

[श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह]

इसके बाद भी हम सोचेंगे कि इसके बारे में और क्या किया जा सकता है। लेकिन हाउस को इस बारे में अनएबेयर तो नहीं रखा गया, स्टेटमेंट देकर पूरा मौका दिया गया, और चारों तरफ से लोगों ने सवाल करके अपने दिल का बुझार निकाला, और उन सवालों का जवाब दिया गया।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I never wanted a statement on the Das Commission. I only wanted that just like that, the same terms of reference that the Government had announced for that Commission should have been announced in the case of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the floor of the House. At the least the Commission has been appointed. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri knows it. I wanted that the announcement should have been made here, so that we could also have seen the terms of reference and tried to discuss them. That is my submission.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा आप से निवेदन है कि जो कुछ होगा सो तो होगा ही लेकिन यह जो हमारा देश प्राये वर्ष बाढ़ों से तबाह होता रहता है और काफ़ी जान, माल का नुकसान पहुँचता है उसके लिए इसी अधिवेशन में जोकि वर्षा-कालीन अधिवेशन है भी, इस में बाढ़ की समस्या पर विशेष रूप से विस्तार से विचार हो जाना चाहिए और देश को इस से होने वाली भयंकर तबाही से बचाने के लिए उपाय सोचा जाना चाहिए।

Mr. Speaker: Bills to be introduced.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहूंगा कि इसी सत्र में इस मामले पर बहस हो जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं बोल नहीं रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बोल भी नहीं रहे हैं और आप की आवाज मुझे आ रही है।

WEALTH-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): On behalf of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Wealth-Tax Act, 1957.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Wealth-Tax Act, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I introduce† the Bill.

12.42 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion which stands in my name and for which leave had been given by the House on Monday last, namely:

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

Sir, I ought to say that I move this motion with the fullest sense of responsibility. We are constrained to move this motion because of the mounting misery of the common man in this country and the critical conditions to which this country has been brought in different spheres compel

*Published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary—Part II, section 2, dated 11-9-1964.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

us to sponsor this motion in the House. There is a crisis in every sphere. Honestly, there is a crisis in social, political, economic and other spheres, and for all this I hold this Government mainly responsible. It is not a question of denunciation of any particular individual. I came to the House in the year 1952 and I had the privilege of working with you when you were one of our colleagues on this side of the House, but we have built up some parliamentary tradition. I can assure you and this House that in this debate we shall maintain the highest standards of both parliamentary behaviour and decorum.

You, Sir, have been a man of law for many years and you have also occupied judicial office. I have also been a man of law. When you have got a strong case, you need not abuse the other side. We have a very strong case and therefore, we need not indulge in any personal abuse or denunciation. We want to indict this Government of India for the unfortunate policies pursued during the last 17 years that they have been in power and in office. The Government should not labour under a sense of smug complacency because of the result of the food policy in this Parliament. Even when the steam-roller majority of the Congress party was being whipped up into action to give the seal of approval and for fixing the mark to the wonderful food policy of the Food Minister and the Government, the Joint Committee of the Delhi Wholesale Foodgrains Dealers' decided last evening in Delhi to discontinue the practice of fixing the prices of wheat and rice and pulses and to discontinue the practice of displaying the prices for the benefit of the consumers. This is the solid achievement to the credit of the Food Minister and of this Government. This is the way big business is today reacting to the Government's stand in this House.

We should realise that it is not simply the Opposition Members in this

House who wish to voice the agony of the long-suffering people; the Governor of Maharashtra, Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit, who was a distinguished Member of this House, who is the sister of our late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and who still occupies an important official position, has, out of the anguish of her heart, posed this question: "How long will the hungry and disappointed men and women listen to the reasons that are offered for the failures of the powers that be?" That is the question which we are also putting.

We are convinced that gradually and steadily the process of degeneration is being accelerated. The limits of human endurance have been reached. The Government has badly bungled; in spite of Ministerial speeches and high-sounding declarations, what is the result? The result is that the life of millions of our people has become thoroughly miserable and this is due to Government's callousness and apathy and administrative inefficiency.

The people are disgusted and it is not merely a question of procurement of foodgrains or distribution of foodgrains. It is not merely a question of periodical visits of some hon. Ministers across the seas to knock at the doors of the imperialists and to beg or cajole them for doles for our starving people.

The problem is more serious; the malady is deep. The acute distress and agony of the common man, specially of the middle classes, the landless labour, the poor kisans, and the workers in the factories, are due to the abetment, direct and indirect, of the blackmarketers, the hoarders, the profiteers and the monopolists. During the last 17 years the Government have built them up and given them the charter to carry on depredations on the common man, because they purchase complete immunity by periodical contributions to the coffers of the ruling party.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, Shame.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Beginning with investment in the Congress funds, many of them, these big businessmen, have now become practically the bosses of the party. The latest report of the ex-Chief Justice S. R. Das' Commission has proved beyond doubt that corruption is now filtering down from the top. It is absolutely futile to take action against small traders, pan-wallas or bidi-wallas, small servants, peons and chaprasis, just to make a show of anti-corruption drive. When the hon. Home Minister, Shri Nanda seriously tries to tackle the mounting problem of corruption through the Sadachar Samiti, it is very significant that the Congress President and the Congress party and the Government have all disowned the Sadachar Gamiti; it is no body's baby now. I do not know even if Shri Nanda tries to keep out of it. It may be said that the Congress Government may say that ex-Chief Justice of India, Mr. S. R. Das, was appointed to enquire into the Punjab corruption case. But the honest truth is that the appointment was wrung out of the unwilling and reluctant Government. The Opposition deserves credit, not the Government, for the exposure of the corrupt elements in the unfortunate administration of Punjab. That is merely typical of other States. What have you done in Kerala?

Mr. Speaker: I?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: The Government. For about two years, systematically an attempt was made to scotch the demand for an enquiry into the charges of corruption against the Kerala Chief Minister. Nothing was done and the present debacle is mostly due to the spontaneous upheaval of the people against the corrupt regime. The Government refused to hold an enquiry even when the Congress President of the Kerala State Congress demanded an honest probe. Repeatedly his demands for an honest

enquiry into the allegations of ministerial corruption were turned down. At last some honest Congressman rebelled against the dishonest regime. Then the Government did what? They sent down their emissary from Delhi, who was just back from his American tour, for wooing them back. At last he promised an enquiry as the price of their support for the Congress Ministry. But they did not swallow the bait as they had lost all confidence in the integrity of the organisation. The result is that people have lost faith in the Government's honesty and integrity.

Kerala and Punjab are not the only two geographical regions which clamour against corruption. There are also other States which are equally indignant over the corrupt regimes under which they are groaning. Orissa, Bihar, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh are all demanding such probes. If an honest probe is made the same picture will be revealed in other parts of India. A picture of reeking corruption and mal-administration will emerge. Corruption creates gangsterism and we are very unhappy over some incidents which have recently happened.

Kashmir has cost us very dear. One of the greatest sons of Bengal, one of the greatest sons of India, Dr. Shyma Prasad Mukherjee sacrificed his life for Kashmir. For years, Government kept a corrupt Ministry there. Crores of rupees of the poor Indian tax-payers' money had gone down the drain in Kashmir. Actually the people feel that the Government of India was subsidising corruption in that State.

After having spent hundreds of crores of rupees of the Indian tax-payers' money, Shri Jai Prakash Narayan has now gone with the Government's blessings to Pakistan to pave the way for India's capitulation. Let the Prime Minister clearly and categorically declare that he has not given his blessing to Shri Jai Prakash Narayan in his endeavour to win

the support of President Ayub. Let the Prime Minister tell us that Shri Jai Prakash Narayan was not carrying a letter from the Prime Minister to President Ayub. People will not allow Kashmir to be bartered away in any manner. They want a clear, solemn and categorical assurance that in spite of the machinations of Sheikh Abdullah, the waverings of Shri Jai Prakash Narayan and the mischievous motives of the western powers, Kashmir shall remain an integral part of India and her accession to India is final and irrevocable. Let the Prime Minister clearly declare that the issue of that accession will never be made a negotiable issue with any power or with any country.

