paradise. There won't be shortages; there won't be any price rise or anything of the sort. We must be aware that this philosophy of Free Enterprise has been discarded as a bankrupt doctrine in the West even by the Anglo-Americans. This doctrine he is propounding here because he has built up a grand alliance of reaction in this country. For the first time, I am very happy that the reaction has come together under one banner and they have got a blessing of Grey Eminence or the high priest of Swatantra Party, Shri Rajaji. Therefore they could propagate with some prestige in this country. I would, therefore, plead and humbly plead that every Member of this House, whether he belongs to this side or that side, should decide about one thing whether he agrees with Shri Masani's philosophy which is incorporated in their party manifesto 'Just abolish the Planning Commission', and everything would be alright. Remember this. Do you believe that the Planning Commission should go? Do

you believe that the destiny of this country should be left to the ex-rulers, a few landlords and ex-princelings and magnates who have the monopoly control? If you believe like that you are free to vote with the motion moved by Acharya Kripalani. Because, Acharya Kripalani has no coherent thinking. The thinking has been done taking advantage of the disunity, by Mr. Masani, and in a wise manner and statesmanlike manner advising the Congressmen and the people to follow him. If we have no faith in the basic policy you can go with him. I would like, let there be a free vote, it does not matter, no whip. Let us reaffirm our faith; it is not a negative vote; I want a positive vote in the policy that we have pursued, the policy of gradual economic development, containing the social urges for freedom and social justice and stability that we aspire to have internally and externally, the friendship with all nations.

One or two more points I will touch and I will finish. The word 'corruption' is bandied about. I know there is corruption. But has any one from the opposition,—particularly I would request Acharya Kripalani who has moved with Gandhiji—applied his mind to this? This is a social evil, particularly in the post-war era. In a democratic set-up, in the early stages of a democracy, certain corruption creeps in. We faced the problem of integration by calling a conference and evolving a certain code. Why not apply your mind to face this evil of corruption in a similar fashion on a national level? Why do you want to bandy about words and carry on a character assassination, knowing full well that when you throw that word you create a certain demoralisation in the country? And in the same breath you say that you want to fight the Chinese. You want to be very brave and you think the present Government is not equally brave. This is a problem which you must face, which I must face, boldly.

There is another question. He referred to it and therefore I have to say a

word about it. He referred to the Kamaraj plan and he said, "You are placing party before Government". I would like to have particularly the reaction of Acharya Kripalani to this. Is it not in keeping with the line of the national struggle and the teachings of Gandhiji? What is wrong there? Certain values we want to restore to our public life, and a supreme effort is made to restore those values to the party and to the Government. What is wrong in it? Is it an attempt to place party before Government? I would like to appeal to those who are sitting on this side to give a patient thought to this aspect of the problem when they want to ridicule the idea.

In conclusion I would like to say one word and then I will finish. Looking to the whole aspect, the one thing that has happened in this country is that an awareness of revolution has been shown throughout this period by Pandit Nehru. It is not a question that he is the leader of the party; he is much more than that, and therefore I say this. He has before him a certain world vision. We are not isolated. And therefore, when we were attacked by the Chinese, if he had raised the cry, as some people on this side would have liked, "Oh, it is an attack of Communists" and raised an anti-communist front on this side, would it have been possible for the non-aligned countries to rally round us; would it have been possible for the Soviet Union to come forward with a massive aid to us? If we take this aspect of the problem into consideration, I feel that this bogey that has been raised is a bogey just to hoodwink the people.

Therefore, in conclusion I would plead that what we are debating today is very significant. There are possibilities of committing mistakes. I do not say the Government has not committed mistakes. That would be wrong and dishonest on my part. Government has committed mistakes. A certain dynamism in our planning

[Shri Khadilkar]

is lost; it has got warped up. We have to correct it. And if we do not correct it, it is just possible that it will go in the wrong direction. These are things which have to be taken very seriously; but when a challenge comes to the fundamentals we must re-affirm our faith and dedicate ourselves not only just for defence in a vague term but we should dedicate ourselves to the fundamentals, the fundamental policy which has stabilised our country in this part of the world.

One last word. Mr. Maşani referred to the rupee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are too many "last words"!

Shri Khadilkar: He said that the rupee is falling. I just want to give him, and this House, an information. While in U.S.A. I happened to discuss the problem of the rupee and our external currency question with some people, and one of the biggest bank executives told me, "Look here, so far as the Indian currency is concerned, it is a soundest currency". And what does it indicate? He told me in confidence.....

An Hon. Member: Don't break the confidence.

Shri Khadilkar: Just listen. He said, "The currency quotation in the black market is a positive indicator of its soundness, and the rupees stands very high in this if you just look beyond the Mediterranean."!

Sir, with these words I thank you for the opportunity given to me.

14.13 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Anthony.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): You said, Sir, that you would give your ruling regarding the adjournment motion on the point of order.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): On the Bombay strike.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I reserved my ruling on the point of order raised by Shri Banerjee and Shri Daji. I have gone into the remarks made by the hon. Speaker. In fact, the Speaker has confirmed my ruling disallowing the adjournment motion. There is no such assurance given as Shri Daji pointed out. In fact, he has stated that facts should be elicited, and then there is the no-confidence motion, the point can be raised here and the reply may be given by the Government, then, if not satisfied, an adjournment motion may be raised. That is for the future. Therefore, I hold that there is no point of order. We will proceed with the discussion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, have you seen the proceedings?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, I have got it here.

Shri Anthony.

14.14 hrs.

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

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this first ever no-confidence motion undoubtedly is a significant occasion. Very respectfully I would like to postulate some basic premises, because I believe they are necessary if we are to see this debate in perspective.

Many of the things we do on both sides of the House are the result of certain compulsive contradictions in our political life. This very no-confidence motion is a reflection of that contradiction. Not even the most deleterious mad hatters can think—and the opposition know it—that it can lead logically, as it should or it might, to an alternative Government or to the exit of this Government. One of the weaknesses of our parliamentary life

has been the absence not only of an alternative democratic party but the absence of a reasonably strong opposition. A virtual one-party system such as we have had produces inevitably trends not only towards a monolithic political structure but to some of the unhealthy features of totalitarian rule. Because of that, virtually an irremovable ruling party, the longer it rules inevitably it suffers increasingly from power drunkenness with all its accompanying evils,—arrogance, complacency, an increasing indifference to a sense of duty and of work and, above all, to an increasing vested interest in the spoils of office, with the accompaniment of party faction, intrigue and blatant corruption.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): How is it irremovable? You are at perfect liberty to remove it.

Shri Frank Anthony: Virtually, I say. That is one of the contradictions of our political life. I can reassure my friend who has just got up that I am not blaming him, I am not blaming his Government, I am not blaming his party. I say this that whatever has happened is a reflection of the contradictions in our political life. No one is solely to blame. These contradictions are a legacy of history. They are more a legacy of these contradictions as I have said in our political life. A complementary weakness, I say a complementary weakness, has been a weak, a splintered opposition. Most of the groups on this side hardly deserve the name of groups. They are more political shavings. That also is a legacy of history. That also is a reflection of the compulsions of our political life. I want the House to try to understand it. There are so many compulsions, the vast size of the country and not least, a predominantly illiterate electorate unable to appreciate even remotely basic economic and political issues. Because of that voting is cast very inevitably along regional, parochial, communal and caste lines. These are the divisive compulsions which are inherent in our political life in the country. (*Inter-*

ruption) Oh, you have an internal sabotage party allowed to function here.

Shri Inderjit Gupta: It is safer to be nominated. Shri Anthony has never had the experience of an election.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: How does Shri Anthony know what happens in a General election?

Shri Frank Anthony: It is not necessary so far as the elective character is concerned, but my friend may have a certain elective capacity as a frog in the well. In my own humble way I possess 90 per cent representative capacity. What I represent is more than what he will ever represent in several incarnations. And that is why I am able, although nominated, to sit in the front bench of the opposition and to say what my friend would never and in so many incarnations dare to say.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: I admit I am not the master of inventions as Shri Anthony is.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Fight the election and see what happens to you.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have limited time. I am more than capable of replying to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no disturbance.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Our constitution allows this nomination. Therefore he has as much right to say what he has to say.

Shri Frank Anthony: My constituency is unique because I have to cover every nook and corner of this country, much more than them. I know what is happening in the country. Why does this Independent Parliamentary Group not support this no-confidence motion? Because, we felt that in the face of these dangers, not only external but internal for the survival of democracy, it is necessary to take a balanced and an objective view. And I am endeavouring to do

[Shri Frank Anthony]

that. And I say this, that whatever the weaknesses and shortcomings of the congress party may be today, whatever they might have been, the congress party has stood between the country and chaos. I say that. I say that the congress party has in the tempestuous critical post-independence period..... (Interruptions) May I have this barracking a little less, Sir? They can have a little more barracking when I come to them. As I was saying, in this tempestuous post-independence period, with all its shortcomings, the congress party has given to the country democratic continuity. It has given to the country political coherence. I admit it. And today, Sir, one of the greatest dangers to the country—this I say very respectfully—to the country, is this. One of the greatest internal dangers to the survival of our democracy and to our unity has been caused by the new compulsive lobbies of regionalism, casteism and communalism in a new and different form. These are the new compulsions. And I say this with great respect to my socialist friends of different shades on this side. Different variants of socialism are not going to make any real appeal to an electorate which is predominantly illiterate because whatever thunder you may have had, has at least from the doctrinal point of view been stolen by the ruling party. And I do not want to pay any special tribute to the Swatantra party. I believe that regional parties, communal parties are not going to make any contribution to the growth of healthy parliamentary traditions. And I say this. People may not agree with me. They may call the Swatantra by all kinds of names, conservatives, rightists, ultra-rightists. But I say this. For the first time during independence this party has marked—I am not likely to join them—this party has marked the emergence of not of an alternative democratic party at least of a party which provides some fundamental democratic contrast, maybe, complete democratic contrast, and it is necessary that you

must have some kind of a democratic contrast if there is going to be any kind of health in our parliamentary democracy. When Shri Khadiolkar talked—I don't say it was in bad taste, I think it was a little gratuitous—about ex-princes, and so forth. But I want to say this to my friends in the ruling party. Do not apply any unnecessary political unctions to our soul. What I say is this. Whatever contradictions you find in the splinter groups on this side, the same contradictions in much larger numerical measure are reflected in the congress party. The congress party today has in its political and economic content people who are spiritually, economically and politically a kin with all the elements on this side. There are more princes, more millionaires in the congress party than in the whole of the opposition. There are more revivalists, more communalists in the congress party than in all the communal reactionary parties in this side. And I think that privately many of the congress members will agree with me that there are certainly more hypocrites, certainly more self-righteous prigs. (Interruption). Let me repeat that here. There are certainly more hypocrites. There are certainly more self-righteous prigs, certainly more would be political sanyasis among the congress than on this side. (Laughter). That may be a laughing matter, but the next is a serious matter. In the context of the emergency, charged with infinite danger to the country, with an infinite potential for internal treachery and sabotage, there are more communistic, more crypto-communists, more fellow-travellers in the congress party than on this side of the House.

Sir, I say this, and I am trying to strike a balance. What is the good of abusing the government the whole time? I don't say that Government does not require to be censured. It ought to be censured every day, day in and day out till it shows an increasing response to the needs of the people. But it is a barren occupation

abusing the government. Let us ask ourselves this question. Who is prepared on both sides of the house to pay the price of real unity in the face of an emergency? Who is prepared to stop grinding his own political axe? Who is prepared to stop collecting for a little while his own grist for his own political mill—grist which may grit the country apart? I say this, Sir, and I repeat it that, today, India is the sole surviving bastion of democracy in Asia because of the congress party with all its weaknesses. I hope the Prime Minister would not take it amiss, but I say this that with all his contradictions, with all his vascillations, and with great respect to him, with all his political ambivalences he is the symbol, the talisman of political unity in the country.

What is the good of our questioning something which is axiomatic? He alone has the necessary image in the public mind to evoke and to activate that unity.

Sir, there was also another reason why we did not support this no-confidence motion. I certainly am not prepared to accept the sweeping assertions because it stems from malice or ignorance to say that the congress party has done nothing for the country. I am one of those who believe that whatever you call it, whether it is underdeveloped economy or developed economy planning is absolutely essential if we are going to make any kind of economic progress.

I agree wholeheartedly that we must have a strong and increasingly strong industrial base. Because I believe inevitably that if at any time we are to break through this vicious inhibiting economic circle which inhibits all under-developed economies, it will only be a projection from that industrial base. I do not agree with my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani who would appear to want us to continue with a bullock-cart economy.

And I say this that I am not going to canvass the achievements of the

Congress Party. They have got much more time and many more speakers, but I say this, Let us look briefly at some of the things.

Even in agriculture—my hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil is not here; he is rather in the doldrums today—there has been a measure of progress. But it is my estimate that there has been some failure. And what have been the reasons for the failure of, and lack of progress in, agriculture? I put it down to two reasons, lack of adequate funds and the greater reason the failure of the State administrations. I do not want to say anything too much about that. I am not indicting them personally, but I say that the failures of the Plan, the failures in health, the failures on education, the failures on agriculture have been the failures predominantly of the State administrations. And I say this also that other parties and powers in the States would not have done much better if they would have done anything better. The failure of the State Governments has been the failure of regionalism. The failure of the State Governments has been the failure of decentralisation in the context of a predominantly illiterate electorate. That is my thesis. And I join issue with the Prime Minister here. We are largely a politically immature people, even our leaders; we are a people who lack practical political sense. Because somebody has passed a slogan down to us from the past, we are repeating it in a parrot-like fashion—A democracy at the grass-roots, democratic decentralisation. I also accept it as a principle, as a basic principle, but surely the first postulate of the success of democracy at the grass-roots is a minimum of education. Surely, it is axiomatic that a proliferation of power by people who are illiterate or semi-illiterate must mean a corresponding proliferation of inefficiency, malpractice and above all, corruption. Do we not see it around us every day? What has happened? The lower the rung of the administra-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

tion, the greater the maladministration, and the greater the corruption. Take the municipal level. Whether they are the PSP or the Congress, or the Jan Sangh people, do we not find people relatively more inefficient and relatively more corrupt? We find that there is a hierarchy, a hierarchy of efficiency or lack of it. I believe that at the Centre there has been more efficiency relatively than in the States, that in the States, there has been relatively more efficiency and less corruption than at the municipal level, and I believe that even the municipal level will show that they are less inefficient and less corrupt than when the panchayats begin really to function. That, Sir, is my reading of the position.

And may I say with great respect,—and I say, with great respect,—the House furnishes an example of what is happening? When this House becomes more representative of this predominantly illiterate electorate with more and more illiterates or semi-illiterates coming into this House, then inevitably, inexorably, parliamentary standards and parliamentary traditions, and ordinary parliamentary decorum will deteriorate.

Shri Tyagi: I protest.

Shri Frank Anthony: That is when they come. They have not come yet. As regards who have come, I would not say anything. But when they come, we can expect that.

And I say this. Who is prepared to pay this price among the parties on both sides to call a halt to democratic decentralisation, to so-called democracy at the grass-roots, unless you have the pre-requisite, the prerequisite of a minimum of education? Nobody is prepared to pay the price either on this side or on that side. Who is prepared to pay the price, to face one of the greatest dangers to everything that we are doing in this country, namely

the population explosion? As somebody has correctly said, everything we do will be completely overtaken by this. We may call not Acharya Kripalani and his cohorts, but may call all the archangels from heaven to run this country, but even what they do will be completely overtaken by this runaway population. The problem is: How are we to control it? There is no way unless we pay the price. Is my hon. friend prepared to pay the price? This kind of family planning which is peripheral, is bound to be utterly and completely ineffective. Are we prepared to pay the price that Japan paid? Are we prepared to do that? Is my hon. friend prepared to get up now and say 'Yes, I shall endorse legislation to legalise abortion? That was the only way by which Japan was able to control that population explosion which was not half as powerful as ours. We will have to pay, if we are going to face this danger, a greater price. We will have to go in almost for mass sterilization. I am postulating basic issues. Who is prepared to pay this price? Everything we do will be overtaken by this run-away explosion. The last ten years have seen a 2½ per cent increase in population. Ten years before, it was 1 per cent. Everything we do will be overtaken by this.

Then, I have something to do with labour and I am a practising lawyer. And I say this that so far as labour conditions are concerned the Congress Party has a not negligible record. And I believe this that in the social sphere the Congress Party has a proud record, because it has struck and struck repeatedly at what I have described elsewhere as medieval mummeries, obscurantist taboos that were throttling an essentially fine philosophy, and throttling the country. You have had these blows struck for emancipation of Hindu womanhood—a whole lot of other progressive forward looking, revolutionary legislative measures.

When I come to Communists, may I say.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your time is up.

Shri Frank Anthony: I would ask you to give me five minutes more. I will take only five minutes.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): Please give him some more time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give you five minutes more.

Shri Frank Anthony: Sir, the greatest single reason why my group did not support this was that we are facing the greatest ever threat to the survival of democracy in this country. I say that there is only one group, one Party, in the country that is in favour of national demoralisation; there can only be one group that can be in favour of sabotaging our defence, our industrial and our economic efforts. I do not want to name the group.

Sir, Chinese aggression has placed on us an inescapable burden. We have an immediate defence burden. How are we to meet this defence burden, maybe by rationalising taxation? But we have to meet that. Today taxation is not only harsh, it is often of unendurable nature at all levels. At a certain level the incidence of taxation is the highest in the world. I think that the Finance Minister has been extremely unimaginative, to say the least, to have extended some of the measures to people below the sub-marginal level. That is by the way. What I am trying to make out is that these conditions are a devil-sent opportunity, a Communist-sent opportunity for them to practise their favourite technique—confuse and demoralise our people—because even if the Chinese do not attack, the very least they will do is to demonstrate to pretend to aggress so that the resources which we would have expanded our development economically and industrially will have to be diverted. But yet we must progress to a minimum at least in the economic and in-

dustrial fields. Otherwise we can never attempt to catch up with the population explosion. We can never attempt to have any kind of a self-generating economy. And that is precisely what the Communists outside and inside want. They do not want us to develop either our defence or industry or our economy. And I say this with great respect to the democratic opposition: Are you going to succumb to the temptation of playing politics? I know politics is a continuous exercise in vote catching. But in the face of this emergency are you going to play politics? Are you going to fall into the trap of the Communists of calculated sabotage of our defence and economic efforts in this country? That is what you will be doing. I am not suggesting for one moment that the Opposition should sit quiet and acquiesce in all the sins of commission and omission of the Government. Not by any means. Let there be unremitting, unrelenting pressure on the Government.

I wanted to take the priorities. What are the priorities? I will deal with three. I say this: however much you may rationalise it, however much you may seek to qualify it, people today, by and large, will have to pay heavy taxes. Next the people are gasping for breath under an increasing pall of suffocating corruption. That, today, is our greatest problem. How do we face it? It is a challenge to both sides. How do we face this challenge. What is the fountainhead of corruption? I say the fountainhead of all corruption in this country is, first, the organised political parties and, second, the politicians. All power is vested in the politicians. They are the focus of all power. They are the focus of all interference with the administration. The compulsions to private corruption are tremendous. How can a politician on a paltry salary maintain two homes? How can he fight exorbitantly expensive elections every five years? The compulsions to private corruption are tremendous. But what has rotted the very foundations of our political life has been

[Shri Frank Anthony]

legalised bribery—donations from businessmen and business houses. That is what has rotted our whole political life at its very foundations.

