

13.04 hrs.

**ADVOCATES (AMENDMENT)
BILL,* 1966**

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Law (Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Advocates Act, 1961.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Advocates Act, 1961.”

The motion was adopted.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: I introduce the Bill.

13.04½ hrs.

**RECALLING OF EXPELLED
MEMBERS—contd.**

श्री बजरत्न सिंह (बरेली) : मेरा एक निवेदन है, अध्यक्ष महोदय ! जिन हमारे मंत्रियों को बाहर निकाला गया है, उनकी मारी जी इच्छा थी वह तो पूर्ण हो चुकी है, बले ही उनके मुख से मांगा हुआ स्टेटमेंट न आया हो, लेकिन उनके लीडर के मुख से मांगा हुआ स्टेटमेंट गवर्नमेंट का हो गया है। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अब उन लोगों को वापिस बुला लिया जाए।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I would request you to give permission, because, we are now discussing an important motion, and it would not look nice when they have to remain outside. It is the desire of the entire House; I request you to let them in.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection and there is nothing that I have to stand upon as a matter of prestige. But the Members of the Opposition should also advise their followers that they should not behave in that man-

ner. How many times had I to ask them not to do that but to sit down again and again. Is it required that the Speaker should go on repeating five, six, seven or eight times that a Member should sit down?

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): I also tried my best but unfortunately some Members had walked out. It was not fair on their part. But still I request you to revoke your decision.

श्री दलजीत सिंह (ऊना) : अगर वे हाउस से माफी मांग लें तो उनको आने दिया जाय।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The leader of the party has stated that he does not approve of the action, and he wanted to prevent him, but he walked out, and he could not be prevented. I would request you to reconsider it.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection.

13.06 hrs.

**MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN
THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS**

Mr. Speaker: Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): It is but fair that the Prime Minister also is present in the House when the motion of no-confidence is taken up.

Mr. Speaker: I hope they have taken notice of it. She will come.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): I beg to move:

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

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is on our part a last resort step, but never before since Independence has Government so deserved from Parliament the order of the boot. Its record of

*Published in Gazette of India dated 1-8-66.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

infamy has truly exhausted the people's patience and we hear cries of anguish from all parts of the country and from all sections of our population, workers and Government employees and students and others, and by this motion we ask Parliament to do its duty.

It is significant also that exactly on the eve of this no-confidence motion, the Government has come forward with legislation which we were constrained to have to oppose even at the introduction stage, because that kind of legislation is the blackest possible which any Government which pretends to democracy could put forward in this House.

Devaluation and other recent goings-on of Government have indeed been the last straw on the camel's back as far as our people are concerned. They represent the biggest betrayal up to date of India's interest and even more of India's self-respect and dignity. This country which carries the load of the centuries could have borne much, but it cannot bear the affront to its honour and the sell-out of our economic independence. I remember an hon. Member on the other side having said that we are too many and just cannot be sold out. He is right, but the point is, when the sell-out is attempted in the interests of a clique that fattens on the backing of predatory international capital and its collaborators in India, Parliament must be stern and do its duty and punish the culprits.

The sordid story of how devaluation was decided upon will perhaps never be told but the indications of what had taken place are dirty enough. The humiliating dependence of those who have been pitchforked into policy-making positions in this country and cunningly condescending to American guidance was pathetically underlined on that black Sunday in June when in betrayal of

every decent canon of political conduct, devaluation was announced. Perhaps two or three individuals in the Cabinet, non-descripts in the Congress Party, with little expertise and less political understanding, who had no right to commit the country as they obviously did during their trips to Dollarland, had taken the initiative in this process of craven surrender, but they seem to be very much on the right side of the Prime Minister and the whole uneasily assorted lot of them are responsible for this perfidious stab in the back of Indian economy and Indian independence and the primacy of Parliament. They are unworthy and unfit to govern the country and in all conscience they should get out.

How can Parliament ever forget the sequence of certain things which took place? Repeatedly during the last three month-long budget session, the Finance Minister and the Planning Minister asserted that the Government was not going to devalue the rupee. On the 17th February, the Planning Minister—I do not see him—

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): Where is he? Why is he not present?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: This kind of thing happens too often; this is just one of the so many pinpricks they give. On 17th February, the Planning Minister in stentorian tones said:

"The Union Government does not propose to devalue the rupee, speculation in the foreign press notwithstanding. There is no question of devaluing the rupee so far as the Government is concerned."

The Finance Minister piped in to the same effect from time to time. Shri Asoka Mehta, who takes the cake in all this business, declared on his way to the United States that he would

refuse, the brave man that he was, to discuss devaluation abroad. And then, a mere three weeks after Parliament was conveniently bundled off, the Government comes forward stealthily like a thief in the night to announce devaluation. It took the country's breath away—the matter and the manner of the decision. This Government has not hesitated to treat Parliament to deliberate and systematic falsehoods persistently purveyed over a period of time. The irony of it is that while many of us on this side are charged repeatedly with having no genuine respect for parliamentary proprieties, Government poses as the paragon of parliamentary virtue. This House has recently had occasion to punish some of us and suspend them from the service of the House on account of their resistance to the self-confessed tricks that Government had planned to play on all of us. This is a queer world; or else, this kind of thing would not have happened. This House, I say in all seriousness, will be guilty of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel if opposition members continue to be penalised, when Government's contumely and contempt of Parliament is condoned. It is terrible to hear also—I wish Government comes forward with a decisive repudiation—that while Parliament was kept in the dark altogether, several interested parties in India and abroad have been given prior intimation regarding the devaluation decision. I know this Government will try to cover up the traces of its crime, but it should be common knowledge here in this House that the decision to force India down to her knees had been made by the cloak and dagger aid-givers of America long ago. The so-called Bell Mission, led by a man whom a knowledgeable ex-Cabinet Minister is said to have described as not good enough to be a Deputy Secretary in this country, had reported at the end of 1964, but was for a while given a short shrift. Then the World Bank called in its ally, the IMF, which put the screw on when it got the chance to

do so over repayment of IMF standby credits. Open tricks followed and we were ordered to put our economic house in order, that is to say, in conformity with their dictates. When our problems piled up with the Indo-Pakistan confrontation and the sudden death of Lal Bahadur Shastri, who had been growing into new dimensions of understanding, they found exactly the situation they were waiting for, the time to apply sternly what Eugene Black, an old World Bank head, had called diplomacy of economic development. In his well-known book on the subject, he wrote:

“The relationship between economic aid and the security of western nations is indeed a direct one. I have suggested that economic should be the principal means by which the West maintains its political and economic dynamic in the under-developed world.”

Now this western dynamic, this subsidiary alliance which the Government has entered into with the United States in particular, impinges on our economy. Even this Government jibbed at devaluation and accepted the rest of the package given to the Prime Minister during her United States visit, the package containing relaxation of controls, import liberalisation and such things, in not so slow and searing stages. The ultimatum came, as a note circulated to Congress Members of this House puts it, “Action on devaluation could not be postponed as all further aid negotiations hinged on it.” So, the die was cast and the Finance Minister now dishes out fairy tale economics. The Prime Minister and her more valiant colleagues made putrid broadcasts and the country knows, howsoever Government tries to prevent its knowing, that the USA comes in this manner to those who are or who will be its pawns.

Are we expected in Parliament to truckle down to the effects and implications of this stinking story? Do

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

we not realise that the collapse of the rupee—mind you, this devaluation is only the beginning of the rot and so many other steps would follow in the wrong direction—the collapse of the rupee will lead, unless we are mighty careful, to the collapse of our economic and eventually also our political independence? It is crystal clear that this Government has neither character nor the capacity to rule the country. This Government is an accessory to a crime against our people and this House cannot forgive them.

While naturally the Cabinet as a whole, led by the Prime Minister is tarred today with the same brush, some outstanding performers among them are today particularly in the dock before the people. The first to come to my mind is the Minister paradoxically of Planning whose book learning is so formidable and who has travelled so serenely perhaps in the company of the Prime Minister from Dogma to Pragma—I am coining words—who has been a protagonist for years of massive food imports, since he was Chairman of a food enquiry committee, who glibly said sometime ago that what we needed was a year's plan holiday, who has before an audience of technicians in Bombay twitted the public sector as a sacred cow he refused to cherish—that same public sector to which a nearly forgotten man called Jawaharlal Nehru had allotted the commanding heights of our economy and in an elusive moment in Moscow his daughter repeated that phrase. But our friend here has broached a new philosophy, which has fluttered even the sedate dovescoats of Yojana Bhavan, the philosophy of foreign aid as the prop of our plan. He has succeeded in nearly scuttling the Fourth Plan and he will be blessed in some quarters for this performance. I have got neither the time nor the inclination to give here an inventory of his recent doings, but there is one thing which strikes me every time I see him. I am sorry, I do not see him

now. Whenever I see him it comes to my mind, here is the man who advised the Americans about the virtues of back-seat driving, that is to say, using us Indians in the role of Shikhandi; here is the man who so overwhelmed by a meeting of minds in the United States perorated that India would be opening up her womb to foreign capital; here is the man who had offered a torn mat to United States capital for wiping its feet on it before entering India almost in the role of a new East India Company; he is today in the pillory and I wonder if the country, if not Parliament, will ever forgive him.

And, what can one say of the Minister of food imports. I see him there, Sir, luckily the face which launched a thousand food ships from the United States. He waxed eloquent at one time, last November,—you might have forgotten about it—I am quoting his words:

“If we have to starve we are prepared for that, but we won't go a begging.”

Despite all this—it is forgotten altogether, erased from everybody's memory in the Cabinet—he went on to speak about a national food plan with systematic procurement and distribution of food-grains, when he began his somersaults, that have not ended yet, and his assumption of shortfall has arisen from two to eight million, then to twelve million tonnes, which his America counterpart, with whom he has hob-nobbed recently in the country, now says is eighteen million tonnes. In an essay which he has sent us free—I read it with interest—on devaluation, he writes on page 14—I am quoting his words:

“The goal in the relative long run is self-reliance; the goal in the immediate present is survival.”

Here is a Food Minister who in November was talking about a plan of self-reliance, something like a new *Swadeshi* movement which we have

been all asking for in this country; here is a man who only a few months ago writes in his own book—which he sends us gratis, without having to pay a paisa for it—that the goal in the immediate present is survival. We have to survive, that is what he says. We have been brought down to this pass. Who in the country is responsible for this, but the Government of this land? How can the Government get away from its responsibility? Is it a joke governing a country like India and saying all kinds of things from time to time? That is exactly what is going on. There is no reason, he says, why indigenously produced goods should go up in prices at all. He does not know. Meanwhile he recommends, what he calls, the mighty task of refashioning India's economic structure; refashioning, indeed, for his aim is to alter the pattern of Indian economy and to yoke it to the chariots of American free booters who are now asking for their pound of flesh by way of payment in dollars. Since his Prime Minister does not either know or care, Parliament should tell Shri Subramaniam that the alternative is not that of starvation or mammoth PL 480 imports but limited imports to be paid for and strict implementation of acceptor policies like the intensified procurement, social control on foodgrains trade, land reforms and greater incentive to the tiller of the soil, stern action against hoarders and profiteers, nationalisation for rice mills and such things. The Food Minister is, of course, pursuing a policy of tie-up with the United States, and our best economists fear the existence of an American vested interest in Shri Subramaniam's plaintive yet slyly purposeful exaggeration. What can one say. He bears the name of a God of war, but when I think of him "Subramaniam, thy name is subservience; that is the point to which you have brought this country".

An hon. Member: Kartikeya.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I see my friend, the Finance Minister, straying into Congress from his accustomed forensic

and financial haunts rather like a man who carries the big drum which another fellow beats. He, naturally, has not taken long to convince himself that there is no shame in handing over the economic management of the country to the World Bank. Politically inconsequential, he still occupies the centre of the stage, but in the wings are more powerful people, bigger fish who flourish in deep water like my very good friend the Railway Minister who has an eye on the elections and, therefore, preference for the time being to keep in the wings.

And, of course, there is the Prime Minister, sometimes slightly bewildered from the look of her but firm in her support to new-fangled policies and more to new-found proteges in her Cabinet. She is welcome personally to whatever ideas she has got and whatever company she chooses to keep, but with that she has no business to be the Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I say this because the Prime Minister cannot be unaware of the nagging pressures of those who have openly made their aid, whose extent is doubtful and whose quality is worse as it is contingent on so-called monetary reforms. She obviously does not see the irony of a situation where devaluation of the rupee has been effected not to defend our economic frame by substituting trade for aid but specifically and clearly for securing even more aid in order to be added up to the load which our descendants in succeeding generations would have to carry. Her Government has neither the conviction nor talent needed to nationalise banking and the export-import trade, two steps which could have rendered devaluation unthinkable. They are incapable of taking firm measures to discipline the national economy on account of dependance on vested interests and not on the masses. They have not the faith and the purposefulness needed to bring about higher production and equitable distribution through effective steps towards socialisation of the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

basic means of production and a policy control of the distribution machinery. They have neither the inclination nor the equipment which is needed to prevent prices spiralling under the manipulation of big business at whose mercy it has placed the economy. It can only be refrigerated elegance, in which the Prime Minister lives, moves and has her being, that is perhaps responsible for such glib statements as "the rise in prices since devaluation has been hardly noticeable". Her Minister of Commerce—is he here—whose report for 1965-66 had explained how devaluation would not boost Indian exports found himself in hot-waters the other day over the issue of rise in prices even of vegetables, edible oils, pulses, medicines, matches, tobacco and all sorts of things that everybody use. A post devaluation survey reported the rise to have been between 15 and 30 per cent in seven weeks. The Reserve Bank is stated to have pitched on the figure of 7 per cent as the rise in wholesale prices in that period and I saw Congress newspapers like the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta of yesterday screeching, very rightly, about the prices reaching dizzy heights. Of course, there has been set up, under the auspices of our good friends in Government, a super-market, to be followed elsewhere by prototypes, where cars congregate and the prosperous make their purchases, combining economy with excitement. This is a devil of a joke, but I guess the Prime Minister and her flock do not see it.

The Prime Minister, of course, is her father's daughter. That is, however, a meagre point of genealogy hardly worthy of any special significance. But one cannot help recalling that even in his twilight days, when perhaps he was doing certain things under pressure which he would not normally have done, Jawaharlal Nehru never swallowed certain things. He could rouse himself to abrogate the VOA Agreement once its implications in terms of the nation's honour and

independence were explained. It is ridiculous, of course, to expect anything of the same sort from the present Prime Minister. After all, as the Information and Broadcasting Minister, she permitted, so everybody says, a sort of modified VOA Agreement by the backdoor, by authorising the American Peace Corps members to set up and work transmitters in our countryside. Perhaps she has solved the daughter's dilemma, but she cannot ride rough-shod over things. She cannot get away with reversing basic policies and putting the national economy out of gear. Her entourage, so largely composed of political upstarts and slimy bureaucrats, hand in glove with Indian and foreign money bags, may flatter her in a sort of smug vanity, but it is unworthy of her not to realise such obvious things as that devaluation, or the notorious fertilizer deal or limitless food imports are not only wrong in themselves but, being also fundamentally linked, are causing an erosion of our independence, our dignity and our political morality.

This is seen in such things as Government's acceptance of the Indo-American Foundation, which is barely concealed attack on the intellectual and patriotic intelligence of Indian education and an invitation for CIA agents, about whom Shri Chagla ought to be familiar with, to penetrate our academic and political life under the grab of education and research. Even more egregiously it has been seen in our country's official attitude on the issue of Viet Nam, which overshadows every other issue in the world today. For quite some time the Prime Minister and all else in authority tried to keep mum over the issue, not daring to irritate our wonderful aid-givers. Then, with her proposals, or ideals, or suggestions, whatever you may call it, about peace in Viet Nam the Prime Minister opened her mouth, only however to discover during her peregrinations abroad that she had put her foot into it.

So, let there be no mistake about it, there is going on for years now in Viet Nam a horror war, launched in defiance of every cherished principle of international conduct and even of humanity by the Pentagon. Their owners, the American people themselves have raised their voice against it. There have been giant demonstrations, massive indictment by intellectuals and others and even self-immolation in protest by white Americans. All honour to them. Even before the criminal bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, and more recently of demilitarized zone between North and South Viet Nam, which India as Chairman of the International Control Commission is supposed to safeguard, Bertrand Russel, one of the greatest men in the world today, was so moved by United States enormity that he made a broadcast in May to the American soldiers fighting in Viet Nam, asking them to give up the job and go back home. He also proposed a tribunal of Nobel Prize winners like himself and others, eminent and most distinguished in the world, trying those who were responsible for, what he calls, American war crimes in Viet Nam. I would like to read to you part of the broadcast made by Bertrand Russel, which is very relevant, about which most of us in this country do not seem to be aware of. He says in an early part of his speech—I am quoting his words:—

“When the United States first began to intervene militarily in South Viet Nam, the pretence was made that the United States is merely helping a Government in Saigon put down subversion from outside. But you American soldiers have seen for yourself what kind of governments have existed in Saigon. They are brutal, corrupt, dictatorial and completely despised by the people. Why is it that these governments have been able to continue, one after another, in Saigon, despite the fact that the students, the women, the villagers, everyone, risks life itself to overthrow them? The sole

answer is that the United States is using its enormous military force to impose on the people of Viet Nam puppet governments which do not represent them...”

Then he talks about horrors which are being practised.

I am quoting his words again:

“The U.S. rulers have built an economic empire which is being resisted from the Dominican Republic to the Congo, and especially in Viet Nam. Could you imagine yourselves voting for Cao Ky? If a foreign power occupied the United States to steal American resources for itself and if a traitor government were established by force, would you feel it was your government? Worse than this, because the Vietnamese people are so determined and show such fantastic heroism that the greatest military power has found it impossible to conquer them. You American soldiers are trained to use every modern weapon of war. Your air force is flying 650 sorties a week in the North.”

—this was in May—

“and the tonnages used in the South are higher than those used during the Second World War or the Korean War.”

This is what Bertrand Russel says:

“You are using napalm, which burns everything it touches. You are using phosphorus, which eats like an acid into those who are in its path.

You are using fragmentation bombs and lazy dogs, which cut up in pieces and lacerate women and children in the villages hit without discrimination. You are using poison chemicals which cause blindness, affect the nervous system and paralyse. You are using poison gases which are listed in army manuals of world wars as poisons, and other gases which are so deadly that even soldiers with gas masks have been killed by their own gas.”

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

I could quote so much more but I have not the time. But the point is that the Americans have been using the worse possible weapons against Asians and they have always used it only against the Asians—the atom bomb against Japan, the germ warfare in Korea and now in Viet Nam germ warfare which was not so effective in the sub-arctic conditions of Korea but which in Viet Nam in the sub-tropical conditions are particularly powerful. You may not believe these, but these are statements which have never been rebutted. The Gandhi Peace Foundation, to which sometimes I have the honour, with my friend, Professor Ranga, to be invited, has prepared a document listing the atrocities which are reportedly being committed by the Americans in Viet Nam. Of course, from other sources we can get the information. American journalists, Australian journalists have given reports which have percolated into a section of our press.

What is happening and why is all this happening to a small country like South Viet Nam with a population of 14 million, less than one-thirtieth of the population of this country? The cost of United States in South Viet Nam in 1965-66 was 13,000 million dollars. They have got 270,000 American soldiers there. They are saying: we shall send 400,000. If they send 400,000 the cost would be 21,000 million dollars, which is a great deal more than the total gross national product of this country, spent in one single year by the Americans in order to crush the freedom instinct of the Vietnamese people. This is the kind of thing which is happening.

I remember the occasion when the House was unanimous, when the use of napalm bomb by the Americans came into the picture, except for a fringe which looks upon India as having a boundary on the Mekong river or somewhere, the entire House was unanimous in indignation against this kind of thing which has been taking place in Viet Nam. The United

States' imperialists have challenged the world to question its divine right of intervention. What is the reaction of our Government, a Government which is responsible as Chairman of the International Control Commission, to report to the world at least as to what exactly is happening in that part of the world? I remember, the Prime Minister on the 30th of June made a speech in Bombay, expressing her concern over United States' bombing, which was now being extended to Haiphong and Hanoi.

At Calicut she made a statement on the 2nd July giving an impression that perhaps she should not get involved too directly in this dirty business. Then something happened and the mystery needs to be explained. On the 7th July she made certain proposals. She suggested a meeting of the Geneva Conference unconditionally, not having consulted anybody who mattered. Then she said on July 16 in Moscow, "Solution only within the framework of the Geneva Conference of 1954". In Parliament she said, "Convene a Geneva type conference".

She goes on making all kinds of statements, but in the beginning on the 7th July she sullied the face of India by making a proposal without careful thought. She went to all kinds of countries, like the UAR, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, and nowhere, in no country, did she get the slightest support because they thought that it was trying to produce something like an alibi for the Americans; except Britain which is always holding the baby for America whenever America wishes her to do so, no other country came forward to support her.