Our charge is that the Government is keeping up an artificial state of emergency to subserve its own purposes and to suppress the peoples' democratic rights and liberties. Although the entire gamut of powers had been unhesitatingly placed at the disposal of the executive, no serious action had been taken under the emergency laws against the hoarders, the profiteers or the black-marketeers.

Shri Vidyacharan Shukla (Mahasamund): On a point of order, Sir. Has the hon. Member taken your permission to read out his speech?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): He is not reading.

Mr. Speaker: The question has been put to me and I have to answer it. No doubt he is consulting his notes too often, but that is the way he argues his case and therefore, let us hear him.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: When the call came to the people after the Chinese aggression our people made a supreme sacrifice unhesitatingly. Rarely in the history of the world have any people made such a supreme sacrifice. Our people completely made over complete sovereign powers in the hands of the Government. You know we have given ourselves a very liberal Constitution in which we

have guaranteed basic human rights, and we have made a conscious departure from other Constitutions.

Sir, I had the privilege to represent the great Bar of India at the Commonwealth Law Conference. There I stood up and proudly proclaimed that we in India have made a conscious departure from other Constitutions. We have not merely given ourselves basic human rights, but we have placed them on a very high pedestal. We have declared that they shall not be touched or whittled down or abridged either by the Parliament or by any State Legislature or by the executive. We have made one radical departure. From Kashmir to Cape Comorin, we have provided under article 32 of the Constitution that any citizen of India can confidently approach the highest court in the country, straight to the Supreme Court he can go, for the vindication and enforcement of his fundamental rights.

Not only that. Repelling the arguments of the Attorney General for the Union of India, the Supreme Court has repeatedly declared in more than one case that consistent with the pledge the Judges have taken to uphold and cherish the Constitution, they must give a hearing to any citizen who makes a complaint that his basic human right has been in any way infringed by the executive or the legislature. But what did we do? We have completely abrogated all that when the call came after the Chinese aggression and practically under the cover of emergency, all fundamental rights have been made illusory. Practically the executive has been made omnipotent and practically access to the courts has been blocked. Under the Defence of India Act and rules, if action is taken, under the latest Supreme Court judgment, no approach can be made under article 32 of the Constitution to the Supreme Court. The access is blocked. We suffered all that. The best part of our Constitution we kept in abeyance, because we believed the Government would take

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

firm and strong action to vindicate India's honour, and drive away the aggressor from Indian territory and re-establish our sovereignty over the conquered territory of India.

But what has happened during the last two years? Under the cloak of emergency, what have they done? They have utilised the emergency powers for their own purposes, but they have not done their duty. They have robbed the people of their democratic rights and privileges, but they have not driven out the aggressor. Not one inch of Indian territory has been conquered back yet. Under the cloak of emergency and continuing danger, they have robbed the people of their fundamental rights. The only emergency is this Government. Let this Government disappear, and the emergency will also disappear tomorrow and there will be complete restoration of the people's basic human rights and freedom; there will be no question of their being utilised for party purposes.

It is a great shame. We are told that planned defence preparations have been made. All preparations are on paper. The Chinese are still occupying the territories they conquered. They have not been pushed back. Our incompetent Government is so enamoured of the Colombo Plan that they are only thinking of writing letters and carrying on negotiations with some people, taking no definite action towards reconquering India's lost territory and vindicating India's honour. It is a great shame and we indict the Government for this weak-kneed policy.

Not only that. The Chinese are beginning to make fresh thrusts and intrusions. They are coming into Sikkim. What are the Government doing? What is the Defence Minister doing? Government are begging for some doles, for some little aid somewhere, going up and down the western countries and nothing is really being done. I am quite sure that this Government with its policy of pusillani-

mity, will write strong letters of protest, which will be consigned to the waste paper basket and that will lead to India's further degradation and insult. Therefore, I am submitting that this emergency should be ended, ought to have been ended or taking advantage of the emergency they ought to have taken strong action, strong steps, for recovering India's territory, for vindicating India's national honour.

12 hrs.

I come from a State which is called the land of the Bande Mataram. In the freedom's battle Bengal, Punjab and Maharashtra were in the forefront under the leadership of the great fighters like Surendranath Banerjee, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aswini Kumar Dutt and Aurobindo Ghosh. A brilliant band of Bengal revolutionaries unfurled the banner of revolt against British imperialism. In order to crush the united strength of Bengalis, the British devised the unholy partition and divided Bengal. The greatest chapter, the most glorious chapter in our history is the brilliant way in which Bengal fought against that partition. Lord Morley declared in the British House of Lords "Let Bengal's leaders shout, let Bengal's leaders go on agitating our stand is clear, it is a settled fact which will never be unsettled." Sir, we unsettled that settled fact imposed by the British.

Unfortunately, when freedom came, Bengal was partitioned, and Punjab was partitioned and the supreme price for India's emancipation from British bondage had to be paid by the people of Bengal and the people of Punjab. What has happened? Mr. Jinnah had declared most solemnly when Pakistan was formed that there shall be no discrimination against the minorities. These pledges have been completely cast to the winds and over five million of the minority community have been driven out squeezed out systematically, completely robbed

economically, and they had to take shelter elsewhere.

I charge this Government with having treated the refugee problem with cruel indifference. Not even one half of the refugees have been really resettled. On the other hand, a new trouble has come after the incident, the unfortunate incident, which occurred in Kashmir, when a dishonest statement was made by President Ayub that the Holly relic was robbed by a non-Muslim. Then the communal carnage started and the systematic policy of minority-baiting has been going on unabated in Pakistan. The result has been that more than half a million people have come to India. But the grievance of our people is that there is a conspiracy among the high-ups in the Congress not to allow these people to be resettled in West Bengal but to have their relief and rehabilitation outside the State of West Bengal. Immediately a man crosses the border an attempt is made to spirit him away straight to Mana Camp or Dandakaranya. Irrespective of his occupational proclivities or potentialities, this is done and I am sorry to say that there has been large-scale deaths in insanitary and unhealthy refugee camps due to want of water, medical relief and other preventable handicaps.

Yet, no attempt has been made by this Government to demand compensation for properties left behind or for cash left behind by these millions of refugees. No attempt has been made even to recover or protect the girls or women who have been taken away or forcibly removed from their hearths and homes. I am therefore saying that with regard to the refugee problem the Government have grievously failed in doing their duty.

With regard to Dandakaranya, it is a matter of great shame that when a very competent officer of the highest integrity and administrative experience had the temerity to point out to

the Indian Government certain gross and patent defects in the administration of Dandakaranya, his life was made miserable and he was ultimately made to resign his chairmanship. What was his crime? What was the offence that he committed? Shri Shaibal Gupta is a distinguished member of the Indian Civil Service. He reported, firstly, that agriculture in Dandakaranya was in a poor way, though this was by and large the principal method of rehabilitation . .

Mr. Speaker: If I may interrupt the hon. Member, his taking of the case of an individual officer is not permissible inside Parliament. If he advocates that such and such officer was very competent, very efficient and honest, the Government shall have an opportunity to say many other things against him, and that question cannot be decided here. Therefore, we should avoid references to individual officers.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am not complaining. He was the Chairman of an autonomous corporation and in that capacity he pointed out certain defects in the Dandakaranya administration set up for the rehabilitation of refugees. He pointed out, for instance, that irrigation was conspicuous by its absence, that urban and semi-urban rehabilitation were all extremely imperfect, that education had a small budget, that there was reckless touring whether in Dandakaranya or outside, the officers spent days together in big cities on the pretext of purchasing stores, that the TA bills of those officers who toured amounted to Rs. 14.48 lakhs for 1963-64 and so on. He also pointed out one significant fact, that an anti-corruption officer had been appointed to look into these cases in Dandakaranya administration but that post was abolished on the plea of economy in administration.