Shri Tyagi: Right.

Shri Frank Anthony: Are my hon. friends on the other side prepared to pay the price? Are they prepared to say 'no donations from business houses'? The Serajuddin affair is only a microscopic symptom of this deep-seated disease. The coffers of all parties—Congress, Communist—are open to contributions from all anti-social elements in this country. When these elements want to buy immunity, when they want to buy strength, they make contributions to the coffers of all parties.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Opposition parties were against it.

Shri Frank Anthony: If you do not ban it, at least subject to audit the funds of all parties, make them open to public scrutiny. That is how you control corruption, organised corruption at its very source.

Shri Tyagi: Agreed.

Shri Frank Anthony: You will have to control the corrupt instruments. Who is prepared to pay the price? Are you prepared? The Congress Party has done it privately. It has been little more than a joke. But are you prepared by legislation to require every person in every public body, from Parliament down to the *Panchayat*, to declare his assets, not only his assets, but the assets of his first degree relatives—father, mother, son, daughter, yes, sons-in-law, because, I say with great respect, that the Hindu joint family is a built-in conduit for siphoning away ill-gotten gains? Are you prepared to do it? Are you prepared to extend the Prevention of Corruption Act to public men, to make section 5(3) applicable to every man in every public body? That is, that the possession of disproportionate means to in-

come raises an absolute presumption of guilt against you. Are you prepared to amend section 6 of the Prevention of Corruption Act so that no sanction of any Government will be required, so that you do not have the ironically stupid position of a corrupt Chief Minister having to sanction his own prosecution?

Finally—I am sorry the Prime Minister has left the House—I say it is a challenge to all of us. This is the greatest testing time. It is a challenge to every Indian. It is a challenge to the Opposition parties to play less of politics and have the capacity for greater statesmanship. It is a challenge to the Congress Party. It is a challenge to the Government. No half measures, no white-washing, none of these hole and corner inquiries where you suppress the truth—none of all that. The situation requires drastic methods.

May I say in passing that this latest Congress decision—it is your own decision—of transferring people from one wing to another will, to my mind, mean nothing? It may mean more loss than profit. Some good Ministers may be transferred to the organisational wing, but the greater danger is that people who have built up a corrupt image—Chief Ministers and others—an utterly corrupt image in the public mind, will be transferred from the ministerial to the organisational wing. They will carry all their corruption, all their taint, into the organisational wing of the Congress Party.

I say this finally to the Prime Minister. To him has been remitted absolute power. To that extent, his responsibility is absolute; in one sense, it is staggering. I do not know; I have a feeling that he faces the challenges of his own nature, the contradictions of Jawaharlal Nehru. His ultrademocratic sensitivity may make him vacillate when he has to be ruthless; his exaggerated sense of loyalty to his colleagues may make him connive and condone where he has to decapitate.

I can only conclude on a prayer. If he falters, history may well record that he destroyed not only his own party, he destroyed not only democracy in India, but—if he falters—history may well record that he destroyed democracy in Asia. Let me conclude on a prayer and say—I believe it will be echoed by a number of Indians—that God may give him the strength, the determination and, aye, the ruthlessness to sweep clean because that alone is the way to democratic survival.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): I would like to know as an ordinary Member of this House whether Shri Anthony was supporting the motion or opposing it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You may draw your own conclusions.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Sir, one would have thought that this motion of no-confidence would be supported with facts and arguments relating to the period after the last general elections. In the last general elections, this Government secured a vote of confidence of the people—not only from the Opposition in this House. The policies and programmes of this Government pursued till then have been approved and this Government has been installed in office again.

14.41 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

The hon. Member, Shri M. R. Masani, referred yesterday to the defect in planning and said that he did not believe in planning. Acharya Kripalani said that the plans are defectively drawn and more defectively executed. Shri Masani, while agreeing '100 per cent' with the policy of socialism, did not believe in the theory of planning. But in modern times, the theory of planning and the theory of socialism cannot be divorced. I wish to quote a person who is not a Russian economist, but a professor who is an authority on planning and in whom at least Shri Masani should have full

confidence. I am quoting what Prof. Galbraith said in this connection.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: He does not believe in Galbraith; he believes in Dulles.

Shri Morarka: Prof. Galbraith has said:

"The theory of planning originated in close alliance with the theory of socialism—one of the reasons, more than incidentally, why the word planning was so long regarded in non-socialist quarters with uneasiness. Socialist theory by its nature placed great emphasis on public ownership of natural resources and capital plant, and, subject to political exigencies, of land. This was deemed necessary to prevent exploitation, insure social justice and insure also that political power would not be arrogated by the owners of capital."

Sir, Acharya Kripalani and other Members of the Opposition talked of the achievements of this Government. What this Government has achieved is not a matter of opinion nor a matter of argument. It is, I submit, a matter of fact, the evidence of which is visible in every nook and corner of this country and on the face of every citizen of this nation. In spite of great difficulties, such as the ever-growing population, the vagaries of the monsoon, the Pakistan problem and last, but not least, the Chinese attack, we have some achievements, in the economic field to our credit. Our agricultural production has increased by 50 per cent; our industrial production has increased by 100 per cent; our national income has increased by 50 per cent; our per capita income has increased by 20 per cent; our progress in the field of social services like health, education, etc., is simply remarkable.

Leaving that aside, I would like to give one or two other quotations,

[Shri Morarka]

again from a person who can speak with some authority. About our planning, he has said:

"Students of economic development must be especially grateful to India. For, from having attempted the most, she has been our best teacher."

Recently, he said again about our planning that "it was the best job done anywhere in the world". He also said on different occasions:

"India has an effective Government; there is a substantial measure of literacy;...her development has attracted more attention than that of any other country partly because it has the most competent planners, and the most articulate journalists. As a result, the world has come, in far greater degree than has been realized, to identify development as a whole with the experience of India. Since capital and technically trained manpower are the limiting factors in India, they are assumed to be the limiting factor everywhere."

This is the reputation that India, Indian planners and Indian planning enjoy throughout the world.

Much has been said, and that is one common point made by all the Members of the Opposition, about the Gold Control Rules. I wish they had selected some stronger point for attacking the Government so far as its economic policies are concerned. To begin with, I agree that the Gold Control Rules have caused a certain amount of unemployment among a certain section of the community. That was inevitable. But what is the main purpose behind these rules? The main, and indeed the only purpose of the Gold Control Order is to stop smuggling. When people criticise the Government and say that this Gold Control Order has not mobilised the

gold holding of the people, that it has not brought in gold to the coffers of the Government, I think they do not appreciate the objectives underlying these rules properly.

Gold worth Rs. 50 crores is smuggled every year, and for this smuggled gold, it is the Government that has to pay in the scarce foreign exchange. It is unthinkable that when we do not have foreign exchange for essential medicines, urgent defence needs, vital plan projects, industrial raw materials or infant food, when we do not have foreign exchange for students to go abroad or for our sick people to go abroad for treatment, we should still fork out Rs. 50 crores every year to finance the activities of these international crooks.

Smuggling is very lucrative because the international price of gold is much lower than the internal price of gold. The international price is about Rs. 53 per ten grams, and the internal price is about Rs. 110 per ten grams. The margin is so big that for the smugglers the risk becomes very marginal. Then would you be surprised to know that there are insurance companies which insure against the risk of confiscation of gold by the customs? The insurance companies charge ten to 15 per cent premium, and they insure that in case the smuggled gold is confiscated, they would pay the full amount to the persons affected.

Smuggling has become so lucrative that not only these international crooks, but even air pilots, officers of the shipping companies, foreign travellers, and, I am sorry to say, even foreign diplomats, have been attracted to collaborate in it. Before issuing these Gold Control Rules, Government tried many other ways. For example, they intensified customs vigilance, increased penalties, issued special currency for the Gulf countries, amended the Sea Customs rules and transferred

the onus of proof from the prosecution to the accused, used modern gold detectors, prohibited forward trading in gold and restricted banks from advancing more money. All these measures were taken but none of them proved very effective. Then there was pressure in the House and outside that Government must do something to stop this smuggling. Smuggling was menacing our economy continuously. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were criticising us for asking for more and more loans, when our foreign exchange was being drained by this nefarious activity. So, Government was obliged to take some action.

What is this Order? Under the scheme Government does not take away anybody's gold, does not require anybody to invest gold in any particular way, does not require anybody to sell gold at any price, nothing of the sort. The only thing Government requires is that if you are holding gold in a non-ornamental form, in the form of bullion, and that also above a certain quantity, you must make a declaration to the Government. The second requirement is that hereafter no ornament of more than 14 carat purity of gold would be permissible. This step was necessary because in any case unless and until you reduce the demand for gold in the country, the internal price of gold cannot come down. How can you reduce the demand for gold unless you impose restrictions on the gold contents in ornaments. The total consumption of gold should be reduced.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar):
Has the price come down now?

Shri Morarka: If you wait for a few more minutes, you will understand.

It was in order to reduce the demand for gold, so that the internal price might be reduced, that this step was taken.

Another possibility was to increase the external price of gold. Many peo-

ple argue that the external price may be increased more easily. But that does not depend on us alone. If we have to increase the external price, we can do that only by depreciating our rupee, and if we do that, all our imports would become more costly, and we would be paying much more for our plan projects than otherwise.

Therefore, since this malady was so deep-seated, and since the problem was so big, Government had no alternative but to introduce these Gold Control Rules, which, I submit, are absolutely innocuous. Government, I repeat, has not deprived anybody of his gold. Government has not imposed any restriction on the use of gold. Even before the Gold Control Order came into force, Government was not giving gold to the goldsmiths. The goldsmiths were making ornaments mostly out of smuggled gold. But assuming for a moment if you like that goldsmiths have become unemployed, I ask in all seriousness a question: would you like the employment of goldsmiths to be sustained, if that can be sustained only by smuggled gold? Let the decision be taken by the House once and for all. This question has been discussed previously, and it is being discussed again. It is pertinent for the House to take a decision. Has the House come to the stage where, in order to get employment of a few lakhs of people, it would allow this continuous drain on our scarce resources and which is a sort of slur on our name and a matter of shame to us?

Let me assure you that all the telegrams and the demonstrations are not engineered by the poor goldsmiths. I agree that they have become unemployed, but the real agitators, the real financiers behind all these things, are the smugglers who have become more unemployed. Behind the screen of the poor goldsmiths, it is the smugglers who were making crores of rupees every year that are creating this trouble because they have lost that income.

[Shri Morarka]

As to whether this scheme has succeeded or failed, it is very difficult for anybody to say precisely.

Shri Keva (Kozhikode): Is there not a Government here to stop smuggling?

Shri Morarka: Let us suppose all the goldsmiths have become unemployed. Why? Because they are not getting gold. If the smuggling still continues, why are they not getting the gold? So, there is a contradiction. If they have become unemployed, then smuggling, if not completely, stopped, has been definitely substantially reduced.

The compulsory deposit scheme has been another target of criticism by the Opposition.

Shri Nambiar: How much gold you have got? Is it worth the name?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): On account of you gold is not coming.

Shri Umanath (Pudukottai): You have left the hoarder and caught us.

Shri Morarka: The C.D. scheme no doubt involves temporary deprivation of money.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Is it temporary hardship?

Shri Morarka: It is temporary hardship; it is only compulsory saving which is refundable after five years with interest. If it is taken in the form of tax, it will not be temporary hardship; it would be a permanent deprivation. Such schemes are not uncommon even in other democratic countries such as U.K., and to a lesser extent in U.S.A. In Canada, during the second world war in the year 1942, such a scheme was introduced. The date of maturity there was uncertain—two to six years after the hostilities cease; the rate of interest payable was only two per cent. Compared to this, our scheme is not only more specific but less vigorous and more lucrative.

Now, why has this scheme become necessary? Under our Third Plan we wanted to raise Rs. 600 crores from small savings but during the first two years we raised less than Rs. 200 crores. There is a governmental report that there is a setback in the voluntary savings movement. The second reason is the Chinese attack. The need for defence outlay increased and it has been approved by this House. On current revenues we expected to get Rs. 500 crores for our Plan in 1961-62 but we actually got a surplus of Rs. 177 crores. But in 1962-63 it went down to deficit of 49 crores and in 1963-64, to deficit 380 crores. In order to get over these deficits this scheme had to be introduced. The other methods available were to increase the rate of personal taxation or to reduce the exemption limits and rope in more people or to indulge in State trading and raise the price of necessities. The hardship that would have been caused by all these measures would have been much more and the persons least able to pay the tax would have suffered more.

It would be interesting to know if the people whose income is Rs. 1,500 or less really want to save or not, whether they are really against the scheme. In many factories persons with salaries of Rs. 125 or Rs. 130 per month clamour for the introduction of the provident fund scheme where the rate of their saving is 8 per cent minimum. In factories which have these schemes, they want the rate to be increased from 8 to 12 per cent. It is not that these people are averse to saving. But there is complete misguidance of these people by interested political parties, by people who want to win elections, by people who agree in the House to one thing but go outside and carry on an agitation.

There were some difficulties in the scheme which were more of an administrative nature and the Government is now taking steps to remove those difficulties or at least to mitigate them.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the House to co-operate with me and hear what he says patiently. Some of his points have not at all been touched by the previous speakers.

Shri Nambiar: One difficulty is that with regard to gold he made a bad point.

Mr. Chairman: He is trying to understand the relation between your party and gold. Mr. Morarka should finish in five more minutes.

Shri Morarka: First of all, Government has exempted all those people who save 11 per cent or more of their salary. Secondly, unless a person is in continuous employment of the same employer for more than 240 days of a year, he will not have to pay anything under this scheme. The definition of salary has also been revised so as to include only the basic salary and not the dearness allowance, bonus, overtime allowance or other perquisites that a worker gets. These would not be calculated while computing the Rs. 1,500 limit. Then there has been the exemption of the land revenue payers upto Rs. 5 and also exemption in conditions of scarcity, floods, etc.

If you look at this picture of the compulsory deposit scheme as a whole, what do you find? You have accepted the necessity of more resources and more funds. How to raise funds, either by taxation or by compulsory savings. A large tax effort is possible in this country only by including larger sections of the people. Whatever your rate of taxation may be, since the number of people in the higher income groups is small, you cannot get a very big amount. In order to get the required resources of the size needed for defence and development this scheme was inevitable.

15 hrs.

A few words about the price. In a planned economy you must look at the

prices in the long perspective and not at what happened this month or the last month or even in one year. If you look at the price level from a long perspective, what do you find? During the First Plan our prices fell. During the Second Plan our prices increased and during the first two years of the Third Plan, in spite of increased spending and investment, the prices remained more or less stable. Now, in the third year of the Third Plan, prices have increased mainly because of the rise in the prices of three commodities: gur, sugar and rice. I take that all the three are necessities of life. There are substitutes to them but let us not bother about them just now.

The price of rice has increased because rice crop in 1962-63 almost failed and rice production was less by two million tons; the consequent rise in price was 13 per cent in the case of rice alone.

The rise in price may be due to increased demand or due to decreased supplies. If the demand increases because the money supply with the people increases, then it results in inflation. That is, people lose confidence in money. Then a situation arises where money starts chasing goods. That is a dangerous signal and Government has to take radical measures. But that is not so because if that happens the price of everything rises. That is when people lose confidence in money the price of every type of commodity rises. At the present time, however, the prices of shares and Government securities have gone down; the price of industrial securities, preference shares and ordinary shares etc. which give dividends, the prices of these securities have gone down. I would ask those people who say that the prices have risen due to the inflationary impact, due to the lessening of the value of the rupee, why these prices of shares and securities are falling. The hon. Member for Rajkot, Shri Masani, made a point yes-

[Shri Morarka]

terday that so far as gold is concerned people are investing in it because they have no confidence in the rupee which is falling in value. I may tell him, however, that a person who invested Rs. 100 in gold in 1939 got in 1962 Rs. 400, whereas a person who invested Rs. 100 at the same time in small savings got Rs. 300 in 1962. I agree that a person investing in small savings got Rs. 100 less, but the person who invested in small savings did not run any risk, whereas the person who invested in gold ran a continuous risk. Fortunately in this case, or unfortunately for the country, the price of gold was continuously rising. If the price had not suddenly risen like this, he would not have got Rs. 400; he might have got less than even Rs. 300 or whatever it is.

In connection with price, there is another pertinent point and that is about the excise duty on commodities.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the hon. Member to conclude now.

Shri Morarka: Yes, Sir. In 1951-52 our revenue from excise duty was Rs. 70 crores. In the current year, 1963-64, this is going to be Rs. 700 crores. It has risen from Rs. 70 crores to Rs. 700 crores. Sales tax has increased in all the States. Then the municipal taxes and octroi duty have increased. On whom has the burden of these taxes fallen? These are commodity taxes and they have fallen on these commodities only. Therefore, if you find a slight increase of 10 or 12 points compared to 1952-53, there is no need to get panicky.

Recently a survey was made of 44 countries in the world in regard to the price-line, and what did we find? Among those 44 countries the position of India was thirteenth. That shows that only 12 countries had done better than India and 31 countries had done worse than India.

15.07 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

So, if you look at it from that point of view also, you will find that the price policy of the Government has succeeded beyond expectations even though there has been a temporary rise in price due to the vagaries of Nature. A very eminent economist recently said that in India the price mechanism is also the victim of the vagaries of Nature because if our agricultural season fails we also suffer from the price rise.

Yesterday, Shri Masani said that the tax level in this country is so high that it has far exceeded the law of diminishing returns. I do not know what he actually meant. I have mentioned about the revenues from excise duties. So far as the excise revenue is concerned, the increase has been from Rs. 70 crores to Rs. 700 crores between 51-52 and 63-64. So far as income-tax and corporation tax are concerned, they have increased from Rs. 180 crores to Rs. 460 crores. So far as customs revenue is concerned, it has increased from Rs. 180 crores to Rs. 300 crores over the same period. This is the period during which the Government has continuously given additional doses of taxation. I thought that when one says diminishing returns what is actually meant is that the additional dose of taxation would bring a lesser revenue. But, if you see the figures...

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): I would say that a lower rate of taxation would get you more revenue by non-evasion and honest payment.

Shri Morarka: But that argument could apply to even one per cent rate of tax. It can be argued that if you do not tax at all, people would be happier and develop their industries to a greater extent. That is not the correct argument. But the point is this: whether the increased rate of taxation has really brought less

revenue for the Government or whether it has brought more revenue for the Government. I submit that the increased taxation has brought sufficiently more revenue to the Government.

In conclusion, I want to say this. The Mover of the motion, while concluding his speech, said, let there be fresh general elections. I wonder why he made this demand. General elections have not been very propitious for the Opposition leaders. I do not know how he has become a victim to this thought. No Opposition leader has ever won in any general election.

Shri Nambiar: That is incorrect.

Shri Hem Barua: That is a wrong statement.

