

12.10 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

"THE ECONOMICS OF MODERNISATION IN THE INDIAN WOOL TEXTILE INDUSTRY"

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri S. V. Ramaswamy): Sir, on behalf of Shri Manubhai Shah I beg to lay on the Table a copy of "The Economics of Modernisation in the Indian Wool Textile Industry". [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3111/64].

INDIAN AIRCRAFT (FIRST AMENDMENT) RULES

The Minister of Civil Aviation (Shri Kanungo): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Indian Aircraft (First Amendment) Rules, 1964 published in Notification No. GSR 881 dated the 20th June, 1964, under section 14A of the Aircraft Act, 1934 together with an explanatory note. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3112/64].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT

The Minister of Transport (Shri Raj Bahadur): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Rules under sub-section (3) of section 458 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958:

- (i) The Shipping Development Fund Committee (General) Amendment Rules, 1964, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 995, dated the 11th July, 1964.
- (ii) The Merchant Shipping (Examination for Skipper and Second hand of a Fishing Vessel) Rules, 1964, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 998, dated the 11th July, 1964.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3113/64].

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INDIAN LAC CESS COMMITTEE

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri

Shahnawas Khan): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Lac Cess Committee for the year 1962-63. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2955/64].

TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT OF THE LAW COMMISSION

The Deputy-Minister in the Ministry of Law (Shri Jaganatha Rao): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Twenty-fifth Report of the Law Commission on Evidence of Officers about forged stamps, currency notes, etc. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3114/64].

12.12 hrs.

STATEMENT CORRECTING FIGURES GIVEN ON 26-3-1964 in LOK SABHA IN CONNECTION WITH DEMANDS OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE MINISTRY

The Deputy Minister for Food and Agriculture (Shri D. B. Chavan): Sir in the speech made by Parliamentary Secretary in the Lok Sabha on the Demands of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture on the 26th March, 1964, he appears to have quoted from some journal on agriculture that Shri E.M. Bhongale, Malad, Baramati Taluk, Poona District, got per-acre yield of 238 tons from sugarcane variety Co 740. On verification I find that the actual per-acre yield obtained by this farmer in the All India Regional Sugarcane Crop Competitions 1962-63 season is 138.33 tonnes.

12.13 hrs.

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

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers moved by Shri Chatterjee on the 11th September 1964.

Shri Morarka (Jhujunu): Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago.

in this very House a motion of a similar nature was moved by the Opposition. At that time, the Opposition emphasized again and again that this Government has lost the confidence of the people, that although the motion would be rejected in the House, if we go to the people we will realise that we have forfeited the confidence of the people. Between that date and today several times we have had the occasion to go to the people and get their verdict. Between that time and now, out of the ten Lok Sabha bye-elections, seven elections have been won by the Congress and three by the other parties. Similarly, in the case of State Assemblies, out of 30 bye-elections, 26 have been won by Congress and 13 by other parties.

श्री शिव नारायण (वासी) : माननीय सदस्य ने अभी कांग्रेस द्वारा उपचुनावों में जीतने की बात कही तो आप उन हथियारों के बारे में भी जरा सोच में बतला दें जिन्हें कि उन चुनावों को जीतने के लिए आप ने बर्ते हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बात वे क्यों कहें ? जो बात आप के फायदे की है वह आप कहिये । अब आप बैठ जायं ।

Shri Morarka: Not a single party has won more than two seats in the Assembly elections or one seat in this House. Leaving elections aside, before the Congress Party are today pending applications for joining the party from a majority of members of the Swatantra Party, and the old PSP not to talk of the other parties like Prajatantra and others. If our party, the Congress Party, has forfeited the confidence of the people, may I know why these people are standing in the queue for joining this party? But the whole trouble is that whenever an Opposition Member wins a bye-election, he thinks that the Congress Party has forfeited the confidence of the people and that he has become the custodian of the people's confid-

ence and the only way he wants to demonstrate it is to come here, gather the support of some hon. Members and sponsor a vote of no confidence.

Now, I would like to show what the hon. Mover of the motion, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, who described his case as a strong case had to say. He said talking about big business:

"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".

A little later he said:

"Beginning with investment in the Congress funds, many of them, these big businessmen have now become practically the bosses of the party".

It was very refreshing to hear these things from Shri Chatterjee.

I remember very well what Shri N. C. Chatterjee, who was an hon. Member of the First Lok Sabha, said when the Estate Duty Bill was brought here which was one of the progressive social measures in the economic field which the Government then introduced. It would be interesting to know the views of Shri Chatterjee on that subject.

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): Times have changed.

An hon. Member: But memories are short.

Shri Morarka: At that time the House was discussing two Bills—one was the Income-tax (Amendment) Bill and the other was the Estate Duty Bill. This is what Shri Chatterjee said then:

"The first Bill will add terror to life and the second will add horror to death. I mean the first is the Income Tax Amendment Bill and the second is the Estate Duty Bill.....But the second Bill makes it impossible to afford any relief even to those people who are contemplating suicide so badly disillusioned of mortal existence".

A little later he said:

"This Bill is an ingenious Bill because it seeks to utilise the conventional and fashionable urge for beating out capital and private property".

Again, Shri Chatterjee said:

"I want also the Finance Minister's plain and frank answer if that is so. If it is meant to be a real front line attack on private enterprise or property then we should declare war on this Bill and we shall have nothing to do with it in any shape or form".

I will conclude by one more quotation from his on Estate Duty Bill. He said:

"Now it is perfectly clear that in modern industrial civilisation, we have got to put up with many evils—plague, cholera and small pox. I am afraid that the stage has also come when the Estate Duty Bill be looked upon as a concomitant evil of our modern industrial civilisation".

These were his views on the Estate Duty Bill.

Mr. Speaker: How long a time has elapsed between that and now?

Shri Morarka: Unfortunately, the House did not have the benefit of his advice or views in the Second Lok Sabha but what he said in the Third

Lok Sabha I am going to place before you shortly.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): At that time you also were with Shri Chatterjee.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore I am defending myself.

Shri Morarka: When the Companies (Amendment) Bill came and the Government took only power to abolish the much maligned managing agency system in certain industries, even on that power being taken over by the Government this is what Shri Chatterjee wrote in his Minute of Dissent:

"This power of abolition of Managing Agency system by executive fiat may be influenced by political objectives and may act as a deterrent on company formation and may check initiative and mainly of undue cramping of activity of existing concerns unless an alternative system is achieved it will be unwise to destroy the existing system in a precipitate manner. The apprehension is not unreasonable that in our anxiety to tighten up the provisions of the Companies Act in order to make the managing agency system shorn of its abuses and malpractices we have gone too far and prescribed too many restrictions which in actual practice would make difficult, if not impossible, the smooth and efficient management of business".

This was what Shri N. C. Chatterjee said.

But an hon. Member of this House criticised Shri Gadgil, because Shri Gadgil vehemently supported the Estate Duty Bill, and that hon. Member said:

"As a matter of fact, I do not know what is its legal alchemy or political philosophy which has

brought about this conversion of Mr. Gadgil. May be that he is recently reading the various attacks on property by the political guru of my Communist friends or he has been converted by the anarchist Prudhon who declared that 'all property is theft'."

And who was this hon. Member? It was Shri Nirmal Chandra Chatterjee.

Could anybody ask him now what has happened to him and how he is converted? Has he adopted communism as his political guru?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Nothing of that kind.

Shri Morarka: Or was he speaking to the brief?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I tell my hon. friend that thousands of Congressmen voted for me in the last elections?

Shri Morarka: Shri N. C. Chatterjee is accustomed to advise his clients that their case is very strong, and out of that habit, he has mentioned here also that his case is very strong.

Mr. Speaker: But it is well known that one is not the correct judge of one's own case.

Shri Morarka: The second point which the hon. Mover of the motion made was this, and that again is interesting. He has said:

"Government are begging for some doles, for some little aid somewhere, going up and down the western countries...."

Look at his emphasis on the words 'western countries.' And he says further:

"....and nothing is really being done."

Then, again, talking about Kashmir, he has said:

The mischievous motives of the "Western Powers".

Then, he says:

"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".

He says one thing more:

"I ask this Government to remember that any cringing bargain for economic or military aid does no credit to our country."

These are his views today. But what did Shri N. C. Chatterjee say in 1953 while speaking on the budget here. Referring to the comment in *The New York Times* he had asked our Government what would happen to our Five Year Plan if we did not change our foreign policy and it did not square with American interest, and he asked us how we were going to finance our Five Year Plans. I shall quote his own words. Speaking on the general budget here in March, 1963, he said:

"*The New York Times* of the 9th February says that India wants 1.3 billion dollars for implementing its Five Year Plan and they expect that the United States will find the bulk of it."

Now, if we pursue our present foreign policy and it does not square with American interest, and with other foreign interest, what will happen of our Five Year Plan? You know the private sector is given a very little role to play"

These were the views of Shri N. C. Chatterjee at that time.

Shri Daji (Indore): The point is that Shri N. C. Chatterjee has grown wiser with the years, but my hon. friend has not.

Shri Morarka: We have just heard the barometer of wisdom. I shall not say anything more about Shri N. C. Chatterjee because the time at my disposal is limited. Now, I shall have something to say about Shri Dandekar.

Shri Daji: Let us hear that now because that will be interesting from my hon. friend particularly.

Shri Morarka: He said that all the difficulties that we were facing today were due to the colossal failure of the Second Plan and the impending failure of the Third Plan.

Shri Jagjivan Ram (Sasaram): That was a maiden speech and that should not be criticised.

Shri Morarka: That is true, but I beg to be excused, because the speech did not sound like a maiden speech.

I was not surprised actually when he criticised the Plan, because the House knows that the Swatantra Party is against the very concept of planning. But if you come to analyse and judge exactly the success or failure of the Plan, I would like to know what tests would you apply? Also what he meant by saying that there was colossal failure of the Second Plan and impending failure of the Third Plan. I admit and the Government have admitted more than anybody else in published documents that we have not been able to achieve our targets. It may be that the targets were too high, or it may be that that there was some defect in our working etc. We set the targets at 100 per cent, and we achieved them 70 per cent, or 80 per cent or 90 per cent or in some cases even 100 per cent. Therefore, could it be said that our Plans have failed? Can it be seriously argued by anybody that there was no need for the Plan or that these Plans have brought about any misery?

I was very surprised to hear this argument from my hon. friend Shri

Dandekar, who is of course, an eminent economist. Then again, he said that he did not mind the import of steel but he minded the import of foodgrains. Take, for instance, steel. We have got all the raw materials required to make steel. There is an ever increasing demand for steel and we want steel in this country at any cost. Steel is not only a basic raw material for the industries but it is also required for agricultural development. So, there is a demand for steel and there is also the raw material to make it. And yet my hon. friend Shri Dandekar from the Swatantra Party says that we should not have steel plants. What type of economy is this? Even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when there was the *laissez-faire* policy, such a type of economy would not have been favoured under which one could go on exporting raw materials and go on importing finished products made out of that raw material.

Again, why is there this objection to the heavy industry? Why this apathy towards industrialisation? Have the heavy industries been developed at the cost of agriculture? Has the allotment to agriculture been cut down and given to heavy industries? The answer is 'No'. I admit that in the Second and Third Plans, the allotments made to agriculture were proportionately less in terms of percentage, than what was allocated in the First Plan. But in absolute terms, the amounts given to agriculture in the Second and the Third Plans were still higher than those in the First Plan. It was Rs. 700 odd crores in the First Plan, Rs. 850 crores in the Second Plan and Rs. 1750 crores in the Third Plan. I am not saying that our agriculture does not need more money, nor do I say that adequate resources were allocated to agriculture. But no wrong impression should be created by saying that heavy industries are developed at the cost of agriculture. 20 per cent of the resources in the Second Plan were given to agriculture, and the same percentage was kept up in

the Third Plan as well, and the total allotment to industries in the Third Plan was Rs. 1500 crores, while that for agriculture was Rs. 1700 crores.

Another point of criticism which Shri Dandekar made was in regard to the public sector. If Government were so much enamoured of the public sector and the public sector alone, and if this Government were against the private sector, can Shri Dandekar seriously contend that the private sector could have existed? Have not this Government done enough, as a matter of fact, more than any other Government including the patronage of the Moghul Emperors or the princes, to foster the industrial development and to protect the private sector?

The amount of help and protection, and the amount of initiative and encouragement given to the private sector today in the matter of industrial development has never been given in the past.

Even then these people here come and have temerity to criticise the Government for showing a step-motherly treatment or attitude towards the private sector. Shri Dandekar said, 'I want to give a chance to this Government. I do not want this Government to be convicted for the sins of their fathers'. Sir, this Government is new only technically. It is not a new Government; it is the same old Government. It has again and again committed itself to the same old policies and principles enunciated by Pandit Nehru. It is not a new Government in any form. I do not think any member of this House wants any indulgence from Shri Dandekar or anybody. We demand strict justice. We demand an impartial verdict of the House. Judge this Government by its performance; judge it by its achievements.

When I say this, I am not saying that I am not conscious of some of the shortfalls. They are there. Nobody is perfect, and similarly our Govern-

ment is not perfect by any means. But then to say that 'I do not want to hang the Government for the sins of its fathers' as Shri Dandekar did, is something I cannot understand. Perhaps he does not know that only about 12 months ago we had a full-dress debate on a similar motion. What happened to that? If Shri Dandekar wants any other time, he can try his luck.

Everytime, we are threatened, 'let us have general elections'. Let general elections come. The next general elections are not too far off. Again the same thing would happen. People whom you see in the Treasury Benches today, the same persons are going to occupy them.

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Morarka: But some of the Opposition members who are today sponsoring this motion may not be there.

Shri S. M. Bamerjee (Kanpur): Why did you not put up Shrimati Indira Gandhi in Phulpur and try your luck? Let us fight it out.

Shri Shoo Narain: You set up your candidate in Phulpur. We will see.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Morarka: I want to say only a few words about prices. I agree there has been a rise in prices. I also admit that this increase has been rather steep during the last few months. If people suggest that it is because of inflationary pressure, that also I do not want to dispute. But if there is any suggestion here that the present rise in prices is only due to the monetary system of the Government, due to the deficit financing of Government or due to excessive spending on the part of Government, I think that is over-stating the case.

The first point I want to make is that most of the increase that you see in prices today is because of the food-

[Shri Morarka]

grain prices. Goodgrain prices have increased much more than the prices of other things. In fact, the prices of industrial raw materials and other things have, as compared to 1961, come down in 1963-64. The prices of government securities and preference shares, debentures and dividend paying shares have come down in 1963-64 as compared to 1960-61. If the present increase was due only to monetary reasons solely under inflationary pressure, then firstly, there would be an overall rise in prices in everything—there would be no question of a price fall, secondly, when your economy is in the grip of inflation, there is no question of improving your exports; your exports will fall. But actually what happened is that our exports have increased. Thirdly, when your economy is in the grip of inflation, your production apparatus goes out of gear. Production shows signs of fall. But here consistently production, though less than what we wish it to be, is still increasing.

What were the reasons for this increase in food prices? According to me, the reasons are all unnatural. There is enough foodgrains stock in the country to go round even for the increased population. But distribution, hoarding and the so-called zonal barriers have created the difficulty.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Who did that?

Shri Morarka: In fact, it would be easier to get wheat under PL 480 from America than to get it from Madhya Pradesh or Punjab!

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Who has done that?

Shri Morarka: I am stating the facts. It is due to the zonal system.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Who has done that?

Shri Morarka: It has been done by the authorities in power.

An Hon. Member: Shy of saying 'ourselves'.

Shri Morarka: It would be interesting to know that even though our total food imports are only 6 per cent of what we produce annually, our import of wheat is as much as 30-40 per cent of our wheat production. If at any time our imports of wheat go down, then there will be scarcity of wheat throughout the country. The importance of PL 480 comes because our production of wheat is 11-12 million tons, while our annual consumption is about 13 million tons. Therefore, we have to supplement indigenous production of wheat with import of wheat.

Since time is limited, I would like to make one or two suggestions in this behalf. The first is that there are many other ways of increasing food production, which Government is pursuing and will pursue more actively, but there is one aspect to which very little attention is given, that is about the preservation of food. The best estimates indicate that about 14 million tons of foodgrains are destroyed every year by pests, insects, rats and plant diseases. Right from the beginning when the seeds are sown up to the time it is consumed by man, there are many competitors for it; not only rats, rodents and birds but also different types of pests and plant diseases. Research has been going on during the last 100 years in America and other countries. They have found out many antidotes for these things. I am sorry to say that in India even today, we have only 14 stations for plant protection throughout the country. Last year, only about 90,000 acres of land were sprayed by planes with insecticides. The point is that if out of these 14 million tons lost every year, by our vigorous methods we can save even 5 million tons from the attack of these undesirable elements, the necessity of PL 480 or the importing of foodgrains can easily be dispensed with. This is not a Herculean task.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Why don't you do it?

Shri Morarka: The USA, West Germany and England have offered us their technical co-operation in this behalf. We must try to get that as soon as possible and be self-sufficient in this direction.

The second practical step which Government can take and will have to take sooner or later is as regards checking the growth of population. Unless you check this growth of population, whatever your development plans, whatever your technical improvements will all be vitiated by this growing population.

श्री मुकम चन्द्र कच्छवाय (देवास) :
उधर रुकवा लीजिये, उधर जनसंख्या ज्यादा बढ़ती जा रही है ।

Shri Morarka: Our population is increasing by 2.4 per cent every year or about 8 million people every year. This rate of growth cannot go on for long. I, therefore, suggest that on an emergency basis steps should be taken by the Government to check the growth of population.

I am grateful to you, Sir, for giving me this time. I wanted to say something more about deficit financing but since I have already taxed your patience, I conclude with these remarks.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Sir, last year I moved a similar resolution. This year I have not supported it even though the conditions are much worse than last year. It is because of two main reasons. Technically this Government is a new Government. Apart from that it has inherited the troubles created by the bungs of the last 14 years in the national and international affairs of this country. The second reason is that last year this motion, a similar motion was supported by all the

democratic parties. This time this motion is chiefly supported by the Communist Party. This has its impact and makes a difference so far as some of us are concerned. Apart from extra-territorial loyalties, the Communist Party stands for nationalisation of the whole of our economic life. They want greater and greater power to be given to the State so that it may become dictatorial and totalitarian. Against this we believe in the democratic conception of the powers of the State. I believe that this was our idea even before Independence. Now, what is this conception? The democratic conception is that individuals be self-reliant and progress be made through voluntary and co-operative effort. The State should have only that power which will enable it to check hindrances in the way of the progress of the people, self-regulated progress by the people themselves. This is the broad ideological difference. Another thing is that the communists want to copy either the Russian or the Chinese pattern whatever be the prevailing political and economic conditions in India. They decide these practical questions not on pragmatical grounds but on theoretical considerations. Yesterday we heard the full-throated denunciation of this Government in the choicest language of communist invectives from Prof. Mukerjee. Yet, it is wonderful that he wants to clothe this corrupt and inefficient and red-tape ridden Government with more and more power! I would advise him to clothe the State with dictatorial power when the time of his party comes. Even if it were desirable to clothe the head of the family with dictatorial powers, I think it will be disastrous to clothe the father with those powers, a father who is a drunkard, who is a spendthrift and who is indifferent about the good of the family. But logic is not a very strong point with the communists, whether it be Aristotilian logic or the Hegelian logic or what they call dialectical logic.

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

I have said that this is technically a new Government. However, it has not been possible for it to change its colour or its outlook. Shri Subramaniam's performance on the food debate was disillusioning. He was as supercilious, egoistic and self-righteous as any member of the Treasury Benches here before. In his indictment he has clubbed all the Opposition parties and individuals together and blackened them with the same brush. Another thing is that he has imputed motives to people in the Opposition but he must remember that they too can play at this game of imputing motives. The Opposition can retaliate and say that instead of resigning as an incompetent and inexperienced Food Minister he wants to throw the blame upon everybody but himself; but in throwing that blame upon others, he has not even spared the provincial Governments. Are the State Governments also motivated by political considerations or is it that they are really suffering? He has also blamed the hoarders and black-marketeers. It has become a system with this Government to throw the blame on somebody else. When there are accidents in the railway, they will say that there is sabotage, as if they are not responsible for sabotage, as if they are not responsible for black-marketing and hoarding and as if it is we (Opposition Members) who have brought about hoarding and black-marketing. When I was in the Congress, I said long ago that the writ of this Government did not run and I also said that either they must govern or keep out. They can say that they have a majority. My answer to that is: Yes; they are entitled to be a Government by law but not by morality. They have lost all moral right to govern this country, to misgovern this country.

They say that we have excited the people. What are the State Governments doing? I live in U.P. and I found that the most sensational things

were said by the Food Minister of U.P. from day to day, blaming the Central Government for having failed to supply grain that it had promised to supply. The Food Minister of U.P. does not belong to the Swatantra Party or the SSP or even to the Communist Party; he belongs to the very distinguished party which is winning election after election. It is all right to win elections but I say it is all wrong to lose your moral authority. However, motives do not change the actual situation. Perhaps by consulting astrologers they come to know about our motives! They think as if motives can bring about a famine in the country. Whatever be our motives, I say it is wrong to go into the motives of the people, when actual facts are there. I think it is absolutely wrong to question the *bona fides* of the Opposition parties and to say they have created this situation. It is just like this: whenever I complained of prevalence of corruption, our late-lamented Prime Minister used to say: it is this talk of corruption that has created corruption; it is this talk of scarcity that has created scarcity and rising prices which we are told are not due to inflation but something else; I do not know what it is.

When I am talking on corruption, let us see what Congressmen themselves say about each other. Let us take State by State. First, there is Utkal; Shri Mahatab blamed his successors for creating and increasing corruption. They replied that he initiated it and these quarrels are yet going on. One Chief Minister therefore had to resign and now there is a search whether they can get an honourable man to occupy his place.

Then there is Bihar. We were told that 50 legislators gave a representation against the Government; against the Congress Government, not the PSP Government. Then comes Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh is a case by itself. In this respect, it has

gone beyond every other State. What are the facts? There are dissidents and they are in the Cabinet! Even when they are in the Cabinet they are not called the Ministerialists; even when they are in the Cabinet, they are not ministerialists; they are dissidents; and the High Command calls them dissidents and the High Command calls the other party as ministerialists, so that what happens in Uttar Pradesh is that the quarrel is both inside the Government and outside the Government. After Uttar Pradesh comes Punjab. I need not say anything about your State, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am grateful to Acharya Kripalani, but his Uttar Pradesh has that honour where there is the lady Chief Minister. There is the lady Chief Minister in Uttar Pradesh. (*Interruption*).

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I sympathise with her with all my heart. What can I do? She happens to be my wife and I have not yet learnt to beat her to obey me as somebody has done somewhere. Some Minister is supposed to have done that in Bombay. I do not know whether he has resigned or not.

An Hon. Member: He has resigned.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
प्रस्ताव के साथ न होने का क्या यही कारण है ?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Then we come to Rajasthan. The same is the story in Rajasthan. Then, the Madhya Pradesh Chief Minister has volunteered to put himself under a committee of enquiry; why? Because Congressmen have accused him of corruption. Then Gujarat: the same old story. Then there is Andhra Pradesh. In Andhra Pradesh, one Reddy in the Congress is fighting another Reddy.

An Hon. Member: The Khammas and the Reddies.

1064 (A) LSD—6.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The Reddies in the Congress are fighting amongst themselves. In Karnatak also there are dissidents, and there are what they call ministerialists. In Kerala—ho, ho, wonderful: we have all our administrators from Kerala and we have our ambassadors from Kerala, but these wretched people cannot manage their own house. And what did the Congress there do? Even the threat of communist rule did not oblige these johnnies to join together.

An Hon. Member: They did.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: They are self-defeated in Kerala. In Kerala the Congress is self-defeated and self-degraded. Then there are other States into the history of which I do not go. But remember, Sir, that today the Congress stands self-condemned. If there are enemies against the Congress, it is the Congressmen. I charge them that they are destroying a great organisation. (*Interruption*). Our religious people say that your enemies are within yourselves; you destroy those enemies and you will conquer the world. If you conquer yourself you conquer the world. There was a time when nobody dared to stand against Congressmen. But it is the Congressmen that are today managing or mismanaging our Government.

When the Congress people say that the Opposition parties are creating trouble, or when the Treasury Benches say like that, I am surprised. Do they think that they have a monopoly of patriotism? Looking at the Treasury Benches, I can say with confidence that there are more post-Independence patriots there than there are on this side of the House. What is the role, after all, of an Opposition party? It is to rouse the people to their sense of duty. It is to rouse the people against tyranny, against misrule; our people are not going to rise unless we stir them. And what did we do in the past? During the war; there was famine in Bengal. 30

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

lakhs of people died uncomplaining. We were in jails. Did we appreciate that? I can tell you that I was ashamed that there was nobody left outside to rouse those people, when the bazars were full of food stuff and grains. Do we want this country to be so dead that even the Opposition party, when there is famine in the country when people cannot get two meals a day, when people are living on roots, should shower encomiums upon this Government. What do they expect of us? What did we do in pre-Independence days under Gandhiji? If Gandhiji had not roused this country, it would have been dead. It was his function and it was our function. Today, we are functioning in the old fashion of the Congress and they are discharging the function of the imperialist Government.

What is wrong with us? What is wrong with the country? Let us humbly admit that both our home policies and our foreign policies have gone wrong. Our home policies are centered round the Plans. I have to say nothing about the Plans. I have said often that these plans are mis-conceived and mis-executed. When the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission was in the PSP, he supported these Plans. As soon as he has become the Deputy Chairman, he says that the Plans are misconceived and mis-executed. It is on this point that I left the PSP, because he supported Plans that were misconceived. Today he has found wisdom.

13 hrs.

I may tell the House why I did not sponsor this no-confidence motion. Congressmen denounce each other, but when it comes to the no-confidence motion, they gang together and support the Government which they have been denouncing privately and even publicly, but not in this House. What has been the result of these Plans? Inflation, in spite of whatever my young friend, Mr. Mo-

rarka, might say. The price of the rupee according to their own calculation is only 17 paise. How are the foreign exchange difficulties sought to be remedied? They send away what we need here very urgently. From U.P. rice was sent out about 6 or 8 months back. Bananas are sent. Banana is good food. The late Prime Minister used to say, "Why don't people cultivate bananas if they have no food?" Russia apart, these bananas worth about Rs. 3½ lakhs were sent to Italy. When they arrived there, they were so rotten that they took only Rs. 25,000 worth of bananas and our Government had to pay Rs. 1 lakh to destroy those rotten bananas. We cannot get good tea here or good coffee. Members of Parliament are provided with coffee here, so that they might get good coffee, but not the public.