Shri S. M. Benerjee: Shame.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am charging the Government with grievous failure to tackle the refugee problem.

On the eve of partition of India, I remember at the request of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, I had to convene the East Bengal convention. Two thousand delegates from East Bengal attended the convention which was held in the city of Calcutta. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, who was a Minister of the Nehru Cabinet, went down to Calcutta and presided. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, as the Prime Minister of India, sent a telegram which was read out there. Referring to the succour and relief of these people the Prime Minister said "I will be a sharer in your joys and sorrows alike and this is the pledge. I am giving as the Prime Minister". Sardar Patel also in very strong terms assured them that they will be given full rehabilitation facilities in case of any difficulty or danger and said "I assure you that you shall be treated completely as Indian citizens if you have got to come over to this country". Now these pledges still remain unredeemed. I am sorry to say that in spite of our repeated demands, Government has not responded in the proper spirit to implement the pledges which the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Indian nation had given to the minority community in East Bengal. I am not saying this merely because I belong to the Opposition. There is lack of administrative integrity in the country.

Shri Asoka Mehta, Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission spoke at Bhopal on the 9th of August and said that the rise in prices of food articles and other essential commodities of daily use throws a challenge not only to the ingenuity of the people with small incomes but also to the political stability of this country. Then he observed—I am quoting his exact language—

"The run away prices would keep on hurting unless the shock of the present crisis induces us to change our methods and our moods."

The complaint is that the Government has not changed its methods or its moods. On the question of corruption and control, Government is sitting poised for a long time. It is really unable to strike the profiteers down. There have been so many declarations regarding Government's intention to check prices and to check corruption; a good deal of political energy has been wasted, yielding little results or no results.

Having solemnly assured this country that the hoarders and black-marketers would be sternly dealt with, they have ended by rounding up the people who have raised their voices of protest against these profiteers and blackmarketers. I have just now received very dismal news from Uttar Pradesh that eminent citizens including some eminent lawyers who were only trying to educate public opinion and were taking part in some non-violent demonstrations have been rounded up and are being subjected to unnecessary harassment because they participated in those demonstrations against the anti-social elements.

India's honour was badly shaken at the last Commonwealth Conference. I take it that India's representatives were very badly briefed. Any reference to disputes between India and Pakistan in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference is an expression of the pro-Pakistani bias that has hitherto governed the British attitude towards India. The British Prime Minister's reference to Kashmir was wholly uncalled for. Our greatest regret is that our representatives whom the Prime Minister was good enough to depute did not enter their protest at the proper time against this attempt to compromise the sovereignty of India.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

I ask this Government to remember that any cringing bargain for economic or military aid does no credit to our country. India was let down and let down badly and we are not satisfied with the halting explanations put forward.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would give some reasons, while summarising my points, why I am pressing this No-Confidence Motion. Firstly, Government's failure to protect our economic independence on account of its policies of increasing reliance on foreign private capital rather than on our own resources for development; secondly, its utter and supine dependence on foreign imports of food when 70 per cent of our people live in villages and more than 40 per cent of our national income comes from agriculture; thirdly, its increasing submission to private monopolists, black-marketers and profiteers and its failure to check the banks from making advances against foodgrains; fourthly, its failure to hold the price-line to check alarming decline in the living standards of the people caused by the galloping price rise of recent months which has completely wiped off all the gains of the three Five Year Plans with regard to the per capita income; fifthly, its failure to provide security of life and property to the citizens of the country; sixthly, its failure to maintain the purity of elections; seventhly, its failure to protect the interests of our nationals abroad in Burma, Ceylon and East Africa; its failure to maintain the territorial integrity of the country by opening up negotiations on issues which every man in this country considers past and closed and which causes considerable embarrassment to our friends abroad and by inadequate defence preparedness resulting in disgraceful yet pliant surrender before our bullying neighbours. The policy of this Government is "Inefficiency at home and infirmity and weakness abroad".

Sir, I have done.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

As the next speaker I must have called the representative of the Swatantra Group because that is the biggest group now, but Shri Trivedi requests that he has to leave; so, I wonder, if it can be adjusted.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Shri Dandekar has been elected recently; it will be his maiden speech.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): He may be called next.

Mr. Speaker: I suppose, Shri Trivedi has to leave only a little later.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): I will not take more than half an hour.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We want to hear him.

Mr. Speaker: All right; let him speak then. Time limit on speeches should also be there. Shri Dandekar wants 30 minutes.

Shri M. R. Masani: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: All right; Shri Dandekar.

Shri N. Dandekar (Gonda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to begin by asking for your indulgence and for the indulgence of the House to my maiden experience here and for my unfamiliarity with parliamentary procedures. I hope I shall acquit myself with as few faults in regard to parliamentary procedures as I can manage.

It seems to me, Sir, that on a motion of this kind it is necessary to take a rapid survey of the factual position in the country today, a sort of a quick review of the state of the nation, because it is only then that

[Shri N. Dandekar]

one can assess the performance that one is to criticise. I shall endeavour to do this in three or four different ways in three or four different sectors of the national state of affairs. I might add that although my survey will be considerably critical, I think, it would be just as well if I made it clear right at the outset that on this motion we are not in support, at this juncture, of the motion of no-confidence. I feel that the proper course at this stage is to take stock and that I shall now proceed to do.

To begin with, on the economic front the main errors is that people are inclined to look at this or that aspect of the economic situation instead of looking at it as a logical whole. If one looks at it in that way, I feel certain that the origins of the present economic situation in the country lies in the total failure of the Second Five Year Plan and the impending failure of the Third Five Year Plan. These failures in both cases are almost entirely due to the fact that physical targets were chosen that were wholly un-achievable, that even when those physical targets were reduced, as in the case of the Second Five Year Plan, such reduced targets could not also be reached; and the only targets that could be reached were the financial targets, which means that with much less by way of physical achievement there was expenditure of the full order that was contemplated for a very much larger size of the project.

The basic reasons for these failures are important because unless one assesses the basic causes, I do not think one is in touch with the real situation. I submit that the three principal reasons for these Plans to have gone all wrong were, in the first place, an over-emphasis on industrial development to the detriment of agriculture; secondly, even within industrial development, an excessive emphasis on heavy industry rather than upon ordinary industry and particularly to the detriment of consumer industries; and, thirdly, even as regards heavy indus-

try, an extra-ordinary preference for development in the public sector.

I have often wondered why these choices were made. I think, partly, they were deliberate, but partly they were also the consequence of the almost semantic hypnotism of words, such as "basic industry" and "public sector". Somehow we have got into the habit of thinking that basic industry must necessarily mean heavy industry, mining, heavy engineering and things of that kind. My submission is that in truth the expression "basic industry" should be relative to the economy and the economic structure of a particular country at a particular time; and on this view, the facts are quite simple as to what should properly be regarded as the basic industry for this country.

The facts are that over 80 per cent of the population in this country is rural population, that over 70 per cent of the working population in this country is the working population in agriculture, that over 47 per cent of the national income of this country is from agriculture, that over 8 per cent is from small-scale industries and some 13 per cent from commerce, trade and transport other than Railways. Now, on facts of that kind, it seems to me almost elementary that, unless we are obsessed with a sort of semantic hypnosis as to the meaning of the expression 'basic industry', unless we were obsessed with the meaning of the words 'basic industry' as equatable to heavy engineering industry, mining and the like the basic industry for this country is agriculture and nothing else. There has been right from the beginning of the Second Five Year Plan and certainly throughout the Third Five Year Plan an extraordinarily warped motion as to the meaning of the words 'basic industry'.