Shri Nambiar: Shri Gopalan got elected thrice continuously and he is the Leader of the main Opposition group.

Shri Morarka: I thought Shri Dange was his leader. Anyway, all that I wish to say is this. Our Communist friends, who dare not openly oppose in this House the Government's stand against China, who dare not oppose the grant of money that is required for our defence, go outside, agitate the masses and oppose all the taxation measures. They do not want the joint air exercises; they do not care what happens. They want that we must build our defences with our own resources irrespective of the time that it takes, knowing fully well that the enemy is not going to wait so long. If that is their attitude, if that is their loyalty, I think we will have to be more careful with the support of these people.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is with a heavy heart that I speak in this debate to exercise want of confidence in the Government, though for different reasons from those of the sponsors of the motion. On many issues like cor-

ruption, high prices and taxation, there would appear to be a common ground. But in fact our approach is totally different from that of the others.

The speech of Shri Masani was the epitome of the approach of his and the likes. He wanted the Government to concentrate on investments in agriculture and not aspire to be self-sufficient in iron and steel. According to him, it would mean that we will have to import our requirements of iron and steel, obviously from America. That would show that his attack against the Government is more to weaken the national interest than to strengthen it. The same voice was raised in the US Senate Foreign Aid Committee last week against the fruition of the Bokaro project. America wants our country to be economically and militarily weak and permanently dependent. That is why I say that our approach, as far as this motion is concerned, is totally different from that of the others.

My charge against the Government is that there is a total divergence between the promises that the Government has given and the policies of the Government. Leave alone the earlier period when the Congress party proclaimed co-operative commonwealth as the goal, and take up the period from the Avadi resolution in which the socialist pattern of society was declared to be the goal. It is the promises of the Government as well as its policies from that period that I want to criticise.

In the election manifesto of 1957 they declared as follows:

"In economic relations, there should be no exploitation and no monopolies, and disparities in income should be progressively lessened."

In practice, however, what have they done about lessening of disparities? What is the position today? They have actually helped the widening of

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

the disparities and the concentration of wealth in a few hands. At no time in the history of our country did monopolists own or control such a big chunk of our economy as now, and the process is continuing. The Prime Minister announced that a committee would be appointed—before the last general elections,—and a committee had already been appointed. I do not want to go into the question of the report of the committee. The committee might not have finished its work. But as far as the results that are seen in the papers are concerned, those results are bad. We know that in regard to disparity, the disparities are widening. I want to mention some facts.

Out of the total of 28,000 private and public limited companies whose total assets come to nearly Rs. 2,800 crores, only seven top houses of Tatas and Birlas alone have between them Rs. 706 crores.

Sir, in the sphere of banking three top banking companies control 30 per cent of the deposits in all banks. These were the figures in 1959, and the position today will be worse.

Shri Masani, when he was speaking, shed tears over the fact that the increase in national income has not gone into the pockets of workers, peasants and middle class people or even the bulk of the industrialists. Where has it gone then? His answer was that it has gone to line up the pockets of a few corrupt politicians. It may be sometimes true that a few politicians have gone richer, just as the Congress President has said that paupers have become millionaires, It may be true. But we cannot hide the fact that a big chunk of the increase in national income has gone to fatten a handful of monopolists, and politicians got only a tiny share of the wealth grabbed by the monopolists for services rendered.

Ever since the Congress Party took over the reins of Government, in their election manifesto of 1946, 1952, 1957 and 1962 and also in the First Five Year Plan and Second Five Year Plan, they have promised that they would hold the price line and prevent inflation. What has happened to their holding of the price line and inflation? The entire economic history of India during the last 16 years has been one of continuing inflation and rise in prices. After the declaration of the emergency the Prime Minister got an undertaking from the big business in this country that they would not resort to speculation and profiteering. Even then, now, the Government admits that the prices have swelled. The Food Minister talks again and again about buffer stocks. He has to admit now that there is a sharp fall in rice production. His only answer is to make an annual pilgrimage to America and beg for food. Last time when he went to America he appealed to the Americans even to lend more rice. So what is the image of India that is presented? It is an image of perennial mendicant that he projects of us to the people of the world. The Food Minister expects people to be satisfied and to live on false statistics. Such a Minister who gives us only statistics and not rice has no business to be in office. The sugar muddle has made it all the more imperative that he quits office here and now. I want only to quote here from the *London Economist* dated 10th August, 1963. There is a long article by the Indian Correspondent. It is a long one and I only want to quote the last portion of it. It says:

“Against this background the importing of grains, now running around 3.5 million tons a year, much of it, American surplus under P.I. 480, is only a palliative. It was the growing strength of this criticism within the Congress Party and Cabinet that led to Mr.

Nehru's recent attempt to shift his Food Minister, Mr. S. K. Patil, to the Railway Ministry. . . . By the middle of this week Mr. Patil seemed to have won the point. He may be no great shakes as a Food Minister, but as a friend of business, he is one of the Congress's principal fun raisers."

This is what the *London Economist* says. I have nothing to comment on it.

On the top of this, the Government is taking advantage of the emergency. In the name of the emergency it has put an unbearable burden by way of taxation and compulsory deposit on the teeming millions of our country. My hon. friend who spoke just before me said that CDS is only something good to the people because they are only to invest some money and get it after five years with interest. Even a great man like Vinoba Bhave wrote in one article, how can a man getting Rs. 125, when he has to spend actually Rs. 150 for the same food, for the same amount of rice and other things that he had been getting a year ago, put Rs. 3 every month in CDS? If he does so I think he will have to ask somebody else to draw it back because himself and the members of his family will not have survived to take back that money after five years. He will not be able to live with the Rs. 125 that he is getting today. He will not be able to keep up his standard, and I do not know how some hon. Members say that he will be saving something and that is good for him. He wants to live first and then only he can think of saving. So the argument that CDS is a good thing is not true. What about the peasants? In Thirunelveli district of Madras State, which I visited last month, the land revenue on one acre of double crop wet land was Rs. 22½ two years ago. It has increased today to Rs. 30 because of the surcharge on land revenue imposed by the Madras Government. Adding the amount to be deposited under the compulsory deposit scheme, a man has to pay Rs. 75

from this year. A man who paid only Rs. 22½ two years ago has to pay today Rs. 75 by way of tax and compulsory deposit.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): May I correct the hon. Member? That is not correct, because half of the land revenue which he was paying two years ago is to be considered and not the amount he is paying today. So it comes to Rs. 11 and not Rs. 25.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He was paying Rs. 22½ and today even without the CDS he has to pay Rs. 50 because of the surcharge imposed by the Madras Government. How can a man owning two acres or one acre of land pay this amount of surcharge, CDS, and other levies. It is not only the surcharge that he has to pay. As far as water tax and other taxes are concerned they have also increased. Not only the rates have increased, I know that in many districts of Kerala and other States they are asked to pay the taxes for five or six years together.

Shri Ranga: He has been in debt already.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Actually the produce of their paddy at the time of harvest procures less price than what they got last year, despite the increased prices in the market two months later.

More indebtedness will be the lot of these millions and ultimately their lands will be grabbed by the money-lenders. My question is, is all this necessary for the defence of the country? Are there no other sources from which funds could be raised?

Before going to the question of raising funds, I want to speak about the land reforms and land reform legislation. It is said that there is no increase in food production. We cannot expect any increase in food production as long as there is faulty implementation of land reforms and faulty legislations. Take, for exam-

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

ple, Kerala. In 1957 a legislation was passed. After two years the President returned it with some modifications. It was implemented for 1½ years. In the course of the implementation, to get some benefit they had to spend some money. After implementation, due to a decree passed by the courts everything is gone now. What will the peasants think? After waiting for several years and getting a legislation passed, he finds that within a short time of its implementation a new legislation is brought. He will have no belief in legislations. He will feel that whatever promises are made are all false. After a legislation is passed and implemented for a short period, it is taken away. When there was some hitch regarding the Constitution, it was remedied. Even then the Kerala Government says whatever may be the money that has been spent on its implementation we must have a new Bill. This must not be allowed to happen. This kind of faulty legislation and faulty implementation should not be allowed.

Shri Tyagi: It is the fault of the Supreme Court and not of the Government.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I do not want to argue on that point. (*Interruption*).

On foodgrains, in future trading, and in the stock exchange and also in urban land, speculation has actually intensified during the period of emergency. Is this speculation necessary for the growth of our economy and for the defence of the country? We demand that serious measures be taken to curtail drastically this unproductive waste of our resources on speculation. It is with this end in view that we have said that Government should take over the banks and general insurance in order to find resources. The money deposited in these banks and insurance companies is not the property of those who control them. It is the wealth of the

suffering people of the country which is today utilised by a few monopoly houses of the country to enrich themselves and their families through speculation and otherwise. The very fact that they have utilised these huge resources for fattening themselves and inflicting untold miseries on the people clearly shows that they are unfit to be in charge of these huge funds. After the publication of the Vivian Bose Report, which we discussed in this House, there is certainly no meaning in handing over crores of rupees to these people. Quite apart from the profits of these companies that would accrue to the Government, the mere stoppage of the utilisation of these funds for speculative purposes, would place in the hands of Government crores of rupees for productive purposes for development as well as for defence purposes.

Coming to the question of foreign trade, it is admitted by many industrialists that there is under-invoicing of exports and over-invoicing of imports. This has become a common feature in the conduct of business by a few big business houses. This could be put a stop to by taking over the entire export and import trade by Government. Also, we will get some money.

Coming to the oil industry, the foreign monopolists in this country refuse even to give proper accounts of their profits to Government. It is known that in many parts of the world there had been even wars fought between the Government and foreign oil companies and Government toppled down because of the greed of the oil magnates for the control and exploitation of the oil resources. By nationalisation of the oil industry we will get not only cheap petrol and cheap oil but Government will also get a few crores of rupees which now the foreign oil companies are pocketing as profits. So, we demand the nationalisation of both production and distribution of oil.

These are not very revolutionary programmes. They have been carried out in our neighbouring countries, Burma and Ceylon even during peace time. And yet our Government refuses to do this even during the period of emergency. The only reason for that can be that it does not want to take even the smallest steps which would hit the vested interests. That is the only reason why Government is not doing it. There cannot be any other reason.

The Finance Minister is a personification of the class policies and the class bias in favour of the vested interests. He is supremely callous to the miserable conditions of the people and revels in putting more miseries on the people. The whole country has pronounced the Gold Control Order as a total failure. While speaking about the Gold Control Order, the hon. Member who preceded me said that only very few persons are affected by it and very few have opposed it. In the whole of India, in every State in India, there are *satyagrahas*, demonstrations and hunger strikes by five lakhs of goldsmiths who earn their living, rather who used to earn their living in this profession.

It is often said even by the Finance Minister and others that this is a social reform and when there is a social reform somebody will have to suffer. But whether there is emergency or not, whether it is an economic reform or not, some sections of the people never suffer and only the working class people suffer. Whether it is a social reform or not, an economic reform or not, if one fine morning lakhs of people find themselves unemployed on account of a legislation now can you call it just? Due to this so-called reform, thousands of goldsmiths are starving. Many goldsmiths have committed suicide. It is said that one of the objects of this reform is to check or prevent smuggling. Yet, we find from the newspapers that smuggling of gold has not been checked. When Government introduces a legislation or brings for-

ward a reform which affects lakhs and lakhs of people in the country, it is the duty of the Government to see that as a result of that reform honest people are not put to unnecessary difficulties. If they sincerely believe that it is a social reform, they must draw up some plans to rehabilitate the goldsmiths who are now on the road.

As far as projects are concerned, so many are taken up in the country and people in their thousands who are living in those areas are driven away. Unfortunately, I do not have enough time to go into the details. The poor people living near the site of the projects are threatened, beaten or forced to vacate those areas. When you take up a project and allot Rs. 4 crores or 5 crores for cement, steel and other things, why can you not allot another Rs. 2 crores so that the people living in those areas and who are affected by the project can be rehabilitated elsewhere? After all, it is part of the project. But you do not do that; you turn them out to the road. The same thing happened at the time of the introduction of prohibition, another social reform measure. Lakhs of people suffered because of that measure and nothing was done to rehabilitate them either. Some of them died, some found out other jobs and others are still starving.

Shri K. N. Pande (Hada): While I do not like to interrupt him, I want one clarification from him.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He can have the clarification after I finish my speech.

Shri K. N. Pande: Since he happens to be the leader of the Communist Party, I would like to know one thing from him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He is not yielding.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: The Finance Minister is not prepared to take drastic action to bring out the thousands of crores of rupees worth of gold kept in the hoards of princes and

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

rich people. The only effect of his measure has been the blatant anti-social onslaught on the common people and unprooting of about five lakhs of goldsmiths and condemning them to perpetual starvation and death. Whenever a social or economic reform measure is brought out, it is the duty of the Government to see that people do not suffer unnecessarily. They must introduce measures in such a way that people, instead of becoming unemployed, get more jobs so that they will become prosperous, which is one of the objects of the Plan. I have nothing more to say about the Gold Control Order.

The corruption that is rampant in the highest places is an inevitable concomitant of the power of money that has grown rapidly during the Congress regime. There is no use of the Prime Minister shouting that the charge of corruption against Ministers is the biggest lie. Photostat copies of letters pertaining to corruption charges are published in the newspapers and yet nothing seems to have been done by the Prime Minister in this direction. Why is it that a judicial inquiry is not conducted? Such a state of affairs is unimaginable under any democratic regime. In Kerala, the head of the Congress Party, not a member of the Communist party or any other political party, says that here is an issue on which some inquiry must be made. Yet, no inquiry is made. That only shows the weakness of the party and how it is afraid of impartial inquiries.

It is admitted that already during the last two years in many of the Asian and African countries we are facing isolation. The recent performance of the Indian delegates at the ILO meet at Geneva at the instance of the External Affairs Ministry when the question of taking action against South Africa came up is another instance in point which shows our isolation.

Government's efforts to evade responsibility for the Voice of America agreement cannot convince anybody. It is said that the agreement was not passed by the Cabinet, that the Prime Minister himself was given information only in bits and pieces and that officials of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting had negotiated it. Even if the information was only in bits and pieces, the obvious fact must have been evident that the United States was going to use our soil for its imperialist propaganda. And if the officials negotiated the agreement, it is only because they knew they were acting in consonance with the present trend in Government policies, a trend away from non-alignment. That might have been the reason why they negotiated for it of their own accord because they knew the policy of the Government.

15.34 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

That the agreement with the Voice of America is not just an aberration has been proved by the agreement with U.S.A. and Britain for joint Air Exercises. This agreement has come after a number of military missions from these countries had already visited India on invitation from the Government. Right from the beginning it has been evident that the Western Powers were not interested in helping us to build any defence self-sufficiency and that they wanted us to depend on them for our defence needs. It has been officially admitted that they are not willing even to give the supersonic jets the Government has asked for.

It is also evident that whatever the West is doing is not just to repel any Chinese attack but with very deliberate long-range plans in view. When the Government announced recently the news of the massing of troops on the border, what did the British and the American press say?

The British press ridiculed it and in the U.S.A. statements were made to the effect that there was no question of any Chinese attack. It is after that that the radar equipment and joint air exercises have come.

What does it mean? It means that the U.S.A. specially wants to get a military foothold on Indian soil. They are not so crude now as they had been before. Now they do not insist on India formally joining any military bloc, but they are acting to make India in fact a part of their global military strategy.

What does this joint air exercise mean? It only means that the Government helps to further the plans of U.S. imperialism. Non-alignment in the eyes of our people as well as in the eyes of the people of Asia and Africa does not mean balancing between two camps but it is only a continuation of the anti-imperialist content of our freedom struggle. Our people are concerned today because involvement with the U.S.A. has led to gradual loss of sovereignty, ending up as a satellite of the U.S.A., in the cases of many countries in the past.

We can recall how we reacted when the aggressive SEATO bloc was formed. So, we should not be surprised if the Afro-Asian countries look at us with suspicion when today we enter into agreements with the imperialist powers for joint air exercises. Our people and the people in Asia and Africa have also read statements from responsible representatives of the U.S. and British ruling classes who have said that non-alignment has been given up *de facto* though it remains *de jure*. Also, in some U.S. papers it has been said that India's non-alignment is dead and has only to be buried. So, when such statements are published in papers and such articles are written in papers and when they say that they want joint air exercises, certainly we have to be very suspicious about these joint air exercises.

This gradual sliding down the inclined plane in our foreign policy has gladdened the hearts of the sponsors of the motion and their friends in the country and abroad. Today they are emboldened precisely because of this sliding down to demand a scrapping of this policy and complete and unalloyed alignment with the Western bloc. That is what I have to say about the foreign policy.

As far as the basic economic policies pursued by the Government are concerned, they have only helped the growth of monopolies and collaboration with the monopolist houses of the West, has strengthened their power in the country. Also, the Defence of India Rules have been utilised to put down the voice of the people seeking to change these basic policies. The emergency has been abused and misused. I quote as an example what is happening today in Bombay. The Defence of India Rules have been utilised not to curb speculation and profiteering and to put behind bars these elements. It has been said that the speculators have not been caught but those who oppose speculation and blackmarketing have been caught and put inside jails. Today it is being resorted to suppress strikes and struggles of the people, the workers and the peasants who demand a reversal of this policy as in Bombay.

What has happened in Bombay? What is the strike for? The strike is to say, "Stop the Compulsory Deposit Scheme" or, as far as the prices are concerned, "Prices have gone up; increase the dearness allowance". That is the basis of the strike, because really the people were suffering today.

As far as the workers are concerned, in a review of the implementation of the Industrial Truce Resolution the Union Ministry has published a statement in which the Union Ministry has said about the role of the employer and the employee, that there is lack of patriotism and enthusiasm as far as the employers are concerned, but as

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

far as the employees are concerned, they have played a positive role. They have said in that review that the workers have played a positive role. Where there were six-lakh working days lost, in 1962 it came down to 1.2 lakh and in January, February and March this year it came down to 40,000, 30,000 and 10,000 respectively. Six lakh working days lost coming down to 1.2 lakhs means that the workers worked more; they gave more funds. So, it is not that they are against the defence interest and that they do not want it. The lesson from the strike which the Government should recognise is that it is high time that drastic measures are taken to check the rise in prices. But it is a matter of deep regret to say that instead of the Defence of India Rules are used to break the struggle of the toiling millions. They say today, "We want to work more and produce more. To produce more and to work more we want at least the same food and the same requirements which we had yesterday." They do not say anything as far as the question of standard of living is concerned. What they are asking today is not that the standard of living should go up. They say, "We want to remain where we were a year or two ago." So, if they want the same amount of food as well as other things, you must either bring down the prices or you must see that the C.D.S. is withdrawn and also dearness allowance according to the rise in prices is given, when they had played a very positive role at the time when there was a very big crisis in the country. The result today is that the speculators and the black-marketers who are raising prices, who made use of the emergency, are left free and the workers who worked more, when today they say, "We want something more" because they want to work as effectively as they had worked a year ago, are arrested under the Defence of India Rules and the Government does not want to see what the reason behind this is. It is now clear that the Defence of India

Rules were enacted not to put down the speculator, the blackmarketer and the profiteer but to break the working class party, the CPI, and the working class struggles against rising prices.

