

Movement) Control Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 779 dated the 26th May, 1965.

(iv) The Inter-Zonal Wheat and Wheat Products (Movement Control) Third Amendment Order, 1965 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 780 dated the 26th May 1965.

(v) The Roller Mills Wheat Products (Price Control) Third Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. GSR 781 dated the 27th May, 1965.

(vi) G.S.R. 810 dated the 3rd June, 1965.

(vii) The Andhra Pradesh Rice and Paddy (Restriction on Movement) Second Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 864 dated the 15th June, 1965.

(viii) The Pondicherry Coarse Grains (Export Control) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 865 dated the 16th June, 1965.

(ix) G.S.R. 926 dated the 1st July, 1965, rescinding the Maharashtra and Gujarat Rice (Export Control) Order, 1964, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 636 dated the 16th April, 1964.

(x) The Wheat Roller Flour Mills (Licensing and Control) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 960 dated the 6th July, 1965.

(xi) G.S.R. 1098 dated the 30th July, 1965.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4594/65].

12.29 hrs

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

MINUTES

Shri P. G. Menon (Mukundapuram): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Minutes of Sitzings of the Committee on Public Undertakings relating to Eleventh Report on the Rourkela Steel Plant of Hindustan Steel Limited, Ranchi.

12.29½ hrs.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS (KERALA), 1965-66

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to present a Statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the State of Kerala, for 1965-66.

12.29½ hrs.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (KERALA), 1961-62

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to present a Statement showing Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the State of Kerala, for 1961-62.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification. How do these Excess Grants relating to as long back as 1961-62 come up today after four years?

Mr. Speaker: We will see when they are before the House.

12.30 hrs.

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

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Yesterday I partially dealt with the arguments advanced by my hon. friend Shri Masani attacking the financial stability

[Shri Khadikar]

of this country, and I stated that the motion as it had come forward was frivolous and had been brought forward with a view to give expression to the accumulated feeling of frustration in the minds of the Opposition. At the same time I said that nobody in this country or in this House would take this motion seriously.

But on this occasion we must apply our mind a little freely, objectively criticising ourselves; a little self-inspection is called for at the present juncture while certain policies are being discussed. I mentioned that one of the vital elements in our economy was food and that the question of food was causing concern all over the country. Therefore, on this occasion, it is not a question whether one agrees with Mr. Masani's other contentions or not. So far as the no-confidence motion is concerned, I brush it aside; it has no ground to stand on. I do not make any apologetic statement about it nor support any suggestion subtly made about a national government in this country. If anybody were to make a suggestion about a national government, I say it will not sustain democracy; national government will bring down democracy in this country. The government that is there is a national government; it is a government of national consensus reflecting all trends in the country.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): No.

Shri Khadikar: Therefore, that suggestion also need not be taken very seriously and nobody takes it seriously.

Of all the questions facing the country today, food is the most important. Our Food Minister here is very sensitive and conscientious and earnest and he is trying to evolve a national food policy. He has placed a statement before us. What is happening? We have got to examine it because it is no use saying that we are doing this and that. What is the

result of it? It must be examined. Today in my State conditions are very bad. There are riots; many people are arrested and some people are shot dead. I am not going to make it an excuse because there is an agitation and people have taken this problem. These problems cannot be solved by an agitation. I am firm in that view. But at the same time these problems cannot be by passed by just saying that we are doing this and that. We have got to examine as to what are the results of our policy. The Food Minister here with all seriousness and earnestness is trying to evolve a policy and in every step he wanted to take in the evolution of a national food policy he has been completely frustrated by the Chief Ministers in this country who have got some vested interests at the State level.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Sir, I rise on a point of order. My hon. friend is taking the Chief Ministers to task. They are not here to defend themselves and it is not right that he should speak for or against the Chief Ministers in order to defend what is called his own ideas of good policies.

Mr. Speaker: If he has taken the Chief Ministers of all the States as a lot, then probably I will not have any objection. Has he taken some individual? I was not closely following. If he has done so, I will not certainly allow it.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): May I make a submission that the number of Chief Ministers in India is limited and they are known; it is known in a general manner to what Chief Ministers he is referring.

Shri Khadikar: I shall say State Governments; it is a good word and it is also non-personal. State Governments have come in the way and they have frustrated all his efforts and no policy worth the name could be followed. (Interruptions.)

Shri Ranga: They are all Congress people.

Shri Khadilkar: The Food Minister wanted to make the movement of coarse foodgrains free. But ultimately, what happened? I tell you very frankly that it is not a party issue; it is a people's issue.

Shri Ranga: It is a Congress issue.

Shri Khadilkar: If we want to avert the crisis facing us, we have to consider this. Food is a sensitive element and it will upset all things that we plan unless we apply our mind here and now. He is succumbing to pressures and instead of evolving a good food policy, all types of horse trading goes on and ultimately some hotch-potch is presented to the country. What is the result? The result is that instead of one national food economy, every State is looking to itself as if it has a national economy in itself, because of this zonal system. So, the first thing is this: if at all we want to preserve the economic and political integrity of this country, the Centre must assert itself. The Centre is showing weakness on every occasion and is trying to yield to all sort of pressures, healthy and unhealthy. The Ministers come here and say one thing; in the States they say another. These things must stop. Some discipline, some ruthlessness, is called for at this juncture from the Centre to discipline all the State Governments and all the State Governments should fall in line with one policy laid down once and for all. If you fail in this, and continue the zonal system, this country will not have one national economy but every State will look at it from the national economy of its own self and all sorts of rivalries in other fields will start and it will disintegrate.

I would like to place another factor in this context. Take Lenin. At the crucial hour he had the boldness to take a step. He surveyed the situation, and by changing the pattern he

evolved a new economic policy at the crucial juncture in the revolutionary period, and took one step back. On the food front, the time has come when you should evolve, lay down and implement a new economic policy.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : यहां लेनिन कौन है ?

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, to evolve a policy, I would suggest, as some committees have suggested a compulsory levy. Take 25 per cent of the produce from those whose holdings are more than five acres. Looking to the nature—this is very important—of the State apparatus at the present juncture, if you block the private trade channels completely, it is not likely to succeed, and therefore, open the private trade channels for other things so that the surplus produce could be marketed and the present situation could be saved.

Even today, when there is no food available, in the black market rice is available for Rs. 3 a kilo in Maharashtra. In the open market, whatever the price, we do not get it. Last year, the same situation developed, and I and my friend Shri More sent a telegram. We forestalled a situation by sending a telegram and communicating to the Government the intensity of the feelings and the crisis that was developing and the Food Minister came and helped; it was averted. But it is not simply Maharashtra or Bihar. In Gujarat and everywhere, the rural poor, the landless labourers, the petty middle-class people who have fixed income or that sort of thing and not in business—all these people are suffering because of the present policy which is being continued without adequate State apparatus to implement the policy.

If you want to take the trade as a whole, you must evolve a State administrative machinery capable of handling it. Have we got it today? In the appraisal of the Plan, the Planning Commission have said that

[Shri Khadilkar]

the Plan's failure is partially due to the administrative failure. We must bear this in mind. We cannot fight on all fronts, and therefore, take one step back. Then, you can perhaps jump over the ditch in which we are likely to be placed if we fail to see the situation at the present juncture. If you like, insulate some big cities with rationing and take the statutory responsibility of feeding the big industrial centres if you have got the machinery. But the general atmosphere in this country, fed on the concept, so far, of free trade so far as food is concerned is such that, unfortunately, there is a built-in resistance against all sorts of restraining; a built-in resistance is there. Taking all these things into consideration, I would plead with the Food Minister: let him be bold enough at this juncture. I know he is a sensitive person. He went to the length of resigning when there were language riots in Madras. Today he must be very much agitated. But resignations do not solve the problem nor do agitations from that side. At the same time, a sensitive person must take stock of the situation and boldly come forward with a policy and try to implement it at all levels.

The zones must be abolished. India must be treated as one economic entity with a national economy. No local economy should be sponsored and free trade channels must be opened. Unless these suggestions are carried out immediately, I am afraid our police force will not be able to cope with the present discontent.

We are threatened on our borders and that is a major problem before us. When we look at our country, internally we must observe a certain sense of unity and all the elements of disturbance must be removed at this juncture, if we want to face Pakistan. There is an evil combination on our border. The UN Observers are there, but unfortunately, because of political pressures, the UN today has more or

less become a prisoner of inaction, frozen into inaction. We in this country will have to realise that Pakistan is an artificial creation of a State on our border. If they have not reconciled themselves to their fate nor found their identity, perhaps a great ingenuity might be required to break the combination of two evil forces on our border. That is not forthcoming at the present juncture. Therefore, it is not a question of today or tomorrow. It is a continuing menace and we must be prepared to face it with all our might, determination, resources and strength and teach Pakistan a lesson. Excuse me for saying that for 2000 years, India's history is not a glorious history from this point of view. Let independent India create a new history and tell the people on our borders that we in free India are determined to beat back any invader from east, west or north. That is the thing which is called for today.

Taking advantage of the position on our borders and in Kashmir, Mr. Masani has propagated one thing. Today unfortunately the world is being pushed to the brink of a world war. America is in a tight corner, trying to find out an escape route. Our Prime Minister, in keeping with the old tradition of non-alignment, in helping to resolve the deadlock peacefully, pleaded again and again not to bomb North Vietnam. Even nuclear scientists—two Americans—have said the same thing. Men like Walter Lippman have pleaded for it. Taking advantage of our strategic necessity for our army crossing the cease-fire, Mr. Masani has made a subtle argument, to which I do not subscribe. Unfortunately, world leaders today are not there to help America. British leadership is weak. Soviet leadership is not assertive. Indian leadership is not as assertive as it was before. Afro-Asian leadership is in disarray. Therefore, to find out an escape route, an non-aligned leadership of stature, standing and firmness is called for to help

America. That would help to save this democracy and all other objectives.

I will conclude by quoting a couplet. It has been said, "If cowards flinch and traitors sneer, the time has come when this party must say with confidence, 'We keep our flag flying here'."

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Mr. Speaker, Sir. I think Mr. Khadilkar at least once has spoken some sense.

Mr. Speaker: That should not be said. If we cast aspersions in this manner against one another, the level of the debate would go down.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I mean I have particularly taken note of the sensible things that he has said today.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing. But when he says that at least once he has spoken sense, it implies that on all other occasions, he does not speak sense. If another member who follows Mr. Dwivedy says some thing like that and casts a reflection, that would not be good. The level of the debate would go down. I am sorry for this.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I do not know how you took it in that light. That was never my intention. As I have said, when I heard him I have noted two things which are sensible to me. One is that the Food Minister is an efficient man, but the policy he has evolved is a patch-work. The second thing is, the Central Government is so weak that it cannot actually do anything at the present moment. That is exactly why this no confidence motion is being discussed in this House.

I was surprised to find a report in the press that the Prime Minister, while speaking at a congress party meeting had said that no-confidence

motions have become a routine nuisance and he is not at all perturbed about it.

Shri Bhagawat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): He did not say that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If he has not said it, I stand corrected. But seeing the House also, I feel that this no confidence motion has not been taken as seriously as it should have been. This betrays a dangerous mentality and complacency in thinking. Why, after all, are these no confidence motions being brought so often, which was never a feature in this House? It is not a fact that these who bring forward these motions do so without realising its seriousness. Everybody realise that this government cannot be defeated in a no confidence motion. Everybody knows that the opposition is hopelessly divided and is in a minority. But even then, if no-confidence motions are brought it is because the country is passing through a great crisis. We are faced with grim problems. This government, which is in charge of the country, has not been able to solve any of the vital problems, leave alone minor things. It is because of their incapacity and lack of imagination. The leadership is lacking.

Even a person like Vinobha Bhave, to whom every year the Prime Minister pays a visit to get his blessings, has said today that on vital problems, the ruling party is always undecided. This mentality works because there is a brute majority behind them. What is the health of the nation today? When we are concerned with so many problems, it is for the Parliament to take note of the situation surrounding us. Because they are in a majority and they know they can defeat anything, they are in a complacent mood. But what is happening today? The party to which they belong, my congress friends should excuse me for saying this, is cracking. They are living in a glass house; actually, in Bangalore, they met in a glass house!

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

Sir, imagine what is happening in this country. When people all over are clamouring for food, when people all over are clamouring for a little morsel of food, what do these ministers do? What is the Congress Party doing? Has there been any discussion whatever in any of the ministries anywhere in this country as to how to solve this acute problem in the country in the face of the danger when the enemies are within our own country? A ministerial crisis is brought about in Uttar Pradesh because a Minister misbehaved with a woman. That is the greatest crisis before them today. You must have observed, Sir, that when the other day a statement was made on Kashmir by our Defence Minister, Shri Chavan, it has been commented upon in the Press that, probably, for Goa Shri Chavan would have spoken about Kashmir with much clarity and forcefulness. If that is the state of affairs, are we not concerned about it? Is it not our duty? I was thinking that they will take this opportunity and set things right.

When there are movements all round the country, when there is firing, when there is lawlessness, when there is acute discontent among the people, naturally, when there is no remedy, people take to direct action. That is their right. They resort to satyagraha. They resort to lawlessness. Nobody would support violence. But there are anti-social elements in the country who would take advantage of this opportunity and destroy life and property. They would like to create chaos in the country. Some hon. friends said here that Dr. Lohia wants to appear to the country as the leader of chaos. Who has given this opportunity to him, I want to ask? Have you evolved any procedure? Have you evolved any grievances machinery? Has the leadership applied its mind to find a peaceful solution to these problems in the democratic set-up that we have? When the

people are really suffering such a great deal, what procedure have you adopted, what procedure have you followed to satisfy the aspirations of the people, to meet their very immediate demands? How are you meeting their demands? You do not do anything with the result, naturally, there is movement, and when there is movement all sorts of elements take advantage of it. When their problems are not solved, people resort to movements.

Therefore, I think, by your policies, by the policies of this Government, you have invited chaos in this country. When we brought this motion, because there is all round discontent, I was thinking that this Government will take this opportunity and explain through the Parliament to the country that the problems are serious and they are going to solve them in such and such a manner so that those, if they think they are right who listen to elements who do not believe in democratic methods would not go with them. But they are treating this as if nothing has happened in this country. I have not heard a single speech so far explaining what is the problem that is facing us. The people are passing through untold misery and unhappiness. Even the teachers are demonstrating here for a fair deal, let alone others.

An Hon. Member: Doctor and Engineers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There is acute shortage and scarcity in the country. We do not feel it. There is an official statement probably from the constituency of the Prime Minister. Whether the Food Minister will accept it or not, it has been published in all papers. This is a statement by the Commissioner of the Allahabad Division. At least one official statement has come. These people never accept that there is scarcity. People are dying for want of

food. No food is available in the country. He says here: "People in the rural areas of Allahabad District have only one meal a day because of scarcity conditions..." Just think of it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): That is an under-statement.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Dada says it is an under-statement. The situation is still more serious. If that is so, how do you want to function? How do you accuse the people if they revolt? I, therefore, agree with what Shri Khadilkar has said, that it is a hotch-potch policy. There is no food policy.

We were told by the Food Minister in August 1964 that it was a lean month and after some two or three months things would be all right and prices would go down. The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, in his first broadcast after becoming the Prime Minister, said that his attention would be first diverted to see that primary things are available to the people, the prices are reduced and sufficient agricultural production is brought about. What has happened? We have this year bumper crops. Our imports have been doubled or trebled. This morning it was asked as to what will be our imports for the coming two years. There was no reply because, probably, the time is coming when we will have to depend only on imports.

What are the reasons for all this? As you know, Sir, there is a very specious plea always that it is all due to the weather. If the intruders come into Kashmir at night, our Government says that the intruders are to be blamed because they come in at night. When there is this food shortage in the country they say that the only thing to be blamed is the weather. I am surprised at what has happened. If you say that with an increase in agricultural production the prices should be reduced, here is an increase in production which has been admitted by all. But

what has happened? The *per capita* consumption of cereal and pulses during 1961-64 has been reduced from 16.4 ounces to 15.7 ounces. What has been the price situation. The Statement on economic situation which was distributed to us by the Finance Minister says that in March 1963 it was 123.5, in June 1964 it was 154.1 and in June 1965 it was 161.3. You can very well realise, Sir, the strain of these conditions on the middle-class people. It has never before been so high on the middle-class people as it has been during this short period.

Therefore, we are in a very dangerous situation. The misery of the people is very great. I cannot just describe what is happening in the rural areas. I do not want to go into the details within the limited time at my disposal. I will go into that when we have the food debate here. I only want to say that they are tinkering with the problem. Take the question of statutory rationing. I am not against it. But what is statutory rationing? What do they want to achieve by that? They want to keep the 15 per cent urban population silent. They want to satisfy the vocal section of the people in the cities and towns. The rural areas will continue to suffer. I know what is happening in the rural areas of Bengal. But Calcutta is quite. This is a clever move, a political device for a solution of the problem. What happens to the 25 per cent landless people in the villages?

श्री मोर्य (अलीगढ़) : सब से ज्यादा दुखी समाज है ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: They do not get anything. Here we hear homilies from them. They say that since we are divided, we are small in number we cannot do anything. What we are trying to do is—Shri Karni Singhji may be right, that the Opposition may not be united—that in this Parliament we want to teach the people, we want to educate our countrymen that, if not now, the time is

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

coming when if the Government does not listen they will see to it that the ruling party is out of power, they are ousted from power and something new emerges. That is the reason why we feel so keenly about it. Nobody likes a No-confidence Motion. I can tell you frankly that this is the reason why it has been brought.

Recently, Sir, I had been to Kashmir. This visit has been really a revelation to me. If you know the things that I have seen, the things that I have heard the things that I was told, you will begin to wonder whether any government worth the name was functioning at Delhi at any time. That is the condition there. I do not want to go into the details. I do not want to give out all those matters here, because we are in a very difficult time. I do not blame anybody for what is happening in Kashmir. The entire blame goes to this Central Government, to the central satraps sitting in Delhi. I am proud of our soldiers. In spite of difficult times, in spite of weak-kneed policies, they have done such a marvellous job. I am proud of the security police which, during these raids, stood up and took the challenge in spite of heavy odds. They are the real guardians of our freedom and they are fighting our battle in Kashmir. I admire their cool, calculated courage and reckless daring. But these people sitting here go on scrutinising files and notes and issue periodical statements. That is all.

13 hrs.

What is the position in Kashmir today? According to authoritative and authentic reports, there are about 8,000 infiltrators inside Kashmir.

An Hon. Member: More than that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I do not know how many more have come in between. In 1947 we have fought

37,000 infiltrators inside the country. Then the conditions were different. Now we have four intelligent offices working there—the Central Intelligence, Military Intelligence, State Intelligence and so on. I do not know what other intelligences are there; there are so many. Every Kashmiri asks the question how is it that in spite of all these intelligent offices, all these infiltrators, thousands of them, could come inside the country for the purpose of capturing Srinagar city itself. They were about to capture that city. The position was so bad, so serious. I want to know how it could happen that the intelligence service had no knowledge of this. Is it a fact, as has been reported in the papers, that the Central intelligence at one time about two months back reported to the Centre that some guerilla training was being undertaken in Azad Kashmir and we brought this fact to the notice of the United Nations? Is it a fact that they have given the signal? If so, what precautionary steps did the Government take to prevent the infiltrators from entering this country? Of course, we cannot blame them entirely, because we know the quality of our intelligence service. They have betrayed the nation twice, in NEFA and in Kutch and now the same thing is happening in Kashmir. It seems that we have not learnt any lessons. I know that the director of the military intelligence who was responsible for many of our reverses was promoted. That is how we function. And we do not know what has happened to the NEFA report. I would not blame Shri Nanda for all this. I know that he is busy. Probably he is preoccupied because his D day is approaching. He had given an assurance that in two years corruption would be eradicated failing which he will quit. Probably now he is preoccupied and planning how to go away, because the way in which he has handled corruption has become a big *tamasha*. Nothing has happened. Orissa is one of the glaring examples.

The same is happening in Rajasthan and Bihar. The most interesting aspect is that when the Congress men in Orissa demanded the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry for the removal of some people who are in office, the complainants are being driven out of the Congress. I find that Dr. Mahtab is here. He can defend himself. I have been fighting them all my life. So, this has been the ultimate result of their request for an injury. I would not blame Shri Nanda for all this. I have all sympathies for him. But what were his other colleagues doing? What was the Government of India doing? You will realise that in such a situation if there is no intelligence, there is no proper appreciation; if there is no proper appreciation, there is no proper preparation. And if there is no proper preparation how can we defend our country?

I say that this Pakistani raid is not an isolated raid into Kashmir. It is a challenge to India's democracy and secularism. This is a Sino-Pakistani design and it has been planned in such a manner that, God forbid, probably before the end of December or even in October we may be faced with a situation where our entire frontier beginning from Assam to Kashmir will be raided by both Pakistan and China. The situation is so serious.

I am glad that Kashmir has stood the challenge to secularism. The Kashmiris are not fighting their battle. They are fighting India's battle, India's national cause. It is said that all Muslims in Kashmir want to remain separate or do not want to come or join India. I say this is a big lie. I have myself come across stories of bravery during these difficult times. A village was attacked by the raiders. There was a platoon of 12 soldiers out of which 10 were Muslims and 2 Hindus. 8 Muslims and 1 Hindu were killed in the incident.

Among the survivors the Hindu was attacked by a bayonet by the raiders and he was badly injured. He told his Muslim friends: now there is no hope for us, let us retreat. But what was the reply of his two Muslim comrades? They said: since the raiders have bayoneted you, we will stand by you; we may be killed by the raiders but we will not leave this battle field and they died fighting. Then I visited a hospital where 20 injured persons were being treated. I asked each one of them their names. Three were civilians and all the rest were from the Kashmir Armed Police and all of them were Muslims. So, it is a big lie to say that all Muslims of Kashmir are not fighting this battle for us. There is communal harmony in Kashmir. If we do not maintain communal harmony in other parts of the country, in such a situation we may lose this battle; but not otherwise. I again repeat that Kashmir will not be lost because of Kashmiris.

An Hon. Member: It will never happen.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It will never happen and it should not happen. But if at all it happens, it happens because of the policies of the Government of India because this government is incapable of meeting the situation.

We have always been equivocal. We must state for once and all what is our stand on Kashmir and what is our relationship with Pakistan. We have never taken a comprehensive review of Indo-Pakistan relations. Wrong assumptions lead to wrong actions. There seems to have been very little thinking on this subject. I appeal to the Prime Minister for God's sake please do not go on appealing to third parties; neither go on explaining what is our position or stand, saying that we have not violated anything. I say that it is humiliating to go on explaining to other parties that we have never aggressed. So far as Pakistan is concerned, we

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

have to bear in mind that there is no peaceful method of solution; there cannot be any. The Government of India committed a blunder in 1948 when the cease-fire agreement was signed. It was done despite military advice to the contrary and we did not take military action. There was another opportunity to meet this challenge in 1950 when Pakistan was driving out our brethren and there was oppression of minorities and our troops were almost ready to march to East Pakistan. But what did we do? For the sake of taking world opinion with us, we signed the Nehru-Liaquat Pact. What has been the result? We had to give Berubari. Now we have got the latest Kutch agreement. The Prime Minister himself had to say that "when I signed the agreement, I saw some ray of hope of peaceful settlement; but now I do not find there is any such thing, so far as Pakistan is concerned". This is a golden opportunity. I would say that this is a blessing in disguise. I am glad to say that today the international opinion realises that it is not India but it is Pakistan which has committed aggression. At least, that realisation is felt in the press but not probably as yet by the people who lead governments in those countries. They are yet keeping mum. Even the U.N. Secretary-General is keeping mum. We heard this morning on the radio that he is still undecided as to whether somebody should be sent or not. When we went to meet the U.N. Observer, Gen. Nimmo, he had no time to meet us. As some press correspondent in Srinagar commented, he is probably busy in transmitting the information from this side to that side. That is the role of the U.N. We are all for the U.N.O. and we want this institution to be strengthened to bring about international accord. But what has been its role? What has been its use? Even the Defence Minister agreed that they have not been effective enough. If that is the situation, let us not very much concern ourselves with what the world outside will think. But let us con-

cern ourselves with what is going to happen to this country and what is the supreme national interest of this country. Let that be the guiding factor in formulating our policy and, when we do that, let us not be deterred by anything in any manner as to how does it affect others when it affects our self-existence, the very existence of a sovereign country.

