

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, having regard to the last part, I think that this House would, in its wisdom, express the lack of confidence in this Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the Prime Minister.

**THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is rather difficult to know how to reply to this debate. Nothing new was said. Most of the issues have been raised earlier. Towards the end of the debate, the question concerning Shri Antulay was raised. It can be called the Antulay debate and not a no-confidence debate. Hon. Members of the opposition were trying to find new reasons to clothe the same old thing arguments. I am not a lawyer but, I have had occasion to read something about the law—the last years compelled me to do so! I noticed that he who was defending a case that had no defence was the loudest in his arguments. This is what we have heard here.

I am not going into the question of corruption. Those who were on the Treasury Benches in the years just before are hardly the people to throw stones. It is their good fortune that we do not want to be vindictive. We do not want to labour these issues. There is hardly a person against whom his own colleagues, have not brought forward serious and cogent allegations. There are hardly a few whose reputations were not the subject of talk not only in India but in far corners of the world, as for instance I was told when I went to London, in 1978. Now to pretend to be clothed in innocence neither rings true nor is it even funny.

Motions of No-Confidence are brought to discuss serious questions. What were the issues raised here? Have they not been discussed, in the last few days, not just in passing but for hours and hours and hours? Did the Essential Services Maintenance

Bill not go on into the early hours of the next day? You, Sir, yourself corrected Shri Stephen informing him that the debate lasted for 22 hours or something like that. Was that an issue to bring up in a No-Confidence Motion almost immediately afterwards? And it is the same with the other questions. Take the Antulay issue; has it not been discussed day after day ever since it came up?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about unemployment?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Unemployment has been mentioned alreday. Perhaps an hon. Member did speak of unemployment, saying that 'I had not solved unemployment'. With great respect may I ask if he can tell me who has solved the unemployment problem and in which country except those which are grossly under-populated and have to import labour. If we had a population of only six million or so, we would certainly not have unemployment. But who is not aware of our population problem? As my friend, Mohsina Kidwai, pointed out, when we were trying to convince people of the importance of the population problem and promoting programmes, the opposition went all out to jettison the project.

Two or three people seem to have coordinated their policy to say that we have given up our old policy and that we do not have the will. Sir, there is a party there—I am not taking the name because they will only make a noise and I know everybody is tired and wants to go home.

AN. HON MEMBER: You take the name.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I shall not because I still have many hours work left. (Interruptions) I do not want to take any names, that is what I said. But there are parties who have made it their main strategy to spread falsehood. What nonsense was not spread about the Family

Planning programme? How many people did they unearth who were forcibly sterilised? How many of them had to be helped? You had said that you would give Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 10,000? How many people were given that money? How many people came forward? Nothing was heard about it afterwards when your Government came in power. This is only one instance.

What did the then Government do to our industry? Some eloquent words were spoken about our not having faith in industrial labour and industrial labour not having faith in us. What happened during the Janata Party period? Did they have faith in them? Why then did they vote for us if they had faith in them? And how many times—I should like to ask my hon. friend who initiated the debate, he said he had participated in no confidence debates against the Janata Party—I have looked up the records. I am sorry to say that I did not find any evidence of this I have looked up two instances of such motions in 1978. You may not have spoken for the Janata Party but you did not support the No-Confidence motion. In fact,...

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Mr. Speaker, let Mr. Stephen...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I could not come across it. If you have done so then I accept your word. But I was shown the records a short while ago...

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: You correct it. I spoke in favour of No-Confidence and voted. He remembers my speech. The other day he referred to it in his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us find out.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: He remembers it, because he referred to it.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You voted against the no-confidence motion, in

1978. You voted against the no-confidence motion; your party voted against the no-confidence motion.

MR. SPEAKER: It will be a privilege motion. We will find out.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you standing? Are you more eloquent than he?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: That is absolutely untrue.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Your word is accepted.