Why did she make this kind of a proposition without careful thought? Somebody called it "kindergarten diplomacy". Who were the advisers who told her to do this kind of a thing? Why plunge in the waters whose depths you do not understand? Why not take a moral stand which you

have taken all the time without getting yourself in difficulty as Chairman of the International Control Commission? Why could you not say certain things which could have been said without any kind of difficulty? Is it all because the new projects loan is a sort of a Damocles' Sword hanging over our head and the United States is revelling in a puppet show to which our foreign policy seems to be reduced?

Not long ago when the hush-hush negotiations with Washington were going on, the Prime Minister made the surprising statement which in effect implied that it was not possible in today's circumstances to ask the Americans to withdraw from Vietnam. She spoke in America about the President being a man of peace whom she admired greatly because of his pursuit of peace at a time when all these enormities and barbarities were taking place. In Moscow she pleaded for a lenient treatment of American pilots who had gone over in defiance of every canon of international law to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, but she did not plead with President Johnson, at least not to the knowledge of anybody, in regard to the stoppage of the brutalities which have been accumulated for so many years now in this part of the world.

We have travelled a long way from positions built up over 17 long years, that of standing firmly and uncompromisingly by the victims of imperialist aggression. That reminds me that 'imperialist' is now a word which the Prime Minister sought to define or rather leave undefined in a very, very different way from what she had learnt in the bad old days when her father wrote letters on world affairs to his daughter.

The Prime Minister should know that expression of platonic regret coupled with what is virtually acquiescence in United States barbarity in Vietnam falls entirely short of the country's expectation and blackens

India's image everywhere. The Prime Minister should remember that we should think of our fellow sufferers in countries who have fought against imperialism and who now discover they have to fight still for the fulfilment of their hard-earned freedom. It is a pity that it was left to an Indian employee of the Foreign Office to be the first diplomat from the non-aligned world to propagate the Washington lie that South Vietnam was a sovereign and independent country and, further, that United States bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong should induce North Vietnam to agree to negotiations. This was our man, our Consul General in South Vietnam. When the Prime Minister was asked about it in a press conference, she hum-hummed and haw-hawed, hesitated, almost quibbled; then, of course, she had to say something. I want to know: Has he been recalled? He seems to have come back. Why has he not yet sacked? How long are we going to tolerate such pseudo-fashionable ruffraff functioning as our diplomatic representatives in very sensitive areas and always queering the pitch for Indian diplomacy to function?

Let the House warn the Prime Minister. She never even whispers the name of the South Vietnam Liberation Front as a factor in the situation. She hardly ever names who is the aggressor in Vietnam, who is the foreign presence in Vietnam. She has not yet commented officially, nor her Government—Shri Swaran Singh or anybody—on the World Court judgement which is scandalous in regard to the case of South West Africa. The more Government moves away from our best traditions, from conviction and idealism and the strength that it gives, to the present degeneration of make-shift pragmatism and double-talk, we would be going from one clarification to another, from one deceit to another and, not too distantly, from drift to disaster.

In regard to Vietnam I have heard my people's voice, not in the corridors of perverted power in New Delhi, but

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

in Calcutta's streets that have echoed recently to the call of our poets anguished by US atrocities in Vietnam and yet elevated by Vietnam's heroism.

वित्तयुद्ध अविरोध विद्यतनाम, विद्यतनाम
स्वाधीनतार अर एक नाम, विद्यतनाम,
विद्यतनाम,
तोमार नाम, अमार नाम, विद्यतनाम,
विद्यतनाम ।”

(Unceaselessly our fight for freedom, Vietnam, Vietnam; It is another name for freedom, Vietnam, Vietnam; Your name and my name is Vietnam, Vietnam) (Laughter).

That is why white men in America are burning themselves to death in protest against that barbarity. You may laugh. You may not have the sense; some people do not have the sense to understand why white men in America are burning themselves to death protesting against the enormity of the conduct of their own rulers. We do not have to think in that way, but our rulers do not even have the desire to say something which would have been morally acceptable to this country and to the world.

I know I cannot call back this government to sense and sensibility; I cannot call back this Congress Party to sense and sensibility. I know that in the mistaken hope that by playing up the danger from Communism India can get massive US aid on Marshall Plan scale, the Prime Minister has stressed that the conflict with China is ideological, an approach which her father had scrupulously avoided. She has even talked about the containment of China and of Communism. I have heard that at the Pentagon entrance there is a bust of a former American Defence Secretary, Forrestal, who was so bent on containing Communism that he went off his mind.

The Government has launched, as a harrowing half-year has just concluded testifying, a massive attack against the people everywhere. In the UP where the Congress writ ran and will never

run in the future, in West Bengal, in Kerala and elsewhere, the voice of the people has been heard. People will fight back the dire consequences of devaluation on the life of the toiling masses. At the last Indian Labour Conference the working class has given notice to the Minister of Labour.

This growing surrender to the United States was invariably accompanied in every country, where this has occurred, by utter suppression of democracy. That is why we have got the latest unlawful activities' Ordinance now to be turned into law ostensibly directed against secessionist activities. It is an evil omen and a child of devaluation. I find in it the definition of 'unlawful activity' including a sweeping clause—Shri Nanda should listen—regarding activities intended to overthrow the lawful government. He is sitting next to a jurist; he is supposed to be a jurist. The intentions of the Opposition are to be punished. The police state mentality is growing but the people cannot just give in.

Jobs have to be done but the Government does not do them. The Congress is having a fight. I do not know how the Congress is carrying on its fight, but in a dogfight every dog gets-beaten. Please remember that. Look after the hundred crores of rupees of foreign exchange secreted, that Shri Khadilkar talked about. As a member of the Santhanam Committee he ought to know about it. Make sure that the ministers at least turn over their foreign-exchange assets to Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri. Stop all talks about wage freeze and the like. Link dearness allowance to wages. You did not funk when allowing big money to have a bounty of bonus shares and so many other things. Come forward, Mr. Finance Minister, to catch the tax thieves and others who have put it in the C. B. Gupta Rs. 65 lakhs Fund or something. This is black money all the time. Find out the sources and punish them. Do not come and put up a sombre face and tell us that you are doing all that

you possible can. Go and do it, catch the thieves who are operating all over your Congress territory.

Above all, remember what one of your Members said in the last session: Don't make India another Brazil. He asked: Are we to be another Brazil or are we to be India? This was said by a Congress M. P. in the last session. Let us be India; let us have new Swadeshi movement; let us have self-reliance—not in the mad way in which Government is opening the flood gates to imports. One order of the 21st June made a staggering list of 59 industries where imports have been relaxed. Of course, let us remember a thing like what Dr. C. V. Raman has said: We stand on our own legs and let us be fearlessly independent. If we have time, let us remember Mahatma Gandhi: Ahimsa was a method; non-violence was a means, method and an instrument of action but the spirit was Abhaya, fearlessness—shed all fear. I see people laughing; I know none of them was visible and none of them participated in the national movement. . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Most of them, these maharajas and lawyers, never participated in the national movement. They will not appreciate this.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know how Gandhi and Nehru are being laughed at by the people. I know how memorials of these great men are being scuttled by those who are in position of power and affluence in this country. I ask you to recall the message of Gandhi; Abhaya, more than Ahimsa, fearlessness; fearlessly proceed with your duty. I know it is a cry in wilderness when I see the kind of audience that is before me. This Government is inefficient, insensitive and corrupt. It has no moral right to stay in office a day longer in spite of its majority in this House.

Let us act once in a moral manner. Let us show to the world the strength

and the reality of the kind of a feeling which is there all over the country. This Government has forfeited the confidence of the people.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Now, about the time-limit of speeches, the ordinary Members may have 15 minutes and the spokesmen of the groups may have 20 to 30 minutes. Shri Harish Chandra Mathur.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you just take away the fury, the storm and the noise of my hon. friend's speech, you will see what is left and what it boils down to. I do not propose to deal with this sabre-rattling, this rattling of the exploded guns. When he was at his best, when he was at the climax, I was wondering whether he was moving a No-Confidence Motion against this Government or the American Government. (*Interruption*) I have no objection to his strong feelings against the U.S. Government. I always see him at his best. When he was at his best, he was all the time pre-occupied with what is happening in U.S.A. and Vietnam.

13.54 hrs.

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Government and the leadership of the Party has left nobody in doubt regarding our attitude on the happenings in Vietnam. We, of course, as the Chairman of the I.C.C. have got to exercise certain restraint. The Prime Minister cannot be expected to speak the same thing as my esteemed friend Prof. Mukerjee can or as I could. Let him understand that this House has accepted more than once—we have stated it clearly and unequivocally—that the solution to the Vietnam problem does not lie through the military aggression or through the military activities and that it lies only

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

through negotiation, that it is a political problem which will have to be solved that way. Nobody denies that. This House has accepted that it lies within the framework of the Geneva Agreement and that exactly is the position which the Government has taken all the time.

While the No-Confidence Motion in the real sense does not make very much sense, because there is not that purpose, there is not that agreed programme, there is not that agreed solution, still, in spite of all this, I do not want to take the Motion of No-Confidence lightly. I want to take it really very seriously. The country is faced with a grave situation and it demands of us all, whether sitting on this side or on that side, that we have a clear and objective critical analysis of the situation which is obtaining in the country, the problems which we have to face, the programmes which we have to draw up with a clear vision and which have got to be executed with vigour and effectiveness. Therefore, I do not want to enter into all these fine professional phrases which he can afford. But let us, because we want to find what the ailment is, find out where we stand, what are the difficulties in our economic situation, what are the difficulties in our foreign affairs and all that and what we have got to do about that.

My hon. friend from the Swatantra Party who had participated earlier in the discussion devoted most of his speech to the economic situation because we were discussing the economic situation. Prof. Mukerjee, in his earlier part of his speech, also talked about devaluation. Of course, they talk at a tangent; they talk at different purposes—I can understand that—but I do not want to make much of that and I do not want to gain any debating points over these people. Let us understand what the situation actually is.

My friend says that this decision of devaluation has been taken under some duress. That is the only grave and the main charge levelled by the Communist Party. It can be said that under the compulsion of certain circumstances, we have taken the decision. But whether the decision has been taken because of certain pressures from U.S.A. or from the World Bank or from the I.M.F., whether it is so or not, I do not know. I think Mr. Mukerjee has certain knowledge which he has not imparted to the House excepting the rhetorical phrases which he used.

Let us examine the things critically and analytically. This problem has been there before the country for two weeks. We have been faced with certain difficulties. My friend says that this decision has been taken under pressure. But the Swatantra Party's stand is not so. According to them, it is the last 15 years economic mismanagement which has led to this state of affairs. Is it really so? I will deal with both of them while I deal with the economic situation and the devaluation.

Mr. Masani's main point was that the controls had killed enterprise and fostered corruption, profiteering and political patronage. My friend wants control all the time and he wants control through the bureaucracy which he condemns all the time. Let us understand the inherent contradiction in what my friend wants. My friend from the Communist Party wants that there should be controls at every stage.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Wherever there are shortages, we have said, you should have controls.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: You have not said, wherever there are shortages—You want controls all along the line.

The present state of bankruptcy, according to Mr. Masani, is the result of what had been done during the

last 15 years in spite of the warnings being given from time to time. I think, Mr. Masani will not understand what I say. But possibly he will understand the situation much better if I give him the factual position. I am not putting the factual position from the government record but from what the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry says. What does the top-body of the industrialists and that traders say? In a booklet which they have circulated, possibly all the Members have got it, there is a heading, "Whither Rupee" where they have said that until 1962 price rise was within reasonable limits. So, it is not the 15 years mismanagement according to them also. It is only since 1962 that things have happened in such a manner that there have been such distortions which have come into our economy which are responsible for the present-day situation. That is what Federation says. This is what everybody else says. What has been the price rise? After all, it is very serious; it is responsible for all the ailments in the country. What has been the price rise from 1951-52 to 1962? It was hardly 20 per cent. 2 per cent is understandable in any developing economy. You take any country, whether it is a developed country or a developing country, everywhere, in most of the countries, the price rise has been not less than 2 per cent a year and so is the case in this country. As a matter of fact, we have passed through three Plans. The First Plan was approved by everybody in the House; nobody raised any objection. Even when we were discussing the Second Plan, we always talked about the First Plan. The First Plan was considered to be very good. (*Interruptions*).

14 hrs.

Mr. Ranga will understand that his objection was to the public sector projects, to the spending in the public sector and he wanted to give a greater filip to Agriculture. That was the character of the First Plan.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): That was my objection then. I did raise my voice against the First Five Year Plan.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): The First Plan was never discussed here.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What was the position in 1956? Let me again put it to the whole House. The record will bear it. What was the position in 1956 when we were at the end of the First Five Year Plan? Our price index was 100 at 1952-53 level; in 1956 it was 92.5. It had come down because it was a bumper year, because it was a good agricultural year. A good agricultural year, does count a considerable lot in our economy. The price rise, investment and every thing went on very well upto 1962. And it is here that my friends, more particularly my Communist friends, have to understand as to what happened. What happened in 1962? There was the Chinese aggression. In the wake of the Chinese aggression, according to the demand of every one in this House, we had to gear up our defence and we had to spend a much larger amount on our defence. On defence we were spending, say, about Rs. 350 to 400 crores and we had to jump to Rs. 800 crores; it had to go up even to Rs. 1000 crores.

Why I want to remind my Communist friends in particular is that I want to take them a little earlier, to those days, when in the USSR that great October Revolution took place. In the wake of that great October Revolution came the Iron Curtain because there were certain Western democracies—you may call them imperialist powers or colonial powers—which wanted to sabotage—that is an important point to my mind—the new social order which was rising in USSR and those people had to shut out all the influences from outside and had to raise the Iron Curtain to have their own development, to have their own economy. Those imperialist powers wanted to sabotage that social order. Exactly the same history is being repeated

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

now. Let it be understood that in 1962 the Chinese Plan was to sabotage the democratic set up in this country, in this part of the region, and the planned economy which we had undertaken and they have willy-nilly succeeded to a little extent in this matter.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: He must know how the young socialist State withstood it, not as we are doing it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Let him understand why I am saying this. Let him understand how those people wanted to sabotage. Here was a definite, clear-cut plan by a Communist country, whether for ideology or whether for this reason or that reason. But the reason was obvious and clear: they wanted to sabotage the democratic functioning of this country; they wanted to sabotage the developmental set up and the planned development which we had adopted in this country. The whole trouble has followed from that. If our Communist friends realise this, then half of the trouble of this country would be solved.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Are you going to save yourself by going into the lap of Americans?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We have to spend so much of amount on defence. It is the duty of every one of us in this country to safeguard its security. We have, under compulsion, to spend about Rs. 500 to 600 crores more a year because this aggression from China has not ended till now. Let us also not forget that we are willing to talk to China, but China is not willing to talk even on the most reasonable Colombo Plan proposals. And funny questions are being asked of the Ministers, "what are you doing". Let them understand that China is continuing the aggression by occupying our land; China is further continuing that aggression by egging Pakistan now. Pakistan is

wanting to adopt those bullying tactics, aggressive tactics and guerilla tactics. We have got to be warned against. Even this week it was China which had clearly indicated that they would support Pakistan. Support Pakistan in what? Is it anybody's claim here that it was India which committed aggression? In such a clear manner it is evident on the cards; by all evidences it is known to every one sitting in this House, but my friends have never condemned China for taking this posture and for taking this attitude of supporting Pakistan—now all the materials are being supplied to them. They were condemning all the time the United States of America. I never heard a word about China from Mr. Mukherjee's voice today when it is most topical. He was talking about America supplying arms and ammunitions to Pakistan. Why should he not say that China is doing the same thing? China, which is our neighbour, is a far greater danger than the Americans. The whole condemnation is against the United States of America.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We do not say that all that China has done is right. We also do not say that it is a much greater danger than the United States. What is your solution? Going into the lap of Americans in order to stop China?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am always a game for all interruptions and that is why I gave an opportunity to interrupt and say something.

Is it my sister's contention that in today's context China is not posing a greater danger to this country? We can sit together and take a decision. It is certainly posing a greater danger. If even the right Communists cannot see the light, then the danger is certainly greater. We have to understand this.

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): Both are one. There is no distinction between China-supporters and Russia-supporters.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Let us see what has happened further. We say that we have been spending beyond our means; we have done this and we have done that. What have we achieved during these 15 years? That has got to be understood. We have got here a Constitution. The Constitution tells us of certain Constitutional responsibilities that are on us. Take, for instance, Education. What has happened in Education? The number of children at school has risen. I will give certain facts so that we may be able to draw certain conclusions, so that they may serve for the future debate on the very two points which have been raised both by the Swatantra as well as by the Communist Party. What are the achievements that this Government has made during these 15 years? The number of children at school has risen from 23 millions in 1950-51 to 68 millions. Today 2 million teachers are there. We talk of governmental expenditure! The number of college students has risen from 3 lakhs to 15 lakhs. Admissions to engineering colleges have risen from 4,700 to 23,000; admissions to polytechnics are 48,000. There are 12,000 scientists. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this is our heaviest bill in our developmental expenditure and we have yet not been able to fulfil the Constitutional obligation about which every day there is a talk that we should have provided by now primary education for each and every child in this country. When we discuss matters in this House, I do not know of any Member who has not asked for further development, whether it is power or irrigation or education, whatever it is. We want more and more of each one of these things, because the country needs them.

You will be amused to know that in a very backward place in Rajasthan, called Jalore, we had a great

agitation last month. It was a very great agitation. The bazar remained closed for five days, and the whole district was at a stand-still. And what was the demand? The demand was that we must have a college there this year. That was the main demand of the entire people. If we give them a college, then we should have a big building for it. There is no college in the district even to this day. That is why this agitation was there. Again, thousands of primary schools, middle schools, high schools and higher secondary schools are demanded. People are coming forward with donations from their side for starting these schools, and yet we are unable to meet their demand; in spite of all the co-operation which they are offering, we are unable to meet the full demand. Every Member of Parliament wants that something more should be done, and the Constitution demands that something more should be done in this matter.

So, along with defence, we have had these developmental activities going on. My hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani had said that both the things could not be dealt with together and such a thing was impossible. His argument was that after the Chinese aggression we should have gone ahead only with defence and we should have ignored development. In other words, he said that we could not have both at the same time.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): I had never said so.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: After all, what is the development which we want? As a matter of fact, what I have been quarrelling about with the Prime Minister for the last one week has been this; I have been telling her that we want a little additional fund for the rural water supply programme, which we have not been able to take up so far. Again, we want rural electrification for lift irrigation and for agriculture purposes. These are the demands which are being made.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

In this context, it would be just right to point out what the achievement has been, whether this Government is bankrupt, whether it has let down the country or this Government has poured everything down the drain and so on. The fact is that the expectation of life has risen from 32 to more than 50. (*Laughter*). My hon. friends may laugh at it. But that is the truth. During these three plans, we have provided employment to about 28 million people, and yet we have an army of unemployed people.

Arguments have been advanced to the effect that we need not have all this heavy machinery and so on. But what has been our achievement? Take the case of iron ore. From a production of 3 lakhs tons, we have gone up to a production of above 15 million tons now, and we are exporting it now. Iron ore happens to be the fourth largest item of export, and we are getting about Rs. 78 to 80 crores from those exports. In the case of machine-tools, the production was 0.63 tons before, and today it is 53.97 tons. We were manufacturing 2,900 railway wagons before, but now we are manufacturing 24,300. The production of cotton cloth has gone up from 4215 million metres to 7445 million metres. The production of sugar has gone up from 11 lakhs tons to 32 lakhs tones.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar): Let him compare this with the population rise.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The production of sugar has gone up from 11 lakhs tons to 32 lakhs tons; whereas the population rise has been to the extent of only 30 per cent sugar production has increased by about 250 per cent.

An hon. Member: Only sugar.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That is also an item where my hon. friend is talking of scarcity.

In regard to foodstuffs, too, the same position will hold good. The production of foodgrains has increased by 68 per cent, whereas the population rise has been only to the extent of 30 or 35 per cent. The plain fact is that our people were living at a semi-starvation level, and those people have now started eating a little more. That is perfectly right, and we have got to provide food to them. We have not only to think of the additional mouths than we are going to feed, but we have also got to take into consideration the fact that people will want to eat a little more, they have been living at a semi-starvation level for years and now they want to eat a little more. Even today, out of the 30 per cent of our people who live in the rural areas, about 15 to 20 per cent at the bottom are in a very unfortunate and very miserable condition. The next 40 per cent above that level who were hardly getting one meal before are now getting two square meals a day. Nobody can deny that. That is the reason why the demand for food has gone up and it will go up in the future also, and we should be prepared for it.

Again, let us take the case of some small items. In the case of fans, the production has gone up from 2 lakhs to 14 lakhs, in the case of sewing machines, from 33,000 to 3 lakhs, in the case of radio sets from 54,000 to 5 lakhs, and in the case of automobiles from 16,000 to about 7 lakhs. So, whether it be the one field or the other, we find that everywhere production has been increasing.

Now, we have fallen into a vicious circle. It is unfortunate. And we are faced with growing difficulties. These difficulties had started from 1962 onwards. I hope everybody understands what the plan behind the 1962 Chinese aggression has been. It is an aggression which is being continued even till today. After 1962, again in 1965 we had another aggression and this was from Pakistan.

Then, we had two bad years of drought. We have to face all these difficulties now.