The problem of unemployment has not been solved. Disparities in wealth have been increasing. The failure of community projects and co-operatives is admitted by the hon. Minister himself. I really wonder how these Ministers can denounce themselves. Who is responsible for the failure of the community projects and co-operatives? It is they who are responsible, and then they talk of the opposition parties.

There has been increase in corruption on account of the quotas and licences. How is corruption sought to be eradicated? It is sought to be eradicated by some samiti or sangh—Sadachar Samiti. Is Congress not a sadachar samiti? Before independence, nobody could have thought of a sadachar samiti, because under Gandhiji Congress itself was a sadachar samiti. To have a sadachar samiti is to declare from the house-tops that there is not enough sadachar left in the Congress itself. Why should they want any other organisation? I warn the Home Minister, he does not know, Sometimes, thieves enter into the crowd that is pursuing them and cry aloud, 'Pakro,

pakro! Chor, Chor!" Such people might enter the sadachar samiti without his knowing it.

I would now say a few words about our foreign policy. Please give me a few more minutes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection. But Acharyaji should appreciate my difficulty. There are so many unattached members and every one of them so eminent and prominent that I cannot refuse them any time. If I count from one end, there is Dr. Lohia, Mr. Chatterjee, Mr. Kripalani, Mr. S. M. Banerjee.....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: All the distinguished people are on this side.

Mr. Speaker: The difficulty with all these distinguished people is that they cannot unite among themselves or with any other body. Therefore, I find it difficult to grant them time in every debate.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I would not be speaking during the foreign affairs debate.

इ० राम बनेहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रसली अविश्वास तो खाली मेरा है यह सब लोग तो नकली अविश्वासी हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: He may have two or three minutes more.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: As I said on a former occasion, this non-alignment has become a mantra. Non-alignment precludes us from following policies, strategy and tactics that would be in our interests. When we talk of non-alignment, I humbly submit that we are committing what is called semantic confusion. We are at cold war with Pakistan and we are at hot war with China. I do not know how we can say, using political words in a scientific sense, that we are non-aligned.

We have given the initiative to the Chinese. We wait till they decide whether they will talk with us or not. We have given the initiative to a small country like Ceylon. There is no initiative left to us. I warned this country in 1950 when the buffer State of Tibet was destroyed. I warn them today: Another buffer area is being destroyed and that is South-east Asia. Unless India, the West, Japan and some countries in South-east Asia and Australia come to an understanding, South-east Asia cannot be saved. If South-east Asia is not saved, remember, we will have a pincer movement. The submarines of China would be coming in the Indian Ocean and we will have also an attack on the Himalayas. Take wisdom while there is yet time. I consider this a buffer area. If anybody doubts that, I think he does not know what international politics is. Do not allow this area to be destroyed. Let us come to an understanding. Let there be not military alliances. Who wants military alliance with us? So far as USA is concerned, has it not reaped the fruit of military alliance with Pakistan? (They are not willing and they have said they do not want any military alliance. But I say, military alliance or no military alliance, you have to come to terms. You will not be hindered even by Russia, because Russia knows that today China is a nationally aggressive country. Not talking of communism, what is prevalent there is this extra-ordinary nationalism that is aggressive. This is all that I have to say about the foreign policy, and if we neglect these facts of foreign policy, I say, we will be in very great trouble, our freedom will be in danger.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the approach of the Government on the vital problem facing the people was never so glaringly irresponsible as what we have seen during the food debate recently. The Food Minister's reply to the debate only exhibited his arrogance perhaps arising out of the power that he

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

enjoys. His effort to blame the Opposition for the food scarcity only shows the bankruptcy of the ruling party. Sir, a ruling party which is isolated from the people and whose food policies are anti-people policies cannot expect even its own members much less the Opposition to keep quiet when the prices shoot up and there is acute shortage in the country.

13.11 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Subramaniam's declaration in this House that he believes in State trading and control to the extent necessary is not a statement of policy but it is an evasion of responsibility. The point before us today is that the Government has totally rejected the solemn promise that had been given to the people in the past. I want to point out a resolution passed by the conference of the Chief Ministers and the provincial Congress Presidents in 1950. That resolution stated that the immediate object in agriculture that the country has to set before itself is self-sufficiency to be attained by the end of 1951. Thirteen years have passed after that and today the situation has become still worse. But the Food Minister takes pride in saying that the worst is over. In his speech he has not said that at least after the Fourth Plan he will see that wheat will top coming from outside and the country will be self-sufficient.

I do not want to complain that this Government is not building socialism because I am sure and confident that this Government can and will never build socialism in this country. My main charge against the Government is that it has not implemented even the elementary things which would have given some relief to the people. Before I point out certain things in this respect, I want to say that the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, in 1933, said: "If an indigenous Government took the place of a

foreign government and kept all the vested interests intact that would not be even the shadow of freedom". Sir, this Government has not only kept the vested interest intact but they have been strengthened as a direct result of the Government's policy. The history of the last 17 years has been a history of legalised loot on an unprecedented scale of the common people by the big business, landlords and the foreign monopolists. The Government has violated the directive principles of state policy enunciated by the Constitution. Yesterday, my hon. friend Shri Hanumanthaiya pointed out about these principles. The citizens, men and women, have a right to adequate means of livelihood. It is denied to them. Ownership and control of the material resources of the community are to be so distributed as best to serve the common good. Today the ownership and control of material resources are not distributed like that. The essential food articles in this country are not controlled by the Government. They are in the hands of hoarders and profiteers, and it is not to serve the common interest. It is being done so to see that the common interest is blocked. According to the directive principles the Government must see that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment. I know what the Mahalanobis Committee has said. I am sure the Government has admitted that the result is concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people.

Is there any progress in the direction of achieving this objective? Certainly not. The statistics published by the Government and also by enquiry committees appointed by the Government have shown beyond doubt that the Government has totally failed in implementing the promises that it has given to the people. What is more serious is that instead of under-

standing what the mistakes are, instead of understanding the reasons that are responsible for this debacle, their spokesmen go on bragging about their achievements. That is the main reason why it has lost the confidence of the people. I would like to point out some of these things. The Planning Commission admitted that there is need for an adequate means of livelihood. After two Plans and three years of the Third Plan, has there been any noteworthy progress? No. Recently the Reserve Bank has made an interesting study of the wage trends during the First and Second Plans. The study shows that during 1952 wages and other emoluments paid to the workers constituted 53.1 per cent of the national income originating from industries. The share of the workers went down to 42.2 per cent during 1961—a fall of 9 per cent. These studies made by official agencies show that the exploitation of the workers has gone up further during the first two Plans. It is not the Opposition that is responsible for this. It is the Government's policy that is responsible for this. When the workers peacefully organise and agitate to bring home to the Government that the exploitation has gone on increasing, we know what is done. They are suppressed.

There is the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee's Report. It is a report of the Government. There is the First Enquiry Committee's Report as well as the Second Enquiry Committee's Report. The first was in 1951 and the second was in 1957. It is stated in that report:

"The Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry, for example, found that incomes of the agricultural labour families fell by 11 per cent between 1950-51 and 1956-57".

After the First Five Year Plan when there was an increase in the national income, as far as the poor agricultural labourers are concerned the result was that their income fell. Not only that,

their number of working days was decreased, their credit was increased and so on—I do not want to go into those details. It is these reports that show these things.

Take, for example, the case of central government employees. What are their real wages today? Their real wages to-day are 16 per cent less than the wages on the eve of independence. Every month with the rising prices the marketing basket of the employees is reduced. A one-man commission has been appointed by the Government to go into the question of dearness allowance. I understand that the Federation of Central Government Employees who come to about 22 lakhs in number have decided to boycott this commission. Why have they taken such a decision? The employees have been demanding that the formula of dearness allowance recommended by the Second Pay Commission should be revised because that formula today is unfair and has failed to give relief in time. They are only saying that this formula may be placed before the one-man commission and that commission may be asked to revise it because today the prices have gone up and according to the rise in prices the formula given by the Second Pay Commission may be revised. The Government is not willing to put that before the one-man commission because the Government thinks that once the Commission takes up this point its decision may go against the Government and it may go in favour of the workers. Their second demand is that an *ad hoc* increase in dearness allowance of Rs. 10 may be given. Even that is not accepted by the Government. They have, therefore, decided to have a 'protest day'. What will happen? Just as in the case of the Sindh Fertilisers, the Hindustan Anti-biotics, the IAC and other public sector undertakings, on the protest day some persons will be arrested under the DIR, there will be victimisation and after oppressing the workers and after creating difficulties for the Government and the country the Government

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

will agree to refer it to the commission.

That is the tradition of the Government. Can the Government conscientiously ask the private employers not to reduce the real wages of the workers. A week back there was an interesting speech by the head of a big industrial concern Shri Tata, who said that Government are passing so many legislations relating to conditions of service of workers and without first implementing them in the public sector they are asking the private sector to implement them. That is a very revealing statement.

There is no public sector undertaking where dearness allowance is given to the workers according to the cost of living index. For the first time, in Hindustan Anti-biotics an industrial tribunal awarded dearness allowance according to the price index. What happened? Government have gone in appeal to the Supreme Court. Is this a policy of social justice? The Tribunal which had been appointed at Pimpri with Justice Meher as Chairman says:

"Public undertakings differ in an important respect from private undertakings. Profit motive and exploitation of workers for private gain have no significance in the State-owned enterprise."

In the end he has said:

"It is often said that the public sector should be the ideal employer. But unfortunately, in spite of several years clamour, the public sector is still behind the private sector in the matter of industrial relations."

This is not my opinion, but the opinion of the Industrial Tribunal that as far as industrial relations are concerned, the public sector is far behind the private sector, at least in some cases.

Then, about the condition of the peasantry, the less said the better. The actual tiller of the soil and the agricultural labour are the worst affected strata of rural society. Here I want to quote the opinion of Shri Gurumukh Singh Musafir, a member in the Panel on Agriculture of the Planning Commission. He said that at the harvest time the price of wheat in Punjab was Rs. 14 per maund while the cost of production was Rs. 15-50. If this is the real position, how can the cultivator manage to live during the year?

If the workers and peasants and the middle class people have not been benefited from this mis-rule, who has got the fruits of planning and industrial production? The Mahalanobis Committee report, a part of which has been published, says about the role of Government in strengthening the hands of the monopolists:

"Government policy during the Plan period has been responsible for the growth of the private sector and in the process especially of big companies. In addition to affording a protected market and the necessary overhead facilities and maintaining a budgetary policy with a mild inflationary situation favourable to industry, the Government have been promoting the growth of private industry by extensive tax incentives".

This is not my view but the view of the Mahalanobis Committee, and I want the Government to note specially the words "extensive tax incentives".

The data compiled by the Company Law Administration also shows that out of Rs. 430.3 crores of the increase in paid-up capital during the period 1951-61, in all the joint stock companies Rs. 404.7 crores increase has taken place only in the concerns with a paid up capital of Rs. 50 lakhs or more. These concerns are known as the giant compa-

nies and they account for more than 55 per cent of the paid-up capital of the joint stock companies in the country. These giant companies number only 1.6 per cent of the total companies and yet they have got 55 per cent of the paid-up capital of all the joint stock companies.

Is there any other proof necessary about the concentration of wealth? Even those having confidence in Government cannot deny the fact that the monopolies have grown ferociously during the Plan period. Is it not sheer hypocrisy to pretend that the ruling party is keen to decrease the concentration of economic power in the country? It is true that Government have appointed the Monopoly Commission. But, then, so many committees have been appointed by the Government without caring to implement the recommendations of those committees that the people have no confidence in the appointment of a committee by Government. For example, the Asoka Mehta Food Enquiry Committee was appointed; that committee submitted its report and it was discussed on the floor of this House. The most important recommendation was about State trading in foodgrains. Even this year we have referred to it but Government have not yet accepted that recommendation.

I need not quote the report of the US team which I have quoted when I was speaking on the food debate. This report shows that the Government have kept the landed interests intact. Whatever modifications in their rights have been made, have not been made in the interest of the peasants or the agricultural labour but have been made in the interest of the landlords. Here I want to point out, because, Sir, you have been presiding over the Joint Committee on the Constitution (Sventeenth Amendment) Bill, that when the Kerala Agrarian Relations Act was held invalid by the Courts, Government wanted some modification in the Constitution. When the Joint Committee was discussing that, the whole Bill was changed, some

of the rights which the peasants and te agricultural labour had were taken away, some rights were given to the landlords and that Bill was hurriedly pushed through as the Kerala Land Reform Act. This shows clearly that the Government have taken care of interest of only the propertied class. Therefore, we have no hesitation in calling this government a Government of the big business and landlords.

The main burden of the Plan is being imposed on the common man. Instead of mobilising resources from the monied people Government are fleecing more and more the common. At the beginning of the Third Plan it was proposed to raise Rs. 550 crores from current revenues. However, during the first three years there is actually a deficit of Rs. 300 crores. The public sector undertakings were expected to supply Rs. 450 crores. However, by the end of the third year of the current Plan the Government could raise only Rs. 139 crores. The only target fulfilled, or rather overfulfilled by the Government was in the field of additional taxation. On the basis of taxation imposed by Government at present, they are confident of raising Rs. 2,400 crores as additional taxation instead of Rs. 1,800 crores planned earlier. What does it mean? It means that they would be getting Rs. 700 crores more than was visualized while framing the Plan. Government may take pride in saying that there is success in securing additional taxation. But the common man is most unhappy about it. It is pure and simple plunder of the people who are toiling day and night to maintain their existence.

Government have further claimed a big victory during the Third Plan period in the field of deficit financing. The target of the Third Plan in this field was Rs. 550 crores but during the first three years they have realised Rs. 616 crores. What is the result of this? It has given rise to terrific in-

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

flation which pushed the prices still further. Perhaps, in keeping tune with the hon. Food Minister, the Finance Minister may hold us responsible for deficit financing also.

This creation of money has played havoc in our economy as the prices are rocketing high. Recently, one professor from Allahabad, who is also an adviser of the Planning Commission, has stated that the value of pre-war rupee is only 17 paise today. When the poorer sections are fleeced as a result of price rise, the richer sections have accumulated huge funds with them, a portion of which can be seen in the swelling bank deposits.

The prices are also going up because there is increasing taxation on the essential commodities every year. Let us see the rise in the case of major essential commodities as compared with the fifties. First taking up excise duties on essential consumer goods, the following chart will make the position clear.

	1950-51	1962-63 [in lakhs]	Increase
Kerosene	28	16,55	16,27
Sugar	6.46	60,17	53,71
Matches	8.07	21,91	13,84
Tobacco	31.99	63,89	31,90
Tea	3.36	10,20	6,84
Paper	2,68	13,18	10,50

This is besides railway fares, postcards and other things. This phenomenal rise in excise duties of essential commodities has increased the burden on the common people.

When the consumers are asked to pay higher and higher prices in the name of economic development, the tax provision for the business Community is not equitable. The bigger the company the lesser is the comparative burden of taxation.

I want to point out some figures from the Reserve Bank Bulletin

which shows the tax provision by size of companies and which is revealing. In 1962-63 the tax provision, by size of companies was:—

Rs. 5-10 lakhs	62.2 per cent
Rs. 10-25 lakhs	63.4 per cent
Rs. 25-50 lakhs	54.2 per cent
Rs. 50 lakhs-Rs. 1 crore	50.0 per cent
Above Rs. 1 crores	47.7 per cent

What do these figures show? These figures from the official sources indicate that the bigger the capitalist the more the concessions that he enjoys as a result of the taxation policy. Compare the indirect taxation as well as the policy arising out of this.

The financial magnates have accumulated huge funds in the form of black money by evasion which the Government has failed to check during all these years. It is estimated, even according to a conservative estimate, that it is of the order of Rs. 3,000 crores. The amount is constantly increasing every year and is corroding the social and political life in the whole country. Instead of bringing this money to book the Government is encouraging the growth of this money. This has raised a serious problem of corruption before the country.

I do not want to go into the details of this corruption because it had already been explained by many hon. Members. About the Chief Ministers of Punjab and Kerala, I only want to say as far as the ex-Chief Minister and the corruption charges against him are concerned. When Shri Patil went there, he said to the dissidents, the Congressmen, who now voted against the Ministry, that there will be an inquiry. I want to know at least now whether there will be an inquiry about it.

Instead of taking strong measures against it, now, as the Prime Minister has said they want to prune the Plan. If this is the policy, the pub-

lic will have no confidence in this Government.

Then, there is the crisis of the foreign exchange. Out of Rs. 2,600 crores of external assistance for the Third Plan Rs. 500 crores have been provided for repayment of loans. The amount is bound to increase every year and it will be a great drain on our economy.

The balance of payments position is also becoming increasingly difficult.

As black money has given rise to corruption there is the scandal of foreign trade which has given rise to smuggling. The public exchequer is not only losing crores of rupees every year by way of tariff but when importers and exporters indulge in under-invoicing and over-invoicing every year the country is also losing a large amount of precious foreign exchange which is repatriated into the country in the form of gold. We have been demanding nationalisation of the import and export trade but the Government refuses to move in the matter and is allowing crores of rupees being drained away every year. Daniel Walcott is not the only man who has escaped. Many more Indians and foreign Walcotts are doing, their business merrily with the protection of the customs officials. How can the Government escape this responsibility?

I now want to say something about foreign capital but before that I want to point out that the Congress leaders conducted the biggest swadeshi movement. The Swadeshi Certifying Board, which was formed by the late Motilal Nehru, refused to accept Binny's cloth as swadeshi in 1930 because, though it was manufactured here, the capital was foreign. In 1945 Gandhiji resoundingly denounced the collaboration agreements entered into by Tatas and Birlas with monopolists, like Britain and America. He said that this collaboration was anti-national. What is the position today? In 1948 the companies under collaboration were only 75; in the year 1962 this number was 1,446.

Now the Finance Minister has decided to keep the doors open for for-

ign capital. The Government's domestic policies have created a hunting ground to the foreign monopolists. The Indian as well as the foreign monopolists are creating much powerful alliances on the Indian soil and this is threatening the economic independence of our country. The Government has decided to welcome foreign equity capital also in the public sector undertakings which is against the Industrial Policy Resolution. In Cochin oil refinery the Government has already allowed foreign private capital and they are repeating it in Madras and Haldia also.

According to a study by the US Department of Commerce which is very important the profits of direct American investments in India in manufacturing industries was among the highest in the whole world being 20.6 per cent in 1962 and 19.2 per cent in 1961. These figures can be compared with US profits in Japan which was only 9.1 per cent in 1962; in Pakistan 18 per cent and in the Philippines 12.7 per cent.

As far as the British capital is concerned, a survey has been conducted which shows that the return in 1962 in India amounted to 9.4 per cent which was higher than the return they got in USA, Australia and Canada.

What do these figures show? They only show the growing loot of our wealth and labour by the foreign monopolists. Instead of checking this trend the Government is welcoming it because the Indian capitalists are getting a share of it. These are very dangerous things for the independent economic development of our country and we are totally against it.

The Government is refusing to tap the resources in the country because they want to keep the vested interest intact; or else they would have tapped Ra. 4,000 crores worth of gold which is said to be hidden and Rs. 3,000 crores worth of unaccounted money. These resources had to be tapped. It is not being done and this path is leading to economic disaster and chaos.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

The only one good thing is that in spite of these things the people are coming out in a big way to protest against these things. Some hon. Members who have spoken before laughed at it and they may laugh again now. There have been movements, strikes and demonstrations in Gujarat, Maharashtra, Kerala, U.P. Goa etc. where the people have understood that unless and until they unite and organise together, certainly there will be no change in the policy. However, instead of realising the aspirations of the people, there is suppression.

Because I have no time I do not want to show how the DIR had been used for suppressing workers in every trade union struggle where Government had been resorting to the DIR. In Ahmedabad it was resorted to; in Kerala it was resorted to not only as far as the strikes were concerned but the Assembly members were prevented, by means of the DIR, from attending the Assembly. EMS Namboodripad, who got down from the train after the picketing day and who did not participate in picketing was arrested along with the others. It is a very shameful thing that when there is a no-confidence motion and there is no majority as far as the ruling party is concerned because some of them had gone away, you arrest others and keep the majority. That is very bad. But I do not want to go into it. I only want to say about the strikes and struggles. Only the other day a trade union leader in Delhi had been arrested under the DIR when a large number of disputes had been pending between the management and the workers. I would like to ask this one question: Is the Government defending the country or is the Government defending the vested interests?

Let alone the private sector; take the public sector. What has happened in the Hindustan Antibiotics, Pimpri

or in Sindri Fertilisers? We had discussed in this House about the IAC pilots. It is said that Rs. 2 crores had been lost by the strike of the IAC pilots. Then, there is this news of September 13 about Bhopal Heavy Electricals:—

"Higher pay for employees. Emoluments of employees of the State-owned Heavy Electricals project... will be raised with retrospective effect from July 1, 1962 to the same level as that of corresponding employees elsewhere."

After 1962 there had been so many strikes there. Some people are even today inside the jail. The workers had been arrested under the DIR and there have been hunger strikes, satyagrahas and all those things. Now it is in 1964 that they say that with retrospective effect from 1962 they are going to increase their emoluments. What is this policy?

Has this policy helped to increase the production in this country? Has this policy helped to create industrial peace in the country? Certainly not. On the contrary, what has been the consequence of this policy of Government? Whenever reasonable demands are put forward by the workers in the public sector, Government just threatens them and for months together, they do not care. When the workers give a notice of strike, then Government suppresses them; they use the Defence of India Rules; they try to break the workers and break the unions; and if that is not possible, they use the Defence of India Rules. As a result of the strike of the IAC pilots, we have lost nearly Rs. 2 crores. If only Rs. 15 to 20 lakhs had been given to the pilots to meet their demands, they would have been satisfied. But Government did not agree, and why did they not they could raise this money always agree? They did not agree because they could not raise this money always by additional taxation. This sum of

Rs. 2 crores which has been lost is sheer waste of the taxpayers' money; and Government do not care if the taxpayers' money is wasted, because if the public sector loses money, Government can raise money by additional taxation, and if the people resist the additional taxation, they can put them behind the bars. That is the policy of the Government.

So, as far as the public sector is concerned, whether it be the case of the Sindri workers or the IAC pilots and others, the policy that Government have followed is one by which they want to suppress the workers; they want to destroy the working class unity; and they want to destroy the union; and they do not care if crores of rupees are spent. I would only like to ask whether action has been taken against the officers and those responsible for this. I am sure no action has been taken against them; it is only the workers who have been suppressed.

As regards the working of democracy, my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur said yesterday that we had the finest democracy in this country. I say that parliamentary democracy was dead and it was buried after the Gonda poll. After the result of the Gonda poll, if you say that parliamentary democracy is the best and the finest in this country, I do not know what it means. Today my hon. friend Shri Morarka said in the course of his speech that after some time, some of us who are here might not be here. Certainly, if the Gonda poll is repeated, some of us may not be here.

I would only like to tell my hon. friend that there are so many changes taking place in the country. Take, for instance, the changes that have taken place in Kerala. It was not the Opposition that was responsible for throwing out the Congress Government, but it was the Congressmen themselves who were responsible for that. I do not repeat what has happened in Kerala. But that is a special testimony to point out that financed and encouraged by the Central

Government something had been done there, over which there was discontentment among the people. Are these *bandhs* all over the country, these cases of lakhs and lakhs of workers going on strike, no signs of discontentment? Probably Government will think that there is discontentment only if there is violence following it. I would like to ask them whether peaceful strikes and hartals are not signs of discontentment? What has happened in Kerala clearly shows, what has happened all over the country in the form of strikes and *bandhs* clearly shows that democracy is dead and it is buried.

Since the Prime Minister has assumed governmental responsibility, there has been a further shift in the official policy in favour of the vested interest in the country, both Indian and foreign. As I have no time, I would not go into the details, but I would like to point out only two things.

The remarkable difference between the prices of foodgrains in the peak and lean seasons is now an admitted fact. At present, nearly 20 million tons of foodgrains are marketed in the country. Even if we assume that the trading community takes a profit of only 25 paise per kilo, it means that due to the policy of Government, according to a very conservative estimate, they are given about Rs. 560 crores by Government, and that is the reason why Government refuse to go in for State trading.

The Reserve Bank study on the finances of the joint-stock companies has shown that the total gross assets of 1,333 companies increased by Rs. 367.3 crores during 1962-63. This shows what the emergency has given to the business community.

I would also like to point out that whatever legislation has been passed by Government has not been implemented. There is the Viscose Rayons Enquiry Committee's report in regard to the thousands of workers working in the rayon industry. The doctors have recommended that not more

[Shri A. K. Gopalan].

than five hours work must be given to those working in the rayon factory, but that recommendation has been thrown to the cold winds, because Birla who is the owner of the rayon mills at Gwalior gets crores of rupees. That is the reason why the recommendation of the doctors has not been implemented. The doctors not merely said that not more than five hours' work should be given to them, but they also said that those five hours should not be continuous but should consist of two periods of two and half hours each with an interval in between. This report was submitted in 1959. There was agitation by the workers that the recommendations of the doctors should be implemented. But even today, the workers have been working for 8 hours.

I would like to point out the instance of another company, namely the Southern Structural Limited, Pattabhiram, Madras. Here is a company in which maharajahs, ex-Ministers and others are partners. Out of 2,500 workers there nearly 2,200 are treated as contract labourers, just to evade the labour legislation. Under the labour legislation, the workers would be entitled to get some benefits, and, therefore, in order to cheat them, they are treated as contract labourers. The term 'contract labourer' does not mean that they are not given pay by the company; on the other hand, the company pays them, and the company gives them the raw material and yet they are called contract labourers. The result is that 2,200 workers in that company do not enjoy the benefits of the labour legislation. I would like to ask whether Government would enquire about this openly. For, some Ministers, ex-Ministers as well as present Ministers are the shareholders in it; and because they are interested, 2,200 workers are treated as contract labourers and thus denied of the benefits of the labour legislation.