The other hypnotic spell that has been holding us down for a long time

has been a complete obsession with the expression 'public sector'. This obsession takes various forms. Some talk about the public ownership of all production which means that production and distribution should be by the Government. Some others feel that what is needed is seizing "commanding heights" in the economy. And others talk about getting hold of the "strategic positions" in the economic structure. But all this is founded upon the misconception that *ex hypothesi*, or *per se*, public sector is necessarily economical and more beneficial than the private sector. I think one forgets the entire lesson of history that the entire economic development practically all over the world, including this country where agriculture is the basic industry, that the basic economic development and progress of the whole world over the past generations has been primarily the contribution of the private sector and only secondarily the contribution of the public sector. But somehow we have got into this mental state of *per se* acceptance of the proposition that the public sector is the only sector that is very important in generating economic growth.

The third thing that went wrong with this planning and continues to be entirely wrong has been a remarkable concealment from the public of the really true cost of the whole project. I was, the other day, tabulating from the Third Five Year Plan what really was the total cost of the project, even as then conceived, and what was provided by way of resources even assuming that those resources, as so provided, would become available, which I even doubt. Here are the figures. The Plan outlay, meaning outlay on investment is Rs. 6300 crores; and current outlay, meaning non-investment outlay, Rs. 1200 crores, and everyone of us thought that this amount of Rs. 7500 crores was the size of the Plan. But actually it is not so. The Planning Commission has planned a further investment outlay of Rs. 800 crores and have specifically stated that it was not then known as

to where the resources would come from. And the most startling was the statement that nothing was being done, no notice is being taken, no problem of resources was being considered for the commitment outlay of something like Rs. 3000 crores arising out of the Second Five Year Plan. There is no provision at all. The total expenditure, contemplated was, therefore, of the order of Rs. 11,300 crores. And even on the basis of the planning, the providing of resources, assuming, as I said, that those resources would be available, was of the order of Rs. 7500 crores involving a supposed deficit financing of the order of Rs. 500 crores only.

I suggest that this kind of deliberate planning for bankruptcy, this kind of deliberate planning of expenditure for which not even any thought was given to the question of resources, actual or imaginary is one of the three principal causes for the failure of the Plans, besides the other two causes to which I have already referred.

Added to this—and this is the fourth important point—is the most extraordinary conglomeration of entirely self-contradictory objectives and purposes in the Plans. The way have got them in the Plans; they, of course, sound very good namely, to reduce disparities of income and wealth, to minimise concentration of economic power and to prevent the growth of monopolies, all high-sounding nonsense—the most wonderful sound but no substance whatever.

To reduce disparities of income and wealth in a country like this where the vast majority of people are poor, exceedingly poor, at subsistence level, is to talk plain nonsense. It is, in fact, to talk for stimulating jealousies and hatred and other things of that kind and not doing anything for raising the levels of incomes and wealth.

Coming to minimising concentration of economic power, I think, during my industrial career I had been the head of the two of the largest corporations

[Shri N. Dandekar]

in this country, and I am not aware that I had any power of any kind. On the contrary, I am aware of having been harassed continually by governmental power in every direction. Sometimes it was foreign exchange; sometimes it was finance; it was this control and that control; it was this Minister and this Government; it was that Minister and that Government and all that—answerable to whom, all the time, I had to approach or be answerable for thousands of things—with the result that for one period of six months I kept a record of the time spent on really doing my job. I spent no more than 30 per cent of time on doing my job. The rest of my time was utterly wasted. At the same time, to say, with this enormous, massive, legislative and executive control, to inhibit, to intervene and to regulate, that there is such a thing in reality as concentration of economic power is another one of those diversionary non-senses which does a good deal of harm and no good that I can see.

Then, there has been this business of prevention of growth of monopolies. When I heard about appointing a Committee or a Commission to examine this question, I looked round to see where was this monopoly and who is the monopolist.

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty (Barackpore): You.

Shri N. Dandekar: If any accepted definition of the word 'monopolist' were examined in relation to the real facts, the only monopolist in the country is the Government. The Government today are monopolising all the essential industries; furthermore, the Government today are contemplating to monopolise various types of trade. There are threats about banking; there are threats about insurance. I know of no monopoly in reality except merely as a propaganda matter. What is the result of all this? What is the briefest picture that I could give you today of the present position about the state of the nation in regard to its

economic affairs? I do not think any further description is necessary. The foreign exchange crisis has been with us for years. There is now the crisis of the idle capacity. Although we have not been able to reach the various industrial targets, nevertheless, there exists in the country today an enormous amount of idle capacity in industrial plants of almost every category. Then there is the capital market crisis. It is impossible to float any kind of equity or the other capital unless—and only unless—large chunks of it are under-written by institutions like the Life Insurance Corporation and various other institutions.

13.29 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then, there is the inflation crisis—and it is no use minimising it. Every time the Government spokesmen talk about inflation they talk about inflationary pressures, they talk about something chasing something. They do not honestly admit that what it is. It is a plain monetary inflation crisis. And this inflation crisis reflects, as it must, in terms of rise in prices, in rising costs of living and consequently in rising wages and rising dearness allowances. A specific example of the inflationary crisis is, of course, the foodgrains crisis. The foodgrains crisis is not merely in terms of availability but also in terms of prices. I could go on listing out these *ad nauseam*. The consequence of all this has been, as was reported by the Committee that looked into the real income of the agricultural workers, that the rural income of the vast majority of the people in this country, after years of planning and after years of this kind of resources planning, has in fact gone down.

There was the other committee that was concerned with the question that the poor had become poorer and the rich had become richer, and they have definitely found that the poor have become poorer, but there was no sign of any rich having become richer.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):
No, no.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):
There are retired ICS officers who
are demanding Rs. 20,000 salary per
month.

An Hon. Member: He was getting
Rs. 20,000.

Shri N. Dandekar: This is the
picture of the present economic
shambles.

Now, I would like the House to take
a look at the constitutional and legal
shambles in this country. Not more
than fifteen years ago, less than fifteen
years ago, our wise men—and they
were wise; there is no doubt about
it—men who had done a lot of sacrifice
for the country—today, they may be
different—these wise men, got to-
gether and framed a Constitution after
a period of two and a half years; they
did a very good job. They studied the
Constitutions all over the world; they
incorporated Fundamental Rights;
they incorporated certain safeguards
like statutory bodies such as the
Auditor-General, the judiciary, the
Chief Justice, the Election Commission
and so on. But hardly had they given
themselves this Constitution, hardly
had we begun to understand what this
Constitution was, than began over a
period of fifteen years a series of am-
endments which have continually and
steadily had only one characteristic,
namely continually to erode the Fun-
damental Rights of the citizens in this
country. It is the most astonishing
performance.

I cannot give it any other name than
to say that the Government have deli-
berately been bending the Constitu-
tion to their will, because the Plan
became their God and the Constitu-
tion had no longer any sanctity.

Moreover, just as they have been
bending the Constitution to the Plan
and to all their ideas about planning,
they have also been bending the law,
the general law, for the same purpose.

I think I should say that when I
started in service myself, the volume
containing the Central laws and the
volumes containing the laws of the
particular Province in which I started
my service were contained in a small
almirah. Today, the volumes of Cen-
tral laws require a library. And if
you wish to have all the volumes of
the State laws,—let it be any State;
I do not care whether it is Maharash-
tra or Gujarat or any other—they are
so voluminous that you require an-
other large library for accommodating
them.