When the question of devaluation came—I am here to give my explanation—I said that it was a great blunder to have agreed to devaluation, not because I supported any of the arguments advanced by the Communist Party or the Swatantra Party but because of other reasons. There is nothing which I would tell outside whether in the executive committee or at the party meeting which I would not say here. I told them; 'I understand that you have taken this decision with the best of intention; I quite agree with you on that', and I very much appreciated the Prime Minister's stand in that connection. Some of us had felt that this should not have been done in the wake of the elections because that would certainly create trouble for us all over the country. And the Prime Minister's stand was that the country was more important than the Congress Party and its chances of success in the elections. That was something which I had to appreciate.

But my point is that there can be differences of opinion. We have to see whether we are in chronic difficulties or we are in temporary difficulties. People say that in a developing economy, once the prices rise, they never come down. As compared with the price index of 100 in the base year 1951, the price index in 1956 came down to 92.5. I would submit that the prices in this country are not governed by industrial production at all but by agricultural production. I would, therefore, suggest that we should tie our economy and tie our thinking to food production. We are facing all these difficulties of price rise etc. because there had been two bad years of drought. If we have bumper crops successively for two years. I have not the least doubt that everybody here would forget what he has said today, because the whole situation will then change.

1076 (A1) LSD—7.

On the question of devaluation, as I have already said, I told the Government at the party meeting. 'You have made a blunder, it is not by importing more of consumer goods or more for consumer industries that you are going to help in improving the situation.' Here, I may tell my hon. friend that we are in an absolutely free country, and we are in a free party and we express our opinions absolutely freely there.

As my hon. friends are aware, the same dialogue is going on in the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom thinks very strongly on one side, while the Deputy Prime Minister thinks absolutely on the other side. We are also having a similar dialogue here in our country. Unfortunately, this being the pre-election year, it distorts our thinking to an extent. I do not know how far it is correct, but to say that they do not think in the same manner in the United Kingdom is not correct. I have got here before me news items regarding this matter. In an item entitled "Devalue the Pound"—call to Wilson', it was reported:

"Devaluation of sterling was advocated by the British Deputy Prime Minister Mr. George Brown as a way out of the present difficulty."

This is the position there; there also, there is a big party. It is not that Mr. Brown has gone out of the Government; it is not that he is going to leave the party; even when one had left the Government, one did not go out of the party.

So, I would submit that there can be honest differences of opinion on this matter. I have a particular opinion for the reasons which I have already mentioned. According to me, they are perfectly legitimate reasons. If my hon. friends say that the situation in this country has become like this, I would only request them to please see what the position is in a well-governed country, as it is said,

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

namely the United Kingdom. I was really amazed to find the result of a gallup-poll conducted, recently in the United Kingdom. I do not think that even Shri Ranga and Shri M. R. Masani have spoken in that way, but they have spoken so very strongly in the United Kingdom. My hon. friends here are a little more reasonable possibly. The report of the gallup-poll is entitled 'Britain's Grin'. The report reads as follows:

"The outlook is matched by the low morale of the country's leading industrialists. A gallup-poll revealed this week the loss of faith in Britain's economic future, in a cross-sector of the captains of industry and finance."

So, they have gone to that extent there. Then, the report further goes on to say:

"The majority of leading industrialists interviewed would emigrate if they were younger men."

That is the state of affairs in regard to the economy of the United Kingdom where there are the greatest pundits looking after everything. Let us not distort the situation, though certainly we are in a situation which is really very grave.

My friend talked about USA. It is a big country. We are very happy that they are prosperous. But what is the position there also? A very great friend of theirs, Gunner Mureal, who is a learned professor has in his book *The Challenge to Affluence* said things which make rather unhappy reading about the state of affairs there also. Let me tell you frankly that that gives me no consolation. We are more concerned with our own affairs and what we should do.

I have given you a critical analysis of the situation as it obtains in the country. There is no reason for defeatism. These are temporary phases which have marked it. If we take the whole thing in a determined manner, I think the situation is all

right. We do not have to be despondent. But we will have to tackle it in a determined manner. We will have to think that we have not to make our economy dependent on, or our future development oriented to, on, foreign aid. We should not be dependent on that. There is certainly no substitute for independence and one's own effort. We must have a clear vision of our objectives and purposes. What we need is an indomitable will and a programme of determined action which must be implemented effectively. We must generate our own resources.

I do not know what more time you shall allow me. But I should like to take another three or four minutes and wind up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken half an hour.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I would have liked to dwell on this matter in greater detail. I want to be absolutely clear in my analysis and I also want to be constructive in my suggestions.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: I would seek a clarification from the hon. Member. As regards devaluation, he said he has got difference of opinion with Government. May I know from him whether he thinks that the Government have taken this devaluation decision only for seeking foreign aid?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The Treasury Benches would be in a better position to answer that. I can only say on the basis of the discussions we have had.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: I want to know what is the position from his point of view.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: As I said earlier, so far as I could understand, the decision has been taken with the best of intentions and absolutely in the national interest, as the Prime Minister has indicated and as

has come out in our discussions all the time. What is really more important is....

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What is his point of view on this with regard to foreign aid?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I think we have to take into consideration certain factors.

There has been so much said about the public sector undertakings. My hon. friend, Prof. Ranga is on that Committee. I have never put myself on any committee here, whether it is the Estimates or any other, all these 14 years. But I did take interest in putting myself on the Committee on Public Undertakings and did try to understand and examine their working and functioning. I gave it up later on of course, but we have discovered—and we are further examining it—that there are good public undertakings and there are bad public undertakings. We should have had this Committee much earlier. If this standing committee had been constituted earlier, it would have done enormous good to the public sector undertakings by our giving them really good guidelines. It is not that we can quote only Hindustan Machine Tools or Pimpri. There are also other such factories.

Only the other day, I visited the Koyali Refinery. Their original estimate was Rs. 30 crores. We always say that it doubles. My friend will bear me out when I say that they took only Rs. 2 crores, and within the other Rs. 3 crores they are almost doubling by expansion.

There are certain factors which have got to be taken notice of. If these public sector enterprises are properly managed, as they ought to be, and if certain steps, which are already in the offing, are taken, they will certainly be a great source of revenue for the Government and they will be deserving the commanding position which has been given to them by Government.

One of the difficulties is that under the project aids, we had to get the machinery, whether it is from the USA or the USSR, and their capital outlay is very heavy. That capital outlay goes into the cost of production. That has been one of the ailments. To compare them from the earlier ones would be absolutely wrong. When we talk of steel, let us, for instance, think of the Tatas also. They have expanded. They have had the same difficulty. Now the expansion of Tatas has completely outstripped all their calculations. The same thing here also. Let us, therefore, not run away with the idea that everything is wrong with public sector enterprises. There is very much to be commended in them.

I shall enumerate certain things which have to be done in the wake of devaluation. First, import of capital goods and components to be cut down to the absolute minimum for the reasons which I have just mentioned; particularly for the purpose of machinery and tools which need imported raw materials; it should not be done. Except for those capital goods which will cut into our import bill, it should not be done. Something which we are importing as essential for our projects only for the next two years—we should confine our industrial growth to that. We are producing 60 per cent of the machinery, thanks to the proper planning which we had done, in our own country. In the next two or three years, our industrial growth should be based on indigenously produced machinery and that machinery which we have to import only to cut into our imports. There should be no liberalisation of imports of raw materials for home consumption under any circumstances; it should be only just to keep the factories going.

Public sector management should be put into perfect shape and made dynamic. It should be given targets after discussions and each Minister concerned should report on the subject monthly. Heavy machinery and

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

electrical equipment manufacture in the public sector should be organised to run on three shifts. We should take immediate steps for that. In each industrial sector, the industries concerned should be taken into confidence and a production programme drawn up on a realistic basis and the progress watched by the Minister himself. They must be given targets for import substitution and exports. Import quotas should gradually be cut down according to schedule.

My friend, Shri Masani, made a cry about decontrol which I mentioned. In the cement industry, we decontrolled completely the production and distribution and what happened. The first two months were good. When Shri Somani met me the other day, he said 'You are a strong critic of decontrol. Now that the distribution is perfect, why not say so?' I said I would say that on the floor of the House. But after the first two months, what has happened in the last three months? It is being sold at Rs. 18—20 per bag. How much money has gone into the blackmarket because of this. How much will it distort the economy of this country? If on one bag, Rs. 8-9 have gone into the black market, whether into the pocket of the industry or into the pocket of the trader, it is black money all the same. Nobody can deny that—even if I say that 50 per cent of the production has not gone into the black market. What about this situation? This is an experiment which we have tried.

When Shri Somani met me the other day, I told him, 'Please apply correctives and see that this experiment is successful if we should support that'. What I say is that where control is removed in any industry, that sector should be given full freedom to organise distribution. This meets Shri Masani's point.

Provision for heavy fiscal penalties should be evolved and undue profit mopped up through those penalties.

There must be some provision. Small and medium irrigation programmes in all States should be fully implemented. blue-prints should be got prepared. I wish the hon. Minister of Planning decides that during 1966-67 all small irrigation projects should be done. Rural electrification is there, that should be done.

I would just like to tell the House that what we spend on our conventional liftirrigation would be cut by half if we just have a pumping set. There is another thing. If you just give them power even at 2 annas rate, it will further cut it by more than half. A gentleman cultivator who has 300 acres is spending about Rs. 25,000 on his pumping sets and diesel. With electricity, he will spend only Rs. 10,000. This cuts into the cost of production of foodgrains, which is the only way how we can cut into our cost of production of agriculture and have cheaper grain, because you would not like to depress the prices unless the cost has gone down.

Agricultural target for each district must be fixed. The District Agricultural Officer and Development Officers must be given targets. If they do not fulfil them, their heads must roll.

Lastly, large-scale projects may be prepared. I am not against them, but these two years should be utilised in preparing those plans, so that there are no lacunae in the plans, and immediately we have generated some economy and our own resources, we may be able to go ahead with it.

I venture to submit that in spite of the elections coming on our head, it is the duty of every one of us to see that a proper climate is created in this country and legitimate and proper steps are taken. It is not a party question, it is a national question which has repercussions in the international field, and therefore it is definitely a far greater responsibility of the Government benches, but no

less of the Opposition, who are as patriotic as anybody sitting on this side, and I do hope that a proper and appropriate attitude will be taken.

Shri Ranga: I thought when my hon. friend Shri Mathur stood up to speak for the Treasury Benches as well as the ruling party, he would make a better show for the ruling party as well as for himself. I was hoping that some day if and when there comes into existence a national government or an all-talents government, he might possibly qualify himself for a place in it. His speech today has disappointed me so much that I do not think any one in his senses would think of recommending his name for such a position.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): It might be helpful if you do not recommend.

Shri Ranga: I was also disappointed with my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Much more?

Shri Ranga: For this reason.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am sorry you are a disappointed man in this world.

Shri Ranga: Because I expected him to take such a line as would be common to all the opposition parties here, but most unfortunately for us he has chosen, for his own very good reasons, to pursue an entirely communist line of criticism and in that way made it so very difficult, if not impossible, for those of us who do not see eye, to eye with the general outlook and approach of the communist parties, both right and left, to associate ourselves so completely as we would have loved to with this motion of no-confidence. It is because that we had some fear that our communist friends would not be able to withstand the temptation of pursuing an entirely partly line that we took care not to associate ourselves, not to join in sup-

port of the motion to be taken up in this House. Yet, we had so much against this Government, and we felt sure that the country was itself seething with so much disaffection and discontent against this Government, that we ourselves of our own accord gave notice of a no-confidence motion. It is by a mere accident of either the ballot or of the timing of lodging the notice for this no-confidence motion that in the ballot Shri Mukerjee's motion came first, and we came next.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Don't grudge it.

Shri Ranga: I don't. That was the reason why he was able to have the opportunity which he has missed to make a common motion for the whole of the opposition. We certainly do not grudge his chance, although we deprecate the manner in which he has missed his opportunity, and we certainly have no confidence in this Government in spite of all that my hon. friend Shri Mathur has said.

He has invoked the fact of my being his colleague in the Public Undertakings Committee. And then he went on saying there is nothing wrong, some undertakings are doing well, some other undertakings are doing badly; we are giving advices, it is only a pity that our committee had not come into existence earlier, otherwise we would have made it much better, and all the rest of it. He would not tell the House or remind the House that in spite of the fact that more than Rs. 2,000 crores have been sunk in these public undertakings, what they have done is to let the country down into losses, into hopeless losses; 3.6 per cent I think is the total net profit that those concerns which have shown any profits at all have been able to offer to the nation; when all of them are taken together, they have not been able to show even one per cent of profit, although the nation's money has been sunk into them to that enormous extent.

[Shri Ranga]

My hon. friend wanted us not to forget the achievements of this great Ministry, of this ruling party, during all the last 15 years. He was at pains to quote the Merchants' Chamber's statistics, but what about the statistics that have been incorporated there, that have been displayed only recently and distributed to us all by the Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies of which Dr. Singhvi is a Director? The Government themselves have admitted that the price spiral has become so unmanageable and there has been an increase of 80 per cent.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I did say.

Shri Ranga: When compared to other countries, you find that in America there was only a two per cent rise.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: My hon. friend will understand that I said that till 1962 the prices had gone only to that extent, and it is from 1962 that there has been an increase of 55 per cent.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend seems to forget that there was what was known as the British Government and a war-time economy, and during that war-time economy there was terrible inflation, and on top of that inflation, on top of that rise in prices, all this rise in prices has been taking place since the British left. What is more, as long ago as 1959 December or 1960 January, the Swatantra Party gave notice to this Government and a warning to the people against the danger of inflation spiral. We organised an anti-inflation day over the whole of this country. The Government did not heed our advice, our warning, it has gone on splendidly!

My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta, standing as he was at that time on this side, then said that a certain amount of inflation is built into every planning. Quite right, he was justified in saying that, and he was honest

in admitting it. I took him to task even then when he was standing in the next seat, for having said that. I said that, there was no need for that kind of inflation; yet, knowingly, consciously, this Government has indulged in this inflation, indulged in deficit planning and landed this country in the present plight in which we find ourselves.

Can anybody who is honest and in his senses deny this? If he denies this, then he would be denying the statements made by our friends themselves in justification of their own devaluation. They themselves have said that there has been an eighty per cent increase in price and secondly, there should no longer be any more inflation. But there has been inflation, they say, and it is injurious and harmful to our social economy. Who is responsible for all this inflation if it is not this Government?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur seems to take for granted that it is the monopoly of the ruling party to play the national role, to be the champion as well as the architect of whatever is good for the nation and therefore, they have placed national interest before their party interests. So, on the urgings and eloquent pleadings of his chief, the Prime Minister, he was good enough to resile from his own position of opposition to devaluation and he went to the extent of coming here and championing whatever this Government has been doing as their first spokesman.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Do not be unfair; I have never gone back.

Shri Ranga: If he has championed them today in what he has said in such a lame fashion, what else has he done? I leave it to him to judge. Is this a national Government? Has it got any right at all to continue to function in the name of the country? Years ago, for a few years soon after

we became free, that Government could lay that claim to work for national interests but then very soon it got into troubled waters and corruption. In 1948, we raised a charge-sheet in Madras but then Pandit Nehru did not want it to be discussed in Parliament. He got it discussed in the working committee and would not come to any proper conclusion. The late Desabhakta Venkatappaih this Government in the Madras Legislature for a number of days and exposed how the canker of corruption was creeping into the ranks of the ministers and congress legislators. The late Desathakta Venkatappaih Pantulu complained to Mahatma Gandhi a few days before his death and Gandhiji had read out that letter and warned the Congress people against the corruption that was creeping in. We were remaining within the Congress and playing the same role in a much better and bolder manner than my hon. friends Shri Hanumanthaiya and Shri Mathur claim to be playing now. We were defeated at every step by Pandit Nehru. He came to that conclusion and forced it down the throat on the Congress Working Committee as well as this Parliament by saying that whatever complaints might be there against a minister should be decided upon by the chief minister and any complaint against the minister here in the Union Government should be decided by the Prime Minister. That was the conclusion which he reached and it came as a recommendation made by the Santhanam committee. What has been the fate of that committee and that recommendation? Only the day before yesterday, the Vigilance Commissioner Mr. Rao said that Government could not implement it. Parliament cavilled at it and therefore, they cannot go forward with it. So much so we have been pressing this demand before Parliament. I think Mr. Mathur also supported us, as well as Dr. Singhvi and various other sections of the House also for having an institution of ombudsman.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I support you even now on this.

Shri Ranga: But till today my hon. friend Mr. Nanda who has also lent his moral support to this has not been able to get his Cabinet to endorse it. The President of this Republic made a reference to it and held out hopes that his Government was going to give effect to it; he referred to this in a speech he made in Madras. Yet, we know, everyone knows what has been happening throughout India. There were charges against the Mysore Chief Minister, against the Rajasthan Chief Minister, Bihar Chief Minister, Orissa Chief Minister, Madhya Pradesh Chief Minister. How many more do you want me to catalogue? Of course there was the man who died in Punjab. There were charges here against some of the Central Ministers too. Only the day before yesterday in the other House, the whole House rose in revolt against the failure of this Prime Minister as well as her Government to take timely action in preventing that officer from being sent as ambassador. It was after all that protest that they said: yes, we are going to stop it. It is this Government that you want us to believe as capable of providing national leadership to this country! What has happened throughout India! You may say: well, we have small wounds and injuries here and there, so many of these discontents are coming up but we are assuaging them; but there is nothing wrong with the body politic. That is the burden of the song of my helpless friend Mr. Mathur. Is it not so? Is it not a fact that what is happening over the whole of India is like carbuncles that are arising upon a diabetic Government, diabetic Ministry, diabetic leadership here? (An Hon. Member: Cancer). All these things culminated the other day in a bandh in U.P. Could it or would it surprise anybody if one of these days there were to be a bandh over this Government from among their own non-gazetted officers or even including gazetted officers. Highly paid

[Shri Ranga]

pilots, ground engineers and signalers and other people who are getting thousands every month, belonging to the Air India and IAC, they themselves were going on strike. Why have they done so? What is happening in the country? Even the INTUC has been obliged in several places to advise their workers or allow them to go on strike. INTUC itself has raised its voice against the manner in which the labour has been ill-treated in so many of these public undertakings and it has in fact expressed its fear against the expansion of these public enterprises and nationalisation, because in the nationalised industries the workers are being treated much worse than in the private industries. Yet they talk about lawlessness.

Nobody asked the Home Minister but he promised this country that he would resign from his position if within two years he could not succeed in putting down corruption. Has he succeeded? When that question was put to him he said: I have left it to the Prime Minister; I have placed my resignation in his hands and if he wants he can enforce it; I think there has been some improvement; we have been able to bring about some improvement in the administration. He still sticks to his position. True, he is much better than many of the ministers; true also that he has a higher sense of integrity than many of the ministers have been able to display. Nevertheless what is meant by integrity? A man should be able to stand by his word; a man should be able to say whether he has failed or not, and when he has failed he should be prepared to throw away his responsibility and show to the country that he is a man worth his salt. Judged on that anvil, my hon. friend Mr. Nanda stands condemned; the Prime Ministers one after the other stand condemned because they had not the moral courage to ask for the resignation of the minister in face of such a glaring failure. When min-

isters fail in this manner and give room to an body and everybody to draw the conclusion that hanging on to their place is more dear, precious and sweeter to them than to stand by their word and discharge their duties, how can you expect the administration to rise to the occasion and to discharge their duties in an honest manner. My hon. friends there in the front benches, whose status has in an unofficial manner been raised, the members of the Administrative Reforms Commission, they were good enough to extend their invitation to us and to my leader Rajaji. They ask us to come and appear before them and tell them what they should do. Why was this Commission appointed? Was it to salvage the Ministers' conscience or to salvage the conscience of the Government as a whole? Is it because they are not able to manage their own administration when they have appointed it? How does it happen that they came to be appointed a few weeks or a few months after one of their leaders came to be defeated in the race for Prime Ministership? Is there no political consequences . . .

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): This was appointed by the previous Prime Minister during his lifetime, as you know, in answer to the no-confidence motion debate. He announced it in November.

Shri Ranga: Do I not know the facts? The previous Prime Minister was being rivalled by Shri Morarji Desai. The only thing was that there was some kind of company management among their own ranks and they showed that it was a unanimous election. Whose eyes does my hon. friend want to blind and blindfold? It was a fact that there were two rivals for the post, and only one of them naturally could become the Prime Minister. It was only the next time that he had the temerity or the moral strength to openly stand against the candidate that was sponsored by their Congress President and the Chief Ministers. I will come to it later on.