This is something which can be easily checked. As I said, I have only looked at the records sitting here now. I do not know what happened before. But from what I read, it seems very clear to me that the no-confidence motion was not supported. To the world outside and to the people of India it seemed as if both the communist parties, broadly speaking—they may or may not have voted, that is immaterial—sometimes they did speak against the Janata Party but broadly speaking in every important issue—they supported their policies... (Interruptions) No, no, I do not accept it.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: CPI never supported the Janta Party ...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: ... as today they are also siding with the rightist elements; you were siding with them then, you are siding with them now, and you are doing everything possible to weaken our effort, knowing that your feeble movements will strengthen the rightists. You may not want to be rightist; I am not concerned with whether you do or do not. But your actions brought in the Rightists before and today you are strengthening them. And I might tell you what an hon. Member has told me. I asked: Do you think that bringing in the Rightists is going to help the country? He said: "No. It will



[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

disrupt the country; it will destroy the country. But they won't be able to touch us"!

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Who is this Member?

PROF. N. G. RANGA: No need to mention names.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not mentioning any names. (Interruptions) But I am not interested in what you think about me. All of you have poured the worst venom, not only on me now, but on my father whilst he was alive. Don't think that I have forgotten all that nor have I forgotten what anybody said. Don't tell me now what you said then, and what you have been saying since, and what you are saying now. I have read it. I have ears to hear and eyes to see and if some of you don't know your own history I am sorry. I was with my father. I know what he had to go through. (Interruptions) Don't make me go into that history because you will be sorry for it. Once before I said it and then you went on and on criticising me for going into such matters. He was called a stooge of the British. He was told by the Communist Party, a stooge of the British. (Interruptions). It is no use shaking your head. If you don't know, keep quiet. I am not distorting facts. I am not used to distorting them. I have never in my life distorted anything knowingly. I may make a mistake if I don't know but this is something I do know, because I was very close to the scene of action. (Interruptions) I am not bothered about what you think of me. We have had enough experience of these groupings, people hopping from party to party for a long time, not just in 1977. It has happened in different States. But in 1977, not only the Indian people, but the people of the world had the opportunity to see how devoted the various parties were to their names, to their ideologies and to their policies. Everything was swept aside by just one desire: 'Let us throw Indira

Gandhi out. Let us somehow get hold of the chair of power.' Our party alone stood up against all the attacks, all the venom, all the hardship. We kept to our name, our ideals and our programmes. (Interruptions).

We have been wedded to certain basic policies. We have not changed those. If we consider those policies irrelevant to the new India we may have to change something but I don't think that is ever going to happen. Because, they are the basic guidelines which are relevant to the Indian condition, the Indian situation and Indian circumstances. But, as we go along, we do have to take some new steps. If something is torn, you have to repair it. And this is what we have to do now. It is not some little thing that was torn. The entire structure was dislocated, the Railways, the Industry and other programmes. They were all totally dislocated. I did not want to repeat all these things but one just has to have the correct picture. I have been taunted that I promised a Government that works. Do you imagine that if we were not working, we could have made such progress in coal and the other items. I have the figures here, I can read them. Those who discredited India's name abroad, when they see that India once more counts, are the ones to tell us that our foreign policy is wrong. (Interruption)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore): What about increase in corruption?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Who increased corruption? What are you talking about? It is the Janata party which institutionalised corruption.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Please sit down.

Please sit down. Behave properly.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is unfortunate. (Interruptions). I am not yielding. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I have a point of order. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Mr. Jethmalani, will you please take your seat?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Jethmalani, you cannot intervene. Please sit down. You cannot intervene now.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: If you are requesting on grounds of civility, I shall drop it.