This jungle of laws not only grows
as jungles grow, but it also grows by
continual amendment of the laws and
rules and regulations, until at one time
Mr. Justice Chagla, who was at that
time the Chief Justice of the Bombay
High Court, trying a case under the
Bombay Tenancy Act, was constrain-
ed to observe that 'Although the ordi-
nary citizen is supposed to know the
law, I the Chief Justice do not know
what the law on the subject is; I can-
not find it. There are far too many
amendment slips attached to this law
and to these rules and regulations'.

The two principal characteristics of
these laws that have been inflicted
upon us during the last ten or fifteen
years are these. The first is to oust on
every occasion the jurisdiction of the
courts to the maximum extent possi-
ble; the second is to have the largest
degree of devolution of powers upon
the executive. The consequences of
these two put together, along with
the utter contempt for the Supreme
Court, so that, whenever the Supreme
Court decides a matter against Gov-
ernment and the Government do not
like it, they bring in legislation sub-
sequently to negative the Supreme
Court's judgment,—the consequence of
these characteristics coupled with the
massive legislations, massive controls,
massive regulations relating to licen-
ces, and quotas and permits and the
like, which have been the fate of this
country, the consequence of these is
this that the ordinary citizen must
move about in this jungle at his peril.

[Shri N. Dandekar]

I shall come now to the point about the political and moral picture as it is today. It has been obvious, I think, to most people, it certainly has been to the Government, because they have a committee working on this, that there is a steadily increasing degree of national disintegration taking place, such a degree of national disintegration that they have something functioning called the Notional Integration Committee. And over the period of these last ten or fifteen years, tenants have been set up against landlords, the workmen against the employers, and new enmities have been raising their heads in every village. I ask all these gentlemen here honestly to ask themselves whether this so-called democratic decentralisation has not brought about new enmities and new bitternesses in the village, in the taluk, in the block committees, in the zilla parishad in the district, in the co-operative societies, in the consumer societies and the like.

Just immediately after the result of my election petition before the tribunal, I went round to my constituency. Although it was raining, I went round, and people were very very nice to me, and they met me, and they said 'You have fought this one battle, but how are we going to fight all these things that are continually going on here?'. They were being daily exploited in numerous ways; and they were being periodically exploited and plagued by these elections, by these partisan situations resulting from the so-called democratic decentralisation, which was nothing less than handing them over to professional politicians who wish to continue in power.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur): On a point of order. The hon. Member has referred to the gentlemen sitting here.

Shri P. K. Deo: The hon. Member is making a maiden speech, and that should not be interrupted in this manner.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: But he did not include the ladies. Are not the ladies here hon. Members of this House?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This is the trouble with the Congress Party. They cannot even interrupt properly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It is mere frivolity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri N. Dandekar: This is the state of affairs in the country. I do not want to keep on saying these things, because one can go on and on and on. I am perfectly certain, and I say this without any hesitation, that all these people sitting here are aware of this. They are aware of the extent to which the common man is being exploited not any more by the landlord, not any more by the capitalists so-called, but he is being exploited by people who ought to know better, by people who are politically, really, their masters and wish to remain their masters. There is no other agency, and there is no other exploiter, and this goes on and on.

It might be asked why in the face of this kind of picture that I see around, in this grand inquest upon the utterly degrading situation that now exists in the country in any sphere that one likes to examine,—why with this sort of picture before me, I, nevertheless, stand here and say on this particular motion, that I am not in favour of the motion that has been moved, and I think that the House is entitled to an explanation for that attitude.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Because you know that the Shastri Government will help you.

Shri N. Dandekar: There are two reasons for it. In the first place, I am quite clear that the present Government that is now in charge of the affairs of the country is a new Government, and they are still finding

their feet. I do not believe that people ought to be hanged for the sins of their fathers. I believe that they ought to be given a chance.

Shri Daji (Indore): A good compliment to Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Shri N. Dandekar: I believe that not merely ought they to be given a chance, but this Government has inherited a situation not entirely of its own making. It is partly of their making, but it is partly a situation arising out of an ever-powering personality who over the past seventeen years had been in fact the *de facto* government in the country. And of course, coming into a legacy of that kind, coming after a great personality of that kind, it is natural and it is proper that one must not really jump upon their throats and start immediately condemning them. I think that what is necessary is that the Government must be made aware of what the situation is, and Government must be given time to put right things by remedial action.

While talking about remedial action, I am imbued by the belief that they do intend taking remedial action; I am fortified in this belief by the pronouncements that have been made carefully and guardedly by the hon. Prime Minister and sometimes by some of his colleagues. I am encouraged in the belief that they are now at least about to approach the problem on the footing of realism, that "pragmatism" is for them no longer just a word but that it will be the basis for sustained policy that will be put actually into practice. I am encouraged in the belief that they will see to it—and have seen to it—that excessive emphasis on heavy industry and heavy engineering is wrong, that excessive emphasis on industry generally at the expense of agriculture and consumer industries which, after all, constitute the content of the standard of living of the ordinary man, is wrong. The ordinary man's standard of living is not built upon steel and boilers; the

standard of living of 85 to 90 per cent of our population is built upon food, upon the variety of food, upon clothing, the variety of clothing, upon a little decent housing, upon a certain amount of travel, upon a certain capacity to spend on ceremonies, upon a certain capacity to save, upon a capacity to participate in melas, cultural activities and things of that kind.

Shri Daji: And then import steel.

Shri N. Dandekar: I would prefer not to import foodgrains; even if I have to import steel, I do not mind. In fact, it is one of the most extraordinary concept which has gained currency that in the name of self-sufficiency, in the name of grandeur in all kinds of schemes, somehow we are not ashamed to import foodgrains, but we are ashamed to import steel.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Shri N. Dandekar: It does not make sense to me. What makes sense is that this country ought to be, first and foremost, self-sufficient in agriculture and not have to go in for this wretched business of PL-480 year after year. In fact, one of the great things that the late Prime Minister did at one time do was in the course of the First Five Year Plan, when he accepted the advice of Mahatma Gandhi and abolished food control. I have looked up statistics. In 1950-51, the first year of the first Five Year Plan, imports of foodgrains were to the tune of 4.7 million tons. In the fifth year, they had gone down to 0.75 million tons. Then we came face to face with the Second Five Year Plan and a reversal took place. The Second Plan started with an annual import of foodgrains at around one million tons and ended at around 4 to 4.4 million tons. It is the most astonishing statement for anybody to make that 'I will import foodgrains, but I must be self-sufficient in steel'. I just do not understand it.

[Shri N. Dandekar]

Now, as I said, I think this Government has to be given a chance. I am equally certain that quietly, steadily, they want to come to grips with the problems. Because the problems are enormous—I do not envy any of them. They have got tremendous problems. They have got the most frightful inheritance and they have to try to make a success of their job. I am prepared to say that they will devote themselves to this task. I am not “non-aligned.” We are in a state of armed neutrality vis-a-vis the Government. We will not hesitate to criticise or even to condemn. But when they do the right thing, we shall respond by saying, ‘All right. Get along. You are doing fine’. If anybody thinks that this is some kind of supine non-alignment, that I am neither on this side nor on that, he is quite wrong. Whenever, for instance, there is any question about an attack on fundamental rights of the people, I am not non-aligned; I shall fight. When it is a question of any further encroachment by Statism against the rights of the individual and of free enterprise, I shall criticise, I shall fight. I am prepared to do that.

So that is the reason why we stand aside from this Motion. When the state of affairs in this country is so bad, let us give these gentlemen time and let them acquit themselves well, if they will, or fail, if they must.