Sir, I want this Government to make the declaration here and now and act upto it that so far as Kashmir is concerned, that is a part of India like any other State of India and that we are not going to permit anybody to encroach upon that land. When Kashmir acceded, we had 84,000 sq. miles. But due to our policy, today half of it is in the enemy's hands. I want this Government to take steps to liberate those areas. Let us go-ahead, let us push ahead and let us get back 12,000 sq. miles which are with Chinese and 32,000 sq. miles which are with the Pakistanis. We have taken Kargil but that is not enough, as has been demanded by the Kashmir Chief Minister himself. As I understand, much of the difficulty arises because of the way in which the cease-fire line has been demarcated. It has been made in such a zig-zag manner that it leaves enough scope for the infiltrators and raiders to come inside and they demand that at least this must be straightened out. One million of our countrymen are suffering there. We must relieve them of that suffering. I can assure you that if once this Government takes the firm step, militarily or otherwise, and makes the declaration that India may go down but Kashmir will remain with India, and they act in that manner, I am sure that if there is any wavering element inside Kashmir today will veer round us and they will see to it that either they live in Kashmir or the invaders leave this country.

I would appeal to them again that let us not say anything or do anything at this juncture which may give an impression that we are not serious about these developments and that we will not stand united to face the

enemy. Let not this impression be created. I want this Government to put down with iron hands anybody, whoever he may be, any voice, any movement, anywhere saying that Kashmir will go to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am concluding now.

As I said I want this policy should not only be announced—this policy should be a national policy—but should be worked out and carried out. That is my concern. Unless that is done, our freedom is at peril.

Lastly, I want to say this. The Government may have failed, they may have blundered. That is not as disastrous as the fact that they neither learn the lesson nor own the mistakes and want to correct them. I do not like that attitude of the Prime Minister who often says, "I am not deviating from the policies of my revered Jawaharlal Nehru." His policy in Kashmir has landed us in this mess.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If you again follow that policy, this country will go to **रूम-बगम**.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Therefore, you have to adopt practical policies. I can assure you that people are willing to cooperate with you. The people can do anything for the sake of the nation. But you should not only cooperate but you should be able to take their cooperation. That is what is lacking today. If you adopt practical policies, then only you can appeal to the countrymen to fight along with you for the purpose we all want to achieve.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री मसानी द्वारा, अविश्वास का जो प्रस्ताव सदन में लाया गया है वह गलत तथ्यों और गलत आंकड़ों पर आधारित है ।

अभी माननीय श्री द्विवेदी जी ने अपना अन्तिम वाक्य कहा कि हमारे भूत-पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री, श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू, ने जो नीतियां चलायीं वे सभी गलत थीं । इससे स्पष्ट मालूम होता है कि उनका यह कहना कितना तर्क और युक्ति पर आधारित है, क्योंकि इन नीतियों की न केवल इस देश ने बल्कि देश के बाहर बड़े-बड़े महानुभावों ने प्रशंसा की । इन नीतियों की आलोचना करके वे आज मंत्रिमंडल पर अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाए हैं । यह कहाँ तक तर्क संगत और युक्ति संगत है ।

श्री मसानी ने अपने प्रस्ताव को लाते हुए कहा कि इस देश की सारी अर्थ व्यवस्था दोष से भरी हुई है, देश की माली हालत बिल्कुल नहीं सुधरी है, तीन योजनाओं में कुछ नहीं हुआ, और इसलिए उन्होंने कहा कि योजनाएँ मत बनाओ । श्री मसानी ने कहा कि प्लानिंग की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है, योजना मत बनाओ सभी चीजें सम्बन्ध-हीन और श्रृंखलाहीन छोड़ दो ।

उनके चार मुख्य स्लोगन रहे हैं :

1-नों प्लान, 2-नो इम्पोर्ट रेस्ट्रिक्शन 3-नो रेस्ट्रिक्शन आन फारिन ट्रेवल, और 4-नो रेस्ट्रिक्शन आन दी एन्टी आफ फारिन कैपिटल ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे बड़ी देश के लिए घातक बातें और कोई नहीं हो सकतीं । और यदि मंत्रिमंडल में यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाने का कारण यह है कि यहां योजना बनायी जाती है, देश में इम्पोर्ट को रोका जाता है, देश में विदेशी पूंजी को आने से रोका जाता है, तो मैं चाहूंगा कि वह हर बार ऐसा प्रस्ताव लावें और हम जोरदार शब्दों में कहेंगे कि हम योजनाएं बनाएंगे, हम चाहेंगे कि देश में गलत चीजों को विदेशों से आना रोका जाए, हम चाहेंगे कि देश में विदेशी पूंजी न आवे जो कि पिछले दरवाजे से आकर देश पर इकानमिक इम्पीरियलिज्म लाद दे ।

[श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद]

उनके तर्क किस चीज़ पर आधारित हैं ? उन्होंने कहा कि पिछली दो योजनाओं में और तीसरी योजना के अब तक के वर्षों में कुछ नहीं हुआ। क्या उनको यह नहीं मालूम जब हमें साम्राज्यवादी अंग्रेजी सरकार छोड़ कर गयी उसके बाद से प्रथम योजना में, द्वितीय योजना में और तीसरी योजना में अब तक राष्ट्रीय आय में कितनी वृद्धि हो चुकी है ? कल रात ही हमारे मंत्रिमंडल ने हमको विवक असेसमेंट आफ नेशनल इनकम दिया था, उससे पता चलता है कि इस वर्ष में राष्ट्रीय आय 7.3 प्रति शत बढ़ी है। ऐसी ही वृद्धि राष्ट्रीय आय में अंग्रेजों के जाने के बाद एक वर्ष और भी हुई थी। अगर यह बात सही है कि प्रथम योजना में राष्ट्रीय आय नहीं बढ़ी, द्वितीय योजना में राष्ट्रीय आय में 21 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि नहीं हुई, और तीसरी योजना में इन चार वर्षों में राष्ट्रीय आय में 4.1 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि नहीं हुई, तो निश्चय ही इस मंत्रिमंडल को जाना चाहिए।

13.19 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

लेकिन क्या वह कहते हैं इस बात को ? वह इस बात को नहीं कहते। वह कभी इस बात को चुनौती नहीं दे सकते कि हमारे देश में जो खाद्यान्न है उस की उत्पत्ति में वृद्धि हुई। यह बात कौन कहता है कि आज देश में हर आदमी को खाने की चीजें बहुत हिसाब से और बहुत आसानी से मिल रही हैं ? देश के प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, स्वास्थ्य मंत्री, गृह मंत्री नन्दा जी और खाद्य मंत्री श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् आदि ने बार बार अपनी कमजोरियों की तरफ खुद इशारा किया है और जिनको कि मसानी साहब ने कोट किया है। इसका अर्थ यह होता है कि हम ने जिन कमजोरियों को दिखाया और जिनकी ओर हम स्वयं देश का और सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट कर रहे हैं उन कारणों से यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पास कर दिया जाये। आखिर यह किस ने कहा कि देश में अनाज काफी मात्रा में आसानी से मिल रहा है ?

क्या खाद्य मंत्री ने स्वयं यह नहीं कहा कि देश में चावल महंगा मिल रहा है ? हम सभी इस चीज़ को मानते हैं और बारबार कहते हैं कि देश में खाद्यान्न की कमी है। हमारे देश का खाद्यान्न का टागेंट जो कि 6 प्रतिशत था, हर वर्ष वह 3.1 प्रतिशत ही बढ़ पाया है। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसका अर्थ यह नहीं हो जाता कि हम सरकार में अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लायें। क्या मसानी साहब कह सकते हैं कि हमारे देश की औद्योगिक, कृषि सम्बन्धी या रेल सम्बन्धी या ऐसी किसी अन्य क्षेत्र में उन्नति नहीं हुई है ? उन्नति हर एक क्षेत्र में हुई है यह दूसरी बात है कि वह पर्याप्त न हुई हो। अब यह तो हम सभी कांग्रेस दल वाले लोग मानते हैं कि जब कि हम यह कहते हैं कि हमने जो अपने टागेंट्स बनाये थे, हमारे पास जो प्लान थे और हमारे पास जो सफलता के सपने थे वह पूरे नहीं हुए। यह तो हम स्वयं उनसे अधिक जोरदार शब्दों में बराबर कहते आये हैं। फर्क सिर्फ यह है कि मसानी साहब मुंह से कहते कुछ और हैं और उनके अन्दर की भावना कुछ और होती है और वह भावना मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

मसानी साहब ने कल लोकनाथन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का हवाला देते हुए बतलाया कि इस देश की जनता में से कुछ लोगों की दैनिक औसत आय 62 पैसे है और 28 पैसे है। लेकिन मैं यहां यह साफ़ कर दूँ कि मसानी साहब ने यह कह कर गरीब लोगों के लिए मगरमच्छ के आंसू बहाये हैं क्योंकि दूसरी तरफ़ वह उस आर्थिक व्यवस्था का समर्थन करते हैं जिसमें यह औसत आमदनी और भी घट जायें। आखिर मसानी साहब उन्हीं पूँजीपतियों के नाम पर ही तो यह कहते हैं कि योजना नहीं होनी चाहिए। इनके मित्र जो बाहर और जो कि इनके फलोर्ट्रैवलर्स हैं, किलोस्कर साहब जो कि प्रेसीडेंट, इंडियन चैम्बर ऑफ़ कौमर्स ऐंड इंडस्ट्री हैं, उन्होंने कल स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा है कि योजना और लोकतन्त्र साथ नहीं चल सकते हैं। इधर सदन के अन्दर मसानी साहब

ने वही बात कही "प्लानिंग ऐंड डेमोक्रेसी केन नॉट गो टुगेदर"। मसानी साहब ने कल सदन के अन्दर वही चीज कही जब उन्होंने कहा :—

"No cut in import; no ceiling on land; no ceiling on urban property . . ."

इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि बाहर के अपने मित्रों की ही आवाज वह यहां सदन में रख रहे थे । मसानी साहब के कहने का अर्थ अब यह भी हो सकता है :—

"No restriction on black-marketing; no restriction on profiteering; no restriction on hoarding".

इन की सारी नोज़ इसलिए हैं कि इस देश की 5 प्रतिशत या 3 प्रतिशत जनता उस से लाभ उठा सके । क्या उनको यह याद नहीं पड़ता कि इसी सरकार ने प्रॉफेसर महालोनबीस की कमेटी बिठाई थी जिसकी कि हम सदस्यों ने मांग की थी । उस कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह कहा था कि इस देश में सम्पत्ति व आया का केन्द्रीयकरण हो रहा है । सरकार ने कभी इस बात से मुंह नहीं मोड़ा । सरकार ने कभी यह नहीं कहा स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जिन्होंने वह कमेटी बिठाई थी उन्होंने भी ऐसा महसूस किया था । हम सबों ने वैसा महसूस किया था । फर्क सिर्फ इतना है कि हम सम्पूर्ण देश का सर्वांगीण विकास चाहते हैं और हम यह चाहते हैं कि यह 68 और 28 पैसे कमाने वालों की औसत आय भी बढ़ाई जायें, लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ इस देश के 3 प्रतिशत लोग जो कि इस देश की आय पर, बैंक पर और हर एक साधनों पर कब्जा किये हुये हैं उनका विकेन्द्रीकरण किया जाये । मसानी साहब मुंह से तो कीमन मैन की बात बोलते हैं लेकिन असल भला उन बड़े-बड़े लोगों का चाहते हैं । अगर उनका यह तरीका है कि इसलिए सरकार के विरुद्ध अविश्वास का

प्रस्ताव पास कराया जाये और वह अपने इस तर्क को बारबार सदन में लाये हैं तो उनको यह मालूम हो जाना चाहिए कि इस से बारबार हमारी सरकार को और हम कांग्रेसी लोगों को यह कहने का मौका वह देते हैं कि हम देश के विकास व उन्नति के लिए योजना बनायेंगे, हम अपनी यह योजना किलॉस्कर अथवा उन के अन्य मित्रों के लिये नहीं बनायेंगे बल्कि हम योजना इस देश की 70 और 80 प्रतिशत जनता के जीवन स्तर को ऊपर उठाने के लिए बनायेंगे । हम अपनी यह योजना अगर उनकी भाषा में मैं कहूं तो एकोनामिकली वीकर सेक्शन आफ दी सोसाइटी जिनको कहा जाता है उनके लिए बनायेंगे । अगर यह बातें जो वह कहत हैं जैसे नो प्लानिंग, नो कट इन इम्पोर्ट, नो सीलींग ऑन लैंड और नो सीलींग ऑन अरबन प्रोपर्टी, अगर उनकी यह बातें मान ली जायें तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि इस देश में एक श्रृंखलाहीन *laissez faire* एकोनामी कायम हो जायगी जो कि कदापि वांछनीय नहीं होगा ।

मसानी साहब ने कल यह भी कहा था : "Bigger the Plan smaller the growth" . मुझे दुःख है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चतुर्थ योजना का आकार 22,500 करोड़ रुपये से घटाकर 21,500 करोड़ कर दिया है । श्री अशोक मेहता ने जिस बात की दलील दी, प्रचार किया, मसानी साहब ने कहा कि वह बिल्कुल गलत बात है । लेकिन हम सभी जानते हैं कि प्लानिंग कमिशन ने अच्छा काम किया है । वह विशेषज्ञों की समिति है जिससे कि हम बराबर सलाह आदि लेते रहते हैं कि किस प्रकार हम अपने देश को उन्नति के रास्ते पर ले जा सकें । मेरी समझ में श्री अशोक मेहता ने बिल्कुल ठीक कहा है कि चतुर्थ योजना का आकार बड़ा हो । हम सभी इस बात के लिये निरन्तर प्रयत्नशील हैं कि देश का विकास हो और वह उन्नति के पथ पर अग्रसर हो और इसके लिए जहां

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

हमने लोकनाथन कमेटी और महालोनबीस कमेटी बैठाई और उनकी राय प्राप्त की वहां आगे भी आवश्यकता महसूस होने पर इस तरह के विशेषज्ञों की समितियों की राय हम प्राप्त करते रहेंगे। उनकी यह दलील "विगर दी प्लान, स्मालर दी ग्रोथ" बिल्कुल गलत और आंकड़ों से विहीन है।

मैं आपका ध्यान एक और चीज की ओर खींचना चाहता हूं। मसानी साहब ने कल इस देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था की तुलना हैवान से की है, पाकिस्तान से की है, फारमोसा से की है। उन्होंने इसकी तुलना इजरायल से की है, जापान से की है, लेकिन मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूं कि जिस पाकिस्तान का उन्होंने इतना ढोल पीटा और बराबर पीटते चले आ रहे हैं बहुत दिनों से, उसकी दरअसल हालत क्या है? हमें कहा जाता है कि भारत की तुलना में पाकिस्तान में आर्थिक प्रगति अधिक है लेकिन उसका आधार क्या है और उसके पीछे क्या कारण है वह भी तो उन्हें अपने सामने रखना चाहिए। दरअसल बात यह है कि 1961-62 में भारत ने जब प्रति व्यक्ति 0.65 डालर की सहायता बाहर से ली तब उसके मुकाबले पाकिस्तान ने 1.11 प्रति व्यक्ति डालर की सहायता ली जिसका कि तात्पर्य यह निकला कि पाकिस्तान ने भारत के मुकाबले दुगुनी सहायता ली। जबकि 1960-61 और 1964-65 में पाकिस्तान ने पी० एल० 480 के अन्तर्गत प्रति व्यक्ति 8 डालर की सहायता ली तब हिन्दुस्तान ने सिर्फ 3 डालर का लोन लिया। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि तीन गुना अधिक पाकिस्तान डालर में हमारे देश से अधिक सहायता ले रहा है। सिर्फ यही नहीं बल्कि पाकिस्तान ने अपने पब्लिक सेक्टर में सारे इनवैस्टमेंट के 70 परसेंट की बाहर से भीख मांगी और कर्ज लिया जब कि हिन्दुस्तान ने अपने पब्लिक सेक्टर के इन्वैस्टमेंट में उस से आधे से कम, अर्थात् 35 परसेंट से

भी कम का बाहर से लोन प्राप्त किया। अब क्या मसानी साहब चाहते हैं कि जिस तरह आज पाकिस्तान में डालर का उपनिवेशवाद है उसी तरह हिन्दुस्तान भी डालर का उपनिवेश बन जाये। अगर हम अपने पब्लिक सेक्टर में पाकिस्तान की तरह 70 परसेंट बाहर से भीख मांग कर लगायें तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय इस देश में गणतन्त्र नहीं रहेगा बल्कि एक उपनिवेशवाद रहेगा। इसलिए हम किसी भी हालत में इस देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था की तुलना पाकिस्तान से नहीं कर सकते और उन्होंने जिस आधार पर अपने अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव रखा है वह आधार ही नहीं रहता है। उन्होंने हमारी तुलना तैवान के साथ की है लेकिन वे यह भूल गये कि तैवान के शहंशाह फारमूसा के यह शहंशाह श्रीमान् च्यांगकाई शेक, जिन्हें कि अमरीका ने बड़ी सहायता दी उनका परिणाम क्या हुआ? वहां चीन में कम्युनिस्टों का साम्राज्य बन गया और आज तैवान के शहंशाह मुख्य भूमि चीन को कम्युनिस्टों के हाथ में सौंप कर फारमूसा को उपनिवेश बना रहे हैं और मसानी साहब हमें यह विश्वास करने को मजबूर करते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान की आर्थिक व्यवस्था की तुलना करें फारमूसा से। मसानी साहब कहते हैं कि हम अपने देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था की तुलना इजरायल से करें। इजरायल आकाश से जमीन पर उतारा गया है। इजरायल की सारी योजना, सारी व्यवस्था मार्शल एंड पर हुई द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद बची हुई उन सामग्रियों से हुई जिसको कि इन विजयी राष्ट्रों ने इजरायल के सिर पर थोप दिया। क्या वह चाहते हैं कि हम अपने देश की तुलना उस इजरायल से करें? वे कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान अपनी तुलना जापान से करे जिसकी कि आर्थिक व्यवस्था 17 और कुछ प्रतिशत बढ़ रही है। अब मसानी साहब यह बतलायें कब वह समय था जापान के आर्थिक इतिहास में जब उसे गुलामी के दिनों में पूरे 200 वर्ष तक अपने देश के सारे रा मंत्रीयल

को बाहर भेजना पड़ा हो और उसे भुखमरी का शिकार होना पड़ा हो ? जापान की आर्थिक व्यवस्था सन् 1905 से बहुत मुक्त रही है, उसे काफी राहत मिली है तो यह किस प्रकार सम्भव है कि हिन्दुस्तान की आर्थिक व्यवस्था पिछले 17 वर्षों में जापान की तुलना कर सके ? इस प्रकार उनकी वह दलील, आर्थिक व्यवस्था का तुलना पाकिस्तान से, तैवान से, इजराइल से या जापान से की जाये बिल्कुल गलत और खोखला है । थलिक इस से भी अधिक मुख्य बात मैं कह डालना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि हमारे देश ने जो भी योजनाओं में खर्च किया है उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उसका 40 प्रतिशत खर्च गैर-उत्पादक सोशल सिक्योरिटी, शिक्षा, स्वास्थ्य आदि पर खर्च कर रहे हैं और जाहिर है कि उससे तुरन्त उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ता । हम सोशल सिक्योरिटी पर खर्च कर रहे हैं । अब आप ही फैसला कीजिये कि हिन्दुस्तान जो एक वेलफेयर स्टेट है, स्वास्थ्य पर, शिक्षा पर, सोशल सिक्योरिटी पर खर्च न करे और पाकिस्तान की तरह से जहाँ पर अधिनायकवाद है, रुपया खर्च करे ? किस नई बात पर उन्होंने प्रकाश डाला है ? हम जो इन कार्यों पर खर्च करते हैं, इस पर हमें नाज है । हमारे भूतपूर्व स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इन नीतियों का प्रतिपादन किया जिन नीतियों पर चल कर हम अपने रिसोर्सिस का चालीस प्रतिशत गैर-उत्पादक चीजों पर खर्च करते हैं ताकि जो बनने वाला इंसान है वह आज की सम्पत्ति तो नहीं लेकिन हाँ कल की सम्पत्ति अवश्य बन जाए । यह सीधी सी बात है । इन सब बातों को देखते हुए मैं समझता हूँ कि मसानी साहब की सारी दलीलें जो उन्होंने इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को पास करने के पक्ष में दी हैं, आर्थिक दृष्टि से, बिल्कुल गलत हैं, उन में कोई तथ्य नहीं है ।

अभी अभी हमारे माननीय सदस्य श्री सुरेन्द्र द्विवेदी ने जो एक आखिर में वाक्य कह दिया उसको सुन कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ ।

उन्होंने कह दिया कि प्रधान मंत्री श्री शास्त्री जो बात तो बहुत बढ़िया करते हैं लेकिन वे भी वही गलती कर रहे हैं जो गलती श्रीजवाहरलाल नेहरू कर रहे थे और उनके कारण ही सब कुछ हुआ है । मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस विशेष भाग पर उस पालिसी के उनको आपत्ति है ? क्या जवाहरलाल जी द्वारा चलाई गई नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी पर उनको आपत्ति है, क्या समाजवादी आर्थिक व्यवस्था जो हम इस अपने गणतन्त्रात्मक राज्य में स्थापित करना चाहते हैं उस पर आपत्ति है, क्या सोशलिज्म जो यहाँ हम लाना चाहते हैं, उस पर आपत्ति है यह तो उन्होंने एक स्वीपिंग रिमार्क पास कर दिया है । अगर उन्होंने अपने इस रिमार्क का विश्लेषण किया होता तो सम्भवतः हम उसका जवाब भी दे पाते । इस तरह से जवाब देना तो हमारे लिए बहुत मुश्किल है ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी : वक्त नहीं था ।

श्री भगवत् श आजाद : एक बात अब मैं अपने कम्युनिस्ट साथियों के बारे में कहूँगा । श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने, अर्थात् कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने इस सारे अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव में एक ही बात पर जोर दिया है और वह डी० आई० आर० के प्रयोग के बारे में है । हम यह नहीं चाहते हैं और सम्भवतः सरकार भी नहीं चाहती है कि डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूज के अंतर्गत किसी भी आदमी को साधारण से साधारण आदमी को भी बन्द किया जाए । अगर किसी को इस के अंतर्गत बन्द कर दिया गया है तो सरकार कहती है कि हम उस केस को रिव्यू करेंगे, उस पर विचार करेंगे । उस को सब केसिस पर विचार करना चाहिये । लेकिन एक बात आप अवश्य ध्यान में रखें । जिस देश की मिट्टी, हवा और अन्न पर चलने वाला आदमी चीन का यशोगान करे, जो चीन की लाल सेना को मुक्ति सेना कहे, उस आदमी को ऐसा कहने का क्या अधिकार है और क्यों न उस को डी० आई० आर० के