But I have a point of order. (Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप स्पीकर हैं या मैं स्पीकर हूँ, मुझे बताना दीजिये। मेरा काम मुझ करन दीजिये।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Sir, there is a convention that when the leader of the House speaks, there should not be any intervention.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I would explain it to them.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: When people sleep, you can wake them up. You can try to tell them. But when they deliberately shut their eyes, then it is not possible to convince them, of anything. Whether it be in the economic field, foreign policy or the overall domestic scene, government has been acting with clarity, decisiveness and vigour. The world knows that today in India there is a Government, not a collection of disparate groups, some moving from party to party and ultimately landing themselves where they are. In 1980, we inherited... (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR): Sir, there must be some decency. You must tell me about the convention that when the Leader of the House speaks, there should be no interruptions.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: In 1980, we inherited an economy which was heading towards total collapse. The decline in our G.N.P. in 1979-80 was 4.5 per cent and the percentage rise in the wholesale price was 23 per cent. Today, according to the impartial assessment of the World Bank our GNP has registered a growth rate of 7 to 8 per cent. The increase in the wholesale price index over the year has come down from 23 per cent in January 1980 to 15 per cent in January 1981 and to less than 9 per cent today. I entirely agree that unless this has an effect on the prices in the market there is not much use quoting figures to an ordinary man in the street. But this is the first step. Unless the wholesale prices come down you cannot bring the others down. The Janata party did not even bring the rate of growth of inflation down, the rate of growth of inflation was going up during the Janata Party Government regime. At least this is one item that we have curbed.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Even our critics have accepted that we stabilised the prices.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: As I said, when prices were sky-rocketing then, I heard no voice of criticism from the other side. Only towards the end when the Janata Party was cracking did some people pick up the courage to speak and of course when the Party broke, they loudly spoke one against the other. But before that nobody mentioned these matters, although prices had started increasing soon after they came to power.

There has been persistent misrepresentation about inflation in India. Nobody with any sense of responsibility can claim that there could be a zero rate of growth in inflation in present-



[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

day world conditions. The average world rate of inflation—these figures have been quoted but I am going to repeat them—was 15 per cent during 1980. The average for Latin America was 56.6 per cent; for West Asia it was 57.6 per cent; for Africa 17.6 per cent. Even for industrialised countries the average rate of inflation has been around 11.3. If we have been able to contain the rate of inflation in India by a series of prudent steps to less than 9 per cent, certainly it is an achievement for which we can take credit.

Now take our economic infra-structure. In 1980, we inherited an infrastructure, which was in shambles. We have now brought the key sectors—power, coal and railways—back to work. *(Interruptions)*

एकमीडिअस, सेवोटज किसने किया था?

When you take back people to work who had earlier committed sabotage, who had been dismissed for good reasons, do you expect that service to work properly?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: When those who were dismissed even in 1974 strike, were taken back; in the first year I projected a surplus of Rs. 65 crore, and it had gone to Rs. 124 crores. Please go through that.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No. In everything you had good movement in the beginning. That was the momentum which we had left; just as we have had difficulty in picking it up because of the slide back after you left. If the country had not we would have gone much faster.

In the Railways the Budget for the current financial year envisages a loading of 20 million tonnes more than last year i.e. 215 million tonnes against 195 million tonnes. Out of the additional 10 million tonnes, nearly 12.5 million tonnes of additional traffic has already been loaded in the first five months of the current financial year. Therefore, we are confident that we

will exceed the Budget estimates of 215 million tonnes and make it a year of the highest revenue originating loading ever achieved in Indian Railways.

Now with regard to coal, it has registered an increase of 9 per cent over the same period last year.

About railways, I think I did not give this figure before, the railways moved 15 per cent more freight during the first quarter of this year compared with the same period of last year; and power generation increased by 17 per cent compared with the same period last year.

It is for the people to decide whether the Government is working or not.

Now, take industrial production. We have brought the key industrial sectors from a stage of stupor to a dynamic growth track as will be evident from the fact about production. In the first quarter of the current year, there was 26 per cent increase in the production of saleable steel, 46 per cent in fertiliser and 20 per cent in cement. From a level of minus 1.4 per cent growth rate in 1979-80, the growth rate for industrial sector today is 11.1 per cent plus. In the face of these facts, again it is for the people to decide.

We are tightening up the public sector. Its professional management is being improved. We have placed the highest stress on maximizing internal production of oil. As you know, the Petroleum Minister has just announced that we have succeeded in cutting down our oil imports by Rs. 1,000 crores. This is not an ordinary achievement.

Many people have referred to the fact that less man-days have been lost this year; that is also an achievement. That is not a bad thing. Still, we had to have the Essential Services (Maintenance) Bill, not because, as somebody has tried to incite the workers

by saying that we don't have faith in them... (Interruptions) Well, maybe, that is your view. I am giving my view. An attempt—very deliberate, soft-spoken attempt was made. The intention was to provoke certain people—to provoke workers into feeling that we are not interested in them farmers into feeling that we are not interested in them, and also the Sikh community—which has so bravely fought for India's freedom; on them rests much of the burden of industry as well as agriculture, nor do we have any doubts whatever about their loyalty or their efficiency. We have no doubt whatever about the patriotism of our workers. I do agree that in times of crisis, they have stood by us. Then what are we afraid of? We are afraid that there are enough people wanting to mislead them for political purposes—not for any gain to the workers themselves. And that is what I am trying to answer, if you will listen patiently.