This Administrative Reforms Commission was appointed. What is it that we have been asking all this time? One of the reasons why the administration has become so much foul, such an anathema to all of us, is the existence of permits, licences and quotas and their party-oriented administration. We want their administration to be handed over to an impartial, quasi-judicial commission to be presided over by a Supreme Court Judge. The Home Minister was agreeable to that also; some of us were invited for inner discussions and yet, this Ministry was not willing to accept that suggestion. Only the day before yesterday, the Commission also said that something could be done and some good effects could be achieved if only such a suggestion were implemented. But this Government is not the one which would implement that suggestion. Am I to go and place this once again before this august Commission so that the august Commission will have the privilege of saying, "Oh, we have examined the whole thing from the left to the right and we have dismissed it as being impractical. This is a political demand." Let the Government, if they have got the courage at all, and if they are prepared to place, as the Prime Minister goes about saying, the nation's interests before party interests, let them be prepared to go to the people and say, "Yes; we are prepared to accept the suggestion and are going to implement it. We have appointed this committee or any other committee to work out all the details of the scheme and we shall implement it." They are not prepared to do that. This Commission is going to make its report in September next year. So, they can go to the country and say, "You come again and give once again your franchise; put us in power for another five years and we will do it. We have put half a dozen people, including one of the Opposition leaders also, on that body. Therefore, put faith in us." That is not the leadership that this country wants or can accept.

Then, what happens to the Ministers? The Prime Minister repeatedly was saying that there is need for economy. What do they do? We think of the time in this country anyhow of the manner in which Lord Rama used to behave. I need not go into all the details of his career but he was a man of his word, and here are these people, and how do they behave? We wanted a residence for the Prime Minister. We had one, and without any consultation or sanction of Parliament, they converted it into a museum by earmarking a crore of rupees worth of national property in a jiffy and that decision also was taken arbitrarily. We were agreeable to it because we did not wish to upset any memories of one who was one of our good old friends. Then, the second Prime Minister wanted a residence; he wanted to be humble and he wanted to set an example to others who wanted or who were so very fond of palatial buildings. He went therefore into an ordinary house that was being given to a leader or the Home Minister. He was satisfied with the ministerial equipment and residence. And they spent more than a lakh of rupees, if my information is correct, in order to reorganise it, so that security arrangements, guests, reception and all other paraphernalia could be provided for the Prime Minister. Then, what about the new Prime Minister? She has no use for it; the rooms are all too small; the height of guests has grown suddenly, seven feet high, and therefore she stuck to her earlier one and she is not prepared to go into that building, and it has to be turned into another office, and I am told that they have been casting their eyes on some other palace, the Nizam's palace or whatever it is. This is the way things are done.

She went down to Andhra the other day, and what did the Ministers do; who are her proteges, friends and indeed her protectors? A building worth not less than a lakh of rupees has been refurbished by spending a lakh of rupees in order to make it fit

[Shri Ranga]

for these big, Prime Ministers of India. So many other things had been done there. This is economy.

Only yesterday, it seems she was saying to somebody—it was published in the newspapers—that the Ministers come in small cars . . .

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K. L. Rao): I had the honour of accompanying the Prime Minister during her visit to Andhra Pradesh. I do not know what exactly the hon. Member means. There was no palatial building being built for her.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend seems to be too anxious to recommend himself to the new Prime Minister. I did not say that they have built a new house. I only said that it had to be refurbished. Does he say that they did not spend anything at all on that?

Dr. K. L. Rao: Nothing at all.

Shri Ranga: Here are two statements. The hon. Minister says they did not spend anything. But the whole of Andhra is crying aloud, and the papers are full of this news. I do not know what my hon. friend means. Anyway, this is the way they deal with economy measures. Some of the big cars of the Ministers have been given up and they are going in for small cars. What a grand sense of economy! This is the Government and that is why we refuse to recognise it as a national government.

Then, sometime ago, the Home Minister complained that the Opposition parties were trying to take advantage of the lawless atmosphere in the country. Why should there be such a lawless atmosphere in the country? I tried to answer it once before in this House during a debate on Kerala bundh. How many bundhs we have! How many bundhs we have in this country! The latest of them is the students' bundh in the Banaras Hindu University, and a most

wonderful and effective bundh is the Government employees' strike in Uttar Pradesh. Would this Government carry on in this manner? Would it say to itself, in order to salvage its own conscience, that it would carry on in the manner in which the British Government carried on? The Portuguese and Bourbon Government also carried on in that way; the Czar Government also carried on in that way. Yet, you know the consequences of those regimes. The same would be the consequences in this country if the Government continue to proceed in the way they do.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister was asking the people to observe austerity in the light of this devaluation. On this devaluation, my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee waxed eloquent against it. I am neither in favour of devaluation nor am I opposed to it. But who is responsible for this devaluation? All that has happened has made devaluation absolutely inevitable, and my hon. friend now says: "Oh, my admiration is for our colleagues for having accepted the surgeon's knife." But who asked them to go round the world ignoring the laws of health, economic health, social health, and then bring about this cancer and tumour upon themselves, upon the whole society, which has made the surgeon's knife inevitable, to come down upon the nation as a whole? It was this Government itself which did it. For that we condemn it and that condemnation, my hon. friend Shri Masani has placed before this House in such an eloquent and effective manner the other day.

15.00 hrs.

Now, if my hon. friend Shri Mathur has any quarrel with the thesis that my hon. friend Shri Masani has placed before this House, he should have come forward and prepared better to answer it. Why not the Government answer it? What is it that Shri Masani has asked for, except what the Prime Minister and her advisers

in the Planning Commission have been pleading before the nation that the people should live within their means, that we should cut down our unnecessary expenditure, that we should economise in governmental expenditure, that we should no longer indulge in huge, big, gigantic projects, which would not be able to yield any results in the near future and that we should give the highest priority to agriculture, and that we should not play with suicidal luxuries like Bokaro and the rest? Mr. Masani had the sagacity to suggest all these things here earlier; 15 months ago he warned the country. I wish to tell my friend, Mr. Mukerjee, that it is not because America insisted on devaluation that devaluation has come now. Devaluation was inevitable. Indeed, this is the second phase of devaluation. There was an earlier one, when Jawaharlal Nehru was alive, when Great Britain devalued the pound. Who knows? There may be a third and fourth one also if this junta of Congress leaders were to manage themselves to be returned here once again in a massive majority, because they caused all these troubles. They wasted public funds; they wasted the national opportunities that were given to them.

Mr. Mathur was saying, we have achieved so many things, so many more schools and so on. What about compulsory elementary education which Gokhale had pleaded for 60 years ago, which we had sworn to ourselves in the Constituent Assembly to achieve within 10 years after independence i.e. by 1960? That has gone and nobody thought of it. One Chief Minister thought of it and he had to pay the price by going out. Why did the several Chief Ministers and successive Prime Ministers also neglect this fundamental elementary duty? They did it because they found it to their benefit. As a result of the failure of the Governments here as well as in the States to implement that sacred pledge—that we had given to ourselves in the name of the Con-

stitution to introduce compulsory and free elementary education, they have succeeded in keeping 75 per cent of our electorate illiterate even till today. Shame on them! The result is that these illiterate people have been enslaved to the symbol of bulls and with the help of the bulls they have been able to rule here.

My friend talked about the sacred cow. I am reminded of that also in the manner in which the Prime Minister has gone round from one country to another. In one country she said that in Vietnam she wanted that there should be scope for talks and both parties should be willing for talks. But when she went to Soviet Russia, under the cupolas of those Churches she got inspiration and she said, there was some imperialistic power under whose influence things are going on. In their theatres in Russia they have still got the devil's dance. She must have seen some devil's dance and said, there were some imperialistic powers under whose influence things are going on and so bombing should be stopped.

My friend wants us to condemn America. Yes, under different circumstances, we might be willing. But he seems to forget what happened in India in 1962 when China invaded our country. Did not Jawaharlal Nehru send out an SOS to all the countries all over the world saying, "please come to our rescue"? Who came to our rescue then? Straightway, almost with atomic speed, America and UK came to our rescue. Some other countries also helped us. Some people say, we do not want American small arms and armaments. Supposing with the help of some of those whom Mr. Nanda wanted to castigate as devils incarnate and put them in jail—I mean those who call themselves Left Communists—if China had continued their invasion and captured the whole of West Bengal and Assam, surely would Jawaharlal Nehru not have himself welcomed not only American arms, but also trained American personnel to come over here and help us?

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): No.

Shri Banga: You were all *bachhas* in those days when we were fighting for freedom. The first cry for freedom of India was from Hume, Wedderburn Sir Athur Cotton. India need not be afraid or fight shy of invoking and welcoming the help of foreigners in the sacred cause of protecting her territory.

Is it not shameful that even today this Government is not prepared to say that it would take all possible measures to evacuate the Chinese from our territory occupied by them? All that the Government says is that it would pursue peaceful methods and only if those methods fail, they would think of other steps. It is that kind of doubtful sense of patriotism that has pervaded and is corrupting their minds and souls that we are opposed to. That is why we want this country to make a change. But how can this be done? These 370 people are not going; they have stuck to their seats. If they are shifted from one place, they are quarrelling about No. 2, No. 3 and so on. Are these the people to make any kind of sacrifice? Of course, all credit goes to my friend Mr. Tyagi, but he is just one amongst 65 members of this Ministry. They are all waiting for another reshuffle to get in. Since these people are not going away, we have moved this motion in order to educate the people in this country and warn them about the failures and incompetence of these people to provide the national leadership that is necessary at this juncture. Would they heed our advice? They may or may not. We are cocksure they would not. They have not got anything to say in favour of themselves except that they are not going to be defeated and they are going to be here for another 5 or 10 years. That is the song their leader has been singing in Moscow. What a shame! The British people were saying it. Winston Churchill asked, "Has His Majesty the King made me Prime Minister to liquidate the British Empire?" What

happened to the British Empire? What has happened to the Congress Party in Kerala, the same fate would overtake them in many other States also. It ought to overtake them. We will do our best. But if we do not succeed, we want them to resign here and now or at least within a month's time so that they can gather their *dhotis* and *saris* and go out. But they would not do it. I want to expose them to the people, show how they stick to power like leeches until the country goes to dogs. In the name of national crisis, the Prime Minister appeals to the people to respond to her call. Why should they respond to this call coming from people who have been repeatedly proved to have been not honest, to have been corrupt, to have been incompetent and unable to stand by their own words and to have deceived the country? They said that there would be no devaluation at all. All the points that could have been advanced by the opponents of devaluation were already advanced by the Finance Minister, the Planning Minister and the Commerce Minister. They said so. All these things have gone over the winds, and they still remain in power, they hang on to it. It is these people who do not deserve to remain in power. So we want them to go.

Then what is to happen? Immediately thereafter, as soon after as possible, we want them to go to the President and ask him to order general elections, only for the Parliament now and not for the legislative assemblies in the States. It is by joining these two elections that these people have been able to get all those people who are not considered to be good enough for their Assemblies to be kicked up here into the Parliament in such a facile manner. Let them have a separate election for Parliament. Then we can see how many of these gentlemen would be able to come back. Then we would be able to show that there is a real swing of public opinion in this country. Then, soon after that, we also want the State Ministries also to be

dismissed by the President and elections to be held. After these elections are held, when the parties come back here, it would be time enough for all of us, all the leaders of political parties as well as other leaders in the country, national leaders who, fortunately for us, are still available even outside the ambit of political parties, to put our heads together and see whether we cannot possibly have a really, truly and fully—hundred per cent full-fledged—representative national government, a national leadership. Even supposing these people are to come back in a majority, they would not be able to claim to be a national government because this is a cosmopolitan country, a country of so many languages, so many different religions, so many social cleavages among its so many castes and communities, and in a country like this this system of one-party rule is not suitable and it would not be able to provide the necessary leadership, national leadership. This is just the occasion, this is just the period we should have a national government, when such a national government can be brought into existence.

Who is to take the initiative for all that? This is my final poser to you all. Someone or the other has to do it. These people happen to be in a majority today. Rightly or wrongly, for their own reasons, they have chosen her as the leader here in this House. Speaking personally for myself, I would have no objection in her continuing to be the leader. She is the daughter of one with whom I have fought so many times, so many years, but for whom I had great respect and affection. Therefore, I am prepared to get on with her as the leader as I have to be prepared to get on with anyone else they may choose. But since they happen to have her there, let her take time by its forelock, let her take a decision and let her live up to her own oft-repeated statements that the country is more important than the party and

that she is prepared to serve the country even if she has to sacrifice her party interests. I hope she would be able to do it. I have got my own fears, but I hope God would give her strength of mind, strength of character and strength of conscience to be able to pull this country out of this morass, in the manner in which I have suggested by organising a national government after the elections and having the elections as early as possible, in the meanwhile themselves resigning and wearing ashes and saffron clothes going to people and offering their apologies for the failures they have heaped this country with.

Shri Heda: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, no-confidence motions have become a regular feature and as Professor Mukerjee, the mover of the present motion says, this is the biggest weapon in their possession. But its use so often makes that weapon lose its edge. From that angle, this has become a regular feature and, therefore, the debates on these motions are as good as any other major debates.

However, the present motion has a certain significance. That significance was referred to a certain extent by Professor Ranga. In the last few months there have been certain spots of discontent and unrest. He has referred to a few of them—students' agitation, slowing down of work to the rule moves by the IAC personnel, various types of bandhs including those by government employees etc. Of course, he forgot to mention one particular move which is very significant in the present context, and that is the recent disasters that have happened in certain railways which gives an indication that there is a certain hand—the Railway Minister has enumerated it—of saboteurs behind all this. So it is in this context that the present motion was

[Shri Heda]

sponsored. There is one other development which we have to remember. Before this session started the Communist Party, both Right Wing and Left Wing, who for the last few years were fighting, to use the words of Professor Mukerjee, like dogs, came together and along with them came the SSP. These three minor opposition parties made a common cause and I was surprised, rather amused, when Shri Madhu Limaye made an announcement on their behalf that they are working for the non-Congress Government. I hoped fondly, that Shri Madhu Limaye has revived his faith in democracy and, probably, he would work democratic means. But the way they organised themselves and proved their mettle on the very first day by holding the whole House to ransom and not allowing it to function showed that they have got a different strategy in their minds. Shri Mathur referred to 1962 and referred to the real intention of the Chinese in their aggression. He said the Chinese intention was to upset our development programme and thereby upset our economy and create a sort of vicious circle. If you take these two moves together you will find that there is a particular significance to the present vote of no-confidence motion.

Having said that, let me now come to another phrase often used by Professor Ranga on a number of occasions. In fact, in every major speech that he has delivered in the last one year or more he has been championing the cause of national government. I know him so well that I can claim, and I do not think he will doubt it, that I know him as he knows himself. I do not attribute any motive to him. I do not say he is after power. But what is it that he means? If a national government of his idea, of his concept, is to be formed, certainly he will find a place in it—there may be nothing wrong in it. But along with him will he like Shri Mukerjee also to find a place in it?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am no candidate.

Shri Heda: You may not be, but if his concept is to be brought into practice, then that will be the result. How would these two gentlemen pull on together? After the first day of the session, when I went home I was surrounded by a few friends who asked me "Mr. Heda, are you safe? How many ambulances were called to the Parliament House?". They got frightened by the show, by the noise, by the organised movement in the House by some members not to allow any work to be transacted. If this trouble repeats in the Cabinet, it would be impossible for the Cabinet to carry on any work. Therefore, the idea or concept that Shri Ranga is championing is not practical from any angle.

Both the speeches from the opposition were more political than economical in content, even though they referred to certain economic developments. Naturally, the most important economic development is devaluation. What were the reactions of Rajaji to this? His first reaction was different from the second one. His first reaction was that it is a natural corollary in the present conditions of our economy. He soon found that he did not exploit the situation fully. Therefore, he made a subsequent statement that he welcomed it because it would bring down the present Government. Today Professor Ranga says that he is neither in favour of it nor is he opposed to it. It is a very strange type of attitude that is adopted by him.

Much is said about devaluation. Whenever members talk about devaluation, they put forth two premises. The first premise is that our economy has become very weak that it needs a drastic remedy. The second premise is that that drastic remedy is provided by devaluation. Many people have given the simile of a

patient and a doctor. When the condition of the patient becomes very serious, doctors think of an operation. This is a sort of operation. Though one is not certain whether the patient will survive or not, one thinks that there is a better chance of survival by operation and, therefore, the operation is performed.

I do not agree with either of these premises. The situation has not become so weak. No doubt, there is weakness in our economy. What is the main reason for that? The main reason is that we had greater ambition than we could afford, so far as the pace of development of our country is concerned. We went far beyond our resources because we wanted to develop this country as fast as possible. The needs of our country are so great. Our country had been exploited for the last two centuries. Therefore, many weaknesses had come in. Naturally, as people's government, we took to planning and one after the other, three Plans were implemented. The Fourth Plan is in the offing. Our plans were all very ambitious. This was the main factor which brought about a certain amount of weakness in our economy, particularly in our balance of payments position. Naturally, we wanted greater imports of capital goods and even though our exports increased immensely, more than double, it could not keep pace with our imports. So, the gap in the balance of payments is the result of that policy. From that angle one can say that the state of the economy is not that bad as it is supposed to be.

Secondly, devaluation is not a drastic remedy. It is a remedy quite often used by governments; practically every government has used it, sometime or the other. Generally, this is resorted to when a nation feels that that a radical measure is called for to boost up the exports and restrict imports. Our present situation warranted it and, therefore, this remedy was applied; and, I think, it was rightly applied.

The main accusation against devaluation is that it has given ground for the rise in prices. The trend of rising prices was already there. As Shri Mathur has explained at some great length, that trend was visible from 1962 onwards. Because of the bad crop last year, that tendency got further strength. So, that tendency was already there; you cannot accuse or blame devaluation for the rise in prices within the country.

But what is the real reason for that trend? The real reason is scarcity, and this scarcity existed in spite of the fact that production all-round has gone far higher than the rise in population. In every sphere the increase in production has surpassed the increase in population. But the consumption or need of the people has also increased. People are eating better kind of foodgrains than they were earlier. Previously, a large section of the people in the north and south did not eat wheat or rice. Now, everyone has taken to wheat or rice. This is a good trend. This shows that the poorer sections are getting at least their minimum requirements. In spite of this increase in consumption, it cannot be said that food consumption in our country has reached the necessary level. We are not consuming that number of calories required for a normal person. Therefore, if we look at it from this angle, the increase in consumption is a welcome factor. This naturally creates a tendency for the prices to rise.

Along with it came another factor, which is also very important. There is a tendency among every section of people—I am not pointing to any particular section—to have more profits. Whether it is the wholesaler, middle man or the retailer, everybody wants to exploit the situation. This results in rise in prices. We can see this strange phenomenon even in Delhi. If you compare the rates for vegetables and fruits on Karol Bagh with the rates obtaining in Irwin Road or Bengali Market you will find that the rates in Karol Bagh are cheaper.

[Shri Heda]

Now, that tendency must be fought and curbed. From that angle, a movement was successfully launched in Delhi which has produced some good results. That is called the Price Resistance Movement. Unfortunately, as it happens in every movement, some black sheep enter the field and spoil the good name. However, it is a very good feature. Take the case of the super bazar, about which much has been said. I have no doubt that the super bazar will not make that much of profit which every ordinary trader is supposed to make. What is the object or function of the super bazaar? Its main object is to stabilise the prices, to bring down the prices. From that angle, it had been successful to a certain extent. Go to any chemist today. You will find that he is not able to charge as much as he was charging earlier. Rather, he is thinking of reducing his charges. That is a welcome feature. In the Shankar Market, adjacent to the super market, the traders have announced that they will charge 1 paise or 2 paise less on every item that is available in the super market. So, the main object of the super-bazaar was to stabilise the rates, to bring down the prices, and to a certain extent it has been successful even in the initial stages.

Professor Ranga dealt with the public sector and other projects. Much has been said about it. Some public sector projects are very successful while some others are not that successful. To my mind the main reason for that is different. The main reason is that the nation has not drafted the business talent in these public sector projects. Wherever the business talent was adequately in existence the public sector project thrived very well and where it was lacking it did not thrive. What is the reason? The main reason is that when the Britishers left, they left behind a steel frame of ICS and we depended upon them. They were good so far as law and order and administration were concerned but they were

not made to look after, to run, to manage these big public sector projects.

15.31 hrs.

[SHRIMATI RENUKA RAY in the Chair]

In my home city I had a very strange phenomenon to observe. The very same factories with the same machines and with the same workmen were not able to produce goods worth Rs. 25 lakhs a year in one factory and in another goods worth 14 tonnes a day; but when the management changed, within three months the production went from Rs. 25 lakhs to about a crore of rupees in one and from 14 tonnes a day to about 95 tonnes a day in another. There was no extra money put in; there was no extra talent brought in. The change of management, better business organisational and management talent worked the trick and brought those results.

From that angle it is time that in these public sector projects we developed the business talent. The earlier idea of an economic service may be revived and given shape, thereby making the public sector projects more successful. The public sector projects have come to stay. Whatever the view of Swatantra and to a certain extent Jana Sangh may be, they would remain. They have a prominent role to play and they would be playing that role. Therefore, it is our duty, a national duty, to see that they play those roles and become more successful.