श्री बागड़ी (हिमर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह भाषण मॉसन के पक्ष में है या विपक्ष में ।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in the last four days, we have had a debate on the food situation. The food debate had given us a lot of figures and some jugglery of words. A mathematical jugglery has been put forward to suggest that we have some sort of self-sufficiency in food. One of the hon. Members suggested in arithmetical terms that each one of us could get daily one lb. of food. This jugglery was not exposed by the Food Minister himself.

The figures given by Government from time to time have indicated that even in a surplus state like UP. the production of wheat has gone down systematically. In 1961-62, it was 41 lakh tons; in 1962, it came down to 32 lakh tons. In 1963-64, it came down to 27 lakh tons. From where are we going to get the food to feed the millions in U.P.? Figures supplied by Government indicate that we need about 63 lakh tons of wheat from foreign countries to tide over the difficulties and we will still not be self-sufficient; to augment that, we would have to import from Pakistan, Thailand and Burma. In the light of this, I do not see with what check a motion was moved that the policy of Government vis-a-vis food be approved. The hon. Food Minister himself said that we are making attempts to tide over the difficulties. But the policy was not laid down. There has been no food policy so far. The only food policy is that of importing food. If importing food is the policy, I should say that we should be ashamed to say that we have approved the policy of Government. None of us has felt that any approval of that policy in this sense was called for.

This morning when I was reading the *Statesman*, I found an editorial. I will quote a few words from that.

“Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit has been voicing her discontent in Bombay. She is oppressed with a sense of shame that after 17 years of independence, the strong, united nation we dreamt about is checker-board of disintegrating states hostile to one another”.

This is what we are finding. Another lady, who is now a Minister here, said plaintively the other day, thinking of the state of the Congress, that she did not know where the party was going. This is the feeling of many amongst the Congress itself, amongst the ruling party itself. Can they not come out honestly and say, ‘We have bungled; we have miserably bungled on the food front; we have mis-

erably bungled in our defence policy; we have most miserably bungled in our relationship with foreign nations; we have bungled in everything which can carry this country to a flourishing state. We have found ourselves in a miserable state'.

Let us take stock of the situation. In the last 17 years, in what way have we improved our situation? Let us cast our eyes on all sides. Here we have got China to deal with. What has happened with China? Today we are just sitting tight, afraid of China. We are only negotiating with Pakistan so that she may come with us, so that the strength of China may be weakened. But we have not strengthened ourselves to face China. Chumbi valley has now been completely occupied by the Chinese. The Chumbi valley in their possession is a dagger in our heart. Anyone of us who looks at the map of India can feel that the occupation of Chumbi valley by the Chinese is only a prelude to cutting us off from Assam. Within one hour of the army marching, we will be cut off from all connections with Assam. What have we done to avert such a situation?

A question was very recently raised. We are only quarrelling on the question as to how far Gangtok is from the boundary. Some say it is 14 miles; others say it is 31 miles. The Minister admitted that at least within 150 yards of the boundary, the Chinese had entered, and when we encountered them, they ran away. I remember we gave our word that any attack on Sikkim would mean an attack on India. Have we attacked back? Have we taken back the Chumbi valley? Have we driven out the army of the Chinese from the Chumbi valley? We have done nothing.

The cease-fire was there. NEFA has been vacated by the Chinese, but we dare not send our army to occupy the territory which we claim to be our own. Why? What precludes us from doing that? Why we are afraid of the Chinese I cannot understand.

The Chinese know their strategy. At a particular time they realised that their line of supply and reinforcement was so long that they would not be able to bring their supplies to the plains of India, and that is why they called a cease-fire. The other reason was that Soviet Russia refused to give them the necessary help, and therefore, they cried a halt in their own interests. We never took advantage of that position to drive back that army.

Very recently I met an army officer who told me of the 110 soldiers who fought back the Chinese in Ladakh. Of them 109 were killed and only one was saved. The officer was narrating to me that for the first time the Indian Army fought back to the last man, and though 109 were killed, as many as 10,000 Chinese were killed by them. But this has never been reported in our press. No glory has been given to these people, and yet the Chinese ants are coming in to swallow us. Our army can drive them back, utterly kill them, destroy them completely, take back Tibet completely, declare Tibet independent and set up a buffer State for our own safety and destroy the Chinese. We need not depend upon the goodwill of Pakistan at all, but we have miserably failed to do what is very apparent and patent to us.

Shri Jaya Prakash Narain is not here.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Ja-lore): Will not be here.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: And he cannot give a reply to the allegations I am going to make, but I say that it is just hanging down one's head in shame that Mr. Jaya Prakash Narain is sent out from here—it is said in some papers with the blessings of the Prime Minister—to go to Pakistan with unjustly humiliating terms for the purpose of yielding Kashmir to Pakistan. What for have we fought for Kashmir? What for have we given crores

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

and crores to Kashmir? How many times have we declared that the accession of Kashmir is irrevocable and cannot be set at naught, and yet we are negotiating on that very basis. What is their demand?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi): He has not gone to negotiate on Kashmir. Do not create misunderstandings.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Let that assurance come from the Prime Minister, we will welcome it. We are awaiting it.

An Hon. Member: He is a Cabinet Minister.

Shri Tyagi: For only friendly relations.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Oh, yes, friendly relations with those who every day attack you, every day hit you, kill your men across the cease-fire line, and you say you want to negotiate. What dispute is there? I come into your house as a burglar and say I have a dispute with you. What dispute have I with you? Entering into a house and trying to commit burglary—that is not the sense of a dispute. There is no other dispute between us and Pakistan. The only point is that we are very docile people.

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bagaha): On a point of order. The hon. Member has made a statement that it appeared in the press that Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan has been sent by the Central Government to Pakistan. That is a misstatement? Can he quote any paper which has published this? How has he made that statement?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can leave it to the Government to contradict it.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes, if he wants I can read out.

Then, let me cast my eyes towards Pakistan. What have we done in Pakistan? Even today 2,000 refugees are pouring in from East Pakistan, and with the atrocities committed upon

them, we cannot tell them not to send away these people from their country. We cannot demand even an inch of land from them. We are prepared to yield Berubari to them. We have got a small railway line running between two corners; it is a small space of about 20 miles through which we are allowed to run it. We cannot claim even a big corridor of 80 miles to protect our interests when Assam is attacked.

Infiltration of Pakistanis has taken place in Assam in huge numbers. People say 46 lakhs, but Government admitted 20 lakhs. Let it be 20 lakhs; even that is a big number. Eight hundred Pakistanis were sent back to Pakistan, but they are still at a stand still as Stateless people near Amritsar. So, in what way can Pakistan be your friend?

Friendship can only come between equals. If we have got a sufficiency of strength and can make a show of our strength, then only Pakistan is going to listen to what we have to say. Unless we have a show of strength, it will not listen to us.

On the other hand, we are throwing away our friends and refusing to shake hands with those friends who are extending their hand of friendship to us. When we require help, America rushes to our help, U. K. rushes to our help, even the Commonwealth countries rushed to our help; yet, when the time comes, we do everything in our power to irritate the United States and the United Kingdom, and seek friendship with those who have never helped us. Why is this wrong policy being followed? Why this wrong policy is being followed in our country passes my comprehension.

Very recently, Gen. Ayub, in a broadcast speech, said that India has got enemies on all sides; so, let the world judge whether India is a good country. She has no good relations with Nepal; with Ceylon, with Burma, with Africa; with Pakistan, with China. So, if one country is at war with the neighbouring coun-

tries, or is not on friendly terms, then the world must come to this inference that Pakistan is the soul of honesty, is the soul of innocence, and that Indians are the only black guards in the world. It is this diplomacy that they are following.

The Chinese have also got a certain amount of diplomacy and I may read a sentence here:

"The latest case is the active and vigorous diplomacy of Communist China, who has thus ensured against any possible military action on our part by creating within the very Indian sub-continent a second and simultaneous threat for us."