The Inams Abolition Act had been passed by Government, but for the last ten months nothing has been done. The President also has given his assent to it, and yet nothing has been done.

The Indian people have given more than enough time to this Government to do some good to the people, but Government have failed to keep up the promises. It has bolstered only vested interests in the name of socialism. As Shri Morarka has pointed out, last year also we had brought forward a no-confidence motion, but the Government and the ruling party had a majority and therefore, that was rejected. This time also, the majority is there and that will dismiss the no-confidence motion. Lathis, dandas, revolvers, bullets, the Preventive Detention Act, the Defence of India Rules, the Criminal Procedure Code, the Indian Penal Code etc. are the powers or weapons in the armoury of Government which enable them to remain in power. But as far as the dumb millions are concerned, who are not parading in the streets, who are not shouting slogans and who do not come outside, there are crores and crores of them who when they go to the market or to the ration shop curse this Government. I am sure that these dumb millions will come together one day, organise and unite themselves and see that this Government is pulled down. Till that time, Shri Morarka and my other friends may think that certainly they have a majority here and they can do what they like.

The situation in the country today is such that it is time for Government to understand how they are to change their policy and why they should change it. But the reply of the Food Minister has shown how their mind is working. As reported in the papers, the Prime Minister is stated to have said that his party Members should try to reply by

hitting back. Yes, let him hit back at us here, with slanders and other things, let his friends hit back at the people outside also. This hitting back at the Opposition and at the people will not solve the problems. I hope that in the long run or even in the near future, the Government will understand that.

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): In my opinion, the motion moved by my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee is groundless inopportune and misconceived. I call it groundless because most of the charges that he has levelled in this House had all been levelled when the motion moved by Shri J. B. Kripalani was considered by this House on the last occasion, and those charges were rejected by this House. The charge of rise in prices and the food crisis was also considered by this House a few days before this motion came up in this House. On that occasion also, the policy of Government was accepted by this House. On all points, therefore, this House had accepted the Government policy and the Government stand and had repudiated all those charges, and the case had been decided against the Opposition, in other words, against the motion of my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee.

My hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee is an astute lawyer and he knows full well that when a case is decided, it cannot be reargued. The principle of *res judicata* is well known. It is not a principle which has come only in the annals of the British system of jurisprudence but it has been accepted throughout the world. I think therefore that a point that has been decided once by this House should not have been brought forward again in this House, and it should have been withdrawn if it had been brought forward by my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee. Either my hon. friend forgot the law or he thought that he was talking to the mob and not to the people who knew law.

Therefore, I say that this motion is

groundless. I say that this motion is inopportune for this reason. I agree with the Food Minister when he said that to meet the food crisis it is necessary to create a climate of confidence. If the Opposition really wanted a solution of this problem, it was their duty to see that this motion was withdrawn, because the only point which they had to consider was whether this motion, the talk of food crisis in this House, the censure of the Government on the question of the food crisis, was going to help in the creation of a climate of confidence or was going to wreck it.

We considered this problem at the time of the food debate. I think every one of us is convinced that the immediate cause for the food crisis and for the rise in prices was the grave agitational approach, the movement of Bharat bundh, U.P. bundh, Maharashtra bundh that was started. Why? As soon as there was a cry that commodities were scarce, people started collecting the commodities. The tenant wanted to take his commodity to the market, but as soon as he heard this, he wanted to hoard it, if he could. The businessman, if he could afford it, withheld the commodity from the market for profit's sake. It was the result of a scarcity of commodities caused by the agitational approach of the Opposition parties that created the crisis. I know on account of the agitation that was started by the Opposition, our Food Minister made a statement in Delhi that he was thinking that the zones should be abolished. One day before that statement, I had purchased wheat at Rs. 18 a maund; the next day, the price shot up to Rs. 22 per maund. This happened in the case of another Minister also. In U.P. on account of this agitational approach of the Opposition, he made a certain statement. People knew the crisis was on and they started storing foodgrains. I held a conference in my constituency of a large number of tried workers from almost every section of villages. I came to know that foodgrains were there, but in every village big tenants has stored,

[Shri G. N. Dixit]

on account of this crisis, good quantities of grains with them. This was the result of the agitational approach. What the House has to consider is whether this motion is going to help create a climate of confidence or wreck it. In my humble submission, this is going to badly affect the climate and therefore, I say this is inopportune.

This is inopportune also for the reason mentioned by Shri Masani and Shri Dandekar. The Shastri Government came into office only, about three months ago. With only three months in office, the opposition want to hit the Government on the first day that this Government sat here in the House. Where was the occasion at all? Of course, the previous Government which was in office was also of the Congress. Therefore, you want to challenge this Government, the present Cabinet. But this is a very inappropriate occasion for Shri Chatterjee and his colleagues who have sponsored this motion, when it has been in office for hardly three months. Therefore, on this ground also I say that the motion was inopportune.

Then I say that the motion was misconceived, and for this reason. On the first day that he accepted office, Shri Shastri held a press conference at which in reply to a question put to him as to what he was going to do first, he said that he was going to bring the prices down. He was going to do that as his first duty in office. He is a sincere man, a good man, a man with his affection for the people. He wanted to do a thing. But the day he made this statement, there was a big conspiracy in this country. My own view is this, which is an inference drawn from facts. There was a conspiracy to defeat Shri Shastri on the policy statement he made. My hon. friends opposite attacked the Congress Government as acting in collaboration with big business. May I ask them which was the party which presented the petition of Shri Rama-

krishna Dalmia in this House? Which was the party which presented the petition of Shri Shanti Prasad Jain in this House? Were they not radical and socialist party members? Still they had the cheek to say that it is the Congress party which was acting in collaboration with big business.

After all, you can never have direct evidence of a conspiracy. It has to be proved by circumstantial evidence. There is ample circumstantial evidence to show collaboration between the Opposition—those who have brought in this motion, and big business. It is one thing to talk and another to do something else. I do not think that these learned, highly intelligent people, did not know that if the climate of confidence is shattered, prices would go up. They knew who were going to benefit out of this situation. I cannot for one moment accept that these people do not know what is going to be the effect of the agitational approach, the Bharat bundh and all those bundh movements and also the motion of no-confidence in this House. The country will charge them with having done an anti-national act. This agitational approach and this censure motion are going to benefit only the hoarder and big business. If there is any hoarding, this is going to benefit only those people. Therefore, I say on this ground also, this approach was wrong and motion is misconceived. I am sure in spite of this challenge, the Government will succeed in meeting the food crisis.

What was there to attack the present Government during this short period of three months, apart from the food crisis. Was it not a period when this Government for the first time thought that the big challenge was that the need of the man should be looked after and the machinery given the second place? Shri H. N. Mukerjee charged this Government with shifting its policy from that laid down by our late lamented leader. After all, there is the question of

character, because the development of the nation depends upon the man. It was the cry of the opposition that the question of character, honesty and integrity must be given first priority. Shri Nanda started this crusade sincerely and is doing everything possible for an individual to do sitting in the office of the Home Minister. When he is succeeding to a great extent, and when the whole House has acclaimed the steps taken by Government in connection with Punjab and when Government is taking steps in connection with matters in other States, was it the time for the Opposition to have charged this Government and the Home Minister, who is a member of the Cabinet, with lack of confidence? Was it the time to bring this charge against the leader of the present Cabinet who truly represents this country? I remember the great words spoken by Lord Templewood (formerly Sir Samuel Hoare) who was Secretary of State for India, about Gandhiji at the time of the Round Table Conference. There a question arose as to how Gandhiji should go to meet the King. Gandhiji would never agree to wear the robes necessitated by protocol for going to meet the King. Ultimately, somehow Sir Samuel Hoare to agree to Gandhiji going to meet the King in his 'naked' condition. He was called a naked fakir and therefore, I use the word. Dhoti was almost no cloth to an Englishman. When Gandhiji went to meet the King, Lord Templewood said: I do not know how this interview will transpire and what will come out of this: there may be difficulty and I may be taken to task. Gandhiji and the King met and the King broke the silence: How is your India, Mr. Gandhi? Gandhiji said: As I stand before Your Majesty. He represented India truly; he was the Father of the nation.

14 hrs.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur):
Are you representing?

Shri G. N Dixit: No. Therefore, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is the leader and I am not. We have got a true leader, a simple and sincere man and an honest man and we are proud to have him in office. This party unanimously elected him and after that election here are some friends of ours, who knowing full well that the resolution is going to be rejected yet come with such a motion on the very day on which he sits here after assuming office. So, this is a misconceived idea. Government is trying to do its best. You may have some charges against one man or another, on one point or another. For that an adjournment motion was sufficient to discuss matters. If the Opposition brought an adjournment motion, Member from this side of the House would have also voiced their feelings on different questions of policy. But this no-confidence motion is entirely misconceived.

I will answer one point raised by Acharya Kripalani about disruption in the Congress ranks. He forgot to think of the bonds of common concord that binds this great party. It is unfair if you talk only of some points and do not consider the other points. Every day, here and now, there are points of disruption in the Opposition groups. He himself resigned as Congress President and joined the KMPP and then associated with so many other groups and parties and lastly he is sitting alone. Is there not a tendency of disruption in him? Is there no tendency of disruption in Opposition Groups? If there is something like that in the Congress camp, why should be lament for it? They should try to minimise the tendency of disruption in the Opposition ranks and forge a united and strong opposition which is needed for a democracy. We want an independent and responsible opposition.

Food must be given the first priority. I shall conclude in two minutes, Sir. Gandhiji used to say: one step is

[Shri G. N. Dixit]

enough for me. Let us not talk tall and shout slogans; they will not solve the problem. Let us decide to have complete irrigation facilities for every farm. If we can give one well to every farmer in this country, I think this Government would have made a great accomplishment. The real problem in the village is irrigation. We have been talking tall and starting so many schemes with all sincerity. But as Gandhiji said our problems are entirely different from those of the United States or the United Kingdom. Gandhiji said always that this country should take to rural civilisation; it cannot adopt urban civilisation. The day this country follows the west in that, it will be, he said, the doom for this country. I am quoting his words. We have committed this mistake. We must talk less and do things in the right way. There is only one philosopher for us; he was the Father of our nation. We cannot accept Marx. Let this Government accept Gandhiji as the philosopher and take to rural civilisation. Let us look to agriculture and give top priority to agriculture. Government and the Cabinet by its resolution must give top priority to that. By doing so, it will follow Gandhiji's dogma: one step is enough. With one charkha, Gandhiji fought our freedom struggle. He taught us that we should give the top priority to the villages. That should be our aim. I think we will succeed in our efforts if we aim at one well, one farm which was the way he taught us.

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम (बांदा): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमन्, अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर विरोधी दल के माननीय सदस्यों के जितने बक्तव्य में सुनती जाती हूँ, उतनी ही मेरा दुःख विश्वास होता जाता है कि केवल मुझे ही नहीं, बल्कि देश में जितने भी रचनात्मक प्रवृत्ति के लोग हैं, उन सब को इस अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव का तब विरोध करना पड़ेगा। श्रीमन्, यह बात नहीं है, कि हमारे परम-शोकप्रिया तथा तत्त्वदर्शी नेता, श्री लाल बहादुर

शास्त्री, को मुझ जैसे प्रतिक्रियण व्यक्ति के सहयोग की आवश्यकता है। यह बात भी नहीं है कि हमारी मौजूदा राष्ट्रीय सरकार, कांग्रेस सरकार, को मेरी सफ़ाई की जरूरत है। किन्तु आज हमें यह देखना है कि युग की पुकार है एकता, आज युग की मांग है सहयोग और भारत-माता अपनी झोली पसार कर अपनी 47 करोड़ सन्तानों से केवल एक ही मांग कर रही है और वह मांग है एकता सहयोग और संगठन की।

चाहे भारत की सीमाओं पर ताक लगाए हुए दुश्मनों का मुकाबला करने की बात हो और चाहे खाद्य समस्या को सुलझाने की बात हो, केवल एक ही वस्तु है, जो कि मौजूदा परिस्थिति में हमें इन सब समस्याओं का मुकाबला करने की शक्ति दे सकती है और वह आपसी विश्वास, श्रद्धा, एकता और मिली-जुली कोशिश।

एक दिन जब इस युग का इतिहास लिखा जायेगा और प्रागे जाने वाली पीढ़ियाँ इस इतिहास को पढ़ेंगी, तो वे इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव की चर्चा को पढ़ कर घृणा से मुँह फेर लेगी और कहेगी कि ऐसे कठिन समय में, जब कि देश को जन-जन के रचनात्मक सहयोग की आवश्यकता थी, जब कि देश को आवश्यकता थी सब के सहयोग और संगठन की, उस वक्त दलगत राजनीतिक स्वार्थों से प्रेरित हो कर कुछ लोग ऐसे कठिन समय का भी फायदा उठाने के लिए उतावले हो गए। उस समय जब कि उन के रचनात्मक सहयोग की आवश्यकता थी, राजनीतिक स्वार्थों की लोलुपता के कारण वे यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव ले आए—भारत माता की झोली एकता और संगठन के लिए फैली थी, किन्तु उन्होंने उस में विघ्न और अविश्वास की चिंगारी डाली।

मैं विनम्रता पूर्वक कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव लाने से पहले इसके

प्रस्तावकों को यह सोचना चाहिए था कि इस भ्रविश्वास प्रस्ताव से अगर किसी को लाभ पहुंच सकता है, तो वह पहुंच सकता है हमारी सीमाओं पर बैठे हुए तथा अन्य दुश्मनों को। अगर वे मेरी बात न मानना चाहें, तो वे इस प्रस्ताव के विषय में पाकिस्तान चीन और पश्चिम के अखबारों में छपी आलोचना को पढ़ें। तब उन को पता चल जायेगा कि यह भ्रविश्वास-प्रस्ताव किस प्रकार से उन के हाथों को मजबूत करता है, उन को ताकत पहुंचाता है।

पिछली बार चीनियों ने जब हमारे देश पर आक्रमण किया, तो उस से हमारे देश में जो प्रतिक्रिया हुई, उस से हम को सबक सीखना चाहिए। जीत के बावजूद चीनियों ने जब लड़ाई बन्द की थी, तो उस का कारण केवल यह था कि वे हमारी एकता से भयभीत हो गए थे। जब उन्होंने देखा कि पूरा राष्ट्र एकमत हो कर अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा करने के लिए भर-मिटने को तैयार है और अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा के लिए उतावला हो रहा है, तो वे भयभीत हो कर चले गए। वे लोग जो इस देश को प्यार करते हैं और जिन की आत्मा विदेशियों के हाथ में गई हुई भारत भूमि को देख कर तड़प उठती है, जो कहते हैं काश्मीर हमारा है और हमारा रहेगा उनको मैं बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि आज हमारे दुश्मन क्या चाहते हैं? वे चाहते हैं कि जगह जगह भ्रविश्वास के प्रस्ताव पास हों, इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव लाये जायें, फूट और भ्रष्टान्ति फैले और हम आध समस्या सुलझा न पायें। इसलिए मेरा आप सब से अनुरोध है कि एक एक शब्द जो आप बोलें उसे पहले राष्ट्र हित की कसौटी पर तौल लें, देख लें, कि इससे कहीं दुश्मन को तो फायदा नहीं होगा, इससे हमारे राष्ट्र का कितना हित होने वाला है और कितना हित नहीं होने वाला है।

1604 (A1) LSD—7.

भ्रविश्वास के प्रस्ताव से न तो आध समस्या हल होगी और न ही बाढ़ें रोकी जा सकेंगी और न पानी में डूबी हुई फसल बचाई जा सकेगी। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि हमारे देश के सामने घनेक कठिन समस्यायें हैं। लेकिन जो जिन्दा मुल्क होता है उसके सामने हमेशा ही समस्यायें रहती हैं। समस्यायें तो मुर्यों के पास नहीं होती हैं। और न कोई ऐसी समस्या ही है जोकि सुलझाई न जा सकती हो। मुझ एक मनोरंजक बात याद आ गई है। एक पड़ोसी ने दूसरे पड़ोसी से पूछा कि कहो, क्या कुशल मंगल तो है? उस पड़ोसी ने बिगड़ कर उत्तर दिया कि कुशल मंगल तो मनहूसों के यहां होती हैं। पड़ोसी ने कहा कि मैं तुम्हारी बात समझा नहीं हूँ। उसने उत्तर दिया कि जिस के यहां फलता फूलता परिवार हो, जिस का बड़ा कुनबा हो, उसके यहां छोटी-मोटी समस्यायें बीमारी बगैरह तो लगी ही रहती हैं। भारतमाता की 47 करोड़ सन्तान हैं तब भला यहां समस्यायें कैसे न रहेंगी। वे तो रहेंगी ही। समस्याये हमेशा से रही हैं और रहेंगी। उन समस्याओं को हमें सुलझाना है और हम सुलझायेंगे। कुछ समस्यायें हमने सुलझाई भी हैं। हमने बड़ी बड़ी विकट समस्यायें सुलझा दी हैं तो भला जो मौजूदा समस्यायें हैं, इनको नहीं सुलझा पायेंगे? कौन नहीं जानता कि हमने हजारों टुकड़ों में बटं हुए भारत को राजाओं महाराजाओं के चंगल से निकाल कर एकता के सूत्र में बांध दिया है। करोड़ों शरणार्थियों को जो बेचर हो कर प्राये थे, बसा दिया है। हमारी करोड़ों एकड़ भूमि जो कि सदियों से प्यासी थी, उसे लहलहा दिया है, उसकी प्यास बड़े बड़े बांध और योजनायें बना कर बुझा दी हैं। तो क्या वे जो अब समस्यायें हमारी आंखों के सामने हैं, इनको हम सुलझा नहीं सकेंगे?

विरोधी दल के एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि सरकार को इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये और दूसरों को मीका देना चाहिये। मैं

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

पूछना चाहती हूँ कि फर्ज कर लीजिये कि यह सरकार इस्तीफा दे देती है तो क्या इसके स्थान पर किसी दूसरी पार्टी की सरकार बन पायेगी और फर्ज कर लीजिये कि दूसरी पार्टी की सरकार बन भी जाती है जोकि असम्भव है तो क्या उसके पास कोई भलादीन का चिराग है जोकि पानी के बजाय अनाज बरसा देगी या जादू का डंढा है जिससे दुश्मनों को भगा देगी? किसी भी दल के पास इतने भी तो व्यक्ति नहीं हैं कि एक भी प्रान्त में ये अपनी सरकार बना पायें। तब क्या यह केन्द्र में सम्भव हो सकता है?

एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि खाद्य पदार्थों का आयात करना शर्मनाक है और हमको इसे बन्द कर देना चाहिये। मैं उन से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या वह माननीय सदस्य भुखमरी और भ्रकाल पसन्द करते हैं? एक तरफ भ्रकाल और भुखमरी है और दूसरी तरफ आयात है, इन दोनों में से वह किस को पसन्द करते हैं? सभी समझ सकते हैं और यह स्पष्ट सी बात है कि अनाज का आयात किया जाए और कोई ऐसा ही मूख व्यक्ति होगा जो कहे कि आयात न किया जाए और लोगों को भूखों मरने दिया जाये।

एक माननीय सदस्य की बात को सुन कर मैं हैरान रह गई। उन्होंने पूछा कि क्यों ये सदाचार समितियां बनाई जा रही हैं? उन्होंने यह भी स्वीकार किया है कि कुरप्शन फैला हुआ है। कुरप्शन को मिटाने के लिए उन माननीय सदस्य ने सदाचार समितियों की खिल्ली उड़ाई है। मैं उन से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि सदाचार समितियां न बना कर के क्या दुराचार समितियां बनाई जायें? किस प्रकार से कुरप्शन को दूर किया जाए, यह वह बताये। मैं चाहती तो यह भी कि गम्भीरता से समस्याओं पर विचार किया जाता और उपयुक्त सुझाव दिये जाते ताकि हमारी जो खाद्य समस्या है वह सुलभ जाती।

मैं चाहती थी कि आपोजीशन की तरफ से कोई माननीय सदस्य यह सुझाव देता कि जो लाखों एकड़ भूमि आज वाटर लाग्ड है पानी के नीचे पड़ी हुई है और जिस को रिकलेम करने की शक्ति किसान में नहीं है उसको रिकलेम करने के लिए एक नेशनल लैंड रिकलेमेशन कमिशन बनाया जाता जिस के पास बड़िया मशीनें होतीं और जो उस भूमि को रिकलेम करके दिखा देता। अगर इतनी भूमि में ही काण्ट होती रही और इतना ही उत्पादन होता रहा और हमारी आबादी इसी तरह से बढ़ती रही तो हम खाद्य समस्या को सुलभ नहीं पायेंगे।

इसी प्रकार से वनस्पति आयलज का डिक्ट्रोल किया गया था। अब चूकि उनके दाम बढ़ गये हैं, इस वास्ते मैं चाहती थी कि आपोजीशन की तरफ से कोई माननीय सदस्य यह मांग करता कि उन पर फिर से कंट्रोल लगाया जाए। शिमला में एक प्रयोग किया गया था और वहां पर एसशियल कमोडिटीज के भाव तय किये गये थे और लोगों का बालैटरी कोओपरेशन लिया गया था इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वहां पर 10 से ले कर 20 और 25 परसेंट तक कीमतें घट गईं, फूड की आइटेम्ज भी घट गईं। वही स्कीम मैं चाहती हूँ कि पूरे देश में लागू की जाए ताकि यह जो कीमतों के बढ़ने की प्रवृत्ति है, इस पर रोक लगाई जा सके। व्यापारियों से बालैटरी नैगोशियेटिड प्राइस तय की जा सकती है।

सफल परिवार नियोजन ही, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खाद्य समस्या को सुलभ सकता है। हमारी आबादी बराबर बढ़ती जा रही है। इस पर रोक लगाने के लिए मैं एक सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ। एक ऐसा टैक्स लगाया जाए कि जिस माता पिता के तीन से अधिक बच्चे हों, जो तीन से अधिक बच्चे पैदा करें उनको छोटा सा टैक्स भुदा करना होगा।

उस टैक्स से कुछ थोड़ा सी लोगों में डर की भावना पैदा होगी और वे ज्यादा बच्चे पैदा नहीं करेंगे

अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं पर बहुत से भाई बोलना शुरू कर देते हैं। मैं चाहती हूँ कि यही लोग, जिन का इस विषय पर अधिकार है और जो इस विषय को समझते हैं, बोला करें। जब इस विषय पर अनधिकार बोलने की चेष्टा की जाती है तो वे सिर पैर की और अनर्गल बातें वे करने लग जाते हैं, और नुक्सान होता है। भारत की जिस मूर्ति को संसार के लोगों ने अपने हृदय श्रद्धा के उच्च मंच पर बिठा रखा है, इस प्रकार की आलोचना से नुक्सान ही पहुँचता है। इस प्रकार की आलोचना करके उस विशाल मूर्ति को, उस श्रद्धास्पद मूर्ति को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश नहीं की जानी चाहिये। शान्ति के अप्रदूत पंडित नेहरू ने अथक परिश्रम के बाद जो इस देश के लिए प्रतिष्ठा कमाई है उसे किसी प्रकार भी धक्का नहीं लगाना चाहिये।

वैज्ञानिक अविष्कारों ने संसार के सभी राष्ट्रों को एक दूसरे के अत्यन्त निकट ला दिया है और विश्व एक ऐसे संतुलन बिन्दु पर खड़ा है जहाँ पर एक ओर तो प्रलय है, संसार की सभ्यता का विनाश है और दूसरी ओर प्रेम और आपसी सहयोग है। हम लोगों का कर्तव्य है कि एक भी बात हम ऐसी न करें जिससे हमारी जो कमाई है, जो अर्जन हम ने कर लिया है, उसे किसी प्रकार से ठेस लगे। जो प्रतिष्ठा हमारे लिए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने प्राप्त की है और विश्व को जिस शान्ति के पथ पर वह ले गये है, हम कोई ऐसा काम न करें कि उस शान्ति के पथ से यह विश्व लौट जाये। नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति के द्वारा उन्होंने विश्व के नवोदित राष्ट्रों के लिए जो एक निर्भय शान्ति चाहते थे, निर्भय शान्ति के स्वप्न देखते थे, उन स्वप्नों को साकार बनाने की कोशिश की है। नान-एलाइनमेंट

की पालिसी ने जो नाम हमारे लिये कमाया है, उसकी जब मैं आलोचना सुनती हूँ तो आश्चर्य चकित रह जाती हूँ और विशेषकर श्रद्धय कृपलानी जी के मुँह से जब मैं आलोचना इसकी सुनती हूँ तो मेरे आश्चर्य का ठिकाना ही नहीं रहता है। हमारा पक्ष-मजबूत है। हिमालय का एक एक पत्थर, विश्व परिवार का एक एक व्यक्ति यह जानता है और कह रहा है कि काश्मीर हमारा है, बहु कह रहा है कि हिमालय की भूमि हमारी है और हमारी रहेगी। हमारे पास जो बड़ी शक्तियाँ हैं सत्य की शक्ति है, न्याय की शक्ति है, उन पर हमें भरोसा करना चाहिये और बेकार में बबराहट दिखाने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। इस प्रकार के अविश्वास प्रस्ताव ला कर के हमें कोई गलत कदम नहीं उठाना चाहिये।

इस प्रस्ताव को ला करके हमारे विरोधी भाइयों ने बार बार पाकिस्तान का जिक्र किया, बार बार चीन का जिक्र किया। उन्होंने बहुत ही आलोचना सरकार की की। लेकिन एक भी रचनात्मक सुझाव उन्होंने नहीं दिया। मैं मानती हूँ कि आलोचना करने का उनको अधिकार प्राप्त है और यह उनका कर्तव्य भी है, लेकिन यह कर्तव्य भी तो उनका है कि आलोचना करने के बाद वे कोई न कोई रचनात्मक सुझाव भी दें। मुझे बड़े ही खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि एक भी विरोधी दल के माननीय सदस्य के मुँह से ऐसा सुझाव सुनने को नहीं मिला है जिससे हमारी शक्ति बढ़ती हो और हमारा पक्ष जो है, वह सबल होता हो।

माननीय हिरेन मुकर्जी साहब ने केरल के सम्बन्ध में किये गये निर्णय को अर्थात्क बताया है और वहाँ की हमारी आपसी फूट की बड़ी चर्चा की है। मैं उन से कहना चाहती हूँ कि वे अपने गरेबा में नखर डाल कर देखें। उनकी पार्टी में क्या हो रहा है इसको तो वे देखें, उस फूट को तो देखें जो उनकी पार्टी में है और तब हमारी फूट के बारे में निर्णय करें। कम से कम हम कांग्रेस के जो सदस्य

[श्री.मति सावित्री निगम]

हैं और जो कभी-कभी भी आपस में लड़ते हैं, विदेशों के साथ गहारीपूर्ण समझौते तो नहीं करते, कम से कम माओ-त्सेतुंग की तस्वीर तो अपने सामने नहीं लगाते, जैसे सुन्दरैया जी ने ब्राम्हर प्रदेश में लगाई थी और जिससे देश को शर्म से अपना सिर नीचे करना पड़ा। जब तक आप अपनी पार्टी की फूट को दूर नहीं कर देते हैं, तब तक आपको अधिकार नहीं है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी की फूट की आप चर्चा करें।

केरल में राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू करने का जो निर्णय किया गया है, वह न्यायसंगत है, उपयुक्त है, जिस समय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के अन्यायपूर्ण, क्रूर और निर्दयतापूर्ण शासन का अन्त करने का निश्चय किया गया था वह भी न्यायपूर्ण था, नैतिक था।

अन्त में मैं इस सदन के इस मंच से उन सब विदेश ताकतों से अपील करना चाहती हूँ कि बिला बजह इस छोट से भविष्यवासी के प्रस्ताव को इतना महत्व न दें क्योंकि देश के 47 करोड़ नर और नारी इस मौजूदा सरकार तथा प्रधान मंत्री पर पूर्ण विश्वास, प्रगाढ़ श्रद्धा और प्रेम रखते हैं। मैं आपोजीशन के माननीय सदस्यों से भी अनुरोध करना चाहती हूँ कि इस संकट के समय में, इस कठिन समय में उनका कर्तव्य होना चाहिये कि वे विध्वंसात्मक प्रवृत्तियों में अपनी शक्ति को न लगा करके रचनात्मक प्रवृत्तियों में लगायें। यदि ऐसा किया गया तभी सही मौजूदा समस्याओं और मौजूदा कठिनाइयों को दूर करने का देशभक्तिपूर्ण एक नमूना व पेश करेंगे।

Shri Chandrabhan Singh: (Bilaspur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the speeches of the big guns of the opposition firing sputniks, rockets, hydrogen and atomic bombs using the same ammunition—food crisis, shortage and high prices, corruption, Chinese invasion, Pakistan, Kashmir and evacuee

problems—have not at all hit the bull's eye. Not only that; they have gone far off the mark, as they have been using the same ballistic calculations for different ranges and different missiles.