Again, so far as the stabilisation of prices is concerned, I would refer to another factor. All India Radio has been announcing the prices and there has been some criticism of it. The criticism is not wrong but the announcement by All India Radio has played a definite role in stabilising the prices. No doubt, there are some merchants and traders here and there who refuse to sell at those prices and say "Go to All India Radio and pur-

chase"; but the fact remains that the purchaser knows what are the prices and, therefore, he can fight, quarrel, at least bargain, with him. In many cases he becomes more successful. Along with it, I would suggest, this Parliament gives a power to the Government so that the name of any merchant or trader, who charges more price than what is should be particularly of manufactured articles—a number of manufacturers and industries have come forward and announced that they have not increased the prices of their soap or other articles—may be announced by the All India Radio. At present we cannot do it because we may be charged for defamation. If we give that power to the Government and Government adopts this method—as swadeshi and boycott, two aspects of the same thing, went together—namely, announcement of prices by All India Radio and in a way blacklisting these people, it would bring the desired effect.

The effort of the Opposition to paint the Government in the blackest colour will not be successful. Their challenge that we should go to the people and face them is unnecessary. Elections are coming and the challenge is there. In every democratic set-up this is the best way to challenge each other and meet it. I have no doubt that after the elections the present Government and the present party will come in better colours than they expect.

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : सभानेत्री महोदया, यह प्रविशवास का प्रस्ताव इस सदन के सामने इस तीसरी लोक सभा में चौथी दफा आ रहा है। तीन बार पहले इस तरह के प्रस्ताव आ चुके हैं और वे गिर गए। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इन प्रस्तावों के नतीजे बुरे होते हैं। इस बात को इस गवर्नमेंट को अच्छी तरह से समझ लेना चाहिये (इंटरप्लॉय)

1076 (A) LS—3.

श्री बजराम सिंह (बरेली) : प्रस्ताव नहीं गिरता है, सरकार गिरती है।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : सरकार नहीं गिरती है, वह प्रधान मंत्री को ले बैठा है।

तुलसी हाय गरीब की,

कवहूँ न खाली जाय ।

ज्यों मुए ढोर की खाल से,

लोहा भस्म हो जाए ।

हम जो आवाज बुलन्द कर रहे हैं वह जनता की आवाज है और जनता की आवाज आप सुन नहीं रहे हैं जनता की आवाज की वजह से जो कुछ ही रहा है वह आप देख रहे हैं और आप ने देख लिया है। ईश्वर न करे कि उस प्रकार का नतीजा फिर हो। पहले जो नतीजे हुए हैं उनको हम देख चुके हैं। पहले प्रस्ताव आया, लेकिन गिर गया लेकिन यंडित जी बदकिस्मती से नहीं रहे। नन्दा जी चल गए आठ दिन में, आछा हुआ। वह बच गए। दूसरा प्रस्ताव आया। तीसरा प्रस्ताव आया। एक बहुत बड़े आदमी ने जिसने हमारे देश को उन्नति के शिखर पर पहुंचाने की कोशिश की और जिसकी मृत्यु के कारण हम सभी दुखी हैं, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, वह चले गए। आज मैं कहता हूँ कि पहला काम आप यह करें, अगर आप अच्छा चाहते हैं, हमारे इस आज के प्रधान मंत्री को आप उनसे हाथ जोड़कर हमारे साथ यह कहें कि वह कम से कम यहां से चली जायें और इस्तीफा दे दें ताकि वह बात न आए। एक बात मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ। आप इस बात को सुनें—

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप क्या ज्योतिषी हैं।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : ज्योतिष की बात मैं नहीं कहता हूँ। सत्य बात कह रहा हूँ। आप इसकी तरफ ध्यान दें।

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि आज से अठारह साल पहले संविधान बना था। संविधान में आपने डायरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स लिखे हुए हैं। इनमें आपने लिखा है . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will please address the Chair.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I thought I was addressing the Chair; but I cannot face the Chair all the time, I have to face my friends also.

आपने डायरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स में कहा है कि गो हत्या नहीं होगी। इस उसूल को आपने माना है। इसके लिए आपने कानून बनाने की बात कही थी। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने कानून बनाया? आपने नहीं बनाया। यहां पर इसको लेकर प्रदर्शन हो रहे हैं। अठारह साल बीत गए हैं। आपकी हिम्मत नहीं हो रही है। आप एक पुछल्ला लगा रहे हैं कि यह तो स्टेट सबजेक्ट है। कौन सा स्टेट सबजेक्ट है? सारी पावर आपके पास हैं। क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड को आपने कई बार एमेंड किया। इंडियन पीनल कोड आप एमेंड कर सकते हैं। इनसालवेंसी एक्ट को आप एमेंड कर सकते हैं। तो क्या इसको आप एमेंड नहीं कर सकते हैं? क्या बच्चों को समझाने चले हो? क्या हम कुछ जानते नहीं हैं? क्यों आप इस तरह की बात हमारे सामने करते हो।

आपने यह भी कहा था कि हम सब के लिए एक सा सिविल कोड बनायेंगे। औरतें सबकी होती हैं। हिन्दुओं की भी औरतें होती हैं, मुसलमानों की भी औरतें होती हैं। मुसलमान औरत का पति मर जाता है या उसका पति अगर ऐसा आदमी होता है जो कि खुद नहीं कमाई करता है तो उस औरत को घर से निकल जाना पड़ता है और उसको नाननफक्का नहीं मिलता है। उसके लिए आपके दिल में दर्द पैदा नहीं हुआ। दिल में आपके दर्द पैदा हुआ हिन्दू स्त्री के लिए। उसको आपने ऐसे अधिकार दे दिए हैं कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में जो

इसको लेकर मुकदमे चल रहे हैं उनकी वजह से हिन्दू लोग जोकि संयुक्त कुटुंब में रहना पसन्द करते हैं, उनके वे संयुक्त परिवार नेस्तोनाबूद हो रहे हैं। उसके लिए आपने फाउंडेशन डाल दी है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपने ऐसा क्यों किया? हिन्दू स्त्री के वास्ते तो आपके दिल में दर्द पैदा हुआ, मुस्लिम स्त्री के लिए क्यों पैदा नहीं हुआ? मुसलमानों में तो एक आदमी चार चार औरतें रख सकता है, हिन्दू अगर अपने शास्त्रों के मुताबिक बच्चा पैदा करने के लिए दूसरी औरत लेना चाहे तो नहीं ले सकता है तब तक जब तक कि वह पहली औरत को तलाक न दे दे। यह कानून बनाने की आपकी जरूरत क्यों पड़ी? क्यों आपने . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is addressing the Government directly.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I will do it through you.

सभापति महोदया, मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों हम लोगों को—और सारे मुल्क को—इस गवर्नमेंट से नफ़रत हो गई है। इस वक्त कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य 370 हैं। हम भी यह मानते हैं कि अगर उसकी संख्या अगले चुनाव के बाद घट भी जायेगी, तो भी वे 240 से कम होने वाले नहीं हैं। हम जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के पास खूब पैसा है और वह खूब अच्छी तरह से लड़ेगी। अगर उसके सदस्यों की संख्या 240 भी रह गई, तो भी कोई परवाह नहीं है। अगर इस सदन में उसकी ताकत कम हो गई, तो हम लोगों को की बोलने की ताकत बढ़ जायेगी। वह दिन दूर नहीं है कि जब उसको यह नज़ारा देखना पड़ेगा।

श्री कमलनयन बजाज (वर्धा) : तो फिर नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन लाने की जल्दी क्या थी ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : सेठ लोग क्यों बीच में बोलते हैं ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) : माननीय सदस्य सेठ लोगों की तरफ से बोलते हैं ।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी ने कहा कि हमारी सरकार अमरीका की गोद में चली गई है । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे दोस्त चीन और रूस की गोद में चले गये हैं । यह सरकार अमरीका की गोद में क्यों जाये और हमारे ये दोस्त रूस और चीन की गोद में क्यों जायें ?

जहां तक इस गवर्नमेंट का ताल्लुक है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, "तुझे पराई क्या पड़ी, अपनी नदें डूँ", । क्यों यह गवर्नमेंट बार-बार वियतनाम के मामले में दखल देती है ? और क्यों उस ने तिब्बत के बारे में आवाज उठाने से इन्कार किया ? जब चीन ने तिब्बत पर कब्जा कर लिया, तो डांगे साहब उसकी निन्दा में एक शब्द भी नहीं बोले—उस समय की डीबेट्स मेरे सामने हैं—और इस बारे में सवाल पूछे जाने पर भी जवाब तक नहीं दिया । उस वक्त हमारी गवर्नमेंट भी चुप रही । श्री मुकर्जी बड़ी अच्छी अंग्रेजी बोलते हैं, जो कि मैं नहीं बोल सकता । उन्होंने वियतनाम के बारे में एक बड़ी अच्छी कविता यहां पर सुनाई । वह वियतनाम का बार-बार जिक्र करते हैं, लेकिन सवाल यह है कि जब चीन ने दो करोड़ आदिमियों को मरवा डाला, तब वे कहां चले गये थे ? उस वक्त उनके दिल में—और गवर्नमेंट के दिल में—दर्द क्यों नहीं था ? उस वक्त चाइनीज एम्बेसी में इस प्रकार की फ़िल्मज दिखाई जाती थीं कि एक तरफ़ ज़मींदार खड़ा है और दूसरी तरफ़ खेतिहर किसान खड़ा है । जब खेतिहर किसान ने बताया कि इस ज़मींदार ने मुझे सताया था, तो उस ज़मींदार की आंखें शूल से फोड़ बी गईं और उसको मार दिया गया । उस वक्त कोई बोलने के लिए तैयार नहीं था । उस वक्त हमारे दोस्त कहां चले गये थे ? उस वक्त उनको यह कहने की हिम्मत नहीं

हुई कि संसार के किसी भी देश में ऐसा अत्याचार नहीं हुआ है और यह कि ऐसा अत्याचार नहीं होना चाहिए । जब मानवता को नीचे गिरा दिया गया था, उस वक्त कोई बोलने के लिए तैयार नहीं था । आज ये लोग चिल्लाते हैं कि वियतनाम पर चढ़ाई हो रही है ।

अमरीकन्ज के दिल में दर्द होगा, इसलिए वे वियतनाम में लड़ने के लिये जा रहे हैं । नार्थ वियतनाम ने साउथ वियतनाम पर हमला किया, लेकिन हम उसके बारे में कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं । चीन नार्थ वियतनाम की मदद कर रहा है, लेकिन हम उसके बारे में कुछ कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं । जब साउथ वियतनाम ने अमरीका की मदद मांगी और अमरीका उसकी मदद करता है, तब हम चिल्लाते हैं ।

हमारा दुर्भाग्य है कि जब रूस ने हंगरी पर चढ़ाई की, तब यह सरकार चुप रही । क्यों ? इसलिए कि हम हमेशा गुंडों से डरते हैं । हमारे मिनिस्टर फ़ार एक्सटर्नल एफ़ेयर्स कहते हैं कि हम इसरायल से दोस्ती नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि उससे मुसलमान नाराज हो जायेंगे । कौन से मुसलमान नाराज हो जायेंगे ? आखिर यह सरकार अरब देशों से क्यों डर रही है ? मुसलमान नाम का यह डर क्यों है ? हमें तय करना है कि हम अपने पांव पर खड़े होंगे और अपने हितों की दृष्टि से अपनी नीति को निर्धारित करेंगे । अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे, तो किसी की क्या मजाल है कि हमारे सामने खड़ा हो सके ।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : अभी तो माननीय सदस्य कह रहे थे कि वियतनाम के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहिए, लेकिन अब वह इसरायल के बारे में सलाह क्यों देने लगे ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रि० दी० : मैं तो सिर्फ़ लाजिक और तर्क की बात कह रहा हूँ । मैं तो सिर्फ़ यह कह रहा हूँ कि हमको—और इस सरकार

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

को—अमरीका, रूस, इसरायल या अरबों से, किसी से भी, डरने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मेरा कहना यह है कि सरकार को किसी से डरना नहीं चाहिये। वह जो कुछ भी करे, वह देश के लिए, देश के हितों को दृष्टि में रख कर करे। अगर वह किसी से दोस्ती करना चाहती है, तो देश के हितों की दृष्टि से करे, वर्ना न करे। हम को अमरीका, इंग्लैंड, रूस या चीन के दबाव में आने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमको किसी के दबाव में आ कर कोई काम नहीं करना चाहिए। हमारी पालिसी हमारे हितों पर आधारित होनी चाहिए और हमें अपने पांव पर खड़ा होना चाहिए। जो भी काम लाजिकल और तर्कसंगत हो, वह हमें करना चाहिए।

मैं 1959 की डीबेट्स पढ़ रहा था। उस वक्त श्री डांगे ने कहा कि वी आलवेज सपोर्ट दि फारेन पालिसी आफ दि गवर्नमेंट। हम देखते हैं कि आज कम्यनिस्ट हमारी फारेन पालिसी को सपोर्ट नहीं करते हैं। क्यों? शायद चीन या रूस से कोई आदेश आ गया है, जिसकी वजह से वे हमारी फारेन पालिसी को सपोर्ट नहीं करते हैं। वे लॉग ट्यूरो को क्यों सोचते हैं? वे अपने मुल्क की सोचें।

पिछली दफा श्री स्वर्ण सिंह ने यहां पर कहा कि हम किसी से घबराते नहीं हैं, हम सब फंसले अपनी पालिसी के मुताबिक करते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या वह किसी हिन्दू को साउदी एरेबिया में एम्बेसडर बना कर भेज सकते हैं। वहां के लिए उनको लाजिमी तौर पर कोई मुसलमान ढूंढना पड़ता है। वहां पर सरकार को कोई किदवई साहब या कोई खान साहब ही ढूंढना पड़ता है? वहां पर सरकार किसी हिन्दू या सिख को नहीं भेज सकती है। इसकी वजह यह है कि साउदी एरेबिया की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि मक्का में कोई मुसलमान ही आ सकता है और हम

वहां पर किसी हिन्दू को नहीं घुसने देंगे। उन लोगों को खुश करने के लिए सब कुछ किया जाता है, लेकिन अपने हितों की रक्षा करने का हमें कोई अधिकार नहीं है। हम हर बात में दूसरों पर निर्भर करते हैं। इस नीति के कारण सरकार के प्रति लोगों में असंतोष पैदा हो रहा है और वे सरकार से नफरत करते हैं।

अभी श्री हेडा और श्री माथुर यहां पर कांग्रेस की तरफ से बोले हैं। ऐसा मालूम होता था कि इन दोनों वकीलों को यह पता था कि हमारा मुवक्किल गुनाहगार है। जिस वकील को यह मालूम हो जाये कि उसका मुवक्किल गुनाहगार है, तो वह ठीक तरह से बहस नहीं कर सकता है। उनकी बातों से साफ पता चल रहा था कि वे अच्छी तरह से समझ रहे थे कि जिस गवर्नमेंट के पक्ष में वे बोल रहे थे, वह इसके योग्य नहीं है।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : माननीय सदस्य किस का केस लड़ रहे हैं ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : मैं माननीय सदस्य की तरफ से, सबकी तरफ से, अपने मुल्क की तरफ से बोलता हूं। मैं अपने मुल्क का केस लड़ता हूं।

श्री हेडा ने कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी अगले चुनाव में और शक्तिशाली हो कर आयेगी। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूं कि अगर कोई पार्टी कांग्रेस का स्थान ले सकती है और पावर में आ सकती है, तो वह जनसंघ है। जनसंघ जो स्थिति प्राप्त करेगा, वह सबके सामने होगी। माननीय सदस्य उसकी फ़िक्र न करें। जहां तक मेरा सम्बन्ध है, मैं उनसे दूर नहीं हूं और वह मुझ से दूर नहीं हैं। मैं रूस, अमरीका, इसरायल या अरब देशों का बिका हुआ नहीं हूं। मैं पाकिस्तान से डरता नहीं हूं। मैं जब बोलता हूं, तो पाकिस्तान रेडियो से

सबसे ज्यादा गालियां मुझे खानी पड़ती हैं, हालांकि जो भी कार्यवाही की जाती है, वह गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से की जाती है, लेकिन मुझे उसका दुख नहीं है।

जहां तक डीवैल्यूएशन का सम्बन्ध है, मैं पहले ही कह चुका हूँ कि इस सरकार की तरफ से यह एक भयंकर भूल हुई है। जिस चीज की कीमत को बढ़ाने की ताकत सरकार के पास नहीं है, उसकी कीमत को घटा कर उसने भयंकर भूल की है और उस भयंकर भूल का नतीजा आज देश को भुगतना पड़ रहा है। सब चीजों के भाव बढ़ गये हैं। सरकार चाहे सुपर मार्केट खोले या और कुछ करे, इससे भाव कम नहीं हो सकते हैं। जहां तक सुपर मार्केट का सम्बन्ध है, उसकी स्थिति "चार दिन की चांदनी, फिर अंधेरी रात" वाली होगी। यह सुपर मार्केट कुछ नहीं कर सकती। दिल्ली में कनाट प्लेस में एक सुपर मार्केट बना देने से देश की साधारण जनता और खास तौर पर देहात की जनता को कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता है। श्री माथुर जोधपुर के रहने वाले हैं। वह अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि पहले गेहूँ पांच-सात रुपये मन बिक रहा था, लेकिन आज 30 रुपये मन गेहूँ कहीं नसीब नहीं हो रहा है। तो क्या हालत है? सीधे आंकड़े, सच्चे आंकड़े क्यों नहीं बोल पाते हैं? क्यों स्टैटिस्टिक्स का सवाल लाया जाता है? इस डीवैल्यूएशन से आज ऐसी खराब परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : डीवैल्यूएशन से पहले पांच रुपये मन गेहूँ कहां मिलता था ?

श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी : डीवैल्यूएशन से पहले नहीं, मैंने सन् 50 की बात कही। आपने कान क्यों बन्द कर रखे हैं? आप कान खोल कर सुनिये।

जी गेहूँ उसे वकन में बिकता था उसकी आज हलत क्या है? डीवैल्यूएशन से क्या

हुआ? आज वह 30 रुपये मन में भी नहीं मिल सकता। बतलाइए, हमारे यहां पालिया-मेन्ट में भी बिकता था, उसमें भी दो-दो रुपये बढ़ा दिये। पहले जो 42 रुपये में मिल जाता था वह अब साढ़ तैतालीस में हो गया। बाजार में किताब खरीदने जाइए। डेढ़ रुपये की किताब साढ़े तीन रुपये में हो गई। 12 हजार, 13 हजार की जो कार आती थी वह 16 हजार की हो गई। डीवैल्यूएशन की रकम तो बढ़ रही है और बढ़ती चली जायेगी। और कर्जा हमारे ऊपर ड्योढ़ा हो गया। ब्याज की रकम उसी प्रकार बढ़ती चली जायेगी। हम उसको चुका नहीं सकेंगे। डीवैल्यूएशन से बहुत से नुकसान हैं। लेकिन मैं इसका पिष्टपेषण नहीं करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि डीवैल्यूएशन की बहस में मैं पहले भाग ले चुका हूँ। इसलिए इतना ही मेरे वास्ते ठीक होगा कि बगैर पुनरुक्ति किये मैं कहता हूँ कि डीवैल्यूएशन की जो भूल गवर्नमेंट ने की है वह बड़ी गम्भीर भूल की है।

सभापति महोदय, अब मैं देश की अन्दरूनी स्थिति पर आता हूँ कि कैसा हमारा एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हो गया है। आज एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हमारे सारे देश में बिलकुल लूज हो गया है। ब्यूरोक्रेटिक गवर्नमेंट इस रूप में हमारे मिनिस्टरों पर हावी हो गई है कि जिसको कहा नहीं जा सकता। कुछ ऐसे दृष्टांत मुझे देखने को मिले कि जो सेक्रेटरी चाहता है वह बात मिनिस्टर को करनी पड़ती है। मिनिस्टर साहब लाख सिर पटक कर मर जायें, उनकी चलती नहीं। मिनिस्टर साहब लिखते हैं कि ऐसा करो। सेक्रेटरी कहता है, नहीं साहब ऐसा करोगे तो ऐसा होगा। मिनिस्टर साहब आर्डर लिखते हैं कि नहीं, जैसा मैंने आर्डर दिया है, वैसा करना पड़ेगा। वह कहता है अच्छा हुआ। आर्डर तो लिख दिया, लेकिन 20-21 दिन के बाद ऐसा सूराग लगाया, ऐसा दिमाग लगाया कि आखिरकार मिनिस्टर साहब ने वही किया जो सेक्रेटरी ने कहा था। तो आज मिनिस्टर

[श्री उ० मु० त्रिवेदी]