So, to sum up, we want to say this. We are for non-alignment. We will fight all those who are against non-alignment as well as fight the policies of the Government which weaken non-alignment, for defending the interests of the country and its people. We will fight those who demand freedom for private capital and also fight those who are against all land reforms. To fight them effectively we will fight the Government's concessions to and compromise with the private sector and the vested interests and also the tardy implementation of faulty land legislation.

We stand for development but we will struggle against the burdens that are being placed on the people while those who benefit from developmental activities are let off lightly. So, we will continue to press our demand to lessen the burdens on the common man, mobilise the people for nationalisation of banking, insurance, export and import trade etc. so that we can get money and the burden on the ordinary man is lessened.

We are expressing no confidence in the Government for the shift to the Right which has already taken place in its policies. We dissociate from those who want to drag the Government's policies still further to the Right. We would even now raise the voice of reason against the continuance of these policies of the Government which have heaped miseries on the people and ask them to consider seriously why despite all their professions and proclamations their policies have led to diametrically opposite results, why it is that the people today are rising against them, why it is that 16 years ago when we got our independence and celebrated

our independence on the first day people were mad with joy and today compared with that we find that most sections of the people in the country are against the policies of the Government. Their proclamations and promises are one thing, but as far as their practice is concerned they are against, whether it is land legislation or any other subject. Instead of marching forward the policies are marching backwards and I do not know who is marching forward. It is for this reason that I request the Government to seriously do some heart-searching and make a break with these policies. If this is not done, any amount of organisational jugglery will not save the ruling Party.

As far as democracy is concerned, there is what is known as the Police verification. I have got letters from hundreds and hundreds of people who have nothing to do with the Communist Party or from some who have something to do with the Communist Party or from the families of those who belong to the Communist Party or other Opposition parties, or from those who have some contact with the Communist Party or other parties, that those who have been working for 6, 7, 8 or 10 years in service have one fine morning got a note saying, "Your services are not required." He does not even know the reason why his services are not required. I got many letters from the people saying, "We have got a notice that our services are not required." When they have worked for six or seven years and if their services are no longer required, democracy requires that they at least be told why their services are not required. Is it because somebody has reported about them? Hence, the police verifications. It will make the man end his service, end his job where he has been in service for 10 or 15 years. Also, those people who have been taken, when they are selected, are sent notices within a week saying, "Your services are not required". So, these police verifications also show

that in a democracy as far as the right to live and the right to work is concerned, even that right is being curtailed. I think that the Government will look into these questions. It is on this basis that we had given the notice of No Confidence Motion.

Shri K. N. Pande: I want to have one clarification. I wanted to know one thing from the leader of the Communist Party. The goldsmiths themselves say that they can make ornaments of 10 carats, whereas the Communist Party says that they should be given facilities to make ornaments upto 22 carats. How is it that a party which claims to represent the proletariat has developed so much lust for gold. That is my question.

Another question is...

Shri A. K. Gopalan: One question will do.

Shri K. N. Pande: The next question is about the C.D.S.—(Interruptions).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I will answer the question. Sit down. (Interruptions).

Shri K. N. Pande: Why should I sit down? Who are you to ask me to do that? (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Why don't you listen to the answer?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: On a point of order, Sir. The reply is to be made by the Minister. There is no clarification across the table.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want only to make the position of the Communist Party clear. The Communist Party has said that there must be a small ceiling on gold and above that ceiling, all the hoarded gold must be taken. There must be a small ceiling because many of the middle class and

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

poorer sections of the people in this country even today, whenever they have a little ornament, put it in the bank. It is just like a bank to them—these ornaments. It is not always for wearing. Whenever there is trouble, whenever there is any difficulty, when there is a marriage, they at once go to the bank and get some money, especially for the peasants. That is what the Communist Party says. We say, put a reasonable ceiling on gold and let the people have 22 carat gold ornaments on them and above that ceiling take away the hoarded gold. The question here is not the gold and the value of gold. The question here is: we want money. If you want money, you put a reasonable ceiling on gold and above that you take away all the hoarded gold which comes to the order of about Rs. 4,000 crores. I am not debating on the value of gold or anything. I say, if you want money, you do this.

Shri Ragbunath Singh: I want to know what is the proposal about the ceiling of the Communist Party? You have said so many things.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Ask the Finance Minister if you have any question. *(Interruption).*

Shri Umanath: On a point of order, Sir. *(Interruptions).*

Mr. Chairman: Please excuse me. Order, order. Shri S. K. Patil.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am indeed grateful to the Opposition for this opportunity of a No-Confidence motion. Some of the people believe that this is not a very good practice, but I am very glad that the Opposition, at least for a change, have come together to move this No-Confidence motion so that both the Government and the Opposition will have an opportunity, an ample opportunity, to say what they like. It is just like an annual spring cleaning

which keeps the channels of democracy very clean. I for one welcome this opportunity because it gives me also an opportunity to state my case and state it in a forthright manner.

Before I come to the Communist Party friends who have chosen me for the signal honour—I am very sorry that I have to share that honour with my hon. colleagues, but I can assure my other colleagues that they need not be jealous—I want to come to agriculture. I shall leave them for the time being because I have got first to put my case for Indian agriculture. I must not miss the wood for the tree. Now, it is very easy for anybody in this House, whether on the side of the Government or on the side of the Opposition, to simplify agricultural proposition. They are all experts in solving agricultural problems. They can magnify the defects if there are any defects and there are, quite true—and suggest solutions and give advice. I have been receiving plentiful advice. I do not know where to keep them and if I really use every type of advice that is given, I think, I would have to end in a lunatic asylum.

Now, four years ago, I came on this present assignment. I never boasted that I knew anything about agriculture. Perhaps, I am the least fitted to be an Agriculture Minister because I was an urban man—I have never held a plough in my hand. But there was a challenge thrown at me and thrown at the country that the agriculture of this country has got to be improved so that our economy may be sound and our freedom may be real. If this predominantly agricultural country does not solve the question of agriculture, any of the other things that you might do are of no avail. When that opportunity came and when that challenge came in all humility I accepted it. I thought I would apply my commonsense to the solution of a great Himalayan problem which was Indian agriculture. When you talk of Indian agriculture, for

God's sake, do not forget, apart from the largeness of the country where as much as 350 million acres of land are under agriculture, where no less than 70 to 80 per cent of the people are either partly or wholly dependent for their occupation on agriculture, where as many as 65 million families have got to be moved so that the agriculture could make any improvement—in a situation like this it does not remain a party matter. I thought agriculture was the one subject in which there is no political ideology. Don't my friends of the Communist Party want that our agriculture should improve? Do they want that it should always remain like and that they should have an occasion for No-Confidence motion? This agriculture during the last four years,—and particularly if I say four years it is only the period in which I have been handling it, or during the last 12 years ever since our planning began—has not agriculture a starting period—has not agriculture moved? People come here and say for the sake of argument that it has become stagnant. In 1951, when our Plans started, our agricultural production was in the neighbourhood of 50 to 52 million tons.

15.55 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If, from that, it has now come to 80 million tons, there is something like 50 per cent increase. This is not stagnation. Even the Communist Party has not moved so fast! As far as agricultural production is concerned, just to say that during all this time it has not moved or granted that it should have moved faster, there have been better result. I would have welcomed them myself. Many of them have quoted the figures. We have also become statisticians. Thanks to the study of statistics in this country, everybody quotes them and he knows that there are others who quote other statistics in order

that the first statistics should be disapproved.

Shri Frank Anthony: There is a contest.

Shri S. K. Patil: I am just telling you that, apart from the fact that during the last 12 years we have been doing things in planned manner, some of them might say that the plan might be defective. But as it is, it has moved agriculture from 54 millions to 80 millions tons. In the worst of years, our production previously used to fall to somewhere about 45 or 46 million tons. In recent years—five or six years back—it fell to somewhere about 72 to 73 million tons. From that during the last five years, it has come to remain at 80 million tons. It is indeed not a sign of stagnation but is a sign of the continuous growth that agriculture in this country has been making.

Now, some of them say that during the last two years, it has not made any progress. Even some of the statisticians believe that every year it must register a progress like an industry. Now I want to disagree with the hon. friends here and outside. Agriculture no doubt is an industry. But it is not an industry where year by year you register a continuous progress and continuous rise in the productivity. That is one factor which is not there in any industry because there is climate, there is nature on which it has got to depend. Any industry can assure results if you give the raw material, labour and machine. So much come out of these. Is there an expert anywhere or such a bold man in this House to say that there is any country on the face of this globe where agriculture is not even to-day conditioned, after many scientific researches, on natural elements unless you have got a production which is more than 100 per cent of your requirements? In the U.S.A., the stock that they have got every year is about 3 or 4 times the annual requirements

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

where they do not fail because they have got enough. In countries like Canada and Australia where the stock itself is about 2 years' consumption of that country or so, perhaps, these things are not availed. But in a country where we consume 100 per cent or 96 per cent we produce, we need something more. It is not correct to expect that in a country where there is stock there would never be a bad year or in a country which has registered every year an increase or has made great progress in agriculture, there would be surplus. It is ignorance. That cannot happen. Even in a country like the U.S.A., once I told this House, as recently as in 1958, there was a sudden spurt in the agricultural production—15 per cent in one year. They cursed themselves because there is a problem of surplus wheat in that country. But after two years, it went down by 12½ per cent and therefore, these ups and downs which are due to climatic conditions are there and they will always remain with them, no matter how much irrigation you have got and no matter how many scientific inventions you have produced. In a country like India where during the last four years barring of course the last three or four months, agriculture has behaved in a manner which even this House has admired time and again (*Interruption*). There has not been a single adjournment motion during the last four years.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Because it has never been allowed by the Speaker.

Shri S. K. Patil: The hon. lady Member would have many more opportunities to move. You can see that all these four years the prices have been maintained. I do not know what would have happened to the Plan? It is not possible for the agriculture to behave in a uniform pattern; just as there are good years, there are bad years too. The last

two years were particularly bad because in a cycle of years, agriculture must be judged by a cycle of years. In India, it is a cycle of five years and curiously enough, it coincides with the Five Year Plan! Therefore, sometimes it happens that in five years, in one year the production is very good. It will be of the order of ten million tons as it was always before. You have seen it. But sometimes you will get a year where the productivity is low. Out of five years, one is a very good year, one is a very bad year and the remaining three years are just like that—not good, not bad, somehow or other it keeps.

16 hrs.

You may ask why this is not done and why all irrigation is not done. Many people have quoted figures "two thousand crores have been spent" etc. I do not know where two thousand crores have been spent. But assuming that even one thousand crores has been spent on major irrigation, have they seen the experience of the world everywhere, not only of India but even of a country like the United States of America where agriculture has made so much of progress, where communications or services of agriculture are so quick that if a farmer produces anything within twentyfour hours everybody knows about it because there is television, there is radio, there are extension services and so on? We do not have those advantages in this country. But even then the progress that agriculture is registering year after year over the five years is not insignificant. You can say it could be more. That is a different matter.

Now, then, what has happened? Here is the question in a nutshell of agriculture which one must understand. If I say so I do not say so with the object of apportioning any blame to anybody. This House understands, and I have made it clear time and again that agriculture is totally, hundred per cent, the subject and the res-

possibility of the States. It is not only not a Central subject but it is not even a concurrent subject.

An Hon. Member: Then why have so many Ministers for it here?

Shri S. K. Patil: I am merely saying this that after laying down the policy and other things, so far as the implementation is concerned, largely—I am not blaming the States—but largely, it is the responsibility of the States because, we cannot divest the States of the responsibility which constitutionally, legally, morally is theirs. It is for us to make plans, to suggest ways and means, to give them the money and the resources that they need. And to the extent that we make mistakes in doing that, surely we are responsible for it.

Now, mark it, this country, as I said, has 350 million acres to cultivate. It has got, as I said, 65 million families of these agriculturists. There cannot be any addition to the land available. Anything may increase, but the acreage in India cannot increase. Therefore, by intensive cultivation we have got to increase the pre-acre yield. That pre-acre yield during the last ten, twelve years has increased by anything from 15 to 20 per cent. It should have increased more. But this large immobile mass of 65 million families of agriculturists is not something which you can by a push-button method activate—that is, you do something here, either my Ministry does it or the Planning Commission does it, and the next day the 65 million families start working in a different manner. Surely they may not even be knowing what my Ministry or any other Ministry may be doing for that purpose.

Therefore you have got to be a little patient where agriculturists are concerned. These occasional demonstrations, every now and then coming and crying hoarse in the name of scarcity—as if some of them want the scarcity in order to base their argu-

ment that the Government is bad, they live on that scarcity—these things do create conditions which are not favourable to the agriculturists. And I can tell you one thing. Apart from what technology may do, what science and progress may do, what irrigation and fertilizer may do, the crux of the problem of Indian agriculture is that unless every farmer feels that agriculture is a remunerative job he will never do it whatever you may do. Leave aside all your other arguments; they are not arguments that the farmer knows.

Therefore, the farmer has to be assured, to be convinced that anything that we tell him is ultimately, not only in the national interest—that comes next—but it must be to his personal interest, that it will increase his income. Today, modern techniques and science are employed in agriculture. What happens? Here is a man who was not spending more than even five rupees per acre. When all of a sudden I ask him to spend fifty rupees or hundred rupees per acre in order that his agricultural income should rise—I have to tell him “you must spend this hundred rupees”—can he spend it, unless he is sure that out of that hundred rupees he will make Rs. 150 or Rs. 200? In the first place he has not got that money. I must make that money available to him. And then, also, I must guarantee, there must be some kind of an assurance, whether it is crop insurance or other insurance, by which I can assure him that he will get much more than what he has spent. You cannot move that man in any other way. And that is the crux of the agricultural problem, that is, to make it economic... (*Inter-ruption*) to make it remunerative.

Therefore, this is a question that is going on for the last quite a few years and we have been trying to do it. We have tried to make some revolutionary changes in agriculture which were not there before. We have come to this conclusion that in order to make these prices economic and remunerative, we

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

must have, if not support prices, floor price or minimum price for every agricultural produce. And that is why you have seen during the last two, three years commodity after commodity is being tackled. Not only are we giving the prices, but occasionally we are raising the prices. We first dealt with cash crops. There were the prices for sugarcane, the price for cotton, the price for tea, coffee and everything, and prices for jute. And, coming to cereals, we began with wheat. Three or four years ago we gave the price of thirty rupees per maund, but within a year we raised it to forty rupees because we thought that thirty rupees was not remunerative. We gave Rs. 14-8 to rice but made it Rs. 16 immediately the next year, because we thought that we shall go on making it more and more remunerative and more and more economic. Then we gave prices to jowar—much neglected, but jowar is an important item being the staple food for nearly 27 per cent of the population. We gave it Rs. 9. When it became scarce it sold for Rs. 15 and Rs. 16, and when it was too much it was selling for Rs. 6 and Rs. 5. That was the condition of the farmer.

It is very paradoxical that sometimes we ask him to give more labour and to spend more money, to work hard on his feet. And when he produces more there is a price fall. In that paradox an honest farmer is not supposed to work. That is something which is not only not remunerative or economic, but that is something which will destroy the very prosperity of agriculture.

As we go along, what do we find? Prices of other commodities increase. I have been hearing of prices of cereals. Has anybody given thought to this that every other thing which is an elementary necessity in a farmer's life, in your life, in my life, has gone up in price? Is not the farmer a human being? Does he also not require his kerosene, his cement, his

plough and bullock? Anything that he buys must also be available at a price at which he can carry on his agriculture. Nobody gives thought to it, because it suits a political ideology to say something out of it, to get the grievances, get the miseries out of it and build castles on the foundations of that misery. That is exactly what the opposition party, and particularly the communist party has been doing. (*Interruption*).

Having done that, I say that that is not enough. Because, after all, while I am looking to the future I must look to the present also; I must make it easy for my hon. friend Nandaji, or the Planning Commission, that his plans must go on. It is a responsibility which is common, both his, mine and everybody's. Therefore, if I merely start laying the foundation and wait for another ten years in order that the results should come, by that time the Third Plan, the Fourth Plan and even the Fifth Plan will go and it will become so very difficult that the plans might be successfully implemented.

Therefore the idea of a buffer came, this buffer stock, and these pilgrimages to which so much reference was made by my hon. friend Shri Gopalan. But he forgets that I made a pilgrimage to Moscow also in order to wipe out the sins which I might have accumulated by my having made those pilgrimages elsewhere. Therefore, because I went to America, and if that becomes a place which is not a good place for pilgrimage, Moscow is such a delightful city that I want to go there every year if I am permitted to go, but unfortunately there are no surpluses of food there! I do not say anything, because I remember that Mr. Khrushchev personally is a good agriculturist, he knows agriculture as very few in this world know, but he has dismissed three or four Agriculture Ministers. Thank God, my Prime Minister has not done that! Otherwise I would not here to put my case before this House. But even after dismissing so many Agriculture Ministers the agriculture

of Russia has not made any headway. I am merely saying so, because agriculture is something which even Mr. Khrushchev has understood and he has given expression to it that unless there is freedom to the farmer, unless he knows he is a master, he cannot make progress. By regimented methods of agriculture and totalitarian methods of agriculture, agriculture does not improve. (*Interruptions*). I thought Russia is a foreign country and therefore you would not be so very upset when I am stating the facts. I am not underrating it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is the price of bread there?

Shri S. K. Patil: I am telling the prices in Russia, and I am telling the prices in China also. You will be interested to know, I think. (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is the price of bread?

Shri S. K. Patil: Please do not disturb me. Therefore, Sir, even in Russia, because they are very serious about it, in the matter of technology, in the matter of mechanisation, Russia had gone even farther than the United States of America. For everything there is a machine. But there is one machine that is lacking and that is, the incentive to the farmer.

And therefore from the Russian statistics I shall come to prove to my friends that on a land which is a small bit of land of 0.4 acres, which is somewhere about one acre which is given to every family to cultivate and everything should belong to them, that income, that productivity of these lands is three times as high as all the other farms put together whether they are state farms or whether they are collective farms. In contrast go to Poland where 87 per cent of the land is still held privately. It is a different story altogether. I am merely stating them to show the difference between the totalitarian and our nation. The incentive is a great thing. Even

after forty years of brain-washing, even in Russia the farmer finds that there is no incentive in the collective farm and the state farm and therefore the productivity in that country does not rise. Do my hon. friends tell me that I should not give these incentives to the farmers?