During the recent strike in Defence Production installations we not only fell back in our production at a time when we desperately needed to increase production, but we lost Rs. 137 crores. This is the problem. The man-days lost may have been fewer in other areas, but in certain key areas, there was a situation which could cause great harm should any other type of crisis develop—the man-days lost in Defence Production were 36.20 lakhs—knowing how important defence works are for our country.

Indian Airlines, in the year 1980-81 made a profit of Rs. 2.48 crores. Air India not only covered up their losses, but during the first three months of 1981-82 made a profit of Rs. 1.98 crores.

Even in agriculture, in spite of many uncertainties of the monsoon, we hope to have a comfortable year. It is as an insurance against uncertainties of rain that we decided it was better to import grain at a time when it was easily available, rather than later being held to ransom by unscrupulous people.

It was interesting to see that having found no other valid point several Members of the Opposition spoke of the rain showers to reinforce their arguments. I should like to know how many of you have been able to attract rain in any place where you have gone?

The public distribution system which, had been completely disrupted, has been enlarged and improved; but I shall be the first to admit that it is by no means satisfactory and until it is strengthened and made more effective, neither our programmes nor goods will be able to reach every section of the people as they should. That is why all our efforts are towards this end.

Our emphasis had been on improving the infrastructure because we felt that that was basic for any other programme. It is not true to say that we are not concerned about unemployment; we are; but you cannot remove unemployment by wishing it away. We have concentrated on what we consider to be the basis and the foundation which is the infrastructure. That has improved and it is improving and it will improve. If all things go well and with the efforts that we are putting in, once the infrastructure is stabilised, as it is being done, it will be a sort of jumping of ground for many other programmes. It is only when you increase production that you can provide greater employment in industries. Each activity is linked: industry is linked with agriculture and agriculture is linked with industrial production.

Several people had spoken about our loan from the IMF. They also raised this point earlier with the Finance Minister, I was rather surprised to hear some of the arguments used and long quotations from the Birla Institute. No country today can keep away from inter-dependence. Our point is not that there should not be inter-dependence, but that inter-dependence must rest on independence. This is the message which India is taking all over the world and which we are trying to implement here in

(Shrimati Indira Gandhi)

our country. But when we found the economy in the state that it was, it was absolutely necessary that, with the huge budgetary deficit which we had never had before—it was the gift of the Janata Party—we should find funds. Either we do nothing or if we want to go ahead with our big plan, we must raise the resources. And as the Finance Minister had assured the House, I would also like to add my voice to say that there is no question whatsoever of giving in to any condition which can be against our declared policy, accepted by Parliament or against our national interest; there is absolutely no question. (Interruptions) This we have definitely told to the Monetary Fund and to all else who have approached us on this matter. Because we feel that now conditions for development are favourable if only we can get this initial help that we have gone in for a big plan and for the IMF loan.

Of the insinuations, some are ideological but most are ill-informed and irrelevant. This is not the first time that we have borrowed from abroad, but at no time was our economy intrinsically stronger or our own negotiating position better than it is now.

Every country in the world knows that my Government is not one that can be pressurised or pushed round politically, economically and militarily. So far as the domestic scene is concerned, no one can accuse me of complacency. We are not at all complacent. We see the dangers of the situation and we have not lowered our guard. Weaknesses and dangers do abound and we must fight them, but, at the same time, we must not belittle our own strength. The danger of communalism is persistent and so long there are extremists and fanatics, whether they are Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians or any other, we simply cannot rest; we must try and change the atmosphere in the

country. This is not merely a question of law and order or of punishing people; what was needed is an atmosphere of brotherhood. Tolerance has to spread. There is now a new phenomenon to which my attention was drawn in Bihar shariat. The people felt that the trouble there was politically motivated. Those who met me, were not my party people. I had gone at hardly a moment's notice and people from all sections were there. They were doing different work, picking up dead bodies or whatever; and this was their spontaneous comment to me. (Interruptions)

21.00 hrs.