की नहीं चलती, सेक्रेटरी की चलती है। सेक्रेटरी ने लिख दिया वही सच। इसलिए हमारी हालत दिनों दिन बिगड़ती हुई चली जा रही है। एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हमारा बिलकुल खराब हो रहा है। जहां भी हम निगाह डालें, हमको मालूम पड़ेगा कि हर जगह एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में करप्शन छिपा हुआ है। करप्शन मिटाने की बहुत बहुत हम लोगों ने कोशिश की, नन्दा जी ने पहलवानी से यह कहा कि दो साल में करप्शन मिटा देंगे। लेकिन उनकी वह पहलवानी धरी रह गई। दो साल में कुछ नतीजा नहीं निकला। हम किस नतीजे पर पहुंचे कि और ज्यादा करप्शन के मसले देखे। जयन्ती शिपिंग कम्पनी वाला 20 हजार रुपये का कपिटल और 20 करोड़ रुपये का लोन लेकर घूम रहा है। एक दूसरा आदमी, कालिगा एयर लाइन्स वाला, 20 हजार का टोटल कॅपिटल और वह ठेके लेता है 4 करोड़ 14 लाख रुपये का काम करने का। और कोई कान्ट्रैक्ट दिया जाता है, दूसरा कोई आदमी होता तो उससे साल्वेंसी सर्टिफिकेट मांगा जाता कि 4 करोड़ की साल्वेंसी लाओ। वह हर एक साल में साढ़े छः लाख का नफा करता है और उसमें क्या होता है? 2 हजार 981 क्विंटल दूध बरबाद कर दिया जाता है। भगवान जाने कलकत्ता के मार्केट में बिक गया या कहां बिक गया? 2981 क्विंटल दूध नेस्त-नाबूद हो जाता है। कहां चला गया? कोई कहता है जला दिया, कोई कहता है गाड़ दिया, कोई कहता है फेंक दिया। 2981 क्विंटल दूध का घी कितना बनता है यह जरा सोचना चाहिए। ऐसे ऐसे कितने ही कान्ट्रैक्ट हैं। लूट मची हुई है। कल्चरल डेलीगेशन के नाम पर, और दूसरे नाम पर, तीसरे नाम पर जिसको जो बनाना था, उसके लिए उसने किस्मत आजमाई की। उसको पैसा देते चले गये। किसी को 12 लाख, किसी को 15 लाख। एक सोसायटी कहने लगी कि हम तुम्हारे लिए एनसाइक्लो-

पीडिया बनाते हैं। जिन आदमियों को हिन्दी का नाम भी नहीं मालूम, हिन्दी बोल नहीं सकते, हिन्दी भाषा क्या है, वह समझते नहीं, उन आदमियों ने उनको काम दे दिया और वह सारा रुपया खा गये। इस तरह वह सारा रुपया बरबाद हो गया।

एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन इस तरह नहीं चल सकता। आज एक अफसर मुझे मिला था। वह कह रहा था कि हम नागालैंड में कैसे रहते हैं, वह मुनिये। वह कहता था नागालैंड में हम रहते हैं तो हम लोगों से टैक्स उगाहने के वास्ते, यानी अफसरों के पास भी वह आते हैं अन्डर आउन्ड नागालैंड गवर्नमेंट वाले और कहते हैं कि टैक्स का इतना रुपया लाओ नहीं तो कल जहमत हो जायगी। वह टैक्स का रुपया उन अफसरों को भी नागालैंड में देना पड़ता है। यह गवर्नमेंट है? इस गवर्नमेंट को शर्म से झुक जाना चाहिए। कल इस्तीफा देते हों, तो आज ही इस्तीफा दे दें और मेहरबानी करके यहां से चलते बनें। ऐसी गवर्नमेंट नहीं चल सकती। रेलवे का टी० टी० कहता है कि करें क्या? रेलवे के आगे चेकिंग नहीं हो सकती। अंगर गलती से हमने चेकिंग कर लिया तो पटापट हमारे सिर पर पड़ती है। हम को कोई बचाने वाला नहीं है। क्या इस तरह से एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चलता है? करप्शन का यह हाल है कि कोई काम बगैर करप्शन के हो नहीं सकता। आज सुबह एक आदमी आया। उसका 10 हजार रुपया बाकी है। गवर्नमेंट से लेना है। 10 हजार रुपया कोर्ट में जमा है। वह उसको पांच साल से नहीं मिल रहा है। एक आदमी कहता है कि 5 सौ रुपया जब तक नहीं दोगे तुम्हारा दस हजार रुपया नहीं मिलेगा। उसका कोई मदद करने वाला नहीं है। यह बातें जो हमारे गवर्नमेंट के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की हैं, इससे लोगों को नफरत हो गई है। यह बड़ी बड़ी बातें

वो छोड़िए, डीवैल्यूएशन, एकोनामिक कंडीशन, वगैरह, इन लुभावनी चीजों को वहीं तक महदूद करिये कि जो एकोनामिक्स में एम० ए० हों, वह एम० ए० वाले आदमी-यहां नहीं हैं। यहां तो वही आदमी आपको भेजने वाले हैं जो मामूली बातों को समझते हैं और उन मामूली बातों से लोगों को सरकार के प्रति नफरत हो गई है। उस नफरत का मैं एलान करता हूं। आपके प्रति जो घृणा पैदा हो गई है, उसका मैं एलान करता हूं। आप से जो आज आदमी दुखी हो गये हैं, उनके दुख को गाया मैं गा रहा हूं कि आप को सतर्क हो जायें। आपको जाना तो पड़ेगा। जल्दी चले जाइए तो बेहतर है। रंगा साहब कहते हैं कि आप अभी तो रहेंगे। लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि आप नहीं रहेंगे। . . . (ब्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप रहेंगे, मगर इधर आयेंगे।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : वह इधर वाला बोर्ड है न, तीनों बोर्ड यहीं भर जायेंगे, आप यहीं रहेंगे। क्या बात है ?

हमारे कई दोस्त कहते हैं जो अपने को कम्यूनिस्ट करके मानते हैं, उनकी एकोनामी का एक सिद्धान्त है, उनका सिद्धान्त क्या है ? सब बातों में कंट्रोल हो। सब बातें गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में आयें। एक तरफ तो ब्यूरोक्रेसी की शुराई करते हैं कि यह ब्यूरोक्रेट्स बड़े खराब हैं और एक तरफ कहते हैं कि सारी चीजों पर कंट्रोल करो। नतीजा क्या मिल रहा है ? लाइफ इन्श्योरेंस कारपोरेशन बना। क्या फायदा हुआ ! अफसरों के सामने सलाम करना पड़ता है, झूठी बातें कहते हैं। गलत तरीके से सारे रुपये का उपयोग होता है। रुपया कहां लगा, कैसे लगा, किसने लगाया, इसका सारा नजारा हम लोग मूंदड़ा कांड में सुन चुके हैं। वह भी लाइफ इन्श्योरेंस का ही रुपया था। आपने दूसरे कारपोरेशन बनाये। कारपोरेशन जब बनने लगे तो किसी हद तक हम यह सोचते थे कि मुमकिन

है, गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में बात जायेगी, पब्लिक यूटिलिटी की चीजें हैं, उन पब्लिक यूटिलिटी की चीजों में जो आदमी नौकरी करेंगे वह इसकी निगाह में रहेंगे। लेकिन हम तो और नजारा देख रहे हैं। क्या हुआ ? एयर इंडिया में हड़ताल हो रही है। किन आदमियों की हड़ताल हो रही है ? शर्म के मारे देखा नहीं जाता, बोला नहीं जाता, वर्णन नहीं हो सकता। कौन आदमी हड़ताल कर रहे हैं ? दो हज़ार तनख्वाह पाने वाले, ढाई हज़ार तनख्वाह पाने वाले, तीन हज़ार तनख्वाह पाने वाले हड़ताल कर रहे हैं और तमाम देश का सौ सौ लाख रुपये का नुकसान करा रहे हैं। ऐसे पढ़े लिखे आदमी हड़ताल कर रहे हैं। इंडियन एयरलाइन्स कारपोरेशन में हड़ताल। रेलवे में टिकट बेचने वाले की 130 रुपये तनख्वाह और दिन भर में वह 800 टिकट बेचे तो 130 रु० तनख्वाह उसको मिलती है, लेकिन इंडियन एयरलाइन्स कारपोरेशन का आदमी दिन भर में 16 टिकट बेचे और उसको 300 रुपये तनख्वाह मिलती है। मगर वह हड़ताल करता है, उस पर काम का बोझ ज्यादा पड़ जाता है। यह आपका ऐड-मिनिस्ट्रेशन है, गवर्नमेंट का ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken 24 minutes. The total time for his party is 30 minutes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am the spokesman of my Party. I have been allowed 30 minutes by the Speaker. I had a talk with the Speaker.

16 hrs.

इसी तरह की चीज हमने यू० पी० में देखी। उत्तर प्रदेश के सरकारी कर्मचारी हड़ताल कर के बैठ गये, गवर्नमेंट का सारा काम ठप्प हो गया। क्या आप अपने दिल पर हाथ रख कर कह सकते हैं, मैं सरकार से पूछता हूं, क्या मिनिस्टर लोग अपने दिलों पर

[श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी]

हाथ रख कर कह सकते हैं कि हमारी व्यवस्था ठीक है।

श्री ज० भ० कृपलानी (अमरोहा) : दिल हो तो हाथ रखें।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : कहीं भी आपकी व्यवस्था ठीक है। अगर आप में व्यवस्था करने की शक्ति नहीं है तो आप सब इस्तीफा दीजिये और छोड़िये इस गद्दी को। इस गद्दी से चिपके रहने की क्यों कोशिश कर रहे हैं, क्यों चिल्ला कर कहते हैं कि हम नहीं छोड़ेंगे, गद्दी से चिपक कर बैठेंगे, गोंद से लगे रहेंगे, लेकिन आखिरकार आपको जाना पड़ेगा, गोंद से चिपक कर हमेशा नहीं बैठे रह सकते। आज जो व्यवस्था है, वह नहीं चल सकती, जो मैनेजमेन्ट है वह नहीं चल सकता। वे आदमी बिक कर नहीं रह सकते जो व्यवस्था को ठीक नहीं रख सकते। जिन आदमियों के पास व्यवस्था को ठीक रखने की शक्ति नहीं है उनको अपने आप निकल जाना चाहिये। आपकी व्यवस्था का यह नमूना है, जोर का एलान है, डोंडो पीटी जा रही है, तमाम उत्तर प्रदेश के सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल की और नतीजा यह हुआ कि इतने दिनों के बाद आपको झुकना पड़ा और अब आप खर्चा बढ़ायेंगे, टैक्स बढ़ायेंगे, फिर भी आप नतीजे पर नहीं पहुंच सके। इसलिये मैं आप से यह कहता हूँ कि आपकी व्यवस्था-शक्ति कम हो गई है, इसलिये आपको यह छोड़ना ही पड़ेगा।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : क्या छोड़ना पड़ेगा ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : यह गद्दी। मैं फिर आप से कहता हूँ कि आप जहाँ कहीं भी निगाह डालें और देखें कि क्या हो रहा है, तो आपको ये बन्द नजर आयेंगे—बिहार बन्द, अहमदाबाद बन्द, गुजरात बन्द, बम्बई बन्द, कलकत्ता बन्द, ये आपको क्या बताते हैं ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप भी बन्द हुए या नहीं ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : मैं तो बन्द नहीं हुआ, लेकिन भले आदमी आपने मुझे अच्छा याद दिला दिया। जो भी बन्द हुए, उनमें ईंट पत्थर फेंके गये, लोग मारे गये, गोली चली, उसको आपने बन्द माना, लेकिन दिल्ली वालों ने बन्द कर के किसी पर गोली नहीं चलवाई, लाठी नहीं चलवाई, उसको आपने बन्द नहीं माना। आपकी यह नीयत हो गई है कि उसको बन्द मानो जहाँ पर गोली चलती है, जहाँ पर लाठी चलती है।

इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था आप चाहते हैं, यह आपको शोभा नहीं देती। आप देख रहे हैं कि आप आपस में भी लड़ रहे हैं, लेकिन आपकी लड़ाई के बारे में हम कहना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन करें क्या कहना पड़ता है।

नागा लोगों की तरफ देखिये, मीजो लोगों की तरफ देखिये, वहाँ आपने क्या किया है। नागा अगर बन्दूक चलाता है तो आप उससे घबराते हैं, नागा हमारे आदमियों को मार देवे, हमारे पुलिस वाले को मार देवे, तब तो जिस ने गोली चलाई वह नागा होस्टाइल कहलाया, लेकिन अगर कहीं हमारा पुलिस वाला किसी नागा को मार देवे, तो नागा को मार दिया, पकड़ो पुलिस वाले को। ऐसे कितने लोगों को आपने पकड़ा है। होम मिनिस्टर साहब यहाँ पर बैठे नहीं हैं, मैं उनसे जवाब तलब करना चाहता हूँ आपने कितने सैन्ट्रल रिजर्व पुलिस के आदमियों को बन्द कर दिया, क्योंकि उन्होंने अपना बचाव किया, अपने बचाव में गोली चलाई। जिस आदमी को आपने वहाँ पर रखा हुआ है, वह अपनी हिफाजत के लिये आज वहाँ पर गोली नहीं चला सकता, क्योंकि आप यह आक्षेप लगाते हैं कि आपने नागाओं को मार दिया जो हमारे साथ लायल थे। एक भी नागा लायल नहीं है, सब होस्टाइल हैं, अगर

आप इन के साथ सख्तों से काम नहीं लेंगे—लेकिन आप सख्तों से काम ले नहीं सकते। अगर आप सख्तों से काम नहीं लेना चाहते, तो मेहरबान, कृपानिधान, श्रीमान्, आप यहां से निकल जाइये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उसके बाद कौन आयेगा ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : उसके बाद हम हैं, क्यों घबरा रहे हो ?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may kindly address the Chair.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It was their interruptions which made me address them. They must not interrupt me.

वंदे शिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : आप अकेले ही या किसी के साथ ?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : देख लो पीछे कितने ही हैं।

सभापति महोदय, मैं एक बात कह कर समाप्त करता हूँ। वह यह है कि . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member time is up.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Time is always up.

एक ही आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ और वह यह है कि समय रहते हुए, विचारवान, बुद्धिमान आदमी भागना पसन्द करता है। अगर समय रहते हुए वह नहीं भागे तो उसका बड़ा नुकसान होता है।

श्री कमलनयन बजाज : कांग्रेस वाले भागते नहीं हैं।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : कांग्रेस वाले भागेंगे और हम भगायेंगे। अभी समय है, जनता ने आपको समय दे रखा है, उस जनता की बात को, आवाज को सुनो।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: As soon as my time is up, I shall sit down. But let me give them this final warning.

आपका समय पक चुका है और चूँकि आपका समय पक चुका है, इसलिये मैं जैम बोलते हुए अभी बैठ जाऊँगा, वैसे ही समय रहते हुए आप यहां से चले जाइये, तो इससे देश का भला होगा।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : सभापति महोदय, सरकार पर अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पेश करते हुए विरोधी दल के तीनों सदस्यों ने तीन प्रकार के भाषण दिये हैं। एक ने विदेश नीति और आर्थिक नीति की समालोचना की—कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रवक्ता ने, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के प्रवक्ता ने सरकार की आर्थिक नीति को समालोचना की और अभी जो बोल गये हैं, इन्होंने खिचड़ी कहा। अब प्रश्न यह है कि इन गलत तथ्यों और आंकड़ों पर आधारित अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव पर हम लोग क्या विचार करें। इन्होंने कहा कि हमारी विदेश नीति गलत है, हमारी आर्थिक नीतियां गलत हैं और हमारी अन्य घरेलू नीतियां गलत हैं। कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रवक्ता ने भाषण देते हुए हमें पब्लिक सेक्टर की याद दिलाई और कहा कि बी० ए० डील के समान हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने एक नये प्रकार का डील इस देश के लिये स्वीकृत कर लिया है जो बिलकुल गलत है। उन्होंने इण्डो-यू० एस० फाउण्डेशन की भी याद दिलाई।

स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के प्रवक्ता ने तोते की तरह से वही पुरानी रट लगाई कि कोई योजना देश में नहीं होनी चाहिये। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि योजना नहीं बनाओ, योजना कमिशन को तोड़ दो, आयात पर कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं होना चाहिये, विदेशी पूँजी को आबाध रूप से, बिना किसी छूट के, देश में आने दो और यों कहा कि इस देश में विदेशी पूँजी को लूट

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

मचाने दो। ये हैं सिद्धान्त स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के, जो हमारी सरकार में अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को पेश करना चाहती है। अगर ऐसा हो कि इस देश में किसी चीज पर भी प्रतिबन्ध नहीं हो, आयात पर प्रतिबन्ध नहीं हो, उसके अनुसार इस देश में विदेशी पूंजी पर प्रतिबन्ध नहीं हो, इस देश में योजना नहीं रहे, योजनायें नहीं हों, अगर अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को पेश करने के ये कारण हैं, तो मैं यह चाहूंगा कि ये अपोजीशन पार्टियां हर बार हमारे अन्दर अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव लायें और हम हर बार यहीं कहेंगे कि हम योजना बनायेंगे, हम अपने देश के गरीबों के लिये योजनायें बनायेंगे, हम अपने देश में आयात पर प्रतिबन्ध लगायेंगे, हम अपने देश में विदेशी पूंजी का अबाध रूप से नहीं आने देंगे, उतनी ही आने देंगे कि जितनी भी हमें आवश्यकता है अपने देश की आर्थिक अवस्था को मजबूत करने के लिये। अगर इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को लाने के यही सिद्धान्त हैं, तो बार बार अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को लाइये और ये जानते हैं कि अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाने का क्या परिणाम होता है। इनके इस सदन में अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाने का एक लाभ यह होता है कि हमको बार बार यह अवसर मिलता है, मुझको और मेरी सरकार को यह बताने का मौका मिलता है कि हम इन तमाम चीजों पर दृढ़ रहेंगे जिनको जवाहरलाल जी ने देश के प्रथम वर्षों में हमें दिया था। उन्होंने कहा था कि किसी भी अविकसित देश को विकास के पथ पर अग्रसर करने के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि उन देश की योजना हो, उस देश का योजना कमिशन हो, उस देश में इन्वेस्टमेंट के लिये एक ऐसा पैटर्न हो कि जिस पैटर्न के अनुसार उस देश का उत्थान हो। वह उत्थान उस देश के किसी खास वर्ग के हाथ में न जाये, बल्कि उस देश के विभिन्न लोगों को, विभिन्न वर्गों को उसका लाभ पहुंचा सके ताकि आने वाले वर्षों में आर्थिक रूप से केन्द्रीकरण, कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ इकानामिक पावर एण्ड वेल्थ न हो।

इसलिये स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के जो सिद्धान्त हैं, वे ऐसे बातक हैं कि हम इन को मान कर अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव पर कोई बहस नहीं कर सकते। मैं यह स्पष्ट कहूँ, समापति महोदया, कि कांग्रेस पार्टी जिसमें मैं हूँ और मेरे बहुत से दोस्त हैं, समय समय पर हम ने अपनी आर्थिक नीति की स्वयं कटु आलोचना की है। हमारे साथी, हमारे बहुत से मित्र हैं, हमारे बहुत से मिनिस्टर हैं, जिन्होंने समय-समय पर अन्तर-परीक्षा (इन्ट्रोस्पेक्शन) किया है। अभी प्रधान मंत्री ने पब्लिक सेक्टर में काम करने वालों को अपने यहां बुलाया था। उनसे उन्होंने बात की, उन्होंने स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा कि हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर में क्या कठिनाइयाँ हैं, कहां दोष हैं? हम स्वयं बार-बार कह चुके हैं, लेकिन उसी प्रधान मंत्री की इन बातों को जो स्वयं उन्होंने इन चीजों को सुधारने के लिये कही थीं, अग्रेंजी की डिविजनरी में से अच्छे अच्छे शब्दों को चुन कर मसानी साहब ने कहीं — “ये मेरे शब्द नहीं हैं, ये प्रधान मंत्री के शब्द हैं।” यह प्रधान मंत्री के शब्द हैं। इस का क्या अर्थ है। प्रधान मंत्री ने पब्लिक सेक्टर को बुला कर अगर सुधारने का प्रयत्न किया तो इसके लिये उनको बड़ी नाराजगी। अगर न सुधारें तो भी उनको नाराजगी। कहने का मतलब है यह कि स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के कहने के अनुसार, जो कि खेसे फंडर एफानमी है, हमें योजना न बनायें, उन के कहने के अनुसार हम विदेशी पूंजी पर प्रतिबन्ध न लगायें, उन के अनुसार हम ब्लैक मार्केटिंग पर नियंत्रण न करें। स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के यह मगर मच्छ के आंसू इस देश की जनता के लिये नहीं हैं, उन के यह आंसू उन पूंजीपतियों के लिये हैं जिन के फंली टूबेलर वह हैं। श्री मसानी को बड़ा प्रेम आता है फंली टूबेलर के नाम पर। उन्होंने कहा कि महालोनियस फंली टूबेलर हैं, उन्होंने कहा कि डा० वी० के० आर० वी० राव क्रिस्टी एफानामिस्ट हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि कृष्ण मेनन और मालवीय आगे नहीं बढ़ सके। वाशिगटन

पेट्रियाट्स को समझना चाहिये कि हम इस देश में विदेशी पूंजी को, चाहे वह अमरीकी पूंजी हो, कोई भी पूंजी हो, अबाध रूप से नहीं आने देंगे ।