[श्री भगवत झा आज़ाद]

अन्तर्गत बन्द कर के रखा जाये ? मैं समझता हूँ आज अगर श्री गोपालन द्वारा दो गई फास्ट की धमकी के आगे सरकार झुक जाती है तो यह सरकार कमजोरी दिखाएगी। मैं प्रो० मुखर्जी से तथा राइट कम्युनिस्टों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन का लैफ्ट कम्युनिस्टों के साथ क्या मतभेद है ? जो हम उन के बारे में कहते हैं, उस के सिवाय और भी क्या कोई मतभेद है ? क्या यह बात झूठ है कि रूस ने और रूप के सब से बड़े इस जमाने के नेता खुश्चेव ने चीनियों के सम्बन्ध में वही बात नहीं कही है जो बात हम लोग कह रहे हैं ? इसलिये कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का यह तर्क कि डी० आई० आर० का बड़ा गलत प्रयोग हुआ है, इसलिये अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाया जाना चाहिये बिजकुज गलत है, निराधार है।

सब से बड़ा आश्चर्य तो इस बात पर होता है कि इन्होंने कौन सा समय इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को लाने का चुना है। इन लोगों ने यह उचित समझा है कि ऐसे समय में इस प्रस्ताव को लाया जाए जब कि हमारी सीमाओं पर दानव पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण हो रहे हैं, जब कि हमारी शस्यश्यामला भूमि पर, पृथ्वी के स्वर्ग काश्मीर पर पाकिस्तानी हमले हो रहे हैं। काश्मीर में जनजागरण हो चुका है, वहाँ की जनता एक स्वर में एक वाणी में, हमलावर खबरदार, हम हिन्दुस्तानी हैं तैयार, की ललकार मचा रही है। एक तरफ तो यह स्थिति और दूसरी तरफ ये अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव यहां लाये हैं। आज काश्मीर में पाकिस्तानी लुटेरे, पश्चिमी साम्राज्यवादी देशों पर चलने वाले पाकिस्तान के लुटेरे हमारी सीमाओं में घुस आये हैं और उनका मुकाबला करने के लिये हमारी सेना के बहादुर जवान और अफसर, हमारी पुलिस के बहादुर सिपाही हमारे कर्मचारी, हमारी इंटेलेजेंस के कार्यकर्ता कटिबद्ध हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में क्या यह उचित था कि इस तरह के प्रस्ताव को लाया जाता ? क्या यह उचित

था कि उस समय इस प्रस्ताव को लाया जाता जब कि पूर्वी सीमायें हमारी सुरक्षित नहीं हैं, वहाँ पर भी आक्रमण हो रहे हैं ? इन के दिमागों में आर्थिक नीतियों में जो खामियां हैं, उन को मैं जानता हूँ। ब्राह्म स्थिति में जो बिगड़ा हुआ है, उस को मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन उस के बावजूद भी क्या यह ठीक था कि आज सम्पूर्ण संसार और इस देश के सामने यह कहा जाए कि हमें अपनी सरकार पर विश्वास नहीं है ? पाकिस्तान हम पर चढ़ा आ रहा है और क्या ये यह समझते हैं कि अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पास हो जाने के बाद इस देश में नई सरकार इन की बन जाएगी ? क्या ये यह समझते हैं कि उस स्थिति में ये पाकिस्तान को हराने में सफल हो जायेंगे मे समझता हूँ कि अगर कोई सरकार पाकिस्तान को हराने में सफल हो सकती है तो वह यही सरकार हो सकती है, दूसरी कोई सरकार नहीं।

प्रसन्नता की बात है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने अपने बयान में स्पष्ट कर दिया है कि काश्मीर के बारे में उन की नीति क्या है। मैं अभी काश्मीर गया था और वहाँ की जनता का सन्देशा मैं ले कर आया हूँ। वहाँ की जनता ने मुझ से कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्य भागों में रहने वाले देशवासियों से तथा अपने प्रधान मंत्री से आप जा कर कहिये कि उन्होंने ने लाल किले पर ऐतिहासिक पन्द्रह अगस्त को जो कुछ कहा है कि किसी से भी काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में बात नहीं की जा सकती है, वह उस पर अड़े रहें, फिर चाहे वह यू० एन० हो या पाकिस्तान हो। काश्मीर भारत का अविभाज्य अंग है और इस की सावरेनटी पर बात नहीं हो सकती है। मैं ने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री ने यह तो साफ कहा है तब उन्होंने ने मुझ से कहा कि अपने प्रधान मंत्री को कहो, बार बार उन को इस बात के बारे में कहो। 1947 में, उन्होंने ने कहा, हम कहा करते थे हमलावर खबरदार,

हम काश्मीरी हैं तैयार, आज हम यह कह रहे हैं, हमलावर खबरदार, हम हिन्दुस्तानी हैं तैयार।

हम प्रधानमंत्री जी से एक बात प्रौर कहना चाहते हैं। अगर यह एग्रेसन हुआ तो इसके लिये दोषी वही नहीं होगा जो कि एग्रेसन करता है, जो कि युद्ध छेड़ता है, दोषी इस के लिये केवल पाकिस्तान ही नहीं होगा बल्कि याद रखिये आप भी दोषी होंगे, शिकार मारने वाला व्याध ही दोषी नहीं होता है, उस व्याध को पनपाने वाला भी दोषी होता है। अगर हमारी तटस्थता और शान्ति की नीति पाकिस्तान कमजोरी की नीति मानता है और उस के आधार पर अगर आपने आज जंग नहीं की तो आने वाला इतिहास आप को कमजोर कहेगा। इसलिये हम कहेंगे :

“समरशेष है नहीं पाप का भागी केवल व्याध, जो तटस्थ हैं समय गिनेगा उनका भी अपराध”

आप का भी अपराध गिना जाएगा। इसलिये आज आप भी जो कमजोरी दिखला रहे हैं, उस को आप छोड़िये।

आप के पास शस्त्र बल है। हमारे बहादुर जवान मोर्चों पर बड़ी बहादुरी दिखा रहे हैं। वे वहां लड़ रहे हैं।

“जहां शस्त्र बल नहीं शास्त्र पछताते या रोते हैं”

आप जानते हैं कि तपस्वियों को तपस्या में सिद्धि तभी मिली थी जब धनुर्धर राम खड़े हो गए थे।

“ऋषियों को भी सिद्धि तभी तप से मिलती है, जब पहरे पर स्वयं धनुर्धर राम खड़े होते हैं।”

इसलिये आप को भी सिद्धि तभी मिलेगी जब आप धनुर्धर राम बन कर अपनी सीमाओं पर खड़े होंगे। प्रसन्नता की बात है कि आज जब आप पर यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाया गया है और इस की सपोर्ट में, इसके समर्थन में जो इन्होंने ने आंकड़े पेश किए हैं चाहे आर्थिक दृष्टि से या राजनीतिक दृष्टि से वे सब थोथे हैं,

उन में कोई सार नहीं है। आप की सरकार मजबूत है। लेकिन आप को चाहिये कि आप ने वीरतनाम पर जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है, आप ने काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है, उस पर आप डटे रहें। आप काश्मीर की घाटियों, बारामूला की पहाड़ियों पर अनन्तनाग की तलहटियों पर यह नारा गूंज रहा है कि हम एक एक इंच भूमि की रक्षा करेंगे जो भी हमले होंगे उन का मुकाबला किया जाएगा। आज काश्मीर की जनता कह रही है कि राल्फ बंच जो आ रहे हैं, उन का काश्मीरी विरोध करते हैं। हम भी उन का विरोध करते हैं हमें आप इजाजत दीजिए कि हम उन्हें काले झंडे दिखा सकें। जब यू० एन० यह भी समझ नहीं पाया है कि पाकिस्तानी दानव लुटेरा है, आक्रामक है, हमारी शस्य श्यामला भूमि पर उस ने चढ़ाई की है, जनरल निम्मो जो काश्मीर में हैं वे भी इस को देख नहीं पाये हैं तो न्यूयार्क में इस को कैसे देखा जा सकता है। आज हम अपना जो विश्वास आप में दे रहे हैं इस विश्वास का प्रतिपादन आप कीजिये, इसका प्रतिफल आप हमें यह कह कर दीजिये कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में कोई बात नहीं होगी, कारगिल के सैक्टर में हमारी फौजें जो बढ़ गई हैं, ठीक बढ़ गई हैं, और काश्मीर में जहां जहां तथा कथित सीज फायर लाइन है, वह गलत है और उस को आप तोड़िये और तोड़ कर आगे बढ़िये। देश आप के साथ है। वना आने वाला इतिहास हमें और आप को माफ नहीं करेगा।

Shri Mahatab (Angul): In the debate, the Opposition has made three points with regard to domestic affairs and one or two points with regard to our foreign policy. I do not attribute any motive to them. I have no doubt that they have brought up these issues with the best of intentions. They are as good representatives as I am, and I have no right, and I am not entitled, to attribute any motive to them. But I feel constrained to observe that these points could have been raised otherwise also. These points are important points

[Shri Mahatab]

which ought to be discussed as frequently as possible in this House and elsewhere also, but there are ways of raising these issues for serious discussion. Unless some propriety is observed in these matters, all these discussions may come down to a low level. That is my fear. And that has happened also here on this occasion.

The Finance Bill is there which will be coming up for discussion. In the course of the discussion on that Bill all these points could have been raised. Or these issues could have been separately discussed also, and I am sure Government would have agreed to discuss all these problems. Therefore, my submission is that this no-confidence-motion which means interruption in the normal business of the House seems to be rather unfair to parliamentary practice. I would request the Opposition parties and their leaders who are as good representatives of the people as any of us, to consider this matter in all seriousness, whether use should be made of this provision in our rules in order to raise these issues. After all, various issues can be discussed dispassionately by other means also.

As regards the points, the points which have been made are not new. These are all well known points, and these have been admitted by Government and all of us, and on many occasions all of us have applied our minds to these problems also.

I will address myself to the Opposition and request them to consider how these problems could be solved. Problems have to be faced; they are not to be shouted about because everybody knows the problems. The question is how to solve them.

With regard to domestic matters, three points have been made. One is the slow rate of growth the plans having not been able to achieve the targets. The second is the use of DIR in some states. The third is about prices including prices of foodstuffs. With regard to the first, slow rate of

growth, you will remember that this very point was discussed here when the midterm appraisal report was before us. I had the opportunity to speak on that occasion. It is not merely Dr Lokanathan's report that has pointed out the thing. The report of the Planning Commission itself is there. I quoted from it then. The perspectives section of the Planning Commission gave us various statistics in a report to prove that the plans were not achieving their targets. Therefore, it is not a secret; it is not that something secret is being divulged here which Government wanted to conceal. It is really the Government which placed that report on the Table; it is the Government which gave us statistics for discussion as to how to find a solution.

The plans are not achieving their targets, why? The simple reason is this—I am not quoting figures and statistics because that will carry us too far from the main points. Shri Masani compared the rate of growth in India with that elsewhere. He should compare also the rate of investment here with that elsewhere. If that is done, we will find that the rate of investment in India is much lower than that elsewhere. In other countries, they have more resources—I am not here to criticise how they raise them. But in India whenever efforts are made to raise resources, there has been discontent. Here we are in a difficult position because we have to carry out our plan in a democratic set-up. We have to take the people with us; we cannot just ride roughshod over the people. We have to take various factors into consideration.

Another difficulty in India is that although the plan in general has been accepted by all the political parties, even then when we come to brass-tacks, political advantage is taken of the discontent caused by raising resources needed for the plan. I will give an instance. Just after the midterm appraisal, when it was found that

more resources had to be secured from the country itself in order to accelerate the progress, several measures were undertaken. When these measures were undertaken—I had the opportunity of seeing the note of the Planning Commission as to how these resources could be raised—accusation was made here on the floor of the House by many as if the Congress Party was not alive to miseries of people. In fact, in 1962, as early as that, the Congress Working Committee appointed a sub-committee, of which I was a member, to find out how the rate of progress could be accelerated. It met many times. Our report was just ready, but it could not be published because of the Chinese invasion. But the facts were known. The rate of progress could be accelerated if only there could be more investment. Various measures were undertaken to that end.

Here I would remind the House, how the difficulty arose. I do not support this side or that. The point is that we must face facts. The compulsory deposit scheme, the Gold Control Order and various other measures were undertaken at that time. But even a person like Shri Morarji Desai, with all his political standing, could not stand the discontent which arose out of these measures. What happened then? It was expected that all political parties would try to control that discontent, manage that discontent. But actually, political advantage was taken of that discontent. So the ruling party—this will apply to whichever party may be in power—found themselves in difficulties. Therefore, they had to retrace their steps. Some of these measures were withdrawn. Sufficient resources for the plan could not be raised.

Similarly, in the states, what do we find? They are expected to raise additional resources. But every state is now most unwilling to do that because of the political difficulty involved. They expect resources from the centre. The Central Government, it was suggested by Shri Khadilkar, should be firm. After all, the Central

Government also is a representative body. It is not an autocratic body that it can ride roughshod over the states. All are bound together. We have to move together.

In this matter, what is expected of the Opposition is this. This was tried at one time. I had the opportunity of attending many of those meetings when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to invite leaders of the Opposition for discussion. He used to try his utmost to take the Opposition parties with him in this planning. After all, it is a national plan; it cannot be a party plan. No plan which is ever a party plan can be executed. Today one party is in power, tomorrow another may take its place. Therefore, in all countries, everywhere, the plan is taken to be a national plan. All the political parties broadly agree with the outlines of the plan. This has been done in India when the First Plan was drawn up. In the case of the Second Plan also, there was broad agreement on the outlines of the plan.

You will remember that Shri S. K. Dey, Minister in charge of community development, sent circular letters to all the states, and it was the policy—even now it is, I believe, the policy; it was the policy at least two years ago—that at the state level the leaders of all political parties should be called upon to participate in the working of the community development projects, as, it was considered to be a non-political organisation. But on all occasions, it has been our misfortune that whenever there is discontent, whenever there is a little hardship to the people, instead of managing that, instead of controlling that, political advantage has been taken of that. Then the Government has had to retrace its steps.

So in this matter, we have to be clear in our mind as to what we want. We have gone ahead with the plan. The plan means that if we want to make our future bright, we have to suffer a little for the present. We have to invest. Investment means in-

[Shri Mahatab]

vestment for the future. The results cannot be had immediately. As soon as we accept this position, we should be prepared to meet, the discontent of the people. That can be done only if there is general agreement among the political parties in a democratic set-up. Otherwise, if it is expected that whatever the other political parties might do, one party which is strong should ride roughshod over the people and get things done, that is not possible to do. We have to bear that in mind. From that point of view we have to judge things as to whether we are proceeding along the right lines.

There may be many mistakes committed. I do not think it is Government's case that no mistakes have been committed. Nobody can claim that. There have been many mistakes. But to suspect the *bona fides* is not the proper thing to do in democracy. We must not suspect each other's *bona fides*. Whatever the Opposition says, they are quite honest in their views and convictions; whatever the Government on this side does, there is honesty there also. Let us meet here on an equal platform and find out solution to these problems.

As I said, the problem with regard to the plan is that of investment, which we must face squarely. Unless we do that, I do not think the rate of progress can be accelerated. Now I am speaking from a common-man's point of view. I do not understand the talk about differences regarding the size of the plan. Unfortunately, I have been seeing from the beginning—that is the opinion of many experts also, and that is the opinion of many members of the Government also and at one time it was seriously discussed—that the plan should be in terms of physical targets. It was seriously discussed at one time and considered that the plan should be formulated in terms of physical targets instead of monetary targets. The Fourth Plan is now said

to be of the dimensions of Rs. 21,500 crores. On the basis of the measures which have been introduced by our Finance Minister, in terms of physical targets I think the plan will come down to Rs. 19,000 crores.

As prices of steel, petrol diesel etc. will increase, in physical terms the next Plan will be cut down by about Rs. 1,000 of Rs. 1,500 crores. That is my rough calculation. So, there is no meaning in discussing the plan in monetary terms. We have to think in terms of physical targets. If that is done, I think that much of the criticism can be met and discussed properly. Otherwise, we will land ourselves nowhere.

With regard to prices, this matter is under discussion at various levels, not that it is not known. I have been at it for the last two or three years, and I shall place the problem as I know it before the Opposition. Let us try to solve it without being critical of each other. Everybody is anxious to see that the prices are reduced. It should not be thought that none on this side realises the danger of rise in prices or the difficulties of the middle class people. Everybody realises it. The question is what is to be done.

Take the case of food. This again is a problem, a conundrum to be solved. The total food production is about 80 million tons. This year it is 88 million or so, but let us take it at 80 million. The consumption of the towns would roughly come to 20 to 25 millions. If that amount could come to the market, there would be no difficulty, but because of the rise of prices, the farmers can meet their needs if they sell only 10 to 15 million tons. As the prices are high, they are not in a hurry to sell as before. That has been admitted by Shri Masani also. Farmers are a little better off, to day therefore the old-time distress sale is not there. They can refrain from selling immediately. Up till now, 40 per cent of the

marketable surplus has not come. That means 12 to 13 million tons have come, the remaining has not come. Where lies this surplus?

It is true, as has been said by Shri-mati Renu Chakravartty, that not all the farmers are holding up the stocks. I would not call it hoarding. If one keeps one's own goods it is not hoarding. We are using wrong terms, we are victims of slogans in that respect. The farmers are holding up, they are not selling. On a rough calculation, 6 to 7 million tons must be with the comparatively large farmers, the number of whom would be about two crores in the whole of India, taking the statistics of holdings into consideration. Is it suggested that the Government of India will immediately apply DIR or some other law against these two crores of people or put them under arrest? Is it possible in a democracy when millions of people are involved?

Shri Khadilkar, I think, referred to N.E.P. of Lenin. This happened in Russia also when their planning proceeded. Lenin was living then. They had to retrace their steps, and allowed the marketable surplus to come to the market through trade channels. Here, I think Shri Vinoba Bhave is right. There is indecision not only on the part of the ruling party, but on the part of the Opposition also. I will place the problem, let them solve it today, I am sure everybody will accept it. The problem is whether the normal trade channel should be made use of for carrying the surplus from the farmer to the market, or a governmental machinery should be built up. There is an opinion that the trade channel should not be trusted, new governmental machinery should be built up. If that is so then this should have been done, in my opinion, during the First Plan itself. Then we would not have been in this difficulty today the situation would have been different.

Here I would put the question to Shri Masani and Shrimati Renu Cha-

kravartty together. Let them give their agreed opinion as to which channel should be used. There the difficulty arises, because, after all, whatever differences exists in the country are reflected in the Government. After all Government is a representative body, it cannot be an autocratic body. That kind of authoritarian attitude should not be expected from an elected Government. Indecision is there in the whole country. That is to say, we have not yet decided what we should do. Let us solve the problem, how the marketable surplus should come out.

I would suggest for the consideration of the Members of the Opposition and our party also, that Government should not provide incentive to the farmers to sell away their surplus. At one time we suggested it in our party committee, of which Shri A. P. Jain was a member. What do these farmers want? Their first attraction is to build their houses. So, provide them with housing materials, steel cement, corrugated iron sheets etc., so that they would be inclined to sell their stocks. Then the marketable surplus is likely to come to the market. Then the Plan would take a different turn. Otherwise, to think that millions of people can be forced to sell their stocks of wheat or rice is not a practicable proposition.

I think these are all matters which can be discussed dispassionately round the table. There is no question of one finding fault with another because everybody is anxious to see that the marketable surplus comes to the market. The Food Minister, the Prime Minister, every one is anxious that the prices should come down but the question is how they will come down. Let us sit down and discuss the matter. I do not think anybody at any time will refuse to discuss matters, but there must be an atmosphere for that. If on every occasion political advantage is taken of the situation, then it becomes difficult for discussion. That is the present difficulty.

[Shri Mahatab]

With regard to food, it was once discussed on the floor of the House. I distinctly remember the marathon debate to which Shri S. K. Patil, the then Food Minister, gave a devastating reply, to the dismay of Members like Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, which left all gaping, and nobody could reply to him. The same situation, the same arguments are put forth now. Let us not go round and round the very same problem. Let us try to face the problem squarely and find out a solution.

With regard to the use of DIR, I know from my own experience that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister are very much averse to taking recourse to this law in normal situations, and in fact, they disapproved it in the case of Orissa when the student agitation was going on, but in some States it is being used. There is no doubt that it is wrong. Supposing there is no emergency, am I to understand that lawlessness could not be tackled? Our officers are getting accustomed to rough and ready method, and they do not use the normal law. Under the existing laws, steps can be taken. But it is the business of State Governments. It should not be thought that the Central Government is such a powerful authority that it can compel the State Governments to do everything they like, but that is not possible. Let us think in a democratic way and behave in a democratic manner. We cannot expect the Central Government to act like the Moghul Emperors of the old days. They have to take into consideration the difficulties of the State Governments, as well.

14 hrs.

With regard to the happenings in Bihar, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty said that it was not the intention of the leaders that destruction of public property should take place, but nevertheless destruction of public property has taken place. Should destruction of public property be tolerated by anybody? If it takes place, it

is to be condemned. Let us assume that the anger of the people is justified, that the people's discontent is justified, should that take the shape of destruction of public property? From newspapers I gather that the total value of public property destroyed in Bihar would come to about 2 crores. Who will pay that money? Will it not come again from these people themselves? This is a serious matter. Let us all with one voice condemn the acts of violence. We have to create an atmosphere of non-violence. Agitation is allowed; we can do satyagraha. But satyagraha has got such a far-fetched meaning now that even killing of human beings comes under satyagraha. I mean Satyagraha. There are many ways of peaceful and perfectly non-violent agitation. If we do not learn them then wrong leadership will land the country in serious difficulty. It is not merely a governmental problem or administrative problem. It is really a problem of the society. How will the society live if there is always an atmosphere of violence, if nobody is sure of his life and property; if some thing goes wrong and somebody feels angry he sets fire to the house. What will happen to the society? This is a problem which all the leaders should consider together and they should in one voice say: this is not the correct thing to do.

Something has been said about our policy of non-alignment. Foreign policy is based on enlightened self-interest. It is not a dogma or slogan or a virtue as prescribed in the scriptures. Whenever it requires to be changed, it will be changed. Today that policy is paying its dividends. Suppose India is in such a position that she can not defend herself without aligning with some power, am I to understand that the country is so attached to the policy of non-alignment that it will sit quite and allow itself to go to dogs? That is not so. Let us not stretch everything to what is known in logic as *reductio ad absurdum*, to a position of absurdity.

With regard to Kashmir, now. Shri S. N. Dwivedy is a great patriot. I would appeal to him to consider whether it is correct to say that whenever a good thing is done the officers are responsible and they are to be given the credit, and whenever a thing goes wrong the political leaders are responsible; if the officers are doing good work they are doing it on their own without any direction from the Government, and if anything goes wrong, then it is the Government who are responsible. Please excuse me for my speaking frankly; this kind of utterances on the part of responsible leaders will create an atmosphere of indiscipline.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is a complete misunderstanding.

Shri Mahatab: Government should be taken as a whole. For everything done right or wrong the, whole Government is responsible and Government means the chain beginning from the Minister down to the jawan who is on the field; all of them are responsible. You cannot make a distinction. Distinctions are made for other purpose and for this platform. Parliament is a responsible body. We are not in a public meeting. Time will soon come in 1967 when all loose things can be said on a lavish scale. But on this platform I think that whatever we say must carry weight. So far as Kashmir is concerned, nobody can go back on what has been said about it. It has become not only a question of prestige; it has become our flesh and blood and we cannot part with it. That is the present position. So far as foreign policy is concerned, how is it to be formulated? We are now faced with enemies on money sides. How to manage the situation is a question which must be left to the Government. To that extent we should have faith in the Government, whatever party may be in power. If there is any evidence, even a slight indication, that there is some deviation from

the correct path, then alone we should come forward and offer criticism. Otherwise if we go on suspecting the motives of the Government, the Government itself will become weak.