I have been reminded of my experience exactly 43 years back when I was a student in the medical college, when we used to be taught the science of prescription writing. First, we write the name of the patient. Here the name of the patient is the Prime Minister and his Council of Ministers. The doctors are what you call the ten *dikpals* of the various parties. The first top physician is my friend, Mr. N. C. Chatterjee. Let us see what these doctors have prescribed.

Dr. Chatterjee prescribes the first item in the prescription, namely, quinine. The second item comes from Mr. Trivedi—arsenic. The third one comes from Mr. Goplan who prescribed mercury. Prof. Hiren Mukerjee prescribes Iodine. There are others who have prescribed chillies. Some of them have prescribed bismuth and carbon; some have prescribed magsulph. The ninth is from Mr. Dandekar who has given aqua pura.

While being taught prescription-writing, we used to be told that the prescriptions must have certain qualities. The first quality is that the drugs must be compatible. That means, one drug should not react against another. But when you look at this prescription, they are incompatible and cannot go together. The mixture they have presented is bottled in a leaky bottle, leaking all the time. The mixture will not remain there. If you look at the colour, it is black and dark and nobody can like it. It has got a nauseating smell. If tasted, it is not only bitter and unpalatable, but it creates tremendous difficulties to gulp it. If you swallow it, God forbid, perhaps it will remove you from your very existence because of its fatal potentialities. That has been

the performance of the Opposition while bringing forward this motion. It proves beyond doubt that they have no case at all. They have produced a prescription which, I am glad to say, no Prime Minister or Council of Ministers will ever take, because we on this side are guided by scientific system of medicine. We know the incompatibilities and the weaknesses of the opposition parties, how they have combined and brought out a prescription which will never do good to either the Prime Minister or the Government or the country or the common man. That is my first impression about this motion of no-confidence brought about by this unholy alliance.

The physicians belong to different systems of medicine. Some of them belong to the communist system of medicine, some to the capitalist system of medicine. Some of them are Samyukt_s and some are Swantantras. These are the various varieties of physicians who have combined to produce such a bad result. It is just as well that the modern medical science knows much better and the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers are quite safe in the safe custody of the scientific system of medicine.

To judge the performance of this Government and the Congress, let us have a quick and rapid look back at the history of the last fifty years. There was the Gandhian period from 1914 to 1947—33 years—with two World Wars, the emergence of Mahatma Gandhi with his band of leaders and followers imbued with the idea of satya (truth), sacrifice, service and non-violence. During this period, the greatest mental change—that is the most important thing brought about by this band of workers—agitation, fearlessness, in going to jail, strikes, satyagraha, defiance of law and order under certain circumstances and dissipation of fear complex from most of the people. As a result of this accumulation of forces, we obtained independence on 15th August, 1947. This legacy of

defiance of law has pervaded and it is still being practised by the leaders of the opposition and their followers. I thought that the defiance of law and order ought to have been given up the day we obtained independence and introduced real democracy.

Then came the period of the great Prime Minister who is no more, the period from 1947 to 1964. During this period, we had the misfortune of partition of the country, the holocaust which followed the partition, the framing of the Constitution and planning for wealth and the three big Five Year Plans. We should remember that the late Prime Minister always had a great vision. He looked at the world and wondered, where is India in the comity of nations when you think about power? The most powerful thing that can give power to a country is steel. In steel production we have got a place in the world. While we were nowhere before, now we are somewhere. The second important point is power. We have big dams producing electricity. We have Hydal and thermal plants and the Necluar Reactor (Trombay) which are producing a tremendous amount of electricity. The third important point which shows the strength of a nation is heavy industry. Here also we are much advanced and we are producing great things. We are trying to become self-sufficient in all these things. So, the late Prime Minister has done a great task and the nation will always remain grateful to him, for all time to come for the greatest achievements of time. It is futile for me to enumerate these things.

During this very period, land reforms came. Certain things—abolition of Zamindari, Talukadari, Malguzari and Princely states—were done and we thought that land reforms will solve the problem of food. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. There has been fragmentation of land and as a result, food production has not been as good as it should have been.

[Shri Chandrabhan Singh]

During this period, there has been pumping in of currency and foreign aid. There has been tremendous increase in the fluid circulation of money and deficit financing and gold smuggling and black-marketing is holding sway. During this very period, Chinese invasion came. There was also the problem of Pakistan and Kashmir and the East Bengal refugee problem. These were the most important problems which have faced us.

Let us be fair and square. Every Indian and not only the Government of the late Prime Minister and the Congress, but the people can be proud of all these things. We are thankful to God for giving us as Prime Minister the very best in the world, who has put the country at the top. We shall always remember him for his greatness.

I would like to call the present period the period of peace and plenty. I call it the period of taking stock of the situation. Looking back—not leaping back—what do we find? Population is the most important thing. Population has been increasing in the world at a great rate. Formerly the population growth was 1.2 per cent; then it was 1.4, 1.6, 1.8 and now we have the tremendous picture of 2.5 per cent. The world population is more than 320 crores and India's population has touched the high-mark of 46 crores. Every year we are multiplying at the rate of 1 crore, which mean 10 million more mouths to feed every year. As a result of the tremendous increase in our population our plans have fallen short. Our food production has increased and everything has increased, but they have not kept pace with increase in the population. So whatever has been done in these respects has not been successful. This is a very important point. Let us remember for all time to come that unless and until we solve this problem of multiplication of the population, all our targets will only fail. Let us therefore put our heart in it and solve this problem by

family planning and control of population to some degree. If we do not, it will not be possible for us to feed our millions.

Let us remember that the amount of food production in the whole world is also not enough. The world population of 320 crores is not getting enough to eat. And if we multiply at this rate, by 1996 we shall be 92 crores and the world population will become more than 600 crores. So this problem is not only a problem for our country, it is an international problem and that problem has got to be solved. And it can only be solved by research and by producing cheap contraceptives, that is by adopting radical methods on almost a war footing. Then only we can solve the problem.

Then, coming to the present Opposition, who are they? All old stalwart nationalists and Congressmen. And now they are non-cooperating. Why are they non-cooperating? Because they have been frustrated and they are disappointed. That is the reason. We have all respect for them. But let us consider this. In any scheme of democracy what is the function of the opposition? The opposition functions, if they are sincere, in a responsible manner making constructive criticism all the time. What have the opposition done in this respect? Their criticism is of a destructive nature, whatever we do. Whatever the Government does, the opposition comes forward with some sort of criticism of a destructive nature, they start demonstrations, they indulge in preaching of violence and defiance of law and order and fasting, and other things. Even in the present debate they have flung abuse and forecast defiance of law and order in the offing. They are threatening us that "if you don't do this, this will happen". That is what the present opposition is doing. Is that responsible, is it proper, is it fair, has the present opposition given a fair and square deal to this Government itself?

The newly found talent of the Swatantra Party in his maiden speech, although not supporting the no-confidence motion, sang the maiden's melodious song of giving the Government a chance. It is a tune to lure us into the lair of Big Finance. We are not going to be trapped by such assurances as have been given by the Swatantra leader. The same thing I can say about the other leaders. Their object is to mislead us.

What do you see when you look around the world? If you look around the world anywhere, whether to the east or to the west or to the north or to the south and see what is happening. You find either military dictatorships, guided democracy, kingship or other forms of autocratic rule. Ours is the only biggest democracy in the world which is still on its feet and which is creating confidence in the whole world. This proves, if proof was needed, that democracy has taken deep root in our country and has become part of our body politic. We have to thank Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru and the millions of workers in the country and even the opposition for this great achievements that we have made.

Coming to the food problem, which is most important, everybody has talked about it. But why is it so? Because our press and our administration have given no publicity for the villager or the villages which comprise the millions, 82 per cent of our population. They have not been given a fair deal. When people talk about the food problem, they do not talk about the villages. This point is of great importance. And how can this be solved? The present Food Minister has already got the situation well in hand, and the long-term measures must treat food as a basic industry. When we think about basic industry we need money, material, methods, machine and man. Let each and every one of us keep in mind the dignity of labour and go to the land and back to the villages. Only then can we solve this problem.

Now a clarion call has been given by the present Prime Minister and he has already asked for the co-operation of the Opposition. The second thing is, let each parliamentarian, MLA and MLC go and live for three days in the year in a village. He has already said that. That means he wants that the villages should have the amenities of sanitation, roads, water to drink, schools and health. This is a very important point. Let us make the villages worth living, and instead of the present urbanisation let the process of ruralisation start. Let us turn back completely. Do not give facilities to the cities to become bigger. On the other hand, let the countryside become bigger. And let, what I would call, rural institutes, rural colleges, rural industries and cottage industries, let them develop. And then only can there be this creation of a combined economy.

People complain against what we call democratic socialism. Let them remember that democratic socialism is an experiment. Where there is democracy, there is socialism. We are trying that experiment and it is our duty to see that democratic socialism will prove a success. And there is no doubt that with the present Prime Minister and his band of Ministers and with the country behind him democratic socialism will prove a success, and it will not be far off when the success will be proved beyond any doubt.

In conclusion I must say, let this be an era of peace and plenty. Let this be a culmination point of the Gandhi and Nehru period. If the American agriculture can feed the world and send grain to Russia, India and other countries, then the Indian farmer can certainly feed India. Let the price of the Indian foodgrain be fixed at an economic and better level. The agricultural labour's earning should not be lower than what an average worker in the town or factory will get. That is a very important point. And once you do that, the granaries will be emptied, the hoarders will dislodge their stocks, and every inch

[Shri Chandrabhan Singh]

of the land will be tilled like that we see in Japan.

In this work our great friends of the Opposition can give their support and help if they are really sincere and if they want to help the poor, the down-trodden and Dridra Narayan. And if they help I have no doubt that the so-called Ram Rajya which is our aim, when everybody will get his food, everybody will have clothes, everybody will have shelter and get his requirements, will be brought to this country. So my request and appeal to the Opposition is not to come with this sort of thing, because by this method they are only creating defiance of law and order which will not do any good to anybody. And they are responsible for this. As regards this no-confidence motion we know the result of it. As I have already said, it is such a bad mixture that the Government is not going to take that mixture; and it is not good even for the Opposition. It is a bad mixture. I will appeal to them to co-operate with the Government and not to come with such motions.

Sir, with these few words I oppose the motion of no-confidence that has been moved.

श्री यू० सि० चौबरी (महेन्द्रगढ़) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस भविष्यवासी प्रस्ताव पर दो तीन दिन से बहस हो रही है। इससे कुछ दिन पहले खाद्य समस्या के ऊपर काफी कुछ कहा गया। पहले भी जब सरकारी प्रस्ताव इस बारे में आया था तो उस वक्त भी खाद्य के बारे में इस तरफ से बहुत कुछ कहा गया और उस तरफ से सरकार। नजरिया काफी खोल कर पेश किया गया।

इस भविष्यवासी प्रस्ताव के बारे में बहुत सारी ऐसी बातें इस सदन के अन्दर दो तीन दिनों के अन्दर कही गयीं जिन से प्रकट होता है कि सरकार के अन्दर, सरकार की नीतियों

के अन्दर कोई कमी नहीं है, जो कुछ भी हो रहा है यह सारा का सारा खाली एक बहस है और अपोजीशन के आदमियों ने एक गुट सा बना करके—जिसके लिए अभी एक बम्ब इस्तीफा किया गया है अनहौल; एलाएंस यहां पर यह भविष्यवासी प्रस्ताव रखा है।

अगर इस तरफ की सारी की सारी बातों को निकाल दिया जाए और केवल कांग्रेस की तरफ की बातों को सुना जाए, तो ऐसा मामूली पहेला कि देश के अन्दर किसी प्रकार की अशांति नहीं है, देश के अन्दर अनाज की बिल्कुल कमी नहीं है, नीतियां बिल्कुल सही हैं, हम अपनी अन्दरूनी और बाहरी नीतियों के अन्दर पूरी तरह से कामयाब हैं, और यह जो कुछ भी हुआ है, जैसा कि सुबहाम्यम् साहब ने कहा था, यह खाली अपोजीशन की तरफ से भड़काने वाली कार्रवाई है, ऐसा प्रतीत होगा। खाली हमारे इस तरफ के लोगों के कहने से या उस तरफ के जो शोक हैं उनके कहने से तो किसी समस्या का हल नहीं होगा। अगर जो असली स्थिति है उसके ऊपर हम नजर डालें तो उसके बाद जो कुछ भी पता चलेगा, सारी चीज का विश्लेषण करने के बाद जो चीज सामने आयेगी वह एक सही तस्वीर होगी।

खाद्यान्न के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया। इस सत्र में पिछले हफ्ते या डेढ़ हफ्ते से जो बहस चल रही है, कम से कम एक बात में सभी आदमी एक राय हुए, चाहे वे इस तरफ के हों या उस तरफ के हों कि देश में खाद्य की समस्या गम्भीर है। डा० साहब ने खाद्यान्न के बारे में और उत्पादन की कमी होने के बारे में हमारे लोगों की बातों को ही सपोर्ट किया, किसानों के साथ उपेक्षा का बर्ताव सरकार का रहा है, यह सब बातें उन्होंने भी कहीं और हमें एक तरह से सपोर्ट ही किया मगर अन्त में बैठते बैठते वह यह बू गये कि मैं इस भविष्यवासी के प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ। यह तो अन्त में उन्होंने कह दिया कि मैं इस भविष्यवासी प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

हूँ लेकिन किसानों के प्रति जो सरकार की एक उपेक्षापूर्ण नीति रही है और जिसकी कि और हमारी तरफ से ध्यान दिलाया गया उसका उन्होंने भी समर्थन किया। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा कि यह जो लैंड का फ्रैगमेंटेशन होता जा रहा है, किसानों को अधिक उत्पादन के लिए प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिल रहा है और परिणामस्वरूप अन्न की पैदावार में इजाफ़ा नहीं हो रहा है तो यह सब बातें एक तरह से हमारे अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन ही करती हैं भले ही आखिर में उन्होंने कह दिया कि मैं इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

भ्राज देश के सामने सबसे बड़ी समस्या अन्न की पैदावार बढ़ाने की है। मैं यह बात मान सकता हूँ कि इन पिछले सत्तरह सालों के अन्दर देश में कितने कारखाने लगे होंगे, उद्योग घड़े स्थापित हुए होंगे, नई सड़कें बनी होंगी और नई रेल की लाइनें भी देश में बिछी होंगी, यह सब बातें मैं मान सकता हूँ लेकिन मैं यह हरगिज मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि किसी प्रकार से कोई भी काम सरकार की तरफ से एक सही नीयत से किसानों को प्रोत्साहन देकर खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाने की दिशा में किया गया। एक, अन्न कानून उस सम्बन्ध में ज़रूर बने, जमींदारियां ज़रूर खत्म हुईं। वे ठीक ही हैं और उनसे मेरा कोई विरोध नहीं है। मेरा विरोध तो सरकार से इस बात को लेकर है कि जहाँ हम एक तरफ अन्न के उत्पादन में कमी होने की शिकायत करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि किसान अधिक उत्पादन करे वहाँ हमें कृषि उत्पादन अधिक करने के लिए जो किसानों को प्रोत्साहन और आवश्यक सुविधाएँ देनी चाहिए, वे नहीं दी जाती हैं।

उदाहरण के तौर पर मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक कारखाना यहाँ पर लगता है तो गवर्नमेंट उसके लिए ऐक्ट लाती है और कुछ इण्डस्ट्रीज को गवर्नमेंट प्रोटेक्शन देती है

और वह इण्डस्ट्रीज गवर्नमेंट के उस प्रोटेक्शन के साथे में पनपती हैं, उस प्रकार का कोई भी कानून, कोई भी इस तरह का प्राविजन जो कि उन्हें प्रोटेक्शन दे किसानों के वास्ते नहीं किया जाता है। क्या सरकार या सरकार का समर्थन करने वाला कोई भी सदस्य यहाँ पर यह कहने के लिए तैयार है कि हमने किसानों को इस प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन दिया है जिससे किसान के मन में उत्साह पैदा होगा और वह आगे बढ़ कर खेती की पैदावार को बढ़ा सकेगा? फ़सलियत तो यह है कि ऐसी कोई बात हरगिज नहीं हुई।

खाद्यान्न सम्बन्धी सरकारी मोशन के ऊपर बोलते हुए भूतपूर्व खाद्य मन्त्री श्री जैन ने यह बतलाया कि देश के अन्दर किसानों की जो सामान्य ज़रूरतें हैं, जैसे पानी, खाद, बीज या कुर्भों के वास्ते बिजली की व्यवस्था, यह सब उन्हें अभी भी नहीं मिल पाती है। खाद के बारे में उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे देश में खाद की कीमत संसार के अन्य देशों के मुकाबले में दुगुनी है, 50 प्रतिशत अधिक है। बिजली की व्यवस्था उनके लिए करने की जहाँ तक बात है स्थिति यह है कि जहाँ एक कारखाने को बिजली 2 या 3 पैसे फी यूनिट मिलती है वहाँ किसान को खेती के लिए वही बिजली 25 से 50 पैसे प्रति यूनिट के हिसाब से सप्लाई की जाती है। अन्य सुविधाओं को भी जहाँ तक किसानों को पहुँचाने का सवाल है वे भी किसान को किसी शक्ल में नहीं दी गईं ताकि किसान प्रोत्साहित हो और अपनी कृषि की उपज का लगन के साथ बढ़ाने में जुट जाये। सरकार जिस प्रकार से कुछ इण्डस्ट्रीज को बढ़ाने के हेतु उन्हें तरफ़ तरफ़ के प्रोत्साहन देती है, किसानों को पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिए वैसे कोई प्रोत्साहन व प्रोटेक्शन नहीं दिया जा रहा है। सरकार को यह बात अच्छी तरह से समझ लेनी चाहिए कि जब तक किसान के दिल के अन्दर, उसकी अपनी ज़मीन के प्रति, उसके अपने काम और धंधे के प्रति प्रोत्साहन पैदा नहीं होगा तब तक यह खाद्य समस्या

। [श्री यू० सि० चौधरी]

ज्यों की त्यों बनी रहेगी और वः किसी प्रकार से भी हल होने वाली नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि खाद्यान्न के बारे में मझे बहुत ज्यादा कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। खुद सरकार और सरकारी पक्ष के आदमी इस बात को मानते हैं कि खाद्य समस्या हमारी बहुत पिछड़ी हुई है, खाद्यान्न के भाव अंधाधुंध बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं, गरीबों के लिए जीवन निर्वाह करना कठिन हो गया है। अब खाद्यान्न के वर्तमान संकट के लिए चाहे प्रायः यह फुड जॉस को जिम्मेदार ठहराये या अन्य बातों को इसके लिए जिम्मेदार ठहराये, हर एक आदमी जो यहां पर बैठा हुआ है उसने एक राय से इस बात को मान लिया है कि खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन काफ़ी पिछड़ चुका है, और सबसे बड़ी समस्या देश के सामने अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाने की है। अन्य बातें इसके मुक़ाबले में नहीं आ सकती हैं। सरकार योजना में जो 70-80 करोड़ रुपये का कट करने का इरादा कर रही है मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। यह ठीक ही विचार है और मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ कि यह रुपया अन्य चीजों में इस्तेमाल न होकर कृषि उत्पादन में इस्तेमाल हो। कारखानों में जो कि खाली खर्चा करने वाले हैं जहां केवल एक्सपेंडीचर ही है, वहां यह रुपया इस्तेमाल न होकर कृषि उत्पादन के क्षेत्र में खर्च किया जाय। बेशक यह स्वागत योग्य बात है और यः उम्मीद की जा सकती है कि इसका अच्छा असर पड़ेगा और खाद्यान्न की पैदावार इससे बढ़ जाय।

जहां तक सरकार की बाहर की नीतियों का सवाल है मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि अभी पिछले शुक्रवार को जब यहां इस सदन में श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री के एक गैर सरकारी प्रस्ताव को लेकर कश्मीर का विशेष दर्जा समाप्त करने के बारे में चर्चा चलाई गई बः आज की स्थिति में बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण है। श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री ने अपने मोशन में कश्मीर

के सम्बन्ध में जो एक खास धारा संविधान में रखी हुई है, कश्मीर को अन्य राज्यों के मुक़ाबले जो एक खास दर्जा व प्रोटेक्शन दे रखा है उसको समाप्त करने की मांग की। आज यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि कश्मीर सम्बन्धी वः धारा टूटा ली जाय और एक जो अनिश्चितता का वातावरण बनाये रखा हुआ है उसे सदा के लिए समाप्त कर दिया जाय। आज पिछले 16-17 सालों से कश्मीर का मामला लटका हुआ है यह सही है कि इन 16-17 सालों से कश्मीर के मामले को लेकर और अन्य बहुत सी बातों को लेकर पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात बहुत खराब हैं। मैं यह तो नहीं कहता कि हमारे पाकिस्तान के साथ ताल्लुकात लगातार खराब होते चले जायें तो हमारे इसमें भला होगा, लेकिन मैं यह कहे बगैर भी नहीं रह सकता कि अगर सरकार या कोई भी आदमी इस तरह की बात सोचता है कि केवल कश्मीर का कुछ हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को दे देने से या अपने अधिकार को कुछ अंश तक छोड़ देने से और कश्मीर के बारे में पाकिस्तान को तुष्ट कर देने से यह समस्या हल हो जायेगी तो यह उसकी गलती व भूल है। यह खेद का विषय है कि कश्मीर के बारे में पाकिस्तान से समझौता करने के लिए कांग्रेस और पुराने कांग्रेसी जो कि अब सर्वोदयी नेता बन गये हैं वे बार बार इस बात की दुःई दे रहे हैं कि इस प्रकार का कोई कदम उठाने से पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे हो जायेंगे। पाकिस्तान के भारत के प्रति शत्रुता और द्वेषपूर्ण इरादे हैं जब तक उनके बारे में गहराई से नहीं सोचेंगे और उनका निराकरण करने के लिए आवश्यक सावधानी नहीं बरतेंगे तब तक केवल कश्मीर घाटी दे देने से, जम्मू व लद्दाख़ इधर रख लेने से या जो हिस्सा आज्ञाद कश्मीर का है और जिस पर कि उसका गैर कानूनी कब्ज़ा है उसको दे देने से इस समस्या का हल हो जायगा एसा मैं हरगिज़ मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ।