अपने देश में हम निश्चित सहायता चाहते हैं । रूस ने अपने कठिनाई के वर्षों में सहायता ली, अमरीका को अपनी स्टैचू आफ लिबर्टी को खड़ा करने के लिये प्रारम्भिक वर्षों में फ्रांस से भीख मांगनी पड़ी थी और उसने फ्रांस के रुपये से माडेल बनाये थे । अमरीका को यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये । इस प्रकार कहने का मतलब यह है कि किसी भी अविश्वसित देश को अपनी अर्थ-व्यवस्था को गतिशील करने के लिये विदेशी पूंजी की जरूरत होती है, और भारत ने विदेशी पूंजी लेना स्वीकार किया है तो कोई गलत काम नहीं किया । लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि अपने देश में चाहे वह अमरीकी पूंजी हो चाहे रूसी पूंजी हो, चाहे पूर्वी पूंजी हो चाहे पश्चिमी पूंजी हो, किसी भी पूंजी को मसानी साहब की तरह हम अबाध रूप से नहीं आने देंगे । इस लिये अगर हम ने अपनी आर्थिक अवस्था को कठिनाई को महसूस किया और उसको सुधारने के लिये प्रयत्न किया तो हमने कोई गलत काम नहीं किया ।

इस सदन में डिवैलुएशन की चर्चा करते हुए श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने यह कहा कि हमने अपने देश को बेच दिया ।

16.13 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

अपने देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था पिछले वर्षों में कुछ कठिनाई से चलती रही है । हमने इस सिद्धान्त का प्रतिपादन नहीं किया जिसके अनुसार अपने देश में अर्थ-व्यवस्था को अधिनायकवाद में लाकर के सारी चीजों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करके उस को स्टेट सेक्टर में ले सकते जोकि कुछ पूर्वी देशों की व्यवस्थाय है । (व्यवधान) मैं आपको फँक्ट्स एंड फीगर्स दूंगा । अगर आप मुह बन्द करके

कान खोलें तो सब कुछ स्पष्ट हो जायेगा । लेकिन अगर आप सुनना चाहें तो मैं फँक्ट्स एंड फीगर्स दे सकता हूँ, ब्रेन कहां से दूँ ।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि विदेशी पूंजी को लेने के लिये आवश्यकता यह है कि हम अपने देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को एक नया पैटर्न दें, और वह नया पैटर्न मिक्स्ड एकानामी के नाम पर देश में आया । इस देश के आर्थिक विकास का पिछले अट्टारह वर्षों का इतिहास एक नये एक्स्पेरिमेंट का इतिहास है, एक नई कठिनाई का इतिहास है । यह बात सत्य है और कौन इसे नहीं मानता है । क्या अभी हमने इस सदन में आपसे कम शब्दों में इसकी आलोचना की है । हमने स्वयं माना है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने माना है इस बात को । आप ही कौन इस बात को कहने वाले हैं कि राष्ट्रीय आय में वृद्धि नहीं हुई । जब प्रथम योजना, द्वितीय योजना और तृतीय योजना में देश की आर्थिक प्रगति सिर्फ एक सेक्टर में हुई तो आपके कहने पर नहीं, हमारे कहने पर हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने महालोनोबिस कमेटी विठलाई । आज भी मोनोपोलीज को खत्म करने के लिये आपके कहने पर नहीं, हमारे कहने पर कांग्रेस पार्टी ने मोनोपोली कमिशन विठलाया लेकिन स्वयं कांग्रेस जन सन्तुष्ट नहीं हैं उसकी प्रगति से । मोनोपोली कमिशन की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको कार्यान्वित करके हमें आगे बढ़ना चाहिये । प्रश्न यह है कि इन तमाम बातों को हम स्वयं कहते हैं । आखिर इन लोगों के कहने का मतलब क्या है । अगर कोई सही बात नहीं हो सकती तो क्या सिर्फ अपोजीशन ही ठकेदार है कि इन शब्दों को कहे । यह हमारी कठिनाई आर्थिक जगत में बराबर रही है । इस पर हमारा मतभेद हो सकता है देश के अन्दर, यह ठीक है, कि आर्थिक कठिनाई है निकलने का रास्ता क्या था । यह भी सम्भव हो सकता है कि इन आर्थिक कठिनाइयों से निकलने के लिये रुपये के अवमूल्यन की आवश्यकता नहीं थी, जैसा कि आप कहते हैं । लेकिन किसी भी

[श्री भगवत झा आजाद]

आर्थिक व्यवस्था के सामने, जब वह अपनी कठिनाई के दौर से गुजरती है तो बहुत से अल्टर्नेटिव रहते हैं। उन में से ही अबमूल्यन भी एक अल्टर्नेटिव था। दूसरा अल्टर्नेटिव यह था जिसको इंग्लैंड की तथाकथित लेबर सरकार कहती है। वह असल में लेबर सरकार है नहीं इसलिये मैं उसे तथाकथित कहता हूँ। इन तमाम अल्टर्नेटिवज में से इस सरकार ने अबमूल्यन को चुना।

प्रश्न यह उठता है कि इस अबमूल्यन के बाद हमें क्या क्या करना चाहिये था। कोई डिवैल्यूएशन की किताब को पढ़ सकता है जिस में उस के थ्योरिटिकल गुण दिये होते हैं कि क्या क्या होना चाहिये। लेकिन आपको चाहिये था कि आप बतलाते कि अबमूल्यन के बाद क्या करना चाहिये था। अगर हमारी गलती कहीं पर थी तो आप बतलाते कि कहां पर हमारी गलती है और किस प्रकार अबमूल्यन के बाद मूल्यों का स्थिरीकरण हो सकता है। हम ने स्वयं स्वतन्त्र पार्टी का स्टेटमेंट आने के पहले इसको उठाया। कांग्रेस पार्टी के मेम्बरों ने अपनी पार्टी के सामने इसे उठा कर एक नहीं दस सुझाव रखे कि उसके बाद सरकार को क्या करना चाहिये। आपके नो कांफिडेंस मोशन मूव करने के पहले हमने बतलाया कि अब आवश्यकता यह है कि अबमूल्यन के बाद देश में मूल्यों का स्थिरीकरण हो। यूगो-स्लाविया और फ्रांस ने अपने अबमूल्यन का फायदा इसलिये उठाया कि वहां की आर्थिक व्यवस्था विदेशी पूंजी के सहारे मजबूत बन चुकी थी और वहां की कीमतों में स्थिरीकरण आ चुका था, उनका स्टैबिलाइजेशन हो चुका था। इसलिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि देश में मूल्यों का स्थिरीकरण किया जाये। इस मामले में एकानामिक पालिसी के प्रस्ताव पर अपने विचार मैं विस्तृत रूप से रखूंगा।

इस के बाद दूसरी बात यह आनी चाहिये कि किस प्रकार हमारा निर्यात बढ़

सकता है। विरोधी दलों को यह बतलाना चाहिये था कि किस प्रकार हम आयात खत्म कर सकते हैं। उनको यह बतलाना चाहिये था कि लिबरलाइजेशन आफ इम्पोर्ट्स के नाम पर कौन-कौन सा कच्चा माल हम अपने यहां आने दें। लेकिन बजाय उस के एक स्वीपिंग सी अर्थात् हवा वाली बात कह दी। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि किन-किन बातों की आलोचना विरोधी दल वालों ने की या जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोगों ने स्वयं नहीं कहा। लेकिन उन में और हम में फर्क यह है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी गणतन्त्र की पार्टी है। हमारी पार्टी के नेता पार्टी में बैठ कर, एग्जिक्यूटिव में बैठ कर, हमारी बात तो सुनते हैं और उस पर विचार करते हैं। लेकिन स्वतन्त्र पार्टी में यह होता है कि फर्मान निकलते हैं श्री राजगोपालाचार्य के, और उन्होंने जो कह दिया वह कानून बन गया। हमारी पार्टी में प्रधान मंत्री ने जो कह दिया वही कानून नहीं हो जाता, अशोक मेहता जो कह देते हैं वही कानून नहीं बन जाता।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कामराज का कहना तो कानून हो जाता है।

श्री भगवत झा आजाद : आप कामराज की बात कहते हैं। कामराज जो कहते हैं वह भी कानून नहीं हो जाता। हमारी पार्टी में और ए०आई०सी०सी० में बैठ कर हर मामले पर खुले आम आलोचना होती है। लेकिन आपकी पार्टी में वह बात कहां है। हमारी और आप की तुलना किस तरह हो सकती है। कहां राजा भोज और कहां भोलुआ तेली। असल बात वह है आप चाहते हैं सरकार ले लेना। हम तो चाहते हैं देश में कांग्रेस पार्टी के बजाय आप सरकार बना लें। बार बार आप ने कहा "निकल जाओ निकल जाओ"। हम निकलना चाहते हैं ताकि देख सकें कि आप में कितनी काबिलियत है, आप में कितनी नैशनल टलेन्ट है सरकार चलाने की। हम चले जायेंगे तो क्या होगा।

Shri Mohammed Koya (Kozhikode):
The Britishers said the same thing.

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : निकल तो जाओ ।

श्री भागवत शः आज़ाद : तुम क्या निकालोगे । श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने कहा . . . (व्यवधान) जरा सुनिये, कान खोलिये, मुंह बन्द कीजिये । आपन योर इग्रस एंड शः योर माउथ्स । मैं यह कह रहा था कि क्या स्वतन्त्र पार्टी सरकार बना सकेगी । जरा उस की तारीफ तो सुनिये । श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी ने स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के बारे में जितनी दलीलें दीं उन से पता चलता है कि कितने लायक हैं स्वतंत्र पार्टी वाले । स्वतंत्र पार्टी वालों ने भी हीरेन मुकर्जी के खिलाफ दलीलें दीं । उन को सुन कर मुझे एक जज की बात याद आ गई । एक जज के सामने दो वकील आये । उन दोनों में से एक ने कहा :

"My Lord, here is the hon. pleader on the other side. He speaks nothing but falsehood, nothing but untruth, nothing but idiocy."

And the other pleader said:

"My Lord, here is the hon. pleader who is nothing but an incarnation of untruth."

After this, the Judge said,

"After this mutual introduction, let us proceed with the case."

इस म्यूचल इंट्रोडक्शन के बाद मैं कहूंगा कि मैं तो आश्वस्त हुआ कि हमारी सरकार चलेगी क्योंकि इस देश की जनता ने हम को यह अधिकार दिया है कि हम इस देश का शासन चलायें । मैं दावा नहीं करता कि यह शासन ठीक से चल रहा है, मैं यह दावा नहीं करता कि मैं ने . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री बृजराज सिंह : आप कर ही नहीं सकते ।

श्री भागवत शः आज़ाद : यह देखिये इन गणतन्त्र वालों का बिहेवियर । अगर उन के बोलने के समय मैं बोलना शुरू कर दूँ तो यह बोल नहीं पायेंगे । लेकिन उन को समझना चाहिये कि गणतन्त्र में अपोजिशन को भी कभी कभी मुंह बन्द करना चाहिये और दूसरों की बात को समझना चाहिये । मैं फँकटस बता रहा हूँ । लेकिन ऐसा मालूम होता है कि फँकटस एंड फिगरज देने से इनको कोई लाभ नहीं । इनके लिए इसका कोई महत्व नहीं । कितनी ही वर्षा हो बांस में कभी फल नहीं लगता है । यह बात ठीक है लेकिन फिर भी आप सुनें तो सही । प्रस्ताव जो आपने पेश किया है, उस पर बहस हो रही है । कुछ तो आपको सीखना चाहिये ।

जो हमारी इकोनोमिक पालिसी है उस पालिसी की मैंने स्वयं आलोचना की है । मैंने स्वयं कहा है कि जितनी भी हमारी आर्थिक नीतियां हैं उनको जितना धागे बढ़ना चाहिये था नहीं बढ़ी हैं । मैंने स्वयं बारबार कहा है, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने भी बारबार कहा है, खाद्य मंत्री ने भी कहा है कि इस देश में सारी बातें बड़ें सुन्दर ढंग से नहीं हो रही हैं । क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी के किसी भी सदस्य ने या मंत्री ने कभी यह कहा है कि देश में सब को भरपेट खाना मिल रहा है ? क्या कामर्स मिनिस्टर ने कभी यह कहा है कि सब को वदन ढकने के लिए कपड़ा मिल रहा है । प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं इस देश में यह कहा है कि हमारे सामने कठिनाइयां हैं । क्या कभी उन्होंने किसी बात को छिपाया है ? सब कुछ कह कर डाक्टर श्रीमान रंगा साहब ने कहा कि यह सरकार डायॉबिटीज से पीड़ित है । रोग का एनेलेसिस तो उन्होंने कर दिया लेकिन आप देखें कि निदान उन्होंने क्या सुझाया ? उन्होंने कहा कि इसको पोटाशियम साइनाइड खिला दो । मामूली सी दवा इंसुलिन इस रोग के निदान के लिए सुझाई जा सकती है लेकिन उन्होंने कह दिया कि इसको पोटाशियम साइनाइड दे दिया जाए । इस देश

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

के जो डाक्टर हैं अगर वे किसी डायबिटीज के पेशेंट के लिए पोटाशियम साइनाइड प्रैस्क्राइब करें तो क्या देश की जनता उन पर विश्वास करेगी।

बार बार उनकी तरफ से कहा जा रहा है कि अगले इलेक्शन में हम देख लेंगे। मेरा यह कोई स्कोरिंग प्वाइंट नहीं है। लेकिन इतना मैं अवश्य कहता हूँ और बार बार मैंने कहा है कि इन पिछले अठारह वर्षों में हमारी आर्थिक नीति में गड़बड़ी रही है। उसका निदान मैंने स्वयं किया है। हमारी कठिनाइयाँ क्यों हैं? इसको हमें देखना चाहिये और उनको दूर करना चाहिये। कौन कहता है कि हमारे देश में आज बहुत से व्यक्तियों को 68 पैसे रोज नहीं मिलते हैं। क्या यह बात हमारे किसी मंत्री ने, हमारी सरकार ने या किसी सदस्य ने कही है? हम जानते हैं कि आजादी हमने दिलाई है और उस समय दिलाई है जब आप में से बहुत से लोग सोये हुए थे। मैं इस बात को भी मानता हूँ कि हमें राज करने के तरीके गांधी जी ने नहीं सिखाये। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि हम में खामियाँ हैं और हम से गलतियाँ हो रही हैं। लेकिन इस सब के बावजूद भी क्या आप समझते हैं कि "कहीं का ईंट कहीं का रोड़ा, भानमती ने कुनवा जोड़ा" वाली विरोधी पार्टियों से इस देश की बेहतरी हो सकती है, इस देश का कल्याण हो सकता है? इस देश को हम अच्छी सरकार दे सकते हैं।

आर्थिक नीति के बारे में और अधिक न कह कर मैं अब अपनी विदेश नीति पर आता हूँ। हमारे हीरेन मुकर्जी साहब ने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की बड़ी आलोचना की है विदेश नीति को लेकर। उन्होंने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने वियतनाम के प्रश्न को लेकर बराबर अपनी स्थिति को बदला

है। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसा कोई प्रश्न वियतनाम पर वियतनाम पर हमारी सरकार ने कहा है कि मुख्य बात यह है कि वियतनाम का मिलिटरी साल्यूशन यानी सामरिक निदान नहीं हो सकता है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और हमारी सरकार ने यह भी कहा है कि वियतनाम पर अमरीकी बमबारी तुरन्त बन्द होनी चाहिये। अमरीका को वहाँ बमबारी करना तुरन्त बन्द कर देना चाहिये। यह नीति हमारी पहले भी रही है और आज भी है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने स्पष्ट शब्दों में घोषणा की है कि वियतनाम सनस्था का हल अमरीका द्वारा वहाँ बमबारी करने से नहीं निकल सकता है, उसका कोई सामरिक हल नहीं है, उसका एक मात्र हल जेनेवा कन्वेंशन के अन्तर्गत तमाम सम्बद्ध देशों को टेबल के पास बुला कर ही निकाला जा सकता है। मैं पृथना चाहता हूँ कि वियतनाम के बारे में कहीं हमारी नीति में परिवर्तन हुआ है? कहां कोई परिवर्तन हुआ आपको नजर आता है?

यह बात ठीक है जो आप कहते हैं कि आक्रामक की घोषणा होनी चाहिये। लेकिन आप देखें कि संगार को मालूम है कि आक्रामक कौन है। हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने अगर आक्रामक की घोषणा नहीं की, अगर हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा कि जेनेवा कन्वेंशन के अन्तर्गत सम्बद्ध देशों का सम्मेलन हो और अमरीकी बमबारी पन्द हो तो मैं आप से जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसस बड़ा, इससे सच्चा इससे निष्पक्ष सिद्धान्त और कौन सा हो सकता है? मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने संसार को आशा दिलाई है कि अभी भी एक देश है जो बार बार अमरीका को अपनी बमबारी बन्द करने के लिए कह रहा है और कन्वेंशन में आने के लिए मजबूर कर रहा है।

आपने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की इस बात के लिए भी समालोचना की है कि आपने यह क्यों नहीं कहा कि अमरीकी पायलट्स का वार क्रिमिनल्स के नाम पर ट्रायल किया जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मंत्री यह कहती तो उस देश के लिए और उस देश के लिए ही नहीं समस्त संसार के लिए भी यह एक दुर्भाग्य की बात होती क्या आप नहीं जानते हैं कि अगर वार क्रिमिनल्स के रूप में उन पायलट्स का ट्रायल किया जाए तो वियतनाम में उसके बाद क्या स्थिति बनेगी ? बहादुरी इस बात में नहीं है कि इस देश को और इस संसार को हम युद्ध के किनारे धकेल दें। एक बार ब्यूबा के मामले को लेकर यह संसार युद्ध के किनारे पहुँच चुका था। तब कनेडी साहब ने अपना गैस चम्बर जागृत कर दिया था, एक्टिवाइज कर दिया था और रूस की मिसाइल्स भी तैयार थीं लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री स्वर्गीय श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने उस युद्ध को रोका। आज फिर हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मंत्री, उसी जवाहर लाल नेहरू की पुत्री ने संसार को किसी युद्ध में जाने से रोका है। इस में गलती क्या है। अगर आज वियतनाम में वार क्रिमिनल्स के तौर पर उन पर मुकदमें चलते हैं तो याद रखिये कि अमरीका की बमबारी और तेज हो सकती है और साथ साथ और भी देश उस में इंटर-बीन कर सकते हैं और उसका परिणाम यह हो सकता है कि सारा संसार विश्वयुद्ध के फिर किनारे आ पहुँचे। इसलिए मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति में आपको कौन सी खामी मालूम हुई है। अगर हमारे इस इवेल्यूएशन से आप नाराज हैं तो बेशक नाराज रहिये। लेकिन इस इवेल्यूएशन की आड़ में सारी की सारी वियतनाम की नीति समालोचना अगर आप करते हैं तो यह बिल्कुल गलत है। हम समझते हैं कि वियतनाम के सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार ने जो नीति पहले अपनायी थी वही नीति आज भी कायम है।

छोटे मोटे और भी प्रश्न इस बहस में उठाये गए हैं। अभी हमारे हीरेन मुकर्जी साहब ने कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री ने सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री की हैसियत से इस देश में वायस आफ अमरीका एग्जिमेंट के तहत अमरोकन पीस कोर के मेम्बरों को ट्रांसमिटर लगाने की स्वीकृति दे दी थी। यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हुई है। अगर ऐसी कोई बात हुई होती तो हम लोगों को उसका पता होता। अमरीका की सरकार ने यह जरूर कहा कि हम चाहते हैं कि इस देश में कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़े और उसके लिए इस देश में डिस्ट्रिक्ट हैड क्वार्टर्स में छूटे छोटे ट्रांसमिटर लगाये जायें। आप जानते हैं कि हमने बहुत पहले से इस प्रस्ताव को नहीं माना। यह प्रस्ताव कहीं भी नहीं है।

आपने इंडो-यू० एम० फाउंडेशन की चर्चा भी की है। आपने इसका विरोध तो बाद में किया, आप से पहले इसी कांग्रेस पार्टी ने अपना विरोध प्रदर्शित कर दिया था। आज से बहुत पहले हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के समय यह इंडो-यू० एम० फाउंडेशन की चर्चा चली थी और करीब करीब यह बात स्वीकृत हो चुकी थी। कांग्रेस पार्टी के गणतंत्रात्मक तरीके को आप देखें। ज्योंही इस प्रश्न पर हमने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये, ज्यों ही इस प्रश्न पर देश के विचार व्यक्त किये गये... (इंटर प्लान्स) जरा सुनो तो सही। अब आप जानते ही हैं कि इंडो-यू० एम० फाउंडेशन तहखाने में पड़ा हुआ है। अगर इसको इस देश में स्वीकार किया जाना है तो उसकी एक शर्त है। मैं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग का विरोधी नहीं हूँ। अगर अमरीका की सरकार छः करोड़ रुपये सात में हमारे देश में किसी खास सेंटर को बढ़ाने के लिए देती है और हम जहाँ और बहुत से कर्ज ले रहे हैं, वहाँ मैं सिर्फ यह बहता हूँ कि उस

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

पर उसका एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कंट्रोल नहीं होगा। आप देखें कि यह इसी पार्टी की महानता है कि उसको हमने रोका और तभी उसको स्वीकार करेंगे जब उसका एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कंट्रोल हमारे हाथ में हो।

इस प्रकार आप देखें कि चाहे आर्थिक नीति को लेकर इनकी दलीलें हो अथवा विदेश नीति को ले कर, किसी भी नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो इनकी दलीलें हैं वे अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को पास करने के लिए पर्याप्त बिल्कुल भी नहीं है। हमने स्वयं कहा है कि हमारी आर्थिक नीतियों में क्या कम-जोरियाँ हैं। स्वयं मंत्रीगण कहते हैं कि खाद्य नीति में हमारी कमजोरियाँ हैं। आज इसका आपके सामने आभास भी आया होगा और आपने देखा होगा कि कांग्रेस सरकार अपनी आर्थिक नीति में बड़ा परिवर्तन करना चाहती है। उस परिवर्तन के अनुसार हम आगे आने वाले वर्ष में अपने इम्पोर्ट को चार मिलियन करना चाहते हैं और उसके साथ साथ अपने देश में प्रोक्थोरमेंट को अधिक करना चाहते हैं। इस नीति का आभास आज हमें अखबारों से मिलता है। गणतंत्र का आखिर क्या टैस्ट है? टैस्ट यह है कि अगर हम गलती करते हैं और उस गलती के प्रति बिल्कुल अपनी आँख मूंद लेते हैं तब तो हम हटने के काबिल हैं लेकिन जब तक हम.....