मेहनती करके अब चुप कोजिए,  
बहुत कर चुके हैं ।

The Jamshedpur Inquiry the Jamshedpur report clearly, brings out the kind of evil doers that are at work; and you know that it is partly because I have fought against it all my life, not from today but ever before independence, during the independence struggle and afterwards that much of this attack and venom has been poured upon me by them and others. This, to me is the Jansangh. You can change the name a million times, but it will remain Jansangh. Nothing can be more insulting to our great leader Mahatma Gandhi than to say that the Jansangh is adopting his ideology. Nothing can be more insulting to him or to India for that matter. Do they take us for fools? People have only to read the speeches of their earlier leaders of the RSS like Golwalkar, what did they speak about Mahatma Gandhi and Mahatma Gandhi's ideas and policies.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:  
Madam, I wish you had read their speeches.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have.

AN HON. MEMBER: Better you refresh your memory.



SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You have not. Don't speak like this in this House.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I talk with deep conviction and with very deep anguish, Shri Vajpayee. It is not a nice thing for me to say this that anybody in this country should hold such views about a person like Mahatma Gandhi. But you did feel that way. (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Jansangh was founded in 1951. (Interruptions) This is not Gandhian approach. This is Indira Gandhian approach. If you want to adopt Gandhian socialism you will never say this.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: They think that we are the only people who should be tolerant and should listen to all kinds of abuse, character assassination and so on. They can't listen to even one word. Talking about character assassination—I forget who it was, an hon. Member opposite Shri Dandavate, I think, who said that he is not interested, that he was least interested in character assassination. But he sat very quiet while it was being indulged in by all of you opposite during those years.

I do not want to go into the cases against me. But one case I do want to mention. I wonder whether you know about it. I had to go all the way to Imphal, Manipur on a non-bailable warrant. Do you know what the charges was?—I was supposed to be an abettor to a person who had stolen two chickens and six eggs? This was the high esteem in which the Janata Party held character and democracy. And the person in charge was the Judge, he has the Prosecutor, he was the persecutor, he was the Government Advocate-General of Manipur and the Chairman of the Commission as well!

Now, I have no hesitation in saying that the communalists are worse than almost any other threat we have and

also casteism. Both are two sides of the same coin and this is the most reprehensible of all anti-national elements. We can easily meet external threats. But communalists, as I have said many times, are like white ants who eat up the wood or the grain from within. And the RSS is not alone in this. It has good company, or bad company in communalists of different hues and denomination. I don't say there are communalists in only one religion; they are there in all religions and anybody who is fanatical in that way, feeds the fires of fanaticism in the other extremists' group. Therefore, we have to be warned against them all equally.

Ever since the present Government assumed office, it has accorded high priority to the maintenance of law and order, which is essential to ensure an orderly life to the community. We have addressed ourselves with earnestness to this primary task and as a result of concerted efforts, the situation has shown improvement in spite of attempts by certain elements, by Certain political parties, to organise agitations on every conceivable issue or non-issue. In the past few months, there has been a perceptible fall in the incidence of violence, murders and intimidation. Of course, crime has not stopped. There are incidents of organised thefts and robbery in certain areas. But I think we can say that as a whole the law and order machinery has been successful in curbing the activities of anti-social elements. (Interruptions). When the Janata Party came in, these people also—the anti-social elements, smugglers and all—were re-based. It is not we who released them. It is the Janata Party who released them. Some of these anti-social elements were actually honoured at receptions and garlanded; pictures appeared in the newspapers. Now to suddenly say, when they have been let loose that we capture them all, is not real-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

istic. Somebody mentioned Galadhar-  
is name. It might interest the hon.  
member to know that it was in 1977  
that these people were removed from  
the list of suspects.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: What  
has happened now?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: It is a  
wrong statement.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It  
is not a wrong statement.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Please  
check from your records, Madam.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I  
have been given this information from  
the records. Why should I invent it?  
I knew nothing about them or what  
cases were against them. (Interrup-  
tions).