एक बात में शोख अब्दुल्ला के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहूंगा। शोख अब्दुल्ला के प्रति सरकार का रुख आज तक मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। आखिर वह इस व्यक्ति को इतना महत्व क्यों दे रही है? शोख अब्दुल्ला की प्रेरणा के ऊपर सरकार आज कश्मीर की समस्या को सुलझाने के लिए फिर से बातचीत करने को तैयार जान पड़ती है और इस समस्या को जैसे भी हो सके सुलझाने का एक वातावरण बनाने का उनकी ओर से प्रयास किया जा रहा है। श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने पिछले शुकवार को कश्मीर सम्बन्धी अपने प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए यह ठीक ही कहा था पहले भी जब हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री नेहरू जी जीवित थे और आज भी जबकि शासन की बागडोर श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के हाथ में है, जहां सवाल पैदा होता था कि हमने आजादी की लड़ाई लड़नी है वहां तो हम राष्ट्रवादी मुसलमान कांग्रेसियों के साथ मिला करते थे और उनको अपने साथ में लेकर चलते थे लेकिन जब कभी कोई अल्पसंख्यकों अर्थात् मुसलमानों के हितों के बारे में बंटवारा करने का सवाल पेश होता था तो हमारे यह कांग्रेसी नेता राष्ट्रवादी मुसलमानों की ओर न देख कर मिस्टर जिन्ना का ही मुँह देखा करते थे। श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने यह बात ठीक ही कही। उन्होंने यह भी बतलाया कि इसी के कारण नाराज होकर सीमान्त गांधी खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां आज तक फिन्नुस्तान के अन्दर नहीं आये। अफसोस की बात है कि आज वही गलत नीति फिर इस सरकार द्वारा दुहराई जा रही है। आज भी शोख अब्दुल्ला को सरकार द्वारा आवश्यकता से अधिक महत्व दिया जा रहा है और कश्मीर के अन्दर जो राष्ट्रवादी मुसलमान बैठे हुए हैं उनकी उपेक्षा की जा रही है। केवल एक व्यक्ति हो, एक ऐसे व्यक्ति को जिसके कि बारे में सब तरफ यह सिद्ध हो चुका है कि वह किसी भी प्रकार से भारत का हितैषी नहीं है, ऐसे व्यक्ति को इतना अधिक महत्व देना, मैं नहीं समझता

कि यह किस प्रकार की कूटनीति और राजनीति पर आधारित है? यह सरासर गलत और बेबुनियाद नीति है। केवल एक व्यक्ति के कानों से कश्मीर का भविष्य एक अनिश्चितता के वातावरण में जटका देना कदापि उचित नहीं है। कौन नहीं जानता कि कश्मीर हमारे देश का एक अविभाज्य अंग है? उस के बारे में एक बार नहीं; जारों बार यह घोषणा की जा चुकी है कि कश्मीर भारत के अन्य राज्यों के समान ही उस का एक राज्य है। कश्मीर वैधानिक रूप से भारत का हिस्सा बन चुका है। अगर इस प्रकार से उस व्यक्ति को खुश करने या उस व्यक्ति की संतुष्टि के वास्ते या पाकिस्तान और फिन्नुस्तान के प्रायस में उत्तम सम्बन्ध बनाने की भाड़ के अंदर इस प्रश्न को अगर दुबारा उठाया जायगा तो इस से हमारी समस्या उलझेगी और हमारी समस्या का कोई समाधान नहीं निकलेगा। इस मामले के अंदर पता नहीं सरकार भी किस प्रकार की नीति अपना रही है? सर्वोदयी व भूदानी नेता आज खुलेआम यह प्रचार करते फिर रहे हैं कि अकसाईचिन अगर चीन को पट्टे पर दे दिया जाय तो चीन के साथ हमारा झगड़ा खत्म हो सकता है। आज जो हमारे देश का एक आम नागरिक है उस के दिल के अन्दर यह शक पैदा किया जा रहा है क्योंकि सरकार की इस बारे में कोई स्पष्ट नीति समझ में नहीं आती है। सरकार की ओर से भूदानी और सर्वोदयी नेता का कोई स्पष्ट विरोध नहीं किया जा रहा है। सरकार की ओर से या कांग्रेस की ओर से कोई भी ऐसा घोषणा या एलान, इधर पिछले डेढ़, दो महीने से जो इस प्रकार की बातें की जा रही हैं, उन से सरकार का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, कोई ऐसा एलान नहीं किया गया है। इस कारण आज आम जनता में एक शक पैदा होता है कि यह जो अकसाईचिन या कश्मीर के बारे में पाकिस्तान के साथ कोई न कोई समझौता करने की बात है, जिस प्रकार का इन सर्वोदयी और भूदानी नेताओं का कांग्रेसी शासकों के साथ सम्बन्ध है और रहा है शायद सरकार के

[श्री यू० सि० चौधरी]

इशारों पर ही यह सारे कदम बने उठा रहे हों। यह बात लोगों में एक प्रकार का भ्रम पैदा कर रही है। इस लिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति स्पष्ट करे। अगर वह सोचती है कि अक्सार्ड-चिन या काश्मीर का कुछ हिस्सा दे कर चीन और पाकिस्तान की समस्या को सुलझाना है, तो उस को साफ़ तौर से यह बात कहनी चाहिए, ताकि वह देख सके कि इन सुझावों के बारे में आम जनता का क्या रीएक्शन है। स्वयं चुप बैठ कर और कुछ दूसरे आदमियों को आगे कर देने से जनता में शक की भावना पैदा होती है। यह शक की भावना देश के लिए तो बुरी है ही, स्वयं सरकार के लिए भी बुरी है, क्योंकि इस अवस्था में उस की नीति स्पष्ट नहीं हो पाती है। आज सरकार स्वयं तो चुप बैठी हुई है, लेकिन दूसरे आदमी बड़े जोशो-खरोश के साथ ऐसी बातें कह रहे हैं, जिन की हम कल्पना नहीं कर सकते हैं और जिन का काफ़ी विरोध भी हो रहा है।

जब अक्सार्ड-चिन के सम्बन्ध में इस प्रकार की बात कही जाती है, तो हम एक महत्वपूर्ण बात को हरगिज नहीं भूल सकते। आज से डेढ़ दो वर्ष पहले सारे सदन ने एकमत हो कर य. प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि जब तक हम अपनी एक एक इंच भूमि का आक्रमणकारी चीनियों से खाली नहीं करवा लेंगे, तब तक हम चीन से नहीं बैठेंगे। इस संदर्भ में जब इस प्रकार की बातें कहती रही हैं, कोई एक व्यक्ति ऐसी बातें कह रहा है और फिर भी सरकार खामोश बैठी है, तो जनता के मन में यह शक पैदा होता है कि इस सदन ने जो प्रस्ताव पास किया था, उस के बारे में सरकार का इरादा बिल्कुल डिलमिल है।

पाकिस्तान से हमारे सम्बन्धों के दिलचस्पी में पाकिस्तान के मुसलमान नागरिकों के आसाम में बसने का जिक्र भी करना चाहता हूँ। एक बार नहीं, हजारों बार यह

प्रश्न उठाया गया है। विभिन्न समाचारपत्रों में इस की चर्चा हुई है। सरकार ने एक बार नहीं अनेक बार यह माना है कि पाकिस्तानी नागरिक लाखों की तादाद में आसाम में बस गए हैं। उस की ओर से य. भी कहा गया है कि वह उन लोगों को अपने य. से निकाल कर उन के अपने देश पाकिस्तान को भेजने के लिए कार्यवाही कर रही है। लेकिन मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि य. मामला ठंडा पड़ गया है। ऐसा कोई प्रमाण नहीं मिला है कि वहाँ से एक आदमी भी निकाला गया है। न तो सरकार की तरफ़ से इस बारे में कोई बयान ही दिया गया है और न ऐसी कोई बात सुनने पढ़ने में आई है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर पाकिस्तानी नागरिक लगातार लम्बे असें तक हमारे देश में बैठ रहेंगे, तो एक दिन आयेगा, जब वे कहेंगे कि हम तो पंद्रह, बीस बरसों से यहाँ ही रहते हैं, पाकिस्तान से हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, हम तो भारत में रहने वाले हैं और हम को इस देश की नागरिकता भी जाये। क्या मैं सरकार से पूछ सकता हूँ कि जब वे इस बात को उठायेंगे, तो हमारे देश की सुरक्षा की क्या स्थिति होगी, जब कि लाखों की तादाद में पाकिस्तानी नागरिक हमारे देश में आबाद होंगे? सरकार आज तक उन लोगों को देश से निकाल नहीं पाई। वह उन को निकालने के लिए कोई भी ठोस कदम उठाने के लिए तैयार नहीं है, इस लिए कि हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ आदमी नाराज न हो जायें और पाकिस्तान इस को नहीं मानता है। यह देश की सुरक्षा का सवाल है। चूँकि आज-कल इस सदन में, और बाहर, इस बारे में शोर मचाना बन्द हो गया है, इस लिए सरकार भी खामोश हो कर बैठ गई है। जब कभी यह सवाल सामने आयेगा तो सरकार अपना मुँह छिपाने की कोशिश करेगी। आज आसाम में और देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में लाखों की तादाद में

पाकिस्तान के नागरिक मौजूद हैं, जो कि कुछ नहीं करते हैं, जो अपना पेट पालने के लिए यहां नहीं आए हैं। उन में से दस से तीस प्रतिशत लोग ज़रूर जासूसी का काम करते होंगे। वे बड़े आराम के साथ घूम रहे हैं और सरकार अपने कर्तव्य से हटी हुई है।

अन्त में मैं दो और बातों का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ, जिन की आजकल बड़ी चर्चा है। कल आरम्भ के दो प्रश्नों में स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू का स्मारक तीनमूर्ति के भवन में बनाए जाने के बारे में बड़ी चर्चा हुई। उस चर्चा से एक बात स्पष्ट हो गई। अगर सरकार को पहले इस बात का ज्ञान नहीं था कि इस तरफ़ के सब आदमियों और एक या दो आदमियों को छोड़ कर उस तरफ़ के बहुत से आदमियों का यह विचार है कि उस मकान को श्री नेहरू का स्मारक बनाना उन का कोई सम्मान नहीं है, तो इस चर्चा से उस को इस सदन के अधिकतर माननीय सदस्यों के दृष्टिकोण का पता चल गया होगा। सदन में हुई इस चर्चा के बाद कल शाम को मैं उस मकान को देखने के लिए गया। वहां पर आज भी यह पत्थर लगा हुआ है कि उस मकान में फ़लां अंग्रेज़ कमांडर-इन-चीफ़ काफ़ी असें तक रहे। समझ में नहीं आता कि जब यह सारी बात चल रही थी, तो प्रधान मंत्री या कांग्रेस के बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों के दिमाग में यह बात नहीं आई।

यह बात नहीं है कि विरोधी दल के माननीय सदस्यों के मन में पंडित नेहरू के प्रति असम्मान की भावना है। प्रश्न यह है कि अगर पंडित नेहरू का कोई स्मारक बनाना है, तो वह बहुत अच्छा बने, लेकिन एक बात तो दिमाग में रखी जानी चाहिए और वह यह कि वह स्मारक कम से कम मौलिक हो और उस का उन के जीवन के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध तो हो। सोलह सत्रह साल तक पंडित नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री होने के नाते वहां पर रहे। दूसरा प्रधान मंत्री भी वहां रह सकता है। यह पता नहीं चलता कि उस भवन को पंडित नेहरू का

स्मारक बनाने का आधार क्या है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक बड़ी बाह्यगत परम्परा है। इस सदन और सारे देश का यह विचार है, आम लोग गली-मुहल्लों में चर्चा कर रहे हैं, अखबारों में प्राया है कि तीनमूर्ति का भवन सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से प्रधान मंत्री के रहने के लिए उपयुक्त है। राष्ट्रपति-भवन उस के सामने है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उस भवन को उन का स्मारक बनाना उन के सम्मान के लिए है या फिजूल की लकीर को पीटना है।

वह बात ख़त्म नहीं हुई कि यह कहा गया कि सिक्कों पर भी पंडित नेहरू की तस्वीर होगी। समझ में नहीं आता कि हम बीसवीं सदी में बैठे हुए हैं या चौदहवीं पंद्रहवीं सदी में बैठे हुए हैं। रूजवेल्ट अमरीका के लिए बड़ा होगा, चर्चिल अपने देश इंग्लैंड के लिए बड़ा होगा और स्टालिन रूस के लिए बड़ा होगा, लेकिन उन के चित्र सिक्कों पर नहीं रखे गए। कोई भी जनतंत्रीय परम्परा में विश्वास करने वाला आदमी इस प्रकार की पुरानी बादशाही और सामन्तयुग की परम्परा को कभी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं होगा। जिद्द में आ कर सरकार चाहे यह फ़ैसला कर ले, लेकिन यह बात किसी आदमी के गले में नहीं उतरेगी। अपनी पार्टी के इन्ट्रेस्ट के लिए और इलीक़शन में इस नाम का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए यह फ़ैसला किया गया है कि सिक्कों पर श्री नेहरू की तस्वीर होगी। सत्रह साल की हुकूमत के बाद नेहरू की तस्वीर लोगों के दिलों में उतर चुकी है। सरकार यह निश्चय रखे कि इन सिक्कों की कोई भी कीमत नहीं रहेगी।

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am grateful to the House for the kindly eye they have on my Ministry. Hon. Members who have participated in this debate did not say much in criticism against my Ministry. I do not claim that my Ministry is functioning more efficiently than other Ministries. But I know that every Member of this

[Shri Tyagi]

House has a heart and every one knows that this Ministry is directly connected with people who are displaced persons. So, from the humanitarian point of view, it is just fair that all parties without exception must give their fullest co-operation to me and my Ministry.

I am always open to conviction and I invite Members of this House to give me their suggestions with regard to the success I am trying to achieve in the rehabilitation of refugees. In this question there is no party; all members are alike. Here I must acquaint the House with the problem, which is becoming more and more serious and severe as time passes. As on 10th September, the total number of displaced persons who have migrated to India is 6,81,611 which works out to an average of 2,000 per day. The plight of the small little children, hungry and famished, who are coming to India daily is really pitiable. We cannot have anything but sympathy for them.

I am sorry that Shri Chatterjee did not take kindly to this Ministry and was not as good as he usually is. He said that nothing is being done for the poor refugees. He further remarked that we were not taking a realistic view of the problem and that our attitude was not sympathetic at all. This is something surprising.

15 hrs.

He said that the Government has treated the refugee problem with cruel indifference. That is rather uncharitable; anyway, he might have had that impression. May I tell him, and this House that it was not possible to resettle them all at once. It is such a huge population. The first concern of the Government in this rainy season was to give them shelter, to provide food and to give them medical relief. That, of course, kept the Ministry engaged. Even then about 5,280 persons have already been

given some employment as artisans, labourers, shopkeepers, teachers, motor drivers, masons, weavers, fishermen etc. and further attempts are being made. About 1,15,000 acres of land has been offered by various States and I am very grateful to all the States in India that they have come forward with an open heart and generosity. They offered thousands of acres of land and the total has now come to 1,15,000 acres.

This problem is being treated on a national basis, as an all-India problem. I am sorry that Shri Chatterjee has remarked—

“.....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.”

I crave your indulgence just for a minute. I hope the House will appreciate it that on the occasion of partition 41,17,000 displaced persons had entered West Bengal and out of those 41,17,000,—31,32,000 had settled in West Bengal. So, last time, factually it was West Bengal alone which just bore the brunt of these displaced persons where the bulk of them were settled. Their population average is high enough. So, how could the fresh DPs be settled there? And then we should not expect a patriot to say that a border State must be overcrowded. I do not know if Shri Chatterjee is aware of the figures. Up till now 4,38,000 people have crossed the border and entered West Bengal.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Are you also satisfied that the contention that West Bengal has reached the saturation point is correct?

Shri Tyagi: I know, my hon. friend is convinced of what I say. Out of these 4,38,000 people who have entered West Bengal, 261,000 have already stayed back; they have not gone out. About 50 per cent of these

displaced persons are staying back in West Bengal. So, it is already becoming overcrowded. And Shri Chatterjee objects to my taking them to Dandakaranya or to other States! Why should not I take them there? Have they not got a right on other States? After all, they are our kith and kin. I am not guided by linguistic or regional considerations. When the refugees come, they have a right to go anywhere, in any corner of the country wherever there is a place. Why only to West Bengal? Therefore to accuse the Government of just throwing them out of Bengal is not fair because even now half the population is staying back.

Then, Shri Chatterjee said:—

“ . . . no attempt has been made by this Government to demand compensation for properties left behind or for cash left behind by these . . . refugees.”

It is a matter which requires serious consideration. I am one with Shri Chatterjee, but I hope, as a lawyer, he knows—it is obvious—that it is a matter which pertains to the External Affairs Ministry, though it is a question of joint responsibility. But the House is aware that under the agreements of April 1950, known as the Nehru-Liaquat Pact—migrants from East Pakistan shall enjoy complete proprietary rights of their property left behind. It was announced. It was agreed that they can sell or exchange their property freely even though they have come to India. That pact has not been abrogated so far, although I am sorry to say, as the House already knows it, that in February 1964 the Government of Pakistan issued an Ordinance, which was later on amended, prohibiting these minority community people from transferring their irremovable property without permission of the authority specified by it. That restriction comes in the way and they have not been able to transfer them; otherwise, there was no question of

compensation and Shri Chatterjee and other friends of mine would not raise any question with regard to compensation because, according to this Pact, they could always dispose of their property even if they were in India. Legally, they are still the proprietors of that property. They have still got the right to transfer the property, but by means of an Ordinance the Pakistan Government has prohibited the transfer without permission. This matter was discussed by the Home Ministers of the two countries when they met last and, I am sure, next time—they are meeting soon—they will have a discussion on it when I shall be in a position to place before the House the result of those negotiations. Till those negotiations take place and something is settled, it will be embarrassing for me to pass any remark about it. I would therefore request the House not to press the question. Of course, the question of compensation surely comes if the property is left behind there and that matter has to be negotiated.

I do not want to take much time of the House as I shall have other occasions to place before the House as to what measures have been taken for the rehabilitation and resettlement of these refugees. My difficulty during these few months has been that on account of the rainy season it was not possible to have reclamations operations on the lands which were offered by the State Governments generously. As soon as the rainy season is over our teams of experts will go about to find out possibilities and report and immediately we shall proceed with reclamation activities. We shall finish it soon and as soon as reclamation is done we shall see that they are resettled on that land.

I might also inform the House that the Prime Minister was recently pleased to announce that the Andamans and Nicobar area will also be open for the purpose. A team has already been constituted which is going to inspect the Andaman and Nicobar Islands when the weather allows.

[Shri Tyagi]

They will soon report and quite a number will be resettled there. But I want to make one thing quite clear to the refugees as well, namely, that whatever efforts we make, it will not be possible to accommodate every agriculturist in agriculture because 80 per cent of them are agriculturists and land is not really available. Therefore my appeal to the displaced persons is and has been that they must also help themselves by seeking some other professions and whatever business they can take to, the Ministry will be helpful to them.

Shri Chatterjee also made a remark about the Chairman, Dandakaranya Development Authority. He has referred to the resignation of the Chairman of the Dandakaranya Development Authority. He has alleged that his life was made miserable and that he was made to resign. He makes out that "the Chairman, Dandakaranya Development Authority, was made to resign because he had the temerity to point out certain gross defects in the Authority." This is a very long case and I am sorry it will be difficult for me to give a long explanation. If you will permit me, I will lay a statement with regard to this on the Table. But I may just say that he never pointed out any defects in the working of the Authority, during the last ten months when he was the Chairman. He was never asked to resign. It is wrong to allege that he was made to resign. Nobody asked him to resign; on the other hand, I tried and told him once, "Please do not resign". The cause of his resignation was the clash between his authority or rights and the executive authority of the Chief Executive Officer who is another whole-time senior officer. By a resolution of the Government the Dandakaranya Development Authority were given the power to assign and allocate powers to various officers. So, the Chief Executive Officer was given the powers by the Dandakaranya Development Authority by means of a resolution and those powers came into clash

with the powers of the Chairman. The Chairman was assigned the power of overall control of the whole procedure of working there and of the plans etc. He was directly responsible to the Dandakaranya Development Authority and, through the Dandakaranya Development Authority, to the Government. He wanted the same to be changed. The Dandakaranya Development Authority did not agree with that. Therefore that was the cause of his resignation. There was no other cause.

As regards a few other points mentioned by Shri Chatterjee, I am sorry to say that Shri Gupta never made any mention of those lapses in the working of the Authority. For instance, he said that the Vigilance Officer was dismissed. It was a case where after the Chinese aggression, every Ministry was asked to curtail expenditure and effect economies, and pursuant to that, the Dandakaranya Authority also effected economies, and consequently, the posts of vigilance officer, industries officer, director of stores purchase, director of resettlement, accounts officer and zonal resettlement officer etc., were curtailed. And the post of vigilance officer etc. was curtailed not because there was any case of corruption brought to notice. It is surprising indeed that Shri N. Chatterjee makes out that the Chairman was forced to resign because he had pointed out some cases of corruption. Factually speaking, it was in the resignation which he submitted that he had pointed out for the first and last time some defects, but in the body of the resignation letter itself there was no such reference to any corruption cases. After all, for ten months, he was in power, and he could take action against the corrupt officers. He never took any action nor did he inform the Dandakaranya Authority about the cases of corruption nor did he submit any report to the Ministry about any lapses. These lapses come to my notice only after I had read his resignation letter. I am sorry that he has resigned. Other-

wise, he was very honest, and scrupulous, and I have all admiration for him. But it is unfortunate that on account of the clash of authority he should have resigned. He wanted that he must look into the details also. The Dandakaranya Authority was of the view that he must be in overall charge like the driver of a motor-car. A driver sits at the steering-wheel and steers the motor-car. He cannot drive well if he becomes the carburetor of the car or the magnet of the car or any other part of the car; if he tries to do so, there would be an accident. The driver is only required to see that every part works in co-ordination and the vehicle moves properly. His is an overall charge.

Similarly, in this case, the chairman had the overall charge. I also asserted that he should be in overall charge. But he was not satisfied, and he resigned. I must also confess one thing here that by nature, I am not inclined to negotiate with officers. If any public servant resigns, immediately, I shall accept the resignation. This has been my policy in the past, and for the future also, whatever be the importance of an officer, if he resigns, it is against the dignity of Government to negotiate with him, and, therefore, I shall accept his resignation immediately.

With your permission, Sir, may I lay this statement on the Table of the House?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri K. C. Pant.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I just ask one question?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he wants to ask any questions, he can ask them when he intervenes in the debate.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The statement has been laid on the Table by the hon Minister. We had tabled a calling-attention-notice on this matter to be replied to. I only want that our calling-attention-notice should not be rejected on this ground that the

statement has already been laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not concerned with it if the calling-attention-notice has been rejected.

The hon. Minister has intervened in the debate and he has also laid a statement on the Table of the House. The statement will be distributed to hon. Members, and Members can comment on it in the course of their speeches.

Shri Tyagi: Actually, it is part of my speech, but because I did not want to take up the time of the House, I laid it on the Table of the House.

Shri K. C. Pant (Naini Tal): We have before us the second no-confidence motion ever moved against the Council of Ministers in the Parliament of free India. The first motion came up last year, sixteen long years after Independence, but the second motion followed after a gap of only one year. It almost seems as though some friends opposite are jealous of the record of the State Assemblies in this regard. At this rate, it may not be long before Parliament becomes the envy of the State Assemblies.

If one recalls the excitement of last year's debate, then I am afraid this year's is something of a damp squib, in spite of Shri N. C. Chatterjee's acrobatic feat on the first day. Who else but he could have acted as a bridge not only between the left and the right wings of the Communist Party, but between his crusading revolutionary colleagues of all hues on the one hand and his no less crusading counter-revolutionary ex-colleagues on the other?

15.15 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

Therefore, Shri N. C. Chatterjee at least cannot be blamed for the failure of this debate to rouse public opinion. The reason for this failure lies elsewhere. It lies really in the mistiming of the debate. Coming at a time

[Shri K. C. Pant]

when the country has hardly recovered from the shock of Pandit Nehru's sad demise and the intense anxiety that followed that sad event, this motion, if I may say so, with all respect, does not reflect the mood of the country. It does not take into account the mood of national crisis born primarily of internal difficulties but heightened by an awareness of the ever-deepening danger from the north which makes the people of India instinctively disown any attempt to disturb the stability of the country or the continuity of the government. It does not take into account the enormous sense of joy and of relief at the smooth manner in which Panditji's successor was elected. The Congress Party can be proud that it did not fail Indian democracy in its hour of trial. For the discipline and maturity that it displayed in the face of the gravest national crisis, what the Congress deserves today is not a vote of no-confidence but a special vote of confidence from all sections including the Opposition.

The people of India realise this, and my hon. friend Shri Morarka this morning referred to the results of various elections. We had an election in Pondicherry recently. There, the communists were supposed to be fairly strong before this, but there too the people indicated in an unmistakable manner where their confidence really lay.

The country has a right to ask my hon. friends, the sponsors of this no-confidence motion: 'Are you prepared to see this through to its logical conclusion? Are you in a position to replace the Government in power?'. I doubt if they will come forward with an answer, because they are fully aware of the irony in the situation, which is that, far from being able to form an alternative government, the worthy parties which have thought it fit to join this motion of no-confidence are themselves in the throes of crisis of confidence. The gallant but ill-fated

P.S.P., whose passing will be mourned by all lovers of democracy, has made its final bow on the stage of Indian politics. Some of its best men have joined the Congress, and those who remain do not quite know what they have got themselves into.

The Communist Party whose strength lay in its discipline and fanatical faith in the bible of Marx and Lenin presents a sorry picture today. The right has no confidence in the left, and the left has no confidence in the right, and neither seems to have confidence in Shri Namboodripad, and there is no hope of the situation improving so long as Russia and China do not decide to come nearer to each other. This is the position, and against this background, I do not really understand why the sponsors of the motion were in such an unholy hurry to bring forward this motion. At least they might have waited till the soul of the dead PSP had had time to adjust itself to the new body to which it has transmigrated. They might have waited till the communist halves—I do not know which of them is the better half—had finally made their choice whether to cohabit or to divorce.

As it is, a motion of no-confidence by parties in a perpetual state of becoming against the Government of the only party capable of forming and running a stable government in this country is nothing but an empty petulant gesture, a theatrical attempt to make the most of the difficulties of the moment.

Just now, the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation referred to some of the remarks made by Shri N. C. Chatterjee regarding the rehabilitation of refugees. I shall also refer to these remarks and try to present another aspect, another viewpoint, of the same problem. Shri Chatterjee spoke of the conspiracy among the high-ups in the Congress to spirit away, as he put it, refugees from West Bengal and settle them outside. Is it his contention that there is sufficient land in

West Bengal to rehabilitate all the refugees that have poured in? If not, how does he serve the interests either of the refugees or of West Bengal by pursuing this line? I really do not know whose interests he seeks to serve by reducing a national problem to parochial proportions.

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi (Bairampur): His own.