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) :
शर्मिन्दा होना चाहिये।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : हम आपसे अधिक जोरदार भाषा में बोलते हैं। फर्क इतना है कि आप सिर्फ चिल्लाते हैं लेकिन हम बोलते हैं और साथ साथ करते भी हैं।

मैं अपनी अन्तिम बात पर आता हूँ। हमें दुःख यह है कि यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव उस समय लाया गया है जिस समय कि नाथूला पास पर आक्रमक चीन की विस्तारवादी नीति चल रही है। हमारे

हीरेन मुखर्जी साहब ने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने चीन को क्यों रिफेंस दिया? मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह कहतीं कि चीन बड़ा भारी और बड़ा अच्छा साम्यवादी देश है? जिन साम्राज्यवादी चीन की खूबार आंखें हमारी जमीन पर हैं, जिसके पंजे हमारी जमीन पर हैं क्या उसकी हम प्रशंसा करते? हमें दुःख इस बात का है कि आज जब नाथूला पास पर चीन के लाउड स्पीकर फिर वही तराना गा रहे हैं जो कि उन्होंने उस समय गाया था जब हमारे देश पर आक्रमण किया था और आज भी जब चीनी दैत्य के काले और खंखार पंजे हमारे नेफा के बोमदीला पर पड़ रहे हैं, आज जब कि कश्मीर की तराइयों में पाकिस्तानी जासूसों का जाल फिर से आना चाहता है, आज जब कि पाकिस्तान सैबर जैट और पैटन टैंक मगा कर फिर से हमारी बारामूला की घाटी पर चढ़ाई करना चाहता है, आज जब कि बारामूला की तराई में और श्रीनगर की उपत्यकाओं में फिर से यह गान किया जा रहा है कि हम उनका विरोध करेंगे, उस समय इस हमारी अपोजीशन पार्टीज ने इस सरकार के हाथ मजबूत करने के बजाय, अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव हमारे सामने रखा है। यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव उस समय लाया गया है जिस समय देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था आप सबका सहयोग चाहती है, सबके कंधों का जोर चाहती है। आपोजीशन के सदस्य इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को उस समय लाए हैं, जब कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री ने मास्को में जारी किये गए ज्वाइंट कम्युनिके में वियतनाम में अन्दरीकी नीति की तीव्र निन्दा की है और स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है कि वहां पर बमबारी को बन्द कर नेगो-शिएटिंग टेबल पर बातचीत की जाये।

वास्तव में आपोजीशन ने सिर्फ एक बात का ध्यान किया है चूँकि पांच महीने के बाद चुनाव आ रहा है, इस लिए सारे सिद्धान्तों को हवा में फेंक कर चुनाव में लाभ उठाने

के लिए यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाया जाये। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जागरूक है वह समझती है कि यद्यपि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने गलतियों की हैं, लेकिन अगर इस पार्टी को बहुमत न मिला, तो इ देश में अराजकता होगी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपोजीशन में कौन कौन से महानुभाव हैं, जिन की पार्टी मैजारिटी में आयेगी क्या उन के पास चुनाव के लिए पर्याप्त कैंडिडेट्स हैं ?

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव बिल्कुल गलत तर्कहीन, गलत आंकड़ों पर, गलत तथ्यों पर, गलत समय में और गलत व्यक्तियों के द्वारा रखा गया है। इस लिए मैं इस का विरोध करता हूँ।

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The irony of fate is that this no confidence motion against Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government has been tabled by the Communist Party of India some of whose Members were very active and offered their support to Mrs. Indira Gandhi at the time of the tussle for the Prime Ministership of India. This is the most unkindest cut of all, I would say.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You would have supported Mr. Morarji Desai?

Shri Hem Barua: No, not that. Let me divulge a secret. When certain Members of the Communist Party came and told me: Mr. Barua, you should be active in seeing that she becomes the Prime Minister of India I said: I have nothing to do about it because it is the Congress Party which should elect its leader and he or she would become the Prime Minister of India. We have that sort of a moral standard and moral strength also. Whatever that might be, we do not try to divide the Congress Party into group of reactionaries and progressives.

Congress Party is a party as a whole for us and we criticise that party or Government, we criticise it as a whole; we do not try to draw a line of dis-

tinction like that. But the very fact that the Communist Party, some of whose Members offered active support to Mrs. Indira Gandhi at the time of her election to Prime Ministership have tabled this motion shows how her government has deteriorated beyond redemption. Or else, why should her own friends have turned their backs against her?

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Their support was not solicited.

Shri Hem Barua: It might not have been; Mr. Khadilkar knows better. I listened with patience to Mr. Azad's speech. The total impression that I have got is this. When a foreign power, Britain, ruled us for about 150 years, there was a psychology in the mind of every white man in this country as if it belonged to them and he conducted himself in that particular way. I remember what an Irish poet has said about the characteristics of Englishmen in general; this is what he said:

Pride in their port and defiance
in their eyes, I see the lords of hu-
mankind pass by.

That was the psychology that operated in this country when Britain ruled us; every blooming white man in India considered himself to be a part of the British Empire and a custodian of that empire. When I listened to Mr. Azad it was my impression that he also suffers from the same psychology: he is the custodian of the destiny of India; every congressman is the custodian of the destiny of India. That is the impression I get from his speech.

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Manubhai Shah): What is wrong about it?

Shri Hem Barua: Every Indian should feel that this country belongs to him and he belongs to this country and he must make all sacrifices for the country.

Shri Manubhai Shah: There is no contradiction.

Shri Hem Barua: He must not think that he is the ruler, and therefore he must enjoy certain privileges, whether he commits a wrong or he does not commit a wrong, and that under whatever circumstances, he must enjoy the privilege because he is a ruler. That psychology is to be demolished.

An hon. Member: The privilege that they are only to serve.

Shri Hem Barua: That is what they say, but instead of serving others, they serve themselves. That is the trouble in this country. That is the bane which Indian society suffers from today. The social mind that was created under the leadership of Gandhiji and was growing under his leadership is today experiencing a slow death, and in the face of that, individual aspirations have come to the surface, and these individual aspirations, when they come into conflict with national good, lead to a bad situation; the situation is degrading today only because of the fact that the social mind that was created under the leadership of Gandhiji is experiencing a slow death. That does not exist today, and only individual aspiration exists today, and that is why the country is going to the dogs day by day. There is no doubt about it. It is with agony that I say this.

This is what Mr. Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, said on the 19th September, 1947:—

"I am not satisfied with anything in India, and had not been for thirty years. Of course, we must meet the situation in every way we can, partly by psychology and partly by force."

The most unfortunate thing is that nobody has tried so far to meet the deteriorating situation in this country either by psychology or by force. Nobody has made any serious attempt to stabilise India or to put India on a solid foundation; that is the trouble in this country. Whether it is in the

field of economics or in the field of politics, whatever that might be these 19 years of Congress rule in this country have been a failure in every avenue of national and international life—failure in the economic field, failure in the political field, failure in the moral *cum* spiritual field. That is what has been happening throughout the 19 years of Congress rule.

An hon. Member: Misrule.

Shri Hem Barua: Yes, misrule. We must not forget one thing. At least our leaders should not forget one thing: that it is only on the capacity to canalise the nation's energies into channels of creative response that the success of leadership in this country lies, and this is more true in the case of India, because India is only recently emerging into the sunshine of freedom.

India has suffered an epoch of economic travail and torpor under alien rule. To be honest, has our leadership succeeded in sizing itself up to the compulsions of time? It has not. Have they succeeded in generating the dynamo of social mobility as soon as we became free? What happened after we became free? The intoxication of power became a psychological obsession with our leaders, and therefore no attempt was made to ignite or to generate the dynamo of social mobility in this country. We talk of China. What about China? In China, the capture of political power was not an end in itself. That was the beginning of a process for economic re-generation. We are in conflict with China today. That is bad. But I would say that the struggle for supremacy between India and China would be decided not in defence matters but in the economic field. If our economic conditions progress, possibly we shall be able to defeat China more easily than we can expect.

What is the position of Chinese agriculture? Chinese agriculture during the last four years has doubled its output. What about Chinese steel?

China's steel production has increased by four times. Like that, China has gone much ahead of us.

An. hon. Member: How does he know?

An hon. Member: Slave labour.

श्री मधु लिमये : श्री हेम बरुआ के आंकड़े सही हैं ।

Shri Hem Barua: I have the figures. If he cannot rely upon these figures, let him verify. The Government may come with their figures. (*Interruption*) We have the democratic system or whatever that be. But the fact remains that China has progressed compared to us even in the field of economics. That is what I say.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): First class propagandists.

Shri Hem Barua: I am being dubbed as a first class....

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Not you, but the Chinese.

Shri Hem Barua: Mr. Asoka Mehta said in that meeting that we should adopt the Chinese method of propaganda and he cited some instances also.

A few streamlined administrative buildings or steel plants cannot be the real barometers of progress. The most glaring fact is that India's poverty is profound and pervasive. It still remains and increases in the broad chunk of our community. Despite huge borrowings and huge spendings, there has been no appreciable rise in our living standard. The Five Year Plans invariably miss the targets. Industrial progress is tardy and our agriculture is in the doldrums. Now there is almost famine condition all over the country. I had the privilege of touring the rural areas of Assam thoroughly. I found that people have gone without food for three or four days and at the same time there are floods. This is how Indian people are starving today due to floods in certain

places and drought conditions in other places.

We talk of the resurgence of this country. Where is the resurgence except in the production of children—8 million babies a year....

Shri Mohammed Koya: What about the loop?

Shri Hem Barua: I know the loops are being distributed in the villages like *prasad* from the Hanuman Mandir here. But the villagers are not taught the art of using them. Our Health Minister, Dr. Sushila Nayar, should instruct her doctors to go to the villages, ask every woman how many children she has and if she has three children immediately fix the loop. That is the way to prevent India from becoming over-populated.

In spite of the much-publicised five year plans, there is a chronic shortage of food and consumer goods also. Besides, unemployment remains a problem and is getting stabilised at a dismal level. During the plan period between March 1961 and September 1963 it has been pointed out that there has been an increase of employment to the extent of 14.4 lakhs people. But should he forget that out of these 14.4 lakhs people, 7.2 lakhs are absorbed in the administrative branches of Government, which are not productive? That means, they are simply increasing the strength of Parkinson's army.

Where are the signs of buoyancy? Even the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has admitted in August 1964 that,—

"While the fact of Plan implementation being defective was being increasingly realised, it had equally to be recognised that planning itself was defective."

I would say, it is a tragic confession, and that too after spending astronomical sums of money on the plans. In terms of price, the national wealth has hardly shown any sign of increase. On the other hand, wealth has got

[Shri Hem Barua]

concentrated in the hands of a few monopolists.

Our economy, under the stewardship of the Congress Government, is almost on the breaking point.

I will tell you why I say like that. The recent decision to devalue the rupee is an official recognition of a naked fact. The naked fact is that our economy is on the breaking point and this drastic measure has been taken to rejuvenate our economy. Our foreign exchange reserve has been declining from 1964. Unfortunately, nothing was done to replenish it or to stop this decline in foreign exchange reserves. Since 1964 nothing was done. All of a sudden this drastic measure was announced. How could they have replenished it? They could have replenished it by promoting exports, putting a check on imports, putting a check on non-project adventures and so on. By all these measures they could have done it. They have not done it.

On the other hand, while this foreign exchange reserve was declining our Government has been indulging in all sorts of things. Would the Government tell us the number of limousines imported from abroad and which they possess? Could they tell us the amount of money spent on lipsticks for ugly women? These are the two things that I want to know. It is the ugly women who use it, not the pretty ones—that is my experience.

Shri Manubhai Shah: I do not mean to interrupt the hon. Member, but I may tell him that both the imports are nil.

Shri Hem Barua: That is very good. But what about the cars that the ministers have?

Shri Manubhai Shah: They are not imported. They come with the foreign nationals and are passed on to us.

They are not paid for in foreign exchange.

Shri Hem Barua: But the spare parts for them are imported from America. When these cars go wrong you have to spend money on the spare parts.

Very recently our Prime Minister said that she had decided to ride in a small car like Ambassador or something like that. Why do Government try to indulge in such petty slogans? In the present system of our economy, the Prime Minister driving in a small car like an Ambassador must not be any news at all. It is not at all inspiring. When millions of Indians go without cars, for the Prime Minister to say that she would be using a small car makes no sense at all. Therefore, it is better not to indulge in this sort of cheap strategy because the elections are approaching.

Tax evasion has become chronic in our economy. More than Rs. 200 crores of tax is annually dodged in this country. What steps have Government taken to mop up these taxes that are dodged by certain un-patriotic Indians? I remember Collin Clerks saying: "If these taxes could have been mopped up, the taxes that are evaded, the budgets in India could have been balanced without any serious difficulty and that too within a short period." What has Government done about it? The Government has done nothing about it.

Devaluation is a drastic measure to rejuvenate our ailing economy. It cannot yield the desired results unless and until the follow-up steps are taken. What about the follow-up steps? The Government are moving in a very lethargic way so far as the follow-up steps are concerned. The exports and imports trade must forthwith be nationalised. Such an action will help the Government to rejuvenate our economy by eliminating black money and back-door profits and by putting a check on corrupt practices and monopolistic tendencies

in our country. These are the ugly features of our present day economy under the auspices of this Government.

About this economy I may say that there is food shortage, there is unemployment in the country, there are so many social evils in this country and, unfortunately, nothing has been done. Not even Shrimati Indira Gandhi has tried to do anything to put the house in order. She has inherited so many things. Her success would depend on the degree of attention she pays to these urgent problems that face our country today. But she has not been doing that.

Coming to our foreign policy, it is a matter on which our Government pays a good lot of attention. They think that because of the foreign policy pursued by India, our image has gone up very high all over the world. Now what has happened is this preoccupation with foreign policy, even at the risk of neglecting our national affairs, has resulted in the focus being lopsided. But no foreign policy, much less non-alignment, is destined to succeed unless it is sustained by a base of sound economic and military strength at home. In this connection, I would like to invite attention to the utterance of President Radhakrishnan when China attacked India. It was Dr. Radhakrishnan who said then that India must be strong both militarily and economically. These are the two sectors in which India must be very strong.

Our debacle during the Chinese aggression in 1962 is a turning point in the position that we enjoyed in international affairs. Never was India humiliated before as she had been humiliated in 1962 in the eyes of the world. China had not only occupied by force 14,500 sq. miles of our territory in Ladakh but compelled India to demilitarise NEFA also and thereby succeeded in building up the image of a 10 foot man casting his ominous shadow on Asia and Africa. That is what China has succeeded in doing in NEFA. There was unilateral cease-

fire but China ordered us not to send Indian troops to NEFA and, somehow, like a pack of good boys, our Government has listened to that order of China, and we have not so far sent our troops to NEFA, not even to guard NEFA.

Now do you have any friends in the world, whatever Shri Swaran Singh may say? The Chinese aggression in 1962 has pin-pointed one fact, that we do not have any friends in Asia or Africa. Then, the Pakistani aggression of 1965 has pin-pointed the fact, into a very lurid light as never before. No country in the world except Yugoslavia has called Pakistani aggression on India as aggression.

An hon. Member: What about Malaysia?

Shri Hem Barua: I have gone to Malaysia. Shall I narrate what happened there? I can do it. I know it. Whatever that might be, I can understand the psychology of U.S.A. U.S.A. has offered military aid to Pakistan to fight China. So, I can understand the psychology of U.S.A. But what about the psychology of our other friend, the Soviet Union? Because she was developing friendship with Pakistan, she did not describe the Pakistani aggression of 1965 on India as aggression. In order to side-track her own responsibility, she proposed the Tashkent Conference. And what happened in the Tashkent Conference? A pact was signed under the auspices of Soviet Russia which is disgraceful to India, both in letter and in spirit.

An hon. Member: Do not say so.

Shri Hem Barua: I will prove how it is disgraceful.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Do you under-estimate the veto exercised by Soviet Russia repeatedly?

Shri Hem Barua: I will deal with that also. We as a people are thankful to Soviet Russia for her veto in the Security Council. Now, because of the developing friendship with

Pakistan, Russia could not come out and give open support to India as against Pakistan. At the same time, she had to save her face. In order to do that, she proposed the peace conference at Tashkent. The Tashkent agreement is a big hoax; it is a fraud perpetrated on India, jointly by Soviet Russia and Pakistan. I know what happened there; Shri Swaran Singh also knows it, how Mr. Kosygin went about flattering our Prime Minister. I would tell you this much also. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has left us, which is an unfortunate and tragic thing for the nation. But, at the same time, I would say that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri did not die of physical strain. Being an honest man, he died of emotional strain because, after signing the Tashkent Agreement, he knew that it was against the interests of India.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: This is all fantastic nonsense.

Shri Hem Barua: You may describe it in any way you like.

Shrimati Renaka Ray: Why drag him in?

Shri Hem Barua: Recently our Prime Minister had visited Soviet Russia. There she had issued a joint statement. What about that joint statement? There she has described certain countries in a vague way as imperialists. When she came back here and when a question was put here whether she had China in her mind, she gave a very vague reply.

Then, she has created another international problem by going against the policy pursued by India so far as two Germanies are concerned. If the Government had reversed their policy and then she had signed that joint communique, I could have understood the psychology; but she has not done that. Why is it that she left for Soviet Russia in order to sign on the dotted line of a communique drafted by the Russian leaders? I

do not understand that. That is what happened. Read the language of the Indo-Soviet Communique and you would know that that is a language of Soviet Russia; that is not the language of India which is projected in that joint communique. I say, by doing this Shrimati Indira Gandhi has brought down not only her own image but also the image of India as a whole.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Are there no imperialists in the world today? Do you mean to say that?

Shri Hem Barua: I do not want to say like that.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: That is a general reference to imperialism.

Shri Hem Barua: For me this is certain—I have said on more than one occasion in this House—that if our policy of non-alignment is really to be non-aligned it must not suffer from any emotional or psychological bias towards this bloc or that bloc. The attack on Suez is as much reprehensible, is as much a criminal attack as the rape of Hungary by Soviet Russia. The trouble about us is that while we go eloquent in condemning the attack on Suez we condone the rape of Hungary by silence. That is the trouble. Here also, there are imperialist powers in this world. For me any country that wants to expand its frontiers, like China, is an imperialist country. America is an imperialist country.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: There are imperialist countries in the world.

Shri Hem Barua: There are. My idea is that not only America is an imperialist country, China is also an imperialist country and we must have the courage to say so because we call ourselves a non-aligned nation. That is my contention.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We agree; both are imperialist, as you say.

Shri Hem Barua: That is what I have been saying because we are truly non-aligned. We have not pinned our faith to the apronstrings

of this bloc power or that bloc power. When we criticize Soviet Russia, we criticize Soviet Russia because we know that Soviet Russia is failing in certain things. When we criticize America, we know that America is failing in certain things. We have tried to maintain a balanced mind between these different powers in the world. We know those people who would condone a minister for indulging in corrupt practices simply because he happens to call himself a socialist, a progressive or a Gandhiite. My own contention is that if a Gandhiite does a wrong thing, he is as much a bad character as any other man who is not a Gandhiite but who indulges in the same wrong thing.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: He is much more a bad character if he calls himself a Gandhiite and does the same wrong.

Shri Hem Barua: You have understood it. You are right; you are absolutely right. I am very happy that

a senior Member like him has agreed with me. I am very thankful to him. But I do not understand this. There are people who say that such-and-such a person or minister is a progressive person, he is a Gandhiite, why do you go against him even if he indulges in a sort of a corrupt thing? I make no distinction between man and man. That is why I brought to your notice times without number the fact of some Members of Parliament, both men and women, renting their flats or servant quarters. We are the elected representatives of the people and if we do not have character, we do not have the right to criticize this Government for not having character.

17.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, August 2, 1966/Sravana 11, 1888 (Saka).