Offences against women are really  
a shame on all of us. I am told that  
they are showing a decrease and that  
the law and machinery is vigilant.  
But of course they still are occurring  
unfortunately. With the amendment  
of the Criminal Procedure Code, IPC  
and the Evidence Act, it is hoped  
that these will be under further con-  
trol. This is an area in which public  
opinion is very important and the op-  
inion of the neighbours.

Our friends opposite get very ex-  
cited. They can talk about any State  
they like, but if we mentioned West  
Bengal or Kerala, all of them get up.  
I am not going to say anything more  
except, can you honestly say that the  
law and order situation in Kerala is  
all right? Our people are being killed,  
but not so many as people of other  
parties.

SHRI M. M. LAWRENCE (Idukki):  
From 1959 onwards we know what  
happened.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I  
am glad that you have such deep  
knowledge, but fortunately or unfor-  
tunately, not all of it is correct. Just  
because your leaders repeat something  
in public, it does become true. But  
no one can deny, whether it is a fore-  
igner or an Indian, who has been to  
Kerala, the large number of political  
murders. Never in any part of India  
have so many political murders taken  
place, not on this scale. (Interrup-  
tions).

There is no truth in the allegation  
that I want to topple Governments.  
Either it is a guilty feeling or they  
want to have it! I do not want to  
topple any Government and my going  
to the States has been welcomed by  
the Chief Ministers, where I have so  
far been, because it enables us to get  
a better understanding of the blocs or  
obstacles in the implementation of  
various accepted programmes, spec-  
ially programmes which have to do  
with our plan. I go with central  
officials or they go earlier and some-  
times stay on later, and then follow  
up these matters and try and help the  
States in whatever way we can.

There seems to be a lot of rhetoric  
on moral values and code of ethics.  
And the question asked was whether  
my name was used in Shri Antulay's  
Trust. I saw no reason for being in  
the House. When it was addressed  
to the Finance Minister. When a  
question was asked to me in Bhub-  
neswar, I did not hesitate, I answered  
it at once. Had they followed up with  
other questions, I would have ans-  
wered those questions. I have ans-  
wered all questions. When Mr. An-  
tulay told me about this Trust—Shri  
Kaushal has read out its objects—I  
thought they were good objects. And I  
agreed that it was a good idea to help  
artists. When I was Minister for In-  
formation in '65, many artists came to  
me with some such demand. So when  
Shri Antulay told me that the Trust  
was going to help young artists, I  
thought it a good idea. In that  
sense I did give my blessings. When

he asked for my name, I advised him not to use it, not because the objective was bad or the Trust was bad but because I do not like to give permission for my name whether it is a Trust, hospital, or any other institution. There are many such requests by Chief Ministers and other people.....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Why did you not say it before? You could have said it much earlier.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Shri Indrajit Gupta, perhaps you would have stopped but I doubt whether the others would have done so.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What do you lose?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not concerned with gaining or losing. I have a single-minded purpose in life and I shall proceed towards it. And until my last breath I will be going towards it regardless of what others may say. I am not interested whether we have this Government or that Government or who is in the chair. I kept working when I was out of power. I kept working when every attempt was made to finish me off. I did not deviate from my goal. I am not interested in whether I lose or gain. And those of us in the Congress Party who have gone through the crucible of Gandhian discipline are in no need of lectures on ethics and codes of conduct from the self-professed neoconverts to Gandhian principles. I am almost tempted to quote a biblical saying 'Physician, heal thyself. However, I do wish the House and the nation to know that my Government and my party will stand for the highest principles of conduct in public life and ensure that those principles and rectitude are not only followed by all those who are privileged to exercise power but also ensure that they seem to be followed. (*Interruption*). In Garhwal I have seen with

my own eyes who has been beating up whom, who has been bashing up whose cars. As I have said earlier, my own staff was threatened.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: By whom?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have told you once before I am not interested in your question. My friend here said, if you had any courage, you could have also resigned at that time (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Who could dare threaten your staff? It is your own government there.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You would be surprised when these are goondas, they certainly dare.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: When there was Punjab Police and Haryana Police.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Punjab Police was not there; it went in little later.

I have been bashed up by your people a number of times. Who the people were, I do not know. But there were attacks on me during those three years, attacks on my life in different parts of India. (*Interruptions*) We have not indulged in such attacks. (*Interruptions*)

Now, unfortunately, provincialism was also given a push. And now there is an attempt to stir up Centre-State antagonism. We have an extraordinary situation in which a State Government says, we do not accept the plan but we will take its help.