Shri K. C. Pant: Does he think that it is so very easy for other States, which have landless people of their own, to rehabilitate refugees? Let me tell him of my own constituency. The Terai jungles were cleared in my constituency with the declared intention of rehabilitating landless people from the hills. But partition came and thousands of refugees came into the area. We welcomed them. This time, again, thousands of refugee families have been brought to the tarai. When I went on a recent tour of my constituency, the landless people asked me, 'What about our plight? Will our claim always go by default?' I chided them and told them that this is a national problem and we must think about it in a national way. But now I find Shri Chatterjee here virtually charging the Government with kidnapping these refugees from West Bengal! If he takes such a narrow, parochial attitude, I do not know if I or other persons like me can hope to convince the landless people of our areas, whose need is also real, about the national nature of this problem.

I do not want to go into the food situation because it has already been discussed sufficiently during the food debate. But I do want to say that the food difficulty in UP is very real. I do not want to use alarmist phrases, but the fact is that there is not even provision for seeds. Therefore, I hope the Minister will employ his resourcefulness to help UP in this situation. He has given us an example of that resourcefulness recently when he had ships on the high seas, destined for other countries, diverted to Indian

ports. That was a bold, imaginative step and I congratulate him for it.

I was amazed to hear Shri P. K. Deo—I am sorry he is not here—making an astounding statement, that we should not spend a single paisa on defence and that we should purchase our protection by aligning ourselves with the west. All I can say is that this is unmanly counsel, unworthy of the dignity and self-respect of a great country like ours.

I listened very carefully to the clever speeches of Shri Dandekar and Prof. Mukerjee and I admired their tactics. The Swatantra Party seems to harbour the hope of winning the sympathy of the new Government by putting on an air of sweet reasonableness. This is their line—the big bad, Prime Minister was there all these years; now a new Government has taken over; let us give it time. The new Prime Minister is a good man; he will listen to us. Prof. Mukerjee, on the other hand, is far more sophisticated—the Prime Minister has a split personality, he says; he pays lip-service to Jawaharlalji, but does not adhere to his policies. May I point out with all respect that the country is not going to accept Prof. Mukerjee as a reliable interpreter of Jawaharlalji's policies and programmes? For that, it will turn to the present Prime Minister, who was a close confidant and colleague of Jawaharlalji, and to the present Government which is exactly the same as the one Jawaharlalji had under him. But even apart from this, the basic point that both Shri Dandekar and Prof. Mukerjee chose to ignore is that Panditji's policies were not the policies of an individual, though he undoubtedly had a large hand in shaping them. They were the policies of a giant, democratic organisation with roots in every village. And they do not reflect the whims of an individual but the considered response of a living, dynamic people's movement to the basic urges and aspirations of the masses. They were born neither of self-interest nor of expediency; they were born in the heat of the struggle. They have been

[Shri K. C. Pant]

tested in the crucible of experience. Let me assure my friends of the Swatantra and Communist parties that neither their praise nor their criticism can swerve the Congress from its chosen path, which is the path shown to us by Jawaharlalji. Ideas and convictions which have over the years become the substance of the life-stream of a great organisation like the Congress cease to be the playthings of individuals; they become expressions of historical forces. Prof. Mukerjee at least should know that.

Having said this, however, I think no reasonable person would deny the new Government the right to adjust their programmes to the needs of the situation. If Panditji taught us anything, it is that inflexible and static minds cannot cope with the problems of a changing and dynamic world.

I was surprised to hear Prof. Mukerjee launch into uncharacteristic personal attacks. But I will not embarrass a gentle person like him by referring to them. I was surprised in particular that he took objection to the Finance Minister praising Malaysia at Kuala Lumpur. Did he expect the Finance Minister to condemn Malaysia in Kuala Lumpur? If Malaysia had to be condemned, surely the Finance Minister would have done better than choose Kuala Lumpur for the purpose. At any rate, ours is a straightforward attitude. Malaysia supported us in our hour of peril, and we are grateful to it for that. A country which takes friends for granted soon becomes friendless.

Finally, Prof. Mukerjee pleaded for a high growth rate and for a bigger plan and against the suspension of projects, particularly in the heavy industry sector. I am personally inclined to agree with him, provided his party agrees to help raise the necessary resources. Because that is the key to the whole question. Nobody denies that the pressure of a rising population, the pressure of ris-

ing aspirations is such that we must have a bigger plan; we must have as big a growth rate as our resources will permit. But if tomorrow we go beyond our resources, Prof. Mukerjee will turn round and ask: why are you resorting to deficit financing? If tomorrow, we go to foreign countries for assistance, Prof. Mukerjee will turn round and ask: why are you selling the country to foreign imperialists?

This is the whole difficulty. When we are trying to raise resources in this country, then too they come in the way. That is the whole difficulty. We might ignore their ritualistic opposition to foreign aid, but how can we ignore their continuous attempts to incite first one section of the people, then another to claim and press for a larger share of the national cake? Because unless there are savings, and unless those savings can be diverted to production, how is he going to have larger plans and a larger growth rate? How can we ignore all the *bundhs* and *hartals* to which his counterpart, Shri Gopalan, who spoke earlier, referred? How can we ignore all these things which disrupt production and how does he reconcile his plea for a greater growth rate with Shri Gopalan's advocacy of *hartals* and *bundhs*? If Prof. Mukerjee is sincere in his desire to step up production and growth, let him advise his partymen to assist Government in generating larger savings and greater production and in desisting from all activities which come in the way of these. That is the acid test, not mere lip-service to planning.

It is not a party question. No country has progressed without making mistakes and without shedding tears. The important thing is to learn lessons from the past. The country today is faced with grave difficulties, internal and external, and the Government is grappling with these problems courageously and imaginatively. Let us strengthen their hands. We must see that our

economy is made to grow, not only as fast as it is now growing—because it is not growing fast enough—but made to grow to such an extent as to outstrip the growing population on the one hand and to meet at least in part the rising tide of aspirations of the people on the other. I am afraid that unless we can do this, unless we can manage this, there is no hope for planning and democracy to continue hand in hand in this country. This is a must if both are to survive.

We have all to work for the day when every citizen of this land can be assured not only of his essential requirements but of something more. I am sure that we are all one at least in this and we should expect the co-operation of all sides of the House in achieving this objective.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar North): Sir, the last arrow in the armoury of the Opposition is out at last. It is the most effective weapon in a democracy. But the Opposition has not been able to use it in a proper way. I do not know whether they think they have used it effectively but they must look to the opinion that is created in this House and the country and outside our country also when they moved this no-confidence motion in this House. The *National Herald* says that the no-confidence motion will give rise to a meandering debate without purpose. The *Mail* says:

“A no-confidence motion at the present moment, besides being a waste of time, risks criticism as showing lack of fairness and considerateness. The motion is misconceived because the Shastri Government has not had sufficient time either to reverse policies that are wrong or to initiate policies that are right.”

Within a very short time, even when the discussion is going on, this is the type of opinion that is created in the

country as regards this motion. The *Statesman* says:

“While allowances must be made for the strong feelings created over the setbacks in food, price policy and planning, none but the most uncharitable can say that the Shastri Cabinet has failed to tackle them in real earnest; proofs of performance so far available are not so inadequate as to warrant outright condemnation.”

That is the opinion that now prevails in the country.

Last time also when they moved the no-confidence motion, they were sure that it would be defeated but they ventured to move it last time; this time also they are doing so. I wonder whether they are going to make it an annual recurring feature because of the right conferred upon them by a democratic set-up. This right has been made a mockery of. I wonder if they have confidence in themselves to move this motion because it requires confidence in them and in their representatives also to bring this motion. Many Opposition friends say that they are representing the grievances of the people. Are they the only representatives elected to this august body . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Yes.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi: If he says: yes, it depicts only his narrow-mindedness. The majority of Members sitting on this side do represent a greater section of society in the country and they are also ventilating the grievances of the people whom they are rightly representing. Constructive criticism has to come from the ruling party itself; the ruling party is very vigilant every moment to guard democracy. I hope the hon. Members sitting on the other side realise that it is only a living organisation, a living country and people who can afford to commit mistakes, not a dead party or dead organisation which fights within itself. I do not think that they have any capacity to fight also.

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

With due respect to his learning and scholarship, hon. Mr. Mukerjee invented a particular strategy that the existing Government is trying to reverse the policies followed by the old Government or proclaimed by the late Pandit Nehru. I do not know how he ventured to say this. If he had properly interpreted and understood things, he would not have said so because he is not a person of that type. I am observing him during these two years. It may be a way of approach and their policy may be different. But I do not know what difference of opinion he intends to create in the Members of the ruling party by saying these things. I might have appreciated this no-confidence motion if they had all gathered together at least on certain points. I must congratulate them certainly on this point that they gathered at least on this occasion not less than fifty Members and brought this motion; otherwise it would not have been allowed. One party is dissociating itself from this motion; there are other independent Members who call this motion misconceived and inappropriate at this time. The Swatantra Party spokesman, Mr. Dandekar, quite fresh from the laurels, gave us his views. I do not know whether there was a fight between the economist and the politician within him. Ultimately the politician in him succeeded, forgetting the economic principles and policies, and he says that the public sector is an utter failure and it ought not to have been encouraged to this extent; that agriculture was being neglected and so on. I wonder how he makes these remarks. During the First Plan more than Rs. 70 crores was devoted to agriculture; during the Second Plan, more than Rs. 90 crores, and in the Third Plan it has been enormously increased. There may be certain lacunae or shortages here and there in the implementation of schemes. Many hon. Members made constructive suggestions that the irrigation potential in the country is not fully utilised and that there is a big

gap between completion of major irrigation projects and their actual utilisation; they also say that improved seeds are not supplied or that land reforms were not properly implemented. They cannot say things without knowing whether agriculture has been encouraged or discouraged. My hon. friend Shri Chatterjee, a very learned advocate, said that no attention is being paid to rehabilitation of the refugees. Mr. Dandekar also similarly said that no attention was being paid to agriculture, without knowing what was being done. Agriculture is the basic industry in our country for not less than 70 per cent of our people. 44 per cent of the national income comes from agriculture. Some of our industries also depend upon agriculture. Even by importing raw materials and food-grains, the shortages were tried to be met. Of course, India should be self-sufficient and that is why huge amounts of money are being spent for that purpose.

Our friends in the Opposition also refer to the suppression of the Fundamental Rights. I do not wish to quote Dicey here, and what he said about the rule of law in England where there is a parliamentary democracy established since ages. In the interest of maintenance of our democracy and preserving our democratic traditions, it is but natural that the ruling party should put reasonable restrictions on Fundamental Rights. Dicey says that even in a country like England, the rule of law could be suspended, in times of emergency. No fundamental right can be absolute; unless there are reasonable restrictions on them no fundamental right could be enjoyed by the citizens. Therefore, knowing fully well the changes, one must proceed. Here, I may be allowed to quote a few words of Justice Gajendragadkar who was kind enough say the other day that amendments to the Constitution or enactments or amendments to the enactments reflect the socio-economic

changes within the country. This is a legislature which is the highest representative body in the country and which represents the changes in the socio-economic fields also. It is bound to introduce certain amendments also. Any enactment, any amendment that goes out of this House is nothing but crystallised common-sense of responsible Members of this House. Taking into consideration this very fact that it is the crystallised common-sense and wisdom of Members of this House, I do not know how Shri Chatterjee says that the fundamental rights are being suspended and that they are very much abridged and that under the Defence of India Rules, the citizen has been deprived of all his fundamental rights. In the interests of maintaining democratic values in the country, it is essential, if the anti-social elements are to be kept behind the bars, for the ruling party and the Government to make use of the Defence of India Rules. If they say that the Defence of India Rules are not being properly interpreted or implemented, that is a different thing. But they cannot say that the Defence of India Rules are made, by virtue of which fundamental rights are being suspended.

Our great scholar and veteran parliamentarian, Dr. Aney, also remarked the same thing. That is one side of the picture. Every coin has got two sides. So, also every problem. Closing their eyes to the other side of the coin, they say this. I do not know whether they do it intentionally or not knowing that there is the other side of the coin. The Kashmir problem and the territorial integrity of the country have also been touched by many of my hon. friends. Do they know that cordial relations are being established in Nagaland? Do they know that our Prime Minister is going to have a talk with President Ayub as regards the establishment of cordial relations between the two countries? Peaceful relation is the policy of the country of India, and by whatever means peaceful relations

are established—without any compromise with principles—that has to be done and that is the policy which is going to be adopted.

Many of my hon. friends in the Opposition refer to things such as integrity, the artificial emergency created by the Government etc. If they are determined to describe it as artificial, or determined to say it in such censoring words, let them realise that they have got the freedom of speech because the Indian Constitution guarantees the freedom of speech, especially to Members of Parliament, who call themselves as representatives of so many people.

As regards refugees coming from East Pakistan and other parts, our hon. Minister has made it quite clear that so much attention is being paid to it and that no stone would be left unturned to see that all the refugees are properly rehabilitated and given proper employment also.

As regards the monetary policy, Shri A. K. Gopalan was rather harsh. He said that the public sector is not being encouraged or the public sector which ought to have been a greater employer is not able to be so, and that the recommendations of the Mahalanobis Committee are not being properly taken into consideration. Does he know that the highest slab of income-tax is 80 per cent of the income, which is being taken away by way of tax? Is it being done in any other country? He complains about the implementation of the Income-tax Act and such other enactments. I can agree with him, but as regards the provisions in respect of the tax and the policy that has been pursued by the Government, I do not know whether he is fully aware of these things. There is not a single country in the world which extracts 80 per cent of the income at the highest slab, except India. Does he not call it a socialist pattern of society? India may not adhere to any

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

doctrinaire definition of socialism. It is not socialism to deprive the means of production or to deprive the people of, or steal away, their property and to give it to others. The means of production and also the proper sources of income must be properly distributed within the society and India is proceeding towards that socialist pattern of society. I hope that hon. Members in the Opposition would try their level best to understand these things.

Shri Dandekar put forth the view that there is democratic decentralisation and he criticised it. I do not understand as to what interpretation they would like to have for democratic decentralisation. He said at the panchayat level and the taluk level and at the district level clashes in the policies and parties are being created. But let me tell him that democracy is taking roots and people are learning to understand democratic values and getting educated in democracy. These difficulties are bound to take place in the initial stage. Having favoured democracy, once we have adopted that sort of Government, there is no going back. Whatever the hardships that we may be required to face in the initial stages, we are going to have our democracy and our people are going to have democratic values. All these things are the great legacy of that our late Prime Minister has left for us. With all this, India is going to survive with prestige and with full democracy. If Members of the Opposition are intent on bringing such things to the fore, I would like to warn them that they would lose the significance of these things and lose the confidence to bring the grievances of the people and at the same time, reduce the values of the no-confidence motion by which again they will be doing a great harm to our democratic values and democratic tradition.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated--Anglo-Indians): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I

rise to oppose this motion. It is a little axiomatic to say that the country is facing many grave problems, some of them constituting a threat, both internal and external, to the survival of our democracy. Because of that I feel that the approach must be a balanced one, and an unjaundiced approach.

I am aware—because I am not unaccustomed to indulge in it—that abuse and criticism are not difficult for people especially in the political field. And may I say, without pointing a finger at anyone, that in politics, except for a few honourable exceptions like Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, and myself, no special training or education is required, because it is, strangely enough, the only profession where no education, no training, no specialised knowledge is required. As some cynic has remarked, it is the only profession which gives gainful employment, sometimes almost rapidly gainful employment, to people who would be otherwise largely unemployed if not unemployable.

Sir, one of my strongest reasons for opposing this motion is that it has, if I may say so with respect, an undisciplined, lawless motive. May I also say with great respect, it is not only Members of the Opposition groups, but also—it is not seldom—Members of the Congress party who seem to be pro-occupied with simulating indiscipline and lawlessness in the country. I feel that the most urgent and indeed the most critical need in India today is the need for discipline, both corporate and individual.

I feel that the lack of discipline is the greatest single threat to the unity and progress of the country. May I say without pointing a finger to this side or that side of the House that in my respectful submission, the fountain-head of indiscipline in this country is the politician, irrespective of his political complexion. I say this too; that the scourge of India

today is the arrogant, lawless politician. Everywhere we see not only a dispiriting but almost a shameful spectacle of political lawlessness. Open your newspaper in the morning, and you will read of an exhibition, a shameful exhibition, of political lawlessness in one legislature or another. I say this that we see it with regret increasingly even in this House. As one of the most senior Members of this House, I regret—I say it with respect—that there is almost studied hooliganism and political exhibitionism in the various legislatures. What has happened? Because of this, —go to the common man—the legislatures today have been brought increasingly into disrepute, even into contempt. The term 'politician' is almost a term of abuse today. Look at it—student indiscipline, studied student hooliganism and goondaism. Is it not a matter for shame to every decent, self-respecting, thinking Indian? Here too, who encourages students' hooliganism? Who fishes constantly in the troubled waters of student hooliganism? Politicians, mostly—I say it with regret—politicians belonging to the Opposition groups. Students cannot be punished because immediately some politicians will go to their rescue. If the police even lathi-charge rioting students immediately some politician will want the police punished or at least a judicial enquiry, whether it is in Bengal or Bihar or Orissa, where we had a most shameful incident recently, or even whether it is in Delhi. I have not a little to do with students; I understand their frustrations. But student thugs, people who deserve at least public flogging; at least rustication, go scot-free. Why? Because they can always depend to be encouraged, to be fortified in their goondaism by political abettors and political protectors. That is why I am opposing this motion, because I feel we have enough of indiscipline and near chaos in the country.

I am aware of the fact that there are some political parties who thrive

on chaos. There are some political parties whose technique is chaos. There are some political parties where, in their spiritual mentor countries, their counterparts have ridden into totalitarian power on the crest of chaos. I feel that the time has come when we must call a halt to indiscipline and chaos in this country, first call a halt to indiscipline and lawlessness on the part of politicians. God knows I am holding no brief for the Congress Party. God knows conditions in many States are bad. They could not be worse. I feel that the common man would not only heave a sigh of relief, but he would literally go down on his bended knees if there was President's rule in many of our States. And I feel it will do the country a great deal of good if we have President's rule not only in Kerala, but in several other obvious States. It would give relief to the people who are gasping for breath from the stranglehold of politicianism. What the people need more than anything else today is some respite from politicianism. It is this politicianism that has demoralised and is demoralising every aspect of our national endeavour and activity. In order to do it, in order that at least President's rule is within our constitutional pattern—it is consistent with our democratic pattern; I think it is long overdue and I think it will be welcomed by people in many States—in order that President's rule should work within the constitutional limits set for it, it is vital that the Central Government must function.

Mr. Chatterjee, a respected colleague of mine at the Bar, in a passage distinguished more by emotion than by political logic, cried out: Let this Government go and everything will be all right. Mr. Chatterjee forgot that in politics, as in nature, a vacuum is abhorred. Mr. Chatterjee did not carry his thesis to its logical conclusion. What was he suggesting as an alternative to the present Central Government? Was he in all

[Shri Frank Anthony]

seriousness suggesting some kind of miscellany made up of, I say with respect, the splinter groups and political shavings on this side? What was Mr. Chatterjee suggesting as an alternative to the present Central Government? Let us try to be a little objective. In spite of all its shortcomings, and God alone knows there have been many shortcomings, in spite of its shortcomings, the Congress Party has stood between the country and chaos. In spite of its shortcomings, it has given to the people a modicum of genuine political stability, a modicum of adherence to parliamentary conventions and standards.

I feel that whatever the Congress Party is suffering from, and it is suffering from a great deal, is due to the one paramount fact that it has had an unduly long political innings. Even in the best regulated democracies, a too long period of power leads to the characteristics which have developed in the Congress Party. It leads to power drunkenness; it leads to power arrogance; it leads to a lust for office; it leads to a regard more for the individual than for the party; it leads to a regard more for the party than for the nation. These are the characteristics which flow in any democracy from an unduly long period of office. But who is to blame? It is one of the compulsions of history, it is a legacy of history that we have this monolithic, we may call it democratic, structure, with no alternative democratic party.

Of one thing, I am quite certain and I have propounded this over and over again that no splinter groups, no multiplicity of political shavings, no uneasy political coalitions, no opportunist coalitions for the country. If anything, it will mean greater instability, greater political manoeuvring, greater political fratricidal strife. Indeed, it will mean greater misery for the people of this country.

15.58 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

At any rate, I say this with great respect, let us try and assess it objectively. My friends in the socialist party—I do not want them to take umbrage. I see little future for them. With all the different variants of socialism, long ago their ideological thunder was stolen by the Congress Party. In any democratic reckoning, we must necessarily leave out the different variants of communism. I say this with great respect to my friend, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee, for whom I have the greatest personal regard, that whatever the present seeming divisions, on one thing, the communists will remain united and that is, for them democracy is not only ununderstandable, but for them democracy is an alien, a hated ideology.

15.59 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I say this that in all this picture—I have no intention of joining, they are not many of them here—the only people who offer some semblance of a democratic alternative are the Swatantra. It is the only party in this country that offers some distinguishable contrasting democratic programme—call it conservative, call it middle-road, call it reactionary—but it is a contrasting democratic programme. And for the larger interests of the country, I wish them well. But I do not know with the latest manifestations how well they are going to do, because they seem to be losing some of their large blocs somewhere. But they have a long way to go before they can offer any democratic alternative government to this country.

What is in my view the greatest single threat posed to the survival of democracy in the country—I am glad the Prime Minister is here—is this all-pervading corruption. Let us not try

to qualify it. It is a pall that is suffocating the country. If I may change the metaphor, it is a blank wall on which very little, if any, dent has been made. Mr. Nandaji is not here; I wish him well. I am one of those who believe in his honesty and sincerity of purpose. But we have been enmeshed in a web largely of political making, and may I say with respect, also stemming from certain defects in our national character.

16 hrs.

In the final analysis, it is the character of a nation which determines the quality and the fibre of its politicians. And, here again, who is the fountain-head, the inspiration of corruption? First of all, organised political parties. "Organised political corruption" is synonymous with "organised political parties". Every political party competes one with the other for collecting funds. Every political party indulges in the encouragement of legalised bribery. The worst of the profiteers, the black-marketeers and the liquor-barons, in spite of Morarji**bh**ai, are the people who pay their money into the coffers not only of the Congress party but of other parties also. With deliberate impartiality they pay their money into the coffers of all parties, because they buy immunity, in the first place, and then they buy continuing prosperity, in the second place. It is all very well to abuse the Prime Minister and the Congress Party. Who is prepared to pay the price for stemming at its very source this greatest source of corruption? Ban, I say, all donations from all businessmen. All right, if you are not prepared to do that, then at least ensure this that there shall be a legal obligation that every donation however small from every businessman would be shown in an audited statement of accounts which shall be open to public scrutiny.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): The British Tory Party collects three million pounds for the party and spends

over a million pounds in advertising as part of their election campaign.

Shri Frank Anthony: Let us not draw comparisons, because comparisons are not possible. There are other conditions which make this thing impossible in this country.

I was asking, Sir, who is prepared to place restraint on the unprincipled, lawless politicians? It is all very well to blame the Prime Minister. I know Shastriji is well meaning. But there is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee; whether you make a declaration of assets to the Congress Party boss or you make a declaration of assets to the Prime Minister or to the respective Chief Ministers, it will remain a deceptive farce. If it is to be meaningful, let there be in the Anti-Corruption Act a legal obligation on every man in public life, from the Members of Parliament down to the panchayat, to declare on oath to the relevant income-tax authority all their assets when I say all their assets I mean not only their assets but I mean the assets of their wives, their children, their grandchildren and their great grand children—in order to pursue the ramifications of the joint Hindu family. Like all your income-tax declarations these declarations of assets must be available for public scrutiny to any citizen in this country.

I know this that every democracy has gone through its phase of corruption. Recently, when I was talking to some friends of mine in the British House of Commons and they talked about this phase of corruption in India, I said: "Yes, until the turn of the century you were among the most indescribables corrupt people in the world". What about my American friends? Let them apply no undue unctious to their American souls. A friend of mine—I don't mention his name; he is one of the most highly placed—said: "Mr. Anthony, I thought we were the most corrupt people in the world; after coming back from America I think we cannot dare touch them. There is not only organised

[Shri Frank Anthony]

corruption, it is corruption which has been reduced—he used the word “reduced”, some people think it has been “raised”—to the refinements of a science. Thank God, in India we have not yet begun to emulate the kind of corruption which is almost a science in America”.

Let us face facts. I know some people will not agree with me. When the Constitution was being framed I said, let us have first things first, let us first give to the people at least a modicum of education before we proliferate democracy, because in a predominantly illiterate people if you proliferate democracy inevitably you proliferate corruption. That is happening, inevitably. As you go lower down in the so-called hierarchy of democracy you get the greatest stench of corruption. I do not want to point a finger at anybody, but I can speak from personal experience. Look at your Delhi Corporation. It is, if I can express it in adequate terms, an absolutely un-cleanable cesspool of inefficiency and corruption (*Interruption*). I talk from personal bitter experience. Unless you are prepared to pay speed money, which I was not prepared in respect of one of my large schools, nothing moves. The Mayor was a personal friend of mine. The Chief Commissioner was a friend of mine. But nothing moves and nothing has moved yet. If I go to the Prime Minister he would be helpless because there is this organised web of corruption. I sent my P.A. He was told: “What can Mr. Anthony do? He can only get me caught, but behind me there are 49 colleagues who will raise so many legal objections that he will not get sanction for this plan for another five years. Let him wait and we will give it in another one or two years.” It is a cesspool of corruption. You have it on your door-step, and who is going to clean it?

As we go down to the panchayats it is there. I know that some people do not like this, because we are an impractical people and, may I say it

with great respect we are also hypocritical people. We seem to have acquired it from the British. They are also a very hypocritical people. But we substitute slogans for solutions. Panchayats mean grass-roots democracy. In the context of illiteracy, panchayats will mean grass-roots-corruption in this country. The first thing you must have as a minimum pre-condition to the functioning of democracy in any kind of partial way is a minimum of education. At least there is some assurance that there will be a minimum of inculcation of civic consciousness with the minimum of education.