There was a case not very long ago. An ex-Member of Parliament, Dr. Satya Narayan Sinha, made a report about the move of the Chinese in the Chumbi Valley. When he made this report, the military intelligence of the Government of India and the Intelligence Department of the Government of India made a report against him, and he was put in a death cell, he was confined to a death cell in Ranchi. His five year old daughter was arrested, and another son was arrested. They were all put behind bars. Fortunately for him, he knew French in which he could write and smuggle out a letter to the late Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Then only the poor man was released. It is this intelligence which misguides us, which puts us in the wrong. Infiltration has gone very bad. It is high time that we checked up this intelligence. It is to our interests that we do it. It is this action of the Government which the country is not prepared to tolerate, and therefore the country feels perturbed.

14 hrs.

It is true that, as Shri Dandekar says, the Government is being criticised for its past actions. Past or present, yours is the firm which is running this limited concern, you are

the holders of the shares and you are responsible for all the actions. We cannot distinguish between X,Y and Z. The shareholders are the same, the managing directors are practically the same. One managing director may not be there, yet we cannot take off your responsibility for the position in which we find ourselves today. When I am talking about this, I am reminded of the position of Indians in Burma. In reply to pointed questions the other day, our External Affairs Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh said that there was no discrimination between Indians and Chinese in Burma. Our misfortune is that even the obvious is not seen by our people. Very recently, in my tour of Malaysia in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference I had been to Burma and I have lived in Burma for fifteen years. I know every nook and corner. I felt very much to know that in every activity the Indian was being pushed out while the Chinaman was not touched. Every shop evicted by an Indian was immediately occupied by the Chinese. Even the betel leaf shops of 122 persons from U.P. were seized and nationalised as if Government was going to sell pan. Every petrol pump owned by Indians was nationalised but not one of the Chinese has been nationalised. He is selling petrol all right and no single policeman from the Burmese side could check it. The Chinese hold is so great that no Government authority could dare do anything to the Chinese because the Chinaman was strongly supported by a strong Chinese Government. Out of 14 lakhs of Indians in Burma in 1941, hardly 2.80 lakhs remain in Burma. All their properties have been confiscated and not one farthing has been paid as compensation. Promises after promises were made but nothing has happened. The same thing is happening in British Guiana. Lakhs and lakhs of Indians are living there but they are being butchered and slaughtered by the negroes because the whole police force is constituted by them even though the Prime Minister happens to be a person c

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

Indian origin and he is unable to control. Indians are being killed but no voice is raised. We have not even an accredited representative to represent our grievances. It is the same thing in Jamaica and Trinidad. Why are we so quiet about it. This is what perturbs everybody who has eyes to see and ears to listen.

When I think of all this, I am reminded of a small country which has become free very recently, like ourselves and which is also being bullied. I refer to Malaysia. Fortunately, it has got a strong Prime Minister. It is a small country, not big as one of our States. Yet he had the guts, with ten million people in his country, to confront the whole of Indonesia which has a hundred million people. When he came to our country, he roared like a lion and he supported India in an unequivocal manner when China attacked us. We have not gone to his rescue; We have not even said that what Indonesia and Soekarno do is wrong. What type of friendship and sympathy we will have from others if we do not render any help, even by a word of mouth. Why cannot we declare: we are with you what prevents us from saying this? It passes my comprehension.

It is not only on the external affairs front that comprehensive criticism can be levelled against the Government. Let us examine what is happening about corruption? A good man that he is, our Home Minister promised that within two years he will drive it out. I questioned his statement and told him that it will take much more. He said: I will do it in one year. I welcomed it. Has it happened? Take the election case of Mr. Ram Rattan Gupta which you discussed only yesterday. You ought to have opened your eyes at the time of the Darji Mashrooqi case. There was an election tribunal and Mr. J. K. Narain, retired judge of the Patna High Court presided over it at Indore. It was brought to the notice of the tribunal

that one district magistrate had the audacity to change from No. 20 totalling up wrongly and declared a particular candidate to have won the election. The matter was hushed up. It had to be admitted by the Minister. The party gave to that district magistrate a house whose real value was about Rs. 50,000 in Bhopal at a paltry price of Rs. 1100. But these facts did not open the eyes of the Government that the returning officers were going in a dishonest manner. This corruption is growing. Very recently, there was a case of disqualifications. The disqualifications of the Congress candidate was removed the next day following the Supreme Court's judgement while it took twelve months for removing the same type of disqualifications in the case of a Jan Sangh candidate. The reason? They were afraid that if the disqualifications of the Jan Sangh candidate were removed, he would win. That is also a type of corruption. We look askance. Big guns are caught. So many times reports have been made about what has happened in Delhi. But the matters are hushed up. Very recently I received another letter from another source saying that there was corruption to the extent of Rs. 66,000 in disposing of corrugated iron sheets by a particular gentleman in Delhi. Is the matter being investigated? The man has said from the very beginning that he is too big a person to be touched by anybody. Naturally, it will be hushed up. If we go on hushing up things like that, we cannot call a halt to corruption though every one of us wants to put an end to it. Each one of us should make up his mind to walk on the edge of a sword if we want to keep our country above corruption. Otherwise, we will fail and corruption will eat the very substance of our body politic. It is no good running down Mr. Nanda. Articles are written about him. He has at least the guts to say facts. Why should we look askance as what he is doing?

I come to another question now. People are clamouring against

the Government on the question of wrong policies of taxation. Taxation is increasing day after day. We see no end to this. Day before yesterday another Bill was shoved in; although the Budget is still far away taxation has been put through back door. A duty of ten paise has been levied on every cheque. So, a net profit of Rs. 8 crores is made on cheques. What a tremendous thing by the backdoor? Why has this levy been put? Why are not the people allowed to draw the cheques as they have been doing so far? Why should a heavy tax be put? It will come even to Rs. 20, Rs. 30, Rs. 50, Rs. 100 or Rs. 500. Let me leave that aside. Very recently, I think the Prime Minister did say that what he was doing was to economise to the extent of about Rs. 75 crores of expenditure. We would have welcome it and we will welcome it, but, at the same time, we would like to see that the burden of taxation goes; it must go. Already, there is an excise duty all over; whenever you look, there is an excise duty; there is an excise duty on cycle hubs; excise duty on spokes; excise duty on rims. What have you left out of the cycle from the point of view of excise duty? There is a heavy excise duty on everything conceivable. That is why, and that is one of the processes by virtue of which the price of consumer goods goes up. We never apply our mind to it. There is taxation on all sides.

When the integration of the States and their reorganisation came, each one of us living in the native States thinking—and thought that it was a blessing on us—that the customs barriers would go and that the taxation will be less and we would be able to get things cheap. But all our desires have become dreams of the past. Instead of having no customs barriers, we have got barriers in every little town. In every town we have to pay chungli. You cannot enter without paying the chungli. The harassment by the chunglis is so much that

for those who want to have remove or take their goods from one place to another, have to take *rawannas* from the chunglis and keep their men to send back the *rawannas*. That obstruction is always there.