My visits to the States have been deliberately misinterpreted. Their purpose, as I said was simply to bring about better understanding and co-ordination in regard to the development programmes that involve the Central and State Governments. They



[Shr:mati Indira Gandhi]

are not inspection tours. We aware not there to see how the State is doing its work. They were problem-solving visits and in a number of places the problems were solved and the situation improved almost immediately. It certainly would be a sad day if the Prime Minister of India cannot take interest in the development programmes all over the contry.

The danger to peace comes not only from casteism and communalism but also from frustrated people and elements who somehow want to create trouble and give Government a bad name. As I said earlier, those who throw stones should not be surprised if some stones are thrown at them. Parties whose record while in office and conduct before, after or during, has been far from commendable are now trying to pick holes in our work. I do not say all of us are angels. No party consists only of angels. We have consistently tried, where we found wrong-doing, to correct it. I can certainly say that our party is in a far better shape as a party than any of those, *(Interruptions)*...but that is your problem, not mine.

So far as foreign policy is concerned, this is a time of exceptional difficulty, and I am sorry that you were not interested enough to have the debate on foreign policy today. It just shows that you are not interested enough.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tomorrow we will have it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Tomorrow it may or may not come. No body knows what you will rake up before this.

Shri Vajpayee and some of his friends are very fond of saying that I am trying to rake up the foreign issue in order to hide some thing here. I have never wanted to hide anything. The advice my father gave me in my very early childhood was that every-

thing should be open, and that is how I have always lived. Therefore, when I see a situation, I speak up about it, and that is why we sometimes get into trouble, because there are lots of people who do not like our type of frank speaking.

There is no doubt that dangers have increased. This is acknowledge by leaders all over the world. It is even more so in our immediate neighbourhood, through no fault of ours, but nevertheless the danger is there, and we have to prepare ourselves.

You have probably seen this very morning the newspapers have reported that a final decision has been taken to accelerate the supply of F-16 to our neighbour. As I said before, it is not a question of whether a particular country should have more or less, but it is the whole attitude behind this and the tension which it is bound to cause, which it has already caused, by upsetting the balance which enjoins on us to be very careful and to see that the tranquillity of our area, which is disturbed, should be somehow restored.

Justifying the acquisition of sophisticated equipment which as I have earlier pointed out is a generation ahead of what we have our neighbour has made unjustified charges of arms build up by us. In the same statement they have also mentioned the Simla Agreement. We have been acting in the Simla spirit and we would welcome a similar policy on the part of Pakistan. But their actions do not seem to correspond to the concept of peaceful, bilateral discussion and eschewal of thoughts or policies of military solutions, nor do we think that the sophisticated weaponry which they are acquiring is compatible with the Simla spirit. Also, they lose no occasion to rake up bilateral matters. It was one of the first conditions of the Simla Agreement that such matters should be left for us to talk between ourselves. This is not the occasion to go deeper into a review of the fore-

ign scene. I have referred to it because Parliament will adjourn very shortly and I thought I should put my anxiety before you.

We all know the extreme seriousness and the delicacy of the international situation. I do not know whether the opposition does not realise it, or whether it just thinks that making trouble is more important—I am not talking about the House, I am talking of what often happens outside. By all this you do not weaken the Government if that is what you hope to do. But you do try to create an atmosphere of frustration, of despair. This is the most weakening thing that can happen to any community or any country. If we take away hope from man—at no time have I said that I personally have been able to get better production. In every single speech I have emphasised that it is the farmers of India, who were willing to adopt new ideas, adopt new methods, were able to increase their production and to make us self-reliant. It is the industrial worker of India who has helped by his sweat and labour to increase our production and to help us to diversify our industry. At no time have we said that we have done this. But we have helped them with our policy, we have helped them by giving direction and above all, we have helped by giving them hope. This is what you are trying to take away from them. This is where we all quarrel and there are bound to be quarrels, whether it is democracy or even if it is not a democratic system, wherever there are human beings there are quarrels and differences. But there are occasions when on some issues we should try and stand as one. Of course, in war time everybody says, 'We are with you, and so on', but in peace time also we have to see that hope is maintained, the people should never feel that this country has no future. It has got a bright future, and we shall go towards it step by step. By talking in anger, in envy or in desperation some Opposition spokesmen are only giving

comfort to the opponents of the country who go away to report in their papers and in other ways that India is falling to pieces. But I know that the greater part of the House and the country will stay solidly with us.