We may abuse the Government for many of its shortfalls and its Plans. I myself have not much faith in your arm-chair-plans and your theoreticians and economists. But who is prepared to face this? I have asked the question over and over again, but I have never received an answer—the challenge posed by the astronomical increase in our population? Not only Shastriji and the Congressmen, but even if we can get all the moon-men, nothing will happen in this country. Nothing will be achieved unless we tackle first and we tackle effectively this all-consuming menace of population explosion. Who is prepared to pay the price? It is all very well to get histrionic on this, to get hysterical even and to blame the Government. As somebody knowledgeable remarked, everything we do—even if the Government is infallible which it cannot be—even if the Government achieves progress at the maximum possible pace, all our planning and all our production will be over-taken by this astronomical population increase. Who is prepared to pay the price? Japan paid it. Why are we not prepared to pay the same price? They had a population explosion more serious relatively than ours. But they are, in the final analysis, a ruthlessly efficient and ruthlessly realistic people. But here the Acharyajaji—he is not here—will probably immediately raise his hands in horror and say: “lega-

lised abortion", although perhaps he has had nothing to do with it in any kind of capacity. But some starry-eyed theorists are saying that legalised abortion will undermine the health of the country. Do you think that no abortion is going on in this country? Of course, it goes on in all the lanes and back-streets and it goes on with dhais under the most dangerous and dirty conditions. I do not understand why it will undermine the health of the nation. Do you think that the health of the nation is not being undermined by our people breeding like rabbits—some people would say that is a conservative statement; perhaps it is like some more fecund animal—I do not know which is a more fecund animal than the rabbit, perhaps it is the rat.

What I am trying to say is this. Look at the increase in the food prices. I have seen all kinds of statements, all kinds of statistical manipulations, all kinds of rationalisation. But nothing can hide the stark fact that food prices have risen within the last few months more than they rose during the ten years previously. That is the stark fact. Nothing can hide the stark fact that on a conservative estimate the food prices have gone up by 25 per cent. I do not blame the Government entirely. I know the problem is complex; it is desperately complex. When there is talk among your planners, arm-chair people, not two of them agree on methods or approaches. You see it even more on this side. Why talk of the Government? There is more contradiction, there is more confusion, there is more incoherence among the Opposition parties as to the respective approaches to the food problem. One will say state trading, the other will say no State trading; one will say zones, the other will say no zones; one will say controls, the other will say no control. It is a desperately complex problem and in spite of all the political nostrum mongers either amongst the planners or on this side, there is no sovereign remedy. We have to reconcile ourselves to the

fact that with the astronomical population increase out-pacing everybody, a denuded soil, adherence to almost superstitious and primitive methods of agriculture, not the least the almost deliberate agricultural feet dragging by most of the State administrations, and also not the least, the almost endemic anti-social profiteering, hoarding complex among our own people, all these will ensure that the food problem will be with us for a long time.

In spite of what my Communist friends say, in spite of their agitational techniques, in spite of the sort of totalitarian techniques that they every day stridently treat us to, they forget what had happened in their own spiritual mentor countries. What is happening in Russia, not to speak of the backward leaping Chinese? I do not know which Wing owes allegiance to that country; I do not think Shri Mukerjee's does. They are all importing more grain today than they ever did. I am reminded of a very illustrative quip. A leading Communist personality was trying to enthrone his Communist audience over the prospect of the Communist millennium, being round the corner and the whole world going Communist. Fortunately, one of them, not entirely brain-washed, asked: Sir, when the whole world goes Communist where will we import our food from?

On foreign affairs I say this. In foreign affairs we will undoubtedly keep to our basic policy of non-alignment. I have always felt that non-alignment answers the needs of a developing economy; it answers the needs of our geo-political contest. I sincerely hope, and I believe with Shastriji there that the interpretations and executions will be different. They will be less exposed to the charge of ambivalence. May I say this? We have been critical of the democracies quite rightly, frankly critical? for instance, on the ill-conceived Suez adventure? But under pressure, especially from the fellow-travelling crypto-Communist groups in the Congress Party, we have spoken

[Shri Frank Anthony]

with our tongues on our cheeks and to our shame on clear-cut issues such as the infamous suppression of the Hungarian freedom-fighters. And not only to our shame but to our obvious detriment we have spoken with our tongues on our cheeks in a disastrously ambivalent way on Tibet. Let us hope that that period of ambivalence is behind us, that we will no longer speak with ambivalence on the obvious policy of genocide by the Chinese of the hapless Tibetan people. As my friend, Shri Krivalani underlined—I do not agree with his point of view always—let us hope we will be realistically alert to this permanent and increasing threat posed by Chinese expansionism and subversion, particularly in South East Asia.

I know that what I say will not appeal to some members of this House. I have always held the view that the security of this sub-continent depends on India and Pakistan facing outwards to the common threat of Chinese neo-imperialism. I know that Pakistan missed a unique opportunity of breaking this deadlock between the two countries during the Chinese attack on us. But I feel that somehow some where we must achieve a detente with Pakistan not on terms of surrender but surely on something decided by men of vision and statesmanship on both sides.

And may I say this? I am not sure whether this is a very relevant. I would like to congratulate Shastriji on the stand he took when a person like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan tried to pursue in his own way efforts at peace and friendship with Pakistan. I entirely disagree with him on his views with regard to China, his reported views with regard to Aksai Chin. But I am a little nauseated that little men, communal, vicious little men should question the integrity and motives of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. I say, thank God, we have people like him in this country; he may be mistaken sometimes but we have people like him. Unfortunately, we have strong, increas-

ingly strong communal parties in this country who thrive on tension between Pakistan and this country, who thrive on fanning the wind of hatred between Hindus and Muslims, who thrive on the periodical miseries of minorities on both sides. And Shastriji will be under pressure from them. But I believe that in his own quiet way he will extend the hand of friendship to Pakistan so that we may get some kind of response from President Ayub an increasing response.

Finally, I oppose this motion because, may I say this with great respect to Shri Chatterjee, I see neither sense nor logic in it. In my own view, it is a travesty of sound, healthy, parliamentary and political procedure and conventions. Anybody with any elementary perception of parliamentary procedure must know that the first postulate of a no-confidence motion is the capacity and the will to replace the government. Not even the most delirious mad man—we may or may not have them here—can expect to replace the government. And in this context I can only say this, and I say that without qualification, the no-confidence motion in this particular context is not only irresponsible but it is a meretricious political exhibition stunt.

Shri Chatterjee indicted Shastriji for the mistakes of the government for the past seventeen years. As a lawyer at least I would have expected him to understand the technical difference. We are indicting, technically speaking, a new government. What has Shastriji got to do with the mistakes of the past seventeen years? My friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee was a little cleverer; I do not know. He tried to beat Shastriji with the memory and the policies of the late revered Jawaharlal Nehru. Nobody had greater respect for Jawaharlal Nehru than I had. But I disagreed with him violently on the interpretation and execution. And what has Shastriji inherited today? What has the coun-

try inherited and the whirlwind in a way it has inherited? I say this with great respect, the whirlwind that we have reaped have been caused regularly by the mistakes in execution of policies—I agree with the basic policies—of the Nehru era. And that is why I feel we must give the Prime Minister every opportunity to settle down, to be able to clean this tremendous political Augean stable which he has, in the final analysis, inherited.

I do not envy him. Under the most favourable circumstances, the task would not only be formidable but it would be a little frightening. And, unfortunately—I say this too of some members of his own party—he can expect sabotage not only from this side, he can expect sabotage from certain members of his own party, and that is why I feel that in this testing time he needs the support of people of vision and of courage so that his hands will not be gratuitously tied or weakened.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विरोधी दलों ने जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव रखा है, उसके बारे में मेरा विचार यह है कि यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव या तो कांग्रेस दल की सरकार पर है या शास्त्री जी की सरकार पर है ।

16.19 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMAL RAO in the Chair.]

मैं इन दोनों बातों पर विरोधी दलों को उत्तर दे सकता हूँ । यदि यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव कांग्रेस दल की सरकार पर है, तो मैं विरोधी दलों को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले साल भी एक अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आया था जिस में यह कहा गया था कि कांग्रेस दल की सरकार को यहाँ पर विश्वास प्राप्त है, लेकिन जनता में विश्वास प्राप्त नहीं है । विरोधी दलों की आंख खोलने के लिए यह काफी था कि सन् 962 में कांग्रेस ने जनता के मतों से यह दिखला दिया था कि उसे विश्वास प्राप्त है ।

अगर यह कहा जाए कि वह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव सन् 1962 के चुनावों के बाद आया था, तो मेरा कहना है कि सन् 1963 में जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया था उसके बाद से अब तक लोक-सभा के दस चुनाव हुए । उन दस चुनावों में विरोधी दलों को केवल तीन स्थान मिले और सात कांग्रेस को मिले । यदि आप विधान सभाओं की बात लेते हों तो मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस वर्ष के बीच में उनके 47 चुनाव हुए, जिन मेंसे विरोधी दलों को 13 स्थान प्राप्त हुए और शेष स्थान कांग्रेस दल को प्राप्त हुए । इससे प्रकट हो सकता है कि कांग्रेस दल की सरकार पर जनता को अधिक पूर्ण विश्वास है और विरोधी दलों को कोई स्थान नहीं है । इस बात का प्रमाण यह है कि चटर्जी साहब स्वयं पहले कलकत्ता से चुनाव लड़े थे । जब उनको उसी क्षेत्र पर विश्वास न रहा तो वह बर्दवान से खड़े हुए जहाँ वह हार गए । उस के बाद उन्होंने आसनसोल पसन्द किया । इसी तरह से आचार्य कृपलानी पहले बिहार से खड़े हुए । वहाँ पर विश्वास नहीं रहा तो बम्बई से खड़े हुए । बम्बई से जब हार गये तो उन्होंने अपने लिए अमरौहा पसन्द किया । कहने का मतलब मेरा यह है कि चाहे मसानी हों, चाहे कृपलानी हों, चाहे चटर्जी हों, मुकर्जी हों या बनर्जी हों, सभी का हाल यह है कि उन के अपने अपने स्थान सुरक्षित नहीं हैं और यही कारण है कि वे अपने स्थान समय समय पर बदलते ही रहते हैं । ऐसी स्थिति में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आखिर है क्या ? क्या अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव केवल इस बात का द्योतक नहीं है कि इस समय जो देश में परिस्थिति है उस का लाभ उठाया जाय और जनता में इस बात का प्रचार किया जाये कि कांग्रेस सरकार गलत काम कर रही है ।

हम मानते हैं कि देश में इस समय आधाप्र का संकट है लेकिन यह वही सरकार है जिसने

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

सस्ते गल्ले की दुकानें खोल कर सर्वसाधारण को इतना खाद्यान्न दिया है कि उन का पेट भर सकता है लेकिन आप उस की इस बात के लिए तारीफ नहीं करना चाहते हैं। आप उस की तारीफ न कर के केवल बुराईयां ही करना चाहते हैं जिस प्रकार से गाय के धन से लगी हुई एक किल्ली केवल गाय का रुधिर पीती है, उसका दूध नहीं पीती है। विरोधी दलों का जो रवैय्या है जनता उस को भली भांति समझती है और इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के लाने के बाद से और भी अच्छी तरह समझ जायेंगी। सरकार के विरुद्ध इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव से हमारे विरोधी दलों का सम्मान बढ़ेगा नहीं उलटे घटेगा ही। यदि यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री पर है तो मुझे यह मानना चाहिए कि लाल बहादुर शास्त्री देश में एक ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिनको कि कांग्रेस दल का सर्वसम्मति से बहुमत प्राप्त हुआ है। सदन में प्रधान मंत्री की हैसियत से जिस दिन उन्होंने प्रवेश किया उसी दिन हमारी लोक-सभा ने अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव हमारे यह विरोधी दल के लोग लाये। हमारे यहां कहा गया है कि विश्वास वाला भ्राम्यी वह है जिसका कि काम देख लिया जाय। आप ने उन का काम तो देखा नहीं बस अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव उन की सरकार पर ले आये। अब यदि व्यक्ति की बात कहते हैं तो क्या यह सही नहीं है कि जब वह रेल मंत्री होते थे और उनके मंत्रित्व काल में जब कई रेल दुर्घटनाएं देश में हुईं तो वे इस्तीफा देकर मंत्रिमंडल से अलग हो गये? क्या यह वही शास्त्री जी नहीं हैं कि जब कामराज योजना के अन्तर्गत इस बात की आवश्यकता महसूस की गई कि मंत्रियों को अपने पदों से हट कर दूसरे कामों पर जाना चाहिए तो इन्हीं शास्त्री जी ने सर्वप्रथम अपना स्थान त्याग दिया था? आज भी यदि देश में आवश्यकता पड़ जाय कि शास्त्री जी को मंत्रिमंडल से अलग होना चाहिए तो मुझे विश्वास है कि श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री उस से अलग हो कर देश में एक

भ्राम्यं उपस्थित कर सकेंगे। एक ऐसे भ्राम्यं व्यक्ति के प्रति जिसका कि काम आप ने देखा नहीं, जिसके कि बारे में आप भली भांति जानते हैं कि वह किस पाये के भ्राम्यी हैं, पहले ही दिन उन के प्रति अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाकर आप इस बात का प्रमाण देना चाहते हैं कि आप में तनिक भी सूझबूझ नहीं है और आप अपने दिमाग घरों पर रख कर यहां आते हैं। आप देश की वर्तमान खाद्यान्न की कठिन स्थिति का नाजायज लाभ उठाना चाहते हैं।

मैं श्री एन्थोनी की कम से कम इस बात में सहमत हूँ कि जब उन्होंने यह कहा कि आज राजनीतिक दलों में आपस में बड़ी भारी डिसयूनिटी है। बड़ी भारी आपस में एक अनुशासनहीनता है। मैं उन की इस बात से इंकार नहीं करता क्योंकि उन्होंने यह बात काफ़ी सोच समझ कर और गहरा अध्ययन कर के कही मालूम पड़ती है। लेकिन मैं उन से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि यह कांग्रेस दल है जिस में कि यह अनुशासनहीनता है। कामराज योजना के अन्तर्गत जब कांग्रेसी मंत्रियों द्वारा त्यागपत्र देकर कांग्रेस संगठन में आकर काम करने के लिए कहा गया तो यह कांग्रेस पार्टी का ही अनुशासन है कि 8, 8 मंत्रियों ने सरकार से इस्तीफा दे दिये और बाहर निकल आये। यह कांग्रेस दल का अनुशासन ही है कि आज जिसे भी कहा जाय वह इस्तीफा दे सकता है। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या विरोधी दलों में कहीं भी कांग्रेस दल जैसा अनुशासन विद्यमान है? कांग्रेस दल में एकता है लेकिन हमारी एकता में विभिन्नता है। जिस प्रकार कि भारत माता की संतानों में एकता में विभिन्नता है उसी प्रकार हमारे कांग्रेस दल में एकता में विभिन्नता है लेकिन इसके विपरीत आप विरोधी दल वालों में एकता में विभिन्नता है अथवा विभिन्नता में एकता है यह समझना दुष्कर है। आप एक नहीं हैं। जैसा कि आप को श्री एन्थोनी ने कहा कि आप ने क्या कोई प्लानरनेटिव भी सोचा है? फर्ज कर

लीजिये अगर हमारी सरकार इस्तीफा दे दे तो प्राज देश में कौन ऐसा दल है जो सरकार बना सकेगा ? प्राज लोहिया-साहब को प्रधान मंत्री बनाते हैं तो बागड़ी साहब हमारे एक्सटरनल अफेयर्स के मंत्री होंगे और श्री रामसेवक यादव गृह मंत्री होंगे और ऐसी परिस्थिति में देश की क्या दशा होगी यह आप स्वयं विचार कर लीजिये । अब आप सोचिये कि हम कम्युनिस्टों की सरकार बनाते हैं तो कम्युनिस्ट्स क्या कहेंगे ? कम्युनिस्ट्स कहेंगे हे माओत्से तुंग "स्वदीयम् वस्तु बोबिन्द तुम्यमेव समर्पयामि" । यह वस्तु आप की है और हम आपको इसे समर्पित करते हैं । यह कम्युनिस्ट दल का हाल है । अब अगर हम समूचे विरोधी दलों को कहें कि आप सब सरकार का काम सम्हाल लीजिये तो क्या हालत बनेगी ? मसानी साहब कहेंगे कि नेशनलाइजेशन नहीं होना चाहिए जबकि गोपालन साहब कहेंगे कि राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाना चाहिए । भिन्न भिन्न वाद की, भिन्न भिन्न मत की जो सरकार बनेगी वह चूँ चूँ का मुरब्बा ही बनने वाली है । अब उस चूँ चूँ के मुरब्बे वाली सरकार से क्या देश का कोई काम बन सकता है ? असलियत तो यह है कि आप में शक्ति नहीं है, आप में साहस नहीं है और संगठन व एकता नहीं है । जब तक कि यह बातें आप में न आ जायें उस समय तक विरोधी दल वालों का इस देश में सरकार बनाने का स्वप्न देखना आकाश में कुसुम देखने के समान है । इस प्रकार की बातों से विरोधी दल स्वयं अपने को ही नुकसान पहुंचायेंगे, अपना सिर नीचा करवायेंगे और अपने सम्मान को क्षति पहुंचायेंगे । कांग्रेस दल का सम्मान ऊंचा हुआ है इस बात के कहने में मुझे तनिक भी हिचकिचाहट नहीं है ।

जहां तक स्वतंत्र पार्टी का सवाल है उस ने बेशक इस समय पर एक बात अच्छी की और वह अकल की बात उसने सोची कि इस शास्त्री मंत्रिमंडल को जोकि अभी नया है,

केवल तीन महीने का ही है उस को समय दिया जाय और उस के कामों को अभी देखा जाय । मैं समझता हूँ कि पहली मर्तबा यह अकल की बात उनकी तरफ से हुई है लेकिन इन के बारे में भी हर कोई यह अच्छी तरह से जानता है कि स्वतंत्र पार्टी स्वयं में एक चूँ चूँ का मुरब्बा है । उस में एक तरफ मसानी साहब हैं तो दूसरी तरफ श्री मुंशी हैं । एक तरफ राजाजी हैं तो दूसरी तरफ श्री यशपाल सिंह जैसे विचारवान व्यक्ति हैं । इसमें अभीब अभीब प्रकार के व्यक्ति हैं जिनका कि आपस में कोई ठीक तरीक से सामंजस्य नहीं है । फिर इसमें दांडेकर साहब प्राये हैं । वे प्राई० सी० एस० अपने को कहते हैं लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि दूसरों को तो समझना और परखना दूर रहा वे खुद अपने को ही नहीं समझते । जो मैडन भाषण इस लोक-सभा में अभी उन्होंने उस दिन किया था उस में कोई सार अथवा तत्व नहीं है । जो चीज उनकी उस अपनी पहली मैडन स्पीच में होनी चाहिए वो वह हमें सुनने को नहीं मिली ।

【प्राचार्य कृपलानी ने बहुत सी बातें कही और यह कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी में स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के पश्चात् बहुत से लोग ऐसे आ गये हैं जोकि तथाकथित पैट्र्याट्स हैं । लेकिन मैं उन से नम्र निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि कांग्रेस में एक क्षमता है कि जब कभी भी लोग अपने विचार बदल कर राष्ट्र में विश्वास रखते हैं और राष्ट्रीय हित से सोचना शुरू कर देते हैं तो उनके वास्ते कांग्रेस का दरवाजा खुला रहता है । कांग्रेस एक रिजिड संस्था नहीं है । वह एक कठोर संस्था नहीं है । उस के दरवाजे ऐसे सभी लोगों के लिए खुले रहते हैं जोकि राष्ट्रीय हित की बात सोचते हों और उस के लिए अपना योगदान देना चाहते हों । क्या यह वाक्या नहीं है कि प्राज विरोधी दल के लोग क्यू बना कर कांग्रेस में शामिल होने के लिए खड़े नहीं हो रहे हैं । चाहे वह स्वतंत्र दल हो, प्रजासमाजवादी दल हो, कोई भी दल हो, सभी विरोधी दलों के कुछ न कुछ

[श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी]

लोग आज क्यूँ सगा कर कांग्रेस में शामिल होने के लिए खड़े हो रहे हैं। यह एक दूसरा प्रमाण कांग्रेस सरकार और कांग्रेस के पक्ष में है। जिस कांग्रेस दल में शामिल होने के लिए आज सभी बिरोधी दलों के लोग क्यूँ बना कर खड़े हों वह दल मानना पड़ेगा कि शक्तिशाली है और वह काम करने की अद्भुत क्षमता रखता है।

मैं मानता हूँ कि हम में कमजोरियाँ हो सकती हैं। हम अपने को दूध का घोया हुआ नहीं कहते। हम में अनेकों कमजोरियाँ हैं लेकिन यह हकीकत है कि हम उन कमजोरियों पर काबू पाना चाहते हैं ताकि हम देश और जनता की ठीक तरीके से सेवा कर सकें। जहाँ कहीं हम में कमी होती है उस का हम आत्मनिरीक्षण करना चाहते हैं ताकि हमारी जो कमजोरियाँ हैं वह हम से दूर हों और हमारा यह विश्वास है कि शास्त्री जी के नेतृत्व में हम अपनी कमजोरियों को दूर कर लेंगे।

श्री नंदा ने अष्टाचार के निवारण की दिशा में सदाचार समिति बनाई है। उस के सम्बन्ध में आचार्य कृपलानी ने कहा कि कांग्रेस ने सदाचार समिति इसलिए बनाई है क्योंकि कांग्रेस में अब सदाचार नहीं रहा है। मैं उन की इस बात से कतई सहमत नहीं हूँ। क्या वे यह भूल गये कि यह वही कांग्रेस है जिसके कि वह कभी अध्यक्ष होते थे? क्या आज वह कांग्रेस बदल गई है? मैं वही पुराना कांग्रेसमैन हूँ। शास्त्री जी भी वही पुराने कांग्रेसमैन हैं और जगजीवन राम भी वही पुराने कांग्रेसमैन हैं। क्या आज कांग्रेस केवल इसलिए बिगड़ गई है क्योंकि वे उसे छोड़ कर चल दिये हैं? स्वतः आचार्य कृपलानी ने कितने दल छोड़े हैं इस पर भी वह ज़रा विचार करें। उन्होंने कितने दल छोड़े और आज वह किस दल के साथ हैं इस बारे में भी वे आत्मनिरीक्षण करें। बरारबी कांग्रेस दल में है या उन में है या दूसरे दल में है

इस पर वे ज़रा विचार करें। जो बात मैं कहता हूँ वह पते की कहता हूँ और जाहिर है कि जब मैं सच्य की बात कहता हूँ तो आप को शर्म आती है और दिल में एक बहराहट होती है।

Shri J. B. Kriplani: I can tell this friend that more people respect me in the Congress than they respect him.

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : मैं मानता हूँ। हम उनकी श्रद्धा करते हैं, उन की रेस्पेक्ट करते हैं और सादा करेंगे, क्योंकि जिसको हमने एक बार अध्यक्ष बना लिया है, हम सदा उसकी श्रद्धा और आदर करेंगे। लेकिन वह इसका गलत फायदा न उठाएँ।

एक बार इंग्लैंड से माले साहब आये हुए थे। कुछ लिबल सदस्यों ने कहा कि हम तो देश के इंजिन हैं, हम राजनीतिक विचारधारा के इंजिन हैं। तो माले ने पूछा कि अच्छा, आप साहब इंजिन हैं, तो गाड़ियाँ कहाँ हैं। अगर हमारे भाई शंटिंग इंजन बन कर "भा भा" करते हुए शोर मचाने की बात करते हैं, तब तो यह बात सत्य है कि वे इंजिन हैं, लेकिन जिन इंजिनों के साथ डिव्बे हैं, जो सवारियाँ और माल ढोने की क्षमता रखते हैं, वे इस वक्त कांग्रेस में हैं। हमारा इंजिन एक है और बाकी हम सब कैरिजिज हैं। उन में दस दस इंजिन मौजूद हैं, लेकिन कैरिजिज दो भी नहीं। इससे विचित्र बात और क्या ही सकती है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि हमारी योजना मिसकन्सीड है। आचार्य कृपलानी ने कहा कि मेहता साहब प्लान का समर्थन करते थे और आचार्य साहब उसका बिरोध करते थे और इसीलिए उन्होंने प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी को छोड़ दिया, लेकिन जब

मेहता साहब विरोधी दल को छोड़ कर प्लानिंग कमीशन में आए, तो वह प्लान की त्रुटियां बता रहे हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब मेहता साहब ने प्लान की त्रुटियों को देखा, तो उन त्रुटियों का सुधार भी किया जायेगा। अगर प्लानिंग में कुछ कमजोरी है, तो उसको दूर करना है। हमने पहली योजना बनाई और उसके बाद दूसरी योजना में कुछ सुधार किया। इसी प्रकार तीसरी योजना में और भी सुधार किया और मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि चौथी योजना उससे भी अधिक अच्छी होगी।

मेहता साहब विरोधी दल के सदस्य थे, लेकिन हम ने प्लानिंग उनके सुपुर्द कर दिया। आप कांग्रेस की उदारता देखिये कि जो विरोधी दल के लोग कांग्रेस की विचारधारा को अपनाते हैं, हम उनको ऊँचे से ऊँचा पद देने और उनके मार्ग-दर्शन में चलने के लिये तैयार हैं। ऐसी उदारता कहां मिलेगी? ऐसी उदारता न इंग्लैंड में मिलेगी, न अमरीका में मिलेगी और न किसी और देश में मिलेगी। अगर माननीय सदस्य पाकिस्तान में होते तो वह जेल के सीखनों में बन्द होते। इस देश की उदारता और इस देश की प्रजातांत्रिक प्रणाली को देखिये कि माननीय सदस्य जो कुछ कह रहे हैं, हम उसको शान्ति और धीरज से सुन रहे हैं। हम माननीय सदस्यों को मौका देते हैं कि वे जो कुछ क्ना चाहते हैं, कहें। अगर उनकी बातों में कोई तथ्य है, कोई बल है, तो हम उससे सीखना चाहते हैं और अपने कार्यों में सुधार करके देश की नैया को प्रागे ले जाना चाहते हैं। केवल विध्वंसक तरीके से बात करना और खामोशी से बैठ जाना हमारा लक्ष्य नहीं है। मुझे कोई बताये कि कौन सा विरोधी दल है, जो देश में रचनात्मक कार्य कर रहा है। कौन से विरोधी दल ने चर्खा चलाया? किस विरोधी दल ने सड़क के बनाने में फाबड़ा उठाया? किस विरोधी दल में यह सामर्थ्य

है कि जब देश पर संकट है, तो हाथ में हल की डांडी पकड़ कर बैलों को हंक कर दिखा दे कि हम भी भ्रष्ट पैदा कर रहे हैं? यदि आज विरोधी दल बेटों में गये होते, तो वे कांग्रेस के प्रत्येक सदस्य को ही नहीं, अपने हजारों साथियों के साथ उसे बेटों में देखते। लेकिन विरोधी दल के पास कोई रचनात्मक कार्य नहीं है। केवल विरोध करना और झूठा बकवास करना, इसके अलावा विरोधी दल के पास और कोई काम नहीं है।

श्री हुकूम चन्द कच्छवाप (देवास) : मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूँ कि वह माननीय सदस्य को उपमंत्नी बना दें।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I rise to a point of order. The hon. Member has said 'Jhootha bakwas'. That is unparliamentary, and he should withdraw that expression.