Mr. Masani said something about Orissa elections. There are two points. Whenever any Opposition party demands an election, the ruling party must agree to it because this is a democracy and there should not be any hide and seek with regard to that matter. But I would plead with all the parties to take into consideration another factor which I placed before the Government when the mid-term election was held in 1961.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): It is not mid-term; the term has expired.

Shri Mahatab: I wrote to Jawaharlalji explaining to him my point of view. I may be excused. Although I am in a political party; I am partly in the academic field also and that makes me a sort of a split personality. Political parties are not everything in the world. Have not the people anything to say in the matter What about the people?

Shri Ranga: Should they not be given the opportunity of saying whether they would like to be loaded with this Biju-Patnaik and Co.?

Shri Mahatab: These are all good sentiments and I share them. But if elections are held in Orissa in 1966, separately from the general elections, the Orissa Government will have to spend Rs. 15 lakhs for that purpose.

Shri Masani: That is the price of a Federal Government.

Shri Mahatab: The Congress Party does not pay for it. The price will be paid by the people. It may be a small sum for States like Bombay or Bengal but it is a big sum in Orissa. If the two elections are held together, the cost will be borne by the State and the Centre. (Interruptions.)

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) : जब इस सदन के सदस्य गवर्नर बना दिये जाते हैं और फिर उपचुनाव होता है तो उसमें क्या जनता का पैसा खर्च नहीं होता है ?

Shri Mahatab: Assuming it is a wrong thing, that does not justify another wrong. My point is that we have to take into consideration the States finances. Secondly, I happen to be a Member of Parliament. Naturally I would like to have the support of seven Members down below; otherwise I will be left alone and I will have to campaign alone. If it is held along with the general elections, I will sink or swim together with seven others. That is a point of view which should also be taken into consideration.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Sir, rising to support this motion of no-confidence I cannot escape feeling unhappy. Sir, I have just returned from my district and my State and I have seen people living in conditions in the 18th year of freedom which beggars description. I have seen people going without any cereal food for days together; I have seen people passing their days and living on boiled leaves and fruits. In West Bengal and in my district, rice is selling at places at Rs. 3 a Kg. This is the state of affairs to which this Government has brought the country and the people after 18 years of uninterrupted rule. It has been said from the other side—many hon. Members from the Congress Benches have spoken—that this no-confidence business has become a seasonal affair, concocted by the motely and disunited Opposition who want to take every opportunity to discredit the Government and perhaps in their hearts entertain a desire to sit on the Treasury Benches. But let us for a moment forget the Government and the Opposition here and think of those people in the villages, especially in the rural areas, be they in West Bengal or

in Bihar or in Maharashtra or in Uttar Pradesh, the people who do not get a morsel of proper food a day. Whatever may be the reason, it should fill all of us, all those of us who get a satisfying meal at least every day, with a sense of crime, and the fact remains that this Government with an uninterrupted rule of 18 years have brought the common people to this pass.

I do not know whether I can evoke any sympathetic chord of response in the minds of gentlemen sitting opposite, but I am myself overwhelmed with a sense of futility, seeing conditions, in which the people live today, that our Constitution leaves me with no other device but to move this futile, paper no-confidence motion against this Government. I only hope that there are forces superior to this Constitution, sanctions superior to this Constitution, which will one day make the welfare of the people the supreme criterion to judge every action of the Government. Unfortunately, Sir, that is not the position today.

Hon. Members from the Government Benches have made much of the fact that this no-confidence motion has been moved at a time when the country faces external aggression. Pakistani infiltrators have crossed the cease-fire line and are attacking the country. Another determined enemy is biding time on the northern frontiers and may be at any time on our throats. But is that a fact to be remembered by the Opposition alone? Is that not a fact to be remembered by the Government equally? And if that is so, was it not obligatory on the Government to tackle certain vital questions with the utmost priority? Any Government worth the name, which faces external aggression, at least sees to it that the people get their elementary necessities of life, the barest necessities of life. But has that been done? What has the

Government done since the Chinese aggression started? And how is it that the economic situation has been brought to such a pass?

Many things have been said on the other side, condemning the violence that has taken place in Bihar recently and in Calcutta a few days back, but with all the seriousness that I can command, I tell the Government and friends opposite that if they allow things to go on as they are continuing, if they do not stem this tide of accelerating deterioration and rot in the body politic, then, let them be prepared for the worst; violence which would overwhelm not only them but the whole country as well. I tell the Government and the gentlemen sitting opposite, let them not lull themselves into complacency with the thought that this no-confidence motion, like others which were moved before, is destined to be defeated by an overwhelming majority. They have a majority. That is a fact. But a still more important fact remains: that this Government has failed on every count by which a Government should be judged or could be judged.

I do not want to go into detailed facts and statistics, but the simple fact remains: that only a few months back, the Food Minister here announced support prices for foodgrains and also the maximum prices for foodgrains which were enforced in different States, not under any special law but again under the Defence of India Rules. But I ask the Government, is there any part of the country where their control prices, whether enforced under the Defence of India Rules or the Essential Commodities Act, are really prevalent. Does their writ run? If this is the position with regard to such a vital matter as food; if this is the state to which you have brought your law and order, do you think that people will go on endlessly suffering starvation and bow down to your law and to your order?

That is why, although it is a very imperfect instrument of expressing popular discontent, we from these benches, as elected representatives of the people, have to take resort to this no-confidence motion. We know that this is bound to be defeated, but this will not be the end of the story. The history that is being forged by the suffering of the people outside will one day assert itself and sweep away not only your government but this farcical way in which you are using emergency powers and DIR.

Leaving aside for a moment the internal state of the country, what is the position on the frontiers? Who was responsible for our reverses in NEFA? We of the opposition were not in charge of the defence of the country. The people paid taxes to you in order to provide an effective defence. And, we know with what results. The result of the enquiry held by the Henderson-Brookes Committee has not yet seen the light of day. We knew then how you manage the defence of the country. There is the latest development on the Kashmir front—the invasion of infiltrators, thousands of them coming across the cease-fire line. Don't, for God's sake, ask the people to believe that all this happened overnight. Everybody knows that these infiltrators came over a period. They could come because, as Mr. Dwivedy said, your security, intelligence, military arrangements, everything was in a mess.

Now speakers from the government benches are eloquent about the patriotism of our Kashmir brethren. But did you, in these matters, listen to the advice of the Kashmir administration? Only two months back, I was in Kashmir and I was told on the authority of no less than the person who holds the highest office in the Kashmir Congress, the former National Conference, that whether in the matter of Abdullah, or security arrangements on the cease-fire line or

[**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri**] in the matter of raising the issue in the UN, the advice of the Kashmir Government was never sought and never respected. Although I accompanied some of my Congress M. P. friends to that high personage, he appealed to me and said, "Although you belong to the opposition, you tell the Government that if they want to set things in Kashmir right, this is not the way they should deal with the Kashmir Government".

So, on all counts, whether it is a question of internal economy—leave aside planning and other things, but take the most vital thing, people's food, without which we cannot live—or whether it is a question of the country's security and external defence, on every single count, this government has failed. A few weeks back, an esteemed lady member on the government side characterised this government as prisoners of indecision. I say that she expressed her feeling of frustration very inadequately. This government is not merely a prisoner of indecision, but it is a government that does not know its own mind, that does not know its own policy, that does not present a united front and a united face to the people, a government whose members undermine each other, a government whose members are interested in sabotaging the professed policies announced on behalf of this government. That is why this no-confidence motion has been moved.

We know this motion will be thrown out in this House by the massive majority of the congress benches. But I appeal once again not to the members of the government benches alone, but to the genius of the congress party—we also once belonged to the congress—is this for which congress fought? Is this for which the martyrs laid down their lives? I ask the average members of the congress benches whether they have given the best to the country and thrown out the best leadership that they could yet throw out.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): Sir, I rise to support the no

confidence motion. When we are discussing this motion, I am bound to say that this government has turned the whole country so to say into a prison. At present, I know that more than 10,000 people are rotting inside jails in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Kerala and everywhere. The DIR is being used indiscriminately against persons whose simple fault is that they demand food for two meals a day and for the holding of price line and reasonable earning so as to meet their daily necessities. And for these faults they are taken into custody under the Defence of India Rules, which has been denounced by all sections of people as black act.

Some time back a responsible Member of the Congress Party in the course of his speech referred to Sri A. K. Gopalan, who is now nearing his death as he is under going fast at the ripe old age of sixty. And nobody knows in the meantime what has happened, because the alarming report that has appeared in today's papers says that he is sinking on account of high blood-pressure. And the government spokesman comes here with the statement that they have not yet been able to get the full information from the Kerala Government. This is the situation, Sir.

It has been pointed out here and outside that this Government is taking the opportunity of the Emergency and this DIR for throwing hundreds of persons into prison, simply to keep themselves in power and for nothing else. The Defence of India Rules are used in our State, for what reason? To suppress the movement of the people who agitate and who hold meetings and demonstrations against the action of the Government in increasing the tramfare—of a tram service which is still under a British company. Simply for asking persons not to go by tram or to boycott the tram or not to pay the enhanced tramfare they are taken into custody and they are still kept in prison.

Everywhere this is the situation. Only three or four days back there

was firing in Kolhapur. And the incidents in Bihar have enlightened people throughout India as to how vindictive this Government is. The government party is making the charge that there was violence and that there was destruction of public property. But the government spokesmen and the Congress Members are not asking the Government what they were doing when the people were starving and eating leaves, when they were eating the jute leaves. They were not getting even one meal a day. And if these hungry people march and demonstrate and ask for food, the police charges them with bayonets and bullets. This is the situation that is prevailing now.

So, whatever may be the fate of this no-confidence motion, I am certain that millions of people outside this Parliament have expressed their no-confidence in this Government. Even yesterday, thousands of teachers who came from all over the country demonstrated before the Parliament. And what was their demand? They are asking the Government for a long time to fix a national minimum pay scale throughout the country. But the Government is paying no heed to their requests, and that is why they are coming and doing *dharna* and demonstrating here that their demands are not being fulfilled. So, Sir, if this is the condition and if this path is chosen by the secondary school teachers, what the people in other spheres of life will do?

So, the Congress Members may derive solace or get consolation that they have got the majority and that they can defeat this sort of no-confidence motion. But if they go back to their constituencies, if the Bihar Members go back to their constituency, they will see, if they have got their eyes open, what is the pitiable condition that is faced by the people, and how furious the people are against the Government. The condition is more or less the same in every part of the country.

Some time back Shri Khadilkar mentioned that food is a very sensitive thing. Where it is a matter of food,

man does not care even the bullet. And that has been proved. Not this time, but even in the past, many millions of people faced anything for food. And what is the situation on the food front? Enough has been discussed here, and so I do not want to go into detail. But in our State where there is rationing, in the City of Calcutta and its suburbs, in the rural areas, rice is selling from Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 per Kg. And at what time is it sold at this price? It has come out in a weekly paper, *Blitz*, as to what is the condition now and how impossible it is for the people to manage. A Rural Household Survey, carried out by the National Council of Allied Economic Research has calculated that over 250 million people get a daily income of 68 paise, another 100 million get 42 paise, the income of 30 million is 32 paise per capita, and the last 10 million earn only 27 paise. So, with a daily income of 27 paise how can a man manage his two meals a day? This may please be answered by those who are so vociferously advocating the actions of this Government.

Not only the prices of rice and wheat, the prices of all essential commodities have gone so high that it has become impossible for the common man to purchase even the bare necessities of daily life. I can quote here several statistics, but I have no time. But from only one instance it will be established to what extent the condition has deteriorated. As regards mustard oil which is used by the average Bengali family, even a year back we could get it at Rs. 2 to Rs. 2.75 per seer. Now-a-days you cannot get it even if you pay Rs. 5 per Kg. As regards fish, Bengal has forgotten the taste of fish. When we go to the market, even for the little fish that comes, the cost that we have to pay is so much that the average people cannot afford to pay it. And sometimes jokingly the *machhwas*, the fishermen, tell the customer, "you put your finger on the fish and go back to your house, your wife will get the smell from it and she will manage with the smell". That is

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya]

the condition. Not only oil and fish but everything has now become beyond the reach of the average people. The ruling party like an ostrich may put their head inside the sand and say that everything is all right, they might say *sub jhoota hai*, our Government is running well, but the reality is not so. The reality is that even after 18 years of independence, even after completion of nearly three Plans, even after spending nearly Rs. 2000 crores, near famine condition is now prevailing throughout the country. Not only in Bengal, not only in Bihar, not only in Maharashtra, everywhere, even in the surplus States like Andhra Pradesh, there is scarcity of food, there is rise in the prices. This thing is going on.

How long will the people tolerate this thing? They are bound to come on the street and agitate. If the Government thinks that they can curb or suppress this agitation by bullets, lathis and by police repression I think, as it is impossible to build a castle in the air, it is impossible to crush this democratic movement throughout the country simply by repression and DIR. Therefore, the Government must try to understand and remedy the situation that is prevailing the country (*Interruption*).

Why are they hesitating to take action against the culprits who are hoarding foodgrains and other essential commodities? It has been mentioned by some respectable Congress leaders that the farmers are hoarding. From my practical experience I can say that even 5 per cent of the farmers do not have the foodgrain to hoard. Where is all the food going? All this food is going into the godowns of the hoarders and profiteers. These profiteers and hoarders are earning a lot of black money. They again invest that black money to loot the people. This Government has no guts to touch these anti-social elements. How can they? These people are the main base of the Congress. They

supply funds during the elections. The Congress Party collect money from these hoarders, black-marketeers and speculators. How can they take action against these people? Therefore, Sir, we have no confidence on this Government. This Government will never be able to solve this food problem or any problem that we may have.

Take the case of the working people. What is happening? Our production has increased. Productivity has increased. But the real wages of the workers have gone down. It is not that I am saying this, even the Government spokesman, the Labour Minister himself, has said that the real wage of the workers has not increased. I say it is still below the pre-independence level. Some cash money has come to the pockets of the white-collar workers, but even in respect of the government employees I may say that the money that they are getting is not equivalent to 87 per cent of the value that they would get in pre-independence days. Like this I can give many figures. On the other side, if we take the profit figure it is soaring high. The amount of profit earned by monopolists and big industrialists is going higher and higher every day. Therefore, the position is that when production has increased, when productivity has increased and the Government boasts of increase in production, the conditions of the workers are getting worse day by day.

Sir, 40 per cent of the total number of industrial workers are getting their D. A. linked up with the cost of living index figures and the rest 60 per cent are not getting even that. Even those who are getting their D. A. linked up with the cost of living index figures are being cheated by the fraudulent methods of compilation of the cost of living index. Now, when there is constant rise in prices in West Bengal, the D.A. of the engineering and textile workers was cut to the tune of Rs. 5.20 to Rs. 5.40.

For the last three months the jute workers there are getting less D. A., because of the faulty compilation, to the tune of Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 per month. The workers are wondering as to under which rule they are living, whether they are living under Mohamed Tuglak's rule or under the Congress rule.

The price of every commodity is becoming beyond the reach of the common man. But the D.A. of the workers is cut. Who is responsible for it? When we raised this question here the hon. Minister replied that it is for the Government of West Bengal. The Government of West Bengal says that they are not responsible for these faulty calculations, the Central Government is supplying these figures and they are giving the D. A. based on those calculations. I put a question to the Minister here only yesterday. I asked whether the Government of West Bengal had requested the Central Government to set up an expert committee to go into the details of these faulty compilation of cost of living index figures. The reply was that it is not for the Central Government to set up a Committee and that the West Bengal Government if it so desires can set up a committee.

Sir, where will the workers go? The tea plantation workers have taken a decision to go on strike. The Government will say that they are *Cheen-walas* or agents of Pakisan or China. Do you know that the INTUC have also given notice of this strike? It is not only the AITUC that has done it. Why? The Minimum Wage Committee gave a decision which is statutorily binding on he employers, but the employers are not abiding by it. Days after days were taken by the employers are the Government machinery for conciliation but no decision could be reached. What are the workers to do? They have to see that they get their demands. They are are not getting their legal claims by constitutional methods. What is the way out other than going on strike. Therefore, the Government and the Congress Party should think over

the situation. The situation is not so simple that simply by taking the opportunity of their being in power and suppressing the people's movement by repressive measures they can escape the consequences of the situation. The people will not tolerate it any longer. They are not tolerating it even now. From Bihar, Kolhapur and other places the Government must learn a lesson.

Now, take DIR. What a preposterous instrument of oppression. A news item has appeared today in *Patriot* and other papers that *sandesh* in West Bengal has been banned under the DIR. *Sandesh* is a traditional sweet of Calcutta and now it has come under the DIR so that there will be no shortage of milk by diversion for preparation of *sandesh*. Is it because family planning is applied to cows also and for that source of supply of milk has become so scarce? Now the West Bengal people have got to stop eating *sandesh* because of the mad policies of the government.

Take, again, the reasons given for detaining the Left Communists. I say that this Government has not given a single reason, not adduced a single evidence in justification of the detention of these people. It is said that Shri Gopalan is a left Communist and he has soft feelings towards China. Then why is Dr. Lohia put in prison in Bihar? Is it not for supporting the demands of the Bihar people for food or lesser tuition fees for Bihar students?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): What about the secret meeting?

Shri Dinan Bhattacharyya: I say it is a false and blatant lie. An hon. Member during the course of his speech yesterday referred to secret circulars. I challenge the government and that particular hon. Member to come out and publish that document. Then people can judge who is right and who is wrong.

Then, Government are not prepared to face the courts in these cases. They act in a shameless manner. They

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya]

blame us for bringing in the no-confidence motion at this critical juncture when Pakistan army is invading Kashmir. But the Government have no respect for its own courts and their decisions. Recently, petitions were filed by four detenus in the Allahabad High Court, challenging their orders of detention. Even before the petitions were heard by the Court, they were released by Government. Why? Why did the Government party come out with an affidavit that they are going to release them so that the petitions will become infructuous? That is a trick of the Government. I appeal to the Congress Members to condemn this action of the Government if they have got any respect for the court of law. In the case, when the detenus were released by the UP Government because of the fear of the court ordering them to release those people, Nanda's henchmen were waiting outside with fresh warrants for their detention. When the UP Government could not satisfy the Allahabad High Court about the justification for the detention and release them because they are afraid of the Allahabad High Court coming to the conclusion that the detention was *mala fide*, how could a fresh order be served by the Central Government for the detention of the very same people? It amounts to doing things in a round about way to avoid strictures from courts of law. The explanation given by Government is also fantastic.

I could also cite many examples where old and ailing men have been kept in jail under DIR. Janab Musafir Ahmad, who has dedicated his whole life for the cause of the poor and down-trodden, he is inside Dum Dum jail. The poor Shri Parulekar was not given any treatment before his death and the Home Minister came out with a statement stating what his wife Shrimati Godavari Parulekar said with regard to his treatment. I know in what circumstances that poor lady who is still in detention had to give

such a statement. Otherwise, she would not have had an opportunity even to get back the dead body of her husband, Parulekar, who was a member of this House. So, under threat such a statement was issued by Shrimati Godavari Parulekar, wife of Shri S. S. Parulekar. Long detention and lack of medical treatment was the cause of death of Parulekar.

My voice may be feeble and the no-confidence motion may not get majority vote, but I have seen during my visits to various parts of the country that all sections of the people have lost their confidence in this Government. When this Government appeals for national unity for the defence of the country, for the defence of our borders, nobody grudges it. But how can it be done when this Government cannot guarantee two square meals a day for the poor man, when the Government cannot guarantee a need-based national minimum wage for the worker, when the Government cannot guarantee the minimum civil liberties to the common citizens? Now the citizens do not know when they will be arrested and for what. This state of affairs cannot last long and so the sooner this Government goes the better it will be for the country and its people.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जो भाषण हुए हैं, उन को सुनती रही हूँ। मैं ने उन बातों को सुना जिन का उत्तर इस संसद में कल से दिया जा रहा है और कल से ही नहीं बल्कि बराबर इस संसद में दिया गया है। माननीय सदस्य अगर यह समझते हैं कि वे अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव इस लिये इस संसद में ला सकते हैं कि डी० आई० आर० के अन्दर वामपथी कम्युनिस्टों को पकड़ कर बन्द किया गया है, उनको बन्द किया गया है जोकि इस देश में उपद्रव और विद्रोह मचाने की तैयारी करते रहे हैं और आगे भी जब कभी मौका मिलेगा, करेंगे और इसके बारे में संसद और

यह देश उन का साथ देगा तो मेरे ख्याल में वे सपने देख रहे हैं, जागे हुए नहीं, सो रहे हैं।

इसी संसद में जब इस मामले पर बहस हुई थी तब सभी दलों ने, सभी पार्टियों ने, संसद के सभी सदस्यों ने एक मत हो कर सरकार के इस फैसले का समर्थन किया था दो चार जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के मੈम्बर यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं सिर्फ उनके मुंह से यह बात नहीं निकली थी जो संसद के अन्य सभी सदस्यों के मुंह से निकली थी कि डी० आई० आर० के अन्दर अगर ऐसे विद्रोहियों को या विद्रोह मचाने वालों को साजिश और योजना करने के अपराध में पकड़ा गया है तो यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। इस लिए मैं नहीं समझती हूं कि जो युक्ति इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव के लिए दी जाती है, यह कोई बहुत अच्छी युक्ति है।

मैं उन बातों को दोहराना नहीं चाहती हूं जो बातें यहां कही गई हैं और जिन बातों की चर्चा गृह मंत्री महोदय ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में की थी। मैं समझती हूं कि रिपोर्ट में वे घटनायें नहीं हैं जो होनी चाहियें थीं। परन्तु यह आभास अवश्य मिलता है रिपोर्ट के पन्नों को देखने से कि जो कुछ भी वे योजना कर रहे थे या करने वाले थे उसका अंजाम बहुत भयंकर होने वाला है।

15 hrs.