Having given that incentive to the farmers, as I was telling you, in order to make our plan function properly and adequately I thought that buffer stock was a necessity, buffer stock whether out of indigenous production or whether outside production. Remember this. Now, even after hundred years, buffer stock is the only remedy by which the price can be held. There is no other remedy that is known to man anywhere. They don't call it 'buffer stock' in other countries because they have got so much stock that they need not call it 'buffer stock'. I asked the Secretary, my opposite number, in the United States what stock he had got. He said, our stock is now reduced and we have now got only 60 million tons. You can quite understand this. People who are holding 60 million tons need not call it 'buffer stock' but buffer stock is necessary. What happened is this. We were talking for a long time about the buffer stock but actually when it materialised two or three years ago you see what has happened. During the last four years the prices of wheat have not moved up and they will never move up because so long as everybody knows that I have got enough stock of wheat that I can blow in like hot air wherever there is scarcity and prices are likely to rise, that will not happen. That is the only reason that the prices of wheat have not risen. I wish I were so lucky to have a buffer stock for rice. If I had the buffer stock for sugar, even the prices that are fluctuating today would not have fluctuated. With that object in view, Sir, I made that pilgrimage and my friend Mr. Gopalan need not be sorry about it because that pilgrimage has been made. That pilgrimage had been made because it happened that

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

America had it. It so happens that America has got the Public Law 480 where we have not got to pay the foreign exchange. How very difficult it is in these days for us to get the foreign exchange? We bought it. We pay for it in rupees over a period but we do pay for it. These buffer stocks have saved us and I thought if the one thing that remained in this matter of price was mastered, then surely, there will be no question of prices rising and that, is, to have buffer stock of rice.

Unfortunately the position of rice in the world is that only half a dozen countries have got surplus. Even there surpluses are sliding down. Burma which 20 years ago used to have surplus of three millions have now hardly any surplus because of the internal conditions, etc. South Viet-Nam North Viet-Nam and Thailand are these countries, and you could understand the political situation in those countries. Therefore the buffer stock available, all the surpluses available of rice are not more than five million tons as against 25 to 30 million tons of wheat. Therefore you could understand it is very difficult indeed for us to raise the buffer stock of rice. Now you ask: why don't you raise the buffer stock in India? Now, tell me, if you produce 33 million tons of rice and I require 34 million tons of rice for my internal consumption how am I going to build it up afterwards when the productivity increases. That is exactly the reason that with the permission of the Cabinet I went to the United States and we are trying to build up this buffer stock of 2 million tons of rice within four years so that when we have got that buffer stock and with our own efforts to raise the productivity in the land, when it comes to that, when we have that buffer stock the price of rice would not rise.

After having said that, Sir, may I tell you this phenomenon in the matter of rice? Everybody gets up

and says that the price of cereals have risen and they quote the figures 7, 7½, 8 per cent, etc. Do they realise that in this country rice is not the only staple food. There are four or five types of staple food and rice is only one of them. 42 per cent eat rice. Wheat comes next with 26 per cent or so. Jowar is almost equal. It is nearly 27 per cent. There is bajra and maize also. These are the five important items. In regard to these five important items has anybody told this House that the prices of wheat, jowar, bajra and maize are lower than they were anywhere last year or year before last? The prices of jowar is the lowest during the last five years. Only the price of rice has risen and where has it risen? Has anybody said that? My hon. friend Mr. Ranga asked me a question: Is the rise in the rice price universal everywhere in India or is it confined to a particular State? It was a good question. He knew from his own experience. The price of rice today in Mysore, in Madras and in Kerala is even lower than it was last year. In Andhra sometimes it goes a little up, a little down, but it is stationary. But it has certainly risen. Risen where? Risen in Bengal, Orissa and Bombay and Gujarat because they draw their rice from Madhya Pradesh. Why? Because last year the production of rice was somewhere a million and a half tons less than the previous year and the year prior to that. How can I bring this 1½ million tons of rice? Do you mean to say that I should have gone to fritter away our money in getting this 1½ millions? That means frittering away our resources of Rs. 75 crores in order to bring the rice from outside in these difficult days of our emergency. And, therefore, not only did I not bring this million and a half, but even in respect of the usual 3½ lakh tons also, I bought one lakh tons less. I thought that with the stock that I have got, somewhere about 8 or 9 lakhs, I would manage with the help of wheat which I am giving in the ratio of 50 per cent rice and 50 per cent wheat because we have got

to learn this habit of taking wheat also. If we do not produce there should not be a cry that it must be bought from outside the country no matter what foreign exchange is expended in that matter. I shall not be the Minister to do that. That is not in consonance with either your patriotic feeling or the national responsibility that you and I have got to share and bear. Therefore, in a country, in a period of four or five years there are two or three lean months until the new crop comes, like, June, July, August, September. These are the three or four lean months until the new crop comes. I said that I have got rice with us enough to give to the fair price shops. During the last one or two years, 5,000 more fair price shops have come in this country and my instructions are that wherever the fair price shops are necessary because rice is not available, they should open them. We have got enough to give to the fair price shops. I may even repeat here that so far as labour is concerned, those who are in charge of labour should open more shops either on their own or with our assistance so that we may make it possible for our labour and working class people to go to the fair price shops and take advantage of these fair price shops. Therefore, if in the market the prices of rice rise a little bit, then, surely, we need not be perturbed because this is a phenomenon which is restricted to this lean period of 2 or 3 months and this, in the nutshell, is the case of Indian food and agriculture. The case of Indian food and agriculture is not a case of which one should be ashamed about. It is not a case that one should resign or somebody should ask that this Minister should go away from the Cabinet. It is a case that these Ministers have done their job very well indeed. I am not giving a certificate for myself. It is a certificate which anybody, at any time, in any circumstances, should have given for the way that the agriculture has behaved in our country.

Shri Nambiar: All this is self-praise.

Shri S. K. Patil: I now come to my friends in the Communist party. They seem to be very anxious and impatient. I was really wondering why they were picking, for their special honour my hon. friend Mr. Morarji and myself and saying that these bad boys must go. After hearing it I became a little of a doctor and tried to analyse what is the malady in the minds of my hon. friends. The malady has driven them mad to such an extent that even a very gentle and well-meaning man like Professor Shri H. N. Mukerjee who is so nice that sometimes he appear as if even butter would not melt in his mouth, all of a sudden, has to talk those words. And I am quite sure that he was very shy in uttering them. I was watching him very carefully. First, he said not Shri Morarji Desai or Shri S. K. Patil, but he said 'The Finance Minister and the Minister of Food and Agriculture'. I thought: 'What a good man! He did not mention me by name'. But, thereafter, because of the urge of the party and the responsibility that he has undertaken on himself, he said 'So-and-so', but he qualified it by saying that 'Shri Morarji Desai is my personal friend, and Shri S. K. Patil is a great personal friend, and he is good' and so on. He also added that he would like to enjoy a cup of tea and any other beverage. Then, I thought whether he really had administered to himself any hot beverage in the morning so that he should come here and say those things which, I am sure, in the best of his judgment, he would not say: I know him; he is a scholarly person: he reads and he understands things, but sometimes, this party line becomes very difficult and the man has got to say something because he has made up his mind.

I find a very significant thing, which I must share with this House, as to how this has come all of a sudden. I remember that some days back, our Prime Minister spoke at a political meeting, at our party meeting, and he naturally said that there are some fascist trends in this country. Everybody understand him properly. There

[Shri S. K. Patil]

was no misunderstanding about it. He was referring to certain parties in this country; he was referring to certain fascist trends in this country. Within 24 hours I find that *Pravda* comes out with a big article on fascist trends, and instead of the persons whom possibly the Prime Minister wanted to refer to, it referred to other people also. Then, the scope was further narrowed down by 'His Master's Vice', from Shri S. A. Dange in Bombay, who while giving an interview said that there are fascist trends, and even the Prime Minister says so, and these fascist trends are inspired by some Congressmen. Naturally, some inquisitive newspaperman asked: 'Who are those people who are inspiring these fascist trends?' And he says: 'It is Shri Morarji Desai and the Minister Shri S. K. Patil'. Therefore, right from *Pravda* to Shri S. A. Dange, we find this, which was not intended at all; I do not think that in the wildest dream also that was in the mind of the Prime Minister. Possibly, that was not in the columns of the *Pravda* also. But we came in, because this is a very strange conception of the Communist Party. They have got certain assumptions. They have made them that this Government is a leftist Government; they have taken it for granted, as if they control the policy of this Government, and therefore, they have got to keep the balance between the Ministers, and if the balance has been disturbed, the balance has got to be restored, and if one or two Ministers in whom they have faith have gone—surely, I am very sorry that they have gone; I am not suggesting anything about them—therefore, they must do something just like a goldsmith; when he measures his gold, either fourteen-carat or twenty-two carat, he must also be doing the same thing that if on one side it is a little, then he must add something more on the other side. And, therefore, my hon. friend picked up on the very, very attractive heads of the Finance Minister and the Food and

Agriculture Minister. But I am sure, and I can share that confidence with you, my friends, and that is this, that if the Finance Minister was not the Finance Minister but some other Minister, and if the Food and Agriculture Minister was the Railway Minister, they would have yet chosen the same persons and not the Food and Agriculture and Finance Ministers. Therefore, it is a tribute that they have given, and I very gladly accept that tribute. Now, I can understand this, I am merely saying so because this is a political thing; this is a question of ideology; it is not a question that the food policy has gone wrong; it is not a question that something else has gone wrong. They have made their pigeonholes as to which man to put where. Therefore, they assign places to us, saying, this man is rightist, this man is leftist, this is that ideology, this is this ideology, and they decide how this balance must be there so that they remain here where they were. When the Chinese aggression came, you should have looked at their faces. They know that they have lost their popularity, and somehow or other, they must get back that popularity in this country; that is what they are doing. But, remember,—I am not going into that—this is a cheap method of winning popularity; it does not give popularity; the people of India are wise enough to understand whom they should vote for and whom they should not vote for.

Having said that about the Communist Party, now, I come to the Opposition, that is, to the other parties in the Opposition. So, they need not say that I have ignored them completely. What I am going to say in regard to them is a different thing, and it is this. I do not want to go into those particulars, but I could tell you that that very often, I feel as a democrat and not as a Congressman, that it is not fair for a party to sit in office for a long period, because the channels of democracy get choked,

and, therefore, the system of two parties or something of that type has to emerge some time or the other. But do they suggest that the Congress was the usurper of power? Do they suggest that the Congress stole the power? Who was on the battle-field when the power was transferred? It was the Indian National Congress that was fighting the battle; it was not the Communists. My hon. friends the Communists were opposing in 1942 the 'quit India movement'. Therefore, the power would not have gone to them; the power would not even have been shared by them. Therefore, if the Congress legitimately came into power and had that power, it is not that it stole it. But power sometimes corrupts; as Lord Acton says, power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. We are not angels. Sometimes, the power becomes a heady wine; it does become that. And if it has become so, we have to see, as our Prime Minister and everybody else has tried to see, what the methods are by which this can be checked. Therefore, we apply that self-analysis to ourselves. We discuss in public our failings. You point to one or two cases of corruption, and you come to the conclusion that the whole Congress is corrupt. Now, because some of the cases amongst you have not been pointed out, therefore, you take that very dubious advantage that you must be quite different from the rest of the people. I am not saying that what we have done is right. I am not saying that. But a continuous process, every day and every minute, of self-analysis in the Congress organisation is going on. It is in furtherance of that process that a very historic decision has been taken so that the people should not really feel that the Congress is mad after power and it knows nothing but power. It is not a ruse; it is not anything which is so theatrical as it has been sought to be made out. It is a process of self-analysis by which we can clean ourselves. But I do expect that just as the Government is good or bad, likewise, the Opposition also has got the responsi-

bility to be good or bad. I was hoping in my mind that some party, some democratic party, would emerge in the Opposition which would be ready, if not now, at least after five years or ten years to take power, so that if there is one defeat for the Congress we go, and that will teach us many lessons afterwards. But who can take that power just now? Now, can that power go to those who are opposite? Sir, we have seen the real position. I do not want to comment upon it. Somebody called it a marriage of convenience, but that marriage has brought so much of inconvenience here. Somebody else called it something else. I do not say anything like that. But I could quite expect from my friends like Acharya Kripalani and Shri M. R. Masani, with whom I had the pleasure of working not for one year or two years but for twenty or twenty-five or thirty years,—they are a part of us, although they sit in the opposite ranks—that it is their responsibility and my responsibility too (I am not blaming them) to so conduct the Opposition that if not today, at least after two years or five years or ten years, the public would regard them as so very responsible that the transfer of power would become easily possible. Have they performed those duties? Somehow or other, they only come forward every now and then and say 'no-confidence' or 'adjournment motion', or have one little thing and thereby come to a conclusion that the entire Congress is corrupt and bad.

Sir, I do not want to take the time of the House. But I could tell you one thing, that within the limited resources, within the limited advantages that this country had—when the Congress organisation got power and formed the Ministries, it had to start from scratch; there was nothing with them; they had not even the requisite talent with them which was tested and tried—they have conducted this administration well for the last fifteen years, and I could say, look round; along with India, as many as thirty or forty

[Shri S. K. Patil].

countries in Asia and Africa have been liberated; they have also got their governments. Watch those Governments, and look at this Government, and you will come to the same conclusion that the Congress organisation, with the powers that they got, had made the best use of them and not only kept democracy alive here in this country but it has become a live wire by which it can be an example to other countries to follow. If that is so, then, surely, there is no basis for this no-confidence motion. Sir, I have done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Today also, the House will sit till 6 P.M.

श्री त्यागी : मेरा ख्याल है कि आप हाउस को ऐडजर्न कर दीजिए। अपोजीशन बहुत गर्मा गई है।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : नहीं साहब मेरा ख्याल है कि त्यागी साहब बहुत जंप गए हैं उन को जाने दीजिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Manoharan.

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am very happy to rise to support the no-confidence motion tabled by Acharya Kripalani. Before me the talented Food Minister Shri S. K. Patil had his talk in the House and from his talk everybody is given to understand that the food requirements of the country are fulfilled and he has done his job. But I want to put one question. Just six months back I happened to read a particular piece of speech which was given by a notable personality of the country of India. That is this:

"I often hang my head in shame when I think of a nation with 70 per cent of its population engaged in agricultural production depend-

ing on foreign countries for its food requirements. The nation's failure to establish self-sufficiency in food even after 15 years of independence disturbs my mind more than the Chinese aggression".

This is exactly the certificate of merit given to the Food Minister by the Prime Minister of India. That was in Ludhiana, Punjab, where the Prime Minister said:

"The nation's failure to establish self-sufficiency in food even after 15 years of independence disturbs my mind more than the Chinese aggression".

I hope the honourable Food Minister will look into this matter and it is not my job to see whether he is going to be late or otherwise regarding his performance.

Another thing. I have heard in this House ever so many people from the Congress benches very conveniently saying that after all this Opposition is hotch-potch and they have nothing to do in common and they have got different ideologies and different shades of political opinion and how can they come together to put up a strong fight against the Government. I want to say to this House that differences in political complexion and conviction did not stop us or prevent us from presenting a united front against the present ruling party because of their arrogance, because of their power-mongering, because of the anti-democratic trends which have developed in them for so many years. Therefore, what I want to say is this: do not criticise the Opposition as you usually do. What we want to refer or to bring to the attention of the ruling party is this: You have got a good tradition in the past so many years because Congress is an organisation which has stood for the liberty of the country. Therefore the past glory of your organisation should lead you not to conceit, but humility. You should deve-

lop a sense of tolerance when the Opposition members are speaking and you should listen. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise. They duty of the Opposition is to condemn; the duty of the Opposition is to expose; the duty of the Opposition is to embarrass the Government. The duty of the Government is to listen. They should understand problems.. (interruption) Please do not disturb me. While we speak you should hear; while I attack, you should understand; while I condemn you should search your conscience and if possible you should reform yourself. That is the point. There is absolutely no point in criticising the Government for the sake of criticism itself. We have got something to say. Acharya Kripalani, the Mover of the Motion of no-confidence, might have got something to say. We, the DMK, have got something to say and our views should be understood. I want to place before this House the views of the DMK for the appreciation of Members here, without brushing them aside by simply saying that the 'DMK is a party which stands for separation; therefore, we need not hear the DMK viewpoint'. So is the case with the Communist Party. You are brandishing certain parties and brushing aside their ideologies and you want to thrive on that. I would request the ruling party not to adopt that attitude.

The majority of the Congress Members here were briefed by the Prime Minister. I have read so in the papers. (Some Hon. Members: No, no.) I mean for a good thing. Further, I am told a request has been made by the Prime Minister that this important parliamentary forum should not be reduced to a forum for the use of bad language. It is a good thing which has started; I hope it will be followed. So far as we are concerned, we want to stick to that.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): His mere presence sees to that.

Shri Manoharan: Thank you.

In the history of the independent Parliament of India, I think this is the first time that the Opposition Parties have joined together and brought forward a no-confidence motion.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Except the communists.

Shri Manoharan: The Communist Party also brought in a no-confidence motion, but for want of requisite number of Members in support, it fell through. So the spirit was there. Therefore, the no-confidence motion against the present Government is all the more imperative. Every Opposition Party in this Parliament feels the same way about it. I feel that itself is a success, efficient success, for democracy in our country. Do not divide the Opposition and try to flourish on that. If you would excuse me, I would say this is a cheap way of flourishing so far as the ruling party is concerned.

Another thing. You should also accommodate criticism. I am reminded of what Harold Laski said:

"Governments that are wise"—

I hope the present Government is wise—

"can always earn more from the criticism of their opponents than they can hope to discover in the eulogies of their friends".

I do not think the Prime Minister will depend upon the eulogies of their friends. The Prime Minister as well as the Government should depend upon the criticism offered by the Opposition.

An Hon. Member: There is power failure. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Failure of Government.

Shri Manoharan: The best index of the quality of a government is the

[Shri Manoharan]

degree to which it permits free criticism of itself. I am sorry to note that the ruling party, members of the ruling party, are not prepared even to hear what the members of Opposition parties have to say. Therefore, I request each and every member of the ruling party to have the mind to hear, to listen to what we say, when the DMK are presenting their case.

Of course, we have got a separate philosophy. Our philosophy is different. It may not be digested or accommodated by the Opposition members as well as the ruling party members there. That does not mean that I should not submit my philosophy. I have got elected and I have got a right to represent my case. Nobody can reject it *in toto*. India is a multi-lingual country. Our society is plural, our culture is varied, our population polyglot; our Constitution is flexible and our topography varying. In such a country like India with different cultures, conflicting cultures, conflicting terrain, we, the members of the DMK, want to have a separate country under the Indian sun. This is our philosophy. We are here to represent that philosophy, and if possible, convert the members of the Opposition and the ruling Party here. There is scope here also. This is the usual nature of the ruling party, not to take away the opportunities of the Opposition Members here as well in the politics of the country.

Therefore, what I say is that we want a separate nation for ourselves, and it is the duty of the ruling party to invite us, to talk to us, and if possible convert us. But instead of doing that, they have come forward with a legal weapon to curb the Opposition. With all humility I tell the Prime Minister as well as the Members of the ruling party that such kind of repressive measures is the high road to revolution. By this you cannot definitely curb the spirit of the revolution. On the contrary, you are creating a situation where you will de-

initely fail, and the Opposition viewpoint will triumph ultimately. In the name of the sixteenth amendment, a particular amendment has been introduced in the Constitution.

The country is faced with Chinese invasion, external aggression is there. On 8th November, 1962 the Prime Minister moved a resolution specifically stating that the Chinese aggression should be stopped, for which the entire country should unite. I still remember what I said then. We the DMK came forward to join the national effort to fight the Chinese aggression. That spirit is still there. When the Prime Minister's resolution was passed by the House, enthusiasm was rampant, and without minding the difference in ideologies, all the parties stood together. They gave their wholehearted support to the Prime Minister, they decided to strengthen his hands. That feeling was there then.