Shri Joachim Alva: Was the Rajasthan Canal planned in the old regime?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Well, that reminds me of one thing. I would ask Shri Alva to come with me and stay at least for 48 hours at the Rajasthan Canal, and then I will show him what damage has been done by the Rajasthan Canal. One lakh acres of land have been destroyed entirely on account of seepage and not one grain is allowed to be grown in that area which was flourishing with fields of wheat all along. About 8,000 acres of land have been drowned and submerged in water; those were areas where the best crop of wheat used to grow. We have not drawn any advantage so far. If he wants to see the Rajasthan Canal, let him come with me and look at the seepage himself. I do not say that we will not reap any benefit at all. But the immediate benefits has not come and that is why I have been clamouring all along that if you are planning for the sake of planning, please cry a halt to it. I do not say you should not plan. You cannot completely close it now, since you have gone so far. But it is high time that you must cry a halt and take stock of what we have been able to achieve and consolidate the position to which we have risen. Let us derive the benefits from those projects that we have completed; do not proceed ahead blindly in a manner which persons who have got only bookish knowledge pursue, who do not know whether grams grow on a plant or on a tree. It is these people who are formulating policies for our planning. They shake the tree to find out whether the gram is going to fall from the tree or not! Let God save us from such people, from such bookish professors. They have done a very great harm to the

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

country. It is high time—and I plead with you—that the Government should open its eyes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would now say a few words about the Chinese question: it comes again to my mind. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had said, in one of his speeches, as follows:

"We believe and many countries agree with us that China as constituted today is an aggressive and expansionist country, possibly with vast designs for the future. It believes in the inevitability of major wars. Essentially, it does not believe in co-existence between countries."

If this is the firm position or opinion of a man who had a softness for China—Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai—I say that it is high time for us to make up our minds—that by placating China we will be doing a great harm to our country. And that is why to try to placate through Pakistan is also another miserable step that we are taking. It is a blunder that we are committing. It is high time that we think, pause, ponder and consider over this position: that we must stop this negotiation with Pakistan and we should for all time to come say with one breath and with one voice that Kashmir shall be ours and we will not give it up.

With these observations, I second the motion moved by Shri N. C. Chatterjee.

श्री चं. ला. चौधरी (महुआ) :
उन्होंने तमाम खामियों की तरफ तो इशारा किया लेकिन सरकार ने जो अच्छा काम किया है इसकी तरफ इशारा नहीं किया।

श्री कृष्ण चन्द कछवाड़ी (दवास) :
घाप को सीका मिले तो बता देना।

Shri Kaper Singh (Ludhiana): I did not wish to interrupt Shri Trivedi when he got up and was on his feet. But at that time I wanted to make a

brief submission. With your permission, I wish to make that submission now. My submission is with regard to the conduct of certain Members at the time when my hon. friend Shri Dandekar was speaking. We all knew that his was a maiden speech and yet, Members of the Communist party and also many Members from the Congress party constantly and by design interrupted him. If the proceedings of this House have to be effective, then, it is necessary that certain levels of decorum should be observed. I request you to make an observation to that effect, that what has happened ought not to have happened, and ought not to happen.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The objection should have been raised then.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Sir, a little more than a year and one month ago, the first no-confidence motion against the Congress Ministry was moved by the Opposition. A very senior leader of our nation Acharya Kripalani, moved that proposition. I was here, and I listened to the speeches made on that occasion. They were full of fire and brimstone, and the Opposition was almost united. Today, we in the Congress party are in a happy position to see that the mover of the no-confidence motion Shri Chatterjee, was more dignified than fiery; more argumentative than what is called carping critic. The Swatantra party has practised in a way in this House the policy of non-alignment, which it is publicly denouncing in the country. It is good to see that this party of intellectuals sees reason many a time when confronted with efficient leadership, leadership with sincerity and honesty. Shri Chatterjee made a great point in regard to the corruption that is practised according to him by the Congress Party and the administration. I have been delivering in public meetings that in England Magna Carta proved to be the basis of democracy in the United Kingdom. The House of Commons was called the

Mother of Parliaments, the Mother of Democracies. Even today, the House of Commons is considered to be the Mother of Parliaments. The root goes to the charter called Magna Carta. Das Commission has proved to be the Magna Carta of good Government in India. Here in India for the last few years charges of corruption at the top level were being made not only by Opposition parties but by Congressmen themselves. May I submit to the mover of the no-confidence motion that we in the Congress party may or may not be a brute majority. But I assure him we are a self-regulating majority. When we see things going wrong, we take up the cudgels much more than any of the opposition Members of all of them but together. The late Prime Minister was the greatest democrat that the world has seen. Instead of behaving as a dictator, he behaved as a true and ideal democrat. When he saw that there was opinion in the party and in the country in favour of an enquiry, he conceded it. The Das Commission was appointed as you know against a Congress Ministry, against one of the stalwarts of the Congress, who was considered the strong man of the Congress in Punjab.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It was appointed under the pressure of the opposition.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Under the pressure of Parliament and the opposition.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That shows that we are responsive.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: If we have appointed a Commission against our own colleague, the world will appreciate that when occasion demands and when there is a crisis, we take the most impartial attitude that can be possibly taken by an individual. It is this guts that makes the Congress win the confidence of the people of India. If on the basis of this confidence we get a huge majority for the Congress, you cannot dispute it.

Shri Nath Pal: You have a majority of seats and not votes.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Mr. Chatterjee is a man of law and I am supporting his point that we must have the rule of law. We must have good foundations for our democracy. The Das Commission report and the subsequent action taken by the Government of India and by the Congress leadership is going to be the firm foundation of honest and able Government in this country.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Only in future.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Majorities managed through corruption, casteism etc. will not sustain a Ministry. It is only honest administration that will be able to give benefits to the country and give a good name to the Congress. This one achievement of the Congress should command the admiration of a man of law like the great, Mr. Chatterjee. In other countries, I very much doubt whether such a serious step would have been taken against such a powerful person.

Shri Nath Pal: It should have been taken much earlier without prodding from the Parliament, the public and the Press.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The Parliament is here in order to bring to the notice of the authorities or the Ministers what wrong there is and they act on it. That is the basis of the working of Parliament. Otherwise, if Ministers are expected to act *suo motu* there is no necessity for Parliament at all.

Mr. Chatterjee made a great point in regard to the Congress Party's misbehaviour so far as the rule of law is concerned, and the sanctity of elections. I would appeal to him to ponder over this allegation. Recently an election was set aside by an Election Tribunal and the officer alleged to have been guilty has been punished by Government. Here comes the candidate to make as good a speech by way of criticism of Government.

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

Is it not the test of democracy and sanctity of elections? You want to blame the Government and the Congress Party even for the good things it does.

Shri Nath Pal: Is the tribunal a part of the Congress party?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The Congress Party comes into the picture when the Prime Minister made a report to the party and action was taken against the Returning Officer. When he announced it, the party as well as the Prime Minister come into the picture, with all the *bona fides* that one is capable of.

Shri Nath Pal: In spite of 17 years of Congress rule, we have still some Independent bodies left in the country.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Like the Election Commission and Supreme Court. They are not part of the Congress party apparatus.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Mr. Chatterjee made a great point regarding demonstrations. He also says he is a man of law. He knows very well that under a democratic Constitution, the dignified way is to go before the people, speak to them, convert them and make a majority for themselves. Demonstrations and going about the streets shouting is not part and parcel of this democratic apparatus. It is only when you lose hopes in yourself and in your policies that you resort to street-shouting! *(Interruptions)*.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Go to Mysore and you will know.

Shri Nath Pal: Why are you disowning the glorious past of your party?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There was no democracy then.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: You remember what Gandhiji said in the matter of law-breaking. When there is no legal or constitutional remedy, you can certainly break law and that is satyagraha. But when there is a

remedy legal and constitutional if you resort to breaking of law, in any way, that is what is called not playing the game in a fair manner and according to rules. You want to be the man of the rule of law and at the same time, directly or indirectly if you encourage the breaking of law, it does not argue well for the proposition you want to make.

Look at the way of the Maharashtra people. The other day they took great credit in making a success of what is called Maharashtra bund.

Shri Nath Pal: Bandh, not bund.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: My knowledge of Hindi is so poor that I mistook it for something like the Dhassa bund and its breach.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can continue on Monday. We have to take up non-official business now.

14.30 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-SIXTH REPORT

Shri Muthiah (Tirunelveli): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th September, 1964."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th September, 1964."

The motion was adopted.