कानून की ये सिफारिश करते हैं। किस से ये कानून की सिफारिश करते हैं? जो कानून में खुद विश्वास नहीं करते हैं, जो कानून के शिकंजे से अपने को बचा कर रखने के लिए अन्दर जा कर बन्द कमरों में साजिशें किया करते हैं उन्हें जब मौका मिलता है, कानून की चादर में अपने को ढक लेने का तो फिर कानून की चादर की तलाश करते हैं, काश कानून ऐसा होता कि इनके बन्द अंधेरे कमरों में जो योजना होती है, उन तक कानून पहुंच पाता। अगर कानून के पंजे वहां तक पहुंच पाते तो हमें डी० आई० आर० में

इन्हें पकड़ने की जरूरत न पड़ती और कानूनी ढंग से बड़े पैमाने से इनका वन्दोबस्त किया जा सकता था। परन्तु जिस तरह के कानूनों में ये विश्वास करते हैं, उस तरह के कानूनों में हम विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। दुनिया में ऐसे कानून हैं जो कि खलेआम जनता के बीच चौराहे में ऐसे लोगों को पकड़ कर जनता के हवाले कर देते हैं लेकिन उन कानूनों का हम इस्तेमाल नहीं करते हैं चूंकि हम प्रजातांत्रिक पद्धति में अपने उसूलों को बांध चुके हैं। हम प्रजातांत्रिक पद्धति में विश्वास करते हैं। इसलिए हम से यह आशा न करें कि हम उन कोठारियों में होने वाले काले कारनामों को कानून की शरियत में लायेंगे और बेकाम कर देंगे। चूंकि मासूम कानून उन की उन बातों तक नहीं पहुंच पाता, चूंकि उस के हाथ उन की करतूतों तक नहीं पहुंच पाते हैं, जब इस लिये मैं उन को उस की शरण में जाते देखती हूं तो मुझे हंसी आती है। कानून न कभी उन्होंने माना है और न कानून उन को वह हक देगा कि जिस के अन्दर वह कमरे में बैठकर इस मुल्क की सरकार के खिलाफ साजिश करें, एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कुचक्र के फेर में पड़ कर अपनी कुछ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय साजिशों को कामयाब बनाने के लिये। यह नहीं बात हमारे सामने नहीं आई है। माओ त्से तुंग के उस वक्तव्य को हमने भी पढ़ा है, हमने भी यह देखा है कि मुल्क के ऊपर चढ़ाई करो, उस के बाद जब मौका मिले तो थोड़ा पीछे हट जाओ, आगे मत बढ़ो, परन्तु इस के साथ साथ इस बात का तरफ तवज्जह रखो और काफी ध्यान रखो कि मुल्क में अराजकता फैलाओ जिस पर तुमने चढ़ाई की है, मुल्क में विद्रोह को जगाओ, विद्रोह की आग लगाओ, जब वह मुल्क टूट कर टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जाये तो उस पर मुल्क पर अपनी चादर फैला दो तानाशाही की और शह-शाही की। हम इन बातों को अच्छी तरह जान चुके हैं, हर पहलू को समझ चुके हैं। हम देश को दूसरा कम्बोडिया और कोरिया नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं, हम देश को दूसरा

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

वियटनाम नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं। मैं चाहूंगी कि उन लोगों को इस बात का मौका न दिया जाय कि वह इस बात को साजिशें करें कि हिन्दुस्तान को दूसरे वियटनाम में बदल दिया जाये। जो कुछ वहां पर हो रहा है उसका उन को कोई दर्द नहीं है। ऊपर से कहते जरूर हैं कि दर्द है उन को मामूम बच्चों और विधवाओं का। लेकिन दर्द कहाँ है उन लोगों के लिये जो कि वियटनाम में मारे जा रहे हैं, चाहे गलती किसी की भी हो। इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है कि जिस देश के कुचक्र से वियटनाम की दुर्दशा हुई है, हम उस कुचक्र को इन लोगों की मार्फत हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं फैलने देंगे।

जो कुछ मसानी साहब ने कहा उस के बारे में मुझ से पूर्व वक्ता ने काफी समय व्यतीत किया कल भी उस के बारे में काफी उत्तर दिया जा चुका है, उस के बारे में मैं अधिक नहीं कहना चाहती थी, लेकिन मैंने सोचा कि कुछ जरूर मसानी साहब की बातों का जवाब दूं। मसानी साहब अपनी जबान को बहुत रेशमी बनाकर बोलते हैं। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि रेशमी जबान के तानों बानों में वह जो बात कहते हैं कभी कभी उस में लाख रुपये की बात कह जाते हैं। जबान उन्होंने लाख रुपये की पाई है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है, परन्तु अफसोस कि मसानी साहब को उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करना आया। ऐसी अच्छी जबान पाकर प्रेक्षक का कुछ भला होना चाहिये था। इन हाथों से मुल्क का कुछ भला होना चाहिये था, लेकिन मसानी साहब जैसे सदस्य से—जिन के बारे में मुझे काफी श्रद्धा है उन के विचारों और वक्तव्यों के बारे में नहीं परन्तु उन की तबज्जह के बारे में कि वह काफी तकलीफ उठाकर काफी मेहनत करके अपनी बातों को रखते हैं—मुझ को यह उम्मीद नहीं थी कि आज के इस मौके पर यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लायेंगे। मसानी साहब

पार्लियामेंट के एक माने हुए सदस्य हैं, मसानी साहब उन सदस्यों में से हैं जो पार्लियामेंट के इस मंच पर बैठ कर आगे आने वाली संसद के लिये कानून बनाते हैं, जो आगे आने वाली संसद के लिये संस्कार बनाते हैं। आगे आने वाली संसद के इतिहास में वह पन्ने लिखे जायेंगे जिन से आगे जो संसद बैठेगी वह इन प्रस्तावों के आधार पर, इन उम्मीदों के आधार पर इन संस्कारों के आधार पर चलेगी और उन पर अपना काम कर सकेगी। वही मसानी साहब आज के दिन अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाये हैं संसद के सामने। क्या कहना है।

क्या कश्मीर की सीमा पर, कच्छ की सीमा पर, बंगाल की सीमा पर, जो सीमा समुद्र से आकर टकराती है उस को छोड़ कर, ऐसी भी कोई सीमा है हिन्दुस्तान की जहां आज ऐसे बादल नहीं छा रहे हैं जो कि हमारे लिये बहुत बुरे बादल हैं। ऐसी अवस्था में जब मसानी साहब खुद बाहर जाकर बड़े लम्बे लम्बे भाषण देते हैं और सेना को चुनौती दिया करते हैं कि हमें इस देश की मिल कर रक्षा करनी है, मिल कर सारी समस्याओं का मुकाबला करना है, तब वह यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाते हैं संसद में। और यह जानते हुए, वह खुद कहते हैं अपने भाषण के शुरु शुरु में, कि उनको मालूम है कि यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पास नहीं होगा, वह इसे लाते हैं। जब वह पास नहीं होगा तब आप इस प्रस्ताव को लाये क्यों? क्या अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव कोई खिलौना है, कोई मोम का पुतला है। आखिर उस की कोई अहमियत होती है। यह ठीक है कि आज कांग्रेस का बहुमत है। परन्तु बहुमत होते हुए अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का जो महत्व होता है वह कम नहीं हो जाता। मैं तो कहती हूं कि अविश्वास प्रस्ताव जो होता है उसका बड़ा महत्व होता है पार्लियामेंट के इतिहास में। यहां ही नहीं हर जगह की

पार्लियामेंट की इतिहास में महत्व होता है अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का। अगर संसद में अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाया जाये तो देश की जनता की धड़कनों को लेकर आना चाहिये।

अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव जनता भी किया करती है, लेकिन जनता अपने तरीके से करती है और आप को मालूम है कि वह कैसे करती है। अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव जनता किया करती है मत दे कर के सरकार की विरोधी पार्टियों को। लेकिन जब इस अधिवेशन में नो कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन सदन में आने वाला था तब तीन नये सदस्य संसद में आये और तीनों कांग्रेस की ओर के आये। विरोधी दल को यह सौभाग्य नहीं प्राप्त हुआ कि उन की तरफ से कोई सदस्य आ कर यहां पर शपथ ग्रहण करता। यह है जनता का विश्वास जो उस ने कांग्रेस को दिया है।

यह मैं नहीं कहती कि कांग्रेस ने कोई गलती नहीं की, उसने जो कुछ किया है अच्छा ही किया है, उस में कोई कमी नहीं है। अगर कोई ऐसा कहने की हिमाकत करता है तो वह मनुष्य नहीं है, देवता है, वह पृथ्वी का नहीं है स्वर्ग का है। पर कांग्रेस जो भी गलतियां करती है उन से फायदा उठाने की कोशिश करती है, वह सोचती है कि दूसरी बार वह गलती न हो। अपनी गलतियों से हम सीखते हैं, लेकिन दूसरे कोशिश नहीं करते सीखने की। जो भी गलतियां कांग्रेस ने की हैं, मैं उन की वकालत नहीं करती। बहुत सी गलतियां हुई हैं जिन को विरोधी पार्टियां बतलाती हैं। अगर अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव न आया होता और इस तरह की बातें कही जाती तो हम भी कहते कि कई बात सही कही गई हैं। लेकिन अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के नीचे वह चाहते हैं कि सरकार को गिरा दें, तो जनता कहती है कि नहीं, वह गलती नहीं कर रही है क्योंकि जनता उस सरकार को चाहती है जिसके आप चिथड़े करने की बात करते हैं, और उस के ख़ाब देखते हैं। जनता उसी सरकार को मत दे कर संसद में

लाती है, और उस का जीता जागता नमूना वह तीन सदस्य हैं जिन्होंने संसद में आकर शपथ ग्रहण की है, ऐसे समय में भी जब कि खाद्य समस्या विकट है, जब कि सीमा पर हमारे मामले काफी उलझ गये हैं। ऐसे समय में जनता उन लोगों को बाई एलेक्शनन्स में मत देती है। अगर हम कभी हार भी जाते हैं बाई एलेक्शन में तो जितनी तबज़्जह हम देते हैं कि हम क्यों हारे उतनी शायद विरोधी पार्टियां नहीं देती।

जो अविश्वास प्रस्ताव श्री मसानी लाये हैं वह बहुत मौजू नहीं है। अच्छा होता कि श्री मसानी कोई प्रस्ताव खाद्य के सम्बन्ध में लाते, मंहगाई के बारे में लाते। तब शायद इधर के बहुत से सदस्य उन का साथ देते कि हां यह समस्याएँ हैं परन्तु इन समस्याओं का जो समाधान वह सरकार को हटा कर करना चाहते हैं वह ठीक समाधान नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि विरोधी पार्टियों ने कौन सा मैनिफेस्टो निकाला है जिस की बुनियाद में जा कर हम कह सकें कि वह समस्या का समाधान हो सकता है। आज विरोधी पार्टी वाले मंहगाई की बात करते हैं। मैं स्वतंत्र पार्टी के मेम्बरों से जानना चाहती हूँ कि उन की तरफ से ऐसा कौन सा मजमून निकला जो रास्ता दिखा सका हो कि मंहगाई को खत्म करने का यह साधन है, और चूँकि सरकार उन को नहीं अपना रही है इसलिये वह सरकार को हटाना चाहते हैं। आज स्वतंत्र पार्टी के लोग बहुत सी चीजों को हटाना चाहते हैं। वह कहते हैं कि कंट्रोल खत्म कर दो। कंट्रोल कैसे खत्म कर दो और क्यों खत्म कर दो। आज श्री मसानी साहब यह नहीं कहते कि हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति का ढांचा कैसा हो। श्री मसानी साहब एक पुस्तक को अपनी बाइबिल समझते हैं जिस को उन्होंने पढ़ कर सुनाया। मैं समझती थी कि श्री मसानी में इन्स्टिट्यूट आफ़ एकॉनॉमिक ऐंड साइंटिफिक रिसर्च एसोसिएशन से कुछ ज्यादा

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

अकलमन्दी होगी, उन में सोचने समझने का मादा। कुछ होगा। मैं इस तरह की पुस्तकों को बहुत ज्यादा महत्व नहीं देती। ऐसी पुस्तकें बहुत ज्यादा निकला करती हैं। वह क्यों निकला करती हैं, कैसे निकला करती हैं यह भी बहुत अच्छी तरह समझती हूं। मसानी साहब ने उन में दी हुई बातों की तरफ ज्यादा तवज्जह दी है, पर अगर वह अपने दिमाग से, अपनी बुद्धि से उन बातों को सोचते तो मैं समझती हूं कि वह ऐसी गलतियां न करते जो उन्होंने अपने भाषण में की हैं। मसानी साहब ने उस पुस्तक को अपनी बाइबिल समझ कर उस के एक एक लाइन को, एक एक लफ्ज को यहां पर रखा। जब मैंने उस पुस्तक को पढ़ा तो मैंने सोचा कि कहीं श्री मसानी की स्पीच को ही तो नहीं पढ़ रही हूं। मुझे उन की कही हुई सारी बातें उस पुस्तक में मिल गई जो कि उन्होंने उस किताब में से निकाल कर रखी हैं। एक छोटा सा समुदाय है जो कि इस तरह की रिमर्च किया करता है। श्री मसानी साहब ने कोई बड़ा रास्ता मुल्क के सामने नहीं रखा जिस से मुल्क को आगे बढ़ने में मदद मिलती। विरोधी पार्टियों ने कोई ऐसी बात समझाने की बात नहीं की कौन सा रास्ता हम अख्तियार करें, कोई अहमियत का सुझाव देने की कोशिश नहीं की जिन से हम अपने मसलों और समस्याओं का समाधान कर लें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह कहते हैं कि हम प्रजातांत्रिक पद्धति को मानते हैं। मैं उन से जानना चाहती हूं कि आज एशिया में और मध्य एशिया में ऐसे कौन से देश हैं जो हमारी तरह की प्रजातांत्रिक पद्धति के उमूलों पर चलते हुए अपने आर्थिक विकास को हमारी तरह कामयाबी से चला रहे हैं। मैं इसके बारे में चेलेंज देना चाहती हूं कि ऐसा कहीं नहीं हो रहा है।

वह डिमाक्रेसी की बात करते हैं। मुझे मालूम है कि आज दुनिया में कई तरह का

प्रजातंत्र चल रहा है, जैसे गाइडेड डिमाक्रेसी मिलिटरी डिमाक्रेसी, बेसिक डिमाक्रेसी। प्रजातंत्र की ये पद्धतियां आज बहुत से मुल्कों में चल रही हैं और शायद उनका आर्थिक विकास हम से अधिक महत्वपूर्ण मालूम होगा। लेकिन जिस तरह से उन देशों में प्रजातंत्र चल रहा है, क्या उसी तरह मसानी साहब भी इस देश में चलाना पसन्द करेंगे? एक तरफ तो वे व्यक्ति की स्वतंत्रता की बात करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं कि जो स्वतंत्र हो कर चल रहा है, उसको इतनी जल्दी चलाओ जिससे कि वह रास्ते में थक कर बैठ जाए।

मैं भी दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों के इतिहास के बारे में जानती हूं। मैं भी अर्थ शास्त्र की एक छोटी सी विद्यार्थी हूं। मैं इस बात का दावा करती हूं कि आज दुनिया में जितने मुल्क, जिनको ग्रैंडर डेवलपड कहा जाता है, वह कोई हमारी पद्धति को ले कर के अपनी उन्नति नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैं यह भी जानती हूं कि दूसरे मुल्कों में क्या हो रहा है। हम आज छोटे छोटे मुल्कों को ले कर उनसे इस देश का मुकाबला करते हैं, जैसे मलाया में, सिंगापुर में, कम्बोडिया में, सीलोन में, घाना में, या ईजिप्ट में। उन देशों में जो अन्न की पैदावार होती है उसका मुकाबला इस देश से किया जाता है। हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा है, उसकी बहुत बड़ी और बढ़ती हुई आबादी है। इसका मुकाबला उन छोटे देशों से नहीं किया जा सकता।

जिस दिन हमने इस देश में प्रजातंत्र की बुनियाद रखी थी, उसी दिन हमें मालूम था कि देश में अन्न की कमी है और यह कमी बनी रहेगी। यह ठीक है कि ऐसे छोटे देशों जैसे घाना, ईजिप्ट, कम्बोडिया, और लाओस में अन्न की कमी नहीं है। आपको मालूम होना चाहिए कि ये पिछड़े हुए देश भी अन्न के मामले में हम से पिछड़े हुए नहीं हैं। वे इतना

अन्न पैदा करते हैं कि उसे बाहर के देशों को भी निर्यात कर सकते हैं। हमारी यह बद-किस्मती है कि हमारी जनसंख्या इतनी घनी रहते हुए भी उत्पादन कम है। हमको इस समस्या को हल करना है। हम इसको डी० आई० आर० के मातहत नहीं हल कर सकते। हम स्वतंत्र प्रजातांत्रिक पद्धति के अनुसार अपने उसूलों पर चलते हुए इन समस्याओं को हल करना चाहते हैं, यह हमारे लिए कोई शर्म की बात नहीं होनी चाहिए बल्कि गौरव और गर्व की बात होनी चाहिए।

मसानी साहब जान लुई को प्रायः कोट किया करते हैं। वह अर्थशास्त्र के बहुत बड़े विद्वान हैं। मैं भी उनके कुछ शब्द श्री मसानी के सामने रखना चाहती हूँ, उनको वह ध्यान से सुनें। उन्होंने कहा है :

"Economic growth is not all honey and milk, or more accurately, the honey and milk come only after the sweat and tears have been shed."

हमने तो अब अपना खून और पसीना बहाना शुरू किया है। हमें तो आजादी बड़ी आगानी से मिल गयी। उन मुल्कों की तरफ तबज्जह कीजिए जिन को आज तक आजादी हासिल नहीं हुई और जो लड़ते लड़ते थक गए हैं। आप अल्जीरिया की तरफ तबज्जह कीजिए। उसके मुकाबले में हमारा देश कितना खुश-किस्मत है कि हम ने इतनी सहूलियत से आजादी हासिल कर ली। आज हम अपना पसीना बहा रहे हैं। आज हमको मौका मिला है अपनी देश की समस्याओं को हल करने का। लेकिन जो लोग हिन्दुस्तान के भविष्य को बनाना चाहते हैं, जो हिन्दुस्तान के भविष्य को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहते हैं, जो इस सरकार को हटा कर हिन्दुस्तान के भविष्य की बागडोर अपने हाथ में लेना चाहते हैं, जो आज इस सरकार को हटाने के लिए अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाए हैं, उनके मुंह से हम यह बात सुनते हैं समस्याओं से हम ए है। आज समस्याओं के कारण उनके

माथे पर बल दिखायी देते हैं। और फिर भी वे आज इस देश की बागडोर को संभालने की तमन्ना रखते हैं। इस देश की बागडोर को वही संस्था संभाल सकती है जो मुश्किलों के भंवरों में खड़े रहने की शक्ति रखती हो, और आज यह सरकार मुश्किलों के भंवरों में घिरी हुई खड़ी है, और हम जानते हैं कि किस तरह खड़ी है।

उन्होंने कहा कि चीजों के दाम बढ़ गए हैं। लेकिन मेरे पास भी कुछ आंकड़े हैं जो कि मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहती हूँ। उनको यह भी बताना चाहिए था कि कुछ चीजों के, जिनकी देश को जरूरत है, दाम घटे भी हैं। क्या देश को फरटीलाइजर की जरूरत नहीं है, क्या देश को चमड़े के सामान जैसे जूतों की जरूरत नहीं है, क्या देश को कागज की जरूरत नहीं है। इस तरह की कई चीजों के दाम कम हुए हैं। इन्साफ की बात तो यह होती कि वह यह कहते कि खाद्यान्नों की कीमत बढ़ी है, उनकी कमी हो गयी है, पर साथ साथ इन चीजों की कीमतें घटी हैं। कागज की कीमत घटी है, न्यूजप्रेट की घटी है, चमड़े के सामान की कीमत घटी है, फरटीलाइजर की कीमत घटी है। इन चीजों की दर में कमी हुई है। कपड़े में भी बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ोतरी नहीं हुई है। तो ये आंकड़े मैं कीमतों की रूप रेखा के बारे में आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूँ।

दूसरी चीज जिस की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूँ वह यह है कि यहाँ बार बार यह कहा गया है कि कारखानों में मैन्युफैक्चर होने वाली चीजें हैं उनके दाम बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ रहे हैं और खाद्यान्नों की कीमत उतनी नहीं बढ़ी है। सन् 1962-63 में खाद्यान्नों की कीमत में 11 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई, और कपड़े की कीमत में 14 प्रतिशत वृद्धि हुई, और उसी के साथ साथ जो कल कारखानों में उत्पादित वस्तुएँ हैं उनकी कीमत में 30 से ले कर 38 प्रतिशत तक बढ़ोतरी हुई। उस वक्त हमारे मसानी

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

साहब की आवाज क्यों नहीं निकली ? हम ने उस समय कहा था कि गांवों के उत्पादन में और शहरी उत्पादन में संतुलन कायम होना चाहिए और अगर उन में संतुलन कायम नहीं होगा तो देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था संतुलित रूप से नहीं चल सकती। उस समय मसानी साहब के मुंह से आवाज नहीं निकली। आज जो कल कारखानों की चीजों की कीमत 38 प्रतिशत बढ़ गयी है उसको कुछ हद तक संतुलित करने के लिए....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member asked for two more minutes, but has already taken eight minutes more.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : मैं आंकड़े दे रही हूँ। सरकार की तरफ से जो आंकड़े निकालेंगे उनके बारे में तो वह कहते हैं कि हम उनको मानते नहीं, इसलिए मेरे पास जो आंकड़े हैं उनको मैं दे देना चाहती हूँ। अगर आज रूरल इकानमी में बढ़ोतरी हुई है और उसका मुनाफा अगर आज गांवों में गया है, तो उसके लिए उनको ऐतराज नहीं करना चाहिए।

हम चाहते हैं कि कारखानों के उत्पादन में और खेतों के उत्पादन में दोनों में, संतुलन कायम हो। अगर एक की कीमतें बढ़ेंगी और दूसरे में बढ़ोतरी नहीं होती तो आर्थिक संतुलन कायम नहीं हो सकता।

अब सरकार को सोचना होगा कि किस तरह इन चीजों की तरफ तबज्जह दे कि कीमतें बढ़ना बन्द हो। मेरा इसके बारे में एक सुझाव है। इस समय कृषि मंत्री यहाँ उपस्थित हैं। मैं उन से अपील करती हूँ कि जिस प्रकार आप पी० एल० 480 के मातहत अनाज बाहर से मंगाने हैं उसी तरह फरटी-लाइजर मंगाने का भी कुछ उपाय करना चाहिए। हमको फरटीलाइजर की जरूरत है, आपने शायद उसके लिए वित्त

विभाग से 800 या 1000 करोड़ का फारिन एक्सचेंज मांगा है। मेरी इस सम्बन्ध में आप से अपील है कि जो देश हमको मदद करना चाहते हैं जैसे अमरीका है या जापान है, उनसे आप कहें कि कोई दूसरा एग्रीमेंट वह करे जिस के मातहत हमको फरटीलाइजर रूपी पेमेंट से मिल सके।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has to close now.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : दूसरा सुझाव मैं आपके सामने यह रखना चाहती हूँ कि जिस प्रकार रुपए पैसे के मामले में एक कन्सार्टियम खोला गया है, उसी तरह पिछड़े देशों को फरटालाइजर और पैस्टी-साइड देने के लिए एक इंटरनेशनल कन्सार्टियम बनाया जाना चाहिए।

यह ही मेरे दो सुझाव हैं। इन को आपके सामने रख कर मैं आज्ञा चाहती हूँ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is, I think, unjust of you to call me after such an eloquent, intelligent and instructive speech of my sister. I cannot compete with her in all these qualities. I am very unhappy that I have to associate myself with this motion of no-confidence. It is because the old members in the Cabinet have been my colleagues and co-workers for more than thirty years, and as the poet says, "to be wrath with one's friends works like madness on the brain." Another difficulty which makes me unhappy is that this Government of ours is harassed by so many problems that it does not know what to do. To put greater burden upon a harassed Government is not chivalrous.

There is yet another aspect which makes me unhappy. I know that there are in the Congress conscientious people and they deplore the condition in which we find ourselves, economic, political, social, international and

national, and they talk of it in the Lobbies, and in the Central Hall and elsewhere, frankly saying that they are frustrated and they do not see any hope. There are others who put on a bold face and who are politicians believing in expediency. When we bring a no-confidence-motion, both these combine. The former themselves believe that what they speak they do not feel. We know what they feel, because in their own meetings, in the party meetings, and in the party executive meetings, from whatever comes out in the press we will find that they are depressed and they are unhappy and that they are not satisfied with the conditions that prevail in the country both internally and internationally. This breeds a kind of hypocrisy which is not good for my friends.

However, I associated myself with this motion because I think,—I may be wrong,—it represents the opinion of the country.

Shri Maurya: It does.