Now in 1963, August, I find an entirely different situation. It is drastically different and fantastically fluid. How has it happened? The entire country stood behind the Government then. The moment the resolution was passed in the House, I saw the Prime Minister. He was young like a flamboyant youth then, because he was highly elated. He could explain to the world that though we had so many differences, political and otherwise, when it came to a question of foreign invasion, we would relegate our differences to the background and join together and put up a heroic fight against the Chinese. That impression was created.

Six months elapsed, and what has happened now? Why has the Communist Party come forward to move a motion of no-confidence against the Government, the Council of Ministers? Why has the Jana Sangh, the DMK, the Swatantra Party, come forward similarly? It is up to the ruling party to sit straight and think about it. Somehow the situation has been changed. Who is the real villain?

That is my question. The upsurge which had been created, thanks to the Chinese aggression, is missing today. Why? It does not mean that if aggression is repeated; all these parties now moving the no-confidence motion will not support the Prime Minister. We will support the Prime Minister and strengthen his hands. That is an entirely different argument. We will have to face the situation now.

Why has it happened? Because of something which the Government of India has done. So far as I am concerned, unnecessarily and without the situation warranting it, the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution has been introduced. We have already stated that we have suspended our political ideology till the Chinese aggression is over. What made the Prime Minister or his colleagues doubt the *bona fides* of the DMK? What is the necessity? Has any letter been received by the Prime Minister from Chou En-lai that if he moved the sixteenth amendment, they would not make war against us? Without the situation warranting it, the Prime Minister and his Government have introduced this amendment to curb the Opposition. That is why I say the emergency has been used as a camouflage. There is then, for instance the Official Language Bill. What is the necessity now to open this Pandora's Box while the entire country's attention should be focussed on the Chinese aggression? You should understand it or at least think about it. Simple soap box oratory cannot help matters. Then, there is another thing: the gold control order. Why was it brought now. On behalf of my party, two Members of Parliament, Shri Rajaram and Shri Chezian met the Finance Minister to explain the difficulties of goldsmiths as well as the profound feelings of the people of Tamilnad, especially the women folk. He says it is a social reformation. It may be true. But any reformation presupposes that the time is ripe. He could have invited the Leaders of the Opposition and the ruling party to a round table

conference and discussed the proposal. But, no. One fine morning the gold control order comes during the time of the emergency and the next moment we are told that we should follow. It is nothing but sheer undemocratic attitude that our Finance Minister is developing. When two Members of my party met him and explained the position and the holiness attached to the *thali*, rightly or wrongly, being coupled with the purity of gold, they were told: the order is an order; nobody can smash it. I am prepared to face the penalty. Now, if that is the attitude of the Finance Minister, it is time for him to quit the Ministry; that is the will of the people; it is not I who says it.

What amount of havoc has been produced in the country by this compulsory deposit scheme? At the time of emergency, the Government comes out with this scheme and then says: look here, there is the emergency. I can understand the importance of the emergency but I accuse the Government of India for not having preserved the spirit of emergency; emergency has been misused by the Government of India.

In the time of emergency, what is happening? In Kerala the Chief Minister was charged with corruption. I am sorry because I am a Keralite. Look at Bihar, or M. P. or Orissa. Which part of our country, I want to know, has escaped the charge of corruption? Everywhere. Not only that. The Congress leaders, eastwhile Ministers, Ministers and others have come forward to wash their bloody dirty linen in public; it is all the more nauseating. They do not care about the emergency while they are doing all this thing exchanging fiery words among themselves and cutting each other's throats but while the Opposition Members come forward to ventilate their grievances they are reminded about emergency; they are asked to be careful.

Here is a case and I want the Prime Minister to reply to that because that is the spirit of the country. After

[Shri Manoharan]

having heard the statement of Shri K. D. Malaviya on that day in the House, I openly confess that I was inclined to accept his bona fides. He resigned the Ministership while he was not guilty and the Prime Minister tells us that he is not guilty; he is a man of integrity and honesty and probity. But the Opposition has hurled the charge against him that he is guilty. Whether he is guilty or otherwise, the country wants to know. The Prime Minister had given an able defence which I consider feeble because I feel that if Shri Malaviya walked out of that office with clean hands, it should have been explained to the public. If he is really guilty, resignation is not a punishment. He should be punished; and if he is not guilty, and, if his innocence is proved, the Opposition Members who have been responsible for hurling attacks on him ought to be punished. The Prime Minister should take a correct view regarding this matter, because the country wants to know about it.

Then I want to tell the Prime Minister that authority lives not by its power to command but by its power to convince. The 16th amendment to the Constitution, the Gold Control Order, the Compulsory Deposit Scheme and the unwanted Official Language Bill—these are all things which have shaken the confidence of the people and brought doubt and fear in the minds of the people which, I feel, is definitely full of danger both to the defence as well as development of the country.

Finally, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I want to make certain accusations against the Government, or the Council of Ministers, before I finish my speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have been doing the same till now.

Shri Manoharan: I am finishing. I accuse this Ministry—I hope the Prime

Minister will be very interested to hear my accusation—for its inefficiency, red-tapism, nepotism and corruption. I accuse the Ministry for having failed to preserve the country's upsurge in the event of emergency. I accuse the Ministry for having gone back on the assurances given to the non-Hindi-speaking people. I accuse the Ministry for having butchered the fundamental rights at the altar of power. I accuse the Ministry for having protected and harboured the corruptive elements and for the *mala fide* administration. I accuse the Ministry for having squandered the country's wealth and resources and manpower in ill-designed and ill-executed plans. I accuse the Ministry for its having thwarted the people's moral values and their faith in the democratic form of Government. I accuse the Ministry for having exploited the Governmental machinery for the perpetuation of its own party selfish ends. I accuse the Ministry for grabbing enormous powers and converting a federal democracy into a monolithic totalitarian regime. I accuse the Ministry for having failed to protect the borders of the country and for having brought humiliation, dishonour and anguish, tribulation and trial. I I accuse the Ministry for having followed a negulous, unfruitful and vacillating foreign policy. I accuse the Ministry for having adopted a schizophrenic attitude of practice in variance with precepts.

Finally, one word about the Council of Ministers. I am convinced that the Leader of the ruling party, our Prime Minister, is highly emotional in spite of his age; he is impatient to Opposition in spite of his age; he is a dictator in the Cabinet and, whether one likes it or not, I hope the majority of the people will agree—he is a Caesar in the making.

Therefore, considering all these aspects, I should like to join in the

sentiment and spirit expressed in the no-confidence motion tabled by Shri J. B. Kripalani.

Shri P. G. Menon (Mukundapuram): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the speaker who closed his speech just now concluded with a string of accusations against the Government. It reminded me of the famous accusation in literature which probably he was copying. He began his speech with an appeal to the members of the Congress party to be humble and not be arrogant and to listen to what he has to say. With all humility, I have done so. And, having done so, I hope he would permit me to say that there is evident among the various groups who are supporting the No-confidence Motion under discussion an amazing sense of irresponsibility. That is what I find.

The various hon. Members who spoke in support of the motion from the various groups have marshalled reasons which are so mutually conflicting that if any of them had even the remotest belief that this motion would be carried I am sure the motion would not have been moved. It is because of their belief that in the foreseeable future none of them would be called to shoulder the burdens of office that these various opinions and suggestions have been made on the floor of the House.

The motion has been occasioned, as has been evidenced at various stages of the debate, to enable each group in the Opposition to air their pet aversions against the Government. But to have chosen a weapon of a No-confidence Motion for this purpose is evidence of light-hearted irresponsibility. The Constitution enjoins that the Council of Ministers shall be responsible to the Lok Sabha. I put it to you, Sir, how can the Prime Minister or any of his colleagues be responsive to these various groups who have put forward points of view which are mutually destructive.

And, this situation, Sir, has rendered the task of debate easy to supporters

of the Government. Nevertheless, this is a source of confusion to the public.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Sir, I rise to a point of order. A very eminent writer and intellectual like Shri Govinda Menon should not read from his notes.

Shri P. G. Menon: Sir, this has been a source of confusion to the public, and because the public has been fed only with 13 ominous words which go to make up the motion standing in the name of Acharya Kripalani, if the bunch of telegrams which he produced here rather dramatically towards the end of his speech are not intended to request him or to entreat him not to move the motion, then it is on account of the confusion created by the situation.

Can the groups arrayed behind these 13 words, slogan, contribute anything constructive regarding the administration of the country? Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani condemned the Government for its declared policy of non-alignment in foreign affairs. Shri Dwivedy says that in principle his party stands for this policy, and Professor Mukerjee and Shri Gopalan of the Communist Party argued with fervour in support of the policy. Which of these views should the Government accept?

An Hon. Member: It is obvious.

Shri P. G. Menon: Shri Masani argued for the Voice of America Agreement with the skill and eloquence of a trained lawyer as if he was arguing for a specific performance of the agreement before a court of law. And Shri Mukerjee wanted the agreement to be denounced.

17 hrs.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You become the arbitrator.

Shri P. G. Menon: Shri Masani attributes all the economic ills of the country today to planning and the public sector, while certain others

[Shri P. G. Menon]

attack Government on the ground that the pace of socialisation is slow. Dr. Lohia has been demanding the effacement of English language from all Government records.

An Hon. Member: He is not here.

Shri P. G. Menon: But we know his views. I have heard that he has been physically effacing certain writings in public places. My hon. friend, Shri Manoharan, spoke just now, and we know what his views are.

The views of the shareholders of this no-confidence motion are so mutually destructive that it is most confusing. The Swatantra and the DMK groups want English to continue. I need not take the time of the House to expatiate all these conflicting ideas of the Opposition. Each party in its turn wants to express want of confidence in the other. That is what they are doing. I submit, it is no-confidence of each opposition group in the other that has been prominently in evidence in this debate. Under these circumstances, this is not a no-confidence motion in substance against the Government: it is so only in form. This debate should convince the House and the public, if further conviction was necessary, that the policies of the Prime Minister, the Council of Ministers and the Congress Party are in their main essentials sound and for the good of the country.

On the policy of non-alignment, I need not advance arguments on the floor of this House. Others have done it, and I am sure the Prime Minister will certainly speak about it with the authority and knowledge which he alone will command. As was pointed out by my friend, Shri Ravindra Varma, on other occasions when Acharya Kripalani's vision was not as clouded as it is today, he has in his inimitable eloquence praised the virtues of non-alignment. When he did so a few years ago, the statesmen of certain countries were critical of this policy of ours. Today, when

the leading statesmen the world over, in America, in Europe and the Afro-Asian countries have begun to recognise the validity and the usefulness of this policy, it is strange and tragic that Acharya Kripalani and his Swatantra friends should tilt their swords against this policy.

This is not an empty slogan, nor an article of unthinking faith, but a sound policy, conceived and developed in the best interests of the country. Recent events have shown that this brought us the sincere friendship of all leading countries of the world. The sarcastic question posed by Acharya Kripalani how India can be non-aligned with China, which has attacked us, does little credit to the intelligence which he is reported to possess. Did he understand non-alignment to mean friendship with an attacking enemy? Did he think that this policy would stand in the way of our defending our country? Did the policy stand in the way of asking for and receiving aid? One should not distort and caricature a policy and then condemn the caricatured picture.

If non-alignment is the chief plank of our foreign policy, planning and democratic socialism constitute the main planks of our domestic policy. Are there many in this House or in the country who would want us to give up planning and our march towards socialism? The Acharya enumerated three instances of mistakes committed by the planners. It should be remembered that in the matter of planning we are treading upon virgin ground largely speaking. I do not know whether the facts stated by him are correct, but assuming that they are, miscalculations regarding programmes costing Rs. 10 crores or Rs. 20 crores cannot be the basis of an attack on a Rs. 11000 crore Plan. This criticism is an example of a lack of sense of proportion.

Shri Masani appears to think that we should not have gone in for the

steel plants. I presume, he had in mind also the other heavy industries projects which like the steel projects are capital intensive. He attributes high prices to these enterprises. I have heard that such are the views of the Swatantra Party, but I did not imagine that the distinguished Secretary of the Swatantra Party would speak in the strain that he did, in the language of outmoded economics. Does he want the country for ever to depend upon other countries for its industrial and other requirements? I hope, he does not and, if he does not, he should concede that we should have heavy industries, like, the steel plants in our country. The captains of the private sector industries have conceded that it is not possible for them to put up such industries immediately in connection with the recent controversy regarding Bokaro.

He spoke of the smallness of the returns from our public sector industries. I am sure, he knows that it took years before some of the flourishing private sector industries began to earn profits. He conveniently forgot those public sector industries, like the HMT, which have made profits from the very beginning.

Many will not agree with Shri Masani that during the 16 years of independence there has been no progress in society in India. It has been stated authoritatively that a rise in the average expectation of life from 32 years before independence to 48 years now has taken place. This is no evidence of a deteriorating or stagnant economy; it is the result of more and better food for the masses, better hygienic surroundings and a rising amplitude of health services. The face of the country is changing for the better and in the years to come welfare is bound to go up in geometric rather than in arithmetic progression. That is the law of progress. In the anxiety to cry down the administration, let not Shri Masani and his friends shut their eyes to these facts.

Acharya Kripalani and Shri Masani made an amusing claim that the sponsors of the no-confidence motion represent the majority in the country. That both of them made their claims and quoted figures correct upto decimal places shows that they are indulging in some sort of a systematic sophism on the subject. I read also the report of a statement by the founder of the Swatantra Party that it is preposterous that the Congress Party which polled only 45 or 46 per cent of the votes in the General Election should carry on the administration. There has been at least one case in India, after the Constitution, of a distinguished person who was not elected to any legislature and, therefore, polled nil per cent votes, becoming the Chief Minister of an important State. In all the three general elections, after the Constitution, the Congress Party, although it was returned to the Lok Sabha with massive majorities, polled votes which were less than 50 per cent. This is not the case in 1962 only. In 1952, in 1957 and in 1962, the votes polled by the Congress Party were round about 45 to 48 per cent. Now, since this happened immediately after the Congress took power during the middle of the period and at the end of twelve years, this cannot be due to any loss or fall in the popularity of the Congress. There should be other reasons for this phenomenon.

In India during elections, a multiplicity of parties and often independents attached to no party came into the election fray and, as we know, where there are more than two candidates, often the winning candidate may not get 50 per cent of the votes. I have some experience of the behaviour of the electorate in my State and I have seen that if a Tom, Dick or Harry files a nomination paper and he keeps quiet, even then he polls 10 to 15 per cent of the votes. He gets these votes even if he does not canvass. This is because of caste, religion and group loyalties which exist in the:

[Shri P. G. Menon]

place. Before the days when the marking on the ballot paper was introduced, even the box kept for a candidate who had withdrawn got 10 to 15 per cent of the votes polled. That is the reason why Congress, the biggest and the strongest and the most popular party in the country with massive majority in the Lok Sabha in all the three general elections managed to get only less than 50 per cent of the votes. Here, I would like to state that in U.K. also, after the emergence of three parties, the party which was victorious at the polls often polled only 45 to 46 per cent of the votes. Now, it is amusing that Acharya Kripalani should have claimed that all these votes including probably the invalid votes—often the invalid votes are large—should belong to the people here who have sponsored this No-Confidence motion.

Then, is Acharya Kripalani serious that there should be the system of proportional representation with the single transferable vote? There is no difficulty. The rules of elections are not a part of the Constitution. They are contained in the Representation of Peoples Act. He can attempt an amendment there and if he succeeds, he can create confusion and chaos in the Governance of the country. That is the estimate regarding the proportional representation by political thinkers.

I am not able to understand what the stand of the Communist Party is on this motion? This is a motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers. Having listened closely to the speeches of Mr. Mukerjee and Mr. A. K. Gopalan, I have not been able to understand what their stand is. Do they or do they not want to express their want of confidence in the Ministry? I must say that it is unfair, it is out of taste that a Party like the Communist Party in the Opposition should give their approbation to certain Congress leaders and their condemnation to certain other Congress leaders. We do not want that. This is

an insidious attempt to divide us and create a confusion in our ranks. But I must tell them that they are bound to fail.

Shri Tyagi: They are the tactics of Mao Tse-tung.

Shri P. G. Menon: They are bound to fail. The policies of the Prime Minister, the policies of the Cabinet, are the policies of the Government. Do you call them progressive and leftists? Then, the Congress is progressive and leftist. Do you think they are rightist and reactionary? Then the Congress is that; the policies are theirs. Of all the tyrannies I know of, the tyranny of words is the most subtle, and let not people suffer from a tyranny of words of left and right, leftist and rightist, and try to divide the Congress party. I wish to tell my hon. friends that they will miserably fail in that attempt. And Prof. Mukerjee wanted, and Shri Gopalan also, that two Ministers should resign. How can that be done? They may resign if the Prime Minister wants them to. But I have never heard an instance of an Opposition party, during a no-confidence motion, singling out two ministers and asking them to resign. Shri S. K. Patil has answered them, and I am sure the Finance Minister will do likewise. What is the charge against the Finance Minister? Prof. Mukerjee said that he has not abolished, the privy purses of ex-rulers. I ask the Communists, was not the Communist Party in office for more than two years in Kerala State, from the Consolidated Fund of which privy purses to two royal houses are being disbursed?

Shri Tyagi: Was it so?

Shri P. G. Menon: Yes, Travancore and Cochin. And these moneys come from the revenues of the State and not from the revenues of the Centre. I want to ask them; why was it not abolished; why were the privy purses of the ex-rulers of Travancore and Cochin not abolished? Because, the Constitution has guaranteed it.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: What a question to ask?

Shri P. G. Menon: And why should the Finance Minister resign for a provision in the Constitution? That is my point.

As Shri S. K. Patil pointed out, these demands of resignations are made on grounds other than what appear on the surface. And that is what we object to.

Then again, it was demanded today by Shri Gopalan that banks should be nationalised, insurance should be nationalised, export and import trade should be nationalised, and gold over certain maximum or certain ceiling should be taken over. That would bring money, according to him, for financing the defence operations. I am not against nationalisation of banks or insurance, and I do not think the Congress Party would be against nationalisation of banks or of insurance. Life insurance was nationalised by the Congress Government. But the question is, when it should be done. It is only when the Government feel that it is the opportune moment to do it that it will be done.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: After the emergency is over?

Shri P. G. Menon: Nationalisation of insurance was not done during an emergency. And, in the meantime, whether these steps would bring in money for financing the defence operations, that is the most important point. Now, the Communist Party in office in Kerala did not do many of the things which they have been proclaiming they will do, because once in office you know when to do a thing, what to do, how to do, the difficulties involved. So without knowing all these things and without ever thinking that you would be called upon to discharge the duties of office all sorts of demands are made.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is the wisdom of an ex-Chief Minister!