Mr. Chairman: I would advise the hon. Member not to use such expressions. He can use better language. He is a good Hindi pandit, and he can use a better phrase.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं "झूठा बकवास" शब्द वापस लेकर फिजूल बकवास करता हूँ। सब माननीय सदस्य मेरे मित्र हैं। वैसे "झूठा" शब्द पार्लियामेंटरी है, लेकिन अगर माननीय सदस्यों को आपत्ति है, तो मैं फिजूल की बकवास, निरर्थक बकवास, अनगल बकवास कह सकता हूँ। अगर माननीय सदस्य इसकी आडम्बरपूर्ण बातों से देश में सस्ती किस्म की लोकप्रियता हासिल करना चाहते हैं, तो क्या वह मिल सकेगी? नहीं मिल सकती है, यह विश्वासपूर्वक कहा जा सकता है।

शास्त्री जी के प्रति, जिन्होंने केवल हमारे संसदीय दल का ही नहीं, बल्कि सब का मागदर्शन किया है, इस प्रकार का अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव लाना बिल्कुल उचित नहीं। मेरा अनुरोध है कि माननीय सदस्य इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें और इस सरकार को

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

शान्त हो कर कुछ दिनों के लिये काम करने का मौका दें। अगर साल, डेढ़ साल तक ठीक काम न हो, तो वे भविष्यवास प्रस्ताव ला सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस भविष्यवास प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ और सरकार का पूरा समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुर्जा) : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्रि-परिषद् के प्रति भविष्यवास-प्रस्ताव का विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

यो न जानाति यस्य गुणप्रकर्षं
सः तं निन्दति नास्त्रिभ्रं
यथा किराती करि कुम्भ जातां
मुक्तां परित्यज्य विभति गुंजाम।

अर्थात् जो जिसके गुणों की प्रकर्षता (खुबी) को नहीं जानता, वह उस की निन्दा करता है, इसमें कोई आश्चर्य नहीं है, जिरा प्रकार जंगल की भीलनी लाल और च्यूटनी में (जिससे सोना तोला जाता है) भेद नहीं करती है और वह लाल को छोड़ कर च्यूटनी को ले लेती है।

विरोधी दल के जो भाई यह भविष्यवास-प्रस्ताव लाये हैं, उन्होंने ऐसा ही प्रदर्शित किया है। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की मृत्यु के पश्चात् हमारे जनप्रिय नेता, श्री लाल बहापुर शास्त्री, आज देश की सरकार के अग्रगनी बन कर खड़े हैं।

श्री स० म० बनर्जी : शास्त्री जी सब का नाम नोट कर रहे हैं।

श्री बाल्मीकी : यदि माननीय सदस्य जरा भी सोचते विचारते, तो इस प्रस्ताव को लाने की आवश्यकता ही नहीं होती। यदि इस साल बहापुर सरकार को लाल सरकार कहा जाये, तो उसमें कोई मुजायका नहीं है।

अभी उनकी लाल सरकार कायम होने में बहुत दिन लगेंगे और वह करीब करीब नहीं आ सकती है, लेकिन यह लाल सरकार लोकतंत्र पर आधारित है। जिस मुख्य द्वार से हम इस भवन में प्रवेश करते हैं, उस पर यह वेद-मंत्र लिखा हुआ है : लोक-द्वारमपावा ३१३३ परश्वेमत्वा बयं वैरा ३३३३ देवो, यह लोक द्वार खोल दिया है, लेकिन इसमें वही षुसंगे, जो अधिक तादाद में भाते हैं। वही सरकार कायम करते हैं, जिनको बाहर जनता का अधिक विश्वास और मत प्राप्त है। जनता के मत और विश्वास तथा लोकतंत्रीय परम्पराओं पर आधारित यह जो सरकार है, वह आपके सामने है। माननीय सदस्य अगर उसको कुछ काम करने का और भवसर देते, तो अच्छा होता। उसके प्रति एकदम इस प्रकार का भविष्यवास-प्रस्ताव लाना कोई बड़ी भारी प्रेरणा पैदा नहीं करता है।

देश पर संकट है और अब भी संकट-कालीन षड़ी है। चीन का रुख अच्छा नहीं है। पड़ोसी देशों का रुख अच्छा नहीं है। यद्यपि इस देश में प्रयत्न चल रहे हैं। देश में भी हालत कुछ इस तरह की है कि हम दूसरे तरीके से नहीं सोचते हैं। हमारे विरोधी दल के भाई भी उसमें अधिक से अधिक पार्ट भेदा कर सकते हैं मैं उन भ्रादरियों में से नहीं हूँ, जो कटाक्ष करते हैं या कटाक्ष-पूर्ण भाषा बोलते हैं। लेकिन यह अवश्य है कि ऐसे वक्त में, जब कि देश पर संकट है और देश के लिये उत्तरदायित्व की आवश्यकता है, माननीय सदस्यों के सहयोग की भी आवश्यकता है। सरकार वही है, जो कि लोगों के दिलों और विचारों को जीते, जो लोगों के दिमागों में जगह पैदा करे। उसी के अनुसार हम लोग यहां आए हैं। लेकिन देश में उत्तेजना, केन्द्रास और गड़बड़ी के बाद भी कोई सरकार चल सकती है, ऐसा नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य समझें कि अगर

कोई एक आधार हो सकता है सरकार चलाने का तो वह लोकतंत्रीय आधार है, जो कि हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन, उसकी परम्परा और उसके प्रति विश्वास पर आधारित है।

भाज सदन से बाहर का वातावरण ऐसा है कि हमारे विरोधी दल के भाई, कुछ विशेष भाई, कुछ विश्वास दल के लोग, उत्तेजना, गड़बड़ी, भ्रराजकता पैदा करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन क्या भाज की स्थिति में उत्तेजना और भ्रराजकता से कोई शासन चल सकता है ?

शासन के तबल के पायों को भ्रगर तोड़ा जाएगा और भ्रगर तोड़ा जा सकता है तो केवल जनता के विश्वास पर, जनता का मत प्राप्त करके, जनता का धैर्य जीत कर। इसका और कोई दूसरा तरीका नहीं है। इलैक्शन होते हैं चुनाव होते हैं और उन चुनावों में खड़े होने का हर किसी को समान अवसर मिलता है। केवल चुनाव में बहुमत प्राप्त करके लोग सरकार को बदल सकते हैं और आप भी बदल सकते हैं। जिस तरह की बातें आपने की हैं, जिस तरह से देश के भ्रन्दर हड़तालें आप करवाते हैं, जिस तरह से खास तौर पर आगजनी के केस आप करवाते हैं, जिस तरह से बाबेला आप पैदा करने की कोशिश करते हैं, जिस तरह से बड़े बड़े जलूस आप निकालते हैं, उससे तो भ्रराजकता ही फलती है और कोई काम नहीं बनता है। उनसे तो गड़बड़ी ही होती है।

जो समस्याएँ भाज बिकट रूप धारण किये हुए हैं, उनके निराकरण के रचनात्मक उपाय हमें सोचने चाहियें। इस तरह की तोड़ फोड़ की बातें उन समस्याओं का निराकरण करने में सहायक नहीं होती हैं। इससे

इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता कि देश में भ्रभ्र और गल्ले की कमी है। यह भी सही है कि और भी बहुत सी समस्याएँ हमारे सामने हैं। रोजाना की आवश्यकता की जो चीजें हैं, जो जरूरियात जिन्दगी हैं, यह सही है कि उनके दाम बेहद बढ़ रहे हैं। इसके लिये आवश्यक यह था कि उन समस्याओं को हल करने के सही उपाय बतलाये जाते, किन्तु वह बात नहीं की गई है। देश में पंचवर्षीय योजना चल रही है। उसमें आप सहयोग दे सकते हैं। योजनाबद्ध अर्थ नीति में सहयोग दे कर, देश के दूसरे कल्याणकारी कामों में सहयोग दे कर, हम और आप देश को आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं। यही तरीका है देश को आगे बढ़ाने का, यही तरीका है देश की उन्नति करने का, देश को प्रगति-पथ पर भ्रभ्रसर करने का।

आज कहा जाता है कि राजनीति भ्रभ्र और जोर पकड़ती जा रही है। जब लोगों के भ्रन्दर प्रजातंत्र की भावना, लोकतंत्र की भावना जागृत होती है तो ऐसा होता ही है। मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ जो जनसाधारण को या आम लोगों को राजनीति से दूर रखना चाहते हों। लेकिन मैं गंधी राजनीति के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ, दूषित राजनीति के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ, भ्रविश्वसनीय राजनीति नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं स्वस्थ राजनीति चाहता हूँ, वह राजनीति चाहता हूँ जिस में उच्चता होती है, जिस में उच्चतम भावना होती है शासन को कायम रखने की। गड़बड़ी पैदा करने वाली राजनीति में नहीं चाहता हूँ। सदियों पहले की बात है कि मर्य के लिए, सुशासन के लिए और सुव्यवस्था के लिये एक उच्च महामानव ने एक जनसाधारण में से उभरे हुए साधारणजन ने जहर का प्याला पिया था, सकुरात ने ? जहर का प्याला पिया था जब क्राइटो से उसकी बातचीत हुई थी। यह ठीक है कि आज की व्यवस्था तथा शासन प्रबन्ध के पीछे दोष हैं और उसके भी कई कारण हैं। लेकिन जहाँ तक मेरा सम्बन्ध है, मैं भ्रव्यवस्था नहीं चाहता हूँ,

[श्री शाल्मीका]

मैं गड़बड़ी नहीं चाहता हूँ जिस प्रकार सकुरात ने सुव्यवस्था के हित चुपके से जहर दिया था और आज तक उसका नाम अमर है, उसी प्रकार हमें भी जहर का बूट पीना है। हमारे देश की परम्परायें भी उसी प्रकार की रही हैं :

जड़ चेतन गुण दोष विष्व कीन्ह करतार
संत हंस सम पय पियें परि हर दोष विकार

इस से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है कि दोष और गुण हर चीज में होते हैं। लेकिन दोषों को त्याग करके गुणों को लेना आवश्यक होता है। इसके लिए मैं समझता हूँ सद-असद-विषेक गुण-निर्णायत्मका बुद्धि में विश्वास रखने वाले लोग हों। इसी की आज सर्वोपरि आवश्यकता है। आज इस तरह की नुक्ताचीनी की जरूरत नहीं है कि जिस तरह की सदन में की जा रही हैं, बल्कि सहयोग तथा सद्भावना का वातावरण लाने की आवश्यकता है।

मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि पंडित जी की मृत्यु के पश्चात शास्त्री जी साधारण लोगों की जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं, उनको दूर करने की कोशिश करेंगे और अपनी इन कोशिशों में वह सफल भी होंगे। लोगों को आज बढ़ती हुई कीमतों और गल्ले की कमी के कारण कपटों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। इन समस्याओं को हल करने की हमारी सरकार कोशिश कर रही है, यह प्रसन्नता की ही बात है।

एक अखबार मेरे सामने है। उस में मैंने देखा है कि शास्त्री जी ने कहा है कि मैं गांवों में किसानों के साथ काम करूंगा। यही बात उन्होंने अपने मंत्रियों से भी कही है कि वे गांवों में जायें और किसानों से सम्पर्क स्थापित करें। यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है। ये क्रियात्मक जो बातें हैं, इनको करने की आज आवश्यकता है। जहां आप आज धीरोगीकरण पर विशेष ध्यान दे रहे हैं, उद्योगों धंधों को बढ़ाने पर अपनी

शक्ति लगा रहे हैं, पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं पर ध्यान दे रहे हैं, वहां यह भी आवश्यक है कि हमारे देश के जो किसान हैं जो सच्चे देश के निर्माता हैं, जो देश का निर्माण करने वाले हैं, हमारे देश में जो मजदूर हैं, जो अपनी मेहनत से इस देश को बना रहे हैं, उनकी तरफ भी ध्यान दिया जाए। इन्हीं लोगों में हरिजन भाई भी आते हैं, हमारे देश के भ्रष्टपूष्य भाई जिन को आप कहते हैं वे भी आते हैं। इन सब की तरफ अगर पर्याप्त ध्यान दिया जाए तभी देश का उद्धार हो सकता है। उनका उद्धार हो सकता है इसी सरकार के हाथों से, ऐसा कुछ विश्वास उनका है। मैं बिरोधी भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मस्तिष्कों के अन्दर भी वेदना है; खिन्नता है, दुःखजनक स्थिति है। जिस प्रकार भगवान शंकर ने विष पान किया है, और वह विष पान करके भी अमर हैं, यह एक अलग बात है। इसी प्रकार से हम भी विष पान करते हैं, हमें भी पूरा यकीन है कि हम देश का नक्शा बदल देंगे। देश की जो परम्परायें रहीं हैं, देश के अंदर जो प्रजातान्त्रिक भावना है, उसको देखते हुए मैं समझता हूँ कि निराशा होने की जरूरत नहीं है। आज कांग्रेस ही एक ऐसी जमात है, कांग्रेस ही एक ऐसी संस्था है, कांग्रेस शासन ही ऐसा शासन है, जो देश का उद्धार कर सकता है, इन लोगों का उद्धार कर सकता है। इसी संस्था के प्रति लोगों का पूर्ण विश्वास है।

हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि प्रशासन में तबदीली हो, हकूमत में तबदीली हो। यह उन माननीय सदस्यों का विचार हो सकता है, लेकिन जन-साधारण का ऐसा विचार नहीं है। जन साधारण यही चाहता है कि यह सरकार कायम रहे और उसके भले के काम करती रहे। मामूली मजदूर जो हैं, किसान लोग जो हैं, मामूली हरिजन लोग जो हैं, उन सब का इस सरकार में पूर्ण विश्वास है और उनका पूरा यकीन है कि उनकी

समस्याओं का निराकरण इसी सरकार के हाथों हो सकता है। उन के मस्तिष्क में भी वही बात है जो हमारे मस्तिष्क में है।

इस सब के साथ साथ मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता हूँ कि जो प्रयत्न चल रहे हैं उनके उद्धार के, उन में तेजी लाने की जरूरत है। हमारे प्रयत्नों में एक मुद्दागी सी है, और उनको हमें प्राणावान बनाना है। उनको नया जीवन देना है। लैंडलेस लेबरजं को हमने जमीन देने का वायदा किया था भूमिहीन लोगों को और विशेषकर हरिजन भाइयों को भूमि देने की बात हमने की थी जो अभी तक पूरी नहीं हुई है उसको हमें पूरा करना है। इसको हम पूरा करेंगे इस में कोई सन्देह की बात नहीं है। हमारे दिमागों के अन्दर कोई अंधेरा नहीं है, हमारे दिमागों में रोशनी है, आशा की किरण है। हम पूरी तरह से आशावान हैं कि इस अपने प्रयत्न में हम सफल होंगे, यदि सरकार इस दिशा में जागरूक है।

अगर कोई समस्या हमारे सामने आती है और उस पर हम विचार करते हैं तो दोषारोपण करने से काम नहीं चल सकता है। "गुणना हिराना गुणप्राहक हिराना है"—दोष गुण का नहीं, गुण को लेने वाले का है हम तो साफ साफ बात कह देना चाहते हैं जो कमियाँ हैं, उनको भी बता देना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हम दोषारोपण नहीं करते हैं एक दूसरे को कोसते नहीं हैं। अगर आपका भी विश्वास हमें प्राप्त हो तो हम और तेजी से आगे बढ़ सकते हैं। हम कुछ कम आगे बढ़े हैं अपने प्रयत्नों में, लेकिन हलके हलके हम आगे ही बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। और हलके हलके जनता का उद्धार करते जा रहा है।

हम जो यहाँ सपने में बैठे हुए हैं, जन साधारण का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं। प्रजातंत्र का यह नियम है कि हम जन साधारण का आवाज रखें, उसकी दशा सुधारने का प्रयत्न

करें। जब हम जन साधारण का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, तो जनसाधारण की जो भावना है उसका भी हमें धादर करना होगा। आज यह देखना है कि जन-साधारण की आवश्यकता की चीजों को, चाहे वह अन्न हो कि जिसकी कमी है, चाहे वह किसी भी कारण से है तथा और भी इस तरह की दूसरी आवश्यक चीजें हैं, और जिन के भाव अधिक बढ़े हुए हैं उनके हल के लिए उपाय सोचें। मैं यह कोई नुकताचीनी करने की भावना से नहीं कह रहा हूँ। लेकिन जो समस्याएँ आज हैं उनको हल करने के जो हम प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, उन प्रयत्नों में बल लाने की जरूरत है विश्वास पैदा करने की जरूरत है। मैं अपो-जीशन वाले भाईयों से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनका जो सोचने का ढंग है वह भी इसी तरह का होना चाहिये। केवल दोष ही उनको नहीं निकालते रहना चाहिये। जब तक सही रास्ता नहीं दिखाया जाता है तब तक कोई बात नहीं बन सकती है। अनर्गल बातें करने से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता है, व्यर्थ असाप करते रहने से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता है। जिस तरह से बूढ़ी मातायें छोटे बच्चों को गाना सुनाया करती हैं और उस गाने के अन्दर भी आनन्द होता है, उसी तरह से आपको भी कभी कभी ऐसी बातें कहनी चाहियें जिन को सुन कर हम आनन्दित हों, हमारा हाँसना बढ़े और देश में उत्साह बढ़े

यह सही है कि देश के अन्दर महंगाई है, अन्न की कमी है, जमाखोरी की कुप्रवृत्ति है, चोर बाजारी व अधिक लाभ कमाने की कुप्रवृत्ति पाई जाती है। दाम घटाने की बात भी है इस तरह की प्रवृत्तियों पर हम रोक नहीं लगा सके हैं, इसके बारे में खिन्नता मेरे दिमाग में भी है, विरोध की भावना मेरे मस्तिष्क में भी है, मैं भी यह चाहता हूँ कि सरकार कोई इस दिशा में बड़ा कदम उठाये। मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार की कुप्रवृत्तियों को दूर किया जाए, इन पर

[श्री बाल्मीकी]

कड़ी रोक लगाई जाए और जो कमी है उसको पूरा किया जाए। लेकिन मैं यह नहीं चाहता हूँ कि इस स्थिति से कोई राजनीतिक लाभ उठाया जाए, राजनीतिक झुठे कायम करने की कोशिश की जाए। मैं केवल यह चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को सक्रिय सहयोग दिया जाए ऐसी बातों की जायें, जिन में कुछ जान हो ऐसी बातें बतलाई जायें, निज से कुछ काम बने, कुछ बात बने।

और बातों की ओर न जा करके एक बात में भ्रवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी यह अपनी जो सरकार है, यह कागजी काम अधिक करती है, क्रियात्मक काम कम करती है। मैं यह बात कोई विरोध की भावना के बगीभूत हो कर नहीं कह रहा हूँ। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि देश में कोई निर्माण कार्य ही नहीं हुए हैं बहुत से हुए हैं। अगर आपको उनकी झांकी देखनी हो तो आप देश में घूम घूम कर सबंग देख सकते हैं। पंच वर्षीय योजना का प्रभाव, सामुदायिक विकास का प्रभाव साफ तौर से नजर आ रहा है। प्रौद्योगिकरण भी हमारे देश का हुमा है। और भी बहुत से विकास के काम हुए हैं। लेकिन किसान की ओर जितना ध्यान देना चाहिये था, उतना नहीं दिया गया है, यह मैं कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ अगर किसानों की ओर मजदूरों की ओर, हरिजनों की ओर जितना ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था, उतना दिया जाता तो आज इस तरह का अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव यहां नहीं आता। निन्दा की बात मैं नहीं कर रहा हूँ काम हुए हैं, काफी हुए हैं और हमारा देश आगे भी बढ़ा है। लेकिन हमारे देश की जो विभीषिका है सब से बड़ी, वह बढ़ती हुई आबादी है। बढ़ती हुई आबादी के सामने यह काम थोड़े नजर आते हैं क्योंकि आबादी बढ़ रही है 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100 के हिसाब से और उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है 1, 2,

3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 के हिसाब से। हमें अपने उत्पादन को तिगुना और चौगुना करना है और वह तभी हो सकता है कि जब किसानों, मजदूरों, हरिजनों, गरीबों और मेहनतकशों को आप साथ लें और उनका सहारा लें इस तरह से आप चले और उत्पादन को बढ़ायें साथ में बढ़ रही आबादी को भी कंट्रोल करें।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ हो रहा है उस में दोष हमारी सरकार का नहीं किसी और का भी नहीं, सब से बड़ा दोष खाद्यान्न तथा ऐसी वस्तुओं की वितरण प्रणाली का है उसी के कारण यह बातें हो रही हैं। मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करता हूँ कि वह इस वितरण प्रणाली में चमत्कारिक सुधार करे। और सरकार को इधर ध्यान देना है, चाहे विदेशों से आने वाला गेहूँ हो चाहे खेती का उत्पादन तिगुना चौगुना करने की बात हो। विशेष कर खेती पर ध्यान दे कर और किसान को हर प्रकार की सहूलियतें दे कर बीज की, खाद की, पानी की तथा प्राधुनिक औजारों व रसायनिक खाद की चीजों को सहूलियत देकर सरकार काम करें तो हमारा उत्पादन काफी बढ़ सकता है।

अन्त में मैं एक शब्द में कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार फटिलाइजर की तरफ तो ध्यान दे रही है लेकिन साधारण देशी खादों की ओर भी विशेष ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये।

Shrimati Lakshminanthamma (Khammam): Mr. Chairman, Sir the opposition Members, while speaking on this motion, have been denouncing themselves. It makes our task easier. It is more of distrust and fear against each other that made them bring this motion. Mr. Dandekar expressed the fear that Congress may go towards socialism and Mr. Hiren Mukerjee expressed the fear that the Congress may give up the policies of our beloved

leader, who is physically no more here. But I can assure Mr. Mukerjee that we follow neither the dogmatic communist way nor the die-hard capitalist way. We follow the ways of the people, of Jawaharlalji and of Gandhiji.

Last time when Acharya Kripalani brought this motion, it was when the Kamaraj Plan was in vogue. Acharya Kripalani left the Congress on the plea that organisation was not given importance. But when the Kamaraj Plan was in vogue, when everybody was thinking of giving importance to the organisation, then he brought the no-confidence motion. At that time, Mr. Mukerjee himself said, the camp of which Mr. Kripalani is the spokesman, is against our Prime Minister, against socialism, against our policy of non-alignment and against planned development. So, he said, "We have no truck with them". But now Mr. Mukerjee has trucked himself with this group. Last time Mr. Mukerjee said that CDS must go, that State-trading in foodgrains must come gradually, etc. All these things have been done. I do not find any reason why Mr. Mukerjee should now truck himself with these reactionary forces. The reason is probably frustration.

By bringing this sort of non-confidence motion often, they are not only doing great injustice to this motion, but also making it stale and ineffective. It is time that the opposition thinks of other innovations in parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Mukerjee again said something about our present Prime Minister. Our beloved Jawaharlal, for whom Mr. Mukerjee has so much love and respect, has paid high tributes to Shastriji.

He said:

"No one can wish a better colleague in any undertaking. Mr. Shastri is a man of high integrity, loyalty, devoted to ideals, a man of conscience and a man of hard work."

These are the tributes paid by Jawaharlalji to our present Prime Minister. The other day, Shri Chatterjee was saying that the Congress Party is bossed by businessmen. From the son of a school teacher to the Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy, Shastriji made it through service, sacrifice, loyalty to the ideals of Gandhiji and Nehru. The head of the Congress organisation himself comes from an ordinary family of farmers. There may be some businessmen in the Congress. The Congress does not stop any person provided he accepts the principles of the Congress. We have no class hatred. I remember what Gandhiji said about women. If physical strength is supposed to be the real strength then the women are weak, but if will power and moral strength form the real strength, then the women are stronger than even men. If you consider Shastriji from the point of view of his physical strength he may be weak, but he is stronger than the strongest.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You are comparing Shastriji with women; you should not do that.

Mr. Chairman: Her argument is that women are stronger than men.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: May hon. friend is a Communist and still he believes in the inferiority of women.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have great regard for them.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: This House, Shri Mukerjee and everybody in this House, knows that our present Prime Minister is not attached to power. Is being not attached to power a weakness, I want to ask Shri Mukerjee. Everyone in this country knows the work he has done as Home Minister in tackling intricate and controversial problems. Everybody knows how he tackled the language riots in Assam, the language problem in the South and the problem connected with the theft of the holy

[Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma]

relic in Kashmir and several other problems. How can we forget all these things so soon and say that he is weak, will drift from the policy that is laid down.

As far as our foreign policy, of which he has expressed concern, there have been efforts to strengthen our relationships, more than ever before, with every neighbouring country. Our President is now touring in USSR. He has already expressed in clear terms that there will not be any change in our policy of non-alignment and other things.

No doubt, with the passing away of a towering personality like Jawaharlalji the image of the country has tended to get blurred. The personality of our present Prime Minister is

yet to be felt in other countries and other countries, especially the big powers, would like to be sure about the orientation of our foreign policy. Our efforts should be to this end so that substantial results be achieved in the shortest possible time.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. Member finish in another five minutes?

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: I will finish tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman: She may continue her speech tomorrow.

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, September 16, 1964/Bhadra 25, 1886 (Saka).