Some hon Member: It does not.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: It represents the opinion of the masses. Go anywhere, in the bazars, in the marketplace, in the club, anywhere where people meet, in the family circles etc. and you will find that the one exclusive topic is the condition of the country and how we are to get out of it. Were it not for that impelling duty as a spokesman of my countrymen whom I represent here, I would not have associated myself with this motion.

There is another point of view also. It is said that these no-confidence-motions have become a hardy annual. This is absolutely wrong. During a period of seventeen years, only in 1963 was the first no-confidence-motion moved, and with the second one, many of us not associate. But this is the time when we feel that some people must raise the voice of the country in this House. I can again assure my

hon. friends in the Congress that it is very painful for me to associate myself with this motion. But I think that it is the call of duty which impels me.

Now, let us look at things internationally and nationally. These are the two aspects from which we can examine the policy of a Government, foreign policy and home policy. In foreign policy, we have always declared that we are non-aligned, but we have said nothing about our strategy and our tactics. Non-alignment does not preclude a manipulation of our strategy and tactics. These we must keep in a mobile condition and we must regulate them according to the circumstances of the time and the place, which we have failed to do, and non-alignment has come to be only, as I said once before in this House, "a mantram" by which everything will be solved. Today, who is not a non-aligned nation? Even China can say that it is not aligned; it has no military pacts with any other country.

Shri Khadilkar: China is a member of the Warsaw Pact.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I know that. I also know that it has repudiated that pact long ago. This is the information that I give to my hon. friend, if he does not know it. Russia and China are fighting with each other, and my hon. friend is talking of the Warsaw Pact. Anyway, China can quite truly claim itself to be non-aligned.

Further, after all, non-alignment is a negative conception. May I point out that Pakistan is aligned with many countries, while we are only non-aligned, and we are aligned with no country?

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): We have no friends.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: We are sufficient unto ourselves, as if any country in modern times, however strong it may be, however big it may be and however well-equipped it may be, can defend itself alone; and this was clear when we were

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

attacked by China. It was then said by the Former Prime Minister and the Defence Minister that to take military aid from any quarter would be to enter the cold war, and yet they entered into the cold war! It was a Congressman who said that the late Prime Minister wrote a letter to Mr. Kennedy that some portion of his fleet should be in the Bay of Bengal, and this the Congressmen repudiated. But what did they do to that member? They sat silent because they perhaps knew that that member was correct and he might come out with something else! This is what is happening. So, it is useless to say that we can stand alone.

If we are non-aligned, then we must also have some restraint upon ourselves. A non-aligned nation does not give its opinion unasked. There are so many countries in South-East Asia; not one of them has given its opinion on what is going on in Viet Nam, except ourselves because we say that we want to establish peace and good-will in the world. But peace and good-will can be established by nations that are strong. Peace and good-will cannot be established by nations that are weak, that are economically weak, that are politically weak, that are socially weak. Peace and good-will cannot be established by people who are starving; they cannot be established by people who go with a begging bowl to every country in the world.

15.29 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

This is not the way to bring about the peace of the world. Only the strong can bring about the peace of the world, and we have seen it. We saw it when there was a stoppage, or at least a partial stoppage, of experiments in nuclear weapons. Who were able to do it? It was Russia and America! Where were we in those days? Our voice does not count. In the international world, the only voice that counts is the voice of strength. If we have no strength, our voice will

not count. Weakness is the greatest sin, not only in individual life but in national life and in international life. The weak can commit any sin; and any amount of nonsense can come out from their mouths; the weak can never be moral. Weakness is the most immoral thing. What did Gandhiji do when he came to India? He found a nation weak. The first thing that he did was to make it strong, the magistracy, strong against the police, strong against the Army, strong against the foreigner, so that every child could stand up and say that 'This is a Satanic Government, and I want to dispense with it'. He brought strength among the people so that they stood up. When a nation is not strong, it cannot stand up and face things.

Take the question of Kashmir. My hon. friend, Shri Dwivedy, dwelt upon it. I do not want to expatiate upon it. For 17 years, the bulk of our army has been in Kashmir, and 15 days before knowledge of this infiltration came into our possession, what did our great Defence Minister say? He said that we are very strong in Kashmir and we will allow nobody to enter there. And he challenged Pakistanis. Not only did he challenge them, but several times he challenged both China and Pakistan, saying, 'Let them come together and we will face them'. Now he cannot face the infiltrators!

I do not want to go into details, about our foreign policy. I want to come to the home policy. The home policy is woven round our periodic five year plans. What were the objects of the Third Five Year Plan? The first was a rise in national income by 6 per cent. Upto 1963, for which statistics of the Government are available, the rise has been about 2½ per cent.

Shri M. R. Masani: That is right.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: This is the rise in the national income. The

second was self-sufficiency in food. Not only self-sufficiency, but the late Prime Minister said that we should have excess to export. To export! You can read the Third Five Year Plan. Now there is not only no export, but there is not sufficient to eat here, and year after year we have to send for more food, adulterated food, damaged food, from foreign countries. And yet we cannot fill our belly. Some people in the constituency of our Prime Minister—as one of his officers said—are taking one meal a day. I tell you from my experience that that is an exaggeration. They are not having even one meal a day.

The Food Minister has admitted that 17 per cent of our food is destroyed away by rats and bad storage and our deficiency is only 5 per cent. Can they not tackle rats? They, who are going to tackle China and Pakistan. They cannot even have storage that can be proof against insects.

Then they tell us that it is not the question of food, but the population has been increasing. In the same breath, they say that there has been an increase of 45 per cent in food production. I submit very humbly that our population has not increased at that rate. These are their statistics. Shri Masani did not bring statistics from his house or from his office. He has no such bureau. What he quoted are official figures. These are there to belie the claims of this Government.

The aims of the Plan were that there was to be increase of steel, fuel, power, machine building capacity and cement production. In all these, the Third Five Year Plan has failed. There are shortfalls, 15 per cent, 20 per cent; in housing, it is 75 per cent shortfall.

Another thing that was targeted was: full utilisation of idle capacity, of manpower in the nation. What has been the result up till 1963? Instead of 17.70 million unemployed,

we had 25 million unemployed. These are not our figures. These are official figures.

Then they talked about reduction in inequalities. Anybody going about in the country can see whether there has been any decrease in inequalities. Inequalities in power, inequalities in education, inequalities in income, inequalities in getting the essentials of life, everywhere there is inequality. This has become a more aristocratic society than it was during the foreign rule.

Why has this happened? Because, there are structural deficiencies in our five year plans. The rural needs of the people are neglected. There is no public enthusiasm in the country for these plans because the common people do not understand them. The investment pattern is strange. While things that can be produced quickly and rapidly get very little capital, capital is locked up in what are called the capital industries.

Further there has been no decentralisation, which had been promised to us. Then take management. What should I talk about it? This bureaucracy, whom the late Prime Minister used to denounce in pre-independence days, has suddenly become very clever, very efficient. They were not equal to the task of managing the administration. Now they have been given the task of managing our economic affairs, they who know nothing about economics. They never have managed even their own households; their households are managed by their wives. They are going to manage our economic affairs.

I remember before independence when I was General Secretary of the Congress—when we made the first five year plan, I had something to do with the drafting of it—we had said that we would create in free India an economic agency, not an administrative agency but an economic agency,

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

to manage whatever industry was to be nationalised. Upto this time, after 18 years, we have not produced in our services an economic cadre and, therefore, the old bureaucracy goes on as usual merrily.

Then there is absolutely no price policy. Prices are increasing day by day. When they increase, they can never be lowered. I have found only one instance where the price has come down. And what is that? In the crematorium in Delhi, they were charging Rs. 25; and now they are going to charge Rs. 15. If we are not going to die quickly, that also will go up. The price of every other commodity has increased; further there is neither honest nor efficient administration.

What is the conclusion? The conclusion is given by the new Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission. First of all, let me tell you that this Planning Commission is a strange animal. For example, membership of the Planning Commission is only a stepping stone to the Treasury Benches, and I can assure you that the present Vice-Chairman is not so much concerned with your economics: he is concerned with politics, because he has been a politician all along. What does he say? When he was in the PSP he used to support the Plan and say that it was only defectively executed. When he became the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, he said that the Plans were not properly made, and were more improperly executed. These are his words, not mine. God bless him, he spoke the truth.

Let us see what Congressmen have been saying in the last day and a half. One said that planning was not a failure. For them nothing is a failure as long as their Government lasts. They might even tell us tomorrow that the prices of commodities have fallen. That people are happy, that no one is unhappy. Why? Because, the people vote for them? This voting is a strange thing. About 50 per cent of

the votes are cast, and of the votes cast the Congress gets 40 per cent, but they can say, as I said on a previous occasion that because they have got the votes, they have the divine right to rule and misrule.

They say that there is no failure of the Plan, when the failure of the Plan is writ so large that even those who run may read it. They say that Shri Masani has given false statistics. All the statistics that he has given are from official sources, from the Cabinet, from the Planning Commission, from the Reserve Bank. Who said that the average income is 68 paise? We did not say it. If you believe us, Dr. Lohia said it was only 27 paise. We only quote official statistics. Sixty eight paise is the average income, including that of the Tatas and Birlas. What then the income of the poorer section of the people would be I wish Congressmen would imagine for themselves. I do not want to give any sermon to them.

The condition of the common people, they say, has improved. Take out the Third Plan and read it. In the draft Plan it is said that employment for the landless labour, (which is 25 per cent of our population,) has decreased, their real income has decreased. If that is the condition of the landless labourers, what would be the condition of those who have uneconomic holdings, who must be about 75 per cent? People speak with their tongue in their cheeks when they say that the condition of the poor has improved. The condition of the poor has become worse!

Then again they say that this no confidence motion is sponsored by a combination of parties, that one party speaks in one language and another party speaks in another language, but I say that they speak in two languages, not about the condition of the people, but about the methods by which it can be improved. My friends, my enemies, the Communists have one way of improving the condition of the

pepole, Shri Masani has another way, perhaps I have another way as a follower of Gandhiji though people like Shri Masani would say that they also follow in the footsteps of Gandhiji. God bless them.

I am not a spokesman on behalf of the Communists, but it is wrong to say that only the Communists invited the Chinese aggression. We have it from the mouth of the President of the Republic that the Chinese invasion was due to our credulity, inefficiency and negligence. Credulity and negligence—mind you, these are not my words, these are the words of the head of the State. When did he utter these words? He uttered them, after the invasion, he went to NEFA and saw the conditions there. I charge the Government with having brought about the Chinese invasion by their negligence, by their inefficiency and by encouraging the cry of 'Hind Chini bhai bhai.' The Defence Minister and the Prime Minister said that the Chinese had no bad intentions whatsoever, they were a peaceful people, that their Ambassadors and they themselves said that it was not a Communist revolution, it was only an agricultural revolution. They said that China was a democratic country. These people themselves being misled, misled us.

I once asked the Government here why they were increasing the Defence budget by Rs. 100 crores at one stroke when China was *bhai bhai* to them, when they said that they would never fight with Pakistan, but would settle all disputes by peaceful means. They throw that in my face and ask if I did not say that they must not increase Defence expenditure by Rs. 100 crores. You say that you have no enemies. Then, I am entitled to say, "If you have no enemies, what the defence are you spending the money for? Why are you over-taxing?" Anyhow, the Defence budget remained as it was, it was not diminished.

I say that you are needlessly inflating the Budget. Year after year

this Defence budget has been over-estimated. The Government had not spent the money that they got. How could they spend the money that they had? Therefore, they had to make coffee percolators and other things. And when the Chinese attacked us, what were our weapons? We were fighting with guns that were used in the First World War, and some people, those who were experts, said that they were those used in the Boer War.

Whether I was in the Congress, whether I was in the PSP, or now as an independent Member, I have always spoken only what I have felt to be the truth. I may have been mistaken, but nobody need mistake my credentials. It is wrong for a friend in the Congress, who has recently joined it, I do not know where he was before, to say that I am frustrated. Was it not possible for me to get some seat on the official benches? Is there a President of the Congress, a General Secretary of the Congress, who was not on the Treasury Benches? To tell me that I am frustrated is, I say, false.

I am not frustrated but there are on the Treasury Benches people who are frustrated because they do not enjoy a higher position than they hold today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member might kindly conclude.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I have worked for the independence of the country in my own humble way; I have worked for its greatness and I have worked for its prosperity; I have worked for its glory. It is painful for me to see the condition we are in. We have not only made a mess of our lives; we have made a mess of the national life. There is not one section of the people that is not frustrated. What is the remedy? The remedy is, may I humbly suggest to my Congress friends: at least unite among yourselves. You talk of unity; you say times are critical and that we of the Opposition

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

should unite with you. We are dying to unite with you but you are not united among yourselves. There is a facade of unity in the Centre but in the provinces the Cabinets are divided into ministerialists and dissidents. How do you ask us to unite among ourselves? My hon. friend from Bikaner who has come just now said that it was a fault of the opposition parties that they did not unite. Even if we were to unite after all we can muster 100 people against 400. Remember, when England was in a bad condition, who saved England? Not the Labour party but, the Conservative Party. It is the Conservative Party that denounced—whom?—their own Prime Minister Chamberlain and said: for God's sake, govern or go out. Is there anybody in the Congress Party who would tell his colleagues on the Cabinet Benches: govern or go out? There is not one man! I want you to unite among yourselves. I am an old man and I think in this House there is only one older than I; Dr. Aney, who was an associate of Lok Manya Tilak. I come next to him. As an old man I tell you: for God's sake, forget this competition for powers, competition for position, competition for office; at this critical moment when your Home Policies and foreign policy seem to be failing, at this time, please, do not have a national Government if you like I would say; at least have an all talents Government. What did we do when we began? We gave place to Shyama Prasad Mukerjee who belonged to the Hindu Maha Sabha, to Ambedkar who belonged to the Scheduled Castes Federation, John Mathai who belonged to nowhere; then there was Sanmukhan Chetty; there was that Parsi gentleman, Bhabha. We showed the way. But afterwards, you have become so ambitious; the Congress people have become so ambitious of grasping all positions of power and office that there are not enough offices to go round. How will you call the other people now?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude now.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Yes, Sir; I have done. I humbly request again my Congress people to put their house in order. They are the only hope. I remember once Jawaharlal Nehru said: I am not so impudent as to think that all the problems of this big country can be solved by my Government or by my party. Then I got up and said: Sir, if it is so, you must call the co-operation of others. He said: the time is not yet. And I hope you will not say that the time is not yet.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने बहुत भावात्मक शब्दों में कांग्रेस की आलोचना की है। उन्होंने कांग्रेस एग्जीक्यूटिव की आलोचना करते हुए कहा है कांग्रेस एग्जीक्यूटिव के लोग एक स्वर से नहीं बोलते। जहाँ डिमाक्रेसी होगी वहाँ सब को अपने अपने विचार प्रकट करने का पूरा अधिकार प्राप्त होगा। अगर कांग्रेस एग्जीक्यूटिव के सदस्य अपने विचारों को बिना किसी व्यवधान के प्रकट करते हैं, तो यह इस बात का सबूत है कि भारतवर्ष में लोकतंत्र की नींव जम गयी है। भारतवर्ष में कोई भी, चाहे वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर हो या कोई और हो, अपने विचार प्रकट करने से डरेगा नहीं। यही कांग्रेस की सब से बड़ी शक्ति है।

साथ ही साथ मैं बताना चाहता हूँ भगवान बुद्ध ने, जो कि सब से बड़े डिमाक्रेट थे, कहा था। जहाँ लोग मिलते हैं। अपने विचारों को प्रकट करते हैं। वहाँ लोकतंत्र का नाश नहीं होता। लोकतंत्र की अवन्ति नहीं होती। बल्कि लोकतंत्र की उन्नति होती है। लोकतंत्र शक्तिशाली होता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आचार्य जी ने जो आक्षेप किया है। उसमें कोई तत्व नहीं है।

लार्ड ब्राइस ने डिमाक्रेसी को डिफाइन करते हुए कहा था कि हाउस आफ कामन्स

इसलिए शक्तिशाली है कि कंजरवेटिव या लिबरल दल वाले जब अपनी अपनी पार्टी में बैठते हैं तो मुक्त रूप से विचार प्रकट करते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कृपालानी जी ने कांग्रेस एग्जीक्यूटिव पर जो आक्षेप किया है उस में तथ्य नहीं है। यह तो हमारी शक्ति का द्योतक है।

दूसरी बात उन्होंने कही है कैंनेडी से हैल्प लेने की। उन्होंने रक्षा मंत्री श्री चट्टाण की इस बात का उद्धरण दिया है कि उन्होंने चीन के हमले के समय कहा था कि इस हम को जहाँ से मदद मिलेगी हम उस मदद को प्राप्त करने की कोशिश करेंगे। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आप को पुराण की एक कथा सुनाना चाहता हूँ। एक बार एक अवसर आया विश्वामित्र ने कुत्ते का मांस खाया। इस पर लोगों ने कहा। अधर्म का काम किया है। इसका उत्तर विश्वामित्र ने यह दिया। आपद्धर्म के रूप में उन्होंने कुत्ते का मांस खाया था। वह अधर्म नहीं है।

अगर कोई पागल कुत्ता या सांप आता है तो अगर हम उसको अहिंसा के नाम पर मारें नहीं और छोड़ दें तो यह ठीक नहीं होगा। उस वक्त सांप या कुत्ते को मारना आपद्धर्म है। जोव को रक्षा करने के लिए उसका मारना उचित है। इसलिए अगर श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने या श्री चट्टाण ने कहा कि हम को जहाँ से सहायता मिलेगी हम उसको लेगे, तो ऐसा करके उन्होंने आपद्धर्म का पालन किया था। जब हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर आक्रमण हो रहा था, और देश को आजादी खतरे में थी, तो उस वक्त उस आजादी की रक्षा करने के वास्ते जो भी हमारी सहायता के वास्ते आता हम उसकी सहायता का स्वागत करते।

15.56 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

इसके बाद तीसरी बात श्री कृपालानी ने यह कही कि हम ने शत्रु पैदा किये। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने शत्रु क्रिएट नहीं पैदा

किये हैं। उन्होंने शत्रु पैदा करवाया है। जब देश का विभाजन हुआ तो वही कांग्रेस के प्रेसीडेंट थे। उन्होंने ही देश का विभाजन कराया। हम तो नई जनरेशन के आदमी हैं। आज जो पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान को दुश्मन नम्बर 1 कहता है, उसको किसने बनाया? उसको उन्होंने ही बनाया। उस वक्त उन्होंने क्यों उसके विरुद्ध आवाज नहीं उठायी। इसकी जिम्मेवारी उनकी है। उन्होंने जो किया हम तो उसका प्रायश्चित्त कर रहे हैं।

श्री त्रिवेदी जी ने महमूद की बात दुहरायी। अयूब साहब भी महमूद की बात दुहराते हैं। त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा कि महमूद ने 17 बार हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला किया। वह सोमनाथ तक पहुँचा। साथ ही साथ पाकिस्तान के होम मिनिस्टर साहब भी कहते हैं कि महमूद हमारा आदर्श है। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ। महमूद गजनी हिन्दुस्तान में 18वीं और 19वीं बार हारा। इतिहास की यह बात बहुत कम लोगों को मालूम है। कहाँ हारा? काश्मीरिया से। हिन्दुस्तान की फौज ने महमूद गजनी को 18वीं और 19वीं बार हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं हराया, काश्मीर पर जब उस ने लोहारकोट पर हमला किया तो महमूद गजनी को पहली हार खानी पड़ी। दूसरी हार खानी पड़ी। वहाँ से लौटने के बाद उसने फिर हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करने का नाम नहीं लिया। आज उसी काश्मीर में हमला हो रहा है। जो महमूद गजनी को अपना आदर्श मानते हैं उनको मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उनकी कब्र भी काश्मीर में ही बनने वाली है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कब बनगी ?

16 hrs.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह हम लोग जब चाहेंगे तभी बनेंगी। अभी बनेंगी।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों ने लैफ्टिस्टों ने डी० आई० आर० पर बड़ा आक्रमण किया है। कहा कि 1500 आदमी गिरफ्तार हो गये हैं। किसी भी

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

देश की रक्षा के लिए दो चीजें आवश्यक होती हैं। आन्तरिक रक्षा और बाह्य रक्षा। बाह्य रक्षा के लिए तो फौज होती है। सेना होती है। आन्तरिक रक्षा के वास्ते होम डिपार्टमेंट होता है। कानून होता है। होम डिपार्टमेंट ने, कानून ने अगर डी० आई० आर० पास किया। उतका कोई कारण रहा होगा। ऐसा तो नहीं हो सकता है कि उन्होंने भारत रक्षा नियम बिला वजह पास कर दिये। क्या उनको अकल नहीं थी। किसी भी भाई को जेल में रखने में मुख नहीं मिलता? अगर जरा भी किसी में मानवता होगी तो किसी को तकलीफ़ देने में उसे तनिक भी मुख नहीं होगा।

लेकिन क्या क्या जाय। आप प्रोचाइन्स जो हैं? हिन्दुस्तान हमारा है। हम देश की आवाज उठाते हैं। आप चीन की आवाज उठाते हैं। हम चाहते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान शक्तिशाली हो। हिन्दुस्तान बहादुरी से हर एक शत्रु का सामना करे। ऐसे समय में हिन्दुस्तान में आन्तरिक विद्रोह की ज्वाला शांत रहे किन्तु वे उस ज्वाला में धी डालते हैं। बिहार में क्या हुआ। कौन नहीं जानता? कलकत्ते में ट्रामवेज जलाई गई। बिहार में एक तरह का रैबोलूशन जैसा कि 9 अगस्त सन् 1942 में हुआ था, उस तरह का एक छोटे स्केल पर आन्दोलन यहां किया गया। कोई भी सरकार कहीं की हो उस सरकार का यह धर्म है कि देश के आन्तरिक असन्तोष रूपी आन्दोलन से देश की रक्षा करे और अगर सरकार ने उसके लिए ठोस और कारगर क़दम उठाया तो वह एक उचित ही बात कही जायेगी।

मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं। मैं समझता हूं कि अपोजीशन के लोगों ने मुख्यतः कर्णी सिंह जी ने बिलकुल ठीक कहा कि अगर हम को वोट देना होगा तो वे कांग्रेस

पार्टी को वोट देंगे और हम कांग्रेस के स्टैंड का समर्थन करते हैं।

जहां तक नो कौन्फिडेंस मोशन के लाने का सवाल है, डा० मुनरो जो कि पोलिटिकल साइंस के अच्छे राइटर्स हुए हैं, अपोजीशन के तीन कर्तव्य बतलाये हैं। Opposition without being a rebel. अपोजीशन वैसे ठीक है। लेकिन अगर किसी डेमोक्रेटिक अपोजीशन में रिवैल की भावना पैदा हुई, विद्रोह की भावना पैदा हुई तो फिर वह डेमोक्रेटिक अपोजीशन नहीं है। आप में विद्रोह की भावना पैदा हुई। आप में रिवैल की भावना पैदा हुई। आप ने क्या किया? 1922 में जैसे कि फ़ासिस्टों ने रॉस पर मार्च किया। 50,000 आदमी आये और पार्लियामेंट को घेर लिया। गवर्नमेंट पैरलाइज हो गयी। मुसोलिनी के हाथ में शक्ति आ गई। आप ने यहां पर क्या बिन्दा? दो लाख आदमी लेकर यहां आये। दिल्ली के ऊपर मार्च किया। आप ने 1922 के अक्टूबर मास के रैबोलूशन का एक छोटा सा नक़शा यहां पर उपस्थित किया। क्या कोई भी सरकार इस को बदलित कर सकती है? यह क्या अपोजीशन की ड्यूटी थी। जब हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला हो रहा था। घुसपैठिये हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर मौजूद हैं। हमारे देशवासियों को मार रहे हैं, गांवों में आग लगा रहे हैं उस समय आप इस तरह के यहां पर मार्च और आरगनाइज किया जाय। क्या उस समय आप को यह उचित था कि अपोजीशन दिल्ली में बाहर से दो लाख आदमियों को लाकर यहां पार्लियामेंट के चारों ओर घेरा डलवाये?