Shri P. G. Menon: Sir, I am closing. I do not want to speak on other matters to which there have been references already. Before I conclude let me say this. I need not be modest in my claims on behalf of the Congress Party and the Congress Government. It has great achievements to its credit which generations to come will gratefully remember. It has fulfilled tasks which may well be called Herculean. After independence the princely States were liquidated, and the complaint is of some privy purse that is being given now! It has introduced planning, which, sooner or later—sooner, I hope, than later—will fully secure to the people plenty and prosperity. It has declared as its goal socialism, to which goal it is surely moving. In the context of falling democracies round about in many regions, it has preserved truly and well in India an enduring democracy. Above all, it has united this vast sub-continent into one well-knit State, a condition which existed never in history. The Congress continues to be the link, let me say, the only link with its firm roots in all parts of the country, which keeps the country together. For these achievements . . .

Shri A. V. Raghavan (Badagara): Was there not neglect of Kerala by the Centre?

Shri P. G. Menon: I am not referring to the so-called neglect of Kerala. I am speaking of the linking of the country together.

For these achievements, the Congress Government and its great leader, the Prime Minister, have been responsible. Let not passing passions and frustrations cause this central fact to be forgotten.

Sir, I oppose the motion.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Sitting here and listening to the debate, I have been feeling like Alice in Wonderland. I have been getting curiouser and curiouser every minute after hearing the things that I heard

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

in some of the speeches from the Opposition. It is not because they speak in a varied way with different voices; that is something to be expected. Where there is no ideological unity, where many of these groups have no political philosophy, one does not expect any kind of unity in the voices that speak. But there is one underlying theme for which the Congress is being accused today, and that is this. The emergency came in October and November, and there was so much enthusiasm among the people, but now that enthusiasm among the people is waning. There is waning of enthusiasm, but may I ask who is trying to encourage that waning of enthusiasm? I want to ask whether it is true or not that this country has a neighbour on its borders that is an aggressor and is still building massively its military potential, and also there is another neighbour on our borders, which has come in close collaboration with China, namely Pakistan. Do the Members of the Opposition believe that this is true or not? Or do they feel that this too is some kind of a myth or a fantasy? Otherwise, how could they come forward and say that there is not sufficient enthusiasm in the country today and then do everything possible to see that that enthusiasm is smashed? If it were left to them, that enthusiasm would have been smashed, but I do not think that they command that much following in the country, or that they have that much support in the country that so many people would listen to their voice and forget the country's danger.

The real tragedy of India is that, even though we have had a parliamentary democracy for nearly sixteen years, not a single Opposition Party has been able to grow, not even to take over the responsibility of Government completely on their shoulders, but even to undertake the lesser task of being able to share in a national government during the

emergency. Now can these varying groups who have clashing ideologies, who cannot come to any agreed settlement about anything, as Acharya Kripalani, I am sure, knows to his cost, except to indict the Government and to censure it, take power at any time? That being the case, what is the reality behind the motion of no-confidence? That is what I would like to ask.

I was really surprised at the extraordinary suggestion made by Shri H. N. Mukerjee, to which the last speaker has also referred, that two Ministers of the Government should go out of the Cabinet, but he did not consider that this was a great indictment of the Prime Minister. Surely, this is the biggest insult to the intelligence of the Prime Minister that he who chooses the Cabinet does not know how to choose it, and the Communists must help him.

Then, we hear Shri M. R. Masani saying in a light vein that this Congress Party should shed its leadership and carry on by itself. This is a calculated insult to the intelligence of the party. Does Shri M. R. Masani feel that after three and a half years, he and his party will stand a better chance, if he could provoke the Congress party to get rid of its leadership? Does he really think that because there may be differences of opinion in the Congress Party, it is a disunited party, that in fundamentals it is disunited? If he thinks so, then he is very much mistaken.

His speech, of course, was full of oratorical skill. But I would like to say that some of the things that he has suggested are fantastic in their exaggerations. He says that in this country, there has been no kind of real planning; as if he was very keen about planning, he said that the planning had been altogether defective, and what is more, he has also said that its implementation has gone completely wrong. He seems to say at the beginning of his speech that

he subscribes to the policy of Government, because in his words "Government objective is socialism or the creation of a more prosperous, free and equal society;" and he said that that was not being attained. But Shri M. R. Masani, while pretending to subscribe to this policy and by expressing his condemnation over the fact that this socialist society has not yet come in view, really stands for the vested interests of this country,—For, what else does the Swatantra Party stand for?—for the feudal interests of this country, for big business, and for all that has kept the country from going forward, for all that tries to prevent Government from going on with the implementation of their socialistic policies. He cannot even bear any sort of "controls". He says, sweep them aside and have the law of the jungle.

He has spoken also a good deal about the public sector. I do not want to repeat what the hon. Member who spoke before me has said to refute his charges. But I would merely like to point out to him that the public sector in many of its industries has proved a great success. The Chittaranjan engines are much better and much cheaper than the engines of Tatas. Who does not know that? There are many such examples. To judge the steel works in the public sector before they have had a chance to grow and develop, and compare them with those which are already there in the private sector is, to say the least, a very unfair procedure. The public sector is one of the means through which we hope to be able to bring in a more equal society. And, certainly, anyone who stands against the public sector cannot stand for the common man.

I do not know what to say about the PSP, the PSP of whom there were great expectations in this country at one time, expectations not only by the nation as a whole but in the Congress itself, a party for whose growth the Congress has given up seats in the past, a party which we

had hoped would become the second party in this country so that democracy could succeed, if not at once, at least at a later period a second party could come in. It has many able leaders in it. But it is Acharya Kripalani who is leading them again with a motley crowd of others, and about whom he said when he left that party, that it was a party of leaders and there were no followers. Probably, that may be the reason why the PSP who ought to have acquired the position of being a second party in this country, finds itself today under the banner, of course, of Acharya Kripalani, but with a variety of parties many of which cannot possibly share in any of the ideologies for which they stand. I would like to know what they have in common with the Swatantra Party. How can they possibly believe that in bringing in a motion of no confidence in this manner they are going to help the country's growth, that they are going to help the defence effort? Can they, who have amongst them a number of intelligent persons, really have allowed their intelligence to become so warped because of their bitterness against the Congress Party or the Congress leadership that today they cannot even use their judgment and not join in what is a futile motion of no-confidence.

Shri Frank Anthony and some others also have quite rightly pointed out that this lack of growth of a second party in a parliamentary democracy makes it very difficult; it leaves a very big lacuna. I think it would be true to say, particularly in this Parliament, that under the leadership of Pandit Nehru, the party in power itself acts to a large extent as an opposition, an informed opposition, to criticise in a reasonable way; for when the Opposition cannot fulfil that function, it becomes necessary for members of the party in power to help towards offering informed criticism. It is because of this that many times in this House we rise and say many things about many of the

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

policies, not against the basic policies but against the ways of implementation thereof. It is we the members of the party who point out the administrative failures of this Government in an informed way. That work of the Opposition is not done by the Opposition parties in a concrete manner; so it has to be done by the party in power itself.

Shri Tyagi: We have to do it

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I bring this point to the notice of the members of the PSP and other parties. Is this the way they have to function in the Opposition that we ourselves should act as the Opposition so that our democracy may continue in this country?

We cannot see the growth of a second party or of more than one party which can bear responsibility in this country. As I said, the Congress Party has tried to help the PSP to rise, but unfortunately even that did not happen.

Today there are many issues before the public. It is quite true that there is no criticism of our basic policies, even by Members of the Opposition. I have listened carefully to their speeches. Except the Swatantra Party of Shri Minoo Masani, I have not heard one word of real criticism against the basic things for which we stand, neither against the building up of a socialist State through the ways of democracy nor against the policy of non-alignment.

Therefore, in so far as implementation of policies is concerned, the Congress Government and the Congress Members in the party are perhaps more exercised in their minds than any Opposition can be, at tardy progress, and the fact that some things in fact many things go wrong. We have no objection to confess failure. Mahatma Gandhi confessed to even Himalayan blunders. Of course, there will be failures. It will be so many

times and we shall have to rectify our mistakes and go ahead again. But I dare say that when posterity judges the actions of this Government so far as the home front even is concerned—at a time when partition came after independence, when so many complex problems came before the Government—it will say that in spite of the fact that there were many things that went wrong, in these 16 years of rule the Congress not only knit the country together but sowed the seeds of progress in the future.

One word about non-alignment. Acharya Kripalani was able to tell us: I told you so about Tibet and China. Yes, of course, He had that prophetic vision, no doubt, about Tibet and China. But does he forget that he was a member of the galaxy of leaders that Gandhiji built up, and does he forget that it is the creed of the Congress to try to come to a settlement through peaceful ways, and that it is only when this fails, we may think of other means? It is true there was a surprise attack on this country last October and we were totally unprepared. We are not ashamed to owning up to it, but this is also true that once the Government became awake to it, it is taking every step that is possible, and without any prejudices as to where the help comes from, so that we can build up our defence potential in a rightful manner.

Although Acharya Kripalani had supported the policy of non-alignment, he seems to scoff at it today. I wonder if he realises the shifting values of the world today. Just as at one time religious conflicts used to shake the world, and then died down, so today we are witnessing a toning down of the division of the world into communist and anti-communist groups. It has been shown already that the USA and the USSR can come together to prevent the destruction of

humanity by nuclear war. I think that tomorrow will show that these differences of today, the ideologies that divide the world into two today, are gone into the dustbin of historical record, it will no longer be the reality of tomorrow. It is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who had the prophetic vision to see this, that the policy of non-alignment, of not joining the power blocs, was not only the best thing for today, not only paid the best dividends for the present, but that in future there would not be such controversies as communism and anti-communism, that new ideologies would take the place of the old, that these differences which still divide the world would be a matter of historical record.

So, whether it is a question of our foreign policy or our domestic policy, there can be nobody who can say that these are wrong. Of course, when it comes to implementation of policy, and even in regard to certain details of policy, we may have differences of opinion. As I said, the Members of the Congress Party have the freedom to express their opinions in this matter. There is a lot of heart-searching going on just now. No party that is asleep, no Government deriving its power from a party that has gone to sleep, can possibly consider everything that goes wrong in such detail as we are doing today. No party that is complacent, no Government that is complacent, could possibly behave in the way that we are doing. Our Ministers also know that there are many things to be attended to.

For instance, even in regard to the Gold Control Order, there are certain things which some of us may not like, here and in the country outside, and I am certain that Shri Morarji Desai, against whom the Communist Party has stood, has got that much resilience in him, that much liability, to listen to what the people in the country, and particularly the representatives of the party, have to say about these things. I do not feel that there is such darkness and gloom so far as the future

of the Government is concerned. But I do feel that it is very necessary that we should get together in this hour of peril, those in the Opposition and those who sit this side, so that in future it may not be said that in this time of crisis, all were for the party and none was for the State. If the Opposition Parties which have said some things here out of bitterness and have cast some aspersions which are not even true, if they were to say that they are willing to join hands and help in this crisis, we can all work together. Each of us represents here a constituency, whether we are on this side or that side and we have some responsibility to the electorate and if that responsibility is to be discharged in a proper manner in the hour of the country's danger it is necessary that we join hands and work together and not bring in a motion of no-confidence which will neither succeed now nor, in our view, has any future. As Mr. Patil said, we would welcome and the Congress Party would welcome if someone else was capable of taking up the Government. But unfortunately there is no such party and we cannot build that party; it is not our job. So, there is no reality behind this motion. Then, is it only a dramatic gesture in the hour of peril? Does it show any sense of responsibility? Is it not time, I would ask my friends in the Opposition, not only Acharya Kripalani but the P.S.P. Members and other Party Members, is it not possible for us now to combine, I can understand if there is someone whose ideology clashes with our ideology and they could not combine; but if there is no such clash, I would merely ask them to come forward and help us in this crisis and not get frustrated and take to such measures like the bringing in of motion of no-confidence which is the most important armour in parliamentary democracy and thus bring it to ridicule, for it can be but still-born in the present circumstances in the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. His party has ten

[Mr. Deputy Speaker].

minutes. He may try to conclude within fifteen minutes.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज से आठ मास पूर्व चीनी
आक्रमण के बाद जब इस सदन में चर्चा उसकी
आई थी उस समय संसद् में और सदन
के बाहर भी कुछ इस प्रकार की चर्चाएँ थीं कि
इस समय जो सरकार है, उसे अपना स्थान
छोड़ देना चाहिए अथवा फिर एक मिली
जुली सरकार का निर्माण करना चाहिये। मैं
तब उन व्यक्तियों में था जिसने यहाँ और
बाहर भी इस बात पर बल दिया था कि जब
नाव मसदार में हो और मल्लाह पूरी शक्ति से
लगा कर पार ले जाने का यत्न कर रहा हो,
ऐसे समय में उस मल्लाह को बदलने की राय
देना कुछ बुद्धिमत्ता की बात नहीं है, ऐसे समय
में उसकी पीठ थपथपाना और उसको शाबास
शाबास कह कर नाव किनारे की ओर ले जाने
की प्रेरणा देना ही बुद्धिमत्ता की बात होगी।
लेकिन आज आठ महीने के बाद न केवल यहाँ
अपितु सारे देश में, जिस जनता ने रक्षा कोष
के लिये सरकार को इतना सहयोग दिया था
रक्षा प्रयत्नों में यहाँ की सरकार को पूरा सहयोग
दिया, भारत के प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल
नेहरू की कोई आलोचना करता था तो लोग
उस समय उसके साथ लड़ने और झगड़ने के
लिये तैयार हो जाते थे, स्थिति ने पलटा खाय़ा
है। जो लोग प्रधान मन्त्री की आलोचना के
नाम पर लड़ते थे और झगड़ते थे आज उन्हीं
प्रान्तों में, उन्हीं नगरों में, उन्हीं मुहल्लों में
सभायें हो रही हैं, प्रस्ताव पास किये जा रहे
हैं और जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव यहाँ
आया है, इसी भावना को वहाँ भी प्रेरित किया
जा रहा है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यत्नमाम
स्थिति क्यों उत्पन्न हुई।

कोई भी राष्ट्र अगर वहाँ अपनी सुरक्षा
चाहता है तो उसको तीन नीतियों को बड़ी
सुदृढ़ता के साथ चलाना पड़ता है। पत्नी
नीति अर्थ नीति है, दूसरी नीति विदेश नीति

है और तीसरी नीति गृह नीति है। जहाँ तक
अर्थ नीति का सम्बन्ध है, मैं कोई अर्थ शास्त्र का
विद्यार्थी नहीं हूँ। केवल उसके संबंध में मैं
एक संकेत मात्र देना चाहता हूँ। भारत ने
अपनी आवश्यकताओं को पूर्ति के लिए जो
बाहर से ऋण लिये हैं, वे अपेक्षित थे, वे ठीक
थे। परन्तु जहाँ तक उन ऋणों का संबंध है
जिनके कारण सरकार ने हमारे देश को विश्व
के अन्दर ऐसी स्थिति में ला कर खड़ा कर दिया
है कि शायद ऋण लेने वाले या मांगने वाले
देशों में भारतवर्ष का नम्बर प्रथम है। ३१ मार्च
१९६३ को हमारे देश के ऊपर १७६०.१६
करोड़ का ऋण था। इस ऋण पर सूद की शकल
में जो पैसा हम को देना पड़ता था वह ५६.४०
करोड़ रूपया था। इतनी बड़ी धनराशि में
केवल सूद की शकल में देनी पड़ती है। और
आवश्यक बातों के लिये जो चीज ली जाए,
वह तो सही है। परन्तु शासन में और नीति में
चाणक्य ने लिखा है कि वह पिता अपनी सन्तान
के साथ अन्याय करता है जो अपना ऋण सन्तान
पर छोड़ कर जाता है। ऋणकर्ता पिता शत्रु।
मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम जिस समय अपनी
झोलियाँ फैलायें, सोच समझ कर फैलायें।
जैसी विपत्ति इस समय आई है, उस में तो
सहयोग अपेक्षित था परन्तु ऐसी स्थिति में यह
न हो जायें कि हमारी पीढ़ी दर पीढ़ी भी उस
भारी ऋण से उच्छ्रान्त न हो पाए।

दूसरी बात मैं विदेश नीति के संबंध
में कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझे आज दुःख के साथ
यह कहना पड़ता है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि मुझे
प्रधान मन्त्री जी इसको कहने की आज्ञा दें
कि हमारी विदेश नीति में आरम्भ से ही कुछ
गलतियाँ चली आ रही हैं। तिब्बत के संबंध
में अगर मैं अपने मुँह से कहूँ तो यह छोटा मुँह
बड़ी बात हो जाएगी, लेकिन मैं भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति
डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद के शब्दों में कहना चाहता
हूँ जो उन्होंने चीनी आक्रमण के बाद पटना
के गांधी मैदान में कहा था कि आज जो चीन
ने हमारे देश पर आक्रमण किया है, यह उस

पाप का प्रायश्चित्त है कि जब चीनी राक्षस तिब्बत रूपी शिशु को अपने मुंह में डुप रहा था उस समय हम अपने मुंह पर पट्टी बांधें बैठे रहे। काश्मीर के संबंध में भी मैं अपने शब्दों में न कह कर भारत के भूतपूर्व उप-प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री स्वर्गीय सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल के शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने दुखी हो कर एक बार डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद को कहा था कि जो कि उनकी डायरी में लिखा हुआ है कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में मेरी चलती है, लेकिन जवाहरलाल जी के घर काश्मीर के अन्दर मेरी नहीं चलती है। जनमत संग्रह की बात का अदूरदर्शिता के साथ ऐलान करना और इस केस को सुरक्षा परिषद में ले जाना बड़ी भूलें थी। आज हम काश्मीर के बारे में किस स्थिति में ला कर खड़े कर दिये गये हैं, इसको आप देखें। पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे संबंध धीरे धीरे कटते चले जा रहे हैं। लेकिन हम अभिमान कर रहे हैं विदेश नीति की इस बात पर कि रूस और अमरीका दोनों चीन के साथ सहयोग नहीं कर रहे हैं। क्या मैं बड़े ही विनम्र शब्दों में पूछ सकता हूँ कि द्वितीय महायुद्ध में उस रूस और अमरीका में समझौता हुआ था, उस समय क्या हमारी विदेश नीति वहां काम कर रही थी? अपने हित की रक्षा के लिये भी दो मुल्क रूस और अमरीका जब मिल सकते हैं हिटलर का मुकाबला करने के लिये तो आज के हिटलर को मुकाबला करने के लिए अगर रूस और अमरीका ने चीन के साथ अपनी तटस्थता की नीति रक्खी है, तो इसका सोलहों आने श्रेय हम अपने कंधों पर नहीं ले सकते हैं। उनका अपना हित भी उसके अन्दर निहित है।

जब चीन का आक्रमण हुआ तो हमने कहा कि वह पंचशील के दस्तावेज पर हस्ताक्षर करके अपने वचन से पीछे हटा है। चीन ने हमारे साथ विश्वासघात किया है। लेकिन उस से भी बड़ा विश्वासघात हमारी सरकार ने जनता के साथ किया है, देश के साथ किया है। क्यों तमाम रहस्यों को आपने छिपा कर रखा है? किस तरह से सड़कें बन रहीं थीं, किस तरह से

हवाई अड्डे के लिये जगह तलाश की जा रही थी, क्यों वर्षों तक इस तरह के रहस्यों को छिपा कर आपने रखा? अपने श्वेत पत्रों में अपनी कलम से आपने तमाम बातों को लिखा है। इससे भी बड़ी चीज है कि नेफा की पराजय की रिपोर्ट को फिर उसी तरह से सरकार दबा कर रखना चाहती हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी, नेफा की पराजय की रिपोर्ट न केवल संसद के माननीय सदस्य ही मांग रहे हैं, मगर मैं आपकी जानकारी के लिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि नेफा में पराजयों की रिपोर्ट की मांग कर रही हैं वे हजारों विधवायें जिन के पति उन पहाड़ों पर मारे गये हैं, नेफा में पराजयों की रिपोर्ट की मांग कर रहे हैं वे हजारों अनाथ बच्चे जो पिताओं से रहित कर दिये गये हैं, नेफा की पराजय की रिपोर्ट की मांग कर रहे हैं वे हजारों बूढ़े मां बाप जिन के बच्चे उनके हाथों से जाते रहे हैं। कब तक आप इस रिपोर्ट को दबा कर रखेंगे? आज उनकी पुण्य आत्मा पृच्छती है कि उस पापी का नाम बताया जाए जिस की वजह से हम बेहाल कर दिये गये। कब तक आप इसको इस तरह से दबा कर रखेंगे? एक मजबूत आदमी सुरक्षा मंत्रालय में आया था जिस ने स्थिति को सम्भाला था। लेकिन मुझे इस कटु सत्य को कहने की आज्ञा दीजिए कि आपने उसके आने के बाद सुरक्षा मंत्रालय को तीन हिस्सों में बांट कर उसके उत्साह को भी ठंडा कर दिया था। प्रधान मंत्री जी, अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव जिस समय चीन ने आक्रमण किया था शायद उसके कुछ दिन बाद आ जाता, लेकिन वैसा नहीं हुआ। तब भी वैसी ही स्थिति बनी थी। लेकिन आज यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव तब आया है जब पानी होंटों तक आ चुका है, जनता के असन्तोष का प्याला जब भर चुका है और आपकी ढलमुल नीति का ही यह परिणाम ह

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

कि वायस आफ अमरिका के साथ इस तरह से समझौता हुआ । आप कहते हैं कि मुझे पूरी तरह पता नहीं था । लेकिन जिन लोगों ने आपको जानकारी देनी थी और जिन्होंने पूरी जानकारी नहीं दी और जिस की वजह से समझौते से पीछे हटने की दुनियां में चर्चा हो रही है, इतने बड़े देश के साथ दुलमुल गीत के कारण हमारे दूसरे समझौतों के संबंध में सन्देह पैदा होने लगा है, मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपने उनके खिलाफ क्या कार्रवाई की है ?