Now, one small point I want to make, which is on leadership. I am quite distressed that my side keeps on Kshetriya Gramin Bank Kanpur raising this issue. People raise it only because we are taunted by the other side. When they see that their leader is under attack, they all feel that they must rush to rescue her, but they should know very well by now that I am fully capable of looking after myself.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: They come to your rescue only.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: And also your rescue sometimes. (*Interruptions*) What I am trying to say is that although in the Congress Party there has always been a recognised leader, this does not mean that the party collapses without that leader. When one leader has gone, another has always come to take his place in a peaceful democratic manner. Whether the leader is strong or not is important, but what is more important is that the party should solid in spite of our quarrels. We do not have the strict discipline which some parties have, whether it is on this side or on that side. We allow our people to talk. That is our weakness, it is also our strength. But our party will remain strong, Indira Gandhi or no Indira Gandhi. The Congress Party is a party which is giving the programmes and policies, the implementation of which will lead this country forward. We do not think that we can solve all problems nobody has solved them in one or two generations. All we can hope is to take the country forward in the right direction and to see that it is in good hands who can take it further ahead.

So, I appeal to all the hon. Members here to defeat this Motion of No-Confidence, bearing in mind the critical days ahead on all fronts and to rise to

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

the occasion to preserve our democracy, our secularism, our national unity and to scrupulously guard against falling a prey to the forces of destabilisation within or without.  
21.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I listened with rapt attention the speeches made by my friends on the other side and the speech of the Prime Minister.

The conclusion I can come to is that the assessment of the overall situation is just-totally different. The speakers on the other side and the Prime Minister have placed a rosy picture that we have now come out of the woods, that our economy is advancing and that the future is bright. The future of the country will be very bright only when the present system is overthrown and only when a new system is established.

On the day the debate on prices was going on, I thank the Finance Minister who made one admission that wherever you go, India or to Timbuktoo—you will find that the prices will be increasing. He said:

"I will make one qualification that in a totally controlled economy where it is possible to control the supply and where it is possible to control the production, it is possible to control prices."

This is his admission. I expect, at least that admission should come from the Prime Minister and all other friends. He also said:

"That is not the economy which we have adopted. Therefore, the price control is not possible."

It is a quotation from the Finance Minister's speech. It is an admission that you are defending a system which is opposed to controlled system, meaning a socialist system. In your Constitution, in the Preamble, you have declared that India is Socialist, but you are doing just the opposite and opposing socialism.

I am reading from *Soviet affairs* dated 9th September, 1981. The head-

line is: USSR without Inflation. I quote:

"Moscow, September 9. The prices of essential goods and services have been stable in the Soviet Union over the years. There is hardly any other country where the prices should be stable as in the USSR. This stability is characteristic of the Soviet way of life. Bread and other bakery products, confectionery (except chocolates) tea, sugar, cheese and also cotton, woollen and linen textiles and products made from them are sold today at the same prices as 25 years ago. The prices of meat and meat products, butter, dairy products, eggs have not changed since 1962."

"The rent which has not changed since 1928 is the lowest in the world. The averaging is 3 to 4 per cent of a worker's family budget. The index of consumer retail prices has gone up by as little as 3 points in the USSR since 1955 whereas average monthly wages and salaries have increased by 2.3 times."

If this is the reality, the poor people of our country will have to choose between this type of social system or the type of system which you are building up for the last 34 years. Even our Speaker has said in Bhubaneswar that rich have become richer and the poor poorer. This point you did not mention.

Rashtrapati has also said—everybody admits this—that the rich have become richer and the poor poorer. This is the net result of your rule.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Our Prime Minister has cited figures to show that the wholesale price index has gone down. But we are concerned with the life of the common people. What is the price position in the consumer price index? In 1980, it was 382. In the beginning of 1981, it was 433. Now it is 447. Will the people believe you when you say that prices are going down?