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : हम प्रदर्शन द्वारा आप को यह बतलाना चाहते थे कि देश की रक्षा की खातिर हम आप की सहायता करने को बिलकुल तैयार हैं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ । लेकिन क्या ही बेहतर होता । यही दो लाख आदमी बजाय पार्लियामेंट के चारों तरफ घेरा डालने के वहाँ कश्मीर में जहाँ पर आग लगी हुई है । वहाँ पर उसे बुझाने के लिए चले जाते ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : सारा सीमा के झगड़े का मामला हमें सौंप दीजिये । हम उसे सफलतापूर्वक निबटाने के लिए तैयार हैं ।

श्री इन्द्रजीत लाल मल्होत्रा (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : कश्मीर में इन जनसंघ वालों को मत भेजिये । हम उसके लिए तैयार नहीं हैं ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सारा झगड़ा हमें सौंप दीजिये हम उसे निबटाने को तैयार हैं ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : ठीक है । आप ऐसा आज बड़े जोर से कह रहे हैं लेकिन हमारे यहाँ कहावत मशहूर है । बादल जो गरजते हैं वह बरसते नहीं हैं । जैसा मैं ने कहा जल्द ही तो इस बात की थी । यह दो लाख आदमी जो यहाँ मार्च करके आये वे असम में चले जाते, कश्मीर में चले जाते, बंगाल में चले जाते या अन्यत्र चले जाते जहाँ कि लोग गरीबी से परेशान हैं या बाहरी शत्रुओं द्वारा सताये जा रहे हैं । वहाँ पहुँच कर उनको राहत देते व उनकी रक्षा करते । उनको दवा दारु देते । खाने कपड़े की व्यवस्था करते । जिन घरों में पाकिस्तानी हमलावरों ने आग लगाई है । उनकी कुछ मदद करते । वह तो आपने किया नहीं । बेकार में इतना पैट्रोल फूँक कर लाशियाँ और जीपों से इतने आदमियों को यहाँ लाकर पार्लियामेंट पर मार्च करवाया । फ़ासिस्ट रिवोल्यूशन कैसा होता है इसका एक नक़्क़शा आप ने देश के सामने रख दिया ।

अपोजीशन का दूसरा कर्तव्य यह बतलाया गया है :—

“Opposition in Parliament is a wholesome spur to efficiency in

administration.” नो कौन्फिडेंस का जो प्रस्ताव लाया गया है उस की बाबत मैं कल से सुन रहा हूँ । सिवाय एकोनामिक बात के और कोई बात नहीं कही गई । कोई आप ने रचनात्मक सुझाव, कोई एक ठोस आईडिया अपोजीशन वालों ने दिया हो वैसा मैं नहीं पाता । अपोजीशन की यह ड्यूटी है । अगर ट्रेजरी बैंचेज कोई गलती करती हैं, तो वह उसको ठीक करें । अपोजीशन डेमोक्रेसी को देखना चाहते हैं लेकिन उन्होंने डेमोक्रेसी को बनाने की क्या कोशिश की । उन्होंने इसके लिए कोई कोशिश नहीं की ।

तीसरा कर्तव्य अपोजीशन का है “एफि-शिएंसी इन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन” । वार इमरजेंसी के समय में अपोजीशन ट्रेजरी बैंचेज की जो मदद करता है, सहायता करता है, उसकी मैं आप को मिसाल देकर बतलाना चाहता हूँ । सन् 1914 में इंग्लैंड ने जर्मनी के ऊपर वार डिक्लेयर की । लिबरल पार्टी उस समय इंग्लैंड में पावर में थी । क्या कंजर्वेटिव पार्टी ने उसके खिलाफ़ वोट आफ़ नो कौन्फिडेंस पास कराया ? दूसरी मिसाल आप लीजिये । सन् 1939 में फिर इंग्लैंड ने जर्मनी के ऊपर वार डिक्लेयर की । डैफ़्रिक में इंग्लैंड पीछे हटा, भागा एक तरीक़े से । लेकिन क्या लेबर पार्टी जोकि उस समय अपोजीशन में थी वह गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ़ वोट आफ़ नो कौन्फिडेंस लाई ? तीसरी मिसाल मैं जो देना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि सन् 1915 में फ्रांस में फ़र्लेन्ड्स बरडून तक जर्मनी की सेना पहुँच गयी थी । लेकिन क्या फ्रांस की पार्लियामेंट में वहाँ की गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ़ किसी अपोजीशन के मेम्बर ने नो कौन्फिडेंस का वोट उपस्थित किया था ?

हिन्दुस्तान ही एक ऐसा देश है जहाँ कि सारे देशवासियों को पूरी पूरी आजादी है । दुःख का विषय है । आज की नाजुक घड़ी में उस आजादी का आप दुरुपयोग कर रहे हैं ।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

आपका कर्तव्य था, इस वक्त इमरजेंसी के जमाने में जबकि हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर हमला हुआ है, उस समय आप सरकार के हाथ उसका मुकाबला करने के लिए मजबूत करते। आप इस हमले को साधारण हमला मत समझिये। इस हमले को जो साधारण हमला समझते हैं, वह अंधकार में हैं, सारे देश का भाग्य इस के ऊपर निर्भर करता है। अगर आप कश्मीर में जीतते हैं। और वहां से आक्रमणकारियों को खदेड़ देते हैं। पाकिस्तान के दांत खट्ट करते हैं तो आप का भाग्य उज्ज्वल है नहीं तो आपका भाग्य सदा सर्वदा के लिए अंधकारमय हो जायगा। ऐसे संकटकाल में आप नो कौनफिडेंस का मोशन लायें मुझे यह कहने पर विवश होना पड़ता है कि उस के पीछे कोई बुद्धि या तर्क नहीं है। मैं कहने पर मजबूर हूं। अपोजीशन का जो कर्तव्य था, डेमोक्रेसी के जितने भी साधन हैं, लोकतंत्र की जितनी भी भावनाएं हैं, उनका किसी का भी पालन अपोजीशन ने नहीं किया है। हम ने उस का पालन किया है। लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी और सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने कश्मीर सम्बन्धी अपने स्टेटमेंट के समय आप से हमेशा सद्भावना की मांग की है। कहा कि हम आप की सद्भावना चाहते हैं। आप की सहानुभूति व मदद चाहते हैं। लेकिन आप ने लाल बहादुर जी शास्त्री और सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह को उसका क्या जवाब दिया? सद्भावना देने के बदले में आप ने उन्हें वोट ऑफ़ नो कौनफिडेंस प्रदान किया है।

अब मैं चौथी बात पर आता हूं और वह यह कि पाकिस्तान के भाई रेशियल सुप्रिमेसी की बात करते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की रेस अलग है। पाकिस्तान की रेस अलग है अतएव हमें हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर हमला करना है। दारूल हरब को तोड़ कर दारूल इस्लाम बनाना है। महमूद गजनवी आइडियल है। इस तरह की बड़ी बड़ी बातें करते हैं। मैं उन से बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ

कहना चाहता हूं। जहां लोगों ने रेशियल सुप्रिमेसी के ऊपर अपनी सत्ता स्थापित की है, वह सत्ता धूल में मिली है। जनता ने उन की बात नहीं पृथी है। जनता ने उन के मुंह पर थूका है। अब आप ऐग्जाम्पल ले लीजिये। सन् 1921 में मसोलीनी ने कहा

Romans race is the best in the World. The Romans should rule the Medditerranean. इस का परिणाम क्या हुआ? सन् 1922 में मुसोलीनी पावर में आये। उन्होंने अवेसीनियम पर हमला किया। लेकिन आज मुसोलीनी कहां हैं? जब वह मरे तो अंजाम क्या हुआ? उनकी लाश को लोगों ने जूतों से पीटा। मुसोलीनी अपने समय की एक बहुत बड़ी शक्ति थे। उनका यह अंजाम हुआ।

दूसरा उदाहरण मैं हिटलर का देना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने आर्यन सुप्रिमेसी का नारा लगाया। ब्ल्यू ब्लड की बात कही। साठ लाख यहूदियों को उन्होंने फूक डाला। जला डाला, गैस चैम्बर में डाल कर मरवा दिया। लेकिन जब हिटलर मरा तो एक कम्बल में लपेट कर उसको रख दिया गया। पेट्रोल से जला दिया गया। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूं। यह रेशल सुप्रिमेसी सब से भयंकर चीज है। यह आग है। भयंकर आग है। भयंकर ज्वाला है। किसी भी देश को बड़ी आसानी से तबाह कर सकती है। जर्मनी गया, इटली गया। पाकिस्तान इसको एडवोकेट कर रहा है। हम तो सैक्युलरिज्म में विश्वास करते हैं। हमारा एक धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य है। इस में हमारा दृढ़ विश्वास है। इस में हम बड़े विश्वास के साथ विश्वास करते हैं . . .

श्री विशानचन्द्र सेठ (एटा): झूठ बात है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह: झूठ हिन्दू महासभा वाले बोलते हैं, हम नहीं बोलते हैं।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, he is making a very good speech. He should be given more time.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं एक उदाहरण आप के सामने मराठों की रखना चाहता हूँ। अठारहवीं शताब्दी में उनके हाथ में ताकत आई। उनका राज्य कटक से ले कर अटक तक फैल गया। वे दिल्ली में आये। एक भी मजिस्ट्रड उन्होंने गिराई नहीं। सिखों के हाथ में ताकत आई। पंजाब में तो आप एक भी उदाहरण बता दें, कोई भी आदमी बता दे, कि सिखों ने एक भी मस्जिद को तहसनहस किया। एक भी मुस्लिम को क्या इसलिए मारा कि वह सिख नहीं होना चाहता था? हिन्दुओं की तो आप बात ही छोड़ दें। वे तो किसी को हिन्दू बनाना ही नहीं चाहते थे।

हमारा इतिहास, हमारी परम्परा ही सेक्युलरिज्म की रही है। जो लोग यह श्वाब देखते हैं कि हम हिन्दुओं की भावनाओं को उभाड़ कर, सिखों की भावनाओं को उभाड़ कर हिन्दुस्तान में एक तहलका पैदा कर देंगे या इस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान का पाकिस्तान पर और पाकिस्तान की जनता पर हिन्दुस्तान का हमला करवा देंगे, वे बिल्कुल स्वप्न में हैं। यह चीज कभी सफल होने वाली नहीं है।

श्री हनुमन्तैया जी ने कहा कि नैशनल गवर्नमेंट यहाँ बननी चाहिये। वह हमारे बड़े दोस्त हैं। बड़े मित्र हैं। नैशनल गवर्नमेंट होनी चाहिये। लेकिन क्या इन लोगों के साथ नैशनल गवर्नमेंट बनेगी? जिस वक्त चैम्बरलेन म्यूनिख से लौट कर आये और जर्मनी पर हमला हुआ था तो श्री एटली श्री चैम्बरलेन के पास गये थे। लेकिन ये एटली की तरह से नहीं आये हैं। ये आये हैं नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन ले कर। ये आये हैं मुसोलीनी की तरह से, हिटलर की तरह से। हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर आफत आई है और ये अपोजीशन के लोग नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन ले कर आ गये हैं। श्री हनुमन्तैया जी का चाहे

विश्वास हो लेकिन इस तरह से नैशनल गवर्नमेंट बन नहीं सकती है।

आज सबाल हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का नहीं है। सबाल दुनिया के सामने एक ही है। लोकतंत्र एशिया में या दुनिया में रहेगा या नहीं रहेगा। लोकतंत्र की जिन्दगी है या नहीं है। जज मुसोलीनी ने अवेसीनिया को हड़प लिया, डालमिशिया को हड़प लिया, उस वक्त सारा संसार चुप बैठा रहा। उसका फल क्या हुआ। सैंकड वर्ल्ड वार हुई। हिटलर ने चैकोस्लोवाकिया को, आस्ट्रिया को तथा दूसरे छोटे छोटे मुल्कों को हड़प लिया तो सारी दुनिया बैठी तमाशा देखती रही। लोकतंत्र का नाश होते दुनिया ने देखा। फल यह हुआ। हिटलर द्वारा किये गये संहार से सारी दुनिया जल उठी। लोकतंत्रीय राष्ट्रों को आज देखना चाहिये। अगर हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की लड़ाई होती है और उसमें अगर हिन्दुस्तान असफल होता है और पाकिस्तान की डिक्टेटरशिप सफल होती है, तो क्या दुनिया में थर्ड वर्ल्ड वार नहीं होगी? क्या दुनिया इस थर्ड वर्ल्ड वार के लिए तैयार है? किसी भी डिक्टेटर को प्रश्रय देना, दुनिया के ही हित में नहीं है। लिहाजा मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। दुनिया क जितने भी डेमोक्रेटिक मुल्क हैं, जितने भी लोकतंत्र में विश्वास करने वाले देश हैं। उन सब को एक आवाज से हिन्दुस्तान का समर्थन और पाकिस्तान की भर्त्सना करनी चाहिये।

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): Sir, I have been listening with rapt attention to the hon. Members from the Opposition parties, particularly when they made points with regard to the food situation in the country. I am not surprised that the hon. Members feel very much concerned with the state of agriculture in our country and also feel disturbed about the present food situation, because this is a matter which affects every individual

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

in the country. I do realise that we are passing through difficult days. Those difficult days are not only in the food front but in various other fronts also. So we have added troubles today, and therefore it is necessary for us to see that when we have enemies on our frontiers at least inside we have a certain amount of peace. That peace can come not with hungry stomachs, but it can only come when we are in a position to feed the people.

In solving this problem, I do feel my own inadequacies. When I took up this challenging job, it is not because of my faith in my own ability it is because of my faith in the people, particularly the farming community, that I took up this challenge.

Sir, particularly during the last one month, the situation was looking desperate. The monsoon this year began a little late. Even that was not alarming. But after some time we had this long dry spell. As a matter of fact, when the censure motion was given the situation looked bleak. The rains had come as perhaps an effective answer even to the censure motion.

An hon. Member: It is because of us.

Shri M. R. Masani: We all rejoice.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Yes, if the censure motion had brought rains we should thank you for that.

But some hon. Members mentioned, I think the leader of the P.S.P., that we are still depending upon weather for our production, our production gets affected by weather conditions. Unfortunately, it is so. But it is not only with reference to our country. I was trying to look into the production pattern with regard to various countries, even developed countries,

in the world. I found startling variations in the production figures mainly due to weather conditions. In spite of scientific advancement, in spite of technological inventions, still the world has not got over the weather, the nature's fury sometimes, whether it be drought or floods. But what has been achieved in other countries is that even during adverse weather conditions their level of production is fairly high to meet the requirements of the people of the country. Therefore, what has got to be done in our country also is that while weather changes are bound to be there and weather conditions are likely to be adverse during certain years and favourable during certain other years, we have to reach a base of production which would even under adverse weather conditions meet the requirements of our country.

Some people criticise the Government by saying that on the agricultural front we have completely failed or we have not made sufficient progress. If only they look into the statistics and production figures they will find that, after all we need not be ashamed of our performance even at the farm front. Particularly during the ten years ending with 1961-62, if we look into the statistics and production figures we will find that they are comparable with those of any country, if I may say so. But, during the last two or three years, we had continuous adverse weather and that had brought us difficulties, because there was stagnation of production at the same level for the last two or three years.

In spite of this progress on the farm front for ten years, I do agree that this progress was not adequate, particularly for the increasing population. When we formulated the Second Plan, we based our production targets on the basis of a certain order of increase in population. But the census

was taken in 1961 we found that instead of the anticipated increase of 1.5 per cent, the increase in population actually came to 2.4 or 2.5 per cent. As a matter of fact, this increase in population is itself the result of certain developments that have taken place within the country, developments with regard to health amenities, control of diseases, availability of food etc. which prolong life. Therefore, while we did make progress it was not adequate enough to fill the gap which was already there when we achieved freedom and also to meet the increasing needs of the expanding population.

While speaking on this debate, Shri Masani put the blame for all the inadequacies in our country entirely on planning. I do not know how far he is correct in doing that. If we consider what we have achieved during the last three Plan periods, we will find that in spite of our difficulties and deficiencies we have achieved a good deal. What is more, we have to learn by the experiences of these three Plans. If there are deficiencies and failures we have to analyse and find out what they are and see that in the formulation of the next Plan, and more than that in the implementation of the next Plan, we are more efficient. It is not correct to say that simply because there were certain defects in the implementation, simply because there were failures in reaching targets, so we have to give up planning altogether. Even those countries which have been advocating *laissez faire* and saying that planning is not necessary, even such countries are planning because it is only on the basis of planning that they can progress and go ahead. Even when there is no formal planning, in an informal way there is a good deal of planning in those countries. Therefore, it is not planning which is causing all the delays.

Then he had some harsh words to

say on the Planning Commission. Not only he but many others outside, in other forums, have also criticised the Planning Commission as some extra-constitutional body which is not responsible to Parliament. I would respectfully ask members to look at the constitution of the Planning Commission. It is the Prime Minister who is the Chairman of the Planning Commission. The Home Minister, the Finance Minister and other Ministers are members of the Commission. It is not as if because of the association of certain expert personnel that body becomes irresponsible or not responsible to Parliament or any other institution. Also, it is not as if the decision of the Planning Commission on the finalisation of the Plan is the last word. It has to come to Parliament and Parliament has to give its sanction. Not only that, every year the budget for the implementation of the Plan has to be approved by Parliament. Therefore, it is not as if the Planning Commission is a dictatorial body, presided over by a Deputy Chairman, which is not responsible to Parliament and so its decisions or opinions should not be given any weight whatsoever. Therefore, I respectfully submit that to criticise the Planning Commission on this basis, if I may say so, will be ignoring the composition of the Planning Commission, the functions of the Planning Commission and the procedure; that the Planning Commission follows. Of course the criticism is not against the Planning Commission. Shri Masani and his associates are against the planning itself. They say so. There is no question of merely criticising the Planning Commission. The criticism is against planning itself. He thinks that the Plan is something of an evil and, therefore, according to his philosophy, the smaller the Plan, as far as possible, the lesser the evil and therefore, if it is not possible to get rid of plans and planning, you make the Plan as small as possible so that, according to him, the evil may become as less as possible and the greater the Plan, as he thinks, the greater the evil. That seems to be his philosophy.

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

If it is a question of making economic development, if it is a question of making investments in the various sectors of economic development, the planning, if done properly and if it is implemented properly, will be the best instrument for economic development. If Shri Masani and his associates point out our defects and failures in the implementation, certainly they are welcome to do that and I am sure the Planning Commission, the entire implementing machinery, will take into account those criticisms and we will try to better ourselves in our performances and in the implementation of the Plans in the future. But that is quite a different thing altogether. My own suspicion is—I advisedly say ‘suspicion’; it might be a wrong suspicion—that Shri Masani and his associates are interested in some other thing and that is that planning would mean greater emphasis on public sector, greater investment in public sector, to that extent depriving the private sector. Therefore, with his Swatantra philosophy of private sector, he thinks that planning stands in the way of private enterprise, giving emphasis to public enterprise. Unfortunately, if that is the philosophy and it is on that basis they are opposing planning, then we have to differ from them with great respect in spite of the great leader they have.....

Shri Ranga: It is not so.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): I do not want to interrupt the hon. Minister. This is for his information. The Bombay planners put the Tata/Birla Plan before the country much before the hon. Dr. John Mathai announced his Plan in the House in 1950. The difference was that they wanted to monopolise it through big Plan which came before 1950.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Whatever it is, I do not think anybody can get away from planning. What is important is to make the Plan more effective and to make the implemen-

tation more efficient and that is the only way to make progress.

Then, the criticism was made that lip-service was being paid to agriculture while we are saying we are giving first priority to agriculture—as a matter of fact, the Fourth Plan draft does not show that priority. I happen to be in-charge of Agriculture portfolio now and I can tell Shri Masani that the allocation of funds for Agriculture, even what has been made already, is not an insignificant sum and it is not as if this is the end. If, in the course of working this Plan and giving priority to Agriculture, further resources become necessary, certainly this is a matter which will have to be looked into. But what is now important is to strike a balance in the various sectors.

16.29 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Another factor which has been missed by Shri Masani is that he still looks into what has been allocated to Agriculture alone, what is shown under the head ‘Agriculture’ and he adds up what is shown under the head ‘Irrigation’ and then he says, this is the allocation for Agriculture. Today, Agriculture is not confined to mere agriculture and irrigation. It is something more than that about which I will have to speak in a little great detail later. It requires so many other industries to back up for agricultural production. Therefore, today electrification in the agricultural sector—use of electricity for pumping water and use of electricity for various other purposes—is important. Therefore, rural electrification programme which gives Rs. 500 crores will have to be added. Take the case of chemical industries; the entire fertiliser industry is for the purpose of agriculture and that will have to be added to the agricultural sector. We

have to produce various machines for the purpose of tractors and other implements. So, the provision in the industrial sector for this purpose has to be added to Agriculture. If he adds all these, he would find not what he has found as an inadequate sum having been allotted to Agriculture, but certainly a significant sum, a significant percentage, for that purpose.

Apart from that, looking into the figures you will find that besides percentages in terms of rupees, the increase is from Rs. 1090 crores in the Third Plan to Rs. 2400 crores in the Fourth Plan, i.e., an increase of 12%. For Agricultural Programmes proper, the allocation in the public sector is Rs. 1928 crores as compared to an anticipated outlay of Rs. 685 crores in the Third Plan. This shows an increase of 180% over the Third Plan outlay. As I have already stated, the outlays for Agricultural Programmes are to be supplemented by supporting outlays for industrial sector, pesticides, machinery and equipment and also the provision for rural electrification, communication, rural works programmes, etc., in the Plan. Therefore all these will have to be taken as supporting programmes for Agriculture and this is a comprehensive allocation. If this is taken into account, I am sure that there will not be any base for criticism that we have not given priority for Agriculture.

It is not merely the allocation of resources which is important. How we are going to use these resources for the purpose of improving agricultural production is more important in my view. We are talking again that, by the end of the Fourth Plan, we should reach self-sufficiency in foodgrains. This is not a new target. If you take the First Plan, the Second Plan or the Third Plan, you will find that this laudable desire has been expressed in all these Plans. If it has not been attained, we should also look into the causes as to why we have not attained. It is not as if we did not want to do it. Where has been the deficiency? Where has been the failure

or have we not understood the problem correctly? This is the matter which we have to look into. In this connection I would like to read out a quotation from one of the well-known experts on agricultural development. This is what Theodore W. Schultz says:

"The man who farms as his forefathers did cannot produce much food no matter how rich the land or how hard he works. The farmer who has access to and knows how to use what science knows about soils, plants, animals and machines can produce an abundance of food though the land be poor. Nor need he work nearly so hard and long. He can produce so much that his brothers and some of his neighbours will move to town to earn their living. Enough farm products can be produced without them. The knowledge that makes this transformation possible is a form of capital whenever it is an integral part of the material inputs farmers use and whenever it is a part of their skills and what they know.

"Farming based wholly upon the kinds of factors of production that have been used by farmers for generations can be called traditional agriculture. A country dependent upon traditional agriculture is inevitably poor, and because it is poor it spends much of its income for food. But when a country develops an agricultural sector such as Denmark has in Europe, Israel in the Near East, Mexico in Latin America, and Japan in the Far East, food becomes more abundant, income rises, and less of the income of the country is spent for food. How to transform traditional agriculture, which is niggardly, into a highly productive sector of the economy is the central problem."