तीसरी चीज है हमारी गृह नीति । भ्रष्टाचार के सम्बंध में उन छोटी छोटी चर्चाओं को नहीं करना चाहता जिन से आज गांवों के आदमी परेशान हैं । पुलिस कैसे रिश्वत लेती है, कचेहरी में कैसे रिश्वत चलती है, किस प्रकार से चक्रवन्दी में लूट मच रही है, किस प्रकार से थाने में रिश्वत चलती है, इन चर्चाओं को भी मैं करना नहीं चाहता कि सेल्स टैक्स आफिस, इनकम टैक्स आफिस और एक्साइज आफिस में किस प्रकार की लूट मची हुई है । इस भ्रष्टाचार के सम्बंध में आज कांग्रेस पार्टी के जिम्मेदार नेता श्री श्रीमन्नारायण अग्रवाल के वक्तव्य की बात कहना चाहता हूँ, बिहार के राज्यपाल अग्र्यंगर के वक्तव्य की बात कहना चाहता हूँ जोकि अभी समाचारपत्रों में प्रकाशित हुआ है । आप कहते हैं कि भ्रष्टाचार केवल नीचे के स्तर पर है, करप्शन केवल लेवल पर है । मैं पूछता हूँ कि दास रिपोर्ट और नेफा एन्क्वायरी के बाद भी क्या आप कह सकेंगे कि करप्शन छोटे स्तर पर है, लोअर लेवल पर है ? आज करप्शन छोटे स्तर पर नहीं है, करप्शन आप के दायें बायें बैठा हुआ है । सिराजुद्दीन रिपोर्ट के ऊपर आप ने कहा कि चार कांडों में से केवल दो कांडों में मालवीय जी को दोषी ठहराया गया है और दो कांडों के अन्दर निर्दोषी ठहराया गया है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि दो नहीं, एक नहीं,

आधे में नहीं, चौथाई में भी अगर दोषी ठहराया जाता है तो आप को क्या अधिकार था कि आप अपने वक्तव्य में कहते कि उन्हें निर्दोषी मानता हूँ ? जब दो चीजों में दोषी ठहराया गया है तो फिर आप ने निर्दोषी होने का सर्टिफिकेट किस आधार पर दिया ? इसी तरह की चीज नेफा के सम्बंध में मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ और आप अपने वक्तव्य में इस का उत्तर दें । नेफा की पराजय की रिपोर्ट के अन्दर जिस व्यक्ति को दोषी ठहराया गया है क्या वह आज जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी में १० हजार ६० मासिक पर नियुक्त कर के नहीं भेजा गया ? आप बतलाइये । इन बातों को मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, पंडित जी । इन तमाम बातों को दबाने से सन्देह की एक दीवार उठती चली जा रही है और आप के सम्बंध में लोगों के अन्दर इस प्रकार की चीज पैदा होती चली जा रही है । आप कहते हैं कि नीचे के स्तर पर करप्शन था तो क्या यह नीचे के स्तर पर करप्शन था ?

केरल पी० सी० सी० के प्रेजिडेंट ने जो रिपोर्ट दी थी केरल के चीफ मिनिस्टर के सम्बंध में और एक दूसरे मिनिस्टर के सम्बंध में, क्या वह नीचे के स्तर के करप्शन की रिपोर्ट थी ? पंजाब के पहले के कांग्रेसी और वर्तमान कांग्रेसी जो चार्जशीट मुख्य मंत्री के खिलाफ दे रहे हैं, वह मेरे पास है लेकिन समयभाव के कारण मैं उसे पढ़ नहीं सकता लेकिन अगर आप चाहें तो मैं उस को सभा की टेबिल पर रख सकता हूँ । क्या वह नीचे के स्तर का करप्शन है ?

उड़ीसा के सम्बंध में जो पी० एस० पी० के जिम्मेदार सदस्य ने यह कहा कि हम को रुपया दे कर हराने के लिये उड़ीसा में यह किया गया, क्या यह नीचे के स्तर पर करप्शन है ? राजस्थान में, उत्तर प्रदेश में, मध्य प्रदेश में, किस स्तर पर करप्शन है ? अगर आप

देश को उस से बचाना चाहते हैं तो बचाने का एक ही तरीका है कि आप उच्च स्तरीय कमीशन बनाइये और जहां जहां कमीशन से करप्शन की शिकायत आये उस की जांच कीजिये। वरना मैं आज आप को चेतावनी के तौर पर महर्षि व्यास के महाभारत के शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय तक्षक इंद्र के आसन से जा कर लिपट गया और जन्मेजय के नाग यज्ञ में जितने भी सांप थे वे आ कर पड़ गये, और जिस समय इंद्र के ऋषियों को पता चला कि तक्षक इंद्र के आसन पर लिपटे होने के कारण नहीं आ रहा है उस समय विवश हो कर ऋषियों को आवाज लगानी पड़ी।

“तक्षकाय स्वाहा, इंद्राय स्वाहा”

आज आप के इंद्रासन में एक तक्षक नहीं, न जाने कितने तक्षक लिपटे हुए हैं उड़ीसा में, पंजाब में और दिल्ली में, जिस से विवश हो कर अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाना पड़ा। फिर आप कहते हैं कि करप्शन नहीं है। इस प्रकार की स्थिति है।

जहां तक टैक्सों का सम्बंध है, कम्पत्सरी डिपाजिट का सम्बंध है, मोरारजी देसाई के गोल्ड कंट्रोल का ताल्लुक है, जिसने लाखों लोगों को मौत के दरवाजे पर लाकर खड़ा कर दिया है, इन सब को छोड़िये, मैं पंडित जी से केवल एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। जिस समय जनता से आप चाहते हैं कि त्याग करें उस के त्याग करने से पहले आप के अगल बगल में जो इतने लोग बैठे हुए हैं कभी आप ने उन से त्याग करवाया? कितनी बार इस सदन में पूछा गया है कि कितना टी० ए० और डी० ए० एक एक मिनिस्टर को पिछले दो सालों में दिया। १३ मई, १९६१ को पूछा गया, २८ मई, १९६२ को पूछा गया। २६ मार्च, १९६२ को पूछा गया और १० अप्रैल १९६३ को पूछा गया, लेकिन बराबर वही जवाब दिया गया कि फिगर्स क्लेक्ट कर रहे हैं। स्पीकर साहब ने खास तौर पर

होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहा कि जल्दी से जल्दी उनको दिया जाये लेकिन नहीं दिया गया क्योंकि कहीं वह सनसनी न पैदा करे। मैं समझता हूँ कि टी० ए० और डी० ए० की रिपोर्टों को इसलिये दबा कर रखना चाहते हैं कि उन को ले कर देश में चर्चायें चलेंगी। आज बंगाल के मिनिस्टर के विषय में निकला है कि साढ़े छः लाख का उन का ट्रंक काल का बिल है। आप बतलाइये कि यहां पर जो मिनिस्टर बैठे हुए हैं और वे भी ट्रंक काल करते हैं, उन का कितने रुपये का ट्रंक काल का बिल आता है। आप देखिये कि स्टाफ कार का क्या उपयोग चल रहा है, क्या आप के रूल्स और रेगुलेशन्स का पूरी तरह से पालन किया जा रहा है। यह जितने भी मामले हैं उन के लिये कामराज मिक्स्चर क्या काम करेगा? यह एक ऐसा कांग्रेस का कैसर है जिस के लिये रेडियम की किरणों को लाना पड़गा, तब जा कर इस रोग का इलाज आप कर सकेंगे।

दूसरी बात यह कि आप की इस दुर्बलता का नतीजा यह है कि प्रान्तों में तानाशाही बढ़ती चली जा रही है। आज संविधान की धारा ३५६ के प्रयोग न करने का परिणाम यह हुआ कि आज बहुत से प्रान्तों में जैसे पंजाब है, यहां से दस मील चल कर पंजाब शुरू हो जाता है, वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने अपनी नई मिलिटरी बना कर खड़ी कर ली। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने कहा कि इस प्रकार से कोई चीफ मिनिस्टर अपनी सेना या रक्षा दल नहीं बनायेगा, केवल होम गार्ड रहेंगे लेकिन मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब में उस की ड्रेस अलग, उस के लिये कमान्डेंट अलग, सब कुछ होम गार्ड्स से अलग है। उस के पश्चात ३ सितम्बर को यहां पर जो प्रदर्शन होने वाला है, मेरी निजी जानकारी है कि वही मिलिटरी यहां पर प्रदर्शन करने के लिये लाई जा रही है। यह तमाम चीजें चल रही हैं। क्या आप नहीं जानते हैं कि पंजाब के अन्दर भी इंडियन सिविल सर्विस

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

के आदमी हैं, जितने इंडियन पुलिस सर्विस के आदमी हैं, जितने इंडियन इंजीनियरिंग सर्विस के आदमी हैं उन की क्या स्थिति है ? भाखरा डैम के सुपरिंटेंडिंग इंजीनियर क्लेयर ने क्यों आत्म हत्या की ? छवील लाल मेहता ने क्यों आत्म हत्या की ? कपूर केस, ग्रेवाल केस, इतने तो आप की जानकारी में है। आप की इस दुर्बल नीति का परिणाम यह है कि प्रान्तों में उच्छ्रंखलता बढ़ती चली जा रही है। लखनऊ में इतने दिन से आठ मिनिस्टर इस्तीफा दिये पड़े हैं। यह स्थिति चल रही है। मध्य प्रदेश में भी यह स्थिति है। आप कहते हैं कि अपोजीशन पार्टियों ने पता नहीं कैसे सब मिल यह प्रस्ताव रख दिया। यहां सिद्धांतों का मतभेद हो सकता है। लेकिन पंडित जी, एक खानदान में जब यदुकुल की प्रवृत्ति पैदा हो जाती है तो उस को बचाना मुश्किल हो जाता है। अगर यह यादवी प्रवृत्ति बढ़ती चली जाती है तो मुझे खतरा है कि कहीं यह देश को नुकसान न पहुंचाये।

असम में सात लाख पाकिस्तानी आ कर बैठे हुए हैं और आप कहते हैं कि सरकार का इस के अन्दर हाथ नहीं है। सरकार किसी प्रकार से उन को नहीं बिठलाना चाहती। मगर मेरे पास उन आदेशों की प्रतिलिपि है जो वहां के सेटलमेंट आफिसर ने अपने असिस्टेंट आफिसर को लिखा है। उस से पता चल जायेगा कि किस प्रकार से सरकारी प्रभाव में आ कर अवैध पाकिस्तानियों को शरण दी जा रही है। इस के शब्द अगर आप सुनना चाहें तो मैं उन को सुना सकता हूँ। ३ जनवरी, १९६२ को गोहाटी से लिखी हुई है। तमाम नम्बर वगैरह बतला सकता हूँ और अगर आप चाहेंगे तो मैं उस को भी सदन की मेज पर रख सकता हूँ। उस में स्पष्ट लिखा गया है :-

"With reference to the above, I am to inform you to submit the list of allottees of Bhangnamari P.G.R. in consultation with Shri

Tajuddin Ahmed, M.L.A. and Shri Atur Rahman of Barapeta within 21st May, 1962 positively. You are to enlist only the Muslim immigrants of Gauhati and Barapeta sub-division."

इतने से ही उस को सन्तोष नहीं है। अगले पैराग्राफ में लिखते हैं :-

"No Hindu should be enlisted".
(Interruption).

अब वह सेटलमेंट आफिसर ए० डी० एम० शिलांग बना दिया गया है।

Now he is promoted as A.D.M. in Shillong.

Shri Raghunath Singh: What is the name of that officer?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : ए० सी० शर्मा अब उस को यह पुरस्कार दिया गया है और आप कहते हैं कि सरकारी प्रश्रय उन को नहीं मिल रहा है ? सरकार की तरफ से यह चीजें मिल रहीं हैं। आप चाहे तो यह चिट्ठी पूरी पढ़ भी लीजिये।

अन्त में अपने वक्तव्य को उपसंहार की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं दो बातें विशेष तौर से कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री त्यागी : हिन्दूओं को एनलिस्ट करने के लिये इसलिये इन्कार किया गया होगा कि वे बेचारे वहां से चले गये होंगे।
(Interruptions).

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : आप मेरे समय को नष्ट न कीजिये।

दूसरी बात जो मैं अपने वक्तव्य के अन्त में कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि आचार्य कृपलानी जो ने अपने गांधी आश्रम के वर्क्स का इस्तेमाल किया। मुझे इस बीच में आने की कोई जरूरत

नहीं। लेकिन क्या मैं पूछ सकता कि पंडितजी, आप ने राष्ट्रीय एकता परिषद में विज्ञान भवन में यह कहा था कि जातीयता साम्प्रदायिकता इन से राष्ट्रीय एकता टूट रही है। क्या आप हृदय पर हाथ रख कर बतलायेंगे कि आप ने अमरोहा में जो कैंडिडेट चुना था वह कौन सी राष्ट्रीय एकता का आधार बना कर चुना था, वहां पर जो जाति बरादरी के लीडर भेजे गये थे वे कौन सी राष्ट्रीय एकता को सुरक्षित करने के लिये भेजे गये थे ? लेकिन इस से भी आगे चल कर मैं एक और बड़ी बात आप से कहना चाहता हूं। आप उत्तर प्रदेश में चल कर देखिये। वहां पर 'सम्पूर्णानन्द जी ने कहा था, जब वह चीफ मिनिस्टर थे, कि कोई सरकारी सर्वेट डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड का सदस्य नहीं माना जायेगा। लेकिन आज श्री चन्द्रभानु गुप्त ने वहां के उन परिषदों द्वारा कुछ स्थानों पर अधिकार बनाये रखने के लिये जितने उच्च सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं उन की उक्त परिषदों का मेम्बर बना दिया है और कुछ को बाहर से कोआप्ट कर लिया है।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी (: हमीरपुर) यह गलत है।

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : यह चार्ज गलत है।

श्री प्रकाशबीर झास्त्री : मैं चेलेंज करता हूं आप को इस के लिये। इस का परिणाम यह है कि (*Interruption*) आज उत्तर प्रदेश की जितनी भी परिषदें हैं उन के सम्बंध में यह बात कही जा रही है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : शिव नारायण जी, यही तुम्हारा काम है, यही तुम्हारा कानून है ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : जिला परिषद् के मेम्बर डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड के मेम्बर नहीं हैं। पहले थे अब नहीं हैं।

मैं अन्त में गांधी जी के कुछ शब्द कह कर समाप्त करूंगा। मगर इस के पहले यह भी कहूंगा कि जिस शासन के अन्दर बरोजगारी चोरबाजारी, रिश्वत, अप्टाचार बढ़ गया है, जिस शासन के अन्दर कुनवापरस्ती, ऐयाशी, गरीबी, मंहगाई बढ़ गई है, जिस शासन में अज्ञान, अभाव, अम्याय, अधर्म का बोलबाला है, जिस शासन में तानाशाही, चारित्रिक पतन, अनुशासनहीनता बढ़ी है, जिस शासन में कायरता, दुर्बलता, अकर्मण्यता, आत्महीनता, बढ़ी है, जिस शासन में कत्ल, डाके, चोरी, बलात्कार, अपहरण की कोई गिनती नहीं, जनता के सेवक गोरे साहब की जगह काले साहब बनने में गर्व करते हैं, उन्हें गांधी जी के शब्द सुना कर बैठ जाता हूं। वह शब्द गांधी जी ने अपनी प्रार्थना सभा में पटना में २१-५-४७ को बिहार की कौमी आग में नवजीवन प्रेस अहमदाबाद से छपी है, लिख हैं :-

18 hrs.

“हमारी राज्य सत्ता अंग्रेजों की तरह बन्दूक के जोर से नहीं निभ सकती। अनेक प्रकार के त्याग और तपस्या द्वारा कांग्रेस ने जनता का विश्वास संपादन किया है। परन्तु यदि आज कांग्रेस वाले जनता को धोखा देंगे और सेवा करने के बजाय उस के मालिक बन जायेगा तथा मालिक की तरह व्यवहार करेंगे, तो मैं शायद जीऊँ या न जीऊँ, परन्तु इतने वर्षों के अनुभव के आधार पर यह चेतावनी देने की हिम्मत करता हूँ कि देश में बलवा मच जायेगा, सफेद टोपी वालों को लोग चुन-चुन कर मारेंगे और कोई तीसरी सत्ता इसका लाभ उठा लेगी।

18-01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 21, 1963|Sravana 30, 1885 (Saka).