Therefore, Sir, if today we have to make advance in the industrial sector, it can only be based on new science and technology.

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

If we have to advance in agriculture, it has to be based on science and technology. With our traditional methods, with our traditional pattern of agriculture, whatever might be the investment, whatever might be our labours and whatever efforts we might put in, the increase could only be marginal. The same thing is true in industry also. After all, we were producing steel long before many of the other countries produced steel, but science brought these mass production methods for manufacture of steel. And that technology is changing now, and newer and newer techniques are coming up now for more efficient and greater production. In the same way, science has given us new knowledge and new techniques to increase production on the agricultural front also. It is only to the extent that we are able to take advantage of that new science and technology that we shall be able to make progress. Mere allocation of more and more resources and giving more priority to agriculture is not going to deliver the goods. Therefore, how we approach this problem is the main thing that we shall have to consider.

We have been emphasising more and more that we should have better production per acre. That is the only answer, because in a country like ours we do not have large tracts of land which are lying fallow; we have to use whatever we already have to the best advantage possible. For the purpose of reaching greater production during the Fourth Plan, we cannot even depend upon the new irrigation projects, even the new minor irrigation projects that we shall be building up during the Fourth Plan. We have to depend upon the potentials which we have built up already during the Second and Third Plan periods. Therefore, it is no use coming forward with an excuse that minor irrigation has not come up to expectation, that medium irrigation has not come up to expectation, or that large-sized irriga-

tion projects have not come up to expectation and there is no utilisation of the land because of that. Already, we have created sufficient potentials, and we have to use those potentials to the best advantage.

Shri Ranga: We have failed to utilise those potentials fully.

Shri C. Subramaniam: We shall use them now. It is not as if we have not been using them; we have been using them, but on seeds and varieties of seeds which with the best of efforts gives only a 2 per cent or 3 per cent increase. That is the point which I am going to make and which I am making today, that we have to break away from those past traditions in agriculture; then alone shall we be able to get higher production and we would be able to meet the needs of the country.

Take, for example, wheat. We have got the best of our farmers in the Punjab. It is not as if they are not willing to take to new techniques; they are prepared to adopt new techniques; they are prepared to use fertilisers to whatever extent it becomes necessary, but with the present variety of wheat which we have today, what happens is that it gives increased production up to a certain level of fertilisers, say, up to 10 lbs or 15 lbs of nitrogen, but after that, instead of getting better results, it dislodges the crop, and instead of creating increased production actually it creates decreased production; the law of diminishing returns sets in, diminishing returns not with reference to the cost involved but with reference to the production, which becomes less because the variety does not absorb more than 10 to 15 or 20 lbs of nitrogen which we give to it, and, therefore, the production gets limited. Therefore, we only claim that we have reached a production of 30 maunds per acre or 40 maunds per acre. That itself is quite good. But science has given us the

benefit of new knowledge with regard to plants. We are in a position now to breed new varieties of these grains, varieties with whatever characteristics we want with better grains, larger grains, with larger yields and which will stand fertilisation. This is one of the blessings which science has given to us, namely the evolution of new varieties. This evolution of new varieties has brought about a revolution in agriculture even in a country like Mexico which we cannot call advanced. I was looking into the history of Mexico, the agricultural history of Mexico.

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bagaha): Have we got the seeds?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Yes, we have.

I found in Mexico that they are using just the implements which we have all along been using, the same traditional agricultural implements, almost the same method. In the beginning of the century, they were getting 6 bushels yield per acre. Today it has gone above every other country, even the USA, and it is producing 39 bushels per acre. How has this happened? It is by the introduction of a new variety which is able to stand fertilisation to the extent of 100 lbs., 120 lbs. and the yields have gone up. Therefore, if we have to take the best advantage of the potentials which we have, there is no use of using the water or fertiliser or pesticide on the local indigenous variety, whose potential is by its very nature limited, but we must have new varieties of seeds.

Shri Ranga: Why do you labour that point? It is so obvious. Everybody accepts it. Nobody is opposed to it.

Shri J. B. Singh (Ghosi): Tell us what you are going to do just now, not long-term.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I will certainly tell you. I cannot immediately deliver the bags of wheat to the hon.

Member. It has to be produced on the field. The hon. Member said that on this basis of planning nothing can be done. I want to show that on this basis of planning, it can be shown that production can be increased.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khammam): Everybody knows what the Opposition Members were saying yesterday.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Therefore, this is the variety which we want to introduce in our country. We have planned for it. Already we are getting this new variety from Mexico for the purpose of multiplication of seeds and we are aiming that by the end of the Fourth Plan, we should reach 9—10 million acres with these new seeds, leaving the other areas to progress as best as possible with the existing varieties.

In the same way, new strains of paddy have been identified for our country which would stand high fertilisation and whose yield would be very high. I do not think Prof. Mukerjee would object to it because it has got a Taiwan name. It was evolved there not by Taiwan but by scientists. It is science which is responsible for it. That Taiwan variety we are getting which gives a minimum yield of 5000 to 6000 lbs. It has already yielded 8,500 lbs. and we will have at least 12 million acres by the end of the Fourth Plan under it. The seed multiplication process we have started within the country and it is there already on the field.

In the same way, four other foodgrains have been selected, hybrid maize which is already becoming popular, hybrid sorgum, hybrid bajra and ragi. We want to concentrate on these 6 major foodgrains and give the farmers the materials, this material and various other things which are necessary for getting the maximum production, and see that by the end of the Fourth Plan we have at least 35 million acres under these new strains, with the fertilisers required for the purpose, with plant protection,

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

with water and also the credit so that there could be sufficient investment by the farmers.

It has been technically assessed that if we make the administrative arrangements possible, for which we are already taking action, it should be possible from these 35 million acres—though it is only 1/10th of the cultivated area and half of the assured irrigated area—to get at least 25 million tonnes of extra foodgrains. This would come progressively from year to year. We have laid down the programme, how many acres should be covered during the first year of plan, how many during the second year, how many during the third, fourth and fifth year of the plan.

But this would mean fertiliser of this order being available. Therefore, we are trying to ensure that the extra fertiliser required is made available. On this basis, we are making the calculation as to what should be the availability of fertiliser. Naturally, the internal production cannot catch up with the demand. Today the demand is so much that the supply even including imported fertilisers is very much below the demand. Giving priority to agriculture would mean seeing that this material input, the supply of fertiliser, is assured during the Fourth Plan period, and therefore, whatever is possible by way of internal production is made an estimate of, and the rest is to be imported till we catch up by intensive production.

Shri Ranga: When?

Shri C. Subramaniam: With these fertilisers, plant protection becomes necessary, and therefore plant protection chemicals have to be produced within the country, and to the extent we are unable to produce, foreign exchange availability is given high priority for imports; in the same way for equipment for use of pesticides, credit requirements etc. This is how we envisage the new strategy for the pur-

pose of tackling on the food front the production problem. I do not think any other approach to the problem will be able to produce results within a short time to meet the requirements of the people.

Shri Ranga: Five years ago he made the same approach.

Shri C. Subramaniam: If we feel disappointed, then we should quit our country, and perhaps quit this life. After all, if we have made mistakes, what is important is that we have to learn the lessons of those mistakes, and if we say that we will never learn, then as a nation we will have to perish, that is all. If no programme would satisfy Acharya Ranga and the Opposition, the only thing which would satisfy them would be perhaps to sit here and speak.

Shri Ranga: Quite right.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Unfortunately, the people are not prepared to take that risk. What are we to do about it? We are not to blame.

Shri Ranga: That is the only point in your favour.

Shri C. Subramaniam: After all, if the people are with us, if that is our only fault, we plead guilty to that that we have the support of the people, and if that is a sin, we are committing that sin of getting the support of the people. If, without the support of the people, anybody wants to be in power, what sort of regime they want to have we can very well imagine. Perhaps, that is why the censure motion is being brought. They think that even with a minority they should be able to upset the Government and get into power, that is their hope. It is as much hopeful as their getting through the censure motion here.

I have been stressing this point that with these new varieties which our

scientists have identified, which our scientists have evolved, it should be possible for us to tackle this problem with some confidence and say that we shall solve this problem of foodgrains; and once we approach this problem in a scientific manner in this limited field, it is not going to be confined to this area. It is going to be infectious. Therefore, in the other areas also, not only with reference to foodgrains but with regard to fibres and oilseeds the same techniques could be expanded, and it is possible for us to reach the targets of production.

Therefore, when we talk about priority for agriculture, it is priority with reference to making available these various material inputs and the credit required for this purpose, various other facilities required for this purpose, the administrative set-up required for this purpose. That is how we envisage the priority for agriculture, and on the basis of the failures of the past, which alone teach us hard lessons, let us get rid of what we have been labouring under, and let us go forward and try to conquer new areas in the agricultural field, so that we get to modern agriculture, scientific agriculture, which alone would give us greater production.

With regard to fertilisers, we have to put up our own factories here, and in the present context, we have to import those equipments, but when we look into the requirements of fertilisers not only during the Fourth but during the Fifth and Sixth Plan . . .

Shri Ranga: Until your grand sons come.

Shri C. Subramaniam: . . . naturally we have to create capacity within the country for fabrication of this equipment; that will have to be taken up even within the Fourth Plan. Therefore, when we talk of priority to agriculture, it is a package. It is not merely what is to be done in the field

but also the other ancillary things, namely, supporting industries which are absolutely necessary to move forward in agriculture. That is how we visualise it and I hope and trust that with the help of our scientists and technicians and the enthusiasm of our farmers it should be possible for us to achieve these things.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : इस देश में अन्न के मामले को आप कब तक हल कर देंगे

Shri C. Subramaniam: I do not know whether Mr. Bagri was following me or simply shouting at me something . . . (Interruptions.)

Criticism has been made that after 17 years of Independence we are still dependent on imported foodgrains. I was trying to have a world picture, whether any other country which had undertaken development was importing foodgrains or not. I find that not only our country but even Russia which had a much earlier start . . .

Shri Ranga: Follow Russia.

Shri C. Subramaniam: . . . and not only the socialist countries but even the capitalist countries such as West Germany, etc. all these countries are in the habit of importing foodgrains from other countries. Taking into account our stagnation for centuries under foreign domination and the great population increase in our country we need not be ashamed of our position. Certainly we should try to get rid of it as soon as possible and that is our endeavour (Interruptions.)

श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : इनको शर्म आनी चाहिए। बार बार ये विघ्न डाल रहे हैं इस तरह से।

Shri C. Subramaniam: By this new approach it is our endeavour to get rid of our dependence on imports at least by the end of the Fourth Plan and I am quite confident that it should be possible to reach this target. It is

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

not only cereals that are important; various other nutritive diets and protective food are important and they are to be emphasised; they are cattle development, dairy development, poultry development, fisheries and various other things. I would respectfully submit to Mr. Masani that it is not merely lip service to agriculture; we are allocating financial resources for this purpose so that we may go forward. We are more concerned with what we have to do today than the problem of tomorrow. I agree we are passing through difficult days. Particularly during the last one month the situation became a little critical; in spite of the fact that we had a bumper crop and a record production of 88.5 million tons in 1964-65, it has happened. Some people say: You had a bumper crop in 1964-65; you had a bumper import also during 1964-65. Why this difficulty? You have to look to the background; we had three years of stagnation; the pipe-line had been completely exhausted. Having undergone difficulties during these three years the farmer also is hesitant before he unloads the entire marketable surplus and he wants to make sure of the future prospects and be assured that they would be good enough. The monsoon also has played the trick; unfortunately it was delayed by a month. Then the psychology of scarcity again prevails and perhaps we go back to the years, 1962-63 and 1963-64. Therefore, the market arrivals are there, about which I have given the figures in the review. It is not merely the tendency to hoard, the tendency to make money, but the tendency of every individual is to play safe as far as he is concerned so that the future may be safeguarded, and therefore they wanted to hold on to the stocks till the prospects became brighter. (Interruption). After this late start also, we found there was a longer dry spell than usual, which affected the standing crops and it is in this atmosphere of gloom, with a complete failure of the monsoon, that the prices began to rise, which had a tendency of

falling from January onwards up to June. Therefore, if you see the price-structure, it has been falling from January to June, but after the delay in the monsoon, and particularly after the long dry spell, the prices had shot up and have been rising. Let us hope that this monsoon which has set in now again will not be a temporary phenomenon, that it would be followed up with further showers to create greater confidence in the minds of the people. I have no doubt in my mind that when there is greater confidence, when greater confidence comes, then the farmers who are holding on to the stock will come forward to share their stock with the other consumers also. After all, we cannot blame the farmers merely; they have to look to their future also. But let us hope that the conditions would be such that they would be able to unload their stocks into the market, in easier and better conditions, to the consuming public. (Interruption).

Shri Ranga: We should be thankful to them for keeping them in advance for the benefit of the country.

Shri C. Subramaniam: With regard to the food distribution policy, criticism was made on the basis of the zonal restrictions. Zonal restriction on the basis of each State being a zone has been criticised not only by the Opposition, but even among the Congress Members there is a difference of view about this. In my view, each point of view has its own validity and its own relevancy. It is not as if one point of view is alone absolutely correct and the other point of view has no validity. This is a complex problem. Therefore we have to find out under given circumstances what are the alternatives available and out of the alternatives which is the most practical thing which could be adopted. In making that approach, we have to take into account the behaviour of trade during the last two or three years and the tendency of the farmer

also to hold on to the stocks particularly when the conditions become a little bit gloomy. Also, we have to take into account the attitude of the State Governments.

Some hon. Member,—I think it was Shri Khadilkar,—made the point that the Chief Ministers or the State Governments have got certain vested interests. Simply because we are in Parliament or in the Central Government we should not allow an attitude that we are all super human beings, that we are much wiser men than the persons in the State Governments. I have functioned in the State Government for 10 years. I can tell the House that the State Governments have a much greater responsibility, much greater burden to share with the people, than the Central Government or the Parliament Members here. I do not want to minimise our responsibility or our share of the burden, but it is the State Governments which have to come into contact with the people every day. Therefore, the Chief Ministers have got to take that responsibility of safeguarding the interests of the people who have put them in power. Therefore, to say that they have got vested interests, I am sorry to say, is not doing justice to the Chief Minister. After all when we sit down and talk, it is not as if I am a dictator or the Prime Minister is a dictator to say that this policy alone should be adopted. I am glad we are sitting round the table and discussing things and then, even though there might be different points of view, we are able to arrive ultimately at agreed solutions. That is absolutely necessary in our country to-day, particularly for the functioning of democracy, and particularly taking into account the situation prevailing in the various parts of the country, with reference to the level of development and even the level of administrative efficiency. We have to take all that into account.

Some people seem to think we can have a regimented pattern of procurement and a regimented pattern of dis-

tribution throughout the country. It is an impossibility, taking into account the vastness of the country and the different conditions prevailing in various parts of the country. Therefore, the views of the Chief Ministers have to be given the utmost consideration. If you say it is a weakness, I say it is strength. If we ignore the views of the State Governments and Chief Ministers, we would be going towards disaster much earlier. Let us not take the view that we should dictate and impose something from here. In the present context, it is necessary to take the Chief Ministers along with us, discuss with them and come to agreed conclusions.

17 hrs.

On this basis the zonal restriction was discussed and various points of view were put forward. The Chief Ministers of deficit States pleaded there should be bigger zones or no zones at all, the surplus States pleading against bigger zones. After taking into consideration various aspects of the situation prevailing in the country, we came to the unanimous conclusion that there should be State zones. Some people seem to think that because they are State zones, Kerala or any other State becomes an independent State and this will lead to disintegration. I do not know how. For instance, if Kerala is asked to sustain itself on the production of what it has, it is not as if Kerala has to enter into agreements with various States for getting foodgrains. On the other hand, we procure foodgrains in other States like Andhra and Madras and send it at lower prices to Kerala, so that the poor people in Kerala could be sustained. The only thing is, if it is a free zone, free trade will make this transfer from State to State. (*Interruption*). Of course, our Swatantra Party friends are averse to anything which is done by Government. That is why they will never be in government. Once they are in the government, they will have the philosophy that government should do nothing

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

whatsoever. So, I am glad they are kept back.

After all, we had the experience during 1963-64 in the functioning of a bigger southern zone and we know how the trade cornered the stocks and created scarcity conditions not merely in Kerala, but in surplus States like Andhra and Madras. That is why, taking into consideration the behaviour of the trade during the last two or three years, we decided that we could not take the risk of allowing free trade to function in transferring surplus stocks from one part of the country to another. On the other hand, it should be done on a planned basis of State Government to State Government. That is the basis of zonal restriction. In this, naturally, the responsibilities of the surplus States and the liabilities of the deficit States will have to be properly assessed. There is likely to be some hitch there. That is why we have taken the further decision that the Planning Commission assisted by the Agricultural Prices Commission shall assess the surplus which should be available from a particular State and also what would be the deficit in other States. Of course, it is an exercise which will have to be made as best as possible and on that basis we should make the transfer. Shall we trust the private traders on the basis of their getting maximum profits to make these transfers from one State to another or shall we do it on a planned basis? There, we came to the unanimous conclusion that it will have to be done on a State to State basis. That is why in inter-State trade, we have to eliminate the private trader. Those who believe in private enterprises will find something wrong with this decision. But those who find that there has got to be planned movement, I am sure will agree that this is a good decision and a correct decision too.

Then, Sir, with regard to the national policy the question put by some was, does this not distort the picture

of the national policy. I do not think the national policy can be only on the basis of having a regimented picture everywhere of free trade being allowed to move stocks from one place to another. The national policy is based on these two basic principles: first of all, our food policy should not be such that it would inhibit production and, secondly, there should be equitable distribution of the foodgrains at fair prices. This can be done by various alternatives. Some people say, allow the free trade to function without any government controls whatsoever. They say, eliminate completely State trading and allow free enterprise, free trade to function. Unfortunately, that is too great a risk to take. There is the other extreme view. They say, completely eliminate private trade and take over the entire thing in State trading. They talk of monopoly procurement and monopoly distribution. Even though theoretically it might be the correct thing, unfortunately, we are not in a position, particularly taking into account the administrative efficiency in the various parts of the country, to undertake that great task. It will not be possible to do that and have monopoly procurement and monopoly distribution. That is why we have to find a via-media in which it would be possible for us to control the situation.

That via-media position has been taken on this basis. Let us take care of the pressure pockets where there is a higher purchasing power. As it was pointed out by Shri Masani, where has the new purchasing power in the planned development arisen? Where has it come about? It is mainly in the urban areas and industrial areas. The rural areas, as it has been pointed out, have not yet got the benefits of this planned development to the extent the urban areas have got. Therefore, this higher purchasing power is concentrated in the urban areas. The question that arises is, can we not cord off these high purchasing power pockets—the urban areas and the

industrial areas—so that the rural areas will be protected by this process? Somebody, talking about statutory rationing, asked, if we assure supply to the towns having a population of one million or more, what about the rural areas. To the extent you are able to restrict consumption in the urban areas, to the extent you are able to control prices in the urban areas, to that extent availability in the rural areas also will be more and the price factor also will not get distorted because the price increase starts from urban areas and high purchasing power areas. On this basis we have come to the conclusion that all cities having above one lakh population should be ultimately statutorily rationed and even other urban areas having a population between 5000 and one lakh should have informal rationing of at least six ounces of foodgrains. On that basis we can have either State zones or till we reach the target we can even remove the zones and make the whole country as one unit.

Then the only question is about getting supplies of foodgrains to urban areas. The total comes to about 9 crores of people—4.2 crores under statutory rationing and 5 crores under informal rationing. In this way we would require 7.5 million tonnes of foodgrains at the rate of 12 ounces in urban areas with 10 per cent more for manufacturing labourers and 6 ounces in the smaller urban towns with informal rationing. On this basis we require 7.5 million tons of foodgrains out of which 4 million tonnes will be wheat and 3.5 million tonnes of rice. This is where a procurement policy will have to be evolved under which we will be able to get this amount of foodgrains. To the extent we have to import wheat imported wheat will be available for the purpose of meeting wheat requirements. As far as rice is concerned, when we are producing 40 million tons it will not be an impossible task to procure 3.5 million tonnes, not even 10 per cent—a little below that—from the producers. That is how we envisage the ultimate picture of rationing in the

urban areas and informal rationing in the smaller urban areas, releasing the other areas free for the free market to operate. It is on this basis that we have taken the first step of statutorily rationing cities with a population of over one million and above, because statutory rationing would mean sure supply every day, every week and every fortnight. That is why stocks will have to be built up. But once we introduce rationing and we have the stocks, to that extent we release the stocks outside from entering the urban areas. Therefore, the position becomes better even for procurement for the purpose of introducing rationing in other areas. That is how we visualise it. Ultimately, this is not going to be solved on the basis of controls alone. Control is not an end itself, it is only a means to an end. Provided our agricultural strategy works successfully, provided we are able to increase our production as we are envisaging today, ere long it will be possible to remove controls. There is no question of having controls for control's sake.

Therefore, our food policy will ultimately depend upon the success of our food production. One is mixed with the other, intertwined with the other. So, let us work for abundance in production in the agricultural sector. Then perhaps we can relax controls and there can be a free market, and to the extent necessary the governmental or public sector agencies can work in the field for the purpose of controlling the private trade to the extent necessary.

This is the policy which we have evolved. No doubt, a variety of views are possible on this. Unfortunately, everybody thinks that a solution is a solution only when his point of view is accepted. Therefore, the Swatantra Party thinks that as long as there is control there is no solution. The Communists think that as long as there is free trade there is no solution. Those people who are against statutory rationing say that as long as there is

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

statutory rationing a wrong solution has been adopted. But I can tell you that it is not as if any solution is hundred per cent perfect. Unfortunately, in a deficit economy every solution has got its own defects and shortcomings. What is important is to select the alternative. But what is more important is to remember that when we select an alternative, it is a package. We cannot select one portion of one alternative and another portion of another alternative. Yet, that is exactly what some people want the Government to do. Once we select an alternative what is important is to observe the disciplines, observe what are necessary for working or implementing that alternative. If we proceed on that basis, even though our position is difficult now, even though we have our shortcomings, it would be possible to have equitable distribution and it would be possible to control the prices also.

Even with regard to prices I would request hon. Members to keep in mind what has happened during the last year. Take, for example, Maharashtra where wheat is supposed to sell at Rs. 120 or 130 per quintal. But what is the portion which is selling at that level? It is only the indigenous production. If you take the whole market, 80 per cent of it is imported wheat which is sold at controlled prices. Then, take Kerala. It was stated that the open market prices there are at a high level. If we consider what we are distributing at 6 ounces per head, it will be found that

86 per cent of the rice which is being sold is at controlled price. Therefore, when we calculate the prices we have to take into account things which are distributed at controlled prices. Today we are distributing more than 50 per cent of the marketed wheat and 27 per cent of the marketed rice through controlled channels and through this controlled distribution we are trying to control prices. I do agree that in spite of that in the open market there are erratic rises and sometimes erratic falls also. But that can be avoided only when we are able to produce enough to meet our entire requirements. In short this is our policy.

I am not saying that there are no difficulties. There are difficulties but they will be there in the very nature of a deficit economy. No policy and no Food Minister can convert a deficit economy into a surplus economy. Till that happens we have to stand the stresses and strains. That is all what I would plead with this House and with our people.

17.14½ hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE THIRTY-EIGHTH REPORT

Shri Rane (Buldana): Sir, I beg to present the Thirty-eighth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

17.15 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 25, 1965/Bhadra 3, 1887 (Saka).